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Abstract

In view of the LHC we present a concise review of the status of the Standard Model and of the models of new physics.

1 Preamble

I have chosen the formula "Concluding Talk" in the title of my contribution to this very interesting Workshop. Indeed this is not a "Summary Talk": it is impossible to review in 30 minutes/10 pages the great variety of results, ideas and projects for the future that have been presented at this Conference. Also, I am not really competent on some purely experimental areas which were discussed in many impressive talks. It is not a "Conclusion" talk either: the subject of LHC physics is at present a gigantic work in progress and we are not at the end of a particular phase where a sharp line can easily be drawn. Rather, in my presentation I will briefly review the conceptual status of particle physics at present while we eagerly wait for the start up of the LHC.

2 The Result of Precision Tests of the Standard Model

The results of the electroweak precision tests as well as of the searches for the Higgs boson and for new particles performed at LEP and SLC are now available in nearly final form.
Taken together with the measurements of $m_t, m_W$ and the searches for new physics at the Tevatron, and with some other data from low energy experiments, they form a very stringent set of precise constraints [1] to compare with the Standard Model (SM) or with any of its conceivable extensions. When confronted with these results, on the whole the SM performs rather well, so that it is fair to say that no clear indication for new physics emerges from the data [2]. The main lesson of precision tests of the standard electroweak theory can be summarised as follows. The couplings of quark and leptons to the weak gauge bosons $W^\pm$ and $Z$ are indeed precisely those prescribed by the gauge symmetry. The accuracy of a few per-mille for these tests implies that, not only the tree level, but also the structure of quantum corrections has been verified. To a lesser accuracy the triple gauge vertices $\gamma W W$ and $Z W W$ have also been found in agreement with the specific prediction of the $SU(2) \otimes U(1)$ gauge theory. This means that it has been verified that the gauge symmetry is unbroken in the vertices of the theory: the currents are indeed conserved. Yet there is obvious evidence that the symmetry is otherwise badly broken in the masses. Thus the currents are conserved but the spectrum of particle states is not at all symmetric. This is a clear signal of spontaneous symmetry breaking. The practical implementation of spontaneous symmetry breaking in a gauge theory is via the Higgs mechanism. The Higgs sector of the SM is still very much untested. What has been tested is the relation $m^2_W = m^2_Z \cos^2 \theta_W$, modified by computable radiative corrections. This relation means that the effective Higgs (be it fundamental or composite) is indeed a weak isospin doublet. The Higgs particle has not been found but in the SM its mass can well be larger than the present direct lower limit $m_H \gtrsim 114$ GeV obtained from direct searches at LEP-2. The radiative corrections computed in the SM when compared to the data on precision electroweak tests lead to a clear indication for a light Higgs, not too far from the present lower bound. No signal of new physics has been found. However, to make a light Higgs natural in presence of quantum fluctuations new physics should not be too far. This is encouraging for the LHC that should experimentally clarify the problem of the electroweak symmetry breaking sector and search for physics beyond the SM.

3 Outlook on Avenues beyond the Standard Model

Given the success of the SM why are we not satisfied with that theory? Why not just find the Higgs particle, for completeness, and declare that particle physics is closed? The reason is that there are both conceptual problems and phenomenological indications for physics beyond the SM. On the conceptual side the most obvious problems are that quantum gravity is not included in the SM and the related hierarchy problem. Among the main phenomenological hints for new physics we can list coupling unification, dark matter, neutrino masses, baryogenesis and the cosmological vacuum energy.

The computed evolution with energy of the effective SM gauge couplings clearly points towards the unification of the electro-weak and strong forces (Grand Unified Theories: GUT’s) at scales of energy $M_{\text{GUT}} \sim 10^{15} - 10^{16}$ GeV which are close to the scale of quantum gravity, $M_{\text{Pl}} \sim 10^{19}$ GeV. One is led to imagine a unified theory of all interactions also including gravity (at present superstrings provide the best attempt at such a theory). Thus GUT’s and
the realm of quantum gravity set a very distant energy horizon that modern particle theory cannot ignore. Can the SM without new physics be valid up to such large energies? This appears unlikely because the structure of the SM could not naturally explain the relative smallness of the weak scale of mass, set by the Higgs mechanism at \( \mu \sim 1/\sqrt{G_F} \sim 250 \text{ GeV} \) with \( G_F \) being the Fermi coupling constant. This so-called hierarchy problem is related to the presence of fundamental scalar fields in the theory with quadratic mass divergences and no protective extra symmetry at \( \mu = 0 \). For fermion masses, first, the divergences are logarithmic and, second, they are forbidden by the \( SU(2) \otimes U(1) \) gauge symmetry plus the fact that at \( m = 0 \) an additional symmetry, i.e. chiral symmetry, is restored. Here, when talking of divergences, we are not worried of actual infinities. The theory is renormalisable and finite once the dependence on the cut off is absorbed in a redefinition of masses and couplings. Rather the hierarchy problem is one of naturalness. We should see the cut off as a parameterization of our ignorance on the new physics that will modify the theory at large energy scales. Then it is relevant to look at the dependence of physical quantities on the cut off and to demand that no unexplained enormously accurate cancellations arise.

The hierarchy problem can be put in very practical terms: loop corrections to the higgs mass squared are quadratic in \( \Lambda \). The most pressing problem is from the top loop. With \( m_h^2 = m_{\text{bare}}^2 + \delta m_h^2 \) the top loop gives

\[
\delta m_h^2_{\text{top}} \sim \frac{3G_F}{\sqrt{2}\pi^2} m_t^2 \Lambda^2 \sim (0.3\Lambda)^2
\]

If we demand that the correction does not exceed the light Higgs mass indicated by the precision tests, \( \Lambda \) must be close, \( \Lambda \sim o(1 \text{ TeV}) \). Similar constraints arise from the quadratic \( \Lambda \) dependence of loops with gauge bosons and scalars, which, however, lead to less pressing bounds. So the hierarchy problem demands new physics to be very close (in particular the mechanism that quenches the top loop). Actually, this new physics must be rather special, because it must be very close, yet its effects are not clearly visible (the "LEP Paradox" [3]). Examples of proposed classes of solutions for the hierarchy problem are:

**Supersymmetry.** In the limit of exact boson-fermion symmetry the quadratic divergences of bosons cancel so that only log divergences remain. However, exact SUSY is clearly unrealistic. For approximate SUSY (with soft breaking terms), which is the basis for all practical models, \( \Lambda \) is replaced by the splitting of SUSY multiplets, \( \Lambda \sim m_{\text{SUSY}} - m_{\text{ord}} \). In particular, the top loop is quenched by partial cancellation with s-top exchange.

**Technicolor.** The Higgs system is a condensate of new fermions. There are no fundamental scalar Higgs sector, hence no quadratic divergences associated to the \( \mu^2 \) mass in the scalar potential. This mechanism needs a very strong binding force, \( \Lambda_{TC} \sim 10^8 \Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \). It is difficult to arrange that such nearby strong force is not showing up in precision tests. Hence this class of models has been disfavoured by LEP, although some special class of models have been devised a posteriori, like walking TC, top-color assisted TC etc (for recent reviews, see, for example, [5]).

**Large compactified extra dimensions.** The idea is that \( M_{\text{PL}} \) appears very large, that is
gravity seems very weak because we are fooled by hidden extra dimensions so that the real gravity scale is reduced down to $o(1 \, TeV)$. This possibility is very exciting in itself and it is really remarkable that, in some forms, it is compatible with experiment.

**“Little Higgs” models.** In these models extra symmetries allow $m_h \neq 0$ only at two-loop level, so that $\Lambda$ can be as large as $o(10 \, TeV)$ with the Higgs within present bounds (the top loop is quenched by exchange of heavy vectorlike new charge-$2/3$ quarks).

We now briefly comment in turn on these possibilities.

SUSY models are the most developed and most widely accepted. Many theorists consider SUSY as established at the Planck scale $M_{Pl}$. So why not to use it also at low energy to fix the hierarchy problem, if at all possible? It is interesting that viable models exist. The necessary SUSY breaking can be introduced through soft terms that do not spoil the good convergence properties of the theory. Precisely those terms arise from supergravity when it is spontaneously broken in a hidden sector. This is the case of the MSSM [6]. Of course, minimality is only a simplicity assumption that could possibly be relaxed. For example, adding an additional Higgs singlet $S$ helps in addressing naturalness constraints [4]. The MSSM is a completely specified, consistent and computable theory which is compatible with all precision electroweak tests. In this most traditional approach SUSY is broken in a hidden sector and the scale of SUSY breaking is very large of order $\Lambda \sim \sqrt{G_F^{-1/2}} M_{Pl}$.

But since the hidden sector only communicates with the visible sector through gravitational interactions the splitting of the SUSY multiplets is much smaller, in the TeV energy domain, and the Goldstino is practically decoupled. But alternative mechanisms of SUSY breaking are also being considered. In one alternative scenario [7] the (not so much) hidden sector is connected to the visible one by ordinary gauge interactions. As these are much stronger than the gravitational interactions, $\Lambda$ can be much smaller, as low as 10-100 TeV. It follows that the Goldstino is very light in these models (with mass of order or below 1 eV typically) and is the lightest, stable SUSY particle, but its couplings are observably large. The radiative decay of the lightest neutralino into the Goldstino leads to detectable photons. The signature of photons comes out naturally in this SUSY breaking pattern: with respect to the MSSM, in the gauge mediated model there are typically more photons and less missing energy. The main appeal of gauge mediated models is a better protection against flavour changing neutral currents but naturality problems tend to increase. As another possibility it has been pointed out that there are pure gravity contributions to soft masses that arise from gravity theory anomalies[8]. In the assumption that these terms are dominant the associated spectrum and phenomenology have been studied. In this case gaugino masses are proportional to gauge coupling beta functions, so that the gluino is much heavier than the electroweak gauginos, and the wino is most often the lightest SUSY particle.

What is really unique to SUSY with respect to all other extensions of the SM listed above is that the MSSM or similar models are well defined and computable up to $M_{Pl}$ and, moreover, are not only compatible but actually quantitatively supported by coupling unification and GUT’s. At present the most direct phenomenological evidence in favour of supersymmetry is obtained from the unification of couplings in GUTs. Precise LEP data on $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ and $\sin^2 \theta_W$
show that standard one-scale GUTs fail in predicting $\sin^2 \theta_W$ given $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ (and $\alpha(m_Z)$) while SUSY GUTs are in agreement with the present, very precise, experimental results. If one starts from the known values of $\sin^2 \theta_W$ and $\alpha(m_Z)$, one finds [11] for $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ the results: $\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.073 \pm 0.002$ for Standard GUTs and $\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.129 \pm 0.010$ for SUSY GUTs to be compared with the world average experimental value $\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.119 \pm 0.003$. Another great asset of SUSY GUT’s is that proton decay is much slowed down with respect to the non SUSY case. First, the unification mass $M_{GUT} \sim \text{ few } 10^{16} \text{ GeV}$, in typical SUSY GUT’s, is about 20-30 times larger than for ordinary GUT’s. This makes $p$ decay via gauge boson exchange negligible and the main decay amplitude arises from dim-5 operators with higgsino exchange, leading to a rate close but still compatible with existing bounds (see, for example,[9]). It is also important that SUSY provides an excellent dark matter candidate, the neutralino. We finally recall that the range of neutrino masses as indicated by oscillation experiments, when interpreted in the see-saw mechanism, point to $M_{GUT}$ and give additional support to GUT’s [10].

In spite of all these virtues it is true that the lack of SUSY signals at LEP and the lower limit on $m_H$ pose problems for the MSSM. The lightest Higgs particle is predicted in the MSSM to be below $m_h \lesssim 135 \text{ GeV}$ (the recent increase of $m_t$ helps in this respect). The limit on the SM Higgs $m_H \gtrsim 114 \text{ GeV}$ considerably restricts the available parameter space of the MSSM requiring relatively large $\tan \beta$ ($\tan \beta \gtrsim 2 - 3$: at tree level $m_h^2 = m_Z^2 \cos^2 2\beta$) and rather heavy s-top (the loop corrections increase with $\log m_t^2$). Stringent naturality constraints also follow from imposing that the electroweak symmetry breaking occurs at the right place: in SUSY models the breaking is induced by the running of the $H_u$ mass starting from a common scalar mass $m_0$ at $M_{GUT}$. The squared Z mass $m_Z^2$ can be expressed as a linear combination of the SUSY parameters $m_{\tilde{g}}^2$, $m_{\tilde{l}/\tilde{u}}^2$, $A_t^2$, $\mu^2$, ... with known coefficients. Barring cancellations that need fine tuning, the SUSY parameters, hence the SUSY s-partners cannot be too heavy. The LEP limits, in particular the chargino lower bound $m_{\tilde{\chi}} \gtrsim 100 \text{ GeV}$, are sufficient to eliminate an important region of the parameter space, depending on the amount of allowed fine tuning. For example, models based on gaugino universality at the GUT scale are discarded unless a fine tuning by at least a factor of 20 is not allowed. Without gaugino universality [12] the strongest limit remains on the gluino mass: $m_{\tilde{g}}^2 \sim 0.7 m_{\tilde{\chi}_{1}}^2 + \ldots$ which is still compatible with the present limit $m_{\tilde{g}} \gtrsim 200 \text{ GeV}$.

The non discovery of SUSY at LEP has given further impulse to the quest for new ideas on physics beyond the SM. Large extra dimensions [13] and ”little Higgs” [14] models are the most interesting new directions in model building. Large extra dimension models propose to solve the hierarchy problem by bringing gravity down from $M_{Pl}$ to $m \sim o(1 \text{ TeV})$ where $m$ is the string scale. Inspired by string theory one assumes that some compactified extra dimensions are sufficiently large and that the SM fields are confined to a 4-dimensional bulk while gravity, which feels the whole geometry, propagates in the bulk. We know that the Planck mass is large because gravity is weak: in fact $G_N \sim 1/M_{Pl}^2$, where $G_N$ is Newton constant. The idea is that gravity appears so weak because a lot of lines of force escape in extra dimensions. Assume you have $n = d-4$ extra dimensions with compactification radius $R$. For large distances, $r >> R$, the ordinary Newton law applies for gravity: in natural units $F \sim G_N/r^2 \sim 1/(M_{Pl}^2 r^2)$. At short distances, $r \lesssim R$, the flow of lines of force in extra dimensions modifies Gauss law and $F^{-1} \sim m^2 (mr)^{d-4} r^2$. By matching
the two formulas at \( r = R \) one obtains \((M_{Pl}/m)^2 = (Rm)^{d-4}\). For \( m \sim 1 \text{ TeV} \) and \( n = d-4 \) one finds that \( n = 1 \) is excluded \((R \sim 10^{15} \text{ cm})\), for \( n = 2 \) \( R \) is at the edge of present bounds \( R \sim 1 \text{ mm} \), while for \( n = 4, 6, 10^{-9}, 10^{-12} \text{ cm} \). In all these models a generic feature is the occurrence of Kaluza-Klein (KK) modes. Compactified dimensions with periodic boundary conditions, as for quantization in a box, imply a discrete spectrum with momentum \( p = n/R \) and mass squared \( m^2 = n^2/R^2 \). There are many versions of these models. The SM brane can itself have a thickness \( r \) with \( r < \sim 10^{-17} \text{ cm} \) or \( 1/r > \sim 1 \text{ TeV} \), because we know that quarks and leptons are pointlike down to these distances, while for gravity there is no experimental counter-evidence down to \( R < \sim 0.1 \text{ mm} \) or \( 1/R > \sim 10^{-3} \text{ eV} \). In case of a thickness for the SM brane there would be KK recurrences for SM fields, like \( W_n, Z_n \) and so on in the TeV region and above. There are models with factorized metric \((ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu + h_{ij}(y)dy^i dy^j)\), where \( y \) (i,j) denotes the extra dimension coordinates (and indices), or models with warped metric \((ds^2 = e^{-2kR|\phi|}g_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu - R^2\phi^2 \) [15]. In any case there are the towers of KK recurrences of the graviton. They are gravitationally coupled but there are a lot of them that sizably couple, so that the net result is a modification of cross-sections and the presence of missing energy.

Large extra dimensions provide a very exciting scenario [16]. Already it is remarkable that this possibility is compatible with experiment. However, there are a number of criticisms that can be brought up. First, the hierarchy problem is translated in new terms rather than solved. In fact the basic relation \( Rm = (M_{Pl}/m)^{2/n} \) shows that \( Rm \), which one would apriori expect to be 0(1), is instead ad hoc related to the large ratio \( M_{Pl}/m \). In this respect the Randall-Sundrum variety is more appealing because the hierarchy suppression \( m_W/M_{Pl} \) could arise from the warping factor \( e^{-2kR|\phi|} \) with not too large values of \( kR \). Also it is not clear how extra dimensions can by themselves solve the LEP paradox (the large top loop corrections should be controlled by the opening of the new dimensions and the onset of gravity): since \( m_H \) is light \( \Lambda \sim 1/R \) must be relatively close. But precision tests put very strong limits on \( \Lambda \) In fact in typical models of this class there is no mechanism to sufficiently quench the corrections. No simple, realistic model has yet emerged as a benchmark. But it is attractive to imagine that large extra dimensions could be a part of the truth, perhaps coupled with some additional symmetry or even SUSY.

In the extra dimension general context an interesting direction of development is the study of symmetry breaking by orbifolding and/or boundary conditions. These are models where a larger gauge symmetry (with or without SUSY) holds in the bulk. The symmetry is reduced in the 4 dimensional brane, where the physics that we observe is located, as an effect of symmetry breaking induced geometrically by suitable boundary conditions. There are models where SUSY, valid in \( n > 4 \) dimensions is broken by boundary conditions [17], in particular the model of ref.[18], where the mass of the Higgs is computable and can be estimated with good accuracy. Then there are "Higgsless models" where it is the SM electroweak gauge symmetry which is broken at the boundaries [19]. Or models where the Higgs is the 5th component of a gauge boson of an extended symmetry valid in \( n > 4 \) [20]. In general all these alternative models for the Higgs mechanism face severe problems and constraints from electroweak precision tests [21]. Some modern versions of technicolour can also be obtained from extra dimensions and the AdS/CFT correspondence[22]. At the GUT scale, symmetry breaking by orbifolding can be applied to obtain a reformulation of SUSY.
GUT’s where many problematic features of ordinary GUT’s (e.g. a baroque Higgs sector, the doublet-triplet splitting problem, fast proton decay etc) are improved [23], [16].

In “little Higgs” models the symmetry of the SM is extended to a suitable global group G that also contains some gauge enlargement of $SU(2) \otimes U(1)$, for example $G \supset [SU(2) \otimes U(1)]^2 \supset SU(2) \otimes U(1)$. The Higgs particle is a pseudo-Goldstone boson of G that only takes mass at 2-loop level, because two distinct symmetries must be simultaneously broken for it to take mass, which requires the action of two different couplings in the same diagram. Then in the relation between $\delta m_h^2$ and $\Lambda^2$ there is an additional coupling and an additional loop factor that allow for a bigger separation between the Higgs mass and the cut-off. Typically, in these models one has one or more Higgs doublets at $m_h \sim 0.2 \text{ TeV}$, and a cut-off at $\Lambda \sim 10 \text{ TeV}$. The top loop quadratic cut-off dependence is partially cancelled, in a natural way guaranteed by the symmetries of the model, by a new coloured, charge-2/3, vectorial quark $\chi$ of mass around 1 TeV (a fermion not a scalar like the s-top of SUSY models). Certainly these models involve a remarkable level of group theoretic virtuosity. However, in the simplest versions one is faced with problems with precision tests of the SM [24]. Even with vectorlike new fermions large corrections to the epsilon parameters arise from exchanges of the new gauge bosons $W'$ and $Z'$ (due to lack of custodial $SU(2)$ symmetry). In order to comply with these constraints the cut-off must be pushed towards large energy and the amount of fine tuning needed to keep the Higgs light is still quite large. Probably these bad features can be fixed by some suitable complication of the model (see for example, [25]).

But, in my opinion, the real limit of this approach is that it only offers a postponement of the main problem by a few TeV, paid by a complete loss of predictivity at higher energies. In particular all connections to GUT’s are lost.

Finally, we stress the importance of the dark matter and of the cosmological constant or vacuum energy problem [26]. In fact, we know by now [27] that most of the (flat) Universe is not made up of atoms: $\Omega_{\text{tot}} \sim 1$, $\Omega_{\text{baryonic}} \sim 0.044$, $\Omega_{\text{matter}} \sim 0.27$, where $\Omega$ is the ratio of the density to the critical density. Most is Dark Matter (DM) and Dark Energy (DE). We also know that most of DM must be cold (non relativistic at freeze-out) and that significant fractions of hot DM are excluded. Neutrinos are hot DM (because they are ultrarelativistic at freeze-out) and indeed are not much cosmo-relevant: $\Omega_\nu \lesssim 0.015$. Identification of DM is a task of enormous importance for both particle physics and cosmology. If really neutralinos are the main component of DM they will be discovered at the LHC and this will be a great service of particle physics to cosmology. Also, these results on cosmological parameters have shown that vacuum energy accounts for about 2/3 of the critical density: $\Omega_{\Lambda} \sim 0.65$. Translated into familiar units this means for the energy density $\rho_{\Lambda} \sim (2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV})^4$ or $(0.1 \text{ mm})^{-4}$. It is really interesting (and not at all understood) that $\rho_{\Lambda}^{1/4} \sim \Lambda_{\text{EW}}^4/M_{\text{Pl}}$ (close to the range of neutrino masses). It is well known that in field theory we expect $\rho_{\Lambda} \sim \Lambda_{\text{cut-off}}^4$. If the cut off is set at $M_{\text{Pl}}$ or even at 0(1 TeV) there would an enormous mismatch. In exact SUSY $\rho_{\Lambda} = 0$, but SUSY is broken and in presence of breaking $\rho_{\Lambda}^{1/4}$ is in general not smaller than the typical SUSY multiplet splitting. Another closely related problem is ”why now?”: the time evolution of the matter or radiation density is quite rapid, while the density for a cosmological constant term would be flat. If so, then how comes that precisely now the two density sources are comparable? This suggests that the vacuum energy is not a cosmological constant term, but rather the vacuum expectation value of some field (quintessence) and
that the "why now?" problem is solved by some dynamical mechanism.

Clearly the cosmological constant problem poses a big question mark on the relevance of naturalness as a relevant criterion also for the hierarchy problem: how we can trust that we need new physics close to the weak scale out of naturalness if we have no idea on the solution of the cosmological constant huge naturalness problem? The common answer is that the hierarchy problem is formulated within a well defined field theory context while the cosmological constant problem makes only sense within a theory of quantum gravity, that there could be modification of gravity at the sub-eV scale, that the vacuum energy could flow in extra dimensions or in different Universes and so on. At the other extreme is the possibility that naturalness is misleading. Weinberg [28] has pointed out that the observed order of magnitude of \( \Lambda \) can be successfully reproduced as the one necessary to allow galaxy formation in the Universe. In a scenario where new Universes are continuously produced we might be living in a very special one (largely fine-tuned) but the only one to allow the development of an observer. One might then argue that the same could in principle be true also for the Higgs sector. Recently it was suggested [29] to abandon the no-fine-tuning assumption for the electro-weak theory, but require correct coupling unification, presence of dark matter with weak couplings and a single scale of evolution from the EW to the GUT scale. A "split SUSY" model arises as a solution with a fine-tuned light Higgs and all SUSY particles heavy except for gauginos, higgsinos and neutralinos, protected by chiral symmetry. Or we can have a two-scale non-SUSY GUT with axions as dark matter. In conclusion, it is clear that naturalness can be a good heuristic principle but you cannot prove its necessity.

\section{Summary and Conclusion}

Supersymmetry remains the standard way beyond the SM. What is unique to SUSY, beyond leading to a set of consistent and completely formulated models, as, for example, the MSSM, is that this theory can potentially work up to the GUT energy scale. In this respect it is the most ambitious model because it describes a computable framework that could be valid all the way up to the vicinity of the Planck mass. The SUSY models are perfectly compatible with GUT’s and are actually quantitatively supported by coupling unification and also by what we have recently learned on neutrino masses. All other main ideas for going beyond the SM do not share this synthesis with GUT’s. The SUSY way is testable, for example at the LHC, and the issue of its validity will be decided by experiment. It is true that we could have expected the first signals of SUSY already at LEP, based on naturality arguments applied to the most minimal models (for example, those with gaugino universality at asymptotic scales). The absence of signals has stimulated the development of new ideas like those of large extra dimensions and "little Higgs" models. These ideas are very interesting and provide an important reference for the preparation of LHC experiments. Models along these new ideas are not so completely formulated and studied as for SUSY and no well defined and realistic baseline has sofar emerged. But it is well possible that they might represent at least a part of the truth and it is very important to continue the exploration of new ways beyond the SM.
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