# $(g-2)_{\mu}$ and physics beyond the SM

#### Dominik Stöckinger

Glasgow, Dresden

PHIPSI08, April 2008

Dominik Stöckinger

 $\langle \square 
angle \, \langle \square 
angle \, \rangle \, \langle \square 
angle \, \rangle \, \langle \square 
angle \, \rangle$   $(g-2)_{\mu}$  and physics beyond the SM

### A $3\sigma$ deviation for $a_{\mu}^{\exp} - a_{\mu}^{SM}$ has been established!

- Which types of physics beyond the SM could explain this?
- What is the impact of a<sub>µ</sub> on physics beyond the SM?

- Different types of new physics the Czarnecki/Marciano bound
- SUSY could explain the deviation
- 3 Examples for impact of  $a_{\mu}$  on new physics





< 同 > < 三 > < 三

#### Outline

## Different types of new physics — the Czarnecki/Marciano bound

2 SUSY could explain the deviation

3 Examples for impact of  $a_{\mu}$  on new physics

### Conclusions

# Relation $a_{\mu}-m_{\mu}$

		In loops: new heavy particles, coupling to muons $\Rightarrow$
$m_{\mu}$ _		$\delta m_{\mu} \sim rac{c^2}{16\pi^2}~M$
$a_{\mu}$ _		$\delta oldsymbol{a}_{\mu} \sim rac{c^2}{16\pi^2} rac{m_{\mu}}{M}$
	generally:	$\frac{\delta m_{\mu}(\text{N.P.})}{m_{\mu}} = \boldsymbol{C} \iff \delta \boldsymbol{a}_{\mu}(\text{N.P.}) = \mathcal{O}(\boldsymbol{C}) \left(\frac{m_{\mu}}{M}\right)^{2}$

2

# Relation $a_{\mu}$ – $m_{\mu}$



Therefore, assuming  $|\delta m_{\mu}/m_{\mu}| < 1$ :

$$\delta a_{\mu} = C \left(rac{m_{\mu}}{M}
ight)^2, \qquad |C| < \mathcal{O}(1) \qquad [Czarnecki, Marciano'01]$$

э

N

generally: 
$$\frac{\delta m_{\mu}(\text{N.P.})}{m_{\mu}} = C \Leftrightarrow \delta a_{\mu}(\text{N.P.}) = \mathcal{O}(C) \left(\frac{m_{\mu}}{M}\right)^2$$

Allows classification of types of new physics:

$$C = O(\frac{\alpha}{4\pi}),$$
 Z', W', extra dim., ...

$C = \mathcal{O}(1),$	radiative muon mass generation
	technicolor, [Czarnecki,Marciano '01]

$$C = O(\tan \beta \frac{\alpha}{4\pi}),$$
 supersymmetry

generally: 
$$\frac{\delta m_{\mu}(\text{N.P.})}{m_{\mu}} = C \Leftrightarrow \delta a_{\mu}(\text{N.P.}) = \mathcal{O}(C) \left(\frac{m_{\mu}}{M}\right)^2$$

Allows classification of types of new physics:

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{C} &= \mathcal{O}(\frac{\alpha}{4\pi}), & Z', \ W', \ \text{extra dim., } \dots \\ \text{contributions very small!} \quad \delta a_{\mu} \sim 28 \times 10^{-10} \ \text{for M} < 100 \text{GeV} \\ \mathcal{C} &= \mathcal{O}(1), & \text{radiative muon mass generation} \\ \text{technicolor, } \dots \ _{\text{[Czarnecki,Marciano '01]}} \end{split}$$

$$C = \mathcal{O}(\tan \beta \frac{\alpha}{4\pi}),$$
 supersymmetry

generally: 
$$\frac{\delta m_{\mu}(\text{N.P.})}{m_{\mu}} = C \Leftrightarrow \delta a_{\mu}(\text{N.P.}) = \mathcal{O}(C) \left(\frac{m_{\mu}}{M}\right)^2$$

Allows classification of types of new physics:

$$C = \mathcal{O}(\frac{\alpha}{4\pi}),$$
 Z', W', extra dim., ...

 $C = \mathcal{O}(1),$ 

radiative muon mass generation

contributions large!  $\mathbf{C} = \mathcal{O}(\tan\beta\frac{\alpha}{4\pi}),$ 

technicolor, ... [Czarnecki, Marciano '01]

 $\delta a_{\mu} \sim 28 \times 10^{-10}$  for M>1TeV

0

generally: 
$$\frac{\delta m_{\mu}(\text{N.P.})}{m_{\mu}} = C \Leftrightarrow \delta a_{\mu}(\text{N.P.}) = \mathcal{O}(C) \left(\frac{m_{\mu}}{M}\right)^2$$

Allows classification of types of new physics:

$$C = O(\frac{\alpha}{4\pi}), \qquad Z', W', \text{ extra dim., } \dots$$

C = O(1), radiative muon mass generation technicolor, ... [Czarnecki,Marciano '01]

 $C = O(\tan \beta \frac{\alpha}{4\pi}),$  supersymmetry fits well!  $\delta a_{\mu} \sim 28 \times 10^{-10}$  for M~300GeV,  $\tan \beta \sim 10$ 



- Different types of new physics can lead to very different contributions to a<sub>µ</sub>
- *a*<sub>µ</sub> is highly useful to discriminate between these different types of new physics

< 同 > < 三 > < 三

### Outline

#### Different types of new physics — the Czarnecki/Marciano bound

#### SUSY could explain the deviation

3) Examples for impact of  $a_{\mu}$  on new physics

### Conclusions

# $a_{\mu}$ and SUSY

SUSY is a particularly promising scenario: can nicely explain  $a_{\mu}$  and is motivated in many other ways

Where does the tan  $\beta$ -enhancement come from? SUSY requires two Higgs doublets  $H_{1,2}$ :

$$\tan \beta = \frac{\langle H_2 \rangle}{\langle H_1 \rangle}, \qquad \mu = H_2 - H_1 \text{ transition}$$

•  $\lambda_{\mu} \rightarrow \lambda_{\mu}^{\rm SM} \tan \beta$ 

• in  $a_{\mu}$  this enhancement requires  $H_2 - H_1$  transition

 $\Rightarrow$  leading contributions  $a_{\mu}^{\text{SUSY}} \propto \frac{\alpha}{4\pi} \tan \beta \operatorname{sign}(\mu) \frac{m_{\mu}^2}{M_{\text{SUSY}}^2}$ 

## SUSY prediction

1-loop and most 2-loop contributions known

• remaining theory uncertainty  $\delta a_{\mu}^{SUSY} \approx 3 \times 10^{-10}$  [DS '06] Approximate result:

$$a_{\mu}^{\rm SUSY} \approx 12 \times 10^{-10} \tan \beta \, {
m sign}(\mu) \left(rac{100 {
m GeV}}{M_{
m SUSY}}
ight)^2$$

e.g.  $a_{\mu}^{\rm SUSY} = 24 \times 10^{-10}$  for

$$\begin{array}{ll} \tan\beta=2, & M_{\rm SUSY}=100~{\rm GeV}\\ \tan\beta=50, & M_{\rm SUSY}=500~{\rm GeV} \end{array} (\mu>0) \end{array}$$

 $\Rightarrow$  SUSY could easily be the origin of the observed deviation!

Dominik Stöckinger

### Numerical results



In the following: three examples for impact of  $a_{\mu}$  on new physics

### Outline

### Different types of new physics — the Czarnecki/Marciano bound

2 SUSY could explain the deviation



### Conclusions

## "Superconservative approach"



"superconservative": general MSSM, require  $a_{\mu}^{\text{SUSY}}$  within  $5\sigma$  band  $\Rightarrow$  region under the curves is excluded by  $a_{\mu}$  and nothing else

 $a_{\mu}$  provides indispensable information that cannot be obtained from other observables!

Dominik Stöckinger

# **Constrained MSSM scans**

Constrained MSSM (only 4 parameters) (gravity-mediated susy-breaking)

Experimentally constrained by  $a_{\mu}$ ,  $b \rightarrow s\gamma$ , dark matter, EWPO, ...



[Ellis, Olive, Sandick '06]

Comprehensive CMSSM scan [Roszkowski et al] (similar scans by [Allanach et al, Ellis et al]):

 $\Rightarrow$  not easy to accomodate all current observations in CMSSM  $\Rightarrow$  more precise determinations could seriously challenge CMSSM!

 $a_{\mu}$  plus other observables have the potential to rule out CMSSM even before LHC-data!

Dominik Stöckinger

## Yukawa Unification

Yukawa Unification [G.G. Ross, M. Serna '07]

requires particular running of  $m_b \leftrightarrow \delta m_\mu \leftrightarrow a_\mu$ 

in model considered by Ross, Serna:

$$rac{\mu M_3}{m_{\widetilde{b}}^2} \sim -0.5, \hspace{1em}$$
 while  $a_\mu$  requires  $\mu M_2 > 0$ 

 $\Rightarrow$   $M_3 < 0, M_{1,2} > 0? \Rightarrow$  anomaly-mediated SUSY breaking?

 $a_{\mu}$  can provide hints even on ultra-high energy physics, such as Grand Unification and the mechanism of susy-breaking/mediation

### Outline

- Different types of new physics the Czarnecki/Marciano bound
- 2 SUSY could explain the deviation
- 3 Examples for impact of  $a_{\mu}$  on new physics



### Conclusions

- *a<sub>µ</sub>* provides one of the strongest indications for new physics at/below the TeV-scale
- $a_{\mu}$  useful to discriminate between different types of new physics
  - susy with tan  $\beta$  > 10, sign( $\mu$ )=+,  $M_{susy} \sim 200...600$ GeV fits very well
  - strong constraints on susy and other types of new physics
- $a_{\mu}$  is independent from and complementary to collider data
- More precise determination very important and promising!