

Resolving the $(g - 2)_\mu$ Discrepancy with \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$ Intersecting D-branes

Joseph L. Lamborn,¹ Tianjun Li,^{2,3} James A. Maxin,¹ and Dimitri V. Nanopoulos^{4,5,6}

¹*Department of Chemistry and Physics, Louisiana State University, Shreveport, Louisiana 71115 USA*

²*CAS Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Theoretical Physics,
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, P. R. China*

³*School of Physical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences,
No.19A Yuquan Road, Beijing 100049, P. R. China*

⁴*George P. and Cynthia W. Mitchell Institute for Fundamental Physics and Astronomy,
Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843, USA*

⁵*Astroparticle Physics Group, Houston Advanced Research Center (HARC), Mitchell Campus, Woodlands, TX 77381, USA*

⁶*Academy of Athens, Division of Natural Sciences,
28 Panepistimiou Avenue, Athens 10679, Greece*

A discrepancy between the measured anomalous magnetic moment of the muon $(g - 2)_\mu$ and computed Standard Model value now stands at a combined 4.2σ following experiments at Brookhaven National Lab (BNL) and the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory (FNAL). A solution to the disagreement is uncovered in flipped $SU(5)$ with additional TeV-Scale vector-like $\mathbf{10} + \overline{\mathbf{10}}$ multiplets and charged singlet derived from local F-Theory, collectively referred to as \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$. Here we engage general No-Scale supersymmetry (SUSY) breaking in \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$ D-brane model building to alleviate the $(g - 2)_\mu$ tension between the Standard Model and observations. A robust $\Delta a_\mu(\text{SUSY})$ is realized via mixing of M_5 and M_{1X} at the secondary $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$ unification scale in \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$ emanating from $SU(5)$ breaking and $U(1)_X$ flux effects. Calculations unveil $\Delta a_\mu(\text{SUSY}) = 19.0 - 22.3 \times 10^{-10}$ for gluino masses of $M(\tilde{g}) = 2.25 - 2.56$ TeV and higgsino dark matter, aptly residing within the BNL+FNAL 1σ mean. This $(g - 2)_\mu$ favorable region of the model space also generates the correct light Higgs boson mass and branching ratios of companion rare decay processes, and is further consistent with all LHC Run 2 constraints. Finally, we also examine the heavy SUSY Higgs boson in light of recent LHC searches for an extended Higgs sector.

PACS numbers: 11.10.Kk, 11.25.Mj, 11.25.-w, 12.60.Jv

INTRODUCTION

The Fermi National Accelerator Lab (FNAL) launched an experiment to update the original Brookhaven National Lab (BNL) analysis of the magnetic moment of the muon $(g - 2)_\mu$. The BNL measurements showed an enticing 3.7σ deviation [1] from the theoretical Standard Model calculation [2–31], albeit burdened with a large factor of uncertainty. The independently conducted FNAL venture sought to either confirm or exclude these initial BNL findings. Concluding the anticipation, FNAL announced recently a similar disparity with the Standard Model value, leading to a combined 4.2σ discrepancy of $\Delta a_\mu = a_\mu(\text{Exp}) - a_\mu(\text{SM}) = 25.1 \pm 5.9 \times 10^{-10}$ [32], in conjunction with a reduced uncertainty by a factor of four. Even more intriguing is the magnitude of the discrepancy, which just so happens to be similar in scale to the electroweak contribution [30, 31] to $a_\mu(\text{SM})$, suggesting new physics obscured at the TeV-scale.

A natural explanation for the anomaly is supersymmetry (SUSY), certainly the most auspicious extension to the Standard Model. The muon’s magnetic moment maintains the benefit of precision measurements and is rather sensitive to new physics, thus it has long been viewed as a gateway to probing SUSY. The triumphs of SUSY are numerous and well known with regards to stabilizing quantum corrections to the scalar Higgs field,

gauge coupling unification, mechanism for radiatively breaking electroweak symmetry, and yielding a dark matter candidate in the form of the lightest supersymmetric particle (LSP) under R-parity. Our model we investigate here showcases intersecting D-branes, therefore a critical feature of SUSY is its fundamental presence in superstring theory.

The SUSY grand unification theory (GUT) model we study merges the realistic intersecting D6-brane model [33–47] with the phenomenologically [48–59] and cosmologically [60–69] favorable No-Scale flipped $SU(5)$. The union of these with extra vector-like matter, dubbed flippons [50], is referred to as the \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$ D-brane model, which in aggregate reinforces deep theoretical constructions, furnishing a compelling natural GUT candidate for our universe. Serving as a viable high-energy candidate though, it must be capable of elegantly explaining any and all empirical observations, so we shall stress test the model to affirm whether or not it can indeed explain the BNL+FNAL 4.2σ discrepancy (Spoiler Alert: It can!). But first we must review the \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$ D-brane model’s foundation before we then take the deep dive into the calculations of $(g - 2)_\mu$ and corresponding phenomenology later in the paper.

\mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$ INTERSECTING D-BRANES

The \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$ literature is amply stocked with discussions of the minimal flipped $SU(5)$ model (for instance, see Refs. [51, 55, 56, 58, 59, 70–72] and references therein). We shall provide here only a condensed review of the minimal flipped $SU(5)$ model [73–75], where the gauge group $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$ is embedded into the $SO(10)$ model. First, the generator $U(1)_{Y'}$ in $SU(5)$ is defined as

$$T_{U(1)_{Y'}} = \text{diag} \left(-\frac{1}{3}, -\frac{1}{3}, -\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right), \quad (1)$$

which provides the hypercharge given by

$$Q_Y = \frac{1}{5} (Q_X - Q_{Y'}). \quad (2)$$

There are three families of Standard Model fermions, and the quantum numbers under $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$ respectively are

$$F_i = (\mathbf{10}, \mathbf{1}), \quad \bar{f}_i = (\bar{\mathbf{5}}, -\mathbf{3}), \quad \bar{l}_i = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{5}), \quad (3)$$

with $i = 1, 2, 3$. Relevant for our D-brane model notation, we associate F_i , \bar{f}_i and \bar{l}_i with the particle assignments

$$F_i = (Q_i, D_i^c, N_i^c), \quad \bar{f}_i = (U_i^c, L_i), \quad \bar{l}_i = E_i^c, \quad (4)$$

where Q_i , U_i^c , D_i^c , L_i , E_i^c and N_i^c are the left-handed quark doublets, right-handed up-type quarks, down-type quarks, left-handed lepton doublets, right-handed charged leptons, and neutrinos, respectively. Three Standard Model singlets ϕ_i can be introduced to generate heavy right-handed neutrino masses.

The GUT and electroweak gauge symmetries can now be broken, and this is accomplished by introducing two pairs of Higgs representations

$$H = (\mathbf{10}, \mathbf{1}), \quad \bar{H} = (\bar{\mathbf{10}}, -\mathbf{1}), \\ h = (\mathbf{5}, -\mathbf{2}), \quad \bar{h} = (\bar{\mathbf{5}}, \mathbf{2}). \quad (5)$$

The H and F multiplet states are labeled similarly, including only a “bar” added above the fields for \bar{H} . More precisely, the Higgs particles are

$$H = (Q_H, D_H^c, N_H^c), \quad \bar{H} = (\bar{Q}_H, \bar{D}_H^c, \bar{N}_H^c), \quad (6)$$

$$h = (D_h, D_h, D_h, H_d), \quad \bar{h} = (\bar{D}_h, \bar{D}_h, \bar{D}_h, H_u), \quad (7)$$

such that H_d and H_u are a single pair of MSSM Higgs doublets.

We introduce this GUT scale Higgs superpotential to break the $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$ gauge symmetry down to the Standard Model gauge symmetry:

$$W_{\text{GUT}} = \lambda_1 H H h + \lambda_2 \bar{H} \bar{H} \bar{h} + \Phi (\bar{H} H - M_H^2). \quad (8)$$

Consequently, there is only one F-flat and D-flat direction existing, which can certainly be rotated along

the N_H^c and \bar{N}_H^c directions. As a result, we obtain $\langle N_H^c \rangle = \langle \bar{N}_H^c \rangle = M_H$. Additionally, the supersymmetric Higgs mechanism allows the superfields H and \bar{H} to be consumed and thus acquire large masses, except D_H^c and \bar{D}_H^c . Moreover, the superpotential terms $\lambda_1 H H h$ and $\lambda_2 \bar{H} \bar{H} \bar{h}$ couple D_H^c and \bar{D}_H^c respectively with D_h and \bar{D}_h , which forms massive eigenstates with masses $2\lambda_1 \langle N_H^c \rangle$ and $2\lambda_2 \langle \bar{N}_H^c \rangle$. Accordingly, doublet-triplet splitting naturally occurs due to the missing partner mechanism [75]. There is only a small mixing through the μ term in the triplets h and \bar{h} , so colored higgsino-exchange mediated proton decay remains negligible, *i.e.*, the dimension-5 proton decay problem is absent [76].

String-scale gauge coupling unification at about 10^{17} GeV can be realized by introducing the following vector-like particles (referred to as flippons) at the TeV scale derived from local F-theory model building [77–79]

$$XF = (\mathbf{10}, \mathbf{1}), \quad \overline{XF} = (\bar{\mathbf{10}}, -\mathbf{1}), \\ Xl = (\mathbf{1}, -\mathbf{5}), \quad \overline{Xl} = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{5}). \quad (9)$$

Under Standard Model gauge symmetry, the particle content resulting from decompositions of XF , \overline{XF} , Xl , and \overline{Xl} are

$$XF = (XQ, XD^c, XN^c), \quad \overline{XF} = (XQ^c, XD, XN), \\ Xl = XE, \quad \overline{Xl} = XE^c. \quad (10)$$

The additional vector-like particles under the $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ gauge symmetry have the quantum numbers

$$XQ = (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{2}, \frac{1}{6}), \quad XQ^c = (\bar{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{2}, -\frac{1}{6}), \quad (11)$$

$$XD = (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}, -\frac{1}{3}), \quad XD^c = (\bar{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1}, \frac{1}{3}), \quad (12)$$

$$XN = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{0}), \quad XN^c = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{0}), \quad (13)$$

$$XE = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, -\mathbf{1}), \quad XE^c = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}). \quad (14)$$

The superpotential is

$$W_{\text{Yukawa}} = y_{ij}^D F_i F_j h + y_{ij}^{U\nu} F_i \bar{f}_j \bar{h} + y_{ij}^{E\nu} \bar{l}_i \bar{f}_j h \\ + \mu h \bar{h} + y_{ij}^N \phi_i \bar{H} F_j + M_{ij}^\phi \phi_i \phi_j \\ + y_{XF} X F X F h + y_{\overline{XF}} \overline{X F} \overline{X F} \bar{h} \\ + M_{XF} \overline{X F} X F + M_{Xl} \overline{Xl} Xl, \quad (15)$$

and after the $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$ gauge symmetry is broken down to the Standard Model gauge symmetry, the superpotential presented directly above gives

$$W_{\text{SSM}} = y_{ij}^D D_i^c Q_j H_d + y_{ij}^{U\nu} U_i^c Q_j H_u + y_{ij}^{E\nu} E_i^c L_j H_d \\ + y_{ij}^{U\nu} N_i^c L_j H_u + \mu H_d H_u + y_{ij}^N \langle \bar{N}_H^c \rangle \phi_i N_j^c \\ + y_{XF} X Q X D^c H_d + y_{\overline{XF}} \overline{X Q} X D^c H_u \\ + M_{XF} (X Q^c X Q + X D^c X D) \\ + M_{Xl} X E^c X E + M_{ij}^\phi \phi_i \phi_j \\ + \dots (\text{decoupled below } M_{\text{GUT}}). \quad (16)$$

where y_{ij}^D , $y_{ij}^{U\nu}$, y_{ij}^E , y_{ij}^N , y_{XF} , and $y_{\overline{XF}}$ are Yukawa couplings, μ is the bilinear Higgs mass term, and M_{ij}^ϕ , M_{XF} and M_{Xl} are new particle masses. The vector-like particle flippons are of course these new particles. The masses M_{ij}^ϕ , M_{XF} , and M_{Xl} have not been explicitly computed yet, reserving that in-depth project for the future. Regardless, a common mass decoupling scale M_V for the vector-like multiplets is implemented.

Contributions from vector-like multiplets require changes to the one-loop gauge β -function coefficients b_i that promote a flat $SU(3)$ Renormalization Group Equation (RGE) running ($b_3 = 0$) [49], separating the secondary $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L$ unification around 10^{16} GeV, which we refer to as the mass scale M_{32} , and the primary $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$ unification near the string scale 10^{17} GeV, defined as the mass scale $M_{\mathcal{F}}$. This is significant as it elevates unification close to the Planck mass. The M_3 and M_2 gaugino mass terms and couplings α_3 and α_2 unify at the scale M_{32} into a single mass parameter M_5 and coupling α_5 [48], where $M_5 = M_3 = M_2$ and $\alpha_5 = \alpha_3 = \alpha_2$ between M_{32} and $M_{\mathcal{F}}$ [49]. The flattening of the M_3 gaugino RGE running between M_{32} and M_V produces a characteristic mass texture of $M(\tilde{t}_1) < M(\tilde{g}) < M(\tilde{q})$, spawning a light stop and gluino that are lighter than all other squarks [55].

Two critical effects naturally transpire at the scale M_{32} . First, $U(1)_X$ flux effects [48] cause a small increase in M_1 from the evolution of M_{1X} via the following

$$\frac{M_1}{\alpha_1} = \frac{24}{25} \frac{M_{1X}}{\alpha_{1X}} + \frac{1}{25} \frac{M_5}{\alpha_5} \quad (17)$$

where $\alpha_1 = 5\alpha_Y/3$ is the $U(1)_Y$ gauge coupling. Second, in the $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$ models motivated by D-brane model building, there exist three chiral multiplets in the $SU(5)$ adjoint representation, for example, see Ref. [80]. These chiral multiplets can obtain vacuum expectation values around the $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L$ unification scale M_{32} , and then the gaugino masses for $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_{Y'}$ of $SU(5)$ can be split due to the high-dimensional operators [81, 82]. Because the bino mass is a linear combination of the $U(1)_{Y'}$ and $U(1)_X$ gaugino masses, the bino mass M_1 , wino mass M_2 , and gluino mass M_3 can be independent free parameters at M_{32} . Thus, we shall consider such effects by introducing the following relationship at the scale M_{32} that stimulates mixing between M_5 and M_{1X} :

$$M_2 = \frac{18}{25} M_5 - \frac{7}{25} M_{1X} \quad (18)$$

This effect drives the wino to small values at the electroweak scale and we use the resulting phenomenology to constrain the coefficients in Eq. (18). A larger contribution from M_5 decreases the wino contribution to $(g-2)_\mu$. On the contrary, a smaller contribution from M_5 shifts the $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L$ unification scale M_{32} lower, to below 10^{16} GeV. The lower M_{32} in turn pushes the proton

decay rate $\tau_p(p \rightarrow e^+ \pi^0)$ down to unacceptably fast time periods of 10^{34} yrs or less. We study the nominal mixing highlighted in Eq. (18) in this analysis, though plan a more in-depth study later regarding maximum limits on the mixing parameters of Eq. (18).

Following upon the F_i , \bar{f}_i , and \bar{l}_i of Eq. (4), the general No-Scale SUSY breaking soft terms at $M_{\mathcal{F}}$ are M_5 , M_{1X} , $M_{QD^c N^c}$, $M_{U^c L}$, M_{E^c} , M_{H_u} , M_{H_d} , A_τ , A_t , and A_b . Note that $M_{QD^c N^c}$ is the **10**, $M_{U^c L}$ is the **5**, and M_{E^c} is the **1** of Eq. (3). General SUSY breaking soft terms of this type are motivated by D-brane model building [80], where F_i , \bar{f}_i , \bar{l}_i , and h/\bar{h} arise from intersections of different stacks of D-branes. As a result, the SUSY breaking soft mass terms and trilinear A terms will be different. The Yukawa terms HHh and \overline{HHh} of Eq. (8) and $F_i F_j h$, $X F X F h$, and $\overline{X F X F h}$ of Eq. (15) are forbidden by the anomalous global $U(1)$ symmetry of $U(5)$, nonetheless, these Yukawa terms can be generated from high-dimensional operators or instanton effects. Differing from $SU(5)$ models, the Yukawa term $F_i F_j h$ in the \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$ model gives down-type quark masses, so these Yukawa couplings can be small and hence generated via high-dimensional operators or instanton effects.

PHENOMENOLOGICAL RESULTS

The general No-Scale soft SUSY breaking terms in the \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$ D-brane model are implemented at the $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$ unification scale $M_{\mathcal{F}}$, and we concurrently float the low-energy parameters $\tan\beta$, m_t , and M_V . Over 1.2 billion points in the model space are sampled by computing the SUSY mass spectra, rare decay process branching ratios, spin-independent dark matter cross-sections, and relic density using a proprietary mpi codebase built on scaled down versions of *Micromegas* 2.1 [83] and *SuSpect* 2.34 [84]. The intervals scanned are:

$$\begin{aligned} 100 \text{ GeV} &\leq M_5 \leq 1700 \text{ GeV} \\ 100 \text{ GeV} &\leq M_{1X} \leq 3800 \text{ GeV} \\ 10 \text{ eV} &\leq M_{U^c L} \leq 1500 \text{ GeV} \\ 1 \text{ GeV} &\leq M_{E^c} \leq 2400 \text{ GeV} \\ 1 \text{ keV} &\leq M_{QD^c N^c} \leq 1900 \text{ GeV} \\ 100 \text{ GeV} &\leq M_{H_u} \leq 4000 \text{ GeV} \\ 100 \text{ GeV} &\leq M_{H_d} \leq 4000 \text{ GeV} \\ -10 \text{ TeV} &\leq A_\tau \leq 10 \text{ TeV} \\ -10 \text{ TeV} &\leq A_t \leq 13 \text{ TeV} \\ -10 \text{ TeV} &\leq A_b \leq 15 \text{ TeV} \\ 2 &\leq \tan\beta \leq 60 \\ 1 \text{ TeV} &\leq M_V \leq 8000 \text{ TeV} \end{aligned}$$

A small tolerance of $172.3 \leq m_t \leq 174.4$ GeV is ap-

TABLE I. The \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$ D-brane model general No-Scale SUSY breaking soft terms along with their associated mass spectra and other pertinent data for 12 benchmark spectra representative of that region of model space that can explain the BNL+FNAL 4.2σ discrepancy. All spectra have higgsino LSP, with the higgsino percentage listed in the bottom line.

M_1 (GeV)	2700	2700	2500	2700	2900	2500	2800	3100	3400	3600	3500	3600
M_5 (GeV)	1510	1510	1530	1570	1600	1600	1600	1600	1610	1640	1660	1700
$M_{U^c L}$ (keV)	10	10	10	10	10	100	10	10	10	10	10	10
$M_{Q D^c N^c}$ (keV)	10	10	10	10	10	100	10	10	10	10	10	10
M_{E^c} (GeV)	1200	1200	1400	1200	1300	1400	1200	1200	900	1000	1000	900
M_{H_u} (GeV)	1800	1800	1900	1900	2100	2000	1900	2000	1900	2000	1900	1900
M_{H_d} (GeV)	2300	2300	2300	2300	2400	2500	2400	2500	2400	2600	2600	2600
A_τ (GeV)	800	800	1200	400	1200	700	600	800	1200	1200	600	800
A_t (GeV)	600	600	200	400	0	300	500	100	400	200	800	1000
A_b (GeV)	-4600	-4900	-4900	-5200	-4300	-4500	-5200	-4900	-5000	-4700	-5000	-5000
M_V (TeV)	4000	7000	7000	4000	4000	5500	5500	7000	8000	7000	8000	8000
$\tan\beta$	60	60	60	60	60	59	59	60	60	60	60	60
m_{top} (GeV)	173.3	173.1	172.7	173.3	173.7	173.3	172.7	172.9	172.3	173.1	172.3	172.5
$\Delta a_\mu(\text{SUSY}) (\times 10^{-10})$	21.1	22.3	21.1	20.1	19.3	19.0	19.4	20.2	20.6	19.0	19.5	19.0
$\text{Br}(b \rightarrow s\gamma) (\times 10^{-4})$	3.01	3.04	2.99	3.09	3.01	3.02	3.10	2.99	3.14	2.99	3.16	3.26
$\text{Br}(B_S^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) (\times 10^{-9})$	5.8	4.9	5.7	6.2	6.2	4.6	4.6	5.6	5.7	5.2	4.3	4.1
$\sigma_{SI}^{\text{rescaled}} (\times 10^{-9} \text{pb})$	8.6	6.7	6.8	8.7	6.5	4.9	6.2	6.7	7.8	4.9	6.1	6.2
$\tau_p(p \rightarrow e^+ \pi^0) (\times 10^{35} \text{yrs})$	1.3	1.3	1.5	1.4	1.0	1.4	1.5	1.1	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0
Ωh^2	0.0039	0.0041	0.0049	0.0048	0.0043	0.0055	0.0050	0.0039	0.0030	0.0024	0.0032	0.0035
$M_{\tilde{\chi}_1^0}$ (GeV)	235	201	202	217	185	207	215	197	190	210	197	185
$M_{\tilde{\chi}_2^0}$ (GeV)	-282	-237	-232	-251	-215	-234	-247	-233	-234	-271	-240	-222
$M_{\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm}$ (GeV)	239	206	208	223	191	213	220	202	195	213	201	190
$M_{\tilde{\tau}_1^\pm}$ (GeV)	412	380	352	463	458	355	475	396	416	396	416	374
$M_{\tilde{e}_R, \tilde{\mu}_R}$ (GeV)	1074	1054	1076	1109	1155	1115	1113	1129	1133	1174	1162	1184
$M_{\tilde{t}_1}$ (GeV)	1737	1738	1710	1784	1727	1770	1833	1753	1829	1814	1903	1968
$M_{\tilde{g}}$ (GeV)	2254	2281	2306	2341	2372	2388	2397	2406	2428	2463	2500	2554
$M_{\tilde{u}_R}$ (GeV)	2522	2507	2537	2619	2658	2651	2655	2650	2660	2713	2739	2798
m_h (GeV)	123.3	123.3	123.6	124.0	124.6	124.0	123.6	124.2	123.4	124.3	123.1	123.0
M_{H^0} (GeV)	936	946	889	847	831	1014	1000	904	813	1010	962	904
$M_{32} (\times 10^{16} \text{ GeV})$	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0
$M_{\mathcal{F}} (\times 10^{17} \text{ GeV})$	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7
LSP Higgsino Composition	67%	80%	86%	82%	86%	89%	84%	79%	71%	52%	72%	79%

plied around the World Average top quark mass [85]. We only consider a positive Higgs bilinear mass term μ , and the strong coupling constant is fixed at $\alpha_S(M_Z) = 0.1184$, within the Particle Data Group 1σ variation [85]. The SUSY contribution to Δa_μ is calculated using GM2Calc 1.7.5 [86].

The computational results are constrained by filtering the data through current limits on pertinent beyond the Standard Model (BSM) experiments. A tolerance of 2σ is allowed around the branching ratio $\text{Br}(b \rightarrow s\gamma)$ of the b-quark decay [89] and branching ratio $\text{Br}(B_S^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ of the rare B-meson decay to a dimuon [90]. The WMAP 9-year [91] and 2015-18 Planck [92, 93] upper limit of about $\Omega h^2 \simeq 0.12$ is required, though no lower limit on the relic

density is applied. A lower bound on the proton decay rate $\tau_p(p \rightarrow e^+ \pi^0) \geq 1.7 \times 10^{34} \text{ yrs}$ [94] is also enforced. In summary, the points are filtered to ensure consistency with the following requirements:

$$\begin{aligned}
2.99 &\leq \text{Br}(b \rightarrow s\gamma) \leq 3.87 \times 10^{-4} \\
0.8 &\leq \text{Br}(B_S^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) \leq 6.2 \times 10^{-9} \\
0 &\leq \Omega h^2 \leq 0.12 \\
\tau_p(p \rightarrow e^+ \pi^0) &\geq 1.7 \times 10^{34} \text{ yrs} \\
123 &\leq m_h \leq 127 \text{ GeV}
\end{aligned}$$

A 2σ experimental uncertainty and reasonable theoretical uncertainty is permitted around the observed light




FIG. 1. Depiction of $\Delta a_\mu(\text{SUSY})$ as a function of the gluino mass $M(\tilde{g})$, distinguished by whether the spectra satisfy the BNL+FNAL 1σ or 2σ limits on Δa_μ . The points are also separated into groups regarding consistency with the LHC constraints on electroweakinos for those spectra with higgsino LSP, namely chargino production. The uncertainty on all $\Delta a_\mu(\text{SUSY})$ calculations is about $\pm 2.4 \times 10^{-10}$.




FIG. 2. Illustration of the $\mathcal{F}\text{-}SU(5)$ D-brane model points that can explain the BNL+FNAL 4.2σ discrepancy on Δa_μ evaluated against the ATLAS constraints on electroweakinos for those spectra with higgsino LSP. The points are superimposed upon the ATLAS exclusion curves of Ref. [87] that addresses electroweakino production in compressed spectra, namely, higgsino. The $SU(5)$ breaking effects drive the wino to small values, engendering some tension with the lower LHC bound on chargino masses. However, as this Figure exhibits, there remains a large region that handily satisfies this constraint.




FIG. 3. Depiction of the $\mathcal{F}\text{-}SU(5)$ D-brane model points that can explain the BNL+FNAL 4.2σ discrepancy on Δa_μ evaluated against the CMS constraints on electroweakinos for those spectra with higgsino LSP. The points are superimposed upon the CMS exclusion curves of Ref. [88] that addresses electroweakino production in compressed spectra, namely, higgsino. In this plot for clarity we only show those points that survive the ATLAS electroweakino constraint of Ref. [87], as displayed in FIG. 2. The CMS simplified model scenario applied is not an exact match for the $\mathcal{F}\text{-}SU(5)$ D-brane model space, but it is nonetheless instructive as to how our model measures against the latest chargino constraints.

Higgs boson mass of $m_h = 125.09$ GeV [95, 96], providing a range of $123 \leq m_h \leq 127$ GeV on the computed total m_h . The total light Higgs boson mass calculation includes the vector-like particle contribution, which couples through the vector-like multiplet Yukawa coupling. We assume a maximum coupling, implying the (XD, XD^c) Yukawa coupling is $Y_{XD} = 0$ and the (XU, XU^c) Yukawa coupling is $Y_{XU} = 1$, and furthermore, the trilinear coupling A -term is $A_{XD} = 0$ while the (XU, XU^c) A -term is $A_{XU} = A_U$ [55, 97]. These numerical values ensure a maximal coupling between the vector-like particles and light Higgs boson.

Given only an upper limit established on the abundance of the lightest neutralino $\tilde{\chi}_1^0$, multi-component dark matter is generally necessary. Therefore, we rescale the spin-independent cross-section σ_{SI} on nucleon-neutralino collisions as such:

$$\sigma_{SI}^{\text{rescaled}} = \sigma_{SI} \frac{\Omega h^2}{0.12} \quad (19)$$

The $SU(5)$ breaking effects drive the wino to near degeneracy with the lightest neutralino, generating higgsino LSPs. Compressed spectra with $M(\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm) - M(\tilde{\chi}_1^0) = 3 - 7$ GeV and $M(\tilde{\chi}_2^0) < 0$ are typical conditions identifying higgsino spectra, and indeed these are the char-




FIG. 4. Histogram binned by counts of the heavy SUSY Higgs mass $M(H^0)$. All 261,562 points that satisfy the LHC electroweakino constraints and reside within either the BNL+FNAL 1σ or 2σ limits on Δa_μ are counted in the bins. The bin width is 10 GeV. The peak lies in the [985, 995] bin, or $M(H^0) \simeq 1$ TeV.

acteristics of the \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$ D-brane points. Twelve sample benchmark points are presented in TABLE I, with the higgsino LSP composition percent shown. Given the small wino, the most stringent LHC constraints on the \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$ D-brane model are ATLAS electroweakino production searches for higgsino LSP [87]. The small wino though does provide ample contribution to $\Delta a_\mu(\text{SUSY})$ to explain the BNL+FNAL 4.2σ discrepancy. The D-brane model has a large region within both the 1σ and 2σ limits around the BNL+FNAL 25.1×10^{-10} central value. This is graphically illustrated in FIG. 1, where $\Delta a_\mu(\text{SUSY})$ is plot versus the gluino mass. The points are distinguished by satisfaction of the ATLAS light chargino constraint for those spectra with higgsino LSP [87]. The uncertainty on all Δa_μ calculations is about $\pm 2.4 \times 10^{-10}$. For the amount of M_5 and M_{1X} mixing in Eq. 18, $\Delta a_\mu(\text{SUSY})$ remains in the BNL+FNAL 1σ range up to $M(\tilde{g}) \approx 2.56$ TeV. It is clear in FIG. 1 that the current LHC Run 2 gluino constraint of $M(\tilde{g}) \gtrsim 2.25$ TeV [98–104] correlates to the current chargino constraint for higgsino LSP since the BNL+FNAL 1σ and 2σ points that satisfy the ATLAS chargino constraint show a coincident lower bound of $M(\tilde{g}) \simeq 2.25$ TeV.

To more accurately assess any tension with LHC electroweakino production constraints so that we can provide a frame of reference for our relatively small wino, we superimpose the D-brane model points of FIG. 1 onto the ATLAS electroweakino production summary plot for higgsino LSP [87], as displayed in FIG. 2, and also the CMS electroweakino production plot for higgsino LSP [88], as shown in FIG. 3. The points are likewise separated into

those that reside within either the BNL+FNAL 1σ or 2σ limits on Δa_μ . Given the compressed nature of the D-brane spectra, these higgsino simplified models appear to be the only search regions capable of probing the D-brane model space that resolves the BNL+FNAL 4.2σ discrepancy. In the CMS plot in FIG. 3, for clarity we show only those points that satisfy the ATLAS chargino constraint of FIG. 2. The CMS simplified model scenario applied in FIG. 3 is not a precise fit for the \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$ D-brane model space, but it does give a good summary as to how our model stands against the current chargino constraints. The CMS analysis of Ref. [88] also studies the higgsino model in the phenomenological MSSM (pMSSM), though constraints are given in terms of the wino mass as a function of μ and all points in our model are well beyond these exclusion limits due to the large μ term.

Other than the small wino, the only other class of measurements the D-brane model would seem to be experiencing tension with are the direct-detection spin-independent cross-sections, which we rescale for small Ωh^2 . However, given the difficulty with which higgsino LSPs can be detected, we are not alarmed by the larger $\sigma_{SI}^{\text{rescaled}} \sim 10^{-9}$ pb cross-section.

Recently, ATLAS and CMS have completed searches for heavy resonances that would include heavy Higgs bosons found in an extended Higgs sector. The ATLAS search [105] involves b-jet and τ -lepton final states, whereas the CMS search [106] focuses on b -quark pairs. All 261,562 points that pass the LHC chargino constraints on higgsino spectra and concurrently reside

within either the BNL+FNAL 1σ or 2σ limits on Δa_μ are binned in the histogram of FIG. 4, using 10 GeV bin widths. The histogram peak resides in the (985, 995] GeV bin, or $M(H^0) \simeq 1$ TeV.

CONCLUSIONS

The recent FNAL confirmation of the BNL discrepancy between the measured value of the anomalous magnetic moment of the muon $(g-2)_\mu$ and the Standard Model (SM) prediction presents a combined deviation of 4.2σ . Given the possible confirmation of a statistically significant 5σ discovery in forthcoming years, all natural GUT model candidates should be capable of elegantly explaining these experimental anomalies. Supersymmetry (SUSY) persists as one promising extension of the SM, hence we study in this work a merging of a realistic D-brane model with the supersymmetric GUT model flipped $SU(5)$ with extra TeV-scale string derived vector-like multiplets, referred to collectively as the \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$ D-brane model. Flipped $SU(5)$ has been shown to be both phenomenologically and cosmologically favorable, therefore, it is an ideal candidate to pursue whether it can indeed resolve the BNL+FNAL observed disparity with the SM calculations.

The supersymmetric GUT model \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$ produces a distinctive two-stage unification process. The primary unification occurs at the $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$ scale where $M_1 = M_2 = M_3$, then a secondary unification at the $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L$ scale. However, the large wino mass M_2 at $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$ due to the primary unification presents difficulties since a light wino at low-energy provides a large contribution to the muon $(g-2)_\mu$. This dilemma can be resolved when the three chiral multiplets in the $SU(5)$ adjoint representation acquire vevs around the scale $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L$, and then the gaugino masses for $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_{Y'}$ of $SU(5)$ can be split due to high-dimensional operators, leading to independent bino, wino, and gluino masses. These effects from $SU(5)$ breaking can drive the wino M_2 to small values at the electroweak scale, which in consequence generates a large contribution to the muon $(g-2)_\mu$.

A deep analysis of the parameter space uncovered a region in the model that can explain the BNL+FNAL muon $(g-2)_\mu$ measurements of $\Delta a_\mu = a_\mu(\text{Exp}) - a_\mu(\text{SM}) = 25.1 \pm 5.9 \times 10^{-10}$. Calculations show that the model can produce an anomalous magnetic moment as large as $\Delta a_\mu(\text{SUSY}) = 22.3 \times 10^{-10}$ for a gluino mass of $M(\tilde{g}) = 2281$ GeV, well within the 1σ uncertainty on the observed value. Moreover, we completed computations for gluino masses as large as $M(\tilde{g}) = 2560$ GeV, sufficient to ensure probing of the model space for several years to come at the LHC Run 2. We found that $\Delta a_\mu(\text{SUSY})$ can remain tucked just above the lower 1σ bound of $\Delta a_\mu(\text{SUSY}) \simeq 19.0 \times 10^{-10}$ all the way up to

the 2560 GeV gluino mass. The small M_2 does drive the chargino mass $M(\tilde{\chi}_1^\pm)$ to near degeneracy with the LSP mass $M(\tilde{\chi}_1^0)$ along with a small negative neutralino mass $M(\tilde{\chi}_2^0)$, generating higgsino dark matter. In addition to the favorable $\Delta a_\mu(\text{SUSY})$, these same points in the model space are consistent with the observed light Higgs boson mass and other rare decay branching ratios, and also all LHC constraints, particularly those on electroweakinos, given the small chargino. Lastly, in light of recent LHC searches for heavy Higgs bosons in an extended Higgs sector, for this same region that can explain the BNL+FNAL measurements, we examined the heavy SUSY Higgs by plotting all viable $(g-2)_\mu$ points in a histogram with 10 GeV bin widths and discovered that the histogram peak resides at $M(H^0) \simeq 1$ TeV.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Portions of this research were conducted with high performance computational resources provided by the Louisiana Optical Network Infrastructure (<http://www.loni.org>). This research was supported in part by the Projects 11475238, 11647601, and 11875062 supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (TL), by the Key Research Program of Frontier Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences (TL), and by the DOE grant DE-FG02-13ER42020 (DVN).

-
- [1] G. W. Bennett et al. (Muon $g-2$), “Final Report of the Muon E821 Anomalous Magnetic Moment Measurement at BNL,” *Phys. Rev.* **D73**, 072003 (2006), hep-ex/0602035.
 - [2] M. Davier, A. Hoecker, B. Malaescu, and Z. Zhang, “Reevaluation of the Hadronic Contributions to the Muon $g-2$ and to $\alpha(M_Z)$,” *Eur.Phys.J.* **C71**, 1515 (2011), 1010.4180.
 - [3] M. Davier, A. Hoecker, B. Malaescu, and Z. Zhang, “Reevaluation of the hadronic vacuum polarisation contributions to the Standard Model predictions of the muon $g-2$ and $\alpha(m_Z^2)$ using newest hadronic cross-section data,” *Eur. Phys. J.* **C77**, 827 (2017), 1706.09436.
 - [4] A. Keshavarzi, D. Nomura, and T. Teubner, “Muon $g-2$ and $\alpha(M_Z^2)$: a new data-based analysis,” *Phys. Rev.* **D97**, 114025 (2018), 1802.02995.
 - [5] G. Colangelo, M. Hoferichter, and P. Stoffer, “Two-pion contribution to hadronic vacuum polarization,” *JHEP* **02**, 006 (2019), 1810.00007.
 - [6] M. Hoferichter, B.-L. Hoid, and B. Kubis, “Three-pion contribution to hadronic vacuum polarization,” *JHEP* **08**, 137 (2019), 1907.01556.
 - [7] M. Davier, A. Hoecker, B. Malaescu, and Z. Zhang, “A new evaluation of the hadronic vacuum polarisation contributions to the muon anomalous magnetic moment and to $\alpha(m_Z^2)$,” *Eur. Phys. J.* **C80**, 241 (2020), [Erratum: *Eur. Phys. J.* **C80**, 410 (2020)], 1908.00921.

- [8] A. Keshavarzi, D. Nomura, and T. Teubner, “The $g - 2$ of charged leptons, $\alpha(M_Z^2)$ and the hyperfine splitting of muonium,” *Phys. Rev.* **D101**, 014029 (2020), 1911.00367.
- [9] A. Kurz, T. Liu, P. Marquard, and M. Steinhauser, “Hadronic contribution to the muon anomalous magnetic moment to next-to-next-to-leading order,” *Phys. Lett.* **B734**, 144 (2014), 1403.6400.
- [10] A. Gérardin, M. Cè, G. von Hippel, B. Hörz, H. B. Meyer, D. Mohler, K. Ottnad, J. Wilhelm, and H. Wittig, “The leading hadronic contribution to $(g - 2)_\mu$ from lattice QCD with $N_f = 2 + 1$ flavours of $O(a)$ improved Wilson quarks,” *Phys. Rev.* **D100**, 014510 (2019), 1904.03120.
- [11] C. Aubin, T. Blum, C. Tu, M. Golterman, C. Jung, and S. Peris, “Light quark vacuum polarization at the physical point and contribution to the muon $g - 2$,” *Phys. Rev.* **D101**, 014503 (2020), 1905.09307.
- [12] D. Giusti and S. Simula, “Lepton anomalous magnetic moments in Lattice QCD+QED,” *PoS LAT-TICE2019*, 104 (2019), 1910.03874.
- [13] K. Melnikov and A. Vainshtein, “Hadronic light-by-light scattering contribution to the muon anomalous magnetic moment revisited,” *Phys. Rev.* **D70**, 113006 (2004), hep-ph/0312226.
- [14] P. Masjuan and P. Sánchez-Puertas, “Pseudoscalar-pole contribution to the $(g_\mu - 2)$: a rational approach,” *Phys. Rev.* **D95**, 054026 (2017), 1701.05829.
- [15] G. Colangelo, M. Hoferichter, M. Procura, and P. Stoffer, “Dispersion relation for hadronic light-by-light scattering: two-pion contributions,” *JHEP* **04**, 161 (2017), 1702.07347.
- [16] M. Hoferichter, B.-L. Hoid, B. Kubis, S. Leupold, and S. P. Schneider, “Dispersion relation for hadronic light-by-light scattering: pion pole,” *JHEP* **10**, 141 (2018), 1808.04823.
- [17] A. Gérardin, H. B. Meyer, and A. Nyffeler, “Lattice calculation of the pion transition form factor with $N_f = 2 + 1$ Wilson quarks,” *Phys. Rev.* **D100**, 034520 (2019), 1903.09471.
- [18] J. Bijnens, N. Hermansson-Truedsson, and A. Rodríguez-Sánchez, “Short-distance constraints for the HLbL contribution to the muon anomalous magnetic moment,” *Phys. Lett.* **B798**, 134994 (2019), 1908.03331.
- [19] G. Colangelo, F. Hagelstein, M. Hoferichter, L. Laub, and P. Stoffer, “Longitudinal short-distance constraints for the hadronic light-by-light contribution to $(g - 2)_\mu$ with large- N_c Regge models,” *JHEP* **03**, 101 (2020), 1910.13432.
- [20] V. Pauk and M. Vanderhaeghen, “Single meson contributions to the muon’s anomalous magnetic moment,” *Eur. Phys. J.* **C74**, 3008 (2014), 1401.0832.
- [21] I. Danilkin and M. Vanderhaeghen, “Light-by-light scattering sum rules in light of new data,” *Phys. Rev.* **D95**, 014019 (2017), 1611.04646.
- [22] F. Jegerlehner, “The Anomalous Magnetic Moment of the Muon,” *Springer Tracts Mod. Phys.* **274**, 1 (2017).
- [23] M. Knecht, S. Narison, A. Rabemananjara, and D. Rabetiariyony, “Scalar meson contributions to a_μ from hadronic light-by-light scattering,” *Phys. Lett.* **B787**, 111 (2018), 1808.03848.
- [24] G. Eichmann, C. S. Fischer, and R. Williams, “Kaon-box contribution to the anomalous magnetic moment of the muon,” *Phys. Rev.* **D101**, 054015 (2020), 1910.06795.
- [25] P. Roig and P. Sánchez-Puertas, “Axial-vector exchange contribution to the hadronic light-by-light piece of the muon anomalous magnetic moment,” *Phys. Rev.* **D101**, 074019 (2020), 1910.02881.
- [26] T. Blum, N. Christ, M. Hayakawa, T. Izubuchi, L. Jin, C. Jung, and C. Lehner, “The hadronic light-by-light scattering contribution to the muon anomalous magnetic moment from lattice QCD,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 132002 (2020), 1911.08123.
- [27] G. Colangelo, M. Hoferichter, A. Nyffeler, M. Passera, and P. Stoffer, “Remarks on higher-order hadronic corrections to the muon $g - 2$,” *Phys. Lett.* **B735**, 90 (2014), 1403.7512.
- [28] T. Aoyama, M. Hayakawa, T. Kinoshita, and M. Nio, “Complete Tenth-Order QED Contribution to the Muon $g-2$,” *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **109**, 111808 (2012), 1205.5370.
- [29] T. Aoyama, T. Kinoshita, and M. Nio, “Theory of the Anomalous Magnetic Moment of the Electron,” *Atoms* **7**, 28 (2019).
- [30] A. Czarnecki, W. J. Marciano, and A. Vainshtein, “Refinements in electroweak contributions to the muon anomalous magnetic moment,” *Phys. Rev.* **D67**, 073006 (2003), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev.* **D73**, 119901 (2006)], hep-ph/0212229.
- [31] C. Gnendiger, D. Stöckinger, and H. Stöckinger-Kim, “The electroweak contributions to $(g - 2)_\mu$ after the Higgs boson mass measurement,” *Phys. Rev.* **D88**, 053005 (2013), 1306.5546.
- [32] B. Abi et al. (Muon $g-2$), “Measurement of the Positive Muon Anomalous Magnetic Moment to 0.46 ppm,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 141801 (2021), 2104.03281.
- [33] M. Berkooz, M. R. Douglas, and R. G. Leigh, “Branes intersecting at angles,” *Nucl.Phys.* **B480**, 265 (1996), hep-th/9606139.
- [34] M. Cvetič, G. Shiu, and A. M. Uranga, “Three family supersymmetric standard - like models from intersecting brane worlds,” *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **87**, 201801 (2001), hep-th/0107143.
- [35] M. Cvetič, G. Shiu, and A. M. Uranga, “Chiral four-dimensional $N=1$ supersymmetric type 2A orientifolds from intersecting D6 branes,” *Nucl.Phys.* **B615**, 3 (2001), hep-th/0107166.
- [36] R. Blumenhagen, B. Kors, D. Lust, and T. Ott, “The standard model from stable intersecting brane world orbifolds,” *Nucl.Phys.* **B616**, 3 (2001), hep-th/0107138.
- [37] L. E. Ibanez, F. Marchesano, and R. Rabadan, “Getting just the standard model at intersecting branes,” *JHEP* **0111**, 002 (2001), hep-th/0105155.
- [38] M. Cvetič, I. Papadimitriou, and G. Shiu, “Supersymmetric three family $SU(5)$ grand unified models from type IIA orientifolds with intersecting D6-branes,” *Nucl.Phys.* **B659**, 193 (2003), hep-th/0212177.
- [39] R. Blumenhagen, M. Cvetič, P. Langacker, and G. Shiu, “Toward realistic intersecting D-brane models,” *Ann.Rev.Nucl.Part.Sci.* **55**, 71 (2005), hep-th/0502005.
- [40] M. Cvetič, T. Li, and T. Liu, “Supersymmetric Pati-Salam models from intersecting D6-branes: A Road to the standard model,” *Nucl.Phys.* **B698**, 163 (2004), hep-th/0403061.

- [41] M. Cvetič, P. Langacker, T.-j. Li, and T. Liu, “D6-brane splitting on type IIA orientifolds,” Nucl.Phys. **B709**, 241 (2005), hep-th/0407178.
- [42] C.-M. Chen, T. Li, and D. V. Nanopoulos, “Standard-like model building on Type II orientifolds,” Nucl.Phys. **B732**, 224 (2006), hep-th/0509059.
- [43] C. M. Chen, G. V. Kraniotis, V. E. Mayes, D. V. Nanopoulos, and J. W. Walker, “A Supersymmetric flipped $SU(5)$ intersecting brane world,” Phys. Lett. **B611**, 156 (2005), hep-th/0501182.
- [44] C.-M. Chen, G. Kraniotis, V. Mayes, D. V. Nanopoulos, and J. Walker, “A K-theory anomaly free supersymmetric flipped $SU(5)$ model from intersecting branes,” Phys.Lett. **B625**, 96 (2005), hep-th/0507232.
- [45] C.-M. Chen, T. Li, V. Mayes, and D. V. Nanopoulos, “A Realistic world from intersecting D6-branes,” Phys. Lett. **B665**, 267 (2008), hep-th/0703280.
- [46] C.-M. Chen, T. Li, V. Mayes, and D. Nanopoulos, “Towards realistic supersymmetric spectra and Yukawa textures from intersecting branes,” Phys. Rev. **D77**, 125023 (2008), 0711.0396.
- [47] J. A. Maxin, V. E. Mayes, and D. V. Nanopoulos, “The Search for a Realistic String Model at LHC,” Phys. Rev. D **81**, 015008 (2010), 0908.0915.
- [48] T. Li, J. A. Maxin, D. V. Nanopoulos, and J. W. Walker, “Dark Matter, Proton Decay and Other Phenomenological Constraints in \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$,” Nucl. Phys. **B848**, 314 (2011), 1003.4186.
- [49] T. Li, J. A. Maxin, D. V. Nanopoulos, and J. W. Walker, “The Golden Point of No-Scale and No-Parameter \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$,” Phys. Rev. **D83**, 056015 (2011), 1007.5100.
- [50] T. Li, J. A. Maxin, D. V. Nanopoulos, and J. W. Walker, “The Golden Strip of Correlated Top Quark, Gaugino, and Vectorlike Mass In No-Scale, No-Parameter \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$,” Phys. Lett. **B699**, 164 (2011), 1009.2981.
- [51] T. Li, J. A. Maxin, D. V. Nanopoulos, and J. W. Walker, “The Ultrahigh jet multiplicity signal of stringy no-scale \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$ at the $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV LHC,” Phys.Rev. **D84**, 076003 (2011), 1103.4160.
- [52] T. Li, J. A. Maxin, D. V. Nanopoulos, and J. W. Walker, “The Unification of Dynamical Determination and Bare Minimal Phenomenological Constraints in No-Scale \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$,” Phys.Rev. **D85**, 056007 (2012), 1105.3988.
- [53] T. Li, J. A. Maxin, D. V. Nanopoulos, and J. W. Walker, “The Race for Supersymmetric Dark Matter at XENON100 and the LHC: Stringy Correlations from No-Scale \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$,” JHEP **1212**, 017 (2012), 1106.1165.
- [54] T. Li, J. A. Maxin, D. V. Nanopoulos, and J. W. Walker, “A Two-Tiered Correlation of Dark Matter with Missing Transverse Energy: Reconstructing the Lightest Supersymmetric Particle Mass at the LHC,” JHEP **02**, 129 (2012), 1107.2375.
- [55] T. Li, J. A. Maxin, D. V. Nanopoulos, and J. W. Walker, “A Higgs Mass Shift to 125 GeV and A Multi-Jet Supersymmetry Signal: Miracle of the Flippons at the $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV LHC,” Phys.Lett. **B710**, 207 (2012), 1112.3024.
- [56] T. Li, J. A. Maxin, D. V. Nanopoulos, and J. W. Walker, “No-Scale \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$ in the Light of LHC, Planck and XENON,” Jour.Phys. **G40**, 115002 (2013), 1305.1846.
- [57] T. Li, J. A. Maxin, D. V. Nanopoulos, and J. W. Walker, “Testing No-Scale Supergravity with the Fermi Space Telescope LAT,” J. Phys. **G41**, 055006 (2014), 1311.1164.
- [58] T. Li, J. A. Maxin, and D. V. Nanopoulos, “The return of the King: No-Scale \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$,” Phys. Lett. **B764**, 167 (2017), 1609.06294.
- [59] T. Ford, T. Li, J. A. Maxin, and D. V. Nanopoulos, “The heavy gluino in natural no-scale \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$,” Phys. Lett. B **799**, 135038 (2019), 1908.06149.
- [60] J. Ellis, M. A. G. Garcia, N. Nagata, D. V. Nanopoulos, and K. A. Olive, “Cosmology with a master coupling in flipped $SU(5) \times U(1)$: the λ_6 universe,” Phys. Lett. B **797**, 134864 (2019), 1906.08483.
- [61] J. Ellis, D. V. Nanopoulos, K. A. Olive, and S. Verner, “Unified No-Scale Attractors,” JCAP **09**, 040 (2019), 1906.10176.
- [62] J. Ellis, B. Nagaraj, D. V. Nanopoulos, K. A. Olive, and S. Verner, “From Minkowski to de Sitter in Multifield No-Scale Models,” JHEP **10**, 161 (2019), 1907.09123.
- [63] J. Ellis, M. A. G. Garcia, N. Nagata, D. V. Nanopoulos, and K. A. Olive, “Superstring-Inspired Particle Cosmology: Inflation, Neutrino Masses, Leptogenesis, Dark Matter & the SUSY Scale,” JCAP **01**, 035 (2020), 1910.11755.
- [64] J. Ellis, M. A. G. Garcia, N. Nagata, D. V. Nanopoulos, and K. A. Olive, “Proton Decay: Flipped vs Unflipped $SU(5)$,” JHEP **05**, 021 (2020), 2003.03285.
- [65] J. Ellis, D. V. Nanopoulos, K. A. Olive, and S. Verner, “Phenomenology and Cosmology of No-Scale Attractor Models of Inflation,” JCAP **08**, 037 (2020), 2004.00643.
- [66] J. Ellis, N. E. Mavromatos, and D. V. Nanopoulos, “Supercritical String Cosmology drains the Swampland,” Phys. Rev. D **102**, 046015 (2020), 2006.06430.
- [67] D. V. Nanopoulos, V. C. Spanos, and I. D. Stamou, “Primordial Black Holes from No-Scale Supergravity,” Phys. Rev. D **102**, 083536 (2020), 2008.01457.
- [68] J. Ellis, D. V. Nanopoulos, K. A. Olive, and S. Verner, “Non-Oscillatory No-Scale Inflation,” JCAP **03**, 052 (2021), 2008.09099.
- [69] I. Antoniadis, D. V. Nanopoulos, and J. Rizos, “Cosmology of the string derived flipped $SU(5)$,” JCAP **03**, 017 (2021), 2011.09396.
- [70] T. Leggett, T. Li, J. A. Maxin, D. V. Nanopoulos, and J. W. Walker, “Confronting Electroweak Fine-tuning with No-Scale Supergravity,” Phys.Lett. **B740**, 66 (2015), 1408.4459.
- [71] R. De Benedetti, C. Li, T. Li, A. Lux, J. A. Maxin, and D. V. Nanopoulos, “Inspiration from intersecting D-branes: general supersymmetry breaking soft terms in no-scale \mathcal{F} - $SU(5)$,” Eur. Phys. J. **C78**, 958 (2018), 1809.09695.
- [72] R. De Benedetti, T. Li, J. A. Maxin, and D. V. Nanopoulos, “Naturalness in D-brane inspired models,” JHEP **07**, 048 (2019), 1904.10809.
- [73] S. M. Barr, “A New Symmetry Breaking Pattern for $SO(10)$ and Proton Decay,” Phys. Lett. **B112**, 219 (1982).
- [74] J. P. Derendinger, J. E. Kim, and D. V. Nanopoulos, “Anti- $SU(5)$,” Phys. Lett. **B139**, 170 (1984).
- [75] I. Antoniadis, J. R. Ellis, J. S. Hagelin, and D. V. Nanopoulos, “Supersymmetric Flipped $SU(5)$ Revitalized,” Phys. Lett. **B194**, 231 (1987).
- [76] R. Harnik, D. T. Larson, H. Murayama, and M. Thormeier, “Probing the Planck scale with proton decay,” Nucl.Phys. **B706**, 372 (2005), hep-ph/0404260.

- [77] J. Jiang, T. Li, and D. V. Nanopoulos, “Testable Flipped $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$ Models,” Nucl. Phys. **B772**, 49 (2007), hep-ph/0610054.
- [78] J. Jiang, T. Li, D. V. Nanopoulos, and D. Xie, “F-SU(5),” Phys. Lett. **B677**, 322 (2009), 0811.2807.
- [79] J. Jiang, T. Li, D. V. Nanopoulos, and D. Xie, “Flipped $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$ Models from F-Theory,” Nucl. Phys. **B830**, 195 (2010), 0905.3394.
- [80] C.-M. Chen, T. Li, and D. V. Nanopoulos, “Flipped and unflipped SU(5) as type IIA flux vacua,” Nucl. Phys. **B751**, 260 (2006), hep-th/0604107.
- [81] T. Li and D. V. Nanopoulos, “Generalizing Minimal Supergravity,” Phys. Lett. **B692**, 121 (2010), 1002.4183.
- [82] C. Balazs, T. Li, D. V. Nanopoulos, and F. Wang, “Supersymmetry Breaking Scalar Masses and Trilinear Soft Terms in Generalized Minimal Supergravity,” JHEP **09**, 003 (2010), 1006.5559.
- [83] G. Belanger, F. Boudjema, A. Pukhov, and A. Semenov, “Dark matter direct detection rate in a generic model with micrOMEGAs2.1,” Comput. Phys. Commun. **180**, 747 (2009), 0803.2360.
- [84] A. Djouadi, J.-L. Kneur, and G. Moultaka, “SuSpect: A Fortran code for the supersymmetric and Higgs particle spectrum in the MSSM,” Comput. Phys. Commun. **176**, 426 (2007), hep-ph/0211331.
- [85] C. Patrignani et al. (Particle Data Group), “Review of Particle Physics,” Chin. Phys. **C40**, 100001 (2016).
- [86] P. Athron, M. Bach, H. G. Fargnoli, C. Gnendiger, R. Greifenhagen, J.-h. Park, S. Paßehr, D. Stöckinger, H. Stöckinger-Kim, and A. Voigt, “GM2Calc: Precise MSSM prediction for $(g - 2)$ of the muon,” Eur. Phys. J. C **76**, 62 (2016), 1510.08071.
- [87] G. Aad et al. (ATLAS), “Searches for electroweak production of supersymmetric particles with compressed mass spectra in $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV pp collisions with the ATLAS detector,” Phys. Rev. D **101**, 052005 (2020), 1911.12606.
- [88] “Search for physics beyond the standard model in final states with two or three soft leptons and missing transverse momentum in proton-proton collisions at 13 TeV,” (2021), CMS-PAS-SUS-18-004.
- [89] Y. Amhis et al. (Heavy Flavor Averaging Group), “Averages of B-Hadron, C-Hadron, and tau-lepton properties as of early 2012,” (2012), 1207.1158.
- [90] R. Aaij et al. (LHCb Collaboration), “First evidence for the decay $B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$,” (2012), 1211.2674.
- [91] G. Hinshaw et al. (WMAP), “Nine-Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Cosmological Parameter Results,” Astrophys. J. Suppl. **208**, 19 (2013), 1212.5226.
- [92] P. A. R. Ade et al. (Planck), “Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters,” Astron. Astrophys. **594**, A13 (2016), 1502.01589.
- [93] N. Aghanim et al. (Planck), “Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters,” (2018), 1807.06209.
- [94] V. Takhistov (Super-Kamiokande), in *Proceedings, 51st Rencontres de Moriond on Electroweak Interactions and Unified Theories: La Thuile, Italy, March 12-19, 2016* (2016), pp. 437–444, 1605.03235.
- [95] G. Aad et al. (ATLAS), “Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC,” Phys. Lett. **B716**, 1 (2012), 1207.7214.
- [96] S. Chatrchyan et al. (CMS), “Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV with the CMS experiment at the LHC,” Phys. Lett. **B716**, 30 (2012), 1207.7235.
- [97] Y. Huo, T. Li, D. V. Nanopoulos, and C. Tong, “The Lightest CP-Even Higgs Boson Mass in the Testable Flipped $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$ Models from F-Theory,” Phys. Rev. **D85**, 116002 (2012), 1109.2329.
- [98] “Search for supersymmetry in final states with missing transverse momentum and multiple b -jets in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector,” (2018), ATLAS-CONF-2018-041.
- [99] G. Aad et al. (ATLAS), “Search for new phenomena in final states with large jet multiplicities and missing transverse momentum using $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV proton-proton collisions recorded by ATLAS in Run 2 of the LHC,” JHEP **10**, 062 (2020), 2008.06032.
- [100] M. Aaboud et al. (ATLAS), “Search for supersymmetry in final states with two same-sign or three leptons and jets using 36 fb $^{-1}$ of $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV pp collision data with the ATLAS detector,” JHEP **09**, 084 (2017), [Erratum: JHEP 08, 121 (2019)], 1706.03731.
- [101] A. M. Sirunyan et al. (CMS), “Searches for physics beyond the standard model with the M_{T2} variable in hadronic final states with and without disappearing tracks in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” Eur. Phys. J. C **80**, 3 (2020), 1909.03460.
- [102] A. M. Sirunyan et al. (CMS), “Search for supersymmetry in proton-proton collisions at 13 TeV in final states with jets and missing transverse momentum,” JHEP **10**, 244 (2019), 1908.04722.
- [103] A. M. Sirunyan et al. (CMS), “Search for top squark production in fully-hadronic final states in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” (2021), 2103.01290.
- [104] A. M. Sirunyan et al. (CMS), “Search for supersymmetry in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with 137 fb $^{-1}$ in final states with a single lepton using the sum of masses of large-radius jets,” Phys. Rev. D **101**, 052010 (2020), 1911.07558.
- [105] “Search for resonant and non-resonant Higgs boson pair production in the $bb^- \tau^+ \tau^-$ decay channel using 13 TeV pp collision data from the ATLAS detector,” (2021), ATLAS-CONF-2021-030.
- [106] “Search for new particles in an extended Higgs sector in the four b quark final state at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” (2021), CMS PAS B2G-20-003.