

New physics searches with the ILD detector at the ILC

Mikael Berggren¹

on behalf of the ILD concept group

¹DESY, Hamburg

EPS-HEP2021, Online, July, 2021




CLUSTER OF EXCELLENCE
QUANTUM UNIVERSE



The ILC strong points for searches

- e^+e^- collider with $E_{CMS} = 250 - 500$ (- 1000) GeV, and **polarised beams**
- e^+e^- means EW-production \Rightarrow **Low background**.
 - Detectors w/ $\sim 4\pi$ **coverage**.
 - Rad. hardness not needed: only **few % X_0** in front of calorimeters.
 - **No trigger**
- e^+e^- means colliding point-like objects \Rightarrow **initial state known**
- 20 year running $\rightarrow 2 \text{ ab}^{-1}$ @ 250 GeV, **4 ab^{-1} @ 500 GeV**.
- Construction under **political consideration** in Japan.




The ILD concept (arXiv:2003.01116)

Physics requirements, SM and BSM:

- $\sigma(1/p_{\perp}) = 2 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$
- JER $\sim 3\text{-}4\%$
- $\sigma(d_0) < 5\mu$
- particle Id (PID)
- hermeticity down to 5 mrad
- triggerless operation.

Leads to key features of the detector:

- low mass tracker with PID:
 - Main device: TPC
 - Enhanced by silicon
- High granularity calorimeters optimised for particle flow
- Power-pulsing.



BSM at ILC

In this short talk: Concentrating on

- **SUSY:**
 - *The* most complete theory of BSM.
 - Serves as a boiler-plate for BSM: almost any new topology can be obtained in SUSY...
 - Most studied model with serious simulation: In most cases, full simulation of ILD, with all SM backgrounds, all beam-induced backgrounds included.
 - Under some **stress(?)** by LHC. However, ILC offers
 - Loop-hole free searches.
 - Complete coverage of Compressed spectra - the most interesting case.
- + One slide on non-SUSY BSMs...

BSM at ILC

In this short talk: Concentrating on

- **SUSY:**
 - *The* most complete theory of BSM.
 - Serves as a boiler-plate for BSM: almost any new topology can be obtained in SUSY...
 - Most studied model with serious simulation: In most cases, full simulation of ILD, with all SM backgrounds, all beam-induced backgrounds included.
 - Under some **stress(?)** by LHC. However, ILC offers
 - Loop-hole free searches.
 - Complete coverage of Compressed spectra - the most interesting case.
- + One slide on non-SUSY BSMs...

BSM at ILC

In this short talk: Concentrating on

- **SUSY:**
 - *The* most complete theory of BSM.
 - Serves as a boiler-plate for BSM: almost any new topology can be obtained in SUSY...
 - Most studied model with serious simulation: In most cases, full simulation of ILD, with all SM backgrounds, all beam-induced backgrounds included.
 - Under some **stress(?)** by LHC. However, ILC offers
 - Loop-hole free searches.
 - Complete coverage of Compressed spectra - the most interesting case.
- + One slide on non-SUSY BSMs...

SUSY: What *do* we know ?

Naturalness, hierarchy, DM, g-2 all prefer **light electroweak** sector.

- Except for 3rd gen. squarks, **the coloured sector doesn't enter the game.**

- If the LSP is higgsino: *Natural SUSY*:

- $m_Z^2 = 2 \frac{m_{H_u}^2 \tan^2 \beta - m_{H_d}^2}{1 - \tan^2 \beta} - 2 |\mu|^2$

- \Rightarrow Low fine-tuning $\Rightarrow \mu = \mathcal{O}(m_Z)$

- Wino LSP: EW sector also “compressed”.
Only bino-LSP can have large $\Delta(M)$.
- So, most sparticle-decays are **via cascades**, with small $\Delta(M)$ at the end.
- For this, current LHC limits are for specific models. **LEP2** sets the scene.
- Same goes for sleptons in general, and the $\tilde{\tau}$ in particular.

SUSY: What *do* we know ?

Naturalness, hierarchy, DM, g-2 all prefer **light electroweak** sector.

- Except for 3rd gen. squarks, **the coloured sector doesn't enter the game.**



- If the LSP is higgsino: *Natural SUSY*:

- $m_Z^2 = 2 \frac{m_{H_u}^2 \tan^2 \beta - m_{H_d}^2}{1 - \tan^2 \beta} - 2 |\mu|^2$
- \Rightarrow Low fine-tuning $\Rightarrow \mu = \mathcal{O}(m_Z)$

- Wino LSP: EW sector also “compressed”. Only bino-LSP can have large $\Delta(M)$.

- So, most sparticle-decays are **via cascades**, with small $\Delta(M)$ at the end.

- For this, current LHC limits are for specific models. LEP2 sets the scene.
- Same goes for sleptons in general, and the $\tilde{\tau}$ in particular.



SUSY: What do we know ?

Naturalness, hierarchy, DM, g-2 all prefer **light electroweak** sector.

- Except for 3rd gen. squarks, **the coloured sector doesn't enter the game.**

- If the LSP is higgsino: *Natural SUSY*:



- $m_Z^2 = 2 \frac{m_{H_u}^2 \tan^2 \beta - m_{H_d}^2}{1 - \tan^2 \beta} - 2 |\mu|^2$
- \Rightarrow Low fine-tuning $\Rightarrow \mu = \mathcal{O}(m_Z)$

- Wino LSP: EW sector also “compressed”. Only bino-LSP can have large $\Delta(M)$.

- So, most sparticle-decays are **via cascades**, with small $\Delta(M)$ at the end.


- For this, current LHC limits are for specific models. **LEP2** sets the scene.

- Same goes for sleptons in general, and the $\tilde{\tau}$ in particular.




Why compressed spectra ? Global fits

pMSSM11 fit by **Mastercode** to
LHC13/LEP/g-2/DM(=100% LSP)/precision observables
(arXiv:1710.11091):



Why compressed spectra ? Global fits

pMSSM11 fit by **Mastercode** to
LHC13/LEP/g-2/DM(=100% LSP)/precision observables
(arXiv:1710.11091):




Low $\Delta(M)$!

Sparticle Mass-spectrum

Why compressed spectra ? Global fits


pMSSM11 fit by **Mastercode** to
LHC13/LEP/g-2/DM(=100% LSP)/precision observables
(arXiv:1710.11091):



$M_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm} - M_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$ plane

Why compressed spectra ? Global fits

pMSSM11 fit by **Mastercode** to
LHC13/LEP/g-2/DM(=100% LSP)/precision observables
(arXiv:1710.11091):




Low $\Delta(M)$!

$M_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm} - M_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$ plane

SUSY@ILC: Loop-hole free searches

- All is **known** for given masses, due to SUSY-principle: “sparticles couples as particles”.
- This doesn't depend on the SUSY *breaking mechanism* !
- Obviously: There is **one** NLSP, and it **must have 100 % BR** to it's SM-partner and the LSP.




SUSY@ILC: Loop-hole free searches

- All is **known** for given masses, due to SUSY-principle: “sparticles couples as particles”.
- This doesn't depend on the SUSY *breaking mechanism* !
- Obviously: There is **one** NLSP, and it **must** have 100 % BR to it's SM-partner and the LSP.

So, at ILC :

- Model **independent** exclusion/ discovery reach in $M_{NLSP} - M_{LSP}$ plane.
- Repeat for **all** NLSP:s.
- Cover entire parameter-space in a few plots
- **No fine-print!**




SUSY@ILC: Loop-hole free searches

- All is **known** for given masses, due to SUSY-principle: “sparticles couples as particles”.
- This doesn't depend on the SUSY *breaking mechanism* !
- Obviously: There is **one** NLSP, and it **must** have 100 % BR to it's SM-partner and the LSP.



So, at ILC :

- Model **independent** exclusion/ discovery reach in $M_{NLSP} - M_{LSP}$ plane.
- Repeat for **all** NLSP:s.
- Cover entire parameter-space in a few plots
- **No fine-print!**



ILC projection for Higgsino or $\tilde{\tau}$ NLSP


From arXiv:2002.01239



From arXiv:2105.08616


ILC projection for Higgsino or $\tilde{\tau}$ NLSP

From arXiv:2002.01239



Note:

Discovery and Exclusion are almost the same !



From arXiv:2105.08616

At ILC: discovery in a week...

ILD fast detector simulation studies: Selectrons in a co-annihilation model (EPJC 76,183 (2016)), after:

- $5 \text{ fb}^{-1} \approx 1 \text{ week}$

and

- $500 \text{ fb}^{-1} \approx 2 \text{ years.}$

Will never be in “3 σ limbo” !

At ILC: discovery in a week...


ILD fast detector simulation studies: Selectrons in a co-annihilation model (EPJC 76,183 (2016)), after:

- $5 \text{ fb}^{-1} \approx 1 \text{ week}$

and

- $500 \text{ fb}^{-1} \approx 2 \text{ years.}$

Will never be in “ 3σ limbo” !



At ILC: discovery in a week...


ILD fast detector simulation studies: Selectrons in a co-annihilation model (EPJC 76,183 (2016)), after:

- $5 \text{ fb}^{-1} \approx 1 \text{ week}$

and

- $500 \text{ fb}^{-1} \approx 2 \text{ years.}$

Will never be in “3 σ limbo” !



At ILC: discovery in a week...


ILD fast detector simulation studies: Selectrons in a co-annihilation model (EPJC 76,183 (2016)), after:

- $5 \text{ fb}^{-1} \approx 1 \text{ week}$

and

- $500 \text{ fb}^{-1} \approx 2 \text{ years.}$



Will never be in “3 σ limbo” !



ILC = the LEP of SUSY

ILD detector simulation studies:



- Typical slepton signal ($\tilde{\tau}$ and $\tilde{\mu}$), in a co-annihilation model (FastSim). (EPJC 76,183 (2016))
- Typical chargino signal...
- ... and typical neutralino signal, higgsino-LSP model, with moderate ΔM (FullSim) (Phys Rev D 101,095026 (2020))
- Typical chargino/neutralino signal, higgsino-LSP model, with very low ΔM (Fast/FullSim). (EPJC 73,2660 (2013))



ILC = the LEP of SUSY

ILD detector simulation studies:



- Typical slepton signal ($\tilde{\tau}$ and $\tilde{\mu}$), in a co-annihilation model (FastSim). (EPJC 76,183 (2016))
- Typical chargino signal...
- ... and typical neutralino signal, higgsino-LSP model, with moderate ΔM (FullSim) (Phys Rev D 101,095026 (2020))
- Typical chargino/neutralino signal, higgsino-LSP model, with very low ΔM (Fast/FullSim). (EPJC 73,2660 (2013))



ILC = the LEP of SUSY

ILD detector simulation studies:



- Typical slepton signal ($\tilde{\tau}$ and $\tilde{\mu}$), in a co-annihilation model (FastSim). (EPJC 76,183 (2016))
- Typical chargino signal...
- ... and typical neutralino signal, higgsino-LSP model, with moderate ΔM (FullSim) (Phys Rev D 101,095026 (2020))
- Typical chargino/neutralino signal, higgsino-LSP model, with very low ΔM (Fast/FullSim). (EPJC 73,2660 (2013))



ILC = the LEP of SUSY

ILD detector simulation studies:

- Typical slepton signal ($\tilde{\tau}$ and $\tilde{\mu}$), in a co-annihilation model (FastSim). (EPJC 76,183 (2016))
- Typical chargino signal...
- ... and typical neutralino signal, higgsino-LSP model, with moderate ΔM (FullSim) (Phys Rev D 101,095026 (2020))
- Typical chargino/neutralino signal, higgsino-LSP model, with very low ΔM (Fast/FullSim). (EPJC 73,2660 (2013))



ILC = the LEP of SUSY

ILD detector simulation studies:



- Typical slepton signal ($\tilde{\tau}$ and $\tilde{\mu}$), in a co-annihilation model (FastSim). (EPJC 73,2660 (2013))


- Typical chargino/neutralino signal, higgsino-LSP model, with moderate ΔM (FastSim).

- ... and typical $\tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_2^0$ signal, higgsino-LSP model, with moderate ΔM (FastSim).
- In all cases:
- SUSY masses to sub-percent
 - Cross-sections to few percent
 - Also: Branching fractions, mixing angles, sparticle spin ...

- Typical chargino/neutralino signal, higgsino-LSP model, with very low ΔM (Fast/FullSim).

(EPJC 73,2660 (2013))








12/14


Other BSM: a gallery

DM from mono- γ (light mediator)




DM from $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma \chi \bar{\chi}$
(Phys. Rev. D 101,
075053 (2020))

Other BSM: a gallery



SMEFT model separation




(Phys. Rev. D 97, 0535003 (2018))



Other BSM: a gallery

SMEFT model separation

(Phys. Rev. D 97, 0535003 (2018))

DM from π 

DM from π
(Phys. Rev. D 101,
075053 (2020))

New scalar as peak in recoil-mass

(arXiv:2005.06265)

Conclusions

- Sometimes, the capabilities for the **direct discovery** of new particles at the ILC **exceed** those of the LHC, since ILC provides
 - Well-defined **initial state**
 - **Clean environment** without QCD backgrounds
 - **Extendability** in energy and **polarised beams**
 - Detectors like **ILD**, factors more precise, **hermetic**, and with **no need** for triggering
- Many **ILC - LHC synergies** from energy-reach vs. sensitivity.
 - SUSY: High mass vs. Low $\Delta(M)$. If SUSY is reachable at ILC, it means 5σ discovery, and precision measurements. This input might be just what is needed for LHC to transform a 3σ excess to a discovery of states beyond the reach of ILC.
 - Dark matter, FIPS, ...: Leptophilic vs. Leptophobic - Higher mass and higher coupling vs. lower mass and lower coupling.

Conclusions

- Sometimes, the capabilities for the **direct discovery** of new particles at the ILC **exceed** those of the LHC, since ILC provides
 - Well-defined **initial state**
 - **Clean environment** without QCD backgrounds
 - **Extendability** in energy and **polarised beams**
 - Detectors like **ILD**, factors more precise, **hermetic**, and with **no need** for triggering
- Many **ILC - LHC synergies** from energy-reach vs. sensitivity.
 - **SUSY**: High mass vs. Low $\Delta(M)$. If **SUSY** is reachable at ILC, it means 5σ discovery, and precision measurements. This input might be just what is needed for LHC to transform a 3σ excess to a discovery of states beyond the reach of ILC.
 - **Dark matter, FIPS, ...**: Leptophilic vs. Leptophobic - Higher mass and higher coupling vs. lower mass and lower coupling.


Thank You !

Backup

BACKUP SLIDES

Only WIMPs

- What if this is the **only accessible NP** ?
- Search for direct WIMP pair-production at collider : Need to **make the invisible visible**:
 - Require initial state radiation which will recoil against “nothing” \Rightarrow **Mono-X** search.
 - At ILC: $e^+e^- \rightarrow \chi\chi\gamma$, ie. **X** is a γ



- ILC simulation studies: arXiv:1206.6639v1, A. Chaus, Thesis, M. Habermehl, Thesis, in preparation.
- Model-independent **Effective operator approach** to “?”
 - Analyse as an effective four-point interaction. Strength = Λ .
 - Allowable if direct observation the mediator is beyond reach. Mostly true at ILC, but not at LHC !
 - Write down all possible Lorentz-structures of the operators.
 - Exclusion regions in M_χ/Λ plane, for each operator.



ILC and LHC exclusion

- Examples:
 - Vector operator (“spin independent”), Note how useful **beam-polarisation** is!
- At LHC, EffOp can't be used
 \Rightarrow use “simplified models”
- Need to translate Λ to M_{med} :

$$M_{med} = \sqrt{g_{SM}g_{DM}}\Lambda$$

ILC/LHC complementarity


- LHC: coupling to **hadrons**,
 ILC: coupling to **leptons**.
- LHC has best M_χ reach, ILC best M_{med} reach



Aspects of the spectrum

Another angle: $\Delta(M)$ for $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ vs. that of $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$: Important experimentally


- Three regions:
 - Bino: Both the same, but can be anything.
 - Wino: $\Delta_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}$ small, while $\Delta_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0}$ can be anything.
 - Higgsino: Both often small
- But note, seldom on the “Higgsino line”, ie. when the chargino is *exactly* in the middle of mass-gap between the first and second neutralino.



Aspects of the spectrum

Another angle: $\Delta(M)$ for $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ vs. that of $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$: Important experimentally


- Three regions:
 - Bino: Both the same, but can be anything.
 - Wino: $\Delta_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}$ small, while $\Delta_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0}$ can be anything.
 - Higgsino: Both often small
- But note, **seldom on the “Higgsino line”**, ie. when the chargino is *exactly* in the middle of mass-gap between the first and second neutralino.



Aspects of the spectrum


Another angle: $\Delta(M)$ for $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$ vs. that of $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$: Important experimentally

- Three regions:
 - Bino: Both the same, but can be anything.
 - Wino: $\Delta_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}$ small, while $\Delta_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0}$ can be anything.
 - Higgsino: Both often small
- But note, **seldom on the “Higgsino line”**, ie. when the chargino is *exactly* in the middle of mass-gap between the first and second neutralino.




Key element for “Disappearing tracks”: $\Delta(M)$

- Higgsino LSP.
- Zoom in. The line is the absolute limit mentioned in the BB.
- Reason: 1703.09675 considers *only SM* effects on the mass-splitting, ie. that M_1 and $M_2 \gg \mu$
- Same for Wino LSP.




Key element for “Disappearing tracks”: $\Delta(M)$

- Higgsino LSP.
- Zoom in. The line is the absolute limit mentioned in the BB.
- Reason: 1703.09675 considers *only SM* effects on the mass-splitting, ie. that M_1 and $M_2 \gg \mu$
- Same for Wino LSP.




Key element for “Disappearing tracks”: $\Delta(M)$

- Higgsino LSP.
- Zoom in. The line is the absolute limit mentioned in the BB.
- Reason: 1703.09675 considers *only SM* effects on the mass-splitting, ie. that M_1 and $M_2 \gg \mu$
- Same for Wino LSP.



Key element for “Disappearing tracks”: $\Delta(M)$


- Higgsino LSP.
- Zoom in. The line is the absolute limit mentioned in the BB.
- Reason: 1703.09675 considers *only SM* effects on the mass-splitting, ie. that M_1 and $M_2 \gg \mu$
- Same for Wino LSP.



Bino LSP: BRs

Why is the decay-mode an issue? Here's why :


- Vary relative signs of μ , M_1 , and M_2
- For $\mu > M_2$
- or $\mu < M_2$
- Conclusion: Whether the Z or the H decay-mode of $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ dominates is **pure speculation** and
- The exclusion-region is the **intersection** of the two plots, not the **union**!



Bino LSP: BRs

Why is the decay-mode an issue? Here's why :


- Vary relative signs of μ , M_1 , and M_2
- For $\mu > M_2$
- or $\mu < M_2$
- Conclusion: Whether the Z or the H decay-mode of $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ dominates is **pure speculation** and
- The exclusion-region is the **intersection** of the two plots, not the **union**!



Bino LSP: BRs

Why is the decay-mode an issue? Here's why :


- Vary relative signs of μ , M_1 , and M_2
- For $\mu > M_2$
- or $\mu < M_2$
- Conclusion: Whether the Z or the H decay-mode of $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ dominates is **pure speculation** and
- The exclusion-region is the **intersection** of the two plots, not the **union**!



Bino LSP: BRs

Why is the decay-mode an issue? Here's why :


- Vary relative signs of μ , M_1 , and M_2
- For $\mu > M_2$
- or $\mu < M_2$
- Conclusion: Whether the Z or the H decay-mode of $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ dominates is **pure speculation** and
- The exclusion-region is the **intersection** of the two plots, not the **union**!



Bino LSP: BRs

Why is the decay-mode an issue? Here's why :


- Vary relative signs of μ , M_1 , and M_2
- For $\mu > M_2$
- or $\mu < M_2$
- Conclusion: Whether the Z or the H decay-mode of $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ dominates is **pure speculation** and
- The exclusion-region is the **intersection** of the two plots, not the **union**!



Bino LSP: BRs

Why is the decay-mode an issue? Here's why :


- Vary relative signs of μ , M_1 , and M_2
- For $\mu > M_2$
- or $\mu < M_2$
- Conclusion: Whether the Z or the H decay-mode of $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ dominates is **pure speculation** and
- The exclusion-region is the **intersection** of the two plots, not the **union**!



Bino LSP: BRs

Why is the decay-mode an issue? Here's why :

- Vary relative signs of μ , M_1 , and M_2
- For $\mu > M_2$
- or $\mu < M_2$
- Conclusion: Whether the Z or the H decay-mode of $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ dominates is **pure speculation** and
- The exclusion-region is the **intersection** of the two plots, not the **union**!



Bino LSP: BRs

Why is the decay-mode an issue? Here's why :

- Vary relative signs of μ , M_1 , and M_2
- For $\mu > M_2$
- or $\mu < M_2$
- Conclusion: Whether the Z or the H decay-mode of $\tilde{\chi}_2^0$ dominates is **pure speculation** and
- The exclusion-region is the **intersection** of the two plots, not the **union**!

