

# Linear Colliders the Higgs boson microscopes

Mila Pandurovic

Vinca Institute of Nuclear sciences Belgrade, Serbia



#### 22. March 2018

### Outline



#### Introduction

- Standard model of particle physics
- Open questions
- Motivation for new machine in high energy physics
- The synergy of hadron and lepton colliders
- Linear Collider options: ILC and CLIC
- Accelerator design
- Detectors for ILC
- Physics program of linear colliders
- Summary

### LHC discovery



2013. Standard model has passed the exam again:

New resonance

The Nobel Prize in Physics 2013 was awarded jointly to François Englert and Peter W. Higgs

"For the theoretical discovery of a mechanism that contributes to our understanding of the origin of mass of subatomic particles, and which recently was confirmed through the discovery of the predicted fundamental particle, by the ATLAS and CMS experiments at CERN's Large Hadron Collider"

0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	*1275 Gevice' 273 C 1/2 C charm top gluon +128 Gevice' 0 G 1/2 G 1/2 C 1/2 C 1	Weak E Interaction Elec	lectromagnetic troweak Strong
2500 2000 1500 1000 I s=7 TeV, ∫Ldt=4.8fb <sup>-1</sup>	+95 MeWe <sup>2</sup> -13 12 Strange UN 7 MeWe <sup>4</sup> (13 12 bottom UN 7 MeWe <sup>4</sup> (13 12 bottom UN 7 MeWe <sup>4</sup> (13 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	Particles which are "mediators"	⊻ (photon) Gluon
500 = 100 $100 = 100 $ $100 = 100$	n muon c155 Market 20 40 Adams	No of 3 "mediators"	1 8
-100 -200 100 110 120 130 140 150 160	a la	Strength of the force $10^{-16}$	10-3 1
m <sub>n</sub> [GeV] للمعتبي [GeV] Linear colliders – the Higgs boson microscope	M. Pandurovic	University of Pavia	22. March 2018.

### Open questions of particle physics

- Still there are many open questions that directly connected to the properties of the Higgs boson in relation to the new physics
  - The SM does not explain why was the symmetry broken!
  - Gravity is not included
    - Hierarchy Problem why the gravity is 'so much weaker' then the other torces
  - At the high energy the Higgs boson mass becomes 'infinite' (the problem of "naturalness")
  - Matter/Anti-Matter asymmetry
  - Dark matter, ...
- In order to answer at least a part of these questions several paths of Physics Beyond Standard model has been developed
  - SuperSymetrical models (SUSY)
  - Models with Extra Dimensions
  - Composite Higgs models ...







#### Standard model holds!

#### ATLAS SUSY Searches\* - 95% CL Lower Limits

	Model	$e, \mu, \tau, \gamma$	Jets	$E_{\mathrm{T}}^{\mathrm{miss}}$	∫£ dt[fb	-1]	Mass limit	$\sqrt{s} = 7, 8$	<b>TeV</b> $\sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV}$
Inclusive Searches	$ \begin{array}{l} \bar{q}\bar{q}, \bar{q} \rightarrow q \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \bar{q}\bar{q}, \bar{q} \rightarrow q \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \bar{g}\bar{x}, \bar{g} \rightarrow q \bar{q} \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \bar{g}\bar{x}, \bar{g} \rightarrow q \bar{q} \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \bar{g}\bar{x}, \bar{g} \rightarrow q \bar{q} (\mathcal{L}) \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \bar{g}\bar{x}, \bar{g} \rightarrow q q (\mathcal{L}) \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \bar{g}\bar{x}, \bar{g} \rightarrow q (\mathcal{L}) \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \bar{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \bar{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \bar{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \bar{\chi}_{2}^{0} \\ \bar{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \bar{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ \bar{\chi}_{2}^{0} \\ \bar{\chi}_{1}^{0} $	0 mono-jet 0 0 <i>ee,μμ</i> 3 <i>e,μ</i> 0 1-2 τ + 0-1 ℓ 2 γ γ 0	2-6 jets 1-3 jets 2-6 jets 2 jets 4 jets 7-11 jets 0-2 jets - 2 jets mono-jet	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	36.1 36.1 36.1 14.7 36.1 36.1 36.1 36.1 36.1 36.1 20.3	<ul> <li>\$\vec{q}\$</li> <li>\$\vec{q}\$</li> <li>\$\vec{k}\$</li> <li>\$\vec{k}\$</li></ul>	710 GeV	1.57 TeV m 2.02 TeV 2.01 TeV 1.7 TeV 1.87 TeV 1.87 TeV 1.8 TeV 2.0 TeV 2.15 TeV 2.05 TeV	$\begin{split} & \{\hat{\xi}^{0}^{1}\} < 200  \text{GeV},  m(1^{4}   \text{gen.}  \hat{q}) = m(2^{244}  \text{gen.}  \hat{q}) \\ & m(\hat{\xi}^{0}) = 0.0  \text{GeV},  m(\hat{\xi}^{0}) = 0.5 (m(\hat{\xi}^{0}) + m(\hat{g})) \\ & m(\hat{\xi}^{0})_{1} > 200  \text{GeV},  m(\hat{\xi}^{0}) = 0.5 (m(\hat{\xi}^{0}) + m(\hat{g})) \\ & m(\hat{\xi}^{0})_{1} > 200  \text{GeV},  m(\hat{\xi}^{0}) = 0.5 (m(\hat{\xi}^{0}) + m(\hat{g})) \\ & m(\hat{\xi}^{0})_{1} > 100  \text{GeV},  m(\hat{\xi}^{0}) = 0.5  \text{Im},  m(\hat{\xi}^{0})_{1} = 0.5  \text{Im}$
3 <sup>rd</sup> gen. <u>ğ</u> med.	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \rightarrow b\bar{b}\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}$ $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \rightarrow t\bar{t}\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}$	0 0-1 <i>e</i> ,μ	3 b 3 b	Yes Yes	36.1 36.1	i Bo Bo		1.92 TeV 1.97 TeV	m(𝔅¹)<600 GeV m(𝔅¹)<200 GeV
3 <sup>rd</sup> gen. squarks direct production	$\begin{array}{l} \bar{b}_1 \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_1 \! \! - \! \! b \bar{k}_1^0 \\ \bar{b}_1 \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_1 \! \! - \! \! b \bar{k}_1^0 \\ \bar{b}_1 \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_1 \! \! - \! \! b \bar{k}_1^0 \\ \bar{b}_1 \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_1 \! \! - \! b \bar{k}_1^0 \\ \bar{b}_1 \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_1 \! \! - \! b \bar{k}_1^0 \\ \bar{b}_1 \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_1 \! \! - \! b \bar{k}_1^0 \\ \bar{b}_1 \bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_1 \! \! - \! b \bar{k}_1^0 \\ \bar{b}_1 \bar{b}_2, \bar{b}_2 \! \! - \! \bar{b}_1 \! \! + \! b \end{array}$	0 2 e, µ (SS) 0-2 e, µ 0-2 e, µ 0 0 2 e, µ (Z) 3 e, µ (Z) 1-2 e, µ	2 b 1 b 1-2 b -2 jets/1-2 mono-jet 1 b 1 b 4 b	Yes Yes b Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	36.1 36.1 4.7/13.3 20.3/36.1 36.1 20.3 36.1 36.1 36.1	b1         b1           b1         117-170 GeV           ī1         90-198 GeV           ī1         1           ī2         72	950 GeV 275-700 GeV 200-720 GeV 0.195-1.0 TeV 90-430 GeV 150-600 GeV 290-790 GeV 320-880 GeV		$\begin{split} & m(\tilde{t}_{1}^{2}) < 420 \text{ GeV } \\ & m(\tilde{t}_{1}^{2}) = 000 \text{ GeV } , m(\tilde{t}_{1}^{2}) = m(\tilde{t}_{1}^{2}) + 100 \text{ GeV } \\ & m(\tilde{t}_{1}^{2}) = 2m(\tilde{t}_{1}^{2}) , m(\tilde{t}_{1}^{2}) = 55 \text{ GeV } \\ & m(\tilde{t}_{1}^{2}) = 150 \text{ GeV } \\ & m(\tilde{t}_{1}^{2}) = 150 \text{ GeV } \\ & m(\tilde{t}_{1}^{2}) = 150 \text{ GeV } \\ & m(\tilde{t}_{1}^{2}) = 0 \text{ GeV } \\ & m(\tilde{t}_{1}^{2}) = 0 \text{ GeV } \end{split}$
EW direct	$ \begin{split} \tilde{\ell}_{1,\mathbf{k}}\tilde{\ell}_{1,\mathbf{k}}, \tilde{\ell} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{1}^{0} \\ \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{T}\tilde{\chi}_{1}, \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{T} \rightarrow \tilde{\ell} \chi(\tilde{v}) \\ \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{T}\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{T}\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{2}\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{T} \rightarrow \tilde{\tau} \psi(\tilde{v}), \tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0} \rightarrow \tilde{\tau} \tau(v\tilde{v}) \\ \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{T}\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0} \rightarrow U_{1}^{T}\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{T} \partial \psi(v), \tilde{v}\tilde{\ell}_{1}(\ell v) \\ \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{T}\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0} \rightarrow W_{1}^{T}\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{T} \\ \tilde{\chi}_{2}^{T}\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0} \rightarrow W_{1}^{T}\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{T} \\ \tilde{\chi}_{2}^{T}\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0} \rightarrow W_{1}^{T}\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{T} \\ \tilde{\chi}_{2}^{T}\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0} \rightarrow U_{1}^{T}\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{T} \\ \tilde{G}GM (wino NLSP) weak prod., \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \rightarrow y \end{split} $	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \ e, \mu \\ 2 \ e, \mu \\ 2 \ \tau \\ 3 \ e, \mu \\ 2 \cdot 3 \ e, \mu \\ e, \mu, \gamma \\ 4 \ e, \mu \\ q \\ \tilde{G} \ 1 \ e, \mu + \gamma \\ \tilde{G} \ 2 \gamma \end{array}$	0 0 - 0-2 jets 0-2 <i>b</i> 0 -	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	36.1 36.1 36.1 36.1 20.3 20.3 20.3 36.1	$\tilde{t}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{\pm}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{\pm}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{\pm}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{\pm}$ $\tilde{\psi}$ $\tilde{W}$	90-500 GeV 750 GeV 760 GeV 1.13 Te 580 GeV 270 GeV 635 GeV 115-370 GeV 1.06 TeV	✓ m(k <sup>±</sup> <sub>1</sub> )=m( m(k <sup>0</sup> <sub>2</sub> )=m(	$\begin{split} m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2}) = 0 & m(\tilde{k}, \tilde{\gamma}) = 0.5(m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2}) + m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2})) \\ m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2}) = 0, m(\tilde{k}, \tilde{\gamma}) = 0.5(m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2}) + m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2})) \\ m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2}) = m(\tilde{k}, \tilde{\gamma}) = 0.5(m(\tilde{k}, \tilde{\gamma}) + m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2})) \\ m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2}) - m(\tilde{k}, \tilde{\gamma}) = 0.5(m(\tilde{k}, \tilde{\gamma}) + m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2})) \\ m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2}) - m(\tilde{k}, \tilde{\gamma}) = 0.7 & decoupled \\ m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2}) - m(\tilde{k}, \tilde{\gamma}) = 0, m(\tilde{k}, \tilde{\gamma}) = 0.5(m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2}) + m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2})) \\ m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2}) - m(\tilde{k}, \tilde{\gamma}) = 0.5(m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2}) + m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2})) \\ m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2}) = 0.7 & (1 + m) \\ m(\tilde{k}) = 0.5(m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2}) + m(\tilde{k}_{1}^{2})) \\ m(\tilde{k}) = 0.5(m(\tilde{k}) + m(\tilde{k})) $
Long-lived particles	$\begin{array}{l} & \operatorname{Direct} \hat{x}_1^{+} \widetilde{x}_1^{-} \operatorname{prod.}, \log - \operatorname{lived} \hat{x}_1^{+} \\ & \operatorname{Direct} \hat{x}_1^{+} \widetilde{x}_1^{-} \operatorname{prod.}, \log - \operatorname{lived} \hat{x}_1^{+} \\ & \operatorname{Stable}_{\tilde{g}} R - \operatorname{hadron} \\ & \operatorname{Metastable}_{\tilde{g}} R - ha$	Disapp. trk dE/dx trk 0 trk dE/dx trk displ. vtx 1-2 μ 2 γ displ. ee/eμ/μμ	1 jet - 1-5 jets - - - - - -	Yes Yes - Yes - Yes	36.1 18.4 27.9 3.2 32.8 19.1 20.3 20.3	$\tilde{\chi}_{\pm}^{\pm}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{\pm}^{\pm}$ $\tilde{g}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{\pm}^{0}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{\pm}^{0}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{\pm}^{0}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{\pm}^{0}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{\pm}^{0}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{\pm}^{0}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{\pm}^{0}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{\pm}^{0}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{\pm}^{0}$ $\tilde{\chi}_{\pm}^{0}$	460 GeV 495 GeV 850 GeV 537 GeV 440 GeV 1.0 TeV	1.58 TeV 1.57 TeV 2.37 Tr	$\begin{split} m(\tilde{t}_1^2) & m(\tilde{t}_1^2) - 160 \; \text{MeV}, \tau(\tilde{t}_1^2) = 0.2 \; ns \\ m(\tilde{t}_1^2) & m(\tilde{t}_1^2) - 160 \; \text{MeV}, \tau(\tilde{t}_1^2) < 15 \; ns \\ m(\tilde{t}_1^2) - 100 \; \text{GeV}, 10 \; \mu_{S} < \tau(\tilde{t}_{S}) < 100 \; \text{s} \\ m(\tilde{t}_1^2) = 100 \; \text{GeV}, 10 \; ns \\ m(\tilde{t}_1^2) = 100 \; \text{GeV} \\ m(\tilde{t}_1^2) = 100 \; \text{GeV} \\ 10 < \tan \rho < 50 \\ 1$
RPV	$\begin{array}{l} LFV pp {\rightarrow} \bar{\mathbf{v}}_\tau + \mathbf{X}, \bar{\mathbf{v}}_\tau {\rightarrow} e \mu j e \tau / \mu \tau \\ Blinear RPV CMSSM \\ \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 {\rightarrow} W \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_0 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 {\rightarrow} ever_\tau \\ \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 {\rightarrow} W \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_0 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 {\rightarrow} ever_\tau \\ \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 {\rightarrow} W \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_0 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 {\rightarrow} ever_\tau \\ \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 {\rightarrow} \bar{\mathbf{W}} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_0 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 {\rightarrow} ever_\tau \\ \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 {\rightarrow} Q q \\ \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 {\rightarrow} Q s \\ \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 {\rightarrow} D s \\ \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 {\rightarrow} D s \\ \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\dagger_1 {\rightarrow} D s \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} e\mu, e\tau, \mu\tau \\ 2 \ e, \mu \ (SS) \\ 4 \ e, \mu \\ 3 \ e, \mu + \tau \\ 0 \ 4-1 \\ 1 \ e, \mu \ 8-1 \\ 1 \ e, \mu \ 8-0 \\ 2 \ e, \mu \end{array}$	- 0-3 b - 5 large-R je 10 jets/0-4 10 jets/0-4 2 jets + 2 b 2 b	Yes Yes Yes ets b b b -	3.2 20.3 13.3 20.3 36.1 36.1 36.1 36.7 36.7 36.1	\$\vec{x}_r\$           \$\vec{x}_i^1\$           \$\vec{x}_i^1\$           \$\vec{x}_i^2\$           \$\vec{x}_i^1\$           \$\vec{x}_i^1\$ </td <td>1.14 Te 450 GeV 100-470 GeV 480-610 GeV 0.4-</td> <td>1.9 TeV 1.45 TeV V 1.875 TeV 1.875 TeV 1.65 TeV 1.45 TeV</td> <td><math display="block">\begin{split} \lambda_{111}^{i} &amp; 0.11, \lambda_{122(13)(23)} = 0.07 \\ m(\hat{q}) = m(\hat{q}), c_{T,LF} &lt; 1 \text{ mm} \\ m(\hat{r}_{11}^{i}) = 0.00 \text{ GOV}, \lambda_{121} \neq 0 \text{ (} k = 1, 2) \\ m(\hat{r}_{11}^{i}) = 0.2 \text{ cm}(\hat{r}_{11}^{i}), \lambda_{133} \neq 0 \\ m(\hat{r}_{11}^{i}) = 0.2 \text{ For } N_{112} \neq 0 \\ m(\hat{r}_{11}^{i}) = 1 \text{ TeV}, \lambda_{122} \neq 0 \\ m(\hat{r}_{11}^{i}) = 1 \text{ TeV}, \lambda_{132} \neq 0 \\ \text{BR}(\hat{r}_{1} \rightarrow br/\mu) &gt; 20\% \end{split}</math></td>	1.14 Te 450 GeV 100-470 GeV 480-610 GeV 0.4-	1.9 TeV 1.45 TeV V 1.875 TeV 1.875 TeV 1.65 TeV 1.45 TeV	$\begin{split} \lambda_{111}^{i} & 0.11, \lambda_{122(13)(23)} = 0.07 \\ m(\hat{q}) = m(\hat{q}), c_{T,LF} < 1 \text{ mm} \\ m(\hat{r}_{11}^{i}) = 0.00 \text{ GOV}, \lambda_{121} \neq 0 \text{ (} k = 1, 2) \\ m(\hat{r}_{11}^{i}) = 0.2 \text{ cm}(\hat{r}_{11}^{i}), \lambda_{133} \neq 0 \\ m(\hat{r}_{11}^{i}) = 0.2 \text{ For } N_{112} \neq 0 \\ m(\hat{r}_{11}^{i}) = 1 \text{ TeV}, \lambda_{122} \neq 0 \\ m(\hat{r}_{11}^{i}) = 1 \text{ TeV}, \lambda_{132} \neq 0 \\ \text{BR}(\hat{r}_{1} \rightarrow br/\mu) > 20\% \end{split}$
Other	Scalar charm, $\tilde{c} \rightarrow c \tilde{\ell}_1^0$	0	<b>2</b> <i>c</i>	Yes	20.3	ĉ	510 GeV		m( ${ar \chi}_1^0) {<} 200{ m GeV}$
*Only a phen simpl	a selection of the available mas omena is shown. Many of the li ified models, c.f. refs, for the as	s limits on n mits are bas ssumptions	ew state sed on made.	s or	1(	)-1	1	·	Mass scale [TeV]

#### ATLAS Exotics Searches\* - 95% CL Upper Exclusion LimitsStatus: July 2017 $\int \mathcal{L} dt = (3.2 - 37.0) \text{ fb}^{-1}$



\*Only a selection of the available mass limits on new states or phenomena is shown. †Small-radius (large-radius) jets are denoted by the letter j (J).



ATLA

### New machine in high energy physics



- What can we learn by studying Higgs bosons and top quarks in electron-positron collisions?
- Which precision measurements can hint to new physics at very high scales?
- Do lepton colliders have the potential to make direct observations if the LHC has found nothing so far?
- Higgs physics
  - Higgs couplings
  - Higgs mass
  - Total Higgs decay width
  - CP properties
- Top precision physics
  - Top couplings
  - Top mass
- The search for New Physics beyond the Standard Model
  - Extended gauge theories
  - Theories with extra dimensions
  - SUSY ...



# Complementarity of hadron and lepton colliders



#### DISCOVERY



#### HIGH PRECISION



HADRON COLLIDERS	LEPTON COLLIDERS
Initial state not known event by event	Initial state precisely known
Partons carry a fraction of energy	Full energy available for the collision
High QCD background	Clean experimental conditions
Multilevel trigger schemes	Triggerless readout
High cross section for colored states	Superior sensitivity for electro-weak states
/	Possibility of beam polarization

Event display



#### Large Hadron Collider



#### Linear colliders



# Current options of electron-positron colliders





- Japanese Mountainous Sites -





250 GeV Z pole, WW 1 TeV preCDR published Full CDR mid 2018





380 GeV **1.5 GeV** 3 TeV **CDR 2012 Updated baseline 2016** 





90 GeV 350 GeV **Preparation of** the CDR document 2018



# Energy and luminosity





#### Electron-positron colliders





- Beam circulates a long time
- Smaller number of accelerating cavities
- Many bending magnets
- Radiation losses due to circulation  $\Delta E_{sync} \approx \frac{E^4}{m^4 R}$

#### Linear Collider



- Small number of magnets
- Many accelerating cavities
- Beam passes only once!
- High energy high accelerating gradient
- Small beam sizes beamstrahlung

### Energy losses of the beam

- At linear colliders the beams are separated in bunches of nm size
- Very dense bunches imply high electric field inside a bunch
- The field is influencing the particles in the opposite bunch, causing them to emit the radiation called beamstrahlung
- Converted e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> pairs high doses deposited in the forward detectors
- $\gamma\gamma$  to hadrons influences event reconstruction
- Beamstrahlung radiation leads to important energy loses









ILC



 International Linear Collider (ILC) is one the most advanced concept for a future energy frontier e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> collider



#### CLIC



- Staged machine with three center-of-mass energies: 350/380 GeV, 1.5 TeV, 3.0 TeV
- The operating energy can be adapted to possible LHC discoveries at 13/14 TeV



### Principle of particle acceleration

 Both proposed future colliders, ILC and CLIC, use the use the radio-frequency (RF) acceleration principle



# Accelerating structures

- The RF acceleration is the technology which could provide TeV range e+/e- collisions in the near future
- New types of
- ILC "L-band" (1.3 GHz, or 20 cm) superconducting cavity, standing wave (ILC) average gradient 31.5MV/m

#### CLIC

- "X-band" (11-12 GHz, ~2.6 cm),
- normal conducting cavity, traveling wave
   Gradient 72/100MV/m

380GeV/3TeV accelerator

22/50 km length

20,600 /140000 modules



A 9-cell SCL-band structure



20-cell NC cavity

#### The RF power electron linear accelerators is provided by 10MW multi-beam klystrons (MBK)

- Two alternative methods of transporting the RF microwave power to the accelerating structures are considered
- The first is a Distributed Klystron Scheme (DKS)
  - each klystron drives 39 cavities
  - the klystrons and modulators are distributed along the entire length of the SCRF linear accelerators (linacs), in the same tunnel

The second is a novel Klystron Cluster Scheme (KCS)

 All the klystrons are located in 'clusters' in surface buildings located periodically along the linacs

### Power production for acceleration ILC



Figure 1: Layout of ILC MBK.



# Power production for acceleration CLIC



- New acceleration scheme: Two beam technique
- Drive beam supplies RF power
  - 12 GHz bunch structure
  - High current 100A
  - Low energy 2.4 GeV to 240 MeV
- Main beam for physics
  - Lower current 1.2A
  - High energy 9 GeV to 1.5TeV



- CLIC will be operating at high gradient level (100 MV/m) at the highest energy stage of 3 TeV  $\,$
- Two beam technique demonstrated at CERN, CLIC CTF3 test facility

22. March 2018

#### Detector requirements: jet energy resolution



- Certain physics processes of interest are setting the necessary precision goal of the measurement that has to be achieved in specific subdetectors
- Very high technical challenges!
- Jet energy resolution:

Calorimeters

- measurement: separation of W and Z bosons, multijet final states  $HZ \rightarrow q\bar{q}q\bar{q}q\bar{q}$
- Gauge boson widths set the natural limit for minimum jet energy resolution

•  $m_Z = 91.2 \text{ GeV}$   $\Gamma_Z \sim 2.5 \text{ GeV}$   $m_W = 80.4 \text{ GeV}$   $\Gamma_W = 2.1 \text{ GeV}$ 



# Particle flow algorithm

- Jet composition: 60 % charged hadrons 30 % photons 10 % neutral hadrons
- CLASICAL CALORIMETRY
  - Jet energy measurement exclusively using electromagnetic and hadronic calorimeters
  - HCAL intrinsically has very low resolution  $\sigma_{\rm E}/E \sim \frac{60\%}{\sqrt{E}}$
  - This resolution limits overall jet energy resolution

#### PARTICLE FLOW CALORIMETRY

- Measure only neutral hadrons in HCAL
- Photons in ECAL
- $\sigma_{\rm E}/E \sim \frac{20\%}{\sqrt{E}}$ Charged hadrons in the TRACKER







#### Detector requirements: momentum and impact parameter





# ILC detectors

- Two detector concepts for ILC: SiD & ILD
- Both designs optimized for particle flow calorimetry for the best jet energy reconstruction
- Push-pull operation
- Silicon Detector (SiD): B=5 T
  - vertex Si pixel ECAL Si/W
  - HCAL glassRPC/Fe Muon: Sc
  - tracking detector Si
- Cost-constrained detector with silicon tracking
- Time-stamping on single bunch crossings
- International Large Detector (ILD)
- Large detector optimized for good energy and momentum resolution
  - Tracking gaseous (TPC) for excellent pattern recognition an dE/dx capability
  - vertex Si pixel ECAL Si/W HCAL Sc or gaseous /Fe
  - Muon RPC or SC strips







Oniversity of Lana CE. March EU

### New CLIC detector model

 $\frown$ 



- Iron return yoke instrumented with muon detectors (RPC)
- 4 T superconducting solenoid magnet
- Fine grained calorimetry system
  - -• HCAL Sc/W , 60 layers, 7.5  $\lambda_i$
  - ECAL Si/W , 40 layers, 22 X<sub>0</sub>
- Tracker Si 7μm single point resolution
- Vertex Si pixel

The optimized detector model after full detector simulation

- Cost optimization
- Physics performance of CLIC\_ILD and CLIC\_SiD very similar
- Background conditions are not favorable at 3 TeV for TPC
- $\Rightarrow$  one detector, all silicon tracking

11.4 m

### Physics program at lepton colliders



A full set of the full simulation studies have been performed at the ILC and CLIC

The result has proven that all of these measurements can be performed at the both proposed colliders, with the precision that is much higher then at Large Hadron Collider LHC

- Higgs factory
- 250 GeV 0.5 ab-1 :
- Standard model Higgs physics measurement
- 350 GeV tt threshold scan ~ 200 fb<sup>-1</sup>
- 500 GeV 0.5 ab-1
- Top-Yukawa coupling ttH , Higgs self coupling
- Rare Higgs decays
- Top quark physics
- 1 TeV
- BSM physics
- Higgs self coupling
- Rare Higgs decays
- Top-Yukawa coupling

- Three construction stages optimized for physics runs
- 380 GeV 0.5 ab-1 :
- Standard model Higgs physics measurement
- Top physics
- tt threshold scan ~350 GeV 100 fb<sup>-1</sup>
- 1.5 TeV 1.5 ab-1
- BSM physics
- Top-Yukawa coupling ttH , Higgs self coupling
- Rare Higgs decays
- Top quark physics
- 3 TeV 3.0 ab<sup>-1</sup>
- BSM physics
- Higgs self coupling
- Rare Higgs decays
- Top quark physics



Linear colliders – the Higgs boson microscope

M. Pandurovic

University of Pavia

22. March 2018.



### Higgs couplings



- The measurement of the Higgs boson couplings provide a strong test for the Standard model
- The deviation from the linearity of couplings vs. masses would be the sign of new physics⇒ necessary to achieve high precision of the measurement
- Measurement of the Higgs-self couplings is the only way to access the Higgs potential

$$V = \mu^{2}(\phi^{+}\phi) + \lambda(\phi^{+}\phi)^{2} \Longrightarrow \lambda = \frac{m_{H}^{2}}{V}$$

- Higgs couplings measurements at CLIC
  - Yukawa couplings( c, τ, b, top, μ)
  - Gauge couplings (W,Z)
  - Self coupling
  - Effective couplings for loop induced decays

 $(H \rightarrow \gamma \gamma, H \rightarrow Z \gamma)$ 



## Higgs boson couplings: New physics signatures





Linear colliders – the Higgs boson microscope

M. Pandurovic

### Model independent $\sigma(HZ)$



- The measurement of the total cross-section of the Higgsstrahlung process  $\Rightarrow g_{HZZ}$
- Measure only properties of the Z decay
  - Invariant mass of lepton pair identifies Z
  - Recoil mass identifies H
- Leptonic Z decays -the cleanest signature



$$m_{\rm rec}^2 = s + m_Z^2 - 2E_Z\sqrt{s}$$

- Hadronic  $Z \rightarrow q\bar{q}$  high branching fraction ~ 70%
- almost model-independent measurement
- $\Rightarrow$  Substantial improvement in precision possible
- Challenge: Z reconstruction depends on H-decay mode, H/Z separation  $\Delta(\sigma_{H7})/\sigma_{H7} \approx 1.8\% \rightarrow \Delta(g_{H77})/g_{H77} \approx 0.9\%$







# Invisible Higgs decays



- The invisible Higgs decay process is highly suppressed in the SM
- However, many beyond SM scenarios allow for enhanced H  $\rightarrow$ invisible decay modes
- Using recoil mass technique the invisible Higgs decays Branching fraction is measured to be less than a percent (0.4%) at 250 GeV (at the 95% confidence level) using combined leptonic and hadronic Z decays





# Higgs width



- Lepton colliders: model independent measurement of absolute couplings of the Higgs to Z boson in Higgsstrahlung σ(HZ)~g<sup>2</sup><sub>HZZ</sub> and the total Higgs decay width
- Influences reachable precision on all other absolute Higgs couplings and the determination of total Higgs width
- Determine g<sub>HWW</sub> from ratio of the Higgsstrahlung and WW-fusion using the same Higgs decay mode

 $\left(\frac{g_{HZZ}}{g_{HWW}}\right)^2 \propto \frac{\sigma(e^+e^- \to ZH) \times BR(H \to xx)}{\sigma(e^+e^- \to Hv_e v_e) \times BR(H \to xx)} \implies g^2_{HWW} \quad e^+$ 

• Determine total Higgs width ( $\Gamma_{\rm H}$ ) from

$$\sigma(e^+e^- \to Hvv) \ge BR(H \to WW^*) \propto \frac{g^4_{HWW}}{\Gamma_{H}} \implies \Gamma_{H}$$



Linear colliders – the Higgs boson microscope

#### Other Higgs couplings



Decay mode	Branching ratio
$H \to b \overline{b}$	56.1 %
$\mathrm{H} \rightarrow \mathrm{W}\mathrm{W}^{*}$	23.1 %
$H \rightarrow gg$	8.5 %
$H\to\tau^+\tau^-$	6.2 %
$H \rightarrow c \overline{c}$	2.8 %
$H \rightarrow ZZ^*$	2.9 %
$H \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$	0.23 %
$H \to Z \gamma$	0.16 %
$H {\rightarrow} \mu^+ \mu^-$	0.021 %



Linear colliders – the Higgs boson microscope



#### Higgs self-coupling

- Higgs boson can also couple to itself
- The determination of the Higgs self coupling is the way to access the Higgs potential
- New physics scenarios can enhance of selfcoupling
   λ of the SM value up to tens of percent



### Top-Yukawa coupling



- Is a coupling of top quark to a Higgs boson
- Because of very high mass top quark may play a special role in electroweak symmetry breaking
- High sensitivity to the physics beyond the Standard model



Linear colliders – the Higgs boson microscope

### Combined fits



- From the measurements obtained at each energy stage the Higgs coupling parameters and total width are extracted by a global fit
- Model independent fit
  - Input: the cross sections of the specific Higgs decays (σxBR)
  - Output of the fit: absolute couplings and total Higgs width

$$\chi^{2} = \sum_{i} \frac{\left(C_{i} \ / \ C_{i}^{\rm SM} - 1\right)^{2}}{\Delta F_{i}^{2}}, \quad i = 1,10$$

- Model dependent
  - Input: the ratio between partial width of the studied Higgs decays, to one expected in SM
  - Constraints: total Higgs width is constrained by the Standard model
     Assumption no invisible Higgs decays

$$\kappa_{\rm Hi} = \frac{\Gamma_{\rm Hi}}{\Gamma_{\rm Hi}^{\rm SM}},$$

#### Couplings results



#### Model independent

#### Model dependent

#### Model-independent (MI) global fits





# Top quark physics



- Loop contributions to the processes that can be studied with high precision show sensitivity to BSM signals
- Uncertainty of the top mass, along with the uncertainty on the Higgs boson mass, is one of the key
  inputs to the studies of the SM vacuum stability

Dedicated measurements:

- Top quark mass
  - Top quark threshold scan
  - Direct reconstruction
- Top -Yukawa coupling
- Probe of new physics
  - Top quark electroweak couplings
  - Top quark production asymmetries
  - CP violation in top sector





# Top quark threshold scan

- At linear collider they can be produced in pairs
- The minimum required energy for production is  $(E > 2m_t) \Rightarrow$ 'threshold'
- Near the production threshold the production cross-section is showing the resonant behavior
- measurements
  - *m<sub>t</sub>* top quark mass
  - $\Gamma_t$  top width
  - $\alpha_S$  stron coupling constant
  - *y<sub>t</sub>* top − Yukawa coupling
- Measurement at different center-of-mass energies in the tt production threshold region (data also useful for Higgs physics)
- Ten scan point, 100 fb<sup>-1</sup>
- Expected precision on 1S mass: ≈50 MeV (dominated by theory) NNNLO scale uncertainty)

Z, Y

37



Beneke et al. NNNLO - μ = 80 GeV





M. Pandurovic

Linear colliders - the Higgs boson microscope

22. March 2018.

6 1 2 4

#### Top quark measurements



#### FCNC top decays

Mass of Top2 fcnc

- . FCNC top decays are Direct acces
  - Direct access to top-Yukawa coupling at energies above 500 GeV

Top-Yukawa coupling

- $t \rightarrow bW, H \rightarrow b\overline{b} \Longrightarrow multi jet signature$
- complex reconstruction







Collider	LHC		ILC	ILC	CLIC
CM Energy [TeV]	14	14	0.5	1.0	1.4
Luminosity $[fb^{-1}]$	300	3000	1000	1000	1500
Top Yukawa coupling $\kappa_t$	(14 - 15)%	(7 - 10)%	10%	4%	4%

- In the Standard Model, FCNC top decays are strongly suppressed
- $BR(t \rightarrow c\gamma) = 2 \cdot 10^{-14}$
- $BR(t \rightarrow cZ) = 1 \cdot 10^{-14}$
- $BR(t \rightarrow cH) = 3 \cdot 10^{-15}$
- Image: Sol rop2 tene
   Entries 1 1527

   180
   Mean
   1507

   160
   Image: Sol rop2 tene
   Mean

   140
   Image: Sol rop2 tene
   Image: Sol rop2 tene

   160
   Image: Sol rop2 tene
   Image: Sol rop2 tene

   160
   Image: Sol rop2 tene
   Image: Sol rop2 tene

   160
   Image: Sol rop2 tene
   Image: Sol rop2 tene

   160
   Image: Sol rop2 tene
   Image: Sol rop2 tene
   Image: Sol rop2 tene

   100
   Image: Sol rop2 tene
   Image: Sol rop2 tene
   Image: Sol rop2 tene
   Image: Sol rop2 tene

   0
   Sol rop2 tene
   Image: Sol rop2 tene
   Image: Sol rop2 tene
   Image: Sol rop2 tene

   0
   Sol rop2 tene
   Image: Sol rop2 tene
   Image: Sol rop2 tene
   Image: Sol rop2 tene
- Significant enhancement possible in many new physics scenarios
   Ongoing CLIC

Model	2HDM	MSSM	<b>₽</b> SUSY	LH	Q singlet	RS
$BR(t \to c \gamma)$	10 <sup>-6</sup>	$10^{-6}$	10 <sup>-5</sup>	$10^{-7}$	$8 \cdot 10^{-9}$	$10^{-9}$
$BR(t \rightarrow c h)$	10 <sup>-2</sup>	$10^{-4}$	$10^{-6}$	10 <sup>-5</sup>	$4 \cdot 10^{-5}$	10 <sup>-4</sup>

Linear colliders - the Higgs boson microscope

### Beyond Standard Model searches

- Linear colliders have a significant discovery potential for the physics Beyond Standard Model
- Direct searches
  - Direct reconstruction of new particles
  - Possible observation of the new phenomena
  - Kinematic limit at the of 0.5/1.5 TeV for ILC/CLIC
- Indirect searches
  - Precision measurements of sensitive observables reveal a signs of new physics, comparing to the SM expectations
  - Kinematic limit is higher several tens of TeV





### BSM physics: direct measurement





	$\sqrt{s}$ (TeV)	Process	Decay mode	SUSY model	Measured quantity	Stat. uncertainty
uction of and neutralino		Sleptons	$\widetilde{\mu}_{R}^{+} \widetilde{\mu}_{R}^{-} \rightarrow \mu^{+} \mu^{-} \widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}$		$\tilde{\ell}$ mass $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ mass	0.6% 1.9%
	3.0		$\widetilde{e}_R^+ \widetilde{e}_R^- \to e^+ e^- \widetilde{\chi}_1^0 \widetilde{\chi}_1^0$	II	$\tilde{\ell}$ mass $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ mass	0.3% 1.0%
on of W/Z/h			$\widetilde{\nu}_{e}\widetilde{\nu}_{e}\!\rightarrow\!\widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}\!\widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}\!e^{+}e^{-}W^{+}W^{-}$		$\tilde{\ell} \max_{1}^{\ell} \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm} \max_{1}^{\ell} \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\ell} \max_{1}^{\ell} \tilde{\chi}_$	0.4% 0.6%
	3.0	Chargino Neutralino	$\begin{array}{l} \widetilde{\chi}_1^+ \widetilde{\chi}_1^- \rightarrow \widetilde{\chi}_1^0 \widetilde{\chi}_1^0 W^+ W^- \\ \widetilde{\chi}_2^0 \widetilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow h/Z^0  h/Z^0  \widetilde{\chi}_1^0 \widetilde{\chi}_1^0 \end{array}$	II	$\begin{array}{l} \widetilde{\chi}_1^\pm \mbox{ mass } \\ \widetilde{\chi}_2^0 \mbox{ mass } \end{array}$	1.1% 1.5%
s boson fuction of four ggs bosons which ost degenerate in $A \to b\overline{b}b\overline{b}$ $H^-H^+ \to t\overline{b}b\overline{t}$ final state	3.0	Squarks	$\widetilde{q}_{R}\widetilde{q}_{R} \rightarrow q\overline{q}\widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}\widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}$	Ι	$\tilde{q}_R$ mass	0.52%
	3.0	Heavy Higgs	$\begin{array}{l} H^0 A^0 \rightarrow b \overline{b} b \overline{b} \\ H^+ H^- \rightarrow t \overline{b} b \overline{t} \end{array}$	Ι	${H^0/A^0}\ mass$ ${H^\pm}\ mass$	0.3% 0.3%
	1.4	Sleptons	$\begin{split} &\widetilde{\mu}_{R}^{+}\widetilde{\mu}_{R}^{-} \rightarrow \mu^{+}\mu^{-}\widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}\widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ &\widetilde{e}_{R}^{+}\widetilde{e}_{R}^{-} \rightarrow e^{+}e^{-}\widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}\widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \\ &\widetilde{\nu}_{e}\widetilde{\nu}_{e} \rightarrow \widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}\widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}e^{+}e^{-}W^{+}W^{-} \end{split}$	Ш	$\widetilde{\ell} \text{ mass}  \widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \text{ mass}  \widetilde{\ell} \text{ mass}  \widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{0} \text{ mass}  \widetilde{\ell} \text{ mass}  \widetilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm} \text{ mass} $	0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 0.1% 2.5% 2.7%
	1.4	Stau	$\widetilde{\tau}_1^+ \widetilde{\tau}_1^- \to \tau^+ \tau^- \widetilde{\chi}_1^0 \widetilde{\chi}_1^0$	III	$\tilde{\tau}_1$ mass	2.0%
	1.4	Chargino Neutralino	$ \begin{aligned} \widetilde{\chi}_1^+ \widetilde{\chi}_1^- &\to \widetilde{\chi}_1^0 \widetilde{\chi}_1^0 W^+ W^- \\ \widetilde{\chi}_2^0 \widetilde{\chi}_2^0 &\to h/Z^0 h/Z^0 \widetilde{\chi}_1^0 \widetilde{\chi}_1^0 \end{aligned} $	III	$\widetilde{\chi}_1^{\pm}$ mass $\widetilde{\chi}_2^0$ mass	0.2% 0.1%

 $e^+ \rho^-$ 

# BSM physics: indirect measurements



#### **Composite Higgs**

- These theories assume Higgs boson is not the fundamental but a composite particle which built out of fermions
  - Higgs is viewed as a bound state of fermions
  - Main consequence of this model is the existence of new particles that are excitations of the Higgs boson  $m_{\rho}$
  - $4\pi f$  is the scale of compositeness
  - $\xi = \left(\frac{\nu}{f}\right)^2$  is the strength of Higgs interactions
- This theory solves the 'naturalness' problem: mass of SM Higgs boson at high energies becomes divergent
- At linear colliders we have better reach for the masses of new particles and at higher energies then the LHC



# Summary



- The Higgs boson that has been discovered in 2012 has completed the SM particle spectrum and showed the way how the mechanism of electroweak symmetry breaking was realized
- Still many open questions:
  - why the electroweak symmetry was broken
  - question of asymmetry of matter and antimatter
  - The existence of dark matter and dark energy ...
- In order to answer these question the high precision of the measurement of the sensitive observables is needed
- The necessary high precision is leading towards a next generation of electron positron colliders
- Performed physics studies show excellent potential of both linear colliders ILC and CLIC for high precision measurements, as well as large discovery potential for physics beyond the Standard model

Thank you for your attention



#### CLIC timeline



#### CLIC aims to provide **multi-TeV electron-positron** collisions with high luminosity at affordable cost and power consumption



(e.g. CLIC, FCC)

#### Power consumption





Linear colliders – the Higgs boson microscope

#### Linear colliders – the Higgs boson microscope

M. Pandurovic

#### University of Pavia

22. March 2018.

48

## Foundation of the Standard model

- The idea behind the formulation of the Standard model is the unification of forces and symmetry of the 'equations of motion'
- First unification of forces under symmetry group U(1): electric and magnetic force
- Second unification: Glashow, Weinberg and Salam in 1960's the unification of the weak and electromagnetic force into electroweak under gauge group  $SU(2) \times U(1)_{Y}$
- Experimental confirmation of the electroweak theory: discovery of the W and Z bosons at UA1 and UA2 experiments at LEP, CERN – Nobel Prize 1973!
- Third unification SU(3)<sub>C</sub>xSU(2)<sub>L</sub>xU(1)<sub>Y</sub>: Standard model

mathematical unification weak, electromagnetic force and strong (color)

physical unification is not yet proven

Problem:









# Where did Higgs came from?



- introduce a new field with a potential that keeps the full Lagrangian invariant under symmetry, with the ground state which breaks the symmetry
- $\Rightarrow$  Spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB)
- In the presence of SSB, the gauge bosons associated acquire mass proportional to the gauge couplings and the vacuum expectation value
- Standard model assumes the Higgs field ⇒ masses in SM
- The Higgs field

$$V = \mu^{2}(\phi^{+}\phi) + \lambda(\phi^{+}\phi)^{2} \Longrightarrow \lambda = \frac{m_{H}^{2}}{\nu}$$

•  $\Rightarrow$  from symmetry an existence of the Higgs boson is predicted !!!

