Um a M ahanta M ehta R esearch Institute C hhatnag R oad, Jhusi A llahbad-211019

Abstract

If supersymmetry is spontaneously broken at a low energy scale then the resulting gravitino will be very light. The interaction strength of the longitudinal components of such a light gravitino to e e pair then becomes comparable to that of electroweak interactions. If such a light gravitino is present it would signify analy modify the cross-section for $e_L e_R$! $e_L e_R$ from its MSSM value. Precision measurement of this cross-section could therefore be used to probe the low energy supersymmetry breaking scale s.

If supersymmetry (SUSY) is spontaneously broken at a low energy scale ($_{s}$ 1 10 Tev) then the resulting gravitino is expected to be very light (m $_{\frac{3}{2}}$ $\frac{F}{M_{p}}$ 10⁴ 10² ev). The interaction strength of the longitudinal components of such a light gravitino i.e. the goldstino with ferm ion-sferm ion pair is expected to be of the order of electrow eak couplings [1]. Such a light gravitino could lead to new and interesting signatures at forthcom ing high energy colliders. It could also signi cantly modify the collider expectations for m any processes from their corresponding M SSM value [2]. Precision m easurem ent of the crosssection for such processes can therefore be used to set stringent bounds on the SU SY breaking scale ($_{s}$).

A high energy e e collider with the provision for polarising both the incoming electron beam s to a high degree provides an ideal environm ent for such studies. Consider for example the selectron pair production at an e e collider. Depending on the polarizations of the incom ing electron beam s there are three distinct processes that can be studied namely $e_L e_R$! $e_L e_R e_R e_R e_R e_R$ and $e_L e_L$! $e_L e_L e_L$. In the context of MSSM the low est order contribution to the st and second processes arise from the t channel exchange of a B $[\beta]$, whereas the last process receives non-vanishing contributions both from B and W $_3$ exchanges. In this work we shall assume for sim plicity that the lightest neutralino is gaugino like and m ore precisely a bino. The M a jorana nature of \mathbb{B}^{2} and \mathbb{W}_{3} gives rise to ferm ion number violating propagtors which is crucial for all the three processes to take place. shows that they arise from the chirality ipping part of the gaugino propagator. They therefore vanish as the relevant gaugino mass approaches zero. However the amplitude for $e_L e_R ! e_L e_R$ arises from the chirality conserving part of the gaugino propagator and therefore it remains nite in the same limit. The longitudinal components of the gravitino behaves as a M a prana ferm ion and it also interacts with e e pair through Yukawa interactions just like the electroweak gauginos. The only di erence is that tha gauge couplings are replaced by the soft gravitino coupling $e_g = \frac{mr_e^2}{F}$ [4]. Here $\frac{p_{-}}{F}$ s is the scale for dynam ical supersymmetry breaking. Hence it follows from the above discussion that the existence of a su ciently light gravitino would modify the cross-section for $e_L e_R$! $e_L e_R$ but keep the cross-sections for the processes $e_L e_L$! $e_L e_L$ and $e_R e_R$! $e_R e_R$ almost una ected. P recision measurement of the cross-section for $e_L e_R$! $e_L e_R$ could therefore be used to set a lower bound on the SUSY breaking scale s. This however requires that the selectron mass m_e and the bino mass (M) be known with su ciently good accuracy from other studies. The selectron mass and the bino mass can be determined from the energy distribution of the electron arising from selectron decay.

The Yukawa interactions of bino (\mathbb{B}°) and gravitino (\mathbb{G}°) with e e pair are given by [4]

$$L_{1} = \left[\underbrace{\mathbf{p}}_{\underline{2}}^{0} \mathbb{B}^{P}_{L} \underbrace{\mathbf{e}}_{L}\right]^{p} - \frac{p}{2g^{0}} \mathbb{B}^{P}_{R} \underbrace{\mathbf{e}}_{R}] + h \mathbf{c}:$$
(1)

$$L_2 = e_g 2[GP_R ee_R + GP_L ee_L] + hc:$$
(2)

In the context of M SSM (e_g 0) the transition amplitude for $e_L e_R$! $e_L e_R$ arises from the t channel exchange of a bino and is given by M = M_a + M_b where

$$M_{a} = g^{02} v (p_{2}; s_{2}) P_{R} \frac{p_{1}: k_{1}:}{t M^{2}} P_{L} u (p_{1}; s_{1}):$$
(3)

$$M_{b} = g^{02} v (p_{2}; s_{2}) P_{L} \frac{p_{1}: k_{2}:}{u M^{2}} P_{R} u (p_{1}; s_{1}):$$
(4)

Clearly M_a and M_b are the transition amplitudes associated with the direct and crossed diagram s. Here $(p_1; p_2)$ are the momenta of the incoming electrons and $(k_1; k_2)$ are the momenta of the outgoing selectrons. Squaring the transition amplitude and summing over the incoming electron spins we get

$$X = \frac{1}{2g^{04}} p_{1}^{2} = \frac{2g^{04}}{(t - M^{2})^{2}} [2p_{1}:(p_{1} - k_{1})p_{2}:(p_{1} - k_{1}) - p_{1}:p_{2}:(p_{1} - k_{1})^{2}] + \frac{2g^{04}}{(u - M^{2})^{2}} [2p_{1}:(p_{1} - k_{2})p_{2}:(p_{1} - k_{2}) - p_{1}:p_{2}:(p_{1} - k_{2})^{2}]:$$
(5)

Note that at very high energy where the electron mass can be neglected there is no interfernce between M_a and M_b i.e. the t and u channel am plitudes. For sim plicity in this work we shall ignore any mixing between e_L and e_R and assume that $m_{e_L} = m_{e_R} = m_e$. The above expression for P_{s_1,s_2} M f then becomes after some algebra

$$\sum_{s_1, s_2} M = 2g^{04} (ut m_e^4) \left[\frac{1}{(u M^2)^2} + \frac{1}{(t M^2)^2} \right]:$$
 (6)

The contribution of a light gravitino exchange to the transition amplitude for $e_L e_R$! $e_L e_R$ is given by

$$M = 2e_{g}^{2} \left[\frac{1}{t} v(p_{2};s_{2})(p_{1} k_{1}): P_{L}u(p_{1};s_{1}) + \frac{1}{u}v(p_{2};s_{2})(p_{1} k_{2}): P_{R}u(p_{1};s_{1})\right]:$$
(7)

A ssum ing that M is small compared to M we can neglect j M j compared to M f. We then obtain

$$X = M + M^{2} \int 2g^{04} (ut m^{4}_{e}) \left[\frac{1}{(t M^{2})^{2}} + \frac{1}{(u M^{2})^{2}} \right]$$

$$8g^{02}e_{g}^{2} (ut m^{4}_{e}) \left[\frac{1}{t(t M^{2})} + \frac{1}{u(u M^{2})^{2}} \right]: (8)$$

Integrating over all directions the total cross-section for $e_L e_R ! e_L e_R$ to low est order in e_g^2 becomes $_{LR} = (_{LR})_{m \ ssm} + _{LR} where$

$$(_{LR})_{m \text{ ssm}} = \frac{1}{2 \text{ s}} \frac{p}{\frac{1}{5} \frac{4mr_e^2}{p}}{\frac{p}{s}} \frac{q^{04}}{4} [\frac{a}{b} \ln \frac{a+b}{a} 2]$$
 (9)

$$_{R} = \frac{1}{2 \text{ s}} \frac{p}{p} \frac{1}{\overline{s}} \frac{4m_{e}^{2}}{p} \frac{g^{02}e_{g}^{2}}{2} \left[\frac{b^{2}}{b(c-a)} \ln \frac{a+b}{a-b} - \frac{b^{2}}{b(c-a)} \ln \frac{c+b}{c-b} - 2\right];$$
(10)

In the above $a = m_e^2$ $M^2 \frac{s}{2}$, $b = \frac{p_s}{2}p \frac{1}{s} - 4m_e^2$ and $c = m_e^2 \frac{s}{2}$. A su ciently light gravitino would therefore lower the cross-section LR from its MSSM value. We nd that unless the selectron m ass is too close to the threshold the M SSM contribution to the crosssection is quite large. For example $m_e = 150 \text{ Gev}$ and M' = 100 Gev yields a cross-section of 960 fb. W ith an integrated lum inosity of 50 fb¹ per year we therefore expect around 48000 events. The statistical error in the cross-section would therefore be about .4% which can be further be reduced by increasing the lum inosity or the running time. The gravitino contribution to LR is bounded by the di erence between the experim ental value and the M SSM contribution. We therefore need to estim ate the theoretical system atic error in the MSSM cross-section arising from the uncertainties in M and me. The values of M and m_e are constrained by the electron energy distribution to lie in a narrow elliptical region with positive correlation [5]. The M SSM cross-section decreases with increasing M or m_e . The contours of constant LR are therefore perpendicular to the uncertainty ellipse. If we assume that M and m_e are both known with an accuracy of 1% then by using Eqn.(9) it can be shown that the system atic error in the M SSM cross-section is about 1.5% for the central values M = 100 Gev and $m_e = 150 \text{ Gev}$. Both the system atic error and the statistical error how ever decreases with decreasing superpartner mass. The condition $\frac{j_{LR}j}{(L_R)_{m ssm}}$:01 could therefore be used to derive an approximate lower bound on $\stackrel{P}{F}$ provided m_e and M are around 100 Gev. W e $\,$ nd that for M $\,$ = 100 Gev and m $_{\rm e}$ = 150 Gev the SUSY breaking scale must be greater than 1.4 Tev so that the gravitino contribution is below the precision limit for measuring L_R . The bound corresponds to a center of mass energy of 500 G ev. A technically better estim ate of the bound can be obtained by using the relation

and

L

2. Here B is the MSSM background and S is the gravitino contribution to the signal. For $m_e = 150 \text{ Gev}$, $M^{\sim} = 100 \text{ Gev}$ and an integrated lum inosity of 50 fb⁻¹ we then qet F 124 Tev which is close to the bound obtained by using the relation $\frac{j-j}{j}$:01. The angular distribution of the gravitino contribution clearly diers from from that of the MSSM contribution since the form er involves a massless propagator and the latter a massive one. Hence by considering an angular range where the gravitino contribution is enhanced relative to the MSSM contribution it might be possible to push the lower bound on s to higher values. W hat are the implications of our result on known models of low energy dynam ical supersymmetry breaking (DSB)? Recently a lot of interest has been devoted to the construction of models with gauge mediated SUSY breaking (GMSB) [6] which constitutes an example of low energy DSB. However for the simplest models of GM SB the SUSY breaking scale $_{\rm s}$ lies between 10^2 10^5 Tev. Hence the process considered in this work will not be able to probe the SUSY breaking scale associated with the simplest versions of GMSB. However there could well be other scenarios of DSB with a SUSY breaking scale close to 1 Tev and super partners in few hundred Gev range which could fall within the sensitivity reach of the process considered in this work. The supersymmetry breaking in such models has to be communicated to the visible sector by som e interactions other than SM gauge interactions.

It should be noted that the selectron pair production cross-section at an e^+e^- collider can also be used to set bounds on ${}^{p}\overline{F}$. At an e^+e^- collider depending on the polarization of the incoming electron beam there are two distinct cross-sections that can measured namely $_{L}$ and $_{R}$. To eliminate the contribution of t channel W_{3} the incoming electron beam can be chosen to be RH. The transition amplitude for $_{R}$ receives contribution from t channel B' exchange and s channel and Z exchanges. The contribution of t channel B' exchange has a chirality conserving and a chirality ipping piece. C learly the existence of a very light gravitino modi es only the chirality conserving piece. However there are several advantages in using the e e collision mode for probing the SU SY breaking scale

6

instead of the e^+e^- m ode. Firstly in the context of M SSM at an e^-e^- collider, $_{LR}$ gets contribution only from t channel B' exchange. However at an e^+e^- collider $_R$ gets contribution from t channel B' exchange as well as a channel and Z exchanges. The analytical expression for $_R$ at an e^+e^- collider is therefore much more complicated than that of $_{LR}$ at an e^-e^- collider. Secondly the backgrounds to selectron pair production at e^-e^- collider are very sm all. M ost of the major backgrounds to selectron pair production and chargino pair production are prohibited by ferm ion number conservation. The remaining e^-W^- background originating from the LH incoming electron beam can be suppressed by in posing suitable kinemiatic cuts on the transverse energy of the nalistate electron. These remaining backgrounds can be calculated and subtracted from the total cross-section so as to reduce the total uncertainty in the M SSM contribution.

References

1. P.Fayet, Phys. Lett. B 69, 489 (1977); 70, 461 (1977); 84, 421 (1979); 86, 272 (1979).

- 2. S.D im opoulos, S. Thom as and J. D. W ells, Nucl. Phys. B 488, 39 (1997); J. A. Bagger, K.T. Matchev, D. M. Pierce and R.-J. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D 55, 3188 (1997);
 J.L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos and A. Zichichi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 5168 (1996); J. Ellis, J.L. Lopez and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B 394, 354 (1997).
- 3. H.E.Haber and G.L.Kane, Phys. Rept. 117, 76 (1985); H.-C.Cheng, Ferm ilab-Conf-98/005-T, hep-ph/9801234.
- 4. P.Fayet, Phys. Lett. B, 84, 416 (1979); 86, 272 (1979).
- 5. H. -C. Cheng, J. L. Feng and N. Polonsky, Phys. Rev. D 56, 6875 (1997); H. -C. Cheng, J. L. Feng and N. Polonsky, Phys. Rev. D 57, 152 (1998); J. L. Feng, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 62, 36 (1998).
- 6. M. D ine and A. Nelson, Phys. Rev. D 48, 1277 (1993); M. D ine, A. Nelson and Y. Shinman, Phys. Rev. D 51, 1362 (1995); M. D ine, Y. N ir and Y. Shinman Phys. Rev. D 53, 2658 (1996).

7