New physics interpretation of $W$-boson mass anomaly
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Abstract

The CDF collaboration has recently reported an updated result on the $W$-boson mass measurement, showing a $7\sigma$ deviation from the standard model prediction. The discrepancy may indicate new contributions to the Fermi coupling constant. We study simple extensions of the standard model by introducing an extra scalar, fermion or vector field. It is found that the tension implies the new physics existing in multi-TeV scales if the new coupling to the electron and/or muon is of order unity.
1 Introduction

The CDF collaboration has very recently reported an updated result of the \(W\)-boson mass \[1\],

\[
M_W = (80.4335 \pm 0.0064_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.0069_{\text{syst}}) \text{ GeV} = 80.4335 \pm 0.0094 \text{ GeV}. \tag{1}
\]

The result shows a deviation at more than 7\(\sigma\) level from the Standard Model (SM) prediction, \(M_W = (80.3500 \pm 0.0056) \text{ GeV} \[2\]. By combining the experimental results of \(M_W\) from LEP 2, Tevatron \[1\], LHC ATLAS \[3\] and LHCb \[4\], the averaged value is (see, e.g., Ref. \[2\])

\[
M_W = 80.4133 \pm 0.0080 \text{ GeV}, \tag{2}
\]

and the deviation becomes 6.5\(\sigma\). Although the CDF result has a tension with the previous experimental data as well as the SM prediction, if this discrepancy would be confirmed in future, it might be a sign of new physics beyond the SM. Implications of the discrepancy have been studied in Refs. \[2,5–32\].

The SM prediction of the \(W\)-boson mass is determined by the electroweak precision observables (EWPO). The CDF discrepancy implies the following three possibilities; i) new physics contributions arising in the operator \(\phi^\dagger \sigma^a \phi W^a_{\mu \nu} B^{\mu \nu}\) in terms of the SM effective field theory (SMEFT) \[33\], ii) those appearing in \((\phi^\dagger D^\mu \phi)((D^\mu \phi)^\dagger \phi)\) and iii) those via the Fermi coupling constant. Here, \(\phi\) is the SM Higgs boson, \(W^a_{\mu \nu}\) (\(B_{\mu \nu}\)) is the field strength of the SU(2)\(_L\) (U(1)\(_Y\)) gauge boson, and \(D^\mu\) is the covariant derivative. In other words, the contributions to the first and second operators are understood as new physics effects on the oblique \(S\) and \(T\) parameters, respectively. See, e.g., Refs. \[2,5,7–10,12,14,18–20,23–25,27,28,30,32\] for such studies in light of the CDF result. Alternatively, we study the third possibility in this paper\[\#1\]. The Fermi coupling constant \(G_F\) is determined precisely by measuring the \(\mu\)on decay to the electron, and receives new physics corrections of \((\phi^\dagger i \gamma^\mu \phi)(\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu \sigma^a \ell_j)\) and \((\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu \ell_j)(\bar{\ell}_k \gamma^\mu \sigma^a \ell_l)\), where \(\ell_i\) is a left-handed lepton in the \(i\)-th generation.

In this paper, we discuss new physics scenarios that affect \(G_F\). In particular, we consider simple extensions of the SM by introducing an extra scalar, fermion or vector field. Among them, scalar fields with a hypercharge 1 and couplings to the SM leptons can contribute to \(G_F\) via the four-Fermi interactions \((\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu \ell_j)(\bar{\ell}_k \gamma^\mu \sigma^a \ell_l)\) with keeping other SMEFT operators unaffected. Also, extra vector bosons which have charged-current interactions with the SM leptons may mimic the SM \(W\) boson, and contribute to \(G_F\). On the other hand, extra leptons which couple to the SM Higgs boson as well as the SM leptons induce multiple \(\#1\)In Ref. \[15\], the \(W\)-boson mass discrepancy is resolved by a shift in the Fermi constant caused by right-handed neutrinos.
SMEFT operators including \((\phi^\dagger i \overset{\leftrightarrow}{D}_\mu^a \phi)(\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu \sigma^a \ell_j)\). Also, we examine flavor dependence of the new physics contributions in the extra lepton scenarios.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sections 2 we explain constraints from the EWPO and study the updated result on the \(W\)-boson mass measurement in the SMEFT framework. In Section 3 we investigate single-field extensions of the SM. Finally our conclusions are drawn in Section 4.

## 2 Electroweak precision observables

The EWPO including the \(W\)-boson mass \(M_W\) can receive contributions of new physics. If its energy scale is higher than the electroweak scale, they are represented in terms of higher dimensional operators of the SMEFT,

\[
\mathcal{L}_{d>4} = \sum_i C_i \mathcal{O}_i,  \tag{3}
\]

where \(C_i\) is a Wilson coefficient and \(\mathcal{O}_i\) is a higher dimensional operator. The dimension-six operators relevant for \(M_W\) in our scenarios are

\[
(\mathcal{O}_{\phi \phi}^{(3)})_{ij} = (\phi^\dagger i \overset{\leftrightarrow}{D}_\mu^a \phi)(\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu \sigma^a \ell_j), \tag{4}
\]

\[
(\mathcal{O}_{\ell \ell})_{ijkl} = (\bar{\ell}_i \gamma_{\mu} \ell_j)(\bar{\ell}_k \gamma_{\mu} \sigma^a \ell_l), \tag{5}
\]

where \(\ell_i (e_{Ri})\) denotes the SU(2)\(_L\) doublet (singlet) lepton in the \(i\)-th generation, and the derivatives mean

\[
\phi^\dagger \overset{\leftrightarrow}{D}_\mu \phi = \phi^\dagger (D_{\mu} \phi) - (D_{\mu} \phi)^\dagger \phi, \quad \phi^\dagger \overset{\leftrightarrow}{D}_\mu^a \phi = \phi^\dagger \sigma^a (D_{\mu} \phi) - (D_{\mu} \phi)^\dagger \sigma^a \phi, \tag{6}
\]

with the Pauli matrix \(\sigma^a\). In addition, when fermion extensions of the SM are discussed in the next section, the EWPO and the leptonic decay of the Higgs boson are affected via the operators,

\[
(\mathcal{O}_{\phi \ell}^{(1)})_{ij} = (\phi^\dagger i \overset{\leftrightarrow}{D}_\mu \phi)(\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu \ell_j), \tag{7}
\]

\[
(\mathcal{O}_{e \phi})_{ij} = (\phi^\dagger \phi)(\bar{\ell}_i \phi e_{Rj}). \tag{8}
\]

Let us define dimensionless coefficients as

\[
\hat{C}_i = v^2 C_i. \tag{9}
\]
Here \( v \) denotes the vacuum expectation value of the Higgs field, \( \phi = [0, (v + h)/\sqrt{2}]^T \), where the Nambu–Goldstone bosons are ignored.

The operator \( O_{\phi f}^{(3)} \) alters the charged-current interactions of leptons after the electroweak symmetry breaking, and the four-Fermi operator \( O_{\ell \ell} \) contributes directly to the muon decay to the electron and neutrinos. Therefore, the measured value of \( G_F \) from the decay is shifted from the SM prediction as

\[
G_F = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2} v^2} (1 + \delta_{G_F}) , \quad \delta_{G_F} = (\hat{C}_{\phi f}^{(3)})_{11} + (\hat{C}_{\phi f}^{(3)})_{22} - (\hat{C}_{\ell \ell})_{1211} .
\]

Note that \((\hat{C}_{\ell \ell})_{1211} = (\hat{C}_{\ell \ell})_{2112} \). Then, the modification of \( G_F \) affects the W-boson mass as

\[
M_W = (M_W)_{\text{SM}} \left[ 1 - \frac{s_W^2}{2(c_W^2 - s_W^2)} \delta_{G_F} \right] ,
\]

where \( s_W \) and \( c_W \) are the sine and cosine of the weak mixing angle. A quantity with the subscript “SM” denotes the SM prediction, which is calculated with the measured values of the input parameters \( G_F, \alpha, M_Z, \) etc. The W-boson partial widths also receive the corrections to \( M_W \) and those to the charged-current couplings as

\[
\Gamma(W^+ \rightarrow \ell^+_i \nu_{\ell_i}) = \Gamma(W^+ \rightarrow \ell'^+_i \nu_{\ell_i})_{\text{SM}} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{2(c_W^2 - s_W^2)} \delta_{G_F} + 2(\hat{C}^{(3)}_{\phi f})_{ii} \right] ,
\]

\[
\Gamma(W^+ \rightarrow ij) = \Gamma(W^+ \rightarrow ij)_{\text{SM}} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{2(c_W^2 - s_W^2)} \delta_{G_F} \right] .
\]

where \( ij \) in the lower line represents quark final states such as \( \bar{d}u \) and \( \bar{s}c \).

The operators \( O_{\phi f}^{(1)} \) and \( O_{\phi f}^{(2)} \) contribute to the neutral-current interactions of left-handed leptons. The Z-boson couplings to the SM fermions \( f \) are written as

\[
\mathcal{L}_Z = \frac{g}{c_W} f_{\gamma \mu} \left[ (T_{L}^0 - Q s_W^2 + \delta g_L) P_L + (T_{R}^0 - Q s_W^2 + \delta g_R) P_R \right] f Z_{\mu} ,
\]

where \( T_{L,R}^0 \) and \( Q \) are the weak isospin and the electric charge of \( f \), and the new physics contributions are obtained as

\[
\delta g_L = \begin{cases} 
-\frac{1}{2} \left[ T_L^0 + \frac{Q s_W^2}{c_W^2 - s_W^2} \right] \delta_{G_F} - \frac{1}{2} \left( C_{\phi f}^{(1)} \right)_{ii} + T_R^0 \left( C_{\phi f}^{(3)} \right)_{ii} & \text{for } f = \ell, \nu_{\ell_i} , \\
-\frac{1}{2} \left[ T_L^0 + \frac{Q s_W^2}{c_W^2 - s_W^2} \right] \delta_{G_F} & \text{otherwise},
\end{cases}
\]

\#2Here, we omitted contributions from \( O_{\phi WB} = (\phi^d \sigma^a \phi^B_{\mu \nu} B^{\mu \nu}) \) and \( O_{\phi D} = (\phi^d D_{\mu} \phi^B (D^\mu \phi)^* \phi^B) \), which can be taken into account by replacing \( \delta_{G_F} \rightarrow \delta_{G_F} + \frac{2c_{\theta_W}}{s_{\theta_W}} \hat{C}_{\phi WB} + \frac{c_{\theta_W}^2}{2s_{\theta_W}} \hat{C}_{\phi D} \) in Eq. (11).
The Z-boson observables in Table 1 are represented in terms of these effective $Z_{ff}$ couplings (see, e.g., Ref. [34]).

We perform a Bayesian fit of the SMEFT operators to the experimental data of the EWPO [35–37]. The analysis utilizes the HEPfit v1.0 package [38], which is based on the Markov Chain Monte Carlo provided by the Bayesian Analysis Toolkit (BAT) [39]. The full two-loop electroweak corrections are included for the SM contributions to $M_W$ and the $Z$-boson observables [40–42], while the $W$-boson widths are calculated at one-loop level [43,44]. Additionally new physics contributions are implemented to the package for the current work. Theoretical uncertainties from missing higher-order corrections in the SM are included only for the $W$ mass, $\delta_{\text{th}} M_W = 4 \text{ MeV}$ [40] assuming the Gaussian distribution, while those for the other observables are not significant [45] and neglected from the fit. The input values necessary for this study are summarized in Table 1, where the choice of $\alpha_s(M_W^2)$, $\Delta \alpha_{\text{had}}(M_W^2)$ and $m_t$ are followed by those in Refs. [2,46]. In the following analysis, the parameters $G_F$, $\alpha$ and the light fermion masses are fixed to be constants.

$$\delta g_R = -\frac{Q s_W^2}{2(c_W^2 - s_W^2)} \delta G_F.$$  (16)

Table 1: Experimental measurement of the SM input parameters and EWPO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_s(M_Z^2)$</td>
<td>0.1177 ± 0.0010</td>
<td>$M_Z$ [GeV]</td>
<td>91.1876 ± 0.0021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta \alpha_{\text{had}}(M_Z^2)$</td>
<td>0.02766 ± 0.00010</td>
<td>$\Gamma_Z$ [GeV]</td>
<td>2.4955 ± 0.0023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_t$ [GeV]</td>
<td>171.79 ± 0.38</td>
<td>$\sigma_h^0$ [nb]</td>
<td>41.4807 ± 0.0325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_h$ [GeV]</td>
<td>125.21 ± 0.12</td>
<td>$R^0_e$</td>
<td>20.8038 ± 0.0497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_W$ [GeV]</td>
<td>80.4133 ± 0.0080</td>
<td>$R^0_\mu$</td>
<td>20.7842 ± 0.0335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma_W$ [GeV]</td>
<td>2.085 ± 0.042</td>
<td>$R^0_\tau$</td>
<td>20.7644 ± 0.0448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{B}(W \to e\nu)$</td>
<td>0.1071 ± 0.0016</td>
<td>$A_{\text{FF}}^{0,e}$</td>
<td>0.0145 ± 0.0025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{B}(W \to \mu\nu)$</td>
<td>0.1063 ± 0.0015</td>
<td>$A_{\text{FF}}^{0,\mu}$</td>
<td>0.0169 ± 0.0013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{B}(W \to \tau\nu)$</td>
<td>0.1138 ± 0.0022</td>
<td>$A_{\text{FF}}^{0,\tau}$</td>
<td>0.0188 ± 0.0017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_e$ (SLD)</td>
<td>0.1516 ± 0.0021</td>
<td>$R^0_b$</td>
<td>0.21629 ± 0.00066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_\mu$ (SLD)</td>
<td>0.142 ± 0.015</td>
<td>$R^0_c$</td>
<td>0.1721 ± 0.0030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_e$ (SLD)</td>
<td>0.136 ± 0.015</td>
<td>$A_{\text{FF}}^{0,b}$</td>
<td>0.0992 ± 0.0016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_\tau$ (LEP)</td>
<td>0.1498 ± 0.0049</td>
<td>$A_{\text{FF}}^{0,c}$</td>
<td>0.0707 ± 0.0035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_e$ (LEP)</td>
<td>0.1439 ± 0.0043</td>
<td>$A_b$</td>
<td>0.923 ± 0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$A_c$</td>
<td>0.670 ± 0.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The $Z$-boson observables in Table 1 are represented in terms of these effective $Z_{ff}$ couplings (see, e.g., Ref. [34]).
As shown in Eq. (10), the Fermi coupling constant is affected by $(C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{11,22}$ or $(C_{\ell \ell})_{1221}$. In Figs. 1 and 2, we show the probability distributions for $(C_{\ell \ell})_{1221}$ and $(C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{ii}$, respectively. The horizontal axes are shown in units of TeV$^{-2}$. It is noticed from Eq. (10) that $G_F$ depends on $(C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{ii}$ in a combination of $(C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{11} + (C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{22}$. According to Eqs. (12) and (15), these Wilson coefficients also contribute to the $Z$-observables and the leptonic channels of the $W$-boson decays directly. Hence we performed the analysis in a flavor-dependent way. For the top two plots in Fig. 2, only a single operator for $(C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{11}$ or $(C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{22}$ is switched on, while the lepton-flavor universality is assumed for the bottom-left plot: $(C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{ii} \equiv (C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{11} = (C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{22} = (C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{33}$. In the bottom-right plot, the two coefficients are fitted simultaneously. From the figures it is found that the Wilson coefficient is implied to take a positive value for $(C_{\ell \ell})_{1221}$, while $(C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{ii} < 0$ is favored to relax the $W$-boson mass discrepancy. As will be discussed in the next section, these results are useful to discriminate the models.

The numerical results are summarized in Tables 3 and 4. Here, we also show a result of $M_W$ pull in units of the standard deviation for each fit. It is found that the contributions $(C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{11,22}$ or $(C_{\ell \ell})_{1221}$ can relax the $W$-boson mass discrepancy significantly. In particular, the lepton-flavor universal contribution $(C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{ii} \equiv (C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{11} = (C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{22} = (C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{33}$ provides the best result. The simultaneous fit of $(C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{11}$ and $(C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{22}$ has a similar value. In the tables, the values of the information criterion (IC) are also presented:

$$ IC = -2 \ln L + 4 \sigma^2_{\ln L}, $$

where $\ln L$ and $\sigma^2_{\ln L}$ are the posterior mean and the variance of the log-likelihood distribution, respectively. Preferred scenarios give smaller $IC$ values. Note that the SM fit gives $IC = 96$.

### 3 New physics interpretation

Let us investigate new physics scenarios to relax the $W$-boson mass discrepancy. The CDF result may indicate extra contributions to the Fermi coupling constant via $(C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{11,22}$ or $(C_{\ell \ell})_{1221}$. We consider simple extensions of the SM, *i.e.*, introduce a single scalar, fermion,
or vector field at a time. The quantum numbers of possible candidates are summarized in Table 2.

3.1 Scalar extension

The $W$-boson mass can be modified by complex scalar fields, $S_1$ and $\Xi_1$, via $(C_{\ell\ell})_{1221}$. They have Yukawa interactions with the SM (left-handed) leptons as

$$-\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} = (y_{S_1})_{ij} S_1^\dagger \bar{\ell}_i c \sigma^2 \ell_j^c + (y_{\Xi_1})_{ij} \Xi_1^\dagger \bar{\ell}_i c \sigma^2 \ell_j^c + \text{h.c.},$$

where $c$ denotes the charge conjugation. The SMEFT operators receive corrections by exchanging the scalar bosons. If we focus on the above Yukawa interactions, only the Wilson coefficient $C_{\ell\ell}$ among the SMEFT operators is shifted as

$$(C_{\ell\ell})_{ijkl} = \frac{(y_{S_1})^*_{ik}(y_{S_1})_{kj}}{M_{S_1}^2} + \frac{(y_{\Xi_1})^*_{ik}(y_{\Xi_1})_{kj}}{M_{\Xi_1}^2},$$

at the tree level. Here $M_{S_1}$ and $M_{\Xi_1}$ are the masses of $S_1$ and $\Xi$, respectively. Although $\Xi_1$ can also have scalar interactions with the SM Higgs boson, they are generically independent of the above Yukawa interaction and irrelevant for $M_W$. Hence, we neglect them in the following analysis.

The Fermi coupling constant receives corrections from $(C_{\ell\ell})_{ijkl}$ with \{i, j, k, l\} = \{1, 2, 2, 1\} (see Eq. (10)):

$$(C_{\ell\ell})_{1221} = \frac{(y_{S_1})_{12}(y_{S_1})_{21}}{M_{S_1}^2} + \frac{(y_{\Xi_1})_{12}(y_{\Xi_1})_{21}}{M_{\Xi_1}^2}. $$

Here, we assume that the Yukawa couplings are real. From Fig. 1, it is found that the couplings and masses are favored to be within the range,

$$0.13 < \frac{\mathcal{Y}_{S_1}}{M_{S_1}}, \frac{\mathcal{Y}_{\Xi_1}}{M_{\Xi_1}} < 0.17 \text{ TeV}^{-1}, \quad (68\%)$$

where $\mathcal{Y}_{S_1} = \sqrt{(y_{S_1})_{21}(y_{S_1})_{12}}$, $\mathcal{Y}_{\Xi_1} = \sqrt{(y_{\Xi_1})_{21}(y_{\Xi_1})_{12}}$. This result implies that the new physics scale is around 6–7 TeV for $\mathcal{Y}_i \sim 1$. In Table 3, the pull of $M_W$ is the same as that for $(C_{\ell\ell})_{1221}$ because the scalar bosons contribute to the EWPO only via this Wilson coefficient.
Figure 1: Probability distribution for $C_{\ell\ell}_{1221}$ in units of TeV$^{-2}$ obtained from a fit to the EWPO, where the darker (lighter) region correspond to the 68% (95%) probability.

### 3.2 Vector extension

The $W$-boson mass can be modified by massive vector bosons, $B$ and $W$, via $(C_{\ell\ell})_{1221}$. Here, we do not assume any mechanism to generate the vector boson mass or any UV realization of the model, but consider a low-energy effective framework. The vector interactions with the SM (left-handed) leptons are represented as

$$-\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} = (g_B)_{ij} B_{\mu} \bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu \ell_j + \frac{1}{2} (g_W)_{ij} W^a_{\mu} \bar{\ell}_i \sigma^a \gamma^\mu \ell_j.$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

Here, $(g_B, g_W)_{ij}$ are real parameters and symmetric under $i \leftrightarrow j$. By exchanging the vector bosons, the Wilson coefficient $C_{\ell\ell}$ becomes \[48,49\]

$$(C_{\ell\ell})_{ijkl} = -\frac{(g_B)_{kl}(g_B)_{ij}}{2M_B^2} - \frac{(g_W)_{kj}(g_W)_{il}}{4M_W^2} + \frac{(g_W)_{kl}(g_W)_{ij}}{8M_W^2},$$ \hspace{1cm} (23)

at the tree level, where $M_B$ and $M_W$ are the masses of $B$ and $W$, respectively. Similarly to the scalar case, there are no contributions to other SMEFT operators as long as only the interactions (22) are considered. Although the vector bosons may also have interactions with the SM right-handed leptons, quarks or Higgs boson, they are not always correlated with $(g_{B,W})_{ij}$. Since they are irrelevant for $M_W$, we neglect them in the following analysis.

The Fermi coupling constant receives corrections from $(C_{\ell\ell})_{ijkl}$ with $\{i,j,k,l\} = \{1,2,2,1\}$ (see Eq. (10)). Then, the above Wilson coefficient is shown as

$$(C_{\ell\ell})_{1221} = -\frac{(g_B)_{12}^2}{2M_B^2} - \frac{(g_W)_{11}(g_W)_{22}}{4M_W^2} + \frac{(g_W)_{12}^2}{8M_W^2},$$ \hspace{1cm} (24)
where \((g_{B,W})_{ij} = (g_{B,W})_{ji}\) is used. The sign of the second term in the right-hand side can be flipped if the product \((g_{W})_{11}(g_{W})_{22}\) is negative. On the other hand, the first and third terms do not have such a degree of freedom. Since the \(W\)-boson mass discrepancy favors a positive value for \((C_{\ell\ell})_{1221}\) as shown in Fig. [4], only the vector boson \(W\) can be a source of the anomaly. Consequently, we obtain
\[
0.27 < \frac{G_W}{M_W} < 0.34 \text{ TeV}^{-1}, \quad 0.38 < \frac{(g_W)_{12}}{M_W} < 0.49 \text{ TeV}^{-1},
\]
(25)
at the 68% probability. Here \(G_{\ell\ell} = \sqrt{-(g_{W})_{11}(g_{W})_{22}}\). The results imply that the mass of \(W\) is around 2–4 TeV for \(g_{W}, G_{\ell\ell} \sim 1\). In similar to the scalar case, the pull of \(M_{W}\) is the same as that for \((C_{\ell\ell})_{1221}\) (see Table [3]).

In Eq. (23), the first and third terms in the right-handed side are understood as the neutral-current contribution, while the second one is a charged-current effect. In presence of \((g_{W})_{12}\), the muonium-antimuonium oscillation can be induced by exchanging the neutral vector boson, because \((C_{\ell\ell})_{1212} = (C_{\ell\ell})_{1221}\) due to \((g_{W})_{12} = (g_{W})_{21}\). Currently, the experimental constraint is \((C_{\ell\ell})_{1212} < 0.1 \text{ TeV}^{-2}\) at 90% C.L. [50], and it is found that the limit is looser than the parameter region required to relax the \(W\)-boson mass discrepancy.

### 3.3 Fermion extension

As the third scenario, let us consider extra leptons, \(E\) and \(\Sigma_1\). The Yukawa interactions with the SM (left-handed) leptons are shown as
\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} = (\lambda_E)_i \bar{E}_R \phi^i \ell_i + \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_{\Sigma_1})_i \Sigma^a_{1L} \phi \sigma^a \ell_i + \text{h.c.}
\]
(26)
In addition, it is assumed that the extra leptons have vectorlike mass terms, \(-\mathcal{L}_{\text{mass}} = M'_E \bar{E}_L E_R + M'_{\Sigma_1} \Sigma^a_{1L} \Sigma^a_{1R} + \text{h.c.}\). After the electroweak symmetry breaking, their masses are determined from these terms and Eq. (26). In the following analysis, we assume that the former contribution is dominant due to \(M'_E, M'_{\Sigma_1} \gg v\), and the mass eigenvalues are denoted as \(M_E (\simeq M'_E)\) and \(M_{\Sigma_1} (\simeq M'_{\Sigma_1})\). Also, we ignore mixing angles between the SM and extra leptons which arise in diagonalizing mass matrices. Then, the Wilson coefficients are obtained as [48,49]
\[
(C_{\ell\ell})_{ij} = (y_{\ell})^*_{jk} \left[ \frac{(\lambda_E)_k (\lambda_E)^*_{1k}}{2 M_E^2} + \frac{(\lambda_{\Sigma_1})_k (\lambda_{\Sigma_1})^*_{1k}}{8 M_{\Sigma_1}^2} \right],
\]
(27)
We will not consider a gauge singlet \(N \sim (1,1)_0\) and an SU(2)_L adjoint lepton \(\Sigma \sim (1,3)_0\), because they are likely to generate too large neutrino masses [51,55].
Figure 2: Probability distributions for the coefficients $C_{\phi \ell}^{(3)}$. The horizon axis is shown in units of TeV$^{-2}$. Only a single operator is switched on at a time for the top two plots, while the lepton-flavor universality is assumed for the bottom-left plot: $(C_{\phi \ell}^{(3)})_{ii} = (C_{\phi \ell}^{(3)})_{11} = (C_{\phi \ell}^{(3)})_{22} = (C_{\phi \ell}^{(3)})_{33}$. In the bottom-right plot, the two coefficients are fitted simultaneously.

\begin{align}
(C_{\phi \ell}^{(1)})_{ij} &= -\frac{(\lambda_E)_{ij}(\lambda_E)^*_i}{4M_E^2} - \frac{3(\lambda_{\Sigma_1})_{ij}(\lambda_{\Sigma_1})^*_i}{16M_{\Sigma_1}^2}, \\
(C_{\phi \ell}^{(3)})_{ij} &= -\frac{(\lambda_E)_{ij}(\lambda_E)^*_i}{4M_E^2} + \frac{(\lambda_{\Sigma_1})_{ij}(\lambda_{\Sigma_1})^*_i}{16M_{\Sigma_1}^2},
\end{align}

at the tree level. Here $(y_\ell)_{ij}$ is the lepton Yukawa coupling. The $W$-boson mass receives corrections from $(C_{\phi \ell}^{(3)})_{11,22}$ via the Fermi coupling constant, while the $Z$-boson observables are additionally affected by $(C_{\phi \ell}^{(1,3)})_{ii}$ directly, and the $W$-boson partial decay width $\Gamma(W^+ \to \ell^+ \nu_\ell)$ are by $(C_{\phi \ell}^{(3)})_{ii}$ (see Sec. 2).

For the Fermi coupling constant, the Wilson coefficient in Eq. (29) is shown as

\begin{equation}
(C_{\phi \ell}^{(3)})_{11,22} = -\frac{(\lambda_E)_{1,2}^2}{4M_E^2} + \frac{(\lambda_{\Sigma_1})_{1,2}^2}{16M_{\Sigma_1}^2},
\end{equation}
where we assume that the Yukawa couplings are real. Since the contribution from the extra lepton $E$ ($\Sigma_1$) is negative (positive), it is found from Fig. 2 that $E$ can be a source of the $W$-boson mass discrepancy.

The extra lepton $E$ induces the SMEFT operators $O_{\phi \phi}$, $O^{(1)}_{\phi \ell}$ and $O^{(3)}_{\phi \ell}$, where the EWPO are insensitive to the first one. With including all the contributions, we obtain the EWPO fit of the model parameters with a lepton-flavor dependent or universal assumption. The results are shown in Fig. 3. In the top two plots, either ($\lambda_E)_1$ or ($\lambda_E)_2$ is switched on in the analysis, while in the bottom-left plot, we assume ($\lambda_E)_1 = ($\lambda_E)_2 = ($\lambda_E)_3 \equiv ($\lambda_E)_i$; and in the bottom-right plot, ($\lambda_E)_1$ and ($\lambda_E)_2$ are fitted simultaneously with ($\lambda_E)_3 = 0$.

From the figure, it is found that the muonic interaction ($\lambda_E)_2$ is preferably larger than ($\lambda_E)_1$, and the $W$-boson mass implies that the extra lepton $E$ may exist in 5–7 TeV for ($\lambda_E)_1 \sim 1$ and around 3–4 TeV for ($\lambda_E)_2 \sim 1$. For the universal case, the extra lepton mass is favored to be 5–6 TeV for ($\lambda_E)_i \sim 1$. From Table 3 we also found that the pull of $M_W$ is slightly worse than the result of $C_{\phi \ell}^{(3)}$. This is because of the additional contributions to
the EWPO via \(C_{\phi\ell}^{(1)}\). On the other hand, from Table 4 the degradation is found to be milder when \((\lambda_E)_1\) and \((\lambda_E)_2\) are fitted simultaneously.

The extra leptons can also affect the Higgs interactions via the SMEFT operator \(O_{e\phi}\). The lepton Yukawa coupling is shifted as

\[
y_{\ell i} = \sqrt{2} \frac{m_{\ell i}}{v} + \frac{1}{2} (\hat{C}_{e\phi})_{ii} = (y_{\ell i})_{\text{SM}} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{2} \delta_G \right] + \frac{1}{2} (\hat{C}_{e\phi})_{ii},
\]

after the electroweak symmetry breaking. Consequently, the signal strength of the Higgs decay rate into lepton pair is modified from the SM prediction as

\[
\mu_{\ell_i \ell_i} \equiv \frac{\Gamma(h \rightarrow \ell_i \ell_i)}{\Gamma(h \rightarrow \ell_i \ell_i)_{\text{SM}}} = \left| 1 - \frac{1}{2} \delta_G - \frac{1}{(y_{\ell i})_{\text{SM}}} (\hat{C}_{e\phi})_{ii} \right|^2.
\]

In Fig. 4 the theoretical predictions of \(\mu^{\mu\mu}\) and \(\mu^{\tau\tau}\) are shown for the cases when only \((\lambda_E)_2\) is switched on (left) and the universal coupling \((\lambda_E)_i\) is varied (right). The vertical axis represents the deviation of the signal strength from the SM prediction, \(\Delta \mu_{\ell_i \ell_i} = \mu_{\ell_i \ell_i} - 1\). It is found that the signal strengths decrease by \(O(0.1\%)\) by the contributions of \(E\). The effect is sufficiently weaker than the current experimental sensitivities; the experimental results are \(\mu^{\mu\mu} = 1.2 \pm 0.6\) \cite{atlasMuonMu}, \(\mu^{\tau\tau} = 1.14 \pm 0.32\) \cite{atlasMuonTau} from ATLAS, and \(\mu^{\mu\mu} = 1.19^{+0.40}_{-0.39}\text{(stat)}^{+0.15}_{-0.14}\text{(syst)}\) \cite{atlasMuonMu}, \(\mu^{\tau\tau} = 1.02^{+0.26}_{-0.24}\) \cite{atlasMuonTau} from CMS. In future, the HL-LHC experiment may achieve \(\delta \mu^{\mu\mu}/\mu^{\mu\mu} = 9\%\) and \(\delta \mu^{\tau\tau}/\mu^{\tau\tau} = 4\%\) at \(\sqrt{s} = 14\text{ TeV}\) with the integrated luminosity \(L = 6\text{ ab}^{-1}\), and the sensitivities could reach \(\delta \mu^{\mu\mu}/\mu^{\mu\mu} = 0.8\%\) and \(\delta \mu^{\tau\tau}/\mu^{\tau\tau} = 0.9\%\) and at FCC-ee/eh/hh \cite{fcc}. Therefore, further improvement is necessary to detect the effects of the extra lepton.

### 4 Conclusions and discussion

Motivated by the tensions reported in the updated measurement of the W-boson mass by the CDF collaboration, we studied new physics interpretations. We considered the scenarios that affect \(G_F\) and investigated single-field extensions of the SM, \(i.e.,\), introducing one of the extra scalars (\(S_1\) and \(\Xi_1\)), leptons (\(E\) and \(\Sigma_1\)), and vector fields (\(B\) and \(W\)). It was found that the models with \(S_1, \Xi_1, E\) and \(W\) can relax the discrepancy if the new particles exist in multi-TeV scales when the new coupling to the SM leptons is \(\sim 1\). In particular, the scalars and vectors affect \(M_W\) via the lepton four-Fermi operator \(O_{\ell\ell}\); its Wilson coefficient is favored to be \(\sim 0.02-0.03\text{ TeV}^{-2}\). On the other hand, the extra leptons contribute to the Fermi coupling constant via \(O_{e\phi}^{(3)}\), and the \(M_W\) discrepancy prefers \((C_{\phi\ell}^{(3)})_{11}\) and/or \((C_{\phi\ell}^{(3)})_{22}\) becoming \(\sim -(0.01-0.03)\text{ TeV}^{-2}\). It was shown that the anomaly could be relaxed if any of
shown to be relaxed drastically. In particular, the lepton-flavor universal contribution of $C_{\ell\ell}^{(3)}$ provides the best result. Also, the masses of $S_1$, $\Xi_1$, $\mathcal{W}$, and $E$ are fixed to be 1 TeV. In the SMEFT fits, only a single operator is switched on at a time, while the lepton-flavor universality is assumed for $(C_{\ell\ell}^{(3)})_{ii}$ and $(\lambda_E)_i$, i.e., $(C_{\ell\ell}^{(3)})_{ii} \equiv (C_{\ell\ell}^{(3)})_{11} = (C_{\ell\ell}^{(3)})_{22} = (C_{\ell\ell}^{(3)})_{33}$ and $(\lambda_E)_i \equiv (\lambda_E)_1 = (\lambda_E)_2 = (\lambda_E)_3$. The forth column shows the pull value for the difference between the fit result and the experimental average of $M_W$, while the values in the last column are the information criterion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>68% prob. range</th>
<th>95% prob. range</th>
<th>$M_W$ pull [$\sigma$]</th>
<th>$IC$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$(C_{\ell\ell}^{(3)})_{11}$</td>
<td>$[0.018, 0.030]$</td>
<td>$[0.012, 0.035]$</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(C_{\ell\ell}^{(3)})_{11}$</td>
<td>$[-0.027, -0.017]$</td>
<td>$[-0.032, -0.012]$</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(C_{\ell\ell}^{(3)})_{22}$</td>
<td>$[-0.028, -0.017]$</td>
<td>$[-0.033, -0.012]$</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(C_{\ell\ell}^{(3)})_{ii}$</td>
<td>$[-0.020, -0.014]$</td>
<td>$[-0.024, -0.011]$</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $Y_{S_i}$ | $[0.13, 0.17]$ | $[0.11, 0.19]$ | 2.9 | 71 |
| $Y_{\Xi_1}$ | $[0.13, 0.17]$ | $[0.11, 0.19]$ | 2.9 | 71 |
| $G_W$ | $[0.27, 0.34]$ | $[0.22, 0.38]$ | 2.9 | 71 |
| $(g_W)_{12}$ | $[0.38, 0.49]$ | $[0.31, 0.53]$ | 2.9 | 71 |
| $|(|(\lambda_E)_1| | [0.13, 0.20] | [0.08, 0.23] | 4.0 | 87 |
| $|(|(\lambda_E)_2| | [0.23, 0.30] | [0.19, 0.32] | 3.4 | 73 |
| $|(|(\lambda_E)_i| | [0.17, 0.22] | [0.14, 0.24] | 3.1 | 71 |

Table 3: Fit results for the SMEFT coefficients in units of TeV$^{-2}$ and for the new couplings at 68% and 95% probability ranges. Here $Y_{S_i} = \sqrt{y_{S_i}^2 (y_{S_i})_1 y_{S_i}^2 (y_{S_i})_2}$, $Y_{\Xi_1} = \sqrt{y_{\Xi_1}^2 (y_{\Xi_1})_1 y_{\Xi_1}^2 (y_{\Xi_1})_2}$, and $G_W = \sqrt{-(g_W)_{11} (g_W)_{22}}$. Also, the masses of $S_1$, $\Xi_1$, $\mathcal{W}$, and $E$ are fixed to be 1 TeV. The forth column shows the pull value for the difference between the fit result and the experimental average of $M_W$, while the values in the last column are the information criterion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>68% prob. range</th>
<th>95% prob. range</th>
<th>$M_W$ pull [$\sigma$]</th>
<th>$IC$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$(C_{\ell\ell}^{(3)})_{11}$</td>
<td>$[-0.022, -0.011]$</td>
<td>$[-0.027, -0.005]$</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(C_{\ell\ell}^{(3)})_{22}$</td>
<td>$[-0.022, -0.011]$</td>
<td>$[-0.028, -0.005]$</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(\lambda_E)_1</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.26, 0.40]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(\lambda_E)_2</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.45, 0.59]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Same as Table 3 but for the fits with the two coefficients $(C_{\ell\ell}^{(3)})_{11}$ and $(C_{\ell\ell}^{(3)})_{22}$, or $|(|(\lambda_E)_1|$ and $|(|(\lambda_E)_2|$. $(\lambda_E)_1$ and $(\lambda_E)_2$ is $\sim 0.1$–0.3 for $M_E = 1$ TeV. We also evaluated the pull of $M_W$ in each fit. Although any of the scenarios cannot explain the discrepancy perfectly, the tension is shown to be relaxed drastically. In particular, the lepton-flavor universal contribution of $C_{\ell\ell}^{(3)}$ provides the best result.

Let us comment on connections with other anomalies. Currently, the experimental results
Figure 4: Signal strength of the Higgs boson decays for $\lambda_E$ with $M_E = 1$ TeV. Only $(\lambda_E)_2$ is switched on in the left plot, while the coupling is universal in the right. The blue regions correspond to the 68% probability ranges provided in Fig. 3.

of the anomalous magnetic moment of muon [61–64] show a $4.2\sigma$ discrepancy from the SM prediction [65]. This tension can be solved by introducing the vectorlike leptons at the one-loop level [66–81]. In fact, the extra contributions become as large as $\mathcal{O}(10^{-9})$ even for $M_i = \mathcal{O}(1)$ TeV by introducing another extra lepton, $\Delta_1 \sim (1, 2)_{-\frac{1}{2}}$ or $\Delta_3 \sim (1, 2)_{-\frac{3}{2}}$, in addition to $E$, because the interaction between the extra leptons enhances a chirality flip. Note that $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_3$ do not contribute to $G_F$, while they affect EWPO via the SMEFT operator $(\phi^\dagger iD_\mu \phi)(\bar{\epsilon}_i \gamma^\mu \epsilon_j)$. Hence, further analyses are required for detailed studies.

On the other hand, the Cabibbo-angle anomaly [82–86] may be resolved by introducing $(C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{ii}$. According to Ref. [85], the anomaly favors $(C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{11} \sim -0.02$ TeV$^{-2}$ and $(C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{22} \sim +0.01$ TeV$^{-2}$. Since the $W$-boson discrepancy implies $(C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{11,22} \sim -(0.02–0.03)$ TeV$^{-2}$, both tensions may be relaxed by introducing $(C^{(3)}_{\phi \ell})_{11}$ simultaneously. Such a situation can be realized in the extra lepton models (cf., Refs. [78,79]).

Note added

When we were finalizing this paper, Ref. [24] appeared on arXiv, which discusses single field extensions of the SM. In contrast to that paper, we investigated here in details the scenarios where the $W$-boson mass anomaly is relaxed by the new physics affecting the Fermi constant. In particular, we studied the effects of the flavor non-universal couplings in addition to the flavor universal ones. Furthermore, we considered the scalar field $\Xi_1$, which was not studied in Ref. [24].
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