FERM ILAB-PUB-08-343-T

R {sym m etric gauge m ediation

Santiago De Lope Amigo^{a1}, Andrew E.Blechman^{a2}, Patrick J.Fox^{b3}, Erich Poppitz^{a4}

^aD epartm ent of P hysics, U niversity of Toronto Toronto, ON M 5S 1A 7, C anada

^bT heoretical P hysics D epartm ent, Ferm i N ational A coelerator Laboratory B atavia, IL 60510,U SA

A bstract

W e present a version of G auge M ediated Supersym m etry B reaking which preserves an R-sym m etry | the gauginos are D irac particles, the A-term s are zero, and there are four H iggs doublets. This o ers an alternative way for gauginos to acquire m ass in the supersym m etry-breaking m odels of Intriligator, Seiberg, and Shih. W e investigate the possibility of using R-sym m etric gauge m ediation to realize the spectrum and large sferm ion m ixing of the m odel of K ribs, P oppitz, and W einer.

¹E -m ail: slam igo@ physics.utoronto.ca

²E-m ail: blechm an@ physics.utoronto.ca

³E-m ail: pjfox@ fnal.gov

⁴E -m ail: poppitz@ physics.utoronto.ca

1 Introduction

1.1 M otivation

Supersymmetry is one of the most studied ideas for physics at the LHC. Supersymmetric phenomenology is usually described by the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) and its variations (xMSSM's), obtained either by adding extra states, usually gauge singlets, or by focusing on certain regions of parameter space.

It was only recently realized [1] that a new universality class of supersymmetric particle physics models, characterized by an extra R-symmetry | which can be continuous or discrete (Z_4), exact or approximate | is not only phenomenologically viable, but also helps to signi cantly alleviate the supersymmetric avor problem and has novel signatures at the TeV scale. A model with an exact R-symmetry, called the \M inim alR-symmetric Supersymmetric Standard M odel" (M R SSM) was constructed in [1]. It was shown, somewhat unexpectedly, that with the imposition of the new symmetry signi cant avor violation in the sfermion sector is allowed by the current data, even for squarks and sleptons with mass of a few hundred G eV, provided the D irac gauginos are su ciently heavy, while the avor-singlet supersymmetric CP-problem is essentially absent. Stronger bounds on the allowed avor violation, obtained by including the leading-log QCD corrections, were subsequently given in [2]. The D irac nature of gauginos and higgsinos and the possibility of large sferm ion avor violation in the M R SSM both present a departure from usual supersymmetric phenomenology.

The analysis of the MRSSM in [1] was performed in the framework of an elective supersymmetric theory with the most general soft terms respecting the R-symmetry. The place of this model in a grander framework, including the breaking and mediation of supersymmetry, was not addressed in detail. The purpose of this paper is to investigate a possible ultraviolet completion of the MRSSM in the framework of gaugemediated supersymmetry breaking, with the hope that an ultraviolet completion will help narrow the choice of parameters of the elective eld theory analysis. The focus of this paper on gaugemediation is motivated by several recent observations.

First of all, phenom enological studies [3] of the MRSSM have shown that D irac charginos are typically the next-to-lightest supersymmetric particles (NLSPs) in the visible sector. This points toward a possible small scale of supersymmetry breaking, with the resulting light gravitino allowing a decay channel of the light charginos.

Secondly, it has been known [4] for a while that models with non-generic superpotentials can have both broken supersymmetry and unbroken R-symmetry. More recently, Intriligator, Seiberg, and Shih (ISS) [5] observed that metastable supersymmetrybreaking and R-preserving vacua in supersymmetric gauge theories are, in a colloquial sense, quite generic. Majorana gaugino masses require breaking of the R-symmetry; instead we explore the possibility that the gauginos are D irac and the R-symmetry is unbroken. Combined with the fact that these vacua can preserve large nonabelian avor symmetries, it makes sense to use ISS models to build R-symmetric models of direct m ediation of supersymmetry breaking.

1.2 The M R SSM

For completeness, here we recall the main features of the MRSSM as an elective softly broken supersymmetric extension of the Standard M odel (SM) with an R symmetry. The most important difference from the MSSM are the extended gauge and Higgs sectors and the R-charge assignments.

The quarks and leptons of the SM and their superpartners are described by R-charge 1 chiral super elds, while the R-charges of the two higgs doublet super elds, H $_{\rm u}$ and H $_{\rm d}$ are zero. To allow for R-symmetric gaugino masses, SM-adjoint chiral super elds,

 $_{1,2,3}$, of R-charge 0 are introduced. An additional pair of H iggs doublets, R_u and R_d , of R-charge 2 are needed to allow R-symmetric $_{u,d}$ -terms. The R symmetry forbids the new H iggs elds from coupling to SM matter through renormalizable operators. W hile we will refer to U (1)_R as the R-symmetry," we should stress that for most phenom enological purposes a Z_4 subgroup su ces, while a Z_6 is su cient to forbid soft dimension-5 operators violating baryon and/or lepton number such as QQQL and QQQR_u.

The MSSM -term is forbidden by the U $(1)_R$, and there are new terms in the superpotential allowed by U $(1)_R$ and the SM gauge symmetry:

$$W = {}_{u}H_{u}R_{u} + {}^{u}_{1}H_{u} {}_{1}R_{u} + {}^{u}_{2}H_{u} {}_{2}R_{u} + (u ! d) :$$
(1.1)

The allowed R-symmetric soft terms are: soft scalar masses, D irac gaugino masses (combining the W eyl gauginos of the gauge supermultiplets with the fermion components of the SM adjoint chiral super elds), holom orphic and nonholom orphic masses for the scalar components of $_{1;2;3}$, and the usual B $h_u h_d$ term; the MSSM A-terms and M a jorana gaugino masses are forbidden. As explained in [1], the D irac nature of gauginos, the absence of A-terms, and the extended Higgs sector \mid all features following from the R-symmetry \mid can combine to address avor problems in various regions of tan .

1.3 Outline

In this paper, we present a model that uses direct gauge mediation and the metastable solution of ISS to generate the MRSSM. In the next section, we will discuss the relevant details of the ISS model and how it can be used to generate direct gauge mediation with an R symmetry. We will also introduce notation for computing masses that will be used throughout the paper. In Section 3 we will consider how to use the model presented in Section 2 to generate soft terms in the visible sector. This section is divided into two parts: contributions from the cuto scale UV physics, and direct contributions from the messenger sector, that we call \IR contributions". At this stage we will also discuss a generalization of the model where we identify the important features of the

m etastable ISS solution and consider how these essential features can be extracted in a general, phenom enologically viable way. Then, in Section 4, we present som e examples of qualitatively di erent spectra, and discuss constraints such as perturbativity and tuning. A thourough study of the phenom enology of these m odels, such as the details of the EW SB sector, collider signals, dark m atter, etc., are left for future work.

2 ISS and R-sym m etric direct gauge m ediation

D irect gauge m ediation postulates that the SM gauge group G_{SM} is part of the global sym m etry of the supersym m etry breaking sector, thus relaxing the need to have a separate m essenger sector of supersym m etry breaking. D ynam icalm odels of direct m ediation have been considered in the past, see e.g. [6,7]. The ISS m odels [5] of m etastable supersym m etry breaking are attractive setups for constructing m odels of gauge m ediation, particularly in the R -sym m etric setup. A swe shall see in this paper, using ISS as an illustrative example of an R -sym m etric supersym m etry-breaking/m ediation sector w ill teach us som e general lessons on R -sym m etric m ediation; these open the way for the future study of m ore generalm odels w ith di erent phenom enology.

The \electric" (high-energy) ISS model is supersymmetric QCD with gauge group SU ($\hat{N_c}$) and N_f avors of quarks Q and Q, with a tree level superpotential:

$$W_{el:} = Trm QQ:$$
 (2.1)

The dual \m agnetic" (low -energy) theory has gauge group SU (N_c), N_c = N_f $\hat{N_c}$, N_f avors of m agnetic quarks q;q, gauge-singlets M , transform ing as (N_f; N_f) under the avor group, and superpotential:

$$W_{m agn:} = qM q + Trm M + :::$$
 (2.2)

where the dots denote nonperturbatively generated terms (that are not important in the m etastable supersymmetry breaking vacuum) and is the duality scale. As ISS show, there exists a metastable supersymmetry-breaking vacuum in this theory, since the equation of motion for M following from (2.2): $q^i \quad g = m_j^i$ (the dot denotes summation over the gauge indices) can not be satisticed, for N_f > N_c and a mass matrix of maximal rank N_f, due to the rank condition. The avor symmetry preserved by the mass terms in (2.2) is broken in the supersymmetry breaking vacuum, while an R-symmetry, under which M has R-charge 2 and q; q have R-charge 0, remains unbroken. That the R-symmetry is unbroken follows from the Coleman-W einberg calculation of [5], which shows what while the dual quarks get expectation values, the trace of M , which is a classical at direction, does not.

R-sym m etry breaking is needed to obtain M a jorana gaugino m asses. Thus, a lot of the m odel building using ISS and other supersym m etry-breaking m odels has focused on breaking the R sym m etry, either explicitly or spontaneously; for exam ple [8{20]. A s described in the Introduction, in light of the recent observations of [1] on the interesting

_	SU (5) _V	U(1)	U (1) $_{\rm R}$
М	Adj+1	0	+ 2
Х	1	0	+ 2
Ν	5	+ 6	+ 2
Ν	5	{6	+ 2
,	5	+1	0
'	5	{1	0
	1	{5	0
	1	+ 5	0
	Adj ⁰	0	0
M ⁰	Adj	0	0

Table 1: Charges of super elds of the supersymmetry breaking and mediation sector. Note that the chiral super elds are only adjoints under G $_{\rm SM}$ and not the full SU $(5)_{\rm V}$, denoted by A dj⁰. In addition to the continuous symmetries indicated, we impose a charge-conjugation symmetry (C) under which barred and unbarred elds are exchanged, the G $_{\rm SM}$ SU $(5)_{\rm V}$ vector super elds change sign, as does ; the elds M ;M 0 ;X are invariant.

phenom enological features of supersymm etric models with unbroken R symmetry, we explore here the contrary possibility. We build R-symmetric models of direct gauge mediation, where gauginos are D irac, and study their phenom enological consequences.

2.1 The supersymmetry-breaking/mediation sector

To be more concrete, we consider a simple ISS model allowing for direct gauge mediation.¹ For simplicity, we take $N_c = 1$, $N_f = 6$ ($\hat{N_c} = 5$), as done by [11]. The \magnetic" dual theory is then an O'R aifertaigh model. The supersymmetry-breaking vacuum has a reduced vectorlike global symmetry SU (6)_V ! SU (5)_V due to the vevs of the dual squark elds q and q. W e will describe the model in terms of a set of elds with de nite quantum numbers under the unbroken SU (5)_V, related to the ones in (2.2) as follow s:

$$M = \frac{M N}{N X}; q = '; q = ': (2.3)$$

In addition to the elds in (2.3), as we will shortly explain, our model will also require the introduction of two other elds which transform as adjoints under SU $(5)_{V}$

¹Since our purpose here is more to emphasize the general features of R -symmetric gauge mediation rather than to construct a model with minimal netuning, in most of this paper we consider this simple example where G_{SM} SU (5)_V. More general constructions are possible, perhaps even desirable, and will be discussed later in the paper.

and carry vanishing R-charge. We will call these elds M 0 and . In what follows, it will only be necessary for to be an adjoint under G $_{\rm SM}$ rather than the full SU $(5)_{\rm V}$ sym metry (will be used to give D irac masses to the gauginos). This avoids the need for \bachebr" elds of [21]; they can be added with minimal trouble, but in the spirit of minimization of the model, we will leave them out.

The charges of the various super elds of the supersymmetry-breaking/mediation sector under the global SU $(5)_V$ symmetry of the ISS model, the U $(1)_R$ symmetry, and a residual U (1) global symmetry (which is spontaneously broken by the dual squark vevs) are given in Table 1.

The spontaneous breaking of SU $(6)_{V}$! SU $(5)_{V}$ in the ISS model will have behind a massless N am bu-G oldstone (NG) boson in the messenger sector. However, the gauging of G_{SM} explicitly breaks the the full SU $(6)_{V}$ and the NG boson will acquire a mass. Since the symmetry is broken in this way we consider the more general case where we \tilt" the couplings in the superpotential in eqn. (2.2) so that the SU $(6)_{V}$ symmetry is explicitly broken, keeping certain ratios of couplings xed as would be the case for the gauging of G_{SM}, e.g. in W_{m agn} below. Finally, the most general nontrivial tilting of the superpotential that is consistent with the remaining symmetries is

$$W = W_{m agn} + W_{1}; \qquad (2.4)$$

where:

 $W_{magn} = 'M' + {}^{0}X + 'N + N' f^{2}(X + ! TmM);$ (2.5)

is the (tilted) ISS superpotential from Equation (2.2), while

$$W_1 = Y' N N';$$
 (2.6)

are additional terms, which explicitly break the global U(1) of Table 1.² The couplings in W₁ are needed to generate D irac gaugino mass. For now, we simply postulate a C-parity, de ned in the caption to Table 1, which explains the relative m inus sign in (2.6); we will come back to this point below. Notice that we can recover the SU (6)_V limit by setting = 0 = ! = 1. By rephasing elds it is possible to take all the parameters in (2.5) and (2.6) to be real, which we do in the following.

 $^{^2}$ In a complete SU (6) $_{\rm V}$ description this term can be thought of originating from a term q[^;M]q in the magnetic superpotential (2.2), with ^ being an extension of to SU (6) $_{\rm V}$, similar to the relation between M and M in (2.3); this allows following Seiberg duality for the construction of the corresponding electric theory, if such a thing is desired. How ever, for the purposes of this paper we will simply treat these terms as additional terms allowed by symmetries, making no assumptions as to the origin of the y couplings.

2.2 Scales of supersym m etry breaking and m ediation

The F-term equations at the SUSY breaking metastable minimum of (2.5) give:

h i
$$v^2 = \frac{f^2}{0};$$
 (2.7)

$$hF_{TM} i = !f^2$$
: (2.8)

We also nd h' i = h' i = hN i = hN i = hX i = 0, all with masses near f. The other elds are stabilized at higher order in the loop expansion, as we will see below.

At the minimum (2.7, 2.8) the scalar mass squared term s are:

and ferm ion masses are:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & r & \frac{2}{2} & 1 \\ r & \frac{2}{0} e^{i} & c & r \\ \frac{2}{0} e^{i} & 0 & A & N \\ \frac{2}{0} e^{i} & 0 & 0 \\ \end{pmatrix}$$
(2.10)

Notice that all the masses can be scaled to depend on two variables:

x !;
z
$$\frac{!^{0}}{2};$$
 (2.11)

and we can de ne an overall messenger mass scale:

$$M_{m ess}^{2} = \frac{x}{z}f^{2}$$
; (2.12)

which is independent of SUSY breaking. From the above mass matrices, we see that the N; N scalars as well as the two ferm ion messengers all have mass M $_{\rm m\,ess}$. The mass eigenstates of the upper 2 2 block of the scalar mass matrix are:

$$= \frac{p^{1}}{p^{2}} (' + ');$$

$$= \frac{p^{1}}{p^{2}} (' + ');$$
(2.13)

³N otice that canonically norm alizing TrM would require a factor of p 5 be introduced in Equation (2.8), as in [11]. This factor can be reabsorbed into our de nition of ! and not doing so only serves to clutter the notation, so we will not include it here. Om itting this factor has no e ect on the low energy phenom enology of the m odel.

and have m ass squareds:

$$m^2 = (1 \ z)M_{m ess}^2$$
: (2.14)

Hence, to avoid tachyons, we require z 1. In fact, z = 1 is the SU $(6)_V$ limit where there is a massless messenger, as we can see explicitly from (2.14). Further in our analysis, we will take z 0.9. We note, from (2.14), that there is a signi cant mass hierarchy in the messenger sector for small breaking of SU $(6)_V$.

The F-term conditions (2.7) and (2.8) do not x the vacuum expectation values of M and ; :

$$= ve^{(+i)=v}$$
 (2.15)

$$=$$
 ve $(+i)=v$: (2.16)

At one loop, following the calculation of ISS, we nd hM i = h i = 0 with m assess one order of magnitude down from the messenger scale. This haves the massless eld , which is the NG boson of the spontaneously broken U (1) of Table 1. The Yukawa term s in W₁ break the U (1) sym m etry, hence this NG boson will get a mass starting at two loops due to the diagram shown in Figure 1. In the Appendix, we calculate the diagram and show that it generates a potential for :

$$V_{e}$$
 () = ${}^{2}v^{2}\cos{\frac{2}{v}}$; (2.17)

with positive 2^{2} given in (A.1). Thus, the minimum of the potential is at h i = 0, leading to the conclusion that the C-symmetry of the model is not spontaneously broken, and a mass of :

$$m^{2} = \frac{y}{16^{2}} M_{m ess}^{2} H(z);$$
 (2.18)

where H (z) is given in (A.3). Here we simply note that H (1) = 2^{-2} =3 and vanishes in the supersymmetric (z = 0) limit.



Figure 1: The leading diagram contributing to the mass.

Finally, we discuss the remaining messenger fermions. These come with a mass matrix 0 1 0 1

where $v = M_{m ess}$ is given by (2.7) and we have set h = h = 0. This matrix can be diagonalized with the result that the X ferm ion has mass $m_{X'} = v$ and the ;

elds m ix m axim ally, one getting a m ass¹ 2v and the other with vanishing m ass. This spectrum is not a surprise: the X ferm ion, having R = +1, can only m ix with the goldstino, the ferm ionic partner of TrM; one of these ferm ions marries the gravitino, while the other has a mass M_{mess} . The ; ferm ions each have R = 1 and can m ix. That there is a m assless ferm ion is not surprising, since the ; sector contains the pseudo-NG boson discussed above, and by supersymmetry this must come with a massless ferm ion (notice that there is no supersymmetry breaking in these ferm ion masses). The ; super elds can couple to the SM ferm ions starting at two loops, with gauge elds and m essengers in the loops; how ever, since these operators are generated by gauge bosons the operator is avor diagonal. These can then generate four-ferm ion (avor conserving) operators that, thanks to supersymmetry, are nite and small, with any divergent bop integrals cut o by the mass (2.18). Such massless ferm ions m ight have some interesting phenom enological or cosm ological consequences; from the R symmetry they can only be pair-produced. We will not say any more about them here.

This completes the discussion of the spectrum in the messenger sector. We may now discuss the phenomenology of the visible sector. Before doing so we comment on a few technical features of our model.

2.3 D irac gaugino m asses, C -parity, and the extra adjoints

G enerating a D irac gaugino m ass requires a chirality ip on a ferm ion line as explained in Section 3.2. This can only come from a superpotential ferm ion m ass term and requires the sum of the R-charges of the elds involved to be 2. The m ass of the scalar involved in the loop m ust be di erent from the ferm ion | if not there is a cancellation and the gaugino m ass is zero. This SUSY breaking splitting m ust come from o diagonal terms in the scalar m ass m atrix, otherwise the supertrace is non-zero and there will logarithm ic divergences in the scalar m asses [22]. Only scalar elds of zero R-charge can have these o diagonal m ass terms. Hence in order to generate a nonzero D irac gaugino m ass in R-symm etric gauge m ediation one needs elds with both R-charge 2 and R-charge 0. The m odel discussed here is of this general form : the ' and ' have zero R-charge and acquire o diagonal m asses (2.9), while the elds N and N have R-charge 2 and supply the needed chirality ip. W e will discuss a m ore general version of this m odel, involving fewer adjoints in Section 3.2. Recall now that in two component notation, D irac gaugino m ass terms are

$$m_{1=2} \stackrel{a}{\longrightarrow} i$$
; (2.20)

where is a W eyl ferm ion in the adjoint of the gauge group, part of the N = 1 vector multiplet, and is the W eyl ferm ion component of a chiral supermultiplet , also in the adjoint of the gauge group. In addition to preserving an R-symmetry, D irac (2.20), as opposed to M a jorana, gaugino m asses are odd in the gaugino eld . Hence, they change sign under C -parity if only is C -odd. Note that this already im plies that D irac gaugino m asses can not be generated by coupling the adjoint eld M from the supersymmetry breaking sector to the gauginos , even in modi cations of the ISS m odel with broken R symmetry, as the eld M is even under C (provided the ISS-m odi cation does not break C).

We chose to assign negative C -parity to the chiral adjoint making the D irac gaugino mass C -even. This also requires the relative minus sign between the two couplings in W₁ in (2.6). Naively, one might think that with a di erent ratio of the two couplings in (2.6) the loop-induced D irac gaugino mass might be reduced or even made to vanish. Take, for example, the extrem e case of a positive relative sign between the two terms in W₁. Then one might argue that the D irac gaugino mass should vanish: indeed, in this case, we could modify our de nition of C so that was even, thus forbidding the loop-induced D irac gaugino mass term (2.20). However, in this case the diagram of Figure 1 would generate a positive-cosine e ective potential for , instead of (2.17), leading to spontaneous C symmetry breaking, and giving rise to the same absolute value of the loop-generated D irac gaugino mass.⁴

However, a choice of C with even , or the absence of any symmetry, would allow for the generation of a tadpole for $_{\rm Y}$ | the gauge singlet hypercharge \adjoint." Such tadpoles are known to destabilize the hierarchy, see e.g. [23]. Having $_{\rm Y}$ odd under an unbroken discrete symmetry eliminates this tadpole, at least the supersymmetrybreaking/messenger sector contribution. A lso, this parity can be used to forbid kinetic mixing of the SUSY -breaking spurion with the hypercharge gauge eld strength, which could lead to large tachyonic scalarm asses. C -violation in the SM m ay introduce other contributions that will involve loops of quarks and leptons and will be suppressed by products of SM gauge and Yukawa couplings. In what follow swew ill assume that these contributions are sm all and can be ignored. This is similar to the standard \messenger parity" that goes along with gauge mediation [24{27] except is also charged under the parity.

The introduction of yet another zero-R-charge adjoint, M^0 , of even C-parity, is necessitated by the requirement to give the adjoint M a mass. This is because in the absence of R symmetry breaking the fermionic components of M are forbidden from obtaining masses due to loops, as is usually expected in a model where R is broken.

 $^{^{4}}$ T hat a maxim all absolute value gaugino mass is always generated is true for any value of the couplings in (2.6) | the theory simply wants to maxim ize the (negative) vacuum energy contribution from gauginos.

Finally, take note that G_{SM} SU $(5)_V$, and therefore the appearance of these new m essengers will have a strong e ect on the Standard M odel running couplings. In particular, all the couplings lose asymptotic freedom and will develop Landau poles. For typical choices of parameters used below, these Landau poles occur relatively close to the m essenger m ass scale.

3 Soft terms in the visible sector

Now we proceed to the calculation of the soft term s in the visible sector. To begin, we note that there are two main sources of visible sector soft masses in our model:

1. Ultraviolet (UV) contributions due to higher-dimensional operators. Typical in models with direct mediation of supersymmetry breaking, all couplings in the SM lose asymptotic freedom. In our model, the scales of the SM Landau poles are not too far above the messenger scale M_{mess} .

A s usual, the UV contributions can not be calculated in the low-energy theory. We estimate the scale suppressing the higher dimensional operators and their contribution to the SM soft parameters in Section 3.1 using naive dimensional analysis (NDA). The largest UV contributions are to soft scalarm asses, which are expected to be avor-nondiagonal, and to and B term s. UV contributions to gaugino m asses are suppressed, similar to the well-known pre-anom aly mediation gaugino m ass problem of supergravity hidden-sector models.

2. Infrared contributions to the soft param eters arise due to loops of the particles in the direct-m ediation sector and are calculable in the low-energy theory. M essenger loops generate D irac gaugino m asses and avor-diagonal soft scalar m asses. The IR contributions to the soft param eters are a loop factor below M $_{\rm m\,ess}$ and are calculated in Section 3.2.

There is an interplay between these two types of soft masses in our model. As we discuss in Section 4.1, the scale suppressing the UV contributions to the soft parameters is about a bop factor above $M_{m\,ess}$. Thus the bop-suppressed IR contributions are typically similar to that due to the higher-dimensional operators. This allows us, at the cost of moderate cancellations of the various contributions in the scalar sector (see Section 4.3) to realize the scenario proposed in [1], where D irac gauginos heavier than the scalar suppress the avor-changing neutral currents due to non-degenerate squarks.

3.1 Estimating the UV contributions

We begin by discussing the typical size of UV contributions. From eqn. (2.8), the F-term supersymmetry breaking spurion of R-charge 2 is:

$$hTrM i = {}^{2}!f^{2}:$$
 (3.1)

U sing this spurion, m any R -sym m etric higher-dim ensional operators that com m unicate supersym m etry breaking to the SM can be written down. They are all suppressed by some high scale , the value of which will be discussed later, in Section 4.1. These UV -operator induced soft m ass contributions are of order M $_{\rm UV}$, de ned as:

$$M_{UV} = \frac{!f^2}{!f^2} = \frac{z}{!f^2} = \frac{M_{mess}}{!f^2} M_{mess}$$
(3.2)

where for future use we chose to rewrite M $_{\rm UV}$ in terms of the messenger scale M $_{\rm m}^2$ and the dimensionless parameters of eqn. (2.11)-(2.12).

is the scale at which these operators are generated and is a model-dependent parameter. However, before we study the operators that are generated at this scale, a few words can be said about its size.

O ne possibility is that M_P : this is the usual expectation from gauge + gravity mediation, where any \UV operators" are generated by new physics at the P lanck scale and are irrelevant. It solves the avor problem trivially, since all avor-changing operators are P lanck suppressed; how ever it assumes that all physics below the P lanck scale is avor-conserving, which is a strong assumption. As it does nothing to realize the features of the MRSSM, we do not consider this possibility further here.

The other extrem e is that is related to $_3$, the QCD Landau pole, where presum – ably there is a new dual description that takes over. It is quite reasonable to assume that there are new states in this dual theory that can generate avor-violating operators. We will discuss more careful estimates of below but as this turns out to be the most constraining possibility we will consider it throughout the paper.

We now enumerate the R-symmetric higher-dimensional operators that can be written down. Dirac gaugino masses $m_{1=2}$ can be generated by the \supersoft" operator [21]:

$$Z d^2 - \frac{1}{3} Tr(W) D^2 D^{y} ! m_{1=2} M_{UV} - \frac{M_{UV}}{3} : (3.3)$$

Similarly, soft scalar masses, m $_{0 \text{ ij}}$, generically avor non-diagonal, for the SM elds (say, quark super elds Q) are given by:

$$Z d^{4} \frac{C_{ij}}{2} \qquad ^{y} Q^{y}_{i}Q_{j} ! m_{0ij} M_{UV} :$$
(3.4)

where c_{ij} is a naively avor-anarchic matrix with 0 (1) entries. We note that unless $M_{UV} = = 0$ (1), D irac gaugino masses due to higher dimensional operators are suppressed⁵ compared to the soft scalar mass. In addition, the smallness of this operator means that we can ignore supersoft contributions to the scalar masses [21]. As we will see below, the problem of too-small masses due to higher-dimensional operators will

 $^{^{5}}$ For M $_{Pl}$ this is the well known pre-anom aly-mediation problem of gaugino masses in supergravity without singlets.

be addressed by direct gauge m ediation in this m odel, along with an estimate of the relevant cuto scale.

Next, we recall that in the R-symmetric M SSM the usual -term is forbidden by R-symmetry and that there are, instead, two -terms, $_{u}H_{u}R_{u}$ and $_{d}H_{d}R_{d}$, where $R_{u;d}$ are two new R-charge 2 Higgs doublets. The $_{u;d}$ terms, as opposed to the M SSM, preserve a PecceiQuinn (PQ) symmetry, which forbids B but not $_{d}$, $_{u}$ (H $_{d;u}$ can be taken to have PQ charge + 2, $R_{u;d}$ charge 2, and the quark and lepton super elds charge 1). This symmetry implies that, unlike the M SSM, $_{u=d}$ and B originate from dierent operators.

The B term B $h_u h_d$ is, however, allowed by R symmetry. B is generated by an R-preserving G iudice-M asiero type operator:

$$\begin{array}{c} Z \\ d^{4} \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad (\ ^{y} \) \\ H_{u}H_{d} \quad ! \quad \stackrel{p}{=} \quad M_{UV} ; \end{array}$$

which yields B similar to the soft scalar mass (3.4). The $_{u,d}$ -terms are instead generated by R-preserving operators⁶ of the form:

$$Z = d^{4} - \frac{1}{2} Y H_{u(d)} R_{u(d)} + u_{u(d)} M_{UV} :$$
(3.6)

In addition, there is an operator that is not forbidden by any symmetry allowing (3.5), is renormalizable, naively expected to be unsuppressed and generating an unacceptably large B term:

Ζ

$$d^2$$
 H_uH_d ! p_{mess} : (3.7)

However, one can put forward arguments in defense of ignoring (3.7). The only difference between the desirable (3.5) and the undesirable (3.7) (as written), is that the former vanishes as ! 1 while the latter does not. Now, the scale is expected to be proportional to the SM Landau pole. Thus all UV-suppressed operators coupling the SM to the supersymmetry-breaking sector that we wrote so far except (3.7) vanish as one takes the SM gauge couplings to zero, since the Landau pole scale goes to in nity in this lim it. One might adopt a broad de nition of \gauge mediation" by requiring that all couplings of SM to supersymmetry-breaking sector elds vanish as one takes the SM gauge coupling to zero (and, in our model, the coupling y of W₁, which may be related by a high-scale N = 2 supersymmetry to the gauge coupling). Clearly, in posing this criterion amounts to an assumption on the nature of the unknown UV theory: in particular, it should have an accidental PQ symmetry which forbids (3.7) but is broken by higher-dimensional operators such as (3.5). In the absence of an explicit dual, it is hard to be more precise; in practical terms, in what follows we will set the coe cient of (3.7) to zero and appeal to technical naturalness in supersymmetry.

⁶N otice that C parity in plies $_{u} = _{d}$, but this need not be required in general; considerations along these lines is delegated for future work.

The scalars in the adjoint chiral multiplets (of zero R-charge) will also obtain soft masses of order M $_{\rm UV}$ from K ahler potential term s, such as:

$$Z d^4 - \frac{Y}{2} Tr^{Y} + Tr^{2}$$
: (3.8)

We can also write a large superpotential B term " for but chose not to for the same reasons as avoiding (3.7). Finally, as explained in Section 2.3, to avoid massless SM adjoint ferm ions, we introduced (see Table 1) another SU (5)_v adjoint, M⁰, of zero R-charge. The R-preserving operator:

$$d^4 = \frac{1}{2} \gamma T M M^0 ! m_{1=2}^M M_{UV};$$
 (3.9)

gives rise to a D irac m ass for M and M 0 of the same order as the soft scalar m ass (3.4).

3.2 Calculating the IR contributions

7

We now consider the calculable IR contributions to the soft mass parameters. There is a 1-bop contribution (sim ilar graphs were considered in [28]) to the D irac gaugino mass from graphs involving the ' (') and N (N) messengers, shown in Figure 2, as well as the usual two-bop gauge mediated contributions to the scalar masses. We now proceed to calculate these soft masses.

Soft masses in ISS-models



Figure 2: One of the diagram s contributing to the 1-loop gaugino mass. The other graphs are obtained by di erent choices of ', ' N, and N running in the loop.

The diagram of Figure 2 involves an R preserving ferm ion mass insertion and a scalar with a SUSY-breaking mass and generates a Dirac gaugino mass. Using the values for our masses and couplings of Section 2.2, we not that the loop-induced Dirac gaugino masses can be written as:

$$m_{1=2} = \frac{gy}{16^2} M_{m ess} R(z) \cos \frac{h i}{v}$$
; (3.10)

where:

$$R(z) = \frac{1}{z} [(1+z) \log (1+z) \quad (1-z) \log (1-z) \quad 2z]; \quad (3.11)$$

where z is de ned in (2.11) and measures the o -diagonal supersymmetry breaking mass splitting in the scalar mass matrix (2.9). Notice the dependence of the gaugino mass on $\cos(h \ i=v)$. Since (see discussion in Section 2.3 and the Appendix) h i = 0 this factor is just 1. In principle the SU (3), SU (2) and U (1) pieces of the SU (5)_V may have di erent and y coe cients. However, for simplicity, we take the 3-2-1 pieces to all be the same; breaking this would e ect the relative size of the gauginos and sferm ions associated with each SM group.

The sferm ions acquire a gauge-m ediated m ass from loops involving the m essengers ';', but not N; N since they do not have supersymmetry-breaking m asses. Following [29], this contribution can be calculated. Thus, the contribution from gauge group a to a sferm ion m ass squared is:

$$m_0^{(IR)2} = 2C_F^{(a)} \frac{a}{4}^2 M_{mess}^2 F(z);$$
 (3.12)

where $C_F^{(a)} = (N^2 - 1)=2N$ for SU (N) and $\frac{3}{5}Y^2$ for U (1)_Y and:

F (z) = (1 + z)
$$\log(1 + z)$$
 $2Li_2 \frac{z}{1+z} + \frac{1}{2}Li_2 \frac{2z}{1+z} + (z! z)$: (3.13)

We note that the contribution of the R-symmetric messenger sector to soft scalar masses (3.12) is the same as that of one messenger multiplet in usual gauge mediation. The function F (z) from (3.12), with our parameter z identied with $F = S^2$ of usual gauge mediation, is the same appearing in, e.g., [29]. The D irac gaugino mass (3.10), however, is governed by a di erent function of z than in the case of M a prana mass. This qualitative di erence arises because the D irac gaugino mass requires the presence of an R-preserving chirality ip in the loop. This R-symmetric chirality ip does not appear in the two-loop diagram s generating the scalar mass, which are thus identical to those in one- avor gauge mediation [the messenger scalars ' and ', which have a supersymmetry-breaking spectrum contribute to the scalar masses, while N and N, which are supersymmetric, do not.

In addition note that $\Re(z \mid 0)$ j! z^2 , unlike usual gauge mediation where m₁₌₂ z. This is easy to understand since due to R-charges the D irac mass operator (3.3) needs two insertions of the spurion, ! f^2 , unlike a M a jorana mass that needs just one insertion. This qualitative di erence leads to the general fact that in R-symmetric gauge mediation the gaugino mass is typically lighter than the scalar mass, in contrast to usual gauge mediation, where the m₁₌₂ :m₀ ratio is larger than unity, see [29]. The ratio of gaugino to sferm ion mass in R-symmetric gauge mediation is:

$$\frac{m_{1=2}}{m_{0}^{IR}} = \frac{1}{p \cdot \frac{1}{2C_{F}}} + \frac{y}{g} + \frac{R(z)}{p \cdot \frac{R(z)}{F(z)}} :$$
(3.14)



Figure 3: The function of z entering the ratio (3.14) of gaugino to scalar mass. At z = 1 there is a branch point, with $R(z) = \frac{p}{F(z)} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2$

The ratio R = F, as F igure 3 shows, is strictly less than 1: for z = 0.99, R = F j = :64. Thus, in order to solve the supersymmetry avor puzzle along the lines of [1], which requires large gaugino to squark mass ratios, within an ISS supersymmetry-breakingcum-mediation sector, we must have a large Yukawa coupling y (near the boundary allowed by perturbativity, as we will discuss in Section 4.3).

F inally, the scalar adjoint elds in the supermultiplets also get real and holom orphic m asses from the m essenger loops:⁷

$$V_e = m^2 + \frac{1}{2}B (^2 + ^2);$$

These are given by

$$m^{2} = \frac{Y^{2}}{16^{2}} M_{m ess}^{2} R_{s}(z) ;$$
 (3.15)

$$B = \frac{Y^2}{16^{-2}} M_{m ess}^2 R (z) ; \qquad (3.16)$$

where

$$R_{s}(z) = \frac{1}{z} (1+z)^{2} \log(1+z) (1-z)^{2} \log(1-z) 2z ; \qquad (3.17)$$

and the z dependence in (3.16) is the sam e as in the gaugino m ass (3.11). These m asses are the sam e order, but it can be seen that $\beta_{i} \leq m^{2}$ for any value of z, so the gauge sym m etry is protected. A loo notice that B is strictly negative, which m eans that the scalar will always be lighter than the pseudoscalar. This is the reverse of ordinary

 $^{^7{\}rm W}$ e thank M arkus Luty for pointing this out to us.

supersoft m ediation [21]. Notice that since this a one-loop scalar m ass, it is enhanced compared to the gaugino m ass:

$$\frac{m}{m_{1=2}} = \frac{r}{4};$$
 (3.18)

where is the ne structure constant of the relevant gauge group. Thus we generally expect the adjoint scalars to be roughly an order of magnitude heavier than the gauginos, although there could be a sizable cancellation between the real and holom orphic mass. In addition, there could be cancellations with the UV operators that we de ned in the previous section (3.8).

G eneralized R-sym m etric gauge m ediation

In this section, we introduce a model of generalized R-symmetric gauge mediation. Inspired by previous discussions of generalized gauge mediation, see e.g. [29], we implement supersymmetry breaking in terms of an R-charge 2 spurion ${}^{2}f^{2}$, instead of a dynamical supersymmetry-breaking sector.

From the ISS model considered in the previous sections, we learned that only the elds ';', and N; N of ISS play a role in the mediation of supersymmetry breaking to leading order in the bop expansion. Furthermore, as we explained in Section 2.3, this is the minimal set of messenger elds required to achieve R-symmetric gauge mediation. Thus, in our generalized model, we will keep only these elds and consider a messenger sector consisting of N_{mess} copies:

$$W_{m ess} = \frac{N_{M ess}}{i=1} + M_{m ess} + M_{m ess$$

Here is the supersymmetry breaking spurion (3.1), M _{m ess} is a rigid messenger m as scale; the R -assignments of the multiple copies of messengers are the same as their namesakes of Table 1, as is their C -parity.

The messenger sector (3.19) gives rise, through the same set of one and two loop diagrams as the ones discussed in the previous section, to N_{mess} the gaugino mass contribution of (3.10) and N_{mess} the scalarm ass squared contribution of (3.12), where we reinterpret $z = f = M_{mess}$. Thus the ratio of loop-induced gaugino to scalar mass of eqn. (3.14) is enhanced by a factor of N_{mess} . The enhancement of the D irac gaugino mass by N_{mess} in the generalized model relaxes (some of, see Section 4.3) the need of having a large Yukawa coupling y. In addition, the absence of the SM adjoints M , M ⁰ from (3.19) pushes the SM Landau pole up: we note that the s beta function of the MR SSM vanishes already above the scale of the D irac gaugino mass and thus adding any colored messenger inevitably leads to a Landau pole. We will have to say more about this below.

To end this section, we note that in light of its phenom enogical desirability, it would be of some interest to have a UV completion of the generalized messenger model of (3.19), ideally including both the dynam ics of supersymmetry breaking and generating the messenger mass scale M $_{\rm mess}$ without introducing the extra adjoint baggage of the ISS model; we have this for future work.⁸

4 N um erics

4.1 How high can be?

It is well known that in order to avoid constraints from K $\,$ K m ixing, the dimension six operator $\,$ $_{\rm Z}$

$$d^4 \frac{Q^{y}Q Q^{y}Q}{\frac{2}{Q}}$$

must have a cuto $_Q$ 10³ TeV. Thus we need to chose parameters such that our cuto is no smaller than this.

To understand how large the scale suppressing the UV contributions () can be, we must consider the location of the Landau pole. Consider the beta functions of G $_{\rm SM}$:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\ln} \frac{1}{\mathrm{i}(\mathrm{i})} = \frac{\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{i}}}{2} : \tag{4.1}$$

The model (2.4) contains elds that transform under SU (3)_C SU (2)_L as:

$$M; M^{0} : (8;1) + (1;3) + (1;1) + (3;2) + (3;2)$$

: (8;1) + (1;3) + (1;1)
'; N : (3;1) + (1;2)
'; N : (3;1) + (1;2) : (42)

Now we must consider how the spectrum behaves, since the running will be sensitive to the ferm ionic and bosonic mass thresholds of the various multiplets. We solve the one-loop renormalization group equations including the various contributions as we pass their mass threshold, but we do not include nite threshold elects.

The presence of a large number of elds charged under the SM means that the Landau pole of SU (3) typically occurs at a relatively low scale, resulting in potentially sizeable UV -induced softm asses (3.2). However, the D irac gaugino m assw ill still be too sm all if the UV -generated operator (3.3) is the only source of its mass. For the Yukawa couplings in (2.6) of order one the gauginos have phenom enologically viable masses but

⁸One simple way to achieve this is to make dynamical and add a linear term f^2 to (3.19). The model with superpotential W mess + f^2 has an R-preserving supersymmetry-breaking (possibly metastable) vacuum at the origin of moduli space (= 0) as a consequence of the R-charge assignments [30]. One could further \retro t" [31] the explicit mass scales.

the gluino will still be som ewhat lighter than the squarks, see (3.14). W ithout a large value for y it is not possible to realize the scenario of [1]. For larger values of y, su cient to allow for large squark mixing and the interesting avor physics of the MRSSM, there will be a Landau pole for som e Yukawas below the strong coupling scale of SU (3). The generalized m odel of Section 3.2 alleviates som e of these issues by rem oving som e of the adjoints, raising the Landau pole, and increasing the num ber of messenger families, which lowers the Landau pole but also raises the gaugino scalar mass ratio.

Once the location of the SU (3) Landau pole $_3$ has been determined we may estimate the size of the UV contributions. If all gauge and Yukawa couplings became strong at the same scale one would expect that the scale of Section 3.1 would be related to the strong coupling scale $_3$ by, $_3$ 4. However, not all couplings become strong at the same scale and the operators involve, which is not charged under SU (3). Such operators should have a suppression from the perturbative coupling which is weak at that scale, weakening some of the constraints that we will nd below.

O focurse, we know that while there should be a suppression, it is hard to estimate: above $_3$, in the absence of an explicit dual description, we have no idea how the other couplings run (as we have a duality cascade, where after dualizing SU (3), the other gauge content will change) and where the other Landau poles now are. For the purposes of estimating the UV contributions we will therefore make the simplifying but conservative assumption that $= _3=4$, which potentially overestimates the size of the UV contributions, especially in the electroweak sector.

4.2 Sam ple Spectra

In this section we will consider three examples of spectra: the full ISS model with perturbative Yukawas, the full ISS model with large y (and consequently large gaugino m asses) and the generalised model. In all cases we consider z = 0.99. All squark and slepton m asses in the tables below are from the IR-direct gauge mediation contribution; we will discuss the UV m ass contributions in the next section.

Spectrum at sm all Yukawa

We consider a case where the Yukawas of (2.5) and (2.6) remain perturbative up to the Landau pole of SU (3); so we consider here the case of y = 2, = 1 and all other Yukawas are O (1). As discussed below (3.14), this results in too light a gluino mass and this situation does not allow for large squark mixing. We will assume that the UV contributions to the scalar masses have small coe cients so that the avor diagonal, IR contributions (3.12) dominate. Solving the RGEs we not the spectrum, at the messenger scale, shown in Table 2: the Landau pole occurs at $_3$ 8 10^3 TeV and $_3$ (M mess) 0:12.

SU (3)	m _q	1400 G eV	m _g	880 G eV
SU (2)	m ₁	360 G eV	m _w	520 G eV
U (1)	m _e e	160 G eV	m _{Bĩ}	370 G eV
M essenger	M ;M °;~	15 TeV	m	10 TeV
sector	M _{m ess}	100 TeV	m	3100 G eV

Table 2: Spectrum for y = 2, = 1 and all other Yukawas are 0 (1). Here and in Tables 3,4, only the IR contributions to squark and slepton masses are shown.

Spectrum at large Yukawa

As discussed in Section 3.2, to get large gaugino m asses and so allow large s avor violation in the MRSSM [1] we need a large Yukawa; here we consider the case of y = 8 and all other Yukawas are 0 (1). For such a large Yukawa the Yukawa Landau pole is close to the messenger scale. The squark masses are somewhat large, but below we will assume some cancellation between the UV (3.4) and IR (3.12) contributions, allowing for large squark mixing a la [1]: this will require some tuning and we will discuss this in the next section. In this case, we not the spectrum of Table 3 while ${}_{3} \mbox{M}_{mess}$ 0:11 and ${}_{3} \mbox{10}^{4} \mbox{TeV}$. The Landau poles of the other SM gauge groups are signi cantly higher, but as we mentioned above, \dualizing" color at ${}_{3} \mbox{would}$ necessarily change that estim ate. We emphasize that we do not expect this spectrum

SU (3)	m _q	1300 G eV	m _g	3500 G eV
SU (2)	m ₁	350 G eV	m _w	2100 G eV
U (1)	m _e c	160 G eV	m _B	1500 G eV
M essenger	M ;M °;~	13 TeV	m	10 TeV
sector	M _{m ess}	100 TeV	m	13 TeV

Table 3: Spectrum for y = 8 and all other Yukawas are 0 (1).

to be an accurate sample of parameter space with such a large Yukawa coupling; rather, we can see from this exercise that the only hope we have to realize an MRSSM scenario in the IR masses is to go to strong coupling, which would necessitate a more detailed analysis, including the elects of higher loops.

Spectrum in the generalized model

In the models of generalized R-symmetric gauge mediation of (3.19) increasing the number of messenger families, N_{mess} , increases the ratio of the gaugino mass to the scalar mass. Furthermore, the SM Landau pole is postponed because of the absence of the SU (5)_V adjoints M , M⁰, which allow s us to take a lower messenger scale. Perform - ing the same analysis as above, we nd that for y = 3, $N_{mess} = 6$ and $M_{mess} = 80$ TeV

we have $_{\rm s}$ (M $_{\rm m\,ess}$) = 0.08 and $_{\rm 3}$ = 5 10^4 TeV. The corresponding spectrum is shown in Table 4. Because of the large number of messengers the Yukawa has a Landau pole below $_{\rm 3}$.

SU (3)	m _q	1900 G eV	m _g	5300 G eV
SU (2)	m ₁	620 G eV	m _{w~}	3500 G eV
U (1)	m _{e^e}	290 G eV	m _B	2600 G eV
M essenger sector	M _{m ess}	80 TeV		

Table 4: Spectrum in the generalized model for y = 3 and $N_{m ess} = 6$.

4.3 Estimation of tuning

Recall that there are two contributions to the soft squark masses: one from the direct mediation, which is xed by the calculation in Section 3.2, and the other from the UV operators in (3.4). The latter comes with a coe cient that we will call c_D for the avor-diagonal terms, and c_{OD} for the avor-o-diagonal terms. Ideally we would like these coe cients to be 0 (1), and to solve the avor puzzle we would also want $c_D = c_{OD}$. This means that there are two potential sources of tuning: one com ing from the UV-IR cancellation of the diagonal masses, and one com ing from the smallness of the avor-violating terms relative to the avor-diagonal terms. We will discuss each of these in turn.

First of all, some general comments can be made about the rst kind of tuning between UV and IR contributions. Recall that we made the conservative assumption that the scale of the UV operators was proportional to the QCD Landau pole ₃ i.e. = ₃=4 . This means that M_{UV} M²_{mess} = is typically quite large unless we wish to make big, which would introduce another Landau pole. This mass scale is typically O (10) TeV in the ISS models, and smaller for the generalized models, as can be seen from the tables in the previous section. If the nal scalar mass is m₀, we have

$$c_{\rm D} = \frac{m_0^2 m_{\rm IR}^2}{M_{\rm UV}^2}; \qquad (4.3)$$

with m_{IR}^2 given by (3.12). If $m_0 < m_{IR}$ 1 TeV, this means that $j_D j$ 10² in the ISS models, and $j_D j$ 1 in the generalized models. This is smaller than hoped for in the ISS case, although it does very well in the generalized model; but it should be noted that it depended on the cuto being so low, and our hopes to avoid another Landau pole in . If we are willing to accept strong coupling, or the added assumption that the generation of avor-changing operators is postponed to a higher scale (the SU (2) Landau pole, for instance), then this tuning can be weakened.

To analyze the second form of tuning, if is the ratio of the avor-changing mass squared term over m_0^2 , we have

$$c_{OD} = \frac{m_0}{M_{UV}}^2$$
 : (4.4)

G iven Equations (4.3)-(4.4), we can immediately write down a formula that quantiles the avortuning:

t
$$\frac{C_{0D}}{C_D} = \frac{1}{j!} (m_{IR} = m_0)^2 j$$
: (4.5)

Notice that this expression is independent of M_{UV} . Typical allowed values of are of order 0.1 or less [2], given $m_{1=2}=m_0$ of 5{10. We saw from (3.14) that m_{IR} is typically larger or of order the gaugino mass, so we immediately see from (4.5) that this model will be some what tuned. For example, if we demand a 10% tuning, we require $m_0 = m_{IR} = 2$, which is very hard to do while maintaining the gaugino squark ratio. Low ering our standard to a 1% tuning, we require $m_0 = m_{IR} = 11$ which is much easier to accomplish. So there is a trade o . In Table 5 we give the avortunings for

	m _o		t
ISS with Large y	600 G eV	0.05	1.4%
GeneralM odel	1 TeV	0.07	2.7%

Table 5: Size of the avor tuning for the MRSSM spectra considered above.

the two models considered in Tables 3 and 4. The values of $_{\rm L} = _{\rm R}$ are the maximum values for the given m₀ and gluino mass after QCD corrections to K K mixing are taken into account [2].

4.4 Lifetime of the false vacuum

We have concentrated our attention on the physics around the SUSY breaking vacuum of ISS but this minimum of the potential is metastable. The true minimum of the system, whose existence is due to the higher dimension non-perturbatively generated term we ignored in (2.2), has unbroken supersymmetry. The additional operator is due to instanton contributions,

$$W_{inst} = \frac{\det M}{3}; \qquad (4.6)$$

where in this section denotes the duality scale, the strong coupling scale of the gauge coupling in the microscopic theory. Once this additional term is included the rank condition can now be satis ed and there is a SUSY preserving minimum at,

hM i f
$$\frac{3}{f}$$
 II; hqi = hqi = 0: (4.7)

Because the additional term is irrelevant this SUSY preserving minimum is far from the SUSY breaking minimum. It is this distance that results in the metastable vacuum being very long lived. Transitions from one vacuum to another are initiated by bubble form ation, the rate for this process is determined by the action of the 4 dimensional Euclidean bounce action,

$$f^{4} \exp(S_{4})$$
: (4.8)

In general calculating the bounce action analytically is not possible and it must be determ ined num erically. For the case of ISS how ever the potential is well approxim ated by a square potential for which there are known analytic solutions [32]. The bubble action for our model is given [5,11] by

$$S_4 = \frac{12=5}{f}$$
 (4.9)

Requiring that the false vacuum lives longer than the age of the universe results in the requirem ent [33]

$$\frac{1}{E}$$
 > 3: (4.10)

As seen in Section 4.1 the SU (3) Landau pole, the upper bound on the duality scale, was approximately 100f, so (4.10) can be easily satis ed for the scales discussed earlier.

5 D iscussion

In conventional models of supersymmetry breaking the dynamics that leads to the breaking of supersymmetry also breaks R-symmetry. When this breaking is communicated to the visible sector it results in R-symmetry violating gaugino masses, B and A-term s. There has been much recent interest in the ISS models of supersymmetry breaking for which there exists a metastable supersymmetry breaking vacuum that preserves the R -sym m etry. If such m odels are to be phenom enologically viable the gauginosm ust acquire a mass. Many variants of ISS have been explored that break the R-sym metry and allow for M a prana gaugino masses. Here we have discussed the alternative possibility that the R-symmetry is preserved and instead the gauginos acquire a D irac m ass. The D irac gaugino m ass and the sferm ion m asses are com m unicated to the visible sector through gauge m ediation; hence we have a m odel of R -sym m etric G auge Mediated Supersymmetry Breaking (RGMSB). Because the R-symmetry is preserved the gauginos are D irac, the A term s are zero, and the Higgs sector now consists of four Higgs doublets: the eld content of the MRSSM.We showed that the dependence of the gaugino mass on the supersymmetry breaking scale diers from that of usual GM SB, but the scalar masses do not. The gaugino mass is lower than in usual gauge m ediation.

We considered two examples for the R-preserving-supersymmetry-breaking sector: a version of ISS which may allow for direct mediation, and a generalization (an O'R aifeartaigh m odel) with fewer elds. The necessity of including an adjoint chiral super eld to act as the D irac partner of the gauginos m eans that these m odels have a Landau pole for gauge couplings, the low est of which is for SU (3). In the case of the ISS m odel there are m any new elds charged under the standard m odel and this Landau pole is low, typically a few decades above the scale of the m essenger m asses. For the O'R aifeartaigh m odel it can be som ew hat higher. There are potentially new operators, such as avor non-diagonal scalar m asses, generated at the strong coupling scale. The size of these operators is unknown. If sm all then the m odel is an R -sym m etric version of gauge m ediation, with a spectrum that di ers som ew hat from that of [29]. How ever, if large (but not too large) this has all the features of the M R SSM .

Making a conservative estimate of the the size of these UV generated operators we found that it is possible to realize the MRSSM scenario of large avor-violating couplings by using R-symmetric gauge mediation, but only at the expense of introducing ne tuning or strong coupling or both. If these operators were instead smaller than expected, then the spectrum of the MRSSM could be realized, but there would be no source of the large sferm ion mixings (allowed because of the R-symmetry) that lead to the interesting avor signatures. This does not rule out the possibility of the MRSSM, but it does suggest that a better understanding of the UV theory is required in order to decide how natural such a spectrum actually is.

A cknow ledgem ents

PF and EP thank the K ITP Santa Barbara and the Aspen Center for Physics for hospitality during completion of this work. We thank G raham K ribs, M arkus Luty, T in Tait, M artin Schmaltz, and Yuri Shim an for discussions, and M artin Schmaltz for suggesting a title. SA acknow ledges the support of the D irection G eneral de R elaciones Internacionales de la Secretar a de Educacion Publica (DGRI-SEP) of M exico. SA, AB, and EP acknow ledge support of the N ational Science and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) of C anada. Ferm ilab is operated by Ferm i Research A lliance, LLC, under C ontract DE-AC 02-07C H 11359 with the U nited States D epartment of Energy.

A Mass of the pseudo-NG boson

As shown in Equations (2.15) and (2.16) there is still a messenger mode that corresponds to the NG boson of the spontaneously broken U (1) sym metry. However, because of the presence of the operators in W₁ this sym metry is explicitly broken⁹, and a mass for the mode will be generated at two loops. To leading order there is only one diagram that generates this mass, shown in Figure 1 plus its complex conjugate. This

 $^{^{9}}$ N otice that if these operators come from the dimension four superpotential term q[$^{:}$ M]q as mentioned in a previous footnote, then these operators no longer explicitly break the sym metry, and in fact the eld remains a true massless NG boson.

diagram is nite. Expanding around the minimum, with vacuum expectation values from Equations (2.15) and (2.16) and h = 0, we not the electric potential for is

$$V_{e}$$
 () = ${}^{2}v^{2}\cos{\frac{2}{v}}$;

where 2 is the value of the loop in Figure 1:

$${}^{2} = \frac{(y)^{2}}{4} [I(m_{+};m_{+}) + I(m_{-};m_{-}) 2I(m_{+};m_{-})]; \quad (A.1)$$

and the Euclidean loop integrals I (m 1; m 2) are computed in [29] and have the form

$$\frac{Z}{(2)^{d}} \frac{d^{d}k}{(2)^{d}} \frac{Z}{(2)^{d}} \frac{d^{d}q}{(k+q)^{2}} \frac{1}{k^{2}+m_{1}^{2}} \frac{1}{q^{2}+m_{2}^{2}} :$$

This leads to a mass:

$$m^{2} = \frac{Y}{16^{-2}} M_{m ess}^{2} H(z);$$
 (A.2)

where

H (z) = (1 + z)
$$\log^2 \frac{1+z}{1-z}$$
 2Li₂ $\frac{2z}{1-z}$ + (z ! z): (A.3)

In particular: H (1) = 2^{2} =3, and vanishes for z = 0 (the SUSY lim it).

References

- [1] G.D.Kribs, E.Poppitz, and N.W einer, Flavor in Supersymmetry with an Extended R-symmetry, 0712.2039, to appear in Phys. Rev. D.
- [2] A.E.Blechm an and S.P.Ng, QCD Corrections to K-K bar M ixing in R-symmetric Supersymmetric Models, JHEP 06 (2008) 043, [0803.3811].
- [3] G.D.Kribs, A.Martin, and T.S.Roy, Supersymmetry with a Chargino NLSP and Gravitino LSP, 0807.4936.
- [4] A.E.Nelson and N.Seiberg, R symmetry breaking versus supersymmetry breaking, Nucl. Phys. B 416 (1994) 46{62, [hep-ph/9309299].
- [5] K. Intriligator, N. Seiberg, and D. Shih, D ynam ical SUSY breaking in meta-stable vacua, JHEP 04 (2006) 021, [hep-th/0602239].
- [6] E.Poppitz and S.P.Trivedi, New models of gauge and gravity mediated supersymmetry breaking, Phys. Rev. D 55 (1997) 5508 [5519, [hep-ph/9609529].

- [7] N. Arkani-Hamed, J. March-Russell, and H. Murayama, Building models of gauge-mediated supersymmetry breaking without a messenger sector, Nucl. Phys. B 509 (1998) 3{32, [hep-ph/9701286].
- [8] M. D ine and J. M ason, G auge m ediation in m etastable vacua, Phys. Rev. D 77 (2008) 016005, [hep-ph/0611312].
- [9] R.Kitano, H.Ooguri, and Y.Ookouchi, Direct mediation of meta-stable supersymmetry breaking, Phys. Rev. D 75 (2007) 045022, [hep-ph/0612139].
- [10] H.Murayam a and Y.Nomura, Gauge mediation simplied, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98 (2007) 151803, [hep-ph/0612186].
- [11] C.Csaki, Y.Shim an, and J.Teming, A simple model of low-scale direct gauge mediation, JHEP 05 (2007) 099, [hep-ph/0612241].
- [12] O.Aharony and N. Seiberg, Naturalized and simplied gauge mediation, JHEP 02 (2007) 054, [hep-ph/0612308].
- [13] K. Intriligator, N. Seiberg, and D. Shih, Supersymmetry Breaking, R-Symmetry Breaking and Metastable Vacua, JHEP 07 (2007) 017, [hep-th/0703281].
- [14] S.Abel, C.Dumford, J.Jaeckel, and V.V.Khoze, Dynam icalbreaking of U (1)_R and supersymmetry in a metastable vacuum, Phys. Lett. B 661 (2008) 201{209, [0707.2958].
- [15] S.A.Abel, C.Dumford, J.Jaeckel, and V.V.Khoze, Patterns of gauge mediation in metastable susy breaking, JHEP 02 (2008) 074, [0712.1812].
- [16] B.K.Zur, L.M azzucato, and Y.Oz, D irect M ediation and a V isible M etastable Supersymmetry B reaking Sector, 0807.4543.
- [17] A.Giveon, A.Katz, Z.Kom argodski, and D.Shih, Dynam ical SUSY and R-symmetry breaking in SQCD with massive and massless avors, 0808.2901.
- [18] N.Haba and N.Maru, A Simple Model of Direct Gauge Mediation of Metastable Supersymmetry Breaking, Phys. Rev. D 76 (2007) 115019, [0709.2945].
- [19] A.Amariti, L.G irardello, and A.Mariotti, On meta-stable SQCD with adjoint matter and gauge mediation, Fortsch. Phys. 55 (2007) 627{632, [hep-th/0701121].
- [20] A.Amariti, L.G irardello, and A.M ariotti, Non-supersymmetric meta-stable vacua in SU (N) SQCD with adjoint matter, JHEP 12 (2006) 058, [hep-th/0608063].

- [21] P.J.Fox, A.E.Nelson, and N.W einer, D irac gaugino m assess and supersoft supersymmetry breaking, JHEP 08 (2002) 035, [hep-ph/0206096].
- [22] E. Poppitz and S. P. Trivedi, Som e rem arks on gauge-m ediated supersymmetry breaking, Phys. Lett. B 401 (1997) 38{46, [hep-ph/9703246].
- [23] J.Bagger, E.Poppitz, and L.Randall, Destabilizing divergences in supergravity theories at two bops, Nucl. Phys. B 455 (1995) 59{82, [hep-ph/9505244].
- [24] M.D ine and W.Fischler, A Phenom enological Model of Particle Physics Based on Supersymmetry, Phys. Lett. B 110 (1982) 227.
- [25] S.D in opoulos and G.F.G iudice, Multi-m essenger theories of gauge-m ediated supersymmetry breaking, Phys. Lett. B 393 (1997) 72{78, [hep-ph/9609344].
- [26] L.M. Carpenter, M.Dine, G. Festuccia, and J.D. Mason, Implementing General Gauge Mediation, 0805.2944.
- [27] P.M eade, N. Seiberg, and D. Shih, General Gauge Mediation, 0801.3278.
- [28] P.Fayet, Massive gluinos, Phys. Lett. B 78 (1978) 417.
- [29] S.P.M artin, G eneralized m essengers of supersymmetry breaking and the sparticle m ass spectrum, Phys. Rev. D 55 (1997) 3177{3187, [hep-ph/9608224].
- [30] D. Shih, Spontaneous R-symmetry breaking in O'Raifeartaigh models, JHEP 02 (2008) 091, [hep-th/0703196].
- [31] M.Dine, J.L.Feng, and E.Silverstein, Retro tting O'Raifeartaigh models with dynamical scales, Phys. Rev. D 74 (2006) 095012, [hep-th/0608159].
- [32] M.J.Duncan and L.G.Jensen, Exact tunneling solutions in scalar eld theory, Phys.Lett. B 291 (1992) 109{114.
- [33] N.J.Craig, P.J.Fox, and J.G.W acker, Reheating m etastable O 'Raifeartaigh m odels, Phys. Rev. D 75 (2007) 085006, [hep-th/0611006].