

On non-universal Goldstino couplings to matter

E. Dudas^{a,b}, G. Gersdorff^a, D. M. Ghilencea^{c,d}, S. Lavignac^e, J. Parmentier^{a,e}

^a *Centre de Physique Théorique[†], Ecole Polytechnique and CNRS, F-91128 Palaiseau, France.*

^b *Laboratoire de Physique Théorique[‡], Université de Paris-Sud, Bât. 210, F-91405 Orsay, France.*

^c *Theory Division, CERN, 1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland.*

^d *DFT, National Institute of Physics and Nuclear Engineering (IFIN-HH) Bucharest MG-6, Romania*

^e *Institut de Physique Théorique[§], CEA-Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette Cedex, France.*

Abstract

Using the constrained superfields formalism to describe the interactions of a light goldstino to matter fields in supersymmetric models, we identify generalised, higher-order holomorphic superfield constraints that project out the superpartners and capture the non-universal couplings of the goldstino to matter fields. These arise from microscopic theories in which heavy superpartners masses are of the order of the supersymmetry breaking scale (\sqrt{f}). In the decoupling limit of infinite superpartners masses, these constraints reduce to the familiar, lower-order universal constraints discussed recently, that describe the universal goldstino-matter fields couplings, suppressed by inverse powers of \sqrt{f} . We initiate the study of the couplings of the Standard Model (SM) fields to goldstino in the constrained superfields formalism.

[†]Unité mixte du CNRS (UMR 7644).

[‡]Unité mixte du CNRS (UMR 8627).

[§]Laboratoire de la Direction des Sciences de la Matière du Commissariat à l'Energie Atomique et Unité de Recherche associée au CNRS (URA 2306).

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Non-linear supersymmetry and constrained superfields	3
3	UV versus effective Lagrangians and generalized constraints	6
3.1	Goldstino in microscopic theories and universal constraints.	7
3.2	Kahler potentials and generalized chiral constraints	8
3.3	Yukawa couplings and generalized chiral constraints	11
4	Leading-order low-energy effective Lagrangians	12
4.1	Onshell Lagrangian with R-parity violating and goldstino couplings	12
4.2	General onshell Lagrangian with general 4-fermion terms	14
5	The SM coupled to goldstino using universal constraints	16
6	Conclusions	20
A	The effects of derivatives of light fields on the constraints.	22
B	Heavy gauginos and constrained vector superfields	22
C	Heavy higgsinos.	24

1 Introduction

The study of the interactions of the goldstino with matter is an interesting research area, that started originally with the pioneering work of Akulov and Volkov [1], and was investigated extensively in the past [2]-[6], with renewed interest in [7] -[22]. Such theoretical study could also be of phenomenological relevance if the scale of supersymmetry breaking (in the hidden sector), \sqrt{f} , is in the few-TeV range, near the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) energy; however, this work is valid independent of such restrictions for f . The first formalisms describing goldstino interactions with matter, using in particular constrained superfields, were constructed in the early days of supersymmetry [3], [4], [5], [6]. More recently, an approach starting from microscopic descriptions of the supersymmetric theories was further considered [7], [16] in which heavy superpartners were integrated out via field equations, leading to constrained superfields and renewed interest in this method.

An intriguing aspect of the constraints used in [16] is that their solution is *unique* and are *insensitive* to the details of the UV physics, in particular are independent of the superparticle

masses m_i . As a result, the corresponding low-energy actions contain *universal* couplings of the goldstino to matter fields, suppressed by \sqrt{f} . It is clear however that the decoupling of heavy superpartners can also lead to *non-universal couplings*, suppressed at low-energy by their masses m_i rather than the supersymmetry breaking scale \sqrt{f} . The main purpose of the present paper is to clarify the emergence of the non-universal couplings in a superfield formalism endowed with constraints, generated by the decoupling of the heavy superpartners. To this purpose we extend the formalism of constrained superfields developed so far and identify new, higher order polynomial constraints for superfields, that effectively project out (integrate out) the massive superpartners of the SM spectrum. One possible advantage of this is that one could then use, in principle at least, a pure superfield formalism endowed with such generalised constraints to describe the non-supersymmetric SM Lagrangian.

Our study shows that the non-universal couplings of the goldstino to matter are described at the low-energy by superfields with higher order, non-minimal constraints. Rather interestingly, and unlike the universal case, the solution to these generalised constraints is *not unique*, but depends on some arbitrary coefficients. In specific microscopic models (i.e. UV completions) these coefficients are functions of the superpartners masses that ultimately depend on the parameters of the UV microscopic theory. The aforementioned arbitrariness of these coefficients seems interesting and may turn out to be an advantage. Indeed, since the constraints (and solutions) that we find are the same for all classes of UV completions (of different UV parameters), they may turn out to be applicable beyond the limited valability of the convergent effective Lagrangian expansion in powers of $1/m_i^2$. This could allow an extension of the valability of the superfield formalism with generalised constraints beyond that of the effective Lagrangian obtained upon integrating out the superpartners, into the non-perturbative regime. In the formal limit of infinite superpartners masses the goldstino couplings to matter become universal and the generalised, higher order constraints of the superfields that we identify recover the universal constraints.

When integrating out the superpartners, one should ensure that they are massive enough to decouple at the low-energy E at which the Lagrangian is studied, and light enough for the UV and supersymmetry breaking scales separation. In detail, if the superpartners masses m_i are too light $E \lesssim m_i \ll \sqrt{f}$, then one cannot integrate them out, at energy scales $E \sim m_i$; so the formalism is less reliable since the expansion in E/m_i is not rapidly convergent. If on the contrary, the superpartners are massive enough, of the order of supersymmetry breaking scale, $E \ll m_i \lesssim \sqrt{f} < \Lambda$, and in the absence of some cancellations of the aforementioned coefficients (in the microscopic action), then it means $m_i^2 \approx f^2/\Lambda^2 \sim f$, therefore $\Lambda^2 \sim f$, where Λ is the UV scale. This last relation means that there would be no significant scale separation between the scales $m_i \sim \sqrt{f}$ and Λ , therefore there would be no reliable UV microscopic description. The conclusion is that one has to work in a regime of energy values

between these two “dangerous” choices, and in applications this remains a difficult issue. However, note that holomorphic superfield constraints (and their solutions) that we identify to project out massive scalar superpartners are similar for different superpartners masses and UV physics details. Therefore, they could be more powerful in capturing aspects of UV physics without a specific UV completion or a concern for scales separation, and, as argued earlier, could even capture effects of non-perturbative physics.

The plan of the paper is as follows. Section 2 reviews the goldstino couplings and the universal constraints formalism. In Section 3 we identify generalised holomorphic superfield constraints for generic Kahler potentials of matter fields and goldstino, and superpotentials with additional matter couplings. In Section 4 we use the new formalism to provide examples with the R-parity violating couplings in supersymmetric model, in the decoupling limit of heavy squarks and sleptons masses. We extend this and evaluate the onshell Lagrangian of goldstino coupled to a general Kahler potential for matter fields, with additional superpotential matter couplings. Section 5 outlines the steps for writing the Standard Model and its two-Higgs doublet model extension coupled to a light goldstino in the superfield formalism by using universal constraints only, with particular attention to the Higgs sector. We find a new quartic correction to the Higgs potential similar to that in [22], but unlike that, it is not universal, but depends on additional parameters. We also point out that in general, the leading higgs-goldstino couplings are not universal, being generated by a term analogous to the μ -term in MSSM. The Appendix contains some comments on the effects on the formalism of constrained superfields from microscopic terms that contain derivatives of light fields, and microscopic examples generating heavy gauginos and higgsinos.

2 Non-linear supersymmetry and constrained superfields

In this section we review the goldstino action and its (universal) couplings to the SM, in a superfield formalism with constraints. We consider in the following energy scales well below the mass of the (scalar) sgoldstino ϕ_X , the superpartner of goldstino ψ_X . We denote the goldstino chiral superfield by X with the components $X = (\phi_X, \psi_X, F_X)$. One can use the component fields formalism to describe the corresponding Volkov-Akulov action and then couple it “geometrically” to the SM action. Alternatively, one can use the more convenient superfield formalism, endowed with constraints. For the goldstino superfield, this constraint is [4, 5, 7, 10, 16].

$$X^2 = 0 . \tag{1}$$

Starting with the Lagrangian¹

¹We use the conventions of [23].

$$\mathcal{L}_X = \int d^4\theta X^\dagger X + \left\{ \int d^2\theta f X + h.c. \right\} = |\partial_\mu \phi_X|^2 + F_X^\dagger F_X - \left[\frac{i}{2} \bar{\psi}_X \bar{\sigma}^\mu \partial_\mu \psi_X - f F_X + h.c. \right] \quad (2)$$

endowed with the aforementioned constraint, one recovers the Volkov-Akulov action. Indeed, the constraint is solved by

$$X = \phi_X + \sqrt{2} \theta \psi_X + \theta^2 F_X, \quad \text{with} \quad \phi_X = \frac{\psi_X \psi_X}{2 F_X} \quad (3)$$

which, when used back in eq.(2) recovers [16] the Volkov-Akulov Lagrangian [1]. After using the equation of motion for F_X , we find $F_X = -f + \dots$, where f (that can be chosen real) is the SUSY breaking scale. Therefore, in the infrared description of the SUSY breaking, the scalar component (sgoldstino) becomes a function of the goldstino ψ_X .

Let us now review the (universal) couplings of the goldstino to the SM matter fields, in the superfield formalism. Consider a SM fermion field (quark or lepton), denoted ψ_q in what follows and introduce the corresponding superfield $Q = (\phi_q, \psi_q, F_q)$. We assume that the scalar (squark or slepton) has a large mass, so it decouples at low (EW) scales. The decoupling can be described in the superfield language, by imposing a constraint on the corresponding superfield Q , which effectively “projects out” (i.e. integrates out) ϕ_q . The simplest constraint that realizes this is [10, 16]

$$Q X = 0, \quad (4)$$

whose solution is

$$Q = \frac{1}{F_X} \left(\psi_q - \frac{F_q}{2 F_X} \psi_X \right) \psi_X + \sqrt{2} \theta \psi_q + \theta^2 F_q. \quad (5)$$

Solutions (3) and (5) of the constraints can be obtained in the low energy limit of the following microscopic Lagrangian that couples X and Q :

$$\mathcal{L} = \int d^4\theta \left\{ X^\dagger X + Q^\dagger Q - \epsilon_x (X^\dagger X)^2 - \epsilon_q (Q^\dagger Q)(X^\dagger X) \right\} + \left\{ \int d^2\theta f X + h.c. \right\} \quad (6)$$

where $\epsilon_{x,q} \equiv c_{x,q}/\Lambda^2$, $\Lambda > \sqrt{f}$ is a UV cutoff scale and the positive, dimensionless coefficients $c_{x,q}$ are of order $c_X, c_q \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$. The sgoldstino and squark (slepton) masses are then:

$$m_X^2 = 4\epsilon_x f^2, \quad m_q^2 = \epsilon_q f^2. \quad (7)$$

The microscopic Lagrangian in (6) has a minimal structure in the sense that it contains the minimal number of terms needed to provide large scalar masses and to stabilize the scalar vev's to zero, while keeping vanishing fermions masses. After integrating out the massive scalar fields ϕ_X and ϕ_q by using the *zero momentum part* of the Lagrangian, one obtains

solutions (3), (5), as anticipated. A naive procedure would be to consider zero-momentum for heavy fields but keep non-vanishing momenta (derivatives) for the light fields. Such procedure would modify the constraints in (1), (4) (for an example see Appendix A).

One notices that, somewhat intriguingly, the constraints $X^2 = 0$, $XQ = 0$ and their solution in (3), (5) are actually independent of the UV details, in this case the masses of the heavy scalars. However, this is not the most general case: in a microscopic theory only mildly different from (6), other terms in the Kahler potential and superpotential can be present, compatible with all the symmetries of the low-energy theory. As we shall see later in detail, such terms can change the constraints (1), (4) in the generic case $m_X^2, m_q^2 \sim f$. In the extreme limit of $m_X^2, m_q^2 \gg f$, all the goldstino couplings to matter become universal and the constraints (1), (4) and their solution are recovered. However, since $\Lambda^2 > f$, such *formal* limit of very heavy scalars is only possible for unnaturally large values of the coefficients $c_x, c_q \gg 1$, that question the reliability of the expansion in $(1/\Lambda)$. Even so, such large values for c_x, c_q are difficult to obtain, even in a strongly coupled regime when one would expect at most $c_i \sim 4\pi$. Ultimately, the constraints $X^2 = 0$ and $XQ = 0$ will receive UV dependent corrections, however they can still be used to identify the universal couplings of the goldstino to matter fields, via this limit. Finally, the constraints we shall identify in the following sections will help one identify the non-universal goldstino couplings, and will recover these universal constraints as a special case. There can be exceptions to this: even in the limit of large c_x, c_q etc, with some ratios of them kept fixed, it is possible that the universal constraints $X^2 = XQ = 0$ change to become nonzero in $\mathcal{O}(1/f^2)$ order². However, by taking large values only for those coefficients contributing to the physical masses, we do recover the universal constraints.

This discussion can be extended to include gauge multiplets. The question is then what constraint to impose in order to integrate out the heavy gauginos. A simple choice is [16]

$$X W_\alpha = 0, \quad (8)$$

where W_α is the supersymmetric field strength. The solution is given by

$$\begin{aligned} W_\alpha &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}F_X}(\delta_\alpha^\beta D - i\sigma_\alpha^{mn,\beta} F_{mn})\psi_{X,\beta} - \frac{\psi_X \psi_X}{2F_X^2}(\sigma^m \partial_m \bar{\lambda})_\alpha + (\delta_\alpha^\beta D - i\sigma_\alpha^{mn,\beta} F_{mn})\theta_\beta \\ &+ \theta^2 (\sigma^m \partial_m \bar{\lambda})_\alpha \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Note that in (9) the gaugino is defined implicitly, the solution can be found in Appendix, eq.(B.8). As discussed in Appendix B, similarly to the above case of heavy scalars, eq.(8) is exact only in the formal limit of infinitely heavy gaugino masses, $M^2 \gg f$. In the case $M^2 \sim f$

²See for example Section 3.1 and eq.(29).

one could consider instead a different constraint, $X W_\alpha W^\alpha = 0$. However, the universal goldstino coupling to the gauge field is indeed generated by both types of constraints.

Finally, let us discuss the Higgs sector. For the Higgs multiplet(s), one would like to decouple the fermions (higgsinos) instead of the scalars. The simplest choice is provided by the constraints [16]

$$X H_i^\dagger = \text{chiral} \quad \leftrightarrow \quad X \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}} H_i^\dagger = 0, \quad (10)$$

which determine the higgsinos and the whole Higgs superfields in terms of the higgs scalars h_i and the goldstino ψ_X

$$H_i = h_i + i\sqrt{2} \theta \sigma^m \left(\frac{\bar{\psi}_X}{\bar{F}_X} \right) \partial_m h_i + \theta^2 \left[-\partial_m \left(\frac{\bar{\psi}_X}{\bar{F}_X} \right) \bar{\sigma}^n \sigma^m \frac{\bar{\psi}_X}{\bar{F}_X} \partial_n h_i + \frac{1}{2\bar{F}_X^2} \bar{\psi}_X^2 \square h_i \right]. \quad (11)$$

We discuss in Appendix C a microscopic model leading to a value of the higgsino as shown above, $\psi_{h,i} = (i/\bar{F}_X) \sigma^m \bar{\psi}_X \partial_m h_i$, (although the details of the low-energy theory and in particular the auxiliary fields $F_{h,i}$ are slightly different).

The various superfield constraints presented above raise an interesting question. What are the fundamental, “primary” superfield constraints in a given model? More explicitly, consider the case of the goldstino X and matter fields Q_i discussed earlier, with the solution (3), (5) satisfying the constraints $X^2 = XQ_i = 0$. By an explicit calculation and using eq.(5) one shows that the following relation (i labels a particular fermion)

$$Q_i Q_j Q_k = 0. \quad (12)$$

is also satisfied and can itself be regarded as a constraint. At first sight this does not seem to be immediately implied by the “primary” constraints (1) and (4), but eq.(12) cannot be an independent one since the constraints $X^2 = XQ_i = 0$ uniquely determine solutions (3), (5). The answer to these questions is related to the generalized class of constraints that encode not only the universal but also the additional, non-universal couplings of the goldstino to the SM fields, that we discuss in the next sections.

3 UV versus effective Lagrangians and generalized constraints

In this section we identify new, generalised constraints for superfields and their relation to integrating out massive superpartners. The framework is that of supersymmetric theories in which all would-be SM superpartners are heavy and decoupled at low energy. In order to integrate out the heavy scalars³, via their classical field equations, we use the zero-momentum limit of the Lagrangian of a rigid supersymmetric theory with N fields, given by [24]

³We comment in Appendix B and C on the case of integrating heavy fermions like higgsinos/gauginos.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} &= \int d^4\theta K(\Phi_I^\dagger, \Phi^I) + \left\{ \int d^2\theta W(\Phi^I) + h.c. \right\} \\
&= K_I{}^J \left[\partial_\mu \phi^I \partial^\mu \phi_J^\dagger - \frac{i}{2} (\psi^I \sigma^\mu \mathcal{D}_\mu \bar{\psi}_J - \mathcal{D}_\mu \psi^I \sigma^\mu \bar{\psi}_J) + F^I F_J^\dagger \right] \\
&+ \frac{1}{4} K_{IJ}^{KL} \psi^I \psi^J \bar{\psi}_K \bar{\psi}_L + \left[(W_K - \frac{1}{2} K_K^{IJ} \bar{\psi}_I \bar{\psi}_J) F^K - \frac{1}{2} W_{IJ} \psi^I \psi^J + h.c. \right] \quad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

where the lower (upper) indices in K and W functions denote derivatives wrt scalar fields (their hermitian conjugate), respectively, in a standard notation, $\mathcal{D}_\mu \psi^I$ denote the Kahler covariant derivative acting on the fermion ψ^I , $K_I = \partial K / \partial \Phi^I$, $K^J = \partial K / \partial \Phi_J^\dagger$, etc. Here $\Phi_I = (\phi_I, \psi_I, F_I)$ can denote X or a matter superfield, such as that of a quark/squark (Q) or lepton/slepton. For such a theory, the goldstino is defined as

$$\psi_X = \frac{1}{|F|} \bar{F}_I \psi^I = - \frac{1}{|F|} (K^{-1})_I{}^J W_J \psi^I, \quad \text{where} \quad |F|^2 = \sum_I |F_I|^2 \quad (14)$$

is the total magnitude of supersymmetry breaking. Expression (14) is valid on the ground state, so all scalars should be replaced by their vev's.

Integrating out the massive superpartners can be performed in terms of superfield constraints that we identify below; their form will depend on the complexity of the Kahler potential and superpotential. Nevertheless, in all cases these constraints will be some polynomials in superfields. Let us provide some examples.

3.1 Goldstino in microscopic theories and universal constraints.

To begin with, consider a particular case of the microscopic action in (13), with N fields

$$K = \Phi_I^\dagger \Phi^I - \frac{1}{\Lambda^2} \left(\Phi_I^\dagger \Phi^I \right)^2, \quad W = \sum_I f_I \Phi_I, \quad (15)$$

with summation over $I = \overline{1, N}$; here the Kahler potential preserves a global $U(N)$ symmetry while f_I are some constants, chosen real. Using a zero-momentum integration of the heavy scalars one finds

$$\Phi_I = \left[\frac{1}{|F|^2} \left(\psi_I - F_I \frac{\bar{F}_J \psi^J}{2|F|^2} \right) \bar{F}_N \psi^N \right] + \sqrt{2} \theta \psi_I + \theta^2 F_I, \quad (16)$$

where a summation over J, N is understood. It is important to notice that in this case $\Phi_I^2 \neq 0$ for each field Φ_I . However, the superfield

$$X = \frac{1}{|F|} \bar{F}_J \Phi^J = \frac{(\bar{F}_J \psi^J)^2}{2|F|^3} + \sqrt{2} \theta \frac{\bar{F}_J \psi^J}{|F|} + \theta^2 |F| \quad (17)$$

satisfies the constraint $X^2 = 0$, with its goldstino as defined in eq.(14). Further, any linear combination $Q_I = c_{IJ}\Phi^J$ can be written in the form (5) with $\psi_q \rightarrow \psi_{qI} = c_{IJ}\psi^J$, $F_q \rightarrow F_{qI} = c_{IJ}F^J$ and therefore satisfies the constraint in (4), $XQ = 0$.

However, the details of the microscopic theories are important and the constraint $X^2 = 0$ is not valid in all such theories, even though the goldstino fermion remains that defined as in (14). Instead of the relation $X^2 = 0$, a higher order monomial constraint applies, as we shall see shortly in more general microscopic models. The case discussed above is rather special, due to the $U(N)$ symmetry of the microscopic Kahler potential (15); this lead to equal masses for the heavy scalars and therefore to only one mass scale and then $X^2 = 0$ follows.

3.2 Kahler potentials and generalized chiral constraints

The Kahler potential in eq.(6) is the minimal one required by a consistent decoupling of the heavy scalars, but it is not protected by any symmetry. Therefore, it can contain additional terms of the form $(Q^\dagger Q)^2/\Lambda^2$ in the matter fields sector. New terms in the Kahler potential (K) introduce new mass scales, and the form of K and the total number of low-energy fields determine the nature of the constraints on the low-energy superfields. Let us provide an example with one goldstino superfield X and one SM matter fermion whose superfield is Q . The microscopic action that we consider is then (we ignore gauge interactions):

$$\begin{aligned} K &= X^\dagger X + Q^\dagger Q - \epsilon_1 (X^\dagger X)^2 - \epsilon_2 (Q^\dagger Q)^2 - \epsilon_3 (Q^\dagger Q)(X^\dagger X) , \\ W &= f X , \quad \text{where} \quad Q \equiv (\phi_q, \psi_q, F_q) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where $\epsilon_i \sim 1/\Lambda^2$ have mass dimension -2 and Λ is the UV scale. The scalar fields have squared masses ⁴ of values $4\epsilon_1 f^2$ for sgoldstino and $\epsilon_3 f^2$ for the squark (or slepton), respectively. We integrate out these scalar fields, using the zero-momentum Lagrangian for the heavy scalar fields *and also* for the light fermion fields. One finds the low-energy superfields

$$\begin{aligned} X &= (a_{11} \psi_X \psi_X + a_{12} \psi_X \psi_q + a_{22} \psi_q \psi_q) + \sqrt{2} \theta \psi_X + \theta^2 F_X , \\ Q &= (b_{11} \psi_X \psi_X + b_{12} \psi_X \psi_q + b_{22} \psi_q \psi_q) + \sqrt{2} \theta \psi_q + \theta^2 F_q , \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where the coefficients have the expressions

$$\begin{aligned} a_{11} &= \frac{\epsilon_1 \bar{F}_X}{\Delta} (\epsilon_3 |F_X|^2 + 4\epsilon_2 |F_q|^2) , \quad a_{12} = \frac{2\epsilon_2 \epsilon_3 F_q \bar{F}_q^2}{\Delta} , \quad a_{22} = -\frac{\epsilon_2 \epsilon_3 F_X \bar{F}_q^2}{\Delta} , \\ b_{11} &= -\frac{\epsilon_1 \epsilon_3 F_q \bar{F}_X^2}{\Delta} , \quad b_{12} = \frac{2\epsilon_1 \epsilon_3 F_X \bar{F}_X^2}{\Delta} , \quad b_{22} = \frac{\epsilon_2 \bar{F}_q}{\Delta} (\epsilon_3 |F_q|^2 + 4\epsilon_1 |F_X|^2) , \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

⁴For $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_3 > 0$, there is a local minimum at the origin, $\langle X \rangle = 0$, $\langle Q \rangle = 0$; this is the vacuum we work with in what follows.

and

$$\Delta = 2(\epsilon_1\epsilon_3|F_X|^4 + \epsilon_2\epsilon_3|F_q|^4 + 4\epsilon_1\epsilon_2|F_X|^2|F_q|^2) . \quad (21)$$

One can check that the low-energy superfields (19) satisfy the following cubic constraints

$$X^3 = X^2Q = XQ^2 = Q^3 = 0 \quad \text{but} \quad X^2 \neq 0, \quad XQ \neq 0 . \quad (22)$$

A peculiar feature of the constraints in (22) is that, unlike the “minimal” ones in eqs.(1), (4), their solution is not unique. The solution of (22) with the ansatz (19) is

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \left(\frac{\psi_X\psi_X}{2F_X} - \frac{c_1}{2F_X}(F_q\psi_X - F_X\psi_q)^2 \right) + \sqrt{2}\theta\psi_X + \theta^2 F_X , \\ Q &= \left(\frac{\psi_q\psi_q}{2F_q} - \frac{c_2}{2F_q}(F_q\psi_X - F_X\psi_q)^2 \right) + \sqrt{2}\theta\psi_q + \theta^2 F_q , \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

which are valid for arbitrary coefficients $c_{1,2}$. In practice, however, $c_{1,2}$ are nontrivial functions of the auxiliary fields and for our case, eq.(20), can be written as

$$c_1 = \frac{2}{\Delta} \epsilon_2\epsilon_3 \overline{F}_q^2, \quad c_2 = \frac{2}{\Delta} \epsilon_1\epsilon_3 \overline{F}_X^2 . \quad (24)$$

For $\epsilon_2 = 0$ one has $c_1 = 0$, $c_2 = 1/F_X^2$ and one recovers from (23) the familiar case of the solutions (3), (5) that respect eqs.(1), (4). The non-unique character of the solutions (23) is related to the fact that in specific examples they depend on the UV data, i.e. the parameters of the UV Kahler potential, as seen from eq.(24).

The coefficients $c_{1,2}$ which are functions of the fields can be expanded in powers of the ratio F_q/F_X . Indeed, since F_q is small ($\langle F_q \rangle \sim \epsilon_i \ll \langle F_X \rangle \sim f$), the leading-order Lagrangian in the number of fermion fields corresponds to the lowest terms in F_q and we can write

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= \frac{1}{F_X^2} \left(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \frac{F_q^2}{F_X^2} + \alpha_2 \frac{\overline{F}_q^2}{F_X^2} + \alpha_3 \left| \frac{F_q}{F_X} \right|^2 + \dots \right) , \\ c_2 &= \frac{1}{F_X^2} \left(\beta_0 + \beta_1 \frac{F_q^2}{F_X^2} + \beta_3 \left| \frac{F_q}{F_X} \right|^2 + \dots \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

The form of this expansion (even powers of the ratios F_q/F_X) is due to the symmetries of the UV Lagrangian (18). Onshell this expansion is actually finite, since F_X and F_q contain bilinears in $\psi_{X,q}$. For the expansion to be well-defined, it is necessary that $\beta_2 = 0$ and $\beta_0 = 1$. For our model (18), $\alpha_0 = 0$, $\alpha_1 = 0$, $\alpha_2 = \epsilon_2/\epsilon_1$, $\beta_0 = 1$, $\beta_1 = 0$, $\beta_3 = -4\epsilon_2/\epsilon_3$. The low-energy, effective Lagrangian corresponding to (18) contains non-universal interactions that

depend on the ratio of parameters ϵ_i only in the sub-leading terms in the expansion (25). Non-universal interactions are therefore suppressed by powers of F_q/F_X .

Additional UV terms can be present in the Kahler potential of (18). Such terms can modify the dominant terms in the corresponding low-energy, effective action, obtained after integrating out the massive scalars fields. Consider for example the addition to (18) of the term

$$\delta K = -\epsilon_4 (X^\dagger)^2 Q^2 + \text{h.c.} . \quad (26)$$

Such term can be present in extensions of the MSSM in which Q is not a squark/slepton anymore, but would denote a gauge singlet or a modulus superfield (if the modulino fermionic component ψ_q is an accidentally light fermion), in string theory. The constraints in (22) and the parametrization (23) remain valid. We find

$$c_1 = \frac{2}{\Delta'} \epsilon_3 (\epsilon_2 \overline{F}_q^2 - \epsilon_4 \overline{F}_X^2) \quad , \quad c_2 = \frac{2}{\Delta'} \epsilon_3 (\epsilon_1 \overline{F}_X^2 - \epsilon_4 \overline{F}_q^2) \quad , \quad \text{where} \\ \Delta' = 2 \left[\epsilon_3 F_X^2 (\epsilon_1 \overline{F}_X^2 - \epsilon_4 \overline{F}_q^2) + \epsilon_3 F_q^2 (\epsilon_2 \overline{F}_q^2 - \epsilon_4 \overline{F}_X^2) + 4(\epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_4^2) |F_X|^2 |F_q|^2 \right] . \quad (27)$$

In this case, the explicit solution for the heavy scalars is modified even at the zero-th order in the expansion (25), giving $c_1 = (-\epsilon_4/\epsilon_1) (1/F_X^2) + \mathcal{O}(1/F_X^4)$ and $c_2 = 1/F_X^2 + \mathcal{O}(1/F_X^4)$. In this approximation the sgoldstino is changed according to

$$X = \frac{1}{2F_X} \left(\psi_X \psi_X + \frac{\epsilon_4}{\epsilon_1} \psi_q \psi_q \right) + \sqrt{2} \theta \psi_X + \theta^2 F_X . \quad (28)$$

The above form of the sgoldstino modifies in turn the leading, universal goldstino couplings in the low-energy action. One can then see that $X^2 \neq 0$, since

$$\phi_{X^2} = \frac{1}{2F_X^2} \frac{\epsilon_4}{\epsilon_1} (\psi_X \psi_X) (\psi_q \psi_q) \neq 0 . \quad (29)$$

To complete the above discussion, we replace above the auxiliary fields by their values from the eqs of motion:

$$F_X = -f - 2\epsilon_1 \phi_X^\dagger \psi_X \psi_X - \epsilon_3 \phi_q^\dagger \psi_X \psi_q - 2\epsilon_4 \phi_X^\dagger \psi_q \psi_q - f \epsilon_3 |\phi_q|^2 - 4f \epsilon_1 |\phi_X|^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_i^2 f^2) \\ F_q = - \left[2\epsilon_4 \phi_q^\dagger \psi_X \psi_X + \epsilon_3 \phi_X^\dagger \psi_X \psi_q + 2\epsilon_2 \phi_q^\dagger \psi_q \psi_q + 4f \epsilon_4 \phi_q^\dagger \phi_X + f \epsilon_3 \phi_q \phi_X^\dagger \right] + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_i^2 f^2) \quad (30)$$

Using the system of coupled eqs.(30) and ϕ_X, ϕ_q identified from (23), (27), one finds the onshell result for sgoldstino and squarks/sleptons in the microscopic model of (18) with (26)

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_X &= -\frac{\psi_X \psi_X}{2f} - \frac{\epsilon_4}{\epsilon_1} \frac{\psi_q \psi_q}{2f} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_i^2 f^2) , \\
\phi_q &= -\frac{\psi_X \psi_q}{f} - \frac{1}{f^3} (\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_4^2/\epsilon_1) (\psi_X \psi_X) (\bar{\psi}_X \bar{\psi}_q) (\psi_q \psi_q) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_i^2 f^2) .
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

For $\epsilon_4 = 0$ one verifies that $X^2 = XQ = 0$, even though, as we saw earlier, this is not valid before eliminating the auxiliary fields.

The above analysis can be generalised to an arbitrary number N of matter fermions Q^i . In this case, we obtain chiral superfield constraints given by the vanishing of all possible superfield monomials of order $N + 2$ constructed out of the superfields X and Q^i , $i = 1, N$. Notice that in order to find a monomial constraint of the type $P(X_i) = 0$, one checks the vanishing of its θ -independent and θ component, by using Grassmann identities of the type $\psi^3 = 0$, $(\psi_1 \psi_2)^2 = -(1/2)\psi_1^2 \psi_2^2$, etc. The vanishing of the θ^2 component, is an automatic consequence of the fact that the integration of heavy scalars respects supersymmetry. We checked that the θ^2 component vanishes in all cases discussed, which ensures the supersymmetry invariance of the solutions found.

3.3 Yukawa couplings and generalized chiral constraints

So far we discussed the impact of the Kahler potential on the polynomial constraints. A superpotential with additional, R-parity violating coupling⁵ increases the order of the monomial chiral constraints. Here we provide a generic example, with

$$\begin{aligned}
K &= X^\dagger X + Q^\dagger Q - \epsilon_x (X^\dagger X)^2 - \epsilon_q (Q^\dagger Q)(X^\dagger X) , \\
W &= f X + \frac{\lambda}{3} Q^3 .
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

As before, one finds $m_X^2 = 4\epsilon_x f^2$, $m_q^2 = \epsilon_q f^2$. In this case the integration of the heavy scalars leads to low-energy fields of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
X &= d_{11} \psi_X \psi_X + d_{12} \psi_q \psi_q + d_{13} \psi_X \psi_q + d_{14} (\bar{F}_q \bar{\psi}_X - \bar{F}_X \bar{\psi}_q)^2 + \sqrt{2} \theta \psi_X + \theta^2 F_X , \\
Q &= d_{21} \psi_X \psi_X + d_{22} \psi_q \psi_q + d_{23} \psi_X \psi_q + d_{24} (\bar{F}_q \bar{\psi}_X - \bar{F}_X \bar{\psi}_q)^2 + \sqrt{2} \theta \psi_q + \theta^2 F_q .
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where we do not write explicitly the (long) expressions for d_{ij} . By Grassmann variable arguments one can check that in this case we obtain quartic constraints

$$X^4 = X^3 Q = X^2 Q^2 = X Q^3 = Q^4 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad X^2 \neq 0, \quad X Q \neq 0 . \tag{34}$$

If λ vanishes, one recovers the conditions in (1), (4).

⁵The Higgs superfields constraints are different and will be discussed in Section 5 and Appendix C.

4 Leading-order low-energy effective Lagrangians

In this section we continue the analysis of the effects of additional couplings in the superpotential on the expression of the sgoldstino field, which lead earlier to modified superfield constraints. We study the goldstino couplings for arbitrary Kahler potentials with an R-parity violating superpotential. In the heavy scalars limit, non-universal couplings vanish and the universal couplings of the goldstino are recovered, compatible with the universal constraints.

4.1 Onshell Lagrangian with R-parity violating and goldstino couplings

Let us consider N superfields (quarks and/or leptons for MSSM) plus the goldstino superfield X . We add the minimal high-energy Kahler potential needed to decouple all scalars and add an R-parity violating coupling, denoted λ_{ijk} , symmetric in its indices. We consider

$$\begin{aligned} K &= X^\dagger X + Q_i^\dagger Q_i - \epsilon_x (X^\dagger X)^2 - \epsilon_i (Q_i^\dagger Q_i)(X^\dagger X) , \\ W &= f X + \frac{1}{3} \lambda_{ijk} Q_i Q_j Q_k , \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where a sum over repeated indices is understood. In this section and the following, to avoid multiple indices for the component fields of $Q_i = (\phi_{q_i}, \psi_{q_i}, F_{q_i})$ we shall use a simplified notation $Q_i \equiv (\phi_i, \psi_i, F_i)$, where $i = \overline{1, N}$. By integrating-out the $N+1$ massive scalars fields of mass $m_X^2 = 4\epsilon_x f^2$ and $m_i^2 = \epsilon_i f^2$ we obtain solutions of the generic form (33). Instead of writing the exact solution, we use a simpler approach and expand it in powers of F_i/F_X , as also done in Section 3.2, eq.(25). This is possible since onshell, F_X is much larger than F_i . In the first order in this expansion, we find the solutions for sgoldstino and squarks/sleptons:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_X &= \frac{\psi_X \psi_X}{2F_X} + \frac{4}{m_X^2 F_X} \lambda_{ijk} \bar{F}_i \bar{\psi}_j \bar{\psi}_k , \\ \phi_i &= \frac{\psi_X \psi_i}{F_X} - \frac{F_i}{2F_X^2} \psi_X \psi_X - \frac{1}{m_i^2} \lambda_{ijk} \bar{\psi}_j \bar{\psi}_k + \frac{2}{m_i^2} \lambda_{ijk} \bar{F}_j \left(\frac{\bar{\psi}_X \bar{\psi}_k}{F_X} - \frac{1}{m_k^2} \lambda_{klm} \psi_l \psi_m \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

As before, with these sgoldstino and squarks fields, $X^2 \neq 0$ and $X Q_i \neq 0$ and higher order constraints are respected instead. If only interested in the four-fermion low-energy effective Lagrangian, the auxiliary fields F_i can be neglected, since they contribute only starting with eight-fermion terms. As for the auxiliary field F_X , its expression is

$$\begin{aligned} -F_X &= f + \frac{1}{4f^3} \bar{\psi}_X^2 \square \psi_X^2 + \frac{1}{f^3} (\bar{\psi}_X \bar{\psi}_i) \square (\psi_X \psi_i) + \frac{1}{m_i^2 f} (\lambda_{ijk} \bar{\psi}_j \bar{\psi}_k) (\bar{\lambda}_{imn} \psi^m \psi^n) \\ &+ \frac{1}{m_i^2 f^2} (\bar{\lambda}_{ijk} \bar{\psi}_j \bar{\psi}_k) \square (\psi_X \psi_i) + \frac{2}{m_i^2 f^2} (\lambda_{ijk} \bar{\psi}_j \bar{\psi}_k) \square (\bar{\psi}_X \bar{\psi}_i) \\ &+ \frac{2}{m_i^4 f} (\lambda_{ijk} \bar{\psi}_j \bar{\psi}_k) \square (\bar{\lambda}_{imn} \psi^m \psi^n) . \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Using this result, one finds the on-shell low-energy Lagrangian, up to four-fermion fields:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = & -f^2 + \mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}}(\psi_X, \psi_i) + \frac{1}{4f^2} \bar{\psi}_X^2 \square \psi_X^2 + \frac{1}{f^2} (\bar{\psi}_X \bar{\psi}_i) \square (\psi_X \psi_i) \\
& + \frac{1}{m_i^2} (\lambda_{ijk} \bar{\psi}_j \bar{\psi}_k) (\bar{\lambda}_{imn} \psi_m \psi_n) + \frac{1}{m_i^2 f} (\bar{\lambda}_{ijk} \psi_j \psi_k) \square (\psi_X \psi_i) \\
& + \frac{1}{m_i^4} (\lambda_{ijk} \bar{\psi}_j \bar{\psi}_k) \square (\bar{\lambda}_{imn} \psi_m \psi_n) .
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

\mathcal{L}_{kin} denotes kinetic terms of ψ_X, ψ_i . Note that, as expected, non-derivative terms involving the goldstino canceled, by using the identity $\lambda_{ijk}(\psi_X \psi_i)(\psi_j \psi_k) = 0$. The first line in (38) gives the universal goldstino couplings discussed extensively in the literature, while the following lines give the model-dependent couplings. These are all couplings with up to four fermions.

In the absence of R-parity violating couplings, the fourth term in the rhs of (38) is the leading interaction between the goldstino and matter fermions and was discussed in detail from a phenomenological viewpoint in [11, 12]. In the presence of R-parity couplings λ_{ijk} , (38) contains further interactions of phenomenological relevance. Notice in particular the last term in the second line of (38), which can generate interactions of type $\psi_i \psi_j \rightarrow \psi_k \psi_X$, with a coupling $1/(m_i^2 f)$. This coupling can be stronger than the $\mathcal{O}(1/f^2)$ coupling of two-goldstinos processes $\psi_i \psi_i \rightarrow \psi_X \psi_X + \text{jet}$ and $\psi_q \psi_q \rightarrow \psi_X \psi_X \gamma$ discussed in [11, 12]. It would then be useful to study the phenomenological consequences of this leading process $\psi_i \psi_j \rightarrow \psi_k \psi_X$.⁶

We end this Section with a brief remark on the Goldstino couplings in the low-energy effective Lagrangian versus those derived from its microscopic version. It seems that all possible goldstino couplings obtained by starting from a microscopic theory (as those in (38)) can be obtained starting instead from an effective Lagrangian with any set of constraints that can eliminate the superpartners, to which one adds appropriate sets of higher-dimensional and higher-derivative operators (suppressed by m_i or f). To illustrate this idea, take the simplest set of constraints of [16], instead of those respected by the fields leading to (38). One then notices that the Lagrangian (38) can also be obtained by starting from a low-energy Lagrangian containing the constrained superfields $X^2 = XQ_i = 0$, of the type

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} = \int d^4\theta \left[X^\dagger X + Q_i^\dagger Q_i + \frac{1}{m_i^2} \lambda_{ijk} \lambda_{imn} Q_i^\dagger Q_j^\dagger Q_m Q_n + \frac{1}{m_i^2} \lambda_{ijk} Q_i Q_j D^2 Q_k \right. \\
\left. + \frac{1}{m_i^4} \lambda_{ijk} \lambda_{imn} Q_i^\dagger Q_j^\dagger \square (Q_m Q_n) \right] + \left\{ \int d^2\theta f X + \text{h.c.} \right\} . \tag{39}
\end{aligned}$$

⁶For the Standard Model case, there are three R-parity violating couplings in the second line of (38), of the type $a_{ijk} u_i d_j \square (d_k \psi_X)$, $b_{ijk} l_i q_j \square (d_k \psi_X)$, $c_{ijk} l_i l_j \square (e_k \psi_X)$ plus permutations. The first one was analyzed in [26] where it was shown that it is severely constrained since it generates at tree-level the proton decay mode $p \rightarrow \pi^+ \bar{\psi}_X$. The second can generate a charged pion decay mode $\pi^+ \rightarrow e^+ \psi_X$. We thank G. Ferretti for discussions on this issue.

However, notice that a low-energy Lagrangian of the type given in (39), with arbitrary coefficients in front of higher-dimensional operators *does not* necessarily correspond to a (microscopic) UV Lagrangian, which may not even exist. So the most general low-energy theories defined in an expansion $E/m_i, E/\sqrt{f}$ might not have a UV completion and end up in the so-called “swampland” [25], while only a subset of the low-energy theories can be derived from simple UV theories.

4.2 General onshell Lagrangian with general 4-fermion terms

The results of Section 4.1 can be extended to an arbitrary Kahler potential. For simplicity, we start directly with the onshell formulation of the Lagrangian obtained from (13)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} = & -K_I^J \left(\partial_\mu \phi_J^\dagger \partial_\mu \phi^I + \frac{i}{2} \mathcal{D}_\mu \psi^I \sigma^\mu \bar{\psi}_J + h.c. \right) - (K^{-1})_I^J W_J \bar{W}^I \\ & + \frac{1}{4} R_{IJ}^{KL} \psi^I \psi^J \bar{\psi}_K \bar{\psi}_L - \frac{1}{2} \left(W_{IJ} - \Gamma_{IJ}^K W_K \right) \psi^I \psi^J + h.c.\end{aligned}\quad (40)$$

where Γ and R are the connection and curvature of the Kahler metric. Here the capital indices I, J, K, \dots take the value 0 to label the goldstino superfield components $X = (\phi_X, \psi_X, F_X)$ and the values i, j, k, \dots , to label the (quark/lepton) matter superfields of components $Q_i = (\phi_i, \psi_i, F_i), \dots$, respectively, with $i = 1 \dots N$, where N is the number of the matter fields. Similarly, the derivatives of W and K wrt the scalar components (or their hermitian conjugates) are labeled with lower (upper) indices, respectively, in the standard notation: $K_j = \partial K / \partial \phi_j^\dagger$, $K^j = \partial K / \partial \phi_j^\dagger$, $K_0 = \partial K / \partial \phi_X$, $K^0 = \partial K / \partial \phi_X^\dagger$, etc.

Let us expand the Lagrangian around the minimum (ground state), in normal coordinates

$$\begin{aligned}K_I^J &= \delta_I^J + R_{IL}^{JK} \phi^L \phi_K^\dagger + \dots, & (K^{-1})_I^J &= \delta_I^J - R_{IL}^{JK} \phi^L \phi_K^\dagger + \dots \\ \Gamma_{IJ}^K &= (K^{-1})_L^K K_{IJ}^L = R_{IJ}^{KL} \phi_L^\dagger + \dots\end{aligned}\quad (41)$$

The superpotential that we consider here is similar to that used in Section 4.1

$$W = fX + \frac{1}{3} \lambda_{ijk} Q^i Q^j Q^k, \quad (42)$$

where the contribution of the goldstino field is taken linear, to break SUSY. One finds

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} = & -\partial_\mu \phi_X^\dagger \partial_\mu \phi_X - \partial_\mu \phi_i^\dagger \partial_\mu \phi^i + \frac{1}{4} R_{kl}^{ij} \bar{\psi}_i \bar{\psi}_j \psi^k \psi^\ell \\ & + R_{00}^{00} |f\phi_X + \frac{1}{2} \psi_X \psi_X|^2 + R_{0\ell}^{0k} (f\phi_k^\dagger + \bar{\psi}_k \bar{\psi}_X) (f\phi^\ell + \psi^\ell \psi_X) \\ & + \left[R_{0i}^{k\ell} \bar{\psi}_k \bar{\psi}_\ell (f\phi^i + \psi_X \psi^i) + \frac{1}{2} R_{00}^{k\ell} \bar{\psi}_k \bar{\psi}_\ell (f\phi_X + \frac{1}{2} \psi_X \psi_X) \right. \\ & \left. - \lambda_{kij} \phi^k \psi^i \psi^j + h.c. \right] + \dots\end{aligned}\quad (43)$$

where all terms that do not contribute to four-fermion interactions are not shown. It is then straightforward to obtain the zero momentum expressions for the sgoldstino ϕ_X and squarks (sleptons) ϕ^l , up to the bilinear order in the fermions:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_X &= -\frac{1}{2f}\psi_X\psi_X + \frac{f}{2m_X^2}R_{ij}^{00}\psi^i\psi^j, \\ \phi^\ell &= -\frac{1}{f}\psi_X\psi^\ell - (M^{-2})_k^\ell \left(\bar{\lambda}^{kij}\bar{\psi}_i\bar{\psi}_j - \frac{f}{2}R_{ij}^{0k}\psi^i\psi^j \right).\end{aligned}\quad (44)$$

The first term in each equation is the same universal fermion bilinear already encountered in eq. (36). Here we have defined the scalar masses $(M^2)_j^i = -f^2 R_{0j}^{0i}$ and⁷ $m_X^2 = -f^2 R_{00}^{00}$. Using this in the Lagrangian of eq. (43) one finds that all terms involving goldstinos but no derivatives cancel, to give

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\text{Goldstino}}^{4\text{-fermion}} &= +\frac{1}{4f^2}\bar{\psi}_X^2\Box\psi_X^2 + \frac{1}{f^2}\bar{\psi}_X\bar{\psi}_i\Box(\psi_X\psi^i) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4m_X^2}R_{ij}^{00}\bar{\psi}_X^2\Box(\psi^i\psi^j) + (M^{-2})_\ell^k\bar{\psi}_X\bar{\psi}_k\Box\left(f^{-1}\bar{\lambda}^{\ell ij}\bar{\psi}_i\bar{\psi}_j - \frac{1}{2}R_{ij}^{0\ell}\psi^i\psi^j\right) + h.c.\end{aligned}\quad (45)$$

In the first line one identifies again the universal terms, independent of UV physics. These terms originate from the first terms in the rhs of eqs. (44). Unlike the operators in the second line in (45), they do not involve the scalar fields masses (as one would naively expect from integrating out heavy states). Moreover, the various cancellations between the non-derivative terms leading to eq. (45) are also entirely due to the first terms in the rhs of eqs. (44). These cancellations are not accidental, but are due to the underlying non-linearly realized supersymmetry. A similar result is found if instead of integrating out superpartners, one uses field redefinitions, in which the fields are shifted by the first terms in eq. (44). Such shift induces similar cancellations and generates the universal terms in eq. (45). In Ref. [13] it was noticed that this redefinition can be lifted to a goldstino-dependent supersymmetry transformation that can be used to prove that no derivative-free couplings of the goldstino can ever occur in the universal couplings.

For completeness, let us list the terms involving only matter fields:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\text{matter}}^{4\text{-fermion}} &= \frac{1}{4}R_{ij}^{k\ell}\psi^i\psi^j\bar{\psi}_k\bar{\psi}_\ell + \frac{f^2}{4m_X^2}\left(R_{00}^{ij}\bar{\psi}_i\bar{\psi}_j\right)\left(1 + \frac{\Box}{m_X^2}\right)\left(R_{k\ell}^{00}\psi^k\psi^\ell\right) \\ &\quad + \left(\lambda_{mk\ell}\psi^k\psi^\ell - \frac{f}{2}R_{0m}^{k\ell}\bar{\psi}_k\bar{\psi}_\ell\right)\left(M^{-2} + M^{-4}\Box\right)_n^m\left(\bar{\lambda}^{nij}\bar{\psi}_i\bar{\psi}_j - \frac{f}{2}R_{ij}^{0n}\psi^i\psi^j\right).\end{aligned}\quad (46)$$

This concludes the discussion on goldstino and matter couplings, that goldstino induces, with up to four-fermion fields, for an arbitrary Kahler and a polynomial superpotential.

⁷We assume for simplicity that there is no mixing induced by the soft mass squared matrix between the goldstino and matter fields.

5 The SM coupled to goldstino using universal constraints

In this section we provide an application to the Standard Model (SM), to identify the effects of coupling the goldstino to the SM fields, in particular to the Higgs sector, in a superfield language. To this purpose we use an effective Lagrangian approach, “promote” any SM field to a superfield and impose the universal superfield constraints on both goldstino and the SM fields [16], to decouple their superpartners. This means that all matter superfields are in non-linear supersymmetry representations. We employ the universal constraints, since as argued at the end of Section 4.1, one may indeed use these (instead of their non-universal extension) to write a low energy effective Lagrangian, as long as a detailed microscopic (UV) picture is not sought. The strategy we employ is to write down all the interactions that one should include in order to obtain the usual Standard Model couplings/masses, and then deduce the additional Goldstino couplings they imply. At the end of this section, we also comment on the most relevant additional couplings that one could expect beyond these “universal” terms.

To write the effective interactions allowed, one uses that various couplings can be eliminated by using the constraints that decouple the superpartners. These are

$$X^2 = XQ_i = Q_iQ_jQ_k = 0 \quad (47)$$

and the field equations for the constrained superfields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4}X\overline{D}^2X^\dagger &= fX \quad , \quad \frac{1}{4}Q_iQ_j\overline{D}^2X^\dagger = fQ_iQ_j, \\ X\overline{D}^2Q_i^\dagger &= 0, \quad Q_j\overline{D}^2Q_i^\dagger = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Eqs.(48) can be obtained, for example, from the following action with Lagrange multiplier chiral superfields χ_0, χ_i , to enforce the constraints (47):

$$K = X^\dagger X + Q_i^\dagger Q_i, \quad W = fX + \frac{1}{2}\chi_0 X^2 + \chi_i XQ_i. \quad (49)$$

The field equations for all the fields are then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4}\overline{D}^2X^\dagger &= f + \chi_0 X + \chi_i Q_i \quad , \quad \frac{1}{4}\overline{D}^2Q_i^\dagger = \chi_i X, \\ X^2 &= XQ_i = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

After appropriately combining eqs.(50) one obtains (47), (48). Notice that further nontrivial relations can be obtained by taking appropriate (superspace) derivatives of the constraints and of the equations of motion, such as $XD_\alpha X = 0$, $Q_iQ_jD^2X = XD^2Q_iQ_j$, etc. This ends

the list of constraints for the goldstino and matter superfields Q (for quarks), with similar constraints for the leptons case (L).

Regarding the constraints for the Higgs multiplets, one has two cases. The first case is to consider two Higgs doublets, as in the MSSM, “promoted” to superfields and impose the constraints in (10) to decouple the higgsinos; in this case one ends up at low energy with a two Higgs doublet model (2HDM). The second case is to impose (10) on one Higgs superfield, while the other is set to zero; in this case one has exactly the SM case with one Higgs doublet.

Let us consider the first case of two Higgs multiplets. With squarks/sleptons decoupled by the above superfield constraints, the low-energy theory consists of the SM plus two Higgs doublets. One can then write a general effective Lagrangian, that can be separated into a universal part (that does not bring additional parameters) and a non-universal one. The universal part is similar to that of the MSSM. The result is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \int d^4\theta \left[X^\dagger X \left(1 - P(H_i, H_i^\dagger) \right) + \sum_{i:H,Q,U,D,L,E} \Phi_i^\dagger e^{V_i} \Phi_i \right] + \left\{ \int d^2\theta \left[f X \left(1 + \tilde{P}(H_i, H_i^\dagger) \right) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + Y_{ij}^u Q_i U_j H_2 + Y_{ij}^d Q_i D_j H_1 + Y_{ij}^l L_i E_j H_1 + \frac{1}{4} \left(\text{tr } W_\alpha^\alpha W_\alpha^\alpha \right) + \mu H_1 H_2 \right] + \text{h.c.} \right\}, \quad (51) \end{aligned}$$

Note that, unlike the MSSM case, here all superfields other than $H_{1,2}$ satisfy the aforementioned constraints, to ensure that their superpartners are decoupled. $H_{1,2}$ are also constrained. The dimensionless functions P and \tilde{P} are general functions of the constrained (chiral) superfields H_i, H_i^\dagger , and without loss of generality we can assume P to be real. Due to the constraints $X \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}} H_i^\dagger = 0$, ($i = 1, 2$), $X V(H_i, H_i^\dagger) = \text{chiral}$, for any function V [16]. Because of this, the superfield redefinition

$$X \rightarrow \frac{X}{\sqrt{1 - P}} \quad (52)$$

is holomorphic and leads, together with (51), to a contribution V_F to the scalar potential

$$V_F = f^2 \frac{(1 + \tilde{P})(1 + \tilde{P}^\dagger)}{1 - P} = f^2 + f^2(P + \tilde{P} + \tilde{P}^\dagger) + f^2|P + \tilde{P}|^2 + \dots \quad (53)$$

The functions P, \tilde{P} , can be expanded as

$$\begin{aligned} f^2 P(H_i, H_i^\dagger) &= m_i^2 |H_i|^2 + B_\mu (H_1 H_2 + \text{h.c.}) + \mathcal{O}|H^4|, \\ f^2 \tilde{P}(H_i, H_i^\dagger) &= \tilde{m}_i^2 |H_i|^2 + \tilde{B}_\mu H_1 H_2 + \tilde{B}'_\mu H_1^\dagger H_2^\dagger + \mathcal{O}|H^4|. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Together with the D-term contribution to the potential, which is similar to that in the MSSM, and ignoring the quartic terms in P, \tilde{P} , one obtains the Higgs potential

$$\begin{aligned}
V &= (m_i^2 + 2\tilde{m}_i^2) |h_i|^2 + ([B_\mu + \tilde{B}_\mu + \tilde{B}'_\mu] h_1 \cdot h_2 + \text{h.c.}) \\
&+ \frac{1}{f^2} \left| (m_i^2 + \tilde{m}_i^2) |h_i|^2 + (B_\mu + \tilde{B}_\mu) h_1 \cdot h_2 + (B_\mu + \tilde{B}'_\mu) h_1^\dagger h_2^\dagger \right|^2 \\
&+ \frac{g_1^2 + g_2^2}{8} \left[|h_1|^2 - |h_2|^2 \right]^2 + \frac{g_2^2}{2} |h_1^\dagger h_2|^2 .
\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

The mass parameter μ in (51) does not contribute to the scalar potential but gives additional higgs-goldstino interactions [16], that we discuss shortly.

Rather interestingly, V contains a peculiar quartic correction, similar to that pointed out in ⁸ “non-linear” MSSM model of [22]. The difference between the present potential, which is that of a two-Higgs doublet model extension of the SM and the model in [22] is that in (55), the new quartic terms in the second line contain four additional parameters, (compared to the parameters in the first line), while in “non-linear MSSM” [22], the new quartic terms did not bring in additional parameters. While the present setup leads to a restrictive case of a 2HDM potential (with four new quartic couplings instead of seven in a general 2HDM), it loses its predictive power for the Higgs mass, relative to the model [22]. Ultimately, this difference is not too surprising, and is due to the fact that a supersymmetric theory with superpartners projected out by superfield constraints (as in [22]) is not necessarily identical to that built in an effective approach, by promoting to (non-linear) superfields the SM spectrum with two additional Higgs doublets.

So far we neglected the quartic terms in P, \tilde{P} . If present, they bring corrections to V :

$$\Delta V = \frac{a_i f^2}{\Lambda^4} |h_i|^4 + \dots . \tag{56}$$

If $a_i \sim m_i^4 \Lambda^4 / f^4$, such terms give contributions to the quartic Higgs couplings similar to those in the second line of (55), generated by F_X . One obtains then a full, general two-Higgs doublet model scalar potential, as expected. The values of a_i are model-dependent and reduce the predictive power of the model to that of usual 2HDM case.

Let us now comment on the leading (in $1/f$) interactions of the Higgs with the goldstino. From our Lagrangian, eq. (51), one can identify two sources. The first one is the kinetic term for the nonlinear Higgs multiplet, which is always present in any theory and hence universal. Using (11), it becomes

$$-i \psi_{h,i} \sigma^m \partial_m \bar{\psi}_{h,i} \rightarrow -\frac{i}{f^2} \psi_X \partial_m \bar{h}_i \sigma^m \square (\bar{\psi}_X h_i) , \tag{57}$$

⁸In the case of [22] a similar quartic Higgs correction, which was a square of the MSSM Higgs soft term contribution, lead to a tree-level increase of the Higgs mass to the LEP2 bound, for a low $\sqrt{f} \sim 2$ to 7 TeV, while at large f the usual MSSM case is recovered. For further discussions on the corrections to the higgs potential in similar set-ups, see [27].

where the equations of motions and an integration by parts were used in the last step. The second source is the term $\mu H_1 H_2$, that does not contribute to the scalar potential, but gives instead additional higgs-goldstino interactions [16]. Interestingly enough, for energies $E < \mu$, the leading higgs-goldstino couplings originate from this term:

$$- \mu \psi_{h,1} \psi_{h,2} \rightarrow - \frac{\mu}{f^2} \bar{\psi}_X \bar{\psi}_X \partial^m h_1 \partial_m h_2 . \quad (58)$$

Therefore, depending on the energy regime, one or the other of interactions (57), (58), provide the dominant higgs-goldstino couplings. We should comment that the $\mu H_1 H_2$ term is actually not needed to reproduce any of the couplings and masses of the 2HDM, in particular, μ is not related to the mass of any physical particle. However, it does in principle give an interaction comparable or even dominant over the “universal” one in (57). The Lagrangian in (51) together with (57), (58) provide the leading couplings of the model. This ends the discussion of the case of two light Higgs doublets.

Let us consider now the second case for the Higgs multiplets, in which one of the two Higgs doublets is heavy and is eliminated by imposing the superfield constraint $H_1 = 0$. In this case, the Higgs potential can be obtained by setting $h_1 = 0$ in eq. (55). The Yukawa couplings for the up-quarks are the usual ones, while the ones for the down-quarks and the leptons have to be constructed in a different manner; they can instead arise from the Kahler operator

$$\int d^4\theta \frac{1}{f} (Y_{ij}^d X^\dagger Q_i D_j H_2^\dagger + Y_{ij}^l X^\dagger L_i E_j H_2^\dagger) . \quad (59)$$

Interestingly, the interactions of the fermions with the goldstino resulting from the two types of Yukawas will be the same. Using eqns. (5) and (11) we see that they are given by

$$\frac{1}{f^2} (\psi_X \sigma^\mu \bar{\psi}_X) \left[Y_{ij}^d (q_L^i \bar{d}_R^j) (\partial_\mu h^\dagger) + Y_{ij}^u (q_L^i \bar{u}_R^j) (\partial_\mu h) + \text{h.c.} \right] \quad (60)$$

These couplings are again universal for any theory reproducing the SM at low energy. They show a similar suppression ($\sim 1/f^2$) as the other universal interactions, resulting from kinetic terms, that we derived in eqns. (38) and (45).

Finally, let us comment on some additional couplings that one can write in this approach that can be of some interest⁹. The lowest dimensional operators that one could imagine are dimension-four and dimension-five R-parity violating operators. However, due to the constraints (12), all these R-parity violating operators are vanishing

$$U_i D_j D_k = L_i Q_j D_k = L_i L_j E_k = Q_i Q_j Q_k L_m = 0 . \quad (61)$$

⁹As with the μ term discussed above, the interactions here are not necessary to reproduce any SM couplings.

The most dangerous proton-decay and flavor-violating operators are thus absent, and one does not need to impose any R-parity for them. However, dangerous proton decay and flavour-violating operators appear in other non-universal, model-dependent couplings in the theory. In particular, one can have couplings of the type

$$\int d^2\theta \frac{1}{\Lambda^2} (a_{ijk} U_i D_j \square D_k + b_{ijk} L Q_j \square D_k + c_{ijk} L_i L_j \square E_k + \text{permutations}) , \quad (62)$$

where the permutations are over the position of the box operator. These are the same operators that were mentioned in footnote 6 at the end of Section 4.1. It is likely that one thus still needs to impose R-parity to forbid these terms.

6 Conclusions

In this work we studied the couplings of the goldstino to matter fields in a supersymmetric formalism with superfields endowed with constraints. There are two classes of constraints that can be present. The first of these is now well-known, and describes universal constraints that are independent of the superpartner masses and of the UV details of the theory. This class describes, in an elegant way and using a superfield formalism, the goldstino action and its universal couplings to matter (super)fields, suppressed by inverse powers of \sqrt{f} . In this paper we identified a second class of superfield constraints, which are higher order polynomials in superfields. These constraints are non-universal, i.e. they help one to identify the non-universal couplings of the goldstino. These constraints recover the former, universal class in the formal limit of infinite masses for superpartners.

An interesting aspect of the non-universal constraints is that their general solution (for sgoldstino and squarks/sleptons) is usually a function of some arbitrary parameters, that can have similar values for different UV completions. For example, in the case of cubic constraints the solutions depended on two such parameters. In specific microscopic models, these parameters can be expressed in terms of the UV details, such as UV coefficients of the effective operators in the microscopic action and also on the auxiliary fields or the fermionic components. It may then be possible that the class of generalised constraints could capture aspects of UV physics (even in non-perturbative regime), without the need for a detailed description of the UV physics. The constraints we found could be used to describe interactions of the goldstino to matter even in the limit where the usual effective expansion (in E/m_i) is not rapidly convergent. Finally, it should be mentioned that the link of the superfield constraints to microscopic models is valid only at the leading order in a light-fields derivative expansion. Consequently sub-leading terms in the low-energy action are not easily mapped into terms in a microscopic theory (see Appendix).

We computed the onshell Lagrangian with R-parity violating and goldstino couplings for a minimal Kahler potential that enforces that all superpartners be massive enough and decouple

at low energy. The results were then extended to a general Kahler potential, for which the Lagrangian of the goldstino and its couplings to matter fields with up to four-fermions were computed. These couplings are suppressed by (positive) powers of the supersymmetry breaking scale (\sqrt{f}) for the case of universal couplings, and by the superpartner masses (sgoldstino, squarks, sleptons) for the case of non-universal couplings. Finally, the Lagrangian with up to four-fermions involving only matter fields that was induced by decoupling the superpartners including the sgoldstino, was also computed, with the couplings suppressed by the curvature of the Kahler potential (of matter fields) or by the sgoldstino mass.

To write the low energy effective Lagrangian of goldstino coupled to the SM matter fields, our results suggest that one could in principle use either set of superfield constraints (minimal or non-minimal), provided one adds an appropriate number of higher-dimension and higher-derivative operators, with coefficients that have to be matched to a microscopic (UV) Lagrangian. From this point of view the simpler constraints in [16] can be more practical compared to the generalized constraints. However, the fact that the former follow only from very simple UV theories make the connection between UV and IR theories more difficult. One negative outcome is that the dimension of an operator is not enough to determine its low-energy relevance.

Ignoring this potential problem, we initiated the use of the simplest set of constraints to couple the Standard Model to a light goldstino. In an appropriate two-higgs doublet SM extension that was supersymmetrized non-linearly by constraints, we wrote the lowest order terms, in particular the Higgs potential. This potential includes additional quartic higgs terms, similar to those investigated in [22], containing however four additional couplings (parameters). This has an impact on the predictive power of the model relative to the case discussed in [22]. Finally, we argued that the leading higgs-goldstino couplings could originate from the superpotential term $\mu H_1 H_2$. This interaction is non-universal in the sense that it does not contribute any interactions to the 2HDM besides couplings to goldstinos, and hence it is not needed for the parametrization of the theory. This is in contrast to the Kahler term $H_i^\dagger H_i$, which generates Higgs kinetic terms as well as goldstino interactions at the same time. Other, important, non-universal goldstino couplings arise from R parity violating operators that could lead to proton decay. Although the leading ones vanish due to the constraints, the sub-leading ones can be present and probably need to be forbidden by imposing R parity.

Acknowledgments

We thank I. Antoniadis, G. Ferretti, Z. Komargodski, C. Petersson, A. Romagnoni, P. Tziveloglou and F. Zwirner for interesting discussions. This work was partially supported by the European ERC Advanced Grant 226371 MassTeV, by the CNRS PICS Nos. 3747 and 4172,

by the European Initial Training Network PITN-GA-2009-237920 and by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche.

Appendix

A The effects of derivatives of light fields on the constraints.

In deriving our various matter constraints from a microscopic Lagrangian, we neglected the effects of the derivatives of the light fields (quarks and leptons). Including these, generates further terms in the equations for the scalars that can invalidate the simple, lowest order superfield constraints. This is true in particular for the simple case of Section 3.2 with only ϵ_1, ϵ_3 non-zero and $\epsilon_2 = \epsilon_4 = 0$. In this case $X^2 = XQ = 0$ as discussed in the text and in [16]. The microscopic action also contains terms with derivatives of the light (fermionic) fields of the type

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\mathcal{L} = & -(1 - 4\epsilon_1|\phi_X|^2 - \epsilon_3|\phi_q|^2) \psi_X i\sigma^m \partial_m \bar{\psi}_X - (1 - \epsilon_3|\phi_X|^2) \psi_q i\sigma^m \partial_m \bar{\psi}_q \\ & + (\epsilon_3 \bar{\phi}_X \phi_q \psi_X i\sigma^m \partial_m \bar{\psi}_q + \text{h.c.}) . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

After including the effects of these terms when integrating out the heavy scalars ϕ_X, ϕ_q via their equations of motion, we find that the constraints $X^2 = XQ = 0$ are no longer satisfied. However, these terms add only higher-order corrections (in derivatives and in $1/f$), which change the low-energy Lagrangian only at a higher order in the number of fermions and derivatives.

B Heavy gauginos and constrained vector superfields

In Section 3 we discussed the integrating out of massive scalar fields and the associated non-universal constraints. Here we consider the case of decoupling the heavy fermions instead.

To begin with, consider the case of decoupling the massive gauginos. We provide a simple microscopic realization of models with heavy gauginos that we integrate out and then write down the low-energy constrained vector multiplet. We then compare the result to the constraint in (8) [16], that is supposed to decouple the massive gauginos. The simplest UV Lagrangian providing large masses to the sgoldstino and gaugino is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \int d^4\theta \left[X^\dagger X - \epsilon (X^\dagger X)^2 \right] \\ & + \left\{ \int d^2\theta \left(fX + \frac{1}{4} W^\alpha W_\alpha + \frac{M}{f} X W^\alpha W_\alpha \right) + \text{h.c.} \right\} , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where M is the gaugino mass and the discussion applies to both the Abelian and the non-Abelian cases. The zero-momentum equation of motion for the sgoldstino X gives the same solution as in (1), (3). However, if we keep the momenta of the light fields, similarly to the heavy scalar case discussed in Appendix A, there are corrections of the type

$$\phi_X = \frac{\psi_X \psi_X}{2F_X} + \frac{M}{4\epsilon f |F_X|^2} \bar{L}_\alpha^\beta \bar{L}_\beta^\alpha, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where $L_\alpha^\beta = \delta_\alpha^\beta D - i\sigma_\alpha^{mn,\beta} F_{mn}$. However, these corrections change the constraint $X^2 = 0$ and the discussion below only by terms of high-order in the low-energy Lagrangian, that we can neglect in what follows. Further, let us write the equation for the gaugino λ , by keeping for the time being the momentum-dependent terms. We find

$$-i\sigma^m \partial_m \bar{\lambda} + \frac{M}{f} \left[-2F_X \lambda + i\sqrt{2}(D - i\sigma^{mn} F_{mn})\psi_X - 2i\phi_X \sigma^m \partial_m \bar{\lambda} - 2i\partial_m (\bar{\phi}_X \bar{\lambda} \bar{\sigma}^m) \right] = 0. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

The zero-momentum (in the) gaugino equation has the solution

$$\lambda = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}F_X} (D - i\sigma^{mn} F_{mn}) \psi_X. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

The corresponding (supersymmetric) gauge field strength W_α is then given by

$$W_\alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}F_X} (\delta_\alpha^\beta D - i\sigma_\alpha^{mn,\beta} F_{mn}) \psi_{X,\beta} + (\delta_\alpha^\beta D - i\sigma_\alpha^{mn,\beta} F_{mn}) \theta_\beta + \theta^2 (\sigma^m \partial_m \bar{\lambda})_\alpha \quad (\text{B.5})$$

and satisfies the following equations (by using ϕ_X^0 with the constraint $X^2 = 0$)

$$X W_\alpha = \frac{\psi_X \psi_X}{2F_X} (\sigma^m \partial_m \bar{\lambda})_\alpha \theta^2, \quad X W^\alpha W_\alpha = 0. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

The first constraint in (B.6) is however not invariant under supersymmetry transformations. At first sight this seems puzzling, since the second eq. in (B.6) is manifestly supersymmetric. The explanation is that the general solution of $X W^\alpha W_\alpha$, although it contains (B.4), it is in fact more general

$$\lambda = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}F_X} (D - i\sigma^{mn} F_{mn}) \psi_X + \chi_\alpha \Psi_X \Psi_X, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where χ_α is an arbitrary Weyl fermion. The situation here is similar to that described for the heavy scalars in eqs. (22) and (23). Indeed, the solutions of the cubic constraints depend on the free parameters $c_{1,2}$, that have however nontrivial supersymmetry transformations.

Let us compare these results with (8), (9). The difference between them is that in the latter case the gauginos are the solution [16] of the implicit equation

$$\lambda = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}F_X}(D - i\sigma^{mn}F_{mn})\psi_X - i\frac{\psi_X\psi_X}{2F_X^2}\sigma^m\partial_m\bar{\lambda}, \quad (\text{B.8})$$

instead of the solution in (B.4). Notice that this corresponds to the spinor χ_α in (B.7) being equal to $\chi_\alpha = -i\sigma^m\partial_m\bar{\lambda}/2F_X^2$. The solution in (B.8) can be obtained more easily by setting to zero the square bracket in (B.3) (i.e. the terms proportional to M/f), which corresponds to taking the limit $M \rightarrow \infty$ in the gaugino field equation. A similar self-consistent procedure in the field eqs for ϕ_X is however ambiguous, since the corresponding field equation involves both the sgoldstino and gaugino mass. Notice however that the difference between (8),(9) and (B.4) is of higher-order in an $1/f$ expansion in the low-energy action. Therefore, in both cases the leading goldstino-gauge field interaction comes from the gaugino kinetic term by using the common terms proportional to $\sigma^{mn}F_{mn}\psi_X$ in (B.4). We recover again the situation encountered earlier: different constraints, the simplest with a unique solution (8) and the higher-order one (B.6) share the same leading term, which fixes the universal coupling of goldstino to gauge fields.

C Heavy higgsinos.

In this section we consider the case of projecting out the massive Higgs superpartners (higgsinos). The standard example is the MSSM with its two Higgs multiplets $H_{1,2}$, in which the two higgsinos $\psi_{1,2}$ are massive; this leads at low-energy to two nonlinear Higgs multiplets, that contain as physical degrees of freedom only the complex scalars. To simplify the equations, in what follows we consider only one chiral multiplet $H = (\phi_h, \psi_h, F_h)$ and decouple the corresponding fermion ψ_h by assuming it has a large mass M . The simplest Lagrangian giving a large mass to the fermion but not to the scalar Higgs ϕ_h is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \int d^4\theta \left[X^\dagger X + H^\dagger H - \epsilon (X^\dagger X)^2 + \frac{M}{4f^2} X^\dagger X (D^\alpha H D_\alpha H + \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}} H^\dagger \bar{D}^{\dot{\alpha}} H^\dagger) \right] \\ & + \left\{ \int d^2\theta f X + \text{h.c.} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

The component Lagrangian at zero-momentum for the heavy fields ϕ_X, ψ_h is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & (1 - 4\epsilon|\phi_X|^2)|F_X|^2 + |F_h|^2 + \left\{ \bar{F}_X (f + 2\epsilon\bar{\phi}_X\psi_X\psi_X) + \frac{M}{f^2} \left[|\phi_X|^2 (F_h\Box h - \partial F_h\partial h) \right. \right. \\ & - \bar{\phi}_X F_X (\partial h)^2 + \phi_X \bar{F}_X F_h^2 + iF_h\partial_m h\psi_X\sigma^m\bar{\psi}_X - iF_X\partial_m h\psi_h\sigma^m\bar{\psi}_X \\ & \left. \left. - \bar{F}_X F_h\psi_X\psi_h + \frac{1}{2}(|F_X|^2 + \frac{i}{2}\partial_m\bar{\psi}_X\bar{\sigma}^m\psi_X - \frac{i}{2}\bar{\psi}_X\bar{\sigma}^m\partial_m\psi_X)\psi_h\psi_h \right] + \text{h.c.} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

The field equation for the higgsino ψ_h and the auxiliary field F_h give

$$\psi_h = \frac{i}{\bar{F}_X} \sigma^m \bar{\psi}_X \partial_m h \quad , \quad F_h = -\frac{2M}{f^2} |\phi_X|^2 \square h \quad . \quad (\text{C.3})$$

We therefore find the solution for the higgsino shown in eq.(11).

When comparing our microscopic theory to the results of using the Higgs superfield constrained as in (10), (11) one encounters a puzzle that is not yet clarified. This refers to the fact that there is no simple, clear interpretation in the microscopic theory of the fact that the auxiliary field F_h in (11) is not dynamical.

References

- [1] D. V. Volkov, V. P. Akulov, “Is the Neutrino a Goldstone Particle?,” Phys. Lett. B **46** (1973) 109.
- [2] P. Fayet, “Mixing between Gravitational And Weak Interactions Through The Massive Gravitino,” Phys. Lett. B **70** (1977) 461. “Weak Interactions Of A Light Gravitino: A Lower Limit On The Gravitino Mass From The Decay $\Psi \rightarrow \text{Gravitino Anti-Photino}$,” Phys. Lett. B **84** (1979) 421. “Scattering Cross-Sections Of The Photino And The Goldstino (Gravitino) On Matter,” Phys. Lett. B **86** (1979) 272. R. Casalbuoni, S. De Curtis, D. Dominici, F. Feruglio and R. Gatto, “A Gravitino - Goldstino High-Energy Equivalence Theorem,” Phys. Lett. B **215** (1988) 313 “High-Energy Equivalence Theorem In Spontaneously Broken Supergravity,” Phys. Rev. D **39** (1989) 2281.
- [3] E. A. Ivanov, A. A. Kapustnikov, “Relation Between Linear And Nonlinear Realizations Of Supersymmetry,” “General Relationship Between Linear And Nonlinear Realizations Of Supersymmetry,” J. Phys. A **11** (1978) 2375. “The Nonlinear Realization Structure Of Models With Spontaneously Broken Supersymmetry,” J. Phys. G **8** (1982) 167.
- [4] M. Rocek, “Linearizing The Volkov-Akulov Model,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **41** (1978) 451.
- [5] U. Lindstrom, M. Rocek, “Constrained Local Superfields,” Phys. Rev. D **19** (1979) 2300.
- [6] S. Samuel and J. Wess, “A Superfield Formulation Of The Nonlinear Realization Of Supersymmetry And Its Coupling To Supergravity,” Nucl. Phys. B **221** (1983) 153.
- [7] R. Casalbuoni, S. De Curtis, D. Dominici, F. Feruglio and R. Gatto, “Nonlinear realization of supersymmetry algebra from supersymmetric constraint” Phys. Lett. B **220** (1989) 569.
- [8] T. E. Clark and S. T. Love, “Goldstino couplings to matter,” Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 5723 [arXiv:hep-ph/9608243].

- [9] T. E. Clark, T. Lee, S. T. Love and G. Wu, “On the interactions of light gravitinos,” *Phys. Rev. D* **57** (1998) 5912 [arXiv:hep-ph/9712353].
- [10] A. Brignole, F. Feruglio and F. Zwirner, “On the effective interactions of a light gravitino with matter fermions,” *JHEP* **9711** (1997) 001 [arXiv:hep-th/9709111].
- [11] A. Brignole, F. Feruglio, F. Zwirner, “Signals of a superlight gravitino at e^+e^- colliders when the other superparticles are heavy,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B516** (1998) 13-28. [hep-ph/9711516].
- [12] A. Brignole, F. Feruglio, M. L. Mangano, F. Zwirner, “Signals of a superlight gravitino at hadron colliders when the other superparticles are heavy,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B526** (1998) 136-152. [hep-ph/9801329].
- [13] M. A. Luty and E. Ponton, “Effective Lagrangians and light gravitino phenomenology,” *Phys. Rev. D* **57** (1998) 4167 hep-ph/9706268,v3 [revised version of *Phys. Rev. D* **57** (1998) 4167].
- [14] I. Antoniadis and M. Tuckmantel, “Non-linear supersymmetry and intersecting D-branes,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **697** (2004) 3 [arXiv:hep-th/0406010]; I. Antoniadis, M. Tuckmantel and F. Zwirner, “Phenomenology of a leptonic goldstino and invisible Higgs boson decays,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **707** (2005) 215 [arXiv:hep-ph/0410165].
- [15] A. Brignole, J. A. Casas, J. R. Espinosa and I. Navarro, “Low-scale supersymmetry breaking: Effective description, electroweak breaking and phenomenology,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **666** (2003) 105 [arXiv:hep-ph/0301121].
- [16] Z. Komargodski and N. Seiberg, “From Linear SUSY to Constrained Superfields,” *JHEP* **0909** (2009) 066 [arXiv:0907.2441 [hep-th]].
- [17] L. Alvarez-Gaume, C. Gomez and R. Jimenez, “Minimal Inflation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **690** (2010) 68 [arXiv:1001.0010 [hep-th]].
- [18] C. Cheung, F. D’Eramo, J. Thaler, “The Spectrum of Goldstini and Modulini,” [arXiv:1104.2600 [hep-ph]]. C. Cheung, Y. Nomura, J. Thaler, “Goldstini,” *JHEP* **1003** (2010) 073. [arXiv:1002.1967 [hep-ph]].
- [19] N. Craig, J. March-Russell, M. McCullough, “The Goldstini Variations,” *JHEP* **1010** (2010) 095. [arXiv:1007.1239 [hep-ph]].
- [20] R. Argurio, Z. Komargodski and A. Mariotti, “Pseudo-Goldstini in Field Theory,” [arXiv:1102.2386 [hep-th]].

- [21] M. Dine, G. Festuccia, Z. Komargodski, “A Bound on the Superpotential,” JHEP **1003** (2010) 011. [arXiv:0910.2527 [hep-th]].
- [22] I. Antoniadis, E. Dudas, D. M. Ghilencea and P. Tziveloglou, “Non-linear MSSM,” Nucl. Phys. B **841** (2010) 157 [arXiv:1006.1662 [hep-ph]].
- [23] J. Wess and J. Bagger, “Supersymmetry and Supergravity”, second edition, Princeton University Press, 1992 ; P. Binetruy, G. Girardi, R. Grimm, “Supergravity couplings: A Geometric formulation,” Phys. Rept. **343** (2001) 255-462. [hep-th/0005225].
- [24] B. Zumino, “Supersymmetry and Kahler Manifolds,” Phys. Lett. **B87** (1979) 203.
- [25] C. Vafa, “The String landscape and the swampland,” [hep-th/0509212].
- [26] K. Choi, E. J. Chun, J. S. Lee, “Proton decay with a light gravitino or axino,” Phys. Rev. **D55** (1997) 3924-3926. [hep-ph/9611285].
- [27] I. Antoniadis, E. Dudas, D. M. Ghilencea, P. Tziveloglou, “Beyond the MSSM Higgs with d=6 effective operators,” Nucl. Phys. **B848** (2011) 1-32. [arXiv:1012.5310 [hep-ph]]. “MSSM Higgs with dimension-six operators,” Nucl. Phys. **B831** (2010) 133-161. [arXiv:0910.1100 [hep-ph]]. “MSSM with Dimension-five Operators (MSSM(5)),” Nucl. Phys. **B808** (2009) 155-184. [arXiv:0806.3778 [hep-ph]]. S. Cassel, D. M. Ghilencea, G. G. Ross, “Fine tuning as an indication of physics beyond the MSSM,” Nucl. Phys. **B825** (2010) 203-221. [arXiv:0903.1115 [hep-ph]]. M. Carena, K. Kong, E. Ponton, J. Zurita, “Supersymmetric Higgs Bosons and Beyond,” Phys. Rev. **D81** (2010) 015001. [arXiv:0909.5434 [hep-ph]]. M. Dine, N. Seiberg, S. Thomas, “Higgs physics as a window beyond the MSSM (BMSSM),” Phys. Rev. **D76** (2007) 095004. [arXiv:0707.0005 [hep-ph]].