



Carla Biggio Università di Genova e INFN

Bosone di Higgs o prima particella supersimmetrica scoperta?

Based on CB, Riva, Pomarol, JHEP 1302 (2013) 081

Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Genova 10/12/13

The energetic balance of the universe

5%

69%

26%

Ordinary matter its interactions are explained by the Standard Model (SM) Dark matter: interacts gravitationally but not electromagnetically

Dark energy: correspond to the accelerated expansion of the universe

The SM in one slide...

QUARKS EM, weak & strong interactions

LEPTONS EM & weak nteractions



Higgs boson:

discovered @LHC July 2012
Nobel price 2013 Englert, Higgs responsible of EWSB and of the masses of these particles

GAUGE VECTORS BOSONS force mediators

Based on gauge symmetry SU(3)xSU(2)XU(1)

or two...



Fermion masses come from the interaction of the fermion and the Higgs: the larger the coupling the heavier the mass $H - \frac{Y_f}{\sqrt{fR}} \frac{\bar{f}_R}{f} = Y_f \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}$

Why we need to go beyond the SM? Ite SM have been tested at the \$\mathcal{T}\$ level in LEP Why we need to go beyond the SM?
✓ the SM have been tested at the ‰ level in LEP
✓ the last missing piece → Higgs boson have been discovered at the LHC

Why we need to go beyond the SM?
✓ the SM have been tested at the ‰ level in LEP
✓ the last missing piece → Higgs boson have been discovered at the LHC

However:

neutrino oscillation exps have revealed that neutrinos are massive (and veeery light) while in the SM are not.

Even to explain completely ordinary matter the SM must be extended

Why we need to go beyond the SM? \checkmark the SM have been tested at the % level in LEP \checkmark the last missing piece \rightarrow Higgs boson have been discovered at the LHC

However:

neutrino oscillation exps have revealed that neutrinos are massive (and veeery light) while in the SM are not.

 \rightarrow Even to explain completely ordinary matter the SM must be extended

O simplest extension: just add v_R and Dirac neutrino masses O "nicer" extension: add v_R with heavy Majorana mass $(\rightarrow \text{new physics scale})$ and get neutrinos naturally light → "seesaw mechanism"

8







Ø Dark Matter (DM)

Dark matter:

🔊 Da

V

postulated in the 70's to explain the galaxies rotation curves: Distribution of Dark Matter in NGC 3198



in the galaxies there is more gravitational mass than visible mass

11



Ø Dark Matter (DM)

øbaryogenesis

Baryogenesis

⊘ v r

🔊 Da

🔊 bai

Why the universe is made of matter and no antimatter?

Matter & antimatter are created in pairs; which mechanism generated an unbalance?

 $\eta_B = \frac{n_B - n_{\bar{B}}}{n_{\gamma}} \simeq \frac{n_B}{n_{\gamma}} \simeq 10^{-10}$

Within the SM it is not possible to explain the generation of this asymmetry



- Ø Dark Matter (DM)
- øbaryogenesis
- Strong CP problem



- Ø Dark Matter (DM)
- øbaryogenesis
- Strong CP problem
- Dark Energy (DE)



- Ø Dark Matter (DM)
- øbaryogenesis
- Strong CP problem
- Ø Dark Energy (DE)





- Ø Dark Matter (DM)
- øbaryogenesis
- Strong CP problem
- Dark Energy (DE)
- (hierarchy problem)

The most studied BSM physics: SUSY SUPERSYMMETRY: to each bosonic degree of freedom corresponds a fermionic one and viceversa



The most studied BSM physics: SUSY SUPERSYMMETRY: to each bosonic degree of freedom corresponds a fermionic one and viceversa



The most studied BSM physics: SUSY SUPERSYMMETRY: to each bosonic degree of freedom corresponds a fermionic one and viceversa



SUSY exact: mass of susy partners should be equal so far no SUSY particles → SUSY must be broken
SUSY solves the hierarchy problem (if light sparticles) The most studied BSM physics: SUSY Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) In order to avoid fast proton decay: R-parity



Conseqs: 1. stable Lightest SUSY Particle (LSP): DM candidate?
2. @LHC SUSY particles produced in pairs
3. @LHC if LSP neutral, a lot of MET (missing energy)

Introduced to solve the hierarchy problem

Moreover, for free:

- Dark Matter candidate
- baryogenesis
- gauge couplings unification

Introduced to solve the hierarchy problem

Moreover, for free: - Dark Matter candidate - baryogenesis

- gauge couplings unification



Introduced to solve the hierarchy problem

Moreover, for free:

- Dark Matter candidate
- baryogenesis
- gauge couplings unification

All this work (especially the solution to the hierarchy problem) if SUSY particles are lighter than 1 TeV

Introduced to solve the hierarchy problem

Moreover, for free:

- Dark Matter candidate
- baryogenesis
- gauge couplings unification

All this work (especially the solution to the hierarchy problem)

if SUSY particles are lighter than 1 TeV

However LHC started operations...

SUSY and the LHC

ATLAS SUSY Searches* - 95% CL Lower Limits

Status: SUSY 2013

full data

partial data

full data

ATLAS Preliminary

 $\int \mathcal{L} dt = (4.6 - 22.9) \text{ fb}^{-1}$ $\sqrt{s} = 7, 8 \text{ TeV}$

	Model	e, μ, τ, γ	Jets	$\mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{T}}^{\mathrm{miss}}$	∫£ dt[fb	Mass limit	·	Reference
Inclusive Searches	MSUGRA/CMSSM MSUGRA/CMSSM MSUGRA/CMSSM $\tilde{q}\tilde{q}, \tilde{q} \rightarrow q \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}$ $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \rightarrow q q \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}$ $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \rightarrow q q \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{1} \rightarrow q q W^{\pm} \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}$ $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \rightarrow q q (\ell \ell / \ell v / v v) \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}$ GMSB (ℓ NLSP) GMSB (ℓ NLSP) GGM (bino NLSP) GGM (higgsino-bino NLSP) GGM (higgsino NLSP) GGM (higgsino NLSP) Gravitino LSP	$ \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 1 e, \mu \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 e, \mu \\ 2 e, \mu \\ 2 e, \mu \\ 1 - 2 \tau \\ 2 \gamma \\ 1 e, \mu + \gamma \\ \gamma \\ 2 e, \mu (Z) \\ 0 \end{array} $	2-6 jets 3-6 jets 7-10 jets 2-6 jets 3-6 jets 0-3 jets 0-2 jets - 1 b 0-3 jets mono-jet	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	20.3 20.3 20.3 20.3 20.3 20.3 20.3 20.3	q.ğ 1.7 TeV ğ 1.2 TeV ğ 1.1 TeV q 740 GeV ğ 1.3 TeV ğ 1.3 TeV ğ 1.18 TeV ğ 1.12 TeV ğ 1.12 TeV ğ 1.12 TeV ğ 1.12 TeV ğ 1.24 TeV ğ 1.07 TeV ğ 619 GeV ğ 619 GeV ğ 690 GeV ğ 690 GeV ğ 690 GeV	$\begin{array}{l} m(\tilde{q}) = m(\tilde{g}) \\ \text{any } m(\tilde{q}) \\ \text{any } m(\tilde{q}) \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 0 \text{ GeV} \\ tan\beta < 15 \\ tan\beta < 18 \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) > 50 \text{ GeV} \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) > 50 \text{ GeV} \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) > 50 \text{ GeV} \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) > 220 \text{ GeV} \\ m(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}) > 200 \text{ GeV} \\ m(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}) > 200 \text{ GeV} \\ m(\tilde{g}) > 10^{-4} \text{ eV} \end{array}$	ATLAS-CONF-2013-047 ATLAS-CONF-2013-062 1308.1841 ATLAS-CONF-2013-047 ATLAS-CONF-2013-047 ATLAS-CONF-2013-062 ATLAS-CONF-2013-069 1208.4688 ATLAS-CONF-2013-026 1209.0753 ATLAS-CONF-2012-144 1211.1167 ATLAS-CONF-2012-152 ATLAS-CONF-2012-147
ğ med.	$ \begin{split} \tilde{g} &\rightarrow b \bar{b} \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \tilde{g} &\rightarrow t \bar{t} \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \tilde{g} &\rightarrow t \bar{t} \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \tilde{g} &\rightarrow b \bar{t} \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{+} \end{split} $	0 0 0-1 <i>e</i> ,μ 0-1 <i>e</i> ,μ	3 b 7-10 jets 3 b 3 b	Yes Yes Yes Yes	20.1 20.3 20.1 20.1	ğ 1.2 TeV ğ 1.1 TeV ğ 1.34 TeV ğ 1.3 TeV	$\begin{array}{l} m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) <\! 600 \mathrm{GeV} \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) <\! 350 \mathrm{GeV} \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) <\! 400 \mathrm{GeV} \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) <\! 300 \mathrm{GeV} \end{array}$	ATLAS-CONF-2013-061 1308.1841 ATLAS-CONF-2013-061 ATLAS-CONF-2013-061
direct production	$ \begin{split} \tilde{b}_{1}\tilde{b}_{1}, \tilde{b}_{1} \rightarrow b \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \tilde{b}_{1}\tilde{b}_{1}, \tilde{b}_{1} \rightarrow t \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm} \\ \tilde{t}_{1}\tilde{t}_{1}(\text{light}), \tilde{t}_{1} \rightarrow b \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm} \\ \tilde{t}_{1}\tilde{t}_{1}(\text{light}), \tilde{t}_{1} \rightarrow W b \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \tilde{t}_{1}\tilde{t}_{1}(\text{medium}), \tilde{t}_{1} \rightarrow t \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \tilde{t}_{1}\tilde{t}_{1}(\text{medium}), \tilde{t}_{1} \rightarrow t \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \tilde{t}_{1}\tilde{t}_{1}(\text{heavy}), \tilde{t}_{1} \rightarrow t \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \tilde{t}_{1}\tilde{t}_{1}(\text{heavy}), \tilde{t}_{1} \rightarrow t \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \tilde{t}_{1}\tilde{t}_{1}(\text{ntural GMSB}) \\ \tilde{t}_{2}\tilde{t}_{2}, \tilde{t}_{2} \rightarrow \tilde{t}_{1} + Z \end{split} $	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 2 \ e, \mu \ (SS) \\ 1-2 \ e, \mu \\ 2 \ e, \mu \\ 2 \ e, \mu \\ 0 \\ 1 \ e, \mu \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 2 \ e, \mu \ (Z) \\ 3 \ e, \mu \ (Z) \end{array}$	2 b 0-3 b 1-2 b 0-2 jets 2 jets 2 b 1 b 2 b ono-jet/c-t 1 b 1 b	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes ag Yes Yes Yes	20.1 20.7 4.7 20.3 20.3 20.1 20.7 20.5 20.3 20.7 20.7	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{l} m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) < 90 \ \mathrm{GeV} \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{+}) = 2 \ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 55 \ \mathrm{GeV} \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = m(\tilde{t}_{1}) \cdot m(W) \cdot 50 \ \mathrm{GeV}, \ m(\tilde{t}_{1}) < < m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{+}) \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 0 \ \mathrm{GeV} \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 20 \ \mathrm{GeV} \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 0 \ \mathrm{GeV} \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 10 \ \mathrm{GeV} \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 10 \ \mathrm{GeV} \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 150 \ \mathrm{GeV} \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 150 \ \mathrm{GeV} \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}) = m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) + 180 \ \mathrm{GeV} \end{array}$	1308.2631 ATLAS-CONF-2013-007 1208.4305, 1209.2102 ATLAS-CONF-2013-048 ATLAS-CONF-2013-065 1308.2631 ATLAS-CONF-2013-037 ATLAS-CONF-2013-024 ATLAS-CONF-2013-025 ATLAS-CONF-2013-025
direct	$ \begin{split} &\tilde{\ell}_{L,R}\tilde{\ell}_{L,R}, \tilde{\ell} \rightarrow \ell \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ &\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{+}\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{-}, \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{+} \rightarrow \tilde{\ell} \nu (\ell \tilde{\nu}) \\ &\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{+}\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{-}, \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{+} \rightarrow \tilde{\ell} \nu (\tau \tilde{\nu}) \\ &\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm}\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0} \rightarrow \tilde{\ell}_{L} \nu \tilde{\ell}_{L} \ell (\tilde{\nu}\nu), \ell \tilde{\nu} \tilde{\ell}_{L} \ell (\tilde{\nu}\nu) \\ &\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm}\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0} \rightarrow W \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} Z \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ &\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm}\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0} \rightarrow W \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} h \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \end{split} $	2 e,μ 2 e,μ 2 τ 3 e,μ 3 e,μ 1 e,μ	0 0 - 0 2 b	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	20.3 20.3 20.7 20.7 20.7 20.7 20.3	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{l} m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 0 \; \text{GeV} \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 0 \; \text{GeV}, \; m(\tilde{\ell}, \tilde{\nu}) = 0.5(m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm}) + m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0})) \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 0 \; \text{GeV}, \; m(\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\nu}) = 0.5(m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm}) + m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0})) \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0}), \; m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 0, \; m(\tilde{\ell}, \tilde{\nu}) = 0.5(m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm}) + m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0})) \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm}) = m(\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0}), \; m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 0, \; \text{sleptons decoupled} \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm}) = m(\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0}), \; m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 0, \; \text{sleptons decoupled} \end{array}$	ATLAS-CONF-2013-049 ATLAS-CONF-2013-049 ATLAS-CONF-2013-028 ATLAS-CONF-2013-035 ATLAS-CONF-2013-035 ATLAS-CONF-2013-093
particles	Direct $\tilde{\chi}_1^+ \tilde{\chi}_1^-$ prod., long-lived $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ Stable, stopped \tilde{g} R-hadron GMSB, stable $\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \rightarrow \tilde{\tau}(\tilde{e}, \tilde{\mu}) + \tau(e$ GMSB, $\tilde{\chi}_1^0 \rightarrow \gamma \tilde{G}$, long-lived $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ $\tilde{q}\tilde{q}, \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \rightarrow qq\mu$ (RPV)	Disapp. trk 0 $(\mu) 1-2\mu$ 2γ 1μ , displ. vtx	1 jet 1-5 jets - - -	Yes Yes - Yes -	20.3 22.9 15.9 4.7 20.3	$ \begin{array}{c cccc} \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm} & 270 \ {\rm GeV} \\ \tilde{g} & 832 \ {\rm GeV} \\ \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} & 475 \ {\rm GeV} \\ \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} & 230 \ {\rm GeV} \\ \tilde{q} & 1.0 \ {\rm TeV} \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{l} m(\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm})\text{-}m(\tilde{\chi}_1^{0}) {=} 160 \; \mathrm{MeV}, \; \tau(\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm}) {=} 0.2 \; \mathrm{ns} \\ m(\tilde{\chi}_1^{0}) {=} 100 \; \mathrm{GeV}, \; 10 \; \mu \mathrm{s} {<} \tau(\tilde{g}) {<} 1000 \; \mathrm{s} \\ 10 {<} \tan \beta {<} 50 \\ 0.4 {<} \tau(\tilde{\chi}_1^{0}) {<} 2 \; \mathrm{ns} \\ 1.5 {<} c \tau {<} 156 \; \mathrm{mm}, \; \mathrm{BR}(\mu) {=} 1, \; m(\tilde{\chi}_1^{0}) {=} 108 \; \mathrm{GeV} \end{array}$	ATLAS-CONF-2013-069 ATLAS-CONF-2013-057 ATLAS-CONF-2013-058 1304.6310 ATLAS-CONF-2013-092
RPV	$ \begin{array}{c} LFV \ pp \rightarrow \widetilde{v}_{\tau} + X, \widetilde{v}_{\tau} \rightarrow e + \mu \\ LFV \ pp \rightarrow \widetilde{v}_{\tau} + X, \widetilde{v}_{\tau} \rightarrow e(\mu) + \tau \\ Bilinear \ RPV \ CMSSM \\ \widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{+} \widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{-}, \widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{+} \rightarrow W \widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}, \widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \rightarrow e \widetilde{v}_{\mu}, e \mu \widetilde{v}_{\tau} \\ \widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{+} \widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{-}, \widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{+} \rightarrow W \widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}, \widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \rightarrow \tau \tau \widetilde{v}_{e}, e \tau \widetilde{v}_{\tau} \\ \widetilde{g} \rightarrow q q \\ \widetilde{g} \rightarrow \widetilde{t}_{1} t, \ \widetilde{t}_{1} \rightarrow b s \end{array} $	$2 e, \mu 1 e, \mu + \tau 1 e, \mu 4 e, \mu 3 e, \mu + \tau 0 2 e, \mu (SS)$	- 7 jets - - 6-7 jets 0-3 <i>b</i>	- Yes Yes Yes - Yes	4.6 4.6 4.7 20.7 20.7 20.3 20.7	$ \begin{array}{c c} \tilde{v}_{\tau} & 1.61 \text{ TeV} \\ \tilde{v}_{\tau} & 1.1 \text{ TeV} \\ \tilde{v}_{\tau} & 1.2 \text{ TeV} \\ \tilde{q}, \tilde{g} & 1.2 \text{ TeV} \\ \tilde{x}_{1}^{\pm} & 760 \text{ GeV} \\ \tilde{x}_{1}^{\pm} & 350 \text{ GeV} \\ \tilde{g} & 916 \text{ GeV} \\ \tilde{g} & 880 \text{ GeV} \\ \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{l} \lambda_{311}'=0.10,\lambda_{132}=0.05\\ \lambda_{311}'=0.10,\lambda_{1(2)33}=0.05\\ m(\tilde{q})=m(\tilde{g}),c\tau_{LSP}<1\ \mathrm{mm}\\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0})>300\ \mathrm{GeV},\lambda_{121}>0\\ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0})=80\ \mathrm{GeV},\lambda_{133}>0\\ \mathrm{BR}(t)=\mathrm{BR}(b)=\mathrm{BR}(c)=0\% \end{array}$	1212.1272 1212.1272 ATLAS-CONF-2012-140 ATLAS-CONF-2013-036 ATLAS-CONF-2013-036 ATLAS-CONF-2013-091 ATLAS-CONF-2013-007
Other	Scalar gluon pair, sgluon $\rightarrow q\bar{q}$ Scalar gluon pair, sgluon $\rightarrow t\bar{t}$ WIMP interaction (D5, Dirac χ)	$ \begin{array}{c} 0\\ 2 e, \mu (SS)\\ 0 \end{array} $	4 jets 1 <i>b</i> mono-jet	Yes Yes	4.6 14.3 10.5	sgluon 100-287 GeV sgluon 800 GeV M* scale 704 GeV	incl. limit from 1110.2693 $m(\chi)$ <80 GeV, limit of<687 GeV for D8	1210.4826 ATLAS-CONF-2013-051 ATLAS-CONF-2012-147
	vs = / lev 1	vs = o lev	vs =	olev		10 ⁻¹ 1		

Mass scale [TeV]

*Only a selection of the available mass limits on new states or phenomena is shown. All limits quoted are observed minus 1 σ theoretical signal cross section uncertainty.

SUSY and the LHC

Summary of CMS SUSY Results* in SMS framework SUSY 2013



SUSY and the LHC

No signal of SUSY so far (no signal of any BSM physics so far...)

SUSY is "in trouble":

- it can always be there at a higher scale
- but the original motivation (hierarchy problem) would be lost; at least stops must be "light"

is it possible that low scale SUSY is there but "hidden"?

 \rightarrow look for alternative SUSY scenarios!

A (new) idea

The recently discovered Higgs boson H and the neutrino v have the <u>same gauge quantum numbers</u>:

 $\begin{pmatrix} L = \begin{pmatrix} \nu \\ l_L^- \end{pmatrix} = (1,2)_{1/2} \qquad \qquad H = \begin{pmatrix} h^0 \\ h^- \end{pmatrix} = (1,2)_{1/2}$

but L is a fermion and H is a boson

can they be one the superpartner of the other?

A (new) idea

The recently discovered Higgs boson H and the neutrino v have the same gauge quantum numbers:

 $\begin{pmatrix} L = \begin{pmatrix} \nu \\ l_L^- \end{pmatrix} = (1,2)_{1/2} \qquad \qquad H = \begin{pmatrix} h^0 \\ h^- \end{pmatrix} = (1,2)_{1/2}$

but L is a fermion and H is a boson

can they be one the superpartner of the other? YES, but not trivial 2 conditions have to be satisfied

Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM)



R=1

Higgs as a slepton



R=1

R=-1

Higgs as a slepton



R=1

R=-1

Higgs as a slepton



R=1

35

Higgs as a slepton: R-parity is still viable?



R=1

R=-1
$H \equiv \tilde{v}$: is it possible? (1)

Higgs as a slepton: R-parity is still viable? NO!



R=1

R=-1

The scalar vev breaks R-parity and L-number

- p–decay
- large neutrino masses

$H \equiv \tilde{v}$: is it possible? (1)

1^{st} condition: replace the R-parity with a U(1)_R symmetry

$H \equiv \tilde{v} : \text{ is it possible? (1)}$ $1^{\text{st}} \text{ condition:}$ replace the R-parity with a U(1)_R symmetry



Fayet 76 – Gherghetta Pomarol 2003 – Frugiuele Gregoire 2011 – Riva, CB, Pomarol 2013 ...

$H \equiv \tilde{v}$: is it possible? (1)

1st condition: replace the R-parity with a $U(1)_R$ symmetry

Consequences:

– new decays @ LHC \rightarrow leptoquark decays $\tilde{q} \rightarrow q\ell$

$H \equiv \tilde{v}$: is it possible? (1)

1st condition: replace the R-parity with a $U(1)_R$ symmetry

Consequences:

– new decays @ LHC \rightarrow leptoquark decays $\tilde{q} \rightarrow q\ell$

– relations among squark masses $m_{ ilde{b}_L}^2 = m_{ ilde{t}_L}^2 - m_t^2 + m_b^2$

$H \equiv \tilde{v}$: is it possible? (1)

1st condition: replace the R-parity with a $U(1)_R$ symmetry

Consequences:

– new decays @ LHC \rightarrow leptoquark decays $\tilde{q} \rightarrow q\ell$

– relations among squark masses $m_{ ilde{b}_T}^2 = m_{ ilde{t}_L}^2 - m_t^2 + m_b^2$

- Dirac gaugino masses \rightarrow no same-sign dileptons

$H \equiv \tilde{v}$: is it possible? (1)

1^{st} condition: replace the R-parity with a U(1)_R symmetry

Consequences:

- new decays @ LHC \rightarrow leptoquark decays $\widetilde{q} \rightarrow q\ell$
- relations among squark masses $m_{ ilde{b}_L}^2 = m_{ ilde{t}_L}^2 m_t^2 + m_b^2$
- Dirac gaugino masses \rightarrow no same-sign dileptons
- lepton-gaugino mixing: lepton couplings modified

→ gaugino masses > TeV

$H \equiv \tilde{v}$: is it possible? (2)

 m_d

H--<^q

 H^{\dagger}

 \mathcal{U}

 m_u

44

$H \equiv \tilde{v}$: is it possible? (2)

 $H - \sqrt{q}$ Can be supersymmetrized

 m_d



 m_u H^{\dagger}_{-} \swarrow_{u}^{q} \swarrow Cannot be supersymmetrized: (superpotential must be analytic)

$H \equiv \tilde{v}$: is it possible? (2)

 H_{-}

 m_d



 H^{\dagger}_{-} $\begin{pmatrix} q \\ \end{pmatrix}$ Cannot be supersymmetrized: (superpotential must be analytic)

Usual solution:

$$m_{d} \qquad H_{1} - \sqrt{q} \qquad \checkmark$$

$$m_{u} \qquad H_{2} - \sqrt{q} \qquad \checkmark$$

Two scalar doublets: - MSSM $-H_u + L = H_d$ Frugiuele Gregoire 2011

$H = \tilde{\mathbf{v}} : \text{ is it possible? (2)}$ $m_d \qquad H = \sqrt{\frac{q}{d}} \qquad \text{Can be supersymmetrized}$

 m_u H^{\dagger}_{-} \swarrow_{η}^{q} \swarrow Cannot be supersymmetrized: (superpotential must be analytic)

We would like to have only 1 scalar doublet, identified with a lepton superpartner

$H \equiv \tilde{\mathbf{v}} : \text{ is it possible? (2)}$ $m_d \qquad H^{-} \swarrow \begin{pmatrix} q \\ & \checkmark \end{pmatrix} \qquad Can \text{ be supersymmetrized}$ $m_u \qquad H^{\dagger} \checkmark \begin{pmatrix} q \\ & \checkmark \end{pmatrix} \qquad Cannot \text{ be supersymmetrized:} \\ (superpotential must be analytic)}$

We would like to have only 1 scalar doublet, identified with a lepton superpartner

→ 2nd condition: the masses of the up-type quarks should come from a SUSY breaking sector Masses from SUSY breaking sector: not a surprise!

m_H≈125GeV requires SUSY :

 $(125 \text{GeV})^2 = m_Z^2 \cos^2 2\beta + \delta m^2$ SUSY: < (91 GeV)² (86 GeV)²

> (In the MSSM large A-terms or heavy stops)

 $W = Y_d HQD + Y_{e\,ij} HL_i E_j$

 $\rightarrow m_d$ $\rightarrow m_e \text{ (not for L_3)}$

$$W = Y_d HQD + Y_{e\,ij} HL_i E_j \qquad \xrightarrow{\rightarrow} m_d \\ \rightarrow m_e \text{ (not for } L_3)$$

All the rest comes from SUSY breaking terms:

$$W = Y_d HQD + Y_{e \, ij} HL_i E_j \qquad \xrightarrow{\rightarrow} m_d \\ \rightarrow m_e \text{ (not for } L_3)$$

All the rest comes from SUSY breaking terms:

- 1. up-type quarks Yukawa couplings
- 2. L₃ Yukawa coupling
- 3. gaugino masses
- 4. Higgs quartic coupling

$$W = Y_d HQD + Y_{e \, ij} HL_i E_j \qquad \xrightarrow{\rightarrow} m_d \\ \rightarrow m_e \text{ (not for } L_3)$$

All the rest comes from SUSY breaking terms:

1. up-type quarks Yukawa couplings

$$\begin{split} &\int d^4\theta \ y_u \frac{X^{\dagger}}{M} \frac{H^{\dagger}QU}{\Lambda} = \int d^2\theta \ Y_u H^{\dagger}QU}{Y_u = y_u \frac{F}{M\Lambda}} \\ & \text{SUSY mediation scale}^{\checkmark} \qquad \text{`effective op. scale} \\ & Y_u \sim 1 \Rightarrow \Lambda \sim y_u \frac{F}{M} \qquad m_{\tilde{q}} \sim \frac{F}{M} \lesssim \text{TeV} \Rightarrow \Lambda \lesssim 4\pi \text{TeV}} \end{split}$$

 $\sim \overline{M} \sim$

 $\Lambda \gtrsim 4\pi$

This model is an effective theory valid up to ~ 10 TeV

 $T \iota \tilde{q}$



No Higgsinos

Hierachy problem still solved, natural "splitted" spectrum

Phenomenology: the Higgs

Only 1 scalar, tree-level couplings as in the SM. Possible deviations from:

modification of couplings from loops mediated by stops
 higher dimensional operators
 invisible decays

Phenomenology: the HiggsOnly 1 scalar, tree-level couplings as in the SM.Possible deviations from:1. loops mediated by stops $g_{HYY} \rightarrow \Gamma(H \rightarrow \Upsilon Y)$ modified \leftarrow small effect $g_{Hgg} \rightarrow \Gamma(H \rightarrow gg)$ and σ_{prod} modified \leftarrow sizable effect



Fit to Higgs data: heavier stops are favored...

Phenomenology: the HiggsOnly 1 scalar, tree-level couplings as in the SM.Possible deviations from:1. loops mediated by stops $g_{HYY} \rightarrow \Gamma(H \rightarrow \Upsilon \Upsilon)$ modified \leftarrow small effect $g_{Hgg} \rightarrow \Gamma(H \rightarrow gg)$ and σ_{prod} modified \leftarrow sizable effect

57



m _{tR} < <m<sub>tL</m<sub>	m>280 GeV
m _{tL} < <m<sub>tR</m<sub>	m>290 GeV
m _{tL} =m _{tR}	m>420 GeV

Stops lighter than tops seem to be excluded in our model from Higgs data fit

Phenomenology: the Higgs Only 1 scalar, tree-level couplings as in the SM. Possible deviations from:

3. invisible decays

H and v superpartners \rightarrow interact with goldstino if the gravitino is light (LSP):

$$\Gamma(h \to \tilde{G}\nu_L) \simeq \frac{1}{16\pi} \frac{m_h^5}{F^2}$$

 $\sqrt{F} \approx 1 \text{ TeV} \rightarrow Br_{inv} \approx 10\%$

Brinv ≠0 lighter stops still allowed



No A-terms \Rightarrow prediction:

 $m_{\tilde{b}_L}^2 = m_{\tilde{t}_L}^2 - m_t^2 + m_b^2$

No A-terms \Rightarrow prediction:

$$m_{\tilde{b}_L}^2 = m_{\tilde{t}_L}^2 - m_t^2 + m_b^2$$

Decay	Interaction	
$\tilde{t}_L o b_R \bar{l}_L^-$	$Y_d HQD _{\theta^2}$	
$\tilde{t}_L \to t_R \bar{\nu}_L$	$\frac{1}{\Lambda^2} H ^2 Q ^2 _{ heta^4}$	
$\tilde{t}_L o t_L \tilde{G}$	$\left rac{m_t^2 - m_{ ilde{t}_L}^2}{F} ilde{t}_L^* ilde{G} t_L ight $	
$\tilde{b}_L o b_R \bar{\nu}_L$	$Y_d QHD _{\theta^2}$	
$\tilde{b}_L \rightarrow b_L \tilde{G}$	$\left[{{m_b^2 - m_{\widetilde{b}_L}^2}\over F} \widetilde{b}_L^* \widetilde{G} b_L ight]$	

Decay	Interaction
$\tilde{t}_R \to t_L \nu_L$	$\frac{1}{\Lambda^2} H ^2 U ^2 _{\theta^4}$
$\tilde{t}_R \to t_R \bar{\tilde{G}}$	$rac{m_t^2-m_{ ilde{t}_R}^2}{F} ilde{t}_R^*ar{ ilde{G}}ar{t}_L$
$\tilde{b}_R \to b_L \nu_L$	$Y_d QHD _{\theta^2}$
$\tilde{b}_R \to t_L l_L^-$	$Y_d QHD _{\theta^2}$
$\tilde{b}_R \to b_R \bar{\tilde{G}}$	$rac{m_b^2-m_{ ilde{b}_R}^2}{F} ilde{b}_R^*ar{ar{G}}ar{b}_L$

No A-terms \Rightarrow prediction:

$$m_{\tilde{b}_L}^2 = m_{\tilde{t}_L}^2 - m_t^2 + m_b^2$$

Decay	Interaction	
$\tilde{t}_L o b_R \bar{l}_L^-$	$Y_d HQD _{\theta^2}$	
$\tilde{t}_L \to t_R \bar{\nu}_L$	$\frac{1}{\Lambda^2} H ^2 Q ^2 _{\theta^4}$	
$\tilde{t}_L ightarrow t_L \tilde{G}$	$\left rac{m_t^2 - m_{ ilde{t}_L}^2}{F} ilde{t}_L^* ilde{G} t_L ight $	
$\tilde{b}_L o b_R \bar{\nu}_L$	$Y_d QHD _{\theta^2}$	
$\tilde{b}_L \rightarrow b_L \tilde{G}$	$-rac{m_b^2-m_{ ilde{b}_L}^2}{F} ilde{b}_L^* ilde{G}b_L$	

Decay	Interaction
$\tilde{t}_R \to t_L \nu_L$	$\frac{1}{\Lambda^2} H ^2 U ^2 _{\theta^4}$
$\tilde{t}_R \to t_R \bar{\tilde{G}}$	$\left[{ {m_t^2 - m_{{ ilde t}_R}^2 \over F} { ilde t_R} {ar { ilde G} {ar t}_L} } ight]$
$\tilde{b}_R \to b_L \nu_L$	$Y_d QHD _{\theta^2}$
$\tilde{b}_R \to t_L l_L^-$	$Y_d QHD _{\theta^2}$
$\tilde{b}_R \to b_R \bar{\tilde{G}}$	$-rac{m_b^2-m_{ ilde{b}_R}^2}{F} ilde{b}_R^*ar{ar{G}}ar{b}_L$

Only jets + MET

No A-terms \Rightarrow prediction:

$$m_{\tilde{b}_L}^2 = m_{\tilde{t}_L}^2 - m_t^2 + m_b^2$$

Dee	cay	Interaction
$ ilde{t}_L$.	$\rightarrow b_R \bar{l}_L^-$	$Y_d HQD _{\theta^2}$
$ ilde{t}_L$ ·	$\rightarrow t_R \bar{\nu}_L$	$\frac{1}{\Lambda^2} H ^2 Q ^2 _{\theta^4}$
$ ilde{t}_L$	$\rightarrow t_L \tilde{G}$	$rac{m_t^2-m_{ ilde{t}_L}^2}{F} ilde{t}_L^* ilde{G}t_L$
b_L	$\rightarrow b_R \bar{\nu}_L$	$Y_d QHD _{\theta^2}$
\tilde{b}_L	$\rightarrow b_L \tilde{G}$	$rac{m_b^2-m_{\widetilde{b}_L}^2}{F}\widetilde{b}_L^*\widetilde{G}b_L$

Only jets + MET

Dec	cay	Interaction
\tilde{t}_R	$\rightarrow t_L \nu_L$	$\frac{1}{\Lambda^2} H ^2 U ^2 _{\theta^4}$
\tilde{t}_R	$\rightarrow t_R \bar{\tilde{G}}$	$rac{m_t^2-m_{ ilde{t}_R}^2}{F} ilde{t}_R^*ar{ ilde{G}}ar{t}_L$
\tilde{b}_R	$\rightarrow b_L \nu_L$	$Y_d QHD _{\theta^2}$
\tilde{b}_R	$\rightarrow t_L l_L^-$	$Y_d QHD _{\theta^2}$
\tilde{b}_R	$\rightarrow b_R \bar{\tilde{G}}$	$rac{m_b^2-m_{ ilde{b}_R}^2}{F} ilde{b}_R^*ar{ ilde{G}}ar{b}_L$

Both jets + MET and leptoquark decays

 f_R and b_L decay only into top/bottom + MET \Rightarrow MSSM searches can be adapted

 $m_{\tilde{b}_L} > 650 {
m ~GeV}$

from $\tilde{b} \rightarrow b \chi_0$ with massless neutralino:

from $\tilde{t} \rightarrow t \chi_0$ with massless neutralino:

 $190~{\rm GeV} < m_{\tilde{t}_R} < 685~{\rm GeV}$

stops lighter than tops in principle still allowed ($m_{\tilde{t}_R} > 150 \text{ GeV}$)

 $\longrightarrow m_{\tilde{t}_L} > 670 \text{ GeV}$

 $\tilde{\mathsf{f}}_{\mathsf{L}}$





searches jets + MET: 190 GeV $< m_{\tilde{t}_T} < 685$ GeV

 $\tilde{\mathsf{f}}_{\mathsf{L}}$



searches jets + MET: $190 \,\,{
m GeV} < m_{{\tilde t}_L} < 685 \,\,{
m GeV}$ Look for b-jet + e/μ !!!

 \tilde{t}_{1}

searches leptoquarks:





Light gravitino: b+MET dominates (factor ~10); otherwise:



 \tilde{b}_{R}

Similar Br, both controlled by Y_b , bounds from b-jets+MET

$$m_{\tilde{b}_R} > 650 {
m ~GeV}$$

Look for top + leptons!!!

LHC search strategy (an example of how to distinguish from MSSM)

> b-jet + MET observed:

- it's our \widetilde{b}_R only if observe also leptoquark decays @ same mass - it can be \widetilde{b}_L if observe \widetilde{f}_L @ slightly heavier mass

> t + MET observed:

- it's our \tilde{t}_L if observe also b+l decays - it can be \tilde{t}_R ; look at top helicity

LHC search strategy (an example of how to distinguish from MSSM)

> b-jet + MET <u>observed:</u> - it's our \tilde{b}_R onl - it can be \tilde{b}_{L} it

> + + MET obse - it's our \tilde{t}_L if a - it can be \tilde{t}_R ;

op helicity:
-
$$m_{{ ilde t}_R} \gg m_t$$

$$\tilde{t}_R \rightarrow t_R \tilde{G}$$
 as MSSM
 $\tilde{t}_R \rightarrow t_L \nu_L$

ass

$$m_{\tilde{t}_R} < m_t$$



Pheno: 1st and 2nd gen. squarksIght gravitino (and F≈TeV2) $\tilde{q} \rightarrow q\tilde{G} \rightsquigarrow jets + MET$ m>830GeV

Pheno: 1st and 2nd gen. squarks light gravitino (and F≈TeV²) $\tilde{q} \rightarrow q\tilde{G} \sim jets + MET m>830GeV$ heavy gravitino (or F>>TeV²) 2-body decays suppressed by small Yukawas \Rightarrow 3-body decays can dominate $\tilde{u}_{L,R}, \tilde{d}_{L,R}$ -- \mathcal{U}, u, d u, dh, Z, W $M_{\tilde{W}} \gtrsim 2 \mathrm{TeV}$

Pheno: sleptonsIight gravitino (and F≈TeV2) $\tilde{l} \rightarrow l\tilde{G} \rightarrow leptons + MET$ $\tilde{v} \rightarrow v\tilde{G} \rightarrow MET$; monojet, dijet+MET

heavy gravitino (or F>>TeV²)

3-body decays can dominate

$\tilde{e}_L ightarrow u_e + \bar{\nu}_L + W^-$	$ ilde{\mu}_L ightarrow u_\mu + ar{ u}_L + W^-$	$ ilde{ au}_L o au + ar{ u}_L$
$\tilde{e}_R \rightarrow e + l_L^- + W^+$	$\tilde{\mu}_R ightarrow \mu + u_L (50\%)$	$ ilde{ au}_R o au + u_L ext{ (50\%)}$
	$\rightarrow \nu_{\mu} + l_L^- (50\%)$	$\rightarrow \nu_{\tau} + l_L^-$ (50%)
$\tilde{\nu}_e ightarrow e + \bar{l}_L^- + Z$	$\tilde{ u}_{\mu} ightarrow \mu + Z + \bar{l}_L^-$	$\tilde{ u}_{ au} ightarrow au + \bar{l}_L^-$

Look for these channels!!!
The SM should be extended

The SM should be extendedOne appealing possibility: SUSY

The SM should be extended
One appealing possibility: SUSY
LHC is putting SUSY in a corner

The SM should be extended
One appealing possibility: SUSY
LHC is putting SUSY in a corner
However SUSY could be already here, if the Higgs is the SUSY partner of the neutrino

The SM should be extended
One appealing possibility: SUSY
LHC is putting SUSY in a corner
However SUSY could be already here, if the Higgs is the SUSY partner of the neutrino
Under certain conditions this could be realized

The SM should be extended One appealing possibility: SUSY LHC is putting SUSY in a corner
 However SUSY could be already here, if the Higgs is the SUSY partner of the neutrino Output Conditions this could be realized This model shows an interesting spectrum (only light stops and sbottoms) and interesting signatures @ LHC

The SM should be extended One appealing possibility: SUSY LHC is putting SUSY in a corner
 However SUSY could be already here, if the Higgs is the SUSY partner of the neutrino Output Conditions this could be realized This model shows an interesting spectrum (only light stops and sbottoms) and interesting signatures @ LHC Seven if at present SUSY seems to be disfavoured, do not desperate, maybe we are already in the SUSY era!

Grazie! :) The SM should be extended One appealing possibility: SUSY LHC is putting SUSY in a corner However SUSY could be already here, if the Higgs is the SUSY partner of the neutrino O Under certain conditions this could be realized This model shows an interesting spectrum (only light stops and sbottoms) and interesting signatures @ LHC Seven if at present SUSY seems to be disfavoured, do not desperate, maybe we are already in the SUSY era!