12. Beyond the Standard Model Particle and Nuclear Physics

Prof. Alex Mitov



Prof. Alex Mitov

12. Beyond the Standard Model

- Summary of the Standard Model
- Problems with the Standard Model
- Neutrino oscillations
- Supersymmetry

The Standard Model (2012)

Matter: point-like spin $\frac{1}{2}$ Dirac fermions



+ antiparticles

	Fermion		Charge [e]	Mass
	Electron	e^-	-1	0.511 MeV
gen	Electron neutrino	ν_e	0	~ 0
L st	Down quark	d	-1/3	4.8 MeV
	Up quark	и	+2/3	2.3 MeV
	Muon	μ^{-}	-1	106 MeV
gen	Muon neutrino	$ u_{\mu}$	0	~ 0
pud	Strange quark	S	-1/3	95 MeV
	Charm quark	С	+2/3	$1.3~{ m GeV}$
	Tau	$ au^-$	-1	1.78 GeV
gen	Tau neutrino	$ u_{ au}$	0	~ 0
3rd	Bottom quark	b	-1/3	4.7 GeV
(')	Top quark	t	+2/3	$173 { m GeV}$

The Standard Model (2012)

Forces: mediated by spin 1 bosons

Bosons



Force	Particle	Mass
Electromagnetic	Photon γ	0
Strong	8 gluons g	0
Weak (CC)	W^{\pm}	$80.4~{\rm GeV}$
Weak (NC)	Ζ	$91.2~{\rm GeV}$

• The Standard Model also predicts the existence of a spin-0 Higgs boson which gives all particles their masses via its interactions. Evidence from LHC confirms this, with $m_H \sim 125$ GeV.

The Standard Model successfully describes all existing particle physics data, with the exception of one

 \Rightarrow Neutrino Oscillations \Rightarrow Neutrinos have mass

In the SM, neutrinos are treated as massless; right-handed states do not exist \Rightarrow indication of physics Beyond the Standard Model

Prof. Alex Mitov

Problems with the Standard Model

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

- But: many (too many?) input parameters:
- Quark and lepton masses
- Quark charge
- Couplings $\alpha_{\rm EM}$, $\sin^2 \theta_W$, α_s
- Quark (+ neutrino) generation mixing $V_{\rm CKM}$
- and: many unanswered questions:
- Why so many free parameters?
- Why only three generations of quarks and leptons?
- Where does mass come from? (Higgs boson probably OK)
- Why is the neutrino mass so small and the top quark mass so large?
- Why are the charges of the *p* and *e* identical?
- What is responsible for the observed matter-antimatter asymmetry? 0
- How can we include gravity?

23 free parameters in SM

- 9 fermion masses (e, μ , τ , u, d, s, c, b, t)
- 4 CKM: 3 mixing angles + CPV phase
- 4 PMNS: 3 mixing angles + CPV phase
- 3 gauge couplings: U(1), SU(2), SU(3)
- 3 other: QCD vacuum angle (strong CPV), Higgs VEV, Higgs mass

etc

イロト イボト イヨト イヨト

Beyond the Standard Model – further unification??

Grand Unification Theories (GUTs) aim to unite the strong interaction with the electroweak interaction. Underpins many ideas about physics beyond the Standard Model.

The strength of the interactions depends on energy:



- Suggests unification of all forces at $\sim 10^{15}~{
 m GeV}$?
- Strength of Gravity only significant at the Planck Mass $\sim 10^{19}~{
 m GeV}$

Prof. Alex Mitov

Neutrino Oscillations

In 1998 the Super-Kamiokande experiment announced convincing evidence for neutrino oscillations implying that neutrinos have mass.



 $\pi \to \mu \nu_{\mu}$ $\hookrightarrow e \nu_{\mu} \overline{\nu}_{e}$

Expect $rac{N(
u_{\mu})}{N(
u_{e})}\sim 2$

Super-Kamiokande results indicate a deficit of ν_{μ} from the upwards direction. Upward neutrinos created further away from the detector.

- Interpreted as $\nu_{\mu} \rightarrow \nu_{\tau}$ oscillations
- Implies neutrino mixing and neutrinos have mass





< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > <

Detecting Neutrinos

Neutrinos are detected by observing the lepton produced in charged current interactions with nuclei. e.g. $\nu_e + N \rightarrow e^- + X$ $\bar{\nu}_\mu + N \rightarrow \mu^+ + X$

Size Matters:

- Neutrino cross-sections on nucleons are tiny; $\sim 10^{-42} (E_{
 u}/~{
 m GeV}){
 m m}^2$
- Neutrino mean free path in water \sim light-years.
- Require very large mass, cheap and simple detectors.
- Water Čerenkov detection

Čerenkov radiation

- Light is emitted when a charged particle traverses a dielectric medium
- A coherent wavefront forms when the velocity of a charged particle exceeds c/n (n = refractive index)
- Čerenkov radiation is emitted in a cone i.e. at fixed angle with respect to the particle.

$$\cos\theta_C = \frac{c}{nv} = \frac{1}{n\beta}$$





Super-Kamiokande

Super-Kamiokande is a Water Čerenkov detector sited in Kamioka, Japan



50,000 tons of water Surrounded by 11,146 \times 50 cm diameter, photo-multiplier tubes

Super-Kamiokande

Examples of events

$u_{\mu} + \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mu^{-} + \mathbf{X}$



The Cerenkov radiation from a muon produced by a muon neutrino event yields a well defined circular ring in the photomultiplier detector bank.





The Cerenkov radiation from the electron shower produced by an electron neutrino event produces multiple cones and therefore a diffuse ring in the detector array.



 $\nu_e + N \rightarrow e^- + X$

Prof. Alex Mitov

ヨークへ

Super-Kamiokande ν deficit



Expect

- Isotropic (flat)
 distributions in cos θ
- $N(
 u_{\mu}) \sim 2N(
 u_{e})$

Observe

- Deficit of ν_{μ} from **below**
- Whereas ν_e look as expected

Interpretation

- $\nu_{\mu} \rightarrow \nu_{\tau}$ oscillations
- \Rightarrow neutrinos have mass



nac

The quark states which take part in the weak interaction (d', s') are related to the flavour (mass) states (d, s)

Weak Eigenstates
$$\begin{pmatrix} d' \\ s' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_C & \sin \theta_C \\ -\sin \theta_C & \cos \theta_C \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \end{pmatrix}$$
 Mass Eigenstates Cabibbo angle $\theta_C \sim 13^\circ$

Suppose the same thing happens for neutrinos. Consider only the first two generations for simplicity.

Weak Eigenstates = flavour eigenstates $\begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ \nu_\mu \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & \sin\theta \\ -\sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_1 \\ \nu_2 \end{pmatrix}$ Mass Eigenstates Mixing angle θ

e.g. in π^+ decay produce μ^+ and ν_{μ} i.e. the neutrino state that couples to the weak interaction.

or expressing the mass eigenstates The ν_{μ} corresponds to a linear combination in terms of the weak eigenstates of the states with definite mass, ν_1 and ν_2

 $\nu_e = +\nu_1 \cos \theta + \nu_2 \sin \theta$ $\nu_1 = +\nu_e \cos \theta - \nu_\mu \sin \theta$ $\nu_2 = +\nu_e \sin\theta + \nu_{\mu} \cos\theta$ $\nu_{\mu} = -\nu_1 \sin \theta + \nu_2 \cos \theta$ Prof. Alex Mitov 12. Beyond the Standard Model

・ ロ ト ・ 目 ト ・ 目 ・ う へ ()・

・ ロ ト ・ 目 ト ・ 目 ・ う へ ()・

・ ロ ト ・ 目 ト ・ 目 ・ う へ ()・

Suppose a muon neutrino with momentum \vec{p} is produced in a weak decay, e.g. $\pi^+ \to \mu^+ \nu_\mu$

At t = 0, the wavefunction $\psi(\vec{p}, t = 0) = \nu_{\mu}(\vec{p}) = \nu_{2}(\vec{p}) \cos \theta - \nu_{1}(\vec{p}) \sin \theta$

The time evolution of ν_1 and ν_2 will be different if they have different masses

$$u_1(\vec{p},t) = \nu_1(\vec{p}) e^{-iE_1t}; \quad \nu_2(\vec{p},t) = \nu_2(\vec{p}) e^{-iE_2t}$$

After time t, state will in general be a mixture of ν_e and ν_μ $\psi(\vec{p}, t) = \nu_2(\vec{p}) e^{-iE_2 t} \cos \theta - \nu_1(\vec{p}) e^{-iE_1 t} \sin \theta$ $= [\nu_e(\vec{p}) \sin \theta + \nu_\mu(\vec{p}) \cos \theta] e^{-iE_2 t} \cos \theta - [\nu_e(\vec{p}) \cos \theta - \nu_\mu(\vec{p}) \sin \theta] e^{-iE_1 t} \sin \theta$ $= \nu_\mu(\vec{p}) [\cos^2 \theta e^{-iE_2 t} + \sin^2 \theta e^{-iE_1 t}] + \nu_e(\vec{p}) [\sin \theta \cos \theta (e^{-iE_2 t} - e^{-iE_1 t})]$

 $= c_{\mu}
u_{\mu}(ec{p}) + c_{e}
u_{e}(ec{p})$

・ロト ・ 日 ト ・ 目 ト ・ 目 ・ り へ ()

Probability of oscillating into ν_e

$$P(\nu_{e}) = |c_{e}|^{2} = \left|\sin\theta\cos\theta\left(e^{-iE_{2}t} - e^{-iE_{1}t}\right)\right|^{2}$$
$$= \frac{1}{4}\sin^{2}2\theta\left(e^{-iE_{2}t} - e^{-iE_{1}t}\right)\left(e^{iE_{2}t} - e^{iE_{1}t}\right)$$
$$= \frac{1}{4}\sin^{2}2\theta\left(2 - e^{i(E_{2} - E_{1})t} - e^{-i(E_{2} - E_{1})t}\right)$$
$$= \sin^{2}2\theta\sin^{2}\left[\frac{(E_{2} - E_{1})t}{2}\right]$$

But
$$E = \sqrt{\vec{p}^2 + m^2} = \vec{p}\sqrt{1 + \frac{m^2}{\vec{p}^2}} \sim \vec{p} + \frac{m^2}{2\vec{p}}$$

for $m \ll E$

 $1 + x \sim (1 + x/2)^2$ when x is small, can ignore x^2 term

$$\Rightarrow E_{2}(\vec{p}) - E_{1}(\vec{p}) \sim \frac{m_{2}^{2} - m_{1}^{2}}{2\vec{p}} \sim \frac{m_{2}^{2} - m_{1}^{2}}{2E}$$
$$\Rightarrow P(\nu_{\mu} \rightarrow \nu_{e}) = \sin^{2} 2\theta \sin^{2} \left[\frac{(m_{2}^{2} - m_{1}^{2})t}{4E} \right]$$

2

2

Prof. Alex Mitov

12. Beyond the Standard Model

2

2

nac

For
$$\nu_{\mu} \rightarrow \nu_{\tau}$$
 $P(\nu_{\mu} \rightarrow \nu_{\tau}) = \sin^2 2\theta \sin^2 \left[\frac{(m_3^2 - m_2^2)t}{4E}\right] = \sin^2 2\theta \sin^2 \left[\frac{1.27\Delta m^2 L}{E_{\nu}}\right]$

where L is the distance travelled in km, $\Delta m^2 = m_3^2 - m_2^2$ is the mass difference in (eV)² and E_{ν} is the neutrino energy in GeV.

Interpretation of Super-Kamiokande Results

For $E(\nu_{\mu}) = 1$ GeV (typical of atmospheric neutrinos)



Results are consistent with $\nu_{\mu} \rightarrow \nu_{\tau}$ oscillations:

 $|m_3^2 - m_2^2| \sim 2.5 \times 10^{-3} \ {\rm eV}^2; \qquad \sin^2 2\theta \sim 1$

Prof. Alex Mitov

12. Beyond the Standard Model

Neutrino Mixing – Comments

- Neutrinos almost certainly have mass
- Neutrino oscillation only sensitive to mass differences
- More evidence for neutrino oscillations Solar neutrinos (SNO experiment) Reactor neutrinos (KamLand) suggest $|m_2^2 - m_1^2| \sim 8 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$.
- More recent experiments use neutrino beams from accelerators or reactors; observe energy spectrum of neutrinos at a distant detector.
- At fixed *L*, observation of the values of E_{ν} at which minima/maxima are seen determines Δm^2 , while depth of minima determine $\sin^2 2\theta$.
- Note all these experiments only tell us about mass **differences**.
- Best constraint on absolute mass comes from the end point in Tritium β -decay, $m(\nu_e) < 2 \text{ eV}$.

Three-flavour oscillations



Supersymmetry (SUSY)

A significant problem is to explain why the Higgs boson is so light.

The effect of loop corrections on the Higgs mass should be to drag it up to the highest energy scale in the problem (i.e. unification, or Planck mass).



- One attractive solution is to introduce a new space-time symmetry, "supersymmetry" which links fermions and bosons (the only way to extend the Poincaré symmetry of special relativity and respect quantum field theory.)
- Each fermion has a boson partner, and vice versa, with the same couplings. Boson and fermion loops contribute with opposite sign, giving a natural cancellation in their effect on the Higgs mass. f



- 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, without any direct evidence (yet), and introduces lots of new unknown parameters.

Prof. Alex Mitov

12. Beyond the Standard Model

The Supersymmetric Standard Model



 $\mathrm{SM}: \ W^{\pm}, \ W^{0}, \ B \xrightarrow{\mathrm{mixing}} W^{\pm}, \ Z, \ \gamma \qquad \mathrm{SUSY}: \ \tilde{H}^{0}_{u}, \ \tilde{H}^{0}_{d}, \ \tilde{W}^{0}, \ \tilde{B}^{0} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{mixing}} \tilde{\chi}^{0}_{1}, \ \tilde{\chi}^{0}_{2}, \ \tilde{\chi}^{0}_{3}, \ \tilde{\chi}^{0}_{4}$

 $ilde{H}^+_u, \ ilde{H}^-_d, \ ilde{W}^+, \ ilde{W}^- \xrightarrow{\mathrm{mixing}} ilde{\chi}^\pm_1, \ ilde{\chi}^\pm_2$

<□ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ >

SUSY and Unification

- 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.
- Details depend on the version of SUSY, but in general unification much improved.
 Resolution [m]
 Resolution [m]



Prof. Alex Mitov

SUSY and cosmology

- SUSY, or any unified theory, tends to have potential problems with explaining the non-observation of proton decay.
- For this reason, many versions of SUSY introduce a conserved quantity "*R*-parity", which means that sparticles have to be produced in pairs.
- A consequence is that the lightest sparticle would have to be stable. In many scenarios this would be a "neutralino" $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ (a mixture of neutral "gauginos" and "Higgsinos").
- Cosmologists tell us that $\sim 25\%$ of the mass in the universe is in the form of "dark matter", which interacts gravitationally, but otherwise only weakly.
- The lightest sparticle could be a candidate for the "WIMPs" (Weakly Interacting Massive Particles) which could comprise dark matter.
- So there are several different reasons why SUSY is attractive.



21

However, no sign of supersymmetry yet...

On general grounds, some sparticles ought to be seen at energies around 1 TeVor lower. So LHC ought to be able to see them, especially squarks+gluinos



(high σ @LHC).

ATLAS SUSY Searches* - 95% CL Lower Limits							ATLAS Preliminary			
Jl	Model	Si	gnature	e ∫⊿	<i>L dt</i> [fb⁻	¹] Mass	limit			$\sqrt{s} = 13$ lev Reference
(0)	$\tilde{q}\tilde{q},\tilde{q}{ ightarrow}q\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}$	0 <i>e</i> ,μ mono-jet	2-6 jets 1-3 jets	E_T^{miss} E_T^{miss}	139 36.1	 <i>q</i> [1×, 8× Degen.] <i>q</i> [8× Degen.] 	1.0 0.9	1.85	m($ ilde{\chi}_1^0$)<400 GeV m($ ilde{\omega}$)-m($ ilde{\chi}_1^0$)=5 GeV	2010.14293 2102.10874
Searches	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \; \tilde{g} \rightarrow q \tilde{q} \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	0 <i>e</i> , <i>µ</i>	2-6 jets	E_T^{miss}	139	ĩg ĩg	Forbidden	2.3 1.15-1.95	m($\tilde{\ell}_1^0$)=0 GeV m($\tilde{\ell}_1^0$)=1000 GeV	2010.14293 2010.14293
	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}W\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	1 <i>e</i> , <i>µ</i>	2-6 jets		139	ĝ		2.2	$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)$ <600 GeV	2101.01629
Ve	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}(\ell\ell)\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}$	ee, µµ	2 jets	E_T^{miss}	36.1	Ĩ		1.2	$m(\tilde{g})-m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=50 \text{ GeV}$	1805.11381
clusi	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \rightarrow qqWZ\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}$	0 e,μ SS e,μ	7-11 jets 6 jets	E_T^{miss}	139 139	ευ ευ	1	1.97	$m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) < 600 \text{ GeV}$ $m(\tilde{g})-m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0})=200 \text{ GeV}$	2008.06032 1909.08457
Ц	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \rightarrow t \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	0-1 <i>e</i> , μ SS <i>e</i> ,μ	3 b 6 jets	$E_T^{\rm miss}$	79.8 139	ğ ğ		2.25	$m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) < 200 \text{ GeV} \ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 300 \text{ GeV}$	ATLAS-CONF-2018-041 1909.08457
	$ ilde{b}_1 ilde{b}_1$	0 <i>e</i> , <i>µ</i>	2 b	$E_T^{\rm miss}$	139	${ ilde b_1 \over ilde b_1}$	0.68	1.255	m(${ ilde {\lambda}}_1^0$)<400 GeV 10 GeV<Δm(${ ilde {b}}_1 { ilde {\lambda}}_1^0$)<20 GeV	2101.12527 2101.12527
rks tion	$\tilde{b}_1 \tilde{b}_1, \tilde{b}_1 \rightarrow b \tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow b h \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	0 e,μ 2 τ	6 b 2 b	E_T^{miss} E_T^{miss}	139 139	<i>b</i> ₁ Forbidden <i>b</i> ₁	0 0.13-0.85) .23-1.35 ∆	$m(\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0}, \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 130 \text{ GeV}, m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 100 \text{ GeV}$ $\Delta m(\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0}, \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 130 \text{ GeV}, m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 0 \text{ GeV}$	1908.03122 ATLAS-CONF-2020-031
onp	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow t \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	0-1 <i>e</i> , <i>µ</i>	≥ 1 jet	E_T^{miss}	139	\tilde{t}_1		1.25	$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=1 \text{ GeV}$	2004.14060,2012.03799
n. s pro	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow W b \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	1 <i>e</i> , <i>µ</i>	3 jets/1 b	E_T^{miss}	139	Ĩ1	Forbidden 0.65		$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=500 \text{ GeV}$	2012.03799
ge	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow \tilde{\tau}_1 b \nu, \tilde{\tau}_1 \rightarrow \tau G$	1-2 τ	2 jets/1 b	E_T^{miss}	139		Forbidden	1.4	m(īt ₁)=800 GeV	ATLAS-CONF-2021-008
3 rd dire	$t_1 t_1, t_1 \rightarrow c \chi_1^\circ / \tilde{c} \tilde{c}, \tilde{c} \rightarrow c \chi_1^\circ$	0 e,μ 0 e,μ	2 c mono-jet	E_T^{miss} E_T^{miss}	36.1 139	\tilde{t}_1	0.85		$m(\tilde{\chi}_1)=0 \text{ GeV}$ $m(\tilde{\iota}_1,\tilde{c})-m(\tilde{\chi}_1)=5 \text{ GeV}$	1805.01649 2102.10874
	$\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow t\tilde{\chi}_2^0, \tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow Z/h\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	1-2 <i>e</i> , µ	1-4 b	E_T^{miss}	139	<i>ι</i> ₁	0.067-	1.18	$m(\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0})=500 \text{ GeV}$	2006.05880
	$l_2 l_2, l_2 \rightarrow l_1 + Z$	3 e,µ	1.6	ET	139		-orbidden 0.86	m	$(\chi_1^{\circ})=360 \text{ GeV}, m(t_1)-m(\chi_1^{\circ})=40 \text{ GeV}$	2006.05880
	$ ilde{\chi}_1^{\pm} ilde{\chi}_2^0$ via WZ	Multiple ℓ/jets ee, μμ	≥ 1 jet	E_T^{miss} E_T^{miss}	139 139		0.96		$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=0$, wino-bino $m(\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm})-m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=5$ GeV, wino-bino	2106.01676, ATLAS-CONF-2021-022 1911.12606
	$\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm} \tilde{\chi}_1^{\mp}$ via WW	2 <i>e</i> , <i>µ</i>		E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm}$	0.42		$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=0$, wino-bino	1908.08215
	$\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm}\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0}$ via Wh	Multiple <i>l</i> /jets		E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm}/\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ Forbidden	1.0	6	$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=70$ GeV, wino-bino	2004.10894, ATLAS-CONF-2021-022
N ect	$\chi_1^+\chi_1^-$ via $\ell_L/\tilde{\nu}$	2 e,µ		E_T^{miss}	139	χ_1^{-}	1.0		$m(\ell, \tilde{v})=0.5(m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{x})+m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{v}))$	1908.08215
Чi	$\tau\tau, \tau \rightarrow \tau\chi_1$ $\tilde{e}_{-} = \tilde{e}_{-} = \tilde{e}_{-} e \tilde{\nu}^0$	21	0 iets	E _T E ^{miss}	139	7 U.16-0.3 U.1.	0.7		$m(\tilde{x}_1)=0$ $m(\tilde{v}^0)=0$	1908 08215
	$\iota_{\mathrm{L,R}}\iota_{\mathrm{L,R}}, \iota \rightarrow \iota_{\mathrm{A}}$	ee, μμ	≥ 1 jet	E_T^{Tmiss}	139	ř ℓ 0.256	0.7		$m(\tilde{\ell})-m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=10 \text{ GeV}$	1911.12606
	$\tilde{H}\tilde{H}, \tilde{H} \rightarrow h\tilde{G}/Z\tilde{G}$	0 e, µ	$\geq 3 b$	$E_{T_{\text{price}}}^{\text{miss}}$	36.1	<i>Ĥ</i> 0.13-0.23	0.29-0.88		$BR(\tilde{\chi}^0_1 \rightarrow h\tilde{G})=1$	1806.04030
		$4 e, \mu$ $0 e, \mu \geq$	0 jets 2 large jets	E_T^{miss} S E_T^{miss}	139 139	Ĥ Ĥ	0.55		$BR(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \rightarrow Z\tilde{G})=1$ $BR(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \rightarrow Z\tilde{G})=1$	2103.11684 ATLAS-CONF-2021-022
				1					Bridd - 199-1	
p s	Direct $\tilde{\chi}_1^+ \tilde{\chi}_1^-$ prod., long-lived $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$	Disapp. trk	1 jet	$E_T^{\rm miss}$	139	$ \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm} $ $ \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm} $ 0.21	0.66		Pure Wino Pure higgsino	ATLAS-CONF-2021-015 ATLAS-CONF-2021-015
-live	Stable \tilde{g} R-hadron		Multiple		36.1	Ĩ		2.0		1902.01636,1808.04095
ng	Metastable \tilde{g} R-hadron, $\tilde{g} \rightarrow qq \tilde{\chi}_1^0$		Multiple		36.1	$\tilde{g} = [\tau(\tilde{g}) = 10 \text{ ns}, 0.2 \text{ ns}]$		2.05 2.4	m($\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}$)=100 GeV	1710.04901,1808.04095
D Lo	$\tilde{\ell}\tilde{\ell}, \tilde{\ell} \rightarrow \ell\tilde{G}$	Displ. lep		E_T^{miss}	139	<i>ẽ</i> , μ̃	0.7		$\tau(\tilde{\ell}) = 0.1 \text{ ns}$	2011.07812
						τ 0.34			$\tau(\ell) = 0.1 \text{ ns}$	2011.07812
	$\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm} \tilde{\chi}_1^{\mp} / \tilde{\chi}_1^0$, $\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm} \rightarrow Z \ell \rightarrow \ell \ell \ell$	3 <i>e</i> , µ			139	$\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\mp}/\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}$ [BR(Z τ)=1, BR(Z e)=1]	0.625 1.05	5	Pure Wino	2011.10543
	$\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm} \tilde{\chi}_1^{\mp} / \tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow WW/Z\ell\ell\ell\ell\nu\nu$	4 e, µ	0 jets	E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm}/\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0} = [\lambda_{i33} \neq 0, \lambda_{12k} \neq 0]$	0.95	1.55	$m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0})=200 \text{ GeV}$	2103.11684
	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \rightarrow qq\chi_1^0, \chi_1^0 \rightarrow qqq$	4	-5 large jets	5	36.1	$\tilde{g} = [m(\chi_1^*)=200 \text{ GeV}, 1100 \text{ GeV}]$	0.55 4.00	1.3 1.9	Large \mathcal{L}_{112}^{0}	1804.03568
2	$tt, t \rightarrow t\tilde{\chi}_1, \tilde{\chi}_1 \rightarrow tbs$		Nulliple		120	7 [A ₃₂₃ =20-4, 10-2]	0.55 1.0: Farbiddan 0.95	D	$m(\chi_1)=200 \text{ GeV}, \text{ bino-like}$ $m(\tilde{\chi}^{\pm}) = 500 \text{ GeV}$	AILAS-CONF-2018-003
H	$i_1, i \to 0 \land [, \land] \to bbs$ $\tilde{i}_1 \tilde{i}_1, \tilde{i}_1 \to bs$:	2 iets + 2 b		36.7	\tilde{t}_1 [aa, bs]	0.42 0.61		m(x1)=500 GeV	1710.07171
	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow q\ell$	2 <i>e</i> , <i>µ</i>	2 b		36.1	Ĩ		0.4-1.45	$BR(\tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow be/b\mu) > 20\%$	1710.05544
		1μ	DV		136	t_1 [1e-10< λ'_{23k} <1e-8, 3e-10< λ'_{23k} <3e	9] 1.0	1.6	$BR(\tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow q\mu) = 100\%$, $\cos\theta_t = 1$	2003.11956
	$\tilde{\chi}_1^x/\tilde{\chi}_2^o/\tilde{\chi}_1^o, \tilde{\chi}_{1,2}^0 \rightarrow tbs, \tilde{\chi}_1^+ \rightarrow bbs$	1-2 e, µ	≥6 jets		139	<i>x</i> ⁰ ₁ 0.2-0.32			Pure higgsino	ATLAS-CONF-2021-007
*Only a selection of the available mass limits on new states or 10^{-1}							1			
Juny	a serection of the available ma		ow siales	5 01		v		•	mass scale (16V)	

phénomena is shown. Many of the limits are based on

Prof. Alex Mitov

12. Beyond the Standard Model

nan

ATI AS Preliminary

Signs of anything else?

(non-examinable)

LHCb Flavour Anomalies



Lepton universality in SM predicts $R = \frac{\mu\mu}{ce} = 1$

Test using rare decays of B mesons

- easy to see deviations from small values
- precise theory predictions

$$R_{K} = 0.85 \pm 0.04(stat.) \pm 0.01(syst.)$$

3 standard deviations from prediction. Evidence of something new!

5 std.dev is gold standard for discovery.

Similar effects seen in several rare decay modes.

This might be the first glimpse of new particles affecting decay rates, e.g. Leptoquarks



Prof. Alex Mitov

12. Beyond the Standard Model

Signs of anything else?

(non-examinable)

Muon g-2 Anomaly



Measure muon spin precession in magnetic field. Precision test of QED – precession frequency depends on how much it interacts with the magnetic field.

All known particles contribute to the muon's magnetic moment. Measure this very precisely and look for deviations.





20 year anomaly has been confirmed with a new measurement at Fermilab – measured muon magnetic moment to 0.46 ppm.

4.2 standard deviations from prediction.

Evidence of something new! Perhaps smuons?

Prof. Alex Mitov

Follow the results from LHC yourself!

To date (2024) LHC has taken only \sim 5% of its planned total dataset. Stay tuned!!

```
http://atlas.ch
http://cms.web.cern.ch
http://lhcb-public.web.cern.ch/lhcb-public/
```

Summary

- Over the past 50 years our understanding of the fundamental particles and forces of nature has changed beyond recognition.
- The Standard Model of particle physics is an enormous success. It has been tested to very high precision and can model almost all experimental observations so far.
- The Higgs "hole" is now becoming closed, though some other aspects of the SM are not quite yet under as much experimental "control" as one might wish for (the neutrino sector, the CKM matrix, etc).
- Good reasons to expect that the next few years will bring many more (un)expected surprises (more Higgs or gauge bosons, SUSY?).

Problem Sheet: q.29-30

Up next...

Section 13: Nuclear Physics, Basic Nuclear Properties

Prof. Alex Mitov