

CERN-TH/96-309
hep-ph/9610469

The Fate of the Leptophobic Z^0_a

Michelangelo L. MANGANO^b, Guido ALTARELLI

CERN, TH Division, Geneva, Switzerland

Nicola Di Bartolomeo

SISSA, Trieste, Italy

Ferruccio FERUGLIO

Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università and INFN, Padova, Italy

Raoul GATTO

Département de Physique Théorique, Univ. de Genève, Geneva, Switzerland

Abstract

We review the main features of the leptophobic- Z^0 phenomenology, commenting on the prospects of these models after the recent experimental results on R_c , R_b and after the recent theoretical analyses of jet production at the Tevatron.

CERN-TH/96-309
October 1996

^aTo appear in the Proceedings of the International Conference on High Energy Physics, Warsaw, Poland, July 24-31, 1996.

^bPresenting author. On leave of absence from INFN, Pisa, Italy.

1 Introduction

The possible existence of a new gauge interaction, mediated by a neutral, massive vector boson (Z^0) and very weakly coupled to leptons, has stimulated a large number of studies over the past year. Although the presence of additional $U(1)$ groups is a recurrent feature of models beyond the SM, the particular class of theories that we will be interested in here originated^{2,3} from the attempts to explain a very specific set of anomalies present in recent experimental data from LEP and from the Tevatron:

1. a 2.5 discrepancy between the measured and expected value of R_c (the fraction of hadronic Z decays into charm-quark pairs)⁴,
2. a 3.5 discrepancy between the measured and expected value of R_b (the fraction of hadronic Z decays into bottom-quark pairs)⁴, and
3. a large discrepancy between the measured and expected rate of high- E_T jets produced at the Tevatron pp collider⁵.

The total disappearance of the first effect, the existence of a new precise measurement of R_b which indicates a sharp decrease of the relative anomaly⁶, and the reduced significance of the high- E_T jet anomaly due to a better estimate of the gluon-density systematics⁷, remove completely the need to invoke such a departure from the SM. Or, to say the least, make it much less appealing than before. In this presentation I will nevertheless dutifully comply to the request of the session organizers, and present a short review of the main features of the leptophobic Z^0 models and of their possible phenomenological applications.

2 The origin

What made the proposal of a leptophobic Z^0 appealing was the coincidence of several, independent, facts. The large size of R_b , for example, made explanations in terms of virtual effects, such as supersymmetry, unlikely. The anomaly

⁴The number of papers appeared and the number of issues discussed are so large that in no way I will be able to quote and discuss them all, given the shortness of this contribution.

in R_c would also not easily be understood in a supersymmetric model, requiring additional features not present in the standard SUSY realizations. Among possible new tree-level phenomena, the existence of an extra $U(1)$, weakly coupled to leptons but sufficiently coupled to quarks so as to affect the relative rate of Z decays to different quark flavours, seemed a natural explanation to the R_c and R_b anomalies. Such a model, however, would have required a fine tuning of the Z^0 couplings to different quark flavours, in order to explain the precise agreement between the measured total Z hadronic width (Γ_h) and its SM value. Such a fine tuning would have spoiled the elegance of the model. A third feature of the data allowed an elegant solution to the fine-tuning problem: the 1995 values of R_b and R_c led in fact to the remarkable numerical coincidence that $3 R_b + 2 R_c = 0.0047 \pm 0.0134$, i.e. a number compatible with zero. This can be naturally accommodated by assuming a family-independent coupling of the Z^0 to up- and down-type quarks. This reduces the number of independent couplings to quarks from 9 to 3, and makes it easier to enforce the stability of Γ_h . It is this feature that in my view made the models of ref.^{2,3} particularly appealing. A failure of the relation among the R_c and the R_b anomalies would make this class of models less interesting. Using the latest data, one now gets $3 R_b + 2 R_c = 0.0047 \pm 0.0057$, a number still compatible with 0 at the 1- σ level. The current experimental situation, in which the world averaged R_b is a couple of σ s away from the SM and the R_c anomaly has vanished, would however be explained in a more theoretically-rewarding way by invoking a supersymmetric interpretation.

3 The models and their constraints

A leptophobic Z^0 model with the features sketched above is defined by at least 5 parameters: M_{Z^0} , the Z - Z^0 mixing angle θ , the coupling to L-handed quarks (κ) and the couplings to up- and down-type R-handed quarks ($\gamma_{u,d}$). To obtain a consistent model one should also provide a Higgs sector and complete the set of fermions in order to achieve anomaly cancellation. In addition to this, but not mandatory, one might want to consider high-energy embeddings of SM $U(1)^0$ into GUT or string models⁸. The minimal required Higgs sector can be determined by calculating the $U(1)^0$

charges of the doublet Higgs fields involved in the couplings to the known fermions. It is easy to see these charges are x_{Y_L}, x_{Y_R} and 0 for u-quark, d-quark and lepton mass terms respectively. Only one Higgs doublet is therefore necessary if $x_{Y_L} = x_{Y_R} = y_d$ (plus a field to break the $U(1)^0$ symmetry), two are needed if either $x_{Y_L} = x_{Y_R}$ or $x_{Y_L} = x_{Y_R} \neq 0$, and three Higgs doublets are necessary otherwise. The phenomenology of this extended Higgs sector, by itself, could lead to interesting phenomena and additional features observable at the Tevatron⁹.

The main constraints on the values of the 5 parameters of the models come from precision EW data. The Z^0 contribution to a generic EW observable O can be parametrized as follows:

$$O = \frac{A_O}{M} + B_O (x; y_u; y_d) \quad , \text{ where } \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{M_{Z^0}}{M_Z} = \frac{1}{\sin^2 \theta_W} \quad ;$$

$$\frac{M_{Z^0}}{M_Z} = \frac{M_{Z^0}}{M_Z} \quad ;$$

Typical examples are:

the total Z hadronic width:

$$\Gamma_h = (0.52x + 0.28y_u + 0.21y_d) \quad ; \quad (2)$$

which sets a strong correlation among the values of the three couplings because of the permille accuracy of the agreement between data and SM ;

the weak charge of the Cesium nucleus:

$$Q_W = 1 - \frac{M_Z}{M_{Z^0}} \quad ; \quad (3)$$

$$(798x + 376y_u + 422y_d) \quad ; \quad (3)$$

(experimentally equal to 1.8) which for $M_{Z^0} = M_Z$ sets an independent correlation among x, y_u and y_d because of the large coefficients;

the Z^0 b partial hadronic width (R_b):

$$R_b = (3.2x + 0.7y_u + 0.3y_d) \quad ; \quad (4)$$

Fits performed using pre-Warshaw data, i.e. data incorporating the spring results, give (for




Figure 1: Solid: dijet cross section at the Tevatron from the production of a Z^0 , integrated over the mass and rapidity ranges indicated in the plot. Dashes: 95% CL limits on the production cross section of a resonance decaying into jet pairs, as a function of the resonance mass, from CDF data.

$M_{Z^0} = 1 \text{ TeV}, m_H = 300 \text{ GeV}$ and $s = 0.118$):

$$= (2.8^{+0.9}_{-1.3}) \cdot 10^{-3} \quad x = 1.4^{+0.6}_{-1.4} \quad (5)$$

$$y_u = 3.3^{+2.9}_{-1.3} \quad y_d = 1.8^{+2.0}_{-1.0} \quad (6)$$

Fits performed using the Warshaw data⁶ give (for $M_{Z^0} = 1 \text{ TeV}, m_H = 300 \text{ GeV}$ and $s = 0.118$):

$$= (2.2^{+0.9}_{-5.3}) \cdot 10^{-3} \quad x = 0.49 \pm 0.6 \quad (7)$$

$$y_u = 2.0 \pm 1.4 \quad y_d = 2.1 \pm 1.7 \quad (8)$$

Notice that, neglecting correlations in the error matrix, all couplings and mixing are now individually compatible with 0 to within 1.5 .

4 Z^0 phenomenology at the Tevatron

As already mentioned, one of the appealing features of the leptophobic Z^0 is its possible connection with the high- E_T jet rate anomaly at the Tevatron. Several other possible implications for the Tevatron physics have been considered in the literature: the enhancement of the top-quark cross section¹⁰, the associated production of a light Z^0 and EW gauge bosons¹¹, the associated production of $W = Z$ with neutral and charged Higgs bosons⁹, the decay of the Z^0 into exotic fermions¹², the impact of Z^0 exchange on dijet angular correlations¹³. We present here the impact

on some observables which cover the Z^0 mass range $130 < M_{Z^0}(\text{GeV}) < 1200$. We used the central values of the t results presented in the previous section for both the pre-Warsaw and post-Warsaw experimental data. Fig. 1 shows the dijet invariant mass spectrum, in the range $150\{1000$ GeV, compared to CDF limits on a resonance of mass M and approximate width $0.1M$. The latest $R_{b/c}$ results reduce the window in which a Z^0 can be excluded from the $280\{560$ GeV range to the $320\{500$ GeV range. The reduction in excluded range is not dramatic as one might expect, due to decreased width of the Z^0 , which partly compensates the loss in total production rate by making the signal more peaked. Above 600 GeV the Z^0 becomes very wide. Only a small fraction of its rate can be found in a mass region of $0.1M_{Z^0}$, so that no limit can be obtained from bump searches in this region. Coverage down to lower mass values can be obtained from the old UA2 analysis¹⁴ (see Fig. 2). In this case the 90% CL excluded range is reduced to a window between 200 and 250 GeV. The effect of a Z^0 on the top production cross section, compared to the SM expectation¹⁵, is shown in Fig. 3. This effect used to set the strongest constraints on a Z^0 with mass in the region between 300 and 1000 GeV. Now one can exclude only the region $350\{600$ GeV, similar to the window excluded by the CDF searches in the m_{jj} spectrum.

The effect of the Z^0 on the dijet mass spectrum at the Tevatron, compared to current CDF data, is shown in Fig. 4, for 1 TeV Z^0 . As already pointed out in ref.², the central values of the typical pre-Warsaw t would give too large a j et rate in the region around 1000 GeV, unless the Z^0 mass were larger than 1.2 TeV. The reduction in couplings due to the latest t improves a bit the situation, but again less than naively expected, due to the reduced width which reduces the dijet mass smearing. One could nevertheless argue that the current t s produce a reasonable agreement with the high-mass behaviour of the data. If one neglected the indications⁷ that the uncertainty in the gluon density could reduce the j et anomaly, one should accept this as the only remaining evidence for the possible existence of a leptophobic Z^0 .




Figure 2: Same as Fig. 1, from UA2 data at the 90% CL.




Figure 3: Contribution of the Z^0 to the total tt cross section at the Tevatron (solid), compared to the SM expectation (dashes).




Figure 4: The standard comparison between data and QCD (or Z^0 vs QCD) for the dijet mass spectrum, on a linear scale. We show results for a 1 TeV Z^0 , with the set of pre- and post-Warsaw fixed couplings.

5 Conclusions

The new measurements of R_{cjb} seriously undermine the phenomenological motivations for the class of leptophobic Z^0 models recently considered in the literature. Due to the weakening of the fitted couplings (which are now consistent with 0 at the 1.5- σ level) the mass regions in which a Z^0 would have given a signal in hadronic collisions are significantly reduced. A Z^0 in the range below 200 GeV and above 600 GeV would have easily escaped detection so far. The high- E_T jet anomaly at CDF remains as the only set of data supporting, but not necessarily mandating, the existence of a Z^0 .

References

1. Presenting author
2. G. Altarelli et al., Phys. Lett. B 375 (1996)292.
3. P. Chiappetta et al., Phys. Rev. D 54 (1996)789.
4. The LEP Collaborations and the LEP Electroweak Working Group, CERN-PPE/95-172.
5. F. Abe et al, CDF coll., Phys. Rev. Lett. 77 (1996)438.
6. The LEP collaborations, SLD, the LEP EW Working Group and the SLD Heavy Flavour Working Group, LEP EW WG/96-02.
7. H.L. Lai et al, hep-ph/9606399.
8. K. Agashe, M. Graesser, I. Hinchli and M. Suzuki, hep-ph/9604266;
A. Faraggi and M. Masip, hep-ph/9604302;
K. Babu, C. Kolda and J. March-Russell, hep-ph/9603212;
M. Cvetič and P. Langacker, hep-ph/9602424.
9. H. Georgi and S. Glashow, hep-ph/9607202.
10. T. Gehrmann and W.J. Stirling, hep-ph/9603380.
11. V. Barger, K. Cheung and P. Langacker, hep-ph/9604298.
12. J. Rosner, hep-ph/9607207 and hep-ph/9607467.
13. M. Heyssler, hep-ph/9605403
14. J. Alitti et al, UA2 coll., Nucl. Phys. B 400 (1993)3.

15. S. Catani, M. L. Mangano, P. Nason and L. Trentadue, Phys. Lett. B 378 (1996)329.