Explaining B anomalies with Planck-safe Z'

Tom Steudtner
Technische Universität Dortmund
University of Sussex

based on 2109.06201
in collaboration with

Gudrun Hiller, Rigo Bause, Tim Höhne, Daniel Litim

Jahrestreffen der deutschen LHCb-Gruppen
TU Dortmund 08.10.2021

Various hints of new physics in b → sμμ decays

$$R_{K^{(*)}} = \frac{\int_{q^2_{\rm min}}^{q^2_{\rm max}} \frac{\mathrm{d}\mathcal{B}(B\to K^{(*)}\mu^+\mu^-)}{\mathrm{d}q^2}\mathrm{d}q^2}{\int_{q^2_{\rm min}}^{q^2_{\rm max}} \frac{\mathrm{d}\mathcal{B}(B\to K^{(*)}e^+e^-)}{\mathrm{d}q^2}\mathrm{d}q^2}$$

Obs.	Region of q^2 /	$\mathrm{Pull}_{\mathrm{SM}}$
R_{K^*}	$[0.045,\ 1.1]$	$2.5\,\sigma$
	$[1.1,\ 6.0]$	$2.5\,\sigma$
R_K	$[1.1,\ 6]$	$3.1\,\sigma$

[LHCb collaboration: 1705.05802, 2103.11769]

Various hints of new physics in b → sμμ decays

$$R_{K^{(*)}} = \frac{\int_{q^2_{\min}}^{q^2_{\max}} \frac{\mathrm{d}\mathcal{B}(B\to K^{(*)}\mu^+\mu^-)}{\mathrm{d}q^2}\mathrm{d}q^2}{\int_{q^2_{\min}}^{q^2_{\max}} \frac{\mathrm{d}\mathcal{B}(B\to K^{(*)}e^+e^-)}{\mathrm{d}q^2}\mathrm{d}q^2}$$

Obs.	Region of q^2 /	$\mathrm{Pull}_{\mathrm{SM}}$
R_{K^*}	$[0.045,\ 1.1]$	$2.5\,\sigma$
	$[1.1,\ 6.0]$	$2.5\,\sigma$
R_K	$[1.1,\ 6]$	$3.1\,\sigma$

[LHCb collaboration: 1705.05802, 2103.11769]

» described model-independent NP Wilson coefficients

[Bause, Gisbert, Golz, Hiller: 2109.01675]

$$C_9^\mu \sim (\bar{s}_L\gamma_\nu b_L)\,(\bar{\mu}\gamma^\nu\mu)$$

$$C_{10}^\mu \sim (\bar{s}_L\gamma_\nu b_L)\,(\bar{\mu}\gamma^\nu\gamma^5\mu)$$

Dim.	Fit	C_9^μ	C_{10}^μ	$\mathrm{Pull}_{\mathrm{SM}}$
1d	C_9^μ	-0.83 ± 0.14	0	$6.0\,\sigma$
1d	$C_{10}^\mu = -C_9^\mu$	-0.41 ± 0.07	$-C_9^\mu$	$6.0\,\sigma$
2d	$C_{9,10}^\mu$	-0.71 ± 0.17	0.20 ± 0.13	$5.9\,\sigma$

Various hints of new physics in b ⟶ sμμ decays

$$R_{K^{(*)}} = \frac{\int_{q^2_{\min}}^{q^2_{\max}} \frac{d\mathcal{B}(B\to K^{(*)}\mu^+\mu^-)}{dq^2} dq^2}{\int_{q^2_{\min}}^{q^2_{\max}} \frac{d\mathcal{B}(B\to K^{(*)}e^+e^-)}{dq^2} dq^2}$$

Obs.	Region of q^2 /	Pull_{SM}
R_{K^*}	$[0.045,\ 1.1]$	$2.5\,\sigma$
	$[1.1,\ 6.0]$	$2.5\,\sigma$
R_K	$[1.1,\ 6]$	$3.1\,\sigma$

[LHCb collaboration: 1705.05802, 2103.11769]

» described model-independent NP Wilson coefficients

[Bause, Gisbert, Golz, Hiller: 2109.01675]

$$C_9^\mu \sim (\bar{s}_L\gamma_\nu b_L)\,(\bar{\mu}\gamma^\nu\mu)$$

$$C_{10}^\mu \sim (\bar{s}_L\gamma_\nu b_L)\,(\bar{\mu}\gamma^\nu\gamma^5\mu)$$

Dim.	Fit	C_9^μ	C_{10}^μ	Pull_{SM}
1d	C_9^μ	-0.83 ± 0.14	0	$6.0\,\sigma$
1d	$C_{10}^\mu = -C_9^\mu$	-0.41 ± 0.07	$-C_9^\mu$	$6.0\,\sigma$
2d	$C_{9,10}^\mu$	-0.71 ± 0.17	0.20 ± 0.13	$5.9\,\sigma$

$$C_9^{\prime\mu} \sim (\bar{s}_R\gamma_\nu b_R)\,(\bar{\mu}\gamma^\nu\mu)$$

$$C_{10}^{\prime\mu} \sim (\bar{s}_R\gamma_\nu b_R)\,(\bar{\mu}\gamma^\nu\gamma^5\mu)$$

consistent with zero

[Bause, Gisbert, Golz, Hiller: 2109.01675]

$$C_9^\mu = -1.07\pm0.17 \qquad C_9^{\prime\mu} = 0.27\pm0.32$$

$$C_{10}^\mu = 0.18\pm0.15 \qquad C_{10}^{\prime\mu} = -0.28\pm0.19$$

can generate $R_{K^*} \neq R_K$

» How to generate the NP Wilson coefficients?

$$C_9^\mu \sim (\bar{s}_L \gamma_\nu b_L)(\bar{\mu}\gamma^\nu \mu) \qquad C_{10}^\mu \sim (\bar{s}_L \gamma_\nu b_L)\left(\bar{\mu}\gamma^\nu \gamma^5 \mu\right)$$

» How to generate the NP Wilson coefficients?

$$C_9^{\mu} \sim (\bar{s}_L \gamma_\nu b_L)(\bar{\mu}\gamma^\nu \mu) \qquad C_{10}^{\mu} \sim (\bar{s}_L \gamma_\nu b_L)\left(\bar{\mu}\gamma^\nu \gamma^5 \mu\right)$$

» Model building: Leptoquarks? *Z'* models? A mix thereof ? ...

» How to generate the NP Wilson coefficients?

$$C_9^\mu \sim (\bar{s}_L \gamma_\nu b_L)(\bar{\mu}\gamma^\nu \mu) \qquad C_{10}^\mu \sim (\bar{s}_L \gamma_\nu b_L)\left(\bar{\mu}\gamma^\nu \gamma^5 \mu\right)$$

» Model building: Leptoquarks? *Z'* models? A mix thereof ? ...

→ ~~light, leptophilic *Z'*~~

» How to generate the NP Wilson coefficients?

$$C_9^\mu \sim (\bar{s}_L \gamma_\nu b_L)\,(\bar{\mu}\gamma^\nu \mu) \qquad C_{10}^\mu \sim (\bar{s}_L \gamma_\nu b_L)\,(\bar{\mu}\gamma^\nu \gamma^5 \mu)$$

» Model building: Leptoquarks? *Z'* models? A mix thereof ? ...

→ ~~light, leptophilic *Z'*~~

→ heavy *Z'* , tree-level couplings to quarks



» How to generate the NP Wilson coefficients?

$$C_9^\mu \sim (\bar{s}_L \gamma_\nu b_L)(\bar{\mu}\gamma^\nu \mu) \qquad C_{10}^\mu \sim (\bar{s}_L \gamma_\nu b_L)\left(\bar{\mu}\gamma^\nu \gamma^5 \mu\right)$$

» Model building: Leptoquarks? *Z'* models? A mix thereof ? ...

→ ~~light, leptophilic *Z'*~~

→ heavy *Z'*, tree-level couplings to quarks



» consistent QFT: $U(1)'$ extension of SM gauge group

» fermions have **generation-dependent charges**



$$C^{\mu}_{9,10} \sim \frac{g^{bs}_L \left[g^{\mu\mu}_R \pm g^{\mu\mu}_L\right]}{M^2_{Z'}}$$

» Direct coupling to quarks: *Z'* is heavy

$M_{Z'} \gtrsim 5$ TeV first generation quarks [CMS collaboration: 2103.02708]



$$C^{\mu}_{9,10} \sim \frac{g^{bs}_L \left[g^{\mu\mu}_R \pm g^{\mu\mu}_L\right]}{M^2_{Z'}}$$

» Direct coupling to quarks: *Z'* is heavy

$M_{Z'} \gtrsim 5$ TeV first generation quarks [CMS collaboration: 2103.02708]

» Sizable *Z'* couplings required to account for $C^{\mu}_{9,10}$

$$g^{\mu\mu}_L = g_4\, F_{L_2} \qquad g^{\mu\mu}_R = g_4\, F_{E_2} \qquad g^{bs}_L = g_4\, V_{tb} V^{*}_{ts} \left(F_{Q_3} - F_{Q_2}\right)$$



$$C^{\mu}_{9,10} \sim \frac{g^{bs}_L \left[g^{\mu\mu}_R \pm g^{\mu\mu}_L\right]}{M^2_{Z'}}$$

» Direct coupling to quarks: *Z'* is **heavy**

$M_{Z'} \gtrsim 5$ TeV first generation quarks [CMS collaboration: 2103.02708]

» **Sizable *Z'* couplings** required to account for $C^{\mu}_{9,10}$

$$g^{\mu\mu}_L = g_4\, F_{L_2} \qquad g^{\mu\mu}_R = g_4\, F_{E_2} \qquad g^{bs}_L = g_4\, V_{tb} V^*_{ts} \left(F_{Q_3} - F_{Q_2}\right)$$

→ Landau poles of g_4 before the Planck scale

» e.g. *minimal* model

$$M_{Z'} \gtrsim 5 \text{ TeV}$$

left muon and b-quark have $U(1)'$ charge + gauge anomaly cancellation

Landau pole $\mu_L \lesssim 10^{10}$ TeV

» e.g. *minimal* model

$M_{Z'} \gtrsim 5$ TeV

left muon and b-quark have $U(1)'$ charge + gauge anomaly cancellation

Landau pole $\mu_L \lesssim 10^{10}$ TeV

» in practice:



Are all these theories excluded?

» e.g. *minimal* model

$M_{Z'} \gtrsim 5$ TeV

left muon and b-quark have $U(1)'$ charge + gauge anomaly cancellation

Landau pole $\mu_L \lesssim 10^{10}$ TeV

» in practice:



Are all these theories excluded?

Landau pole has to be (re)moved!

→ **Planck safety**

What is Planck Safety?

Between EW and Planck scale:

- no Landau poles, couplings remain finite
- parameters remain physical
- scalar potential is stable

What is Planck Safety?

Between EW and Planck scale:

- no Landau poles, couplings remain finite
- parameters remain physical
- scalar potential is stable

$\longrightarrow$ consistent, predictive until M_{Pl}

"Asymptotic Safety until the Planck scale"

$\longrightarrow$ provides additional theory constraints

How to achieve Planck Safety (in Practice)

» SM is **not** Planck-safe – Higgs metastability !

$\longrightarrow$ remove Landau poles and restore Higgs stability

How to achieve Planck Safety (in Practice)

» SM is **not** Planck-safe – Higgs metastability !

$\longrightarrow$ remove Landau poles and restore Higgs stability

» *template* BSM sector inspired by Asymptotic Safety [Litim, Sannino, JHEP 2014]

ψ_i — N_f vector-like fermions (charged) – "quark"

S_{ij} — $N_f \times N_f$ matrix-like scalars (uncharged) – "meson"

How to achieve Planck Safety (in Practice)

» SM is **not** Planck-safe – Higgs metastability !

$\longrightarrow$ remove Landau poles and restore Higgs stability

» *template* BSM sector inspired by Asymptotic Safety [Litim, Sannino, JHEP 2014]

ψ_i N_f vector-like fermions (charged) – “quark”

S_{ij} $N_f \times N_f$ matrix-like scalars (uncharged) – “meson”

» tame Landau poles by Yukawa interaction

$$-\mathcal{L}_y = y\,\left(\overline{\psi}_{Li}\, S_{ij}\, \psi_{Rj} + \text{h.c.}\right)$$

unbroken flavor symmetry

How to achieve Planck Safety (in Practice)

» SM is **not** Planck-safe – Higgs metastability !

$\longrightarrow$ remove Landau poles and restore Higgs stability

» *template* BSM sector inspired by Asymptotic Safety [Litim, Sannino, JHEP 2014]

ψ_i $\quad N_f$ vector-like fermions (charged) – "quark"

S_{ij} $\quad N_f \times N_f$ matrix-like scalars (uncharged) – "meson"

» tame Landau poles by Yukawa interaction

$$-\mathcal{L}_y = y\left(\overline{\psi}_{Li}\, S_{ij}\, \psi_{Rj} + \text{h.c.}\right)$$

unbroken flavor symmetry

$$\frac{d\alpha_4}{d\,\ln\mu} = +\,\#\,\alpha_4^2 + \#\,\alpha_4^3 - \#\,y^2 N_f^2\,\alpha_4^2$$

How to achieve Planck Safety (in Practice)

» SM is **not** Planck-safe – Higgs metastability !

$\longrightarrow$ remove Landau poles and restore Higgs stability

» *template* BSM sector inspired by Asymptotic Safety [Litim, Sannino, JHEP 2014]

ψ_i N_f vector-like fermions (charged) – “quark”

S_{ij} $N_f \times N_f$ matrix-like scalars (uncharged) – “meson”

» tame Landau poles by Yukawa interaction

$$-\mathcal{L}_y = y\left(\overline{\psi}_{Li}\, S_{ij}\, \psi_{Rj} + \text{h.c.}\right) \qquad \frac{d\alpha_4}{d\ \ln\mu} = +\#\,\alpha_4^2 + \#\,\alpha_4^3 - \#\,y^2 N_f^2\,\alpha_4^2$$

unbroken flavor symmetry

- $N_f,\, N_c \to \infty$ exact UV fixed point (asymptotic safety)
- $N_f = 3$, embed in gauge group $\longrightarrow$ potentially enables Planck safety

How to achieve Planck Safety (in Practice) II

» tame Landau poles by Yukawa interaction

$$-\mathcal{L}_y = y\,\left(\overline{\psi}_{Li}\,S_{ij}\,\psi_{Rj} + \text{h.c.}\right)$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_4}{\mathrm{d}\,\ln\mu} = +\,\#\,\alpha_4^2 + \#\,\alpha_4^3 - \#\,y^2 N_f^2\,\alpha_4^2$$

How to achieve Planck Safety (in Practice) II

» tame Landau poles by Yukawa interaction

$$-\mathcal{L}_y = y\,\left(\overline{\psi}_{Li}\, S_{ij}\, \psi_{Rj} + \text{h.c.}\right)$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_4}{\mathrm{d}\,\ln\mu} = +\,\#\,\alpha_4^2 + \#\,\alpha_4^3 - \#\,y^2 N_f^2\,\alpha_4^2$$

» stabilize Higgs potential by scalar portals, sometimes additional Yukawas

$$\sim \delta\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[S^\dagger S\right]\,(H^\dagger H)$$

How to achieve Planck Safety (in Practice) II

» tame Landau poles by Yukawa interaction

$$-\mathcal{L}_y = y\,\left(\overline{\psi}_{Li}\, S_{ij}\, \psi_{Rj} + \text{h.c.}\right) \qquad \frac{\mathrm{d}\alpha_4}{\mathrm{d}\,\ln\mu} = + \#\,\alpha_4^2 + \#\,\alpha_4^3 - \#\,y^2 N_f^2\,\alpha_4^2$$

» stabilize Higgs potential by scalar portals, sometimes additional Yukawas

$$\sim \delta\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[S^\dagger S\right]\,(H^\dagger H)$$

» enhances physics predictivity:

$\longrightarrow$ previous work with BSM vector-like leptons [Hiller, Hormigos-Feliu, Litim, TS: Phys.Rev.D 102 (2020) 9]

$\longrightarrow$ simultaneous explanation for $(g-2)_{\mu,e}$ [Hiller, Hormigos-Feliu, Litim, TS: Phys.Rev.D 102 (2020) 7]

Putting it all together

» extended gauge group $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)'$

» SM matter fields Q_i, U_i, D_i, L_i, E_i and Higgs H

Putting it all together

- » extended gauge group $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)'$
- » SM matter fields $Q_i,\, U_i,\, D_i,\, L_i,\, E_i$ and Higgs H
- » for models with $C_{10}^{\mu} \neq 0$: right-handed neutrinos ν_i

Putting it all together

- » extended gauge group $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)'$
- » SM matter fields $Q_i,\, U_i,\, D_i,\, L_i,\, E_i$ and Higgs H
- » for models with $C_{10}^{\mu} \neq 0$: right-handed neutrinos ν_i
- » $U(1)'$ breaking, charged scalar ϕ

Putting it all together

- » extended gauge group $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)'$
- » SM matter fields $Q_i,\ U_i,\ D_i,\ L_i,\ E_i$ and Higgs H
- » for models with $C_{10}^{\mu} \neq 0$: right-handed neutrinos ν_i
- » $U(1)'$ breaking, charged scalar ϕ
- » Planck-Safety sector:
  - vector-like BSM fermion ψ_i
  - uncharged 3 x 3 BSM scalar S_{ij}
- » scalar portals between $H,\ \phi,\ S_{ij}$

Assigning *U(1)'* charges

» choice:

- BSM fermion ψ_i is SM singlet, but $U(1)'$ charged (invisible!)

Assigning *U(1)’* charges

» choice:

- BSM fermion ψ_i is SM singlet, but $U(1)'$ charged (invisible!)
- Higgs is uncharged under $U(1)'$ $\longrightarrow$ no interference with EWSB

Assigning *U(1)'* charges

- choice:
  - BSM fermion ψ_i is SM singlet, but $U(1)'$ charged (invisible!)
  - Higgs is uncharged under $U(1)'$ $\longrightarrow$ no interference with EWSB
- 6 gauge anomaly cancellation conditions for $U(1)'$

Assigning *U(1)'* charges

» choice:

- BSM fermion ψ_i is SM singlet, but $U(1)'$ charged (invisible!)
- Higgs is uncharged under $U(1)'$ $\longrightarrow$ no interference with EWSB

» 6 gauge anomaly cancellation conditions for $U(1)'$

» condition for each component of SM Yukawa matrices

- diagonal quark Yukawas Y^u_{ii}, Y^d_{ii} compatible with $U(1)'$
- lepton and off-diagonal CKM elements are small breaking
  $\longrightarrow$ some models allow diagonal lepton and RHN Yukawas Y^e_{ii}, Y^ν_{ii}

Assigning *U(1)’* charges

» choice:

- BSM fermion ψ_i is SM singlet, but $U(1)'$ charged (invisible!)
- Higgs is uncharged under $U(1)'$ $\longrightarrow$ no interference with EWSB

» 6 gauge anomaly cancellation conditions for $U(1)'$

» condition for each component of SM Yukawa matrices

- diagonal quark Yukawas Y^u_{ii}, Y^d_{ii} compatible with $U(1)'$
- lepton and off-diagonal CKM elements are small breaking

  $\longrightarrow$ some models allow diagonal lepton and RHN Yukawas Y^e_{ii}, Y^ν_{ii}

» choose CKM rotation in down-sector only

  $\longrightarrow$ no FCNCs for up-type quarks

Assigning *U(1)'* charges

» choice:

- BSM fermion ψ_i is SM singlet, but $U(1)'$ charged (invisible!)
- Higgs is uncharged under $U(1)'$ $\longrightarrow$ no interference with EWSB

» 6 gauge anomaly cancellation conditions for $U(1)'$

» condition for each component of SM Yukawa matrices

- diagonal quark Yukawas Y^u_{ii}, Y^d_{ii} compatible with $U(1)'$
- lepton and off-diagonal CKM elements are small breaking

  $\longrightarrow$ some models allow diagonal lepton and RHN Yukawas Y^e_{ii}, Y^ν_{ii}

» choose CKM rotation in down-sector only

  $\longrightarrow$ no FCNCs for up-type quarks

» small gauge-kinetic at the electroweak scale mixing between $U(1)_Y \times U(1)'$

U(1)' charges and benchmark models

Model	F_{Q_i}			F_{U_i}			F_{D_i}			F_{L_i}			F_{E_i}			F_{ν_i}			F_H	F_ψ	F_ϕ
$\mathbf{BM_1}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	0	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$	0	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$	0	0	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{5}$
$\mathbf{BM_2}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	0	1	0	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{12}$	$-\frac{1}{12}$	1	0	$\frac{11}{12}$	$\frac{1}{9}$
$\mathbf{BM_3}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	1	$\frac{1}{8}$
$\mathbf{BM_4}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	1	$\frac{1}{6}$

» pass 6 gauge anomaly cancellation conditions

» allow at least diagonal quark Yukawas

U(1)' charges and benchmark models

Model	F_{Q_i}			F_{U_i}			F_{D_i}			F_{L_i}			F_{E_i}			F_{ν_i}			F_H	F_ψ	F_ϕ
BM₁	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	0	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$	0	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$	0	0	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{5}$
BM₂	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	0	1	0	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{12}$	$-\frac{1}{12}$	1	0	$\frac{11}{12}$	$\frac{1}{9}$
BM₃	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	1	$\frac{1}{8}$
BM₄	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	1	$\frac{1}{6}$

» pass 6 gauge anomaly cancellation conditions

» allow at least diagonal quark Yukawas

» no *Z'* – electron couplings

U(1)' charges and benchmark models

Model	F_{Q_i}			F_{U_i}			F_{D_i}			F_{L_i}			F_{E_i}			F_{ν_i}			F_H	F_ψ	F_ϕ
BM₁	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	0	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$	0	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$	0	0	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{5}$
BM₂	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	0	1	0	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{12}$	$-\frac{1}{12}$	1	0	$\frac{11}{12}$	$\frac{1}{9}$
BM₃	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	1	$\frac{1}{8}$
BM₄	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	1	$\frac{1}{6}$

» pass 6 gauge anomaly cancellation conditions

» allow at least diagonal quark Yukawas

» no Z' – electron couplings

» no Kaon mixing

U(1)' charges and benchmark models

Model	F_{Q_i}			F_{U_i}			F_{D_i}			F_{L_i}			F_{E_i}			F_{ν_i}			F_H	F_ψ	F_ϕ
BM₁	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	0	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$	0	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$	0	0	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{5}$
BM₂	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	0	1	0	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{12}$	$-\frac{1}{12}$	1	0	$\frac{11}{12}$	$\frac{1}{9}$
BM₃	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	1	$\frac{1}{8}$
BM₄	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	1	$\frac{1}{6}$

» pass 6 gauge anomaly cancellation conditions

» allow at least diagonal quark Yukawas

» no *Z'* – electron couplings

» no Kaon mixing

» B_s mixing bound

U(1)' charges and benchmark models

Model	F_{Q_i}			F_{U_i}			F_{D_i}			F_{L_i}			F_{E_i}			F_{ν_i}			F_H	F_ψ	F_ϕ
BM₁	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	0	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$	0	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$	0	0	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{5}$
BM₂	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	0	1	0	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{12}$	$-\frac{1}{12}$	1	0	$\frac{11}{12}$	$\frac{1}{9}$
BM₃	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	1	$\frac{1}{8}$
BM₄	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	1	$\frac{1}{6}$

» pass 6 gauge anomaly cancellation conditions

» allow at least diagonal quark Yukawas

» no *Z'* – electron couplings

» no Kaon mixing

» B_s mixing bound

» tame Landau pole

U(1)’ charges and benchmark models

Model	F_{Q_i}			F_{U_i}			F_{D_i}			F_{L_i}			F_{E_i}			F_{ν_i}			F_H	F_ψ	F_ϕ
BM_1	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	0	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$	0	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$	0	0	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{5}$
BM_2	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	0	1	0	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{12}$	$-\frac{1}{12}$	1	0	$\frac{11}{12}$	$\frac{1}{9}$
BM_3	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	1	$\frac{1}{8}$
BM_4	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	1	$\frac{1}{6}$

» pass 6 gauge anomaly cancellation conditions

» allow at least diagonal quark Yukawas

» no *Z’* – electron couplings

» no Kaon mixing

» B_s mixing bound

» tame Landau pole

» *U(1)’* breaking, no additional Yukawas

U(1)' charges and benchmark models

Model	F_{Q_i}			F_{U_i}			F_{D_i}			F_{L_i}			F_{E_i}			F_{ν_i}			F_H	F_ψ	F_ϕ
BM₁	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	0	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$	0	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$	0	0	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{5}$
BM₂	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	0	1	0	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{12}$	$-\frac{1}{12}$	1	0	$\frac{11}{12}$	$\frac{1}{9}$
BM₃	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	1	$\frac{1}{8}$
BM₄	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	1	$\frac{1}{6}$

- » pass 6 gauge anomaly cancellation conditions
- » allow at least diagonal quark Yukawas
- » no *Z'* – electron couplings
- » no Kaon mixing
- » B_s mixing bound
- » tame Landau pole
- » *U(1)'* breaking, no additional Yukawas
- » EWSB without *U(1)'* sector

U(1)’ charges and benchmark models

Model	F_{Q_i}			F_{U_i}			F_{D_i}			F_{L_i}			F_{E_i}			F_{ν_i}			F_H	F_ψ	F_ϕ
BM$_1$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	0	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$	0	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$	0	0	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{5}$
BM$_2$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	0	1	0	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{12}$	$-\frac{1}{12}$	1	0	$\frac{11}{12}$	$\frac{1}{9}$
BM$_3$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	1	$\frac{1}{8}$
BM$_4$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	1	$\frac{1}{6}$

» pass 6 gauge anomaly cancellation conditions

» allow at least diagonal quark Yukawas

» no *Z’* – electron couplings

» no Kaon mixing

» B_s mixing bound

» tame Landau pole

» *U(1)’* breaking, no additional Yukawas

» EWSB without *U(1)’* sector

$C_9^\mu \neq 0,\ C_{10}^\mu = 0$ → **BM$_1$**, **BM$_4$**

$C_9^\mu = -C_{10}^\mu$ → **BM$_2$**

$C_{9,10}^\mu \neq 0$ → **BM$_3$**

U(1)' charges and benchmark models

Model	F_{Q_i}			F_{U_i}			F_{D_i}			F_{L_i}			F_{E_i}			F_{ν_i}			F_H	F_ψ	F_ϕ
BM₁	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{20}$	$-\frac{1}{10}$	0	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$	0	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{9}{10}$	0	0	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{5}$
BM₂	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	0	1	0	0	0	1	$\frac{1}{12}$	$-\frac{1}{12}$	1	0	$\frac{11}{12}$	$\frac{1}{9}$
BM₃	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	1	$\frac{1}{8}$
BM₄	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	0	$\frac{1}{9}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	0	1	$\frac{1}{6}$

» pass 6 gauge anomaly cancellation conditions
» allow at least diagonal quark Yukawas
» no *Z'* – electron couplings
» no Kaon mixing
» B_s mixing bound
» tame Landau pole
» *U(1)'* breaking, no additional Yukawas
» EWSB without *U(1)'* sector

$C_9^\mu \neq 0,\ C_{10}^\mu = 0$ → **BM₁** no right-handed neutrinos
→ **BM₄** lighter *Z'*

$C_9^\mu = -C_{10}^\mu$ → **BM₂**

$C_{9,10}^\mu \neq 0$ → **BM₃**



[Bause, Gisbert, Golz, Hiller: 2109.01675]

How to check for Planck-Safety

How to check for Planck-Safety





How to check for Planck-Safety





How to check for Planck-Safety



RG running



1
10^{-1}
10^{-2}
10^{-3}
10^{-4}
10^5
10^7
10^9
10^{11}
10^{13}
10^{15}
10^{17}
10^{19}
μ/GeV
α_y
α_4
$\alpha_{\tilde{\delta}}$
α_u
α_λ
α_s
α_ν
α_t
$|\alpha_w|$
α_3
η
α_2
α_1
$|\alpha_\delta|$

RG running



no Landau pole
α_y
α_4
$\alpha_{\tilde{\delta}}$
α_u
α_λ
α_s
α_v
α_t
$|\alpha_w|$
α_3
η
α_2
α_1
$|\alpha_\delta|$
1
10^{-1}
10^{-2}
10^{-3}
10^{-4}
10^5 10^7 10^9 10^{11} 10^{13} 10^{15} 10^{17} 10^{19}
μ/GeV

RG running



walking regime
no Landau pole
α_y
α_4
$\alpha_{\tilde{\delta}}$
α_u
α_λ
α_s
α_v
α_t
$|\alpha_w|$
η
α_3
α_2
α_1
$|\alpha_\delta|$
1
10^{-1}
10^{-2}
10^{-3}
10^{-4}
10^5
10^7
10^9
10^{11}
10^{13}
10^{15}
10^{17}
10^{19}
μ/GeV

RG running


walking regime
no Landau pole
BSM Yukawa brakes Landau pole
α_y
α_4
$\alpha_{\tilde{\delta}}$
α_u
α_λ
α_s
α_v
α_t
$|\alpha_w|$
η
α_3
α_2
α_1
$|\alpha_\delta|$
1
10^{-1}
10^{-2}
10^{-3}
10^{-4}
10^5
10^7
10^9
10^{11}
10^{13}
10^{15}
10^{17}
10^{19}
μ/GeV

RG running

walking regime



BSM Yukawa brakes Landau pole

scalar portal coupling stabilizes

Higgs potential is stable

RG running



BSM Yukawa brakes Landau pole

scalar portal coupling stabilizes

Higgs potential is stable

SM gauge couplings not trapped

BSM critical surface





$$-\mathcal{L}_y = y\left(\overline{\psi}_{Li}\, S_{ij}\, \psi_{Rj} + \text{h.c.}\right)$$

$$-\mathcal{L}_{\text{portal}} = \delta\, \text{Tr}\left[S^\dagger S\right](H^\dagger H) + \tilde{\delta}\,(\phi^\dagger\phi)(H^\dagger H)$$

BSM critical surface





$$-\mathcal{L}_y = y\left(\overline{\psi}_{Li}\, S_{ij}\, \psi_{Rj} + \text{h.c.}\right)$$

$$-\mathcal{L}_{\text{portal}} = \delta\, \text{Tr}\left[S^\dagger S\right](H^\dagger H) + \tilde\delta\,(\phi^\dagger\phi)(H^\dagger H)$$

$$\alpha_y(\mu_0) \gtrsim 10^{-1.25} \ldots 10^{-1}$$

bounds on α_δ, $\alpha_{\tilde\delta}$ vary among BMs

Phenomenology

» broad decay of Z' to invisibles $Z' \to \bar{\psi}\psi,\ \bar{\nu}\nu$ with 65 .. 85% BR

Model	jets	b	t	e	μ	τ	$\nu_{e,\mu,\tau}$	h	$\psi_{1,2,3}$	ϕ
$\mathbf{BM_1}$	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	15	15	15	0	54	0.2
$\mathbf{BM_2}$	14	1.5	1.5	0	9	9	18	0	46	0.1
$\mathbf{BM_3}$	5	0	0	0	4	4	8	0	79	0.1
$\mathbf{BM_4}$	0	0.9	0.9	0	3	11	14	0	72	0.2

Phenomenology

» broad decay of Z' to invisibles $Z' \to \bar{\psi}\psi,\, \bar{\nu}\nu$ with 65 .. 85% BR

Model	jets	b	t	e	μ	τ	$\nu_{e,\mu,\tau}$	h	$\psi_{1,2,3}$	ϕ
$\mathbf{BM_1}$	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	15	15	15	0	54	0.2
$\mathbf{BM_2}$	14	1.5	1.5	0	9	9	18	0	46	0.1
$\mathbf{BM_3}$	5	0	0	0	4	4	8	0	79	0.1
$\mathbf{BM_4}$	0	0.9	0.9	0	3	11	14	0	72	0.2

» can be probed & models distinguished at μμ collider:

$$\sigma(\mu^+\mu^- \to Z' \to \bar{\psi}\psi, \bar{\nu}\nu) \approx (10^2..10^3)\, \sigma(\mu^+\mu^- \to Z \to \bar{\nu}\nu)^{\rm SM}$$

Phenomenology

» broad decay of Z' to invisibles $Z' \to \bar{\psi}\psi,\, \bar{\nu}\nu$ with 65 .. 85% BR

Model	jets	b	t	e	μ	τ	$\nu_{e,\mu,\tau}$	h	$\psi_{1,2,3}$	ϕ
$\mathbf{BM_1}$	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	15	15	15	0	54	0.2
$\mathbf{BM_2}$	14	1.5	1.5	0	9	9	18	0	46	0.1
$\mathbf{BM_3}$	5	0	0	0	4	4	8	0	79	0.1
$\mathbf{BM_4}$	0	0.9	0.9	0	3	11	14	0	72	0.2

» can be probed & models distinguished at μμ collider:

$$\sigma(\mu^+\mu^- \to Z' \to \bar{\psi}\psi, \bar{\nu}\nu) \approx (10^2..10^3)\, \sigma(\mu^+\mu^- \to Z \to \bar{\nu}\nu)^{\rm SM}$$

» only mildly enhanced $B \to K^{(*)}\bar{\nu}\nu$, consistent with SM expectation

Phenomenology

» broad decay of Z’ to invisibles $Z' \to \bar{\psi}\psi,\, \bar{\nu}\nu$ with 65 .. 85% BR

Model	jets	b	t	e	μ	τ	$\nu_{e,\mu,\tau}$	h	$\psi_{1,2,3}$	ϕ
$\mathbf{BM_1}$	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	15	15	15	0	54	0.2
$\mathbf{BM_2}$	14	1.5	1.5	0	9	9	18	0	46	0.1
$\mathbf{BM_3}$	5	0	0	0	4	4	8	0	79	0.1
$\mathbf{BM_4}$	0	0.9	0.9	0	3	11	14	0	72	0.2

» can be probed & models distinguished at μμ collider:

$$\sigma(\mu^+\mu^- \to Z' \to \bar{\psi}\psi, \bar{\nu}\nu) \approx (10^2..10^3)\,\sigma(\mu^+\mu^- \to Z \to \bar{\nu}\nu)^{\mathrm{SM}}$$

» only mildly enhanced $B \to K^{(*)}\bar{\nu}\nu$, consistent with SM expectation

» benchmarks are consistent with LHC search [CMS collaboration: 2103.02708]

Summary

Model	μ_0	$\alpha_4(\mu_0)$	C_9^μ	C_{10}^μ	$Y_{ii}^{u,d}$	Y_{ii}^e	Y_{ii}^ν	r_{B_s}	$\mathcal{B}(Z' \to \text{inv.})$	ν_R
$\mathbf{BM_1}$	5 TeV	$1.87 \cdot 10^{-2}$	-0.83	0	✓	✓	X	0.35	73%	X
$\mathbf{BM_2}$	5 TeV	$5.97 \cdot 10^{-3}$	-0.41	$-C_9^\mu$	✓	X	X	0.86	64%	✓
$\mathbf{BM_3}$	5 TeV	$4.60 \cdot 10^{-2}$	-0.71	$+0.24$	✓	X	X	0.60	87%	✓
$\mathbf{BM_4}$	3 TeV	$2.46 \cdot 10^{-2}$	-0.83	0	✓	✓	✓	0.70	86%	✓

Summary

Model	μ_0	$\alpha_4(\mu_0)$	C_9^μ	C_{10}^μ	$Y_{ii}^{u,d}$	Y_{ii}^e	Y_{ii}^ν	r_{B_s}	$\mathcal{B}(Z' \to \text{inv.})$	ν_R
$\mathbf{BM_1}$	5 TeV	$1.87 \cdot 10^{-2}$	-0.83	0	✓	✓	X	0.35	73%	X
$\mathbf{BM_2}$	5 TeV	$5.97 \cdot 10^{-3}$	-0.41	$-C_9^\mu$	✓	X	X	0.86	64%	✓
$\mathbf{BM_3}$	5 TeV	$4.60 \cdot 10^{-2}$	-0.71	$+0.24$	✓	X	X	0.60	87%	✓
$\mathbf{BM_4}$	3 TeV	$2.46 \cdot 10^{-2}$	-0.83	0	✓	✓	✓	0.70	86%	✓

heavy Z' models that

» explain B-anomalies in several interesting NP scenarios

» compliant with anomaly cancellation, quark Yukawas, precision measurements

» are predictive until M_{Pl} $\longrightarrow$ no Landau poles

» stabilize the Higgs potential

» can be probed at colliders

» decay mostly to invisibles