Un-natural vs Natural Theories of the TeV Scale

> John March-Russell Oxford & Stanford University

> > thanks to Asimina Arvanitaki, Savas Dimopoulos, Sergei Dubovsky, Kiel Howe, Isabel Garcia Garcia

# Hierarchy Problem

• Discovery of Higgs with properties consistent with elementary scalar dof makes hierarchy problem even more pressing

 $\langle h \rangle = 247 \,\mathrm{GeV} \ll M_{\mathrm{Planck}}$ 

Often stated that in absence of SUSY or compositeness



• Misleading: SM renormalizable theory and divergencies do not appear in renormalized pert'n theory. Have to interpret meaning of cutoff correctly

# Hierarchy Problem

- Quadratic cutoff correction is proxy for possible dependence of higgs mass parameter on physical but unknown UV mass thresholds. Not reliably calculable in IR theory. (eg, dim reg only gives IR-saturated log terms)
- From UV perspective can discuss hierarchy problem directly in terms of Wilsonian RG flow of finite quantities

eg, for non-SUSY GUT theory just below GUT scale...





- Mystery: SM trajectory very closely approaches vanishing IR Higgs mass parameter when trajectory in UV isn't special (no enhanced symmetry) and large corrections present
- *cf.* tuning of a phase transition to 2nd-order point there is nothing *a-priori* special about 374.4C and 217.7atm for water
- Hierarchy problem is sharpest for theories where Higgs properties (EWSB and mass) are calculable

# Hierarchy Problem & "Physical Naturalness"?

Bardeen, Foot, Shaposhnikov, Lykken, Strumia, Dubovsky

- Keep scale of gravity at Planck mass
- In principle gravity might be UV completed with no new particles so not affecting the Higgs mass (this not true of string constructions as far as we know)
- Additionally suppose there are **no other** too heavy particles materially coupling to Higgs

Is this a successful "no-tuning" solution to hierarchy problem (with no low-energy consequences)?

# Consequences of Physical Naturalness

• All BSM states carrying SM gauge quantum numbers must be below a few TeV (so no high scale GUT)

• Yukawa coupled particles can be heavier,  $M_{\nu R} < 10^7 \text{ GeV}$ 

Gravitationally coupled particles less than 10<sup>12</sup> GeV? (requires a 3 loop calculation not yet performed)
Arvanitaki

# Challenges for Physical Naturalness

• Must do all physics with previous constraints:

Charge quantization

Family quantum numbers

Dark matter

Neutrino masses

Baryogenesis

Inflation (high scale if BICEP2 interpretation correct)

Flavour

 $sin^2\theta_w$ ...

• AND avoid ALL Landau Poles in a controllable way

# Model Building Physical Naturalness

Arvanitaki, Dimopoulos, Dubovsky, Strumia, Villadoro

- Must expand gauge group at TeV scale (SU(4)xSU(2)xSU(2), SU(3)<sup>3</sup> ...) to avoid U(1) Landau pole
- And add states to avoid Higgs quartic Landau pole...
- And do all rest of physics satisfying physical naturalness bounds...
- And still have mysteries of a) how gravity manages to be UV completed, and b) what sets weak-to-Planck scale ratio (remember this is supposed to be distinct from an anthropic solution)...

Looks very tough: attempts so far failed even at first stages, but worth more study

#### Hierarchy problem remains real and serious!

Given the importance of this for future theory and experiment useful to look at other cases of small numbers in physics...

## Naturalness - Dynamics

Problem Hydrogen Binding Energy

Solution

$$E_b = \frac{1}{2} \frac{e^4}{(4\pi)^2} m_e$$

Deuteron Binding Energy Nuclear Binding Energy

 $\pi^+$  -  $\pi^o$  mass difference

Symmetry/Dynamics

Flavour Symmetry

 $E_b \approx \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{m_N}{2}$ 

 $K - \overline{K}$  mixing

QCD scale

Dimensional Transmutation

Electron Mass

Chiral Symmetry

# Something else...

#### Problem

Earth-Sun Distance

Cosmological Constant

7 eV line of <sup>229</sup>Th nucleus

Solar Eclipse & moon's size

#### Solution

Anthropic Selection 10<sup>22</sup> suns Anthropic Selection 10<sup>500</sup> universes??? "Look-elsewhere" effect Plain luck!

Anthropic's major flaw: we know nothing about distribution of stable vacua, which parameters scan and how, and what properties we should select for. Once accept <1% tuning why not 0.001% or 0.000000001%?? No principle at all in my opinion

No one is going to believe an anthropic EW 'solution' until every possibility of symmetry & dynamics is exhausted

# The Missing Superpartner Problem



## The Gluino Sucks Problem

Log RG evolution quickly pulls up stop mass, and thus EW scale, to gluino mass



Gluino bounds constrain all MSSM-like scenarios...

# Status of Naturalness in MSSM-like SUSY

- In the MSSM: Tuning dominated by achieving the Higgs Mass
- In any model that fixes the Higgs mass: Tuning dominated by LHC bounds



LHC pushes the bounds on Naturalness for MSSM-like models

# Last Vestiges of Naturalness? (*traditional* MSSM-like SUSY)

- Natural SUSY (1st/2nd gen sfermions heavy)
- R-Parity breaking: B violation (hide via hadrons)
- Hide and Seek models ("just-so" spectra and decays)

Natural SUSY and RPV: Gluino bounds already imply ~1% tuning

Hide & Seek: Many `coincidences' needed so still highly tuned

#### A natural theory requires abandoning MSSM structure

Savas Dimopoulos, Kiel Howe, JMR arXiv:1404.7554 & papers in preparation + SD, Isabel Garcia Garcia, KH, JMR

Consider 4D theories arising from 5D SUSY with maximal Scherk-Schwarz SUSY breaking (SSSB) at a KK scale 1/R of several TeV



Never well approximated by a 4D softly-broken N=1 SUSY limit

Higgsinos, gauginos, and 1st/2nd family sfermions get (mainly Dirac) SSSB masses of size 1/2R by SUSY-breaking bc

ONLY  $\langle H_u \rangle \neq 0$ . Down-like quark and lepton masses from Kahler couplings to R. Davies, JMR, M. McCullough, arXiv1103.1647  $H_u$ 

NO  $\tan \beta$ ,  $B_{\mu}$ ,  $\mu$ 

(Physical Higgs is automatically SM-like up to loop-level effects)

Apart from 3rd generation sfermions SM-charged SUSY spectrum is remarkably heavy, with only ~ 50% tuning at a gluino mass of ~2 TeV, stop mass ~650 GeV, and KK ~4 TeV



For minimal tuning must introduce Z' with nondecoupling D-term to get 126 GeV Higgs



Why so much less tuned than usual?

- No tree-level tuning as no  $\mu$
- SUSY breaking directly communicated to Higgsinos, gauginos, and 1st/ 2nd family sfermions. 3rd family protected from tree SUSY breaking
- SSSB is super-soft as it is a non-local (in 5d) breaking of SUSY. No logs, so suppresses the gluino sucks problem
- A natural SUSY spectrum is trivial to obtain via localization of the 3rd family on a 4D brane (also vital for successful EWSB)
- There is an approximate  $U(1)_R$  symmetry



For *minimal* tuning more structure - a U(1)' - needed to get 126 GeV Higgs mass

$$G_{SM} \times U(1)', \ F_{1,2}, \ H_{u,d}, \ \Phi_{1,2}$$
  
$$F_3, \ X$$
  
$$\Delta W = \lambda X(\phi_1 \phi_2 - \tilde{v}^3)$$



How EWSB works: (magnitude of EW scale<sup>2</sup> 1-EW-loop effect from EW-ino masses)



# Amusing Possibility for 126 GeV Higgs



For stop mass ~3TeV & 10TeV gluino (~ 3% tuning) successful Higgs mass without need of U(1)' sector as model automatically realises  $\tan \beta \rightarrow \infty$  limit without flavour problems

# Discovery Reach of 100 TeV



Cohen et. al. (2013)

LHC 14: Probing MSSM-like theories much worse than 1% tuned, and Max Natural SUSY in dominant region of parameter space

100 TeV Collider: Probes MSSM-like theories at 0.01% level, and can discover simplest Max Natural SUSY in regime giving 126GeV higgs at ~3% tune