

KAIST-CHEP-96/03

February 1996

# $R_b-R_c$ Crisis and the Higgs Boson Mass from LEP Precision Data

Jae Sik Lee<sup>1</sup> and Jae Kwan Kim

Department of Physics,  
Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology,  
Taejeon 305-701, Korea

## ABSTRACT

We study the effects on the Higgs boson mass from LEP precision data of the new physics explaining  $R_b-R_c$  crisis. We implement a fit to LEP observables with the new physics. We obtain  $M_H^{\text{New Physics}} = 85^{+467}_{-56}$  GeV. Comparing with the value of the SM  $M_H^{\text{SM}} = 38^{+96}_{-21}$  GeV, the errors are larger and the central value is higher. The new physics may allow  $M_H$  to have a value out of the range of  $O(M_Z)$ .

PACS numbers : 14.80.Bn, 14.80.Cp

---

<sup>1</sup>e-mail address: jslee@chep6.kaist.ac.kr

It is remarkable that the top-quark mass  $M_t$  measured at CDF and D0 agrees well with the value predicted by the LEP precision data [1]. The success of the  $M_t$  prediction shifts the focus of interest to the prediction of the Higgs boson mass  $M_H$  [2]. It is shown that there is a weak preference for a light Higgs boson mass  $M_H < 300$  GeV. But it is not trivial that the electroweak data have consistently favored a Higgs mass in a range of  $O(M_Z)$  [3].

Recently it was reported by LEP collaborations that the measured ratios of  $R_b = (\sigma(Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}) / \sigma(Z \rightarrow \text{hadrons}))$  and  $R_c = (\sigma(Z \rightarrow c\bar{c}) / \sigma(Z \rightarrow \text{hadrons}))$  are different from those predicted by the standard model (SM).  $R_b$  is higher than the SM prediction at 3.7 level and  $R_c$  is smaller than that at 2.7 level [1]. These discrepancies may be the first signals for new physics beyond the SM if these are confirmed by future measurements.

A number of possible scenarios of new physics are being suggested to explain these  $R_b$  and  $R_c$  discrepancies simultaneously [4,5]. The nonuniversal interactions acting on only the b-quark and c-quark are attractive candidates for new physics explaining these discrepancies since the SM predictions for other flavors should not be disrupted by the new physics [6]. But it is not possible to explain  $R_b, R_c$  with consistent  $s$  from low energy determinations invoking only non-standard  $Zbb$  and  $Zcc$  couplings. With only nonuniversal interactions acting on the b-quark and c-quark results in  $s = 0.18$  [5]. This value is significantly in conflict with the low energy determination  $s = 0.112 \pm 0.005$  [7]. If we don't discount the measured value of  $R_c$ , therefore, new physics corrections to the  $Zss$  couplings are also needed.

In this paper, we study the effects of the new physics which are introduced to explain  $R_b$  and  $R_c$  discrepancies on the Higgs boson mass prediction from the LEP precision data. By fitting to the LEP observables we calculate the new physics scale of the nonuniversal interactions and obtain  $M_H$ . There are theoretical bounds on the SM Higgs boson mass which are obtained from the stability of the electroweak vacuum [8] and by requiring the SM couplings to remain perturbative up to some scale [9]. We briefly comment whether our results of fitting are compatible with those from the vacuum stability and perturbativity.

In this paper we do not construct a specific model but use the effective Lagrangian

technique. We take the  $Z \rightarrow f\bar{f}$  vertex to be given phenomenologically by the expression

$$\mathcal{L}_{Zff} = \frac{h}{2} \bar{f} (g_V^{ef} + g_A^{ef} \gamma_5) f \quad ; \quad (1)$$

where  $g_V^{ef}$  and  $g_A^{ef}$  are the effective vector and axial vector coupling constants given by

$$\begin{aligned} g_V^{ef} &= 2 (g_L^{ef} + g_R^{ef}) ; \\ g_A^{ef} &= 2 (g_L^{ef} - g_R^{ef}) ; \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

We introduce the nonuniversal interactions for  $f = s, c, b$ . For  $f = c, b$ , we parametrize the nonuniversal interaction effects in the  $Z \rightarrow f\bar{f}$  vertex by introducing the parameters  $\delta_{L,R}^f$ . These parameters shift the SM tree level couplings of the neutral currents  $g_{L,R}^f$  to the effective couplings  $g_{L,R}^{ef}$ :

$$g_{L,R}^{ef} = g_{L,R}^f (1 + \delta_{L,R}^f) ; \quad (3)$$

where

$$g_L^f = I_3^f - Q^f \sin^2 \theta_W ; \quad g_R^f = -Q^f \sin^2 \theta_W ; \quad (4)$$

$I_3^f$  and  $Q^f$  are the weak isospin and electric charge respectively. Since non-standard couplings to the strange quark enter the neutral current observables only via their contributions to the total hadronic width of the  $Z^0$  boson,  $\Gamma_{\text{had}}$ , we parametrize the effects by introducing the parameter  $\delta_s$ . It is expected that the  $\delta_s$  is positive and has the value which nearly cancels the deficit of  $\delta_c$  [7]. Since  $(g_L^f)^2 = (g_R^f)^2$ , we  $\delta_R^{cb} = 0$  in our analysis. So we introduced three parameters of new physics:  $\delta_L^b, \delta_L^c$  and  $\delta_s$ .

We use the following set of 15 variables in our fitting procedure (see Table 1):  $\Gamma_{Z, \text{tot}}, R_e, R_{\text{had}} = \Gamma_e / \Gamma_{\text{had}}, R_{\text{had}} = \Gamma_{\text{had}} / \Gamma_{\text{had}} = 1, A_{\text{FB}}^0(e), A_{\text{FB}}^0(\mu), A_{\text{FB}}^0(\tau), A_e, R_b, R_c, A_{\text{FB}}^0(b), A_{\text{FB}}^0(c)$  and  $\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{lep}}$ . From Table 1, we can see there are three observables which show deviations from the predictions of the SM:  $A_{\text{FB}}^0(\mu), R_b$  and  $R_c$ . The inability of the effective Lagrangian approach to fully explain the deviations in the asymmetry observables is discussed in Ref. [5]. And it is out of the range of this paper to consider  $A_{\text{FB}}^0(\mu)$  deviation as the effect of the new physics. So we regard that this deviation results from not well understood systematic effects in the experiments.

We fix  $\alpha_s = 0.123$  since the strong coupling constant is no longer strongly constrained by fits with the new physics [5]. We take another value of  $\alpha_s = 0.112$  from low energy determinations to investigate the effects of the procedure of fixing  $\alpha_s$  in our fit. We observe that the effects of varying  $\alpha_s$  are negligible.

We used ZFITTER [10] with the function minimizing program MINUIT [11] to perform the  $\chi^2$  fit for the LEP observables. Firstly, we implement the SM fit where no new physics parameters are added. And we fix  $M_H = 300$  GeV to see the reliability for subsequent fits. In this case, the fitting parameters are  $M_t$  and  $\alpha_s$ . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} M_t &= 171.5 \pm 8.4 \text{ GeV}; \\ \alpha_s &= 0.123 \pm 0.004; \end{aligned}$$

These values are well agree with those reported by the LEP electroweak working group [1]. Note the agreement of the fitted value of  $M_t$  with the value measured at CDF and D0:  $180 \pm 12$  GeV (CDF + D0) [12].

Next, we implement the SM fit where no new physics parameters are added. In this case we fix  $\alpha_s = 0.123$ . Fixing  $\alpha_s$  is for comparisons with the results from subsequent fits including new physics parameters. In this case, the fitting parameters are  $M_t$  and  $M_H$ . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} M_H &= 38^{+96}_{-21} \text{ GeV} \quad \ln \log_{10}(M_H) = 1.53^{+0.60}_{-0.30}; \\ M_t &= 145.3^{+16.7}_{-11.4}; \end{aligned}$$

The lower and upper errors are obtained by projecting the  $\chi^2 = 1$  ellipse in  $(M_t; \ln \log_{10}(M_H))$  plane on the vertical and horizontal axes.  $M_t$  is lower than that of previous case mainly because we don't fix  $M_H$  at 300 GeV. These values are consistent with recent ones obtained by the authors of Ref. [3]. The results of this fit are shown in Table 1 as the SM results.

To investigate the effects of the new physics we perform the fit with the new physics parameters  $\frac{b}{L}$ ,  $\frac{c}{L}$  and  $\alpha_s$  fixing  $\alpha_s = 0.123$ . This is our new physics fit. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} M_H &= 86^{+467}_{-56} \text{ GeV} \quad \ln \log_{10}(M_H) = 1.94^{+0.80}_{-0.47}; \\ M_t &= 160.9^{+28.0}_{-14.0}; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{b}{L} &= 0.013 \quad 0.004; \\
\frac{c}{L} &= 0.059 \quad 0.026; \\
s &= 18.8 \quad 12.6 \text{ M eV} :
\end{aligned}$$

As expected  $s$  has nearly same value as the deficit of  $c$  and is positive.  $\frac{c}{L}$  has negative value at 2 level.  $\frac{b}{L}$  has the same central value of our previous work [6] at 3 level.  $M_t$  is more consistent with the value measured at CDF and D0 than the SM fit is. The errors of  $M_H$  are larger than those of the SM fit and the center value is higher. The upper limit at 2 level is about 2 TeV. This means that perturbative calculations are not reliable always. And the upper limit at 1 level (500 GeV) diminishes the hope for finding the Higgs at the LEP2 or the LHC. In the SM framework, the electroweak data consistently favor a Higgs mass in a range of  $O(M_Z)$ . But, even though it is not significant because of the large error, there is a possibility that  $M_H$  has a value out of the range of  $O(M_Z)$ . The results of this fit are shown in Table 1 as the new physics.

To see the effects of future, more precise measurements of  $R_b$  and  $R_c$  on  $M_H$ , we reduce errors of  $R_b$  and  $R_c$  by half. We do not change the central values of  $R_b$  and  $R_c$ . Fixing  $s = 0.123$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
M_H &= 85^{+278}_{-59} \text{ GeV} \quad \log_{10}(M_H) = 1.93^{+0.63}_{-0.51}; \\
M_t &= 160.9^{+19.7}_{-11.8}; \\
\frac{b}{L} &= 0.013 \quad 0.002; \\
\frac{c}{L} &= 0.063 \quad 0.014; \\
s &= 20.9 \quad 6.7 \text{ M eV} :
\end{aligned}$$

We observe the errors of  $\frac{b}{L}$ ,  $\frac{c}{L}$ , and  $s$  decrease. The errors of  $M_H$  decrease slightly and the center value does not change.

To study the effects of fixing  $s$ , we also execute a fit fixing  $s = 0.112$ . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
M_H &= 86^{+474}_{-55} \text{ GeV} \quad \log_{10}(M_H) = 1.94^{+0.81}_{-0.45}; \\
M_t &= 160.9^{+27.8}_{-13.9}; \\
\frac{b}{L} &= 0.015 \quad 0.004;
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} c_L &= 0.057 \pm 0.026; \\ s &= 22.3 \pm 12.6 \text{ MeV} : \end{aligned}$$

Comparing with the new physics  $t$ , we can see the effects of mixing  $s$  are negligible.

Because we take a model-independent approach, we do not explicitly describe the parameters  $b_L$ ,  $c_L$  and  $s$  by specific physical quantities here. We know, however, that these parameters are related to the new physics scale  $\Lambda$ . For example, we consider the  $t$ -quark condensation models where the third generation  $Q_L$  and  $t_R$  states at a minimum participate in a new strong interaction for  $b_L$  [13]. Then the relevant term of the effective Lagrangian is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_e = \frac{1}{2} b_L \bar{b} b + (g_V + g_A \gamma_5) \bar{b} t; \quad (5)$$

where  $g_V$  and  $g_A$  are parameters. Here one would expect that the  $t$ -quark loop will generate an effective contribution to  $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  vertex  $b_L$ . Thus we have

$$b_L = \frac{g_A}{g_L} \frac{N_c}{8} \frac{M_t^2}{\Lambda^2} \ln \frac{\Lambda^2}{M_t^2}; \quad (6)$$

where  $N_c = 3$ . Our  $t$  result  $b_L = 0.013$  yields  $\Lambda = 1 \text{ TeV}$  with  $|g_A| = 4 \pm 0.11$  [14]. The results from the analyses of stability [8] and perturbative [9] bounds on the SM Higgs boson mass gives

$$50 \text{ GeV} < M_H < 700 \text{ GeV} \quad \text{for } \Lambda = 1 \text{ TeV} :$$

The perturbative bound  $700 \text{ GeV}$  gets much corrections from two-loop functions and one-loop matching condition on the Higgs boson mass. So this value is considered to be in a range from  $500 \text{ GeV}$  to  $1 \text{ TeV}$ . For smaller  $\Lambda$  the bounds become weaker. We can see that our new physics  $t$  for  $M_H$  is well compatible with these bounds.

We implement a  $t$  to LEP observables with new physics explaining  $R_b$  and  $R_c$  discrepancies. We obtain  $M_H^{\text{New Physics}} = 85^{+467}_{-56} \text{ GeV}$ . Comparing with the value of the SM  $t$ ,  $M_H^{\text{SM}} = 38^{+96}_{-21} \text{ GeV}$ , the errors are larger and the central value is higher. The new physics may allow  $M_H$  to have a value out of the range of  $O(M_Z)$ .

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by Korea Science and Engineering Foundation.

## References

- [1] LEP electroweak working group and the LEP collaborations, "A combination of Preliminary LEP Electroweak Results and Constraints on the Standard Model", prepared for summer 1995 conference talks.
- [2] J. Ellis, G. L. Fogli and E. Lisi, Phys. Lett. B 333 (1994) 118, P. H. Chankowski and S. Pokorski, Max-Planck Institute Report No. MPI-Ph/95-39.
- [3] J. Ellis, G. L. Fogli and E. Lisi, CERN-TH/95-202, BARI-TH/211-95, hep-ph/9507424.
- [4] G. Bhattacharyya, G. C. Branco and W. Hou, CERN-TH/95-326, FISIST/14-95/CFIF, NTU-TH-95-11, hep-ph/9512239, C. V. Chang, D. Chang and W. Keung, NHCU-HEP-96-1, UIC-HEP-TH/96-6, hep-ph/9601326, G. Altarelli, N. D. Bartolomeo, F. Feruglio, R. Gatto and M. L. Mangano, CERN-TH/96-20, UGVA-DPT 1996/01-912, hep-ph/9601324.
- [5] P. Bamber, McGill/95-64, NEP-95-014, hep-ph/9512445.
- [6] J. K. Kim, Y. G. Kim, J. S. Lee and K. Y. Lee, KAIST-CHEP-95/14, hep-ph/9509319, Phys. Rev. D 53 (1996) 1712.
- [7] M. Shifman, TPI-MINN-95/32-T, UMN-TH-1416-95, hep-ph/9511469, and references therein.
- [8] C. Ford, D. R. T. Jones and P. W. Stephenson, Nucl. Phys. B 395 (1993) 17, M. Sher, Phys. Lett. B 317 (1993) 159, G. Altarelli and G. Isidori, Phys. Lett. B 337 (1994) 141, J. A. Casas, J. R. Espinosa and M. Quiros, Phys. Lett. B 342 (1995) 171.
- [9] M. Lindner, Z. Phys. C (1986) 295, B. Grzadkowski and M. Lindner, Phys. Lett. B 178 (1986) 81, J. S. Lee and J. K. Kim, KAIST-CHEP-95/19, hep-ph/9602406, to be published in Phys. Rev. D.
- [10] D. Bardin et al., Report No. CERN-TH.6443/92 (unpublished).

- [11] F. James and M. Roos, Comput. Phys. Commun. 10 (1975) 343.
- [12] F. Abe et al, CDF Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, (1995) 2626, S. Abadiet al, D0 Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, (1995) 2632.
- [13] C. T. Hill and X. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D 51 (1995) 3563.
- [14] C. T. Hill and S. Parke, Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994) 4454.



## Table C options

Table 1 : Our global fit to LEP observables in the standard model framework and with nonuniversal interactions explaining  $R_b$  and  $R_c$  discrepancies.

| Observables                    | Experiment |        | SM results | $\chi^2$ | New Physics | $\chi^2$ |
|--------------------------------|------------|--------|------------|----------|-------------|----------|
| $\sqrt{s}$ (GeV)               | 2:4963     | 0:0032 | 2:4936     | 0:710    | 2:4963      | 0:000    |
| $\sigma_{\text{tot}}$ (nb)     | 41:488     | 0:078  | 41:429     | 0:580    | 41:441      | 0:368    |
| $R_e$                          | 20:797     | 0:058  | 20:799     | 0:001    | 20:784      | 0:052    |
| $R$                            | 20:796     | 0:043  | 20:799     | 0:004    | 20:784      | 0:079    |
| $R$                            | 20:813     | 0:061  | 20:846     | 0:290    | 20:831      | 0:087    |
| $A_{\text{FB}}^0(e)$           | 0:0157     | 0:0028 | 0:0157     | 0:000    | 0:0158      | 0:001    |
| $A_{\text{FB}}^0(\mu)$         | 0:0163     | 0:0016 | 0:0157     | 0:134    | 0:0158      | 0:103    |
| $A_{\text{FB}}^0(\tau)$        | 0:0206     | 0:0023 | 0:0157     | 4:513    | 0:0158      | 4:381    |
| $A$                            | 0:1418     | 0:0075 | 0:1447     | 0:155    | 0:1451      | 0:191    |
| $A_e$                          | 0:139      | 0:0089 | 0:1447     | 0:417    | 0:1451      | 0:466    |
| $R_b$                          | 0:2219     | 0:0017 | 0:2168     | 8:868    | 0:2219      | 0:000    |
| $R_c$                          | 0:154      | 0:0074 | 0:1719     | 5:863    | 0:1557      | 0:053    |
| $A_{\text{FB}}^0(b)$           | 0:0997     | 0:0031 | 0:1016     | 0:361    | 0:1020      | 0:535    |
| $A_{\text{FB}}^0(c)$           | 0:0729     | 0:0058 | 0:0725     | 0:006    | 0:0688      | 0:494    |
| $\sin^2 \theta_W^{\text{lep}}$ | 0:2320     | 0:0016 | 0:2318     | 0:014    | 0:2318      | 0:021    |
| total                          |            |        |            | 21:9     |             | 6:8      |

Table 1: