

CP-odd A^0 production at e^+e^- colliders in MSSM with CP violating phases

Abdesslam Arhrib*

*Max-Planck Institut für Physik, Föhringer Ring 6, 80805 München, Germany
and*

*LPHEA, Physics Department, Faculty of Science-Semlalia, P.O.Box 2390,
Marrakesh, Morocco.*

(November 6, 2018)

Abstract

We study the production of a heavy CP-odd A^0 boson in association with a photon $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$ and a Z boson $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$ as well as the single production of A^0 via $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e\bar{\nu}_eA^0$ in the MSSM with CP violating phases. In the case of $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma/A^0Z$, we show that the squark contribution, which vanishes in the MSSM with real parameters, turns out to be sizeable in presence of CP violating phases in the soft SUSY parameters. For $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e\bar{\nu}_eA^0$ in both the 2HDM and MSSM with real parameters, the cross section does not reach observable rates at a NLC. It is found that with a large CP violating phase for A_t , cross sections of the order 0.08 fb are attainable for all the processes $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$, $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e\bar{\nu}_eA^0$.

*e-mail arhrib@mppmu.mpg.de

1. INTRODUCTION

Supersymmetric (SUSY) theories, in particular the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) [1], are currently considered as the most theoretically well motivated extensions of the Standard Model. Recently, the phenomenology of the MSSM with complex SUSY parameters has received growing attention [2–4]. Such phases give new sources of CP violation which may explain: electroweak baryogenesis scenarios [5], and CP violating phenomena in K and B decays [6]. It has been shown in [7] that by assuming universality of the gaugino masses at a high energy scale, the effects of complex soft SUSY parameters in the MSSM can be parametrized by two independent CP violating phases: the phase of the Higgsino mass term μ ($\text{Arg}(\mu)$) and the phase of the trilinear scalar coupling parameters $A = A_f$ ($\text{Arg}(A_f)$) of the sfermions \tilde{f} . The presence of large SUSY phases can give contributions to electric dipole moments of the electron and neutron (EDM) which exceed the experimental upper bounds. In a variety of SUSY models such phases turn out to be severely constrained by such constraints i.e. $\text{Arg}(\mu) < (10^{-2})$ for a SUSY mass scale of the order of few hundred GeV [8,9].

However, the possibility of having large CP violating phases can still be consistent with experimental data in any of the following three scenarios: i) Effective SUSY models [8], ii) Cancellation mechanism [12] and iii) Non-universality of trilinear couplings A_f [10]. At tree level, the Higgs sector of the MSSM with complex phases is CP conserving. The particle spectrum consists of 2 neutral CP–even scalars (h^0 and H^0), a pair of charged scalars (H^+, H^-) and a CP–odd neutral scalar A^0 . At the one loop level the Higgs sector of the MSSM is no longer CP conserving. The presence of SUSY phases induces mixing between the CP–even and CP–odd scalars, resulting in the 3 mass eigenstates H_1^0, H_2^0 and H_3^0 which do not have a definite CP parity. This mixing affects their phenomenology at present and future colliders, both in production mechanisms and decay partial widths [13,14]. Recent studies [15,16] show that the processes $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z^* \rightarrow H_i^0 Z$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow H_i^0 \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e$ would be a way of probing CP violation in the Higgs sector at the NLC. Both mechanisms are mediated by the effective tree–level couplings $H_i^0 VV$, $V = Z, W^\pm$.

Due to electromagnetic invariance, there is no effective tree level coupling $\gamma Z H_i^0$ and $\gamma \gamma H_i^0$. Consequently, the process $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma H_i^0$ is loop mediated. To have an idea about the order of magnitude of the cross section of $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma H_i^0$, we will evaluate the cross section of $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma A^0$ in MSSM including CP violating phases of $A_{t,b}$. Such approximation would be correct only in the case where the couplings $H_i^0 f \bar{f} \approx A^0 f \bar{f}$, which means that CP violating phases does not affect that much the $H_i^0 f \bar{f}$ couplings. Same arguments apply for $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z H_i^0$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e H_i^0$ specially when H_i^0 is weakly interacting with gauge bosons $H_i^0 VV \approx A^0 VV = 0$.

In the CP conserving MSSM we have access only to $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z^* \rightarrow h^0 Z / H^0 Z$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e h^0 / \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e H^0$ while $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0 Z$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$ are mediated at one loop level. The one loop evaluation of $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0 Z$ has been studied both in the MSSM with real parameters [17] and the 2HDM [18,19]. Note that ref. [19] has also studied the heavy fermion contribution to $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$ through W–W fusion. In order to be able to disentangle the CP conserving MSSM from the CP violating one, the evaluation of the cross section of $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0 Z$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$ is necessary and this is the goal of the present paper. Such processes, if observed, can give information on the vertices $A^0 \gamma \gamma$, $A^0 \gamma Z$, $A^0 Z Z$ and

$A^0 WW$.

CP-odd Higgs bosons can be produced at e^+e^- colliders [20] via $e^+e^- \rightarrow h^0 A^0$, $H^0 A^0$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow b\bar{b}A^0, t\bar{t}A^0$ [21]. If the $\gamma\gamma$ option is available then $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow A^0$ is very promising for $\tan\beta < 10$ [22]. In $\gamma\gamma$ colliders, one can have access to CP-odd A^0 through the associate production $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow ZA^0$ or the pair production $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow A^0 A^0$ [23]. Note that in the MSSM the kinematically favored mechanism $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z^* \rightarrow A^0 h^0$ is suppressed by the factor $\cos^2(\beta - \alpha)$ which is very small in the region $M_A \geq 250$ GeV, while $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z^* \rightarrow A^0 H^0$ is kinematically suppressed.

At future e^+e^- colliders the simplest way to produce CP-even Higgs scalars is in the Higgsstrahlung process $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z^* \rightarrow HZ$. Due to CP-invariance, the CP-odd A^0 possesses no tree-level coupling A^0 -Z-Z and A^0 -Z-photon. The dominant contribution is therefore from higher order diagrams which will be mediated by both SM and non-SM particles. Therefore the rates are expected to be strongly model dependent. Note that the associate production of single Higgs boson with gauge boson: $H^\mp W^\pm$ [24], A^0 -Z, A^0 - γ and γH^0 [25,17–19] would allow greater kinematical reach for the Higgs bosons mass (up to $\sqrt{s} - M_V$, M_V is the mass of the gauge boson). If any of $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0 \gamma$, $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0 Z$ and/or $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$ were sizeable it would provide an alternative way of producing A^0 at e^+e^- colliders, with a kinematical reach superior to that for the mechanism $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z^* \rightarrow A^0 H^0$.

In this paper, we calculate the associated production mechanisms $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0 \gamma$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0 Z$ in the MSSM, numerical results are given both for polarized and unpolarized electron-positron beams. We analyze also the one-loop process $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$ in 2HDM and MSSM. Heavy fermions contribution to $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$ one-loop W boson fusion production has been evaluated in [19]. We complete this study by including fermions, sfermions, charginos and neutralinos contributions in different topologies and not only for W boson fusion. The effect of CP phases of trilinear Soft SUSY breaking parameters $A_{t,b}$ on $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma A^0$, $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZA^0$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$ is examined. We provide also comparison of $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZA^0, \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$ in CP conserving MSSM with $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH_i^0, \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e H_i^0$ in CP violating MSSM [2–4].

2. NOTATION AND CONVENTIONS

First we summarize the MSSM parameters needed in our analysis, with particular attention given to the sfermion sector. In the MSSM, the sfermion sector is specified by the mass matrix in the basis $(\tilde{f}_L, \tilde{f}_R)$. In terms of the scalar mass \tilde{M}_L, \tilde{M}_R , the Higgs-Higgsino mass parameter μ and the soft SUSY-breaking trilinear coupling A_f , the sfermion mass matrices squared reads as [26]:

$$\mathcal{M}_f^2 = \begin{pmatrix} m_f^2 + m_{LL}^2 & m_{LR}^* m_f \\ m_{LR} m_f & m_f^2 + m_{RR}^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

with

$$m_{LL}^2 = \tilde{M}_L^2 + m_Z^2 \cos 2\beta (I_3^f - Q_f s_W^2), \quad (2)$$

$$m_{RR}^2 = \tilde{M}_R^2 + m_Z^2 \cos 2\beta Q_f s_W^2, \quad (3)$$

$$m_{LR} = (A_f - \mu^* (\tan \beta)^{-2I_3^f}). \quad (4)$$

$I_3^f = \pm 1/2$ and Q_f are the weak isospin and electric charge of the sfermion \tilde{f} and $\tan \beta = \frac{v_2}{v_1}$ with v_1, v_2 being the vacuum expectation value of the Higgs fields.

We will take A_f and μ as complex parameters: $A_f = |A_f| e^{i\arg(A_f)}$ and $\mu = |\mu| e^{i\arg(\mu)}$ with $0 < \arg(A_f, \mu) \leq \pi$. The hermitian matrix (1) is then diagonalised by a unitarity matrix $R_{\tilde{f}}$, which rotates the current eigenstates, \tilde{f}_L and \tilde{f}_R , into the mass eigenstates \tilde{f}_1 and \tilde{f}_2 as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{f}_1 \\ \tilde{f}_2 \end{pmatrix} = R^{\tilde{f}} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{f}_L \\ \tilde{f}_R \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\delta_f/2} \cos \theta_f & e^{-i\delta_f/2} \sin \theta_f \\ -e^{i\delta_f/2} \sin \theta_f & e^{-i\delta_f/2} \cos \theta_f \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{f}_L \\ \tilde{f}_R \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

where δ_f is the phase of $m_{LR} = |m_{LR}|e^{i\delta_f}$, and $-\pi/2 \leq \theta_f \leq \pi/2$ is the mixing angle; they are given by the relations:

$$\tan 2\theta_f = \frac{2|m_{LR}|}{m_{LL}^2 - m_{RR}^2}, \quad \sin \delta_f = \frac{\Im(m_{LR})}{|m_{LR}|}. \quad (6)$$

The physical masses, with $m_{\tilde{f}_1} < m_{\tilde{f}_2}$, are given by

$$m_{\tilde{f}_{1,2}}^2 = \frac{1}{2}(2m_f^2 + m_{LL}^2 + m_{RR}^2 \mp \sqrt{(m_{LL}^2 - m_{RR}^2)^2 + 4|m_{LR}m_f|^2}). \quad (7)$$

The interaction of the neutral gauge bosons γ, Z and the CP-odd Higgs boson with the sfermion mass eigenstates is described by the Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & -ieA^\mu \sum_{i=1,2} Q_f \tilde{f}_i^* \partial_\mu \tilde{f}_i - \frac{ig}{c_W} Z^\mu \sum_{i,j=1,2} \{(I_3^f - Q_f s_W^2) R_{j1}^{\tilde{f}} R_{i1}^{\tilde{f}*} - Q_f s_W^2 R_{j2}^{\tilde{f}} R_{i2}^{\tilde{f}*}\} \tilde{f}_i^* \partial_\mu \tilde{f}_j \\ & - \frac{ig}{\sqrt{2}} W^\mu \sum_{i,j=1,2} \{R_{j2}^{\tilde{f}} R_{i2}^{\tilde{f}*}\} \tilde{f}'_i \partial_\mu \tilde{f}_j + \{g_{A^0 \tilde{f}_L \tilde{f}_R} R_{j2}^{\tilde{f}} R_{i1}^{\tilde{f}*} + g_{A^0 \tilde{f}_L^* \tilde{f}_R} R_{j1}^{\tilde{f}} R_{i2}^{\tilde{f}*}\} A^0 \tilde{f}_i^* \tilde{f}_j \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

with $g_{A^0 \tilde{f}_L \tilde{f}_R} = -\frac{gm_f}{2m_W} (A_f (\tan \beta)^{-2I_3^f} + \mu^*)$ and $g_{A^0 \tilde{f}_L^* \tilde{f}_R} = -(g_{A^0 \tilde{f}_L \tilde{f}_R})^*$

For the coupling of the CP-odd A^0 to a pair of sfermions, one can easily show that it takes the following form

$$\begin{aligned} A^0 \tilde{f}_1^* \tilde{f}_2 &= -\frac{gm_f}{2M_W} \{(A_f (\tan \beta)^{-2I_3^f} + \mu^*) e^{-i\delta_f} \sin^2 \theta_f + (A_f^* (\tan \beta)^{-2I_3^f} + \mu) e^{i\delta_f} \cos^2 \theta_f\} \\ A^0 \tilde{f}_1^* \tilde{f}_1 &= \frac{-igm_f}{2M_W} \sin 2\theta_f \{|A_f| (\tan \beta)^{-2I_3^f} \sin(\arg(A_f) - \delta_f) - |\mu| \sin(\arg(\mu) + \delta_f)\} \\ A^0 \tilde{f}_2^* \tilde{f}_2 &= -(A^0 \tilde{f}_1^* \tilde{f}_1) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Note that in the MSSM with real soft SUSY breaking parameters, the coupling of A^0 to a pair of sfermions satisfies the following relation: $(A^0 \tilde{f}_i \tilde{f}_j^*)_{i \neq j} = -(A^0 \tilde{f}_j \tilde{f}_i^*)_{i \neq j}$. The couplings $(A^0 \tilde{f}_i \tilde{f}_i^*)$, $i=1,2$, vanish and only $(A^0 \tilde{f}_1 \tilde{f}_2^*) = -(A^0 \tilde{f}_2 \tilde{f}_1^*)$ are non-zero.

3. CP-ODD PRODUCTION AT E^+E^- COLLIDERS

3.1 Associated photon- A^0 and Z- A^0 production:

Now we are ready to discuss the associated production mechanisms $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$ in the MSSM with and without CP violating phases. These processes have

been studied in the MSSM with real parameters in Refs. [25] and [17], where the full set of Feynman diagrams which contribute to these processes can be found. In both studies it was shown that the sfermion contribution to the vertices γ -Z- A^0 and Z-Z- A^0 vanishes due to the fact that $(A^0 \tilde{f}_1 \tilde{f}_2^*) = -(A^0 \tilde{f}_2 \tilde{f}_1^*)$.

In the presence of CP violating phases in μ and A_f , one can clearly see from (9) that $(A^0 \tilde{f}_i \tilde{f}_i^*) \neq 0$ for $i=1,2$, and $(A^0 \tilde{f}_1 \tilde{f}_2^*) \neq -(A^0 \tilde{f}_2 \tilde{f}_1^*)$. Consequently the sfermion contribution to $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma A^0$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z A^0$ (Fig.1) no longer vanishes. Note that in the case of stop, the effect of CP phases in $(A^0 \tilde{t}_i \tilde{t}_i^*)$, $i=1,2$, is enhanced by the top mass as well as by large $|A_t|$ and large $|\mu|$. While in the case of scalar bottom and tau, the effect of the CP phase of A_b and A_τ may show up with large $\tan \beta$ eq.(9).

3.2 Single A^0 production via $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$

It is well known that at high energies $\sqrt{s} > 500$ GeV, WW fusion $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e h^0$ is the most promising process with which to discover the Higgs boson. Due to CP invariance, A^0 possesses no tree-level coupling A^0 -W-W. The dominant contribution is therefore from higher order diagrams which will be mediated by both SM and SUSY particles. In the MSSM, one can generate the $\nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$ final state at e^+e^- colliders through one of the generic diagram depicted in Fig.2. $\nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$ can also be generated through the one-loop process $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z A^0$ (on-shell Z) followed by the decay of the Z boson to $\nu_e \bar{\nu}_e$, although such a final state could be removed experimentally by recoil reconstruction. Consequently, this two-body production and decay will not be addressed here.

In Fig.2, we show the generic one-loop contributions to $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$. These comprise the following: a.) Fig. 2.1: contribution from W-W- A^0 vertex b.) Fig. 2.2-2.5: $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z^* \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e^*, \nu_e^* \bar{\nu}_e$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e^*, \nu_e^* \bar{\nu}_e$ followed by one-loop neutrino decay: $\nu_e^* \rightarrow \nu_e A^0$ or $\bar{\nu}_e^* \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e A^0$ c.) Fig.2.6-2.8 and 2.14 to 2.16: one-loop contribution from $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0 Z^*$ with $Z^* \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e$, d.) Fig. 2.9 and 2.10: one-loop correction to $A^0 e^+ e^*$ and $A^0 e^- e^*$, e.) Fig. 2.11 \rightarrow 2.13: box diagrams with virtual gauge bosons $V = \gamma, Z$ and f.) Fig.2.17 \rightarrow 2.22: box diagrams with virtual gauge boson W. Additional contributions come from the non-diagonal self-energies of photon- A^0 , Z- A^0 and W^\pm - H^\mp . However, the amplitudes of these contributions are proportional to the electron mass and consequently vanish in the approximation $m_e \approx 0$.

All the Feynman diagrams are generated and computed using FeynArts [27] and FormCalc [28] packages in the dimensional regularization scheme. We also use FF-package and looptools [29] in the numerical analysis. In the case of $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$, the three body phase space integration is performed using VEGAS routines [30].

4. RESULTS

Before discussing our numerical results, we define the free parameters that will be used. In MSSM, it is common to parameterize the tree level Higgs sector with $\tan \beta$ and M_A . However, in our cases $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma A^0$, $Z A^0$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$ are one-loop mediated. In all cases, the amplitudes depend on tree level masses and parameters, the inclusion of radiative correction to those masses and parameters would be of higher order. Consequently, in our

numerical analysis we will use $\tan\beta$ and M_A to parameterize the Higgs sector. We stress in passing that the cross sections are not very sensitive to the effect of radiative corrections on the Higgs sector. We will assume that $\tan\beta \geq 2.5$.

The chargino neutralino sector can be parametrized by the usual M_1 , M_2 and μ . We assume that, $M_1 \approx M_2/2$ and $\mu > 0$. The third-generation sfermions are parametrized by: a common sfermion mass $M_{SUSY} = \widetilde{M}_L = \widetilde{M}_R$, soft trilinear A_f coupling which we will take to be identical for top, bottom and tau ($A_t = A_b = A_\tau$), $\tan\beta$ and the μ parameters. Once these parameters are given, the mixing angle and the sfermions masses are fixed by eqs. (6, 7). In our analysis we will take into account the following constraints when the SUSY parameters are varied:

- i) the extra contribution $\delta\rho$ to the ρ parameter [31] should not exceed the current limits from experimental measurements $\delta\rho \lesssim 10^{-3}$,
- ii) $m_{\tilde{t}_1, \tilde{b}_1} > 100$ GeV, $m_{\chi_1^\pm} > 103$ GeV, $m_{\chi_1^0} > 50$ GeV and $m_h > 110$ GeV.

We first start with the MSSM contributions to $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$. We focus only on the case where the SUSY particles are rather light, taking $M_{SUSY} = \mu \approx 200$ GeV, $M_2 = 150$ GeV and $\tan\beta = 2.5$. For such low $\tan\beta$ and in order to satisfy $m_h > 110$ GeV in MSSM with real parameters, we need large $A_t \approx 6$ TeV and large third generation SUSY scale $M_{stop}^{L,R}$ of the order 3 TeV together with $M_A > 130$ GeV. While in MSSM with CP phases, the bound $m_h > 110$ GeV is reduced and even a light Higgs bosons with a mass $m_{H_1} \approx 70$ GeV may have escape detection at LEP II [4]. Note that the 2HDM contribution is enhanced in the small $\tan\beta \lesssim 1$ regime by the top quark mass [17,18,25,19] while for large $\tan\beta$ the 2HDM contribution is suppressed and does not attain observable rates.

As can be seen in Fig.3, the 2HDM cross section for both $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$ is enhanced by light SUSY particles. The SUSY enhancement is not that spectacular since there is strong destructive interference between the vertex and box diagrams which reduces the cross section. In the case of $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$ one can reach ≈ 0.02 fb for $M_A < 350$ GeV. The cross section can also be enhanced by polarizing the electron and positron beams. As shown in Fig.3, the cross section with left-handed longitudinally polarized electrons is approximately twice that for the non-polarized case, while for left-handed electrons and right-handed positrons the enhancement is approximately a factor of 4. The cross section of $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$ is approximately one order of magnitude smaller than $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$, and consequently $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$ is more promising, especially if polarized electron positron beams are available. At a higher center of mass energy ($\sqrt{s} = 800$ GeV) with light SUSY particles $M_{SUSY} = 200$ GeV, the cross sections for $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma, A^0Z$ are suppressed. The maximum value for $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$ (resp $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$) is about 0.003 fb (resp 0.001 fb) for $300 < M_A < 350$ GeV.

Let us now discuss the single CP-odd Higgs boson production $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$. We start with the 2HDM contribution which basically arises from the typical diagrams shown in Fig.2.1, 2.6, 2.11 \rightarrow 2.20. The dominant contribution comes from top-bottom contribution in Fig.2.1 and 2.6 with fermion exchange ¹. Ref. [19] evaluated the top-bottom contribution to $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$ coming from Fig.2.1 only. The full 2HDM contribution is under investiga-

¹It has been shown recently [32], that the radiative correction to $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e h^0$ in the MSSM receive sizeable enhancements from heavy fermion loops compared to sfermion loops.

tion, and preliminary results can be found in [33]. We have cross checked with the existing results [19,33] and we found agreement.

In Fig. 4, we plot the cross section of $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$ in the 2HDM for 500 GeV and 800 GeV center of mass energies. For the Higgs couplings and masses we use the MSSM values including radiative corrections to the lightest Higgs boson mass. We found that the inclusion of the diagrams of Fig.2.6, which was neglected in [19], can slightly enhance the cross section which can reach 0.0033 fb at $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV, $M_A = 100$ GeV and small $\tan\beta = 0.5$. For large $\tan\beta$ the cross section drops by 2 order of magnitude. At high energy $\sqrt{s} = 800$ GeV, the cross sections are of the order 0.006 fb for small $\tan\beta = 0.5$ and $M_A < 400$ GeV.

We have also included the full MSSM contribution coming from vertex and boxes (Fig.2), omitting the five point-functions, these five point-functions do not have any enhancement factor and their contribution is expected to be smaller.

Numerically, in the MSSM with real parameters, we found that even in the optimistic scenario where all SUSY particles are light of order 200 GeV and $\tan\beta = 2.5$ the cross section does not receive any substantial enhancement both at $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV and 800 GeV.

Let us now turn on the CP violating phases of the trilinear terms A_t , A_b and A_τ and see their effect on $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma A^0$, $e^+e^- \rightarrow Z A^0$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$. As was pointed in the introduction, allowing large CP violating phases in A_t and A_b may violate the experimental bounds on the electron and neutron EDMs [11]. Since we are interested only in the effect of the CP phases of third generation sfermions², the first and second generation sfermions can be decoupled together by taking them at 5 TeV. Then the one-loop electron and neutron EDMs [9] are safely within the experimental limits. However, in the scenario of large CP phases in A_t , A_b and A_τ , two-loop Barr-Zee type diagrams can violate the EDMs constraints for large $\tan\beta \gtrsim 30$. In such a case one may need to arrange for a cancellation mechanism among the various one and two-loop contributions or among the full two-loop contribution alone. In our study we limit ourself to the case of moderate $\tan\beta \leq 25$.

It has been shown in [2], that when the three neutral Higgs bosons mix their effective couplings to fermions can be rather different at one loop. However, one can find parameters space in the MSSM where such corrections turn out to be only of the order of few percent [13], in such case one of the H_i^0 look like CP-odd A^0 . Taking into account the above observation, we present our numerical results for $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma A^0$, $Z A^0$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$ only in the case of low $|\mu| \leq 600$ GeV, low $|A_{t,b}| \leq 600$ GeV and low SUSY scale $M_{SUSY} \leq 300$ GeV where scalar-pseudoscalar mixing is not sizeable and so such approximation is correct. In our numerical results we assume that only $A_{t,b,\tau}$ carry CP violating phases. We assume that μ , M_1 and M_2 are real, since we do not expect the charginos neutralinos contributions to give sizeable enhancement.

As we stress above, the first and second generation sleptons and squarks are set to 5 TeV. We have observed that there is some non-decoupling effects in $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0 \gamma$, $A^0 Z$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e A^0$. Those non-decoupling effects originate from t-channel diagrams with exchange of two neutralinos(charginos) and one selectrons(sneutrinos). The asymptotic dependence on sleptons mass $m_{\tilde{l}}$ goes like $\log(m_{\tilde{l}})$ for very large $m_{\tilde{l}}$ compared to charginos and neutralinos

²The coupling of A^0 to sfermions is proportional the fermion mass. Consequently the first and second generation do not have any impact on the diagrams of Fig. 1 with sfermion exchange.

masses. This non-decoupling effect can be seen in Fig. 5 only for low $\mu = 300$ GeV and gives 0.025 fb (resp 0.015 fb) cross section for $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$ (resp $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$) at small CP phases.

Numerically, it turns out that the squark contribution with virtual photon exchange (Fig.1) is more important than the one with virtual Z exchange for both $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$. Note that the couplings $Z\tilde{t}_i\tilde{t}_j^*$ are not very sensitive to the CP phases while $A^0\tilde{t}_i\tilde{t}_j^*$ exhibit a strong dependence on the CP phases. For instance, the coupling $A^0\tilde{t}_i\tilde{t}_i^*$, which is zero for vanishing CP phases, reaches its maximum value, which is comparable to $A^0\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_2^*$, for $\arg(A_t) \gtrsim 5$ degrees.

We illustrate in Fig. 5 the cross section of $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$ (left plot) and $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$ (right plot) as function of CP phases $\arg(A_f) = \arg(A_t) = \arg(A_b) = \arg(A_\tau)$ at $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV, $\tan\beta = 2.5$ and for $\mu = 300, 450, 600$ GeV. The CP phase is varied from 0 to about 100 degrees. For CP phases greater than 100 degrees, the mass of the lightest stop $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ becomes less than about 100 GeV which is ruled out by experiments. As one can see in Fig. 5, for low value of μ the effect of the CP phase $\arg(A_f)$ is not important.

In both cases, the cross section can reach values of about 0.08 fb for large CP phases and $\mu = 600$ GeV. The sensitivity to the CP phase is more important for $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$. This is simply due to the fact that gauge invariance in case of $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$ allows the photon to couple to only two identical sfermions with the electromagnetic coupling. For large $\tan\beta$, the contributions of the CP violating phases of A_b and A_τ may show up and become comparable to the effect of the CP phase of A_t . We have checked that for $\tan\beta \approx 24$, $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV, light CP-odd $M_A = 200$ GeV and large CP phases $\arg(A_f) \approx \pi/2$, the maximum reach for $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$ is about 0.032 fb, decreasing for larger M_A . In the case of $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$ production, the situation is better. A cross section of about 0.052 fb can be obtained for $\tan\beta = 24$, large CP phases $\arg(A_f) \approx \pi/2$ and $M_A = 200$ GeV. At large $\tan\beta$, the contribution from the CP phases of A_τ and A_b can give cross sections comparable to those from the CP phase of A_t in the low $\tan\beta$ regime, especially in the case of $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$ production.

In Fig. 6, we show the CP phases effect on $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e\bar{\nu}_e A^0$ for center of mass energy $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV, $M_A = 200$ GeV (left) and $\sqrt{s} = 800$ GeV, $M_A = 400$ GeV (right). In both cases, the large CP phases can enhance the cross section by one to two orders of magnitude and one can reach 0.08 fb cross sections for 500 GeV center of mass energy.

To end this analysis, for completeness, we present cross sections for $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH_i^0$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e\bar{\nu}_e H_i^0$ in CP violating MSSM [3,4]. We use the same set of parameters used in $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZA^0$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e\bar{\nu}_e A^0$:

$$M_{SUSY} = \widetilde{M}_L = \widetilde{M}_R = M_2 = 300, \quad \mu = 300 \rightarrow 600, \quad |A_t| = |A_b| = 600 \text{ GeV} \quad (10)$$

In CP violating MSSM we use the public fortran program [34]. We will take the charged Higgs mass $M_{H^\pm} = 215$ GeV as input parameter. For this charged Higgs mass and the set of parameters fixed above, H_2^0 is dominated by CP-odd component and its mass about 200 GeV for small CP phases while H_3 is dominated by CP-even component and its mass about 220 GeV.

In Fig.6 we show cross section for $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH_i^0$ at $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV, $\tan\beta = 2.5$ (left plot) and WW fusion $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e\bar{\nu}_e H_i^0$ at high energy $\sqrt{s} = 800$ GeV (right plot). It can be seen from the left plot that for $\mu = 300$ GeV (solid lines), the cross section of $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH_2^0$

(resp $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH_3^0$) is less than 2×10^{-2} fb (resp about 1.2 fb) for a large CP phases range. This means that H_2^0 is dominated by CP-odd component and H_3^0 is dominated by CP-even component. For $\mu = 600$ GeV the cross section of $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH_2^0$ is enhanced and reach 0.073 fb. The cross section we obtain in this scenario, with scalar-pseudoscalar mixing, both for $\mu = 300$ GeV and $\mu = 600$ GeV are comparable to what we found for $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZA^0$ with large CP phases. At $\sqrt{s} = 800$ GeV, the WW fusion offers better reach for $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e\bar{\nu}_eH_2^0$ with 0.2 fb cross section.

5. CONCLUSIONS

We have computed the cross-sections for the production mechanisms $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$, $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e$ at high energy e^+e^- colliders in the framework of the MSSM. Such processes proceed via higher order diagrams and are strongly model dependent. We presented results for the 2HDM and the MSSM.

In the 2HDM the cross sections are small for large $\tan\beta$ and are enhanced by the top loop effect for $0.5 < \tan\beta < 1$. In the MSSM with real parameters, light SUSY particles may enhance the cross sections resulting in maximum values of order 0.02 fb for $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$, which can be enhanced by a factor of 2 if the electron beam can be polarized.

In the case of $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e$, light SUSY particles may give important contributions to the cross-section, resulting in maximum values of order 0.005 fb (resp 0.001 fb) for $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$ (resp $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e$) for $\tan\beta = 2.5$ and $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV. Therefore the SUSY enhancement is not sufficient to produce an observable signal at the planned luminosities of 500fb^{-1} . With an integrated luminosity of $\mathcal{L} \approx 500\text{-}1000 \text{fb}^{-1}$ expected at proposed e^+e^- colliders, in the MSSM with real parameters one could expect a non-negligible number of events only from $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$. While $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e$ does not attain observable rates.

In the MSSM with explicit CP phases and small scalar-pseudoscalar mixing, one of H_i^0 would be dominated by CP-odd A^0 component, we have shown that, in this case, $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma A^0$, ZA^0 and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e\bar{\nu}_eA^0$ processes discussed above can be enhanced by large CP phases and reach cross sections of the order 0.08 fb at high energy. In the MSSM with sizeable scalar-pseudo scalar mixing, it is possible to have cross sections greater than 0.1 fb for $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH_i$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e\bar{\nu}_eH_i$ for all $i=1,2,3$. [15]. Therefore such signals could not be explained in the MSSM unless sizeable scalar-pseudoscalar mixing is taken place.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Thomas Hahn and Christian Schappacher for their patience in answering all my questions about the new version of FeynArts [28]. We are grateful to Andrew Akeroyd and to Wolfgang Hollik for fruitful discussions and for reading the paper. We would like to thank Sven Heinemeyer for fruitful discussion. This work is supported by Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. P. Nilles, Phys. Rept. **110** (1984) 1; H. E. Haber and G. L. Kane, Phys. Rept. **117** (1985) 75.
- [2] A. Pilaftsis, Phys. Lett. B **435** (1998) 88. D. A. Demir, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 055006 (1999); A. Pilaftsis and C. E. Wagner, Nucl. Phys. B **553**, 3 (1999).
- [3] S. Y. Choi, M. Drees and J. S. Lee, Phys. Lett. **B481** (2000) 57; S. Heinemeyer, Eur. Phys. J. C **22**, 521 (2001) T. Ibrahim and P. Nath, arXiv:hep-ph/0204092.
- [4] M. Carena, J. Ellis, A. Pilaftsis and C. E. Wagner, Nucl. Phys. B **586** (2000) 92; M. Carena, J. Ellis, A. Pilaftsis and C. E. Wagner, Phys. Lett. B **495** (2000) 155.
- [5] M. Carena, J. M. Moreno, M. Quiros, M. Seco and C. E. Wagner, Nucl. Phys. B **599** (2001) 158; M. Brhlik, G. J. Good and G. L. Kane, Phys. Rev. D **63** (2001) 035002.
- [6] S. w. Baek and P. Ko, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 488 (1999); T. Goto, Y. Y. Keum, T. Nihei, Y. Okada and Y. Shimizu, Phys. Lett. B **460**, 333 (1999); C. K. Chua, X. G. He and W. S. Hou, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 014003 (1999); A. G. Akeroyd, Y. Y. Keum and S. Recksiegel, Phys. Lett. B **507**, 252 (2001)
- [7] M. Dugan, B. Grinstein and L. J. Hall, Nucl. Phys. B **255**, 413 (1985).
- [8] P. Nath, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** (1991) 2565; Y. Kizukuri and N. Oshimo, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 3025 (1992).
- [9] S. Pokorski, J. Rosiek and C. A. Savoy, Nucl. Phys. B **570**, 81 (2000).
- [10] S.A. Abel and J.M. Frere, Phys. Rev. D **55** (1997) 1623.
- [11] D. Chang, W.Y. Keung and A. Pilaftsis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82** (1999) 900; A. Pilaftsis, Phys. Lett. B **471**, 174 (1999)
- [12] T. Ibrahim and P. Nath, Phys. Lett. B **418** (1998) 98; Phys. Rev. D **57** (1998) 478 [Erratum-ibid. D **58** (1998) 019901; D **60** (1999) 079903; D **60** (1999) 119901; M. Brhlik, G. J. Good and G. L. Kane, Phys. Rev. D **59** (1999) 115004.
- [13] A. Dedes and S. Moretti, Nucl. Phys. B **576** (2000) 29; Phys. Rev. Lett. **84** (2000) 22;
- [14] S. Y. Choi and J. S. Lee, Phys. Rev. D **61** (2000) 015003; *ibid* D **61** (2000) 115002; S. Y. Choi, K. Hagiwara and J. S. Lee, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 032004 (2001); S. Y. Choi, K. Hagiwara and J. S. Lee, Phys. Lett. B **529**, 212 (2002); A. Arhrib, D. K. Ghosh and O. C. Kong, Phys. Lett. B **537**, 217 (2002); S. Y. Choi, B. c. Chung, P. Ko and J. S. Lee, arXiv:hep-ph/0206025.
- [15] A. G. Akeroyd and A. Arhrib, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 095018 (2001)
- [16] D. A. Demir, Phys. Lett. B **465**, 177 (1999); D. A. Demir, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **81**, 224 (2000); S. W. Ham, S. K. Oh, E.J. Yoo and H.K. Lee, J. Phys. G **27** (2001) 1.
- [17] A. G. Akeroyd, A. Arhrib and M. Capdequi Peyranère, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 075007 (2001) [Erratum-ibid. D **65**, 099903 (2002)]
- [18] A. G. Akeroyd, A. Arhrib and M. Capdequi Peyranère, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **14**, 2093 (1999) [Erratum-ibid. A **17**, 373 (2002)];
- [19] T. Farris, J. F. Gunion and H. E. Logan, arXiv:hep-ph/0202087.
- [20] E. Accomando *et al.* [ECFA/DESY LC Physics Working Group Collaboration], Phys. Rept. **299**, 1 (1998).
- [21] A. Djouadi, J. Kalinowski and P. M. Zerwas, Z. Phys. C **54**, 255 (1992); S. Dawson and L. Reina, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 015003 (1999).
- [22] D. M. Asner, J. B. Gronberg and J. F. Gunion, arXiv:hep-ph/0110320; M. M. Muhlleit-

- ner, M. Kramer, M. Spira and P. M. Zerwas, *Phys. Lett. B* **508**, 311 (2001); J. F. Gunion and H. E. Haber, *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 5109 (1993).
- [23] G. J. Gounaris, P. I. Porfyriadis and F. M. Renard, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **20**, 659 (2001); G. J. Gounaris and P. I. Porfyriadis, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **18**, 181 (2000)
- [24] O. Brein, arXiv:hep-ph/0209124, Talk given at SUSY02, Hamburg (2002) and PhD thesis, Karlsruhe university Unpublished; H. E. Logan and S. f. Su, arXiv:hep-ph/0206135; H. E. Logan and S. f. Su, arXiv:hep-ph/0203270; A. Arhrib, M. Capdequi Peyranere, W. Hollik and G. Moulaka, *Nucl. Phys. B* **581**, 34 (2000); S. Kanemura, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **17**, 473 (2000); S. H. Zhu, arXiv:hep-ph/9901221.
- [25] A. Djouadi, V. Driesen, W. Hollik and J. Rosiek, *Nucl. Phys. B* **491**, 68 (1997)
- [26] J. F. Gunion, H. E. Haber, G. L. Kane and S. Dawson, “The Higgs Hunter’s Guide,” SCIPP-89/13, (Addison–Wesley, Reading, 1990).
- [27] J. Kublbeck, M. Bohm and A. Denner, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **60**, 165 (1990); T. Hahn, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **140**, 418 (2001); T. Hahn and C. Schappacher, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **143**, 54 (2002)
- [28] T. Hahn and M. Perez-Victoria, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **118**, 153 (1999);
- [29] G. J. van Oldenborgh, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **66**, 1 (1991); T. Hahn, *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **30**, 3469 (1999)
- [30] G. P. Lepage, *J. Comput. Phys.* **27**, 192 (1978).
- [31] A. Djouadi, P. Gambino, S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik, C. Junger and G. Weiglein, *Phys. Rev. D* **57**, 4179 (1998); M. Drees and K. Hagiwara, *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 1709 (1990); S. K. Kang and J. D. Kim, *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 071901 (2000)
- [32] H. Eberl, W. Majerotto and V. C. Spanos, *Phys. Lett. B* **538**, 353 (2002)
- [33] S.Su, talk presented at SUSY02 and S.SU private communication.
- [34] <http://home/cern.ch/p/pilaftsis/www/>.

FIGURES




FIG. 1. Squark contributions to $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma A^0$.




FIG. 2. Typical Feynman diagrams contributing to $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}A^0$ in the MSSM.




FIG. 3. Total cross section at 500 GeV center-of-mass energy for $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$ (left) and $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$ (right) in 2HDM and MSSM with real parameters. $M_{SUSY} = M_{\text{sfermions}} = \mu \approx 200$ GeV, $M_2 = 150$ GeV and $\tan\beta = 2.5$




FIG. 4. Total cross section for $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\nu\bar{\nu}$ at 500 GeV (left) and 800 GeV (right) center-of-mass energy in the 2HDM.




FIG. 5. Total cross section at 500 GeV center-of-mass energy for $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0\gamma$ (left) and $e^+e^- \rightarrow A^0Z$ (right) as function of $\text{Arg}(A_f)$ for $\tan\beta = 2.5$ with $M_{SUSY} = 300$, $A_{t,b} = 600$ GeV and $M_2 = 300$ GeV.




FIG. 6. Total cross section for $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e\bar{\nu}_e A^0$ as function of $\text{Arg}(A_f)$ for $\tan\beta = 2.5$, $M_{SUSY} = 300$, $|A_{t,b,\tau}| = 600$ GeV and $M_2 = 300$ GeV. Left plot $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV and right plot $\sqrt{s} = 800$ GeV




FIG. 7. Total cross section for: (left plot) $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH_i$ at $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV, (right plot) $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}H_i$ at $\sqrt{s} = 800$ GeV with $M_{H^\pm} = 215$ GeV and $\tan\beta = 2.5$, $\mu = 300$ GeV (solid lines) and $\mu = 600$ GeV (dashed lines). In both cases we use parameters set in (10)