

Higgs sector contributions to Δa_μ and the
constraints on two-Higgs-doublet-model with
and without SUSY.

Otto C.W. Kong

Department of Physics, National Central University,

Chung-li, TAIWAN 32054

E-mail: otto@phy.ncu.edu.tw

Interesting contributions to Δa_μ from a two-Higgs-doublet-model is coming from a two-loop Barr-Zee diagram for most part of the parameter space — a fact that has been overlooked by some Higgs/SUSY experts. A definite positive contribution has requirements that go against precision EW data and other known constraints. For the case without SUSY, in particular, this is almost enough to kill the two-Higgs-doublet-model (II). We will discuss the interplay of all the constraints and their implications.

* Talk presented at SUSY 2003 (Jun 4-11), Tucson, AZ USA
— submission for the proceedings.

HIGGS SECTOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO Δa_μ AND THE CONSTRAINTS ON TWO-HIGGS-DOUBLET-MODEL WITH AND WITHOUT SUSY.

OTTO C. W. KONG*

Department of Physics, National Central University, Chung-li, TAIWAN 32054
E-mail: otto@phy.ncu.edu.tw

Interesting contributions to Δa_μ from a two-Higgs-doublet-model is coming from a two-loop Barr-Zee diagram for most part of the parameter space — a fact that has been overlooked by some Higgs/SUSY experts. A definite positive contribution has requirements that go against precision EW data and other known constraints. For the case without SUSY, in particular, this is almost enough to kill the two-Higgs-doublet-model (II). We will discuss the interplay of all the constraints and their implications.

1. Δa_μ Anomaly and Higgs Contributions

This talk is based on the suggestion that there is a disagreement between the experimentally measured value of the muon anomalous magnetic moment and that of the SM theoretical value. We are interested in the significance of the Higgs sector contributions within the framework of a two-Higgs-doublet-model (2HDM), with or without SUSY. Apparently, there has been a lack of appreciation for the fact that the dominating Higgs contributions is coming from a two-loop Barr-Zee diagram^{1,2}. We discuss the kind of contributions and their possible role to the explanation of the Δa_μ anomaly.

Most of the specific results used for illustrations here are based on our earlier paper². In particular, the Δa_μ anomaly number is taken as

$$\Delta a_\mu \equiv a_\mu^{\text{exp}} - a_\mu^{\text{SM}} = (33.9 \pm 11.2) \times 10^{-10} \quad (\text{based on } e^+e^- \text{ data}),$$

which represents a discrepancy at a 3σ level³. It should be noted that if the hadronic vacuum polarization contribution within the SM calculations is obtained based on input from τ data, instead of the e^+e^- data, the

*Work partially supported by grant NSC92-2112-M-008-044 of the National Science Council of Taiwan.

2

discrepancy would be reduced³.

Our focus here is the Higgs sector contributions. A 1-loop diagram has a contribution too small to explain the discrepancy for $m_\phi > 10$ GeV⁴. However, at the 2-loop level, there is a (photon) Barr-Zee diagram (as shown to the right) with contribution easily dominates over the 1-loop result for $m_\phi > 3$ GeV. The diagram may have enhancement from a large $\tan\beta$. We have


$$\Delta a_\mu^\phi = \frac{N_c^f \alpha_{\text{em}}}{4\pi^3} m_\mu^2 \mathcal{Q}_f^2 \left[A_\mu A_f g\left(\frac{m_f^2}{m_\phi^2}\right) - \lambda_\mu \lambda_f f\left(\frac{m_f^2}{m_\phi^2}\right) \right], \quad (1)$$

where λ_f and A_f represent the effective scalar and pseudoscalar couplings of a fermion f to the Higgs state, with loop functions $f(z) = \frac{1}{2}z \int_0^1 dx \frac{1-2x(1-x)}{x(1-x)-z} \ln \frac{x(1-x)}{z}$ and $g(z) = \frac{1}{2}z \int_0^1 dx \frac{1}{x(1-x)-z} \ln \frac{x(1-x)}{z}$.

The most interesting point to note is that the 2-loop contribution has, in general, an opposite sign to the 1-loop result. It is negative for a real scalar, but positive for a pseudoscalar. With a minimally extended Higgs sector, a 2HDM has two real scalars (h and H) and a pseudoscalar (A). If the latter contribution dominates, there is a chance that the Higgs sector contributions can account for the Δa_μ anomaly. We illustrate in the plot below the result from the contribution of a single pseudoscalar (1-loop + photon Barr-Zee, with SM fermions) with the variations of m_A and $\tan\beta$. In the case of a concrete model, the cancellation effect from the negative scalar contributions has also to be taken into account.

2. On the Two-Higgs-Doublet-Model


The 2HDM II is the most appealing Higgs sector extension, and a natural component of the supersymmetric SM. Neglecting the very small admissible CP violation, we have the following results on the relative couplings for t , b , and τ , respectively :



$$\begin{aligned}
h(\lambda_f) &: \frac{\cos\alpha}{\sin\beta} & - & \frac{\sin\alpha}{\cos\beta} & - & \frac{\sin\alpha}{\cos\beta} \\
H(\lambda_f) &: \frac{\sin\alpha}{\sin\beta} & \frac{\cos\alpha}{\cos\beta} & \frac{\cos\alpha}{\cos\beta} \\
A(\lambda_f) &: \cot\beta & \tan\beta & \tan\beta
\end{aligned}$$

From the above, it is clear that for the Higgs sector contributions to account for any substantial part of the Δa_μ anomaly, a light pseudoscalar together with heavy scalars and a relatively large $\tan\beta$ would be required. The condition $m_A < m_h$ is not admissible in the SUSY case. However, one is still left with the question if the Higgs sector contributions could have a significant role to play, may be giving a substantial negative overall contribution to shift the parameter space solution region from that of the naive 1-loop considerations. While the possible role of the Barr-Zee diagrams, here extended to includes the ones with sfermions running in the upper loop, in the SUSY case for the study of EDM is well documented, the corresponding situation of the magnetic moments is largely overlooked. Studies of fitting Δa_μ focused only on the 1-loop chargino and neutralino contributions. Fortunately, we obtained a definite negative result², for a generic choice of SUSY parameters.

For the case without SUSY, while a light pseudoscalar is admissible, the fit the required Δa_μ numerical, a substantial splitting between m_A and m_h ($< m_H$) is needed¹. In fact, the Δa_μ anomaly imposes a



Plots of all constraints on 2HDM.

very stringent constraint on the model in a way largely complementary to the precision EW, and other known, constraints. The interplay of all these is very interesting. For example, taking the 3.3σ Δa_μ together with the R_b constraint with a limit $\chi^2 < 4$, the 2HDM would largely be ruled out.

3. Putting Together the Other Constraints

We have performed a comprehensive study of the overall Higgs sector contributions, together with other available constraints on the model². We illustrate a few plots from our result on the previous page. The dark color shaped regions represent solutions to $\chi^2 < 4$ for Δa_μ and the R_b constraints combined. The light color shaped regions have $\chi^2 < 10.3$, the SM value. Here, the R_b constraint used is given by $\Delta R_b \equiv R_b^{\text{exp}} - R_b^{\text{SM}} = 0.000692 \pm 0.00065$. We have, for each plot, pick a choice of values for $\tan\beta$ and the scalar Higgs mixing angle α . The heavy scalar H is assumed to be heavy enough for its effects to be neglected, while the charged Higgs mass is set at 500 GeV. The charged Higgs contributes, through the charged current interaction with CKM mixings, strongly to $b \rightarrow s \gamma$. Our choice of m_{H^\pm} is then about the lowest admissible value. Our careful analysis of the constraint from the ρ -parameter² illustrated that the Higgs masses are forced into a very fine-tuned relation, which, for the case of $m_A < m_h \ll m_{H^\pm}$, requires m_H to be at least a few times m_{H^\pm} . Hence, it justifies our neglecting H contributions (to R_b and a_μ). Finally, we also lput in the experimental bounds from OPAL and DELPHI⁵. The first two plots shown represent what is close to the best case scenario. Any possible surviving region in the parameter space would have an α value around $-3\pi/8$ to $-\pi/2$, and a value of $\tan\beta$ that is uncomfortably large.

This write-up is done while the author is visiting as the Korea Institute for Advanced Study. The institute is to be thanked for the great hospitality. The author is in debt to K. Cheung, from the collaboration results with whom that the presentation is based.

References

1. K. Cheung, C.-H. Chou, and O.C.W. Kong, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 111301(R) (2001); see also D. Chang *et.al.*, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 091301(R) (2001).
2. K. Cheung and O.C.W. Kong, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 053003 (2003).
3. M. Davis *et.al.*, Eur. J. Phys. C **37**, 493 (2003); K. Hagiwara *et.al.*, Phys. Lett. B **557**, 69 (2003). See K. Hagiwara *et.al.*, hep-ph/0312250 for update.
4. A. Dedes and H. Haber, JHEP **0105**, 006 (2001).
5. OPAL, physics note PN475, 2001; DELPHI, report 2002-037-CONF-571.