# Implications of SUSY Model Building

Manuel Drees\*

Dept. of Physics, Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706

and

Stephen P. Martin
Dept. of Physics, Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109–1120

#### Abstract

We discuss the motivations and implications of models of low-energy supersymmetry. We present the case for the minimal supersymmetric standard model, which we define to include the minimal particle content and soft supersymmetry-breaking interactions which are universal at the GUT or Planck scale. This model is in agreement with all present experimental results, and yet depends on only a few unknown parameters and therefore maintains considerable predictive power. From the theoretical side, it arises naturally in the context of supergravity models. We discuss radiative electroweak symmetry breaking and the superpartner spectrum in this scenario, with some added emphasis on regions of parameter space leading to unusual or interesting experimental signals at future colliders. We then examine how these results may be affected by various modifications and extensions of the minimal model, including GUT effects, extended gauge, Higgs, and matter sectors, non-universal supersymmetry breaking, non-conservation of R-parity, and dynamical supersymmetry breaking at low energies.

<sup>\*</sup>Heisenberg fellow

# 1) Introduction and Motivation

"Supersymmetry is a symmetry that connects bosons and fermions." This sentence, or something very much like it, used to be part of almost every talk on supersymmetry until a few years ago. By now the concept of supersymmetry is being taught in (graduate-level) classes, and speakers usually no longer think it necessary to mention this elementary definition. However, for the purpose of this article it might be helpful to keep in mind that "testing supersymmetry" means just that: To test whether there exists a (softly broken) symmetry in nature that connects elementary bosons and fermions. It does *not* mean testing a specific supersymmetric model, no matter how popular it might be at a given time.

This is a noble goal. However, in practice it is impossible to discuss how the existence of supersymmetry can be tested outside the context of some specific realization of this symmetry. This realization might be described by a very general ansatz with an abundance of free parameters, standing for "a wide class of models"; nevertheless it should be clear that we can never test *all* softly broken SUSY models.\* We therefore must focus on some subset of models which we feel to be more reasonable, or in some sense more "likely" to be a close approximation of the true theory. When making this judgement it might be helpful to briefly recount the main motivations for the introduction of SUSY.

Historically there have been two main arguments in favor of SUSY, one of which might be called theoretical and the other very theoretical. The latter, purely formal argument for space—time supersymmetry rests on the Haag—Lopuszanski—Sohnius (HLS) theorem [2], which states that the largest symmetry that a field theory can have without becoming trivial (non-interacting) is the direct product of a (local) supersymmetry (the algebra of which includes the generators of the Lorentz group) and an internal gauge symmetry (with possibly very complicated group structure).

The description of particle physics in terms of relativistic field theories has been very successful; by now it appears to be the only serious contender for a realistic theory, at least for energies well below the Planck scale  $M_P = 2.4 \cdot 10^{18}$  GeV. Much of this success is due to the development of gauge theories, which can describe all particle interactions we have seen so far. Since we are doing a good job describing nature using two of the three ingredients of the HLS theorem, isn't it likely that we'll do even better once we incorporate the third ingredient – supersymmetry – as well?

This argument is strengthened further by the realization that, as remarked above, the generators of the Lorentz algebra are a necessary ingredient of the SUSY algebra if supersymmetry is to be realized locally. This allows one to derive the theory of general relativity, our best classical theory of gravity, from a deeper symmetry principle. A connection between SUSY and gravity is also hinted at by the failure to develop a consistent quantum theory of gravity that does *not* involve supersymmetry. The inconsistency of all non–supersymmetric quantum gravity theories has not been proven (other than "by exhaustion"); nor does there exist a completely satisfying supersymmetric quantum gravity theory. The fact remains, however, that all recent attempts to quantize gravity perturbatively, including superstring theories, involve supersymmetry [3].

<sup>\*</sup>A falsifiable prediction of all weakly coupled SUSY models is the existence of at least one light Higgs boson, with mass less than 150 GeV [1]. However, discovery of a light Higgs is not quite an unambiguous signal for SUSY.

This first argument says almost nothing about the scale where SUSY is broken. Given that problems with quantum gravity seem to appear mostly at Planckian energies, any SUSY breaking at or below  $M_P$  would do. Of course, superpartners (sparticles) with mass close to  $M_P$  will not be produced in laboratory experiments any time soon. Fortunately, the second main argument in favor of supersymmetry points towards a much lower breaking scale.

This argument rests on the observation, most succinctly proven by Witten [4], that the introduction of superpartners with mass not much above the scale of electroweak symmetry breaking solves the technical part of the "hierarchy problem" [5]. The basic statement is that in supersymmetric theories you are allowed to introduce widely separate energy scales, such as the weak scale characterized by  $m_Z$  and the scale  $M_X$  of grand unification (GUT) or the Planck scale, without having to worry about quantum corrections spoiling this hierarchy, as they tend to do in non–supersymmetric theories with elementary scalars. In other words, in a nonsupersymmetric theory the introduction of an elementary Higgs boson with mass of order  $m_Z$ , rather than  $\mathcal{O}(M_P)$ , is highly unnatural, while in a supersymmetric theory any choice of the Higgs mass is technically natural, i.e. protected from large quantum corrections, as long as the mass splitting between "ordinary" particles and their superpartners does not (greatly) exceed 1 TeV.

Of course, we do not know for sure that an elementary Higgs boson does indeed exist; however, it remains the by far simplest, and theoretically most easily treatable, realization of the idea of spontaneous breaking of gauge symmetries. Indeed, while one can speak of supersymmetric theories, where predictions for measurable quantities in terms of a few as—yet unknown parameters can be derived reliably, the same cannot be said for models that attempt to make do without elementary scalars. One might argue that this is more a statement about our collective incompetence than about nature; however, we feel that a theory that actually allows one to make predictions is preferable to models where at best rough estimates are possible.

#### 6.5truein

Fig. 1: The number of papers on supersymmetry that have been published in the last twenty years, according to the SLAC Spires data base.

Witten's theorem [4] only tells us that in a supersymmetric theory there is nothing wrong with having the weak scale so much below the Planck scale; it does not tell us how the weak scale got to be this small in the first place. A glance at fig. 1 shows that SUSY only began to be widely taken seriously after 1981/82, when a mechanism was discovered [6] that might actually explain why  $m_Z$  is so small. Here one posits that at very high energies the electroweak gauge symmetry is indeed unbroken; more formally, the scalar (Higgs) potential renormalized at some scale close to the Planck or GUT scale is assumed to have its minimum at the origin. Quantum corrections drive the minimum away from the origin when the potential is probed at scales of order  $m_Z$ . These corrections are roughly  $\propto \frac{\alpha}{4\pi} \log \frac{M_X}{m_Z}$ , where  $\alpha$  is some generic coupling, and become  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  only if  $m_Z \sim M_X \cdot e^{-4\pi/\alpha}$  is exponentially smaller than the more fundamental (input) scale  $M_X$  or  $M_P$ . This for the first time established a link between these widely separate scales. It has to be admitted, however, that at present SUSY breaking masses very roughly of order  $m_Z$  still have to be introduced "by hand"; the thorny issue of SUSY breaking remains without definitive solution. While

SUSY models do not necessarily exhibit radiative gauge symmetry breaking, we feel that the elegance of this mechanism justifies putting a strong emphasis in this article on those models that do.

Fig. 1 shows a recent resurgence of SUSY's popularity, after the decline from the peak years caused by the realization that the UA1 monojet events did not signal the discovery of supersymmetry after all. This resurgence has been triggered by refs.[8], which pointed out that LEP data clearly rule out the unification of the  $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$  gauge group of the SM into a GUT without the introduction of new particles and/or an intermediate scale; moreover, the supersymmetric version of the SM automatically contains just the right additional degrees of freedom to allow beautiful unification of all gauge interactions, without the need for ad hoc introduction of additional scales or exotic particles (other than those dictated by supersymmetry, of course). The only assumption is that sparticle masses do not greatly exceed 10 TeV. This is summarized in fig. 2, taken from ref.[7]. In our view this observation not only argues in favor of weak–scale SUSY, but also argues against the existence of an intermediate scale that significantly influences the running of the gauge couplings, since such a scale would make the apparent unification shown in fig. 2 a mere accident. The main emphasis of this article will therefore be on models with a "grand desert" between the weak and GUT scales.

SUSY models also tend to have other nice features. They allow [9] for unification of at least some Yukawa couplings within certain GUT models, which might be a first step towards a complete understanding of the intricacies of the quark and lepton spectrum. The introduction of superpartners also raises the GUT scale sufficiently to make nucleon decay rates due to the exchange of GUT gauge bosons fall safely below present experimental bounds. (SUSY GUTs often have other, potentially more troublesome contributions to proton decay, however [10].) Since sparticle mass terms in the Lagrangian respect all gauge symmetries of the SM, sparticles decouple quickly from gauge interactions once their mass exceeds the energy scale relevant for a given experiment; in other words, quantum corrections due to sparticle loops tend to be small. This is fortunate since electroweak precision experiments are in good agreement with the SM. Finally, in many SUSY models the lightest sparticle (LSP) is absolutely stable, and makes a good particle physics candidate for the missing dark matter of the universe [11]. This list of at least qualitative successes becomes even more impressive when compared with the track record of SUSY's main competitor, technicolor models [12], which have problems on many fronts, flavor changing neutral currents, the electroweak Sparameter, and  $Z \to bb$  decays being the most prominent ones.

> 6.5truein 6.5truein

Fig. 2: The running of the gauge couplings in the Standard Model (top) and its supersymmetric extension (bottom). Both figures assume  $\alpha_S(m_Z) = 0.120 \pm 0.01$ . In the lower frame an effective SUSY particle threshold at  $m_Z$  has been assumed; adapted from ref.[7].

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. Sec. 2 is devoted to a rather thorough discussion of the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM), which we define to include radiative gauge symmetry breaking and a simple sparticle spectrum at the

GUT or Planck scale.<sup>†</sup> This model is fully realistic (in agreement with experiment), and yet has only a few free parameters and hence considerable predictive power. After our definition of "the MSSM" (2a) and a more detailed discussion of radiative symmetry breaking (2b), we map out the parameter space in terms of physical masses in sec. 2c. In sec. 2d we give handy analytical approximate solutions to the relevant renormalization group equations, and sec. 2e discusses a few sample spectra in more detail, with emphasis on those that give rise to somewhat unusual SUSY signals at colliders. Finally, sec. 2f discusses the question whether useful, strict upper bounds on sparticle masses can be given in the MSSM.

Sec. 3 treats minor modifications of the MSSM, where the ideas of a grand desert and of radiative gauge symmetry breaking are kept but the details of SUSY breaking are altered. In sec. 3a we discuss various sum rules that might allow one to unravel such details, and in sec. 3b possible GUT effects on the sparticle spectrum are summarized. Sec. 4 is devoted to more extensive modifications of the MSSM. Sec. 4a deals with the question whether significant statements about the sparticle spectrum can be made in grand desert models with completely arbitrary SUSY breaking at the GUT scale, a scenario that has recently been popularized in the string context. In secs. 4b, 4c and 4d models with extended Higgs, gauge and matter sectors, respectively, are discussed. Sec. 4e contains a brief summary of models with broken R parity, and sec. 4f is devoted to a discussion of recent attempts to break SUSY dynamically at relatively low scales. Finally, in sec. 5 we make some concluding remarks.

# 2) The MSSM

## 2a) Definition

The minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) is the by far most widely studied potentially realistic SUSY model. It owes its popularity mostly to its simplicity, being essentially a straightforward supersymmetrization of the SM. However, different authors often make different assumptions about SUSY breaking, which can lead to quite different phenomenological predictions. We therefore start our discussion with a definition of the MSSM, to be used throughout this article.

There is little disagreement about the particle content of the MSSM: It contains three generations of (chiral) quark and lepton superfields, the (vector) superfields necessary to gauge the  $SU(3) \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  group of the SM, and two (chiral) SU(2) doublet Higgs superfields. The introduction of a second Higgs doublet is necessary in order to cancel the anomalies produced by the fermionic members of the first Higgs superfield, and also to give masses to both charge = +2/3 and charge = -1/3 quarks. Notice that, while all matter superfields contain elementary scalars, Higgs superfields still have to be introduced separately; the boson–fermion symmetry therefore does not imply a Higgs–matter symmetry.

The interactions between Higgs and matter superfields are described by the superpotential

$$W = h_U Q_L H_2 U_R + h_D Q_L H_1 D_R + h_E L_L H_1 E_R + \mu H_1 H_2. \tag{1}$$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Our definition differs from the one used in the chapter by Baer et al. [13].

Here  $Q_L$  contains SU(2) (s)quark doublets and  $U_R$  and  $D_R$  the corresponding singlets; (s) lepton doublets and singlets reside in  $L_L$  and  $E_R$ , respectively, while  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  denote Higgs superfields with hypercharge  $Y = \pm 1/2$ . In eq.(1) summation over gauge and generational indices is implicit; in particular,  $h_U$ ,  $h_D$  and  $h_E$  are  $3 \times 3$  matrices in generation space. Note that the only mass term in (1) gives masses to Higgs bosons and fermions; the masses of all SM fermions are due to the vacuum expectation values (vevs)  $v_1 \equiv \langle H_1^0 \rangle$  and  $v_2 \equiv \langle H_2^0 \rangle$  that break  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ , in close analogy to the SM. Since  $\mu$  appears in the expressions for Higgs masses even after SUSY breaking, it is clear that it must very roughly be of order of the weak breaking scale; we saw in the Introduction that this must be true for SUSY breaking masses as well. Yet within the MSSM  $\mu$  is an independent free parameter; it is not clear why it should be of the same order of magnitude as sparticle masses. This is called the " $\mu$ -problem" of the MSSM. One class of solutions [14] makes use of nonrenormalizable terms either in the superpotential or in the Kähler potential appearing in the supergravity Lagrangian; after SUSY breaking,  $\mu$  is then automatically of the order of the sparticle masses. Another possibility [15] is to connect  $\mu$  with the Peccei-Quinn solution [16] of the strong CP problem, such that  $\mu \sim M_{\rm PQ}^2/M_P$  with  $M_{\rm PQ} \sim 10^{10}$  GeV, which again gives  $\mu \sim 1$  TeV. Other solutions, which also connect  $\mu$  to the effective SUSY breaking scale, will be discussed in Secs. 3b1 and 4b.

If SUSY were exact, sfermions would have the same mass as the corresponding SM fermions. This obviously not being the case in nature, we have to allow for the presence of soft SUSY breaking terms when writing down the scalar potential. Here "soft breaking" means that the introduction of these terms does not lead to the re–appearance of quadratically divergent quantum corrections to scalar masses, the absence of which was one of the main arguments in favor of SUSY. These terms have been classified in ref.[17] and include mass terms for sfermions and gauginos (but not for chiral fermions) as well as trilinear and bilinear (but not quartic) scalar interactions. The scalar potential can thus be written as:

$$V = \sum_{j} \left| \frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi_{j}} \right|^{2} + V_{D}$$

$$+ \sum_{i,j} m_{ij}^{2} \phi_{i}^{*} \phi_{j} + A_{U} h_{U} \widetilde{Q}_{L} H_{2} \widetilde{U}_{R} + A_{D} h_{D} \widetilde{Q}_{L} H_{1} \widetilde{D}_{R} + A_{E} h_{E} \widetilde{L}_{L} H_{1} \widetilde{E}_{R} + B \mu H_{1} H_{2}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\phi_j$  stands for any scalar field, and the "D-terms"  $V_D$  can, e.g., be found in ref.[18]. The first line in (2) gives the supersymmetric contributions to the potential, while the remaining terms break SUSY.<sup>‡</sup>

We have followed the usual convention in writing the trilinear soft breaking terms as a product of a Yukawa coupling and an A parameter. The products  $A_U h_U$ ,  $A_D h_D$  and  $A_E h_E$  are again  $3 \times 3$  matrices; there could also be flavor off-diagonal sfermion masses. In addition, we have to introduce SUSY breaking masses  $M_i$ , i=1,2,3 for U(1), SU(2) and SU(3) gauginos. Altogether one would then need more than 100 real parameters to describe soft SUSY breaking in full generality. Clearly some simplifying assumptions are necessary if

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>‡</sup>In principle there can be additional soft breaking terms [19], of the form  $\phi_i\phi_j\phi_k^*$ , e.g.  $\widetilde{Q}_LH_1^*\widetilde{U}_R$ ,  $\widetilde{Q}_LH_2^*\widetilde{D}_R$ ,  $\widetilde{L}_LH_2^*\widetilde{E}_R$ ; however, these terms do not arise in supergravity–type SUSY breaking scenarios, and will lead to quadratic divergencies if there are chiral gauge singlet superfields in the underlying theory.

we want to achieve something close to a complete study, either theoretical or experimental, of parameter space.

In sec. 1 we presented arguments linking the electroweak scale with the Planck or GUT scale across a grand desert. In addition, most recent attempts to understand SUSY breaking connect it to Planck–scale physics in the form of some supergravity or superstring theory [3]. Finally, the "unification dogma" stipulates that physics ought to be in some sense simpler, i.e. more symmetric, at very high energies. This leads us to the following ansatz for the soft breaking parameters, which are viewed here as "running" (scale dependent) quantities:

$$M_i(M_X) = m_{1/2}, \ i = 1, 2, 3;$$
 (3a)

$$m_j^2(M_X) = m_0^2, \ j = \tilde{u}, \tilde{d}, \dots;$$
 (3b)

$$A_k(M_X) = A, \ k = U, D, E. \tag{3c}$$

This reduces the number of free parameters describing SUSY breaking to just four: The gaugino mass  $m_{1/2}$ , the scalar mass  $m_0$ , and the trilinear and bilinear soft breaking parameters A and B. We do not assume any relation between A and B, e.g.  $A = B + m_0$ , since such relations tend to be very model—dependent [20]. We do assume unification of the gauge couplings at scale  $M_X \simeq 2 \cdot 10^{16}$  GeV, but fig. 2 shows that this is more or less automatic anyway as long as  $m_0$  and  $m_{1/2}$  do not exceed 10 TeV or so. At this point we do not assume any relations between Yukawa couplings, since they are again very dependent on the specific GUT model.§

The values of the soft breaking parameters at experimentally accessible energies can be computed from a set of coupled renormalization group equations (RGE), which were first derived by Inoue et al.[21]. This leads us to radiative gauge symmetry breaking, which is the topic of the next subsection.

## 2b) Radiative Symmetry Breaking

As remarked in sec. 1, the possibility to break the electroweak  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  symmetry of the SM radiatively is widely regarded as one of the main arguments in favor of SUSY, since it offers a dynamical explanation for the mysterious negative squared mass of the Higgs boson, which has to be introduced "by hand" in the SM. In fact, in the MSSM as defined in the previous subsection, radiative symmetry breaking is a *necessity*. Understanding radiative symmetry breaking is therefore essential for a full appreciation of the MSSM.

<sup>§</sup>From a theoretical perspective it would be more natural to impose boundary conditions like eqs.(3) at the Planck or perhaps string compactification scale  $M_C \simeq 5 \cdot 10^{17}$  GeV, rather than the GUT scale. In string theory unification of the gauge couplings can be achieved even in the absence of a GUT; in this case it makes little difference whether we impose eqs.(3) at scale  $M_X$  or  $M_C$ . On the other hand, if a GUT does exist, and some of its superheavy fields have large Yukawa couplings, weak–scale predictions can be affected substantially. We will come back to this point in sec. 3b.

<sup>¶</sup>Recently these equations have been extended to two–loop order [22]. No numerical study of the sparticle spectrum using these refined equations has yet been published (see, however, ref.[23]). Generally one expects two–loop effects to be comparable in size to one–loop threshold corrections, which can be computed only once the GUT (or string) model has been specified.

Focusing on the neutral components of the Higgs doublets, the scalar potential (2) reads [24]:

$$V_0^{\text{Higgs}} = m_1^2 |H_1^0|^2 + m_2^2 |H_2^0|^2 + B\mu \left( H_1^0 H_2^0 + h.c. \right) + \frac{g_1^2 + g_2^2}{8} \left( |H_1^0|^2 - |H_2^0|^2 \right)^2, \tag{4}$$

where  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  are the U(1) and SU(2) gauge couplings and the subscript 0 in  $V_0^{\text{Higgs}}$  indicates that for the moment we are only interested in the tree-level (classical) potential, although the parameters in eq.(4) are scale-dependent (running). Notice that the quartic term vanishes in the direction  $|H_1^0| = |H_2^0|$ ; the potential will therefore only be well-behaved (bounded from below) if

$$m_1^2 + m_2^2 > 2|B\mu|. (5)$$

Further, when trying to minimize  $V_0^{\rm Higgs}$  one finds a minimum with nonvanishing vevs only if

$$m_1^2 m_2^2 < |B\mu|^2. (6)$$

On the other hand, the boundary conditions (3) imply that

$$m_1^2(M_X) = m_2^2(M_X) = m_0^2 + \mu^2(M_X).$$
 (7)

It is quite easy to convince oneself that conditions (5) and (6) cannot be fulfilled simultaneously if  $m_1^2 = m_2^2$ , thereby seemingly excluding the possibility of consistent  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  breaking.

The solution of this dilemma rests on the observation [6, 21] that quantum corrections lift the degeneracy of the Higgs masses. Eq.(7) only holds at the GUT scale; the values of  $m_1^2$  and  $m_2^2$  at lower scales can be computed from the RGE given in ref.[21]. It is easy to understand that these two Higgs masses will run differently. A glance at the superpotential (1) shows that  $H_2$  couples to top (s)quarks, while  $H_1$  only couples to b (s)quarks and  $\tau$  (s)leptons. These couplings are expected to be of very different strengths, since the top quark is much heavier than all other SM fermions. The crucial observation is that Yukawa couplings enter the RGE for squared scalar masses with positive sign; since we are running the RGE "backward", from  $M_X$  down to the weak scale, the Yukawa terms tend to reduce the squared Higgs masses, until eventually condition (6) is satisfied and the gauge symmetry is broken. Since for scales  $Q < M_X$  one has  $m_1^2 > m_2^2$  it is generally not difficult to choose parameters such that inequality (5) remains true at all scales. Finally, while the top Yukawa coupling also influences the running of the squared stop masses, due to Casimir factors appearing in the RGE [21]  $m_2^2$  is reduced more quickly than  $m_{\tilde{t}_{L,R}}^2$ ; again, it is not difficult to make sure that squared stop masses remain positive even when condition (6) is satisfied.

This is demonstrated in fig. 3, where we plot  $m_{H_{1,2}}^2$  (defined as  $m_{1,2}^2 = m_{H_{1,2}}^2 + \mu^2$  at all scales) and  $m_{\tilde{t}_R}^2$  as a function of the scale Q, for two different sets of parameters leading to a moderate and a large value for the ratio of vevs  $\tan\beta = v_2/v_1$ . In both cases  $m_{H_2}^2$  is decreased most quickly, and  $m_{\tilde{t}_R}^2$  actually increases with decreasing Q due to gluino loop contributions [21]. ( $m_{\tilde{t}_L}^2$  grows even faster.) For small or moderate  $\tan\beta$ ,  $m_{H_1}^2$  also increases with decreasing Q or remains more or less constant, whereas for large  $\tan\beta$  it decreases, albeit more slowly than  $m_{H_2}^2$  does. This dependence on  $\tan\beta$  follows from the relation

between Yukawa couplings and quark masses:

$$h_b = \frac{m_b}{v_1} = \frac{g_2 m_b}{\sqrt{2} \cos \beta m_W} \to \frac{g_2 m_b}{\sqrt{2} m_W} \tan \beta; \tag{8a}$$

$$h_t = \frac{m_t}{v_2} = \frac{g_2 m_t}{\sqrt{2} \sin\beta m_W} \to \frac{g_2 m_t}{\sqrt{2} m_W},\tag{8b}$$

where  $\to$  refers to the limit  $\tan^2 \beta \gg 1$ . Large  $\tan \beta$  therefore implies a large bottom Yukawa coupling, which leads to a sizable reduction of  $m_{H_1}^2$  when going from  $M_X$  down to the weak scale.\*

#### 6.5truein

Fig. 3: The running of the SUSY breaking squared Higgs and  $\tilde{t}_R$  masses from  $M_X = 2 \cdot 10^{16}$  GeV to the weak scale, for a running top mass  $m_t(m_t) = 165$  GeV and two different values of  $\tan \beta$ .

Of course, we do not merely want  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  to be broken; we also want the Z boson to have the experimentally measured mass. Furthermore, in view of the strong dependence of some weak–scale quantities on  $\tan\beta$  shown in fig. 3, it is often more convenient to treat it as an independent input parameter. Since  $m_Z^2 = \frac{g_1^2 + g_2^2}{2} (v_1^2 + v_2^2)$ , fixing  $m_Z$  and  $\tan\beta$  determines both vevs  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ . On the other hand, these vevs can also be computed by minimizing the potential (4). Requiring  $\frac{\partial V_0^{\text{Higgs}}}{\partial v_1} = \frac{\partial V_0^{\text{Higgs}}}{\partial v_2} = 0$  then gives:

$$\mu^2 = \frac{m_{H_2}^2 \sin^2 \beta - m_{H_1}^2 \cos^2 \beta}{\cos^2 \beta} - \frac{1}{2} m_Z^2; \tag{9a}$$

$$2B\mu = \tan 2\beta \left( m_{H_1}^2 - m_{H_2}^2 \right) + m_Z^2 \sin 2\beta. \tag{9b}$$

Recall that  $h_t > h_b$  implies  $m_2^2 < m_1^2$  and thus  $v_2 > v_1$ , which means that  $\cos 2\beta < 0$ ; it is then easy to see that  $\mu^2 > 0$  in the cases depicted in fig. 3. On the other hand, eq.(9b) only allows to fix the sign of  $B\mu$ . Since the B parameter appears nowhere else in the theory (unlike  $\mu$ , which appears in chargino, neutralino and sfermion mass matrices), we can satisfy eq.(9b) for either sign of  $\mu$  by choosing the sign of B appropriately; in general we therefore have to consider both signs of  $\mu$ . It is important to notice, however, that in this scheme the value of  $|\mu|$  is fixed by our choice of  $m_0$ ,  $m_{1/2}$ , A,  $\tan \beta$  and  $m_t$ , all of which affect the values of  $m_{H_{1/2}}^2$  at the weak scale.

The Yukawa couplings are the driving force of electroweak symmetry breaking in the MSSM. Fortunately we now have good evidence [25] that the mass of the top quark lies in the vicinity of 175 GeV. For most values of  $\tan\beta$  and the soft breaking parameters, varying  $m_t$  by about  $2\sigma$  to either side of this central value does not alter the predictions for the spectrum dramatically, although the value of  $|\mu|$  computed from eq.(9a), and of the masses of the heavier physical Higgs bosons of the model [24], still do vary significantly. This is illustrated in fig. 4a, where we show predictions for the masses of the lighter stop and stau eigenstates, for the pseudoscalar Higgs mass  $m_P$ , and for  $\mu$  at the weak scale, as a function

<sup>\*</sup>Note that for the case  $\tan\beta=5$  shown in fig. 3,  $m_2^2=m_{H_2}^2+\mu^2$  remains positive at all scales, but condition (6) is nevertheless fulfilled. Similarly, even though  $m_{H_1}^2$  eventually turns negative for  $\tan\beta=35$ ,  $m_1^2$  remains well above zero and condition (5) remains satisfied.

of the running top mass  $m_t(m_t)$ , which is the mass appearing in eq.(8b); it is related to the physical (on–shell) top mass by [26]

$$m_t^{\text{ON}} = m_t(m_t) \left[ 1 + \frac{4}{3} \frac{\alpha_s(m_t)}{\pi} + 11.0 \left( \frac{\alpha_s(m_t)}{\pi} \right)^2 \right],$$
 (10)

where we have ignored smaller electroweak corrections. The CDF central value [25]  $m_t^{\rm ON} = 174$  GeV corresponds to  $m_t(m_t) \simeq 165$  GeV, which we will adopt as out standard choice from now on.

6.5truein 6.5truein

Fig. 4: The dependence of the physical  $\tilde{t}_1$ , P and  $\tilde{\tau}_1$  masses as well as the value of  $|\mu|$  at the weak scale as a function of the running top mass (a) and  $\tan\beta$  (b). The value of  $|\mu|$  has been fixed by the requirement of correct electroweak symmetry breaking, eq.(9a). Notice that in (b),  $m_P^2$  turns negative at  $\tan\beta \simeq 51$ , which determines the upper bound on this quantity for the given choice of parameters.

The qualitative trends in fig. 4a are quite easy to understand. For given SUSY breaking parameters, increasing  $m_t$  will decrease  $m_{H_2}^2$  leaving  $m_{H_1}^2$  more or less the same, thereby increasing  $|\mu|$  as dictated by eq.(9a). At tree level, the mass of the pseudoscalar Higgs boson is simply given by

$$m_P^2 = m_1^2 + m_2^2 = m_{H_1}^2 + m_{H_2}^2 + 2\mu^2;$$
 (11)

an increase of  $|\mu|$  therefore leads to an increase of  $m_P$  as well.

The masses of the lighter stop and stau eigenstates can be computed from the following mass matrices [27] (we follow the sign conventions of ref.[28]):

$$\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{t}}^{2} = \begin{pmatrix} m_{\tilde{t}_{L}}^{2} + m_{t}^{2} + 0.35D & -m_{t}(A_{t} + \mu \cot \beta) \\ -m_{t}(A_{t} + \mu \cot \beta) & m_{\tilde{t}_{P}}^{2} + m_{t}^{2} + 0.16D \end{pmatrix};$$
 (12a)

$$\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\tau}}^{2} = \begin{pmatrix} m_{\tilde{\tau}_{L}}^{2} + m_{\tau}^{2} - 0.27D & -m_{\tau}(A_{\tau} + \mu \tan \beta) \\ -m_{\tau}(A_{\tau} + \mu \tan \beta) & m_{\tilde{\tau}_{R}}^{2} + m_{\tau}^{2} - 0.23D \end{pmatrix},$$
(12b)

where  $D=m_Z^2\cos 2\beta<0$ .  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  decreases with increasing  $m_t$  since the top Yukawa coupling decreases  $m_{\tilde{t}_{L,R}}^2$  compared to other squark masses.  $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1}$  here depends very little on  $m_t$  since for the given choice of  $\tan\beta$ ,  $\tilde{\tau}_L-\tilde{\tau}_R$  mixing is still negligible.

Fig. 4b shows that the dependence of the same masses on  $\tan\beta$  tends to be be stronger than on  $m_t$ , at least when  $\tan\beta$  is varied over its entire allowed range. The lower end of this range is determined by the requirement that the top Yukawa coupling  $h_t$  remains finite all the way up to the GUT scale. This implies [9]

$$\sin \beta \ge \frac{m_t(m_t)}{192 \text{ GeV}},\tag{13}$$

or  $\tan \beta \geq 1.65$  for  $m_t(m_t) = 165$  GeV.

As  $\tan\beta$  is increased from this minimal value, the top Yukawa coupling initially decreases quite rapidly, see eq.(8b); moreover,  $|\cos 2\beta|$  increases. Both effects reduce  $|\mu|$  as computed

from eq.(9a). The decrease of  $h_t$  and  $|\mu|$  leads to the observed increase of  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ . However, for  $\tan\beta \geq 5$ ,  $\mu$  becomes more or less independent of  $\tan\beta$  since now  $\sin\beta \simeq 1$  and  $\cos2\beta \simeq -1$  anyway. At the same time the bottom Yukawa coupling keeps increasing, and hence  $m_{H_1}^2$  at the weak scale keeps decreasing. Eventually this leads to  $m_P^2 < 0$ , i.e. an unstable Higgs potential (condition (5) is violated). In the absence of hypercharge interactions and for vanishing  $h_\tau$ , this happens for  $\tan\beta = m_t(m_t)/m_b(m_t)$  where  $h_t = h_b$  so that the equality  $m_1^2 = m_2^2$  again holds at all scales. The small effects from hypercharge interactions and the  $\tau$  Yukawa coupling on this upper bound tend to cancel, so that one has to good approximation

$$\tan \beta \le \frac{m_t(m_t)}{m_b(m_t)}.\tag{14}$$

Notice that the running bottom mass at scale  $m_t$  is relevant here, which amounts to about 3 GeV if  $m_b(m_b) \simeq 4.5$  GeV. If  $\tan\beta$  is close to this upper bound,  $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1}$  is also reduced significantly, due to the decrease of the diagonal masses  $m_{\tilde{\tau}_{L,R}}^2$  and the increase of the off-diagonal entries in the mass matrix (12b). The mass of the light sbottom eigenstate behaves very similarly [28]; however, while  $\tilde{\tau}_1$  is dominantly an SU(2) singlet,  $\tilde{b}_1$  is mostly doublet since  $m_{\tilde{b}_L}$  is affected by the dominant top Yukawa coupling while  $m_{\tilde{b}_R}$  only feels the influence of  $h_b$ .

So far we have limited our discussion to the RGE-improved tree-level potential. As pointed out in ref.[29], in general one can greatly improve the reliability of the calculation by including at least the leading terms of the 1-loop corrections to the potential, given by [30]

$$V_1^{\text{Higgs}} = \frac{1}{64\pi^2} Str \mathcal{M}^4(H_1, H_2) \left[ \log \frac{\mathcal{M}^2(H_1, H_2)}{Q_0^2} - \frac{3}{2} \right], \tag{15}$$

where bosons (fermions) contribute with positive (negative) sign in the supertrace, and the mass matrix  $\mathcal{M}$  has to be considered to be a function of the Higgs fields  $H_1$  and  $H_2$ . The scale  $Q_0$  in eq.(15) is to be identified with the scale where the RG running of the parameters in  $V_0^{\text{Higgs}}$  is terminated. The sum  $V_0^{\text{Higgs}} + V_1^{\text{Higgs}}$  then depends only weakly on  $Q_0$ , in sharp contrast with  $V_0^{\text{Higgs}}$  by itself, the remaining scale dependence being due to wave–function renormalizations and higher loops, both of which are small effects. If one is satisfied with 5% accuracy it is generally sufficient to only include (s)top and perhaps (s)bottom contributions to the supertrace.

Notice that the 1-loop correction (15) is linear in  $\log Q_0^2$ ; it is therefore always possible to find a value of  $Q_0$  such that this correction is quite small in the minimum of the potential. In many cases it is sufficient to treat the minimization of the potential by simply using the tree-level relations (9) with  $Q_0^2 \simeq m_0^2 + 3m_{1/2}^2$ , which is something like an average squared stop mass; the same choice also ensures that corrections to the masses of the pseudoscalar Higgs boson (11), as well as the charged Higgs, are quite small. However, at least the 1-loop corrections from the (s)top sector should always be included when calculating the masses of the physical scalar Higgs bosons, in particular the lighter one [31, 32, 33]; in the MSSM they increase the upper bound on its mass from  $m_Z$  to something like 135 GeV.<sup>†</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>The scalar Higgs masses can be computed from the second derivatives of the Higgs potential at its minimum. One finds that the entire  $\log Q_0^2$  dependence of these derivatives can be absorbed in the mass of the pseudoscalar Higgs boson, leaving a large,  $Q_0$  independent 1–loop correction to the scalar Higgs masses behind [32].

This completes our discussion of the mechanism of radiative symmetry breaking. We are now ready to explore the parameter space of the MSSM in a more systematic way.

### 2c) The Particle Spectrum of the MSSM

In this subsection we explore the parameter space of the MSSM, with emphasis on the resulting particle spectrum. The masses of squarks and sleptons of the first two generations, whose Yukawa couplings are too small to affect the running of their masses significantly, can be computed from the input parameters  $m_0$ ,  $m_{1/2}$  and  $\tan\beta$  using the following well–known expressions [18]:

$$m_{\tilde{e}_R}^2 = m_0^2 + 0.15 m_{1/2}^2 - \sin^2 \theta_W D;$$
 (16a)

$$m_{\tilde{e}_L}^2 = m_0^2 + 0.52 m_{1/2}^2 - \left(\frac{1}{2} - \sin^2 \theta_W\right) D;$$
 (16b)

$$m_{\tilde{\nu}}^2 = m_0^2 + 0.52m_{1/2}^2 + \frac{1}{2}D;$$
 (16c)

$$m_{\tilde{u}_R}^2 = m_0^2 + (0.07 + c_{\tilde{g}})m_{1/2}^2 + \frac{2}{3}\sin^2\theta_W D;$$
 (16d)

$$m_{\tilde{d}_R}^2 = m_0^2 + (0.02 + c_{\tilde{g}})m_{1/2}^2 - \frac{1}{3}\sin^2\theta_W D;$$
 (16e)

$$m_{\tilde{u}_L}^2 = m_0^2 + (0.47 + c_{\tilde{g}})m_{1/2}^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{3}\sin^2\theta_W\right)D;$$
 (16f)

$$m_{\tilde{d}_L}^2 = m_0^2 + (0.47 + c_{\tilde{g}})m_{1/2}^2 - \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{3}\sin^2\theta_W\right)D,$$
 (16g)

where  $D = m_Z^2 \cos 2\beta$  as before. The coefficient  $c_{\tilde{g}}$  describes the contribution from gluinoquark loops to the running of squark masses and is given by

$$c_{\tilde{g}} = \frac{8}{9} \left[ \left( \frac{\alpha_S(m_{\tilde{q}})}{\alpha_S(M_X)} \right)^2 - 1 \right]. \tag{17}$$

Notice that  $c_{\tilde{g}}$  depends logarithmically on the squark mass in question. However, it is usually sufficient to take  $m_{\tilde{q}}^2 = m_0^2 + 6m_{1/2}^2$  on the r.h.s. of eq.(17). Numerically  $c_{\tilde{g}}$  varies between approximately 4.5 and 6 for squark masses between 0.1 and 1 TeV.\*

The values of the gaugino masses at the weak scale are also easily computed [18]:

$$M_i(Q) = m_{1/2} \frac{\alpha_i(Q)}{\alpha_i(M_X)}. (18)$$

Numerically,  $M_1 \simeq 0.41 m_{1/2}$  and  $M_2 \simeq 0.84 m_{1/2}$  for  $Q \simeq m_Z$ ; the Q-dependence is quite mild here. This is not true for the running gluino mass  $M_3$ , however. In addition, the

<sup>\*</sup>Eqs.(16d)–(16g) compute the running squark masses. Eq.(17) makes sure that they are computed at scale  $Q = m_{\tilde{a}}$ ; the difference between running and on–shell mass is then quite small.

difference between the physical (on–shell) and running mass can be quite significant in this case [34]:

$$m_{\tilde{g}} = M_3(Q) \left\{ 1 + \frac{\alpha_S(Q)}{4\pi} \left[ 15 - 18 \log \frac{M_3(Q)}{Q} + \sum_{\tilde{q}} B_1(M_3^2, m_{\tilde{q}}, m_q) \right] \right\},$$
 (19)

where  $B_1$  is the (finite part of) a standard 2-point function:

$$B_1(s, m_1, m_2) = \int_0^1 dx x \log \frac{x m_1^2 + (1 - x) m_2^2 - x (1 - x) s}{Q^2}$$

$$\simeq \log \frac{m_1}{Q} \quad (m_1^2 \gg m_2^2, s). \tag{20}$$

The difference between  $m_{\tilde{g}}$  and  $M_3(M_3)$  can amount to 30% if  $M_3 \simeq 0.1$  TeV and  $m_{\tilde{q}} \simeq 1$  TeV. Notice that the physical gluino mass  $m_{\tilde{g}}$  in (19) is (to 1–loop order) independent of the scale Q.

The masses of third generation sfermions and Higgs bosons, as well as the  $\mu$  parameter, are slightly more difficult to compute. If only the top Yukawa coupling is significant, expressions can be given that only depend on a single integral that has to be computed numerically [35]. If  $h_b$  and/or  $h_\tau$  are non-negligible, i.e. for large  $\tan\beta$ , no such semi-analytical solutions can be found. In this subsection we will use fully numerical methods to integrate the RGE, implement radiative symmetry breaking, and compute the (s)particle spectrum at the weak scale. By now many such programs have been written [6, 35, 28, 36, 37].

Since even for fixed  $m_t$  the MSSM contains four free parameters  $(m_0, m_{1/2}, A \text{ and } \tan\beta)$ , the mass of any one particle can usually vary from its experimentally defined lower limit to (effectively) infinite; the only (very important) exception is the mass of light Higgs boson, which cannot exceed  $\sim 135 \text{ GeV}$  in the MSSM, as already noted. In contrast, there are often quite striking correlations between pairs of masses; in other words, it is often not possible to choose two masses independently from each other. A well–known example [38] is given by the gluino mass and the first or second generation squark masses, collectively denoted by  $m_{\tilde{q}}$ :

$$m_{\tilde{q}} \ge 0.85 m_{\tilde{g}},\tag{21}$$

which follows from eqs.(16)–(19) and the requirement  $m_0^2 \geq 0$ . This inequality means that one of the two often studied extreme cases of squark and gluino searches at hadron colliders [39], viz.  $m_{\tilde{q}} \ll m_{\tilde{q}}$ , cannot be realized in the MSSM.<sup>†</sup>

Other correlations are slightly less straightforward to derive since they involve radiative symmetry breaking. Examples are shown in figs. 5a–j, where we show the allowed regions of the planes spanned by the parameters  $M_2$  and  $\mu$  appearing in chargino and neutralino mass matrices (fig. 5a), as well as by pairs of the physical masses  $m_P$ ,  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ ,  $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1}$ ,  $m_{\tilde{u}_L}$ ,  $m_{\tilde{Z}_1}$  and  $m_{\tilde{W}_1}$ ; here  $\tilde{Z}_1$  and  $\tilde{W}_1$  denote the lightest neutralino and chargino, respectively, and  $\tilde{u}_L$  has been chosen as a "typical" first or second generation squark.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>The CDF study tries to incorporate part of the MSSM by linking the LSP and gluino masses via eq.(18). This leads to the somewhat bizarre statement that scenarios with  $m_{\tilde{g}} \gg m_{\tilde{q}}$  cannot be ruled out experimentally since the LSP becomes so heavy that there is little missing  $E_T$  in the event. Including eq.(18) but ignoring the constraint (21) offers a prime example how model predictions should *not* be used in experimental analyses.

We have fixed  $m_t(m_t) = 165$  GeV and the GUT gauge coupling  $g_X = 0.71$  at  $M_X = 1.9 \cdot 10^{16}$  GeV<sup>‡</sup>; we have considered three different values of  $\tan\beta$ .  $\tan\beta = 1.65$  (long dashed) corresponds to the case of maximal top quark Yukawa coupling (so–called fixed point scenario [40], since this maximal coupling at the weak scale is approached from a wide range of choices for  $h_t(M_X)$ ; in practice we have chosen  $h_t(M_X) = 2$ .) This choice is of interest not only because maximizing  $h_t$  obviously maximizes its contributions to the RGE, but also because it allows [9] the b and  $\tau$  Yukawa couplings to be unified,  $h_b(M_X) = h_{\tau}(M_X)$ . Moreover, large Yukawa couplings are preferred dynamically [41] in certain superstring models where these couplings are determined by MSSM quantum effects. The case  $\tan\beta = 8$  (solid) stands for the "typical" situation where  $h_t$  is already almost independent of  $\tan\beta$  (with  $h_t(M_X) \simeq 0.53$ ), but  $h_b$  and  $h_\tau$  are still essentially negligible in the RGE. This is no longer true for our third choice,  $\tan\beta = 35$  (short dashed), although this is still well below the maximal value of  $\tan\beta$ , see fig. 4b.

The allowed region of parameter space is defined by the following constraints:

- For the given (large) value of  $m_t$ , radiative symmetry breaking always occurs, i.e.  $\mu^2$  in eq.(9a) is always positive. However, sometimes eq.(9b) forces  $|B\mu|$  to be so large that the Higgs potential becomes unbounded at high scales, i.e. condition (5) is violated at scale  $M_X$ . This is not acceptable, since it would lead to a mass of the Z boson of order  $M_X$  or more.
- Searches for charginos and neutralinos at LEP, as well as measurements of the total and invisible width of the Z boson, exclude [39] some combinations of  $M_2$ ,  $\mu$  and  $\tan \beta$ .
- Higgs searches at LEP [39] exclude scenarios with a light scalar Higgs boson h. As we shall see,  $m_P$  is automatically quite large here, so searches for associate hP production are not relevant. (They do play a role if  $\tan\beta$  is very close to its upper bound, since then  $m_P$  can become very small, as discussed in the previous subsection.)
- We have required all charged sparticles to be heavier than 45 GeV, which satisfies all LEP search limits [39].\(^{\}\) Similarly,  $m_{\tilde{\nu}} > 40$  GeV makes sure that sneutrinos contribute little to the invisible width of the Z.
- Searches for squarks and gluinos at hadron colliders [39] are less straightforward to interpret, since the resulting bounds depend [43] on the  $\tilde{g}$  and  $\tilde{q}$  decay branching ratios. We have conservatively required  $m_{\tilde{g}} \geq 120$  GeV; in most cases the resulting bound on  $m_{1/2}$  is weaker than that from LEP searches.
- We have required the LSP to be electrically neutral. This is necessary [44] if the LSP is absolutely stable, which it is in the MSSM as defined here, since stable charged particles in the interesting mass range would accumulate in matter, bound to nuclei,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>‡</sup>For consistency we use 1-loop RGE everywhere

<sup>§</sup>The light stop might be even lighter if the  $\tilde{t}_L - \tilde{t}_R$  mixing angle is chosen such that the  $Z\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_1$  coupling is very small and in addition  $m_{\tilde{Z}_1}$  is very close to  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ . We have ignored this somewhat artificial possibility, although solutions of this type can be found in the MSSM [42].

leading to an unacceptably large concentration of exotic isotopes. In practice this is not very constraining, since  $\tilde{Z}_1$  is almost always the LSP anyway.

- We have required that the scalar potential should not have an absolute minimum in the D-flat directions [46]  $\tilde{t}_L = \tilde{t}_R = H_2^0$ ,  $\tilde{b}_L = \tilde{b}_R = H_1^0$  and  $\tilde{\tau}_L = \tilde{\tau}_R = H_1^0$  (with all other vevs being zero). This is certainly a necessary condition if one wants the vacuum we are living in to be absolutely stable. We are not aware of any readily implementable sufficient condition that would guarantee the absence of such "false vacua". This constraint usually limits  $|A|/m_0$  to be below  $\sim 3-5$ .
- For the case  $\tan \beta = 8$  we have also required that the LSP relic density  $\Omega h^2$  does not exceed 1, which is roughly equivalent to requiring the universe to be at least 10 billion years old. Since this cosmological limit is often considered to be less watertight than the direct search limits and internal consistency conditions listed above, we show results with (dotted) and without (solid) this additional constraint. For the purposes of this article it should be sufficient to keep in mind that the relic density is approximately inversely proportional to the total LSP annihilation cross section for non–relativistic LSP's.\*\*
- Finally, in order to keep the search region finite we have required  $m_0 \leq 1$  TeV and  $m_{1/2} \leq 0.5$  TeV, leading to  $m_{\tilde{g},\tilde{q}} \leq 1.3$  TeV. This is certainly a very crude "naturalness" criterion, but hopefully not too far from what most practicing supersymmetrists consider reasonable. In any case, it should be quite straightforward to extend the allowed regions towards larger masses. We have indicated the upper ends of these regions in figs. 5, since their dependence on  $\tan\beta$  contains useful information. We will come back to the question of upper bounds on sparticle masses in sec. 2f.

Notice that we have not included any constraints from electroweak precision experiments, or from sparticle loop contributions to rare processes like the recently popular  $b \to s \gamma$  decays. The reason is that in most cases sparticle loop contributions are quite small within the MSSM with radiative symmetry breaking [51, 52]. Moreover, these calculations usually contain some theoretical ambiguity. Therefore the region of parameter space that could be excluded reliably from such considerations is quite small once the direct search constraints listed above have been incorporated.

Fig. 5a shows the  $(M_2, \mu)$  plane often used in experimental as well as phenomenological studies involving charginos or neutralinos. Notice the different scales of the two axes. Indeed,

<sup>¶</sup>Strictly speaking this requirement may not be necessary even in our restrictive version of the MSSM, since the LSP might be the gravitino or some member of the "hidden sector" [3] thought to be responsible for SUSY breaking in supergravity or superstring theories. However, in this case bounds from nucleosynthesis and from the relic density of the LSP force the LSP mass to be significantly below the mass of the lightest sparticle in the visible sector, making this scenario less attractive [45].

Notice that this constraint should only be imposed at the weak scale. Even if the potential renormalized at scale  $M_X$  did have a minimum in one of these directions, the vevs would still be very roughly of order of the weak scale, so the natural scale to study them is this lower scale [29].

<sup>\*\*</sup>We have computed the LSP annihilation cross section including all accessible two-body final states [47], but used a simple analytical approximation [48] to compute the relic density from the annihilation cross section. It has recently been pointed out [49] that a more sophisticated method [50] is necessary to obtain reliable results in the vicinity of s-channel poles in the LSP annihilation cross section.

probably the most important result of this figure is that

$$|\mu| \ge 1.4M_2 \simeq 2.8M_1 \tag{22}$$

which holds for our choice  $m_t(m_t) = 165$  GeV. This implies that  $\widetilde{Z}_1$  is a rather pure gaugino, and even  $\widetilde{W}_1$  and  $\widetilde{Z}_2$  are dominated by their gaugino components.  $\widetilde{Z}_{3,4}$  and  $\widetilde{W}_2$  are higgsinolike, and become nearly degenerate in mass as  $|\mu|$  increases. This has ramifications not only for direct searches for all these sparticles, but also for cascade decays [43] of heavy squarks and gluinos, which usually preferably produce gaugino-like charginos and neutralinos. It should be noted, however, that the inequality (22) is quite sensitive to  $m_t$ ; if  $m_t(m_t) \leq 155$  GeV, solutions with  $|\mu| \leq M_1$ , i.e. higgsino-like LSP, can still be found [47] if  $\tan\beta$  is not small and  $m_0^2 \gg m_{1/2}^2$ .

Notice the overall decrease of  $|\mu|$  as  $\tan\beta$  is increased from its lower bound; we have already seen this behaviour in fig. 4b. Finally, requiring a sufficiently small LSP relic density excludes the region of small or moderate  $M_2$  and very large  $|\mu|$ . Increasing  $|\mu|$  reduces the coupling of the LSP to Z and Higgs bosons, which usually decreases the LSP annihilation cross section, i.e. increases the relic density. In addition, large  $|\mu|$  are associated with large  $m_0$  here, see eq.(9a), which suppresses LSP annihilation via sfermion exchange in the t-channel.

#### 6.5truein

Fig. 5a: The allowed region of the  $(M_2, \mu)$  plane allowed in the MSSM for  $\tan \beta = 1.65$  (long dashed), 8 (solid and dotted), and 35 (short dashed). We have fixed  $m_t(m_t) = 165$  GeV and varied the SUSY breaking parameters  $m_0$ ,  $m_{1/2}$  and A within their experimentally and theoretically allowed ranges, as described in the text. For  $\tan \beta = 8$ , only the region enclosed by the dotted curve is allowed by the LSP density constraint; similar reductions of the allowed parameters space could be derived from this constraint for our other choices of  $\tan \beta$ . (At small  $|\mu|$ , the dotted lines coincide with the solid ones.) Note that the upper limits in this and the following figures are determined from our rather arbitrary naturalness condition  $m_0 \leq 1$  TeV,  $m_{1/2} \leq 0.5$  TeV; see sec. 2f for a detailed discussion of upper limits on sparticle masses.

#### 6.5truein

**Fig. 5b:** The allowed region in the  $(m_{\tilde{u}_L}, m_{\tilde{t}_1})$  plane. Notations are as in Fig. 5a.

In fig. 5b we show the  $(m_{\tilde{u}_L}, m_{\tilde{t}_1})$  plane. Here the allowed region obviously moves only little when  $\tan\beta$  is varied. The fixed point solution  $\tan\beta = 1.65$  has a slightly reduced maximal value of  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ , due to the increase of the terms  $\propto h_t^2$  in the RGE for  $m_{\tilde{t}_{L,R}}^2$ ; however, this value obviously depends on our rather arbitrary upper bounds on  $m_0$  and  $m_{1/2}$ . More interesting is the reduction of the allowed region left after the relic density constraint is imposed. This excludes combinations of parameters where  $m_0$  is large and  $m_{\tilde{Z}_1}$  lies above the range where s-channel  $H_2$  and Z exchange diagrams are important, unless  $\tilde{Z}_1\tilde{Z}_1 \to t\bar{t}$  is possible and has a sizable cross section, which gives an upper bound on  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  if  $m_{\tilde{u}_L} \geq 1.1 m_0$ .\*

The most important feature of fig. 5b is that  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  can be very much lighter than  $m_{\tilde{u}_L}$ ; in fact, it can be close to its experimental lower bound even if  $m_{\tilde{u}_L} \simeq 1$  TeV. This emphasizes

<sup>\*</sup>The increase of the lower bound on  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  for  $m_{\tilde{u}_L} \ge 600$  GeV is most likely an artifact of our approximate treatment of s-channel poles.

the necessity to take squark non–degeneracy seriously, e.g. when analyzing squark searches at colliders.

Fig. 5c shows the  $(m_{\tilde{g}}, m_{\tilde{t}_1})$  plane. Here the dependence on  $\tan\beta$  is more pronounced; in particular, the allowed region for  $\tan\beta=1.65$  becomes quite narrow. The reason is [37] that in this scenario the value of  $A_t$  at the weak scale depends only very weakly on the value of the input parameter A;  $A_t$  approaches a fixed point that depends only on  $m_{1/2}$ . For the other values of  $\tan\beta$ , or if  $m_{\tilde{g}} \leq 600$  GeV, the lower bound on  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  is basically given by  $\max(45 \text{ GeV}, m_{\tilde{Z}_1})$ . For  $m_{\tilde{g}} \geq 450$  GeV, where s-channel contributions to  $\tilde{Z}_1$  annihilation become unimportant, the bound on the LSP relic density reduces the maximal value of  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  by imposing an upper bound on  $m_0$ , as discussed above. Notice that, especially for  $\tan\beta=1.6$ ,  $\tilde{g}\to t\tilde{t}_1$  decays are often allowed even if the gluino cannot decay into first generation squarks.

#### 6.5truein

**Fig. 5c:** The allowed region in the  $(m_{\tilde{g}}, m_{\tilde{t}_1})$  plane. Notations are as in Fig. 5a.

Fig. 5d depicts the  $(m_{\tilde{u}_L}, m_{\tilde{g}})$  plane. Neither of these masses is affected by radiative symmetry breaking, so that the allowed region depends very little on  $\tan\beta$ . The exception is the lower limit on  $m_{\tilde{g}}$  (see also the previous figure): The hadron collider bound  $m_{\tilde{g}} \geq 120$  GeV can be saturated only for small  $\tan\beta$  (and  $\mu < 0$ ), since otherwise the chargino search limit from LEP requires  $m_{\tilde{g}} \geq 170$  GeV. Notice that imposing the relic density constraint greatly reduces the allowed region: If  $m_{\tilde{g}} \geq 450$  GeV (so that s-channel diagrams become unimportant) and  $m_{\tilde{g}} \leq 1$  TeV (so that  $m_{\tilde{Z}_1} < m_t$ ), a rather stringent upper bound on  $m_0$  emerges; as a result, first and second generation squark masses cannot exceed  $m_{\tilde{g}}$  significantly. If  $m_{\tilde{g}} \simeq m_{\tilde{q}}$ , the small mass splittings between squarks of different flavors, eq.(16d)-(16g), can change  $\tilde{g}$  branching ratios significantly. For example, the larger masses of SU(2) doublet squarks compared to the SU(2) singlets can greatly reduce the production of  $\widetilde{W}_1$  and  $\widetilde{Z}_2$  in  $\tilde{g}$  decays in such a scenario. If  $m_{\tilde{g}} > 1$  TeV,  $\widetilde{Z}_1$  annihilation into  $t\bar{t}$  pair becomes possible and large values of  $m_0$  are allowed as long as  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  is sufficiently small, as discussed above.

#### 6.5truein

**Fig. 5d:** The allowed region of the  $(m_{\tilde{u}_L}, m_{\tilde{q}})$  plane. Notations are as in Fig. 5a.

We next turn to the  $(m_P, m_{\tilde{u}_L})$  plane shown in fig. 5e. For fixed  $\tan\beta$  the correlation between these masses is quite striking; it is a direct consequence of radiative gauge symmetry breaking. This correlation becomes even stronger if we impose the relic density constraint. However, the strong dependence of  $m_P$  on  $\tan\beta$ , which we have already seen in fig. 4b, means that the correlation shown in fig. 5e can only be used to test the MSSM if  $\tan\beta$  is known. Notice finally that even for  $\tan\beta = 1.65$  the pseudoscalar Higgs boson is never heavy enough to decay into a pair of first or second generation squarks.

In contrast, fig. 5f shows that scenarios with  $m_P > 2m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  can quite easily be found. While the pseudoscalar Higgs boson does not couple to an identical squark–antisquark pair, the heavy scalar Higgs boson, whose mass is very close to  $m_P$ , does [24]. One can even find cases where  $m_P > m_{\tilde{t}_1} + m_{\tilde{t}_2}$ ; in this case  $H^+ \to \tilde{b}_1 \tilde{t}_1$  will also occur. In some cases these decays into stops might even constitute the dominant decay modes for the heavy Higgs bosons of the MSSM. Finally, we again observe the reduction of  $m_P$  with increasing  $\tan \beta$ , and the shrinking of the allowed parameter space with large  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  if the LSP relic density constraint is imposed.

6.5truein

**Fig. 5e** The allowed region in the  $(m_P, m_{\tilde{u}_L})$  plane. Notations are as in Fig. 5a.

6.5truein

**Fig. 5f** The allowed region in the  $(m_P, m_{\tilde{t}_1})$  plane. Notations are as in Fig. 5a.

Fig. 5g shows that there exists only a mild correlation between  $m_P$  and the LSP mass  $m_{\tilde{Z}_1}$ , unless the relic density constrained is imposed, which greatly reduces the upper limit of  $m_P$  for  $m_{\tilde{Z}_1} < m_t$ . Note that even for  $\tan \beta = 35$  we always have  $m_P > 2m_{\tilde{Z}_1}$ . This means that P-exchange contributions to the LSP annihilation cross section will still be suppressed. More importantly, it also means that P (and hence also the heavy scalar  $H_1$ ) will have some SUSY decay modes, unless  $\tan \beta \geq 40$  or so. This casts doubt on the reliability of studies of SUSY Higgs searches that ignore Higgs decays into sparticles.

6.5truein

**Fig. 5g:** The allowed region in the  $(m_P, m_{\tilde{Z}_1})$  plane. Notations are as in Fig. 5a.

Fig. 5h depicts the  $(m_{\tilde{t}_1}, m_{\tilde{Z}_1})$  plane. Since  $\tilde{Z}_1$  is always gaugino-like, this figure is essentially a re-scaled (and rotated) version of fig. 5c. We include it mostly in order to emphasize that even in the MSSM, the  $\tilde{t}_1 - \tilde{Z}_1$  mass difference might be very small. The open production of pairs of light stop squarks that are nearly degenerate with the LSP might be very difficult to detect, especially at hadron colliders. This may be an example where even a strongly interacting particle is more easily detected at  $e^+e^-$  colliders. (However,  $\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_1^*$  bound states might be detectable [53] at hadron colliders in such a scenario.) Note also that in some cases  $t \to \tilde{t}_1\tilde{Z}_1$  decays are possible.

6.5truein

**Fig. 5h:** The allowed region in the  $(m_{\tilde{t}_1}, m_{\tilde{Z}_1})$  plane. Notations are as in Fig. 5a.

Fig. 5i shows that there is little correlation between  $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1}$  and  $m_{\widetilde{W}_1}$  unless we impose the relic density constraint. As discussed above, this leads to a strong upper bound on  $m_0$  if 55 GeV  $\leq m_{\widetilde{Z}_1} \leq m_t$ , which roughly translates to 110 GeV  $\leq m_{\widetilde{W}_1} \leq 2m_t$  since  $m_{\widetilde{Z}_1} \simeq M_1$  and  $m_{\widetilde{W}_1} \simeq M_2$  are related by eq.(18). Similarly, the requirement  $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1} > m_{\widetilde{Z}_1}$  defines the upper bound on  $m_{\widetilde{W}_1}$  for given  $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1}$ . Notice that even if the relic density constraint is imposed, we can find examples both where  $\widetilde{W}_1 \to \widetilde{\tau}_1 + \nu_{\tau}$  decays are allowed and those where  $\widetilde{\tau}_1 \to \widetilde{W}_1 + \nu_{\tau}$  decays are possible. Finally, the reduction of  $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1}$  due to terms involving  $h_{\tau}$  is still quite small even for  $\tan\beta = 35$ .

6.5truein

**Fig. 5i:** The allowed region in the  $(m_{\tilde{\tau}_1}, m_{\widetilde{W}_1})$  plane. Notations are as in Fig. 5a.

#### 6.5truein

**Fig. 5j** The allowed region in the  $(m_{\tilde{u}_L}, m_{\tilde{\tau}_1})$  plane. Notations are as in Fig. 5a.

This can also be seen from fig. 5j, which shows the  $(m_{\tilde{u}_L}, m_{\tilde{\tau}_1})$  plane. Nearly the entire plane with  $1 \leq m_{\tilde{u}_L}/m_{\tilde{\tau}_1} \leq 5$  is allowed unless the relic density constraint is imposed. Notice that the lower bound on  $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1}$  for given  $m_{\tilde{u}_L}$  is set by the requirement  $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1} > m_{\tilde{Z}_1}$ , independent of  $\tan\beta$ ; on the other hand, the upper limit on  $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1}$  for fixed  $m_{\tilde{u}_L}$  is reduced somewhat for large  $\tan\beta$ , as already shown in fig. 4b.

This concludes our pictorial exploration of the spectrum of the MSSM. We already mentioned that we cannot derive upper bounds on (s)particle masses from these figures, since we imposed arbitrary upper limits on SUSY breaking mass parameters. However, at least for fixed  $\tan\beta$  one can often give lower bounds on (s)particle masses that are significantly more stringent than the direct search limit for this (s)particle. This simply results from the fact that the model contains far fewer free parameters than new (s)particles; any experimental lower bound can therefore have ramifications for the allowed range of other masses.

This is demonstrated in table 1, where we give the lower bounds on  $|\mu|$  and  $M_2$  as well as several sparticle and Higgs boson masses, for the three values of  $\tan\beta$  considered in figs. 5. The only experimental lower bounds that can be saturated for all values of  $\tan\beta$  are those on  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  and on  $m_{\tilde{W}_1}$ . On the other hand, LEP Higgs searches are found to constrain the parameter space only at the lowest value of  $\tan\beta$  considered; as remarked above, they again become relevant at very large  $\tan\beta$ . Table 1 shows that even the discovery of a Higgs boson at LEP2 would likely exclude a large range of intermediate values of  $\tan\beta$ , since here the mass of lightest scalar Higgs boson must exceed 94 GeV in the MSSM; this is related to the lower bound on  $m_P$ , which in turn is determined indirectly by the neutralino and chargino searches at LEP1. On the other hand, the Higgs search constraint from LEP1 helps to push the minimal possible value of the sneutrino mass to 55 GeV if  $\tan\beta = 1.65$ ; at this small value of  $\tan\beta$  sizable radiative corrections to  $m_{H_2}$  are needed, which puts constraints on the allowed choices of SUSY breaking parameters.

Table 1: The minimal values of the parameters  $M_2$  and  $\mu$  and of various sparticles masses allowed in the MSSM, given the experimental and theoretical constraints discussed in sec. 2c, but without constraint on the  $\tilde{Z}_1$  relic density; in case of the light scalar Higgs boson h both lower and upper bounds are given. The values of  $\tan\beta$  chosen here are the same as in figs. 5. All masses are in GeV.

	$\tan\beta = 1.65$	$\tan \beta = 8$	$\tan \beta = 35$
$ \mu $	198	108	120
$M_2$	32	44	47
$m_P$	241	119	86
$m_h$	60/107	94/132	85/132
$m_{ ilde{ u}}$	55	40	40
$m_{ ilde{ au}_1}$	49	56	47
$m_{ ilde{u}_L}$	235	172	221
$m_{ ilde{b}_1}$	216	182	119
$m_{ ilde{t}_1}$	45	45	45
$m_{ ilde{g}}$	120	170	181
$m_{ ilde{Z}_1}$	18	23	24
$m_{\widetilde{W}_1}$	45	45	45

Conversely, if the production of first or second generation squarks is observed at the Tevatron in the near future, very large or very small values of  $\tan\beta$  could be excluded within the MSSM, since here the lower bound on  $m_{\tilde{u}_L}$  is quite high. (Bounds for other first or second generation squark masses are very similar.) The bound on  $m_{\tilde{u}_L}$  is always at least partly determined by chargino and neutralino searches at LEP. In addition, at low  $\tan\beta$  Higgs searches are important for determining the minimal allowed value of  $m_{\tilde{u}_L}$ , while at high  $\tan\beta$  the  $\tilde{\tau}_1$  search bound from LEP becomes relevant. On the other hand, while the present bound on the gluino mass can only be saturated at small  $\tan\beta$ , with increased luminosity the Tevatron should be able to probe some part of the allowed parameter space via gluino searches even for larger values of  $\tan\beta$ . Notice that the  $\tilde{b}_1$  can also be quite light if  $\tan\beta$  is large.

The rather large lower bounds on  $|\mu|$  imply that within the MSSM one would not expect the heavier chargino or either of the heavier neutralinos to be detectable at LEP2. On the other hand, searches for the pair production of light charginos, for associate  $\tilde{Z}_1\tilde{Z}_2$  production, and for the production of slepton or stop pairs might yet succeed, or at least would allow to derive new constraints of the parameter space of the MSSM. We thus see that even in this rather constrained model it is quite possible that existing facilities (LEP, Tevatron) will discover a SUSY signal before the LHC is completed. On the other hand, a glance at figs. 5 shows that a discovery cannot be guaranteed at these colliders.

So far our explanations for the features observed in figs. 4 and 5 as well as in table 1 have been rather qualitative. In the next subsection we will discuss analytical approximation that allow a semi–quantitative understanding of the MSSM with the help of a pocket calculator. Readers with access to a program that computes the sparticle spectrum, or who are only interested in numerical predictions of the MSSM, might want to skip this subsection and directly continue with our discussion of some sample spectra in sec. 2e.

## 2d) Approximate Analytical Expressions

In this subsection we give approximate analytical solutions of the the relevant RGE. Together with eq.(9a), which determines the value of  $|\mu|$ , they allow one to compute sparticle and Higgs masses to a precision of typically 10 to 20%.

We have already seen that the RGE for running scalar masses are easily integrated if all Yukawa couplings are negligible compared to the gauge couplings; the results are listed in eqs.(16). If there is only one sizable Yukawa coupling  $(h_t)$ , the solutions for the running Higgs and squark masses can still be expressed [35] in terms of a single definite integral that has to be computed numerically. No such solutions can be given if two or more Yukawa couplings have to be taken into account. However, in practice the solutions of the RGE can still be approximated by sums of terms proportional to a single squared Yukawa coupling; the cross–interactions between these terms is quite small, partly due to the smallness of certain numerical coefficients in the RGE [21].\*

We therefore start with the ansatz:

$$m_{H_1}^2 = m_0^2 + 0.52m_{1/2}^2 - X_b - X_\tau/3;$$
 (23a)

$$m_{H_2}^2 = m_0^2 + 0.52m_{1/2}^2 - X_t.$$
 (23b)

In the (unrealistic) limit of vanishing Yukawa couplings,  $X_t = X_b = X_\tau = 0$ , and the SUSY breaking Higgs mass parameters run just like sneutrino masses. The same quantities  $X_i$  also appear in the running third generation sfermion masses:

$$m_{\tilde{\tau}_R}^2 = m_0^2 + 0.15 m_{1/2}^2 - \frac{2}{3} X_\tau;$$
 (24a)

$$m_{\tilde{\nu}_{\tau}}^2 = m_{\tilde{\tau}_L}^2 = m_0^2 + 0.52m_{1/2}^2 - \frac{1}{3}X_{\tau};$$
 (24b)

$$m_{\tilde{t}_L}^2 = m_{\tilde{b}_L}^2 = m_0^2 + (0.47 + c_{\tilde{g}})m_{1/2}^2 - \frac{1}{3}(X_b + X_t);$$
 (24c)

$$m_{\tilde{t}_R}^2 = m_0^2 + (0.07 + c_{\tilde{g}})m_{1/2}^2 - \frac{2}{3}X_t;$$
 (24d)

$$m_{\tilde{b}_R}^2 = m_0^2 + (0.02 + c_{\tilde{g}})m_{1/2}^2 - \frac{2}{3}X_b,$$
 (24e)

where  $c_{\tilde{g}}$  has been given in eq.(17). Approximate expressions for the  $X_i$  are:

$$X_{t} = \left(\frac{m_{t}(m_{t})}{150 \text{ GeV } \sin\beta}\right)^{2} \left\{0.9m_{0}^{2} + 2.1m_{1/2}^{2} + \left[1 - \left(\frac{m_{t}(m_{t})}{190 \text{ GeV } \sin\beta}\right)^{3}\right] \left(0.24A^{2} + Am_{1/2}\right)\right\}; \quad (25a)$$

$$X_b = X_t(m_t(m_t) \leftrightarrow m_b(m_t), \sin\beta \leftrightarrow \cos\beta);$$
 (25b)

$$X_{\tau} = \frac{10^{-4}}{\cos^2 \beta} \left( m_0^2 + 0.15 m_{1/2}^2 + 0.33 A^2 \right). \tag{25c}$$

<sup>\*</sup>For example, the r.h.s. of the RGE for  $h_t^2$  contains the combination  $6h_t^2 + h_b^2$ , while in the RGE for  $h_b^2$  one finds the term  $6h_b^2 + h_t^2$ ; the Yukawa couplings affect each other's running therefore only rather weakly.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>A similar expression for  $X_t$  has been found by Carena et al. [37]; for approximate expressions including effects of the bottom Yukawa coupling, see ref.[41].

The only other quantity needed to compute the sparticle spectrum is

$$A_t = A \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{m_t(m_t)}{190 \text{ GeV } \sin \beta} \right)^2 \right] + m_{1/2} \left[ 3.47 - 1.9 \left( \frac{m_t(m_t)}{190 \text{ GeV } \sin \beta} \right)^2 \right].$$
 (26)

Whenever  $\tilde{b}_L - \tilde{b}_R$  or  $\tilde{\tau}_L - \tilde{\tau}_R$  mixing are important they are dominated by the term  $\propto \mu$  in eq.(12b), since it grows  $\propto \tan \beta$ .

Notice that  $|\mu|$  practically only depends on  $X_t$ ; the terms  $\propto X_{b,\tau}$  in eq.(9a) come with a factor  $\cos^2 \beta$  and are thus always negligible. Inserting eqs.(23) and (25a) into eq.(9a) gives:

$$\mu^2 \simeq -m_0^2 - 0.52m_{1/2}^2 - \frac{1}{2}m_Z^2 + \frac{X_t}{1 - \cot^2 \beta},$$
 (27)

which holds at the weak scale. For  $m_t(m_t) > 158$  GeV the coefficient of  $m_0^2$  on the r.h.s. of eq.(27) is always positive; the coefficient of  $m_{1/2}^2$  is positive if  $m_t > 75$  GeV. This explains why  $|\mu|$  is always quite large for our standard choice  $m_t(m_t) = 165$  GeV, but also indicates that arbitrarily small values of  $|\mu|$  will be allowed for small ratio  $m_{1/2}/m_0$  if  $m_t(m_t) < 155$  GeV, which is less than  $1\sigma$  below the central value cited by the CDF collaboration [25].

Another useful observation [33] is that the mass of the pseudoscalar Higgs boson, eq.(11), is independent of  $X_t$  if it is expressed in terms of  $\mu^2$ :

$$m_P^2 \simeq \frac{m_{\tilde{\nu}}^2 + \mu^2 - X_b - X_\tau/3}{\sin^2 \beta}.$$
 (28)

For  $\tan\beta \leq 20$  or so,  $X_b$  and  $X_\tau$  are essentially negligible; the resulting simple expression is useful since it establishes a quantitative connection<sup>‡</sup> between a sparticle mass, a Higgs mass and the  $\mu$  parameter. This is to be contrasted with many phenomenological analyses where the parameters of the sfermion, chargino/neutralino, and Higgs sectors are often considered to be completely independent. Eq.(28) means that in the MSSM the pseudoscalar Higgs boson, and hence also the heavy neutral scalar as well as the charged Higgs boson, are heavier than the higgsino-like chargino and neutralinos, whose masses are close to  $|\mu|$ , and also heavier than the sleptons, unless  $\tan\beta$  is very large. This explains our observation of the previous subsection that for  $\tan\beta \leq 35$ , the heavy neutral Higgs bosons always have some supersymmetric decay channels.

## 2e) Sample Spectra

In this subsection we present a few examples of (s)particle spectra as computed from the four input parameters of the MSSM  $(m_0, m_{1/2}, A \text{ and } \tan\beta)$ . In the previous subsection we emphasized that the mechanism of radiative symmetry breaking allows one to compute the value of  $|\mu|$  from this input; together with the boundary condition (7) this also determines the Higgs boson masses. The MSSM as defined here has therefore fewer free parameter than has often been assumed in phenomenological analyses, where  $\mu$  and  $m_P$  have been varied independently of the sfermion and gaugino masses.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>‡</sup>Corrections stemming from the 1-loop potential (15) only amount to a few percent if the scale  $Q_0$  is chosen to be of the order of the average stop mass, as discussed at the end of sec. 2a.

In this subsection we want to emphasize that in spite of this small number of free parameters the MSSM allows to construct more complicated spectra at the weak scale than have usually been considered. This is partly due to the possible reduction of third generation (current) sfermion masses by the Yukawa terms in the RGE, and partly due to mixing between SU(2) doublet and singlet sfermions of the same charge; the first effect lowers the average mass of the two sfermion eigenstates with a given flavor, while the second effect leads to a mass splitting between these two eigenstates. The overall result is that some third generation sfermions can be significantly lighter than their counterparts in the first two generations. Since third generation sfermions almost always decay into third generation fermions, which lead to quite different signatures than first or second generation fermions, such mass splittings can have quite dramatic consequences for the kind of SUSY signals one expects at a given collider.

Both the reduction of sfermion current masses and mixing between current eigenstates becomes more important with increasing Yukawa couplings. By now we know that the top quark is heavy, so that its Yukawa coupling is  $\mathcal{O}(1)$ . Both effects are therefore usually important for stop squarks.§ The possibility that the lighter stop eigenstate lies significantly below the other squarks has already been discussed in a number of papers [54, 55]. However, it has not always been appreciated that the top Yukawa coupling also reduces the mass of the SU(2) partner of  $\tilde{t}_L$ , the  $\tilde{b}_L$ , compared to those of  $\tilde{d}_L$  and  $\tilde{s}_L$ ; this is a direct consequence of SU(2) invariance. If  $\tan\beta$  is not large,  $h_b$  and  $h_\tau$  are quite small; in this case there is little mixing between the superpartners of left– and right–handed b's and  $\tau$ 's, and  $\tilde{b}_2$  and  $\tilde{\tau}_{1,2}$  will be close in mass to the corresponding first generation sfermions.

An example for such a "typical" scenario is given in the first column of table 2, where we have taken  $m_0 = m_{1/2} = 100$  GeV, A = 0,  $\tan \beta = 2$  and  $\mu < 0$ . (Recall that radiative symmetry breaking only fixes  $|\mu|$ , but leaves its sign free.) This leads to first generation squark and gluino masses at the upper end of the range that might eventually be detectable at the Tevatron. Since the SUSY breaking scale is rather low, the supersymmetric contributions to the stop mass matrix (12a), i.e. the  $m_t^2$  terms on the diagonal, are not negligible; they largely cancel the reduction of the diagonal SUSY breaking mass terms due to the top Yukawa coupling. Moreover, since  $\mu < 0$  and  $\tan \beta$  is quite small there is a partial cancellation in the off-diagonal terms; note that even though A = 0 at the GUT scale,  $A_t > 0$  at the weak scale due to gaugino loops [21]. As a result,  $\tilde{t}_1$  is not much lighter than first generation squarks here, while  $\tilde{t}_2$  is the heaviest of all squarks.

The lighter b eigenstate is (coincidentally) very close to  $\tilde{t}_1$  in mass in this example. This rather moderate decrease of  $m_{\tilde{b}_1}$  compared to first generation squark masses is quite important, however, since it increases the branching ratio for  $\tilde{g} \to \tilde{b}b$  decays to about 35%. Since  $\tilde{q}\tilde{g}$  and  $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$  cross sections are larger than squark pair cross sections at hadron colliders, this means that in this scenario SUSY events at hadron colliders are expected to be b-rich. Moreover, since  $\tilde{b}_1$  is mostly an SU(2) doublet, the reduction of  $m_{\tilde{b}_1}$  leads to an enhanced rate for  $\tilde{Z}_2$  production in  $\tilde{g}$  decays, compared to the case where all squark masses are equal; note that  $\tilde{b}_1 \to t \tilde{W}_1$  is kinematically forbidden here.

In this example sleptons are substantially lighter than squarks; this is always true in the MSSM, unless  $m_0^2 \gg m_{1/2}^2$ . Because of the rather low SUSY breaking scale the D-term

 $<sup>\</sup>frac{\tilde{t}_L - \tilde{t}_R}{\tilde{t}_L - \tilde{t}_R}$  mixing can be "accidentally" small if  $A_t + \mu \cot \beta$  is small due to a cancellation, see eq.(12a).

contributions to eqs.(16a)–(16c) are still of some importance, leading to some  $\tilde{e}_L - \tilde{\nu}$  mass splitting; the near–degeneracy of  $\tilde{e}_R$  and  $\tilde{\nu}$  in this example is accidental. For larger SUSY breaking scales  $\tilde{e}_R$  will be the lightest first generation slepton, again unless  $m_0^2 \gg m_{1/2}^2$  in which case all first generation sleptons are very close in mass. Since  $h_{\tau}$  is small, the  $\tilde{\tau}$  eigenstates lie very close to the  $\tilde{e}$  and  $\tilde{\mu}$  here.

Because we have chosen  $\mu < 0$  and small  $\tan\beta$ , higgsino–gaugino mixing increases  $m_{\widetilde{W}_1}$  and  $m_{\widetilde{Z}_2}$  above the current mass  $M_2 \simeq 84$  GeV;  $m_{\widetilde{Z}_1}$  is also somewhat larger than  $M_1 \simeq 42$  GeV. As a result, the only SUSY process that might be detectable at LEP2 (with  $\sqrt{s} \leq 200$  GeV) is  $\widetilde{Z}_1\widetilde{Z}_2$  production; since the selectrons are quite light, the cross section for this process should not be too small. Finally, the light scalar Higgs h should be easily detectable at LEP2 in this scenario.

In the second column of table 2 we have chosen the same values for the dimensionful parameters  $m_0$ ,  $m_{1/2}$  and A, but we have increased  $\tan\beta$  to 40. This has quite dramatic effects on the resulting phenomenology; in particular, even though all dimensionful input parameters (and hence "the SUSY breaking scale") have remained the same, many sparticles have become significantly lighter.  $\P$ 

**Table 2:** Three MSSM sample spectra for  $m_t(m_t) = 165$  GeV; the values of the other input parameters are as indicated.  $\tilde{u}_R$  and  $\tilde{d}_L$  are the lightest and heaviest first generation squark, respectively. All masses are in GeV.

<sup>¶</sup>Unfortunately the ISASUSY program package that computes branching ratios for various sparticle and Higgs decay modes in the MSSM does not yet allow for mass splitting between different generations of sleptons. The following discussion therefore has to remain qualitative at times.

	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3
$m_0$	100	100	200
$m_{1/2}$	100	100	100
$\mathring{A}$	0	0	400
$\tan\beta$	2	40	40
$\mu$	-200	-134	-211
$m_P$	256	76	99
$m_h$	66	75	95
$m_H$	268	104	110
$m_{H^+}$	268	110	127
$m_{ ilde{Z}_1}$	46	37	41
$m_{ ilde{Z}_2}$	97	64	74
$m_{ ilde{Z}_3}$	207	154	226
$m_{ ilde{Z}_4}$	225	178	237
$m_{\widetilde{W}_1}$	97	62	74
$m_{ ilde{W}_2}$	224	183	242
$m_{\tilde{e}_R}$	113	116	208
$m_{ ilde{e}_L}$	128	132	217
$m_{ ilde{ u}}$	112	105	202
$m_{ ilde{ au}_1}$	112	63	120
$m_{ ilde{ au}_2}$	128	149	211
$m_{ ilde{g}}$	272	271	275
$m_{ ilde{u}_R}$	247	246	299
$m_{ ilde{d}_L}$	261	263	313
$m_{ ilde{b}_1}$	233	186	156
$m_{ ilde{b}_2}$	250	255	267
$m_{ ilde{t}_1}$	231	190	126
$m_{ ilde{t}_2}$	287	313	325

To begin with,  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  has gone down, mostly since there is little cancellation in the off-diagonal entry of the mass matrix (12a) now, the term  $\propto \mu$  being suppressed by a factor  $\cot \beta = 1/40$ ; for the same reason  $m_{\tilde{t}_2}$  has gone up slightly compared to the previous case. Since  $h_b$  is now quite substantial, the diagonal entries of the sbottom mass matrix are reduced, while the off-diagonal entries are much larger than before; these two effects tend to cancel for the heavier eigenstate, but go in the same direction for the lighter one. As a result,  $\tilde{b}_1$  is the lightest squark and  $Br(\tilde{g} \to \tilde{b}b) \simeq 64\%$ .

The masses of first and second generation squarks and sleptons are little affected by the increase of  $\tan\beta$ , but there is now a very substantial mass splitting between the lighter  $\tilde{\tau}$  eigenstate and the other sleptons. As a result,  $\tilde{\tau}_1$  pair production should be easily observable at LEP2 in this example. Moreover,  $\widetilde{W}_1$  and  $\widetilde{Z}_2$  decays almost always lead to final states containing  $\tau\nu_{\tau}$  and  $\tau^+\tau^-$  pairs, respectively. This greatly reduces the cross section for the production of hard electrons or muons in SUSY events at hadron colliders, but should increase the missing  $E_T$  signal due to the large number of  $\tau$  neutrinos in the event; obviously, the capability to detect  $\tau$  leptons at a hadron collider would be very helpful here. Notice also that  $\widetilde{W}_1$  and  $\widetilde{Z}_2$  are now light enough to be pair produced at LEP2; since  $\widetilde{W}_1$  and  $\widetilde{\tau}_1$  are

very close in mass here, it might prove challenging to disentangle contributions from  $\tilde{\tau}_1^+ \tilde{\tau}_1^-$  and  $W_1^+ W_1^-$  pairs to the production of a collinear  $\tau^+ \tau^-$  pairs.

The increase of  $\tan\beta$  has also decreased  $|\mu|$ , see eq.(9a) or (27), which reduces  $m_{\tilde{Z}_3}$ ,  $m_{\tilde{Z}_4}$ , and  $m_{\tilde{W}_2}$ ; even  $\tilde{Z}_1\tilde{Z}_3$  production might now be detectable at LEP2. Moreover, the mass of the pseudoscalar Higgs boson has been greatly reduced compared to the previous example, so that associate hP production should be easily observable at LEP2. On the other hand, the near–degeneracy of h and P means that the ZZh coupling is very small [24]; Zh production will therefore probably not be detectable.

The reduced Higgs boson masses also imply greatly increased Higgs production rates at hadron colliders. For example, the charged Higgs boson is now light enough to be produced in top decays. Moreover, all Higgs bosons of the MSSM can be produced in decays of the heavier stop eigenstate  $\tilde{t}_2$ . Even though  $\tilde{t}_2$  pairs can be produced via strong interactions and at least some of the branching ratios of  $\tilde{t}_2$  into a Higgs boson plus  $\tilde{t}_1$  or  $\tilde{b}_1$  should be sizable, such events might be quite difficult to detect at hadron colliders; recall that  $\tilde{g}$  decays also lead to b—rich events in this scenario, so that b—tagging may not be sufficient to isolate the Higgs signal. The study of  $\tilde{t}_2$  decays into Higgs bosons is very interesting since it probes directly the trilinear scalar interactions, which are not easily accessible experimentally.

Other sources of Higgs bosons at hadron colliders in this example are the decays of  $\tilde{Z}_3$  and  $\tilde{Z}_4$  produced in  $\tilde{b}_1$  decays; the  $Br(\tilde{b}_1 \to \tilde{Z}_{3,4})$  should be quite substantial here, since  $\tilde{Z}_{3,4}$  are higgsino–like and  $h_b$  is larger than the electroweak gauge couplings. Both in  $\tilde{t}_2$  and in  $\tilde{Z}_{3,4}$  decays modes containing a Higgs boson have to compete with modes containing a real W or Z boson.

In the last column of table 2 we have kept  $m_{1/2}$  and  $\tan\beta$  as in the second column, but increased  $m_0$  and A to 200 and 400 GeV, respectively. Because of the larger value of  $m_0$  all first and second generation squarks are now heavier than the gluino, and will thus predominantly decay into a gluino and a light quark. Due to the increase of A,  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  has gone down compared to the previous example; even though  $\tilde{t}_1$  is now again the lightest squark,  $\tilde{g} \to \tilde{t}_1 t$  decays are still kinematically forbidden. As a result, the only two–body decays of  $\tilde{g}$  now involve sbottom squarks, which means that almost all  $\tilde{g}$  decays will produce at least one  $b\bar{b}$  pair.

The increase of  $m_0$  and A (with  $m_{1/2}A > 0$ ) has led to an increase of  $|\mu|$ , and thus of the masses of the heavier neutralino and chargino states; in particular,  $\tilde{Z}_{3,4}$  are no longer accessible in  $\tilde{b}_1$  decays, and will thus be produced only very rarely in the decays of gluinos or the superpartners of light quarks. The larger value of  $|\mu|$  also reduced gaugino—higgsino mixing, which slightly increased  $m_{\tilde{Z}_1}$ ,  $m_{\tilde{Z}_2}$  and  $m_{\tilde{W}_1}$  compared to the previous example; however,  $\tilde{Z}_2$  and  $\tilde{W}_1$  can still be pair—produced at LEP2.

All slepton masses are significantly larger than in the previous example; in particular,  $\widetilde{W}_1$  and  $\widetilde{Z}_2$  decays can no longer proceed via the exchange of an almost real  $\widetilde{\tau}_1$ . However, since  $\widetilde{Z}_2$  and, to a lesser extent,  $\widetilde{W}_1$  decays are still dominated by sfermion exchange contributions and  $\widetilde{\tau}_1$  is still by far the lightest slepton, the branching ratio for final states containing  $\tau$  leptons is still enhanced significantly compared to those for electrons or muons; notice that the branching ratios scale like the inverse fourth power of the mass of the exchanged sfermion if sfermion exchange contributions dominate.

Finally, the masses of the Higgs bosons have also gone up compared to the example in

column 2; no Higgs signal will be observable at LEP2 in this scenario unless the center–of–mass energy can be increased to at least 200 GeV. However,  $t \to H^+b$  decays are still allowed, and all four Higgs bosons of the MSSM can again be produced in  $\tilde{t}_2$  decays.

In this subsection we have emphasized examples with large  $\tan\beta$ , since such scenarios have not yet been explored very much in the literature. We picked relatively low values of  $m_0$  and  $m_{1/2}$ , leading to rather light sparticles, in order to emphasize that these considerations are of interest to present and near–future experiments; unfortunately, much larger sparticle masses cannot be excluded, as will be discussed in the next subsection. Spectra for the case where the top Yukawa coupling is close to its upper bound (fixed–point scenario) have been discussed in several recent papers [37, 55, 56]. Other "generic" spectra can be found in refs.[36].

### 2f) An Upper Bound on Sparticle Masses?

We have emphasized repeatedly that the small number of free parameters makes the MSSM quite predictive. However, so far we have not addressed in a quantitative way the perhaps most important question about phenomenological SUSY: At what mass should we expect sparticles to appear? We have seen in the examples of the previous subsection, as well as the figures of sec. 2c, that it is quite possible that some sparticles will be discovered at LEP2 or the Tevatron; however, such a discovery is by no means guaranteed. Given the (in our view) strong motivation for SUSY (see sec. 1), it is obviously important to determine just how high in energy one has to go in order to test this idea decisively, or at least to test the MSSM.

Actually, we have already mentioned a couple of times that the MSSM predicts the existence of at least one new particle with relatively moderate mass: The light scalar Higgs boson h should lie below 135–140 GeV, even if we interpret bounds on  $m_t$  conservatively. Given this bound, it can be shown [57] that an  $e^+e^-$  collider with  $\sqrt{s} \geq 300$  GeV would have to detect at least one of the Higgs bosons of the MSSM; this remains true even if we do not require radiative gauge symmetry breaking, and allow for arbitrary boundary conditions at the GUT scale. Such a collider has therefore the potential to exclude all SUSY models with minimal Higgs content. We will see in sec. 4b that this no-lose theorem can be extended to all SUSY models, as long as the Higgs sector remains weakly interacting up to scales of order  $M_X$ .

Unfortunately the detection of h would not prove the existence of SUSY, however. If the pseudoscalar Higgs is heavy, which will be true in the MSSM with heavy sparticles unless  $\tan\beta$  is close to its upper bound, h will behave just like the Higgs boson of the nonsupersymmetric SM. Indeed, any model where the Higgs sector remains perturbative up to scales of order  $M_X$  has at least one neutral scalar Higgs boson with mass below about 200 GeV; if this is the only light Higgs boson, its couplings will always resemble those of the SM. The upper bound for weakly coupled SUSY theories is somewhat below that for nonsupersymmetric ones; hence the introduction of weak–scale SUSY does lead to a definite sharpening of this bound. Nevertheless, by looking for a light Higgs boson one really tests whether physics below the Planck scale can be described by a perturbative quantum field theory, rather than the existence of weak–scale SUSY.\* There is no substitute for the

<sup>\*</sup>One might argue that a perturbative Higgs sector really only makes sense in the supersymmetric version,

detection of at least one sparticle.

Three methods have been suggested in the literature to derive (approximate) upper bounds on sparticle masses: Threshold effects in the running gauge couplings; naturalness arguments; and bounds on the cosmological relic density of LSPs left over from the very early universe. We will briefly discuss all three methods here.

Determining sparticle masses from the running gauge couplings has several weaknesses. To begin with, one has to assume gauge coupling unification. This includes some assumption about threshold corrections at the GUT scale; after all, it makes little sense to include threshold corrections at only one of the two scales between which the gauge couplings are run. This means that any bounds on sparticle masses will depend quite strongly on details of the GUT model one is considering. Finally, sparticle masses enter the running of the gauge couplings only logarithmically. Allowing for experimental and theoretical uncertainties, e.g. due to GUT–scale threshold effects, then leads to a very large uncertainty in the upper bounds on sparticle masses that can be derived in this fashion. For this reason most recent analyses (see e.g. [7]) assume a range of sparticle masses, usually from naturalness arguments, and treat the corresponding range of threshold corrections as uncertainties in the SUSY GUT predictions for the gauge couplings measured at scale  $m_Z$ .

The use of naturalness arguments to derive quantitative upper bounds on sparticle masses has been pioneered by Barbieri and Giudice [58]. It should be noted that neither ref. [58] nor later refinements of this method [59] use radiative corrections to Higgs masses as a naturalness criterion, which would follow most closely the main motivation for weak–scale SUSY. Rather, these analyses always assume radiative gauge symmetry breaking, and require that the spectrum at the weak scale, including the Z boson mass, should not depend too sensitively on the values of the input parameters. The most sensitive parameter is usually the top quark Yukawa coupling  $h_t$ .

The main advantage of this method is that sparticle masses enter the fine—tuning constraint quadratically, as opposed to the logarithmic dependence of the threshold corrections to the running gauge couplings. The reason is that the Higgs vevs, and hence  $m_Z$ , are determined essentially by the dimensionful parameters of the Higgs potential (4), all of which depend quadratically on some SUSY breaking parameter (or  $\mu$ ). The most "natural" values of the vevs would then be of the order of those masses (or zero or infinite, if conditions (5) or (6) are violated). If these masses are significantly larger than  $m_Z$ ,  $h_t(M_X)$  has to be chosen very carefully, for given values of the other input parameters, in order to produce "just a little bit" of SU(2) symmetry breaking. In such a situation a small decrease of  $h_t$  would lead to no symmetry breaking at all  $(m_Z = 0)$ , while a slight increase would give  $m_Z$  of order of the SUSY breaking scale.

Barbieri and Giudice [58] required less than 10% fine-tuning, i.e.

$$\frac{h_t}{m_Z^2} \frac{\partial m_Z^2}{\partial h_t} < 10; \tag{29}$$

this leads to bounds on sparticle masses below 1 TeV for squarks and gluinos, and  $\sim 200~{\rm GeV}$  for sleptons and the light chargino. The quadratic mass dependence means that allowing

where corrections to the Higgs masses are under control. However, such naturalness arguments are not likely to convince all skeptics.

for fine–tuning at the 1% level would "only" increase these bounds by about a factor of 3. However, as pointed out in [59], the bounds become worse once the 1–loop corrections (15) to the Higgs potential are included. As discussed in sec. 2b, the main effect of this correction term can be absorbed by increasing the scale  $Q_0$  where the RG running is terminated, to a value proportional to the SUSY breaking scale. Since for fixed input parameters an increase of  $Q_0$  decreases the vevs, this reduces the sensitivity of  $m_Z$  on the SUSY breaking parameters, loosening the upper bounds on sparticle masses by a about a factor of two.

Unfortunately there is a fair amount of arbitrariness in this procedure. Obviously the upper bounds will depend on what value one chooses on the r.h.s. of (29). Even worse, one can question whether the constraint (29) corresponds to a true bound on fine—tuning at all. This point has recently been raised by Anderson and Castaño [60], who pointed out that (29) is a poor measure of our intuitive concept of fine—tuning if the l.h.s. is large for all values of the input parameters. In such a situation no value of  $m_Z$  could be said to be more or less natural than any other. They therefore suggested to divide the l.h.s. of (29) by something like its average, defined via an integral over parameter space. Numerically one finds that this modified fine—tuning parameter is about 10 times smaller than the quantity in (29).

While this procedure corresponds more closely to our intuitive concept of fine–tuning, it also introduces some additional arbitrariness in the result. The bounds will depend on how exactly one computes the average over the l.h.s. of (29), e.g. what boundaries one uses when integrating over parameter space. Moreover, in order to derive quantitative results one has to introduce a probability distribution for the fundamental parameters of the theory. In their numerical work [60], Anderson and Castaño use two different distributions, a constant [f(a) = 1, where a is one of the fundamental input parameters] and a scale–invariant distribution [f(a) = 1/a, which corresponds to a flat distribution on a logarithmic scale]. The upper bounds on sparticle masses derived using these two choices differ by typically 10% or so. Requiring that their fine–tuning parameter be less than 10 then leads to bounds of about 700–800 GeV for squarks and gluinos, 400 GeV for sleptons, and 250 GeV for the lighter chargino.

There are two fundamental problems besetting all attempts to quantify fine—tuning: First, one must decide on a probability measure on the parameter space; second, one must decide how much fine—tuning one can tolerate. Both these choices are quite subjective. It therefore seems to us that all bounds on sparticle masses derived from fine—tuning arguments are at best semi—quantitative. Indeed, it is not clear whether these calculations, which in case of the method advocated in ref.[60] are quite complicated, are really an improvement over simply requiring that sparticles should not be "much heavier than the weak scale", or should be "at or below the TeV scale".

Calculations of the LSP relic density seemed to offer a road towards more precise upper bounds on sparticle masses [47, 61]. We saw in sec. 2c that requiring  $\Omega h^2 \leq 1$  excludes sizable chunks of parameter space even for relatively modest sparticle masses. Unitarity implies that the LSP annihilation cross section must decrease like the square of the inverse of the SUSY breaking scale; the relic density will therefore grow like the square of that scale, up to logarithmic corrections. It then seems plausible to assume that this cosmological constraint might provide useful upper bounds on sparticle masses.

This is indeed true for most values of the dimensionless input parameters, where we have

included the ratios  $m_{1/2}/m_0$  and  $A/m_0$  among the dimensionless parameters of the MSSM. We saw in sec. 2c that the MSSM with heavy top predicts the LSP to be gaugino-like; if its mass exceeds  $m_h/2$  its annihilation cross section will be dominated by the exchange of sfermions in the t-channel, the exchange of right-handed sleptons being especially important due to their large hypercharge and relatively small mass. Demanding that  $\Omega h^2 \leq 1$  is then approximately equivalent to the constraint [47]

$$\frac{\left(m_0^2 + 0.32m_{1/2}^2\right)^4}{m_{1/2}^2 \left(m_0^4 + 0.28m_{1/2}^2 m_0^2 + 0.052m_{1/2}^4\right)} \le 1.8 \cdot 10^5 \text{ GeV}^2,\tag{30}$$

where the value on the r.h.s. is directly proportional to the bound on  $\Omega h^2$  one assumes. The constraint (30) implies [47]:

$$m_0 < 300 \text{ GeV};$$
 (31a)

$$m_{1/2} \le 825 \text{ GeV},$$
 (31b)

or, in terms of physical sparticle masses:

$$m_{\tilde{e}_R} \le 350 \text{ GeV};$$
 (32a)

$$m_{\tilde{e}_L} \le 630 \text{ GeV};$$
 (32b)

$$m_{\tilde{W}_1} \le 700 \text{ GeV};$$
 (32c)

$$m_{\tilde{g}} \le 2.0 \text{ TeV};$$
 (32d)

$$m_{\tilde{q}} \le 1.8 \text{ TeV},$$
 (32e)

where  $m_{\tilde{q}}$  in (32e) again refers to first or second generation squark masses. If these bounds are indeed satisfied, a 1 TeV  $e^+e^-$  collider should detect SU(2) singlet sleptons (unless they happen to lie very close in mass to the LSP), while the LHC should detect squark and gluino production once  $\mathcal{O}(100)$  fb<sup>-1</sup> of data have been accumulated [13].

Unfortunately these bounds only hold if the LSP is gaugino–like and its annihilation cross section is not "accidentally" enhanced. There are several ways of violating at least some of these bounds without overclosing the universe:

- If  $m_{\tilde{Z}_1} \simeq m_h/2$ , s—channel h—exchange can greatly increase the LSP annihilation cross section, and the bounds (31a) and (32a), (32b) can be badly violated [49]. In this case one always has a light chargino, with mass  $m_{\widetilde{W}_1} \simeq m_h$ , and rather light gluino, with  $m_{\tilde{q}} \simeq 3m_h$ . Some sparticles should therefore be easily detectable in this scenario.
- We saw in sec. 2c that the LSP annihilation cross section can be greatly enhanced if  $m_{\tilde{Z}_1} > m_t$  and  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  is not large. This allows arbitrarily large values of  $m_0$ , as long as  $m_{1/2} \leq 750$  GeV so that  $m_{\tilde{Z}_1}$  is not too much larger than  $m_t$ . This still leaves the bounds (31b) and (32c), (32d) more or less unchanged. However, since (32e) can be badly violated, it is not clear whether gluino production at the LHC would have to be detectable in this scenario; note that gluinos always decay into  $t + \tilde{t}_1$  here. The light stop must not be too much heavier than the LSP for this scenario to satisfy the relic

density constraint; this potentially very small mass splitting might make  $\tilde{t}_1$  difficult to detect at hadron colliders. A decisive test of this scenario might then have to rely on the bound (32c), which presumably can only be tested at  $e^+e^-$  colliders with  $\sqrt{s} \geq 1.5$  TeV.

- As mentioned in secs. 2c and 2d, the LSP could still be higgsino-like if  $m_t(m_t) \leq 155 \text{ GeV}$  and  $\tan\beta$  is not small. Such an LSP would have a very large annihilation cross section into pairs of W and Z bosons [62, 47]. A higgsino-like LSP is therefore cosmologically safe as long as  $m_{\tilde{Z}_1} \leq 2 \text{ TeV}$  or so. In this scenario all sparticles (and all Higgs bosons except for h) could therefore be well beyond the reach of existing or planned colliders. As long as we strictly stick to our definition of the MSSM this loophole would be closed if a careful measurement of the top mass shows that  $m_t(m_t) \geq 160 \text{ GeV}$ , i.e. the physical mass exceeds 168 GeV or so. However, it could be re-opened by allowing some very minor modification of the model, as discussed in sec. 3.
- We have mentioned several times that the mass of the pseudoscalar Higgs boson can be greatly reduced if  $\tan\beta$  is large; in particular,  $m_P \simeq 2m_{\tilde{Z}_1}$  becomes possible, see e.g. table 2. In this case s-channel P-exchange contributions will greatly enhance the LSP annihilation cross section, allowing for gaugino-like LSPs with mass well above 1 TeV.<sup>†</sup>

All four scenarios where (some of) the bounds (31), (32) are violated involve some amount of fine–tuning, in the sense that some relation between the input parameters must hold to good precision if the relic density is to remain acceptably small; this comes on top of the fine–tuning necessary to ensure that  $m_Z$  is smaller than sparticle masses, as discussed earlier in this subsection. We nevertheless have to conclude that even within the MSSM we cannot strictly guarantee the detection of any sparticle at any of the colliders that are currently being planned. Moreover, it is quite easy to circumvent the relic density constraint altogether, e.g. by introducing some amount of R—parity breaking which would allow the LSP to decay into SM particles; this possibility is discussed in sec. 4e.

Of course, all this does not mean that we actually expect the LSP mass to exceed 1 TeV; rather, we feel that SUSY would lose much of its appeal if the LHC or a TeV  $e^+e^-$  collider failed to detect any sparticles. However, one should keep in mind that even within the MSSM this sentiment cannot be backed up by mathematically strict upper bounds on sparticle masses.

# 3) Minor Modifications of the MSSM

In this section we discuss extensions or modifications of the MSSM that do not involve new light (s)particles or new interactions between MSSM particles. In sec. 3a we discuss sum rules that allow one to test various aspects of SUSY breaking quantitatively, and in sec. 3b we describe how the existence of a GUT sector might modify the sparticle spectrum

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Note that pseudoscalar Higgs exchange proceeds via an s-wave; it is therefore more efficient than scalar Higgs exchange, which contributes only if the two annihilating LSPs are in a p-wave state.

### 3a) Testing SUSY Breaking via Sum Rules

The boundary conditions (3) describing SUSY breaking at the GUT scale are important ingredients of our definition of the MSSM. They led to eqs.(16) for first and second generation sfermion masses, and eq.(18) for gaugino masses. These latter equations obviously allow to test the boundary conditions once all sparticle masses are known. However, it is often more convenient to test specific relations ("sum rules") between sparticle masses which are independent of the input parameters at the GUT scale, and which in principle allow to test different aspects of SUSY breaking separately.

An obvious, yet very important example is the near-degeneracy of sfermions of the first two generations with identical gauge quantum numbers,  $m_{\tilde{e}_R} = m_{\tilde{\mu}_R}$ ,  $m_{\tilde{u}_L} = m_{\tilde{e}_L}$ , and so on. This remains true as long as there are no new large Yukawa interactions involving the first two generations. In particular, one need not assume eqs.(3a) or (3c). Extensions of the gauge group will also leave this result unchanged as long as the first two generations couple with equal strength to the new gauge boson(s); this is true, e.g., for popular extensions involving new U(1) factors and/or an  $SU(2)_R$  symmetry.

The following sum rules are of even more general validity:

$$m_{\tilde{d}_L}^2 - m_{\tilde{u}_L}^2 = m_{\tilde{e}_L}^2 - m_{\tilde{\nu}}^2 = -M_W^2 \cos(2\beta).$$
 (33)

They follow directly from  $SU(2)_L$  invariance as long as the current eigenstates are also mass eigenstates. Given that  $SU(2)_L$  invariance in the matter sector has been tested quite thoroughly, a violation of one of these relations would most likely indicate mixing between different current states. However, we know that mixing between SU(2) singlet and doublet sfermions of the same electric charge has to be small for the first two generations, due to the smallness of the corresponding fermion masses, see eq.(12). Mixing with exotic sfermion states would presumably also be tightly constrained by the strong bounds [63] on mixing of SM fermions with exotic states. We therefore consider eq.(33) to be the by far most reliable theoretical prediction involving sparticle masses.

The following sum rule is slightly more model dependent [64]:

$$2\left(m_{\tilde{u}_R}^2 - m_{\tilde{d}_R}^2\right) + \left(m_{\tilde{d}_R}^2 - m_{\tilde{d}_L}^2\right) + \left(m_{\tilde{e}_L}^2 - m_{\tilde{e}_R}^2\right) = \frac{10}{3}\sin^2\theta_W M_Z^2\cos(2\beta). \tag{34}$$

It relies on the assumption that sfermions within one generation are degenerate at some energy scale.\* It does not assume degeneracy of gaugino masses at any scale. However, unlike the degeneracy of sfermions with identical gauge quantum numbers it will in general not be valid in the presence of new gauge interactions.

It is difficult to derive useful sum rules for third generation sfermion masses if  $\tan\beta$  is very large, in which case all third generation Yukawa couplings are sizable. However, in the important special case where only  $h_t$  affects the RG running of sfermion masses significantly additional sum rules can be given. Within the MSSM they should hold to good precision as long as  $\tan\beta \leq 15$  or so. In particular [64],

$$m_{\tilde{t}_1}^2 + m_{\tilde{t}_2}^2 - 3m_{\tilde{b}_L}^2 - 2m_t^2 = m_{\tilde{u}_L}^2 + m_{\tilde{u}_R}^2 - 3m_{\tilde{d}_L}^2;$$
(35)

<sup>\*</sup>More exactly, it only assumes that the l.h.s. vanishes at some scale (up to D-terms), since the combination of explicit SUSY breaking mass terms that appears here is an RG invariant in the absence of new interactions.

recall that  $\tilde{b}_L$  is to good approximation a mass eigenstate if  $\tan\beta$  is not large. This sum rule tests degeneracy of sfermions both within one generation and between the first two and the third generation; it is again independent of gaugino masses. The same assumptions also imply

$$\left(m_{\tilde{t}_2}^2 - m_{\tilde{t}_1}^2\right)^2 = 4m_t^2 \left(A_t + \mu \cot\beta\right)^2 + \left(m_{\tilde{b}_L}^2 - m_{\tilde{d}_L}^2 - m_{\tilde{u}_L}^2 + m_{\tilde{u}_R}^2\right)^2,\tag{36}$$

which allows to determine  $|A_t + \mu \cot \beta|$  from the knowledge of sparticle masses alone, if sfermion masses are unified at some scale.

None of the sum rules we have discussed so far tests the unification of gaugino masses. It is in principle possible to test eq.(3a) using sfermion masses [64], at least if eq.(3b) holds; in practice this is hampered by our at present poor knowledge of the coefficient  $c_{\tilde{g}}$  appearing in eqs.(16). It is therefore probably preferable to test relations between gaugino masses more directly. In particular, it has been shown [65] that the relation

$$M_1 = \frac{5}{3} \tan^2 \theta_W M_2 \simeq 0.5 M_2 \tag{37}$$

can be tested to good precision using measurements of chargino production cross sections at an  $e^+e^-$  collider with polarized beams. An even more direct test of the unification of gaugino masses can be made using the following sum rule [64]

$$\sum_{i=1}^{4} \epsilon_i |m_{\tilde{Z}_i}| = \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}{\alpha_3} M_3. \tag{38}$$

Here  $\epsilon_i$  is the sign of the *i*.—th eigenvalue of the neutralino mass matrix. In most of the allowed parameter space only one  $\epsilon_i$  is negative; in the MSSM this will be one of the higgsino-like states. The  $\epsilon_i$  can e.g. be determined from an analysis of off-diagonal  $\tilde{Z}_i\tilde{Z}_j$  production at  $e^+e^-$  colliders. The  $\alpha_i$  are the fine structure constants of the three factor groups of the SM, with  $\alpha_1$  in a GUT normalization. Finally,  $M_3$  is the running gluino mass; it is related to the on-shell mass by eq.(19). Unfortunately this means that for a precision test of eq.(38) we also have to know the squark masses.

Finally, under the same assumptions that led to eqs. (36) and (37) one has:

$$m_P^2 = \frac{m_{\tilde{\nu}}^2 + \mu^2}{\sin^2 \beta};\tag{39}$$

this is simply eq.(28) for small or moderate  $\tan\beta$ . This sum rule tests whether at scale  $M_X$  SUSY breaking scalar masses are the same in the Higgs and matter  $(\tilde{\nu})$  sectors; it is again independent of the unification of gaugino masses. Unfortunately the r.h.s. of eq.(39) cannot easily be written in terms of physical sparticle masses alone. If  $|\mu|$  is large, it is approximately equal to the masses of the heavy neutralino and chargino states [47, 64]. More constraints on  $\mu$  and  $\beta$  can be derived from the following relations [64]:

$$m_{\widetilde{W}_1}^2 + m_{\widetilde{W}_2}^2 = M_2^2 + \mu^2 + 2M_W^2;$$
 (40a)

$$m_{\widetilde{W}_1} m_{\widetilde{W}_2} = \mu M_2 - M_W^2 \sin 2\beta,$$
 (40b)

which follow directly from the structure of the chargino mass matrix and thus only rely on the assumption of minimal particle content. Notice that eq.(40b) is more sensitive to  $\beta$  than the sfermion masses if  $\tan \beta \geq 3$  or so.

The sum rules presented in this subsection hold at the RG-improved tree level. With the exception of eq.(38) we expect radiative corrections to these relations to be quite small, although they obviously will have to be included [66] if these sum rules are to be tested at the percent level. Many of these relations involve differences of large numbers, and necessitate light flavor tagging; it therefore seems unlikely that good tests can be performed using hadron collider data only, although knowledge of the gluino mass might well have to come from hadron collider experiments.

### 3b) GUT Effects

Broadly speaking the presence of a GUT sector can change predictions for the sparticle spectrum in two ways: It can lead to relations between parameters that would otherwise be independent of each other; and it can change the sparticle spectrum at scale  $M_X$ , i.e. the boundary conditions (3). The first effect usually increases the predictive power of the model, while the second tends to decrease it since it will depend on the parameters of the GUT model. We will discuss both kinds of effects in turn.

### 3b1) GUT-Imposed Constraints

The most studied [67, 9] additional prediction due to GUTs is based on the relation  $h_b(M_X) = h_\tau(M_X)$ , which holds in SU(5)-like GUTs (up to small threshold corrections). As shown in fig. 6, taken from Barger et al. [9], this bottom-tau Yukawa unification only leads to the correct value of  $m_b$  (assuming  $m_\tau = 1.78$  GeV) if either  $h_t$  is very large (fixed-point solution), or  $\tan\beta \simeq m_t(m_t)/m_b(m_t)$ , in which case  $h_b$  is quite large. If all Yukawa couplings were much smaller than the strong coupling, QCD effects would increase  $h_b$  too much, giving  $m_b(m_b) \sim 5 - 5.5$  GeV; a large  $h_t$  or large  $h_b$  can slow down the running of  $h_b$  as required by the experimental result  $m_b(m_b) = 4.25 \pm 0.1$  GeV. The parameter space of the MSSM with large  $h_t$  was explored in sec. 2c, and in sec. 2e we discussed the case of large  $\tan\beta$ .

In SO(10) models where the weak–scale Higgs doublets reside entirely within a 10–dimensional representation, one expects all three Yukawa couplings of the third generation to be unified; this uniquely singles out solutions with rather heavy top quark and very large  $\tan \beta$  [69, 70].

#### 6.5truein

**Fig.6:** The region of the  $(m_t, \tan\beta)$  plane that is compatible with the unification of the bottom and tau Yukawa couplings at the GUT scale, for various combinations of  $\alpha_S(m_Z)$  and the effective SUSY threshold. The recently discovered [68] weak–scale threshold corrections to  $m_b$  have not been included here; they might be significant for very large  $\tan\beta$ . Adapted from Barger et al. [9].

It should be mentioned that not even  $b-\tau$  unification can be extended successfully to the first and second generation. Instead one often assumes that the masses of these light

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>It has recently been pointed out [68] that for  $\tan\beta \gg 1$ , weak–scale threshold corrections to  $m_b$  can be large; this changes the shape of the allowed region with large  $\tan\beta$ , depending on the values of the soft–breaking parameters. However, it still remains true that bottom–tau Yukawa unification requires either a very large  $h_t$  or very large  $\tan\beta$ .

fermions are created by non-renormalizable (effective) operators, and are thus suppressed by powers of  $M/M_P$ , where M is some mass of order  $M_X$ . One can construct realistic fermion mass matrices in this fashion, often with fewer parameters than a completely general ansatz would have [70, 71]. Unfortunately it is not easy to test such schemes, since they usually allow some variation in the predicted values of masses and CKM angles. One possibility is to extend the ansatz to the neutrino sector where little solid experimental information exists as yet, so that genuine predictions (as opposed to fits of data) are still possible. None of the schemes suggested to reproduce first and second generation fermion masses seems to lead to new predictions for the sparticle or Higgs spectrum.

A more direct test of the existence of a GUT would be the detection of a process which is strictly forbidden within the MSSM. The most widely studied example [72, 10] is nucleon decay. Unfortunately predictions for the lifetime of the proton depend quite strongly on details of the GUT model. In minimal SUSY SU(5) and similar models the largest contributions to nucleon decay amplitudes involve the exchange of the colored SU(5) partner of the weak-scale SU(2) doublet higgsinos. Within minimal SU(5) one can determine the masses of these SU(3) triplet higgsinos, with some uncertainty, from their threshold effects on the running of the gauge couplings [73, 23]. The result tends to come out rather low; the existing experimental bounds on proton decay then lead to rather strong constraints on the parameter space of the MSSM [10, 49]. In particular, solutions with large  $\tan\beta$  are disfavoured since some of the Yukawa couplings appearing in nucleon decay amplitudes grow  $\propto \tan \beta$ . On the other hand, a large value of  $m_0/m_{1/2}$  tends to suppress nucleon decay, since higgsino exchange leads to a virtual two-sfermion intermediate state which has to be transformed into a two-fermion state by the exchange of a weak-scale chargino or neutralino; the resulting "dressing loop function" is  $\propto m_{1/2}/m_0^2$ . Including bottom-tau unification, minimal SUSY SU(5) thus predicts small  $\tan\beta$ , large  $h_t$ , and  $m_0^2 \gg m_{1/2}^2$ ; the resulting phenomenology has been studied in ref. [55].

However, minimal SUSY SU(5) is not really a satisfactory model, since the required huge mass splitting between the weak–scale Higgs doublets and their SU(5) partners requires extreme fine–tuning of parameters in the GUT superpotential. This is still some improvement over the non–supersymmetric version since this hierarchy, once created, will be stable against radiative corrections [4]; nevertheless it is certainly not a very appealing solution of the hierarchy problem. More elegant solutions [74] require a more complicated GUT Higgs sector. In such models the higgsino exchange contributions to nucleon decay are often severely suppressed or altogether absent; these models do therefore not impose additional restrictions on the values of the soft breaking parameters of the MSSM.

It has recently been argued by Barbieri and Hall [75] that predictions for lepton–number violating processes [76] can be made much more reliably in SUSY GUTs than predictions for nucleon decay. The basic observation is that any GUT model worth its name will unify (s)quarks and (s)leptons within a single representation of the GUT gauge group. We know experimentally that there is mixing between quarks of different generations; this means that the corresponding Yukawa couplings must be nontrivial matrices in generation space. The non–diagonal Yukawa couplings will then generate non–diagonal entries in the slepton mass matrices at the one loop level. These non–diagonal entries will be left essentially unchanged by the RG running from  $M_X$  down to the weak scale. The net effect is that in SUSY GUTs, lepton flavour violating processes like  $\mu \to e \gamma$  are only suppressed by powers

of slepton masses; this is in sharp contrast to non–SUSY GUTs where, in the absence of neutrino masses, these processes are suppressed by powers of  $M_X$  and are thus completely unobservable. Barbieri and Hall estimate [75] that for minimal SUSY SU(5) with large  $h_t$ ,  $\mu \to e \gamma$  decays and  $\mu \to e$  conversion in matter should occur at rates about ten times below present bounds for slepton masses of 100 GeV; the rates scale like  $m_{\tilde{l}}^{-4}$ . More importantly, they argue that this estimate remains roughly valid in a wide class of models, including those giving rise to realistic quark and fermion mass matrices. At present this does not lead to new bounds on sparticle masses beyond those derived from LEP searches, but it certainly gives renewed impetus to efforts to improve the sensitivity of searches for lepton–flavour violating processes.

As a final example for additional constraints on parameter space due to the presence of a GUT we mention the result of ref.[77], where the bound  $|B(M_X)| \geq 2m_0$  was derived under the assumption that the  $\mu$  parameter is created entirely by integrating out superheavy fields of the GUT sector; recall that B appears in the low energy Higgs potential (4). This mechanism offers an appealing solution of the  $\mu$  problem (see Sec. 2.1), since the value of  $\mu$  created in this way is automatically of order of the SUSY breaking scale. However, other solutions to the  $\mu$  problem have been suggested [14, 15].

### 3b2) Changes of the Boundary Conditions

In a supergravity context one would expect the boundary conditions (3) to hold at the Planck scale rather than the GUT scale. RG running between  $M_P$  and  $M_X$  can then change some sparticle and Higgs masses significantly. Additional contributions can come from GUT scale threshold effects (at one loop level), or due to D-terms if the rank of the GUT group is bigger than four.

The possible importance of the RG scaling of soft breaking parameters between  $M_P$  and  $M_X$  was recognized about ten years ago [78]. More recently this has been studied in some detail in ref.[79], within the framework of minimal SU(5). The relevant terms in the superpotential are:

$$W = \lambda' \operatorname{tr} \Sigma^3 + M_{\Sigma} \operatorname{tr} \Sigma^2 + M_H H_1 H_2 + \lambda H_1 \Sigma H_2 + h_U \Psi \Psi H_2 + h_D \Psi \Phi H_1.$$
 (41)

Here  $\Sigma$  denotes a **24** and breaks SU(5),  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  are  $\bar{\bf 5}$  and  $\bf 5$  representations containing the light Higgs fields, and  $\Psi(10)$  and  $\Phi(\bar{\bf 5})$  contain the matter superfields. The RG running between  $M_P$  and  $M_X$  then has essentially three effects:

- We know that at least one Yukawa coupling in eq.(41), that of the top quark, is quite big. The  $h_U$  term will therefore tend to reduce  $m_{H_2}^2$  at  $M_X$ , and also the masses of the third generation sfermions residing in the  $\mathbf{10}$ , i.e.  $\tilde{t}_L$ ,  $\tilde{t}_R$ ,  $\tilde{b}_L$  and  $\tilde{\tau}_R$ . Apart from the reduction of  $m_{\tilde{\tau}_R}^2$  this merely enhances trends that already exist in the MSSM. In particular, the reduction of  $m_{H_2}^2$  increases the value of  $|\mu|$  determined from weak symmetry breaking even further.
- If the coupling  $\lambda$  in eq.(41) is large, it will reduce the masses of both  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  at scale  $M_X$ , compared to squark and slepton masses. This increases the value of  $|\mu|$  yet again, but leaves the masses of the physical Higgs fields at the weak scale more or less unchanged.

• Gaugino loops will increase the masses of members of 10-plets over those of 5-plets. In particular, this increases the masses of stop squarks compared to those of Higgs bosons, and therefore once again requires an increase of  $|\mu|$  to get correct symmetry breaking at the weak scale. Notice that the right-handed (s)leptons also reside in the 10. As a result, in SUSY SU(5) one has [80]

$$m_{\tilde{e}_R}^2 \ge 3.1 M_1^2,$$
 (42)

where  $M_1$  is the bino mass; this is to be compared with  $m_{\tilde{e}_R}^2 \geq 0.87 M_1^2$  in the MSSM. This new constraint reduces the annihilation cross section of bino–like LSPs for given values of  $m_0$  and  $m_{1/2}$ , and therefore lowers the bounds on sparticle masses that follow from imposing an upper limit on the LSP relic density in the "generic" case of a bino–like LSP whose annihilation cross section is not enhanced by s-channel contributions. In particular, the coefficients of  $m_{1/2}^2$  and  $m_{1/2}^4$  in the inequality (30) change, which implies:

$$m_0 \le 225 \text{ GeV};$$
 (43a)

$$m_{1/2} \le 400 \text{ GeV}.$$
 (43b)

In particular (43b) is a much tighter constraint than (31b); it implies  $m_{\tilde{g}} \leq 1$  TeV, so that gluino production should be quite easily observable at the LHC. Recall, however, that these bounds have several loopholes, as discussed in sec. 2f.

Altogether the authors of ref.[79] found that, at least within minimal SU(5), RG scaling between  $M_P$  and  $M_X$  increases  $|\mu|$ , often quite substantially; the masses of the heavy Higgs bosons are usually also increased, although by a smaller amount. For the same set of input parameters the mass of the lightest stop is also increased; however, very small values of  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  are not excluded, since combinations of parameters that previously gave  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}^2 < 0$  might now be allowed.

An additional complication arises when the rank of the GUT group is bigger than four. In this case at least one diagonal group generator needs to be broken to reach the SM gauge group; in general this will lead to the occurrence of nonzero D—term contributions to scalar masses [81, 80]. In an SO(10) model they might allow small values of  $|\mu|$  by giving positive contributions to  $m_{H_2}^2$  [80]. On the other hand, if the D—term contribution is negative for  $m_{H_2}^2$  and positive for  $m_{H_1}^2$ , it becomes easier [82] to find solutions with  $\tan \beta \simeq m_t/m_b$ , since even if  $h_t(M_X) = h_b(M_X)$  one has  $m_{H_1}^2 > m_{H_2}^2$  at the weak scale, as required for  $\tan \beta > 1$ . The sign of the D—terms depends on the details of the GUT model. The breaking of additional U(1) factors at an intermediate scale will in general also produce D—term contributions to scalar masses [81]; these contributions are therefore expected to exist in all models where the rank of the gauge group exceeds four. Such terms could, e.g., destroy the near—degeneracy of squarks within the first or second generation. Since they do not lead to mass splitting between squarks with equal gauge quantum numbers these D—terms do not create problems with flavor—changing neutral currents (FCNC); nevertheless it is clear that sizable mass splittings between different squarks can have substantial impact on collider phenomenology.

One of the most vexing problems in SUSY model building is the failure to construct a realistic GUT model based on the superstring [83]. Part of the problem is that most GUT

models need rather large Higgs representations; these can only be produced in string models if one goes to higher levels of the underlying Kac-Moody algebra, which poses technical difficulties. The semi-realistic models found in ref. [83] usually predict the existence of several new light fields, which destroyed the successful prediction for the gauge couplings at low energies. The "flipped SU(5)" model of ref. [84] manages to break the underlying  $SU(5)\times U(1)$ group down to the SM gauge group using only 10-dimensional Higgs representations. In addition it leads to automatic mass splitting between the light doublet Higgs fields and their GUT partners, and uniquely singles out  $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$  as low energy gauge group. Finally, higgsino exchange does not contribute to nucleon decay in this model. Unfortunately it is not fully unified, since part of the  $U(1)_Y$  factor of the SM gauge group resides in the additional U(1) factor of the GUT group. Superstring theory predicts the two in principle independent couplings of the model to unify at the string scale  $M_C \simeq 5 \cdot 10^{17}$  GeV; however, this gives the correct values for the gauge couplings at low energy only if one introduces additional fields below the unification scale. In this model the apparent unification of gauge couplings with MSSM field content is thus a mere accident. On the positive side, it does not appear to be difficult to derive flipped SU(5) models from superstring theory. See ref. [84] for further discussions of the phenomenology of this model.

We already mentioned that string theory predicts unification of all gauge interactions even if there is no real GUT sector. Unfortunately the predicted unification scale is too high  $(5 \cdot 10^{17} \text{ GeV})$ , unless there are large threshold corrections. While the existence of such large corrections cannot be excluded, from the string point of view they appear to be somewhat unexpected [85]. The problem can be solved by the introduction of additional states below  $M_X$ , as in the flipped SU(5) model, but then one merely fits, rather than predicts, the low energy gauge couplings.

# 4) Major Modifications of the MSSM

In this section we discuss what we consider to be major modifications of the MSSM. We will be quite brief here, partly for reasons of space, and partly because not too many significant predictions for or constraints on sparticle or Higgs masses are known within these models, which almost always contain (far) more parameters than the MSSM does. However, we will try to provide the interested reader with references where more details can be found. Specifically, in sec. 4a we discuss what happens if the boundary conditions (3) are given up, still keeping a "Grand Desert" scenario. We then discuss models with extended Higgs (4b), gauge (4c) and matter (4d) sectors. In sec. 4e we briefly describe models with broken R-parity, and sec. 4f is devoted to a discussion of recent attempts to break SUSY dynamically at a rather low scale (compared to  $M_P$ ).

## 4a) Arbitrary SUSY Breaking at the Planck Scale

We have already seen in sec. 3b that the MSSM predictions of sec. 2 can be altered quite significantly if we modify the boundary conditions (3), e.g. due to RG scaling between  $M_P$  and  $M_X$ . In this subsection we address the question whether one can derive significant constraints on the sparticle or Higgs spectrum simply from the assumption of a Grand Desert

(no intermediate scale between the SUSY breaking and GUT or Planck scales), without having to specify the boundary conditions at very high energies.\*

Not surprisingly, shifts of the allowed region of parameter space are usually not very large if deviations from universality at the GUT scale are modest [86]. The region of very large  $\tan \beta$  is an exception to this rule, since it is quite sensitive to the ratio of Higgs masses at the GUT scale, as already discussed in sec. 3b. Such minor deviations might e.g. be expected in supergravity models with almost (but not entirely) flat Kähler metric. However, if we do not impose any constraints on this metric (or, equivalently, the form of the kinetic energy terms of chiral superfields near  $M_P$ ), arbitrary scalar masses can be generated already at the Planck scale [87, 80]; not even the presence of a GUT sector necessarily implies any relations between scalar masses (between members of the same GUT group multiplet, for example), if the kinetic terms for the light chiral superfields depend on the fields that break the GUT group [88]. Large differences between scalar masses can also appear easily in certain string models [89]; this has spawned renewed interest in this kind of generalized models.

Obviously the number of free parameters is increased greatly if we do not impose constraints on the scalar spectrum at some very high energy; an exhaustive scan of parameter space therefore becomes all but impossible. A perhaps more serious criticism is that models where the two SU(2) doublet Higgs bosons have different masses already at the Planck scale do in general not need any radiative corrections in order to achieve weak gauge symmetry breaking. Note that attempts [90] to understand the size of soft breaking masses dynamically within supergravity or string models all rely on radiative gauge symmetry breaking. The basic observation is that radiative symmetry breaking requires  $\log(M_P/M_{\rm SUSY})\gg 1$ . If the SUSY breaking scale is somehow related dynamically to the vevs of the weak Higgs doublets it is therefore naturally expected to be exponentially smaller than the Planck scale, as required if SUSY is to solve the hierarchy problem. In contrast, the application of this idea to models where Higgs fields acquire a vev already at tree level would give an "infinite" SUSY breaking scale. However, this can be used only as an argument in favor of (nearly) equal Higgs masses at the GUT scale; it is independent of the form of the squark and slepton spectrum.

Certain inequalities between sparticle masses will still hold if we assume that all squared squark and slepton masses are positive (or zero) at the GUT scale. In particular, this implies [38] that squarks of the first and second generation cannot be much lighter than gluinos, see eq.(21). It should be noted, however, that there is nothing intrinsically wrong with having  $m_{\tilde{q}}^2 < 0$  at scale  $M_X$  as long as  $|m_{\tilde{q}}|$  is of order of the weak scale. In this case the tree–level potential renormalized at scale  $M_X$  will have a minimum with  $\langle \tilde{q} \rangle$  of order of the weak scale, or possibly of order  $|m_{\tilde{q}}|/h_q$  where  $h_q$  is a Yukawa coupling. However, in order to determine whether this minimum really exists one should minimize the potential renormalized at the scale of this vev [29]. If the running of  $m_{\tilde{q}}^2$  between  $M_X$  and this lower scale increases it to a positive value, this minimum is in fact spurious. In this case the inequality (21) might be badly violated.<sup>†</sup>

<sup>\*</sup>Of course, constraints from direct experimental searches are more or less independent from assumptions on the sparticle spectrum, at least as far as searches at  $e^+e^-$  colliders are concerned. Here we are mostly interested in constraints imposed by the structure of the model itself, similar to our discussion in sec. 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>This mechanism will not work in the MSSM since there the masses of SU(2) singlet sleptons run very little between  $M_X$  and  $m_Z$ . The requirement  $m_{\tilde{e}_R} > m_{\tilde{Z}_1}$  then excludes the possibility that  $m_0^2$  (=  $m_{\tilde{q}}^2$ 

It is often claimed that a high degree of degeneracy at least between certain squark masses is needed in order to avoid problems with flavor changing neutral current (FCNC) processes, e.g. in  $K^0 - \overline{K^0}$  mixing. The reason is that the introduction of completely arbitrary squark mass matrices (in generation space) in general gives rise to large flavor off-diagonal  $\tilde{g}\tilde{q}_iq_j$  couplings, where  $\tilde{q}_i$  and  $q_j$  are mass eigenstates. Since this involves strong interactions, the size of such couplings is indeed constrained quite severely [91]. These constraints are most easily derived in the basis where the  $\tilde{g}\tilde{q}_iq_j$  couplings are diagonal but the squark mass matrices are not; one can then give rather strong bounds on the off-diagonal entries of these matrices.

For example, from expressions given by Gabbiani and Masiero [91] one can derive the bound

$$\Delta_{\tilde{d}\tilde{s}} \le 1.3 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-1} \cdot \overline{m}_{\tilde{d}\tilde{s}}^3 \tag{44}$$

from the requirement that  $\tilde{g} - \tilde{q}$  box diagrams do not contribute more than the experimental value of  $3.5 \cdot 10^{-15}$  GeV to the  $K_L - K_S$  mass difference. Here  $\Delta_{\tilde{d}\tilde{s}}$  is the off-diagonal (1,2) entry in the mass matrix for charge = 1/3 squarks and  $\overline{m}_{\tilde{d}\tilde{s}}^2$  is the geometric mean of the diagonal (1,1) and (2,2) entries. In deriving the bound (44) we have assumed identical mass matrices for SU(2) doublet and singlet squarks and have ignored mixing between these two sectors. If only one of these two mass matrices has an off-diagonal (1,2) entry the coefficient in (44) has to be increased to  $4.4 \cdot 10^{-5}$  GeV<sup>-1</sup>. (These coefficients depend weakly on the ratio  $m_{\tilde{g}}/m_{\tilde{q}}$ ; the given numbers are for  $m_{\tilde{g}} = m_{\tilde{q}}$ .)

It should be noted, however, that (44) is not really a bound on squark mass splitting, i.e. on the difference of the eigenvalues of the squark mass matrices. For example, if these matrices are diagonal in the current basis, one has  $\Delta_{\tilde{d}\tilde{s}} = \sin\theta_C \cos\theta_C \left(m_{\tilde{d}}^2 - m_{\tilde{s}}^2\right) \simeq \left(m_{\tilde{d}}^2 - m_{\tilde{s}}^2\right)/5$ . This still gives quite a strong bound on  $\tilde{d} - \tilde{s}$  mass splitting, requiring  $|m_{\tilde{d}} - m_{\tilde{s}}| \leq 1.5$  (35) GeV for  $\overline{m}_{\tilde{d}\tilde{s}} = 0.2$  (1.0) TeV. However, due to the smallness of the mixing angles between the third and the first two generations of quarks, quite sizable mass splittings are allowed between squarks of the first two and the third generation if the squark mass matrix is flavor–diagonal in the current basis; this is why the MSSM is not much constrained by FCNC processes even if the top quark is heavy, i.e. third generation squark masses are reduced substantially.

Finally, it is possible that the squark mass matrix is (almost) perfectly aligned with the quark mass matrix, e.g. due to a horizontal symmetry [92]. In this case gluino and neutralino exchange do not contribute at all to FCNC processes. Squark mass splitting is then constrained only by bounds on chargino exchange contributions, which vanish identically for degenerate squarks due to the super–GIM mechanism [93]. Since we are now dealing with a purely weak process which in addition is suppressed by CKM mixing elements the resulting bounds are much weaker than in the previous case. For example, the bound from  $K^0 - \overline{K^0}$  mixing gives:

$$\left| \frac{2 \left( m_{\tilde{u}_L}^2 - m_{\tilde{c}_L}^2 \right)}{m_{\tilde{u}_L}^2 + m_{\tilde{c}_L}^2} \right| \le \frac{m_{\tilde{W}_1}}{1 \text{ TeV}} \sqrt{2 + \frac{m_{\tilde{u}_L}^2 + m_{\tilde{c}_L}^2}{8m_{\tilde{W}}^2}}.$$
(45)

A slightly weaker bound on the  $\tilde{d}_L - \tilde{s}_L$  mass difference follows from the experimental bound on  $D^0 - \overline{D^0}$  mixing. Notice that squark mixing in the SU(2) singlet squark sector is now

at scale  $M_X$ ) is significantly less than zero. Of course, this argument breaks down if we allow squark and slepton masses to differ already at the GUT scale.

completely unconstrained. Moreover, the bound (45) is for on–shell squark masses. The bounds on the running squark masses at the GUT or Planck scale are usually much weaker, due to the large contribution from gluino loops which is, of course, the same for all flavors.<sup>‡</sup> For example, (45) translates into the following constraint on GUT–scale quantities:

$$|\delta_{\tilde{u}\tilde{c}}| \le \frac{0.8m_{1/2}}{1 \text{ TeV}} \left( 1 + 6\frac{m_{1/2}^2}{\overline{m}_0^2} \right) \sqrt{4.3 + 0.4\frac{\overline{m}_0^2}{m_{1/2}^2}},$$
 (46)

where  $\overline{m}_0^2$  is the average and  $\overline{m}_0^2 \delta_{\tilde{u}\tilde{c}}$  the difference between squared  $\tilde{u}_L$  and  $\tilde{c}_L$  squark masses at scale  $M_X$ . Notice that  $\delta_{\tilde{u}\tilde{c}} \simeq 1$  is allowed already for  $\overline{m}_0 = m_{1/2} = 100$  GeV.

We therefore conclude that experimental constraints on FCNC processes do lead to significant bounds on mixing between squarks of the first two generations; in "generic" models, e.g. if the squark mass matrices are diagonal in the current basis, the mass splitting between first and second generation squarks of the same charge is then also tightly constrained. However, much larger mass splittings are allowed for the third generation; no bound on mass splitting between squarks of different charge exists; and even for squarks with the same charge the bounds become quite weak if squark and quark mass matrices are aligned, e.g. due to a horizontal symmetry. Moreover, there could be "accidental" cancellations between different SUSY contributions; this possibility has not been included when deriving the constraints (44), (45). Hence the assumption of a Grand Desert scenario, even when combined with experimental bounds on FCNC processes, does not lead to constraints on sparticle masses that are of general validity, apart from the sum rule (33) which follows directly from SU(2) invariance.

## 4b) Models with Extended Higgs Sector

One of the most frequently studied extensions of the MSSM is the model with an additional Higgs singlet superfield N. This model has the virtue of allowing a purely cubic superpotential; there is no need to introduce a supersymmetric mass term ( $\mu$ -term). Instead, one introduces Higgs self-couplings in the superpotential:

$$W_N = \lambda N H_1 H_2 + \lambda' N^3, \tag{47}$$

so that  $\lambda \langle N \rangle$  serves as an effective  $\mu$ -term. Since N is a gauge singlet, the running of the gauge couplings is not affected significantly; the unification of the gauge couplings observed in the MSSM therefore carries over to this model. However, the introduction of a gauge singlet might be problematic. If it couples to superheavy GUT sector fields, the stability of the gauge hierarchy cannot be guaranteed at the quantum level [95].

The most important phenomenological difference to the MSSM results from the fact that we now have introduced Higgs self–interactions of unknown strength, in addition to the gauge interactions given by the D–term. As a result, we can give an upper bound on the mass of the lightest neutral Higgs scalar only if we can bound the coupling  $\lambda$  in eq.(47) from above; in this respect the model resembles the nonsupersymmetric SM. Such a bound can

 $<sup>^{\</sup>ddagger}$ The running of flavor off-diagonal entries of squark mass matrices and soft breaking A parameters has recently been studied in ref.[94].

be derived [96] from the requirement that  $\lambda$  remains perturbative up to scales of order  $M_X$ . More recently it has been shown [97] that the bound on  $\lambda$  becomes stronger as the Yukawa coupling of the top quark increases. As a result, the upper bound on the mass of the lightest Higgs boson depends only rather weakly on  $m_t$  once Coleman–Weinberg corrections to the scalar potential are included, which grow  $\propto m_t^4$  as in the MSSM. Numerically the bound amounts to about 150 GeV.

Note that the physical Higgs spectrum of this model contains three neutral scalars and two pseudoscalars. The lightest Higgs eigenstate could now be dominantly a gauge singlet, in which case it couples very weakly to gauge bosons or quarks; its production cross section at colliders would then be small. However, in such a situation the bound of about 150 GeV also applies to the next–to–lightest Higgs scalar. It can therefore be shown [98] that an  $e^+e^-$  collider with  $\sqrt{s} \geq 300$  GeV must find at least one of the Higgs bosons of this model. However, as in the case of the MSSM this boson might be very difficult to distinguish from the SM Higgs boson.

It has recently been argued by Sher [99] that the running of the gauge couplings might not even be changed significantly if  $\lambda$  becomes non-perturbative at some scale well below  $M_X$ . In this case no upper bound on the Higgs boson mass can be given; indeed, just like in the heavy Higgs limit of the SM, the existence of a recognizable (narrow) Higgs field itself cannot strictly be guaranteed if Higgs self-interactions become non-perturbative already at the TeV scale. However, it seems to us that requiring the Higgs sector to be well behaved (perturbative) up to some very high energies is much better motivated in the supersymmetric case than without SUSY, since in the latter case the quantum behavior of the theory is in any case problematic. Moreover, it is not clear to us whether the usual proof [4, 17] for the cancellation of quadratic divergencies in SUSY theories still holds in such a strongly coupled model.

Because the lightest Higgs boson of this model might be dominantly a singlet, the usual LEP Higgs mass bounds do not apply. Similarly, the existence of a fifth neutralino state can have consequences for collider phenomenology [100] as well as cosmology [101]. Finally, we mention that this model allows the charged Higgs boson to be lighter than the W boson, in contrast to the MSSM [96].

Since the singlet superfield does not affect the running of the gauge couplings at the one–loop level, eqs.(16)–(20) still hold. However, the third generation sfermion masses, the masses of the heavy Higgs bosons, and the effective  $\mu$ –parameter might all differ significantly from the MSSM. A full RG study is needed to address this question quantitatively [102]. Unfortunately two recent analyses of this model reached somewhat contradictory conclusions [103, 104]. No definite statement can therefore be made at present, although we still expect the light stop and left–handed sbottom squarks to be significantly lighter than first and second generation squarks; the reduction of the masses of the other third generation scalars for large values of  $\tan\beta$  should also remain qualitatively as in the MSSM, but quantitative details will in general differ.

The motivation for an even more extensive modification of the Higgs sector of the MSSM is in our opinion rather weak, unless it is required by the introduction of a larger gauge group; see sec. 4c. We merely mention the possibility that each generation of quarks and leptons might come with its own pair of Higgs doublets [105]. However, in such a model the suppression of Higgs exchange contributions to FCNC processes is no longer automatic

[106]. Moreover, even the first two generations of quarks and leptons might now have sizable Yukawa couplings, if the corresponding vevs are very small (or zero); this might lead to a very complicated (non-degenerate) scalar spectrum at the weak scale.

It should be emphasized that, no matter how complicated the Higgs, gauge and matter sectors are, one can still give quite a strong upper bound on the mass of the lightest neutral Higgs boson, if we require all couplings to remain perturbative up to scales of order  $M_X$  [1]; in fact, this bound is numerically very close to the bound of 150 GeV derived in the model with additional singlet. Moreover, if this bound is saturated the lightest Higgs boson is an SU(2) doublet. We therefore expect that the "no–lose" theorem [57, 98] for SUSY Higgs searches at  $e^+e^-$  colliders with  $\sqrt{s} \geq 300$  GeV (and  $\int \mathcal{L}dt \geq 10$  fb<sup>-1</sup>) holds in all weakly coupled models.

### 4c) Models with Extended Gauge Sector

Models with extended gauge sector at the TeV scale, i.e. additional charged and/or neutral gauge bosons, were very popular in the mid–80's, when it was believed that superstring models singled out the rank–6 GUT group E(6); see ref.[107] for a review of the phenomenology of these E(6) based models. Here we are more interested in possible implications of an extended gauge sector on the spectrum of sparticles that are already present in the MSSM; after all, SUSY predicts that the superpartners of known SM particles must exist, independent of possible extensions of the model.

We have already seen in sec. 3b that an enlargement of the gauge group will in general introduce new D-term contributions to scalar masses. This is true independent of the scale where the group breaks down to the SM gauge group; the only condition is that there has to be some splitting between the masses of the scalar fields responsible for this symmetry breaking [81]. If this symmetry breaking occurs significantly below  $M_X$ , the new gauge interactions will also change the running of sfermion masses, i.e. the coefficients of the terms  $\propto m_{1/2}^2$  in eqs.(16) will change. This can be especially significant for the  $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L$  singlet fields  $\tilde{e}_R$ , since the MSSM predicts their masses to run only slowly. If they are embedded into  $SU(2)_R$  doublets or even  $SU(4)_c$  quartets their masses will run much faster below  $M_X$ . In contrast, the relation (18) between gaugino masses still holds [80] if the gauge group is unified into a GUT at some scale.

The presence of new gauge bosons at the TeV scale means that the chargino, neutralino and Higgs sectors also have to be extended. The masses of these new fields are usually linked intimately to the masses of the new gauge bosons, which are now known to be quite high [39]; otherwise they would have been detected directly at the Tevatron or indirectly (via Z - Z' mixing) at LEP/SLC. Indeed, the necessity to achieve  $m_{Z',W'}^2 \gg m_{Z,W}^2$  can be considered to constitute a second hierarchy problem. If the Higgs bosons that give masses to the new gauge bosons couple to those that break the  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  symmetry of the SM, the parameters of the Higgs potential have to be fine—tuned to produce this hierarchy [108]; note that such a coupling will be present (through the D-terms) whenever the Higgs fields responsible for  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  breaking transform nontrivially under the new gauge group, which is true in all models where the SM gauge group is extended other than by simply appending additional factor groups  $(G = SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times G')$ . While the necessary fine—tuning is much less severe than that needed to produce the hierarchy

between  $m_Z$  and  $M_X$ , it cannot be protected by SUSY, since the SUSY breaking scale in such models is of order  $m_{Z'}$ , not of order  $m_Z$  [108, 109, 110].\* If a new Z' boson were to be discovered we would therefore expect the SUSY breaking scalar masses to be quite high, at least if we assume unification of these masses at some scale. In spite of their large masses the new gauginos and higgsinos might then be produced in the decays of MSSM squarks and sleptons. In such models the MSSM gauginos could still be reasonably light if  $m_{1/2} \ll m_0$ . Another drawback of models where the SM gauge group is embedded nontrivially in a larger group is that the apparent unification of gauge couplings in the MSSM becomes accidental.

In view of these problems the motivation for most Z' models seems quite weak to us. An exception might be models with an  $SU(2)_R$  (or  $U(1)_{B-L}$ ) symmetry [112]. The breaking of this symmetry can give rise to non-vanishing neutrino masses, as might be required to explain the observed solar and atmospheric neutrino anomalies. However, the elegant seesaw mechanism [113] for the generation of very small neutrino masses typically predicts  $SU(2)_R$  to be broken at scale  $M_I \simeq m_\mu^2/m_{\nu_\mu} \simeq 10^9$  GeV for  $m_{\nu_\mu} \simeq 0.01$  eV as required for the standard solution of the solar neutrino problem [114], making the new gauge bosons and their superpartners completely unobservable.

### 4d) Models with Enlarged Matter Sector

Additional matter superfields have also often been studied in the context of "string-inspired" E(6) models [107, 109]. In addition to the fields of the MSSM, a complete 27 of E(6) contains vectorlike charge = -1/3 quarks<sup>†</sup>  $g, \bar{g}$ ; vectorlike  $SU(2)_L$  leptons  $H, \bar{H}$ ; and SM singlets N and  $\nu_R$ . The most general superpotential compatible with the low-energy gauge symmetry of the model contains quite a few terms, not all of which are allowed to be present simultaneously if the proton is to be sufficiently long-lived and neutrinos are to be sufficiently light. The usual solution [115] is to impose some discrete symmetries that constrain the form of the superpotential. There are also weaker constraints on the size of these couplings from rare processes [116]. Many of these new couplings can violate R-parity; see the following subsection. Moreover, couplings of the type  $LQ\bar{g}$  can greatly reduce the mass of  $\tilde{L}$  sleptons, and  $\bar{U}\bar{D}\bar{g}$  couplings can lead to significant squark mass splitting [117]. Even in the absence of new superpotential couplings eqs.(26) will have to be modified [109], since the presence of new matter fields changes the  $\beta$ -functions for the gauge couplings. Recall that we expect sfermions to be "generically" quite heavy in such models, since they contain additional gauge bosons.

The masses of the new vectorlike fermions are proportional to the vev of N and can thus be quite large, of order of the Z' boson mass. However, the  $\widetilde{N}$  fermions obtain masses only through mixing with  $SU(2)_L$  doublets  $\widetilde{H}$ ,  $\widetilde{\overline{H}}$  [118]; they would be massless in the limit of exact  $SU(2)_L$  invariance. One can therefore derive an upper bound of about 120 GeV on the mass of the lightest neutral exotic lepton in such models [119].

<sup>\*</sup>This problem does not exist in models where the Higgs potential possesses a D-flat direction and is stabilized by non–renormalizable terms [111]. However, in in this case the new gauge bosons typically have masses of order  $10^9$  GeV or more and thus completely decouple from the TeV scale; see [110] and references therein. The sfermion spectrum will in general still differ from that of the MSSM, however, as discussed above.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>These fields might be di- or lepto-quarks, depending on the superpotential.

The motivation for such E(6) type models now appears somewhat weak. A much better case can be made for the existence of right-handed neutrino superfields: They are necessary if a complete generation of the SM is to be united in a single representation of a GUT group [the **16** of SO(10)], and allow to produce nonvanishing neutrino masses. As gauge singlets they do not affect the MSSM sparticle spectrum at all, unless one also enlarges the gauge group (see the preceding subsection). However, the  $\tilde{\nu}_R$  fields might play a crucial role in creating the baryon density of the universe [120].

## 4e) Models with Broken R-parity

The MSSM as defined in sec. 2a is invariant under a discrete  $Z_2$  symmetry called R-parity. All SM quarks, leptons and gauge fields as well as the Higgs bosons of the MSSM are even under this parity, whereas their superpartners are odd. Conservation of R-parity implies that sparticles can only be produced in pairs, and that the lightest sparticle is absolutely stable. This obviously has immediate consequences for SUSY searches at colliders [13].

However, the superpotential (1) is *not* the most general one that is compatible with the gauge symmetries of the MSSM; rather, the following terms can be added:

$$W_R = \lambda_L L_L L_L E_R + \lambda_L' L_L Q_L D_R + \lambda_B U_R D_R D_R, \tag{48}$$

where generation indices have again been suppressed. Note that the terms  $\propto \lambda_L, \lambda_L'$  violate lepton number, while the term  $\propto \lambda_B$  violates baryon number; the simultaneous conservation of lepton and baryon number always guarantees the existence of an exact R-parity.\* The bound on the proton lifetime then implies upper bounds of order  $10^{-25}$  or stronger on the products  $\lambda_L \cdot \lambda_B, \lambda_L' \cdot \lambda_B$ , for sfermion masses of 1 TeV or less. One therefore usually assumes either  $\lambda_B = 0$  or  $\lambda_L = \lambda_L' = 0$ . Even in that case bounds on the magnitude of certain couplings in eq.(48) can be derived from bounds on rare processes like  $\mu \to e\gamma$ ,  $K \to \pi l^+ l^-$ , etc. [121].

The existence of R-parity breaking terms in the superpotential can change SUSY phenomenology quite dramatically. If some of the couplings in (48) are of order of the gauge couplings, they have to be included in all stages of cascade decays of heavy sparticles; moreover, new single-sparticle production processes can become important [13]. In the presence of sizable R-parity breaking couplings the running of the corresponding sfermion masses would be altered, so that some of the eqs.(16) might no longer hold. Large R-parity violating couplings involving third generation quarks would also change the "fixed-point" value for the top Yukawa coupling [122]; the same analysis also gives upper bounds on these new couplings from the requirement that they remain perturbative up to the GUT scale.

If the new couplings are much smaller than gauge couplings but larger than about  $3 \cdot 10^{-8} \left(\frac{100 \text{ GeV}}{m_{\tilde{Z}_1}}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{m_{\tilde{f}}}{m_{\tilde{Z}_1}}\right)^2$ , the only effect of R-parity breaking is that the LSP (assumed to be  $\tilde{Z}_1$ , as favored by the RG analysis of sec. 2) will decay inside the detector. If the R-parity couplings are even smaller than this, but larger than about  $3 \cdot 10^{-15} \left(\frac{100 \text{ GeV}}{m_{\tilde{Z}_1}}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{m_{\tilde{f}}}{m_{\tilde{Z}_1}}\right)^2$ ,

<sup>\*</sup>The inverse is not true, i.e. there might be an exact R-parity even if baryon and/or lepton number are broken; this is the case, e.g., in minimal SUSY SU(5).

collider phenomenology will not change, but  $\widetilde{Z}_1$  will decay sufficiently fast not to endanger successful SM predictions for nucleosynthesis [45]; recall that both baryon and lepton number might be broken simultaneously if the couplings in (48) are less than  $10^{-13}$  or so.<sup>†</sup> In this case the LSP relic density constraint on the parameter space of the MSSM (see sec. 2f) obviously no longer applies. Moreover, the LSP might now be charged; in the MSSM with broken R-parity, the lighter stop eigenstate and (if  $m_0 \ll m_{1/2}$  and/or  $\tan\beta \gg 1$ ) the lighter stau eigenstate are possible candidates for a charged LSP. This will again change collider phenomenology, especially if the LSP does not decay inside the detector.

Clearly SUSY phenomenology depends quite strongly on which, if any, of the couplings in (48) are sizable, i.e. whether baryon or lepton number is broken. From a theorist's perspective it seems attractive to ensure the longevity of the proton by a (discrete) gauge symmetry, since otherwise the symmetry is likely to be broken by quantum gravity effects. Viable gauge symmetries, including discrete ones, are constrained by anomaly cancellation conditions. In particular, it was shown in ref.[123] that with the particle content of the MSSM, only two viable discrete  $Z_N$  symmetries survive. One is the standard R-parity, and the other is a  $Z_3$  symmetry that ensures baryon number conservation but allows lepton number violation. This second symmetry actually forbids all proton decay, because it implies a selection rule that baryon number can only be violated in multiples of three units. More complicated anomaly-free discrete symmetries also exist, including examples with conserved lepton number and broken baryon number [123].

In any case, it should be clear that none of the terms in the superpotential (48) need exist in a viable SUSY model. The principle of minimality ("Occam's razor") then argues against their existence. Moreover, the presence of a GUT group often strongly constrains or even completely excludes the possibility of explicit R-parity violation. For instance, in minimal SU(5) all couplings in the superpotential (48) are proportional to each other, and must therefore be of order  $10^{-12}$  or less, as discussed above. Moreover, R-parity conservation is actually automatic in extensions with gauged B-L as long the only nonvanishing VEVs are of fields with even value of  $3 \cdot (B-L)$  [124, 123]; many SO(10) models fall in this category.

Even if the Lagrangian itself is R-parity invariant, it might still be broken spontaneously. This possibility has mostly been discussed in the context of supersymmetric Majoron models [125], where R-parity breaking is linked intimately to the generation of neutrino masses. Such models predict mixing between neutralinos and neutrinos, and between charginos and charged leptons, where the upper bound on the mixing angles is related to the upper bounds on neutrino masses. If  $m_{\nu_{\tau}} \simeq 10$  MeV, these effects might still be observable [125]. In principle R-parity can even be broken radiatively in the MSSM [126] by nonzero (small) vevs of some sneutrinos. However, in order to avoid the creation of an unacceptable massless  $SU(2)_L$  doublet Majoron one has to introduce some explicit R-parity breaking as well, e.g. by adding a term  $\mu'L_LH_2$  to the superpotential. Finally we mention the result of Kuchimanchi and Mohapatra [112] that R-parity has to be broken spontaneously in supersymmetric left-right symmetric models, by vevs of right-handed sneutrinos. In this case the LSP might decay invisibly, leaving collider phenomenology unaltered.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>The LSP decay width is proportional to the square of some R-parity breaking coupling, while the proton decay width is quartic in those couplings. One can therefore simultaneously have  $\tau_{\tilde{Z}_1} \leq 10^6$  sec and  $\tau_p \geq 10^{31}$  yrs even if all couplings in (48) are of comparable size.

### 4f) Models of Dynamical SUSY Breaking

So far we have assumed that SUSY is broken in a "hidden sector" by some unknown dynamics; SUSY breaking is then transmitted to the visible sector by interactions that are suppressed by some power of  $M_P$ . In this approach the only thing we need to know about SUSY breaking, at least as far as phenomenological considerations are concerned, are the boundary conditions, eq.(3) or their modifications discussed in secs. 3 and 4a. In this subsection we summarize recent attempts [127] to understand the dynamics of SUSY breaking in more detail. While these results could in principle also be used in hidden sector models, the characteristic feature of this approach is that it allows SUSY breaking to occur at much lower scales, which can have experimentally testable ramifications.

In these models one introduces additional non-abelian gauge groups, which break SUSY by instanton-effects if the right number of chiral superfields is assumed [128]. This is quite similar to the hidden sector of some supergravity or superstring models. However, one also postulates the existence of a "messenger sector" that transmits SUSY breaking to the gauge and chiral superfields of the MSSM. In ref.[127] this sector consists of a pair of vectorlike  $SU(2)_L$  singlet quarks and a pair of vectorlike doublet leptons, as well as several fields that are singlets under the SM gauge groups but might carry the charge of a new U(1) gauge group. Note that the MSSM matter and Higgs fields are singlets under all the new gauge group factors; moreover, the masses of the messenger fields are expected to lie in the 10 to 100 TeV range. It will therefore be difficult to directly probe these new sectors experimentally.

Nevertheless a number of testable predictions can be derived [127]. To begin with, gaugino masses fulfill the "unification condition" (18), i.e. are proportional to the squared gauge couplings. This is because they are produced radiatively by diagrams involving the vectorlike messenger fields. Sfermion masses are also produced radiatively. They are proportional to the gaugino masses, with known coefficients. For example,  $m_{\tilde{q}} \simeq \frac{16}{\sqrt{3}} m_{\tilde{g}}$  (up to electroweak and higher loop corrections), and  $m_{\tilde{e}_R} \simeq 8M_1$ , where  $M_1$  is the bino mass. Note that sfermions with equal gauge quantum numbers are automatically degenerate in this model, so that there are no problems with FCNC. The reduction of stop (and  $\tilde{b}_L$ ) masses should be less here than in the MSSM, since RG scaling only occurs over  $\sim 5$  (rather than  $\sim 13$  or so) orders of magnitude, and A—terms are expected to be small.

Since all masses are supposed to be created dynamically in this model, the  $\mu$ -term has to be replaced by the vev of a singlet Higgs field, as described in sec. 4b. Finally, since the SUSY breaking scale is relatively low here, the gravitino is the lightest sparticle, with mass in the few keV range. The lifetime for  $\tilde{Z}_1 \to \tilde{G} + \gamma$  decays is estimated to lie in the range  $10^{-13} - 10^{-5}$  seconds, most of which could be covered quite easily in laboratory experiments once a SUSY signal has been found. This last prediction should be very generic for this class of models, since it directly follows from the low SUSY breaking scale; it is independent of the details of the SUSY breaking and messenger sectors.

In the model of ref.[127] the new fields that are nonsinglets under the SM gauge group fill complete multiplets of SU(5); they do therefore not change the predicted value of  $\sin^2\theta_W$  if Grand Unification of the SM gauge interactions is assumed. However, if all gauge interactions of this model were to be unified, a very large GUT group (with rank  $\geq 8$ ) would be needed. Moreover, in the standard hidden sector scenario the transmission of SUSY breaking to the visible sector is basically automatic; it is caused by terms in the Lagrangian whose

presence is dictated by local supersymmetry, although their exact form (and hence the sparticle spectrum) cannot be predicted as yet. From this point of view the introduction of a messenger sector, which is unavoidable if SUSY is to be broken at scales below  $\sqrt{M_P m_Z}$ , appears to be an unnecessary complication. On the other hand, in this model the absence of FCNC can be proven rigorously; in the standard approach it follows from certain assumptions about the scalar spectrum at very high energies. Given that the model appears to be phenomenologically viable, one might as well go ahead and test its predictions.

## 5) Concluding Remarks

A large number of SUSY models have been suggested in the literature; even the subsample discussed in this article might leave some readers bewildered as to what is a "generic" SUSY prediction and what is contingent on details of specific models.

To state the obvious, weak–scale supersymmetry uniquely predicts the existence of superparticles "at the weak scale". As discussed in sec. 2f, even in the MSSM it is difficult to make this statement more quantitative. As long as signals for sparticle production do not differ strongly from those discussed in the framework of the MSSM, the failure to detect SUSY at the LHC would certainly make the idea of weak–scale SUSY much less attractive. It is at present not clear whether SUSY models can be constructed, e.g. by explicitly breaking baryon number conservation and hence R-parity, where squarks and gluinos would be essentially unobservable at hadron colliders even if they are produced copiously; it is certainly fair to say that no real motivation for this kind of SUSY model has yet been advanced. We are not aware of any model where the visibility of charginos and sleptons at  $e^+e^-$  colliders might be jeopardized; the failure to detect these sparticles therefore leads to almost completely model-independent bounds on their masses. However, a 500 GeV collider, which is now being discussed together with the LHC, might in our view not be quite sufficient to decisively test the idea of weak–scale SUSY.

We have emphasized repeatedly that the mass of the lightest neutral Higgs boson has to be less than about 150 GeV in all weakly coupled SUSY models. However, quite similar predictions can be made also in weakly coupled nonsupersymmetric models. A light Higgs does appear to be more natural in the context of supersymmetry, but discovery of the former is not (quite) sufficient to prove the latter.

Turning to relations between sparticle masses, by far the most reliable prediction is the sum rule (33) connecting masses of members of the same  $SU(2)_L$  sfermion doublet. The "unification condition" (18) for gaugino masses also seems to be relatively robust; it even holds in some models that are not unified at all, as discussed in sec. 4f. However, this relation is not protected by a gauge symmetry. One can therefore construct renormalizable (well-behaved) models where it is broken, although at present the motivation for doing so is lacking.

We feel that the possibility of radiative gauge symmetry breaking described in sec. 2b is a great advantage of SUSY models. However, it is difficult to derive model–independent predictions from the assumption of radiative symmetry breaking alone. In models with minimal particle content below the GUT scale, i.e. in Grand Desert scenarios, one would generically expect a large  $\mu$ -parameter, i.e. heavy higgsinos, given that the top is heavy.

However, if we allow some fine–tuning as well as non–degenerate scalar masses at scale  $M_X$ , small values of  $\mu$  cannot strictly be excluded.

We feel that models with automatic suppression of the most dangerous (gluino induced) FCNC are preferable. However, as shown in sec. 4a, this does not necessarily imply the degeneracy of scalars with equal gauge quantum numbers. Assuming equal masses, say, for  $\tilde{u}_R$  and  $\tilde{d}_R$  type squarks can at present only be motivated by simplicity arguments. In contrast, the degeneracy of the eight gluinos is obviously guaranteed by  $SU(3)_c$  invariance. Searches for gluino production at hadron colliders might therefore be somewhat less model dependent than squark searches, although gluino decay branching ratios, and hence signals for gluino production, do depend on the squark spectrum.

The MSSM as described in sec. 2 is certainly a very attractive SUSY model. It has a fairly small number of free parameters, which makes it quite predictive, and easily passes all experimental tests. Unfortunately it seems quite unlikely to us that it is exactly correct. For example, present data offer tantalizing hints at a Grand Unified theory, see fig. 2; we saw in sec. 3b that the presence of a GUT sector could modify some predictions of the MSSM substantially. It should be admitted, however, that no really compelling SUSY GUT has yet been suggested. The minimal SU(5) model needs extreme fine-tuning of parameters. Models that solve this problem tend to be either quite complicated (like models employing the missing partner mechanism), or offer only partial unification (like flipped SU(5) models). From a theoretical point of view the difficulty in understanding the apparent unification of gauge couplings in the MSSM at a scale around 10<sup>16</sup> GeV in the framework of superstring theory, either with or without the presence of a GUT sector, is also quite annoying. At present we can therefore only state that even within the Grand Desert scenario we expect some modifications of the MSSM due to physics at very high scales,  $\geq 10^{16}$  GeV. These modifications may only amount to a few percent, as in threshold corrections to gauge couplings, but might also be much more significant. Of course, it is also possible that the MSSM needs to be changed more extensively, see sec. 4. One should therefore always be aware that testing the MSSM is *not* the same as testing SUSY.

It is perhaps worth emphasizing again that even within the MSSM the sparticle spectrum at the weak scale is more complicated than has often been assumed. In particular, squarks and sleptons do usually not have the same masses. Assuming a fixed mass ratio, independent of gaugino masses, is hardly better. Moreover, at least some third generation squarks are expected to be lighter than those of the first two generations. The failure to discover these mass splittings would indicate a rather complicated form of the spectrum at high energies, and/or new interactions involving light quarks. Since  $|\mu|$  is large, we expect most Higgs bosons to be quite heavy, unless  $\tan\beta$  is large, in which case we expect the mass splitting between the first two and the third generation to also exist in the slepton sector. In general it seems to us that having a highly degenerate spectrum at very high energies, where physics is supposed to be simple (i.e. unified) is preferable, even if this implies a fairly diverse spectrum at experimentally accessible energies.

Lest the reader be discouraged we want to end on an upbeat note. At least within supergravity (or string) models, studying sparticle masses and mixings is *the* best way to learn about Planck scale physics. Even in models of dynamical SUSY breaking discussed in sec. 4f the sparticle spectrum contains information about physics at mass scales which will not be directly accessible to experiment within our lifetime. Of course, finding a superparticle

would be a very great discovery in itself. Measuring sparticle masses and interactions will then allow us a glimpse at truly fundamental physics.

### Acknowledgements

We thank X. Tata, G.L. Kane and V. Barger for a critical reading of the manuscript and useful comments, and Y. Okada for discussions on models with extended Higgs sector. We owe special thanks to Heath Pois for his collaboration during the early stages of this project, as well as a careful reading of the final manuscript. The work of M.D. was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy under grant No. DE-FG02-95ER40896, by the Wisconsin Research Committee with funds granted by the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation, as well as by a grant from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft under the Heisenberg program. The work of S.P.M. was supported in part by the US Department of Energy.

# References

- G.L. Kane, C. Kolda and J.D. Wells, Phys. Rev. Lett 70, 2686 (1993); D. Comelli and C. Verzegnassi, Phys. Rev. D47, 764 (1993).
- [2] R. Haag, J. Lopuszanski and M. Sohnius, Nucl. Phys. **B88**, 257 (1975).
- [3] See the chapter by G.L. Kane et al. in this volume, and references therein.
- [4] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B188, 513 (1981); N. Sakai, Z. Phys. C11, 153 (1981); S. Dimopoulos and H. Georgi, Nucl. Phys. B193, 150 (1981); R.K. Kaul and P. Majumdar, Nucl. Phys. B199, 36 (1982).
- [5] E. Gildener and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D13**, 3333 (1976); E. Gildener, Phys. Rev. **D14**, 1667 (1976).
- [6] L.E. Ibáñez and G.G. Ross, Phys. Lett. 110B, 215 (1982); L.E. Ibáñez, Phys. Lett. 118B, 73 (1982); J. Ellis, D.V. Nanopoulos and K. Tamvakis, Phys. Lett. 121B, 123 (1983); L. Alvarez-Gaumé, J. Polchinski and M.B. Wise, Nucl. Phys. B221, 495 (1983); L.E. Ibáñez and C. López, Nucl. Phys. B233, 511 (1984); C. Kounnas, A.B. Lahanas, D.V. Nanopoulos and M. Quirós, Nucl. Phys. B236, 438 (1984); G.F. Guidice and G. Ridolfi, Z. Phys. C41, 447 (1988); M. Olechowski and S. Pokorski, Phys. Lett. 214B, 239 (1988); W. Majerotto and B. Mösslacher, Z. Phys. C48, 273 (1990).
- [7] P. Langacker and N. Polonsky, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 4028 (1993).
- [8] U. Amaldi, W. de Boer and H. Fürstenau, Phys. Lett. 260B, 447 (1991); P. Langacker and M. Luo, Phys. Rev. D44, 817 (1991); J. Ellis, S. Kelley and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B260, 131 (1991).
- [9] V. Barger, M.S. Berger and P. Ohmann, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 1093 (1993); P. Langacker and N. Polonsky, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 1454 (1994); M. Carena, S. Pokorski and C.E.M. Wagner, Nucl. Phys. **B406**, 59 (1993).

- [10] P. Nath, A. Chamseddine and R. Arnowitt, Phys. Rev. **D32**, 3248 (1985); J. Hisano,
   H. Murayama and T. Yanagida, Nucl. Phys. **B402**, 46 (1993).
- [11] H. Goldberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 50, 1419 (1983); J. Ellis, J. Hagelin, D.V. Nanopoulos,
   K. Olive and M. Srednicki, Nucl. Phys. B238, 453 (1984).
- [12] See the chapter S. Chivukula et al. in this volume.
- [13] See the chapter by H. Baer et al. in this volume.
- [14] G.F. Giudice and A. Masiero, Phys. Lett. B206, 480 (1988); J.A. Casas and C. Muñoz, Phys. Lett. B306, 288 (1993).
- [15] J.E. Kim and H.P. Nilles, Phys. Lett. **B138**, 50 (1984), and **B263**, 79 (1991).
- [16] R.D. Peceei and H.R. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. 38, 1440 (1977).
- [17] L. Girardello and M.T. Grisaru, Nucl. Phys. **B194**, 65 (1982).
- [18] For reviews, see H.P. Nilles, Phys. Rep. **110**, 1 (1984); P. Nath, R. Arnowitt and A. Chamseddine, *Applied N=1 Supergravity*, ITCP Series in Theoretical Physics (World Scientific, Singapore, 1984), Vol. 1.
- [19] L.J. Hall and L.Randall, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 2939 (1990).
- [20] L.J. Hall, J. Lykken and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D27**, 2359 (1983).
- [21] K. Inoue, A. Kakuto, H. Komatsu and H. Takeshita, Prog. Theor. Phys. 68, 927 (1982) and 71, 413 (1984).
- [22] I. Jack, D.R.T. Jones, S.P. Martin, M.T. Vaughn and Y. Yamada, Phys. Rev. D50, 5481 (1994), and references therein.
- [23] J. Bagger, K. Matchev and D. Pierce, Johns Hopkins preprint JHU-TIPAC-95001, hep-ph 9501277.
- [24] K. Inoue, A. Kakuto, H. Komatsu and S. Takeshita, Prog. Theor. Phys. 67, 1889 (1982); R.A. Flores and M. Sher, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 148, 95 (1983); J.F. Gunion and H.E. Haber, Nucl. Phys. B272, 1 (1986).
- [25] CDF collab. F. Abe et al., Phys. Rev. D50, 2966 (1994), and FERMILAB-PUB-95-022-E, hep-ex 9503002; D0 collab., S. Abachi et al., FERMILAB-PUB-95-028-E, hep-ex 9503003.
- [26] R. Tarrach, Nucl. Phys. B183, 384 (1980); H. Gray, D.J. Broadhurst, W. Grafe and K. Schilcher, Z. Phys. C48, 673 (1990); H. Arason, D.J. Castano, B. Keszthelyi, S. Mikaelian, E.J. Piard, P. Ramond and B.D. Wright, Phys. Rev. D46, 3945 (1992).
- [27] J. Ellis and S. Rudaz, Phys. Lett. **128B**, 248 (1983).
- [28] M. Drees and M.M. Nojiri, Nucl. Phys. **B369**, 54 (1992).

- [29] G. Gamberini, G. Ridolfi and F. Zwirner, Nucl. Phys. **B331**, 331 (1990).
- [30] S. Coleman and E. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D7**, 1888 (1973).
- [31] Y. Okada, M. Yamaguchi and T. Yanagida, Prog. Theor. Phys. 85, 1 (1991), and Phys. Lett. B262, 54 (1991); R. Barbieri, M. Frigeni and F. Caravaglio, Phys. Lett. B258, 167 (1991); H.E. Haber and R. Hempfling, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 1815 (1991).
- [32] J. Ellis, G. Ridolfi and F. Zwirner, Phys. Lett. **B257**, 83 (1991), and **B262**, 477 (1991).
- [33] M. Drees and M.M. Nojiri, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 2482 (1992).
- [34] S.P. Martin and M. Vaughn, Phys. Lett. **B318**, 331 (1993).
- [35] A. Bouquet, J. Kaplan and C.A. Savoy, Nucl. Phys. **B262**, 299 (1985).
- [36] G.G. Ross amd R.G. Roberts, Nucl. Phys. B377, 571 (1992); R. Arnowitt and P. Nath, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 725 (1992); S. Kelley, J. Lopez, D.V. Nanopoulos, H. Pois and K. Yuan, Nucl. Phys. B398, 3 (1993); G.L. Kane, C. Kolda, L. Roszkowski and J. Wells, Phys. Rev. D49, 6173 (1994).
- [37] M. Carena, M. Olechowski, S. Pokorski and C.E.M. Wagner, Nucl. Phys. B419, 213 (1994); M. Carena and C.E.M. Wagner, CERN-TH-7393-94; see also D.J. Castaño, E.J. Piard and P. Ramond, Phys. Rev. D49, 4882 (1994); B. Ananthanarayan, K.S. Babu and Q. Shafi, Nucl. Phys. B428, 19 (1994).
- [38] U. Ellwanger, Phys. Lett. **B141**, 435 (1984).
- [39] Particle Data Group, L. Montanet et al., Phys. Rev. **D50**, 1173 (1994).
- [40] C.T. Hill, Phys. Rev. **D24**, 691 (1981); B. Pendelton and G.G. Ross, Phys. Lett. **98B**, 291 (1981); E.A. Paschos, Z. Phys. **C26**, 235 (1984).
- [41] C. Kounnas, I. Pavel, G. Ridolfi and F. Zwirner, CERN-TH/95-11, hep-ph 9502318.
- [42] T. Kon and T. Nonaka, Phys. Lett. **B319**, 355 (1993).
- [43] H. Baer, X. Tata and J. Woodside, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 207 (1991).
- [44] S. Wolfram, Phys. Lett. 82B, 65 (1979); C.B. Dover, T.R. Gaisser and G. Steigman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 42, 1117 (1979). For experimental bounds see P.F. Smith et al., Nucl. Phys. B206, 333 (1982).
- [45] T. Moroi, H. Murayama and M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Lett. **B303**, 289 (1993).
- [46] J.M. Frère, D.R.T. Jones and S. Raby, Nucl. Phys. B222, 11 (1983); M. Claudson, L. Hall and I. Hinchliffe, Nucl. Phys. B228, 501 (1983).
- [47] M. Drees and M.M. Nojiri, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 376 (1993).
- [48] E.W. Kolb and M.S. Turner, *The Early Universe*, Addison-Wesley (New York, 1990).

- [49] R. Arnowitt and P. Nath, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 3696 (1993); J.L. Lopez, D.V. Nanopoulos and K. Yuan, Phys. Rev. D48, 2766 (1993).
- [50] K. Griest and D. Seckel, Phys. Rev. **D43**, 3191 (1991).
- [51] M. Drees, K. Hagiwara and A. Yamada, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 1725 (1992); J.L. Lopez,
   D.V. Nanopoulos, G.T. Park, H. Pois and K. Yuan, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 3297 (1993).
- [52] S. Bertolini, F. Borzumati, A. Masiero and G. Ridolfi, Nucl. Phys. B353, 591 (1991);
   M.A. Diaz, Phys. Lett. B322, 207 (1994); F.M. Borzumati, Z. Phys. C63, 291 (1994).
- [53] M. Drees and M.M. Nojiri, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 4595 (1994).
- [54] G. Altarelli and R. Rückl, Phys. Lett. 144B, 126 (1984); I. Bigi and S. Rudaz, Phys. Lett. 153B, 335 (1985); H. Baer and X. Tata, Phys. Lett. 167B, 241 (1986); K. Hikasa and M. Kobayashi, Phys. Rev. D36, 724 (1987); M. Drees and K. Hikasa, Phys. Lett. B252, 127 (1990); H. Baer, J. Sender and X. Tata, Phys. Rev. D50, 4517 (1994).
- [55] H. Baer, M. Drees, C. Kao, M.M. Nojiri and X. Tata, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 2148 (1994).
- [56] V. Barger, M.S. Berger and P. Ohmann, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 4908 (1994).
- [57] V. Barger, K. Cheung, R.J.N. Phillips and A. Stange, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 3041 (1993);
  A. Djouadi, J. Kalinowski and P.M. Zerwas, Z. Phys. **C57**, 569 (1993);
  A. Yamada, Z. Phys. **C61**, 247 (1994).
- [58] R. Barbieri and G.F. Giudice, Nucl. Phys. **B306**, 63 (1988).
- [59] B. de Carlos and J.A. Casas, Phys. Lett. **B309**, 320 (1993).
- [60] G.W. Anderson and D.J. Castaño, MIT-CTP-2350, hep-ph 9409419, and MIT-CTP-2369, hep-ph 9412322.
- [61] G.L. Kane et al., in [36].
- [62] K. Griest, M. Kamionkowski and M.S. Turner, Phys. Rev. **D41**, 3565 (1990); J. Mc-Donald, K.A. Olive and M. Srednicki, Phys. Lett. **B283**, 80 (1992).
- [63] E. Nardi, E. Roulet and D. Tommasini, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 3040 (1992).
- [64] S.P. Martin and P. Ramond, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 5365 (1993).
- [65] T. Tsukamoto, K. Fujii, H. Murayama, M. Yamaguchi and Y. Okada, KEK–PREPRINT–93-146 (to appear in Phys. Rev. **D**).
- [66] D. Pierce and A. Papadopoulos, Phys. Rev. D50, 565 (1994), and Nucl. Phys. B430, 278 (1994).
- [67] L.E. Ibáñez and C. Lopez, Phys. Lett. B126, 54 (1983); H. Arason, D. Castaño, B. Keszthelyi, S. Mikaelian, E. Piard, P. Ramond and B.D. Wright, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 2933 (1991); A. Giveon, L.J. Hall and U. Sarid, Phys. Lett. B271, 138 (1991).

- [68] L.J. Hall, R. Rattazzi and U. Sarid, Phys. Rev. D50, 7048 (1994); M. Carena, M. Olechowski, S. Pokorski and C.E.M. Wagner, Nucl. Phys. B426, 269 (1994); R. Hempfling, Phys. Rev. D49, 6168 (1994); B.D. Wright, MAD/PH/812, hep-ph 9404217.
- [69] B. Ananthanarayan, G. Lazarides and Q. Shafi, Phys. Rev. D44, 1613 (1991); G. Lazarides and C. Panagiotakopoulos, Phys. Lett. B337, 86 (1994).
- [70] S. Dimopoulos, L.J. Hall and S. Raby, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 4192 (1992); G. Anderson, S. Raby, S. Dimopoulos, L.J. Hall and G.D. Starkman, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 3660 (1994).
- [71] L.E. Ibáñez and G.G. Ross, Phys. Lett. B332, 100 (1994); D.B. Kaplan and M. Schmaltz, Phys. Rev. D49, 3741 (1994).
- [72] N. Sakai and T. Yanagida, Nucl. Phys. B197, 533 (1982); S. Dimopoulos, S. Raby and F. Wilzcek, Phys. Lett. 112B, 133 (1982); D.V. Nanopoulos and K. Tamvakis, Phys. Lett. 114B, 235 (1982); J.P. Derendinger and C.A. Savoy, Phys. Lett. 118B, 347 (1982).
- [73] J. Hisano, H. Murayama and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 1014 (1992); K. Hagiwara and Y. Yamada, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 709 (1993); J. Hisano, T. Moroi, K. Tobe and T. Yanagida, Tohoku Univ. preprint TU-470, hep-ph 9411298.
- [74] A. Masiero, D.V. Nanopoulos, K. Tamvakis and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. 115B, 380 (1982); B. Grinstein, Nucl. Phys. B206, 327 (1982); K.S. Babu and S.M. Barr, Phys. Rev. D48, 5354 (1993); J. Hisano, H. Murayama and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. D49, 4966 (1994); T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B344, 211 (1995).
- [75] R. Barbieri and L.J. Hall, Phys. Lett. **B338**, 212 (1994).
- [76] L.J. Hall, V.A. Kostelecky and S. Raby, Nucl. Phys. B267, 415 (1986); F. Gabbiani and A. Masiero, Phys. Lett. B209, 289 (1988).
- [77] G.F. Giudice and E. Roulet, Phys. Lett. **B315**, 107 (1993).
- [78] P. Moxhay and K. Yamamoto, Nucl. Phys. B256, 130 (1985); K. Grassie, Phys. Lett. B159, 32 (1985); B. Gato, Nucl. Phys. B278, 189 (1986), and Z. Phys. C35, 77 (1987).
- [79] N. Polonsky and A. Pomarol, hep-ph 9410231.
- [80] Y. Kawamura, H. Murayama and M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. **D51**, 1337 (1995).
- [81] M. Drees, Phys. Lett. B181, 279 (1986); J.S. Hagelin and S. Kelley, Nucl. Phys. B342,
   95 (1990); H.-C. Cheng and L.J. Hall, LBL-35950, hep-ph 9411276.
- [82] R. Hempfling, DESY-94-078, hep-ph 9405252.
- [83] G. Aldazabal, A. Font, L.E. Ibáñez and A.M. Uranga, hep-th 9410206.
- [84] For example, J.L. Lopez, D.V. Nanopoulos and K. Yuan, Nucl. Phys. B399, 654 (1993);
  J.L. Lopez, Lectures given at the 22nd ITEP Winter School of Physics, Moscow,
  Russia, 1994, hep-ph 9405278; and references therein.

- [85] V.A. Kaplunovsky, Nucl. Phys. B307, 145 (1988); L.E. Ibáñez, D. Lüst and G.G. Ross, Phys. Lett. B272, 251 (1991).
- [86] D. Matalliotakis and H.P. Nilles, Nucl. Phys. **B435**, 115 (1995).
- [87] S.K. Soni and H.A. Weldon, Phys. Lett. 126B, 215 (1983).
- [88] M. Drees, Phys. Rev. **D33**, 1468 (1986).
- [89] A. Brignole, L.E. Ibáñez and C. Muñoz, Nucl. Phys. **B422**, 125 (1994).
- [90] Such "no-scale" models are discussed within a supergravity context in: E. Cremmer, S. Ferrara, C. Kounnas and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. 133B, 61 (1983); J. Ellis, A.B. Lahanas, D.V. Nanopoulos and K. Tamvakis, Phys. Lett. 134B, 429 (1984); J. Ellis, C. Kounnas and D.V. Nanopoulos, Nucl. Phys. B241, 406 (1984), and B247, 373 (1984). For recent papers within the context of superstring models, see: C. Kounnas, I. Pavel and F. Zwirner, Phys. Lett. B335, 403 (1995); A. Brignole and F. Zwirner, Phys. Lett. B342, 117 (1995); S. Kelley, J.L. Lopez, D.V. Nanopoulos and A. Zichichi, CERN-TH.7433/94, hep-ph 9409223.
- [91] M.J. Duncan, Nucl. Phys. B221, 285 (1983); J.F. Donoghue, H.P. Nilles and D. Wyler, Phys. Lett. 128B, 55 (1983); A. Bouquet, J. Kaplan and C.A. Savoy, Phys. Lett. B148, 69 (1984); M. Dugan, B. Grinstein and L.J. Hall, Nucl. Phys. B255, 413 (1985); F. Gabbiani and A. Masiero, Nucl. Phys. B322, 235 (1989); J. Hagelin, S. Kelley and T. Tanaka, Nucl. Phys. B415, 293 (1994).
- [92] Y. Nir and N. Seiberg, Phys. Lett. **B309**, 337 (1993).
- [93] J. Ellis and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. 110B, 44 (1982); R. Barbieri and R. Gatto, Phys. Lett. 110B, 343 (1982); B.A. Campbell, Phys. Rev. D28, 209 (1983).
- [94] Ph. Brax and C.A. Savoy, Univ. Cambridge preprint DAMTP 95-03, hep-ph 9503306.
- [95] H.P. Nilles, M. Srednicki and D. Wyler, Phys. Lett. 124B, 337 (1983).
- [96] M. Drees, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A4, 3635 (1989); J. Ellis, J.F. Gunion, H.E. Haber, L. Roszkowski and F. Zwirner, Phys. Rev. D39, 844 (1989).
- [97] U. Ellwanger, Phys. Lett. B303, 271 (1993); J. Elliott, S.F. King and P.L. White, Phys. Rev. D49, 2435 (1994).
- [98] J. Kamoshita, Y. Okada and M. Tanaka, Phys. Lett. **B328**, 67 (1994).
- [99] M. Sher, William and Mary preprint WM-94-107, hep-ph 9406253.
- [100] F. Franke, H. Fraas and A. Bartl, Phys. Lett. **B336**, 415 (1994).
- [101] S.A. Abel, S. Sarkar and I.B. Whittingham, Nucl. Phys. B392, 83 (1993).
- [102] J.P. Derendinger and C.A. Savoy, Nucl. Phys. **B237**, 307 (1984).

- [103] U. Ellwanger, M. Rausch de Trautenberg and C.A. Savoy, Phys. Lett. **B315**, 331 (1993), and Orsay preprint LPTHE 95–04, hep-ph 9502206.
- [104] J. Elliott, S.F. King and P.L. White, Southampton Univ. preprint SHEP-93/94-19, hep-ph 9406303.
- [105] K. Griest and M. Sher, Phys. Rev. **D42**, 3834 (1990).
- [106] S.L. Glashow and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D15, 1958 (1977); E.A. Paschos, Phys. Rev. D15, 1966 (1977).
- [107] J. Hewett and T.G. Rizzo, Phys. Rep. 183, 193 (1989).
- [108] M. Drees, N.K. Falck and M. Glück, Phys. Lett. **B167**, 187 (1986).
- [109] J. Ellis, K. Enqvist, D.V. Nanopoulos and F. Zwirner, Nucl. Phys. B276, 14 (1986);
   L.E. Ibáñez and J. Mas, Nucl. Phys. B286, 107 (1986).
- [110] D. Suematsu and Y. Yamagishi, Kanazawa Univ. preprint 94–22, hep-ph 9411239.
- [111] M. Dine, V. Kaplunovsky, M. Mangano, C. Nappi and N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. B259, 549 (1985).
- [112] M. Cvetic and J.C. Pati, Phys. Lett. 135B, 57 (1984); R. Kuchimanchi and R.N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. D48, 4352 (1993); K. Huitu and J. Maalampi, Phys. Lett. B344, 217 (1995).
- [113] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and S. Slansky, in *Supergravity*, eds. P. van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Freedman (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979), p. 315; T. Yanagida, in *Workshop on Unified Theory and Baryon Number in the Universe*, eds. A. Sawada and H. Sugawara (KEK, Tsukuba, Japan, 1979).
- [114] For example, N. Hata and P. Langacker, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 632 (1994), and references therein.
- [115] D.J. Castaño and S.P. Martin, Phys. Lett. **B340**, 67 (1994).
- [116] B.A. Campbell, J. Ellis, K. Enqvist, M.K. Gaillard and D.V. Nanopoulos, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A2, 831 (1987).
- [117] M. Drees, Nucl. Phys. **B298**, 333 (1988).
- [118] J. Ellis, D.V. Nanopoulos, S.T. Petcov and F. Zwirner, Nucl. Phys. **B283**, 93 (1987).
- [119] M. Drees and X.R. Tata, Phys. Lett. **B196**, 65 (1987).
- [120] H. Murayama and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. **B322**, 349 (1993).
- [121] V. Barger, G.F. Giudice and T. Han, Phys. Rev. **D40**, 2987 (1990).
- [122] B. Brahmachari and P. Roy, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 39 (1994).

- [123] L.E. Ibáñez and G.G. Ross, Nucl. Phys. **B368**, 3 (1992).
- [124] R.N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. D34, 3457 (1986); A. Font, L.E. Ibáñez and F. Quevedo,
   Phys. Lett. B228, 79 (1989); S.P. Martin, Phys. Rev. D46, 2769 (1992).
- [125] A. Masiero and J.W.F. Valle, Phys. Lett. B253, 273 (1990); J.C. Romao and J.W.F. Valle, Nucl. Phys. B381, 87 (1992).
- [126] D. Comelli, A. Masiero, M. Pietroni and A. Riotto, Phys. Lett. **B324**, 397 (1994).
- [127] M. Dine, A. Nelson and Y. Shirman, Phys. Rev. **D51**, 1362 (1995).
- [128] I. Affleck, M. Dine and N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. **B256**, 557 (1985).