Supersoft Supersymmetry at the LHC

Adam Martin CERN/Notre Dame adam.martin@cern.ch

Mainz, Jan 22nd, 2013

Outline

- 1. Brief Intro
- 2. Dirac Gauginos and "Supersoft Supersymmetry"
- 3. Colored Superpartner Production @ LHC
- 4. Jets + missing searches for supersymmetry @ LHC ex.) ATLAS; CMS ατ;
- 5. Further extensions, directions
- 6. Conclusions

Where's SUSY?

in simplified, yet generic cases, limits on MSSM colored sparticles are pushed to ~**1.5 TeV**...

limits are driven by jet $+$ ME T channels, though many other searches

ATLAS $jets + MET$ August 2012

All limits quoted are observed minus 1o theoretical signal cross section uncertainty.

"Data are coming! Data are coming!"

[from J. Lykken]

Escape routes?

• make it unnatural:

heavy squarks (especially 1st, 2nd generation), though 3rd gen. limits are catching up

• deplete MET: R-parity violation

• deplete visible energy:

compressed spectra, long/complicated cascades

• go Dirac/supersoft

A little reminder

- SUSY in hidden sector, communicated to MSSM via messengers at scale Mmess
- SUSY parameterized by soft-masses

describe soft masses with higher-dim. operators involving **spurions** ($X = \theta^2 F$, etc.), & suppressed by messenger scale

$$
\mathcal{L} \supset \int d^4\theta \kappa \frac{Q Q^\dagger X_i X_i^\dagger}{M_{mess}^2} \cdots, \quad \int d^2\theta \, \omega_Y \frac{X}{M_{mess}} \mathcal{W}_Y \mathcal{W}_Y \cdots \quad \text{etc.}
$$
\n
$$
\kappa \frac{|F|^2}{M_{mess}^2} \tilde{Q} \tilde{Q}^* \to m_Q^2 \tilde{Q} \tilde{Q}^*
$$
\n
$$
\omega_Y \frac{F}{M_{mess}} \lambda_Y \lambda_Y \to m_{1/2} \lambda_Y \lambda_Y
$$

• RG run operators from M_{mess} to EW scale

HuQU^R

*^d*²θλ *^X*

A little reminder

- SUSY in hidden sector, communicated to MSSM via messengers at scale Mmess
- SUSY parameterized by soft-masses

describe soft masses with higher-dim. operators involving **spurions** ($X = \theta^2 F$, etc.), & suppressed by messenger scale

• RG run operators from M_{mess} to EW scale

HuQU^R

What about Dirac masses?

simple change has big implications

Polchinski, Susskind (1982)

Fox, Nelson, Weiner (2002)

...

Hall, Randall (1991)

requires communicating SUSY breaking to gauginos through **D-term** spurions:

$$
\mathcal{W}'_{\alpha}=\theta_{\alpha}D
$$

Dirac gaugino masses arise from:

Extra matter

we have to give up minimality to get Dirac masses .. added new adjoint superfields Φ_a for each gauge group

$$
\int d^2\theta \sqrt{2} \frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha}' \mathcal{W}_{a}^{\alpha} \Phi^a}{M_{mess}} \quad \supset \quad M_D \left(A^a + A^{*a} \right) D_a
$$
\nnew adjoint scalars \sum D-term for SM gauge groups

eliminating Da ...

$$
-\frac{M_D^2}{2} (A^a + A^{*a})^2 - M_D (A^a + A^{*a}) \left(\sum_i g_a \phi_i^* \tau_a \phi_i \right)
$$

new trilinear interactions

could also add

$$
\int d^2\theta \frac{\mathcal{W}'_{\alpha}\mathcal{W}'_{\alpha}\Phi^a\Phi^a}{M_{mess}^2}
$$
 opposite sign mass terms for Re
+h.c. [A_a], Im[A_a]

squark/slepton masses generated at loop level

from new trilinear interactions

$$
\tilde{m}_Q^2 = 4\,g_i^2\,C_i(\phi)\,\int\frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4}\frac{1}{k^2} - \frac{1}{k^2 - M_D^2} + \frac{M_D^2}{k^2(k^2 - m_{adj}^2)} \propto\,M_D^2\log\left(\frac{m_{adj}^2}{M_D^2}\right)
$$

masses are independent of Mmess!

squark/slepton masses generated at loop level

vs. in usual MSSM case

$$
\tilde{m}_Q^2 = 4 g_i^2 C_i(\phi) \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{k^2} - \frac{1}{k^2 - M_D^2} \propto M_D^2 \log\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{M_D^2}\right)
$$

squark/slepton masses generated at loop level

$$
\tilde{m}_Q^2 = 4\,g_i^2\,C_i(\phi)\,\int\frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4}\frac{1}{k^2} - \frac{1}{k^2-M_D^2} \quad \propto \,M_D^2\,\log\left(\frac{M_{mess}^2}{M_D^2}\right)
$$

Dirac gauginos:

Dirac gauginos:

Dirac gauginos:

gluinos can easily be several TeV, while the squarks are « TeV

Supersoft SUSY: naturalness

δm² H : compare the MSSM and supersoft

loop:
$$
\delta m_{H_u}^2 = -\frac{3\lambda_t^2}{8\pi^2} M_{\tilde{t}}^2 \log \frac{\Lambda^2}{M_{\tilde{t}}^2}
$$

$$
\textbf{2-loop:} \qquad \delta m_{H_u}^2 = -\frac{\lambda_t^2}{2\pi^2} \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} |\tilde{M}_3|^2 \left(\log \frac{\Lambda^2}{\tilde{M}_3^2} \right)^2 \qquad \qquad \textbf{(finite)}
$$

plug in numbers:

$$
\Lambda = 20 M_3 \qquad \qquad \frac{M_3^2}{M_{\tilde{t}}^2}
$$

$$
\text{tuning for: } (M_3)_{Maj} = 900 \,\mathrm{GeV}
$$

MSSM supersoft

$$
\delta m_{H_u}^2 = -\frac{3\lambda_t^2}{8\pi^2} M_{\tilde{t}}^2 \log \frac{M_3^2}{M_{\tilde{t}}^2}
$$

$$
\log \frac{m_{adj}^2}{M_3^2} = 1.5
$$

$$
M_{\tilde{t}}^2 = \frac{3\alpha_s}{4\pi} M_3^2
$$

 $1-$

Supersoft SUSY: naturalness

δm² H : compare the MSSM and supersoft

1-loop:	\n $\delta m_{H_u}^2 = -\frac{3\lambda_t^2}{8\pi^2} M_t^2 \log \frac{\Lambda^2}{M_{\tilde{t}}^2}$ \n	\n $\delta m_{H_u}^2 = -\frac{3\lambda_t^2}{2\pi^2} \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \tilde{M}_3 ^2 \left(\log \frac{\Lambda^2}{\tilde{M}_3^2} \right)^2$ \n	\n $\delta m_{H_u}^2 = -\frac{\lambda_t^2}{2\pi^2} \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \tilde{M}_3 ^2 \left(\log \frac{\Lambda^2}{\tilde{M}_3^2} \right)^2$ \n
plug in numbers:	\n $\log \frac{m}{\tilde{t}}$ \n		

$$
\Lambda = 20 M_3 \qquad \qquad \frac{\log \frac{\log N_3}{M_3^2}}{M_{\tilde{t}}^2}
$$

$$
\text{tuning for: } (M_3)_{Maj} = 900 \,\text{GeV} \qquad \qquad \textstyle \int \, (M_3)_{Dir} = 5.0 \,\text{TeV}
$$

persoft

$$
\delta m_{H_u}^2 = -\frac{3\lambda_t^2}{8\pi^2} M_{\tilde{t}}^2 \log \frac{M_3^2}{M_{\tilde{t}}^2}
$$

(finite)

$$
\log \frac{m_{adj}^2}{M_3^2} = 1.5
$$

$$
M_{\tilde{t}}^2 = \frac{3\alpha_s}{4\pi} M_3^2
$$

$$
(M_3)_{Dir} = 5.0 \,\mathrm{TeV}
$$

Supersoft SUSY: naturalness

δm² H : compare the MSSM and supersoft

1-loop:	\n $\delta m_{H_u}^2 = -\frac{3\lambda_t^2}{8\pi^2} M_t^2 \log \frac{\Lambda^2}{M_t^2}$ \n	\n $\delta m_{H_u}^2 = -\frac{3\lambda_t^2}{8\pi^2} M_t^2 \log \frac{M_2^2}{M_t^2}$ \n	\n $\delta m_{H_u}^2 = -\frac{3\lambda_t^2}{8\pi^2} M_t^2 \log \frac{M_3^2}{M_t^2}$ \n
2-loop:	\n $\delta m_{H_u}^2 = -\frac{\lambda_t^2}{2\pi^2} \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \tilde{M}_3 ^2 \left(\log \frac{\Lambda^2}{\tilde{M}_3^2} \right)^2$ \n	\n $\delta m_{H_u}^2 = -\frac{3\lambda_t^2}{8\pi^2} M_t^2 \log \frac{M_3^2}{M_t^2}$ \n	
glug in numbers:	\n $\Lambda = 20 M_3$ \n	\n $\log \frac{m_{adj}^2}{M_s^2} = 1.5$ \n	
tuning for:	\n $(M_3)_{Maj} = 900 \text{ GeV}$ \n	\n $(M_3)_{Dir} = 5.0 \text{ TeV}$ \n	

substantially heavier gluino **just as natural** in supersoft

Why not supersoft?

sounds great so far, as we can have heavier sparticles and stay natural

BUT, recall:

:
1980 - Paris
1980 - Paris $d^2\theta$ $\sqrt{2} \frac{\mathcal{W}_{\alpha}^{\prime} \mathcal{W}_{a}^{\alpha} \Phi^{a}}{M}$ *Mmess* ⊃ $M_D(A^a + A^{*a}) D_a$ +...

EOM for Re[Aa]:
$$
\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial Re(A^a)} \cong D_a = 0
$$

 $SU(2)_w$, $U(1)_Y$ D-terms = Higgs quartic -> tree level Higgs mass so if EW gauginos are Dirac then $m_h = 0$ at tree level!

$$
m_h^2 = m_Z^2 \cos^2 2\beta + \frac{3}{4\pi^2} \cos^2 \alpha y_t^2 m_t^2 \ln \frac{m_{\tilde{t}_1} m_{\tilde{t}_2}}{m_t^2}
$$

Why not supersoft?

"pure" supersoft won't work. We could...

- keep winos, binos Majorana
- \bullet make stops very heavy (>10 TeV)
- NMSSM-ology
- add other sources of SUSY

• ...

production of squarks/gluinos basically independent of how we repair EW/Higgs sector

so: focus on collider ramifications for now, $return to m_H$ issue later

LHC limits on supersoft

other work on Dirac gauginos @ LHC:

Benakli, Goodsell '08, '09, '11 Frugiuele, Gregoire et al '11,'12 Choi, Drees et al '08

differ in treatment of EW sector

Supersoft at the LHC

heavy Dirac gluino means several colored sparticle production channels are suppressed by kinematics alone

Supersoft at the LHC

heavy Dirac gluino means several colored sparticle production channels are suppressed by kinematics alone

Supersoft at LHC

suppression goes beyond kinematics: SUSY kinetic terms contain a U(1)R symmetry $R[\lambda] = 1$, $R[q] = R[\tilde{q}] - 1$ **preserved** by Dirac masses, $R[\psi] = -1$

Supersoft at LHC

suppression goes beyond kinematics: SUSY kinetic terms contain a U(1)R symmetry $R[\lambda] = 1$, $R[q] = R[\tilde{q}] - 1$ **preserved** by Dirac masses, $R[\psi] = -1$

Supersoft at LHC

suppression goes beyond kinematics: SUSY kinetic terms contain a U(1)R symmetry $R[\lambda] = 1$, $R[q] = R[\tilde{q}] - 1$ **preserved** by Dirac masses, $R[\psi] = -1$

Supersoft production

production of colored superstuff with Dirac gluino \ll traditional MSSM

Supersoft limits

form a 'simplified supersoft model' [Kribs, AM '12]

heavy gluino, degenerate 1st, 2nd gen. squarks (L,R), massless LSP

Supersoft versus MSSM Simplified Models

then perform apples-for-apples comparison against MSSM.

 f ram quatad hackaraunde-uuncertainly use salculated erese from quoted backgrounds + uncertainly, use calculated cross \blacksquare section (NLO), derived acceptance to bound SUSY parameters \blacksquare spectra and the SSSM. The third comparison model, "heavy MSSM", directly compares the results for a Dirac gluino versus a $=$ $_{\text{NlQ}}$ section (NLO), derived acceptance to bound SUSY parameters $= M_O$

 Γ fig. 1. The spectra for this paper. The spectra for this paper. The left-most panel is pare interest – the left-most panel interest – the left-most panel interest – the left-most panel interest – the left-most panel

supersoft supersymmetric simplified model (SSSM). It contains a gluino with a large Dirac mass *M*³ = 5 TeV, first and second

 $g_{\rm eff}$, $g_{\rm eff}$, $g_{\rm eff}$ times lighter than gluino, and an LSP that is generally assumed to be much lighter than gluino, and an LSP that is generally assumed to be much lighter than gluino, and α

on the relaxation of the bounds on the SSSM when the SSSM when the SSSM when the SSSM when the LSP is heavier.

B Excluded regions in supersymmetry parameter space showing the chan-ATLAS jets + missing search strategy

tivity at each point in a simplified MSSM scenario with only strong production of gluinos and first- and

of MSUGRA/CMSSM for tan β = 10, *A*⁰ = 0 and µ > 0 (right). The red lines show the observed limits,

0 leptons; all jets pT > 40 GeV

 $\mathop{\mathsf{m}}\nolimits_0$ [GeV] $m_{\text{eff}}(incl.)$ [589 > 1999/400/500/12080001908500 5
<u>ဖ</u>ြ 700
– \widetilde{z} Ξ 200 300 400 500 600 Cl Kequirementat Dt El El El $\frac{p_T(f_4) \cdot 100 \cdot \frac{1}{20}}{p_T(f_2) \cdot 1000}$ – $\frac{p_T(f_4) \cdot 1000}{p_T(f_2) \cdot 1000}$ – $\frac{1}{9}$ Bt Θ Dt **(1400) q** El E t E m E m E m E m $p_{\rm T}(j_3)$ [GeV] α – β ₁ (Et | i Dt – β t – θ U $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ = $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ Et | Em Em Em | Em | 受伤 一 Em Ct Em Em El At Et i Dr Gm Dt El Dt Bt At Em $Ep/$ Dt 00 00 00 Bt Em Bt At Dt Bt Bt Bt At **Q**m Dt qı At Dt Bt \mathbf{c} At Cl Em Em El Bt LEP**W**hargino Et Bt Cl Bt Bt C_{um} Et + Et Em Em Em Em Em Em Em Cl Em Cl Em 0.4 $(i = 1)$ Et Bt Dt At Em **g (600) [~] g (800) [~] g (1000) [~] N**o EWSB₀ *E*^{*n*₀</sub>} **~ ~ (1800) q ~** MSUGRA/CMSSM: tanβ = 10, A₀= 0, μ>0 \int L dt = 4 Δ 71 mannel $\dot{\mathcal{E}}$ l vs=7 TeV C embined **ATLAS** Preliminary observed 95% C.L. limit T^{miss} GeV] $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}$ 1600 and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}$ 1600 and expected limit ATLAS EPS 2011 τ LSP ∼ Figure 38: 95% *CLs* exclusion limits obtained by using the signal region with the best expected sensi- A^{\perp} \parallel A^{\perp} \parallel B^{\cdots} \parallel C^{\cdots} \parallel D^{\perp} \parallel E *E*miss *p*T(*j*₁) [GeV] > 130 $p_T(j_2)$ [GeV] $>$ $\frac{1}{N}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ Bi $\frac{1}{N}$ -Bt $\frac{1}{N}$ -Dt *p*T(*j*5) [GeV] > – – – – 40 40 $p_{\text{T}}(j_6)$ [GeV] > – – – – – – $\frac{3}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{3}{2}$ = – $\frac{1}{2}$ + $\frac{1}{2}$ = – $\frac{3}{2}$ (800) $\frac{1}{2}$ + $\frac{1}{2}$ = – 1 $Δφ(ie)$ $\sum_{\text{min}}^{\text{max}}$)_{min} > \top \top \top \longrightarrow $\frac{1}{4}$ ($i =$ {1, 2, (3)}) $E_{\rm m}^{\rm mis}$ $T^{\text{max}}[\frac{m_{\text{eff}}(N)}{N}] \geq \frac{1}{N}$ (0.15 (6j) (2) (1.1 (2) (3) (1.25 (3j) $(0,25)$ (3j) $(0,15)$ (6j) 0.15 (6j) *m*^eff(incl.) [GeV] > 1900/1400/– –/1200/– 1900/–/– 1500/1200/900 1500/–/– 1400/1200/900 tight the right to dee tight sse _{ti}ght _{tight rip ase} id rid mid idni

second-generation squarks, and direct decays to jets and neutralinos (left); and in the (*m*⁰ ; *m*1/2) plane ATLAS-CONF-2012-033

ATLAS Search Bounds

- $-$ E_T: all jets > 50 GeV; leading 2 jets > 100 GeV (a) Comparison of *H*^T between data and MC for the hadronic selection for *H*^T ≥ 375 GeV and *H*/T *>* and MC for the hadronic selection, for *H*^T ≥ 375 GeV \mathbf{b} comparison of the jet multiplicity between data \mathbf{b}
- $H_T = \sum_{i=1}^n E_T$
	-
- posite mismeasurement

cut on:

 $\alpha_T = E_{T,jet\#2}/M_{T(j1j2)}$

CMS Bounds on Simplified Models

CMS α_T Search Bounds

Effectiveness of LHC strategy

difference in limits not just difference in cross-section

Effectiveness of LHC strategy

strongest limits on MSSM points come from **highest** M_{eff}/H_T cuts

[showed α_T , ATLAS jets + MET, also true for CMS MHT, razor searches...]

at lower squark mass, where SSSM has comparable cross section, high cuts are very inefficient

Supersoft limits

projection to higher luminosity

[Kribs, AM '12]

also: limits degrade as M_X gets closer to M_Q

Keynote physics

•R-symmetry prevents same-sign lepton channel

• for natural μ , large M₂, M₁ (Dirac): lighest charginos/neutralinos are Higginos, are very degenerate

if neutralino is LSP: little phase space for

$$
\tilde{\chi}^{\pm}{}_{1} \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}^{0}{}_{1} + W^{\pm}
$$

$$
\tilde{\chi}^{0}{}_{2} \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}^{0}{}_{1} + Z^{0}
$$

if gravitino is LSP: often have

$$
\tilde{\chi}^0{}_i \rightarrow G \, + \, h^0
$$

will effect tri-lepton limits...

3rd generation searches:

most dedicated stop searches rely on leptons, assume 100% BR to one mode

$$
\tilde{t} \rightarrow b \times^{\pm} \mathbf{W} \times^{\circ} \qquad \qquad \tilde{t} \rightarrow t \times^{\circ} \mathbf{W}
$$

 $\mu \ll M_1$, M₂ = degenerate chargino/neutralino + mixture of stop $BR \rightarrow$ much looser bounds

strongest bound from sbottom searches (b-jets + MET)

[Kribs, AM, Menon in progress]

3rd generation searches:

most dedicated stop searches rely on leptons, assume 100% BR to one mode

 $\mu \ll M_1$, M₂ = degenerate chargino/neutralino + mixture of stop $BR \rightarrow$ much looser bounds

strongest bound from sbottom searches (b-jets + MET)

[Kribs, AM, Menon in progress]

3rd generation searches:

most dedicated stop searches rely on leptons, assume 100% BR to one mode

 $\mu \ll M_1$, M₂ = degenerate chargino/neutralino + mixture of stop $BR \rightarrow$ much looser bounds

 t_R *tL, bL, b^R* μ − − − − 100 GeV $\sim 400\,{\rm GeV}$ region with light stops still allowed, a 'supernatural' setup strongest bound from sbottom searches (b-jets + MET)

300

[Kribs, AM, Menon in progress]

FIG. 1. two different spectra

is there a 'smoking - gun' signal for the dirac setup?

YES: extra states, the scalars in $\Phi_i = A_i$

 $Re[A_i]$ are heavy, mass $\sim M_D$, Im $[A_i]$ can be light

 A_i are R-parity even \rightarrow they can be singly produced, though only tree-level interactions involve gauge fields..

is there a 'smoking - gun' signal for the dirac setup?

YES: extra states, the scalars in $\Phi_i = A_i$

 $Re[A_i]$ are heavy, mass $\sim M_D$, Im $[A_i]$ can be light

A are R-parity even \rightarrow they can be singly produced, though only tree-level interactions involve gauge fields..

 A_i single production looks hopeless

is there a 'smoking - gun' signal for the dirac setup?

YES: extra states, the scalars in $\Phi_i = A_i$

 $Re[A_i]$ are heavy, mass $\sim M_D$, Im[A_i] can be light

A are R-parity even \rightarrow they can be singly produced, though only tree-level interactions involve gauge fields..

is there a 'smoking - gun' signal for the dirac setup?

YES: extra states, the scalars in $\Phi_i = A_i$

 $Re[A_i]$ are heavy, mass $\sim M_D$, Im[A_i] can be light

A are R-parity even \rightarrow they can be singly produced, though only tree-level interactions involve gauge fields..

 $pp \rightarrow$ equal mass di-jet resonances

is there a 'smoking - gun' signal for the dirac setup?

YES: extra states, the scalars in $\Phi_i = A_i$

 $Re[A_i]$ are heavy, mass $\sim M_D$, Im[A_i] can be light

A are R-parity even \rightarrow they can be singly produced, though only tree-level interactions involve gauge fields..

 $pp \rightarrow$ equal mass di-jet resonances

see Plehn, Tait '08, also CMS-EXO-11-016, ATLAS 1110.2693

is there a 'smoking - gun' signal for the dirac setup?

YES: extra states, the scalars in $\Phi_i = A_i$

 $Re[A_i]$ are heavy, mass $\sim M_D$, Im $[A_i]$ can be light

A are R-parity even \rightarrow they can be singly produced, though only tree-level interactions involve gauge fields..

 $pp \rightarrow$ equal mass di-jet resonances

see Plehn, Tait '08, also CMS-EXO-11-016, ATLAS 1110.2693

EW Aᵢ production unexplored

<u>.. About that Higgs mass</u>

some example fixes for $\lambda_{h,\text{tree}}=0$

1.) extend the EW-sector (nMSSMology):

ex.) add in $R_u = (1,2)_{-1/2}$, $R_d = (1,2)_{+1/2}$ $R[R_u] = R[R_d] = 2$ allows: $W \supset K H_u \Phi_B R_u + u \leftrightarrow d$

$$
V(h) = \frac{m_0^2}{2}h^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(2 M_D a - \frac{g}{2}h^2\right)^2 + \kappa \mu h^2 a + \cdots
$$

some example fixes for $\lambda_{h,\text{tree}}=0$

1.) extend the EW-sector (nMSSMology):

ex.) add in R_u = (1,2)_{-1/2}, R_d = (1,2)_{+1/2} R[R_u] = R[R_d] = 2

maintains R-symmetry

allows: $W \supset K H_u \Phi_B R_u + u \leftrightarrow d$

$$
V(h) = \frac{m_0^2}{2}h^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(2 M_D a - \frac{g}{2}h^2\right)^2 + \kappa \mu h^2 a + \cdots
$$

some example fixes for $\lambda_{h,\text{tree}}=0$

1.) extend the EW-sector (nMSSMology):

ex.) add in R_u = (1,2)_{-1/2}, R_d = (1,2)_{+1/2} R[R_u] = R[R_d] = 2

maintains R-symmetry

allows: $W \supset K H_u \Phi_B R_u + u \leftrightarrow d$

$$
V(h) = \frac{m_0^2}{2}h^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(2M_D a - \frac{2h^2}{2}h^2\right)^2 + \kappa \mu h^2 a + \cdots
$$

$$
a \sim \frac{g h^2}{4M_D}
$$

some example fixes for $\lambda_{h,\text{tree}}=0$

1.) extend the EW-sector (nMSSMology):

ex.) add in R_u = (1,2)_{-1/2}, R_d = (1,2)_{+1/2} R[R_u] = R[R_d] = 2

maintains R-symmetry

allows: $W \supset K H_u \Phi_B R_u + u \leftrightarrow d$

$$
V(h) = \frac{m_0^2}{2}h^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(2M_D a \frac{2}{2}h^2\right)^2 + \kappa \mu h^2 a + \cdots
$$

becomes effective
quartic

<u>.. About that Higgs mass</u>

1.) mass term for Φ_i : $\delta V(h) = m_a^2 a^2$

requires a second SUSY-breaking spurion: $X = \theta^2 F$

provided **X** is not a singlet, can't write **X** WαW^α , **gauginos still Dirac**

[Kribs, Okui, Roy '11]

1.) mass term for Φ_i : $\delta V(h) = m_a^2 a^2$

requires a second SUSY-breaking spurion: $X = \theta^2 F$

provided **X** is not a singlet, can't write **X** WαW^α , **gauginos still Dirac** [Kribs, Okui, Roy '11]

 $1+2$.) charge **X** under $U(1)_R$ preserved by SUSY kinetic terms, R $[X] = 2$. add matter to enforce R-symm throughout $=$ M**R**SSM

[Kribs, Poppitz, Weiner '07]

\overline{m} **mRSSM** \blacksquare *R*[*Qⁱ, U^c* μ ² *n***₁</sup>
***DCCN₁* \mathbf{I} = 1, allowing the usual Yukawa cou- \mathbf{I} plings in the superpotential contract of the superpotential contrac

 $W \supset \mu_u\, H_u\, R_u + \mu_d\, R_d\, H_d$, " μ "-term mus Throughout the Dirac gauge
and the Dirac gauge-the Dirac gauge-the Dirac gaug-the Dirac gaug-the Dirac gaug-the Dirac gaug-the Dirac gaug
Throughout the Dirac gaug-the Dirac gaug-the Dirac gaug-the Dirac gaug-the Dirac gau ino masses to be large. This limit simplifies our calcupotential operators \boldsymbol{M} ^r on the \boldsymbol{M} $\mu_{\nu} \equiv \nu_{\nu} \equiv \mu_u \, H_u \, H_u + \mu_d \, R_d \, H_d$. " μ "-term must be changed

also defines the *^R*-charges of the matter fields to be

 $W \;\supset\; \lambda_B^u\,\Phi_B\,H_u\,R_u + \lambda_B^d\,\Phi_B\,R_d\,H_d$ new terms in W $\hskip 1.0cm + \lambda_W^u \Phi_W^a H_u \,\tau^a R_u + \lambda_W^d \Phi_W^a R_d \,\tau^a H_d$ α *R-partners ensures that electronic contract v* $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ Ref. [35] found the *SU*(2)*^w* gaugino masses should be ¹ *^R*-symmetry is not essential here. Majorana gaugino masses can be avoided as long as *^X* is not ^a singlet [50].

ϵ from the rest of the theory and play little rest of the theory and play little role in ϵ can get m $H~125$ GeV and strong EWPT *x*

$$
M_2 = 1 \text{ TeV}
$$

\n
$$
\mu_u = \mu_d = 200 \text{ GeV}
$$

\n
$$
m(\tilde{t}_{L,R}) = 3 \text{ TeV}
$$

\n
$$
m_a = 0
$$

[Fok, Kribs, AM, Tsai '12]

be avoided as long as *^X* is not ^a singlet [50].

tween the Higgs and squarks or sleptons are for sleptons are for sleptons are for α

the MRSSM, on the other hand, come from *^µ^u, ^µd*, which

with the MSSS superpotential structure and \mathcal{M}

 $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$, heavy Dirac gauginos, when combined combin

by *^R*-symmetry. For viable phenomenology, we allow the

we take the electroweak scale to the electroweak scale.

relative size of the supersymmetry breaking contributions

larger than ¹ TeV. Such heavy electroweak gauginos de-

to be within roughly one order of magnitude in mass.

\overline{m} **mRSSM** \blacksquare *R*[*Qⁱ, U^c* μ ² *n***₁</sup>
***DCCN₁* \mathbf{I} = 1, allowing the usual Yukawa cou- \mathbf{I} plings in the superpotential contract of the superpotential contrac

 $W \supset \mu_u\, H_u\, R_u + \mu_d\, R_d\, H_d$, " μ "-term mus $W \;\supset\; \lambda_B^u\,\Phi_B\,H_u\,R_u + \lambda_B^d\,\Phi_B\,R_d\,H_d \qquad \qquad \text{new terms in W} \qquad \qquad \text{(S)flavor}$ $t+\lambda_W^u \Phi_W^a H_u \tau^a R_u + \lambda_W^d \Phi_W^a R_d \tau^a H_d$ α *R-partners ensures that electronic contract v* Throughout this paper we will take the Dirac gaugdinariyed. Interesting. to a conflict properties. Ref. [35] found the *SU*(2)*^w* gaugino masses should be potential operators \boldsymbol{M} ^r on the \boldsymbol{M} $\mu_{\nu} \equiv \nu_{\nu} \equiv \mu_u \, H_u \, H_u + \mu_d \, R_d \, H_d$. " μ "-term must be changed $\partial W + \lambda_W^u \Phi_W^a H_u \, \tau^a R_u + \lambda_W^d \Phi_W^a R_d \, \tau^a H_d \, .$ **VV** properties! be avoided as long as *^X* is not ^a singlet [50]. interesting (s)flavor

also defines the *^R*-charges of the matter fields to be

ϵ from the rest of the theory and play little rest of the theory and play little role in ϵ can get m $H~125$ GeV and strong EWPT *x*

$$
M_2 = 1 \text{ TeV}
$$

\n
$$
\mu_u = \mu_d = 200 \text{ GeV}
$$

\n
$$
m(\tilde{t}_{L,R}) = 3 \text{ TeV}
$$

\n
$$
m_a = 0
$$

[Fok, Kribs, AM, Tsai '12]

be avoided as long as *^X* is not ^a singlet [50].

tween the Higgs and squarks or sleptons are for sleptons are for sleptons are for α

the MRSSM, on the other hand, come from *^µ^u, ^µd*, which

with the MSSS superpotential structure and \mathcal{M}

 $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$, heavy Dirac gauginos, when combined combin

by *^R*-symmetry. For viable phenomenology, we allow the

we take the electroweak scale to the electroweak scale.

relative size of the supersymmetry breaking contributions

larger than ¹ TeV. Such heavy electroweak gauginos de-

to be within roughly one order of magnitude in mass.

Conclusions

•Dirac gauginos (supersoft SUSY): naturally very heavy, $U(1)$ _R preserved

• significantly reduced colored sparticle production limits (≲ 5 fb-1, 8 TeV data): **~ 680-750 GeV**

> degenerate 1st, 2nd gen. squarks, massless LSP

- analysis optimized for high H_T do poorly

 $limits \sim independent$ of EW sector, which cannot be pure supersoft & achieve $m_H \sim 125$ GeV

extra **X** spurion, interactions Maj. winos/binos

- many interesting directions to go in from here!