

Collider Signatures of Higgs-portal Scalar Dark Matter (Postprint)

Authors: Han,H, Yang,JM, Zhang,Y, Zheng,S

Date: 2016-12-27T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

In the simplest Higgs-portal scalar dark matter model, the dark matter mass has been restricted to be either near the resonant mass ($m_h/2$) or in a large-mass region by the direct detection at LHC Run 1 and LUX. While the large-mass region below roughly

Full Text

Preamble

Collider Signatures of Higgs-portal Scalar Dark Matter

Huayong Han,¹ Jin Min Yang,^{2,3} Yang Zhang,² and Sibozheng¹

¹Department of Physics, Chongqing University, Chongqing 401331, P. R. China

²Institute of Theoretical Physics, Academia Sinica, Beijing 100190, P. R. China

³Department of Physics, Tohoku University, Sendai 980-8578, Japan

(Dated: Jan 2016)

In the simplest Higgs-portal scalar dark matter model, the dark matter mass has been restricted to be either near the resonant mass ($m_h/2$) or in a large-mass region by direct detection results from LHC Run 1 and LUX. While the large-mass region below roughly 3 TeV can be probed by the future Xenon1T experiment, most of the resonant mass region lies beyond Xenon1T's scope. In this paper, we study the direct detection of such scalar dark matter in the narrow resonant mass region at the 14 TeV LHC and the future 100 TeV hadron collider. We demonstrate the luminosities required for 2σ exclusion and 5σ discovery.

Introduction

New physics beyond the Standard Model (SM) has drawn extensive attention since the discovery of the SM Higgs boson [?, ?]. While problems such as

stabilizing the Higgs mass against ultraviolet radiative corrections point to high-mass-scale new physics, we instead focus on dark matter with mass near the weak scale. Such dark matter models have promising prospects for discovery at both astrophysical and particle collider experiments, in contrast to new physics appearing at much higher scales.

In particular, we are interested in the simplest Higgs-portal dark matter model, where dark matter communicates with SM particles via the Higgs scalar. Unlike fermionic dark matter scenarios, scalar dark matter in the so-called Higgs-portal scalar dark matter model (HSDM) [?] remains viable under the latest data from direct detections at Xenon100 [?] and LUX [?], indirect detections at Fermi-LAT [?, ?], and Higgs invisible decay at LHC Run 1 [?]. Detailed discussions of this model appear throughout the literature [?]. Fitting the experimental data indicates that the dark matter mass is either near the resonant mass region between 53 GeV and 62.5 GeV or in a large-mass region above 185 GeV. While the large-mass region between 185 GeV and 3 TeV can be probed by future Xenon1T [?] experiments, most of the resonant mass region lies beyond that facility's reach. In this paper, we discuss the collider signatures of scalar dark matter in the HSDM model with mass between 53 GeV and 62.5 GeV at the 14 TeV LHC and the future 100 TeV proton collider (FCC). We show that, similar to the Circular Electron Positron Collider (CEPC) [?, ?], the FCC will be a useful machine for searching for dark matter in this narrow mass region. For the FCC with a luminosity of 10 ab^{-1} , the exclusion and discovery sensitivities reach 57 GeV and 56 GeV respectively through the Vector Boson Fusion (VBF) channel, and 54.8 GeV and 53.9 GeV respectively via the mono-Z channel. This indicates that the FCC with 10 ab^{-1} is a competitive facility compared to CEPC or Xenon1T.

The remaining parts of this paper are organized as follows. In Sec. II, we briefly discuss the direct and indirect detection constraints on the HSDM. In Sec. III we address the collider phenomenology for the HSDM with dark matter mass in the narrow resonant mass region at the 14 TeV LHC and the 100 TeV FCC, focusing on both the VBF channel and mono-Z channel. Our main results appear in Sec. IV, where we show the luminosities required for 2σ exclusion and 5σ discovery. Finally, we conclude in Sec. V.

II. Model and Constraints

A. Model

In the simplest HSDM model, the dark matter s communicates with SM particles through the SM Higgs scalar. The Lagrangian for this model reads as

$$\mathcal{L} \supset \frac{1}{2}(\partial s)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\mu_s^2 s^2 - \frac{1}{4}\lambda_s s^4 - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_s s^2 H^\dagger H,$$

where μ_s , λ_s , and κ_s are the singlet scalar bare mass, the self-interaction cou-

pling constant, and the coupling constant between dark matter and the SM Higgs, respectively. A Z_2 parity, under which s is odd and other fields are even, is imposed to make the DM stable, which reduces the number of model parameters. After electroweak symmetry breaking, one obtains

$$\mathcal{L} \supset \frac{1}{2}(\partial s)^2 - \frac{1}{2}m_s^2 s^2 - \frac{1}{4}\lambda_s s^4 - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_s v s^2 h - \frac{1}{4}\kappa_s s^2 h^2,$$

where $m_s^2 = \mu_s^2 + \kappa_s v^2/2$ is the physical mass of the singlet scalar, $H = (v + h)/\sqrt{2}$, and $v = 246$ GeV.

Among the three model parameters, the self-interaction coupling λ_s does not directly affect the DM relic abundance, the DM-nucleon scattering cross section, or the DM production cross section at colliders, so we simply decouple this parameter from the DM phenomenology discussed below. It turns out that the remaining two parameters are strongly constrained.

B. Constraints from Indirect Detections

Assuming that cold dark matter is saturated by the singlet scalar s , s should account for the DM relic density measured by Planck and WMAP [?], $\Omega_{\text{DM}} h^2 = 0.1199 \pm 0.0027$, from which one infers the correlation between m_s and κ_s as shown in Fig. 1. Besides the relic abundance in Eq. (3), there are other indirect constraints, including the Higgs invisible decay $h \rightarrow ss$ in the mass region $m_s < m_h/2$ and the γ -ray limits from Fermi-LAT [?, ?]. For the Higgs invisible decay, Fig. 1 shows the latest limits at the 8 TeV LHC [?], HL-LHC, and CEPC [?], which indicates that m_s below 52 GeV is excluded by the data $\text{Br}(h \rightarrow ss) > 29\%$, while the HL-LHC and CEPC can reach 54 GeV and 57 GeV, respectively.

[Figure 1: see original paper] Indirect constraints on the dark matter mass m_s from the dark matter relic abundance and Higgs invisible decays at the LHC Run 1, HL-LHC, and CEPC.

C. Constraints from Direct Detections

Direct detection at LUX and Xenon1T can further constrain the parameter space, according to the spin-independent DM-nucleon scattering cross section given by

$$\sigma_{\text{SI}} = \frac{\kappa_s^2 f_N^2 \mu^2 m_N^2}{4\pi m_h^4 m_s^2},$$

where m_N is the nucleon mass, $\mu = m_s m_N / (m_s + m_N)$ is the DM-nucleon reduced mass, and $f_N \approx 0.3$ is the hadron matrix element [?]. Fig. 2 shows the predicted values of the spin-independent DM-nucleon scattering cross section,

together with direct detection limits from XENON100 [?] and LUX [?] experiments. The limits from XENON1T [?] are also shown. It indicates that the dark matter mass is restricted to a narrow resonant region between 53 GeV and 63 GeV. Once we employ the latest Fermi-LAT limits [?], this narrow mass region is further reduced to between 53 GeV and 62.5 GeV.

[Figure 2: see original paper] Direct-detection constraints on dark matter mass m_s from LUX and Xenon experiments. The red curve represents the dark matter relic abundance constraint.

III. Dark Matter at Hadron Colliders

In this section we study the collider signatures of scalar dark matter at the 14 TeV LHC and 100 TeV FCC. We explore the sensitivities at these two colliders for dark matter mass in the narrow resonant region between 53 GeV and 62.5 GeV. We consider the dominant VBF channel as well as the sub-leading but relatively clean mono-Z channel.

We use FeynRules [?] to generate model files prepared for MadGraph5 [?], which includes Pythia 6 [?] for parton showering and hadronization, and the package Delphes 3 [?] for fast detector simulation. In particular, the default CMS detector card and the Snowmass detector card are used for the 14 TeV and 100 TeV pp collider, respectively. Events are generated using Madgraph5 at leading order with the 125 GeV Higgs and fixed value $\kappa_s = 1.0$ for different dark matter masses. Cross sections are reproduced by rescaling κ_s which corresponds to m_s .

A. Vector Boson Fusion

In the VBF channel, dark matter pairs are produced through the Higgs scalar via $h + jj \rightarrow ss + jj$, where the Higgs h should be on-shell in our case. The primary SM backgrounds to this process include Z +jets, W +jets, $t\bar{t}$ +jets, and QCD multi-jets. For simplicity we consider the main contributions arising from Z +jets and W +jets channels, and adopt the cuts used by the CMS VBF analysis [?] for event selection: $p_T^{j1(2)} > 50$ GeV, $|\eta_{j1(2)}| < 4.7$, $\eta_{j1} \cdot \eta_{j2} < 0$, $\Delta\eta_{jj} > 4.2$, $M_{jj} > 1100$ GeV, $\Delta\phi_{jj} < 1.0$, $E_T^{\text{miss}} > 130$ GeV, where $p_T^{j1(2)}$ and $\eta_{j1(2)}$ are the transverse momentum and pseudo-rapidity of the first (second) leading jet, respectively. $\Delta\eta_{jj}$, $\Delta\phi_{jj}$, and M_{jj} are the rapidity difference, azimuthal-angle difference, and invariant mass of the two leading jets, respectively. Any event with an additional jet with $p_T > 30$ GeV and pseudo-rapidity between those of the two tagged jets is rejected.

We first apply the criteria in Eq. (6) to the 8 TeV LHC with data of 19.5 fb^{-1} . The number of events for the SM background is 134 in the Z +jets channel and 145 in the W +jets channel, respectively. Compared with the reported number of events (99 in the Z +jets channel and 183 in the W +jets channel) by the CMS collaboration [?], they are consistent with each other.

The criteria in Eq. (6) will also be applied to both the 14 TeV LHC and 100 TeV FCC simulations for consistency. This is based on the following facts. First, there is little difference between the 8 TeV LHC and 14 TeV LHC except the collision energy, which means the cut on the pseudo-rapidity of the first two leading jets should remain unchanged. Second, the kinetic distribution of the signal events from on-shell Higgs decay and the main backgrounds Z +jets and W +jets have similar changing trends when one modifies the cuts in Eq. (6), as the mass difference between the Higgs and $Z(W)$ boson can be omitted compared to the variation of collision energy. It turns out that for a benchmark DM mass, the effects on the ratio of signal over background events S/B are less than a factor of two due to variations on the cuts in Eq. (6) such as $p_T^{j1(2)}$, $\Delta\eta_{jj}$, M_{jj} , $\Delta\phi_{jj}$, and E_T^{miss} . See Table I for details.

[TABLE:I] Effects on the ratio S/B due to variations on the cuts in Eq. (6) for benchmark DM mass $m_s = 53$ GeV at 100 TeV FCC.

B. Mono-Z Channel

In the mono- Z channel, dark matter pairs are produced via the process $h + Z \rightarrow ss + Z$. Compared with the VBF channel, the mono- Z channel is sub-leading but relatively cleaner. For event selection in this channel we adopt the following cuts as suggested by the CMS leptonic mode analysis [?]:

$$\begin{aligned} p_T^\ell &> 20 \text{ GeV}, & |\eta_{e(\mu)}| &< 2.5(2.4), & E_T^{\text{miss}} &> 50 \text{ GeV}, \\ p_T^{\ell\ell} &> 80 \text{ GeV}, & \Delta\phi_{\ell\ell, \vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}}} &> 2.7, & u_{\parallel} &< 0.2, \end{aligned}$$

where $p_T^{\ell\ell}$ is the dilepton transverse momentum and u_{\parallel} is defined as the component of $\vec{u} = -\vec{p}_T^{\text{miss}} - \vec{p}_T^{\ell\ell}$ parallel to the direction of $\vec{p}_T^{\ell\ell}$. Events are rejected if an additional electron or muon is reconstructed with $p_T > 10$ GeV, and any event having two or more jets with $p_T > 30$ GeV.

Similar to the discussions in the preceding section, the criteria in Eq. (8) are examined via the 8 TeV LHC simulation with data of 19.7 fb^{-1} . The number of events for the SM background is 88 in the mono- Z channel. Compared with the reported number of events 138 in the same channel by the CMS collaboration [?], they are consistent with each other. Unlike the CMS result, next-to-leading order (NLO) effects have been neglected in our simulation. The two numbers of events would likely match better if NLO effects were included in our analysis. Following the similar reasoning mentioned in the preceding section, the criteria in Eq. (8) will be directly applied to both the 14 TeV LHC and 100 TeV FCC simulations.

IV. Results

We present our main results in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4, which show the integrated luminosity needed for exclusion and discovery at the 14 TeV LHC and 100

TeV FCC, respectively. Here, we take the following definition of significance: $S/\sqrt{B} = 1.96$ (for exclusion) and $S/\sqrt{S+B} = 5$ (for discovery). Systematic uncertainties are neglected in both the signal and background simulations.

[Figure 3: see original paper] The integrated luminosity needed for exclusion determined by $S/\sqrt{B} = 1.96$ and 5σ discovery determined by $S/\sqrt{S+B} = 5$ in VBF and mono-Z channels at the 14 TeV LHC, respectively. The solid dark line represents the 10 ab^{-1} integrated luminosity.

In Fig. 3 one observes that for $\mathcal{L} = 10^2 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ the scalar dark matter mass up to 53.5 GeV can be excluded, and for $\mathcal{L} = 10^3 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ the exclusion and discovery limits via the VBF channel will reach 54.6 GeV and 54 GeV, respectively. In contrast, Fig. 4 shows that for $\mathcal{L} = 10^2 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ the scalar dark matter mass up to 54.5 GeV can be excluded, and for $\mathcal{L} = 10^3 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ the exclusion and discovery limits at the FCC via the VBF channel approach 55.8 GeV and 55 GeV, respectively. The exclusion limits via the mono-Z channel are obviously weaker in comparison with the VBF channel. Taking an integrated luminosity of 10 ab^{-1} at the 100 TeV FCC, one finds that the exclusion and discovery limits approach 57 GeV and 56 GeV in the VBF channel, respectively. Compared with either CEPC or Xenon1T, where the exclusion limits approach 56.5 GeV and 56 GeV, respectively, the FCC with $\mathcal{L} = 10 \text{ ab}^{-1}$ is a competitive facility.

Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 also illustrate that it is unlikely to detect scalar dark matter in the mass range between 57 GeV and 62.5 GeV in the HSDM model at any present and future facilities mentioned in this paper.

[Figure 4: see original paper] Same as Fig. 3, but for the 100 TeV FCC.

V. Conclusion

In this paper, we explored the collider signatures of scalar dark matter in the HSDM model. Our study shows that for the 100 TeV FCC with an integrated luminosity of 10 ab^{-1} , the exclusion and discovery sensitivities reach 57 GeV and 56 GeV respectively through the VBF channel, and 54.8 GeV and 53.9 GeV respectively via the mono-Z channel. Compared with either CEPC or Xenon1T, where the exclusion limits approach 56.5 GeV and 56 GeV, respectively, the FCC is a competitive facility. Unfortunately, scalar dark matter in the mass range between 56.5 GeV and 62.5 GeV is unlikely to be either directly or indirectly detected at any present or future facility discussed in this paper.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grant Nos. 11275245, 11135003, and 11405015, and by the CAS Center for Excellence in Particle Physics (CCEPP).

References

- [1] G. Aad et al. [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B 716, 1 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex]].
- [2] S. Chatrchyan et al. [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B 716, 30 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex]].
- [3] V. Silveira and A. Zee, Phys. Lett. B 161, 136 (1985).
- [4] J. McDonald, Phys. Rev. D 50, 3637 (1994) [hep-ph/0702143].
- [5] J. McDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 091304 (2002) [hep-ph/0106249].
- [6] M. C. Bento, O. Bertolami, R. Rosenfeld, and L. Teodoro, Phys. Rev. D 62, 041302 (2000) [astro-ph/0003350].
- [7] C. P. Burgess, M. Pospelov, and T. Veldhuis, Nucl. Phys. B 619, 709 (2001) [hep-ph/0011335].
- [8] E. Aprile et al. [XENON100 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 109, 181301 (2012) [arXiv:1207.5988 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [9] D. S. Akerib et al. [LUX Collaboration], arXiv:1512.03506 [astro-ph.CO].
- [10] M. Ackermann et al. [Fermi-LAT Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 115, 231301 (2015) [arXiv:1503.02641 [astro-ph.HE]].
- [11] M. Ackermann et al. [Fermi-LAT Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D 91, 122002 (2015) [arXiv:1506.00013 [astro-ph.HE]].
- [12] G. Aad et al. [ATLAS Collaboration], ATLAS-CONF-2015-004.
- [13] H. Davoudiasl, R. Kitano, T. Li, and H. Murayama, Phys. Lett. B 609, 117 (2005) [hep-ph/0405097].
- [14] A. Kusenko, Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 241301 (2006) [hep-ph/0609081].
- [15] D. O'Connell, M. J. Ramsey-Musolf, and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D 75, 037701 (2007) [hep-ph/0611014].
- [16] V. Barger, et al., Phys. Rev. D 77, 035005 (2008) arXiv:0706.4311 [hep-ph].
- [17] H. S. Cheon, S. K. Kang, and C. S. Kim, JCAP 0805, 004 (2008) [arXiv:0710.2416 [hep-ph]].
- [18] X. G. He, et al., Phys. Rev. D 79 (2009) 023521 [arXiv:0811.0658 [hep-ph]].
- [19] R. N. Lerner and J. McDonald, Phys. Rev. D 80, 123507 (2009) [arXiv:0909.0520 [hep-ph]].
- [20] M. Farina, D. Pappadopulo, and A. Strumia, Phys. Lett. B 688 (2010) 329 [arXiv:0912.5038 [hep-ph]].
- [21] W. L. Guo and Y. L. Wu, JHEP 1010 (2010) 083 [arXiv:1006.2518 [hep-ph]].
- [22] S. Profumo, L. Ubaldi, and C. Wainwright, Phys. Rev. D 82 (2010) 123514 [arXiv:1009.5377 [hep-ph]].
- [23] A. Biswas and D. Majumdar, Pramana 80, 539 (2013) [arXiv:1102.3024 [hep-ph]].
- [24] A. Djouadi, O. Lebedev, Y. Mambrini, and J. Quevillon, Phys. Lett. B 709, 65 (2012) [arXiv:1112.3299 [hep-ph]].
- [25] C. Cheung, M. Papucci, and K. M. Zurek, JHEP 1207, 105 (2012) [arXiv:1203.5106 [hep-ph]].
- [26] A. Djouadi, A. Falkowski, Y. Mambrini, and J. Quevillon, Eur. Phys. J. C

- 73 (2013) 2455 [arXiv:1205.3169 [hep-ph]].
- [27] J. M. Cline and K. Kainulainen, JCAP 1301, 012 (2013) [arXiv:1210.4196 [hep-ph]].
- [28] J. M. Cline, K. Kainulainen, P. Scott, and C. Weniger, Phys. Rev. D 88 (2013) 055025 [arXiv:1306.4710 [hep-ph]].
- [29] M. Endo and Y. Takaesu, Phys. Lett. B 743, 228 (2015) [arXiv:1407.6882 [hep-ph]].
- [30] N. Craig, H. K. Lou, M. McCullough, and A. Thalappilil, arXiv:1412.0258 [hep-ph].
- [31] C. E. Yaguna, JCAP 0903, 003 (2009) [arXiv:0810.4267 [hep-ph]].
- [32] L. Feng, S. Profumo, and L. Ubaldi, JHEP 1503, 045 (2015) [arXiv:1412.1105 [hep-ph]].
- [33] M. Duerr, P. F. Perez, and J. Smirnov, Phys. Lett. B 751, 119 (2015) [arXiv:1508.04418 [hep-ph]].
- [34] M. Duerr, P. F. Perez, and J. Smirnov, arXiv:1509.04282 [hep-ph].
- [35] M. Duerr, P. F. Perez, and J. Smirnov, arXiv:1510.07562 [hep-ph].
- [36] H. Han and S. Zheng, JHEP 1512, 044 (2015) [arXiv:1509.01765 [hep-ph]].
- [37] H. Han and S. Zheng, arXiv:1510.06165 [hep-ph].
- [38] N. Bernal and X. Chu, arXiv:1510.08527 [hep-ph].
- [39] E. Del Nobile, M. Nardecchia, and P. Panci, arXiv:1512.05353 [hep-ph].
- [40] A. Beniwal, et al., arXiv:1512.06458 [hep-ph].
- [41] Y. Mambrini, Phys. Rev. D 84, 115017 (2011), arXiv:1108.0671 [hep-ph].
- [42] F. S. Queiroz, K. Sinha, and A. Strumia, Phys. Rev. D 91, no. 3, 035006 (2015), arXiv:1409.6301 [hep-ph].
- [43] E. Aprile et al. [XENON1T Collaboration], arXiv:1206.6288 [astro-ph.IM].
- [44] CEPC-SPPC Study Group Group (2015), http://cepc.ihep.ac.cn/preCDR/main_preCDR.pdf.
- [45] CEPC-SPPC Study Group Group (2015), http://cepc.ihep.ac.cn/preCDR/Pre-CDR_final_2015031.pdf.
- [46] P. A. R. Ade et al. [Planck Collaboration], Astron. Astrophys. 571, A16 (2014) [arXiv:1303.5076 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [47] A. Alloul, et al., Comput. Phys. Commun. 185, 2250 (2014) [arXiv:1310.1921 [hep-ph]].
- [48] J. Alwall et al., JHEP 1407, 079 (2014) [arXiv:1405.0301 [hep-ph]].
- [49] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, JHEP 0605, 026 (2006) [hep-ph/0603175].
- [50] J. de Favereau et al. [DELPHES 3 Collaboration], JHEP 1402, 057 (2014) [arXiv:1307.6346 [hep-ex]].
- [51] S. Chatrchyan et al. [CMS Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C 74, 2980 (2014) [arXiv:1404.1344 [hep-ex]].
- [52] V. Khachatryan et al. [CMS Collaboration], arXiv:1511.09375 [hep-ex].

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv – Machine translation. Verify with original.