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Dedicated experiments to measure EDMs at CERN?

- Nuclear EDMs (apart from neutrons) are screened inside the atoms (Schiff theorem) resulting in a huge penalty in sensitivity. Mercury EDM at $10^{-29}$ cm results in $\sim 10^{-26}$ or $25$ cm bound on $d_{p,n}$. Not so for charged particles in the [future dedicated] storage rings.

- Opportunity for CERN to pursue the EDM projects (proton, deuteron, and in the future possibly more complicated nuclei).

- Muon EDMs are poorly constrained [we know constraints on WIMP EDMs better than muon EDMs!]. Room for improvement. *Also new ideas of probing EDMs of charm and beauty containing baryons with channeling in bent crystals.*
Why bother with EDMs?

Is the accuracy sufficient to probe TeV scale and beyond?

Typical energy resolution in modern EDM experiments

\[ \Delta \text{Energy} \sim 10^{-6} \text{Hz} \sim 10^{-21} \text{eV} \]

translates to limits on EDMs

\[ |d| < \frac{\Delta \text{Energy}}{\text{Electric field}} \sim 10^{-25} \text{e} \times \text{cm} \]

Comparing with theoretically inferred scaling,

\[ d \sim 10^{-2} \times \frac{1 \text{ MeV}}{\Lambda_{CP}^2}, \]

we get sensitivity to

\[ \Lambda_{CP} \sim 1 \text{ TeV} \]

Comparable with the LHC reach! EDMs are one of the very few low-energy measurements sensitive to the fundamental particle physics.
Purcell and Ramsey (1949) ("How do we know that strong interactions conserve parity?" \( \rightarrow |d_n| < 3 \times 10^{-18} \text{ecm.} \))

\[
H = -\mu \mathbf{B} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{S}}{S} - d \mathbf{E} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{S}}{S}
\]

\( d \neq 0 \) means that both P and T are broken. If CPT holds then CP is broken as well.

CPT is based on locality, Lorentz invariance and spin-statistics = very safe assumption.

*search for EDM = search for CP violation, if CPT holds*

Relativistic generalization

\[
H_{T,P-\text{odd}} = -d \mathbf{E} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{S}}{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\text{CP-odd}} = -d \frac{i}{2} \overline{\psi} \sigma^{\mu\nu} \gamma_5 \psi F_{\mu\nu},
\]

corresponds to dimension five effective operator and naively suggests \( 1/M_{\text{new physics}} \) scaling. Due to \( SU(2) \times U(1) \) invariance, however, it scales as \( m_f/M^2 \).
If dark matter particles have EDM...

it also must be small. They will contribute to the elastic scattering on normal nuclei \((\text{Pospelov, ter Veldhuis, 2000})\),

\[
\sigma = 8\pi Z^2 \left( \frac{d}{e} \right)^2 \left( \frac{\alpha}{v} \right)^2 \frac{S + 1}{3S} \ln \frac{q_{\text{min}}}{q_{\text{max}}}.
\]

Recent constraints from Xenon 100 experiments would limit an EDM of a hypothetical 100 GeV WIMP to better than \(10^{-23}\) e cm.
Current Experimental Limits

”paramagnetic EDM”, Berkeley experiment

\[ |d_{\text{Tl}}| < 9 \times 10^{-25} \text{e cm} \]

”diamagnetic EDM”, U of Washington experiment

\[ |d_{\text{Hg}}| < 2 \times 10^{-28} \text{e cm} \]

factor of 7 improvement in 2009!

\[ |d_{\text{Hg}}| < 3 \times 10^{-29} \text{e cm} \]

And another factor of 4 in 2016

\[ 7.4 \times 10^{-30} \]

neutron EDM, ILL experiment

\[ |d_{n}| < 3 \times 10^{-26} \text{e cm} \]

Notice that Thallium EDM is usually quoted as \( d_{e} < 1.6 \times 10^{-27} \text{ cm} \) Bound. It was modestly improved by YbF results.

2013 ThO result by Harvard-Yale collaboration: \( |d_{e}| < 8.7 \times 10^{-29} \)

”Confirmed” using different techniques at JILA, \( |d_{e}| < 1.3 \times 10^{-28} \)
CKM model

\[ \mathcal{L}_{cc} = \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} (\bar{U}_L W^+ V D_L + (\text{H.c.})) . \]

CP violation is closely related to flavour changing interactions.

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
  d^I \\
  s^I \\
  b^I 
\end{pmatrix} = 
\begin{pmatrix}
  V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\
  V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\
  V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb}
\end{pmatrix} 
\begin{pmatrix}
  d \\
  s \\
  b
\end{pmatrix} \equiv V_{\text{CKM}} 
\begin{pmatrix}
  d \\
  s \\
  b
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

CKM model of \( CP \) violation is independently checked using neutral \( K \) and \( B \) systems. No other sources of \( CP \) are needed to describe observables!

\( CP \) violation disappear if any pair of the same charge quarks is degenerate or some mixing angles vanish.

\[
J_{CP} = \text{Im}(V_{tb}V_{td}^*V_{cd}V_{cb}^*) \times 
(y_t^2 - y_c^2)(y_t^2 - y_u^2)(y_c^2 - y_u^2)(y_b^2 - y_s^2)(y_b^2 - y_d^2)(y_s^2 - y_d^2) < 10^{-15}
\]
EDMs from CKM

CKM phase generates tiny EDMs:

\[ d_d \sim \text{Im}(V_{tb}V_{td}^*V_{cd}V_{cb}^*)\alpha_s m_d G_F^2 m_c^2 \times \text{loop suppression} \]

\[ < 10^{-33}\text{ecm} \]

EDMs do not have \( \delta_{\text{KM}} \)-induced background. On a flip-side, \( \delta_{\text{CKM}} \) cannot source baryogenesis.

1. Extra amount of CP violation in many models beyond SM
2. Some (but not all!) theories of baryogenesis
3. Mostly scalar-fermion interactions in the theory
4. EDMs are one of the very few low-energy probes that are sensitive to energy scale of new physics beyond 1 TeV

Maxim Pospelov, GGI workshop, Florence 03/23/2010

Direct quark EDMs identically vanish at 1 and 2 loop levels (Shabalin, 1981). 3-loop EDMs are calculated by Khriplovich.

d_e first appears at 4 loops (Khriplovich, MP, 1991)
**Long(er) distance contribution dominate**

- Combination of $\Delta S = +1$ and $\Delta S = -1$ (and $\Delta$ charm $= \pm 1$) gives a larger estimate to $d_n$ than just $d_q$. Can be as large as $10^{-31}$ e cm (Khriplovich, Zhitnitskiy; Gavela et al). Charm contribution was recently looked at by Mannel, Uraltsev.
- EDMs of diamagnetic atomic species (closed e shells, nuclear spin) are generated by the CKM contribution to the nuclear Schiff moment. (Novosibirsk group; Donoghue, Holstein, Musolf)
- Direct contribution of $d_e$(CKM) to $d_{\text{Atom}}$ is negligible compared to the semi-leptonic contribution (nuclear CP-odd polarizability), $d_e^{\text{equiv}} \sim 10^{-44}$ cm. (MP, Ritz, 2013)

**Bottom line:** EDMs(CKM) are $\sim$ 5 orders and more below current limits
At what values do we need to be worried about CKM-induced EDMs?

Consider an outrageous overestimate for $d_n$ that puts loop factors like $\alpha_s/4\pi$ to 1, and chooses constituent rather current quark mass scale $d_n \sim \text{Im}(VVVV) \, G_F^2 m_c^2 \times 100 \, \text{MeV} < 10^{-29} \, \text{cm}$.

- Nonzero neutron EDM above $10^{-29} \, \text{cm}$ is guaranteed to be NP
- Nonzero n EDM in $-29$ to $-31$ range is either NP or SM. (Once we cross $10^{-29} \, \text{cm}$, we may need better $d_n(\text{CKM})$ calculations)
- Nonzero n EDM at $-31$ and below will be consistent with the SM, given current uncertainties.
CP violation from the Theta term

- If CKM gave too small an EDM, there is a much bigger source of CP violation in the flavor conserving channel - theta term

Energy of QCD vacuum depends on $\theta$-angle:

$$E(\bar{\theta}) = -\frac{1}{2}\bar{\theta}^2 m_\ast \langle \overline{q}q \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\bar{\theta}^4, m_\ast^2)$$

where $\langle \overline{q}q \rangle$ is the quark vacuum condensate and $m_\ast$ is the reduced quark mass, $m_\ast = \frac{m_u m_d}{m_u + m_d}$. In CP-odd channel,

$$d_n \sim e \frac{\bar{\theta} m_\ast}{\Lambda_{\text{had}}^2} \sim \bar{\theta} \cdot (6 \times 10^{-17}) \text{ e cm}$$

**Strong CP problem** = naturalness problem = Why $|\bar{\theta}| < 10^{-9}$ when it could have been $\bar{\theta} \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$? $\bar{\theta}$ can keep ”memory” of CP violation at Planck scale and beyond. Suggested solutions

Axions or clever symmetry for keeping theta=0; $m_u=0$...
Effective CP-odd Lagrangian at 1 GeV

in the spirit of Wolfenstein’s superweak interaction, Khriplovich et al., Weinberg,... Applying EFT, one can classify all CP-odd operators of dimension 4,5,6,... at $\mu = 1$ GeV.

$$\mathcal{L}_{1\text{GeV}}^{\text{eff}} = \frac{g_s^2}{32\pi^2} \theta_{QCD} G_{\mu\nu}^a \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^a$$

$$- \frac{i}{2} \sum_{i=e,u,d,s} d_i \bar{\psi}_i (F^{\sigma}) \gamma_5 \psi_i - \frac{i}{2} \sum_{i=u,d,s} \tilde{d}_i \bar{\psi}_i g_s (G^{\sigma}) \gamma_5 \psi_i$$

$$+ \frac{1}{3} w f^{abc} G_{\mu\nu} G_{\nu\beta}^b G_{\beta\mu}^c + \sum_{i,j=e,d,s,b} C_{ij} (\bar{\psi}_i \psi_i) (\bar{\psi}_j \gamma_5 \psi_j) + \cdots$$

If the model of new physics is specified, for example, a specific parameter space point in the SUSY model, Wilson coefficients $d_i, \tilde{d}_i$, etc. can be calculated.

To get beyond simple estimates, one needs $d_n, \text{atom}$ as functions of $\theta, d_i, \tilde{d}_i, w, C_{ij}$, which requires non-perturbative calculations, which I review in the next few transparencies.
Hadronic scale, 1 GeV, is the normalization point where perturbative calculations stop.

Our old slide from the pre-LHC time…
Synopsis of EDM formulae

Thallium EDM:
The Schiff (EDM screening) theorem is violated by relativistic (magnetic) effects. Atomic physics to $10 - 20\%$ accuracy gives

$$d_{Tl} = -585 d_e - e \ 43 \text{ GeVC}_S^{(0)}$$

where $C_S$ is the coefficient in front of $\bar{N}N i\vec{e}\gamma_5 e$. Parametric growth of atomic EDM is $d_e \propto \alpha^2 Z^3 \log Z$. Typically one need several species to limit both $d_e$ and $C_S$

neutron EDM:

$\sim 50-100\%$ level accuracy QCD sum rule evaluation of $d_n$ is available. Ioffe-like approach gives

$$d_n = -\frac{e m_* \bar{\theta}}{2\pi^2 f^2_\pi}; \ d_n = \frac{4}{3} d_d - \frac{1}{3} d_u - e \left( \frac{m_n}{2\pi f_\pi} \right)^2 \left( \frac{2}{3} \tilde{d}_d + \frac{1}{3} \tilde{d}_u \right)$$

(Reproduces naive quark model and comes close to chiral-log estimates) Also uses Vainshtein’s estimate for e.m. polarizability of qcd

Mercury EDM: Screening theorem is avoided by the finite size of the nucleus

$$d_{Hg} = d_{Hg} \left( S(\bar{g}_{\pi NN}[\tilde{d}_i, C_{q_1q_2}], C_S[C_{q_e}], C_P[C_{eq}], d_e) \right).$$

For most models $\bar{g}_{\pi NN}$ is the most important source. The result is dominated by $d_u - \tilde{d}_d$ but the uncertainty is large:

$$d_{Hg} = 7 \times 10^{-3} e \ (\tilde{d}_u - \tilde{d}_d) + ...$$
Synopsis of EDM formulae

Thallium EDM:
The Schiff (EDM screening) theorem is violated by relativistic (magnetic) effects. Atomic physics to 10 – 20% accuracy gives

\[ d_{\text{Tl}} = -585d_e - e\ 43 \ \text{GeV}C_S^{(0)} \]

where \( C_S \) is the coefficient in front of \( \bar{N}Ni\bar{e}\gamma_5e \). Parametric growth of atomic EDM is \( d_e \times \alpha^2 Z^3 \log Z \).

neutron EDM:
\~50-100% level accuracy QCD sum rule evaluation of \( d_n \) is available. Ioffe-like approach gives

\[ d_n = -\frac{em_u\tilde{\theta}}{2\pi^2 f_\pi^2}; \quad d_n = \frac{4}{3}d_d - \frac{1}{3}d_u - e \left( \frac{m_n}{2\pi f_\pi} \right)^2 \left( \frac{2}{3}\tilde{d}_d + \frac{1}{3}\tilde{d}_u \right) \]

(Reproduces naive quark model and comes close to chiral-log estimates)

Mercury EDM: Screening theorem is avoided by the finite size of the nucleus?, see Ban et al, 2010

\[ d_{\text{Hg}} = d_{\text{Hg}} \left( S(\bar{g}_{\pi NN}[\tilde{d}_i, C_{q1q2}], C_S[C_{qe}], C_P[C_{eq}], d_e) \right) \]

For most models \( \bar{g}_{\pi NN} \) is the most important source. The result is dominated by \( d_u - \tilde{d}_d \) but the uncertainty is large:

\[ \Rightarrow \quad d_{\text{Hg}} = 7 \times 10^{-3} e (\tilde{d}_u - \tilde{d}_d) + \ldots \]
Further comments:

1. The results for $d_n(W.C.)$ could be improved using e.g. lattice calculations. Significant efforts have been invested, not only in the tensor charge ($d_q$ contributions), but in the $d_n(\theta)$, $d_n$(CEDM). Not all matrix elements are calculated yet.

2. The result for higher-dimensional operators depends on whether you have a PQ symmetry, because of the additional adjustment of axion vacuum, $\theta_{\text{ind}} \sim < O_{CP}, G*G_{\text{dual}} >$. The effect is most pronounced for EDM of light quarks.

3. Estimates of $d_n(d_s)$, $d_n$(CEDM$_s$) could use some improvement. (e.g. lattice results for $\bar{s}s$ matrix element came to be much smaller than originally thought…)

4. A better quality [indirect] limit on $d_{\text{charm}}$ could be derived.

5. Most important theoretical issue: Schiff moment of $^{199}$Hg induced by $\bar{g}_{pnn}$ needs to be revisited by independent groups.
Anatomy of SUSY EDMs

All one-loop and most important (\(\tan \beta\)-enhanced) two-loop diagrams have been computed.

\[
\frac{d_e}{e\kappa_e} = \frac{g_1^2}{12} \sin \theta_A + \left(\frac{5g_2^2}{24} + \frac{g_1^2}{24}\right) \sin \theta_\mu \tan \beta,
\]

\[
\frac{d_q}{e_q\kappa_q} = \frac{2g_3^2}{9} \left(\sin \theta_\mu [\tan \beta]^{\pm 1} - \sin \theta_A\right) + O(g_2^2, g_1^2),
\]

\[
\frac{\tilde{d}_q}{\kappa_q} = \frac{5g_3^2}{18} \left(\sin \theta_\mu [\tan \beta]^{\pm 1} - \sin \theta_A\right) + O(g_2^2, g_1^2).
\]

\[
\kappa_i = \frac{m_i}{16\pi^2 M_{\text{SUSY}}^2} = 1.3 \times 10^{-25}\text{cm} \times \frac{m_i}{1\text{MeV}} \left(\frac{1\text{TeV}}{M_{\text{SUSY}}}\right)^2.
\]

\[M_{\text{SUSY}} = 500\text{GeV}, \text{and}\ \tan \beta = 3.\]
Hadronic scale, 1 GeV, is the normalization point where perturbative calculations stop.
EDMs and New Physics

- EDM observable ~
  ~ [some QCD/atomic/nuclear matrix elements] ×

  \[ \text{SM mass scale (} m_e, m_q) \times (\text{CP phase})_{NP}/\Lambda_{NP}^2 \]

With some amount of work all matrix elements can be fixed. For the flavor blind NP, \( d_i \sim m_i \). Unfortunately, we have no idea where actually \( \Lambda_{NP} \) is !!!

100 GeV, 1 TeV, 10 TeV, 100 TeV, 1000 TeV … GUT scale … \( M_P \)

After the LHC did not find the abundance of new states immediately above EW scale, “guessing EDMs” became even more difficult. What shall we put in the denominator? E.g. \((\text{TeV})^2\) or \((\text{PeV})^2\)?
EDMs from 100 TeV SUSY

- Measured Higgs mass value, ~126 GeV, may be pointing toward very heavy squark mass scale. The Higgs potential must be “tuned” to a considerable level.

- Such mass scale, 50 TeV-PeV allows [almost] not to worry about SUSY flavor issues [and about producing sfermions at the LHC]. Wells, 2003; …. In the post-Higgs era by Arvanitaki et al., Arkani-Hamed et al, other groups, 2012-2013. “Mini-split” scenario.

- Gaugino could be around EW scale, giving dark matter and allowing many models of SUSY breaking to easily explain such a scenario.

- Such a huge mass scale suppresses all EDMs, of course, but the absence of flavor-diagonal squark mass matrix can lead to a considerable enhancement via \( d_i \sim m_{\text{top}} \), McKeen, MP, Ritz, 2013. See also Altmannshofer et al., 2013.
Naturalness of masses and EDMs

\[ d_u \simeq \frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi} M_3 (\delta_{LL}^u)_{13} (\delta_{LR}^u)_{33} (\delta_{RR}^u)_{31} \times \frac{3}{M_{sc}} \log \left( \frac{M_{sc}^2}{M_3^2} \right) \sin \phi_{\bar{u}_\mu} \]

\[ \sim 3 \frac{\delta m_u}{\Lambda_{SUSY}^2} \log \left( \frac{\Lambda_{SUSY}^2}{M_3^2} \right) \sin \phi_{\bar{u}_\mu} \]

\[ \sim 1 \times 10^{-26} \text{ cm} \left( \frac{3}{\tan \beta} \right) \left( \frac{\theta_u^2}{1/3} \right) \left( \frac{M_3}{1 \text{ TeV}} \right) \left( \frac{100 \text{ TeV}}{\Lambda_{SUSY}} \right)^3 \]

\[ \times \left[ \log \left( \frac{\Lambda_{SUSY}^2}{M_3^2} \right)/10 \right] \left( \frac{\sin \phi_{\bar{u}_\mu}}{0.1} \right) \]

Common squark, Higgsino mass scale is assumed. Quark mass itself is also corrected and we require the tuning in \( m_u \) not be very large,

\[ \delta m_u \sim \frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi} \frac{\theta_u^2}{\Lambda_{SUSY} \tan \beta} \frac{m_t M_3}{\Lambda_{SUSY} \tan \beta} \]

\[ \sim 2 \text{ MeV} \left( \frac{3}{\tan \beta} \right) \left( \frac{\theta_u^2}{1/3} \right) \left( \frac{M_3}{1 \text{ TeV}} \right) \left( \frac{100 \text{ TeV}}{\Lambda_{SUSY}} \right) \]

Saturating naturalness in \( m_u \) allows fixing many free parameter in \( d_u \).

Current bounds on \( d_{Hg} \) limit CEDM of up quark at \( \sim 5 \times 10^{-27} \text{ cm} \).
Naturalness estimates for EDMs

\[ d_u^C = 6 \times 10^{-27}, 6 \times 10^{-28} \text{ cm} \]

\[ d_d^C = 6 \times 10^{-27}, 6 \times 10^{-28} \text{ cm} \]

\[ d_e = 1 \times 10^{-27}, 1 \times 10^{-28} \text{ e cm} \]

\[ m_h \sim 125 \text{ GeV} \]

\[ d_e, d_{\text{Hg}} \text{ probe } \sim 100 \text{ TeV scale in this scenario. So, sub-PeV SUSY is not hopeless for EDMs. But we may never learn that it is SUSY...} \]
MSSM is an effective theory. Even if the soft-breaking sector tuned/constructed to have no CP-violation, higher-dimensional effective operators can generate EDMs. Some of these operators, $QQQL$, $DDUE$, $LH_u LH_u$, have been studied extensively in connection with proton decay, $0
u 2\beta$ decays, and neutrino masses.

Extra dim=5 operators capable of inducing EDMs:

$$\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}_{\text{MSSM}} + \frac{y_h}{\Lambda_h} H_d H_u H_d H_u + \frac{Y_{qe}}{\Lambda_{qe}} (U Q) E L$$

$$\frac{Y_{qq}}{\Lambda_{qq}} (U Q) (D Q) + \frac{\tilde{Y}_{qq}}{\Lambda_{qq}} (U t^A Q)(D t^A Q)$$

Decoupling properties of the observables: $\sim v_{EW}/(m_{soft}\Lambda_{(5)})$. 

**Dim 5 of MSSM $\rightarrow$ Dim 6 of SM**

\[ \mathcal{L}_{CP} = -\frac{\alpha_s \text{Im} Y_{qe}^{1111}}{6\pi \Lambda_{qe} m_{\text{susy}}} [(\bar{u}u)e ig_5 e + (\bar{u}i g_5 u)\bar{e}e] \]

Assumption of $\text{Im} Y \sim O(1)$ gives

\[ \Lambda^{qe} > 3 \times 10^8 \text{ GeV} \quad \text{from Tl EDM} \]
\[ \Lambda^{qe} > 7 \times 1.5 \times 10^8 \text{ GeV} \quad \text{from Hg EDM} \]
\[ \Lambda^{qq} > 7 \times 3 \times 10^7 \text{ GeV} \quad \text{from Hg EDM} \]

\[ \text{(m}_{\text{susy}} = 300 \text{ GeV is used)} \]
# Sensitivity to scales of New Physics

## Standard Model + New Physics at $\Lambda$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomenon</th>
<th>Limit/Reach in GeV</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$p$ decay</td>
<td>$\Lambda_B \gtrsim \text{few } \times 10^{15}$</td>
<td>$p$ lifetime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu$ oscillations</td>
<td>$\Lambda_R \sim 10^{15} - 10^{16}$</td>
<td>$\Delta m^2_{\nu}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F = 2$ meson mixing</td>
<td>$\Lambda_{QF} \gtrsim 10^7 - 10^8$</td>
<td>$\Delta m_{K(B)}$; $\epsilon_K$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMs</td>
<td>$\Lambda_{CP} \gtrsim 10^6$</td>
<td>EDMs of n, Tl, Hg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lepton flavour</td>
<td>$\Lambda_{LF} \gtrsim 10^6$</td>
<td>$\mu \to e$ conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNC</td>
<td>$\Lambda_{Z'} \gtrsim 10^2 - 10^3$</td>
<td>Cs; Moller sc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Weak scale Supersymmetric SM + New Physics at $\Lambda$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomenon</th>
<th>Limit/Reach in GeV</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$p$ decay</td>
<td>$\Lambda_B \gtrsim 10^{24}$</td>
<td>SuperK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu$ oscillations</td>
<td>$\Lambda_R \sim 10^{15} - 10^{16}$</td>
<td>$\Delta m^2_{\nu}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F = 2$ meson mixing</td>
<td>$\Lambda_{QF} \gtrsim 10^7 - 10^8$</td>
<td>$\Delta m_{K(B)}$; $\epsilon_K$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMs</td>
<td>$\Lambda_{CP} \gtrsim 10^8 - 10^9$</td>
<td>EDMs of n, Tl, Hg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lepton flavour</td>
<td>$\Lambda_{LF} \gtrsim 10^8$</td>
<td>$\mu \to e$ conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNC</td>
<td>$\Lambda_{Z'} \gtrsim 10^2 - 10^3$</td>
<td>Cs; Moller sc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Constraining properties of 125 GeV Higgs-like particle with EDMs

- New resonance discovered last year at the LHC may be exactly the SM Higgs or it may be a SM-Higgs-like with some deviations of its couplings from what’s expected in the SM

- EDMs are *less direct* but most sensitive way or testing CP violation for H(125).

- If so, does it have any implications for the EDMs, and vice verse, do EDMs put certain constraints on the couplings and decay channels of this new resonance?
Example of $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}$

$$\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^{\text{SM}} = \frac{m_h^3}{4\pi} \left( \frac{\alpha}{4\pi} \right)^2 \left| \frac{A_{\text{SM}}}{2v} \right|^2 \approx 9.1 \text{ keV},$$

which corresponds to branching of 0.0023. Top contribution to amplitude is positive, and $W$ is negative and large,

$$A_{\text{SM}}(m_h = 125 \text{ GeV}) \approx A_W + A_t \approx -6.5$$

Before the Higgs discovery, one could guess that if anything

$$R_{\gamma\gamma} = \frac{\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}}{\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^{\text{SM}}}$$

will go down because more heavy matter fields like tops is possibly out there.
More on the CP-odd channel for Higgs
(McKeen, MP, Ritz, 2012)

Consider two effective operators from some physics that is integrated out:

\[ \frac{c_h v}{\Lambda^2} h F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + \frac{\tilde{c}_h v}{\tilde{\Lambda}^2} h F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} \]

Then,

\[ R_{\gamma\gamma} = \frac{\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}}{\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^{SM}} \simeq \left| 1 - c_h \frac{v^2}{\Lambda^2} \frac{8\pi}{\alpha A_{SM}} \right|^2 + \left| \tilde{c}_h \frac{v^2}{\tilde{\Lambda}^2} \frac{8\pi}{\alpha A_{SM}} \right|^2 \]

and deviations are \( O(1) \) if \( c/\Lambda \sim 1/5 \text{ TeV} \).

Given that coefficients \( c \) and \( \tilde{c}_\text{tilde} \) are most likely perturbative, \( \sim \alpha \), then \( O(1) \) deviations are only if Lambda is relatively low.

The CP is probed rather well in many channels – is it reasonable to expect large contribution from the CP-odd channel?
Current sensitivity of electron EDM

2012 limit on electron electric dipole moment,

$$|d_e| < 8.7 \times 10^{-29}$$

This is beyond the 2-loop benchmark from EW scale particles:

In comparison, 2-loop EW-induced typical value is

$$d_f^{(2l)} \equiv \frac{|e| \alpha m_f}{16\pi^3 v^2} \implies d_e^{(2l)} \simeq 2.5 \times 10^{-27} \text{ e \cdot cm.}$$
Higgs-gamma loop is too big!

Integrating $h$-gamma, we end up with log-sensitivity to UV scale,

$$d_i = \tilde{c}_h \frac{|e| m_f}{4\pi^2 \tilde{\Lambda}^2} \ln \left( \frac{\Lambda_{UV}^2}{m_h^2} \right)$$

$$= d_f^{(2l)} \times \frac{\tilde{c}_h}{\alpha/(4\pi)} \times \frac{v^2}{\tilde{\Lambda}^2} \ln \left( \frac{\Lambda_{UV}^2}{m_h^2} \right)$$

Cutting the log at the same scale, one ends up with

$$\tilde{\Lambda} \gtrsim 50 \sqrt{\tilde{c}_h} \text{ TeV.}$$

which is a lot larger than $h\rightarrow 2$ gamma rates “wants”. Consequently, once the EDM bound is imposed,

$$\Delta R_{\gamma\gamma}(\tilde{c}_h) \lesssim 1.6 \times 10^{-4}.$$ 

This is very restrictive and one wonders if this would hold outside of the contact operator approximations. The only way to avoid it is to have more states degenerate with the Higgs.
Higgs-top CP violation induces EDMs at two loops

CP violation comes from

\[ \mathcal{L}_{CP} = y_t Q t_R H + \frac{1}{(M')^2} y'_t Q t_R H (H^\dagger H), \]

when \( y \) and \( y' \) have relative complex phase. Only the top operator is important for \( \eta_B \).

The 2-loop contributions to \( d_f \) and \( \tilde{d}_f \) mediated by the top loop.

\[ h \bar{t} i \gamma_5 t \rightarrow h F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \bar{\psi} i (F \sigma) \gamma_5 \psi \]

Considered in Huber et al. 2006; limits scenarios of EW baryogenesis based on extra \( \text{dim}=6 \) terms in the Higgs potential.
Theoretical wish list

1. Schiff moment from pion-nucleon constants

2. Full lattice results for $d_n$(W.C.), including strangeness. Understanding if such lattice results are reliable.

3. Axion-nucleon CP-violating constant ($a_{NN}$ coherent coupling) from CKM - not done properly.

4. More motivated models with some accessible scales (e.g. something other than 100 TeV SUSY, perhaps motivated by EW baryogenesis.)
Conclusions

1. CKM phase gives too small an EDM, and before experimentally we cross $10^{-29}$ cm, we can be sure that we are probing new physics.

2. EDMs generated by theta term is too large – one needs to remove theta from the theory by some adjustment mechanism. Neither $\theta_{\text{QCD}}$ nor $\phi_{\text{CKM}}$ look as viable sources for BAU..

3. Main uncertainty in the EDM business comes not from QCD or nuclear physics, but from us not knowing where New Physics is and how it looks like. But even if it is very heavy – I argue – EDMs are capable of probing scales as high as several 100 TeV. (Example = “minimally unnatural SUSY”)

4. Main obstacle now: experimental sensitivity. But we also need theory improvement, notably with Schiff moment induced by pion-nucleon constants.