Baryon number violation at the LHC: The top option

> Gauthier Durieux (FNRS, CP3–UCLouvain)

Phys.Rev.D 85 (2012) 016006 (arXiv:1107.3805 [hep-ph]) U. of Wisconsin, Madison: Z. Dong and T. Han CP3 – UCLouvain: G.D., J.-M. Gérard and F. Maltoni

23 March 2012 Alliance Top Quark Workshop 2012



Outline

The baryon number

Non-conserving models Experimental evidence and constraints

The minimal effective BNV model

Effective operators Experimental constraints Top phenomenology at the LHC

Motivation

for baryon number violation (BNV)

- $\cdot\,$ strong theoretical support
 - in nearly all possible models, SM included
- $\cdot\,$ no direct experimental observation

very strong bounds from nucleon decay but hint from the $B-\overline{B}$ asymmetry

for an effective approach

 $\cdot \,$ model independent

valuable given the wealth of BSM extensions

- $\cdot\,$ simple description of the relevant physics
- for searches at the LHC, with top quarks
 - $\cdot\,$ in a new energy range
 - $\cdot\,$ in second and third generations
 - · almost at the quark level
 - $\cdot\,$ with unique experimental signatures

Outline

The baryon number

Non-conserving models Experimental evidence and constraints

The minimal effective BNV model

Effective operators Experimental constraints Top phenomenology at the LHC

The baryon number

A Noether charge associated with a global, accidental and classical $U(1)_B$ symmetry of the SM Lagrangian

$$B = \frac{1}{N_c} \sum_{a=1}^{N_f} \int d^3 \mathbf{x} \bigg[\bar{q}_a \gamma^0 q^a + \bar{u}_a \gamma^0 u^a + \bar{d}_a \gamma^0 d^a \bigg]$$

The baryon number

A Noether charge associated with a global, accidental and classical $U(1)_B$ symmetry of the SM Lagrangian

$$B = \frac{1}{N_c} \sum_{a=1}^{N_f} \int d^3 \mathbf{x} \left[\bar{q}_a \gamma^0 q^a + \bar{u}_a \gamma^0 u^a + \bar{d}_a \gamma^0 d^a \right]$$

Non-conserving theories

The SM: thanks to the (B + L)-anomaly [Adler (1969), Bell–Jackiw (1969)] · by *instanton* tunnelling transitions [t'Hooft (1976)] (at a negligible rate) by thermal sphaleron transitions [Klinkhamer–Manton (1984)] (for temperatures $\gtrsim 100$ GeV) GUT models: thanks to extra gauge/scalar bosons e.g. in a minimal SU(5), [Georgi–Glashow (1974)] new (3, $\overline{2}$, -5/6) vector and (3, 1, -1/3) scalar SUSY models [Weinberg (1982)] *R*-parity violating interactions $(\mathcal{U} \mathcal{D} \mathcal{D})$ dimension-five operators (\mathcal{QQQL} and $\overline{\mathcal{U}\overline{\mathcal{U}}\overline{\mathcal{D}}\overline{\mathcal{E}}}$)

Black-holes physics

[Bekenstein (1972)]

Baryon number violation

Experimentally

Evidence from the baryon-anti-baryon asymmetry

Universe around us made of matter (rather than anti-matter):

- $-\ \bar{p}$ fluxes in cosmic rays compatible with secondary production
- no strong and characteristic γ emissions observed

Standard baryogenesis requires *B*-violation

[Sakharov (1967)]

to create a net excess of Bs (or segregate Bs and \overline{B} s)

from a $B-\overline{B}$ symmetric initial condition

Baryon number violation

Experimentally

Evidence from the baryon–anti-baryon asymmetry

Universe around us made of matter (rather than anti-matter):

- $-\bar{p}$ fluxes in cosmic rays compatible with secondary production
- no strong and characteristic γ emissions observed

Standard baryogenesis requires *B*-violation

to create a net excess of Bs (or segregate Bs and Bs)

from a $B-\overline{B}$ symmetric initial condition

Constraints from matter stability

 $|\Delta B| = 1$

Nucleon decays:

- disappearance searches (process independent bounds)
- decay products searches

 $\tau_p/\text{Br}(p \to \pi^0 e^+) > 0.82 \times 10^{34} \text{yr} (90\% \text{ CL})$ [SuperK (2009)]

- $\cdot \tau$ lepton, D and B mesons decays [Argus, Belle, BaBar, Cleo (1992-2011)] [Opal (1999)]
- · $Z \rightarrow pe^-$ or $p\mu^-$ decays

 $|\Delta B| = 2$

- $\cdot n \bar{n}$ oscillation (free or bounded) [ILL (1994), Soudan-2 (2002)]
- *nn*, *np*, *pp* dinucleon decays (bounded)

[Frejus (1991)]

[Sakharov (1967)]

Outline

The baryon number

Non-conserving models

Experimental evidence and constraints

The minimal effective BNV model

Effective operators Experimental constraints Top phenomenology at the LHC

The minimal effective BNV model

minimal mass-dimension SM fields (interaction eigenstates: q, l, u, d, e) Lorentz and $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ invariance

 \rightarrow a basis of five scalar operators \cdot QQQL form: dimension-six

B-L conserving

[Weinberg, Wilczek–Zee, Abbott–Wise (1979-1980)]

$$O_{abcd}^{(1)} \equiv (\overline{d^c})_a^{\alpha}(u)_b^{\beta} \quad (\overline{q^c})_c^{i\gamma}(l)_d^{j} \quad \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \quad \epsilon_{ij}$$

$$O_{abcd}^{(2)} \equiv (\overline{q^c})_a^{i\alpha}(q)_b^{j\beta} \quad (\overline{u^c})_c^{\gamma}(e)_d \quad \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \quad \epsilon_{ij}$$

$$O_{abcd}^{(3)} \equiv (\overline{q^c})_a^{i\alpha}(q)_b^{j\beta} \quad (\overline{q^c})_c^{k\gamma}(l)_d^{l} \quad \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \quad \epsilon_{ij}\epsilon_{kl}$$

$$O_{abcd}^{(4)} \equiv (\overline{q^c})_a^{i\alpha}(q)_b^{j\beta} \quad (\overline{q^c})_c^{k\gamma}(l)_d^{l} \quad \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \quad [\epsilon\tau]_{ij} \cdot [\epsilon\tau]_{kl}$$

$$O_{abcd}^{(5)} \equiv (\overline{d^c})_a^{\alpha}(u)_b^{\beta} \quad (\overline{u^c})_c^{\gamma}(e)_d \quad \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \qquad \psi^c \equiv C\overline{\psi}^T$$

$$a, b, c, d: \text{ flavour}$$

$$i, j, k, l: \text{ SU}(2)_L$$

$$\alpha, \beta, \gamma: \text{ colour}$$

The minimal effective BNV model

in the physical basis (flavour generic U, D and E) with a top quark with a charged lepton but no neutrino Angular momentum conservation gives $\Delta(L+3B) \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ So, one single charged lepton implies $\Delta B \neq 0$ But $|\Delta L| = 1$ cannot be ensured in presence of \mathscr{K}_T

ightarrow a basis of two scalar operators:

[Dong et al. (2012)]

F

$$O^{(s)} \equiv \left[\overline{t_{\alpha}^{c}}(a P_{L} + b P_{R})D_{\beta}\right] \left[\overline{U_{\gamma}^{c}}(c P_{L} + d P_{R})E\right] \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma}$$
$$O^{(t)} \equiv \left[\overline{t_{\alpha}^{c}}(a' P_{L} + b' P_{R})E\right] \left[\overline{U_{\beta}^{c}}(c' P_{L} + d' P_{R})D_{\gamma}\right] \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma}$$

where a, ..., d' are flavour dependent, dimensionless parameters

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} + \frac{1}{\Lambda^2} \left(O^{(s)} + O^{(t)} + h.c. \right)$$

Experimental constraints

- No direct constraint so far!

Experimental constraints

- No direct constraint so far!
- Indirect constraints from nucleon decays [Morrissey et al., Hou et al. (2005)]
 - · at tree level, with W emission(s)



 $\rightarrow~$ formidable strong constraints

less stringent for effective coupling with higher generation fermions

Experimental constraints

- No direct constraint so far!
- Indirect constraints from nucleon decays [Morrissey et al., Hou et al. (2005)]
 - \cdot at tree level, with W emission(s)



→ formidable strong constraints less stringent for effective coupling with higher generation fermions $\cdot \,$ at loop level



 \rightarrow fixing flavours to *tcb* μ gives:

$$rac{c_6^{tcb\mu}}{\Lambda^2} \lesssim rac{10^{-11}-10^{-16}}{(1 \; {
m TeV})^2}$$

but *GIM-like* cancellations could occur when summing on all possible *UDUE* flavours

Top BNV decay

Signal

 $t\bar{t}$: SM hadronic + BNV



Signature:

- 5 jets, 1 single charged lepton
- -2 same-sign b's
- $\operatorname{no} \not \! E_t$

Branching ratio:

$$egin{array}{lll} {\sf Br}(ar t o b\mu^- c) \ &= 1.2 imes 10^{-6} \ \left[{\it A} + {\it B} + {\it C}
ight] \left({rac{1 \; {\sf TeV}}{\Lambda}}
ight)^4 \end{array}$$



 $\begin{array}{l} \text{neglecting all masses w.r.t. } m_t \\ A \equiv \left(|a|^2 + |b|^2 \right) \left(|c|^2 + |d|^2 \right) \\ B \equiv \left(|a'|^2 + |b'|^2 \right) \left(|c'|^2 + |d'|^2 \right) \\ C \equiv \mathfrak{Re} \left\{ a^* c^* a' c' + b^* d^* b' d' \right\} \end{array}$

Top BNV decay





Background SM tW production



Signature:

- 3 jets, 1 single charged lepton
- $\operatorname{no} \mathcal{E}_t$

$$\hat{\sigma}_{t}^{\text{BNV}} = \frac{1}{96\pi\Lambda^{4}} \int_{m_{t}^{2}-\hat{s}}^{0} \left[A \frac{\hat{t}\left(\hat{t}-m_{t}^{2}\right)}{\hat{s}^{2}} + B \frac{\left(\hat{s}-m_{t}^{2}\right)}{\hat{s}} + 2C \frac{\hat{t}}{\hat{s}} \right] \text{ neglecting all masses w.r.t. } m_{t}$$
$$= \frac{\hat{s}}{96\pi\Lambda^{4}} \left(1 - \frac{m_{t}^{2}}{\hat{s}} \right)^{2} \left[\left(\frac{A}{3} + B + C \right) + \frac{m_{t}^{2}}{\hat{s}} \frac{A}{6} \right]$$

 \hat{s} growth: The effective theory assumes $\sqrt{\hat{s}} \ll \Lambda$. We impose $\sqrt{\hat{s}} < \Lambda$ for consistency.

$$\hat{\sigma}_t^{\text{BNV}} = \frac{1}{96\pi\Lambda^4} \int_{m_t^2 - \hat{s}}^{0} \left[A \frac{\hat{t} \left(\hat{t} - m_t^2 \right)}{\hat{s}^2} + B \frac{\left(\hat{s} - m_t^2 \right)}{\hat{s}} + 2C \frac{\hat{t}}{\hat{s}} \right] \text{ neglecting all masses w.r.t.}$$
$$= \frac{\hat{s}}{96\pi\Lambda^4} \left(1 - \frac{m_t^2}{\hat{s}} \right)^2 \left[\left(\frac{A}{3} + B + C \right) + \frac{m_t^2}{\hat{s}} \frac{A}{6} \right]$$
$$\hat{s} \text{ growth: The effective theory assumes } \sqrt{\hat{s}} \ll \Lambda.$$

We impose $\sqrt{\hat{s}} < \Lambda$ for consistency.

For representative flavour assignations:

	most PDF favoured	two flavour pairs	most PDF suppressed two flavour pairs
σ [fb]	$ud ightarrow \overline{t}E^+$	$ub ightarrow \overline{t}e^+$	$cb ightarrow \overline{t} \mu^+$
ABC	$ar{u}ar{d} ightarrow tE^-$	$ar{u}ar{b} o te^-$	$ar{c}ar{b} o t\mu^-$
1 0 0	250	30	1.2
	14	3.1	1.2
0 1 0	910	110	3.7
	45	9.1	3.7
1 1 1	2 100	240	9.1
	110	22	9.1
			_

MadGraph 5, LHC@7 TeV, $\sqrt{\hat{s}} < \Lambda = 1$ TeV

 m_t



 $\begin{array}{l} \sqrt{\hat{s}} < \Lambda = 1 \ \text{TeV} \\ \text{Decays: } & W^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu_\mu, \quad \overline{t} \rightarrow \overline{b} j \, j \\ \text{Jets: } & p_T > 40 \ \text{GeV}, \quad |\eta| < 2.5, \quad \Delta R_{jj} > 0.5 \\ \text{Muon: } & |\eta| < 2.5, \quad \Delta R_{j\mu} > 0.5 \\ \text{Backgrounds: } & \not{\textit{L}}_T < 30 \ \text{GeV} \\ & W^+ \ \text{jjj: } & |m_{jjj} - m_t| < 40 \ \text{GeV}, \quad b \ \text{tag} \end{array}$

Summary and conclusions

Baryon number violation:

- $\cdot \,$ well motivated from a theoretical point of view
- $\cdot\,$ a privileged probe for new physics
- $\cdot\,$ evidence from baryogenesis, strong low energy bounds
- \ldots but no measurement at TeV scales

The minimal effective BNV model:

- $\cdot \,$ with lowest dimensional operators
- $\cdot\,$ for exploring top BNV phenomenology
- $\cdot\,$ a powerful, simplified, and model independent framework