


Z' Explanations of Neutral Current B Anomalies



by

Ben Allanach
(University of Cambridge)



- Can we directly discover particles from explanations?
- Third Family Hypercharge Model
- General $SM \times U(1)$ model

BCA, Gripaios, You, [arXiv:1710.06363](https://arxiv.org/abs/1710.06363); BCA, Davighi, [arXiv:1809.01158](https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.01158); BCA, Corbett, Dolan, You, [arXiv:1810.02166](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.02166)

Support The Guardian

Sign in

The Guardian

Contribute →

Subscribe →

News

Opinion

Sport

Culture

Lifestyle





UK World Business Football UK politics Environment Education Society **Science** More

Cern


Cern draws up plans for collider four times the size of Large Hadron

The Future Circular Collider would smash particles together in a tunnel 100km long






LHC / HL-LHC Plan



LHC Upgrades




High Luminosity (HL) LHC: go to 3000 fb^{-1} (3 ab^{-1}).

High Energy (HE) LHC: Put FCC magnets (16 Tesla rather than 8.33 Tesla) into LHC ring: roughly *twice* collision energy: 27 TeV.

$R_K^{(*)}$ in Standard Model

$$R_K = \frac{BR(B \rightarrow K \mu^+ \mu^-)}{BR(B \rightarrow K e^+ e^-)}, \quad R_{K^*} = \frac{BR(B \rightarrow K^* \mu^+ \mu^-)}{BR(B \rightarrow K^* e^+ e^-)}.$$



These are **rare decays** (each $BR \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-7})$) because they are absent at tree level in SM.




$R_{K^{(*)}}$ Measurements

LHCb results from 7 and 8 TeV: $q^2 = m_U^2$.


	q^2/GeV^2	SM	LHCb 3 fb ⁻¹	σ
R_K	[1, 6]	1.00 ± 0.01	$0.745^{+0.090}_{-0.074}$	2.6
R_{K^*}	[0.045, 1.1]	0.91 ± 0.03	$0.66^{+0.11}_{-0.07}$	2.2
R_{K^*}	[1.1, 6]	1.00 ± 0.01	$0.69^{+0.11}_{-0.07}$	2.5



LHCb $B^0 \rightarrow K^{0*} e^+ e^-$ Event¹




LHCb Detector II²



2

LHCb Detector³




Optimised to study beauty and charm hadrons

→ provides **complementary** η coverage compared with a GPD.

LHCb as a forward GPD:

- ✓ Precise integrated **luminosity** computation
- ✓ **Stable** data-taking conditions due to **luminosity levelling**
- ✓ Average pile-up ~ 2 (twice design)
- ✓ Excellent **vertexing**, particle ID, momentum resolution...
- ✗ Lower luminosity than to ATLAS/CMS
- ✗ Lower acceptance
- ✗ **Not hermetic!** (can't use E_T^{miss} variable)

³Diaz talk 53rd EW Rencontres de Moriond 2018



Wilson Coefficients \bar{c}_{ij}^l

In SM, can form an **EFT** since $m_B \ll M_W$:

$$\mathcal{O}_{ij}^l = (\bar{s}\gamma^\mu P_i b)(\bar{l}\gamma_\mu P_j l).$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} &\supset \sum_{l=e,\mu,\tau} \sum_{i=L,R} \sum_{j=L,R} \frac{c_{ij}^l}{\Lambda^{2_{l,ij}}} \mathcal{O}_{ij}^l, \\ &= \sum_{l=e,\mu,\tau} V_{tb} V_{ts}^* \frac{\alpha}{4\pi v^2} (\bar{c}_{LL}^l \mathcal{O}_{LL}^l + \bar{c}_{LR}^l \mathcal{O}_{LR}^l \\ &\quad + \bar{c}_{RL}^l \mathcal{O}_{RL}^l + \bar{c}_{RR}^l \mathcal{O}_{RR}^l) \\ \Rightarrow \bar{c}_{ij}^l &= (36 \text{ TeV}/\Lambda)^2 c_{ij}^l.\end{aligned}$$

$c_{ij}^l \sim \pm \mathcal{O}(1)$ all predicted by weak interactions in SM.

Which Ones Work?

Options for a single *BSM* operator:

- \bar{c}_{ij}^e operators fine for $R_{K^{(*)}}$ but are disfavoured by global fits including other observables.
- \bar{c}_{LR}^μ disfavoured: predicts *enhancement* in both R_K and R_{K^*}
- $\bar{c}_{RR}^\mu, \bar{c}_{RL}^\mu$ disfavoured: they pull R_K and R_{K^*} in *opposite directions*.
- $\bar{c}_{LL}^\mu = -1.33 \pm 0.34$ fits well globally⁴.

⁴D'Amico et al, 1704.05438.

Statistics⁵

	\bar{c}_{LL}^μ	$\sqrt{\chi_{SM}^2 - \chi_{best}^2}$
clean	-1.33 ± 0.34	4.1
dirty	-1.33 ± 0.32	4.6
all	-1.33 ± 0.23	6.2
	$C_9^\mu = (\bar{c}_{LL}^\mu + \bar{c}_{LR}^\mu)/2$	$\sqrt{\chi_{SM}^2 - \chi_{best}^2}$
clean	-1.51 ± 0.46	3.9
dirty	-1.15 ± 0.17	5.5
all	-1.19 ± 0.15	6.7


Table 1: A fit to flavour anomalies for ‘clean’ ($R_K, R_{K^*}, B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu$) and ‘dirty’ (100 others) observables

⁵[D’Amico, Nardecchia, Panci, Sannino, Strumia, Torre, Urbano 1704.05438](#)



Simplified Models for C_{LL}^{μ}


At tree-level, we have:



At loop-level, there are many more possibilities but the particles are 4π lighter: they are much easier to detect.


Principle of Maximal Pessimism

$B_s - \bar{B}_s$ Mixing




$$\bar{g}_L^{sb} \lesssim \frac{M_{Z'}}{148 \text{ TeV}}.$$

$$R_{D^{(*)}} = BR(B^- \rightarrow D^{(*)}\tau\nu) / BR(B^- \rightarrow D^{(*)}\mu\nu)$$



$R_{D^{(*)}}$: BSM Explanation

SM



... has to compete with

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} = -\frac{2}{\Lambda^2} (\bar{c}_L \gamma^\mu b_L) (\bar{\tau}_L \gamma_\mu \nu_{\tau L}) + H.c.$$

$$\Lambda = 3.4 \text{ TeV}$$

A factor 10 lower than required for $R_{K^{()}} \Rightarrow$ different explanation?*

PMP \Rightarrow we ignore $R_{D^{(*)}}$.

$Z' \mu\mu$ ATLAS 13 TeV 36 fb⁻¹


ATLAS analysis: look for two track-based isolated μ , $p_T > 30$ GeV. One reconstructed primary vertex. Keep only highest scalar sum p_T pair⁶.

$$m_{\mu_1\mu_2}^2 = (p_1^\mu + p_2^\mu) (p_{1\mu} + p_{2\mu})$$



CMS also have released⁷ a similar 36 fb⁻¹ analysis.


⁶[1707.02424](#)

⁷[1803.06292](#)



High $m_{\mu\mu} = 2.4$ TeV Event





Simplified Z' Models⁸

Naïve model: only include couplings to $\bar{b}s/b\bar{s}$ and $\mu^+\mu^-$ (*less model dependent*).

$$\mathcal{L}_{Z'}^{\text{min.}} \supset (g_L^{sb} Z'_\rho \bar{s} \gamma^\rho P_L b + \text{h.c.}) + g_L^{\mu\mu} Z'_\rho \bar{\mu} \gamma^\rho P_L \mu,$$

which contributes to the \mathcal{O}_{LL}^μ coefficient with

$$\bar{c}_{LL}^\mu = -\frac{4\pi v^2}{\alpha_{\text{EM}} V_{tb} V_{ts}^*} \frac{g_L^{sb} g_L^{\mu\mu}}{M_{Z'}^2},$$

$$\Rightarrow g_L^{sb} g_L^{\mu\mu} \left(\frac{36 \text{ TeV}}{M_{Z'}} \right)^2 = -1.33 \pm 0.34 \text{ (clean)}.$$

⁸BCA, Queiroz, Strumia, Sun arXiv:1511.07447

Simplified Z' Models⁹

$$\mathcal{L}_{Z'f} = \left(\overline{\mathbf{Q}'_{Li}} \lambda_{ij}^{(Q)} \gamma^\rho \mathbf{Q}'_{Lj} + \overline{\mathbf{L}'_{Li}} \lambda_{ij}^{(L)} \gamma^\rho \mathbf{L}'_{Lj} \right) Z'_\rho,$$

After CKM mixing of $V = V_{u_L^\dagger} V_{d_L}$ and PMNS $U = V_{\nu_L^\dagger} V_{e_L}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \left(\overline{\mathbf{u}_L} V \Lambda^{(Q)} V^\dagger \gamma^\rho \mathbf{u}_L + \overline{\mathbf{d}_L} \Lambda^{(Q)} \gamma^\rho \mathbf{d}_L + \right. \\ & \left. \overline{\mathbf{n}_L} U \Lambda^{(L)} U^\dagger \gamma^\rho \mathbf{n}_L + \overline{\mathbf{e}_L} \Lambda^{(L)} \gamma^\rho \mathbf{e}_L \right) Z'_\rho, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Lambda^{(Q)} \equiv V_{d_L^\dagger} \lambda^{(Q)} V_{d_L}, \quad \Lambda^{(L)} \equiv V_{e_L^\dagger} \lambda^{(L)} V_{e_L}.$$

⁹BCA, Corbett, Dolan, You, [arXiv:1810.02166](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.02166)

Limiting Cases



Mixed Up Model: all quark mixing is in left-handed ups

$$\Lambda^{(Q)} = g_{bs} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Lambda^{(L)} = g_{\mu\mu} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$




Mixed Down Model: all quark mixing is in left-handed downs

$$\Lambda^{(Q)} = g_{tt} V^\dagger \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot V, \quad \Lambda^{(L)} = g_{\mu\mu} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$


$\Rightarrow g_{bs} = V_{ts}^* V_{tb} g_{tt} = 0.04 g_{tt}$: the quark couplings are weaker than the leptonic ones




Widths: pick g_{bs} to fit anomalies at each point.



MUM Model, 95% Sensitivity



MDM Model, 95% Sensitivity



During the 1990s

We wanted to be the Grand Architects, searching for **the** string model to rule them all



During the 2010s

We are happy with **any** beyond the Standard Model
roof



Third Family Hypercharge Model

Add complex SM singlet scalar θ and gauged $U(1)_F$:

$$\begin{array}{c} SU(3) \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)_F \\ \downarrow \langle \theta \rangle \sim \text{Several TeV} \\ SU(3) \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \\ \downarrow \langle H \rangle \sim 246 \text{ GeV} \\ SU(3) \times U(1)_{em} \end{array}$$

- SM fermion content
- anomaly cancellation
- 0 F charges for first two generations

Unique Solution

$F_{Q'_i} = 0$	$F_{u_{R'_i}} = 0$	$F_{d_{R'_i}} = 0$	$F_{L'_i} = 0$
$F_{e_{R'_i}} = 0$	$F_H = -1/2$	$F_{Q'_3} = 1/6$	$F_{u'_{R3}} = 2/3$
$F_{d'_{R3}} = -1/3$	$F_{L'_3} = -1/2$	$F_{e'_{R3}} = -1$	$F_\theta \neq 0$

$$\mathcal{L} = Y_t \overline{Q'_{3L}} H t'_R + Y_b \overline{Q'_{3L}} H^c b'_R + Y_\tau \overline{L'_{3L}} H^c \tau'_R + H.c.,$$

- First two families massless at renormalisable level
- Their masses and fermion mixings generated by small non-renormalisable operators

This explains the hierarchical heaviness of the third family and small CKM angles

$Z - X$ mixing

Because $F_H = -1/2$, $Z - X$ mix:

$$\mathcal{M}_N^2 = \frac{v^2}{4} \begin{pmatrix} g'^2 & -gg' & g'g_F \\ -gg' & g^2 & -gg_F \\ g'g_F & -gg_F & g_F^2(1 + 4F_\theta^2 r^2) \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} -B_\mu \\ -W_\mu^3 \\ -X_\mu \end{matrix}$$

- $v \approx 246$ GeV is SM Higgs VEV
- $g_F = U(1)_F$ gauge coupling
- $r \equiv v_F/v \gg 1$, where $v_F = \langle \theta \rangle$
- F_θ is F charge of θ field

$Z - X$ mixing angle

$$\sin \alpha_z \approx \frac{g_F}{\sqrt{g^2 + g'^2}} \left(\frac{M_Z}{M'_Z} \right)^2 \ll 1.$$

This gives small non-flavour universal couplings to the Z boson proportional to g_F and:

$$Z_\mu = \cos \alpha_z \left(-\sin \theta_w B_\mu + \cos \theta_w W_\mu^3 \right) + \sin \alpha_z X_\mu,$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{X\psi} = g_F \left(\frac{1}{6} \overline{\mathbf{u}_L} \Lambda^{(u_L)} \gamma^\rho \mathbf{u}_L + \frac{1}{6} \overline{\mathbf{d}_L} \Lambda^{(d_L)} \gamma^\rho \mathbf{d}_L - \frac{1}{2} \overline{\mathbf{n}_L} \Lambda^{(n_L)} \gamma^\rho \mathbf{n}_L - \frac{1}{2} \overline{\mathbf{e}_L} \Lambda^{(e_L)} \gamma^\rho \mathbf{e}_L + \frac{2}{3} \overline{\mathbf{u}_R} \Lambda^{(u_R)} \gamma^\rho \mathbf{u}_R - \frac{1}{3} \overline{\mathbf{d}_R} \Lambda^{(d_R)} \gamma^\rho \mathbf{d}_R - \overline{\mathbf{e}_R} \Lambda^{(e_R)} \gamma^\rho \mathbf{e}_R \right) Z'_\rho,$$

$$\Lambda^{(I)} \equiv V_I^\dagger \xi V_I, \quad \xi = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Z' couplings, $I \in \{u_L, d_L, e_L, \nu_L, u_R, d_R, e_R\}$

Example Case

Take a simple limiting case:

$V_{u_L} = 1 \Rightarrow V_{d_L} = V$, the CKM matrix. $V_{u_R} = V_{d_R} = V_{e_R} = 1$ for simplicity and the ease of passing bounds.

$$V_{d_L} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos \theta_{sb} & -\sin \theta_{sb} \\ 0 & \sin \theta_{sb} & \cos \theta_{sb} \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_{e_L} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & U_{\mu 2} & U_{\mu 3} \\ 0 & U_{\tau 2} & U_{\tau 3} \end{pmatrix}$$


$V_{e_R} = 1 \Rightarrow V_{\nu_L} = V_{e_L} U^\dagger$, where U is the PMNS matrix.


Important Z' Couplings

$$g_F \left(\frac{1}{6} \overline{\mathbf{d}_L} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sin^2 \theta_{sb} & \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\theta_{sb} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\theta_{sb} & \cos^2 \theta_{sb} \end{pmatrix} Z' \begin{pmatrix} d_L \\ s_L \\ b_L \end{pmatrix} + \right.$$

$$\left. - \frac{1}{2} \overline{\mathbf{e}_L} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & |U_{\tau 2}|^2 & U_{\tau 2}^* U_{\tau 3} \\ 0 & U_{\tau 2} U_{\tau 3}^* & |U_{\tau 3}|^2 \end{pmatrix} Z' \begin{pmatrix} e_L \\ \mu_L \\ \tau_L \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

$|U_{\tau 2}| \approx 0.6$, $|U_{\tau 3}| \approx 0.7$. Put $|\sin \theta_{sb}| = |V_{ts}| = 0.04$, so $g_{\mu\mu} \gg g_{bs}$, which helps us survive $B_s - \overline{B}_s$ constraint





Example Case Predictions

Mode	BR	Mode	BR	Mode	BR
$t\bar{t}$	0.42	$b\bar{b}$	0.12	$\nu\bar{\nu}'$	0.08
$\mu^+\mu^-$	0.08	$\mu^\pm\tau^\mp$	0.03	$\tau^+\tau^-$	0.30

ATLAS¹⁰ $BR(Z \rightarrow \mu\tau) < 1.3 \times 10^{-5}$ at 95%, results in $g_F \leq M_{Z'}/(0.8 \text{ TeV})$, less stringent than LEP LFU


$$g_F^2 \left(\frac{M_Z}{M_{Z'}} \right)^2 \leq 0.004 \Rightarrow g_F \leq \frac{M_{Z'}}{1.3 \text{ TeV}}.$$

It's worth LHCb, BELLE II chasing $BR(B \rightarrow K^{(*)}\mu^\pm\tau^\mp)$.

¹⁰[arXiv:1804.09568](https://arxiv.org/abs/1804.09568)

Quantum Field Theory

Anomalies



$$A \equiv \sum_{LH f_i} Y_i^3 - \sum_{RH f_i} Y_i^3$$

Anomaly equations

4 linear ones, and

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 (F_{Q_i}^2 - F_{L_i}^2 - 2F_{u_i}^2 + F_{d_i}^2 + F_{e_i}^2) = 0,$$

, ACC is the cubic

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 (6F_{Q_i}^3 + 2F_{L_i}^3 - 3F_{u_i}^3 - 3F_{d_i}^3 - F_{e_i}^3 - F_{\nu_i}^3) = 0,$$

Look for solutions in **rational numbers**. Also, re-scaling invariance means that can re-scale to **integers**.

Solve case for 1 or 2 families of charges *analytically*, using old Diophantine methods. For 3 families, wrote a **efficient** computer program to search through $(2Q_{max}+1)^{18}$ sets of charges for SM and $SM+3\nu_R$, find all those that solve the anomaly equations.

Q	Q	Q	ν	ν	ν	e	e	e	u	u	u	L	L	L	d	d	d
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	1	-1	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	1	0	0	0	-1	0	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	1	-1	0	1	0	0	0	-1	0	1
-1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	1	0	0	0
-1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	1	0	0	0	-1	0	1
-1	0	1	0	0	0	-1	0	1	-1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
-1	0	1	0	0	0	-1	0	1	-1	0	1	-1	0	1	-1	0	1

eg: $Q_{max} = 1$. Charges within a species are listed in *increasing order*.

Q_{\max}	Solutions	Symmetry	Quadratics	Cubics	Time/sec
1	8	8	32	8	0.0
2	22	14	1861	161	0.0
3	82	32	23288	1061	0.0
4	251	56	303949	7757	0.0
5	626	114	1966248	35430	0.0
6	1983	144	11470333	143171	0.2
7	3902	252	46471312	454767	0.6
8	7068	336	176496916	1311965	2.2
9	14354	492	539687692	3310802	6.7
10	23800	582	1580566538	7795283	20

SM solutions

An Anomaly-Free Atlas

The atlas is available for public use:

<http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1478085>

We did various checks (are solutions that were found in the literature before present, and are classes that have been banned not present?)

[BCA, Davighi, Melville, arXiv:1812.04602](#)

Conclusions

The answers to the questions raised by $R_{K^{(*)}}$ may provide a direct experimental probe into the flavour problem.

File Edit View History Tools People Help

Fwd: Gran x Inbox - be x Imperial P x 1609.020 x LumiPubl x Has the q x


https://aeon.co/essays/has-the-quest-for-top-down-...

Going nowhere fast

After the success of the Standard Model, experiments have stopped answering to grand theories. Is particle physics in crisis?

Photo by Getty

Ben Allanach is a professor in the department of applied mathematics and theoretical physics at the University of Cambridge. Along with other members of the Cambridge Supersymmetry Working Group, his research focuses on collider searches for new physics.

 Loading audio player...
Brought to you by [Curio](#), an [Aeon partner](#)

2,900 words

SYNDICATE THIS ESSAY

In recent years, physicists have been watching the data coming in from the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) with a growing sense of unease. We've spent decades devising elaborate accounts for the behaviour of the quantum zoo of subatomic particles, the most basic components of the known universe. The Standard Model is

Other conclusions

- The answers to the questions raised by $R_{K^{(*)}}$ may provide a **direct experimental probe into the flavour problem**.
- Focused on *tree-level* explanations of $R_{K^{(*)}}$ as they are usually harder to discover: Z' and leptoquarks.
- News on $R_K^{(*)}$ expected *in 2019*. At the current central value, Belle II can reach 5σ by mid 2021. LHCb's R_{K^*} would be close to¹¹ 5σ by 2020.
- $R_{K^{(*)}} \Rightarrow$ *HL-LHC, HE-LHC and FCC-hh*

¹¹[Albrecht et al, 1709.10308](#)

Backup







FIG. 10. Neutrino trident process that leads to constraints on the Z^μ coupling strength to neutrinos-muons, namely $M_{Z'}/g_{\nu\mu} \gtrsim 750$ GeV.




Q_{\max}	Solutions	Symmetry	Quadratics	Cubics	Time/sec
1	38	16	144	38	0.0
2	358	48	31439	2829	0.0
3	4116	154	1571716	69421	0.1
4	24552	338	34761022	932736	0.6
5	111152	796	442549238	7993169	6.8
6	435305	1218	3813718154	49541883	56

SM + 3 ν_R : number of solutions etc


Solutions



Anomaly-Free Fraction



Constraints on Example Case




Widen allowed white sliver with less strong assumptions?

Known Solutions

Model	Q	Q	Q	ν	ν	ν	e	e	e	u	u	u	L	L	L	d	d	d
$L_\mu - L_\tau$	0	0	0	-1	0	1	-1	0	1	0	0	0	-1	0	1	0	0	0
TFHM	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	-4	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2
$B_3 - L_3$	-1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	-1	0	0	0	0	3	-1	0	0

13 TeV ATLAS 3.2 fb⁻¹ $\mu\mu$



Neutrino Masses

At dimension 5:

$$\mathcal{L}_{SS} = \frac{1}{2M} (L'_3{}^T H^c) (L'_3 H^c),$$

but if we add RH neutrinos, then integrate them out


$$\mathcal{L}_{SS} = 1/2 \sum_{ij} (L'_i H^c) (M^{-1})_{ij} (L'_j H^c),$$

where now $(M^{-1})_{ij}$ may well have a non-trivial structure. If $(M^{-1})_{ij}$ are of same order, large PMNS mixing results.

Froggatt Neilsen Mechanism¹²



A means of generating the non-renormalisable Yukawa terms, e.g. $F_\theta = 1/6$:

$$Y_c \overline{Q'_{L2}}^{(F=0)} H^{(F=-1/2)} c'_R{}^{(F=0)} \sim \mathcal{O} \left[\left(\frac{\langle \theta \rangle}{M} \right)^3 \overline{Q'_{L2}} H c'_R \right]$$



¹²C Froggatt and H Neilsen, NPB147 (1979) 277


$$B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0} (\rightarrow K^+ \pi^-) \mu^+ \mu^-$$



Decay fully described by three helicity angles $\vec{\Omega} = (\theta_\ell, \theta_K, \phi)$ and $q^2 = m_{\mu\mu}^2$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{d(\Gamma + \bar{\Gamma})/dq^2} \frac{d^3(\Gamma + \bar{\Gamma})}{d\vec{\Omega}} &= \frac{9}{32\pi} \left[\frac{3}{4}(1 - F_L) \sin^2 \theta_K + F_L \cos^2 \theta_K + \frac{1}{4}(1 - F_L) \sin^2 \theta_K \cos 2\theta_\ell \right. \\ &\quad - F_L \cos^2 \theta_K \cos 2\theta_\ell + S_3 \sin^2 \theta_K \sin^2 \theta_\ell \cos 2\phi \\ &\quad + S_4 \sin 2\theta_K \sin 2\theta_\ell \cos \phi + S_5 \sin 2\theta_K \sin \theta_\ell \cos \phi \\ &\quad + \frac{4}{3} A_{\text{FB}} \sin^2 \theta_K \cos \theta_\ell + S_7 \sin 2\theta_K \sin \theta_\ell \sin \phi \\ &\quad \left. + S_8 \sin 2\theta_K \sin 2\theta_\ell \sin \phi + S_9 \sin^2 \theta_K \sin^2 \theta_\ell \sin 2\phi \right] \end{aligned}$$


$$P'_5$$



$P'_5 = S_5 / \sqrt{F_L(1 - F_L)}$, leading form factor uncertainties cancel. Tension already in 1 fb^{-1} and confirmed in 3 fb^{-1}
[LHCb-CONF-2015-002](#)

Hadronic Uncertainties

- ▶ Hadronic effects like charm loop are photon-mediated \Rightarrow vector-like coupling to leptons just like C_9



- ▶ How to disentangle NP \leftrightarrow QCD?
 - ▶ Hadronic effect can have different q^2 dependence
 - ▶ Hadronic effect is lepton flavour universal ($\rightarrow R_K!$)

LQ Models

Scalar¹³ $S_3 = (\bar{3}, 3, 1/3)$ of $SU(2) \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$:

$$\mathcal{L} = \dots + y_3 Q L S_3 + y_q Q Q S_3^\dagger + \text{h.c.}$$

Vector $V_1 = (\bar{3}, 1, 2/3)$ or $V_3 = (3, 3, 2/3)$

$$\mathcal{L} = \dots + y'_3 V_3^\mu \bar{Q} \gamma_\mu L + y_1 V_1^\mu \bar{Q} \gamma_\mu L + y'_1 V_1^\mu \bar{d} \gamma_\mu l + \text{h.c.}$$

$$\Rightarrow \bar{c}_{LL}^\mu = \kappa \frac{4\pi v^2}{\alpha_{\text{EM}} V_{tb} V_{ts}^*} \frac{|y_i|^2}{M^2}.$$


$\kappa = 1, -1, -1$ and $y = y_3, y_1, y'_3$ for S_3, V_1, V_3 .

¹³Capdevila *et al* 1704.05340, Hiller and Hisandzic 1704.05444, D'Amico *et al* 1704.05438.

CMS 8 TeV 20fb^{-1} 2nd gen

CMS-PAS-EXO-12-042: $M > 1.07$ TeV.

95% CL lim. 2nd gen. leptoquark pair production



Other Constraints On LQs

Note that the extrapolation is **very rough** for **pair** production. Fix $M = 2M_{LQ}$, assuming they are produced close to threshold: $\Delta = 0.1$.

$B_s - \bar{B}_s$ **mixing** is at one-loop:


$$\mathcal{L}_{\bar{b}s\bar{b}s} = k \frac{|y_{b\mu} y_{s\mu}^*|^2}{32\pi^2 M_{LQ}^2} (\bar{b}\gamma_\mu P_L s) (\bar{s}\gamma^\mu P_L b) + \text{h.c.}$$

$y = y_3, y_1, y'_3$ and $k = 5, 4, 20$ for S_3, V_1, V_3 .

Data $\Rightarrow c_{LL}^{bb} < 1/(210\text{TeV})^2$. Recently, some¹⁴ used a Fermilab MILC lattice determination of f_B which **makes the SM differ from experiment at the 2σ level.**

¹⁴Lenz *et al*, 1712.06572

8 TeV CMS 20fb^{-1} 2nd gen



Up to 14 TeV LQs with 100 TeV 10ab^{-1} FCC-hh. $M_{LQ} < 41\text{ TeV}$.⁶⁹

LQ Mass Limits


S_3	41 TeV
V_1	41 TeV
V_3	18 TeV

From $B_s - \bar{B}_s$ mixing and fitting b -anomalies.


Pair production has a reach up to 12 TeV.

The pair production cross-section is insensitive to the representation of $SU(2)$ in this case.

95% CL lim. 2nd gen. leptoquark pair production



HL-LHC/HE-LHC LQs



$$B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$$

Lattice QCD provides important input to

$$BR(B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu)_{SM} = (3.65 \pm 0.23) \times 10^{-9},$$


$$BR(B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu)_{exp} = (3.0 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-9}.$$

$$\frac{BR(B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu)}{BR(B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu)_{SM}} = \left| \frac{(\bar{c}_{LL}^\mu + \bar{c}_{RR}^\mu - \bar{c}_{LR}^\mu - \bar{c}_{RL}^\mu)^{tot}}{(\bar{c}_{LL}^\mu + \bar{c}_{RR}^\mu - \bar{c}_{LR}^\mu - \bar{c}_{RL}^\mu)^{SM}} \right|^2.$$

Other Flavour Models


Realising¹⁵ the vector LQ solution based on $PS = [SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R]^3$. SM-like Higgs lies in third generation PS group, explaining large Yukawas (others come from VEV hierarchies). Get $U(2)_Q \times U(2)_L$ approximate global flavour symmetry.

¹⁵Di Luzio Greljo, Nardecchia [arXiv:1708.08450](https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.08450), Bordone, Cornella, Fuentes-Martin, Isidori, [arXiv:1712.01368](https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.01368)




Single Production of LQ

Depends upon **LQ coupling** as well as LQ mass



Current bound by CMS from 8 TeV 20 fb^{-1} : $M_{LQ} > 660$ GeV for $s\mu$ coupling of 1. We include b as well from NNPDF2.3L0 ($\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.119$), re-summing large logs from initial state b . Integrate $\hat{\sigma}$ with LHAPDF.




σ s for S_3 with $y_{s\mu} = y_{b\mu} = y$.

Single LQ Production σ

$$\hat{\sigma}(qg \rightarrow \phi l) = \frac{y^2 \alpha_S}{96 \hat{s}} (1 + 6r - 7r^2 + 4r(r+1) \ln r) ,$$

where¹⁶ $r = M_{LQ}^2 / \hat{s}$ and we set $y_{s\mu} = y_{b\mu} = y$.


¹⁶Hewett and Pakvasa, PRD **57** (1988) 3165.



Science [Life and Physics](#)

Modelling the fourth colour: dispatch from de Moriond

At the particle physics conference, it's clear inconclusive LHCb data are stimulating strange new ideas



▲ Four colours (or colors?) Photograph: Ben Allanach

Ben Allanach
Sat 17 Mar 2018 10.15 GMT

In the middle of the [Rencontres de Moriond](#) particle physics conference in Italy, the scientific talks stopped to allow a standing ovation dedicated to the memory and achievements of my inspirational colleague Stephen Hawking, who we heard had died earlier that day.

The talks quickly resumed, which I think Stephen would have approved of. The most striking thing about the scientific content of the conference this year was that a whole day was dedicated to the weirdness in bottom particles that [Tevong You and I wrote about](#) last November. As Marco Nardecchia reviewed in his talk ([PDF](#)), bottom particles produced in the LHCb detector in proton collisions are decaying too often in certain particular ways, compared to predictions from the Standard Model of particle physics. Their decay products are coming out with the wrong angles too often compared with predictions, too.



Anomalous bottoms at Cern and the case for a new collider

[Read more](#)

We were hoping for an update on the data at the conference: the amount of data has roughly doubled since they were last released, and we need to see the new data to be convinced that something really new is happening in the collisions. I strongly suspect that if the effect is seen in the new data, the theoretical physics community will “go nuts” and we will quickly see the resulting avalanche of papers. If the new data look ordinary, the effect will be forgotten and everyone will move on. Taking such measurements correctly takes care and time, however, and the LHCb experiment didn't release them.

We shall have to wait until other conferences later this year for the LHCb to present its analyses of the new data.

There were interesting theory talks on how new forces could explain the strange properties of the bottom particle decays. The full mathematical models look quite baroque: they need a lot of “bells and whistles” in order to pass other experimental tests. But these models prove that it can be done, and they are quite different to what has been proposed before.

[One of them](#) even unifies different classes of particle (leptons and quarks), describing the lepton as the “fourth colour” of a quark. We are used to the idea that quarks come in three (otherwise identical) copies: physicists label them red, green and blue to distinguish them. As Javier Fuentes-Martin describe ([PDF](#)), once you design the mathematics to make leptons the fourth colour, the existence of a new force-carrying particle with just the correct properties to break up the