



MITP, March 2018

``BSM summary"

Michael Krämer (RWTH Aachen University)

Aachen Bonn Heidelberg Mainz





Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung

BSM physics at the LHC?

Flavour hierarchy of fermion masses, in particular ν mixing pattern: small mixing for q versus large mixing for ν Anomalies (g - 2)_μ b-physics: R_{D(*)} = Γ(B → D(*)τν)/Γ(B → D(*)lν) (l = e, μ) R_{K(*)} = Γ(B → K(*)μ+μ-)/Γ(B → K(*)e+e-) Cosmology Dark matter Baryon asymmetry of the Universe

see Werner's talk





ρ

Naturalness, Hierarchy, and Fine Tuning

28 February 2018 to 2 March 2018	
Aachen	
Europe/Zurich timezone	

Overview

- Call for Abstracts
- Timetable
- **Contribution List**
- Book of Abstracts
- Registration
- Participant List

Support

harlander@physik.rwth-...

a +49-241-80-27045

The requirement of naturalness has long served as an influential constraint on model-building in theoretical particle physics. Yet there are many ways of understanding what, precisely, this requirement amounts to, from restrictions on the amount of fine-tuning that a model can exhibit, to prohibitions on sensitive dependence between physics at different scales, to the requirement that dimensionless parameters defining the Lagrangian of a theory all be of order one unless they are protected by a symmetry. This workshop aims to



clarify the relationships among these concepts of naturalness and their connection to the hierarchy problem, as well as to assess arguments for and against imposing various forms of naturalness as a requirement on particle physics model-building.

This workshop is part of the DFG research unit "Epistemology of the Large Hadron Collider".

Starts 28 Feb 2018, 08:45 Ends 2 Mar 2018, 18:00 Europe/Zurich



Robert Valentin Harlander

Aachen SuperC (Generali-Saal) RWTH Aachen, Templergraben 57, 52062 Aachen

Search...



- BSM searches with Standard Model cross sections
- Effective field theories and (simplified) models: BSM searches and novel/subtle LHC signatures

BSM searches with Standard Model cross sections

Search for BSM signals which are similar to SM "background"



for $m_{\tilde{t}_1} \approx m_W + m_b + m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$

Search for virtual BSM effects



Reinterpreting diboson cross sections

e.g. to search for SUSY through $pp \to \tilde{t}\tilde{t}^*$ with $\tilde{t} \to W + \tilde{\chi}^0 + b$



K. Rolbiecki, J. Tattersall / Physics Letters B 750 (2015) 247-251

cf. Feigl, Rzehak, Zeppenfeld, arXiv:1205.3468 [hep-ph]; Curtin et al., arXiv:1406.0848 [hep-ph]

Reinterpreting top-quark cross-sections

Stop production might be hiding in the top cross section: $\sigma_{\exp} = \sigma_{t\bar{t}} + \sigma_{\tilde{t}\tilde{t}^*}$



Czakon et al., arXiv:1407.1043 [hep-ph]

Reinterpreting top-quark cross-sections

Stop production might be hiding in the top cross section: $\sigma_{\exp} = \sigma_{t\bar{t}} + \sigma_{\tilde{t}\tilde{t}^*}$



Czakon et al., arXiv:1407.1043 [hep-ph]

Constraints on new theories using Rivet (Contur)

J. Butterworth, MK, D. Grellscheid, B. Sarrazin and D. Yallup JHEP 1703 (2017) 078 & contur.hepforge.org

We rely on precision SM cross section measurements.

They should

- not assume the SM
- agree with the SM prediction



Thus they can potentially constrain BSM processes with SM-like signatures

Constraints on new theories using Rivet (Contur)



Constraints on new theories using Rivet (Contur)





Can we probe this region through indirect precision?







Higgs portal model with dark fermions

$$\mathcal{L} \supset y \left[\sin(2\theta)(\chi_3\chi_3 - \chi_1\chi_1) - 2\cos(2\theta)\chi_3\chi_1 \right] h$$





Voigt and Westhoff, arXiv:1708.01614 [hep-ph]

Higgs portal model with dark fermions

 $\mathcal{L} \supset y \left[\sin(2\theta)(\chi_3\chi_3 - \chi_1\chi_1) - 2\cos(2\theta)\chi_3\chi_1 \right] h$





Virtual effects of dark fermions are sizeable for large Yukawa couplings, and can probe parameter regions with heavy mediators or compressed spectra, complementary to direct searches

Voigt and Westhoff, arXiv:1708.01614 [hep-ph]

We need precision to explore BSM models after discovery

We need precision to explore BSM models after discovery

Do we need precision to improve constraints on BSM models before a discovery?

We need precision to explore BSM models after discovery

Do we need precision to improve constraints on BSM models before a discovery?

Why being an optimist?

- 10 years to develop a tool
- BSM predictions needed for discovery (and for limit setting?)
- Experience with one model can be used for others

Need for both, optimists and pessimists

Conclusion:

Modern OLP are (getting) ready for BSM theories.

see Jean-Nicolas' talk





- BSM searches with Standard Model cross sections
- Effective field theories and (simplified) models: BSM searches and novel/subtle LHC signatures



arXiv:1506.03116 [hep-ph]

B physics anomalies $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} - \frac{1}{v^2} \lambda_{ij}^q \lambda_{\alpha\beta}^\ell \left[C_T \left(\bar{Q}_L^i \gamma_\mu \sigma^a Q_L^j \right) (\bar{L}_L^\alpha \gamma^\mu \sigma^a L_L^\beta) + C_S \left(\bar{Q}_L^i \gamma_\mu Q_L^j \right) (\bar{L}_L^\alpha \gamma^\mu L_L^\beta) \right]$



Buttazzo, Greljo, Isidori, Marzocca, arXiv:1706.07808 [hep-ph]

B physics anomalies $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} - \frac{1}{v^2} \lambda_{ij}^q \lambda_{\alpha\beta}^\ell \left[C_T \left(\bar{Q}_L^i \gamma_\mu \sigma^a Q_L^j \right) (\bar{L}_L^\alpha \gamma^\mu \sigma^a L_L^\beta) + C_S \left(\bar{Q}_L^i \gamma_\mu Q_L^j \right) (\bar{L}_L^\alpha \gamma^\mu L_L^\beta) \right]$



20

B physics anomalies $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} - \frac{1}{v^2} \lambda_{ij}^q \lambda_{\alpha\beta}^\ell \left[C_T \left(\bar{Q}_L^i \gamma_\mu \sigma^a Q_L^j \right) (\bar{L}_L^\alpha \gamma^\mu \sigma^a L_L^\beta) + C_S \left(\bar{Q}_L^i \gamma_\mu Q_L^j \right) (\bar{L}_L^\alpha \gamma^\mu L_L^\beta) \right]$



B physics anomalies $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} - \frac{1}{v^2} \lambda_{ij}^q \lambda_{\alpha\beta}^\ell \left[C_T \left(\bar{Q}_L^i \gamma_\mu \sigma^a Q_L^j \right) (\bar{L}_L^\alpha \gamma^\mu \sigma^a L_L^\beta) + C_S \left(\bar{Q}_L^i \gamma_\mu Q_L^j \right) (\bar{L}_L^\alpha \gamma^\mu L_L^\beta) \right]$



21





Reducing background uncertainties in jets + MET $Z(\ell^+\ell^-)$ + jet see Luca's talk 10^{-} 10 10 10 10^{-9} 10^{-10} 1.2 1.12 1.15 1.0 000 OCD 1.05 1.0 0.95 0.9 0.85 0.85 $\Delta \sigma / \sigma \lesssim 10\%$ 0.8 1.2 1.15 1.00 1.05 1.0 0.95 0.9 0.85 for $p_T \lesssim 3 \text{ TeV}$ 0.8 Lindert et al., arXiv:1705.04664 [hep-ph] 1.2 1.2 1.15 1.1 0.05 1.0 0.95 0.95 0.85 0.8 1.2



Freeze-in dark matter

Hall, Jedamzik, March-Russell, West arXiv:0911.1120 [hep-ph]

Implies tiny couplings between SM and dark sector



Freeze-in dark matter

Hall, Jedamzik, March-Russell, West arXiv:0911.1120 [hep-ph]

Implies tiny couplings between SM and dark sector





Search for long-lived particles and displaced decays

De Roeck

Strongly interacting dark matter

Implies strongly interacting hidden sector



Hochberg, Kuflik, Volansky, Wacker, arXiv:1402.5143 [hep-ph]

Strongly interacting dark matter

Implies strongly interacting hidden sector





Hochberg, Kuflik, Volansky, Wacker, arXiv:1402.5143 [hep-ph]

Novel collider signatures, such as emerging jets, anomalous underlying events,...

Schwaller, Stolarski, Weiler, arXiv:1502.05409 [hep-ph]

Strongly interacting dark matter

Implies strongly interacting hidden sector



Hochberg, Kuflik, Volansky, Wacker, arXiv:1402.5143 [hep-ph]



Novel collider signatures, such as emerging jets, **anomalous underlying events**,...

Harnik, Wizansky, <u>arXiv:0810.3948</u> [hep-ph]

How can we extract subtle BSM signatures from SM backgrounds?

see Luca's talk



How can we extract subtle BSM signatures from SM backgrounds?



Extra dimension theories, e.g. clockwork mechanisms



Extra dimension theories, e.g. clockwork mechanisms



Giudice, Kats, McCullough, Torre, Urbano, <u>arXiv:1711.08437</u> [hep-ph]



- The reinterpretation of SM measurements provides constraints on new physics, complementary to direct searches.
- Virtual effects of new particles can be probed in SM precision observables; need a global analysis of BSM models, incorporating both direct and indirect searches for new physics.
- NLO-automation is crucial to cover a wide range of BSM models.
- EFTs, simplified models and UV-complete models and their interplay are needed to explore BSM physics.
- Simplified and UV-complete models, in particular, can motivate BSM searches through novel and/or subtle LHC signatures.
- Can machine learning help to discovery BSM physics in LHC data in a more model-independent way?