Cat sh: A M onte Carlo sim ulator for black holes at the LHC

M.Cavaglia^a, R.Godang^{a;b}, L.Crem aldi^a and D.Summers^a

^(a) Department of Physics and Astronom y, University of Mississippi University, MS 38677-1848, USA

^(b) University of South A labama, Department of Physics, M obile AL 36688, USA

Abstract

W e present a new Fortran M onte C arlo generator to simulate black hole events at CERN's Large H adron C ollider. The generator interfaces to the PYTHIA M onte C arlo fragmentation code. The physics of the BH generator includes, but not limited to, inelasticity e ects, exact eld em issivities, corrections to sem iclassical black hole evaporation and gravitational energy loss at formation. These features are essential to realistically reconstruct the detector response and test di erent m odels of black hole formation and decay at the LHC.

PACS: 04.80 C c, 04.50.+ h, 12.60.-i, 13.85.-t K eyw ords: Extra dim ensions, black holes, hadron colliders, M onte C arlo m ethods

W ork supported in part by the U S.D epartm ent of Energy contract DE-FG 05-91ER 40622.

1 Introduction

The fundam ental scale of gravity m ay be much lower than the measured gravitational scale [1]. In scenarios with large or warped extra dimensions, the observed weakness of gravity is explained by assuming that Standard M odel (SM) elds are constrained to propagate on a four-dimensional submanifold, whereas gravitons propagate in the higher-dimensional spacetime [2]. If the gravitational coupling constant is of the order of few TeV s, super-P lanckian events at CERN's LHC could lead to the form ation of subnuclear B lack H oles (BH s) [3] and branes [4] (For review s and further references, see R efs. [5, 6]).

The sem iclassical lim it of super-P lanckian scattering suggests that the cross section for creation of a BH or brane with radius R is approximately equal to the geometrical B lack D isk (BD) cross section $_{BD}(s;n) = R^2(s;n)$, where \bar{P} is the C enter of M ass (CM) energy of the colliding quanta and n is the number of extra dimensions. The sem iclassical H awking e ect [7] provides a therm all decay mechanism for BHs, thus allowing their detection. The spectrum of massive excitations in string theories suggests that branes may also decay therm ally [8]. Under the most favorable circum stances, the BH event rate at the LHC should be comparable to the tt event rate.

Untilnow, num erical studies of observational signatures have used M onte C arbo (M C) generators in plem enting the sem iclassical picture outlined above. Currently, there are two M C generators for BH production at particle colliders: TRUENOIR [9] and CHARYBDIS [10]. However, recent results have m odi ed signi cantly our understanding of BH form ation and evolution. It is thus tim ely and worthwile to exam ine the observational signatures of BH events beyond the sim ple sem iclassical picture. To this purpose, we have developed a new Fortran M C generator for BH events at the LHC which includes m any of the accepted theoretical results in the literature. The generator, called CATFISH (C ollider grAviT ational Field Sim ulator for black Holes), interfaces to the PYTHIA M C fragmentation code [11] using the Les Houches interface [12]. CATFISH allows the most accurate description of BH events at the TeV scale up-to-date. Its exibility perm its to com pare the signatures of di erent theoreticalm odels of BH production. M C generators with sim ilar characteristics of CATFISH have already been successfully utilized to sim ulate BH production in ultrahigh-energy cosm ic ray air showers [13] and in lepton colliders [14]. P recom piled executable versions of CATFISH (Linux and M ac OS platform s) are available at the CATFISH website http://www.phy.olemiss.edu/GR/catfish.

2 Basics of BH form ation and evolution

In this section we follow Ref. [13] and brie y review the basics of BH form ation and evolution.

2.1 BH form ation and cross section at parton level

Thome's hoop conjecture [15] states that an event horizon form swhen a mass M is compacted into a region with circum ference smaller than twice the Schwarzschild radius R (M) in any direction. At the LHC, this process can be achieved by scattering two partons ij with CM energy larger than M and impact parameter smaller b than R. The BH event is described by the inelastic process ij ! BH + E (X), where E (X) denotes the collisional energy that does not fall beyond the event horizon. Due to the gravitational nature of the process, this energy includes mainly a bulk component of gravitational radiation, although non-SM gauge elds and a brane component of SM elds cannot be excluded. If E (X) is zero, the hoop conjecture in plies that the parton cross section for BH production is equal to the geom etrical BD cross section, $_{ij}(s;n) = _{BD}(s_{ij};n)$ (R (s_{ij}) b). If E (X) \in 0, the cross section is generally smaller and depends on the impact parameter. Note that this treatment is valid only if the BH is larger than the C ompton length of the colliding quanta. (For discussions on the e ect of wave packet size on the BH form ation process, see Refs. [16].) A precise calculation of the collisional energy loss is essential to understanding BH form ation.

The hoop conjecture has been tested by di erent methods [6], the most popular one being the Trapped-Surface (TS) approach [17, 18, 19], The TS model gives a bound on the inelasticity by modeling the incoming partons as two Aichelburg-Sexl shock waves [20]. The Aichelburg-Sexl wave is obtained by boosting the Schwarzschild solution to the speed of light at xed energy. The resulting metric describes a plane-fronted gravitational shock wave corresponding to the Lorentz-contracted longitudinal gravitational eld. The parton scattering is simulated by superposing two shock waves traveling in opposite directions. The union of these shock waves de ness a closed TS that allows to set a low er bound on the initial BH mass M_{BH}. The collisional energy loss depends on the impact parameter and increases as the number of spacetime dimensions increases. The BH mass monotonically decreases with the impact parameter from a maximum of about 60–70% of the CM energy for head-on collisions.

The TS result is consistent within one order of magnitude with the hoop conjecture. However, this approach neglects mass, spin, charge and nite-size e ects of the incoming partons. Size and spin e ects are expected to be mostly relevant around the Planck energy. Charge e ects could dom inate at higher energy. The pointlike approximation fails for directions transversal to the motion [21]. Even with these assumptions, the TS model provides only a lower bound on M_{BH}. Independent estimates of the gravitational collisional energy loss are possible through alternative approaches. The gravitational energy emission in a hard instantaneous collision can be evaluated in the linearized limit [22]. This computation suggests that the TS method overestimates the gravitational energy bess is only about 10% of the CM energy. This result is in agreement with perturbative calculations modeling the parton-parton collision as a plunge of a relativistic test particle into a BH with mass equal to the CM energy [23].

In conclusion, a conservative estimate of gravitational loss in relativistic scattering at parton level gives a BH mass ranging between 60% and 100% of the CM energy. The TS result and the BD result can be considered as the lower and upper bounds on M_{BH} , respectively.

2.2 Cross section at nucleon level

The total cross section for a super-Planckian BH event involving two nucleons is obtained by integrating the parton cross section over the Parton Distribution Functions (PDFs). If the BH m ass depends on the impact parameter, the generally accepted form ula for the total cross section of the pp process is

$$PP! BH (s;n) = \begin{cases} X & Z_{1} & Z_{1} \\ 2zdz & dx \\ ij & 0 & x_{m} \end{cases} dx = \begin{cases} X & X_{1} & Z_{1} \\ 2zdz & dx \\ x^{0} & x_{m} & x \end{cases} dx^{0} f_{i}(x^{0};Q) f_{j}(x=x^{0};Q) F_{BD} (xs;n); \end{cases} (1)$$

where $f_i(;Q)$ are the PDFs with four-m on entum transfer squared Q 24,25] and z is the impact parameter normalized to its maximum value. The cuto at small x is $x_m = M_{min}^2 = (sy^2(z))$, where y(z) and M_{min} are the fraction of CM energy trapped into the BH and the minimum -allowed mass of the gravitational object, respectively. F is a form factor. The total cross section for the BD m odel is obtained by setting F = 1 and y²(z) = 1. Dierent sets of PDFs are de ned in the literature. The PDFs are not known at energies above the TeV and for values of momentum transfer expected in BH formation. Equation (1) is usually calculated by imposing a cut-o at these values. The PDFs also su er from uncertainties at any momentum transfer (10%) [26] and from the ambiguity in the de nition of Q [27]. The momentum transfer is usually set to be M_{BH} or the Schwarzschild radius inverse. The uncertainty due to this ambiguity is about 10 20%.

The form factor and the am ount of trapped energy depend in principle on energy, gravitational scale, geom etry and physical properties of the spacetime. The TS method gives numerical values of order unity for these quantities. (See Refs. [17, 18] and discussion above). However, these results depend on the way the TS is identied. Other models [28] give values which are more or less consistent with the TS method. It is common practice in the literature to either choose the TS result or the simple BD model.

The lower cuto on the fraction of the nucleon momentum carried by the partons is set by the minimum -allowed form ation mass of the gravitational object, M_{min} . This threshold is usually considered to be roughly equal to the minimum mass for which the sem iclassical description of the BH is valid. However, this argument is based on Hawking's sem iclassical theory and may not be valid at energies equal to few times the Planck mass. For example, the existence of a minimum spacetime length l_m implies the lower bound on the BH mass [29, 30]:

$$M_{m1} = \frac{n+2}{8 \frac{n+3}{2}} P_{m} M_{2} = 2^{n+1} M_{2}; \qquad (2)$$

where M_? is the fundam ental P lanck m ass. BH s with m ass less than M_{m1} do not exist, since their horizon radius would fall below the minimum -allowed length. Note that M_{m1} grows as a power of l_m^{n+1} at xed M_?. Therefore, M_{min} m ay be much larger than M_? for higher-dimensional spacetimes.

2.3 BH evolution

It is believed that the decay of microscopic BH shappens in four distinct stages: I. radiation of excess multipole moments (balding phase); II. spin-down; III. Hawking evaporation; IV. nalexplosion or form ation of a BH remnant.

A though some progress has been made, a quantitative description of the balding phase and the spin-down phase is not fully known. For example, the emission of radiation from a (n + 4)-dimensional rotating BH on the brane is not known for spin-2 elds [31]. Due to these limitations, balding phase and spin-down phase elects are not implemented in the current version of CATFISH. It should be stressed, how ever, that balding and spin-down elects could play an important role in BH phenomenology at the LHC.

M any papers have been devoted to the investigation of BH evaporation in higher dimensions [32], leading to a better understanding of the Hawking phase. Field emissivities for all SM elds have recently been calculated [33]. For non rotating BH s and them inim alSU (3) SU (2) U (1) SM, m ost of the BH m ass is radiated as SM quanta on the brane, although the gravitational emission in the bulk cannot be neglected for high n. Two points should be stressed [34]: (i) it is not clear what is the elect of rotation on BH emissivities; (ii) the eld content at trans-P lanckian energies is not know n. O nset of supersymmetry, for example, could lead to other evaporation channels and large emission of undetectable non-SM quanta during the decay phase even in absence of rotation [35].

Quantum gravitationale ects and BH recoil [36] could also a ect the em ission of visible quanta on the brane. Examples of quantum gravitational e ects are quantum thermal uctuations and corrections to the Hawking them odynam ics due to the existence of a minimum length [30]. The existence of a minimum scale of the order of the Planck length [37] is a common consequence of most (if not all) theories of quantum gravity such as string theory, non-commutative geometry, canonical quantum gravity, etc. The presence of a cuto at the Planck scale leads to a modi cation of the uncertainty principle. Since the Hawking them odynam ical quantities can be derived by applying the uncertainty principle to the BH, the existence of a minimum length leads to corrections in the them odynam ical quantities [29, 30].

At the end of the Hawking phase, the BH is expected to either non-them ally decay in a number n_p of hard quanta or leave a remnant. In either case, the lack of a theory of quantum gravity does not allow more than a phenom enological treatment. The naldecay is usually described by setting a cuto on the BH mass of the order of the Planck mass, Q_{min} M_?, and equally distributing the energy Q_{min} to n_p quanta. Since the decay is non-them al, and in absence of any guidance from a theory of quantum gravity, the quanta are dem ocratically chosen among the SM D egrees of Freedom (D oF s). Note that Q_{min} does not necessarily coincide with M_{min} . The form er gives the threshold for the onset of quantum gravity e ects in the decay phase, whereas the latter gives the minimum -allowed mass of the classical BH in the form ation process. From the above de nitions, it follows M_{min} Q_{min}. The existence of a minimum length gives a natural means to set Q_{min} . In that case, them odi ed therm odynam ical quantities determ ine the endpoint of Hawking evaporation when the BH mass reaches M_{min} . This mass can be identied with the mass of the BH remnant.

3 BH generator

In this section we list the main characteristics of the CATFISH generator. The physics of BH form ation and decay is determined by the following set of external parameters and switches in the M C code:

Fundam ental P lanck scale (M $_{?}$) Number of large extra dimensions (n) G ravitational loss at form ation G ravitational loss m odel M inim um BH m ass at form ation (M $_{m in}$) Q uantum BH m ass threshold at evaporation (Q $_{m in}$) N um ber of quanta at the end of BH decay (n $_{p}$) M om entum transfer m odel in parton collision C onservation of electrom agnetic (EM) charge M inim um spacetim e length ()

These parameters are brie y explained below.

3.1 BH form ation and parton cross section

The M C generator does not require any lower or upper bound on the P lanck m ass M₂. However, experimental constraints exclude values of M₂. 1 TeV [38, 39] and BHs do not form at the LHC if M₂ > 14 TeV. M odels with one or two at large extra dimensions are excluded experimentally [38, 39]. Most of the theoretical models are limited to n 7. Therefore, the allowed number of extra dimensions n ranges from 3 to 7. (W arped scenarios such as the R and all-Sundrum models [40] with a single extra dimension are experimentally viable. However, the extra dimension is warped.

Since most of the results in the literature concerning black holes at colliders have been derived for a at extra-dimensional scenario, we choose not to allow n = 1 to min ic BH production in warped models.)

CATFISH includes three models for BH form ation and cross section: BD, Yoshino-Nambu (YN) TS model [17], and Yoshino-Rychkov (YR) in proved TS model [18]. The minimum BH mass M_{min} is set in units of $M_{?}$ or, if a minimum length is present, M_{ml} : $X_{min} = M_{min} \quad Max(M_{?}; M_{ml})$. This parameter is always larger than one.

3.2 Total and di erential cross section

The distribution of the initial BH m asses is sam pled from the di erential cross section d =dM $_{\rm BH}$. CATFISH uses the (stable) cteq5 PDF distribution [24, 41]. The use of di erent PDF distributions should not signi cantly a ect the total and di erential cross sections. Therefore, di erent PDF distributions are not im plem ented in the code. The uncertainty due to the choice of the m om entum transfer is generally larger. A logical switch allows a choice between M $_{\rm BH}$ or inverse Schwarzschild radius, as the de nition of m om entum transfer. The part of CM energy of the pp collision which is not trapped or lost in gravitational radiation at form ation forms the beam remnant, which is hadronized by PYTHIA.

3.3 BH evaporation

D ue to the lack of results for the balding and spin-down phases described above, energy losses in these stages are assumed to be either negligible or included in the energy loss during formation. Since the TS model likely overestimates the actual energy loss, this is a reasonable assumption. However, we stressed above that balding and spin-down elects could signi cantly a lect the event signatures. We plan to include balding and spin-down elects in updated versions of the code, as soon as theoretical results become available.

A similar approach is used in the Hawking phase, where the MC uses only the emissivities of non-rotating spherically-symmetric BHs [33]. (Emissivities for rotating BHs are not fully known.) This is a reasonable assumption, given that the BH is expected to be bald and spinless by the time the evaporation phase begins. Moreover, intrinsic uncertainties in event reconstruction should hide at least some of the dimension between rotating and non-rotating eld emissivities. The particle content at trans-Planckian energy is assumed to be the minimal SU (3) SU (2) U (1) SM with three families and a single Higgs boson on a thin brane. For black holes with mass few TeV the Hawking temperature is generally above 100 G eV. Therefore, all SM D oFs can be considered massless. (Considering massive gauge bosons does not a ect the conclusions signi cantly.) The spin-0, -1/2 and -1 D oFs on the brane are 1 (Higgs eld), 90 (quarks + charged leptons + neutrinos) and 27 (gauge bosons), respectively. The longitudinal D oFs of the weak bosons are included in the counting. The D oFs c_i and the relative emissivities P_i and P_i [33] are given in Table I (III, respectively. In the notations of R ef. [33] the total decay multiplicity is [34]

$$N = \frac{(n+1)S}{4} \frac{P_{j} c_{i}R_{j}R_{j}}{P_{j} c_{j}P_{j}P_{j}};$$
(3)

where S is the initial entropy of the BH and the emissivity normalizations for spin-s elds are:

$$P_{s} = \begin{cases} 8 \\ \ge & 2:9 \\ 1:6 \\ 1:6 \\ 1:6 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:4 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:4 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:4 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:4 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:4 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:4 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:4 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:4 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:5 \\ 1:4 \\ 1:5$$

The decay multiplicities per species N_i are

$$N_{i} = N \frac{P_{i}^{C_{i}R_{i}}R_{i}}{j^{C_{j}R_{j}}R_{j}} :$$
(5)

The presence of a minimum length a ects the evaporation phase. CATFISH uses the dimensionless parameter $= \lim_{m} M_2 = 2$ to determine the minimum length. If there is no minimum length, i.e.

= 0, the MC evaporates the BH according to the Hawking theory (with varying temperature). A lternatively, the BH evolution proceeds according to the modi ed therm odynam ics of R ef. [29, 30]. In both cases the evaporation ends when the BH reaches the mass $Q_{m in}$. This is set in units of M_? (M_{ml}) if the minimum length is zero (nonzero). Note that the BH minimum formation mass M_{min} and the endpoint of Hawking evaporation $Q_{m in}$ are independent parameters.

Four-m om entum is conserved at each step in the evaporation process by taking into account the recoil of the BH on the brane due to the em ission of the Hawking quanta. The initial energy of the BH is distributed dem ocratically am ong all the Hawking quanta with a random sm earing of

10%. This sm earing factor is introduced on a purely phenom enological basis to take into account quantum uncertainties in the emission of each quantum.

3.4 BH naldecay

The MC code allows for two di erent choices of nalBH decay: Final explosion in a number n_p of quanta or BH rem nant. If $n_p = 0$, the BH settles down to a rem nant with mass $Q_{m in}$. If $n_p = 2...18$, the BH decays in a number n_p of quanta by a n-body process with total CM energy equal to $Q_{m in}$.

CATFISH allows conservation of color and EM charges. Color charge is always conserved. A logical switch controls conservation of EM charge in the decay process (Hawking evaporation + naldecay). The purpose of this switch is to allow for the existence of a charged or neutral BH rem nant.

If the EM charge switch is set to FALSE, there is no constraint on the total charge of the em itted quanta Q_E . If $n_p = 0$, physical charge conservation in plies the relation $Q_E + Q_R + Q_B = 2e$, where Q_E is the total charge of the Hawking quanta, Q_R is the charge of the BH rem nant and Q_B is the charge of the beam rem nant. In that case, the BH rem nant can be either neutral or charged, depending on the event. The choice $n_p \in 0$ and no charge conservation (FALSE) is unphysical and should be avoided.

If the EM charge switch is set to TRUE, the absolute value of the total charge of the emitted quanta is $\mathbf{\hat{y}}_{E}$ j 4e=3, i.e. the maximum possible total charge of the scattering partons. In that case, the excess charge 2e Q_{E} is assigned to the beam remnant and, if $n_{p} = 0$, the BH remnant is considered neutral. This is justified from the fact that local charges should have been shed earlier in the evaporation process. (See, however, R ef. [42] for a different view point.) It should be stressed that the collider phenom enology of a charged remnant is not known and it is not clear how to track it in a detector in a meaningfulway.

	Ci	
Quarks	72	
Charged leptons	12	
Neutrinos	6	
Photon	2	
EW bosons	9	
G luons	16	
H iggs	1	
G raviton	1	

Table 1: DoFs c_i for the SM elds on a thin brane. The graviton is assumed to propagate in all (n + 4) dimensions. Following Ref. [33], the (n + 4)(n + 1)=2 graviton helicities are included in the emissivities (see Table 2 and 3 below). Therefore, the graviton counts as one DoF. Longitudinal DoFs are included in the EW boson counting.

	n= 3	n= 4	n= 5	n= 6	n= 7
H iggs	1	1	1	1	1
Fermions	0.89	0.87	0.85	0.84	0.82
Gauge Bosons	1.0	1.04	1.06	1.06	1.07
G ravitons	2.7	4.8	8.8	17.7	34.7

Table 2: Fraction of radiated power per D oF and species i, P_i , norm alized to the H iggs eld. The graviton values include all the helicity states. (From Ref. [33].)

	n= 3	n= 4	n= 5	n= 6	n= 7
H iggs	1	1	1	1	1
Fermions	0.78	0.76	0.74	0.73	0.71
Gauge Bosons	0.83	0.91	0.96	0.99	1.01
G raviton	0.91	1.9	2.5	5.1	7.6

Table 3: Fraction of emission rates per D oF and species i, R_i , normalized to the Higgs eld. The graviton values include all the helicity states. (From Ref. [33].)

3.5 Event sim ulation

The steps to simulate a BH event are:

- 1. Two proton beams of energy 7 + 7 TeV are injected in the Monte Carlo (CM frame).
- 2. The cross section for the process is computed.
- 3. The initial black hole mass is sampled from the di erential cross section (see Fig. 1).
- 4. The black hole is decayed through the Hawking mechanism and nalhard event (or black hole remnant).
- 5. The unstable quanta from the black hole and beam remnant are hadronized or decayed instantaneously by PYTHIA. Initial and nal-state radiation are included in PYTHIA's output.

4 Analysis of BH events

Signatures of BH events at the LHC have been investigated in a number of papers [43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48] using the TRUENO IR [9] or CHARYBD IS [10] generators. In this section we present some results for CATFISH. We focus on a purely statistical analysis of variables which allow an easy comparison with previous results obtained with the CHARYBD IS generator. A more re ned analysis of other detector response-dependent signatures such as back-to-back di-jet suppression, di-lepton events ($^+$, ^+e , $^+e^+$, ...) will be presented in a future publication [49].

4.1 V isible energy and visible/m issing transverse m om entum

M issing transverse m on entum (P_T) and visible transverse m on entum of leptons and hadrons are important signatures of BH production in particle colliders. Figure 2 shows the simulation output for 10,000 events at the LHC with the following parameters (benchmark):

$$n = 6;$$
 $M_{m in} = Q_{m in} = M_{?};$ $n_p = 4;$ $= 0;$

BD cross section and conservation of EM charge. The momentum transfer is set to be equal to the Schwarzschild radius inverse. Particles in the beam pipe and in the inital-radiation phase has been removed by imposing P_T cuts of 5 G eV and 15 G eV on leptons (e;) and photons + hadrons (;h), respectively. (These choices of cuts and momentum transfer apply to all simulations throughout the paper.) The plots show the total visible energy distribution, P_T and the visible transverse momentum of leptons (e;) and photons + jets (;h) with varying fundamental scale M₂ = 1:::3 TeV.

The plots in Fig. 2 for the BD m odel can be used to com pare CATFISH with previous BH generators. For example, these results are in good agreem ent with results obtained with CHARYBD IS [44]. BH events may show a large am ount of transverse momentum up to several TeV, depending on the value of the fundam ental scale and the number of extra dimensions.

In the absence of a BH rem nant and for the BD m odel, the m issing transverse m om entum is due to undetectable quanta (gravitons + neutrinos) during the evaporation phase. D etectable quanta are originated in the Hawking and nal decay phase with an upper bound to their multiplicity given by N + n_p , where N is given in Eq. (3). The bulk of BH events is characterized by light, low-entropy BHs. Since the graviton and neutrino channels accounts only for a sm all fraction of the total multiplicity in the decay phase, only rare high-m ass events show a large am ount of m issing transverse m om entum. A rough counting of D oFs shows that the hadronic-to-leptonic decay ratio of a BH event should be approximately 5:1. The prevalence of the hadronic channel on the leptonic channel is evident from the low er panels of Fig. 2.

Figures 2 also shows the e ect of the fundamental scale on visible energy and missing and visible transverse momentum. Increasing M₂ leads to more massive BHs, i.e., higher multiplicity and harder quanta in the Hawking phase. Therefore, higher values of M₂ tend to produce larger \mathbb{P}_T . The visible transverse momenta show a similar pattern. Observation of events with high \mathbb{P}_T would indicate high values of M₂, independently of the details of BH form ation and the number of extra dimensions. If BHs are observed at the LHC, it is thus conceivable that M₂ could be measured to a certain degree of precision.

Changing the number of extra dimensions a ects the BH mass and the missing and visible energy outputs. Graviton emission increases with the number of extra dimensions [33], leading to a decrease in visible energy for high n. The variation in P_T due change in spacetime dimensionality is

much less signi cant due to the high degree of sphericity of BH events (upper-right panels). E ects due to the dimensionality of spacetime are more evident for massive BHs, whereas most of the BHs produced at the LHC are very light. Therefore, it is likely that LHC would not be able to determ ine the number of extra dimensions just by statistical means.

Figure 3 shows the elects of varying them in in um mass lower bound. The distributions separate quite easily the two values of M_{min} . However, since M_{min} is a lower bound on the BH mass, increases in M_{min} are akin to increases in $M_{?}$ (compare the upper-left panels of Fig. 2 and Fig. 3). Changes in M_{min} are also entangled with the initial graviton emission, in particular for massive events: In the BD model, larger values of M_{min} (at xed $M_{?}$) lead to more massive BHs, and thus to higher visible transverse momenta. If the initial gravitational emission is turned on, this increase may be balanced by a decrease due to lower multiplicity (compare $M_{min} = 1$ TeV for the BD model with $M_{min} = 2$ TeV for the YR model). A measure of M_{min} on purely statistical basis might prove to be di cult at the LHC.

Figure 4 displays the e ects of the nalBH decay (YR TS model). The distributions show that it is virtually in possible to distinguish the $n_p = 2 \text{ m}$ odel from the $n_p = 4 \text{ m}$ odel. A lthough quanta em issivities in the Hawking phase and the nalphase di er for the presence of greybody factors in the form er, the di erence is not su cient to allow a separation without a spectral analysis of the energy and the number of em itted quanta. The detection of a BH rem nant stands a better chance because of larger P_T and sm aller visible m om entum due to its undetectability. (See also R efs. [42, 43].) Note that a large fraction of events with rem nant produces very little visible output. This is due to the fact that m ost of the BH s are initially so light that the Hawking phase does not take place. For higher m ass events, the energy carried by the decay products is m uch larger than the invisible energy carried by the rem nant. Therefore, detection of a rem nant is less likely in high-m ass events.

Figure 5 com pares a smooth spacetim e and a spacetim e with nonzero minimum length equal to the fundam ental P lanck scale inverse. The plots show no signi cant statistical di erences between the two cases. The e ects of a small distance cut-o becomes only relevant when the minimum scale is very close to the threshold of complete suppression of BH production, i.e., when the minimum allowed mass Eq. (2) is so large that BHs cannot form at the LHC CM energy. Therefore, observation of minimum length e ects at the LHC requires a certain degree of ne tuning in the parameter \cdot .

4.2 Sphericity, thrust and Fox-W olfram moments

BH events are expected to be highly spherical because of the spherical nature of H aw king evaporation. The event shape can be quantiled by means of the sphericity S and aplanarity A [50], thrust and oblateness T [51], and Fox-W olfram moment $R_1 ::: R_4$ variables [52]. Fig. 6 shows sphericity, aplanarity, oblateness and thrust for

$$M_{?} = 1 \text{ TeV}; \quad n = 6; \quad M_{m in} = Q_{m in} = M_{?}; \quad = 0;$$

BD and TS models and di erent naldecay modes ($n_p = 2;4$), respectively. (Rare) massive BH events are characterized by very high sphericity and isotropy. A similar conclusion is reached by examining the second Fox-W olfram moment (see rst panel of Fig. 7). Increasing M_{min} makes the events even more spherical because of the higher multiplicity in the decay phase.

C om parison between BD and TSm odels at $xed n_p$ shows that the BD m odel leads on average to m ore spherical events. This is expected because BD BHs are m ore massive and em it m ore quanta in

the Haw king phase than TSBHs. The higher sphericity of BD events is evident from the central part of the distributions, where Hawking emission dominates the emission in the nal explosive phase, making the statistical di erence between BD and TS models more clear. Comparison between $n_p = 2$ and $n_p = 4$ at xed BD or TS shows the former to be less spherical than the latter. This e ect is better displayed in the region of the plots corresponding to light BHs, where emission in the

nalphase dom inates over Hawking em ission. However, it should be stressed that the distinction between $n_p = 2$ and $n_p = 4$ at the LHC m ight well prove in possible due to the presence of non-BH background. Distinction between BD and alternative models of BH form ation should be possible by selecting massive spectacular events with high sphericity.

4.3 Heavy and light jet mass

The upper-right and the low erpanels of Fig. 7 show the number of jets and heavy and light jet m ass [11] for the choice of parameters discussed above, respectively. Note that these plots include initialand nal-state radiation jets in addition to the jets originated by the BH decay phase. The BD model produces on average more jets than the TS model (upper-right panel of Fig. 7). This is also evident from the right portions of the jet mass distributions, where the BD model is characterized by more massive jets than the TS model at xed n_p . Therefore, measurement of high jet mass allows determination of the BH formation model independently of the shape variables. The left portions of the jet mass distributions are sensitive to the nal BH decay. Final decay in two jets produces more heavy jets than nal decay in four jets at xed BD or TS model. Therefore, the measurement of low jet mass may give important information on the physics of the nal BH phase.

5 Conclusions and further developm ents

The study of BH production at the TeV scale is now a few years old and entering the mature stage. A lthough some of the characteristics of subatom ic BH production remain obscure, many new theoretical results have been published in the literature. A MC generator which includes these theoretical results is needed for accurate simulations of BH events at the forthcom ing LHC. Such a generator is also important to check the stability of the overall picture of BH production against in provements in the theory and have independent con mation of previous results obtained with existing generators. W ith this in mind, we have developed CATFISH. The CATFISH generator in plan ents several features of BH production at the TeV scale which were not included in TRUENO IR and CHARYBD IS.CATFISH new physics includes inelasticity e ects during the BH form ation phase [17, 18], exact eld emissivities (albeit only for non-rotating BH s) [33], corrections to Hawking's sem iclassical evaporation phase [29, 30], BH recoil on the brane, and di erent nal BH decay modes with possibility of rem nant form ation [42]. These features allow them ost accurate description of BH events at the TeV scale up-to-date. Another important feature of CATFISH is its

exibility. CATFISH design based on independent subroutine blocks allows easy inclusion of new theoretical results as soon as they become available. For example, the most signi cant changes to the phenomenology of BH formation in particle colliders is expected to arise from spin and charge e ects. Em issivities for rotating and/or charged BHs can be easily implemented in CATFISH if known. We are also planning to include in future versions of the MC generator backreaction e ects during the Hawking phase (see, e.g., Ref. [45]), therm odynamic uctuations [30], SUSY e ects [35] and photosphere and chrom osphere e ects [53].

The analysis of BH form ation presented in the second part of this paper is limited to a few

statistical observables. This represents by no means CATFISH fullpotentiality. Several other interesting signatures of BH form ation in particle colliders have been investigated in the literature (see, e.g., Refs. [43, 44, 46, 47, 48]). In particular, suppression of high-energy back-to-back-correlated di-jets with energy above the fundam ental scale and di-lepton production with large transverse momentum are expected to be two of the most interesting signatures of BH production at the LHC. Investigation of these signatures with CATFISH is in progress [49]. Finally, detector response and event reconstruction are also fundam ental issues to be addressed in a complete analysis of BH events at the LHC.Further work along these lines is currently being pursued. P recom piled executable Linux and M ac OS versions of CATFISH can be downloaded at the CATFISH website: http://www.phy.olemiss.edu/GR/catfish.

A cknow ledgm ents

The authors would like to thank V itor Cardoso, D avid C line, G reg Landsberg, A lexander M elnitchouk, R obert Palmer, D avid Sinn, Janes P infold, H ans W enzel and G raham W ilson for discussions and m any useful suggestions. This work was supported in part by the U S.D epartment of E nergy contract DE-FG 05-91ER 40622.

References

- [1] N. ArkaniHamed, S.D in opoulos and G.R. Dvali, Phys. Lett. B 429 (1998) 263;
 I. Antoniadis et al., Phys. Lett. B 436 (1998) 257;
 N. ArkaniHamed, S.D in opoulos and G.R. Dvali, Phys. Rev. D 59 (1999) 086004.
- [2] R.Maartens, Living Rev.Rel. 7 (2004) 7.
- [3] T. Banks and W. Fischler, \A model for high energy scattering in quantum gravity," arXiv:hep-th/9906038;
 - S.B.G iddings and S.Thom as, Phys.Rev.D 65 (2002) 056010;
 - S.D im opoulos and G.Landsberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87 (2001) 161602;
 - K.m.Cheung, Phys.Rev.Lett.88 (2002) 221602;
 - A.Chamblin and G.C.Nayak, Phys.Rev.D 66 (2002) 091901.
- [4] E.J.Ahn, M. Cavaglia and A.V.O linto, Phys. Lett. B 551 (2003) 1;
 E.J.Ahn and M. Cavaglia, Gen.Rel.Grav. 34 (2002) 2037;
 K.Cheung and C.H.Chou, Phys.Rev.D 66 (2002) 036008.
- [5] M.Cavaglia, Int.J.M od.Phys.A 18 (2003) 1843;
 - G.Landsberg, J.Phys.G 32 (2006) R 337;
 - R.Emparan, \B lack hole production at a TeV, "arX iv hep-ph/0302226;
 - P.Kanti, Int.J.M od.Phys.A 19 (2004) 4899;
 - S.Hossenfelder, \W hat black holes can teach us," arX iv hep-ph/0412265.
- [6] V.Cardoso, E.Berti and M.Cavaglia, Class. Quant. Grav. 22 (2005) L61.
- [7] S.W. Hawking, Commun.Math.Phys.43 (1975) 199 Erratum -ibid.46 (1976) 206].
- [8] D.Amatiand J.G.Russo, Phys.Lett.B 454 (1999) 207.

- [9] S.D im opoulos and G.Landsberg, in: Proc. of the APS/DPF/DPB Summer Study on the Future of Particle Physics (Snowmass 2001) ed.N.Graf, eConfC 010630 (2001) P 321.
- [10] C.M. Harris, P.Richardson and B.R.Webber, JHEP 0308 (2003) 033.
- [11] T.Sjostrand, S.M renna and P.Skands, JHEP 0605 (2006) 026.
- [12] E.Boos et al., G energic user process interface for event generators," and iv hep-ph/0109068.
- [13] E.J.Ahn and M.Cavaglia, Phys. Rev. D 73 (2006) 042002.
- [14] R.Godang et al, Int.J.M od.Phys.A 20 (2005) 3409.
- [15] K S. Thome, in: M agic without m agic: John A rchibald W heeler, ed. J.K lauder (Freem an, San Francisco, 1972).
- [16] M.B.Voloshin, Phys.Lett.B 518 (2001) 137;
 M.B.Voloshin, Phys.Lett.B 524 (2002) 376 Erratum -ibid.B 605 (2005) 426];
 T.G.Rizzo, JHEP 0202 (2002) 011;
 V.S.Rychkov, Phys.Rev.D 70 (2004) 044003;
 S.B.Giddings and V.S.Rychkov, Phys.Rev.D 70 (2004) 104026.
- [17] H.Yoshino and Y.Nambu, Phys.Rev.D 67 (2003) 024009.
- [18] H.Yoshino and V.S.Rychkov, Phys. Rev. D 71 (2005) 104028.
- [19] O. I. Vasilenko, \Trap surface formation in high-energy black holes collision," arX iv hep-th/0305067.
- [20] P.C.Aichelburg and R.U.Sexl, Gen.Rel.Grav.2 (1971) 303.
- [21] E.Kohlprath and G.Veneziano, JHEP 0206 (2002) 057.
- [22] V.Cardoso, O.J.C.Dias and J.P.S.Lem os, Phys.Rev.D 67 (2003) 064026.
- [23] E.Berti, M.Cavaglia and L.Gualtieri, Phys.Rev.D 69 (2004) 124011.
- [24] R.Brock et al. [CTEQ Collaboration], Rev. M od. Phys. 67 (1995) 157.
- [25] W.-M. Yao et al. [Particle Data Group], J. Phys. G 33 (2006) 1.
- [26] E.J.Ahn, M.Ave, M.Cavaglia and A.V.Olinto, Phys. Rev. D 68 (2003) 043004.
- [27] R.Emparan, M.Masip and R.Rattazzi, Phys.Rev.D 65 (2002) 064023.
- [28] H.Yoshino, T.Shirom izu and M.Shibata, Phys. Rev. D 72 (2005) 084020.
- [29] M. Cavaglia, S. Das and R. Maartens, Class. Quant. Grav. 20 (2003) L205.
- [30] M. Cavaglia and S. Das, Class. Quant. Grav. 21 (2004) 4511.
- [31] G.Du y, C.Harris, P.Kantiand E.W instanley, JHEP 0509 (2005) 049;
 M.Casals, P.Kantiand E.W instanley, JHEP 0602 (2006) 051;
 D.Ida, K.y.Oda and S.C.Park, Phys.Rev.D 71 (2005) 124039;
 D.Ida, K.y.Oda and S.C.Park, Phys.Rev.D 73 (2006) 124022.

- [32] P.Kanti and J.March-Russell, Phys.Rev.D 66 (2002) 024023;
 D.Ida, K.y.Oda and S.C.Park, Phys.Rev.D 67 (2003) 064025 [Erratum -ibid.D 69 (2004) 049901];
 P.Kanti and J.March-Russell, Phys.Rev.D 67 (2003) 104019;
 C.M.Harris and P.Kanti, JHEP 0310 (2003) 014;
 C.M.Harris and P.Kanti, Phys.Lett.B 633 (2006) 106;
 - E.Jung and D.K.Park, Nucl. Phys. B 731 (2005) 171;
 - A.S.Comell, W.Naylor and M.Sasaki, JHEP 0602 (2006) 012;
 - D.K.Park, Phys.Lett.B 638 (2006) 246.
- [33] V.Cardoso, M.Cavaglia and L.Gualtieri, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96 (2006) 071301 [Erratum -ibid.
 96 (2006) 219902];
 V.Cardoso, M.Cavaglia and L.Gualtieri, JHEP 0602 (2006) 021.
- [34] M. Cavaglia, Phys. Lett. B 569 (2003) 7.
- [35] A. Chamblin, F. Cooper and G. C. Nayak, Phys. Rev. D 70 (2004) 075018.
- [36] V.P.Frolov and D.Stojkovic, Phys. Rev. D 66 (2002) 084002.
- [37] L.J.Garay, Int.J.M od.Phys.A 10 (1995) 145.
- [38] M. Acciarri et al. [L3 Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B 470 (1999) 268;
 G. Abbiendi et al. [DPAL Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C 18 (2000) 253;
 A. Heister et al. [A LEPH Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C 28 (2003) 1;
 P. Abreu et al. [DELPH I Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B 485 (2000) 45;
 V. M. Abazov et al. [D Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 90 (2003) 251802;
 D. Acosta [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 92 (2004) 121802.
- [39] V.D.Barger, T.Han, C.Kao and R.J.Zhang, Phys.Lett.B 461 (1999) 34;
 S.Hannestad and G.Ra elt, Phys.Rev.Lett. 87 (2001) 051301;
 S.Hannestad and G.G.Ra elt, Phys.Rev.Lett. 88 (2002) 071301;
 M.Fairbaim, Phys.Lett.B 508 (2001) 335;
 L.J.Hall and D.R.Sm ith, Phys.Rev.D 60 (1999) 085008.
- [40] L.Randalland R.Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83 (1999) 4690;
 L.Randalland R.Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83 (1999) 3370.
- [41] H.L.Laietal. [CTEQ Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J.C 12 (2000) 375.
- [42] B.Koch, M.Bleicher and S.Hossenfelder, JHEP 0510 (2005) 053.
- [43] H. Stocker, \Stable TeV black hole remnants at the LHC: Discovery through dijet suppression, mono-jet emission and a supersonic boom in the quark-gluon plasma," arXiv:hep-ph/0605062.
- [44] C.M.Harris et al., JHEP 0505 (2005) 053;
 B.Webber, eConfC 0507252 (2005) T 030.
- [45] G. L. Alberghi et al., \Probing quantum gravity e ects in black holes at LHC," arXiv:hep-ph/0601243.

- [46] J.Tanaka, T.Yam am ura, S.Asaiand J.Kanzaki, Eur. Phys. J.C 41 (2005) 19.
- [47] L.Lonnblad, M.Sjodahland T.Akesson, JHEP 0509 (2005) 019.
- [48] G.C.Nayak and J.Sm ith, Phys.Rev.D 74 (2006) 014007.
- [49] M. Cavaglia et. al, \B lack holes vs. SUSY at the LHC," in preparation.
- [50] J.D.B jorken and S.J.Brodsky, Phys.Rev.D 1 (1970) 1416.
- [51] S.Brandt, C.Peyrou, R. Sosnow skiand A.W roblew ski, Phys. Lett. 12 (1964) 57.
- [52] G.C.Fox and S.W olfram, Phys.Rev.Lett. 41 (1978) 1581;
 G.C.Fox and S.W olfram, Nucl.Phys.B 149 (1979) 413 Erratum -ibid.B 157 (1979) 543].
- [53] L.Anchordoquiand H.Goldberg, Phys. Rev. D 67 (2003) 064010; A.Casanova and E.Spallucci, Class. Quant. Grav. 23 (2006) R 45.



Figure 1: M $_{BH}$ distribution for the black disk m odel (BD) and the Yoshino-Rychkov TS m odel (YR) and number of extra dimensions n = 3:::6. The fundamental Planck scale M $_2$ is 1 TeV.



Figure 2: V isible energy, \mathbb{P}_T and visible transverse m om entum of leptons and photons+ jets (G eV) for the black disk model (BD) and fundamental Planck scale M₂ = 1;2;3 TeV. The number of spacetime is ten-dimensional (n = 6). The nalBH decay is in $n_p = 4$ quanta.



Figure 3: V isible energy, \mathbb{P}_T and visible transverse m om entum of leptons and photons+jets (GeV) for the black disk model (BD) and the Yoshino-Rychkov TS model (YR). The fundam entalP lanck scale is M₂ = 1 TeV. The minimum formation mass of the BH is M_{min} = 1 TeV or M_{min} = 2 TeV. The nalBH decay is in $n_p = 4$ quanta.



Figure 4: V isible energy, \mathbb{P}_{T} and visible transverse m om entum of leptons and photons+ jets (G eV) for the Yoshino-Rychkov TS m odel (YR) with fundamental Planck scale M₂ = 1 TeV and three di erent naldecay modes: neutral rem nant (n_p = 0), two and four quanta.



Figure 5: V isible energy, \mathbb{P}_{T} and visible transverse m om entum of leptons and photons+ jets (G eV) for the black disk m odel (BD) and the Yoshino-Rychkov TS (YR) m odelwith zero (= 0) or M $_{?}^{1}$ (= 0.5) m inimum length. The nalBH decay is in $n_{p} = 2$ quanta.



Figure 6: Sphericity, aplanarity, oblateness and thrust for the black disk model (BD) and the Yoshino-Rychkov TS model (YR). The nalblack hole decay is in two $n_p = 2 \text{ or } n_p = 4$ quanta.



Figure 7: Fox-W olfram moment R_2 , number of jets, heavy and light jet mass for the black disk model (BD) and the Yoshino-Rychkov TS model (YR). The nalblack hole decay is in $n_p = 2$ or $n_p = 4$ quanta.