June 1996

Production of Nonlinear SUSY Higgs Bosons at e⁺ e Colliders

SW.Ham¹, H.Genten², BR.Kim², SK.Oh¹

¹ Department of Physics, Kon-Kuk University, Seoul, Korea

² III. Physikalisches Institut, RW TH Aachen, Germany

Abstract

We investigate the Higgs sector of a nonlinear supersymmetric standard model at LEP 1 and LEP 2, as well as at future linear e^+e^- colliders with $P\bar{s} = 500$, 1000, and 2000 GeV. The LEP 1 data do not put any constraints on the parameters of the model, and allow a massless Higgs boson in particular. For LEP 2, there are remarkable di erences between the Higgs productions at $P\bar{s} = 175$ GeV on the one hand and that at $P\bar{s} = 192$ GeV and 205 GeV on the other hand. The case for $P\bar{s} = 175$ GeV is similar to LEP 1, whereas those for $P\bar{s} = 192$ GeV and 205 GeV will be able to give experimental constraints on the parameters. Finally the e^+e colliders with $P\bar{s} = 500$, 1000, and 2000 GeV are most probably able to test the model conclusively.

1 Introduction

For m ore than a decade the phenom enology of supersym m etric m odels has been studied, and the search for supersym m etric particles is one of the m ain goals of existing and future accelerators. M ost of the supersym m etric m odels investigated so far are linear ones, i.e., supersym m etry is realized linearly in them [1]. How - ever, it is still an open question whether supersym m etry is realized linearly or nonlinearly.

The form alism for extending the standard model nonlinear-supersymmetrically was developed by Samuel and Wess [2]. Recently one of us has constructed the general form of a nonlinear supersymmetric standard model in curved space and derived the Higgs potential in the at limit [3]. In global nonlinear supersymmetric models the only new particle is the Akulov-Volkov eld [4], which is a Goldstone fermion. Experimentally, no Goldstino has been observed. In local nonlinear supersymmetric models this goldstino can be gauged away; it is absorbed into the gravitino, which becomes massive [5]. In the at limit, the supergravity multiplet decouples from the ordinary matter with the only reminiscence of supersymmetry manifesting itself in the Higgs sector.

The Higgs sector of the nonlinear SUSY models is evidently larger than that of the Standard model. It contains at least two dynamical Higgs doublets and an auxiliary Higgs singlet. In the case that both a dynamical and an auxiliary singlet are included in the theory, the Higgs boson spectrum of the nonlinear model resemble that of the linear next-to-minim al supersymm etric standard model (NM SSM). In both models, there are three scalar Higgs bosons, two pseudoscalar Higgs bosons, and a pair of charged Higgs bosons. How ever, the structure of the Higgs potential is di erent between nonlinear and linear supersymmetry.

In this article we investigate the phenom enology of the nonlinear supersym – metric model with both an auxiliary and a dynamical Higgs singlet beside the doublets. In particular, we are interested in how far the Higgs sector can be tested at LEP, as well as at future e^+e^- colliders.

2 The M odel

The complete Higgs potential of our model is given in Ref. [3]:

$$\nabla = \frac{1}{8} (g_1^2 + g_2^2) (\mathfrak{H}^{1} \mathfrak{f}^{2} + \mathfrak{H}^{2} \mathfrak{f})^{2} + \frac{1}{2} g_2^{2} \mathfrak{H}^{1+} \mathfrak{H}^{2} \mathfrak{f} + \frac{2}{1} \mathfrak{H}^{1} \mathfrak{f}^{2} + \frac{2}{2} \mathfrak{H}^{2} \mathfrak{f}^{2} + \frac{2}{0} \mathfrak{N}^{2} \mathfrak{f} + \frac{2}{0} \mathfrak{H}^{1T} \mathfrak{H}^{2} \mathfrak{f}^{2} + k^{2} \mathfrak{N}^{9} \mathfrak{N}^{2} + \mathfrak{N}^{2} \mathfrak{f} (\frac{2}{1} \mathfrak{H}^{1} \mathfrak{f}^{2} + \frac{2}{2} \mathfrak{H}^{2} \mathfrak{f})$$
(1)
 + k_{0} [(\mathfrak{H}^{1T} + \mathfrak{H}^{2})^{9} \mathfrak{N}^{2} + h\mathfrak{c}:]
 + [\frac{1}{1} \mathfrak{H}^{1} \mathfrak{f}^{3} \mathfrak{N} + \frac{2}{2} \mathfrak{H}^{2} \mathfrak{f}^{3} \mathfrak{N} + \frac{0}{0} \mathfrak{0} (\mathfrak{H}^{1T} + \mathfrak{H}^{2})^{9} \mathfrak{N} + h\mathfrak{c}:]
 + [\mathfrak{k}_{0} \mathfrak{N}^{9} \mathfrak{N}^{2} + h\mathfrak{c}:] :

The two Higgs doublets H¹ and H² and the singlet N develope vacuum expectation values v_1 , v_2 , and x, respectively. The full mass matrices can be found in

Ref. [3]. We denote the three scalar H iggs bosons and their m asses respectively by S_1 , S_2 , S_3 and m_{S_1} m_{S_2} m_{S_3} . As in the case of the NM SSM [7], one can derive an upper bound on m_{S_1} in our model as

$$m_{S_1}^2 \quad m_{S_1,max}^2 = m_Z^2 \cos^2 2 + \frac{2_0^2}{g_1^2 + g_2^2} \sin^2 2$$
; (2)

where tan = $v_2 = v_1$. This relation shows that the quartic coupling $_0$ is relevant for the upper bound as in the case of the standard model. For $_0^2$ $(g_1^2 + g_2^2) = 2 =$ $(0.52)^2$ this relation gives m $_{S_1}^2$ m $_Z^2$, whereas for $_0^2 > (0.52)^2$ the upper bound is given by m $_{S_1}^2$ $(1.92 \ _0m_Z)^2$. In the latter case, the upper bound of $_0$ determ ines that of m $_{S_1}$. For m $_t = 175 \text{ GeV}$ (190 GeV) and with the GUT scale as the cut-o scale, one obtains $_{0max}$ 0.74 (0.66) and m $_{S_1}$ 130 GeV (117 GeV).

It is very instructive to notice that, as in the case of the NM SSM [8], the upper bounds on m $_{S_2}$ and m $_{S_3}$ can be derived as functions of m $_{S_1,max}$ and m $_{S_1}$:

$$m_{S_{2}}^{2} m_{S_{2}max}^{2} = \frac{m_{S_{1}max}^{2} R_{1}^{2}m_{S_{1}}^{2}}{1 R_{1}^{2}}$$

$$m_{S_{3}}^{2} m_{S_{3}max}^{2} = \frac{m_{S_{1}max}^{2} (R_{1}^{2} + R_{2}^{2})m_{S_{1}}^{2}}{1 (R_{1}^{2} + R_{2}^{2})}$$
(3)

with

$$R_{1} = U_{11} \cos + U_{12} \sin R_{2} = U_{21} \cos + U_{22} \sin ; \qquad (4)$$

where U_{ij} is the orthogonalm atrix that diagonalises the scalar m ass m atrix, and $0 = R_1^2 + R_2^2$ 1. C learly, R_1 and R_2 are complicated functions of the relevant paremeters. Nevertheless these relations turn out to be very useful to derive the lower limits on the production cross section of the scalar H iggs bosons.

3 Higgs Production at LEP 1 and LEP 2

The LEP 1 data yield an experimental lower bound of 60 GeV on the Higgs boson m ass of the standard m odel, and 44 GeV for the m ass of the lightest scalar Higgs boson of the m inimal linear supersymmetric standard m odel (M SSM). In the case of the NM SSM the LEP 1 data do not exclude the existence of a massless scalar Higgs boson [9]. Now, we analyse the LEP 1 data in the frame of our m odel. As in the case of the NM SSM, the main contributions to the production cross section come from (i) the Higgs-strahlung process, (ii) the process where S_i is radiated o leptons or quarks, and (iii) associated pair production P_jS_i , where P_i (j = 1;2) is a pseudoscalar Higgs boson:

(i) Z ! Z
$$S_i$$
 ! ffS_i
(ii) Z ! ff ! ffS_i (5)
(iii) Z ! P_jS_i ! ffS_i ;



Figure 1: C ontour lines of the lightest H iggs boson m ass m_{S1} (dotted) and of the production cross section $_1$ (solid) at ${}^{P}s = m_Z$, as functions of $_1$ and $_2$, for $_0 = 0.4$, k = 0.02, tan = 3, and m_C = 200 G eV. The shadowed region m arks the parameter region excluded by LEP 1, de ned as the region where the production cross section is greater than 1 pb.

The dom inant contributions com e from the b quark, f = b.

O urm odel has 6 free parameters which can be taken as $_{0}$;k; $_{1}$; $_{2}$;tan and m $_{C}$ (the charged H iggs mass). We search for parameter regions where none of S $_{1}$ (i = 1;2;3) has enough production cross sections to be detected at LEP 1 and where m $_{S_{1}} = 0$ is still allowed. Fig. 1 shows such a region. We plot for $_{0} = 0.4$, k = 0.02, m $_{C} = 200$ GeV, and tan = 3 the contours of m $_{S_{1}}$ and the production cross section of S $_{1}$, $_{1}$. Only the shadowed region where $_{1}$ 1 pb is excluded by the LEP 1 data. $_{2}$ is smaller than 12.3 fb and $_{3}$ vanishes in the entire plane. Thus we conclude that the LEP 1 data allow the existence of massless S $_{1}$ in our model.

Now we turn to LEP 2. In order to obtain a feeling we plot in Fig. 2a, 2b, and 2c the production sections of $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}$, and $\begin{pmatrix} a \\ 3 \end{pmatrix}$ (a = i; i; ii) for the three processes of Eq. (5), as well as the production cross sections 1, 2, and 3 for the sum of their processes, against the cm .energy of the e⁺ e collider for a xed set of parameters. The contribution from the Higgs-strahlung process is dominant for S₁ and S₂. $\begin{pmatrix} i \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}$ are approximately equal to 1 and 2, with $1 > 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $2 > 2 \end{pmatrix}$, respectively. The dominant contribution of interferences between three processes arises positively at the Z peak for S₁, negatively at P s 180 GeV for S₂, and negatively at P s = 500 GeV for S₃. The maximum values of their contributions are 1 fb for S₁, 10 P = 16 for S₂, and 10 = 16 for S₃. We observe that 2 is a very steep function of P = 180 GeV and 240 GeV. Thus



Figure 2: (a) The production cross sections $_{1}^{(a)}$ (a = 1;2;3) and $_{1}$ of S₁ for $_{0}$ = 0.3, k = 0.02, $_{1}$ = -0.3, $_{2}$ = 0.45, tan = 6, and m $_{c}$ = 400 G eV. $_{1}^{(a)}$ and $_{1}$ denote the production cross sections for the three processes of Eq. (5) and for the sum of these processes 1, respectively. $_{1}^{(i)}$ is approximately equal to $_{1}$. (b) The according production cross sections of S₂. $_{2}^{(i)}$ is approximately equal to $_{2}$. (c) The according production cross sections of S₃. $_{3}^{(ii)}$ is neglegible.



Figure 3: C ontour lines of the lightest H iggs boson m assm_{S1} (dotted) and of the production cross section $(_1 + _2)$ (solid) at $^{D}\overline{s} = 175 \text{ GeV}$, as functions of $_1$ and $_2$, for $_0 = 0.4$, k = 0.02, tan = 3, and m $_c = 200 \text{ GeV}$. The cross section $(_1 + _2)$ is smaller than 50 fb in the hatched region.

we expect a relevant di erence between the behavior at ${}^{P}\bar{s} = 175 \text{ GeV}$ on the one hand and that at ${}^{P}\bar{s} = 192 \text{ GeV}$ or 205 GeV on the other hand. It turns out that this expectation is generally correct when the sum $({}_{1} + {}_{2})$ is around 30 fb 50 fb. The discovery limit is about 50 fb form ${}_{S} = 80 \text{ GeV}$ and 30 fb form ${}_{S} = 40 \text{ GeV}$ at a luminosity of 500 pb 1 for ${}^{P}\bar{s} = 175 \text{ GeV}$ and at one of 300 pb 1 for ${}^{P}\bar{s} = 192$ and 205 GeV in our model [10]. In Fig. 3 the contours of ${}_{S_{1}}$ and those of $({}_{1} + {}_{2})$ are plotted. We nd $({}_{1} + {}_{2})$ 50 fb and $({}_{1} + {}_{2})_{min}$ 26 fb in the hatched region. This region contains part of the m ${}_{S_{1}} = 0$ contour, which m eans that LEP 2 with ${}^{P}\bar{s} = 175 \text{ GeV}$ would not be able to put any constraints on m ${}_{S_{1}}$.

In order to see whether LEP 2 can put a constraint on the quartic coupling constant $_0$, we scan the parameter space jkj = 0.7, $j_1j = 1$, $0 < _2 < 1$, $2 < \tan < 15$, and 150 GeV $< m_c < 1000$ GeV and plot $(_1 + _2)$ as a function of $_0$, for p = 175 GeV in Fig. 4. About 10^6 points are considered. A gain one sees that with a discovery limit of 30 fb = 50 fb LEP 2 with 175 GeV will not be able to put any experimental limit on $_0$, either.

As expected, the situations both with ${}^{P}\bar{s} = 192 \text{ GeV}$ and with ${}^{P}\bar{s} = 205 \text{ GeV}$ are much more favorable. We scan the same parameter space as that of Fig. 4a and determine $(_{1} + _{2})$ as a function of $_{0}$ at these cm. energies. We then plot the results in Fig. 4b for ${}^{P}\bar{s} = 192 \text{ GeV}$ and in Fig. 4c for 205 GeV. Fig. 4b shows that $(_{1} + _{2})$ is greater than 50 fb for $_{0}$ 0.54. Thus LEP 2 with ${}^{P}\bar{s} = 192 \text{ GeV}$ would be able to put an experimental lower limit on $_{0}$ as



Figure 4: The cross section $(_1 + _2)$, as a function of $_0$, for jkj 0:7, j₁j 1, 0 < $_2 < 1, 2 < tan < 15$, and 150 GeV < m $_c < 1000$ GeV, at (a) $\overline{s} = 175$ GeV, (b) $\overline{s} = 195$ GeV, (c) $\overline{s} = 205$ GeV.



Figure 5: (a) The cross section $(_1 + _2)$ with m_{s_1} 10 GeV at $p_{\overline{s}} = 192$ GeV, as function of $_0$, for jkj 0.7, j j 1, $0 < _2 < 1, 2 < \tan < 15$, and 150 GeV $< m_c < 1000$ GeV. (b) The same as (a), except for $p_{\overline{s}} = 205$ GeV and m_{s_1} 27 GeV.

This experimental lower limit in plies via Eq. (2) an experimental lower limit on the upper limit on m $_{\rm S_1}$ as

$$m_{S_1,max,EXP}$$
 1:92 $_{0,EXP}$ m_Z 92 G eV : (7)

Similarly from Fig. 4c we conclude for p = 205 GeV

$$_{0;EXP}$$
 0:61 (8)

and

$$m_{S_1,m,ax:EXP}$$
 107 G eV : (9)

Now, we turn to the question of imposing a lower limit on m_{S_1} itself. In Fig. 5a we plot (1 + 2) for $\overline{S} = 192$ GeV with the constraint $m_{S_1} = 10$ GeV. We omit the points for 0 < 0.5 as in the region (1 + 2) = 50 fb. For $m_{S_1} = 10$ GeV + 1 GeV = 11 GeV, there are points with (1 + 2) < 30 fb. We nd that (1 + 2) for $m_{S_1} < 10$ GeV is always greater than 30 fb. This implies that LEP 2 with $\overline{S} = 192$ GeV and discovery limit 30 fb would be able to put an experimental lower limit on m_{S_1} as

$$m_{S_{1};EXP}$$
 10 GeV : (10)

In Fig. 5b we plot the same as in 5a for $\overline{s} = 205 \text{ GeV}$. In this case we obtain

$$m_{S_1;EXP}$$
 27 G eV : (11)

4 Higgs Production at LC 500, 1000, and 2000

As discussed in section 2, the upper bound of m_{S_1} is about 130 GeV. Thus, if the collider energy $P_{\overline{s}}$ is larger than $E_c = m_z + 130$ GeV, which is a kind of threshold energy, the production via the H iggs-strahlung is possible in the whole parameter space for at least one of S_i (i = 1;2;3). In this case one should consider the productions of S_1 ; S_2 , and S_3 simultaneously. In order to be system atic, we consider the production cross sections of S_1 ; S_2 , and S_3 via the H iggs-strahlung process, denoted respectively by m_1, m_2 , and m_3 :

where $_{\rm SM}$ (m) is the cross section in the standard model for the production of the Higgs boson of mass m via the Higgs-strahlung process.

A useful observation is that $_{i}(m_{S_{1}max})$ $_{i}(m_{S_{1}})$, which allows to derive the parameter-independent lower limit of $_{i}$ as we will show in the following. At rst, we determ ine the cross sections $_{1}(R_{1};R_{2};m_{S_{1}})$, $_{2}(R_{1};R_{2};m_{S_{2}max})$, and $_{3}(R_{1};R_{2};m_{S_{3}max})$ at a xed set of $m_{S_{1}}$, R_{1} , and R_{2} . Secondly, we keep R_{1} and R_{2} xed, while varying $m_{S_{1}}$ from its minimum to maximum and determine the quantity

$$(R_1; R_2) = \min[\max(1; 2; 3)] \quad (0 \quad m_{S_1} \quad m_{S_1; m \, ax}) \quad (13)$$

where $_{1} = _{1}(R_{1}; R_{2}; m_{S_{1}})$ and $_{i} = _{i}(R_{1}; R_{2}; m_{S_{i}; m ax})$ (i = 2;3).

As last step, we vary R_1^2 and R_2^2 from 0 to 1 (0 R_1^2 1 and 0 R_2^2 1) and plot ($R_1;R_2$) in the $R_1^2-R_2^2$ plane. For \overline{s} $E_T = m_Z + m_{S_1,m_{ax}}$ 222 GeV this plot produces null results because ($R_1;R_2$) = 0, which is the case for LEP 2. For $\overline{s} > E_T$, ($R_1;R_2$) never vanishes in the entire $R_1^2-R_2^2$ plane and the minimum value of ($R_1;R_2$) is a parameter-independent lower limit of one of 1; 2; 3. Thus, this minimum is a characteristic quantity of the model.

In Fig. 6a we plot $(R_1;R_2)$ for $\overline{s} = 500 \text{ GeV}$. The minimum of $(R_1;R_2)$ in the plane is about 19 fb, which means that one of S_i will be produced with i 19 fb for $\overline{s} = 500 \text{ GeV}$. For a discovery limit of 50 events per year one would need an integrated luminosity of about 2.5 fb⁻¹, which is a realistic one.

Fig. 6b and 6c show $(R_1;R_2)$ for $\overline{s} = 1000 \text{ GeV}$ and 2000 GeV, respectively. The minimum $(R_1;R_2)$ is about 5 fb for $\overline{s} = 1000 \text{ GeV}$ and 1.2 fb for $\overline{s} = 2000 \text{ GeV}$. The conclusion is that this model may most probably be tested at future LC 500, 1000, and 2000 colliders.



Figure 6: Contour lines of $(R_1; R_2)$ as de ned by Eq. (13) for (a) p = 500 GeV, (b) p = 1000 GeV, (c) p = 2000 GeV. The minimum values are 19 fb for (a), 5 fb for (b), and 1.2 fb for (c).

5 Qualitative D iscussion about D ecay M odes

The main purpose of the present paper is to investigate at which energy and \lim investigate of which energy and \lim is nosity our model could in principle be tested. This is what we have just done considering the production of on-shell S_i . However, for experimental searches, more detailed informations are needed, in particular on their decay modes. Comprehensive investigations in this respect are under way, similar to the investigations done for the M SSM [11]. Here, we merely make a few quantitative remarks.

The dom inant decay modes of S_1 are those into b quark and lepton pairs, except for the case where m $_{S_1}$ approaches its maximum value. In this case, S_1 behaves like the standard model H iggs boson, and other decay modes, for example those into pairs of gauge bosons will become important, with partial widths that could become comparable to those of the bb channel for large tan . An important signature of S_1 is certainly its upper mass bound of about 130 G eV.

The decay modes of the heavy bosons S₂, S₃ could be more complex, depending on tan . For large tan these bosons decay dominantly to bb and ⁺ . In the M SSM, the decay of the heavy neutral scalar H iggs boson into a pair of light scalar or pseudoscalar bosons can be dominant in the parameter region where the mass of the heavy H iggs boson approaches its maximum [11]. The question whether this could happen in our model, too, is under investigation. For sm all tan , the decay modes into pairs of light H iggs bosons, gauge boson pairs, and m ixed pairs of H iggs and gauge bosons will become important. Above the tt threshold, S₃ will decay dominantly into t quark pairs. The upper bound of m s₂ is smaller than the threshold. We num erically determined bounds for the masses of S₂, S₃, P₁, and P₂ by system atically scanning the parameter space and obtained 55 G eV $^{<}$ m s₂ $^{<}$ 260 G eV, m s₃ $^{>}$ 150 G eV, m s₁ $^{<}$ 240 G eV, and m scalar m scalar does and m scalar bosons in the scalar boson has a scalar boson in the scalar boson has a scalar boson boson has a scalar boson boson has a scalar boson be dominantly into the scalar boson boson pairs and m scalar boson bos

A nother interesting question is how to distinguish the Higgs sector of our model from those of other models, in particular, from that of the NM SSM, which has the same Higgs particle spectrum. The Higgs sectors should be easy to distinguish if some of the s-particles of the NM SSM were light enough for the Higgs bosons to decay into. O therwise, the decay patterns should be very similar in both models. A theoretical possibility to distinguish the models arises from the number of free parameters of the Higgs sector. A lthough both models have the same num ber of parameters on tree level, the numbers di er on loop level. For the NM SSM, the num ber increases due to the contributions of the s-particles, whereas for our model, it remains the same, i.e. six. So once all Higgs bosons were found, our model could be determined completely by six independent experiments.

6 Conclusion

We demonstrated that at LEP 2 with p = 175 GeV no bounds on m_{S1} and 0 can be derived, whereas LEP 2 with s = 192 GeV and s = 205 GeV will be

able to put experimental lower bounds on $_0$, m $_{S_1,max}$, and m $_{S_1}$. Our analysis predicts

$$\begin{array}{rcl} & 0.53 & (0.61) \\ m_{S_1,max;EXP} &> & 92 \ GeV & (107 \ GeV) \\ m_{S_1,EXP} &> & 10 \ GeV & (27 \ GeV) \end{array} \tag{14}$$

for p = 192 GeV (205 GeV). We also derived a lower limit of the production cross sections of the scalar Higgs bosons to be 19 fb, 5 fb and 1.2 fb at e^+e colliders with p = 500 GeV, 1000 GeV, and 2000 GeV respectively, which are large enough to test the model conclusively.

One should remark that the above results are based on tree level calculations.

References

- [1] P.Fayet and S.Ferrara, Phys.Rep. 32 (1977) 249; H P.Nilles, Phys.Rep. 110 (1984) 1; H E.Haber and G L.Kane, Phys.Rep. 117 (1985) 75; A B. Lahanes and D V.Nanopoulous, Phys.Rep. 145 (1991) 1; R.Barbieri, Riv. Nuovo C in ento 11 (1988) 1.
- [2] S.Samueland J.Wess, Nucl. Phys. B 233 (1984) 488; B 226 (1983) 289.
- [3] B.R.Kim, Z.Phys.C 67 (1995) 337.
- [4] D.V.Volkov and V.P.Akulov, Phys Lett. B 46 (1973) 109.
- [5] S.Deser and B.Zum ino, PhysRev.Lett 38 (1977) 1433; D.Z.Freedm an and A.Das, Nucl. Phys B 120 (1977) 221.
- [6] J.Ellis, J.F.Gunion, H.E.Haber, L.Roszkowski and F.Zwimer, Phys. Rev.D 39 (1989) 844.
- [7] M.Drees, Int.J.Mod.Phys.A 4 (1989) 3635.
- [8] JR.Espinosa and M.Quiros, Phys Lett B 279 (1992) 92; Phys Lett B 302 (1993) 51; G.Kane, C.Kolda and JD.W ills, Phys.Rev.Lett. 70 (1993) 2686; J.Kam oshita, Y.Okada and M.Tanaka, Phys.Lett.B 328 (1994) 67; SF.King and PL.W hite, SHEP-95-27, hepdata reports OUTP-95-319, to appear in Phys.Rev.D.
- [9] B.R.Kim, S.K.Oh and A. Stephan, Proceedings of e⁺ e Collisions at 500 GeV, The Physics Potential, DESY 92-123B (1992) 697.
- [10] P. Janot, Private communication.
- [11] A.D jouadi, J.Kalinowski and P.M. Zerwas, DESY 95-211, KA-TP-9-95, FT-95-14 (1995).