Models as existence proofs, speculations or... peaces of physical reality

Riccardo Barbieri Zuoz II, July 16/21, 2006

An example of what could happen, based on:

An "ultra-bottom-up" hypothesis

2 concrete realizations (why not a single one?)

The idea

RB, Hall

Seek simple Higgs sector that:

Agrees with all data (EWPT)
 Is fully natural up to 1.5 TeV

 (+ maybe something else)

A modest "ultra-bottom-up" approach, with crucial consequences for LHC



A Heavy SM Higgs and the EWPT



 $T_{IDM} = T_{SM} + \Delta T$ $S_{IDM} = S_{SM} + \Delta S$

A heavy Higgs $m_h = 400 \div 600 \ GeV$ + a positive ΔT

Origin of ΔT ?? (Peskin, Wells and many others) prefer models that populate the 1-2 σ ellipse in most of parameter space. Are there any?



2. H_2 mass splittings lead to $\Delta T > 0$ controlled by approximate $SU(2)_V$

3. $H_2 \rightarrow -H_2$ is exact, and not spontaneously broken

Lightest Inert Particle (LIP) is stable and could be Dark Matter

The IDM is natural and perturbative up to ~1.5 TeV (instead of the SM only up to ~400 GeV)



A Dark Matter candidate

Unbroken $H_2 \Rightarrow -H_2$ (for natural flavour conservation) Inert scalars always in pair Stable lightest inert scalar

To get the observed Ω_m need co-annihilation of S, A into light fermions as dominant process



⇒ Shouldn't one have seen S and A at LEP2 via $e^+e^- \rightarrow A + S \rightarrow (Z^* + S) + S$?

 $\Rightarrow \text{ What about direct DM detection } ?$ $\sigma_h(\text{L}p \to \text{L}p) \approx 2 \times 10^{-9} \text{ pb } \left(\frac{\lambda_L}{0.5}\right)^2 \left(\frac{70 \text{ GeV}}{m_L}\right)^2 \left(\frac{500 \text{ GeV}}{m_h}\right)^4$

Can one do better than $\Lambda_{nat} \approx 1.5 \ TeV$? ("UV completion")

2H doublets ⇔ Supersymmetry ... but without a light Higgs boson!

How??

In the most straightforward way: Add a coupling λ through $\Delta f = \lambda SH_1H_2$ with λ only constrained by perturbativity up to 10-12 TeV

 $\Rightarrow \lambda SUSY \equiv NMSSM \text{ with} \\ \lambda_{low \ energy} \leq 2 \\ \text{dominating over all other couplings} \qquad RB, Hall, Nomura, Rychkov$

Not consistent with gauge unification? An open question, depending on the physics above 10-12 TeV See, e.g., Harnik et al, Gripaios and West



For $\tan \beta \le 2.5$ and s-particles in their natural range, most of parameter space inside the 1-2 σ ellipse $\tan \beta = 1$ an exact custodial symmetry point

Particle spectrum (naturalness bounds) in λ SUSY $\lambda = 2$

 $m_{H^{\pm}} = 700 \text{ GeV}$ μ^{max} $m_{\tilde{q}}^{\max}$ m_S^{\max} $m_{\tilde{Q},\tilde{t}_R}^{\max}$ t $m_h m_H m_A$ 350 700 780 1 4901000900 2000310 720 780 390 1750900 1.5800 2260 740 780 3107507001500 $2.5 \quad 220 \quad 750 \quad 780$ 260650600 12503 190760 - 7801100220550500 $(m^{max} \propto \sqrt{\Delta/5})$ with up to 20% tuning $\Lambda_{mess} = 100 TeV$

and no significant bound on other s-fermions and SU(2)xU(1) gauginos

Dark Matter in λ SUSY





with no special relation among parameters (MSSM)

Provisional conclusions

Doubling the Higgs multiplet the simplest solution (?) of the l.h.p., realized in several possible ways



⇒ LHC will explore for the first time the relevant energy range, well above the Fermi scale

An example: The Inert Doublet Model RB, Hall, Rychkov

Consider the most general 2H doublet model invariant under $H_2 \Rightarrow -H_2$ to get natural flavour conservation (i.e., only H_1 couples to matter)

$$V = \mu_1^2 |H_1|^2 + \mu_2^2 |H_2|^2 + \lambda_1 |H_1|^4 + \lambda_2 |H_2|^4 + \lambda_3 |H_1|^2 |H_2|^2$$
$$+ \lambda_4 |H_1^{\dagger} H_2|^2 + \frac{\lambda_5}{2} [(H_1^{\dagger} H_2)^2 + \text{h.c.}]$$
$$\lambda_4, \ \lambda_5 \Rightarrow \text{ custodial symmetry}$$
$$\lambda_5 \Rightarrow \text{ PQ symmetry}$$

Take $\mu_1^2 < 0, \ \mu_2^2 > 0$ so that

$$H_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^+ \\ v + (h + i\chi)/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad H_2 = \begin{pmatrix} H^+ \\ (S + iA)/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}$$

The Inert Doublet Model (continued)

Parameter space:

 $\mu_1^2, \lambda_1 \Rightarrow v(M_Z), m_h \quad \text{(in the usual way)}$ $\lambda_2 \quad \text{(not relevant to the spectrum)}$ $\mu_2^2, \lambda_{3,4,5} \Rightarrow m_L, m_{NL}, m_H; \lambda_L \quad \lambda_L \equiv \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 - |\lambda_5|$ $m_H^2 = \mu_2^2 + \lambda_3 v^2$ $m_S^2 = \mu_2^2 + (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 + \lambda_5) v^2$ $m_A^2 = \mu_2^2 + (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 - \lambda_5) v^2$

custodial symm. limit: $m_H = m_S = m_A$ PQ symmetry limit: $m_S = m_A$

absolute minimum:

 $\lambda_{1,2} > 0$ $\lambda_3, \lambda_L \equiv \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 - |\lambda_5| > -2(\lambda_1\lambda_2)^{1/2}$

Naturalness, perturbativity, EWPT in the IDM

1. Naturalness

$$\delta m_h^2 = \alpha_t \Lambda_t^2 + \alpha_g \Lambda_g^2 + \alpha_{11} \Lambda_{H_1}^2 + \alpha_{12} \Lambda_{H_2}^2$$

$$\delta \mu_2^2 = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\alpha_g \Lambda_g^2 + \alpha_{22} \Lambda_{H_2}^2 + \alpha_{21} \Lambda_{H_1}^2 \right)$$

2. Perturbativity

$$16\pi^2 \frac{d\lambda_i}{d\log\Lambda} = \beta_i(\lambda)$$

⇒ A perturbative range of λ 's easily characterized with $\Lambda_{nat} = min(\Lambda_i) \approx 1.5 TeV$



In the Standard Model: $m_h = 91^{+45}_{-32} GeV$

In the IDM:
$$\begin{array}{l} m_h = 400 \div 600 \; GeV \\ (m_H - m_S)(m_H - m_A) = M^2, \; M = 120^{+20}_{-30} \; \text{GeV} \end{array}$$

Collider Signals

350 $\triangle \Gamma$ (GeV) $m_h = 400 \div 600 \ GeV$ 1. 300 A standard Higgs boson? 250 (GeV) $h \rightarrow SS, AA, H^+H^$ g 150 <3 $\Gamma_h = 68 \ GeV$ at 100 \dot{T} $m_h = 500 \; GeV$ 50 10 $\left(\right)$ 100 125 150 175 200 225 250 75 $m_{T_{i}}$ (GeV) 2. $pp \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow HA \text{ or } HS$

 $H \to AW \text{ or } SW$ $A \to SZ^{(*)}$

for the DM parameters, looking for 3 charged leptons $\sigma_{signal}\approx 3.5~fb \qquad \sigma_{bg}\approx 20~fb$