

# SUSY Without <sup>too much</sup> Prejudice



19? DO NOT ERASE

1	21	41	61	81	101	121	141	161	181	19?
2		42	OK   OK	62	OK   Error 1	82	OK   Error 1	102		
3	OK   OK	23	43	63		83		103		
4	OK   OK	24	44	64	OK   Error 1	84		104		
5		25	45	OK   OK	65	OK   Error 1	85			
6		26	46	66		86		106		
7		27	OK   Error 1	47	67	OK   OK	87			
8		28	48	68		88		108		
9		29	49	69	OK   OK	89	OK   OK	109		
10	OK   OK	30	Error 2	50	OK   OK	70	OK   OK	90	OK   OK	DO NOT ERASE
11		31	OK   Error 1	51	71		91			Error 1: ... cannot ...
12		32	Error 2	52	OK   OK	72		92		Error 2: ... cannot ...
13		33	OK   Error 1	53		73		93		OK = one OK + ...
14		34	54	OK   Error 1	74		94	OK   OK		OK = Error 1
15		35	Error 2	55	OK   Error 1	75		95	OK   OK	
16		36	OK   Error 1	56	Error 2	76		96		
17	OK   OK	37	57	Error 1	77		97	OK   OK		
18		38	OK   Error 1	58	OK   Error 1	78		98	OK   OK	
19	OK	39	59	Error 2	79		99	OK   OK		
20	OK   OK	40	60		80		100	OK   OK		

19? DO NOT ERASE

1-10 John  
1-25 John  
36-40 Tom  
41-55 Paul  
56-70 John  
71-85 Daniel  
86-100 Daniel

The MSSM has many nice features but is very difficult to study in any model-independent manner due to the large number of soft SUSY breaking parameters ( $\sim 120$ ).

To circumvent this issue, authors generally limit their analyses to a specific SUSY breaking scenario(s) such as mSUGRA, GMSB, AMSB,... which then determines the sparticle masses, couplings & signatures in terms of only a few parameters.

But how well do any or all of these reflect the true breadth of the MSSM?? Do we really know the MSSM as well as we think?


Is there another way to approach this problem & yet remain *more general*? *Some* set of assumptions are necessary to make any such study practical. **But what?** All sorts of choices are possible...

# Most Analyses Assume mSUGRA/CMSSM Framework

- CMSSM:  $m_0, m_{1/2}, A_0, \tan\beta, \text{sign } \mu$
- $\chi^2$  fit to some global data set

Prediction for Lightest Higgs Mass

Fit to EW precision, B-physics observables, & WMAP




# Comparison of CMSSM to GMSB & AMSB

Heinemeyer et al arXiv:0805.2359

## Lightest Chargino

## Gluino

## Lightest Sbottom



## FEATURE Analysis Assumptions :

- The most general, CP-conserving MSSM with R-parity
- Minimal Flavor Violation
- The lightest neutralino is the LSP.
- The first two sfermion generations are degenerate (sfermion type by sfermion type).
- The first two generations have negligible Yukawa's.
- No assumptions about SUSY-breaking or GUT

This leaves us with the pMSSM:

→ the MSSM with 19 real, weak-scale parameters...

What are they??

$M_A$

$\tilde{M}_{Q1}$

$\tilde{M}_{Q3}$

$\tilde{M}_{L1}$

$\tilde{M}_{L3}$

$\tilde{M}_{u1}$

$\tilde{M}_{d1}$

$\tilde{M}_{e1}$

$\tilde{M}_{u3}$

$\tilde{M}_{d3}$

$\tilde{M}_{e3}$

$A_t$

$A_b$

$A_r$

$M_1$

$M_2$

$M_3$

$\mu$

$\tan \beta$

# What are the Goals of this Study???

- Prepare a large sample,  $\sim 50k$ , of MSSM models (= parameter space points) satisfying 'all' of the experimental constraints. A large sample is necessary to get a good feeling for the variety of possibilities.
  - Examine the properties of the models that survive. Do they look like the model points that have been studied up to now???? What are the differences?
  - Do physics analyses with these models for LHC, FERMI, PAMELA/ATIC, ILC/CLIC, etc. etc. – all your favorites!
- Such a general analysis allows us to study the MSSM at the electroweak/TeV scale without any reference to the nature of the UV completion: GUTs? New intermediate mass scales? Messenger scales?

# How?

We have performed 2 large scans (& two smaller scans)

i)  $10^7$  points with flat priors for masses:

- $100 \text{ GeV} \leq \tilde{M}_{\text{sfermions}} \leq 1 \text{ TeV}$
- $50 \text{ GeV} \leq |M_1, M_2, \mu| \leq 1 \text{ TeV}, \quad 100 \text{ GeV} \leq M_3 \leq 1 \text{ TeV}$
- $\sim 0.5 M_Z \leq M_A \leq 1 \text{ TeV}, \quad 1 \leq \tan \beta \leq 50$
- $|A_{t b \tau}| \leq 1 \text{ TeV}$

These are Lagrangian parameters evaluated at the SUSY scale.

Absolute value signs account for possible 'phases' (i.e., signs) :  
only  $\text{Arg}(M_i \mu)$  and  $\text{Arg}(A_f \mu)$  are physical...we take  $M_3 > 0$


ii)  $2 \times 10^6$  points with log priors for masses:

- $100 \text{ GeV} \leq \tilde{M}_{\text{sfermions}} \leq 3 \text{ TeV}$
- $10 \text{ GeV} \leq |M_1, M_2, \mu| \leq 3 \text{ TeV}, \quad 100 \text{ GeV} \leq M_3 \leq 3 \text{ TeV}$
- $\sim 0.5 M_Z \leq M_A \leq 3 \text{ TeV}, \quad 1 \leq \tan \beta \leq 60$
- $10 \text{ GeV} \leq |A_{t b \tau}| \leq 3 \text{ TeV}$

While scan (i) emphasizes sparticles with moderate masses, scan (ii) emphasizes light sparticles BUT also extends to higher masses simultaneously

Comparison of these two scans will show the prior sensitivity.  
→ This analysis required  $\sim 1$  processor-century of CPU time...  
this is the real limitation of this study.

What constraints and experimental data do we employ?



# Constraints


- $-0.0007 < \Delta\rho < 0.0026$  (PDG'08)
  - $b \rightarrow s \gamma : B = (2.5 - 4.1) \times 10^{-4}$  ; (HFAG) + Misiak etal. & Becher & Neubert
  - $\Delta(g-2)_\mu$  ???  $(30.2 \pm 8.8) \times 10^{-10}$  (0809.4062)  
 $(29.5 \pm 7.9) \times 10^{-10}$  (0809.3085)  
 $[\sim 14.0 \pm 8.4] \times 10^{-10}$  [Davier/BaBar-Tau08]
- $(-10 \text{ to } 40) \times 10^{-10}$  to be conservative..
- $\Gamma(Z \rightarrow \text{invisible}) < 2.0 \text{ MeV}$  (LEPEWWG)  
 This removes Z decays to LSPs w/ large Higgsino content
  - **Meson-Antimeson Mixing** : Constrains 1<sup>st</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> sfermion mass ratios to be in the range  $0.2 < R < 5$  in MFV context

# $B \rightarrow \tau \nu$

Isidori & Paradisi, hep-ph/0605012 & Erikson et al., 0808.3551 for loop corrections

Bounds on NP by rare decays: example of Two-Higgs-Doublet Model

Haisch, arXiv:0805.2141



New data from Babar and Belle talks by Baracchini, Hara

\* New bounds:  $B \rightarrow K \nu \bar{\nu}, B \rightarrow \mu \nu$

\* New HFAG for  $B \rightarrow \tau \nu$

$$BR(B \rightarrow \tau \nu) = (1.51 \pm 0.33) 10^{-4}$$

$$SM: \propto |V_{ub}|^2 f_B^2$$

$$BR(B \rightarrow \tau \nu) = (0.80 \pm 0.12) 10^{-4}$$

UTfit, 2008

$\tan \beta$  suppression expected in THDM/MSSM

Super-B ( $\geq 50 ab^{-1}$ ) sensitivity

3 – 4% Stocchi et al., arXiv:0710.3799

Heavy Flavour Theory, Tobias Hurth (CERN, SLAC)




→  $B = (55 \text{ to } 227) \times 10^{-6}$


# Indirect Search: $B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu$

The search for  $B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu$  is perhaps the most sensitive to SUSY since sparticles show up in loops

Especially sensitive at high  $\tan\beta$  ( $\propto \tan\beta^6$ )




CDF, PRL 100, 101802 (2008)




Preliminary Combined CDF/DØ  
 $BR(B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu) < 4.5 \times 10^{-8}$   
 @95%

$BR_{SM} = 3.5 \times 10^{-9}$

$\sim \tan^6\beta$   
 mSUGRA at  $\tan\beta = 50$   
 Arnowitt, Dutta, et al., PR 53R (2007) 171



# Dark Matter: Direct Searches for WIMPs



- CDMS, XENON10, DAMA, CRESST-I,... → We find a factor of  $\sim 4$  uncertainty in the nuclear matrix elements. This factor was obtained from studying several benchmark points in detail & so we allow cross sections 4x larger than the usually quoted limits. Spin-independent limits are completely dominant here.
- Dark Matter density:  $\Omega h^2 < 0.1210$  → 5yr WMAP data + We treat this only as an upper bound on the LSP DM density to allow for multi-component DM, e.g., axions, etc. Recall the lightest neutralino is the LSP here
- LEP and Tevatron Direct Higgs & SUSY searches : there are *many* of these searches but they are very complicated with many caveats.... CAREFUL!

Zh, h- $\rightarrow$  bb,  $\tau\tau$




Figure 1: The 95% c.l. upper bound on the coupling ratio  $\xi^2 = (g_{HZZ}/g_{HZZ}^{\text{SM}})^2$  (see text). The dark (green) and light (yellow) shaded bands around the median expected line correspond to the 68% and 95% probability bands. The horizontal lines correspond to the Standard Model coupling. (a): For Higgs boson decays predicted by the Standard Model; (b): for the Higgs boson decaying exclusively into  $b\bar{b}$  and (c): into  $\tau^+\tau^-$  pairs.

# LEP II: Associated Higgs Production

$$Z \rightarrow hA \rightarrow 4b, 2b2\tau, 4\tau$$






Figure 3: Model-independent 95% c.l. upper bounds,  $S_{95}$ , for various topological cross sections motivated by the pair-production process  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2\mathcal{H}_1$ , for the particular case where  $m_{\mathcal{H}_2}$  and  $m_{\mathcal{H}_1}$  are approximately equal. Such is the case, for example, in the CP-conserving MSSM scenarios for  $\tan\beta$  greater than 10. The abscissa represents the sum of the two Higgs boson masses. The full line represents the observed limit. The dark (green) and light (yellow) shaded bands around the median expectation (dashed line) correspond to the 68% and 95% probability bands. The curves which complete the exclusion at low masses are obtained using the constraint from the measured decay width of the Z boson, see Section 3.2. Upper plot: the Higgs boson decay branching ratios correspond to the  $m_h$ -max benchmark scenario with  $\tan\beta=10$ , namely 94%  $\mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ , 6%  $\mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ , 92%  $\mathcal{H}_2 \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  and 8%  $\mathcal{H}_2 \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ ; lower left: both Higgs bosons are assumed to decay exclusively to  $b\bar{b}$ ; lower right: the Higgs bosons are assumed to decay, one into  $b\bar{b}$  only and the other one into  $\tau^+\tau^-$  only. For the case where both Higgs bosons decay to  $\tau^+\tau^-$ , the corresponding upper bound can be found in Ref. [31], Figure 15.

# RH Sleptons



Note the holes where the leptons are too soft...

We need to allow for a mass gap w/ the LSP & also in the squark case when soft jets are possible..light guys may slip through



Large mass gap chargino search

Depends on the sneutrino mass in the t-channel if less than  $\sim 160$  GeV due to interference if large wino content

Some 'light' charginos may slip through as search reach is degraded

# Tevatron Constraints : I Squark & Gluino Search

## • 2,3,4 Jets + Missing Energy (D0)

TABLE I: Selection criteria for the three analyses (all energies and momenta in GeV); see the text for further details.

Preselection Cut		All Analyses		
$\cancel{E}_T$		$\geq 40$		
Vertex $z$ pos		$< 60$ cm		
Acoplanarity		$< 165^\circ$		
Selection Cut	"dijet"	"3-jets"	"gluino"	
Trigger	dijet	multijet	multijet	
jet <sub>1</sub> $p_T^a$	$\geq 35$	$\geq 35$	$\geq 35$	
jet <sub>2</sub> $p_T^a$	$\geq 35$	$\geq 35$	$\geq 35$	
jet <sub>3</sub> $p_T^b$	–	$\geq 35$	$\geq 35$	
jet <sub>4</sub> $p_T^b$	–	–	$\geq 20$	
Electron veto	yes	yes	yes	
Muon veto	yes	yes	yes	
$\Delta\phi(\cancel{E}_T, \text{jet}_1)$	$\geq 90^\circ$	$\geq 90^\circ$	$\geq 90^\circ$	
$\Delta\phi(\cancel{E}_T, \text{jet}_2)$	$\geq 50^\circ$	$\geq 50^\circ$	$\geq 50^\circ$	
$\Delta\phi_{\min}(\cancel{E}_T, \text{any jet})$	$\geq 40^\circ$	–	–	
$H_T$	$\geq 325$	$\geq 375$	$\geq 400$	
$\cancel{E}_T$	$\geq 225$	$\geq 175$	$\geq 100$	

<sup>a</sup>First and second jets are also required to be central ( $|\eta_{\text{jet}}| < 0.8$ ), with an electromagnetic fraction below 0.95, and to have  $\text{CPF0} \geq 0.75$ .

<sup>b</sup>Third and fourth jets are required to have  $|\eta_{\text{jet}}| < 2.5$ , with an electromagnetic fraction below 0.95.

Multiple analyses keyed to look for:

Squarks  $\rightarrow$  jet + MET

Gluinos  $\rightarrow$  2 j + MET


The search is based on mSUGRA type sparticle spectrum assumptions which can be VERY far from our model points

# Gluginos at the Tevatron


Alwall, Le, Lisanti, Wacker arXiv:0803.0019

- Tevatron gluino/squark analyses performed solely for mSUGRA – constant ratio  $m_{\text{gluino}} : m_{\text{bino}} \approx 6 : 1$

Glauino-Bino mass ratio determines kinematics



## Exclusion Limits



## D0 benchmarks

TABLE II: For each analysis, information on the signal for which it was optimized ( $m_0$ ,  $m_{1/2}$ ,  $m_{\tilde{g}}$ ,  $m_{\tilde{q}}$ , and nominal NLO cross section), signal efficiency, the number of events observed, the number of events expected from SM backgrounds, the number of events expected from signal, and the 95% C.L. signal cross section upper limit. The first uncertainty is statistical and the second is systematic.

Analysis	$(m_0, m_{1/2})$ (GeV)	$(m_{\tilde{g}}, m_{\tilde{q}})$ (GeV)	$\sigma_{\text{nom}}$ (pb)	$\epsilon_{\text{sig.}}$ (%)	$N_{\text{obs.}}$	$N_{\text{backgrd.}}$	$N_{\text{sig.}}$	$\sigma_{95}$ (pb)
“dijet”	(25,175)	(439,396)	0.072	$6.8 \pm 0.4^{+1.2}_{-1.2}$	11	$11.1 \pm 1.2^{+2.9}_{-2.3}$	$10.4 \pm 0.6^{+1.8}_{-1.8}$	0.075
“3-jets”	(197,154)	(400,400)	0.083	$6.8 \pm 0.4^{+1.4}_{-1.3}$	9	$10.7 \pm 0.9^{+3.1}_{-2.1}$	$12.0 \pm 0.7^{+2.5}_{-2.3}$	0.065
“gluino”	(500,110)	(320,551)	0.195	$4.1 \pm 0.3^{+0.8}_{-0.7}$	20	$17.7 \pm 1.1^{+5.6}_{-3.3}$	$17.0 \pm 1.2^{+3.3}_{-2.9}$	0.165

TABLE III: Definition of the analysis combinations, and number of events observed in the data and expected from the SM backgrounds.


Selection	“dijet”	“3-jets”	“gluino”	$N_{\text{obs.}}$	$N_{\text{backgrd.}}$
Combination 1	yes	no	no	8	$9.4 \pm 1.2$ (stat.) $^{+2.3}_{-1.8}$ (syst.)
Combination 2	no	yes	no	2	$4.5 \pm 0.6$ (stat.) $^{+0.7}_{-0.5}$ (syst.)
Combination 3	no	no	yes	14	$12.5 \pm 0.9$ (stat.) $^{+3.6}_{-1.9}$ (syst.)
Combination 4	yes	yes	no	1	$1.1 \pm 0.3$ (stat.) $^{+0.5}_{-0.3}$ (syst.)
Combination 5	yes	no	yes		kinematically not allowed
Combination 6	no	yes	yes	4	$4.5 \pm 0.6$ (stat.) $^{+1.8}_{-1.3}$ (syst.)
Combination 7	yes	yes	yes	2	$0.6 \pm 0.2$ (stat.) $^{+0.1}_{-0.2}$ (syst.)
At least one selection				31	$32.6 \pm 1.7$ (stat.) $^{+9.0}_{-5.8}$ (syst.)

## Combos of the 3 analyses

→ Feldman-Cousins 95% CL Signal limit: 8.34 events

SuSpect -> SUSY-Hit -> PROSPINO -> PYTHIA -> D0-tuned PGS4 fast simulation (to reproduce the benchmark points)...  
redo this analysis  $\sim 10^5$  times !

This D0 search provides strong constraints in mSUGRA..  
squarks & gluinos  $> 330\text{-}400$  GeV...our limits can be *much weaker* on both these sparticles as we'll see !!



# Tevatron II: CDF Tri-lepton Analysis

CDF RUN II Preliminary  $\int \mathcal{L} dt = 2.0 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  : Search for  $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm \tilde{\chi}_2^0$

Channel	Signal	Background	Observed
3tight	$2.25 \pm 0.13(\text{stat}) \pm 0.29(\text{syst})$	$0.49 \pm 0.04(\text{stat}) \pm 0.08(\text{syst})$	1
2tight,1loose	$1.61 \pm 0.11(\text{stat}) \pm 0.21(\text{syst})$	$0.25 \pm 0.03(\text{stat}) \pm 0.03(\text{syst})$	0
1tight,2loose	$0.68 \pm 0.07(\text{stat}) \pm 0.09(\text{syst})$	$0.14 \pm 0.02(\text{stat}) \pm 0.02(\text{syst})$	0
Total Tripleton	$4.5 \pm 0.2(\text{stat}) \pm 0.6(\text{syst})$	$0.88 \pm 0.05(\text{stat}) \pm 0.13(\text{syst})$	1
2tight,1Track	$4.44 \pm 0.19(\text{stat}) \pm 0.58(\text{syst})$	$3.22 \pm 0.48(\text{stat}) \pm 0.53(\text{syst})$	4
1tight,1loose,1Track	$2.42 \pm 0.14(\text{stat}) \pm 0.32(\text{syst})$	$2.28 \pm 0.47(\text{stat}) \pm 0.42(\text{syst})$	2
Total Dilepton+Track	$6.9 \pm 0.2(\text{stat}) \pm 0.9(\text{syst})$	$5.5 \pm 0.7(\text{stat}) \pm 0.9(\text{syst})$	6

We need to perform the 3 tight lepton analysis  $\sim 10^5$  times

Table 3: Number of expected signal and background events and number of observed events in  $2 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ . Uncertainties are statistical(stat) and full systematics(syst). The signal is for the benchmark point described in section 5.

We perform this analysis using CDF-tuned PGS4, PYTHIA in LO plus a PROSPINO K-factor

→ Feldman-Cousins 95% CL Signal limit: 4.65 events

The non-‘3-tight’ analyses are not reproducible w/o a better detector simulation

# Tevatron III: D0 Stable Particle (= Chargino) Search




FIG. 2: The observed (dots) and expected (solid line) 95% cross section limits, the NLO production cross section (dashed line), and NLO cross section uncertainty (barely visible shaded band) as a function of (a) stau mass for stau pair production, (b) chargino mass for pair produced gaugino-like charginos, and (c) chargino mass for pair produced higgsino-like charginos.

$$\text{Interpolation: } M_\chi > 206 |U_{1w}|^2 + 171 |U_{1h}|^2 \text{ GeV}$$

This is an *incredibly* powerful constraint on our model set as we will have **many** close mass chargino-neutralino pairs. This search cuts out a huge parameter region as you will see later. **No applicable bounds on charged sleptons..the cross sections are too small.**

# SOME RESULTS

# Survival Rates


- Flat Priors :

- $10^7$  models scanned
- 68.5 K (0.68%) survive

- Log Priors :

- $2 \times 10^6$  models scanned
- 3.0 K (0.15%) survive

```
9999039 slha-okay.txt
7729165 error-okay.txt
3270330 lsp-okay.txt
3261059 deltaRho-okay.txt
2168599 gMinus2-okay.txt
617413 b2sGamma-okay.txt
594803 Bs2MuMu-okay.txt
592195 vacuum-okay.txt
582787 Bu2TauNu-okay.txt
471786 LEP-sparticle-okay.txt
471455 invisibleWidth-okay.txt
468539 susyhitProb-okay.txt
418503 stableParticle-okay.txt
418503 chargedHiggs-okay.txt
132877 directDetection-okay.txt
83662 neutralHiggs-okay.txt
73868 omega-okay.txt
73575 Bs2MuMu-2-okay.txt
72168 stableChargino-2-okay.txt
71976 triLepton-okay.txt
69518 jetMissing-okay.txt
68494 final-okay.txt
```



**For the curious:**



Most well-studied models do not survive confrontation with the latest data.

For many models this is not the unique source of failure

# Similarly for the SPS Points





SPS1a	killed by $b \rightarrow s\gamma$
SPS1a'	OK
SPS1b	killed by $b \rightarrow s\gamma$
SPS2	killed by $\Omega h^2$ (GUT) / OK(low)
SPS3	killed by $\Omega h^2$ (low) / OK(GUT)
SPS4	killed by $g-2$
SPS5	killed by $\Omega h^2$
SPS6	OK
SPS9	killed by Tevatron stable chargino

# Light Higgs Mass Predictions




LEP Higgs mass constraints **avoided** by either **reducing** the ZZh coupling and/or **reducing** the, e.g.,  $h \rightarrow \bar{b}b$  branching fraction by decays to LSP pairs. We have **both** of these cases in our final model sets.

# Distribution of Sparticle Masses By Species






# Distribution of Sparticle Masses By Species





Flat Priors





Log Priors



# Glauino Masses







# Squarks CAN Be Light !!!







Light squarks can be missed by Tevatron searches for numerous reasons..





# Distribution of Sparticle Masses By Species





# Distribution of Sparticle Masses By Species





# LSP Composition




The identity of the **nLSP** is a critical factor in looking for SUSY signatures..**who** can play that role here????? Just about  
**ANYBODY !!!**










# nLSP-LSP Mass Difference










# nLSP-LSP Mass Difference



# nLSP Mass Distributions By Species







Flat

Log

Linear Priors		Log Priors	
Mass Pattern	% of Models	Mass Pattern	% of Models
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\chi}_3^0$	9.82	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\chi}_3^0$	18.59
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\ell}_R$	5.39	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\nu}_\tau$	7.72
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\tau}_1$	5.31	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\ell}_R$	6.67
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\nu}_\tau$	5.02	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\tau}_1$	6.64
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{b}_1$	4.89	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{d}_R$	5.18
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{d}_R$	4.49	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\nu}_\ell$	4.50
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{u}_R$	3.82	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{b}_1$	3.76
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{g}$	2.96	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{g}$	3.73
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\nu}_\ell$	2.67	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{u}_R$	2.74
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{u}_L$	2.35	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\nu}_\tau < \tilde{\tau}_1$	2.27
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\nu}_\tau < \tilde{\tau}_1$	2.19	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_3^0$	2.24
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_3^0$	2.15	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\ell}_R < \tilde{\chi}_2^0$	1.42
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < A$	2.00	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{u}_L$	1.32
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{t}_1$	1.40	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0$	1.22
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\nu}_\ell < \tilde{\ell}_L$	1.37	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{\chi}_2^0$	1.19
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{\chi}_2^0$	1.35	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\nu}_\tau$	1.15
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\ell}_R < \tilde{\chi}_2^0$	1.32	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\ell}_R < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0$	1.05
$A < H < H^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	1.24	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\nu}_\tau < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$	1.02
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{d}_R < \tilde{\chi}_2^0$	1.03	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\nu}_\ell < \tilde{\ell}_L$	0.95
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{u}_L < \tilde{d}_L$	0.95	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{d}_R < \tilde{\chi}_2^0$	0.71
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{b}_1 < \tilde{\chi}_2^0$	0.89	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\nu}_\tau < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0$	0.68
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{u}_R < \tilde{\chi}_2^0$	0.84	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < A$	0.64
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < A < H$	0.74	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\nu}_\tau < \tilde{\chi}_2^0$	0.61
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{g} < \tilde{\chi}_2^0$	0.65	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{d}_R$	0.54
$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{\nu}_\tau$	0.51	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{\nu}_\tau$	0.54

Top 25 most common mass patterns for the 4 lightest SUSY & heavy Higgs particles in our final model samples..these are important when we study cascade decays at the LHC

There were 1109 (267) such patterns found for the case of flat (log) priors ...so plenty of work to be done here.

		% of Models	
mSP	Mass Pattern	Linear Priors	Log Priors
mSP1	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\chi}_3^0$	9.82	18.59
mSP2	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < A/H$	2.08	0.68
mSP3	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\tau}_1$	5.31	6.64
mSP4	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{g}$	2.96	3.73
mSP5	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{\ell}_R < \tilde{\nu}_\tau$	0.02	0.14
mSP6	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0$	0.46	1.22
mSP7	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{\ell}_R < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$	0.02	0.03
mSP8	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\tau}_1 < A \sim H$	0.10	0
mSP9	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{\ell}_R < A/H$	0.01	0
mSP10	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{t}_1 < \tilde{\ell}_R$	0	0
mSP11	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{t}_1 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{\chi}_2^0$	0.09	0
mSP12	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{t}_1 < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$	0.01	0
mSP13	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{t}_1 < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{\ell}_R$	0.01	0
mSP14	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < A \sim H < H^\pm$	0.35	0.10
mSP15	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < A \sim H < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$	0.08	0
mSP16	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < A \sim H < \tilde{\tau}_1$	0.01	0.03
mSP17	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$	0.18	0.41
mSP18	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{\ell}_R < \tilde{t}_1$	0.01	0
mSP19	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{t}_1 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$	0.01	0
mSP20	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{t}_1 < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$	0.06	0
mSP21	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{t}_1 < \tilde{\tau}_1 < \tilde{\chi}_2^0$	0.01	0
mSP22	$\tilde{\chi}_1^0 < \tilde{\chi}_2^0 < \tilde{\chi}_1^\pm < \tilde{g}$	0.27	0.51


Frequency of the ‘most common’ mSUGRA mass patterns ( which are rank ordered according to P. Nath et .al.) found in our flat and log prior model samples

Many are rare & some do not occur at all at this level of statistics !


# Predicted Dark Matter Density : $\Omega h^2$

It is not likely that the LSP is the dominant component of dark matter in 'conventional' cosmology...but it can be in some model cases..

Number of Models with Relic Density in Given Range





Number of Models with Relic Density in Given Range



# Direct Detection Expectations


Extremely small cross sections are possible in either the flat or log prior cases...far smaller than expected in, e.g., mSUGRA....




# Correlation Between Dark Matter Density & the LSP-nLSP Mass Splitting

Small mass differences can lead to rapid co-annihilations reducing the dark matter density....

LSP - nLSP Mass Difference Versus Relic Density




LSP - nLSP Mass Difference Versus Relic Density




# Dark Matter Density Correlation with the Direct Search Cross Section

WIMP-Proton  $\sigma_{SI}$  Versus Relic Density





WIMP-Proton  $\sigma_{SI}$  Versus Relic Density



# 'Fine-Tuning' or Naturalness Criterion

We find that small values of 'fine-tuning' are very common !




# Summary


- The pMSSM has a far richer phenomenology than any of the conventional SUSY breaking scenarios. The sparticle properties can be vastly different, e.g., the nLSP can be almost any sparticle!
- Light partners may exist which have avoided LEP & Tevatron constraints and may be difficult to observe at the LHC due to rather common small mass differences
- Light squarks may be accessible at a 500 GeV ILC but have not been well-studied there
- With the WMAP constraint employed as a bound the LSP is not likely to be the dominant source of DM...but can be.
- The study of these complex models is still at early stage..

# BACKUP SLIDES

Flat




Log




# Predictions for $\Delta(g-2)_\mu$


flat




log



# Kinematic Accessibility at the ILC : I




# Kinematic Accessibility at the ILC : II



# Log Prior Sample : LSP Composition

The LSP composition is found to be both mass dependent as well as (no surprise) sensitive to the nLSP-LSP mass splitting...similar results are found for the case of flat priors



# Clustering of Model Points in 19-Dimensional Space

