If the lighter top squark has no kinematically allowed two-body decays that conserve flavor, then it will form hadronic bound states. This is required in models that are motivated by the supersymmetric little hierarchy problem and obtain the correct relic abundance of dark matter by top-squark-mediated neutralino annihilations, or by top-squark-neutralino co-annihilations. It is also found in models that can accommodate electroweak-scale baryogenesis within minimal supersymmetry. I study the prospects for detecting scalar stoponium from its diphoton decay mode at the Large Hadron Collider, updating and correcting previous work. Under favorable circumstances, this signal will be observable over background, enabling a uniquely precise measurement of the superpartner mass through a narrow peak in the diphoton invariant mass spectrum, limited by statistics and electromagnetic calorimeter resolutions.

Contents

I. Introduction 2

II. Diphoton signal for stoponium and backgrounds 3

III. Results for compressed supersymmetry models 8

IV. Results for models with electroweak-scale baryogenesis 12

V. Outlook 14

Appendix: Stoponium partial decay widths 14

References 16
I. INTRODUCTION

The classic collider signatures for supersymmetry depend on the presence of missing energy carried away by a stable, neutral, weakly interacting lightest supersymmetric particle in each event. (For reviews, see [1,2,3]. This paper follows the conventions and notations of the last reference.) In a sense, this is disappointing, because there are no kinematic mass peaks whose positions would yield measurements of superpartner masses. Observables at hadron colliders can give precision determinations of superpartner mass differences by way of kinematic edges and other distributions, but if R-parity is conserved the overall mass scale will be much harder to ascertain with precision in most models [4,5].

A possible exception occurs if the supersymmetric particles can form resonances that annihilate into final states containing only Standard Model particles with strong or electromagnetic interactions. An example is stoponium, a bound state of a pair of top squarks. The lighter top squark (or stop) $\tilde{t}_1$ has possible avor-preserving two-body decays into the lightest chargino or neutralino,

$$\tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow h\tilde{c}_1;$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.1)

$$\tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow t\tilde{N}_1;$$ \hspace{1cm} (1.2)

which, if kinematically allowed, would cause it to decay long before it could form a hadronic bound state. However, the first decay will be closed if the chargino $\tilde{c}_1$ is not at least 5 GeV lighter than the top squark, and the large top squark mass means that the second decay may well also be kinematically closed. In most of the so-called mSUGRA parameter space, this situation is not encountered, but it is nevertheless quite possible and even common in other model frameworks. Then one must consider three-body (and four-body) decays that preserve avor, and a two-body decay to charm that violates avor:

$$\tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow W^(+)\tilde{h}_1;$$ \hspace{1cm} (1.3)

$$\tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow c\tilde{N}_1;$$ \hspace{1cm} (1.4)

The partial widths associated with the decays (1.3) and (1.4) are known [6,7] to be far smaller than the binding energy of stoponium or other bound hadronic states involving $\tilde{t}_1$.

Therefore, it is worthwhile on general grounds to consider signals for the production and decay of stoponium. At hadron colliders, stoponium is produced primarily in gluon-gluon fusion, with the largest cross-section for the 1S ($Q^{PC} = 0^{++}$) scalar ground state, denoted in the following as $\tau$. This state will decay primarily by annihilation, with the possible two-body final states including $gg, WW, ZZ, h^0h^0, tt, bb$, and $N_1\tilde{N}_1$. The QCD backgrounds for the gluon and quark final states are too huge to contaminate a signal. Also, the $WW, ZZ$, and $h^0h^0$ final states are plagued by either large backgrounds or small branching fractions, and the $N_1\tilde{N}_1$ final state does not give a reconstructable signature. However, Dreiss and Nojiri in [8,9] pointed out that $\tau^-$ provides a viable signal at the CERN Large Hadron Collider. (See also refs. [10]-[14] for earlier works related to stoponium at hadron colliders.)

Refs. [8,9] appeared before two important experimental developments which bring this possibility into sharper focus. The first is the 1995 discovery of the top quark. Second, the results of WMAP and other experiments have bracketed the density of cold dark matter in the standard cos-
mology [15]-[17]. This is important because the measurement of $\rho M_h^2 \approx 1$ can be correlated with a top squark light enough to forbid the decays (1.1) and (1.2) in at least two scenarios. First, neutralino LSP and top-squark co-annihilations can give the observed dark matter density if the mass difference $m_{\tilde{t}} - m_{\tilde{N}}$ is in a small range [18]-[22]. Second, the neutralino LSP can efficiently pair-annihilate into a top-anti-top pair, mediated by the t-channel exchange of a top squark that is not more than about 100 GeV heavier than the LSP [23,24]. These two scenarios are often continuously connected in parameter space, but the latter one requires far less adjustment of parameters to realize. It does, however, require that the gaugino masses are not unified in the way assumed in mSUGRA models. A particularly attractive model from work that meets the requirements of the stop-mediated annihilation scenario is provided by \textquoteleft\textquoteleft compressed supersymmetry\textquoteright\textquoteright\ [23,24], in which the gluino mass parameter is taken to be significantly smaller than the wino mass parameter at the scale of apparent gauge coupling unification $M_{\text{GUT}} \approx 2 \times 10^{16}$ GeV. A reduction of the gluino mass compared to the wino and bino mass parameters can also ameliorate the supersymmetric little hierarchy problem. Another quite different motivation for a light top squark is provided by models that can have a strongly first-order phase transition leading to electroweak-scale baryogenesis [26]-[28]; this can also incorporate the neutralino-stop co-annihilation scenario for dark matter.

In this paper, I will consider the $t^\tau$ signal at the LHC along similar lines to ref. [3], taking into account the now known top-quark mass, considering motivated models that agree with the observed dark matter density and Higgs mass constraints, and using a more liberal angular cut but a more conservative energy resolution for the electromagnetic calorimeter. I also correct (see Appendix) factor of 2 errors appearing in the gg and partial decay widths in ref. [3]. This leads to a somewhat pessimistic evaluation of the detection potential, but in many parts of parameter space the diphoton signal will be detectable given a large integrated luminosity at the LHC.

II. DIPHOTON SIGNAL FOR STOPONIUM AND BACKGROUNDS

The leading-order partial decay widths of $t^\tau$ into gluon and photon final states are:

\[ (t^\tau \rightarrow gg) = \frac{4}{3} \frac{2}{3} R(0)m_{t^\tau}^2; \quad (2.1) \]
\[ (t^\tau \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = \frac{32}{27} \frac{2}{3} R(0)m_{t^\tau}^2; \quad (2.2) \]

where $R(0) = \frac{Q}{4}$ is the radial wavefunction at the origin. In the Coulomb approximation to the bound state problem, $R(0)m_{t^\tau}^2 = 4 \frac{2}{3} m_{t^\tau} = 27$. However, the study of ref. [29] indicates a softer potential, with the Coulomb limit not obtained even for very large bound state masses. In the following, I will adopt the $\frac{Q}{M_S} = 300$ MeV parameterizations of the wavefunction at the origin and the binding energy as given in ref. [29]:

\[ R(0)m_{t^\tau}^2 = (0.1290 + 0.0754L + 0.0199L^2 + 0.0010L^3) \text{ GeV; (2.3)} \]
\[ 2m_{t^\tau} = (3.274 + 1.777L + 0.560L^2 + 0.081L^3) \text{ GeV; (2.4)} \]
Figure 1: The binding energies for the 1S, 2S, and 1P stoponium states as a function of the stoponium mass, as computed from the potential model of ref. \[^{29}\] with \( \frac{m_{\tilde{t}}}{M_S} = 300 \) MeV.

where \( L = \ln(m_{\tilde{t}} = 250 \text{ GeV}) \). The binding energies of the 1S ground state and the 2S and 1P excited states are shown in Figure 1. It should be noted that these results are based on a considerable extrapolation from known experimental results on cc and bb bound states, and other potentials can give quite different results. (For example, see the ones reviewed in ref. \[^{30}\].) The partial width into gluons is of order 2 MeV over the considered range of \( m_{\tilde{t}} \). The fact that the binding energy is much larger shows that the stoponium bound state will indeed form, provided that other partial widths do not overwhelm \( (\tilde{t} ! \text{ gg}) \) by a factor of 1000, a requirement easily satisfied by models studied below.

At leading order and in the narrow-width approximation, the production cross-section for \( \tilde{t} \) in pp collisions is given in terms of its gluonic decay width by

\[
(\text{pp} ! \tilde{t}) = \frac{2}{8m_{\tilde{t}}} \left( \begin{array}{c} \tilde{t} ! \text{ gg} \\ \text{Z} \\ \text{Z}^2 
\end{array} \right) \int xg(x;Q^2)g(=x;Q^2); \tag{2.5}
\]

where \( g(x;Q^2) \) is the gluon parton distribution function, and \( m_{\tilde{t}} \) is in terms of the pp collision energy squared \( s \). In the following, I use the CTEQ5L \[^{31}\] set for the parton distribution functions, evaluated at \( Q = m_{\tilde{t}} \) for the signal and \( Q = M \) for the backgrounds.

For comparison, the ratio of the stoponium production cross-section to that of a Standard Model Higgs boson \( H \) with the same mass is just \( (\text{pp} ! \tilde{t}) = (\text{pp} ! H) = (H ! \text{ gg}) = (H ! \text{ gg}) \) at leading order. For \( m_{\tilde{t}} = (200;250;300;400;500;600;700;800) \text{ GeV} \), this is approximately \( (\text{pp} ! \tilde{t}) = (\text{pp} ! H) = (1.44;0.74;0.40;0.098;0.064;0.054;0.050;0.048) \). However, \( \text{BR}(\tilde{t} ! \text{ gg}) \) is much larger than \( \text{BR}(H ! \text{ gg}) \) for masses larger than 140 GeV, because the latter is loop-suppressed compared to relatively huge widths into \( ZZ^{(1)}, WW^{(1)}, \text{ and } t\bar{t} \) final states. This explains why the stoponium signal \( \tilde{t} \) can be viable over the mass range where \( H \) observation is not possible. In contrast, \( \text{BR}(\tilde{t} ! ZZ) = \text{BR}(H ! ZZ) \) turns out to be at most about 0.2 over the same mass range. This explains why the search for stoponium in pp ! \( \tilde{t} ! ZZ \) in the \( \ell^+ \ell^- \) and \( \ell^+ \text{ jj} \) channels is almost certainly not viable \[^{3}\] for masses where it is the best search option for \( H \).

Now, multiplying eq. (2.5) by the branching fraction into a diphoton state, and rearranging the
factors, one obtains:

\[(pp \! \rightarrow \! \tau \! \rightarrow \! \tau) = \frac{2}{8m_\tau^3} \text{BR}(\tau \! \rightarrow \! \tau) \cdot \text{BR}(\tau \! \rightarrow \! \tau) \cdot \frac{Z_1}{x} \int \frac{dx}{x} g(x;Q^2) g(x;Q^2): \quad (2.6)\]

This way of writing the result is useful because, in many realistic models, the gluonic decay dominates over all other neutral states. Therefore, it is instructive to adopt an idealized limit where \(\text{BR}(\tau \! \rightarrow \! \tau)\) is not specified explicitly, as a standard reference scenario. (Note that the partial width is typically about 0.005 of the gg partial width.) Then results for particular models can be obtained by scaling the signal cross-section by the actual \(\text{BR}(\tau \! \rightarrow \! \tau)\).

We next consider the diphoton backgrounds at the LHC. The \(pp \! \rightarrow \! \tau \! \rightarrow \! \tau\) process has parton-level contributions:

\[qg \! \rightarrow \! \tau \; ; \quad (2.7)\]

\[gg \! \rightarrow \! \tau \; ; \quad (2.8)\]

with leading-order differential cross-sections found in [32]-[35]. The leading order total cross-section for eq. (2.7) is proportional to \(\ln[(1+z_0)/(1-z_0)]\), where \(z_0\) is the cut on \(\cos j\) with the photon momentum angle with respect to the beam direction in the center-of-momentum frame. Since the signal is isotropic, the total signal cross-section proportional to \(z_0\), it follows that \(S=\text{BR}\) is maximized for \(z_0\sim 0.005\). The process (2.8) involves Feynman diagrams that have quark box loops. It is somewhat central than the \(qg\) background, and so would favor a larger cut \(z_0\), but it is quite subdominant over the diphoton mass range considered here. For simplicity, I will impose a cut on both signal and background of

\[\cos j < 0.7 \quad (2.9)\]

in the center-of-momentum frame. This guarantees a high \(p_T\) for the photons, for high-mass stoponium states. In addition, I will require that the photons be well-separated from the beam direction and the remnant beam jets, so

\[\cos j < 0.95 \quad (2.10)\]

(or \(j < 1.83\)) in the lab frame. The cut (2.9) is opposite for low rapidities, and (2.10) for high rapidities. The results for the background at leading order after these cuts are shown in Fig. 2 as a function of the invariant mass of the diphoton system, \(M\).

Higher-order corrections to the background can be quite important, increasing the cross-section after cuts by a factor of 2 or more [36]-[39]. This includes a large contribution from the hard scattering process \(qg \! \rightarrow \! \tau\) (and \(\overline{q} \! \rightarrow \! \tau\) \(\bar{q}\) and the related process \(qg \! \rightarrow \! \tau\) followed by a photon from the fragmentation of the quark jet, as well as from double fragmentation contributions. Imposing isolation cuts on hadronic activity near the photons and requiring the absence of additional hard jets reduces these backgrounds considerably. The isolation cut requirement is necessary anyway, to eliminate an otherwise large background from jets faking photons, including \(\tau\) and \(0\) decays that are not resolved in the electromagnetic calorimeter. Also, the initial-state gluon contri-
FIG. 2: The differential cross-section $d^2\sigma/dM$ for the diphoton backgrounds in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV, due to the parton-level processes $q\bar{q}$ and $gg$, at leading order. Here $M$ is the diphoton invariant mass. The cuts imposed on the angle with respect to the beam axis are $|c_\theta| < 0.7$ in the diphoton center-of-momentum frame and $|c_\theta| < 0.95$ in the lab frame. The kink in the $gg$ background at $M = 2m_t$ is due to the threshold in the top-quark box loop.

The background contributions from jets without charged tracks faking photons can likely be reduced to a small level with isolation cuts imposed in one analysis [40]. In any case, because the stoponium diphoton resonance will be very narrow, in practice the background should be determined directly from LHC data by a sideband analysis.

Inclusion of the higher-order background contributions is beyond the scope of this paper, especially since the corresponding higher-order corrections to the stoponium signal cross-section are not available. In addition, the increased background will likely be at least partly compensated for by contributions to the signal from production of excited stoponium states, followed either by decays to the $1S$ state by emission of photons or soft mesons or by direct decays to $2S$. For example, the $2S$ state has a binding energy that is probably only slightly less than the $1P$ state (see g.1), so decays of $2S$ stoponium to the $1P$ state and a meson would be kinematically forbidden according to this potential model. The $2S$ non-annihilation decays therefore will most likely go entirely to the $1S$ ground state. These signal contributions will be effectively merged due to the detector energy resolution, leading to an overall enhancement of the signal of perhaps a factor of 1.5 (see g.9 of ref. 3). This unknown enhancement is not included here, to be conservative.

The energy resolutions of the ATLAS and CMS electromagnetic calorimeters at the LHC will clearly dominate over the very small intrinsic width of stoponium in determining the experimental width of the signalpeak. Therefore, to estimate the significance of the signal over the background, I consider a bin with width $0.94m_t$, chosen to contain essentially all of the signal peak on which it is centered. (See ref. [40] for a CMS study of a similar diphoton signal peak at higher mass, and the CMS and ATLAS physics technical design reports [1,2] for estimates that put the electromagnetic calorimeter resolutions at roughly the percent level.) The resulting combination of the signal and background within such a bin is found in g.[4]. Here I have taken the signal corresponding to the idealized reference case of $BR(t\rightarrow gg) + BR(t\rightarrow g) = 1$.

The resulting integrated luminosities needed to reach significances $S/B = 2;3;4;5$, taking enough events to use Gaussian statistics, are shown in g.[4]. Because there are many bin widths
over the mass range considered, the probability of a 2-sigma excess in one of them arising just from a fluctuation in the background is not negligible. However, the LHC will likely have already produced a preliminary estimate of the $t_1$ mass from gluino or direct open stop production before the stoponium diphoton signal becomes feasible, so the search range for the stoponium mass peak will not be too large. The luminosities in Fig. 4 should be multiplied by $1 = [BR(t_1 \rightarrow gg)]^2$, since the required luminosity scales like the square of the signal cross-section eq. (2.6).

From Fig. 4 one sees that the expected significance for a 500 GeV stoponium resonance will be at most only about $S/B = 2$ for a canonical high luminosity year of data (100 fb$^{-1}$). This is more pessimistic than in ref. [2], due in part to a factor of 2 error in that paper in the $t_1$ width, but also due to their assumption of electromagnetic calorimeter resolution providing an acceptable bin for $M_{t_1}$ that is twice as narrow as assumed in the present paper. However, a more sophisticated approach based on a maximum likelihood fit, which is beyond the scope of this paper.
will certainly do better than the simple counting in a single bin used here. (Note that the detector mass resolution will in any case be smaller than the bin width needed to catch all of the signal events.) Also, the integrated luminosity needed is proportional to the square of the signal cross-section and to the reciprocal of the background, and so is strongly dependent on assumptions that are difficult to evaluate confidently at present.

III. RESULTS FOR COMPRESSED SUPER SYMMETRY MODELS

In the previous section, I estimated the integrated luminosity needed to achieve detection of the stoponium resonance at a given significance, but considering an idealized reference model where $\text{BR}(\tau \rightarrow gg)$ was nearly 100%. In this section and the next, I consider the actual branching ratio achieved in realistic, motivated models that satisfy the dark matter density and Higgs mass constraints. As discussed in the previous section, the integrated luminosity needed for discovery scales like $l=\text{BR}(\tau \rightarrow gg)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

First, I will follow ref. [23,24] and consider models where the bino, wino, and gluino masses can be parameterized at $M_{\text{GUT}}$ by:

$$M_1 = m_{1=2}(1 + C_{24});$$
$$M_2 = m_{1=2}(1 + 3C_{24});$$
$$M_3 = m_{1=2}(1 + 2C_{24});$$

corresponding to an $F$-term source for supersymmetry breaking in a linear combination of the singlet and adjoint representations of SU(5). For the sake of simplicity, I also assume a common scalar mass $m_0$ and scalar trilinear coupling $A_0$ at $M_{\text{GUT}}$. For $C_{24}$ of order 0.2, one finds that the supersymmetry breaking little hierarchy problem is ameliorated, with a significant part of parameter space where $t_1$ is the next-to-lightest supersymmetric particle. The dark matter thermal relic abundance can be sufficiently suppressed by $N_1/N_1^* \tau \rightarrow \tau$ due to $t$-channel $t_1$ exchange, giving $\frac{\Omega_{\text{DM}} h^2}{\Omega_{\text{DM}}^0} = 0.1$ in accord with observations. I impose this as a requirement by adjusting the value of $m_0$ for fixed values of the other parameters, using the program micrOMEGAs 2.0.1 [41] (checked for approximate agreement with DarkSUSY [42]) interfaced to the supersymmetry model parameter program SOFTSUSY 2.0.11 [43] (checked for approximate agreement with SuSpect [44] and ISAJET [45]). The resulting $m_0$ values are reasonably small and do not require fine-tuning. In these models, $m_{t_1} - m_{N_1} < 100$ GeV, so that stoponium will indeed form as a bound state before it has a chance to decay. These stop-mediating annihilation models are continuously connected in parameter space to more fine-tuned regions in which the $t_1, N_1$ mass difference is just right to allow e cient stop-neutralino co-annihilations.

In general, as shown in ref. [3], the most important final states in competition with the $gg$ and $WW$ ones are $W^+W^-, ZZ, h^0h^0, \bar{t}t, b\bar{b}$, and $N_1^*N_1$. Formulas for the decay widths for these neutral states were given in ref. [3], and are presented in the Appendix of the present paper.

\footnote{The LHC phenomenology (other than from stoponium) and dark matter detection prospects of these models have been discussed in refs. [23,24,46]. There has recently been considerable interest in the phenomenology of other models that achieve realistic dark matter with non-universal gaugino masses [47,48].}
FIG. 5: The branching ratios of scalar stoponium into the most important neutral states, for some representative models of the type described in the text. In all cases, \( \tan \beta = 10, \ > 0 \), and \( M_1 \) varies, with \( m_0 \) adjusted to give \( \Delta M_h^2 = 0 \). The upper left, upper right, lower left, and lower right panels have respectively \((C_{24}; A_0=M_1) = (0.19;1), (0.21;1), (0.21;15), \) and \((0.24;15)\). The thicker part of the gg line indicates the range of stoponium mass for which stop-mediated annihilations \( N_1 N'_1 \) contribute more than 50% to \( \Delta M_h^2 \).

Different notation. Results for the branching ratios in four typical model lines are shown in $g$. These model lines each have a continuously varying overall gaugino mass scale, parametrized by the bino mass parameter $M_1$, with the wino and gluino masses at $M_{GUT}$ then given by the fixed values of $C_{24}$, as in eqs. (3.1)–(3.3). The parameter $\tan \beta = 10$ and $A_0 = M_1$ are fixed, and the value of $m_0$ is adjusted to give $\Delta M_h^2 = 0$. The four representative model lines were chosen to have \((C_{24}; A_0=M_1) = (0.19;1), (0.21;1), (0.21;15), \) and \((0.24;15)\). The tuning of $m_0$ needed
is particularly mild in the regions indicated by the thicker solid (blue) lines for $\text{BR}(\tau^+ \tau^-)$, corresponding to models for which $N_1^* N_1$ dominates the annihilation of dark matter in the early universe. This typically gives $m_\tau$ in the range 400-600 GeV. The model lines in Fig. 6 show the common features that $\text{BR}(\tau^+ \tau^-)$ is quite high, typically 80% or higher for the range shown, and often in excess of 90% for smaller $m_\tau$ and smaller top-squark mixing. In the mass range where neutralino annihilation dominates, the branching ratios for $W^+W^-, ZZ$, and $h^0h^0$ are denoted by solid (blue) lines, other models by dashed (red) lines. The integrated luminosity needed to achieve a given $S=1$ can be obtained from $g.\text{Eq}$ by scaling by $1=\text{BR}(\tau^+ \tau^-)$. The crucial branching ratio into the $\tau^+ \tau^-$ final state is shown in $g.\text{Eq}$ for different slices through parameter space. In the left panel, $A_0=M_1=1$ at $M_{\text{GUT}}$, with various $C_{24}=0.21$ to 2.0 as labeled. In the right panel, $C_{24}=0.21$, with various $A_0=M_1=0.4$ to 2.0 as labeled on the far right. In all cases, $\tan \beta = 10$, $\tan \beta > 0$, and $M_1$ varies, with $m_0$ adjusted to give $\Delta m^2 = 0.1$. The models for which stop-$m$ mediated annihilations $N_1^* N_1$ contribute more than 50% to $\Delta m^2 h^2$ are denoted by solid (blue) lines, other models by dashed (red) lines. The integrated luminosity needed to achieve a given $S=1$ can be obtained from $g.\text{Eq}$ by scaling by $1=\text{BR}(\tau^+ \tau^-)$. The crucial branching ratio into the $\tau^+ \tau^-$ final state is shown in $g.\text{Eq}$ for different slices through parameter space. In the left panel, $A_0=M_1=1$ at $M_{\text{GUT}}$, with various $C_{24}=0.21$ to 2.0 as labeled. In the right panel, $C_{24}=0.21$, with various $A_0=M_1=0.4$ to 2.0 as labeled on the far right. In all cases, $\tan \beta = 10$, $\tan \beta > 0$, and $M_1$ varies, with $m_0$ adjusted to give $\Delta m^2 = 0.1$. The models for which stop-$m$ mediated annihilations $N_1^* N_1$ contribute more than 50% to $\Delta m^2 h^2$ are denoted by solid (blue) lines, other models by dashed (red) lines. The integrated luminosity needed to achieve a given $S=1$ can be obtained from $g.\text{Eq}$ by scaling by $1=\text{BR}(\tau^+ \tau^-)$.

The crucial branching ratio into the $\tau^+ \tau^-$ final state is shown in $g.\text{Eq}$ for different slices through parameter space. In the left panel, $A_0=M_1=1$ at $M_{\text{GUT}}$, with various $C_{24}=0.21$ to 2.0 as labeled. In the right panel, $C_{24}=0.21$, with various $A_0=M_1=0.4$ to 2.0 as labeled on the far right. In all cases, $\tan \beta = 10$, $\tan \beta > 0$, and $M_1$ varies, with $m_0$ adjusted to give $\Delta m^2 = 0.1$. The models for which stop-$m$ mediated annihilations $N_1^* N_1$ contribute more than 50% to $\Delta m^2 h^2$ are denoted by solid (blue) lines, other models by dashed (red) lines. The integrated luminosity needed to achieve a given $S=1$ can be obtained from $g.\text{Eq}$ by scaling by $1=\text{BR}(\tau^+ \tau^-)$.

The crucial branching ratio into the $\tau^+ \tau^-$ final state is shown in $g.\text{Eq}$ for different slices through parameter space. In the left panel, $A_0=M_1=1$ at $M_{\text{GUT}}$, with various $C_{24}=0.21$ to 2.0 as labeled. In the right panel, $C_{24}=0.21$, with various $A_0=M_1=0.4$ to 2.0 as labeled on the far right. In all cases, $\tan \beta = 10$, $\tan \beta > 0$, and $M_1$ varies, with $m_0$ adjusted to give $\Delta m^2 = 0.1$. The models for which stop-$m$ mediated annihilations $N_1^* N_1$ contribute more than 50% to $\Delta m^2 h^2$ are denoted by solid (blue) lines, other models by dashed (red) lines. The integrated luminosity needed to achieve a given $S=1$ can be obtained from $g.\text{Eq}$ by scaling by $1=\text{BR}(\tau^+ \tau^-)$.

The crucial branching ratio into the $\tau^+ \tau^-$ final state is shown in $g.\text{Eq}$ for different slices through parameter space. In the left panel, $A_0=M_1=1$ at $M_{\text{GUT}}$, with various $C_{24}=0.21$ to 2.0 as labeled. In the right panel, $C_{24}=0.21$, with various $A_0=M_1=0.4$ to 2.0 as labeled on the far right. In all cases, $\tan \beta = 10$, $\tan \beta > 0$, and $M_1$ varies, with $m_0$ adjusted to give $\Delta m^2 = 0.1$. The models for which stop-$m$ mediated annihilations $N_1^* N_1$ contribute more than 50% to $\Delta m^2 h^2$ are denoted by solid (blue) lines, other models by dashed (red) lines. The integrated luminosity needed to achieve a given $S=1$ can be obtained from $g.\text{Eq}$ by scaling by $1=\text{BR}(\tau^+ \tau^-)$.

The crucial branching ratio into the $\tau^+ \tau^-$ final state is shown in $g.\text{Eq}$ for different slices through parameter space. In the left panel, $A_0=M_1=1$ at $M_{\text{GUT}}$, with various $C_{24}=0.21$ to 2.0 as labeled. In the right panel, $C_{24}=0.21$, with various $A_0=M_1=0.4$ to 2.0 as labeled on the far right. In all cases, $\tan \beta = 10$, $\tan \beta > 0$, and $M_1$ varies, with $m_0$ adjusted to give $\Delta m^2 = 0.1$. The models for which stop-$m$ mediated annihilations $N_1^* N_1$ contribute more than 50% to $\Delta m^2 h^2$ are denoted by solid (blue) lines, other models by dashed (red) lines. The integrated luminosity needed to achieve a given $S=1$ can be obtained from $g.\text{Eq}$ by scaling by $1=\text{BR}(\tau^+ \tau^-)$.

The crucial branching ratio into the $\tau^+ \tau^-$ final state is shown in $g.\text{Eq}$ for different slices through parameter space. In the left panel, $A_0=M_1=1$ at $M_{\text{GUT}}$, with various $C_{24}=0.21$ to 2.0 as labeled. In the right panel, $C_{24}=0.21$, with various $A_0=M_1=0.4$ to 2.0 as labeled on the far right. In all cases, $\tan \beta = 10$, $\tan \beta > 0$, and $M_1$ varies, with $m_0$ adjusted to give $\Delta m^2 = 0.1$. The models for which stop-$m$ mediated annihilations $N_1^* N_1$ contribute more than 50% to $\Delta m^2 h^2$ are denoted by solid (blue) lines, other models by dashed (red) lines. The integrated luminosity needed to achieve a given $S=1$ can be obtained from $g.\text{Eq}$ by scaling by $1=\text{BR}(\tau^+ \tau^-)$.

The crucial branching ratio into the $\tau^+ \tau^-$ final state is shown in $g.\text{Eq}$ for different slices through parameter space. In the left panel, $A_0=M_1=1$ at $M_{\text{GUT}}$, with various $C_{24}=0.21$ to 2.0 as labeled. In the right panel, $C_{24}=0.21$, with various $A_0=M_1=0.4$ to 2.0 as labeled on the far right. In all cases, $\tan \beta = 10$, $\tan \beta > 0$, and $M_1$ varies, with $m_0$ adjusted to give $\Delta m^2 = 0.1$. The models for which stop-$m$ mediated annihilations $N_1^* N_1$ contribute more than 50% to $\Delta m^2 h^2$ are denoted by solid (blue) lines, other models by dashed (red) lines. The integrated luminosity needed to achieve a given $S=1$ can be obtained from $g.\text{Eq}$ by scaling by $1=\text{BR}(\tau^+ \tau^-)$.

The crucial branching ratio into the $\tau^+ \tau^-$ final state is shown in $g.\text{Eq}$ for different slices through parameter space. In the left panel, $A_0=M_1=1$ at $M_{\text{GUT}}$, with various $C_{24}=0.21$ to 2.0 as labeled. In the right panel, $C_{24}=0.21$, with various $A_0=M_1=0.4$ to 2.0 as labeled on the far right. In all cases, $\tan \beta = 10$, $\tan \beta > 0$, and $M_1$ varies, with $m_0$ adjusted to give $\Delta m^2 = 0.1$. The models for which stop-$m$ mediated annihilations $N_1^* N_1$ contribute more than 50% to $\Delta m^2 h^2$ are denoted by solid (blue) lines, other models by dashed (red) lines. The integrated luminosity needed to achieve a given $S=1$ can be obtained from $g.\text{Eq}$ by scaling by $1=\text{BR}(\tau^+ \tau^-)$.
due to the effect noted in ref. 9 of an s-channel resonance in stoponium annihilation to $\bar{b}b$ and $\bar{t}t$ from $H^0$ exchange. This can ruin the possibility of stoponium detection at the LHC. In the model from work with a common $m_0$ and other values of $C_{24}$, this resonant annihilation to quarks occurs for a range of $A_0=M_1$ less than 1. It is interesting that these models correspond to the more optimistic projected sensitivity for the direct detection of dark matter in the next generation of low-background underground experiments 24. However, more generally, the heavy neutral Higgs boson mass can be made essentially arbitrary without changing the other essential features of the model, by assuming non-universal scalar masses at $M_{GUT}$. Therefore, it is impossible to make any definitive statements about the complementarity of the detectability of the stoponium resonance at LHC and the direction detection of dark matter.

Another dangerous decay mode is the $h^0h^0$ final state, which can dominate over all others if $m_{\tau}$! $h^0h^0$ is not too far above threshold, as noted in refs. 9, 13. In the dark-matter motivated models I have studied here, this turns out never to be a fatal problem, because the stoponium mass is always sufficiently large. This is illustrated in Fig. 7, which shows the luminosity needed to obtain an expected $S/B = 2:3;4:5$ for $M_{\tau}$ in a bin with $m_{\tau} < 0.02 m_{\bar{t}}$, as a function of $m_{\tau}$, for two representative model lines with $C_{24} = 0.21$ and $A_0=M_1 = 1; 2$. If the stoponium mass is small enough, detection might even occur with less than 10 fb$^{-1}$ of data. In general, the models that are consistent with the dark-matter scenario proposed in 23, 24 can be prime candidates for stoponium detection in the diphoton mode, provided that the stoponium mass is not too large and not so close to $m_{\bar{t}}$ as to allow a near-resonant annihilation decay.
FIG. 8: The branching ratios of scalar stoponium into $gg$, $WW$, $ZZ$, and $h^0h^0$ neutral states, for model lines inspired by electroweak-scale baryogenesis, as described in the text, with varying $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$. The left panel depicts a relatively optimistic case with $m_{h^0} = 115$ GeV, $\kappa_{t}\tan\beta = 0.3$ and the right panel a pessimistic case with $m_{h^0} = 120$ GeV, $\kappa_{t}\tan\beta = 0.5$. The range that can lead to electroweak-scale baryogenesis in the MSSM includes roughly $235 \text{ GeV} < m_{\tilde{t}_1} < 270 \text{ GeV}$.

IV. RESULTS FOR MODELS WITH ELECTROWEAK-SCALE BARYOGENESIS

Another motivation for a relatively light top squark is the possibility of achieving electroweak-scale baryogenesis in the MSSM [26]-[28]. The need for a strongly first-order phase transition to a metastable electroweak symmetry-breaking vacuum limits the allowed parameter space, requiring a mostly right-handed top squark with mass less than $m_t$. (For more details, see [26]-[28].) Here, I will consider a model framework proposed in [27], with an off-diagonal top-squark squared mass matrix element $m_{\tilde{t}}X_{\tilde{t}}$ with $0.3 < \kappa_{t}\tan\beta < 0.5$, and $m_{\tilde{t}}$ very large (here 10 TeV), $\tan\beta = 5$ to 10, $m_{h^0}$ between 115 and 120 GeV, and all other superpartners except the LSP supposed to be sufficiently heavy that they do not mediate large contributions to the stoponium decay width. Then the parameters with the most important impact on the stoponium decay widths are $m_{h^0}$, $m_{\tilde{t}}$, and the top-squark mixing angle. The region of parameter space where electroweak-scale baryogenesis can work is roughly $120 \text{ GeV} < m_{\tilde{t}} < 135 \text{ GeV}$ [28], but I will consider a wider range consistent with a metastable vacuum and the Higgs mass constraint from LEP2 [27].

In Fig. 3, I show the relevant branching ratios for stoponium decay in a relatively optimistic case with $m_{h^0} = 120$ GeV and $\kappa_{t}\tan\beta = 0.3$ (left panel), and a pessimistic case with $m_{h^0} = 115$ GeV and $\kappa_{t}\tan\beta = 0.5$ (right panel). In both cases, $\tan\beta = 10$. Unfortunately, the branching ratio for the decay $\tau^- h^0h^0$ is seen to be quite large above threshold [3,13], due to a small denominator (coming from the top-squark propagator) in the last term in eq. (A.4). The BR($\tau^- h^0h^0$) decreases as one moves to higher stoponium masses. I have made the optimistic but not unreasonable assumption that the other neutral Higgs boson $H^0$ is sufficiently heavy that the decay $\tau^- H^0$ is not near resonance and can be neglected. I have also optimistically assumed that the LSP is close enough in mass to $\tilde{t}_1$ so that $\tau^- N_1N^-_1$ is unimportant due to kinematic suppression.
The existing collider lower limits on $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ from the Tevatron and LEP2 do not constrain the top squark when $m_{\tilde{t}_1} - m_{\tilde{N}_1} < 0.02m_{\tilde{t}}$, because of the softness of the charm jets from the decay. Obtaining a thermally dark matter density in agreement with WMAP from stop-neutralino co-annihilations in these models requires $m_{\tilde{t}_1} - m_{\tilde{N}_1} > 20$ GeV, but a smaller mass difference is still allowed, since it would just mean that the dark matter is something else, for example axions, or LSPs arising from a non-thermal source.

Despite the large branching ratio to $h^0h^0$, there are still good prospects for stoponium detection at the LHC in these models, because the stoponium mass is necessarily not too large. This can be seen in Fig. 9, which depicts the required luminosity for detection at various expected signal rates, i.e. the results of Fig. 4 divided by BR($\tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow gg$). In the most optimistic case, a clear observation of stoponium could be possible with less than $100 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ over a large range of stoponium masses including the range that can accommodate electroweak-scale baryogenesis. If the decay $\tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow h^0h^0$ is kinematically forbidden, an observation could even be made with less than $10 \text{ fb}^{-1}$.

The detection of direct open light stop squark production will probably be quite difficult at the LHC, especially if the $m_{\tilde{t}_1} - m_{\tilde{N}_1}$ mass difference is very small, because then the charm jets from $\tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow c\tilde{N}_1$ will be very soft. Most stop squarks will likely come from gluino pair production followed by the decay $g \rightarrow \tilde{t}_1 \tilde{t}_1$. The Majorana nature of the gluino implies that half of the resulting events will have like-charge top quarks and soft charm jets. This was found to be a viable signal in [64], and endpoint analyses will allow the determination of relations between the gluino, lighter stop, and LSP masses. A relatively precise measurement of $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ would clearly be very helpful in pinning down the masses of all three particles.
V. OUTLOOK

In this paper, I have examined prospects for observing sttoponium at the LHC in the process $pp \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-$, as first suggested by Drees and Nojiri in [8,9]. As illustrated in two distinct motivated scenarios, this search will likely be a long-term project, requiring good precision in the electromagnetic calorimeter and high integrated luminosity. For a positive detection with 100 fb$^{-1}$ or less, it is estimated to be probably necessary (but certainly not sufficient) that the sttoponium mass is less than about 500 GeV, which happens to be in the middle of the range preferred by compressed supersymmetry models of the type discussed in refs. [23,24]. If the sttoponium mass is less than 300 GeV, detection might even be possible with 10 fb$^{-1}$ or less. My estimates of the detectability for the idealized case of models for which $BR(\tau^+ \tau^- gg) \equiv 1$ are somewhat more pessimistic than in [9], but there is a clear opportunity if Nature is kind.

It would be useful to understand the higher-order corrections to sttoponium production and decay, which might well have a large impact on the viability of the signal. Because these higher-order corrections are lacking for the signal, I have not included them for the background either, but they are likely to be substantial in both cases. In practice, the background will be obtainable from data using a sideband analysis. There is also an unknown, but possibly large, benefit from production of the excited states of sttoponium adding to the signal.

An important remaining question is how accurately the observation of sttoponium can determine the lighter top-squark mass, and from it other superpartner masses. The answer is quite sensitive to unknowns, including the true size of the backgrounds, the experimental mass resolution and systematic errors for diphotons, as well as an estimate of theoretical errors in the binding energies and wavefunctions for sttoponium bound states. However, it seems clear that the observation of sttoponium would present a unique opportunity to gain precise information about the superpartner masses, and a key ingredient in deciphering the mechanism behind supersymmetry breaking.

Appendix: Sttoponium partial decay widths

In this Appendix, I collect the results for the scalar sttoponium annihilation decay widths. I agree with the results of ref. [8], except for the $gg$ and $W^+W^-$ widths; equations (A.1) and (A.2) of that reference should each be multiplied by a factor of $1/2$ on the right side. (This is on top of, and distinct from, the factor of $1/2$ for identical particles which is correctly included in equation (5) of ref. [8].) For these two widths, I agree with refs. [11] and [65]. Also, I have generalized ref. [8] slightly, by including the effects of sbottom mixing and possible CP violating phases. I use a convention in which chargino and neutralino masses are always real and positive. All equations below use couplings and other notations and conventions as given in detail in the second sections of the two papers in ref. [65], which will not be repeated here for the sake of brevity.

The general form for sttoponium annihilation decay widths is

\[
(\tau^+ \tau^- AB) = \frac{3}{32} \frac{1}{(1 + AB)} \left( \frac{m_A}{m_B}^2 \frac{m_B}{m_A}^2 \right)^{1/2} \frac{BR(0j^2)}{m_{\tau^+}^2} \frac{1}{m_{\tau^-}^2} \frac{X}{M^2} \frac{j}{M^2} ; \quad (A.1)
\]

for $AB = gg, ZZ, h^0h^0, ZW^+W^-, tt, h\bar{h}, N_iN_j$, with $AB = 1$ for the first four cases and the last case when $i = j$, and $AB = 0$ in the others. Here $(x;yz) = x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - 2xyz$, $2xy$, $2xz$, $2yz$;
and \( R(0) \) is the wavefunction at the origin, for which I use the \( (4^{1/2}) \) = 300 MeV parameterization from Table A.1 of ref. [29] in numerical work; see eq. (2.8) of the present paper. It remains to give the spin-summed squared matrix element, \( \mathcal{M} \).

For the gluon-gluon and photon-photon final states, the results are independent of soft supersymmetry-breaking parameters, by gauge invariance:

\[
\mathcal{M}(\tau!gg)^f = \frac{16}{9} g_s^4 \quad (A.2)
\]

\[
\mathcal{M}(\tau! \gamma \gamma)^f = 8g_s^4 \epsilon^4 \quad (A.3)
\]

where \( g_s = 2=3 \). For the \( h^0 h^0 \) final state,

\[
\mathcal{M}(\tau! h^0 h^0)^f = h^0 h^0 t_0 + \frac{X}{4m^2 t_0} (0_{h^0 h^0}^{L0}) \left( \frac{m^2}{m^2 t_0} \right)^2 \quad (A.4)
\]

For the \( ZZ \) and \( W^+W^- \) final states,

\[
\mathcal{M}(\tau! ZZ)^f = 2(a_{ZZ}^T)^2 + (a_{ZZ}^L)^2 \quad (A.5)
\]

\[
\mathcal{M}(\tau! W^+W^-)^f = 2(a_{W}^T)^2 + (a_{W}^L)^2 \quad (A.6)
\]

where

\[
a_{ZZ}^T = \frac{2}{g^2 + g^Z} \frac{g^2}{6} \left[ \left( \frac{m^2}{m^2 t_0} \right)^2 \right] \quad \text{and} \quad a_{ZZ}^L = (1 - 2m^2 t_0)^2 \frac{a_{ZZ}^T}{6}
\]

\[
a_{ZZ}^L = \frac{8}{g^2 + g^Z} \left[ \frac{g^2}{6} \right] \quad \text{and} \quad a_{ZZ}^L = (1 - 2m^2 t_0)^2 \frac{a_{ZZ}^T}{6}
\]

\[
a_{WW}^T = \frac{g^2}{2} \left[ \left( \frac{m^2}{m^2 t_0} \right)^2 \right] \quad \text{and} \quad a_{WW}^L = (1 - 2m^2 t_0)^2 \frac{a_{WW}^T}{6}
\]

For the \( Z \) final state,

\[
\mathcal{M}(\tau! Z)^f = 2g^2 \epsilon^2 (g^2 + g^Z)(\mathcal{M}_{\tau\tau}^f \quad 4a_{WW}^2 = 3)^2 \quad (A.11)
\]

The top-quark and bottom-quark final states have:

\[
\mathcal{M}(\tau! tt)^f = 6(m^2 t_0) (2Re[a_{tt}]) m_{t\bar{t}}^2 + 24m^2 t_0 (Im[a_{tt}])^2 \quad (A.12)
\]

\[
\mathcal{M}(\tau! bb)^f = 6(m^2 b) (2Re[a_{bb}]) m_{b\bar{b}}^2 + 24m^2 b (Im[a_{bb}])^2 \quad (A.13)
\]
where

\[ a_{tt} = \left( 8g_2^2 - 9 \right) \frac{m_t L_t R_{t_t}}{m_t^2} \]

\[ b_{tt} = \frac{8g_2^2 - 9}{m_t^2} \]

\[ a_{bb} = \frac{\frac{Y_b}{2}}{4m_t^2} \]

\[ b_{bb} = \frac{1}{3} \frac{X^2}{m_t^2} \]

Finally, the final state with neutralinos has:

\[ X \mathcal{M} (t, \nu_1, \nu_N, \nu_N^c) = \frac{3^j}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \left( \frac{8m_{\tilde{t}}^2}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{m_{\tilde{t}}^2}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{m_{\tilde{t}}^2}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{m_{\tilde{t}}^2}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \right)^2 \]

where

\[ a_{\nu N, \nu N^c} = \frac{3^j}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \left( \frac{8m_{\tilde{t}}^2}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{m_{\tilde{t}}^2}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{m_{\tilde{t}}^2}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{m_{\tilde{t}}^2}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \right)^2 \]

\[ b_{\nu N, \nu N^c} = \frac{3^j}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \left( \frac{8m_{\tilde{t}}^2}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{m_{\tilde{t}}^2}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{m_{\tilde{t}}^2}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{m_{\tilde{t}}^2}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \right)^2 \]

If there are no CP-violating phases, then \( a_{\nu N, \nu N^c} \) and \( b_{\nu N, \nu N^c} \) are real, and eq. (A.18) simplifies to:

\[ X \mathcal{M} (t, \nu_1, \nu_N, \nu_N^c) = 2 \left( \frac{2m_{\tilde{t}}^2}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{m_{\tilde{t}}^2}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{m_{\tilde{t}}^2}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \right)^2 \left( \frac{m_{\tilde{t}}^2}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \right)^2 \]
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