Particle Physics for specialists

Beyond Standard Model
Direct searches for New Physics

Paweł Brückman de Renstrom

IFJ PAN, Kraków

Some slides stollen from Anna Kaczmarska and Glen Cowan

State of the art…

The Standrad Model is the combination of the Gauge groups
$$SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$$
including the Higgs Mechansism

Leptons

$e, \ \mu, \ \tau$
$\nu_e, \ \nu_\mu, \ \nu_\tau$

l

Quarks

q

$u, \ c, \ t$
$d, \ s, \ b$

γ

W

Z

g

Photon

W⁺/W⁻   **Z⁰**

Gluons

H

Higgs Boson

Gravity is described separately by General Relativity

SM complete. End of the story?

- The Standard Model successfully describes all existing particle physics data (though question marks over the neutrino sector)

- But: many (too many? At least 19…) input parameters:
    - Quark and lepton masses
    - Quark charge
    - Couplings
    - Quark (+ neutrino) generation mixing, etc.
- And: many unanswered questions:
    - Why so many free parameters?
    - Why only 3 generations of quarks and leptons?
    - Why is the neutrino mass so small and the top quark mass so large (mass hierarchy)?
    - Higgs naturalness?
    - Why are the charges of the p and e identical?
    - What is responsible for the observed matter-antimatter asymmetry?
   - How can we include gravity?
    - Etc.

The mass hierarchy…

▶ **Do you want to be famous?**
▶ **Do you want to be a king?**
▶ **Do you want more than the Nobel Prize?**

- Then solve the mass problem –
R.P. Feynman

Why are we there in the first place?

We exist because there is no antimatter around us !!!

- The Big Bang should have created equal amounts of matter and antimatter in the early universe.

- If matter and antimatter are created and destroyed together, it seems the universe should contain nothing but leftover energy

- Nevertheless, a tiny portion of matter – about one particle per billion – managed to survive. This is what we see today.

- The laws of nature do not apply equally to matter and antimatter!

    - CP violation we observe in kaons and B mesons systems seem to be not enough…

    - There has to be New Physics to explain that asymmetry!

„Fine Tuning"? Higgs naturalness problem

- Scalar quantum fields (like Higgs boson) get corrections terms to their masses which are sensitive to physics at arbitrarily high energies
- Quadratically divergent loop contributions to the Higgs mass drive the Higgs mass to unacceptably large values unless the tree level mass parameter is finely tuned to cancel the large quantum corrections.

$$m^2_{H_{SM}}(\text{phys}) \simeq m^2_{H_{SM}} + \frac{c}{16\pi^2}\Lambda^2$$

If $\Lambda \sim 10^{16}$ GeV, then fine-tuning to 1 part in 10^{26} needed

Alternatively, if $\Lambda \sim 1$ TeV, then no fine-tuning, but then SM is valid only below 1 TeV scale

Fermionic and bosonic loops with the same coupling constants do cancell exactly!

BUT in order for the mechanism to work one needs bosonic partners with reasonably low masses - *O*(TeV).

Cosmos is NOT stars & planets!

**DARK ENERGY73%
(DRIVES THE EXPANSION)**

Galaxy rotation curves
Gravitational lensing
CMB pattern

**BARYONIC MATTER 4%
(SHINING MATTER
ONLY ~0.4%)**

**DARK
MATTER 23%**

**NEUTRINOS
0.1-2%**

Is the 125 GeV scalar what we assume?

So far the Higgs…
  looks like SM,
  sounds like SM,
  smells like SM.

But:

CONSISTENT with SM ≠ INCOMPATIBLE with BSM

T.Kibble   G.Guralnik   R.C.Hagen   F.Englert R.Brout   &   P.Higgs

❖ Essential questions:
➢ Is the 125 GeV Higgs the only one (extended sector)?
➢ Is it responsible for all the particle mass?
➢ Is it fundamental?

❖ Need to define models of interest. Most popular are additional EW singlet, 2HDM, NMSSM, additional Higgs Triplet, Three dublets, Composite Higgs, etc.

❖ All allow for SM-like light Higgs phenomenology with smaller or larger coupling modifications.

Is the 125 GeV scalar what we assume?

ROADMAP

Explore the 125 GeV Higgs
- Production rates (ggH, WH,ZH, VBF, ttH, HH, tH, bbH)
- Decay widths ($\gamma\gamma$, ZZ, WW, bb, $\tau\tau$, $\mu\mu$, Zγ, fg, rg, etc.)
- Couplings to SM particles
- Spin and parity
- LFV, H->$\alpha\alpha$, H->inv, $\gamma+\not{E}$, etc.

Directly search for BSM scalars
- Heavy neutral CP-even and CP-odd states ($\gamma\gamma$, ZZ, WW, bb, $\tau\tau$, HH, HZ, tt)
- Charged Higgs ($\tau\nu$, tb, WZ, cs, etc.)
- Doubly-charged Higgs
- Any deviations from SM backgrounds?

How much of the BSM scenarios can current data exclude?

2HDM models

❖ Generic class implementing a second Higgs doublet.
❖ After EWSB left with 5 physical states:
Three neutral: CP-even **h**, **H**, CP-odd **A**, two charged **H⁺, H⁻**

$$\tan\beta \equiv v_2/v_1 \qquad g_{hVV}^{2HDM}/g_{hVV}^{SM} = \sin(\beta - \alpha)$$

$$v_1^2 + v_2^2 = \bar{v}^2 \approx (246\,\text{GeV})^2 \qquad g_{HVV}^{2HDM}/g_{HVV}^{SM} = \cos(\beta - \alpha)$$

Constraints from Higgs coupling measurements

❖In order to prevent flavour-changing neutral currents, one is left with four coupling schemes:

Type I: Only one doublet couples to all SM fermions.
Type II: one doublet couples to up-type quarks, the other to down-type quarks and leptons: „MSSM -like"
Lepton-specific: couplings to quarks as in the Type I model and to leptons as in Type II.
Flipped: couplings to quarks as in the Type II model and to leptons as in Type I.

Data Analysis in a nutshell
Typical workflow in BSM searches

❖ Assume the signal model we want to search for and prepare the corresponding Monte Carlo simulation (MC).

❖ Construct the complete Standard Model background model using MC and/or data-driven techniques.

❖ Identify selection cuts defining so-called Signal Region (SR).

❖ Identify the test statistics – variable(s) – bearing discrimination between signal and background. Nowadays, often a MVA discriminant (Machine Learning)

❖ Validate background modelling in the Control Regions (CR - typically similar to SR but with suppressed contribution from the signal).

Data Analysis in a nutshell
Typical workflow in BSM searches

❖ Perform statistical analysis of the test statistic in order to claim discovery or exclude signal strength μ exceeding certain value.

❖ The above needs to account for all possible systematic uncertainties
❖ Interpret the result within assumed model(s)

Artificial Neural Networks
The multi-layer perceptron

Use e.g. logistic sigmoid activation function,

$$s(u) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-u}}$$

Define values for 'hidden nodes'

$$h_i(\vec{x}) = s\left(w_{i0} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ij}x_j\right)$$

The network output is given by

$$t(\vec{x}) = s\left(a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i h_i(\vec{x})\right) .$$

Trained on (simulated) data, usually by *backward propagation*, to minimize a specific *loss function*

(Boosted) Decision Trees

A training sample of signal and background data is repeatedly split by successive cuts on its input variables.

Order in which variables used based on best separation between signal and background.

Iterate until stop criterion reached, based e.g. on purity, minimum number of events in a node.

Resulting set of cuts is a 'decision tree'.

Tends to be sensitive to fluctuations in training sample.

BOOST:
increase the weights of misclassified events and reconstruct the tree

Iterate $\rightarrow$ forest of trees (perhaps > 1000). For the mth tree,

$$T_m(\vec{x}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \vec{x} \text{ in signal acceptance region} \\ -1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Define a score α_m based on error rate of mth tree.

Boosted tree = weighted sum of the trees: $T(\vec{x}) = \sum_m \alpha_m T_m(\vec{x})$

Statistical analysis
Searching for BSM signal

Search for signal in a region of phase space; result is a histogram of some variable *x* with bin counts:

$$\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \ldots, n_N)$$

where bin contents depends on existence of the sought for signal (signal strength μ):

$$E[n_j] = \mu s_j + b_j$$

The Likelihood function:

$$L(\mu, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{j=1}^{N} \frac{(\mu s_j + b_j)^{n_j}}{n_j!} e^{-(\mu s_j + b_j)}$$

Signal strength   Nuisance parameters

both s_j and b_j generally depend on nuisance parameters

Statistical analysis
Searching for BSM signal

The **profile likelihood ratio** provides an optimal test (Neyman-Pearson lemma):

$$\lambda(\mu) = \frac{L(\mu, \hat{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}})}{L(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})}$$

maximizes for
a given μ

maximize L

The maximum Likelihood Ratio (LR) should be a near-optimal estimator for μ with nuisance parameters θ.

A monotonic function of LR is equally good.
In practice, minimise test statistic q:

$$q = -2\ln\lambda(\mu)$$

Statistical analysis

_p_-value for discovery

Large q_0 means increasing incompatibility between the data and hypothesis, therefore _p_-value for an observed $q_{0,\text{obs}}$ is

$$p_0 = \int_{q_{0,\text{obs}}}^{\infty} f(q_0|0)\, dq_0$$

From _p_-value get equivalent significance,

$$Z = \Phi^{-1}(1 - p)$$

where Φ is the cumulative of standard Gaussian.

Statistical analysis

Expected (or median) significance / sensitivity

When planning the experiment, we want to quantify how sensitive we are to a potential discovery, e.g., by given median significance assuming some nonzero strength parameter μ'.

So for p-value, need $f(q_0|0)$, for sensitivity, will need $f(q_0|\mu')$.

Approximation due to Wald (1943):

$$-2\ln\lambda(\mu) = \frac{(\mu - \hat{\mu})^2}{\sigma^2} + \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{N})$$

$$\hat{\mu} \sim \text{Gaussian}(\mu', \sigma)$$

i.e., $E[\hat{\mu}] = \mu'$

σ from covariance matrix V, use, e.g.,

$$V^{-1} = -E\left[\frac{\partial^2 \ln L}{\partial\theta_i \partial\theta_j}\right]$$

Statistical analysis
discovery / upper limit

$$\lambda(\mu) = \frac{L(\mu, \hat{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}})}{L(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})}$$

Discovery:

Try to reject background-only ($\mu = 0$) hypothesis using:

$$q_0 = \begin{cases} -2 \ln \lambda(0) & \hat{\mu} \geq 0 \\ 0 & \hat{\mu} < 0 \end{cases} \qquad p_0 = \int_{q_{0,\text{obs}}}^{\infty} f(q_0|0) \, dq_0$$

Upper limit:

For purposes of setting an upper limit on μ use:

$$q_\mu = \begin{cases} -2 \ln \lambda(\mu) & \hat{\mu} \leq \mu \\ 0 & \hat{\mu} > \mu \end{cases} \qquad p_\mu = \int_{q_{\mu,\text{obs}}}^{\infty} f(q_\mu|\mu) \, dq_\mu$$

Statistical analysis
upper limit – example

N statistically independent trials

The "Brazilian" plot

Systematic uncertainties on background (& signal) description generally weaken the limit and increase its error.

BSM higgs searches and constraints on hMSSM

Supersymmerty

- Attractive solution: introduce a new symmetry, "supersymmetry" which links fermions and bosons
- Each fermion has a boson partner, and vice versa, with the same couplings.

Ex. : $\quad q\ (s=1/2) \quad \rightarrow \quad \widetilde{q}\ (s=0) \qquad$ skwark

$\qquad\qquad g\ (s=1) \quad \rightarrow \quad \widetilde{g}\ (s=1/2) \qquad$ gluino

- Boson and fermion loops contribute with opposite sign, giving a natural cancellation in their effect on the Higgs mass

- Must be a broken symmetry, because we clearly don't see bosons and fermions of the same mass
- However, this doubles the particle content of the model, and introduces lots of new unknown parameters

Supersymmetric family

The Standard Model — Fermions, Bosons

- Quarks: u, c, t, d, s, b
- Leptons: e, μ, τ, ν_e, ν_μ, ν_τ
- Bosons: g, γ, W, Z (Force carriers)

Supersymmetry — Sbosons, Sfermions

- Squarks: $\tilde{u}$, $\tilde{c}$, $\tilde{t}$, $\tilde{d}$, $\tilde{s}$, $\tilde{b}$; $\tilde{g}$, $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$, $\tilde{\chi}_2^\pm$
- Sleptons: $\tilde{e}$, $\tilde{\mu}$, $\tilde{\tau}$, $\tilde{\nu}_e$, $\tilde{\nu}_\mu$, $\tilde{\nu}_\tau$; $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$, $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$, $\tilde{\chi}_3^0$, $\tilde{\chi}_4^0$

Mass generation: h, H, A, H^+, H^-

$$\text{SM}: W^\pm,\ W^0,\ B \xrightarrow{\text{mixing}} W^\pm,\ Z,\ \gamma$$

$$\text{SUSY}: \tilde{H}_u^0,\ \tilde{H}_d^0,\ \tilde{W}^0,\ \tilde{B}^0 \xrightarrow{\text{mixing}} \tilde{\chi}_1^0,\ \tilde{\chi}_2^0,\ \tilde{\chi}_3^0,\ \tilde{\chi}_4^0 \quad \boxed{\text{neutralinos}}$$

$$\tilde{H}_u^+,\ \tilde{H}_d^-,\ \tilde{W}^+,\ \tilde{W}^- \xrightarrow{\text{mixing}} \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm,\ \tilde{\chi}_2^\pm \quad \boxed{\text{charginos}}$$

Supersymmerty & DM

- Impose *B* & *L* conservatiobn => R-parity

$$R_p = (-1)^{3(B-L)+2S} \qquad \text{S: Spin}$$

- SM particles   R=+1
- SUSY particles R=-1
- Multiplicative number
- Two important consequences if R-parity is preserved:
  - Superpartners are pair-produced
  - Lightest superpartner is stable (LSP)
  - Proton is stable (in general SUSY allows for non conservation of L and B)

5% Visible Matter

25% Dark Matter

70% Dark Energy

- LSP is good candidate for Dark Matter particle
  - neutralino (mix of bino, wino and higgsino)
  - Very hard to detect!

- Ordinary matter (~5%)
  – the only thing we knew until recently

- Dark matter (~25%)
  – does not emit light, but seen with gravity

- Dark energy (~70%)
  – do not know what it is; explains accelerated expansion

Supersymmerty & Grand Unification

α_1 weak force
α_2 EM force
α_3 strong force

SM World Average

$\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.117 \pm 0.005$
$\sin^2\Theta_{\overline{MS}} = 0.2317 \pm 0.0004$

μ (GeV)

68% CL

α_1 weak force
α_2 EM force
α_3 strong force

MSSM World Average

U.A. W&B H.F.

μ (GeV)

strong
GUT
electroweak
electro-magnetic
TOE
weak
gravity
time (seconds)
energy (GeV)
10^{-20} 10^{15} 100

- In the Standard Model, the interaction strengths are not quite unified at very high energy

- Add SUSY, the running of the couplings is modified, because sparticle loops contribute as well as particle loops

Why we would like Supersymmetry? summary

❖ Solution to „fine tuning problem"

❖ Dark matter candidate

❖ Coupling constants unification $< M_P$

❖ Simply beautiful extension of SM ☺

❖ ...and many others

Possible production and decay of SUSY particles @ LHC

Basic scenario: R-parity conserved :
- SUSY is pair produced
- LSP at the end of the cascade decay (missing energy signature)

skwarks & gluinos (strong int.)   charginos & neutralinos (weak int.)

Understanding of SM backgrounds essential!

The cascade decay always ends with an LSP! (RPC) => Missing Transverse Energy.

Lots of high p_T jets and leptons

SUSY & LHC?

A lot of signatures!

- Strong production... (large cross-section)

- ... or weak production

RPV

Important and difficult experimental observable:
- Σ (all) => Missing Energy
In experiment we have to understand "all" with high precision!

Richness of SUSY (new particles, production and decay channels) has its price
- Even Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model has 124 free parameters
- Usually we introduce "scenarios" with additional relations between parameters (from mechanism of SUSY breaking)
  - In that case we work with fewer parameters

Example exclusion limits from ATLAS

Example exclusion limits from ATLAS

However, no sign of SUSY up to ~1 TeV

ATLAS SUSY Searches* - 95% CL Lower Limits
July 2020

| Model	Signature	$\int \mathcal{L}\,dt$ [fb^{-1}]	Mass limit		Reference
Inclusive Searches					
$\tilde{q}\tilde{q}$, $\tilde{q}\to q\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	$0\,e,\mu$	139	$\tilde{q}$ [10× Degen.]	1.9	ATLAS-CONF-2019-040
	mono-jet 1-3 jets E_T^{miss}	36.1	$\tilde{q}$ [1×, 8× Degen.] 0.43 0.71		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)<400 GeV; m($\tilde{q}$)-m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=5 GeV	1711.03301
$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$, $\tilde{g}\to q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	$0\,e,\mu$ 2-6 jets E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{g}$ 2.35		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=0; m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=1000 GeV	ATLAS-CONF-2019-040
			$\tilde{g}$ Forbidden 1.15-1.95			ATLAS-CONF-2019-040
$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$, $\tilde{g}\to q\bar{q}W\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	$1\,e,\mu$ 2-6 jets	139	$\tilde{g}$ 2.2		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)<600 GeV	ATLAS-CONF-2020-047
$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$, $\tilde{g}\to q\bar{q}(\ell\ell)\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	$ee,\mu\mu$ 2 jets E_T^{miss}	36.1	$\tilde{g}$ 1.2		m($\tilde{g}$)-m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=50 GeV	1805.11381
$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$, $\tilde{g}\to qqWZ\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	$0\,e,\mu$ 7-11 jets E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{g}$ 1.97		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)<600 GeV	ATLAS-CONF-2020-002
	SS e,μ 6 jets	139	$\tilde{g}$ 1.15		m($\tilde{g}$)-m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=200 GeV	1909.08457
$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$, $\tilde{g}\to t\bar{t}\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	0-$1\,e,\mu$ $3\,b$ E_T^{miss}	79.8	$\tilde{g}$ 2.25		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)<200 GeV	ATLAS-CONF-2018-041
	SS e,μ 6 jets	139	$\tilde{g}$ 1.25		m($\tilde{g}$)-m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=300 GeV	1909.08457
3rd gen. squarks direct production					
$\tilde{b}_1\tilde{b}_1$, $\tilde{b}_1\to b\tilde{\chi}_1^0/t\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$	Multiple	36.1	$\tilde{b}_1$ Forbidden 0.9		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=300 GeV, BR($b\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=1	1708.09266, 1711.03301
	Multiple	139	$\tilde{b}_1$ Forbidden 0.74		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=200 GeV, m($\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$)=300 GeV, BR($t\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$)=1	1909.08457
$\tilde{b}_1\tilde{b}_1$, $\tilde{b}_1\to b\tilde{\chi}_2^0\to bh\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	$6\,b$ E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{b}_1$ Forbidden 0.23-1.35		Δm($\tilde{\chi}_2^0,\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=130 GeV, m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=100 GeV	1908.03122
	$2\,\tau$ $2\,b$ E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{b}_1$ 0.13-0.85		Δm($\tilde{\chi}_2^0,\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=130 GeV, m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=0 GeV	ATLAS-CONF-2020-031
$\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_1$, $\tilde{t}_1\to t\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	0-$1\,e,\mu$ ≥ 1 jet E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{t}_1$ 1.25		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=1 GeV	ATLAS-CONF-2020-003, 2004.14060
$\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_1$, $\tilde{t}_1\to Wb\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	$1\,e,\mu$ 3 jets/1 b E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{t}_1$ 0.44-0.59		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=400 GeV	ATLAS-CONF-2019-017
$\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_1$, $\tilde{t}_1\to\tilde{\tau}_1 b\nu$, $\tilde{\tau}_1\to\tau\tilde{G}$	$1\,\tau + 1\,e,\mu,\tau$ 2 jets/1 b	36.1	$\tilde{t}_1$ 1.16		m($\tilde{\tau}_1$)=800 GeV	1803.10178
$\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_1$, $\tilde{t}_1\to c\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ / $\tilde{c}\tilde{c}$, $\tilde{c}\to c\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	$0\,e,\mu$ $2\,c$ E_T^{miss}	36.1	$\tilde{c}$ 0.85		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=0	1805.01649
			$\tilde{t}_1$ 0.46		m($\tilde{t}_1,\tilde{c}$)-m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=50 GeV	1805.01649
	$0\,e,\mu$ mono-jet E_T^{miss}	36.1	$\tilde{t}_1$ 0.43		m($\tilde{t}_1,\tilde{c}$)-m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=5 GeV	1711.03301
$\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_1$, $\tilde{t}_1\to t\tilde{\chi}_2^0$, $\tilde{\chi}_2^0\to Z/h\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	1-$2\,e,\mu$ 1-4 b E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{t}_1$ 0.067-1.18		m($\tilde{\chi}_2^0$)=500 GeV	SUSY-2018-09
$\tilde{t}_2\tilde{t}_2$, $\tilde{t}_2\to\tilde{t}_1 + Z$	$3\,e,\mu$ $1\,b$ E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{t}_2$ Forbidden 0.86		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=360 GeV, m($\tilde{t}_1$)-m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=40 GeV	SUSY-2018-09
EW direct					
$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ via WZ	$3\,e,\mu$ E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm/\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ 0.64		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=0	ATLAS-CONF-2020-015
	$ee,\mu\mu$ ≥ 1 jet E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm/\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ 0.205		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$)-m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=5 GeV	1911.12606
$\tilde{\chi}_1^+\tilde{\chi}_1^-$ via WW	$2\,e,\mu$ E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ 0.42		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=0	1908.08215
$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ via Wh	0-$1\,e,\mu$ $2\,b/2\gamma$ E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm/\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ Forbidden 0.74		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=70 GeV	2004.10894, 1909.09226
$\tilde{\chi}_1^+\tilde{\chi}_1^-$ via $\tilde{\ell}_L/\tilde{\nu}$	$2\,e,\mu$ E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ 1.0		m($\tilde{\ell},\tilde{\nu}$)=0.5(m($\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$)+m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$))	1908.08215
$\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\tau}$, $\tilde{\tau}\to\tau\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	$2\,\tau$ E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{\tau}$ [$\tilde{\tau}_L, \tilde{\tau}_{R,L}$] 0.16-0.3 0.12-0.39		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=0	1911.06660
$\tilde{\ell}_{L,R}\tilde{\ell}_{L,R}$, $\tilde{\ell}\to\ell\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	$2\,e,\mu$ 0 jets E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{\ell}$ 0.7		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=0	1908.08215
	$ee,\mu\mu$ ≥ 1 jet E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{\ell}$ 0.256		m($\tilde{\ell}$)-m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=10 GeV	1911.12606
$\tilde{H}\tilde{H}$, $\tilde{H}\to h\tilde{G}/Z\tilde{G}$	$0\,e,\mu$ $\geq 3\,b$ E_T^{miss}	36.1	$\tilde{H}$ 0.13-0.23 0.29-0.88		BR($\tilde{\chi}_1^0\to h\tilde{G}$)=1	1806.04030
	$4\,e,\mu$ 0 jets E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{H}$ 0.55		BR($\tilde{\chi}_1^0\to Z\tilde{G}$)=1	ATLAS-CONF-2020-040
Long-lived particles					
Direct $\tilde{\chi}_1^+\tilde{\chi}_1^-$ prod., long-lived $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$	Disapp. trk 1 jet E_T^{miss}	36.1	$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ 0.46		Pure Wino	1712.02118
			$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ 0.15		Pure higgsino	ATL-PHYS-PUB-2017-019
Stable $\tilde{g}$ R-hadron	Multiple	36.1	$\tilde{g}$ 2.0			1902.01636, 1808.04095
Metastable $\tilde{g}$ R-hadron, $\tilde{g}\to qq\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	Multiple	36.1	$\tilde{g}$ [$\tau(\tilde{g})$=10 ns, 0.2 ns] 2.05 2.4		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=100 GeV	1710.04901, 1808.04095
RPV					
$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm\tilde{\chi}_1^\mp/\tilde{\chi}_1^0$, $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm\to Z\ell\to\ell\ell\ell$	$3\,e,\mu$	139	$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm/\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ [BR($Z\tau$)=1, BR(Ze)=1] 0.625 1.05		Pure Wino	ATLAS-CONF-2020-009
LFV $pp\to\tilde{\nu}_\tau + X$, $\tilde{\nu}_\tau\to e\mu/e\tau/\mu\tau$	$e\mu,e\tau,\mu\tau$	3.2	$\tilde{\nu}_\tau$ 1.9		λ'_{311}=0.11, $\lambda_{132/133/233}$=0.07	1607.08079
$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm\tilde{\chi}_1^\mp/\tilde{\chi}_2^0\to WW/Z\ell\ell\ell\ell\nu\nu$	$4\,e,\mu$ 0 jets E_T^{miss}	36.1	$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm/\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ [$\lambda_{i33}\neq 0, \lambda_{12k}\neq 0$] 0.82 1.33		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=100 GeV	1804.03602
$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$, $\tilde{g}\to qq\tilde{\chi}_1^0$, $\tilde{\chi}_1^0\to qqq$	4-5 large-R jets	36.1	$\tilde{g}$ [m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=200 GeV, 1100 GeV] 1.3 1.9		Large λ''_{112}	1804.03568
	Multiple	36.1	$\tilde{g}$ [λ''_{112}=2e-4, 2e-5] 1.05 2.0		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=200 GeV, bino-like	ATLAS-CONF-2018-003
$\tilde{t}\tilde{t}$, $\tilde{t}\to t\tilde{\chi}_1^0$, $\tilde{\chi}_1^0\to tbs$	Multiple	36.1	$\tilde{t}$ [λ''_{323}=2e-4, 1e-2] 0.55 1.05		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=200 GeV, bino-like	ATLAS-CONF-2018-003
$\tilde{t}\tilde{t}$, $\tilde{t}\to b\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$, $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm\to bbs$	$\geq 4b$	139	$\tilde{t}$ Forbidden 0.95		m($\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$)=500 GeV	ATLAS-CONF-2020-016
$\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_1$, $\tilde{t}_1\to bs$	2 jets + 2 b	36.7	$\tilde{t}_1$ [qq, bs] 0.42 0.61			1710.07171
$\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_1$, $\tilde{t}_1\to q\ell$	$2\,e,\mu$ $2\,b$	36.1	$\tilde{t}_1$ 0.4-1.45		BR($\tilde{t}_1\to be/b\mu$)>20%	1710.05544
	$1\,\mu$ DV	136	$\tilde{t}_1$ [1e-10< λ'_{23k} <1e-8, 3e-10< λ'_{23k} <3e-9] 1.0 1.6		BR($\tilde{t}_1\to q\mu$)=100%, cosθ_t=1	2003.11956

10^{-1} 1   **Mass scale [TeV]**

# Dark matter revisited
Higgs portal to Dark Sector

Direct searches for WIMP's are complemented by constraints on invisible Higgs decays.

In the context of Higgs portal to DS models, invisible decays occure via 125 GeV Higgs mixing to a DS Higgs which subsequently decays to WIMPs.

The x-section limit can be converted to a limit on WIMP-nucleon limit for either Scalar or Majorana WIMP. Sensitivity up to $m_{WIMP} < m_H/2$!

VBF Higgs production and top-associated production are investigated.
Missing energy is the main signature.

What is out fate?
Higgs potential and self-couplings

The confirmed BEH mechanism depends barely on the local expansion of the Higgs potential

Higgs self-interaction probed e.g. via the di-Higgs production (0.1% of pp->H x-section).
Currently not observable, unless New Physics contributes!

Why gravity so weak? Extra Dimensions?

- The ultimate unification of the forces should include gravity (TOE)
- But gravity very much weaker than other forces
- Most particles (and us) can only travel in the regular 3 space + 1 time dimensions
- Gravitions - the bosons which propagate gravity - can travel in the Extra Dimensions (Arkhani-Hamed Dimopoulos Dvali -1998)
- The real gravitational constant is larger than the effective one we see
- They have to be small extra dimensions, otherwise we'd have seen them already
- If the dimensions are big enough we might see their effects at the LHC!

Speculative!

Gravity "escaping" into the extra dimensions.

$$F \sim G/R^{N-1}$$

OUR BRANE

$$L \sim 10^{-17+30/N}$$

$$M_{Pl}^2 = M_*^{2+N}(2\pi L)^N$$

- Mini black hole production at the LHC would be an observable consequence of extra space-time dimensions
- Black hole will decay very quickly (~10^{-26} s) via Hawking radiation: particles emitted isotopically

# Production & decay of Black Holes

Bring mass closer than its
Schwarzschild Radius, R_S,

$$R_S = \frac{2\,G\,M}{c^2}$$

and a black hole will form!

- BH lifetime @ LHC   ~ 10^{-27}–10^{-25} s

  due to Hawking radiation

- Decays with equal probability to all particles.

EVENT HORIZON

quark

quark R_S

SINGULARITY

$$R_S^{Earth} = 8.8mm$$

A micro Black Hole could look like this:

Randall-Sundrum models (RS)

$$ds^2 = g_{MN} dx^M dx^N = e^{-2\sigma} \eta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu - dy^2,$$

✘ All particles but graviton live on the TeV (weak) brane

✘ Small probability for graviton to be near the Weak-brane

✘ Graviton coupling suppressed by $1/M_{Pl}$

✘ If we live anywhere but the Gravity-brane, gravity will seem weak

✘ Natural consequence of warped geometry

(Randall Sundrum – 1999)

Consequence
KK excitations

❖ All particles living in the bulk will have Kaluza-Klein excitations!

❖ Those manifest in 4D as heavier mass states (the entire spectrum!)

Protons collide
- ✖ **Produce a Kaluza-Klein particle**
- ✖ **Which Decays**
- ✖ **Definite mass spectrum and "spin"-2 (if a graviton!)**

TOE – super-strings?

- The most famous candidate is the (super)string theory
    - Goal: marriage of gauge theories with gravity!
- Basic building blocks are not point-like particles, but 1-D objects – the strings
- Emission or absorption of a particle corresponds to breaking up or merging strings
- Particles are string excitations, from a distance look like point-like objects.
- String theories require 9(10) space dimensions + one time dimension.
- Due to spontaneous symmetry breaking only 3D are large. The others remain small and curved.
- The theory remains „secure" as there is no way to validate or falsify it experimentally.

Summary

- The discovery of the Higgs boson finally completes the Standard Model of particle physics.
- The fundamental 125 GeV scalar exhibits all properties expected from SM Higgs.
- Neither Supersymmetry nor large Extra Dimensions have been observed at LHC.
- SM holds strong while BSM hides cleverly from us.
- But this is not the the end of our quest.
- The Higgs sector remains exquisitely attractive tool to search for BSM phenomena.
- A lot of crucial questions still unanswered.
- Like never before, the breakthrough will be driven by experimental evidence.
- Many options on the market to address the vital puzzles.

- We are in a particularly exciting moment.

HEP needs you!!!