# G lobal Fits of the SM and M SSM to E lectrow eak P recision D ata

W .de Boer<sup>i1</sup>, A .D abelstein<sup>iii2</sup>, W .H ollik<sup>ii3</sup>, W .M osle<sup>ii4</sup>, U .Schw ickerath<sup>i5</sup>,

i) Inst. fur Experim entelle Kemphysik, Univ. Karlsnuhe, Postfach 6980, D-76128 Karlsnuhe, Germany

 ii) Inst. fur Theoretische Physik, Univ. Karlsruhe, Postfach 6980, D-76128 Karlsruhe, Germany

iii) Inst. fur Theoretische Physik, Univ. Munchen,

Jam es Franck Stra e, D-85747 Garching, Germ any

#### A bstract

A program including all radiative corrections to the M inim al Supersymmetric Standard M odel (M SSM) at the same level as the radiative corrections to the Standard M odel (SM) has been developed and used to perform global ts to all electroweak data from LEP, SLC and the Tevatron and the radiative b! s decay from CLEO.Values of the strong coupling constant at the M  $_{\rm Z}$  scale and sin<sup>2</sup>  $_{\rm M,S}$  are derived, both in the SM and M SSM.

Recent updates on electroweak data, which have been presented at the W arsaw C onference in summer 1996, reduce the too high branching ratio of the Z<sup>0</sup> boson into b-quarks in the SM from a 32 to a 18 e ect. In addition, the b! s decay is 30% below the SM prediction. In the M SSM light stops and light charginos increase  $R_b$  and decrease the b! s rate, so both observations can be brought into agreement with the M SSM for the same region of parameter space. However, the resulting <sup>2</sup> value for the M SSM ts is only marginally lower and in addition, the splitting in the stop sector has to be unnaturally high.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Em ail: wim de boer@ cern.ch

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>E-m ail: Andreas D abelstein@ tu-m uenchen.de

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>E-m ail: hollik@ itpaxp3 physik uni-karlsruhe.de

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>E-mail: wm@ ipaxp1 physik uni-karlsruhe de

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>E-mail: Ulrich Schwickerath@cern.ch

•

## 1 Introduction

Supersymmetry presupposes a symmetry between fermions and bosons, which can be im plemented in the Standard M odel (SM ) by introducing a ferm ion for each boson and vice versa [1]. In this case the problem of quadratic divergent radiative corrections to the Higgs boson masses is solved, since ferm ions and bosons contribute with an opposite sign to the loop corrections. These new supersymmetric particles (\sparticles") contribute additionally to the radiative corrections and can in uence electroweak precison variables, like e.g.  $R_b = \sum_{2^0! b^0} \sum_{2^0! b^0} or the penguin mediated decay b! s . Radiative corrections have$ been calculated in the M in in al Supersymm etric Standard M odel (M SSM ) to nearly the same level as in the SM, so an equivalent analysis of all electroweak data can be performed both in the SM and M SSM . In this paper such analysis are described using data from Tevatron [2, 3], LEP and SLC [4, 5], the measurement of  $R_{b!s} = \frac{BR(b!s)}{BR(b!ce)}$  from CLEO [6] and lim its on the masses of supersymmetric particles [7, 8, 9, 10, 11]. For the SM predictions the ZFITTER program [12] was used, while for the M SSM predictions the SUSYFITTER program [13], which will be discussed below, was used. In both cases M INUIT [14] was used as<sup>2</sup> m in imizer in order to obtain the optimum parameter values. For all SU SY m asses well above the electroweak scale one does not expect signi cant di erences between the SM and the M SSM predictions.

Previous LEP data [5] showed a too high value of  $R_b$  (3.2) and a too low value of  $R_c$  (2). It has been shown by several groups [15]-[23] that it is possible to increase  $R_b$  in the MSSM with light charginos, top squarks or Higgses, which yield large positive contributions to the Z bb vertex because of the large Yukawa couplings of the third generation. The rst two generations are not a ected by such corrections, so no modi cations in  $R_c$  can be obtained. Recent updates of electroweak data, presented at the W arsaw Conference [4], show no deviation of  $R_c$  anym ore and a value of  $R_b$  which is 1.8 above the SM value. In addition, the experimental value for  $R_{b!s} = \frac{BR(b!s)}{BR(b!ce)}$  from CLEO [6] equals (2:32 0:67) 10<sup>4</sup>, which is about 30% below the SM prediction after taking the ca. 10% increase in the prediction by the next-to-leading-log contributions into account [24].

In the M SSM an increase in  $R_b$  can cause a decrease in the b! s rate, since both cases involve similar diagram susually with an opposite sign, e.g. the t  $\tilde{t}$  vertex corrections in Z<sup>0</sup>! bo and the t loop corrections in b! s have an opposite sign. Both, the too high value of  $R_b$  and the too low value of b! s prefer a chargino m ass around 90 G eV and a stop m ass around 50 G eV or alternatively light H iggses around 50 G eV, so both observations agree with the M SSM for the same region of parameter space, albeit an unnatural one, as will be show n.

## 2 Radiative Corrections in the M SSM

At the Z boson resonance two classes of precision observables are available:

#### a) inclusive quantities:

the partial leptonic and hadronic decay width  $_{\rm ff}$  ,

the total decay width  $_{\rm Z}$  ,

the hadronic peak cross section  $_{\rm h}$  ,

the ratio of the hadronic to the electronic decay width of the Z boson:  $R_h$ ,

the ratio of the partial decay width for Z  $\, ! \,$  cc (b) to the hadronic width, R  $_{\rm c},$  R  $_{\rm b}.$ 

b) asymmetries and the corresponding mixing angles:

```
the forward-backward asym m etries A^{\rm f}_{\rm F\,B} , the left-right asym m etries A^{\rm f}_{\rm L\,R} , the ~ polarization P ,
```

This set of precision observables together with the  $R_{b!s}$  rate [6], the W - and the top m ass is convenient for a num erical analysis of the supersymmetric parameter space. In the following the observables de ned above are expressed with the help of extive couplings.

### 2.1 The e ective Z-f-f couplings

The coupling of the Z boson to ferm ions f can be expressed by e ective vector and axial vector coupling constants  $v_{eff}^{f}$ ;  $a_{eff}^{f}$  in term s of the NC vertex:

$$J_{NC} = \frac{e}{2s_{W} c_{W}} \qquad (v_{eff}^{f} a_{eff}^{f}); \qquad (1)$$

where the convention is introduced :  $c_W^2 = \cos^2_W = 1$   $s_W^2 = M_W^2 = M_Z^2$  [25]. Input parameters are the decay constant G = 1:166392 10 <sup>5</sup> G eV <sup>2</sup>, <sub>EM</sub> = 1=137:036 and the mass of the Z<sup>0</sup> boson M<sub>Z</sub> = 91:1884 G eV. The mass of the W boson is related to these input parameters through:

$$\frac{G}{P_{\overline{2}}} = \frac{EM}{2s_{W}^{2} M_{W}^{2}} \frac{1}{1 r_{MSSM} (EM; M_{W}; M_{Z}; m_{t}; ...;)};$$
(2)

where the complete MSSM one-loop contributions are parameterized by the quantity  $r_{MSSM}$  [26]. Leading higher order SM corrections [27, 28] to the quantity r are included in the calculation.

The elective couplings  $v_{eff}^{f}$ ;  $a_{eff}^{f}$  can be written as:

$$v_{\text{eff}}^{f} = \frac{q}{Z_{Z}} (v^{f} + v^{f} + Z_{M} Q_{f})$$
  

$$a_{\text{eff}}^{f} = \frac{q}{Z_{Z}} (a^{f} + a^{f}) : \qquad (3)$$

v<sup>f</sup> and a<sup>f</sup> are the tree-level vector and axial vector couplings:

$$v^{f} = I_{3}^{f} 2Q_{f}s_{W}^{2}$$
;  $a^{f} = I_{3}^{f}$ : (4)

 $Z_{Z}$ ,  $Z_{M}$  are given in eq. (10). The complete M SSM one-bop contributions of the nonuniversal nite vector and axial vector couplings v<sup>f</sup>, a<sup>f</sup> have been calculated [13], together with the leading two-bop Standard M odel contributions [27, 28, 29]. They are derived in the 't Hooft-Feynm an gauge and in the on-shell renorm alization schem e[30]. Fig. 1 shows the MSSM one-loop Z ! ff vertex correction diagram s.









Figure 1: MSSM one-loop Z ! ff vertex correction diagram s. i; j; k = 1; ::; 2(4) are chargino (~ ), neutralino ( $\sim^0$ ) and sferm ions (f) indices, while h, H, are the scalar H iggs bosons, A is the pseudoscalar Higgs boson, and G are Goldstone bosons. No particle permutations are shown. 4



Figure 3: Z boson wave function renormalization. For notation see g.1.

The non-universal contributions can be written in the following way:

$$v_f = F_V^{SM} + F_V;$$
  
 $a_f = F_A^{SM} + F_A;$ 

The Standard M odel form factors  $F_{V,A}^{SM}$  corresponding to the diagram s of gs. 1 and 2 can be found e.g in refs. [30, 27]. The diagram s with a virtual photon are listed for completeness in the gures. They are not part of the elective weak couplings but are treated separately in the QED corrections, together with realphoton brem sstrahlung. The non-standard contributions are summarized by

$$F_{V} = \begin{array}{c} X \\ F_{V} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} V_{f} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} V_{f} \\ V_{V} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} V_{f} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} Z_{A}^{f} \\ Z_{A}^{f} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} Z_{A}^{f} \end{array}$$

$$F_{A} = \begin{array}{c} X^{i} \\ \vdots \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} F_{A} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} V_{f} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} Z_{A}^{f} \\ Z_{A}^{f} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} A_{f} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} Z_{A}^{f} \end{array}$$

where the sum extends over the diagram s of g. 1 with internal charged and neutral Higgs bosons, charginos, neutralinos and scalar ferm ions. Each diagram contributes

$$F_V^{(i)}$$
  $F_A^{(i)}$  5

to the Z ff-vertex. The self-energy diagram s of g. 2 with internal neutral Higgs, chargino, neutralino and sferm ion lines determ ine the eld renorm alization constants

$$Z_{V}^{f} = V_{f}(\mathfrak{m}_{f}^{2}) - 2\mathfrak{m}_{f}^{2} [V_{V}(\mathfrak{m}_{f}^{2}) + S_{S}(\mathfrak{m}_{f}^{2})]$$

$$Z_{A}^{f} = A_{f}(\mathfrak{m}_{f}^{2})$$
(5)

with the scalar functions VAS in the decomposition of the ferm ion self-energy according to

$$= \oint_{V} v + \oint_{D_{5}A} + m_{f_{5}}:$$

The contributions from the Higgs sector are given explicitly in ref. [31]. For the genuine SUSY diagrams, the couplings for charginos, neutralinos and sferm ions are taken from [32], together with the diagonalization matrices given in the next section.

The universal propagator corrections from the nite Z boson wave function renormalization  $Z_Z$  and the Z mixing  $Z_M$  are derived from the (; Z) propagator matrix. The inverse matrix is:

) 
$$^{1} = ig \qquad \begin{pmatrix} k^{2} + \hat{k}^{2} \end{pmatrix} \stackrel{2}{_{Z}} \begin{pmatrix} k^{2} \end{pmatrix} \stackrel{2}{_{X}} \begin{pmatrix} k$$

where  $\hat{}, \hat{}_z, \hat{}_z$  are the renorm alized self energies and mixing. They are obtained by sum m ing the loop diagram s, shown symbolically in g. 3, and the counter term s and can be found in ref. [13].

The entries in the (; Z) propagator matrix:

(

$$= ig \qquad \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ z & & z \\ z & z \end{array}; \qquad (7)$$

are given by:

The renorm alization condition to de ne the mass of the Z boson is given by the pole of the propagator matrix (eq. 6). The pole  $k^2 = M_Z^2$  is the solution of the equation:

$$R \in [(M_{Z}^{2} + (M_{Z}^{2}))_{Z}^{*}(k^{2})_{Z}^{*}(M_{Z}^{2})] = 0 :$$
(9)

Eq. (8) yields the wave function renorm alization  $Z_Z$  and m ixing  $Z_M$ :

$$Z_{Z} = \operatorname{Res}_{M_{Z} Z} = \frac{1}{1 + \operatorname{Re}^{0}_{Z}(k^{2}) - \operatorname{Re}^{\frac{2}{2}} \frac{k^{2}}{k^{2} + \frac{2}{k^{2}}}}{k^{2} + \frac{2}{k^{2}}}$$

$$Z_{M} = \frac{\frac{2}{M_{Z}^{2}} M_{Z}^{2}}{M_{Z}^{2} + \frac{2}{k^{2}} M_{Z}^{2}} : \qquad (10)$$

### 2.2 Z boson observables

The ferm ionic Z boson partial decay widths  $_{\rm ff}$  can be written as follows:

1) f € b:

$$f_{ff} = \frac{N_{c}}{12} \left[ \frac{p}{2G} M_{Z}^{3}}{12} (1 + \frac{m_{SSM}}{4}) \right] \left[ (v_{eff}^{f})^{2} + (a_{eff}^{f})^{2} (1 + \frac{6m_{f}^{2}}{M_{Z}^{2}}) \right]^{\#}$$

$$(1 + \frac{3}{4} Q_{f}^{2}) (1 + \frac{f}{Q_{CD}});$$

$$(11)$$

where

$$f_{QCD} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & ; f = leptons \\ \frac{-s}{2} + 1:405(\frac{-s}{2})^2 & 12:8(\frac{-s}{2})^3 & \frac{Q_f^2}{4} - \frac{s}{2} & ; f = quarks \end{pmatrix}$$
(12)

2) 
$$f = b$$
:

$${}_{bb} = \frac{N_{C}}{12} \frac{p_{ZG}}{12} M_{Z}^{3} (1 r_{MSSM})^{h} (v_{eff}^{b})^{2} + (a_{eff}^{b})^{2^{i}} (1 + \frac{3_{EM}}{4} Q_{b}^{2}) (1 + \frac{b_{QCD}}{2}) + b_{bb} :$$
(13)

In  $_{bb}$  the b quark specic nite mass term swith QCD corrections [29] are included.  $_{QCD}^{b}$  is given in eq. (12). The total decay width  $_{\rm Z}$  is the sum of the contributions from leptons and quarks:

$$_{Z} = \bigvee_{f \text{ ff }}^{X}$$
(14)

In the following  $_{had} = {P \atop q qq}$  is the hadronic decay width of the Z boson.

The hadronic peak cross section is de ned as

$$_{\rm h} = \frac{12}{M_{\rm Z}^2} \frac{_{\rm ee \ had}}{_{\rm Z}^2} :$$
 (15)

The ratio of the hadronic to the electronic decay width is de ned as

$$R_{e} = \frac{had}{ee}$$
 (16)

The ratio of the partial decay width for Z ! bb (cc) to the total hadronic decay width is given by

$$R_{b(c)} = \frac{b(cc)}{had} :$$
 (17)

The following quantities and observables depend on the ratio of the vector to axial vector coupling. The elective avour dependent weak mixing angle can be written as

$$\sin^{2} f_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{4 \mathfrak{D}_{f} \mathfrak{j}} \overset{0}{=} 1 \frac{v_{\text{eff}}^{f}}{a_{\text{eff}}^{f}} A :$$
(18)

The left-right asymmetries are given by

$$A_{LR}^{f} = A^{f} = \frac{2v_{eff}^{f} = a_{eff}^{f}}{1 + (v_{eff}^{f} = a_{eff}^{f})^{2}};$$
(19)

while the forward-backward asymmetries can be written as

$$A_{FB}^{f} = \frac{3}{4} A^{e} A^{f}$$
 : (20)

ı.

I.

# 3 The M SSM

### 3.1 Higgs sector

The MSSM has two Higgs doublets:

$$H_{1} = \begin{array}{c} v_{1} + \frac{1}{p^{2}} \left( H^{0} \cos h^{0} \sin + iA^{0} \sin iG^{0} \sin \right)^{2} \\ H_{1} = H \sin G \cos \end{array}$$
(21)

$$H_{2} = H^{+} \cos + G^{+} \sin$$

$$H_{2} = v_{2} + \frac{1}{p_{2}^{1}} (H^{0} \sin + h^{0} \cos + iA^{0} \cos + iG^{0} \sin )$$
(22)

Here H ;h and A represent the neutral H iggs bosons, while the G's represent the G oldstone elds, which correspond to the longitudinal polarization components of the heavy gauge bosons. The imaginary and real sectors do not m ix, since they have di erent CP-eigenvalues; and are the m ixing angles in these di erent sectors, so one is left with 2 neutral CP-

even H iggs bosons H  $^{0}$  and h $^{0}$ , one CP-odd neutral H iggs bosons A  $^{0}$ , and two charged H iggs bosons.

Their masses are completely determined by the ratio of the vacuum expectation values of tan  $= v_2 = v_1$  and the pseudoscalar mass M<sub>A</sub>, together with the radiative corrections. The latter ones are taken into account in terms of the elective potential approximation with the leading terms m<sup>4</sup><sub>t</sub>, including the mixing in the scalar top system [33]. In this way, the coupling constants of the various Higgs particles to gauge bosons and fermions can be taken over from [32] substituting only the scalar mixing angle by the improved elective mixing angle which is obtained from the diagonalization of the scalar mass matrix, discussed in the next section.

### 3.2 Sferm ion sector

The physical masses of squarks and sleptons are given by the eigenvalues of the 2 2 mass matrix:

$$M_{\tilde{f}}^{2} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M_{q}^{2} + M_{f}^{2} + M_{z}^{2} (I_{3}^{f} Q_{f} s_{W}^{2}) \cos 2 & M_{f} (A_{f} + f \cot ; \tan g) \\ M_{f} (A_{f} + f \cot ; \tan g) & M_{fU,D_{g}}^{2} + M_{f}^{2} + M_{z}^{2} Q_{f} s_{W}^{2} \cos 2 \end{pmatrix}^{1} A_{f} ; (23)$$

with SUSY soft breaking parameters  $M_{\sigma}$ ,  $M_{\sigma}$ ,  $M_{\sigma}$ ,  $A_{f}$ , and the mass parameter from the Higgs sector [1]. It is convenient to use the following notation for the o-diagonal entries in eq. (23):

$$A_{f}^{0} = A_{f} + \text{fcot} ; \text{tan } g:$$
 (24)

Scalar neutrinos appear only as left-handed m ass eigenstates. Up and down type sfem ions in (23) are distinguished by setting f = u (d) and select cot (tan ) in the curly brackets. Since the non-diagonal term s are proportional to  $m_f$ , it seems natural to assume unmixed sfem ions for the lepton and quark case except for the scalar top sector. The tm ass matrix is diagonalized by a rotation matrix with a mixing angle  $m_{ix}$ . Instead of  $M_{Q}$ ,  $M_{U}$ ,  $M_{D}$ ,  $A_{t}^{0}$  for the b, t system the physical squark masses  $m_{B_{L}}$ ;  $m_{B_{R}}$ ,  $m_{t_{2}}$  can be used together with  $A_{t}^{0}$  or, alternatively, the stop mixing angle  $m_{ix}$ . For simplicity we assume  $m_{B_{L}} = m_{B_{R}}$ , and w,  $\tilde{d}$ , c, s to have m asses equal to the B squark mass.

A possible mass splitting between  $\tilde{b}_L - \tilde{t}_L$  yields a contribution to the -parameter<sup>6</sup> = 1 + <sup>0</sup> in term s of [26]:

$${}^{0}_{b\ t} = \frac{3_{EM}}{16 \ s^{2}_{W} \ M_{W}^{2}} {}^{0}_{W} \ m^{2}_{B_{L}} + m^{2}_{t_{L}} 2 \frac{m^{2}_{B_{L}} m^{2}_{t_{L}}}{m^{2}_{B_{L}} \ m^{2}_{t_{L}}} \log \frac{m^{2}_{B_{L}} A}{m^{2}_{t_{L}} A} :$$
(25)

As a universal loop contribution, it enters the quantity

$$r' = EM = \frac{C_W^2}{S_W^2} = 0 + ...$$
 (26)

 $<sup>^{6}</sup>$ T he superscript in  $^{0}$  indicates that no left-right m ixing is present.

and all the Z boson widths

$$_{ff}$$
 1+ <sup>0</sup>+

and is thus signi cantly constrained by the data on M  $_{\rm W}$  and the leptonic widths.

### 3.3 Chargino/Neutralino sector

The chargino (neutralino) m assess and the m ixing angles in the gaugino couplings are calculated from and the soft breaking parameters  $M_1$ ,  $M_2$  in the chargino (neutralino) m ass m atrix [32].

The chargino 2 2 m ass m atrix is given by

$$M_{-} = \frac{M_{2}}{M_{W}} p \frac{p_{-} 2 \sin^{-1}}{2 \cos^{-1}} :$$
 (27)

The physical chargino m ass states  $\sim_i$  are the rotated w ino and charged H iggsino states:

$$\sim_{i}^{t} = V_{ij} \;_{j}^{t}$$
  
 $\sim_{i} = U_{ij} \;_{j} \;;\; i; j = 1; 2 :$  (28)

 $V_{ij}$  and  $U_{ij}$  are unitary chargino mixing matrices obtained from the diagonalization of the mass matrix eq. 27:

$$U M = V^{\perp} = diag(m_{1};m_{2})$$
: (29)

The neutralino 4 4 m ass m atrix can be written as:

$$M_{\sim 0} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M_{1} & 0 & M_{z} \sin_{W} \cos M_{z} \sin_{W} \sin^{-1} \\ M_{\sim 0} = \begin{pmatrix} B \\ B \\ B \\ C \\ M_{z} \sin_{W} \cos M_{z} \cos_{W} \cos & 0 \\ M_{z} \sin_{W} \sin M_{z} \cos_{W} \sin & 0 \\ M_{z} \sin_{W} \sin M_{z} \cos_{W} \sin & 0 \\ \end{pmatrix}$$
(30)

where the diagonalization can be obtained by the unitary matrix N ii:

$$N M _{\sim 0} N^{-1} = \operatorname{diag}(m_{\sim 0}) :$$
 (31)

The elements  $U_{ij}$ ,  $V_{ij}$ ,  $N_{ij}$  of the diagonalization matrices enter the couplings of the charginos, neutralinos and sferm ions to ferm ions and gauge bosons, as explicitly given in ref. [32]. Note that our sign convention on the parameter is opposite to that of ref. [32].

### 4 Results

The experimental limits included in the tare summarized in table 1 [7, 8, 9, 10, 11]. They have not been updated with the latest results, since in practice only  $R_{b!\,s}$  and  $R_b$  require light SUSY particles, but their deviation from the SM has become so small, that they do not require sparticles below the experimental limits. The experimental observables used in the ts are shown in the rst column of table 2. The calculation of the total decay width of

experimental limits				
m ~ <sub>1;2</sub>	> 65 G eV			
m ~01	> 13 G eV			
m ~02	> 35 G eV			
m ~0 3;4	> 60 G eV			
Z! neutralinos	< 2 M eV			
m <sub>t1;2</sub>	> 48 G eV			
$m_h$ , $m_H$ , $m_A$ , $m_H$	> 50 G eV			

Table 1: Mass limits assumed for the optimized ts.

the Z boson into neutralinos is based on reference [34], the calculation of the ratio  $R_{b! s}$  on reference [35]. The next-to-leading-log calculations increase the SM prediction for  $R_{b! s}$  by about 10% to (3.2 0.5)10<sup>4</sup> [24]. This higher order contribution was taken into account in the rst order calculation by choosing the renorm alization scale = 0:7 m<sub>b</sub>.

As discussed in section 2.1,  $R_b$  depends on stop -, chargino- and Higgs masses. First the behaviour of the chargino masses as a function of the SUSY parameters and  $M_2$  is discussed, then the  $R_b$  dependence on the relevant SUSY masses is studied, both for the low and high tan scenarios. These studies are followed by the best solutions in the SM and MSSM.

#### 4.1 Chargino Masses

In order to explain an enhanced value of  $R_b$  in the data, the MSSM needs a light right handed stop and light chargino (low tan scenario), or a light pseudoscalar Higgs A (high tan scenario) [15]-[23]. A higgsino-like chargino can be obtained for a low value of the in the mass matrix (eq. 27). Figs. 4 and 5 show the dependence of the param eter charging masses on the parameter . For high tan  $m_{2}$  is almost symmetric around = 0, whereas for low tan this dependence is more complicated, as can be seen from g.4. For  $M_2 = 3j$  jthe light charging mass passes zero at = 40 GeV, so the following low tan plots were made for 40 GeV and 40 GeV. The asymmetric structure of g.4 > is rejected in the contours of constant R  $_{\rm b}$  in the m  $_{\rm 2}$  versus light scalar top m  $_{\rm tr}$  plane (see g. 6). Values of R<sub>b</sub> up to 0.2194 are possible (see gs. 6 and 7), although these special regions of the parameter space are already experimentally excluded by the lower limits on sparticle masses.

For  $M_2 = 3j$  j the lightest chargino is mostly higgsino-like, while the heavier one is gaugino like. M ixing the charginos more by taking  $M_2 = j$  jdoes not change these results very much, as can be seen from a comparison of the <sup>2</sup> distributions in g.8 ( $M_2 = 3j$ ) and g.9 ( $M_2 = j$ ). The sm all increase of the <sup>2</sup> at chargino m asses around 80 G eV in the left hand part of g.9 is due to neutralino threshold singularities, for which an additional

 $^2$  contribution has been added, when the sum of two neutralino m asses is close to the Z<sup>0</sup> m ass. The sharp increase of the  $^2$  function at low chargino m asses is due to experimental limits on chargino, neutralino and stop m asses from LEP 1.5 [7, 8, 9].

#### 4.2 Low tan scenario

Fig. 10 shows the change in the best obtainable <sup>2</sup> in the chargino – stop plane. For each value of the lighter scalar top m  $_{t_2}$  and lighter chargino m  $_{-2}$  in a grid of 10 10 points an optimization of m  $_{t}$ , s and the stop mixing angle m ix was performed, assuming M  $_2$  = 3j j for a xed value of tan = 1.6. In the next section this assumption on M  $_2$  will be dropped. Low sparticle masses yield a sharp increase in the <sup>2</sup> in g.10 because of the included m ass limits. The minimum <sup>2</sup> is obtained for chargino masses above 80 GeV and increases only slow ly with increasing sparticle masses. R<sub>b</sub> increases significantly with decreasing values of the stop and chargino mass, as can be seen from g.11. Much less significant is the change of R<sub>c</sub>. Within the plane of g.11 it changes less than 0.0005 units. The increase of R<sub>b</sub> must be compensated by a decrease of s (see g.12) in order to keep the total Z <sup>0</sup>-width constant. The stop mixing angle m ix, shown in g.13, is mainly determined by the CLEO measurement of R<sub>bl s</sub>. The chargino contribution to R<sub>bl s</sub> is proportional to the H iggs mixing parameter , which changes its sign form  $_{-2}$  60 GeV (see g.4), so the R<sub>bl s</sub> rate changes rapidly for these chargino masses, as shown in g.14.

### 4.3 High tan scenario

Similar ts can be performed for the high tan scenario in the pseudoscalar Higgs  $m_A$  versus light chargino plane. In g.15 the resulting change in the <sup>2</sup> is given for xed tan = 35. For small chargino masses there is a sharp increase in the <sup>2</sup> due to the corresponding mass limit, see above. The highest values for  $R_b$  can be obtained for small values of  $m_A$  and  $m_{\sim}$ , see g.16. As in the low tan case the enhancement of  $R_b$  must be compensated by a decrease of s, see g.17, and the change of  $R_c$  is small, less than 0.0006 within the given parameter plane. The mixing angle, shown in g.18, is mainly determined by the  $R_{b! s}$  rate, which can be tted in the whole  $m_A - m_{\sim}$  plane, see g.19.

#### 4.4 Best Solutions

#### Standard M odel F its:

The predictions of the SM are completely determ ined by the set of six input parameters  $M_Z$ ,  $m_t$ , the SM Higgs mass  $M_h$ , s,  $E_M$  and G. The error of the muon decay constant is so small that G can be treated as a xed parameter. The ne structure constant was taken to be  $1 = (M_Z) = 128.89 \quad 0.09[36]$ . The error on  $1 = (M_Z)$  turns out not to be negligible: xing  $1 = (M_Z)$  underestimates the error on the Higgs mass by 30%. The SM predictions were obtained from the ZFITTER package [12] and all the error correlations were taken from [4]. The tswere made with  $M_Z$ ,  $m_t$ ,  $m_H$ , s and as free parameters, which resulted in

$$M_{Z} = 91.186 \quad 0.002 \text{ GeV}$$

$$m_{t} = 172.0^{+5.8}_{5.7} \text{ GeV}$$

$$m_{H} = 141^{+140}_{77} \text{ GeV}$$

$$_{s}(M_{Z}) = 0.1197 \quad 0.0031$$

$$1=(M_{Z}) = 128.90^{+0.089}_{-0.090}$$

The minor di erences to the results given in [4] originate from the inclusion of the R  $_{b! s}$  ratio. The electroweak mixing angle can be determined from these parameters:

$$\sin^2 \frac{1}{MS} = 0.2316 \quad 0.0004$$
:

Both the strong coupling constant and the electroweak mixing angle  $\sin^2 \frac{1}{MS}$  have been determined at the scale M<sub>z</sub> in the  $\overline{MS}$  renormalization scheme. With m<sub>t</sub> = 175 GeV  $\sin^2 \frac{1}{MS} = \sin^2 \frac{lept}{eff}$  to an accuracy better than 0.0001. The quoted errors have been determ ined using M INOS [14]. Further details of the procedure are described elsewhere, see for example [37, 38]. The  $^{2}$ =dp:f of the SM t is 19.6/15 which corresponds to a probability of 19%. Here, the main contributions to the  $^2$  originate from  $\sin^2 \frac{lept}{eff}$  from SLD  $(^{2} = 4.9)$ ,  $R_{b}$   $(^{2} = 3.1)$  and  $A_{FB}^{b}$   $(^{2} = 3.5)$ . The prediction of  $R_{c}$  is good. If  $R_{b!s}$ is excluded from the t, one obtaines a  $^{2}$ =dp:f of 18.9/14, corresponding to a probability of 17%, in agreement with [4]. The correlation parameter between  $m_{\rm H}$  and  $m_{\rm t}$  for the best t is approximately 0.7; this strong correlation is shown in g. 20. One observes that the upper lim it on the Higgs mass is obtained for m<sub>t</sub> above 175 GeV; however, the upper lim it is sensitive to  $\sin^2 \frac{lept}{eff}$  as shown by the dashed contour in g.20, where the precise value of  $\sin^2 \frac{lept}{eff}$  from SLD was excluded from the t. The dependence of  $\sin^2 \frac{lept}{eff}$  on the SM Higgs mass is approximately logarithm ic (see g. 21). The LEP data without SLD yields  $m_{\rm H} = 241^{+218}_{123} \,\text{GeV}$ , while the SLD value of  $\sin^2 \frac{\text{lept}}{\text{eff}}$  corresponds to  $m_{\rm H} = 16^{+16}_{-9} \,\text{GeV}$ ; both m<sub>h</sub> values are indicated in gure 21 (by the square and the circle, respectively). The SLD value is excluded by the lower limit of 58.4 GeV from the combined LEP experiments [11], so m ore data is eagerly awaited.

The <sup>2</sup> dependence of the Higgs mass is shown in g. 22 for various conditions. Clearly, the  $\sin^2 \frac{lept}{eff}$  from SLD gives a large weight, while the new value from  $R_b$  plays only in m inor role in contrast to the previous value[5].

#### MSSM Fits and Comparison with the SM:

In order to obtain the best M SSM to the assumption M  $_2$  = 3j j is dropped and M  $_2$  is treated as a free parameter. As discussed in section 2.1 the dominant contributions vary for the high and the low tan scenario. The preferred tan values for these scenarios are around 35 and 1.6, respectively. Since the t is not very sensitive to the precise tan value, it was xed to these values. The tted M SSM parameters and the corresponding SU SY masses are given in table 3; the predicted values of all observables and their pulls are sum marized in table 2. For the M SSM M  $_{\rm Z}$ , G and were treated as xed parameters. The M SSM prediction of the W -boson mass is always higher than the SM one, but the values of the strong coupling constant, the electroweak mixing angle and the top mass are very similar in the M SSM :

$$_{s}$$
 (M<sub>z</sub>) = 0:116 0:005  
m<sub>t</sub> = 172 5 G eV  
sin<sup>2</sup>  $_{M,S}$  = 0:2315 0:0004:

These values are for the low tan scenario, but for high tan the same values are obtained, except for  $_{\rm s}$  = 0:119 0:005 in that case. The remaining parameters are given in table 3. A direct comparison to the SM ts is given in gs. 24-25. The SM t to the 20 measurements of table 2 with 5 parameters yields <sup>2</sup>=dp:f:= 19:6=15 which corresponds to a probability of 19%, while the M SSM ts correspond to probabilities of 17% (tan = 1:6, <sup>2</sup>=dp:f:= 16:6=12) and 11% (tan = 35, <sup>2</sup>=dp:f:= 18:1=12). In counting the do.f the insensitive (and xed) parameters are ignored, so only the parameters given in table 3 are considered. The di erence in <sup>2</sup> between SM and M SSM ts is mainly caused by R<sub>b</sub>, which is better described in the M SSM, although the di erence in <sup>2</sup> is insu cient to distinguish between the models.

The H iggs m ass is not an independent parameter in the M SSM, since the couplings in the H iggs potential are gauge couplings, which lim it the m ass of the lightest H iggs to a rather narrow range[39]. The high tan needs a light pseudoscalar H iggs m ass. As the lightest H iggs m ass is strongly correlated with the pseudoscalar H iggs m ass, it is also low. Sim ilar H iggs values in the M SSM m odel were obtained in ref. [40].

An interesting point is the tted value of  ${}_{\rm s}$  (M  ${}_{\rm Z}$ ). In previous analysis with the high values of R  ${}_{\rm b}$ ,  ${}_{\rm s}$  (M  ${}_{\rm Z}$ ) in the M SSM ( 0:11) was always significantly smaller than the SM value(0:123 0:005[11]), which supported the low energy values from deep inelastic scattering (D IS) (0:112 0:005[11]) and lattice calculations of the heavy quark splittings (0:110 0:006[11]). However, the discrepancies between the low energy  ${}_{\rm s}$  values and the LEP data have practically disappeared at the W arsaw C onference[41]: the Standard M odel value (0:120 0:003, see above) is now in agreem ent with D IS measurements (0:115 0:005[41]), lattice calculations 0:117 0:003[41] and the world average 0:118 0:003[41]. The M SSM values of  ${}_{\rm s}$  are in good agreement with these other determinations, as shown in g. 26.

The particle spectrum for the best ts, as shown in table 3, suggests that some SUSY particles could be within reach of LEP II. Unfortunately, if the stop-, chargino-and/or Higgs mass are well above the discovery reach of LEP II, the  $^2$  of the t increases at most up to the SM value, since these particles basically decouple as soon as they become heavier than the heaviest SM mass, say the top mass of about 200 G eV. So one cannot get upper limits on these particles, since the probability changes only a few percent between the SM and M SSM .

## 5 CMSSM and $R_{b}$

In the MSSM ts discussed above the lightest stop is mainly right-handed, while the lefthanded stop has to be heavy. If both would be light, then all other squarks would likely be light, which would upset the good agreem ent between the SM and all other electroweak data. A large mass splitting in the stop sector needs a very articial ne tuning of the few free parameters in the Constrained MSSM, which assumes unication of gauge and b-Yukawa couplings[38]. This is obvious from the sferm ion mixing matrix for the stop quarks, eq. 23. The D-terms proportional to  $\cos 2$  are negligible for tan 1. If one of the diagonal elements is much larger than  $m_t$ , the o-diagonal terms of the order  $m_t$  will not cause a mixing and the di erence between the left- and right-handed stops has to come from the evolution of the diagonal terms (for the notation see ref. [38]):

$$\frac{dM_{\mathcal{Q}_{3}}^{2}}{dt} = \left(\frac{16}{3} \sim_{3} M_{3}^{2} + 3 \sim_{2} M_{2}^{2} + \frac{1}{15} \sim_{1} M_{1}^{2}\right) \qquad (32)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix}Y_{t} \left(M_{\mathcal{Q}_{3}}^{2} + M_{\mathcal{D}_{3}}^{2} + m_{H_{2}}^{2} + A_{t}^{2} m_{0}^{2}\right) \\
+ Y_{b} \left(M_{\mathcal{Q}_{3}}^{2} + M_{\mathcal{D}_{3}}^{2} + m_{H_{1}}^{2} + A_{b}^{2} m_{0}^{2}\right)\right]$$

$$\frac{dM_{\mathcal{D}_{3}}^{2}}{dt} = \left(\frac{16}{3} \sim_{3} M_{3}^{2} + \frac{16}{15} \sim_{1} M_{1}^{2}\right) \\
- 2Y_{t} \left(M_{\mathcal{Q}_{3}}^{2} + M_{\mathcal{D}_{3}}^{2} + m_{H_{2}}^{2} + A_{t}^{2} m_{0}^{2}\right)$$

$$(32)$$

O ne observes that the di erence between left-and right handed stops, denoted by  $Q_3$  and  $U_3$ , respectively), depends on the Yukawa couplings for top and bottom  $(Y_t; Y_b)$  and the trilinear couplings  $A_{t(b)}$ . For low tan  $Y_b$  is negligible, while  $A_t$  and  $Y_t$  are not free parameters, since they go to xed point solutions[38]. Therefore there is little freedom to adjust these parameters within the CM SSM in order to get a large splitting between the left- and right-handed stops.

In addition, problems arise with electroweak symmetry breaking, since this requires the Higgs mixing parameter to be much heavier than the gaugino masses[38], while  $R_b$  requires low values of for a signi cant enhancement (since the chargino has to be preferably Higgsino-like). In conclusion, within the CM SSM an enhancement of  $R_b$  above the SM is practically excluded.

## 6 Conclusions

Both the MSSM and SM provide a good description of all electroweak data. The best  $^2$ =d p:f in the MSSM (SM) is 16.6/12 (19.6/15), which corresponds to a probability of 17% (19%). The lower  $^2$  of the MSSM is mainly due to the better description of R<sub>b</sub>, but the t requires an unnatural large splitting in the stop sector, as discussed in the previous section. Since the nalanalysis of most of the available LEP data is still in progress, one has to wait and see if the present prelim in any value of R<sub>b</sub> will indeed stay above the SM prediction.

Sym bol	m easurem ent		best tobservables					
			SM		M SSM			
tan and pull				pull	1.6	pull	35	pull
M <sub>z</sub> [GeV]	91.1863	0.0020	91.1861	80.0	91.1863	_	91.1863	_
z [GeV]	2.4946	0.0027	2.4958	-0.45	2.4946	-0.00	2.4940	0.22
<sub>h</sub> [nb]	41.508	0.056	41.468	0.72	41.461	0.84	41.449	1.05
R <sub>1</sub>	20.778	0.029	20.755	0.80	20.769	0.32	20.772	0.22
A <sup>l</sup> <sub>FB</sub>	0.0174	0.0010	0.0160	1.41	0.0162	1.20	0.0162	1,22
R <sub>b</sub>	0.2178	0.0011	0.2158	1.75	0.2174	0.38	0.2168	0.92
R <sub>c</sub>	0.1715	0.0056	0.1722	-0.13	0.1707	0.14	0.1708	0.12
A <sup>b</sup> <sub>FB</sub>	0.0979	0.0023	0.1022	-1.87	0.1031	-2.26	0.1031	-2.24
A <sup>c</sup> <sub>FB</sub>	0.0735	0.0048	0.0731	0.10	0.0736	-0.02	0.0736	0.01
A <sub>b</sub>	0.863	0.049	0.933	-1.45	0.9353	-1.49	0.9356	-1.50
A <sub>c</sub>	0.625	0.084	0.667	-0.50	0.6678	-0.51	0.668	-0.51
A	0.1401	0.0067	0.1460	-0.88	0.1470	-1.03	0.1466	-0.97
A <sub>e</sub>	0.1382	0.0076	0.1460	-1.03	0.1470	-1.16	0.1469	-1.14
$\sin^2 \frac{lept}{eff}hQ_{FB}i$	0.2320	0.0010	0,2316	0.35	0,2315	0.48	0,2315	0.46
M <sub>W</sub> [GeV]	80.356	0.125	80.355	0.01	80.403	-0.38	80.428	-0.58
$1 M_W^2 = M_Z^2$	0.2244	0.0042	0,2235	0.23	0.2225	0.45	0.2220	0.56
mt[GeV]	175	6.	172.0	0.50	172.5	0.42	172.0	0.50
$\sin^2 \frac{\text{lept}}{\text{eff}} (A_{LR})$	0,23061	0.00047	0.2316	-2,21	0,2315	-1.94	0.2315	-1.97
$R_{b!s}$ /10 $^4$	2.32 0	.67 0.5	3.1	-0.86	2.43	-0.12	2.33	0.0
1= (M <sub>z</sub> )	128.896	0.09	128.905	-0.10	128.89	-	128.89	-

Table 2: M easurem ents[4] and the predicted results of the tswith minimum <sup>2</sup>. The pulls are dened by (m easurem ent -predicted value) / error of the measurem ent. The second error for  $R_{b!\ s}$  has been added to take care of the uncertainty by the renormalization scale used for the calculation of that quantity. For the MSSM ts M<sub>z</sub> and 1= (M<sub>z</sub>) were taken as xed parameters, because their uncertainties are negligible compared to uncertainties arising from the soft breaking parameters. Leaving them free does not change the results.

Fitted SUSY parameters and masses					
Sym bol	tan = 1.6	tan = 35			
m <sub>t</sub> [GeV]	172	172			
S	0.116	0.1190			
M <sub>2</sub> [G eV ]	113	-			
[G eV ]	60	111			
m <sub>t2</sub> [G eV ]	48	187			
m ix	-0.18	0.04			
m <sub>A</sub> [G eV ]	-	50			
Particle Spectrum					
m <sub>ti</sub> [G eV ]	1 TeV				
m 🖞 [G eV ]	48	187			
m _ [G eV ]	1 TeV				
m <sub>1</sub> [GeV]	0.5 TeV				
m [G eV ]	149	1504			
m [G eV ]	84	111			
m [G eV ]	54	107			
m _0 [G eV ]	64	114			
m المرقي [G eV ]	100	722			
m [G eV ]	150	1504			
m <sub>h</sub> [G eV ]	109	50			
т <sub>н</sub> [GeV]	1 <b>:</b> 5 TeV	112			
m <sub>A</sub> [GeV]	1 <b>:</b> 5 TeV	50			
т <sub>н</sub> [GeV]	1 <b>:</b> 5 TeV	123			
<sup>2</sup> =dp:f:	16.6/12	18.1/12			
P robability	17%	11%			

Table 3: Values of the tted parameters (upper part) and corresponding mass spectrum (lower part). On the right hand side the results of the optimization for high tan are given. The dashes indicate irrelevant parameters which were chosen high.



Figure 4: Dependence of the chargino m asses (solid line= lightest one) on the parameter for  $M_2 = j j$  and  $M_2 = 3j j$  for tan = 1:6,  $_{\rm S}$  0:117 and  $m_{t_2}$  60 GeV. The shaded regions indicate chargino m asses less than 65 GeV which are excluded by LEP 1:5 and chargino m asses less than 96 GeV, which is the discovery reach for LEP II. Note that two light charginos are easier obtained, if  $M_2$ .



Figure 5: Dependence of the lightest chargino mass on the parameter for tan = 35 and M<sub>2</sub>=1500 GeV. The shaded regions as in g. 4. The heavy chargino mass is close to M<sub>2</sub> = 1500 GeV (not indicated).



Figure 6:  $R_b$  in the light stop versus light chargino plane with  $M_2 = 3j$  jand tan = 1:6. 40 GeV, in the lower part the one with The upper part shows the solution with < 40 GeV is displayed. In the latter solution quite high values for R<sub>b</sub> are possible, as > can be seen in the gure. The dashed line in the upper plot indicates the old 2 lower lim it of  $R_b$ . Recent updates of electroweak data yield  $R_b = 0.2178$ 0:0011.



 $R_b$  in the m<sub>A</sub> versus light chargino plane with  $M_2 = 3j j$  for the high tan Figure 7: solution. was chosen positive here. In this case choosing the opposite sign for doesn't change  $R_{b}$ .



Figure 8: Dependence of the absolute  $^{2}$  for > 40 GeV (left side) and < 40 GeV (right side), using M<sub>2</sub> = 3j j. No optimization of parameters was performed, but they were xed to values near the minimum.



Figure 9: The same as 8, but for M  $_2 = j j$ .



Figure 10: The <sup>2</sup> in the light stop and light chargino plane for tan = 1:6. At each point of the grid an optimization of  $m_t$ , s and the stop mixing angle  $m_{ix}$  was performed with > 40 GeV and  $M_2 = 3j j$ .



Figure 11:  $R_b$  in the light stop and light chargino plane. Optim ization as in g.10.



Figure 12:  $_{\rm s}$  in the light stop and light chargino plane. Optim ization as in g.10.



Figure 13: Stop mixing angle  $_{mix}$  in the light stop and light chargino plane. It is mainly determined by the  $R_{b!s}$  rate. Optimization as in g.10.



Figure 14:  $R_{b!s}$  in the light stop and light chargino plane for tan = 1:6. For chargino m assess higher than 60 GeV (and > 0) the predicted value is close to the CLEO m easurement of 2:32 0:67 10<sup>4</sup>. Optimization as in g.10.



Figure 15: The  $^2$  in the pseudoscalar H iggs and light chargino plane for tan = 35. For each given m<sub>A</sub> and light chargino m ass an optim ization of m<sub>t</sub>, s, m<sub>t<sub>2</sub></sub> and the stop m ixing angle m ix was performed. The irrelevant parameter M<sub>2</sub> was set to 1500 GeV.



Figure 16:  $R_b$  in the pseudoscalar H iggs and light chargino plane for tan = 35.0 ptim ization as in g.15.



Figure 17:  $_{\rm s}$  in the pseudoscalar H iggs and light chargino plane for tan = 35.0 ptim ization as in g.15.



Figure 18: Stop mixing angle  $_{mix}$  in the pseudoscalar Higgs and light chargino plane for tan = 35.0 ptimization as in g.15.



Figure 19:  $R_{b!s}$  in the pseudoscalar Higgs and light chargino plane for tan = 35. The prediction is close to the CLEO m easurement of 2:32 0:67 10 <sup>4</sup> within the whole parameter space. Optimization as in g. 15.



Figure 20:  $^2 = 1$  and  $^2 = 4$  contour lines for all electroweak data including  $\sin^2 \frac{\text{lept}}{\text{eff}}$  from SLD (continous line) and without it (dashed line). The stars indicate the best ts.



Figure 21: Dependence of the SM  $\sin^2 \frac{\text{lept}}{\text{eff}}$  on the Higgs mass. The top mass  $m_t = 175 - 9 \text{ GeV}$  was varied within its error, as shown by the dashed band labelled SM (upper (lower) boundary  $m_t = 166(184) \text{ GeV}$ ). The SLD and the LEP measurement of  $\sin^2 \frac{\text{lept}}{\text{eff}}$  are also shown as horizontal bands. The star and the square are respectively the results of the combined t to SLD and LEP data and LEP data without the SLD measurement of  $\sin^2 \frac{\text{lept}}{\text{eff}}$ , whereas the circle indicates the Higgs mass corresponding to the SLD measurement of  $\sin^2 \frac{\text{lept}}{\text{eff}}$ . Clearly, the SLD value yields a Higgs mass less than the combined LEP limit of 58.4 GeV (shaded area).



Figure 22: Dependence of the SM  $^2$  on the Higgs mass for a free top mass, taking all data (continuous line), all data without the SLD measurement of  $\sin^2 \frac{lept}{eff}$  (dashed line) and all data without R<sub>b</sub> (dotted line).



Figure 23: The  $^2$  in the region of the best t in the light stop and light chargino plane for tan = 1.6. Here the constraint on M<sub>2</sub> was dropped. At each point of the grid an optimization of m<sub>t</sub>, M<sub>2</sub>, s and the stop mixing angle mix was performed with > 40.



Figure 24: Resulting observables for the t given in table 3 for tan = 1:6.  $m_{\rm B}$  was xed to 1000 GeV,  $m_{\rm A}$  and the gluino mass were xed to 1500 GeV. The remaining deviation of  $R_{\rm b}$  from the SM prediction can be fully explained within the MSSM.



Figure 25: Resulting observables for the t given in table 3 for tan = 35.  $m_{\rm B}$  was xed to 1000 GeV, M<sub>2</sub> and the gluino mass were xed to 1500 GeV. It is possible to improve the prediction of R<sub>b</sub> with Supersymmetry even for high values of tan , but the result is not as good as for low values.



Figure 26: C om parison of di erent m easurements of  $_{\rm s}$  with our tresults, labeled SM and M SSM . The data has been taken from [11] and [41].

## References

- [1] For references see e.g. the review papers: H.-P.Nilles, Phys. Rep. 110 (1984) 1; H E.Haber, G L.Kane, Phys. Rep. 117 (1985) 75; A B. Lahanas and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Rep. 145 (1987) 1; R. Barbieri, Riv. Nuo. Cim.11 (1988) 1; W. de Boer, Progr. in Nucl. and Particle Phys., 33 (1994) 201. M. F. Sohnius, Phys. Rep.128 (1985) 39; P.Fayet and S.Ferrara, Phys.Rep. 32 (1977) 249.
- [2] F.Abe et al., CDF Collaboration, M easurem ents of the W Boson M ass, Phys. Rev. D 52 (1995) 4784; C.K.Jung, D Collaboration, W M ass M easurements from D and CDF Experiments at the Tevatron, talk given at the 27th ICHEP, G lasgow, Scotland, 20-27 July 1994.
- [3] F.Abe et al, CDF Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74 (1995) 2626, M arch 1995. S.Abachietal, D Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74 (1995) 2632, M arch 1995; An updated top m ass  $(m_t = 175 \ 6 \text{ GeV}/c^2)$  from the combined CDF and D0 data was given by P. Tipton, Plenary talk at 28th Int. Conf. on High Energy Physics, W arsaw, July, 1996;
- [4] A Blondel, Plenary talk at 28th Int. Conf. on High Energy Physics, W arsaw, July, 1996; LEP Electroweak Working Group, Internal Note Warsaw 96 LEPEW WG /96-02, July 1996.
- [5] LEP Electroweak Working Group, A Combination of Preliminary LEP Electroweak Measurements and Constraints on the Standard Model, CERN-PPE/95-172; LEP Electroweak W orking G roup, Internal N ote M oriond 96 LEPEW W G /96-01, M arch 1996.
- [6] CLEO-Collaboration, R. Ammaret al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, (1995) 2885.
- [7] ALEPH Collaboration, Search for Supersymmetric Particles on  $e^+e^-$  Collisions at Centre-of-M ass Energies of 130 and 136 GeV, CERN-PPE/96-10. L3 Collaboration, Search for Supersymmetric Particles at 130 < 5 < 140 GeV at LEP ,CERN-PPE/06-29 OPAL Collaboration, Searches for Supersymmetric Particles and Anom abus Four-Jet Production at  $rac{1}{s}$  = 130 and 136 GeV at LEP, CERN-PPE/96-096
- [8] OPAL Collaboration, Topological Search for the Production of Neutralinos and Scalar Particles, CERN-PPE/96-019; Search for Chargino and Neutralino P roduction U sing the OPAL D etector at p = 130-136 GeV, CERN-PPE/96-020; DELPHICollaboration, Search for the Lightest Chargino at p = 130 and 136 GeV, CERN-PPE/96-75.
  - ALEPH Collaboration, M ass Lim it for the Lightest Neutralino, CERN-PPE/96-083

- [9] D 0 C ollaboration, Search for Light Top Squarks in pp C ollisions at 1.8 TeV, Phys. Rev. Letters 76, 2222 (1996), FERM ILAB-PUB-95/380-E;
   D E LP H IC ollaboration, Search for neutralinos, scalar leptons and scalar quarks in e<sup>+</sup> e interactions at <sup>P</sup> s = 130 G eV and 136 G eV, CERN-PPE/96-110
   O PAL C ollaboration, Search for Scalar Top and Scalar Bottom Q uarks using the O PAL D etector at LEP, CERN-PPE/96-133
- [10] ALEPH Collaboration, M ass Limit for the Standard M odel Higgs Boson with the full LEP IALEPH D ata Sample, CERN PPE/96-079.
- [11] R M . Barnett et al., Phys. Rev. D 54 (1996) 1.
- [12] D.Bardin et al., ZFITTER, An Analytical Program for Fermion Pair Production in e<sup>+</sup>e Annihilation, CERN-TH.6443/92.
- [13] A.Dabelstein, Z.Phys.C 67 (1995) 495; Nucl. Phys. B 456 (1995) 25; A.Dabelstein,
   W.Hollik, W.Mosle, in preparation.
- [14] F. Jam es, M INUIT Reference M anual, Version 94.1, Computing and Networks D ivision CERN Geneva, Switzerland.
- [15] Proceedings of the W orkshop Physics at LEP2, Editors G. Altarelli, T. Sjostrand, F.Zwimer, Vol.1 and Vol2, CERN 96-01.
- [16] M.Boulware, D.Finnell, Radiative Corrections to BR (Z ! bb) in the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model, Phys. Rev. D 44 (1991) 2054.
- [17] P.H.Chankowski, S.Pokorski, Chargino M ass and R<sub>b</sub> Anom aly, Nucl. Phys.B 475 (1996) 3-26, hep-ph 9603310.
- [18] J.Ellis, J.L.Lopez, D.V.Nanopoulos, hep-ph/9512288.
- [19] D. Garcia, J. Sola, The Quantum Correlation R<sub>b</sub> R<sub>c</sub> in the MSSM: More Hints of Supersymmetry?, hep-ph/9502317, Phys. Lett. B 354 (1995) 335.
- [20] G L.Kane, R G.Stuart, JD.W ells, A G bbalFit of LEP/SLC Data with Light Superpartners, Phys. Lett. B 354 (1995) 350, UM -TH -94-16, hep-ph/9505207.
- [21] JD.Wells, C.Kolda, G.L.Kane, Implications of (Z ! bb) for Supersymmetry Searches and Model-Building, Phys. Lett. B 338 (1993) 219, UM -TH -94-23, hep-ph/9408228.
- [22] D.Garcia, R.Jimenez, J.Sola, Supersymmetric Electroweak Renormalization of the Z
   Width in the MSSM Phys. Lett. B 347 (1995) 309; Phys. Lett. B 347 (1995) 321.
- [23] D. Garcia, J. Sola, M atching the low Energy and the high Energy D eterm inations of <sub>s</sub> (M (Z)) in the M SSM , Phys. Lett. B 357 (1995) 349.
- [24] C.Greub, T.Hurth, Towards a next-to-leading logarithm ic result in B ! X<sub>s</sub>, SLAC-PUB-7267, IIP-SB-96-46, hep-ph/9608449;
   M.M isiak, talk given at 28th Int. Conf. on H igh Energy Physics, W arsaw, July, 1996.

- [25] A.Sirlin, Phys. Rev. D 22 (1980) 971.
   W.J.Marciano and A.Sirlin, Phys. Rev. D 22 (1980) 2695.
- [26] D.Garcia and J.Sola, Mod.Phys.Lett.A 9 (1994) 211. P.H.Chankowski, A.Dabelstein, W.Hollik, W.Mosle, S.Pokorskiand J.Rosiek, Nucl. Phys.B 417 (1994) 101.
- [27] For a recent review see: Precision Calculations for the Z Resonance, Yellow report CERN 95-03, eds. D. Bardin, W . Hollik and G. Passarino, and references therein.
- [28] L.Avdeev, J.Fleischer, S.M ikhailov and O.V.Tarasov, Phys. Lett. B 336 (1994) 560.
  J.Fleischer, O.V.Tarasov and F.Jegerlehner, Phys. Lett. B 319 (1993) 249;
  R.Barbieri, M.Beccaria, P.Ciafaloni, G.Curci. A.Vicere, Phys. Lett. B 288 (1992) 95; ibid. B 409 (1993) 105;
  K.G.Chetyrkin, J.H.Kuehn, M.Steinhauser, Phys. Lett. B 351 (1995) 331;
  J.Fleischer, F.Jegerlehner, P.Raczka, O.V.Tarasov, Phys. Lett. B 293 (1992) 437;
  G.Buchalla, A.J.Buras, Nucl. Phys. B 398 (1993) 285.
- [29] K.G.Chetyrkin, J.H.Kuhn and A.Kwiatkowski, Phys. Lett. B 282 (1992) 221;
  K.G.Chetyrkin and A.Kwiatkowski, Phys. Lett. B 305 (1993) 285;
  K.G.Chetyrkin, A.Kwiatkowski and M. Steinhauser, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 29 (1993) 2785;
  A.Kwiatkowski, M.Steinhauser, Phys. Lett. B 344 (1995) 359;
  K.G.Chetyrkin, J.H.Kuhn and A.Kwiatkowski, in: Precision Calculations for the Z Resonance, CERN 95-03, eds. D.Bardin, W.Hollik, G.Passarino S.Peris, A.Santam aria, CERN-TH-95-21 (1995).
- [30] M.Bohm, W.Hollik and H.Spiesberger, Fortschr. Phys. 34 (1986) 687.
   W.Hollik, Fortschr. Phys. 38 (1990) 165.
- [31] A.Denner, R.Guth, W.Hollik, J.H.Kuhn, Z.Phys. C 51 (1991) 695.
- [32] H.P.N illes, Phys. Rep. 110 (1984) 1.
  H.E.Haber and G.Kane, Phys. Rep. 117 (1985) 75.
  J.F.G union and H.E.Haber, Nucl. Phys. B 272 (1986) 1; Nucl. Phys. B 402 (1993) 567. J.F.G union, H.E.Haber, G.Kane and S.Dawson: The Higgs Hunter's Guide, Addison-W esley 1990.
- [33] J.Ellis, G.Ridol and F.Zwimer, Phys. Lett. B 257 (1991) 83.
- [34] R. Barbieri, G. Gamberini, G. Giudice, G. Ridol, Nucl. Phys. B 296 (1988) 75-90.
- [35] R.Barbieri and G.Giudice, Phys. Lett. B 309 (1993) 86;
  R.Garisto and J.N.Ng, Phys. Lett. B 315 (1993) 372;
  S.Bertolini, F.Borzum ati, A Masiero, and G.Ridol, Nucl. Phys. B 353 (1991) 591 and references therein;
  N.Oshimo, Nucl. Phys. B 404 (1993) 20;
  S.Bertolini, F.Vissani, Z.Phys. C 67 (1995) 513, 1995.

- [36] S.Eidelm an and F.Jegerlehner, Z.Phys.C 67 (1995) 585;
   H.Burkhardt and B.Pietrzyk, Phys. Lett. B 356 (1995) 398.
- [37] R.Ehret, Die Bestimmung der Kopplungskonstanten <sub>s</sub> am LEP-Speicherring und Tests von gro en Vereinigungstheorien, Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. Karlsruhe, IEKP-KA/95-13.
- [38] W .de Boer et al, Combined Fit of Low Energy Constraints to M inim al Supersymmetry and D iscovery Potential at LEP II, hep-ph/9603350; W .de Boer et al, Predictions of SUSY masses in the minimal supersymmetric grand uni ed theory, Z. Phys. C 67, (1995) 647-664.
- [39] W. de Boer et al., MSSM predictions of the Neutral Higgs Boson Masses And LEP II Production Cross-Sections, hep-ph/9603346 and references therein.
- [40] J. Ellis, G.L. Fogli, E. Lisi, Indications from Precision Electroweak Physics Confront Theoretical Bounds on the M ass of the Higgs Boson, CERN-TH/96-216, hepph/9608329.
- [41] M. Schmelling, Plenary talk at 28th Int. Conf. on High Energy Physics, W arsaw, July, 1996.