Explaining Data Anomalies over the NMSSM Parameter Space with Deep Learning Techniques

Raymundo Ramos
Korea Institute for Advanced Study

Based on:
A. Chakraborty, A. Hammad, P. Ko, S. Moretti and RR, arXiv:2508.13912
A. Hammad and RR, arXiv:2412.19675

2nd APCTP Workshop on Precision Calculation and Collider Phenomenology
November 25, 2025

Main motivations



Experimental observations – 95.4 GeV



2.9σ local (1.3σ global)
[2405.18149]



1.7σ local
[2407.07546]

Experimental observations – 650 → 90 GeV [2310.01643]



Experimental observations – 650 $\rightarrow$ 90 GeV

CMS [2506.2312]:

X $\rightarrow$ YH $\rightarrow$Y($\gamma\gamma$)H($\tau\tau$)

(X, Y) with masses: (600, 95) GeV and (650, 95) GeV
local significances: 2.5σ and 2.3σ, respectively

Experimental observations – Electroweakino mismatch [ATLAS 2106.01676]

Simplified models



Experimental observations – Electroweakino mismatch [ATLAS 2106.01676]





Why SUSY

Why Supersymmetry?

- Mass of the Higgs is protected by symmetry.
- Higgs potential generated dynamically
- Convergence of the coupling "constants" at a higher scale.
- Lightest supersymmetric particle (LSP) can be a dark matter candidate.

Why the next-to-minimal supersymmetryc standard model (NMSSM)?

- Minimal SUSY model plus an additional singlet superfield.
- μ term generated by additional singlet VEV.
- The 125 GeV Higgs mass is more natural
- Extension results in three CP-even Higgs bosons.

Deep learning parameter scan [arXiv:2207.09959, arXiv:2412.19675]



Looks complicated...

DLScanner: a tool to streamline the process

Install: `pip install DLScanner`
Code: `git clone https://github.com/raalraan/DLScanner.git`

- Implementation of the regressor and classifier workflows.
- Use tools like SPheno, micrOMEGAs, or custom tools.
- User focuses more on the HEP study and less on the DL setup.
- Possible to customize every aspect of the DL setup or the exploration of the parameter space.
- Use the default setup as starting point.

DLScanner: a tool to streamline the process



DLScanner: deep learning + VEGAS maps

VEGAS maps use increments on coordinates attempting to flatten the distribution.

Train with accumulated samples!



Scanning over the NMSSM

The NMSSM extends the superpotential of the MSSM

$$W_{\mathrm{NMSSM}} = W_{\mathrm{MSSM}} + \lambda \hat{H}_u \hat{H}_d \hat{S} + \frac{1}{3}\kappa \hat{S}^3,$$

where the MSSM superpotential has the μ term set to 0. The second term generates $\mu_{\mathrm{eff}} = \lambda s$ where $s = \langle S \rangle$.

The soft SUSY breaking part of the potential is

$$V_{\mathrm{soft}} = m_{H_u}^2 |H_u|^2 + m_{H_d}^2 |H_d|^2 + m_S^2 |S|^2 + \lambda A_\lambda \hat{H}_u \hat{H}_d \hat{S} + \frac{1}{3}\kappa A_\kappa \hat{S}^3,$$

Setup of the scan

Calculations use `NMSSMTools` which coordinates a series of tools: `NMHDECAY`, `NMSPEC`, `NMGMSB`, `NMHDECAY_CPV`, `NMSDECAY`, `micrOMEGAs` and `SModelS`.



Setup of the scan

Preliminary scan in **wide** range.
Definitive scan in **narrow** range.

	$\tan\beta$	λ	κ	A_λ
wide	[1.97, 10.9]	[0.013, 0.687]	[0.0058, 0.391]	[−5000, 480]
narrow	[3.2, 6.2]	[0.07, 0.42]	[0.05, 0.3]	[351, 834]
	A_κ	μ_{eff}	M_1	M_2
wide	[−621, 362]	[−244, 291]	[178, 3000]	[304, 10000]
narrow	[−300, −150]	[120, 220]	[500, 3000]	[750, 10000]
	M_3	A_t	M_{Q_3}	M_{U_3}
	[423, 5000]	[−5000, 1288]	[272, 10000]	[570, 10000]

Setup of the scan

`DLScanner`: Classifier method is stable even if target space too small.

→ However, difficult to find points in the target space for the first training!

Use a penalty function!

- If target region is not found, classify regions according to **low and high penalty**.
- Allows using deep learning to sequentially reduce the parameter space.

$$P_{\text{constraint}}(O^{\text{th}}, O^{\text{exp}}_{\pm 2\sigma}) = \begin{cases} 0, & O^{\text{exp}}_{-2\sigma} < O^{\text{th}} < O^{\text{exp}}_{+2\sigma}, \\ |O^{\text{exp}}_{+2\sigma} - O^{\text{th}}|^2, & O^{\text{th}} > O^{\text{exp}}_{+2\sigma}, \text{ if } O^{\text{exp}}_{+2\sigma} \text{ exists}, \\ |O^{\text{th}} - O^{\text{exp}}_{-2\sigma}|^2, & O^{\text{th}} < O^{\text{exp}}_{-2\sigma}, \text{ if } O^{\text{exp}}_{-2\sigma} \text{ exists}, \end{cases}$$

Individual penalties are weighted by 1σ
but we are **free to use any type of weighting**.

Setup of the scan

Small target: Dynamical classifier from penalty function



- If target is empty, define a *pseudotarget* from a penalty threshold for the next iteration
- In the next iteration, DLScanner will try to sample inside the *pseudotarget*
- The threshold for the *pseudotarget* should converge to penalty $= 0$.

The constraints: SM-like Higgs properties

$m_{h125} = 125.2 \pm 3$ GeV due to theoretical uncertainty



The constraints: Dark matter measurements

$$\Omega_{\mathrm{CDM}} h^2 < 0.122$$

σ^p_{SI} below LZ limits [2207.03764]



Relic density consistent with other studies: Ellwanger and Hugonie [2309.07838]

The constraints: Low energy observables

$$\mathrm{BR}(B \to X_s\gamma)_{E_\gamma \geq 1.6\ \mathrm{GeV}} = (3.32 \pm 0.15) \times 10^{-4}\,,$$
$$\mathrm{BR}(B^\pm \to \tau^\pm \nu_\tau) = (1.11 \pm 0.165) \times 10^{-4}\,.$$





Finding a 95 GeV scalar

$$\mu_{\gamma\gamma} = \frac{\sigma(gg \to h_{95} \to \gamma\gamma)}{\sigma(gg \to h_{95}^{\rm SM} \to \gamma\gamma)}, \qquad \mu_{b\bar{b}} = \frac{\sigma(e^+e^- \to Zh_{95} \to Zb\bar{b})}{\sigma(e^+e^- \to Zh_{95}^{\rm SM} \to Zb\bar{b})}, \qquad \mu_{\tau^+\tau^-} = \frac{\sigma(gg \to h_{95} \to \tau^+\tau^-)}{\sigma(gg \to h_{95}^{\rm SM} \to \tau^+\tau^-)}.$$



Finding a 650 GeV scalar



Remember that local significances are still low in the 2-3σ range.

Finding electroweakinos

Get EWino in the discrepant region





Predicting signatures for mono-H and Z

We study the following processes

$$pp \to \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 H \quad \text{and} \quad pp \to \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 Z,$$











Predicting signatures for mono-H and Z

Production cross sections



Red star: mono-Z benchmark point

Black star: mono-H benchmark point

	$\tan\beta$	λ	κ	A_λ	A_κ	μ_{eff}	M_1	M_2	M_3	A_t	$m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$
mono-H	4.62	2.6×10^{-1}	2.0×10^{-1}	6.1×10^2	-2.97×10^2	1.33×10^2	2.7×10^3	1.08×10^3	3×10^3	-4.9×10^3	1.26×10^2
mono-Z	4.62	2.9×10^{-1}	2.3×10^{-1}	5.6×10^2	2.94×10^2	1.29×10^2	2.49×10^3	9.1×10^2	1.4×10^3	-4.6×10^3	1.2×10^2

Predicting signatures for mono-H and Z: efficiencies

Selection cuts	$\bar{t}t$ leptonic	$V + jj$	VV	Zh_{SM}	mono-H
Cross-section [pb]	26.9	516	0.587	0.106	4×10^{-4}
$\not{E}_T \geq 200$ GeV	1.5×10^{-2}	1.5×10^{-3}	2×10^{-2}	4.7×10^{-2}	0.436
$N(b) \geq 2$	1.2×10^{-2}	1.1×10^{-3}	1.4×10^{-2}	3.5×10^{-2}	0.325
$p_T(b_1) \geq 50$, $p_T(b_2) \geq 30$ GeV	1.8×10^{-3}	1.7×10^{-4}	3×10^{-3}	1.4×10^{-2}	0.13
80 GeV $\leq m(b\bar{b}) \leq$ 140 GeV	5×10^{-4}	6×10^{-5}	2.6×10^{-3}	1.2×10^{-2}	0.121
$\Delta\phi(b_{1,2}, \not{E}) > 0.35$	4×10^{-4}	4×10^{-5}	2.4×10^{-3}	1.1×10^{-2}	0.120

Selection cuts	$\bar{t}t$ leptonic	$V + jj$	VV	Zh_{SM}	mono-Z
Cross-section [pb]	26.9	516	0.587	0.106	5×10^{-4}
$\not{E}_T \geq 200$ GeV	1.5×10^{-2}	1.5×10^{-3}	2×10^{-2}	4.7×10^{-2}	0.38
$N(b) \geq 2$	1.2×10^{-2}	1.1×10^{-3}	1.4×10^{-2}	3.5×10^{-2}	0.29
$p_T(b_1) \geq 30$, $p_T(b_2) \geq 20$ GeV	1.1×10^{-2}	5.5×10^{-4}	4.8×10^{-2}	2.8×10^{-2}	0.182
50 GeV $\leq m(b\bar{b}) \leq$ 120 GeV	6×10^{-3}	3×10^{-4}	4.3×10^{-2}	2.6×10^{-2}	0.12
$\Delta\phi(b_{1,2}, \not{E}) > 0.35$	5.5×10^{-3}	3×10^{-4}	2.5×10^{-2}	1.1×10^{-2}	0.11

Predicting signatures for mono-H and Z: DL setup

Final state hadrons $\rightarrow$ fully connected graph
each hadron has $(M, p_T, E, \eta, \phi, \text{charge})$

Kinematical input: MET, $p_T(b_{1,2})$, $\eta_T(b_{1,2})$, $p_T(b\bar{b})$, $\eta_T(b\bar{b})$, $m(b\bar{b})$,
$\Delta R(b,\bar{b}) = \sqrt{\Delta_\eta(b,\bar{b})^2 + \Delta_\phi(b,\bar{b})^2}$



Predicting signatures for mono-H and Z: HL-LHC





$$\sigma = \left[2 \left((N_s + N_b) \ln \frac{(N_s + N_b)(N_b + \sigma_b^2)}{N_b^2 + (N_s + N_b)\sigma_b^2} - \frac{N_b^2}{\sigma_b^2} \ln(1 + \frac{\sigma_b^2 N_s}{N_b(N_b + \sigma_b^2)}) \right) \right]^{1/2},$$

N_s, N_b number of signal and background events, respectively
σ_b systematic uncertainty, assumed 10%

Summary

- Supersymmetry is still alive and well motivated, with the NMSSM gaining popularity
- New observations may point the way for new theoretical explorations but add work to the numerical work.
- New data analysis techniques may be needed. Machine learning is recently stepping up as a great candidate.
- We performed an scan of the parameter space of the NMSSM in search for a number of recent observations and found regions that successfully satisfy all the constraints.
- We also applied deep learning to the search for mono-H and Z signals and found points that deserve further exploration.
- In the future we hope that `DLScanner` can be used in more studies that have to deal with costly and time-consuming computations.

Useful links

`DLScanner`:
https://github.com/raalraan/DLScanner

Example code for this work:
https://github.com/raalraan/DLScanner/tree/main/tests/examples/2508_13912

Thanks for listening!