#### **Probing Gauge-Higgs Unification models at the ILC with AFB** at center-of-mass energies above the Z-mass

A. Irles Quiles, J.P. Márquez Hernández, <u>A. Saibel</u>, H. Yamamoto (before at Tohoku University) AITANA group at IFIC – CSIC/UV

> R. Poeschl, F. Richard IJCLab IN2P3/CNRS

N. Yamatsu Kyoto University (before at Taiwan University)





Financiado por

NextGenerationEU

la Unión Europea



















# **Gauge-Higgs Unification**



Andrej Saibel

- 5D metric
  - Introducing the Hosotani symmetry breaking mechanism
- Models have only one parameter:
  - Hosotani angle  $\theta_{\mathbf{H}}$ : projection of 5D fields
  - **Prediction**:
  - Kaluza-Klein Resonances  $\rightarrow Z'\,{\rm bosons}\,\,m_{Z'}>7\,{\rm TeV}$
  - Modifications of electroweak couplings
    - Deviations visible at 250 GeV CME
  - Benchmark scenario:
  - Funatsu, Hatanaka, Hosotani, Orikasa, Yamatsu GHU models

#### **Studied Models**

- **A-Models**: <u>1705.05282</u>

- **B-Models**: <u>2309.01132</u>, <u>2301.07833</u>

 $B_{1}^{\pm}: \theta_{H} = 0.10, m_{KK} = B_{2}^{\pm}: \theta_{H} = 0.07, m_{KK} = B_{3}^{\pm}: \theta_{H} = 0.05, m_{KK} =$ 

 $\begin{array}{l} A_1: \theta_H = 0.0917, m_{KK} = 8.81 \ \text{TeV} \rightarrow m_{Z^1} = 7.19 \ \text{TeV} \\ A_2: \theta_H = 0.0737, m_{KK} = 10.3 \ \text{TeV} \rightarrow m_{Z^1} = 8.52 \ \text{TeV} \end{array}$ 

$$13 \text{ TeV} \rightarrow m_{Z^1} = 10.2 \text{ TeV}$$
  
 $19 \text{ TeV} \rightarrow m_{Z^1} = 14.9 \text{ TeV}$   
 $25 \text{ TeV} \rightarrow m_{Z^1} = 19.6 \text{ TeV}$ 

#### Assuming H2O-staged program

	ILCGigaZ	ILC250	ILC500	ILC1000	• -
$\int \mathcal{L} \left[ f b^{-1} \right]  \Big $	100	2000	4000	8000	
$( P_{e^-} ,  P_{e^+} )$	(0.8, 0.3)	$\mid$ (0.8,0.3)	(0.8,0.3)	$\mid$ (0.8,0.2)	
OSP SSP[%]	40 10	45 $ $ 5	40 10	40 10	

International Linear Detector (ILD)

- Optimised for Particle Flow
- Precise tracking, vertexing, and PID



- Observable: Forward-backward asymmetry
  - Two back-to-back c- or b-jets
  - Full simulation of International Large Detector (ILD)
- <u>General Strategy</u>: •
  - Pre-selection: background suppression<sup>0.2</sup>
  - **Jet-Flavor ID** 
    - Double Tag: reduce flavor tag unc. ullet
  - **Jet-Charge**:
    - Double charge + data-driven correction ullet
  - Compare measurements to GHU
- Estimated stat. unc. in permille region
  - What about systematic uncertainties?

Andrej Saibel









Andrej Saibel



- ulletdependence
- K-ID or full Vtx charge for measurement
- ulletcorrectly P<sub>chg</sub>
  - Apply migration correction

Andrej Saibel

7



### **Results: GHU vs SM Discrimination**

masses

Higher

Statistical significance

$$d_{ij} = \frac{|A_{FB,i} - A_{FB,j}|}{\Delta A_{FB,j}}$$

- Assuming normally distributed uncertainties
- Multivariate Gaussian used for combination
  - No correlations between measurements assumed
- Three scenarios:
  - Current coupling precision
  - ILC250 (radiative return) precision
  - ILC Giga-Z

Andrej Saibel

GHU vs SM discrimination power ( $\sigma$ -level)



Z-fermion

- C: Current precision
- R: ILC250 (Rad. Ret.)

• Z: Giga-Z



More data/higher energy





Detwoon model discrimination power (- lovel)

### Conclusion

- The International Linear Collider offers a clean environment for BSM searches
- International Large Detector has excellent PID and vertexing capabilities
- Presented a **benchmark BSM search** at ILC
- Expected statistical uncertainties are on permille level
- Experimental uncertainties can be minimised through data-driven methods
- Measurements can lead to observations or exclusion of physics way above the energy reach of the collider
- Discrimination between models is also achievable



#### BACKUP

### Impact of Beam Polarisation

- Plot similar to slide 8
- **Fixing Z-fermion couplings** to ILC250 radiative return case
- Impact of 0, 30, 60% positron
  beam polarisation on the results is shown
- No polarisation is assumed for ILC250 (no pol.)

GHU vs SM discrimination power ( $\sigma$ -level)

$B_3^+$	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.3	1.3	2.3	2.5	2.8		
$B_3^-$	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.8	0.9	0.9	2.5	2.7	2.8	6.5	6.7	6.9		
$B_2^+$	0.7	0.7	0.7	1.2	1.5	1.7	1.9	2.2	2.4	4.1	4.5	4.9		
$B_2^-$	0.7	0.7	0.7	1.3	1.4	1.5	4.5	4.6	4.8	>10	>10	>10		< 3
$B_1^+$	1.6	1.6	1.6	2.6	3.2	3.7	3.8	4.4	4.9	6.4	6.8	7.4		3-4
$B_1^-$	1.4	1.4	1.4	2.5	2.7	2.9	9.2	9.6	9.9	>10	>10	>10		4-5
$A_2$	3.3	3.3	3.3	4.1	4.8	5.4	>10	>10	>10	>10	>10	>10		<i>&gt;</i>
$A_1$	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.5	5.0	5.5	>10	>10	>10	>10	>10	>10		
				0	30	60	0	30	60	0	30	60	] e <sup>+</sup>	pol.
	IL	<i>C2</i> :	50 <b>*</b>	IL	<i>C2</i> :	50	IL	C2	50	IL	C25	50		
	(n	ор	ol.)				+;	500	)	+{	500			
										+	100	0*		







## Impact of Particle Identification

- Plot similar to slide 8
- Fixing Z-fermion couplings to ILC250 radiative return case
- Charged hadron particle identification (PID) is studied
  - O: no PID
  - E: ILD baseline dE/dx PID
  - N: optimised TPC with cluster counting dN/dx
- No polarisation is assumed for ILC250 (no pol.)

GHU vs SM discrimination power ( $\sigma$ -level)													
$B_3^+$	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.9	1.2	1.3	2.1	2.5	2.5	
$B_3^-$	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.9	1.7	2.6	2.7	4.2	6.5	6.7	
$B_2^+$	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.9	1.4	1.5	1.7	2.1	2.2	3.8	4.4	4.4	
$B_2^-$	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.8	1.3	1.4	2.9	4.5	4.6	8.0	>10	>10	
$B_1^+$	1.1	1.5	1.6	2.2	3.1	3.2	3.4	4.3	4.4	5.7	6.7	6.8	
$B_1^-$	0.6	1.2	1.4	1.4	2.4	2.7	5.9	9.3	9.6	>10	>10	>10	
$A_2$	2.2	3.2	3.3	3.3	4.7	4.8	>10	>10	>10	>10	>10	>10	
$A_1$	2.7	3.8	3.9	3.5	4.9	5.0	>10	>10	>10	>10	>10	>10	
	0	Е	N	0	Е	N	0	Е	N	0	Е	N	
	IL	C2	50 <b>*</b>	IL	C2	50	ILC250			ILC250			
	(n	ор	ol.)				+:	500	)	+500			
										+	100	0*	

