Thomas Gajdosik

# **Introduction to Particle Physics**



- The Particle Zoo Symmetries
- The Standard Model

Thomas Gajdosik Faculty of Physics Department of Theoretical Physics

Thomas Gajdosik

## The Particle Zoo

The Standard Model



 $e^{-}$ 



1900 - 1924



1897

1914

1897

The Standard Model

Thomas Gajdosik

# the proton – the atomic nucleus $e^{-}$ THOMSON fluorescentscreen gold foil radiation source (radium) erford RUTHERFORD



#### Stern-Gerlach experiment $\rightarrow$ Spin



Thomas Gajdosik



# the muon

#### Raby: "Who ordered that one?"



1897





 $\pi$ 

The Standard Model

 $\left[ n \right]$ 





e

1897

The Standard Model

# the positron



#### Discovery



#### **Prediction**





n

 $\pi$ 



1897

## the neutrino – theory prediction



Thomas Gajdosik

## strange particles

#### Pic du Midi





#### **K:** Rochester and **Butler**

(Univ. of Manchester)

#### $\Lambda$ : Hopper and **Biswas** (Univ. of Melbourne)

#### particles in a cloud chamber







Thomas Gajdosik

Willis E. Lamb, Jr.

#### Fine structure of the hydrogen atom

Nobel Lecture, December 12, 1955

When the Nobel Prizes were first awarded in 1901, physicists knew something of just two objects which are now called «elementary particles»: the electron and the proton. A deluge of other «elementary» particles appeared after 1930; neutron, neutrino,  $\mu$  meson,  $\pi$  meson, heavier mesons, and various hyperons. I have heard it said that «the finder of a new elementary particle used to be rewarded by a Nobel Prize, but such a discovery now ought to be punished by a \$10,000 fine».



1947





#### Looking for some order in this "chaos" ...

#### 1. properties of particles:

• order by mass (approximately, rather to be seen historically):

leptons	(Greek: ''light'')	electrons, muons, neutrinos,
mesons	(''medium-weight'')	pions, kaons,
baryons	(''heavy'')	protons, neutrons, lambda,

#### • order by charge:

neutral

- $\pm 1$  elementary charge
- $\pm 2$  elementary charge
- order by spin:

 fermions
 (spin  $\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $1\frac{1}{2}$ , ...)

 bosons
 (spin 0, 1, ...)

electrons, protons, neutrinos, ... photons, pions, ...

neutrons, neutrinos, photons, ...

proton, electron, muon, ...

 $\Delta^{++}, \Sigma_c^{++}, \ldots$ 

• order by "strangeness", parity, ...

Thomas Gajdosik



Looking for some order in this "chaos" ...

#### 2. conservation laws for particles:

- conservation of energy:
  - $n \to p + \dots$  but not  $\pi^0 \to \pi^{\pm} + \dots$
- conservation of charge:
  - $n \to p + e^- + \dots$  but not  $n \to p + e^+ + \dots$
- conservation of lepton number:
  - $n \rightarrow p + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$  but not  $n \rightarrow p + e^- + \nu_e$
- conservation of **baryon number**:
  - $n \to p + \dots$  but not  $n \to \pi^+ + \pi^- + \dots$
- conservation of **strangeness** (only in "fast" processes): fast  $K^* \to K + \pi$  but only "slow"  $K \to \pi + \pi$

Thomas Gajdosik



Thomas Gajdosik

# Symmetries & where do we find them? → everywhere in nature:



 snowflakes exhibit a 6-fold symmetry



• crystals build lattices

symmetries of the microcosm are also visible in the macrocosm



#### How do symmetries look like in theory?

**★** symmetries are described by symmetry transformations:

Example 1: Butterfly symmetry transformation S<sub>0</sub>: mirror all points at a line



formally: W = "original picture"  $\Rightarrow W' =$  "mirrored picture" apply symmetry in operator notation:  $S_0W = W'$ 

a symmetry is given if and only if  $S_0W = W$  !

#### How do symmetries look like in theory?

**★** symmetries are described by symmetry transformations:

Example 2: crystal lattice symmetry transformations  $S_i$ : move all points by the same vectors  $(\vec{x}_1 \text{ or } \vec{x}_2)$ 



*formally:* W = "original picture"  $\Rightarrow W' =$  "moved picture" apply symmetry in operator notation:  $S_iW = W'$ 

a symmetry is given if and only if  $S_i W = W$  !

How do symmetries look like in theory?
★ symmetry transformations form group structures

Example: translations symmetry transformations  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ : move all points by the same vector  $(\vec{x}_1 \text{ or } \vec{x}_2)$ 

movement of all points by the vector

 $\vec{x}_3 = \vec{x}_1 + \vec{x}_2$ 

is also a symmetry transformation !

$$S_3 = S_1 \circ S_2$$



#### Groups, mathematically:

a group  $(\overline{G}, \circ)$  is a set  $G = \{a, b, c, \dots\}$  with a

**binary operation** • that fulfills (the axioms)

- closure:  $c = a \circ b \in G \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad a, b \in G$
- associativity:  $(a \circ b) \circ c = a \circ (b \circ c)$
- identity:  $\exists e \text{ with } a \circ e = e \circ a = a \quad \forall a \in G$
- inverse:  $\forall a \in G$   $\exists b = a^{-1}$  (the inverse)

with  $a \circ b = b \circ a = e$ 

an Abelian group fulfills an additional relation

• commutativity:  $a \circ b = b \circ a \quad \forall a, b \in G$ 

#### Groups, an example:

using these six triangles, we can construct a group:



- the triangles themselves will not be elements
   as we have no clue, how to connect them
- their relations will be elements of a group!
  - we know, how we can transform one triangle into the other
  - then the set is  $\{I, R_1, R_2, R_3, R_+, R_-\}$
- then these transformations can be connected:
  - do first one, then the other:
    - $R_1 \circ R_2 =$ doing first  $R_2$ , then  $R_1$





- discrete symmetry transformations:
   parity transformation P
  - to mirror at a plane (a mirror) is easy to understand, but depends on the (arbitrary) position and orientation of the plane.
  - a more general definition: mirror at the origin

(space inversion, parity transformation):

PW(t, x, y, z) := W(t, -x, -y, -z)

 the parity transformation corresponds to a rotation followed by a mirroring at a plane



# discrete symmetry transformations: time reversal T (reversal of the "arrow of time")

- corresponds to a movie played backwards
- in case of a movie (= everday physics), this is spotted at once (i.e. there is no symmetry)
- however, the laws of mechanics are timesymmetric (example: billiard)
- definition:

$$\mathbf{T}W(t, x, y, z) := W(-t, x, y, z)$$



# discrete symmetry transformations: charge conjugation C (exchanging matter and anti-matter)

- for every known particle, there is also a anti-partner
- anti particles are identical to their partners with respect to some properties (e.g. mass), and opposite w.r.t. others (e.g. charge)
- charge conjugation exchanges all particles with their (anti)partners (and vice versa)
- definition:

$$\mathbf{C}W(t,x,y,z) := \overline{W}(t,x,y,z) = W^{\dagger}(t,x,y,z)$$



**★** continuous symmetry transformations:

- they can be performed in arbitrary small steps

time shift: physics(today) → physics(tomorrow)
 more accurately: shift by a time-step Δt

$$e^{\Delta t \frac{\partial}{\partial t} W(t, x, y, z)} = W(t + \Delta t, x, y, z)$$

• space shift: physics(here)  $\rightarrow$  physics(there) - more accurately: shift in space by a vector  $\Delta \vec{r} = (\Delta x, \Delta y, \Delta z)$ 

$$e^{\Delta \vec{r} \cdot \nabla} W(t, x, y, z) = W(t, x + \Delta x, y + \Delta y, z + \Delta z)$$

**★** continuous symmetry transformations:

- they can be performed in arbitrary small steps

DW(t, x, y, z) = W(t, x', y', z')



#### **★ continuous** symmetry transformations:

- they can be performed in arbitrary small steps

#### • U(1) transformation:

- does not affect the outer coordinates (t, x, y, z), but inner properties of particles
- U(1) is a transformation, which rotates the phase of a particle field (denoted as  $\Psi$ ) by an angle  $\alpha$ :

$$U(1)\Psi(t,x,y,z) = e^{i\alpha}\Psi(t,x,y,z)$$

**insertion**: **particles** are represented by fields in quantum field theory. At each point in space and time, the field  $\Psi$  can have a certain complex phase.





Thomas Gajdosik

#### The fundamental importance of symmetries

★ Noether's theorem:

to each symmetry of a field theory corresponds a certain conserved quantity -> conservation law



that means: if a field theory remains unchanged under a certain symmetry transformation S, then there is a mathematical procedure to calculate a property of the field which does not change with time, whatever complicated processes are involved.

#### The fundamental importance of symmetries

### ★ applications of Noether's theorem:

"also tomorrow the sun will rise" --> conservation of energy

- the laws of physics do not change with time
- more accurate: the corresponding field theory is invariant under time shifts:



$$e^{\Delta t \frac{\partial}{\partial t}} W(t, x, y, z) = W(t + \Delta t, x, y, z) \doteq W(t, x, y, z)$$

From Noether's theorem follows the conservation of a well-known property: energy!



#### The fundamental importance of symmetries

### ★ applications of Noether's theorem:

"also tomorrow the sun will rise" --> conservation of energy

- the laws of physics do not change with time
- more accurate: the corresponding field theory is invariant under time shifts:



$$e^{\Delta t \frac{\partial}{\partial t}} W(t, x, y, z) = W(t + \Delta t, x, y, z) \doteq W(t, x, y, z)$$

From Noether's theorem follows the conservation of a well-known property: energy!



#### just to be clear:

★ we are talking about properties of the underlying theory, not a certain physics scenario:

#### Example: chess:

- there is virtually an infinite number of ways a game of chess can develop
- a game tomorrow can be completely different from a game today

#### but:

• the rules of chess remain the same, they are invariant under time shifts!





#### The fundamental importance of symmetries

### **★** applications of Noether's theorem:

- the laws of physics do not depend on where you are
- more accurate: the corresponding field theory is invariant under space shifts:

$$e^{\Delta \vec{r} \cdot \nabla} W(t, \vec{r}) = W(t, \vec{r} + \Delta \vec{r}) \doteq W(t, \vec{r})$$

> Y

From Noether's theorem follows the conservation of a well-known property: momentum!



#### The fundamental importance of symmetries

#### **★** applications of Noether's theorem:

"going round and round" **conservation of angular momentum** 

- the laws of physics do not depend on which way you look
- more accurate: the corresponding field theory is invariant under rotations:

 $DW(t, \vec{r}) = W(t, \vec{r}') \doteq W(t, \vec{r})$ 

From Noether's theorem follows the conservation of a well-known property: angular momentum!


The fundamental importance of symmetries
★ applications of Noether's theorem: even more abstract symmetries get a meaning:
★ conservation of charge

 as it turns out, the field theory of electro-dynamics is invariant under a global\* U(1) transformation:

 $U(1)\Psi(t, x, y, z) = e^{i\alpha}\Psi(t, x, y, z)$  $\Rightarrow W'(t, x, y, z) \doteq W(t, x, y, z)$ 

\* global means: affecting all space-points (t,x,y,z) in the same way

From Noether's theorem follows the conservation of charge!



## **Overview**

## symmetries and conservation laws

symmetry	conservation law	
time shift	energy	
space shift	momentum	
rotation	angular momentum	
$oldsymbol{U}(1)$ phase	charge	

- Are symmetries perfect?
- ★ the small imperfections make it more interesting ...

is physics really perfectly symmetric?

- obviously, many things in our macroscopic world are not symmetric
- but is this also true for the fundamental laws of physics?





- ★ Originally it seemed that nature does not only exhibit the previously discussed continuous symmetries, but the discrete symmetries as well:
  - **P** (**parity transformation** = mirror symmetry)
  - T (time reversal)
  - C (charge conjugation)

- originally, all experiments indicated that the microcosmic world is perfectly mirror-symmetric
- 1956 Tsung-Dao Lee and Chen Ning Yang postulated a violation of parity for the weak interaction
  in the same year, Chien-Shiung
- Wu demonstrated the violation experimentally
- nature is <u>not</u> mirror-symmetric, P-symmetry (parity) is <u>violated</u>





★ a deeper understanding of the Wu experiment



- also (undetected) anti-neutrinos are emitted
- anti-neutrinos have a spin that is always orientated in the direction of movement (they are "right-handed")
- since a P-transformation changes the direction of movement, but not the spin, it produces a "left-handed" anti-neutrino
- as it turns out, we do not see a left-handed anti-neutrino in nature at all!
- therefore, Parity is said to be maximally violated

 $\star$  Parity violation – but maybe a CP symmetry?



anti-neutrino

left-handed neutrino

- there is no left-handed anti-neutrino, but there is a lefthanded neutrino (and only a such-handed!)
- obviously, this violates C-symmetry (Charge conjugation, the symmetrie between matter and anti-matter)
- BUT: the combined symmetry transformation CP (exchange matter/anti-matter plus mirroring) works:



right-handed anti-neutrino





left-handed neutrino

1980

## Are symmetries perfect? • the kaon experiment of 1964 99.8% $\pi$ 0.2% $\overline{K}$ $\overline{\tau}$ 0.2% $\overline{\pi}$ 0.2% $\overline{K}$ $\overline{\tau}$ $\overline{T}$ 0.2% $\overline{K}$ $\overline{T}$ $\overline{T}$ 0.2% $\overline{K}$ $\overline{T}$ $\overline{T}$

- if there is a CP-symmetry in nature, by Noether's theorem there is also a corresponding conserved quantum number "CP"
- kaons and pions are pseudo-scalars
  - $\Rightarrow$  **P**K = -K and **P** $\pi$  = - $\pi$
- therefore, CP is conserved for the decay of the long-lived kaon into three pions, but not for the decay into two

CP is (slightly) violated

- ★ implications of CP-violation in Cosmology
- why CP-violation is important for our existence:
- our universe consists as far as we know –
- almost completely of matter
- but where is the anti-matter?
- and why haven't matter and anti-matter just annihilated?



- at the big bang, there were large amounts of matter and anti-matter
- almost all of them annihilated
- but smallest asymmetries in the laws of nature for matter and antimatter left a tiny excess of matter: the matter of our universe
- 1967, Andrej Sacharow gave a list of conditions for this explanation
   one of it is CP-violation

Without CP-violation, our universe would not be the one we know!



## Are symmetries perfect? ★ "last hope" CPT ?

#### the CPT-theorem states:

- under very general conditions
  - i.e.: transformations of the Poincaré group
    - are symmetries of microscopic physics
- quantum field theories (the "language" of particle physics) always have CPT as a symmetry
- ... also experimentally, no violations have been observed so far

## -> CPT is (as far as we know today) not violated

#### interesting side remark:

- **CPT**-symmetry together with **CP**-violation, gives also **T-violation**
- that means: the fundamental laws of nature are not time-symmetric, there is a special direction of time even at the microscopic level

#### "the future IS different from the past, after all!"

## Overview

## discrete symmetries

symmetry	valid in the universe?
P (parity: "mirroring")	×
C (charge conjugation)	×
T (time reversal)	×
<b>CP</b> (combination of C and P)	×
CPT (combination of C, P, & T)	✓

# How symmetries make theories★ QED, the quantum theory of light

#### remember:

• physics is invariant under a global U(1)-transformation of the field  $\Psi$ :

$$U(1)\Psi(t,x,y,z) = e^{i\alpha}\Psi(t,x,y,z)$$

 global means a synchronous phase transformation of all particles in the whole universe!



#### the idea:

• replace the global transformation by a local one:

$$U(1)\Psi(t,x,y,z) = e^{i\alpha(t,x,y,z)}\Psi(t,x,y,z)$$

(different particles at different positions get transformed independently)

# How symmetries make theories★ QED, the quantum theory of light

#### result of a local U(1) transformation:

- if only particles are transformed
  - ★ not changing the electromagnetic interaction
- the theory is not invariant under local U(1) transformations!
- if the electromagnetic interaction is included in the transformation
- the theory becomes invariant under local U(1) transformations!



 this works only, because the electromagnetic interaction has "just the right form"

"coincidence or deeper truth?"

# How symmetries make theories ★ QED, the quantum theory of light

#### the modern viewpoint

#### ("gauge principle"):

- a non-interacting theory,
  - invariant under a global symmetry
  - can be made locally symmetric
  - by introducing
    - ★ additional fields
    - $\bigstar$  and interactions
- → the full theory is now for QED:
  - ★ locally symmetric
  - ★ and interacting

invariant under local phase transformations

the electro-magnetic gauge field  $A_{\mu}$ , describing photons

# each local symmetry produces an interaction plus new particles which mediate it



Thomas Gajdosik

# How symmetries make theories ★ Quantum-Chromo-Dynamics (QCD) the theory of the strong force

- experiments show that protons (and neutrons) have an inner structure
- observations suggest the existence of
  - ★ fermions (quarks) with
  - ★ 3 inner degrees of freedom (color)
  - inside the nucleon





## How symmetries make theories

- ★ Quantum-Chromo-Dynamics (QCD) the theory of the strong force
  - we do not see "color"
  - color states can be redefined
    - ★ without changing the theory!

"new colors" = mixture of old colors

$$q = A_{rr} q + A_{rg} q + A_{rb} q$$

$$q = A_{gr} q + A_{gg} q + A_{gb} q$$

$$q = A_{br} q + A_{bg} q + A_{bb} q$$



- $\bullet$  mathematically, this corresponds to a unitary 3  $\times$  3 matrix A
- the symmetry group is called SU(3)

## How symmetries make theories

★ Quantum-Chromo-Dynamics (QCD) the theory of the strong force

#### gauge principle:

- making the SU(3)<sub>color</sub>-symmetry local we get
  - $\star$  the strong force with
  - $\star$  the gluon as the force carrier
- the strong force binds the quarks into mesons and baryons
- it is also (indirectly) responsible for the stability of nuclei

(binding of proton and neutron, the nuclear force)

## the color symmetry of quarks enables the existence of atoms!



## How symmetries make theories ★ sketch of electro-weak interaction

- proton and neutron behave similar inside the nucleus
  - ★ iso-spin symmetry
- extending this iso-spin symmetry to all left-handed fermions
  - ★ groups them in pairs (doublets)
  - $\bigstar$  is a symmetry of the free theory

#### gauge principle:

- making the  $SU(2)_L$ -symmetry local (and "mixing" it with a local  $U(1)_Y$ -symmetry) we get
  - $\bigstar$  the electro-weak force
  - $\star$  with W- and Z-bosons (and photons) as force carriers

"new flavor" = mixture of old flavors

$$\nu_e' = A_{uu} \nu_e + A_{ud} e_{L}^-$$

$$e_{L}' = A_{du} \nu_{e} + A_{dd} e_{L}$$

$$u'_{L} = A_{uu} \quad u_{L} + A_{ud} \quad d_{L}$$
$$d'_{L} = A_{du} \quad u_{L} + A_{dd} \quad d_{L}$$

## **Overview**

## **Symmetries and Interactions**

symmetry		interaction		
U(1)	symmetry of all leptons and quarks	$U(1)_Y$	electro-	
<b>SU(2)</b>	symmetry of left-handed leptons and quarks	weak	weak	
<b>SU(3)</b>	symmetry of quarks alone	strong		
?	is it a symmetry of space-time geometry itself, or something qualitatively different?	(quantum-) gravity		

Thomas Gajdosik



## Particles of the Standard Model: Fermions

- 1. reminder about the particles
  - from the historical introduction
- 2. the ordering principle
  - example: electron and neutrino
- 3. the systematics
  - extending the ordering to all fermions
  - counting the degrees of freedom
- 4. overview

The Standard Model



e

1897

The Standard Model

## the positron



#### Discovery



## **Prediction**





n

 $\pi$ 



1897

## the neutrino – theory prediction



Thomas Gajdosik

Reminder: Are symmetries perfect? ★ Parity violation – but maybe a CP symmetry?





left-handed neutrino

- there is no left-handed anti-neutrino, but there is a lefthanded <u>neutrino</u> (and only a such-handed!)
- obviously, this violates C-symmetry (Charge conjugation, the symmetrie between matter and anti-matter)
- BUT: the combined symmetry transformation CP (exchange matter/anti-matter plus mirroring) works:



right-handed anti-neutrino





left-handed neutrino

Thomas Gajdosik

## Ordering principle: discreet symmetries

- Parity P
  - left-handed or right-handed
- Charge Conjugation C
  - particle or antiparticle
- Charge Q or Flavour
  - possible values:
- Generation
  - first second third









Thomas Gajdosik

## Particles of the Standard Model:

## Fermions

#### left

## right









1914

1897

The Standard Model

Thomas Gajdosik

## the proton – the atomic nucleus $e^{-}$ THOMSON fluorescentscreen gold foil radiation source (radium) erford RUTHERFORD

Thomas Gajdosik



## partons / parton model Richard Feynman 1969



1969

1955



a hadron is composed of pointlike constituents, called "partons". The number of partons depends on the probing energy  $\Rightarrow$ **parton distribution functions** 



Thomas Gajdosik

## Particles of the Standard Model:

## Fermions

## left

## right











 $\pi$ 

The Standard Model

 $\left[ n \right]$ 





Thomas Gajdosik

## Particles of the Standard Model:

## Fermions

## left

## right





# antiparticles







## the muon

#### Raby: "Who ordered that one?"



1897





Thomas Gajdosik

## Particles of the Standard Model:

## Fermions

## left

## right





antiparticles







Thomas Gajdosik

## strange particles

#### Pic du Midi





#### **K:** Rochester and **Butler**

(Univ. of Manchester)

#### $\Lambda$ : Hopper and **Biswas** (Univ. of Melbourne)

#### particles in a cloud chamber







Thomas Gajdosik

## Particles of the Standard Model:

## Fermions

#### left

## right










# antineutrino

ar Pond

#### **Cowan–Reines neutrino experiment**

#### Savannah River Site

 ${\cal V}$ 



nah Rive



used the antineutrino flux from the nuclear reactors of the Savannah River Site (South Carolina).





Thomas Gajdosik

## Particles of the Standard Model:

## Fermions

#### left

#### right













## muon neutrino

the Alternating Gradient Synchrotron (AGS)



1962 Leon Lederman Melvin Schwartz Jack Steinberger



use the pions and kaons of the AGS. These dacays produce also (anti)neutrinos; with a similar setup like the Cowan–Reines experiment they detect muons, but no electrons ⇒ the neutrinos coming from pions and kaons have to differ from the neutrinos coming from the neutrinos coming from the reactors.



1962

Thomas Gajdosik

## Particles of the Standard Model:

## Fermions

#### left

#### right















charm quark:  $J/\psi$ 

SLAC with detector complex at the right (east) side



**BNL: NSLS-II under construction** 



1955

1974

**Burt Richter (SLAC)** Samuel Ting (BNL) 1974



Thomas Gajdosik

## Particles of the Standard Model:

## Fermions

#### left

#### right















Martin Perl (SLAC-LBL) 1975

• using Mark I (SLAC-LBL Magnetic Detector)

1975

- first  $4\pi$ -detector
- comparing signal to background

1955





Thomas Gajdosik

## Particles of the Standard Model:

### **Fermions**

#### left

#### right





antiparticles









1955

## bottom quark: $\Upsilon$

1977





background suppression and computer aided statistical analysis lets the Fermilab E288 experiment discover the Upsilon meson 1974



Thomas Gajdosik

## Particles of the Standard Model:

### **Fermions**

#### left

#### right





antiparticles









Thomas Gajdosik

# Particles of the Standard Model:

## Fermions

#### left

#### right





antiparticles









Thomas Gajdosik

# Particles of the Standard Model:

### Fermions

#### left

#### right





antiparticles







2001

1998



# neutrino oscillations

#### 1957 predicted by **B. Pontecorvo**



Super Kamiokande (SK) announces first experimental evidence for atmospheric neutrino oscillations in 1998



1957

Sudbury Neutrino Observatory (SNO) provides clear evidence of neutrino flavor change in solar neutrinos in 2001

only then the solar neutrino puzzle was solved





**Neutrino oscillations:** 



- **★** solve the solar neutrino puzzle
- neutrinos have a tiny mass
  - there exist also right-handed neutrinos



- ★ no charge, no hypercharge, and no color
- no interaction except the mass-term
- → their existence does not change
  - (the predictions of) the Standard Model!

Thomas Gajdosik

## Particles of the Standard Model:

### Fermions

#### left

#### right





antiparticles







## Particles of the Standard Model: Gauge Bosons

#### 1. screening in QED

- Vacuum polarization
- running coupling constant
- 2. anti-screening in QCD
  - asymptotic freedom
  - confinement
- 3. massive vector bosons

 $e^{-}$ 



1900 - 1924



1897

#### screening

- the effective charge of an ion in a dielectric medium is reduced by the dielectric molecules surrounding the charge
- the same happens in the vacuum:
  if one looks at the charge with sufficient energy to see virtual electron-positron pairs







#### screening

 the energy dependence of the effective charge in the vacuum due to the Vacuum polarization is described by the



## ★ running coupling



 $\boldsymbol{g}$ 

gluon

#### The Standard Model

 $e^{-}$ 

U

 $\boldsymbol{g}$ 





the consistent interpretation of **3-jet events** as **gluon bremsstrahlung** in the framework of QCD, done in PLUTO, TASSO, MARK-J, and JADE (experiments at PETRA, DESY), marks the discovery of the gluon **1979** 



1955

1979

## anti-screening

- the self couplings in QCD have the opposite effect for the color charges
  - the closer one looks, the weaker the charges seem to become
  - asymptotic freedom !







## anti-screening

- at high energies (colliders)
  we have no problem to separate color charges
- at lower energies
  - the force connecting the charges seems to become stronger





strong enough that the potential (= force \* distance)
 creates a quark-antiquark pair, that restores
 color neutrality
 Color confinement !

- color confinement
- low energy states have to be color neutral
- → we can only observe color neutral particles
- the strong force hides inside the nucleons
- the nuclear force is more like a van der Waals force:
  - mediated by mesons (quark antiquark pairs)
  - Baryons and Mesons are color singlets



Modern Theoretical Physics

Z

The Standard Model

Thomas Gajdosik

## hints for $W^{\pm}$ - and Z-boson



1955



1973

Weak charged currents were known from neutrino detection.

CERN announced the experimental observation of weak neutral currents, shortly after they were predicted by the electroweak theory of Abdus Salam, Sheldon Glashow and Steven Weinberg.



Thomas Gajdosik



#### event in the UA1 detector



Z-event in UA1



January 1983:

Rubbia: "They look like Ws, they feel like Ws, they smell like Ws, they must be Ws".

4 Z-events by end of June 1983



UA2 detector





Thomas Gajdosik

### **Weak Interactions**

- 1933 Enrico Fermi explained the radioactive beta decay
  - by coupling four fermions
- the same coupling constant  $G_F = \frac{1.16637 \times 10^{-5}}{{\rm GeV}^2} \ {\rm describes}$ 
  - radioactive beta-decay
  - muon decay
  - charged pion decay
  - neutrino interactions

 $\star$  but it cannot work for energies bigger than  $\sim 100$  GeV

 $\pi^+$ 



 $u_{\mu}$ 

Thomas Gajdosik

### Weak Interactions: modern explanation

- weak interactions couple a pair of fermions with another pair
  - via vector bosons
- the Fermi coupling constant

$$G_F=rac{\sqrt{2}}{8}rac{g^2}{m_W^2}$$

is independent of energy
 only if the energy is (much)
 smaller than the mass
 of the W-boson (80 GeV)





## Weak Interactions: LEP

- electron-positron colliders can produce Z-bosons or pairs of W-bosons
  - ★ which decay to hadrons and leptons



LEP



### Weak Interactions: LEP

 electron-positron colliders determine the energy of collisions very accurately
 precision measurements





## Weak Interactions: LEP

- measuring more predictions than there are parameters in a theory
   consistency check
  - for the Standard Model



	Measurement	Fit	0 <sup>m</sup> 0	<sup>eas</sup> –C	0 <sup>fit</sup> ∣/σ <sup>m</sup> 2	eas 3
$\Delta \alpha_{had}^{(5)}(m_Z)$	$0.02750 \pm 0.00033$	0.02759				
m <sub>z</sub> [GeV]	$91.1875 \pm 0.0021$	91.1874				
Г <sub>Z</sub> [GeV]	$2.4952 \pm 0.0023$	2.4959				
$\sigma_{\sf had}^0$ [nb]	$41.540 \pm 0.037$	41.478			•	
R <sub>I</sub>	$20.767 \pm 0.025$	20.742				
A <sup>0,I</sup> <sub>fb</sub>	$0.01714 \pm 0.00095$	0.01645				
A <sub>I</sub> (Ρ <sub>τ</sub> )	$0.1465 \pm 0.0032$	0.1481				
R <sub>b</sub>	$0.21629 \pm 0.00066$	0.21579		•		
R <sub>c</sub>	$0.1721 \pm 0.0030$	0.1723				
$A_{fb}^{0,b}$	$0.0992 \pm 0.0016$	0.1038				
A <sup>0,c</sup> <sub>fb</sub>	$0.0707 \pm 0.0035$	0.0742				
A <sub>b</sub>	$0.923\pm0.020$	0.935				
A <sub>c</sub>	$0.670\pm0.027$	0.668				
A <sub>l</sub> (SLD)	$0.1513 \pm 0.0021$	0.1481				
$\sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}(Q_{fb})$	$0.2324 \pm 0.0012$	0.2314		-		
m <sub>w</sub> [GeV]	$80.385 \pm 0.015$	80.377				
Г <sub>w</sub> [GeV]	$2.085 \pm 0.042$	2.092	•			
m <sub>t</sub> [GeV]	$173.20 \pm 0.90$	173.26				
March 2012			0	1	2	3

## Particles of the Standard Model: Higgs Boson

- 1. Why a Higgs Boson?
- 2. The Higgs mechanism
  - ... no formulas ... ... only handwaving
- 3. Systematics:
  - counting the degrees of freedom
- 4. Experimental evidence
  - History of the discovery

### Why a Higgs Boson ?

- The Standard Model is a chiral gauge field theory
- → it is described with massless fermion fields
- the gauge symmetries enforce massless vector bosons
- But we have
  - ★ massive fermions: leptons and quarks
  - $\star$  massive vector bosons:  $W^{\pm}$  and  $Z^0$
- Solution: the Higgs mechanism

- The Higgs Mechanism
- Ingredients:
  - ★ scalar fields
  - ★ continuous local symmetries = gauge symmetries
  - ★ the vacuum
- Result
  - **★** gauge symmetries are spontaneously broken
  - the scalar fields develop a vacuum expectation value (vev)
  - **★** other fields can acquire masses due to the vev

### symmetry breaking

#### Example: chess:

- the rules of chess are in principle
  - absolutely symmetric
  - ▶ for both players
- i.e. the rules how the pieces move are the same for black and white

#### but:

- the symmetry is broken at the beginning due to the initial setup of the pieces
- therefore
  - → a bishop never can change the color of the field it is standing on




# symmetry breaking

★ the origin of mass

In the SM, masses of particles are an effect of symmetry breaking:

- originally, all particles are massless, but interact with the Higgs field
- due to spontaneous symmetry breaking
  - $\star$  the value of the Higgs field is non-zero in the vacuum (=vev)
- the interaction with this vev produces the mass of particles



spontaneous symmetry breaking

Thomas Gajdosik

# degrees of freedom only $SU(2) \times U(1)$ bosons

### massless theory

## massive theory

#	particles	dof	#
1	complex scalar doublet	4	1
4	massless gauge bosons ( $B$ , $W^i$ )	8	1
0	massive gauge bosons	0	3
		12	

#	particles	dof
1	real scalar field (Higgs)	1
1	massless gauge boson (photon)	2
3	massive gauge bosons ( $W^{\pm}$ , $Z^0$ )	9
		12

# production at LEP

#### **Higgs-strahlung**



#### **Higgs-fusion**



#### **Higgs production cross section**



Thomas Gajdosik

# exclusion by LEP I & II



 comparison between an expected (calculated)
 distribution and the measured distribution
 of events



measured mass distribution

# hints: electroweak precision measurements

- very precise measurements allow the comparison with precise calculations
- all loop calculations depend on the masses of all the particles in the loop!
- sensitivity to particles, that can not yet be produced!



	Measurement	Fit	$ O^{\text{meas}} - O^{\text{fit}}  / \sigma^{\text{meas}}$ 0 1 2 3
$\Delta \alpha_{had}^{(5)}(m_Z)$	$0.02750 \pm 0.00033$	0.02759	
m <sub>z</sub> [GeV]	$91.1875 \pm 0.0021$	91.1874	
Г <sub>Z</sub> [GeV]	$2.4952 \pm 0.0023$	2.4959	-
$\sigma_{\sf had}^0$ [nb]	$41.540 \pm 0.037$	41.478	
R <sub>I</sub>	$20.767 \pm 0.025$	20.742	
A <sup>0,I</sup> <sub>fb</sub>	$0.01714 \pm 0.00095$	0.01645	
A <sub>I</sub> (P <sub>τ</sub> )	$0.1465 \pm 0.0032$	0.1481	-
R <sub>b</sub>	$0.21629 \pm 0.00066$	0.21579	
R <sub>c</sub>	$0.1721 \pm 0.0030$	0.1723	
A <sup>0,b</sup> <sub>fb</sub>	$0.0992 \pm 0.0016$	0.1038	
A <sup>0,c</sup> <sub>fb</sub>	$0.0707 \pm 0.0035$	0.0742	
A <sub>b</sub>	$0.923\pm0.020$	0.935	
A <sub>c</sub>	$0.670\pm0.027$	0.668	
A <sub>l</sub> (SLD)	$0.1513 \pm 0.0021$	0.1481	
$sin^2 \theta_{eff}^{lept}(Q_{fb})$	$0.2324 \pm 0.0012$	0.2314	
m <sub>w</sub> [GeV]	$80.385 \pm 0.015$	80.377	
Г <sub>w</sub> [GeV]	$2.085 \pm 0.042$	2.092	
m <sub>t</sub> [GeV]	$173.20 \pm 0.90$	173.26	
March 2012			

# production at LHC



#### top-associated-production





The Higgs particle — history of the experimental search reduction of the allowed mass range

- 2004 LEP limit:  $m_H > 114.4 \text{ GeV}$ 
  - uses data, collected from the LEP experiments until 2000
- 2010 Tevatron exclusion:  $158 < m_H/\text{GeV} < 175$  is excluded – data from the Fermilab experiments CDF and DØ
- July 2011 LHC exclusion: 145  $< m_H/{\rm GeV} <$  466 is excluded
  - data from the ATLAS and CMS from 2010 and 2011
- December 2011 LHC limits the allowed mass range
  - ATLAS: 116  $< m_H/{\rm GeV} <$  130
  - CMS:  $115 < m_H/{
    m GeV} < 127$
- July 4<sup>th</sup> 2012 CERN announces the detection of a boson compatible with the SM Higgs boson
  - ATLAS:  $m_H \sim$  126.5 GeV @ 5  $\sigma$  significance
  - CMS:  $m_H = 125.3 \pm 0.6 \,\text{GeV}$  @ 4.9  $\sigma$  significance

### by the Atlas detector



#### by the CMS detector





### How was that measurement achieved?

combining production- with decaychannels of the Higgs boson

### largest branching ratios

- $b\overline{b}$ ,  $\tau^-\tau^+$ ,  $c\overline{c}$ , and gg
  - hard to distiguish
     from background
- $WW \rightarrow 4q$



- $WW \rightarrow 2\ell 2\nu$ 
  - neutrinos are not measured  $\Rightarrow$  bad reconstruction
- $\Rightarrow$  looking for  $\gamma\gamma$  and  $ZZ \rightarrow 4\ell$ 
  - has also very good mass resolution

 $\Rightarrow$  'golden channel''



 $H\to\gamma\gamma$ 

- Monte Carlo and data:
  - gives a signal on a background





a possible  $H \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$  event

with local p-value at 125 GeV with a local significance of 4.1  $\sigma$ 

The Higgs particle — experimental search  $H \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow \mu^- \mu^+ + e^- e^+$ CMS **μ+(Z1) pT : 43** GeV e-(Z2) pT : 10 8 TeV DATA GeV 4-lepton Mass : 126.9 GeV μ-(Z1) pT : 24 GeV e+(Z2) pT : 21 CMS Experiment at LHC, CERN Data recorded: Mon May 28 01:35:47 2012 CEST Run/Event: 195099 / 137440354 Lumi section: 115

Combining  $H \to \gamma \gamma$  and  $H \to ZZ^* \to 4\ell$ 

- combining the high sensitivity, high mass resolution channels:  $H \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$  and  $H \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow 4\ell$ 
  - $\gamma\gamma$  has 4.1  $\sigma$  excess -  $4\ell$  has 3.2  $\sigma$  excess
- near the same mass of 125 GeV
- ⇒ combined significance of 5  $\sigma$ (as of 2012 ... now it is more)



Characterising the excess in all channels

- results for the mass are self consistent
- and can be combined

 $\Rightarrow m_X = 125.9 \pm 0.4 \, \text{GeV}$ 

• But is it the SM Higgs boson?

 $\Rightarrow$  comparing to other hypotheses:





#### Comparing couplings to fermions and to vector bosons

- Group the Higgs couplings into 'Vectorial'' and 'Fermionic'' sets.
- with coupling strength relative to the SM value
  - $c_V$  for vectors
  - $c_F$  for fermions
- use theoretical LO prediction for the loop-induced  $H \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$  and  $H \rightarrow gg$  vertices
- agreement with SM in 95% range
  - fermio-phobic Higgs ? ... statistics
- $\Rightarrow$  We need more data!



and they will come

• • •

#### Nobelprize in Physics 2013



Francois Englert and Peter W. Higgs

The Standard Model

Thomas Gajdosik

