

Just so Higgs boson

F. Bazzocchi

IFIC - Instituto de Física Corpuscular
University of Valencia, Apartado de Correos 22085
E-46071 Valencia, Spain

M. Fabbrichesi and P. Ullio

INFN, Sezione di Trieste and
Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati
via Beirut 4, I-34014 Trieste, Italy
(Dated: March 26, 2022)

We discuss a minimal extension to the standard model in which there are two Higgs bosons and, in addition to the usual fermion content, two fermion doublets and one fermion singlet. The little hierarchy problem is solved by the vanishing of the one-loop corrections to the quadratic terms of the scalar potential. The electro-weak ground state is therefore stable for values of the cut-off up to 10 TeV. The Higgs boson mass can take values significantly larger than the current LEP bounds and still be consistent with electro-weak precision measurements.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Qc, 12.60.Fr, 14.80.Cp, 95.35.+d

I. MOTIVATIONS

There is some tension between the value of the electroweak (EW) vacuum and the scale at which we expect new physics to become manifest according to EW precision measurements [1]. If we take the latter scale around 10 TeV as the cut-off of our effective theory, some degree of fine tuning is necessary in the scalar potential in order to guarantee the vacuum stability against radiative corrections. This little hierarchy problem – and before it the more general (and more serious) problem of the large hierarchy between the EW vacuum and the GUT and Planck scale – has been used as a clue to the development of models in which the scalar sector of the standard model is enlarged to provide better stability, as, for instance, in supersymmetry, technicolor and little-Higgs models.

Here we discuss a different approach in which no new symmetry is introduced to cancel loop corrections and instead the parameters of the Lagrangian are such as to make the one-loop corrections vanish and thus ensure the stability of the effective potential for the scalar particles up to the energy scale at which two-loop effects begin to be sizable, namely 10 TeV. Clearly, by its very nature, such a procedure can only be applied to the little hierarchy problem and not to the more general GUT or Planck scale hierarchy problem. It is a limited solution to a little (hierarchy) problem, a problem that – contrary to those arising in much larger hierarchies – may well be contingent to the choice of the Lagrangian parameters.

Given the simplicity of the idea behind this approach, it is not surprising that it was suggested early on (by Veltman [2]) in the following terms: the quadratically divergent one-loop correction to the Higgs boson mass m_h ,

$$\frac{3}{16} \frac{\Lambda^2}{v_W^2} (2m_W^2 + m_Z^2 + m_h^2 - 4m_t^2); \quad (1)$$

can be made to vanish, or at least made small enough, if m_h happens to be around 316 GeV at the tree level. The remaining contributions – not included in (1) – are proportional to the light quark masses and therefore negligible.

Such a cancellation does not originate from any dynamics and it is the accidental result of the values of the physical parameters of the theory. The absence of this quadratically divergent term in the two-point function of the scalar bosons makes possible to increase the cut-off for the theory to a higher value with respect to the standard model (SM) where the renormalization of the Higgs boson mass and the given value of the expectation value v_W impose a cut-off of around 1 TeV to avoid unnaturally precise cancellations among terms.

We now know that a value of $m_h = 316$ GeV is a little over 3 with respect to current precision measurements of EW data [1]. This however does not mean that a scenario in which the Higgs boson mass is chosen just so to make the cancellation a la Veltman is ruled out. It only means that we must either enlarge the SM with new particles propagating below 1 TeV and then redo the EW data fit [4] or introduce new physics at a higher scale, the effect of which is to correct the precision observables and make room for the shifted value of the Higgs boson mass (as described in the framework of the effective EW Lagrangian in [3]).

Bearing this in mind, we introduce the minimal extension to the SM in which

quadratically divergent contributions cancel at one-loop a la Veltman;

it is consistent with the EW precision data.

The model, as we shall see, is quite simple and provides an explicit example of an extension of the SM in which the mass of the Higgs boson can assume significantly larger values with respect to the current lower bound without having the EW precision measurements violated. In so doing, it introduces a characteristic spectrum of states beyond the SM that can be investigated at the LHC.

The model is natural in the sense that the EW vacuum is stable against a cut-off of the order of 10 TeV for a large choice of parameters. It is just so because the physical parameters are chosen by hand in order to satisfy the constraints. These parameters are however numbers of order unity and not extravagantly small or large; moreover, they can be chosen among many possible values so that no unique determination is required, as it would be in the original Veltman's condition where the only free parameter is the Higgs boson mass, or what amounts to the same thing the quartic coupling.

Because among the additional states required there is a stable neutral (exotic) fermion, we also discuss to what extent this state can be considered a candidate for dark matter.

II. THE MODEL: HOW THE HIGGS GOT ITS MASS

We consider a model in which there are two scalar EW doublets, h_1 and h_2 , the lightest scalar component of which is going to be identified with the SM Higgs boson and two Weyl fermion doublets, ψ_1 and ψ_2 . In addition, we also introduce a Weyl fermion ψ_3 which is a $SU(2)_W \times U(1)_Y$ singlet.

Let us briefly discuss to what extent this choice of new states is the minimal extension which cancels the quadratic divergence. In the model with only two Higgs bosons it is possible to reduce or indeed cancel the contribution of the top quark to the quadratic divergence but not that of the gauge bosons and the cut-off cannot be raised up to 10 TeV. We comment on this class of models in sec. V II below. The mass of a single fermion doublet (with two singlets) is necessarily proportional to the scalar field vacuum expectation and cannot be varied independently of the Veltman condition (if we want to choose naturally the Yukawa of the new fermions). Two doublet fermions are also necessary in order to be anomaly free. The singlet fermion is necessary to lift the fermion degeneracy and couple the fermions to the scalar fields.

The states of the model are similar to those of a SUSY minimal extension of the scalar sector of the SM into a Wess-Zumino chiral model in which the singlet boson has been integrated out. However, a model with softly broken supersymmetry cannot be the model we are discussing because the supersymmetry, if present at any scale, would make the quadratically divergence zero.

The Lagrangian for the scalar bosons is given by

$$L_h = \sum_{i=1,2} D_\mu h^i D^\mu h^i + V[h_1; h_2] \quad (2)$$

with the potential

$$V[h_1; h_2] = \frac{1}{2} (h_1^Y h_1)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (h_2^Y h_2)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (h_1^Y h_1) (h_2^Y h_2) + \frac{1}{4} (\tilde{h}_2^Y h_1) (\tilde{h}_1^Y h_2) + \frac{1}{5} (\tilde{h}_2^Y h_1)^2 + H \psi_3 + \frac{1}{2} (h_1^Y h_1) + \frac{1}{2} (h_2^Y h_2); \quad (3)$$

where $\tilde{h}_2 = i h_2$. The potential in eq. (3) is the most general for the two Higgs doublets once we impose a parity symmetry T_1 according to which the two doublets h_1 and h_2 are, respectively even and odd. In this way, the quadratic and quartic mixing terms are forbidden, which makes the discussion simpler.

The Lagrangian of eq. (3) can be studied to find the ground state that triggers the electroweak symmetry breaking. It is

$$\langle h_1 \rangle = \begin{matrix} 0 \\ v_1 = \frac{p}{2} \end{matrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle h_2 \rangle = \begin{matrix} \frac{p}{2} \\ 0 \end{matrix}; \quad (4)$$

The requirement of matching the EW vacuum v_w to this vacuum state constrains one parameter of the model.

The mass eigenstates of the scalar particles can thus be derived. The masses are

$$m_{h;H}^2 = v_1^2 + v_2^2 \sqrt{\frac{q}{(v_1^2 - v_2^2)^2 + (3 + 4 + 5)^2 v_1^2 v_2^2}} \quad (5)$$

$$m_A^2 = 5 v_w^2;$$

for the three neutral scalar bosons (two of which, h and H , are scalars and one, A , a pseudoscalar),

$$m_{H^\pm}^2 = (4 + 5)v_w^2; \quad (6)$$

for the charged boson H^\pm after using the constraint $v_w^2 = v_1^2 + v_2^2$ in eqs. (5)–(6).

By introducing the mixing angle α and β to rotate the scalar boson gauge states into the mass eigenstates, we write:

$$h_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \sin \alpha H^\pm \\ v_1 + \cos \alpha h \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad h_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} v_2 + \sin \alpha h \\ \cos \alpha H^\pm \end{pmatrix} + \cos \beta A; \quad (7)$$

As usual in 2 Higgs doublet model $\tan \beta = v_2/v_1$ and

$$\tan 2\beta = \frac{3v_1v_2}{(2v_2^2 - v_1^2)}; \quad (8)$$

The exotic fermion content of the model is given by two $SU(2)_W$ doublets:

$$\psi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} + \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \psi_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix};$$

and one $SU(2)_W$ singlet ψ_3 ; we can also define the Majorana 4-components fermions current eigenstates as

$$\tilde{\psi}_i^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ i \\ 0 \\ i \end{pmatrix} \quad \tilde{\psi}_i^+ = \begin{pmatrix} + \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix};$$

The SM fermions are even under the T_1 parity symmetry and therefore can have Yukawa interactions only with the scalar doublet h_1 . The exotic doublet fermions ψ_i are odd under this parity symmetry while the singlet ψ_3 is even. We also introduce an additional parity T_2 under which the Higgs bosons are even while all the exotic fermions are odd (SM particles are always even under both parities). In this way the exotic fermions do not mix with the SM fermions and may have Yukawa terms only with the scalar doublet h_2 .

The Lagrangian for the exotic fermions is simply given by the kinetic and the Yukawa terms, that is

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{kin} + \mathcal{L}_m; \quad (9)$$

where \mathcal{L}_{kin} is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{kin} = \bar{\psi}_1 \hat{D} \psi_1 + \bar{\psi}_2 \hat{D} \psi_2 + \bar{\psi}_3 \hat{D} \psi_3$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_m = & \tilde{\psi}_i^+ \psi_j + \tilde{\psi}_3^+ \psi_3 + \frac{k_1}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{\psi}_3^+ h_2^y \psi_1 + \text{H.c.} \\ & + \frac{k_4}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{\psi}_3^+ h_2^y \psi_j + \text{H.c.}; \end{aligned}$$

From \mathcal{L}_m we see that the charged Dirac fermion $\tilde{\psi}^+$ has mass $m_{\tilde{\psi}^+} = m_{\tilde{\psi}}$ while once we insert eq. (4) into eq. (10) the Majorana mass matrix for the neutral states is given by

$$M^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & \\ & 0 & & \\ & & \tilde{m} & \\ & & & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} \tilde{\psi}_1^0 \\ \tilde{\psi}_2^0 \\ \tilde{\psi}_3^0 \\ \tilde{\psi}_3^+ \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} \frac{k_1 v_2}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{k_4 v_2}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{k_1 v_2}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{k_4 v_2}{\sqrt{2}} \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} \frac{p-1}{2} \\ \frac{p}{2} \\ \frac{p}{2} \\ A \end{matrix}; \quad (10)$$

This matrix is diagonalized by a neutralino mixing matrix V which satisfies $V^T M^0 V = M_{diag}^0$. From the 2-components mass eigenvectors of eq. (10) $\tilde{\psi}_{i=1,3}^0$, we define the 4-components neutral fermions that will be our neutralinos

$$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \tilde{\chi}_2^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \\ 0 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \tilde{\chi}_3^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 3 \\ 0 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix};$$

where in eq. (11) the definition of $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ takes into account that the corresponding eigenvalue of the Majorana mass matrix is negative.

EW precision measurements severely constrain the possible values of the three parameters S , T and U . In the SM, the data allow [1], for a Higgs boson mass of $m_h = 117 \text{ GeV}$,

$$\begin{aligned} S &= 0.13 \pm 0.10 \\ T &= 0.17 \pm 0.12 \\ U &= 0.22 \pm 0.13 \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

These constraints must be rescaled for the different values of the Higgs boson mass. If we want the model to be consistent with the EW precision measurements within, for instance, one sigma we have three further constraints on the parameters of the model [5] of which still remain free at this point.

A mass of the Higgs boson larger than the reference value will make the parameter T smaller, the size of the correction going like the $\ln m_h^2 = \ln \frac{m_h^2}{m_Z^2}$. This can be compensated by the fermion contribution which can give a $T > 0$ of size $m^2 \ln m^2$ where m^2 is the isospin splitting of the fermion masses. The parameter S is changed by the larger Higgs mass with a $S > 0$, a change that is in general difficult to compensate. In our model a negative contribution to S comes about because of the fermion with both Dirac and Majorana masses which gives a negative contribution proportional to $\ln(m_+ = m_{\tilde{0}_i})$, and $m_+ = m_{\tilde{0}_i}$ is the isospin mass splitting between the chargino and the neutralino i .

Let us consider their contributions to T and S separately in a simplified model which helps in visualizing better how scalar and fermion contributions compensate one other in order to accommodate the EW experimental values.

For what concerns the fermions, suppose to be in the simple case in which $m_+ = m_{\tilde{0}_i}$. The fermion contribution to the T parameter can be written as

$$T^f = T_{LL}^f + T_{LR}^f; \quad (16)$$

where T_{LL}^f takes into account the one loop contributions that arise from the vacuum polarizations of the gauge bosons of the kind $\frac{LL}{11;33}$ and $\frac{RR}{11;33}$, T_{LR}^f the ones that arise from $\frac{LR}{11;33}$ and $\frac{RL}{11;33}$. The latter are not present in the SM case. Keeping only the leading contributions, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{LL}^f &= \frac{2}{C_W^2 S_W^2 m_Z^2} \sum_i^n U_i^{\text{eff}h} m_{\tilde{0}_+}^2 + \frac{(m_{\tilde{0}_+} - m_{\tilde{0}_i})^2}{2} \log \frac{m_{\tilde{0}_+}^2}{m_Z^2} \\ &\quad \times \sum_{ij} U_{ij}^{\text{eff}h} m_{\tilde{0}_i}^2 + \frac{(m_{\tilde{0}_i} - m_{\tilde{0}_j})^2}{2} \log \frac{m_{\tilde{0}_i}^2}{m_Z^2} \\ T_{LR}^f &= \frac{2}{C_W^2 S_W^2 m_Z^2} \sum_i^n U_i^{\text{eff}h} m_{\tilde{0}_+} + m_{\tilde{0}_i} \log \frac{m_{\tilde{0}_+}^2}{m_Z^2} \\ &\quad \times \sum_{ij} \frac{U_{ij}^{\text{eff}h}}{2} m_{\tilde{0}_j} m_{\tilde{0}_i} \log \frac{m_{\tilde{0}_i}^2}{m_Z^2}; \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where U_{ij}^{eff} are effective couplings related to the neutralino mixing matrix V and are in general different for the LL contribution and for the LR one. For example $U_i^{\text{eff}h}$ in T_{LL}^f is given by $V_{ik} = V_{ik}^Y V_{ki}$. Notice that when the third neutralino decouples, the T_{LL}^f contribution goes to zero when $m_{\tilde{0}_+} = m_{\tilde{0}_{1,2}}$ and the isospin symmetry is restored. The same happens also for T_{LR}^f . In a manner similar to the T parameter, the S parameter receives a fermion contribution that can be splitted in

$$S^f = S_{LL}^f + S_{LR}^f; \quad (18)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} S_{LL}^f &= \frac{1}{3} \sum_i (U_{ij}^{\text{eff}} - 1) \left[2 \log \frac{m_{\tilde{0}_+}^2}{m_Z^2} + 2 U_{ij}^{\text{eff}} \log \frac{m_{\tilde{0}_i}^2}{m_Z^2} \right] \\ S_{LR}^f &= \frac{2}{3} (Y_R + Y_R^{\text{eff}h}); \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where $Y_{R+} = 1/2$ follows by the definition of $+$ and where we have defined $Y_{R0}^{\text{eff}h} = 2 \sum_{k=1,2} T_{3k} Y_{Rk} f(V_{ki}; V_{kj})$ where T_{3k} and Y_{Rk} are the isospin and the hypercharge of the Majorana singlets defined in eq. (9) and $f(V_{ki}; V_{kj})$ is

$$S_h^{SM} = \frac{1}{12} \log \frac{m_h^2}{m_Z^2} : \quad (23)$$

EW precision measurements indicate that at $m_h = 185 \text{ GeV}$ [1] and therefore the introduction of the fermions in our model is justified if T^S and S^S exceeds the contributions T_h^{SM} and S_h^{SM} corresponding to $m_h = 185 \text{ GeV}$. This is shown in fig. 2.

For fixed m_h and m_H , and a given fermion spectrum that accommodates the T parameter, the fermion contribution to S is fixed and therefore the only freedom left is in the values of m_A and m_{H^\pm} . In the case in which $m_{H^\pm} = m_A$, their total contribution to S has the same sign of the fermion one, therefore we expect that m_A cannot in general be too heavy. This is verified in the numerical analysis.

V. A DARK MATTER CANDIDATE?

The lightest neutral exotic fermion state in the model is similar to the neutralinos in a minimal supersymmetric extension of the SM (NMSSM) in which the composition is dominated by Higgsinos. It is stable because the Lagrangian does not contain couplings between the SM and the exotic fermions or, alternatively, you can think of the Lagrangian as written with a underlying conserved parity.

We compute by means of the program DARKSUSY [7] its relic abundance $\Omega_{DM} h^2$. To do this we need the Lagrangian written on the exotic fermion mass eigenstates:

$$\begin{aligned} 2L_m = & \sum_{i=1,2,3} m_i \tilde{\nu}_i^0 \tilde{\nu}_i^0 + \sum_{i,j=1,2,3} \tilde{\nu}_i^0 (V_{i3}^T V_{1j} P_L + V_{i3}^Y V_{1j} P_R) \tilde{\nu}_j^0 \\ & [(k_1 U_{2n}^R + k_2 U_{1n}^R) H_n] \\ & + \sum_{i,j=1,2,3} \tilde{\nu}_i^0 (V_{i3}^T V_{2j} P_L + V_{i3}^Y V_{2j} P_R) \tilde{\nu}_j^0 [\sum_{n=1,2} (k_4 U_{2n}^R + k_3 U_{1n}^R) H_n] \\ & + \sum_{i,j=1,2,3} \tilde{\nu}_i^0 [(i V_{i3}^T V_{1j} P_L + i V_{i3}^Y V_{1j} P_R) (k_1 \cos \alpha + k_2 \sin \alpha) \\ & + (i V_{i3}^T V_{2j} P_L - i V_{i3}^Y V_{2j} P_R) (k_4 \cos \alpha + k_3 \sin \alpha)] \tilde{\nu}_j^0 A \\ & + \tilde{\nu}_i^0 \tilde{\nu}^{+\dagger} (V_{i3}^T P_L + V_{i3}^Y P_R) ((k_2 - k_3) U_{12}^C + (k_4 - k_1) \cos \alpha) H + H \nu_i; \end{aligned}$$

where $H_{n=1,2} = h; H$ are the two neutral scalars, A the pseudoscalar, H^\pm the charged scalar, α the mixing angle defined in eq. (7) and U^R is the mixing matrix related to the real neutral components of the two doublets h_1 and h_2 given by

$$U^R = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \alpha & \sin \alpha \\ \sin \alpha & \cos \alpha \end{pmatrix}; \quad (24)$$

where α is the mixing angle defined in eq. (8).

The analysis shows that the relic abundance is always at least one order of magnitude too small than the presently favorite abundance of dark matter in the Universe. This seems to be due to the lack of cancellations among different diagrams introduced by the arbitrariness in the Yukawa couplings that makes pair annihilation rates too large. Therefore, the lightest neutral exotic fermion can at most be a marginal component of dark matter.

VI. THE MODEL SOLVED

The model has eleven parameters, 10 of which are in principle free once the ground state has been identified with v_w . If we enforce the Veltman conditions and thus make the one-loop quadratically divergent corrections vanish we are left with eight parameters. These can be traded for the masses of the 4 scalar and 4 fermion states. These can be varied and for each choice of them the S , T and U parameters computed and compared against the EW constraints.

We vary the dimensionless parameters within one order of magnitude. In particular, we keep the μ and the λ between 1 and 4 (after which the perturbative analysis may break down). Mass parameters m_h and m_H are varied between 100 and 300 GeV.

We find that for a large choice of the remaining parameters the model is consistent with the EW precision measurements. For these choices, masses as large as 450 GeV are possible for the lightest neutral scalar Higgs boson.




FIG . 3: Distribution of values for the masses m_χ vs. m_h for values of the parameters within 1% of EW precision measurements.




FIG . 4: Distribution of values for the masses m_A vs. m_h for values of the parameters within 1% of EW precision measurements.

As its mass increases those of the neutral pseudoscalar tends to favor lighter values so that there are solutions in which the lightest Higgs boson is the pseudoscalar. The lightest neutral fermion mass tends to increase together with the mass of the Higgs boson.

Figure 3 shows some of the possible values we obtain for the Higgs boson and lightest neutral fermion masses for values of the parameters which satisfy within 1% the EW precision measurements. Figure 4 shows the distribution of the masses for the scalar and pseudoscalar states under the same conditions.

Our result may help in dispelling excessive surprise in not seeing a bantam weight Higgs boson with m_h just above the current LEP bound of 117 GeV and should encourage searches at the LHC for a Higgs boson substantially heavier than the current LEP bound | what we can call a welterweight at m_h around 300 GeV or even a cruiserweight at 500 GeV. Such a scenario has been pointed out recently in [8] and [9] in the framework of the little Higgs models [10] and in [11, 13] in a two-Higgs extension of the SM.

VII. MODELS WITH TWO HIGGS BOSONS AND NO EXTRA FERMIONS

Different possibilities of realizing a minimal extension of the scalar sector of the SM could have a natural cut-off around few TeV while being compatible with EW precision measurements have been discussed in the last year. The authors of [11, 12, 13] have analyzed different realizations of the 2 Higgs doublets model (2HDM) and have

TABLE I: Representative values (among those used in the plots) of the eight parameters of the model, and mass spectrum of the most relevant states: scalar and pseudo-scalar bosons and lightest fermion, that satisfy the bounds from EW precision measurements.

(GeV) \sim (GeV)	k_1	α_1	α_2	α_3	α_4	α_5	m_h (GeV)	m_A (GeV)	m (GeV)	
173	287	1.4	8.5	4.6	2.8	8.5	5.6	146	600	131
138	128	1.6	6.3	6.4	2.3	10.6	2.9	210	417	96
276	438	2.9	7.7	5.0	8.1	7.1	8.5	304	715	223
266	381	3.8	5.3	12.5	1.7	7.0	3.5	450	460	212
239	180	3.8	4.8	11.4	7.3	11.9	2.1	470	360	190

parameterized the fine tuning parameter in terms of the dependence of the mass of the light Higgs boson on the cut-off. In the Barbieri-Hall (BH) model [11] both doublets acquire a VEV, but the small mixing angle between them makes the light scalar coupling to the top quark quite small and becomes proportional to the mass of the heavy neutral scalar. The mass of the heavy neutral scalar is then bounded by the requirement of satisfying the EW precision measurements and this allows to reach more or less 2 TeV when the light Higgs boson has a mass $m_h = 115$ GeV. The twin doublets model [12] is a particular version of the 2HDM in which only one doublet couples to the SM fermions. The symmetry of the model makes possible to improve the bound found in the BH model and to reach a cut-off between 3 and 4 TeV. Finally, the inert doublet model (IDM) [13] proposes a different picture. Instead of trying to justify through naturalness the existence of a light Higgs boson and a cut-off of few TeV, it describes the possibility of having a heavy Higgs while being still compatible with EW precision measurements. The cut-off of the model turns out to be of few TeV (a value that would be natural even in the SM context if the Higgs were heavy). The new feature of the IDM is that the model may be compatible with the EW precision measurements even in the presence of a heavy Higgs boson. This is realized thanks to the contribution to the EW parameters that arises from the heavy new scalars. In general, in the different realizations of the 2HDM the T parameter receives a SM-like contribution and a contribution that arises from loops involving the new scalars. These contributions are approximately given by [14]

$$\begin{aligned}
T_a &= \frac{3}{16 \cos^2 \frac{\alpha}{2}} \left(\cos^2 \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} \right) \log \frac{m_h^2}{m_Z^2} + \sin^2 \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} \right) \log \frac{m_H^2}{m_Z^2} \right) \\
T_b &= \frac{1}{4 s_W^2 m_W^2} \left(\cos^2 \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} \right) (m_{H^+} + m_h)^2 + \sin^2 \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} \right) (m_{H^+} + m_H)^2 + (m_{H^+} + m_A)^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \cos^2 \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} \right) (m_A + m_h)^2 - \sin^2 \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} \right) (m_A + m_H)^2 \right); \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tan \beta = v_2/v_1$ with v_i the vev of h_i and α the mixing angle between the two neutral scalars. If both the doublets acquire a VEV (BH, twin and the just-so models) T_b is negligible because $m_A + m_{H^+}$ cannot be too large (for natural choice of the α_i parameter of the potential). On the contrary, in the IDM T_b may not be negligible and can balance the contribution to T_a arising from a heavy Higgs boson; in this way, the model predicts a heavy Higgs boson and a cut-off around 3 TeV. In conclusion, in all the version of 2HDM the cut-off can be around 5 TeV but not much higher.

Our approach is different with respect to the models that present improved naturalness. The cancellation of the Veltman condition fixes our cut-off at 10 TeV and the requirements to be compatible with the EW precision measurements and to cover the most general neutral scalar spectrum forces us to include at least a new fermion doublet.

Acknowledgments

This work is partially supported by MIUR and the RTN European Program MRTN-CT-2004-503369. F.B. is supported by a MEC postdoctoral grant.

[1] S. Eidelin et al., Phys. Lett. B 592 (2004) 1.

[2] M. J. G. Velhman, Acta Phys. Polon. B 12, 437 (1981).

[3] J. A. Bagger, A. F. Falk and M. Swartz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 1385 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/9908327].

- [4] See, for instance, M. E. Peskin and J. D. Wells, Phys. Rev. D 64, 093003 (2001) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0101342](#)].
- [5] M. E. Peskin and T. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. D 46, 381 (1992).
- [6] G. Marandella, C. Schappacher and A. Strumia, Phys. Rev. D 72, 035014 (2005) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0502096](#)].
- [7] P. Gondolo, J. Edsjö, P. Ullio, L. Bergstrom, M. Schelke and E. A. Baltz, JCAP 0407, 008 (2004) [[arXiv:astro-ph/0406204](#)].
- [8] F. Bazzocchi, M. Fabbrichesi and M. Piai, Phys. Rev. D 72, 095019 (2005) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0506175](#)].
- [9] F. Bazzocchi and M. Fabbrichesi, Phys. Rev. D 70, 115008 (2004) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0407358](#)]; Nucl. Phys. B 715, 372 (2005) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0410107](#)].
- [10] N. Arkani-Hamed, A. G. Cohen and H. Georgi, Phys. Lett. B 513, 232 (2001) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0105239](#)];
N. Arkani-Hamed, A. G. Cohen, E. Katz, A. E. Nelson, T. Gregoire and J. G. Wacker, JHEP 0208, 021 (2002) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0206020](#)];
I. Low, W. Skiba and D. Smith, Phys. Rev. D 66, 072001 (2002) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0207243](#)];
- [11] R. Barbieri and L. J. Hall, [arXiv:hep-ph/0510243](#).
- [12] Z. Chacko, H. S. Goh and R. Hamik, JHEP 0601, 108 (2006) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0512088](#)].
- [13] R. Barbieri, L. J. Hall and V. S. Rychkov, Phys. Rev. D 74, 015007 (2006) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0603188](#)].
- [14] J. A. Casas, J. R. Espinosa and I. Hidalgo, JHEP 0411, 057 (2004) [[hep-ph/0410298](#)].