

Higgs and SUSY Particle Predictions from SO(10) Yukawa Unification¹

S. Raby

*Department of Physics, The Ohio State University,
174 W. 18th Ave., Columbus, Ohio 43210*

Abstract

In this talk we assume SO(10) boundary conditions at the GUT scale, including unification for the third generation Yukawa couplings $\lambda_t = \lambda_b = \lambda_\tau$. We find that this assumption is only consistent with the low energy data in a narrow region of soft SUSY breaking parameter space. We discuss the consequences of this result for Higgs and SUSY searches.

¹Talk given at the 1st International Conference on String Phenomenology, Oxford, UK, July 6 - 11, 2002.

1 SUSY GUTs

1.1 Soft SUSY Breaking Parameters and “Naturalness”

Supersymmetric particles have still not been discovered. Many supersymmetry [SUSY] enthusiasts are becoming discouraged. “Naturalness” constraints suggest a spectrum of light SUSY particles with mass of order a few hundred GeV, IF we demand fine tuning less than 1 in 10. On the other hand, if we allow for fine tuning of order 1 in 1000, then SUSY particles with mass of order a TeV are fine. How much fine tuning is too much? Recall that in the standard model, the problem we are trying to solve (why the Higgs is so much lighter than, say, the GUT scale) requires fine tuning to 1 part in 10^{28} for the Higgs mass squared. Perhaps 1 part in 1000 is not so bad.

Another guide for SUSY searches comes by assuming that the LSP provides the observed dark matter in the universe. Using such arguments, several authors (see for example, Ellis and Nanopoulos in these proceedings) have obtained “natural” ranges for soft SUSY breaking parameters.

In this talk we discuss a different guide for SUSY searches.² We show that SO(10) boundary conditions at the GUT scale, for soft SUSY breaking parameters as well as for the Yukawa couplings of the third generation, are consistent with the low energy data, including M_t , $m_b(m_b)$, M_τ , ONLY in a narrow region of SUSY breaking parameter space. Moreover, this region is also preferred by constraints from CP and flavor violation, as well as by the non-observation of proton decay. Finally we discuss the consequences for the Higgs and SUSY spectrum.

1.2 Virtues of SO(10) SUSY GUT

Supersymmetric grand unified theories have many virtues. Supersymmetry alone provides a framework for solving the gauge hierarchy problem and a mechanism for naturally obtaining electroweak symmetry breaking with a heavy top quark. In addition, GUTs explain the charge assignments of quarks and leptons, i.e. charge quantization [2].

Recall that in \mathbf{SU}_5 the quarks and leptons of one family are described by $\{Q = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ d \end{pmatrix} \quad \bar{e} \quad \bar{u}\} \subset \mathbf{10}$ and $\{\bar{d} \quad L = \begin{pmatrix} \nu \\ e \end{pmatrix}\} \subset \bar{\mathbf{5}}$. And the two Higgs doublets are given by $H_u, H_d \subset \mathbf{5}_H, \bar{\mathbf{5}}_H$.

In \mathbf{SO}_{10} we have the more compelling unification of all quarks and leptons of one family into one irreducible representation such that $\mathbf{10} + \bar{\mathbf{5}} + \bar{\nu}_{sterile} \subset \mathbf{16}$ and the two Higgs doublets are also unified with $\mathbf{5}_H, \bar{\mathbf{5}}_H \subset \mathbf{10}_H$.

Moreover at the moment the only experimental evidence for supersymmetry is through the successful prediction of gauge coupling unification[3, 4, 5]. This prediction is now tested at the level of two loop renormalization group running from the GUT to the weak scales. Self-consistency thus requires including one loop threshold corrections at both the weak and GUT scales. It is important to note that there are significant GUT threshold corrections from the Higgs and GUT breaking sectors. It is thus useful to define the GUT

²This talk is based on two papers in collaboration with T. Blažek and R. Dermíšek [1].

scale M_G as the scale where $\alpha_1(M_G) = \alpha_2(M_G) \equiv \tilde{\alpha}_G$. A good fit to the low energy data then requires a threshold correction $\epsilon_3 \equiv \frac{(\alpha_3(M_G) - \tilde{\alpha}_G)}{\tilde{\alpha}_G} \sim -4\%$.

1.3 SO_{10} Yukawa unification

Minimal SO_{10} also predicts Yukawa unification for the third family of quarks and leptons with $\lambda_b = \lambda_t = \lambda_\tau = \lambda_{\nu_\tau} = \lambda$ at the GUT scale[6].

Ignoring threshold corrections, one can use the low energy value for m_b/m_τ to fix the universal Yukawa coupling λ . RG running from M_G to M_Z then gives $\lambda_\tau(M_Z)$. Hence given $m_\tau = \lambda_\tau \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} \cos\beta$ we obtain $\tan\beta \approx 50$. Finally, a prediction for the top quark mass is given by $m_t = \lambda_t \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} \sin\beta \sim 170 \pm 20$ GeV (see Anderson et al.[6]).

Note, in this case there are insignificant GUT threshold corrections from gauge and Higgs loops. Nevertheless, the previous discussion is essentially a *straw man*, since there are huge threshold corrections at the weak scale[7]. The dominant contributions are from gluino and chargino loops plus an overall logarithmic contribution due to finite wave function renormalization given by $\delta m_b/m_b = \Delta m_b^{\tilde{g}} + \Delta m_b^{\tilde{\chi}} + \Delta m_b^{\log} + \dots$. These contributions are characteristically of the form

$$\Delta m_b^{\tilde{g}} \approx \frac{2\alpha_3}{3\pi} \frac{\mu m_{\tilde{g}}}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \tan\beta, \quad (1)$$

$$\Delta m_b^{\tilde{\chi}^+} \approx \frac{\lambda_t^2}{16\pi^2} \frac{\mu A_t}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \tan\beta \quad \text{and} \quad (2)$$

$$\Delta m_b^{\log} \approx \frac{\alpha_3}{4\pi} \log\left(\frac{\tilde{m}^2}{M_Z^2}\right) \sim 6\% \quad (3)$$

with $\Delta m_b^{\tilde{g}} \sim -\Delta m_b^{\tilde{\chi}} > 0$ for $\mu > 0$ [with our conventions]. These corrections can easily be of order $\sim 50\%$. However good fits require $\delta m_b/m_b < -2\%$.

Note, the data favors $\mu > 0$. First consider the process $b \rightarrow s\gamma$. The chargino loop contribution typically dominates and has opposite sign to the standard model and charged Higgs contributions for $\mu > 0$, thus reducing the branching ratio. This is desirable, since the standard model contribution is a little too large. Hence $\mu < 0$ is problematic when trying to fit the data. Secondly, the recent measurement of the anomalous magnetic moment of the muon suggests a contribution due to NEW physics given by $a_\mu^{NEW} = 26(16) \times 10^{-10}$ [8]. However in SUSY the sign of a_μ^{NEW} is correlated with sign of μ [9]. Once again the data favors $\mu > 0$.

Before discussing our analysis of Yukawa unification, we need to consider one important point. $SO(10)$ Yukawa unification with the minimal Higgs sector necessarily predicts large $\tan\beta \sim 50$. It is much easier to obtain EWSB with large $\tan\beta$ when the Higgs up/down masses are split ($m_{H_u}^2 < m_{H_d}^2$) [10]. In our analysis we consider two particular Higgs splitting schemes we refer to as Just So and D term splitting. In the first case the third generation squark and slepton soft masses are given by the universal mass parameter m_{16} , and only Higgs masses are split: $m_{(H_u, H_d)}^2 = m_{10}^2 (1 \mp \Delta m_H^2)$. In the second case we assume D term splitting, i.e. that the D term for $U(1)_X$ is non-zero, where $U(1)_X$ is obtained in the decomposition of $SO(10) \rightarrow SU(5) \times U(1)_X$. In this second case, we have

$m_{(H_u, H_d)}^2 = m_{10}^2 \mp 2D_X$, $m_{(Q, \bar{u}, \bar{e})}^2 = m_{16}^2 + D_X$, $m_{(\bar{d}, L)}^2 = m_{16}^2 - 3D_X$. The Just So case does not at first sight appear to be very well motivated. However we now argue that it is quite natural [1]. In $SO(10)$, neutrinos necessarily have a Yukawa term coupling active neutrinos to the “sterile” neutrinos present in the **16**. In fact for ν_τ we have $\lambda_{\nu_\tau} \bar{\nu}_\tau L H_u$ with $\lambda_{\nu_\tau} = \lambda_t = \lambda_b = \lambda_\tau \equiv \lambda$. In order to obtain a tau neutrino with mass $m_{\nu_\tau} \sim 0.05$ eV (consistent with atmospheric neutrino oscillations), the “sterile” $\bar{\nu}_\tau$ must obtain a Majorana mass $M_{\bar{\nu}_\tau} \geq 10^{13}$ GeV. Moreover, since neutrinos couple to H_u (and not to H_d) with a fairly large Yukawa coupling (of order 0.7), they naturally distinguish the two Higgs multiplets. With $\lambda = 0.7$ and $M_{\bar{\nu}_\tau} = 10^{13}$ GeV, we obtain a significant GUT scale threshold correction with $\Delta m_H^2 \approx 10\%$, remarkably close to the value needed to fit the data. At the same time, we obtain a small threshold correction to Yukawa unification $\approx 2.5\%$.

1.4 χ^2 Analysis

Our analysis is a top-down approach with 11 input parameters, defined at M_G , varied to minimize a χ^2 function composed of 9 low energy observables. The 11 input parameters are: M_G , $\alpha_G(M_G)$, ϵ_3 ; the Yukawa coupling λ , and the 7 soft SUSY breaking parameters μ , $M_{1/2}$, A_0 , $\tan\beta$, m_{16}^2 , m_{10}^2 , Δm_H^2 (D_X) for Just So (D term) case. We use two (one)loop renormalization group [RG] running for dimensionless (dimensionful) parameters from M_G to M_Z and complete one loop threshold corrections at M_Z [11]. We require electroweak symmetry breaking using an improved Higgs potential, including m_t^4 and m_b^4 corrections in an effective 2 Higgs doublet model below M_{stop} [12]. Note, in the figures we have chosen to keep three input parameters μ , $M_{1/2}$, m_{16} fixed, minimizing χ^2 with respect to the remaining 8 parameters only. The χ^2 function includes the 9 observables; 6 precision electroweak data α_{EM} , G_μ , $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.118$ (0.002), M_Z , M_W , ρ_{NEW} and the 3 fermion masses $M_{top} = 174.3$ (5.1), $m_b(m_b) = 4.20$ (0.20), M_τ .




Figure 1: χ^2 contours for $m_{16} = 1500$ GeV (Left) and $m_{16} = 2000$ GeV (Right). The shaded region is excluded by the chargino mass limit $m_{\tilde{\chi}^+} > 103$ GeV.

Fig. 1 (Left) shows the constant χ^2 contours for $m_{16} = 1500$ GeV in the case of Just So squark and slepton masses. We find acceptable fits ($\chi^2 < 3$) for $A_0 \sim -1.9 m_{16}$,

$m_{10} \sim 1.4 m_{16}$ and $m_{16} \geq 1.2$ TeV. The best fits are for $m_{16} \geq 2000$ GeV with $\chi^2 < 1$. Fig. 1 (Right) shows the constant χ^2 contours for $m_{16} = 2000$ GeV.




Figure 2: Contours of constant $m_b(m_b)[\text{GeV}]$ (Left) and Δm_b in % (Right) for $m_{16} = 2000$ GeV.

Fig. 2 gives the constant $m_b(m_b)$ and $\delta m_b/m_b$ contours for $m_{16} = 2000$ GeV. We see that the best fits, near the central value, are found with $\delta m_b/m_b \leq -2\%$. The chargino contribution (Eqn. 2) is typically opposite in sign to the gluino (Eqn. 1), since A_t runs to an infrared fixed point $\propto -M_{1/2}$ (see for example, Carena et al.[7]). Hence in order to cancel the positive contribution of both the log (Eqn. 3) and gluino contributions, a large negative chargino contribution is needed. This can be accomplished for $-A_t > m_{\tilde{g}}$ and $m_{\tilde{t}_1} \ll m_{\tilde{b}_1}$. The first condition can be satisfied for A_0 large and negative, which helps pull A_t away from its infrared fixed point. The second condition is also aided by large A_t . However in order to obtain a large enough splitting between $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ and $m_{\tilde{b}_1}$, large values of m_{16} are needed. Note, that for Just So scalar masses, the lightest stop is typically lighter than the sbottom. We typically find $m_{\tilde{b}_1} \sim 3 m_{\tilde{t}_1}$. On the other hand, D term splitting with $D_X > 0$ gives $m_{\tilde{b}_1} \leq m_{\tilde{t}_1}$. As a result in the case of Just So boundary conditions excellent fits are obtained for top, bottom and tau masses; while for D term splitting the best fits give $m_b(m_b) \geq 4.59$ GeV.

The bottom line is that Yukawa unification is only possible in a narrow region of SUSY parameter space with

$$A_0 \sim -1.9 m_{16}, \quad m_{10} \sim 1.4 m_{16}, \quad (4)$$

$$(\mu, M_{1/2}) \sim 100 - 500 \text{ GeV} \quad \text{and} \quad m_{16} \geq 1.2 \text{ TeV}. \quad (5)$$

It would be nice to have some a priori reason for the fundamental SUSY breaking mechanism to give these soft SUSY breaking parameters. However, without such an a priori explanation, it is all the more interesting and encouraging to recognize two additional reasons for wanting to be in this narrow region of parameter space.

1.5 Inverted Mass Hierarchy & Proton Decay Bounds

One mechanism for suppressing large flavor violating processes in SUSY theories is to demand heavy first and second generation squarks and sleptons (with mass \gg TeV) and

the third generation scalars lighter than a TeV. Since the third generation scalars couple most strongly to the Higgs, this limit can still leave a “naturally” light Higgs. It was shown that this inverted scalar mass hierarchy can be obtained via renormalization group running from M_G to M_Z with suitably chosen soft SUSY breaking boundary conditions at M_G [13]. All that is needed is $SO(10)$ boundary conditions for the Higgs mass (i.e. m_{10}), squark and slepton masses (i.e. m_{16}) and a universal scalar coupling A_0 . In addition, they must be in the ratio

$$A_0^2 = 2 m_{10}^2 = 4 m_{16}^2, \quad \text{with } m_{16} \gg \text{TeV}.$$

Secondly, in order to suppress the rate for proton decay due to dimension 5 operators one must also demand [14]

$$(\mu, M_{1/2}) \ll m_{16}, \quad \text{with } m_{16} > \text{few TeV}.$$

2 Consequences for Higgs and SUSY Searches

In Fig. 3 we show the constant light Higgs mass contours for $m_{16} = 1500$ and 2000 GeV (solid lines) with the constant χ^2 contours overlaid (dotted lines). Yukawa unification for $\chi^2 \leq 1$ clearly prefers a light Higgs with mass in a narrow range, 112 - 118 GeV.




Figure 3: Contours of constant m_h [GeV] (solid lines) with χ^2 contours from Fig. 1 (dotted lines) for $m_{16} = 1500$ GeV (Left) and $m_{16} = 2000$ GeV (Right).

In this region the CP odd A^0 , the heavy CP even Higgs H^0 and the charged Higgs bosons H^\pm are also quite light. In addition we find the mass of $\tilde{t}_1 \sim (150 - 250)$ GeV, $\tilde{b}_1 \sim (450 - 650)$ GeV, $\tilde{\tau}_1 \sim (200 - 500)$ GeV, $\tilde{g} \sim (600 - 1200)$ GeV, $\tilde{\chi}^+ \sim (100 - 250)$ GeV, and $\tilde{\chi}^0 \sim (80 - 170)$ GeV. All first and second generation squarks and sleptons have mass of order m_{16} . The light stop and chargino may be visible at the Tevatron. With this spectrum we expect $\tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}^+ b$ with $\tilde{\chi}^+ \rightarrow \tilde{\chi}_1^0 \bar{l} \nu$ to be dominant. Lastly $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$ is the LSP and possibly a good dark matter candidate [15].

Our analysis thus far has only included third generation Yukawa couplings; hence no flavor mixing. If we now include the second family and 2-3 family mixing, consistent

with V_{cb} , we obtain new and significant constraints on $m_{\tilde{t}_1}$ and m_{A^0} . The stop mass is constrained by $B(b \rightarrow s\gamma)$ to satisfy $m_{\tilde{t}}^{MIN} > 450$ GeV (unfortunately increasing the bottom quark mass). In addition, as shown by Babu and Kolda [16] the one loop SUSY corrections to CKM mixing angles (see Blažek et al.[7]) result in flavor violating neutral Higgs couplings. As a consequence the CDF bound on the process $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ places a lower bound on $m_{A^0} \geq 200$ GeV [16]. χ^2 , on the other hand, increases as m_{A^0} increases. However the increase in χ^2 is less than 60% for $m_{A^0} < 400$ GeV. Note, the H^\pm , H^0 masses increase linearly with m_{A^0} .

In conclusion, we have demanded $SO(10)$ Yukawa unification for the third generation and, instead of predicting the top, bottom and tau masses, we have turned the tables around and used it to predict Higgs and SUSY particle masses. We have shown that Yukawa unification only works in a narrow region of soft SUSY breaking parameters. This same region is also preferred (1) for suppressing large SUSY CP and flavor violation with an inverted scalar mass hierarchy and (2) suppressing proton decay due to dimension 5 operators. We find a SUSY particle spectrum with light gauginos, third generation squarks and sleptons lighter than a TeV, but first and second generation scalars heavier than a TeV. We find $m_h^0 \sim 114 \pm 5 \pm 3$ GeV where the first uncertainty comes from the range of SUSY parameters with $\chi^2 \leq 1.5$ and the second is an estimate of the theoretical uncertainties in our Higgs mass. The light Higgs mass is naturally in this range as a consequence of having large $\tan\beta$ and a light stop. Since we necessarily have $m_{16} > 1200$ GeV, we obtain a small SUSY contribution to the anomalous magnetic moment of the muon with $a_\mu^{SUSY} < 16 \times 10^{-10}$. Finally, our best results are obtained with a light CP odd Higgs. However the CDF bound on the process $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ places a lower bound on $m_{A^0} \geq 200$ GeV [16]. We would thus not be surprised to see evidence for $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ in Run II at the Tevatron.

References

- [1] T. Blažek, R. Dermíšek and S. Raby, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 111804 (2002); *Phys. Rev.* **D65**, 115004 (2002).
- [2] J. Pati and A. Salam, *Phys. Rev.* **D8** 1240 (1973); H. Georgi and S.L. Glashow, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **32** 438 (1974); H. Georgi, *Particles and Fields*, Proceedings of the APS Div. of Particles and Fields, ed C. Carlson, p. 575 (1975); H. Fritzsch and P. Minkowski, *Ann. Phys.* **93**, 193 (1975).
- [3] S. Dimopoulos, S. Raby and F. Wilczek, *Phys. Rev.* **D24**, 1681 (1981).
- [4] S. Dimopoulos and H. Georgi, *Nucl. Phys.* **B193**, 150 (1981); L. Ibanez and G.G. Ross, *Phys. Lett.* **105B**, 439 (1981); N. Sakai, *Z. Phys.* **C11**, 153 (1981); M. B. Einhorn and D. R. T. Jones, *Nucl. Phys.* **B196**, 475 (1982); W. J. Marciano and G. Senjanovic, *Phys. Rev.* **D 25**, 3092 (1982).
- [5] U. Amaldi, W. de Boer and H. Fürstenau, *Phys. Lett.* **B260**, 447 (1991); J. Ellis, S. Kelly and D.V. Nanopoulos, *Phys. Lett.* **B260**, 131 (1991); P. Langacker and M. Luo, *Phys. Rev.* **D44**, 817 (1991); P. Langacker and N. Polonsky, *Phys. Rev.* **D47**, 4028

- (1993); M. Carena, S. Pokorski and C.E.M. Wagner, *Nucl. Phys.* **B406**, 59 (1993); see also the review by S. Dimopoulos, S. Raby and F. Wilczek, *Physics Today*, 25–33, October (1991).
- [6] T. Banks, *Nucl. Phys.* **B303**, 172 (1988); M. Olechowski and S. Pokorski, *Phys. Lett.* **B214**, 393 (1988); S. Pokorski, *Nucl. Phys.* **B13** (Proc. Supp.), 606 (1990); B. Ananthanarayan, G. Lazarides and Q. Shafi, *Phys. Rev.* **D44**, 1613 (1991); Q. Shafi and B. Ananthanarayan, ICTP Summer School lectures (1991); S. Dimopoulos, L.J. Hall and S. Raby, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 1984 (1992), *Phys. Rev.* **D45**, 4192 (1992); G. Anderson et al., *Phys. Rev.* **D47**, 3702 (1993); B. Ananthanarayan, G. Lazarides and Q. Shafi, *Phys. Lett.* **B300**, 245 (1993); G. Anderson et al., *Phys. Rev.* **D49**, 3660 (1994); B. Ananthanarayan, Q. Shafi and X.M. Wang, *Phys. Rev.* **D50**, 5980 (1994).
- [7] L.J. Hall, R. Rattazzi and U. Sarid, *Phys. Rev.* **D50**, 7048 (1994); R. Hempfling, *Phys. Rev.* **D49**, 6168 (1994), M. Carena et al., *Nucl. Phys.* **B426**, 269 (1994); T. Blažek, S. Pokorski and S. Raby, *Phys. Rev.* **D52**, 4151 (1995).
- [8] Muon $g-2$ Collaboration and Brookhaven E821 Collaboration 2000.
- [9] U. Chattopadhyay and P. Nath, *Phys. Rev.* **D53**, 1648 (1996).
- [10] M. Olechowski and S. Pokorski, *Phys. Lett.* **B344**, 201 (1995); D. Matalliotakis and H.P. Nilles, *Nucl. Phys.* **B435**, 115 (1995); N. Polonsky and A. Pomarol, *Phys. Rev.* **D51**, 6532 (1995); H. Murayama, M. Olechowski and S. Pokorski, *Phys. Lett.* **B371**, 57 (1996); R. Rattazzi and U. Sarid, *Phys. Rev.* **D53**, 1553 (1996).
- [11] D. Pierce et al., *Nucl. Phys.* **B491**, 3 (1997).
- [12] H.E. Haber and R. Hempfling, *Phys. Rev.* **D48**, 4280 (1993); M. Carena et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B355**, 209 (1995); M. Carena, M. Quiros and C.E.M. Wagner, *Nucl. Phys.* **B461**, 407 (1996).
- [13] J. Bagger, J. Feng, N. Polonsky and R. Zhang, *Phys. Lett.* **B473**, 264 (2000).
- [14] R. Dermíšek, A. Mafi and S. Raby, *Phys. Rev.* **D63**, 035001, (2001).
- [15] See for example, L. Roszkowski, R.R. de Austri and T. Nihei, hep-ph/0106334.
- [16] G. Isidori and A. Retico, hep-ph/0110121; A. Dedes, H.K. Dreiner and U. Nierste, hep-ph/0108037; K.S. Babu and C. Kolda, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 228 (2000) and references therein.