



بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

∞∞∞∞

تم رفع هذه الرسالة بواسطة / حسام الدين محمد مغربي

بقسم التوثيق الإلكتروني بمركز الشبكات وتكنولوجيا المعلومات دون أدنى

مسئولية عن محتوى هذه الرسالة.

ملاحظات : لا يوجد





## **A Study of BSM Physics with Leptons plus MET Final State at The LHC**

BY

**Nada Hussein Ezzelarab Hussein**

A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Women for Arts, Science and Education,  
Ain Shams University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree

Master of Science, theoretical Physics.

January, 2022

### **Supervisors:**

**Prof. Manal Mahmoud Ahmed**

**Sirag**

Prof. of theoretical Physics,

Faculty of Women for Arts, Science and  
Education, Ain Shams University

**Dr. Ahmed Ali Abdelalim**

Lecturer of High Energy Physics,

Faculty of Science, Helwan University.

## Abstract

The work presented here is based on a study expected by the minimal supersymmetric extension of the Standard model (MSSM) of  $\sqrt{s} = 14$  eV  $pp$  collisions at the LHC, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of  $139 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ . The calculation of the cross section, limits of mass and kinematic distribution for the chargino-neutralino pair production at LHC is presented. The results are compared with the latest results recorded by ATLAS and LHC at  $\sqrt{s} = 8, 13, 14$  eV in three-lepton final states. In the minimal supersymmetric extension of the SM (MSSM) the mass parameters for the bino, wino, and higgsino states represented by  $M_1$ ,  $M_2$ , and  $\mu$ . Our results depend on the nature of the chargino-neutralino pair production and its masses. In case of light higgsino like sleptons the total cross section produced is small, while for gauginos like s-quarks produced a large cross section due to the fact that gauginos are constrained by CMS and ATLAS to be heavier than 1 eV. Assuming that the lightest supersymmetric particle (LSP)  $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$  is stable with R-parity conservation, it is a well-motivated or viable dark-matter candidate. Two scenarios of chargino-neutralino pair production are considered in this search. The first scenario is Higgsino like with two conditions on the wino-bino and higgsino mass parameters  $[(M_1 < M_2 < \mu) \text{ and } (M_1 < M_2 < -\mu)]$ . The second scenario is gaugino like with two conditions on the wino-bino and higgsino mass parameters  $[(M_1 < -\mu < M_2) \text{ and } (-\mu < M_1 < M_2)]$ . Also, the effect of the sign and value of  $\mu$  on the total cross sections for higgsino and gaugino is presented. Results are graphed and tabulated. Also, mass limits are expected on  $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ .

## Introduction

Theoretical physics like all sciences based. First approach. Theoretical predictions of . The other one starts from an idea formulated as a theory, and proceeds to make predictions which then acts as a test of the theory and of its original idea. Like Supersymmetry (SUSY) which started as an idea, then now a theory.

In physics of high energy, we hope of all

. Supersymmetric carriers), and the interactions between them.

to unify gravity with other interactions, but they fail to describe our real world. So we are hoping. Since gravity is a long range force and not strong enough at short distances, so it is an elusive goal of Unification of gravity with other forces. The exchange of particles in the strong, electromagnetic and weak interactions could be described by a quantum field theory, which is a locally gauge invariant.

The strength called Planck's energy. It can be estimated from his expression

Where  $\hbar, c, G$ , are nature constants. A point particle with Planck mass would have a Schwarzschild radius equal to twice its Compton wavelength. effects over a vast range ( proton decay

can describe all these. This must happen at energies of  $10^{15} \text{ GeV}$ , means four orders of magnitude less than  $E_{\text{Planck}}$ . *Grand*. The goal, even if it could unify them with each other. One of the motivations

this thesis ( $P_T^{\text{miss}}$ , of magnitude  $E_T^{\text{miss}}$ ). The search uses expected data for proton-proton at the CERN Large Hadron Collider mass energy  $\sqrt{s} = 14 \text{ eV}$  corresponding to an integrated

# Cheaper (1)

## Standard Model

### Standard Model of Electroweak Interactions

The invention of renormalization theories of electroweak interactions is actually one of elementary particle physics. The first of his theory of Glashow, Weinberg and Salam (**GWS**) known constructed a model for the weak and electromagnetic interactions of leptons which was based on the theory introduced “by hand”, *ad hoc*, the model was unrenormalizable. In 1967- and Salam constructed the  $SU(2) \times U(1)$  model of electroweak interactions of leptons including a gauge symmetry. In 1971-1972 it was proved using the mechanism proposed by Glashow, Iliopoulos, and Maiani.

The *GWS* theory is the fermions (and quarks), a local  $SU(2) \times U(1)$  gauge invariance (broken by the Higgs scalar fields with the gauge vector bosons and, is introduced. As a result of the gauge bosons all acquire masses.

The parameter, which enters in the definition of the neutral current in the *GWS* theory, is  $\sin^2\theta_W$  (where  $\theta_W$  is the weak angle)

Neutral currents were discovered at CERN in 1973 in an experiment using the large bubble chamber “Gargamelle”. In the process  $\overline{\nu}_\mu + e \rightarrow \nu_\mu + e$  was observed. After the pioneering work of the “Gargamelle”, a number of other experiments were done and the unique solution is in agreement with the *GWS* theory.

In 1980-1981, in experiments on the cross sections of the process  $e^+ + e^- \rightarrow l^+ + l^-$  ( $l = e, \mu, \tau$ ). These data also *sanard electroweak model*.

The *GWS* theory predicts the values of the charged ( $W$ ) and neutral ( $Z$ ) intermediate boson masses, namely,  $m_W \sim 80 \text{ GeV}$

At the *CERN*  $p\bar{p}$  collider, with exactly the predicted masses, was a dramatic confirmation of the *GWS theory*.

## Gauge Local Invariance

The concept of gauge invariance [1] grew out of the observation that a “charge” (e.g. electric charge) “transformations  $\psi \rightarrow e^{iq\theta}\psi$  for all fields  $\psi$  which describe particles of charge  $q$ . depend on the space-time coordinates, i.e. if  $\theta = \text{const.}$  then, in a search for globally-invariant field theories capable of describing and classifying all charge (i.e. making them  $x$ -dependent) forces us to introduce the electromagnetic four-vector potential and, as a result, the photon. The result is quantum electrodynamics. Requiring other gauge theories which govern the interactions of particles and their effects on the distribution of the debris in high energy particle collisions (*jets*). So, in sum, “gauge”

is used exclusively for theories with local gauge invariance.

will again be an invariance,

2- “No transformation” is the identity element,

3- here is exactly

very similar. here said to differ only in “color”, hence the name quantum- by global invariance, and

## Renormaliz

*Renormalization* is in the perturbative - for physical processes. Such expansions are unfortunately the only calculation tools currently available for solving the equations of motion of which appear can be solved by redefining, in each order of the perturbative expansion, a finite number of. Other processes can be calculated uniquely to the same order. In the low energy constants and factors which are multiplied to the wave functions. Correspondingly, one the series of moments for gauge theories is their renormalizability.

A theory is called non- with negative mass dimensions (for  $\hbar = c = 1$ ) lead to non-renormalizable theories. No matter is therefore non-renormalizable.

## Quantum Electro-dynamics

Quantum Electrodynamics (*QED*) is the gauge invariant field has the standard form,[2].

$$\mathcal{L} = -\bar{\psi}(\gamma_\alpha \partial_\alpha + m)\psi$$

$$\psi(x) \rightarrow \psi'(x) = e^{i\lambda}\psi(x),$$

where  $\lambda$  is an arbitrary real Lagrangian (1.1) is not invariant with respect to the local gauge transformation

$$\psi(x) \rightarrow \psi'(x) = U(x)\psi(x)$$

where

$$U(x) = \exp\{i\lambda(x)\}$$

and where  $\lambda(x)$  is an arbitrary  $\partial_\alpha \psi(x)$  is indeed transformed under (1.3) as the field  $\psi(x)$  itself. Really, we have

$$\partial_\alpha \psi'(x) = U(x)(\partial_\alpha + i\partial_\alpha \lambda(x))\psi(x)$$

As is well known, the local gauge invariance

$$\partial_\alpha \psi \rightarrow (\partial_\alpha - ieA_\alpha)\psi$$

where

$$A'_\alpha(x) = A_\alpha(x) + \frac{1}{e}\partial_\alpha \lambda(x)$$

From (1.4) it is obvious that the Lagrangian, which follows from (1.1) by the substitution

$$\partial_\alpha \psi \rightarrow (\partial_\alpha - ieA_\alpha)\psi$$

is now invariant with respect to the gauge transformation (1.3) and (1.5).

$$F_{\alpha\beta} = \partial_\alpha A_\beta - \partial_\beta A_\alpha$$

$$\mathcal{L} = -\bar{\psi}[\gamma_\alpha(\partial_\alpha - ieA_\alpha) + m]\psi - \frac{1}{4}F_{\alpha\beta}F_{\alpha\beta}$$

The substitution  $\partial_\alpha \psi$  by the covariant derivative  $(\partial_\alpha - ieA_\alpha)\psi$  in the free Lagrangian of the field  $\psi$  leads to the following interaction Lagrangian for electrons and photons;

$$\mathcal{L}_i = iej_\alpha A_\alpha$$

where  $j_\alpha = \bar{\psi}\gamma_\alpha\psi$  is the electromagnetic current. Thus the substitution (1.6) fixes uniquely the form of the interaction Lagrangian. Such an interaction is called minimal electromagnetic interaction. It is, however, not the principle of gauge invariance alone that does it.

The Lagrangian (1.9) is the free Lagrangian which governs the interactions of electrons and photons. It is also well known that electrodynamics, with the minimal interaction (1.9), is a renormalizable theory.

### Higgs-Mechanism

The Lagrangian mass terms are introduced into the *GWS* theory via the so-called *Higgs* mechanism for the spontaneous breaking of some classical examples of spontaneous symmetry breakdown in relativistic field theory.

Consider for instance the complex scalar field  $\phi(x)$  with the Lagrangian density [3]

$$\mathcal{L} = -\partial_\alpha\phi^*\partial_\alpha\phi - V(\phi^*\phi)$$

where

$$V(\phi^*\phi) = -\mu^2\phi^*\phi + \lambda(\phi^*\phi)^2$$

and where  $\mu^2$  and  $\lambda$  are positive constants. The Hamiltonian density obtained from equation (1.27) reads:

$$\mathcal{H} = \partial_0\phi^*\phi + \nabla\phi^*\nabla\phi + V(\phi^*\phi)$$

We now look for the minimum of the energy of the system. Obviously, the Hamiltonian (1.29) is minimal at  $\phi = \text{const.}$ , a value obtained from the condition

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial\phi} = \phi^*(-\mu^2 + 2\lambda\phi^*\phi) = 0$$

$$\phi_0 = \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}e^{i\alpha}$$

where  $\alpha$  is an arbitrary phase obviously connected with the fact the Lagrangian (1.27) is invariant with respect to the global  $U(1)$  transformations



$$\phi(x) \rightarrow \phi'(x) = e^{i\lambda} \phi(x)$$

the energy minimum of the invariance of equation (1.32) is always possible to take

$$\phi_0 = \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}$$

this is the typical example of the spontaneously broken symmetry; the Lagrangian of the field  $\psi$  is invariant with respect to the global  $U(1)$  transformations, while the value of the field  $\phi$  is invariant with respect to the, while the value of the field  $\phi$ , corresponding to the minimal energy, is just one of many possible choices.

We further introduce two real fields  $\chi_1$  and  $\chi_2$  as

$$\phi = \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\chi_1 + i\chi_2)$$

It follows from equation (1.33) that the energy of the system reaches its minimum value when the fields  $\chi_1, \chi_2$  have vanishing values. Substituting (1.34) into equation (1.27), and omitting the unimportant constant  $\frac{\lambda v^4}{4}$ , we get the Lagrangian of the system in the following form:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha \chi_1 \partial_\alpha \chi_1 - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha \chi_2 \partial_\alpha \chi_2 - \frac{1}{4} \lambda (4v^2 \chi_1^2 + 4v \chi_1^3 + \chi_1^4 + 4v \chi_1 \chi_2^2 + 4\chi_1^2 \chi_2^2 + \chi_2^2)$$

It now describes the interactions of two neutral scalar fields. The mass term of the field  $\chi_1$  is

$$2\lambda v^2 \chi_1^2 = m_{\chi_1}^2 \chi_1^2$$

Consequently, in the case of quantized fields, the mass of the field quantum  $\chi_1$  equals  $m_{\chi_1} = \sqrt{2\lambda\mu} = \sqrt{2}\mu$ . There is no term quadratic in the field  $\chi_2$ . This means that the particle

of the constants  $\lambda$  and  $\mu^2$  in the Lagrangian (1.27) are positive. Consequently, the quadratic term in the field  $\phi$  appears.

Let us assume that this interaction is introduced by the substitution  $\partial_\alpha \phi \rightarrow (\partial_\alpha - igA_\alpha)\phi$  in equation (1.27)

the complete Lagrangian of the system is

$$\mathcal{L} = (\partial_\alpha + igA_\alpha)\phi^*(\partial_\alpha - igA_\alpha)\phi - V(\phi^*\phi) - \frac{1}{4}F_{\alpha\beta}F_{\alpha\beta}$$

where

$$F_{\alpha\beta} = \partial_\alpha A_\beta - \partial_\beta A_\alpha$$

The Lagrangian (1.37) is invariant with respect to the local gauge transformations

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(x) &\rightarrow \phi'(x) = e^{i\lambda(x)}\phi(x), \\ A_\alpha(x) &\rightarrow A'_\alpha(x) = A_\alpha(x) + \frac{1}{g}\partial_\alpha\lambda(x), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda(x)$  is an arbitrary

function. The energy corresponds to a value of the field  $\phi$  equal to  $\left(\frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}\right)e^{i\alpha}$  (where  $\alpha$  is a constant). Due to the gauge invariance of the Lagrangian (1.37) the “vacuum” value of the field  $\phi$  can always be taken as

$$\phi_0 = \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}$$

We shall write the field  $\phi$  in the form

$$\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v + \chi(x))e^{i\frac{\theta(x)}{v}}$$

where  $\chi(x)$  and  $\theta(x)$  are real functions of  $x$  defined so that their zero values correspond to the minimum of  $V$ .

$$\phi(x) = \frac{(v + \chi(x))}{\sqrt{2}}$$

Substituting (1.42) into the Lagrangian, we get the Lagrangian of the system under consideration in the following form

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2}\partial_\alpha\chi\partial_\alpha\chi - \frac{1}{2}g^2(v + \chi)^2A_\alpha A_\alpha - \frac{1}{4}\lambda(\chi + 2v)^2\chi^2 - \frac{1}{4}F_{\alpha\beta}F_{\alpha\beta}$$

The Lagrangian (1.43) can be written as  $\sqrt{2}\mu$ , respectively.

Before spontaneous symmetry breakdown the Lagrangian of the system contained a complex scalar field (no field).

The mechanism just discussed is called Higgs mechanism. The scalar particle, corresponding to the quantum of the field  $\chi$ , is called the Higgs particle.

We have explained the basic principles which are used in constructing models of electroweak or the detailed discussion of the standard  $SU(2) \times U(1)$  theory of *Glashow, Weinberg, and Salam*.

## Chapter (2)

### Supersymmetry

#### Motivation for Supersymmetry

Ever since its discovery in the early seventies, supersymmetry has been the focus of considerable attention. No experimental evidence for supersymmetry, its remarkable theoretical properties have provided sufficient motivation for its study.

Supersymmetry, is a novel most general (known) symmetry of the  $S$  – *matrix* consistent with *Poincaré*' invariance. It occurs in Quantum Field theory (QFT), in particular, quadratic partner of the *graviton*. QFT's exhibit a bad ultraviolet behavior, they may provide a hope of eventually obtaining a consistent quantum theory that includes gravitation. Finally, supersymmetry is an essential ingredient in the construction of the most recent candidates for a *theory of everything*, *or*, the *SUPERSRING*.

At this point, one may ask why all experiments are consistent with a gauge theory based on  $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ , with the  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  being spontaneously broken to  $U(1)_{em}$ .

In the *GWS* model, the spontaneous breakdown is brought about by the introduction of an elementary scalar field. The discovery of the  $W^\pm$  and  $Z^0$  bosons at the *CERN*  $p\bar{p}$  collider, and the hope by many theorists to be an unpleasant feature of the standard model.

the problem is the instability of the scalar particles masses under radiative corrections. For example, one-loop radiative corrections to these diverge quadratically, leading to corrections of the form:

$$\delta m^2 = O(\alpha/\pi)\Lambda^2$$

where  $\Lambda$  is a cut-off parameter representing the scale of the theory and  $\alpha = e^2/\hbar c \approx \frac{1}{137}$  is the fine structure

constant, usually referred to as “unnatural”, because the parameters have to be tuned with unusual precision in order to preserve the lightness of the Higgs mass compared to the GUT scale  $\Lambda \sim O(10^{16} \text{ GeV}/c^2)$ .

One possible solution to the problem of how to solve the problem at present energies, it does not really represent a problem to understand why the gauge principle seems to work so well at low energies.

A different approach would be to give masses to the  $W^\pm$  and  $Z^0$ , it does not account for quark and lepton masses. This led to the introduction of the yet another interaction, the extended technicolor. This appears to have

(2.1) is

$$\delta m_f = O(\alpha/\pi)m_f \ln(\Lambda/m_f)$$

Thus, massless fermions do not acquire masses via radiative corrections. This is a manifestation of the chiral symmetry. The naturalness problem arises because, unlike the case of fermions, there is no symmetry to keep massless scalars from acquiring large masses via radiative corrections.

In practice, at the one-loop level, this works because boson and fermion loops both enter the scalar correction, but with a relative minus sign. For supersymmetric theories, equation (2.1) takes the form

$$\delta m^2 \approx O(\alpha/\pi)\Lambda^2 - O(\alpha/\pi)\Lambda^2 = 0$$

Exact cancellation requires that the bosons and fermions enter with the same quantum numbers (this is ensured, maintains a relation between the couplings but breaks the mass relations, and equation (2.4) takes the form

$$\delta m^2 \approx O(\alpha/\pi) |m_B^2 - m_f^2|$$

We see from expression (1.2) and (1.5) that for supersymmetry to solve the naturalness problem,

$$|m_B^2 - m_f^2| \leq O(1\text{TeV}/c^2)^2$$

where  $m_B^2$  ( $m_f^2$ ) is the boson (fermion) to have masses  $\leq O(1\text{TeV}/c^2)$  and hope that these may show up at future LEP energies.

We emphasize that there is no one particular mass scale for supersymmetric particles (sparticles). It is only if we theories, once this value has been set, either “by hand” or by any other mechanism, radiative corrections preserve this hierarchy of scales.

### Rules of Supersymmetry

We are here to establish some of the rules of supersymmetry reamend [8].

First and foremost we postulate the *existence* of supersymmetry between fermions and bosons which should precisely, the transformations are to be represented by linear operators acting on the vector space. (the “*representation space*”) spanned by the multiplet. Finally the theory will manifest itself in the invariance of its *Lagrangian* - or rather its integral over all time, **the action** - if all the fields undergo their respective supersymmetry transformations. Because of the lack of experimental input, a large fraction of the research effort of respecting interactions.

The theoretical framework in which to construct supersymmetric models in flat space-time is quantum field theory, and it must be pointed out that *the standard concept of quantum field theory allow for related events*. As an example, consider the  $SU(3)$  gauge theory of gluons, which can be made  $\frac{1}{2}$ -particles. Such spin  $\frac{1}{2}$  partners of the gluons are called “*gluinos*”. If our models contains not only gluons but also quarks, we must also add corresponding partners for them. These have spin 0 and are commonly called “*squarks*”. (Procedures like

-force duality. After all, the wave particle duality of quantum mechanics and the subsequent question of the “exchange particle” in perturbative quantum field theory seemed to have been abolished: classical fields; fermions are seen as matter because no two identical ones can occupy the same point in space.

For some time it was thought that supersymmetry which would naturally relate forces and fermionic matter would be in conflict with which would directly relate to each other several of the  $SU(3)$  multiplets (baryon octet, decuplet, etc.) even if these had different spins. The failure of attempts. Indeed the only symmetry generators which transform all under both translations and rotations are those of the Lorentz  $m^2$  and  $l(l+1)\hbar^2$  of the mass and spin operators. This means that irreducible multiplets of symmetry groups can not contain One of the assumptions made in Coleman and Mandula’s proof did, a real phase angle  $\theta$  about which we talked earlier. The charge operators associated with such Lie groups of symmetry transformations (their generators) obey well-defined *commutation relations* with each other. Perhaps the best-known example is the set of commutators  $L_x L_y - L_y L_x \equiv [L_x, L_y] = i\hbar L_z$ , for the angular momentum operators which generate spatial rotations.

Different spins in the same multiplet are allowed if one includes symmetry operations whose generators obey *anticommutation relations* of the form  $AB + BA \equiv \{A, B\} = C$ . This was first proposed in 1971 by Gol’fand and Likhman, and followed up by Volkov and Akulov who arrived at what we now call a non-linear realization of supersymmetry. Their model of operator which carried a spin  $\frac{1}{2}$ , and thus when acting on a state of spin  $j$  resulted in a linear combination of states with spin  $j + \frac{1}{2}$  and  $j - \frac{1}{2}$ . Such operators must and do observe anticommutator relations with each other. They do not generate Lie groups and are therefore not ruled out by the Coleman-Mandula no-go theorem. In the light of this discovery, Haag, Lopuszanski, and Sohnius extended the results of symmetries can only be related to each other by fermionic symmetry operators  $Q$  of spin  $\frac{1}{2}$  (*not  $\frac{3}{2}$  or higher*) whose properties are either exactly those of the Wess-Zumino model or are at least closely related to them. Only in the presence of supersymmetry can multiplets contain particles of different spin, such as the graviton and the photon.

## Essentials of Supersymmetry Algebra

Supersymmetry transformations are generated by quantum operators  $Q$  which change fermionic states to bosonic ones and vice versa,

$$Q|fermion\rangle =$$

supersymmetric model under study. Here are, however, a number of properties which are common to the  $Q$ 's in all supersymmetric models.

By definition, the  $Q$ 's change the statistics and hence the spin of the state. Spin is related to behavior under spatial rotations, and thus supersymmetry is- in some sense- a space-time symmetry. Normally, and particularly so in models of "extended supersymmetry" (supergravity is being one example), the  $Q$ 's also affect the internal quantum numbers of the states. Field theories interesting in the attempt to unify all fundamental interactions.

As a simple illustration of the non-trivial space-time properties of the  $Q$ 's, consider the following. Because fermions and bosons behave differently under rotations, the  $Q$  can not be invariant under such rotations. We can, for example, apply the unitary operator  $U(U^{-1}U = 1)$  which, in

and since all fermionic and bosonic states, taken together, form a basis in the Hilbert space, we easily see that we *must* have

$$UQU^{-1} = -Q$$

the rotated supersymmetry generator picks up a minus sign, just as a fermionic state does. One can extend this, the  $Q$ 's transform like tensor operators of spin  $\frac{1}{2}$  and, in particular, they do not commute with Lorentz transformations followed by a supersymmetry transformation is different from that when the order of the transformation is reversed.

It is not easy to illustrate, but it

$$= [Q, \mathbf{P}] = 0$$

The structure of a set of symmetry operations is determined by the result of two subsequent operations. For continuous ones, or vice versa. It can be shown that the canonical quantization