Discussion

What light particles can couple to SM?

New particles <~GeV must couple to SM neutral operators

 $\phi H^{\dagger}H$ Scalar ϕ mix w/ Higgs (similar for pseudo)



 $F'_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$ Vector A' mix w/ photon $A'_{\mu}J^{\mu}_{\rm EM}$

 $V_{\mu}J_{\rm SM}^{\mu} \qquad \begin{array}{l} \text{Vector V anomaly free U(1)} \\ B-L \ , \ L_i - L_j \ , \ B-3L_i \end{array} \qquad V_{\mu}J_{\rm SM}^{\mu}$

 ϵNHL New lepton mix w/ neutrinos $N \nu_L$

Complete List of lowest dimensionality super renormalizable couplings

New Particle Decays to SM: LLP @ Beam Dumps

Procedure to probe for Dark Photon, Scalar, Vector and Neutrino portals



New Particle Decays to DM: Scatter @ Beam Dumps



Rate $\propto g_{\rm SM}^4$



Relevant Experiments

Signal: Energy in detector

SHiP: proton Beam Dump Facility NA62(++): proton beam (dump mode) REDTOP: proton beam

Signal: Energy of the beam

LDMX: electron beam / muon beam NA64(++): electron/muon beam

Keep an eye out for Flavour Physics, particularly pertinent given current Flavour anomalies. SPS ideal playground TauFV: proton Beam Dump Facility KLEVER: proton beam NA62(++): proton beam

International Complementarity

Belle II LHCb(+UpgradeII) FASER, Codex-b, MATHUSLA DUNE/LBNF SBN BDX T2K JSNS**2 MiniBoone SeaQuest/(DarkQuest?)

Broad search for new forces (pseudo) scalar, vector

Scenarios related to vMSM

- Low Scale Leptogenesis HNL search
- Origin of neutrino masses
- ν MSM also contains non thermal DM candidate (indirect detection)

Light physics related to hierarchy problem (relaxion)

Scope of Fixed Target BSM Program: Invisible Decays

Covers nearly all predictive direct-annihilation models < GeV



Scalar Ruled out



Dark photon



Anomaly free U(1) *B-L, B-3Le* ... etc.

Thermal coverage: LDMX, SHiP, MiniBooNE...

Also with muon/tau flavor couplings (need muon beam LDMX/NA64)

Only one anomaly free U(1) group $L_{\mu} - L_{\tau}$

 $\mu, au,
u_{\mu},
u_{ au}$

What is the connection to Future Collider programme at CERN?

What is the optimal use of facilities in light of the international effort of broadening our strategies?

(why CERN vs SLAC vs FNAL vs...)

How are these approaches complementary to Direct or Indirect Detection, Collider (including B-factories) searches etc?

Case Study 1

We first see a signal at existing/near future experiments (eg. FASER, NA62, SENSEI...)

What do SHiP, LDMX, NA64++... uniquely bring to the table?

Case Study 2

We first see signal at **SHiP or LDMX**

How can one experiment confirm/uncover model behind signature of another?

How can other techniques help?

How can experiments best confirm that a potential signal is not an instrumental effect or unaccounted background?



Experimental aspects

- Looking for very rare signatures requiring background suppression of multiple orders of magnitudes
- Need to be able to validate understanding of residual backgrounds or instrumental effects
- Can achieve this through the use of redundant systems to define control regions in data.

Example from SHiP

1 Combination of momentum and vertex information to reject candidates not originating from collision point



- 2 Combine with veto subsystems
 - \triangleright Surrounding the decay vessel
 - ▷ At the entrance of the decay vessel
 - \triangleright Backgrounds leave multiple hits in veto systems \rightarrow very effective vetos
- 3 Add timing information between candidate tracks (σ =100 ps)

Complementarity

- Comprehensive coverage of Hidden Sector models
 - Without a smoking gun, need to probe multitude of potential sectors with maximum coverage
- Wide range of couplings and mass
 - Multiple experiments to maximise coverage
- Variety of approaches
 - Different techniques to search for same physics
- SHiP and LDMX approaches satisfy these
 - Important to consider interplay with Direct DM searches, LHC, B-factories...

Classify DM by Annihilation During CMB Era



Rules out s-wave relic cross section for DM < 10 GeV

Classify DM by Annihilation During CMB Era $\mathcal{L} \supset g_D A'_\mu J^\mu_\gamma$ all annihilate away pre-CMB $\overline{\chi}$ no more **annihilation** partners $J^{\mu}_{\chi} = \begin{cases} \overline{\chi} \gamma^{\mu} \chi & \text{Asym. Dirac} \\ \overline{\chi}_{1} \gamma^{\mu} \chi_{2} & \text{Pseudo} - \text{Dirac} \\ \frac{1}{2} \overline{\chi} \gamma^{\mu} \gamma^{5} \chi & \text{Majorana} \\ i \chi^{*} \partial_{\mu} \chi & \text{Scalar} \end{cases}$ Heavier χ_2 decays pre-CMB no more **coannihilation** partners $\sigma v \propto v^2$ velocity redshifts tiny annihilation rate at CMB

Safe models require either:

P-wave annihilation Scalar or Majorana **Different DM population @ CMB** Asymmetric Dirac or Pseudo-Dirac

Higgs Portal Direct-Annihilation Ruled Out!



Conclusion independent of DM candidate Similar situation for pseudo-scalar mediator

GK arXiv:1512.04119

Higgs Portal Secluded-Annihilation OK



Comprehensive Coverage: Other Viable Mediators



Test of other direct-annihilation models

Berlin, Blinov GK, Schuster, Toro arXiv: 1807.01730

Predictive Direct Annihilation Targets



Scalar Ruled out



Dark photon



Anomaly free U(1) *B-L*, *B-3Le* ... etc.

Thermal coverage: LDMX, BDX, MiniBooNE, SENSEI, Super-CDMS, Belle II

Also with muon/tau flavor couplings (need muon beam LDMX/NA64)

Only one anomaly free U(1) group $L_{\mu} - L_{\tau}$

Z' $\mu, au,
u_{\mu},
u_{ au}$

Physics performance: visible decays



[1504.04956, 1504.04855, 1811.00930, 1901.09966]

from top left: HNL (heavy meson decays), dark photon (decays + bremsstrahlung + QCD), scalar (*K* and *B* decays), ALPs coupled to fermions, ALPs coupled to photons

event selection: high signal efficiency + redundant BG suppression

11/12

E. Gaverini's talk

Thermal Targets Down Around Near Resonance





Comprehensive Coverage: Other Viable Mediators



Test of other direct-annihilation models

Berlin, Blinov GK, Schuster, Toro arXiv: 1807.01730