# Resurrecting the minimal renormalizable supersymmetric SU(5)model

to appear\*

#### Timon MEDE

Institute of Particle and Nuclear Physics Prague

CZECH REPUBLIC

Portorož 2015



\*B. Bajc, S. Lavignac, T.M.

### Is the *minimal renormalizable SUSY SU(5)* really ruled out?

The *minimal renormalizable supersymmetric SU(5)* is the simplest GUT model, but ...

... <u>excluded</u> according to *Murayama-Pierce '01* , ...

- ▶ gauge coupling unification (MSSM @ 2-loops  $\longrightarrow m_T \lesssim 1.4 \cdot 10^{15} \, {\rm GeV})$
- proton decay ( $m_T \gtrsim 2.0 \cdot 10^{17} \, \mathrm{GeV}$ )

#### Assumption:

light SUSY spectrum - 3<sup>rd</sup> generation sparticles  $\sim O(1 \text{ TeV})$ , gauginos  $\sim O(m_Z)$  $(M_2 \approx 200 \text{ GeV}, M_3/M_2 \simeq 3.5)$ .

#### <u>Goals</u>:

more general superpartner mass spectrum —> phenomenological constraints?

The *minimal renormalizable supersymmetric SU(5)* is the simplest GUT model, but ...

... <u>excluded</u> according to Murayama-Pierce '01 , ...

- ▶ gauge coupling unification (MSSM @ 2-loops  $\rightarrow m_T \lesssim 1.4 \cdot 10^{15} \, \text{GeV}$ )
- proton decay ( $m_T \gtrsim 2.0 \cdot 10^{17} \, \mathrm{GeV}$ )

#### Assumption:

light SUSY spectrum - 3<sup>rd</sup> generation sparticles  $\sim O(1 \text{ TeV})$ , gauginos  $\sim O(m_Z)$ ( $M_2 \approx 200 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $M_3/M_2 \simeq 3.5$ ).

#### <u>Goals</u>:

more general superpartner mass spectrum  $\rightarrow$  phenomenological constraints?

The *minimal renormalizable supersymmetric SU(5)* is the simplest GUT model, but ...

... <u>excluded</u> according to Murayama-Pierce '01 , ...

- ▶ gauge coupling unification (MSSM @ 2-loops  $\rightarrow m_T \lesssim 1.4 \cdot 10^{15} \, \text{GeV}$ )
- proton decay ( $m_T \gtrsim 2.0 \cdot 10^{17} \, \mathrm{GeV}$ )

#### Assumption:

light SUSY spectrum -  $3^{rd}$  generation sparticles  $\sim O(1 \text{ TeV})$ , gauginos  $\sim O(m_Z)$   $(M_2 \approx 200 \text{ GeV}, M_3/M_2 \simeq 3.5)$ .

#### <u>Goals</u>:

more general superpartner mass spectrum —> phenomenological constraints?

The *minimal renormalizable supersymmetric SU(5)* is the simplest GUT model, but ...

... <u>excluded</u> according to Murayama-Pierce '01 , ...

- ▶ gauge coupling unification (MSSM @ 2-loops  $\rightarrow m_T \lesssim 1.4 \cdot 10^{15} \, \text{GeV}$ )
- proton decay ( $m_T \gtrsim 2.0 \cdot 10^{17} \, \mathrm{GeV}$ )

#### Assumption:

light SUSY spectrum -  $3^{rd}$  generation sparticles  $\sim O(1 \text{ TeV})$ , gauginos  $\sim O(m_Z)$   $(M_2 \approx 200 \text{ GeV}, M_3/M_2 \simeq 3.5)$ .

#### Goals:

more general superpartner mass spectrum  $\rightarrow$  phenomenological constraints?

### Outline









#### Assumptions

### Our starting points

- 1. Why minimal renormalizable SUSY SU(5)?
  - \* predictiveness probably the only way to test the high scale Yukawas (no SU(5) singlets, small # of parameters  $\longrightarrow$  masses calculable) \* smallness of terms  $W \supset C \frac{Q_i Q_j Q_k L_l}{M_{Planck}}$ ;  $C \lesssim 10^{-7}$  experimental fact
- 2. *perturbativity* (of couplings) at least up to the unification scale
- 3. soft terms at the GUT scale SU(5) invariant (supergravity mediation)
- 4. studying the mass scales of the theory (*the effects of running*)
- 5. correcting the *down-sector quark masses* by generation dependent supersymmetric thresholds (a-terms)

#### Assumptions

### Our starting points

- 1. Why minimal renormalizable SUSY SU(5)?
  - \* predictiveness probably the only way to test the high scale Yukawas (no SU(5) singlets, small # of parameters  $\longrightarrow$  masses calculable) \* smallness of terms  $W \supset C \frac{Q_i Q_j Q_k L_l}{M_{Planck}}$ ;  $C \lesssim 10^{-7}$  experimental fact
- 2. *perturbativity* (of couplings) at least up to the unification scale
- 3. soft terms at the GUT scale SU(5) invariant (supergravity mediation)
- 4. studying the mass scales of the theory (*the effects of running*)
- 5. correcting the *down-sector quark masses* by generation dependent supersymmetric thresholds (a-terms)

#### BEYOND THE SCOPE of this project

- 6. flavour structure [the only constraint are *small FCNCs* ]
- neutrino masses (bilinear RPV?)
- 8. DM (gravitino?)

#### Scales in the theory



Running of model parameters between matching scales (RGEs)

single scale effective theory 2-loop RGEs + 1-loop thresholds

### Minimality

#### 1. Higgs sector:

adjoint representation:  $SU(5) \rightarrow SU(3)_{C} \times SU(2)_{L} \times U(1)_{Y}$ 



fundamental & antifundamental representation:  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \rightarrow U(1)_{em}$ 

$$\mathbf{5}_{\mathsf{H}} = \underbrace{(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}, -\frac{1}{3})}_{m_{\mathsf{T}}} \oplus \underbrace{(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \frac{1}{2})}_{m_{\mathsf{H}}} \quad , \qquad \overline{\mathbf{5}}_{\mathsf{H}} = \underbrace{(\overline{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1}, \frac{1}{3})}_{m_{\mathsf{T}}} \oplus \underbrace{(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, -\frac{1}{2})}_{m_{\mathsf{H}}}$$

### Minimality

2. Gauge sector:

$$24_{g} = (8,1,0) \oplus (1,3,0) \oplus (1,1,0) \oplus \underbrace{(3,2,-\frac{5}{6}) \oplus (\overline{3},2,\frac{5}{6})}_{m_{V}}$$

3. Matter (Yukawa) sector:

$$\mathbf{10_i} = (\underbrace{\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{2}, \frac{1}{6}}_{m_{\bar{Q}_i}}) \oplus \underbrace{(\overline{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1}, -\frac{2}{3})}_{m_{\bar{u}_i^c}} \oplus \underbrace{(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})}_{m_{\bar{e}_i^c}} \quad, \qquad \overline{\mathbf{5}_i} = (\underbrace{\overline{\mathbf{3}}, \mathbf{1}, \frac{1}{3}}_{m_{\bar{d}_i^c}}) \oplus \underbrace{(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, -\frac{1}{2})}_{m_{\bar{L}_i}}$$

### Renormalizability

#### Higgs sector superpotential

$$W_{H} = \frac{\mu}{2} Tr \mathbf{24_{H}}^{2} + \sqrt{30} \frac{\lambda}{3} Tr \mathbf{24_{H}}^{3} + \eta \,\overline{\mathbf{5}}_{\mathbf{H}} \left( \mathbf{24_{H}} + 3\frac{\langle \sigma \rangle}{\sqrt{30}} \right) \mathbf{5}_{\mathbf{H}}$$

#### Yukawa sector superpotential

$$W_{Y} = \overline{\mathbf{5}}_{i} Y_{5}^{i,j} \mathbf{10}_{j} \,\overline{\mathbf{5}}_{H} + \frac{1}{8} \,\mathbf{10}_{i} Y_{10}^{i,j} \mathbf{10}_{j} \,\mathbf{5}_{H} \quad , \quad i=1,2,3$$

$$\begin{array}{ll} m_{T} & = & \frac{5}{\sqrt{30}} \eta \langle \sigma \rangle \\ m_{3,8} & = & 5\mu = 5\lambda \langle \sigma \rangle \\ m_{1} & = & \mu = \lambda \langle \sigma \rangle \\ m_{V} & = & \frac{5}{\sqrt{30}} g_{GUT} \langle \sigma \rangle \end{array} \right\} \Longrightarrow \textit{perturbativity} (m_{T}, m_{3,8} \lesssim m_{V})$$

### Renormalizability

#### Higgs sector superpotential

$$W_{H} = \frac{\mu}{2} \operatorname{Tr} \mathbf{24_{H}}^{2} + \sqrt{30} \, \frac{\lambda}{3} \operatorname{Tr} \mathbf{24_{H}}^{3} + \eta \, \overline{\mathbf{5}}_{\mathbf{H}} \left( \mathbf{24_{H}} + 3 \frac{\langle \sigma \rangle}{\sqrt{30}} \right) \mathbf{5}_{\mathbf{H}}$$

#### Yukawa sector superpotential

$$W_{Y} = \overline{\mathbf{5}}_{i} Y_{5}^{i,j} \mathbf{10}_{j} \,\overline{\mathbf{5}}_{\mathsf{H}} + \frac{1}{8} \,\mathbf{10}_{i} Y_{10}^{i,j} \mathbf{10}_{j} \,\mathbf{5}_{\mathsf{H}} \quad , \quad i=1,2,3$$

$$\begin{array}{ll} m_{T} & = & \frac{5}{\sqrt{30}} \eta \langle \sigma \rangle \\ m_{3,8} & = & 5\mu = 5\lambda \langle \sigma \rangle \\ m_{1} & = & \mu = \lambda \langle \sigma \rangle \\ m_{V} & = & \frac{5}{\sqrt{30}} g_{GUT} \langle \sigma \rangle \end{array} \right\} \Longrightarrow \textit{perturbativity} (m_{T}, m_{3,8} \lesssim m_{V})$$

#### Theoretical and experimental constraints

- \* Higgs mass ( $m_h \simeq 125.7 \, {
  m GeV}$ )
- \* correct *down-sector fermion mass* relations ( $\delta m_d$ ,  $\delta m_s$ ,  $\delta m_b$ )
- \* vacuum (meta)stability (UFB 1,2,3 and CCB 1,2,3)
- \* gauge coupling *unification*
- \* perturbativity  $(m_T, m_{3,8} \lesssim m_V \ll M_{Planck})$
- \* proton lifetime bounds  $\tau_p^{exp}(p \to K^+ \overline{\nu}) > 2.3 \times 10^{33} \,\mathrm{yrs} \longrightarrow m_T \gtrsim \cdots$ ,  $\tau_p^{exp}(p \to \pi^0 e^+) > 13 \times 10^{33} \,\mathrm{yrs} \longrightarrow m_V \gtrsim \cdots$
- \* LEP and LHC bounds on sfermion and gaugino masses  $(m_{\tilde{Q}_{1,2}}, m_{\tilde{g}} \gtrsim 1 \,\mathrm{TeV}; m_{\tilde{Q}_3}, m_{\tilde{\chi}} \gtrsim 300 \,\mathrm{GeV})$

#### Theoretical and experimental constraints



#### Higgs mass

### Mass of the SM Higgs

For heavy stops the usual MSSM expressions for  $m_h$  not accurate

2-loop SM running of the Higgs quartic coupling
 +
 1-loop matching between SM and MSSM RGEs

$$\lambda(m_{susy}) = \underbrace{\left(\frac{3}{5}g_1^2(m_{susy}) + g_2^2(m_{susy})\right)\frac{\cos^2(2\beta)}{4}}_{1-\frac{1}{12}\left(\frac{X_t}{m_{susy}}\right)^2 \left[1 - \frac{1}{12}\left(\frac{X_t}{m_{susy}}\right)^2\right]}_{1-\frac{1}{12}\left(\frac{X_t}{m_{susy}}\right)^2} + \dots$$

 $\begin{array}{ll} {\tt 0} \mbox{ matching scale:} & m_{susy} \equiv \sqrt{m_{\tilde{t}_1} m_{\tilde{t}_2}} \approx \sqrt{m_{\tilde{u}_3}(m_{susy}) m_{\tilde{Q}_3}(m_{susy})} \\ {\rm for} \ X_t \equiv \frac{a_t}{\lambda_t} - \frac{\mu}{\tan\beta} \end{array}$ 

### Mass of the SM Higgs



#### Higgs mass

### Mass of the SM Higgs

For each  $\tan \beta$  exist a *minimal*  $m_{susy}$  which fits the measured Higgs mass



### SU(5) unification

$$\alpha_1(M_{GUT}) = \alpha_2(M_{GUT}) = \alpha_3(M_{GUT}) \equiv \alpha_{GUT}$$

$$Y_u(M_{GUT}) = Y_u^T(M_{GUT})$$
  
$$Y_d(M_{GUT}) = Y_e^T(M_{GUT})$$

$$egin{aligned} A_u(M_{GUT}) &= A_u^T(M_{GUT}) \ A_d(M_{GUT}) &= A_e^T(M_{GUT}) \end{aligned}$$

$$M_1(M_{GUT}) = M_2(M_{GUT}) = M_3(M_{GUT}) \equiv M_{1/2}$$

$$\begin{array}{ll} m_{\tilde{Q}_i}(M_{GUT}) = m_{\tilde{u}_i^c}(M_{GUT}) = m_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_i^c}(M_{GUT}) & \equiv \tilde{m}_{10_i} \\ m_{\tilde{L}_i}(M_{GUT}) = m_{\tilde{d}_i^c}(M_{GUT}) & \equiv \tilde{m}_{\bar{5}_i} \end{array} \qquad (i = 1, 2, 3)$$

All the *splittings* within SU(5) representations are only due to *running* !

No unification in MSSM  $\longrightarrow$  high-energy thresholds  $m_T$ ,  $m_8$ ,  $m_3$ ,  $m_V$  required

single scale  $(m_{susy})$  MSSM **2-loop** RGEs + **1-loop** thresholds

No unification in MSSM  $\longrightarrow$  high-energy thresholds  $m_T$ ,  $m_8$ ,  $m_3$ ,  $m_V$  required

single scale  $(m_{susy})$  MSSM **2-loop** RGEs + **1-loop** thresholds

$$\begin{bmatrix} \overbrace{m_{V}^{2}}^{m_{T}^{2}} (m_{3}m_{8})^{1/2} \end{bmatrix}^{1/3} = M_{GUT} \times \exp\left[\frac{\pi}{18} \left(5\alpha_{1}^{-1} - 3\alpha_{2}^{-1} - 2\alpha_{3}^{-1}\right)_{2-loop} (M_{GUT})\right] \\ \times \left(\frac{m_{susy}^{2}}{m_{\tilde{w}}m_{\tilde{g}}}\right)^{1/9} \underbrace{\prod_{i=1}^{3} \left(\frac{m_{\tilde{u}_{i}^{c}}m_{\tilde{e}_{i}^{c}}}{m_{\tilde{Q}_{i}}^{2}}\right)^{1/36}}_{O(1)}$$

No unification in MSSM  $\rightarrow$  high-energy thresholds  $m_T$ ,  $m_8$ ,  $m_3$ ,  $m_V$  required

single scale  $(m_{susy})$  MSSM **2-loop** RGEs + **1-loop** thresholds

$$m_{T} \simeq 2 \times 10^{15} \text{ GeV} \times \left(\frac{m_{susy}}{1 \text{ TeV}}\right)^{5/6}$$

$$= M_{GUT} \times \exp\left[\frac{5\pi}{6} \left(-\alpha_{1}^{-1} + 3\alpha_{2}^{-1} - 2\alpha_{3}^{-1}\right)_{2-loop} \left(M_{GUT}\right)\right]$$

$$\times \underbrace{\left(\frac{m_{3}}{m_{8}}\right)^{5/2}}_{\parallel 1} \underbrace{\left(\frac{m_{\tilde{w}}}{m_{\tilde{g}}}\right)^{5/3}}_{m_{\tilde{g}}^{2}} \underbrace{\prod_{i=1}^{3} \left(\frac{m_{\tilde{Q}_{i}}^{4}}{m_{\tilde{u}_{i}}^{3} m_{\tilde{e}_{i}}^{2}} \frac{m_{\tilde{L}_{i}}^{2}}{m_{\tilde{d}_{i}}^{2}}\right)^{1/12}}_{\mathcal{O}(1)} \left(\frac{m_{\tilde{h}}^{4} m_{A}}{m_{susy}^{5}}\right)^{1/6}$$

Light  $m_T$  mediates too fast proton decay.

Large  $m_{susy}$  poses the opposite problem:  $m_T$  can be too heavy (perturbativity).

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu|^{2} &= \frac{m_{H_{d}}^{2} - m_{H_{u}}^{2} \tan^{2} \beta}{\tan^{2} \beta - 1} - \frac{m_{Z}^{2}}{2} \quad (\text{tree-level EWSB condition at } m_{susy}) \\ m_{\tilde{h}} &= |\mu| \\ m_{A} &= \sqrt{(\mu^{2} + m_{H_{d}}^{2})(1 + 1/\tan^{2} \beta)} \approx \sqrt{(m_{H_{d}}^{2} - m_{H_{u}}^{2})\frac{\tan^{2} \beta + 1}{\tan^{2} \beta - 1}} \\ m_{T} &= M_{GUT} \times \exp\left[\frac{5\pi}{6}\left(-\alpha_{1}^{-1} + 3\alpha_{2}^{-1} - 2\alpha_{3}^{-1}\right)_{2-loop}\left(M_{GUT}\right)\right] \\ &\times \underbrace{\left(\frac{m_{3}}{m_{8}}\right)^{5/2}}_{\parallel 1} \underbrace{\left(\frac{m_{\tilde{w}}}{m_{\tilde{g}}}\right)^{5/3}}_{m_{\tilde{g}} \approx m_{susy}} \underbrace{\prod_{i=1}^{3}\left(\frac{m_{\tilde{Q}_{i}}^{4}}{m_{\tilde{u}_{i}^{c}}^{2}m_{\tilde{e}_{i}^{c}}^{2}}\right)^{1/12}}_{\mathcal{O}(1)} \left(\frac{m_{h}^{4}m_{A}}{m_{susy}^{5}}\right)^{1/6} \end{aligned}$$

#### Perturbativity

Yukawas:  $\lambda_i(M_{GUT}) \lesssim 1$ 

## Heavy thresholds: $m_T, m_{3,8} \lesssim m_V \ll M_{Planck}$



#### Proton decay bounds

Dimension 5 *colour Higgs triplet exchange* operators get *dressed* by *winos* which leads to Weinberg type 4-fermion effective operators



Dominant proton decay channel is  $p \to K^+ \bar{\nu}$  that scales approximately as

$$\tau(\mathbf{p} \to \mathbf{K}^+ \bar{\nu}) \propto \left(\frac{\tan\beta}{1 + \tan^2\beta}\right)^2 m_{susy}^2 m_{\mathcal{T}}^2 \propto \left(\frac{\tan\beta}{1 + \tan^2\beta}\right)^2 m_{susy}^{11/3}$$

### Proton decay bounds



Timon MEDE (IPNP)

realistic minimal SUSY SU(5)







$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{e}}, \mathbf{y}_{\mu}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau} &: m_{Z} \xrightarrow{SM} m_{susy} \xrightarrow{MSSM} M_{GUT} \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{no susy threshold corr.} \\ \alpha_{2} \text{ instead of } \alpha_{3} \text{ depen.} \end{array} \right) \\ \\ & \mathbf{minimal renormalizable} \\ & \mathbf{SU(5) \text{ model}} \end{array} \longrightarrow \begin{cases} m_{e}(M_{GUT}) &= m_{d}(M_{GUT}) \\ m_{\mu}(M_{GUT}) &= m_{s}(M_{GUT}) \\ m_{\tau}(M_{GUT}) &= m_{b}(M_{GUT}) \end{cases} \\ \\ & \mathbf{y}_{d}, \mathbf{y}_{s}, \mathbf{y}_{b} : M_{GUT} \xrightarrow{MSSM} m_{susy} \xrightarrow{SM} m_{Z} \end{cases} \\ \\ & \frac{m_{e}(m_{Z})/m_{d}(m_{Z})}{m_{\mu}(m_{Z})/m_{b}(m_{Z})} \\ \\ & \mathbf{w}_{r}(m_{Z})/m_{b}(m_{Z}) \end{cases} \\ \\ \end{array} \right\} = \text{wrong} \longrightarrow \text{threshold corrections needed} \end{aligned}$$

### Correcting light fermion masses with a-terms

Diagrams for the finite corrections to the quark Yukawa couplings.



### Vacuum (meta)stability

1. absolute vacuum stability  $\rightarrow$  our vacuum is NOT a global minimum

**UFB 1,2,3**  $\longrightarrow m_{H_u}^2 > 0$ **CCB 1,2,3**  $\longrightarrow |a_{d_i}| \nleq \lambda_i \sqrt{3(m_{H_d}^2 + m_{\tilde{Q}_i}^2 + m_{\tilde{d}_i^c}^2)}$ 

 vacuum metastability → our vacuum only a local minimum, but its lifetime longer than the age of the Universe

$$egin{aligned} \mathsf{CCB} \ \mathbf{1,2^*,3^*} \ \longrightarrow \ |a_{d_i}| \lesssim \sqrt{m_{H_d}^2 + m_{ ilde{Q}_i}^2 + m_{ ilde{d}_i}^2} \ S \gtrsim 400 \end{aligned}$$

\*more complicated situation, numerical analysis required

### Solving RGEs

 $\mathbf{g_a}, \mathbf{y_i}, \lambda @ 2-loops$  $\mathbf{M_a}, \mathbf{a_i}, \mathbf{\tilde{m}_i^2} @ 1-loop$ 15 free parameters in the soft sector  $(1 \times M_a, 6 \times a_i, 8 \times \tilde{m}_i^2)$ 

SCANNING the parameter space

Problem: system of entangled differential equations  $\longrightarrow$  numerically demanding

Solution: "disentangle" the equations  $\longrightarrow$  solve them in a specific order  $[1. g_a, y_i, \lambda, 2. M_a, 3. a_i, 4. \tilde{m}_i^2]$ 

Problem: boundary conditions defined at various scales connecting different quantities @  $M_{GUT}$ : SU(5) unification  $(M_a, a_i, \tilde{m}_i^2)$ @  $m_{susy}$ : no tachyons  $(\tilde{m}_i^2 > 0)$ , EWSB  $(\mu^2 > 0)$ , Higgs matching  $(M_a, a_i, \tilde{m}_i^2, \mu^2)$ , fermion mass corrections  $(M_a, a_i, \tilde{m}_i^2, \mu^2)$ 

#### **INPUT**:



#### A-terms:

at $\mathbf{M}_{GUT}$	at m <sub>susy</sub>
$egin{aligned} a_t(M_{GUT}) &= 14.6{ m TeV} \ a_b(M_{GUT}) &= 118.9{ m TeV} \ a_{ au}(M_{GUT}) &= 118.9{ m TeV} \end{aligned}$	$egin{aligned} a_t(m_{susy}) &= -25.9{ m TeV}\ a_b(m_{susy}) &= 234.4{ m TeV}\ a_{ au}(m_{susy}) &= 160.2{ m TeV} \end{aligned}$
$egin{aligned} &a_c(M_{GUT}) \ &= \ 14.8{ m TeV} \ &a_s(M_{GUT}) \ &= \ 39.7{ m TeV} \ &a_\mu(M_{GUT}) \ &= \ 39.7{ m TeV} \end{aligned}$	$egin{aligned} &a_c(m_{susy}) \ = \ 26.5  { m TeV} \ &a_s(m_{susy}) \ = \ 85.5  { m TeV} \ &a_\mu(m_{susy}) \ = \ 54.0  { m TeV} \end{aligned}$
$egin{array}{rcl} a_u(M_{GUT}) &=& 14.7{ m TeV} \ a_d(M_{GUT}) &=& -0.4{ m TeV} \ a_e(M_{GUT}) &=& -0.4{ m TeV} \end{array}$	$egin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$

Result sample

#### A-terms:



50

100.

10 000: 1. × 10<sup>8</sup> 1. × 10<sup>10</sup> 1. × 10<sup>12</sup> 1. × 10<sup>14</sup> TeV

### Soft masses (1):

at M <sub>GUT</sub>	at m <sub>susy</sub>
$M_{1/2} = 34.0 \mathrm{TeV}$	$egin{array}{rcl} M_1(m_{ ilde g}) &=& m_{ ilde b} &=& 16.7{ m TeV} \ M_2(m_{ ilde g}) &=& m_{ ilde w} &=& 29.6{ m TeV} \ M_3(m_{ ilde g}) &=& m_{ ilde g} &=& 62.0{ m TeV} \end{array}$
$m_{H_u,GUT} = 105.0 { m TeV}$ $m_{H_d,GUT} = 525.0 { m TeV}$	$egin{array}{lll} m_{H_u}(m_{susy}) &=& 75.9{ m TeV} \ m_{H_d}(m_{susy}) &=& 478.1{ m TeV} \end{array}$
	$\mu(m_{susy}) = 95.4 { m TeV}$ $m_A(m_{susy}) = 502.6 { m TeV}$

### Soft masses (1):



Soft masses (2):

at M <sub>GUT</sub>	at m <sub>susy</sub>
$\tilde{m}_{10_1} = 79.0 \mathrm{TeV}$	$m_{\tilde{Q}_1}(m_{susy}) = 104.7 \mathrm{TeV}$
$\tilde{m}_{\bar{5}_1} = 150.0 \mathrm{TeV}$	$egin{aligned} &m_{ ilde{u}_1}^{lpha}(m_{susy}) = 15.6~{ m feV} \ &m_{ ilde{e}_1}^{lpha}(m_{susy}) = 136.7~{ m feV} \ &m_{ ilde{L}_1}(m_{susy}) = 129.7~{ m feV} \ &m_{ ilde{d}_2}^{lpha}(m_{susy}) = 170.3~{ m feV} \end{aligned}$
$\tilde{m}_{10_2} = 79.0 \mathrm{TeV}$	$egin{aligned} m_{ ilde{Q}_2}(m_{susy}) &= 98.8\mathrm{TeV}\ m_{ ilde{u}_2}^{-1}(m_{susy}) &= 15.5\mathrm{TeV} \end{aligned}$
$\tilde{m}_{\bar{5}_2} = 150.0 \mathrm{TeV}$	$egin{array}{lll} m_{ ilde{e}_2^c}(m_{susy}) &= 131.1{ m TeV}\ m_{ ilde{L}_2}(m_{susy}) &= 126.8{ m TeV}\ m_{ ilde{d}_2^c}(m_{susy}) &= 163.0{ m TeV} \end{array}$

Soft masses (2):

at  $M_{GUT}$ at  $m_{susy}$  $\tilde{m}_{10_3} = 124.3 \,\mathrm{TeV}$  $m_{\tilde{Q}_3}(m_{susy}) = 81.1 \,\mathrm{TeV}$  $\tilde{m}_{\tilde{U}_3}(m_{susy}) = 48.5 \,\mathrm{TeV}$  $m_{\tilde{u}_3}(m_{susy}) = 48.5 \,\mathrm{TeV}$  $\tilde{m}_{\tilde{5}_3} = 139.5 \,\mathrm{TeV}$  $m_{\tilde{c}_3}(m_{susy}) = 83.7 \,\mathrm{TeV}$ 

$$m_{\tilde{d}_3^c}(m_{susy}) = 76.5 \,\mathrm{TeV}$$

### Soft masses (2):



### Phenomenology:

#### Spectrum

- \* Higgs mass 🗸
- \* Fermion masses 🗸
- \* NO tachyons 🗸
- Unification of gauge couplings  $\checkmark$

 $\begin{array}{rcl} m_T &=& 8.5 \times 10^{16} \, {\rm GeV} \\ m_{8,3} &=& 5.1 \times 10^{13} \, {\rm GeV} \\ m_V &=& 8.6 \times 10^{16} \, {\rm GeV} \\ \alpha_{GUT}^{-1} &=& 24.7 \end{array}$ 

#### Perturbativity 🗸

#### Proton decay 🗸

$$egin{array}{lll} au_{
ho}(
ho^+ 
ightarrow K^+ ar{
u}) &=& 5.4 imes 10^{33} \ {
m yrs} \ &=& 2.3 imes au_{
ho}^{exp} \end{array}$$

(for 
$$\phi_1 = \phi_2 = \phi_3 = 0$$
)

#### Vacuum stability

- \* absolute stability 🗡
- \* metastability 🗸

$$S_{min} = 1793$$

### Summary

#### POINTS TO TAKE HOME:

- \* minimal renormalizable SUSY SU(5) works
- large a-terms
- $* \hspace{0.1 cm}$  heavy spectrum  $\longrightarrow$  probably  $\exists \hspace{0.1 cm} a \hspace{0.1 cm}$  lower bound

#### <u>TO DO</u>:

 $\ast\,$  scan of the soft SUSY parameter space



### Thank you for your attention!

Timon MEDE (IPNP)

realistic minimal SUSY SU(5)