Collider Phenomenology of models with Dynamical EW Symmetry breaking

Alexander Belyaev

Southampton University & Rutherford Accelerator LAB



OUTLINE

- Motivation for models with Dynamical Symmetry Breaking
- LHC & ILC phenomenology and tools
- Beyond the Minimal Higgsless model
- Conclusions

Collaborators:

Chivukula, Christensen, Foadi, Frandsen, Järvinen, He, Kuang, Pukhov, Qi, Sannino, Simmons, Zhang

The present status of the SM

- Based on SU(3)xSU(2)_LxU(1)_Y gauge symmetry spontaneously broken down to SU(3)xU(1)_e:
- Matter: 3 generations of quarks and leptons
- One of the central role is played by Higgs field
 - one higgs doublet, interacts with all fields
 - develops condensate
 - W,Z bosons, lepton and quarks and Higgs field itself acquires mass



Higgs boson is not found yet and is the most wanted particle! The present Higgs mass limit is M_H>114.4 GeV from LEP2 The mechanism responsible for EWSB symmetry remains unknown!

What do we know about Electroweak Symmetry Breaking? It takes Place!

- status of theory of electro-weak interactions: per mil precision measurements confirm its SU(2)L × U(1)Y gauge structure
- the symmetry is broken W and Z bosons are massive: there are serious problems in any Lorentz-invariant theory of massive vector bosons, unless those particles are Yang-Mills bosons and the gauge symmetry is spontaneously broken [Nambu,Anderson; Higgs; Englert,Brout; Guralnik, Hagen,Kibble;...]
- How SU(2) × U(1) is broken?
 SU(2) × U(1) does not break its own symmetry couplings are weak
 Higgs mechanism?
 - Dynamical symmetry breaking (Technicolor)?
 - Extra dimensions?
 - ...?

Non-linear sigma model

One can eliminate h(x) and still have EWSB via Sigma term in the Higgsless model

$$\mathcal{L}_H \to \mathcal{L}_\Sigma = \frac{v^2}{4} \operatorname{tr} \left(\left[\mathcal{D}^{\mu} \Sigma \right]^{\dagger} \mathcal{D}_{\mu} \Sigma \right)$$

$$\begin{split} &|D_{\mu}\varphi|^{2} \\ &= \left(0 \quad v/\sqrt{2}\right) \left|\frac{g}{\sqrt{2}}W^{+}\sigma^{+} + \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}}W^{-}\sigma^{-} + \frac{g}{2}W^{0}\sigma^{3} + \frac{g'}{2}B\right|^{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{v^{2}}{4} [g^{2}W^{+}W^{-} + \frac{1}{2}(-gW^{0} + g'B)^{2}] \end{split}$$

Non-linear sigma model

There are many 4D CP-conserving operators that can be written down

£1=	$=\frac{1}{2}g^2\alpha_1 B_{\mu\nu} \mathrm{Tr}(TF^{\mu\nu})$	$\mathcal{L}_6 = \alpha_6 \operatorname{Tr}(V_{\mu}V_{\nu}) \operatorname{Tr}(TV^{\mu}) \operatorname{Tr}(TV)$	$\mathcal{L}_{11} = \alpha_{11} \operatorname{Tr}[(\mathfrak{D}_{\mu} V^{\mu})^{2}]$	$\mathcal{L}_{15} = 2i\alpha_{15} \operatorname{Tr}(V_{\mu} \mathcal{D}_{\nu} V^{\nu}) \operatorname{Tr}(TV^{\mu})$
£2 =	$= \frac{1}{2} i g \alpha_2 B_{\mu\nu} \operatorname{Tr}(T[V^{\mu}, V^{\nu}])$	$\mathcal{L}_{7} = \alpha_{7} \operatorname{Tr}(V_{\mu}V^{\mu})[\operatorname{Tr}(TV_{\nu})]^{2}$	$\mathcal{L}_{12} = \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{12} \operatorname{Tr}(T \mathcal{D}_{\mu} \mathcal{D}_{\nu} V^{\nu}) \operatorname{Tr}(T V^{\mu})$	$\mathcal{L}_{16} = i\alpha_{16} \operatorname{Tr}[T(\mathfrak{D}_{\mu}V_{\nu} + \mathfrak{D}_{\nu}V_{\mu})]$
£3 =	$= ig\alpha_3 \operatorname{Tr}(F_{\mu\nu}[V^{\mu}, V^{\nu}])$	$\mathcal{L}_8 = \frac{1}{4}g^2 \alpha_8 [\mathrm{Tr}(TF_{\mu\nu})]^2$	$\mathcal{L}_{13} = \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{13} [\mathrm{Tr}(T \mathcal{D}_{\mu} V_{\nu})]^2$	$ imes { m Tr}(V^{\mu}V^{ u})$
£4 =	$= \alpha_4 [\mathrm{Tr}(V_{\mu}V_{\nu})]^2$	$\mathcal{L}_{9} = \frac{1}{2} i g \alpha_{9} \mathrm{Tr}(TF_{\mu\nu}) \mathrm{Tr}(T[V^{\mu}, V^{\nu}])$	$\beta \mathcal{L}_{14} = \alpha_{14} [\mathrm{Tr}(F_{\mu\nu}V^{\nu})\mathrm{Tr}(TV^{\mu})]$	$\mathcal{L}_{17} = \frac{1}{2} i \alpha_{17} \operatorname{Tr} [T(\mathfrak{V}_{\mu} V_{\nu} + \mathfrak{V}_{\nu} V_{\mu})]$
£5 =	$= \alpha_5 [\mathrm{Tr}(V_{\mu}V^{\mu})]^2$	$\mathcal{L}_{10} = \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{10} [\mathrm{Tr}(TV_{\mu}) \mathrm{Tr}(TV_{\nu})]^2$	$-\mathrm{Tr}(F_{\mu\nu}V^{\mu})\mathrm{Tr}(TV^{\nu})]$	$\times \mathrm{Tr}(TV^{\mu})\mathrm{Tr}(TV^{\nu})$
[Ар	pelquist, Bernard wh	l '80 ; Longitano '80] <mark>ich can be tested at t</mark>	he LHC	$\mathcal{L}_{18} = \frac{1}{2} i \alpha_{18} \operatorname{Tr}([V_{\mu}, T] \mathfrak{D}^{\mu} \mathfrak{D}^{\nu} V_{\nu})$
qd 0.03 gd/qE by 0.025 0.02 0.015 0.01	(c) pp -> VVjj	0.03 0.02 ZZ 0.01 0 -0.01	wtv, ww wtw, ww wtw, ww wtw, ww ww why why why why why why why why wh	only quartic interactions for custodial symmetry $\mathcal{L}_{4} = \alpha_{4}(\operatorname{tr} [V_{\mu}V_{\nu}])^{2}$ $\mathcal{L}_{m_{\mathcal{H}_{4}}} \mathcal{L}_{5} = \alpha_{5}(\operatorname{tr} [V_{\mu}V^{\mu}])^{2}$ Eboli, Gonzalez–Garcia, koshi, Novaes, Zacharov '98]
0.005	background	-0.02	[Ebol	i, Gonzalez–Garcia,

combined limit

-0.01

-0.02

Mizukoshi '06]

Alexander Belyaev

500

signal+backgrounc

1000 1500 2000 2500 3000 3500

E iet | pp

4000

-0.03

-0.03

"Collider Phenomenology of DEWSB models" Soton, July 7, 2010

0.01

0.02

0.03

0

 α_4

Non-linear sigma model

There are many 4D CP-conserving operators that can be written down

$\mathcal{L}_1 = \frac{1}{2}g^2\alpha_1 B_{\mu\nu} \operatorname{Tr}(TF^{\mu\nu})$	$\mathcal{L}_6 = \alpha_6 \operatorname{Tr}(V_{\mu}V_{\nu}) \operatorname{Tr}(TV^{\mu}) \operatorname{Tr}(TV^{\nu})$	$\mathcal{L}_{11} = \alpha_{11} \operatorname{Tr}[(\mathfrak{N}_{\mu} V^{\mu})^2]$	$\mathcal{L}_{15} = 2i\alpha_{15} \mathrm{Tr}(V_{\mu} \mathfrak{D}_{\nu} V^{\nu}) \mathrm{Tr}(T V^{\mu})$
$\mathcal{L}_2 = \frac{1}{2} i g \alpha_2 B_{\mu\nu} \operatorname{Tr}(T[V^{\mu}, V^{\nu}])$	$\mathcal{L}_7 = \alpha_7 \operatorname{Tr}(V_{\mu}V^{\mu})[\operatorname{Tr}(TV_{\nu})]^2$	$\mathcal{L}_{12} = \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{12} \operatorname{Tr}(T \mathcal{D}_{\mu} \mathcal{D}_{\nu} V^{\nu}) \operatorname{Tr}(T V^{\mu})$	$\mathcal{L}_{16} = i\alpha_{16} \operatorname{Tr}[T(\mathfrak{D}_{\mu}V_{\nu} + \mathfrak{D}_{\nu}V_{\mu})]$
$\mathcal{L}_3 = ig\alpha_3 \operatorname{Tr}(F_{\mu\nu}[V^{\mu}, V^{\nu}])$	$\mathcal{L}_8 = \frac{1}{4}g^2 \alpha_8 [\mathrm{Tr}(TF_{\mu\nu})]^2$	$\mathcal{L}_{13} = \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{13} [\mathrm{Tr}(T \mathcal{D}_{\mu} V_{\nu})]^2$	$ imes { m Tr}(V^{\mu}V^{ u})$
$\mathcal{L}_4 = \alpha_4 [\mathrm{Tr}(V_\mu V_\nu)]^2$	$\mathcal{L}_9 = \frac{1}{2} i g \alpha_9 \operatorname{Tr}(TF_{\mu\nu}) \operatorname{Tr}(T[V^{\mu}, V^{\nu}])$	$\mathcal{L}_{14} = \alpha_{14} [\mathrm{Tr}(F_{\mu\nu}V^{\nu})\mathrm{Tr}(TV^{\mu})$	$\mathcal{L}_{17} = \frac{1}{2}i\alpha_{17} \operatorname{Tr}[T(\mathfrak{D}_{\mu}V_{\nu} + \mathfrak{D}_{\nu}V_{\mu})]$
$\mathcal{L}_5 = \alpha_5 [\mathrm{Tr}(V_{\mu}V^{\mu})]^2$	$\mathcal{L}_{10} = \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{10} [\mathrm{Tr}(TV_{\mu}) \mathrm{Tr}(TV_{\nu})]^2$	$-\operatorname{Tr}(F_{\mu\nu}V^{\mu})\operatorname{Tr}(TV^{\nu})]$	$ imes \mathrm{Tr}(TV^{\mu})\mathrm{Tr}(TV^{\nu})$
[Appelquist, Bernard	$\mathcal{L}_{18} = \frac{1}{2} i \alpha_{18} \operatorname{Tr}([V_{\mu}, T] \mathfrak{D}^{\mu} \mathfrak{D}^{\nu} V_{\nu})$		

ILC will slightly improve quartic coupling measurement



the only quartic interactions under custodial symmetry

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{L}_{4} = \alpha_{4} (\operatorname{tr} \left[V_{\mu} V_{\nu} \right])^{2} \\ \mathcal{L}_{5} = \alpha_{5} (\operatorname{tr} \left[V_{\mu} V^{\mu} \right])^{2} \end{array}$$

[Eboli, Gonzalez-Garcia, Lietti, Novaes '00]

[Beyer, Kilian, Krstonosic, Monig, Reuter, Schmidt, Schroder '06]

Higgs (if there is) prefers to be non-SM like!



Why do/should we think about alternative way of Electroweak Symmetry Breaking?

Example of Comparison SM Higgs vs Technicolor

- simple and economical
- GIM mechanism, no FCNC problems, EW precision data are OK for preferably light Higgs boson
- SM is established, perfectly describes data
- fine-tuning and naturalness problem; triviality problem
- there is no example of fundamental scalar
- Scalar potential parameters and yukawa couplings are inputs

- complicated at the effective theory level
- FCNC constraints require walking, potential tension with EW precision data
- no viable ETC model suggested yet, work in progress
- no fine-tuning, the scale is dynamically generated
- Superconductivity and QCD are examples of dynamical symmetry breaking
- parameters of low-energy effective theory are derived once underlying ETC is constructed

Electroweak Symmetry Breaking without Higgs boson but within the Electroweak theory

Electroweak Symmetry Breaking without Higgs boson but within the Electroweak theory The Loss of Unitarity and EW precision data is the main worry!



Unitarity with and without Higgs boson



Unitarity with and without Higgs boson



How one can preserve unitarity without Higgs ?

Higgsless Models

Low-energy effective theories with natural EW symmetry breaking alternative to Supersymmetry and Strong dynamics

- massive 4-d gauge bosons originate from 5-d gauge theory (moose representation) with appropriate boundary conditions
- massive vector boson scattering amplitude is unitarised via KK modes exchange – not the Higgs boson exchange!



4D KK Mode Scattering



- Cancellation of bad high energy behavior provided through
- exchange of massive vector particles

Chivukula, He, Dicus; Csaci, Grojean, Pilo, Murayama, Pilo, Terning

DECONSTRUCTION

moose diagram can be interpreted as the discretization of a continuum gauge theory in 5D along a fifth dimension



Discretize fifth dimension

Χ₅

- 4D gauge group at each site
- Nonlinear sigma model link fields
- To include warping: vary f_j
- For spatially dependent coupling: vary g_k
- Continuum Limit: take $N \rightarrow$ infinity
- Finite N, a 4D theory w/o 5D constraints

Arkani-Hamed, Georgi, Cohen & Hill, Pokorski, Wang

......

xμ

Conflict S and Unitarity



 Z' resonance unitarizes WW scattering, similar to what Higgs boson does in SM (Chivukula,He,Dicus)

- Z' mass is bounded from above: $m_{Z_1} < \sqrt{8\pi} v$
- ... and yields too much a value of S-parameter: $\alpha S \ge \frac{4s_Z^2 c_Z^2 M_Z^2}{8\pi v^2} = \frac{\alpha}{2}$ [Chivukula, Simmons, He, Kurachi, Tanabashi]
- Solution delocalization of the fermions: mixing of "brane" and "bulk" modes! [Cacciapaglia, Csaki, Grojean, Reece, Terning; Foadi Gopalakrishna, Schmidt]
- Alternatively there could be a large contribution to T parameter

Fermion delocalization



$$\begin{pmatrix} G^0_{\mu} \\ G^1_{\mu} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c_g & s_g \\ s_g & -c_g \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_{\mu} \\ B_{\mu} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \psi_L^0 \\ \psi_L^1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -c_f & s_f \\ s_f & c_f \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_L^A \\ \psi_L^B \end{pmatrix}$$

Mixing of light and heavy fermions helps to suppress contribution from heavy bosons to the EW observables!



Ideal Fermion Delocalization

- Recall that the light W's wavefunction is orthogonal to wavefunctions of KK modes
- Choose fermion delocalization profile to match W wavefunction profile along the 5th dimension: $g_i x_i \propto v_i^W$
- No (tree-level) fermion couplings to KK modes!



$$\hat{S} = \hat{T} = W = 0$$
$$Y = M_W^2 (\Sigma_W - \Sigma_Z)$$

Fermion delocalization profile can be chosen to match W-wave function along the 5th dimension: **leading to vanishing coupling of fermions to KK modes!** [Chivukula,Simmons,He, Kurachi, Tanabashi; Casalbuoni, De Curtis, Dolce, Dominici]

Three site model (TSM) simplest, realistic, highly deconstructed, higgsless





Alexander Belyaev

The Three Site Model representative and testable!





- The parameter space is: simple and bounded
 - from below by experiment
 - from above by unitarity
- Low energy phenomenology of a Higgsless ED is dominated by the 1st



 The Three Site Model consistently implements the 1st KK mode in a gauge invariant way

Can be tested at the LHC

Tools

LanHEP [Andrei Semenov]

- Automatic generation of Feynman rules from the Lagrangian
- Has checks for
 - Hermiticity
 - BRST invariance
 - EM charge conservation
 - Particle mixings, mass terms, and mass matrices

CalcHEP

[Alexander Pukhov, AB, Neil Christensen]

- Automatic calculations of treelevel processes within userdefined model
- User friendly graphical interface
- Easy implementation of new models
 - Especially using LanHEP
- Feynman gauge and unitary gauge
 - Important cross check.
 - New features of CalcHEP

• batch interface

[Neil Christensen]

- Improved CalcHEP-MC
 - interface [AB, Pukhov]

Example of model Implementation using LanHEP



Alexander Belyaev

Example of model Implementation using LanHEP



Alexander Belyaev

Gauge boson widths and branchings

- Fermiophobic nature of the gauge bosons
- Dominant decay into WW and WZ pairs
- Z' Br does not depend much on deviation from ideal delocalization



W' decays

decay into fermions more strongly depends on fermion delocalization



LHC SIGNATURES



Alexander Belyaev

Three Site Model Signatures



LHC reach for DY di-lepton signature



- Decay and production are suppressed by x^4 compared to 'usual' PYTHIA Z' model
- One should be prepared to face with this scenario with very different Z'/W' features

LHC reach for DY di-lepton signature



- Decay and production are suppressed by x⁴ compared to SM-like Z' models
- One should be prepared to face with this scenario with very different Z'/W' features
 - Discovery reach for DY process is about 0.5-0.6 TeV (vs 3-5 TeV)
 - fermiophobic Z' required by EW data (vs SM-like Z'-fermions couplings)
 - Z'WW coupling is non-vanishing to provide unitarity

Could be a big surprise for experimentalists expecting charming DY dilepton signatures from Z' upto 5 TeV!

Dilepton invariant mass spectrum



LHC status at @7TeV

- LHC has really started to deliver luminosity
 - Bunches ~1e11
 - Had L_{inst} of ~1e30 (only for 0.8h)
 - Currently running 10b4-2-4 (10 bunches, 4 colliding only in CMS)
 - Soon 12 bunches (8 colliding in CMS)

 Technical stop on July 17th to allow 24+ bunches

CMS: Integrated Luminosity 2010



LHC projected potential @7TeV


Vector-boson fusion WZ → W' and associate W'Z production are much more promising: larger rates + clean signature



Alexander Belyaev

$pp \rightarrow W^+Zjj$: Exact tree-level calculation with CalcHEP

- No effective WZ approximation.
- Complete set of signal and background diagrams including interference.

CalcHEP/symb							
Model: 3-site-tfg			Calcher/symb Delete,On/off,Restore,Latex 35/612				
Proc 7816 dia 0 dia	ess: p,p->W+,Z,j,j Feynman diagrams grams in 21 subprocesse grams are deleted.	s are constructed.	$\begin{array}{c} u1 \longrightarrow & u1 \\ & A \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ &$	$u1 \longrightarrow u1$ A W+ W+ U1 $U1 \longrightarrow Z$	u1 u1 u1 W+ u1 U1 U1 U1 U1 U1 U1 U1 U	$u1 \longrightarrow u$ $A \longrightarrow U+$ w+ $u1 \longrightarrow d1$	u1 A W+ u1 W+ Z d1
	NN Subprocess	Del Rest		111	111		<u>111</u>
	* 1 ul,ul -> Z,W+,ul,dl 2 ul,Ul -> Z,W+,Ul,dl	0 612 0 612	$\begin{array}{c} u1 \\ A \\ \widetilde{W} \\ \widetilde{W} \\ \widetilde{W} \\ \widetilde{V} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} W^+ \\ V \\ Z \end{array}$	A ₩ ₩ ¥	A ₩ ₩ +Z	$u1 \rightarrow W^+$ $\widetilde{W}^+ \cdots \rightarrow d1$	A A ₩ ₩ + ₩ +
	3 u1,d1 -> Z,W+,d1,d1 4 u1,D1 -> Z,W+,u1,U1 5 u1,D1 -> Z,W+,d1,D1	0 306 0 612 0 612		$u1 \longrightarrow d1$	$ ilde{W}\widetilde{+}$ $ extsf{ul}$ $ extsf{u}$ $ extsf{u$		u1 $u1$ Z
	6 u1,D1 -> Z,W+,G,G						
	/ uI,G -> Z,W+,G,dI 8 U1.u1 -> Z.W+.U1.d1		$u1 \longrightarrow u1$	ul ul	ul ul	u1 u1	u1→u1
	9 U1,D1 -> Z,W+,U1,U1	i 0i 306	W+ ₩ĭ	A W+	A W+	A W+	A ul
	10 d1,u1 -> Z,W+,d1,d1 11 d1 D1 -> Z W+ U1 d1			WŦ ãĩ dl	₩̃∓́ z	₩¥- Z	ul dl
	12 D1,u1 -> Z,W+,u1,U1		$u1 \longrightarrow Z$	ul → · · · · Z	ul→d1	dl	×~~~₩+
	13 D1,u1 -> Z,W+,d1,D1						
	14 D1, U1 -> Z, W+, G, G 15 D1, U1 -> Z, W+, U1, U1		a11	411	411	411	
	16 D1,d1 -> Z,W+,U1,d1	i 0i 612					
	1/ DI,DI $->$ Z,W+,UI,DJ 18 D1.G $->$ Z,W+,G,U1			$u1 \rightarrow u1$			
	19 G,u1 -> Z,W+,G,d1	i 0i 76	al	W+YW+	W+ W+	ul	al
	20 G,D1 -> Z,W+,G,U1		Č-Z	`~Z	``-Z	`~₩+	`~Z
	<u></u>						
			F1-Help, F2-Man, F	allo, PaDn, Home, En	d,# ,Esc		

Alexander Belyaev

 $pp \to W'^{(*)}Z \to WZZ \to jj\ell^+\ell^-\ell^+\ell^-$



LHC reach for WZ->W' process

[AB, Chivukula, Christensen, He, Kuang, Pukhov, Qi, Simmons, Zhang '07]







the complete WZjj BG is factor 4 bigger then PYTHIA effective V-boson approximation!

To be compared with Birkedal, Matchev, Perelstein '05 $E_{j} > 300 \text{ GeV}$ $p_{Tj} > 30 \text{ GeV}$ $|\eta_{j}| < 4.5$ $|\Delta \eta(jj)| > 4$ $p_{T\ell} > 15 \text{ GeV}$ $|\eta_{\ell}| < 2.5$ $0.85M_{W'} < M_{T} < 1.05M_{W'}$

LHC reach for WZ->W' process

[AB, Chivukula, Christensen, He, Kuang, Pukhov, Qi, Simmons, Zhang '07]





luminosity (fb⁻¹) for discovery/observation

LHC reach for WZ->W' process

[AB, Chivukula, Christensen, He, Kuang, Pukhov, Qi, Simmons, Zhang '07]





LHC reach for s-channel Z' and W' [Ohl,Speckner '08]



luminosity (fb⁻¹) for discovery/observatior

Alexander Belyaev

ILC PHENOMENOLOGY

Alexander Belyaev

ILC potential

clean environment and precision measurements [e.g. see Ohl, Djouadi, ... talks]

• precision gauge boson couplings measurement will allow to establish sum rules $g_{WWWW} = g_{WWZ}^2 + g_{WW\gamma}^2 + \sum_i (g_{WWV}^{(i)})^2$,

$$4g_{\rm WWWW} M_{\rm W}^2 = 3 \left[g_{\rm WWZ}^2 M_{\rm Z}^2 + \sum_i (g_{\rm WWV}^{(i)})^2 (M_i^0)^2 \right]$$

- high mass resolution will allow to perform spectroscopy of new accessible resonances expected to be below 1 TeV
- has indirect sensitivity to larger mass scale than LHC
- dominant hadronic decay modes can be used now W' mass can be fully reconstructed

Prospects for ILC@ 0.5 TeV: g_{wwz}



Alexander Belyaev

W' production at the ILC via VBF



Birkedal, Matchev, Perelstein '05

Beyond the 3-site model

there is an increasing progress in Higgsless models and Technicolor models see e.g. recent talks at "Dynamical Electroweak Symmetry Breaking", Sep '08, Denmark

equivalent description on the languages of Deconstructon and Technicolor [Barbieri, Isidori, Rychkov,Trincherini '08]



Z' is not necessarily fermiophobic! Complementarity of DY di-lepton and di-boson channels

Effective Lagrangian for SU(2)_L X SU(2)_R to order O(p²)

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{boson}} = -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[\widetilde{W}_{\mu\nu} \widetilde{W}^{\mu\nu} \right] - \frac{1}{4} \widetilde{B}_{\mu\nu} \widetilde{B}^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[F_{\text{L}\mu\nu} F_{\text{L}}^{\mu\nu} + F_{\text{R}\mu\nu} F_{\text{R}}^{\mu\nu} \right]$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Higgs}} = \frac{\mu^2}{2} \text{Tr} \left[M M^{\dagger} \right] - \frac{\lambda}{4} \text{Tr} \left[M M^{\dagger} \right]^2$$

$$W_{\mu
u}$$
 and $B_{\mu
u}$ are EW filed strength tensors

$$F_{
m L/R\mu
u}$$
 are the field strength tensors $A_{
m L/R\mu}$ associated to the vector meson fields $A_{
m L/R\mu}$

2x2 Matrix
$$M = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[v + H + 2 \ i \ \pi^a \ T^a \right] , \quad a = 1, 2, 3$$

Covariant derivative

$$D_{\mu}M = \partial_{\mu}M - i \ g \ \widetilde{W}^{a}_{\mu} \ T^{a}M + i \ g' \ M \ \widetilde{B}_{\mu} \ T^{3}$$

Effective Lagrangian for SU(2)_L X SU(2)_R to order O(p²)

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Higgs-Vector}} = m^2 \operatorname{Tr} \left[C_{\text{L}\mu}^2 + C_{\text{R}\mu}^2 \right]$$

+ $\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr} \left[D_\mu M D^\mu M^\dagger \right] - \tilde{g^2} r_2 \operatorname{Tr} \left[C_{\text{L}\mu} M C_{\text{R}}^\mu M^\dagger \right]$
- $\frac{i \, \tilde{g} \, r_3}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \left[C_{\text{L}\mu} \left(M D^\mu M^\dagger - D^\mu M M^\dagger \right) + C_{\text{R}\mu} \left(M^\dagger D^\mu M - D^\mu M^\dagger M \right) \right]$
+ $\frac{\tilde{g}^2 s}{4} \operatorname{Tr} \left[C_{\text{L}\mu}^2 + C_{\text{R}\mu}^2 \right] \operatorname{Tr} \left[M M^\dagger \right]$

$$C_{\mathrm{L}\mu} \equiv A_{\mathrm{L}\mu} - \frac{g}{\tilde{g}}\widetilde{W_{\mu}} , \quad C_{\mathrm{R}\mu} \equiv A_{\mathrm{R}\mu} - \frac{g'}{\tilde{g}}\widetilde{B_{\mu}} .$$

NMWT parameter space and particle content

• fixing S=0.3 ~ S_{pert} and using WSR parameter space is reduced to $M_A, \ \tilde{g}, \ s, \ M_H$

$$S = \frac{8\pi}{\tilde{g}^2} (1 - \chi^2) ,$$

$$r_2 = r_3 - 1 .$$

$$\chi \equiv 1 - \frac{v^2 \tilde{g}^2 r_3}{4M_A^2}$$

- s, M_H have sizable effect in the process involving composite Higgs
- new particles two triplets of heavy mesons: $R_1^{\pm}(R_2^{\pm})$ and $R_1^0(R_2^0)$

Walking Technicolor and S-parameter

Perturbative S reads as: $S_{\text{pert}} = \frac{N_D}{6\pi}$

N_c=2 case

Conformal window condition for the fundamental representation

$$N_f \simeq 8 \Longrightarrow S_{\text{pert}} \simeq 0.42$$

Conformal window condition for the $N_f \simeq 2 \Longrightarrow S_{\rm pert} \simeq 0.16$ adjoint representation

Small N_f is preferred N_f=2 in the higher dimensional representation of N_c=2 case is promising to be studied: Minimal Walking Technicolor (Sannino, Tuominen 05)

Viable NMWT parameter space



Barbieri, Pomarol, Rattazzi, Strumia 04

Decay Branching Ratios (R₁)



Decay Branching Ratios (R₂)



LHC Signatures



Signature (1)

(1) $\ell^+\ell^-$ signature from the process $pp \to R^0_{1,2} \to \ell^+\ell^-$



double resonance signal pattern can be resolved --distinct footprint, different from 3-site model (Chivukula,Coleppa, Di Chiara, Simmons, He, Kurachi,Tanabashi 06) or generic Z' models

Alexander Belyaev

Signature (2)

(2) $\ell + \not\!\!\!E_T$ signature from the process $pp \to R_{1,2}^{\pm} \to \ell^{\pm} \nu$



for higher masses only one resonance is observed

Signature (3)

(3) $3\ell + \not\!\!\!E_T$ signature from the process $pp \to R_{1,2}^{\pm} \to ZW^{\pm} \to 3\ell\nu$



highly complementary channel to fermiophobic ones: not very high rates, but clean signal

LHC discovery potential for NMWT



LHC discovery potential for NMWT

(3) $3\ell + \not\!\!\!E_T$ signature from the process $pp \to R_{1,2}^{\pm} \to ZW^{\pm} \to 3\ell\nu$





Higgs-vector boson associate production can be significantly enhanced noted by Zerwekh 06

NMWT model studies at ILC@1TeV (work in progress)



Alexander Belyaev

Our Expectations from LHC

Alexander Belyaev











Signatures could look alike





Alexander Belyaev

The strategy for delineating of underlying theory



Alexander Belyaev

First Steps towards "Dictionary"

A.B., Asesh Datta, Albert De Roeck, Rohini Godbole, Bruce Mellado, Andreas Nyffeler, Chara Petridou, D.P. Roy, Pramana 72:229-238,2009. e-Print: arXiv:0806.2838 [hep-ph]

Variables		SUSY (MSSM)	LHT	UED	
Spin		heavy partners differ in spin by 1/2	heavy partners have the same spin, no heavy gluon	heavy partners have the same spin	
Higher level		NO	NO	YES	
modes		heavy partners	heavy partners	heavy partners	
N_{l+l+}/N_{l-l}	!	$R_{SUSY} < R_{LHT}$	R_{LHT}	$R_{UED} \simeq R_{LHT}$	
SS leptons ra	ates	from several channels: SS heavy fermions,	only from SS heavy fermions	only from SS heavy fermions	
		Majorana fermions	Majorana fermions		
$R = \frac{N(\not\!\!\!E_T + jets)}{N(l's + \not\!\!\!E_T + jets)}$		$R_{\rm SUSY}$	$R_{\rm LHT} < R_{\rm SUSY}$	$R_{\rm UED}$	
b-jet multiplicity		enhanced (FP)	not enhanced	not enhanced	
Single heavy top		NO	YES	YES via KK2 decay	
polarization	$tt + E_T$	to be studied	to be studied	to be studied	
effects	$\tau \tau + E_T$	to be studied	to be studied	to be studied	
Direct DM detection rate		high (FP) low (coann)	low (Bino-like LTP)	typically low for $\gamma_1(5D)$ DM [22] typically high for $\gamma_H(6D)$ DM [22]	
Tools for delineating underlying theory



Tools for delineating underlying theory



Conclusions and outlook

- Dynamical EWSB models are compelling:
 - no hierarchy problem, analog is realized in nature (QCD), effective theory parameters are potentially derivable from underlying theory
 - holography principles, applications to hadronization
 - new phenomenology including new DM developments
- Models implemented:
 - 3-site model, 3-site HLS model
 - 4-site model
 - MWTC, NMWTC + DM sector
 - New requests?

Conclusions and outlook

- Distinctive phenomenology:
 - One or several Z'/W'
 - Boosted Z,W,H bosons and boosted heavy quarks
 - Combining different signatures: the way to establish no-loose theorem?
 - ➡ 3-site model: di-lepton DY discovery range is up to M_w ~0.5-0.6 TeV, trilepton signature from WZ->W' signal can completely cover M_w space
 - one step beyond the minimal Higgsless model
 - Z' is not necessarily fermiophobic
 - equivalence between 4-site and NMWT models
 - DM within TC models: more exciting signatures collider ones as well as signals at Direct and Indirect DM search experiments
- What we expect from this workshop
 - discuss current progress and new ideas
 - discuss new possible projects
 - requests for tools? (FR generators, ME generators, MC generators)
 - Anything not mentioned above?

Conclusions and outlook

- Distinctive phenomenology:
 - One or several Z'/W'
 - Boosted Z,W,H bosons and boosted heavy quarks
 - Combining different signatures: the way to establish no-loose theorem?
 - → 3-site model: di-lepton DY discovery range is up to M_{w'} ~0.5-0.6 TeV, trilepton signature from WZ->W' signal can completely cover M_{w'} space
 - one step beyond the minimal Higgsless model
 - Z' is not necessarily fermiophobic
 - equivalence between 4-site and NMWT models
 - DM within TC models: more exciting signatures collider ones as well as signals at Direct and Indirect DM search experiments
- What we expect from this workshop
 - discuss current progress and new ideas
 - discuss new possible projects
 - requests for tools? (FR generators, ME generators, MC generators)
 - Anything not mentioned above?

THANKS TO ALL OF YOU!



Allowed deviation from IDL

-0.33 < S < 0.07 at 95% C.L. $M_{H}^{ref} = 117 {\rm GeV}$



[Matsuzaki, Chivukula, Simmons, Tanabashi; Dawson, Jackson]

One more hope for the ILC? (Dubna, Russia)

Sissakian, Shirkov, Trubnikov, Budagov, Denisov, Kozlov, Tokareva, Vorozhtsov, Ivanov '08



"Collider Phenomenology of DEWSB models" Soton, July 7, 2010

Appendix

TSM: Representative of a Higgsless Extra Dimension

 Low energy phenomenology of a Higgsless ED is dominated by the 1st KK mode.



 The Three Site Model consistently implements the 1st KK mode in a gauge invariant way.

TSM: Representative of Dynamical EWSB



- Warped Higgsless ED is conjectured to be dual to a walking technicolor theory.
- The Three Site Model consistently implements the vector resonances (TC) in a gauge invariant way.
- Satisfies precision electroweak measurements (S=0).

The Three Site Model



Chivukula, Coleppa, Di Chiara, Simmons PRD **74**, 075011 (2006)

"Collider Phenomenology of DEWSB models" Soton, July 7, 2010



Particle Content

 γ, G Z', W'^{\pm} Z,W^{\pm} $\left(egin{array}{c} u \ d \end{array}
ight) \left(egin{array}{c} c \ s \end{array}
ight) \left(egin{array}{c} t \ b \end{array}
ight) \qquad \left(egin{array}{c} u' \ d' \end{array}
ight) \left(egin{array}{c} c' \ s' \end{array}
ight) \left(egin{array}{c} t' \ b' \end{array}
ight)$ $\left(egin{array}{c}
u_e \\
e \end{array}
ight) \left(egin{array}{c}
u_\mu \\
\mu \end{array}
ight) \left(egin{array}{c}
u_ au \\
 au \end{array}
ight) = \left(egin{array}{c}
u'_e \\
 e' \end{array}
ight) \left(egin{array}{c}
u'_\mu \\
 e' \end{array}
ight) \left(egin{array}{c}
u'_\pi \\
 e' \end{array}
ight)$



 $SU(2)_0 imes SU(2)_1 imes U(1)_2$

$$W_j = \left(egin{array}{ccc} rac{1}{2} W_j^0 & rac{1}{\sqrt{2}} W_j^+ \ rac{1}{\sqrt{2}} W_j^- & -rac{1}{2} W_j^0 \ rac{1}{\sqrt{2}} W_j^- & -rac{1}{2} W_j^0 \end{array}
ight)$$

$$W_2=\left(egin{array}{ccc} rac{1}{2}W_2^0 & 0 \ 0 & -rac{1}{2}W_2^0 \end{array}
ight)$$

Gauge Sector

$$g_0 = g, \quad g_1 = \tilde{g}, \quad g_2 = g'$$

$$\tilde{g} \gg g, g'$$

$$\Rightarrow g/\tilde{g} = x \ll 1, g'/g = s/c = t$$

$$\frac{1}{e^2} = \frac{1}{g^2} + \frac{1}{\tilde{g}^2} + \frac{1}{g'^2}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{F^2} = -rac{1}{2} ext{Tr} \Big[F_0^2 + F_1^2 + F_2^2 \Big]$$
 where

$$F_{j}^{\mu
u}=\partial^{\mu}W_{j}^{\mu}-\partial^{
u}W_{j}^{\mu}+ig_{j}\left[W_{j}^{\mu},W_{j}^{
u}
ight]$$

Casalbuoni, De Curtis, Dominici, Gatto (BESS) Phys. Lett. B155 (1985) 95



 $SU(2)_0 imes SU(2)_1 imes U(1)_2$

Gauge - Goldstone Sector

$${\cal L}_{D\Sigma} = {f^2\over 2} {
m Tr} \Big[\left(D_\mu \Sigma_0
ight)^\dagger D^\mu \Sigma_0 + \left(D_\mu \Sigma_1
ight)^\dagger D^\mu \Sigma_1 \Big]$$

 $\Sigma_j = e^{irac{2\pi_j}{f}}$

$$D_\mu \Sigma_j = \partial_\mu \Sigma_j + i g_j W_j \Sigma_j - i g_{j+1} \Sigma_j W_{j+1}$$

$$\pi_j = \left(egin{array}{ccc} rac{1}{2}\pi_j^0 & rac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\pi_j^+ \ rac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\pi_j^- & -rac{1}{2}\pi_j^0 \end{array}
ight)$$

This gives the gauge boson mass matrices:

$$M^2_{\pm} = rac{f^2}{4} \left(egin{array}{cc} g^2_0 & -g_0 g_1 \ -g_0 g_1 & 2g^2_1 \end{array}
ight)$$

$$M_N^2 = rac{f^2}{4} \left(egin{array}{ccc} g_0^2 & -g_0 g_1 & 0 \ -g_0 g_1 & 2 g_1^2 & -g_1 g_2 \ 0 & -g_1 g_2 & g_2^2 \end{array}
ight)$$



Independent parameters: M_w , M_z , e, M_w . Dependent parameters: g_0 , g_1 , g_2 , f

 $SU(2)_0 imes SU(2)_1 imes U(1)_2$

$$egin{aligned} x &= rac{g_0}{g_1} & t = rac{g_2}{g_0} \ rac{1}{e^2} &= rac{1}{g_0^2} + rac{1}{g_1^2} + rac{1}{g_2^2} \end{aligned}$$

$$rac{M_W^2}{M_{W'}^2} = rac{2{+}x^2{-}\sqrt{4{+}x^4}}{2{+}x^2{+}\sqrt{4{+}x^4}}$$

$$rac{M_W^2}{M_Z^2} = rac{2{+}x^2{-}\sqrt{4{+}x^4}}{2{+}x^2(1{+}t^2){-}\sqrt{4{+}x^4(1{-}t^2)^2}}$$

$$M_W = g_1 f rac{\sqrt{2 + x^2 - \sqrt{4 + x^4}}}{2\sqrt{2}}$$





Ideal Delocalization (IDEL)

$$g_{i}v_{Le}^{i}v_{L\nu}^{i} = [g_{W_{SM}} + O(x^{4})]v_{W}^{i}$$
$$g_{W_{TSM}} = g_{0}v_{Le}^{0}v_{L\nu}^{0}v_{W}^{0} + g_{1}v_{Le}^{1}v_{L\nu}^{1}v_{W}^{1}$$





Chivukula, Simmons, He, Kurachi, Tanabashi: PRD 72, 015008 (2005) Casalbuoni, Deandrea, De Curtis, Dominici, Gatto, Grazzini, : PRD 53, 5201 (1996)

Alexander Belyaev



 $SU(2)_0 imes SU(2)_1 imes U(1)_2$

Gauge Fixing Sector

$$\mathcal{L}_{GF} = - ext{Tr} \Big[G_0^2 + G_1^2 + G_2^2 \Big]$$
 where

$$G_0 = \partial \cdot W_0 - rac{1}{2} g_0 f(\pi_0 \quad)$$

$$\pi_1^{ns} = \left(egin{array}{cc} rac{1}{2} \pi_j^0 & 0 \ 0 & -rac{1}{2} \pi_j^0 \end{array}
ight)$$

$$egin{aligned} G_1 &= \partial \cdot W_1 - rac{1}{2}g_1fig(\pi_1 - \pi_0ig) \ G_2 &= \partial \cdot W_2 - rac{1}{2}g_2fig(\ - \pi_1^{ns}ig) \end{aligned}$$



Ghost Sector

$$\mathcal{L}_{\bar{c}c} = -\mathrm{Tr} \Big[\bar{c}_0 \delta_{_{BRST}} G_0 + \bar{c}_1 \delta_{_{BRST}} G_1 + \bar{c}_2 \delta_{_{BRST}} G_2 \Big]$$

where

$$\delta_{_{BRST}} W_{\mu j} = - \Big(\partial_{\mu} c_j + i g_j \, [\ W_{\mu j} \ , \ c_j \] \, \Big)$$

$$egin{aligned} \delta_{_{BRST}}\pi_j &= rac{1}{2}fig(g_jc_j - g_{j+1}c_{j+1}ig) + rac{i}{2}\,[\,\,g_jc_j + g_{j+1}c_{j+1}\,\,,\,\pi_j\,\,] \ &- rac{1}{6f}ig[\,\,\pi_j\,\,,\,\,[\,\,\pi_j\,\,,\,\,g_jc_j - g_{j+1}c_{j+1}\,\,]\,\,ig] + \cdots \end{aligned}$$







- Feynman vs. Unitary gauge.
- Decoupling of heavy fields.
- Masses and mixings (LanHEP).
- Hermiticity (LanHEP).



Alexander Belyaev

Heavy fermions



crucial ingredient of the model, in particular, provide unitarity

• but are too heavy to be observed even in strong pair production processes

LHC reach for DY tri-lepton signature



Alexander Belyaev

"Collider Phenomenology of DEWSB models" Soton, July 7, 2010

EW precision data

Fits to precision electroweak data also constrain the Higgs boson mass in the SM.



Alexander Belyaev

"Collider Phenomenology of DEWSB models" Soton, July 7, 2010