

# Living dangerously with decoupled first/second generation scalars: SUSY prospects at the LHC

Howard Baer<sup>1\*</sup>, Vernon Barger<sup>2†</sup> and Kairui Zhang<sup>1¶</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Homer L. Dodge Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706 USA*

## Abstract

The string landscape statistical draw to large scalar soft masses leads to a mixed quasi-degeneracy/decoupling solution to the SUSY flavor and CP problems where first/second generation matter scalars lie in the 20-40 TeV range. With increasing first/second generation scalars, SUSY models actually become more natural due to two-loop RG effects which suppress the corresponding third generation soft masses. This can also lead to substantial parameter space regions which are forbidden by the presence of charge and/or color breaking (CCB) minima of the scalar potential. We outline the allowed SUSY parameter space for the gravity-mediated three extra-parameter-non-universal Higgs model NUHM3. The natural regions with  $m_h \sim 125$  GeV,  $\Delta_{EW} \lesssim 30$  and decoupled first/second generation scalar are characterized by rather heavy gluinos and EW gauginos, but with rather small  $\mu$  and top-squarks not far beyond LHC Run 2 limits. This scenario also explains why SUSY has so far eluded discovery at LHC in that the parameter space with small scalar and gaugino masses is all excluded by the presence of CCB minima.

---

\*Email: baer@ou.edu

†Email: barger@pheno.wisc.edu

¶Email: kzhang25@ou.edu

# 1 Introduction

At the end of the twentieth century, it was commonly believed that weak scale supersymmetry (SUSY) would be revealed at sufficiently energetic colliding beam experiments with sparticle masses in the few hundred GeV range [1]. The dominant SUSY breaking paradigm at the time was that of gravity mediation, where hidden sector SUSY breaking would be communicated to the visible sector via gravitational couplings already present in the supergravity Lagrangian [2, 3]. While SUSY provided a 't Hooft technical naturalness solution to the big hierarchy problem [4, 5], motivations from practical naturalness [6]— that SUSY contributions to the weak scale should be comparable to or less than the weak scale— seemingly pointed to a few hundred GeV as the SUSY breaking mass scale [7]. In spite of this, there were already conflicting indications that the SUSY breaking scale could well be higher, in the TeV or beyond range. At issue was that in generic SUGRA theories, large flavor-violating and CP-violating effects were expected as there was no known symmetry to suppress these. In fact, the SUSY flavor and CP problems soon motivated alternative paradigms— gauge mediation [8], anomaly mediation [9] and gaugino mediation [10]— which led to universal scalar soft terms and suppression of flavor violating effects via a super-GIM mechanism.

However, already in 1993 Dine et al. [11] proposed an alternative for SUGRA-based theories that the first two generations of scalar masses could lie in the tens of TeV range, yielding a decoupling solution to the flavor and CP problems, whilst third generation scalar masses could lie in the TeV-range, which was more consistent with naturalness. This proposal was further amplified by Cohen et al. [12] (CKN) with their 'more minimal' or effective SUSY scheme which delineated the attractive features of such a scenario [13]. This also motivated the radiatively-generated scalar mass hierarchy models of Bagger et al. [14] where all scalars had multi-TeV values at the high scale, but where large (unified) Yukawa coupling effects drive the third generation masses to TeV-scale values while leaving first/second generation scalars in the tens-of-TeV range [15].

In the 21st century, the discovery of  $m_h \sim 125$  GeV seemed to require for SUSY theories either large trilinear soft ( $A$ ) terms or else top squark soft terms in the  $\sim 10 - 100$  TeV range when  $A$ -terms were small (as was expected for gauge, anomaly or gaugino mediation) [16]. For this latter case, the large third generation scalar masses violated even the most conservative naturalness conditions, thus selecting out gravity-mediation models as being able to generate  $m_h \sim 125$  GeV whilst preserving naturalness and maintaining consistency with LHC sparticle mass search limits [17]. But if gravity-mediation was then preferred, what of the SUSY flavor and CP problems? [18] One possibility was to abandon naturalness as in split [19, 20] or minisplit [21] SUSY models which could then allow for the required 10-100 TeV third generation scalars [22]. But in these models, rather light gauginos and higgsinos were also expected and so these models could not escape pressure from negative LHC searches.

## 2 Inverted scalar mass hierarchy from the string landscape

Another route to sparticle spectra with an inverted scalar mass hierarchy ( $m_0(1,2) \gg m_0(3)$ ) arose with the advent of the string landscape. Under flux compactifications of type II-B string theory [23,24], the huge number of compactification possibilities, of order  $10^{500-272,000}$  [25], each leads to different  $4-d$  laws of physics. This scenario provides a basis for Weinberg's anthropic solution to the cosmological constant problem [26]: in the greater multiverse with a huge number of vacua with the SM as low energy EFT, but with different cosmological constants, then it may be no surprise that we find ourselves in a pocket universe with  $\rho_{vac} \sim 10^{-122} m_P^4$  since if it were much bigger, the universe would expand so quickly that structure, and hence observers, would not arise.

This logic can also be applied to other dimensionful quantities, such as the overall SUSY breaking scale [27,28], which in turn determines the magnitude of the weak scale. The different functional dependence of the various soft SUSY breaking terms on hidden sector/moduli fields leads them to effectively scan independently in the multiverse [29]. Since nothing in string theory favors one over another value of SUSY breaking scales, then the  $F$ -breaking fields are expected to be uniformly distributed as complex numbers whilst the  $D$ -breaking fields scan as real numbers. The overall SUSY breaking scale is then statistically expected to scan as a power-law draw to large terms as [28,30,31]

$$f_{SUSY} \sim m_{soft}^{2n_F+n_D-1} \quad (1)$$

where  $m_{soft} \sim m_{hidden}^2/m_P$ , and  $n_F$  is the number of  $F$ -breaking fields and  $n_D$  is the number of  $D$ -breaking fields contributing to the overall SUSY breaking scale. Thus, even for the textbook case of SUSY breaking via a single  $F$ -term field, the multiverse would favor a statistical linear draw to large soft terms, and if more SUSY breaking fields also contribute, then the draw to large soft terms would be even stronger.

Naively, this picture would favor SUSY breaking at the highest scales possible, but now one must fold in anthropics. Restricting ourselves to string vacua with the MSSM as low scale EFT (as expected in Calabi-Yao compactifications [32]), then the weak scale is determined by minimizing the scalar potential. The  $Z$  mass in each pocket universe is given by

$$(m_Z^{PU})^2/2 = \frac{m_{H_d}^2 + \Sigma_d^d - (m_{H_u}^2 + \Sigma_u^u) \tan^2 \beta}{\tan^2 \beta - 1} - \mu^2 \simeq -m_{H_u}^2 - \mu^2 - \Sigma_u^u(\tilde{t}_{1,2}). \quad (2)$$

Here,  $m_{H_u}^2$  and  $m_{H_d}^2$  are the Higgs field soft terms,  $\mu$  is the SUSY conserving  $\mu$  parameter<sup>1</sup>,  $\tan \beta = v_u/v_d$  is the ratio of Higgs field vevs and the  $\Sigma_u^u$  and  $\Sigma_d^d$  contain over 40 loop corrections, which can be found in the Appendix to Ref. [34], using the Coleman-Weinberg formalism [35]. The anthropic condition is that  $m_Z^{PU}$  must lie not-to-far from its measured value in our universe, lest the up-down quark mass difference lead to pocket universes with either all protons, or all neutrons, and no complex nuclei, which are needed for observers. This window of anthropically-allowed weak scale values is called the ABDS window [36]:

$$0.5m_Z^{OU} \lesssim m_Z^{PU} \lesssim (2-5)m_Z^{OU} \quad (3)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Twenty solutions to the SUSY  $\mu$  problem are reviewed in Ref. [33].

where  $m_Z^{OU} = 91.2$  GeV. Thus, if a contributing soft term is too large, it will typically lead to contributions to Eq. 2 beyond the ABDS window, unless some implausible accidental finetuning occurs.

In most landscape scans with small  $\mu \sim 100 - 350$  GeV, the  $\Sigma_u^u(\tilde{t}_{1,2})$  are the largest weak scale contributions since their Yukawa couplings are large:

$$\Sigma_u^u(\tilde{t}_{1,2}) = \frac{3}{16\pi^2} F(m_{\tilde{t}_{1,2}}) \times \left[ f_t^2 - g_Z^2 \mp \frac{f_t^2 A_t^2 - 8g_Z^2(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{2}{3}x_W)\Delta_t}{m_{\tilde{t}_2}^2 - m_{\tilde{t}_1}^2} \right] \quad (4)$$

where  $\Delta_t = (m_{\tilde{t}_L}^2 - m_{\tilde{t}_R}^2)/2 + m_Z^2 \cos 2\beta(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{2}{3}x_W)$ ,  $g_Z^2 = (g^2 + g'^2)/8$ ,  $x_W \equiv \sin^2 \theta_W$  and  $F(m^2) = m^2(\log(m^2/Q^2) - 1)$  with  $Q^2 \simeq m_{\tilde{t}_1} m_{\tilde{t}_2}$ . Hence, top-squarks cannot be too heavy. Since  $\Sigma_u^u(\tilde{t}_{1,2}) \sim m_{\tilde{t}_1}^2/16\pi^2$ , the top squark masses lie typically in the few TeV range. (In addition, for large  $A_t$  terms, there can be large cancellations in the numerator of  $\Sigma_u^u$ . [37]) However, for first/second generation squarks and sleptons, since their Yukawa couplings are much smaller, then they would be selected to be far heavier, in the 10-40 TeV range [38]. Actually, the upper bounds on first/second generation sfermions do not come from the  $\Sigma_u^u$  terms but rather from 2-loop RG running [39] of third generation sfermions [22, 40]:

$$\frac{dm_i^2}{dt} = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \beta_{m_i^2}^{(1)} + \frac{1}{(16\pi^2)^2} \beta_{m_i^2}^{(2)}, \quad (5)$$

where  $t = \log(Q)$  and  $i = Q_j, U_j, D_j, L_j$  and  $E_j$  with  $j = 1 - 3$  a generation index. The  $\beta_{m_i^2}^{(1)}$  are the usual 1-loop beta functions while the 2-loop beta functions contain the terms

$$\beta_{m_i^2}^{(2)} \ni a_i g_3^2 \sigma_3 + b_i g_2^2 \sigma_2 + c_i g_1^2 \sigma_1 \quad (6)$$

and where

$$\sigma_1 = \frac{1}{5} g_1^2 \{3(m_{H_u}^2 + m_{H_d}^2) + \text{Tr}[\mathbf{m}_Q^2 + 3\mathbf{m}_L^2 + 8\mathbf{m}_U^2 + 2\mathbf{m}_D^2 + 2\mathbf{m}_E^2]\} \quad (7)$$

$$\sigma_2 = g_2^2 \{m_{H_u}^2 + m_{H_d}^2 + \text{Tr}[3\mathbf{m}_Q^2 + \mathbf{m}_L^2]\} \quad (8)$$

$$\sigma_3 = g_3^2 \text{Tr}[2\mathbf{m}_Q^2 + \mathbf{m}_U^2 + \mathbf{m}_D^2]. \quad (9)$$

The coefficients  $a_i$ ,  $b_i$  and  $c_i$  are related to the quantum numbers of the scalar fields but are all positive constants. Normally, the 2-loop contributions to Eq. 5 are small relative to the 1-loop contributions. But the  $\sigma_i$  terms contain all scalar masses, so when some of these become huge, then the 2-loop terms can be comparable or even exceed the 1-loop beta functions. In our case with  $m_0(1,2) \gg m_0(3)$ , then the large first/second generation scalar masses leads to *suppression* of 3rd generation scalar masses in their running from  $Q = m_{GUT}$  to  $Q = m_{weak}$ , and thus typically a diminution of the  $\Sigma_u^u(\tilde{t}_{1,2})$  terms: *i.e.* the theory becomes more *natural* [41]! Since the terms in Eq's 7-9 depend on gauge and not Yukawa couplings, the upper bounds on first/second generation sfermions masses are the same, leading to a landscape selection of quasi-degeneracy, *i.e.* degeneracy at the  $\sim 1 - 20\%$  level [41].

The third generation scalar soft term running is shown in Fig. 1 for  $m_0(3) = 6$  TeV,  $m_{1/2} = 2.2$  TeV,  $A_0 = -m_0(3)$ ,  $\tan \beta = 10$  with  $\mu = 200$  GeV and  $m_A = 2000$  GeV. For the

solid curves in NUHM2, we take scalar mass degeneracy with  $m_0(1, 2) = m_0(3)$  while for the dashed curves in NUHM3 we take  $m_0(1, 2) = 30$  TeV. From the plot, the downward RG push on all five third generation scalar masses is evident and  $m_{U_3}^2$  is particularly noticeable in that its weak scale value shifts from  $\sim 4$  TeV for universality to  $m_{U_3} \sim 1$  TeV for  $m_0(1, 2) = 30$  TeV. The downward push on third generation masses can reduce the dominant  $\Sigma_u^u(\tilde{t}_{1,2})$  terms in Eq. 2, making the spectra more natural. If the value of  $m_0(1, 2)$  is increased even more beyond  $\sim 30$  TeV, then in fact the  $m_{U_3}^2$  soft term can be driven to tachyonic values leading to CCB minima in the scalar potential. Such CCB minima must also be vetoed in the multiverse as leading to unlivable universes.




Figure 1: Running third generation soft scalar masses vs. scale  $Q$  in the NUHM2 model listed in Table 1 with  $m_0(1, 2) = 6$  TeV (solid) and NUHM3 (dashed) with  $m_0(1, 2) = 30$  TeV. We also take  $A_0 = -m_0(3)$  TeV,  $m_0(3) = 6$  TeV,  $m_{1/2} = 2.2$  TeV,  $m_A = 2$  TeV,  $\mu = 200$  GeV and  $\tan \beta = 10$ .

### 3 Landscape scan of NUHM3 model

Here, we scan the landscape of NUHM3 vacua over the range<sup>2</sup> We scan over the following parameters but with a *linear*  $n = 1$  selection favoring large soft terms:

- $m_0(1, 2) : 20 - 50$  TeV,
- $m_0(3) : 0 - 15$  TeV,

<sup>2</sup>We use Isajet 7.91 [42] for sparticle and Higgs mass and  $\Delta_{EW}$  generation.

- $m_{1/2} : 0 - 3.5$  TeV,
- $A_0 : 0 - (-25)$  TeV (negative only),
- $m_A : 0 - 10$  TeV,
- $\tan \beta : 3 - 60$  (flat) and
- $\mu = 200$  GeV.

for fixed  $\mu = 200$  GeV (since  $\mu$  is not a soft term but arises from whatever solution to the SUSY  $\mu$  problem is assumed). For each parameter set, the expected value of the weak scale in each pocket universe is computed from  $m_{weak}^{PU} = m_Z \sqrt{\Delta_{EW}/2}$  and solutions with  $m_{weak}^{PU} > 4m_{weak}^{OU}$  are rejected as lying beyond the ABDS window. (An important technical point is that the scan range upper limits must be selected to be beyond the upper limits imposed by the anthropic ABDS window.) To gain the probability distributions for Higgs and sparticle masses in *our* universe, then as a final step  $m_Z^{PU}$  must be adjusted (but not finetuned!) to our value  $m_Z^{OU} = 91.2$  GeV.

### 3.1 Distribution of $m_0(1)$ , $m_0(2)$ and $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ from the landscape

The resulting probability distribution for *the average* first/second generation scalar masses is shown in Fig. 2a). From the plot, we see that  $m_0(1,2)$  actually has a broad peak from  $\sim 25 - 35$  TeV which then tails off towards zero around 45 TeV. Since we expect independent (non-universal) generations from gravity-mediation, then  $m_0(1,2)$  is interpreted as an *average* of  $m_0(1)$  and  $m_0(2)$  but where  $m_0(1) \sim m_0(2)$ : partially decoupled with quasi-degeneracy which as shown in Ref. [41] can resolve the SUSY flavor and CP problems.

In Fig. 2b), we show the corresponding landscape scan in  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ . In this case, the range of  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  starts at below the 1 TeV level but then builds to a peak probability distribution around 2 TeV before tapering off at around 3 TeV. We also show the current ATLAS/CMS rough bound on  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  from simplified model searches for top-squark pair production (wavy line) and the  $5\sigma$  and 95% CL reach of HL-LHC with  $\sqrt{s} = 14$  TeV and  $3000 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  [43].

### 3.2 Improved naturalness from decoupled first/second generation scalars

The behavior of improved naturalness arising from decoupled first/second generation scalars is shown in Fig. 3, where we plot  $\Delta_{EW}$  vs. increasing  $m_0(1,2)$  for the same NUHM3 parameters as used in Fig. 1. Starting with  $m_0(1,2) \sim 20$  TeV, we see that  $\Delta_{EW} \sim 100$ , and is dominated by the  $\Sigma_u^u(\tilde{t}_{1,2})$  terms since we have chosen  $\mu = 200$  GeV. But as  $m_0(1,2)$  increases to even larger values, the top squark soft masses become RG suppressed by the 2-loop terms, and so  $\Delta_{EW}$  steadily decreases to  $\Delta_{EW} \lesssim 30$  for  $m_0(1,2) \sim 30$  TeV. For even higher values of  $m_0(1,2)$ , then the lighter top squark  $\tilde{t}_1$  drops into the LHC-excluded region with  $m_{\tilde{t}_1} \ll 1.1$  TeV, and furthermore, previous large cancellations in the numerator of Eq. 4 no longer occur, so  $\Delta_{EW}$  shoots upwards to large values shortly before the spectra become tachyonic and CCB minima occur. Thus, even higher values of  $m_0(1,2)$  are ruled out. This behavior of soft SUSY breaking




Figure 2: Distribution in a)  $dP/dm_0(1,2)$  vs  $m_0(1,2)$  and b)  $dP/dm_{\tilde{t}_1}$  vs.  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  for a landscape scan in the NUHM3 model. The wavy line in frame b) corresponds to current LHC Run 2 limits on  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  from simplified model searches whilst the other vertical lines correspond to the projected stop mass reach of HL-LHC within natural SUSY models.

parameters is an example of what Arkani-Hamed *et al.* (ADK) [31] label as *living dangerously* on the landscape in that some parameter or quantity can be drawn to such large values that

the pocket universe is on the edge of catastrophic breakdown: in this case soft terms are pulled just beyond the edge of their range that would lead to the onset of catastrophic CCB minima.





Figure 3: Naturalness measure  $\Delta_{EW}$  vs.  $m_0(1, 2)$  for  $A_0 = -m_0(3)$  TeV,  $m_0(3) = 6$  TeV,  $m_{1/2} = 2.2$  TeV,  $m_A = 2$  TeV,  $\mu = 200$  GeV and  $\tan \beta = 10$ .


Similar behavior can be found in the landscape draw of the trilinear soft term  $A_t$  to large (negative) values. In decades past, it was frequent to see the SUSY parameter space plotted in the  $m_0$  vs.  $m_{1/2}$  parameter space of models like the CMSSM, which was expected to be a manifestation of gravity mediation. These plots would often be shown for  $A_0 = 0$ , which allowed one to display (among other things) the focus point region [44] of CMSSM parameter space, which occurs when  $A_0 \sim 0$ . However, unless one has in hand a specific mechanism to suppress  $A_0$ , this goes against supergravity expectations, where *all* soft terms are expected of order the gravitino mass  $m_{3/2}$ . Furthermore, using naturalness measures such as  $\Delta_{HS} \equiv \delta m_{H_u}^2 / m_{H_u}^2(\Lambda)$  [45], it was expected that large  $A$ -terms would lead to *increased* finetuning. However, in Fig. 4 we show again the EW finetuning parameter as derived for the set of fixed NUHM3 model parameters versus  $-A_0/m_0(3)$  with *a*)  $m_0(1, 2) = 30$  TeV and *b*)  $m_0(1, 2) = 40$  TeV. Variation of the strength of the  $A_0$  parameter can lead to changes in  $\Sigma_u^u(\tilde{t}_{1,2})$  in three different ways: 1. larger  $A_0$  values influence the RG running of third generation soft masses, and can *decrease* their weak scale values if taken large enough, 2. large  $A_0$  and consequently large  $A_t(weak)$  influences top-squark mixing and can lead to large splitting of the stop mass eigenstates that enter Eq. 4 and 3. large  $A_t(weak)$  can lead to large cancellations in the numerator of Eq. 4, thus also leading to greater naturalness due to smaller  $\Sigma_u^u$  values. This behavior is realized in Fig. 4*a*) where  $\Delta_{EW}$  starts off at  $\sim 80$  for  $A_0 \sim 0$ . As  $A_0/m_0(3)$  increases, there is a slight increase in  $\Delta_{EW}$  followed by a slide to low values with  $\Delta_{EW}$  reaching below  $\sim 30$  for  $-A_0/m_0(3) \sim 1$ . For even higher  $A_0$  values, the cancellations in  $\Sigma_u^u$  are upset, and  $\Delta_{EW}$  shoots



upward shortly before driving stop soft terms to tachyonic values and thus CCB minima in the scalar potential. Similar behavior is shown in frame *b*) with  $m_0(1,2) \sim 40$  TeV. In this case, the onset of CCB minima occurs for  $-A_0/m_0(3) \sim 1.2$ .



(a)



(b)

Figure 4: Naturalness measure  $\Delta_{EW}$  vs.  $-A_0/m_0(3)$  for *a*)  $m_0(1,2) = 30$  TeV,  $m_0(3) = 5.85$  TeV,  $m_{1/2} = 2.25$  TeV and *b*)  $m_0(1,2) = 40$  TeV,  $m_0(3) = 8$  TeV,  $m_{1/2} = 3$  TeV. For both frames, we take  $m_A = 2$  TeV,  $\mu = 200$  GeV and  $\tan \beta = 10$ .

In Table 1, we show spectra for the two SUSY benchmark cases illustrated in Fig. 1 with  $m_0(3) = 6$  TeV,  $m_{1/2} = 2.2$  TeV,  $\tan \beta = 10$ ,  $A_0 = -6$  TeV and with  $\mu = 200$  GeV and  $m_A = 2$  TeV. For the NUHM2 case, we take  $m_0(1,2) = 6$  TeV (universality) while for NUHM3 we take  $m_0(1,2) = 30$  TeV. For the NUHM2 BM point, we see that  $m_h = 123.3$  GeV with  $m_{\tilde{t}_1} \simeq 4$  TeV. The value of  $\Delta_{EW} = 158$ , so the model is finetuned in the electroweak. Proceeding to the NUHM3 BM point with  $m_0(1,2) = 30$  TeV, and all else the same as for NUHM2, then

we see that  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  has dropped to  $m_{\tilde{t}_1} \sim 1$  TeV, while  $m_h$  has increased to 124.5 GeV and  $\Delta_{EW} = 25$ , so the model appears now to be EW natural! For the NUHM2 case, only light higgsino pair production will be available to HL-LHC searches. For the more natural NUHM3 BM point, which allows for the mixed decoupling/quasi-degeneracy solution to the SUSY flavor and CP problems, then also top-squark pair production should be available, and is in fact just below the current ATLAS/CMS mass limits for top-squark pair production within simplified models [46–48].

## 4 SUSY parameter space with decoupled first/second generation scalars


In Fig. 5, we show the  $m_0(3)$  vs.  $m_{1/2}$  parameter space plane of *a)* the NUHM2 model with  $m_0(3) = m_0(1,2)$  and *b)* the NUHM3 model with  $m_0(1,2) = 20$  TeV. For both frames, we take  $A_0 = -1.6m_0(3)$ ,  $m_A = 2$  TeV,  $\mu = 200$  GeV and  $\tan\beta = 10$ . In frame *a)*, the natural region with  $\Delta_{EW} \lesssim 30$  is shown as red-shaded while green-shaded has  $\Delta_{EW} < 100$ . The region between the two orange-dashed contours has  $123 < m_h < 127$  GeV, so is consistent with LHC  $m_h$  measurements. The region below the purple-dashed contour has  $m_{\tilde{g}} < 2.2$  TeV and so is excluded by ATLAS/CMS gluino pair searches within the context of simplified models [49–51]. The grey-shaded regions contain CCB minima and so are also excluded. For this NUHM2 case, a large chunk of natural parameter space is already excluded by LHC searches, but a significant portion remains natural but with  $m_{\tilde{g}} > 2.2$  TeV. Top squarks with mass  $m_{\tilde{t}_1} < 1.1$  TeV lie below the light-blue dotted contour. Naively, we would expect this model to suffer from the SUSY flavor problem if  $m_0(3) \neq m_0(1) \neq m_0(2)$ , but instead just average to  $m_0(3)$ .

As we progress to frame *b)* with  $m_0(1,2) = 20$  TeV, the flavor problem may be reduced or eliminated. (Here, the  $m_0(1,2) = 20$  TeV means just an average quasi-degeneracy where we might actually expect say  $m_0(1) \sim 21$  TeV and  $m_0(2) \sim 19$  TeV.) In this case, the entire lower-left CCB region has greatly expanded and now we see that LHC  $m_{\tilde{g}} > 2.2$  TeV mass requirements do not exclude any allowed parameter space with  $m_0(3) \lesssim 9$  TeV. Still, the bulk of parameter space has  $m_h \sim 125$  GeV. Furthermore, the natural parameter space region has moved up to  $m_{1/2} \sim 1.8 - 2.4$  TeV, and shows two disjoint regions. The left-most larger region is partially excluded by LHC top-squark searches and has  $m_{\tilde{t}_1} \lesssim 1.1$  TeV. The remainder has top-squark masses just above the LHC bounds. The smaller right-most natural region has somewhat heavier top-squarks. From this plot, it is no surprise that LHC hasn't discovered gluinos with  $m_{\tilde{g}} \lesssim 2.2$  TeV since they would likely live in either unnatural regions of parameter space or else p-space with CCB minima.


In Fig. 6, we show the same NUHM3 parameter space as Fig. 5 except now pushing the average  $m_0(1,2)$  up to  $\sim 30$  TeV. To do this, we must lower  $A_0 \sim -m_0(3)$ . For this more extreme case, we see the CCB-excluded region has risen as high as  $m_{1/2} \sim 3$  TeV for the left-hand-side of the plot. Since  $m_{\tilde{g}} \sim 2.3m_{1/2}$  here, that corresponds to  $m_{\tilde{g}} \gtrsim 7$  TeV. Only one small natural region of p-space remains with  $m_0(3) \sim 6$  TeV and  $m_{1/2} \sim 2$  TeV, where  $m_{\tilde{g}} \sim 4.5$  TeV. Nonetheless, the value of  $m_h \sim 125$  GeV while top-squarks lie not-too-far from current LHC search limits. Thus, again if we take the landscape mixed quasi-degeneracy/decoupling solution to the SUSY flavor problem, then we should not be surprised that LHC has failed

parameter	NUHM2	NUHM3
$m_0(1, 2)$	6000	30000
$m_0(3)$	6000	6000
$m_{1/2}$	2200	2200
$\tan \beta$	10	10
$A_0$	-6000	-6000
$\mu$	200	200
$m_A$	2000	2000
$m_{\tilde{g}}$	4852.9	5178.7
$m_{\tilde{u}_L}$	7193.5	30256.0
$m_{\tilde{u}_R}$	7257.6	30323.3
$m_{\tilde{e}_R}$	5836.7	29961.9
$m_{\tilde{t}_1}$	4008.8	1012.0
$m_{\tilde{t}_2}$	5813.7	3405.3
$m_{\tilde{b}_1}$	5809.5	3441.5
$m_{\tilde{b}_2}$	6985.6	5336.2
$m_{\tilde{\tau}_1}$	5776.8	5639.4
$m_{\tilde{\tau}_2}$	6233.1	5772.0
$m_{\tilde{\nu}_\tau}$	6237.1	5725.2
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^\pm}$	1837.1	1936.1
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}$	213.8	211.3
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_4^0}$	1865.1	1938.8
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_3^0}$	991.2	1018.7
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0}$	208.5	207.1
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$	203.3	202.2
$m_h$	123.3	124.5
$\Omega_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}^{TP} h^2$	0.009	0.01
$BF(b \rightarrow s\gamma) \times 10^4$	3.1	3.0
$BF(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-) \times 10^9$	3.8	3.8
$\sigma^{SI}(\tilde{\chi}_1^0, p)$ (pb)	$4.3 \times 10^{-10}$	$4.0 \times 10^{-10}$
$\sigma^{SD}(\tilde{\chi}_1^0, p)$ (pb)	$8.0 \times 10^{-6}$	$7.5 \times 10^{-6}$
$\langle \sigma v \rangle _{v \rightarrow 0}$ (cm <sup>3</sup> /sec)	$1.9 \times 10^{-25}$	$2.0 \times 10^{-25}$
$\Delta_{EW}$	158	25

Table 1: Input parameters and masses in GeV units for the NUHM2 and NUHM3 model SUSY benchmark points with  $m_t = 173.2$  GeV using Isajet 7.91.



(a)



(b)

Figure 5: The  $m_0(3)$  vs.  $m_{1/2}$  parameter space of *a*) the NUHM2 model with  $m_0(1, 2) = m_0(3)$  and *b*) the NUHM3 model with  $m_0(1, 2) = 20$  TeV. For both frames, we take  $A_0 = -1.6m_0(3)$ ,  $m_A = 2$  TeV,  $\mu = 200$  GeV and  $\tan\beta = 10$ .

to discover SUSY, although SUSY could be available within the next 2 – 10 years via the light higgsino pair production [52–55] or top-squark pair production signatures [43]. This is a consequence of the string landscape draw to large soft terms which results in living dangerously near the edge of the onset of CCB minima in the scalar potential.

In Fig. 7, we instead show the  $m_0(3)$  vs.  $A_0$  parameter space plane in the NUHM3 model




Figure 6: The  $m_0(3)$  vs.  $m_{1/2}$  parameters space of the NUHM3 model with  $A_0 = -m_0(3)$  and  $m_0(1, 2) = 30$  TeV. We also take  $m_A = 2$  TeV,  $\mu = 200$  GeV and  $\tan \beta = 10$ .

with  $m_0(1, 2) = 30$  TeV with  $m_{1/2} = 2.2$  TeV,  $m_A = 2$  TeV and with  $\mu = 200$  GeV and  $\tan \beta = 10$ . This plane should again have the landscape mixed decoupling/quasi-degeneracy solution to the SUSY flavor problem. In this case, we again see that the red-shaded natural region is rather small (and hence predictive). And again: it is living dangerously, rather close to the left gray-shaded CCB excluded region. The value of  $m_h \sim 125$  GeV throughout the bulk of the allowed parameter space. For this plot, we also show contours of  $A_0/m_0(3)$  since the allowed natural parameter space is sensitive to this ratio for large  $m_0(1, 2)$  in the tens of TeV. Here, we see that the natural region extends from  $-5 > A_0 > -9$  TeV and where the ratio  $A_0/m_0(3)$  varies between  $0.9 - 1.2$ .

#### 4.1 Top squark mass from the landscape for decoupled first/second generation sfermions

To hone our expectations for rather light stops in the  $m_{\tilde{t}_1} \sim 1 - 2$  TeV range, we return to our landscape scan from Subsec. 3.1. From this scan, we plot in Fig. 8 the surviving landscape scan points in the  $m_{1/2}$  vs.  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  mass plane. Gray dots are excluded as having CCB minima while red dots lie within the ABDS window with  $\Delta_{EW} < 30$ . The region to the left of the vertical black contour around  $m_{1/2} \sim 0.7$  TeV has  $m_{\tilde{g}} \lesssim 2.2$  TeV and so is LHC-excluded. Some of the remaining red dots with  $m_{\tilde{t}_1} \lesssim 1.1$  TeV are also excluded by LHC top-squark searches. The remaining red dots lie within the  $m_{\tilde{t}_1} \sim 1 - 2$  TeV band. This is to be compared to the recent study of Ref. [43] where prospects for top-squark detection in natural SUSY models were examined for HL-LHC. In that work, it was found that HL-LHC with  $\sim 3 \text{ ab}^{-1}$  could reach to




Figure 7: The  $m_0(3)$  vs.  $A_0$  parameters space of the NUHM3 model with  $m_0(1, 2) = 30$  TeV. We also take  $m_{1/2} = 2.2$  TeV,  $m_A = 2$  TeV,  $\mu = 200$  GeV and  $\tan \beta = 10$ .

$m_{\tilde{t}_1} \sim 1.7 - 2$  TeV (lower number is  $5\sigma$  while higher number is 95%CL reach).




Figure 8: Distribution of landscape scan points in  $m_{1/2}$  vs.  $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$  plane in the NUHM3 model.

## 5 Conclusions

The string landscape offers a mixed decoupling/quasi-degeneracy solution to the SUSY flavor and CP problems in SUSY models with gravity mediated SUSY breaking. The expected spectra is that of radiatively-driven natural SUSY with light higgsinos  $\sim 100 - 350$  GeV, but with gauginos and top squarks in the few TeV and first/second generation sfermions in the 10 – 40 TeV range, while  $m_h$  is pushed to  $\sim 125$  GeV. This scenario reconciles naturalness with LHC Higgs and sparticle mass limits and lack of FCNCs and electric dipole moment (EDM) deviations. It also helps explain why no SUSY signal has so far been seen at LHC: for decoupled first/second generation sfermions, then the bulk of low  $m_0(3)$  and  $m_{1/2}$  parameter space which would ordinarily be accessible to LHC13 is actually not available, but is excluded by the presence of CCB vacua. The remaining natural parameter space lies adjacent to the CCB excluded region, providing an example of living dangerously in the string landscape. In these favored regions, we expect light higgsinos which may be accessible via higgsino pair searches, but also the presence of light top-squarks with  $m_{\tilde{t}_1} \sim 1 - 2$  TeV which should be accessible to HL-LHC. Gluinos and winos would likely be too heavy to be detected in this scenario with rather heavy first/second generation sfermions.

*Acknowledgements:*

VB gratefully acknowledges support from the William F. Vilas estate. HB gratefully acknowledges support from the Avenir Foundation.

## References

- [1] H. Murayama, Supersymmetry phenomenology, in: ICTP Summer School in Particle Physics, 2000, pp. 296–335. [arXiv:hep-ph/0002232](#).
- [2] E. Cremmer, S. Ferrara, L. Girardello, A. Van Proeyen, Yang-Mills Theories with Local Supersymmetry: Lagrangian, Transformation Laws and SuperHiggs Effect, Nucl. Phys. B 212 (1983) 413. [doi:10.1016/0550-3213\(83\)90679-X](#).
- [3] R. Arnowitt, A. H. Chamseddine, P. Nath, The Development of Supergravity Grand Unification: Circa 1982-85, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 27 (2012) 1230028, [Erratum: Int.J.Mod.Phys.A 27, 1292009 (2012)]. [arXiv:1206.3175](#), [doi:10.1142/S0217751X12300281](#).
- [4] E. Witten, Dynamical Breaking of Supersymmetry, Nucl. Phys. B 188 (1981) 513. [doi:10.1016/0550-3213\(81\)90006-7](#).
- [5] R. K. Kaul, Gauge Hierarchy in a Supersymmetric Model, Phys. Lett. B 109 (1982) 19–24. [doi:10.1016/0370-2693\(82\)90453-1](#).
- [6] H. Baer, V. Barger, M. Savoy, Upper bounds on sparticle masses from naturalness or how to disprove weak scale supersymmetry, Phys. Rev. D 93 (3) (2016) 035016. [arXiv:1509.02929](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.035016](#).

- [7] R. Barbieri, G. F. Giudice, Upper Bounds on Supersymmetric Particle Masses, Nucl. Phys. B 306 (1988) 63–76. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(88)90171-X.
- [8] M. Dine, A. E. Nelson, Y. Nir, Y. Shirman, New tools for low-energy dynamical supersymmetry breaking, Phys. Rev. D 53 (1996) 2658–2669. arXiv:hep-ph/9507378, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.53.2658.
- [9] L. Randall, R. Sundrum, Out of this world supersymmetry breaking, Nucl. Phys. B 557 (1999) 79–118. arXiv:hep-th/9810155, doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(99)00359-4.
- [10] M. Schmaltz, W. Skiba, Minimal gaugino mediation, Phys. Rev. D 62 (2000) 095005. arXiv:hep-ph/0001172, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.62.095005.
- [11] M. Dine, R. G. Leigh, A. Kagan, Flavor symmetries and the problem of squark degeneracy, Phys. Rev. D 48 (1993) 4269–4274. arXiv:hep-ph/9304299, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.48.4269.
- [12] A. G. Cohen, D. B. Kaplan, A. E. Nelson, The More minimal supersymmetric standard model, Phys. Lett. B 388 (1996) 588–598. arXiv:hep-ph/9607394, doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(96)01183-5.
- [13] H. Baer, S. Kraml, A. Lessa, S. Sekmen, X. Tata, Effective Supersymmetry at the LHC, JHEP 10 (2010) 018. arXiv:1007.3897, doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2010)018.
- [14] J. A. Bagger, J. L. Feng, N. Polonsky, R.-J. Zhang, Superheavy supersymmetry from scalar mass: A parameter fixed points, Phys. Lett. B 473 (2000) 264–271. arXiv:hep-ph/9911255, doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(99)01501-4.
- [15] H. Baer, M. Brhlik, M. A. Diaz, J. Ferrandis, P. Mercadante, P. Quintana, X. Tata, Yukawa unified supersymmetric SO(10) model: Cosmology, rare decays and collider searches, Phys. Rev. D 63 (2000) 015007. arXiv:hep-ph/0005027, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.63.015007.
- [16] A. Arbey, M. Battaglia, A. Djouadi, F. Mahmoudi, J. Quevillon, Implications of a 125 GeV Higgs for supersymmetric models, Phys. Lett. B 708 (2012) 162–169. arXiv:1112.3028, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.01.053.
- [17] H. Baer, V. Barger, D. Mickelson, M. Padeffke-Kirkland, SUSY models under siege: LHC constraints and electroweak fine-tuning, Phys. Rev. D 89 (11) (2014) 115019. arXiv:1404.2277, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.115019.
- [18] F. Gabbiani, E. Gabrielli, A. Masiero, L. Silvestrini, A Complete analysis of FCNC and CP constraints in general SUSY extensions of the standard model, Nucl. Phys. B 477 (1996) 321–352. arXiv:hep-ph/9604387, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(96)00390-2.
- [19] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, Supersymmetric unification without low energy supersymmetry and signatures for fine-tuning at the LHC, JHEP 06 (2005) 073. arXiv:hep-th/0405159, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2005/06/073.



- [20] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, G. F. Giudice, A. Romanino, Aspects of split supersymmetry, *Nucl. Phys. B* 709 (2005) 3–46. [arXiv:hep-ph/0409232](#), [doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2004.12.026](#).
- [21] A. Arvanitaki, N. Craig, S. Dimopoulos, G. Villadoro, Mini-Split, *JHEP* 02 (2013) 126. [arXiv:1210.0555](#), [doi:10.1007/JHEP02\(2013\)126](#).
- [22] N. Arkani-Hamed, H. Murayama, Can the supersymmetric flavor problem decouple?, *Phys. Rev. D* 56 (1997) R6733–R6737. [arXiv:hep-ph/9703259](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.56.R6733](#).
- [23] R. Bousso, J. Polchinski, Quantization of four form fluxes and dynamical neutralization of the cosmological constant, *JHEP* 06 (2000) 006. [arXiv:hep-th/0004134](#), [doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2000/06/006](#).
- [24] M. R. Douglas, S. Kachru, Flux compactification, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 79 (2007) 733–796. [arXiv:hep-th/0610102](#), [doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.79.733](#).
- [25] S. Ashok, M. R. Douglas, Counting flux vacua, *JHEP* 01 (2004) 060. [arXiv:hep-th/0307049](#), [doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2004/01/060](#).
- [26] S. Weinberg, Anthropic Bound on the Cosmological Constant, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 59 (1987) 2607. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.59.2607](#).
- [27] F. Denef, M. R. Douglas, Distributions of flux vacua, *JHEP* 05 (2004) 072. [arXiv:hep-th/0404116](#), [doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2004/05/072](#).
- [28] M. R. Douglas, Statistical analysis of the supersymmetry breaking scale (5 2004). [arXiv:hep-th/0405279](#).
- [29] H. Baer, V. Barger, S. Salam, D. Sengupta, String landscape guide to soft SUSY breaking terms, *Phys. Rev. D* 102 (7) (2020) 075012. [arXiv:2005.13577](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.075012](#).
- [30] L. Susskind, Supersymmetry breaking in the anthropic landscape, in: *From Fields to Strings: Circumnavigating Theoretical Physics: A Conference in Tribute to Ian Kogan, 2004*, pp. 1745–1749. [arXiv:hep-th/0405189](#), [doi:10.1142/9789812775344\\_0040](#).
- [31] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, S. Kachru, Predictive landscapes and new physics at a TeV (1 2005). [arXiv:hep-th/0501082](#).
- [32] P. Candelas, G. T. Horowitz, A. Strominger, E. Witten, Vacuum configurations for superstrings, *Nucl. Phys. B* 258 (1985) 46–74. [doi:10.1016/0550-3213\(85\)90602-9](#).
- [33] K. J. Bae, H. Baer, V. Barger, D. Sengupta, Revisiting the SUSY  $\mu$  problem and its solutions in the LHC era, *Phys. Rev. D* 99 (11) (2019) 115027. [arXiv:1902.10748](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.115027](#).

- [34] H. Baer, V. Barger, P. Huang, D. Mickelson, A. Mustafayev, X. Tata, Radiative natural supersymmetry: Reconciling electroweak fine-tuning and the Higgs boson mass, *Phys. Rev. D* 87 (11) (2013) 115028. [arXiv:1212.2655](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.115028](#).
- [35] S. R. Coleman, E. J. Weinberg, Radiative Corrections as the Origin of Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking, *Phys. Rev. D* 7 (1973) 1888–1910. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.7.1888](#).
- [36] V. Agrawal, S. M. Barr, J. F. Donoghue, D. Seckel, Viable range of the mass scale of the standard model, *Phys. Rev. D* 57 (1998) 5480–5492. [arXiv:hep-ph/9707380](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.57.5480](#).
- [37] H. Baer, V. Barger, P. Huang, A. Mustafayev, X. Tata, Radiative natural SUSY with a 125 GeV Higgs boson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 109 (2012) 161802. [arXiv:1207.3343](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.161802](#).
- [38] H. Baer, V. Barger, H. Serce, K. Sinha, Higgs and superparticle mass predictions from the landscape, *JHEP* 03 (2018) 002. [arXiv:1712.01399](#), [doi:10.1007/JHEP03\(2018\)002](#).
- [39] S. P. Martin, M. T. Vaughn, Two loop renormalization group equations for soft supersymmetry breaking couplings, *Phys. Rev. D* 50 (1994) 2282, [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 78, 039903 (2008)]. [arXiv:hep-ph/9311340](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.50.2282](#).
- [40] H. Baer, C. Balazs, P. Mercadante, X. Tata, Y. Wang, Viable supersymmetric models with an inverted scalar mass hierarchy at the GUT scale, *Phys. Rev. D* 63 (2001) 015011. [arXiv:hep-ph/0008061](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.63.015011](#).
- [41] H. Baer, V. Barger, D. Sengupta, Landscape solution to the SUSY flavor and CP problems, *Phys. Rev. Res.* 1 (3) (2019) 033179. [arXiv:1910.00090](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevResearch.1.033179](#).
- [42] F. E. Paige, S. D. Protopopescu, H. Baer, X. Tata, ISAJET 7.69: A Monte Carlo event generator for pp, anti-p p, and e+e- reactions (12 2003). [arXiv:hep-ph/0312045](#).
- [43] H. Baer, V. Barger, J. Dutta, D. Sengupta, K. Zhang, Top squarks from the landscape at high luminosity LHC, *Phys. Rev. D* 108 (7) (2023) 075027. [arXiv:2307.08067](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.108.075027](#).
- [44] J. L. Feng, K. T. Matchev, T. Moroi, Multi - TeV scalars are natural in minimal supergravity, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 84 (2000) 2322–2325. [arXiv:hep-ph/9908309](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.84.2322](#).
- [45] R. Kitano, Y. Nomura, Supersymmetry, naturalness, and signatures at the LHC, *Phys. Rev. D* 73 (2006) 095004. [arXiv:hep-ph/0602096](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.73.095004](#).
- [46] G. Aad, et al., Search for a scalar partner of the top quark in the all-hadronic  $t\bar{t}$  plus missing transverse momentum final state at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV with the ATLAS detector, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 80 (8) (2020) 737. [arXiv:2004.14060](#), [doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-020-8102-8](#).

- [47] G. Aad, et al., Search for new phenomena with top quark pairs in final states with one lepton, jets, and missing transverse momentum in  $pp$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV with the ATLAS detector, JHEP 04 (2021) 174. [arXiv:2012.03799](#), [doi:10.1007/JHEP04\(2021\)174](#).
- [48] A. M. Sirunyan, et al., Search for top squark production in fully-hadronic final states in proton-proton collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV, Phys. Rev. D 104 (5) (2021) 052001. [arXiv:2103.01290](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.052001](#).
- [49] Search for squarks and gluinos in final states with jets and missing transverse momentum using 139 fb<sup>-1</sup> of  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV  $pp$  collision data with the ATLAS detector (8 2019).
- [50] A. Canepa, Searches for Supersymmetry at the Large Hadron Collider, Rev. Phys. 4 (2019) 100033. [doi:10.1016/j.revip.2019.100033](#).
- [51] G. Aad, et al., The quest to discover supersymmetry at the ATLAS experiment (3 2024). [arXiv:2403.02455](#).
- [52] H. Baer, V. Barger, P. Huang, Hidden SUSY at the LHC: the light higgsino-world scenario and the role of a lepton collider, JHEP 11 (2011) 031. [arXiv:1107.5581](#), [doi:10.1007/JHEP11\(2011\)031](#).
- [53] Z. Han, G. D. Kribs, A. Martin, A. Menon, Hunting quasidegenerate Higgsinos, Phys. Rev. D 89 (7) (2014) 075007. [arXiv:1401.1235](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.075007](#).
- [54] H. Baer, A. Mustafayev, X. Tata, Monojet plus soft dilepton signal from light higgsino pair production at LHC14, Phys. Rev. D 90 (11) (2014) 115007. [arXiv:1409.7058](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.115007](#).
- [55] H. Baer, V. Barger, D. Sengupta, X. Tata, New angular and other cuts to improve the Higgsino signal at the LHC, Phys. Rev. D 105 (9) (2022) 095017. [arXiv:2109.14030](#), [doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.105.095017](#).