

# Probing NMSSM Scenarios with Minimal Fine-Tuning by Searching for Decays of the Upsilon to a Light CP-Odd Higgs Boson

Radovan Dermšek,<sup>1</sup> John F. Gunion,<sup>2</sup> and Bob McElrath<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Natural Sciences, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ 08540

<sup>2</sup>Department of Physics, University of California at Davis, Davis, CA 95616

(dated: March 24, 2024)

Completely natural electroweak symmetry breaking is easily achieved in supersymmetric models if there is a SM-like Higgs boson,  $h$ , with  $m_h < 100$  GeV. In the minimal supersymmetric model, such an  $h$  decays mainly to  $b\bar{b}$  and is ruled out by LEP constraints. However, if the MSSM Higgs sector is expanded so that  $h$  decays mainly to still lighter Higgs bosons, e.g.  $h \rightarrow aa$ , with  $\text{Br}(h \rightarrow aa) > 0.7$ , and if  $m_a < 2m_b$ , then the LEP constraints are satisfied. In this letter, we show that in the next-to-minimal supersymmetric model the above  $h$  and  $a$  properties (for the lightest CP-even and CP-odd Higgs bosons, respectively) imply a lower bound on  $\text{Br}(\Upsilon \rightarrow a)$  that dedicated runs at present (and future) B factories can explore.

Low energy supersymmetry remains one of the most attractive solutions to the naturalness / hierarchy problem of the Standard Model (SM). However, the minimal supersymmetric model (MSSM), containing exactly two Higgs doublets, suffers from the "problem" and requires rather special parameter choices in order that the light Higgs mass is above LEP limits without electroweak symmetry breaking being "ne-tuned", i.e. highly sensitive to supersymmetry-breaking parameters chosen at the grand-unification scale. Both problems are easily solved by adding Higgs (super) fields to the MSSM. For generic SUSY parameters well below the TeV scale, ne-tuning is absent [1] and a SM-like  $h$  is predicted with  $m_h < 100$  GeV. Such an  $h$  can avoid LEP limits on the tightly constrained  $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z + b\bar{b}$  channel if  $\text{Br}(h \rightarrow b\bar{b})$  is small by virtue of large  $\text{Br}(h \rightarrow aa)$ , where  $a$  is a new light (typically CP-odd) Higgs boson, and  $m_a < 2m_b$  so that  $a \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  is forbidden [2]. The perfect place to search for such an  $a$  is in Upsilon decays,  $\Upsilon \rightarrow a$ . The simplest MSSM extension, the next-to-minimal supersymmetric model (NMSSM), naturally predicts that the lightest  $h$  and  $a, h_1$  and  $a_1$ , have all the right features [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. In this letter, we show that large  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1)$  implies, at fixed  $m_{a_1}$ , a lower bound on  $\text{Br}(\Upsilon \rightarrow a_1)$  (from now on,  $\Upsilon$  is the 1S resonance unless otherwise stated) that is typically within reach of present and future B factories.

In the NMSSM, a light  $a_1$  with substantial  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1)$  is a very natural possibility for  $m_Z$ -scale soft parameters developed by renormalization group running starting from  $U(1)_R$  symmetric GUT-scale soft parameters [5]. (See also [6, 7] for discussions of the light  $a_1$  scenario.) The ne-tuning-preferred  $m_{h_1} \sim 100$  GeV (for  $\tan\beta > \text{few}$ ) gives perfect consistency with precision electroweak data and the reduced  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow b\bar{b}) \sim 0.09 - 0.15$  explains the  $2:3$  excess at LEP in the  $Zb\bar{b}$  channel at  $M_{b\bar{b}} \sim 100$  GeV. The motivation for this scenario is thus very strong.

Hadron collider probes of the NMSSM Higgs sector are problematical. The  $h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1 \rightarrow 4$  ( $2m <$

$m_{a_1} < 2m_b$ ) or 4 jets ( $m_{a_1} < 2m_b$ ) signal is a very difficult one at the Tevatron and very possibly at the LHC [8, 9, 10, 11]. Higgs discovery or, at the very least, certification of a marginal LHC Higgs signal will require a linear  $e^+e^-$  collider (ILC). Direct production and detection of the  $a_1$  may be impossible at both the LHC and ILC because it is rather singlet in nature. In this letter, we show that by increasing sensitivity to  $\text{Br}(\Upsilon \rightarrow a_1)$  by one to three orders of magnitude (the exact requirement depends on  $m_{a_1}$  and  $\tan\beta$ ), there is a good chance of detecting the  $a_1$ . This constitutes a significant opportunity for current B factories and a major motivation for new super-B factories. Even with ILC  $h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1$  data, measurement of  $\text{Br}(\Upsilon \rightarrow a_1)$  and  $a_1$  decays would provide extremely valuable complementary information.

As compared to the three independent parameters needed in the MSSM context (often chosen as  $\mu, \tan\beta$  and  $M_A$ ), the Higgs sector of the NMSSM is described by the six parameters

$$\mu; A; A; \tan\beta; e; \epsilon; \quad (1)$$

where  $e = h S_i$  is the effective term generated from the  $\mathcal{S}H_u H_d$  part of the superpotential,

$A S H_u H_d$  is the associated soft-SUSY-breaking scalar potential component, and  $\mu$  and  $A$  appear in the  $\frac{1}{3} S^3$  and  $\frac{1}{3} A S^3$  terms in the superpotential and associated soft-supersymmetry-breaking potential. In addition, values must be input for the soft SUSY-breaking masses that contribute to the radiative corrections in the Higgs sector and to the Higgs decay widths. Our computations for branching ratios and so forth employ NMHDECAY [12]. An important ingredient for the results of this paper is the non-singlet fraction of the  $a_1$  defined by  $\cos A$  in

$$a_1 = \cos A A_{MSSM} + \sin A A_S; \quad (2)$$

where  $A_S$  is the CP-odd Higgs boson contained in the unmixed  $S$  complex scalar field. The coupling of  $a_1$  to  $b\bar{b}$  and  $b\bar{b}$  is then  $\propto \tan\beta \cos A; \cos A$  itself has some  $\tan\beta$  dependence with the net result that  $\tan\beta \cos A$  increases modestly with increasing  $\tan\beta$ .

In [1, 3, 4], we scanned over the NMSSM parameter space holding  $\tan\beta$  and the gaugino masses  $M_{1,2,3}$  ( $m_Z$ ) fixed, searching for choices that minimized a numerical measure,  $F$ , of EWSB re-tuning, i.e. of how precisely the GUT-scale soft-SUSY-breaking parameters must be chosen to obtain the observed value of  $m_Z$  after RG evolution. For  $F < 15$ , re-tuning is no worse than 7%, and we regard this as equivalent to absence of significant re-tuning. For the sample values of  $\tan\beta = 10$  and  $M_{1,2,3} = 100;200;300$  GeV ( $F$  only depends significantly on  $M_3$ ), to achieve the lowest  $F$  values ( $F \leq 6$ ), the  $h_1$  must be fairly SM-like and  $m_{h_1} \approx 100$  GeV is required; this is only consistent with LEP constraints for scenarios in which  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1)$  is large and  $m_{a_1} < 2m_b$ .<sup>1</sup> Crucially, for these scenarios one finds a lower bound on  $|\cos\theta_A|$  e.g.  $|\cos\theta_A| > 0.04$  at  $\tan\beta = 10$ . As described in [5], this is required in order that  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1) > 0.7$  when  $m_{a_1} < 2m_b$ .<sup>2</sup>

Aside from EWSB re-tuning, there is a question of whether re-tuning is needed to achieve large  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1)$  and  $m_{a_1} < 2m_b$  when  $F < 15$ . This was discussed in [5]. The level of such re-tuning is determined mostly by whether  $A$  and  $A'$  need to be re-tuned. (For given  $s$  and  $\tan\beta$ ,  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1)$  and  $m_{a_1}$  depend significantly only on  $\mu$ ,  $A$  and  $A'$ ; all other SUSY parameters have only a tiny influence.) Since specific soft-SUSY-breaking scenarios can evade the issue of tuning  $A$  and  $A'$  altogether, in this study we do not impose a limit on the measures of  $A/A'$  re-tuning discussed in [5]. However, it is worth noting that we find that  $A/A'$  re-tuning can easily be avoided if  $m_{a_1} > 2m_b$  and  $\cos\theta_A$  is small and negative, e.g. near  $\cos\theta_A \approx -0.05$  if  $\tan\beta = 10$ . In some models, the simplest measures of  $A/A'$  re-tuning are much larger away from the preferred  $\cos\theta_A$  region and/or at substantially lower  $m_{a_1}$  values.

We now turn to  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1)$ . We have computed the branching ratio for this decay based on Eqs. (3.54), (3.58) and (3.60) of [13] (which gives all appropriate references). Eq. (3.54) gives the result based on the non-relativistic quarkonium model; Eqs. (3.58) and (3.60) give the procedures for including QCD corrections and relativistic corrections, respectively. Both cause significant suppression with respect to the non-relativistic quarkonium result. In addition, there are bound state corrections. These give a modest enhancement, rising from a small percentage at small  $m_{a_1}$  to about 20% at  $m_{a_1} = 9.2$  GeV (see the refer-




FIG. 1:  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1)$  for NMSSM scenarios with various ranges for  $m_{a_1}$ : dark grey (blue) =  $m_{a_1} < 2m_b$ ; medium grey (red) =  $2m_b < m_{a_1} < 7.5$  GeV; light grey (green) =  $7.5$  GeV  $< m_{a_1} < 8.8$  GeV; and black =  $8.8$  GeV  $< m_{a_1} < 9.2$  GeV. The plots are for  $\tan\beta = 10$  and  $M_{1,2,3}$  ( $m_Z$ ) =  $100;200;300$  GeV. The left plot comes from the  $A/A'$  scan described in the text, holding  $m_e$  ( $m_Z$ ) =  $150$  GeV fixed. The right plot shows results for  $F < 15$  scenarios with  $m_{a_1} < 9.2$  GeV found in a general scan over all NMSSM parameters holding  $\tan\beta$  and  $M_{1,2,3}$  fixed as stated.

ences in [13]).<sup>3</sup> For  $m_{a_1} \in [m_b - 2m_b; m_b + 2m_b]$ , where  $m_b \approx M_{1,2,3} \approx 50$  MeV and  $m_b \approx 50$  MeV, the  $a_1$  mixes significantly with the  $b$ , giving rise to a huge enhancement of  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1)$ . We have chosen not to plot results for  $m_{a_1} > 9.2$  GeV since we think that the old theoretical results in this region require further refinement. In Fig. 1, we present results for  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1)$  that are consistent with existing experimental limits<sup>4</sup> in two cases: (a) using a scan over  $A/A'$  values holding  $m_e$  ( $m_Z$ ) =  $150$  GeV and  $M_{1,2,3}$  ( $m_Z$ ) =  $100;200;300$  GeV fixed (in this scan, identical to that described in Ref. [5], and are also scanned over and all other SUSY-breaking parameters are fixed at  $300$  GeV { results are insensitive to this choice and, therefore, representative of the whole parameter space); (b) for the  $F < 15$  points found in the NMSSM parameter scan described earlier. In both cases,

<sup>1</sup> We should note that the precise location of the minimum in  $F$  shifts slightly as  $\tan\beta$  is varied. For example, at  $\tan\beta = 3$  ( $\tan\beta = 50$ ) the minimum is at roughly  $92$  GeV ( $102$  GeV). However, for these cases the minimum value of  $F$  is only very modestly higher at  $m_{h_1} \approx 100$  GeV, the LEP excess location.

<sup>2</sup> Also, as one approaches the  $U(1)_R \times A/A' \rightarrow 0$  symmetry limit, large  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1)$  is not possible.

<sup>3</sup> In contrast, for a scalar Higgs, bound state corrections give a very large suppression at higher Higgs masses near  $M_{1,2,3}$ .

<sup>4</sup> We impose the limits of Fig. 3 of [14], Fig. 4 of [15], and Fig. 7b of [16]. The first two limit  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow X)$ , where  $X$  is any visible state. The first provides the only strong constraint on the  $m_{a_1} < 2m_b$  region. The third gives limits on  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow X) \text{Br}(X \rightarrow h_1)$  that eliminate  $2m_b < m_{a_1} < 8.8$  GeV points with too high  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow a_1)$  (for  $m_{a_1} > 2m_b$ ,  $\text{Br}(a_1 \rightarrow h_1) \approx 0.9$ ). Since the inclusive photon spectrum from  $h_1$  decays falls as  $E$  increases, the strongest constraints are obtained for small  $m_{a_1}$ .




FIG. 2: We plot  $\text{Br}(\tau \rightarrow \gamma a_1)$  as a function of  $\cos \theta_A$  for the  $A; A$  scan, taking  $M_{1,2,3}(m_Z) = 100; 200; 300$  GeV,  $m_e(m_Z) = 150$  GeV with  $\tan \beta = 3$  (left) and  $\tan \beta = 50$  (right). The point notation is as in Fig. 1.

all points plotted pass all NM HDECAY constraints | all points have  $m_{h_1} = 100$  GeV, but avoid LEP constraints by virtue of  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1) > 0.7$  and  $m_{a_1} < 2m_b$ . For both plots, we divide results into four  $m_{a_1}$  regions:  $m_{a_1} < 2m_c$ ,  $2m_c < m_{a_1} < 7.5$  GeV,  $7.5$  GeV  $< m_{a_1} < 8.8$  GeV and  $8.8$  GeV  $< m_{a_1} < 9.2$  GeV. Fig. 1 makes clear that  $\text{Br}(\tau \rightarrow \gamma a_1)$  is mainly controlled by the non-singlet fraction of the  $a_1$  and by  $m_{a_1}$ . The only difference between the (a) and (b) plots is that  $F < 15$  restricts the range of  $\cos \theta_A$  to smaller magnitudes (implying smaller  $\text{Br}(\tau \rightarrow \gamma a_1)$ ) and narrows the  $m_{a_1}$  bands. As seen in the figure, the  $\cos \theta_A = 0.05$ ,  $m_{a_1} > 2m_c$  scenarios that can have no  $A; A$  tuning have  $\text{Br}(\tau \rightarrow \gamma a_1) < \text{few } 10^{-5}$ . For general  $\cos \theta_A$  and  $m_{a_1}$ , values of  $\text{Br}(\tau \rightarrow \gamma a_1)$  up to  $10^{-3}$  ( $5 \cdot 10^{-3}$ ) are possible for  $F < 15$  points (in the general  $A; A$  scan). In Fig. 1, points with  $\text{Br}(\tau \rightarrow \gamma a_1) > \text{few } 10^{-4}$  (depending on  $m_{a_1}$ ) are not present, having been eliminated by 90% CL limits from existing experiments. The surviving points with  $m_{a_1} < 9.2$  GeV can be mostly probed if future running, upgrades and facilities are designed so that  $\text{Br}(\tau \rightarrow \gamma a_1) \sim 10^{-7}$  can be probed. As stated earlier, predictions at higher  $m_{a_1}$  are rather uncertain, but obviously  $\text{Br}(\tau \rightarrow \gamma a_1) \neq 0$  for  $m_{a_1} \neq M_\tau$ . To access higher  $m_{a_1}$  (but  $m_{a_1} < 2m_b$ ),  $(2S) \rightarrow a_1$  and  $(3S) \rightarrow a_1$  can be employed; computation of the branching ratios requires careful attention to  $a_1$  mixing, which can lead to even larger branching ratios than for the  $\tau$  if  $m_{a_1} \sim m_b$ .

Results from the  $A; A$  scan with  $m_e = 150$  GeV and  $M_{1,2,3} = 100; 200; 300$  GeV are given in the cases of  $\tan \beta = 3$  and  $\tan \beta = 50$  in Fig. 2. Note that al-

most all  $\tan \beta = 3$  points that pass NM HDECAY and LEP constraints are consistent with existing limits on  $\text{Br}(\tau \rightarrow \gamma a_1)$ . To probe the full set of  $m_{a_1} < 9.2$  GeV points shown, sensitivity to  $\text{Br}(\tau \rightarrow \gamma a_1) < \text{few } 10^{-8}$  is needed. Conversely, for  $\tan \beta = 50$  a lot of the scan points consistent with NM HDECAY and LEP constraints are already absent because of existing limits and one need only probe down to  $\text{Br}(\tau \rightarrow \gamma a_1) \sim 10^{-6}$  to cover the  $m_{a_1} < 9.2$  GeV points.

We note that the points with small negative  $\cos \theta_A$  (e.g.  $\cos \theta_A = 0.5$  for  $\tan \beta = 10$ ) that are most likely to escape  $A; A$  tuning issues are well below the existing limits from [14, 15, 16] for all  $m_{a_1}$  values for all three  $\tan \beta$  choices.<sup>5</sup> However, none of the above analyses [14, 15, 16] have been repeated with the larger data sets available from CLEO-III, BaBar, or Belle. Presumably, much stronger constraints than those we included can be obtained. Or perhaps a  $a_1$  signal will be found.

We expect that the best way to search for the NM SSM light  $a_1$  is to use its exclusive decay modes, as this reduces backgrounds, especially those important when the photon is soft. For  $m_{a_1} > 3.6$  GeV and  $\tan \beta > 1$ , the dominant decay mode is  $a_1 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$ . For example, Ref. [19] has proposed looking for non-universality in  $\tau \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$  vs.  $\tau \rightarrow e^+ e^-$ ;  $\pi^+ \pi^-$  decays. This would fit nicely with the low- $F$  scenarios. For  $m_{a_1} < 2m_c$ ;  $2m_c < m_{a_1} < 2m_b$  the decay mode  $a_1 \rightarrow gg$  is generally in the range 20%–30%, giving a contribution to  $\tau \rightarrow gg$  at the  $10^{-4}$ – $10^{-6}$  level; the  $s\bar{s}$  mode is typically larger.

In the  $\tau$  final state, the direct  $\tau \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$  production cross section is 61 pb. Using signal=background as the criterion, this becomes the limiting factor for branching ratios below the  $4 \cdot 10^{-5}$  level when running on the (1S), and below the  $2 \cdot 10^{-4}$  level when running on the (3S). To improve upon the latter, one can select a sample of known (1S) events by looking for dipion transitions from the higher resonances. The dipion transition gives a strong kinematic constraint on the mass difference between the two  $\tau$ 's. When running on the (3S), the effective cross section in  $(3S) \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- (1S)$  is 179 pb [20].<sup>6</sup> To limit  $\text{Br}(\tau \rightarrow \gamma a_1) < 10^{-6}$ ,  $5.6 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  would need to be collected on the (3S), where  $\epsilon$  is the experimental efficiency for isolating the

<sup>5</sup> For a CP-odd  $a_1$  that decays into non-interacting states, there are further constraints available from Crystal Ball and CLEO [17]; these only apply to the scenarios considered here if  $M_1$  is reduced to a very small value (as possible without affecting EW SB fine tuning) so that  $a_1 \rightarrow e_1^0 e_1^0$  decays are significant. For example, at  $\tan \beta = 10$ , our low fine-tuning scenarios with  $M_1$  decreased to 3 GeV can yield  $m_{e_1^0} < 2$  GeV and  $\text{Br}(a_1 \rightarrow e_1^0 e_1^0) \sim 2$  [0.15; 0.35].

(Generic scenarios with substantial  $\text{Br}(\tau \rightarrow \gamma a_1) \text{Br}(a_1 \rightarrow e_1^0 e_1^0)$  were considered in [18].)

<sup>6</sup> This can also be done on the (2S) but the pions are softer, implying much lower efficiency. On the (4S) this transition has a very small branching ratio  $< 10^{-4}$ .

relevant events. This analysis can also be done on the (4S), where the (3S) is produced via ISR. The effective ISR (3S)  $\rightarrow$  ISR  $^+$  (1S) cross section is 0.78 fb. To limit  $\text{Br}(\tau \rightarrow a_1) < 10^{-6}, 1.3 \text{ ab}^{-1}$  would need to be collected. These integrated luminosities needed to probe  $\text{Br}(\tau \rightarrow a_1) < 10^{-6}$  would appear to be within reach at existing facilities and would allow discovery of the  $a_1$  for many of the favored NMSSM scenarios.

Are there other modes that would allow direct  $a_1$  detection? Reference [21] advocates  $e^+e^- \rightarrow e_1^+e_1^-a_1$  with  $a_1 \rightarrow \tau$ . This works if the  $a_1$  is very singlet, in which case  $\text{Br}(a_1 \rightarrow \tau)$  can be large. However, see [5] and earlier discussion, a minimum value of  $|\cos \theta_A|$  (e.g.  $|\cos \theta_A| > 0.04$  if  $\tan \beta = 10$ ) is required in order that  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1) > 0.7$  and  $m_{a_1} < 2m_b$ . For the general  $A \rightarrow A$  scans with  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1) > 0.7$  and  $m_{a_1} < 2m_b$  imposed,  $\text{Br}(a_1 \rightarrow \tau) < 4 \times 10^{-4}$  with values near few  $\times 10^{-5}$  being very common. It is conceivable that a super-B factory could detect a signal for  $\tau \rightarrow a_1 \tau$  which would provide a very interesting check on the consistency of the model.

Flavor changing decays based on  $b \rightarrow s a_1$  or  $s \rightarrow d a_1$ , in particular  $B \rightarrow X_s a_1$ , have been examined in [7]. All penguin diagrams containing SM particles give contributions to the  $b \rightarrow s a_1$  amplitude that are suppressed by  $\cos \theta_A = \tan \beta$  or  $\cos \theta_A = \tan^3 \beta$  (since up-type quarks couple to the  $A_{\text{NMSSM}}$  with a factor of  $1 = \tan \beta$ ). Ref. [7] identifies two diagrams involving loops containing up-type squarks and charginos that give  $b \rightarrow s a_1$  amplitudes that are proportional to  $\cos \theta_A \tan \beta$ . However, the sum of these diagrams vanishes in the super-GIM limit (e.g. equal up-type squark masses), yielding a tiny  $B \rightarrow X_s a_1$  transition rate. Away from this limit, results are highly model-dependent. In contrast, the predictions for  $\tau \rightarrow a_1$  depend essentially only on  $\cos \theta_A$ ,  $\tan \beta$  and  $m_{a_1}$ , all of which are fairly constrained for the low-ne-tuning NMSSM scenarios.

If  $m_{a_1} < 2m_c, J = \tau \rightarrow a_1$  decay will be possible. However,  $\text{Br}(J = \tau \rightarrow a_1)$  is  $10^{-9}$  ( $10^{-7}$ ) for the smallest (largest)  $|\cos \theta_A|$  values in the standard  $A \rightarrow A$  scan for  $\tan \beta = 10$ , increasing modestly as  $\tan \beta$  increases.

Before concluding, we note that a light, not-too-singlet  $a_1$  could allow consistency with the observed amount of dark-matter if the  $e_1^0$  is largely bino and  $2m_{e_1^0} \approx m_{a_1}$ . This is explored in [18]. We found that these scenarios could provide a consistent description of the dark-matter relic density in the case of a very light  $e_1^0$ . We report here that this can be coincident with the  $F < 15$  scenarios (as well as the small negative  $\cos \theta_A, m_{a_1} > 2m_c$  scenarios that are the most likely to have small  $A \rightarrow A$  ne-tuning). All that is required relative to the  $M_1 = 100 \text{ GeV}$  choice made for our scans is to decrease  $M_1$  to bring down  $m_{e_1^0}$  near  $\frac{1}{2}m_{a_1}$ .  $M_1$  is an independent parameter that has essentially no influence on the value of the ne-tuning measure  $F$  so long as  $M_1 < M_3$ .

In summary, aside from discovering the  $a_1$  in  $h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1$  decays, something that will almost certainly have to await LHC data and, because of the unusual final state, might not even be seen until the ILC, it seems that the most promising near-term possibility for testing the NMSSM scenarios for which EW SB ne-tuning is absent, or more generally any scenario with large  $\text{Br}(h_1 \rightarrow a_1 a_1)$  and  $m_{a_1} < 2m_b$ , is to employ the  $\tau \rightarrow a_1$  decay at either existing B factories or future factories.

We are grateful to Miguel Sanchis-Lozano for stressing the importance of this study as a possible motivation for super-B factories. We thank M. Peskin and S. Fleming for helpful discussions. Thanks go to the Galileo Galilei Institute (JFG) and the Aspen Center for Physics (JFG and RD) for hospitality and support during the initial stages of this research. JFG and BM are supported by DOE grant DE-FG 02-91ER 40674 and by the U.S. Davis HEFTI program. RD is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, grant DE-FG 02-90ER 40542.

- [1] R. Dermisek and J. F. Gunion, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 041801 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0502105];
- [2] R. Dermisek and J. F. Gunion, Phys. Rev. D 73, 111701 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0510322].
- [3] R. Dermisek and J. F. Gunion, in preparation.
- [4] R. Dermisek and J. F. Gunion, arXiv:hep-ph/0611197.
- [5] R. Dermisek and J. F. Gunion, arXiv:hep-ph/0611142.
- [6] B. A. Dobrescu, G. Landsberg and K. T. Matchev, Phys. Rev. D 63, 075003 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0005308]. B. A. Dobrescu and K. T. Matchev, JHEP 0009, 031 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/0008192].
- [7] G. Hiller, Phys. Rev. D 70, 034018 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0404220].
- [8] J. F. Gunion, H. E. Haber and T. Moroi, eConf C960625, LTH 095 (1996) [arXiv:hep-ph/9610337].
- [9] U. Ellwanger, J. F. Gunion, C. Hugonie and S. Moretti, arXiv:hep-ph/0305109.
- [10] U. Ellwanger, J. F. Gunion, C. Hugonie and S. Moretti, arXiv:hep-ph/0401228.
- [11] U. Ellwanger, J. F. Gunion and C. Hugonie, JHEP 0507, 041 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0503203].
- [12] U. Ellwanger, J. F. Gunion and C. Hugonie, arXiv:hep-ph/0406215.
- [13] J. F. Gunion, H. E. Haber, G. Kane and S. Dawson, The Higgs Hunter's Guide (Perseus Publishing, Cambridge, MA, 1990).
- [14] P. Franzini et al., Phys. Rev. D 35, 2883 (1987).
- [15] H. Albrecht et al. [ARGUS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B 154, 452 (1985).
- [16] H. Albrecht et al. [ARGUS Collaboration], Z. Phys. C 29, 167 (1985).
- [17] D. Antreasyan et al. [Crystal Ball Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B 251, 204 (1990); R. Balest et al. [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D 51, 2053 (1995).
- [18] J. F. Gunion, D. Hooper and B. M. O'Leary, Phys. Rev. D 73, 015011 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0509024].
- [19] M. A. Sanchis-Lozano, arXiv:hep-ph/0610046.
- [20] S. Glenn et al. [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D 59, 052003 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ex/9808008].
- [21] A. Arhrb, K. Cheung, T. J. Hou and K. W. Song, arXiv:hep-ph/0606114.