## Setting limits on simplified dark matter models using LHC monojet results

Karl Nordström

Supervised by Andreas Weiler, Caterina Doglioni, and Sofia Vallecorsa

August 12th, 2014



Things I will discuss:

- Why mono-X  $(X = jet, \gamma, Z, W)$  analyses are sensitive to particle dark matter models
- $\triangleright$  What simplified dark matter (DM) models are, and why they are needed for the interpretation of LHC results
- <span id="page-1-0"></span> $\blacktriangleright$  How to set limits on such models



Figure : Diagram for DM pair production with a gluon radiated off the initial state.

<span id="page-2-0"></span> $\triangleright$  Question: how do we describe the interaction in a model-independent way?

Solution 1: Assume the mediator is heavy and integrate out  $-$  the Effective Field Theory (EFT) approach. Assuming a vector mediator and Dirac fermion DM with vector couplings, the operator is:

 $\bar{\chi}\gamma_\mu\chi\bar{\mathsf{q}}\gamma^\mu\mathsf{q}$ 



<span id="page-3-0"></span>Figure : Diagram of the EFT approach.

Pros:

- $\triangleright$  The simplest way to add DM to the Standard Model, little model dependence
- $\triangleright$  Easy to compare limits to those set by (in)direct detection experiments

Cons:

- $\triangleright$  Depending on  $M_{\text{med}}$ , might be probing events where  $Q > \Lambda = M_{\text{med}} / \sqrt{g_q g_\chi}$  at the LHC: 1402.1275 (Busoni et al.)
- $\triangleright$  Can over/underestimate limits depending on details of UV physics: 1308.6799 (Buchmueller et al.)

<span id="page-5-0"></span>

Figure : Same diagram as before, but with an explicit mediator.

Solution 2: Use a theory with a generic mediator  $\xi$  – the Simplified Model approach. Again assuming a vector mediator and Dirac fermion DM with vector couplings, we get the operator $^1\colon$ 

$$
g_q\bar{q}\gamma^\mu q\xi_\mu+g_\chi\bar{\chi}\gamma_\mu\chi\xi^\mu
$$

Pros:

 $\triangleright$  Gives reliable results for all kinematically allowed configurations of  $M_{\text{med}}$ ,  $M_{\text{DM}}$ , and Q

Cons:

 $\triangleright$  Is more complicated to set limits on, and the limits can not be easily compared to those of (in)direct detection experiments

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>With thanks to Amelia Brennan!

- 1. Write down Lagrangian in FeynRules and output a model file
- 2. Plug model into MadGraph and generate parton level events
- 3. Shower the events in Pythia 8
- 4. Perform detector simulation and analysis in Atom/Rivet
- <span id="page-7-0"></span>5. Do statistics with numpy/RooStats

MET distribution, SR1, Data Events/GeV **ATLAS** 10 Background + Signal  $10<sup>2</sup>$  $10^{\degree}$  $\mathbf{I}$  $10^{-1}$  $10^{-2}$  $1.4$ MC/Data 1.2 T  $0.8$  $0.6$ 800 200 400 600 1000 1200  $\circ$  $E_T^{miss}$  [GeV]

<span id="page-8-0"></span>Figure : Example of background + signal versus data for missing  $E_T$  in one of the signal regions. In this case the signal is for  $M_{\rm med}=1$  TeV,  $M_{\rm DM}=400$  GeV at  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV.



Figure : Example of output for  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV. This is for the operator defined earlier with  $\Gamma_{\xi} = M_{\xi}/3$ .

Karl Nordström 9 / 10

## <span id="page-10-0"></span>Thank you!