#### **ADRIAN CARMONA BERMUDEZ**

# 

## MITP PROGRAM - Flavor at t

athenea

nales









## Charming ALPs' AC, Scherb, Schwaller. JHEP 08 (2021) 121, arXiv: 2101.0783

 'The ALPs from the Top: Searching for long-lived axion-like particles from exotic top decays' AC, Elahi, Scherb, Schwaller. arXiv: 2202.0973



# NTRODUCTION

## NATURALLY LIGHT SCALARS

The scale of new physics seems to be rather heavy

A natural way of obtaining light scalar degrees of freedom is through the Goldstone theorem









## NATURALLY LIGHT SCALARS

#### **QCD** gives us a beautiful example









## Axion-like particles (ALPs) are pseudo-Nambu-Goldstone bosons (pNGBs) of a spontaneously broken global symmetry

## One typically assumes that CP is a good symmetry and that the ALP is CP-odd



## ALP + SM FFT **ALP EFT** above the electroweak scale



FCNCs are generated via  $c_{WW}$  at one loop Gavela et al, 1901.02031



 $-\frac{a}{f_{a}}\left[c_{GG}\frac{g_{3}^{2}}{32\pi^{2}}G_{\mu\nu}^{a}\tilde{G}^{a\,\mu\nu}+c_{WW}\frac{g_{2}^{2}}{32\pi^{2}}W_{\mu\nu}^{I}\tilde{W}^{I\,\mu\nu}+c_{BB}\frac{g_{1}^{2}}{32\pi^{2}}B_{\mu\nu}\tilde{B}^{\mu\nu}\right]$ 





U,C,T  $A_{QCO}$ π, Χ, Ο,...



#### Schwaller, Bai, '14

an ar ar L Doaco TTOLD (B)

\* SU(ND) gauge froup \* If Dirac fermions \* MQ << ADDOCD

\* SU(nf) & SU(nf) SU(nf)

![](_page_9_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### Schwaller, Bai, '14

![](_page_10_Figure_5.jpeg)

#### The SM couplings are fixed by the quantum numbers of $\chi$ , bifundamental of both strong gauge groups

![](_page_10_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_4.jpeg)

#### Schwaller, Bai, '14

#### The SM couplings are fixed by the quantum numbers of $\chi$ , bifundamental of both strong gauge groups

![](_page_11_Picture_8.jpeg)

## A QCD-LIKE DARK SECTOR Schwaller, Bai, '14 When $m_Q \to 0$ , $m_{\gamma} \to \infty$ , $SU(3)_{DL} \otimes SU(3)_{RD} \to SU(3)_{DV}$ by $\langle \bar{Q}_{\alpha} Q_{\beta} \rangle \sim \delta_{\alpha\beta} \Lambda^3_{DOCD}$ delivering 8 pNGB Dark Quark content Dark lions $\pi T_{D}^{(1,2)}$ Q2Q1 $\overline{Q_2}\overline{Q_1}$ π(1,3) Q2Q2 $\pi^{(2,3)}$ $V_2 \left[ Q, Q_1 - Q_2 Q_2 \right]$ Tt<sub>D3</sub> $1/12[\overline{Q}, \overline{Q}, + \overline{Q}_2 Q_2 - 2\overline{Q}_3 Q_3]$ TTOP

![](_page_12_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_3.jpeg)

energy EFTs

 $SU(3)_{c} \times SU(3)_{b} \times SU(2)_{c} \times U(1)_{y}$ 

 $\chi \sim (33,1,1_2)$ 

Schwaller, Renner '18

 $\chi \sim (3, \overline{3}, 1, -2/3)$ 

![](_page_13_Picture_7.jpeg)

AC, Scherb, Schwaller '21

#### Schwaller, Bai, '14

#### Depending of the quantum numbers of the heavy scalar we can have different low

Lit - Kaidzi Qua X+ h.c

Lint D-Kaine; Qualth.C

![](_page_13_Picture_13.jpeg)

energy EFTs

 $SU(3)_{c} \times SU(3)_{n} \times SU(2)_{r} \times U(1)_{y}$ 

 $\chi \sim (3, 3, 1, 1_2)$ 

Schwaller, Renner '18

 $\chi \sim (3, \overline{3}, 1, -2/3)$ 

Mz

AC, Scherb, Schwaller '21

#### Schwaller, Bai, '14

#### Depending of the quantum numbers of the heavy scalar we can have different low

Reff >  $\frac{10^2}{m_{x}^2}$  Kaik  $\tilde{k}_{pj}$   $\tilde{j}_{\pi}$   $\pi_0^{(a,p)}$   $\tilde{d}_{Ri}$   $i^{M} dR_j$ Left > to Kaikaj 2 To NR: 1 UR;

15

![](_page_15_Picture_4.jpeg)

## FLAVONS

### pNGBs of horizontal symmetries

$$\mathscr{L} = \frac{1}{f_a} \partial_\mu a^\alpha J^{\mu\alpha} = \frac{1}{f_a} \partial_\mu a^\alpha \bar{\psi}_i \gamma^\mu [f_L P_L + g_{\mu\nu}] \partial_\mu a^\alpha \bar{\psi}_i \gamma^\mu [f_L P_L + g_{\mu\mu}] \partial_\mu a^\alpha \bar{\psi}_i \gamma^\mu [f_L$$

Consider e.g. a Froggatt-Nielsen (FN) model with charges

![](_page_16_Figure_4.jpeg)

#### Feng et al. '98

 $g_R P_R ] T^{\alpha}_{ij} \psi_j$ 

 $\frac{c_{e}}{4} \frac{t_{e}}{6} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{v_{i}}{2} \left(\frac{s}{\delta}\right)^{n} \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{4$ 

![](_page_16_Picture_8.jpeg)

# **GOMPOSITE HIGGS MODELS**

## **COMPOSITE HIGGS MODELS**

- The Higgs could be the pNGB from a strongly interacting sector e.g.  $SO(5) \rightarrow SO(4) \supseteq SU(2)_{L} \otimes U(L)_{Y}$ 21/2
- However, more 'realistic' models (aka UV complete) will give you a bunch of extra dof
  - $3_{1} + 3_{0} + 2_{1} + 1_{0}$ 50(5)/SOC5) 21/2 + 1
- SU(41/Sp(4)  $SO(4) \times SU(4) / SU(4) = 3_0 + 2_{12} + 2_{12} + 1_1 + 1_0 + 1_0$

#### See e.g. 1610.06591, 1902.06890

## **COMPOSITE HIGGS MODELS**

#### **One typically expects**

![](_page_19_Figure_2.jpeg)

RH quarks can be made composite more easily since they are custodially protected

Partial compositeness comes with 'top partners' 

#### See e.g. 1610.06591, 1902.06890

## TAKE THE COUPLINGS AND RUN

![](_page_20_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_0.jpeg)

Choi et al, 1708.00021 Chala et al, 2012.09017 Bauer et al, 2012.12272

Even if some Wilson coefficients are zero at the UV they will be generated via the RGEs. For instance

$$\frac{u_R Y_u}{4\pi^2} \ln\left(\frac{\Lambda_{NP}}{\mu^2}\right), \qquad c_H = \frac{3}{8\pi^2} \operatorname{Tr}\left(Y_u c_{u_R} Y_u\right) \ln\left(\frac{\Lambda_{NP}}{4\pi^2}\right)$$

$$\frac{\partial_{\mu}a}{\Lambda_{NP}} \left( \bar{q}_{Li} \gamma^{\mu} q_{Lj} \right), \qquad \mathcal{O}_{H} = \frac{\partial_{\mu}a}{\Lambda_{NP}} \left( H^{\dagger} i \overleftrightarrow{D}^{\mu} H \right)$$

Top couplings will make a difference!

![](_page_21_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_7.jpeg)

# STANDARD FLAVOR PROBES

## FI AVAR PROBES OF ALPS

## $\Delta$ F=2 Neutral meson mixing

![](_page_23_Picture_2.jpeg)

B-B mixing/K-K mixing/D-D mixing

Depending on Ma/Mais we might need to me OPE

#### $\Delta$ F=1 Rare meson decay

![](_page_23_Picture_6.jpeg)

 $D \rightarrow \pi a, B \rightarrow K a, B \rightarrow \pi a, K \rightarrow \pi a, \dots$ 

![](_page_23_Picture_8.jpeg)

## FLAVOR PROBES OF ALPS

bounds as well as by collider or fixed target experiments

10 KeV 0'I Ger feu Ber 10<sup>2</sup> Ber Willing and an mannage and the second of the RED GINT SNIPSTA FLANDA STRAVE

## Flavor probes will compete or be complemented by astrophysical or cosmological

![](_page_24_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_5.jpeg)

25

# CHARMING ALPS

## **CHARMING ALPS**

We assume the following EFT at the UV

$$\mathscr{L} = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_{\mu} a) (\partial^{\mu} a) - \frac{m_a^2}{2} a^2 + \frac{\partial_{\mu} a}{f_a} (c_{uR})_{ij} \Big($$

**RGEs and heavy-quark loop induced processes will lead to** 

$$a \to \ell^+ \ell^-, a \to \bar{d}_i d_j, a \to \gamma \gamma, a \to gg$$

We consider several benchmarks motivated by the dark QCD model

$$a = \pi_{D3}, (c_{uR})_{33} = 0$$
  $a = \pi_{D8},$ 

 $\left( \bar{u}_{Ri} \gamma^{\mu} u_{Rj} \right)$ 

 $(c_{uR})_{33} \neq 0$ 

![](_page_26_Picture_12.jpeg)

#### **ALPS** MINI HNK

 $f_a = 10^4 \text{ TeV}$ 

![](_page_27_Figure_2.jpeg)

 $a = \pi_{D8}, (c_{uR})_{33} \neq 0$ 

![](_page_27_Picture_4.jpeg)

## FLAVOR BOUNDS

![](_page_28_Picture_1.jpeg)

Mixing () - ()

![](_page_28_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_8.jpeg)

 $B \rightarrow Ka, B \rightarrow \pi a, K \rightarrow \pi a$ 

 $D \rightarrow \pi a$ 

![](_page_28_Picture_11.jpeg)

## FLAVOR BOUNDS

 $D^+ \to (\tau^+ \to \pi^+ \nu) \bar{\nu} \text{ recasted with } M^2_{\text{miss}} \text{ for } D^+ \to \pi^+ a$  $B^+ \to \pi^+ \bar{\nu} \nu \text{ recasted with } \sqrt{\vec{p}_{\pi}^2} \text{ for } B \to \pi a$ •  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ a$  for  $m_a > 0$ 

-  $B^{\pm} \to K^{\pm} \bar{\nu} \nu$  expected at Belle II with 50  $ab^{-1}$  and  $K^{\pm} \to \pi^{\pm} \bar{\nu} \nu$  at NA62

Recasts done with the CLs method

## **CLEO 0806.2112**

 $B^+ \to K^+ \bar{\nu} \nu, B^0 \to K^0 \bar{\nu} \nu$  recasted with  $s_B = k^2 / m_B^2$  for  $B \to Ka$  BaBar 1303.7465

#### BaBar hep-ex/0411061

#### NA62 2011.11329

![](_page_29_Picture_9.jpeg)

30

## ASTRO & COSMO BOUNDS

### **Red Giant bursts**

$$\mathscr{L} \supset iag_{a\ell\ell}(\bar{\ell}\gamma_5\ell), \quad g_{a\ell\ell} = \frac{3m_e}{8\pi v^2 f_a} \ln\left(\frac{f_a^2}{m_t^2}\right) \sum_{i=1}^3 \left(\mathscr{M}_u\right)_{ii} \left(c_{u_R}\right)_{ii} \qquad \text{Gase} < 4.6.10$$

#### **SN1987**a

Bremsstrahlung

 $L_a \le L_\nu = 3 \cdot 10^{52} \,\mathrm{erg/s} \qquad \qquad N + N \to N + N + a$ 

$$N_{eff}$$
, distorsion of CMB, BBN, ... Cac Mill Dep

Most of the bounds derived assumed only couplings to photons but they can still be recasted

$$c_{app} = (c_{u_R})_{11}(0.75 \pm 0.03)$$
$$c_{ann} = (c_{u_R})_{11}(-0.51 \pm 0.03)$$

damuro, Redondo '12 llea, Knox '15 pta et al '20

![](_page_30_Picture_10.jpeg)

3)

31

## **COLLIDER AND FIXED TARGET EXPERIMENTS**

## Fixed target experiments: NA62, SHiP, CHARM

![](_page_31_Figure_2.jpeg)

## $N_a = N_D \cdot \operatorname{Br}(D \to \pi a) \cdot \varepsilon_{\text{geom}} \cdot F_{\text{decay}}$

### LHC forward detectors: FASER, FASER II, MATUSHLA

deca

![](_page_31_Picture_7.jpeg)

## **CHARMING ALPS PARAMETER SPACE**

![](_page_32_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_2.jpeg)

## CHARMING ALPS PARAMETER SPACE

![](_page_33_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_2.jpeg)

# 

![](_page_35_Picture_1.jpeg)

**Searching for long-lived** particles from exotic top decays, 2202.0973

![](_page_35_Picture_3.jpeg)

## **ALPS FROM THE TOP**

## **Probe charming ALPs above charm threshold**

![](_page_36_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_6.jpeg)

## **ALPS FROM THE TOPS: CONSTRAINTS**

We recast searches from exotic top decays

![](_page_37_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_3.jpeg)

PROMPT

LONG-LIVED

r< 0'01 cm

$$\int_{0}^{10^{-4} \mathrm{m}} (\gamma c\tau)^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{ct}{\gamma c\tau}\right) d(ct) \qquad \qquad \int_{2.5 \cdot 10^{-2} \mathrm{m}}^{2 \mathrm{m}} (\gamma c\tau)^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{ct}{\gamma c\tau}\right) d(ct)$$

![](_page_37_Picture_8.jpeg)

25 cm < r < 2m

**'STABLE'** 

CT > 10 m

$$\exp\left(-\frac{10\,\mathrm{m}}{\gamma c\tau}\right)$$

![](_page_37_Picture_15.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_1.jpeg)

 $m_a$  =

 $\sigma_{
m sign}$ 

![](_page_38_Picture_6.jpeg)

We consider two benchmarks with ALP masses

$$m_a = 2 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_a = 10 \text{ GeV}$$
  
 $\sigma_{\text{signal}} = \sigma_{tt} \cdot \text{Br}(t \to Wb) \cdot \text{Br}(t \to aq)$   
 $(c_{u_R})_{ij} = \mathcal{O}(1), \quad f_a = \mathcal{O}(10^5 - 10^9) \text{ GeV} \Rightarrow c\tau \sim 1 \text{ mm} - 10$ 

while having  $Br(t \rightarrow aq) \lesssim 10^{-3}$ 

![](_page_38_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_12.jpeg)

## SIGNAL - HADRONIC CALORIMETER

![](_page_39_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### **Large Ehad/Ecal ratio**

No tracks in the displaced jet

## **3-5(6) jets with 1(2) displaced and another b-tagged**

![](_page_39_Picture_7.jpeg)

## SIGNAL - HAURONIC CALORIMETER

![](_page_40_Figure_1.jpeg)

For tit with log (Ebul (Edu))

![](_page_40_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### **Large Ehad/Ecal ratio**

#### No tracks in the displaced jet

## **3-5(6) jets with 1(2) displaced and another b-tagged**

![](_page_40_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Picture_8.jpeg)

# SIGNAL - HANRANIC CALARIMETER

	$\mathbf{m_a} = 2 \; \mathbf{GeV}$	$m_{\mathbf{a}} = 10  \mathrm{GeV}$	$\mathbf{t}\overline{\mathbf{t}}$
total	(1) $2.79 \times 10^5$	(1) $2.79 \times 10^5$	(1) $2.91 \times 10^8$
3-6 jets with			
$\mathbf{p_T} > 40 \mathbf{GeV} \&   \eta  < 2.5$	$(0.8439) \ 2.35 \times 10^5$	$(0.8414) \ 2.35 \times 10^5$	$(0.71801) 2.09 \times$
$1 \;  ext{jet with } \log_{10}\left(rac{\mathbf{E}_{ ext{had}}}{\mathbf{E}_{ ext{em}}} ight) > 1.2$	$(0.1436) 4.00 \times 10^4$	$(0.0775) \ 2.16 \times 10^4$	$(0.01244)$ $3.61 \times$
displaced jet has $\leq 2$ tracks	$(0.1436) 4.00 \times 10^4$	$(0.0775) \ 2.16 \times 10^4$	$(0.00022)$ $6.39 \times$
with $\mathbf{p_T} > 2  \mathbf{GeV}$			

![](_page_41_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### **Large Ehad/Ecal ratio**

**No tracks in the displaced jet** 

## **3-5(6) jets with 1(2) displaced and another b-tagged**

![](_page_41_Figure_6.jpeg)

42

## SIGNAL - MINN SPFCTROMFTFR

![](_page_42_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### **Event in the muon system**

## No associated track pointing to the primary vertex

## 2-4(5) jets

#### Signal is background free

![](_page_42_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_44_Figure_0.jpeg)

# **CONCLUSIONS**

## GONGLUSIONS

- ALPs are ubiquitous in beyond the SM physics
- They can be probed by very different and complementary experiments
- Interesting models of Dark Matter and/or Flavor can lead to ALP mediated FCNC
- A direct measurement of  $D \rightarrow \pi a$  can provide a complementary test of charming ALPS
- Exotic top decays provide a unique way of probing ALPs above the charm threshold
- We can probe  $Br(t \rightarrow aq) \lesssim 10^{-4}$  and there is room for improvement!

![](_page_47_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Picture_1.jpeg)

## **15 - 17 JUNE 2022** HEFT 2022 HTTPS://FTAE.UGR.ES/HEFT2022

![](_page_48_Figure_1.jpeg)

The workshop will begin on June 15th morning and end after lunch on June 17th.

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement and UGR Research and Knowledge Transfer Found – Athenea3i

![](_page_48_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_48_Picture_7.jpeg)

#### **HIGGS AND EFFECTIVE FIELD THEORY - HEFT 2022**

15-17 June 2022

Salon de Actos del Carmen de la Victoria, Cuesta del Chapiz, 9 (Granada)

HEFT is an annual workshop focusing on the use of effective field theories to search for physics beyond the Standard Model. A broad range of topics are encouraged, ranging from collider phenomenology and formal aspects to the latest experimental updates on dedicated searches. The meeting aims to foster discussions between theorists and phenomenologists from varied backgrounds as well as with experimental colleagues.

We would like to achieve a balance of senior and junior speakers, enhancing the visibility of younger scientists while keeping some overview talks.

This year's edition is organized by (and will be held in) the Dpto. Física Teórica y del Cosmos of the Universidad de Granada. The format of the event will be in-person only.

![](_page_48_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Picture_0.jpeg)

SNIGRA  $L_{a} = \int_{r \leq R_{v}} dV \int_{M_{v}} dw \left(\frac{dP_{a}}{dV}\right) e^{-\sigma}$ 

Rfor ~ O(100-1000 Km) for ry, Rfar være not produced efficiently e-o: probability for on ALP produced with r. R. to reach for Otherwise their energy is converted back to V

![](_page_51_Figure_0.jpeg)

Y, &, Yy arrection tactors p(r), Tir)

## **GOSMO BOUNDS**

- is enough for this bound to apply

### Bounds can be directly applied when the decay to electron pairs dominate

When the decay to pair of muons dominate, the limits are conservative since muon decays also heat the neutrino bath, reducing the impact of  $N_{eff}$ 

• When  $a \rightarrow 3\pi$  dominates, bounds from <sup>4</sup>He overproduction (the dominant) bound in this region) still holds, since only a minimal amount of charged pions

For even larger masses, ALP decays into hadrons will eventually make its lifetime shorter than a second, making nucleosynthesis constraints harmless

## FIXED TARGET EXPERIMENTS

Experiment	distance from IP	length of decay volume	radius/opening angle	$N_D$
FASER	480 m	$1.5 \mathrm{m}$	0.1 m	$1.1 \times 10^1$
FASER2	480 m	$5 \mathrm{m}$	1 m	$2.2 \times 10^1$
MATHUSLA	$68 \mathrm{~m}$ downstream,	100 m	$25 \mathrm{~m~high}$	$2.2 \times 10^1$
	$60 \mathrm{~m}$ above			
NA62	80 m	$65 \mathrm{m}$	$\theta_{\rm max} = 0.05$	$2 \times 10^{15}$
SHiP	60 m	$50 \mathrm{m}$	$2.5 \mathrm{m}$	$6.8  imes 10^1$
CHARM	480 m	35 m	$0.0068 < \theta < 0.0126$	$4.08 \times 10^{-10}$

![](_page_53_Figure_2.jpeg)