Variants of the Standard M odel with E lectrow eak-Singlet Q uarks

Robert Shrock

C.N.Yang Institute for Theoretical Physics State University of New York Stony Brook, NY 11794

The successful description of current data provided by the Standard M odel includes fundam ental ferm ions that are color-singlets and electrow eak-nonsinglets, but no ferm ions that are electrow eak-singlets and color-nonsinglets. In an e ort to understand the absence of such ferm ions, we construct and study gedanken m odels that do contain electrow eak-singlet chiral quark elds. These m odels exhibit several distinctive properties, including the absence of any neutral lepton and the fact that both the (uud) and (ddu) nucleons are electrically charged. We also explore how such m odels could arise as low energy limits of grand uni ed theories and, in this m ore restrictive context, we show that they exhibit further exotic properties.

PACS num bers: 11.15.-q,12.10 D m ,12.60.-i

I. IN TRODUCTION

The fundam ental ferm ions in nature, as probed up to energies reached in experim ents so far, exhibit an intriguing asymmetry. The asymmetry with respect to fermion chirality is well-known. This is evident in the fact that the ferm ion content of the Standard M odel (SM) is chiral with respect to its gauge group, $G_{SM} = SU(3)_c$ SU $(2)_{I}$, U $(1)_{Y}$. The asym metry that we focus on here is the fact that there are ferm ions, namely the leptons, that are color-singlets but nonsinglets under the electrow eak (EW) subgroup of G_{SM} , $G_{EW} = SU(2)_L$ U(1)_Y, but there no evidence for ferm ions that are singlets under G_{EW} while being nonsinglets under SU (3)_c. Can one understand this property of nature at a deeper level? To address this question, we construct and study gedanken m odels that are variants of the Standard M odel and that include electroweak-singlet quarks. Our aim here is not to try to nd another model that ts current data but instead to work out properties of these gedanken models and determ ine in what general ways these properties dier from those observed in the realworld. Our methods of analysis are simply those of quantum eld theory and group theory; we do not include any results from anthropic argum ents.

One class of variants involves the addition of a vectorlike set of electroweak-singlet, color-nonsinglet ferm ions to the Standard M odel. A second class of variants is obtained by altering the hypercharges and thus also the electric charges of the quarks in the Standard M odel so that either the d_R -type or u_R -type quarks of each generation have Y = Q = 0. This can be done in a manner consistent with constraints from anomaly cancellation so long as one also makes corresponding changes in the charges of the leptons [1]. W ithin this class of m odels we discuss three particular cases. In two of these, the electric charges of left- and right-handed W eyl com ponents of ferm ions satisfy $q_{f_{L}} = q_{f_{R}}$ and (i) $q_{d_{R}} = 0$ or (ii) $q_{\mu_R} = 0$. In the third, all ferm ions have Y = 0. We nd several ways in which the properties of such variants dier from those of the Standard Model, including the

absence of any neutral leptons and the fact that both the (uud) and (ddu) nucleons are electrically charged. We then consider possible \ultraviolet completions" of these models [2]. There are various motivations, including gauge coupling uni cation, quark-lepton uni cation, and charge quantization, to believe that the SM is a low energy e ective eld theory resulting from a grand unied theory (GUT) based on a (sem i) sim ple gauge group, G_{GUT}. M odem grand uni ed theo-G_{GUT}, with G_{SM} ries usually entail a supersymm etric extension of the SM [3], although examples of gauge coupling uni cation in non-supersymmetric contexts have also been found [4]. In the grand uni ed theories that we consider, we show that such models would exhibit further exotic properties; for example in an SU (5) theory, we nd breaking of U (1)_{em} by QCD quark condensates.

W e recall certain basic properties and x som e notation. The ferm ion content of the Standard M odel consists of N_g = 3 generations of the quarks $Q_{n;L}^{a} = \frac{u_{n}^{a}}{d_{n-L}^{a}}$, $u_{n;R}^{a}$, and $d^a_{n\,;R}$, transform ing respectively as $(3;2)_{1=3}$, $(3;1)_{4=3}$, and (3;1) $_{2=3}$, and the leptons $L_{n,L} = e_n e_{n,L}$ and $e_{n,R}$ transform ing as $(1;2)_1$ and $(1;1)_2$. Here a is the color index, the numbers in parentheses are the dimensions of the representations of SU $(3)_{\rm c}$ and SU $(2)_{\rm L}$, the subscripts are the weak hypercharge Y, n is the generational index, and we use a compact notation in which u_1 u, c, u₃ t, etc. To accom odate m assive neutrinos, u_2 we also include a number ns of electroweak-singlet neutrinos, $\sum_{n,R}$ transform ing as $(1;1)_0$ and will usually take $n_s = N_q = 3$. We have $Q = T_3 + (Y=2)$ and will consider theories with values of Y and hence Q di erent from those in the SM itself. For supersymmetric extensions of the SM, we stress that our aim is to study models with EW -singlet, color-nonsinglet m atter ferm ions contained in chiral super elds; of course, such models automatically include electroweak-singlet color-adjoint ferm ions in vector super elds, nam ely the gluinos.

II. MODELW ITH ADDITIONALVECTORLIKE FERMIONS

One way to construct a variant of the Standard M odel with electroweak-singlet color-nonsinglet m atter ferm ions is simply to add a vectorlike set of SU $(2)_{L}$ singlet fermions ff_L ; f_Rg , i.e. a set in which f_L and f_R transform according to the same representation of SU $(3)_c$ and have the same Y = Q, including some with Y = Q = 0. If one starts with the minimal supersymmetric Standard M odel (M SSM), possibly augmented with G_{SM} -singlet chiral super elds, then one would add the set of (left-handed) chiral super elds $f\hat{F}$; $\hat{F}^{c}g$. It is easy to see why one would not have observed such particles at energies probed so far, since the bare ferm ion mass term $m_F F_L F_R + h$: or corresponding super eld term $\hat{F}\,\hat{F}^{\,c}$ is invariant under G $_{S\,M}$, and hence m $_{F}$ would be expected to be of order the scale characterizing the ultraviolet com pletion of the theory, such as the GUT scale. This is a special case of the general result that elds that can form bare m ass term s consistent with gauge symmetry group describing the theory at a given scale do form such terms at this scale, and are integrated out in the e ective eld theory below this scale [5]. Rather than adding such elds to the SM or M SSM , one can, instead, change the hypercharge assignm ents of the SM or M SSM elds them selves, as we discuss next.

III. SM W ITH ALTERED FERM ION HYPERCHARGES

A. Models with $q_{f_L} = q_{f_R}$

A minim alway to obtain electrow eak-singlet quarks in a SM -like model or extension thereof is to change the hypercharge assignments for the SM fermions. To keep U $(1)_{em}$ vectorial in the simplest manner, we maintain the relations for the electric charges

$$q_{f_{L}} = q_{f_{R}} ; \qquad (3.1)$$

where f runs over the quarks and leptons. Since the $T_3 = 1{=}2$ component of the SU $(2)_L$ -doublet lepton eld willhave a nonzero charge for the models of interest here, we avoid the SM notation $L_{n\,;L} = \begin{smallmatrix} e_n \\ e_n \end{smallmatrix}_L$ and instead write

$$L_{L} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ L \end{pmatrix};$$
 (3.2)

where here and below we shall often suppress the generational index n. The altered hypercharge assignments are subject to the constraint of cancellation of anom alies in gauged currents. The SU $(3)_c^3$ and SU $(3)_c^2$ U $(1)_Y$ triangle anom alies vanish because of the vectorial property of SU $(3)_c$ and U $(1)_{em}$, The condition that the SU $(2)_L^2$ U $(1)_Y$ triangle anom aly vanishes is

$$N_{c}Y_{Q_{L}} + Y_{L_{L}} = 0;$$
 (3.3)

where we display the general N $_{\rm c}$ dependence. This is equivalent to the condition [1]

$$q_{1} = q_{1} + 1 = \frac{1}{2} - 1 - \frac{(2q_{2} + 1)}{N_{c}}$$
 : (3.4)

T his provides two ways to get electrow eak-singlet quarks. We discuss these for the relevant case N $_{\rm c}$ = 3.

The rst way entails the Y assignments and corresponding SU $(2)_L$ -doublets (with electric charges in parentheses and suppressing generation indices)

$$Y_{Q_{L}} = 1; \quad Q_{L}^{a} = \frac{u^{a}(1)}{d^{a}(0)}$$

$$Y_{L_{L}} = 3; \quad L_{L} = \frac{1}{2}(2); \quad (3.5)$$

and SU (2) $_{\rm L}$ singlets having Y $_{\rm f_R}$ = 2q $_{\rm f_R}$,

$$u_{R}^{a}$$
 (1); d_{R}^{a} (0); $'_{1;R}$ (1); $'_{2;R}$ (2); (3.6)

so that d_R^a is an EW singlet. We denote this case as DRS, standing for \d_R singlet".

The second case has SU $(2)_L$ -doublets

$$Y_{Q_{L}} = 1; \quad Q_{L}^{a} = \frac{u^{a}(0)}{d^{a}(1)}$$

$$Y_{L_{L}} = 3; \quad L_{L} = \frac{1}{2}(2)$$

and SU (2) $_{\rm L}$ singlets

 u_{R}^{a} (0) ; d_{R}^{a} (1) ; $'_{1;R}$ (2) ; $'_{2;R}$ (1) ; (3.8)

so that u_R^a is an electrow eak-singlet (denoted case URS). Both the DRS and URS cases also satisfy the conditions of vanishing U $(1)_Y^3$ and G²U $(1)_Y$ triangle anom alies, where G = graviton. The DRS and URS cases correspond to cases C 4_q and C 5_q with N $_c$ = 3 in the classication of R ef. [1].

The DRS and URS models exhibit several properties that di er from those of the Standard M odel. First, they do not have any neutral leptons. Second, not just the proton, $p = (uud)_{J=1=2}$, but also its isospin partner nucleon, $n = (ddu)_{J=1=2}$ (the neutron in the SM), would be charged and would have charges q_p and $q_h = q_p$ 1 of the same sign:

$$q_p = 2$$
; $q_n = 1$ DRS case; (3.9)

 $q_p = 1$; $q_n = 2$ URS case: (3.10)

For arbitrary q_{1_2} it follows from eq. (3.4) that

$$q_p = q_{1_2}; q_n = q_{1_1}:$$
 (3.11)

(T his is true m ore generally for the analogues of p and n for higher N $_{\rm c}$ [1, 8].)

O ne can construct a supersymmetric extension of either the DRS or URS SM -like model. The usual Higgs mechanism in its SM or M SSM form can be implemented for these DRS and URS models, considered in isolation. One could also choose one of the various scenarios for supersymmetry breaking, so that, in the observable sector this occurs at the electrow eak level, as in the M SSM . A 1ternatively, as gedanken theories, one might use dynam ical electroweak symmetry breaking (EW SB) via technicolor (TC) [6] and extended technicolor (ETC) [7]. If the residual nuclear force had the same strength as in the realworld, then the binding of nucleons to form nucleiw ould be som ew hat reduced because of the increased Coulomb repulsion between nucleons resulting from the fact that both types of nucleons have nonzero electric charges of the same sign (and indeed one of these is double the usual proton charge in magnitude). This would tend to destabilize som e nuclei that are stable in the real world. A lthough both m em bers of the nucleon isodoublet are charged, there are spin-1/2 baryons that are neutral in thism odel. For the DRS and URS cases these include, for example, the spin-1/2 baryons

(dds); (dss); (ddb); etc: (DRS case) (3.12) (uuc); (ucc); (uut); etc: (URS case): (3.13)

If one keeps the masses of the quarks equal or sim ilar to their values in the real world, then these are heavier than the nucleons and would beta decay. We shall show below how the matter ferm ion content of the DRS and URS models can arise from a grand united theory, where their structure is more tightly constrained.

B. Modelwith all Ferm ions Having Y = 0

A di erent modi cation of the SM with electroweaksinglet quarks that is allowed by anom aly constraints is for each ferm ion generation to have the SU $(2)_L$ doublets (again suppressing the n index)

and SU (2) $_{\rm L}\,$ singlets ${\rm ff}_{\rm R}\,g\,w$ ith

$$Y_{f_R} = q_{f_R} = 0 \ 8 \ f_R$$
 : (3.15)

To keep SU (3)_c vectorial, the set ff_R g includes two color triplets for each generation, which we denote $_{R}^{a}$ and $_{R}^{a}$. (We avoid denoting these as u_{R}^{a} and d_{R} since they have di erent electric charges than u_{L}^{a} or d_{L}^{a} .) The remainder of the set ff_R g is comprised of (two or some other number of) G_{SM} -singlets. We denote this model with the matter fermion content in Eqs. (3.14) and (3.15) as the YZ (Y zero) case; it corresponds to the case C2_{q;sym} (equivalently C2_{';sym}) in the classi cation of Ref. [1]. A l-though SU (3)_c (with other interactions turned o) and

U (1)_{em} (with other interactions turned o) are vectorial sym m etries in the YZ m odel, this occurs in a \twisted" m anner, in which there is not a 1-1 correspondence between a left-handed W eyl eld and a right-handed W eyl eld with the sam e color and charge [9]. From Eq. (3.11), it follows that both m em bers of the nucleon isodoublet are charged:

$$q_p = q_n = \frac{1}{2}$$
 (Y Z case) : (3.16)

If one considers the YZ model in isolation without trying to construct an ultraviolet completion, then one can include a I = 1=2, Y = 1 SM Higgs eld or, in an MSSM context, I = 1=2 Y = 1 Higgs chiral super elds. With either of these one can break SU (2)_{T.} U(1)y to U(1)em via Higgs vacuum expectation values (VEV's). However, one cannot construct G_{SM} -invariant Yukawa couplings and use these to generate m asses for the m atter ferm ions. For example, the Yukawa term $Q_{a;n;L} f_{n^0;R}^a$ + h:c: is forbidden by U (1)_Y gauge invariance, since it transform s as a Y = 1 operator. A ssigning any value of Y other than 1 to the H iggs eld (s) would not allow EW SB, since the Higgs would not have any neutral com ponents.

In this YZ model, QCD con nes and spontaneously breaks chiral sym m etry. The most attractive channel for condensate formation, 3 3! 1, yields the condensates (suppressing n indices) $h_{a_{1L}} f_{R}^{a} i$ and $h_{a_{1L}} f_{R}^{a} i$, where f_{R} refers to $_{R}$ or $_{R}^{0}$. W ithout loss of generality, we can write these as $h_{a_{1L}} f_{R}^{a} i$ and $h_{a_{1L}} f_{R}^{a} i$. Since $q_{L} = 1=2$, $q_{L} = 1=2$, and $q_{R} = q_{R}^{0} = 0$, these condensates break not just SU (2)_L, but also U (1)_{em}. This model is thus strikingly di erent from the real world. We shall show below how the matter ferm ion content of the YZ model (but not I = 1=2, Y = 1 Higgs eld(s)) arises naturally as a low-energy e ective eld theory if one requires electrow eak-singlet ferm ions in an SU (5) GUT.

IV. GRAND UNIFICATION IN SU (5)

W e now analyze electrow eak-singlet quarks in the context of grand unied theories. Much modern work on grand uni ed theories has focused on meeting constraints from proton decay and deriving models from a presum ed underlying string theory. Our purpose here is som ew hat di erent; we are not trying to account in detail for the experim entally observed values of gauge couplings or lim its on proton decay. Instead, we wish to explore the properties of gedanken grand uni ed theories containing electroweak-singlet quarks, accepting that these would entail changes in the measured values of $\sin^2 w$, etc. We rst consider the case where the GUT group has the minim alrank, namely 4, the same as G_{SM} . For this case, the canonical choice is $G_{GUT} = SU$ (5) [10]. One assigns the left-handed m atter ferm ions of each generation to a 5 and 10 representation. Under SU (3)_c SU (2)_L these decom poseas 5 = (3;1) (1;2) and 10 = (3;1) (3;2) (1;1). In

order to make the (3;1) in the 5 of SU (5) an EW -singlet (anti)quark, we assign it zero hypercharge. In term s of the the equivalent 5_R , we write

$$_{R} = \underset{L^{C}}{\overset{a}{\underset{R}}}$$
(4.1)

where a is again the color index and Y $_{\rm R}$ = 0. As before, we use the symbol $_R$ rather than u_R or d_R for this quark because it will not have the charge of either $u_{\rm L}$ or d_L . If the GUT group is SU (5), then Y (and hence Q) are (linear combinations of) generators of the Lie algebra of SU (5) and hence satisfy Tr(Y) = Tr(Q) = 0. **'**1 (1=2) Therefore, $Y_{L_R^c} = 0$, and $L_L =$ (charges ¹₂ (1=2) _⊥ listed in parentheses). Consequently, as operators, Y =diag(0;0;0;0;0) and thus

$$Q = diag(0;0;0;1=2; 1=2):$$
 (4.2)

These operators are to be contrasted with the form s in conventional SU (5) [10],

$$Y_{conv:} = diag(2=3; 2=3; 2=3;1;1)$$
 (4.3)

and thus

$$Q_{conv:} = diag(1=3; 1=3; 1=3;1;0):$$
 (4.4)

It follows that the Y assignments in the 10 of SU (5) in the present case are

$$10 = (3;1)_0 \quad (3;2)_0 \quad (1;1)_0 ; \qquad (4.5)$$

with respective component elds

$$d_{a;L}^{0c}(0)$$
; $u^{a}(1=2)$; $C_{L}^{c}(0)$: (4.6)
 $d^{a}(1=2)$

Thus, for each generation (suppressing the generation index) the ferm ions from the 5_L and 10_L comprise the representations

$$Q_{L}^{a} = \frac{u^{a} (1=2)}{d^{a} (1=2)} : (3;2)_{0} ;$$

$$L_{L} = \frac{1}{2} (1=2) : (1;2)_{0} (4.7)$$

and

$${}^{a}_{R}(0); {}^{ba}_{R}(0): (3;1)_{0}; {}^{R}(0): (1;1)_{0}: (4.8)$$

This therefore yields a YZ-type model. There could also be SU (5)-singlet m atter ferm ions.

One envisions that the SU (5) gauge symmetry is spontaneously broken to G_{SM} at the GUT scale, M_{GUT} . The resultant theory below M GUT has several properties that are quite di erent from those of the real world. First, since all of the particles have Y = 0, the e ective gauge group is just SU $(3)_{c}$ SU $(2)_{L}$, without a U $(1)_{Y}$ factor. Thus, in this model $Q = T_3$ and $U(1)_{em}$ is a subgroup

of SU (2)_L . Second, as noted above, although the SU (3)_c and U (1)em gauge interactions are individually vectorial, this is realized in a manner di erent from that of the SM . Third, one cannot construct a SM - or M SSM -type Higgs sector in this theory because the operator Q has no color-singlet, SU (2) -doublet, electrically neutral com ponent. For example, the Higgs SU (2) L doublet contained $^{(1=2)}_{(1=2)}$. A VEV for in an SU (5) 5 of Higgs is = either component of this Higgs doublet breaks SU (2). com pletely, including its U (1)em subgroup. For the sam e reason, usual SM -type Yukawa couplings and their supersymmetric extensions are not possible in this theory. The (SU (3), -invariant) m ass terms that one m ight consider for the quarks,

X
$$q_{a;n;L} M_{nn^{0}}^{(q)} f_{n^{0};R}^{a} + h c:$$
 (4.9)

with q = u; d and $f = ; ^{0}$, break SU (2)_L and hence also U $(1)_{em}$. The same is true of the lepton D irac mass term s

n

X
$$j_{jm,L} M (j) a_{n^0,R} + h c;;$$
 (4.10)

where j = 1;2. The SU $(2)_{L}$ -doublet leptons can have the G_{SM} -invariant M a jorana bare m ass term s

$$\sum_{\substack{ijL n,L \\ n,n^{0}}} L_{n,L}^{iT} C M_{nn^{0}} L_{n^{0};L}^{j} + h \varepsilon:$$
(4.11)

where i; j denote SU (2) $_{\rm L}$ indices. The structure of this operator in plies that M $_{nn^0}^{(L)} = M_{n^0n}^{(L)}$, so for the relevant case of odd N_q there is at least one zero eigenvalue, i.e., a massless charged lepton at this level. Via diagram s involving the exchange of GUT-scale gauge bosons, the proton and $\frac{1}{2}$ will mix, as will the (ddu)_{J=1=2} nucleon and ${}_{1}^{c}$, which will give extremely small masses to these leptons. The e ect of the very low -m ass charged unconned leptons is reduced by the fact that U (1) em is broken, as we discuss next. The n;R 's could have bare M a prana mass terms $\prod_{n:n^0} \prod_{n:R}^{T} C M^{()} \prod_{n^0;R} + h:c:.$

Since the SU $(3)_c$ gauge interaction is asymptotically free, as the energy scale decreases below M_{GUT} , the SU (3)_c coupling grows. As decreases through QCDand $s = q_s^2 = (4)$ reaches values of order unity, the QCD sector exhibits con nem ent. Since mass terms for the quarks would violate U (1) em , we take them to be massless. Then in the lim it where one neglects electroweak interactions, the theory has a global avor symmetry

$$G_{fl} = SU (2N_q)_L SU (2N_q)_R$$
 (4.12)

The QCD interaction spontaneously breaks G_{fl} by the form ation of the bilinear quark condensates (in the 3 3! 1 channel)

X
$$hg_{a,n;L} f_{n^0;R}^a i + hc;;$$
 (4.13)

where q = u; d and f = ;⁰. As with the mass term s, these condensates are invariant under SU (3)_c but break SU (2)_L and hence U (1)_{em}. This is the sam e as the YZ model, now seen in a GUT context.

V. GRAND UNIFICATION IN SO (10)

O ne can construct grand unied theories with electroweak-singlet quarks that avoid the breaking of U (1)_{em} by using $G_{GUT} = SO$ (10) [11] and taking advantage of the additional freedom of having Y, and hence Q, be generators of SO (10) but not of SU (5). SO (10) m odels in which Y and Q are not generators of SU (5) were constructed in Ref. [12] with conventional quark and lepton charges and the u_R^a assigned to the 5_R , so that Y = diag(4=3;4=3;4=3;1;1). W e will use this freedom in a di erent way here. W e denote \hat{Y} as the generator of SU (5) that commutes with SU (3)_c and SU (2)_L. Now SO (10) contains, as a maximal subgroup, SU (5) U (1)_X, and the spinor 16 of SO (10) transform s as $16 = 1_5 \ 5 \ 3 \ 10_1$, where subscripts denote X values. W e set

$$\hat{\Upsilon} = aY + bX : (5.1)$$

Since the electrow eak-singlet quark is assigned to the rst N $_{\rm c}$ = 3 components of $_{\rm R}$, it follows that for the 5 of SU (5),

$$Y = diag(0;0;0;y;y); \quad y = Y_{L_{o}^{c}} = Y_{L_{L}}:$$
 (5.2)

Hence $Tr(\Upsilon) = 2ay + 15b$. We can take a = 1, and solve to get b = 2y=15, so that

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}} = \mathbf{Y} - \frac{2\mathbf{y}}{15}\mathbf{X}$$
 : (5.3)

For the DRS case, with d_R in $_R$ and $Y_{L_L} = 3$, we thus have $\hat{Y} = Y$ (2=5)X. For the 5 of SU (5) this is

DRS:
$$\Upsilon = \frac{1}{5}$$
diag(6; 6; 6;9;9): (5.4)

For a representation R with a given value of X, one then calculates Y and Q by using Eq. (5.3). For the 5 of SU (5), Y = diag(0;0;0;3;3) and Q = diag(0;0;0;2;1). The components of the 10 of SU (5) have the Y values indicated,

DRS:
$$10_{L}$$
: (3;1) ₂ (3;2)₁ (1;1)₄; (5.5)

with component elds given by $u_{a;L}^{c}$ (1), $u^{a}(0)_{L}$ and $\binom{c}{2}_{L}$ (2). The remaining component of the 16 of SO (10) is an SU (5) singlet, $\binom{c}{1}_{L}$ (1). These elds thus comprise the set in Eqs. (3.5)-(3.6).

For the URS case, with u_R in $_R$ and $Y_{L_L} = 3$, we have $\Upsilon = \Upsilon + (2=5)X$. For the 5 of SU (5) this is

URS:
$$\Upsilon = \frac{1}{5}$$
diag(6;6;6; 9; 9): (5.6)

Thus for the 5 of SU (5), Y = diag(0;0;0; 3; 3) and Q = diag(0;0;0; 1; 2). The components of the 10 of SU (5) have the Y values indicated,

URS:
$$10_{L}$$
: $(3;1)_{2}$ $(3;2)_{1}$ $(1;1)_{4}$ (5.7)

with component elds given by $d_{a;L}^{c}(1)$, $u^{a(0)}_{d^{a}(-1)}_{L}$ and $\binom{c}{1}_{L}$ (2). The remaining component of the 16 of SO (10) is an SU (5) singlet, $\binom{c}{2}_{L}$ (1). These elds make up the set in Eqs. (3.7)-(3.8).

Using the relation $\sin^2 w = Tr_R (T_3^2)=Tr_R (Q^2)$, we nd

$$\sin^2 W = \frac{1}{2(1 + 3Y_{Q_L}^2)}$$
 at M_{GUT}: (5.8)

Thus, at M $_{G\,U\,T}$, sin² $_{W}$ 1=2, and this value is reached for the Y choices leading to the YZ low energy eld theory. The Y choices leading to the DRS or URS models yield sin² $_{W}$ = 1=8 at M $_{G\,U\,T}$.

In these SO (10)-based DRS and URS models the 16dimensional spinor representation has no color-singlet, SU (2), -doublet, electrically neutral entries, in contrast to both conventional [11] and 'ipped" [12] SO (10) m odels, and the sam e follows for the 5 and 10 representations of SU (5) arising from this spinor. A Higgs (super) eld that could give rise to electroweak symmetry breaking is thus problem atic. One could consider adding a (super) eld transform ing as a vector representation of SO (10). Under SU (5) U (1) $_{\rm X}$ the 10 of SO (10) decomposes as $10 = 5_2 = 5_2$. In the DRS and URS cases the 5 of Higgs resulting from this would have charges (1; 1; 1;1;0) and (1;1;1;0; 1), respectively. Although these Higgs elds thus contain color-singlet, SU (2)_L-doublet, neutral entries, they can form bare, SO (10)-invariant m ass term s with m asses naturally of order the GUT scale and hence would be integrated out of the low-energy theory operative below this scale. M oreover, if such mass terms were not present, then colortriplet Higgs components in the Higgs 10 of SO (10) could contribute to overly rapid nucleon decay. For the purposes of our further analysis, we assume that GUT-scale m ass term s are present for H iggs (super) elds transform ing as the 10 of SO (10).

If one were to depart from this simple GUT and adjoin to the theory a technicolor sector, then one could use this to break electroweak symmetry at the 250 GeV scale (where in this gedanken model we would accept resultant technicolor modi cations of Z and W propagators) [13]. However, if we consider the theory by itself, without such an addition, then we may ask if this resultant theory would break electroweak symmetry. The answer is yes, and this breaking is dynamical. There would not be Higgs-based Yukawa couplings or TC /ETC contributions to give fermions masses. In the absence of these and in the limit where one turns o electroweak interactions, the QCD sector would have the global chiral symmetry G fl in Eq. (4.12). (Note that there would not be any strong CP problem in QCD because the massless quarks would allow one to rotate away the angle.) Because the SU (3)_c gauge interaction is asymptotically free, $_{\rm S}$ increases as the energy scale decreases below M $_{\rm G\,U\,T}$, reaching O (1) at $_{\rm Q\,C\,D}$, at which scale this interaction produces the bilinear quark condensates in the 3 $\,$ 3 $\,$ 1 channel. W e now turn the electrow eak interactions back on. By vacuum alignment arguments, the condensates preserve U (1)_{em} and the diagonal, vectorial subgroup SU (2N $_{\rm g})_{\rm V}$ of G $_{\rm fl}$, thereby producing (2N $_{\rm g})^2$ $\,$ 1 N am bu-G oldstone bosons (NGB's). W ithout loss of generality, we can dene the ordering of the generational bases for left– and right-handed quarks so that these condensates take the form (summed on a, not on n),

$$hu_{a;n;L} u_{n;R}^{a} i + h c:$$

 $hd_{a;n;L} d_{n;R}^{a} i + h c;$ 1 n N_g: (5.9)

These condensates transform with weak I = 1=2, jr j= 1 and break SU (2)_L U (1)_Y to U (1)_{em}, so three of the NGB's are absorbed to produce longitudinal components and masses for the W and Z, leaving the remaining 4 (N $_{g}^{2}$ 1) (P)NGB's in the spectrum. Denoting f as the generalized pion decay constant and g and g^{0} as the SU (2)_L and U (1)_Y gauge couplings, one has $m_{W}^{2} = N_{g}g^{2}f^{2}N_{g}$ =4 and $m_{Z}^{2} = N_{g}(g^{2} + g^{02})f^{2}$ =4, satisfying $m_{W}^{2} = m_{Z}^{2}\cos^{2}$ w. The realization that QCD quark condensates break electroweak symmetry and that three of the resultant NGB's would be absorbed to give the W and Z masses was, indeed, one of the main motivations for the original development of technicolor [6].

The con nem ent and spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking in the QCD sector generates dynam ical, constituent masses of order OCD for the quarks. Provided that the quarks have zero hard m asses, the resultant constituent masses would be equal for u-type and d-type quarks, up to electrom agnetic corrections. W e assum e that if one begins with a supersymmetric grand unied theory, the supersymmetry is broken at a higher scale. The spectrum of the theory depends sensitively on the num ber ofm atter ferm ion generations. In the hypotheticalcase $N_{q} = 1$, since the NGB's (pions) are absorbed by and Z, the low-lying hadron spectrum would be the W comprised of the isovector and isoscalar!, the nucleons, the (non-NGB) isoscalar pseudoscalar analogue of ⁰, and so forth. For $N_g = 2$ or $N_g = 3$, the spectrum would be qualitatively di erent because of the (i) residual (P)NGB's and (ii) electrically neutral, spin-1/2, ground state baryons. Indeed, the absence of hard, current-quark m asses would mean that, up to electrom agnetic e ects, the various ground-state baryons of a given spin would be essentially degenerate. Thus, although the (uud) and (ddu) baryons would be charged, there would be the spin-1/2 ground-state baryons listed in Eqs. (3.12) and (3.13) for the respective DRS and URS cases.

Concerning the charged baryons, one expects a Coulombic energy contribution roughly proportional to $q^2=R$ to a hadron of charge q and size R. Hence, in the absence of hard quark masses, for N_q = 1, the p and

n would be the lightest baryons, while for N_g = 2;3 the lightest baryons would be the neutral ones in the respective Eqs. (3.12) and (3.13). Am ong ground-state baryons, electrom agneticm ass di erences would be of order' em QCD, i.e., a few M eV if one continues to take QCD to have its real-world value of 200 M eV. Since the size of the proton p and its isospin partner nucleon n would be essentially the same, and since $q_p = 2$ and $q_n = 1$ for the DRS case, one infers that

$$m_p > m_n$$
 DRS case: (5.10)

For the URS case, since $q_p = 1$ while $q_h = 2$, one has

$$m_n > m_p$$
 URS case: (5.11)

G iven that the leptons have very small masses (see below), the following beta decays would occur:

$$p! n'_{12}^{c}$$
 (DRS) (5.12)

and

$$n ! p'_{2}'_{1}^{c}$$
 (URS): (5.13)

In each of these cases, one could make the form al observation that the lighter nucleon could form a neutral C oulom bic bound state that are stable with respect to strong and weak decays, namely

$$[h(1)'_1(1)]$$
 (DRS) (5.14)

and

$$[p(1)'_2(1)]$$
 (URS); (5.15)

where we have indicated charges in parentheses and in – plicitly refer to the lightest mass eigenstates in the relevant interaction eigenstates $'_j$. Also, formally, there could be stable three-body leptonic Coulomb bound states,

 $['_{2}(2)'_{1}^{c}(1)'_{1}^{c}(1)]$ (DRS); $['_{1}(2)'_{2}^{c}(1)'_{2}^{c}(1)]$ (URS): (5.16)

However, in the absence of Lagrangian m ass terms for the matter fermions, both the DRS and URS models resulting from this SO (10) GUT have charged, uncon ned '1 and '2 leptons with zero Lagrangian masses. There is mixing between the p and '^C₂ and, separately, mixing between the n and '^C₁. These mixings generate nonzero, although extremely small, masses for these leptons. To illustrate this, let us take the DRS case for de niteness (sim ilar statements hold for the URS case) and N_g = 1 for simplicity. Here the GUT gauge boson sector includes bosons (Y^a (1); X^a (2)) transforming as (3; 2)₃ and their adjoints. A tree-level amplitude contributing to proton decay is u + u ! d^c + '^C₂, mediated by the s-channel exchange of a X^a_g. The corresponding uud'₂ operator also gives rise to the mixing u + u + d \$ '^C₂. The matrix element of this operator between the states $pi \mbox{ and } j_2^c i \mbox{ is } Am p (p \ _2)' (g_{G \, U \, T}^2 = M_{G \, U \, T}^2)_{Q \, C \, D}^3$, where $g_{G \, U \, T}$ is the G UT gauge coupling. D iagonalizing the corresponding 2 $2 \ mbox{ ming matrix, one } nds \ a negligibly sm all shift in the proton m ass m <math display="inline">_p$ and a nonzero m ass

$$m_{\nu_2} = \frac{j \hat{j}}{m_p}$$
: (5.17)

 $U sing_{QCD} = 200 \text{ MeV}$ and the illustrative values $_{\rm G\,U\,T}$ ' 1=24 and M $_{\rm G\,U\,T}$ ' 10¹⁶ GeV, we have m $_{2}$ ' 10 72 GeV.A similar mass is generated for $`_1.$ Since these masses are so small, they are obviously quite sensitive to additional ingredients in an ultraviolet com pletion of the theory and should only be considered as illustrative. Form ally, an isolated C oulom bic state such those in Eqs. (5.14) or (5.15) would have a size set by the Bohr radius a $(_{em} m_{i})^{-1}$, j = 1;2. However, this is only form al, since with the tiny 'j masses, this size would be m any orders of m agnitude larger than the present size of the (real-world) universe. Uncon ned charged leptons with such smallmasses would cause an infrared instability in the theory, so that the above-m entioned C oulom bic bound states would be replaced by a plasm a, sim ilar to the situation in the hypothetical case of SM with conventional ferm ion charges but without a Higgs eld [14].

In view of these various results, we may conclude that even though our SO (10) GUT constructions yielding DRS and URS models as low-energy e ective eld theories avoid the breaking of U $(1)_{em}$ that a icted the YZ model, they still exhibit exotic properties and striking di erences as compared with the realworld. Some further remarks may be in order. In the absence of a usual SM Higgs or the pair of M SSM Higgs chiral superelds, the perturbatively calculated partial wave am plitudes for the scattering of longitudinally polarized vector bosons in the DRS and URS models would exceed unitarity upper bounds at a center-of-m assenergy som ew hat above the EW SB scale. The unitarization of these am plitudes would depend on the ultraviolet completion of the theory. If the only source of EW SB is QCD, then this unitarization would involve exchanges of the scalar and vector hadrons of QCD at the scale of O (1) GeV. If one were to adjoin a TC/ETC sector to obtain EW SB at the usual physical scale of 250 GeV, then this unitarization would involve exchanges of technihadrons. One could also consider larger grand uni ed groups. In particular, we have studied electrow eak-singlet quarks in the context of a GUT based on the gauge group E_6 , which

contains SO (10) as a subgroup, and have obtained sim ilar conclusions.

Our nding that the DRS and URS models are more tightly constrained when considered as low -energy e ective eld theories resulting from an SO (10) grand uni ed theory than when considered in isolation is understandable, since the larger structure of a GUT provides a more predictive theoretical fram ework. This is analogous to the fact that the ratios of gauge couplings for the three factor groups in the Standard M odel are essentially arbitrary when this theory is considered in isolation, but are predicted when it (or its supersymmetric extension) is embedded in a grand uni ed theory. In principle, one m ight further extend the present analysis of electrow eaksinglet quarks to the case of GUT's containing an extension of the SM with N_c dierent from 3. However, although one can satisfy anom aly constraints in an N_cextended Standard M odel, the naturalem bedding of such a theory in an SO $(2(N_c + 2))$ grand uni ed theory would require

$$2^{N_{c}+1} = 4 (N_{c}+1); \qquad (5.18)$$

which only has a solution for N $_{\rm c}$ = 3 [1, 15]. A coordingly, we do not pursue such an N $_{\rm c}$ -generalization here.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have sought to gain a deeper understanding of one property of the Standard M odel, nam ely the absence of electrow eak-singlet quarks. For this purpose we have constructed and studied gedanken models that are sim ilar to the Standard M odel but do contain electroweak-singlet quarks. We have found that these models exhibit properties fundam entally di erent from those of the Standard M odel, including the absence of neutral leptons and the fact that both the (uud) and (ddu) nucleons are charged. Furtherm ore, working in the context of a grand uni ed theory, we have shown that (i) an SU (5) theory with electroweak-singlet quarks leads to a low-energy eld theory which, am ong other things, violates U (1)em; and (ii) SO (10) grand uni ed theories in which Y and Q are generators of SO (10) but not SU (5) can avoid breaking of U (1)em, but still generically lead to low-energy e ective eld theories quite di erent from the Standard M odel.

This research was partially supported by the grant NSF-PHY-06-53342.

- [1] R.Shrock, Phys. Rev. D 53, 6465 (1996).
- [2] A lthough we use the common term \ultraviolet completion", a preferable term m ight be \ultraviolet extension", since such theories could well have further new structure at yet higher energies.
- [3] Recent reviews include S. P. Martin, hep-ph/9709356 (v4, 2006); J. Terning, Modern Supersymmetry: Dynam ics and Duality (Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2006); P. Binetruy, Supersymmetry: Theory, Experiment, and Cosmology (Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, UK, 2006); M.

D ine, Supersym m etry and String Theory: Beyond the Standard M odel (C am bridge U niv. P ress, C am bridge, UK, 2007). An early review of (non-supersym m etric) G UT's is P.Langacker, Phys. Repts. 72, 185 (1981).

- [4] V.Barger, J.Jiang, P.Langacker, and T.Li, Phys.Lett. B 624, 233 (2005); Nucl. Phys. B 726, 149 (2005) and references therein.
- [5] T. Appelquist and J. Carazzone, Phys. Rev. D 11, 2856 (1975); H. Georgi, Nucl. Phys. B 156, 126 (1979).
- [6] S.W einberg, Phys. Rev. D 19, 1277 (1979); L.Susskind, ibid. D 20, 2619 (1979).
- [7] S.D im opoulos and L.Susskind, Nucl. Phys. B 155, 237 (1979); E.E ichten and K.Lane, Phys. Lett. B 90, 125 (1980).
- [8] One may ask, for general N_c, which choices of matter ferm ion charges could yield a neutral nucleon. In addition to the conventional SM set of charges, there is one other SM -like set: Y_{QL} = 1=N_c, Y_{LL} = 1, and q_{fL} = q_{fR}, resulting in q_p = 0, q_n = 1 (case C 4 · in [1]). For N_c = 3 this set can be embedded in an SU (5) GUT with 5_R containing u_{R}^{a} (1=3) and L_{R}^{c} , where $L_{L} = \binom{1}{\binom{1}{2}\binom{1}{0}}_{L}$, 10_L containing $Q_{L}^{a} = \binom{u^{a}(1=3)}{d^{a}(2=3)}_{L}$, $d_{a,L}^{c}$ (2=3), and $c_{1,L}^{c}$ (1), with Y = diag(2=3;2=3;2=3; 1; 1) and a possible SU (5)-singlet $c_{2,L}^{c}$ (0).
- [9] A model with $Y_{Q_L} = Y_{L_L} = 0$ and conventionally vectorial SU (3)_c and U (1)_{em} would have SU (2)_L-singlet elds u_R^a (1=2); d_R^a (1=2); $'_{1;R}$ (1=2); $'_{2;R}$ (1=2) rather than Eq. (3.15).

- [10] H. Georgi and S. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. 32, 438 (1974).
- [11] H. Georgi, in Particles and Fields, 1974, ed. C. E. Carlson (A IP., New York, 1975), p. 575; H. Fritzsch and P. Minkowski, Ann. Phys. 93, 193 (1975).
- [12] S.Barr, Phys.Lett.B 112, 219 (1982); see also A.DeRujula, H.Georgi, and S.G lashow, Phys.Rev.Lett.45, 413 (1980); I.Antoniadis, J.R.Ellis, J.S.Hagelin, and D. V.Nanopoulos, Phys.Lett.B 194, 231 (1987).
- [13] Recent studies on how one m ight try to unify couplings in m odels with dynam ical electroweak sym m etry breaking include N.D.Christensen and R.Shrock, Phys.Rev.D 72,035013 (2005); S.B.G udnason, T.A.Ryttov, and F. Sannino, Phys.Rev.D 76,015005 (2007); and N.Chen and R.Shrock, Phys.Rev.D 78 035002 (2008).
- [14] C.Quigg, Rept. Prog. Phys. 70, 1019 (2007). Som e further discussion is in C.Quigg and R.Shrock, to appear.
- [15] In Ref. [1], Eq. (5.18) was found in the context of an N_cextended SM in which one allowed both quark and lepton charges to deviate from their conventional SM values. In the special case where one considers general N_c but requires the leptons to have their conventional charges, obstacles to grand unication with N_c € 3 were shown earlier by H.G eorgi, Nature 288, 649 (1980) and Y.Tosa and S.O kubo, Phys.Rev.D 23, 2486 (1981).See also C.-K.Chow and T.-M.Yan, Phys.Rev.D 53, 5105 (1996); R.Shrock, Phys.Rev.D 76, 055010 (2007).