

Rozpraszanie foton-foton narzędziem do poszukiwania cząstek spoza Modelu Standardowego

Iwona Grabowska-Bołd Katedra Oddziaływań i Detekcji Cząstek Seminarium WFiIS AGH Kraków, 5 marca 2021



OUR PAPER

- New paper submitted and accepted for Journal of High Energy Physics
 - Measurement of LbyL based on all data collected by ATLAS (2015+2018 data)
 - Search for new hypothetical particles
 - Leading contributions from dr Prabhakar Palni, dr Klaudia Maj, dr Mateusz Dyndał (CERN), MSc Agnieszka Ogrodnik and IGB
- ► Earlier work:
 - 4.4σ evidence published in <u>Nature</u> <u>Physics 13 (2017) 852</u> (2015 data set)
 - ► 8.2σ observation published in <u>Phys.</u> <u>Rev. Lett. 123 (2019) 052001</u> (2018 data)

arXiv:2008.05355v1 [hep-ex] 12 Aug 2020



EUROPEAN ORGANISATION FOR NUCLEAR RESEARCH (CERN)

Measurement of light-by-light scattering and search for axion-like particles with 2.2 nb⁻¹ of Pb+Pb data with the ATLAS detector

The ATLAS Collaboration

This paper describes a measurement of light-by-light scattering based on Pb+Pb collision data recorded by the ATLAS experiment during Run 2 of the LHC. The study uses 2.2 nb⁻¹ of integrated luminosity collected in 2015 and 2018 at $\sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 5.02$ TeV. Light-by-light scattering candidates are selected in events with two photons produced exclusively, each with transverse energy $E_{\text{T}}^{\gamma} > 2.5$ GeV, pseudorapidity $|\eta_{\gamma}| < 2.37$, diphoton invariant mass $m_{\gamma\gamma} > 5$ GeV, and with small diphoton transverse momentum and diphoton acoplanarity. The integrated and differential fiducial cross sections are measured and compared with theoretical predictions. The diphoton invariant mass distribution is used to set limits on the production of axion-like particles. This result provides the most stringent limits to date on axion-like particle production for masses in the range 6–100 GeV. Cross sections above 2 to 70 nb are excluded at the 95% CL in that mass interval.

CERN-EP-2020

13th August 2020



- Introduction to light-by-light (LbyL) scattering
 - ► First attempts to measure it
 - ► How to measure LbyL at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC)
- Experimental challenges in measurements of LbyL in the ATLAS experiment
 - Photon identification
 - ► Trigger
 - Background processes
- ► New results
- Search for new particles beyond the Standard Model
- Summary and outlook

INTRODUCTION



INTRODUCTION

- In 1935 Hans Euler defends and publishes his PhD thesis "On the scattering of light by light based on Dirac's theory" under Werner Heisenberg's supervision
- ➤ They demonstrated for the first time that Paul Dirac's introduction of the positron opens the possibility that photons in electron-positron pair production scatter with each other and calculated the cross section for this process
- Introduction of Euler–Heisenberg Lagrangian laid the basis for the quantitative treatment of <u>vacuum polarisation</u>
- By treating the vacuum as a medium, it predicts rates of quantum electrodynamics (QED) light interaction processes
- ► Robert Karplus and Maurice Neuman calculated the full amplitude $O(\alpha^{4}_{em} \approx 3 \times 10^{-9})$ in 1951
 - Tiny cross section, not measured directly for decades



H.Euler (1909-1941) W.Hei

W.Heisenberg (1901-1976)

Their work predicted existence of several processes involving photons:

- Delbruck scattering (1953)
- Photon splitting (2002)
- Light-by-light scattering (2019)



FIRST EXPERIMENTAL ATTEMPTS TO LBYL



Figure 3 Apparatus for a light-light scattering experiment: The two lenses C and D focus sun light on the same spot O in a light-tight box AB. The dark-adapted eye of an observer at the point P serves as the detector for scattered light.

- Search for scattering of visible photons using focused sunlight by Hughes and Jauncey in [Phys. Rev. 36 (1930), 773]
- ► No light was detected
 - "Calculations show that if the photon has a cross section, its area must be less than 3x10⁻²⁰ cm²."
- Cross section for visible light actually is: 10⁻⁶⁰ cm²!

PHOTON-PHOTON PHYSICS AT COLLIDERS



Basis for photon-photon physics by

- ► Fermi, Nuovo Cim. 2 (1925) 143
- ➤ Weizsacker, Z. Phys. 88 (1934) 612
- ➤ Williams, Phys. Rev. 45 (10 1934) 729
- Led to formulation of Weizsacker-Williams Approximation or Equivalent Photon Approximation (EPA)

- ► Cross section for processes $AA(\gamma\gamma) \rightarrow AA(X)$ are calculated using:
 - Number of equivalent photons (EPA) by integration of relevant EM form factors

$$\begin{split} n(b,\omega) &= \frac{Z^2 \alpha_{em}}{\pi^2 \omega} | \int dq_{\perp} q_{\perp}^2 \frac{F(Q^2)}{Q^2} J_1(bq_{\perp})|^2 \\ Q^2 &< 1/R^2 \qquad \omega_{\max} \approx \gamma/R \\ Z^4 \text{ enhancement in Pb+Pb over pp} \end{split}$$

► Elementary cross section of $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow X$:



LARGE HADRON COLLIDER



- ► Large Hadron Collider (LHC) is a 27 km long machine
- ➤ Most of the time collides protons-protons at 0.9, 7, 8 (2009-2013) and 13 TeV (2015-2018)
- > One month per year is dedicated to a heavy-ion (HI) programme with lead-lead collisions at 2.76 TeV (2010, 2011) and 5.02 TeV (2015, 2018)

DATA AVAILABLE AT THE LHC

- ► Years 2009-2013 (Run 1) early collisions at lower energy
- ► Years 2015-2018 (Run 2) the centre-of-mass energy was doubled
 - ► Opportunity to study energy dependence
 - ► Large integrated luminosity
- ► Years 2019-2021 a long shutdown is ongoing

	System	Year	sqrt(s _{NN}) [TeV]	L _{int}	
<u></u>	рр	2012	8	19.4 fb -1	
5	Pb+Pb	2011	2.76	0.14 nb ⁻¹	
RL	рр	2013	2.76	4 pb ⁻¹	
	p+Pb	2013	5.02	29 nb ⁻¹	
	рр	2015-18	13	139 fb ⁻¹	
\sim	рр	2015	5.02	28 pb ⁻¹	
Run	Pb+Pb	2015	5.02	0.49 nb ⁻¹	
	p+Pb	2016	5.02	0.5 nb ⁻¹	
	p+Pb	2016	8.16	0.16 pb ⁻¹	
	Xe+Xe	2017	5.4	3 µb-1	
	рр	2017	5.02	~100-200 pb ⁻¹	
	Pb+Pb	2018	5.02	1.73 nb ⁻¹	

ATLAS DETECTOR





SINGLE EXCLUSIVE DIMUON EVENT IN PB+PB



Ph

Pb

11

Run: 287038 Event: 71765109 2015-11-30 23:20:10 CEST

Dimuons UPC Pb+Pb 5.02 TeV



EXCLUSIVE DIMUON PRODUCTION IN PB+PB COLLISIONS



- ► ATLAS measured the $\gamma \gamma \rightarrow \mu + \mu$ production in Pb+Pb collisions at 5.02 TeV
 - ► 12 132 event candidates selected
- \blacktriangleright Cross sections for exclusive dimuon production in $m_{\mu\mu}$ in three intervals of $y_{\mu\mu}$ are measured
 - ► 34.1±0.3(stat.) +0.7 (syst.) µb and compared to predictions 32.1 µb
- > Data is compared to the theory predictions assuming signal comes from gamma-gamma interactions
 - Very good agreement found with Standard Model
- \blacktriangleright This is the most precise result for high dimuon masses at the LHC

EXPERIMENTAL CHALLENGES



"Did you really have to show the error bars?"

Standard Model Production Cross Section Measurements



Status: May 2020

- ► ATLAS measures cross sections for a broad variety of Standard Model processes
 - ► In pp collisions at 5, 7, 8 and 13 TeV
- Measurements span 14 orders of magnitudes
- Excellent agreement with the Standard Model
- Red dashed line indicates a LbyL cross section in pp collisions at 14 TeV

PHOTON IDENTIFICATION IN ATLAS

- Photons do not create tracks in the ID, they deposit most of their energy in the EM calorimeter
 - Potential small
 leakage to HAD
 calorimeter (isolation)
- ► Simple signature:
 - Photon = EM cluster
 - Unless they convert to a e+e- pair



Possible issues:

- An electron with a low-quality track might mimic a photon
- Track reconstruction efficiency is 80% in pp collisions in ATLAS
- A low-p_T electron may emit bremsstrahlung, and bend in a magnetic field w/o deep entering to the ID

PHOTON EFFICIENCY IN ATLAS



- ► Typical measurements with photons use p_T>40 GeV
- ► While LbyL photons have p_T in a region of 2.5-25 GeV
- ► Default ATLAS photon identification is not optimal for low-p_T photons from LbyL
 - Photon identification efficiency is below 60%, for two photons below 36%
- ► Dedicated optimisation has been developed for low-p_T photons
 - Based on artificial neural network
 - Vey good performance: constant 95% photon identification efficiency

TRIGGER: EVENT FILTERING IN REAL TIME

- Interaction rate:
 - ► 40 MHz in pp collisions
 - ► 300 kHz in Pb+Pb collisions
- ► ATLAS can record and analyse about 1 kHz
- Trigger: online filtering system
 - Rejects 99.998% events in pp, and 99.5% events in Pb+Pb
 - Has to be inclusive not to miss potential signal
 - If one wants to measure a given process, one has to have a dedicated trigger to select event candidates online
 - AGH UST was heavily involved in trigger preparations to 2015 and 2018 Pb+Pb runs









- ► A lot of activity in the entire detector
- ► It is a challenge to trigger and then reconstruct these events

TRIGGER FOR LOW-PT PHOTONS

- Dedicated trigger for LbyL events has been designed:
 - ► Expected O(10) signal events out of 4 billion interactions
 - Two-step approach: events accepted at Level-1 at O(1k Hz) rate and High Level Trigger at O(10 Hz) rate
 - ➤ Trigger efficiency studied with a novel method using yy→e+e-process in data
 - ► Great improvement between 2015 and 2018 Level-1 performance
- ► In 2018 Pb+Pb data set:
 - Efficiency grows from 60% at 5 GeV to 100% at 9 GeV
 - ► The analysis uses $E_{\rm T}^{\rm cluster1} + E_{\rm T}^{\rm cluster2} > 5 {
 m GeV}$
- ► In 2015 Pb+Pb data set:
 - ► Significant inefficiency below 8 GeV in $E_{\rm T}^{\rm cluster1} + E_{\rm T}^{\rm cluster2}$
- Expect most of events from the 2018 data set



BACKGROUND PROCESSES WITH ELECTRONS AND PHOTONS



- Very detailed background studies:
 - ➤ What process can mimic two photons in Pb+Pb collisions at the LHC?
 - ► Exclusive production of electron pairs: $\gamma \gamma \rightarrow e+e-$
 - ► Very high cross section α^{2}_{em} higher comparing to LbyL
 - Electron and photons are distinct objects: electrons deposit tracks
 - ► What about if tracks are not measured in the ID?
 - Production precisely known from QED, this background can be evaluated and subtracted
 - ► Central Exclusive Production: $gg \rightarrow \chi \chi$
 - ► Signature is the same as for LbyL, rely on data-driven techniques to evaluate this contribution
 - ► Also other rare processes have ben considered

RESULTS



LBYL EVENT SELECTION

- Good-quality data in the detector
- ► Trigger
- Exactly two photons with p_T>2.5 GeV and |η|<2.37, excluding the crack region 1.37<|η|<1.52
- ► Invariant diphoton mass M_{inv}>5 GeV
- ► Veto extra activity in the ID in $|\eta|$ <2.5
 - ► No reconstructed tracks with p_T>100 MeV
 - No reconstructed pixel tracks with p_T>50 MeV and |Δη(y,track)| < 0.5
- Back-to-back topology
 - > p_T४४</sub><1 GeV</p>

• Acoplanarity
$$Aco = 1 - \frac{|\Delta \phi_{\gamma\gamma}|}{\pi} < 0.01$$

Signal: LbyL event candidate



Background: e+e- event candidateImage: State in the state in t

FIRST LBYL SCATTERING MEASUREMENTS

► First strong evidence measurements published by ATLAS (2017) and CMS (2019)

- ► ATLAS: p_T >3 GeV and $M_{\chi\chi}$ >6 GeV
- ► CMS: p_T >2 GeV and $M_{\chi\chi}$ >5 GeV
- Excess consistent with the LbyL signal from Standard Model
 - ► ATLAS: 4.4σ significance with 13 event candidates, with 2.6±0.7 events from background
 - ► CMS: **4.1** σ significance with **14 event candidates**, about 3 events from background

Measured cross sections:

ATLAS - σ_{fid} =70±20 (stat) ± 17 (syst) nb, **CMS** - σ_{fid} =120±46 (stat) ± 28 (syst) ± 4 (th) nb In agreement with Standard Model [arXiv:1601.07001, 1305.7142]



NEW LBYL RESULTS FROM ATLAS



- ► New measurement based on **2015+2018 data sets** with 2.2 nb⁻¹
- ► In total 97 events observed, with 27 events from backgrounds are expected
 - ► Background contributions from $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow e^+e^-$ (15±7) and $gg \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ (12±3)
- > Cross section in the fiducial region $p_T^{\gamma} > 2.5 \text{ GeV}, m_{\gamma\gamma} > 5 \text{ GeV}, |\eta^{\gamma}| < 2.4, p_T^{\gamma\gamma} < 1 \text{ GeV}$

 $\sigma_{\text{fid}}^{\text{meas}} = 120 \pm 17 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 13 \text{ (syst.)} \pm 4 \text{ (lumi.) nb}$

Comparison to theory predictions

 $\sigma_{\text{fid}}^{\text{theory1}} = 80 \pm 8 \text{ nb}$ by M.Klusek-Gawenda et al. [Phys. Rev. C 93 (2016) 044907] $\sigma_{\text{fid}}^{\text{theory2}} = 78 \pm 8 \text{ nb}$ from SuperChic 3.0 [Eur. Phys. J. C 79 (2019) 39]

► Reasonable agreement

NEW LBYL RESULTS FROM ATLAS



- ► New measurement based on **2015+2018 data sets** with 2.2 nb⁻¹
- ► Fiducial region defined by $p_T^{\gamma} > 2.5 \text{ GeV}, m_{\gamma\gamma} > 5 \text{ GeV}, |\eta^{\gamma}| < 2.4, p_T^{\gamma\gamma} < 1 \text{ GeV}$
- > Differential cross sections have been measured in four variables for the first time
 - ► After background subtraction
 - ► Good agreement in shape, some differences in the normalisation

SEARCH FOR UNKNOWN



Stand				ments May 2020	$\int \mathcal{L} \mathrm{dt}$ 1 [fb ⁻¹]	Reference
nn	$\sigma = 96.07 \pm 0.18 \pm 0.91 \text{ mb (data)} \\ \text{COMPETE HPR1R2 (theory)}$		Å	4	50×10 ⁻⁸	PLB 761 (2016) 158
P	$\sigma = 95.35 \pm 0.38 \pm 1.3$ mb (data) COMPETE HPR1R2 (theory)	ATLAS Preliminary	\$		8×10 ⁻⁸	NPB 889, 486 (2014)
	$\sigma = 190.1 \pm 0.2 \pm 6.4$ nb (data) DYNNLO + CT14NNLO (theory)		ļ . Þ	P P	0.081	PLB 759 (2016) 601
N	$\sigma = 112.69 \pm 3.1$ nb (data) DYNNLO + CT14NNLO (theory)	Bun 1 2 $\sqrt{s} = 7.8.13$ Te		4	20.2	EPJC 79, 760 (2019)
	$\sigma = 98.71 \pm 0.028 \pm 2.191 \text{ nb (data)}$ DYNNLO + CT14NNLO (theory)	$10111, 2 \sqrt{5} = 7, 0, 10$	• •	ρ	4.6	EPJC 77, 367 (2017)
	$\sigma = 58.43 \pm 0.03 \pm 1.66$ nb (data) DYNNLO+CT14 NNLO (theory)		, Þ	P	3.2	JHEP 02 (2017) 117
2	$\sigma = 34.24 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.92 \text{ nb (data)}$ DYNNLO+CT14 NNLO (theory)		<u> </u>	4	20.2	JHEP 02 (2017) 117
	σ = 29.53 ± 0.03 ± 0.77 nb (data) DYNNLO+CT14 NNLO (theory)		¢	P	4.6	JHEP 02 (2017) 117
	$\sigma = \begin{array}{l} 826.4 \pm 3.6 \pm 19.6 \text{ pb (data)} \\ \text{top++ NNLO+NNLL (theory)} \end{array}$. 中		•	36.1	arXiv: 1910.08819
Ē	$\sigma = 242.9 \pm 1.7 \pm 8.6 \text{ pb} \text{ (data)}$ top++ NNLO+NNLL (theory)	20.2	EPJC 74, 3109 (201			
	$\sigma = 182.9 \pm 3.1 \pm 6.4 \text{ pb} (\text{data})$ top++ NNLO+NNLL (theory)	\$		0	4.6	EPJC 74, 3109 (2014
	$\sigma = 247 \pm 6 \pm 46 \text{ pb (data)}$ NLO+NLL (theory)	Þ			3.2	JHEP 04 (2017) 086
t–chan	$\sigma = 89.6 \pm 1.7 + 7.2 - 6.4 \text{ pb} \text{ (data)}$ NLO+NLL (theory)	4		△	20.3	EPJC 77, 531 (2017)
	$\sigma = 68 \pm 2 \pm 8 \text{ pb (data)}$ NLO+NLL (theory)	0		0	4.6	PRD 90, 112006 (20
	$\sigma = 130.04 \pm 1.7 \pm 10.6 \text{ pb} \text{ (data)}$ NNLO (theory)	ļ 🖕		ф (36.1	EPJC 79, 884 (2019)
VW	$\sigma = 68.2 \pm 1.2 \pm 4.6 \text{ pb (data)}$ NNLO (theory)	4			20.3	PLB 763, 114 (2016)
	$\sigma = 51.9 \pm 2 \pm 4.4 \text{ pb (data)}$ NNLO (theory)	0			4.6	PRD 87, 112001 (20 PRL 113, 212001 (2
	$\sigma = 61.7 \pm 2.8 + 4.3 - 3.6 \text{ pb} (\text{data})$ LHC-HXSWG YR4 (theory)	þ			79.8	PRD 101 (2020) 012
1	$\sigma = 27.7 \pm 3 + 2.3 - 1.9 \text{ pb (data)}$ LHC-HXSWG YR4 (theory)	4	_		20.3	EPJC 76, 6 (2016)
	$\sigma = 22.1 + 6.7 - 5.3 + 3.3 - 2.7 \text{ pb} (data)$ LHC-HXSWG YR4 (theory)		Theory		4.5	EPJC 76, 6 (2016)
	$\sigma = 94 \pm 10 + 28 - 23 \text{ pb (data)}$ NLO+NNLL (theory)				3.2	JHEP 01 (2018) 63
Vt	$\sigma = 23 \pm 1.3 + 3.4 - 3.7 \text{ pb} \text{ (data)}$ NLO+NLL (theory)	4	LHC pp $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV		20.3	JHEP 01, 064 (2016
	$\sigma = 16.8 \pm 2.9 \pm 3.9 \text{ pb (data)}$ NLO+NLL (theory)	0			2.0	PLB 716, 142-159 (2
	$\sigma = 51 \pm 0.8 \pm 2.3 \text{ pb} (\text{data})$ MATRIX (NNLO) (theory)	Ċ.		Þ	36.1	EPJC 79, 535 (2019) PLB 761 (2016) 179
NZ	$\sigma = 24.3 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.9$ pb (data) MATRIX (NNLO) (theory)	A	stat ⊕ syst	4	20.3	PRD 93, 092004 (20 PLB 761 (2016) 179
	$\sigma = 19 + 1.4 - 1.3 \pm 1 \text{ pb (data)}$ MATRIX (NNLO) (theory)	Ó.		•	4.6	EPJC 72, 2173 (2012 PLB 761 (2016) 179
	$\sigma = 17.3 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.8$ pb (data) Matrix (NNLO) & Sherpa (NLO) (theory)	Ļ.	LHC pp √s = 8 TeV	b b	36.1	PRD 97 (2018) 0320
Z	$\sigma = 7.3 \pm 0.4 + 0.4 - 0.3 \text{ pb} \text{ (data)}$ NNLO (theory)	4	Data		20.3	JHEP 01, 099 (2017
	$\sigma = 6.7 \pm 0.7 + 0.5 - 0.4 \text{ pb} \text{ (data)}$ NNLO (theory)	¢ –	stat		4.6	JHEP 03, 128 (2013) PLB 735 (2014) 311
s–chan	$\sigma = 4.8 \pm 0.8 + 1.6 - 1.3 \text{ pb} (\text{data})$ NLO+NNL (theory)		stat ⊕ syst		20.3	PLB 756, 228-246 (2
-	$\sigma = 870 \pm 130 \pm 140$ fb (data) Madgraph5 + aMCNLO (theory)		LHC pp √s = 7 TeV		36.1	PRD 99, 072009 (20
τνν	σ = 369 + 86 - 79 ± 44 fb (data) MCFM (theory)		Data		20.3	JHEP 11, 172 (2015)
I7	$\sigma = 950 \pm 80 \pm 100$ fb (data) Madgraph5 + aMCNLO (theory)	þ 🔤	stat		36.1	PRD 99, 072009 (20
τΖ	$\sigma = 176 + 52 - 48 \pm 24 \text{ fb (data)}$ HELAC-NLO (theory)	-	stat ⊕ syst		20.3	JHEP 11, 172 (2015
vww	$\sigma = 0.65 + 0.16 - 0.15 + 0.16 - 0.14 \text{ pb} (data)$ Sherpa 2.2.2 (theory)		-		79.8	PLB 798 (2019) 134
VWZ	$\sigma = 0.55 \pm 0.14 + 0.15 - 0.13$ pb (data) Sherpa 2.2.2 (theory)				79.8	PLB 798 (2019) 134
	lml			Liliiiii	i	
1	0^{-4} 10^{-3} 10^{-2} 10^{-1}	$1 10^1 10^2 10^3 10^3$	$4 10^5 10^6 10^{11}$	0.5 1.0 1.5 2.0		
1	10 10 10 10	- 10 10 10 10				
			σ IDDI	data/theory		

01-1

- > Standard Model does a very good job in the description of pp data collected at the LHC
 - ► Over 12 orders of magnitude!
 - ► Including a discovery of **Higgs boson** in 2012
 - ► But ...

SHORTCOMINGS OF STANDARD MODEL

- Standard Model does not provide answers to all fundamental questions of physics
- ► List of some open issues:
 - Matter-antimatter asymmetry in the Universe
 - Dark matter and dark energy
 - ► Gravity

 \succ

. . . .

- Strong CP violation
- Neutrino mass
- ► Grand unification



- ► Therefore, Standard Model cannot be the final theory
- ► This motivates searches for new phenomena, and new particles

METHOD OF SEARCHING FOR NEW PARTICLES

Signal Higgs boson→<u>γγ</u>



- Higgs boson decays into two high-energy photons
 - Energy and angles at which the photons move carry information about the mother particle from which they were created
- But there are background processes that also have two final photons
 - > On the $m_{\gamma\gamma}$ distribution they do not give a peak
- This technique was used to establish the Higgs boson discovery in 2012

$$m_X = m_H = \sqrt{E^2 - p^2} = m_{\gamma\gamma} = 2E_1 E_2 (1 - \cos \alpha)$$

MANY SEARCHES ONGOING AT THE LHC

[arXiv: 2102.13405]



- Search for a new particle decaying to two photons from ATLAS
 - ➤ Measurement uses pp collisions at 13 TeV with 139 fb⁻¹
 - No excess over background has been found
 - Exclusion limits are derived (Brazilian plot)



AXIONS OR AXION-LIKE PARTICLES

- In 1977, a hypothetical particle proposed to solve one of SM problems
 - Named axion by Frank Wilczek, Steven Weinberg proposed -Higglet
 - Interacts: gravity, electromagnetic
 - ► Its non-zero mass m_a is not predicted by theory
 - ► It might be a possible component of **dark matter**
 - ► It may decay to **two photons**
- Axion and axion-like particles (ALP) have intensively been searched for in a broad range of masses
 - Using cosmology, astrophysics and particle physics data
 - Almost 1 preprint on arXiv per day





[arXiv:2102.08971]



SEARCH FOR ALP



- > Distribution of $m_{\gamma\gamma}$ used to **search for ALP** in $6 < m_{\gamma\gamma} < 100 \text{ GeV}$ range
 - ► Signal: $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow a \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, BR($a \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$)=100%
 - ► Background: LbyL, $\gamma \gamma \rightarrow e^+ e^-$, central exclusive production of $gg \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$
- $\blacktriangleright\,$ 95% CL limits on cross section and coupling $1/\Lambda_{\rm a}$
 - ► Largest deviation of 2.1σ at $m_{\gamma\gamma} \sim 10~{\rm GeV}$
 - The most stringent limit established for ALP masses between 6-100 GeV



[arXiv: 2008.05355, submitted for JHEP]



- Light-by-light scattering a fundamental QED process has been measured directly by the ATLAS experiment at the LHC
 - ATLAS is a leading experiment in this field of research
 - Members of the AGH UST have leading contributions to the LbyL measurement
 - In the combined 2015+2018 data set, 97 events were observed with a contribution of 27 background events
 - Results are consistent with Standard Model
 - Differential cross sections have been measured for the first time
 - > Preprint submitted for publication in Journal of High Energy Physics [arXiv: 2008.05355]
- LbyL is sensitive to beyond-Standard Model physics
 - ► The diphoton mass distribution was used to search for axion-like particles
 - ► No significant excess has been found
 - ► The most stringent limits on ALP production derived for masses between 6-100 GeV
- ► Looking into the future
 - ► Expected 10 nb⁻¹ in Run 3-4 with the upgraded ATLAS detector
 - In the meantime, other LHC experiments also have potential to contribute to LbyL measurements

MORE ON LBYL



ABOUT DISCOVER RESOURCES UPDATES Q SEARCH All News Briefings Features Portraits Press Blog

Physics Briefing

Tags: HION group, Heavy Ion, Physics Results, LHCP 2020, LHCP

ATLAS measures light scattering on light and constrains axion-like particles

25th May 2020 I By ATLAS Collaboration

Light-by-light scattering is a very rare phenomenon in which two photons – particles of light – interact, producing another pair of photons. Direct observation of this process at high energy had proven elusive for decades, until it was first seen by the ATLAS Collaboration in 2016 and established in 2019. In a new measurement, ATLAS physicists are using light-by-light scattering to search for a hyped phenomenon beyond the Standard Model of particle physics: axion-like particles.

- ATLAS briefing (2020): <u>https://atlas.cern/updates/briefing/light-scattering-light-constrains-axion-particles</u>
- ATLAS briefing (2019): <u>https://atlas.cern/updates/briefing/atlas-observes-light-scattering-light</u>
- CERN press statement (2017): <u>https://home.cern/about/updates/2017/08/atlas-observes-</u> <u>direct-evidence-light-light-scattering</u>
- CERN Courier (2017): <u>http://cerncourier.com/cws/article/cern/66878</u>

BACK-UP SLIDES

35

EXAMPLE: INDIRECT LBYL MEASUREMENT (TBR)

- ➤ Prior to 2017, only indirect measurements of LbyL existed
- > Electron magnetic moment, μ
- > Magnitude of μ scaled by the Bohr magneton, g/2
- ➤ g/2=1 for a point electron in the Dirac description
- ► QED predicts that vacuum fluctuations and polarisation slightly increase this value
- Physics beyond Standard Model could deviate it from unity even more
- Result of g/2 published in 2008 by the Harvard group (<u>Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 120801 (2008</u>))

$$g/2 = 1.00115965218073(28)$$

- ► An uncertainty is 2.7 smaller w.r.t. the previous measurement
- This measurement and QED theory determine the fine structure constant with an uncertainty 20 times smaller than before (Phys. Rev. Lett. 99, 110406 (2007))

 $1/\alpha = 137.035999084(51)$

Further improvements in precision are limited by the theory predictions



 $\mu = -\frac{g}{2}\mu_{\rm B}\frac{\mathbf{S}}{\hbar/2}$

PREDICTIONS FOR LBYL AT THE LHC

- The ATLAS LbyL measurement was inspired by two theory papers
 - From 2013: Observation of LbyL scattering at the LHC ([1] arxiv: 1305.7142) by D'Enterria (CERN) et al
 - From 2016: LbyL scatterings in UPC at the LHC ([2] arxiv: 1601.07001) by Szczurek (IFJ PAN) et al
- EPA theory applied to the LHC conditions
 - γγ luminosities are extremely enhanced for ion beams (Z⁴=5x10⁷ for Pb beams)
 - First estimates prior to data taking were 18 events in 1 nb⁻¹ predicted by [1] for M_{γγ}>5 GeV, while [2] predicts ~8 times more
 - Potentially could be seen at the LHC for the first time
 - Erratum came later in Feb 2016 and made them consistent
 - Considered background processes
 - Relatively clean process for $M_{\gamma\gamma}$ >5 GeV
 - Expected contributions from CEP gg $\rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and QED $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow e^+e^-$

$\sqrt{s_{_{ m NN}}}$	$\mathcal{L}_{ ext{AB}} \cdot \Delta t$	γ	$R_{ m A}$	$\omega_{ m max}$	$\sqrt{s_{\gamma \gamma}^{ m max}}$	$\sigma^{ m excl}_{\gamma\gamma ightarrow\gamma\gamma}$	$N_{\gamma \gamma}^{ m excl}$ (per year)
(TeV)	(per year)		(fm)	(GeV)	(GeV)	$[m_{\gamma\gamma} > 5~GeV]$	$[m_{\gamma\gamma}>5$ GeV, after cuts]
14	1 fb^{-1}	7455	0.7	2450	4500	$105\pm10~{\rm fb}$	(3) 12
8.8	$200 \ \mathrm{nb}^{-1}$	4690	7.1	130	260	$260\pm26~\rm pb$	(2) 6
5.5	$1 \ {\rm nb^{-1}}$	2930	7.1	80	160	$370\pm70~\rm{nb}$	(18) 70
	$\sqrt{s_{_{\rm NN}}}$ (TeV) 14 8.8 5.5	$\begin{array}{c c} \sqrt{s_{_{\rm NN}}} & \mathcal{L}_{{\rm AB}} \cdot \Delta t \\ ({\rm TeV}) & ({\rm per \ year}) \\ 14 & 1 \ {\rm fb}^{-1} \\ 8.8 & 200 \ {\rm nb}^{-1} \\ 5.5 & 1 \ {\rm nb}^{-1} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c c} \sqrt{s_{_{\rm NN}}} & \mathcal{L}_{{\rm AB}} \cdot \Delta t & \gamma \\ ({\rm TeV}) & ({\rm per \ year}) \\ \hline 14 & 1 \ {\rm fb}^{-1} & 7455 \\ 8.8 & 200 \ {\rm nb}^{-1} & 4690 \\ 5.5 & 1 \ {\rm nb}^{-1} & 2930 \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c cccc} \sqrt{s_{_{\rm NN}}} & \mathcal{L}_{{\rm AB}} \cdot \Delta t & \gamma & R_{\rm A} \\ ({\rm TeV}) & ({\rm per \ year}) & & ({\rm fm}) \\ \hline 14 & 1 \ {\rm fb}^{-1} & 7455 & 0.7 \\ 8.8 & 200 \ {\rm nb}^{-1} & 4690 & 7.1 \\ 5.5 & 1 \ {\rm nb}^{-1} & 2930 & 7.1 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c ccccc} \sqrt{s_{_{\rm NN}}} & \mathcal{L}_{{\rm AB}} \cdot \Delta t & \gamma & R_{\rm A} & \omega_{\rm max} \\ ({\rm TeV}) & ({\rm per \ year}) & ({\rm fm}) & ({\rm GeV}) \\ \hline 14 & 1 \ {\rm fb}^{-1} & 7455 & 0.7 & 2450 \\ 8.8 & 200 \ {\rm nb}^{-1} & 4690 & 7.1 & 130 \\ 5.5 & 1 \ {\rm nb}^{-1} & 2930 & 7.1 & 80 \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$



ATLAS SUSY Searches* - 95% CL Lower Limits

Α <i>Jι</i>	TLAS SUSY Sea	rches*	- 95%	6 Cl	L Lov	ver Limits					ATLAS Preliminary $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV
	Model	S	ignatur	e j	∫ <i>L dt</i> [fb ⁻	¹] Ma	ss limit				Reference
Ś	$\tilde{q}\tilde{q}, \tilde{q} \rightarrow q \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	0 <i>e</i> , μ mono-jet	2-6 jets 1-3 jets	E_T^{miss} E_T^{miss}	139 36.1	 <i>q̃</i> [10× Degen.] <i>q̃</i> [1×, 8× Degen.] 	0.43	0.71		1.9 $m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0) < 400 \text{ GeV}$ $m(\tilde{q}) - m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0) = 5 \text{ GeV}$	ATLAS-CONF-2019-040 1711.03301
lusive Searche	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}$	0 <i>e</i> , <i>µ</i>	2-6 jets	$E_T^{\rm miss}$	139	ο δο δ		Forbidden	1.	2.35 $m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=0 \text{ GeV}$ 15-1.95 $m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=1000 \text{ GeV}$	ATLAS-CONF-2019-040 ATLAS-CONF-2019-040
	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}W\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	1 <i>e</i> ,μ	2-6 jets	rmiss	139	ğ			10	2.2 $m(\tilde{\ell}_1^0) < 600 \text{ GeV}$	ATLAS-CONF-2020-047
	$gg, g \to qq(\ell \ell)\chi_1$ $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \to qqWZ\tilde{\chi}_1^0$	0 e, μ SS e, μ	7-11 jets 6 jets	$E_T \\ E_T^{\text{miss}}$	139 139	יפט פא		1	1.2	1.97 $m(\tilde{\chi}_1) = 50 \text{ GeV}$ $m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0) < 600 \text{ GeV}$ $m(\tilde{\chi}_1) = 200 \text{ GeV}$	ATLAS-CONF-2020-002 1909.08457
Juc	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \rightarrow t \tilde{t} \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	0-1 <i>e</i> ,μ SS <i>e</i> ,μ	3 <i>b</i> 6 jets	$E_T^{\rm miss}$	79.8 139	- da ai			1.25	2.25 $m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0) < 200 \text{ GeV}$ $m(\tilde{g}) - m(\tilde{\chi}_1^1) = 300 \text{ GeV}$	ATLAS-CONF-2018-041 1909.08457
	$\tilde{b}_1 \tilde{b}_1, \tilde{b}_1 {\rightarrow} b \tilde{\chi}_1^0 / t \tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm}$		Multiple Multiple		36.1 139	$egin{array}{ccc} & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & $	Forbidden	0.9 0.74		$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)$ =300 GeV, BR($b\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=1 $m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)$ =200 GeV, m($\tilde{\chi}_1^+$)=300 GeV, BR($t\tilde{\chi}_1^+$)=1	1708.09266, 1711.03301 1909.08457
s) U	$\tilde{b}_1 \tilde{b}_1, \tilde{b}_1 \rightarrow b \tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow b h \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	0 <i>e</i> , μ 2 τ	6 <i>b</i> 2 <i>b</i>	$E_T^{ m miss}$ $E_T^{ m miss}$	139 139	<i>b</i> ₁ Forbidden <i>b</i> ₁		0 0.13-0.85	.23-1.35	$ \Delta m(\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0}, \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 130 \text{ GeV}, \ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 100 \text{ GeV} \\ \Delta m(\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0}, \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 130 \text{ GeV}, \ m(\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{0}) = 0 \text{ GeV} $	1908.03122 ATLAS-CONF-2020-031
uark	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow t \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	0-1 <i>e</i> , <i>µ</i>	≥ 1 jet	$E_T^{\rm miss}$	139	\tilde{t}_1			1.25	$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)$ =1 GeV	ATLAS-CONF-2020-003, 2004.14060
bs odl	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow W b \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	1 <i>e</i> , <i>µ</i>	3 jets/1 b	E_T^{miss}	139	\tilde{t}_1	0.44-0.59	9		$m(ilde{\chi}_1^0)$ =400 GeV	ATLAS-CONF-2019-017
ien. St pi	$\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow \tilde{\tau}_1 bv, \tilde{\tau}_1 \rightarrow \tau \tilde{G}$	$1\tau + 1e,\mu,\tau$	2 jets/1 b	E_T^{miss}	36.1	\tilde{t}_1			1.16	m($ ilde{ au}_1$)=800 GeV	1803.10178
3 rd g direc	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow c \tilde{\chi}_1^0 / \tilde{c} \tilde{c}, \tilde{c} \rightarrow c \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	0 e,μ 0 e,μ	2 c mono-jet	E_T^{miss} E_T^{miss}	36.1 36.1	\tilde{c} \tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1	0.46 0.43	0.85		m(₹1)=0 GeV m(ĩ₁,č)-m(₹1)=50 GeV m(ĩ₁,č)-m(₹1)=5 GeV	1805.01649 1805.01649 1711.03301
	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow t \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow Z/b \tilde{\chi}_1^0$	1-2 e.u	1-4 <i>b</i>	Emiss	139	Ĩ.		0.067-	1.18	$m(\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0}) = 500 \text{ GeV}$	SUSY-2018-09
	$\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow \tilde{t}_2, \tilde{t}_2 \rightarrow \tilde{t}_1 + Z$	3 e, µ	1 <i>b</i>	E_T^{miss}	139	\tilde{t}_2	Forbidden	0.86		$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)$ =360 GeV, $m(\tilde{t}_1)$ - $m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)$ = 40 GeV	SUSY-2018-09
	$ ilde{\chi}_1^{\pm} ilde{\chi}_2^0$ via WZ	3 e,μ ee,μμ	≥ 1 jet	$E_T^{ m miss}$ $E_T^{ m miss}$	139 139		0	.64		$\mathbf{m}(\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm})=0$ $\mathbf{m}(\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm})-\mathbf{m}(\tilde{\chi}_1^{0})=5~\mathrm{GeV}$	ATLAS-CONF-2020-015 1911.12606
	$ ilde{\chi}_1^{\pm} ilde{\chi}_1^{\mp}$ via WW	2 <i>e</i> , <i>µ</i>		E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm}$	0.42			$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=0$	1908.08215
÷	$\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm} \tilde{\chi}_2^0$ via <i>Wh</i>	0-1 <i>e</i> ,μ	2 <i>b</i> /2 γ	E_T^{miss}	139	$\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm}/\tilde{\chi}_{2}^{0}$ Forbidden		0.74		$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=70 \text{ GeV}$	2004.10894, 1909.09226
	$\hat{\chi}_{1}^{+}\hat{\chi}_{1}^{+}$ via $\ell_{L}/\tilde{\nu}$	2 <i>e</i> , µ		E_T^{miss}	139	χ_1^+	0.40.0	1.0		$m(\tilde{\ell},\tilde{\nu})=0.5(m(\tilde{\ell}_1^{\pm})+m(\tilde{\ell}_1^{0}))$	1908.08215
di E	$\tilde{\tau}\tilde{\tau}, \tilde{\tau} \rightarrow \tau \chi_1^\circ$	2τ	0 ioto	E_T^{miss}	139	τ [τ _L , τ _{R,L}] 0.16-0.3	0.12-0.39	0.7		$\mathbf{m}(\chi_1^{\circ}) = 0$	1911.06660
	$\ell_{\mathrm{L,R}}\ell_{\mathrm{L,R}}, \ell \rightarrow \ell \chi_1^\circ$	2 e,μ ee,μμ	≥ 1 jet	E_T^{miss} E_T^{miss}	139 139	ℓ ℓ̃ 0.256		0.7		$m(\widetilde{\ell})=0$ $m(\widetilde{\ell})-m(\widetilde{\chi}_1^0)=10~GeV$	1908.08215 1911.12606
	$\tilde{H}\tilde{H},\tilde{H}{ ightarrow}h\tilde{G}/Z\tilde{G}$	0 <i>e</i> ,μ 4 <i>e</i> ,μ	$\geq 3 b$ 0 jets	$E_T^{ m miss}$ $E_T^{ m miss}$	36.1 139	<i>H</i> 0.13-0.23 <i>H</i>	0.55	0.29-0.88		$ \begin{array}{l} BR(\tilde{\chi}^0_1 \to h\tilde{G}) = 1 \\ BR(\tilde{\chi}^0_1 \to Z\tilde{G}) = 1 \end{array} $	1806.04030 ATLAS-CONF-2020-040
lived cles	Direct $\tilde{\chi}_1^+ \tilde{\chi}_1^-$ prod., long-lived $\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm$	Disapp. trk	1 jet	$E_T^{\rm miss}$	36.1	$ \begin{array}{c} \tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm} \\ \tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm} \end{array} 0.15 \end{array} $	0.46			Pure Wino Pure higgsino	1712.02118 ATL-PHYS-PUB-2017-019
Long- parti	Stable \tilde{g} R-hadron Metastable \tilde{g} R-hadron, $\tilde{g} \rightarrow qq \tilde{\chi}_1^0$		Multiple Multiple		36.1 36.1	\tilde{g} $\tilde{g} = [\tau(\tilde{g}) = 10 \text{ ns}, 0.2 \text{ ns}]$				2.0 2.05 2.4 $m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=100 \text{ GeV}$	1902.01636,1808.04095 1710.04901,1808.04095
	$\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm} \tilde{\chi}_1^{\mp} / \tilde{\chi}_1^0$, $\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm} \rightarrow Z \ell \rightarrow \ell \ell \ell$	3 <i>e</i> , <i>µ</i>			139	$\tilde{\chi}_1^{\mp}/\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ [BR($Z\tau$)=1, BR(Ze)=1]	0.6	25 1.0	5	Pure Wino	ATLAS-CONF-2020-009
	LFV $pp \rightarrow \tilde{v}_{\tau} + X, \tilde{v}_{\tau} \rightarrow e\mu/e\tau/\mu\tau$	$e\mu,e au,\mu au$			3.2	$\tilde{\nu}_{\tau}$				1.9 $\lambda'_{311} = 0.11, \lambda_{132/133/233} = 0.07$	1607.08079
	$\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm} \tilde{\chi}_1^{\mp} / \tilde{\chi}_2^0 \to WW/Z\ell\ell\ell\ell\nu\nu$	4 <i>e</i> , μ	0 jets	E_T^{miss}	36.1	$\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm}/\tilde{\chi}_2^0 [\lambda_{i33} \neq 0, \lambda_{12k} \neq 0]$		0.82	1.33	$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=100 \text{ GeV}$	1804.03602
>	$\tilde{g}\tilde{g}, \tilde{g} \rightarrow qq\tilde{\chi}_1^0, \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \rightarrow qqq$	4	-5 large-R je Multiple	ets	36.1 36.1	$\tilde{g} [m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=200 \text{ GeV}, 1100 \text{ GeV}] \\ \tilde{g} [\lambda_{112}''=2e-4, 2e-5]$		1.0	1.3 5	1.9 Large $\lambda_{112}^{"}$ 2.0 m($\tilde{\chi}_1^0$)=200 GeV, bino-like	1804.03568 ATLAS-CONF-2018-003
RР	$\tilde{t}\tilde{t}, \tilde{t} \rightarrow t\tilde{\chi}_1^0, \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \rightarrow tbs$		Multiple		36.1	\tilde{t} [λ_{323}'' =2e-4, 1e-2]	0.55	1.0	5	$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)=200$ GeV, bino-like	ATLAS-CONF-2018-003
	$\tilde{t}\tilde{t}, \tilde{t} \rightarrow b\tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm}, \tilde{\chi}_{1}^{\pm} \rightarrow bbs$		$\geq 4b$		139	ĩ	Forbidden	0.95		$m(\tilde{\chi}_1^{\pm})$ =500 GeV	ATLAS-CONF-2020-016
	$\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow bs$		2 jets + 2 b		36.7	$\tilde{t}_1 [qq, bs]$	0.42 0.6	61			1710.07171
	$\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow q\ell$	2 <i>e</i> ,μ 1 μ	2 <i>b</i> DV		36.1 136	$ ilde{t}_1 \ ilde{t}_1 \ ilde{t}_{1} \ ilde{t}_{23k} < ext{1e-8}, ext{3e-10} < \lambda'_{23k} \ ilde{t}_{23k} \ ilde{t}_{2$	<3e-9]	1.0	0.4-1.45 1.	$\begin{array}{c} BR(\tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow be/b\mu) > 20\%\\ BR(\tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow q\mu) = 100\%, \cos\theta_i = 1 \end{array}$	1710.05544 2003.11956
Only	a selection of the available ma	ss limits on	new state	s or	1	0^{-1}			1	Mass scale [TeV]	

phenomena is shown. Many of the limits on new states or simplified models, c.f. refs. for the assumptions made.

LBYL IN PROTON-PROTON OR LEAD-LEAD COLLISIONS?

System	$\sqrt{s_{_{ m NN}}} \mathcal{L}_{ m AB} \cdot \Delta t \gamma$		$R_{ m A}$	$\omega_{ m max}$	$\sqrt{s_{\gamma \gamma}^{ m max}}$	$\sigma^{\rm excl}_{\gamma \gamma ightarrow \gamma \gamma}$	$N_{\gamma \gamma}^{ m excl}$ (per year)	
	(TeV)	(per year)		(fm)	(GeV)	(GeV)	$[m_{\gamma\gamma} > 5 \text{ GeV}]$	$[m_{\gamma \gamma} > 5 \text{ GeV}, \text{ after cuts}]$
p-p	14	$1 {\rm ~fb^{-1}}$	7455	0.7	2450	4500	$105 \pm 10 \text{ fb}$	12
p-Pb	8.8	$200 \ \mathrm{nb}^{-1}$	4690	7.1	130	260	$260\pm26~\rm pb$	6
Pb-Pb	5.5	1 nb^{-1}	2930	7.1	80	160	370 ± 70 nb	70



LbyL in proton-proton system:

- > In total 100 fb⁻¹ at 8 and 13 TeV —> ~1200 events
- ► Harder photon spectrum
- Larger pileup in 2017 up to 60 simultaneous interactions
- Larger backgrounds from Central Exclusive Production (CEP)





- LbyL in peripheral lead-lead collisions:
 - ➤ 0.5 nb⁻¹ at 5.02 TeV —> ~35 events
 - ► Softer photon spectrum
 - Almost no pileup very clean environment for photon studies
 - ► Background from CEP reduced

PHOTON CONVERSIONS IN ATLAS

- There is a lot of inactive material in the ID which make a probability of photon conversion quite high
 - ► Weight: 4.5 tons
 - Active sensors and mechanics account each only for ~ 10% of material budget
- ► Momentum of the photon is not simply shared equally between the electron and the positron
 - Some fraction of the photon conversions will be highly asymmetric, and either the electron or the positron may be produced with very low energy
 - If energy falls below the threshold required to produce a reconstructable track in the ID, then the converted photon will be seen to have only one track, and will be difficult to distinguish from a single electron or positron



EXCLUSIVE MEASUREMENTS IN PP COLLISIONS

- ► $\chi \chi \rightarrow |+|$ production <u>PLB 749</u> (2015) 242-261
 - pp collisions at 7 TeV with 4.6 fb⁻¹ of data
 - In agreement with Standard Model predictions
- > yy → W+W- production <u>PRD94</u> (2016) 3, 032011
 - pp collisions at 8 TeV with 20.2 fb⁻¹ of data
 - Establish 3σ evidence for W+Wproduction which is consistent with theory
 - ► Search for $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow H+H-$, upper limit set to 1.2 pb



41

BSM SEARCHES: MAGNETIC MONOPOLES

In 1934 Born and Infeld a conceptually distinct nonlinear modification of the Lagrangian of QED

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm BI} = \beta^2 \Big(1 - \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{2\beta^2} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{16\beta^4} (F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu})^2} \Big)$$

- where β is an a priori unknown parameter with the dimension of [Mass]², $\beta = M^2$
- In 1985 Fradkin and Tseytlin found a connection of BI theory with the string theory, extra dimensions
 - M might have any value between a few hundred GeV and the Planck scale ~ 10¹⁹GeV
 - Recently it was pointed out that a a finite-energy electroweak monopole is a solution which is a consequence of the BI theory
- John Ellis et al interpreted the LbyL measurement by ATLAS in the BI theory which allowed to put a lower limit on M (Phys. Rev. Lett. 118, 261802)



Limits:

 $M = \sqrt{\beta} \ge 100 \text{ GeV}$ $M_{\text{monopole}} \ge 11 \text{ TeV}$

THREE orders of magnitude stronger limits than the previous one!

Unfortunately, this search is beyond the reach of MoEDAL or any other experiment at the LHC, but could lie within reach of a similar experiment at any future 100-TeV pp collider or of a cosmic ray experiment. ► Transverse momentum, p_T

 $p_{\rm T} = \sqrt{p_{\rm x}^2 + p_{\rm y}^2}$

> Polar angle, θ

> Azimuthal angle, ϕ

► Pseudorapidity, η

$$\eta \equiv -\ln\left[\tan\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)\right],$$

$$\eta \equiv 0$$

$$\eta = 0$$

$$\eta = 0.88$$

$$\eta = 0.88$$

$$\theta = 90^{\circ}$$

$$\eta = 0.88$$

$$\eta = 0.88$$

HEAVY-ION PHYSICS PROGRAM IN ATLAS



One of the main goals of heavy-ion (HI) physics is to study the QGP

► Use variety of final states to provide insight into properties of the QGP

- ► Hard probes
 - ► Color objects e.g. jets, hadrons insight into partonic energy loss in the QGP
 - Colorless objects e.g. electroweak bosons standard candles in the medium, look for nuclear effects on PDFs

► Bulk particle production

- Sensitivity to initial geometry, initial conditions, collective behaviour, etc
- ► Understand the origin of ridge in small systems

► Ultra peripheral collisions

 Use gamma-gamma or gamma-nucleus interactions to study initial state, explore QED, also a potential window for BSM physics