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Abstract

Supersymmetric (SUSY) theories such as the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) predict a new particle spectrum, including an extended Higgs sector, in order to address fundamental questions that remain unanswered with the results obtained at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) so far. Despite an extensive programme to search for additional Higgs bosons at the LHC, no new Higgs-like particles have been observed beyond the discovered signal at 125 GeV. Such searches have not taken into account $CP$-violating effects in the Higgs sector, which are well-motivated in the light of the perceived baryon asymmetry in the universe, and which can induce significant deviations in the phenomenology of the Higgs bosons. The search for additional Higgs bosons should therefore account for the possibility that they may not necessarily be $CP$-eigenstates. In the most general case where the MSSM parameters can be complex, the three neutral Higgs bosons of the theory are the loop-corrected mass eigenstates $\{h_1, h_2, h_3\}$, which are admixtures of the tree-level $CP$-even and $CP$-odd Higgs states. This thesis focusses on the effects of complex parameters on the production cross sections of these Higgs bosons and the interference occurring between nearly mass-degenerate Higgs states. In the first part of this thesis, we discuss higher-order corrections in the Higgs sector which give rise to $CP$-violating mixing between the tree-level mass eigenstates, and present a computation of inclusive cross sections for the production of the $CP$-admixed Higgs bosons through gluon fusion and bottom-quark annihilation. The predictions for the gluon-fusion process are based on an explicit calculation of the leading-order cross section for the general case of arbitrary complex parameters, supplemented by various higher-order corrections. The cross sections for the bottom-quark annihilation process are treated with a simple re-weighting procedure. In the next part, we describe the implementation of our cross-section predictions into an extension of the numerical code SusHi, named SusHiMi. In our numerical analysis, we employ SusHiMi to study the effects of the phase of the soft SUSY-breaking trilinear coupling of the Higgs with the top squark, and of the phase of the gluino mass parameter on the neutral Higgs cross sections, masses, and mixings. We demonstrate that squark effects can be strongly dependent on the phases of the complex parameters, and emphasise the relevance of the resummation of squark effects in the bottom-Yukawa coupling. Furthermore, we show that in a scenario where the two heavy Higgs bosons, $h_2$ and $h_3$, are strongly admixed and nearly mass-degenerate, experimentally resolving the two Higgs bosons as separate signals may not be possible. Only the sum of their cross sections including interference terms can be measured experimentally. Finally, we incorporate our cross section predictions into a formalism to account for the $CP$-violating interference between the Higgs bosons. In the prediction of the process $b\bar{b} \rightarrow h_2, h_3 \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$, we show that strongly destructive interference arises in the benchmark scenario defined in this thesis. Consequently, considerable parameter regions escape the exclusion bounds, which would be ruled out in LHC searches which neglect these interference contributions.
Zusammenfassung

Supersymmetrische (SUSY) Theorien wie das Minimale Supersymmetrische Standardmodell (MSSM) sagen ein erweitertes Teilchenspektrum inklusive eines erweiterten Higgs-Sektors voraus, um damit Fragen zu beantworten, die nach der bisherigen Datennahme des “Large Hadron Collider” (LHC) noch offen geblieben sind. Obwohl am LHC sehr intensiv nach weiteren Higgs-Bosonen gesucht wurde, gibt es keine Anzeichen auf weitere Higgs-Bosonen neben dem beobachteten Signal bei 125 GeV. Bisher berücksichtigten die Suchen jedoch keine CP-verletzenden Effekte im Higgs-Sektor, obwohl Letztere insbesondere durch die Baryonasymmetrie im Universum gut motiviert sind. Zudem haben sie einen erheblichen Einfluss auf die Higgs-Phänomenologie. Im allgemeinsten Fall mit komplexen MSSM-Parametern sind die drei neutralen Higgs-Bosonen schleifenkorrigierte Masseneigenzustände \{h_1, h_2, h_3\}, die Mischungen der CP-geraden und -ungeraden Higgs-Zustände in niedrigster Ordnung Störungstheorie sind.

In dieser Arbeit konzentrieren wir uns auf Effekte dieser komplexen Parameter auf die Produktionswirkungsquerschnitte der Higgs-Bosonen und auf die Interferenzen, die zwischen massenentarteten Higgs-Bosonen auftreten. Die Arbeit gliedert sich in drei Teile: Im ersten Teil diskutieren wir Korrekturen höherer Ordnung im Higgs-Sektor. Wir berechnen den inklusiven Wirkungsquerschnitt für die Produktion durch Gluon-Fusion und Bottom-Quark Paarvernichtung. Die Vorhersagen für Gluon-Fusion basieren auf einer expliziten Berechnung des Wirkungsquerschnittes in führender Ordnung Störungstheorie für den allgemeinsten Fall komplexer Parameter. Dieses Resultat wird ergänzt durch Korrekturen höherer Ordnung. Die Wirkungsquerschnitte durch Bottom-Quark Paarvernichtung werden durch eine Reskalierung gewonnen. Im zweiten Teil beschreiben wir die Implementierung unserer Wirkungsquerschnittsberechnung in einer Erweiterung des numerischen Programmes SusHi namens SusHiMi. Wir nutzen SusHiMi um die Effekte der Phase der trilinearen Kopplung des Higgs-Bosons an Stop-Squarks und der Phase des Gluino-Massenparameters auf die neutralen Higgs-Boson Wirkungsquerschnitte, die Higgs-Massen und deren Mischung zu untersuchen. Wir zeigen, dass die Squarkeffekte stark von den Phasen der komplexen Parameter abhängen und betonen die Bedeutung der Resummation von Squarkeffekten in der Bottom-Quark Yukawa-Kopplung. Desweiteren zeigen wir in einem Szenario, in dem zwei schwere Higgs-Bosonen \(h_2\) und \(h_3\) stark mischen und nahezu massenentartet sind, dass die beiden Higgs-Bosonen als getrennte Signale experimentell in allgemeinen nicht auflösbar sind, sondern nur die Summe der Wirkungsquerschnitte inklusive des Interferenzterms experimentell bestimmbar ist. Zuletzt lassen wir unsere Wirkungsquerschnittsberechnung in einen Formalismus einfließen, der die hervorgerufene Interferenz zwischen den Higgs-Bosonen im Falle von CP-Verletzung berücksichtigt. Für den Prozess \(b\bar{b} \to h_2, h_3 \to \tau^+\tau^-\) zeigen wir die starke deskriptiv Interferenz für ein in dieser Arbeit definiertes Szenario. In einem solchen Fall sind Parameterregionen erlaubt, die im reellen Fall der Parameter (ohne Interferenzbeiträge) durch LHC Suchen bereits ausgeschlossen wären.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Search for invariances

The discovery of a Higgs boson in 2012 [3, 4] occupies a unique and essential place in the story of our pursuit for invariances; of lawfulness and regularities in the behaviour of the universe. That the spontaneous breaking of electroweak symmetry is realised through an $SU(2)$ doublet scalar field had evaded many attempts at experimental confirmation since the independent conception of the idea in 1964 by Robert Brout and François Englert [5], by Peter Higgs [6] and by Gerald Guralnik, Carl R. Hagen and Tom Kibble [7]. Its eventual discovery was the cumulative success of thousands of scientists and engineers who contributed not only to the knowledge that was required for the genesis of the Higgs hypothesis, but also to the theoretical and experimental expertise needed to confirm its existence.

The 125 GeV Higgs boson is the last particle that can be accommodated within the Standard Model (SM) of particle physics, a well-tested theory that has been remarkably successful in describing the electroweak and strong interactions of elementary particles. However, the SM suffers from several experimental and theoretical shortcomings, which give us ample reason to believe that it can at most be a low-energy manifestation of a more fundamental theory. The search for this underlying fundamental theory, or what is often referred to as new physics, continues with Run II of the Large Hadron Collider (LHC), now operating at an unprecedented centre-of-mass energy of 13 TeV and steadily increasing luminosities. Of the many new models hypothesising what may lie beyond the SM, one of the most popular and widely studied class of models proposes an extension of the direct product of a gauge symmetry with the Poincaré group, called supersymmetry (SUSY). Indeed, phenomenologically viable SUSY models such as the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) or its next-to-minimal extension can not only alleviate many shortcomings of the SM, but also accommodate the observed signal at 125 GeV as one of several Higgs bosons predicted by their extended Higgs sectors. The precise measurement of the properties of the discovered Higgs boson is necessary in order to detect any possible deviations from SM expectations, and therefore is as important as searching directly for additional Higgs bosons belonging to new physics models.
1 Introduction

The possible landscape of new physics is vast, and so far undetected. The LHC experiments ATLAS and CMS have carried out extensive direct searches for signatures of new physics, including the MSSM. The failure to observe its signatures has set constraints on its parameter space and limits on the masses of SUSY particles. In the face of a seemingly shrinking parameter space that is available phenomenologically, it is important to carefully examine all the assumptions that go into the construction of the exclusion bounds and study how they are altered when some of these assumptions are modified. Most experimental analyses are optimised to search for a surplus of observed events over the background expected from the SM hypothesis. However, new physics can be detected not just in the form of an excess of measured data, but particles from beyond the SM spectrum could also cause a deficit of events due to destructive interference with the SM background. Moreover, new physics could be hidden from LHC searches due to destructive interference between closely appearing new resonances.

In the context of searches for additional Higgs bosons of the MSSM, such an effect can arise between the two neutral heavier Higgs bosons when we assume, for instance, that the \( CP \) symmetry is violated. In such a case, the experimental limits which have been set under the assumption of \( CP \) conservation may not present an accurate picture of the unambiguously excluded parameter regions and might need to be re-evaluated. Confronting the observed limits from the LHC searches with possible modifications arising due to such interference effects needs an accurate knowledge of production cross sections and branching ratios of the additional Higgs bosons, as well as the interferences that can occur between them. At the same time, computational tools need to be developed to perform and optimise theory calculations.

This forms the central theme of this thesis. The work presented in the following chapters aims to investigate the influence of \( CP \)-violating phases of the MSSM on production cross sections of the neutral Higgs mass eigenstates, the interference effects that result from \( CP \)-violating mixings of the neutral Higgs bosons, and their implication on Higgs searches at the LHC.

Thesis outline

The thesis begins with a theoretical introduction to the SM in Chapter 2, focussing on its particle content, and detailing in particular the electroweak symmetry breaking mechanism. Following a discussion on the demerits of the SM, supersymmetry is motivated in Chapter 3, where we describe the particle sector of the MSSM at tree level, and the complex parameters in the theory which provide additional sources of \( CP \) violation beyond the SM. The extended Higgs sector of the MSSM with its two Higgs doublets is discussed in detail, and we set the notations needed for the work presented in later chapters. In Chapter 4 we briefly review the Higgs results from the ATLAS and CMS experiments, and summarise the exclusion limits from recent searches for SUSY particles and additional Higgs bosons relevant to the processes studied in this thesis.
Chapter 5 is dedicated to higher-order contributions to the Higgs sector of the MSSM with complex parameters. We begin with a discussion on the $\mathcal{CP}$-violating Higgs self-energies which give rise to mixing among the tree-level $\mathcal{CP}$-even and $\mathcal{CP}$-odd Higgs states of the MSSM. Next, we describe the use of wave function normalisation factors (or the $\tilde{Z}$ factors) needed to provide a correct and consistent description of the on-shell properties of external Higgs bosons, and introduce the notation for $\tilde{Z}$ factors which is used in Chapters 6-9. The central work of this thesis is contained in Chapters 6-8. In order to adequately study the effects of $\mathcal{CP}$-violating phases on searches for additional Higgs bosons, precise theoretical predictions for production cross sections of the Higgs bosons are required, followed by a formalism for taking into account $\mathcal{CP}$-violating interference effects that can arise between nearly mass degenerate and heavily admixed states in their production and decay. In Chapter 6, first the leading order calculation for Higgs production via gluon fusion in the SM is reviewed, followed by a discussion on the various ways in which $\mathcal{CP}$-violating phases modify the production cross sections of the neutral Higgs mass eigenstates of the MSSM, as compared to the $\mathcal{CP}$-conserving case. We then present the state-of-the-art gluon-fusion and bottom-quark annihilation cross sections for Higgs bosons in the MSSM for the general case of complex parameters.

Developing tools to automate calculations is crucial in making the theoretical predictions useful and accessible. In Chapter 7, we describe the FORTRAN code SusHi and introduce its extension SusHiMi, where we have implemented our predictions for production cross sections of $\mathcal{CP}$-admixed Higgs bosons in the MSSM with complex parameters. SusHiMi is employed in the phenomenological studies in Chapter 8, wherein the numerical impact of the phases of the trilinear coupling of the Higgses with the stop, and the gluino mass parameter ($\phi_{\text{At}}$ and $\phi_{\text{M3}}$, respectively) on Higgs masses, cross sections and $\tilde{Z}$ factors is investigated. Our studies are carried out in two scenarios where the lightest MSSM Higgs boson, interpreted to be the SM-like Higgs, is accompanied by a strong admixture of two heavy Higgs bosons nearly equal in mass. The chapter also examines the assorted theoretical uncertainties that are involved in our cross section predictions.

The cross section predictions developed in Chapter 6 and their subsequent implementation in SusHiMi need to be accompanied by an appropriate treatment of the interference effects that arise in the calculation of cross section times branching ratio of a full process of production and decay of the nearly mass-degenerate Higgs bosons. Chapter 9 reviews such a formalism and describes the implementation of the relative interference factors in SusHiMi, which is then used to explore the implications of $\mathcal{CP}$-violating phases giving rise to Higgs mixing and interference in the process $b\bar{b} \to \tau^+\tau^-$. The resulting exclusion bounds are compared to existing bounds from Run II of the LHC which assume $\mathcal{CP}$ conservation. For this purpose, we define a benchmark scenario in accordance with the most up-to-date bounds on masses of SUSY particles and parameters described in Chapter 4. With Chapter 10 we summarise the results presented in this thesis and conclude.
Chapter 2

The Standard Model

This chapter provides a brief introduction to the Standard Model of particle physics, describing its particle content and underlying symmetries. Subsequently the need for new physics beyond the Standard Model is motivated. This introductory chapter mainly follows Refs. [8–12].

2.1 Introduction

The history of particle physics is a long and involving tale. Attempts to deconstruct the structure of matter date back perhaps to the earliest origins of scientific thought itself. Generations of physicists have built upon the works of those who came before them, which led to a series of experimental and theoretical breakthroughs in the 20th century finally culminating in a singularly successful theory of fundamental particles and forces: The Standard Model.

The Standard Model (SM) of particle physics is a theory describing the elementary particles that make up the observed matter in the universe, along with their interactions via the electroweak and strong forces [13–20], which encompass all the known forces except gravity. Formulated in the 1970s, it accounts for practically all the experimental data from high energy physics experiments so far. The Higgs boson, whose existence is required for generating masses of the matter particles (fermions) and force carriers (bosons), was predicted as a part of the SM a little more than half a century ago [5–7,21]. The breakthrough discovery of a new scalar confirmed to be a SM-like Higgs boson at the LHC in July 2012 put in place the last missing piece of the SM and paved the way towards a new era of particle physics. In this chapter, we will describe the particles that make up the Standard Model and the underlying symmetries that drive their interactions. The primary focus will be on electroweak symmetry breaking and the Higgs mechanism, in order to set up the concepts and notations used throughout the thesis. We will then discuss the shortcomings of the theory and incite the need for searches for physics beyond the Standard Model (BSM), and in particular the role of extended Higgs sectors.
2.2 Symmetries

The SM contains fermionic (spin $\frac{1}{2}$) fields $\psi$, bosonic (spin 1) fields $A_\mu^a$, and a scalar (spin 0) field $\Phi$. Fermions make up the visible matter in the universe. They interact with each other through the intermediaries of the Yang-Mills gauge fields, the force carrying vector bosons. This means that the various gauge interactions are completely determined by the algebraic structures of certain internal symmetry groups. The remaining scalar spin 0 field is required for the Brout-Englert-Higgs (BEH) mechanism in the SM, which will be discussed in detail in Section 2.3.

The Standard Model is a renormalisable and mathematically self-consistent quantum field theory (QFT). It is invariant under the transformations defined by the Poincaré group, the full symmetry of special relativity, namely the Lorentz transformations and the inhomogeneous translations in Minkowski space-time. The gauge structure of SM is the non-Abelian group $SU(3)_C \otimes SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$. It comprises of two parts. $SU(3)_C$ with a conserved colour ($C$) charge is the symmetry group of Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD), the theory of strong interactions. $SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$ describes the electroweak theory, with left chiral fields charged under weak isospin (subscript $L$ for the left-handed fermions it couples to) and the weak hypercharge ($Y$).

The derivatives of the fermionic fields $\psi$ and general gauge fields $A_\mu^a$ define their kinetics and are fully determined by the global symmetries of the Poincaré group:

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}}^{\text{fermion}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}}
\]

\[
= \bar{\psi}i\gamma^\mu \psi - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^a F^{a\mu\nu} \tag{2.1}
\]

with $\bar{\psi} = \psi^i \gamma^0$ and $\gamma^\mu = \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu$. With the coupling of the gauge group $g$ and the structure constants $f^{abc}$, the field strength tensors $F_{\mu\nu}^a$ for all gauge groups are defined as

\[
F_{\mu\nu}^a = \partial_\mu A_\nu^a - \partial_\nu A_\mu^a + g f^{abc} A_\mu^b A_\nu^c. \tag{2.2}
\]

For gauge invariance of the Lagrangian under a generic gauge group, a covariant derivative $D_\mu = \partial_\mu - ig T^a A_\mu^a$ with generators\(^1\) $T^a$ replaces the derivatives $\partial_\mu$ in the kinetic terms.

More specifically, if we demand invariance of the SM fields under gauge transformations of the $SU(3)_C \otimes SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$ group, the derivatives $\partial_\mu$ need to be replaced by covariant derivatives $D_\mu$ as follows\(^2\)

\[
\partial_\mu \rightarrow D_\mu := \partial_\mu - ig_1 \frac{\lambda^a}{2} g^a_\mu \pm ig_2 W^a_\mu - ig_1 \frac{Y}{2} B_\mu
\]

\(^1\) $f^{abc}$ are defined by $T^a$, the $N^2 - 1$ generators of a generic gauge group $SU(N)$: $[T^a, T^b] = i f^{abc} T^c$.

\(^2\) the sign convention is $-$ in the SM and $+$ in the MSSM.
where \( g_s, g_2, g_1 \) are the coupling constants of the gauge groups \( SU(3)_C, SU(2)_L \) and \( U(1)_{Y} \), respectively, and summation over the gauge indices \( a \) is implied. This replacement by covariant derivatives leads to couplings of vector fields to fermions and scalars, as we will see in Section 2.3. The group \( SU(3)_C \) is generated by the eight Gell-Mann matrices \( \lambda^a, a \in \{1, \ldots, 8\} \), with the corresponding gauge fields \( g_a^\mu \) called gluons, the carriers of the strong force. The Pauli matrices \( \sigma^a, a \in \{1, 2, 3\} \), generate the \( SU(2)_L \) group through \( I^a = \sigma^a / 2 \), and define the weak isospin \( I^3 \). The gauge bosons of this group are the three \( W^a_\mu \). Finally, the Abelian group \( U(1)_Y \) has the generator \( Y_2 \), defining the weak hypercharge, and one gauge field \( B_\mu \). For the strong \( SU(3)_C \) interactions we define \( \alpha_s = g_2^2 / (4\pi) \), and for the electroweak \( SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y \) interactions we will use the relations

\[
e = \frac{g_1 g_2}{\sqrt{g_1^2 + g_2^2}}, \quad \alpha = \frac{e^2}{4\pi}.
\]

The weak isospin and hypercharge together define the electric charge by the Gell-Mann-Nishijima formula

\[
Q = I^3 + \frac{Y}{2}.
\]

Replacing \( \partial / \partial t \) with \( \gamma^\mu D_\mu \) and using the definition of field strength tensors for \( g_a^\mu, W^a_\mu \) and \( B_\mu \) from Eq. (2.2) in Eq. (2.1), we obtain the fermion and gauge boson dynamics encoded in the SM Lagrangian as

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}} = \bar{\psi} i \gamma^\mu D_\mu \psi - \frac{1}{4} G^a_{\mu\nu} G^{a\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4} W^a_\mu W^{a\mu} - \frac{1}{4} B^{\mu\nu} B_{\mu\nu}.
\]

### 2.3 Electroweak theory and the Higgs mechanism

For the SM Lagrangian to be invariant under gauge transformations there can be no explicit mass terms for the charged fermions and the gauge bosons, since they violate gauge symmetry. However, the only massless gauge bosons observed experimentally are the gluons in the strong sector and the photon in the electroweak sector. This means that the \( SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y \) symmetry must be broken down to the \( U(1)_{\text{EM}} \) such that masses can be introduced for the gauge bosons while still maintaining the renormalisability of the electroweak theory. Moreover, a mechanism for generation of fermion masses is required as well. Therefore the theoretical explanation for the experimentally observed massive bosons and SM fermions needs a new ingredient. Such a mechanism was proposed in 1964, by introducing a new \( SU(2)_L \)-doublet scalar field \( \Phi \), which induces a spontaneous breaking of the \( SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y \) gauge symmetry via the Brout-Englert-Higgs mechanism [5–7, 21]. The complex scalar field \( \Phi \), a colour singlet with hypercharge \( Y = 1 \) was named
the Higgs field, and can be represented as

\[ \Phi(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^+(x) \\ \phi^0(x) \end{pmatrix}. \]  

(2.6)

To obtain the masses of the gauge bosons, the Lagrangian receives the additional terms

\[ \mathcal{L}_{\text{Higgs}} = (D_\mu \Phi)^\dagger (D^\mu \Phi) - V(\Phi). \]  

(2.7)

The most general gauge invariant scalar potential in \( \Phi \) is given by

\[ V(\Phi) = -\mu^2 \Phi^\dagger \Phi + \frac{\lambda}{4} (\Phi^\dagger \Phi)^2. \]  

(2.8)

This potential must be renormalisable, so \( V(\Phi) \) cannot contain powers higher than \( (\Phi^\dagger \Phi)^2 \). Additionally, a stable potential must be bounded from below, which requires \( \lambda > 0 \) and no dependence on odd powers of \( \Phi \). Furthermore, choosing \( \mu^2 < 0 \) results in a minimum of the potential at \( |\langle \Phi \rangle| = \sqrt{\Phi^\dagger \Phi} = 0 \). In this case the minimum of the potential leaves the electroweak symmetry unbroken and no mass terms emerge. In order to induce the spontaneous breaking of the \( SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y \) symmetry we need \( \mu^2 > 0 \), resulting in a non-zero vacuum expectation value (vev) \( v \) of the neutral component of the field \( |\langle \Phi \rangle| \equiv \sqrt{\frac{2\mu^2}{\lambda}} = \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} \). This choice of parameters in the Higgs potential gives rise to the famous Mexican Hat shape, which has an infinite set of degenerate minima lying on a circle of radius \( \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} \). These degenerate ground states rotate into each other under gauge transformations. It is now possible to obtain a physical picture of the excitations around the vacuum state. The system is free to rotate along the circumference of the circle of minima: since the potential is flat along the circle, the excitations along that direction do not cost any energy. Excitations along this circumference therefore correspond to the massless or Goldstone modes. In contrast, the potential looks approximately like that of a harmonic oscillator in the radial direction, and an excitation along a radius gives rise to the massive particles.

Following phase conventions, we can choose a specific minimum for \( \Phi \) as

\[ \Phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix}. \]  

(2.9)

The spontaneous breaking of the \( SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y \) symmetry of the potential to \( U(1)_{\text{EM}} \) by this ground state is known as Electroweak Symmetry Breaking (EWSB). The full Higgs field can be written as an expansion around the minimum as

\[ \Phi(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^+(x) \\ \phi^0(x) \end{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( v + H^0(x) + i\chi^0(x) \right). \]  

(2.10)
2.3 Electroweak theory and the Higgs mechanism

This Higgs field possesses four real degrees of freedom (dof). Here $H^0(x)$ is the physical Higgs field that predicts a massive scalar Higgs boson in the SM [21]. The other three degrees of freedom $\phi^\pm$ and $\chi^0$ are the unphysical Goldstone bosons [22, 23] with zero vacuum expectation value. They are absent in the unitary gauge and contribute to the longitudinal dofs of the gauge bosons $W^\pm$ and $Z$.

### 2.3.1 Gauge boson masses

The masses of the gauge bosons are obtained by expanding the kinetic term $(D_\mu \Phi)^\dagger(D^\mu \Phi)$ of Eq. (2.7) around the minimum of the Higgs field. The physical mass eigenstates for charged gauge boson fields $W^\pm$ are derived from the gauge eigenstates as

$$W^\pm_\mu = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(W^1_\mu \mp iW^2_\mu), \quad (2.11)$$

and the neutral mass eigenstates $Z$ and $A$ result from the following rotation of the neutral gauge eigenstates:

$$\begin{pmatrix} Z_\mu \\ A_\mu \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c_W & s_W \\ -s_W & c_W \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} W^3_\mu \\ B_\mu \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.12)$$

with $s_W \equiv \sin \theta_W, c_W \equiv \cos \theta_W$, and $\theta_W$ is the weak mixing angle having the tree-level definition

$$s_W \equiv \frac{g_1}{\sqrt{g_1^2 + g_2^2}}, \quad c_W \equiv \frac{g_2}{\sqrt{g_1^2 + g_2^2}}. \quad (2.13)$$

To understand in detail how the gauge boson masses arise, we look at the following expansion of the kinetic term:

$$\begin{align*}
(D_\mu \Phi)^\dagger(D^\mu \Phi) &= \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu H^0)(\partial^\mu H^0) + \frac{1}{8} g_2^2 (v + H^0)^2 (W^1_\mu - iW^2_\mu)(W^1_\mu - iW^2_\mu) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{8} (v + H^0)^2 (g_2 W^3_\mu + g_1 B_\mu)(g_2 W^3_\mu + g_1 B_\mu). \quad (2.14)
\end{align*}$$

From the second term of the above equation we see that the two electrically charged mass eigenstates $W^\pm_\mu$ acquire the mass

$$m_W = v \frac{1}{2} g_2. \quad (2.15)$$
The third term contains the masses for the neutral gauge bosons. They are the eigenvalues of the mass matrix obtained from the $v^2$-term:

$$\mathbf{M}_0^2 = \frac{v^2}{4} \begin{pmatrix} g_1^2 & g_1 g_2 \\ g_1 g_2 & g_2^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$  \hfill (2.16)

The determinant of $\mathbf{M}_0^2$, and therefore one of the eigenvalues is zero, so we get a massless photon corresponding to the gauge boson of the unbroken $U(1)_{\text{EM}}$ symmetry, while the second eigenvalue gives the mass of the $Z$ boson:

$$m_\gamma = 0, \quad m_Z = \frac{v}{2} \sqrt{g_1^2 + g_2^2}.$$  \hfill (2.17)

Finally, expanding the Higgs potential $V(\Phi)$ around the minimum of the Higgs field, we determine the mass term for the Higgs boson, which arises from the Higgs self-coupling $\lambda$:

$$m_{H^0}^2 = \frac{\partial V(H^0)}{\partial H^{0\dagger} H^0} = \frac{\lambda}{2} v^2.$$  \hfill (2.18)

The Higgs mass in the SM is a free parameter and needs to be measured experimentally. The gauge bosons $\gamma, W^\pm$ and $Z$ are intermediaries of the electroweak forces. All electrically charged particles interact electromagnetically by exchanging photons. The $W^\pm$ and $Z$ bosons carry the weak force. While the $Z$ couples to all fermions, $W^\pm$ couple only to the left-handed ones. Gluons, the gauge bosons of the strong sector, remain unaffected by electroweak symmetry breaking and are massless. They mediate interactions between coloured particles.

### 2.3.2 Fermion masses and Yukawa couplings

Fermions make up the visible matter in the universe. SM fermions can be classified into quarks and leptons. Quarks are $SU(3)_C$ triplets that carry a colour charge. Since all freely existing particles are colour neutral, quarks can only exist in colour-neutral bound states called hadrons. Leptons are chargeless under $SU(3)_C$ and can exist as free particles. Fermions are chiral fields, which means that left-handed quarks and leptons $(q_L, l_L)$ transform differently from the right-handed ones $(q_R, l_R)$. The SM contains three copies or generations of fermions $(i \in \{1, 2, 3\})$ with similar quantum numbers, each containing a collection of chiral fields $(f_{i_L}, f_{i_R})$ with different particle masses. The left-handed fields in each generation $(q_{i_L}, l_{i_L})$ transform as doublets under $SU(2)_L$ while the right-handed ones $(q_{i_R}, l_{i_R})$ transform as weak singlets.

Within a generation, the left-handed quark doublet $q_{i_L}$ consists of an up-type $(u_{i_L})$ and a down-type $(d_{i_L})$ quark. The corresponding right-handed singlets are $u_{i_R}$ and $d_{i_R}$. Similarly, the left-handed lepton doublet has an up-type lepton, which is a neutrino $\nu_i$ and a charged down-type lepton. The corresponding down-type right-handed leptons are
2.4 Full SM Lagrangian

There are no right-handed neutrinos in the SM.

Fermions acquire masses in the SM through Yukawa couplings of the Higgs field to the Dirac fields, since explicit fermion mass terms break the gauge symmetry of the Lagrangian. These appear in the Lagrangian as follows:

\[ \mathcal{L}_{\text{Yukawa}} = -\bar{q}_L y_d \Phi d_R - \bar{q}_L y_u \Phi u_R - \bar{l}_L y_l \Phi e_R + h.c. \]  

(2.19)

where the charged conjugated Higgs field \( \Phi^* = i \sigma_2 \Phi^* \), with the neutral \( \langle \phi^0 \rangle \) in the upper component, induces masses for the up-type fermions. As a result, just one Higgs doublet is sufficient for generating masses for both the up- and down-type fermions and the gauge bosons in the SM. The lepton mass matrix is given by

\[ m_l = \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} y_l. \]  

(2.20)

Since there are no right-handed neutrinos to participate in the Higgs couplings, neutrinos are massless in the SM, although more recent evidence of neutrino oscillations indicates that they are in fact massive (see e.g. Ref. [24]). A diagonal mass matrix for the quarks is obtained by diagonalising the 3×3 Yukawa matrices \( y_f, f \in \{u, d\} \) through a unitary transformation:

\[ m_f = V_L^f y_f V_R^{f \dagger} \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}. \]  

(2.21)

Notice that the coupling strength of the massive fermions (as well as the massive gauge bosons) to the Higgs boson is directly proportional to their masses, which is a consequence of the BEH mechanism. The product of the unitary matrices \( V_L^u V_L^{d \dagger} \) appears in the couplings of the charged-current \( W^\pm \) interactions to the physical states \( u_L, d_L \) and is called is the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix [25,26]. It contains the only complex parameter of the SM, and it is the solitary source of CP violation within the SM:

\[ V_{\text{CKM}} = V_L^u V_L^{d \dagger}. \]  

(2.22)

2.4 Full SM Lagrangian

Quantisation and higher-order corrections in the SM require gauge fixing terms in the Lagrangian, set by \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{fix}} \). These terms introduce additional, unphysical degrees of freedom of the gauge bosons to the theory, which must be cancelled. This compensation necessitates the introduction of the so-called Faddeev-Popov ghost and anti-ghost terms \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{ghost}} \). These ghosts are not real physical quantities, they are purely mathematical entities appearing as virtual particles within loops. Therefore the full Lagrangian of the Standard
The Standard Model is

\[ \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} + \mathcal{L}^{\text{fermion}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{Yukawa}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{Higgs}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{fix}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{ghost}}. \]  

2.5 Shortcomings of the Standard Model

The Standard Model has been extremely successful in the description of almost all the measurements made in high energy experiments over the past decades, with no unambiguous hints of additional physics found in these measurements even as the TeV scale is probed. However, the SM falls short of explaining several experimental observations, in addition to certain theoretical shortcomings. This suggests that the SM cannot be the complete theory of nature but it can only serve as an effective theory describing the universe at the energy scales we currently explore.

The first and most obvious indication of the SM being an inherently incomplete theory is that it cannot accommodate a description of the gravitational force. Gravitational effects in the quantum regime become discernible only at \( M_P \), the Planck energy scale. While these hardly have any phenomenological impact at the current energy scales investigated by particle physics experiments, a new framework is certainly required at \( M_P \), which serves as the maximal cut-off scale for the validity of the SM.

The SM is a renormalisable QFT, which means that even if no new physics exists between the electroweak scale (\( M_{\text{EW}} \)) and the Planck scale, it can be run all the way up to the highest cut-off \( \Lambda \sim M_P \). If we treat the SM as an effective theory, one would expect the Higgs mass to be a prediction of the full theory above \( M_P \), which is 17 orders of magnitude higher than \( M_{\text{EW}} \). This hierarchy of scales can drastically effect the stability of the Higgs mass in the presence of quantum corrections. The mass of the Higgs boson receives radiative corrections from every particle that can couple to it, either directly or indirectly, giving rise to a term \( \Delta M^2_{H^0} \) which is independent of the bare mass of the Higgs:

\[ M^2_{H^0} = M^2_{H^0,0} + \Delta M^2_{H^0}. \]  

These correction terms are quadratically dependent on the ultraviolet momentum cut-off \( \Lambda \). For example, a one-loop correction to the Higgs mass from a fermion loop takes the form

\[ \Delta M^2_{H^0} = -\frac{y_f^2}{8\pi^2} \Lambda^2 + \cdots \]  

The ellipsis represents terms proportional to \( m_f^2 \) which grow logarithmically with \( \Lambda \). Setting the cut-off to the Planck scale makes the quantum correction around 30 orders

\^3M_P = \mathcal{O}(10^{19}) \text{ GeV.}
of magnitude larger than the measured $M_{H^0} \sim 125$ GeV, which then requires the bare mass $M_{H^0,0}$ in Eq. (2.24) to be extremely fine-tuned. This instability is unique for scalar masses. The masses of fermions and gauge bosons are protected by symmetries such that they are not quadratically divergent with the cut-off momentum. Furthermore, there can be contributions similar to Eq. (2.25) from virtual effects of any new heavy particles that might exist and couple to the Higgs. Such contributions are sensitive to the masses of the heavy particles, not just the cut-off. While within the SM itself such a cancellation is technically possible since the Higgs mass is a free parameter, for a UV completion of the SM where the Higgs mass is a predicted quantity, it is considered highly unnatural to have such an enormously precise cancellation without a symmetry reason, and is called the Hierarchy Problem. It motivates new physics below the Planck scale which can regulate these radiative corrections.

If one demands theoretical elegance from the SM, then an explanation for fractional electric charges of the quarks giving rise to accidental cancellation of gauge anomalies is missing, as is an explanation for the hierarchy in masses of fermions. In addition, if we expect the gauge couplings $g_1, g_2, g_3$ to unify at the GUT scale, then new particles need to be introduced to alter the running of the couplings [27].

It would seem fair to conclude that worrying about perceived imperfections of a theory, even a phenomenologically successful one, can pay off. However, the shortcomings of the SM are not just limited to aesthetics. As mentioned earlier, the observation of non-zero neutrino masses leading to neutrino oscillations [24] is not explained by the SM. Furthermore, the only source of $\mathcal{CP}$ violation in the SM is the single phase of the CKM matrix. $\mathcal{CP}$ violation, along with baryon number violation and departure from thermal equilibrium, is a condition required for the observed baryon asymmetry in the universe [28–30]. However, the one complex parameter in the SM is not adequate to explain the perceived matter-antimatter asymmetry, and additional $\mathcal{CP}$-violating parameters are needed. Evidence from astrophysical observations points to the existence of Dark Matter (DM) and Dark Energy (DE), which make up $\sim 27\%$ and $\sim 68\%$ of total energy density of the universe, respectively [31], whereas ordinary matter only constitutes $\sim 5\%$. For DM to be made up of elementary particles, not only does it need to have no electromagnetic or strong interactions with the SM particles, it also needs to be stable on cosmological time scales. The SM does not offer a viable candidate for cold DM, or an explanation for DE.

In recognition of these shortcomings, there are several extensions of the Standard Model that attempt to tackle a combination of these problems. They include ideas proposing composite Higgses, extended Higgs sectors, additional space-time dimensions, new symmetries etc. Even though there has been no evidence of new physics beyond the SM so far, the search for new particles continues as we probe higher energies with greater luminosities in present day particle accelerators.

This thesis focuses on one such BSM theory, Supersymmetry (SUSY), which introduces
a new symmetry relating fermions and bosons. As one of the most widely studied BSM theories, it offers solutions to the fine-tuning of the Higgs mass, provides candidates for DM, enables the unification of the gauge couplings and can provide additional sources of $CP$ violation which contribute to the matter-antimatter asymmetry in the universe, making it a compelling phenomenological theory.
Chapter 3
The MSSM with complex parameters

This chapter discusses the basic features of supersymmetry, with focus on the physics of the MSSM, and is based on Refs. [12, 32–38]. In particular the properties of the Higgs sector and the role of complex parameters relevant for this thesis are outlined. Similarities to Ref. [1] are intended and reflect the contributions of the author.

3.1 The Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model

In the early 1900s, only three types of particles had been discovered: photons, electrons and protons. Wolfgang Pauli addressed his now famous letter suggesting the existence of a new kind of weakly interacting particles, the neutrinos, to the Radioactive Ladies and Gentlemen [39], who would meet in Tübingen to discuss beta decays, at a time when conception of new particles was not considered a popular solution to fundamental problems. However, neutrinos were indeed the correct solution to the problem of the continuous beta decay spectrum. Problem solving paradigms in particle physics have changed since then; new particles are suggested in most of the prominent models of new physics in order to overcome the shortcomings in the field. Perhaps the boldest of these models is supersymmetry, which proposes a vast and new, yet undiscovered particle spectrum which could solve many of the problems that plague the Standard Model today.

In this section we give a brief historical perspective to the motivations for developing SUSY and its resulting implications on particle physics phenomenology. We will discuss how weak scale supersymmetry provides solutions to the shortcomings of the SM and subsequently we will describe the particle content of the minimal realisation of SUSY: The Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM).

3.1.1 A brief history of supersymmetry

It is a plausible assertion that a dominant theme in twentieth century physics was that of symmetry, the pursuit of which was heuristically very successful. Symmetries are often
the primary feature of nature that constrain the allowed dynamics of an interaction, and have proved to be a reliable concept for exploring and formulating physical laws.

In Chapter 2 we saw that the interactions of the SM are driven by symmetries and the subsequent breaking of some of them. However, the SM does not encompass all the symmetries of nature that are compatible with Lorentz invariance. This can serve as a motivation for studying extensions of the SM symmetries that can manifest physically. Nonetheless, space-time symmetries and internal, local symmetries cannot be combined arbitrarily. Every realistic quantum field theory can only have a Lie group symmetry that is the direct product of the Poincaré group and the internal symmetry groups. This was proven in the landmark “no-go” theorem by Sidney Coleman and Jeffrey Mandula in 1967 \(^4\) which stated the “impossibility of combining space-time and internal symmetries in any but a trivial way”. In 1971, Y.A. Golfand and E.P. Likhtman introduced four anti-commuting spinor generators in 3+1 dimensions that can extend the Poincaré group \(^4\), which came to be known as supercharges. In 1972, D.V. Volkov and V.P. Akulov independently suggested non-linear realisations of supersymmetry \(^4\). Rudolf Haag, Jan Lopuszanski and Martin Sohnius analysed all possible superalgebras in the general form and showed that by weakening the assumptions of the Coleman-Mandula theorem and allowing both commuting and anticommuting symmetry generators such that the ordinary Lie algebra was replaced by a Lie superalgebra, it was possible to non-trivially bypass the no-go theorem \(^4\).

In 1974, Julius Wess and Bruno Zumino introduced the simplest interacting supersymmetric quantum field theory with a free chiral supermultiplet \(^4\). The minimal supersymmetric extension of the Standard Model proposed in order to address the shortcomings of the SM was developed starting in the late 1970s and early 1980s. While the number of viable supersymmetric models has greatly increased over the last decades; with several models containing additional symmetries and ingredients, as well as non-minimal extensions, the non-observation of SUSY has severely constrained the parameters of the theory.

### 3.1.2 A symmetry of fermions and bosons

Supersymmetry is a space-time symmetry that relates a fermionic state to a bosonic state and vice versa. Even though the initial reasons for studying SUSY were purely mathematical, it is well motivated in the light of the shortcomings of the SM. SUSY predicts new scalar particles for each SM fermion, and a fermionic particle for each SM gauge boson. These new particles are called superpartners. The supersymmetric operator \(Q\) generating such a transformation is an anti-commuting spinor which changes the spin of a particle by \(\frac{1}{2}\). The single particle states of a supersymmetric theory are contained in irreducible representations of the supersymmetry algebra, called supermultiplets. A supermultiplet contains both fermionic and bosonic states with equal degrees of freedom. \(Q\) and its hermitian conjugate \(Q^\dagger\), also a supersymmetric operator, must satisfy the
commutation and anti-commutation algebra defined by

\[
[P^\mu, Q_\alpha] = [P^\mu, Q^\dagger_\alpha] = 0, \quad (3.1)
\]
\[
\{Q_\alpha, Q^\dagger_\alpha\} = -2\sigma^\mu_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} P^\mu, \quad (3.2)
\]
\[
\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = \{Q^\dagger_\alpha, Q^\dagger_\beta\} = 0, \quad (3.3)
\]

where \(P^\mu\) is the 4-momentum generator of space-time translations with Lorentz index \(\mu\), \(\sigma^\mu\) are the Pauli matrices, and \(\alpha, \dot{\alpha}, \beta, \dot{\beta}\) are the spinor indices. \(Q\) and \(Q^\dagger\) also commute with generators of all the gauge transformations, so that the particles housed in a single supermultiplet have the same quantum numbers for electric charge, weak isospin and colour. Furthermore, we see from Eq. (3.1) that the squared mass operator \(-P^2\) commutes with \(Q\) and \(Q^\dagger\):

\[
[Q_\alpha, P^2] = [Q_\alpha, P^\mu] P^\mu + P^\mu [Q_\alpha, P^\mu] = 0. \quad (3.4)
\]

This relation implies that all the fields in a supermultiplet have equal eigenvalues of \(-P^2\) and are mass degenerate in unbroken supersymmetric models.

We can already notice hints of how a supersymmetric extension of the Standard Model can alleviate some of its shortcomings. As discussed in Section 2.5, each fermion loop in the Higgs self-energy contributes a quadratically divergent term proportional to \(-y_f^2 \Lambda^2\), where \(y_f\) is the Yukawa coupling and \(\Lambda\) is the momentum cut-off of the integral. The predicted existence of a scalar partner \(\tilde{f}_{L/R}\) for each fermion chirality state \(f_{L/R}\) means then that the Higgs self-energy receives quadratically sensitive contributions from the scalar loops, which are proportional to \(y_f^2 \Lambda^2\). As a result, the quadratically divergent contributions from the fermions are cancelled by those from the scalar loops if \(y_f = y_{\tilde{f}}\). The complete quantum corrections to the Higgs mass also contain logarithmically divergent terms, which vanish entirely if the masses of the SM particles and their superpartners are equal. However, SUSY cannot be realised in nature as an exact symmetry, as we discuss in more detail in Section 3.1.5. SUSY breaking results in a mass splitting between fermions and their superpartners, \(m_{\tilde{f}}^2 = m_f^2 + \Delta^2\). As long as the relationship between the dimensionless couplings \(y_f = y_{\tilde{f}}\) is maintained, \(\Delta^2\) does not spoil the cancellation of the quadratically divergent terms. This is known as soft breaking of SUSY. However, even though the mass split is performed such that it does not affect the quadratically divergent terms in the renormalised self-energy corrections to the Higgs mass, it induces correction terms of the form \(\ln\left(\frac{m_{\tilde{f}}^2}{m_f^2}\right)\). These corrections can be kept small enough such that fine-tuning is not reintroduced if the masses of the superpartners are not too separate from those of the SM particles and appear at \(\mathcal{O}(\text{TeV})\).

TeV scale masses of the superpartners can additionally improve the unification of the strong, weak and electromagnetic couplings [27]. SUSY not only addresses the theoretical shortcomings of the SM, but can also provide explanations for experimental observations.
not predicted by the SM. The new SUSY particle spectrum contains a light, stable, weakly interacting state which could be a candidate for cold dark matter. Finally, several parameters of the theory may be complex, opening up new portals to CP violation. We will discuss the last feature in greater detail in Section 3.3.

Incorporating the SM into SUSY

In a supersymmetric extension of the SM, the known fermions and bosons are embedded into chiral or gauge supermultiplets, with a superpartner having a spin differing by $\frac{1}{2}$. We saw that Standard Model quarks and leptons have left- and right-handed parts that transform differently under gauge transformations, therefore they must be a part of chiral supermultiplets. Since these left- and right-handed components are separate Weyl spinors $\psi$, each of them has its own complex spin 0 scalar partner (called a scalar fermion or sfermion). On-shell, this complex field has two real propagating degrees of freedom, similar to the two spin polarization states of $\psi$. However, off-shell the Weyl fermion is a complex object with two components and four real degrees of freedom, two of which are eliminated on-shell. We see that there is a mismatch in the fermionic and bosonic degrees of freedom off-shell. The chiral supermultiplet therefore also contains an auxiliary complex scalar field $F$ which closes the supersymmetry algebra off-shell. This field vanishes on-shell and does not propagate. The chiral Lagrangian including auxiliary terms is given by

$$L_{\text{chiral}} = -D^\mu \phi^i D_\mu \phi_i + i \psi^i \bar{\sigma}^\mu D_\mu \psi_i + F^i F_i + \left[ \left( -\frac{1}{2} W^{ij} \psi_i \psi_j + W^i F_i \right) + \text{h.c.} \right]. \quad (3.5)$$

The $W$ and $W_{ij}$ are the first and second derivatives of the superpotential with respect to the complex scalar fields:

$$W_i = \frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi_i}, \quad W_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial \phi_i \partial \phi_j}. \quad (3.6)$$

The Euler-Lagrange equations of motion for the auxiliary fields give $F_i = -W^*_i, F^{*i} = -W^i$, which can be replaced accordingly. In the above equations $W$ is the superpotential containing the most general set of renormalisable, SUSY-invariant non-gauge interactions:

$$W = L^i \phi_i + \frac{1}{2} M^{ij} \phi_i \phi_j + \frac{1}{6} g^{ijk} \phi_i \phi_j \phi_k. \quad (3.7)$$

Here, $L_i$ are parameters with mass dimension 2 and only affect the scalar potential part of the Lagrangian. They are allowed only when $\phi_i$ are gauge singlets and can play an important role in spontaneous supersymmetry breaking.

Analogously, the gauge supermultiplet contains the SM vector bosons $A^a_\mu$ along with their fermionic superpartners $\lambda^a$ (called gauginos), and a real bosonic auxiliary field $D^a$, included for the same reasons as $F$. The Lagrangian describing the vector supermultiplets...
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is

\[ \mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} = -\frac{1}{4} F^a_{\mu\nu} F^{a\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} D^a D^a + i \bar{\lambda}^a \sigma^\mu \sigma^\mu \lambda^a, \quad (3.8) \]

with the field strength tensors \( F^a_{\mu\nu} \) defined in Eq. (2.2). Finally, the complete SUSY Lagrangian is expressible as

\[ \mathcal{L}_{\text{SUSY}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{chiral}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{gauge}} - \sqrt{2} g \left( (\phi^* T^a \phi) \lambda^a + \lambda^\dagger (\psi^\dagger T^a \phi) \right) + g (\phi^* T^a \phi) D^a, \quad (3.9) \]

where \( T^a \) are the gauge group generators. The additional terms in the Lagrangian consist of all possible gauge invariant and renormalisable interaction terms, and the equation of motion for \( D^a \) turns out to be \( D^a = -g (\phi^* T^a \phi) \).

The scalar potential of the supersymmetric Lagrangian can be split into “\( F \)”-terms, determined by the Yukawa interactions, and “\( D \)”-terms determined by the gauge interactions, and is bounded from below:

\[ V(\phi, \phi^*) = V_F + V_D = F^{i*} F_i + \frac{1}{2} D^a D^a = W^i W^i + \frac{1}{2} g_a^2 (\phi^* T^a \phi)^2. \quad (3.10) \]

3.1.3 The MSSM superpotential

The MSSM is the simplest phenomenologically viable SUSY model. The SM particle spectrum is more than doubled, with each left- and right-handed fermion and gauge bosons getting their corresponding superpartners. The gauge and chiral multiplets are detailed in Table 3.1. By convention, the chiral multiplets are defined in terms of the left-handed Weyl spinors, with the right-handed fermions and their superpartners being the conjugate of the left-handed ones. With a generation index \( i \in \{1, 2, 3\} \), the left-handed quark doublets are denoted as \( q_i = (u_i L, d_i L) \). Their scalar superpartners (or squarks) are \( \tilde{q}_i = (\tilde{u}_{iL}, \tilde{d}_{iL}) \). Transforming under the same representation of the gauge groups, both \( q_i \) and \( \tilde{q}_i \) are contained in a chiral supermultiplet \( Q_i \). The right-handed up-type quark singlet \( u_{iR}^\dagger \), denoted in our convention as \( \bar{u}_{iL} \), and its superpartner \( \tilde{u}_{iL} \) are contained in the supermultiplet \( \bar{u}_i \). Similarly the multiplet \( \bar{d}_i \) contains the down-type quark singlet \( \tilde{d}_{iL} \) along with its superpartner \( \tilde{d}_{iL}^\dagger \).

The supermultiplet \( L_i \) contains the left-handed lepton doublets \( \ell_i = (\nu_i, e_{iL}) \) along with the corresponding scalar leptons (sleptons) \( \tilde{\ell}_i = (\tilde{\nu}_i, \tilde{e}_{iL}) \). Finally, \( \tilde{\ell}_i \) contains the charged lepton singlets \( (\tilde{\ell}_{iR}^\dagger, \tilde{\ell}_{iR}^\dagger) \), owing to the absence of right-handed neutrinos in the SM or the MSSM.

The gauge bosons and their superpartners occur in three supermultiplets: one each for the \( B \)-boson and the \( \text{bino} \) \( \tilde{B} \), the \{\( W^\pm, W^3 \}\) bosons and the \( \text{wino} \) \{\( \tilde{W}^\pm, \tilde{W}^3 \)\}, and the gluon \( g \) with the \( \text{gluino} \) \( \tilde{g} \).

The Higgs sector of the MSSM is richer than that of the SM. The MSSM is a two-Higgs doublet model that is constrained by supersymmetry. Constraints imposed by SUSY, as
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Table 3.1: Chiral and gauge supermultiplets of the MSSM [36,37].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chiral</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Spin-0</th>
<th>Spin-1/2</th>
<th>(SU(3)_C, SU(2)_L, U(1)_Y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(S)quarks</td>
<td>$Q$</td>
<td>$\tilde{u}_L, \tilde{d}_L$</td>
<td>$(u_L, d_L)$</td>
<td>$(3, 2, 1/3)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\tilde{u}$</td>
<td>$\tilde{u}^c_R$</td>
<td>$u^c_R$</td>
<td>$(3, 1, -4/3)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\tilde{d}$</td>
<td>$\tilde{d}^c_R$</td>
<td>$d^c_R$</td>
<td>$(3, 1, 2/3)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S)leptons</td>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>$\tilde{\nu}_L, \tilde{e}_L$</td>
<td>$(\nu_L, e_L)$</td>
<td>$(1, 2, -1)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\tilde{e}$</td>
<td>$\tilde{e}^c_R$</td>
<td>$e^c_R$</td>
<td>$(1, 1, 2)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgs(inos)</td>
<td>$\mathcal{H}_1$</td>
<td>$h_0^d, h_0^-_d$</td>
<td>$(h_0^d, \tilde{h}_0^-_d)$</td>
<td>$(1, 2, -1)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\mathcal{H}_2$</td>
<td>$h_0^u, h_0^-_u$</td>
<td>$(h_0^u, \tilde{h}_0^-_u)$</td>
<td>$(1, 2, 1)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gluino, gluon</td>
<td>$\tilde{g}$</td>
<td>$g$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$(8, 1, 0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bino, B-boson</td>
<td>$\tilde{B}$</td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$(1, 1, 0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winos, W-bosons</td>
<td>${\tilde{W}^\pm, \tilde{W}^3}$</td>
<td>${W^\pm, W^3}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$(1, 3, 0)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

will be discussed subsequently, dictate that at least two Higgs doublets are required to provide masses for both the up- and down-type fermions and the gauge bosons. In the SM, these masses are generated by the scalar doublet $\Phi$ and its complex conjugate $\Phi$. The two complex Higgs doublets of the MSSM have a total of eight degrees of freedom. Three of these dof lend longitudinal components to the massive gauge bosons via the EWSB mechanism. The remaining physical dof manifest themselves as five Higgs bosons. Each of these Higgses have corresponding spin $\frac{1}{2}$ superpartners called Higgsinos. We discuss the mixings of the particles described in Table 3.1 into mass eigenstates and their manifestation as physical fields in Section 3.2.

The chiral and gauge supermultiplets appear in the R-parity (see Section 3.1.4) conserving superpotential containing the non-gauge interactions as follows:

$$W_{\text{MSSM}} = y_u Q \cdot \mathcal{H}_2 - \bar{y}_d Q \cdot \mathcal{H}_1 - \bar{y}_e L \cdot \mathcal{H}_1 + \mu \mathcal{H}_1 \cdot \mathcal{H}_2.$$  (3.11)

The dot operator is the $SU(2)_L$-invariant product contracted by the total anti-symmetric tensor $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}$, and the gauge indices and generations of the supermultiplets have been suppressed. The $y_{u,d,e}$ are the $3 \times 3$ Yukawa matrices in family space as described in Section 2.3.2. Here we see two separate Higgs doublets that couple to the up- and down-type fermions, in contrast to the SM where the doublet $\Phi$ with a vev in the lower component and $\overline{\Phi}$ with a vev in the upper component render both the up-type and down-type fermions massive. However, it is not possible to replace $\mathcal{H}_2$ by $\overline{\mathcal{H}_1}$, since $W_{\text{MSSM}}$ is a holomorphic function that cannot contain complex conjugates in order to preserve SUSY. Furthermore, we also need two Higgsinos and therefore two Higgs doublets with hypercharges $Y_{\mathcal{H}_{1,2}} = \pm 1$ to facilitate the cancellation of gauge anomalies that would occur in
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a scenario where only one fermionic Higgsino existed. In Eq. (3.11), \( \mu \), the only SUSY conserving parameter later appears as the potentially complex Higgsino mass parameter.

3.1.4 R-parity

Experimental searches have not shown deviations from lepton (\( L \)) and baryon (\( B \)) number conservation so far. In the SM, their conservation occurs accidentally, since all possible renormalisable terms exclude ones that violate \( L \) and \( B \). Even though \( W_{\text{MSSM}} \) in Eq. (3.11) conserves lepton and baryon number, \( L \)- and \( B \)-violating terms are not excluded from the renormalisable and gauge invariant MSSM, which can lead to an unstable proton. In order to safeguard the MSSM from the consequences of \( B \) and \( L \) violation, a new symmetry called R-symmetry [45] is introduced. We require that every coupling preserves R-parity, which is defined as

\[
R = (-1)^{3B+L+2S},
\]

where \( S \) is the spin of the particle. This assigns \( R = +1 \) for SM particles and \( R = -1 \) for their superpartners. It allows all interactions in Eq. (3.11) but forbids the baryon- and lepton-number violating terms. Mathematically, it can be motivated as the discrete subgroup \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \), a remnant of the continuous \( U(1) \) gauge symmetry. If R-parity is conserved, SUSY particles can only be produced in pairs, and the lightest supersymmetric particle (LSP) is completely stable. This has phenomenological importance: if the LSP is colour and charge neutral as well as weakly interacting, it is an ideal candidate for cold non-baryonic dark matter [46, 47]. In the MSSM the lightest neutralino \( \tilde{\chi}_0 \) can play this role. Additionally, any sparticle can only decay into an odd number of LSPs. There exist phenomenological SUSY models that allow for R-parity violation, however all the interactions considered in this thesis preserve R-parity.

3.1.5 SUSY breaking

As discussed in Section 3.1.2, unbroken SUSY interactions would imply that the SM particles and their SUSY counterparts are mass degenerate. However, the fact that we have not detected SUSY particles in experiments so far means that supersymmetry is not realised exactly in nature. Any phenomenologically viable model must therefore involve SUSY breaking. From a theoretical perspective, one would expect SUSY to be broken spontaneously in the manner of EWSB. Spontaneous breaking of SUSY could occur in a hidden sector which has no direct renormalisable couplings to the visible sector and could be mediated to the visible sector through different mechanisms. From a practical point of view, the exact SUSY breaking mechanism does not have much phenomenological impact. It is therefore useful to parametrise our ignorance of the exact dynamics of supersymmetry breaking by introducing terms that break the symmetry explicitly in the
Lagrangian. As argued in Section 3.1.2, the SUSY breaking couplings must be soft, which means that the relations between the dimensionless couplings must remain unmodified in order to avoid reintroducing the quadratic divergences in the Higgs mass correction terms.

The most general renormalisable Lagrangian for soft SUSY breaking terms with gauge invariance and R-parity conservation is $[36, 37]$

$$L_{\text{soft}} = - \frac{1}{2} \left( M_3 \tilde{g}^a \tilde{g}_a + M_2 \tilde{W}^a \tilde{W}_a + M_1 \tilde{B} \tilde{B} + \text{h.c.} \right)$$

$$- \left( \tilde{\bar{u}} a_u \tilde{Q} \cdot \mathcal{H}_2 - \tilde{\bar{d}} a_d \tilde{Q} \cdot \mathcal{H}_1 - \tilde{\bar{e}} a_e \tilde{Q} \cdot \mathcal{H}_1 + \text{h.c.} \right)$$

$$- \tilde{Q}^\dagger m_Q^2 \tilde{Q} - \tilde{L}^\dagger m_L^2 \tilde{L} - \tilde{\bar{u}} m_u^2 \tilde{\bar{u}} - \tilde{\bar{d}} m_d^2 \tilde{\bar{d}} - \tilde{\bar{e}} m_e^2 \tilde{\bar{e}}$$

$$- m_{H_1}^2 \mathcal{H}_1 \cdot \mathcal{H}_1 - m_{H_2}^2 \mathcal{H}_2 \cdot \mathcal{H}_2 - \left( m_{12}^2 \mathcal{H}_1 \cdot \mathcal{H}_2 + \text{h.c.} \right) .$$  

(3.13)

Here, $a$ is the gauge index, and $M_{1,2,3}$ are the bino, wino and gluino masses, respectively. The second line contains the dimensionful trilinear interaction terms $a_u, a_d$ and $a_e$ of the Higgs boson with two sfermions. Each $a_u, a_d$ and $a_e$ is a complex $3 \times 3$ matrix in family space, with a one-to-one correspondence to the Yukawa couplings of the superpotential $[36]$. In the third line are the soft sfermion squared masses $m_{\tilde{f}}^2$ with $\tilde{f} \in \{ \tilde{Q}, \tilde{L}, \tilde{u}, \tilde{d}, \tilde{e} \}$, which, along with $M_{1,2,3}$ from the first line, break the mass degeneracy between the SM particles and their superpartners. The last line introduces the squared mass terms of the Higgs supermultiplets $m_{H_1,2}^2$ and the bilinear term in the Higgs field with the soft breaking mass parameter $m_{12}^2$.

We see that while the superpotential (which conserves SUSY) introduces only one new parameter, $\mu$, the SUSY breaking Lagrangian introduces a number of masses, mixing angles and couplings with potentially complex values that are not present in the SM. The MSSM contains 105 new parameters in the most general case, in addition to 19 from the SM. It is useful to impose an organizing principle on the SUSY breaking Lagrangian, since several of the new parameters in Eq. (3.13) are severely constrained by experiment. Therefore, in phenomenological studies of the MSSM, one imposes simplifying assumptions motivated by experimental constraints that can reduce the parameter space considerably.

In this thesis, we will assume that SUSY breaking is “universal” with respect to flavour. In an idealised limit where the squark and slepton squared mass matrices are flavour diagonal, one can assume

$$m_{\tilde{Q}, \tilde{L}}^2 = m_{\tilde{Q}, \tilde{L}}^2 1, \quad m_{\tilde{u}}^2 = m_{\tilde{u}}^2 1, \quad m_{\tilde{d}}^2 = m_{\tilde{d}}^2 1, \quad m_{\tilde{e}}^2 = m_{\tilde{e}}^2 1 .$$  

(3.14)

This ensures that SUSY contributions to the severely constrained flavour-changing neutral currents are minimal. Assuming minimal flavour violation (MFV) $[48–50]$, which means that SUSY does not introduce any flavour violating interactions beyond those already
present in the SM, renders the trilinear couplings proportional to the corresponding Yukawa couplings:

\[ a_u = A_u y_u, \quad a_d = A_d y_d, \quad a_e = A_e y_e. \tag{3.15} \]

As a consequence of this structure in the MFV case, only squarks and sleptons of the third generation have large couplings to the Higgs boson. Another simplifying assumption to further shrink the parameter space in the MSSM is to assume CP conservation. However, as we will demonstrate in Chapter 5 and onwards, CP-violating terms can give rise to rich phenomenological features and we therefore allow parameters to be complex throughout this thesis. Lastly, along with the unification of gauge couplings, one can also assume that the gaugino masses unify at GUT scale, which leads to the following relation for the electroweak soft-breaking mass parameters:

\[ M_1 = \frac{5}{3} s_W^2 M_2. \tag{3.16} \]

### 3.2 The mass spectrum of the MSSM

The gauge eigenstates of the sfermion and gaugino sectors mix into and propagate as physical mass eigenstates as a result of electroweak symmetry breaking. In the subsequent sections, we describe the physical fields of the MSSM, especially the ones relevant to this thesis. A significant portion of this section will be dedicated to detailing the Higgs sector and the electroweak symmetry breaking mechanism in the MSSM.

#### 3.2.1 Sfermion sector

In the MSSM without flavour mixing in the sfermion sector, sfermions \( \tilde{f}_{L,R} \) of one generation mix into mass eigenstates \( \tilde{f}_{1,2} \). The term of the Lagrangian containing the sfermion mass matrix of one generation is given by [51]

\[ \mathcal{L}_f \supset -(\tilde{f}^L, \tilde{f}^R) M_f^2 \left( \begin{array}{c} \tilde{f}^L \\ \tilde{f}^R \end{array} \right) \]

with

\[ M_f^2 = \begin{pmatrix} M_{f_L}^2 + m_f^2 + m_Z^2 \cos 2\beta (I_f^3 - Q_f s_W^2) & m_f X_f^* \\ m_f X_f & M_{f_R}^2 + m_f^2 + m_Z^2 \cos 2\beta Q_f s_W^2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.17} \]

Here \( m_f \) is the corresponding fermion mass and \( X_f := A_f - \mu^* \cdot \{\cot \beta, \tan \beta\} \), where \( \cot \beta \) and \( \tan \beta \) apply to up- and down-type sfermions, respectively. The soft-breaking masses \( M_{f_L}^2 \) and \( M_{f_R}^2 \), the third component of the weak isospin \( I_f^3 \), the electric charge \( Q_f \) and the mass of the fermion \( m_f \) are real parameters. This also applies to the Z-boson mass \( m_Z \) and the sine of the weak mixing angle \( s_W \equiv \sin \theta_W \). Contrarily, in the \( \mathcal{CP} \)-violating MSSM the trilinear couplings of the Higgs to the sfermions \( A_f = |A_f| e^{i\phi_A} \) and
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the Higgsino mass parameter $\mu = |\mu|e^{i\phi}$, and hence $X_f$, can be complex. These complex parameters enter the Higgs sector via the Higgs–sfermion couplings, see Appendix A, and are thus also of direct relevance for Higgs boson production.

For minimal flavour violation, the mass matrix is diagonalised for all $f$ separately through the unitary matrix $U_f$ having real diagonal elements and complex off-diagonal elements,

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
\tilde{f}_1 \\
\tilde{f}_2
\end{pmatrix} = U_f 
\begin{pmatrix}
\tilde{f}_L \\
\tilde{f}_R
\end{pmatrix}.
$$

(3.18)

The sfermion masses $m_{\tilde{f}_1}$ and $m_{\tilde{f}_2}$, using the convention $m_{\tilde{f}_1} \leq m_{\tilde{f}_2}$, are calculated as the eigenvalues of Eq. (3.17). Explicitly, these are given by

$$
m_{\tilde{f}_{1,2}}^2 = m_f^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[ M_{\tilde{f}_L}^2 + M_{\tilde{f}_R}^2 + I_3^f m_2^2 \cos 2\beta \right.
\left. \mp \sqrt{\left[ M_{\tilde{f}_L}^2 - M_{\tilde{f}_R}^2 + m_2^2 \cos 2\beta (I_3^f - Q^f s_W^2) \right]^2 + 4m_f^2 |X_f|^2} \right].
$$

(3.19)

The fact that the left-handed soft-breaking parameter $M_{\tilde{f}_L}^2$ is the same for the fields in an $SU(2)_L$ doublet gives rise to a tree-level relation between masses of up-type and down-type squarks.

3.2.2 Gluino sector

The gluino $\tilde{g}$, a colour octet fermion with spin $s = \frac{1}{2}$, does not mix with other fields and enters the tree-level Lagrangian in the form

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{g}} \supset -\frac{1}{2} \bar{\tilde{g}} m_{\tilde{g}} \tilde{g},
$$

(3.20)

where $m_{\tilde{g}}$ is the absolute value of the possibly complex soft-breaking parameter $M_3 = m_3 e^{i\delta_3}$. In the Feynman diagrams for the Higgs boson self-energies and the Higgs boson production via gluon fusion, the gluino only contributes beyond the one-loop level. However it affects the bottom-quark Yukawa coupling already at the one-loop level, where it enters the leading corrections to the relation between the bottom-quark mass and the bottom-quark Yukawa coupling which can be resummed to all orders. A more detailed discussion of this will follow in Section 6.4.1.

3.2.3 Neutralino sector

The Higgsinos and electroweak gauginos mix with each other as a result of electroweak symmetry breaking. The neutral Higgsinos ($\tilde{h}^0_u, \tilde{h}^0_d$) and the neutral gauginos ($\tilde{B}, \tilde{W}^3$)
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combine into four neutral eigenstates called neutralinos. Their gauge eigenstates
\[ \tilde{G}^0 = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{B} \\ \tilde{W}^3 \\ \tilde{h}_d \\ \tilde{h}_u \end{pmatrix}, \]
appear in the MSSM Lagrangian as
\[ \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{\chi}^0} \supset \frac{1}{2} \tilde{G}^{0\dagger} M_{\tilde{\chi}^0} \tilde{G}^0 + h.c., \]
where \( \tilde{\chi}^0 \) denote the neutralinos,
\[ \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \\ \tilde{\chi}_2^0 \\ \tilde{\chi}_3^0 \\ \tilde{\chi}_4^0 \end{pmatrix} = N \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{B} \\ \tilde{W}^3 \\ \tilde{h}_d \\ \tilde{h}_u \end{pmatrix}. \]

\( M_{\tilde{\chi}^0} \) is the symmetric neutralino mass matrix given by
\[ M_{\tilde{\chi}^0} = \begin{pmatrix} M_1 & 0 & -m_Z s_W \cos \beta & m_Z s_W \sin \beta \\ 0 & M_2 & -m_Z c_W \cos \beta & -m_Z c_W \sin \beta \\ -m_Z s_W \cos \beta & m_Z c_W \cos \beta & 0 & -\mu \\ m_Z s_W \sin \beta & -m_Z c_W \sin \beta & -\mu & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \]
and the complex, unitary matrix \( N \) diagonalises the mass matrix\(^1\):
\[ N^* M_{\tilde{\chi}^0} N^{-1} = \text{diag} (m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}, m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0}, m_{\tilde{\chi}_3^0}, m_{\tilde{\chi}_4^0}), \]
such that \( m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} \leq m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0} \leq m_{\tilde{\chi}_3^0} \leq m_{\tilde{\chi}_4^0} \). The gaugino mass parameters \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \), in addition to the Higgsino mass parameter \( \mu \), can also be complex. However, one of the phases of \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) can be rotated away by an \( \mathbb{R}_2 \) transformation without loss of generality and the other only has a minor impact on the Higgs sector. We will therefore neglect their phase dependence in this thesis.

3.2.4 Chargino sector

Analogous to the mixings that result in neutralinos, the charged Higgsinos \( \tilde{h}_u^+, \tilde{h}_d^- \) and the charged winos \( \tilde{W}^\pm \) mix into charginos, \( \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm, \tilde{\chi}_2^\pm \). The mass eigenstates are related to

\(^1\)\( M_{\tilde{\chi}^0} \) can have negative mass eigenstates, which is fixed by applying the Takagi factorisation. A unitary transformation \( T \) rotates the eigenvalue resulting in \( m_{\tilde{\chi}^0} \geq 0 \) [52, 53].
the gauge eigenstates by
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\tilde{\chi}_1^+ \\
\tilde{\chi}_2^+
\end{pmatrix} = V \begin{pmatrix}
\tilde{W}^+ \\
\tilde{h}_u^+
\end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix}
\tilde{\chi}_1^- \\
\tilde{\chi}_2^-
\end{pmatrix} = U \begin{pmatrix}
\tilde{W}^- \\
\tilde{h}_d^-
\end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.26)
\]
Notice that the mixing matrix for the positively charged and negatively charged fermions is different. The gauge eigenstates can be defined as
\[
\tilde{g}^+ = \begin{pmatrix}
\tilde{W}^+ \\
\tilde{h}_u^+
\end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{g}^- = \begin{pmatrix}
\tilde{W}^- \\
\tilde{h}_d^-
\end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.27)
\]
and the MSSM Lagrangian containing the chargino mass terms is
\[
\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{\chi}^\pm} \supset \frac{1}{2} [\tilde{g}^{+T} \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\chi}^\pm}^{-1} \tilde{g}^- + \tilde{g}^{-T} \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\chi}^\pm} \tilde{g}^+] + h.c., \quad (3.28)
\]
with the tree-level chargino mass matrix \( \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\chi}^\pm} \) governed by the Higgsino mass parameter \( \mu \) and the gaugino mass parameter \( M_2 \) as follows,
\[
\mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\chi}^\pm} = \begin{pmatrix}
M_2 & \sqrt{2}m_W \sin \beta \\
\sqrt{2}m_W \cos \beta & \mu
\end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.29)
\]
The masses of the charginos are obtained by diagonalising \( \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\chi}^\pm} \) using the two \( 2 \times 2 \) unitary matrices \( U \) and \( V \):
\[
U^* \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\chi}^\pm} V = \text{diag}(m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}, m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^\pm}) \quad (3.30)
\]
such that \( m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm} \leq m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^\pm} \). This results in the eigenvalues
\[
m_{\tilde{\chi}_{1,2}^\pm} = \frac{M_2^2 + |\mu|^2 + 2m_W^2}{2} \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{M_2^2 + |\mu|^2 + 2m_W^2}{2}\right)^2 - |\mu M_2 - m_W^2 \sin 2\beta|^2}. \quad (3.31)
\]

### 3.2.5 Higgs sector and EWSB in the MSSM

As discussed in Section 3.1.3, the MSSM contains two Higgs doublets with opposite hypercharges \( Y_{H_{1,2}} = \pm 1 \) in order to introduce masses for both the up- and down-type fermions:
\[
\mathcal{H}_1 = \begin{pmatrix}
\tilde{h}_d^0 \\
\tilde{h}_d^-
\end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{H}_2 = \begin{pmatrix}
\tilde{h}_u^+ \\
\tilde{h}_u^0
\end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.32)
\]
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The Higgs potential consists of Higgs-specific $F$- and $D$-terms, and the soft-breaking terms from the last line of Eq. (3.13):

$$V_H = (V_F + V_D - \mathcal{L}_{\text{soft}}) |_H$$

$$= (|\mu|^2 + m^2_{H_2}(|h^0_u|^2 + |h^+_u|^2) + (|\mu|^2 + m^2_{H_1})(|h^0_d|^2 + |h^-_d|^2)$$

$$+ \left[m^2_{12} (h^+_d h^-_d - h^+_u h^-_u) + h.c.\right] + \frac{g^2_1 + g^2_2}{8} \left[|h^0_u|^2 + |h^+_u|^2 - |h^0_d|^2 - |h^-_d|^2\right]^2 \quad (3.33)$$

where we employed

$$V_F = \left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial H_1}\right|^2 + \left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial H_2}\right|^2 , \quad (3.34)$$

$$V_D = \frac{g^2_2}{2} \sum_{a=1}^3 \left(H_1^a \sigma^a \frac{1}{2} H_1 + H_2^a \sigma^a \frac{1}{2} H_2\right)^2 + \frac{g^2_1}{2} \left(H_2^1 \frac{1}{2} H_2 - H_1^1 \frac{1}{2} H_1\right)^2 . \quad (3.35)$$

The quadratic terms of $V_H$ contain the SUSY parameter $|\mu|^2$ and the real soft breaking terms $m_{H_1}$, $m_{H_2}$. The full scalar potential of the MSSM also contains terms that involve squark and slepton fields that are ignored here since they do not get vevs. The bilinear terms have the soft coefficient $m^2_{12}$, which can be complex, but whose phase can be absorbed by redefining the phases of $\mu$ and $m^2_{12}$ through a Peccei-Quinn transformation [54,55].

So far, we have encountered the possible complex parameters $M_1, M_2, M_3, A_f, \mu$ and $m^2_{12}$. In Section 3.3, we will describe the $\mathbb{R}_2$ and Peccei-Quinn (PQ) transformations used to absorb the phases of $M_2$ and $m^2_{12}$ and discuss the experimental bounds on the rest of the phases.

Electroweak symmetry breaking in the MSSM

In order to obtain massive fermions and gauge bosons, we require that the minimum of Eq. (3.33) should break down the symmetry to $SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y \to U(1)_{\text{EM}}$ in accordance with observations in nature. However the presence of an additional complex Higgs doublet makes the EWSB mechanism more complicated than in the SM.

In order to simplify the EWSB mechanism in the MSSM, one can take advantage of the freedom to use gauge transformations, and carry out an $SU(2)_L$ transformation to rotate away $h^+_d$ at the minimum such that we can assume without loss of generality that $\langle h^+_d \rangle = 0$ [36]. A potential satisfying this minimising condition also has $\langle h^-_d \rangle = 0$. This implies that the $U(1)_{\text{EM}}$ symmetry is unbroken in the vacuum state since the charged components of the Higgs doublets have vanishing vevs.
We can now express the Higgs potential $V_H$ in terms of the neutral Higgs states:

$$V_H^0 = (|\mu|^2 + m_{\tilde{H}_1}^2)|h_u^0|^2 + (|\mu|^2 + m_{\tilde{H}_2}^2)|h_d^0|^2$$

$$- [m_{12}^2 h_u^0 h_d^0 + \text{h.c.}] + \frac{g_1^2 + g_2^2}{8} [|h_u^0|^2 - |h_d^0|^2]^2 .$$  \hfill (3.36)

For the MSSM scalar potential to successfully induce EWSB, it must satisfy the same properties that we imposed on the SM scalar potential in Eq. (2.8). Not only must it have a stable minimum that does not lie at the origin, but it must also be bounded from below. The quartic interactions of $V_H$ are able to stabilise the potential for arbitrarily large values of $h_u^0$ and $h_d^0$. However, when $h_u^0 = h_d^0$, the quartic $D$-term (proportional to $g_1^2 + g_2^2$) is identically zero. This is called the $D$-flat direction in field space, and for the scalar potential to be bounded from below we require the quadratic part of the potential to be positive in this direction. This imposes the following relation on $\mu$, $\mathcal{H}_{1,2}$ and $m_{12}^2$:

$$0 < 2m_{12}^2 < 2|\mu|^2 + m_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2 + m_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 .$$  \hfill (3.37)

The second condition on the scalar potential is that it needs to have a saddle point at the origin $|h_u^0| = |h_d^0| = 0$. This unstable origin is achieved when the linear combination of $h_u^0$ and $h_d^0$ has a negative mass squared:

$$m_{12}^2 > (|\mu|^2 + m_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2) + (|\mu|^2 + m_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2) .$$  \hfill (3.38)

It is clear that Eq. (3.37) and Eq. (3.38) cannot be simultaneously fulfilled if $m_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2 = m_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2$ and especially for $m_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2 = m_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 = 0$, which means SUSY breaking is necessary for successful EWSB in the MSSM. There exist models with boundary conditions derived from Minimal SUper GRAvity (MSUGRA) or Gauge-Mediated Supersymmetry Breaking (GMSB) wherein $m_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2 = m_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2$ holds at the GUT scale, but radiative corrections involving large top-Yukawa couplings can drive $m_{\mathcal{H}_0}^2$ to small values, unequal to $m_{\mathcal{H}_1}^2$, at the electroweak scale. In such models electroweak symmetry breaking is induced by quantum radiative corrections proportional to the squared masses of SUSY particles via a mechanism known as radiative EWSB, which generates EWSB dynamically for universal boundary conditions. Naturally, in order to prevent the reintroduction of large fine tuning of the bare Higgs mass in such a case, the SUSY particle masses should not be larger than $\mathcal{O}(\text{TeV})$.

Having established the conditions necessary for $h_u^0$ and $h_d^0$ to have real non-vanishing vevs, we can write

$$\langle h_u^0 \rangle = v_u , \quad \langle h_d^0 \rangle = v_d .$$  \hfill (3.39)

Their ratio is written as

$$\tan \beta = \frac{v_u}{v_d}$$  \hfill (3.40)

and is one of the primary input parameters describing MSSM phenomenology. The values of $v_u$ and $v_d$ must satisfy the observed phenomenology of the Higgs sector, and hence we
define their relation to the SM vev
\[ v^2 = v_a^2 + v_d^2 = \frac{4m_Z^2}{g_1^2 + g_2^2} \approx (246 \text{ GeV})^2, \]
where \( m_Z \) is the mass of the Z-boson.

### The \( \mu \) problem

The minimisation condition for the scalar potential leads to the relation
\[ \frac{m_Z^2}{2} = -\mu^2 + \frac{m_{H_1}^2 - m_{H_2}^2 \tan^2 \beta}{\tan^2 \beta - 1}. \tag{3.42} \]
The left-hand side of this equation resides at the electroweak scale. On the other hand, \( \mu \) is a SUSY conserving parameter, and \( m_{H_1,2}^2 \) are soft-breaking parameters with \( m_{\text{soft}} \) as their mass scale. These parameters on the right-hand side of Eq. (3.42) with a priori separate origins must combine to result in the electroweak scale. Unless their mass scales are within a couple of orders magnitude of \( m_Z \), additional cancellations will be required to fulfil the above relation. The MSSM does not provide an explanation for why \( \mu^2 \) must be small compared to, say, \( M_2^2 \) and in particular why it should be of the order of \( 10^2 \) or \( 10^3 \) GeV. This is known as the “\( \mu \) problem” [56, 57] and serves as a motivation for next-to-minimal supersymmetric models, where \( \mu \) naturally arises at the electroweak scale as the vev of an additional singlet. However, in this thesis we will limit ourselves to the MSSM.

### Tree-level masses and mixings

In an expansion around the minimum, the neutral fields of the two Higgs doublets can be decomposed into \( CP \)-even \( (\phi_1^0, \phi_2^0) \) and \( CP \)-odd \( (\chi_1^0, \chi_2^0) \) components as follows
\[ H_1 = \left( v_d + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\phi_1^0 + i\chi_1^0) \right), \quad H_2 = e^{i\xi} \left( v_u + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\phi_2^0 + i\chi_2^0) \right). \tag{3.43} \]
Here \( \xi \) is a possible relative phase between the two doublets. Inserting this expansion into the scalar potential we obtain
\[ V_H \supset -\sum_i T_i \Phi_i^0 + \frac{1}{2} \Phi^0 M_{\phi\phi} \Phi^{0T} + \frac{1}{2} \Phi^{-} M_{\phi^+\phi^-} \Phi^{+T} \cdots, \tag{3.44} \]

\(^2\)We note that the convention differs from the convention employed by FeynHiggs by a different sign of \( \chi_1^0 \) and \( \phi_1^- \), which induces different signs in the corresponding elements of the matrices in Eq. (3.44), Eq. (3.46) and Eq. (3.47) and the \( \chi_1^0 \) couplings to (s)quarks displayed in Appendix A.
3 The MSSM with complex parameters

with \( \Phi^0 := (\phi^0_1, \phi^0_2, \chi^0_1, \chi^0_2) \) and \( \Phi^\pm := (\phi^\pm_1, \phi^\pm_2) \). \( T_i \) are the tadpole coefficients, \( M_{\phi\phi\chi\chi} \) is the mass matrix of the neutral degrees of freedom,

\[
M_{\phi\phi\chi\chi} = \begin{pmatrix}
M_{\phi\phi}^2 & M_{\phi\chi}^2 \\
M_{\phi\chi}^2 & M_{\chi\chi}^2
\end{pmatrix},
\]

(3.45)

and \( M_{\phi^\pm,\phi^\pm} \) is the \( 2 \times 2 \) Hermitian mass matrix of the charged Higgs components. At tree level, the minimisation conditions for \( V_H \) require the tadpole coefficients and the relative phase \( \xi \) between the Higgs doublets to vanish. Consequently, the Higgs sector of the MSSM is \( \mathcal{CP} \)-conserving at lowest order. This also implies that \( M_{\phi\phi\chi\chi} \) is block diagonal. The two complex Higgs doublets of Eq. (3.43) contain eight degrees of freedom.

In analogy to the SM, EWSB results in three of these degrees of freedom contributing to the longitudinal polarisation components of \( Z \) and \( W^\pm \) bosons. The remaining five degrees of freedom manifest themselves as five physical Higgs bosons of the MSSM: \( \mathcal{CP} \)-even \( h, H \), a \( \mathcal{CP} \)-odd \( A \) and two charged Higgses \( H^\pm \) at lowest order. The tree-level neutral mass eigenstates \( \{h, H, A, G\} \), where \( G \) is the unphysical Goldstone boson, are obtained from the tree-level neutral gauge eigenstates \( \{\phi^0_1, \phi^0_2, \chi^0_1, \chi^0_2\} \) through a unitary matrix as follows:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
h \\
H \\
A \\
G
\end{pmatrix} =
\begin{pmatrix}
-s_\alpha & c_\alpha & 0 & 0 \\
c_\alpha & s_\alpha & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & s_\beta_n & c_\beta_n \\
0 & 0 & -c_\beta_n & s_\beta_n
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\phi^0_1 \\
\phi^0_2 \\
\chi^0_1 \\
\chi^0_2
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

(3.46)

Similarly, for the charged Higgs states one obtains

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
H^+ \\
G^+
\end{pmatrix} =
\begin{pmatrix}
s_\beta_c & c_\beta_c \\
-c_\beta_c & s_\beta_c
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\phi^+_1 \\
\phi^+_2
\end{pmatrix},
\]

(3.47)

where \( s_x \equiv \sin x, c_x \equiv \cos x \). \( \alpha, \beta_n \) and \( \beta_c \) are the mixing angles for the \( \mathcal{CP} \)-even Higgs bosons \( (h, H) \), the neutral \( \mathcal{CP} \)-odd states \( (A, G) \), and the charged states \( (H^\pm, G^\pm) \), respectively. Minimising the Higgs potential leads to \( \beta := \beta_n = \beta_c \) at tree level, with the following relation between the mixing angles

\[
\tan(2\alpha) = \frac{m_A^2 + m_Z^2}{m_A^2 - m_Z^2} \tan(2\beta).
\]

(3.48)

The masses of the Higgs bosons at tree level are given by the relations

\[
m^2_{h/H} = \frac{1}{2} \left( m_A^2 + m_Z^2 + \sqrt{(m_A^2 + m_Z^2)^2 - 4m_A^2m_Z^2\cos^2(2\beta)} \right)
\]

(3.49)

\[
m^2_{H^\pm} = m_A^2 + m_W^2, \quad m_A^2 = \frac{2m_{12}^2}{\sin(2\beta)}.
\]

(3.50)
3.2 The mass spectrum of the MSSM

Table 3.2: A summary of physical states of the MSSM [36] excluding the SM fermions and gluons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Gauge eigenstates</th>
<th>Physical states</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sfermions</td>
<td>$\tilde{f}_L, \tilde{f}_R$</td>
<td>$\tilde{f}_1, \tilde{f}_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutralinos</td>
<td>$\tilde{B}, \tilde{W}^3, \tilde{h}_u^0, \tilde{h}_d^0$</td>
<td>$\tilde{\chi}_1^0, \tilde{\chi}_2^0, \tilde{\chi}_3^0, \tilde{\chi}_4^0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charginos</td>
<td>$\tilde{W}^\pm, \tilde{h}_u^\pm, \tilde{h}_d^\pm$</td>
<td>$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm, \tilde{\chi}_2^\pm$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gluino</td>
<td>$\tilde{g}$</td>
<td>$\tilde{g}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauge bosons</td>
<td>$B, W^1, W^2, W^3$</td>
<td>$\gamma, Z, W^\pm$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgs bosons</td>
<td>$h_u^0, h_d^0, h_u^+, h_d^-$</td>
<td>$h, H, A, H^\pm$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with $m_h < m_H$. The Higgs sector of the MSSM at lowest order is fully determined (besides the gauge couplings) by two parameters, which are usually chosen as $m_A$ (or equivalently, $m_{H^\pm}$) and $\tan \beta (\equiv t_\beta)$ for the case of the MSSM with real parameters. For the MSSM with complex parameters, we choose the mass $m_{H^\pm}$ instead of $m_A$ as the input parameter, since beyond tree-level, $\mathcal{C}\mathcal{P}$-violating mixings give rise to $\mathcal{C}\mathcal{P}$-admixed Higgs bosons and $A$ is no longer a mass eigenstate. At higher orders as particles from other sectors contribute to loop-induced effects, also other SUSY parameters affect the Higgs boson masses and mixings.

Eq. (3.49) gives the upper bound $m_h \leq m_Z$ at tree level, which had already been excluded at LEP for a SM-like Higgs boson [58]. We must take into consideration higher order corrections to the Higgs mass; while the 1-loop contributions from third generation (s)quarks are substantial and can shift the upper bound to about 140 GeV [59–63], leading 2-loop corrections reduce this bound to about 130 GeV for TeV scale SUSY masses [64]. For the latest developments in Higgs mass calculations we refer the reader to Refs. [65–69] and references therein. The discovery of the SM-like Higgs signal at $\sim$125 GeV by ATLAS and CMS in 2012 is therefore a priori compatible with the lightest MSSM Higgs boson $h$. While there exist scenarios wherein the heavier $\mathcal{C}\mathcal{P}$-even Higgs boson $H$ can be interpreted as the SM-like discovered state [70–74], in this thesis we will mainly consider scenarios where the lightest MSSM Higgs boson is SM-like.

A summary of the mass eigenstates of the MSSM resulting from mixings of the gauge eigenstates is presented in Table 3.2.

The decoupling limit

In the MSSM, the tree-level couplings of the neutral Higgs bosons to the up and down-type fermions and gauge bosons depend on the mixing angles $\alpha$ and $\beta$. These couplings, relative to those of the SM Higgs, are summarised in Table 3.3. Eq. (A.1) in Appendix A illustrates how they explicitly appear in the Lagrangian.

In models with an extended Higgs sector, the SM Higgs coupling to gauge bosons is
Table 3.3: Tree-level couplings of the neutral MSSM Higgs bosons to SM massive fermions and gauge bosons relative to the couplings of the SM Higgs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\phi$</th>
<th>$g^\phi_u$</th>
<th>$g^\phi_d$</th>
<th>$g^\phi_V$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>$H^0$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSM</td>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>$c_\alpha/s_\beta$</td>
<td>$-s_\alpha/c_\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H$</td>
<td>$s_\alpha/s_\beta$</td>
<td>$c_\alpha/c_\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$A$</td>
<td>$1/t_\beta$</td>
<td>$t_\beta$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

distributed among the neutral BSM Higgs bosons to maintain unitarity. For example, the MSSM features the following sum rule for the relative gauge boson ($V$) couplings to the three neutral Higgs bosons \[75\]:

$$\sum_{\phi \in \{h, H, A\}} (g^\phi_V)^2 = 1 ,$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.51)

These couplings of the Higgs bosons of the MSSM relative to SM values are

$$g^h_V = \sin(\beta - \alpha), \quad g^H_V = \cos(\beta - \alpha) ,$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.52)

with no tree-level couplings of the $CP$-odd $A$ or $H^\pm$ to $VV$. When $m_A \gg m_Z$, the Higgs masses and mixing angles simplify:

$$m^2_h \approx m^2_Z \cos^2 2\beta, \quad m^2_H \approx m^2_A + m^2_Z \sin^2 2\beta, \quad \cos^2 (\beta - \alpha) \approx \frac{m^4_Z \sin^2 4\beta}{4m^4_A} .$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.53)

In this limit, it is apparent that $m_A \simeq m_H \simeq m_{H^\pm}$, and $\cos(\beta - \alpha) \to 0$ up to corrections of $O(m^4_Z/m^4_A)$. Consequently, the tree-level mixing angles $\alpha$ and $\beta$ approach the limiting values

$$\sin(\alpha) \to -\cos(\beta), \quad \cos(\alpha) \to \sin(\beta), \quad \sin(\beta - \alpha) \to 1, \quad \cos(\beta - \alpha) \to 0 .$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.54)

This results in $H$ and $A$ decoupling from $VV$, and the $hAZ$ coupling $g^h_{AZ} = \cos(\beta - \alpha)$ vanishes. The $h$ coupling to $VV$ and the fermions behaves like that of the SM Higgs boson. This is called the decoupling limit \[76\]. In this limit, the MSSM Higgs sector behaves SM-like, and the heavy Higgs bosons searches in the production and decay channels with gauge bosons become difficult because of small rates. The couplings of the heavy Higgses to the fermions may either be suppressed or enhanced depending on the angles $\alpha$ and $\beta$.

As the discovered 125 GeV scalar has yet to show any significant deviation from SM properties, limits such as the decoupling limit or the more general alignment limit\[^3\] \[77–79\]

\[^3\]Here an SM-like Higgs boson arises if one of the neutral Higgs mass eigenstates is approximately aligned with the direction of the Higgs vev in field space.
where one of the Higgs bosons can be interpreted as the SM-like discovered state are crucial for benchmark scenarios for MSSM Higgs searches. The scenarios investigated in this thesis will largely lie in the decoupling region.

3.3 $\mathcal{CP}$-violating phases in the MSSM

In Section 3.1.5 we discussed the introduction of 105 additional parameters in the MSSM parametrising our ignorance of the precise SUSY breaking mechanism. Assuming MFV restricts the total number of new MSSM parameters to 41. Along with a mass in the Higgs sector\textsuperscript{4} $M_A$ (or $M_{H^\pm}$), they are: $\tan \beta$, the gaugino mass parameters $|M_1|$, $|M_2|$, $|M_3|$ and $|\mu|$, the sfermion masses $m_{\tilde{u}}$, $m_{\tilde{d}}$, $m_{\tilde{e}}$, $m_{\tilde{L}}$, $m_{\tilde{Q}}$ for the three generations, and the trilinear couplings $|A_f|$, $f \in \{e, \mu, \tau, u, d, c, s, t, b\}$ of the sfermions.

In addition to these real parameters, there are also 14 possible $\mathcal{CP}$-violating phases: the Higgsino mass parameter phase $\phi_\mu$, the gluino mass parameter phase $\phi_{M_3}$, the phase of the soft-breaking bilinear mass term $\phi_{m_{12}^2}$, the phases of the gaugino mass parameters, $\phi_{M_1}$, $\phi_{M_2}$ and the phases of the trilinear couplings $\phi_{A_f}$, $f \in \{e, \mu, \tau, u, d, c, s, t, b\}$. However, as we have already mentioned in Section 3.2.3 and Section 3.2.5, not all of the 14 phases are physical. The phases of $m_{12}^2$ and $M_2$ (or $M_1$) can be rotated away, leaving us with 12 independent $\mathcal{CP}$-violating phases.

To absorb the phases of $M_2$ and $m_{12}^2$, we perform two $U(1)$ transformations: $\mathbb{R}_2$ and Peccei-Quinn (PQ), as follows [32]. The transformation of parameters $M_{1,2,3}, A_f, m_{12}^2$ and $\mu$ is defined such that the Lagrangian remains invariant. Quantities are multiplied by $e^{iq\varphi}$ under a general $U(1)$ transformation, where $\varphi$ is the rotation angle and $q$ is the $U(1)$ charge. The U(1) charges of the parameters $M_{1,2,3}, A_f, m_{12}^2$ and $\mu$ under an $\mathbb{R}_2$ transformation are $q_{\mathbb{R}_2} = -1, -1, 0, 1$, respectively. Similarly, their charges under a PQ transformation are $q_{PQ} = 0, 0, -1, -1$, respectively. First, an $\mathbb{R}_2$ transformation with the angle $\phi_{M_2}$ is performed on each of the parameters and fields, followed by a PQ transformation with the angle $\phi_{m_{12}^2}$. This has the following effect on the phases:

\[ \{\phi_\mu, \phi_{M_1}, \phi_{M_2}, \phi_{M_3}, \phi_{m_{12}^2}, \phi_{A_f}\} \]
\[ \downarrow \mathbb{R}_2(\phi_{M_2}) \]
\[ \{\phi_\mu + \phi_{M_2}, \phi_{M_1} - \phi_{M_2}, 0, \phi_{M_3} - \phi_{M_2}, \phi_{m_{12}^2}, \phi_{A_f} - \phi_{M_2}\} \]
\[ \downarrow PQ(\phi_{m_{12}^2}) \]
\[ \{\phi_\mu + \phi_{M_2} - \phi_{m_{12}^2}, \phi_{M_1} - \phi_{M_2}, 0, \phi_{M_3} - \phi_{M_2}, 0, \phi_{A_f} - \phi_{M_2}\} \]

The remaining non-vanishing phases and fields are redefined to absorb $\phi_{M_2}$ and $\phi_{m_{12}^2}$. The phases of $M_2$ and $m_{12}^2$ are thus rotated away. If we attempt further $U(1)$ transformations

\textsuperscript{4}We use capital letters to denote loop-corrected Higgs masses.
on the remaining angles, no more phases can be absorbed. Note that the phases of $M_1$ or $M_3$ could also have been chosen for the $\mathbb{R}_2$ transformation but $\phi_{M_2}$ is chosen as a matter of convention.

The complex parameters in the MSSM provide additional sources of $CP$ violation beyond the single phase of the CKM matrix [25, 26]. Such additional sources are needed to explain the observed baryon asymmetry in the universe. However, this thesis will concentrate on investigating the impact of these complex parameters on the Higgs phenomenology of the MSSM applied to key processes at the LHC. In particular, we concentrate on parameters that have a significant impact on Higgs boson production via gluon-fusion and bottom-quark annihilation. The most important of these are the phases of the trilinear couplings of the Higgs to the third generation fermions $\phi_{A_t, A_b}$, owing to potentially large stop and sbottom loop effects arising from large top- and bottom-Yukawa couplings. We also investigate the effect of the phase of the gluino mass parameter and the Higgsino mass parameters $\phi_{M_3}$ and $\phi_{\mu}$, respectively. While $\phi_{M_3}$ affects the bottom-Yukawa coupling at one-loop level and the Higgs boson self-energies at two-loop level, $\phi_{\mu}$ affects both at one-loop level.

However, the phases of these parameters face experimental constraints. The most restrictive constraints on the phases arise from bounds on the electric dipole moments (EDMs) of the electron and the neutron [80–82]. EDMs from heavy quarks [83, 84] and the deuteron [85] also have an impact. MSSM contributions to these EDMs already contribute at the one-loop level and primarily involve the first two generations of sleptons and squarks. Thus, EDMs lead to severe constraints on the phases of $A_q$ for $q \in \{u, d, s, c\}$ and $A_l$ for $l \in \{e, \mu\}$. Using the convention that the phase of the wino soft-breaking mass $M_2$ is rotated away, one finds tight constraints on the phase of $\mu$ [86]. On the other hand, constraints on the phases of the third-generation trilinear couplings are significantly weaker. Ref. [87] provides a comprehensive review of the same. While recent constraints from EDMs [88] taking into account two-loop contributions [89] have the potential to rule out the largest values of the phase of $A_t$, there is still significant room for variation of the phases of $A_t$ and $M_3$.

In this thesis, we will therefore display the full range of the phases of $A_t$ and $M_3$ in our considered scenarios without explicitly imposing EDM constraints, following the common approach in benchmark scenarios for Higgs phenomenology (Ref. [90] provides a recent discussion). In Chapter 5, the impact of the complex parameters giving rise to $CP$-violating self-energies which induce a mixing between the tree-level mass eigenstates $h, H$ and $A$ will be discussed. In Chapter 6 we will investigate the effects of $CP$-violating couplings and mixings on gluon-fusion and bottom-quark annihilation cross sections for neutral Higgs production, and provide a numerical and phenomenological study of the processes in Chapter 8.
Chapter 4

Experimental status at the LHC

This chapter provides a brief review of the current experimental status for a selection of measurements and searches at the LHC relevant for the work in this thesis. Note that it is in no way an overview of all the important results and measurements made by high-energy experiments in the past years, and more recently at Run II of the LHC. Other than the sources cited in the text, Refs. [91–96] have been used for this chapter.

4.1 Introduction

The Large Hadron Collider builds on the successes of collider experiments such as the Large Electron-Positron Collider (LEP), the Tevatron, and the DESY colliders HERA, DORIS, and PETRA. The LHC at the European Laboratory for Particle Physics (CERN) is a circular proton–proton collider with a circumference of 27.6 km. It is housed in the tunnel that was built for the LEP, and is placed at a depth ranging from 50–175 m. The tunnel has two beamlines intersecting at four points. Particle collisions are analysed by seven experiments: ATLAS and CMS, the biggest of these, use general purpose detectors to study a wide range of physics. The LHC started up in the fall of 2008 and in the years 2010–12 ran at centre-of-mass (com) energies $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV and $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV. At design luminosity, the LHC can allow more than 2800 bunches of protons to circulate in each beam with the nominal intensity of $10^{11}$ protons per bunch. In the first years of Run I of the LHC, ATLAS and CMS had collected more than 20 fb$^{-1}$ of integrated luminosity. In 2015, the LHC started to collide protons at the centre-of-mass energy of 13 TeV, which substantially improves the reach of searches for BSM physics. The anticipated integrated luminosity for Run II of the LHC, scheduled to end in 2018, is around 120 fb$^{-1}$ per experiment, leading to much larger sets of available data.

In the following sections, we present a summary of the measurements of the SM Higgs production and decay rates made by ATLAS and CMS, following which we will discuss the relevant results for SUSY and heavy Higgs searches. In particular, we will discuss the exclusion limits on the masses of stops and gluinos from direct SUSY searches, and the bounds on the MSSM parameter space from searches for additional Higgs bosons.
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4.2 Experimental results

4.2.1 Higgs production and decay at the LHC

In 2012, ATLAS and CMS announced the discovery of a new particle with a mass of 125 GeV compatible with the properties of the SM Higgs boson. With its measured properties, the discovered particle can also be interpreted to be a Higgs boson belonging to new physics models having extended Higgs sectors, such as the MSSM. The neutral Higgs bosons $h$, $H$ and $A$ of the MSSM can be produced via the main SM Higgs production channels (Fig. 4.1):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{gluon fusion:} & \quad gg \rightarrow h/H/A \\
\text{associated production with heavy quarks:} & \quad gg \rightarrow q\bar{q} + h/H/A \\
\text{associated } h/H \text{ production with } W/Z (\text{Higgsstrahlung}): & \quad q\bar{q} \rightarrow V + h/H \\
\text{vector boson fusion for } h/H \text{ production:} & \quad qq \rightarrow VV \rightarrow qq + h/H
\end{align*}
\]

However, due to modified couplings of the MSSM Higgs bosons to the fermions and gauge bosons, as well as the presence of additional SUSY particles that couple to the Higgses and participate in the loops, the production rates and cross sections of the MSSM Higgs bosons are significantly different than for the SM case. The differences that arise in the gluon-fusion and bottom-quark annihilation cross sections of the MSSM Higgs bosons in comparison to the SM Higgs will be discussed in detail in Chapter 6. For low and

![Figure 4.1: The dominant neutral Higgs production mechanisms in hadronic collisions are (a) gluon fusion (b) associated production with heavy quarks (c) Higgsstrahlung and (d) vector boson fusion.](image-url)
medium values of \( \tan \beta \), the MSSM Higgs bosons are predominantly produced through gluon fusion. At high \( \tan \beta \), the production in association with a pair of bottom quarks is the dominant process, due to the enhanced bottom-Yukawa coupling to the Higgs bosons. Additionally, at tree level, only the \( \mathcal{CP} \)-even MSSM Higgs bosons \( h \) and \( H \) can be produced in the Higgsstrahlung and vector boson fusion processes, since there are no tree-level couplings of the \( \mathcal{CP} \)-odd \( A \) to \( V = W, Z \). The lowest-order cross sections in these processes are those of the SM Higgs boson folded with the square of the normalised \( g_{V} \) couplings to the MSSM Higgs bosons \( h \) and \( H \). Beyond tree level, couplings of the \( \mathcal{CP} \)-odd Higgs \( A \) to the vector bosons can also be induced. Moreover, SUSY particles participating in the loops can alter the production rates of the MSSM Higgs bosons compared to the SM case. There are also other mechanisms for the production of the MSSM Higgses, as in the SM. The processes for the production of two Higgs particles, 

\[
\text{Higgs boson pair production : } \quad q\bar{q}, gg \rightarrow \phi_{i}\phi_{j},
\]

with \( \phi_{i,j} \in \{h, H, A\} \) are naturally more numerous for extended Higgs sectors than in the SM, and can be enhanced due to resonant heavy Higgs bosons. In the MSSM, two of these processes, the production of \( hA \) and \( HA \), can occur at tree level through \( qq \) annihilation, and at one loop in the \( gg \rightarrow hA, HA \) mechanisms. The other pair production processes \( gg \rightarrow hh, HH, hH, AA \), are loop induced, as in the case of the SM [97].

For the 125 GeV Higgs, \( H^0 \), at the LHC, the dominant production channel is the gluon-fusion process. This can be seen from Fig. 4.2 (a) which shows the inclusive Standard Model Higgs boson production cross sections at 13 TeV for various production modes. The Higgs is detected through its final state decay products \( F \), and can decay via several modes, each of which is quantified by its branching ratio:

\[
\text{BR}^F = \frac{\Gamma^F}{\Gamma^{\text{tot}}},
\]

(4.1)

where \( \Gamma^F \) is the partial width of the process \( H^0 \rightarrow F \) and \( \Gamma^{\text{tot}} \) is the total width. A 125 GeV Higgs provides an excellent opportunity to explore Higgs couplings to many SM particles. The dominant decay modes for a 125 GeV SM-like Higgs are \( H^0 \rightarrow b\bar{b} \) and \( H^0 \rightarrow WW^* \) followed by \( H^0 \rightarrow gg, H^0 \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-, H^0 \rightarrow c\bar{c} \) and \( H^0 \rightarrow ZZ^* \), as seen in Fig. 4.2 (b). The rates of \( H^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma, H^0 \rightarrow \gamma Z \) and \( H^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^- \) are much smaller. However large the branching ratio for \( H^0 \rightarrow b\bar{b} \) is, for any given \( M_{H^0} \), the sensitivity of a search channel depends not only on the production cross section and the branching ratio of the decay channel, but also on the reconstructed mass resolution, selection efficiency of the detector, and the amount of background in the final state. The \( H^0 \rightarrow b\bar{b} \) and \( H^0 \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^- \) channels suffer from large backgrounds — with the QCD backgrounds for the former being much more overwhelming — and a relatively poor mass resolution. The \( H^0 \rightarrow W^+W^- \rightarrow l^+\nu_l l^-\bar{\nu}_l \) channel has a relatively large branching fraction but the presence of neutrinos spoils the mass resolution. The channels where the signal has been
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Figure 4.2: (a) Inclusive production cross sections at the LHC for the SM Higgs boson [92] and (b) the SM Higgs boson decay branching ratios at 13 TeV [91].

discovered first, therefore, are $H^0 \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ and $H^0 \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow 4l$, where all the final state particles are measured very precisely and the $M_{H^0}$ resolution is very good. For $M_{H^0} \geq 150$ GeV, the most sensitive search channels are $H^0 \rightarrow WW^*$ and $H^0 \rightarrow ZZ^*$, with $W$ and $Z$ decaying into several leptonic and hadronic final states. With the combined 2011–12 dataset at 7 and 8 TeV com energy and an integrated luminosity $25 \text{ fb}^{-1}$, the excess in $H^0 \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ had a local significance of $7.4\sigma$ as measured by ATLAS [98], and $4.2\sigma$ as measured by CMS [99], for a background only hypothesis. In the $H^0 \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow 4l$ channel the values were $6.6\sigma$ in the ATLAS measurement [100], and $6.8\sigma$ in the CMS measurement [101]. The 125 GeV Higgs boson was “rediscovered” by ATLAS and CMS in 2016 with the 13 TeV dataset in Run II of the LHC, and so far no significant deviation from the properties predicted for the SM Higgs have been found.

One possibility for characterising Higgs boson yields is by using the signal strength $\mu$, defined as the ratio of the measured Higgs boson rate to its SM prediction. For a specific production process $I \rightarrow H^0$ and decay mode $H^0 \rightarrow F$, the signal strengths for the production $\mu_I$ and decay $\mu^F$ are defined as

$$\mu_I = \frac{\sigma_I}{(\sigma_I)_{\text{SM}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu^F = \frac{\text{BR}^F}{(\text{BR}^F)_{\text{SM}}}$$

(4.2)

where $\sigma_I$ and $\text{BR}^F$ are the production cross sections for $I \rightarrow H^0$ and branching fractions for $H^0 \rightarrow F$, respectively. The data does not allow the quantities $\mu_I$ and $\mu^F$ to be measured separately for a given process, and the experimentally measured quantity is
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Figure 4.3: Run I legacy: Best fit for (a) the production and (b) the decay signal strength parameter $\mu$ in individual channels for the combination of ATLAS and CMS data. The thick error bars indicate 1$\sigma$, and the thin bars indicate 2$\sigma$ intervals. For the production signal strength, an extrapolation from fiducial to the inclusive cross section was performed. Figures from Ref. [102].

the product $\mu_I \cdot \mu^F$. This gives the combined signal strength

$$\mu_I^F = \frac{\sigma_I \cdot BR^F}{(\sigma_I)_{SM} \cdot (BR^F)_{SM}} = \mu_I \cdot \mu^F. \quad (4.3)$$

All combined fits of signal strengths therefore make assumptions about the relationship between $\mu_I$ of different production processes or similarly between $\mu^F$ of different decay modes. Thus the meaning of the signal strength depends on the assumptions made. The signal strengths for individual production and decay channels are shown for combined ATLAS and CMS data at 8 TeV in Fig. 4.3. While they show a great degree of agreement to the SM prediction, the measurements are still affected by considerable uncertainties. The mass of the discovered Higgs boson determined from combined measurements from ATLAS and CMS is [102]

$$M_{H^0} = 125.09 \pm 0.21{\text{(stat.)}} \pm 0.11{\text{(syst.)}} \text{ GeV}. \quad (4.4)$$

In order to probe the spin and $CP$-properties of the discovered Higgs, systematic analyses of its production and decay angles are needed. Most of these analyses are based on the discrimination of distinct hypothesis for the spin and $CP$-properties. The experiments so far provide evidence of the spin-0 nature of the Higgs [103, 104]. The detected signal disfavours the pure $CP$-odd hypothesis, but the experimental measurements have a very
limited sensitivity to a possible admixture of $\mathcal{CP}$-even and $\mathcal{CP}$-odd components.

### 4.2.2 Direct SUSY searches

Among the results from the ATLAS and CMS experiments are a multitude of searches for supersymmetric particles. The programmes for SUSY searches in both experiments are based on a wide range of techniques that measure SM background contributions and a plethora of final states. No evidence of the SUSY sparticle spectrum has been detected so far [94,96]. However, unlike the SM, SUSY has different possibilities for mass hierarchies, decay patterns etc., which can give rise to a variety of signatures. The reported limits on masses of SUSY particles are therefore reliant on specific assumptions placed on the model parameters. Consequently, the results presented cannot be interpreted in a wholly generic way and one must be careful when making use of these limits in a particular SUSY model. One approach is to conduct the search in specific models with a reduced set of free parameters. The phenomenological MSSM or pMSSM assumes no R-parity violation, no new sources of $\mathcal{CP}$ violation, mass degenerate first and second generation scalars and no flavour changing neutral currents. These assumptions reduce the parameter set of SUSY to 19. Another popular approach is to present the experimental results within the

Figure 4.4: Exclusion limits at 95% CL for simplified models of top (s)quarks produced via decays of gluino pairs in the (a) T1tttt and (b) T5ttcc scenarios. The solid black curves represent the observed exclusion contour with respect to NLO+NLL cross section calculations and the accompanying ±1 standard deviation uncertainties. The dashed red curves represent the expected exclusion contour and the ±1 standard deviation uncertainties including experimental uncertainties. Figures from Ref. [105].
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constrained MSSM or the CMSSM, which only has 4 parameters, and a sign.

A complementary approach to searches in specific models is to present search results in terms of simplified models [106–111]. These are effective models built with a minimal set of particles necessary to produce SUSY-like final states, with a specific sequence of their production and decay contributing to the channels of interest. They are parametrised directly in terms of sparticle masses. The simplified model approach can quantify the dependence of an experimental limit on the particle spectrum or a certain sequence of particle production and decay more generally than a specific model [109]. Confronting the limits obtained in simplified models with the predictions of a realistic model, one needs to take into account the fact that the sensitivity in a simplified model is in general higher, since the considered decay chain is assumed to occur with 100% branching ratio.

As an example, in Fig. 4.4 (a) and (b) we show exclusion limits at 95% CL for simplified models of top quarks and squarks produced via decays of gluino pairs in the T1tttt and T5ttcc scenarios, presented by CMS for a dataset at 13 TeV com energy and an integrated luminosity of 2.3 fb\(^{-1}\). The T1tttt is a scenario in simplified models of gluino pair production where each gluino decays into a top-antitop pair and a neutralino, whereas in T5ttcc the gluino decays to an on-shell top squark and a top quark, and the top squark decays to a charm and a neutralino [105, 108]. The colour spectrum depicts the 95% CL upper limit on the cross section values in pb. As described in the plot, the observed exclusion contour with respect to NLO+NLL cross section calculations [112] and corresponding ±1 standard deviation uncertainties are represented by the solid black curves. The dashed red curves indicate the expected exclusion contour for the background-only hypothesis with the ±1 standard deviation uncertainties. For the T1tttt scenario shown in Fig. 4.4 (a), gluino masses up to 1550 GeV and neutralino masses up to 900 GeV are excluded\(^1\). In the depicted T5ttcc scenario in Fig. 4.4 (b), gluino masses up to 1450 GeV and neutralino masses up to 820 GeV are excluded.

In a similar vein, Fig. 4.5 shows a summary of ATLAS searches for stop pair production [94]. The dashed and solid lines show the expected and observed limits, respectively, including all uncertainties except the theoretical signal cross section uncertainty (PDF and scale uncertainty). Four decay modes have been considered separately with the assumption of a 100% branching ratio: \(\tilde{t} \to W + b + \tilde{\chi}^0\) which is a three-body decay for \(m_\tilde{t} < m_t + m_\tilde{\chi}^0\), \(\tilde{t} \to f + f' + b + \tilde{\chi}^0\) which is a four-body decay, \(\tilde{t}_1 \to t + \tilde{\chi}_1^0\) and \(\tilde{t} \to c + \tilde{\chi}_1^0\). These exclusion plots are an overlay of contours resulting from different stop decay channels which have different sparticle mass hierarchies and simplified decay scenarios, so their interpretation in a realistic model is not straightforward. The full understanding of the implications of these searches requires the interpretation of the experimental results in the context of all kinds of theoretical models. A description of one of the several methods to use simplified model limits to constrain general SUSY models can be found in

\(^1\)A Moriond 2017 update from CMS to the gluino mass limits in the T1tttt scenario with data from 35.9 fb\(^{-1}\) of integrated luminosity excludes gluino masses up to a little more than 2 TeV, see Ref. [96].
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Figure 4.5: Summary of the dedicated ATLAS searches for top squark pair production based on 3.2 to 36.1 fb$^{-1}$ of pp collision data taken at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. Exclusion limits at 95% CL are shown in the $m_{\tilde{t}_1} - m_{\tilde{\chi}^0_1}$ mass plane. Figure from Ref. [94].

Ref. [113]. There are many publicly available tools that have been developed for recasting results from LHC searches for BSM physics, such as CheckMATE [114,115], RIVET [116], XQCAT [117,118], ATOM/Fastlim [119], SModelS [120,121], and the more recently released GAMBIT [122], among others.

4.2.3 Searches for heavy Higgs bosons

The first run of the LHC in 2011–12 imposed strong constraints on the allowed MSSM parameter space, arising from the discovery of a scalar boson at 125 GeV, with couplings that are compatible with the SM predictions, the non-observation of SUSY particles and the non-observation of additional neutral Higgs bosons in direct searches [123–126]. As discussed in Section 3.2.5, the discovered Higgs can be interpreted as the lightest neutral Higgs $h$ of the MSSM, while interpreting it as the heavier scalar $H$ of the MSSM is under pressure from the data [125,126]. If we consider the discovered state to be the lightest MSSM Higgs $h$, the predicted existence of heavier Higgses $H, A$ and $H^\pm$ needs to be probed. In this interpretation, $M_A$ must be large so that the theory is in the decoupling limit. In the decoupling limit for $t_\beta \gtrsim 10$, the mass of the lightest scalar is bound at tree level by $m_h < m_Z$ and a SUSY mass scale of $\sim 1$ TeV is required in the maximal mixing case to obtain the observed Higgs mass of 125 GeV, whereas, when the value of $|X_t|$ is small, multi-TeV stops are necessary [129]. However, the $\tan \beta$-enhancement of the couplings of the heavy Higgs bosons to bottom quarks and $\tau$-leptons leads to significant
Figure 4.6: (a) The observed (black) and expected (dashed) limits at 95% CL on \( \tan \beta \) as a function of \( M_A \) are shown in the \( m_{h^{mod+}} \) scenario of the MSSM, measured by ATLAS in the \( H/A \to \tau^+\tau^- \) channel for \( \sqrt{s} = 13 \) TeV and 36.1 fb\(^{-1}\) of integrated luminosity [127]. (b) Exclusion limits combining all channels in the \( m_{h^{mod+}} \) scenario of the MSSM measured by CMS for \( \sqrt{s} = 13 \) TeV and 12.9 fb\(^{-1}\) of integrated luminosity [128].

Constraints on the \( (M_A, \tan \beta) \) plane from direct searches by ATLAS and CMS [123–126].

Searches for SUSY Higgs bosons are typically carried out in benchmark scenarios, described for example, in Ref. [130]. Fig. 4.6 shows the exclusion contours in one such benchmark in the MSSM, called the \( m_{h^{mod+}} \) scenario. In Fig. 4.6 (a) regions in the \( (M_A, \tan \beta) \) plane excluded at 95% CL in the \( m_{h^{mod+}} \) scenario of the MSSM measured by ATLAS for \( \sqrt{s} = 13 \) TeV and 36.1 fb\(^{-1}\) of integrated luminosity are shown. Dashed lines of constant \( M_h \) and \( M_H \) are shown in red and blue, respectively. The observed (expected) 95% CL upper limits exclude \( \tan \beta > 5.3 \) (7.5) for \( M_A = 0.25 \) TeV and \( \tan \beta > 54 \) (60) for \( M_A = 1.5 \) TeV. Fig. 4.6 (b) shows the model exclusion limits in the \( (M_A, \tan \beta) \) plane combining all channels, for the same scenario in the MSSM, measured by CMS for \( \sqrt{s} = 13 \) TeV and 12.9 fb\(^{-1}\) of integrated luminosity. The red contour indicates the region which does not yield a Higgs boson consistent with a mass of 125 GeV within the theoretical uncertainties of \( \pm 3 \) GeV.

It is pertinent to note that these exclusion limits assume that all parameters in the MSSM are real and \( CP \)-symmetry is conserved. Recall from our discussion in Section 3.3 that in the most general case, the MSSM can have 12 physical \( CP \)-violating phases. Their inclusion in the predictions of observables such as masses, cross sections, and decay rates leads to significant changes in the phenomenology of the MSSM, and is necessary for the general case of the MSSM with complex parameters to have an accurate compari-
son of theoretical predictions with experimental results. We presented a brief overview of experimental constraints on the phases of the complex parameters of the MSSM in Section 3.3. In Chapter 5, we will describe the Higgs sector of the MSSM with complex parameters beyond the lowest order and show that at higher orders an admixture of all three neutral Higgs bosons, i.e. the two $\mathcal{CP}$-even Higgs bosons $h, H$ and the $\mathcal{CP}$-odd Higgs boson $A$, is induced. In Chapter 8, we will analyse scenarios where the light Higgs boson describes the SM-like Higgs at $\sim 125$ GeV and the heavy Higgs bosons are strongly admixed. For a proper prediction in such a case, $\mathcal{CP}$-violating interference effects need to be taken into account in the full process involving production and decay of the Higgs bosons, which requires going beyond the usual narrow-width approximation (see also Refs. [131–135]). A convenient way to incorporate interference effects is a generalised narrow-width approximation for the production and decay of on-shell particles as described in Refs. [32, 136, 137], where in Ref. [136] only lowest-order contributions have been considered, while in Refs. [32, 137] also the inclusion of higher-order corrections has been addressed. In Chapter 9, we will review such a formalism and define benchmark scenarios with $\mathcal{CP}$ violation to describe the effect of the interferences on the exclusion limits for Higgs searches at the LHC.
Chapter 5

Higgs mixing at higher orders

In this chapter, we discuss the higher-order corrections that give rise to CP-violating mixings in the Higgs sector of the MSSM with complex parameters. We will set up the notations for the calculation of $\hat{Z}$ factors which are used throughout the thesis. This review largely follows Refs. \cite{33,138} and references therein. Similarities to Ref. \cite{1} in parts of this chapter are intended and reflect the contributions of the author.

5.1 Introduction

In Chapter 3, the Higgs sector of the MSSM was reviewed, along with a discussion on the possible complex parameters of the theory which could give rise to interesting phenomenological implications. The Higgs sector of the MSSM is $\mathcal{CP}$-conserving at tree level. Higher-order corrections in the MSSM Higgs sector have a huge impact on its phenomenology, with particles from other sectors contributing significantly to observables such as masses, widths, and cross sections via loop diagrams. In particular, we must account for higher-order corrections in order to study the impact of $\mathcal{CP}$-violating phases. Beyond the lowest order, the Higgs sector receives contributions from loop corrections and all possible mixings with other particles that are $\mathcal{CP}$-violating in the most general case. In the following sections, we present a discussion on $\mathcal{CP}$-violating effective self-energies in the general case of complex parameters, and the treatment of masses of the resultant physical eigenstates. We will then introduce the non-unitary $\hat{Z}$ matrix which is required for the correct on-shell properties of incoming and outgoing loop-corrected mass eigenstates.

$\mathcal{CP}$-violating mixing between the neutral Higgs bosons $\{h, H, A\}$ arises as a consequence of radiative corrections and results in the neutral mass eigenstates $\{h_1, h_2, h_3\}$. The full mixing at higher orders takes place not just between $\{h, H, A\}$, but also with the Goldstone boson and the electroweak gauge bosons. In general, $6 \times 6$ mixing contributions involving the fields $\{h, H, A, G, Z, \gamma\}$ need to be taken into account. However, for the calculation of the Higgs boson masses and wave function normalisation factors at the considered order it is sufficient to restrict ourselves to a $3 \times 3$ mixing matrix among $\{h, H, A\}$, since mixing effects with $\{G, Z, \gamma\}$ only appear at the sub-leading two-loop
level and beyond. In processes with external Higgs bosons, on the other hand, mixing contributions with $G$ and $Z$ already enter at the one-loop level, but the numerical effect of these contributions has been found to be very small, see e.g. Refs. [51,139–141]. In the description and numerical analysis of Higgs production through gluon fusion and bottom-quark annihilation presented in Chapters 6 and 8 respectively, we will therefore neglect these kinds of (electroweak) mixing contributions of the external Higgs bosons with Goldstone and gauge bosons.

Concerning electroweak corrections, we only incorporate the potentially numerically large contributions to the Higgs boson masses and wave function normalisation factors as well as the electroweak contribution to the correction affecting the relation between the bottom-Yukawa coupling and the bottom-quark mass (detailed in Section 6.4.1). All other contributions considered here such as the electroweak corrections to gluon fusion involve at least one power of the strong coupling. For the contribution of the $Z$ boson and the Goldstone boson to the gluon-fusion process via $gg \to \{Z^*, G^*\} \to h_i$ (the photon only enters at higher orders) it should be noted that contributions from mass-degenerate quark weak-isodoublets vanish and only top- and bottom-quark contributions proportional to their masses are of relevance, as can be inferred from the discussion of the Higgsstrahlung process in Refs. [142,143]. This is a consequence of the fact that only the axial component of the quark–quark–$Z$ boson coupling contributes to the loop-induced coupling of the $Z$ boson to two gluons. Similarly, squark contributions in $gg \to \{Z^*, G^*\}$ are completely absent at the one-loop level, even in case of CP violation in the squark sector. The one-loop contributions to $gg \to \{Z^*, G^*\}$ therefore have no dependence on the phases of complex parameters. Thus, for the remainder of this chapter, we focus our discussion on the contributions to the $3 \times 3$ mixing between the lowest-order mass eigenstates $\{h, H, A\}$ giving rise to the loop-corrected CP-admixed mass eigenstates $\{h_1, h_2, h_3\}$.

### 5.2 Effective self-energies

The $3 \times 3$ mass matrix $\mathbf{M}$ contains the tree-level masses $m_i^2$ on the diagonal and has non-zero (off-)diagonal self-energies involving the Higgs states [144]. It enters the Lagrangian, with $\Phi \in \{h, H, A\}$, as follows

$$\mathcal{L} \supset -\frac{1}{2} \Phi \mathbf{M} \Phi^T,$$

with

$$\mathbf{M}(p^2) = \begin{pmatrix}
m_h^2 - \hat{\Sigma}_{hh}(p^2) & -\hat{\Sigma}_{hH}(p^2) & -\hat{\Sigma}_{hA}(p^2) \\
-\hat{\Sigma}_{Hh}(p^2) & m_H^2 - \hat{\Sigma}_{HH}(p^2) & -\hat{\Sigma}_{HA}(p^2) \\
-\hat{\Sigma}_{Ah}(p^2) & -\hat{\Sigma}_{AH}(p^2) & m_A^2 - \hat{\Sigma}_{AA}(p^2)
\end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.2)$$
When all the parameters are real, the $\mathcal{CP}$-even Higgs bosons $h$ and $H$ do not mix with the $\mathcal{CP}$-odd $A$ and therefore $\hat{\Sigma}_{hA} = \hat{\Sigma}_{HA} = 0$. However, allowing for certain parameters to have $\mathcal{CP}$-violating phases permits all self-energies $\hat{\Sigma}_{ij}(p^2)$ for $i, j \in \{h, H, A\}$ to be in general non-zero. The propagator matrix (up to contributions from Goldstone bosons and gauge bosons that are neglected here, see above) is then given by

$$\Delta_{hH A}(p^2) = - \left[ \hat{\Gamma}_{hH A}(p^2) \right]^{-1},$$

(5.3)

where the irreducible 2-point vertex functions

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{ij}(p^2) = i \left[ (p^2 - m_i^2) \delta_{ij} + \hat{\Sigma}_{ij}(p^2) \right]$$

(5.4)

form the elements of the matrix

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{hH A}(p^2) = i \left[ p^2 1 - M(p^2) \right].$$

(5.5)

Therefore the 3×3 propagator matrix can be written as

$$\Delta_{hH A}(p^2) = \begin{pmatrix}
\Delta_{hh}(p^2) & \Delta_{hH}(p^2) & \Delta_{hA}(p^2) \\
\Delta_{Hh}(p^2) & \Delta_{HH}(p^2) & \Delta_{HA}(p^2) \\
\Delta_{Ah}(p^2) & \Delta_{AH}(p^2) & \Delta_{AA}(p^2)
\end{pmatrix}$$

$$= i \begin{pmatrix}
p^2 - m_h^2 + \hat{\Sigma}_{hh}(p^2) & \hat{\Sigma}_{hH}(p^2) & \hat{\Sigma}_{hA}(p^2) \\
\hat{\Sigma}_{Hh}(p^2) & p^2 - m_H^2 + \hat{\Sigma}_{HH}(p^2) & \hat{\Sigma}_{HA}(p^2) \\
\hat{\Sigma}_{Ah}(p^2) & \hat{\Sigma}_{AH}(p^2) & p^2 - m_A^2 + \hat{\Sigma}_{AA}(p^2)
\end{pmatrix}^{-1}.$$

(5.6)

The individual components of $\Delta_{hH A}$ are the propagators $\Delta_{ij}(p^2)$, which result from the matrix inversion in Eq. (5.3). The diagonal Higgs propagators are therefore given by the following expression:

$$\Delta_{ii}(p^2) = \frac{\hat{\Gamma}_{jj} \hat{\Gamma}_{kk} - \hat{\Gamma}_{jk}^2}{-\Gamma_{ii} \Gamma_{jj} \Gamma_{kk} + \hat{\Gamma}_{ii} \hat{\Gamma}_{jk}^2 - 2\hat{\Gamma}_{ij} \Gamma_{jk} \hat{\Gamma}_{ki} + \Gamma_{jj} \hat{\Gamma}_{ki}^2 + \hat{\Gamma}_{kk} \hat{\Gamma}_{ij}^2}$$

$$= \frac{i}{p^2 - m_i^2 + \hat{\Sigma}_{ii} - i \frac{2\Gamma_{ij} \Gamma_{jk} \hat{\Gamma}_{ki} - \hat{\Gamma}_{kk} \hat{\Gamma}_{ij}^2 - \hat{\Gamma}_{kk} \hat{\Gamma}_{ij}^2}{\Gamma_{jj} \Gamma_{kk} - \hat{\Gamma}_{jk}^2}} = \frac{i}{p^2 - m_i^2 + \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}(p^2)}.$$ 

(5.7)

All the 2-point vertex functions depend on $p^2$ through Eq. (5.4), which we have dropped for ease of notation, and $i, j, k$ are all different with no summation over them. The diagonal propagator obtained in the last line of Eq. (5.7) has the same structure as for the case without any $\mathcal{CP}$-violating mixing, but the self-energy is replaced by the effective
self-energy $\hat{\Sigma}_{ii}^{\text{eff}}(p^2)$,
\[ \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}^{\text{eff}}(p^2) = \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}(p^2) - \frac{2\hat{\Gamma}_{ij}\hat{\Gamma}_{jk}\hat{\Gamma}_{ki} - \hat{\Gamma}_{jj}\hat{\Gamma}_{kk}^2 - \hat{\Gamma}_{kk}\hat{\Gamma}_{ij}^2}{\hat{\Gamma}_{jj}\hat{\Gamma}_{kk} - \hat{\Gamma}_{jk}^2}, \]  
(5.8)

which is defined such that it also includes the mixing contributions in the off-diagonal elements. Notice that it separates the diagonal self-energy $\hat{\Sigma}_{ii}$ already existing at 1-loop order from the mixing 2-point functions whose products contribute to $\hat{\Sigma}_{ii}^{\text{eff}}$ only at 2-loop level. When there is no $\mathcal{CP}$-violating mixing, the second term in Eq. (5.8) is zero and we obtain the result for the $\mathcal{CP}$-conserving propagator matrix.

Similarly, for $i \neq j$, the propagator entries are
\[ \Delta_{ij}(p^2) = \frac{\hat{\Gamma}_{ij}\hat{\Gamma}_{kk} - \hat{\Gamma}_{jk}\hat{\Gamma}_{ki} - \hat{\Gamma}_{jj}\hat{\Gamma}_{kk} - \hat{\Gamma}_{kk}\hat{\Gamma}_{ij}^2}{\hat{\Gamma}_{jj}\hat{\Gamma}_{kk} - \hat{\Gamma}_{jk}^2}. \]  
(5.9)

Using the notation $D_i(p^2) = p^2 - m_i^2$, the ratios of the propagators can be written as,
\[ \frac{\Delta_{ij}}{\Delta_{ii}} = \frac{-\hat{\Gamma}_{ij}\hat{\Gamma}_{kk} - \hat{\Gamma}_{jk}\hat{\Gamma}_{ki} - \hat{\Gamma}_{jj}\hat{\Gamma}_{kk} - \hat{\Gamma}_{kk}\hat{\Gamma}_{ij}^2}{(D_j + \hat{\Sigma}_{jj})(D_k + \hat{\Sigma}_{kk}) - \hat{\Sigma}_{jk}^2}. \]  
(5.10)

The above equation can be used to express the effective self-energy alternatively as
\[ \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}^{\text{eff}}(p^2) = \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}(p^2) + \frac{\Delta_{ij}(p^2)}{\Delta_{ii}(p^2)} \hat{\Sigma}_{ij}(p^2) + \frac{\Delta_{ik}(p^2)}{\Delta_{ii}(p^2)} \hat{\Sigma}_{ik}(p^2), \]  
(5.11)

with $i \neq j \neq k$. In Eq. (5.11), we see that the ratio of the off-diagonal and diagonal propagators are weights of the off-diagonal self-energies, and the total effective self-energy appears as a sum of the diagonal and weighted off-diagonal self-energies.

### 5.3 Higgs masses

Since the renormalised self-energies are complex in general, the propagator poles can lie on the complex momentum plane. The neutral Higgs masses are determined as the complex poles of the propagators,
\[ \mathcal{M}^2 = M^2 - iM\Gamma, \]  
(5.12)

where $M$ are the loop-corrected masses extracted from the real parts of the complex pole, and $\Gamma$ are the total widths obtained from the imaginary parts of $\mathcal{M}^2$. These complex poles are the roots of the determinant of the matrix $\hat{\Gamma}_{hHA}(p^2)$,
\[ \det [\hat{\Gamma}_{hHA}(p^2)] = - \left( \det [\Delta_{hHA}(p^2)] \right)^{-1} = 0. \]  
(5.13)
5.3 Higgs masses

It is straightforward to ascertain the masses at tree level when there are no self-energy contributions to the 2-point vertex functions,

\[ \hat{\Gamma}_{ij}(p^2) = i(p^2 - m_i^2) \delta_{ij}, \quad (5.14) \]

and the matrix \( \hat{\Gamma} \) is diagonal,

\[ \hat{\Gamma}^{(0)}_{hHA}(p^2) = i \begin{pmatrix} D_h(p^2) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & D_H(p^2) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & D_A(p^2) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.15} \]

In this case, the solutions to Eq. (5.13) are the tree-level masses \( m_i^2 \) for the lowest-order mass eigenstates \( h, H \) and \( A \). One can now go beyond the lowest order and consider the case where self-energies are restricted to just the diagonal elements, i.e. \( \hat{\Sigma}_{ij} = 0 \) for \( i \neq j \). In this case where no mixing is allowed, we determine the masses from the roots of the determinant of the matrix

\[ \hat{\Gamma}^{(\text{no mixing})}_{hHA}(p^2) = i \begin{pmatrix} D_h(p^2) + \hat{\Sigma}_{hh}(p^2) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & D_H(p^2) + \hat{\Sigma}_{HH}(p^2) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & D_A(p^2) + \hat{\Sigma}_{AA}(p^2) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.16} \]

The condition

\[ \det \left[ \hat{\Gamma}^{(\text{no mixing})}_{hHA}(p^2) \right] = \prod_{i \in \{h,H,A\}} D_i(p^2) + \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}(p^2) = 0 \tag{5.17} \]

is fulfilled for any \( p^2 - m_i^2 + \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}(p^2) = 0 \), and there is one pole \( p^2 = M_i^2 \) for each propagator \( \Delta_i(p^2) \), which yields the loop-corrected masses \( M_i^2 \) for \( i \in \{h,H,A\} \). In the absence of mixing self-energies among the lowest-order mass eigenstates \( h, H, A \), the loop-corrected mass eigenstates \( h_1, h_2, h_3 \) maintain their pure \( CP \)-even and -odd nature. As a result, there is a clear one-to-one correspondence such that \( h_1, h_2 \) and \( h_3 \) can be identified as \( h, H \) and \( A \) respectively.

The case for a \( CP \)-conserving \( 2 \times 2 \) mixing between \( h \) and \( H \) is more involved. In this case, the matrix \( \hat{\Gamma} \) is block diagonal,

\[ \hat{\Gamma}^{(2 \times 2)}_{hHA}(p^2) = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\Gamma}_{hH}(p^2) & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{\Gamma}_{A}(p^2) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5.18} \]

where \( \hat{\Gamma}_{hH}(p^2) \) is the \( 2 \times 2 \) matrix,

\[ \hat{\Gamma}_{hH}(p^2) = i \begin{pmatrix} D_h(p^2) + \hat{\Sigma}_{hh}(p^2) & \hat{\Sigma}_{hH}(p^2) \\ \hat{\Sigma}_{Hh}(p^2) & D_H(p^2) + \hat{\Sigma}_{HH}(p^2) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.19} \]
and \( \hat{F}_A(p^2) = i[p^2 - m_A^2 + \hat{\Sigma}_{AA}(p^2)] \). Since \( A \) does not participate in the mixing, we can infer right away that the pole \( \mathcal{M}_A^2 \) fulfils \( \mathcal{M}_A^2 - m_A^2 + \hat{\Sigma}_{AA} = 0 \), and results in the loop-corrected mass \( M_A \) for the lowest-order mass eigenstate \( A \).

The other two masses are determined from the poles of the propagators from the \( 2 \times 2 \) matrix \( \hat{\Gamma}_{hh}(p^2) \). Its determinant, given by

\[
\text{det} \left[ \hat{\Gamma}_{hh}(p^2) \right] = D_h(p^2) + \hat{\Sigma}_{hh}(p^2) \quad \text{det} \left[ \hat{\Gamma}_{HH}(p^2) \right] - \hat{\Sigma}_{hh}^2(p^2) \quad (5.20)
\]

has two roots. However, unlike the previous cases, we do not have a trivial one-to-one correspondence between the lowest-order mass eigenstates \( \{h, H\} \) and the loop-corrected mass eigenstates \( \{h_1, h_2\} \). This can be understood by inverting the \( 2 \times 2 \) matrix to obtain the individual propagators:

\[
\Delta_{ii}(p^2) = \frac{i \left[ D_j(p^2) + \hat{\Sigma}_{jj}(p^2) \right]}{\left[ D_i(p^2) + \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}(p^2) \right] \left[ D_j(p^2) + \hat{\Sigma}_{jj}(p^2) \right] - \hat{\Sigma}_{ij}^2(p^2)} \quad (5.21)
\]

\[
= \frac{D_i(p^2) + \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}(p^2) - \frac{\hat{\Sigma}_{ij}^2(p^2)}{D_j(p^2) + \hat{\Sigma}_{jj}(p^2)}}{i \left[ D_j(p^2) + \hat{\Sigma}_{jj}(p^2) \right]} \quad (5.22)
\]

\[
= \frac{i}{p^2 - m_i^2 + \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}^\text{eff}(p^2)} \quad (5.23)
\]

where the effective self-energy is described as

\[
\hat{\Sigma}_{ii}^\text{eff}(p^2) = \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}(p^2) - \frac{\hat{\Sigma}_{ij}^2(p^2)}{D_j(p^2) + \hat{\Sigma}_{jj}(p^2)} \quad (5.24)
\]

and \( i \neq j \) in all of the above. On comparing Eq. (5.20) and Eq. (5.21), we notice that the inverse diagonal propagators are proportional to the determinant of the \( 2 \times 2 \) matrix,

\[
\frac{1}{\Delta_{ii}(p^2)} = i \frac{D_j(p^2) + \hat{\Sigma}_{jj}(p^2)}{\text{det} \left[ \hat{\Gamma}_{hh}(p^2) \right]} \quad (5.25)
\]

The above equation tells us that the two roots of the determinant are poles for both \( \Delta_{hh} \) and \( \Delta_{HH} \). If we label the two poles \( \mathcal{M}_1 \) and \( \mathcal{M}_2 \), then the equation

\[
p^2 - m_i^2 + \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}^\text{eff}(p^2) = 0 \quad (5.26)
\]

is satisfied by \( p^2 = \mathcal{M}_a, \ a \in \{1, 2\} \) for each \( i \in \{h, H\} \). As a result, the straightforward correspondence between \( \{h, h_1\} \) and \( \{H, h_2\} \) no longer holds, since the loop-corrected mass eigenstates \( \{h_1, h_2\} \) are admixtures of the lowest-order mass eigenstates \( \{h, H\} \). From Eq. (5.26) we deduce the loop-corrected masses \( M_{h_1} \) and \( M_{h_2} \). By convention we choose \( M_{h_1} \leq M_{h_2} \). However, note that they are still both purely \( \mathcal{CP} \)-even and it is therefore often convenient for a \( \mathcal{CP} \)-conserving \( 2 \times 2 \) mixing to label \( h_1 \) as \( h \), and \( h_2 \) as...
the heavy state $H$.

One can now extend these results to the general case of 3×3 mixing in the MSSM where the $CP$-violating self-energies $\hat{\Sigma}_{hA}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_{HA}$ participate in the loop-corrections as well. In this case, the loop-corrected mass eigenstates $h_a$, $a \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ are admixtures of the lowest-order mass eigenstates $h, H$ and $A$. The determinant of $\hat{\Gamma}_{hHA}(p^2)$ now has three roots. Following the same procedure as in the case for 2×2 mixing, the diagonal propagator can be written as

$$\frac{1}{\Delta_{ii}} = \frac{\det \left[ \hat{\Gamma}_{hHA}(p^2) \right]}{(D_j + \hat{\Sigma}_{jj})(D_k + \hat{\Sigma}_{kk}) - \hat{\Sigma}_{jk}^2}. \quad (5.27)$$

Similarly, the off-diagonal propagator is

$$\frac{1}{\Delta_{ij}} = \frac{\det \left[ \hat{\Gamma}_{hHA}(p^2) \right]}{\hat{\Sigma}_{jk}\hat{\Sigma}_{ki} - \hat{\Sigma}_{ij}(D_k + \hat{\Sigma}_{kk})}. \quad (5.28)$$

Both the inverse diagonal and the off-diagonal propagators are proportional to the determinant of $\hat{\Gamma}_{hHA}$, analogous to the case for the 2×2 mixing. Consequently, all the three roots of the determinant are poles of each propagator i.e. the three poles $p^2 = M_a^2$, $a \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ satisfy the equation

$$M_a^2 - m_i^2 + \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}^\text{eff}(M_a^2) = 0 \quad (5.29)$$

for any $i \in \{h, H, A\}$. Therefore, there is no one-to-one mapping between the lowest-order and loop-corrected mass eigenstates. Each loop-corrected mass eigenstate $h_a$ is an admixture of all three lowest-order mass eigenstates $h, H, A$. Finally, we obtain the loop-corrected masses $M_{h_a}$ from Eq. (5.29), which are ordered such that $M_{h_1} \leq M_{h_2} \leq M_{h_3}$.

### 5.4 Wave function normalisation factors for external Higgs bosons

In the Feynman-diagrammatic approach, a physical process that involves external Higgs bosons is defined in terms of the tree-level mass eigenstates $i \in \{h, H, A\}$. However, as we saw in Section 5.3, $CP$-violating higher-order contributions induce mixings between the tree-level mass eigenstates and they are no longer the physical states. Instead, the physical states are the $CP$-admixed $h_a$, $a \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. In evaluating processes with external Higgs bosons beyond lowest order, an appropriate prescription to account for the mixings is required so that the outgoing particle has the correct on-shell properties, and the S-matrix is properly normalised. This is fulfilled if the fields are renormalised according to the full on-shell conditions, where it is ensured that all the different fields do not mix on
their mass shells at the loop level. The on-shell renormalisation conditions also result in a unit residue for the fields. However, in the Higgs sector of the MSSM we adopt the $\overline{\text{DR}}$ scheme for $\tan \beta$ and field renormalisation \[\delta \tan \beta |_{\overline{\text{DR}}} = 1 \quad \text{with} \quad (5.30)\]
\[
\delta Z_{H_1}^{\overline{\text{DR}}} = - \text{Re} \left[ \Sigma_{H H}^{(\text{div})} (m_{H_1}^2) \right]_{\alpha=0}, \quad (5.31)
\]
\[
\delta Z_{H_2}^{\overline{\text{DR}}} = - \text{Re} \left[ \Sigma_{hh}^{(\text{div})} (m_{h_1}^2) \right]_{\alpha=0}. \quad (5.32)
\]

The field renormalisation constants in this scheme do not ensure that all mixing contributions between the mass eigenstates $\{h_1, h_2, h_3\}$ vanish on-shell and the propagators of the external particles have unit residue. As a result, the correct on-shell properties need to be established via the introduction of finite wave function normalisation factors, denoted as the so-called $\hat{Z}$ factors [145–147]. The matrix of those $\hat{Z}$ factors contains the correction factors for the external Higgs bosons $\{h_1, h_2, h_3\}$ relative to the lowest-order mass eigenstates $\{h, H, A\}$. The (non-unitary) matrix elements $\hat{Z}_{ai}$ [138] (see also Refs. [51, 139]) are composed of the root of the external wave function normalisation factor $\hat{Z}_i^a$, and the on-shell transition ratio $\hat{Z}_{ij}^a$ which are evaluated at the complex pole $M_a^2$. The wave function normalisation factors for an external Higgs boson $i \in \{h, H, A\}$ are defined as the residue of the propagators at the complex pole $M_a^2$ according to the LSZ formalism [148],
\[
\hat{Z}_i^a := \text{Res}_{M_a^2} \{ \Delta_{ii}(p^2) \}, \quad (5.33)
\]

They are obtained by expanding $\hat{\Sigma}_{ii}^{\text{eff}}(p^2)$ around the complex pole $p^2 = M_a^2$ in the diagonal propagator in Eq. (5.7),
\[
\Delta_{ii}(p^2) = \frac{i}{p^2 - m_i^2 + \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}^{\text{eff}}(p^2)} = \frac{i}{p^2 - m_i^2 + \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}^{\text{eff}}(M_a^2) + (p^2 - M_a^2) \cdot \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}^{\text{eff}}'(M_a^2) + \mathcal{O}((p^2 - M_a^2)^2)}
\]
\[
= \frac{i}{p^2 - M_a^2} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}^{\text{eff}}(M_a^2) + \mathcal{O}(p^2 - M_a^2)}, \quad (5.34)
\]
which gives the following residue at $p^2 \to M_a^2$,
\[
\hat{Z}_i^a = \frac{1}{1 + \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}^{\text{eff}}(M_a^2)}. \quad (5.35)
\]
For going from the second to the third line of the equation in Eq. (5.34) we used the pole condition to substitute $M_a^2 = m_i^2 - \hat{\Sigma}_{ii}^{\text{eff}}(M_a^2)$. Since the propagator for Higgs boson $i$ on

\[1\text{A summary of renormalisation schemes for the Higgs sector of the MSSM is given in Appendix C.}\]
an external line has three poles $\mathcal{M}^2_a$, $a \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ there are three choices of $\mathcal{M}^2_a$ at which the residue of $\Delta_a(p^2)$ can be computed for each $i$. If we evaluate the amputated Green’s function at $\mathcal{M}^2_a$, the correct S-matrix normalisation is given by $\sqrt{Z^a_i}$, and the outgoing mass eigenstate is $h_a$. Similarly, if the amputated Green’s function is evaluated at $\mathcal{M}^2_b$, the normalisation factor is $\sqrt{Z^b_i}$ with $h_b$ as the outgoing particle. Thus, the factor $\sqrt{Z^a_i}$ accounts for the normalisation of each external particle $i \in \{h, H, A\}$ at the mass shell $p^2 = \mathcal{M}^2_a, a \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Furthermore, the mixing between $i$ and $j$ on an external line at $\mathcal{M}^2_a$ needs to be accounted for as well. For this, the factor $\sqrt{Z^a_i}$ needs to be multiplied by the transition ratio $\hat{Z}_{ij}$ which occurs in a diagram where $h_a$ is the external particle but $i$ couples to the vertex. It is defined as

$$\hat{Z}_{ij} = \frac{\Delta_{ij}(p^2)}{\Delta_{jj}(p^2)} \bigg|_{p^2 = \mathcal{M}^2_a}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.36)

The indices $\{a, b, c\}$ refer to the loop-corrected mass eigenstates, while $\{i, j, k\}$ label the lowest-order mass eigenstates. As before, there are three possible poles $\{\mathcal{M}^2_a, \mathcal{M}^2_b, \mathcal{M}^2_c\}$ at which $\{\hat{Z}_i, \hat{Z}_{ij}, \hat{Z}_{ik}\}$ can be computed. Similarly, $\{\hat{Z}_j, \hat{Z}_{ji}, \hat{Z}_{kj}\}$ and $\{\hat{Z}_k, \hat{Z}_{ki}, \hat{Z}_{kj}\}$ can also be evaluated at all possible poles $\{\mathcal{M}^2_a, \mathcal{M}^2_b, \mathcal{M}^2_c\}$. Even though all possibilities allowed by the mixing can be used because of the pole structure of each propagator, it is necessary to be consistent and define at which pole to evaluate the factors $\hat{Z}_{ij}$ for any given state $i$. Moreover, a particular choice can be numerically more convenient than another one. Throughout the thesis, we follow the index scheme defined in Ref. [138], unless stated otherwise. Under this scheme $\hat{Z}_i, \hat{Z}_{ij}$ and $\hat{Z}_{ik}$ are evaluated at $\mathcal{M}^2_a$; $\hat{Z}_j, \hat{Z}_{ji}$, and $\hat{Z}_{jk}$ are evaluated at $\mathcal{M}^2_b$; and finally $\hat{Z}_k, \hat{Z}_{ki}$ and $\hat{Z}_{kj}$ are evaluated at $\mathcal{M}^2_c$. Using this scheme we will employ the notation [33,138]

$$\hat{Z}_a := \hat{Z}^a_i, \quad \hat{Z}_{aj} := \hat{Z}^a_{ij}, \quad \hat{Z}_{aj} := \hat{Z}^a_{ij}, \quad \hat{Z}_{aj} := \hat{Z}^a_{ij}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.37)

The $\hat{Z}$ factors are therefore written as

$$\hat{Z}_{aj} = \sqrt{Z}_a \hat{Z}_{aj},$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.38)

corresponding to the non-unitary matrix

$$\hat{Z} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\hat{Z}_1} \hat{Z}_{1h} & \sqrt{\hat{Z}_1} \hat{Z}_{1H} & \sqrt{\hat{Z}_1} \hat{Z}_{1A} \\ \sqrt{\hat{Z}_2} \hat{Z}_{2h} & \sqrt{\hat{Z}_2} \hat{Z}_{2H} & \sqrt{\hat{Z}_2} \hat{Z}_{2A} \\ \sqrt{\hat{Z}_3} \hat{Z}_{3h} & \sqrt{\hat{Z}_3} \hat{Z}_{3H} & \sqrt{\hat{Z}_3} \hat{Z}_{3A} \end{pmatrix}. \hspace{1cm} (5.39)$$

The non-unitarity of the matrix results from the imaginary parts of the self-energies of unstable particles evaluated at a non-vanishing incoming momentum. As a result we do not get a unitary transformation between the lowest-order mass eigenstates $\{h, H, A\}$.
and the loop-corrected mass eigenstates \( \{ h_1, h_2, h_3 \} \). As explained above, these \( \hat{Z} \) factors provide the correct normalisation of a matrix element with an external on-shell Higgs boson \( h_a \), \( a \in \{ 1, 2, 3 \} \), at \( p^2 = M_a^2 \). Consequently, they satisfy the condition of unit residue and vanishing mixing on-shell \[32, 51, 139\],

\[
\lim_{p^2 \to M_a^2} \frac{i}{p^2 - M_a^2} (\hat{Z} \cdot \hat{\Gamma}_{hHA} \cdot \hat{Z}^T)_{hh} = 1, \quad (5.40)
\]

\[
\lim_{p^2 \to M_b^2} \frac{i}{p^2 - M_b^2} (\hat{Z} \cdot \hat{\Gamma}_{hHA} \cdot \hat{Z}^T)_{HH} = 1, \quad (5.41)
\]

\[
\lim_{p^2 \to M_c^2} \frac{i}{p^2 - M_c^2} (\hat{Z} \cdot \hat{\Gamma}_{hHA} \cdot \hat{Z}^T)_{AA} = 1. \quad (5.42)
\]

Starting with Eq. (5.40)–Eq. (5.42) and deriving the elements of the \( \hat{Z} \) matrix works equally well. The application of the \( \hat{Z} \) factors yields an expression of the amplitude \( A_{h_a} \) for an external on-shell Higgs boson \( h_a \) in terms of a linear combination of the amplitudes resulting from the one-particle irreducible diagrams for each of the lowest-order mass eigenstates \( \{ h, H, A \} \) according to

\[
A_{h_a} = \hat{Z}_{ah} A_h + \hat{Z}_{aH} A_H + \hat{Z}_{aA} A_A + \ldots = \sqrt{\hat{Z}_a} \left( \hat{Z}_{ah} A_h + \hat{Z}_{aH} A_H + \hat{Z}_{aA} A_A \right) + \ldots , \quad (5.43)
\]

which can be written more succinctly in matrix form as

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
A_{h_1} \\
A_{h_2} \\
A_{h_3}
\end{pmatrix} = \hat{Z}
\begin{pmatrix}
A_h \\
A_H \\
A_A
\end{pmatrix} + \ldots . \quad (5.44)
\]

The ellipsis indicates additional mixing effects with Goldstone bosons and gauge bosons, which we neglect in our numerical analysis, following the discussion in Section 5.1. The sum arises because contributions from each lowest-order mass eigenstate need to be taken into account for each loop-corrected mass eigenstate \( h_a \). Eq. (5.43) is pictorially represented in Fig. 5.1. Thus, we see that the propagator corrections at the external legs

![Figure 5.1: A diagrammatic representation depicting the use of \( \hat{Z} \) factors for external Higgs bosons. The amplitude \( A_{h_a} \) is composed of a combination of the individual amplitudes of the tree-level mass eigenstates computed on the mass shell of \( h_a \), along with the transition ratios \( \hat{Z}_{aj} \) and the overall normalisation factor \( \hat{Z}_a \).]
are absorbed into the vertices of the neutral Higgs bosons $h_a$. The calculation of $\hat{Z}$ factors for the MSSM Higgs bosons can be performed using the code FeynHiggs [64,67,144,149,150], where these results are obtained for the general case of complex parameters.

In Section 6.3.2, we will detail the application of the $\hat{Z}$ factors in the analytical calculation of gluon-fusion and bottom-quark annihilation cross sections for the $\mathcal{CP}$-admixed Higgs states $h_1, h_2$ and $h_3$, and we will study their numerical impact in Chapter 8. In Chapter 9 we will discuss them in the context of internal propagators and investigate their role in interferences between the Higgs bosons being exchanged in a full process of production and decay.
Chapter 6

Higgs cross sections in the MSSM with complex parameters

In this chapter, we will present the results for the gluon-fusion and bottom-quark annihilation cross sections in the MSSM with complex parameters. The chapter begins with an illustrative procedure for calculating the gluon-fusion process in the Standard Model and subsequently presents the cross section for neutral Higgs production in the MSSM with real parameters. Finally, results for the cross section for gluon fusion and bottom-quark annihilation in the MSSM with complex parameters including higher-order contributions are presented. These results have been published in Ref. [1].

6.1 Motivation

As we have discussed previously, the 125 GeV Higgs signal observed by ATLAS and CMS can easily be accommodated in extended Higgs sectors like a Two-Higgs-Doublet Model (2HDM) or supersymmetric extensions, e.g. the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model. Therefore, an essential part of the programme of the LHC experiments in the upcoming years will be the search for additional Higgs bosons predicted by such models. For this purpose, and in order to test possible deviations from the SM expectations for the SM-like Higgs boson, the precise knowledge of production cross sections through gluon fusion and bottom-quark annihilation for these Higgs bosons is a key ingredient. For a detailed summary of current efforts in this direction, the reader is referred to the reports of the LHC Higgs Cross Section Working Group, see Refs. [91,92,151,152].

We saw in Chapter 4 that the searches for additional Higgs bosons have been interpreted in various scenarios beyond the Standard Model, including several supersymmetric ones. However, there have been no analyses so far for the most general case where $\mathcal{CP}$ is violated and leads to mixing between $\mathcal{CP}$-even and -odd eigenstates. This is mainly due to the lack of appropriate theoretical predictions for the Higgs production rates at the LHC for complex parameters in the MSSM and of a practical prescription for taking into account relevant interference effects in Higgs production and decay. A discussion of the latter has recently been given in Ref. [137].
Therefore the primary goal of this thesis has been to provide state-of-the-art cross-section predictions in the MSSM, taking into account ££P-violating effects, for the two main Higgs production channels at the LHC, which can be used as input for future experimental analyses in ££P-violating Higgs scenarios. We present in this chapter precise predictions for neutral Higgs boson production through gluon fusion and bottom-quark annihilation in the MSSM with complex parameters, in which ££P-even and ££P-odd Higgs states form three admixed Higgs mass eigenstates \( h_a, a \in \{1, 2, 3\} \).

Early investigations of Higgs production through gluon fusion at hadron colliders in the MSSM with complex parameters were carried out in Refs. \([153–155]\). A thorough analysis taking different production channels into account was presented in Ref. \([156]\), and results for Higgsstrahlung can be found in Ref. \([157]\). Large effects of stops on the cross section for a ££P-odd Higgs boson neglecting ££P-even and -odd Higgs mixing were discussed in Ref. \([158]\). Refs. \([159,160]\) discuss the production of a light Higgs through gluon fusion including its decay into two photons in the MSSM with complex parameters. It should be noted that the mentioned references were published before the Higgs discovery in 2012 and mostly employ only the lowest order in perturbation theory for the production processes. It is therefore timely to improve these predictions by including up-to-date higher-order corrections and to investigate the compatibility with the experimental results obtained for the observed signal at 125 GeV.

For this purpose, the results presented in this chapter for cross section predictions in the MSSM with complex parameters were implemented into the numerical code SusHi (SUperSymmetric HIggs) \([161,162]\), which calculates Higgs production cross sections through gluon fusion and heavy-quark annihilation \([163]\) in the SM, the MSSM, the Two-Higgs-Doublet-Model (2HDM) and the Next-to-Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (NMSSM) \([164]\). However, until now, SusHi did not support complex parameters in the MSSM and thus did not provide predictions for ££P-admixed Higgs bosons.

The structure of the chapter is as follows: We start by presenting the calculation for the gluon-fusion cross section for the SM Higgs in Section 6.2. This will be followed by discussing the additional ingredients that modify this cross section for neutral Higgs bosons in the MSSM with real parameters in Section 6.3.1. In Section 6.3.2, we will then present the full leading order cross section for gluon fusion in the MSSM with ££P violation considering the mixing of Higgs bosons (discussed in Chapter 5), the complex Yukawa couplings, and resummation of SUSY QCD corrections. Higher-order corrections to this gluon-fusion cross section are modified and adapted for the complex case from results available for the case of the MSSM with real parameters.

These cross section predictions have been implemented into an extension of SusHi, named SusHiMi (SUperSymmetric HIggs MIXing) \([1]\). SusHiMi will be released as a part of SusHi-1.7.0, the next update of SusHi. Higher-order corrections and the scope of their implementation in SusHiMi are discussed in detail in Section 6.4. Finally, we discuss the calculation and implementation of bottom-quark annihilation cross sections in the
MSSM with complex parameters, which have been treated with a simple re-weighting procedure.

Program packages for cross section calculations

In the following, a number of particle physics program packages have been employed at various steps of the calculations. We make use of the Mathematica package *FeynArts* [165–169] to generate the processes considered here. The package *FormCalc* [170–174] has been used to compute amplitudes and cross sections for the processes. Furthermore, we employ the package *FeynCalc* [175, 176] for the reduction of tensor integrals. To obtain cross sections for the $CP$-violating MSSM, we made use of the MSSMCT model file available within *FeynArts* [169]. For the calculation of the masses and the wave function normalisation factors ensuring the correct on-shell properties of external Higgs bosons, which involves the evaluation of Higgs boson self-energies and their renormalisation (see Chapter 5), we use the code *FeynHiggs* [64, 67, 144, 149, 150]. The numerical evaluation of cross sections is carried out using *SusHi* [161, 162]. The exclusion bounds for heavy Higgs searches in the MSSM with complex parameters are obtained using *HiggsBounds* [177–180].

For the calculations presented in Section 6.2 and Section 6.3 we use *FeynArts*-3.9, *FormCalc*-8.4 and *FeynCalc*-8.2.0. In our phenomenological studies in Chapter 8 we use *SusHiMi* within *SusHi*-1.7.0 (to be released) and *FeynHiggs*-2.11.2. For the implementation of interference factors and the study of their phenomenological impact in Chapter 9, we use *SusHiMi* along with *FeynHiggs*-2.13.0 and *HiggsBounds*-5.1.1beta.
6.2 Gluon-fusion cross section in the SM

Neutral Higgs production at the LHC mainly takes place via five channels, as described in Section 4.2.1, with the main channel being gluon fusion due to high gluon luminosity. In the SM, there is no direct coupling between the Higgs boson and the gluons. The gluon-fusion process is therefore loop mediated, with quarks running in the loops. We know from Section 2.3.2 that the Higgs-quark Yukawa coupling is directly proportional to the quark masses. This means that the biggest contribution to the gluon-fusion cross section comes from third generation quarks coupling to the Higgs. The Higgs boson Yukawa coupling is 35 times larger for the top quark in comparison to the next heaviest fermion, the bottom quark. The top-loop coupling corresponds to an effective Lagrangian that is given by

\[ \mathcal{L} = H^0 G_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu}, \]  

(6.1)

with the Higgs field \( H^0 \) and the QCD field strength tensor \( G_{\mu\nu} \). At leading order (LO), the gluon-fusion cross section has been known since a long time [181,182]. In this section, we will present those results for the lowest order calculation in the SM with only the top quark running in the loop, as an illustrative procedure. The derivation and notations used largely follow the detailed review in Ref. [183].

At the lowest order, there are two Feynman diagrams that contribute to the process, shown in Fig. 6.1. The momentum definitions have been labelled in the figure. The kinematic relations are

\[ k_1^2 = k_2^2 = 0 \]  

(6.2)

\[ (k_1 + k_2)^2 \equiv q^2 = \hat{s} = m_{H^0}^2. \]  

(6.3)

The colour of the gluons in the \( SU(3) \) adjoint representation is denoted by the indices \( a, b \); the colour of quarks in the fundamental \( SU(3) \) representation is denoted by \( i, j \).

![Figure 6.1: The two contributing diagrams along with the notation used for momenta and indices. Charge flow is indicated by arrows on spinor fields and momentum flow is denoted by separate arrows.](image-url)
Lorentz group indices for gluons are given by $\mu, \nu$ and spinor indices by $\alpha, \beta$. Next, we need the Feynman rules to write down the matrix elements of the diagrams:

\[
i \frac{j}{\alpha \beta} a, \mu - ig_s \gamma^\mu_{\beta \alpha} [t^a]_{ji} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\]

The top quark propagator, neglecting width effects, is therefore given by

\[
i \frac{(p + m)_{\beta \alpha} \delta_{ij}}{p^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon} . \quad (6.4)
\]

With the polarisation of external gluons given by $\epsilon^\mu(\lambda, k)$ with spin $\lambda$ and momentum $k$, the momentum in the loop $l$, the mass in the loop $m$, and the loop integral regularised in $d = 4 - 2\epsilon$ dimensions, the matrix element for the two diagrams is as follows,

\[
\mathcal{M} = (-ig_s)^2 \left(-i \frac{y}{\sqrt{2}}\right) \delta^{\alpha \beta} [t^a][t^b] \left(-1\right) \epsilon(\lambda_1, k_1) \epsilon(\lambda_2, k_2)
\]

\[
\int \frac{d^d l}{(2\pi)^d D_1 D_2 D_3} \text{Tr}\left[\gamma^\mu (l + m) \gamma^\nu (l - k_1 + m)\right] \left(-\gamma^\mu (l - k_2 + m)\right]. \quad (6.5)
\]

Here, the propagators in the denominator are

\[
D_1 = l^2 - m^2 , \\
D_2 = (l - k_1)^2 - m^2 , \\
D_3 = (l + k_2)^2 - m^2 . \quad (6.6)
\]

The trace in Eq. (6.5) can be simplified using FORM, and results in [183]

\[
\text{Tr}[\gamma^\mu (l + m) \gamma^\nu (l - k_1 + m) + \gamma^\nu (l - k_2 + m)] = 8m \left[k_1^\mu k_2^\nu - k_1^\mu k_2^\nu + 2k_1^\mu l^\nu - 2k_2^\mu l^\nu - g^{\mu \nu} k_1 \cdot k_2 - g^{\mu \nu} l \cdot l + g^{\mu \nu} m^2\right]. \quad (6.7)
\]

The principal complexity of the calculation comes from the fact that this expression needs to be integrated over the loop integral $l$. Inserting Eq. (6.7) in Eq. (6.5) requires
us to calculate the tensor integral

\[ C_{\mu \nu} = \int \frac{d^d l}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{l_\mu l_\nu}{D_1 D_2 D_3}. \]  

(6.8)

Using the method of Passarino-Veltman reduction of tensor integrals \[185, 186\] it can be shown that \( C_{\mu \nu} \) can be written in terms of the scalar two- and three-point functions \( B_0 \) and \( C_0 \):

\[ C_{0} = \int \frac{d^d l}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{D_1 D_2 D_3}, \]  

(6.9)

\[ B_0(p, q) = \int \frac{d^d l}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{D_p D_q}, \]  

(6.10)

with \( p, q \in \{1, 2, 3\} \) and \( p \neq q \). Carrying out the Passarino-Veltman reduction of \( C_{\mu \nu} \) and expanding the dependence on the dimension \( d \) in terms of \( \varepsilon \) as \( \frac{1}{(d-2)} \sim \frac{1}{2} (1 + \varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 + \cdots) \) the complete integral of the trace is

\[ \mathcal{M} = \int \frac{d^d l}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{D_1 D_2 D_3} \text{Tr}[(l + k_2 + m)\gamma^\mu \cdots (-l - k_2 + m)] \]

\[ = (\epsilon_1 \cdot \epsilon_2) \left[ 8m(\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2)B_0(2, 3) - 4mC_0m_{H_0}^2 + 16m^3(1 + \varepsilon + \varepsilon^2)C_0 \right] \]

\[ + (k_1 \cdot \epsilon_2)(k_2 \cdot \epsilon_1) \left[ \frac{16m}{m_{H_0}^2} (-\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2)B_0(2, 3) + 8mC_0 + \frac{32m^3}{m_{H_0}^2} (-1 - \varepsilon - \varepsilon^2)C_0 \right]. \]  

(6.11)

Here we have redefined \( \mathcal{M} \) by leaving out all the pre-factors before the integral in Eq. (6.5) for ease of expression. We will take them into account again in the end. The above result can then be expressed as

\[ \mathcal{M} = (\epsilon_1 \cdot \epsilon_2) \ a + (k_1 \cdot \epsilon_2) \ (k_2 \cdot \epsilon_1) \ b, \]  

(6.12)

with

\[ a = 8m \ (\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2) \ B_0(2, 3) - 4m \ C_0m_{H_0}^2 + 16m^3(1 + \varepsilon + \varepsilon^2) \ C_0, \]

\[ b = - \frac{2a}{m_{H_0}^2}. \]  

(6.13)

Evaluating the scalar integral \( B_0 \) and applying the limit \( \varepsilon \to 0 \) simplifies the coefficients

---

1 A detailed description of the scalar one loop integrals can be found in Ref. [184].
2 See Ref. [183] for a step-by-step derivation. This reduction was re-derived using FeynCalc as a cross check.
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to

\[ a = \frac{8m_m}{16\pi^2} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} m_H^2 (1 - \tau) 16\pi^2 C_0 \right), \]

\[ b = -\frac{2a}{m_H^2}. \]  

(6.14)

where \( \tau = \frac{4m_m^2}{m_H^2} \). Finally, the cross section can be written as

\[ \hat{\sigma} = \frac{1}{2s} \int dPS \sum_{\text{spin, colour}} |\mathcal{M}|^2, \]

(6.15)

with the 2 \(\rightarrow\) 1 phase space

\[ \int dPS = \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} (2\pi) \delta_+(q^2 - m_H^2) (2\pi)^4 \delta^4(k_1 + k_2 - q) \]

\[ = 2\pi \delta(\hat{s} - m_H^2). \]  

(6.16)

Averaging over colour gives a factor of \((\frac{1}{8})^2\) and averaging over initial state spin gives a factor of \((\frac{1}{2})^2\). Furthermore, we use \( m \equiv m_t, (g_s^2)^2 = 16\pi^2 \alpha_s^2 \) and \( \frac{g_s^2}{(\sqrt{2})^2} = \frac{m_t^2}{\sqrt{\tau}} = \sqrt{2} G_F m_t^2 \), where \( G_F \) is Fermi’s constant. The square of trace of the colour factor (Tr[t_a t_b] = \(\frac{1}{2}\delta_{ab}\)) contributes a factor 2. Therefore the total cross section, using Eq. (6.12) and Eq. (6.14), is

\[ \hat{\sigma} = \frac{\alpha_s^2(\mu_R)^3 \sqrt{2} G_F}{8 m_H^2} \frac{m_t^2}{m_H^2} \sum_{\text{spins}} |\mathcal{M}|^2 m_H^2 \delta(\hat{s} - m_H^2) \]

\[ = \frac{\alpha_s^2(\mu_R) G_F}{128 \sqrt{2} \pi} \tau^2 \left| 1 - \frac{1}{2} m_H^2 (1 - \tau) 16\pi^2 C_0 \right|^2 m_H^2 \delta(\hat{s} - m_H^2), \]  

(6.17)

where \( \mu_R \) is the renormalisation scale, which at LO only enters through the scale dependence of the strong coupling constant \( \alpha_s \). In the last line, we used the fact that summing the squared matrix element over the gluon polarisation gives us a factor of 2|a|^2. \( C_0 \) is the scalar three-point function given by [185]:

\[ C_0 = \frac{i}{16\pi^2 \hat{s}} \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \left[ \ln \left( \frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta} \right) - i\pi \right]^2, & \beta = \sqrt{1 - \tau}, \ \tau < 1 \\ -2 \arcsin^2 \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}} \right), & \tau > 1. \end{cases} \]  

(6.18)

Therefore, the complete result of the lowest order partonic cross section is expressed as [182]:
\[ \hat{\sigma} \equiv \sigma_{\text{LO}} = \frac{\sigma_0^{H^0}}{m_{H^0}^2} \delta(\hat{s} - m_{H^0}^2), \]
\[ \sigma_0^{H^0} = \frac{G_F^2(\mu_R)}{288\sqrt{2}\pi} |A^{H^0}|^2, \]
\[ A^{H^0} = \frac{3}{2} \tau [1 + (1 - \tau)f(\tau)], \]
\[ f(\tau) = \begin{cases} \arcsin^2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}}, & \tau \geq 1 \\ \frac{1}{4} \left( \log \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - \tau}}{1 - \sqrt{1 - \tau}} - i\pi \right)^2, & \tau < 1. \end{cases} \] (6.19)

With increasing mass, the width of the Higgs boson of the SM becomes broader as it approaches \( W^+W^-, ZZ \) thresholds. In the lowest order approximation, it is possible to incorporate this effect by replacing the zero-width \( \delta \)-distribution with the Breit-Wigner function and changing the kinematic factors \( m_{H^0}^2 \to \hat{s} \) appropriately [182]:
\[ \delta(\hat{s} - m_{H^0}^2) \to \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\hat{s}\Gamma_h/m_{H^0}}{(\hat{s} - m_{H^0}^2)^2 + (\hat{s}\Gamma_h/m_{H^0})^2}. \] (6.20)

So far we have discussed the calculation of the partonic cross section. However, gluons are a part of the colliding protons and therefore a convolution with the parton distribution functions (PDFs) needs to be performed in order to obtain the hadronic cross section. This also induces a dependence on the factorisation scale \( \mu_F \). If we denote the gluon luminosity as
\[ L^{gg}(\tau) = \int_{\tau}^{1} \frac{dx}{x} g(x)g(\tau/x), \] (6.21)
the lowest-order proton–proton cross section in the narrow-width approximation is
\[ \sigma_{\text{LO}}(pp \to H^0) = \sigma_0 \tau_{H^0} L^{gg}(\tau_{H^0}) \] (6.22)
where \( \tau_{H^0} = m_{H^0}^2/s \) and \( s \) is the hadronic centre of mass energy.

### 6.3 Gluon-fusion cross section in the MSSM

In this section we discuss the calculation of the gluon-fusion cross section in the MSSM with particular emphasis on the effects of complex parameters. In Section 6.3.1, we will review the lowest order gluon-fusion cross section for the case of the MSSM with real parameters, where no \( CP \) violation is allowed. A detailed discussion of this process can be found in Ref. [182] and references therein. Our notation closely follows Ref. [161] and Ref. [1]. In Section 6.3.2 we will present the results for the leading order cross section in the \( CP \)-violating case of the MSSM.
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6.3.1 Cross section in the MSSM with real parameters

We saw in Section 4.2.1 that the main mechanisms for production of neutral Higgs bosons in the MSSM are the same as those in the SM, with gluon fusion being the dominant one as before. Since the leading order process for gluon fusion starts at one-loop level, it is a production mechanism where new physics can play a significant role in changing the production cross section by entering the loop and couplings with the Higgs. In the MSSM, in addition to the quark induced contributions, the squark induced contributions to the gluon-fusion process also participate, even though they are suppressed by inverse powers of the supersymmetric particle masses if those masses are heavy. However, these contributions become significant and even comparable to quark contributions when the squarks have sub-TeV masses as predicted in several benchmark scenarios for the MSSM [130], as well as many supergravity-inspired models, see for instance Ref. [187]. While these benchmark scenarios with light squarks in the MSSM are in tension with current exclusion limits from squark searches, there exist parameter regions where they haven’t been completely ruled out.

In the calculation for the gluon-fusion cross section in the MSSM, differences from the expression for the SM cross section arise not just from the squark loops, but also from the weights of the top- and bottom-loop contributions which have to be modified by the relative couplings to the MSSM Higgs bosons presented in Table 3.3, since the mixing angles of the Higgs sector can alter the hierarchy of the couplings. For example, the coupling of the bottom quarks to the Higgs states is strongly enhanced for large tan $\beta$ compared with the coupling to the heavier top quark.$^3$

When CP is conserved, the physical Higgs states are the CP-eigenstates $h, H$ and $A$. There are no CP-violating mixings between the three neutral Higgses, and at tree level only the CP-even eigenstates mix$^4$, which is controlled by the mixing angle $\alpha$.

![Figure 6.2: Lowest order diagrams for gluon-fusion Higgs production in the MSSM with real parameters.](image)

$^3$Note that this is not true for $h$ in the decoupling region.

$^4$Going beyond tree level, higher-order contributions can induce additional CP-conserving mixings between the Higgs states, as was described in Section 5.3.
The LO diagrams for the process $gg \to \phi$ with $\phi \in \{h, H, A\}$ are depicted in Fig. 6.25. In this section, we will present only the lowest order results for the gluon-fusion cross section in the MSSM with real parameters. The leading contributions arise from the third generation quarks and squarks: i.e. the top, bottom, stop and sbottom loops. We defer the discussion of higher-order corrections to Section 6.4.

The procedure for calculating the amplitudes for stop- and sbottom-induced loops is similar to what was outlined in Section 6.2. The matrix elements can be obtained by using the Feynman rules for the squark–gluon and squark–Higgs vertex for the $\mathcal{CP}$-even and $\mathcal{CP}$-odd Higgses, which can be found, for e.g., in Ref. [188].

The tensor structures for the loop amplitudes for the $\mathcal{CP}$-even Higgses $\phi^e \in \{h, H\}$ are given by [153]:

$$i\epsilon_\mu(k_1)\epsilon_\nu(k_2)\mathcal{M}_{ab}^{\mu\nu}(gg \to \phi^e) \propto \delta_{ab}\epsilon_\mu(k_1)\epsilon_\nu(k_2) \left( g_{\mu\nu} k_1 \cdot k_2 - k_1^\mu k_2^\nu \right) \times$$

$$\left\{ \sum_{q \in \{t, b\}} g_q^{\phi^e} \tau_q^{\phi^e} \left[ 1 + (1 - \tau_q^{\phi^e})f(\tau_q^{\phi^e}) \right] - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{q \in \{t, b\}} \tau_q^{\phi^e} \sum_{i=1}^2 g_{qii}^{\phi^e} \left[ 1 - t_{qii} f(\tau_q^{\phi^e}) \right] \right\}. \quad (6.23)$$

The tensor structure for the $\mathcal{CP}$-odd Higgs boson $A$ is

$$i\epsilon_\mu(k_1)\epsilon_\nu(k_2)\mathcal{M}_{ab}^{\mu\nu}(gg \to A) \propto \delta_{ab}\epsilon_\mu(k_1)\epsilon_\nu(k_2) \times$$

$$\left\{ i\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} k_1^\rho k_2^\sigma \sum_{q \in \{t, b\}} g_q^A \tau_q^A f(\tau_q^A) \right\}. \quad (6.24)$$

The definitions for momentum, colour and, spin follow the same conventions as in Section 6.2. Here $\tau_q^\phi = \frac{4m_q^2}{m_\phi^2}$ and $\tau_q^{\phi^e} = \frac{4m_q^2}{m_{\phi^e}^2}$. The $g_q^\phi$ are the relative Higgs–quark couplings as specified in Table 3.3 for $\phi \in \{h, H, A\}$. The Higgs–squark couplings $g_{qij}^{\phi^e}$ for this case can be obtained from Appendix A by setting all the parameters to be real. Needless to say, the SM results are recovered by setting the Higgs–squark couplings to zero, and the relative Higgs–quark couplings $g_q^\phi$ to 1. Notice that there is no contribution from squarks in the amplitude for the $\mathcal{CP}$-odd Higgs boson $A$. This is because in the $\mathcal{CP}$-conserving MSSM, the squarks do not couple to the $\mathcal{CP}$-odd Higgs $A$ at LO due to $\mathcal{CP}$ invariance; only couplings involving $\tilde{f}_i - \tilde{f}_j - A$ with $i \neq j$ are non-vanishing, which do not enter the LO calculation. Averaging over all the polarisations and colours, the LO partonic cross section in Eq. (6.19) for $\phi \in \{h, H, A\}$ can be written in the form

$$\sigma^\phi_0 = \frac{G_F \alpha_s^2(\mu_R)}{288\sqrt{2}\pi} |\mathcal{A}^\phi|^2, \quad (6.25)$$

---

5Here we denote the $\mathcal{CP}$-eigenstates by $\phi$, in a convention that differs from our notation for the tree-level mass eigenstates $\tilde{i}$ in Chapter 5, in order to avoid confusion with the squark index $\tilde{q}_{ii}$.
where the loop amplitude is the sum of the individual quark and squark contributions:

\[ A^\phi = \sum_{q \in \{t, b\}} \left( a^\phi_q + \tilde{a}^\phi_q \right). \]  

The quark contributions to the amplitude for the $\mathcal{CP}$-even Higgses are the same as for the SM Higgs boson, barring the Higgs–quark couplings that contain the mixing angles for the $\mathcal{CP}$-even Higgs bosons. On the other hand, the amplitude for the $\mathcal{CP}$-odd Higgs has a much simpler form factor:

\[ a^e_q = g^e_q \frac{3 \tau^e_q}{2} \left[ 1 + \left(1 - \tau^e_q\right)f(\tau^e_q) \right], \]  

\[ a^A_q = g^A_q \frac{3 \tau^A_q}{2} f(\tau^A_q). \]  

Similarly, the individual squark contributions are

\[ \tilde{a}^e_q = -\frac{3 \tau^e_q}{8} \sum_{i=1}^2 g^e_{\tilde{q}ii} \left[ 1 - \tau^e_{\tilde{q}i}f(\tau^e_{\tilde{q}i}) \right], \]  

\[ \tilde{a}^A_q = 0. \]

### 6.3.2 Cross section in the MSSM with complex parameters

For the case of the MSSM with complex parameters we need to compute cross sections for the three neutral mass eigenstates $h_1, h_2$ and $h_3$, which are admixtures of the lowest-order mass eigenstates $h, H$ and $A$. The leading order diagrams for the production of $h_{1,2,3}$ via gluon fusion therefore additionally include the loop-induced $\mathcal{CP}$-violating mixings as depicted in Fig. 6.3. Differences with respect to the calculation in the MSSM with real parameters are induced due to the following reasons:

1. $\mathcal{CP}$-violating couplings between the $\mathcal{CP}$-odd Higgs $A$ and the squarks $g^A_{fi}$ give rise to a non-zero amplitude: $\tilde{a}^A_q \neq 0$ in Eq. (6.30).
2. Different left- and right-handed quark couplings, $g_{q_L}^\phi$ and $g_{q_R}^\phi = (g_{q_L}^\phi)^* \in \{h, H, A\}$ result in non-zero contributions to the quark loop amplitudes for the three neutral Higgses proportional to $(g_{q_L}^\phi - g_{q_R}^\phi)$. In the $b$/$\bar{b}$ sector, we take into account higher-order corrections to the relation between the bottom-quark mass and the bottom-Yukawa coupling [189–194]. These corrections, known as the $\Delta_b$ corrections, are a function of the complex gluino and Higgsino mass parameters $M_3$ and $\mu$. Therefore, we cannot use the relation $g_{b_R}^\phi = (g_{b_L}^\phi)^* = g_b^\phi$ for the bottom-quark coupling to the Higgs as we did for the cross section calculation in the SM and the MSSM with real parameters. A detailed description of these SUSY QCD contributions will be given in Section 6.4.1.

3. $\hat{Z}$ factors, which determine the $\mathcal{CP}$-violating mixings between the $\mathcal{CP}$-eigenstates, relate the amplitude for an external on-shell Higgs $h_a$ in the mass eigenstate basis to the amplitudes of the $\mathcal{CP}$-even lowest-order states $h$ and $H$ and the $\mathcal{CP}$-odd state $A$ (recall the discussion in Section 5.4). The cross section $pp \rightarrow h_a$, which involves one-loop diagrams in the production process $pp \rightarrow \phi$, is denoted as “LO cross section” despite the fact that it contains higher-order effects through the application of the $\hat{Z}$ factors (Fig. 6.3).

In order to clearly see how $\mathcal{CP}$ violation affects the cross section due to these three factors, we will investigate each effect one at a time and subsequently build up the final cross section.

6.3.2.1 Effect of non-zero couplings $g_{f_{ii}}^A$

When we allow $\mathcal{CP}$ invariance to be violated, a non-zero $g_{f_{ii}}^A$ coupling gives rise to an additional term in the loop amplitude. A first analysis of this effect was presented in Ref. [153]. Assuming, at this point, that there is no mixing between the neutral $\mathcal{CP}$-eigenstates, and neglecting SUSY QCD corrections at the vertex, the tensor structure of the loop amplitude in Eq. (6.24) is modified by an additional term,

$$i\epsilon^\mu(k_1)\epsilon_\nu(k_2)M_{ab}^{\mu\nu}(gg \rightarrow A) \propto \delta_{ab}\epsilon^\mu(k_1)\epsilon_\nu(k_2) \times \left\{ i\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} k_{1\rho} k_{2\sigma} \sum_{q \in \{t,b\}} g_q^A \left[ \tau_q^A f(\tau_q^A) \right] - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{q \in \{t,b\}} \tau_q^A (g^{\mu\nu} k_1 \cdot k_2 - k_1^\mu k_2^\nu) \sum_{i=1}^2 g_{q_{ii}}^A \left[ 1 - \tau_i^A f(\tau_i^A) \right] \right\}. \quad (6.31)$$

Notice that the tensor structure of the squark contributions to the amplitude of the $\mathcal{CP}$-odd Higgs is similar to that of the squark contributions to the $\mathcal{CP}$-even Higgs. Furthermore, there is an antisymmetric part containing the Levi-Civita tensor $\epsilon$ associated to the quark contributions and a symmetric part associated to the squark contributions. As a result, there are no interference terms between the quark and squark loop contributions for the $\mathcal{CP}$-odd Higgs production. As we will see in the next sections, this
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will no longer be true when we take into account SUSY QCD corrections that make the bottom-Yukawa coupling complex or when an admixture with CP-even states is induced. The squark loop amplitude for $\tilde{q}$, averaging over all spins and colours, is

$$\tilde{a}_q^A = -\frac{3}{8} \tau_q^A \sum_{i=1}^{2} g_{\tilde{q}ii}^A \left[ 1 - \tau_{\tilde{q}i}^A f(\tau_{\tilde{q}i}^A) \right].$$

(6.32)

The amplitudes of the CP-even Higgses at this stage have the same expression as given in Eq. (6.27) and Eq. (6.29).

6.3.2.2 Effect of complex Yukawa couplings

In the following, we will present the expressions for the quark-loop amplitudes of $h, H$ and $A$ for a general case of complex Yukawa couplings, without limiting ourselves to just the complex bottom-Yukawa couplings resulting from $\Delta_b$ corrections\(^6\). As mentioned earlier, when the Yukawa couplings are complex, the relation $g_{\tilde{q}L}^\phi = g_{\tilde{q}R}^\phi = g_{\tilde{q}Q}^\phi$ we have used in the expressions for the amplitudes so far is invalid, and there are additional contributions that modify the quark loop amplitude which need to be considered. For the CP-even Higgses $\phi^e \in \{h, H\}$, the quark loop amplitudes now consist of two parts, written as

$$a_{q,+}^{\phi^e} = \frac{1}{2} \left( g_{qL}^{\phi^e} + g_{qR}^{\phi^e} \right) \frac{3}{2} \tau_q^{\phi^e} \left[ 1 + (1 - \tau_q^{\phi^e}) f(\tau_q^{\phi^e}) \right],$$

(6.33)

$$a_{q,-}^{\phi^e} = i \frac{1}{2} \left( g_{qR}^{\phi^e} - g_{qL}^{\phi^e} \right) \frac{3}{2} \tau_q^{\phi^e} f(\tau_q^{\phi^e}),$$

(6.34)

where the subscripts + and − denote amplitude components proportional to the sum and difference of the left- and right-handed couplings respectively. Similarly, the quark loop amplitudes for the CP-odd Higgs also contain an additional contribution:

$$a_{q,+}^{A} = \frac{1}{2} \left( g_{qL}^{A} + g_{qR}^{A} \right) \frac{3}{2} \tau_q^{A} f(\tau_q^{A}),$$

(6.35)

$$a_{q,-}^{A} = i \frac{1}{2} \left( g_{qR}^{A} - g_{qL}^{A} \right) \frac{3}{2} \tau_q^{A} \left[ 1 + (1 - \tau_q^{h_A}) f(\tau_q^{A}) \right].$$

(6.36)

Terms in $a_{q,+}^{\phi}$ do not interfere with terms in $a_{q,-}^{\phi}$, due to the fact that they are associated with symmetric and antisymmetric terms, respectively, in the tensor structure of the loop amplitude for the scalars $\phi^e$, and vice versa in case of the CP-odd Higgs $A$. Furthermore, it is easy to see that in the limit where all the Yukawa couplings are real we retrieve the results obtained in Section 6.3.1 and Section 6.3.2.1.

\(^6\)In Section 6.4.1 we will point towards a possibility of redefining (s)quark fields such that their phase is rotated away. However, here we will stick with the most general description of complex Yukawa couplings.
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6.3.2.3 Effect of the $\hat{Z}$ factor matrix

So far we have studied how the individual amplitudes for the lowest-order mass eigenstates $h, H$ and $A$ are affected by $\mathcal{CP}$-violating interactions and contributions. The next step is to obtain the amplitudes for the mass eigenstates $h_a, a = 1, 2, 3$ as admixtures of $h, H$ and $A$ using the non-unitary $\hat{Z}$ matrix. Recall that the full mixing takes place not just between the tree-level Higgs mass eigenstates but also with the Goldstone boson and the electroweak gauge bosons. However, following the discussion in Section 5.1, we only consider the $3 \times 3$ mixing between $\{ h, H, A \}$. The LO hadronic production cross section of the mass eigenstates $h_a$ can be written as

$$\sigma_{LO}(pp \to h_a) = \sigma_{0}^{h_a} \tau_{h_a} \mathcal{L}^{gg}(\tau_{h_a}) \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{L}^{gg}(\tau) = \int_{\tau}^{1} \frac{dx}{x} g(x) g(\tau/x),$$

where $\tau_{h_a} = M_{h_a}^2/s$, and $M_{h_a}$ is the loop-corrected mass of the eigenstate $h_a$. Accordingly, the partonic LO cross section for $gg \to h_a$ is given by

$$\sigma_{0}^{h_a} = \frac{G_F \alpha_s^2(\mu_R)}{288\sqrt{\pi}} \left[ |A_{h_a,e}|^2 + |A_{h_a,o}|^2 \right]$$

with

$$A_{h_a,e} = \hat{Z}_{ah} A_{h}^b + \hat{Z}_{aH} A_{H}^b + \hat{Z}_{aA} A_{A}^b$$

and

$$A_{h_a,o} = \hat{Z}_{ah} A_{h}^o + \hat{Z}_{aH} A_{H}^o + \hat{Z}_{aA} A_{A}^o,$$

where $\hat{Z}_{a\phi}$ are the elements of the $\hat{Z}$ matrix from Eq. (5.39). We see from Eq. (6.38) that the final polarisation and colour averaged squared loop amplitude for a mass eigenstate $h_a$ consists of two non-interfering terms. This is a consequence of the different tensor structures of various contributions, as we have illustrated in previous sections. In the effective field theory approach of heavy quark and SUSY masses, where the gluon–gluon–Higgs interaction is condensed into a single vertex, the amplitudes of the first term in Eq. (6.38) can be identified with a contribution that stems from $\mathcal{L} \supset G^{\mu\nu} G_{\mu\nu} \phi$ with the gluon field strength $G^{\mu\nu}$. The amplitudes of the second term stem from $\mathcal{L} \supset \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu} G_{\mu\nu} \phi$, which involves the dual of the gluon field strength tensor $\tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}$. This results in the cross section being expressible as the sum of two non-interfering squared amplitudes. This also explains the naming of the first and the second term with $A_{h_a,e}$ and $A_{h_a,o}$, respectively: the terms in $A_{h_a,e}$ possess a tensor structure similar to the quark and squark contributions to the $\mathcal{CP}$-even amplitude in Eq. (6.23), while the terms in $A_{h_a,o}$ possess a tensor structure similar to the quark contributions to the $\mathcal{CP}$-odd amplitude in Eq. (6.24). Similarly, we can split $\sigma_{LO}$ into $\sigma_{eLO}$ and $\sigma_{oLO}$. Each of $A_{h_a,e}$ and $A_{h_a,o}$ is comprised of the individual quark and squark loop contributions to amplitudes of $h, H$ and $A$, now evaluated on the mass shell of $h_a$. For the two $\mathcal{CP}$-even lowest-order mass eigenstates $\phi^e \in \{ h, H \}$ we
obtain the amplitudes

\[ A_+^{\phi_+} = \sum_{q \in \{t,b\}} \left( a_{q,+}^{\phi_+} + \tilde{a}_q^{\phi_+} \right), \quad A_-^{\phi_-} = \sum_{q \in \{t,b\}} a_{q,-}^{\phi_-} \] (6.39)

with

\[ a_{q,+}^{\phi_+} = \frac{1}{2} \left( g_{qL}^{\phi_+} + g_{qR}^{\phi_+} \right) \frac{3}{2} \tau_q^{ha} \left[ 1 + (1 - \tau_q^{ha}) f(\tau_q^{ha}) \right], \quad a_{q,-}^{\phi_-} = \frac{i}{2} \left( g_{qR}^{\phi_-} - g_{qL}^{\phi_-} \right) \frac{3}{2} \tau_q^{ha} f(\tau_q^{ha}), \]

\[ \tilde{a}_q^{\phi_-} = -\frac{3}{8} \tau_q^{ha} \sum_{i=1}^{2} g_{qi}^{\phi_-} \left[ 1 - \tau_q^{ha} f(\tau_q^{ha}) \right]. \] (6.40)

Similarly, for the CP-odd Higgs boson \( A \) we have

\[ A_+^A = \sum_{q \in \{t,b\}} \left( a_{q,+}^A + \tilde{a}_q^A \right), \quad A_-^A = \sum_{q \in \{t,b\}} a_{q,-}^A \] (6.41)

with

\[ a_{q,+}^A = \frac{1}{2} \left( g_{qL}^A + g_{qR}^A \right) \frac{3}{2} \tau_q f(\tau_q^{ha}), \quad a_{q,-}^A = \frac{i}{2} \left( g_{qR}^A - g_{qL}^A \right) \frac{3}{2} \tau_q^{ha} \left[ 1 + (1 - \tau_q^{ha}) f(\tau_q^{ha}) \right], \]

\[ \tilde{a}_q^A = -\frac{3}{8} \tau_q^{ha} \sum_{i=1}^{2} g_{qi}^A \left[ 1 - \tau_q^{ha} f(\tau_q^{ha}) \right]. \] (6.42)

We checked that this result is consistent with Ref. [153], which however assumes \( g_{qL}^\phi = g_{qR}^\phi \) and does not take into account the mixing among the tree-level mass eigenstates \( \phi \in \{h, H, A\} \). All squark contributions, i.e. \( \tilde{a}_q^{\phi_-} \) and \( \tilde{a}_q^A \), enter the first term, \( A_{h_{n}}^{\phi_-} \), in Eq. (6.38). Quark contributions to \( A_{h_{n},e}^{\phi_-} \) which couple to the CP-odd lowest-order mass eigenstate \( A \) are proportional to the difference between the left- and right-handed quark couplings. The same holds for the quark contributions to the second term \( A_{h_{n},e}^{\phi_-} \) in Eq. (6.38) which couple to the CP-even lowest-order mass eigenstates \( \phi^e \). All these terms are therefore denoted with the subscript \( A_- \). It should be noted that the quark contributions in \( A_{h_{n},e}^{\phi_-} \) only arise due to the complex nature of the Yukawa couplings, which is a consequence of the incorporation of higher-order contributions entering via the \( \Delta q_{ij} \) corrections, and our choice of working with a complex Yukawa coupling. Consequently, they vanish in the MSSM with real parameters.

The expressions in Eq. (6.38)–Eq. (6.42) contain the central result of this chapter. This analytical form of the leading order gluon-fusion cross section for the loop-corrected mass eigenstates \( h_1, h_2 \) and \( h_3 \) of the MSSM, taking into account complex Yukawa couplings, CP-violating Higgs–squark couplings, and a 3×3 mixing for the general case of complex parameters has been presented for the first time in our publication Ref. [1].
6.4 Higher-order contributions

6.4.1 Resummation of SUSY QCD contributions

At tree level in the MSSM, there is no $\bar{b}_L h_u^0 b_R$ coupling, only the neutral component of the Higgs doublet $H_1$, $h_0^0$ couples to the bottom quark. However, a coupling of the form $\bar{b}_L h_0^0 b_R$ can be induced by corrections from gluino–squark loops, such as the one shown in Fig. 6.4.

The leading parts of such SUSY QCD corrections arising from gluino–squark loops, as well as leading electroweak corrections, can be absorbed into the effective bottom-Yukawa coupling to the Higgs bosons [189–194]. For a heavy SUSY mass scale, the leading corrections are obtained from an effective Lagrangian

$$L_{\text{eff}} = -y_b \bar{b}_R \left[ h_d^0 + \frac{\Delta_b}{t_\beta} h_u^0 \right] b_L + h.c. \quad (6.43)$$

This loop induced correction shifts the $b$-quark mass from its tree-level value and is described by

$$m_b \to y_b v_d \left( 1 + \Delta_b \right). \quad (6.44)$$

It also results in a shift of the bottom-Yukawa couplings from the tree level relations. Following the treatment in Ref. [32], and inserting the expression for the bottom-Yukawa coupling from Eq. (6.44) into Eq. (6.43) for the general case of a complex $\Delta_b$ results in

$$L_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{1}{1 + \Delta_b} \frac{m_b}{v_d} \bar{b}_R \left[ h_d^0 + \frac{\Delta_b}{t_\beta} h_u^0 \right] b_L + h.c. \quad (6.45)$$

Figure 6.4: Feynman diagram that induces an effective coupling of the bottom quarks to the Higgs field component $h_u^0$. 

where the quantities \( x \) and \( y \) are defined as
\[
x = \frac{\text{Im}\Delta_b}{1 + \text{Re}\Delta_b}, \tag{6.46}
\]
\[
y = \text{Re}\Delta_b + x \text{Im}\Delta_b. \tag{6.47}
\]

Neglecting terms involving Goldstone bosons, the effective Lagrangian reads \([51]\)
\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \bar{b} \frac{1}{1 + t_\alpha} \left( 1 - t_\alpha \gamma_5 x \right) \left( 1 + \frac{1}{t_\alpha} \right) v^\text{tree}_{hb} h \\
+ \left[ 1 + t_\alpha \gamma_5 x \right] \left( 1 - t_\alpha \right) v^\text{tree}_{Hb} H \\
+ \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{t_\beta} \right] y \left( 1 + \frac{1}{t_\beta} \right) v^\text{tree}_{Ab} A \right) b + \cdots, \tag{6.48}
\]

where \( t_\alpha \equiv \tan \alpha \).

Finally, \( v^\text{tree}_{hb}, v^\text{tree}_{Hb}, v^\text{tree}_{Ab} \) are given by
\[
\mathcal{L}^\text{tree} = \bar{b} \left[ v^\text{tree}_{hb} h + v^\text{tree}_{Hb} H + v^\text{tree}_{Ab} A \right] b + \cdots \\
= \bar{b} \left[ -\frac{y_b^0}{\sqrt{2}} (s_\alpha) h - \frac{y_b^0}{\sqrt{2}} (c_\alpha) H - \frac{y_b^0}{\sqrt{2}} (i\gamma_5) (s_\beta) A \right] b + \cdots, \tag{6.49}
\]

with
\[
\frac{y_b^0}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{m_b}{v_d} = \frac{m_b}{\sqrt{2} \cos \beta}, \tag{6.50}
\]

where we have used \( v = \frac{2m_W}{g_2} \) and \( g_2 = \frac{e}{s_W} \) from Eq. (2.3), Eq. (2.13) and Eq. (2.15). Substituting the expressions from Eq. (6.46), Eq. (6.47) and Eq. (6.49) into Eq. (6.48) we obtain the following expression for the effective Lagrangian,
\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \frac{m_b}{v} \sum_{\phi^c \in \{h, H\}} \bar{b} \left[ g_{hL}^{\phi} P_L + (g_{hR}^{\phi})^* P_R \right] b \phi^c + i \frac{m_b}{v} \bar{b} \left[ g_{hL}^{A} P_L - (g_{hR}^{A})^* P_R \right] b A \tag{6.51}
\]
in terms of the left-handed and right-handed couplings \( g_{hL}^{\phi} \) and \( g_{hR}^{\phi} = (g_{hL}^{\phi})^* \), where \( P_{L/R} = \frac{1}{2}(1 \mp \gamma_5) \) are the left- and right-handed projection operators, respectively. The explicit form of the couplings can then be deduced to be
\[
g_{hL}^{h} = \frac{f_{h\beta}}{1 + \Delta_b} \left[ 1 - \frac{\cot \alpha}{\tan \beta} \Delta_b \right], \quad g_{hL}^{H} = \frac{f_{h\beta}}{1 + \Delta_b} \left[ 1 + \frac{\tan \alpha}{\tan \beta} \Delta_b \right], \quad g_{hL}^{A} = \frac{f_{h\beta}}{1 + \Delta_b} \left[ 1 - \frac{\Delta_b}{\tan^2 \beta} \right], \tag{6.52}
\]
with \( f_{h\beta} = \sin \alpha / \cos \beta, \quad f_{h\beta}^{H} = \cos \alpha / \cos \beta \) and \( f_{h\beta}^{A} = \tan \beta \) (see also Refs. [51, 195]).
The effective Lagrangian therefore provides a resummation of leading tan β-enhanced contributions entering via the quantity \( \Delta_b \). The leading QCD contribution to \( \Delta_b \) has the form

\[
\Delta_b = \frac{2 \alpha_s(\mu_d)}{3} M_3^* \mu^* \tan \beta I(m_{b_1}^2, m_{b_2}^2, m_{\tilde{g}}^2),
\]

(6.53)

\[
I(a, b, c) = -\frac{ab \log \left( \frac{b}{a} \right) + ac \log \left( \frac{c}{a} \right) + bc \log \left( \frac{c}{b} \right)}{(a - c)(c - b)(b - a)}
\]

(6.54)

where \( \alpha_s \) is typically evaluated at an averaged SUSY scale \( \mu_d = (m_{b_1} + m_{b_2} + m_{\tilde{g}})/3 \). As one can see from Eq. (6.53), the leading contribution to \( \Delta_b \) has an explicit dependence on the complex parameters \( M_3 \) and \( \mu \). In the numerical analysis in this thesis the value for \( \Delta_b \) is obtained from \textit{FeynHiggs} (see Ref. [196]), which includes additional QCD and electroweak contributions [197–200].

We will use the expression for the bottom-quark Yukawa coupling according to the effective Lagrangian of Eq. (6.51) and Eq. (6.52) in our leading-order expressions for the (loop-induced) gluon-fusion process. For bottom-quark annihilation and the implementation of higher-order corrections to the gluon-fusion process, we will use as a simplified version [51]

\[
g_b^\phi = g_b^\phi_L = g_b^\phi_R = \frac{1}{|1 + \Delta_b|} f_{\alpha\beta},
\]

(6.55)

in which the left- and right-handed couplings to bottom quarks are identical to each other. We will compare the numerical impact of the two implementations at LO in Chapter 8. The effective Yukawa coupling in Eq. (6.51) is complex. The phase of this coupling could be rotated away by an appropriate redefinition of the (s)quark fields, as described e.g. in Ref. [197]. This redefinition could be used to avoid having to explicitly differentiate between \( g_b^\phi_L \) and \( g_b^\phi_R \). Still, we prefer to use the most general expression for a complex Yukawa coupling. In the phenomenological discussion in Chapter 8 we compare the effect of the complex Yukawa coupling of Eq. (6.51) with the simplified real coupling of Eq. (6.55) (which are not equivalent to each other) and subsequently show that the numerical differences are small.

### 6.4.2 Gluon fusion at higher orders

Gluon fusion receives sizeable corrections at higher orders. Higher-order corrections have been calculated for the production of the SM Higgs boson, as well for the Higgs bosons of the MSSM with real parameters, in various orders of perturbation theory and expansions. In the following, we provide a brief overview of status of higher-order calculations for the gluon-fusion process involving both the SM, and SUSY particles for the case of real parameters. In the next sections, we will discuss to what degree they have been
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implemented in SusHi. Subsequently, we will explain how they can be modified and incorporated into the cross sections for Higgs production in the MSSM with complex parameters, as well the scope of their implementation in SusHiMi.

The total effect of the next-to-leading order (NLO) real and virtual corrections for the SM quark contributions is the increase of the LO cross section by a factor of 1.5–1.7, with a residual dependence on renormalisation and factorisation scales of about 30%. These NLO QCD contributions have been known for arbitrary quark masses since the late 1990s and early 2000s [182,201–205]. Their sizeable effect motivated the calculation of next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO) SM QCD contributions which were calculated in the limit of a heavy top-quark mass [206–208]. The NNLO QCD corrections are smaller than the NLO ones, but are still significant and improve the stability against renormalisation and factorisation scale dependence. Finite top-quark mass effects at NNLO are known in an expansion of inverse powers of the top-quark mass [209–216].

More recently, N^3LO contributions for a CP-even Higgs boson in an expansion around the threshold of Higgs production [217–221] were published, also in the heavy quark mass limit\(^7\). We will later discuss in more detail for which Higgs mass ranges these corrections are applicable, which also explains why the above mentioned N^3LO contributions will only be employed for the CP-even component of the light Higgs boson.

Higher-order corrections to the gluon-fusion process are not just limited to QCD effects. Electroweak (EW) NLO corrections have been accounted for as well. In Refs. [224,225] they were calculated in the infinite top mass limit, and the corrections to the gluon-fusion cross section were found to be less than 1%. However, contributions from diagrams with a closed loop of light fermions were more sizeable. These contributions have been evaluated in a closed analytic form in terms of generalised harmonic polylogarithms (GHPLs) in Refs. [226,227]. In the intermediate Higgs mass range between 114 GeV up to the threshold of 2\(m_W\) these corrections can lead to an increase from the LO cross section by 4–9%. For masses of the Higgs boson above the 2\(m_W\) threshold, the light fermion corrections change sign and decrease the LO cross section by up to 2%. In Ref. [228], the remaining EW corrections from top quark contributions were evaluated in a Taylor expansion in \(m_H^2/(4m_W)^2\), with a valid result in the \(m_H < 2m_W\) range. However these corrections were found to be very small in size, reaching at most 15% of the light fermion contributions. Electroweak corrections as discussed in Ref. [226] can be added as well.

For the production of CP-even MSSM Higgs bosons \(h\) and \(H\), the QCD effects from the quarks can be adapted from the SM calculation by using the rescaled Yukawa couplings shown in Table 3.3. NNLO QCD corrections to the quark induced cross section for the CP-odd Higgs boson \(A\) were calculated in Refs. [229,230] in addition to Ref. [214]. In the MSSM with real parameters, NLO corrections from real radiation arising from Higgs production in association with a quark or gluon jet at one loop, mediated by

\(^7\)Most recently the N^3LO QCD corrections for CP-odd Higgs bosons have also become available [222,223]. In the analysis presented in this thesis, those contributions are neglected.
quarks and squarks, can be expressed in terms of Passarino-Veltman functions \([186]\), as presented in Ref. \([231]\). The analytical NLO virtual contributions involving squarks, quarks and gluinos are either known in the limit of a vanishing Higgs mass \([232–235]\) or in an expansion of heavy SUSY masses \([236–238]\)\(^8\). Even NNLO corrections of stop-induced contributions to gluon fusion are known \([242–244]\). We neglect the latter contributions in our analysis for the MSSM with complex parameters.

### 6.4.2.1 NLO contributions

In this section, we will describe the numerically relevant NLO corrections to the LO cross section. A brief discussion of electroweak contributions will follow.

As explained in Section 6.4.1, a complex Yukawa coupling is only induced for the bottom quark through the incorporation of \(\Delta_b\) contributions. According to this approach, for the top-quark Yukawa coupling \(g_{\phi t}\), left- and right-handed components are identical also in the MSSM with complex parameters. Therefore we can directly take over the known higher-order QCD corrections to the top-quark loop contribution for the MSSM with complex parameters. For the incorporation of the bottom-quark contribution at NLO (SM) QCD, on the other hand, we will rely on the simplified version of the \(\Delta_b\) corrections to the bottom-Yukawa coupling as specified in Eq. (6.55). This approximation ensures that the higher-order quark contributions, both real and virtual, are of the same structure as in the \(\mathcal{CP}\)-conserving MSSM.

The hadronic cross section for \(h_a, a \in \{1, 2, 3\}\) at NLO can be written as

\[
\sigma_{\text{NLO}}^{e/o}(pp \to h_a + X) = \sigma_0^{h_a e/o} \tau_{h_a} \mathcal{L}^{gg}(\tau_{h_a}) \left[ 1 + C_{e/o}^e \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right] + \Delta \sigma_{gg}^{e/o} + \Delta \sigma_{gq}^{e/o} + \Delta \sigma_{q\bar{q}}^{e/o}.
\]

(6.56)

At NLO in the MSSM with complex parameters, supersymmetric contributions are present both in virtual and real corrections. The terms \(\Delta \sigma\) denote the real corrections. They arise from the hard \(gg, gq\) and \(g\bar{q}\) scattering and are regular as \(\hat{s} \to M_{h_a}\) in the partonic cross section. They are one-loop processes where the Higgs boson is produced with a gluon or quark jet. In the MSSM, the loop can be mediated by quarks as well as squarks. Example processes are depicted in Fig. 6.5.

The real corrections show a similar behaviour as observed for the LO cross section. Working with Eq. (6.55) implies that the left- and right-handed Yukawa couplings are equal and terms in the cross section proportional to their difference are absent. Therefore in the real corrections the only new ingredients arising due to complex parameters are Higgs–squark couplings to the \(\mathcal{CP}\)-odd, \(g_{\tilde{q}ii}^A\). These squark induced contributions of \(\mathcal{CP}\)-odd components proportional to \(g_{\tilde{q}ii}^A\) are added as a complex component to the \(\mathcal{CP}\)-even couplings. Consequently, the real corrections can be split in \(\Delta \sigma^e\) and \(\Delta \sigma^o\) since no

\(^8\)Exact numerical and for certain contributions analytical results for NLO virtual contributions were presented in Refs. \([204, 205, 239–241]\).
interference terms arise. In SusHiMi, the real corrections have been taken over from the implementation in SusHi which uses the full analytical expressions presented in Ref. [231].

The factors \(C^{c/o}\) in Eq. (6.56) contain the NLO virtual corrections to the \(gg\) process, regularised by the infrared singular part. They also contain counterterms to the LO quantities. For the quark induced contributions SusHi incorporates the full analytical formulas of Ref. [203]. These results are directly taken over for the complex case in SusHiMi. The NLO virtual contributions from supersymmetric particles can arise from diagrams containing gluon–squark or gluino–quark–squark loops. In order to preserve supersymmetry, the purely squark induced terms need to be evaluated in combination with the mixed gluino–quark-squark terms. Some example diagrams for the NLO virtual contributions are shown in Fig. 6.6.

In SusHi, these contributions are implemented for the case of real parameters in two limits [161]. The expansions in those limits hold if the Higgs mass is not much larger in comparison to the SUSY masses. For very large Higgs masses, only the numerical result of Ref. [239] is known so far.

1. The first limit is \(m_\phi, m_q \ll m_{\tilde{q}_1,2}, m_{\tilde{g}}\) [231, 236–238], which can be applied to the bottom–sbottom sector and the top–stop sector, and is valid when \(m_\phi < \min(2m_q, m_{\tilde{q}} + m_{\tilde{g}})\). SusHi uses the formulas of Refs. [237, 238] in these cases.

2. The limit \(m_\phi \ll m_q, m_{\tilde{q}_1,2}, m_{\tilde{g}}\) [232, 233, 235] is valid for \(m_\phi < \min(2m_q, 2m_{\tilde{q}})\) and is applied to the top–stop sector as long as \(\phi\) is not too heavy. These corrections are incorporated in SusHi using the subroutine evalcsusy.f [245].
The approach using the second limit in \texttt{evalcsusy.f} uses the tree-level coupling $\alpha$ explicitly in the amplitudes, and therefore is not compatible with the implementation of \( \hat{Z} \) factors used for the amplitudes according to Eq. (5.43) in \texttt{SusHiMi}. Consequently, we will use the first approach in our computation of NLO virtual contributions to $h_1, h_2, h_3$ production and its implementation in \texttt{SusHiMi}.

However, the NLO virtual contributions from supersymmetric particles as described above are not easily adjustable to the MSSM with complex parameters. We therefore interpolate the NLO virtual contributions between phases $0$ and $\pi$ of the various MSSM parameters using a cosine interpolation \cite{246,247}. This interpolation makes use of on-shell stop- and sbottom-quark masses defined at phases 0 and $\pi$. Thus, within the interpolated result we have to ensure the correct subtraction of the NLO contributions that have already been taken into account through $\Delta_b$ effects in the bottom-quark Yukawa coupling. This is done by expanding the $\Delta_b$ correction to next-to-leading order in the subtraction term.

For a certain value of the phase $\phi_z$ of a complex parameter $z$, the virtual NLO amplitude $A_{NLO}(\phi_z)$ can be approximated using

\[
A_{NLO}(\phi_z) = \frac{1 + \cos \phi_z}{2} A_{NLO}(0) + \frac{1 - \cos \phi_z}{2} A_{NLO}^\phi(\pi) \tag{6.57}
\]

for each of the lowest-order mass eigenstates $\phi \in \{h, H, A\}$. Here $A_{NLO}^\phi(0)$ is the analytical result for the MSSM with real parameters, and $A_{NLO}^\phi(\pi)$ is the analytical result with $z \rightarrow -z$. Using the factors $\cos \phi_z$ ensures a smooth interpolation such that the known results for a vanishing phase are recovered. Whereas a dependence on the phases of $A_q$
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and $\mu$ is already apparent in the lowest-order diagrams of $gg \to \phi$, the phase of $M_3$ only enters through the NLO virtual corrections. Besides the $\Delta_h$ contributions, where the full phase dependence is incorporated, the treatment of the phase of $M_3$ therefore relies on the performed interpolation. While the implemented routines for the MSSM with real parameters are expressed in terms of the gluino mass, they can also be used for a negative soft-breaking parameter $M_3$, such that we can obtain interpolated results for a complex-valued parameter $M_3$. We note that the NLO virtual amplitudes with a negative $M_3$ are identical to the virtual amplitudes for positive $M_3$ with opposite signs of the parameters $A_t$, $A_b$ and $\mu$. This can be understood from the structure of the NLO diagrams involving the squark–quark–gluino couplings. It should however be noted in this context that due to the generation of Higgs–squark couplings $g_{\tilde{q}ii}^A$ for non-vanishing phases, a new class of NLO virtual diagrams arises which is not present in the MSSM with real parameters. Since the interpolation is based on the result for the MSSM with real parameters as input for the predictions at the phases $0$ and $\pi$, the additional set of diagrams may not be adequately approximated in this way and therefore remain unaccounted for.

Despite this fact, we expect that the interpolation of the virtual two-loop contributions involving squarks and gluinos to the gluon-fusion amplitude provides a reasonable approximation, for the following reasons (we discuss the theoretical uncertainty associated with the interpolation in Section 8.6 and assign a conservative estimate of the uncertainty in our numerical analysis). We focus here on the gluon-fusion amplitude without $\hat{Z}$ factors, since in the $\hat{Z}$ factors the full phase dependence is incorporated without approximations. Gluino contributions are generally suppressed for gluino masses that are sufficiently heavy to be in accordance with the present bounds from LHC searches, while gluon-exchange contributions do not add an additional phase dependence compared to the dependence on the phases of $A_q$ and $\mu$ in the LO cross section, which is fully taken into account. The dependence of the NLO amplitude on the phases of $A_q$ and $\mu$ is therefore expected to follow a similar pattern as the LO amplitude, which is also what we find in the application of the interpolation method.

One can also compare the higher-order corrections to the gluon-fusion process with the ones to the Higgs boson masses and $\hat{Z}$ factors. In fact, a similar interpolation was applied in the prediction for Higgs boson masses in the MSSM with complex parameters, see e.g. Refs. [144,247–249], where the phase dependence of sub-leading two-loop contributions beyond $O(\alpha_t\alpha_s)$ were approximated with an interpolation before the full phase dependence of the corresponding two-loop corrections at $O(\alpha_s^2)$ was calculated [250,251]. Generally good agreement was found between the full result and the approximation [250,251]. In order to investigate the interpolation of the phase of $M_3$ we performed a similar check concerning the phase dependence of two-loop squark and gluino loop contributions. We numerically compared the full result for the Higgs mass prediction at this order from FeynHiggs with an approximation where the phases at the two-loop level are interpolated. Despite the fact that for the Higgs mass calculation new diagrams proportional
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to $g_{q_i}^A$ arise away from phases 0 and $\pi$ as well, the phase dependence of the interpolated results generically follows the behaviour of the full results very well.

Based on the NLO amplitude that has been obtained as described above, we can construct the NLO cross sections $\sigma_{NLO}^e$ and $\sigma_{NLO}^o$ individually, following Ref. [161], by defining the NLO correction factors $C^e$ and $C^o$:

$$C^{e/o} = 2\text{Re} \left[ \frac{A_{NLO}^{h_a,e/o}}{A_{NLO}^{h_a,e/o}} \right] + \pi^2 + \beta_0 \log \left( \frac{\mu^2}{\mu_F^2} \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.58)

The amplitudes are given by $A_{NLO}^{h_a,e} = \hat{Z}_{ah}^* A_{NLO}^h + \hat{Z}_{ah} A_{NLO}^H$ and $A_{NLO}^{h_a,o} = \hat{Z}_{aA} A_{NLO}^A$, $\mu_F$ denotes the factorisation scale, and $\beta_0 = 11/2 - n_f/3$ with $n_f = 5$. Note that the LO amplitudes $A^{h_a,e/o}$ entering Eq. (6.58) are taken in the limit of large stop and sbottom masses, see Ref. [161].

6.4.2.2 Electroweak corrections

The full NLO electroweak corrections are known only in the Standard Model [252]. Consequently, for the MSSM, we can construct the EW amplitude only for the $\mathcal{CP}$-even eigenstates $h$ and $H$. Since the $\mathcal{CP}$-odd Higgs $A$ does not couple to gauge bosons, EW corrections to the $\mathcal{CP}$-odd Higgs production are expected to be negligible. This follows from the fact that important EW corrections arise from two-loop diagrams containing an internal light quark loop where the Higgs couples to the $W$ and $Z$ bosons. An example diagram is depicted in Fig. 6.7. These light quark diagrams are not suppressed by quark Yukawa couplings and therefore have a multiplicity enhancement from summing over the light quarks.

The electroweak effects of this kind are incorporated into the cross section in terms of a correction factor that multiplies the NLO cross section$^9$:

$$\sigma_{NLO,\, EW}^e = \sigma_{NLO}^e \left( 1 + \delta_{EW}^{\text{ff}} \right).$$ \hspace{1cm} (6.59)

The factor $\delta_{EW}^{\text{ff}}$ parametrises the contribution from light quarks, which can be reweighted

---

$^9$This assumes factorisation of electroweak and QCD effects.
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to the MSSM with complex parameters. We follow Ref. [253] and define the correction factor

$$\delta_{\text{EW}}^{\text{hf}} = \frac{\alpha_{\text{EM}}}{\pi} \frac{2 \text{Re} \left( A_{h_a,e}^\text{LO} A_{h_a,e,\text{EW}}^* \right)}{|A_{h_a,e}|^2},$$

(6.60)

where $A_{h_a,e}$, which has been given in Eq. (6.38), denotes the $C\bar{P}$-even part of the LO amplitude including quark and squark contributions. Accordingly, this electroweak correction factor is only applied to the $C\bar{P}$-even component of the LO and NLO cross section. The electroweak amplitude is given by [226]

$$A_{h_a,\text{EW}} = \frac{3}{8} \frac{1}{x_W s_W^2} \left[ \frac{2}{c_W} \left( \frac{5}{4} - \frac{7}{3} s_W^2 + \frac{22}{9} s_W^4 \right) A_1[x_Z] + 4 A_1[x_W] \right]$$

$$\times \left( -\hat{Z}_{ah} \sin \alpha \cos \beta + \hat{Z}_{aH} \cos \alpha \sin \beta \right),$$

(6.61)

with the abbreviation

$$x_V = \frac{M_{h_a}^2}{(m_V - i \Gamma_V/2)^2}, \quad V \in \{W, Z\}.$$  

(6.62)

In Eq. (6.60) $\alpha_{\text{EM}}$ denotes the electro-magnetic coupling. $\Gamma_V$ and $m_V$ are the mass and the width of the heavy gauge bosons $V \in \{W, Z\}$. The function $A_1[x]$ is expressed in terms of the GHPLs defined in Ref. [226] as follows,

$$A_1[x] = -4 + 2 \left( 1 + \frac{1}{x} \right) G(-1; x) + \frac{2}{x} G(0, -1; x) + 2 \left( 1 + \frac{3}{x} \right) G(0, 0, -1, x)$$

$$+ \left( 1 + \frac{2}{x} \right) \left[ 2G(0, -r, -r; x) - 3G(-r, -r, -1; x) \right] - \sqrt{x(x+4)} \left\{ \frac{2}{x} G(-r; x) \right\}$$

$$+ \frac{x + 2}{x^2} \left[ 2G(-r, -r, -r; x) + 2G(-r, 0, -1; x) - 3G(-4, -r, -1; x) \right].$$

(6.63)

The numerical evaluation of this function is very involved, and in SusHi the $\delta_{\text{EW}}^{\text{hf}}$ are implemented through an interpolation grid in $M_{h_a}$ using fixed values for the masses and widths of the gauge bosons and the weak mixing angle,

$$m_W = 80.385 \text{ GeV}, \quad \Gamma_W = 2.085 \text{ GeV}, \quad \sin^2 \theta_W = 0.22295$$

$$m_Z = 91.1896 \text{ GeV}, \quad \Gamma_Z = 2.4952 \text{ GeV}.$$  

(6.64)

Thus, the electroweak input values to SusHi for these correction factors are ignored.

Until now, we have presented how the gluon-fusion cross section in the MSSM is calculated considering all the different effects arising from the presence of complex parameters in the theory. We discussed the addition of higher-order contributions from various sectors and their adaptation and generalisation to the case of MSSM with complex pa-
rameters. In Chapter 7, we will describe how these components of the cross section, including NNLO and N^3LO contributions, are assembled in the numerical code SusHiMi.

6.5 Cross section for bottom-quark annihilation

The Higgs boson can be produced in association with bottom quarks ($b\bar{b}\phi$), similar to the process $t\bar{t}\phi$. In the SM, an increased phase space for $b\bar{b}\phi$ can compensate for the suppression by smaller Yukawa couplings. Depending on the centre-of-mass energy and the Higgs mass, this can result in the $b\bar{b}\phi$ cross section being even greater than that for $t\bar{t}\phi$ [254]. However, its experimental significance is reduced due to an enormous QCD background. In theories with extended Higgs sectors such as the 2HDM or the MSSM, the bottom-Yukawa couplings can be enhanced relative to the SM one so that $b\bar{b}\phi$ can become a dominant production channel for the Higgs bosons.

The theoretical prediction for this process can be made in two approaches. The first is called the four-flavour scheme (4FS) [255–257], where the leading order partonic processes are $q\bar{q} \rightarrow b\bar{b}\phi$ and $gg \rightarrow b\bar{b}\phi$, with $q \in \{u,d,c,s\}$. Here, the bottom quark appears as a final state particle and is not associated with a PDF. An example leading order diagram for this is depicted in Fig. 6.8 (a). In the 4FS, the cross section is known at NLO QCD in the SM. However, integration over phase space can lead to divergences arising from kinematic regions where the bottom quarks are collinear to the incoming partons which result in potentially large logarithms $\ln m_b/m_\phi$.

Ideally, these can be dealt with by resumming the large perturbative coefficients. This can be done in the five-flavour scheme (5FS) [258,259], which introduces bottom-quark PDFs such that bottom quarks appear in the initial state (Fig. 6.8 (b)). The PDFs implicitly resum the momenta of the bottom quarks through DGLAP evolution\textsuperscript{10}. SusHi employs the 5FS for the bottom-quark annihilation process for a SM Higgs boson at NNLO QCD. In the employed five-flavour scheme, where the bottom quarks are understood as

![Leading order diagrams for bottom-quark annihilation](image)

Figure 6.8: Leading order diagrams for bottom-quark annihilation in the (a) four-flavour scheme and (b) five-flavour scheme.

\textsuperscript{10}Recently, calculations that perform a resummation of the logarithms combining the 4FS and 5FS are available, see e.g. Refs. [260–263].
partons, the result equals the cross section of a $CP$-odd Higgs $A$ (in a 2HDM with $\tan \beta = 1$). In the MSSM with real parameters, SusHi links to the program bbh@nnlo [264] for obtaining the inclusive cross section $\sigma_{b\bar{b}H^0}$ in the SM at NNLO QCD which uses $m_{\tilde{b}}^{\overline{MS}}(\mu_R)$ for the bottom-Yukawa coupling. This is subsequently reweighted by the resummed SUSY coupling $g_b^\phi$.

For the production of the Higgs boson $h_a$ in the MSSM with complex parameters, as implemented in SusHiMi, the results for the SM Higgs boson are further reweighted to the MSSM with $|\hat{Z}_{ah}g_b^h + \hat{Z}_{aH}g_b^H|^2 + |\hat{Z}_{aA}g_b^A|^2$, which includes $\tan \beta$-enhanced squark effects through $\Delta_b$ according to the simplified resummation of Eq. (6.55). This procedure equals the application of a $K$-factor on the full LO cross section including $\hat{Z}$ factors. In case of non-equal left- and right-handed couplings $g_{bL}$ and $g_{bR}$ due to the application of the full resummation in Eq. (6.52), the SM cross section has to be multiplied with

$$
|\hat{Z}_{ah}(g_{bL}^h + g_{bR}^h) + \hat{Z}_{aH}(g_{bL}^H + g_{bR}^H) + i\hat{Z}_{aA}(g_{bL}^A - g_{bR}^A)|^2 \\
+ |\hat{Z}_{ah}(g_{bR}^h - g_{bL}^h) + i\hat{Z}_{aH}(g_{bR}^H - g_{bL}^H) + \hat{Z}_{aA}(g_{bL}^A + g_{bR}^A)|^2.
$$

(6.65)

We only discuss Higgs production through bottom-quark annihilation with simplified $\Delta_b$ resummation in this thesis.
Chapter 7

The program SusHi and its extension SusHiMi

This chapter describes the code SusHi and its extension SusHiMi, which incorporates the results for cross sections for neutral Higgs bosons in the MSSM with explicit CP violation presented in Chapter 6. The summary of the computational framework for SusHi is based on the manual Ref. [161]. The description of SusHiMi closely follows Ref. [1], reflecting the author’s contribution.

7.1 Introduction

Studying the phenomenology of BSM models with high precision is a challenging task, especially since it can involve complex computations of mass matrices, interaction vertices, cross sections, and decay rates in a large number of processes. For this reason, it is essential to develop computational tools that can automate complicated and time consuming calculations and get robust numerical predictions to a high degree of precision. Such precise predictions are indeed required to discriminate between different models, or constrain the parameter space of new physics models at the level of accuracy delivered by the experiments.

One such computer code, whose development and extension this thesis is largely concerned with, is SusHi. SusHi is a numerical FORTRAN code [161, 162] which combines analytical results for the calculation of Higgs boson cross sections through gluon fusion and heavy-quark annihilation in models beyond the Standard Model up to the highest known orders in perturbation theory. It harbours several extensions, such as aMCSusHi [265, 266], a script for generating events for Higgs production at the LHC via gluon fusion which is used within MadGraph, and MoRe-SusHi (MOmentum REsummed SusHi) [266–268], which allows for the calculation of the transverse momentum distribution of a Higgs boson in the SM, the 2HDM, the MSSM, and the NMSSM by applying the formalism of analytic resummation to the gluon fusion-process. However, SusHi up to now did not allow for CP violation in the Higgs sector. Following our discussion in Chapter 6 we present the calculation of Higgs boson production in the context of the
MSSM with complex parameters, which we have included in an extension of SusHi named SusHiMi.

### 7.2 Workflow of SusHi

The input of SusHi is controlled by an SLHA-inspired [269, 270] input file. For the MSSM, the Higgs mass can be calculated by FeynHiggs or input by the user. The renormalisation scheme to be used is chosen in the input file, using which SusHi initialises the internal parameters. Various choices for the bottom-quark Yukawa coupling are supported, including the resummation of $\tan \beta$-enhanced sbottom effects. Subsequently the cross sections for gluon fusion and bottom-quark annihilation are calculated up to the order specified in the input file. The link to LHAPDF [271] takes place at various stages in the internal calculation. The output is generated in an output file as well as printed on the screen. The workflow for SusHi has been summarised in Fig. 7.1.

The external codes ggh@nnlo and bbh@nnlo are integrated into SusHi and are a part of the distribution. However, it must, especially for the MSSM with complex parameters, be linked to FeynHiggs, which is used to calculate the Higgs boson masses and mixings, and to LHAPDF, which provides the PDF sets that are used within SusHi.

### 7.3 The extension SusHiMi

The extension SusHiMi allows for complex values for the trilinear couplings of the Higgs with third generation sfermions $A_{t,b}$, the Higgsino mass parameter $\mu$, and the gluino mass parameter $M_3$. While it is possible to also take into account $CP$ violation in other sectors, we focus on the parameters that most affect the production cross sections through gluon fusion and bottom-annihilation.

We proceed along the lines of Fig. 7.2, which depicts the SusHiMi workflow, and calculate the Higgs boson production cross section through gluon fusion as follows: SusHiMi calls SusHi twice and in these two calls performs a “$CP$-even” calculation for $\sigma_{NLO}^{e}$ and a “$CP$-odd” calculation for $\sigma_{NLO}^{o}$ according to Eq. (6.56). Thus, the total gluon-fusion cross section is the sum of the two parts

$$\sigma_{N^4LO}^{e}(pp \rightarrow h_a + X) = \sigma_{N^4LO}^{e}(pp \rightarrow h_a + X) + \sigma_{N^4LO}^{o}(pp \rightarrow h_a + X). \quad (7.1)$$

We obtain the result beyond LO QCD through\(^1\)

$$\sigma_{N^4LO}^{e} = \sigma_{NLO}^{e}(1 + \delta_{EW}^{(4)}) + \left(\sigma_{N^4LO, EFT}^{t,e} - \sigma_{NLO, EFT}^{t,e}\right), \quad (7.2)$$

$$\sigma_{N^4LO}^{o} = \sigma_{NLO}^{o} + \left(\sigma_{N^4LO, EFT}^{t,o} - \sigma_{NLO, EFT}^{t,o}\right), \quad (7.3)$$

\(^1\)These formulas equal the master formulas employed in previous SusHi releases [161, 162].
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Figure 7.1: Internal workflow of SusHi. Red boxes indicate interaction with the user while green boxes refer to external code (see text), which is linked to/included in SusHi. Figure from Ref. [161].

whereas $\sigma^{e/o}_{t,LO}$ was specified in Section 6.3.2, and $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. The $\mathcal{C}\mathcal{P}$-odd component $\sigma^{e/o}_{N^k,LO,EFT}$ is only implemented up to $k = 2$ (see below). In the previous formulas $\sigma^{e/o}_{NLO}$ are the NLO cross sections including real contributions and the interpolated NLO virtual corrections as discussed in Section 6.4.2.1. They employ the simplified $\Delta_b$ resummation according to Eq. (6.55), named $\Delta_{bi}$. $\sigma^{t,e}_{N^k,LO,EFT}$ and $\sigma^{t,o}_{N^k,LO,EFT}$ are cross sections including the top-quark contribution only. They are based on a $K$-factor calculated in the EFT approach of an infinitely heavy top-quark obtained for a SM Higgs boson $H$ and a $\mathcal{C}\mathcal{P}$-odd $A$ (in a 2HDM with $\tan \beta = 1$) with mass $M_{h_a}$, respectively.

This $K$-factor is subsequently reweighted with the exact LO cross section. For this purpose the employed LO cross sections $\sigma^{t,e/0}_{LO}$ and $\sigma^{t,o}_{LO}$ are again evaluated as discussed in Section 6.3.2 with full $\mathcal{Z}$ factors, but include only the top-quark contribution. They are multiplied with the $K$-factors in $\sigma^{t,e/0}_{N^k,LO,EFT}$ and $\sigma^{t,o}_{N^k,LO,EFT}$, respectively. Due to their small numerical impact in $\sigma^{e/o}_{N^k,LO,EFT}$ we do not take into account top-quark mass effects beyond NLO even though they are implemented in SusHi. An alternative approach,
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Higgs masses and $\hat{Z}$ factors by FeynHiggs

SusHiMi Call #1: $\sigma_{\text{LO}}^{e/o} \to \text{Full } \Delta_b$ resummation [Eq. (6.52) $\to$ $\Delta_b^2$]

SusHiMi Call #2: $\sigma_{\text{LO}}^{e/o} \to \text{Simplified } \Delta_b$ resummation [Eq. (6.55) $\to$ $\Delta_b^1$]

SusHiMi Call #3: $\sigma_{\text{NLO}}^{e/o} \to \text{Simplified } \Delta_b$ resummation [Eq. (6.55) $\to$ $\Delta_b^1$]

$\sigma_{\text{LO}}^{e/o} = \sigma_{\text{NLO}}^{e/o} (1 + \delta_{\text{EW}}) + (\sigma_{\text{NLO/NNLO},\text{EFT}}^{t,e/o} - \sigma_{\text{NLO, EFT}}^{t,e/o})$

$\sigma_{\text{NLO}}^{e/o} \to$ Exact results for quark contributions
Interpolated results for squark contributions

Combination to $\sigma(pp \to h_a + X)$

$\sigma_{\text{NLO,}\Delta_b^1} + \sigma_{\text{NLO,}\Delta_b^1}^{e/o} + \sigma_{\text{LO,}\Delta_b^2}^{e/o} + \sigma_{\text{LO,}\Delta_b^2}^{e/o} \to \sigma_{\text{LO,}\Delta_b^1}^{e/o} + \sigma_{\text{LO,}\Delta_b^1}^{e/o}$

Figure 7.2: Pictorial view of the gluon-fusion cross section calculation in SusHiMi.
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which is not discussed in this thesis but can be implemented in SusHiMi, is to include the relative couplings $g^\phi$ and the \( \hat{Z} \) factors into the complex-valued Wilson coefficients of the EFT directly.

As already mentioned in Section 6.4.2, the N^3LO QCD corrections are only taken into account for the CP-even component of the light Higgs boson, which allows us to match the precision of the light Higgs boson cross section in the SM employed in up-to-date predictions. This is motivated by the fact that the light Higgs boson that is identified with the observed signal at 125 GeV is usually assumed to have a dominant CP-even component, which is also the case in the scenarios which are considered in the numerical discussion that will follow in Chapter 8. For the CP-odd component of the light Higgs and the heavy Higgs bosons we employ the NNLO corrections for the top-quark induced contributions to gluon fusion in the effective theory of a heavy top-quark, i.e. we do not take into account top-quark mass effects beyond NLO, but only factor out the LO QCD cross sections $\sigma_{\text{LO}}^{t,e}$ and $\sigma_{\text{LO}}^{t,o}$.

The strategy to employ the EFT result at NNLO beyond the top-quark mass threshold can be justified from the comparison of NLO corrections, which are known in the EFT approach and exactly with full quark-mass dependence and agree also beyond the top-quark mass threshold. On the other hand, the N^3LO QCD corrections that were obtained for the top-quark contribution are only known in the EFT approach and for an expansion around the threshold of Higgs production at $x = M^2_{h_a}/s \to 1$, which we can take into account up to $O(1-x)^{16}$. Since the combination of the EFT approach and the threshold expansion becomes questionable above the top-quark mass threshold, we apply N^3LO QCD corrections only for the CP-even component of the light Higgs boson and thus match the precision of the SM prediction. Finally, the electroweak correction factor $\delta_{\text{EW}}$ multiplied in the “CP-even” run is obtained from Eq. (6.60).

As shown in Fig.7.2 we call SusHiMi three times in order to take into account the different possibilities of the resummation of tan $\beta$-enhanced sbottom effects in the LO QCD contributions. We add the results as follows

$$\sigma(pp \to h_a + X) = \sigma_{N^3LO}^{\Delta b_1} + \sigma_{\text{LO}}^{\Delta b_2} - \sigma_{\text{LO}}^{\Delta b_1}, \quad (7.4)$$

where in the N^kLO QCD cross section following Eq. (7.1) the simplified resummation according to Eq. (6.55) is employed, indicated through the index $\Delta b_1$. We add and subtract the LO QCD cross section using the full resummation according to Eq. (6.52), named $\Delta b_2$, and the simplified resummation, respectively. As we will demonstrate, the differences between the two versions of resummation are small, which can partially be understood from a possible rephasing of complex Yukawa couplings by a redefinition of all (s)quark fields (see the discussion in Section 6.4.1).

The cross section for the bottom-quark annihilation process is implemented in the 5FS at NNLO QCD by modifying the bottom-Yukawa couplings as in Eq. (6.65).

SusHi also allows one to obtain differential cross sections as a function of the transverse
momentum or the (pseudo-)rapidity of the Higgs boson. These effects can be studied also in the MSSM with complex parameters. In the case of non-vanishing transverse momentum, which is only possible through additional radiation, i.e. real corrections, the precision for massive quark contributions in extended Higgs sectors is currently limited to the LO prediction \([266,272]\). The predictions of the \(p_T\) distributions in SusHiMi have been obtained from the LO contributions with arbitrary complex parameters, and in contrast to the total cross sections are therefore not affected by additional interpolation uncertainties from higher orders in comparison to the case of the MSSM with real parameters.

In Chapter 8, we will discuss the applications of SusHiMi for the Higgs boson phenomenology of the MSSM with complex parameters and study the effects of the phase of the complex parameters \(A_t\) and \(M_3\) on the masses, mixings and cross sections of the three neutral Higgs bosons. In Chapter 9, we will discuss the \(\mathcal{CP}\)-violating interference factors that arise in a process of production and decay of the Higgs states \(h_a, a \in \{1, 2, 3\}\) and describe their implementation in SusHiMi. We will then employ our cross section predictions along with the interference factors from SusHiMi to study how such interference effects can modify exclusion bounds for the MSSM from collider searches.
Chapter 8

Phenomenology of \( \mathcal{CP} \) violation in MSSM Higgs production

In this chapter we address the phenomenological implications of the \( \mathcal{CP} \)-violating parameters in the Higgs sector of the MSSM using the results from Chapter 6 and their implementation into the code described in Chapter 7. The results presented in this chapter have been published in Ref. [1].

8.1 Introduction

In the previous chapters we studied how to calculate the production cross sections of neutral Higgs bosons for the gluon fusion and bottom-quark annihilation processes in the MSSM with explicit \( \mathcal{CP} \) violation, and described their implementation in SusHiMi. After these methodological studies, we will now investigate the phenomenological implications of the complex parameters on various aspects of the Higgs sector. In particular, we will focus on the role played by the \( \mathcal{CP} \)-violating phases of the trilinear couplings of the Higgs with third generation sfermions, specifically \( A_t \), and of the gluino mass parameter \( M_3 \) in affecting the predictions for mixings and cross sections of the heavy Higgs bosons \( h_2 \) and \( h_3 \). In the context of \( \mathcal{CP} \)-violating mixing, loop contributions can lead to large interference effects in the cross sections of the highly admixed heavy Higgses. Such interferences can lead to significant enhancement or suppression of the heavy Higgs cross sections, giving rise to modified exclusion bounds from collider searches as compared to the MSSM with real parameters.

As a first step, we will study scenarios where \( \phi_{A_t} \) and \( \phi_{M_3} \) substantially alter the phenomenology of Higgs bosons via \( \mathcal{CP} \)-violating effects from the squark and gluino sectors. The scenarios presented in this chapter were originally published before the latest updates on exclusion bounds for SUSY particle masses were released by CMS and ATLAS using data from Run II of the LHC. While the phenomenological viability of these scenarios may be under pressure in view of the latest exclusion bounds from the SUSY searches, they are useful for illustrating the possible effects of the \( \mathcal{CP} \)-violating phases. Note also that the cross section predictions in this chapter are for the individual Higgs
states $h_a$, and the interference between the production and decay contributions of the different Higgs bosons have not been taken into account. In Chapter 9, we will explore scenarios that are up to date with the most recent experimental results, and incorporate the effects of interference terms in our studies.

### 8.2 Definition of scenarios

For our numerical analysis we slightly modify two standard MSSM scenarios introduced in Ref. [130], namely the $m_h^{\text{mod+}}$ and the light-stop scenario\(^1\). As mentioned above, the scenarios have been chosen for illustration, featuring relatively large squark and gluino contributions to the gluon-fusion process. The corresponding effects will be relevant in our discussion of the associated theoretical uncertainties.

The light-stop inspired scenario that we use for our numerical analysis is defined for vanishing phases as follows

\begin{align}
M_1 &= 340 \text{ GeV}, \quad M_2 = \mu = 400 \text{ GeV}, \quad M_3 = 1.5 \text{ TeV}, \\
X_t &= X_b = X_\tau = 1.0 \text{ TeV}, \quad A_q = A_t = 0, \\
\tilde{m}_{Q_2} &= \tilde{m}_L = 1 \text{ TeV}, \quad \tilde{m}_{Q_3} = 0.5 \text{ TeV},
\end{align}

where the modified values of $M_1$ and $M_2$ have been chosen to avoid direct bounds from stop searches obtained in LHC Run I (assuming $R$-parity conservation). For the $m_h^{\text{mod+}}$ inspired scenario we choose for vanishing phases of the complex parameters:

\begin{align}
M_1 &= 250 \text{ GeV}, \quad M_2 = 500 \text{ GeV}, \quad M_3 = 1.5 \text{ TeV}, \\
X_t &= X_b = X_\tau = 1.5 \text{ TeV}, \quad A_q = A_t = 0, \\
\mu &= \tilde{m}_Q = \tilde{m}_L = 1 \text{ TeV}.
\end{align}

The values of the SM parameters for both the scenarios are

\begin{align}
m_t^{\text{OS}} &= 173.20 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_{b}^{\text{MS}}(m_b) = 4.16 \text{ GeV}, \\
m_b^{\text{OS}} &= 4.75 \text{ GeV}, \quad \alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.119.
\end{align}

The on-shell bottom-quark mass is used as internal mass for propagators and for the bottom-quark Yukawa coupling in the gluon-fusion process. The specified value of $\alpha_s$ is only used for the evaluations of \texttt{FeynHiggs}, for the cross sections the value of $\alpha_s$ associated with the employed PDF set is taken. We employ the MMHT2014 PDF sets at LO, NLO, NNLO and $\text{N}^3\text{LO}$ QCD [273]. The central choice for the renormalisation and factorisation scales $\mu_R^0$ and $\mu_F^0$, respectively, is $(\mu_R^0, \mu_F^0) = (M_{h_a}/2, M_{h_a}/2)$ for gluon fusion and $(\mu_R^0, \mu_F^0) = (M_{h_a}, M_{h_a}/4)$ for bottom-quark annihilation. More details are described

\(^1\)A detailed documentation of the parameters for each scenario presented here is given in Appendix B.
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For the $m_h^{\text{mod}+}$-inspired scenario we choose the heavy Higgs boson masses through $M_{H^\pm} = 900 \text{ GeV}$ with $\tan \beta = 10$ and 40 for the study of $\Delta_b$ effects, while for the light-stop inspired scenario we set $M_{H^\pm} = 500 \text{ GeV}$ with $\tan \beta = 16$. A detailed discussion of squark effects for the Higgs boson cross sections in the light-stop scenario in the MSSM with real parameters can also be found in Ref. [274]. For the chosen parameter point the squark effects are sizeable, both for the light Higgs boson and in particular also for the heavy $CP$-even Higgs boson, where they reduce the gluon-fusion cross section by about $\sim 90\%$. The Higgs boson masses and the $\hat{Z}$ factors are obtained from FeynHiggs 2.11.2. The cross sections are evaluated with SusHiMi, which is based on the latest release of SusHi. We will mostly focus on the gluon-fusion cross section and present the bottom-quark annihilation cross section only for the $m_h^{\text{mod}+}$-inspired scenario with $\tan \beta = 40$.

In order to isolate the effects of individual phases, we vary them one at a time, keeping the rest of the parameters real. For the parameter points associated with the mentioned scenarios, the absolute value of $A_t$ is set using $A_t = X_t - \mu^*/\tan \beta$, and we set the values $A_b = A_\tau = |A_t|$. Therefore, we will vary the phases of $A_t = |A_t|e^{i\phi_{A_t}},$ and similarly $M_3 = m_3 e^{i\phi_{M_3}},$ leaving the absolute values constant in order to address various aspects in the phenomenology of Higgs boson production. The phases of $A_b$ and $\mu$ do not introduce new phenomenological features, and we do not display results for the variation of those phases. A variation of the phase of $X_t$ leads to very similar cross sections for all Higgs bosons as observed for the variation of the phase of $A_t$. This can be understood from the fact that the chosen values of $\mu$ and $\tan \beta \geq 10$ are not too large, and so $X_t \approx A_t$. Note that the stop masses are constant as a function of the phase of $X_t$, if the absolute value of $X_t$ is fixed.

Recall that in Section 3.3 we discussed bounds on the phases of complex parameters resulting from limits on EDMs of heavy quarks and the neutron. We had concluded from that discussion that the phases of $A_t$ and $M_3$ still offer large room for variation and therefore, in the plots shown in this chapter, we will consider the full range of $\phi_{A_t}$ and $\phi_{M_3}$, from 0 to $2\pi$ radians, as is done frequently in such studies. It should be noted in this context that in particular the variation of $A_t$ affects the values of the stop masses. Additionally, the Higgs boson masses are a function of the phases of the complex parameters. The impact of the phases can be particularly pronounced for the mass of the light Higgs boson. A significant part of the observed phase variation of the cross sections can be a kinematic effect from the variation of mass. In general $h_1$ is almost fully $CP$-even in the decoupling limit. In order to factor out the impact of phase space effects, we normalise the prediction for the cross section of the light Higgs boson in the MSSM to the cross section of a SM Higgs boson having the same mass $M_{h_1}$ as the light Higgs $h_1$. In case of the heavy Higgs bosons for which the phase space effects are much less severe, we stick to the inclusive cross sections without such a normalisation. The
predicted value for the Higgs boson mass $M_{h_1}$ deviates from 125 GeV by up to a few GeV in our studies. Deviations from the experimental value in this ballpark are still commensurate with the remaining theoretical uncertainties from unknown higher-order corrections of current state-of-the-art calculations of the light Higgs boson mass in the MSSM [65, 68, 92, 275, 276].

In the studies that follow, we will discuss three aspects: We start by investigating the effect of squark loops on the Higgs boson production cross sections. They are of relevance both for the heavy Higgs bosons and the light Higgs boson. Second, we focus on the admixture of the two heavy Higgs bosons (described through $\hat{Z}$ factors) and its effect on production cross sections. Lastly we discuss $\Delta_b$ corrections in the context of the $m_{h^\text{mod}+}$-inspired scenario with large $\tan\beta$, for which the bottom-quark annihilation process for the heavy Higgs bosons is relevant as well.

Note that given the large admixture of the two heavy Higgs bosons in the MSSM with complex parameters, interference effects in the full processes of production and decay can be large. The results for the cross sections obtained in this chapter can be employed in a generalised narrow-width approximation as described in Refs. [137, 277] in order to incorporate interference effects. This issue will be addressed in the next chapter.

The prediction for Higgs boson cross sections is affected by various theoretical uncertainties, which will be discussed in detail in Section 8.6. In order to demonstrate the improvement in precision through the inclusion of higher-order corrections, all subsequent figures which show the LO cross section and our best prediction cross section according to Eq. (7.1) include renormalisation and factorisation scale uncertainties. The procedure for obtaining these scale uncertainties is outlined in Section 8.6.

### 8.3 Squark contributions in the light-stop inspired scenario

We start with a discussion of squark effects on the Higgs boson cross section $\sigma(gg \to h_a)$ for all three Higgs bosons $h_a$ within the light-stop inspired scenario with $M_{H^\pm} = 500$ GeV and $\tan\beta = 16$. The variation of the light Higgs boson mass $M_{h_1}$ as well as the stop masses is depicted in Fig. 8.1 (a) as a function of $\phi_{A_t}$. The light Higgs mass in this scenario may appear to be too light to be compatible with the signal observed at the LHC, however we regard it as sufficiently close in view of the issue that our discussion should demonstrate phenomenological effects only, and that on the other hand there are still sizeable theoretical uncertainties in the MSSM prediction for the light Higgs boson mass. The lightest stop mass has its minimum at around 308 GeV. For the heavy Higgs bosons with masses between 492 and 494 GeV, which are shown in the Fig. 8.2, the NLO squark–gluino contributions [236–238] which assume squarks and gluinos to be heavier than half the Higgs mass are thus well applicable. The variation of the heavy Higgs boson masses as a function of the phases of $\phi_{A_t}$ (as well as $\phi_{M_b}$) turns out to be small,
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namely within 0.6 GeV. Due to the strong admixture of the left- and right-handed stops through a large value of $A_t$, also a phase dependence of the stop masses is observed, see Fig. 8.1. We checked that we obtain constant stop masses upon varying the phase of $X_t$ for a constant value of $|X_t|$.

Fig. 8.1 (b) shows the production cross section through gluon fusion for the light Higgs boson $h_1$. The black, dot-dashed curve depicts the cross section with only top-quark and bottom-quark contributions and electroweak corrections in the production amplitudes, i.e. in the formulas of Chapter 7 we omit all squark contributions which enter either directly or through $\Delta_b$. Note however that squark contributions are always part of the $Z$ factors.

Due to the decoupling with large values of $M_{H^\pm}$ in our scenarios, the light Higgs $h_1$ has mostly SM-like couplings to quarks and gauge bosons. Thus, thanks to the inclusion of $N^3$LO QCD contributions for the top-quark induced contribution, our prediction of the gluon-fusion cross section omitting the squark contributions (black, dot-dashed curve

---

Figure 8.1: (a) Mass of $h_1$ and stop masses in GeV as a function of $\phi_{A_t}$; (b) LO (red) and best prediction for the gluon-fusion cross section (blue) for the light Higgs $h_1$ in pb as a function of $\phi_{A_t}$. The results are shown for the light-stop inspired scenario as specified in Eq. (8.1). The black, dot-dashed curve depicts the best prediction cross section without squark contributions (except through $Z$ factors). The depicted uncertainties are scale uncertainties. In the lower panel we normalise to the cross section of a SM Higgs boson with the same mass $M_{h_1}$. 

95
Figure 8.2: Variation of masses (in GeV) of the heavy Higgs bosons \( h_2 \) (violet) and \( h_3 \) (green) with \( \phi_{A_t} \) in the light-stop inspired scenario specified in Eq. (8.1).

in Fig. 8.1 (b) is very close to the one for the SM Higgs boson with the same mass as provided by the LHC Higgs Cross Section Working Group [92, 278]. The inclusion of squark contributions explicitly and through \( \Delta_b \) resummation lowers the gluon-fusion cross section by about 20\%, as can be inferred from the blue, solid curve, which is shown together with its renormalisation and factorisation scale uncertainty (to be discussed in Section 8.6). For completeness we also show the LO cross section calculated according to Eq. (6.37) including squark effects as the red curve. It is apparent that the scale uncertainties are significantly reduced from LO QCD to our best prediction cross section calculated according to Eq. (7.1).

Fig. 8.1 (b) also includes the cross section for \( h_1 \) normalised to the cross section of a SM Higgs boson with the same mass. Here the \( \sim 20\% \) reduction due to squark effects is apparent once again, while the quark-induced cross section shows the decoupling behaviour. Not shown in the figures are the following effects, which are stated here for completeness: The variation of \( \phi_{M_3} \) leads to a very similar picture, even though the light Higgs mass variation is not as pronounced and the stop masses are unaffected. Moreover, in the comparison of the simplified and the full resummation of \( \Delta_b \) contributions in the LO gluon-fusion cross section of \( h_1 \), we observe a well-known behaviour, namely the simplified resummation of Eq. (6.55) does not yield a decoupled bottom-quark Yukawa coupling, whereas the full resummation of Eq. (6.52) does.

Fig. 8.3 (a) and (b) show the gluon-fusion cross sections of the heavy Higgs bosons \( h_2 \) and \( h_3 \), respectively, as a function of \( \phi_{A_t} \). The colour coding is identical to Fig. 8.1 except for the fact that the lower panel depicts the \( K \)-factor of our best prediction for the cross section with respect to the LO cross section, \( \sigma/\sigma_{LO} \), rather than a cross section normalised to the SM Higgs boson cross section. Since the heavy Higgs masses change only slightly as a function of the phase \( \phi_{A_t} \), the associated phase space effect is small. For vanishing phase \( \phi_{A_t} = 0 \) it is known that squark effects are huge and reduce the
cross section by $\sim 89\%$ ($h_2$) and $\sim 22\%$ ($h_3$) [274]. These squark effects are strongly dependent on the phase $\phi_{A_t}$ and induce a large positive correction at phase $\phi_{A_t} = \pi$ in case of $h_2$. For $h_3$ the effects are not as pronounced, but still sizeable. The $K$-factor for both processes $gg \to h_2$ and $gg \to h_3$ remains within $[1, 1.6]$, i.e. higher-order corrections mainly follow the phase dependence of the LO cross section. The dependence of the $K$-factor on $\phi_{A_t}$ follows the black, dot-dashed curve, which shows the cross section with quark contributions only. The significant dependence of the cross section where only quark contributions are included on the phase $\phi_{A_t}$ is induced by the admixture of the two Higgs bosons through $\tilde{Z}$ factors. We will discuss this feature in detail for the $m_{h_1}^{\text{mod}+}$-inspired scenario in Section 8.4.

The phase dependence on $\phi_{M_3}$ is less pronounced. The corresponding cross sections for the two heavy Higgs bosons $h_2$ and $h_3$ are shown in Fig. 8.4. As in previous figures, we observe a significant reduction in the scale dependence from LO QCD to our best prediction for the cross section. The inclusion of squark and gluino contributions through the $\tilde{Z}$ factors and through $\Delta \alpha_b$ induces a dependence on the gluino phase already for the

Figure 8.3: LO (red) and best prediction for the gluon-fusion cross section (blue) for (a) $h_2$ and (b) $h_3$ in fb as a function of $\phi_{A_t}$. The results are shown for the light-stop inspired scenario as specified in Eq. (8.1). The black, dot-dashed curve depicts the best prediction cross section without squark contributions (except through $\tilde{Z}$ factors). The depicted uncertainties are scale uncertainties. In the lower panel we show the $K$-factor $\sigma/\sigma_{LO}$. 

97
8 Phenomenology of $\mathcal{CP}$ violation in MSSM Higgs production

![Graphs showing cross section as a function of $\phi_{M_3}$](image)

Figure 8.4: LO (red) and best prediction for the gluon-fusion cross section (blue) for (a) $h_2$ and (b) $h_3$ in fb as a function of $\phi_{M_3}$. The results are shown for the light-stop inspired scenario as specified in Eq. (8.1). The black, dot-dashed curve depicts the best prediction cross section without squark contributions (except through $\tilde{Z}$ factors). The depicted uncertainties are scale uncertainties. In the lower panel we show the $K$-factor $\sigma/\sigma_{LO}$.

LO cross section. The almost flat black dot-dashed curves show the cross section with quark contributions only, and any variation with $\phi_{M_3}$ is an effect of the $\tilde{Z}$ factors, which in this case is negligible since $\phi_{M_3}$ only enters at the two-loop level. The $K$-factor, which takes into account our interpolated NLO virtual corrections, only shows a relatively mild dependence on the phase. We will discuss the interpolation uncertainty for this scenario in Section 8.6, since we obtain the largest relative interpolation uncertainty in the cross section variation with phases for the interpolation of the gluino phase $\phi_{M_3}$.

8.4 Admixture of Higgs bosons in the $m_h^{\text{mod}+}$-inspired scenario

In this section we discuss the $m_h^{\text{mod}+}$-inspired scenario with tan $\beta = 10$ and $M_H^\pm = 900 \text{ GeV}$. Since the squark masses are at the TeV level in this scenario, the numerical effect of the squark loops in the gluon-fusion vertex contributions is rather small for the
production cross section of the light Higgs boson $h_1$. We will not discuss the results for $h_1$ in this section, however the considered scenario is typical for the decoupling region of supersymmetric theories, where a light SM-like Higgs boson is interpreted as the signal observed at about 125 GeV, as can be seen in Fig. 8.5. The predicted mass of $h_1$ in this scenario is close to the experimental value of the observed signal. It is accompanied by additional heavy Higgs bosons that are nearly mass degenerate. The results for the two heavy Higgs bosons are displayed in Fig. 8.6 and Fig. 8.7. The effects from squark loops are at the level of about $\pm 20\%$ for the cross sections of $h_2$ and $h_3$. In the general case where the possibility of $CP$-violating interactions is taken into account, there can be a large mixing between the $CP$-even and $CP$-odd neutral Higgs states. This feature is clearly visible in Fig. 8.6. The dependence on the phase $\phi_{At}$ is seen to be closely correlated to the mixing character of the two neutral heavy Higgs bosons.

Fig. 8.6 depicts the masses of the two heavy Higgs bosons $h_2$ and $h_3$ as a function of $\phi_{At}$ together with the $CP$-odd character of $h_2$ and $h_3$, being defined as $|\tilde{Z}_{uA}|^2$. For illustration here and in the following we call the mass eigenstates $h_2$ and $h_3$ either $h_c$ or $h_o$, depending on their mixing character: if $|\tilde{Z}_{uA}|^2 \gtrsim 1/2$ the mass eigenstate $h_a$ is called $h_o$, otherwise it is called $h_c$. It can be seen in Fig. 8.7 (a) and (b) that the behaviour of the cross sections as a function of $\phi_{At}$ closely follows the variation in the $CP$-even and $CP$-odd character of the Higgs states. A similar effect was already apparent in the top- and bottom-quark induced cross sections depicted in the light-stop inspired scenario, see Fig. 8.3, however there the effects of squark contributions are dominant. As above, also in Fig. 8.7, the uncertainty of our best prediction for the cross section is significantly reduced in comparison with the prediction in LO QCD. The variation of the $K$-factors between about 1.2 and 1.5 with the phase $\phi_{At}$ follows the modification of the mixing character of the two neutral heavy Higgs bosons.

Since the heavy Higgs bosons are nearly mass degenerate, it may not be possible in such a case to experimentally resolve the two heavy neutral Higgs bosons as separate signals.

Figure 8.5: $M_{h_1}$ in GeV as a function of $\phi_{At}$ in the $m_{h}^{\text{mod}^+}$-inspired scenario specified in Eq. (8.2) with $\tan \beta = 10$.  
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Figure 8.6: Masses of $h_2$ and $h_3$ in GeV as well as CP-odd character $|\tilde{Z}_{uA}|^2$ as a function of $\phi_{A_t}$ in the $m_{h_1}^{mod+}$-inspired scenario specified in Eq. (8.2) with $\tan \beta = 10$. The solid and dashed curves depict regions in $\phi_{A_t}$, where $h_2$ and $h_3$ are predominantly CP-even ($h_e$) or odd ($h_o$), respectively, corresponding to $|\tilde{Z}_{uA}|^2$ being below or above 0.5 as shown in the lower panel.

Figure 8.7: LO (red) and best prediction for the gluon-fusion cross section (blue) for (a) $h_2$ and (b) $h_3$ in fb as a function of $\phi_{A_t}$ in the same scenario as Fig. 8.6. The black, dot-dashed curve depicts the best prediction for the cross section without squark contributions (except through $\tilde{Z}$ factors). In the lower panel we show the $K$-factor $\sigma/\sigma_{LO}$. The depicted uncertainties are scale uncertainties.
Rather than the individual cross sections times their respective branching ratios, the experimentally measurable quantity then consists of the sum of the cross sections of the two Higgs states times their respective branching ratios together with the interference contribution involving the two Higgs states. The latter can be particularly important if the mass difference between the two Higgs states is smaller than the sum of their total widths \([137]\). The incorporation of such interference effects into the prediction for the production and decay process will be discussed in Chapter 9. One can already infer from the plots of Fig. 8.7 (a) and (b) that in the overall contribution there will be sizeable cancellations between the phase dependencies of the separate contributions.

### 8.5 \(\Delta_b\) corrections in the \(m_h^{\text{mod+}}\)-inspired scenario

We finally discuss the impact of \(\Delta_b\) effects, which have been investigated for the two heavy Higgs bosons in the \(m_h^{\text{mod+}}\)-inspired scenario with tan\(\beta\) = 40. In this scenario the admixture between the two heavy Higgs bosons, \(h_2\) and \(h_3\), is sizeable both as a function of \(\phi_{A_t}\) and as a function of \(\phi_{M_3}\). This even leads to mass crossings as seen in Fig. 8.8. Since the mass eigenstates are defined such that \(M_{h_3} \geq M_{h_2}\), for a case where the masses are degenerate and their hierarchy varies as we scan through \(\phi_{A_t}, M_3\), we observe a continuous mass curve only when we plot both the masses together. It is therefore convenient to discuss the results in terms of the predominantly \(CP\)-even mass eigenstate \(h_e\) and the predominantly \(CP\)-odd mass eigenstate \(h_o\), as defined in Section 8.4, as for those states a smooth behaviour of the cross section as function of the phases is obtained. The masses of the two heavy Higgs bosons and their \(CP\) character (defining \(h_o\) and \(h_e\)) are shown in Fig. 8.8 as a function of \(\phi_{A_t}\) and \(\phi_{M_3}\). One can see that the states \(h_2\) and \(h_3\) drastically change their \(CP\) character upon variation of the phases \(\phi_{A_t}\) and \(\phi_{M_3}\), while on the other hand the state \(h_e\) is almost purely \(CP\)-even and \(h_o\) is almost purely \(CP\)-odd for the whole range of phase values, unlike what we saw in Section 8.4. Thus the mixing between the tree-level mass eigenstates is not very pronounced. It should be kept in mind in this context that \(|\tilde{Z}_{eA}|^2\) arises from a non-unitary matrix and can therefore have values above 1. For vanishing phases the mass eigenstate \(h_2\) corresponds to \(h_e\) and \(h_3\) to \(h_o\). This can also be seen in Fig. 8.9 (a) and (b), where we show the LO (red) and our best prediction cross section for gluon fusion (blue) for the Higgs states \(h_2\) (solid curve) and \(h_3\) (dotted curve) as a function of \(\phi_{A_t}\) and \(\phi_{M_3}\), respectively, with their \(K\)-factors depicted in the lower panel. These plots further illustrate the discontinuities in the cross sections of \(h_2\) and \(h_3\) that occur due to the mass crossings and the jumps in their \(CP\)-character as discussed for Fig. 8.8. Continuous curves are obtained only when the cross sections for \(h_2\) and \(h_3\) are plotted together. The lower red and blue curves in Fig. 8.9 (a) and (b) correspond to \(h_e\) and the upper red and blue curves to \(h_o\). In order to demonstrate the discontinuities encountered in the cross sections of \(h_2\) and \(h_3\), they have been plotted without uncertainty bands.
Figure 8.8: Masses of $h_2$ and $h_3$ in GeV and CP-odd character as a function of (a) $\phi_{A_t}$ and (b) $\phi_{M_3}$ in the $m_h^{\text{mod}+}$-inspired scenario specified in Eq. (8.2) with $\tan \beta = 40$. As in Fig. 8.6, the solid and dashed curves refer to $h_c$ and $h_o$, respectively.

Figure 8.9: LO (red) and best prediction for the gluon-fusion cross section (blue) of $h_2$ and $h_3$ in fb as a function of (a) $\phi_{A_t}$ and (b) $\phi_{M_3}$ in the $m_h^{\text{mod}+}$-inspired scenario specified in Eq. (8.2) with $\tan \beta = 40$. The solid curves specify the cross section for $h_2$ whereas the dotted curves denote the cross section for $h_3$. In the lower panel we show the $K$-factor $\sigma / \sigma_{\text{LO}}$. 
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Figure 8.10: LO (red) and best prediction gluon-fusion cross section (blue) for $h_\epsilon$ in fb as a function of (a) $\phi_{A_t}$ and (b) $\phi_{M_3}$ in the $m_h^{\text{mod}+}$-inspired scenario specified in Eq. (8.2) with $\tan \beta = 40$. The black dot-dashed curves depict the best prediction cross section without squark contributions (except through $Z$ factors). In the lower panel we show the $K$-factor $\sigma/\sigma_{\text{LO}}$. The depicted uncertainties are scale uncertainties. Figures (c) and (d) show the corresponding results for $h_\sigma$. 
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In the following we mainly describe the results for the predominantly $\mathcal{CP}$-even mass eigenstate $h_e$. The observations for $h_o$ are very similar. We will only add comments where appropriate, though they are presented for completeness in Fig. 8.10 (c) and (d). In Fig. 8.10 (a) and (b) we show the gluon-fusion cross section for $h_e$ as a function of the phases $\phi_{A_t}$ and $\phi_{M_3}$. Fig. 8.10 (c) and (d) show the corresponding results for $h_o$. The behaviour for the full prediction, including the squark contributions, is dominated by $\Delta_b$ corrections. For vanishing phases those corrections significantly reduce the cross sections compared to the case where only quark contributions are taken into account. For phase values around $\pi$, however, the $\Delta_b$ corrections can also give rise to a substantial enhancement of the cross section. In particular, for $\phi_{M_3}$ the quantity $\Delta_b$ changes sign between $\phi_{M_3} = 0$ and $\phi_{M_3} = \pi$, such that the bottom-Yukawa coupling is suppressed for small values of $\phi_{M_3}$ and enhanced for $\phi_{M_3}$ values close to $\pi$ as a consequence of the resummation of the $\Delta_b$ corrections. The reduction of the scale uncertainties from LO QCD to our best prediction for the cross section is similar as in the previous plots. The $K$-factors in the lower panel show that the dependence of the NLO cross sections on the phases $\phi_{A_t}$ and $\phi_{M_3}$ follows a similar trend as the LO cross section.

In Fig. 8.11 we separately analyse the squark contributions for the LO cross section of $h_e$. The prediction omitting the squark loop contributions (black dot-dashed curves) is compared with the ones where first the pure LO squark contributions are added (depicted in cyan), and then the resummation of the $\Delta_b$ contributions to the bottom-quark Yukawa coupling is taken into account. For the latter both the results for the full ($\Delta_{b2}$ from Eq. (6.52), blue) and the simplified ($\Delta_{b1}$ from Eq. (6.55), red) resummation are shown. While the pure LO squark contributions are seen to have a moderate effect, it can be seen that the incorporation of the resummation of the $\Delta_b$ contribution leads to a significant enhancement of the squark loop effects. Looking at the blue and red curves, it can be confirmed that for the heavy neutral Higgs bosons considered here the simplified resummation approximates the full resummation of the $\Delta_b$ contribution very well. The curves corresponding to $\Delta_{b2}$ and $\Delta_{b1}$ hardly differ from each other both for the variation of $\phi_{A_t}$ and $\phi_{M_3}$. As mentioned before all curves include the same $\hat{Z}$ factors obtained from FeynHiggs. The results for $h_o$, which are not shown here, are qualitatively very similar. The LO squark contributions are less relevant for the $h_o$ cross section, since those contributions are absent in the MSSM with real parameters. We also note that the curves for $h_o$ follow a similar behaviour as the ones for $h_e$, which implies that there are no large cancellations expected in the sum of the cross sections for the two heavy Higgs bosons times their respective branching ratios. Thus, the phases entering $\Delta_b$ could potentially lead to observable effects in the production of the two heavy Higgs bosons even if the two states cannot be experimentally resolved as separate signals.

Having discussed the three different sources for $\mathcal{CP}$-violating effects relevant for Higgs boson production through gluon fusion in the MSSM — squark loop contributions, admixtures through $\hat{Z}$ factors and resummation of $\Delta_b$ contributions — for completeness we
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Figure 8.11: Effect of $\Delta_b$ contributions on the LO cross sections of $h_e$ as a function of (a) $\phi_{A_t}$ and (b) $\phi_{M_3}$ in the $m^\text{mod+}_h$-inspired scenario specified in Eq. (8.2) with $\tan \beta = 40$. The black dot-dashed curves depict the prediction without squark contributions (except through $Z$ factors), while the cyan lines correspond to the prediction where the squark loop contributions at the one-loop level are included. In the red (blue) curves furthermore the simplified (full) resummation of the $\Delta_b$ contributions is included.

Figure 8.12: Bottom-quark annihilation cross section for $h_e$ in fb as a function of (a) $\phi_{A_t}$ and (b) $\phi_{M_3}$ in the $m^\text{mod+}_h$-inspired scenario specified in Eq. (8.2) with $\tan \beta = 40$. The depicted uncertainties are scale uncertainties.
also briefly discuss the bottom-quark annihilation cross section for the \( m_h^{\text{mod+}} \)-inspired scenario with \( \tan \beta = 40 \). The corresponding cross section is shown in Fig. 8.12 as a function of \( \phi_{A_t} \) and \( \phi_{M_3} \). For such a large value of \( \tan \beta \) this cross section exceeds the gluon-fusion cross section by far. It shows a very significant dependence on the phases \( \phi_{A_t} \) and \( \phi_{M_3} \), which is mainly induced by the \( \Delta_b \) contribution.

### 8.6 Theoretical uncertainties

In the previous section we analysed the behaviour of our cross section predictions with \( \mathcal{CP} \)-violating effects entering via squark loop contributions, \( \hat{Z} \) factors and \( \Delta_b \) contributions. Therein, we included renormalisation and factorisation scale uncertainties, which as expected are reduced upon inclusion of higher-order corrections. However, the cross section predictions are also affected by other relevant theoretical uncertainties, which will be discussed in detail in this section.

Some of the theoretical uncertainties of cross sections in the MSSM with complex parameters are very similar to the ones in the MSSM with real parameters as discussed in Ref. [274]. Therefore, we can directly transfer the discussion of PDF+\( \alpha_s \) uncertainties as well as the uncertainty associated with the renormalisation prescription for the bottom-quark Yukawa coupling from the case of the MSSM with real parameters.

**PDF+\( \alpha_s \) uncertainties**

The inexact knowledge of the proton PDFs affects the cross section predictions at the hadron level. Uncertainties due to PDFs can arise not only due to the fact that the PDFs are fitted from experimental data whose experimental errors permeates the prediction of any PDF-dependent quantity, but they also arise from the fitting methodology and mathematical representation used, which can create an ambiguity in the predictions. PDF uncertainties are of particular significance for the prediction of bottom-quark annihilation cross sections. The bottom mass effects need to be included consistently in the evolution of the PDFs according to the DGLAP equations. The transition between the 4FS and 5FS occurs at a matching scale set to the bottom mass, on which the bottom density in the proton is dependent. This consequently affects the cross section prediction.

The uncertainty due to experimental errors in the data from which the PDFs are extracted are estimated as follows: The PDF collaborations introduce \( N \) different replicas of PDF sets which can equivalently describe the data from a statistical point of view. To get the uncertainty associated with the experimental data and the fitting methodology, an observable must then be computed \( N \) different times to obtain the spread in its values. Moreover, there is an additional source of uncertainty arising from the choice for the input value of the strong coupling constant \( \alpha_s \). The recommended central value of \( \alpha_s(m_Z) \) is different for each PDF set, which also results in a spread of calculated values.
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depending on the PDF set employed. Since the gluon-fusion cross section is proportional
to $\alpha_s^2$ at LO with QCD corrections of $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$ at NLO, these uncertainties are very relevant.

Ref. [279] first discussed the correlation and combination of PDF and $\alpha_s$ (PDF+$\alpha_s$) uncertainties. In Refs. [164,274] it was observed that the relative size of PDF+$\alpha_s$ uncertainties does not depend on the details of the partonic process, but only on the Higgs mass, even upon inclusion of supersymmetric effects of squarks. We will therefore not discuss them in more detail, since – similar to the prescription for MSSM Higgs boson cross sections by the LHC Higgs Cross Section Working Group [92] – relative uncertainties can be taken over from tabulated relative uncertainties obtained for the SM Higgs boson or a CP-odd Higgs (in a 2HDM with tan $\beta = 1$) as a function of its mass.

In our calculation we employ the MMHT2014 PDF sets at LO, NLO, NNLO and N$^3$LO [273], which can be used for both gluon fusion and bottom-quark annihilation. For Higgs masses in the range between 50 GeV and 1 TeV the typical size of PDF+$\alpha_s$ uncertainties for gluon fusion is $\pm (3-5)\%$ following the prescription of Ref. [280]. They increase up to $\pm 10\%$ for Higgs masses up to 2 TeV. For bottom-quark annihilation they are in the range $\pm (3-8)\%$ for Higgs masses between 50 GeV and 1 TeV and up to $\pm 16\%$ for Higgs masses below 2 TeV.

Renormalisation of the bottom-quark mass and definition of the bottom-Yukawa coupling

In our calculation, the bottom-quark mass is renormalised on-shell, and the bottom-Yukawa coupling is obtained from the bottom-quark mass as described in Section 6.4.1. The renormalisation of the bottom-quark mass and the freedom in the definition of the bottom-Yukawa coupling are known to have a sizeable numerical impact on the cross section predictions. This is in particular the case for large values of tan $\beta$ where the bottom-Yukawa coupling of the heavy Higgs bosons is significantly enhanced and the top-quark Yukawa coupling is suppressed. On the other hand, in these regions of parameter space bottom-quark annihilation is the dominant process, for which there is less ambiguity regarding an appropriate choice for the renormalisation scale. The described uncertainties in the MSSM with complex parameters are analogous to the case of real parameters. We therefore refer to the discussion in Ref. [274] and references therein for further details.

8.6.1 Remaining theoretical uncertainties

The approximate NNLO stop-quark contributions and accordingly the uncertainty associated with the approximation of the involved Wilson coefficients, which was discussed in Ref. [274], are neglected in our analysis. The impact of the NNLO stop-quark contributions for the case of the MSSM with real parameters can be compared with our estimate for the renormalisation and factorisation scale uncertainty of our calculation.
As an example, the NNLO stop-quark contributions lower the inclusive cross section for the light Higgs boson by about 2 pb for zero phases in the light-stop inspired scenario, which is at the lower edge of the scale uncertainty depicted in Fig. 8.1 (b).

Other uncertainties discussed in Ref. [274] are renormalisation and factorisation scale uncertainties and an uncertainty related to higher-order contributions to \( \Delta b \). Moreover, we add another uncertainty related to the performed interpolation of supersymmetric NLO QCD contributions. We discuss in the following our estimates for the three previously mentioned uncertainties:

Scale uncertainties: The complete all-order result for a hadronic cross section would be independent of the renormalisation and factorisation scales\(^2\) \( \mu_R \) and \( \mu_F \). However, the cross section at a fixed order of perturbation has a dependence on \( \mu_R \) and \( \mu_F \), which is usually one order higher than the accuracy of the calculation. For a calculation at a given order, the choice of scales is usually arbitrary, and is fixed at some central value for \( \mu_R \) and \( \mu_F \) which is characteristic for the hard process. The variation of scales around the central values gives us an estimate of the size of the excluded higher-order contributions. We obtain the renormalisation and factorisation scale uncertainty as follows: The central scale choice is \((\mu^0_R, \mu^0_F) = (M_{h_a}/2, M_{h_a}/2)\) for gluon fusion and \((\mu^0_R, \mu^0_F) = (M_{h_a}, M_{h_a}/4)\) for bottom-quark annihilation. We obtain the scale uncertainty by taking the maximal deviation from the central scale choice \( \Delta \sigma \) obtained from the additional scale choices:

\[
(\mu_R, \mu_F) \in \{ (2\mu^0_R, 2\mu^0_F), (2\mu^0_R, \mu^0_F), (\mu^0_R, 2\mu^0_F), (\mu^0_R, \mu^0_F/2), (\mu^0_R/2, \mu^0_F), (\mu^0_R/2, \mu^0_F/2) \}
\]

We perform this procedure individually for all three cross sections in Eq. (7.4) and then obtain the overall absolute uncertainty through

\[
\Delta \sigma^{\text{scale}} = \sqrt{\left( \Delta \sigma_N^{\Delta b_1} \right)^2 + \left( \Delta \sigma_0^{\Delta b_2} - \Delta \sigma_0^{\Delta b_1} \right)^2}, \quad (8.4)
\]

where we assume the two LO cross sections to be fully correlated. The uncertainty bands that we have displayed in the plots shown in the previous sections correspond to the cross section range covered by \( \sigma \pm \Delta \sigma^{\text{scale}} \).

\( \Delta_b \) uncertainty: Here we largely follow the discussion presented in Ref. [274]. The value for \( \Delta_b \) used in our analysis is obtained from FeynHiggs, which also contains electroweak contributions to \( \Delta_b \). One can improve the calculation of \( \Delta_b \) corrections by including other one-loop contributions such as those arising from diagrams with stops and charginos, controlled by the top-Yukawa coupling. The calculation of \( \Delta_b \) effects can further be extended by including dominant two-loop contributions. Refs. [198, 199, 281] showed that the one-loop result for \( \Delta_b \) is quite sensitive to the scales at which the strong, gauge, and top-Yukawa couplings are expressed. This can be stabilised by including two-loop contributions. The one-loop sbottom-gluino and stop-chargino contributions to \( \Delta_b \)

\[^2\]While this is true in principle, note however that since the PDFs are fitted from data it is hard to get rid of the \( \mu_F \) dependence fully.
vary by around $\pm 10\%$ when the renormalisation scales are lowered or raised by a factor of two around their central values.

Therefore, in order to display the propagation of an uncertainty arising from higher-order contributions to $\Delta_b$ to our cross section calculation, we vary the value of $\Delta_b$ obtained from FeynHiggs by $\pm 10\%$. We label the obtained uncertainty as $\Delta \sigma^{\text{resum}}$ and assign an uncertainty band of $\sigma \pm \Delta \sigma^{\text{resum}}$.

**Interpolation uncertainty:** The employed interpolation for the two-loop virtual squark–gluino contributions following Eq. (6.57) leads to a further uncertainty. A conservative estimate for it can be obtained as follows: We determine the cross section $\sigma(\phi_z)$ following Eq. (7.1) not only for the correct phase $\phi_z$ in Eq. (6.57), but also leave the phase within Eq. (6.57) constant, i.e. fixed to 0 and $\pi$. We call the obtained cross sections $\sigma(0)$ and $\sigma(\pi)$. For each value of $\phi_z$ we take the difference $\Delta \sigma^{\text{int}} = \sin^2(\phi_z)|\sigma(0) - \sigma(\pi)|/2$. It is reweighted with $\sin^2(\phi_z)$, since we know that our result is correct at phases 0 and $\pi$. The obtained uncertainty band is given by $\sigma \pm \Delta \sigma^{\text{int}}$.

In the following we display the effects of the estimated uncertainties for certain scenarios, where we choose the displayed scenarios and the displayed cross sections such that the effect of the uncertainties is largest. While the scale uncertainties were included in all previous figures for the LO prediction as well as for our best prediction already, we will discuss the interpolation uncertainty for the light-stop inspired scenario with $\tan \beta = 16$ and the resummation uncertainty for the $m^\text{mod+}$-inspired scenario with $\tan \beta = 40$.

Fig. 8.13 shows the renormalisation and factorisation scale uncertainties $\Delta \sigma^{\text{scale}}$ as before and in addition the above described interpolation uncertainty $\Delta \sigma^{\text{int}}$, which in case of the variation of $\phi_{M_3}$ can be substantial. As can be seen in Fig. 8.13, the interpolation uncertainty obtained from our conservative estimate can in this scenario even exceed the scale uncertainty for the gluon-fusion cross section of $h_2$. It should be noted that this is an extreme case, while the interpolation uncertainty, which is an NLO effect related to the squark and gluino loop contributions, remains small for the other previously described scenarios (which we do not show here explicitly). This is simply a consequence of the fact that the relative impact of the squark and gluino contributions in the other scenarios is much smaller than in the light-stop inspired scenario.

The interpolation uncertainty for the gluon-fusion cross section of $h_3$ in Fig. 8.13 is much less pronounced than for $h_2$, since as discussed above the squark loop corrections are significantly smaller in this case and would vanish if $h_3$ were a pure $\mathcal{CP}$-odd state. The behaviour in the lower panels of Fig. 8.13 displays the fact that by construction the assigned interpolation uncertainty vanishes for the phases 0 and $\pi$, where the interpolated result in the MSSM with complex parameters merges the known result of the MSSM with real parameters and thus reflects the $\sin^2 \phi_z$ behaviour. For the variation of $\phi_{A_t}$ the LO cross section incorporating squark contributions already includes the dominant effect on the cross section, such that the uncertainty due to the interpolated NLO contributions is also less pronounced than in case of the variation of $\phi_{M_3}$.
The described $\Delta_b$ uncertainties are depicted in Fig. 8.14. Since $\Delta_b$ crosses 0 as a function of $\phi_{M_3}$ twice, the uncertainty that we have associated to it according to the prescription discussed above also vanishes there, as can be seen in the lower panel of Fig. 8.14(b). Even for the large value of $\tan \beta$ chosen here the assigned $\Delta_b$ uncertainty of $\pm 10\%$ is much smaller than the scale uncertainty of the displayed cross sections. Despite the different behaviour with the phases $\phi_{A_t}$ and $\phi_{M_3}$ displayed in the lower panel of Fig. 8.14 the qualitative effect of the resummation uncertainties on the Higgs boson production cross sections is nevertheless rather similar. The latter is also true for the bottom-quark annihilation cross section, which is not depicted here. The resummation uncertainties are of most relevance for large values of $\tan \beta$, where the cross section of bottom-quark annihilation exceeds the gluon-fusion cross section.
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Figure 8.13: Renormalisation and factorisation scale uncertainties $\Delta \sigma^{\text{scale}}$ (blue) and interpolation uncertainties $\Delta \sigma^{\text{int}}$ (green) for the gluon-fusion cross section of (a) $h_2$ and (b) $h_3$ as a function of $\phi_{M_3}$ in the light-stop inspired scenario specified in Eq. (8.1). In the lower panel the upper and lower edge of the band of the cross section prediction with the assigned interpolation uncertainty is normalised to the cross section without this uncertainty.

Figure 8.14: Renormalisation and factorisation scale uncertainties $\Delta \sigma^{\text{scale}}$ (blue) and resummation uncertainties $\Delta \sigma^{\text{resum}}$ (green) for the gluon-fusion cross section of $h_c$ as a function of (a) $\phi_{A_t}$ and (b) $\phi_{M_3}$ in the $m_h^{\text{mod+}}$-inspired scenario specified in Eq. (8.2) for $\tan \beta = 40$. In the lower panel the upper and lower edge of the band of the cross section prediction with the assigned resummation uncertainty is normalised to the cross section without this uncertainty.
Chapter 9

Impact of interference effects on MSSM Higgs searches

This chapter discusses the effects of CP-violating mixing and interference between the Higgs bosons of the MSSM with complex parameters on exclusion limits from the LHC. We will set up the analytical framework for calculating the interference terms in the full process of Higgs production and decay, following Refs. [32,33,138,277], and describe their implementation in SusHiMi. Finally, we will present a numerical study of interference effects with a proposed benchmark scenario for CP-violating MSSM Higgs searches at the LHC. The results presented in this chapter are based on ongoing work.

9.1 Introduction

So far we have focussed our studies on effects of the complex parameters of the MSSM on individual cross sections of the neutral Higgs bosons $h_1$, $h_2$ and $h_3$. These parameters impact the cross section predictions through CP-violating Higgs–sfermion couplings, complex Yukawa couplings, and the mixing of tree-level Higgs states described by the application of $\hat{Z}$ factors to the external Higgs bosons. However, as we saw in Section 8.4, in scenarios where the two heavy Higgs bosons, $h_2$ and $h_3$, are nearly mass degenerate and strongly admixed, it may no longer be possible to experimentally resolve the two states as discernible signals. The measured quantity in this case is the total cross section times branching ratio ($\sigma \times \text{BR}$) of $h_2$ and $h_3$ combined. The amplitude of the full process of production and decay of the two Higgs states contains non-zero interference terms, which would vanish for the case where all the parameters of the theory are real.

In order to accurately interpret the experimental limits on $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ from Higgs searches at the LHC, it is therefore crucial to also account for these interference contributions in their predictions, which could significantly enhance or diminish the value of $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ in comparison to their values for the CP-conserving case. At the LHC, all searches for additional heavy Higgs bosons that are interpreted in specific scenarios assume that the signal contributions from different Higgs bosons can be added incoherently, i.e. without any interference effects. In the MSSM with real parameters, where the physical states
are the $\mathcal{CP}$-eigenstates $h, H$ and $A$, interference can occur only between the $\mathcal{CP}$-even Higgs bosons $h$ and $H$, and any interference contributions between the $\mathcal{CP}$-even and $\mathcal{CP}$-odd Higgs states are absent. However, if we allow for $\mathcal{CP}$ violation, the tree-level mass eigenstates can mix and all three loop-corrected mass eigenstates can interfere. Such interference effects are especially significant when the mass splitting between the Higgs bosons is smaller than the sum of their total widths and they are strong admixtures of $\mathcal{CP}$-even and $\mathcal{CP}$-odd states, as is the case for $h_2$ and $h_3$ in the $m_h^{\text{mod+}}$-inspired scenario with $\tan \beta = 10$ in Section 8.4. In this chapter, we present the calculation of these interference effects and discuss their impact on the MSSM Higgs searches carried out at the LHC. In particular, we will study the modification of current exclusion bounds when $\mathcal{CP}$-violating interference effects are taken into account in the predictions for Higgs production and decay.

9.2 Use of $\hat{Z}$ factors for internal Higgs bosons

In Chapters 5 and 6, we discussed the use of the $\hat{Z}$ factors to calculate amplitudes and cross sections of external, on-shell Higgs bosons. Although the $\hat{Z}$ matrix was introduced for the correct normalisation of external Higgs bosons appearing between two vertices, in order to account for higher-order mixing properties [277]. For this, we employ the formalism developed in Refs. [33, 138, 277]. Recall the propagator matrix $\Delta_{hH A}(p^2)$ defined in Eq. (5.6). The elements of $\Delta_{hH A}$ are the propagators $\Delta_{ij}(p^2)$, which start as Higgs state $i$ and end on Higgs state $j$, with all permutations of mixings in between. The off-diagonal propagators of the propagator matrix can be expanded around the three complex poles $M_a^2, M_b^2$ and $M_c^2$. First, we carry out the expansion around $p^2 \simeq M_a^2$ as follows [33],

$$\Delta_{ij}(p^2) = \frac{\Delta_{ij}(p^2)}{\Delta_{ii}(p^2)} \Delta_{ii}(p^2) \simeq \hat{Z}_{ao} \hat{Z}_{ai} \Delta_a^{\text{BW}}(p^2) = \hat{Z}_{ao} \hat{Z}_{ai} \Delta_a^{\text{BW}}(p^2), \quad (9.1)$$

where we use the Breit-Wigner propagator with constant width defined as

$$\Delta_a^{\text{BW}}(p^2) := \frac{i}{p^2 - M_a^2} = \frac{i}{p^2 - M_{h_a}^2 + i M_{h_a} \Gamma_{h_a}}. \quad (9.2)$$

The second equivalence in Eq. (9.1) is obtained through the expansion of the diagonal propagator around $p^2 \simeq M_a^2$ derived in Eq. (5.34),

$$\Delta_{ii}(p^2) = \frac{i}{p^2 - M_a^2} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + \Sigma_{ii}^{\text{eff}}(M_a^2)}. \quad (9.3)$$

We can recognise the first term on the right-hand side of Eq. (9.3) as the Breit-Wigner propagator from Eq. (9.2). Furthermore, we use the index notation defined in Eq. (5.37)
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to identify the second term as $\hat{Z}_a$. This results in the expression

$$\Delta_{ii}(p^2) \simeq \Delta_{i}^{BW}(p^2)\hat{Z}_a = \Delta_{i}^{BW}(p^2)\hat{Z}_a^2.$$

(9.4)

For the final equivalence $\hat{Z}_{ai}\hat{Z}_a^2\Delta_{i}^{BW}(p^2) = \hat{Z}_{aj}\hat{Z}_a\Delta_{a}^{BW}(p^2)$ in Eq. (9.1), we make use of the fact that $\hat{Z}_{ai} = \sqrt{\hat{Z}_a}$ and $\hat{Z}_{aj} = \sqrt{\hat{Z}_a}\hat{Z}_{aj}$, following Eq. (5.37).

Similarly, $\Delta_{ij}(p^2)$ can also be expanded around the poles $M_b^2$ and $M_c^2$. Since the $\hat{Z}$ factors are scheme invariant [33], for the expansion around the poles $p^2 \simeq M_b^2$ and $p^2 \simeq M_c^2$, we switch to a scheme where the index $i$ is associated with state $b$, and $c$, respectively,

$$\Delta_{ij}(p^2) = \hat{Z}_{ai}\Delta_{i}^{BW}(p^2)\hat{Z}_{bj},$$

(9.5)

$$\Delta_{ij}(p^2) = \hat{Z}_{ci}\Delta_{i}^{BW}(p^2)\hat{Z}_{cj}.$$

(9.6)

It is therefore possible to approximate the resonant contribution to the propagators close to one of the poles by a combination of the corresponding Breit-Wigner propagator and the $\hat{Z}$ factors calculated at that pole. In order to account for possibly overlapping resonances, the approximation can be extended to a general case by summing all three expansions of the propagators,

$$\Delta_{ij}(p^2) \simeq \sum_{a=1}^{3} \hat{Z}_{ai}\Delta_{i}^{BW}(p^2)\hat{Z}_{aj}.$$

(9.7)

as visualised in Fig. 9.1. Here the non-unitary $\hat{Z}$ factors quantify the transition between the states $i$ and $h_a$. From Eq. (9.7), we see that the main momentum dependence is contained in the Breit-Wigner propagators $\Delta_{i}^{BW}(p^2)$, $a \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Furthermore, Eq. (9.7) also covers the possibilities where $CP$ is conserved and only the $CP$-even eigenstates mix, in which case $\hat{Z}_{ih}$ and $\hat{Z}_{iH}$ are zero. Similarly, if $CP$ is violated but the theory is in the decoupling regime such that $h_1$ is mostly $CP$-even and the mass splitting between $h_1$ and $h_{2,3}$ is very large, then $\hat{Z}_{1H}$ and $\hat{Z}_{1A}$ are close to zero.

Consider a physical process involving the production and decay of Higgs bosons, where they appear as internal particles exchanged between the production vertex $X$ and decay

![Figure 9.1: The full mixing propagators illustrated as a sum of the Breit-Wigner propagators combined with $\hat{Z}$ factors to account for the change of state from lowest-order mass eigenstate $i$ to loop-corrected mass eigenstate $h_a$. See also Ref. [138].](image-url)
Figure 9.2: Pictorial representation of the amplitude for a process containing an internal exchange of Higgs boson $h_a$. All the diagrams contributing to the sum in Eq. (9.12) are shown, with the Breit-Wigner propagator $\Delta^\text{BW}_a(p^2)$ for the state $h_a$ denoted by the internal red line. Its transition from and into the tree-level states $i$ and $j$ is represented by the violet lines connected to the vertices [138].

In such a process, contributions from all permutations of the mixing propagators $\Delta_{ij}(p^2)$ need to be taken into account when calculating the full amplitude. From Fig. 9.1, we can count 27 diagrams that would contribute to the amplitude if we account for all possible combinations of $i$ and $j$. The total amplitude is expressed as a sum over the irreducible vertex functions for a coupling of the Higgs $i$ at the first vertex $X$ ($\hat{\Gamma}^X_i$) and the irreducible vertex functions for a coupling of the Higgs $j$ at the second vertex $Y$ ($\hat{\Gamma}^Y_j$), combined with the momentum-dependent mixing propagators $\Delta_{ij}(p^2)$ from Eq. (9.7) [138]:

$$
\mathcal{A} = \sum_{i,j \in \{h,H,A\}} \hat{\Gamma}^X_i \Delta_{ij}(p^2) \hat{\Gamma}^Y_j \simeq \sum_{i,j \in \{h,H,A\}} \hat{\Gamma}^X_i \left[ \sum_{a=1}^{3} \hat{Z}_{ai} \Delta^\text{BW}_a(p^2) \hat{Z}_{aj} \right] \hat{\Gamma}^Y_j \quad (9.8)
$$

$$
= \sum_{a=1}^{3} \left( \sum_{i \in \{h,H,A\}} \hat{Z}_{ai} \hat{\Gamma}^X_i \right) \Delta^\text{BW}_a(p^2) \left( \sum_{j \in \{h,H,A\}} \hat{Z}_{aj} \hat{\Gamma}^Y_j \right) \quad (9.9)
$$

$$
= \sum_{a=1}^{3} \hat{\Gamma}^X_h \Delta^\text{BW}_a(p^2) \hat{\Gamma}^Y_h \quad (9.10)
$$

In the last line we have expressed the one-particle irreducible vertex functions $\hat{\Gamma}_h$ as a linear combination of the vertex functions of the lowest-order states using $\hat{Z}$ factors, analogous to Eq. (5.43),

$$
\hat{\Gamma}_h = \hat{Z}_{ah} \hat{\Gamma}_H + \hat{Z}_{aH} \hat{\Gamma}_H + \hat{Z}_{aA} \hat{\Gamma}_A + \cdots \quad (9.11)
$$
where the ellipsis denotes additional mixing contributions from Goldstone and vector bosons, which are neglected here. From Eq. (9.10), the contribution of a single resonance $h_a$ can be expressed as

$$A_{h_a} = \hat{\Gamma}_X h_a \Delta_{BW}(p^2) \hat{\Gamma}_Y \tag{9.12}$$

$$= \sum_{i,j \in \{h, H, A\}} \left( \hat{\Gamma}_i X \hat{Z}_{ai} \Delta_{BW}(p^2) \hat{Z}_{aj} Y \hat{\Gamma}_j \right) \tag{9.13}$$

$$= \sum_{i,j \in \{h, H, A\}} \hat{\Gamma}_i X \hat{Z}_{ai} \Delta_{BW}(p^2) \hat{Z}_{aj} Y \hat{\Gamma}_j. \tag{9.14}$$

Eq. (9.12)–Eq. (9.14) can be pictorially represented as shown in Fig. 9.2.

9.3 Interference effects in Higgs production and decay

In the previous section, we discussed the treatment of Higgs bosons appearing as internal propagators between two vertices $X$ and $Y$. We now consider a full process of Higgs production and decay and calculate the interference of amplitudes in an $s$-channel exchange of the Higgses $h_1, h_2$ and $h_3$ in a generic $2 \rightarrow 2$ parton level process

$$I \rightarrow h_1, h_2, h_3 \rightarrow F, \tag{9.15}$$

with the initial state $I$ denoting the production process and final state $F$ denoting the decay products. Later on, we will apply this to specific production and decay mechanisms.

The calculation of the interference factors is carried out at leading order taking into account Higgs masses, total widths, and $\hat{Z}$ factors from FeynHiggs computed with full one-loop and leading two-loop contributions. State-of-the-art higher-order contributions are taken into account in the computation for production cross sections for $I$ and branching ratios for $F$. For the QCD corrections, a factorisation of higher-order corrections between initial and final states is often justified. This only misses corrections connecting initial and final state particles. Therefore it is well motivated to apply the interference factor calculated at LO only, with the full process containing higher-order corrections.

The interference term for a process $I \rightarrow F$ with $h_{1,2,3}$ Higgs exchange is obtained from the difference between the coherent and incoherent sum of the $2 \rightarrow 2$ amplitudes,

$$|A|_{int}^2 = |A|_{coh}^2 - |A|_{lincoh}^2 \tag{9.16}$$

$$= \sum_{a < b} 2 \text{ Re} \left( A_{h_a} A_{h_b}^* \right). \tag{9.17}$$
where the coherent and incoherent sums are defined as

\[
|A|_{\text{coh}}^2 = \left| \sum_{a=1}^{3} A_{h_a} \right|^2, \quad |A|_{\text{incoh}}^2 = \sum_{a=1}^{3} \left| A_{h_a} \right|^2. \tag{9.18}
\]

The coherent sum of the partonic amplitudes therefore accounts for the interference between the amplitudes for production and decay of the three Higgs bosons \(h_1, h_2\) and \(h_3\). The coherent and incoherent sums of amplitudes are depicted for two example production processes in Fig. 9.3. Using the expression for \(A_{h_a}\) from Eq. (9.12) in Eq. (9.17) we obtain

\[
|A|_{\text{int}}^2 = 2 \text{Re} \left[ A_{h_1} A_{h_2}^* + A_{h_2} A_{h_3}^* + A_{h_1} A_{h_3}^* \right] \tag{9.19}
\]

where each vertex function \(\hat{\Gamma}_{h_a}^{I,F}\) is expanded according to

\[
\hat{\Gamma}_{h_a}^{I,F} = \sum_{i \in \{h,H,A\}} \hat{Z}_{ai} \hat{\Gamma}_i^{I,F}. \tag{9.21}
\]

For a scenario where we only consider mixing between the two heavy Higgses \(h_2\) and \(h_3\), Eq. (9.19) reduces to

\[
|A|_{\text{int}}^2 = 2 \text{Re} \left[ \left( \hat{\Gamma}_{h_2}^{I} \Delta_{h_2}^{\text{BW}}(p^2) \hat{\Gamma}_{h_2}^{F} \right) \left( \hat{\Gamma}_{h_3}^{I} \Delta_{h_3}^{\text{BW}}(p^2) \hat{\Gamma}_{h_3}^{F} \right)^* \right] \tag{9.22}
\]

which can be evaluated at the momentum \(p^2 = \hat{s} = \left( \frac{M_{h_2} + M_{h_3}}{2} \right)^2\). However, this approach of evaluating the Breit-Wigner propagators at the squared average of the masses of the two heavy Higgses may not adequately account for all the phase space effects. For this reason, at partonic level we integrate Eq. (9.22) over \(s\) with

\[
\sqrt{s}_{\text{min}} = \sqrt{\hat{s}} - 5 \left( \frac{\hat{\Gamma}_{h_2} + \hat{\Gamma}_{h_3}}{2} \right), \quad \sqrt{s}_{\text{max}} = \sqrt{\hat{s}} + 5 \left( \frac{\hat{\Gamma}_{h_2} + \hat{\Gamma}_{h_3}}{2} \right), \tag{9.23}
\]
so that the interference term is given by the integral

$$\sigma(|A|^2) = \int_{s_{\text{min}}}^{s_{\text{max}}} ds \; 2 \text{Re} \left[ \left( \Gamma_{h_2}^{\text{BW}}(s) \Gamma_{h_2}^F \right) \left( \Gamma_{h_3}^{\text{BW}}(s) \Gamma_{h_3}^F \right)^* \right].$$

(9.24)

This covers the dominant fraction of a squared Breit-Wigner propagator. Similarly we define \(\sigma_{\text{coh}} \equiv \sigma(|A|^2)\) and \(\sigma_{\text{incoh}} \equiv \sigma(|A|^2)\). Note that these cross sections miss a proper normalisation and the convolution with proton densities. However, those effects drop out in the subsequently discussed ratios of cross sections. The relative interference term for each production mode \(I\) and decay mode \(F\) is defined as

$$\eta_{IF} = \frac{\sigma_{\text{int}}}{\sigma_{\text{coh}}}. \tag{9.25}$$

We can separate the total cross section for a given production mode \(I\) and decay channel \(F\) into the individual contribution from each Higgs boson \(\sigma_{h_a}\), \(a \in \{1, 2, 3\}\), and the contribution from the interference terms \(\sigma_{\text{int}_{ab}}\), \(a \neq b \in \{1, 2, 3\}\),

$$\sigma_{IF} = \sigma_{h_1} + \sigma_{h_2} + \sigma_{h_3} + \sigma_{\text{int}_{12}} + \sigma_{\text{int}_{23}} + \sigma_{\text{int}_{13}}. \tag{9.26}$$

We define the relative contribution to the cross section for a single Higgs \(h_a\) from its interference with the Higgses \(h_b\) and \(h_c\) as

$$\eta^I_{FA} = \frac{\sigma_{\text{int}_{ab}}}{\sigma_{h_a} + \sigma_{h_b}} + \frac{\sigma_{\text{int}_{ac}}}{\sigma_{h_a} + \sigma_{h_c}}. \tag{9.27}$$

With this definition the relative interference term is stable even when one of the contributions \(\sigma_{h_a}^{IF}\) is suppressed. Using Eq. (9.27) in Eq. (9.26) results in the expression

$$\sigma_{IF} = \sigma_{h_1}^{IF} (1 + \eta^I_{1F}) + \sigma_{h_2}^{IF} (1 + \eta^I_{2F}) + \sigma_{h_3}^{IF} (1 + \eta^I_{3F}), \tag{9.28}$$

such that the total cross section for the full process is a sum of the cross sections of the individual Higgs bosons rescaled by their relative interference contributions. Therefore, the relative interference contributions \(\eta^I_{aF}\) can be used to approximately predict the experimentally measurable (coherent) \(\sigma \times \text{BR}\) as follows,

$$\sigma(pp \to I \to h_{1,2,3} \to F) \simeq \sum_{a=1}^{3} \sigma(pp \to I \to h_a) \cdot (1 + \eta^I_{aF}) \cdot \text{BR}(h_a \to F). \tag{9.29}$$

In the studies conducted in the following section, we make use of cross sections and interference factors obtained from \texttt{SusHiMi} and branching ratios from \texttt{FeynHiggs-2.13.0}. Currently \texttt{SusHiMi} implements the relative interference factors for the heavy Higgs bosons, \(\eta^I_{2F}\) and \(\eta^I_{3F}\), for the case where only \(h_2\) and \(h_3\) interfere using Eq. (9.27). The squared amplitude \(|A|^2\) used to obtain \(\sigma_{\text{int}_{23}}\) is implemented using the expression from
Eq. (9.22) with the vertex functions expanded according to Eq. (9.21), and a numerical integration of $|A|^2_{\text{int}}$ is performed using the limits described in Eq. (9.23).

At the current level of implementation in SusHiMi, it is possible to choose the production mode $I = b\bar{b}$ and the decay mode $F \in \{\tau^+\tau^-, b\bar{b}, t\bar{t}\}$. In our studies, we will consider the process $b\bar{b} \rightarrow h_2, h_3 \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ where each $h_a$ is an admixture of $h, H, A$. For this choice of $I$ and $F$, the interference contribution to the squared amplitude is proportional to $[32, 277]$

$$|A|^2_{\text{int}} \propto c_\beta^{-4} 2\text{Re} \left[ (c_\alpha^2 \hat{Z}_{2H} \hat{Z}_{3H} + s_\beta^2 \hat{Z}_{2A} \hat{Z}_{3A}^*)^2 \Delta_2^{BW}(s) \Delta_3^{BW}(s) \right]. \quad (9.30)$$

In the decoupling region, where the two heavy Higgses tend to be nearly mass-degenerate, i.e. $M_{h_2} \approx M_{h_3}$ with similar widths $\Gamma_{h_2} \approx \Gamma_{h_3}$, the product $\Delta_2^{BW}(s) \Delta_3^{BW*}(s) \approx |\Delta_2^{BW}|^2$ is approximately real and $\cos \alpha \rightarrow \sin \beta$. Moreover, in this limit we get $\hat{Z}_{2H} \approx \hat{Z}_{3A}$, $\hat{Z}_{2A} \approx -\hat{Z}_{3H}$. Therefore, Eq. (9.30) simplifies to

$$\begin{align*}
|A|^2_{\text{int}} &\propto -8\tan^4 \beta \left( \text{Im}\hat{Z}_{2H} \text{Re}\hat{Z}_{2A} - \text{Re}\hat{Z}_{2H} \text{Im}\hat{Z}_{2A} \right)^2 |\Delta_2^{BW}(s)|^2. \quad (9.31)
\end{align*}$$

A non-zero interference term requires non-vanishing imaginary parts of the $\hat{Z}$ factors. Furthermore, if $CP$ is conserved, the interference term vanishes since $\hat{Z}_{2A} = \hat{Z}_{3H} = 0$. Notice also that $|A|^2_{\text{int}}$ in Eq. (9.31) is negative, which means that in this limit the interference is expected to be destructive. In the next section, we will study scenarios which fulfil these conditions, and give rise to large interference contributions between the two heavy Higgs bosons.
9.4 Phenomenological effects of interference contributions

9.4.1 Definition of benchmark scenarios

In order to investigate the impact of $\mathcal{CP}$-violating interference contributions in $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ calculations and their effect on the exclusion limits for heavy Higgs bosons at the LHC, we start by defining a benchmark scenario in accordance with the latest bounds on the masses of SUSY particles by ATLAS and CMS. This benchmark scenario, which we call the “$\mathcal{CP}$Int” scenario, contains two strongly admixed neutral heavy Higgs bosons $h_2$ and $h_3$, while the lightest neutral Higgs $h_1$ is interpreted to be the discovered Higgs state with a mass of about 125 GeV. We present our studies for two variations of the benchmark scenario. In each version of the scenario, the phases of complex parameters are kept fixed, and the behaviour of quantities such as the lightest Higgs mass, stop and sbottom masses, $\bar{b}b$ production cross sections and interference factors $\eta$ is analysed in the $(M_{H^\pm}, \tan \beta)$ plane. For the first version of the scenario, denoted as “$\mathcal{CP}$Int$_1$” we choose the parameter values

\begin{align}
M_{\text{SUSY}} &= 1.5\text{ TeV}, \quad \mu = 1.5\text{ TeV}, \\
M_1 &= 0.5\text{ TeV}, \quad M_2 = 1\text{ TeV}, \quad M_3 = 2.5\text{ TeV}, \\
A_t &= \left( \frac{\mu}{\tan \beta} + 1.5 M_{\text{SUSY}} \right) e^{i \frac{2}{3}} \pi, \quad A_b = A_t, \quad A_{\tau} = |A_t|, \\
M_{U_3} = M_{Q_3} &= M_{D_3} = M_{L_{1,2}} = M_{E_{1,2}} = M_{\text{SUSY}}.
\end{align}

and for the second version, denoted as “$\mathcal{CP}$Int$_2$”, we choose

\begin{align}
M_{\text{SUSY}} &= 1.5\text{ TeV}, \quad \mu = 1.5\text{ TeV}, \\
M_1 &= 0.5\text{ TeV}, \quad M_2 = 1\text{ TeV}, \quad M_3 = 2.5 \cdot e^{i \frac{\pi}{3}} \text{ TeV}, \\
A_t &= \left( \frac{\mu}{\tan \beta} + 1.8 M_{\text{SUSY}} \right) e^{i \frac{2}{3}} \pi, \quad A_b = A_t, \quad A_{\tau} = |A_t|, \\
M_{U_3} = M_{Q_3} &= M_{D_3} = M_{\text{SUSY}}, \\
M_{L_{1,2}} = M_{E_{1,2}} &= 0.5\text{ TeV}.
\end{align}

The Standard Model input parameters for both versions are

\begin{align}
m_t &= 172.5\text{ GeV}, \quad m_b = 4.18\text{ GeV}, \\
M_W &= 80.385\text{ GeV}, \quad M_Z = 91.1876\text{ GeV}, \\
\alpha_s(m_Z) &= 0.118.
\end{align}

\begin{footnote}
A detailed record of the parameter values for each scenario can be found in Appendix B.
\end{footnote}
Figure 9.4: Mass of the lightest neutral Higgs $h_1$ in GeV as a function of $M_{H^\pm}$ and $\tan \beta$ for the $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_1$ and $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_2$ scenarios.

In accordance with the recommendations in Ref. [92], in both the scenarios, the phases of the parameters $A_t = A_b$ and $M_3$ have been chosen to be non-maximal in view of the impact of bounds from EDMs. Fig. 9.4 depicts the mass of the lightest Higgs boson $h_1$ for the two scenarios in the $(M_{H^\pm}, \tan \beta)$ plane, obtained with FeynHiggs-2.13.0 at two-loop level with NNLL resummation. In both cases, the mass $M_{h_1}$ is within $125 \pm 3$ GeV for most of the $(M_{H^\pm}, \tan \beta)$ plane except for very low values of $\tan \beta$ and $M_{H^\pm}$. A mass prediction in this region appears to be phenomenologically viable in view of the current theoretical uncertainties from unknown higher-order corrections [65, 68, 92, 275, 276]. While for the $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_1$ scenario the predicted mass stays equal to or below 124 GeV throughout the $(M_{H^\pm}, \tan \beta)$ plane, for $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_2$ it reaches a maximum of about 126 GeV for the region of large $\tan \beta$ and small $M_{H^\pm}$.

In view of the latest experimental bounds on stop masses, the scenarios have been defined such that these masses are well above a TeV. For the $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_1$ and $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_2$ scenarios, the lightest stop mass varies with $\tan \beta$ by a couple of GeV around the values of 1.37 TeV and 1.34 TeV, respectively. The small variation in the stop masses with $\tan \beta$ can be understood from the fact that we choose a phase for $A_t$ but not for $\mu$, such that $|X_t|$ is not constant. Moreover, the lightest sbottom mass, $m_{b_1}$, in the $\mathcal{CP}$Int scenarios is well above 1.3 TeV, which is in accordance with the latest search results, see for e.g. Refs. [96, 282]. In the $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_1$ scenario, the sbottom mass ranges from 1.38–1.5 TeV, a variation of 120 GeV. Similarly, in the $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_2$ scenario the sbottom mass varies up to a 100 GeV with $\tan \beta$. This relatively large variation with $\tan \beta$ takes place because in the sbottom sector the relevant parameter entering the mass matrix is $(\mu \tan \beta)$. 
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9.4.2 $b\bar{b}$ cross sections and interference terms in the $\mathcal{CP}$Int scenarios

Having seen the properties of $M_{h_1}, m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ and $m_{\tilde{b}_1}$ in the $\mathcal{CP}$Int scenarios, we compare the individual production cross sections $\sigma(b\bar{b} \rightarrow h_a)$ in the case where the mass eigenstates $h_a$ undergo a full 3×3 mixing between $h, H$ and $A$, with the case of a $\mathcal{CP}$-conserving 2×2 mixing. We will only show these cross sections for the Higgs $h_2$, with the plots for $h_3$ being qualitatively very similar. Due to the non-unitarity of the $\hat{Z}$ factor matrix, individual cross sections of the admixed Higgs bosons can undergo significant enhancement in comparison to the case where no $\mathcal{CP}$-violating mixing takes place. This is in particular true when the admixture between the Higgs bosons is large, and the off-diagonal and imaginary parts of the $\hat{Z}$ matrix become substantial, as is the case in the scenarios considered here. In the decoupling limit, where the lightest Higgs is mostly $\mathcal{CP}$-even and its mixing with the heavy Higgses can be neglected, the cross sections of $h_2$ and $h_3$ scale as $|\hat{Z}_{aH}|^2|A_H|^2 + |\hat{Z}_{aA}|^2|A_A|^2$ for $a \in \{2, 3\}$. Since the elements of the $\hat{Z}$ matrix can be greater than one, this can lead to the cross section of $h_a$ being larger than that of $H$ and $A$ individually.

This effect can be seen in Fig. 9.5 (a)–(d), which depict the bottom-quark annihilation cross sections for $h_2$. Fig. 9.5 (a) shows the $b\bar{b}$ cross section for $h_2$ in the $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_1$ scenario where all parameters are real and only a 2×2 mixing is allowed between the $\mathcal{CP}$-even states $h$ and $H$. On the other hand, Fig. 9.5 (b) shows the $b\bar{b}$ cross section for $h_2$ with the full 3×3 mixing in the $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_1$ scenario with complex phase $\phi_{A_t} = \pi/4$. Fig. 9.5 (c) and (d) show the same quantities for the $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_2$ scenario, where in Fig. 9.5 (c) all phases are zero and in Fig. 9.5 (d) we have $\phi_{A_t} = \pi/4$ and $\phi_{M_h} = \pi/3$. In both scenarios, we observe an enhancement of the cross sections in comparison to the real case in certain areas of the parameter space. For the $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_1$ scenario, in the region around $\tan \beta = 18$ and $M_{H^\pm} = 550$ GeV, the cross section is doubled as compared to the case with 2×2 mixing. A similar effect is seen for the $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_2$ scenario, where for the region around $\tan \beta = 18$ and $M_{H^\pm} = 570$ GeV an enhancement in the cross section by almost a factor of 2 is observed yet again. Note that the small disconnected regions observed in the cross section contours depicted in Fig. 9.5 (b) and Fig. 9.5 (d) are an artefact of the sampling density of points in the $(M_{H^\pm}, \tan \beta)$ plane, and a smooth contour can be obtained for a finer scan of the parameters.

For the $\mathcal{CP}$Int scenarios, the factors $\eta^{b\bar{b}}$ taking into account the interference between $h_2$ and $h_3$ for the process $b\bar{b} \rightarrow h_2, h_3 \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$, computed using Eq. (9.27), are plotted in the $(M_{H^\pm}, \tan \beta)$ in Fig. 9.6 (a) and (b). Recalling our discussion following Eq. (9.31), we note that since the chosen scenarios lie in the decoupling region, the interference contribution is negative throughout the plane. For both the $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_1$ and $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_2$ scenarios, the heavy Higgs states are nearly mass degenerate and have sizeable $H - A$ mixing. This

---

$^2$When we consider interference between just $h_2$ and $h_3$, $\eta^{b\bar{b}}_2 = \eta^{b\bar{b}}_3 \equiv \eta^{b\bar{b}}_F$. We have dropped “$\tau\tau$” in the superscript of $\eta^{b\bar{b}}$ for ease of notation.
Figure 9.5: Production cross section in fb for $h_2$ via bottom-quark annihilation plotted in the $(M_{H^\pm}, \tan \beta)$ plane in the $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_1$ scenario in the case of (a) real parameters with only a $\mathcal{CP}$-conserving $2 \times 2$ mixing and (b) complex parameters with a full $3 \times 3$ mixing. In (c) and (d), the same quantities are depicted for the $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_2$ scenario.
Figure 9.6: Relative interference contribution of the Higgs bosons $h_2$ and $h_3$ decaying into $\tau^+\tau^-$ for the $b\bar{b}$ production mode in the (a) $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_1$ scenario with $\phi_{A_1} = \pi/4$ and (b) $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_2$ scenario with $\phi_{A_1} = \pi/4$ and $\phi_{M_3} = \pi/3$.

results in large interference contributions, with $\eta_{b\bar{b}}^{h}$ reaching a minimum of almost $-98\%$ in parts of the parameter space. In the $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_1$ scenario depicted in Fig. 9.6 (a), we observe a valley of strong destructive interference of about $-90\%$ starting from around the points $(450 \text{ GeV}, 23)$ to $(670 \text{ GeV}, 14)$ in the $(M_{H^\pm}, \tan \beta)$ plane whereas in the $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_2$ scenario depicted in Fig. 9.6 (b) the valley of strongest interference contributions exceeding $-90\%$ extends from around $(550 \text{ GeV}, 20)$ to $(1000 \text{ GeV}, 11)$ in the parameter plane.

9.4.3 Modified predictions with coherent cross sections

In the previous sections we defined a benchmark scenario and studied two consequences of $\mathcal{CP}$-violating mixing: the resonant enhancement of production cross sections of the Higgs states $h_2$ and $h_3$, and the destructive interference that results from the coherent sum of the amplitudes of the full process $b\bar{b} \rightarrow h_2, h_3 \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$. In this section, we will compare the theoretical predictions for $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ of $h_2$ and $h_3$ obtained using the formulation described in Section 9.3, which accounts for the relative interference term in the prediction, with the experimental limits from searches for additional heavy neutral Higgs bosons produced via bottom-quark annihilation and decaying into $\tau^+\tau^-$ final state at Run II of the LHC [283].

All the searches for heavy Higgs bosons carried out at the LHC so far, including the ones presented in Fig. 4.6 in Chapter 4, assume in their interpretation in particular scenarios that $\mathcal{CP}$-symmetry is conserved. This means that exclusion limits on model parame-
ters are set based on predictions in which the $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ are added incoherently for closely occurring resonances, i.e. without any interference terms. However, $\mathcal{CP}$ conservation is an ad-hoc assumption in this context. In this section, our goal is to examine how the exclusion bounds obtained under the assumption of $\mathcal{CP}$ conservation are modified in the most general case where mixing and interference effects arising from $\mathcal{CP}$ violation are taken into account.

The phenomenological impact of $\mathcal{CP}$-violating effects in the MSSM Higgs sector had already been investigated for Higgs searches at LEP [284,285]. The analyses in Refs. [51, 139,284,285] studied the effect of the phases of the trilinear couplings $A_{t,b}$ and the mixing between the $\mathcal{CP}$-eigenstates in the CPX scenario [286] which led to unexcluded parameter regions at relatively small values of the mass of the lightest Higgs. Furthermore, an analysis of interference in the $\mathcal{CP}$-conserving case between the light and heavy neutral MSSM Higgs bosons $h$ and $H$ produced via decays of heavy neutralinos was carried out in Ref. [137]. Such effects were studied for $gg \to h/H \to VV, V = W, Z$ with background contributions within a 2HDM in Ref. [287], and for the singlet extension of the SM in Ref. [288]. Ref. [289] discusses the $\mathcal{CP}$-violating interference between two light Higgs bosons decaying to two photons in the NMSSM. Studies of interference effects between heavy neutral Higgs bosons and with the background at low $\tan\beta$ in the $t\bar{t}$ final state have been made in Refs. [290–292].

Our studies in this section provide a follow-up to the analysis in Ref. [277], which examined the effects of $\mathcal{CP}$-violating mixing and interference between $h_2$ and $h_3$ decaying to two $\tau$-leptons for gluon fusion and bottom-quark annihilation production channels and the impact of the interference factors on LHC exclusion limits from Run I. Here, we will examine these effects on Run II exclusion limits, wherein the cross sections have been augmented by the state-of-the-art cross section predictions described in Chapter 6, and the computation of the interference factors has also been automated by an implementation in SusHiMi.

In Fig. 9.7 (a) and (b) we show the theoretical predictions for $\sigma(pp \to b\bar{b} \to h_2,h_3 \to \tau^+\tau^-)$ as a function of the mass $M_{h_a}$ of a neutral scalar resonance $h_a$ for the two $\mathcal{CP}$Int scenarios, along with the respective experimental limits for the production of a single resonance $\phi$ at mass $M_{\phi}$ obtained from ATLAS searches for neutral Higgs bosons in Run II at 13 TeV with $\int L = 13.3$ fb$^{-1}$ reported in Ref. [283]. The black curves present essentially model-independent upper limits on the $b\bar{b}$ production cross section times the $\tau^+\tau^-$ branching ratio of a scalar boson versus its mass. The solid black line represents the observed exclusion bound and the dotted black line depicts the expected bound. The theoretical predictions have been obtained using Eq. (9.29) with $a = 2,3$ with $\tan\beta$ and $M_{H^\pm}$ as input parameters:

$$
\sigma(pp \to b\bar{b} \to h_{2,3} \to \tau^+\tau^-) = \sigma(pp \to b\bar{b} \to h_2) \cdot (1 + \eta_{h_2}^{b\bar{b}}) \cdot \text{BR}(h_2 \to \tau^+\tau^-) \\
+ \sigma(pp \to b\bar{b} \to h_3) \cdot (1 + \eta_{h_3}^{b\bar{b}}) \cdot \text{BR}(h_3 \to \tau^+\tau^-).
$$

(9.35)
Figure 9.7: Comparison of coherent $h_2$ and $h_3$ cross sections times branching ratio (in fb) for $b\bar{b} \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ in the $CP\text{Int}$ scenarios with the 95% CL exclusion bounds obtained by ATLAS at 13 TeV for 13.3 fb$^{-1}$ integrated luminosity from Ref. [283]. The colour coding for (a) $\tan\beta = 13, 14, 15, 16, 17$ for the $CP\text{Int}_1$ scenario and (b) $\tan\beta = 13, 14, 15, 16, 18$ for the $CP\text{Int}_2$ scenario is depicted in the respective plots.
The theoretical predictions have been plotted for a sample of tan $\beta$ values in Fig. 9.7 as a function of $M_{h_a} = M_{h_3}$, where in the relevant regions we also have $M_{h_3} \simeq M_{h_2}$. The values of tan $\beta$ have been chosen to display the regions of strongest interference, which is destructive. When we compare theoretical predictions with the cross section limits presented in the ATLAS measurement, $M_{h_a}$ values for which the predicted $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ is larger than the observed limit are excluded at 95% CL for the given value of tan $\beta$. Therefore, the lower bound on $M_{h_a}$ for a particular value of tan $\beta$ is set by the point where the curve for the theoretical prediction crosses the observed limit. In general, the inclusion of the interference contribution in the full process can reduce this lower bound for a given tan $\beta$ value compared to the $\mathcal{CP}$-conserving case, as was shown in Ref. [277]. For a given tan $\beta$, the suppression of the predicted $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ due to interference contributions can result in a range of $M_{h_a}$ values, that would have been excluded if we assumed $\mathcal{CP}$ conservation, which escape the exclusion limits. In Fig. 9.7 (a) and (b) we examine this effect for the scenarios $\mathcal{CP}\text{Int}_1$ and $\mathcal{CP}\text{Int}_2$.

In Fig. 9.7 (a), the plotted curves show the interference-corrected $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ for tan $\beta = 13, 14, 15, 16, 17$ in the $\mathcal{CP}\text{Int}_1$ scenario, compared to the roughly model-independent cross section limits by ATLAS in black. We see the strongest suppression in the predicted values of $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ for tan $\beta = 15$, with slightly shallower valleys for values of tan $\beta \pm 2$. Fig. 9.7 (b) shows the corresponding quantities for the $\mathcal{CP}\text{Int}_2$ scenario with $\phi_{A_t} = \pi/4$ and $\phi_{M_3} = \pi/3$. Here the tan $\beta$ values for the depicted curves are 13, 14, 15, 16 and 18. In contrast to Fig. 9.7 (a) where we saw the steepest valley for one value of tan $\beta$ with the trough of the valleys tapering off for the neighbouring values of tan $\beta$, in this case the destructive interference contributing to the suppression of cross section times branching ratios is about equally strong for all the values of tan $\beta$ that have been sampled. Consequently, in these scenarios one can expect that even if future analyses continue to increase the lower bound of excluded $M_{h_a}$, the dips in the $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ due to strong destructive interference will have the effect that certain ranges of Higgs bosons masses, depending on the considered value of tan $\beta$, will remain unexcluded in comparison to the case where $\mathcal{CP}$ conservation is assumed.

In our preliminary analysis, we refrain from a detailed discussion on the theoretical and experimental uncertainties that can affect this comparison of predictions for cross sections times branching ratios including interference with observed limits, since we primarily want to display the qualitative effects of the $\mathcal{CP}$-violating mixing and interference terms. A discussion on the theoretical uncertainties in our cross section prediction was already provided in Section 8.6. A detailed analysis of theory uncertainties can be found in Ref. [92], and a discussion of experimental uncertainties for the displayed exclusion limits is presented in Ref. [283]. A closer examination of the uncertainties involved in the calculation of interference contribution is deferred to a future publication [2].
9.4 Phenomenological effects of interference contributions

9.4.4 Impact on LHC exclusion bounds

In the previous sections, we encountered large CP-violating interference effects which modified the predictions for $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ of $b\bar{b}$ Higgs production and decay to $\tau^+\tau^-$ significantly. Comparing these predictions to the roughly model-independent experimental limits on the cross sections resulted in a range of unexcluded values for $M_{h_a}$. Experimental exclusion bounds on the parameter space of the MSSM are therefore affected by interference contributions between $h_1, h_2$, and $h_3$. We now analyse the exclusion limits in the $(M_{H^\pm}, \tan \beta)$ plane for the CPInt scenarios using HiggsBounds-5.1.1beta [177–180]. For any particular model, HiggsBounds takes a selection of Higgs sector predictions as input and uses the experimental topological cross section limits from Higgs searches at LEP, the Tevatron and the LHC to determine whether this parameter point has been excluded at 95% CL.

In order to incorporate the interference effects into the prediction of $\sigma(b\bar{b} \rightarrow h_a)$ times the respective branching ratio, the ratio of production cross sections which are used as input to HiggsBounds are rescaled with the interference factor. Given that the exclusion is driven by the $\tau^+\tau^-$ final state, for simplicity we apply $\eta^{b\bar{b}\tau\tau}$ to all $b\bar{b}$ production cross sections and redefine

$$\frac{\sigma_{\text{MSSM}}^{\text{MSSM}}(b\bar{b} \rightarrow h_a)}{\sigma_{\text{SM}}^{\text{SM}}(b\bar{b} \rightarrow h_a)} \rightarrow \frac{\sigma_{\text{MSSM}}^{\text{MSSM}}(b\bar{b} \rightarrow h_a)}{\sigma_{\text{SM}}^{\text{SM}}(b\bar{b} \rightarrow h_a)} \cdot (1 + \eta^{\text{MSSM}}_{a}),$$

(9.36)

where the $\eta_{a}$ values are computed via our implementation in SusHiMi, and plotted in Fig. 9.6. The quantity $\sigma_{\text{SM}}^{\text{SM}}(b\bar{b} \rightarrow h_a)$ is the SM production cross section for a Higgs with mass $M_{h_a}$. The rescaled production ratio multiplied to the branching ratio of $h_a \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ is then compared by HiggsBounds with the observed experimental limit for each point in the $(M_{H^\pm}, \tan \beta)$ plane.

In Fig. 9.8 (a) and (b), we show the exclusion bounds in the $(M_{H^\pm}, \tan \beta)$ plane for the CPInt scenarios with non-zero CP-violating phases in blue, together with the exclusion bounds in red for the same scenarios where all the parameters are real, i.e. no CP-violating phases or resulting interference effects are present. In these plots we see the effects of the reduced $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ rates that we described in Section 9.4.3. Certain parameter points in the $(M_{H^\pm}, \tan \beta)$ plane, that appear to be excluded when CP conservation is assumed, have a predicted cross section times branching ratio that is smaller than the observed limit when we include the CP-violating interference term in the prediction. As a result, those parameter points become unexcluded when the interference-corrected prediction is compared with the experimental limits.

In Fig. 9.8 (a), we show the exclusion for the CP-conserving and the CP-violating case in red and blue, respectively, for the CPInt1 scenario. The blue region corresponds to the scenario where $\phi_A = \pi/4$. Here we see that accounting for the interference term and the complex parameters in the $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ prediction leads to a “wedge” of destructive interference in the region between $M_{H^\pm} \sim 500$ GeV and 750 GeV for $\tan \beta \sim 12$ to 20.
that remains unexcluded, in contrast to the $\mathcal{CP}$-conserving case. In Fig. 9.8 (b), where the blue region corresponds to the $\mathcal{CP}$Int$_2$ scenario with $\phi_{A_t} = \pi/4$ and $\phi_{M_S} = \pi/3$, such a wedge occurs between $M_{H^\pm} \sim 550$ GeV and 800 GeV for $\tan \beta \sim 13$ to 20. In the above plots one can also notice disconnected red points that appear in the low $\tan \beta$ region in Fig. 9.8 (a) and blue points that appear around $\tan \beta = 20$ and $M_{H^\pm} \sim 900$ GeV in Fig. 9.8 (b). These occurrences seem to result from numerical instabilities.

In the light of these results which show that accounting for the effects of $\mathcal{CP}$ violation in the MSSM Higgs sector can lead to significant modifications of the exclusion contours, we assert that interpretations of exclusion limits from the searches for heavy Higgs bosons should account for the possibility that the Higgs sector of the MSSM is not $\mathcal{CP}$-conserving.
9.5 Summary and outlook

In this chapter, we investigated the effects of CP-violating interference contributions on the predictions for the full process of production and decay of the MSSM Higgs bosons. We used an approximation of the $3 \times 3$ propagator matrix that employs the $\hat{Z}$ factors evaluated at the complex poles along with the Breit-Wigner propagators to calculate the interference terms in the amplitudes of the full process. Furthermore, we reviewed a formalism to incorporate relative interference factors into the prediction for the on-shell production and decay of the Higgs states $h_a$, $a \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and described the implementation for the calculation of these interference factors into SusHiMi.

In order to study the phenomenology of the Higgs sector in parameter regions where the interference effects are important, we defined a benchmark scenario (“CPInt”). Note that these interference effects arise generically in the theory, and it was not necessary to fine-tune the benchmark scenario to a particular set of parameters in order to make them visible. Focussing on the interference between $h_2$ and $h_3$ in the process $b\bar{b} \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ in the CPInt scenario, we highlighted four aspects. First, we showed that nearly mass degenerate heavy Higgs states leads to a substantial $H - A$ mixing and there is a resonant enhancement in the individual $b\bar{b}$ cross sections of $h_2$ and $h_3$. The strong mixing in this resonant region also gives rise to a large destructive interference, which overcompensates the enhancement in cross sections. We showed that in the considered scenarios strongly destructive interference of up to $\sim 98\%$ occurs in significant regions of the studied $(M_{H^\pm}, \tan \beta)$ plane, which leads to modified predictions for $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ in the process of $h_2, h_3$ production and decay. Our cross section predictions described in previous chapters and implemented in SusHi were used to obtain the modified predictions. We compared the values of $\sigma \times \text{BR}$, which take the interference contributions into account, to the roughly model-independent experimental limits for the considered process. The suppression in the predicted $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ in the resonance region due to destructive interference resulted in significant regions of Higgs masses that remain unexccluded while they would appear to be excluded under the assumption of CP conservation. Lastly, we analysed the modification of exclusion bounds in the $(M_{H^\pm}, \tan \beta)$ plane using production rates rescaled by the interference factors as an input to HiggsBounds. We found that in the case where CP violation is allowed and interference effects are accounted for, a region of unexccluded parameter points opens up.

In our preliminary analysis, we only considered one process of Higgs production and decay. In future investigations, we will incorporate interference factors for the $gg$ production channel into SusHiMi, such that the gluon-fusion cross section predictions can be directly used to obtain values for $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ with interference effects included. Furthermore, a detailed study of the modified exclusions with a variation in the phases of $A_t, A_b, M_3$ and $\mu$ will be performed.
Chapter 10

Conclusions

Precise theory predictions are indispensable for testing deviations, or lack thereof, from the Standard Model. They are also essential for increasing the sensitivity to signatures of new physics. We have seen that BSM theories with extended Higgs sectors provide viable solutions to some of the shortcomings of the SM. For the search of these additional Higgs bosons, not only do we need an accurate knowledge of their production cross sections, branching ratios, and potential interference effects, but a meaningful comparison of the predictions to the experimental data is also important for the proper interpretation of the new results from Run II of the LHC.

The year 2016 ended on an exceptional note for the LHC, with the ATLAS and CMS experiments receiving an integrated luminosity of almost 40 fb$^{-1}$ as compared to the 25 fb$^{-1}$ that was originally planned. In the spring of 2017, the physics runs at LHC restarted and promised to deliver even greater statistics. With higher energies than Run I and a remarkable amount of data available in Run II, this translates to improved and more decisive constraints on physics beyond the Standard Model.

While the non-observation of the heavier Higgs bosons of the MSSM has been used for confining the SUSY parameter space, scenarios that allow $\mathcal{CP}$ violation are more difficult to restrict using the Higgs search data. The MSSM predicts three neutral mass eigenstates at lowest-order: the $\mathcal{CP}$-even $h$ and $H$, and the $\mathcal{CP}$-odd $A$. At tree level, and at higher orders for vanishing phases, the Higgs sector is $\mathcal{CP}$-conserving and only the $\mathcal{CP}$-even Higgs states $h$ and $H$ mix. So far, experimental investigations have been carried out under the assumption that the MSSM is $\mathcal{CP}$-conserving. However, $\mathcal{CP}$ is not an inherent symmetry of nature. In fact, an explanation for the baryon asymmetry in the universe demands additional sources of $\mathcal{CP}$ violation not contained in the SM. While allowing for $\mathcal{CP}$ violation does increase the number of free parameters in the MSSM, there is no a priori physical reason to assume that all parameters of the MSSM must be real. Complex parameters in the MSSM can enter the Higgs sector via loop induced $\mathcal{CP}$-violating corrections and result in three new $\mathcal{CP}$-admixed neutral mass eigenstates $h_1, h_2$ and $h_3$ with $M_{h_1} \leq M_{h_2} \leq M_{h_3}$. This leads to interesting deviations from the phenomenology of the $\mathcal{CP}$-conserving MSSM.

In this thesis, we studied the relevance of these $\mathcal{CP}$-violating phases in searches for
neutral Higgs bosons of the MSSM. The investigation of the effects of the complex parameters of the theory giving rise to additional \(CP\) violation beyond the single phase of the SM was carried out in two steps, summarised in the following.

**On-shell Higgs production in the MSSM with complex parameters**

In Chapter 6, we presented the theoretical predictions for inclusive cross sections for \(h_1, h_2\) and \(h_3\) production via gluon fusion and bottom-quark annihilation in the MSSM with complex parameters. The cross section predictions for the gluon-fusion process at leading order are based on an explicit calculation taking into account the dependence on all complex parameters in the MSSM. The complete form of the analytical formulae for the general \(CP\)-violating case including Higgs mixing has been presented in the literature for the first time. The 3×3 mixing of the lowest-order mass eigenstates of the Higgs bosons \(\{h, H, A\}\) into the loop-corrected mass eigenstates \(\{h_1, h_2, h_3\}\) was described in Chapter 5 with full propagator-type corrections using the \(\tilde{Z}\) factors of the neutral Higgs bosons, which are provided by the code \texttt{FeynHiggs}. Moreover, we discussed how the predictions for the gluon-fusion process in the MSSM with complex parameters deviate from those of the MSSM with real parameters due to non-zero couplings of the squarks to the \(CP\)-odd Higgs boson \(A\) and potentially different left- and right-handed bottom-Yukawa couplings arising from the resummation of \(\tan\beta\)-enhanced sbottom contributions in \(\Delta_b\).

The LO computation of the cross section was further supplemented by higher-order contributions. Using a simplified version of the \(\Delta_b\) resummation for the treatment of the higher-order corrections, we included the full massive top- and bottom-quark contributions at NLO QCD and interpolated the NLO SUSY QCD corrections from the amplitudes in the MSSM with real parameters. The uncertainties involved in using such an interpolation were discussed in Chapter 8. The interpolation uncertainty at NLO is most relevant in scenarios where the squarks and the gluino are relatively light, which are under tension from the present limits from LHC searches. This uncertainty could be avoided if an explicit result for the squark–gluino contributions at NLO QCD in the MSSM becomes available for the general case of complex parameters. For the top-quark contribution in the effective theory of a heavy top-quark, we added NNLO QCD contributions for all Higgs bosons, and \(N^3\)LO QCD contributions in an expansion around the threshold of Higgs production for the \(CP\)-even component of the amplitude of the light Higgs boson \(h_1\) to match the precision of the predictions for the SM Higgs boson. Finally, electroweak corrections which include two-loop contributions with couplings of the heavy gauge bosons to the Higgs bosons mediated by light quarks were added to the gluon-fusion cross section. The results for cross sections presented in this thesis are currently the state of the art for neutral Higgs production in the MSSM with complex parameters.

In Chapter 7 we described the implementation of the cross section calculations in an extension of the code \texttt{SusHi}, called \texttt{SusHiMi}, which is linked to \texttt{FeynHiggs}. Using
SusHiMi, we investigated the phenomenological effects of \( CP \)-violating phases on the production of Higgs bosons in the MSSM with complex parameters in two scenarios, inspired by the light-stop and \( m_h^{\text{mod+}} \) benchmark scenarios. We found in our analysis of Higgs boson production through gluon fusion that a proper description of squark and gluino loop contributions is essential, in particular if their masses are light. This refers both to the loop contributions to the gluon–gluon–Higgs vertex and to the corrections entering through \( \Delta_b \). Squark and gluino loop contributions furthermore enter the wave function normalisation factors that are necessary to ensure the correct on-shell properties of the produced Higgs boson. In regions where squark and gluino contributions are sizeable, the production cross sections show a significant dependence on the \( CP \)-violating phases. We discussed the remaining theoretical uncertainties in the cross section predictions taking into account renormalisation and factorisation scale uncertainties, a resummation uncertainty for \( \Delta_b \) and an uncertainty due to the performed interpolation of \( NLO \) SUSY QCD corrections, in addition to other uncertainties that can directly be taken over from the case of the MSSM with real parameters or the SM.

In the \( m_h^{\text{mod+}} \)-inspired scenario, which features a slightly heavier squark spectrum, an important feature in the production processes of the two heavy states \( h_2 \) and \( h_3 \) was the large mixing between the nearly mass-degenerate states. Their mixing effects are incorporated in the wave function normalisation factors for the external Higgs bosons. In a scenario such as this, we note that the signals of the two Higgs bosons cannot be experimentally resolved and the measured quantity is the sum of their cross sections times branching ratios. For an accurate interpretation of experimental exclusion limits arising from MSSM Higgs searches, which so far have only been analysed in the framework of the \( CP \)-conserving MSSM, it is important to take into account the interference effects in the full process of Higgs production and decay arising from \( CP \)-violating interactions. Such interference contributions are especially large when the mixing is large and the heavy Higgses have a very small mass splitting. Our results for the cross sections for on-shell Higgs bosons can be directly used in the formalism of a generalised narrow-width approximation to incorporate these interference effects.

Impact of interference effects on LHC Higgs searches

In Chapter 9, we reviewed the formalism to incorporate interference terms in the factorisation of a full process into the on-shell production and decay of an intermediate particle. Interference effects between Higgs bosons can be crucial in assessing allowed and excluded parameter regions. \( CP \)-conserving interference between the \( CP \)-even Higgs states \( h \) and \( H \) becomes relevant when their mass difference is smaller than the sum of their total widths. However, in such scenarios both these Higgs states are light, which is under pressure from experimental limits. In this thesis we have mainly investigated scenarios where the lightest Higgs \( h_1 \) is mostly \( CP \)-even and SM-like, having a large mass splitting from the Higgses \( h_2 \) and \( h_3 \) which are nearly mass-degenerate. This is typical
in the decoupling regions of models with an extended Higgs sector. Since $h_2$ and $h_3$ are $CP$-admixed states in the MSSM with complex parameters, the total matrix element of their production and decay has non-zero interference terms, and the $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ of these two Higgs states cannot be added incoherently. This interference term in the coherent sum of $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ is dependent on the diagonal and off-diagonal elements of the $\hat{Z}$ matrix and the Breit-Wigner propagators of $h_2$ and $h_3$. We described the implementation of the relative interference factors in SusHiMi for the $b\bar{b}$ initial state, which is planned to be extended to the $gg$ initial state as well. Therefore, a SusHiMi run outputs not just the relevant Higgs cross section for a chosen initial state, but also the interference factor that must be multiplied to it for a given final state while calculating the $\sigma \times \text{BR}$ for the chosen Higgs. This provides a tool for systematically incorporating and accounting for the effects of $CP$-violating phases in the process of production and decay of a Higgs boson.

A $CP$-violating scenario ("$CP\text{Int}$") with non-zero phases for the trilinear coupling $A_t$ and gluino mass parameter $M_3$ was defined in order to investigate the impact of complex parameters giving rise to interference in the process $b\bar{b} \to h_2, h_3 \to \tau^+\tau^-$. We found that the interference between $h_2$ and $h_3$ was strongly destructive with values of up to 98%. For sample values of $\tan \beta$, this interference was found to reduce the theoretical prediction for the cross section times branching ratio of the considered process significantly below the experimentally observed limits. Consequently, it opened up parameter regions that were regarded as excluded in Higgs searches that assume $CP$-conservation and do not account for such $CP$-violating interferences. The two versions of the defined scenario within which we analysed the interference effects are proposed to serve as benchmarks for neutral Higgs searches with $CP$ violation in future analyses by ATLAS and CMS.

Run II of the LHC promises to vastly improve the reach of searches for new physics, including supersymmetry. In this thesis we have presented precise predictions for the production of Higgs bosons in the $CP$-violating MSSM for two prominent production channels at the LHC, and developed a tool for systematically studying the effects of complex parameters in the full process of Higgs production and decay in the MSSM. We look forward to utilising these results in the light of the upcoming Higgs search data from the LHC.
Appendix A

Formulas: Higgs–quark and Higgs–squark couplings

In SusHiMi the Higgs–(s)quark couplings are expressed in terms of the $\mathcal{CP}$-even and $\mathcal{CP}$-odd neutral gauge eigenstates $\phi_g \in \{\phi_0^1, \phi_0^2\}$ and $\chi_g \in \{\chi_0^1, \chi_0^2\}$, respectively. In order to obtain the couplings of the squarks with the lowest-order mass eigenstates $\phi \in \{h, H, A, G\}$ the gauge eigenstates are rotated using the tree-level mixing matrix $\mathcal{R}$ as depicted in the following Feynman diagrams

\[
\phi - \quad \overline{q} = \begin{cases} \frac{i}{v} m_\nu \sqrt{\mathcal{R}(g_{qL}^\phi P_L + g_{qR}^\phi P_R)} \\ \frac{-i}{v} m_\nu \sqrt{\mathcal{R}(g_{qR}^\phi P_L - g_{qL}^\phi P_R)} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi - \quad \hat{q}_j = i \frac{1}{v} \sqrt{\mathcal{R} g_{\hat{q}_j}^\phi \chi_0^x}
\]

(A.1)

with $v = 2m_W/g_2 = 1/\sqrt{2G_F}$ and the tree-level mixing matrix $\mathcal{R}$ given in Eq. (3.46). At the amplitude level the results will then also be multiplied with the corresponding $\hat{Z}$ factor.

The couplings between the gauge eigenstates and the third generation quarks are $g_{qL} = 1/\cos \beta$ for $\phi_0^1$ and $\chi_0^1$ and $g_{qL} = 1/\sin \beta$ for $\phi_0^2$ and $\chi_0^2$. For $\Delta_6$ corrections we refer to Eq. (6.52) and Eq. (6.55).

The couplings between the gauge eigenstates and the third generation squarks contain terms from the squark mass diagonalisation matrix $U_\hat{q}$ (see Eq. (3.18)) which is a unitary matrix with real diagonal elements and complex off-diagonal elements, i.e. it can be written as follows

\[
U_\hat{q} = \begin{pmatrix} U_{q11} & U_{q12} \\ -U_{q12}^* & U_{q22} \end{pmatrix}.
\]

(A.2)

They are obtained with MaCoR [184, 293]. For the $\mathcal{CP}$-even state $\phi_0^1$ we have the stop couplings (using $s_\beta \equiv \sin \beta$, $c_\beta \equiv \cos \beta$, $t_\beta \equiv \tan \beta$, $s_W \equiv \sin \theta_W$ and $c_W \equiv \cos \theta_W$):
A Formulas: Higgs–quark and Higgs–squark couplings

\[ g_{t_{11}} = U_{t_{12}}^* \left[ -\frac{U_{11}m_{t\mu}}{s_\beta} + \frac{4}{3} U_{12} c_\beta m_Z^2 s_W^2 \right] - U_{t_{11}}^* \left[ \frac{U_{11}m_{t\mu}}{s_\beta} + c_\beta m_Z^2 U_{t_{11}} (\frac{1}{3}s_W^2 - c_W^2) \right] \]

\[ g_{t_{12}} = U_{t_{12}}^* \left[ -\frac{U_{12}m_{t\mu}}{s_\beta} + \frac{4}{3} U_{12} c_\beta m_Z^2 s_W^2 \right] - U_{t_{12}}^* \left[ \frac{U_{12}m_{t\mu}}{s_\beta} + c_\beta m_Z^2 U_{t_{12}} (\frac{1}{3}s_W^2 - c_W^2) \right] \]

\[ g_{t_{21}} = U_{t_{22}}^* \left[ -\frac{U_{11}m_{t\mu}}{s_\beta} + \frac{4}{3} U_{12} c_\beta m_Z^2 s_W^2 \right] - U_{t_{21}}^* \left[ \frac{U_{11}m_{t\mu}}{s_\beta} + c_\beta m_Z^2 U_{t_{21}} (\frac{1}{3}s_W^2 - c_W^2) \right] \]

\[ g_{t_{22}} = U_{t_{22}}^* \left[ -\frac{U_{12}m_{t\mu}}{s_\beta} + \frac{4}{3} U_{12} c_\beta m_Z^2 s_W^2 \right] - U_{t_{22}}^* \left[ \frac{U_{12}m_{t\mu}}{s_\beta} + c_\beta m_Z^2 U_{t_{22}} (\frac{1}{3}s_W^2 - c_W^2) \right] \].

(A.3)

For the $CP$-even state $\phi_2$, the couplings are:

\[ g_{t_{11}}^e = U_{t_{12}}^* \left[ \frac{U_{11}m_{tA}^*}{s_\beta} + \frac{2}{3} U_{11} m_{t}^2 \right] + U_{t_{11}}^* \left[ \frac{U_{12} m_{tA}}{s_\beta} + \frac{2}{3} U_{12} m_{t}^2 \right] \]

\[ g_{t_{12}}^e = U_{t_{12}}^* \left[ \frac{U_{12} m_{tA}^*}{s_\beta} + \frac{2}{3} U_{12} m_{t}^2 \right] + U_{t_{12}}^* \left[ \frac{U_{12} m_{tA}}{s_\beta} + \frac{2}{3} U_{12} m_{t}^2 \right] \]

\[ g_{t_{21}}^e = U_{t_{22}}^* \left[ \frac{U_{11} m_{tA}^*}{s_\beta} + \frac{2}{3} U_{11} m_{t}^2 \right] + U_{t_{21}}^* \left[ \frac{U_{12} m_{tA}}{s_\beta} + \frac{2}{3} U_{12} m_{t}^2 \right] \]

\[ g_{t_{22}}^e = U_{t_{22}}^* \left[ \frac{U_{12} m_{tA}^*}{s_\beta} + \frac{2}{3} U_{12} m_{t}^2 \right] + U_{t_{22}}^* \left[ \frac{U_{12} m_{tA}}{s_\beta} + \frac{2}{3} U_{12} m_{t}^2 \right] \].

(A.4)

Similarly for the $CP$-odd states $\chi_1^0$ and $\chi_2^0$, the stop couplings are given as:

\[ g_{t_{11}}^o = i \frac{m_t}{s_\beta} [-\mu U_{t_{12}}^* U_{t_{11}} + \mu U_{t_{11}}^* U_{t_{12}}] \]

\[ g_{t_{12}}^o = i \frac{m_t}{s_\beta} [-\mu U_{t_{12}}^* U_{t_{21}} + \mu U_{t_{21}}^* U_{t_{12}}] \]

\[ g_{t_{21}}^o = i \frac{m_t}{s_\beta} [-\mu U_{t_{22}}^* U_{t_{11}} + \mu U_{t_{11}}^* U_{t_{22}}] \]

\[ g_{t_{22}}^o = i \frac{m_t}{s_\beta} [-\mu U_{t_{22}}^* U_{t_{21}} + \mu U_{t_{21}}^* U_{t_{22}}] \].

(A.5)
Analogously, the Higgs–sbottom couplings for the $\mathcal{CP}$-even state $\phi_1^0$ are:

$$
g_{b,11}^\phi = U^*_{b11} \left[ \frac{U_{b11} A_{1b} m_b}{c_\beta} + U_{b12} \left( \frac{2 m_b^2}{c_\beta} - \frac{2}{3} c_\beta m_Z^2 s_W^2 \right) \right]
+ U^*_{b11} \left[ \frac{U_{b12} A_{2b} m_b}{c_\beta} + \frac{2 U_{b11} m_b^2}{c_\beta} - c_\beta m_Z^2 U_{b11} \left( \frac{1}{3} s_W^2 + c_W^2 \right) \right],
$$

$$
g_{b,12}^\phi = U^*_{b12} \left[ \frac{U_{b12} A_{1b} m_b}{c_\beta} + U_{b21} \left( \frac{2 m_b^2}{c_\beta} - \frac{2}{3} c_\beta m_Z^2 s_W^2 \right) \right]
+ U^*_{b12} \left[ \frac{U_{b21} A_{2b} m_b}{c_\beta} + \frac{2 U_{b12} m_b^2}{c_\beta} - c_\beta m_Z^2 U_{b21} \left( \frac{1}{3} s_W^2 + c_W^2 \right) \right],
$$

$$
g_{b,21}^\phi = U^*_{b21} \left[ \frac{U_{b21} A_{1b} m_b}{c_\beta} + U_{b22} \left( \frac{2 m_b^2}{c_\beta} - \frac{2}{3} c_\beta m_Z^2 s_W^2 \right) \right]
+ U^*_{b21} \left[ \frac{U_{b22} A_{2b} m_b}{c_\beta} + \frac{2 U_{b21} m_b^2}{c_\beta} - c_\beta m_Z^2 U_{b21} \left( \frac{1}{3} s_W^2 + c_W^2 \right) \right],
$$

For the $\mathcal{CP}$-even state $\phi_0^0$ they are given as:

$$
g_{b,11}^\phi = U^*_{b11} \left[ \frac{U_{b11} m_b}{c_\beta} + \frac{2}{3} U_{b12} s_\beta m_Z^2 s_W^2 \right]
+ U^*_{b11} \left[ \frac{U_{b12} m_b}{c_\beta} + s_\beta m_Z^2 U_{b11} \left( \frac{1}{3} s_W^2 + c_W^2 \right) \right],
$$

$$
g_{b,12}^\phi = U^*_{b12} \left[ \frac{U_{b12} m_b}{c_\beta} + \frac{2}{3} U_{b22} s_\beta m_Z^2 s_W^2 \right]
+ U^*_{b12} \left[ \frac{U_{b22} m_b}{c_\beta} + s_\beta m_Z^2 U_{b22} \left( \frac{1}{3} s_W^2 + c_W^2 \right) \right],
$$

$$
g_{b,21}^\phi = U^*_{b21} \left[ \frac{U_{b21} m_b}{c_\beta} + \frac{2}{3} U_{b22} s_\beta m_Z^2 s_W^2 \right]
+ U^*_{b21} \left[ \frac{U_{b22} m_b}{c_\beta} + s_\beta m_Z^2 U_{b21} \left( \frac{1}{3} s_W^2 + c_W^2 \right) \right],
$$

$$
g_{b,22}^\phi = U^*_{b22} \left[ \frac{U_{b22} m_b}{c_\beta} + \frac{2}{3} U_{b21} s_\beta m_Z^2 s_W^2 \right]
+ U^*_{b22} \left[ \frac{U_{b21} m_b}{c_\beta} + s_\beta m_Z^2 U_{b22} \left( \frac{1}{3} s_W^2 + c_W^2 \right) \right].
$$

Finally, for the $\mathcal{CP}$-odd states $\chi_1^0$ and $\chi_2^0$ the Higgs–sbottom couplings are:
\[ g_{b,11}^{\chi_0} = i \frac{m_b}{c_\beta} \left[ -A_b^* U_{b12}^* U_{b11} + A_b U_{b11}^* U_{b12} \right] \quad g_{b,11}^{\chi_2} = i \frac{m_b}{c_\beta} \left[ -\mu U_{b12}^* U_{b11} + \mu^* U_{b11}^* U_{b12} \right] \]

\[ g_{b,12}^{\chi_0} = i \frac{m_b}{c_\beta} \left[ -A_b^* U_{b12}^* U_{b21} + A_b U_{b21}^* U_{b12} \right] \quad g_{b,12}^{\chi_2} = i \frac{m_b}{c_\beta} \left[ -\mu U_{b12}^* U_{b21} + \mu^* U_{b21}^* U_{b12} \right] \]

\[ g_{b,21}^{\chi_0} = i \frac{m_b}{c_\beta} \left[ -A_b^* U_{b22}^* U_{b11} + A_b U_{b11}^* U_{b22} \right] \quad g_{b,21}^{\chi_2} = i \frac{m_b}{c_\beta} \left[ -\mu U_{b22}^* U_{b11} + \mu^* U_{b11}^* U_{b22} \right] \]

\[ g_{b,22}^{\chi_0} = i \frac{m_b}{c_\beta} \left[ -A_b^* U_{b22}^* U_{b21} + A_b U_{b21}^* U_{b22} \right] \quad g_{b,22}^{\chi_2} = i \frac{m_b}{c_\beta} \left[ -\mu U_{b22}^* U_{b21} + \mu^* U_{b21}^* U_{b22} \right] . \]
Appendix B

Parameter points in MSSM scenarios

In the following we summarise the parameter values in GeV for scenarios used or referenced in this thesis. We use the relation $A_t = \left( X_t + \mu^* \cot \beta \right) \cdot e^{i \phi A_t}$ as the input to SusHiMi in all the scenarios and $X_t$ is given in the on-shell scheme. The GUT relation is given by Eq. (3.16):

$$M_1 = \frac{5}{3} \frac{s^2_W}{c_W} M_2 .$$

Table B.1: An overview of the MSSM scenarios used in this thesis. All quantities except for the ratios are in GeV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Parameter</th>
<th>light-stop</th>
<th>$m_h^{mod+}$</th>
<th>light-stop</th>
<th>$m_h^{mod+}$</th>
<th>$C!P!Int_1$</th>
<th>$C!P!Int_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$m_t$</td>
<td>173.2</td>
<td>173.2</td>
<td>173.2</td>
<td>173.2</td>
<td>172.5</td>
<td>172.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_{H\pm}$ (or $M_A$)</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Varied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tan \beta$</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Varied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_{SUSY}$</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_{t_3}$</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>$M_{SUSY}$</td>
<td>$M_{SUSY}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_t/M_{SUSY}$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_b$</td>
<td>$A_t$</td>
<td>$A_t$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_t</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_\tau$</td>
<td>$A_t$</td>
<td>$A_t$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_t</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_1$</td>
<td>$GUT$</td>
<td>$GUT$</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_2$</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_3$</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>$1500 \cdot M_3$</td>
<td>$1500 \cdot e^{i \phi M_3}$</td>
<td>$2500 \cdot e^{i \phi M_3}$</td>
<td>$2500 \cdot e^{i \phi M_3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_{\tilde{q}_{1,2}}$</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>$M_{SUSY}$</td>
<td>$M_{SUSY}$</td>
<td>$M_{SUSY}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_{\tilde{t}_{1,2}}$</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>$M_{SUSY}$</td>
<td>$M_{SUSY}$</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{f\neq t,b,\tau}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Renormalisation of the MSSM Higgs sector

Higher-order corrections to the MSSM Higgs sector have a significant impact on its phenomenology. Beyond tree level, the Higgs sector is affected by many more parameters in addition to $M_{A,H^\pm}$ and $\tan \beta$. In the following, we summarise the renormalisation of relevant quantities in the Higgs sector, for which a hybrid on-shell and $\overline{\text{DR}}$-renormalisation scheme is adopted as defined in Ref. [144].

C.1 Higgs potential

At one loop, the linear and bilinear terms in the MSSM Higgs potential (Eq. (3.33)) are renormalised by the following transformations

\[ M_{\phi\chi\chi} \rightarrow M_{\phi\chi\chi} + \delta M_{\phi\chi\chi} \]  
\[ M_{\phi^\pm\phi^\pm} \rightarrow M_{\phi^\pm\phi^\pm} + \delta M_{\phi^\pm\phi^\pm} \]  
\[ T_i \rightarrow T_i + \delta T_i, \quad i = h, H, A \]  
\[ \tan \beta \rightarrow \tan \beta(1 + \delta \tan \beta) \].

Minimising the Higgs potential results in the one-loop tadpole coefficients to vanish,

\[ T_i^{(1)} + \delta T_i = 0 \implies \delta T_i = -T_i, \quad i = h, H, A. \]  

The mass counterterm matrices in the mass eigenbasis have the elements denoted by

\[ \delta m_i^2 = (\delta M_{hHAG})_{ij} = (U_n\delta M_{\phi\chi\chi}U_n^\dagger)_{ij}. \]
\[ \delta m^2_i \equiv \delta m_i^2, \quad i, j = h, H, A, G. \]
and
\[ \delta m_{kl}^2 = (\delta M_{H^\pm G^\pm})_{kl} = (U_c M_{\phi^\pm \phi^\pm} U_c^\dagger)_{kl}, \quad (C.8) \]
\[ \delta m_{kk}^2 \equiv \delta m_k^2, \quad k, l = H^\pm, G^\pm. \quad (C.9) \]

\( U_n(\alpha_n, \beta_n) \) and \( U_c(\beta_c) \) are the rotation matrices which stay unrenormalised. Furthermore, one field renormalisation constant is introduced for each Higgs doublet,
\[ \mathcal{H}_{1,2} \to (1 + \frac{1}{2} \delta Z_{\mathcal{H}_{1,2}}) \mathcal{H}_{1,2}. \quad (C.10) \]

The renormalisation constants \( \delta Z_{ij}, \delta Z_{kl} \) of the physical fields are related to the above as
\[ \delta Z_{hh} = s_\alpha^2 \delta Z_{H_1} + c_\alpha^2 \delta Z_{H_2}, \quad (C.11) \]
\[ \delta Z_{AA} = s_\beta^2 \delta Z_{H_1} + c_\beta^2 \delta Z_{H_2} = \delta Z_{H-H^+}, \quad (C.12) \]
\[ \delta Z_{hH} = s_\alpha c_\alpha (\delta Z_{H_2} - \delta Z_{H_1}), \quad (C.13) \]
\[ \delta Z_{AG} = s_\beta c_\beta (\delta Z_{H_2} - \delta Z_{H_1}) = \delta Z_{H^\pm G^\pm}, \quad (C.14) \]
\[ \delta Z_{HH} = c_\alpha^2 \delta Z_{H_1} + s_\alpha^2 \delta Z_{H_2}, \quad (C.15) \]
\[ \delta Z_{GG} = c_\beta^2 \delta Z_{H_1} + s_\beta^2 \delta Z_{H_2} = \delta Z_{G-G^+}, \quad (C.16) \]
and all the CP-violating terms are zero: \( \delta Z_{hA} = \delta Z_{hG} = \delta Z_{HA} = \delta Z_{HG} = 0. \)

### C.2 Field and parameter renormalisation

There is no obvious physical observable to which we could relate \( \tan \beta \) for an on-shell definition, therefore the \( \overline{\text{DR}} \) scheme is adopted which has been shown to give numerically stable and gauge invariant results at one-loop order. The renormalisation constant for \( \tan \beta \) is constructed from the field renormalisation constants for the Higgs doublets also defined in the \( \overline{\text{DR}} \) scheme,
\[ \delta \tan \beta_{\overline{\text{DR}}} = \frac{1}{2} (\delta Z_{\mathcal{H}_{1,2}}^{\overline{\text{DR}}} - \delta Z_{\mathcal{H}_{1,2}}^{\overline{\text{DR}}}) \quad \text{with} \]
\[ \delta Z_{\mathcal{H}_1}^{\overline{\text{DR}}} = - \text{Re} \left[ \Sigma^{(\text{div})}_{\mathcal{H}H}(m_H^2) \right]_{\alpha=0}, \quad (C.20) \]
\[ \delta Z_{\mathcal{H}_2}^{\overline{\text{DR}}} = - \text{Re} \left[ \Sigma^{(\text{div})}_{\mathcal{H}h}(m_h^2) \right]_{\alpha=0}. \quad (C.21) \]
C.3 Higgs self-energies

The renormalised self-energies of the neutral Higgs bosons can be expressed in terms of the previously defined quantities as

\[ \hat{\Sigma}_{ij}(p^2) = \Sigma_{ij}(p^2) + \delta Z_{ij} \left( p^2 - \frac{1}{2}(m_i^2 + m_j^2) \right) - \delta m_{ij}^2, \quad (C.22) \]
\[ \hat{\Sigma}_{ik}(p^2) = \Sigma_{ik}(p^2) - \delta m_{ik}^2, \quad (C.23) \]

with \( i, j \in \{h, H\} \) being the \( \mathcal{CP} \)-even eigenstates and \( k = A \) being the \( \mathcal{CP} \)-odd one. Further, \( \delta Z_{ij} \) are the field renormalisation constants and \( \delta m_{ij}^2, \delta m_{ik}^2 \) are the mass counterterms defined earlier.
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