CP V iolation, H iggs C ouplings, and Supersym m etry

K S.Babu, Christopher Kolda^y, John March-Russell^z and Frank W ilczek

School of Natural Sciences Institute for Advanced Study Princeton, NJ 08540

Abstract

Supersym m etric extensions of the standard m odel generically contain additional sources of CP violation. We discuss how at one loop a potentially large CP violating coupling of the lightest H iggs, h^0 , to leptons is induced in the m inim al supersym m etric standard m odel (M SSM). The CP violating couplings of h^0 in extensions of the M SSM, such as the next-to-m inim al supersym m etric standard m odel (NM SSM) are also considered. We indicate how this CP violation m ight be observed; in particular a polarization-dependent production asym m etry, in the context of a m uon collider, provides a m eans to access this coupling cleanly. In the M SSM, existing lim its on the electric dipole m om ent (EDM) of the electron, coupled with standard universality assumptions, severly constrains any such signal. N evertheless, extensions of the M SSM, allow CP-violating signals as large as 100%.

Current address: Departm ent of Physics, Oklahom a State University, Stillwater, OK 74078 ^yCurrent address: Law rence Berkeley National Laboratory, M S 50A-5101, One Cyclotron Road, Berkeley, CA 94720

^zA lfred P.S.ban Foundation Fellow. Current address: Theory Division, CERN, CH-1211, Geneva 23, Switzerland

1 Introduction

Supersymmetric (SUSY) extensions of the Standard M odel generically contain several additional CP-violating phases beyond the usual C abbibo-K obayashiM askawa phase. E lucidating their magnitude and structure is important if we are properly to understand the origin of CP violation, or the closely related question of the origin of the cosm ic matter-antimatter asymmetry. In this paper we will be concerned with new sources of CP violation in the Higgs sector of SUSY models.

D espite the large number of new phases in the model as a whole, it is well known that in the minimal SUSY extension of the standard model (MSSM) the tree level Higgs potential contains just one complex parameter, the term $B H_u H_d$. Even this phase can be removed by rede nitions of the Higgs elds. Then the vacuum expectation values of the Higgs scalars will be real, with no mixing between the physical scalar and pseudoscalar Higgs elds.

At one loop the situation is di erent. In Section 2 we will demonstrate that sizable H iggs sector CP violation can be induced at one-loop, even within the M SSM, and especially so at large tan . One place where CP-violating e ects can manifest them selves is in the couplings of the lightest neutral H iggs boson to Standard M odel ferm ions. In fact, we will see that these are in principle accessible at a suggested m uon collider operating on the H iggs resonance, at least in some regions of the SU SY parameter space. A lternatively, in variations of the M SSM with extended H iggs sectors (such as the so-called NM SSM, de ned below) the tree-level H iggs potential contains irrem ovable CP violating phases. Then substantial CP violation is possible even for sm all tan .

The possible m agnitude of CP violation in the H iggs sector is severely constrained by experimental limits on electric dipole moments (EDMs) of fermions. This is because the same diagrams that contribute to the CP-violating Higgs couplings also contribute to the EDMs of fermions. As we discuss in Section 3, current bounds on the EDM do little to constrain our scenario, but within the MSSM, bounds on the eEDM are highly constraining given minimal theoretical prejudices. In Section 3 we therefore also discuss how observation of CP violation, or lack thereof, in the Higgs-lepton coupling ts into the broader picture painted by avor-changing and CP-violation constraints on SUSY extensions of the Standard M odel. We emphasize that CP violation in the Higgs-ferm ion couplings is a way of discriminating the MSSM from more elaborate extensions, such as the NMSSM. Our conclusions are summarized in Section 4.

Though most of our discussion is phrased in terms of the coupling of the lightest neutral H iggs, h^0 , to charged leptons, much of our analysis applies more generally with only slight alterations to H iggs-quark couplings. There are also potentially interesting e ects of CP violation in the heavy H iggs sector, which are under study.

2 CP V iolation in the H iggs Sector

2.1 The M SSM

Let us rst discuss the situation in the minimal supersymemtric extension of the standard model (MSSM).

In the absence of SUSY breaking, the charged leptons couple to the Higgs eld H_d^0 , but not H_u^0 . A fler SUSY breaking, a coupling of the leptons to H_u^0 is generated at one loop, and in general it will not be real, due to phases in the soft-breaking parameters and the term. The resulting coupling of the lepton to the Higgs elds is of the form

$$\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{a} \mathbf{\bar{L}} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{H}_{d}^{0} + \mathbf{b} \mathbf{\bar{L}} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{H}_{u}^{0} + \mathbf{h} \mathbf{z};$$
(1)

By rede ning lepton elds while keeping the vacuum expectation values of the Higgs

elds real, we may choose a real but must then allow b to be complex. The resulting lepton mass term is then:

$$L_{mass} = \overline{L} (av_d + bv_u) + hc:$$

= Re (av_d + bv_u) + iIm (av_d + bv_u) + 5 ; (2)

where $v_{u,d} = \begin{bmatrix} D & E \\ H & u,d \end{bmatrix}^{D}$. In the Standard M odelw ith only one H iggs doublet, no physical CP violation can arise from the H iggs coupling, because the same rotations that m ake the lepton m asses real also m ake their couplings to the neutral H iggs particle real. But in this two-doublet extension the ferm ion m asses do not correspond directly to the couplings to the physical H iggs states. Speci cally, we can write

Re
$$H_{u}^{0} = \frac{p}{2} \cos h^{0} + \sin H^{0}$$

Re $H_{d}^{0} = \frac{1}{p} \sin h^{0} + \cos H^{0}$ (3)

where $m_{h^0} < m_{H^0}$.

Here, for the sake of sim plicity, we have m ade the good approxim ation of om itting additional \pseudoscalar" components on the right hand side. In principle one loop contributions to the Higgs elective potential can spontaneously break CP [1], and/or communicate explicit CP-violation in the soft masses and -term to the Higgs sector. In either case, a smallphase in the Higgs vacuum expectation values is induced which leads to scalar-pseudoscalar mixing, but this elect is < 1%, too small to a lect our conclusions. A relative phase between H_ui and H_di arises in the MSSM when a Higgs quartic coupling term $(H_uH_d)^2$ is induced, but since supersymmetry is broken

In general, because of SU $(2)_L$ -breaking, one should write one set of terms for the lepton mass generation and another set for their Yukawa couplings to the Higgses. However, if the electroweak symmetry-breaking elects are small (m_z smaller than M_{SUSY}), both the mass term and the Higgs coupling will to a good approximation arise from the terms in Eq. (1).

softly, such quartic terms arise from nite box graphs, which lead to a very small coe cient.

Since the transform ations that elim inate phases in the lepton and quark masses do not elim inate phases from their couplings to h^0 and H^0 , there is a residual violation of CP. In order to extract the CP violating portion of the h^0 , coupling, we must bok for some m ism atch between its phase and the phase of the $\overline{}$ mass term. It is convenient to write the H iggs coupling and m ass terms in the form s (1=2)j a sin + bcos jh^0 $\overline{}e^{i^{5'}}$ and $jav_d + bv_u \, \overline{j}e^{i^{5'}}$ respectively, where

$$\tan' = \frac{\text{Im} (a \sin + b \cos)}{\text{Re} (a \sin + b \cos)}$$
(4)

$$\tan = \frac{\operatorname{Im} (a \cos + b \sin)}{\operatorname{Re} (a \cos + b \sin)};$$
(5)

W hen the mass term is made real through a chiral rotation of the '- eld, the coupling to the light H iggs becomes

$$L_{h\bar{n}} = \frac{1}{\frac{p}{2}} j a \sin + b \cos j h^{0\bar{n}} e^{i(r)^{5}}$$
: (6)

The observable CP-violating phase is then '. It is clear that in the limit $!_{\overline{2}}$, or equivalently cot ! tan , the phase ' disappears (recall tan $v_i = v_d$). This is the well-known H iggs decoupling limit of the M SSM in which the second doublet becomes much heavier than the weak scale ($m_A m_Z$) so that the low - energy H iggs sector closely approximates that of the SM. The H iggs mixing angle aligns itself with that of the fermion mass terms so that the fermions e ectively couple to only one scalar H iggs eld, allowing all phases to be removed.

We are interested in the CP violation in the Higgs sector arising from the one loop induced parameter b. Representatives of the two basic classes of diagram s that contribute to the $\bar{V}H_{u}^{0}$ amplitudes are shown in Fig.1. These are in the same class of diagram s whose real parts have been studied both in certain ferm ion m ass generation scenarios [2] and have been found to signi cantly shift the b-quark m ass at large tan [3]; here we will con ne ourselves to the leptonic sector of the theory and study the imaginary parts of the diagram s. We will only work to leading order in the slepton, neutralino and chargino mixing, which is to say m_Z ;M₂; m_~, and in the lim it of 1. In these lim its, all of the contributing diagram s are linearly dependent on

= \cos , though for di erent reasons. (C ontributions proportional to soft trilinear A - term s do not receive this 1= \cos enhancem ent and thus their contributions to H iggs sector CP violation are unobservably sm all in generic scenarios.) This is also the approximation in which our elective Lagrangian is adequately described by Eq. (1); that is, we ignore term s in L with multiple insertions of H $^{0y}_{u,d}$ H $^{0}_{u,d}$ suppressed by the SU SY -breaking scale. This approximation is sulcient for our purposes since in the region where the CP violating H iggs couplings of the M SSM are signil cant, the corrections due to exact diagonalization of the various mass matrices are sm all.



Figure 1: Representative diagram s which contribute to the $\overline{L}_{L}^{\circ} R H_{u}^{0} + hc$: coupling.

The contribution to the Yukawa coupling from diagram 1(a) contains a factor of $= \cos \mod \inf$ from the left-right mixing of the sleptons^y:

$$A_{1} = \frac{3}{20} y$$
, $M_{1}f$, M_{1}^{2} ; m_{γ}^{2} ; m_{γ}^{2} (7)

where y_{v} is the lepton Yukawa coupling, M_{1} is the U (1) gaugino (i.e., bino) mass and

f
$$m_1^2; m_2^2; m_3^2$$
 $\frac{1}{m_3^2} \frac{x \ln x}{1 x} \frac{y \ln y}{1 y} \frac{1}{x y}$ (8)

with $x = m_1^2 = m_3^2$ and $y = m_2^2 = m_3^2$. Diagram 1(b) picks up a 1 = cos from the Yukawa coupling of the external muon to the H_d higgsino and a from the mixing of the H_d with H_u on the internal line:

$$A_{2} = \frac{2}{8} y_{1} M_{2} f^{2} f^{2}; M_{2}^{2} + 2f^{2}; M_{2}^{2}; M_{2}^{2}$$
(9)

where M_2 is the SU (2) gaugino (i.e., wino) mass. The contributions from both the charged and neutral gaugino/higgsino loops are included in A_2 . Finally, there are also contributions analogous to those of diagram 1 (b) but including only the (neutral) bino states in the loops. They contribute to the amplitude

$$A_{3}^{'} = \frac{3}{40} y_{*} M_{1}^{h} f^{2}; m_{*}^{2}; M_{1}^{2} 2f^{2}; m_{*}^{2}; M_{1}^{2}^{i}$$
(10)

Note that the function $M_2 f(^2; m_{\star}^2; M_2^2)$ in Eq. (9) (and similarly in Eq. (10)) has a maximum value of 1. In contrast, the function $M_1 f(M_1^2; m_{\star}^2; m_{\infty}^2)$ of Eq. (7) has a maximum value of $=M_1$ which can be signi cantly larger than 1.

The parameter b in the e ective Lagrangian is then simply the sum of the A_i 's. Numerically, jotan j a (since b is loop-suppressed) so that we can approximate

$$\sum_{CP} \tan(\prime) \prime \frac{\operatorname{Im}(b)}{a_{P}} (\cot + \tan)$$
(11)

$$2\frac{\text{Im } (\overset{F}{A}_{i})}{y_{y}} \frac{\min(m_{A}^{2};m_{Z}^{2})}{m_{A}^{2}+m_{Z}^{2}}$$
(12)

^yIn order to set our sign convention for , we take $W = (H_d H_u^+ H_d^0 H_u^0)$.

where C_{P} will be used henceforth to parameterize the amount of CP violation in the Higgs-lepton couplings. To get this last equation, we have used the well-known relation [4] of the MSSM, $\sin 2$ ' $(m_A^2 + m_Z^2) = jm_A^2 - m_Z^2 j \sin 2$ for large tan . Note that Eq. (12) demonstrates explicitly the suppression of the CP violation in the Higgs decoupling (large m_A) lim it.

For the case of the MSSM, lower tan means proportionally smaller C_{P} . Therefore we will restrict our attention to the large tan regime, in which C_{P} is maximized, when discussing the MSSM. Of course, even if the underlying CP violating phase arg() is 0 (1), the elects in the Higgs-lepton couplings will always be suppressed by a loop factor. Thus even at tan 50 one does not expect more than a 10% elect in the Higgs couplings, i.e., $C_{P} \leq 0.1$.

On the other hand, for the down-type quarks in the M SSM, the one-bop induced CP violation in the H iggs-quark couplings can be substantially bigger (of order 100%) owing to the tan -enhanced contribution from the gluino.

In Figure 2 we have shown a contour plot of the value of $_{CP}$ for tan = 50 and arg() = =4, with j jalong the x-axis. For simplicity we parameterize the masses of the gauginos along the y-axis using the usual supergravity-type parameter, M₁₌₂, where gaugino mass unication is assumed, i.e., $M_i = _iM_{1=2} = _{unif}$. We also assume escalar mass unication, de ning a \common" scalar mass M_0 ; however this last assumption is only used to de nem $_{\chi_L}^2 = M_0^2 + 0.5M_{1=2}^2$ and $m_{\chi_R}^2 = M_0^2 + 0.15M_{1=2}^2$ which are the form ulas which follow from a renorm alization-group analysis in supergravity models. For this gure we make the further illustrative choice that $M_0 = 2M_{1=2}$, though the qualitative features of the gures are independent of this, or any other, simplication. Both j j and $M_{1=2}$ are allowed to vary from 50 GeV to 10 TeV logarithm ically.

Note that the biggest e ects occur when the SUSY masses are large compared to the weak scale, with both Higgs doublets remaining light. This is not necessarily an unnatural scenario. Indeed, within supergravity-mediated models of SUSY-breaking, one expects the Higgs potential at large tan to be extremely at. In this case the second derivative along the imaginary direction (i.e., m_A^2) will be small, ensuring light Higgs doublets.

2.2 The NM SSM

The next-to-m inim al supersymmetric standard model (NM SSM) is the simplest extension of the M SSM. In this model, the H $_{d}$ H $_{u}$ term is replaced by the superpotential interaction W = N H $_{d}$ H $_{u}$ + $\frac{k}{3}$ N³, where N is a gauge singlet [5]. This has the advantage that the explicitly dimensionful parameter of the M SSM is replaced by hN i, with dimensionless. For our present purposes, the most important di erence from the M SSM is that now there is an irrem ovable phase in the H iggs sector, which can generate large CP violation even if all the soft supersymmetry breaking parameters are approximately real. Explicitly, the H iggs potential now has three term s with



Figure 2: P bot of _{CP} in the M SSM as a function of j jand the gaugino m ass parameter M ₁₌₂, both varying on a log scale from 50 G eV to 10 TeV. We have chosen tan = 50, arg() = =4 and the smuon soft m ass parameter M₀ = 2M₁₌₂. The shaded regions correspond to _{CP} > 10%, 5%, 2.5%, 1%, 0.5%, 0.25%, and 0.125% going from darkest to lightest.

non-trivial phase structure: V $k H_u H_d N^2 + A H_u H_d N + A_k k N^3 + hc: Even if the soft term s A and A_k are real, the phase of k cannot be removed. This generally leads to complex vev's for H_u, H_d and N [6]. The physical Higgs particles will then be admixtures of scalars and pseudoscalars.$

Thus in the NM SSM there are, already at tree-level, CP-violating couplings of the m ass eigenstate H iggs particles to ferm ions. This follows simply from

$$L = a \overline{}_{L} \overline{}_{R} H_{d}^{0} + h \varepsilon;$$

= $p \overline{\frac{a}{2}} O_{11} \overline{}_{N} h^{0} i O_{21} \overline{}_{5} h^{0} ;$ (13)

where O_{ij} is the matrix diagonalizing the H iggs sector mass eigenstates in the basis $(\text{ReH}_d^0; \text{Im H}_d^0; \text{ReH}_u^0; :::)^T = O(h^0; :::)^T$. We can again de ne C_P for the NM SSM (or any larger extension of the M SSM) as the amount of CP violation present in the H iggs-lepton couplings: $C_P = Q_1 = O_{11}$, assuming $C_P = 1$. (The above arguments follow equally well for H iggs couplings to quarks in the NM SSM.)

Now, however, in contrast to the MSSM , $_{\rm CP}$ has no strong dependence on tan , and no loop suppression, so that there can be large CP-violating e $\,$ ects over a wide range of tan $\,$.

2.3 Collider Searches

In order to measure directly the am ount of CP violation in the Higgs-lepton couplings, one will undoubtedly require a very large number of well-tagged Higgs bosons. To our know ledge, the most promising scheme for producing such a large sample is to operate a muon collider on the Higgs resonance^z. There are in principle several CP-violating observables which are accessible in a muon facility [8]. The most straightforward analysis is for the left-right polarization production asymmetry:

which is zero in the absence of CP violation. It is simple to show that

A '
$$\frac{4_{CP}P}{1+P^2}$$
: (15)

for beam polarizations P, assuming the same polarization for both beam s and $_{CP}$ 1. This is to be compared to a background from $^+$! (;Z)! $\overline{b}b$, which has a cross-section of the same order as that of the Higgs mediated process, but suppressed by $(1 P^2)$. A simple estimate can be made of the integrated luminosity, L, that will be necessary in order to make a 3 discovery of non-zero A (without considering losses due to acceptances and e ciencies): $L = (3=A)^2 (_{S} + _{B}) = \frac{2}{S}$ where $_{S(B)}$ is the signal (background) cross-section $_{LL} + _{RR}$.

In Fig. 3 we plot the lum inosity needed for a 3 measurement of non-zero A in one year (10⁷ s) against our CP-violating parameter _{CP}. (The gure assumes $m_{h^0} = 100 \,\text{GeV}$, but varying m_{h^0} changes the gure little.) The plotted lines represent the limit for di erent beam polarizations: from top to bottom, P = 0.2;0.5;0.8 and 1.0. For current collider design parameters of $L = 5 = 10^{30} \,\text{cm}^2 \,\text{s}^1$ and \natural" beam polarization (P = 0.2 [9]), one sees from the gure that _{CP} > 8% is accessible. To probe down to _{CP} = 2% would require a 16-fold increase in the luminosity or beam polarizations better than 75%.

A swew ill discuss in the next section, meausurements of the electron EDM, combined with well motivated assumptions about the slepton mass spectrum, constrain the CP violation in the muon coupling to be very small within the MSSM, usually < 1%. However, the constraints on the coupling are much weaker. So if the MSSM model is correct a more theoretically promising, though experimentally demanding, window for viewing CP violation in the Higgs-lepton couplings is in the nal state polarization asymmetry from h^0 ! ⁺ . (See Ref. [8] for a related discussion.)

W ithin the NM SSM (or other extensions of the M SSM Higgs sector), much larger CP-violating e ects are possible in the Higgs-lepton couplings. Though the constraints on the mass spectrum and CP-violating phases arising from the eEDM and EDM, reviewed in the following section, are essentially identical to those in the

^zFor a related discussion on CP violation in two photon coupling of the Higgs, see Ref. [7].



Figure 3: Lum inosity needed for a 3 m easurement of CP violation in the polarized production asymmetry $\stackrel{+}{}_{L,R} L_{,R} ! h^0 ! \overline{b}$ in one year, as a function of the amount of CP violation in the Higgs muon coupling ($_{CP}$). The four lines correspond (in descending order) to beam polarizations P = 0.2, 0.5, 0.8 and 1.0.

M SSM, the elective amount of CP violation in the Higgs-lepton couplings, $c_{\rm P}$, is much larger for two reasons. First, $c_{\rm P}$ in the NM SSM is unsuppressed by loop factors. Second, we can have a significant elective next for smalltan. In the next section, we will see that these properties permit much larger values of $c_{\rm P}$ 10% to 100% in the NM SSM. Conservative muon collider design parameters are already suicient to see such large CP violation.

3 Electric and magnetic dipole moments

The fundam ental CP-violating phase of the term which is responsible for the existence of a CP-violating H iggs-ferm ion coupling also contributes to the electric dipole m om ents (EDM s) of the electron, m uon and neutron. In fact, the diagram s of F ig. 1 contribute directly to the EDM of an electron or m uon when the external H iggs is replaced by its vacuum expectation value and a photon is attached to any charged line. Because the experimental constraints on the m uon and electron couplings are so di erent, we will consider them each in turn.

W hen ' = e in Figure 1, a non-zero eEDM is generated. Current experim ental constraints on the eEDM are extremely strong. Speci cally, $d = (1:3 \quad 1:6)$



Figure 4: EDM constraints for (a) tan = 50 and (b) tan = 2, as a function of j j and the gaugino m ass parameter, $M_{1=2}$, both varying on a log scale from 50 GeV to 10 TeV. For illustrative purposes, the soft scalar m ass parameter is taken to satisfy $M_0 = 2M_{1=2}$. Solid, long-dashed, and short-dashed curves correspond to arg() = =4,0.1,0.01 respectively. Regions below the curves are excluded by the current eEDM bound.

10²⁷ ecm [10]. The e ect of this constraint on the SUSY parameter space is astonishing. In Figure 4(a) we have shown the region of { M $_{1=2}$ parameter space excluded (at 90% C L.) for tan = 50 by the eEDM bound, following the calculation of Ref. [11]^x. Di erent contours correspond to di ering sizes of arg(): =4,0.1, and 0.01. Again, gaugino m ass uni cation is assumed, M_i = $_{i}M_{1=2}=_{unif}$, and the soft selectron m ass parameter is taken to satisfy M₀ = 2M₁₌₂. Figure 4(b) shows the excluded regions for tan = 2.

Plainly for O (1) phases and tan = 50, the masses of the SUSY particles must be so heavy as to approach being unnatural. The end result, in any case, is that one expects very little observable CP violation in the coupling of the H iggs to electrons. (O f course, sim ply observing the CP-conserving H iggs-electron coupling is so challenging that this is probably a moot point.)

For '=, the situation is not as clear. Current experimental bounds on the EDM, d = 3:7 3:4 10^{19} ecm [12], are not particularly constraining. Taken alone, the current bound on the EDM does little to limit the SUSY parameter space or the size of _{CP} predicted in the MSSM. Slightly more constraining is the muon magnetic dipole moment which is already measured to an accuracy of approximately 10^8 [12]. It is well-known that g 2 of the muon already excludes the MSSM with very large tan and very light sleptons: for universal masses and tan = 50, the sleptons must lie above 250 GeV at 90% C L. [13]. In fact, it is the real part of the

^xIn our evaluation of the 1-loop contributions to the `EDM s we have num erically diagonalized the full complex neutralino and slepton m ass m atrices. No m ass-insertion approximation has been performed.

diagram s of F ig. 1 that give such large contributions to g 2.

There are plans to improve both the EDM measurement as well as that of (g 2) in the near future [14]. Over the next few years, direct limits on the EDM should dram atically improve, reaching a limit near 10²³ ecm. Scaled by the appropriate $m_e=m$, this limit approaches within a factor of 10 that already obtained for the electron. If a non-zero EDM were to be measured, this would strongly bolster the case for observable CP violation in the direct H iggsm uon coupling. Conversely, non-observation would produce a strong bound, essentially equivalent to the arg() = 0:1 eEDM bound shown in Figure 4(a), making it unlikely that CP-violation in the M SSM H iggsm uon coupling could be observed.

We should take a moment to comment on the heavy mass limit. Figure 4(a) clearly shows that EDM constraints do/will require either very small phases or very heavy sparticles. In the case of sm all phases, c is similarly sm all. However, heavy m asses do not necessarily imply sm all cp, which is to say that this is an example of a SUSY non-decoupling e ect. It is easy to understand why we do not nd decoupling. In particular, if one takes $m_{\rm A}$ large along with the SUSY masses, leaving only a one Higgs doublet Standard M odel at low energies, then these e ects do decouple by virtue of the fact that in a one H iggs doublet m odel all CP violation can be elim inated eld rede nitions. The same is not true in a two Higgs doublet version of through the Standard M odel, which is what one has for light m A. Now when the SUSY states are integrated out, they generate CP-violating h^{07} terms in the Lagrangian of the two doublet model. Because this Higgs coupling is marginal (renorm alizable), those couplings are only logarithm ically sensitive to the SUSY scale. This is in contrast to the EDM operator, ⁵ F , which is irrelevant (non-renorm alizable) and therefore ow squickly to zero in the infrared as $1=M_{SUSY}$.

Do such large SUSY masses make sense? Perhaps. The main \esthetic" or \naturality" constraint on supersymm etric partnerm asses is that they not induce too large a correction to the Higgs (m ass)² param eter through diagram swhich grow quadratically with the mass of the superpartner. The one-loop contributions of the selectrons and sm uons to the H iggs (m ass)² param eter are proportional to their relatively sm all Yukawa couplings, allowing one to satisfy the naturality constraint with masses as large as 1000 TeV. (By way of contrast, the third generation squarks and sleptons as well as the gauginos, because of their 0 (1) couplings to the Higgs, must have m asses $< 1 \,\mathrm{TeV}$). However, there are two-loop contributions involving the light generation sferm ions not proportional to their sm all Yukawa couplings, and naturality [15] and vacuum stability [16] require that these sferm ion m asses be below about (5 20) TeV. Thus it is not immediately clear whether one should consider smuon masses such as those dem anded by Figure 4(a) to be unnatural or not. (Note that if the gaugino m asses are $< 1 \, \text{TeV}$, but 1st and 2nd generation scalars have m asses in the 5 10 TeV range, then \dot{c}_{P} in the MSSM is suppressed by a factor of $(m_2 = m_{\sim})$ 1=10; see Eqs. (7) { (10).)

However, as we now explain, under some reasonable assumptions concerning the

SUSY spectrum, the constraint on the eEDM can be used to constrain the EDM already. This is because the phase that enters the leptonic coupling via arg() is universal { all sleptons receive exactly the same phase. There can be non-universal phases com ing from the trilinear A term s, but they are not enhanced at large tan , and unless one assumes some kind of cancellation, the size of the CP -violating phases of the various sleptons are correlated. Furtherm ore, if the sm uon and selectron are approxim ately degenerate, then the constraint on the eEDM translates directly into a constraint on the m uon-H iggs coupling. It im plies for one thing that d < 10²⁴ ecm, which m eans that the BNL E 821 experiment [14] looking for a non-zero EDM should obtain a null result. It also m eans that the current lim it on the eEDM already constraints the CP violation in the M SSM H iggs-m uon coupling to be unobservable at a H iggs factory, even without any im provement in the EDM measurement.

W hy should we assume that the smuons and sleptons will be degenerate? Nondegenerate sleptons generically lead to large avor-changing neutral currents (FCNC's), speci cally ! e. Very heavy sleptons could also account for the lack of FCNC's in leptonic processes, but if the sleptons are non-degenerate then it is natural to expect the same for the squarks, and there the constraints are much stronger. In particular, in the presence of generic CP-violating phases, d-squark m asses would have to exceed approximately 5000 TeV [17] in order to agree with the measured CP violation in the kaon system, speci cally $_{\rm K}$ ' 2 10^3 . This is far above any possible de nition of a natural squark mass and we do not consider this possibility further. There is also the possibility that the new contributions to $_{\rm K}$ could be eliminated through alignment of the quark/squark mass matrices [18], but to our know ledge no very attractive model has been built along these lines. Thus we are left with degeneracy in the squark sector as by far the most attractive solution to the dual problem s of FCNC's and $_{\rm K}$, and by extension degeneracy becomes the most attractive scenario for the sleptons as well.

The preceding discussion of degeneracy really only applies to the st two generations of sparticles. The third generation, thanks to its small quark mixings with the other generations, has suppressed contributions to FCNC's and $_{\rm K}$. It would not be di cult to imagine, for example, that the st two generations of sleptons are degenerate and heavy, while the third is much lighter. In that case the constraint from the eEDM would not limit CP violation in the sector and so the decay h^0 ! + may be a likely place to observe violation of CP. (If $m_{e} = m_{e}$, then the eEDM constraint does apply, leaving little room for CP violation in the Higgs- coupling.)

The situation for the NM SSM and other extensions is slightly di erent. First, we emphasize that the EDM constraints on the (tree-level) phase are essentially identical (for a given SU SY spectrum) to the constraint on the size of CP-violating phases in the M SSM. Indeed, after suitable eld rede nitions, this phase of the NM SSM can be m oved into a phase of the eld rede nitions, this phase of the NM SSM can be m oved into a phase of the eld rede nitions, this phase of the NM SSM can be m oved into a phase of the eld rede nitions, this phase of the NM SSM can be m oved into a phase of the eld rede nitions, this phase of the NM SSM can be m oved into a phase of the eld rede nitions, this phase of the NM SSM can be m oved into a phase of the eld rede nitions, this phase of the NM SSM can be m oved into a phase of the eld rede nitions, this phase of the NM SSM can be m oved into a phase of the eld rede nitions, this phase of the NM SSM can be m oved into a phase of the eld rede nitions, this phase of the NM SSM can be m oved into a phase of the eld rede nitions, this phase of the NM SSM can be m oved into a phase of the eld rede nitions, this phase of the NM SSM can be m oved into a phase of the eld rede nitions, this phase of the NM SSM can be m oved into a phase of the eld rede nitions, this phase of the NM SSM can be m oved into a phase of the eld rede nitions, this phase of the NM SSM can be moved into a phase of the eld rede nitions, this phase of the NM SSM can be moved into a phase of the eld rede nitions, this phase of the NM SSM can be moved into a phase of the eld rede nitions, this phase of the NM SSM can be moved into a phase of the eld rede nitions, the NM SSM can be moved into a phase of the eld rede nitions into a phase of the NM SSM can be moved into a phase of the eld rede nitions into a phase of the NM SSM can be moved into a phase of the eld rede nitions into a phase of the eld rede nit

component of the neutralino to the EDM are suppressed, and one recovers exactly the structure arising in the M SSM .

Nevertheless, as we discussed in Sections 2.2–2.3, there are two important di erences between the MSSM and NMSSM.First, in the NMSSM the CP violation in the Higgs-lepton couplings is neither enhanced nor diminished by tan since it is a tree-level e ect. Therefore one does not require very large values of tan in order to obtain observable violations of CP.From the point of view of the EDM constraints, how ever, it is advantageous to have small tan. This is clear when comparing Figures 4 (a) and (b). For the same phase, the mass bounds at tan = 2 are roughly four times weaker than those at tan = 50. Thus the constraint coming from naturalness (i.e., dem anding light scalar masses) is less restricting at small tan , allowing in tum larger underlying phases and thus larger $_{CP}$.

A second di erence is that in the NM SSM CP-violating couplings of the Higgs particles to ferm ions occur at tree-level. Thus there are no loop suppressions which suppress $_{CP}$ with respect to the EDM.

The nale ect of these di erences is that for scalarm asses in the range 1 to 3 TeV, the underlying CP-violating phases in the NM SSM can be O (1) and thus \dot{C}_{P} O (1) as well. Even for sleptons in the 500 G eV mass range, it is quite natural to expect \dot{C}_{P} 10%, which can easily be probed in a single year at a muon collider of current conservative design parameters (see Figure 3). This is contrasted with the much smaller value (\dot{C}_{P} 1%) expected in the M SSM. Indeed, one can take advantage of this di erence and use a combination of EDM and CP-violating muon-Higgs coupling m easurements to discrim inate between the M SSM and its extensions.

4 Conclusions

In this paper we have shown that at 1-bop a potentially large CP-violating coupling of the H iggs to SM ferm ions is induced in the M SSM. The CP-violating coupling to m uons, $_{\rm CP}$, could be accessed cleanly through the polarization-dependent production asym metry at a m uon collider operating on the H iggs resonance. However, by in posing reasonable theoretical expectations, the motivations for which were discussed in Section 3, together with the current bounds on the eEDM, we found stringent constraints on the size of $_{\rm CP}$ in the M SSM. We argued that the CP-violating coupling of third generation ferm ions to the H iggs could be substantial nevertheless. In simple, natural extensions of the M SSM, such as the NM SSM, CP-violating couplings of h⁰ to SM ferm ions occur at tree level, and large CP violation is plausible for the H iggs couplings of all three generations of SM ferm ions, even after in posing the eEDM constraints. In particular, CP-violating signals at a muon collider of 0 (100%) are not ruled out.

A cknow ledgm ents

This research was supported in part by U.S.D epartm ent of Energy contract # DE-FG 02-90ER 40542, and by the W M.Keck Foundation. CK wishes to acknow ledge the generosity of Helen and M artin Chooljian.JM R is supported in part by an A lifed P.Sloan Foundation fellow ship. We would like to thank T.Ibrahim, H.Murayama, M.Peskin, and N.Polonsky for helpful conversations.

References

- [1] N.Maekawa, Phys. Lett. B 282 (1992) 387.
- [2] T.Banks, Nucl. Phys. B 303 (1988) 172;
 R.Hemp ing, Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994) 6168.
- [3] L.Hall, R.Rattazzi and U.Sarid, Phys. Rev. D 50 (1994) 7048.
- [4] See, e.g., J. Gunion et al., The Higgs Hunter's Guide, Addison-Wesley, 1990.
- [5] P.Fayet, Nucl. Phys. B 90 (1975) 104.
- [6] N.Haba, Prog. Theor. Phys. 97 (1997) 301.
- [7] B.Grzadkowski and J.Gunion, Phys. Lett. B 294 (1992) 361.
- [8] D. Atwood and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D 52 (1995) 6271;
 A. Pilaftsis, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77 (1996) 4996;
 B. Kam al, W. Marciano and Z. Parsa, hep-ph/9712270.
- [9] R. Palmer (for the Muon Collider Collaboration), physics/9802005.
- [10] E.Commins et al, Phys. Rev. A 50 (1994) 2960.
- [11] T. Ibrahim and P.Nath, Phys. Rev. D 57 (1998) 478.
 See also Y.Kizukuri and N.Oshimo, Phys. Rev. D 46 (1992) 3025.
- [12] R.Barnett et al. (Particle Data Group), Phys. Rev. D 54 (1996) 1.
- [13] T.Moroi, Phys. Rev. D 53 (1996) 6565;
 M.Carena, G.Giudice, and C.Wagner, Phys. Lett. B 390 (1997) 234.
- [14] Y. Sem ertzidis et al. (E821 Collaboration), AGS Expression of Interest: Search for an Electric Dipole Moment of the Muon, Sept. 1996. See also http://www.phy.bnl.gov/g2muon/home.html.
- [15] S.D in opoulos and G.G iudice, Phys. Lett. B 357 (1995) 573;
 A.Cohen, D.Kaplan and A.Nelson, Phys. Lett. B 388 (1996) 588.

- [16] N.ArkaniHam ed and H.Murayam a, Phys.Rev.D 56 (1997) 6733.
- [17] F.Gabbianietal, Nucl. Phys. B 477 (1996) 321;J.Bagger, K.Matchev and R.Zhang, Phys. Lett. B 412 (1997) 77.
- [18] Y.Nir and N.Seiberg, Phys.Lett.B 309 (1993) 337;
 Y.Nir and R.Rattazzi, Phys.Lett.B 382 (1996) 363.