Vacuum Stability and asymptotic behaviour in Extended Higgs and Leptoquarks

Shilpa Jangid
Research Scholar
IIT Hyderabad

SUSY 2021

Based on:[1] JHEP 08 (2020) 154, [2] Eur.Phys.J.C 80 (2020) 8, 715, [3] JHEP 02 (2021) 075, arxiv:xxxx

In collaboration with: Priyotosh Bandyopadhyay, Bhupal Dev, Arjun Kumar, Manimala Mitra, Anirban Karan

भारतीय प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान हैदराबाद
Indian Institute of Technology Hyderabad

- EW Vacuum stability and perturbativity till Planck scale are the two sources of bound.

Generation of neutrino mass

Type-I Seesaw

- Type-I provides the neutrino mass
- Inert 2HDM + Type-I provides the Dark matter

Type-III Seesaw

- Type-III provides the neutrino mass
- Inert 2HDM + Type-III provides the Dark matter

Dominant top quark effect in SM

- The effective potential for high field values is written as

$$V_{\rm eff}(h,\mu) \simeq \lambda_{\rm eff}(h,\mu)\frac{h^4}{4}, \quad \text{with } h \gg v,$$

- Where λ_{eff} is given by

$$\lambda_{\rm eff}(h,\mu) \simeq \underbrace{\lambda_h(\mu)}_{\text{tree-level}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{16\pi^2}\left[-12Y_t^4\left[\log\frac{Y_t^2h^2}{\mu^2} - \frac{3}{2}\right]\right]}_{\text{Negative Contribution from top quark}}.$$

Condition of metastability

$$0 > \lambda_{eff}(\mu) \simeq \frac{-0.065}{1 - 0.01 \, log\frac{v}{\mu}}$$

When we add fermions it gives negative contribution and the stability is compromised!

$$V_{\text{eff}}(h,\mu) \simeq \lambda_{\text{eff}}(h,\mu)\frac{h^4}{4}, \quad \text{with } h \gg v\,,$$



Within the uncertainty of top mass we are in a metastable vacuum

A Strumia, D Buttazzo, G Degrassi et al.
JHEP 12 (2013) 089

- The general Z_2 symmetric Higgs potential for inert 2HDM is

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{scalar}} &= m_{11}^2\Phi_1^\dagger\Phi_1 + m_{22}^2\Phi_2^\dagger\Phi_2 + \lambda_1(\Phi_1^\dagger\Phi_1)^2 + \lambda_2(\Phi_2^\dagger\Phi_2)^2 \\ &+\lambda_3(\Phi_1^\dagger\Phi_1)(\Phi_2^\dagger\Phi_2) + \lambda_4(\Phi_1^\dagger\Phi_2)(\Phi_2^\dagger\Phi_1) + [\lambda_5(\Phi_1^\dagger\Phi_2)^2 + \text{H.c}]. \end{aligned}$$

- A Z_2 symmetric potential for ITM can be written as

$$V = m_h^2\Phi^\dagger\Phi + m_T^2 Tr(T^\dagger T) + \lambda_1|\Phi^\dagger\Phi|^2 + \lambda_t(Tr|T^\dagger T|)^2 + \lambda_{ht}\Phi^\dagger\Phi Tr(T^\dagger T).$$

Being odd under Z_2, ϕ_2 and T which is $SU(2)$ triplet does not contribute in EWSB and provides a dark matter candidate.

Scalar contribution in RG improved effective potential

- The effective potential for high field values is written as

$$V_{\rm eff}(h,\mu) \simeq \lambda_{\rm eff}(h,\mu)\frac{h^4}{4}, \quad \text{with } h \gg v,$$

- Where λ_{eff} is given by

$$\lambda_{\rm eff}(h,\mu) \simeq \underbrace{\lambda_h(\mu)}_{\text{tree-level}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{16\pi^2}\sum_{\substack{i=W^\pm,Z,t,\\ h,G^\pm,G^0}} n_i\kappa_i^2\left[\log\frac{\kappa_i h^2}{\mu^2} - c_i\right]}_{\text{Contribution from SM}}$$
$$+ \underbrace{\frac{1}{16\pi^2}\sum_{i=H,A,H^\pm/T_0,T^\pm} n_i\kappa_i^2\left[\log\frac{\kappa_i h^2}{\mu^2} - c_i\right]}_{\text{Contribution from IDM/ITM}}.$$

Condition of metastability

$$0 > \lambda_{eff}(\mu) \simeq \frac{-0.065}{1 - 0.01 log\frac{v}{\mu}}$$

$$V_{\text{eff}}(h,\mu) \simeq \lambda_{\text{eff}}(h,\mu)\frac{h^4}{4}, \quad \text{with } h \gg v,$$



(a) IDM (b) ITM

- In both scenarios, Planck scale stability is achievable unlike SM.
- IDM is bit more stable than ITM.

SJ, Priyotosh Bandyopadhyay

Eur.Phys.J.C 80 (2020) 8, 715

With addition of scalars the stability is enhanced and the bounds only come from perturbativity.

Seesaw mechanism is motivated for generating small neutrino mass.

- Two different scenarios are considered

  Type-I Seesaw- Singlet fermions
  Type-III Seesaw- Triplet fermions with $SU(2)$ gauge charge

The $SU(2)$ gauge charge of triplet fermions will show drastic change in stability and perturbativity behaviour.

- Type-I seesaw Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm I} = i\overline{N}_{R_i}\partial\!\!\!/ N_{R_i} - \left(Y_{N_{ij}}\overline{L}_i\widetilde{\Phi}_1 N_{R_j} - \frac{1}{2}\overline{N}^c_{R_i}M_{R_i}N_{R_i} + \text{H.c.}\right),$$

- Neutrino mass matrix

$$\mathcal{M}_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M_D \\ M_D^T & M_R \end{pmatrix}$$

- Light neutrino mass

$$m_\nu = -M_D M_R^{-1} M_D^T$$

- Inverse-Seesaw Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{ISS} = i\bar{N}_R\partial\!\!\!/ N_R + i\bar{S}\partial\!\!\!/ S - \left(Y_N\bar{L}_L\tilde{\Phi}_1 N_R + \bar{N}_R M_R S + \frac{1}{2}\bar{S}^c\mu_s S + H.c.\right),$$

- Neutrino mass matrix

$$\mathcal{M}_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M_D & 0 \\ M_D^T & 0 & M_R \\ 0 & M_R^T & \mu_S \end{pmatrix}$$

- Light neutrino mass

$$m_\nu = M_D M_R^{-1}\mu_S (M_R^T)^{-1} M_D^T$$

- Rest are almost degenrate around $M_R \pm \frac{\mu_S}{2}$

$$V_{\rm eff}(h,\mu) \simeq \lambda_{\rm eff}(h,\mu)\frac{h^4}{4}, \quad \text{with } h \gg v,$$



(a) $Y_N = 10^{-7}$



(b) $Y_N = 0.38$

SJ, P Bandyopadhyay, Bhupal Dev, Arjun Kumar
JHEP 08 (2020) 154

- Lower Y_N corresponds to almost stable region
- Higher Y_N corresponds to large unstable region

- We have SU(2) doublets Φ_1, Φ_2 with same hypercharge $\frac{1}{2}$ and three generations of fermionic triplets Σ_1, Σ_2 with zero hypercharge

$$\Phi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1^+ \\ \phi_1^0 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \Phi_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_2^+ \\ \phi_2^0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\Sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_1^0/\sqrt{2} & \Sigma_1^+ \\ \Sigma_1^- & -\Sigma_1^0/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix} \qquad \Sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_2^0/\sqrt{2} & \Sigma_2^+ \\ \Sigma_2^- & -\Sigma_2^0/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}$$

The general Higgs potential for Type-III Inverse seesaw

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\rm ISS} &= Tr[\overline{\Sigma_{1i}} \not{D} \Sigma_{1i}] + Tr[\overline{\Sigma_{2i}} \not{D} \Sigma_{2j}] - \frac{1}{2} Tr[\overline{\Sigma_{2i}} \mu_{\Sigma_{ij}} \Sigma_{2j}^c + \overline{\Sigma_{2i}^c} \mu_{\Sigma_{ij}}^* \Sigma_{2j}] \\ &\quad - \left(\widetilde{\Phi}_1^\dagger \overline{\Sigma_{1i}} \sqrt{2} Y_{N_{ij}} L_j + Tr[\overline{\Sigma}_{1i} M_{N_{ij}} \Sigma_{2j}] + \text{H.c.} \right)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{g_2, 2gen}^{ID+Type-III+ISS} &= \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\left[\frac{7}{3} g_2^3\right] + \frac{1}{(16\pi^2)^2}\Bigg[\frac{1}{30} g_2^3 \Big(-15\text{Tr}\Big(Y_e Y_e^\dagger\Big) - 165\text{Tr}\Big(Y_N Y_N^\dagger\Big) \\ &+ 2800 g_2^2 + 360 g_3^2 + 36 g_1^2 - 45\text{Tr}\Big(Y_d Y_d^\dagger\Big) - 45\text{Tr}\Big(Y_u Y_u^\dagger\Big)\Big)\Bigg]\end{aligned}$$

- Gauge coupling g_2 enhances positively large in Type-III



SJ, P Bandyopadhyay, Manimala Mitra
JHEP 02 (2021) 075

If we add a $SU(2)$ non-zero charged multiplet either scalar or fermion it increases g_2.

- g_2 contribution is too large with three generations
- Stability gets enhanced with large g_2 contribution



(a) 3 gen

(b) 2 gen

SJ, P Bandyopadhyay, Manimala Mitra

JHEP 02 (2021) 075

Once g_2 is increased, it will enhance the stability but the perturbativity is compromised.

- For $\lambda_i(EW) \leq \lambda_h = 0.1264$, λ_h hits the Landau pole till a particular value of Y_N
- $\lambda_i' s$ hits the Landau pole for higher values of Y_N before λ_h
- Stability scale enhances with increase in λ_i



SJ, P Bandyopadhyay, Manimala Mitra

JHEP 02 (2021) 075

$$V_{\text{eff}}(h,\mu) \simeq \lambda_{\text{eff}}(h,\mu)\frac{h^4}{4}, \quad \text{with } h \gg v,$$

Type-III seesw is completely unstable which motivates its extension.



(a) ID+Type-III+ISS (2gen) ($Y_N = 0.3$)



(b) ID+Type-III+ISS (2gen) ($Y_N = 0.4$)



(c) Type-III ($Y_N = 0.4$)

Since Leptoquarks posses all three gauge charges, the running behaviour of g_1, g_2 and g_3 will be different.



(d) g_1



(e) g_2



(f) g_3

Three generations of $\widetilde{R}_2 + \vec{S}_3$ are not favoured from Planck scale perturbativity.

To be in arxiv soon...

Stability for Leptoquarks



(g) $\widetilde{R}_2$(3 gen)



(h) $\vec{S}_3$(3 gen)

Three generations of $\widetilde{R}_2 + \vec{S}_3$ are not favoured by Planck scale perturbativity.

To be in arxiv soon...

Relic density bound on DM mass in IDM and ITM

- For IDM, $M_A > 700$ GeV corresponds to correct DM relic value
- For ITM, $M_{T_0} > 1200$ GeV corresponds to correct DM relic value
- The presence of one extra Z_2-odd scalar results into higher DM number density in IDM case, leading to lower mass bound on DM mass for IDM.

More @HiggsI by Priyotosh Bandyopadhyay

SJ, Priyotosh Bandyopadhyay

Eur.Phys.J.C 80 (2020) 8, 715

Conclusions

- The minimal extension to SM necessary for Charged Higgs is $SU(2)$ doublet and triplet in $SU(2)$ representation.
- Planck scale stability is achieved in both IDM and ITM unlike SM.
- IDM and ITM both are safe but in case of ITM we have LHC signatures of displaced vertex which are not so natural in IDM.
- The bound on DM mass from DM relic density is $\geq$ 700 GeV in IDM and $\geq$ 1176 GeV in ITM.
- The additional Z_2' symmetry in IDM and ITM also restricts their decay modes.
- In the case of IDM + Type-I, Y_N=0.32 value is crucial from stability bound.
- IDM and Type-I seesaw do not directly talk to each other so one has to rely on three-body decays.
- Type-III scenario is very interesting because of the $SU(2)$ charge of the fermion.
- The Planck scale stability/perturbativity demands only two generations of Type-III.
- Because of the TeV mass range LHC at ($\sqrt{s} = 100$) TeV is better to probe the signals than 14 TeV.


Thank
you