

MSSM AND Z WIDTH : IMPLICATIONS ON TOP QUARK
AND HIGGS PHYSICS ¹

Joan SOLA

Grup de Física Teòrica

and

Institut de Física d'Altes Energies

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Catalonia, Spain

ABSTRACT

We discuss the one-loop quantum corrections to the top quark width and to the hadronic widths of the Higgs bosons of the MSSM, and emphasize the results obtained in particular regions of the MSSM parameter space which have been proposed to alleviate the anomalies observed in the decay modes of the Z into bb and cc. We find that the corrections can be large and should be visible through the measurement of the top quark production cross-sections in future experiments at the Tevatron and at the LHC.

¹Invited talk presented at the XXXIst Rencontres de Moriond, Electroweak Interactions and Unified Theories, Les Arcs, March 1996. To appear in the Proceedings (Editions Frontieres).

Lately we have been witnesses to a flood of experimental information potentially challenging the predictions of the SM to an unprecedented level. We are referring to the recent scrutinies of high precision electroweak data on Z-boson observables [1], where the "anomalies" in the ratios R_b and R_c , far from disappearing, apparently have consolidated their status in the context of the SM. On the face of it, one is tempted to believe that physics might be taking a definite trend beyond the SM. There is in the literature a fairly big amount of early as well as of very recent SUSY work on R_b [2, 3] showing that the discrepancies can be significantly weakened. The fact that the anomalies in R_b and R_c (and perhaps also in $\sigma_s(M_Z^2)$ [4]) can be simultaneously minimized [5] after including supersymmetric quantum effects on the Z-boson partial widths is a remarkable feature of the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) which should not be understated.

In view of the new wave of SUSY potentialities, it is natural to study the possible consequences that the particular subspace of MSSM parameters singled out by the Z observables may have in other areas of Particle Physics. As shown in Refs.[3, 5], one privileged piece of parameter space, call it Region I, is characterized by a large value of $\tan\beta$ ($m_t \approx m_b$) in conjunction with a moderate value of both the CP-odd Higgs and the lightest chargino mass around 60 GeV. In Refs.[6]–[7] we studied the impact of Region I of the MSSM parameter space on the top-quark width. The result for the standard decay $t \rightarrow W^+ b$ is that the overall (electroweak plus strong) SUSY corrections can be relatively large ($\sim 10\%$) in some cases, but in general the SUSY corrections to $t \rightarrow W^+ b$ are larger and in contradistinction to the former case remain sizeable even for all sparticle masses well above 100 GeV. Another relevant region (Region II) is characterized by a large value of the CP-odd Higgs mass, M_{A^0} , namely of a few hundred GeV, and by a relatively light chargino and stop of 60 GeV. Here we encounter what we dubbed the "tangential solution" to the R_b anomaly (see Fig.4 of Ref.[3]); in the light of the present data on R_b [1] it is no longer a strict "solution", though it is certainly much better than the SM prediction, for it only differs $\sim 1.5\%$ from the central value of $R_b^{\text{exp}} = 0.2211 \pm 0.0016$, in comparison to the more severe $\sim 3.4\%$ discrepancy affecting the SM prediction. In Region II the harmful (negative) effects on R_b from heavy Higgses are restrained since $\tan\beta$ is assumed to lie in the intermediate interval $2 < \tan\beta < 20$ (see Fig.3 of Ref.[3]), so that the aforementioned "tangential solution" becomes optimized and is entirely due to genuine (R-odd) supersymmetric particles. We remark that although Region I is more efficient to mitigate the R_b anomaly, its scope is limited to $M_{A^0} < 70$ GeV (equivalently, $M_{H^+} < 100$ GeV). In contrast, the "tangential solution" in Region II extends the range of M_{A^0} (and therefore that of M_{H^+}) from about 100 GeV up to about 1 TeV. Finally, we may envision another situation (Region III) where the R_b anomaly can also be alleviated by pure supersymmetric quantum effects, namely, it is characterized by the same sparticle

spectrum as in Region II together with very small values of $\tan \beta$ (< 0.7) and very large (effectively decoupled) $M_{H^\pm} > 1 \text{ TeV}$. This solution lies in the far left edge of Fig.4 of Ref.[3] but it is not explicitly exhibited there. Since for our purposes we are not interested in a too heavy MSSM Higgs spectrum, we shall not dwell on Region III any further.

From the foregoing considerations, we see that the state of the art in Z-boson anomalies is such that present-day quantum physics of Z-boson observables still tolerates both the "light" ($M_{A^0} < m_t$) and heavy ($M_{A^0} > m_t$) kinematical domains of MSSM Higgs boson masses. (Of course, the CP-even mass remains always relatively light, $M_{h^0} < 130 \text{ GeV}$.) Notwithstanding, these domains are qualitatively very different. Whereas in Region I the charged Higgs decay of the top quark, $t \rightarrow H^\pm b$, is the relevant process to deal with [7], in Region II M_{H^\pm} can be sufficiently large to prompt the top-quark decay of a supersymmetric charged Higgs boson, $H^\pm \rightarrow tb$. In view of the possible existence of Region II compatible with Z-boson data, in the present note we shall be concerned with the bearing of SUSY physics on that decay, perhaps one of the most important decay modes to search for at the LHC and also in the next generation of Tevatron experiments. The study of the quantum effects on $H^\pm \rightarrow tb$ could be the clue to unravel the potential supersymmetric nature of the charged Higgs.

Furthermore, should the physical domain of the MSSM parameter space turn out to fall in Regions I or II, then we shall see that the hadronic widths ($A^0; h^0; H^0 \rightarrow q\bar{q}$) of the neutral Higgs bosons of the MSSM must, too, incorporate important virtual SUSY signatures to look for which can be extracted from measured quantities by subtracting the corresponding conventional QCD corrections [8]. In our analysis we will neglect those decays leading to light $q\bar{q}$ final states since their branching ratios are very small. Thus, for the lightest neutral Higgs, h^0 , we will concentrate on just the decay $h^0 \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ (which can take place only in Region I), whereas for $A^0; H^0$ we shall consider the channels $A^0; H^0 \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ and $A^0; H^0 \rightarrow t\bar{t}$ (involving Regions I/II and II, respectively) with the understanding that the $t\bar{t}$ modes are dominant, if available (i.e. if $M_{A^0} > 2m_t$).

The basic free parameters of our analysis concerning the electroweak sector are contained in the stop and sbottom mass matrices ($q = t; b$):

$$M_q^2 = \begin{pmatrix} M_{qL}^2 + m_q^2 + \cos 2\beta (T_q^3 - Q_q \sin^2 \theta_W) M_Z^2 & m_q M_{LR}^q \\ m_q M_{LR}^q & M_{qR}^2 + m_q^2 + Q_q \cos 2\beta \sin^2 \theta_W M_Z^2 \end{pmatrix}; \quad (1)$$

with

$$M_{LR}^{ftbg} = A_{ftbg} \cot \beta; \tan \beta; \quad (2)$$

being the SUSY Higgs mixing parameter in the superpotential. The A_{tbg} are the trilinear soft SUSY-breaking parameters and the $M_{qL;R}$ are soft SUSY-breaking masses. By $SU(2)_L$ -gauge invariance we must have $M_{t_L} = M_{b_L}$, whereas M_{t_R}, M_{b_R} are in general

independent parameters. In the strong supersymmetric sector, the basic parameter is the gluino mass, $m_{\tilde{g}}$. For the sake of simplicity in the presentation, we shall treat the stop-bottom mass matrix by freezing the stop-bottom mixing parameter at $M_{LR}^b = 0$ and assuming equal eigenvalues: $m_{\tilde{b}_1} = m_{\tilde{b}_2} = m_{\tilde{b}}$. As far as the stop mass matrix is concerned it is generally non-diagonal ($M_{LR}^t \neq 0$) and the stop masses are different, with the convention $m_{\tilde{t}_2} > m_{\tilde{t}_1}$.

For the full SUSY corrections to $t \rightarrow W^+ b$ and $t \rightarrow H^+ b$ we refer the reader to the detailed Refs. [6, 7, 9]. Here we limit ourselves to report on the conventional QCD and SUSY-QCD contributions to the decays $(H^+ \rightarrow tb)$ and $(A^0; h^0; H^0) \rightarrow qq$. Indeed, the strong corrections mediated by quarks, gluons and their SUSY partners (squarks and gluinos, respectively) are expected to be the leading corrections to these decays in the MSSM. (The analysis of the larger and far more complex body of SUSY-electroweak corrections to these modes, namely the corrections mediated by squarks, sleptons, chargino-neutralinos and the Higgs bosons themselves, is given in Refs. [9, 10].)

To compute the one-loop SUSY-QCD corrections to $(H^+ \rightarrow tb)$ in the MSSM, we shall adopt the on-shell renormalization scheme [11] where the fine structure constant, α_s , and the masses of the gauge bosons, fermions and scalars are the renormalized parameters: $(\alpha_s; M_W; M_Z; M_H; m_f; M_{\text{SUSY}}; \dots)$. The interaction Lagrangian describing the $H^+ tb$ -vertex in the MSSM reads as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{Htb} = \frac{gV_{tb}}{2M_W} H^+ t [\bar{a}_L^+(t) P_L + a_R^+(b) P_R] b + \text{h.c.}; \quad (3)$$

where $P_{L,R} = 1/2(1 \mp \gamma_5)$ are the chiral projector operators, V_{tb} is the corresponding CKM matrix element (henceforth we set $V_{tb} = 1$) and

$$a_L^+(t) = \frac{p}{2m_t} \cot \beta; \quad a_R^+(b) = \frac{p}{2m_b} \tan \beta; \quad (4)$$

Similarly, the interaction Lagrangian describing the various neutral Higgs decays $H^i \rightarrow qq$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$; $A^0; h^0; H^0$) at tree-level in the MSSM reads as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{qq} = \frac{g}{2M_W} H^i q [\bar{a}_L^i(q) P_L + a_R^i(q) P_R] q; \quad (5)$$

We shall focus on top and bottom quarks ($q = t, b$). In a condensed and self-explaining notation we have defined

$$\begin{aligned} a_R^1(t; b) &= a_L^1(t; b) = m_q (i \cot \beta; i \tan \beta); \\ a_R^2(t; b) &= a_L^2(t; b) = m_q (-c/s; s/c); \\ a_R^3(t; b) &= a_L^3(t; b) = m_q (-s/s; c/c); \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

with $c = \cos \beta$; $s = \sin \beta$ etc. (Angles β and α are related in the usual manner as prescribed by the MSSM [12]).

The one-loop corrected amplitudes for all the decays above have the generic form ($i = +; 1; 2; 3$):

$$iO^i = \frac{ig^h}{2M_W} a_L^i(q) [1 + O_L^i(q) P_L] + a_R^i(q^0) [1 + O_R^i(q^0) P_R] : \quad (7)$$

The renormalized form factors read

$$\begin{aligned} O_L^i(q) &= K_L^i(q) + \frac{m_q}{m_{q^0}} + \frac{1}{2} Z_L^q + \frac{1}{2} Z_R^q ; \\ O_R^i(q^0) &= K_R^i(q^0) + \frac{m_{q^0}}{m_{q^0}} + \frac{1}{2} Z_L^{q^0} + \frac{1}{2} Z_R^{q^0} ; \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the $K_{L,R}^i(q)$ stand for the 3-point function contributions, and the remaining terms include the mass and wave-function renormalization in the on-shell scheme (see the similar analysis of Ref.[7]).

After explicit computation of the various loop diagrams, the results are conveniently casted in terms of the relative correction with respect to the corresponding tree-level width, δ_0 :

$$\delta_0 = \frac{\delta}{\Gamma_0} : \quad (9)$$

A crucial parameter entering the loop contributions is $\tan\beta$. In supersymmetric theories, like the MSSM, the spectrum of higgses and of Yukawa couplings is richer than in the SM and, in such a framework, the bottom-quark Yukawa coupling may counterbalance the smallness of the bottom mass at the expense of a large value of $\tan\beta$, the upshot being that the top-quark and bottom-quark Yukawa couplings in the superpotential read

$$h_t = \frac{gm_t}{2M_W \sin\beta} ; \quad h_b = \frac{gm_b}{2M_W \cos\beta} : \quad (10)$$

Thus, since the perturbative domain of these Yukawa couplings is $0.5 < \tan\beta < 70$, there is room enough for both h_t and h_b being larger than the gauge coupling, g , and even comparable to one another (for $\tan\beta = m_t/m_b \approx 35$). This is so in Region I where $\tan\beta$ is very large, and is also partly the case in Region II where $\tan\beta$ can be moderately high.

In Fig.1a we plot the width of $H^+ \rightarrow tb$ versus $\tan\beta$ after including SUSY-QCD effects and compare it with the corresponding tree-level width, $\Gamma_0(H^+ \rightarrow tb)$, as well as with the partial widths of two alternative (non-hadronic) modes. We have fixed $m_t = 180 \text{ GeV}$, $M_{H^+} = 250 \text{ GeV} = M_{LR}^t$, the squark masses $m_{\tilde{t}_1} = 60 \text{ GeV}$, $m_{\tilde{b}} = 150 \text{ GeV}$, and the gluino mass $m_{\tilde{g}} = 200 \text{ GeV}$. It is patent that the corrections can be very large in the high $\tan\beta$ regime. This can be further appreciated in Fig.1b, where we plot both the SUSY-QCD (δ_g) and the conventional QCD (δ_g) corrections (9) against M_{H^+} . It is seen that in the very relevant region $M_{H^+} \approx 500 \text{ GeV}$ and depending on the actual value of $\tan\beta$, the SUSY-QCD effects can be comparable or even be dominant over the standard QCD corrections. Since δ_g can have either sign (opposite to the sign of δ_g), the total

QCD correction in the MSSM, δ_{g+g} , could be much smaller than what would be naively expected within the context of conventional quantum chromodynamics. Alternatively, δ_{g+g} could be extremely large near the $t\bar{b}$ threshold, suggesting that in this case higher orders should be taken into account.

The analysis of δ_g and δ_{g+g} (or δ_g) for the neutral Higgs decay modes is exhibited in Figs.1c-1d. We have fixed the same values for the squark masses, gluino mass and mixing parameters as in the previous figures. The shaded areas in Fig.1c signal the differences between the corrections obtained using the tree-level and the one-loop Higgs mass relations. Although δ_g for neutral Higgses is strictly independent of $\tan\beta$, for fixed Higgs masses, the indirect dependence is due to the evolution of the MSSM Higgs masses $M_{H^0}; M_{A^0}$ as a function of M_{A^0} since this evolution does depend on $\tan\beta$. In Regions I and II we see from Fig.1c that the decays $h^0 \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ and $A^0 \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ receive negative standard QCD corrections of about 35%. For $M_{A^0} > 100 \text{ GeV}$, the standard QCD correction to $h^0 \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ remains saturated at that value since the mass M_{h^0} also saturates at its maximum value, whereas the modes $A^0; H^0 \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ obtain increasing negative corrections. In contrast, $A^0 \rightarrow t\bar{t}$ and $H^0 \rightarrow t\bar{t}$, receive positive standard QCD corrections (in this case we have plotted δ_g in Fig.1d), which are of order 40–50% near the threshold. It is clear from Figs. 1c-1d that in many cases the SUSY effects are important since they can be of the same order as the standard QCD corrections. As a matter of fact, there are situations where $|\delta_{g+g}| > |\delta_g|$, with the possibility of the SUSY effects either reinforcing the standard QCD corrections or cancelling them out, perhaps to the extent of reversing their sign!. Obviously, this feature could be used to differentiate SUSY and non-SUSY neutral Higgses produced in the colliders.

In summary, we have found that $t \rightarrow H^+ b$ or $H^+ \rightarrow t\bar{b}$ and/or $A^0; H^0 \rightarrow b\bar{b}; t\bar{t}$ could be the ideal experimental environment where to study the nature of the spontaneously symmetry breaking mechanism. It could even be the right place where to target our long and unsuccessful search for large, and slowly decoupling, quantum supersymmetric effects. In this respect it should be stressed the fact that the typical size of our corrections is maintained even for all particle masses well above the LEP 200 discovery range. Fortunately, the next generation of experiments at the Tevatron and the future high precision experiments at the LHC may well acquire the ability to test the kind of effects considered here [13]. In fact, since the leading Higgs production vertices are the same as the hadronic Higgs decay vertices that we have been dealing with in the present work, we expect that t and $t\bar{t}$ can be copiously produced in association with MSSM Higgs particles in Regions I and II (where the SUSY Yukawa couplings h_t and h_b are enhanced). Moreover, in these regions the large SUSY corrections reported here automatically translate into sizeable effects on the cross-sections, a fact which may constitute a distinctive imprint of SUSY.




Figure 1: (a) The SUSY-QCD corrected and uncorrected width ($H^+ \rightarrow tb$) as a function of $\tan\beta$ (remaining parameters given on the text) as compared to two alternative (non-hadronic) decays; (b) The SUSY-QCD (δ_g) and QCD ($\delta_{\tilde{g}}$) corrections to ($H^+ \rightarrow tb$) versus M_{H^+} ; (c)-(d) As in (b), but for the hadronic widths of the neutral MSSM higgses as a function of M_{A^0} .

As a final remark, we emphasize that the vigorous quantum effects ($\sim 50\%$) potentially underlying the dynamics of the MSSM Higgses are in stark contrast to the milder SUSY radiative effects (few per mill) expected in the physics of gauge bosons [3]. Needless to say, the excellence of the latter over the former lies in the high precision techniques achieved by the Z experiments at LEP, which might enable us to resolve the small SUSY corrections and perhaps confirm that they are responsible for the anomalies observed in the Z width. Be as it may, our analysis suggests that Higgs physics at the colliders might well take its turn in the near future and eventually provide the most straightforward handle to "virtual" Supersymmetry.

Acknowledgements:

The author is thankful to R. A. Jimenez and J. A. Coarasa for their collaboration in the preparation of this contribution. This work has been partially supported by CICYT under project No. AEN 93-0474.

References

- [1] M. Hildreth, these proceedings.
- [2] S. Pokorski, these proceedings; M. Boultware, D. Finnell, Phys. Rev. D 44 (1991) 2054; J. D. Wells, C. Kolda, G. L. Kane, Phys. Lett. B 338 (1994) 219.
- [3] D. Garcia, R. A. Jimenez, J. Sola, Phys. Lett. B 347 (1995) 321 [E: B 351 (1995) 602].
- [4] M. Shifman, these proceedings.
- [5] D. Garcia, J. Sola, Phys. Lett. B 354 (1995) 335 and B 357 (1995) 349.
- [6] D. Garcia, W. Hollik, R. A. Jimenez and J. Sola, Nucl. Phys. B 427 (1994) 53; A. Dabelstein, W. Hollik, R. A. Jimenez, C. Junger, J. Sola, Nucl. Phys. B 456 (1995) 75.
- [7] J. Guasch, R. A. Jimenez, J. Sola, Phys. Lett. B 360 (1995) 47.
- [8] C. S. Li, R. Oakes, Phys. Rev. D 43 (1991) 855; E. Braaten, J. P. Leveille, Phys. Rev. D 22 (1980) 715.
- [9] J. A. Coarasa, D. Garcia, J. Guasch, R. A. Jimenez, J. Sola, preprint UAB-FT (in preparation).
- [10] A. Dabelstein, W. Hollik, preprint MPI-Ph.93-86; A. Dabelstein, preprint KA-TH-EP-4-1995.
- [11] M. Bohm, H. Spiesberger, W. Hollik, Fortschr. Phys. 34 (1986) 687; W. Hollik, Fortschr. Phys. 38 (1990) 165.
- [12] J. F. Gunion, H. E. Haber, G. L. Kane, S. Dawson, The Higgs Hunters's Guide (Addison-Wesley, Menlo-Park, 1990).
- [13] S. Willenbrock, these proceedings; C. P. Yuan, preprint hep-ph/9604434.