Long-lived particles: unconventional signatures in collider experiments

Biplob Bhattacherjee

Centre for High Energy Physics Indian Institute of Science Bengaluru, India

Trends in Astroparticle and Particle Physics IMSc Chennai 27th September 2024

New physics searches

Many BSM models and a large number of possible signatures

No hint of BSM physics so far

Where is BSM physics hiding ?

Three Possibilities:

- BSM particles are very heavy -> Not accessible at the LHC
- BSM particles are just above the current limit -> LHC will discover soon
- New particles are within the reach of LHC, search methods are not very sensitive

Nature of the new physics is completely unknown Probably very unconventional, exotic final states

> NOT YET SEARCHED FOR ? EXPERIMENTALLY CHALLENGING ?

One such interesting possibility : Long-lived particles(LLPs)

le at the LHC-> LHC will discover soonarch methods are not very sensitive

Recipe for conventional search at the LHC

STEPI: Production

- a). Single production $pp \rightarrow X$
- b). Pair production $pp \rightarrow XX$
- c). From decay $pp \rightarrow Y_{SM/BSM} \rightarrow XX$

Goal: Find a new particle X

STEP II : Decay

Various Decay modes possible : X to 2,3,4 body decays to SM particles and also BSM particles

Recipe for conventional search at the LHC Goal: Find a new particle X

STEP I : Production

a). Single production $pp \to X$ b). Pair production $pp \rightarrow XX$

c). From decay $pp \rightarrow Y_{SM/BSM} \rightarrow XX$

STEP III : Final State

Analysis techniques

At the LHC we can identify electron, muon, photon, jets (from quarks and gluons) Indirect identification of invisible particles like neutrinos, dark matter etc. possible (in terms of MET) Classify the signatures based on the production mechanisms and decay modes Example : di-muon final state, multiple jets + missing transverse energy, photons + leptons etc.

Use sophisticated statistical techniques, ML etc.

STEP II : Decay

Various Decay modes possible : X to 2,3,4 body decays to SM particles and also BSM particles

Define variable(s) which can separate signal process from the SM backgrounds.

A concrete example of conventional signature

STEP I : Production

Pair production $pp \rightarrow \tilde{g}\tilde{g}$

STEP III : Final State

Gluino can decay to quarks and dark matter (LSP in MSSM) Final State : Multiple jets + Missing transverse energy

Analysis techniques

Null results from different experiments put stringent limits on the conventional BSM scenarios

Goal: Search for gluino (\tilde{g}) of MSSM

STEP II : Decay

$\tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}$

Missing transverse energy, effective mass, H_T etc

Use techniques to separate signal and backgrounds

Unconventional signature: Long-lived Gluino <u>Goal: Search for long-lived gluino (\tilde{g}) of MSSM</u>

STEPI: Production

Pair production $pp \rightarrow \tilde{g}\tilde{g}$

=> Long-lived gluino !!!

STEP II : Decay

- $\tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}$ decay width is suppressed
- \tilde{g} will be produced at the collision point but not decay instantaneously

Unconventional signature: Long-lived Gluino

STEP I : Production

Pair production $pp \rightarrow \tilde{g}\tilde{g}$

STEP III : Final State

Gluino may not decay to quarks and dark matter (LSP in MSSM) Gluino will hadronize and form heavy hadron Gluino is now semi-stable and will travel through the detector The signature is no longer multi-jet + MET

Analysis techniques

Questions : Is it possible to make gluino long-lived ? Is such a possibility rare? Or too much fine-tuned?

<u>Goal: Search for long-lived gluino (\tilde{g}) of MSSM</u>

STEP II : Decay

 $\tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}$ decay width is suppressed => long lived gluino

LLPs in the Standard Model

Presence of LLP is not unnatural

Many long-lived particles are present in our world

Particle	Lifetime
Muon	2.2 picosecond
Proton	> 10 ³⁰ year
Neutron	878 second
B+	1600 femtosecond
π +	26 nanosecond

LLPs in the Standard Model

Particle	Lifetime
Neutron	878 second
B+	1600 femtosecond
π +	26 nanosecond

Case I

Pion decay in the SM

Neutron decay in the SM





Huge suppression from the W boson propagator

 $\Delta = M_n - M_p \sim 1.3 \text{ MeV}$ Decay is highly phase space suppressed

Case II

Case III

B⁺ decay in the SM



V_{ub} small, gives additional suppression



Long-lived BSM particles



Case 3: Small mass difference



 $\Delta M = M_{\tilde{W}^{\pm}} - M_{\tilde{W}^0} \sim 160 \text{ MeV}$

MSSM with neutral wino as the lightest supersymmetric particle

Charged wino becomes heavier than the neutral wino because of electroweak radiative corrections







Dark Sector



Dark sector particles talk to the SM particles through a portal

Lowest dimensional operator

Vector Portal: $\epsilon B^{\mu\nu}X_{\mu\nu}$ Scalar Portals: $\kappa (H^{\dagger}H)S + \lambda (H^{\dagger}H)S^2$

Neutrino Portal: ył

yHLN

Recent survey: Exploring Dark Sector Portals with High Intensity Experiments [arXiv:2207.06905]

Higher dimensional operator also possible

ALP: $\epsilon a F^{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}$

The new couplings can be very small in principle Possibility of small decay width => LLP !!

Minimal model of LLPs: small coupling





Suppose the coupling λ is small: X is LLP Easy to make X an LLP

Minimal model of LLPs: small coupling

Production mode



Single production cross section $\propto \lambda^2$ For very small coupling X will have high decay length and small cross section

"High" and "small" will depend on the process and the detector



Minimal model : decay and production determined by the same coupling

SM



More possibilities



LLP may come from the decay of SM or other BSM particles, we are using two different couplings

Decay of phase space suppressed LLPs

 $\chi^{\pm} \to \chi^0 + \pi^{\pm}$



Non-minimal model : decay width and production cross section determined by the different couplings

No suppression in the coupling, LLP decay length is small because of the phase space suppression => production cross section can be large

Search Using prompt particles

Tracker Volume



$pp \rightarrow \tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \rightarrow qq' X_{LLP}^{\pm}$ Multiple prompt jets + MET



Search Using prompt particles



$pp \rightarrow \tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \rightarrow qq' X_{LLP}^{\pm}$ Multiple prompt jets + MET

However, we are not fully utilising the presence of the charged LLP. Let us also detect charged LLPs







Search Using prompt particles

Tracker Volume









Significant improvements in the analysis techniques



Matsumoto, Tsutomu T. Yanagida

arXiv:1207.5453, PRD 2013

Our Proposal : shorter tracks

• The selected track must disappear between 142 mm and 520 mm, i.e. between the inner pixel detectors and the semiconductor detector (SCT).

7 TeV searches: Longer tracks

• The selected track must disappear between 514 mm and 863 mm, i.e. within the first and second layers of the transition radiation tracker (TRT).

ATLAS-CONF-2012-034

Current Situation (Huge improvement in the analysis)

Pixel tracklet searches By ATLAS 2201.02472

Also by CMS collaboration

ATLAS 4b analysis : LLP vs Prompt

$PP \rightarrow VH, H \rightarrow \phi \phi, \phi \rightarrow \bar{b}b$

b-jets(Jets including b-hadrons) :

multivariate b-tagging algorithm that combines information from an impact-parameter-based algorithm and from a multi-vertex fitter that tries to identify the b- to c-hadron decay chain

The b-tagging algorithm is also works in identifying b-jets that do not originate from the primary vertex(Prompt).

Slight displacement enhances the sensitivity => drops after ~ 1mm

Prompt searches are not optimal for highly displaced LLPs => need dedicated analysis

1806.07355



X is the long-lived particle

 $pp \rightarrow XX, X_{LLP} \rightarrow e^+e^-$

Suppose X decays promptly

Electron Identification :

Tracker: Track ECAL: energy deposits HCAL : No energy deposition

Muon Spect (Muon Tr
Hadron Calo (Hadrons depo
Electromagnetic (Photon and Electror
Tracke (Tracks of Charg

Proton

X decays promptly

 $pp \to XX, X \to e^+e^-$



Electron Identification :

Tracker: May not be any reconstructed tracks ECAL: energy deposits HCAL : No energy deposition

Looks like a photon !!!

Muon S (Muo i
Hadron (Hadrons d
Electromage (Photon and Election)
т (Tracks of Ch

Proton

LLP decays inside the tracker

 $pp \rightarrow XX, X \rightarrow e^+e^-$



Electron Identification :

Tracker: No track ECAL: No energy deposit HCAL : energy deposition

Looks like a neutral hadron !!!



LLP decays inside the hadronic calorimeter

 $pp \rightarrow XX, X \rightarrow e^+e^-$



Electron Identification :

Tracker: No track ECAL: No energy deposits HCAL: No energy deposits

Looks like an invisible particle !!!

Observation: signature depends where LLP decays Lifetime dependent search required



LLP decays outside the detector

 $pp \rightarrow XX, X \rightarrow e^+e^-$



Muon Spectrometer (Muon Tracks)

Hadron Calorimeter (Hadrons deposit energy)

Electromagnetic Calorimeter (Photon and Electron deposit

Tracker (Tracks of Charged particles)

Secondary vertex

Proton

Primary vertex

(4)077



Unusual features of LLPs : Non-pointing nature





Orientation from the beam axis of the particle = 30 degree





Unusual features of LLPs : Non-pointing nature

In experiment, particle 's η - ϕ corresponds to the η - ϕ of the detector cell where it deposits its energy

Mismatch of displaced particle's $\eta - \phi$ direction with η - ϕ segmentation of the detector

Measured angle from the beam = 30 degree Actual orientation is different

layered structure/depth segmentation needed to visualise the effect Fast detector simulations do not have such layered structure (e.g. Delphes) See non-pointing photon search by CMS collaboration



Unusual features of LLPs : Non-pointing nature



CNN can discriminate displaced vs prompt energy deposition

Physical area taken by the decay products become small with distance and they mostly get contained within fewer $\eta - \varphi$ towers.

> BB, Swagata Mukherjee and Rhitaja Sengupta arXiv:1904.04811, JHEP 2019









Unusual features of LLPs : backward moving particle



Wednesday, 16 May 18

S. Banerjee, G. Bélanger, BB, F. Boudjema, R. Godbole and S. Mukherjee Phys.Rev.D 98 (2018) 11, 115026

Talk by Swagata Mukherjee LHC LLP Workshop 16-18 May, 2018 CERN

Timing Information



Decay products of heavy LLPs will reach late compared to the prompt particles T1 -T0 can be used as a discriminant

T1





$pp \rightarrow \phi \phi, \phi \rightarrow e^+ e^-$

Jet timing

ECAL barrel detector will also provide precise timing information

30ps timing resolution for 20 GeV energy deposition at the beginning of HL-LHC







$$\Delta T_{mean}^{Ewt} = \frac{\sum \Delta T_i \times E_i}{\sum E_i}, \ i \equiv \text{crystals inside the jet}$$

distribution is different for high decay length QCD jets can also have a long tail



Time-delayed QCD jets



Intrinsic spread of the beam-spot in both the temporal and longitudinal direction Particles like KS, Λ , Ω etc. are long lived in the detector ECAL resolution changes with time

BB, Tapasi Ghosh, Rhitaja Sengupta, Prabhat Solanki e-Print: 2112.04518, JHEP 2022

Displaced Jets

Nice features

 $pp \rightarrow X_{LLP}X_{LLP}, X_{LLP} \rightarrow q + \bar{q}$ (jets)

- Displaced multiple tracks
- Secondary vertices

Displaced jets

Energy deposit in the calorimeter, no associated tracks from the primary vertex



• Calorimeter energy deposits are not associated with tracks from primary vertex=> trackless jet

Displaced Jets

Nice features

 $pp \rightarrow X_{ILP}X_{ILP}, X_{ILP} \rightarrow q + \bar{q}$ (jets)

- Displaced multiple tracks
- Secondary vertices

tracks from the primary vertex



• Calorimeter energy deposits are not associated with tracks from primary vertex=> trackless jet

Displaced Vertex search





Displaced Vertex search

- There are a few SM hadrons which can also give rise to displaced vertex signature • their lifetimes and masses are known => better handle
- Highly energetic hadrons can interact with the material of the detector
- Accidental crossing of tracks and merged vertices





Material veto map (CMS) 2012.01581

Multiple unrelated tracks

Displaced Vertex search

• Use material map veto : reject displaced vertices if it falls on the veto region(dense region) => residual backgrounds come from less dense region, LLP hadrons and accidental crossing => mostly peaks in the low invariant mass low multiplicity region

See ATLAS paper 2301.13866 for example



arXiv:2308.05804, JHEP 23

Identification of light LLPs with low multiplicity final states may be difficult !! (Exception : Muon final state)



Track Multiplicity of the DV



Dedicated Forward detector: FASER Experiment

The flux of light hadrons produced at the interaction points of ATLAS/CMS in the forward direction is very high. Mediators produced from the decay of such hadrons will have significant boost. If the mediator are long-lived, it can travel $\sim O(100 \text{ m})$ before it decays.

> Need for a forward detector => the ForwArd Search ExpeRiment(FASER)

REF: The FASER Detector: 2207.11427

The FASER detector is located at ~480 m from the ATLAS detector.

It has about 1.5 m long decay volume followed by tracking stations and calorimeter.

Four Scintillator stations: in front of FASERnu(veto), decay volume, tracking station and Calorimeter

Decay volume and tracking stations are surrounded by 0.57 T Magnetic field.



FASER Experiment : Backgrounds

- Trigger: Signals form Scintillators or Calorimeter
- Dark photon search strategy: $Z_D \rightarrow e^+e^-$
- two collimated charged tracks in the tracker, large energy deposit in the calorimeter
- Trigger Rate : ~ 1KHz mostly from muons
- Other backgrounds : Neutral hadrons from muon in the rock, cosmic muon and neutrino
- no signal in the scintillator, Each Scintillator efficiency > 99.99% => 4 scintillators can effectively suppress muon background, two good quality reconstructed tracks and more than 500 GeV energy in the calorimeter
- Total estimated background less than 1 ($\sim 2 \times 10^{-3}$)





FASER: Limits and Future Projections:

 $pp \to Z_D + X$ $\pi \to Z_D \gamma$



First result on dark photon COM 13.6 TeV , LHC Run 3 CERN-FASER-CONF-2023-001

Future projection 1811.12522

Fixed Target/ Beam Dump Experiment

Fixed target experiment: a beam is dumped mostly on a heavy target(absorb the hadronic cascade quickly) Produce LLPs from rare meson decay, bremsstrahlung etc.

Disadvantage :COM energy is small compared to collider experiment Advantage: High Intensity beam, long decay volume => particularly effective for light LLPs Various past/existing/proposed Fixed target/Beam dump experiments : Past : E137,E141, KEK, Orsay . Existing : NA64e, NA64mu, NA62-BD Proposed : NA64h, Ship, HIKE, SHADOW Future : ILC beam dump : 2105.13768

CMS vs MATHUSLA

LLP Model: $pp \rightarrow h \rightarrow \phi \phi$

 $25 \times 100 \times 100 \,\mathrm{m}^3$

 $60 < x < 85 \,\mathrm{m}$ $-50 < y < 50 \,\mathrm{m}$ 68 < z < 168 m,

Complementarity of the CMS analyses using the muon spectrometer and the MATHUSLA LLP detector at 14 TeV with an integrated luminosity of 3000 fb⁻¹

- The dedicated detectors placed far away from the IP might be sensitive to a range of lifetimes which is complementary to the CMS MS.
- These proposed detectors will be placed a few tens of meters away from the IP of the pp collision.
- Enough shielding of rock or concrete as well as active veto to guarantee very little or almost no backgrounds.
- Therefore, observation of even a few events (\sim 4) can be claimed as a discovery of displaced decays of particles.

A dedicated Transverse Detector fror FCC-hh

<u>Advantage</u>: The collider, as well as the detectors, are not yet constructed, possible to optimise the position as well as the size of the detector to maximise its sensitivity, rather than finding empty spaces near the various IPs to place and fit the LLP detectors for the HL-LHC experiment.

> We here propose three designs of a dedicated LLP detector DELIGHT (Detector for long-lived particles at high energy of 100 TeV), a box-type detector in the periphery of the FCC-hh collider

A position starting at around 25 m in the x-direction around $\eta = 0$ region can be kept empty for placing a dedicated LLP detector.

LLP detectors for FCC-ee is proposed here : 2011.01005

- **DELIGHT (A):** The same as the dimensions of the MATHUSLA detector,
 - i.e. $\Delta x \times \Delta y \times \Delta z = 25 \times 100 \times 100 \,\mathrm{m^3}$.
 - Four times bigger than the MATHUSLA detector,
 - i.e. $\Delta x \times \Delta y \times \Delta z = 100 \times 100 \times 100 \text{ m}^3$.
- **DELIGHT (C):** The same decay volume as the MATHUSLA detector with
 - different dimensions, i.e. $\Delta x \times \Delta y \times \Delta z = 200 \times 50 \times 50 \text{ m}^3$.

DELIGHT-A

DELIGHT (A): The same as the dimensions of the MATHUSLA detector,

DELIGHT (A) $25 \times 100 \times 100$

DELIGHT(A) vs MATHUSLA: an improvement by a factor of \sim 540, around \sim 150 from increased cross-section and integrated luminosity, another factor of ~ 3 – 4 is gained by moving the detector close to the IP. Central position of the detector can benefit light LLPs.

BB, Shigeki Matsumoto and Rhitaja Sengupta e-Print: 2111.02437, PRD 2022

i.e. $\Delta x \times \Delta y \times \Delta z = 25 \times 100 \times 100 \,\mathrm{m^3}.$

LLP Model: $pp \rightarrow h \rightarrow \phi \phi$

)(0 m^3 , 30 ab ⁻¹ , Combined 10-2								
-08	2.7e-07	5.0e-07		$\sqrt{5}$	5 = 100 TeV				10 -
-08	1.7e-07	4.1e-07							10-3
-08	1.4e-07	2.5e-07	1.3e-06	4.1e-05					10^{-4}
-08	1.1e-07	2.5e-07	1.3e-06	1.3e-05					10 ⁻⁵ €
-08	6.0e-08	1.1e-07	5.4e-07	9.4e-07					↑ ₽_
-08	4.5e-08	8.2e-08	4.2e-07	8.7e-07					10 ⁻⁶)
-08	3.7e-08	6.8e-08	3.0e-07	6.7e-07					10 ⁻⁷
-08	3.1e-08	5.8e-08	2.8e-07	4.5e-07					10 ⁻⁸
-08	2.9e-08	5.5e-08	2.6e-07	3.9e-07					10 ⁻⁹
2	- - - - -			4		6			10
T	(m)								

Proposal for a dedicated forward detector@FCC-hh

Proposal for a dedicated forward detector, FOREHUNT (FORward Experiment for HUNdred TeV), for 100 TeV FCC-hh

Collaborators :

- 1. Dr. Rhitaja Sengupta (Graduated in 2023, now at Bonn Univ.)
- 2. Dr. Prabhat Solanki (Graduated in 2024, Now in INFN Pisa, CMS experiment)
- 3. Dr. Nivedita Ghosh (Postdoc @IISc)
- 4. Dr. Swagata Mukherjee (IIT Kanpur)
- 5. Prof. Shigeki Matsumoto(Kavli IPMU)
- 6. Shankha Banerjee (IMSc) +

Directions :

- 1. Trigger developments for LLPs
- 2. ECAL and MTD Timing
- 3. ML for LLPs
- 4. Dedicated detector for FCC-hh
- 5. Parameter estimation for LLPs

ow at Bonn Univ.) ow in INFN Pisa, CMS experiment)

- Long-lived particles are well-motivated in BSM theories
- Various unusual signatures are possible : understanding of detector is required for estimation of backgrounds
- LLPs in many cases
- Dedicated detectors will be required to probe light LLPs
- FCC-hh will be able to improve the search sensitivity as expected
- future collider unlike LHC
- group. => More studies are ongoing

• Signature of LLP not only depends on the decay products also depend where it decays

• General purpose detectors like CMS/ATLAS are capable to identify the presence of

• Optimization of the location and size of the dedicated detectors will be possible for the

• Two proposals for dedicated detectors : FOREHUNT and DELIGHT are made by our

Extra Slides

Not a collision between two protons

Collision between proton bunches

Proton bunch 1

Multiple collision vertices : Pileup vertices

Proton bunch 2

Displaced jets

Expected features

- Displaced multiple tracks
- Secondary vertices
- Calorimeter energy deposits are not associated with tracks from primary vertex=> trackless jet

Current Run of LHC: average number of pileup ~ 50

Narrow jets for LLP

LLP Model: $pp \rightarrow XX, X \rightarrow q\bar{q}$

Only narrow jet will not be sufficient to suppress background Many Variables can be constructed Single narrow jet trigger with pT > 60 GeV with strict cuts on tracking variables may be used.

BB, Swagata Mukherjee, Rhitaja Sengupta, Prabhat Solanki e-Print: 2003.03943, JHEP 2020

$\Delta T_{mean}^{Ewt} > 1.1 \text{ns} \text{ and } p_T^{jet} > 35 \text{GeV}$ $LLP (A), \Delta T_{mean}^{ewt}$ $\bigcirc 0.50 1.86 6.40 15.82 16.13 13.71 9.03 4.06$ $\bigcirc 0.39 0.75 1.97 10.76 16.32 18.78 15.80 8.58$ $\bigcirc 0.38 0.38 0.74 6.80 12.57 19.41 18.98 12.64$ $\bigcirc 0.38 0.43 0.73 4.01 10.03 18.43 21.24 16.26$ $\bigcirc 0.41 0.42 0.42 3.22 7.91 17.80 22.98 19.01$ $= 1 5 10 30 50 100 200 500$ $CT (cm)$ $- \operatorname{Br}(h \to XX) \le 6.2 \times 10^{-6} \text{ for } M_X = 10 \text{ G}$			pp	$\rightarrow l$	<i>n</i> ₁₂₅	\rightarrow	$\phi\phi$	$,\phi$	$\rightarrow l$	bb
$\begin{aligned} \square \Gamma = 0.50 & 1.86 & 6.40 & 15.82 & 16.13 & 13.71 & 9.03 & 4.06 \\ \bigcirc 0 & 0.39 & 0.75 & 1.97 & 10.76 & 16.32 & 18.78 & 15.80 & 8.58 \\ \bigcirc 0 & 0.38 & 0.38 & 0.74 & 6.80 & 12.57 & 19.41 & 18.98 & 12.64 \\ \bigcirc 0 & 0.38 & 0.43 & 0.73 & 4.01 & 10.03 & 18.43 & 21.24 & 16.26 \\ \bigcirc 0 & 0.41 & 0.42 & 0.42 & 3.22 & 7.91 & 17.80 & 22.98 & 19.01 \\ \hline 1 & 5 & 10 & 30 & 50 & 100 & 200 & 500 \\ \hline CT & (CT) & (CT) & (CT) & CT & (CT) \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0$		Δ	T ^{Ewt} mean	> 1.	1ns	and p	$p_T^{jet} >$	35G	eV	
$ \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{O} = 0.50 & 1.86 & 6.40 & 15.82 & 16.13 & 13.71 & 9.03 & 4.06 \\ \mathbf{O} = 0.39 & 0.75 & 1.97 & 10.76 & 16.32 & 18.78 & 15.80 & 8.58 \\ \mathbf{O} = 0.38 & 0.38 & 0.74 & 6.80 & 12.57 & 19.41 & 18.98 & 12.64 \\ \mathbf{O} = 0.38 & 0.43 & 0.73 & 4.01 & 10.03 & 18.43 & 21.24 & 16.26 \\ \mathbf{O} = 0.41 & 0.42 & 0.42 & 3.22 & 7.91 & 17.80 & 22.98 & 19.01 \\ \hline 1 & 5 & 10 & 30 & 50 & 100 & 200 & 500 \\ \mathbf{CT} & (\mathbf{CT}) & (\mathbf{CT}) & \mathbf{CT} & (\mathbf{CT}) & \mathbf{CT} & $					LLF	' (A) ,	ΔT_{1}^{e}	nean		
$SP_{2} = 0.39 0.75 1.97 10.76 16.32 18.78 15.80 8.58$ $SP_{2} = 0.38 0.38 0.74 6.80 12.57 19.41 18.98 12.64$ $Q = 0.38 0.43 0.73 4.01 10.03 18.43 21.24 16.26$ $Q = 0.41 0.42 0.42 3.22 7.91 17.80 22.98 19.01$ $1 5 10 30 50 100 200 500$ $CT (Cm)$ $- Br(h \to XX) \le 6.2 \times 10^{-6} \text{ for } M_X = 10 \text{ C}$		10	0.50	1.86	6.40	15.82	16.13	13.71	9.03	4.06
$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{P} \\ $		20 20	0.39	0.75	1.97	10.76	16.32	18.78	15.80	8.58
$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{FO} & \mathbf{Q} &= 0.38 & 0.43 & 0.73 & 4.01 & 10.03 & 18.43 & 21.24 & 16.26 \\ \mathbf{C} &= 0.41 & 0.42 & 0.42 & 3.22 & 7.91 & 17.80 & 22.98 & 19.01 \\ 1 & 5 & 10 & 30 & 50 & 100 & 200 & 500 \\ \mathbf{CT} & (\mathbf{Cm}) & \mathbf{CT} & (\mathbf{Cm}) & \mathbf{CT} & \mathbf{T} & \mathbf{CT} &$	וss (פפ	°9	0.38	0.38	0.74	6.80	12.57	19.41	18.98	12.64
$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{G} = 0.41 & 0.42 & 0.42 & 3.22 & 7.91 & 17.80 & 22.98 & 19.01 \\ \hline 1 & 5 & 10 & 30 & 50 & 100 & 200 & 500 \\ \hline \mathbf{CT} & (\mathbf{Cm}) & \mathbf{CT} $	INI	40	0.38	0.43	0.73	4.01	10.03	18.43	21.24	16.26
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		50	0.41	0.42	0.42	3.22	7.91	17.80	22.98	19.01
$c\tau$ (cm) - Br $(h \rightarrow XX) \le 6.2 \times 10^{-6}$ for $M_X = 10$ G			1	5	10	30	50	100	200	500
$- Br(h \to XX) \le 6.2 \times 10^{-6}$ for $M_X = 10 G$	$c\tau$ (cm)									
\sim										

Future sensitivity (50 events at L1)

GeV, $c\tau = 50 \,\mathrm{cm}$ $- \text{Br}(h \to XX) \lesssim 5.1 \times 10^{-6} \text{ for } M_X = 30 \text{ GeV}, \ c\tau = 100 \text{ cm}$ $- \operatorname{Br}(h \to XX) \lesssim 4.3 \times 10^{-6} \text{ for } M_X = 50 \,\mathrm{GeV}, \, c\tau = 200 \,\mathrm{cm}$

BB, Tapasi Ghosh, Rhitaja Sengupta, Prabhat Solanki e-Print: 2112.04518, JHEP 2022

Other variables can be constructed.

Tracker vs Muon Spectrometer

ϵ_{MS} The ratio of efficiencies for the LLP (the mediator particle) which decays inside the muon spectrometer and the tracker of the CMS detector $\epsilon_{Tracker}$ detector							
m_{ϕ} $c\tau_{\phi}$	$0.5{ m GeV}$	$5{ m GeV}$	$50~{ m GeV}$				
0.01 m	0.09	0.00	0.00				
$0.1\mathrm{m}$	1.10	0.09	0.00				
$1.0\mathrm{m}$	1.68	1.07	0.07				
$10.0\mathrm{m}$	2.04	1.67	0.85				
$100.0\mathrm{m}$	-	1.59	1.53				
1000.0 m - 1.52							
MS volume : $dT > 4m$ or $ d_Z > 7m$, and, $dT < 7m$ and $ d_Z < 10m$ tracker, volume : $(dT < 1.29m$ and $ d_Z < 3m)$							

Activity in the Muon Spectrometer

cluster of hits.

Experimental Questions : how they exactly look in the MS ? whether these hits can be reconstructed ? whether the position of the dSV can be

identified with such clusters of hits

LLP Model: $pp \rightarrow h \rightarrow \phi \phi$

<u>Why Muon spectrometer ?</u>

- Muon spectrometer is least affected by the increased PU rate (farthest from the IP)
- Large decay volume, suitable for LLPs
- MS has the capability to detect various final states from the mediator decay other than muons
- There exists a range of decay lengths where this ratio is equal to or greater than one

LLP searches using MS by CMS/ATLAS collaborations: 1811.07370, 1911.12575, CMS PAS EXO-20-015, 2107.04833

Particles except muons will look different in the CMS MS due to their interactions with the iron yokes, i.e., they shower and give rise to a

NA62 Experiment

Fixed-target experiment at CERN SPS

400 GeV proton on Beryllium target=> 75 GeV K+ is selected

Kaon is tagged by KTAG, momentum measured by GTK => decay volume is 60 m Decay products are measured by several detectors (and veto on photons)

It can also run in a beam-dump mode: Limit on dark-photon model

SHiP Experiment

The Search for Hidden Particles Collaboration **Proposed** general purpose beam dump experiment at CERN SPS SPS is capable of delivering 4×10^{19} protons with energy 400 GeV (per year) and Neutrino detector and Hidden sector spectrometer (Total length ~ 120 m). decays inside the 50m long decay volume between SND and HS.

- The detector consists of heavy target, hadron stopper, active muon shield followed by Scattering
- HS spectrometer will be able to detect the decay products of the long-lived mediator which

SHiP Experiment

The decay spectrometer will have tracker, muon detector and calorimeter=> possible to identify various decay products of the mediator and also for background suppression

Various backgrounds can be reduced below 1 event

SHiP is sensitive to wide range of models

	Physics model	Final state
	HNL, SUSY neutralino	$\ell^{\pm}\pi^{\mp}, \ell^{\pm}K^{\mp}, \ell^{\pm} ho^{\mp}(ho^{\mp}-$
	DP, DS, ALP (fermion coupling), SUSY sgoldstino	$\ell^+\ell^-$
HSDS	DP, DS, ALP (gluon coupling), SUSY sgoldstino	$\pi^+\pi^-, K^+K^-$
	HNL, SUSY neutralino, axino	$\ell^+\ell^- v$
	ALP (photon coupling), SUSY sgoldstino	γγ
	SUSY sgoldstino	$\pi^0\pi^0$

2112.01487

Projected sensitivity for dark photon and HNL are also available here SPSC-SR-248

LHCb

It uses the high production rate in the forward direction.

Detection of low p_T event possible

Standard analysis : $pp \rightarrow W \rightarrow lN \rightarrow lljj$ also possible

Light scalar : $B \rightarrow \phi K, \phi \rightarrow \mu \mu$

From Run 3, LHCb is using full software trigger

LHCb future sensitivity without VELO 2312.14016

1710.02867

Dark Photon search in the di-muon channel => Peak search above SM continuum bkg. PT of muon >1 GeV Resonance regions excluded

Some patches for LL dark photon also excluded

Light dark photon below 200 MeV can be studied in future from pion decay $\pi \rightarrow Z_D + \gamma$

B-parking@CMS

2018: CMS collected 10¹⁰ *bb* events using a dedicated data stream Events with muons with pT > 7 to 12 GeV recorded Raw data stored and later processed

CMS Scouting

Future projection@BELLE-II

10 GeV electron-positron collider at the SuperKEKB (KEK) Capable of collecting 50 ab-1 of data in future

Smaller background compared to LHC experiments (no Pileup)

Reconstruction of charged and neutral hadrons possible

Phi -> pion, Kaon, Mu and tau

Future projection for dark scalars from BELLE-II(Green): $B + \rightarrow K + Phi$