Impacts of the 2010 LHC run on SUSY/mSUGRA and expectations for 2011/2012

Philip Bechtle,
K. Desch, H. Dreiner, M. Krämer, B. O'Leary, C. Robens, B. Sarrazin,
P. Wienemann

April 18th 2011

An Incomplete Overview of the Current Situation



arXiv:1102.5290 [hep-ex]



arXiv:1101.1628 [hep-ex]





e.g. arXiv:0907.2589 [hep-ph]

- Does the non-observation of SUSY in the 2010 LHC searches agree with mSUGRA?
- If mSUGRA-like SUSY is realized, can we expect to discover SUSY in 2011/2012?
- If not, what are the implications for mSUGRA/SUSY and for Collider Physics?

Confronting LHC Searches with Precision Data

- See PB et al. arXiv:1102.4693 [hep-ph]:
  Frequentist Markov Chain Global Fit of mSUGRA using
  NLO+NLL/Herwig++ predictions
- Fit with Fittino hep-ph/0412012, using also SPheno hep-ph/0301101, theory codes collected in Mastercode arXiv:0907.5568 [hep-ph], and HiggsBounds arXiv:0811.4169 [hep-ph]
- See e.g. also
  Buchmüller et al. arxiv:1102.3149 [hep-ph], Allanach arxiv:1102.4585 [hep-ph], Strumia arxiv:1101.2195 [hep-ph],
  Cassel et al. arXiv:1101.4664 [hep-ph] (list incomplete, just a snapshot)
- Many activities converging in LPCC meetings (e.g.
  http://indico.cern.ch/categoryDisplay.py?categId=2689)
  and many interesting discussions in the Terascale Alliance
  http://www.terascale.de/research_topics/rt1_physics_analysis/susy___bsm_fit_working_group/

Confronting LHC Searches with Precision Data

- Multi-Messenger: Combine Information about SUSY from different sources
- For LHC: Do not only use the 95 % CL as a brick wall, but calculate $\Delta\chi^2$

Processes sensitive to SUSY



Combining χ^2 of LE and LHC



Implementation of an LHC Limit Projection



$$M_{eff} = \sum_i p_{T,i} + E_{Tmiss}$$



- Using the open parametrized detector simulation tool DELPHES arXiv:0903.2225 [hep-ph]
- Careful tuning against public ATLAS full simulation
- Implement the 4jet+MET cuts from atl-pub-phys-2010-010 and generate a grid in $(\Delta M_{1/2} = 25\,\mathrm{GeV}, \Delta M_0 = 50\,\mathrm{GeV})$
- Use a bilinear interpolation to obtain the resulting M_{eff} spectrum

Systematic Check of the MSUGRA Parameter Grid





- Variations of the signal shape for different $\tan\beta$ and A_0 covered by systematic uncertainty
- This is specific for the 0ℓ search – more complicated grids would be necessary for other searches
- Based on the full M_{eff} distribution, calculate CL_{s+b} for the median background hypothesis
- Transfer CL_{s+b} into $\chi^2 = 2[\,\mathrm{erf}^{-1}(1 - 2\,CL_{s+b})]^2$

Pre-LHC knowledge about mSUGRA/CMSSM

mSUGRA fit to LE

m_t	172.4 ± 1.2	172.4
m_b	4.2 ± 0.17	4.2
m_Z	91.1875 ± 0.0021	91.1871
α_s	0.1176 ± 0.0020	0.1177
G_F	$1.16637\ 10^{-5} \pm 10^{-10}$	$1.16637\ 10^{-5}$
α^{-1}_{em}	127.925 ± 0.016	127.924
$m_h >$	114.4	113.3
σ^0_{had}	41.54 ± 0.04	41.48
A^{fb}_l	0.01714 ± 0.00095	0.01644
A_τ	0.1465 ± 0.0032	0.1480
A_l	0.1513 ± 0.0021	0.1480
A_c	0.67 ± 0.027	0.67
A_b	0.923 ± 0.02	0.935
A^{fb}_c	0.0707 ± 0.0035	0.0742
A^{fb}_b	0.0992 ± 0.0016	0.1038
R_c	0.1721 ± 0.003	0.1722
R_b	0.21629 ± 0.00066	0.21604
R_l	20.767 ± 0.025	20.746
Γ_Z	2495.2 ± 2.51	2495.1
$\sin\theta_{eff}$	0.2324 ± 0.0012	0.2314
m_W	80.399 ± 0.027	80.380
Ω_{DM}	0.1099 ± 0.0135	0.1115
$(g\text{-}2)_\mu$	$3.02\ 10^{-9} \pm 9.0\ 10^{-10}$	$2.55\ 10^{-9}$
BR(b$\to$ sγ)	1.117 ± 0.122	1.009
BR(b$\to \tau\nu$)	1.15 ± 0.4	0.96
BR($B_s \to X_s ll$)	0.99 ± 0.32	0.99
BR(K$\to l\nu$)	1.008 ± 0.014	1.000
Δ_{m_K}	0.92 ± 0.14	1.03
$\Delta(m_s)$	1.11 ± 0.32	1.03
$\Delta_{m_s}/\Delta_{m_d}$	1.09 ± 0.16	1.00



- mSUGRA Fit to measured observables



Parameter	Best fit value + Unc.
$\tan\beta$	12.8 ± 9.7
M_{12}	332.8 ± 88.6
M_0	$77.1^{+113.4}_{-30.6}$
A_0	426.2 ± 734.1
signμ	$+1$
χ^2/ndf	$20.4/21$

Projection: Low Energy Fit vs. Present and Future (?) LHC Exclusion

- Projection of how the LHC exclusion potential would evolve during the 7 TeV run compared to the LE data preferred region:



Combined Fit of real LE Data and Estimated Present ATLAS Exclusion

- Not surprisingly: Combined Fit allows a small area below LHC exclusion



Combined Fit of real LE Data and Estimated Present ATLAS Exclusion

- Not surprisingly: Combined Fit allows a small area below LHC exclusion



Outlook for the Coloured Sector

- Not so strongly model dependent



- Looks like SUSY cannot be excluded in the first 2 years at LHC using SUSY searches (combination of searches of course missing, but not so promising for mSUGRA)
- However, if Tevatron and LHC should exclude the Giggs below 170 GeV . . .

Outlook for the Non-Coloured Sector

- Strongly model dependent



- Doing this for a wider range of models than mSUGRA is interesting to test implications for ILC

Is there a Tension Building Up?

- LE prefers low mass scales (for non-coloured sector),
  LHC prefers high mass scales (for coloured sector)



$\mathcal{L}^{int}/\mathrm{fb}^{-1}$	χ^2/ndf	$\mathcal{P}-Value$
0	18.9/20	53.1 %
0.035	20.4/21	49.8 %
1	23.7/21	30.9 %
2	24.2/21	28.3 %
7	25.0/21	24.6 %

- Using the present systematic uncertainties on the background estimation (and ignoring fine-tuning), even mSUGRA will survive the 2011/2012 run.
  You may not find the model too attractive anymore, but that's an entirely different question

Why SUSY is different than e.g. the Higgs-Sector



$S_{95} \equiv$

$\max(\cos^2(\beta - \alpha)$

$\times \mathcal{B}(H_i \to b\bar{b}))$





- Higgs Searches (at least at LEP) could be presented in terms of S_{95} for each signature separately, because the signatures can be nicely isolated experimentally: $hZ \to b\bar{b}\ell\ell$, $hA \to b\bar{b}\,b\bar{b}\ldots$
- Higgs: Only very few parameters: $m_h, m_A, \cos^2(\beta - \alpha)$, model-independent comparison with all possible models e.g. in
  PB et al. arXiv:0811.4169 [hep-ph]
- SUSY: incredibly complicated signatures possible, many masses and relations of couplings

Why SUSY is different than e.g. the Higgs-Sector



$S_{95} \equiv$

$\max(\cos^2(\beta - \alpha)$

$\times \mathcal{B}(H_i \to b\bar{b}))$



	Signal region A
QCD	$7\ ^{+8}_{-7}$[u+j]
W+jets	50 ± 11[u] $^{+14}_{-10}$[j] $\pm$ 5[$\mathcal{L}$]
Z+jets	52 ± 21[u] $^{+15}_{-11}$[j] $\pm$ 6[$\mathcal{L}$]
$t\bar{t}$ and t	$10 \pm$ 0[u] $^{+\ 3}_{-\ 2}$[j] $\pm$ 1[$\mathcal{L}$]
Total SM	118 ± 25[u] $^{+32}_{-23}$[j] $\pm$ 12[$\mathcal{L}$]
Data	87

- Higgs Searches (at least at LEP) could be presented in terms of S_{95} for each signature separately, because the signatures can be nicely isolated experimentally: $hZ \to b\bar{b}\ell\ell$, $hA \to b\bar{b}\,b\bar{b}\ldots$
- Higgs: Only very few parameters: $m_h, m_A, \cos^2(\beta - \alpha)$, model-independent comparison with all possible models e.g. in
  PB et al. arXiv:0811.4169 [hep-ph]
- SUSY: incredibly complicated signatures possible, many masses and relations of couplings

Why SUSY is different than e.g. the Higgs-Sector



$S_{95} \equiv$

$\max(\cos^2(\beta - \alpha)$

$\times \mathcal{B}(H_i \to b\bar{b}))$





- Higgs Searches (at least at LEP) could be presented in terms of S_{95} for each signature separately, because the signatures can be nicely isolated experimentally: $hZ \to b\bar{b}\ell\ell$, $hA \to b\bar{b}\,b\bar{b}\ldots$
- Higgs: Only very few parameters: $m_h, m_A, \cos^2(\beta - \alpha)$, model-independent comparison with all possible models e.g. in
  PB et al. arXiv:0811.4169 [hep-ph]
- SUSY: incredibly complicated signatures possible, many masses and relations of couplings

Other Approaches to Parametrizations of Searches

- Obvious: For model independent results, everything has to be presented in terms of (pseudo)observables (e.g. M_{eff}, masses, couplings, . . .)

Other Approaches to Parametrizations of Searches

- Obvious: For model independent results, everything has to be presented in terms of (pseudo)observables (e.g. M_{eff}, masses, couplings, ...)
- 95 % CL Limit on $\sigma \times \prod_i \mathcal{B}_i$ for a given signature
  - 95 % CL not very useful for global fits $\rightarrow$ need full CL_{s+b} space
  - Very high dimensional binning would be needed (many masses)
  - Can any given signature be isolated experimentally? If yes (e.g. $\ell\ell$ egde), much less sensitive for discovery or exclusion
- 95 % CL Limit on the number of events for a given selection
  - Simulation needed to determine number of events for any model prediction
- Distributions of b, d in discriminating variables corrected for detector effects, acceptances
  - Sounds nice, but probably impossible: Correction depends on many factors (many masses, couplings)
- 95 % CL Limit on "Simplified Model": see CL above, + not (yet?) proven that for each model point in a global fit there is a matching simplified model

Conclusion Based on Our Experience

- As obviously already done here and in many other approaches, and in the first papers by ATLAS and CMS: Publish distributions of b, d in any discriminating variable/regions not corrected for any detector effects or acceptances
- Determine s from a simulation for every model in an appropriate way
- Use very fast rate calculations (e.g. `Dreiner et al. arXiv:1003.2648`) to check parameter space for the necessary grid dimensions and spacing

Conclusion Based on Our Experience

- As obviously already done here and in many other approaches, and in the first papers by ATLAS and CMS: Publish distributions of b, d in any discriminating variable/regions not corrected for any detector effects or acceptances
- Determine s from a simulation for every model in an appropriate way
- Use very fast rate calculations (e.g. `Dreiner et al. arXiv:1003.2648`) to check parameter space for the necessary grid dimensions and spacing
- Significant challenges:
  - Probably cannot produce MC for every point tested in the fit – parametrization in N-dimensional grid
  - Need reliable simulation within $\mathcal{O}(syst)$

Conclusion Based on Our Experience

- As obviously already done here and in many other approaches, and in the first papers by ATLAS and CMS: Publish distributions of b, d in any discriminating variable/regions not corrected for any detector effects or acceptances
- Determine s from a simulation for every model in an appropriate way
- Use very fast rate calculations (e.g. `Dreiner et al. arXiv:1003.2648`) to check parameter space for the necessary grid dimensions and spacing
- Significant challenges:
  - Probably cannot produce MC for every point tested in the fit – parametrization in N-dimensional grid
  - Need reliable simulation within $\mathcal{O}(syst)$
  - Very personal addition:
    The Power of Open Source
    ATLAS and CMS could release officially endorsed, public, fast simulation tools

Conclusion and Outlook

- It is possible to reconcile the LE measurements (dominated by $(g-2)_\mu$ and Ω_{DM}) with a possible non-discovery of mSUGRA at the LHC in 2011/2012
- As expected, LHC generally moves the lower bounds on sparticles to higher values (directly true only for coloured ones)
- As expected, but less obvious:
  As long as global fit χ^2/ndf remain acceptable: LHC moves up the upper bound on sparticles very significantly
- For other SUSY than mSUGRA, the coloured and non-coloured sector can be more decoupled, no definite statements on non-coloured sector yet
- Only Higgs searches can exclude SUSY at the Terascale
- Outlook:
  - Use real search results as input
  - Study more, and more general, models

Conclusion and Outlook

- It is possible to reconcile the LE measurements (dominated by $(g-2)_\mu$ and Ω_{DM}) with a possible non-discovery of mSUGRA at the LHC in 2011/2012
- As expected, LHC generally moves the lower bounds on sparticles to higher values (directly true only for coloured ones)
- As expected, but less obvious:
  As long as global fit χ^2/ndf remain acceptable: LHC moves up the upper bound on sparticles very significantly
- For other SUSY than mSUGRA, the coloured and non-coloured sector can be more decoupled, no definite statements on non-coloured sector yet
- Only Higgs searches can exclude SUSY at the Terascale
- Outlook:
  - Use real search results as input
  - Study more, and more general, models
  - Find and Identify New Physics

Backup Slides

Agreement of our Implementation with the Actual ATLAS Analysis with Data



Full Results for no LHC







Full Results for $35\,\mathrm{pb}^{-1}$ ATLAS Search





Full Extrapolated Results for $1\,\mathrm{fb}^{-1}$ ATLAS Search







Full Extrapolated Results for $2\,\mathrm{fb}^{-1}$ ATLAS Search







Full Extrapolated Results for $7\,\mathrm{fb}^{-1}$ ATLAS Search







Why does $\tan\beta$ move to higher values for growing LHC exclusions?



Why does $\tan\beta$ move to higher values for growing LHC exclusions?



Why does $\tan\beta$ move to higher values for growing LHC exclusions?



Why does $\tan\beta$ move to higher values for growing LHC exclusions?



Why does $\tan\beta$ move to higher values for growing LHC exclusions?



Why are global fits of SUSY so CPU-consuming?

- . . . and impossible with naively employing Minuit?

Looking at any correlations for all other allowed parameters:



Looks OK

Why are global fits of SUSY so CPU-consuming?

- . . . and impossible with naively employing Minuit?

Looking at any correlations for fixed other parameters:



Looks Terrible

Why are global fits of SUSY so CPU-consuming?

- . . . and impossible with naively employing Minuit?

Looking at any correlations for regions of other parameters:



Correlations growing for higher mass parameters

Search Cuts

Number of jets	≥ 2 jets	≥ 3 jets	≥ 4 jets
Leading jet P_T (GeV)	> 180	> 100	> 100
Other jets P_T (GeV)	> 50 (Jet 2)	> 40 (Jet 2-3)	> 40 (Jet 2-4)
$\Delta\phi(jet_i, E_T^{miss})$	$[> 0.2, > 0.2]$	$[> 0.2, > 0.2, > 0.2]$	$[> 0.2, > 0.2, > 0.2, > 0.0]$
$E_T^{miss} > f \times M_{\text{eff}}$	$f = 0.3$	$f = 0.25$	$f = 0.2$

Table 1: Cuts on the P_T of the leading jet, the P_T of the other jets, the azimuthal angle between the leading jets and the missing transverse energy vector and the cut on the missing transverse energy expressed as a fraction of the effective mass. The cuts are shown for each of the studied jet multiplicities.

In the following we describe the event selection criteria for the 0, 1 and 2 lepton channels.

Zero-lepton channels In addition to the electron crack veto, the pre-selection cuts are:

1. Reject events with at least one lepton having $P_T > 20$ GeV.
2. Cut on the number of jets and jet transverse momenta as defined in Table 1.
3. Missing transverse energy $E_T^{miss} > 80$ GeV.
4. Cut on ratio f between E_T^{miss} and M_{eff} as defined in Table 1.
5. Cut on $\Delta\phi(jet_i, E_T^{miss})$ as defined in Table 1.
6. Transverse sphericity, $S_T > 0.2$.

Calculating the χ^2 from LHC

$$Q = \prod_{i=1}^{N_{\mathrm{bins}}} \frac{\mathcal{L}(\mu_i = s_i + b_i; n_i)}{\mathcal{L}(\mu_i = b_i; n_i)}. \tag{1}$$

$$\mathrm{CL}_{s+b} = \int_{t_{\mathrm{obs}}}^{\infty} P_{s+b}(t)\, dt < 0.05\,. \tag{2}$$

$$\chi^2 = 2[\,\mathrm{erf}^{-1}(1 - 2\,\mathrm{CL}_{s+b})]^2\,. \tag{3}$$