Precision in the "near" future of BSM

FCCP2022, Capri, September 22-24, 2022

R. Barbieri (SNS, Pisa)

1. Introduction

My own "prejudices"

2. SM Effective Field Theory

Useful? How to use it?

3. How do precision measurements relate to BSM searches?

Current anomalies as examples

In inverse order of arrival:

M_W $(g-2)_\mu$ $B-anomalies$

4. Any "definite goal"?

Observational

Problems of (questions for) the SM

Structural

0. Which rationale for matter quantum numbers?

$$|Q_p + Q_e - Q_n| < 10^{-21} e$$

1. Phenomena unaccounted for

neutrino masses

matter-antimatter asymmetry

Dark matter

inflation?

2. Why $\theta \lesssim 10^{-10}$?

$$\theta G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}$$

Axions?

3. $\mathcal{O}_i : d(\mathcal{O}_i) \leq 4$ only?

neutrino masses

gravity?

Are the protons forever?

4. Lack of calculability

the hierarchy problem

the flavour problem

Where could some light come from?

1.A theory breakthrough → 1a BSM; 1b Foundations (FT, QM)

1a Not that one hasn't tried, sometimes with great ideas (GUT, susy, axion,...)

2.Astrophysics, Cosmology → 2a DM; 2b B-asymmetry; 2c Gravity

Fundamental questions. Related to the structure of the SM of PP?

3.An experimental deviation from the SM → 3a New particles; 3b Precision

Focus on 3b, assuming (which requires) new physics in the MultiTeV,

A difference in the two sectors of the SM?

$$\mathcal{L}_{SM} = -\frac{1}{4}F^a_{\mu\nu}F^{a\mu\nu} + i\bar{\Psi}\not{D}\Psi$$

The "gauge sector"

$$+|D_\mu\phi|^2 + M^2|\phi|^2 - \lambda|\phi|^4 + \Lambda + \lambda_{ij}\phi\bar{\Psi}_i\Psi_j$$

The "Higgs sector"

(where the Fermi scale originates)

the hierarchy problem — the CC problem — the flavour problem

In EFT they look much the same

No particle mass calculable (15=17-2)

To me: the relatively best motivation for BSM in the MultiTeV

Standard Model EFT

3. $\mathcal{O}_i : d(\mathcal{O}_i) \leq 4$ only?

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{SM} + \Sigma_i \frac{E_i}{v^2} \mathcal{O}_i^{(d>4)}$$

To be used with a grain of salt (about 2500 op.s at d=6 only)

A technical tool

Different subset of op.s for different subset of pseudo-ob.s
and different models!!

Three examples for the "best LEP" coefficients

1. On shell measurements S, T

$\mathcal{O}_{WB} = gg' H^+ \sigma^a H W^a_{\mu\nu} B^{\mu\nu}$ $\quad \mathcal{O}_T = \frac{1}{2}(H^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu H)^2$

$H \to \gamma\gamma$



Falkowski, Straub 2019

Projection with 2 observables only



(On the same scale as the plot on the left)

Three examples for the "best LEP" coefficients

2. Off shell measurements W, Y

$$\mathcal{O}_{2B} = -\frac{1}{2}(\partial^\mu B_{\mu\nu})^2 \qquad \mathcal{O}_{2W} = -\frac{1}{2}(D^\mu W^a_{\mu\nu})^2$$

$$pp \to l\nu, ll$$





HL-LHC $W \to 4 \cdot 10^{-5}$ $Y \to 8 \cdot 10^{-5}$

Panico et al, 2021

Three examples for the "best LEP" coefficients

2. Off shell measurements

$$\mathcal{O}_B = \frac{ig'}{2}(H^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu H)\partial^\nu B_{\mu\nu} \qquad \mathcal{O}_W = \frac{ig}{2}(H^\dagger \sigma^a \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu H) D^\nu W^a_{\mu\nu}$$

$$pp \to VV(h)$$



Franceschini et al, 2018

Example 1

M_W



Bagnaschi et al, 2022

$$\frac{\delta M_W}{M_W} = 0.7\hat{T} - 0.4\hat{S}$$

(2 more op.s in universal theories)

$$\left(\frac{\delta \sin^2_{eff}\theta}{\sin^2_{eff}\theta} = -1.4\hat{T}\right)$$

$$\frac{\delta \sin^2_{eff}\theta}{\sin^2_{eff}\theta}\Big|_{exp} = 10^{-3}$$

$$\frac{\delta M_W}{M_W}\Big|_{exp} = \frac{20\ MeV}{80\ GeV} = 2.5 \cdot 10^{-4}$$

VectorLike Heavy top partners T

Ubiquitous in Composite Higgs



$y_t H \bar{q}_L t_R \qquad \hat{T}(top) = \frac{3m_t^2}{32\pi^2 v^2} = 9.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$



$Y_T H \bar{q}_L T_R \longrightarrow \hat{T}(T) \approx \frac{3Y_T^2}{16\pi^2} \frac{m_t^2}{M_T^2} \lg \frac{M_T^2}{m_t^2}$

$Y_t H \bar{Q}_L t_R, \quad Q = \begin{pmatrix} T \\ B \end{pmatrix} \longrightarrow \hat{T}(T) \approx \frac{3Y_t^2}{8\pi^2} \frac{m_t^2}{M_T^2} \lg \frac{M_T^2}{m_t^2}$

($\hat{S}, \delta g_b$ smaller)

	If CDF II	If $\delta M_W \lesssim 10\ MeV$
Singlet	$\frac{M_T}{Y_T} \approx (1.8 \div 2.2)\ TeV$	$\frac{M_T}{Y_T} \gtrsim (2.8 \div 3.5)\ TeV$
Doublet	$\frac{M_T}{Y_t} \approx (2.5 \div 3)\ TeV$	$\frac{M_T}{Y_t} \gtrsim (4 \div 5)\ TeV$



B,Bellazzini et al, 2007

LHC searches of heavy T

$$T \to Ht, Wb$$

Pair production



Single production



Example 2

$$(g-2)_\mu$$

$$\Delta a_\mu|_{HVP} = 6845(40)\cdot 10^{-11}$$

$$\Delta a_\mu|_{Weak} = 153(1)\cdot 10^{-11}$$

$$\Delta a_\mu|_{HLbL} = 92(18)\cdot 10^{-11}$$



$$a_\mu|_{exp} - a_\mu|_{th} = 250(60)\cdot 10^{-11}$$

SUSY as an "EASY" and MOTIVATED interpretation

1. Relevant (low energy) parameters:

$$M_1 \tilde{b}\tilde{b}, \quad m_{\tilde{\mu}_L} \tilde{\mu}_L^+ \tilde{\mu}_L, \quad m_{\tilde{\mu}_R} \tilde{\mu}_R^+ \tilde{\mu}_R, \quad \mu H_1 H_2, \quad \tan\beta = \frac{< H_2 >}{< H_1 >}$$

2. Size of the effect:



$$m^2_{LR} = m_\mu \mu \tan\beta$$

$$\Delta a_\mu|_{SUSY} \approx \frac{g_1^2}{16\pi^2} m_\mu^2 \frac{M_1 \mu \tan\beta}{m^2_{\tilde{\mu}_L} m^2_{\tilde{\mu}_R}} \approx 2.5 \cdot 10^{-9} (\frac{\tan\beta}{10})(\frac{\mu}{1\ TeV})(\frac{M_1}{100\ GeV})(\frac{200\ GeV}{m_{\tilde{\mu}_L}})^2 (\frac{200\ GeV}{m_{\tilde{\mu}_R}})^2$$

3. Main constraints on parameter space

The straightest(?) way to go

- No coloured partners below $1 \div 2\ TeV$

$$M_3 \tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \quad M_3 \gtrsim a\ few\ TeV$$

- No LFV observed so far $\mu \to e\gamma,\ \mu N \to eN,\ \mu \to 3e,\ \tau \to \mu\gamma, etc$

$$m_{\tilde{e}_L} = m_{\tilde{\mu}_L} = m_{\tilde{\tau}_L}$$ (and similarly for $m_{\tilde{l}_R}$)

Due to $m^2_{LR}(\tau) = m_\tau \mu \tan\beta \approx (150\ GeV)^2 \frac{\tan\beta}{10} \frac{\mu}{TeV}$ $\Rightarrow \tilde{\tau} =$ lightest s-lepton (or tachyonic)

(LFU violation)

- Cancellations needed

$$m^2_Z = -2(m^2_{H_2} + |\mu|^2)$$ + loop

- CPV highly constrained

$$d_e \approx 10^{-24} \phi_e\ e \cdot cm \qquad \Rightarrow \phi_e < 10^{-5}$$

4. Direct signals



$$M_1 < m_{\tilde{l}_L}, m_{\tilde{l}_R} < M_2 < \mu < M_3$$

Cox et al, 2021



- LHC $\sigma(pp \to \tilde{l}\tilde{l}) \approx 1 \div 10 \ fb$

  backgrounds: $VV, \ V + jets, \ V^* \to l\bar{l}, \ t\bar{t}, \ t + V$

- DM

  $\tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\tau}$ co-annihilation $\Delta m \equiv m_{\tilde{\tau}} - m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0} \lesssim 15 \ GeV$





5. Indirect but very important signal

(If reachable)

- $a_e \approx 10^{-13}$ $\quad (a_\tau \approx 10^{-(6\div5)})$

Example 3: **B-anomalies in semi-leptonic decays**

- Anomalies only seen in semi-leptonic op.s $(\bar{q}q\ \bar{l}l)$
  not in $\tau \to \mu\nu\nu$ $(\bar{l}l\ \bar{l}l)$ nor in $\Delta F = 2$ $(\bar{q}q\ \bar{q}q)$
- Need left-handed ops. $(\bar{q}_L\gamma_\mu q_L\ \bar{l}_L\gamma_\mu l_L)$ to interfere with the SM
- A larger effect in CC [SM tree-level] $b(3)c(2) \to \tau(3)\nu_\tau(3)$
- A smaller effect in NC [SM loop-level] $b(3)c(2) \to \mu(2)\mu(2)$

A pattern similar to Yukawa couplings !?!?

A vector lepto-quark $U(1)_1^{2/3}$





with hierarchical couplings to different generations

What if B-anomalies confirmed and interpreted by U_μ ?

→ 3 "necessities" and 1 question



1. $U_\mu^{2/3} \subset \mathcal{G}_\mu^A$ (S(4) Pati-Salam) [gauged or ρ-like]

2. No direct coupling of $f_{1,2}$ to $\mathcal{G}_\mu^A$ but only via mixing to vector-like F_j

3. Approximate flavour-symmetry protection of low scale M_U



1. Can the $\mathcal{G}_\mu^A$ be related to Higgs compositeness? $[\rho, F_j]$

Most relevant low energy observables

(influenced by $\mathcal{G}_\mu^A$-exchanges at three level or in loops dominated by IR logs)

Class	Observable	Experiment/constraint	Correlation	SM prediction
I	$C^\mu_{9,\mathrm{NP}} = -C^\mu_{10,\mathrm{NP}}$	-0.39 ± 0.07 [29]	–	0
	R_D	0.340 ± 0.030 [30]	$\rho = -0.38$	0.298 ± 0.003 [30]
	R_{D^*}	0.295 ± 0.014 [30]		0.252 ± 0.005 [30]
II	$(g_\tau/g_{e,\mu})$	1.0012 ± 0.0012 [30]	–	1
III	$\tau \to 3\mu$	$< 2.1 \times 10^{-8}$ [34]	–	0
	$K_L \to \mu^\pm e^\mp$	$< 4.7 \times 10^{-12}$ [34]	–	0
IV	$\delta(\Delta m_{B_s})$	0.0 ± 0.1 [*]	–	0
	$\mathrm{Im}(\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{NP}}_{uc})$ [GeV^{-2}]	$(-0.03 \pm 0.46) \times 10^{-14}$ [32, 33]	–	0
	$\mathrm{Im}(\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{NP}}_{ds})$ [GeV^{-2}]	$(0.06 \pm 0.09) \times 10^{-14}$ [32, 33]	–	0

Overall fit in 4 simplified SU(4) models

with different flavour breaking coherently implemented in $\mathcal{L}_Y(H, f_i; F_j) + \mathcal{L}_{mix}(f_i, F_j)$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm int} = g_U \mathcal{G}^A_\mu J^{\mu\, A} \;=\; g_U \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(U^a_\mu J^{\mu\, a}_U + {\rm h.c.} \right) + G^{\hat a}_\mu J^{\mu\, \hat a}_G + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} X_\mu J^\mu_X \right]$$



$$J^{\mu\, a}_U = \bar{Q}^a_j \gamma_\mu L_j$$

$$J^{\mu\, \hat a}_G = \bar{Q}_j T^{\hat a} \gamma_\mu Q_j$$

$$J^\mu_X = \bar{Q}_j \gamma_\mu Q_j - 3 \bar{L}_j \gamma_\mu L_j$$

$R_{D^{(*)}}, b \to sll$ $\quad U_\mu$- exchange

τLFU $\quad \approx U_\mu$- exchange at one loop

$\tau \to 3\mu$ $\quad X_\mu$- exchange

$\Delta m_{B_s}, Im[C_D], Im[C_K]$ $\quad \approx G^{\hat a}_\mu$- exchange

B, Isidori, Cornella, 2022

Range of $m_{eff} = \frac{M_U}{g_U}$ to account for the anomalies



$$m_{eff} \equiv \frac{m_U(TeV)}{g_U} \approx 0.8 \div 1.5$$

t-channel vector lepto-quark exchange



$$A \propto \left(\frac{g_U}{\sqrt{2}}\right)^2 \frac{1}{M_U^2}$$

($pp \to \tau\mu, \mu\mu$ weaker)







$$m_{eff} \equiv \frac{m_U(TeV)}{g_U} \approx 0.8 \div 1.5$$

A definite goal

What is the radius of Higgs compositeness, if any? $l_H = 1/m_*$

A two-parameter "theory"

$m_* = g_* f$

f

m_H

H = pNGB

f = scale of symmetry breaking

m_* = scale of Higgs compositeness

- Higgs couplings — $c_H \sim g_*^2/m_*^2$

- flavour-less ElectroWeak observables

Pole observables: $m_W, sin\theta^l_{eff}$ — $c_W \sim 1/m_*^2$

DiBoson production: Wh, Zh, WZ, WW — $c_W \sim 1/m_*^2$

Drell-Yan $l^+l^-, l\nu$ at high m_{ll}, m_{ll}^T — $c_{2W} \sim 1/g_*^2 m_*^2$

- flavour observables — $g_*^2/m_*^2, g_*/m_*^2, 1/m_*^2$

Universal observables in composite Higgs

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm EFT} = \frac{m_*^4}{g_*^2}\hat{\mathcal{L}}\left[\frac{\partial}{m_*}, \frac{g_* H}{m_*}, \frac{g_*\sigma}{m_*}, \frac{g_*\Psi}{m_*^{3/2}}, \frac{gA}{m_*}, \frac{\lambda\psi}{m_*^{3/2}}\right]$$

Glioti et al, 2022





$\sqrt{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ -factors possible in either direction

A projected gain of about 2 TeV in m_* for any value of g_*

Flavour in composite Higgs

Different flavour symmetries $\mathcal{F}_c$
of the strong sector

$$U(3)_q \times U(3)_u \times U(3)_d \times \mathcal{F}_c$$



(but no LFU violations)

Current constraints

Glioti et al, 2022

Flavour in composite Higgs

(but no LFU violations)

If $g_U \to g_*$ and $m_U \to m_*$

$m_{eff} = \frac{M_U}{g_U}$



Glioti et al, 2022

A projection of the future sensitivity on some key observables from LHCb only

Observable	Current LHCb	LHCb 2025 ($23\ fb^{-1}$)	Upgrade II ($300\ fb^{-1}$)
EW Penguins			
R_K $(1 < q^2 < 6\,\mathrm{GeV}^2 c^4)$	0.1 [4]	0.025	0.007
R_{K^*} $(1 < q^2 < 6\,\mathrm{GeV}^2 c^4)$	0.1 [5]	0.031	0.008
$\boldsymbol{b \to c\ell^- \bar{\nu}_l}$ **LUV studies**			
$R(D^*)$	0.026 [15, 16]	0.0072	0.002
$R(J/\psi)$	0.24 [17]	0.071	0.02

Statistical uncertainty

Flavour in composite Higgs

Different flavour symmetries $\mathcal{F}_c$
of the strong sector

$$U(3)_q \times U(3)_u \times U(3)_d \times \mathcal{F}_c$$



(but no LFU violations)

Current constraints

$b \to s\, ll$
Improvable by a factor of 10 in rate

Glioti et al, 2022

Summary

1. To turn the SM into a ST still premature,
   in spite of its empirical success
   (in my view mostly because of its unpredicted 15 masses)

2. Precision offers an indirect discovery potential of NP
   at MultiTeV, if any, before the next HE collider

3. Worth to establish a BSM Precision Programme in depth
   and extension (Exp/QCD/EW/PDF/SMEFT/BSM)

4. The scale of Higgs compositeness explorable
   well beyond the reach of direct searches at LHC
   (with a key "unavoidable" role of flavour)

Backup

D=6 operators (16)

$$\mathcal{O}_W = \frac{ig}{2}(H^\dagger \sigma^a \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu H) D^\nu W^a_{\mu\nu}$$
$$\mathcal{O}_B = \frac{ig'}{2}(H^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu H) \partial^\nu B_{\mu\nu}$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{WW} = g^2 |H|^2 W^a_{\mu\nu} W^{a\mu\nu}$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{WB} = g g' H^\dagger \sigma^a H W^a_{\mu\nu} B^{\mu\nu}$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{BB} = g'^2 |H|^2 B_{\mu\nu} B^{\mu\nu}$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{GG} = g_s^2 |H|^2 G^A_{\mu\nu} G^{A\mu\nu}$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{2W} = -\frac{1}{2}(D^\mu W^a_{\mu\nu})^2$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{2B} = -\frac{1}{2}(\partial^\mu B_{\mu\nu})^2$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{2G} = -\frac{1}{2}(D^\mu G^A_{\mu\nu})^2$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{3W} = \frac{g}{6}\epsilon^{abc} W^{a\nu}_\mu W^{b\rho}_\nu W^{c\mu}_\rho$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{3G} = \frac{g_s}{6} f^{ABC} G^{A\nu}_\mu G^{B\rho}_\nu G^{C\mu}_\rho$$
$$\mathcal{O}_T = \frac{1}{2}(H^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu H)^2$$
$$\mathcal{O}_H = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu |H|^2)^2$$
$$\mathcal{O}_6 = \lambda |H|^6$$
$$\mathcal{O}_y \approx |H|^2 (H \bar{q}_L Y_u u_R + h.c.)$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{2y} \approx (\bar{q}_L Y_u u_R)(\bar{u}_R Y_u^+ q_L)$$

'Basis dependent"
Only the number fixed

pseudo-observables (16)

LEP

Wells, Zhang 2015

	EGGM
S	$g^2(E_{WB} + \frac{1}{4}E_W + \frac{1}{4}E_B)$
$\hat{T}$	E_T
W	$\frac{g^2}{4}E_{2W}$
Y	$\frac{g^2}{4}E_{2B}$
Z	$\frac{g^2}{4}E_{2G}$
$\Delta\bar{g}_1^Z$	$-\frac{g^2}{4c_\theta^2}E_W$
$\Delta\bar{\kappa}_\gamma$	$g^2 E_{WB}$
$\bar{\lambda}_\gamma$	$-\frac{g^2}{4}E_{3W}$
$\bar{\lambda}_g$	$-\frac{g^2}{4}E_{3G}$
$\Delta\kappa_3$	$-E_6 - \frac{3}{2}E_H$
$\Delta\bar{\kappa}_F$	$-E_y - \frac{1}{2}E_H$
$\Delta\bar{\kappa}_V$	$-\frac{1}{2}E_H$
f_{gg}	$4E_{GG}$
$f_{z\gamma}$	$2[2c_\theta^2 E_{WW} - 2s_\theta^2 E_{BB} - (c_\theta^2 - s_\theta^2)E_{WB}]$
$f_{\gamma\gamma}$	$4(E_{WW} + E_{BB} - E_{WB})$
c_{2y}	E_{2y}



At LHC

M_W

$pp \to ll, qq$

$pp \to dibosons$

Higgs couplings

Different subset of op.s for different subset of pseudo-ob.s
and different models!!

D=6 operators (16)

$$\mathcal{O}_W = \frac{ig}{2}(H^\dagger\sigma^a \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu H)D^\nu W^a_{\mu\nu}$$
$$\mathcal{O}_B = \frac{ig'}{2}(H^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu H)\partial^\nu B_{\mu\nu}$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{WW} = g^2|H|^2 W^a_{\mu\nu}W^{a\mu\nu}$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{WB} = gg'H^\dagger\sigma^a H W^a_{\mu\nu}B^{\mu\nu}$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{BB} = g'^2|H|^2 B_{\mu\nu}B^{\mu\nu}$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{GG} = g_s^2|H|^2 G^A_{\mu\nu}G^{A\mu\nu}$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{2W} = -\frac{1}{2}(D^\mu W^a_{\mu\nu})^2$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{2B} = -\frac{1}{2}(\partial^\mu B_{\mu\nu})^2$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{2G} = -\frac{1}{2}(D^\mu G^A_{\mu\nu})^2$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{3W} = \frac{g}{6}\epsilon^{abc}W^{a\nu}_\mu W^{b\rho}_\nu W^{c\mu}_\rho$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{3G} = \frac{g_s}{6}f^{ABC}G^{A\nu}_\mu G^{B\rho}_\nu G^{C\mu}_\rho$$
$$\mathcal{O}_T = \frac{1}{2}(H^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu H)^2$$
$$\mathcal{O}_H = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu|H|^2)^2$$
$$\mathcal{O}_6 = \lambda|H|^6$$
$$\mathcal{O}_y \approx |H|^2(H\bar{q}_L Y_u u_R + h.c.)$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{2y} \approx (\bar{q}_L Y_u u_R)(\bar{u}_R Y_u^+ q_L)$$

'Basis dependent"
Only the number fixed

pseudo-observables (16)

Wells, Zhang 2015

	EGGM
$\hat{S}$	$g^2(E_{WB} + \frac{1}{4}E_W + \frac{1}{4}E_B)$
$\hat{T}$	E_T
W	$\frac{g^2}{4}E_{2W}$
Y	$\frac{g^2}{4}E_{2B}$
Z	$\frac{g^2}{4}E_{2G}$
$\Delta\bar{g}_1^Z$	$-\frac{g^2}{4c_\theta^2}E_W$
$\Delta\bar{\kappa}_\gamma$	$g^2 E_{WB}$
$\bar{\lambda}_\gamma$	$-\frac{g^2}{4}E_{3W}$
$\bar{\lambda}_g$	$-\frac{g^2}{4}E_{3G}$
$\Delta\kappa_3$	$-E_6 - \frac{3}{2}E_H$
$\Delta\bar{\kappa}_F$	$-E_y - \frac{1}{2}E_H$
$\Delta\bar{\kappa}_V$	$-\frac{1}{2}E_H$
f_{gg}	$4E_{GG}$
$f_{z\gamma}$	$2[2c_\theta^2 E_{WW} - 2s_\theta^2 E_{BB} -(c_\theta^2 - s_\theta^2)E_{WB}]$
$f_{\gamma\gamma}$	$4(E_{WW} + E_{BB} - E_{WB})$
c_{2y}	E_{2y}



At LHC

M_W

$pp \to ll, qq$

$pp \to dibosons$

Higgs couplings

Different subset of op.s for different subset of pseudo-ob.s and different models!!

Energy growth of diBoson differential cross sections

	SM	BSM
$q_{L,R}\bar{q}_{L,R} \to V_L V_L(h)$	~ 1	$\sim E^2/M^2$
$q_{L,R}\bar{q}_{L,R} \to V_\pm V_L(h)$	$\sim m_W/E$	$\sim m_W E/M^2$
$q_{L,R}\bar{q}_{L,R} \to V_\pm V_\pm$	$\sim m_W^2/E^2$	$\sim E^2/M^2$
$q_{L,R}\bar{q}_{L,R} \to V_\pm V_\mp$	~ 1	~ 1



$$\delta A(\bar{q}q' \to WZ) \approx a_q^{(3)} E^2$$



$$a_q^{(3)} = \frac{16\pi^2}{M^2}$$

$$a_q^{(3)} = \frac{4\pi g}{M^2}$$

$$a_q^{(3)} = \frac{g^2}{M^2}$$

Franceschini et al 2018

Cox et al, 2021



FIG. 1. Bino–stau coannihilation. M_1 has been adjusted to obtain the correct relic abundance, and we fix $M_2 = 1$ TeV. The green (blue) region is consistent with a_μ at 1σ (2σ). The black region is excluded by XENON1T [24]. The region to the right of the red line is excluded by the ATLAS slepton search with 139 fb^{-1} [22], and the red region is excluded by slepton searches at LEP [25]. The grey region is excluded by vacuum instability. Left: $\tan\beta = 50$. Right: $\tan\beta = 20$.

A vector lepto-quark living inside Pati-Salam $SU(4)$

A recast of large-Γ dijet and $t\bar{t}$ searches

at fixed $g_{G'} \approx g_U = 3$ where $\Gamma(G' \to t\bar{t}, b\bar{b}) \gtrsim 0.24 m_{G'}$

A heavy gluon





Cornella et al 2021

with a significant dependence on the coupling to the light quarks

Timelike → Spacelike





F. Jegerlehner, arXiv:1511.04473



Carloni Calame, MP, Trentadue, Venanzoni, PLB 2015

MUonE



- ☑ **Inclusive measurement**
- ☑ **Smooth integrand**
- ☑ **Direct interplay with lattice QCD**

If the needed precision can be reached

Direct production of vector lepto-quark





$$BR(U_1 \to b\tau) \approx 1/2$$

$$g_U = \sqrt{2}\lambda$$



Example 3: B-anomalies in semi-leptonic decays

Neutral



Charged





ICHEP 2022



- in many cases $\sigma_{th} << \sigma_{exp}$