Task 1.6

Joe Davighi <u>Michelangelo Mangano</u> Matthew McCullough CERN TH

New physics scenarios and SM properties as trigger benchmarks

Identify BSM scenarios and signatures to be used as benchmarks for the assessment of newgeneration triggers performance, aligned with WP2/3, in close collaboration with the experiments



E-group: ngt-1-6-coord@cern.ch Indico: https://indico.cern.ch/category/18030/

Work plan

- Hire of dedicated fellow and formal start of work in 2025
- Preliminary discussions led by Joe Davighi and Matthew McCullough (TH) with ATLAS and CMS reps
- Target models well-motivated for BSM (not just "simplified models" for the signature), in particular related to
 - Dark Matter
 - Flavour puzzle
 - Neutrino masses

Follow some examples



LLP-derived leptons

- <u>Two or more displaced e/µ</u> (eg from dark mediator $A \rightarrow \ell \ell$ with $m_A \ge 2m_\ell$), possibly from distinct decay vertices (as in eg charged LLP pair-production, with LLP $\rightarrow \ell X^0$)
- <u>Prompt + displaced leptons</u>

• eg $pp \to A \xrightarrow{fast} \ell_1 \chi_1 \ (\chi_1 \xrightarrow{slow} \chi_2 \ell_2)$, from models with gauged lepton number, possibly lepton-flavour non-universal

- For explicit relevant models, see eg <u>https://arxiv.org/pdf/2205.04473.pdf</u> and <u>https://arxiv.org/pdf/2105.06918.pdf</u>
- <u>Late-appearing leptons</u>



Soft stuff

- Ultra-slow particles, out-of-time decays with a peaked in-time signal
 - eg heavy mediator A, with $pp \rightarrow A \rightarrow \varphi \varphi$, $pt(A) \ll m_A$, $m_A \approx 2m_\varphi$
 - decay driven by interaction with the oscillating vev of a bkg scalar (see eg <u>https://</u> <u>arxiv.org/abs/2007.03662</u>)

High multiplicity, low-energy, heavy flavour

- See eg https://arxiv.org/pdf/1902.05535.pdf for models' framework
- Typically beyond sensitivity of current triggers
- <u>Large multiplicity of soft b-jets</u> (n>5), eg from multiple associate production of $Z' \rightarrow bb$
- <u>Multiple soft taus</u> , with charge tagging and sensitivity to $\tau^+ \tau^+ \tau^+ vs \tau^+ \tau^+ \tau$

