Disorder at the LHC

Matthew Low

Institute for Advanced Study

in progress with

Raffaele Tito D'Agnolo

Motivation

▶ Why haven't we seen anything at the LHC?

Motivation

- ▶ Why haven't we seen anything at the LHC?
 - ▶ *Possibility 1:* There is nothing to see.



Motivation

- ▶ Why haven't we seen anything at the LHC?
 - ▶ *Possibility 1:* There is nothing to see.



▶ *Possibility 2:* There are too many new particles.



Disorder at the LHC

Large N

 \blacktriangleright Consider N new states



• With $\mathcal{L}_{int} = hy\bar{\psi}_i\psi_i$



For perturbativity



Production rate can still be sizable



$$\sigma_{\rm tot} \sim \sum_{i=1}^{N} y^2 \sigma_h \sim (Ny^2) \sigma_h$$

Large N

►

out of reach

▶ Perhaps only the bottom of the spectrum is accessible

$$\sigma_{\rm acc} \sim y^2 \sigma_h \sim \frac{1}{N} \sigma_h$$



▶ Contribution to invisible Higgs width reduced

$$\Gamma_{\rm inv} \sim \frac{y^2}{y_b^2} \Gamma_{bb} \sim \frac{1}{N} \Gamma_{bb}$$

(given couplings among new sector)

- **Heavy** states lead to cascade decays
 - Many low p_T final state particles
 - Diffuse signal, hard for triggers
- **Light** states have short decay chains
 - Little visible and little missing energy
 - ▶ Hard to extract from backgrounds



Toy Model

• Consider a toy model with two accessible real scalars ϕ_1 and ϕ_2



$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} = (y_1\phi_1^2 + y_{12}\phi_1\phi_2 + y_2\phi_2^2)|H|^2$$



▶ Decays to ϕ_1 and offshell Higgs



► Have $pp \to \phi_2 \phi_2 \to (\phi_1 b \bar{b})(\phi_1 b \bar{b})$ $\to 4b + \not\!\!\! E_T$

• Consider N real scalars ϕ_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$

$$\mathcal{L} \supset rac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi_i \partial^\mu \phi_i - rac{m_{ij}^2}{2} \phi_i \phi_j - oldsymbol{\lambda_{ijkl}} \phi_i \phi_j \phi_k \phi_l$$

▶ Let the mass term be randomly-determined

$$m^{2} = \begin{pmatrix} m_{11}^{2} & m_{12}^{2} & \cdots & m_{1N}^{2} \\ m_{21}^{2} & m_{22}^{2} & \cdots & m_{2N}^{2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \\ m_{N1}^{2} & m_{N2}^{2} & & m_{NN}^{2} \end{pmatrix}$$

• Example 1: $m_{ij}^2 = 0$ for $i \neq j$.

$$m^{2} = \begin{pmatrix} m_{1}^{2} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & m_{2}^{2} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \\ 0 & 0 & & m_{N}^{2} \end{pmatrix}$$

Matthew Low (IAS)

• Example 1:
$$m_{ij}^2 = 0$$
 for $i \neq j$.

$$m^2 = \left(\begin{array}{cccc} m_1^2 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & m_2^2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & m_N^2 \end{array} \right)$$



▶ Spectrum can be shifted by non-zero mean μ

- ► Example 2: Anderson localization
 - Nearest neighbor structure to mass matrix
 - Randomness in diagonal terms, ϵ_i

Mass spectrum



► Example 3: Fully-populated m_{ij}^2 drawn from $Gaus(\mu = 0, \sigma)$

$$m^{2} = \begin{pmatrix} 29.9 & 19.2 & 3.5 & -1.3 \\ 19.2 & 27.6 & -31.5 & -14.7 \\ 3.5 & -31.5 & 19.1 & 14.4 \\ -1.3 & -14.7 & 14.4 & -9.6 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\lambda = 65.6, 31.2, -15.8, -13.9$$



 \blacktriangleright In large N limit, distribution goes to Wigner semicircle

- ▶ Wigner semicircle distribution
 - Distributions has endpoints at $\pm \sqrt{2N}\sigma$
 - \blacktriangleright Non-zero μ does not shift spectrum

$$\lambda_N \sim N\mu$$

 $\lambda_i \in (-\sqrt{2N\sigma}, \sqrt{2N\sigma})$ $i = 1, \dots, N-1$



- ▶ Wigner semicircle distribution
 - Distributions has endpoints at $\pm \sqrt{2N}\sigma$
 - \blacktriangleright Non-zero μ does not shift spectrum

 $\lambda_N \sim N\mu$ $\lambda_i \in (-\sqrt{2N\sigma}, \sqrt{2N\sigma})$ $i = 1, \dots, N-1$

• Consider $\mu \gg \sigma$, matrix is approximately constant

 $\lambda_N \approx N\mu$ trace = $\sum \lambda_i = N\mu$

$$\lambda_i \approx 0$$
 $i = 1, \dots, N-1$



- ▶ Wigner semicircle distribution
 - Distributions has endpoints at $\pm \sqrt{2N}\sigma$
 - \blacktriangleright Non-zero μ does not shift spectrum

 $\lambda_N \sim N\mu$ $\lambda_i \in (-\sqrt{2N\sigma}, \sqrt{2N\sigma})$ $i = 1, \dots, N-1$

• Consider $\mu \gg \sigma$, matrix is approximately constant

 $\lambda_N \approx N\mu$ trace = $\sum \lambda_i = N\mu$

$$\lambda_i \approx 0$$
 $i = 1, \dots, N-1$

- \blacktriangleright Wigner distribution still holds for general μ and σ
 - ▶ A model with σ and μ independent could yield light states



Disorder at the LHC

Possible portals (assuming no light mediators)

$$\phi |H|^2 \qquad \phi^2 |H|^2 \qquad LH\psi$$

▶ We use the following model

$$\mathcal{L} \supset -\frac{1}{2}m_{ij}^2\phi_i\phi_j - \frac{\lambda_{ijkl}\phi_i\phi_j\phi_k\phi_l}{\lambda_{Hij}}|H|^2\phi_i\phi_j$$

▶ For simplicity, for all scalars, take

$$\lambda_{ijkl} = \frac{1}{N} \qquad \lambda_{Hij} = \frac{1}{N}$$

- ▶ For simplicity, take masses uniformly distributed
- Lightest scalar, ϕ_1 , is stable

▶ We use the following model

$$\mathcal{L} \supset -rac{1}{2}m_{ij}^2\phi_i\phi_j - \lambda_{ijkl}\phi_i\phi_j\phi_k\phi_l - \lambda_{Hij}|H|^2\phi_i\phi_j$$

Production from gluon fusion



Decays within scalar sector and via offshell Higgs



▶ When heavy scalars are produced, they cascade down through the scalar sector



- Maximum height of tree $\sim \log N$
- Maximum final state particles $\sim N$
- ▶ In practice, spectrum-dependent



• Number of particles in ϕ_N decay (spectrum A)



• Number of particles in ϕ_N decay (spectrum B)



Outlook

- New sectors are plausible new physics scenarios
- ▶ Have a large N number of new particles does not mean it is necessarily easy to observe
- ▶ Can disorder answer any other interesting questions in model building?

