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I. INTRODUCTION

In models based on supersymmetry the light Higgs boson [1] has a predictive mass range, and recently LHC-7 has stringently constrained the light Higgs boson to lie in the 115 GeV to 131 GeV range (ATLAS) and the 115 GeV to 127 GeV range (CMS) at the 95\% C.L. [2] with possible hints of evidence within a few GeV of 125 GeV. This mass window lies in the range predicted by supergravity unification (SUGRA) [3] (for reviews see [4–6]). In this work we investigate supergravity model points that are consistent with the mass range given by the new LHC-7 data [2] (for a previous work on the analysis of the Higgs boson in SUGRA and string models pointing to a heavier Higgs in the 120 GeV range see [7]).

LHC-7 has made great strides in exploring the parameter space of supersymmetric models. Indeed, early theoretical projections for the expected reach in sparticle masses and in the m_{0} – m_{1/2} plane for LHC-7 [8–11] have been met and exceeded by the 1 fb^{-1} and 2 fb^{-1} LHC-7 data [12–16]. The implications of the new LHC results have been analyzed by a number of authors in the context of lower limits on supersymmetric particles and in connection with dark matter [17–23]. Now the most recent results from CERN [2] indicate that the two detectors, ATLAS and CMS, have collected as much as 5 fb^{-1} of data. One of the most interesting implications of the LHC-7 data concerns the constraints it imposes on the Higgs boson mass.

As mentioned above we will work within the framework of a supergravity grand unification model with universal boundary conditions [3, 24, 25]. Here we discuss the dependence of the light Higgs boson mass on the parameter space, i.e., on m_{0}, m_{1/2}, A_{0}, \tan \beta [26], where m_{0}, m_{1/2} and A_{0} are the parameters at the GUT scale, where the GUT scale, M_{GUT} \sim 2 \times 10^{16} \text{ GeV} is defined as the scale at which the gauge couplings unify, and where m_{0} is soft scalar mass, m_{1/2}, the gaugino mass, A_{0}, the trilinear coupling and \tan \beta , the ratio of the two Higgs VEVs in the minimal supersymmetric standard model.

An important aspect of SUGRA models is that the radiative electroweak symmetry breaking, REWSB, is satisfied for A_{0}/m_{0} typically in the −5 to 5 range. The renormalization group evolution then leads to a value of the trilinear coupling, A_{t}, at the electroweak scale to also be O(\text{TeV}). The relevance of this observation is that quite generically supergravity unification leads to a sizable A_{t} which is needed to give a substantial leading order loop correction to the Higgs Boson mass for any fixed \mu, \tan \beta and m_{0}, where \mu is the Higgs mixing parameter in the superpotential. Thus a generic prediction of SUGRA models under radiative electroweak symmetry breaking for a sizable A_{0}/m_{0} is that there would be a substantial loop correction to the Higgs boson mass, and it is well known that the light Higgs mass at the tree level has the value m_{h^{0}} \leq M_{Z} and there is a significant loop correction \Delta m_{h^{0}} to lift it above M_{Z} [27–33].

The dominant one loop contribution arises from the top/stop sector and is given by

\[ \Delta m_{h^{0}}^{2} \approx \frac{3m_{t}^{4}}{2\pi^{2}v^{2}} \ln \frac{M_{S}^{2}}{m_{t}^{2}} + \frac{3m_{t}^{4}}{2\pi^{2}v^{2}} \left( \frac{X_{t}^{2}}{M_{S}^{2}} - \frac{X_{t}^{4}}{12M_{S}^{2}} \right), \]  

(1)

where v = 246 GeV, M_{S} is an average stop mass, and X_{t} is given by

\[ X_{t} \equiv A_{t} - \mu \cot \beta. \]  

(2)

From Eq. (1) one finds that the loop correction is maximized when

\[ X_{t} \sim \sqrt{6} M_{S}. \]  

(3)

We note that there can be important loop corrections also from the b-quark sector and a correction similar to Eq. (1) can be written where X_{b} is replaced by X_{b} = A_{b} - \mu \tan \beta along with other appropriate replacements. Thus when \mu \tan \beta becomes large, the b-quark contribution to the loop correction, which is proportional to powers of X_{b}, becomes large and is comparable to the top contribution which implies that a high Higgs mass can also result in stau-coannihilation models where typically m_{1/2} is large and m_{0} is relatively small.
Further, we note that the approximation of Eq. (3) would not hold if the off-diagonal elements of the stop mass squared matrix are comparable to the diagonal elements which can happen for very large $A_t$. In addition, it is well known that the two loop corrections are substantial (see e.g. [34] for a numerical analysis). While it is well known that the two loop corrections are sub-
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FIG. 3: (color online) Left: A display of the model points in the $\tan \beta - A_0/m_0$ plane when $m_{h^0} > 115$ GeV. Model points are shaded according to their light Higgs boson mass, $m_{h^0}$. Middle: Same as the left panel except that $m_{h^0} > 123$ GeV. Right: Exhibition of the model points in the $m_{h^0} - A_0/m_0$ plane displayed by $\log(m_0)$ with $m_0$ in GeV units. It is seen that for low values of $|A_0/m_0|$ larger $m_0$ corresponds to a heavier light Higgs boson. The data analyzed passes the general constraints and are generated with both scans of $m_0$ as discussed in the text.

We display the model points consistent with the general constraints in Fig. 1 and in Fig. 3. In the left panel of Fig. 1 we exhibit the Higgs boson mass as a function of $m_0$ for the case when $\tan \beta > 20$ and in the right panel we exhibit it for the case when $\tan \beta < 20$. In both cases we see a slow logarithmic rise of $m_{h^0}$ with $m_0$ for large $m_0$. In the left and middle panels of Fig. 3 we show the distribution of the light Higgs boson mass in the $\tan \beta - A_0/m_0$ plane. One finds that a large part of the parameter space exists where the Higgs boson mass lies in the range $m_{h^0} > 115$ GeV (left panel) or in the narrower range $m_{h^0} > 123$ GeV (middle panel). In the right panel of Fig. 3, we show the distribution of $\log(m_0)$ (where $m_0$ is in GeV units) in the $m_{h^0} - A_0/m_0$ plane.

Our analysis shows a range of possibilities where a heavier Higgs boson, i.e. $m_{h^0} > 125$ GeV, can arise in the minimal supergravity model. Thus for values of $m_0 < 4$ TeV a heavier Higgs boson mass can be gotten for a large $A_0/m_0$ (typically of size $\pm 2$ with a significant spread). In Fig. 2 we give an illustration of the cancellation in REWSB to produce $\mu$ where we plot $\mu$ vs $|m_{H^0}(Q)|$ for different regions of the parameter space. Regions with small $\mu$ and large $|m_{H^0}(Q)|$ imply a large cancellation in REWSB, as in the lower branch of Fig. 2, while regions with a $\mu$ comparable to $|m_{H^0}(Q)|$ imply a small cancellation. We note, however, that even a large cancellation occurs quite naturally because of the structure of the REWSB. For values of $m_0 > 4$ TeV a heavier Higgs boson mass for relatively smaller values of $A_0/m_0$ is also allowed. For this case the first and second generation sfermions may be difficult to observe while the third generation sfermions would still be accessible. However, for the first case where a Higgs mass $m_{h^0} > 125$ GeV arises for low $m_0$ and relatively larger $|A_0/m_0|$, the observation of signals arising from the production of first and second generation sfermions and heavier SUSY Higgses remains very much within reach of the LHC with sparticles of relatively low mass in the spectrum, and variable mass hierarchies present. This will be shown in more detail in the next section.

III. SPARTICLE SPECTRA AND HIGGS MASS

There are some interesting correlations between the light Higgs and the sparticle spectrum. As noted already a larger light Higgs boson mass typically indicates a relatively heavier sparticle spectrum. We give now a more quantitative discussion using the two scans discussed in the previous section after imposing the general constraints. In Table I we present the lower limits on some of the sparticles as the light Higgs mass gets progressively larger between $m_{h^0} = 115$ GeV and $m_{h^0} = 127$ GeV showing the results of the two scans (upper and lower tables). The top panel of the table is for the low value sampling of $m_0$, i.e. the scan with $m_0 \leq 4$ TeV, and the middle panel is for the large value sampling of $m_0$, i.e. the scan with $m_0 > 4$ TeV and 100 TeV. In the bottom panel, we give benchmark points with the sparticle masses near the lower limits presented. Thus, after applying an additional 800 GeV gluino cut on the models, for the low $m_0$ scan we find that a light Higgs boson mass of $m_{h^0} = 115$ GeV allows for a lightest neutralino mass of around 80 GeV, but $m_{h^0} = 125$ GeV indicates a lightest neutralino mass of around 220 GeV. The value of 220 GeV is consistent with independent constraints coming from the search for squarks and gluinos at the LHC (see [19, 20]). For the cases $m_{h^0} = 115$ GeV and $m_{h^0} = 125$ GeV corresponding masses for the lightest chargino, $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$, (degenerate with the second lightest neutralino, $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$) are 100 GeV and 425 GeV; for the gluino, $\tilde{g}$, 800 GeV and 1.3 TeV; for the first and second genera-
SUGRA models. The top panel shows the sparticle lower bounds for the small 
neutralinos and the light chargino being degenerate as seen above when

| $m_{h^0} > 115$ | $m_{h^0} > 117$ | $m_{h^0} > 119$ | $m_{h^0} > 121$ | $m_{h^0} > 123$ | $m_{h^0} > 125$ | $m_{h^0} > 127$ |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| $m_{H^0} \sim m_{A^0}$ | 212 | 216 | 273 | 324 | 1272 | 1517 | 2730 |
| $m_{H^+}$ | 230 | 234 | 288 | 337 | 1275 | 1520 | 2732 |
| $m_{\chi_1^0}$ | 81 | 81 | 81 | 88 | 193 | 218 | 236 |
| $m_{\chi_1^0} \sim m_{\chi_1^0}$ | 104 | 104 | 104 | 111 | 376 | 424 | 459 |
| $m_{\tilde{g}}$ | 800 | 800 | 803 | 803 | 1133 | 1264 | 1373 |
| $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ | 156 | 197 | 228 | 230 | 231 | 246 | 260 |
| $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ | 142 | 161 | 201 | 232 | 321 | 576 | 1364 |
| $m_{\tilde{q}}$ | 729 | 796 | 995 | 1126 | 1528 | 2235 | 2793 |
| $m_{\tilde{\ell}}$ | 163 | 194 | 265 | 325 | 475 | 1631 | 2557 |
| $\mu$ | 107 | 107 | 107 | 120 | 1418 | 1863 | 2293 |
| $m_{h^0} > 115$ | $m_{h^0} > 117$ | $m_{h^0} > 119$ | $m_{h^0} > 121$ | $m_{h^0} > 123$ | $m_{h^0} > 125$ | $m_{h^0} > 127$ |
| $m_{H^0} \sim m_{A^0}$ | 287 | 287 | 287 | 338 | 367 | 548 | 644 |
| $m_{H^+}$ | 301 | 301 | 301 | 349 | 378 | 555 | 646 |
| $m_{\chi_1^0}$ | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 91 | 256 |
| $m_{\chi_1^0} \sim m_{\chi_1^0}$ | 104 | 104 | 104 | 104 | 104 | 104 | 261 |
| $m_{\tilde{g}}$ | 802 | 802 | 802 | 802 | 925 | 1006 | 1813 |
| $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ | 229 | 229 | 229 | 229 | 229 | 360 | 360 |
| $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ | 911 | 911 | 911 | 911 | 1186 | 1186 | 1186 |
| $m_{\tilde{q}}$ | 4035 | 4035 | 4035 | 4035 | 4215 | 4493 | 4493 |
| $m_{\tilde{\ell}}$ | 3998 | 3998 | 3998 | 4002 | 4085 | 4308 | 4308 |
| $\mu$ | 118 | 118 | 118 | 118 | 138 | 140 | 251 |
| Benchmark | $m_0$ | $m_{1/2}$ | $\lambda_3$ | $\tan \beta$ | $m_{h^0}$ | $m_{A^0}$ | $m_{\chi_1^0}$ | $m_{\chi_1^0}$ | $m_{\tilde{g}}$ | $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ | $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ | $m_{\tilde{q}}$ | $m_{\tilde{\ell}}$ | $\mu$ |
| Light Stop | 5108 | 764 | 2.549 | 33.29 | 125 | 321 | 621 | 1828 | 334 | 3604 | 5240 | 5108 | 3887 |
| Light Gauginos, Low $\mu$ | 3340 | 306 | -0.395 | 29.521 | 121 | 91 | 115 | 832 | 1974 | 3070 | 3352 | 3335 | 125 |
| Light Stau | 248 | 548 | -6.834 | 14 | 121 | 228 | 438 | 1254 | 569 | 232 | 1126 | 325 | 1072 |

TABLE I: Display of the lower limits on the sparticle masses as a function of a lower bound on the light Higgs mass for the mSUGRA models. The top panel shows the sparticle lower bounds for the small $m_0$ scan and the middle panel shows the sparticle lower bounds for the large $m_0$ sampling. The model points in both cases pass the general constraints as well as an additional constraint that the gluino mass exceed 800 GeV. We note that the lower bound limits for the sparticles are not necessarily for the same model point. All masses are in GeV. A remarkable aspect of the analysis is that a stop mass as low as 300 GeV can be obtained for parameter points with $m_0 > 4$ TeV. We further note that in this region one has the possibility of the first two neutralinos and the light chargino being degenerate as seen above when $\mu$ is smaller than the electroweak gaugino masses $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ and $m_{\tilde{\ell}_1}$. In the bottom panel, we give benchmark points that show the regions of parameter space that give masses near the minima presented, which shows how some but not all of the lower limits may be obtained by specific points.

Fig. 4: (color online) Analysis is based on the general constraints discussed in the text and for both scans of $m_0$. Left panel: Exhibition of the stop vs the gluino mass in the mass window where both the stop and the gluino masses run till 10 TeV. Middle panel: Exhibition of stop mass vs stau mass. Right panel: Exhibition of the gluino mass vs $\mu$.

tion squarks, $\tilde{q}$, 730 GeV and 2.2 TeV, and for the first and second generation sleptons, $\tilde{\ell}$, 150 GeV and 1.6 TeV. Thus for the low $m_0$ scan the shifts in lower limits are dramatic for the gluino and for the first generation sfermions. The stop, $\tilde{t}_1$, and the stau, $\tilde{\tau}_1$, however, continue to be relatively light. The $\tilde{\tau}_1$ mass, though is very sensitive to the higher mass bins in the light Higgs mass, i.e. bins greater then 123 GeV.

For the large $m_0$ scan the sparticle lower limits are modified in a significant way. Most noticeably, the elec-
troweak gaugino spectrum can remain light at higher Higgs mass relative to what one finds in the more restrictive low $m_0$ scan. Further we observe that as the Higgs mass grows, the value of $\mu$ can remain a few times the $Z$ mass, where as in the low $m_0$ scan this does not occur. In addition we can see that the slepton bounds do not change as drastically as the Higgs mass changes as they did with the low $m_0$ scan, and in particular the masses of the other Higgses $A^0, H^0, H^\pm$ can remain much lighter.

More graphically, in Fig. 4 we compare ranges on the sparticle masses distributed by a light Higgs mass. Thus the left panel of Fig. 4 gives a plot of the stop mass vs. the gluino mass and the middle panel gives a plot of the stop mass vs the stau mass. These correlations of the light Higgs mass with the respective sparticle masses show directly how a determination of the Higgs mass at the LHC will constrain the masses of the R-parity odd particles. The right panel of Fig. 4 gives a display of the gluino mass vs $\mu$ (the Higgsino mass parameter at the scale $Q$ where electroweak symmetry breaking occurs). Here one finds that a $\mu$, as small as a 200 GeV, can generate a Higgs boson mass up to about 122 GeV. However, the larger Higgs masses, i.e., Higgs masses above 125 GeV can also have $\mu$ of size that is sub-TeV. Thus, one can have a heavier Higgs, scalars in the several TeV region, but still have a light $\mu$ [7, 35, 36].

IV. HYPERBOLIC BRANCH OF REWSB AND FOCAL SURFACES

It is known that the radiative electroweak symmetry breaking carries in it a significant amount of information regarding the parameter space of SUGRA models. Thus REWSB allows for a determination of $\mu^2$ in terms of the soft parameters [35, 56] (for further works see [57]) so that the breaking of electroweak symmetry is encoded in the following expression

$$\mu^2 = -\frac{1}{2} M_2^2 + m_0^2 C_1 + A_0^2 C_2 + m_{1/2}^2 C_3 + m_{1/2} A_0 C_4 + \Delta m^2_{\mu \text{loop}},$$

(4)

where $C_i$, $i$ running from 1 to 4, depend on the top mass, $\tan \beta$ and $Q$. It was shown in [35] that one can classify regions of Eq. (4) in the following two broad classes: the Ellipsoidal Branch, denoted EB, where $C_1 > 0$, and the Hyperbolic Branch, denoted HB, where $C_1 \leq 0$. More recently in [52] it was shown that HB can be further classified into three regions. One such region was defined as the Focal Point, HB/FP, where $C_1 = 0$. It was further shown that the HB/FP limits to the Focus Point [58] when $\tan \beta \gg 1$. Another region defined was the Focal Curve, HB/FC, where $C_1 < 0$ and two soft parameters are free to get large, i.e., either $m_0, A_0$ or $m_0, m_{1/2}$. The last region was defined to be the Focal Surface, HB/FS, where $C_1 < 0$ and three soft parameters were free to get large, i.e., $m_0, A_0, m_{1/2}$. It was further shown in [52] that HB/FC was a subset of HB/FS and that the HB/FP was mostly depleted after imposing constraints from flavor physics, WMAP, sparticle mass lower limits and LHC-7. However, other regions of the parameter space were found to be well populated.

In Fig. 5 we give an analysis of the Higgs mass ranges lying on the EB and on the Focal Regions with a comparison to the LHC-7 curves (Ref. 1 of [16] and Ref. 2 of [12]).

In the top two panels we consider the Higgs mass range upwards of 115 GeV. The left panel is for the Ellipsoidal Branch and the middle left panel is for the Focal Point region. In the EB region one finds that the majority of light Higgs boson masses do not exceed 124 GeV, while in the HB/FP region the Higgs masses do not go beyond 120 GeV except perhaps for some isolated points. Further the HB/FP region is highly depleted as can be seen by the paucity of allowed model points in the middle left panel of Fig. 5. The largest Higgs boson masses are achieved on HB/FS, which includes HB/FC, shown in the right two panels of Fig. 5 where the region above a Higgs boson mass of 115 GeV (middle right) and between 123 GeV and 127 GeV (right) are shown. The right panel shows that the Higgs mass region within a few 125 GeV is well populated.

V. HIGGS BOSON AND DARK MATTER

There is a strong correlation between the light Higgs mass and dark matter. It has already been pointed out that annihilation via the Higgs pole can generate the relic density to be consistent with WMAP (see the first paper of [17]). In this case the neutralino mass would be roughly half the light Higgs boson mass. For heavier neutralino masses other annihilation mechanisms become available. We would be interested in the cases which include large $m_0$ and specifically in the spin independent proton-neutralino cross section in this domain. For this case when $m_0$ is large the $s$-channel squark exchange which contributes to the spin independent proton-neutralino cross section becomes suppressed while the $t$-channel Higgs exchange dominates. The scattering cross section in this case is given by

$$\sigma_{SI}^N = \frac{4}{\pi} \frac{(A - Z) f_n}{\mu N}.$$ (5)

Here $f_p/n = \sum_{q=u,d,s} I_{Tq}^{(p/n)} C_q m_{p/n} m_q$, where the form factors $I_{Tq}^{(p/n)}$ and $I_{Tq}^{(p/n)}$ are given in [53, 59, 60] and the couplings $C_i$ are given by [59, 60]

$$C_q = -\frac{g_2 m_q}{4 m_W} \left[ g_{2n_{12} - g_{2n_{11}}} \right] \delta_1 \delta_5 \left( -\frac{1}{m_H^2} + \frac{1}{m_h^2} \right)$$

$$+ (g_{2n_{12} - g_{2n_{11}}}) \delta_2 \left( \frac{\delta_4^2}{m_H^2 + m_h^2} \right).$$ (6)

For up quarks one has $\delta_i = (n_{13}, n_{14}, s, g, s, c, \alpha)$ and for down quarks $\delta_i = (n_{14}, -n_{13}, c, \beta, c, \alpha, -s, \alpha)$, where $i$ runs
FIG. 5: (color online) Analysis of the Higgs boson mass in Focal Regions. The analysis is done for the model points that satisfy the low $m_0$ sampling and the general constraints. Left: Shows the EB region with the light Higgs boson mass greater than 115 GeV. We see that the majority of these points are not in the heavy Higgs boson region. Middle Left: Displays the HB/FP where we see that there are no Higgs masses greater than 120 GeV. In the right two panels we display the HB/FS (which include HB/FC) as follows: in the middle right panel we exhibit the HB/FS model points for the Higgs mass range above 115 GeV and in the right panel we exhibit the HB/FS model points that have the light Higgs boson mass between 123 GeV and 127 GeV. In all panels the dotted magenta line corresponds to the curve CMS given in Ref. 2 of [12] and the solid magenta line corresponds to the ATLAS curve of Ref. 1 of [16].

FIG. 6: (color online) Exhibition of proton-neutralino spin-independent cross section against the neutralino mass. Here we see that models with a Higgs Boson mass in the range consistent with the results from LHC-7 will be probed in the next round of dark matter experiments. In the plots the proton-neutralino spin-independent cross section was corrected by $R \equiv \frac{(\Omega h^2)}{(\Omega h^2)_{\text{WMAP}}}$ to allow for multicomponent dark matter. The analysis is done for the model points passing the general constraints from the low $m_0$ sampling. The left panel gives the full light Higgs boson mass range, i.e. 115 GeV to 131 GeV and the right panel only deals with the sensitive region between 123 GeV to 127 GeV.

from 1 to 5, $\alpha$ is the neutral Higgs mixing parameter, $n_{1j}$ is the neutralino eigencontent, $c_{\alpha}$ denotes $\cos \alpha$ and $s_{\alpha}$ denotes $\sin \alpha$. The above approximation holds over a significant part of the parameter space specifically for large $m_0$ and we have checked that it compares well with the full analysis where the full theory calculation is done with MICROMEGAS. In the analysis work presented here, however, we exhibit only the results of the full analysis. In Fig. 6 we give a plot of the proton-neutralino spin-independent cross section, $\sigma_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0 p}$ times $R$ plotted as a function of the neutralino mass where we have corrected $\sigma_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0 p}$ by a factor $R \equiv \frac{(\Omega h^2)}{(\Omega h^2)_{\text{WMAP}}}$ to take into account the possibility of multicomponent dark matter. The points are shaded according to the Higgs boson masses and we show the XENON-100 [61] exclusion curve as well as the XENON-1T [62] and the SuperCDMS [63] projections.

It is important to observe that when the Higgs mass region 123 GeV to 127 GeV is considered, nearly all of the mSUGRA parameter points that lie in this region which are also consistent with the general constraints (from our low $m_0$ and high $m_0$ scans) give rise to neutralino mass and proton-neutralino spin-independent cross section (scaled by $R$), that lies just beyond what the most recent results from the XENON collaboration have probed. However, a vast majority of this region is projected to be explored by XENON-1T and SuperCDMS. This point is clearly seen in the right panel of Fig. 6.

VI. CONCLUSION

Recent data from LHC-7 indicates a narrow window on the light Higgs mass. This allowed mass window is
consistent with the range predicted by SUGRA models and specifically by the mSUGRA model. Here we discussed the implications of the indicated mass range for the light Higgs boson mass for the sparticle mass spectrum and for dark matter. Using the allowed Higgs mass range above 115 GeV the corresponding ranges for the soft masses and couplings, as well as the ratio of the vacuum expectation values of the Higgs doublets and the Higgsino mass parameter were found. We then investigated the ranges for the sparticle masses correlated to the predicted value of the Higgs Boson mass, specifically for the first and second generation squarks and sleptons for the chosen value of the Higgs Boson mass, i.e., the CP even Higgs \( H^0 \), the CP odd Higgs \( A^0 \), the charged Higgs \( H^\pm \), the CP even Higgs \( H^0 \), and the charged Higgs \( H^\pm \).

Our conclusions are that the largest Higgs masses are realized on the Focal Surface of the Hyperbolic Branch of radiative electroweak symmetry breaking. We also point out that low values of \( \mu \sim 150 \text{ GeV} \) are consistent with heavy squarks and sleptons in the 10 TeV region or larger. We find that \( m_{\tilde{q}} \in (123-127) \text{ GeV} \) does allow for light third generation stop as low as \( m_{\tilde{t}_1} > 230 \text{ GeV} \), though the second generation squarks are at least \( m_{\tilde{q}} > 1.5 \text{ TeV} \) and second generation sleptons are at least 475 GeV. Thus, the restriction of the light Higgs boson to the mass window \( m_{\tilde{q}} \in (123-127) \text{ GeV} \) provides further constraints on the sparticle spectrum that are complementary to the direct searches for sparticles at the LHC.

Further, we find precise predictions for dark matter if the light Higgs boson mass lies between 123 GeV and 127 GeV. For these light Higgs boson masses, the corresponding range of the lightest neutralino mass would be accessible in the next generation of direct detection dark matter experiments. The light Higgs boson in the 123 GeV and 127 GeV range was shown to be generic for the case of heavy scalars in minimal supergravity with \( |A_0/m_0| \sim \mathcal{O}(1) \).
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