


Natural SUSY with Light Higgsinos at the ILC

Tomohiko Tanabe (Tokyo), Howard Baer (Oklahoma),
Mikael Berggren, **Suvi-Leena Lehtinen**, Jenny List (DESY),
Keisuke Fujii, Jacqueline Yan (KEK)



May 29, 2018
ALCW 2018, Fukuoka

Most materials are from Tomohiko and Suvi.

This talk will update one given by Tomohiko in Strasbourg on October 24, 2017.


What's new?

- **More complete BG (missing phase space in low ee -pair invariant mass plugged, 2-photon $ae \rightarrow 3f$ included)**
- **Consistent selection cuts across all benchmarks, final states, and beam polarizations**
- **Global mass fits with improved edge detection**
- **New plots for model parameter extractions using the updated event selection and mass and cross section fit results**

Contents

- **Introduction**
 - Motivation, benchmarks
- **Neutralino channel (N1N2)**
 - Event selection, kinematic edges
- **Chargino channel (C1C1)**
 - Event selection, kinematic edges
- **Results**
 - Mass global fits, Cross section estimation
- **Parameter extraction**
 - Prediction of heavy states, extrapolation to GUT-scale physics
- **Summary**

Tomohiko Tanabe



Suvi-Leena Lehtinen

Introduction

ILC, too, is an energy frontier machine!

It will enter uncharted waters of e^+e^- collisions

Thanks to well-defined initial states,
clean environment w/o QCD BG, and

- ***>10³ higher luminosity than LEP2***
- ***beam polarizations***
- ***much better detectors***

we have ***much better sensitivities to regions with small cross sections and compressed mass spectra, which are challenging for LHC***


ILC can cover blind spots of LHC!

Why Light Higgsinos?

[arXiv:1212.2655, arXiv:1404.7510]

Radiatively driven Natural SUSY

$$\frac{m_Z^2}{2} = \frac{m_{H_d}^2 - m_{H_u}^2 \tan^2 \beta}{\tan^2 \beta - 1} - \mu^2$$




ILC1: ~7% EW fine tuning

ILC2: ~3% EW fine tuning


SUSY is still the best BSM candidate, if μ is not far above 100 GeV.

μ not far above 100 GeV implies Higgsino-like LSP




LC, including its energy upgrade ~500 GeV, is expected to discover natural SUSY (or finally rule it out).

Typical Natural SUSY Spectrum




Thanks to the small mixings of Higgsino / Bino / Wino,
the Bino & Wino are resolvable from the precision measurements of the **polarized cross sections** & **mass** of the lightest Higgsino-like states.

Decomposition




Benchmark Points

Chargino Pair Production
 $e+e^- \rightarrow C1+ C1^-$



Neutralino Mixed Production
 $e+e^- \rightarrow N1 N2$



3 benchmark points with natural higgsinos:

Mass (GeV)	ILC1	ILC2	nGMM1
M(N1)	102.7	148.1	151.4
M(N2)	124.0	157.8	155.8
ΔM(N2,N1)	21.3	9.7	4.4
M(C1)	117.3	158.3	158.7
ΔM(C1,N1)	14.6	10.2	7.3

Cross Section	ILC1	ILC2	nGMM1
C1C1 (e-L, e+R)	1799.9	1530.5	1520.6
C1C1 (e-R, e+L)	334.5	307.2	309.5
N1N2 (e-L, e+R)	490.9	458.9	463.5
N1N2 (e-R, e+L)	378.5	353.8	357.3

*Other SUSY particles are heavy

(Assuming discovery and)



How well can we reconstruct the masses and cross section?

What are the implications for the precision obtained?



Generator-level Distributions

- Key observables in this study: di-lepton / di-jet mass and energy.
- Their maximum values (edges) can be used to extract the masses.

N1N2



C1C1



	ILC1	ILC2	nGMM1
$\Delta M(N2, N1)$	21.3	9.7	4.4
$\Delta M(C1, N1)$	14.6	10.2	7.3


Equations

Maximum energy of the di-lepton / di-jet system is given by

$$E^* = \frac{\gamma(1 + \beta)}{2} \left(1 + \frac{M_1}{M_2} \right) \Delta M$$

where

$$\frac{1}{\gamma} = \sqrt{1 - \beta^2} \quad \frac{1}{\beta} = \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{M_2}{p^*} \right)^2}$$



$\Delta M = M_2 - M_1$ (given by **maximum mass of the di-lepton / di-jet system**)



$$p^* = \frac{\sqrt{s}}{2} \sqrt{1 - 2 \left[\left(\frac{M_1}{\sqrt{s}} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{M_2}{\sqrt{s}} \right)^2 \right] + \left[\left(\frac{M_2}{\sqrt{s}} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{M_1}{\sqrt{s}} \right)^2 \right]^2}$$

How do these signals look in the detector? (1)

$\sqrt{s} = 500 \text{ GeV}$

Chargino pair production with semileptonic decay

$$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^+ \tilde{\chi}_1^- \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 q q' l \nu$$



How do these signals look in the detector? (2)

$v_s = 500 \text{ GeV}$

Neutralino mixed production with leptonic decay

$$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \ell^+ \ell^-$$

electron pair
(compact EM showers)


muon pair
(track reaches muon detector)

Event Selection

Neutralino mixed production with leptonic decay

$$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_2^0 \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \ell^+ \ell^-$$



- Identify **two leptons (ee or μμ)**
- Major residual bkg. are 4f processes accompanied by large missing energy (vvll)
- 2-γ processes removed by BeamCal veto, cuts on lepton track p_T , and coplanarity



Chargino pair production with semileptonic decay

$$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^+ \tilde{\chi}_1^- \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 qq' \ell \nu$$

- Find an **isolated lepton (e or μ)**
- Reconstruct **two jets** from the rest
- BeamCal veto, cuts on missing p_T , # of tracks, # of leptons, and coplanarity **remove almost all bkg.**



N1N2

Kinematic Edges: ILC1 (N1N2)





ee, (-80,+30)

ee, (+80,-30)





$\mu\mu$, (-80,+30)

$\mu\mu$, (+80,-30)

M



E



The kinematic edge is modeled as: straight line (signal) + exponential (background). The precision is estimated using toy MC experiments.

Kinematic Edges: ILC2 (N1N2)





M

ee, (-80,+30)





ee, (+80,-30)

$\mu\mu$, (-80,+30)

$\mu\mu$, (+80,-30)



E




The kinematic edge is modeled as: straight line (signal) + exponential (background). The precision is estimated using toy MC experiments.


Kinematic Edges: nGMM1 (N1N2)

M(J/ψ)
 J/ψ masses are a bit off: will be investigated


ee, (-80,+30)




ee, (+80,-30)







μμ, (-80,+30)







μμ, (+80,-30)



M




E



C1C1


Di-jet Reconstruction

- Naïve reconstruction of di-jet mass suffers from heavy tail
- Dominant effect: neutral reconstruction (**NOT detector resolution**)
- Set only the neutral component of the jet to have zero mass → improves core reconstruction but the tail remains
- Set jet mass to zero → overcompensation in the core but reproduces the edge → used in this study.




Kinematic Edges: ILC1 (C1C1)

M



E



- The core is model with a straight line, while the tail is model with an exponential. The intersection is extract as the edge. The precision is estimated using toy MC experiments.
- A shift in the extract value (bias) is seen. This is correct by a scaling factor.

Kinematic Edges: ILC2 (C1C1)





M

$l=e, (-80,+30)$





$l=e, (+80,-30)$

$l=\mu, (-80,+30)$

$l=\mu, (+80,-30)$



E



- The core is model with a straight line, while the tail is model with an exponential. The intersection is extract as the edge. The precision is estimated using toy MC experiments.
- A shift in the extract value (bias) is seen. This is correct by a scaling factor.

Kinematic Edges: nGMM1 (C1C1)





M

$l=e, (-80,+30)$





$l=e, (+80,-30)$

$l=\mu, (-80,+30)$

$l=\mu, (+80,-30)$



E



- The core is model with a straight line, while the tail is model with an exponential. The intersection is extract as the edge. The precision is estimated using toy MC experiments.
- A shift in the extract value (bias) is seen. This is correct by a scaling factor.

Results

Mass Extraction

- 3 masses as fitted values which are used to compute the two observables: di-lepton/di-jet invariant mass and maximum energy
- 16 measurements: $\{N1N2, C1C1\} \times \{e, \mu\} \times \{E, M\} \times \{2 \text{ polarizations}\}$
- Least-squares fit assuming Gaussian errors and independent measurements
- Calibration applied to M_{jj} edge: assume uncertainty scales linearly and without additional error

$\sqrt{s}=500 \text{ GeV}$ $L=500 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$M(N1)$	$M(N2)$	$M(C1)$
ILC1	$102.6 \pm 0.85 \text{ GeV}$ (0.84%)	$123.7 \pm 0.99 \text{ GeV}$ (0.80%)	$117.2 \pm 0.95 \text{ GeV}$ (0.81%)
ILC2	148.2 ± 1.9 (1.31%)	157.9 ± 2.1 (1.31%)	158.5 ± 2.1 (1.30%)
nGMM1	151.0 ± 2.6 (1.72%)	155.3 ± 2.7 (1.72%)	158.4 ± 2.7 (1.68%)

Percent-level precision for neutralino and chargino masses.
(Sub-percent expected for H-20 luminosities.)

Event selection dedicated to each benchmark will improve the precision.

Cross Section

- Event counting within optimized mass window
 - N1N2:
 - ILC1: [0, 20] GeV
 - ILC2: [0, 9] GeV
 - nGMM1: [0, 3.5] GeV
 - C1C1: use all selected events
- Cross section significance computed via $S/\sqrt{(S+B)}$ for each channel, combined via squared-sums \rightarrow converted to statistical uncertainty

$\sqrt{s}=500$ GeV L=500 fb ⁻¹	$\Delta\sigma/\sigma$ (N1N2)	$\Delta\sigma/\sigma$ (C1C1)
ILC1	1.73%	1.51%
ILC2	2.90%	2.99%
nGMM1	3.03%	3.46%

A few percent precision for neutralino and chargino masses.

(Percent-level expected for H-20 luminosities.)

Event selection dedicated to each benchmark will improve the precision.

Parameter Extraction

SUSY Parameter Fit

Input

Mass N1, N2, C1
Cross Sections


Higgs Mass
Higgs Couplings

Fit


Output

$\mu, M_1, M_2, M_3, \tan\beta (, \dots)$

Deviations of ILC2 Higgs branching ratios from SM




Example: ILC2: *10-parameter* Fit (H20)




Assuming GUT relation, predict M_3 at the EW scale



Or, if a gluino found at LHC, we can test Gaugino mass unification



Prediction of heavy states



N_2, N_4, C_2 masses to $\sim 10\%$
 A, H, H^{\pm} masses to $\sim 20\%$


Sets the target for ILC E-upgrade

Upper limit on stop, other sfermions and gluino

Sets the Energy for next machine?



Distinguish different SUSY breaking scenarios



Mirage mediation separable

Summary

- **ILC, too, is an energy frontier machine. It will enter uncharted waters for e^+e^- collisions.**
- **With beam polarizations, 10^3 higher luminosity, and much better detectors, ILC can find new particles hiding in the LHC's blind spot.**
- **Natural SUSY is viable and very well-motivated, and hence one of the most attractive scenarios of BSM physics.**
- **It predicts light Higgsinos which are compressed. The ILC, including its upgrade, can probe these Higgsinos, and, if discovered, measure their masses & cross sections at percent level with the "full" dataset.**
- **These precise measurements allow us to predict the heavy states and to extract the underlying model parameters.**
- **Test of GUT-scale physics is possible, including the distinction of various scenarios such as gaugino mass unification vs. mirage/string-like unification.**

Backup


PMQ	ILC1	ILC2	nGMM1
m_0	7025.0	5000	$m_{3/2} = 75000$
$m_{1/2} / M_1, M_2, M_3$	568.3	1200	3382.5, 2124.4, 1225.8
A_0	-10427	-8000	$a_3 = 3$
$\tan \beta$	10	15	10
other	–	–	$c_m = 6.9; \alpha = 4$
m_h	125.3	125.4	124.9
m_A	1000.0	1000	2000
m_H	1006.8	1006.7	2013.3
m_{H^\pm}	1003.2	1003.2	2001.6
μ	115.0	150	150
$m_{\tilde{g}}$	1563.5	2832.6	2856.5
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_{1,2}^\pm}$	117.3, 513.0	158.3, 1017.5	158.7, 1791.6
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_{1,2}^0}$	102.7, 124.0	148.1, 157.8	151.4, 155.8
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_{3,4}^0}$	267.0, 524.2	538.7, 1031.1	1526.9, 1799.4
$m_{\tilde{u}_{L,R}}$	7021.3, 7254.2	5440.4, 5565.6	5266.7, 5398.2
$m_{\tilde{t}_{1,2}}$	1893.3, 4919.4	1774.3, 3877.9	1433.1, 3732.0
$m_{\tilde{d}_{L,R}}$	7021.8, 6998.6	5441.0, 5384.5	5267.3, 5228.6
$m_{\tilde{b}_{1,2}}$	4959.2, 6893.3	3902.8, 5204.5	3770.5, 5124.5
$m_{\tilde{e}_{L,R}}$	7152.5, 6758.6	5149.0, 4817.1	5127.8, 4824.6
$m_{\tilde{\tau}_{1,2}}$	6656.6, 7103.1	4652.3, 5072.5	4749.5, 5093.9
$\Omega_{\tilde{\chi}^0}^{std} h^2$	0.009	0.007	0.005
$\langle \sigma v \rangle (v \rightarrow 0)$ [cm ³ /s]	2.2×10^{-25}	2.9×10^{-25}	3.1×10^{-25}
$\sigma^{SI}(\tilde{\chi}^0 p) \times 10^9$ [pb]	6.8	1.5	0.3
$a_\mu^{SUSY} \times 10^{10}$	0.03	0.13	0.06
$BF(b \rightarrow s\gamma) \times 10^4$	3.3	3.3	3.1
$BF(B_S \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) \times 10^9$	3.8	3.8	3.8
$BF(B_u \rightarrow \tau \nu_\tau) \times 10^4$	1.3	1.3	1.3
Δ_{EW}	14	28	15

Table 1: Input parameters and mass spectrum and rates for benchmark points ILC1, ILC2 and nGMM1. All masses and dimensionful parameters are in GeV units. All values have been obtained with Isasugra. The nGMM1 benchmark has parameters $\alpha = 4$ and $m_{3/2} = 75$ TeV with $c_m = 6.9$ and $a_3 = 3$.

Missing Phase Space

Previously missing phase space in 4-fermion backgrounds (due to generator-level cut) is now supplemented by including additional samples (full/fast)

[Thanks to H. Ono, A. Miyamoto, M. Berggren]



Event Selection (N1N2)

1. Pair of isolated leptons (e or μ) **[preselection]**
2. Visible Energy in the event < 25 GeV
3. Missing Energy in the event < 300 GeV
4. Missing $|\cos\theta| < 0.98$
5. No BeamCal hits
6. # of tracks with $p_T > 2$ GeV = 2
7. Lepton $p_T > 2.3$ GeV, $|\cos\theta| < 0.95$
8. di-lepton coplanarity < 0.8
9. di-lepton $|\cos\theta| < 0.98$
- 10. di-lepton mass cuts for di-lepton energy measurement
(process-dependent)**

Consistent across all benchmarks (ILC1/ILC2/nGMM1) **[except #10]**, final states (e/mu), and beam polarizations.

Event Selection (C1C1)

1. One isolated lepton (e or μ) **[preselection]**
2. No BeamCal hits
3. **Lepton $p_T > 5$ GeV (suppress two-photon background)**
4. **# of tracks in event ≥ 4 (suppress ae_3f background)**
5. Missing Energy > 400 GeV
6. Missing $|\cos\theta| < 0.99$
7. Visible Energy < 80 GeV
8. Each jet $|\cos\theta| < 0.98$
9. di-jet coplanarity < 1.0
10. Angle between lepton and dijet system $|\cos\theta| < 0.2$

Consistent across all benchmarks (ILC1/ILC2/nGMM1), final states (e/mu), and beam polarizations.

The event selection is much tighter compared to previous results. This is to ensure the removal of the 2-photon and ae_3f backgrounds.

SUSY Parameter Fit: Details

Chi-square (χ^2) from experimental observables and theory predictions

→ Uncertainty taken from experimental observables

Find SUSY parameters that minimize χ^2


The range of values $\Delta\chi^2 = [0,1]$ gives the uncertainty

Fittino minimises

$$\chi^2 = \left(\frac{\mathcal{O}(ILC) - \mathcal{O}(theory)}{\Delta\mathcal{O}(ILC)} \right)^2$$

(arXiv:hep-ph/0412012)

SPheno 3.3.9beta,
FeynHiggs2.10.2 for Higgs,
MicrOMEGAs and
AstroFit for DM



ILC1	model mass [GeV]	precision	H20 precision
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$	104.8	0.828%	0.463%
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0}$	127.5	0.800%	0.447%
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}$	116.0	0.811%	0.453%
ILC2	model mass [GeV]	precision	I20 precision
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$	151.3	1.282%	0.717%
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0}$	162.4	1.330%	0.743%
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}$	157.0	1.325%	0.741%
nGMM1	model mass [GeV]	precision	I20 precision
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$	154.9	1.722%	0.963%
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0}$	160.2	1.739%	0.972%
$m_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}$	157.4	1.705%	0.953%

Table 4: ILC1, ILC2 and nGMM1 MSSM model masses from `SPheno3.3.9beta`. Experimental mass precision combined from 500 GeV 500^{-1} fb for both $\mathcal{P}(\pm 0.8, \mp 0.3)$. It is assumed that the same precision is valid for these masses and mass differences as the simulation shows for the `Isajet` masses. Last column: precision scaled to 1600 fb^{-1} for both polarisations at $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV, ignoring the data sets with other centre-of-mass energies in H20 and I20 operating scenarios.

ILC1	$\sqrt{s} = 500 \text{ GeV}$	$\sqrt{s} = 500 \text{ GeV}$	$\sqrt{s} = 250 \text{ GeV}$	$\sqrt{s} = 350 \text{ GeV}$
$\Delta(\sigma \times BR)[\%]$	$\mathcal{L} = 500 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$\mathcal{L} = 1600 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$\mathcal{L} = 1350 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$\mathcal{L} = 135 \text{ fb}^{-1}$
$LR \sigma(\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 ee)$	3.80	2.12	1.65	5.36
$LR \sigma(\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \mu\mu)$	3.42	1.91	1.48	4.82
$LR \sigma(\tilde{\chi}_1^+ \tilde{\chi}_1^- \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 qqe\nu_e)$	2.59	1.45	1.20	3.74
$LR \sigma(\tilde{\chi}_1^+ \tilde{\chi}_1^- \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 qq\mu\nu_\mu)$	2.27	1.27	1.05	3.28
$\Delta(\sigma \times BR)[\%]$	$\mathcal{L} = 500 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$\mathcal{L} = 1600 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$\mathcal{L} = 450 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$\mathcal{L} = 45 \text{ fb}^{-1}$
$RL \sigma(\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 ee)$	3.38	1.89	2.56	8.29
$RL \sigma(\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \mu\mu)$	3.33	1.86	2.52	8.17
$RL \sigma(\tilde{\chi}_1^+ \tilde{\chi}_1^- \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 qqe\nu_e)$	4.94	2.76	4.28	12.70
$RL \sigma(\tilde{\chi}_1^+ \tilde{\chi}_1^- \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 qq\mu\nu_\mu)$	4.30	2.40	3.73	11.05

Table 5: ILC1: Simulation results for experimental precisions. Scaled precisions for the various centre of mass energies and the two polarisations. LR refers to the beam polarisation $\mathcal{P} = (-80\%, +30\%)$ and RL refers to $\mathcal{P} = (+80\%, -30\%)$.

ILC2	$\sqrt{s} = 500 \text{ GeV}$	$\sqrt{s} = 500 \text{ GeV}$	$\sqrt{s} = 250 \text{ GeV}$	$\sqrt{s} = 350 \text{ GeV}$
$\Delta(\sigma \times BR)[\%]$	$\mathcal{L} = 500 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$\mathcal{L} = 1600 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$\mathcal{L} = 337.5 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$\mathcal{L} = 1147.5 \text{ fb}^{-1}$
$LR \sigma(\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 ee)$	5.52	3.09	–	3.30
$LR \sigma(\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \mu\mu)$	5.04	2.82	–	3.01
$LR \sigma(\tilde{\chi}_1^+ \tilde{\chi}_1^- \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 qqe\nu_e)$	5.17	2.89	–	3.17
$LR \sigma(\tilde{\chi}_1^+ \tilde{\chi}_1^- \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 qq\mu\nu_\mu)$	4.39	2.45	–	2.70
$\Delta(\sigma \times BR)[\%]$	$\mathcal{L} = 500 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$\mathcal{L} = 1600 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$\mathcal{L} = 112.5 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$\mathcal{L} = 382.5 \text{ fb}^{-1}$
$RL \sigma(\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 ee)$	6.54	3.66	–	3.93
$RL \sigma(\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \mu\mu)$	6.50	3.63	–	3.91
$RL \sigma(\tilde{\chi}_1^+ \tilde{\chi}_1^- \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 qqe\nu_e)$	10.30	5.76	–	6.49
$RL \sigma(\tilde{\chi}_1^+ \tilde{\chi}_1^- \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 qq\mu\nu_\mu)$	8.84	4.94	–	5.57

Table 6: ILC2: Simulation results for experimental precisions. Scaled precisions for the various centre of mass energies and the two polarisations. LR refers to the beam polarisation $\mathcal{P} = (-80\%, +30\%)$ and RL refers to $\mathcal{P} = (+80\%, -30\%)$.

nGMM1	$\sqrt{s} = 500 \text{ GeV}$ $\mathcal{L} = 500 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$\sqrt{s} = 500 \text{ GeV}$ $\mathcal{L} = 1600 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$\sqrt{s} = 250 \text{ GeV}$ $\mathcal{L} = 337.5 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$\sqrt{s} = 350 \text{ GeV}$ $\mathcal{L} = 1147.5 \text{ fb}^{-1}$
$\Delta(\sigma \times BR)[\%]$				
<i>LR</i> $\sigma(\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 ee)$	6.81	3.81	—	4.11
<i>LR</i> $\sigma(\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \mu\mu)$	6.21	3.47	—	3.74
<i>LR</i> $\sigma(\tilde{\chi}_1^+ \tilde{\chi}_1^- \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 qqe\nu_e)$	6.20	3.47	—	3.83
<i>LR</i> $\sigma(\tilde{\chi}_1^+ \tilde{\chi}_1^- \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 qq\mu\nu_\mu)$	4.99	2.79	—	3.08
$\Delta(\sigma \times BR)[\%]$	$\mathcal{L} = 500 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$\mathcal{L} = 1600 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$\mathcal{L} = 112.5 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	$\mathcal{L} = 382.5 \text{ fb}^{-1}$
<i>RL</i> $\sigma(\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 ee)$	5.88	3.29	—	3.56
<i>RL</i> $\sigma(\tilde{\chi}_2^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \mu\mu)$	5.55	3.10	—	3.36
<i>RL</i> $\sigma(\tilde{\chi}_1^+ \tilde{\chi}_1^- \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 qqe\nu_e)$	11.70	6.54	—	7.41
<i>RL</i> $\sigma(\tilde{\chi}_1^+ \tilde{\chi}_1^- \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \tilde{\chi}_1^0 qq\mu\nu_\mu)$	9.90	5.53	—	6.27

Table 7: nGMM1: Simulation results on experimental precisions. Scaled precisions for the various centre of mass energies and the two polarisations. LR refers to the beam polarisation $\mathcal{P} = (-80\%, +30\%)$ and RL refers to $\mathcal{P} = (+80\%, -30\%)$.













Figure 6: Deviations of the branching fractions of the SUSY light Higgs from the Standard Model expectations in ILC1, ILC2 and nGMM1.



Example: ILC1:
10-parameter Fit (H20)



Example: ILC2:
10-parameter Fit (H20)



Example: nGMM1:
10-parameter Fit (H20)