

Dark Matter in a twisted bottle!



IPN Lyon (France)

With: A.Arbey, A.Deandrea, B.Kubik, J.Llodra-Perez, L.Panizzi

SMU, Dallas 03-18-2013

Why do we need Dark Matter?

Observations both in Astrophysics and Cosmology suggest the presence of "Dark" Matter, not explained in the Standard Model!

Astrophysical measurements:

DISTRIBUTION OF DARK MATTER IN NGC 3198





- The Universe contains 4.6% of baryons, and 23.3% of unknown matter.
- The flat rotation curves of spiral galaxies can be explained by the presence of extra non-luminous matter.

WIMP paradigm



Action for a massless scalar in D-dimensions $S = \int d^{D}x \left\{ \partial_{\mu} \phi^{\dagger} \partial^{\mu} \phi - \sum_{j=5}^{D-4} \partial_{j} \phi^{\dagger} \partial_{j} \phi \right\}$ $\phi(x_{\mu}, x_{j}) = \int \frac{d^{4}p}{(2\pi)^{4}} e^{ip_{\mu}x^{\mu}} \sum_{\vec{k}} \varphi_{\vec{k}}(p_{\mu}) f_{\vec{k}}(x_{j})$

Expansion in 4-dim fields on compact extra space:

0

D-dim fields correspond to tower of massive 4-dim fields



D-dim fields correspond to tower of massive 4-dim fields

0



- D-dim fields correspond to tower of massive 4-dim fields
- k's are like <u>frequencies</u> of vibrating membrane!



- D-dim fields correspond to tower of massive 4-dim fields
- k's are like <u>frequencies</u> of vibrating membrane!
- Masses and interactions determined by the wave functions $f_{\overrightarrow{k}}(x_i)$!

RPP



- D-dim fields correspond to tower of massive 4-dim fields 0
- k's are like <u>frequencies</u> of vibrating membrane! 0
- <u>Masses</u> and interactions determined by the wave functions $f_{\overrightarrow{k}}(x_i)$! 0
- <u>Symmetries of the compact space</u> = global symmetries of 4-dim fields: 0 transformation properties of the wave functions!
- Can such symmetry stabilise the Dark Matter? 0

Stability of the Dark Matter "requires" a symmetry!

Can it arise "naturally" from extra dimensions?

Symmetries of the compact space ARE parities for the Kaluza-Klein modes!

The physics is in the wave functions: for instance



Orbifold S^1/\mathcal{Z}_2 $x_5 o \pi R - x_5$ $\cos\left(krac{x_5}{R}
ight) o (-1)^k \cos\left(krac{x_5}{R}
ight).$

However, fixed points (in red) are NOT invariant!

Stability of the Dark Matter "requires" a symmetry!

Can it arise ``naturally" from extra dimensions?

Symmetries of the compact space ARE parities for the Kaluza-Klein modes!

The physics is in the wave functions: for instance



Orbifold S^1/\mathcal{Z}_2 $x_5 o \pi R - x_5$ $\cos\left(krac{x_5}{R}
ight) o (-1)^k \cos\left(krac{x_5}{R}
ight).$

However, fixed points (in red) are NOT invariant!

Stability of the Dark Matter "requires" a symmetry!

Can it arise "naturally" from extra dimensions?

In Gauge-Higgs Unification models, or models of flavour, fermion localisation is essential!



Bulk fermion masses break the KK parity!

Already pointed out by Barbieri, Contino, Creminelli, Rattazzi, Scrucca hep-th/0203039

KK-parity is ad-hoc symmetry!

0

0

KK-parity absent in interesting models! des!

Do orbifolds exist without fixed points and with chiral fermions?

G.C., A.Deandrea, J.Llodra-Perez 0907.4993

- There is none in 5D...
- In 6D there are 17 orbifolds (characterised by the discrete symmetry groups of the flat plane)...
- only ONE has chirality and no fixed points/lines! Unique candidate!

Requiring an exact parity and chirality is rather restrictive!



 $\mathbf{pgg}=\langle r,g|r^2=(g^2r)^2=\mathbf{1}
angle$ G.C., A.Deandrea, J.Llodra-Perez 0907.4993

 πR_6

 πR_5

 $2\pi R_5$

$$r: \begin{cases} x_5 \sim -x_5 \\ x_6 \sim -x_6 \end{cases} \qquad g: \begin{cases} x_5 \sim x_5 + \pi R_5 \\ x_6 \sim -x_6 + \pi R_6 \end{cases}$$

Translations defined as:

Two singular points:

 $t_5 = g^2$ $t_6 = (gr)^2$ $(0,\pi) \sim (\pi,0)$ $(0,0) \sim (\pi,\pi)$

KK parity is an exact symmetry of the space!

Spectrum and interactions determined by these symmetries!



$$\mathbf{pgg} = \langle r, g | r^2 = (g^2 r)^2 = \mathbf{1} \rangle$$

G.C., B.Kubik 1209.6556





 $r': \left\{egin{array}{l} x_5 o -x_5 + \pi R_5 \ x_6 o -x_6 + \pi R_6 \end{array}
ight.$ Can be redefined as a translation,

which commutes with orbifold symmetries:

 $p_{KK} = r' * r : \begin{cases} x_5 \to x_5 + \pi R_5 \\ x_6 \to x_6 + \pi R_6 \end{cases}$

Modes (k, l): $p_{KK} = (-1)^{k+l}$

This is an exact symmetry!



$$\mathbf{pgg} = \langle r, g | r^2 = (g^2 r)^2 = \mathbf{1} \rangle$$

G.C., B.Kubik 1209.6556

Fundamental domain invariant under:

 $m_4: \left\{ \begin{array}{c} x_5 \to -x_5 + \pi R_5 \\ x_6 \to x_6 \end{array} \right.$

Can be redefined as a translation, which commutes with orbifold symmetries:

$$m_4 * g * r : \begin{cases} x_5 \to x_5 \\ x_6 \to x_6 + \pi R_6 \end{cases}$$

Modes (k, l): $p'_{KK} = (-1)^l$

This symmetry is respected by bulk interactions!

Violated by localised interactions!



$$\mathbf{pgg} = \langle r, g | r^2 = (g^2 r)^2 = \mathbf{1} \rangle$$

Case of symmetric radii:



Fundamental domain invariant under:

 $m_d : \left\{ \begin{array}{c} x_5 \to x_6 \\ x_6 \to x_5 \end{array} \right.$

However, it is not a good symmetry, because it does NOT commute with the glide:

 $m_d * g * m_d = g * r : \begin{cases} x_5 \to -x_5 + \pi R_5 \\ x_6 \to x_6 + \pi R_6 \end{cases}$

It does not respect orbifold projections: e.g., a (-+) field mapped into a (--) field!



G.C., B.Kubik 1209.6556

Spectrum of the SM

+

+

+

$p_{KK} = (-1)^{k+l}$	(0,0) m = 0	(1,0) & (0,1) m = 1	(1,1) m = 1.41	(2,0) & (0,2) m = 2	(2,1) & (1,2) m = 2.24
Gauge bosons G, A, Z, W	\checkmark		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
Gauge scalars G, A, Z, W		\checkmark	\checkmark		\checkmark
Higgs boson(s)	\checkmark		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
Fermions	\checkmark	\checkmark	√ (x2)	\checkmark	√ (x2)

DM candidate here!

Spectrum of the SM

+

$p_{KK} = (-1)^{k+l}$	(0,0) m = 0	(1,0) & (0,1) m = 1	(1,1) m = 1.41	(2,0) & (0,2) m = 2	(2,1) & (1,2) m = 2.24
Gauge bosons G, A, Z, W	\checkmark		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
Gauge scalars G, A, Z, W		\checkmark	\checkmark		\checkmark
Higgs boson(s)	\checkmark		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
Fermions	\checkmark	\checkmark	√ (x2)	\checkmark	√ (x2)

One-loop corrections are crucial to determine spectrum and decays!

G.C., A.Deandrea, J.Llodra-Perez 1104.3800

+

G.C., B.Kubik 1209.6556

Spectrum of the SM

Localised: KK number violating!



Spectrum of the SM We focus on two different limits:

asymmetric radii R4 > R5

only (1,0) and (2,0) modes relevant

symmetric radii R4 = R5

- (1,0) and (0,1) exactly degenerate (up to higher order ops)
- only state (2,0) + (0,2) relevant: mass splitting nearly doubled, couplings to SM pair
- (2,0) (0,2) decouples (up to higher order operators)

WMAP bounds!

A.Arbey, G.C., A.Deandrea, B.Kubik 1210.0384

There are several equally relevant contributions:





Annihilation



Co-annihilation (small mass splitting)



2



Resonant annihilation (s-channel level 2 states!)



G.Belanger, M.Kakizaki, A.Phukov 1012.2577

Level 2 annihilation (level 2 decaying into SM pair!)

WMAP bounds: tier (2) effect

Numerical results from MICROMEGAS



$R_5 > R_6$

- Annihilation into level-2 \Rightarrow increased cross-sections \Rightarrow higher mKK
- mloc controls H(2,0) resonance!
- H(2,0) opens resonant funnel!

WMAP bounds: H₍₂₎ resonance

Numerical results from MICROMEGAS



$R_5 > R_6$

- Annihilation into level-2 \Rightarrow increased cross-sections \Rightarrow higher mKK
- mloc controls H(2,0) resonance!

H(2,0) opens resonant funnel up to 1200!

WMAP preferred range: 700 < mKK < 1000

WMAP bounds: $R_5 > R_6 vs. R_5 = R_6$

Numerical results from MICROMEGAS



- In the symmetric case, we have typically smaller mKK
- The reason is that two tiers contribute to the relic abundance!

WMAP bounds: cut-off dependence

Numerical results from MICROMEGAS



 In the annihilation case, larger mass splitting suppressed cross sections (t-channel exchange of massive states)

→ mKK decreases

For co-annihilation, larger mass splitting implies the other states contribute less, thus less degrees of freedom available!

→ mKK increases

Direct detection bounds

Numerical results from MICROMEGAS



Relevant processes: crucial the loop corrections to level-1 masses!

The Spin-Independent cross section is enhanced by the small splittings!

Bound sensitive to cut-off Λ via log-div. loops!

Independent on radii config.



Direct detection bounds

Numerical results from MICROMEGAS



Relevant processes: crucial the loop corrections to level-1 masses!

The Spin-Independent cross section is enhanced by the small splittings!





 $R_5 = R_6$

 $R_5 > R_6$

LHC signatures without MET: tiers (2,0) and (0,2)

G.C., B.Kubik 1209.6556

Cleanest channels are di-lepton (Z') and single lepton + MET (W'):



$$Z_{(2,0)}, A_{(2,0)} \rightarrow I I$$

BR: 0.2% !!
 $W_{(2,0)} \rightarrow I V$

2011 Data only!





R5 > R6

LHC signatures without MET:

tiers (2,0) and (0,2)

G.C., B.Kubik 1209.6556



R5 > **R**6

LHC signatures without MET: tiers (2,0) and (0,2)

G.C., B.Kubik 1209.6556



- smaller production due to higher masses (for same mKK)
- larger splitting in tier (2) opens up decay modes into pair of (1) modes:
 e.g. q(2) → q(1) G(1)
- suppressed branching into SM pairs!

Other LHC bounds

G.C., B.Kubik 1209.6556

Pair of di-jet resonances

3% 13% efficiency efficiency 100 Events with 4 high-pT jets. Reconstruct two invariant masses 10 with similar value. σ [fb] Other kinematic cuts to obtain

smooth QCD background.



 $R_5 > R_6$

Other LHC bounds

4-top final state: search in same-sign dileptons



G.C., R.Chierici, A.Deandrea, L.Panizzi, S.Perries, S.Tosi 1107.4616

Tier (1,1) cannot decay at loop level into SM, nor into a pair of (1,0) + (0,1)!

Chain decay into lightest state A(1,1)

A(1,1) can decay into t tbar!

HUGE production cross sections: all KK states contribute to it!

ATLAS search under evaluation!

MET signatures from (1,0) and (0,1): lighter, but relying on ISR!

G.C., A.Deandrea, J.Ellis, L.Panizzi, J.Marrouche 1302.4750



LHC: the Higgs discovery!

G.C., A.Deandrea, J.Llodra-Perez 0901.0927 G.C., A.Deandrea, G.Drieu La Rochelle, J.B.Flament 1210.8120

The KK resonances of W and top contribute to $H \rightarrow gg$ and $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ loops!

2.0

CMS data (HCP12)

$$\odot H \to \gamma \gamma$$

 \odot H \rightarrow ZZ



0.5

Conclusions and outlook

- Exact KK parity is a very selective requirement on XDs: RPP in 6D flat!
- SM on the RPP: rich pheno, very nice interplay of LHC, WMAP and Direct Detection experiments!
- Case $R_5 = R_6$ excluded by Direct Detection + WMAP.
- LHC bounds @ mKK > 600 GeV level (leptonic Z' and W')
- Others: signatures with MET (+ jets) from (1,0) and (1,2); 4 tops from (1,1); etc.

For the levels (1,0) and (0,1):

 $m = m_{KK} + \delta m$

