Updated: H iggs M ass Bounds Separate M odels of E lectrow eak Sym m etry B reaking

MarcoA.D az

Physics Department University of Southampton Southampton, SO 17 1BJ, U.K.

Tonnis A. ter Veldhuis and Thom as J.W eiler

Department of Physics & Astronomy Vanderbilt University Nashville, TN 37235, USA

ABSTRACT

Vacuum stability and metastability imply lower limits on the mass of the higgs boson in the Standard M odel (SM). In contrast, we present an improved calculation of an upper limit on the lightest higgs mass in supersymmetric (susy) models, by summing to all orders in perturbation theory the leading and next{to{leading logarithm s with a renorm alization group equation technique, and by including nite two-bop QCD corrections. The improvement lowers the M inim al Susy Standard M odel (M SSM) upper limit by about 10 G eV. The main uncertainty in each lim it is the value of the top m ass, which is now constrained by the recent Ferm ilab results. We study the possibility that these bounds do not overlap, and nd that (i) a m ass gap em erges between the SM and the M SSM at m $_{\rm t}$ 175 GeV for $_{\rm s}$ (M $_{\rm z}^2$) = 0:118 (0:130) of s; and between the SM and and at m_{t} 180 GeV for more generous values the M inim alplus Singlet Susy M odel [M + 1)SSM] if the independent scalar self(coupling of the latter is perturbatively small or if the tan parameter is large; these gaps widen with increasing m_{+} ;

(ii) the mass gap emerges with m $_{\rm t}$ 10 G eV lighter if only vacuum stability and not m etastability is imposed;

(iii) there is no overlap between the SM and the M SSM bounds at even sm aller values of m_t for the tan value (1{2}) preferred in Supersymmetric G rand Uni ed Theories.

Thus, a measurement of the rst higgs mass will serve to exclude either the MSSM / (M + 1)SSM higgs sectors or the SM higgs sector. In addition, we discuss the upper bound on the lightest higgs mass in SUSY models with an extended higgs sector. Finally, we comment on the discovery potential for the lightest higgses in these models.

PACS numbers: 12.60Fr, 12.60Jv, 12.15Lk, 14.80Cp. 14.80Bn

1 Introduction

The simplest and most popular possibilities for the electroweak (EW) symmetry breaking sector are the single higgs doublet of the minim al Standard M odel (SM), and the two higgs doublet sector of the M inimal Supersymmetric Standard M odel (M SSM). Experimentally, very little is known about the higgs sector of the electroweak model. However, theoretically, quite a lot of higgs physics has been calculated. The electroweak symmetry { breaking scale is known: the vacuum expectation value (vev) of the complex higgs eld is <0jj > = $v_{SM} = 2 = 175$ GeV. This value is remarkably close to the top quark mass of 176 8 10 GeV (which itself is very consistent with the values inferred from precision electroweak data, assuming the SM : $m_t = 164$ 25 GeV in [1], and more recently, $m_t = 156$ 15 GeV in [2]) announced by the CDF collaboration at Ferm ilab β]. Higgs m as bounds have been calculated, including loop corrections. One aspect of the mass bounds [4] which we quantify in this paper is the following: inputing the CDF value for the top mass into quantum loop corrections for the symmetry {breaking higgs sector leads to mutually exclusive, reliable bounds on the SM higgs mass and on the lightest M SSM higgs mass [5, 6]. From this we infer that, independent of any other measurem ent, the rst higgs m ass measurem ent will rule out one of the two main contenders for the electroweak theory: the SM, with no $10^{10}~{
m GeV}$, or the M SSM with supersymmetry breaking scale M $_{
m SUSY}$ < 1 new physics below TeV. Here we improve our previous calculation [5] of the renorm alized M SSM higgs mass by including two-loop QCD corrections and then summing to all orders in perturbation theory the leading and next { to { leading logarithm s with a renorm alization group equation (RGE) technique [7, 8]. We also use the improved stability [6, 9] and metastability [10] lower bounds on the SM higgs mass (which we summarize in x^2).

In the lim it where the masses of the pseudoscalar, heavy and charged H iggs bosons (these are m_A , m_H and m_H , de ned in x3) are large compared to M_Z (of the order of a TeV for example), the Feynman rules connecting the light H iggs in the M SSM to ordinary matter are approximately equal to the SM Feynman rules[11]. Therefore, in this lim it, the M SSM light H iggs looks very much like the SM H iggs in its production channels and decay modes; the only di erence, a vestige of the underlying supersymmetry, is that the constrained higgs self(coupling requires the M SSM higgs to be light, whereas SM vacuum stability requires the SM higgs of M SSM (with M $_{SUSY}$ < 1 TeV) by their allowed m ass values. We demonstrate these allowed m ass values in our F igures 1 and 2. Furtherm ore, the m ass of the lightest M SSM higgs rules tow ard its upper bound as the \other" higgs masses are increased. ¹ Thus, for m asses in the region where the SM higgs m ay not be distinguishable by branching ratio or width m easurem ents [13]. Only if the two bounds are separated by a gap is this am biguity avoided.

In the SM and even in supersymmetric models the main uncertainty in radiative corrections is the value of the top mass. W ith the announcement of the top quark mass, this

¹The saturation of the M SSM upper bound with increasing \other" higgs m asses is well known in tree{ level relations (the bound m_h M_z jcos(2) j approaches an equality as higgs m asses increase) [12]. The M SSM upper bound still saturates with increasing \other" higgs m asses even when one{ loop corrections are included.

m ain uncertainty is greatly reduced. The radiatively corrected observable most sensitive to the value of the top mass is the mass of the lightest higgs particle in susy models [14]: for large top mass, the top and scalar(top (t) loops dominate all other loop corrections, and the light higgs mass-squared grows as $m_t^4 \ln (m_t = m_t)$.² W e quantify this large correction, including two-loop QCD corrections and summing to all orders in perturbation theory the leading and next-to-leading logarithm s, in x3.

In addition to contrasting the M SSM with the SM, we also consider in x4 supersymm etric m odels with a non-standard H iggs sector, in particular the M inim al{plus{Singlet Susy Standard M odel [(M + 1)SSM] containing an additional SU (2) singlet, and the low energy e ective theory of SUSY m odels with a strongly interacting electroweak sector. A discussion of supersymmetric grand uni ed theories (susy GUTs) is put forth in x5; susy GUTs impose additional constraints on the low energy M SSM, leading to a lower upper bound on the lightest higgs m ass. The discovery potential for the higgs boson is analyzed in x6, and conclusions are presented in x7.

2 Standard m odel vacuum stability bound

It has been shown that when the newly reported value of the top mass is input into the renormalized elective potential for the SM higgs eld, the broken {symmetry potentialm inimum remains stable when the renormalization scale is taken all the way up to the Planck mass only if the SM higgs mass satis es the lower bound constraint [9]

$$m_{\rm H} > 139 + 2:1 \,(m_{\rm t} \ 176) \ 4:5 \left(\frac{{}^{\rm s} \ 0:118}{0:006}\right); = 10^{19} {\rm GeV}:$$
 (1)

In this equation, m assumits are in GeV, and $_{\rm s}$ is the strong coupling constant at the scale of the Z m ass. The accuracy of the bound is estimated to be 5 10 GeV. A similar but slightly lower bound is found in ref. [6]:

$$m_{\rm H} > 136 + 1.92 \,(m_{\rm t} \ 176) \ 4.25 \frac{0.118}{0.006}); = 10^{19} {\rm GeV};$$
 (2)

valid in the range 150 G eV < m $_{\rm t}$ < 200 G eV . These equations are the result of an analysis of the one-bop SM e ective potential using two bop beta functions and the appropriate m atching conditions. Here the estim ated accuracy is < 3 G eV from the theoretical calculation, and < 1 G eV from the linear t resulting in eq. (2).

The de nition of the SM which we use requires no new physics (i. e. a desert) \only" up to the scale 10^{10} GeV. We use the m_H vs. m_t curves for various cut{o values in ref. [6] to determ ine the coe cient of the m_t term at 10^{10} GeV; and we run the SM renormalization group equations (RGE's) to determ ine the coe cient of the sterm at 10^{10} C eV. The mathing buer bound for 10^{10} C eV is

 $10^{10}~{\rm G\,eV}$. The resulting lower bound for $~~10^{10}~{\rm G\,eV}$ is

$$m_{\rm H} > 131 + 1.70 \, \text{(m}_{\rm t} = 176) = 3.47 \frac{(s = 0.118)}{0.006}; = 10^{10} \text{GeV};$$
 (3)

² It is not hard to understand this fourth power dependence; the contribution of the top loop to the SM higgs self energy also scales as m_t^4 . How ever, in the SM the higgs mass is a free parameter at tree{level, and so any radiative correction to the SM higgs mass is not measurable. In contrast, in the M SSM the lightest higgs mass at tree{level is xed by other observables, and so the nite renormalization is measurable.

The accuracy of this bound should approximate that of eq. (2), < 4 GeV. Because the parameter space for a smaller SM desert is necessarily contained within the parameter space for a larger SM desert, a smaller desert in plies weaker constraints on the model; accordingly, we see that the lower bound on the higgs mass relaxes when the cut{o for new physics is reduced. In fact, it has been pointed out [9, 6] that the discovery of a higgs with low mass would place an upper limit on the scale of new physics.

This lower mass bound and the related \triviality bound" [15, 16, 17] are based on the physical requirement that the running higgs self(coupling remains positive and nite up to the energy scale . Below, this energy scale the SM is supposed to be valid. If the higgs boson mass, given by $2 v_{\text{SM}}$, is too small compared to the top quark mass, then the running higgs self(coupling turns negative at a scale below the cut-o [18]. On the other hand, if the higgs boson mass is too large, then the running self(coupling diverges at a scale below the cut $\{o, T, hus, for a given cut \{o, scale, and top quark mass m_t, to the scale below the cut a scale below the scale below the cut a scale below the scale below the scale belo$ the higgs mass is bounded from below by the vacuum stability bound, and bounded from above by the triviality bound. For large values of the $cut\{o, > 10^{10} \text{ GeV}, \text{ these bounds}$ are only weakly dependent on the value of [19, 6]. By comparing eqn. (3) with eqns. (1) and (2), we see that for a top quark mass $m_t = 176 \text{ GeV}$ and s = 0.118, an increase in from 10^{10} GeV to the Planck mass 10^{19} GeV raises the vacuum stability bound by only 5 to 8 GeV. To put it in simple term s: if the running self{coupling} is going to diverge or becom e negative, it will do so at a relatively low energy scale.

It has been known for some time [20] that the SM lower bound rises rapidly as the value of the top m ass increases through M_Z; below M_Z the bound is of order of the Linde{W einberg value, 7 G eV [21]. So what is new here is the inference from the large reported value form_t that the SM higgs lower m ass bound dram atically exceeds 100 G eV ! A dding the statistical and system atic errors of the CDF top m ass measurement in quadrature gives a top m ass ³ with a single estimated error of $m_t = 176$ 13 G eV. The D 0 collaboration has also announced discovery of the top quark [23], with a top m ass estimate of 199 30 G eV, consistent with the (better{determined}) CDF value. The main uncertainty in the SM vacuum stability bound remains the exact value of the top quark m ass. The CDF one{sigm a uncertainty of 13 G eV in the top quark m ass translates into a 22 G eV one{sigm a uncertainty in the bound of Eq. (3). The bound's dependence on the uncertainty in s, a better known parameter, is more mild.

It is possible that the observed vacuum state of our universe is not absolutely stable, but only metastable with a small probability to decay via thermal uctuations or quantum tunneling. If metastability rather than absolute stability is postulated, then a similar but weaker bound results[24]. In an accurate calculation of this metastability bound, next{to{ leading logs are included in the elective potential and one{bop ring graph contributions to the D ebye m ass are summed [10].

SM m etastability bounds are given in ref. [10] in tabular form for $_{\rm s} = 0.124$ and various values of , and in analytic form for $= 10^{19}$ GeV with various values of $_{\rm s}$. To derive the m etastability bound for our cut{o value $= 10^{10}$ GeV and various $_{\rm s}$ values, we do the following: We rst obtain the bound for $_{\rm s} = 0.124$ and $= 10^{10}$ GeV by extrapolating the

 $^{^{3}\}text{A}$ top m ass lim it independent of the top decay m odes is provided by an analysis of the W boson width: m $_{t} > 62 \text{ GeV}$ at 95% con dence [22].

values given in Table 1. of [10]. The $_{\rm s}$ {dependent term at $= 10^{19}$ GeV is obtained from eqn. (30) in [10]. Based upon our experience with running the SM RGEs from $= 10^{19}$ GeV down to $= 10^{10}$ GeV for the SM stability bound, we note that the coe cient of the $_{\rm s}$ {dependent term is renormalized down by 20% (compare eqn. (3) to eqns. (1) and (2)). So we reduce the coe cient of $_{\rm s}$ by 20%. The change in the Higgs mass bound elected by this renormalization is small, 1 or 2 GeV or less. The resulting metastability bound at $= 10^{10}$ GeV is

$$m_{\rm H} > 123 + 2.05 \,(m_{\rm t} \ 176) \ 3.9 \frac{({}^{\rm s} \ 0.118)}{0.006}) (\frac{m_{\rm t}}{176}); = 10^{10} {\rm GeV}:$$
 (4)

A coording to eq. (2), the linear t is valid to better than one GeV for $m_h > 60$ GeV, and the overall theoretical error is negligible compared to the experimental errors in the $_s$ and m_t values.

In our gures, we will present both the stability and the m etastability lower bounds. The m etastability bound is necessarily lower than the stability bound. A comparison of eqns. (3) and (4) shows that the ordering is maintained in the m_t {region of interest, below 200 GeV; beyond $m_t = 200$ GeV the tted equations are no longer valid. The CDF top m ass values including 1 allowances are 163, 176, and 189 GeV. The vacuum stability bounds following from Eq. (3) for these top quark m asses with s = 0.118 are 109, 131, and 153 GeV, respectively, whereas the m etastability bounds are 96, 123, and 150 GeV, respectively ⁴.

As is evident in eqns. (1), (2), (3), and (4), the vacuum stability and m etastability bounds on the SM higgs mass are sensitive to the value of ${}_{s}(M_{z})$. We have taken ${}_{s} = 0.118$ (the central value in the work of [9]) to produce the bounds displayed in Fig. 1. The 1994 world average derived by the Particle Data Group [26] is 0:117 0:005. The value derived from thing SM radiative corrections to LEP/SLC precision electroweak data is 0:005 in [2], and $_{\rm s}$ (M $_{\rm Z}$) = 0:122 $_{\rm S}$ (M $_{\rm Z}$) = 0:124 0:005 in [27]. Other LEP analyses, and deep inelastic leptoproduction (Euclidean) data extrapolated to the M $_{z}$ scale give low er 0:112; a comparison of low Q^2 deep{inelastic data to the B prime sum rule [28] values yields [29] $_{\rm s}$ (M $_{\rm Z}$) = 0:116^{+0:004}. The LEP working group [30] quotes a world average of _s (M _z) = 0:120 0:006 0:002, assuming the SM. If we use the generous value $_{\rm s}$ = 0:130, the stability bound on the SM higgs mass decreases by about 9 GeV for $m_t > 160$ GeV, and the m etastability bound decreases by about 8 G eV.

The vacuum stability bound on the SM higgs mass rises roughly linearly with m_t , for $m_t^{>}$ 100 GeV, whereas the upper limit on the lightest M SSM higgs mass grows quadratically with m_t . Therefore, for very large values of the top quark mass m_t , the two bounds will inevitably overlap. In addition, for low values of m_t the two bounds may overlap. For example, for very large or very small values of tan the M SSM upper bound is at least M_z , but the SM lower bound is only 60 GeV for $m_t = 130$ GeV [31]. However, for m_t heavy, but not too heavy, there may be no overlap. In what follows, we show that in fact for m_t around the value reported by the CDF collaboration, there is little (s = 0.130) or no (s = 0.118) overlap between the SM higgs mass lower bound and the M SSM upper bound. Thus, the

 $^{^{4}}$ LEP experiments have established the <u>non{existence</u> of the SM higgs particle below a mass value of 64 GeV [25].

rst measurement of the lightest higgs mass will probably su œ to exclude either the SM higgs sector, or the M SSM higgs sector!

3 The lightest higgs in the M SSM

The spectrum of the higgs sector in the M SSM contains two CP (even neutral higgses, h and H, with $m_h < m_H$ by convention, one CP (odd neutral higgs A and a charged higgs pair H). A common convenience is to parameterize the higgs sector by the mass of the CP (odd higgs m_A and the vev ratio tan $\Psi = v_B$. These two parameters completely specify the masses of the higgs particles at tree level

$$m_{H,h}^{2} = \frac{1}{2} (m_{A}^{2} + m_{Z}^{2}) \frac{1}{2} (m_{A}^{2} - m_{Z}^{2})^{2} \cos^{2} 2 + (m_{A}^{2} + m_{Z}^{2})^{2} \sin^{2} 2$$

$$m_{H}^{2} = m_{A}^{2} + m_{W}^{2}$$
(5)

in plying for example that m $_{\rm H}~>$ m $_{\rm W}$, that the upper bound on the lightest higgs m ass is given by

$$m_h j\cos(2) jM_Z;$$
 (6)

that the lightest higgs m ass vanishes at tree level if tan = 1, and that the m asses $m_{\rm H}$; $m_{\rm A}$, and $m_{\rm H}$ all increase together as any one of them is increased. However, radiative corrections strongly modify the tree level predictions in the neutral [14, 32, 33, 34] and charged [35, 33, 36] higgs sectors. Some consequences are that the charged higgs can be lighter than the W gauge boson [36], that the tan = 1 scenario, in which $m_{\rm h} = 0$ at tree level, is viable due to the possibility of a large radiatively generated m ass [34], and that the upper bound on the lightest higgs m ass is increased by term s proportional to $m_{\rm t}^4 \ln (m_{\rm t}=m_{\rm t})$, as advertised in our introduction ⁵ [14].

An important mechanism for the production of the neutral higgses in e^+e^- colliders is the brehm sstrahlung of a higgs by a Z gauge boson. Relative to the coupling of the SM higgs to two Z bosons, the Z Z H coupling is $\cos($) and the Z Z h coupling is $\sin($), where

is the m ixing angle in the CP-even neutral higgs m ass m atrix. The angle is restricted to $\frac{1}{2}$ 0, and is given at tree level by

$$\tan 2 = \frac{(m_A^2 + m_Z^2)}{(m_A^2 - m_Z^2)} \tan 2 :$$
 (7)

From Eq.(7) it is seen that the lim it $m_A ! 1$ is important for three reasons. First, it requires ! =2, implying that $\cos() ! 0$, i.e., the heavy higgs decouples from the Z gauge boson. Secondly, it requires that $\sin() ! 1$, i.e., the light higgs behaves like the SM higgs. And thirdly, $m_A ! 1$ is the lim it in which the tree level m_h saturates its maxim alvalue given in Eq. (6) for any value of tan .

⁵ N ote that in the susy lim it, $m_t = m_t$ and the ferm ion and boson loop contributions cancel each other. However, in the real world of broken susy, $m_t \notin m_t$, and the cancellation is incomplete. The top quark gets its mass from its yukawa coupling to the electroweak vev, whereas the scalar top mass arises from three sources, from D {terms, from the top yukawa coupling, but mainly from the insertion into the model of dimensionful soft susy {breaking parameters. The interplay of these diverse masses leads to the dramatic correction. N ote that the correction grows logarithm ically as m_t gets heavy, rather than decoupling!

We use the diagram atic technique with an on-shell renorm alization scheme to calculate the renorm alized lightest M SSM higgs mass, m_h [7]. We include the fullone { bop corrections from the top/bottom quarks and squarks, the leading { bg corrections from the remaining elds (charginos, neutralinos, gauge bosons, and higgs bosons) ⁶, the dom inant two { bop corrections, and the fullm om entum { dependence of the higgs self{energies. We then perform a Renorm alization G roup Equation (RGE) in provement [38] of these results in order to include the resummed leading and next{to{leading logarithms. The result is a highly accurate calculation of the lightest M SSM higgs mass, perhaps the most accurate available in the literature.

We nd the renorm alized neutral higgs masses by looking for the zeros of the determ inant of the inverse propagator matrix, including the loop corrections [8]. The two solutions to

$$_{11}(p^{2})_{22}(p^{2}) = {}^{h}_{12}(p^{2})^{i_{2}}; \qquad (8)$$

are the pole higgs masses $p^2 = m_h^2$ and $p^2 = m_H^2$. The propagators are calculated in a basis in which the CP-even higgs elds 1 and 2 are unmixed at tree-level. We renormalize each matrix element of the inverse propagator matrix rst, and later diagonalize it nonperturbatively. Furthermore, we keep the full momentum dependence of the self energies in eq. (8). This is equivalent to de ning a momentum dependent mixing angle (p^2). With this procedure, we avoid the introduction of a mixing angle counterterm, which allows us to calculate directly the renormalized mixing angle at the two physically relevant scales (m_h^2) [8].

Two{bop corrections are negative and decrease the upper bound of the higgs mass by several GeV [39]. We include the dom inant two{bop corrections of ref. [39] which include the leading and next-to-leading logarithms. Finally, using an RGE technique, we extend the results of ref.[39] by summing to all orders in perturbation theory these leading and next{to{leading logarithm terms. In order to do this, we solve the two-loop RGE [40] with a supersymmetric boundary condition at the scale M_{SUSY} to obtain the quartic higgs self{ coupling constant at the weak scale. In this way, the running higgs mass squared is equal to v^2 , where $v^2 = v_T^2 + v_B^2$ (v_T and v_B are the vevs of the two higgs doublets.). This RGE improvement[34, 39],

$$(m_{\rm h}^2)_{\rm RGE} = v^2 M_{\rm Z}^2 \cos^2 2 (m_{\rm h}^2)_{\rm inll}$$
 (9)

depends of course on the value of the top quark mass. Here (m $_{\rm h}^2$)_{lnll} contains the logarithmic part of the one{ and two{loop corrections, the so{called leading and next{to{leading logarithmis. For example, at m_t 176 GeV, we not the RGE correction to be {2 to {3 GeV for large tan and {5 to {7 GeV if tan is small. We include this correction in all of our plots.

We choose m_A and all squark m ass parameters to be large, equal to 1 TeV ⁷, in order to nd the maximum light higgs mass. With respect to the squark mixing, we work in three

⁶ Calculations of full one{loop corrections from all particles [37] have shown that nite (i.e. non{ logarithm ic) corrections due to loops with particles other than the top/bottom quarks and squarks are very sm all.

 $^{^{7}}$ W e note that $^{<}$ 1 TeV emerges naturally for the heavier superparticle masses when the M SSM is embedded into a GUT [41, 42, 43].

extrem e scenarios:

(a) no mixing, i.e., $= A_t = A_b = 0$, where is the supersymmetric higgs mass parameter and A_i , i = t; b are the trilinear soft supersymmetry breaking terms; and maximalmixing

(b) with $= A_t = A_b = 1 \text{ TeV}$,

(c) and = 1 TeV, $A_t = A_b = 1 \text{ TeV}$.

We mention again that our chosen de nition for the MSSM is the conventional one, with M_{SUSY} , all of the soft supersymmetry breaking terms, and , having a magnitude of at most 1 TeV. One of the motivations for this choice is that in supergravity models the electroweak symmetry can be broken radiatively without ne{tuning the initial parameters, if M_{SUSY} is not too large [44].

The resulting lightest higgs mass as a function of tan is shown in Fig. 1 for the CDF central value of the top quark mass and the 1 mass values. The accuracy of this bound can be estimated to be 10 GeV, which is the difference between the one{ and two{bop bound calculated before the RGE {resummation.For the case tan 1, the SM lower bound and the MSSM upper bound are separated already at $m_t = 163 \text{ GeV}$. Where if not for the SM metastability lower bound, the gap would exist for all values of tan . However, with the SM metastability bound, it is not until m_t 175 GeV that a gap exists for all values of tan . In particular, for the preferred CDF value of $m_t = 176 \text{ GeV}$, the two bounds do not overlap, making it possible to distinguish the SM and the MSSM solely on the basis of a determ ination of the higgs mass. Even for $m_t = 189 \text{ GeV}$ the gap is still increasing with increasing top mass, indicating that the eventual closing of the gap occurs at still higher values of m_t .

Should $_{\rm s}$ turn out to be closer to 0.130 than to the value 0.118 assumed here, then the separation of the SM higgs mass region from the MSSM higgs mass region is not quite com plete. We have seen that the stability and metastability lower bounds on the SM higgs mass decrease as s is increased. The MSSM mass upper bound also decreases with increasing s, but at a much sm aller rate. We nd that raising s from 0:118 to 0:130 shifts the M SSM higgs mass bound by 0.5 GeV for $m_t = 163$ and by 0.8 GeV for $m_t = 189 \text{ GeV}$. The result is that the gap apparent for all values of tan in the s = 0.118, $m_t = 176$ GeV case (displayed in our Fig. 1b), remains a gap in the $_{s} = 0.130$ case only in the tan 1 to 2 region. However, the overlapping mass region for the remaining tan values is small. The region of overlap is interesting only if the observed higgs mass turns out to lie in this region. W ith a sm all overlap region, such an occurence is a priori unlikely. A further (interesting) complication is that the best t value for s, when M SSM radiative corrections are assumed and tted to precision data, is [45] $_{s}$ (M $_{z}$) = 0:114 0:007. This lower value suggests that it may be best to compare SM bounds with a given value assumed for $_{\rm s}$ to M SSM bounds with a slightly lower value assumed for s.

In Fig. 1 we can see that scenario (c) gives us a signi cantly larger range of higgs mass values close to tan 1. This can be understood in the tan = 1 approximation: there are non-leading logarithm ic contributions to the higgs mass from loops involving the top quark and squarks that are proportional to powers of $(A_i)=m_t$ [34]. Also in Fig. 1 we see that scenarios (b) and (c) o ers a larger value for the m_h maximum than does scenario (a), except for the region tan 1. The reason is that am ong the additional light higgs mass terms in (b) is a negative term proportional to $(m_b=\cos)^4$, which becomes larger

[38] when tan 1. M ore signi cant is the fact that the extrem e values in (a), (b) and (c) yield a very sim ilar absolute upper bound in the region of acceptable tan values, thereby suggesting insensitivity of the M SSM upper bound to a considerable range of the squark m ixing parameters.

In the literature there are three popular m ethods to calculate the renorm alized higgs m ass. These are the RGE technique, the e ective potential m ethod, and the diagram atic technique. It is inform ative to compare these techniques, and to point out the advantages of the approach we have undertaken. The RGE technique is used for example in ref. [40], where the leading and next-to-leading logarithm s are sum m ed to allorders in perturbation theory to give the running higgs m ass. This technique is based on the fact that the Veltm an functions [46] which appear in the diagram m atic m ethod can be approxim ated by logarithm s when there are two di erent scales in the problem. The RGE technique sum s these logarithm s to allorders, but drops all non { logarithm ic, nite terms. These term s are offen very im portant [34, 36]. M oreover, the reliability of the RGE treatm ent of the logarithm ic term s decreases if the two scales are not very far apart (as is the case here, where the two scales are the EW and SUSY breaking scales). Num erically, the higgs m ass calculated with the RGE m ethod can di er by 10 G eV or m ore com pared to the diagram atic m ethod, even if two { loop RGE s are used.

The renorm alization group improvement (see our eq. (9)) we use in our work replaces the logarithm ic part of the corrections obtained with the diagram matic method by the resummed logarithm ic corrections as obtained with the renormalization group technique. Our results therefore incorporate both the important mite corrections at the two-loop level and the resummed leading and next{to{leading logarithm ic corrections.

The second popular technique is the elective potential method. In ref. [34] the elective potential method is compared with the diagram atic technique. Working in an on{shell scheme in both methods, it is shown that the two techniques reproduce the same answer when the tree level higgs mass is zero and when all supersymmetric particles are included in the elective potential. On the contrary, if the tree level higgs mass is non{zero, the elective potential answer has to be corrected using diagram atic methods. With these diagram matic corrections, the two methods become indistinguishable.

The elective potential method is used in ref. [47]. There the \overline{M} S renorm alization scheme is also used and so the comparison with our on {shell diagram atic method is not simple. A non {trivial ambiguity for the choice of the arbitrary scale is present in this method. A further limitation in this calculation is the inclusion in the elective potential of only SM particles. Important log terms arising from susy particle loops are therefore absent. When the susy particles are ignored, the only connection with supersymmetry is in the boundary condition for at the scale M_{SUSY} . A partial compensation is made by including the threshold elects of susy particles in the form of step {functions. W hat would be a full Veltman's function in the diagram atic method is approximated in the elective potential method by a step function shift [48] in the boundary condition: $= \frac{1}{4} (g^2 + g^{(2)}) \cos^2 2 + \cdots$

In our diagram atic m ethod these approxim ations are not present since the e ects of the non { logarithm ic terms are included in the full expressions of the Veltman's functions. For example, important non { logarithm ic e ects are included, such as the decreasing of the higgs mass when tan ! 1, 1 TeV and A = 0, as explained above and seen in Fig. 1. A lso, the e ect of large splitting in the masses of the stop squarks is automatically taken into

account in our diagram atic m ethod. These e ects are not included in ref. [47].

There are two further in provem ents that we have achieved. The rst improvem ent is the use of di erent RGEs above and below the top quark mass. Below m_t the top quark mass decouples and the RGE for does not contain the top Yukawa coupling. This e ect can be important. In principle, the RGE for the gauge couplings should also be modiled. In practice, it is a negligible e ect. (This modil cation is more complicated, since the electrow eak gauge symmetry is broken. A careful analysis can be found in ref. [38].) The second improvement is the consideration of the running of tan . In practice, this e ect is num erically small[38].

We nish this section with some comments on the decay b! s. It is known that the branching ratio B (b! s) has a strong dependence on the susy higgs parameters [49, 50, 51]. However, when all squarks are heavy, as here, the contribution from the charged/squark bops to B (b! s) is suppressed. In the case of heavy squarks, the charged {higgs/top{ quark bop m ay seriously alter the rate, and strong constraints on the charged higgs m inim um m ass result [52, 51]. This constraint does not a ect the present work, where we take m_A and therefore m_H and m_H large in order to establish the light higgs upper bound: in the large m_A, large squark m ass limit, the ratio B (b! s) approaches the SM value, consistent with the CLEO bound [53].

4 The lightest higgs in non-standard susy models

The MSSM can be extended in a straightforward fashion by adding an SU (2) singlet S with vanishing hypercharge to the theory [54]. As a consequence, the particle spectrum contains an additional scalar, pseudoscalar, and neutralino. This extended model, the so{ called (M + 1)SSM, features four possible additional terms in the superpotential. Two of these terms, SH_B H_T and $\frac{1}{3}$ S³, enter into the calculation of the lightest higgs mass; enters directly, while enters through the RG equations. is the usual antisymmetric 2 by 2 m atrix.

At tree-level, a study of the eigenvalues of the scalar m ass m atrix gives an upperbound on the m ass of the lightest higgs boson:

$$m_h^2 M_z^2 \cos^2 2 + 2 \frac{2}{g_1^2 + g_2^2} \sin^2 2$$
 : (10)

The rst term on the right hand side is just the M SSM result of Eq. (6). The second term gives a positive contribution, and since the parameter is a priori free, weakens the upperbound considerably [55, 56]. However, there are two scenarios in which the bound prooves to be very restrictive. In the rst scenario tan is large, and therefore $\cos^2 2$ is necessarily $\sin^2 2$. In the second scenario the value of is limited by the assumption of perturbative uni cation. In this latter scenario, even if assumes a high value at the GUT scale, the renorm alization group equations drive the evolving value of to a moderate value at the SUSY breaking scale. The exact higgs m assupper bound depends on the value of the running of the coupling constants is described by the (M + 1)SSM renorm alization group

equations, whereas below this scale the SM renorm alization group equations are valid. At M $_{\rm SUSY}$ the boundary conditions

$${}^{\text{SM}} = \frac{1}{8} g_1^2 + g_2^2 \quad \cos^2 2 + 2 \frac{2}{g_1^2 + g_2^2} \sin^2 2 \quad ;$$

$$g_t^{\text{SM}} = g_t \sin \quad ; \qquad (11)$$

incorporate the transition from the (M + 1)SSM to the SM. Here SM and g_t^{SM} are the standard model higgs self(coupling and top quark yukawa coupling respectively. The value of the higgs boson mass is determined implicitly by the equation 2 SM (m_h) $v_{SM}^2 = m_h^2$. This RGE procedure of running couplings from M_{SUSY} down to the weak scale takes into account logarithm ic radiative corrections to the higgs boson mass, including in particular those caused by the heavy top quark.

In Fig. 2 we show the maximum value of the higgs boson mass as a function of tan for the chosen values of the top quark mass m_t. We have adopted a susy {breaking scale of $M_{SUSY} = 1 \text{ TeV}$; this value is consistent with the notion of stabilizing the weak {to{susy}} GUT hierarchy, and is the value favored by RGE analyses of the observables \sin^2 and m_b=m. The bounds in Fig. 2 are quite insensitive to the choice of M_{SUSY}, increasing very slow ly as M_{SUSY} increases [55]. We have assumed that all superpartners and all higgs bosons except for the lightest one are heavy, i.e. M_{SUSY}. For low values of the top quark mass (M_z) , the mass upper bound on the higgs boson in the (M + 1)SSM will be substantially higher than in the MSSM at tan < a few. This is because (m_h) is large for low m_t, and because $\sin^2 2 \rightarrow \cos^2 2$ for tan < a few. However, for a larger top quark mass, as in Fig. 2, the di erence between the M SSM and (M + 1)SSM upper bounds diminishes. This is because (m_h) falls with increasing m_{t} and because there is an increasing minimum value for sin = $g_{t}^{SM} = g_{t}$ [from the second of Eqs. (11)], and therefore for tan , when m_{t} / g_{t}^{SM} is raised and q is held to be perturbatively sm all up to the GUT scale⁸. This increasing minimum value of tan is evident in the curves of Fig. 2. A comparison of Figs. 1 and 2 reveals that the (M + 1)SSM and MSSM bounds are very similar at tan > 6. Form t at or above the CDF value, only this tan $^{>}$ 6 region is viable in the (M + 1)SSM m odel.

In a fashion very similar to the (M + 1)SSM, perturbative unicaton yields a bound on the mass of the lightest higgs bosons in more complicated extensions of the MSSM. In general, the lowest eigenvalue of the scalar mass matrix is bounded by M_Z times a factor which depends on the dimensionless coupling constants in the higgs sector. The renormalizaton group equations force these coupling constants to assume relatively low values at the SUSY breaking scale, and as a consequence the mass bound on the lightest higgs boson is of the order of M_Z.

A lthough a bound on the mass of the lightest higgs boson exists in perturbative SUSY models, this is not the case in SUSY models with a strongly interacting symmetry breaking sector. The low energy physics of this class of theories is described by a supersymmetric non-linear sigma model, which is obtained by imposing the constraint H_T $H_B = \frac{1}{4}v_{SM}^2 \sin^2 2$ on the action of the MSSM [57]. This constraint is the only one possible in the MSSM

⁸K eeping g_t perturbatively small up to the GUT scale implies m_t its pseudo xed{point value of 200 sin . Therefore, a measured top mass as large as that reported by CDF requires tan > 1 in the GUT scenario, and suggests saturation of the xed{point.

higgs sector that obeys supersymmetry, is invariant under SU (2) U (1), and leaves the vev in a global minimum ⁹. As a result of this constraint one of the scalar higgs bosons, the pseudoscalar, and one of the neutralinos are eliminated from the particle spectrum. The remaining higgs boson has a mass $m_h^2 = M_Z^2 + (m_T^2 + m_B^2) \sin^2 2$, and the charged higgs bosons have masses $m_H^2 = M_W^2 + (m_T^2 + m_B^2)$. Here, m_T^2 and m_B^2 are soft, dimensionful, susy (breaking terms; they may be positive or negative.

In order for the notion of a supersymmetric non-linear model to be relevant, the susy breaking scale is required to be much smaller than the chiral symmetry breaking scale 4 v_{SM} . The natural magnitude for the parameters \mathfrak{m}_B^2 and \mathfrak{m}_T^2 is therefore of the order of M $_Z^2$. Consequently, both the neutral and the charged higgs bosons have masses of at most a few multiples of M $_Z$ in the non{linear model. This form alism of the electrice action allows a description of the low energy physics independent of the particular strongly{interacting underlying theory from which it derives. Thus we believe that the non{linear M SSM model presented here is probably representative of a class of underlying strongly{interacting susy models. The lesson learned then is that measuring a value for m_h at < 300 G eV cannot validate the SM , M SSM , (M + 1)SSM , or any other electrow eak model. How ever, the premise of this present article remains valid, that such a measurement should rule out one or more of these popular models.

5 Supersymmetric Grand Unied Theories

Supersymmetric grand {unied theories (susy GUTs) are the only simple models in which the three low energy gauge coupling constants are known to merge at the GUT scale, and hierarchy and param eter { naturalness issues are solved. Thus, it is well motivated to consider the grand unication of the low energy susy models. At low energies, SUSY GUT models reduce to the M SSM, but there are additional relations between the parameters [42]. The additional constraints must yield an e ective low energy theory that is a special case of the general MSSM we have just considered. Therefore, the upper bound 10 on m_h in such SUSY GUT models is in general lower than in the MSSM without any restrictions. The assumption of gauge coupling constant uni cation (with its implied desert between M SUSY and M GUT) presents no signi cant constraints on the low energy M SSM parameters [42, 58]. However, the further assumption that the top yukawa coupling remains perturbatively small up to tan . This is because the RGE evolves M_{GUT} leads to the low energy constraint 0:96 a large but perturbative top yukawa coupling at M_{GUT} down to its well{known infrared pseudo{ xed{point value at M SUSY and below, resulting in the top m ass value 200 sin GeV. If the bottom yukawa is also required to remain perturbatively small up to M_{GUT}, 52 [59] em erges as a second low energy constraint. then tan

The pseudo{ xed{point solution is not a true xed{point, but rather is the low energy

⁹This M SSM non{linear sigm a model is not the form al heavy higgs lim it of the M SSM, but is a heavy higgs lim it of the (M + 1)SSM; the M SSM does not contain an independent, dimensionless, quartic coupling constant in the higgs sector which can be taken to in nity, whereas the (M + 1)SSM (and the SM) does.

¹⁰ In fact, the additional restrictions may be so constraining as to also yield a lower limit on the lightest higgs mass, in addition to the upper limit. For example, $m_h > 85 \text{ GeV}$ for tan > 5 and $m_t = 170 \text{ GeV}$ is reported in ref.[42], and a similar result is given in [43].

yukawa value that runs to become a Landau pole (an extrapolated singularity, presum ably tam ed by new physics) near the GUT scale. The apparent CDF top m ass value is within the estim ated range of the pseudo{ xed{point value. Thus it is attractive to assume the pseudo{ xed{point solution. With the additional assumptions that the electroweak symmetry is radiatively broken [60] (for which the magnitude of the top mass is crucial) and that the by energy MSSM spectrum is de ned by a small number of parameters at the GUT scale (the susy higgs mass parameter { which is also the higgsino mass, and four universal soft susy {breaking m ass param eters: the scalar m ass, the bilinear and trilinear m asses, and the gaugino mass), two compact, disparate ranges for tan emerge: 1:0 tan 1:4 [59], $m_t = m_b$.¹¹ Reference to our Figs. 1 and 2 shows that the and a large tan solution gap between the SM and M SSM is maximized in the small tan region and minimized in the large tan region, whereas just the opposite is true for the gap between the SM and (M + 1)SSM models. Moreover, the (M + 1)SSM model is an inconsistent theory in the small region if $m_{+} > 160 \text{ GeV}$. tan

In fact, a highly constrained low tan region 1 and high tan region > 40{70 also emerge when bottom { yukawa uni cation at the GUT scale is imposed on the radiatively broken m odel [61, 62, 63, 64]. Bottom { yukawa coupling uni cation is attractive in that it is natural in susy SU (5), SO (10), and E₆, and explains the low energy relation, m_b 3m. W ith bottom - uni cation, the low to m oderate tan region requires the proxim ity of the top m ass to its xed{point value [65], while the high tan region also requires the proxim ity of the bottom and yukawas to their xed{point; the emergence of the two tan regions results from these two possible ways of assigning xed{points.

The net e ect of the yukawa {uni cation constraint in susy GUTs is necessarily to widen the mass gap between the light higgs M SSM and the heavier higgs SM, thus strengthening the potential for experiment to distinguish the models. The large tan region is disfavored by proton stability [66]. A doption of the favored low to moderate tan region leads to a highly predictive fram ework for the higgs and susy particle spectrum [63, 64]. In particular, the xed{point relation sin $m_t = (200 \text{GeV})$ xestan as a function of m_t . For a heavy top m ass as reported by CDF, one has tan (1, 2) for $m_t = (140, 180)$ GeV. Since tan 1 is the value for which the $m_{\rm h}$ upper bound is minimized (the tree [level contribution to $m_{\rm h}$ vanishes), the top yukawa xed {point models o er a high likelihood for h⁰ detection at LEP 200. Reduced m_h upper bounds have been reported in [62, 63]. The reduction in these bounds is due to the small tan restriction, an inevitable consequence of assigning the top mass, but not the bottom mass, to the pseudo xed {point. These bounds are basically our 1, when allowance is made for small di erences resulting from bound in Fig. 1 for tan di erent m ethods and approxim ations.

Even more restrictive susy GUTs have been analyzed. These include the $\oldsymbol{\normalian}$ or minimal supergravity models [67], in which the soft mass parameters m₀ (universal scalar mass) and A are zero at the GUT scale; and its near relative, the superstring GUT, in which the dilaton vev provides the dominant source of susy breaking and so m₀, A, and the gaugino mass parameter all scale together at the GUT scale [68]. Each additional constraint serves to further widen the SM /M SSM higgs mass gap.

¹¹ It m ay be noteworthy that a tofM SSM radiative corrections to the electroweak datum R_b (Z ! bb)= (Z ! hadrons) reveals a preference for just these two tan regions [45].

In radiatively broken susy GUTswith universal soft parameters, the superparticle spectrum emerges at < 1 TeV. If the spectrum in fact saturates the 1 TeV value, then as we have seen the Feynman rules connecting h^0 to SM particles are indistinguishable from the Feynman rules of the SM higgs. Thus, it appears that if a susy GUT is the choice of N ature, then the m ass of the lightest higgs, but not the higgs production rate or dom inant higgs decay m odes, may provide our rst hint of grand unication.

6 D iscovery potential for the higgs boson

The higgs discovery potential of LEP II [69, 70] depends on the energy at which the machine is run. A SM higgs mass up to 105 G eV is detectable at LEP II with the r = 200 G eV option (LEP 200), while a SM higgs mass only up to 80 GeV is detectable with LEP 178. A swe have shown, with the large value of m_{+} reported by CDF, the upper limit on the M SSM h^{0} m ass is 120 GeV. This lim it is 10 GeV lower than that reported in our previous work [5], as a result of the inclusion of RGE { resummed leading and next-to leading logarithms and 2 { loop nite QCD corrections. Near this upper limit the MSSM higgs has the production and decay properties of the SM higgs. D iscovery of this lightest M SSM higgs then argues strongly for the LEP 200 option over LEP 178. Furtherm ore, for any choices of the M SSM parameters, associated production of either $h^0 Z$ or $h^0 A$ is guaranteed at LEP 200 as long as $m_{\tau} < 300$ GeV [69]. Even better would be LEP 230, where detection of Zh^0 is guaranteed as long as $m_r < 1$ TeV [69]. At an NLC 300 (the Next Linear Collider), detection of Z h⁰ is quaranteed for M SSM or for (M + 1)SSM [69]. Turning to hadron colliders [71, 72], it is now believed that while the SM higgs cannot be discovered at Ferm ilab's Tevatron with its present energy and lum inosity, the mass range 80 G eV to 130 G eV is detectable at any hadron collider with \overline{s} > 2 TeV and an integrated lum inosity dtL > 10 fb 1 [72]; the observable m ass window widens signi cantly with increasing lum inosity, but very little with increasing energy. For brevity, we will refer to this High Lum inosity Diffevatron hadron machine as the \HLDT". If the SM desert ends not too far above the electroweak scale, then the SM higgs may be as 600 {800 G eV ¹² (but not heavier, according to the triviality argum ent), in which heavy as case only the LHC (and not even the NLC 500) guarantees detection.

W e present our conclusions on detectability for the CDF central m $_{\rm t}$ value, for the m $_{\rm t}$ 1 values, and for a m $_{\rm t}$ 3 value of 137 GeV :

(i) ifm t 137 GeV, the SM higgs mass lower bound from absolute vacuum stability is equal to the experimental lower bound ofm $_{\rm H}$ = 64 GeV, while the metastability bound allows a mass as low as 43 GeV 13 ; a SM mass up to (80, 105, 130) GeV is detectable at (LEP178, LEP200, HLDT); and the MSSM h^0 is certainly detectable at LEP178 for tan 1{2, and certainly detectable at LEP200 for all tan .

(ii) if m_t 163 GeV, then the abolute (m etastability) SM lower bound rises to 109 (96) GeV, so the SM higgs cannot be detected at LEP178 and probably not at LEP200, but is still detectable at the HLDT if its mass is below 130 GeV; the lightest M SSM higgs is certainly detectable at LEP178 if tan is very close to 1, and is certainly detectable at LEP200 if

 $^{^{12}}$ T heorists would prefer an even lower value of < 400 GeV, so that perturbative calculations in the SM converge [73].

 $^{^{13}}$ R ecall that for the SM vacuum stability and m etastability bounds we assume a desert up to $10^{10}~{
m G\,eV}$.

tan is< 3.

(iii) if $m_t = 176 \text{ GeV}$, then the SM higgs is above 131 (123) GeV, out of reach for LEP II and probably the HLD T as well; the MSSM higgs is certainly detectable at LEP 200 if tan 1{2.

(iv) if m_t 189 G eV, then the SM higgs is above 153 (150) G eV in mass; at any tan value, the M SSM higgs is not guaranteed to be detectable at LEP 200, but is certainly detectable at the HLD T if tan 1{3.

For these mass bounds the value $_{s} = 0.118$ has been assumed. The M SSM mass upper bound is relatively insensitive to changes in $_{s}$, whereas the SM mass lower bounds decrease about 3 G eV with each 0.005 increase in $_{s}$. It is interesting that the h⁰ mass range is most accessible to experiment is tan 1{3, just the parameter range favored by susy GUTs.

7 Discussion and conclusions

For a top quark mass 176 GeV, the central value reported by CDF, and an $_{\rm s}$ value of 0:118, a measurement of the mass of the higgs boson will distinguish the SM with a $^{>}$ 10¹⁰ GeV desert from the MSSM with a SUSY breaking scale of about 1 TeV. For the (M + 1)SSM with the assumption of perturbative unication, conclusions are similar to those of the MSSM. For $_{\rm s}$ above 0:120 and m $_{\rm t}$ 176 GeV, a small overlap of the SM and MSSM mass regions exists, but it is a priori unlikely that the higgs mass will be found in this small range. A coordingly, the rst higgs mass measurement can be expected to eliminate one of these popular models.

M ost of the range of the lightest M SSM higgs m ass is accessible to LEPII. The lightest M SSM higgs is guaranteed detectable at LEP230 and at the LHC; and the lightest (M + 1)SSM higgs is guaranteed detectable at a NLC 300 and at the LHC. Since there is no lower bound on the lightest M SSM higgs m ass other than the experim ental bound, the M SSM h⁰ is possibly detectable even at LEP178 for all tan , but there is no guarantee. In contrast, the SM higgs is guaranteed detectable only at the LHC; if m_t 176 G eV, then according to the vacuum stability (m etastability) argument, the SM higgs m ass exceeds 131 (123) G eV, and so likely will not be produced until the LHC or NLC is available.

Thus, one simple conclusion is that LEPII has a trem endous potential to distinguish MSSM and (M + 1)SSM symmetry breaking from SM symmetry breaking. If a higgs is discovered at LEPII, the higgs sector of the SM with a large desert is ruled out.

A cknow ledgem ents:

This work was supported in part by the U.S.D epartment of Energy grant no.DE-FG05-85ER40226, and the Texas NationalResearch Laboratory Commission grant no.RGFY93{ 303.

References

- The LEP Electroweak Working Group (Aleph, Delphi, L3, Opal), CERN preprint PPE/93{157 (1993).
- [2] J.Ellis, G.L.Fogli, and E.Lisi, preprint CERN {TH/95{202.
- [3] F.Abe et al. CDF Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 2626 (1995); Phys. Rev. D 52, R2605 (1995).
- [4] N.V.Krasnikov and S.Pokorski, Phys. Lett. B 288, 184 (1992).
- [5] Marco A.D az, Tonnis A.ter Veldhuis, and Thom as J.W eiler, Phys. Rev. Lett 74, 2876 (1995).
- [6] JA. Casas, JR. Espinosa, and M. Quiros, Phys. Lett. B 342, 171 (1995).
- [7] M.A.D az, preprint VAND {TH {94{16, SHEP {95{38, in progress.
- [8] M A.D az, preprint VAND {TH {94{19 (hep-ph-9408320), presented at 1994 M eeting of the APS, DPF '94, A louquerque, New M exico, 2-6 Aug. 1994.
- [9] G.Altarelli and G. Isidori, Phys. Lett. B 337, 141 (1994).
- [10] J.R. Espinosa and M. Quiros, Phys. Lett. B 353, 257 (1995).
- [11] H.Haber, Proc. of the \W orkshop on Physics from the Planck Scale to the Electroweak Scale," Univ. W arsaw, Poland, September 1994, and preprint SCIPP 94/39 (hep {ph 9501320).
- [12] The Higgs Hunter's Guide, J.F. Gunion, H.E. Haber, G.L. Kane, and S.Dawson, Addison-Wesley, Redwood City, CA (1990).
- [13] P.H. Chankowski, S. Pokorski, and J. Rosiek, Phys. Lett. B 281, 100 (1992); and in the context of susy GUTs, refs. [42, 43].
- [14] H E. Haber and R. Hemp ing, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 1815 (1991); Y. Okada, M. Yam aguchi and T. Yanagida, Prog. Theor. Phys. 85, 1 (1991); J. Ellis, G. Ridol and F. Zwimer, Phys. Lett. B 257, 83 (1991).
- [15] R.Dashen and H.Neuberger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 50 1897 (1983); M A B.Beg, C.Panagiotakopoulos and A.Sirlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 52 833 (1984).
- [16] Non-perturbative lattice results are obtained in J.Kuti, L.Lin and Y.Shen, Phys.Rev. Lett. 61 678 (1988); M.Luscher and P.W eisz, Nucl. Phys.B 318 705 (1989); G.Bhanot, K.Bitar, U.Heller and H.Neuberger, Nucl. Phys.B 353 551 (1991).
- [17] Non-perturbative W ilson RGE results are obtained in P.Hasenfratz and J.Nager, Z. Phys.C 37 477 (1988); R.Akhoury and B.Haeri, Phys.Rev.D 48 1252 (1993).TE. Clark, B.Haeri, and S.T.Love, Nucl.Phys.B 402 628 (1993); TE.Clark, B.Haeri, S.T. Love, W.T.A.ter Veldhuis and M.A.Walker, Phys.Rev.D 50 606 (1994).

- [18] M. Lindner, M. Sher, and H.W. Zaglauer, Phys. Lett. B 228, 139 (1989); U.Ellwanger and M. Lindner, Phys. Lett. B 301, 365 (1993).
- [19] See, e.g.M. Lindner, Z. Phys. C 31, 295 (1986).
- [20] Two excellent reviews of the e ective potential physics and bounds are: M . Sher, P hys. Rep. 179, 273 (1989); and H.E.Haber, Lectures on Electroweak Symmetry Breaking, TASL, Boulder, CO (1990).
- [21] A.Linde, Phys.Lett.B 62, 435 (1976); S.W einberg, Phys.Rev.Lett. 36, 294 (1976).
- [22] F.Abe et al, CDF Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 220 (1994).
- [23] S.Abachiat al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 2632 (1995).
- [24] P.Amold and M. Vokos, Phys. Rev. D 44, 3620 (1991); G.W. Anderson, Phys. Lett. B 243, 265 (1990).
- [25] D.Buskulic et al., the ALEPH Collaboration, Phys.Lett.B 313, 312 (1993) establish a 62 GeV lower bound; a 64 GeV lower bound has been reported by J.Schwidling, Proc. of the Int. Europhysics Conference, M arseille, France, July 1993.
- [26] Particle Data Group, Review of Particle Properties, p. 1302, Phys. Rev. D 50, 1173 (1994).
- [27] P.H.Chankowski and S.Pokorski, update (hep{ph/9509207) to Phys.Lett.B 356, 307 (1995).
- [28] J.B jorken, Phys. Rev. 148, 1467 (1966); D 1, 1376 (1970).
- [29] J.Ellis and M.Karliner, hep {ph/9510402.
- [30] The LEP collaborations, ALEPH, DELPHI, L3, OPAL, and the LEP E lectrow eak W orking G roup, CERN / PPE / 93 { 157, A ugust 1993.
- [31] M. Sher, Phys. Lett. B 317, 159 (1993), and Addendum (1994) hep-ph # 9404347; see also C. Ford, D. R. T. Jones, P. W. Stevenson and M. B. Einhom, Nucl. Phys. B 395, 62 (1993).
- [32] M.S.Berger, Phys.Rev.D 41,225 (1990); R.Barbieri, M.Frigeni, F.Caravaglios, Phys. Lett. B 258, 167 (1991); R.Barbieri and M.Frigeni, Phys.Lett. B 258, 395 (1991);
 Y.Okada, M.Yam aguchi and T.Yanagida, Phys.Lett. B 262, 54 (1991); A.Yam ada, Phys.Lett. B 263, 233 (1991); J.Ellis, G.Ridol and F.Zwimer, Phys.Lett. B 262, 477 (1991); A.Brignole, Phys.Lett. B 281, 284 (1992).
- [33] M. Drees and M. M. Nojiri, Phys. Rev. D 45, 2482 (1992).
- [34] M A.D az and H E.Haber, Phys. Rev.D 46, 3086 (1992).

- [35] JF.Gunion and A.Turski, Phys.Rev.D 39,2701 (1989);40,2333 (1989); A.Brignole, J.Ellis, G.Ridol, and F.Zwimer, Phys. Lett. B 271, 123 (1991); A.Brignole, Phys. Lett. B 277, 313 (1992); P.H.Chankowski, S.Pokorski, and J.Rosiek, Phys. Lett. B 274,191 (1992).
- [36] M A.D az and H E.Haber, Phys. Rev.D 45, 4246 (1992).
- [37] P.H.Chankowski, S.Pokorski and J.Rosiek, Nucl. Phys. B 423, 437 (1994).
- [38] H E. Haber and R. Hem p ing, Phys. Rev. D 48, 4280 (1993).
- [39] R.Hemp ing and A.H.Hoang, Phys. Lett. B 331, 99 (1994).
- [40] J.R.Espinosa and M.Quiros, Phys. Lett. B 266, 389 (1991).
- [41] P.Langacker and M.Luo, Phys. Rev. D 44, 817 (1991); U.Am aldi, W. de Boer, and H.Furstenau, Phys. Lett. B 260, 447 (1991).
- [42] G.L.Kane, C.Kolda, L.Roszkowski, and J.D.W ells, Phys. Rev. D 49, 6173 (1994), and references therein.
- [43] J. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, H. Pois, X. W ang, and A. Zichichi, Phys. Lett. B 306, 73 (1993).
- [44] B.de Carlos and J.A. Casas, Phys. Lett. B 309, 320 (1993).
- [45] P. H. Chankowski and S. Pokorski, preprint hep{ph/9505308; S. Pokorski, preprint hep{ph/9510224.
- [46] G.'t Hooft and M. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. B 153, 365 (1979); G. Passarino and M. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. B 160, 151 (1979).
- [47] JA. Casas, JR. Espinosa, M. Quiros, and A. Riotto, Nucl. Phys. B 436, 3 (1995), Erratum Nucl. Phys. B 439, 466 (1995).
- [48] R.Hemp ing, preprint DESY -93-012, Feb. 1993.
- [49] S.Bertolini, F.Borzum ati, A.Masiero, and G.Ridol, Nucl. Phys. B 353, 591 (1991);
 N.Oshimo, Nucl. Phys. B 404, 20 (1993); JL.Lopez, D.V. Nanopoulos, and G.T.Park, Phys. Rev. D 48, 974 (1993); Y.Okada, Phys. Lett. B 315, 119 (1993); R.Garisto and JN.Ng, Phys. Lett. B 315, 372 (1993); JL.Lopez, D.V. Nanopoulos, G.T.Park, and A.Zichichi, Phys. Rev. D 49, 355 (1994); M A.D az, Phys. Lett. B 322, 207 (1994); F M.Borzum ati, Z.Phys. C 63, 291 (1994); S.Bertolini and F.Vissani, Z.Phys. C 67, 513 (1995).
- [50] B. de Carlos and JA. Casas, Phys. Lett. B 349, 300 (1995).
- [51] M A.D az, Phys. Lett. B 304, 278 (1993).
- [52] JL. Hewett, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 1045 (1993); V. Barger, M S. Berger and R JN. Phillips, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 1368 (1993).

- [53] R.Ammaret al. (CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 674 (1993); M.S.A lam et al. (CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 2885 (1995).
- [54] J.Ellis, JF.Gunion, H.E.Haber, L.Roszkowski and F.Zwimer, Phys. Rev. D 39, 844 (1989); M.Drees, Int. J.M od. Phys. A 4, 3635 (1989).
- [55] W. T. A. ter Veldhuis, Purdue Preprint PURD-TH-92-11.
- [56] P.Binetruy and C.A. Savoy, Phys. Lett. B 277, 453 (1992); G.L.Kane, C.Kolda and JD.W ells, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70 2686 (1993); JR. Espinosa and M. Quiros, Phys. Lett. B 302 51 (1993); D.Com elliand E.Verzegnassi, Phys. Rev. D 47 764 (1993); T.Elliot, SF.King and PL.W hite, Phys. Lett. B 305, 71 (1993); PN. Pandita, Phys. Lett. B 318, 338 (1993).
- [57] S. Fernara, A. Masiero and M. Poratti, Phys. Lett. B 301 (1993) 358; S. Gernara and A. Masiero, CERN preprint CERN TH-6846-93, to appear in the Proceedings of SUSY 93, W orld Scientic, ed. by P. Nath; S. Fernara, A. Masiero, M. Pornati and R. Stora, Nucl. Phys. B 417, 238 (1994); T. E. C. Lark and W. J. A. ter Veldhuis, Nucl. Phys. B 426, 385 (1994); W. J. A. ter Veldhuis, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 9, 3691 (1994); K. J. Barnes, D. A. Ross and R. D. Simmons, Phys. Lett. B 338, 457 (1994).
- [58] P. Langacker and N. Polonsky, Phys. Rev. D 47, 4028 (1993).
- [59] V.A.Bednyakov, W. de Boer, and S.G.Kovalenko, preprint hep{ph # 9406419, June 1994.
- [60] M.Drees and M.Nojiri, Nucl. Phys. B 369, 54 (1992).
- [61] H. Arason et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 29 (1991), and Phys. Rev. D 46, 3945 (1992);
 D. J. Castano, E. J. Piard and P. Ram ond, Phys. Rev. D 49, 4882 (1994); M. Carena,
 T. E. Clark, C. E. M. Wagner, W. A. Bardeen and K. Sasaki, Nucl. Phys. B 369, 33 (1992).
- [62] V.Barger, M.S.Berger, P.Ohmann, and R.J.N.Phillips, Phys.Lett.B 314, 351 (1993); M.Carena and C.E.M.Wagner, CERN {TH.7320/94, to appear in the Proc. of the \2nd IFT W orkshop on Yukawa Couplings and the Origins of Mass", Gainesville, FL, Feb. 1994, and references therein.
- [63] P. Langacker and N. Polonsky, Phys. Rev. D 49, 1454 (1994); 50, 2199 (1994); N. Polonsky, U. Penn preprint UPR {0595T, presented at SUSY {94, Ann Arbor M I, M ay 14{17, 1994; C.Kolda, L.Roszkowski, J.D.W ells, and G.L.Kane, Phys. Rev. D 50, 3498 (1994), and references therein.
- [64] M. Carena, M. Olechowski, S. Pokorski, and C. E. M. Wagner, Nucl. Phys. B 419, 213 (1994).
- [65] W.A.Bardeen, M.Carena, S.Pokorski, and C.E.M.Wagner, Phys. Lett. B 320, 110 (1994).

- [66] R. A mow itt and P. Nath, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 1014 (1992); Phys. Lett. B 287, 89 (1992), and 289, 368 (1992).
- [67] S.Kelley, J.Lopez, D.Nanopoulos, H.Pois, and K.Yuan, Phys.Lett.B 285, 61 (1992);
 R.Amow itt and P.Nath, Phys.Lett.B 289, 368 (1992); J.Lopez, D.Nanopoulos, H.
 Pois, X.W ang, am d A.Zichichi, Phys.Rev.D 48, 4062 (1993); J.F.G union and H.
 Pois, Phys.Lett.B 329, 136 (1994).
- [68] H.Baer, J.F.Gunion, C.Kao, and H.Pois, Phys. Rev. D 51, 2159 (1995).
- [69] J.F.Gunion, \Searching for the Higgs Boson (s)", to appear in Proc. of the Zeuthen Workshop | LEP 200 and Beyond, Teupitz/Brandenburg, Germ any, 10{15 A pril, 1994, eds. T Riem ann and J Blum lein; and refs. therein.
- [70] A.D jouadi, J.Kalinowski and P.M. Zerwas, Z.Phys.C 57, 569 (1993); V.Barger, K. Cheung, A.D jouadi, B.A.Kniehl, and P.M. Zerwas, Phys. Rev.D 49, 79 (1994); A. D jouadi, Int.J.M od.Phys.A 10, 1 (1995); and refs. therein.
- [71] M. Spira, A. D jouadi, D. G raudenz, and P. M. Zerwas, Phys. Lett. B 318, 347 (1993).
- [72] S.M renna and G.L.K ane, Caltech preprint CIT 68{1938, and hep{ph # 9406337.
- [73] L.Durand, B.A.Kniehl and K.Riesselm ann, Phys.Rev.Lett. 72, 2534 (1994), have shown that the two loop contribution to higgs decay to ff exceeds the one loop contribution if the higgs mass exceeds 400 G eV.

Figure Captions:

Fig. 1 The curves reveal the upper bound on the lightest MSSM higgs particle vs.tan , for top m ass values of (a) 163 G eV, (b) 176 G eV, and (c) 189 G eV. Three extrem e choices of susy parameters are invoked: the solid curve is for $= A_t = A_b = 0$, the dashed curve is for $= A_t = A_b = 1$ TeV, and the dot-dashed curve is for = 1 TeV, $A_t = A_b = 1$ TeV. In all cases, $m_A = m_q = 1$ TeV and $m_b (M_z) = 4$ G eV are assumed. The horizontal dotted lines are the (tan {independent}) SM lower bounds on the higgs m ass; the more restrictive stability bound derives from requiring that the EW vev sits in an absolute m inim um, while the less restrictive m etastability bound derives from requiring that the vev lifetime in the local EW m inim um exceed the age of the universe.

Fig.2

Upper bound on the lightest (M + 1)SSM higgs vs.tan , for the top mass values (a) 163 GeV, (b) 176 GeV, and (c) 189 GeV. All superparticles and higgses beyond the lightest are assumed to be heavy, of order of the chosen susy {breaking scale of 1 TeV. The GUT scale is taken as 10^{16} GeV.









