BlackM ax: A black-hole event generator with rotation, recoil, split branes and brane tension.
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We present a comprehensive black-hole event generator, BlackM ax, which simulates the experimental signatures of micro-black-hole production and evolution at the LHC in the context of brane world models with low-scale quantum gravity. The generator is based on phenomenologically realistic models free of serious problems that plague low-scale gravity, thus offering more realistic predictions for hadron-hadron colliders. The generator includes all of the black-hole grey-body factors known to date and incorporates the effects of black-hole rotation, splitting between the fermions, non-zero brane tension and black-hole recoil due to Hawking radiation (although not all simultaneously).

The generator can be interfaced with H e n g y and Pythia.

The main code can be downloaded from [1].
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I. INTRODUCTION

Models with TeV-scale quantum gravity [2,3,4,5] or very rich collider phenomenology. Most of them assume the existence of a three-plus-one-dim ensional hypersurface, which is referred as the "brane," where Standard Model particles are confined, while only gravity and possibly other particles that carry no gauge quantum numbers, such as right-handed neutrinos can propagate in the full space, so called "bulk." Under certain assumptions, this setup allows for the fundamental quantum-gravity energy scale, $M$, to be close to the electroweak scale. The observed weakness of gravity compared to other forces on the brane (i.e., in the laboratory) is a consequence of the large volume of the bulk which dilutes the strength of gravity.

In the context of these models of TeV-scale quantum gravity, probably the most exciting new physics is the production of micro-black-holes in near-future accelerators like the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) [2]. A corollary to the "coincidence" [2] of the impact parameter of two colliding particles is less than two times the gravitational radius, $r_g$, corresponding to their center-of-mass energy ($E_{CM}$), a black hole with a mass of the order of $E_{CM}$ and horizon radius, $r_g$, would form. Typically, this gravitational radius is approximately $E_{CM} = M^2$. Thus, when particles collide at center-of-mass energies above $M$, the probability of a black-hole formation is high.

Strictly speaking, there exist no complete calculation (including radiation during the process of formation and back-reaction) which proves that a black hole really forms. It may happen that a true event horizon and singularity never form $s$ and that Hawking (or rather Hawking-like) radiation is never quite there at all. In [3] this question was analyzed in detail from a point of view of a asymptotic observer, who is in the context of the LHC the most relevant observer. It was shown that such observers never observe the formation of an event horizon even in the full quantum treatment, they do register pre-Hawking quantum radiation that takes away energy from a collapsing system. Pre-Hawking radiation is non-them at all and becomes them alone in the limit when the horizon is formed. Since a collapsing system has only a finite amount of energy, it disappears before the horizon is seen to be formed. While these results have important implications for theoretical issues like the information loss paradox, in a practical sense very little will change. The characteristic time for gravitational collapse in the context of collisions of particles at the LHC is very short. This implies that pre-Hawking radiation will be quickly experimentally indistinguishable from Hawking radiation calculated for a real black hole. Also, calculations in [3] indicate that the characteristic time in which a collapsing system loses all of its energy is very similar to a life time of a real black hole. Thus, one may proceed with a standard theory of black-holes.

Once a black-hole is formed, it is believed to decay via Hawking radiation. This Hawking radiation will consist of two parts: radiation of Standard Model particles into the brane and radiation of gravitons and any other bulk modes into the bulk. The relative probability for the emission of each particle type is given by the grey-body factor for that mode. This grey-body factor depends on the properties of the particle (charge, spin, mass, etc.) and en-
tum), of the black-hole (mass, spin, charge) and, in the context of TeV-scale quantum gravity, on environmental properties (the number of extra dimensions, the location of the black-hole relative to the brane (or branes), etc.). In order to properly describe the experimental signatures of black-hole production and decay one must therefore calculate the gray-body factors for all of the relevant degrees of freedom.

There are several black-hole event generators available in the literature based on particular, string model ideas of low-scale quantum gravity and incorporating limited aspects of micro-black-hole physics. Unfortunately, low-scale gravity is plagued with many phenomenological challenges like fast proton decay, large neutrino oscillations, axion-changing neutral currents and large mixing between leptons. For a realistic understanding of the experimental signatures of black-hole production and decay, one needs calculations based on phenomenologically viable gravity model ideas, and incorporating all necessary aspects of the production and evolution of the black-holes.

One low-scale gravity model in which the above mentioned phenomenological challenges can be addressed is the split-femion model. In this model, the Standard Model fields are condensed to a "thick brane", much thicker than $M^{-1}$. Within this thick brane, quarks and leptons are stuck on di erent three-dimensional slices (or on di erent branes), which are separated by much more than $M^{-1}$. This separation causes an exponential suppression of all direct couplings between quarks and leptons, because of exponentially small overlaps between their wave-functions. The proton decay rate will be safely suppressed if the spatially small all overlaps between their wave-functions. Since $B = 2$ processes, like $K^0$ oscillations, are mediated by operators of the type $ud^c$, suppressing them requires a further splitting between up-type and down-type quarks. Since the experimental limits on $B = 2$ operators are much less stringent than those on $B = 1$ operators, the $u$ and $d$-type quarks need only be separated by a few times the width of their wave functions.

Current black-hole generators assume that the black-holes that are formed are Schwarzschild-like. However, most of the black-holes that would be formed at the LHC would be highly rotating, due to the non-zero in p Three parameters of the colliding partons. Due to the existence of an ergosphere (a region between the inner redshift surface and the event horizon), a rotating black-hole exhibits super-radiance: some modes of radiation get amplified compared to others. The exact e ect of super-radiance is strongly spin-dependent, with emission of higher-spin particles strongly favored. In particular, the emission of gravitons is enhanced over lower-spin Standard Model particles. Since graviton emission appears in detectors as missing energy, the effects of black-hole rotation cannot be ignored. Similarly, black-holes may be formed with non-zero gauge charge, or acquire charge during their decay. This again may alter the decay properties of the black-hole and should be included.

Another aspect neglected in other generators is the recoil of the black-hole. A small black-hole attached to a brane in a higher-dimensional space emitting quanta into the bulk could leave the brane as a result of recoil. In this case, visible black-hole radiation would cease. Alternatively, in a split-brane model, as a black-hole traverses the thick brane the Standard Model particles that it is able to emit will change depending on which fermionic branes are nearby.

It is also the case that virtually all the work in this field has been done for the idealized case where the brane tension is negligible. However, one generically expects the brane tension to be of the order of the fundamental energy scale, being determed by the vacuum energy contributions of brane-localized matter. A shown in Fig. 1, nine brane tension models the standard gray-body factors.

Finally, it has been suggested that matter on the formation and evaporation of black-holes will be gravitational scattering of parton pairs into a two-body final state. We include this possibility.

Here we present a comprehensive black-hole event generator, BlackMax, that takes into account practically all of the above mentioned issues, and includes almost all the necessary gray-body factors. Preliminary studies show how the signatures of black-hole production and decay change when one includes splitting between the fermions, black-hole rotation, positive brane tension and black-hole recoil. Future papers will explore the implications of these changes in greater detail.

In Section II and III, we discuss the production of black-holes and the gray-body factors respectively. The evaporation process and final burst of the black-holes is discussed in Section IV and V. Sections VI and VII describe the input and output of the generator. Section VIII shows some characteristic distributions of black-holes for different extra dimensions scenarios. The reference list is extensive, reflecting the great interest in the topic.

1 A) although if the black-hole carries gauge charge it will be prevented from leaving the brane.
2 Although not necessarily simultaneously.
3 Except in the case where the graviton gray-body factor for a rotating black-hole, where the horizons have yet to be achieved.
II. BLACK-HOLE PRODUCTION

We assume that the fundamental quantum-gravity energy scale \( M \) is not too far above the electroweak scale. Consider two particles colliding with a center-of-mass energy \( E_{CM} \). They will also have an angular mom emum \( J \) in their center-of-mass (CM) frame. By the hoop conjecture, if the impact parameter, \( b \), between the two colliding particles is smaller than the diameter of the horizon of a \((d+1)\)-dimensional black-hole (where \( d \) is the total number of space-like dimensions) of mass \( M = E_{CM} \) and angular mom emum \( J \),

\[
b < 2r_h(d; M; J);
\]

then a black-hole with \( r_h \) will form. The cross section for this process is approximately equal to the interaction area \( (2r_h)^2 \).

In Boyer-Lindquist coordinates, the metric for a \((d+1)\)-dimensional rotating black-hole (with angular mom emum parallel to the \( t \) in the rest frame of the black-hole) is:

\[
ds^2 = \frac{r^4 d}{(r;)} dt^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d^2 + 2a \sin^2 \theta \frac{r^4 d}{(r;)} dt d\theta + \frac{r^4 d}{(r;)} dr^2 + (r;)^2 d\phi^2
\]

where \( a \) is a parameter related to mass of the black-hole, while

\[
\begin{align*}
\sin \theta &= r^2 + a^2 \cos^2 \theta \\
\cos \theta &= r^2 + a^2
\end{align*}
\]

The mass of the black-hole is

\[
M = \frac{(d+1)A_d}{16 \cdot G_d};
\]

and

\[
J = \frac{2M a}{d-1}
\]

is its angular mom emum. Here,

\[
A_d = \frac{2^{d+2}}{(d-2)}
\]

is the hyper-surface area of a \((d+1)\)-dimensional unit sphere. The higher-dimensional gravitational constant \( G_d \) is defined as

\[
G_d = \frac{d^4}{4M^{d-1}}.
\]

FIG. 1: Horizon radius (in \( \text{GeV}^{-1} \)) of a non-rotating black-hole as a function of mass for 4-10 spatial dimensions.

The horizon occurs when \( r_h = 0 \). That is at a radius given in explicitly by

\[
r_h^{(d)} = \frac{1}{1 + (a=r_h^{(d)})^2} = \frac{r_h^{(d)}}{1 + (a=r_h^{(d)})^2};
\]

Here

\[
r_h^{(d)} = \frac{1}{1-(d-2)}
\]

is the Schwarzchild radius of a \((d+1)\)-dimensional black-hole, i.e., the horizon radius of a non-rotating black-hole. Equation \( \text{(10)} \) can be rewritten as:

\[
r_h^{(d)}(E_{CM}; r; M) = k(d)M^{1-E_{CM}M} \frac{r_h^{(d)}}{1-(d-2)};
\]

where

\[
k(d) = \frac{2^d}{d(6)^{d-2}}
\]

Figure 1 shows the horizon radius as a function of black-hole mass for \( d \) from 4 to 10. We see that the horizon radius increases with mass; it also increases with \( d \).

Figure 2 shows the Hawking temperature of a black-hole

\[
T_h = \frac{d-2}{4r_h}
\]

as a function of the black-hole mass for \( d \) from 4 to 10. The Hawking temperature is a measure of the characteristic energies of the particles emitted by the black-hole. \( T_h \) decreases with increasing mass. However, the behavior of \( T_h \) with changing \( d \) is complicated, reflecting the competing effects of an increasing horizon radius and an increasing \( d \).

For the model with with non-zero tension brane, the radius of the black-hole is defined as

\[
r_h^{(t)} = \frac{r_h}{B^{1-\frac{1}{d}}};
\]
with $B$ the de Sitter angle parameter which is inverse proportional to the tension of the brane.

Figure 3 shows the horizon radius as a function of black-hole mass for the model with non-zero tension brane. As the de Sitter angle parameter increases, the size of the black hole increases.

Figure 4 shows the Hawking temperature of a black hole for the model with non-zero tension brane. The Hawking temperature decreases as the de Sitter angle decreases.

Figure 5 shows the horizon radius as a function of black-hole mass for a rotating black hole. The angular momentum decreases the size of the horizon and increases the Hawking temperature (see figures 4 and 5).

If two highly relativistic particles collide with center-of-mass energy $E_{CM}$, and impact parameter $b$, then their angular momentum in the center-of-mass frame before the collision is $L_{in} = bE_{CM} = 2$. Suppose for now that
the black-hole that is formed retains all this energy and angular momentum. Then the mass and angular momentum of the black-hole will be \( M_{\text{in}} = E_{\text{CM}} \) and \( J_{\text{in}} = L_{\text{in}} \). A black-hole will form if:

\[
b < b_{\text{ax}} \quad \text{and} \quad 2r_{\text{ax}}^3(E_{\text{CM}}; b_{\text{ax}}E_{\text{CM}} = 2) < 1\].
\]

We see that \( b_{\text{ax}} \) is a function of both \( E_{\text{CM}} \) and the number of extra dimensions.

We can rewrite this condition (15) as

\[
b_{\text{ax}}(E_{\text{CM}}; b) = 2r_{\text{ax}}^{2/3}(E_{\text{CM}}) ;
\]

There is one exception to this condition. In the case where we are including the effects of the brane tension, the metric (and hence gravity factors) for a rotating black-hole are not known. In this case we consider only non-rotating black-holes. Therefore, for branes with tension

\[
b_{\text{ax}}^{\text{tension}}(E_{\text{CM}}; b) = 2r_{\text{ax}}^{(d)}(E_{\text{CM}}) ;
\]

Also, for branes with tension only the \( d = 5 \) metric is known.

At the LHC, each proton will have \( E = 7 \text{ TeV} \) in the CM frame. Therefore, the total proton-proton center of mass energy will be \( \sqrt{s} = 14 \text{ TeV} \). However, it is not the protons that collide to make the black-holes, but the partons of which the protons are made. If two partons have energy \( \text{E} \) and \( \frac{\text{E}}{\sqrt{s}} \), much greater than those respective masses, then the parton-parton collision will have

\[
s^2 = p_i^2 + p_j^2 = \left( \frac{\text{E}}{\sqrt{s}} \right) + \left( \frac{\text{E}}{\sqrt{s}} \right) = 4\text{E}^2 = us:
\]

We define a quantity \( Q^0 \)

\[
Q^0 = E_{\text{CM}} = \frac{p^0}{s^0} = \frac{p^0}{us} ;
\]

The center-of-mass energy for the two colliding partons will be \( \frac{\text{P}^0}{\text{us}} \), as will be the 4-momentum transfer \( Q^0 \). The largest impact parameter between the two partons that can form a black-hole with this mass will therefore be \( b_{\text{ax}} \) (\( \text{us}^0 \)), as given by equation (15).

The total proton-proton cross section for black-hole production is therefore

\[
\text{pp} \to b \quad (s; p_{\text{pp}}^0) = \frac{Z^4}{\mu^4} e^{4i/(e + 1)} \frac{d}{dz} b_{\text{ax}} \left( \frac{p_{\text{us}}}{z^0} \right)^2 \times
\]

\[
f_{i}(v; Q^0) f_{j}(u = (v; Q^0)) ;
\]

Here \( f_{i}(v; Q^0) \) is the \( i \)-th parton density function. Loosely this is the expected number of partons of type \( i \) and \( m \)-momentum \( v \) to be found in the proton in a collision at \( m \)-momentum transfer \( Q^0 \).
A. Black-Hole Formation in BlackMax

Within BlackMax, the probability of creating a black-hole of center-of-mass energy $P_{s}$ in the collision of two protons of center-of-mass energy $P_{s}$, is given by

$$ P(Q^0) = \frac{2}{u} \frac{dY}{d\nu} \frac{f_i(\nu; Q^0) f_j(\frac{u}{\nu}; Q^0)}{^{(27)}} $$

According to the theory, there will be some minimum mass for a black-hole. We expect $M_{\text{min}} = M_{\text{max}}$, but leave $M_{\text{min}} = M$ as a free parameter. Therefore, a black-hole will only form if $u > M_{\text{min}} = Q^0$. The type of partons from which a black-hole is formed determines the gauge charges of the black-hole. Clearly, the probability to create a black-hole in the collision of any two particular partons $i$ and $j$ with energies (momenta) $vE_i$ and $uE_j$, is given by

$$ P(vE_i, uE_j) = f_i(v; Q^0) f_j(u; v; Q^0) $$

FIG. 7: Cross section for production of a black-hole (rotating or non-rotating) as a function of the number of spatial dimensions, for a tensionless brane, with no fermion brane-splitting.

FIG. 8: Cross section for production of a non-rotating black-hole as a function of the number of spatial dimensions, for a zero-tension brane, with no fermion brane-splitting.

FIG. 9: Cross section for production of a non-rotating black-hole as a function of the number of fermion brane-splitting dimensions for $d = 10$.

FIG. 10: Cross section for formation of a black-hole (rotating or non-rotating) as function of the minimum mass of black-hole, for a zero-tension brane, with no fermion brane-splitting. The vertical lines are the error bars.
The energies and types of the two colliding partons determine their momenta and accept their locations within the ordinary and extra dimensions. For protons moving in the z-direction, we arbitrarily put one of the partons at the origin and locate the second parton randomly within a disk in the xy-plane of radius $R_{\text{max}}$ ($E_{\text{CM}} = \frac{p_{\text{CM}}}{2}$).

We must, however, also take into account that the partons will be separated in the extra dimensions as well. Each parton type is given a wave function in the extra dimension. For fermions, these wave functions are parameterized by their centers and widths which are input parameters (cf. Fig. 13). In the split-fermion case, the centers of these wave functions may be widely separated; but even in the non-split case, the wave functions have non-zero widths. For gauge bosons, the wave functions are taken to be constant across the (thick) brane.

The output from the generator (described in greater detail below) includes the energies, momenta, and types of partons that yielded black holes. The locations in time and space of the black-holes are also output.

The formation of the black-hole is a very non-linear and complicated process. We assume that, before settling down to a stationary phase, a black-hole loses some fraction of its energy, linear and angular momentum. We parameterize these losses by three parameters: $1 \leq f_e$, $1 \leq f_\theta$ and $1 \leq f_\phi$. Thus the black-hole initial state that we actually evolve is characterized by

$$E = E_{\text{in}} f_e; \quad P_z = P_{z\text{in}} f_{P_z}; \quad J^0 = L_{\text{in}} f_l;$$

(29)

where $E_{\text{in}}$, $P_{z\text{in}}$ and $L_{\text{in}}$ are initial energy, momentum and angular momentum of colliding partons, while $f_e$, $f_{P_z}$ and $f_l$ are the fractions of the initial energy, momentum and angular momentum that are retained by the stationary black-hole. We expect that most of the energy lost in the non-linear regime is radiated in the form of gravitational waves and thus represents missing energy. Yoshino and Rychkov [46] have calculated the energy losses by numerical simulation of collisions. Their results will be incorporated in a future upgrade of BlackMax.

For a small black-hole, the numerical value for the angular momentum is of the order of several $\hbar$. In that range of values, angular momentum is quantized. Therefore a black-hole cannot have arbitrary values of angular momentum. We keep the actual angular momentum of the black-hole, $J$, to be the nearest half-integer, i.e. $2J = 2J^0 + \frac{1}{2}$.

The loss of the initial angular momentum in the non-linear regime has as a consequence that the black-hole angular momentum is no longer in the transverse plane of the colliding protons. We therefore introduce a tilt in the angular momentum

$$\cos \frac{1}{2}(p_{\gamma - J}) = \cos \frac{J}{J(J+1)};$$

(30)

Figure 12 illustrates this geometry.

In this version of the generator, we have assumed that the angular momentum quantum numbers of the black-hole were $(J; J_m = J)^4$. We next randomly choose an angle $\theta$, and then reset the angular momentum axis to $(\theta)$.
III. GRAY-BODY FACTORS

Once the black-hole settles down to its stationary configuration, it is expected to emit semi-classical Hawking radiation. The emission spectra of different particles from a given black-hole depend in principle on the mass, spin and charge of the black-hole, on the environment and on the mass and spin of the particular particle. Wherever possible we have made use of the correct emission spectrum often phrased in terms of the gray-body factor for black-holes in 3+1-dimensional space-time. In most cases these were extant in the literature, but we have calculated the spectra for the split-fermion model ourselves, and reproduced existing spectra independently. The sources of the gray-body factors are summarized in Table I.

Non-rotating black-hole on a tensionless brane: For a non-rotating black-hole, we used previously known gray-body factors for spin 0; 1 = 2 and 1 excitations in the brane, and for spin 2 excitations (i.e., gravitons) in the bulk.

Rotating black-hole on a tensionless brane: For rotating black-holes, we used known gray-body factors for spin 0; 1 = 2 and 1 excitations on the brane. The correct emission spectrum for spin 2 bulk excitations is not yet known for rotating black-holes, we currently do not allow for the emission of bulk gravitons from rotating black-holes. As discussed below, this remains a serious shortcoming of current micro-black-hole phenomenology, since super-radiance might be expected to significantly increase graviton emission from rotating black-holes, and thus increase the missing energy in a detector.

Non-rotating black-holes on a tensionless brane with fermion brane splitting: In the split-fermion model, gauge excitations can propagate through the bulk as well as on the brane, so we have calculated gray-body factors for spin 0 and 1 excitations propagating through the bulk, but only for a non-rotating black-hole for the split-fermion model. These are shown in Figures 56-51.

Non-rotating black-holes on a non-zero tension brane: The bulk gray-body factors for a brane with non-zero tension are affected by non-zero tension because of the modified bulk geometry (de sit angle). We have calculated gray-body factors for spin 0; 1 and 2 excitations propagating through the bulk, again only for the non-rotating black-hole for a brane with non-zero tension and d = 5.

Two particle final states: We use the same gray-body factors as a non-rotating black-hole to calculate the cross section of two-particle final states (excluding gravitons).

In all cases, the relevant emission spectra are loaded into a data base as described in appendices A.

IV. BLACK-HOLE EVOLUTION

The Hawking radiation spectra are calculated for the black-hole at rest in the center-of-mass frame of the colliding partons. The spectra are then transformed to the laboratory frame as needed. In all cases we have not (yet) taken the charge of the black-hole into account in calculating the emission spectrum but have included phenomenological factors to account for it as explained below.

The degrees of freedom of the Standard Model particles are given in Table I. Using the calculated Hawking spectrum and the number of degrees of freedom per particle, we determine the expected charged ux of each type of particle as a function of black-hole and environmental properties. For each particle type we assign to it a specific energy, ~i, with a probability determined by that particle’s emission spectrum. (The particle “types” are listed in Table II.)

Assume a black-hole with mass Mbh emits a massless particle with energy ~i. The remaining black-hole will have energy and momentum like

(Mbh = ~i; ~i) (31)

Here we ignore the other dimensions. We use a classical model to simulate the events. The mass of the remaining black-hole should remain positive. So from equation (31) one gets

~i < Mbh = 2 (32)

Combining this with the observation that energy of a particle is larger than its mass, leads us to require that

Mbh < ~i (33)

We next need to determine whether that particle with that energy is actually emitted within one generator time step t. The time-step itself is an input parameter (cf. figure 14). We choose a random number N from the interval [0; 1]. Given L, i, the total number of pairs of type i, and N, the number of degrees of freedom of that particle type, the particle will be emitted if

L, i, N > N_i: (34)
function of the mode with those angular quantum numbers.

Once the energy and angular-momentum quantum numbers are determined for the l-th particle type, then, if that particle type carries SU(3) color, we assign the color randomly. The color is treated as a three-dimensional vector \( \mathbf{c}_L = (r;b;g) \), in which a quark’s color-vector is either \((1;0;0),(0;1;0), \text{or } (0;0;1)\). Similarly, an antiquark has \( l \) entries in its color-vector. A gluon’s color-vector has one +1 entry, and one -1 entry.

The black-hole gray-body factors which quantify the relative emission probabilities of particles with different spin are calculated for a fixed background, i.e., assuming that the black-hole metric does not change during the emission process. However, as the black-hole emits particles, the spin and charge of the black-hole do change.

A. Electric and Color Charge Suppression

A charged and highly rotating black-hole will tend to shed its charge and angular momentum. Thus, emission of particles with charges of the same sign as that of the black-hole and angular momentum parallel to the black-hole's spin will be preferred. Emission of particles that increase the black-hole's charge or angular momentum should be suppressed. The precise calculation of these effects has not yet been accomplished. Therefore, to account for these effects, we allow optional phenomenological suppression factors for both charge and angular momentum.

The following charge-suppression factors can currently be used by setting parameter \( a = 1 \) (cf. section 19) equal to 2.

\[
P_Q^0 = \exp\left( \frac{Q^{\text{QEM}}}{a} \right) \quad \text{(37)}
\]

\[
P_a^3 = \exp\left( \frac{Q^{\text{EM}}}{a} \right) \quad a = r; b; g; \quad \text{(38)}
\]

Here \( Q^{\text{QEM}} \) is the electromagnetic charge of the black-hole, \( Q^{\text{EM}} \) is the charge of the emitted particle; \( a^{\text{Q}} \), is the color value for the color \( a \), with \( a = r; b; g \), of the black-hole, and \( c^{\text{EM}} \) is the color value for the color \( a \), with \( a = r; b; g \), of the emitted particle. \( a \) and \( c \) are phenomenological suppression parameters that are set as input parameters of the generator.

We estimate \( Q^{\text{EM}} = 0 \) and \( a = 0 \), where \( a \) and \( c \) are the values of the electromagnetic and strong couplings at the Hawking temperature of the black-hole. Note that we currently neglect the possible restoration of the electroweak symmetry in the vicinity of the black-hole when its Hawking temperature is above the electroweak scale. Clearly, since \( a \) \( 10^2 \) we do not expect electromagnetic (or more correctly) electroweak charge suppression to be significant. However, since \( \mu \) \( (1 \text{ TeV})^{-1/2} \) color suppression may well play a role in the evolution of the black-hole.

\[\text{FIG. 13:} \quad \text{The emitted fermion intensity (normalized to one) as a function of the distance between the black-hole and the center of the gaussian distribution of fermion brane. As the black-hole increases the distance from a fermion brane due to recoil, the intensity of the emitted fermions of that type falls off quickly. The radius of black-hole is set to } 2M^-1. \text{ The width of the fermion brane is } M^{-1}. \text{ The plot is for the case of one extra dimension.}\]
Once we have determined the type of particle to be emitted by the black-hole, we draw a random number \( \mathbb{N}_r \) between 0 and 1 from a uniform distribution. If \( \mathbb{N}_r > F^0 \) then the emission process is allowed to occur, if \( \mathbb{N}_r < F^0 \) then the emission process is aborted. We repeat the same procedure for color suppression factor, \( F^3 \). Thus, particle emission which decreases the magnitude of the charge or color of the black-hole is unsuppressed; this suppression prevents the black-hole from acquiring a large charge/color, and gives preference to particle emission which reduces the charge/color of the black-hole.

**B. Movement of the Black-Hole during Evaporation**

We choose the direction of the momentum of the emitted particle (\( P_e \)) according to equation (39) in the center-of-frame and then transform the energy and momentum to their laboratory frame values \(-J^0\) and \( P^\oplus \). The black-hole properties (energy, momentum, mass, colors, and charge) are then accordingly updated for the next time step:

\[
E(t + J) = E(t) - J^0
\]
\[
P(t + J) = P(t) + P_e^\oplus
\]
\[
M(t + J) = E(t + J)^2 P(t + J)^2
\]
\[
\varepsilon_{\text{bh}}(t + J) = \varepsilon_{\text{bh}}(t)
\]
\[
Q_{\text{bh}}(t + J) = Q_{\text{bh}}(t)
\]

Here \( \varepsilon_{\text{bh}} \) is the color 3-vector of the black-hole and can have arbitrary integer entries.

Due to the recoil from the emitted particle, the black-hole will acquire a velocity \( v \) and move to a position \( x \):

\[
\nu(t) = P(t) = E
\]
\[
x(t + J) = x(t) + \nu(t) J
\]

Since fermions are constrained to live on the 3+1-dimensional regular brane, the recoil from fermions is not important. Only the emission of vector axions, scalar axions and gravitons gives a black hole momentum extradimensional. Once a black hole gains momentum extradimensionally, it is able to leave the regular brane if it carries no gauge charge. In the split fermion case, it can move within the mini-bulk even if it carries gauge charge. In the case of rotating black holes, because the gray-body factor for gravitons is not yet known, graviton emission is turned off in the generator and the black holes experience no bulk recoil.

Recoil can in principle change the radiation spectrum of the black-hole in two ways. First, the spectrum will not be perfectly spherically symmetric in the laboratory frame, but rather boosted due to the motion of the black-hole. However, as we shall see, the black-hole never becomes highly relativistic, so the recoil does not significantly affect the shape of the spectrum.

As the lifetime of a small black-hole is relatively short, and its recoil velocity non-relativistic, it does not move far from its point of creation. However, even a recoil of the order of one fundamental length \( M^{-1} \) in the bulk direction could displace the black-hole from the brane. In single-brane models this would result in apparent missing energy for an observer located on the brane able to detect only Standard Model particles. In the split-fermion model as the black-hole moves or on particular fermion branes, the decay channels open to it will change.

**C. Rotation**

Since two colliding particles always define a single plane of rotation, rotating black-holes are formed with a single rotational parameter. For two particles colliding along the z-axis, there should be only one rotation axis perpendicular to the z-axis. However, due to angular-momentum loss both in the formation process, and subsequently in the black-hole decay, three things can happen: i) the amount of rotation can change, ii) the rotation axis can be altered, and iii) more rotation axes can emerge because there are more than three spatial dimensions. Also, if the colliding particles have a non-zero impact parameter in bulk directions, the plane of rotation will not be entirely in the brane direction. Because solutions do not exist for rotating black-holes with more than one rotation axis, we forbid the emergence of secondary rotation axes. We do, on the other hand, allow the single rotation axis of the black-hole to evolve. However, no gray-body factors are known if the single rotation axis acquires components in the extra dimensions, therefore we limit the rotation axis to the brane dimensions. Relaxing these limitations is a subject for future research.

We next must determine the rotational axis of the black-hole. The rotation parameter of a black-hole with angular momentum quantum numbers \((j,j)\) is taken to be

\[
a = \frac{J + n + \frac{2}{2}}{M - \frac{2}{2}}
\]

where \( J = P_{j(j+1)} \). The direction of the black-hole angular momentum is taken to be

\[
J = j - \frac{P}{j-j} ;
\]

6 This is very unlikely because most of the black-holes have gauge charges.

7 Due to the finite thickness of the single brane or splitting between the quark branes.
where \( \hat{t}_y \) is a unit vector in the plane perpendicular to \( \hat{t} \). We chose the direction of \( \hat{t}_y \) randomly.

When the black-hole em its a particle with angular-momentum quantum numbers \((l_m)\), there are several possible final states in which the black-hole can end up. We use Clebsch-Gordan coefficients to find the probability of each state.

\[
\tilde{C}(j;j|l_m; j^0;j) m \rangle \tilde{C}(j;j|l_m; j^0;j) m > \]

We use \( \tilde{C}(j;j|l_m; j^0;j) m \rangle \) as the probability that the new angular-moment quantum numbers of the black-hole will be \((j^0;j) m \). From angular-moment conservation \( J = \hat{t} + j^0\), we can calculate the tilt angle of the black-hole rotation axis as:

\[
\cos = \frac{j(j+1)+ \frac{1}{2}(j^0+1) \cdot l(l+1)}{2^{j^0} j(j+1)(j^0+1)} \]  

(49)

We randomly choose a direction with the tilt angle as a new rotation axis and change quantum numbers to \((j^0;j)\).

In calculating the gray-body factors, the black hole is always treated as a fixed unchanging background. The power spectrum of emitted particles can be calculated from

\[
\frac{dE}{dt} = \sum_{l_m} A_{lm} \int \exp\left( -\frac{1}{m} = T_{bh} \right) \frac{d!}{12} \]  

(50)

Here \( l \) and \( m \) are angular-moment quantum numbers. \( \mu \) is the energy of the emitted particle. \( \mu \) is defined by

\[
\mu = \frac{a}{1 + a^2 M} \]  

(51)

The exponential factor in the denominator of \( \exp \) causes the black hole to prefer to emit high angular-moment particles. However, since the TeV black holes are quantum black holes, the gray-body factors should really depend on both the initial and final black-hole parameters. The calculation of the gray-body spectra on a fixed background cannot cause some problems. In particular, in the current case, the angular moment of the emitted particle (as indeed the energy) may well be comparable to that of the black hole itself. There should be a suppression of particle emission processes in which the black hole has a large final angular moment. We therefore introduce a new phenomenological suppression factor, parameter \( \eta \), to reduce the probability of emission in which the angular momentum of the black hole changes by a large amount.

If parameter \( \eta \) is equal to 1 (cf. section 4), we do not take into account the suppression of decays which increase the angular moment of the black-hole. If we are using a rate suppression (parameter \( \eta \) equal to \( 2 \)) then

\[
F^L = \exp\left( -\frac{1}{T_{bh}} (t^2 + t^2 - 2t^2 \eta) \right) \]  

(52)

If we are using a \( J_{bh} \) suppression (parameter \( \eta \) equal to \( 3 \)) then

\[
F^L = \exp\left( -\frac{1}{T_{bh}} (t^2 + t^2 - 2t^2 \eta) \right) \]  

(53)

If we are using a \( J_{bh} \) suppression (parameter \( \eta \) equal to \( 4 \)) then

\[
F^L = \exp\left( -\frac{1}{T_{bh}} (t^2 + t^2 - 2t^2 \eta) \right) \]  

(54)

We might expect \( \eta \) to be 1, however there is no detailed theory to support this; indeed there is no detailed theory to choose among these three phenomenological suppression factors. It is also worth noting that, while for \( d = 3 \) and \( d = 4 \) there is a maximum angular-moment entanglement that a black-hole of a given mass can carry, for \( d = 5 \) there is no such upper limit. We do impose that a \( R = 2 \) for \( d = 3 \) and a \( R = 4 \) for \( d = 4 \).

As for the charge and color suppression, we choose a random number \( N_f \), between 0 and 1. If \( N_f > F^L \) then the particle emission is aborted.

The procedure described in this section is then repeated at each time step with each particle type, and then successive time steps are taken until the mass of the black hole falls below \( M \). In practice, the time step should be set short enough that in a given time step the probability that particles of one type are emitted is small. We set the time step to \( T = 10^{-5} \text{GeV} \).

In two-body final states, one expects no black-hole, and hence no black-hole decay by emission of Hawking radiation. The generator therefore proceeds directly to the final burst phase.

\[ \text{V. FINAL BURST} \]

In the absence of a self-consistent theory of quantum gravity, the last stage of the evaporation cannot be described accurately. Once the mass of black-hole becomes close to the fundamental scale \( M \), the classical black-hole solution can certainly not be used anymore. We adopt a scenario in which the final stage of evaporation is a burst of particles which conserves energy, angular momentum and all of the gauge quantum numbers. For definiteness, we assume that the remaining black-hole will decay into the lowest number of Standard-Model particles that conserve all quantum numbers, \( m \) on entum and energy.

A black-hole with electromagnetic charge \( Q_{bh} \) and color-vector \( c_{bh} = (\chi_{bh}, \eta_{bh}, \theta_{bh}) \) will be taken to emit \( N_{1:3} \) down-type quarks (i.e. \( d \) or \( b \) quarks), \( N_{2:3} \) up-type quarks (\( u \) or \( t \)), \( N_{1} \) charged leptons and \( W \)
bosons, N_gluons, and N_quark non-charge particles (i.e., Z and Higgs). We use the following procedure to determine N_{burst} (N_{1} \equiv 3; N_{2} \equiv 3; N_{1} ; N_{gluon} \equiv N_{quark})

Step 1: Preliminary solution:

Search all possible solutions with $N_i = 0$.

Choose the minimum number of particles as preliminary solution.

Step 2: Actual charged/colored emitted particle count:

The preliminary $N_{burst}$ (N_{1} \equiv 3; N_{2} \equiv 3; N_{1} ; N_{gluon} \equiv N_{quark}) having now been determined. If the minimum number of solution is less than 2, we then add $N_i$ to keep the total number equal to 2. Later we choose one of them randomly according to the degrees of freedom of each particle.

After obtaining the number of emitted particles, we randomly assign their energies and momenta subject to the constraint that the total energy and momentum equal that of the final black-hole state. We currently neglect any bulk components of the final black-hole momentum.

VI. INPUT AND OUTPUT

The input parameters for the generator are read from the `le param file.txt`, see Fig. [14]:

1. Number_of_simulations: sets the total number of black-hole events to be simulated;

2. Center_of_mass_energy_of_protons: sets the center-of-mass energy of the colliding protons in GeV;

3. M_ph: sets the fundamental quantum-gravity scale ($M_{pl}$) in GeV;

4. Choose_a_case: defines the extra dimensions model to be simulated:

   (a) 1: non-rotating black-holes on a tensionless brane with possibility of fermion splitting,

   (b) 2: non-rotating black-holes on a brane with non-zero positive tension,

   (c) 3: rotating black-holes on a tensionless brane with $d = 5$,

   (d) 4: two-particle near-state scenario;

5. number_of_extra_dimensions: sets the number of extra dimensions; this must equal 2 for brane with tension (Choose_a_case = 2);

6. number_of_splitting_dimensions: sets the number of extra split-fermion dimensions (Choose_a_case = 1);

7. extradimension_size: sets the size of the minimum bulk in units of $1$ TeV (Choose_a_case = 1);

8. tension: sets the deformation parameter $B$ [12, 13] (Choose_a_case = 2);

9. choose_a_pdf_file: defines which of the different CTEQ6 parton-distribution functions (PDF) to use;

10. Minimum_mass: sets the minimum mass $M_{min}$ in GeV of the initial black-holes;

11. fix_time_step: if equal to 1, then code uses the next parameter to determine the time interval between events; if equal to 2 then code tries to optimize the time step, keeping the probability of emitting a particle in any given time step below 10%.

12. time_step: defines the time interval $t$ in GeV which the generator will use for the black-hole evolution;

13. Mass_loss_factor: sets the loss factor 0 for the energy of the initial black-hole, as defined in equation [29];

14. momentum_loss_factor: defines the loss factor 0 for the momentum of initial black-holes as defined in equation [29];

15. Angular_momentum_loss_factor: sets the loss factor 0 for the angular momentum of initial black-holes as defined in equation [29];

16. Seed: sets the seed for the random-number generator (9 digit positive integer);

17. L_suppression: chooses the model for suppressing the accumulation of large black-hole angular momentum during the evolution phase of the black-holes (cf. discussion surrounding equations [52, 53]):

   1: no suppression;

   2: A rea suppression;

   3: $\eta$ suppression;

   4: $J$ suppression;

---

[5] This is the distance between fermion branes where only gauge bosons and Higgs can propagate in split-fermion brane scenario.
FIG. 14: Parameter.txt is the input file containing the parameters that one can change. The words in parentheses are the parameters that are used in the paper.
18. angular_momentum_suppression_factor: denotes the phenomenological angular momentum suppression factor, \( L \) (cf. discussion surrounding equation [55]).

19. charge_suppression: turns the suppression of accumulation of large black-hole electromagnetic and color charge during the black-hole evolution process on or off (cf. discussion surrounding equation [37]).

\begin{align*}
0: & \text{charge suppression turned off;} \\
1: & \text{charge suppression turned on};
\end{align*}

20. charge_suppression_factor: sets the electromagnetic charge suppression factor, \( q \), in [37].

21. color_suppression_factor: sets the color charge suppression factor, \( q \), in [37];

21-94 (odd entries): the widths of fermion wave functions (in \( M^{-1} \) units) and (even entries): centers of fermion wave functions (in \( M^{-1} \) units) in split-brane models, represented as 3-dimensional vectors (for non-split models, set all entries to 0).

When the code term inates, the le output .txt with all the relevant information (i.e., input parameters, cross section) is output to the working directory. This le contains also different segments of information about the generation of black-holes which are labelled at the beginning of each line with an ID word (Parent, Pbh, trace, Pe m , Pem c or E last):

\textbf{Parent:} identifies the partons whose collision resulted in the formation of the initial black-hole (see Fig. 16).

\begin{align*}
\text{(column 1):} & \text{identifies the black-hole;} \\
\text{(column 2):} & \text{PDG ID code of the parton;} \\
\text{(column 3):} & \text{energy of the parton;} \\
\text{(columns 4-6):} & \text{brane momentum of the parton.}
\end{align*}

\textbf{P bh:} contains the evolution of the charge, color, momentum and energy of the black-holes, and, for rotating black-holes, their angular momentum (cf. Fig. 17).

\begin{align*}
\text{(column 1):} & \text{identifies the black-hole;} \\
\text{(column 2):} & \text{time at which the black-hole emitted a particle;} \\
\text{(column 3):} & \text{PDG ID code of a black-hole;} \\
\text{(column 4):} & \text{three times the electromagnetic charge of the black-hole;} \\
\text{(columns 5 to 7):} & \text{color-charge vector components of the black-hole;}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{(columns 8):} & \text{energy of the black-hole in the laboratory frame;} \\
\text{(columns 9 to 11):} & \text{brane components of the black-hole momentum in the laboratory frame;} \\
\text{(column 12 to (8+ d)):} & \text{brane components of the black-hole momentum;} \\
\text{(column (9+ d)):} & \text{angular momentum of the black-hole, in the case of rotating black-holes; empty otherwise.}
\end{align*}

\textbf{trace:} contains the evolution history of the black-holes’ positions (cf. Fig. 18):

\begin{align*}
\text{(column 1):} & \text{idem identifies the black-hole;} \\
\text{(column 2):} & \text{time at which the black-hole emitted a particle;} \\
\text{(columns 3 to 5):} & \text{the brane components of the black-hole position vector when the black-hole emitted a particle;} \\
\text{(columns 6 to (2+ d)):} & \text{the bulk components of the black-hole position vector, when the black-hole emitted a particle.}
\end{align*}

\textbf{P em :} contains a list of the black-holes, with the history of their evolution (cf. Fig. 19):

\begin{align*}
\text{(column 1):} & \text{identifies the black-hole;} \\
\text{(column 2):} & \text{time at which the black-hole emitted a particle;} \\
\text{(column 3):} & \text{PDG ID code of the emitted particle;} \\
\text{(column 4):} & \text{three times the charge of the emitted particle;} \\
\text{(columns 5 to 7):} & \text{color-vector components of the emitted particle;} \\
\text{(column 8):} & \text{energy of the emitted particle in the laboratory frame;} \\
\text{(columns 9 to 11):} & \text{brane components of the momentum of the emitted particle, in the laboratory frame;} \\
\text{(columns 12 to (8+ d)):} & \text{brane components of the momentum of the emitted particle.}
\end{align*}

\textbf{Pem c:} contains the same information as Pem, but in the center-of-mass frame of the collision.

\textbf{E last:} contains the same information as Pem for the particles emitted in the final decay burst of the black-hole. Columns 12 and onwards are omitted as these particles have no bulk momentum.
FIG. 15: Output.txt. There are three parts to this file. The first part is a copy of parameter.txt. The second part includes information about the black-hole and the emitted particles. The first column identifies the type of information each row is supplying (parent is information about the two incoming partons; Pbh is information on the energy and momenta of the produced black-holes; trace describes the location of the black-holes; Pem characterizes the emitted particles in the lab frame; Pemc characterizes the emitted particles in the center-of-mass frame; Elast describes the final burst.

The third part of the file is the black-hole production cross-section as inferred from the events in this generator run.

VII. RESULTS

We choose the following parameters for the distributions shown in this section and normalize them to an integrated luminosity of 10 fb⁻¹, unless otherwise stated. The values of the parameters are chosen to be the same as in figure 14, except where a parameter is varied to study its effect.

- Number of simulations = 10000;
- Center of mass energy of protons = 14000 GeV;
- \( M_{ph} = 1000 \text{ GeV} \);
- extradimension size = 10 TeV⁻¹;
- choose = pdf file = 0;
- Minimum mass = 5000 GeV;
- time step = 10⁵ GeV⁻¹;
- Mass loss factor = 0.0;
- Momentum loss factor = 0.0;
- Angular momentum loss factor = 0.2;
- Seed = 123589341;
- L suppression = 1;
charge suppression = 1;

charge suppression factor irrelevant since charge suppression = 1;

color suppression factor irrelevant since charge suppression = 1;

widths of fermion wave functions = 1 M_1;

centers of quark wave functions:
(10^{2} = 3; 0; 0; ::::;) (GeV^{-1}) (i.e. all quarks have Gaussian wave functions centered on a point displaced from the origin by 10^{2} = 3 GeV^{-1} in the rest splitting direction);

distribution center of leptons:
(10^{2} = 3; 0; 0; ::::;) (GeV^{-1}).

In this section, we present some distributions of properties of the initial and evolving black-holes and of the particles which are emitted by them during the Hawking radiation and null-burst phases.

A. Mass of the Initial Black-Holes

Figures 24, 25, and 26 show the initial black-hole mass distribution for three different scenarios: non-rotating black-holes on a tensionless brane, non-rotating black-holes on a non-zero tension brane and non-rotating black-holes with split fermion branes respectively. Because we chose 5 TeV as the minimum mass of the initial black-hole, the distributions have a cut-off at 5 TeV.

B. Movement of Black-Holes in the Bulk

The generator includes recoil of black-holes due to Hawking radiation. The recoil modulates the spectrum due to the Doppler effect. Even if the effect is small, the high energy tail of the emitted particle’s energy spectrum is longer than for pure Hawking radiation. Fig. 24 shows the random motion in the mini-bulk for 10,000 black-holes as consequence of recoil. While most of the black-holes remain on the brane where they were formed, a significant number of them are capable of drifting all the way to the lepton brane. There are also a few events where the black holes leave the mini-bulk completely. Since Standard Model charges are conserved in the mini-bulk, a black-hole needs to carry zero charge in order to be able to leave the mini-bulk. None of them in the bulk, a black-hole cannot emit Standard Model particles anyway. Models with an additional bulk Z_2 symmetry (e.g. Randall-Sundrum models) do not allow for a black-hole escape from the brane [21]. Unfortunately, the number of black-holes which escape the mini-bulk is so small that experimentally we are unlikely to be able to distinguish between models on this basis.

C. Initial Black-Hole Charge Distribution

Most of the initial black-holes are created by u and d quarks. Denote by N_{30} the number of black-holes that have electron magnetic charge Q. Fig. 25 is a histogram of 30 for n_s = 0, n_s = 4, and n_s = 7 in d = 10 space. Since at these parton momenta, there are roughly twice as many u-quarks in a proton as d-quarks, we expect that most of the black-holes have 3 Q = 4, i.e. are made of two
FIG. 18: Lines in the output file headed by the ID = trace contain the location of the black-hole in each emission step.

FIG. 19: Lines in the output file headed by the ID = Pem contain the type of the emitted particles, their energies and momenta in the lab frame and the times of their emission.

FIG. 20: Lines in the output file headed by the ID = Elast contain the types, energies and momenta of particles of the final burst.
Fig. 21: Mass distribution of initial black-holes (rotating and non-rotating) on a tensionless brane for various numbers of extra dimension.

Fig. 22: Mass distribution of initial (non-rotating) black-holes on a non-zero tension brane for $B = 1$, $B = 0.8$, and $B = 0.6$.

u-quarks ($f_{uu}$). One does indeed see a large peak at $3Q = 4$ in figure 22. A second peak at $3Q = 1$ corresponds to black-holes made of one d and one u-quark, or from one antidi and one gluon. Since there are only a few gluons or anti-quarks at these momenta, $f_{ud}$ is small.

Similarly, the small peak at $3Q = 2$ is predominantly dd and not u-gluon.

We expect that $f_{ud} \sim 2f_{uu}^{\text{adj}}$, and thus $f_{1} \sim 2f_{ud}$ in the split-fermion case. In the split-fermion case, since gluons can move in the minibulk, there is a further suppression of the gluon contribution due to the wave-function-overlap suppression between the gluons and fermions. In particular $3Q = 2$ and $3Q = 1$, which are dominated by gluon-quark collisions, are suppressed, as can be seen in Fig. 23. For a large number of split dimensions, there are almost no gluon-gluon or gluon-quark black-holes. The decline in the gluon-quark configurations accounts for the simultaneous rise in the fraction of quark-only configurations (le. $3Q = 4; 1; 2$).

D. Initial Black-Hole Color Distribution

The colliding partons that form the black-hole carry gauge charges, in particular color and electromagnetic...
From the PDFs [32] we see that, at the relevant parton momentum, most of the partons are u and d type quarks (essentially the valence quarks). Contributions from the sea (other quarks, antiquarks, gluons and other partons) are subdominant. We therefore estimate the distribution of the colors of the initial black-holes to be

\[ N_i(0) : N_i(1) : N_i(2) = 4 : 4 : 1 \]  

(55)

Here \( N_i(p) \) is the number of black-holes whose \( i \)-th color-vector component \((1 = \text{red}, 2 = \text{blue}, 3 = \text{green})\) has the value \( p \). This agrees very well with the graph in Fig. 26. \( N_i(1) \) and \( N_i(2) \) refer to black-holes created from collisions involving gluons or anti-quarks. Their numbers are hard to estimate, but we expect that \( N_i(2) \leq N_i(0) \leq N_i(1) \), again consistent with Fig. 26.

At energy scales accessible at the LHC, the color distribution of black-holes in different brane world models does not differ from each other significantly. However, were \( \text{M} = 4 \) signifi cantly lower (at or below 1 TeV), then black-hole production by gluon-gluon scattering would be more in portant, signifi cantly altering the color distribution, and making it more sensitive to fi ve mon brane splitting (which lowers the gluon-gluon contribution).

\[ \text{E. Evolution of Black-Hole Color and Charge during the Hawking Radiation Phase} \]

Figure 27 shows the color distribution of the black-holes which accumulate during the evaporation phase. From equation 55, the expected average initial color of the black-holes is \( 2 = 3 \). Since the colors of emitted particles are assigned randomly, we expect the cumulative color distribution (CCD) to be symmetric around \( 2 = 3 \) and peaked at the value. This is indeed what we nd.

\[ \text{Fig. 25: Electromagnetic charge distribution of the initial black-holes.} \]

\[ \text{Fig. 26: Initial color distribution of the created black-holes. The vertical lines are error bar.} \]

\[ \text{Fig. 27: Cumulative color distribution for non-rotating black-holes on a tensionless brane with } d = 4 \text{ and no fermion brane splitting. Histogram with the black squares (open circles) is with (without) color suppression.} \]

The width of the CCD depends on the total number of particles emitted by the black-hole during its evaporation phase.

As discussed above, we allow for the possibility of suppressing particle emission which increases the charge, color or angular momentum of the black-hole excessively (cf. discussion around equations 37, 50). Figure 27 shows also the cumulative black-hole color distribution when we suppressed the accumulation of large color charges during the evaporation phase. In order to amplify the effect of color suppression, we have set \( f_3 = 20 \) instead of the expected \( f_3 = 0.1 \). We see that the number of black-holes with a color charge larger than 1 is decreased.
F. Number of emitted particles

**Figure 28:** Number of particles emitted by a non-rotating black-hole on a tensionless brane prior to the "nalburst" as function of number of extra dimensions. Here $n_s = 0$. The error bars denote one standard deviation range.

**Figure 29:** Number of particles emitted by a non-rotating black-hole in the split-fermion model prior to the "nalburst" as a function of the number of brane-splitting dimensions, with $d = 10$. Error bars denote one standard deviation range.

**Figure 30:** Number of particles emitted by a non-rotating black-hole on a non-zero tension brane prior to the "nalburst" as function of the z-polarization angle parameter $B$ with $d = 5$ and $n_s = 2$. Error bars denote one standard deviation range.

**Figure 31:** Number of particles emitted by a rotating black-hole prior to the "nalburst" as function of number of extra dimensions with $n_s = 0$. Error bars denote one standard deviation range.

Figures 28 through 31 show the number of particles that are emitted by a microscopic black-hole during the decay process before its "nalburst" for a variety of models.

In the single tensionless brane model (Fig. 28), the number of emitted particles first increases with the number of dimensions for a non-rotating black-hole, but then decreases. This behavior is a result of the complicated interplay of a number of effects: the horizon size of a black-hole of a given mass as a function of $d$, and its effect on the particle emission spectra; the dependence of the Hawking temperature on $r_{h}$; the existence due to energy-momentum conservation of an upper limit of $M_{\text{BH}} = 2$ on the energy of an emitted particle. The location of the peak will shift as a function of the input parameter $M_{\text{min}}$, the minimum initial mass of a black-hole.

In the split fermion model (Fig. 29), the number of emitted particles decreases with the number of extra dimensions. This is because, even for a fixed Hawking temperature, the average energies of emitted gauge bosons and scalar fields increase as $n_s$ increases.

In the model with a finite tension brane (Fig. 30),...
the number of particles decreases as the parameter B increases, i.e. with decreasing tension. As the tension increases, B gets smaller but the horizon radius of the black-hole increases. The Hawking temperature therefore decreases, and, as a consequence, the average energy of emitted particles falls. More particles will therefore be emitted in the evolution of the black-hole. For rotating black-holes (Fig. 31) (on a tensionless, unsplit brane), the number of emitted particles first increases, then decreases, and finally reaches a plateau. This is due to similar reasons as for non-rotating black-holes. Compared to non-rotating black-holes of the same mass, rotation shifts the energy of emitted particles to higher values because it decreases the horizon radius and increases the emission of higher angular-momentum particles. This decreases the total number of emitted particles. It also means that the effect of the upper kink at \( t = \frac{\pi}{2} \) on the emitted particle’s energy is magnified.

Figure 32 shows the number of particles that are emitted at the final burst stage for a non-rotating black-hole on a tensionless brane with \( d = 5 \) and \( n_s = 0 \). The average number of emitted particles is about 3. During the Hawking radiation phase a black-hole emits about 10 particles, so approximately 30% of the emitted particles will be from the final burst stage. In the case examined in Figure 32, we did not include suppression of large black-hole color or electric charge. Thus, as black-holes acquire larger color and electric charges by the end of the Hawking radiation phase, these black-holes must decay into a larger number of particles (> 5) in the final burst.

G. Energy Distributions of the Emitted Particles

Once formed, the black-holes decay by emission of Hawking radiation, a process which continues until the mass of the black-hole falls to the fundamental quantum-gravity scale. At this stage we choose the black-holes to burst into a set of Standard Model particles as described in section V. The observable signatures of the decay will depend on the distributions of energy, momentum, and particle types of the emitted particles.

Figures 33 through 36 show the relation between the mass of the evolving black-hole and the average energy of emitted particles for different extra dimensions models. The error bars denote the standard deviation of emitted energy. The mass of the initial black-hole is taken to be \( M_{\text{in}} = 5 \text{TeV} \).

We see from Figure 33 that, for a single (i.e. unsplit) brane, when \( M_{\text{bh}} >> M_{\text{c}} \), a black-hole in \( d = 10 \) emits higher energy particles than a black-hole in lower dimensions. For black-hole masses closer to \( M_{\text{c}} \), the highest energy particles are emitted when the dimensionality of space is low, i.e. \( d = 4 \). This reversal can be understood from Figure 34. In the LHC energy range, the curves of Hawking temperature as a function of black-hole mass for different dimension models cross. At high mass, high \( d \) exhibits the highest Hawking temperature; at low mass, low \( d \) exhibits the highest Hawking temperature. It is easy from this figure to estimate the number of emitted particles, and to roughly reproduce the results shown in Figure 34.

The main difference between the curves for different \( d \), comes from the changing size of the black-hole horizon. For low \( d \), the horizon radius increases more quickly with mass than for higher \( d \), as seen in Figure 35. The Hawking temperature of the black-hole is inversely proportional to \( r_\text{h} \). So long as the Hawking temperature remains below the black-hole mass (for \( M_{\text{bh}} > 2\text{TeV} \)), the energy of emitted particles decreases as the mass increases. However as equations (11-12) show, this change is slow for high \( d \). By \( d = 10 \), the energy of emitted particles is almost constant from \( 2\text{TeV} \) to \( 5\text{TeV} \).

The increase of the energy of emitted particles stops at about \( 2\text{TeV} \) and then a decrease begins. The reason, as stated above (equation (28)), is that by energy-momentum conservation, a black-hole can only emit particles with less than half of its mass.

In the split-field model (Fig. 34), the average energy of the emitted particles increases as the number of dimensions in the mini-bulk increases. The energy shift comes from the gauge bosons and scalar fields, which access the higher-dimensional space of the mini-bulk (cf. appendix A: Figure 35 through 36).

For the brane with non-zero tension (Fig. 35), the radius of the black-hole increases with tension hence the energy of emitted particles decreases with tension.
For a rotating black-hole (Fig. 36), angular momentum decreases the size of the horizon. Thus since black-holes are typically formed with some initial angular momentum, they emit higher-energy particles than non-rotating black-holes of the same mass. However, the black-hole tends to shed its angular momentum rapidly as it emits particles. This increases the horizon size, lowers the Hawking temperature, and lowers the average energy of the emitted particles. The rapid shedding of angular momentum thus leads to a drop in the average emitted particle energy around $M_{\text{min}}$.

If one compares rotating with non-rotating black-holes, one finds that the energy of the emitted particles is always larger for the rotating black-holes. By the time the mass of the black-hole has dropped well below $M_{\text{min}}$ (here to approximately 1.2 TeV), almost all of the angular momentum has been lost and the difference between the rotating and non-rotating black-holes is small.

As a Standard Model particle is emitted from a black-hole, this particle may carry some angular momentum in the extra-dimensional directions. As an observer in 3-space observes this particle, he/she will find the apparent mass of the particle is

$$M_{\text{obs}} = M_p^2 + P_e^2$$

Here $M_{\text{obs}}$ is the observed mass, $M_p$ is the true mass of the particle, and $P_e$ is the particle's extra-dimensional
where \( P_1 \) is the regular 3-momentum. We will assume that the shedding of extra-dimensions \( m \) on \( M_p \) is rapid, and henceforth we will refer to \( E_{B} \) (rather than the initial emission energy) as the energy of the emitted particle.

Figure 38 shows the energy distribution of the particles from Hawking radiation in the single-brane model. The cross section for black-hole production increases with \( d \) (Figure 37). The area under the curves also increases with \( d \). The peaks of the curves are around 200 GeV to 400 GeV. One can compare, for example, the energy distributions for \( d = 9 \) and \( d = 10 \). A black-hole in high \( r \) tends to emit particles with higher energy, so the curve for \( d = 10 \) has a longer higher energy tail than for \( d = 9 \).

Figure 39 shows the energy distribution of the particles from the final burst in the single-brane model. The energy these particles share is much smaller than the energy in the earlier Hawking radiation phase. The peak in the energy distribution of these particles is around 200 GeV to 300 GeV. The tails extend just to 1 TeV, which is the mass at which the black hole is taken to be unstable and undergoes a final burst.

Figures 39 through 42 show the energy distribution of emitted particles (including final burst particles) in the various models that BlackMax can simulate.

Figure 40 illustrates the split-fermion model. In this figure, we keep the total number of dimensions \( d \) fixed but change the dimensionality \( n_r \) of the mini-brane. This affects the spectrum of only the gauge boson and scalar fields, as only their propagation is affected by the mini-brane's dimensionality. (Gravitons propagate in the full bulk; other Standard Model particles propagate only on the brane.) As explained above, these spectra shift to higher energies as the number of splitting dimensions is increased. One can see that the curve in \( n_r = 7 \) has the lowest high energy tail.

Figure 41 illustrates the brane with tension model. The energies of the emitted particles shift to lower energy as \( \beta \) decreases.

The energy distribution of emitted particles for rotating black-holes (Figure 42) has the same general characteristics as the distribution for non-rotating black-holes. A regular \( m \) on \( M_p \) causes a black-hole to tend to emit higher energy particles than a non-rotating black-hole. The curves have longer higher energy tails than the non-rotating black-holes.

Figure 43 shows the energy distribution of emitted particles from two-body final-states scenario. The energy of the emitted particles is about half of the incoming partons.

In Figure 44, we show the energy distribution of different types of particles in the \( d = 5 \) single-brane model. The area of each curve is dependent on the degree of freedom of each particle and its power spectrum. One can compare the ratio of the same type of particles. For example,
FIG. 39: Energy density distribution of emitted particles from non-rotating black holes on a tensionless brane with no split fermion branes. Shown are the distributions for $d=10$. The spectra include the final burst particles.

FIG. 40: Energy density distribution of emitted particles from non-rotating black holes on a tensionless brane with fermion brane splitting. Shown are the distributions for $d=10$ and $0 \ n_s = 7$. The spectra include the final burst particles.

The area of gluons should be 8 times as large as the area of photons. It is roughly the same as what the figure shows.

H. Pseudorapidity Distributions of the Emitt ed Particles

Figures 45 to 48 show the pseudorapidity distributions of the emitted particles for different extra dimension scenarios.

Most of black holes are made of two quarks and have charge $3^+4$. For the shown figures we did not include charge suppression, because of that the black holes tend to emit the same number of particles and antiparticles during Hawking radiation phase. This can be seen from the curves without final burst in figures 45 through figure 48. The majority of the black holes are positive charged and will tend to emit positive particles in the final burst. That is why there are more positrons than electrons for the distributions which include the final burst particles.

Figure 49 shows the pseudorapidity distribution in the two-body final-state scenario. The distribution is much wider than the equivalent distribution from Hawking radiation. In this model we do not consider the angular momentum of the black hole. We therefore take the decay process in the two-body final state scenario to be isotropic in the ordinary spatial directions, just as in other models without angular momentum. In the center...
of mass frame, particles are therefore emitted in directions uncorrelated with the beam direction. Nevertheless, because the threshold energy of the two-body final-state model is much lower than that of other models, the intermediate state tends to have a higher velocity down the beam-pipe. The decay products are therefore emitted with larger pseudorapidity. In truth, one may expect that the intermediate state of the two-body final-state scenario has non-negligible angular momentum. However, since the intermediate state is not a real black hole, it is unclear exactly what role the angular momentum of the intermediate state plays.

In the final state scenario, the momenta of the two emitted particles are correlated with the initial parton momenta, and hence the pseudorapidity distribution of the emitted particles reflects that of the initial partons. The ratio of the number of events for pseudorapidity between 0 and 0.5 divided by that for pseudorapidity between 0.5 and 1 is about 1.3. This is much higher than the asymptotic QCD value of 0.6, as predicted by [16,26]. If the ratio is found not to equal 0.6, then this would suggest new physics beyond the Standard Model.

### I. Emittted Particle Types

Table III shows, for a variety of representative extra-dimension scenarios, the fraction of emitted particles which are of each possible type (quarks, gluons, charged leptons, Higgs bosons, neutrinos, gravitons, Higgs bosons and photons). One notable feature is that the intensity of gravitons relative to other particles increases with the number of extra dimensions. Note that the absence of gravitons in the case of a rotating black-hole is not physical, but rather reflects our ignorance of the correct gray-body factor.
VIII. CONCLUSION

Hitherto, black-hole generators for the large-extra-dim ension searches at the LHC have made many sim plifying assum ptions regarding the model of both our three-d im ensional space and the extra-d im ensional space, and sim plifying assum ptions regarding the properties of the black-holes that are produced. In this paper we have discussed a new generator for black-holes at the LHC, BlackM ax, which replaces many of these assum ptions. W ith regard to the extra-d im ensional model it allows for brace tension, and brace splitting. W ith regard to the black-hole, it allows for black-hole rotation, charge (both elect ro-mon 8alt ic and color) and bulk recoil. It also intro duces the possibility of a two-body nai state that is not a black-hole.

A lthough BlackM ax represents a major step forward, there remain important d 8ie ncies that will need to be addressed in the future. BlackM ax continues to insist on a at geom 8try for the bulk space, whereas there is considerable interest in a warped geom 8try 1or in a comp act hyperbol ic geom 8try 2. W hile BlackM ax allows for black-hole rotation, the absence of either an analytic or a num erical gray-body factor for the graviton in more than three space d im ensions for rotating black-holes is a serious shortcom ing that can be expected to m aterially change the signature of black-hole decay for rotating black-holes. O ther issues include how to properly account for the likely suppression of decays that cause a black-hole to acquire very \"large\" color, charge or angular mom en tum . (A s opposed to the som e what contrived phenolog ical approach currently taken.) These are but a few of the fundament al issues that remain to be clari ed.

Despite these (and no doubt other) shortcom ings, we expect that BlackM ax will allow for much improved understanding of the signatures of black-holes at the LHC. W ork in progress focuses on using BlackM ax to explore the consequences for the ATLAS experiment of more realistic black-hole and extra-d im ension models.

W e thank Nicholas Brett for discussions in the early stages of this paper. W e thank Daisuke Kla, K in-ya O da, and Seong Chan Park for providing some of the spectra of rotating black-holes. DCD , DS and GDS thank Ox ford's Atlas group for its hospitality at various stages of this project. DCD, DS and GDS have been supported in part by a grant from the US DOE; GDS was supported in part by the John Sim on Guggenheim M em orial Foun dation and by Oxford's Beecroft Institute for Particle Astrophysics and Cosm ology.

Appendix A: Particle Emission Spectra

Non-adiabatic gray-body factors can be found in many papers. We collect the relevant papers in Table 3. We follow these papers to calculate energy power spectra in our database except for the split-fermion model (although we independently confirm the results as well). We perform an original calculation of the spectra of gauge bosons and scalar fields in the split-fermion model as well.
a function of the number of dimensions $n_s$ in which the fermion branes are split. These are shown in figures 50 to 61.

Anyone who has a better spectrum can upgrade our database. For example, we only calculate the spectra up to the $l=9$ mode.

**FIG. 50:** Spectra of scalar fields in $d=5$ space.

**FIG. 51:** Spectra of scalar fields in $d=6$ space.

**FIG. 52:** Spectra of scalar fields in $d=7$ space.

**FIG. 53:** Spectra of scalar fields in $d=8$ space.

**FIG. 54:** Spectra of scalar fields in $d=9$ space.
FIG. 55: Spectra of scalar fields in $d=10$ space.

FIG. 56: Spectra of gauge bosons in $d=5$ space.

FIG. 57: Spectra of gauge bosons in $d=6$ space.

FIG. 58: Spectra of gauge bosons in $d=7$ space.

FIG. 59: Spectra of gauge bosons in $d=8$ space.

FIG. 60: Spectra of gauge bosons in $d=9$ space.
FIG. 61: Spectra of gauge bosons in $d=10$ space.
**TABLE I: Literature sources for particle emission spectra**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of particle</th>
<th>Type of black hole</th>
<th>Brane model</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard-Model particles</td>
<td>non-rotating</td>
<td>unsplit; tension less</td>
<td>[18][19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gravitons</td>
<td>non-rotating</td>
<td>unsplit; tension less</td>
<td>[17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard-Model particles</td>
<td>non-rotating</td>
<td>split/unsplit; with tension</td>
<td>[15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gravitons</td>
<td>non-rotating</td>
<td>split/unsplit; with tension</td>
<td>[15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scalars and gauge bosons</td>
<td>non-rotating</td>
<td>unsplit; tension less</td>
<td>guinea [50][61]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fermions</td>
<td>rotating</td>
<td>unsplit; tension less</td>
<td>[23][24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gauge bosons</td>
<td>rotating</td>
<td>unsplit; tension less</td>
<td>[22][24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scalar fields</td>
<td>rotating</td>
<td>unsplit; tension less</td>
<td>[18][20][21][24]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE II: Degrees of freedom of Standard-Model particles which are emitted from a black hole.** For gravitons, the table shows 1, because the appropriate growth in the number of degrees of freedom is included explicitly in the graviton emission spectrum. $n_s$ is the number of extra dimensions in which vector and scalar fields can propagate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>particle type</th>
<th>$d_0$</th>
<th>$d_{1,2}$</th>
<th>$d_3$</th>
<th>$d_4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charged leptons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutrinos</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photons or gluons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 + $n_s$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z^0$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 + $n_s$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W^+$ and $W^-$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2(2 + $n_s$)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgs boson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graviton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III: The fraction of emitted particles of different types (including halburst particles) in a variety of extra dimension scenarios. Note that the absence of gravitons in the case of a rotating black hole is due exclusively to our current ignorance of the correct gray-body factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>quarks</th>
<th>gluons</th>
<th>leptons</th>
<th>gauge bosons</th>
<th>neutrinos</th>
<th>gravitons</th>
<th>Higgs bosons</th>
<th>photons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d = 4 n_s = 0 non-rotating black hole</td>
<td>68.21</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>2.09e-01</td>
<td>8.99e-01</td>
<td>8.61e-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 5 n_s = 0 non-rotating black hole</td>
<td>65.77</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.60e-01</td>
<td>8.26e-01</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 6 n_s = 0 non-rotating black hole</td>
<td>63.63</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>7.99e-01</td>
<td>7.76e-01</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 7 n_s = 0 non-rotating black hole</td>
<td>61.25</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>7.89e-01</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 8 n_s = 0 non-rotating black hole</td>
<td>60.99</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>7.63e-01</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 9 n_s = 0 non-rotating black hole</td>
<td>59.40</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>7.45e-01</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 10 n_s = 0 non-rotating black hole</td>
<td>57.56</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>8.97e-01</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 10 n_s = 1 split fermion model</td>
<td>61.58</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>3.83e-01</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>5.88e-01</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 10 n_s = 2 split fermion model</td>
<td>61.28</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>3.49e-01</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>4.56e-01</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 10 n_s = 3 split fermion model</td>
<td>62.10</td>
<td>20.33</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>4.46e-01</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>4.15e-01</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 10 n_s = 4 split fermion model</td>
<td>62.70</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>4.66e-01</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>3.28e-01</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 10 n_s = 5 split fermion model</td>
<td>63.67</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>5.17e-01</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>2.65e-01</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 10 n_s = 6 split fermion model</td>
<td>64.96</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>5.56e-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.35e-01</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 10 n_s = 7 split fermion model</td>
<td>66.38</td>
<td>17.23</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.50e-01</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>2.51e-01</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 2 n_s = 2 B = 10 tension brane model</td>
<td>56.66</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>0.00e+00</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 2 n_s = 2 B = 09 tension brane model</td>
<td>67.15</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>5.17e-01</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>2.65e-01</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 2 n_s = 2 B = 08 tension brane model</td>
<td>56.66</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>0.00e+00</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>