拡張ヒッグスセクターの物理

Shinya KANEMURA Univ. of TOYAMA

余剰次元2011研究会, January 25, 2011, 大阪大学

Plan of Talk

- [1] Introduction
- [2] Physics of extended Higgs sector
- [3] TeV-scale models for tiny neutrino masses and dark matter without fine tuning[4] Summary

Introduction

- Higgs sector remains unknown
 - Minimal/Non-minimal Higgs sector?
 - Higgs Search is the most important issue to complete the SM particle contents.
- We already know BSM phenomena:
 - Neutrino oscillation

 $\Delta m^2 \sim 8 \times 10^{-5} \, eV^2$, $\Delta m^2 \sim 3 \times 10^{-3} \, eV^2$

Dark Matter

 $\Omega_{\rm DM} h^2 \sim 0.1$

– Baryon Asymmetry of the Universe

 $n_{\rm B}/s \sim 9 \times 10^{-11}$



NASA/WMAP Science Team

To understand these phenomena, we need to go beyond-SM

Electroweak Symmetry Breaking

Nothing is known for Higgs sector!

- Anything to trigger EWSB: $SU(2) \times U(1) \rightarrow U(1)$
- Elementary Scalar? Dynamical?
- Scale of EWSB: 246GeV (Fermi Constant)

Higgs: Origin of Mass?

- Weak Gauge Boson
- Quarks and Leptons (Yukawa Interaction)
- Mass of itself

- (Higgs Mechanism)
- - (Higgs Potential)
- [Neutrinos (Dirac? Seesaw? Radiative?)]
- [Dark Matter?]

In the SM, only a Higgs doublet field is responsible for all of them!



SM Higgs

Mass is a free parameter

$$V(\phi) = -\mu^2 |\phi|^2 + \lambda |\phi|^4$$

 $m_{h}^{2} = 2 \lambda v^{2}$

Relation to Λ (RGE)

- Light Higgs (weak: high Λ)
- Heavy Higgs (strong: low Λ)

Constraint from LEP, Tevatron

- 114 GeV < mh < 149 GeV allowed at 95%CL
- 158 GeV < mh < 175 GeV excluded (Tevatron)

Theory and experiment suggest a light Higgs boson



Heavy Higgs is excluded?

No!

A heavy (SM-like) Higgs is not excluded, if there is new physics

The upper bound comes from the loop effect of m_{H} .

$$\Delta T_{\text{Higgs}} \simeq -\ln \frac{m_H^2}{M_W^2} ~(\sim 0)$$

A heavy Higgs is possible by additional new physics loop contributions to the *T* parameter

Heavy Higgs: Signal of New Physics



Mass lighter than 114GeV is excluded?

No!

. . .

It is always possible to relax the lower bound, if there is the mixing in multi-Higgs models

SM + Singlet Higgs2Higgs doublet modelMSSM light Higgs scenario

Multi-Higgs may be more natural from phenomenological view?



Non-minimal Higgs sector?

Many new physics models predict extended Higgs sectors

- SUSY, DSB, Little Higgs, ...
- Extra CPV phases, First order phase transition
- Radiative Seesaw models

Each model has a specific (extended) Higgs sector

Higgs Sector = Window to New Physics

[2] Extended Higgs models

- If the Higgs sector contains more than one scalar bosons, possibility is
 - Extra singlets
 - Extra doublets
 - Extra triplets
- What kind of experimental constraint we have? Most important quantities may be
 - Electroweak rho parameter
 - Flavor Changing Neutral Current (FCNC)

Electroweak rho parameter

$$\rho_{exp} = 1.0008 + 0.0017 - 0.0007$$

$$\rho \equiv \frac{m_W^2}{m_Z^2 \cos^2 \theta_W} = \frac{\sum_i \left[4T_i (T_i + 1) - Y_i^2 \right] |v_i|^2 c_i}{\sum_i 2Y_i^2 |v_i|^2}$$

 $T_i : SU(2)_L$ isospin $Y_i : hypercharge$ $v_i : v.e.v.$ $c_i : 1$ for complex representation 1/2 for real representation

Possibility of $\rho=1$ (tree)

- 1. SM + doublets (D) + singlets (S)
- 2. SM + Triplets (T)

a)
$$V_T \ll V_D$$

b) Combination of several representations $v_D \sim v_T$ [(ex) D+T_0+T_2: Georgi-Machasek model]

Muliti-doublets (+ singlets) are natural extension

FCNC Suppression

SM: FCNC via Z is suppressed by GIM mechanism Multi-Higgs models: FCNC via Higgs

To avoid FCNC, impose a discrete symmetry **2HDM:** $\Phi_1 \rightarrow + \Phi_1$, $\Phi_2 = -\Phi_2$ Each quark or lepton couples only one of the Higgs doublets No FCNC at tree level!

Four types of Yukawa Interaction





Aoki, SK, Tsumura, Yagyu, PRD 80, 015017 (2009)

2 Higgs doublet model (2HDM)

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\mathsf{THDM}} &= +m_1^2 |\Phi_1|^2 + m_2^2 |\Phi_2|^2 - \frac{m_3^2 \left(\Phi_1^{\dagger} \Phi_2 + \Phi_2^{\dagger} \Phi_1\right)}{|\Phi_1|^2 |\Phi_2|^2} \\ &+ \frac{\lambda_1}{2} |\Phi_1|^4 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} |\Phi_2|^4 + \lambda_3 |\Phi_1|^2 |\Phi_2|^2 \\ &+ \lambda_4 \left|\Phi_1^{\dagger} \Phi_2\right|^2 + \frac{\lambda_5}{2} \left[\left(\Phi_1^{\dagger} \Phi_2\right)^2 + (\mathbf{h.c.} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \\ \Phi_1 \text{ and } \Phi_2 \Rightarrow \underbrace{h, \ H, \ A^0, \ H^{\pm} \oplus \text{ Goldstone bosons}}_{\uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \text{ charged}} & \begin{bmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \alpha & -\sin \alpha \\ \sin \alpha & \cos \alpha \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} H \\ h \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z_0^0 \\ z_2^0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z_0^0 \\ A^0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \beta & -\sin \beta \\ \sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \\ w_2^{\pm} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_1^{$$

Decoupling/Non-decoupling

Decoupling Theorem
 Appelquist-Carazzone 1975

 New phys. loop effect in observables
 1/Mⁿ → 0 (M→∞: decouple)



- Violation of the decoupling theorem
 - Chiral fermion loop (ex. top)

 $m_f = y_f v$ - Boson loop (ex. H⁺ in non-SUSY 2HDM) $m_{\phi}^2 = \lambda v^2 + M^2 \text{ (only if } \lambda v^2 > M^2)$

Non-decoupling effect



Higgs potential

To understand the essence of EWSB, we must know the self-coupling in addition to the mass independently

$$V_{\text{Higgs}} = \frac{1}{2} \underline{m_h^2 h^2} + \frac{1}{3!} \underline{\lambda_{hhh}} h^3 + \frac{1}{4!} \underline{\lambda_{hhhh}} h^4 + \cdots$$

Effective potential
$$V_{\text{eff}}(\varphi) = -\frac{\mu_0^2}{2}\varphi^2 + \frac{\lambda_0}{4}\varphi^4 + \sum_f \frac{(-1)^{2s_f} N_{C_f} N_{S_f}}{64\pi^2} m_f(\varphi)^4 \left[\ln \frac{m_f(\varphi)^2}{Q^2} - \frac{3}{2} \right]$$

Renormalization
Conditions $\frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial \varphi} \Big|_{\varphi=v} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial^2 V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial \varphi^2} \Big|_{\varphi=v} = m_h^2, \quad \frac{\partial^3 V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial \varphi^3} \Big|_{\varphi=v} = \lambda_{hhh}$

SM Case
$$\lambda_{hhh}^{\text{SMloop}} \sim \frac{3m_h^2}{v} \left(1 - \frac{N_c m_t^4}{3\pi^2 v^2 m_h^2} + \cdots\right)$$

Non-decoupling effect

Case of the non-SUSY 2HDM

- Consider when the lightest *h* is SM-like $[sin(\beta-\alpha)=1]$
- At tree, the *hhh* coupling takes the same form as in the SM
- At 1-loop, non-decoupling effect m_{Φ}^4 (If M < v)

$$h = f, \phi$$

 $\Phi = H, A, H^{\pm}$

SK, Kiyoura, Okada, Senaha, Yuan, PLB558 (2003)



Electroweak Baryogenesis

Sakharov's conditions: **B** Violation \rightarrow Sphaleron transition at high T \rightarrow CP Phases in 2HDM C and CP Violation \rightarrow 1st Order EW Phase Transition Departure from Equilibrium Veff Expanding **Bubble Wall** of EW Phase T>Tc $\Gamma^{\rm B}_{\rm sph}$ << H(T_c) T_c³ $\Gamma^{s}_{sph} >> H(T_{c}) T_{c}^{3}$ T=Tc Decouple Equiliburium ⇒ n_B frozen 200 250 50 100 150 300 0 (GeV) **Broken Phase** Symmetric Phase Quick sphaleron decoupling to retain $\phi = 0$ $\phi = v_c$ sufficient baryon number in Broken Phase

Electroweak Baryogenesis and the *hhh* coupling



Mass of *h* in the MSSM



m_{*h*} < 120-130GeV

If no Higgs found below 140 GeV at the LHC?

- At the LHC, the Higgs search is underway.
- If no Higgs is found below 140 GeV, probably we must discard the MSSM.
 - Q: Shall we abandon the low scale SUSY ?
 - -A: Maybe No.

Next-to-MSSM

Two Higgs doublets H_u , H_d and a singlet S

$$W = \lambda_{HHS} H_u H_d S - \kappa S^3$$

 μ problem may be solved

Mass of the lightest h in the NMSSM

$$m_h^2 \simeq m_Z^2 \cos^2 2\beta + \frac{(\lambda_{HHS}^2 v^2/2) \sin^2 2\beta + \delta m_{\text{loop}}^2}{\uparrow}$$

What is the size of λ_{HHS} ? RGE analysis with a cut-off scale Λ

 $\Lambda: \text{ GUT scale } \rightarrow \lambda \sim 0.75 \quad (m_h^{\sim} \text{ 140 GeV})$

 Λ : TeV scale $\rightarrow \lambda \sim 2.5$ ($m_h \sim 450$ GeV)

Fat Higgs model

Harnik, Kribs, Larson, Murayama

Composite H_1, H_2, N A UV complete theory At low energy, a strong NMSSM $W = \chi(MU, U, \omega^2)$

 $W = \lambda (NH_1H_2 - v_0^2)$

The SM-like Higgs can be heavy

$$\begin{split} m_h^2 &\simeq \lambda^2 v^2 + \mathcal{O}(m_Z^2) \\ M_{H^\pm}^2 &= M_A^2 - \lambda^2 v^2 \\ \hline \lambda \, \text{can be of O(1)} \end{split}$$

m_h > 200 GeV



Variation of SUSY Higgs sectors

- The mass of the lightest Higgs boson *h* is a good tool to discriminate the SM, MSSM, NMSSM.
- The *hhh* coupling can also be important
- How about the other possibility of extended SUSY Higgs sectors?
 - MSSM+χ (χ:triplet) [Type-II Seesaw]
 - 4HDM+ Ω (Ω : charged singlet) [Super Zee-Model]
- See prediction on m_h and λ_{hhh}

(h: Lightest Higgs (SM-like))

F-term contributions to

$$m_h$$
 and the hh $\phi\phi$ coupling
F-term: $V_F = \sum_i \left|\frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi_i}\right|^2$ (ϕ_i : Scalar component of
a chiral superfield)
 $\phi_i \phi_i \phi_j$

ф: Chiral Superfield which generates F-term

$$W \supset \lambda_{H_{i}H_{j}\phi}H_{i}H_{j}\phi, \quad i, j = u, d$$

$$\rightarrow V_{F} = \lambda_{H_{i}H_{j}\phi}^{2}|H_{i}H_{j}|^{2} + \lambda_{H_{i}H_{j}\phi}^{2}|H_{i}\phi|^{2} + \cdots$$
Candiate of ϕ : S, Ω_{\pm} , ξ , χ_{\pm}

$$S, \xi, \chi_{\pm}$$
: Both m_h & $\lambda_{hh\phi\phi}$ large
$$\rightarrow \text{ large } m_{h}$$

$$\Delta \lambda_{hhh}^{\text{Model}}/\lambda_{hhh}^{\text{SM}} \simeq \frac{m_{\phi}^{4}}{12\pi^{2}v^{2}m_{h}^{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \frac{M_{\phi}^{2}}{m_{\phi}^{2}} \end{pmatrix}^{3} \qquad \Omega_{\pm}$$
: Only $\lambda_{hh\phi\phi}$ large
$$\rightarrow \text{ non-decoupling hhh}$$

For doublet-doublet- Ω coupling $H_{u'}\Omega$ + (4 doublets needed, because of $H_u \cdot H_u = 0$) h

2

$m_h - \Delta \lambda_{hhh}$ plot (tan β = 1-50)



SK, Shindou, Yagyu (2010)

We want O(10) % determination of the *hhh* coupling!

HHH measurement at LHC and ILC



Higgs mass [GeV]

[3] Neutrino mass, DM, Baryon asymmetry and EWSB

Phenomena which cannot be explained in SM

- Neutrino Mass
- Dark Matter
- Baryon Asymmetry of Universe

How we can explain these problems?

2 possibilities

- 1) Scenario dependent on very high scales
 - Maybe compatible with canonical GUTs
 - Large mass hierarchy
 - A direct link to the GUT or Planck Scale?
 - Too high to be tested

- 2) Scenario due to the TeV scale physics
 - Renormalizable theory at the TeV scale
 - No large hierarchy among mass scales
 - Strong connection to EWSB
 - Testable at collider experiments

BSM: Neutrino Mass

Neutirno Mass Term (= Effective Dim-5 Operator)

 $L^{eff} = (C_{ij}/M) v^{i} v^{j} \varphi \phi \qquad <\phi > = v = 246 \text{GeV}$

Mechanism for tiny masses: $m_{ij}^{\nu} = (c_{ij}/M) v^2 < 0.1 eV$ <u>Seesaw (tree level)</u> $m_{ii}^{\nu} = y_i y_i v^2/M$ $M = 10^{13-15} GeV$

 $\begin{array}{l} \underline{\text{Quantum Effects}}\\ m^{\nu}{}_{ij} = C_{ij} \left[1/(16\pi^2) \right]^m v^2 / M & \text{loop suppression} \\ \underline{\text{Higher dim operator (dim 5+2N)}}\\ m^{\nu}{}_{ij} = C_{ij} \left[v/M \right]^{2n} v^2 / M & [v/M]^2 \text{ suppression} \\ \end{array}$

Scenario of radiative $\nu\nu\phi\phi$ generation

- Tiny v-Masses come from loop effects
 - Zee (1980)
 - Zee, Babu (1988)
 - Krauss-Nasri-Trodden (2002)
 - Ma (2006),
- Merit
 - Super heavy particles are not necessary

Size of tiny m_v can naturally be deduced from TeV scale by higher order perturbation

Physics at TeV: Testable at collider experiments



Zee; Babu



Radiative Seesaw with Z₂

To forbid the tree neutrino Yukawa coupling, a Z₂ parity is imposed. Lightest Z₂-odd particle is stable (DM)

Ex) 1-loop

- Simplest model
- SM + NR + Inert doublet (H')
- DM candidate [H' or NR]
 - H' case
 - N_R (LFV and Ωh^2 not compatible)

Ex) 3-loop Aoki, SK, Seto PRL 102, 051805 (2009) Neutrino mass from O(1) coupling.

- 2HDM + η^{0} + S⁺ + N_R
- Electroweak Baryogenesis
- DM candidate [η⁰ (or NR)]



D٨

(odd

SM

fields

even)

Φ (even)

(even)

Ma (2006)

N_R

(odd)

Non-decoupling effect

Successful EWBG requires

Non-decoupling property for S⁺ (or A)

SK, Okada, Senaha 2005



Important Test for our EWBG scenario



Favored region under DM data and Triviality

A New Model

TeV-Scale Spontaneous U(1)_{B-L} Breaking: Mother of Mass of DM and Neutrino

S. Kanemura, O. Seto, T. Shimomura arXiv: 1101.XXXX (coming soon!)

Neutrino Mass

Majorana (instead of Dirac)

- Different scale from EWSB
- Large flavor mixing

Majorana = Lepton Number Violation (LNV).

What is the source of LNV?

- Seesaw scenario: $RHv \leftarrow Source of LNV$

If source of LNV comes from spontaneous symmetry breaking, it may be of the $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry (anomaly free)

What is the scale of the B-L breaking?

WIMP Dark Matter

Weakly Interacting Massive Particle (WIMP) – What is the candidate? WMAP $\Omega_h^2=0.1$ – DM Mass = 10-1000 GeV Why is it similar to Scale of the EWSB?

Maybe, the mass can be spontaneously generated at the scale JUST above EWSB, if it is given at the tree level.

Economical Scenario

- Source of LNV = SSB of the U(1)_{B-L} at TeV
- RH neutrino obtains the mass at the EW scale by the U(1)_{B-L} breaking
- The lightest RH neutrino is the WIMP DM
- Stability? \Rightarrow Z₂-odd RHN \Rightarrow No tree Yukawa \Rightarrow Radiative Seesaw
- LH neutrino obtains the Majorana mass via 1-loop of Z₂-odd particles (RHN and extra scalar doublet).

Minimal Model

Symmetry: $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_I \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)_{B-L} \times Z_2$ - (*B-L*) gauge boson Z'

New Matter Particles

- Singlet scalar (*B-L* Higgs)
- Z₂ odd RH neutrinos
- Z₂ odd iso-doublet

 $N_{R}^{1,2,3}$

n

Higgs potential

$$\begin{split} V(\Phi,\eta,S) &= -\mu_1^2 |\Phi|^2 + \mu_2^2 |\eta|^2 - \mu_S^2 |S|^2 + \lambda_1 |\Phi|^4 \\ + \lambda_2 |\eta|^4 + \lambda_3 |\Phi|^2 |\eta|^2 + \lambda_4 |\Phi^{\dagger}\eta|^2 + \frac{\lambda_5}{2} \left[(\Phi^{\dagger}\eta)^2 + \text{h.c.} \right] \\ + \lambda_S |S|^4 + \tilde{\lambda} |\Phi|^2 |S|^2 + \lambda |\eta|^2 |S|^2, \end{split}$$

Spontaneous Breaking of $U(1)_{B-L}$ and EWSB

3 mass parameters $\mu_1^2, \mu_2^2, \mu_3^3 \Rightarrow v, v_s, \mu_3^2$

$$\Phi, S \quad \tan \beta = \frac{v_S}{v} \qquad \begin{pmatrix} h \\ H \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \alpha & -\sin \alpha \\ \sin \alpha & \cos \alpha \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \phi \\ \phi_S \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\eta \quad \eta = \begin{pmatrix} H'^+ \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(H' + iA') \end{pmatrix}$$

Physical States : h, H, H', A', H'+

$$U(1)_{B-L} \Rightarrow \text{Mass of } N_R^{i}$$

B-L gauge boson Z'

$$m_{Z'} = 2g_{B-L} v_s$$

LEP bounds

 $m_{Z'}/g_{B-L} = 2 v_s > 6-7 \text{ TeV} \implies v_s > 3-3.5 \text{ TeV}$ $\mathcal{L}_{\text{yukawa}} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{3} g_{i\alpha} \overline{L}^i \tilde{\eta} N_R^{\alpha} - \frac{y_R^{\alpha}}{2} \overline{N}_R^{\alpha} S N_R^{\alpha} + \text{h.c.} \right)$

$$m_{N_R^{\alpha}} = -y_R^{\alpha} \frac{v_S}{\sqrt{2}} \qquad y_R = 0.02 \text{ for } M_{NR} = 50 \text{ GeV} \\ v_S = 3000 \text{ GeV}$$

 $N_R: Z_2$ -odd \Rightarrow Lightest N_R is the DM candidate

$U(1)_{B-L} \Rightarrow$ Mass of Neutrinos

- $U(1)_{B-L}$: Source of LNV V_s
- Z_2 : No Yukawa Coupling L O N but $L \eta N$
- Radiative generation from Dim-6 operator LLφφS

$$M_{\nu_L}^{ij} \simeq \frac{\lambda_5}{8\pi^2} \left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^3 g_{i\alpha} y_R^{\alpha} g_{\alpha j}^T \right) \left(\frac{v}{m_{\phi'}} \right)^2 v_S$$

The correct neutrino mass O(0.1) eV can be deduced

- m_{NR1}=50 GeV M_H = O(1) TeV
- All coupling constants O(10⁻²)

Mass structure is the same as the usual seesaw scenario.





Safe from bounds from Lepton Flavor Violation

Thermal relic abundance of N_R^{-1}

Similarity to the Ma model t-channel Strong bound from LFV

Annihilation not enough due to TeV scale inert H' and small coupling g_{1f} [Extension: ex) Suematsu, Toma]

New contribution in our model s-channel (Higgs portal) Enough annihilation

Mixing between S and ϕ is essentially important



Thermal relic abundance of N_R^{-1}



Successful Scenario Mass Spectrum

 \uparrow

Inputs	Vs =3-4 TeV		
Neutrino mass	V =246 GeV		
LFV	MH'= O(1) TeV	1TeV	- $($ $) ($ $) ($ $) ($
DM abundance			
LEP precision tests	Mh=100 GeV		
Z' search results	MH=140GeV		
	$Sin\alpha = 1/Sqrt[2]$		\smile
Perturbative Unitairty	Tanβ=12-15		
Vacuum Stability	MNR=45 GeV		N 2,3
	mZ'= 600-700 GeV		(H)
	g=y=λ5=O(0.01)	100GeV	_(h)\/

-10(0.01)mH'=mA'=mH'+=O(1) TeV

 N_R^1

h

Predictions

- 2 light-neutral Higgs bosons with large mixing
 - LEP and Tevatron bounds OK
 - Type-I like 2HDM (2 bosons with SM-like decay)
- Invisible decays of Higgs bosons
- Invisible decays of Z' (unique!) $Z' \rightarrow N_R^{-1}N_R^{-1}$
- Lepton Flavor Violation
- Inert scalar physics H' A' H⁺', H⁻'
- Production of $N_R^{~2,3}$ and decay $N_R^{~2,3} \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^- ~N_R^{-1}$

 $\mu \rightarrow e \gamma$

Prediction 1: Multi Higgs [h and H]

Large Mixing $[\alpha = \pi/4]$ [$\leftarrow \Omega h^2 = 0.1$] All the *ffh, ffH* coupling constants are 1/Sqrt[2] of the SM *ff* φ_{SM} values.

 $\Rightarrow \Gamma(h,H \rightarrow ff) \sim (1/2) \Gamma(\varphi_{SM} \rightarrow ff) \\ \Gamma(h,H \rightarrow VV) \sim (1/2) \Gamma(\varphi_{SM} \rightarrow VV) \\ \sigma(pp \rightarrow h,H) \sim (1/2) \sigma(pp \rightarrow \varphi_{SM})$

But , $B(h \rightarrow X) \sim B(H \rightarrow X) \sim B(\varphi_{SM} \rightarrow X)$

Two SM-like light Higgs bosons with about a half width

Similar to Type I 2HDM, but no charged Higgs states H⁺, H⁻.

Easily testable at the LHC and the ILC

Prediction 2: Invisible Higgs decays

Higgs decays into NN via the same coupling as the DM annihilation



ILC can test the Higgs invisible decay at the 1 %level



Higgs portal dark matter

N_R¹ (DM) couples to SM particles mainly via Higgs boson (h and H)

(Multi-)Higgs portal DM!

Aoki, SK, Seto (2010)

Experiments Direct Search (CDMS, XENON, ...) Invisible Decay (LHC, ILC)

Testable at ILC and the future direct detection experiments



Prediction 3: Z' Physics

Z' Mass: 500GeV – a few TeV

 $\Gamma(Z' \rightarrow XX) \propto (Charge)^2$

Decay rates determined by B-L charges

Invisible decay = 22.5 % $Z' \rightarrow v_L v_L$ $Z' \rightarrow N_R^{2,3} N_R^{2,3} \rightarrow v_L v_L N_R^{1} N_R^{1}$ $Z' \rightarrow N_R^{1} N_R^{1}$

Production Cross Section of Z' For $v_s = 3.5$ TeV and m_z '=700GeV, we have $g_{B-L}=0.1$, then

 $\sigma(pp \rightarrow Z') = O(1) pb$



Model can be tested by measuring (invisible) decays of the Z' boson



[4] Summary

- Higgs sector is unknown
 - Higgs searches at the LHC and the Tevatron
 - Higgs ID is important not only to confirm the SM, but also to obtain information for new physics.
- Various extended Higgs models have been discussed
 - Mixing, Non-decoupling effects
 - Mass and the hhh coupling in SUSY/non-SUSY models
- TeV-scale models for BSM phenomena (neutrino mass, dark matter, baryogenesis) have also been discussed
 - Extended Higgs sectors
 - Neutrino mass via radiative seesaw with Z₂
 - WIMP DM

Summary (cont.)

Model with 3-loop neutrino mass generation

- M $_{v}$ (3-loop)
- DM (Z₂-odd real scalar boson)
- BAU (Electroweak Baryogenesis)
- Model with TeV scale U(1)_{B-L} breaking
 - Neutrino Mass (1-loop)
 - DM (Z₂-odd RH-neutrino)
 - [BAU (TeV Leptogenesis? EWBG?)]
 - B-L Breaking: Mother of Masses of DM and Neutirno

SK, Seto, Shimomura, in preparation

Aoki, SK, Seto PRL 102, 051805 (2009)

These models can be tested at collider experiments via Higgs phenomenology, LFV and direct/indirect search of DM