

Flavor Violation in a Minimal $SO(10) \times A_4$ SUSY GUT

Abdelhamid Albaid*

Department of Physics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK, 74078 USA

Abstract

Flavor violating processes in the quark and lepton sectors are investigated within a realistic supersymmetric $SO(10) \times A_4$ grand unification model. By employing exotic heavy fermion fields, this model successfully describes various features of the fermion masses and mixings including large neutrino mixings accompanied by small quark mixings. In this model the flavor violation is induced at GUT scale, at which A_4 flavor symmetry is broken, as a consequence of the large mixings of the light fermion fields with these exotic heavy fields. The stringent experimental constraint from $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ decay rate necessitates a high degree of degeneracy of the supersymmetry breaking soft scalar masses of the exotic heavy fields and supersymmetric scalar partners of the light fermion fields. The choice of slepton masses of order 1 TeV is found to be consistent with the constraints from branching ratio of $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ and with all other flavor changing neutral current processes being sufficiently suppressed.

1 Introduction

Flavor changing neutral current (FCNC) processes impose severe constraints on the soft supersymmetric breaking (SSB) sector of the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM). The simplest way to satisfy the FCNC constraints is to adopt universality in the scalar masses at a high energy scale where the effects of supersymmetry (SUSY) breaking in the hidden sector is communicated to the scalar masses of MSSM via gravitational interactions. For example, in the the minimal supergravity model (mSUGRA) [1] the MSSM is a valid symmetry between the weak scale and grand unification scale (M_{GUT}) at which the universality conditions are assumed to hold. In this case, the leptonic flavor violation (LFV) is not induced. However, in a different class of models studied in Refs [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7] the universality

*Email: abdelhamid.albaid@okstate.edu

of the scalar masses will be broken by radiative corrections. Consequently, FCNC will be induced in these models as discussed below.

If the universality conditions hold at the grand unification scale M_{GUT} , the LFV is induced below GUT scale by radiative corrections in the MSSM with right-handed neutrino [2, 3, 4] or SUSY- $SU(5)$ [5] models. Unfortunately, it is difficult to predict LFV decay rates in these models because the Dirac neutrino Yukawa couplings are arbitrary within MSSM. However, in $SO(10)$ GUT model, we can predict the LFV decay rates below the GUT scale because the Dirac neutrino couplings are related to the up-type quark Yukawa couplings and are thus fixed.

The FCNC could also be induced above the GUT scale by radiative corrections. It was shown that as a consequence of the large top Yukawa coupling at the unification scale, SUSY GUTs with universality conditions valid at the scale M^* , where $M_{\text{GUT}} < M^* \leq M_{\text{Planck}}$, predict lepton flavor violating processes with observable rates [6, 7]. The experimental search for these processes provides a significant test for supersymmetric grand unification theory (SUSY GUT). Both contributions of FCNC that are induced above and below M_{GUT} will be studied in our model.

In this paper, the flavor violation processes for charged lepton and quark sectors are investigated in the framework of a realistic SUSY GUT model based on the gauge group $SO(10)$ and a discrete non-abelian A_4 flavor symmetry [8]. This model is realistic because it successfully describes the fermion masses, CKM mixings and neutrino mixing angles. This work differs from other studies in several aspects. First, it is different from those based on MSSM with right-handed neutrino masses or SUSY $SU(5)$ in the sense that the Dirac neutrino Yukawa couplings are determined from the fermion masses and mixing fit of the $SO(10) \times A_4$ model. Thus, this model predicts the lepton flavor violation arising from the renormalization group (RG) running from M_{GUT} to the right-handed neutrino mass scales. Second, it is different from those based on SUSY $SO(10)$ studied in [9] in the sense that the

FCNC processes are closely tied to fermion masses and mixings. Finally, in the $SO(10) \times A_4$ model flavor violation is induced at the GUT scale at which A_4 symmetry is broken due to large (order one) mixing of the third generation of MSSM fields (ψ_3) with the exotic heavy fields (χ_i , i runs from 1 to 3). This large mixing arises when the A_4 flavor symmetry is broken at the GUT scale. This is different from the case where the flavor violation is induced due to large top Yukawa coupling at the GUT scale [6, 7]. The reason for introducing the exotic heavy fermion fields in our model is to obtain the correct fermion mass relations at the GUT scale as we shall see in section 1. The mass scales of these exotic fields range from 10^{14} GeV to 10^{18} GeV depending on the values of the Yukawa couplings and the scale of A_4 flavor symmetry breaking.

In this paper we study flavor violation of the hadronic and leptonic processes by calculating the flavor violating scalar fermion mass insertion parameters $(\delta_{AB})_{ij} = \frac{(m_{AB}^2)_{ij}}{\tilde{m}^2}$, for $(A, B) = (L, R)$, with \tilde{m} being the average mass of the relevant scalar partner of standard model fermions (sfermions). All the flavor violation sources are included in our calculations. The sfermion mass insertions, $\delta_{LL,RR,LR}$, arise from the large mixing between the ψ_3 and χ_i and the mass insertions, $(\delta_{LL}^{ij})^{RHN}$, arise from RG running from M_{GUT} to the right-handed neutrino mass scales. These scalar mass insertion parameters are analyzed in the framework of our model then they are compared with their experimental upper bounds. We found that the most stringent constraint on flavor violation comes from the $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ process. This constraint requires a high degree of degeneracy of the soft masses of MSSM fields and the exotic fields. Therefore, in this model we assume that these soft masses are universal at the scale M^* with $M^* > M_{GUT}$, then we run them down to the GUT scale. The branching ratio $Br(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma)$ close to experimental bound (i.e. $Br(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) = 1.2 \times 10^{-11}$) is obtained when the slepton masses of order 1 TeV, while the Yukawa couplings remain perturbative at the scale M^* . We also found in the framework of our model that once the constraint from $Br(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma)$ is satisfied, all the FCNC processes will be automatically consistent with

experiments.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 1, we show how the fermion mass matrices are constructed in $SO(10) \times A_4$ model. In section 2, we discuss the sources of flavor violation by finding the sfermion mass insertion parameters $\delta_{LL,RR}^{ij}$ at the GUT scale at which A_4 symmetry is assumed to be broken as well as below the GUT scale. The results of the $SO(10) \times A_4$ model regarding flavor violation analysis are presented in section 4. Section 5 has our conclusion. The derivation of the light fermion mass matrices and the light neutrino mass matrix after disentangling the exotic fermions is shown in appendix A. In appendix B, we list the renormalization group equations (RGEs) for various SUSY preserving and breaking parameters between M_{GUT} and M^* relevant for FCNC analysis.

2 A Brief Review of Minimal $SO(10) \times A_4$ SUSY GUT

In the $SO(10)$ gauge group, all the quarks and leptons of the SM are naturally accommodated within a 16-dimensional irreducible representation. However, minimal $SO(10)$ (i.e., with only one 10-dimensional Higgs representation) leads to fermion mass relations at the GUT scale, such as $\frac{m_c^0}{m_t^0} = \frac{m_s^0}{m_b^0}$ and $m_\mu^0 = m_s^0$, that are inconsistent with experiment. This can be fixed by introducing exotic $16 + \overline{16}$ fermions and by coupling 16_i with these exotic fields via 45_H , which is used for $SO(10)$ symmetry breaking. The non-abelian discrete A_4 symmetry is chosen in our model because it is the smallest group that has a 3-dimensional representation, so the three generations of SM fields transform as triplet under A_4 . Besides, FCNC is not induced in the SUSY- $SO(10) \times A_4$ as long as A_4 symmetry is preserved. However, as we will see later, the breaking of A_4 symmetry at the GUT scale will reintroduce the FCNC via large mixing between the exotic and light fields. Based on the above reasons, a $SO(10) \times A_4$ model is proposed in [8]. In this model, a minimal set of Higgs representations are used to break the $SO(10)$ gauge group to SM gauge group so the unified gauge coupling remains perturbative all the way to the Planck scale. Employing this minimal Higgs representation

SO(10)	ψ_i	$\chi_1, \bar{\chi}_1$	$\chi_2, \bar{\chi}_2$	$\chi_3, \bar{\chi}_3$	Z_i^c
A_4	3	1	1	1	3
$Z_2 \times Z_4 \times Z_2$	+,+,+	+,-,+	-,+,+	+,+,-	+,+,+
SO(10)	ϕ_i	ϕ'_i	ϕ''_i	ϕ'''_i	Z_i
A_4	3	3	3	3	3
$Z_2 \times Z_4 \times Z_2$	+, \dot{i} ,+	+,- \dot{i} ,+	+, \dot{i} , -	+, - \dot{i} , -	+, - \dot{i} , +

Table 1: The transformation of the matter fields under $SO(10) \times A_4$ and $Z_2 \times Z_4 \times Z_2$.

and A_4 symmetry, our model successfully accommodates small mixings of the quark sector and large mixings of the neutrino sector in the unified framework as shown summarized below.

The fermion mass matrices of the model proposed in [8] were constructed approximately. In this section, we construct these matrices by doing the algebra exactly and show that the excellent fit for fermion masses and mixings is obtained by slightly modifying the numerical values of the input parameters of Ref.[8]. There are two superpotentials of the model. The first one ($W_{spin.}$) describes the couplings of the standard model fields ($\psi_i(16_i)$, i runs from 1-3) with the exotic heavy spinor-antispinor fields ($\chi_i(16_i)$, $\bar{\chi}_i(\overline{16}_i)$, i runs from 1 to 3), while the second one ($W_{vect.}$) describes the couplings of ψ_i with the exotic 10-vector fields (ϕ_i , ϕ'_i , ϕ''_i , ϕ'''_i , i runs from 1 to 3) as given below:

$$W_{spin.} = b_1 \psi_i \bar{\chi}_1 1_{Hi} + b_2 \psi_i \bar{\chi}_2 1'_{Hi} + k_1 \chi_1 \bar{\chi}_3 45_H + a \chi_3 \chi_2 10_H + M_\alpha \chi_\alpha \bar{\chi}_\alpha, \quad (1)$$

$$W_{vect.} = b_3 \psi_i \phi_i 16_H + M_{10} \phi_i \phi'_i + h'_{ijk} \phi'_i \phi'_j 1_{Hk} + h_{ijk} \phi_i \phi_j 1_{Hk} \\ + A_{ijk} \phi'_i \phi''_j 1''_{Hk} + m \phi''_i \phi'''_i + k_2 \phi'''_i \phi'_i 45_H. \quad (2)$$

The above superpotentials are invariant under A_4 and the additional symmetry $Z_2 \times Z_4 \times Z_2$. The transformations of the matter fields (i.e., the ordinary and exotic fermion fields) and the Higgs fields under the assigned symmetry are given in Table 1 and 2.

The general fermion mass matrix structure that results from integrating out the exotic

SO(10)	10_H	45_H	16_H	$\overline{16}_H$	1_{Hi}	$1'_{Hi}$	$1''_{Hi}$	$1'''_{Hi}$
A_4	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3
$Z_2 \times Z_4 \times Z_2$	-,+,-	+,-,-	+,-i,+	+,-i,+	+,-,+	-,+,+	+,+,-	+,i,+

Table 2: The transformation of the Higgs fields under $SO(10) \times A_4$ and $Z_2 \times Z_4 \times Z_2$.

heavy spinor-antispinor fields in $W_{spin.}$ is:

$$M_F(spin.) = \left(\frac{aT_1T_2T_3f^2\langle 10_H \rangle}{r_F r_{F^c}} \right) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Q_F s_\theta \frac{r_{F^c}}{f} \\ 0 & Q_{F^c} s_\theta \frac{r_F}{f} & (Q_F + Q_{F^c}) c_\theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

where we have made the following transformation: $\psi_1\epsilon_1 + \psi_2\epsilon_2 + \psi_3\epsilon_3 = \epsilon\psi'_3$ and $\psi_1s_1 + \psi_2s_2 + \psi_3s_3 = S(\psi'_2s_\theta + \psi'_3c_\theta)$. Here ϵ_i and s_i are VEV-components of $\langle 1_H \rangle$ and $\langle 1'_H \rangle$ respectively and $s_\theta(c_\theta)$ is $\sin\theta(\cos\theta)$. $f = (1 + T_2^2 + T_1^2(1 + s_\theta^2T_2^2))^{-1/2}$ and $r_F = (1 + Q_F^2T_3^2T_1^2(1 + s_\theta^2T_2^2)f^2)^{1/2}$ are factors that come from doing the algebra exactly (see appendix A). Here $T_1 = \frac{b_1\epsilon}{M_1}$, $T_2 = \frac{b_2S}{M_2}$, $T_3 = \frac{k_1\Omega}{M_3}$ and $Q = 2I_{3R} + \frac{6}{5}\delta(\frac{Y}{2})$ is the unbroken charge that results from breaking $SO(10)$ to the SM gauge group by giving a VEV to 45_H , where $\langle 45_H \rangle = \Omega Q$. The charge Q for different quarks and leptons is given as.

$$\begin{aligned} Q_u = Q_d = \frac{1}{5}\delta, \quad Q_{u^c} = -1 - \frac{4}{5}\delta, \quad Q_{d^c} = 1 + \frac{2}{5}\delta, \\ Q_l = Q_\mu = -\frac{3}{5}\delta, \quad Q_{l^c} = 1 + \frac{6}{5}\delta, \quad Q_{\nu^c} = -1. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The above general structure of fermion mass matrix has the following interesting features:

- (1) The relation $m_b^0 = m_\tau^0$ automatically follows from $Q_d + Q_{d^c} = Q_e + Q_{e^c}$,
- (2) The hierarchy of the the second and third masses generation is obtained by taking the limit $s_\theta \rightarrow 0$, and
- (3) The approximate Georgi-Jarlskog relation $m_\mu^0 = 3m_s^0$ leads to two possible values for δ , either $\delta \rightarrow 0$ or $\delta \rightarrow -1.25$,
- (4) the former possibility is excluded by experiment since it leads to $(m_c^0/m_t^0)/(m_s^0/m_b^0) \rightarrow 1$ at the GUT scale, while the latter possibility leads to $(m_c^0/m_t^0)/(m_s^0/m_b^0) \rightarrow 0$ which is closer to experiments. Let us define $\delta = 1 + \alpha$. The masses and mixings of the first generation arise from W_{vector} . The full mass matrices arising from

W_{spinor} and W_{vector} have the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}
M_D &= m_d^0 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (c_{12} + \delta_3(\frac{3+2\alpha}{5}))r_d r_{dc} & (-2\delta_2(\frac{3+2\alpha}{5}) + \zeta)r_{dc} \\ -\delta_3(\frac{3+2\alpha}{5})r_d r_{dc} & 0 & (2\delta_1(\frac{3+2\alpha}{5}) + s(\frac{-1+\alpha}{5}) + \beta)r_{dc} \\ \zeta r_d & (s(\frac{3+2\alpha}{5}) + \beta)r_d & -2(\beta + \frac{3+2\alpha}{5}\delta_1)fc_\theta s_\theta T_2^2 \end{pmatrix}, \\
M_U &= m_u^0 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & (\frac{1-\alpha}{5})sr_{uc} \\ 0 & (\frac{1+4\alpha}{5})sr_u & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
M_L &= m_d^0 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (c_{12} + 3\delta_3(\frac{-1+\alpha}{5}))r_e r_{ec} & (-\delta_2\alpha + \zeta)r_{ec} \\ -3\delta_3(\frac{-1+\alpha}{5})r_e r_{ec} & 0 & (\delta_1\alpha - 3s(\frac{-1+\alpha}{5}) + \beta)r_{ec} \\ (\zeta - \delta_2\frac{6-\alpha}{5})r_e & (s(\frac{-1+6\alpha}{5}) + \delta_1(\frac{6-\alpha}{5}) + \beta)r_e & -2(\beta + \frac{3+2\alpha}{5}\delta_1)fc_\theta s_\theta T_2^2 \end{pmatrix}, \\
M_N &= m_u^0 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & (\frac{-3+3\alpha}{5})sr_{\nu c} \\ 0 & sr_\nu & 1 \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where the parameters are defined in terms of the Yukawa couplings of the superpotential ($W_{spin.} + W_{vect.}$) and the VEVs of the Higgs fields as shown in appendix A. These matrices are multiplied by left-handed fermions on the right and right-handed fermions on the left. A doubly lopsided structure for the charged lepton and down quark mass matrices of Eq.(5) can be obtained by going to the limit $\beta, \zeta, \alpha, \delta_3, c_{12}, s \ll 1$ and δ_1, δ_2 are of order one. This doubly lopsided form leads simultaneously to large neutrino mixing angles and to small quark mixing angles. Based only on the above fermion mass matrices in Eq.(5), an excellent fit is found for fermion masses (except for the neutrino masses), quark mixing angles and neutrino mixing angles (except the atmospheric angle) by giving the input parameters, appearing in Eq.(5), the following numerical values: $\delta_1 = -1.28$, $\delta_2 = 1.01$, $\delta_3 = 0.015 \times e^{4.95i}$, $\alpha = -0.0668$, $s = 0.2897$, $\zeta = 0.0126$, $c_{12} = -0.0011e^{1.124i}$, and $\beta = -0.11218$. The above numerical values lead to $\sin \theta_{23}^L = 0.92$ which is not close to the experimental central value of atmospheric angle is $\sin \theta_{23}^{atm} = 0.707$ [10]. This contribution to the atmospheric angle is only from the charged lepton sector. Therefore, the neutrino sector should be included by considering the

following superpotential:

$$W_N = b_4 \psi_i Z_i \overline{16}_H + h_{ijk} Z_i Z_j^c 1'''_{Hk} + m_1 Z_i^c Z_i^c, \quad (6)$$

where two fermion singlets Z_i and Z_i^c that couple with the Higgs singlet $1'''_{Hk}$ have been introduced.

The full neutrino mass matrix is constructed in Appendix B. The Higgs singlet $1'''_{Hk}$ has the VEV-components $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$. The light neutrino mass matrix is obtained by employing the see-saw mechanism. The numerical values ($\alpha_1 = 0.075$, $\alpha_2 = 0.07$, $\alpha_3 = 0.9$, and $\lambda = 0.0465$ eV), where λ is defined in appendix B, lead to not only the correct contribution to the atmospheric angles ($\sin \theta_{23}^{atm} = 0.811$) but also to the correct light neutrino mass differences. The predictions of the fermion masses and mixings are slightly altered by doing the algebra exactly compared to the analysis of Ref.[8]. These predictions and their updated experimental values obtained from [10] are shown in Table 3. The right handed-neutrino masses arise from integrating out the exotic fermion singlets Z_i and Z_i^c in Eq.(6). The right handed-neutrino mass matrix is

$$M_R = \Lambda \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\alpha_1^2}{\alpha_3^2} & \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \left(\frac{-1}{\alpha_3^2} + \frac{2}{\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \alpha_3^2} \right) & \frac{-\alpha_1(\alpha_1^2 - \alpha_2^2 + \alpha_3^2)}{\alpha_3(\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \alpha_3^2)} \\ \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \left(\frac{-1}{\alpha_3^2} + \frac{2}{\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \alpha_3^2} \right) & \frac{\alpha_2^2}{\alpha_3^2} & \frac{-\alpha_2(-\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \alpha_3^2)}{\alpha_3(\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \alpha_3^2)} \\ \frac{-\alpha_1(\alpha_1^2 - \alpha_2^2 + \alpha_3^2)}{\alpha_3(\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \alpha_3^2)} & \frac{-\alpha_2(-\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \alpha_3^2)}{\alpha_3(\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \alpha_3^2)} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

where $\Lambda = 8.45 \times 10^{15}$ GeV and the right-handed neutrino masses are given by $M_{R1} \approx M_{R2} \approx 1.4 \times 10^{12}$ GeV and $M_{R3} = 8.5 \times 10^{15}$ GeV.

Another interesting feature of this model is that it contains a minimal set of Higgs fields needed to break $SO(10)$ to the SM gauge group. Consequently, the unified gauge coupling remains perturbative all the way up to the Planck scale. This can be understood from the running of the unified gauge coupling with energy scale $\mu > M_{GUT}$ as

$$\frac{1}{\alpha} = \frac{1}{\alpha_G} - \frac{b_G}{2\pi} \log\left(\frac{\mu}{M_G}\right), \quad (8)$$

	Predictions	Expt.	Pull
$m_c(m_c)$	1.4	$1.27^{+0.07}_{-0.11}$	1.85
$m_t(m_t)$	172.5	171.3 ± 2.3	0.52
m_s/m_d	19.4	19.5 ± 2.5	0.04
$m_s(2GeV)$	109.6×10^{-3}	$105^{+25}_{-35} \times 10^{-3}$	0.184
$m_b(m_b)$	4.31	$4.2^{+0.17}_{-0.07}$	0.58
V_{us}	0.223	0.2255 ± 0.0019	1.3
V_{cb}	38.9×10^{-3}	$(41.2 \pm 1.1) \times 10^{-3}$	2
V_{ub}	4.00×10^{-3}	$(3.93 \pm 0.36) \times 10^{-3}$	0.7
η	0.319	$0.349^{+0.015}_{-0.017}$	1.7
$m_e(m_e)$	0.511×10^{-3}	0.511×10^{-3}	-
$m_\mu(m_\mu)$	105.6×10^{-3}	105.6×10^{-3}	-
$m_\tau(m_\tau)$	1.776	1.776	-
Δm_{21}^2	$7.69 \times 10^{-3} \text{eV}^2$	$(7.59 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-3} \text{eV}^2$	0.5
Δm_{32}^2	$2.36 \times 10^{-3} \text{eV}^2$	$(2.43 \pm 0.13) \times 10^{-3} \text{eV}^2$	0.5
$\sin \theta_{12}^{sol}$	0.555	0.566 ± 0.018	0.61
$\sin \theta_{23}^l$	0.811	0.707 ± 0.108	0.96
$\sin \theta_{13}$	0.141	< 0.22	

Table 3: The fermion masses and mixings and their experimental values. The fermion masses, except the neutrino masses, are in GeV.

where $\alpha = g^2/(4\pi)$ and $b_G = S(R) - 3C(G)$. Here $C(G)$ is the quadratic Casimir invariant and $S(R)$ is the Dynkin index summed over all chiral multiplets of the model. The unified gauge coupling stays perturbative at the Planck scale (i.e $g(M_P) < \sqrt{2}$) as long as $b_G < 26$. Employing large Higgs representations might lead to $b_G \geq 26$. For example, using $126_H + \overline{126}_H$ gives $b_G = 46$. On the other hand, the $SO(10) \times A_4$ -model gives $b_G = 19$ which is consistent with the unified gauge coupling being perturbative till the Planck scale.

We will use the same fit for fermion masses and mixings to calculate the mass insertion parameters $\delta_{LL,RR}^{ij}$, and $\delta_{LR,RL}^{ij}$ in the quark and lepton sectors and consequently investigate the FCNC in this model. The charged lepton and down quark mass matrices in Eq.(5) are diagonalized at the GUT scale by bi-unitary transformation:

$$M_{d,l}^{diag.} = V_R^{\dagger d,l} M_{D,L} V_L^{d,l}, \quad (9)$$

where $V_{R,L}^{u,d,l}$ are known numerically. Now, we discuss the sources of FCNC in this model.

3 Sources of Flavor Violation in $SO(10) \times A_4$ Model

We assume in our flavor violation analysis that A_4 flavor symmetry is preserved above GUT scale and it is only broken at GUT scale. In this case flavor violation is induced at GUT scale where A_4 symmetry is broken. In this section we discuss the flavor violation induced at the GUT scale by studying the sfermion mass insertion parameter $\delta_{LL,RR}^{ij}$ and the chirality flipping mass insertion (A -terms) parameter $\delta_{LR,RL}^{ij}$. We will see that these flavor violation sources arise from large mixing of the light fields with the heavy fields. This large mixing is due to the breaking of A_4 symmetry. In addition, we discuss the induced flavor violation arising below GUT scale through the RG running from M_{GUT} to the right-handed neutrino mass scales.

3.1 The Scalar Mass Insertion Parameters

Let us assume the soft supersymmetry breaking terms originate at the messenger scale M^* , where $M_{\text{GUT}} < M^* \leq M_{\text{Planck}}$. The quadratic soft mass terms of the matter superfields that appear in the superpotential $W_{\text{spin.}}$ are

$$-\mathcal{L} = \tilde{m}_\psi^2 \psi_i^\dagger \psi_i + \tilde{m}_{\chi_i}^2 \chi_i^\dagger \chi_i + \tilde{m}_{\bar{\chi}_i}^2 \bar{\chi}_i^\dagger \bar{\chi}_i. \quad (10)$$

The MSSM scalar fermions that reside in ψ_i transform as triplets under the non-abelian A_4 symmetry. Since the A_4 symmetry is intact, they have common mass (\tilde{m}_ψ^2) at the scale M^* . On the other hand, the exotic fields each of which transforms as singlet under A_4 symmetry have different masses ($\tilde{m}_{\chi_i}^2, \tilde{m}_{\bar{\chi}_i}^2, i$ runs 1-3) at the scale M^* .

The MSSM scalars remain degenerate above the GUT scale where the A_4 symmetry is broken. In order to find the scalar masses in the fermion mass eigenstates, two transformations are required. The first transformation is needed to block-diagonalize the fermion mass matrix into a light and a heavy blocks as shown in Appendix A. The upper left corner represents the 3×3 light fermions mass matrix. The second transformation is the com-

plete diagonalization of the light fermion mass matrix. Applying the first transformation to the quadratic soft mass terms of Eq.(10) by going to the new orthogonal basis (L_2, L_3, H_1, H_2, H_3) as defined in appendix A, the quadratic soft mass matrix of the light states is transformed as follows:

$$\tilde{m}_\psi^2 I \rightarrow \tilde{m}_\psi^2 I + \delta \tilde{m}_\psi^2, \quad (11)$$

where,

$$\delta \tilde{m}_\psi^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \epsilon \\ 0 & \epsilon & \delta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

$\epsilon = \frac{f}{r_F} T_2^2 s_\theta (\tilde{m}_{\chi_2}^2 - \tilde{m}_\psi^2)$, $\delta = ((\frac{f}{r_F})^2 - 1) \tilde{m}_\psi^2 + (\frac{f}{r_F})^2 (\tilde{m}_{\chi_1}^2 T_1^2 + \tilde{m}_{\chi_2}^2 T_2^2 + \tilde{m}_{\chi_3}^2 Q^2 T_1^2 T_3^2)$, and we have safely ignored the terms that contain $s_\theta^2 \ll 1$. It is obvious that the first two generations of the light scalars are almost degenerate because the mixing of the second light generation (L_2) with the heavy states is proportional to $s_\theta \ll 1$. On the other hand, since the mixing of the third light generation (L_3) with the heavy states is of order one, its mass splits from those of the first two generations.

The top Yukawa coupling is given in terms of T_1, T_2 , and T_3 as:

$$Y_t = \frac{a f^2 (Q_u + Q_{u^c}) T_1 T_2 T_3}{r_{u^c} r_u}. \quad (13)$$

The numerical values of $T_1 = 0.0305$, $T_2 = 2$, $T_3 = 100$ and $a \sim 1.2$ are consistent with the top Yukawa coupling at the GUT scale to be of order $\lambda_t^{GUT} \sim 0.5$ and r_{u,u^c} to be of order one. Plugging these numerical values and $s_\theta = 0.0465$ into the expressions for ϵ and δ gives us:

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta_d, \delta_{d^c}, \delta_e, \delta_{e^c}) &= (0.81, 0.87, 0.88, 0.82) (\tilde{m}_\chi^2 - \tilde{m}_\psi^2), \\ (\epsilon_d, \epsilon_{d^c}, \epsilon_e, \epsilon_{e^c}) &= (0.061, 0.05, 0.048, 0.06) (\tilde{m}_\chi^2 - \tilde{m}_\psi^2). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Here we have dropped $\tilde{m}_{\chi_1}^2$ terms because their coefficients are negligible. Also, the RGE expressions of $\tilde{m}_{\chi_2}^2$ and $\tilde{m}_{\chi_3}^2$ are the same (see Eq.(62)), so we have assumed that $\tilde{m}_{\chi_2}^2 = \tilde{m}_{\chi_3}^2 = \tilde{m}_\chi^2$.

The next step is to apply the second transformation by evaluating $V_L^{\dagger d,l} \delta m_\psi^2 V_L^{d,l}$ and similarly for $L \rightarrow R$. The unitary matrices $V_L^{d,l}$ are numerically known from the fitting for fermion masses and mixings. So, the mass insertion parameters for charged leptons and down quarks are given respectively by

$$(\delta_{LL,RR}^{d,e})_{ij} = (V_{L,R}^{\dagger d,l} \delta \tilde{m}_{d,l}^2 V_{L,R}^{d,l})_{ij} / \tilde{m}_{d,l}^2. \quad (15)$$

The above mass insertion analysis without including the superpotential $W_{vect.}$ is good enough because we assumed in our analysis that the mixing of the 10 vector multiplets with the ordinary spinor fields is small.

3.2 The Chirality Flipping Mass Insertion (A-terms)

The FV processes are also induced from the off-diagonal entries of the chirality flipping mass matrix \tilde{M}_{RL} . The chirality flipping soft terms are divided into two parts \mathcal{L}_{spin} and \mathcal{L}_{vect} :

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{L}_{spin} = & \tilde{b}_1 b_1 \tilde{\psi}_i \tilde{\chi}_1 1_{Hi} + \tilde{b}_2 b_2 \tilde{\psi}_i \tilde{\chi}_2 1'_{Hi} + \tilde{k}_1 k_1 \tilde{\chi}_1 \tilde{\chi}_3 45_H \\ & + \tilde{a} a \tilde{\chi}_3 \tilde{\chi}_2 10_H + \tilde{G}_i M_i \tilde{\chi}_i \tilde{\chi}_i, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{L}_{vect} = & \tilde{b}_3 b_3 \tilde{\psi}_i \tilde{\phi}_i 16_H + \tilde{B}_{10} M_1 0 \tilde{\phi}_i \tilde{\phi}'_i + \tilde{h}'_{ijk} h'_{ijk} \tilde{\phi}'_i \tilde{\phi}'_j 1_{Hk} + \tilde{h}_{ijk} h_{ijk} \tilde{\phi}_i \tilde{\phi}_j 1_{Hk} \\ & + \tilde{A}_{ijk} A_{ijk} \tilde{\phi}'_i \tilde{\phi}''_j 1''_{Hk} + \tilde{g} m \tilde{\phi}''_i \tilde{\phi}'''_i + \tilde{k}_2 k_2 \tilde{\phi}''_i \tilde{\phi}'_i 45_H. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The fourth term of Eq.(16) induces the off-diagonal elements of the chirality flipping mass matrix, if it is written in terms of the new orthogonal basis defined in Eqs.(26). This transformation can be represented by

$$\tilde{M}_{RL}^2(spin.) \rightarrow \tilde{a} M_F(spin.), \quad (18)$$

where $M_F(spin.)$ is defined in Eq.(3). The entire chirality flipping mass matrix in the new orthogonal basis is obtained by including $-\mathcal{L}_{vect}$. The bi-unitary transformations that block-diagonalize the full fermion mass matrix is applied on the entire chirality flipping mass matrix

(see Appendix A). Accordingly, the 3×3 quadratic mass matrix (\tilde{M}_{LR}^2) associated with the light states is transformed as follows:

$$\tilde{M}_{RL}^2 \rightarrow \tilde{a}M_F(\text{spin.}) + \tilde{b}_3M_F(\text{vector}), \quad (19)$$

where $M_F(\text{vect.}) = -mM^{-1}M'$ (see Eq.(31)) and we have assumed for simplicity that the soft parameters appearing in Eq.(17) are all of the same order. Then, the M_{LR}^2 matrix is written in the fermion mass eigenstate basis as:

$$\tilde{M}_{RL}^2 \rightarrow V_R^\dagger(\tilde{a}M_F(\text{spin.}) + \tilde{b}_3M_F(\text{vect.}))V_L. \quad (20)$$

It is straightforward to show that the chirality mass insertion parameters are given by:

$$(\delta_{RL})_{ij} = \frac{\tilde{b}_3}{\tilde{m}_f^2} M_{Fi}^{diag.} \delta_{ij} + (\tilde{z}V_R^\dagger M_F(\text{spinor})V_L)_{ij}, \quad (21)$$

where $M_F^{diag.} = V_R^\dagger M_F V_L$ and $\tilde{z} = \frac{\tilde{a}-\tilde{b}_3}{\tilde{m}_f^2}$. The induced FV arises only from the second term of Eq.(21).

3.3 Mass Insertion Parameters Induced Below M_{GUT}

The Dirac neutrino Yukawa couplings $(Y_N)_{ij}$ induce flavor violating off-diagonal elements in the left-handed slepton mass matrix through the RG running from M_{GUT} to the right-handed neutrino mass scales. The RGEs for MSSM with right-handed neutrinos are given in Ref.[3]. The right-handed neutrinos M_{R_i} are determined in the $SO(10) \times A_4$ model. In this case, the induced mass insertion parameters for left-handed sleptons are given by [7],

$$(\delta_{LL}^l)_{ij}^{RHN} = -\frac{3m_\psi^2 + \tilde{a}^2}{8m_\psi^2\pi^2} \sum_{k=1}^3 (Y_N)_{ik} (Y_N^*)_{jk} \ln \frac{M_{\text{GUT}}}{M_{R_k}}, \quad (22)$$

where the matrix Y_N is written in the mass eigenstates of charged leptons and right-handed neutrinos. The total LL contribution for the charged leptons is given by

$$(\delta_{LL}^l)_{ij}^{Tot} = (\delta_{LL}^l)_{ij}^{RHN} + (\delta_{LL}^l)_{ij}. \quad (23)$$




Figure 1: The above graphs show the plot of Log of $\text{Br}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma)$ divided by experimental bound (1.2×10^{-11}) versus m_ψ for two cases I and II with $M_{1/2}=787$ GeV, 437 GeV and 175 GeV.

4 Results

In this section, we investigate the flavor violating processes by calculating the mass insertion parameters δ_{LL} , δ_{RR} , and $\delta_{LR,RL}$, then we compare them with their experimental bounds. These bounds in the quark and lepton sectors were obtained by comparing the hadronic and leptonic flavor changing processes to their experimental values/limits [11, 12]. Eq.(12), Eq.(14) and Eq.(15) are used to calculate $\delta_{LL,RR}$ and Eq.(21) is used to calculate $\delta_{LR,RL}$ for both charged leptons and down quarks. The result of mass insertion calculations and their

Mass Insertion (δ)	Model Predictions	Exp. upper Bounds
$(\delta_{12}^l)_{LL}$	$0.062 \sigma + (\delta_{12}^l)_{LL}^{RHN}$	6×10^{-4}
$(\delta_{12}^l)_{RR}$	$6.1 \times 10^{-4} \sigma$	0.09
$(\delta_{12}^l)_{RL,LR}$	$(0.084, 0.0096) \tilde{k}$	10^{-5}
$(\delta_{13}^l)_{LL}$	$0.022 \sigma + (\delta_{13}^l)_{LL}^{RHN}$	0.15
$(\delta_{13}^l)_{RR}$	0.028σ	-
$(\delta_{13}^l)_{RL,LR}$	$(0.0335, 0.076) \tilde{k}$	0.04
$(\delta_{23}^l)_{LL}$	$0.27 \sigma + (\delta_{13}^l)_{LL}^{RHN}$	0.12
$(\delta_{23}^l)_{RR}$	0.034σ	-
$(\delta_{23}^l)_{RL,LR}$	$(0.055, 0.899) \tilde{k}$	0.03
$(\delta_{12}^d)_{LL}$	$1.9 \times 10^{-4} \sigma$	0.014
$(\delta_{12}^d)_{RR}$	0.15σ	0.009
$(\delta_{12}^d)_{LR,RL}$	$(0.029, 0.035) \tilde{k}$	9×10^{-5}
$(\delta_{13}^d)_{LL}$	0.014σ	0.09
$(\delta_{13}^d)_{RR}$	0.061σ	0.07
$(\delta_{13}^d)_{LR,RL}$	$(0.173, 0.016) \tilde{k}$	1.7×10^{-2}
$(\delta_{23}^d)_{LL}$	0.054σ	0.16
$(\delta_{23}^d)_{RR}$	0.29σ	0.22
$(\delta_{23}^d)_{LR,RL}$	$(0.875, 0.064) \tilde{k}$	$(0.006, 0.0045)$

Table 4: The mass insertion parameters predicted by $SO(10) \times A_4$ model and their experimental upper bounds obtained from [12].

experimental bounds are presented in Table 4. In this table, we have defined $\sigma = \frac{\tilde{m}_{\chi_2}^2 - \tilde{m}_{\psi_i}^2}{\tilde{m}_{\psi_i}^2}$ and $\tilde{k} = \tilde{z}m_{b,\tau}$

The stringent bounds on leptonic δ_{12} , δ_{13} , and δ_{23} in Table 4 come only from the decay rates $l_i \rightarrow l_j \gamma$. The experimental bounds on the mass insertion parameters listed in column 3 were obtained by making a scan of m_0 and $M_{1/2}$ over the ranges $m_0 < 380 \text{ GeV}$ and $M_{1/2} < 160 \text{ GeV}$, where m_0 and $M_{1/2}$ are the scalar universal mass and the gaugino mass respectively [12].

Glancing at Table 4, we note that the stringent constraint on leptonic flavor violation arises from δ_{12}^l which corresponds to the decay rate of $\mu \rightarrow e \gamma$. On the other hand, there is a weaker constraint that arises from δ_{12}^d on the quark sector. One can do an arrangement such that $\tilde{a} - \tilde{b}_3 = 200 \text{ GeV}$ and $\tilde{m}_f = 800 \text{ GeV}$ (equivalent to $\tilde{k} = 2.6 \times 10^{-4}$) so that all the chirality flipping mass insertions will be within their experimental bounds. This arrangement

is possible if the trilinear soft terms vanish at the scale M^* .

Since the stringent constraint comes from the $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ process, let us discuss the branching ratio of this process in more details. In general, the branching ratio of $l_i \rightarrow l_j\gamma$ is given by

$$\frac{BR(l_i \rightarrow l_j\gamma)}{BR(l_i \rightarrow l_j\nu_i\bar{\nu}_j)} = \frac{48\pi^3\alpha}{G_F^2}(|A_L^{ij}|^2 + |A_R^{ij}|^2). \quad (24)$$

We have used the general expressions for the amplitudes $A_{L,R}^{ij}$ given by Ref.[14] where the contributions from both chargino and the neutralino loops are included. These expressions are written in terms of mass insertion parameters.

The correct suppression of the decay rate $\Gamma(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma)$ requires a high degree of degeneracy of the soft mass terms of MSSM fields and the exotic fields. For example, $\sigma \approx 0.01$, as can be seen from Table 4. In order to obtain high degree of degeneracy, let us assume that the SSB terms which are generated at the messenger scale M^* satisfy the universality boundary conditions at the scale M^* given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{m}_{\psi_i}^2 &= \tilde{m}_{\chi_i}^2 = \tilde{m}_{\tilde{\chi}_i}^2 = \tilde{m}_{10_H}^2 = \tilde{m}_{1_H}^2 = \tilde{m}_{1'_H}^2 = m_0, \\ M_\lambda &= M_0, \\ \tilde{a} &= \tilde{b}_1 = \tilde{b}_2 = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where M_λ is the gaugino mass of $SO(10)$ gauge group. Solving the RGE listed in Appendix C with the boundary conditions given by Eq.(25) determines the value of σ . In Table 5 we give the branching ratio of the process $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ predicted by the $SO(10) \times A_4$ model for different choices of the input parameters a , b_1 , b_2 , \tilde{m}_ψ and $M_{1/2}$ at the GUT scale. The experimental searches have put the upper limit on the branching ratio of $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ as $\text{Br}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) \leq 1.2 \times 10^{-11}$ [13]. Note that \tilde{m}_ψ and $M_{1/2}$ originate respectively from m_0 and M_0 through RGEs. In this Table we consider $\ln \frac{M^*}{M_{GUT}} = 1$ and $\ln \frac{M^*}{M_{GUT}} = 4.6$ that correspond respectively to $M^* \approx 3M_{GUT}$ and $M^* \approx M_{\text{Planck}}$.

Let us analyze the four cases in the Table 5. In the cases (I, II and III), the chosen values of the parameters a are consistent with the top Yukawa coupling of order 0.5 at the

	I	II	III	IV
a	1.14	1.07	1.14	0.62
b_1	1.9	1.5	1.24	1.24
b_2	1.9	1.5	1.24	1.24
\tilde{m}_{ψ_i}	542	886	2932	675
$M_{1/2}$	350	787	1924	350
$\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma)$	1.4×10^{-13}	1.16×10^{-11}	1.2×10^{-11}	2.2×10^{-12}

Table 5: Branching ratio of $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ for different choices of input parameters at the GUT scale. Cases I and II correspond to $\ln \frac{M^*}{M_{GUT}} = 1$ and cases III and IV correspond to $\ln \frac{M^*}{M_{GUT}} = 4.6$. \tilde{m}_{ψ_i} and $M_{1/2}$ are given in GeV

GUT scale and with the fitting for fermion masses and mixing. On the other hand, the choice of $a = 0.68$ in Case IV is not consistent with the fit. Although the medium slepton masses of order 550 GeV are obtained in Case I, the choice $b_1 = b_2 = 1.9$ corresponds to non-perturbative Yukawa couplings at the scale M^* (i.e. $b_1 = b_2 = 4$ at M^*). In this case, the solutions of the 1-loop RGEs are not trusted since the Yukawa couplings b_1 and b_2 go non-perturbative above the GUT scale. Also, it is important to point out that the flavor violation constraint on $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ in Case III requires heavy slepton masses (≥ 3 TeV) while it requires slepton masses of order ~ 900 GeV in Case II. In other words, Case II is preferred in our model in the sense that the decay rate of $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ is close to the experimental limit with a reasonable supersymmetric mass spectrum, so it might be tested in the ongoing MEG experiment[15]. Besides, the Yukawa couplings remain perturbative at the messenger scale M^* . Figure 1 shows the allowed values of m_{ψ} that correspond to the graphs below the x -axis for the cases I and II.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we investigated flavor violating processes that arise below and above the GUT scale in the $SO(10) \times A_4$ model. Above the GUT scale, we study how flavor violation gets linked with the fitting of fermion masses and mixing through the factors T_1 , T_2 , and T_3 . The requirement of top Yukawa coupling being ~ 0.5 necessitates some of these factors to

be large. Consequently, this corresponds to an order one mixing of the light fields with the exotic heavy fields. In this case, flavor violation is reintroduced at the GUT scale where A_4 symmetry is broken. The stringent constraint on $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ decay rate requires a high degree of degeneracy of the soft quadratic masses of the exotic heavy fields and the light fields. Therefore, all the quadratic soft masses are assumed to be universal at the scale $M^* \sim 3M_{GUT}$. Flavor violation is also induced below the GUT scale in the presence of right handed neutrinos through the RG running from M_{GUT} to the right handed neutrino mass scales. This FV source is predicted by $SO(10) \times A_4$ model because the Dirac neutrino Yukawa couplings are determined from the fermion masses and mixings fitting. Combining all sources of FV, we found that Case I and Case II presented in Table 5 are consistent with fermion masses and mixing fitting and with $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ decay rate, which is however predicted to be close to the current experimental bound. Thus the ongoing MEG experiment can confirm or rule out our model. Case I that corresponds to slepton mass of order 1 TeV is also consistent with the Yukawa couplings (i.e., b_1 and b_2) being perturbative at the scale M^* . On the other hand, these Yukawa couplings do not remain perturbative at M^* in Case II that corresponds to slepton masses of order 550 GeV.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professor K. S. Babu for reading the manuscript and valuable suggestions. This work is supported by US Department of Energy, Grant Number DE-FG02-ER46140.

6 Appendices

A Derivation of the Light Fermion Mass Matrix

In order to block-diagonalize the mass matrix of W_{spinor} , we define the new orthogonal basis as $Y = UX$, where $Y(X)$ is the column matrix that contains the new(old) eigenstates and U is the 5×5 orthogonal matrix (i.e $U^T U = U U^T = I$). These matrices are given by:

$$\begin{pmatrix} L_2 \\ L_3 \\ H_1 \\ H_2 \\ H_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -N_1 & 0 & 0 & N_1 s_\theta T_2 & 0 \\ \frac{f N_1 c_\theta s_\theta T_2^2}{r_F} & -\frac{f}{N_1 r_F} & \frac{f T_1}{N_1 r_F} & \frac{f N_1 c_\theta T_2}{r_F} & -\frac{f Q_F T_1 T_3}{N_1 r_F} \\ 0 & 0 & G_F Q_F T_3 & 0 & G_F \\ N_2 s_\theta T_2 & N_2 c_\theta T_2 & 0 & N_2 & 0 \\ \frac{f N_2 c_\theta s_\theta T_2^2 T_1}{G_F r_F} & -\frac{f N_2 T_1}{N_1^2 G_F r_F} & -\frac{f G_F}{N_2 r_F} & \frac{f N_2 c_\theta T_2 T_1}{G_F r_F} & \frac{f Q_F G_F T_3}{N_2 r_F} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_2 \\ \psi_3 \\ \chi_1 \\ \chi_2 \\ \chi_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

where $N_1 = 1/\sqrt{1 + T_2^2 s_\theta^2}$, $N_2 = 1/\sqrt{1 + T_2^2}$, $G_F = 1/\sqrt{1 + T_3^2 Q_F^2}$, $f = (1 + T_2^2 + T_1^2(1 + s_\theta^2 T_2^2))^{-1/2}$, and $r_F = \sqrt{(1 + Q_F^2 T_3^2 T_1^2(1 + s_\theta^2 T_2^2)f^2)}$. The parameters appearing in the above matrix are assumed to be real. Define e_i , E_i , \overline{E}_i^c , g_i , g'_i , g''_i , and g'''_i to be the charge (-1) leptons in the ψ_i , χ_i , $\overline{\chi}_i$, ϕ_i , ϕ'_i , ϕ''_i , and ϕ'''_i , respectively; and define e_i^c , E_i^c , \overline{E}_i , g_i^c , $g_i'^c$, $g_i''^c$, and $g_i'''^c$ to be the charge $(+1)$ antileptons in the same representations. By writing the old eigenstates appearing in the superpotential ($W_{spin} + W_{vect}$) of Eqs.(1) and (2) in terms of the new ones, and restricting attention to the electron-type leptons, one gets a 21×21 mass matrix:

$$W_{mass} = \begin{pmatrix} e_i^c & E_\alpha^c & \overline{E}_\alpha & g_i^c & g_i'^c & g_i''^c & g_i'''^c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} m_0 & m \\ M' & M \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e_i \\ E_\alpha \\ \overline{E}_\alpha^c \\ g_i \\ g_i' \\ g_i'' \\ g_i''' \end{pmatrix}, \quad (27)$$

where,

$$m_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{a f v_d Q_e s_\theta T_1 T_2 T_3}{r_e} \\ 0 & -\frac{a f v_d Q_e c s_\theta T_1 T_2 T_3}{r_{ec}} & -\frac{a f^2 v_d (Q_e + Q_{ec}) c_\theta T_1 T_2 T_3}{r_e r_{ec}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The matrices M' , m and M can be written in the compact form as

$$M' = \begin{pmatrix} M'_{11} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (28)$$

$$m^T = \begin{pmatrix} m_{11} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (29)$$

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} & M_{13} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (30)$$

where

$$M'_{11} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & aN_1v_dG_{ec}s_\theta T_2 & \frac{afN_1v_dG_{ec}c_\theta T_2}{N_1r_e} \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{afN_2v_dQ_eT_1T_3}{N_1r_e} \\ 0 & \frac{afN_1v_dG_{ec}Q_{ec}s_\theta T_2T_3}{N_2r_{ec}} & \frac{af^2v_dc_\theta(N_1^2G_{ec}^2Q_{ec}-N_2^2Q_eT_1^2)T_2T_3}{N_1N_2G_{ec}r_er_{ec}} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ b_3v_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -b_3N_1v_1 & \frac{b_3fN_1v_1s_\theta c_\theta T_2^2}{N_1r_e} \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{b_3fv_1}{N_1r_e} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$m_{11} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & aN_1v_dG_{ec}s_\theta T_2 & \frac{afN_1v_dc_\theta G_e T_2}{N_1r_{ec}} \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{afN_2v_dQ_{ec}T_1T_3}{N_1r_{ec}} \\ 0 & \frac{afN_1v_dG_eQ_{ec}s_\theta T_2T_3}{N_2r_e} & \frac{af^2v_dc_\theta(N_1^2G_e^2Q_{ec}-N_2^2Q_{ec}T_1^2)T_2T_3}{N_1N_2G_er_er_{ec}} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ b_3v_5 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -b_3N_1v_5 & \frac{b_3fN_1v_5c_\theta s_\theta T_2^2}{N_1r_{ec}} \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{b_3fv_5}{N_1r_{ec}} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$M_{11} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & aN_2v_dG_{ec} & \frac{afN_2v_dG_{ec}c_\theta T_1T_2}{G_{ec}r_{ec}} & M_1G_{ec}Q_{ec}T_3 \\ aN_2v_dG_e & 0 & \frac{afv_dG_{ec}Q_{ec}T_3}{r_{ec}} & M_1N_2c_\theta T_1T_2 \\ \frac{afN_2v_dG_{ec}c_\theta T_1T_2}{G_{ec}r_{ec}} & \frac{afv_dG_{ec}Q_{ec}T_3}{r_{ec}} & \frac{af^2v_d(G_{ec}^2Q_{ec}+G_{ec}^2Q_{ec})c_\theta T_1T_2T_3}{G_{ec}G_{ec}r_{ec}r_{ec}} & -\frac{fM_1(N_1^2G_{ec}^2+N_2^2T_1^2)}{N_1^2N_2G_{ec}r_{ec}} \\ M_1G_eQ_eT_3 & M_1N_2c_\theta T_1T_2 & -\frac{fM_1(N_1^2G_{ec}^2+N_2^2T_1^2)}{N_1^2N_2G_{ec}r_{ec}} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{M_2}{N_2} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{M_3}{G_e} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b_3N_2v_1s_\theta T_2 & \frac{b_3fN_2v_1s_\theta c_\theta T_1T_2^2}{G_{ec}r_{ec}} & 0 \\ 0 & b_3N_2v_1c_\theta T_2 & -\frac{b_3fN_2v_1T_1}{N_1^2G_{ec}r_{ec}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$M_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{M_3}{G_{ec}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{M_2}{N_2} & 0 & 0 & b_3N_2v_5s_\theta T_2 & b_3N_2v_5c_\theta T_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{b_3fN_2v_5s_\theta c_\theta T_1T_2^2}{G_{ec}r_{ec}} & -\frac{b_3fN_2v_5T_1}{N_1^2G_{ec}r_{ec}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & M_{10} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & M_{10} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & M_{10} & 0 & 0 & 0 & h\epsilon_3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & M_{10} & 0 & h\epsilon_3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & M_{10} & h\epsilon_2 & h\epsilon_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & A_2\gamma_3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & A_1\gamma_3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & A_2\gamma_2 & A_1\gamma_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & k_2\Omega Q_e & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & k_2\Omega Q_e \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$M_{13} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ M_{10} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ h\epsilon_2 & 0 & A_1\gamma_3 & A_2\gamma_2 & -k_2\Omega Q_e & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ h\epsilon_1 & A_2\gamma_3 & 0 & A_1\gamma_1 & 0 & -k_2\Omega Q_e & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A_1\gamma_2 & A_2\gamma_1 & 0 & 0 & -k_2\Omega Q_e & 0 & 0 \\ A_1\gamma_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & m & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ A_2\gamma_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & m & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & m & 0 \\ 0 & m & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ k_2\Omega Q_e & 0 & 0 & m & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here $v_1 = \langle 1(16_H) \rangle$, $v_5 = \langle \bar{5}(16_H) \rangle$, $v_d = \langle \bar{5}(10_H) \rangle$, $s_\theta \equiv \sin \theta$ and $c_\theta \equiv \cos \theta$. The above 21×21 mass matrix may be block-diagonalized as follows [16]:

$$U_R \begin{pmatrix} m_0 & m \\ M' & M \end{pmatrix} U_L^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} (m_0 - mM^{-1}M')(1 + y^\dagger y)^{-1/2} & 0 \\ 0 & (MM^\dagger + M'M'^\dagger) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (31)$$

where

$$U_R = \begin{pmatrix} I & (m_0 M'^\dagger + m M^\dagger)(MM^\dagger + M'M'^\dagger)^{-1} \\ (MM^\dagger + M'M'^\dagger)^{-1}(m_0^\dagger M' + m^\dagger M) & I \end{pmatrix}, \quad (32)$$

and

$$U_L = \begin{pmatrix} (1 + y^\dagger y)^{-1/2} & 0 \\ 0 & (MM^\dagger + M'M'^\dagger)^{-1/2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & -y^\dagger \\ M' & M \end{pmatrix}. \quad (33)$$

Here $y = M^{-1}M'$. Terms of order $(M_{Weak}/M_{GUT})^2$ have been dropped. Then the 3×3 light fermion mass matrix of charged leptons in Eq.(5) is obtained by applying the relation in the left upper block of the matrix in the Eq.(31), where the factor $(1 + y^\dagger y)^{-1/2}$ is close to identity for small mixing between the ψ_i and the 10-plet vectors. Similarly, one can obtain the down-type quark mass matrix. The parameters appearing in Eq.(5) are defined

as follows:

$$\zeta = c_{13} + \delta_2 \frac{3 + 2\alpha}{5}, \quad (34)$$

$$\beta = c_{23} - \delta_1 \frac{3 + 2\alpha}{5}, \quad (35)$$

$$s = \frac{5s_\theta}{f(2 + 3\alpha)c_\theta}, \quad (36)$$

$$c_{12} = \frac{b_3^2 h N_1 v_1 v_5 \epsilon_3}{a f^2 v_d c_\theta M_{10}^2 (Q_e + Q_{e^c}) T_1 T_2 T_3}, \quad (37)$$

$$\delta_3 = \frac{(A_1 - A_2) b_3^2 k_2 N_1 v_1 v_5 \gamma_3 \Omega}{a f^2 m v_d c_\theta M_{10}^2 (Q_e + Q_{e^c}) T_1 T_2 T_3}, \quad (38)$$

$$c_{13} = \frac{b_3^2 h v_1 v_5 (\epsilon_2 - N_1^2 \epsilon_3 c_\theta s_\theta T_2^2)}{a f N_1 v_d c_\theta M_{10}^2 (Q_e + Q_{e^c}) T_1 T_2 T_3}, \quad (39)$$

$$\delta_2 = \frac{(A_1 - A_2) b_3^2 k_2 v_1 v_5 \Omega (\gamma_2 + N_1^2 \gamma_3 c_\theta s_\theta T_2^2)}{a f m N_1 v_d c_\theta M_{10}^2 (Q_e + Q_{e^c}) T_1 T_2 T_3}, \quad (40)$$

$$c_{23} = \frac{-b_3^2 h v_1 v_5 \epsilon_1}{a f v_d c_\theta M_{10}^2 (Q_e + Q_{e^c}) T_1 T_2 T_3}, \quad (41)$$

$$\delta_1 = \frac{(-A_1 + A_2) b_3^2 k_2 v_1 v_5 \gamma_1 \Omega}{a f m v_d c_\theta M_{10}^2 (Q_e + Q_{e^c}) T_1 T_2 T_3}. \quad (42)$$

The above parameters are written in terms of the Yukawa couplings and the VEVs of the Higgs fields appearing in the superpotentials W_{spin} and $W_{vect.}$ in Eqs.(1) and (2). The parameters γ_1 , γ_2 and γ_3 appearing in the above Eqs.(38), (40) and (42) are the VEV components of the Higgs singlet $1_H''$.

B Light Neutrino Mass Matrix

The neutrino mass matrix can be obtained from the superpotentials given by Eqs.(1) and (6). For simplicity, the contribution from the superpotential $W_{vect.}$ in Eq.(2) is ignored by assuming the coupling of the ordinary spinor fields 16_i with the vector multiplets is small. Define the right- and left-handed neutrinos, denoted respectively by $(\nu_i^c$ and $\nu_i)$, residing in ψ_i . Similarly, $\nu_{\chi_i}^c$ and $\nu_{\chi_i}(\overline{\nu_{\chi_i}^c}$ and $\overline{\nu_{\chi_i}})$ reside in $\chi_i(\overline{\chi_i})$ where i runs from 1 to 3. Including the six singlets denoted by Z_i and Z_i^c , one can construct 24×24 mass matrix written in the

following compact form

$$W_{mass} = N^T \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M_D \\ M_D^T & M_R \end{pmatrix} N, \quad (43)$$

where

$$N^T = \left(\nu_i \quad \nu_{\chi_i} \quad \overline{\nu}_{\bar{\chi}_i}^c \quad \nu_i^c \quad \nu_{\chi_i}^c \quad \overline{\nu}_{\bar{\chi}_i} \quad Z_i \quad Z_i^c \right), \quad (44)$$

and

$$M_D^T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ C \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (45)$$

where

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\frac{afv_u Q_\nu s_\theta T_1 T_2 T_3}{r_\nu} \\ 0 & -\frac{afv_u Q_{\nu^c} s_\theta T_1 T_2 T_3}{r_{\nu^c}} & -\frac{af^2 v_u c_\theta (Q_\nu + Q_{\nu^c}) T_1 T_2 T_3}{r_\nu r_{\nu^c}} \\ 0 & a N_1 v_u G_{\nu^c} s_\theta T_2 & \frac{af N_1 v_u c_\theta G_{\nu^c} T_2}{N_1 r_\nu} \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{af N_2 v_u Q_\nu T_1 T_3}{N_1 r_\nu} \\ 0 & \frac{af N_1 v_u G_{\nu^c} Q_{\nu^c} s_\theta T_2 T_3}{N_2 r_{\nu^c}} & \frac{af^2 v_u c_\theta (N_1^2 G_{\nu^c}^2 Q_{\nu^c} - N_2^2 Q_\nu T_1^2) T_2 T_3}{N_1 N_2 G_{\nu^c} r_\nu r_{\nu^c}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here $v_u = \langle 5(10_H) \rangle$. The matrix M_R can be written in the compact form

$$M_R = \begin{pmatrix} M_{R11} & M_{R12} & M_{R13} & M_{R14} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (46)$$

where the matrices M_{R11} , M_{R12} , M_{R13} , and M_{R14} are given respectively by

$$\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
a N_1 v_u G_\nu s_\theta T_2 & 0 & \frac{a f N_1 v_u G_\nu Q_\nu s_\theta T_2 T_3}{N_2 r_\nu} & 0 \\
\frac{a f N_1 v_u c_\theta G_\nu T_2}{r_{\nu^c}} & -\frac{a f N_2 v_u Q_{\nu^c} T_1 T_3}{N_1 r_{\nu^c}} & \frac{a f^2 v_u c_\theta (N_1^2 G_\nu^2 Q_\nu - N_2^2 Q_{\nu^c} T_1^2) T_2 T_3}{N_1 N_2 G_\nu T_\nu r_{\nu^c}} & 0 \\
0 & a N_2 v_u G_{\nu^c} & \frac{a f N_2 v_u c_\theta G_{\nu^c} T_1 T_2}{G_\nu r_\nu} & M_1 G_{\nu^c} Q_{\nu^c} T_3 \\
a N_2 v_u G_\nu & 0 & \frac{a f v_u G_\nu Q_\nu T_3}{r_\nu} & M_1 N_2 c_\theta T_1 T_2 \\
\frac{a f N_2 v_u c_\theta G_\nu T_1 T_2}{G_{\nu^c} r_{\nu^c}} & \frac{a f v_u G_{\nu^c} Q_{\nu^c} T_3}{r_{\nu^c}} & \frac{a f^2 v_u c_\theta (G_\nu^2 Q_\nu + G_{\nu^c}^2 Q_{\nu^c}) T_1 T_2 T_3}{G_\nu G_{\nu^c} r_\nu r_{\nu^c}} & -\frac{f M_1 (N_1^2 G_{\nu^c}^2 + N_2^2 T_1^2)}{N_1^2 N_2 G_{\nu^c} r_{\nu^c}} \\
M_1 G_\nu Q_\nu T_3 & M_1 N_2 c_\theta T_1 T_2 & -\frac{f M_1 (N_1^2 G_\nu^2 + N_2^2 T_1^2)}{N_1^2 N_2 G_\nu r_\nu} & 0 \\
0 & \frac{M_2}{N_2} & 0 & 0 \\
\frac{M_3}{G_\nu} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix},$$

$$\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & a N_1 v_u G_\nu s_\theta T_2 & \frac{a f N_1 v_u c_\theta G_\nu T_2}{r_{\nu^c}} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{a f N_2 v_u Q_{\nu^c} T_1 T_3}{N_1 r_{\nu^c}} & a N_2 v_u G_{\nu^c} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{a f N_1 v_u G_\nu Q_\nu s_\theta T_2 T_3}{N_2 r_\nu} & \frac{a f^2 v_u c_\theta (N_1^2 G_\nu^2 Q_\nu - N_2^2 Q_{\nu^c} T_1^2) T_2 T_3}{N_1 N_2 G_\nu r_\nu r_{\nu^c}} & \frac{a f N_2 v_u c_\theta G_{\nu^c} T_1 T_2}{G_\nu r_\nu} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & M_1 G_{\nu^c} Q_{\nu^c} T_3 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{M_3}{G_{\nu^c}} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{M_3}{G_{\nu^c}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\frac{M_2}{N_2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & v b_4 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -N_1 v b_4 & \frac{f N_1 v b_4 c_\theta s_\theta T_2^2}{r_\nu} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{f v b_4}{N_1 r_\nu} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix},$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccccccc} aN_2v_uG_\nu & \frac{afN_2v_uc_\theta G_\nu T_1T_2}{G_\nu^{r_\nu c}T_\nu^c} & M_1G_\nu Q_\nu T_3 & 0 & \frac{M_3}{G_\nu} & 0 & \\ 0 & \frac{afv_uG_\nu^cQ_\nu^cT_3}{r_\nu^c} & M_1N_2c_\theta T_1T_2 & \frac{M_2}{N_2} & 0 & 0 & \\ \frac{afv_uG_\nu Q_\nu T_3}{r_\nu} & \frac{af^2v_uc_\theta(G_\nu^2Q_\nu+G_\nu^cQ_\nu^c)T_1T_2T_3}{G_\nu G_\nu^c r_\nu r_\nu^c} & -\frac{fM_1(N_1^2G_\nu^2+N_2^2T_1^2)}{N_1^2N_2G_\nu r_\nu} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ M_1N_2c_\theta T_1T_2 & -\frac{fM_1(N_1^2G_\nu^2+N_2^2T_1^2)}{N_1^2N_2G_\nu r_\nu^c} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ \frac{M_2}{N_2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & vb_4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ N_2vb_4s_\theta T_2 & \frac{fN_2vb_4c_\theta s_\theta T_1T_2^2}{G_\nu r_\nu} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ N_2vb_4c_\theta T_2 & -\frac{fN_2vb_4T_1}{N_1^2G_\nu r_\nu} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & c\alpha_3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & c\alpha_2 \end{array} \right),$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -N_1 v b_4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{f N_1 v b_4 c_\theta s_\theta T_2^2}{r_\nu} & -\frac{f v b_4}{N_1 r_\nu} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ N_2 v b_4 s_\theta T_2 & N_2 v b_4 c_\theta T_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{f N_2 v b_4 c_\theta s_\theta T_1 T_2^2}{G_\nu r_\nu} & -\frac{f N_2 v b_4 T_1}{N_1^2 G_\nu r_\nu} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & c\alpha_3 & c\alpha_2 \\ 0 & 0 & c\alpha_3 & 0 & c\alpha_1 \\ 0 & 0 & c\alpha_2 & c\alpha_1 & 0 \\ c\alpha_3 & c\alpha_2 & m_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c\alpha_1 & 0 & m_1 & 0 \\ c\alpha_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & m_1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (47)$$

Here $v = \langle 1(\overline{16}_H) \rangle$. The light neutrino mass matrix is given by the seesaw formula as follows

$$M_\nu = M_D M_R^{-1} M_D^T = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \kappa & \eta \\ 0 & \eta & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (48)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda &= \frac{\Lambda a^2 c^2 f^2 v_d^2 T_1^2 T_2^2 ((\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_3^2) Q_\nu^2 r_{\nu^c}^2 s_\theta^2 + 2N_1^2 \alpha_2 \alpha_3 c_\theta Q_\nu r_{\nu^c} s_\theta ((Q_\nu + Q_{\nu^c}) r_\nu}{m_1 N_1^2 v^2 b_4^2 r_\nu^2 r_{\nu^c}^2} \\
&+ \frac{Q_\nu r_{\nu^c} s_\theta^2 T_2^2) + N_1^4 (\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2) c_\theta^2 ((Q_\nu + Q_{\nu^c}) r_\nu + Q_\nu r_{\nu^c} s_\theta^2 T_2^2)^2 T_3^2}{m_1 N_1^2 v^2 b_4^2 r_\nu^2 r_{\nu^c}^2}, \\
\eta &= \frac{N_1^2 Q_{\nu^c} r_\nu^2 s_\theta (\alpha_2 \alpha_3 Q_\nu r_{\nu^c} s_\theta + N_1^2 (\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2) c_\theta ((Q_\nu + Q_{\nu^c}) r_\nu + Q_\nu r_{\nu^c} s_\theta^2 T_2^2))}{f(A+B)}, \\
\kappa &= \frac{N_1^4 (\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2) Q_{\nu^c}^2 r_\nu^4 s_\theta^2}{f^2(A+B)}. \tag{49}
\end{aligned}$$

Here the numerical values of α_1 , α_2 , α_3 and λ are given in section 2, and we have defined

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= (\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_3^2) Q_e^2 r_{e^c}^2 s_\theta^2 + 2N_1^2 \alpha_2 \alpha_3 c_\theta Q_e r_{e^c} s_\theta ((Q_e + Q_{e^c}) r_e + Q_e r_{e^c} s_\theta^2 T_2^2), \\
B &= N_1^4 (\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2) c_\theta^2 ((Q_e + Q_{e^c}) r_e + Q_e r_{e^c} s_\theta^2 T_2^2).
\end{aligned}$$

C RGEs from the scale M^* to the GUT scale

Neglecting all the couplings in the superpotential W_{vector} , since they do not contribute to the top Yukawa coupling, we present only the RGEs that are needed to find the parameter σ at the GUT scale. The one-loop RGE's of the unified gauge (g_G) coupling, the couplings appearing in W_{spinor} , and the trilinear soft terms associated with W_{spinor} between the scale M^* and GUT scale are

$$16\pi^2 \frac{dg_G}{dt} = 19g_G^3, \tag{50}$$

$$16\pi^2 \frac{db_1}{dt} = b_1(20b_1^2 + b_2^2 - 45g_G^2), \tag{51}$$

$$16\pi^2 \frac{db_2}{dt} = b_2(20b_2^2 + b_1^2 - 45g_G^2), \tag{52}$$

$$16\pi^2 \frac{da}{dt} = a(18a^2 - \frac{63}{2}g_G^2), \tag{53}$$

$$16\pi^2 \frac{d\tilde{b}_1}{dt} = 2(20b_1^2 \tilde{b}_1 + b_2^2 \tilde{b}_2 + 45g_G^2 M_\lambda), \tag{54}$$

$$16\pi^2 \frac{d\tilde{b}_2}{dt} = 2(20b_2^2 \tilde{b}_2 + b_1^2 \tilde{b}_1 + 45g_G^2 M_\lambda), \tag{55}$$

$$16\pi^2 \frac{d\tilde{a}}{dt} = 28\tilde{a}a^2 + 63g_G^2 M_\lambda. \tag{56}$$

The RGE's soft mass terms for the fields appearing in W_{spinor} are given below:

$$16\pi^2 \frac{d\tilde{m}_{\psi_i}^2}{dt} = 2b_1^2(\tilde{m}_{\psi_i}^2 + \tilde{m}_{\tilde{\chi}_1}^2 + \tilde{m}_{1_{H_i}}^2 + \tilde{b}_1^2) + 2b_2^2(\tilde{m}_{\psi_i}^2 + \tilde{m}_{\tilde{\chi}_2}^2 + \tilde{m}_{1'_{H_i}}^2 + \tilde{b}_2^2) - 45g_G^2 M_\lambda^2, \quad (57)$$

$$16\pi^2 \frac{d\tilde{m}_{\tilde{\chi}_1}^2}{dt} = 6b_1^2(\tilde{m}_{\psi_i}^2 + \tilde{m}_{\tilde{\chi}_1}^2 + \tilde{m}_{1_{H_i}}^2 + \tilde{b}_1^2) - 45g_G^2 M_\lambda^2, \quad (58)$$

$$16\pi^2 \frac{d\tilde{m}_{\tilde{\chi}_2}^2}{dt} = 6b_2^2(\tilde{m}_{\psi_i}^2 + \tilde{m}_{\tilde{\chi}_2}^2 + \tilde{m}_{1'_{H_i}}^2 + \tilde{b}_2^2) - 45g_G^2 M_\lambda^2, \quad (59)$$

$$16\pi^2 \frac{d\tilde{m}_{1_{H_i}}^2}{dt} = 32b_1^2(\tilde{m}_{\psi_i}^2 + \tilde{m}_{\tilde{\chi}_1}^2 + \tilde{m}_{1_{H_i}}^2 + \tilde{b}_1^2), \quad (60)$$

$$16\pi^2 \frac{d\tilde{m}_{1'_{H_i}}^2}{dt} = 32b_2^2(\tilde{m}_{\psi_i}^2 + \tilde{m}_{\tilde{\chi}_2}^2 + \tilde{m}_{1'_{H_i}}^2 + \tilde{b}_2^2), \quad (61)$$

$$16\pi^2 \frac{d\tilde{m}_{\chi_{2,3}}^2}{dt} = 10a^2(\tilde{m}_{\chi_2}^2 + \tilde{m}_{\chi_3}^2 + \tilde{m}_{10_H}^2 + \tilde{a}^2) - 45g_G^2 M_\lambda^2, \quad (62)$$

$$16\pi^2 \frac{d\tilde{m}_{10_H}^2}{dt} = 16a^2(\tilde{m}_{\chi_2}^2 + \tilde{m}_{\chi_3}^2 + \tilde{m}_{10_H}^2 + \tilde{a}^2) - 36g_G^2 M_\lambda^2. \quad (63)$$

Here $\tilde{m}_{1_{H_i}}^2$, $\tilde{m}_{1'_{H_i}}^2$ and $\tilde{m}_{10_H}^2$ are the quadratic soft masses for the Higgs superfields appearing in W_{spin} defined in Eq.(1) and the quadratic soft masses $\tilde{m}_{\psi_i}^2$, $\tilde{m}_{\tilde{\chi}_{1,2}}^2$, and $\tilde{m}_{\chi_{1,2}}^2$ are defined in Eq.(10).

References

- [1] A. H. Chamseddine, R. Arnowitt and P. Nath, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 970 (1982); R. Barbieri, S. Ferrara and C. A. Savoy, Phys. Lett. **B119**, 343 (1982); L. J. Hall, J. Lykken and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D27**, 2359 (1983); L. Alvarez-Gaume, J. Polchinski and M. B. Wise, Nucl. Phys. **B221**, 495 (1983), N. Ohta, Prog. Theor. Phys. **70**, 542, (1983).
- [2] F. Borzumati, A. Masiero, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 961 (1986); J. J. Hisano, D. Nomura, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 116005 (1999)[arXiv:hep-ph/0004061].
- [3] Hisano, T. Moroi, K. Tobe, M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. **D53**, 2442 (1996)[arXiv:hep-ph/9605296].
- [4] See e.g. S. F. King and M. Oliveira, Phys. Rev. **D 60**, 035003 (1999); J. Hisano and D. Nomura, Phys. Rev. **D 59**, 116005 (1999); W. Buchmuller, D. Delepine and F. Vissani, Phys. Lett. **B 459**, 171 (1999); K. S. Babu, B. Dutta and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Lett. **B 458**, 93 (1999); A. Belyaev et al, Eur. Phys. J. C **22**, 715 (2002); J. Sato, K. Tobe and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. **B 498**, 189 (2001); S. Lavignac, I. Masina and C. A. Savoy, Phys. Lett. **B 510**, 197 (2001); S. Baek, T. Goto, Y. Okada and K. I. Okumura, Phys. Rev. **D 64**, 095001 (2001); J. Ellis et al, Nucl. Phys. **B 621**, 208 (2002); K. S. Babu, B. Dutta and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. **D 67**, 076006 (2003); S. T. Petcov, S. Profumo, Y. Takanishi and C. E. Yaguna, Nucl. Phys. **B 676**, 453 (2004); A. Masiero, S. Profumo, S. K. Vempati and C. E. Yaguna, JHEP **0403**, 046 (2004); T. Fukuyama, A. Ilakovac and T. Kikuchi, Eur. Phys. J. C **56**, 125 (2008) [arXiv:hep-ph/0506295].
- [5] See e.g. J. Hisano, T. Moroi, K. Tobe and M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Lett. **B 391**, 341 (1997) [Erratum-ibid. **B 397**, 357 (1997)]; J. Hisano, D. Nomura and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. **B 437**, 351 (1998); M. Ciuchini, A. Masiero, L. Silvestrini, S. K. Vempati and O. Vives,

- Nucl. Phys. **B 548**, 60 (1999); Y. Okada, K. I. Okumura and Y. Shimizu, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 094001 (2000).
- [6] R. Barbieri, L.J. Hall, A. Strumia, Nucl. Phys. B**445**, 219 (1995)[arXiv:hep-ph/9501334];
- [7] K. S. Babu, J. C. Pati and P. Rastogi, Phys. Lett. B **621**, 160 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0502152].
- [8] A. Albaid, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 093002 (2009) [arXiv:0909.1762 [hep-ph]].
- [9] See e.g. X. J. Bi, Y. B. Dai and X. Y. Qi, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 096008 (2001); X. J. Bi and Y. B. Dai, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 076006 (2002); S. M. Barr, Phys. Lett. B **578**, 394 (2004); B. Dutta, Y. Mimura, R.N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 115014 (2004); E. Jankowski and D. W. Maybury, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 035004 (2004); M. Bando, S. Kaneko, M. Obara and M. Tanimoto, arXiv:hep-ph/0405071; T. Fukuyama, T. Kikuchi and N. Okada, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 033012 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0304190]; M. C. Chen and K. T. Mahanthappa, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 113013 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0409096]; T. Fukuyama, A. Ilakovac, T. Kikuchi and S. Meljanac, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **144**, 143 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0411282].
- [10] C. Amsler *et al.* [Particle Data Group], Phys. Lett. B **667**, 1 (2008).
- [11] F. Gabbiani, E. Gabrielli, A. Masiero and L. Silvestrini, Nucl. Phys. B **477**, 321 (1996) [arXiv:hep-ph/9604387]; D. Becirevic *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. B **634**, 105 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0112303]; K. S. Babu and Y. Meng, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 075003 (2009) [arXiv:0907.4231 [hep-ph]].
- [12] M. Ciuchini, A. Masiero, P. Paradisi, L. Silvestrini, S. K. Vempati and O. Vives, Nucl. Phys. B **783**, 112 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0702144].
- [13] M. L. Brooks *et al.* [MEGA Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1521 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ex/9905013].

- [14] P. Paradisi, JHEP **0510**, 006 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0505046].
- [15] M. De Gerone *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A **638**, 41 (2011); J. Adam *et al.* [MEG Collaboration], Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A **641**, 19 (2011); M. De Gerone *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A **638**, 41 (2011); T. Iwamoto [MEG Collaboration], PoS **ICHEP2010**, 489 (2010); H. Natori [MEG Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **210-211**, 241 (2011).
- [16] K. S. Babu and S. M. Barr, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 2614 (1997) [arXiv:hep-ph/9512389].