



pMSSM scan update

Jennet Dickinson September 29, 2021

A big test scan

- Launched 100 parallel scans x 20,000 points
 - Signs chosen at random
- McMC acceptance efficiency 43%



McMC likelihood

- Contributions from SPheno and FeynHiggs: Gaussian with mean/width = experimental value/uncertainty
- Contributions from Superiso, HiggsSignals, and HiggsBounds: χ² is calculated directly by the program

Superiso 4.0	SPheno 4.0.4	FeynHiggs 2.18.0	Higgs Signals 2.6.0	Higgs Bounds 5.9.1
Δ ₀ (Β→Kɣ)	BR(B⁺ →тv)	$m_{H}, H \longrightarrow$ properties —	LHC Higgs meas.	LHC Heavy H(тт)
BR(b→sɣ)	$BR(D_s \rightarrow \tau v)$			
BR(B _s →µµ)	$BR(D_s \rightarrow \mu v)$			
BR(B _d →µµ)	α _S			
BR(b→sµµ)	m _{top}			
BR(b→see)	m _{bottom}			
BR(B0→K* ⁰ ¥)				



pMSSM params (1)







pMSSM params (2)







pMSSM params (3)

Log stepping worksSign choice works





pMSSM params (4)







Mass of lightest squark

- Gaussian step width = 5% of parameter range
 - 0.17% of accepted points > 10 TeV



Will run some tests with 10%, 20% width

Don't think we should go lower ...



Physics observables





Likelihood contributions





Adding Δa_{μ} to the likelihood

- Launched 100 parallel scans x 20,000 points
 - Many failed due to bug in batch submission
- McMC acceptance efficiency 1.7%
- Negligible impact on job time









Remaining open items

- Pending update to SPheno
- Gaussian stepping width
- Micromegas in scan or in post-processing?
 - Some trouble running this in batch mode... work in progress
- Want to add SModelS to post-processing

- Volunteers to help with this?

• Want to start sharing output. Where is the best place?

