Identifying future SUSY searches with SmodelS

Federico Ambrogi (HEPHY Vienna), Sam Bein (Uni Hamburg), <u>Malte</u> <u>Mrowietz</u> (Uni Hamburg), Peter Schleper (Uni Hamburg), Jory Sonneveld (Uni Hamburg) Physics at the Terascale - Hamburg, 28.11.2017



Contents and Motivation

- A lot of SUSY parameter space already excluded, many searches interpreted in terms of simplified models: What parameter space is not covered?
- Simplified Model Spectra (SmodelS, arXiv:1701.06586) can **identify uncovered signatures** using simplified model decomposition
- \rightarrow Use SmodelS on SUSY parameter scan.
- Identify signatures worth looking for

Excluding parameter space

The straightforward approach (e.g. used by CheckMATE) arXiv:1611.09856, arXiv:1312.2591

- Take full model, simulate events, reproduce analyses with simulated events, compare to experiment database
- →Model is (not) excluded, get upper limits
- Drawback: Event simulation takes a lot of time
- Can this be done without simulation? →SmodelS



Excluding models with SmodelS

SmodelS process (left, arXiv:1412.1745), UL map example (right, arXiv:1704.07781)



SmodelS: Missing topologies

- Missing topologies: No analysis exists in the database for a predicted simplified model
- →Can help to decide on future searches! For example:
 - Run SmodelS on set of pMSSM points
 - Find important missing topology (e.g. one that occurs in many points)
 - Perform search for topology, incorporate UL map into SmodelS database
 - $\circ \rightarrow$ Exclude parameter space
- Outside grid topologies: Analysis exists in database, but not for needed masses



Using SmodelS: pMSSM parameter scan

For study of the pMSSM, a Monte Carlo Markov Chain scan was used (arXiv:1606.03577)

- ~7000 randomly selected points: Masses < 3TeV, prompt BSM particles, low energy constraints
- ~3500 points <u>not</u> excluded after LHC run 1
- Recent: Further exclusion by CMS-SUS-16-033 (jets+MET, E_{CMS}= 13 TeV, L = 35.9 fb⁻¹)

 \rightarrow 329 remaining points

Common missing simplified models

Results of running SmodelS on remaining pMSSM points (similar studies: arXiv:1606.03577 (Same scan, lists missing models); arXiv:1707.09036 (SmodelS, ATLAS scan))

- Electroweak topologies among most occurring missing models
- Outside grid topologies included here \rightarrow T2 in plot



TChipChimWoffWoff: Weight distribution

- Weight can be translated into events produced for given luminosity
- →Number of produced events is indicator for search potential

TChipChimWoffWoff: Weight vs. Lsp-Chargino mass splitting



TChipChimWoffWoff: A closer look

- Model is already constrained for high mass splittings (TChiWW / TChipChimWW)
- Expect soft final state, ISR induced MET
- Added incentive to explore TChipChimWoffWoff: It tends to occur in natural models
- →Use ∆EW as variable for naturalness (Phys. Rev. D 88.055026)

TChipChimWoffWoff



TChipChimWoffWoff: Naturalness



 ΔEW

Summary

- SmodelS is a fast tool to exclude models/theories
- SmodelS also identifies simplified models not covered by searches, which can be used as a decider for future analyses
- Presented study: Run SmodelS on 329 pMSSM points that are not excluded by CMS →interest in TChipChimWoffWoff & TChiChipmWoffZoff
- Preliminary analysis ongoing



Backup

SmodelS: Decomposition

A closer look at decomposition:

- Start with production cross section for branch mothers
- Sequentially add vertices/decays according to the decay table of the input model
- At each step, compute the weight:

weight = $\sigma \cdot \prod BR_i$

- Decomposition ends when
 - Both branches end in the LSP \rightarrow Simplified model added to spectrum
 - The weight is below a minimum value
 →Simplified model and all derived models
 <u>not</u> part of spectrum



TChiChipmWoffZoff: Naturalness



TChiChipmWoffZoff: Weight distribution



Finalstates in the 'None' category

unweighted finalstates in None Category



SmodelS: Assumptions

See SmodelS Manual, section 2 (arXiv:1701,06586)

- Production mode does not significantly influence event kinematics
- No offshell sparticles in cascade, virtual particles replaced by effective vertex
- No quantum numbers (except mass) are considered
- Narrow width approximation for BSM particles
- Z2 symmetry is required
- No significant differences when applying efficiency maps created from simplified models to full models
- Efficiencies don't change significantly from simplified to full model

SmodelS: Assumption studies

- arXiv:1410.0965 (Influence of different production modes in squark simplified models)
- arXiv:1501.03942 (Influence of spin structure in dijet+MET finalstate)
- arXiv:1503.02960 (see above, dilepton+MET)
- arXiv:160702050 (see above, ttbar+MET)

SmodelS is **not** safe in Mono-X searches for dark matter

Scan parameters

 $\begin{array}{rrrr} -3 \leq M_1, M_2 \leq 3 \, {\rm TeV}, \\ 0 \leq M_3 \leq 3 \, {\rm TeV}, \\ -3 \leq \mu \leq 3 \, {\rm TeV}, \\ 0 \leq m_A \leq 3 \, {\rm TeV}, \\ 2 \leq \ \tan \beta \leq 60, \end{array}$

 $0 \le m_{\tilde{Q}_{1,2}}, m_{\tilde{U}_{1,2}}, m_{\tilde{D}_{1,2}}, m_{\tilde{L}_{1,2}}, m_{\tilde{E}_{1,2}}, m_{\tilde{Q}_3}, m_{\tilde{U}_3}, m_{\tilde{D}_3}, m_{\tilde{L}_3}, m_{\tilde{E}_3} \le 3 \text{ TeV},$ $-7 \le A_t, A_b, A_\tau \le 7 \text{ TeV},$

Scan: Low energy constraints

i	Observable	Constraint	Likelihood function	Comment
	$\mu_i(\theta)$	$D_i^{\text{non-DCS}}$	$L[D_i^{\text{non-DCS}} \mu_i(\theta)]$	
1	$\mathcal{B}(b \to s\gamma)$ [45]	$(3.43 \pm 0.21^{\text{stat}} \pm 0.24^{\text{th}} \pm 0.07^{\text{sys}}) \times 10^{-4}$	Gaussian	reweight
2	$\mathcal{B}(B_s \to \mu\mu)$ [46]	$(2.9\pm0.7\pm0.29^{ m th}) imes10^{-9}$	Gaussian	reweight
3	$R(B \rightarrow \tau \nu)$ [45]	1.04 ± 0.34	Gaussian	reweight
4	Δa_{μ} [47]	$(26.1 \pm 6.3^{\text{exp}} \pm 4.9^{\text{SM}} \pm 10.0^{\text{SUSY}}) \times 10^{-10}$	Gaussian	
5	$\alpha_{\rm s}(m_{\rm Z})$ 48	0.1184 ± 0.0007	Gaussian	
6	m _t [49]	$173.20 \pm 0.87^{\text{stat}} \pm 1.3^{\text{sys}} \text{ GeV}$	Gaussian	reweight
7	$m_{\rm b}(m_{\rm b})$ [48]	$4.19^{+0.18}_{-0.06}{ m GeV}$	Two-sided Gaussian	
8	$m_{ m h}$	LHC: $m_{\rm h}^{\rm low} = 120 \text{GeV}, m_{\rm h}^{\rm high} = 130 \text{GeV}$	1 if $m_{\rm h}^{\rm low} \le m_{\rm h} \le m_{\rm h}^{\rm high}$	reweight
			0 if $m_h < m_h^{\text{low}}$ or $m_h > m_h^{\text{high}}$	
9	$\mu_{\rm h}$	CMS and ATLAS in LHC Run 1, Tevatron	LILITH 1.01 [50] 51]	post-MCMC
10	sparticle masses	LEP [52]	1 if allowed	
		(via MICROMEGAs [53+55])	0 if excluded	

Sources

- LHC picture: <u>http://www.pindex.com/uploads/post_images/original/image_1542.png</u>
- CMS picture: <u>http://www.physikblog.eu/wp-content/uploads/2008/09/cms_aufbau.png</u>
- SM picture: <u>http://cms.web.cern.ch/sites/cms.web.cern.ch/files/styles/large/public/field/image/CMSResult130628_Figure01.jpg?itok=G</u> <u>buSst8u</u>
- Gravity picture: http://discovermagazine.com/~/media/Images/Issues/2013/July-Aug/apple%20gravity.jpg
- Dark matter picture: <u>http://www.astronomy.ohio-state.edu/~pogge/Ast162/Unit6/Images/RotCurve2.gif</u>
- Baryon asymmetry picture: <u>http://www.fnal.gov/pub/today/archive/archive_2013/images/ROW_Figure01_131031.jpg</u>
- Running couplings picture: <u>https://i.stack.imgur.com/3gARs.png</u>
- Higgs loop contributions picture: <u>http://scienceblogs.com/startswithabang/files/2013/05/1000px-Hqmc-vector.png</u>
- SM parameters: https://i.pinimg.com/originals/9d/4b/fd/9d4bfdeb01d1c40a123cea35ba40a4db.jpg