

Mimicking the Standard Model Higgs Boson in UMSSM

Chun-Fu Chang¹, Kingman Cheung^{2,1}, Yi-Chuen Lin¹, and Tzu-Chiang Yuan³

¹*Department of Physics, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu 300, Taiwan*

²*Division of Quantum Phases & Devices, School of Physics,
Konkuk University, Seoul 143-701, Republic of Korea*

³*Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Nankang, Taipei 11529, Taiwan*

(Dated: January 27, 2021)

Abstract

Motivated by the recent results in the standard model (SM) Higgs boson search at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) we investigate the SM-like CP-even Higgs boson of the $U(1)'$ -extended minimal supersymmetric standard model (UMSSM) and its branching ratio into the $b\bar{b}$, WW^* , and $\tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ modes. In the Summer 2011, a 2σ excess was reported in the channel $H \rightarrow WW^* \rightarrow \ell^+\nu\ell^-\bar{\nu}$ around 130–140 GeV range. Later on in December 2011 announcements were made that an excess was seen in the 124–126 GeV range, while the SM Higgs boson above 131 GeV up to about 600 GeV is ruled out. We examine two scenarios of these mass ranges: (i) $130 \text{ GeV} < M_{h_{\text{SM-like}}} < 141 \text{ GeV}$ and show that the Higgs boson can decay into invisible neutralinos to evade the SM bound; and (ii) $120 \text{ GeV} < M_{h_{\text{SM-like}}} < 130 \text{ GeV}$ and show that the Higgs boson can avoid decaying into neutralinos and thus gives enhanced rates into visible particles. We use the η model of E_6 with TeV scale supersymmetry to illustrate the idea by scanning the parameter space to realize these two different scenarios.

I. INTRODUCTION

The excitement of particle physics in the year 2011 was the hunt for the Higgs boson, the Higgs boson of any model, in particular that of the standard model (SM) at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC). The recent data in the Summer 2011 [1], showed an approximately 2σ excess in the channel $WW^* \rightarrow \ell^+\nu\ell^-\bar{\nu}$ ($\ell = e, \mu$) above the expected SM backgrounds. The excess is consistent with a Higgs boson of mass about 140 GeV but with a somewhat smaller production rate of $H \rightarrow WW^* \rightarrow \ell^+\nu\ell^-\bar{\nu}$ than the SM one. However, in December 2011 both ATLAS [2] and CMS [3] announced possible hints of excess in $\gamma\gamma$, WW , and ZZ channels that are consistent with a SM-like Higgs boson in the mass range of 124 – 126 GeV; and at the same time rule out a SM Higgs boson above 131 GeV up to about 600 GeV. Except for the $\gamma\gamma$ channel almost all channels are slightly suppressed relative to the SM cross sections at around 124–126 GeV. Note that these results consist of large errors. In this work, we consider two mass ranges, 120 – 130 and 130 – 141 GeV, for the SM-like Higgs boson of the $U(1)'$ -extended minimal supersymmetric standard model (UMSSM). We will entertain these two ranges in the supersymmetry (SUSY) framework, because the current data are still premature to definitely confirm a Higgs boson, not to mention its mass.

Supersymmetric models in general predicts a light Higgs boson, mostly below about 150 GeV. In particular, the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) predicts a light Higgs boson with $M_h \lesssim 130$ GeV. Thus, a Higgs boson heavier than 130 GeV significantly constrains the parameter space of the MSSM, forcing the sfermions masses to exceed the TeV range, and consequently SUSY loses somewhat of its appeal. It is then more natural to consider extensions to the MSSM if the light Higgs boson is heavier than 130 GeV, and to hide this Higgs boson by suppressing its branching ratio into visible modes. It is well known that by adding singlet Higgs field can easily raise the Higgs boson mass. Recent attempts to raise the Higgs boson mass in SUSY frameworks can be found in Refs. [4–11], and attempts to hide such a light Higgs boson heavier than 130 GeV in the current data can be found in Refs. [12–32].

On the other hand, if the SM-like Higgs boson falls in the mass range of 124–126 GeV and future data may further support that, this Higgs boson should decay into visible particles, almost in the same pattern as the SM Higgs boson, though the current data [2, 3] showed a slightly enhancement to the $\gamma\gamma$ mode while slightly suppression to the WW , ZZ , and $b\bar{b}$

modes. Recent attempts interpreting the 124 – 126 GeV Higgs boson in SUSY framework can be found in Refs. [33]. In order to give a 124 – 126 GeV Higgs boson within MSSM, the stop sector must consist of a very heavy stop, a large mixing, and a relatively light stop, which has an interesting implication to collider phenomenology. However, within the MSSM it is rather difficult to enhance the $\gamma\gamma$ production rate but easier in some other extensions like the Randall-Sundrum scenario [34] and others [35].

It is therefore timely to investigate an extension of MSSM, which involves an extra $U(1)'$ symmetry and a Higgs singlet superfield S . The scalar component of the Higgs singlet superfield develops a vacuum expectation value (VEV), which breaks the $U(1)'$ symmetry and gives a mass to the $U(1)'$ gauge boson, denoted by Z' . At the same time, the VEV together with the Yukawa coupling can form an effective μ_{eff} parameter from the term $\lambda\langle S\rangle H_u H_d = \mu_{\text{eff}} H_u H_d$ in the superpotential, thus solving the μ problem of MSSM (the same as the NMSSM [36]).

Existence of extra neutral gauge bosons had been predicted in many extensions of the SM [37]. String-inspired models and grand-unification (GUT) models usually contain a number of extra $U(1)$ symmetries, beyond the hypercharge $U(1)_Y$ of the SM. The exceptional group E_6 is one of the famous examples of this type. Phenomenologically, the most interesting option is the breaking of these $U(1)$'s at around TeV scales, giving rise to an extra neutral gauge boson observable at the Tevatron and the LHC. In a previous work [38], we considered a scenario of $U(1)'$ symmetry breaking at around TeV scale by the VEV of a Higgs singlet superfield in the context of weak-scale supersymmetry. The Z' boson obtains a mass from the breaking of this $U(1)'$ symmetry and proportional to the VEVs. Such a Z' can decay into the SUSY particles such as neutralinos, charginos, and sleptons, in addition to the SM particles. Thus, the current mass limits are reduced by a substantial amount and so is the sensitivity reach at the LHC [38, 39].

In this work, we turn our focus to the Higgs sector in UMSSM, which consists of 3 CP-even Higgs bosons, 1 CP-odd Higgs boson, and one pair of charged Higgs bosons. Because of the extra singlet Higgs superfield the mass of the lightest Higgs boson is raised by a substantial amount, easily to be above 130 GeV. However, for such a heavy Higgs boson, we have to hide it under the current data because the SM Higgs boson is ruled out for above 141 GeV [2, 3]. In UMSSM, there is an invisible decay mode of the SM-like Higgs boson into a pair of lightest neutralinos. We shall show that there are substantial parameter space

that it is possible to hide the SM-like Higgs boson in this manner. On the other hand, if the SM-like Higgs boson lies in the lower mass range 120 – 131 GeV, we can find the parameter space that this SM-like Higgs boson decays in a manner similar to the SM Higgs boson, i.e., the decay branching ratios into $\gamma\gamma$, WW , ZZ , and $b\bar{b}$ are all similar to the SM values.

So what are the differences between the UMSSM and the other ones such as the next-to-minimal supersymmetric standard model (NMSSM)? There are a number of extensions to the MSSM by adding a Higgs singlet superfield depending on the different extra terms of the singlet in the superpotential (such as κS^3 of the NMSSM). However, these extensions often predict a light CP-odd Higgs boson in addition to the usual MSSM-like CP-odd Higgs boson, such that the SM-like Higgs boson decays dominantly into this light CP-odd Higgs boson. In such a way, the branching ratios into $\gamma\gamma$, WW , ZZ , and $b\bar{b}$ diminish to negligible values, and so cannot explain the excess seen at the LHC. The point here is that not all Higgs-singlet extensions to the MSSM can account for the excess at the LHC, although most of them can raise the Higgs boson to the desirable value. The UMSSM, on the other hand, only has one CP-odd Higgs boson, which is MSSM-like.

We organize the paper as follows. In the next section, we describe the model briefly and work out the mass matrix of the CP-even Higgs bosons. In Sec. III, we list the formulas for the couplings of the CP-even Higgs bosons that are most relevant to our study. In Sec. IV, we search for the parameter space in the model that can have a SM-like Higgs boson in the two mass ranges of (i) 130 – 141 GeV and (ii) 120 – 130 GeV, and show the branching ratios into WW , $b\bar{b}$, and $\tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0$. We discuss and conclude in Sec. V.

II. UMSSM

For illustration we use the popular grand unified models of E_6 , which are anomaly-free. Two most studied $U(1)$ subgroups in the symmetry breaking chain of E_6 are

$$E_6 \rightarrow SO(10) \times U(1)_\psi, \quad SO(10) \rightarrow SU(5) \times U(1)_\chi.$$

In E_6 each family of the left-handed fermions is promoted to a fundamental **27**-plet, which decomposes under $E_6 \rightarrow SO(10) \rightarrow SU(5)$ as

$$\mathbf{27} \rightarrow \mathbf{16} + \mathbf{10} + \mathbf{1} \rightarrow (\mathbf{10} + \mathbf{5}^* + \mathbf{1}) + (\mathbf{5} + \mathbf{5}^*) + \mathbf{1}.$$

We require one of the $U(1)$'s remains unbroken until around TeV scale, and then broken to give masses to the Z' boson and its superpartner Z' -ino. Each **27** contains the SM fermions, two additional singlets ν^c (conjugate of the right-handed neutrino) and S , a D and D^c pair (D is the exotic color-triplet quark with charge $-1/3$ and D^c is the conjugate), and a pair of color-singlet $SU(2)$ -doublets H_u and H_d with hypercharge $Y_{H_u, H_d} = \pm 1/2$. In the supersymmetric version of E_6 , the scalar components of one $H_{u,d}$ pair (out of 3 if there are 3 families) can be used as the two Higgs doublets $H_{u,d}$ of the MSSM. The chiral charges $U(1)_\chi$ and $U(1)_\psi$ for each member of the **27** are listed, respectively, in the third and fourth columns in Table I. In general, the two $U(1)_\psi$ and $U(1)_\chi$ can mix to form

$$Q'(\theta_{E_6}) = \cos \theta_{E_6} Q'_\chi + \sin \theta_{E_6} Q'_\psi, \quad (1)$$

where $0 \leq \theta_{E_6} < \pi$ is the mixing angle. A commonly studied model is the Z'_η model with

$$Q'_\eta = \sqrt{\frac{3}{8}} Q'_\chi - \sqrt{\frac{5}{8}} Q'_\psi, \quad (2)$$

which has $\theta_{E_6} = \pi - \tan^{-1} \sqrt{5/3} \sim 0.71\pi$. There are also the inert model with $Q'_I = -Q'(\theta_{E_6} = \tan^{-1} \sqrt{3/5} \sim 0.21\pi)$, the neutral N model with $\theta_{E_6} = \tan^{-1} \sqrt{15} \sim 0.42\pi$, and the secluded sector model with $\theta_{E_6} = \tan^{-1} \sqrt{15}/9 \sim 0.13\pi$. The chiral charges for each member of the **27** are also listed in the last four columns in Table I for these four variations of Z' models within E_6 . Here we take the assumption that all the exotic particles, other than the particle contents of the MSSM, are very heavy and well beyond the reaches of all current and planned colliders. For an excellent review of Z' models, see Ref. [37].

The effective superpotential W_{eff} involving the matter and Higgs superfields in UMSSM can be written as

$$W_{\text{eff}} = \epsilon_{ab} [y_{ij}^u Q_j^a H_u^b U_i^c - y_{ij}^d Q_j^a H_d^b D_i^c - y_{ij}^l L_j^a H_d^b E_i^c + h_s S H_u^a H_d^b], \quad (3)$$

where $\epsilon_{12} = -\epsilon_{21} = 1$, i, j are family indices, and y^u and y^d represent the Yukawa matrices for the up-type and down-type quarks respectively. Here Q, L, U^c, D^c, E^c, H_u , and H_d denote the MSSM superfields for the quark doublet, lepton doublet, up-type quark singlet, down-type quark singlet, lepton singlet, up-type Higgs doublet, and down-type Higgs doublet respectively, and the S is the singlet superfield. Note that we have assumed other exotic fermions are so heavy that they have been integrated out and do not enter into the above effective superpotential. The $U(1)'$ charges of the fields H_u, H_d , and S are related by $Q'_{H_u} +$

TABLE I. The chiral charges of the left-handed fermions for various Z' models arised in E_6 [37]. Note that $Q'_{f_R} = -Q'(f^c)$ since all the right-handed SM fermions are necessarily charge-conjugated to convert into left-handed fields in order to put them into the irreducible representation of $\mathbf{27}$ of E_6 .

$SO(16)$	$SU(5)$	$2\sqrt{10}Q'_\chi$	$2\sqrt{6}Q'_\psi$	$2\sqrt{15}Q'_\eta$	$2Q'_I$	$2\sqrt{10}Q'_N$	$2\sqrt{15}Q'_{\text{sec}}$
16	$\mathbf{10}(u, d, u^c, e^c)$	-1	1	-2	0	1	-1/2
	$\mathbf{5}^*(d^c, \nu, e^-)$	3	1	1	-1	2	4
	ν^c	-5	1	-5	1	0	-5
10	$\mathbf{5}(D, H_u)$	2	-2	4	0	-2	1
	$\mathbf{5}^*(D^c, H_d)$	-2	-2	1	1	-3	-7/2
1	$\mathbf{1}S$	0	4	-5	-1	5	5/2

$Q'_{H_d} + Q'_S = 0$ such that $SH_u H_d$ is the only term allowed by the $U(1)'$ symmetry beyond the MSSM. Once the singlet scalar field S develops a VEV, it generates an effective μ parameter: $\mu_{\text{eff}} = h_s \langle S \rangle$. The case is very similar to NMSSM, except we do not have the cubic term S^3 since it is forbidden by the $U(1)'$ symmetry.

The singlet superfield will give rise to a singlet scalar boson and a singlino. The real part of the scalar boson will mix with the real part of H_u^0 and H_d^0 to form 3 CP-even Higgs boson. The imaginary part of the singlet scalar will be eaten in the process of $U(1)'$ symmetry breaking and becomes the longitudinal part of the Z' boson. The singlino, together with the Z' -ino, will mix with the neutral gauginos and neutral Higgsinos to form 6 neutralinos. Studies of various singlet-extensions of the MSSM can be found in Refs. [40, 41]. At or below TeV scale the particle content is almost the same as the MSSM, except that it has 3 CP-even Higgs boson, 1 CP-odd Higgs boson, and a pair of charged Higgs boson in the Higgs sector, and also a Z' boson and 2 extra neutralinos (coming from the Z' -ino and the singlino.)

The gauge interactions involving the fermionic and scalar components, denoted generically by ψ and ϕ respectively, of each superfield are

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \bar{\psi}_i i \gamma^\mu D_\mu \psi_i + (D^\mu \phi_i)^\dagger (D_\mu \phi_i), \quad (4)$$

where ψ_i and ϕ_i denote the Majorana fermionic and bosonic components of the superfield,

respectively. The covariant derivative of ϕ_i is given by

$$D_\mu \phi_i = \left[\partial_\mu + ieQA_\mu + i\frac{g}{\sqrt{2}}(\tau^+ W_\mu^+ + \tau^- W_\mu^-) + ig_1(T_{3L} - Qx_w)Z_\mu + ig_2 Z'_\mu Q' \right] \phi_i. \quad (5)$$

Here e is the electromagnetic coupling constant, Q is the electric charge, g is the $SU(2)_L$ coupling, τ^\pm are the rising and lowering operators on weak doublets, T_{3L} is the third component of the weak isospin, and Q' is the chiral charges of the $U(1)'$ associated with the Z' boson. The interactions of Z' with all MSSM fields go through Eqs. (4) and (5). The chiral charges of various Z' models are listed in Tables I. The coupling constant g_1 in Eq. (5) is the SM coupling $g/\cos\theta_w$, while in grand unified theories (GUT) g_2 is related to g_1 by

$$\frac{g_2}{g_1} = \left(\frac{5}{3} x_w \lambda \right)^{1/2} \simeq 0.62 \lambda^{1/2}, \quad (6)$$

where $x_w = \sin^2 \theta_w$ and θ_w is the weak mixing angle. The factor λ depends on the symmetry breaking pattern and the fermion sector of the theory, which is usually of order unity.

The Higgs doublet and singlet fields are

$$H_d = \begin{pmatrix} H_d^0 \\ H_d^- \end{pmatrix}, \quad H_u = \begin{pmatrix} H_u^+ \\ H_u^0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad S. \quad (7)$$

The scalar interactions are obtained by calculating the F - and D -terms of the superpotential, and by including the soft-SUSY-breaking terms. The terms involving the neutral components of the Higgs fields are

$$V_H = V_F + V_D + V_{\text{soft}}, \quad (8)$$

with

$$V_F = | -h_s H_u^0 H_d^0 |^2 + |h_s S|^2 (|H_u^0|^2 + |H_d^0|^2), \quad (9)$$

$$V_D = \frac{g_1^2}{8} (|H_u^0|^2 - |H_d^0|^2)^2 + \frac{g_2^2}{2} (Q'_{H_u} |H_u^0|^2 + Q'_{H_d} |H_d^0|^2 + Q'_S |S|^2)^2, \quad (10)$$

$$V_{\text{soft}} = M_{H_u}^2 |H_u^0|^2 + M_{H_d}^2 |H_d^0|^2 + M_S^2 |S|^2 + (-h_s A_s S H_u^0 H_d^0 + \text{h.c.}). \quad (11)$$

The minimization conditions of $\partial V_H / \partial H_u^0 = 0$, $\partial V_H / \partial H_d^0 = 0$, and $\partial V_H / \partial S = 0$ at the

vacuum give the following tadpole conditions:

$$M_{H_u}^2 = -\frac{v_d^2}{2} \left(h_s^2 - \frac{g_1^2}{4} + g_2^2 Q'_{H_d} Q'_{H_u} \right) - \frac{v_u^2}{2} \left(\frac{g_1^2}{4} + g_2^2 Q'^2_{H_u} \right) - \frac{v_s^2}{2} (h_s^2 + g_2^2 Q'_S Q'_{H_u}) + \frac{h_s A_s v_s v_d}{\sqrt{2} v_u}, \quad (12)$$

$$M_{H_d}^2 = -\frac{v_d^2}{2} \left(\frac{g_1^2}{4} + g_2^2 Q'^2_{H_d} \right) - \frac{v_u^2}{2} \left(h_s^2 - \frac{g_1^2}{4} + g_2^2 Q'_{H_u} Q'_{H_d} \right) - \frac{v_s^2}{2} (h_s^2 + g_2^2 Q'_S Q'_{H_d}) + \frac{h_s A_s v_s v_u}{\sqrt{2} v_d}, \quad (13)$$

$$M_S^2 = -\frac{v_d^2}{2} (h_s^2 + g_2^2 Q'_{H_d} Q'_S) - \frac{v_u^2}{2} (h_s^2 + g_2^2 Q'_{H_u} Q'_S) - \frac{v_s^2}{2} g_2^2 Q'^2_S + \frac{h_s A_s v_u v_d}{\sqrt{2} v_s}. \quad (14)$$

where $\langle H_u^0 \rangle = v_u/\sqrt{2}$, $\langle H_d^0 \rangle = v_d/\sqrt{2}$, and $\langle S \rangle = v_s/\sqrt{2}$ are the VEVs. The two VEVs v_u and v_d satisfy $v^2 \equiv v_u^2 + v_d^2 = (246 \text{ GeV})^2$ and the ratio $\tan \beta \equiv v_u/v_d$ is commonly defined in the literature. Now we can expand the Higgs fields as

$$\begin{aligned} H_d^0 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (v_d + \phi_d + i\chi_d), \\ H_u^0 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (v_u + \phi_u + i\chi_u), \\ H_S^0 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (v_s + \phi_s + i\chi_s), \end{aligned}$$

and substitute into V_F , V_D , and V_{soft} . The tree level mass matrix $\mathcal{M}^{\text{tree}}$ can be read off from the bilinear terms in the expansion, namely

$$V_{\text{mass}} = \frac{1}{2} (\phi_d, \phi_u, \phi_s) \mathcal{M}^{\text{tree}} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_d \\ \phi_u \\ \phi_s \end{pmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{11}^{\text{tree}} &= \left(\frac{g_1^2}{4} + g_2^2 Q'^2_{H_d} \right) v_d^2 + \frac{h_s A_s v_s v_u}{\sqrt{2} v_d}, \\ \mathcal{M}_{22}^{\text{tree}} &= \left(\frac{g_1^2}{4} + g_2^2 Q'^2_{H_u} \right) v_u^2 + \frac{h_s A_s v_s v_d}{\sqrt{2} v_u}, \\ \mathcal{M}_{33}^{\text{tree}} &= g_2^2 Q'^2_S v_s^2 + \frac{h_s A_s v_d v_u}{\sqrt{2} v_s}, \\ \mathcal{M}_{12}^{\text{tree}} &= \left(h_s^2 - \frac{g_1^2}{4} + g_2^2 Q'_{H_u} Q'_{H_d} \right) v_d v_u - \frac{h_s A_s}{\sqrt{2}} v_s = \mathcal{M}_{21}^{\text{tree}}, \\ \mathcal{M}_{13}^{\text{tree}} &= (h_s^2 + g_2^2 Q'_{H_d} Q'_S) v_d v_s - \frac{h_s A_s}{\sqrt{2}} v_u = \mathcal{M}_{31}^{\text{tree}}, \\ \mathcal{M}_{23}^{\text{tree}} &= (h_s^2 + g_2^2 Q'_{H_u} Q'_S) v_u v_s - \frac{h_s A_s}{\sqrt{2}} v_d = \mathcal{M}_{32}^{\text{tree}}. \end{aligned}$$

It is well-known that the lightest CP-even Higgs boson mass receives a substantial radiative mass correction in MSSM. The same is true here for the UMSSM. Radiative corrections to the mass matrix $\mathcal{M}^{\text{tree}}$ have been given in Ref. [41]. We have included radiative corrections in our calculation. The real symmetric mass matrix $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^{\text{tree+radiative}}$ can then be diagonalized by an orthogonal transformation

$$\begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \\ h_3 \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{O} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_d \\ \phi_u \\ \phi_s \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{pmatrix} \phi_d \\ \phi_u \\ \phi_s \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{O}^T \begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \\ h_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (16)$$

such that $\mathcal{O}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{O}^T = \text{diag}(m_{h_1}^2, m_{h_2}^2, m_{h_3}^2)$ in ascending order. The mass spectra for the neutral CP-odd and the pair of charged Higgs bosons are the same as MSSM.

III. COUPLINGS RELEVANT FOR HIGGS DECAYS

In this section, we present the neutral CP-even Higgs bosons couplings with the gauge bosons, quarks and neutralinos. Other couplings that are not relevant to this work will be omitted.

The interactions of physical Higgs bosons $h_{1,2,3}$ with SM particles and other SUSY particles can be obtained by writing down the Lagrangian in the weak eigenbasis and then rotating the Higgs weak eigenstates as

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_d &= \mathcal{O}_{11}h_1 + \mathcal{O}_{21}h_2 + \mathcal{O}_{31}h_3, \\ \phi_u &= \mathcal{O}_{12}h_1 + \mathcal{O}_{22}h_2 + \mathcal{O}_{32}h_3, \\ \phi_s &= \mathcal{O}_{13}h_1 + \mathcal{O}_{23}h_2 + \mathcal{O}_{33}h_3. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

A. Higgs Couplings to Gauge Bosons

The couplings of the Higgs bosons to a pair of gauge bosons come from $(D_\mu H_u)^\dagger(D^\mu H_u) + (D_\mu H_d)^\dagger(D^\mu H_d) + (D_\mu S)^\dagger(D^\mu S)$:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} = \mathcal{L}_{WW} + \mathcal{L}_{ZZ} + \mathcal{L}_{Z'Z'} + \mathcal{L}_{ZZ'} \quad , \quad (18)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{WW} &= \frac{g^2}{4} W_\mu^+ W^{-\mu} [v^2 + 2v_u \phi_u + 2v_d \phi_d + \dots] , \\ &= m_W^2 W_\mu^+ W^{-\mu} + gm_W W_\mu^+ W^{-\mu} [(\sin \beta \mathcal{O}_{j2} + \cos \beta \mathcal{O}_{j1}) h_j + \dots] ,\end{aligned}\quad (19)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{ZZ} &= \frac{g_1^2}{8} Z_\mu Z^\mu [v^2 + 2v_u \phi_u + 2v_d \phi_d + \dots] , \\ &= \frac{m_Z^2}{2} Z_\mu Z^\mu + \frac{g_1}{2} m_Z Z_\mu Z^\mu [(\sin \beta \mathcal{O}_{j2} + \cos \beta \mathcal{O}_{j1}) h_j + \dots] ,\end{aligned}\quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{Z'Z'} &= g_2^2 Z'_\mu Z'^\mu [Q_{H_d}^{\prime 2} |H_d^0|^2 + Q_{H_u}^{\prime 2} |H_u^0|^2 + Q_S^{\prime 2} |S|^2] , \\ &= \frac{1}{2} m_{Z'}^2 Z'_\mu Z'^\mu + g_2^2 Z'_\mu Z'^\mu h_j v \left[\sin \beta Q_{H_u}^{\prime 2} \mathcal{O}_{j2} + \cos \beta Q_{H_d}^{\prime 2} \mathcal{O}_{j1} + \frac{v_s}{v} Q_S^{\prime 2} \mathcal{O}_{j3} \right] ,\end{aligned}\quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{ZZ'} &= 2g_1 g_2 Z_\mu Z'^\mu \left[\frac{1}{2} Q'_{H_d} |H_d^0|^2 - \frac{1}{2} Q'_{H_u} |H_u^0|^2 \right] , \\ &= \frac{g_1 g_2}{2} Z_\mu Z'^\mu [Q'_{H_d} v_d^2 - Q'_{H_u} v_u^2] + g_1 g_2 Z_\mu Z'^\mu h_j v [\cos \beta Q'_{H_d} \mathcal{O}_{j1} - \sin \beta Q'_{H_u} \mathcal{O}_{j2}] \quad (22)\end{aligned}$$

with $m_W = \frac{g}{2}v$, $m_Z = \frac{g_1}{2}v$ and $m_{Z'} \approx g_2(Q_{H_u}^{\prime 2} v_u^2 + Q_{H_d}^{\prime 2} v_d^2 + Q_s^{\prime 2} v_s^2)^{1/2}$ for small $Z - Z'$ mixing.

B. Yukawa Couplings

Yukawa couplings are obtained by taking second order derivatives of the effective superpotential in Eq. (3). The interactions only go through the Higgs doublets, given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\text{Yukawa}} &= -\frac{gm_u}{2m_W \sin \beta} \bar{u}u \phi_u - \frac{gm_d}{2m_W \cos \beta} \bar{d}d \phi_d , \\ &= -\frac{gm_u}{2m_W \sin \beta} \mathcal{O}_{j2} \bar{u}u h_j - \frac{gm_d}{2m_W \cos \beta} \mathcal{O}_{j1} \bar{d}d h_j ,\end{aligned}\quad (23)$$

Similar formulas can be written down for the SM leptons.

C. Higgs Couplings to the Neutralinos

This is relevant when the lightest neutralino is very light such that the Higgs boson can decay into. The sources of neutralino masses come from soft masses of gauginos, from the superpotential term $h_s S H_u H_d$, and from those supersymmetric couplings $-\sqrt{2}g_a \phi^\dagger T^a \tilde{\lambda} \psi$ ($\tilde{\lambda}$ is the Majorana gaugino field of a vector superfield, while ϕ and ψ are the scalar and

fermionic components of a matter chiral superfield). The relevant terms for the masses are

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{\text{neutralinos}}^{\text{mass}} = & -\frac{1}{2}M_1\overline{\tilde{B}}\tilde{B} - \frac{1}{2}M_2\overline{\tilde{W}^a}\tilde{W}^a - \frac{1}{2}M_{\tilde{Z}'}\overline{\tilde{Z}'}\tilde{Z}' \\
& - \frac{1}{2}\left[-\mu_{\text{eff}}\left(\overline{\tilde{h}_u^0}\tilde{h}_d^0 + \overline{\tilde{h}_d^0}\tilde{h}_u^0\right) - \frac{h_s}{\sqrt{2}}v_u\left(\overline{\tilde{S}}\tilde{h}_d^0 + \overline{\tilde{h}_d^0}\tilde{S}\right) - \frac{h_s}{\sqrt{2}}v_d\left(\overline{\tilde{S}}\tilde{h}_u^0 + \overline{\tilde{h}_u^0}\tilde{S}\right)\right] \\
& - \frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{e}{2c_w}v_u\left(\overline{\tilde{B}}\tilde{h}_u^0 + \overline{\tilde{h}_u^0}\tilde{B}\right) - \frac{e}{2c_w}v_d\left(\overline{\tilde{B}}\tilde{h}_d^0 + \overline{\tilde{h}_d^0}\tilde{B}\right)\right. \\
& - \frac{g}{2}v_u\left(\overline{\tilde{W}^3}\tilde{h}_u^0 + \overline{\tilde{h}_u^0}\tilde{W}^3\right) + \frac{g}{2}v_d\left(\overline{\tilde{W}^3}\tilde{h}_d^0 + \overline{\tilde{h}_d^0}\tilde{W}^3\right) \\
& \left. + g_2Q'_{H_u}v_u\left(\overline{\tilde{Z}'}\tilde{h}_u^0 + \overline{\tilde{h}_u^0}\tilde{Z}'\right) + g_2Q'_{H_d}v_d\left(\overline{\tilde{Z}'}\tilde{h}_d^0 + \overline{\tilde{h}_d^0}\tilde{Z}'\right) + g_2Q'_Sv_s\left(\overline{\tilde{Z}'}\tilde{S} + \overline{\tilde{S}}\tilde{Z}'\right)\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Thus the neutralino mass matrix \mathcal{M}_N in the basis of $(\tilde{B}, \tilde{W}^3, \tilde{h}_d^0, \tilde{h}_u^0, \tilde{S}, \tilde{Z}')^T$ is given by

$$\mathcal{M}_N = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & 0 & -\frac{e}{2c_w}v_d & \frac{e}{2c_w}v_u & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & M_2 & \frac{g}{2}v_d & -\frac{g}{2}v_u & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{e}{2c_w}v_d & \frac{g}{2}v_d & 0 & -\mu_{\text{eff}} & -\frac{h_s}{\sqrt{2}}v_u & g_2Q'_{H_d}v_d \\ \frac{e}{2c_w}v_u & -\frac{g}{2}v_u & -\mu_{\text{eff}} & 0 & -\frac{h_s}{\sqrt{2}}v_d & g_2Q'_{H_u}v_u \\ \hline 0 & 0 & -\frac{h_s}{\sqrt{2}}v_u & -\frac{h_s}{\sqrt{2}}v_d & 0 & g_2Q'_Sv_s \\ 0 & 0 & g_2Q'_{H_d}v_d & g_2Q'_{H_u}v_u & g_2Q'_Sv_s & M_{\tilde{Z}'} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{25}$$

The basis $(\tilde{B}, \tilde{W}^3, \tilde{h}_d^0, \tilde{h}_u^0, \tilde{S}, \tilde{Z}')^T$ is rotated into mass eigenstates $(\tilde{\chi}_1^0, \tilde{\chi}_2^0, \tilde{\chi}_3^0, \tilde{\chi}_4^0, \tilde{\chi}_5^0, \tilde{\chi}_6^0)^T$ by

$$(\tilde{B}, \tilde{W}^3, \tilde{h}_d^0, \tilde{h}_u^0, \tilde{S}, \tilde{Z}') = (\tilde{\chi}_1^0, \tilde{\chi}_2^0, \tilde{\chi}_3^0, \tilde{\chi}_4^0, \tilde{\chi}_5^0, \tilde{\chi}_6^0) N \tag{26}$$

and $N\mathcal{M}_N N^T = \text{diag}(M_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}, M_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0}, M_{\tilde{\chi}_3^0}, M_{\tilde{\chi}_4^0}, M_{\tilde{\chi}_5^0}, M_{\tilde{\chi}_6^0})$ arranged in ascending order. N is a 6 by 6 orthogonal matrix since the neutralino mass matrix \mathcal{M}_N is real and symmetric.

The interactions between the CP-even Higgs boson and a pair of neutralinos are given by Eq. (25) with the corresponding VEV replaced by ϕ (i.e. $v_{u,d,s} \rightarrow \phi_{u,d,s}$). We can then rotate into mass eigenstates using (17) and the interaction terms are given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{neutralinos}}^{\text{int}} = \frac{1}{2}h_k\overline{\tilde{\chi}_i^0}\left[\mathcal{H}_{ijk}^*P_L + \mathcal{H}_{ijk}P_R\right]\tilde{\chi}_j^0, \tag{27}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}_{ijk} = & \mathcal{O}_{k1}\left[\frac{h_s}{\sqrt{2}}N_{i5}N_{j4} + \frac{e}{2c_w}N_{i1}N_{j3} - \frac{g}{2}N_{i2}N_{j3} - g_2Q'_{H_d}N_{i6}N_{j3}\right] \\
& + \mathcal{O}_{k2}\left[\frac{h_s}{\sqrt{2}}N_{i5}N_{j3} - \frac{e}{2c_w}N_{i1}N_{j4} + \frac{g}{2}N_{i2}N_{j4} - g_2Q'_{H_u}N_{i6}N_{j4}\right] \\
& + \mathcal{O}_{k3}\left[\frac{h_s}{\sqrt{2}}N_{i4}N_{j3} - g_2Q'_S N_{i6}N_{j5}\right] \\
& + \{i \leftrightarrow j\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

IV. SCANNING OF PARAMETER SPACE

Besides the usual MSSM parameters of gaugino masses $M_{1,2,3}$, squark masses $M_{\tilde{q}}$, slepton masses $M_{\tilde{l}}$, A parameters $A_{t,b,\tau}$, and $\tan\beta$, the UMSSM has the following additional soft parameters: M_S , $M_{\tilde{Z}'}$, A_s , the VEV $\langle S \rangle = v_s/\sqrt{2}$, and the Yukawa coupling h_s . The effective μ parameter is given as $\mu_{\text{eff}} = h_s \langle S \rangle$. The other model parameters are fixed by the quantum numbers Q'_ϕ of various super-multiplets ϕ as given in Table I. The η model of E_6 defined by the generator in Eq. (2) or by the fifth column for the **27** in Table I will be used in the following for illustration.

Ignoring the $Z - Z'$ mixing, the mass of the Z' boson is determined by $m_{Z'} \approx g_2(Q'_{H_u} v_u^2 + Q'_{H_d} v_d^2 + Q'_s v_s^2)^{1/2}$. The most stringent limit on the Z' boson comes from the dilepton resonance search by ATLAS [42]. The limits are 1.5 – 1.7 TeV for the various Z' bosons of the E_6 models. If the limits are translated into v_s using the above expression, the value of v_s has to be larger than a few TeV. Nevertheless, we can avoid these Z' mass limits by assuming the leptonic decay mode is suppressed. The mixing between the SM Z boson and the Z' can also be suppressed by carefully choosing the $\tan\beta \approx (Q'_{H_d}/Q'_{H_u})^{1/2}$. The goal of this work does not concern avoiding all these constraints, but we note that we can always carefully choose the set of quantum numbers Q' such that the Z' mass and mixing constraints can be evaded.

We first fix most of the MSSM parameters (unless stated otherwise):

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &= 0.5M_2 = 0.2 \text{ TeV}, \quad M_3 = 2 \text{ TeV}; \\ M_{\tilde{Q}} &= M_{\tilde{U}} = A_t = 1 \text{ TeV}, \quad M_{\tilde{L}} = M_{\tilde{E}} = 0.2 \text{ TeV}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

We also fix the following two UMSSM parameters

$$M_S = 0.5 \text{ TeV}, \quad A_s = 0.5 \text{ TeV}, \quad (30)$$

while we scan the rest of the parameters in the following ranges

$$0.2 \text{ TeV} < v_s < 2 \text{ TeV}, \quad 0.2 < h_s < 0.7, \quad 1.1 < \tan\beta < 40, \quad 0.2 \text{ TeV} < M_{\tilde{Z}'} < 2 \text{ TeV}. \quad (31)$$

A. Constraints

Charginos Mass. The chargino sector of the UMSSM is the same as that of MSSM with

the following chargino mass matrix

$$M_{\tilde{\chi}^\pm} = \begin{pmatrix} M_2 & \sqrt{2}m_W \sin \beta \\ \sqrt{2}m_W \cos \beta & \mu_{\text{eff}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (32)$$

Thus, the two charginos masses depend on M_2 , $\mu_{\text{eff}} = h_s v_s / \sqrt{2}$, and $\tan \beta$. The current bound is $M_{\tilde{\chi}^\pm} > 94$ GeV as long as the mass difference with the lightest supersymmetric particle (LSP) is larger than 3 GeV [43]. We impose this chargino mass bound in our scans in the parameter space defined by (31).

Invisible Width of the Z Boson. The lightest neutralino $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ is the LSP of the model, and thus would be stable and invisible. When the Z boson decays into a pair of LSP, it would give rise to invisible width of the Z boson, which had been tightly constrained by experiments. The current bound of the Z invisible width is $\Gamma_{\text{inv}}(Z) < 3$ MeV at about 95% CL [43]. The coupling of the Z boson to the lightest neutralino is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{Z\tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0} = \frac{g_1}{4} (|N_{13}|^2 - |N_{14}|^2) Z_\mu \overline{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 \tilde{\chi}_1^0, \quad (33)$$

and the contribution to the Z boson invisible width is

$$\Gamma(Z \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0) = \frac{g_1^2}{96\pi} (|N_{13}|^2 - |N_{14}|^2)^2 m_Z \left(1 - \frac{4m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}^2}{m_Z^2}\right)^{3/2}. \quad (34)$$

Here we impose the experimental constraint on the invisible Z width. The constraint of fulfilling the relic density by the LSP will be ignored in this work.

Current limits on the pseudoscalar Higgs bosons come from the LEP searches of $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z^* \rightarrow A_i H_j$, where i, j denote the mass eigenstates of the Higgs bosons; especially in those MSSM-extended models, such as NMSSM, with multiple pseudoscalar and scalar Higgs bosons the constraint could be severe. However, there is only one pseudoscalar Higgs boson in the UMSSM and in our choice of parameters it is often heavier than a few hundred GeV. Thus, it is not constrained by the current limits. Similarly, the charged Higgs boson is also heavy and not constrained by current searches.

B. The First Scenario: $130 < M_{h_{\text{SM-like}}} < 141$ GeV

In Summer 2011, the LHC experiments reported a 2σ excess in the channel $h \rightarrow WW^* \rightarrow \ell^+ \nu \ell^- \bar{\nu}$ ($\ell = e, \mu$) above the expected SM backgrounds, the implied Higgs boson mass is

around 130 – 141 GeV and the branching ratio into WW^* is about 1/2 of the SM value [1]. Nevertheless, in December 2011 the most updated data [2, 3] indicated that SM Higgs boson above 131 GeV up to about 600 GeV is ruled out. It does not mean that a Higgs boson in the mass range above 131 GeV cannot exist, but just we have to find some ways to hide the Higgs boson. Therefore, when we scan for the SM-like Higgs boson in the mass range 130 – 141 GeV, we also search for the region that allows this Higgs boson to be invisible. We shall elaborate further about this below.

We first do the parameter space scan to search for the points that can give a SM-like Higgs boson of mass between 130 and 141 GeV. Here the SM-like Higgs boson is *not* always the lightest CP-even Higgs boson. Sometimes, the lightest Higgs boson is the singlet-like Higgs boson. We define the Higgs boson h_k to be SM-like by demanding the $O_{k3}^2 < 0.1$ (where $h_k = O_{k1}\phi_d + O_{k2}\phi_u + O_{k3}\phi_s$). In our scan, we do not find more than one SM-like Higgs bosons. We show the points that pass the constraints of chargino mass, invisible Z width, and the mass of the SM-like Higgs boson between 130 and 141 GeV in Figs. 1 for a number of h_s values. It is obvious from the figure that a smaller h_s is more likely to give a Higgs boson in the mass range 130 – 141 GeV. The v_s is between 300 GeV and 1 TeV, and $\tan\beta$ is between 2 and 15. The variation of $M_{\tilde{Z}'}$ in our selected range is rather uniform and thus no preferred range of $M_{\tilde{Z}'}$.

Once we have obtained the points with $M_{h_{\text{SM-like}}}$ between 130 and 141 GeV, we can then calculate the branching ratios. In the mass range 130 – 141 GeV, the dominant decay modes of the SM-like Higgs boson include $b\bar{b}$, $\tau^+\tau^-$, WW^* , ZZ^* , and $\tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0$. Among these decay modes either $b\bar{b}$, WW^* , or $\tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ usually dominate. We found that if the SM-like Higgs boson is h_2 , h_2 is always lighter than twice the lightest h_1 mass so that $h_2 \rightarrow h_1h_1$ is absent in our scan. We show in Fig. 2 the parameter space points obtained in Fig. 1 that have the branching ratio $B(h_{\text{SM-like}} \rightarrow b\bar{b}) > 0.4$ in the first column, $B(h_{\text{SM-like}} \rightarrow WW^*) > 0.4$ in the second column, and $B(h_{\text{SM-like}} \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0\tilde{\chi}_1^0) > 0.4$ in the third column. The rows from top to bottom are for $h_s = 0.4, 0.5,$ and 0.6 , respectively. For smaller h_s the invisible mode is not as frequent as the other visible modes ($b\bar{b}$ and WW^*), while for larger h_s the invisible mode is more frequent. In most recent results of ATLAS [2] and CMS [3], the SM Higgs boson above 130 GeV and up to about 600 GeV is ruled out. Possible ways out include adding invisible or dijet decay modes to the Higgs boson. Therefore, if a Higgs boson has an invisible decay mode with a branching ratio larger than about 0.4, it can survive the search




FIG. 1. Two-dimensional scatter plots for the parameter-space points satisfying the chargino mass constraint $M_{\tilde{\chi}^\pm} > 94$ GeV, invisible Z width less than 3 MeV, and $130 < M_{h_{\text{SM-like}}} < 141$ GeV, where the SM-like Higgs boson $h_{\text{SM-like}}$ satisfies $O_{k3}^2 < 0.1$ (where $h_k = O_{k1}\phi_d + O_{k2}\phi_u + O_{k3}\phi_s$).




FIG. 2. These scattered plots first pass the requirements of chargino masses $M_{\tilde{\chi}^\pm} > 94$ GeV, the invisible Z width $\Gamma_{\text{inv}}(Z) < 3$ MeV, and $130 \text{ GeV} < M_{h_{\text{SM-like}}} < 141$ GeV. The first row for $h_s = 0.4$, the second row for $h_s = 0.5$, and the third row for $h_s = 0.6$. The first column for $B(h_{\text{SM-like}} \rightarrow b\bar{b}) > 0.4$, the second column for $B(h_{\text{SM-like}} \rightarrow WW^*) > 0.4$, and the third column for $B(h_{\text{SM-like}} \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0) > 0.4$.

limit from the LHC. The parameter space points with $B(h_{\text{SM-like}} \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0) > 0.4$ presented here can then survive the LHC limits. So, the current LHC data prefers a larger h_s if the SM-like Higgs boson falls in the mass range of 130 – 141 GeV.

C. The Second Scenario: $120 < M_{h_{\text{SM-like}}} < 130$ GeV

We repeat the whole exercise in the previous scenario with the new requirement of Higgs boson mass in the range $120 < M_{h_{\text{SM-like}}} < 130$ GeV. We show the parameter space points that satisfy the chargino mass bound, Z invisible width, and $120 < M_{h_{\text{SM-like}}} < 130$ GeV in Fig. 3. It is also true for this mass range that a smaller h_s is easier to give a SM-like Higgs boson mass of 120 – 130 GeV. For $h_s = 0.4$ the v_s extends from 500 GeV to 2 TeV, and $\tan \beta$




FIG. 3. Two-dimensional scatter plots for the parameter-space points satisfying the chargino mass constraint $M_{\tilde{\chi}^\pm} > 94$ GeV, invisible Z width less than 3 MeV, and $120 < M_{h_{\text{SM-like}}} < 130$ GeV, where the SM-like Higgs boson $h_{\text{SM-like}}$ satisfies $O_{k3}^2 < 0.1$ (where $h_k = O_{k1}\phi_d + O_{k2}\phi_u + O_{k3}\phi_s$).




FIG. 4. These scattered plots first pass the requirements of charginos masses $M_{\tilde{\chi}^\pm} > 94$ GeV, the invisible Z width $\Gamma_{\text{inv}}(Z) < 3$ MeV, and $120 \text{ GeV} < M_{h_{\text{SM-like}}} < 130$ GeV. The first row for $h_s = 0.4$, the second row for $h_s = 0.5$, and the third row for $h_s = 0.6$. The first column for $B(h_{\text{SM-like}} \rightarrow b\bar{b}) > 0.3$, the second column for $B(h_{\text{SM-like}} \rightarrow WW^*) > 0.3$, and the third column for $B(h_{\text{SM-like}} \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0) > 0.3$.

from 2 to 18. For $h_s = 0.5, 0.6$ the ranges of v_s and $\tan \beta$ are substantially smaller. In Fig. 4, we show the parameter-space points that each branching ratio $B(b\bar{b}) > 0.3$, $B(WW^*) > 0.3$, and $B(\tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0) > 0.3$. We used 0.3 in this figure because the points for WW and $\tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0$ would be very few if we chose 0.4. At such a low-mass range the $b\bar{b}$ often dominates over the WW^* , and the $b\bar{b}$ mode also dominates over $\tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0$ for $h_s = 0.4$; while for $h_s = 0.5$ and 0.6 , the $\tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0$ mode is indeed dominant. This feature is similar to the other mass range $130 - 141$ GeV: when h_s is large the invisible mode becomes more important. Therefore, the current LHC data prefers a smaller h_s if the SM-like Higgs boson falls in the mass range of $120 - 130$ GeV.

Another feature of the current LHC data showed that the production rate of the Higgs boson into diphotons is slightly larger than that of the SM Higgs boson [2, 3]. However,

one has to be careful that the current data consists of large statistical uncertainties, and the data are consistent either with the presence of the SM Higgs boson or without any Higgs boson. It has been shown in a number of recent works that in MSSM [33] or NMSSM [44, 45] the production rate of diphotons is similar to that of the SM Higgs boson, mostly slightly smaller than the SM one, though at some points in the parameter space it could be slightly larger. Nevertheless, under some less restrictive conditions the production rate of diphotons may be enhanced by up to a factor of 2 in the NMSSM [45]. Here, we do not expect the UMSSM can give a dramatic change in diphoton production rate, as long as the SM-like Higgs boson does not decay into the lightest neutralinos. We show those points that have substantial branching ratios into $b\bar{b}$ and WW in Fig. 4 (first and second column). In this case, the production rate into diphotons would not be any different from the MSSM predictions, because the gluon-fusion is very similar and so is the decay into diphotons, except for a slight singlet component in the Higgs boson couplings. Therefore, in this subsection we have shown the parameter space of UMSSM that can give a SM-like Higgs boson of mass 120 – 130 GeV with branching ratios similar to those of the SM Higgs boson. On the other hand, we also show the parameter space points that the SM-like Higgs boson decays mostly into invisible neutralinos in the last column of Fig. 4.

V. DISCUSSION

In principle, in both scenarios studied in the previous section, there may be some parameter space that the second lightest Higgs boson is SM-like and can also decay into the lightest Higgs boson, which is mostly singlet-like. However, in our scan we do not find such parameter-space points.

Comparison with the SM Higgs boson. If the SM Higgs boson falls in the mass range of larger than 130 GeV, it would be inconsistent with the current data [2, 3]. The UMSSM, on the other hand, can allow the SM-like Higgs boson in this mass range to decay invisibly into the lightest neutralinos, such that it can hide from the current data. The SM-like Higgs boson in the UMSSM can also accommodate in the lighter mass range of 120 – 130 GeV with the decay branching ratios very similar to those in the SM.

Comparison with the MSSM. The low energy spectrum of UMSSM has an extra CP-even Higgs boson and two more neutralinos. We have shown that the SM-like Higgs boson is

most of the time the second lightest Higgs boson while the lightest one is more singlet-like. The singlet-like neutralino can be substantially lighter than the MSSM lightest neutralino, such that the SM-like Higgs boson can decay invisibly more frequently once this mode is open, but not quite so in the MSSM.

Comparison with the NMSSM. In terms of particle content, the major differences between UMSSM and NMSSM include

- NMSSM has two pseudoscalar Higgs bosons while UMSSM only has one, because the would-be-Goldstone boson becomes the longitudinal component of the Z' boson.
- NMSSM has five neutralinos with the extra one coming from the singlino while UMSSM has six neutralinos with additional ones from the singlino and Z' -ino.
- UMSSM also has a Z' boson at TeV scale.

Due to the first difference the SM-like Higgs boson in NMSSM often decays into two light pseudoscalar Higgs boson [46]. If so the production rates into $\gamma\gamma$, WW , ZZ , and $b\bar{b}$ would be substantially smaller than the current data. However, some parameter-space points are uncovered recently such that the SM-like Higgs boson can decay very similarly to the SM Higgs boson [44, 45].

To recap, the search for the final missing piece of the SM, the Higgs boson, remains a tantalizing task for both experimentalists and theorists. We have demonstrated that in models beyond the SM like the UMSSM, we might be entertained by a SM-like Higgs boson as a mimicker at the LHC. This SM-like Higgs boson can be light in the mass range of 120 – 130 GeV as indicated by the recent LHC data and behaves almost the same as the SM one or it can decay dominantly into invisible modes and therefore somewhat be hidden if it is heavier. More data are definitely needed at the LHC for detailed studies in order to differentiate among many variants of Higgs bosons once we go beyond the SM.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Rong-Shyang Lu for interesting discussion on the ATLAS Higgs searches. This work was supported in parts by the National Science Council of Taiwan under Grant Nos.

99-2112-M-007-005-MY3 and 98-2112-M-001-014-MY3, and the WCU program through the KOSEF funded by the MEST (R31-2008-000-10057-0).

- [1] Talk given by A. Nisati (ATLAS Coll.) in Lepton-Photon 2011, Mumbai, India; Talk given by V. Sharma (CMS Coll.) in Lepton-Photon 2011, Mumbai, India; K. Sung [CMS Collaboration], arXiv:1109.2457 [hep-ex]; ATLAS and CMS Collaborations, ATLAS-CONF-2011-157 and CMS-PAS-HIG-11-23 (2011).
- [2] ATLAS Coll., ATLAS-CONF-2011-163 (Dec. 2011).
- [3] CMS Coll., CMS PAS HIG-11-032 (Dec. 2011).
- [4] A. Delgado, C. Kolda and A. de la Puente, arXiv:1111.4008 [hep-ph].
- [5] H. Baer, V. Barger, P. Huang and A. Mustafayev, arXiv:1109.3197 [hep-ph].
- [6] Y. Huo, T. Li, D. V. Nanopoulos and C. Tong, arXiv:1109.2329 [hep-ph].
- [7] K. Nakayama, N. Yokozaki and K. Yonekura, JHEP **1111**, 021 (2011) [arXiv:1108.4338 [hep-ph]].
- [8] E. Ma, Phys. Lett. B **705**, 320 (2011) [arXiv:1108.4029 [hep-ph]].
- [9] M. Endo, K. Hamaguchi, S. Iwamoto and N. Yokozaki, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 075017 (2011) [arXiv:1108.3071 [hep-ph]].
- [10] M. Asano, T. Moroi, R. Sato and T. T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **705**, 337 (2011) [arXiv:1108.2402 [hep-ph]].
- [11] A. Elsayed, S. Khalil and S. Moretti, arXiv:1106.2130 [hep-ph].
- [12] X. -G. He and J. Tandean, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 075018 (2011) [arXiv:1109.1277 [hep-ph]].
- [13] M. Raidal and A. Strumia, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 077701 (2011) [arXiv:1108.4903 [hep-ph]].
- [14] U. Ellwanger, Eur. Phys. J. C **71**, 1782 (2011) [arXiv:1108.0157 [hep-ph]].
- [15] M. Carena, P. Draper, T. Liu and C. Wagner, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 095010 (2011) [arXiv:1107.4354 [hep-ph]].
- [16] Y. Mambrini, arXiv:1108.0671 [hep-ph].
- [17] E. Ma, arXiv:1109.4177 [hep-ph].
- [18] I. Low, P. Schwaller, G. Shaughnessy and C. E. M. Wagner, arXiv:1110.4405 [hep-ph].
- [19] C. Englert, J. Jaeckel, E. Re and M. Spannowsky, arXiv:1111.1719 [hep-ph].
- [20] O. Lebedev, H. M. Lee and Y. Mambrini, arXiv:1111.4482 [hep-ph].

- [21] R. Foot, A. Kobakhidze and R. R. Volkas, arXiv:1109.0919 [hep-ph].
- [22] M. Pospelov and A. Ritz, arXiv:1109.4872 [hep-ph].
- [23] E. Weihs and J. Zurita, arXiv:1110.5909 [hep-ph].
- [24] J. -W. Cui, H. -J. He, L. -C. Lu and F. -R. Yin, arXiv:1110.6893 [hep-ph].
- [25] B. Bellazzini, C. Csaki, A. Falkowski and A. Weiler, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 075008 (2009) [arXiv:0906.3026 [hep-ph]].
- [26] Y. Bai, J. Fan and J. L. Hewett, arXiv:1112.1964 [hep-ph].
- [27] D. A. Vasquez, G. Belanger, R. M. Godbole and A. Pukhov, arXiv:1112.2200 [hep-ph].
- [28] B. A. Dobrescu, G. D. Kribs and A. Martin, arXiv:1112.2208 [hep-ph].
- [29] A. Djouadi, O. Lebedev, Y. Mambrini and J. Quevillon, arXiv:1112.3299 [hep-ph].
- [30] C. Englert, T. Plehn, D. Zerwas and P. M. Zerwas, Phys. Lett. B **703**, 298 (2011) [arXiv:1106.3097 [hep-ph]].
- [31] S. Baek, P. Ko and W. -I. Park, arXiv:1112.1847 [hep-ph].
- [32] B. Batell, S. Gori and L. -T. Wang, arXiv:1112.5180 [hep-ph].
- [33] See e.g., H. Baer, V. Barger and A. Mustafayev, arXiv:1112.3017; S. Heinemeyer, O. Stal and G. Weiglein, arXiv:1112.3026; A. Arbey, M. Battaglia, A. Djouadi, F. Mahmoudi and J. Quevillon, arXiv:1112.3028; P. Draper, P. Meade, M. Reece and D. Shih, arXiv:1112.3068 [hep-ph]; M. Carena, S. Gori, N. R. Shah and C. E. M. Wagner, arXiv:1112.3336 [hep-ph]; S. Akula, B. Altunkaynak, D. Feldman, P. Nath and G. Peim, arXiv:1112.3645 [hep-ph]; M. Kadastik, K. Kannike, A. Racioppi and M. Raidal, arXiv:1112.3647 [hep-ph]; J. Cao, Z. Heng, D. Li and J. M. Yang, arXiv:1112.4391 [hep-ph].
- [34] K. Cheung and T. -C. Yuan, arXiv:1112.4146 [hep-ph].
- [35] F. Goertz, U. Haisch and M. Neubert, arXiv:1112.5099 [hep-ph]; A. Arhrib, R. Benbrik and N. Gaur, arXiv:1201.2644 [hep-ph]; D. Choudhury and P. Saha, arXiv:1201.4130 [hep-ph].
- [36] U. Ellwanger, C. Hugonie and A. M. Teixeira, Phys. Rept. **496**, 1 (2010) [arXiv:0910.1785 [hep-ph]].
- [37] For a review, see P. Langacker, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 1199-1228 (2009) [arXiv:0801.1345 [hep-ph]].
- [38] C. -F. Chang, K. Cheung and T. -C. Yuan, JHEP **1109** 058 (2011) [arXiv:1107.1133 [hep-ph]].
- [39] J. Kang and P. Langacker, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 035014 (2005) [hep-ph/0412190].

- [40] V. Barger, P. Langacker and H. -S. Lee, Phys. Lett. **B630**, 85-99 (2005) [hep-ph/0508027]; V. Barger, P. Langacker and G. Shaughnessy, Phys. Lett. **B644**, 361-369 (2007) [hep-ph/0609068].
- [41] V. Barger, P. Langacker and G. Shaughnessy, Phys. Rev. **D75**, 055013 (2007) [hep-ph/0611239]; V. Barger, P. Langacker, H. -S. Lee and G. Shaughnessy, Phys. Rev. **D73**, 115010 (2006) [hep-ph/0603247].
- [42] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. **B700**, 163-180 (2011) [arXiv:1103.6218 [hep-ex]]; G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], arXiv:1108.1582 [hep-ex].
- [43] K. Nakamura *et al.* (Particle Data Group), J. Phys. G **37**, 075021 (2010).
- [44] J. F. Gunion, Y. Jiang and S. Kraml, arXiv:1201.0982 [hep-ph].
- [45] U. Ellwanger, arXiv:1112.3548; S. F. King, M. Muhlleitner and R. Nevzorov, arXiv:1201.2671 [hep-ph].
- [46] R. Dermisek and J. F. Gunion, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 075019 (2007) [hep-ph/0611142].