
ALEXIS

Global Fit to Dark Matter with Leptophobic Mediators

Sven Heinemeyer, IFT/IFCA (CSIC, Madrid/Santander)

Daejeon, 10/2019

1. Previous SUSY analyses
2. Introduction to non-SUSY analyses
3. Set-up and validation
4. General Results
5. Towards UV completions
6. Conclusions

1. Previous SUSY analyses

GUT based models:

1.) CMSSM: $m_0,\ m_{1/2},\ A_0,\ \tan\beta,\ \text{sign}\,\mu$

2.) NUHM1: CMSSM + 1 scalar mass parameter
$m_0,\ m_{1/2},\ A_0,\ \tan\beta,\ \text{sign}\,\mu$ and M_A

3.) NUHM2: CMSSM + 2 scalar mass parameters
$m_0,\ m_{1/2},\ A_0,\ \tan\beta,\ \mu$ and M_A

4.) SU(5): CMSSM + 3 scalar mass parameters
$m_5,\ m_{10},\ m_{1/2},\ A_0,\ \tan\beta,\ m_{H_u},\ m_{H_d}$

5.) mAMSB: different mechanism for SUSY breaking
$m_{3/2}, m_0, \tan\beta, \text{sign}(\mu)$

6.) sub-GUT: CMSSM, but unification at lower scale
$m_0,\ m_{1/2},\ A_0,\ \tan\beta,\ \text{sign}\,\mu$ and M_{in}

7.) ...

$\Rightarrow$ wide variety of models covered!

Problem: We cannot be sure about the SUSY-breaking mechanism

$\Rightarrow$ it is possible that with the CMSSM, NUHM, SU(5), mAMSB, sub-GUT we missed the "correct" mechanism

$\Rightarrow$ hint: strong connection between colored and uncolored sector
tension between low-energy EW effects and (colored) LHC searches

Problem: We cannot be sure about the SUSY-breaking mechanism

$\Rightarrow$ it is possible that with the CMSSM, NUHM, SU(5), mAMSB, sub-GUT we missed the "correct" mechanism

$\Rightarrow$ hint: strong connection between colored and uncolored sector
tension between low-energy EW effects and (colored) LHC searches

Solution: investigate also the "general MSSM"

$\Rightarrow$ 11 parameters are manageable $\Rightarrow$ pMSSM11

- squark mass parameters: $m_{\tilde{q}_{1,2}} =: m_{\tilde{q}}$, $m_{\tilde{q}_3}$
- slepton mass parameter(s): $m_{\tilde{l}}$, $m_{\tilde{\tau}}$
- gaugino masses: M_1, M_2, M_3
- trilinear coupling: A
- Higgs sector parameters: M_A, $\tan\beta$
- Higgs mixing paramter: μ

What if we still did not get it right?

- low-energy model different?
- richer SUSY structure?
- no SUSY model? $\Rightarrow$ not really realistic! ;-)

What if we still did not get it right?

- low-energy model different?
- richer SUSY structure?
- no SUSY model? ⇒ not really realistic! ;-)

Lagrangian according to LHC-DM-WG recommendation:

The Lagrangians

- We consider DMSMs with a spin-1 (Y_1) s-channel mediator.
- The dark matter candidate is a Dirac fermion (X_D).
- We use the model files provided by the DMSIMP package for our implementation.

Spin-1 mediator

- Interaction Lagrangian mediator-DM
$$\mathcal{L}^{Y_1}_{X_D} = \bar{X}_D \gamma_\mu \left(g^V_{X_D} + g^A_{X_D} \gamma_5 \right) X_D Y^\mu_1 .$$
- Interaction Lagrangian mediator-quarks
$$\mathcal{L}^{Y_1}_{quarks} = \sum_{i,j} \left[\bar{d}_i \gamma_\mu \left(g^V_{d_{i,j}} + g^A_{d_{i,j}} \gamma_5 \right) d_j + \bar{u}_i \gamma_\mu \left(g^V_{u_{i,j}} + g^A_{u_{i,j}} \gamma_5 \right) u_j \right] Y^\mu_1$$
- Interaction Lagrangian mediator-leptons
$$\mathcal{L}^{Y_1}_{leptons} = \sum_{i,j} \left[\bar{l}_i \gamma_\mu \left(g^V_{l_{i,j}} + g^A_{l_{i,j}} \gamma_5 \right) l_j \right] Y^\mu_1$$

Scenarios

- Leptophobic, $g^V_{l_{i,j}} = g^A_{l_{i,j}} = 0$ (no constraints from dilepton searches).
- Flavor diagonal, $g^{V/A}_{u/d_{i,j}} = 0$ if $i \neq j$.
- Flavor blind, $g^{V/A}_{u_{i,j}} = g^{V/A}_{d_{i,j}}$.

1. $g^V_{X_D} \equiv g_{DM}$ $\quad g^V_{X_D} = 0$
   $g^V_{u/d} \equiv g_{SM}$ $\quad g^A_{u/d} = 0$,
   pure vector.
2. $g^V_{X_D} = 0$ $\quad g^V_{X_D} \equiv g_{DM}$
   $g^V_{u/d} = 0$ $\quad g^A_{u/d} = g_{SM}$,
   pure axial-vector.

[*taken from E. Bagnaschi*]

Our tool: **Mastercode**

$\Rightarrow$ collaborative effort of theorists and experimentalists

[*Bagnaschi, Borsato, Buchmüller, Costa, De Roeck, Dolan, Ellis, Flächer, Hahn, SH, Isidori, Lucio, Martinez Santos, Olive, Trifa, Sakurai, Weiglein*]

Über-code for the combination of different tools:

- Über-code original in Fortran, now re-written in C++
- tools are included as subroutines
- compatibility ensured by collaboration of authors of "MasterCode" and authors of "sub tools" /SLHA(2)
- sub-codes in Fortran or C++

$\Rightarrow$ evaluate observables of one parameter point consistently with various tools

cern.ch/mastercode

Data we have:

– Higgs boson mass/couplings/. . . (LHC) $\Rightarrow$ FeynHiggs

Data we have:

– Higgs boson mass/couplings/. . . (LHC) $\Rightarrow$ FeynHiggs

– Higgs boson signal strengths (LHC) $\Rightarrow$ HiggsSignals

Data we have:

– Higgs boson mass/couplings/. . . (LHC) $\Rightarrow$ FeynHiggs

– Higgs boson signal strengths (LHC) $\Rightarrow$ HiggsSignals

– Higgs boson exclusion bounds (LHC, Tevatron, LEP) $\Rightarrow$ HiggsBounds

Data we have:

- Higgs boson mass/couplings/. . . (LHC) $\Rightarrow$ FeynHiggs
- Higgs boson signal strengths (LHC) $\Rightarrow$ HiggsSignals
- Higgs boson exclusion bounds (LHC, Tevatron, LEP) $\Rightarrow$ HiggsBounds
- SUSY / di-jet /mono-jet searches (LHC) $\Rightarrow$ own re-cast

Data we have:

- Higgs boson mass/couplings/. . . (LHC) ⇒ FeynHiggs
- Higgs boson signal strengths (LHC) ⇒ HiggsSignals
- Higgs boson exclusion bounds (LHC, Tevatron, LEP) ⇒ HiggsBounds
- SUSY / di-jet /mono-jet searches (LHC) ⇒ own re-cast

- electroweak precision data ⇒ FeynWZ, FeynHiggs
- flavor data ⇒ SuperIso, SuFla
- astrophysical data (DM properties) ⇒ MicrOMEGAs, SSARD

The χ^2 evaluation: Frequentist approach



MSSM Direct Detection prediction

[2014]



MSSM Direct Detection prediction: CMSSM

[2014]



MSSM Direct Detection prediction: NUHM1

[?2014]



MSSM Direct detection prediction: NUHM2

[?2014]



MSSM Diret Detection prediction: SU(5)

[2016]



MSSM Diret Detection prediction: mAMSB:

[2016]



MSSM Diret Detection prediction: sub-GUT

[2017]



$\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ coann.
A/H funnel
$\tilde{t}_1$ coann.
$\tilde{\tau}_1$ coann.
focus point
$\tilde{t}_1$ coann. + H/A funnel
$\tilde{\tau}_1$ + $\tilde{t}_1$ coann.
$\tilde{t}_1$ + $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ coann.
$\tilde{\tau}_1$ coann. + $\tilde{t}_1$ coann. + H/A

σ_p^{SI} : good prospects, all above the neutrino floor

σ_p^{SD} : unclear prospects, best-fit regions below the neutrino floor

MSSM Direct detection prediction: pMSSM11: $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$ vs. $\sigma_p^{\rm SI}$: [2017]



$\Rightarrow$ best-fit point covered by future experiments

$\Rightarrow$ but very low cross sections possible at $1\,\sigma$, below neutrino floor

MSSM Direct detection prediction: pMSSM11: $m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$ vs. σ_p^{SD}: [2017]



$\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm}$ coann. | slep coann. | gluino coann. | stop coann.
A/H funnel | stau coann. | squark coann. | sbot coann.

$\Rightarrow$ slim prospects for future experiments

$\Rightarrow$ large regions allowed at $1\,\sigma$, below neutrino floor

2. Introduction to non-SUSY analyses

Dark Matter @ LHC

- We infer the existence of Dark Matter (DM) from indirect observations (cosmological, astrophysical).
- Can we probe DM at the LHC? Yes, if we assume that it couple sufficiently strongly to the SM (freeze-out points to that). *Unknown: the mass.*
- DM searches at the LHC fully underway.

How to predict the signals and interpret the results? Different possibilities have been studied:

1. EFT approach.
2. *Dark Matter Simplified Models*
3. Complete models (e.g. SUSY).





[*taken from E. Bagnaschi*]

Approach at the LHC for DMSMs: example for spin-1 mediator

Spin-1 mediator

- Interaction Lagrangian mediator-DM

$$\mathcal{L}^{Y_1}_{X_D} = \bar{X}_D \gamma_\mu \left(g^V_{X_D} + g^A_{X_D} \gamma_5 \right) X_D Y^\mu_1 .$$

- Interaction Lagrangian mediator-quarks

$$\mathcal{L}^{Y_1}_{quarks} = \sum_{i,j} \left[\bar{d}_i \gamma_\mu \left(g^V_{d_{i,j}} + g^A_{d_{i,j}} \gamma_5 \right) d_j + \bar{u}_i \gamma_\mu \left(g^V_{u_{i,j}} + g^A_{u_{i,j}} \gamma_5 \right) u_j \right] Y^\mu_1$$

- Interaction Lagrangian mediator-leptons

$$\mathcal{L}^{Y_1}_{leptons} = \sum_{i,j} \left[\bar{l}_i \gamma_\mu \left(g^V_{l_{i,j}} + g^A_{l_{i,j}} \gamma_5 \right) l_j \right] Y^\mu_1$$



– simplifying assumptions on the Lagrangian (more soon)
– Results for fixed values of m_{med}, m_{DM}, g_{SM}, g_{DM}
– overlay results from mono-jet search
– overlay results from di-jet searches
– ...

MasterCode approach

[2019]

Fit to the full Lagrangian (some simplifying assumptions)



Included into the fit:

- DM relic density
- DM direct detection limits
- LHC mono-jet searches
- LHC di-jet searches

⇒ global picture of status and prospects

3. Set-up and validation

Lagrangian according to LHC-DM-WG recommendation:

The Lagrangians

- We consider DMSMs with a spin-1 (Y_1) s-channel mediator.
- The dark matter candidate is a Dirac fermion (X_D).
- We use the model files provided by the `DMSIMP` package for our implementation.

Spin-1 mediator

- Interaction Lagrangian mediator-DM

$$\mathcal{L}^{Y_1}_{X_D} = \bar{X}_D \gamma_\mu \left(g^V_{X_D} + g^A_{X_D} \gamma_5 \right) X_D Y_1^\mu .$$

- Interaction Lagrangian mediator-quarks

$$\mathcal{L}^{Y_1}_{quarks} = \sum_{i,j} \left[\bar{d}_i \gamma_\mu \left(g^V_{d_{i,j}} + g^A_{d_{i,j}} \gamma_5 \right) d_j + \bar{u}_i \gamma_\mu \left(g^V_{u_{i,j}} + g^A_{u_{i,j}} \gamma_5 \right) u_j \right] Y_1^\mu$$

- Interaction Lagrangian mediator-leptons

$$\mathcal{L}^{Y_1}_{leptons} = \sum_{i,j} \left[\bar{l}_i \gamma_\mu \left(g^V_{l_{i,j}} + g^A_{l_{i,j}} \gamma_5 \right) l_j \right] Y_1^\mu$$

Scenarios

- Leptophobic, $g^V_{l_{i,j}} = g^A_{l_{i,j}} = 0$ (no constraints from dilepton searches).
- Flavor diagonal, $g^{V/A}_{u/d_{i,j}} = 0$ if $i \neq j$.
- Flavor blind, $g^{V/A}_{u_{i,j}} = g^{V/A}_{d_{i,j}}$.

1. $g^V_{X_D} \equiv g_{DM}$ $\quad g^V_{X_D} = 0$
   $g^V_{u/d} \equiv g_{SM}$ $\quad g^A_{u/d} = 0$,
   pure vector.

2. $g^V_{X_D} = 0$ $\quad g^V_{X_D} \equiv g_{DM}$
   $g^V_{u/d} = 0$ $\quad g^A_{u/d} = g_{SM}$,
   pure axial-vector.

[taken from E. Bagnaschi]

MasterCode set-up :

– Frequentist fitting framework written in Python/Cython and C++
– Multinest algorithm is used to sample the parameter space
– udocker used for deployment

Scan ranges:

Parameter	Range	# of Segments
m_Y (mediator)	$(0.1, 5)$ TeV	10
m_χ (DM)	$(0, 2.5)$ TeV	8
g_{SM}	$(10^{-6}, \sqrt{4\pi})$	2
g_{DM}	$(10^{-6}, \sqrt{4\pi})$	2
Total # of segments		320

DM constraints:

[2019]

⇒ `micrOMEGAs` for relic density and DD cross sections



⇒ full agreement with ATLAS/CMS results (here: vector model)

Non-LHC constraints

Dark matter

- Relic density constraints from Planck.
- Direct detection constraints on σ_p^{SI} from LUX, XENON1T and PANDAX.
- Direct detection constraints on σ_p^{SD} from PICO60.





[1608.07648, 1705.06655, 1708.06917]



[taken from E. Bagnaschi]

Mono-jet constraints

[2019]

⇒ MG5 aMC(N)LO, Fastlim approach





⇒ full agreement with ATLAS/CMS (red-dashed)

Di-jet constraints

[2019]

⇒ MG5 aMC(N)LO, Fastlim approach



⇒ full agreement with ATLAS/CMS

4. General Results

[2019]

– Results for vector mediator model

– Results for axial-vector mediator model

– No restrictions on couplings or masses

– Color coding:

green: annihilation via t-channel χ exchange
into pairs of mediator particles Y that subsequently decay into SM particles

yellow: rapid annihilation directly into SM particles via the s-channel Y resonance

Vector mediator (I):

[2019]



$\Rightarrow$ clear separation between s- and t-channel

Vector mediator (II):

[2019]



$\Rightarrow$ large ranges allowed, t-channel only for $g_{\mathrm{DM}} \gg g_{\mathrm{SM}}$

Vector mediator (III):

[2019]



$\Rightarrow$ mixed prospects, both for s- and t-channel case

Axial-vector mediator (I):

[2019]



$\Rightarrow$ Larger s-channel region, continous with t-channel

Axial-vector mediator (II):

[2019]



$\Rightarrow$ t- (s-)channel for $g_{\rm SM} \lesssim (\gtrsim) 10^{-2}$

Axial-vector mediator (III):

[2019]



$\Rightarrow$ will not be easy for PICO!

Axial-vector mediator (III):

[2019]



$\Rightarrow$ neither for LZ!

5. Towards UV completions

$\Rightarrow$ So far no UV completion considered!

5. Towards UV completions

$\Rightarrow$ So far no UV completion considered!

In any UV completion the spin-one boson could be expected to have comparable couplings to SM and DM particles, modulo possible group-theoretical factors and mixing angles!

$$g_{\mathrm{DM}}/g_{\mathrm{SM}} = \mathcal{O}(1)$$

5. Towards UV completions

$\Rightarrow$ So far no UV completion considered!

In any UV completion the spin-one boson could be expected to have comparable couplings to SM and DM particles, modulo possible group-theoretical factors and mixing angles!

$$g_{\mathrm{DM}}/g_{\mathrm{SM}} = \mathcal{O}(1)$$

$$1/3 < g_{\mathrm{DM}}/g_{\mathrm{SM}} < 3$$



$\Rightarrow$ dark yellow regions $\Rightarrow$ s-channel favored!

Vector mediator: towards UV completions

[2019]



$\Rightarrow$ mixed prospects for discovery

Axial-vector mediator: towards UV completions [2019]



$\Rightarrow$ t-channel can fully be probed, s-channel only partially

6. Conclusions

- Many SUSY analyses performed, with mixed prospects for DD
- EFT vs. DMSM vs. full theories
- Lagrangian for vector or axial-vector mediator
- So far results presented for fixed values for some of g_{SM}, g_{DM}, m_{med}, m_{DM} and other constraints (mono-jet, di-jet) overlaid
- MasterCode approach: full fit of the model, including
  - DM relic density
  - DM direct detection limits
  - LHC mono-jet searches
  - LHC di-jet searches
- Vector mediator: s- and t-channel separated, mixed prospects for DD
- Axialvector: s- and t-channel continous, mixed prospects for DD
- UV-completions: $1/3 < g_{\text{SM}}/g_{\text{DM}} < 3 \Rightarrow$ s-channel preferred
  $\Rightarrow$ prospects for DD not improved


Further Questions?