SUSY and Exotics

- Standard Model and the Origin of Mass
- Puzzles of Standard Model and Cosmology
- Bottom-up and top-down motivation
- Extra dimensions
- Supersymmetry
- MSSM
- NMSSM
- E₆SSM and its exotics

UK HEP Forum"From the Tevatron to the LHC, Cosener's House, May 2009







Standard Model Puzzles

1. *The origin of mass* - the origin of the weak scale, its stability under radiative corrections, and the solution to the hierarchy problem (most urgent problem of LHC)

2. The quest for unification - the question of whether the three known forces of the standard model may be related into a grand unified theory, and whether such a theory could also include a unification with gravity.

3. The problem of flavour - the problem of the undetermined fermion masses and mixing angles (including neutrino masses and mixing angles) together with the CP violating phases, in conjunction with the observed smallness of flavour changing neutral currents and very small strong CP violation.

Cosmology provide further motivation for new physics BSM:

- Origin of dark energy?
- Origin of dark matter?
- Origin of atoms?
- Origin of the Universe?





Hierarchy problem provides a bottom-up motivation for new physics BSM





Steve King, UK HEP Forum '09, Abingdon



An entomological analogy

Typical string/D-brane set-up involves extra dimensions



UED: flat extra dimensions with everything in the bulk gives KK excitations of everything



RS: warped extra dimensions with gravity only in the bulk

- RS1: "warped" XD, with second (EW or TeV) brane, where gravity exp. suppressed
 - TeV resonances on EW brane ⇔ KK modes .









08/05/2009

Steve King, UK HEP Forum '09, Abingdon 10

What has SUSY ever done for us?

- Solve hierarchy problem (origin of mass)
- Facilitates unification (quest for unification)
- Provides WIMPs (origin of dark matter)
- Helps inflation (origin of universe)
- Enables baryogenesis (origin of atoms)
- What SUSY doesn't help with:
- Cosmological constant (origin of dark energy)
- Quark and lepton spectrum (flavour problem)

In fact SUSY makes the flavour problem worse due to squarks and sleptons (sflavour problem)

Stabilising the Hierarchy in SUSY



SUSY stabilises the hierarchy providing $m_{\tilde{t}} < 1 TeV$

MSSM sparticle spectra for various mediation mechanisms



MSSM EWSB

$$\mathcal{W} = \mu \mathcal{H}_{u} \mathcal{H}_{d} \qquad \qquad \mathcal{H}_{u} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{u}^{+} \\ \mathcal{H}_{u}^{0} \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathcal{H}_{d} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{d}^{0} \\ \mathcal{H}_{d}^{-} \end{pmatrix}$$

A nice feature of MSSM is radiative EWSB Ibanez-Ross (s)top loops drive $m_{H_{\mu}}^2$ negative $m_{H_u}^2 + \mu^2$ M_{GUT} $\delta m_{H_u}^2 \approx -\frac{3}{4\pi^2} \lambda_t^2 m_{stop}^2 \ln \frac{M_{GUT}}{O} \sim -O(1) m_{stop}^2$ Min conds at low energy $\rightarrow \frac{M_Z^2}{2} \approx -\left(\mu^2 + m_{H_u}^2 + \delta m_{H_u}^2\right)$ Naturalness requirement is $M_Z \sim \delta m_{Hu} \sim m_{stop}$ Motivates But $M_Z \ll m_{stop} \rightarrow$ Two per cent fine tuning non-minimal SUS Also no reason why $\mu \sim 1$ TeV (μ problem) models

Non-Minimal SUSY Models

To solve the μ problem and reduce fine tuning consider:

- W= λ SH_uH_d where singlet <S> $\sim \mu$
- But leads to weak scale axion due to global U(1) PQ symmetry

Need to remove axion somehow

In NMSSM we add S³ to break U(1) PQ to Z_3 – but this results in cosmological domain walls (or tadpoles if broken)

In E_6 SSM we gauge the U(1) PQ symmetry to eat the axion resulting in a massive Z' gauge boson. Anomalies are cancelled by three complete 27's of E_6 at the TeV scale with gauged U(1)_N from E_6

Higgs mass bounds in SUSY Models



NMSSM benchmarks

Djouadi et al '08

Point	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5		
GUT/input parameters							
$\operatorname{sign}(\mu_{\operatorname{eff}})$	+	+	+	_	+		
$\tan\beta$	10	10	10	2.6	6	1	
$m_0 \; (\text{GeV})$	174	174	174	775	1500	1	
$M_{1/2} \; ({\rm GeV})$	500	500	500	760	175	1	
A_0	-1500	-1500	-1500	-2300	-2468	1	
A_{λ}	-1500	-1500	-1500	-2300	-800	1	
A_{κ}	-33.9	-33.4	-628.56	-1170	60	1	
NUHM: M_{H_d} (GeV)	-	-	-	880	-311	1	
NUHM: M_{H_u} (GeV)	-	-	-	2195	1910	1	
Parameters at the SUSY scale						-	
λ (input parameter)	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.53	0.016]	
ĸ	0.11	0.11	0.31	0.12	-0.0029	1	
$A_{\lambda} (\text{GeV})$	-982	-982	-629	-510	45.8	1	
$A_{\kappa} $ (GeV)	-1.63	-1.14	-11.4	220	60.2	1	
$M_2 (\text{GeV})$	392	392	393	603	140	1	
$\mu_{\text{eff}} (\text{GeV})$	968	968	936	-193	303	1	
CP even Higgs bosons							
$m_{h_1^0} (\text{GeV})$	120.2	120.5	89.9	32.3	90.7	P	
R_1	1.00	1.00	0.998	0.034	-0.314	1	
t_1	1.00	1.00	0.999	0.082	-0.305	1	
b_1	1.018	1.018	0.975	-0.291	-0.644	1	
$BR(h_1^0 \to bb)$	0.072	0.056	7×10^{-4}	0.918	0.895	1	
$BR(h_1^0 \to \tau^+ \tau^-)$	0.008	0.006	7×10^{-5}	0.073	0.088	1	
$BR(h_1^0 \to a_1^0 a_1^0)$	0.897	0.921	0.999	>0.0	0.0]	

CP even Higgs bosons					
$m_{h_1^0} \ (\text{GeV})$	120.2	120.2	< 89.9	32.3	90.7
R_1	1.00	1.00	0.998	0.034	-0.314
t_1	1.00	1.00	0.999	0.082	-0.305
b_1	1.018	1.018	0.975	-0.291	-0.644
$BR(h_1^0 \to bb)$	0.072	0.056	7×10^{-4}	0.918	0.895
$BR(h_1^0 \to \tau^+ \tau^-)$	0.008	0.006	7×10^{-5}	0.073	0.088
$\mathrm{BR}(h_1^0 \to a_1^0 a_1^0)$	< <u>0.897</u>	0.921	0.999	> 0.0	0.0
CP odd Higgs bosons					
$m_{a_1^0} (\text{GeV})$	< 40.5	9.1	9,1	> 185	99.6
t'_1	0.0053	0.0053	0.0142	0.0513	-0.00438
b'_1	0.529	0.528	1.425	0.347	-0.158
$BR(a_1^0 \to bb)$	< 0.91	0.	0	> 0.62	0.91
$BR(a_1^0 \to \tau^+ \tau^-)$	< 0.085	0.88	0.88	> 0.070	0.090

h \rightarrow aa may dominate, with a \rightarrow bb or $\tau \tau$

Fine tuning in NMSSM vs MSSM





Matter content of E₆SSM at TeV



Plus a TeV scale Z'(N)

Plus all their SUSY superpartners

Message: E₆SSM predicts SUSY+ EXOTICS at LHC

Unification in E₆SSM



Athron, SFK, Miller, Moretti, Nevzorov

The Constrained E_6SSM $W \approx \lambda_i SH_{u,i}H_{d,i} + \kappa_i SD_i \overline{D}_i$ EWSB, LEP, 2-loop RGE

Low Mass Benchmark Points	Α	В	С	D
aneta	3	10	10	10
$\lambda_3(M_X)$	-0.465	-0.37	-0.378	-0.395
$\lambda_{1,2}(M_X)$	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
$\kappa_3(M_X)$	0.3	0.2	0.42	0.43
$\kappa_{1,2}(M_X)$	0.3	0.2	0.06	0.08
s[TeV]	3.3	2.7	2.7	2.7
$M_{1/2}[\text{GeV}]$	365	363	388	358
$m_0 \; [\text{GeV}]$	640	537	681	623
$A_0[{ m GeV}]$	798	711	645	757



CE₆SSM Low Mass Benchmarks Athron, SFK, Miller, Moretti, Nevzorov



Steve King, UK HEP Forum '09, Abingdon

Light gauginos are a general prediction of CE₆SSM

$$M_3 \sim 0.7 \; M_{1/2} \; ----- \qquad \widetilde{g} \qquad {
m Gluino}$$

$${M}_2 \sim 0.25 {M}_{rac{1}{2}}$$
 — ${\chi}_2^0, {\chi}_1^\pm$ ~ Wino

$$M_1 \sim 0.15 M_{1/2}$$
 _____ χ_1^0 ~ Bino

Since $M_i = \frac{\alpha_i}{\alpha_{GUT}} M_{1/2}$ with $\alpha_3 \sim 0.7 \alpha_{GUT}$ in E₆SSM

c.f. MSSM $M_3 \sim 2.7 M_{1/2}, M_2 \sim 0.8 M_{1/2}, M_1 \sim 0.4 M_{1/2}$



http://www-cdf.fnal.gov/physics/exotic/r2a/20080710.dimuon_resonance/

SO(10)	SU(5)	$2\sqrt{10}Q_{\chi}$	$2\sqrt{6}Q_{\psi}$	$2\sqrt{15}Q_{\eta}$	$2Q_I$	$2\sqrt{10}Q_N$	$2\sqrt{15}Q_S$
16	$10 \ (u, d, u^c, e^+)$	-1	1	-2	0	1	-1/2
	$5^* (d^c, \nu, e^-)$	3	1	1	-1	2	4
	$ u^c$	-5	1	-5	1	0	-5
10	$5 (D, H_u)$	2	-2	4	0	-2	1
	$5^{*} (D^{c}, H_{d})$	-2	-2	1	1	-3	-7/2
1	1 S	0	4	-5	-1	5	5/2





D fermions

Usual case is of scalar leptoquarks, here we have novel case of D being fermionic diquarks or fermionic leptoquarks



 $\begin{array}{l} \mbox{Fermionic diquarks D} \rightarrow \ \tilde{t}b, \ t\tilde{b}, \ \bar{t}\bar{b}, \ \bar{t}\bar{b}, \ \bar{t}\bar{b} \\ \mbox{Fermionic leptoquarks D} \rightarrow \ \tilde{t}\tau, \ t\tilde{\tau}, \ \tilde{b}\nu_{\tau}, \ b\tilde{\nu_{\tau}}, \ b\tilde{\nu_{\tau}} \\ \ pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}\tau\bar{\tau} + E_{T}^{\rm miss} + X \\ \ pp \rightarrow b\bar{b} + E_{T}^{\rm miss} + X \end{array}$

D hadrons

It is possible that D fermions are very long lived (lifetime up to 1 sec) giving jets containing heavy long lived D-hadron

D-hadrons resemble protons or neutrons but with mass >300 GeV:

$$D_p = \overline{D}u, D_n = \overline{D}d$$



SFK, Hall

Dark Matter from Inert Higgsinos

3 families of Higgs = 1 MSSM family H_u , H_d + 2 inert families H_{u1} , H_{d1} , H_{u2} , H_{d2}

3 families of Singlets = 1 NMSSM singlet S + 2 inert singlets S_1 , S_2

SUSY partners to inert Higgsinos are good dark matter candidates, which may be almost decouped from the usual MSSM neutralinos and lighter

$$\begin{split} \tilde{\chi}_{\text{int}}^{0} &= \left(\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{H}_{d1}^{0} & \tilde{H}_{u1}^{0} & \tilde{S}_{1} \end{array} \right) & \text{LSP is naturally light} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & \lambda's & f_{u}v\sin(\beta) \\ \lambda's & 0 & f_{d}v\cos(\beta) \\ f_{u}v\sin(\beta) & f_{d}v\cos(\beta) & 0 \end{array} \right) \rightarrow m_{1} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{f_{d}f_{u}}{\lambda'} \frac{v^{2}}{s}\sin(2\beta) \\ \text{LSP is mainly inert} & \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} &= N_{1}^{1}\tilde{H}_{d1}^{0} + N_{1}^{2}\tilde{H}_{u1}^{0} + N_{1}^{3}\tilde{S}_{1} \\ -\frac{f_{d}v}{\lambda's}\cos(\beta) & -\frac{f_{u}v}{\lambda's}\sin(\beta) & 1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{v}{\lambda's}\right)^{2} \left[f_{d}^{2}\cos^{2}(\beta) + f_{u}^{2}\sin^{2}(\beta)\right] \\ \end{split}$$



Conclusion

- Good motivations for BSM physics
- Many possibilities: Extra dimensions, TC, SUSY...
- MSSM problems → NMSSM, E6SSM (light/heavy higgs)
- NMSSM: higgs phenomenology changed e.g. $h \rightarrow aa$
- E₆SSM has light gaugino spectrum and predicts lots of exotics: Z', D-fermions, inert Higgs/higgsinos
- Neutralino Dark Matter could originate from an almost decoupled sector of inert Higgsinos → relaxes parameter space of SUSY models
- SUSY promises the most but CC and sflavour/CP?
- Sflavour/CP problem may be addressed by a theory of flavour that describes the quark and lepton spectrum e.g. SU(3) family symmetry (Antusch, SFK, Malinsky, Ross)