ASYMMETRIC DARK MATTER

KATHRYN ZUREK UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Forward-Backward Asymmetry: Status and Updates

Kathryn Zurek University of Michigan

COIN TOSS



ADM -- AT 5 GEV

AFB

COIN TOSS



ADM -- AT 5 GEV

AFB

Forward-Backward Asymmetry: Status and Updates

Kathryn Zurek University of Michigan

Why this anomaly now?

CDF 5.3 fb^-1, January 2011



Why this anomaly now?



 $-0.116 \pm 0.146 \pm 0.047$

 0.040 ± 0.006

 3.4σ

Why this anomaly, now? Data level

| Selection | NLO (QCD+EW) | CDF, 5.3 fb ⁻¹ | D0, 5.4 fb ⁻¹ | CDF, 8.7 fb-1 |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Inclusive | 6.6 | 15.8 ± 7.4 | 19.6 ± 6.5 | 16.2 ± 4.7 |
| M_{tt} < 450 GeV/c ² | 4.7 | —11.6 ± 15.3 | 7.8 ± 4.8 (Bkg. Subtracted) | 7.8 ± 5.4 |
| $M_{tt} \ge 450 \text{ GeV/c}^2$ | 10.0 | 47.5 ± 11.2 | II.5 ± 6.0 (Bkg. Subtracted) | 29.6 ± 6.7 |
| ∆y < 1.0 | 4.3 | 2.6 ± 11.8 | 6.1 ± 4.1 (Bkg. Subtracted) | 8.8 ± 4.7 |
| ∆y ≥ 1.0 | 13.9 | 61.1 ± 25.6 | 21.3 ± 9.7 (Bkg. Subtracted) | 43.3 ± 10.9 |

D. Mietlicki, Moriond

Measures of top AFB





Can QCD Generate This?

First contribution appears at NLO



Stable against higher order corrections? Claim: yes. Threshold resummed results give same asymmetry as fixed order calculation Almeida, Sterman, Vogelsang 2008

Questions to Ask about the anomaly Probably not Is it systematic? Maybe -- though Is it statistical? growing statistics Is it QCD? ⁸ Hard to see how . How difficult is it but maybe likely to simultaneously given the fit the anomaly and constraints other constraints? Not so easy.

On the LHC Side Cross-section and Invariant Mass Distribution Looks like SM



Models to generate top AFB

- \$ s-channel or tchannel
 - \$ s-channel:
 axigluon



Ferrario and Rodrigo

t-channel: flavor
 violating gauge
 boson (Z', W') or
 scalar color
 triplet or sextet

Jung, Murayama, Pierce, Wells Shu, Tait, Wang Ligeti, Schmaltz, Tavares Grinstein, Kagan, Trott, Zupan

You can also refer How to Generate AFB

Sehgal, Wanninger (1988), Bagger, Schmidt, King (1988), Ferrario, Rodrigo (2009), Frampton, Shu Wang (2009), Chivukula, Simmons, Yuan (2010), Djouadi, Moreau, Richard, Singh (2010), Bauer, Goertz, Haisch, Pfoh, Westhoff (2010), Alvarez, Da Rold, Szynkman (2010), Chen, Cvetic, Kim (2010) Bai, Hewett, Kaplan, Rizzo (2011), Foot (2011), 1103.1266, 1103.1940, Zerwekh (2011), Shu, Wang, Zhu (2011), Alvarez, Da Rold, Vietto, Szynkman (2011), 1103.0956, Tavarez, Schmaltz (2011), Aguilar-Saavedra (2011), Jung, Murayama, Pierce, Wells (2009), Cheung, Keung, Yuan (2009) Shu, Tait, Wang (2010), Arhrib, Benbrik, Chen (2010), Dorsner, Fajfer, Kamenik, Kosnik (2009), Barger, Keung, Yu (2010), Xiao, Wang, Zhu (2010), Cheung, Yuan (2010), Shelton, Zurek (2011), Berger, Cao, Chen Li, Zhang (2011), Grinstein, Kagan, Trott, Zupan (2011), Patal, Sharma (2011), Craig, Kilic, Strassler (2011), Ligeti, Tavares, Schmaltz (2011), Jung, Pierce, Wells (2011), Nelson, Okui, Roy (2011), Duraisamy, Rashed, Datta (2011), Gabrielli, Raidal (2011), Jung, Ko, Lee, Nam (2009), Cao, Heng, Wu, Yang (2010), Cao, McKeen, Rosner, Shaughnessy, Wagner (2010), Jung, Ko, Lee (2010), Choudhury, Godbole, Rindani, Saha(2010), Jung, Ko, Lee, Nam (2010), Delaunay, Gedalia, Hochberg, Perez, Sereq (2011), Gresham, IWK, Zurek (2011), Grinstein, Kagan, Zupan, Trott (2011) ...

Challenges

\$ s-channel models: large AFB, but
small change in tt-bar x-section

t-channel models
 same sign tops
 single top



invariant mass distribution

Challenges

s-channel: particular couplings. Opposite charges for light quarks and top

$$\mathcal{A}_{int} = \frac{g_s^4}{9} \frac{\hat{s}(\hat{s} - m_{G'}^2)}{(\hat{s} - m_{G'}^2)^2 + m_{G'}^2 \Gamma_{G'}^2} (g_L^q + g_R^q) (g_L^t + g_R^t) \\ \left[(2 - \beta^2) + 2 \frac{(g_L^q - g_R^q)(g_L^t - g_R^t)}{(g_L^q + g_R^q)(g_L^t + g_R^t)} c_\theta + c_\theta^2 \right],$$

t-channel: high invariant mass
 spectrum can become skewed

$$\mathcal{A}_{int} = \frac{2g_s^2}{9} \frac{(g_L^2 + g_R^2)}{\hat{s}\hat{t}_{Z'}} \left[2\hat{u}_t^2 + 2\hat{s}m_t^2 + \frac{m_t^2}{m_{Z'}^2} (\hat{t}_t^2 + \hat{s}m_t^2) \right]$$

t-channel models

Challenges from the Tevatron



Gresham, Kim, KZ, 1103.3501



Challenges Tevat of tom the solution the the solution the

$d\sigma/dm_{t\bar{t}}$

Gresham, Kim, KZ, 1103.3501



 $d\sigma$

More Challenges from

Gresham, Kim, KZ, 1107.4364



Total Cross-Section Models which give rise to a large enough AFB for Mtt > 450 GeValso give too large a crosssection

More Challenges from Gresham, Kim, KZ, 1107.4364 LHC

 $|\mu|p/$







 $m \ge 200: \text{ GeV}, \{g,\eta\} = \{0.5, 1\}\}$ $- m = 400. \text{ GeV}, \{g,\eta\} = \{0.5, 0\}$ $- m = 600. \text{ GeV}, \{g,\eta\} = \{0.5, 2\}$ $- m = 800. \text{ GeV}, \{g,\eta\} = \{0.5, 1\}$



A way out Make the mediator light to hannel mediator



Hidden from ttbar event

Atomic Parity Violation Challenges



5

Weak Scalar Doublet Model



 $\lambda \left(\bar{u}_R V_{ib} u_L^i \phi^0 - \bar{u}_R b_L \phi^+ \right) + \text{h.c.}$

Blum, Hochberg, Nir

Provides good fit for mediator mass below 130 GeV

Parity violation at one-loop: $a_R^{\rm NP}(u) = \frac{\lambda^2 |V_{tb}|^2 m_t^2}{32\pi^2} \frac{|V_{tb}|^2 m_t^2}{m_M^2} F(m_t^2/m_M^2)$

t-channel vectors

Gresham, Kim, Tulin, KZ 1203.1320



Best model point of Jung, Pierce, Wells

Naive calculation

With UV completion

t-channel models conclusion

- Heavy t-channel models challenged by LHC total cross-section and invariant mass distributions
- Light t-channel models challenged by APV
- Seasier if asymmetry becomes smaller
 for Mtt > 450 GeV

s-channel models

s-channel models

Again have light-heavy dichotomy

Opposite sign axial couplings for heavy mediator (m > 2 mt), same sign axial couplings for light mediator

$$\mathcal{A}_{int} = \frac{g_s^4}{9} \frac{\hat{s}(\hat{s} - m_{G'}^2)}{(\hat{s} - m_{G'}^2)^2 + m_{G'}^2 \Gamma_{G'}^2} (g_L^q + g_R^q) (g_L^t + g_R^t) \\ \left[(2 - \beta^2) + 2 \frac{(g_L^q - g_R^q)(g_L^t - g_R^t)}{(g_L^q + g_R^q)(g_L^t + g_R^t)} c_\theta + c_\theta^2 \right],$$



Heavy Axiglue LHC tt-bar constraints

Gresham, Kim, KZ 1107.4364



 $m_{t\bar{t}}$

Friday, June 1, 2012

 $d\sigma_{
m o}/dm_{tar{t}}$

One possible solution: bury it



Schmaltz and Tavares

Must reside in particular $140 \text{ GeV} < m_D < 170 \text{ GeV}$ window to evade RPV searches

Burying it continued Below 2 mt Can also bury it

 $\tilde{m} = 350 \text{ GeV}, \tilde{\Gamma} = 0.2 \tilde{m}, \tilde{g}_Q = 0.5$





Drobnak, Kamenik, Zupan

Burying it continued Below 2 mt Can also bury it

 $\tilde{m} = 350 \text{ GeV}, \tilde{\Gamma} = 0.2 \tilde{m}, \tilde{g}_Q = 0.5$





No current Tevatron limit

Drobnak, Kamenik, Zupan

Summary

LHC is squeezing models for AFB
 Seems more favorable to bury models
 In some cases low energy constraints can kill even these models -- for example light t-channel mediator

Summary

Some window still for light and heavy s-channel states

Heavy could be excluded by mtt analysis; light could be further constrained by multi-jet analyses

Need further focus on possible SM explanations