Nucleon decay via dimension-6 operators in anomalous $U(1)_A$ SUSY GUT models and $E_6 \times SU(2)_F$ SUSY GUT model

PASCOS 2013 @ NTU

based on arXiv:1307.7529 [hep-ph] and more Yu Muramatsu(Nagoya university) Collaborator: Nobuhiro Maekawa(Nagoya univesity, KMI

1. Introduction and previous work 2. $E_6 \times SU(2)_F$ Model

Grand Unified Theory

many advantages and several realistic models How do we identify models as "the" grand unified theory?

Model identification $\Lambda_{GUT} = 10^{12-16} GeV \gg \Lambda_{LHC} = 10^{3-4} GeV$

It is hard to identify models by accelerator.

In this work, we try GUT model identification by "the nucleon decay" (arXiv:1307.7529 [hep-ph]).

- phenomenon from GUT(bSM)
- expected to be observed in the near future



Anomalous $U(1)_A$ SUSY GUT

constructed under "natural assumptions"

- consider all operators which are allowed by symmetries
 - consider effects of all higher-order operators
 - operators' coefficients are order 1

Anomalous $U(1)_A$ SUSY GUT models realize many features.

- doublet-triplet splitting
- gauge coupling unification
- realistic quark and lepton masses and mixings etc.
- Nucleon decay is one of the most interesting predictions. via dimension-6 operators via dimension-5 operators

enhanced

Cabibbo angle $\Lambda_A \sim \lambda^{-a} \Lambda_{SUSY \ GUT} < \Lambda_{SUSY \ GUT}$ GUT scale in anomalous $U(1)_A$ SUSY GUT models $\Lambda_A \sim \lambda^{0.5} \Lambda_{SUSY \ GUT} = 10^{16}$ GeV

The nucleon decay via dimension-6 operators is significant. Natural realization of doublettriplet splitting suppresses the nucleon decay via dimension-5 operators.

We study the nucleon decay via dimension-6 operators. 4/16

Diagonalizing Matrix

 $\psi_{Li}Y_{ij}\psi_{Rj}^{c} = (L_{\psi}^{\dagger}\psi_{L})_{i}(L_{\psi}^{T}YR_{\psi})_{ij}(R_{\psi}^{\dagger}\psi_{R}^{c})_{j}$ $= \psi_{Li}'Y_{diag\,ij}\psi_{Rj}'^{c}$ $L_{\psi}, R_{\psi} : \text{diagonalizing matrix}$

In the Standard Model (weak interaction) $U_{CKM} = L_{\nu}^{\dagger}L_d, \ U_{MNS} = L_{\nu}^{\dagger}L_e$ In nucleon decay operators (X type gauge int.) Diagonalizing matrices appear directly. **Experimentally**, We cannot measure diagonalizing matrices directly.

Theoretically, For example in the minimal SU(5) GUT model, Yukawa matrices have few degrees of freedom. Diagonalizing matrices are strongly restricted. But, $Y_d = Y_e^T$ To realize realistic quark and lepton masses and mixings, we introduce additional interactions. additional degrees of freedom Diagonalizing matrices have uncertainties.

In the previous work (arXiv:1307.7529 [hep-ph]), we try to identify GUT models by nucleon decay.

two important ratios

$$R_1 \equiv \frac{\Gamma_{n \to \pi^0 + \nu^c}}{\Gamma_{p \to \pi^0 + e^c}}$$

To identify grand unification group

$$R_2 \equiv \frac{\Gamma_{p \to K^0 + \mu^c}}{\Gamma_{p \to \pi^0 + e^c}}$$

To identify Yukawa structure





8/16

1. Introduction and previous work 2. $E_6 \times SU(2)_F$ Model

$E_6 \times SU(2)_F$ Model

Yukawa structure at GUT scale is restricted.

27 dimensional representation for matter : Ψ $\Psi_a(a = 1,2)$: $SU(2)_F$ doublet for first- and second-generation matters Ψ_3 : $SU(2)_F$ singlet for third-generation matters

Features

- Realize realistic quark and lepton masses and mixings within restricted Yukawa structure
- Solve SUSY CP problem (Chromo-EDM constraint) by spontaneous CP violation mechanism
- Suppress Flavor Changing Neutral Current processes

in previous work

$$\begin{split} Y_{u} &= \begin{pmatrix} y_{u11}\lambda^{6} & y_{u12}\lambda^{5} & y_{u13}\lambda^{3} \\ y_{u21}\lambda^{5} & y_{u22}\lambda^{4} & y_{u23}\lambda^{2} \\ y_{u31}\lambda^{3} & y_{u32}\lambda^{2} & y_{u33} \end{pmatrix} \\ Y_{d} &= \begin{pmatrix} y_{d11}\lambda^{6} & y_{d12}\lambda^{5.5} & y_{d13}\lambda^{5} \\ y_{d21}\lambda^{5} & y_{d22}\lambda^{4.5} & y_{d23}\lambda^{4} \\ y_{d31}\lambda^{3} & y_{d32}\lambda^{2.5} & y_{d33}\lambda^{2} \end{pmatrix} \\ Y_{e} &= \begin{pmatrix} y_{e11}\lambda^{6} & y_{e12}\lambda^{5} & y_{e13}\lambda^{3} \\ y_{e21}\lambda^{5.5} & y_{e22}\lambda^{4.5} & y_{e23}\lambda^{2.5} \\ y_{e31}\lambda^{5} & y_{e32}\lambda^{4} & y_{e33}\lambda^{2} \end{pmatrix} \end{split}$$

 $9 \times 3 = 27 O(1)$ parameters for masses and mixings

in $E_6 \times SU(2)_F$ Model

$$Y_{u} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{3}y_{u12}\lambda^{5} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{3}y_{u12}\lambda^{5} & y_{u22}\lambda^{4} & y_{u23}\lambda^{2} \\ 0 & y_{u23}\lambda^{2} & y_{u33} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$Y_{d} = \begin{pmatrix} y_{d11}\lambda^{6} & y_{d12}\lambda^{5.5} & \frac{1}{3}y_{d13}\lambda^{5} \\ y_{d21}\lambda^{5} & y_{d22}\lambda^{4.5} & y_{d23}\lambda^{4} \\ y_{d31}\lambda^{3} & y_{d32}\lambda^{2.5} & y_{d33}\lambda^{2} \end{pmatrix}$$
$$Y_{e} = \begin{pmatrix} y_{d11}\lambda^{6} & y_{e12}\lambda^{5} & 0 \\ 0 & y_{e22}\lambda^{4.5} & y_{e23}\lambda^{2.5} \\ -y_{e12}\lambda^{5} & y_{d23}\lambda^{4} & y_{d33}\lambda^{2} \end{pmatrix}$$

4 + 9 + 3 = 16 O(1)parameters for masses and mixings

10/16



Yukawa matrix 1-loop renormalization group equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{Y}_{u,d,e} = \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\beta_{\mathbf{Y}_{u,d,e}}^{(1)} \qquad \text{in MSSM}$$

$$\beta_{\mathbf{Y}_u}^{(1)} = \mathbf{Y}_u \left\{ 3\text{Tr}(\mathbf{Y}_u\mathbf{Y}_u^{\dagger}) + 3\mathbf{Y}_u^{\dagger}\mathbf{Y}_u + \mathbf{Y}_d^{\dagger}\mathbf{Y}_d - \frac{16}{3}g_3^2 - 3g_2^2 - \frac{13}{15}g_1^2 \right\}$$

$$\beta_{\mathbf{Y}_d}^{(1)} = \mathbf{Y}_d \left\{ \text{Tr}(3\mathbf{Y}_d\mathbf{Y}_d^{\dagger} + \mathbf{Y}_e\mathbf{Y}_e^{\dagger}) + 3\mathbf{Y}_d^{\dagger}\mathbf{Y}_d + \mathbf{Y}_u^{\dagger}\mathbf{Y}_u - \frac{16}{3}g_3^2 - 3g_2^2 - \frac{7}{15}g_1^2 \right\}$$

$$\beta_{\mathbf{Y}_d}^{(1)} = \mathbf{Y}_e \left\{ \text{Tr}(3\mathbf{Y}_d\mathbf{Y}_d^{\dagger} + \mathbf{Y}_e\mathbf{Y}_e^{\dagger}) + 3\mathbf{Y}_d^{\dagger}\mathbf{Y}_d + \mathbf{Y}_u^{\dagger}\mathbf{Y}_u - \frac{16}{3}g_3^2 - 3g_2^2 - \frac{7}{15}g_1^2 \right\}$$

$$\beta_{\mathbf{Y}_d}^{(1)} = \mathbf{Y}_e \left\{ \text{Tr}(3\mathbf{Y}_d\mathbf{Y}_d^{\dagger} + \mathbf{Y}_e\mathbf{Y}_e^{\dagger}) + 3\mathbf{Y}_e^{\dagger}\mathbf{Y}_e - 3g_2^2 - \frac{9}{5}g_1^2 \right\}$$

$$\beta_{\mathbf{Y}_d}^{(1)} = \mathbf{Y}_e \left\{ \text{Tr}(3\mathbf{Y}_d\mathbf{Y}_d^{\dagger} + \mathbf{Y}_e\mathbf{Y}_e^{\dagger}) + 3\mathbf{Y}_e^{\dagger}\mathbf{Y}_e - 3g_2^2 - \frac{9}{5}g_1^2 \right\}$$

$$\theta_{13}^{uL} = \text{negligible} \quad \theta_{13}^{uR} = \text{negligible} \quad \theta_{13}^{eL} = \text{negligible}$$

$$\theta_{23}^{uL} = \theta_{23}^{uR} \quad \theta_{23}^{dL} = \theta_{23}^{eR} \quad \theta_{12}^{eR} = \theta_{23}^{eL}\theta_{12}^{eL}$$

$$|\theta_{12}^{uL}| = |\theta_{12}^{uR}| = \sqrt{m_u/m_c} \quad \frac{m_\mu}{m_\tau} = -\frac{\theta_{13}^{eR}}{\theta_{12}^{eL}\theta_{12}^{eR}}$$

$$|\theta_{13}^{uL}\theta_{13}^{eR}m_\tau - \theta_{13}^{dL}\theta_{13}^{eR}m_b + \theta_{12}^{eL}\theta_{12}^{eR}m_\tau - \theta_{12}^{dL}\theta_{12}^{dR}}$$

$$= 1$$
Gouditions for mixing angles @ low energy scale

Parameters for real diagonalizing matrix : 3 prameters (mixing angle) for each matrix 7 diagonalizing matrices : L_u , L_d , L_e , L_v , R_u , R_d , R_e 21 parameters

To realize

$$U_{CKM} = L_u^{\dagger} L_d, U_{MNS} = L_v^{\dagger} L_e$$

we use 6 parameters.

 E_6 GUT model in previous work : 21 - 6 = 15 parameters In this work we use 9 conditions. $E_6 \times SU(2)_F$ GUT model : 21 - 6 - 9 = 6 parameters (+ 1 sign) 13/16



14/16



In previous E_6 model $L_{e12} \sim \lambda^{0.5} \sim 0.5$, $L_{e13} \sim \lambda^3 \sim 0.01$

In $E_6 \times SU(2)_F$ model $L_{e12} \sim 0.39 < \lambda^{0.5}, L_{e13} = 0$ Small mixing from first-generation charged lepton $\tau_{p \to \pi^0 + e^c} \ge 1.3 \times 10^{34}$ years @Super-Kamiokande $\tau_{p \to \pi^0 + e^c} \ge 1.3 \times 10^{35}$ years @Hyper-Kamiokande(planning) 15/16

Summary

- We calculate nucleon lifetimes.
 Especially, we pay attention to uncertainties
 - of diagonalizing matrices.
- Flavor symmetry restrict Yukawa structure and diagonalizing matrices, therefore we can reduce uncertainties of diagonalizing matrices.
- In many model points R₁ and R₂ tend to be smaller than these in the E₆ model of previous work by conditions for mixing angles.





Back up slide

Why do we use $n \rightarrow \pi^0 + \nu^c$? $\Gamma_{n\to\pi^0+\nu^c}/\Gamma_{p\to\pi^0+e^c}$ not $p \rightarrow \pi^+ + \nu^c$? sensitivity Partial mean life (10³⁰ years) $N \rightarrow \nu \pi$ > 112 (n), > 25 (p)PDG(2012) form factor $\langle \pi^0 | (ud)_{\Gamma} u_{\Gamma'} | p \rangle = \langle \pi^0 | (du)_{\Gamma} d_{\Gamma'} | n \rangle$ We can cancel form factor and uncertainty of that!!

5 rep. mixing In the minimal SO(10) GUT model, all SM matters and v_R in each generation belong to only 16 rep.

Diagonalizing matrices for each matter are same at the GUT scale.

It is hard to realize realistic fermion masses and mixings in the minimal SO(10) GUT model.

SO(10) GUT with 10 rep.

 $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda & \lambda^3 \\ \lambda & 1 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^3 & \lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ diagonalizing matrix for each matter that belong to 16 rep. in SO(10). for $\overline{5}$ rep.

for 10 rep.

diagonalizing matrix for $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda & \lambda^3 \\ \lambda & 1 & \lambda^2 \\ 1^3 & 1^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ each matter that belong to 10 rep. in SU(5). **CKM** type

belong to 16 rep. belong to 10 rep.-

mixed

 $\overline{5}_{\psi_2}$ $\overline{5}_{\psi_3}$

20.5 λ0.5

diagonalizing matrix for each matter that belong to $\overline{5}$ rep. in SU(5). **MNS** type

dependence for anti-electron mode



dependence for anti-neutrino mode



suppression of dim 5 effective int.



mass matrix of triple Higgs

💋 forbidden

$$(3_H \quad 3_{H'}) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m \\ m & M \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \overline{3}_H \\ \overline{3}_{H'} \end{pmatrix}$$

effective colored Higgs mass

$$m_c^{eff} \sim m^2/M$$

In anomalous $U(1)_A$ SUSY GUT models, we can realize $m_c^{eff} > 10^{18} GeV$.

strongly suppressed

lower limit of nucleon lifetime



Siozawa @ KMI seminar 2012

future lower limit of nucleon lifetime @ Hyper-Kamiokande (10years running)

Mode	Sensitivity $(90\% \text{ CL})$	Current limit
$p \rightarrow e^+ \pi^0$	13×10^{34} years	$1.3{\times}10^{34}$ years
$p ightarrow \mu^+ \pi^0$	9.0×10^{34}	$1.1{ imes}10^{34}$
$p \to e^+ \eta^0$	5.0×10^{34}	$0.42{ imes}10^{34}$
$p \to \mu^+ \eta^0$	3.0×10^{34}	$0.13{ imes}10^{34}$
$p \to e^+ \rho^0$	1.0×10^{34}	$0.07{ imes}10^{34}$
$p ightarrow \mu^+ ho^0$	0.37×10^{34}	$0.02{ imes}10^{34}$
$p \rightarrow e^+ \omega^0$	0.84×10^{34}	$0.03{ imes}10^{34}$
$p ightarrow \mu^+ \omega^0$	0.88×10^{34}	$0.08{ imes}10^{34}$
$n \to e^+ \pi^-$	3.8×10^{34}	$0.20{\times}10^{34}$
$n ightarrow \mu^+ \pi^-$	2.9×10^{34}	$0.10{ imes}10^{34}$
$p \to \overline{\nu} K^+$	2.5×10^{34}	$0.40{ imes}10^{34}$

arXiv:1109.3262 [hep-ex]



origin of $\frac{1}{3}$ $\Psi^a A \Psi_a H$ H: fundamental representation Higgs A: adjoint Higgs $\langle A \rangle \propto Q_{B-L}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ is B-L charge of quarks.