

## New supersymmetric contributions to $t \rightarrow cV$

Jorge L. Lopez\*

*Bonner Nuclear Lab, Department of Physics, Rice University, 6100 Main Street, Houston, Texas 77005*

D. V. Nanopoulos†

*Center for Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843-4242  
and Astroparticle Physics Group, Houston Advanced Research Center (HARC), The Mitchell Campus, The Woodlands, Texas 77381*

Raghavan Rangarajan‡

*Astroparticle Physics Group, Houston Advanced Research Center (HARC), The Mitchell Campus, The Woodlands, Texas 77381*

(Received 18 February 1997; revised manuscript received 2 May 1997)

We calculate the electroweaklike one-loop supersymmetric contributions to the rare and flavor-violating decay of the top quark into a charm quark and a gauge boson:  $t \rightarrow cV$ , with  $V = \gamma, Z, g$ . We consider loops of both charginos and downlike squarks (where we identify and correct an error in the literature) and neutralinos and uplike squarks (which have not been calculated before). We also account for left-right and generational squark mixing. Our numerical results indicate that supersymmetric contributions to  $t \rightarrow cV$  can be up to 5 orders of magnitude larger than their standard model counterparts. However, they still fall short of the sensitivity expected at the next-generation top-quark factories. [S0556-2821(97)01517-8]

PACS number(s): 14.65.Ha, 12.15.Lk, 12.38.Bx, 12.60.Jv

### I. INTRODUCTION

The discovery of the top quark by the Collider Detector at Fermilab (CDF) and D0 Collaborations [1] at Fermilab and its subsequent mass determination ( $m_t = 175 \pm 6$  GeV) have initiated a new era in particle spectroscopy. However, unlike the lighter quarks, the top quark is not expected to form any bound states, and therefore its mass and decay branching ratios may be determined more precisely, both theoretically and experimentally. Upcoming (run II, Main Injector) and proposed (run III, TeV33) runs at the Tevatron will yield large numbers of top quarks, as will be the case at the CERN Large Hadron Collider (LHC), turning these machines effectively into “top-quark factories.” Even though higher precision in the determination of  $m_t$  is expected (it is already known to 3%), more valuable information should come from the precise determination of its branching fractions into tree-level and rare (and perhaps even “forbidden”) decay channels.

The purpose of this paper is to study one class of such rare decay modes:  $t \rightarrow cV$ , with  $V = \gamma, Z, g$ . The particular case of  $t \rightarrow cg$  has received some phenomenological attention recently as a means to probe the scale at which such new and unspecified interactions might turn on [2]. Our purpose here is to consider an explicit realization of this coupling within the framework of low-energy supersymmetry. This is different in spirit from the line of work in Ref. [2], as the effective mass scale at which such vertices “turn on” is determined here by the interactions of presumably rather light sparticles.

Within supersymmetry, the  $t \rightarrow cV$  vertex was first contemplated in Ref. [3], where the one-loop QCD-like (loops of gluinos and squarks) and electroweaklike (loops of charginos and downlike squarks) contributions were calculated. The QCD-like supersymmetric corrections were subsequently re-evaluated and generalized in Ref. [4], which pointed out an inconsistency in the corresponding results of Ref. [3]. Here we study the electroweaklike supersymmetric contributions to  $t \rightarrow cV$ . We reconsider the chargino–downlike-squark loops and point out and correct an inconsistency, essentially a lack of gauge invariance because of the apparent omission of a term, in the corresponding results of Ref. [3]. We also consider for the first time the neutralino–uplike-squark loops, and include the effects of left-right and generational squark mixing.

Our numerical results indicate that for typical values of the parameters one gets a large enhancement over standard model predictions of top-quark decays to gauge bosons [5]. For the most optimistic values of the parameters the enhancement can be as large as five orders of magnitude. However, even for the most optimistic values of the parameters, such rare decay channels fall short of the expected sensitivity of the next-generation top-quark factories.

### II. ANALYTICAL RESULTS

In this section we obtain the one-loop electroweaklike supersymmetric effective top-quark–charm-quark–gauge-boson vertex by considering loops involving charginos and neutralinos, including the effects from left-right and generational squark mixing. We then present the decay rates of the top quark to the charm quark and a gauge boson.

The invariant amplitude for top-quark decay to a charm quark and a gauge boson can be written as

\*Electronic address: lopez@physics.rice.edu

†Electronic address: dimitri@phys.tamu.edu

‡Electronic address: raghu@diana.tdl.harc.edu

$$M = M_0 + \delta M, \quad (1)$$

where  $M_0$  is the tree-level amplitude and  $\delta M$  is the first-order supersymmetric correction. As there are no explicit flavor-violating  $tcV$  couplings in the Lagrangian  $M_0=0$ , whereas  $\delta M$  is given by

$$i\delta M = \bar{u}(p_2) V^\mu u(p_1) \epsilon_\mu(k, \lambda), \quad (2)$$

where  $p_1$ ,  $p_2$ , and  $k$  are the momenta of the incoming top quark, outgoing charm quark, and outgoing gauge boson, respectively, and  $\epsilon_\mu(k, \lambda)$  is the polarization vector for the outgoing gauge boson. The vertices  $V^\mu$  may be written as

$$V^\mu(tcZ) = -i\gamma^\mu(P_L F_{Z1} + P_R F'_{Z1}) + k_\nu \sigma^{\mu\nu}(P_R F_{Z2} + P_L F'_{Z2}), \quad (3)$$

$$V^\mu(tc\gamma) = -i\gamma^\mu(P_L F_{\gamma1} + P_R F'_{\gamma1}) + k_\nu \sigma^{\mu\nu}(P_R F_{\gamma2} + P_L F'_{\gamma2}), \quad (4)$$

$$V^\mu(tcg) = -iT^a \gamma^\mu(P_L F_{g1} + P_R F'_{g1}) + T^a k_\nu \sigma^{\mu\nu}(P_R F_{g2} + P_L F'_{g2}), \quad (5)$$

where as usual we have defined  $P_{R,L} = 1/2(1 \pm \gamma_5)$  and  $\sigma^{\mu\nu} = (i/2)[\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu]$ .  $T^a$  are the generators of  $SU(3)_C$ . The




FIG. 1. Feynman diagrams for one-loop electroweaklike supersymmetric contributions to the  $t$ - $c$ - $V$  ( $V = \gamma, Z, g$ ) vertex. Here  $\chi$  represents the chargino or the neutralino and  $\tilde{q}$  represents the down-type or up-type squarks, respectively. The subscripts are explained in the text. The arrows on the squark lines indicate the direction of flow of flavor; the arrows on the gauge bosons indicate the direction of momentum flow. Diagram (b) is absent for  $V = g$ , and for  $V = \gamma$  when  $\chi = \chi^0$ .

form factors  $F_{1,2}$  and  $F'_{1,2}$  encode the loop functions and depend on the various masses in the theory. The Feynman rules used to obtain them are given in Refs. [6,7] and the corresponding Feynman diagrams are shown in Fig. 1. The vertices are derived assuming  $p_1 - p_2 - k = 0$ .

The form factors for the electroweaklike corrections due to loops involving charginos and strange and bottom squarks are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{i1}^c = & \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \sum_{j=1}^2 \sum_{\rho=1}^2 \sum_{l=1}^2 \sum_{\epsilon=1}^2 \sum_{m=1}^2 \{A_c^{j,\rho,l} D_c^{j,\epsilon,m} E_{ic}^{\rho,\epsilon} [m_t^2(c_{12} + c_{23} - c_{11} - c_{21}) - 2c_{24} + m_c^2(c_{23} - c_{12})] \\
& + B_c^{j,\rho,l} C_c^{j,\epsilon,m} E_{ic}^{\rho,\epsilon} m_c m_t (2c_{23} - c_{11} - c_{21}) + A_c^{j,\rho,l} C_c^{j,\epsilon,m} E_{ic}^{\rho,\epsilon} m_t m_{\chi_j^\pm} (c_0 + c_{11}) + B_c^{j,\rho,l} D_c^{j,\epsilon,m} E_{ic}^{\rho,\epsilon} m_c m_{\chi_j^\pm} \\
& \times (c_0 + c_{11})\}^{(-p_1, k, \chi_j^\pm, \tilde{\epsilon}_m, \tilde{\rho}_l)} + \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \sum_{j=1}^2 \sum_{k=1}^2 \sum_{\rho=1}^2 \sum_{l=1}^2 \{B_c^{j,\rho,l} C_c^{k,\rho,l} F_{ic}^{j,k} m_c m_t (c_{21} + c_{22} - 2c_{23}) + A_c^{j,\rho,l} D_c^{k,\rho,l} E_{ic}^{j,k} \\
& \times [m_c^2 c_{22} - m_t^2 (c_{12} + c_{23}) - 2c_{24} + \frac{1}{2}] + B_c^{j,\rho,l} D_c^{k,\rho,l} F_{ic}^{j,k} m_c m_{\chi_k^\pm} (c_{12} - c_{11}) + A_c^{j,\rho,l} C_c^{k,\rho,l} F_{ic}^{j,k} m_t m_{\chi_j^\pm} (c_{12} - c_{11}) \\
& + A_c^{j,\rho,l} D_c^{k,\rho,l} F_{ic}^{j,k} m_{\chi_j^\pm} m_{\chi_k^\pm} c_0\}^{(-p_1, p_2, \chi_k^\pm, \tilde{\rho}_l, \chi_j^\pm)} + \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \frac{1}{m_t^2 - m_c^2} \sum_{j=1}^2 \sum_{\rho=1}^2 \sum_{l=1}^2 \{A_c^{j,\rho,l} D_c^{j,\rho,l} H_{ic} m_t^2 (-B1) \\
& + A_c^{j,\rho,l} C_c^{j,\rho,l} H_{ic} m_t m_{\chi_j^\pm} B0 + B_c^{j,\rho,l} C_c^{j,\rho,l} H_{ic} m_c m_t (-B1) + B_c^{j,\rho,l} D_c^{j,\rho,l} H_{ic} m_c m_{\chi_j^\pm} B0\}^{(-p_1, \chi_j^\pm, \tilde{\rho}_l)} \\
& + \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \frac{1}{m_t^2 - m_c^2} \sum_{j=1}^2 \sum_{\rho=1}^2 \sum_{l=1}^2 \{A_c^{j,\rho,l} D_c^{j,\rho,l} H_{ic} m_c^2 B1 + A_c^{j,\rho,l} C_c^{j,\rho,l} H_{ic} m_t m_{\chi_j^\pm} (-B0) + B_c^{j,\rho,l} C_c^{j,\rho,l} H_{ic} m_c m_t B1 \\
& + B_c^{j,\rho,l} D_c^{j,\rho,l} H_{ic} m_c m_{\chi_j^\pm} (-B0)\}^{(-p_2, \chi_j^\pm, \tilde{\rho}_l)}, \quad (6)
\end{aligned}$$

$$F_{i1}^{c'} = F_{i1}^c(A, B, C, D, E', F, H \rightarrow B, A, D, C, F, E', G), \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{i2}^c = & \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \sum_{j=1}^2 \sum_{\rho=1}^2 \sum_{l=1}^2 \sum_{\epsilon=1}^2 \sum_{m=1}^2 \{A_c^{j,\rho,l} D_c^{j,\epsilon,m} E_{ic}^{\rho,\epsilon} m_t (c_{12} + c_{23} - c_{11} - c_{21}) + A_c^{j,\rho,l} C_c^{j,\epsilon,m} E_{ic}^{\rho,\epsilon} m_{\chi_j^\pm} (c_0 + c_{11}) \\
& + B_c^{j,\rho,l} C_c^{j,\epsilon,m} E_{ic}^{\rho,\epsilon} m_c (c_{23} - c_{12})\}^{(-p_1, k, \chi_j^\pm, \tilde{\epsilon}_m, \tilde{p}_l)} + \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \sum_{j=1}^2 \sum_{k=1}^2 \sum_{\rho=1}^2 \sum_{l=1}^2 \{A_c^{j,\rho,l} D_c^{k,\rho,l} E_{ic}^{\prime j,k} m_t (c_{11} + c_{21} - c_{12} - c_{23}) \\
& + B_c^{j,\rho,l} C_c^{k,\rho,l} F_{ic}^{j,k} m_c (c_{22} - c_{23}) + A_c^{j,\rho,l} C_c^{k,\rho,l} E_{ic}^{\prime j,k} m_{\chi_k^\pm} (-c_{11} - c_0) + A_c^{j,\rho,l} C_c^{k,\rho,l} F_{ic}^{j,k} m_{\chi_j^\pm} c_{12}\}^{(-p_1, p_2, \chi_k^\pm, \tilde{p}_l, \chi_j^\pm)}. \quad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

$$F_{i2}^{\prime c} = F_{i2}^c(A, B, C, D, E', F \rightarrow B, A, D, C, F, E'). \quad (9)$$

In these expressions  $i=Z, \gamma, g$ , the sums over  $j, k=1, 2$  run over the two chargino mass eigenstates,  $\rho, \epsilon=2, 3$  represent strange and bottom squarks (we ignore the mixing with the down squark), and  $l, m=1, 2$  represent a sum over squark mass eigenstates which are obtained from the  $\tilde{q}_{L,R}$  gauge eigenstates via  $\tilde{q}_{\rho 1} = \cos\theta_\rho \tilde{q}_{\rho L} + \sin\theta_\rho \tilde{q}_{\rho R}$  and  $\tilde{q}_{\rho 2} = -\sin\theta_\rho \tilde{q}_{\rho L} + \cos\theta_\rho \tilde{q}_{\rho R}$ . The various  $B$  and  $c$  functions in the above expressions are the well-documented Passarino-Veltman functions [8] (adapted to our metric where  $p_i^2 = m_i^2$ ); the arguments of the  $B$  and  $c$  functions are indicated by the superscripts on the braces in Eqs. (6)–(9). For example, the arguments of the  $c$  functions that appear within the first set of braces of Eq. (6) are  $(-p_1, k, m_{\chi_k^\pm}, m_{\tilde{q}_{\epsilon m}}, m_{\tilde{q}_{\rho l}})$  while the arguments of the  $B$  functions that appear in the third set of braces of Eq. (6) are  $(-p_1, m_{\chi_k^\pm}, m_{\tilde{q}_{\rho l}})$ . (Note that the Passarino-Veltman functions depend only on the square of their arguments.) The Passarino-Veltman functions contain infinities which cancel each other out, as they should since there is no  $t$ - $c$ - $V$  vertex in the Lagrangian. The coefficient functions are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
A_c^{j,\rho,l} = & \frac{g}{2} \left[ -U_{j1} (K\Gamma_2^\dagger)_{2\rho} \begin{Bmatrix} \cos\theta_\rho & (l=1) \\ -\sin\theta_\rho & (l=2) \end{Bmatrix} \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}m_W \cos\beta} U_{j2} (KM_d B_2^\dagger)_{2\rho} \begin{Bmatrix} \sin\theta_\rho & (l=1) \\ \cos\theta_\rho & (l=2) \end{Bmatrix} \right], \quad (10)
\end{aligned}$$

$$B_c^{j,\rho,l} = \frac{g}{2} \left[ \frac{m_c}{\sqrt{2}m_W \sin\beta} V_{j2}^* (K\Gamma_2^\dagger)_{2\rho} \begin{Bmatrix} \cos\theta_\rho & (l=1) \\ -\sin\theta_\rho & (l=2) \end{Bmatrix} \right], \quad (11)$$

$$C_c^{j,\rho,l} = \frac{g}{2} \left[ \frac{m_t}{\sqrt{2}m_W \sin\beta} V_{j2} (\Gamma_2 K^\dagger)_{\rho 3} \begin{Bmatrix} \cos\theta_\rho & (l=1) \\ -\sin\theta_\rho & (l=2) \end{Bmatrix} \right], \quad (12)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
D_c^{j,\rho,l} = & \frac{g}{2} \left[ -U_{j1}^* (\Gamma_2 K^\dagger)_{\rho 3} \begin{Bmatrix} \cos\theta_\rho & (l=1) \\ -\sin\theta_\rho & (l=2) \end{Bmatrix} \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}m_W \cos\beta} U_{j2}^* (B_2 M_d K^\dagger)_{\rho 3} \begin{Bmatrix} \sin\theta_\rho & (l=1) \\ \cos\theta_\rho & (l=2) \end{Bmatrix} \right], \quad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

$$E_{Zc}^{\rho,\epsilon} = -\frac{g}{\cos\theta_W} \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=2}^3 \Gamma_{QL}^{\rho p} \Gamma_{QL}^{*\epsilon p} + \frac{1}{3} \sin^2\theta_W \delta^{\rho\epsilon} \right], \quad (14)$$

$$E_{\gamma c}^{\rho,\epsilon} = \frac{e}{3} \delta^{\rho\epsilon}, \quad (15)$$

$$E_{g c}^{\rho,\epsilon} = -g_s \delta^{\rho\epsilon}, \quad (16)$$

$$E'_{Zc}{}^{j,k} = \frac{g}{2\cos\theta_W} \left[ -U_{j1}^* U_{k1} - \frac{1}{2} U_{j2}^* U_{k2} + \sin^2\theta_W \delta^{jk} \right], \quad (17)$$

$$E'_{\gamma c}{}^{j,k} = -\frac{e}{2} \delta^{jk}, \quad (18)$$

$$E'_{g c}{}^{j,k} = 0, \quad (19)$$

$$F_{Zc}^{j,k} = \frac{g}{2\cos\theta_W} \left[ -V_{j1} V_{k1}^* - \frac{1}{2} V_{j2} V_{k2}^* + \sin^2\theta_W \delta^{jk} \right], \quad (20)$$

$$F_{\gamma c}^{j,k} = -\frac{e}{2} \delta^{jk}, \quad (21)$$

$$F_{g c}^{j,k} = 0, \quad (22)$$

$$G_{Zc} = -\frac{g}{2\cos\theta_W} \left( -\frac{2}{3} \sin^2\theta_W \right), \quad (23)$$

$$G_{\gamma c} = -\frac{e}{3}, \quad (24)$$

$$G_{g c} = -\frac{g_s}{2}, \quad (25)$$

$$H_{Zc} = -\frac{g}{2\cos\theta_W} \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{3} \sin^2\theta_W \right), \quad (26)$$

$$H_{\gamma c} = -\frac{e}{3}, \quad (27)$$

$$H_{g c} = -\frac{g_s}{2}. \quad (28)$$

The chargino mixing matrices  $U_{ij}$  and  $V_{ij}$  and the generational mixing matrices  $K$ ,  $\Gamma_2$ , and  $B_2$  which appear in these expressions are defined in Ref. [6];  $M_d$  is the diagonal matrix ( $m_d, m_s, m_b$ ) and  $\Gamma_{QL}$  is the squark mixing matrix defined in Ref. [7].

In deriving the above form factors, we have used the relations

$$\sum_{\lambda} k^{\mu} k^{\nu} \epsilon_{\mu}(k, \lambda) \epsilon_{\nu}(k, \lambda) = 0, \quad (29)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}(p_2) p_1^{\mu} P_{R,L} u(p_1) &= \bar{u}(p_2) [m_t \gamma^{\mu} P_{L,R} \\ &\quad + i p_{1\nu} \sigma^{\mu\nu} P_{R,L}] u(p_1), \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}(p_2) p_2^{\mu} P_{R,L} u(p_1) &= \bar{u}(p_2) [m_c \gamma^{\mu} P_{R,L} \\ &\quad - i p_{2\nu} \sigma^{\mu\nu} P_{R,L}] u(p_1), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}(p_2) (p_1 + p_2)^{\mu} P_{R,L} u(p_1) \epsilon_{\mu}(k, \lambda) &= \bar{u}(p_2) 2p_1^{\mu} P_{R,L} u(p_1) \epsilon_{\mu}(k, \lambda) \\ &= \bar{u}(p_2) 2p_2^{\mu} P_{R,L} u(p_1) \epsilon_{\mu}(k, \lambda) \\ &= \bar{u}(p_2) [m_t \gamma^{\mu} P_{L,R} + m_c \gamma^{\mu} P_{R,L} \\ &\quad + i k_{\nu} \sigma^{\mu\nu} P_{R,L}] u(p_1) \epsilon_{\mu}(k, \lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

[The first two equalities in Eq. (32) are only true when one takes the absolute square of both sides of the equation and uses Eq. (29).]

Our results above for the chargino-squark loops disagree with those of Ref. [3] in the limit of  $m_c = 0$ . We have an additional term

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2\pi^2} \sum_{j=1}^2 \sum_{\rho=1}^2 \sum_{l=1}^2 \sum_{\epsilon=1}^2 \sum_{m=1}^2 \\ &\times \{A_c^{j,\rho,l} D_c^{k,\rho,l} F_{ic}^{j,k} m_{\chi_j^{\pm}} m_{\chi_k^{\pm}} c_0\}^{(-p_1, p_2, \chi_k^{\pm}, \tilde{\nu}_l, \chi_j^{\pm})} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

in  $F_{i1}^c$ . This term is required by gauge invariance; i.e., it is needed to ensure that the coefficient of  $\gamma^{\mu}$  in Eqs. (4) and (5) vanish [9] for the massless gauge bosons.

The form factors for the electroweaklike corrections due to loops involving neutralinos and top and charm squarks are given by Eqs. (6)–(9) with  $m_{\chi^{\pm}}$  replaced by  $m_{\chi^0}$  and with the coefficients  $A_c - F_c$  replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} A_n^{j,\rho,l} &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ \frac{2}{3} e N'_{j1} + \frac{g}{\cos\theta_W} \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{3} \sin^2\theta_W \right) N'_{j2} \right] \\ &\times (\Gamma_1^{\dagger})_{2\rho} \begin{Bmatrix} \cos\theta_{\rho} & (l=1) \\ -\sin\theta_{\rho} & (l=2) \end{Bmatrix} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ \frac{g}{2m_W \sin\beta} N_{j4} \right] \\ &\times (M_u B_1^{\dagger})_{2\rho} \begin{Bmatrix} \sin\theta_{\rho} & (l=1) \\ \cos\theta_{\rho} & (l=2) \end{Bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned} B_n^{j,\rho,l} &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ \frac{g}{2m_W \sin\beta} N_{j4}^* \right] (M_u \Gamma_1^{\dagger})_{2\rho} \begin{Bmatrix} \cos\theta_{\rho} & (l=1) \\ -\sin\theta_{\rho} & (l=2) \end{Bmatrix} \\ &+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ \frac{2}{3} e N'_{j1} - \frac{g}{\cos\theta_W} \left( \frac{2}{3} \sin^2\theta_W \right) N'_{j2} \right] \\ &\times (B_1^{\dagger})_{2\rho} \begin{Bmatrix} \sin\theta_{\rho} & (l=1) \\ \cos\theta_{\rho} & (l=2) \end{Bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_n^{j,\rho,l} &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ \frac{g}{2m_W \sin\beta} N_{j4} \right] (\Gamma_1 M_u)_{\rho 3} \begin{Bmatrix} \cos\theta_{\rho} & (l=1) \\ -\sin\theta_{\rho} & (l=2) \end{Bmatrix} \\ &+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ \frac{2}{3} e N'_{j1} - \frac{g}{\cos\theta_W} \left( \frac{2}{3} \sin^2\theta_W \right) N'_{j2} \right] \\ &\times (B_1)_{\rho 3} \begin{Bmatrix} \sin\theta_{\rho} & (l=1) \\ \cos\theta_{\rho} & (l=2) \end{Bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

$$\begin{aligned} D_n^{j,\rho,l} &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ \frac{2}{3} e N'_{j1} + \frac{g}{\cos\theta_W} \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{3} \sin^2\theta_W \right) N'_{j2} \right] \\ &\times (\Gamma_1)_{\rho 3} \begin{Bmatrix} \cos\theta_{\rho} & (l=1) \\ -\sin\theta_{\rho} & (l=2) \end{Bmatrix} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ \frac{g}{2m_W \sin\beta} N_{j4}^* \right] \\ &\times (B_1 M_u)_{\rho 3} \begin{Bmatrix} \sin\theta_{\rho} & (l=1) \\ \cos\theta_{\rho} & (l=2) \end{Bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

$$E_{Zn}^{\rho,\epsilon} = -\frac{g}{\cos\theta_W} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=2}^3 \Gamma_{QL}^{\rho p} \Gamma_{QL}^{* \epsilon p} - \frac{2}{3} \sin^2\theta_W \delta^{\rho\epsilon} \right], \quad (38)$$

$$E_{\gamma n}^{\rho,\epsilon} = -\frac{2}{3} e \delta^{\rho\epsilon}, \quad (39)$$

$$E_{gn}^{\rho,\epsilon} = -g_s \delta^{\rho\epsilon}, \quad (40)$$

$$F_{Zn}^{j,k} = \frac{g}{2\cos\theta_W} \left[ \frac{1}{2} N'_{j3} N'_{k3} - \frac{1}{2} N'_{j4} N'_{k4} \right], \quad (41)$$

$$F_{\gamma n}^{j,k} = 0, \quad (42)$$

$$F_{gn}^{j,k} = 0, \quad (43)$$

$$F_{Zn}^{j,k} = \frac{g}{2\cos\theta_W} \left[ -\frac{1}{2} N'_{j3} N'_{k3} + \frac{1}{2} N'_{j4} N'_{k4} \right], \quad (44)$$

$$F_{\gamma n}^{j,k} = 0, \quad (45)$$

$$F_{gn}^{j,k} = 0. \quad (46)$$

The neutralino mixing matrices  $N_{ij}$  and  $N'_{ij}$  and the generational mixing matrices  $\Gamma_1$  and  $B_1$ , are defined in Ref. [6], and  $M_u$  is the diagonal matrix ( $m_u, m_c, m_t$ ). In Eqs. (6)–(9) the sums over  $j, k$  now run from 1 to 4 over the four neutralino mass eigenstates, and  $\rho, \epsilon, p = 2, 3$  represent charm and top squarks (we ignore the mixing with the up squark);  $l, m = 1, 2$  represent a sum over squark mass eigenstates, as earlier. The coefficients  $G$  and  $H$  are unaltered.

While we have included the charm-quark mass in the form factors above for completeness, we set  $m_c=0$  hereafter. The supersymmetric electroweaklike contribution to the decay rates is then given in terms of the form factors obtained above, as

$$\Gamma(t \rightarrow cZ) = \frac{1}{32\pi m_t^3} (m_t^2 - m_Z^2)^2 \left[ \left( 2 + \frac{m_t^2}{m_Z^2} \right) (F_{Z1}^2 + F_{Z1}'^2) - 6m_t (F_{Z1}F_{Z2} + F_{Z1}'F_{Z2}') + (2m_t^2 + m_Z^2)(F_{Z2}^2 + F_{Z2}'^2) \right], \quad (47)$$

$$\Gamma(t \rightarrow c\gamma) = \frac{m_t}{32\pi} [(2(F_{\gamma1}^2 + F_{\gamma1}'^2) - 6m_t (F_{\gamma1}F_{\gamma2} + F_{\gamma1}'F_{\gamma2}')) + 2m_t^2(F_{\gamma2}^2 + F_{\gamma2}'^2)], \quad (48)$$

$$\Gamma(t \rightarrow cg) = \frac{m_t}{24\pi} [2(F_{g1}^2 + F_{g1}'^2) - 6m_t (F_{g1}F_{g2} + F_{g1}'F_{g2}')] + 2m_t^2(F_{g2}^2 + F_{g2}'^2)]. \quad (49)$$

In these expressions each form factor receives contributions from both chargino-squark and neutralino-squark form factors. It is not hard to verify that for  $m_c=0$ , the chargino contributions to  $F'_{1,2}$  vanish. [In Ref. [3] there is a factor of  $\pi$  missing in the expression for  $\Gamma(t \rightarrow cZ)$  and a factor of  $1/3$  missing in  $\Gamma(t \rightarrow cg)$ .]

### III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

Before we attempt to evaluate the rather lengthy expressions given above, we would like to consider qualitatively the possibility of dynamical enhancements of the loop amplitudes. Experience with similar diagrams contributing to the self-energy of the top quark in supersymmetric theories [10] indicates possible large corrections when the mass of the top quark equals the sum of the masses of the other particles leaving the vertex involving the top quark.<sup>1</sup> In the present case we have vertices with top quarks and (i) gluinos and top squarks in the case of QCD-like contributions (calculated in Refs. [3,4]), (ii) charginos and downlike squarks in the case of ‘‘charged’’ electroweaklike corrections; and (iii) neutralinos and uplike squarks in the case of ‘‘neutral’’ electroweaklike corrections. Given the presently known lower bounds on the squark (excluding  $\tilde{t}$ ) and gluino masses (i.e.,  $m_{\tilde{q}}, m_{\tilde{g}} > 175$  GeV,  $m_{\tilde{q}} \approx m_{\tilde{g}} > 230$  GeV [11]), this type of enhancement might only be present in the third type of contribution when  $m_t \approx m_{\tilde{q}} + m_{\tilde{t}}$ , which requires a light top squark whose mass is constrained experimentally to  $m_{\tilde{t}} \geq 60$  GeV [12]. The ‘‘neutral’’ electroweaklike contributions might also be enhanced by large Glashow-Iliopoulos-Maiani- (GIM) violating top-squark-charm-squark mass

splittings. This latter enhancement is also present in the ‘‘charged’’ electroweaklike contributions. However, the ‘‘charged’’ contributions fall short of the ‘‘neutral’’ electroweaklike corrections for the gluon and photon cases. Interestingly, the ‘‘charged’’ contribution for the  $Z$  is higher than in the ‘‘neutral’’ case. We first address the neutral electroweaklike contributions and comment on the charged contributions afterwards.

The neutral electroweaklike contributions might be enhanced as discussed above, but this is subject to other mixing factors in the  $A_n$ - $F_n$  coupling functions in Eqs. (34)–(46) being unsuppressed. At the root of this question is whether the quark-squark-neutralino couplings might be flavor non-diagonal as a result of their evolution from the unification scale down to the electroweak scale. This question might be explored by considering the squared squark mass matrices at the electroweak scale that are obtained by renormalization group evolution of a universal scalar mass at the unification scale [6,13]:

$$\tilde{X}_{iR}^2 = M_W^2 \mu_{iR}^{(0)} I + \mu_{iR}^{(1)} X_i X_i^\dagger \quad (i=1,2), \quad (50)$$

$$\tilde{X}_{1L}^2 = M_W^2 \mu_{1L}^{(0)} I + \mu_{1L}^{(1)} X_1 X_1^\dagger + \mu_{1L}^{(2)} X_2 X_2^\dagger, \quad (51)$$

$$\tilde{X}_{2L}^2 = M_W^2 \mu_{2L}^{(0)} I + \mu_{2L}^{(1)} X_1 X_1^\dagger + \mu_{2L}^{(2)} X_2 X_2^\dagger, \quad (52)$$

where  $i=1$  ( $i=2$ ) corresponds to up-type (down-type) flavors, the  $\mu^{(0,1,2)}$  are renormalization-group-equation-(RGE)-dependent coefficients, and  $X_1$  ( $X_2$ ) are the up-type (down-type) Yukawa matrices. The matrices  $B_i \equiv \tilde{U}_i^* U_i^T$ , appearing in the equations in Sec. II above, are obtained from the  $\tilde{U}_i$  matrices that diagonalize  $\tilde{X}_{iR}^2$ , and the  $U_i$  matrices that diagonalize the right-handed quark mass matrices. Because of the simple form for  $\tilde{X}_{iR}^2$  in Eq. (50), it can be shown that  $\tilde{U}_i = U_i$  and therefore  $B_i = I$  [6]. (Note that the quark mixing matrices  $U_i$  and  $V_i$  mentioned in this section are different from the chargino mixing matrices  $U_{ij}$  and  $V_{ij}$  mentioned in Sec. II.)

The other relevant set of matrices are  $\Gamma_i \equiv \tilde{V}_i V_i^\dagger$ , obtained from the  $\tilde{V}_i$  matrices that diagonalize  $\tilde{X}_{iL}^2$  and the  $V_i$  matrices that diagonalize the left-handed quark mass matrices. In the case of  $\lambda_t \gg \lambda_b$ , which requires  $\tan\beta \sim 1$ , the  $X_2 X_2^\dagger \propto \lambda_b^2$  term in Eqs. (51) and (52) is small compared to the  $X_1 X_1^\dagger \propto \lambda_t^2$  term, and therefore the former may be neglected. This implies that both  $\tilde{X}_{1L}^2$  and  $\tilde{X}_{2L}^2$  are diagonalized by the same matrix  $\tilde{V}_1 = \tilde{V}_2 = V_1$ , and therefore  $\Gamma_1 = \tilde{V}_1 V_1^\dagger = I$ , whereas  $\Gamma_2 = \tilde{V}_2 V_2^\dagger = V_1 V_2^\dagger = K$  reduces to the regular Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix [6]. As the quark-squark-neutralino couplings in flavor space are proportional to  $\Gamma_i$ , we see that for  $\lambda_t \gg \lambda_b$  there are no flavor off-diagonal couplings in the up-quark sector, as required for an unsuppressed contribution to the ‘‘neutral’’ electroweaklike contributions to  $t \rightarrow cV$ .

One might consider instead a scenario where  $\lambda_t \sim \lambda_b$ , as would be consistent with  $\tan\beta \gg 1$ . In this case the  $X_2 X_2^\dagger \propto \lambda_b^2$  term in Eqs. (51) and (52) is no longer negligible and  $\Gamma_1 \neq I$  is expected. The precise form of  $\Gamma_1$  requires a com-

<sup>1</sup>The sign of these corrections depends on the observable being calculated: In the case of  $B(t \rightarrow cV)$  they are positive, whereas in one-loop supersymmetric corrections to  $\sigma(p\bar{p} \rightarrow t\bar{t})$  [10] they were negative.

plicated calculation, essentially solving the matrix renormalization group equations. For our purposes here it suffices to consider the effective form

$$\Gamma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \epsilon \\ 0 & -\epsilon & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (53)$$

where  $\epsilon$  parametrizes the size of the ratio  $\lambda_b/\lambda_t$ . For moderate values of  $\tan\beta$  this form should be adequate (i.e.,  $\epsilon$  not too close to 1). We still expect  $\Gamma_2 \approx K$ . We assume that the lower  $(2 \times 2)$  right corner of  $V_1$  is approximately the identity to relate  $\Gamma_{QL}$  to  $\Gamma_1$ .

The above forms for  $\Gamma_{1,2}$  plus the result  $B_{1,2}=I$  above allow us to evaluate numerically the branching ratios of Sec. II. Perhaps the most optimistic top-quark factory being contemplated at the moment is a high-luminosity upgrade of the Tevatron, where studies show that one might be sensitive to  $B(t \rightarrow c\gamma) \approx 4 \times 10^{-4}$  ( $8 \times 10^{-5}$ ) [14],  $B(t \rightarrow cZ) \approx 4 \times 10^{-3}$  ( $6 \times 10^{-4}$ ) [14], and  $B(t \rightarrow cg) \approx 5 \times 10^{-3}$  ( $1 \times 10^{-3}$ ) [2] with an integrated luminosity of 10 (100)  $\text{fb}^{-1}$ , where the branching ratios are with respect to  $\Gamma(t \rightarrow bW)$ . These expected sensitivities will not allow direct tests of the standard model predictions for these processes,  $B(t \rightarrow c\gamma)^{\text{SM}} \sim 10^{-12}$ ,  $B(t \rightarrow cZ)^{\text{SM}} \sim 10^{-12}$ , and  $B(t \rightarrow cg)^{\text{SM}} \sim 10^{-10}$  [5], but might uncover virtual new physics effects that enhance these rates over standard model expectations.

Indeed, we generally find that  $B(t \rightarrow cV)$  greatly exceeds the corresponding standard model contribution, but unfortunately falls below the expected experimental sensitivities, as was observed also in previous studies of the QCD-like corrections [4]. Specifically, concentrating on the ‘‘neutral’’ electroweaklike corrections, we have as the dominant inputs the masses of the charm squark and top squark, the top-quark mixing angle, the mass of the neutralino(s), and the neutralino composition. The results for  $V=g, \gamma$  scale with  $\epsilon^2$  as defined in Eq. (53); we take  $\epsilon=0.5$  for concreteness. (For  $V=Z$ , the cross section increases monotonically with  $\epsilon$  for  $\epsilon \leq 0.5$ .) Numerically<sup>2</sup> we find that when  $m_t \approx m_\chi + m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ , the branching ratios are enhanced compared to off-resonance values by a factor of 2–10. This factor depends on the specific combination of neutralino and top-squark masses that satisfy this relation (all other parameters being kept fixed); the enhancement decreases with increasing top-squark mass and so is maximized when  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  is 60 GeV. The off-resonance values themselves are larger than the standard model predictions for not-too-heavy sparticles. We also verify that large  $m_{\tilde{c}} - m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  mass splitting enhances the results, because of its GIM-violating effect. (A useful test of our code is that the branching ratios go to zero due to the GIM mechanism, if we set squark masses equal.) With regards to neutralino composition, the largest branching ratios are obtained for neutralinos with comparable  $B$ -ino and Higgsino admixtures. Increasing the scale of the sparticle masses typi-

cally leads to a rapid decrease in the branching ratios for  $g$  and  $\gamma$ . For the  $Z$  the decrease is very gradual, as has also been noted in Ref. [4]. For  $g$  and  $\gamma$  the cross section seems to be maximized for top-squark mixing angles close to 0 or  $\pi$ . The effects of mixing for  $Z$  are very dependent on the other parameters chosen, such as the neutralino composition, etc. The effect of varying  $\tan\beta$  is of order 1.

In varying the different parameters above we have worked in the most general framework of the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM), in which the various parameters can be varied independently. In a more specific model, such as one with universal scalar masses and radiative electroweak symmetry breaking, these parameters are not all independent. Although our choice of mixing matrices was motivated by certain specific scenarios, we vary our parameters freely so as to look for the maximal supersymmetric contributions. Furthermore, we choose  $m_{\tilde{c}_{1,2}}$  and  $m_{\tilde{t}_2}$  to be  $\sim 1$  TeV.

For the most optimistic values of the parameters, i.e., when the above enhancing circumstances all simultaneously occur, we find  $B(t \rightarrow c\gamma) \leq 2 \times 10^{-7}$ ,  $B(t \rightarrow cZ) \leq 4 \times 10^{-7}$ , and  $B(t \rightarrow cg) \leq 3 \times 10^{-5}$ . We see that  $B(t \rightarrow cg)$  is the one closest to the level of experimental sensitivity expected at the Tevatron, and so perhaps it would be the mode to be first observed at a future sufficiently sensitive machine. This hope is further enlarged by recalling that  $B(t \rightarrow cg)$  receives comparable contributions from the QCD-like supersymmetric corrections [4], which we have not evaluated here. Eventually, such a process can be a possible test for supersymmetry.

We have also evaluated the charged electroweaklike corrections and have found them to be smaller (typically by a factor of 10 or more) than the neutral electroweaklike corrections discussed above for  $g$  and  $\gamma$ , but a factor of 10 higher for the  $Z$ . [Again we assume that the lower  $(2 \times 2)$  right corner of  $V_2$  is approximately the identity to relate  $\Gamma_{QL}$  to  $\Gamma_2$ .] In the case of universal squark masses at the unification scale, GIM-violating bottom-squark strange-squark mass differences are generated by RGE evolution, resulting in shifts to the left-handed downlike squark mass matrices. The dominant term is from the second term of Eq. (52) which may be rewritten as  $-|c|K^\dagger(\hat{m}_u)^2K$ , where  $\hat{m}_u = \{m_u, m_c, m_t\}$  and  $|c| \leq 1$  is an RGE-dependent constant. Inserting the values of the CKM matrix elements we find (approximately)  $m_{s_L}^2 \rightarrow m_{s_L}^2 - |c|(m_t/5)^2$  and  $m_{b_L}^2 \rightarrow m_{b_L}^2 - |c|m_t^2$ . Choosing the maximal ( $|c|=1$ ) mass splittings, we find  $B(t \rightarrow c\gamma) \leq 10^{-8}$ ,  $B(t \rightarrow cZ) \leq 2 \times 10^{-6}$ , and  $B(t \rightarrow cg) \leq 10^{-7}$  for squark masses as low as experimentally allowed. (These results are not much altered even if one drops the assumption of universal squark masses at the unification scale.) The numerical results for the charged electroweaklike corrections cannot be compared with the corresponding ones in Ref. [3] because, as we explained above, the formulas presented in Ref. [3] are inconsistent with gauge invariance constraints.

We finally try to connect up with the recent literature in Ref. [2], where in addition to the  $t \rightarrow cg$  decay mode, people have considered hadronic processes like  $pp \rightarrow t\bar{c}$ , which might be more easily detectable. These works ignore any substructure that the  $t$ - $c$ - $g$  vertex might have, and replace it

<sup>2</sup>We used the software package FF [15] to evaluate the Passarino-Veltman functions.

all by an effective scale  $\Lambda$ , defined, for instance, by the relation  $\Gamma(t \rightarrow cg) = 8\alpha_s m_t^3 / 3\Lambda^2$ . A given branching ratio obtained in the supersymmetric theory then corresponds to a scale  $\Lambda$  in the effective theory. Dividing this expression by  $\Gamma(t \rightarrow bW)$  we find that  $\Lambda \approx 1 \text{ TeV} / \sqrt{B(t \rightarrow cg)}$ . Therefore a supersymmetric prediction of  $B(t \rightarrow cg) \sim 10^{-5}$  corresponds to  $\Lambda \sim 300 \text{ TeV}$ . The point of this exercise is to note how misleading such estimates of new-physics scales might

be, as this actually corresponds in our case to sparticle masses of a few hundred GeV.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work of R.R. has been supported by the World Laboratory. The work of J.L. has been supported in part by U.S. DOE Grant No. DE-FG05-93-ER-40717 and that of D.V.N. by U.S. DOE Grant No. DE-FG05-91-ER-40633.

- 
- [1] CDF Collaboration, F. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2626 (1995); D0 Collaboration, S. Abachi *et al.*, *ibid.* **74**, 2632 (1995).
- [2] E. Malkawi and T. Tait, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 5758 (1996); T. Han, K. Whisnant, B.-L. Young, and X. Zhang, Phys. Lett. B **385**, 311 (1996); T. Tait and C.-P. Yuan, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 7300 (1997). For a recent review of the earlier literature see J. Hewett, T. Takeuchi, and S. Thomas, Report No. hep-ph/9603391.
- [3] C. S. Li, R. J. Oakes, and J. M. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 293 (1994).
- [4] G. Couture, C. Hamzaoui, and H. König, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 1713 (1995).
- [5] J. Diaz-Cruz *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **41**, 891 (1990); B. Dutta-Roy *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 827 (1990); H. Fritzsch, Phys. Lett. B **224**, 423 (1989); W. Buchmüller and M. Gronau, *ibid.* **220**, 641 (1989); G. Eilam, J. Hewett, and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D **44**, 1473 (1991).
- [6] J. Gunion and H. Haber, Nucl. Phys. **B272**, 1 (1986) (see Sec. 5 and Appendixes A and B); **B402**, 567(E) (1993).
- [7] S. Bertolini, F. Borzumati, A. Masiero, and G. Ridolfi, Nucl. Phys. **B353**, 591 (1991) (see Appendix C).
- [8] G. Passarino and M. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. **B160**, 151 (1979).
- [9] See, e.g., M. Peskin and D. Schroeder, *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1995).
- [10] J. Kim, J. L. Lopez, D. V. Nanopoulos, and R. Rangarajan, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 4364 (1996).
- [11] D0 Collaboration, S. Abachi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 618 (1995); CDF Collaboration, F. Abe *et al.*, *ibid.* **69**, 3439 (1992); **76**, 2006 (1996); J. Hauser, in *10th Topical Workshop on Proton-Antiproton Collider Physics*, edited by R. Raja and J. Yoh, AIP Conf. Proc. No. 357 (AIP, New York, 1995), p. 13.
- [12] D0 Collaboration, S. Abachi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 2222 (1996); OPAL Collaboration, K. Ackerstaff *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **389**, 197 (1996).
- [13] M. Duncan, Nucl. Phys. **B221**, 285 (1983); J. F. Donoghue, H. P. Nilles, and D. Wyler, Phys. Lett. **128B**, 55 (1983); J.-M. Gerard, W. Grimus, and A. Raychaudhuri, *ibid.* **145B**, 400 (1984).
- [14] D. Amidei *et al.*, "Future ElectroWeak Physics at the Fermilab Tevatron: Report of the TeV 2000 Working Group," Report No. FERMILAB-PUB-96/082 (unpublished).
- [15] G. J. van Oldenborgh and J. A. M. Vermaseren, Z. Phys. C **46**, 425 (1990); G. J. van Oldenborgh, Comput. Phys. Commun. **66**, 1 (1991).