

**TWO-LOOP HEAVY TOP EFFECTS ON PRECISION
OBSERVABLES AND THE HIGGS MASS***

PAOLO GAMBINO

*Max Planck Institut für Physik, W. Heisenberg Institut,
Föhringer Ring 6, München, D-80805, Germany
E-mail: gambino@mppmu.mpg.de*

ABSTRACT

The electroweak corrections induced by a heavy top on the main precision observables are now available up to $O(g^4 M_t^2/M_W^2)$. The new results significantly reduce the theoretical uncertainty and have a sizable impact on the determination of $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$. We give precise predictions for M_W and $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ in different renormalization schemes, estimate their accuracy, and discuss the implications for the indirect determination of M_H . From the present data for $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ we obtain $M_H = 127_{-71}^{+143}$ GeV (or $M_H \lesssim 430$ GeV at 95% C.L.).

The latest preliminary data from LEP and SLC presented at Warsaw last summer¹ contain no convincing hint of new physics, in contrast with the situation just a year ago. Since the data are in substantial agreement with the Standard Model (SM), we can try to constrain the mass of the SM Higgs boson as much as possible. This is even more interesting in view of the Higgs discovery potential of the LEP2 program currently under way. Indeed, it has been recently observed^{1,2} that at the present level of experimental accuracy the theoretical error arising from unknown higher order effects, estimated from scheme dependence, has a relevant impact on the indirect bounds on the Higgs mass. In the past year substantial progress has been made concerning the higher order corrections of electroweak origin, which is also of relevance for the indirect determination of M_H .

In this talk I will briefly illustrate the calculation of all two-loop electroweak contributions to the main precision observables which are enhanced by powers of the top mass; then I will discuss the residual scheme and scale dependence of the predictions when the new results are implemented in different frameworks. After a short summary of the various sources of theoretical error involved in the calculation of M_W and the effective sine, I will conclude with a discussion of how the new results

¹Talk given at the Workshop on "The Higgs puzzle - What can we learn from LEP II, LHC, NLC, and FMC?", Ringberg Castle, Germany, December 8-13, 1996. To appear in the Proceedings, ed. B. Kniehl.




Figure 1: Two-loop heavy top corrections to $\Delta\hat{\rho}$ in units 10^{-4} . The upper line represents the leading $O(G_\mu^2 m_t^4)$ correction⁶.

affect the indirect determination of M_H .

1. Calculation of $O(g^4 M_t^2 / M_w^2)$ effects

The very precise measurements carried out at LEP, SLC, and the Tevatron in the recent past have made the study of higher order radiative corrections necessary in order to test the Standard Model, and possibly to uncover hints of new physics. The one-loop corrections to all the relevant electroweak observables are by now very well established³, and two and three-loop effects have been investigated in several cases. The dominance of a heavy top quark in the one-loop electroweak corrections, which depend quadratically on the top mass, has allowed to predict with good approximation the mass of the heaviest quark before its actual discovery.

Among the higher order effects connected with these large non-decoupling contributions, the QCD corrections are now known through $O(\alpha_s^2)$ ⁴. As for the purely electroweak effects originated at higher orders by the large Yukawa coupling of the top, reducible contributions have been first studied by Consoli *et al.*⁵, while a thorough investigation of leading irreducible two-loop contributions has been performed by Barbieri *et al.* and others for arbitrary M_H ⁶.

The result of the calculation of the leading $O(G_\mu^2 M_t^4)$ effects on the ρ parameter⁶ is shown in Fig.1 (upper curve). The correction is relatively sizable and in the heavy Higgs case reaches the permille level in the prediction of $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$, comparable to the present experimental accuracy¹. We observe that the correction is extremely small for a small Higgs mass, due to large cancellations. One can naively expect that setting the masses of the vector boson different from zero (and so going beyond the pure Yukawa theory considered in⁶) would spoil the cancellations and lead to relevant deviations from the upper curve of Fig.1 in the light Higgs region.

In addition, the theoretical uncertainty coming from unknown higher order effects is dominated by terms $O(g^4 M_t^2/M_W^2)$ ³. Indeed, the renormalization scheme ambiguities and the different resummation options examined in ³ led to an estimate of the uncertainty of the theoretical predictions which was in a few cases disturbingly sizable, i.e. comparable to the present experimental error. In particular, for $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$, the estimated uncertainty was $\delta \sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}(th) \lesssim 1.4 \times 10^{-4}$, comparable to the present experimental error, $\approx 3 \times 10^{-4}$. For M_W the uncertainty, $\delta M_W(th) \lesssim 16$ MeV, was much smaller than the error on the present world average, 125 MeV. A different analysis based on the explicit two-loop calculation of the ρ parameter in low-energy processes has also reached very similar conclusions ⁷.

Motivated by the previous observations, the complete analytic calculation of the two-loop quadratic top effects has been performed for the relation between the vector boson masses and the muon decay constant G_μ ⁸ and for the effective leptonic mixing angle, $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ ^{9,10}. Corrections to the Z^0 decay width are also under study. Using α , G_μ , and M_Z as inputs, it is then possible to predict at this level of accuracy the mass of the W boson and the effective sine, $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$. These are the two most accurately known observables at the moment, and the ones which allow for the cleanest theoretical interpretation. The present world averages ¹ for the W mass and for the effective sine are $M_W = 80.356 \pm 0.125$ GeV and $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept} = 0.23165 \pm 0.00024$, respectively. The accuracy of their measurement is also going to improve in the near future ¹¹, especially in the case of the W mass, thanks to LEP2 and the upgrade of the Tevatron. The precise determination of $\sin^2 \hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$, a by-product of the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ calculation, is also important for GUTs studies.

The gauge sector of the SM is described in terms of just three input quantities, which are routinely chosen to be α , the Fermi constant G_μ and M_Z . At any order in perturbation theory we can relate the parameters of the Lagrangian to the measured inputs, calculate them, and then make predictions for any observable. Using $s \equiv \sin \theta_W$ and $c \equiv \cos \theta_W$, we can relate the weak couplings to the inputs through the following two relations:

$$s^2 = \frac{\pi\alpha}{\sqrt{2}G_\mu M_W^2} \quad \rightarrow \quad s_R^2 = \frac{\pi\alpha}{\sqrt{2}G_\mu M_W^2} \frac{1}{(1 - \Delta r_W^R)} \quad (1)$$

$$M_W^2 = c^2 M_Z^2 \quad \rightarrow \quad M_W^2 = c_R^2 M_Z^2 \frac{1}{1 - \Delta \rho_R}. \quad (2)$$

Here the l.h.s. corresponds to a tree level description, while on the r.h.s. I have shown that, in a given renormalization scheme "R", the quantum effects can be incorporated through the radiative corrections Δr_W^R and $\Delta \rho_R$. They are functions of s_R , the renormalized mixing angle, and of the physical masses M_W , M_t , M_H , etc., and clearly depend on the renormalization scheme.

All the calculations of the $O(g^4 M_t^2/M_W^2)$ effects have been performed in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme introduced in ¹², i.e. using $\overline{\text{MS}}$ couplings and on-shell masses, a particularly

convenient framework. The mixing angle is then defined by

$$\hat{s}^2 \equiv \sin^2 \hat{\theta}_w(M_Z)_{\overline{\text{MS}}} \equiv \frac{\hat{\alpha}(M_Z)_{\overline{\text{MS}}}}{\hat{\alpha}_2(M_Z)_{\overline{\text{MS}}}} \quad (3)$$

($\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\alpha}_2$ are the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ $U(1)_{e.m.}$ and $SU(2)$ running couplings), while the vector boson masses are defined as the physical masses. In this framework $\Delta\hat{\rho}$ and $\Delta\hat{r}_w$ are the radiative corrections entering the r.h.s. of Eqs. (1) and (2). By solving these two equations simultaneously, the mass of the W boson and the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ mixing angle can be determined.

For what concerns the relation between the effective leptonic sine measured at LEP and SLC from on-resonance asymmetries and the renormalized mixing angle, in an arbitrary renormalization scheme we find

$$\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept} = \left[1 + \Delta k_R(M_Z^2) \right] s_R^2. \quad (4)$$

where $\Delta k_R(M_Z^2)$ is the real part of an electroweak form factor evaluated at $q^2 = M_Z^2$. In the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ framework the relevant quantity is $\Delta\hat{k}(M_Z^2)$ ¹³.

In this $\overline{\text{MS}}$ framework, only $\Delta\hat{\rho}$ contains the leading heavy top dependence of the electroweak amplitudes at one and two-loop level, i.e. $O(g^2 M_t^2/M_w^2)$ and $O(g^4 M_t^4/M_w^4)$ respectively. The calculation of the next-to-leading heavy top corrections relevant for M_W and $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ therefore consists of computing (a) the first corrections to the result of⁶ for $\Delta\hat{\rho}$, which is displayed in Fig.1; this involves only the calculation of on-shell mass counterterms for the vector bosons, and leads to a striking deviation from the leading result. (b) the leading $O(g^4 M_t^2/M_w^2)$ contributions to $\Delta\hat{r}_w$ and $\Delta\hat{k}$, which implies the two-loop calculation of the Z^0 and the muon decays at $O(g^4 M_t^2/M_w^2)$.

The main tools needed to perform such calculations are:

- A consistent heavy mass expansion procedure^{14,15}, whereby the coefficients of the heavy top expansion of any two-loop diagram are expressed in terms of vacuum two-loop integrals and products of one-loop integrals in n dimensions.
- Vacuum two-loop integrals in n dimensions with arbitrary masses.¹⁶
- An efficient algebraic computer package.¹⁷
- A renormalization procedure kept to maximal simplicity. The $\overline{\text{MS}}$ choice has the advantage that the one-loop coupling counterterms are not enhanced by powers of M_t ; only mass renormalization introduces M_t^2 terms. We used bare gauge fixing, which avoids a vector boson–scalar mixing counterterm and has been proved equivalent to the standard procedure¹⁸. The Ward identities fix the mass renormalization of the unphysical scalars and allow an important check of the vector boson self-energies at $q^2 = 0$.

Table 1. Predicted values of M_W and $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ in different frameworks, including only the leading $O(g^4 M_t^4)$ irreducible contribution. QCD corrections based on pole top-mass parametrization. $M_t = 175\text{GeV}$.

M_H	$\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$				$M_W(\text{GeV})$			
	OSI	OSII	$\overline{\text{MS}}$	$ZFitter$	OSI	OSII	$\overline{\text{MS}}$	$ZFitter$
65	.23131	.23111	.23122	.23116	80.411	80.422	80.420	80.420
100	.23153	.23135	.23144	.23138	80.388	80.397	80.396	80.396
300	.23212	.23203	.23203	.23197	80.312	80.316	80.319	80.320
600	.23251	.23249	.23243	.23236	80.256	80.257	80.263	80.265
1000	.23280	.23282	.23272	.23264	80.215	80.213	80.221	80.224

Analytic formulae for the $O(g^4 M_t^2/M_W^2)$ contributions to $\Delta\hat{\rho}$ and $\Delta\hat{r}_W$ can be found in ⁸, and in ¹⁰ for the corresponding $\Delta\hat{\kappa}(M_Z^2)$. The details of the calculation are presented elsewhere ^{9,15}. An interesting comparison ¹⁹ between numerical evaluation and heavy top expansion of two-loop diagrams has been made for a few cases of relevance in this calculation. It shows a very good convergence of the expansion, already acceptable for $M_t = 175\text{GeV}$. The numerical calculation¹⁹ of the two-loop Higgs mass dependent top contributions to Δr is also in very good agreement with our results, within the error range to be discussed in the following.

The QCD corrections play an important role in electroweak calculations ⁴ and are intertwined with the pure electroweak contributions in a subtle way. The most important effect is a substantial (about 12%) screening of the leading top contribution to $\Delta\hat{\rho}$ when this is expressed in terms of the top pole mass M_t . The coefficients of the $a \equiv \alpha_s/\pi$ series are then large and increasing with the power of a , a feature that is absent when the amplitudes are expressed in terms of the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ mass $\mu_t = \hat{m}_t(\mu_t)$. The leading m_t^2 term is rescaled by a factor $(1 + \delta_{QCD})$ which in the pole mass and μ_t parametrizations is given by, respectively:

$$\delta_{QCD}^{M_t} = -2.8599 a(M_t) - 14.594 a^2(M_t); \quad \delta_{QCD}^{\mu_t} = -0.19325 a(\mu_t) - 3.970 a^2(\mu_t). \quad (5)$$

Physically, this can be attributed to the fact that the use of the quark pole mass introduces a spurious sensitivity to long distance dynamics, witnessed by the appearance of the leading IR renormalon in the QCD perturbative expansion²⁰. The natural expansion parameter for electroweak physics is therefore a high-scale mass, such as μ_t . This can be derived from the measured M_t by following the strategy outlined in the first paper of ²⁰ and optimizing the perturbative series. For our numerical study we implement QCD corrections up to $O(\alpha\alpha_s^2)$ adopting consistently either the M_t or the μ_t parametrizations and using $M_Z = 91.1863 \text{ GeV}$, $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.118$, $\Delta\alpha_{had} = 0.0280$, $M_t = 175 \text{ GeV}$ as inputs. For each of the top mass parametrizations, the predictions for M_W and $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme are shown in the corresponding columns of

Table 2. As in Table 1, but including the new $O(g^4 M_t^2)$ contributions.

M_H	$\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$			M_W (GeV)		
	OSI	OSII	$\overline{\text{MS}}$	OSI	OSII	$\overline{\text{MS}}$
65	.23132	.23134	.23130	80.405	80.404	80.406
100	.23153	.23155	.23152	80.382	80.381	80.383
300	.23210	.23214	.23210	80.308	80.306	80.308
600	.23249	.23252	.23249	80.254	80.252	80.254
1000	.23277	.23279	.23277	80.214	80.213	80.214

Table 2 and 3 for different M_H values. Table 1 shows the pole mass result in the case the new $O(g^4 M_t^2/M_W^2)$ corrections to $\Delta\hat{\rho}$ and $\Delta\hat{r}_W$ are neglected. Results for $\sin^2\hat{\theta}_W(M_Z)$ can be found in ¹⁰.

2. Scale and scheme dependence

In the cases of Z^0 and muon decays, the natural scale for the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ couplings is of the order of the vector boson masses. Conventionally ¹² one sets $\mu = M_Z$; however, one may also consider the case of a general μ . In that case, although physical observables are μ -independent, a residual scale dependence is left in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ calculation of M_W and $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ in $O(g^4)$. Of course, the μ -independence of the $O(g^4 M_t^2/M_W^2)$ terms can be explicitly verified. The scale dependence of our predictions can therefore be used to gauge the importance of uncalculated higher order effects. The situation is exemplified in Fig.2. In the range $50\text{GeV} < \mu < 500\text{GeV}$, M_W varies by less than 5MeV. Over a wide range of μ values, the scale dependence of M_W is significantly reduced by the inclusion of the $O(g^4 M_t^2/M_W^2)$ contribution. The case of $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ is very similar.

In order to discuss the scheme dependence of our predictions, it is convenient to combine Eqs. (1) and (2) and calculate directly the W boson mass from α , M_Z , and G_μ :

$$\frac{M_W^2}{M_Z^2} \left(1 - \frac{M_W^2}{M_Z^2}\right) = \frac{\pi\alpha}{\sqrt{2}G_\mu M_Z^2} \frac{1}{1 - \Delta r} \quad (6)$$

where, in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme, using $s^2 = 1 - c^2$ and $c = M_W/M_Z$,

$$1 - \Delta r = [1 - \Delta\hat{r}_W] \left(1 + \frac{c^2}{s^2} \Delta\hat{\rho}\right). \quad (7)$$

Unlike $\Delta\hat{\rho}$ and $\Delta\hat{r}_W$, Δr is a physical observable. In the on-shell (OS) renormalization scheme of ²¹ the couplings are defined directly by the mass relation Eq. (2), where $\Delta\rho_{os} \equiv 0$, $c_{os}^2 \equiv c^2 = M_W^2/M_Z^2$, and by the traditional QED charge renormalization.




Figure 2: Scale dependence of the prediction for M_W in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme for $M_t = 180\text{GeV}$, $M_H = 300\text{GeV}$, including only the leading $O(G_\mu^2 M_t^4)$ correction (dotted curve) or all the available two-loop contributions, through $O(g^4 M_t^2 / M_W^2)$ (solid curve).

Starting from Eq. (7) it is easy to translate our results into the OS framework. We notice that $\Delta\hat{\rho}$ and $\Delta\hat{r}_W$ are functions, respectively, of the couplings \hat{s}^2 , \hat{e}^2 , and \hat{s}^2 , $e^2 = 4\pi\alpha$; \hat{s}^2 is related to the OS counterparts precisely by the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ versions of Eqs.(1,2). Replacing $\overline{\text{MS}}$ couplings with OS ones in a systematic way¹⁰, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\bar{r}_W(s) &= \Delta\hat{r}_W^{(1)}(s^2) + \Delta\hat{r}_W^{(2)}(s^2) + \Delta\bar{r}_W^{(2,add)}(s^2) \\ \Delta\bar{\rho}(s) &= \Delta\hat{\rho}^{(1)}(s^2) + \Delta\hat{\rho}^{(2)}(s^2) + \Delta\bar{\rho}^{(2,add)}(s^2)\end{aligned}\quad (8)$$

where the indices (1,2) indicate the one and two-loop part of the corresponding functions. The one loop contributions can be gleaned from¹², while the additional two-loop contributions are explicitly given in^{8,10}. It is important to notice that $\Delta\bar{r}_W$ must be expressed in terms of α , and $\Delta\bar{\rho}$ in terms of G_μ . Eq. (7) can now be rewritten in the OS scheme as

$$1 - \Delta r = [1 - \Delta\bar{r}_W] \left(1 + \frac{c^2}{s^2} \Delta\bar{\rho} \right). \quad (9)$$

This equation is similar to the one obtained in⁵, but fixes the correct resummation of subleading effects at $O(g^4 M_t^2 / M_W^2)$. We refer to the framework of Eq. (9) as OSI. After deriving in a similar way the corrections relevant for $\sin^2\theta_{eff}^{lept}$ (the one-loop part is given in¹³, the additional two-loop are given again in¹⁰), we obtain the predictions shown in Tables 1,2,3 in the corresponding column.

OSI is a hybrid scheme, which presupposes a $\overline{\text{MS}}$ subtraction and retains a residual μ -dependence in Δr . An alternative OS resummation can be obtained expanding Eq. (9) in powers of M_t , keeping terms only up to $O(g^4 M_t^2 / M_W^2)$. With the understanding that everything is expressed in terms of α , the result is

$$\Delta r = \Delta r^{(1)} + \Delta r^{(2)} + \left(\frac{c^2}{s^2} \right)^2 N_c x_t \left(2\Delta\bar{\rho}^{(1)}(s^2) - N_c \frac{\alpha}{16\pi s^2} \frac{M_t^2}{M_W^2} \right). \quad (10)$$

Table 3. As in Table 2, but parametrizing the top mass in terms of μ_t .

M_H	$\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$			M_w (GeV)		
	OSI	OSII	$\overline{\text{MS}}$	OSI	OSII	$\overline{\text{MS}}$
65	.23132	.23132	.23130	80.404	80.404	80.406
100	.23152	.23154	.23151	80.381	80.381	80.383
300	.23209	.23212	.23209	80.308	80.307	80.309
600	.23248	.23250	.23247	80.255	80.254	80.256
1000	.23275	.23277	.23275	80.216	80.215	80.216

where $\Delta r^{(1)}$ is the original one-loop OS result of ²¹ expressed in terms of α and s^2 , $\Delta r^{(2)} = \Delta \bar{r}_w^{(2)} - (c^2/s^2) \Delta \bar{\rho}^{(2)}$, $N_c x_t$ is the leading M_t^2 part of $\Delta \hat{\rho}^{(1)}$, and $\Delta \alpha$ is the renormalized photon vacuum polarization function at $q^2 = M_Z^2$. We refer to this OS framework as OSII. It retains no record of the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ derivation. The results are shown again in Tables 1,2,3. For comparison purposes I also show in Table 1 the predictions computed by *ZFitter* ²², where the new contributions are not yet implemented.

We can now compare the results in the three approaches. They share the same virtues and are equivalent up to $O(g^4)$ terms not enhanced by power of M_t or by large logarithms $\ln m_f/M_Z$. As expected, the scheme dependence of the predicted values of $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ and M_w is drastically reduced by the inclusion of the $O(g^4 M_t^2/M_w^2)$ contributions, by a factor comparable to the expansion parameter $M_w^2/M_t^2 \approx 0.2$. For instance, the maximum differences in Table 1 are 11 MeV in M_w and 2.1×10^{-4} in $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$, while in Table 2 they are reduced to 2 MeV and 4×10^{-5} , respectively (similar small differences can be observed in Table 3). Although the QCD approaches we have considered are quite different, Tables 2 and 3 show very close results. This is due to a curious cancellation of screening and anti-screening effects in the difference between the two formulations. Because of the sign of the shifts, in general the $O(g^4 M_t^2/M_w^2)$ correction further enhances the screening of the top quark contribution by higher order effects.

By comparing the results in Tables 2 and 3 we estimate the error attached to our predictions. As there is very close and accidental agreement between Tables 2 and 3, we can use scale dependence²³ or other methods²⁰ to pin down the irreducible uncertainty coming from QCD corrections. The values given in Table 4 are somewhat conservative, and do *not* correspond to half-differences (see Table 2). In Table 4 I also display the main parametric uncertainties, i.e. the ones due to the inaccuracy of the input parameters. The dominant effect on $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ is connected to the evolution of the e.m. coupling from $q^2 = 0$ up to the weak scale, which involves long-distance dynamics. The uncertainty due to variations of M_H between 65GeV and 1TeV measures the sensitivity of the observables to the Higgs boson mass. We can conclude that Δr

Table 4. Parametric and intrinsic uncertainties in the calculation of M_W and $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$.

source of uncertainty	δM_W	$\delta \sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$
$\delta M_t = 6 \text{ GeV}$	36 MeV	1.9×10^{-4}
$\delta \alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.005$	3 MeV	2×10^{-5}
$\delta M_Z = 2 \text{ MeV}$	2 MeV	2×10^{-5}
$\delta \alpha(M_Z)/\alpha(M_Z) = 7 \times 10^{-4}$	13 MeV	2.3×10^{-4}
$M_H = 65 - 1000 \text{ GeV}$	190 MeV	14×10^{-4}
higher order contr. EW	2 MeV	4×10^{-5}
higher order contr. QCD	5 MeV	3×10^{-5}

can now be determined with high theoretical accuracy, at the level of 1×10^{-4} , as the theoretical error coming from higher order contributions appears to be well under control. The improvement due to the new calculation of $O(g^4 M_t^2/M_W^2)$ effects is pictorially evident in Fig.3, where the predictions for $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ in different schemes are compared when $O(g^4 M_t^2/M_W^2)$ effects are included or not. The dominant parametric uncertainty is also shown.

3. Indirect Higgs mass determination ¹⁰

Unlike the case of the top quark, the dependence of electroweak amplitudes on the Higgs mass is very mild, at most logarithmic at one-loop level. This explains the very loose bounds that even the present very accurate data put on M_H . With the present experimental errors, $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ is the observable most sensitive to the Higgs boson mass ¹ (see also Table 4). Most of the resolution on M_H that the global fits show comes from this single precise measurement. However, Fig.3 shows that even if we could reduce the experimental error on $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ by a large factor, a strict bound on M_H would be hampered by the large hadronic uncertainty. Still, the new $O(g^4 M_t^2/M_W^2)$ results do have an impact in the present situation.

The results of Table 2 and 3 are well described by $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept} = 0.23153 + 5.2 \times 10^{-4} \ln(M_H/100 \text{ GeV})$. Comparing the current world average $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept} = 0.23165 \pm 0.00024$ with the previous expression, and taking into account in quadrature the errors given in Table 4, we obtain $5.2 \times 10^{-4} \ln(M_H/100 \text{ GeV}) = (1.2 \pm 3.9) \times 10^{-4}$, which implies $M_H = 127_{-71}^{+143} \text{ GeV}$, compatible with MSSM expectations. This corresponds to an upper bound $M_H \lesssim 430 \text{ GeV}$ at 95% C.L. (or 1.64σ) and compares well with the LEP global fit result¹ $M_H = 149_{-82}^{+148} \text{ GeV}$ (or $M_H \lesssim 550 \text{ GeV}$ at 95% C.L. when the theoretical errors estimated in ³ are included, shifting the upper bound by $\approx +100 \text{ GeV}$). Despite the fact that our determination stems from a single piece of data, it has reduced errors and lower central value. This can be understood by noting that




Figure 3: Predictions for $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ as functions of M_H . The values between the thin solid (dotted) lines identify the predictions in the three schemes described in the text with (without) the irreducible $O(g^4 M_t^2/M_W^2)$ contributions and using either the M_t or μ_t parametrizations. The thick solid lines define the range of values allowed when the main parametric uncertainty, coming from $\alpha(M_Z)$, is included.

(i) as shown in Fig.3 and Tables 2 and 3, when the $O(g^4 M_t^2/M_W^2)$ corrections are included, the scheme dependence is much smaller than estimated in ³. (ii) the new corrections generally enhance the screening of the one-loop top contribution induced by other higher order effects (QCD and leading $O(g^4 M_t^4/M_W^4)$ corrections); as it is clear from Fig.3, the prediction of higher $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ values leads to lower central value for M_H . (iii) because of the approximate exponential dependence of M_H on $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$, a small shift in the predicted value of the effective sine implies a significant change in the determination of M_H . For instance, a 0.1% difference in the theoretical calculation of $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ induces a $\approx 55\%$ shift in the $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ determination of M_H and its 1σ bound. In our case higher predicted $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ values imply lower M_H , hence smaller δM_H . We expect that a global analysis performed including the $O(g^4 M_t^2/M_W^2)$ correction with the same data should bring down the upper bound on M_H by a significant amount.

In summary, two-loop electroweak $O(g^4 M_t^2/M_W^2)$ effects are now available in analytic form for the main precision observables in *both* $\overline{\text{MS}}$ and OS frameworks. The new contributions consistently reduce the scheme and scale dependence of the predictions by *at least* a factor $M_t^2/M_W^2 \approx 5$, suggesting a relevant improvement in the theoretical accuracy. The impact on the value of $\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}$ can be sizable, up to 2×10^{-4} , depending on the scheme. The enhancement of the screening of the dominant top contribution from higher order corrections and the sharp reduction of the theoretical uncertainty lead to bounds on the Higgs mass from present data with reduced errors

and lower central value: $M_H = 127_{-71}^{+143}$ GeV or $M_H \lesssim 430$ GeV at 95% C.L.

I am grateful to Bernd Kniehl for the excellent organization and the pleasant atmosphere during the workshop. I wish to thank my collaborators G. Degrassi, A. Sirlin and A. Vicini, with whom the work described here has been done, and G. Ganis, W. Hollik, B. Kniehl, and G. Weiglein for useful discussions and communications.

1. A. Blondel, talk at ICHEP 96, Warsaw, July 1996, and the LEP Electroweak Working Group, Internal Note LEPEWWG/96-02.
2. W. Hollik, talk at ICHEP 96, Warsaw, July 1996, hep-ph/9610457.
3. D. Bardin et al., in *Reports of the Working Group on Precision Calculations for the Z-resonance*, CERN Yellow Report, CERN 95-03, D. Bardin, W. Hollik, and G. Passarino eds., p. 7.
4. A. Djouadi, *Nuovo Cimento* **100A** (1988) 357; B.A. Kniehl, *Nucl. Phys.* **B347** (1990) 86; A. Djouadi, P. Gambino, *Phys. Rev.* **D49** (1994) 3499, E: *ibid.* **D53** (1996) 4111; K.G. Chetyrkin, J.H. Kühn, M. Steinhauser, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, (1995) 3394; L. Avdeev et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B336** (1994) 560, E: *ibid.* **B349** (1995) 597.
5. M. Consoli, W. Hollik, F. Jegerlehner, *Phys. Lett.* **B227** (1989) 167.
6. R. Barbieri et al., *Nucl. Phys.* **B409** (1993) 105; J. Fleischer, O.V. Tarasov, F. Jegerlehner, *Phys. Lett.* **B319** (1993) 249; G. Degrassi, S. Fanchiotti, P. Gambino, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A10** (1995) 1337.
7. G. Degrassi et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B350**, (1995) 75.
8. G. Degrassi, P. Gambino, A. Vicini, *Phys. Lett.* **B383** (1996) 219.
9. P. Gambino, hep-ph/9611358, *Acta Phys. Pol.* **B27**, (1996) 3671.
10. G. Degrassi, P. Gambino, A. Sirlin, hep-ph/9611363, *Phys. Lett.* **B**, to appear.
11. U. Baur, M. Demarteau, hep-ph/9611334.
12. A. Sirlin, *Phys. Lett.* **B232** (1989) 123; G. Degrassi, S. Fanchiotti, A. Sirlin, *Nucl. Phys.* **B351** (1991) 49.
13. P. Gambino, A. Sirlin, *Phys. Rev.* **D49** (1994) 1160.
14. See V.A. Smirnov, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A10** (1995) 1485, and refs. therein; F. Berends, A.T. Davydychev, V.A. Smirnov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B478** (1996), 59.
15. G. Degrassi, P. Gambino, in preparation.
16. A.T. Davydychev, B. Tausk, *Nucl. Phys.* **B397** (1993) 123.
17. G. Degrassi, S. Fanchiotti, and P. Gambino, *ProcessDiagram*.
18. G. Degrassi, F. Feruglio, private communication.
19. S. Bauberger and G. Weiglein, hep-ph/9611445 and private communication.
20. A. Sirlin, *Phys. Lett.* **B348**, 201 (1995); P. Gambino and A. Sirlin, *Phys. Lett.* **B355** (1995) 295.
21. A. Sirlin, *Phys. Rev.* **D22** (1980) 971.
22. D. Bardin et al., ZFITTER 4.9, hep-ph/9412201.
23. B.A. Kniehl, in Ref.³, p. 299.