

# Grand Pleromal Transmutation : UV Condensates via Konishi Anomaly, Dimensional Transmutation and Ultraminimal GUTs

Charanjit S. Aulakh<sup>1</sup>

Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Mohali,  
Sector 81, S. A. S. Nagar, Manauli PO 140306, Punjab India  
and

International Centre for Theoretical Physics,  
Strada Costiera 11, 34100, Trieste, Italy<sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

Using consistency requirements relating chiral condensates imposed by the so called Generalized Konishi Anomaly, we show that dimensional transmutation via gaugino condensation *in the ultraviolet* drives gauge symmetry breaking in a large class of *asymptotically strong* Super Yang Mills Higgs theories. For Adjoint multiplet type chiral superfields  $\Phi$  (transforming as  $r \times \bar{r}$  representations of a non Abelian gauge group  $G$ ), solution of the Generalized Konishi Anomaly (GKA) equations allows calculation of quantum corrected VEVs in terms of the dimensional transmutation scale  $\Lambda_{UV} \simeq M_X e^{\frac{8\pi^2}{g^2(M_X)b_0}}$  which determines the gaugino condensate. Thus the gauge coupling at the perturbative unification scale  $M_X$  generates GUT symmetry breaking VEVs by non-perturbative dimensional transmutation. This obviates the need for large (or any) input mass scales in the superpotential. Rank reduction can be achieved by including pairs of chiral superfields transforming as either  $(\mathbf{Q}(r), \bar{\mathbf{Q}}(\bar{r}))$  or  $(\mathbf{\Sigma}((r \otimes r)_{\text{symm}}), \bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}((\bar{r} \otimes \bar{r})_{\text{symm}}))$ , that form trilinear matrix gauge invariants  $\bar{Q} \cdot \Phi \cdot Q, \bar{\Sigma} \cdot \Phi \cdot \Sigma$  with  $\Phi$ . Novel, robust and *ultraminimal* Grand unification algorithms emerge from the analysis. We sketch the structure of a realistic Spin(10) model, with the 16-plet of Spin(10) as the base representation  $r$ , which mimics the realistic Minimal Supersymmetric GUT but contains even fewer free parameters. We argue that our results point to a large extension of the dominant and normative paradigms of Asymptotic Freedom/IR colour confinement and potential driven spontaneous symmetry breaking that have long ruled gauge theories.

---

<sup>1</sup>aulakh@iisermohali.ac.in

<sup>2</sup>Senior Associate ICTP, 2013-2019

# 1 Introduction

It has been a longstanding dream [1] to provide a mechanism for dynamical generation of the Grand Unification scale from the low energy (i.e. Electro-weak) data. Asymptotic freedom(AF) of the Grand Unified gauge coupling(s) has been a generally unquestioned requirement for acceptable unification models. Some years ago, motivated by the glaring Asymptotic strength(AS) of the couplings of the phenomenologically satisfactory Minimal Supersymmetric Spin(10) GUT model (MSGUT) [2,3], we proposed [4,5] that this ‘defect’ is actually a signal from the model that it generates its own UV cutoff in the form of a Landau polar scale  $\Lambda_{UV}$ . This sets the scale of the (gaugino and other chiral) condensates that form due to strong coupling near the gauge Landau pole. We show that  $\Lambda_{UV}$  is also associated with dynamical symmetry breaking of the AS gauge symmetry in the degenerate spontaneously broken gauge symmetry phases in the energy range below the Landau pole. Inspired by their defining role in our proposal for robust parameter counting ultra-minimal AS Grand Unification we called such condensates *pleromal*. We were particularly enthused by the observation that -in contrast to, say, SuSy QCD-the nearly exact Supersymmetry at the GUT scale implies that the UV dynamics of the MSGUT, and other AS SuSy GUTs, are physically the best justified and most realistic context for the use of the powerful methods [6,7] for analysing strongly coupled SuSy theories.

The phase structure of supersymmetric AS unifying models which possess gauge Landau poles in the UV, often within an order of magnitude above  $M_X$ , must obviously be very different from the well known AF scenarios [8]. We do not agree with the common attitude that assumes AS theories must be inconsistent and buries its head in the sand of a blind taboo against UV strong gauge coupling. It is a broadly applicable scientific truism that in Nature there are no true infinities, but only naive idealisations. UV gauge Landau poles should thus signal that a phase transition takes place and a new phase described by new field variables and gauge couplings comes into play. The canonical example of QCD and its SuSy variants has served us as a template. On that analogy we expect that near the gauge Landau pole the G-coloured particles (i.e. described by gauge variant fields) leave the physical spectrum because their masses run to infinity and wavefunction renormalizations run to singular values. A new set of degrees of freedom analogous to the colour singlet Mesons, Baryons, glueballs and various *physical* condensates of QCD will be expected to describe the behaviour of the condensed phase which should form in the strong coupling region. In fact such candidate effective fields have long been identified in SuSy YM theories [6,9] as being holomorphic gauge invariants formed from the Chiral fields present in theory : which are known to parametrize the D-flat moduli space [10–12] and are thus appropriate to describe the supersymmetric vacua. In analogy with the behaviour at strong coupling in the AF case one expects that a supersymmetric Sigma model involving these gauge singlet but ’t Hooft anomaly matched ‘chiral moduli’ fields describes the UV phase [5].

Be that as it may, the symmetry restored, UV phase expected on general grounds such as RG flows is not the subject of the investigations in this paper beyond the fact that, again in direct analogy with SuSy QCD, we expect gauge invariant, physical, chiral condensates to form in this phase. Once formed, being physical, we expect them to be a physical background that all other phases of the theory must be consistent with. In particular

models based on full renormalizable SYMH theories(i.e. with all massive modes retained) are associated with the various degenerate broken symmetry phases at scales below the UV condensation scale. These models must all obey the infinite network of constraints between SuSy vacuum condensates first identified in the work of Konishi and Shizuya [13] and then greatly expanded in the work of Cachazo, Douglas, Seiberg and Witten(CDSW) [14] and thereafter.

In [5] a toy AS GUT model with gauge group  $SU(2)$  and a single symmetric chiral 5-plet was used to explore the derivation of symmetry breaking VEVs from the gauge singlet physical gaugino condensate. The use of the Konishi Anomaly(KA) [13] allowed us to argue that a VEV driven by the overall gauge singlet gaugino condensate might well develop. Shortly thereafter, a sophisticated and powerful method based on the *Generalized* Konishi anomaly (GKA) was invented [14] which allows fully quantum and non-perturbative calculation of the condensates of the “Chiral Ring” generators  $tr((W_\alpha W^\alpha)^n \Phi^m)|_{n=0,1, m \in Z_{\geq 0}}$  in terms of the first few condensates. Here  $W_\alpha$  is the gaugino-field strength multiplet,  $\Phi$  the  $N \times \bar{N}$  adjoint multiplet of the Unitary gauge group and the trace is in the  $N$ -dimensional fundamental since the adjoint has been written as an  $N \times N$  matrix. Thereafter this method enjoyed a great vogue and was also extended [15,16] by the addition of pairs of fundamental (“quark”) chiral multiplets leading to either Higgs or “pseudo-confining” vacua, or [17] by other sets of chiral supermultiplets, such as (anti)symmetric representations : which provide more general rank breaking scenarios with several novel and non-trivial features in their dynamics.

In this paper we argue that GKA techniques allow fully quantum and non-perturbative calculation of chiral VEVs in terms of assumed underlying gaugino condensates in our [4,5] asymptotically strong(AS) dynamical symmetry breaking scenario. The scenario applies to a vast class of SuSy gauge theories with chiral multiplet  $\Phi$  transforming as  $r \otimes \bar{r}$  : for *any* representation  $r$  of any gauge group  $G$ .  $\Phi$  may be supplemented by representation pairs  $\{Q, \bar{Q}\}; \{\Sigma, \bar{\Sigma}\}$  that can form singlets  $\bar{Q} \cdot \Phi^n \cdot Q, \bar{\Sigma} \cdot \Phi^n \cdot \Sigma$ . Crucially,  $\Phi, \Sigma, \bar{\Sigma}$  can be written as matrices (with rows and columns labelled by indices running over the dimension  $d(r)$  of a general representation  $r$  larger than the fundamental : which we call the *base* representation of the model). This allows the use [14] of resolvent methods to treat whole collections of condensates in terms of a single resolvent. The basic idea of using a tensor product to define a matrix type representation can be extended to gauge groups other than Unitary groups. In particular it applies to the product of spinorial representations of  $Spin(N)$ . We note that by imposing trace constraints on the matrices  $\Phi, \Sigma, \bar{\Sigma}$  that set some, or all but one, irreps contained in the direct products  $r \times \bar{r}, r \times r$  etc. to zero one can try to build models based on a subset of the irreps in  $r \times \bar{r}$ . However this comes at a steep price of much more complicated loop equations and a larger set of condensate coding resolvents to be solved for. These problems have not been addressed yet. Moreover, the normal motivation for choosing the smallest possible set of irreps of the gauge group is to reduce the number of free parameters in the Lagrangian as well as to retain AF. The latter reason is no longer applicable and using specific sub-irreps of  $r \times \bar{r}, (r \times r)_{symm}$  etc. seems to lead to more, not less parameters. Hence in this paper we shall not attempt to extract sub-irreps.

The focus in the literature on GKA [14–18, 21] has been on the restricted class of Asymptotically Free(AF) i.e. IR strong models and the derivation of effective Wilsonian superpotentials to describe the (strongly coupled) low energy theory. In the GUT applica-

tion case one rather wishes to know the Higgs vacuum expectation values (VEVs) that must be substituted in the SYMH Lagrangian to derive the effective *perturbative* spontaneously broken GUT (i.e. with the dynamical symmetry breaking due to strong coupling at the UV Landau pole incorporated into the parameters of the effective SYMH) and therefrom its effective supersymmetric light mode theory (a.k.a. “MSSM”). Thus one needs a definition for the *quantum VEVs* and associated “equivalent quantum superpotential”  $W^{(q)}(\Phi, \lambda, v_i^{(q)})$ . This is a (novel) supplementary superpotential, which we introduce for the specific purpose of coding in the “quantum VEVs” derived via GKA based analysis, into a generalisation of the tree superpotential  $W(\Phi, \lambda, \dots)$  so as to define a consistent SYMH Lagrangian based starting point for the spectrum analysis of the GUT in its spontaneously broken phases. The extrema of  $W^{(q)}$  are the quantum corrected VEVs  $v_i^{(q)}$  computed by the non-perturbative GKA formalism involving solutions for, and contour integrals of, quantum resolvents i.e. by non potential extremisation methods.

Our focus here is to explore *the generation of the GUT scale chiral VEVs, in each of the possible symmetry broken phases, by non-perturbative and fully quantum dimensional transmutation*, especially when the mass parameters in the superpotential are absent or negligible. We emphasise that the parameters describing (a few) irreducible *gauge singlet* physical condensates are to be deduced *in principle* from the non-perturbative dynamics of the UV symmetry restored phase using, say, Lattice methods. In practice, however, they are simply unknown dimensionful input parameters playing a VEV determining role similar to the mass parameters of standard SuSy GUT superpotentials. If one accepts that Asymptotic Strength should result in an underlying physical G-singlet gaugino condensation then in the spontaneously broken phases relevant at lower energies the gaugino condensate ‘fractionates’ into different parts corresponding to a division of the G -gauginos into those associated with the little group  $H$  and cosets  $G/H$ , while maintaining the overall condensate value.

In this work we shall outline the generic features of our proposal applicable to a large class of models with arbitrary gauge group, noting in conclusion only the principal features of its application to a realistic SO(10) model. In short, we suggest a quite novel approach to the hoary problem of GUT symmetry breaking which realises the old dream of symmetry breaking scale determination by dimensional transmutation, not in an engineered perturbative model [1, 19], but generically and robustly in an infinite class of models of a type hitherto largely neglected. Our scenario presents a plausible picture and provides useful and novel calculation techniques for analysing hybrid theories where the deep UV phase G-singlet gaugino condensates drive dynamical symmetry breaking in the lower energy phases. It should thus help to free AS theories from the limbo to which they have hitherto been banished by a taboo that assumes they are automatically logically inconsistent simply because no method had been found to calculate anything interesting about them. If so it may have much wider implications and ramifications for gauge theories as a whole.

In Section 2.1 we first review the GKA analysis of CDSW applied to a very restricted type of AF SuSy YMH models with  $U(N)$  gauge group and adjoint Higgs irrep. Then in Section 2.2 we briefly discuss generic features of the effective theories associated with gaugino condensates in AF vs AS SYMH models to provide a context for the calculations we perform. In Section 2.3, we discuss how the techniques of [14] for Adjoint Multiplets extend to an infinite class of “Generalized Adjoint multiplet type” (GAM) models based on a notion of base- $r$  tensors transforming as direct products  $r \times \bar{r}$  of the gauge group  $G$ . In

Section 2.4 we define the quantum VEVs and superpotential  $v_i^{(q)}, W^{(q)}$ . In Section 3.1 we give a simple example of this extension with gauge group  $SU(3)$  and base representation  $r = (3 \times 3)_{\text{symm}}$  and illustrate calculations with some numerical results. In Section 3.2 we illustrate ‘gaugino condensate fractionation’ using the example. In Section 4. we discuss how rank breaking may be implemented by introducing additional  $(r, \bar{r})$  or  $(r \times r, \bar{r} \times \bar{r})$  pairs of Chiral supermultiplets whose VEVs reduce the rank of the little group  $H$ . In Section 5. we outline a realistic  $Spin(10)$  GUT model whose base representation is the 16 dimensional chiral spinor of  $Spin(10)$ . In Section 6. we discuss our results and the outlook for further work from a general view point.

## 2 Generalized Adjoint models

### 2.1 Generalized Konishi Anomaly and CDSW formalism for matrix form representations

We begin with a short summary of the basic work [14] on which we rely for our calculations. This work confines itself to consideration of the standard Asymptotically free SYMH models which condense in the Infrared. In a supersymmetry preserving vacuum of a super-Yang Mills theory with gauge group  $G$  coupled to a Chiral multiplet  $\Phi$  in an arbitrary representation  $R$  of the gauge group, and with superpotential  $W(\Phi)$ , the GKA implies [14, 17, 18] the following relation for condensates of chiral gauge invariants formed from the Gaugino-Field strength Weyl spinor chiral multiplet  $W_\alpha^A, A = 1 \dots \dim(G), \alpha = 1, 2$  and the chiral fields  $\Phi_I, I = 1 \dots \dim(R)$  :

$$\langle f_I \frac{\partial W}{\partial \Phi_I} \rangle = -\frac{1}{32\pi^2} \langle W_\alpha^A W^{\alpha B} \mathcal{M}^{AJ}_I \mathcal{M}^{BK}_J \frac{\partial f(W_\alpha, \Phi)_K}{\partial \Phi_I} \rangle \quad ; \quad \langle W^{\alpha A} \mathcal{M}^{AJ}_I \Phi_J \rangle = 0 \quad (1)$$

Here  $f(W_\alpha, \Phi)_I$  is an arbitrary chiral variation of the field  $\Phi$  in the representation  $R$  with generators  $\mathcal{M}^A$ . Repeated indices  $I, J, K$  are summed over  $\dim(R)$  values. The important constraint equation whereby the matrix  $W_\alpha$  acting on the “vector form” of the general representation  $\Phi$  is equivalent to zero in the “Chiral Ring” [14] is frequently used in simplifying expressions for chiral expectation values. Henceforth, we drop angular brackets to indicate expectation values of operators since that is all we ever consider.

For the case where  $\Phi$  transforms as the traceful adjoint of  $U(N)$  the method of [14] allowed a complete solution for the generators of the Chiral ring of gauge invariants  $t_{n,m} \sim \text{tr}((W_\alpha W^\alpha)^n \Phi^m) (n = 0, 1; m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})$ . The solution proceeds by solving for the generating functions of the Chiral Ring generators defined as the resolvents  $\text{tr}(W_\alpha W^\alpha)^n (z - \Phi)^{-1}$ . These have obvious expansions as power series, valid for large  $z$ , whose coefficients are the Chiral Ring Generators  $t_{n,m}$ . In [15, 16] the extension to the case with additional (“quark”) superfield pairs  $\bar{Q}, Q$  which can form a singlet with  $\Phi$  as  $\bar{Q} \cdot \Phi^n \cdot Q$  and in [17] the similar case of the Adjoint with conjugate pairs of (anti)symmetric representations  $(\bar{\Sigma}, \Sigma)$  are resolved. These additional models allow consideration of rank breaking supersymmetric Higgs vacua not available with just an adjoint. Thus

$$R(z) = \kappa \text{tr}(W_\alpha W^\alpha (z - \Phi)^{-1}) \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{R_n}{z^{n+1}} \equiv \kappa \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\text{tr}(\Phi^n W_\alpha W^\alpha)}{z^{n+1}}$$

$$T(z) = \text{tr}(z - \Phi)^{-1} \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{T_n}{z^{n+1}} \quad ; \quad \kappa \equiv -\frac{1}{32\pi^2} \quad (2)$$

$\text{tr}$  is taken so that the matrix indices run over  $1\dots d(r) = N$ . The semi classical vacuum of the model is defined by distributing the critical values  $a_i (i = 1..n | W'(a_i) = 0)$  of the superpotential function  $W(z)$  (degree  $n+1$ ) over the diagonal slots of  $\Phi$  and setting the off-diagonal elements to zero (this ensures minimisation of the D-term contributions to the potential via  $D^A(\Phi, \Phi^*) \sim [\Phi, \Phi^\dagger] = 0$ ). One can extract various interesting quantities, such as the number  $N_i$  of times a critical point  $a_i$  is repeated or the value of gauge invariant chiral ring generators, via integrals of  $z^m \{R(z), T(z)\}$  etc. around suitable contours  $C_i$ .

## 2.2 Generics of SYMH condensates

Super-QCD without quarks is AF and so has an IR Landau pole and associated RG-invariant scale  $\Lambda_{SQCD}$ . In the seminal work of Veneziano and Yankielowicz (VY) [9] gaugino condensates consistent with the expected unbroken supersymmetry were found. In contrast to QCD, no condensates (like  $\alpha_3 < G_{\mu\nu}^A G^{A\mu\nu} > \sim \Lambda_{QCD}^4$ ) leading to a contribution to the vacuum energy are permitted by unbroken supersymmetry. On the other hand a condensate for the gaugino bilinear  $< \lambda_\alpha^A \lambda^{\alpha A} > \simeq \Lambda^3$  is chiral (i.e. F-type) and does not break SuSy. SQCD with  $0 < N_f < N_c$  quarks has no stable vacuum but for larger values of  $N_f$  exhibits [7] interesting phenomena like a ‘conformal window’ for  $3N_c > N_f > 3N_c/2$  where the theory has a superconformal fixed point and is in an ‘interacting non-Abelian Coulomb phase’. Our basic assumption when considering the inverse i.e. AS case is that gaugino condensates continue to be formed due to the strong coupling dynamics associated with the (UV) Landau pole.

In IR-strong SuSy theories the unbroken symmetry is set already at high energies where the gauge couplings of the little group  $H = \Pi_i U(N_i)$  left unbroken after  $U(N) \rightarrow H$  breaking are still perturbative. The  $N_i$  refer to the VEV repetition numbers on the  $\Phi$  VEV diagonal. The GKA analysis showed that the vacuum structure of the fully quantum theory is controlled by branch cuts arising from bifurcations of the semi-classical critical points  $a_i$  due to quantum corrections. The branch-cut network has a physical meaning in its own right since the ‘quantum superpotential derivative’ which defines the branch cuts makes no reference to the semi-classical critical points. The gaugino condensate and a few other low lying condensates involving the adjoint supermultiplet  $\Phi$  determine the ‘quantum superpotential derivative’. Consistency implies the branch points coalesce into the semi-classical critical points when the quantum corrections coded in the driving condensates are set to zero by hand. In the IR the non-Abelian gauge couplings become strong and eventually gaugino condensates  $< S_i > \sim W_\alpha^{A_i} W^{\alpha A_i}$ ,  $A_i = 1\dots N_i^2$  form in each of subgroups  $U(N_i)$ . We take over this picture *mutatis mutandis*. The IR effective theory is now the spontaneously broken SYMH theory and not the confined gauge theory of  $\Pi_i U(N_i)$ . Our objective is to calculate and encode the symmetry breaking VEVs into a suitable supersymmetric SYMH Lagrangian rather than to calculate the VY effective potentials. The special techniques available in supersymmetric gauge theories allow the extraction of significant information regarding the whole system of condensates. Our aim is firstly to provide a robust underpinning of automatic UV condensation for GUT SSB. Secondly we aim to reduce the overall number of free parameters of the massive perturbative GUT model which gives rise

to the effective low energy theory. Higgs VEVs develop and are determined by the UV Landau polar scale *even without any input mass parameters in the superpotential*. Thus it is justified to claim that, in sharp contrast to [19], Dimensional Transmutation has emerged robustly from the UV strong coupling dynamics.

The contour integrals used to extract the fully quantum GUT symmetry breaking VEVs in terms of the input condensate parameters (see below for details) are a far cry from the habitual semi-classical minimisation of a scalar field potential. Once we have them in hand we encode them in the form of the parameters of a spontaneously broken Supersymmetric gauge theory of the standard type specified by a “equivalent quantum superpotential” ( $W^{(q)}$ ) with a new set of massive parameters containing information about the effect of the non-perturbative condensates for the perturbative GUT theory.

### 2.3 GKA techniques for Generalized Adjoint Multiplets (GAMs)

Our basic observation is that the equations for resolvents derived via the GKA in [14] also hold for the Generalized Adjoint Multiplet (GAM) type field transforming as  $r \times \bar{r}$  for *any* representation  $r$  of any simple/semisimple gauge group  $G$  with the *sole* replacement of the trace ( $tr$ ) in the fundamental of  $SU(N)$  by the trace ( $Tr$ ) in the representation  $r$  of  $G$ . Note that  $d(r) = N$  for the model of [14] but their results generalise easily using the expanded notion of an “base- $r$  Adjoint”, written as a  $d(r) \times d(r)$  matrix, that transforms as  $r \times \bar{r}$  rather than as  $N \times \bar{N}$ . In other words, under a gauge transformation

$$\Phi' = U_{d(r)} \cdot \Phi \cdot U_{d(r)}^\dagger \quad (3)$$

where  $U_{d(r)}$  are  $d(r) \times d(r)$  dimensional Unitary matrices in the representation  $r$  of  $G$ . The generators can thus be written as

$$\mathcal{M}_{r \times \bar{r}}^A = T_{(r)}^A \times \mathcal{I}_{d(r)} + \mathcal{I}_{d(r)} \times T_{(\bar{r})}^A = T_{(r)}^A \times \mathcal{I}_{d(r)} - \mathcal{I}_{d(r)} \times (T_{(r)}^A)^T \quad (4)$$

and  $T_{(r)}^A$  are Hermitian Generators in the representation  $r$ . Then it is easy to rewrite eqn(1) in the form it was derived in [14] with the generalization  $T_{fund}^A \rightarrow T_{(r)}^A$  :

$$\langle f_{ij} \frac{\partial W(\Phi)}{\partial \Phi_{ik}} \rangle = \kappa \langle W_\alpha^A W^{B\alpha} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi_{ij}} [T_{(r)}^A, [T_{(r)}^B, f(W_\alpha, \Phi)]]_{ij} \rangle \quad (5)$$

In general,  $r \times \bar{r}$  contains one or more irreps of  $G$ , *besides* the singlet and the adjoint always present, and such representations carry large  $S_2(R) \gg 3C_2(G)$ . By constraining the matrix  $\Phi$  so as to single out one or more irreps (which are still AS) one can work in terms of irreps of  $G$ . For example one can remove the singlet and adjoint in  $r \times \bar{r}$  by imposing  $Tr(\Phi) = Tr(T^A \Phi) = 0$  and likewise for  $\delta\Phi$ . The required resolvent formalism will be quite complex and is not yet available.

We define

$$\begin{aligned} I[C, F(z)] &\equiv \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_C dz F(z) \\ N_i &= I[C_i, T(z)] \\ R_0 &= I[C_\infty, R(z)] = \kappa S_2(r) W_\alpha^A W^{\alpha A} = 2S_2(r) \mathcal{S} \\ R_n &= I[C_\infty, z^n R(z)] \quad ; \quad T_k = I[C_\infty, z^k T(z)] \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the gaugino condensate and  $S_2(r)$  the index of the representation  $r$  :  $Tr(T_{(r)}^A T_{(r)}^B) = \delta^{AB} S_2(r)$ . It is obvious that  $v_i^{cl} = a_i = I[C_i, zT(z)]/N_i$  extracts the VEV  $v_i = \Phi_{ii}$  of an  $N_i$ -fold replicated diagonal  $\Phi$  component from the semiclassical  $T(z)$  when  $C_i$  encloses the critical point  $a_i$ . *This motivates the VEV definition in the quantum corrected case when  $C_i$  encircles the branch cut connecting pairs of branch points which are bifurcates of the semi-classical critical points split under the influence of quantum corrections [14]* (see eqn(17) below).

In the presence of quantum corrections the GKA method of [14] solves for the generating functions  $R(z)$  using the position independence and complete factorizability [14] of Chiral ring operator correlators to reduce the GKA (for the case where  $\delta\Phi = \kappa W_\alpha W^\alpha (z - \Phi)^{-1}$ ) to a quadratic equation for  $R(z)$  :

$$R(z)^2 - W'(z)R(z) - \frac{1}{4}f(z) = 0 \quad (7)$$

where  $f(z)$  is a degree  $n - 1$  polynomial which is determined by the driving condensates  $R_{0,1,\dots,n-1}$  and  $W(z)$  is just the superpotential (of degree  $n + 1$ ) as a function of  $z$ . Since our entire focus is on the relevance to renormalizable GUTs, we shall only consider cubic superpotentials ( $W(z) = \lambda z^3/3 + m z^2/2 + \mu^2 z$ ). Then  $f(z)$  is a linear function  $f(z) = f_0 + f_1 z = -4\lambda(R_1 + zR_0) - 4mR_0$ . The coefficients  $R_0, R_1$  are not determined by the GKA and should be regarded as dynamical moduli of the vacuum manifold of the theory which are to be determined by an appropriate numerical investigation of gaugino condensation at strong coupling. Some information about the main contribution to  $R_1/R_0^{4/3}$  can however be gleaned by surveying the GKA constraints numerically.

In the AF case of SuSy YM with Adjoint Chiral Higgs the gauge coupling runs to a Landau pole *in the infrared* at a (RG invariant) scale  $\Lambda$  approximated by the one loop value (exact for the Wilsonian gauge coupling)

$$\Lambda = \mu e^{\frac{8\pi}{b_0 g^2(\mu)}} \quad (8)$$

where  $b_0 = -2N$  for the adjoint-SYM. There are good arguments [9] to support the conjecture that strong coupling causes the development of a gauge singlet, RG invariant and physical gaugino condensate at this scale

$$\mathcal{S} \equiv \frac{\kappa}{2} W_\alpha^A W^{\alpha A} = b\Lambda^3 \quad (9)$$

Where the constant  $b$  is scheme dependent and may be chosen to be 1 [14].

Our core assumption is that physical gaugino condensation also occurs when the gauge coupling runs to a Landau pole *in the ultraviolet*, at a scale  $\Lambda_{UV}$  still given by (8), but for the case  $b_0(R) = S_2(R) - 3C_2(G) > 0$ . Note that  $S_2(r \times \bar{r}) = 2d(r)S_2(r)$ , which grows fast with  $d(r)$ , so that  $b_0(r \times \bar{r}) \gg 0$  for most base representations  $r$ . We deduce, via the GKA relations and consistency conditions, the symmetry breaking quantum VEVs of  $\Phi$  that define the effective low energy theory as functions of the basic gaugino condensates and the superpotential parameters. The analysis is performed at a scale where all the degrees of freedom of the Super YMH theory are retained with the RG invariant gaugino condensates as a given background. Scale dependent quantities such as superpotential parameters and VEVs should be regarded as defined at such an intermediate scale where the gauge and superpotential couplings are still perturbative.



By assumption, a G-singlet physical gaugino condensate  $\mathcal{S}$  for the group as a whole develops in the *ultraviolet*. This gaugino condensate then requires (via the GKA and its solution) that the fields develop VEVs (calculated below) which break the gauge symmetry in a manner dictated by the placement of these quantum corrected VEVs  $v_i^{(q)}$  on the diagonal of the  $\Phi$  VEV *in any way (i.e. with any set of  $\{N_i\}$ ) we choose* : thus defining a variety of degenerate spontaneously broken supersymmetric phases. This placement of VEVs determines the little group  $H$  in practice. The different gaugino bilinears condense in a pattern determined by the VEV placement. The assumption that one may choose the  $N_i$  (subject to  $d(r) = \sum_i N_i$ ) to be fixed integers is an important constraint on dynamical symmetry breaking.

The solution of the GKA equation for  $R(z)$  is

$$\begin{aligned} R(z) &= \frac{1}{2}(W'(z) - \sqrt{W'(z)^2 + f(z)}) \equiv \frac{1}{2}(W'(z) - y(z)) \\ y^2(z) &= W'(z)^2 + f(z) \quad ; \quad f(z) \equiv 4\kappa \text{Tr}(W_\alpha W^\alpha (W'(\Phi) - W'(z))(z - \Phi)^{-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The GKA equation obtained for  $\delta\Phi = (z - \Phi)^{-1}$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} (2R(z) - W'(z))T(z) - \frac{c(z)}{4} &= 0 \\ 4\text{Tr}((W'(\Phi) - W'(z))(z - \Phi)^{-1}) &\equiv c(z) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Like  $f(z)$ ,  $c(z)$  is a polynomial of degree  $n - 1$ . Thus

$$T(z) = -\frac{1}{4} \frac{c(z)}{\sqrt{W'(z)^2 + f(z)}} \equiv -\frac{c(z)}{4y(z)} \quad (12)$$

For a cubic superpotential ( $n = 2$ ) the expansion of  $T(z)$  for large  $z$  and the above solution for  $T(z)$ , yields  $c_0 = -4\lambda T_1 - 4m d(r)$ ,  $c_1 = -4\lambda d(r)$ ,  $T_0 \equiv d(r)$ . The square root of the polynomial  $y^2(z) = W'(z)^2 + f(z)$  encodes the ‘quantum superpotential derivative’, which is distinct from the classical one if  $R_{0,1} \neq 0$ . The higher coefficients  $R_n, T_n$  which are not present in the solutions  $y(z), T(z)$  are determined in terms of  $R_{0,1,\dots,n-1}, T_{0,1,\dots,n-1}$  by the GKA relations. For the cubic case ( $n = 2$ ) the unknowns are thus  $R_{0,1}, T_1$ . The gaugino condensate  $R_0 = 2S_2(R)\mathcal{S} = 2S_2(R)\Lambda^3$  sets the scale of all other condensates and is estimated directly from the running of the perturbative gauge coupling in the full theory. Thus, for numerical work, we can conveniently rescale all our expectation values and integration variables to dimensionless forms using units of  $R_0^{1/3}$ .

For a cubic superpotential  $R(z), T(z)$  the first few dependent  $R_n, T_n$  are :

$$\begin{aligned} R_2 &= -\frac{\mu^2 R_0 - m R_1}{\lambda} \quad ; \quad R_3 = \frac{1}{\lambda^2}(m\mu^2 R_0 + m^2 R_1 + R_0^2 \lambda - \mu^2 R_1 \lambda) \\ T_2 &= -\frac{1}{\lambda^2}(d(r)\mu^2 - m T_1) \quad ; \quad T_3 = \frac{1}{\lambda^2}(d(r)m\mu^2 + m^2 T_1 + 2\lambda d(r)R_0 - \lambda\mu^2 T_1) \\ R_4 &= \frac{1}{\lambda^3}(-m^2\mu^2 R_0 - m^3 R_1 + \lambda\mu^4 R_0 - \lambda m R_0^2 + 2\lambda m\mu^2 R_1 + \lambda^2 2R_0 R_1) \\ T_4 &= \frac{1}{\lambda^3}(-d(r)m^2\mu^2 - m^3 T_1 + \lambda d(r)\mu^4 - 2\lambda d(r)m R_0 + 2\lambda m\mu^2 T_1 + 2\lambda^2 d(r)R_1 + 2\lambda^2 R_0 T_1) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The classically superconformal case where  $m = \mu = 0$ , i.e. the tree level superpotential is free of any mass parameters, is particularly simple and interesting :

$$\begin{aligned} R_2 &= 0; R_3 = \frac{R_0^2}{\lambda}; T_2 = 0; T_3 = \frac{2d(r)R_0}{\lambda}; R_4 = \frac{2R_0R_1}{\lambda} \\ R_5 &= \frac{R_1^2}{\lambda}; T_4 = \frac{2(d(r)R_1 + R_0T_1)}{\lambda}; T_5 = \frac{2R_1T_1}{\lambda} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

If, restoring angular brackets for a moment, we separate  $\Phi(x) = \langle \Phi \rangle + \tilde{\Phi}(x)$  where  $\tilde{\Phi}$  has zero VEV, we see that  $T_1 = Tr \langle \Phi \rangle = \sum N_i v_i^{(q)}$  but

$$\begin{aligned} T_2 &= \langle Tr \Phi(x)^2 \rangle = \langle Tr \Phi(0)^2 \rangle = Tr \langle \Phi \rangle^2 + \langle Tr(\tilde{\Phi}(0)^2) \rangle = 0 \\ \Rightarrow \sum N_i v_i^{(q)2} &= - \langle Tr(\tilde{\Phi}(0)^2) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

This sort of interplay between non-gauge invariant quantum correlators and non-gauge invariant VEVs can yield gauge invariant resolvent coefficients  $R_n, T_n$ . Thus although we shall use vacuum expectation values deducible from  $T(z)$  to calculate masses and define an effective theory with spontaneously broken gauge group at low energies, we must keep in mind that due to the strongly non-perturbative physics at high energies the GKA relations imply a host of strong constraints on higher order chiral correlators whose implications for the effective theory remain to be explained. The phenomenological implications of these constraints for correlators involving quantum fields which are known to describe light particles, like SM fields, are not clear to us. We regard this hybrid of a perturbative effective theory with strong correlations due to underlying microscopic strong coupling as one of the most puzzling and intriguing implications of our results : which may provide fresh insight on how to think about vacua arising non-perturbatively in strongly correlated systems.

We argue below that consistency of the GKA relations with the choice of  $N_i$  also determines  $T_1$  in terms of contour integrals involving  $y(z)$  and the integer repetition numbers  $N_i$  of the VEVs  $v_i^{(q)}, i = 1..n$  on the diagonal of  $\Phi$  which, following [14], we assume to be free inputs stable against quantum deformation. This only leaves  $R_0$  and  $R_1 = \kappa Tr \Phi W_\alpha W^\alpha$  undetermined. We shall see below that the GKA equations offer insight and an estimate even for  $R_1$  : at least in cases where the effects of the condensation are primarily encoded in the quantum VEVs and gaugino condensates.

## 2.4 Determination of Quantum VEVs $v_i^{(q)}$

The essence of the analysis of [14] in the AF case is that the influence of gaugino condensation modifies the polynomial  $y^2(z)$  such that its zeros are bifurcates  $a_i^{\pm(q)}$  of the critical points  $a_i (i = 1..n | W'(a_i) = 0)$ . These pairs are branch points of  $y(z)$  and are connected by branch cuts. They merge when the quantum condensates  $R_0, R_1$  are sent to 0 and  $y(z)$  reverts to its classical value  $W'(z)$ . The polynomial  $y^2(x)$  defines a two sheeted Riemann surface(of genus 1 when  $n = 2$  since  $y^2$  is then quartic). The contours  $C_i$  enclosing the semi-classical critical points  $a_i$  now become contours  $A_i$  enclosing branch cuts running between the corresponding pairs of branch points  $a_i^{-(q)}, a_i^{+(q)}$ . Thus  $\{A_i, i = 1..n\}$  become [14] a (once redundant) basis for the A-cycles of the Riemann surface defined by  $y^2(z)$ . The definitions of the sub-condensates in the quantum case involve integrals around the A-cycles

:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{0i} &\equiv \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{A_i} dz R(z) = -\frac{1}{4\pi i} \oint_{A_i} dz y(z) = -\frac{1}{2} I[A_i, y(z)] \\ R_{1i} &\equiv \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{A_i} dz z R(z) = -\frac{1}{4\pi i} \oint_{A_i} dz z y(z) = -\frac{1}{2} I[A_i, z y(z)] \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Most crucially, we propose that the quantum VEVs should be defined as

$$v_i^{(q)} \equiv \frac{1}{2\pi i N_i} \oint_{A_i} dz z T(z) = -\frac{1}{8\pi i N_i} \oint_{A_i} dz \frac{z c(z)}{y(z)} \quad (17)$$

It is clear that as  $f(z) \rightarrow 0$  the VEVs approach their classical values  $v_i^{(q)} \rightarrow a_i$ . To our knowledge, though natural and obvious, it has not been explicitly considered earlier since in [14] and thereafter the emphasis is on gauge invariant specification of the SSB in the UV via  $\langle \text{Tr} \Phi^n \rangle$  rather than deriving VEVs whose substitution will produce Lagrangians for the spontaneously broken phases of the GUT. As emphasised in [14], the sets of integers  $N_i$  which invariantly specify the little group  $H$  should not change even when evaluated (using the solution for the resolvents) as

$$N_i \equiv \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{A_i} dz T(z) = -\frac{1}{8\pi i} \oint_{A_i} dz \frac{c(z)}{y(z)} \quad (18)$$

In contrast to the  $r = N, \Phi \sim N \times \bar{N}$  case studied in the AF case in [14], the sub-condensates  $R_{0i}$  correspond *not* to unbroken subgroup factors' gaugino condensates but instead to certain combinations of the gauginos of the unbroken gauge sub-group  $H$  and the  $G/H$  coset gaugino condensates. The combination relevant for  $R_{0i}$  can be identified by evaluating  $\text{Tr} T_{(r)}^A T_{(r)}^B \mathcal{I}_{d(r)}^i$  where in  $\mathcal{I}_{d(r)}^i$  only the unit diagonal elements in the sector corresponding to the cycle  $A_i$  are retained and the others are set to zero. This is illustrated explicitly with an example in the next section. The consistency of these contour integrals with the Laurent expansion even in the quantum corrected case is ensured by the fact that

$$\sum_i \oint_{A_i} z^n (y(z))^{\pm m} dz = \oint_{C_\infty} z^n (y(z))^{\pm m} dz = \oint_{C_{z'=0}} dz' z'^{-(n+2)} (y(1/z'))^{\pm m} \quad (19)$$

since the region enclosed by the curves  $\cup_j A_j \cup (-C_\infty)$  is free of singularities or branch cuts.

For  $n = 2$ ,  $T(z) = (d(r)(z\lambda + m) + \lambda T_1)y^{-1}$ , and we can solve the definition of  $N_1$  to obtain a consistency condition of the assumption [14] that the value of the integrals giving  $N_i$  around the critical points  $a_i$  do not change under quantum corrections. From eqn(18) we get

$$T_1 = \frac{2\pi i N_1 - \oint dz (\lambda d(r)z + m d(r))y^{-1}}{\oint dz \lambda y^{-1}} \quad (20)$$

The equation for  $N_2$  gives nothing fresh because of the complementarity of the integrals around  $C_\infty$  and the union of the A cycles. When  $n > 2$  we can similarly obtain equations for  $T_1 \dots T_{n-1}$  by using the definitions of  $N_1 \dots N_{n-1}$  and solving the  $n - 1$  linear equations for the  $T_i$ .

In the pure  $r \times \bar{r}$  case, analysis of the GKA equations also yields insight and constraints upon the form of  $R_1$ . Closed form evaluation of the elliptic or hyper-elliptic type integrals

involved is difficult since  $\lambda, R_1, a_i^{\pm, (q)}$  are, in general, complex. Numerical evaluation of expressions for  $T_1, v_i^{(q)}, R_{0i}, R_{1i}$  (in units of  $R_0^{1/3} \sim \Lambda$ ) for a range of values of  $\lambda, R_1$  and a choice of  $N_i$  is straightforward. An important class of possible (even necessary, if the dynamics is to support a picture where the main effect of the condensation for defining the effective perturbative theory is coded in quantum vacuum expectation values  $v_i^{(q)}$  of the field  $\Phi$ ) solutions are those where  $\sum_j R_{0j} v_j^{(q)}$  closely approximates  $R_1 = \sum_j R_{1j}$  i.e. for which the dimensionless semi-classicality parameter is small :

$$\delta_{SC}(R_1) \equiv \left| \frac{R_1 - \sum_j^n R_{0j} v_j}{R_1} \right| \ll 1 \quad (21)$$

While we cannot calculate the dimensionless condensate  $\hat{R}_1 \equiv R_1/R_0^{4/3}$  we do find that there are regions of the dimensionless parameter space  $(\lambda, \hat{R}_1) \in \mathbf{C}^2$  where  $\delta_{SC}$  is very small. Heuristically speaking, such regions in the parameter space are candidate vacua where the gaugino condensate and the quantum corrected VEVs encode most of the dynamical information relevant for defining the effective perturbative theory below the scale of dynamical gauge symmetry breaking. We emphasise that  $\delta_{SC}$  is merely a numerical measure useful in understanding the types of solutions obtained while numerically scanning the parameter space of the theory (including the values of the non-perturbative physical condensates such as  $R_{0,1}$ ) while evaluating the quantum VEVs. It is *not* any sort of constraint imposed on the supersymmetric dynamics to ensure its consistency, but merely a parameter that indicates that the quantum dynamics is in some sense close to semiclassical when it is small.

#### 2.4.1 The Equivalent Quantum Superpotential $W^{(q)}(z)$

We propose that the VEVs  $v_i^{(q)}$  be used to define a consistent effective Lagrangian for calculating mass spectra in the spontaneously broken theory by modifying the semiclassical superpotential  $W(z)$  to a quantum modified or effective superpotential  $W^{(q)}(z)$  by changing the coefficients in  $W(z)$  so that the VEVs obtained are zeros of  $W'^{(q)}(z)$  i.e.  $W'^{(q)}(v_i^{(q)}) = 0$ . Thus, for example for a cubic superpotential, we take :

$$\begin{aligned} W^{(q)}(z) &\equiv \mu_{(q)}^2 z + \frac{m_{(q)}}{2} z^2 + \frac{\lambda}{3} z^3 \\ \mu_{(q)}^2 &\equiv \lambda v_+^{(q)} v_-^{(q)} \quad ; \quad m_{(q)} \equiv -\lambda(v_+^{(q)} + v_-^{(q)}) \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Classically  $v_{\pm} = \frac{-m \pm \sqrt{m^2 - 4\mu^2 \lambda}}{2\lambda}$  and one recovers the original superpotential. This proposal has the virtue that the cubic coupling describing the interactions has not been modified and the changes made are only in the super-renormalizable couplings. Use of such a superpotential will ensure that the super-Higgs effect and spectrum calculations using  $v_i^{(q)}$  are consistent.

For evaluating the contour integrals around the  $A_i$  cycles we should first define the square root branched function  $y(z)$  to lie unambiguously on the first sheet :

$$y(z) \equiv \lambda \prod_{i=1}^{2n} |(z - z_i)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \prod_{i=1}^n e^{\frac{i}{2}(\theta(\frac{z - z_{2i-1}}{z_{2i} - z_{2i-1}}) + \theta(\frac{z - z_{2i}}{z_{2i} - z_{2i-1}}))} \quad (23)$$

where  $\theta(z) \in (-\pi, \pi]$  is the quadrant wise correct polar angle of the complex number  $z$ . Then the integral over the  $A_i$ -cycle which encloses the branch cut running from  $z_{2i}$  to  $z_{2i-1}$  is achieved by (P.V. denotes principal value and the function  $g(z)$  should be such that the contribution from the end circles around the branch points is zero)

$$\oint_{A_i} dz g(z) = 2 \text{ P.V. } \int_0^1 dx (z_{2i-1} - z_{2i}) g(x(z_{2i-1} - z_{2i}) + z_{2i}) \quad (24)$$

If the dynamical behaviour supports the emergence of an effective spontaneously broken perturbative theory then we expect that  $\sum_j R_{0j} v_j \simeq R_1$  up to small quantum corrections due to irreducible three point correlation functions of two gaugino superfields and  $\Phi$ . We can scan the parameter space of superpotential couplings together with  $R_1$  (in units of  $R_0^{1/3}$ ) to see if there are parameter regions where  $\delta_{SC}(R_1) \ll 1$ . Using parameters from such regions of the parameter space presumably illustrates the behaviour of the effective theory we may expect: even without doing the difficult dynamical calculation of  $R_1/R_0^{4/3}$ . We show instances of such parameter regions in an explicit example below (see Table 1.).

### 3 A Simple $SU(3)$ based GAM Example

#### 3.1 GAM with base representation $r = (3 \times 3)_{\text{symm}}$ of $SU(3)$

As a simple example of condensation in GAM-AS systems, consider a (traceful) GAM  $\Phi$  transforming as  $R \sim 6 \times \bar{6}$  of  $SU(3)$ , i.e. the base representation is  $r = 6_{SU(3)}$ . In this case  $d(r) = 6, S_2(6) = 5/2, d(R) = 36, S_2(R) = 30, b_0 = +21$ . Note also that  $6 \times \bar{6} = 1 + 8 + 27, S_2(27) = 27$ , so that the 27-plet irrep alone could be used as the AM-AS system with  $b_0 = 18$ . We here examine symmetry breaking  $G = SU(3) \rightarrow H = SU(2) \times U(1)_Y, Y = \text{Diag}(1, 1, -2)$  driven by gluino condensation in the UV. The 6-plet of  $SU(3)$  which is the symmetric two (fundamental) index tensor of  $SU(3)$ , decomposes under  $H$  as

$$6_{\alpha\beta} \equiv 3_{(\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta})}[2] + 2_{3\bar{\alpha}}[-1] + 1_{33}[-4] \quad ; \quad \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta} = 1, 2 (T_3 = \pm 1/2, Y = +1) \quad (25)$$

while the  $SU(3)$  triplet index 3 has  $T_3 = 0, Y = -2$ .  $SU(2)$  irreps are identified by dimension and  $Y$  quantum numbers are given in square brackets. Then

$$6 \times \bar{6} \equiv (1 + 3 + 5)[0] \oplus (1 + 3)[0] \oplus 1[0] \oplus \dots \quad (26)$$

The diagonal  $3 \times 3, 2 \times 2, 1 \times 1$  blocks of  $\Phi$  are occupied by representations that are  $Y$  singlets and contain  $SU(2)$  singlets so that

$$\langle \Phi \rangle = \text{Diag}(V_1 \mathcal{I}_3, V_2 \mathcal{I}_2, V_3) \quad (27)$$

where  $V_I, I = 1..3$  (not all equal if symmetry is to break) are chosen from  $\{v_i^{(q)}; i = 1..n = 2\}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_m$  is the  $m$ -dimensional identity matrix.  $\langle \Phi \rangle$  breaks the gauge group  $SU(3)$  to  $SU(2) \times U(1)_Y$ . Three possibilities are  $A : V_1 = V_2 \neq V_3; B : V_1 = V_3 \neq V_2; C : V_2 = V_3 \neq V_1$  and in each case either the equal pair or the single VEV can take the value  $v_1^{(q)}$ .

Fermion mass terms from the superpotential arise in the pattern  $\lambda \psi_I^J \psi_J^I (-(v_1^{(q)} + v_2^{(q)}) + (V_I + V_J)); I, J = 1..6$ . Clearly if  $V_I, V_J$  are distinct i.e.  $V_I + V_J = v_1^{(q)} + v_2^{(q)}$  the mass term

will vanish. In case A this can happen for 5 index pairs (1/2/3/4/5 paired with 6), Case B for 8 base rep index pairs (4/5 paired with 1/2/3/6) and in Case C for 9 (1/2/3 with 4/5/6). Thus these are the numbers of off-diagonal index pairs (out of the total of 15) which remain massless. Since we expect Dirac partners only for the 4 gauginos of the coset  $SU(3)/(SU(2) \times U(1)_Y)$ , pseudo Goldstone (PG) multiplets arise. The 4 coset gauginos transform as two doublets of  $SU(2)$  with  $Y = \pm 3$  and pair up with 2 doublet pairs from the above enumerated massless pairs of conjugate fields. The 6 diagonal pairs are of course always massive. For case A  $\psi_{\bar{\alpha}\beta}^{33}(\psi_{33}^{\bar{\alpha}\beta})$  teams up with  $\lambda_{\bar{3}}^{\bar{\alpha}}(\lambda_{\alpha}^3)$  respectively while  $\psi_{\bar{\alpha}\beta}^{33}$  (and  $\psi_{33}^{\bar{\alpha}\beta}$ ) remain massless. However we shall see that introduction of rank breaking fields gives these putative PG (PPG) multiplets a mass.

It is perhaps worth emphasising again that the basic calculations of  $v_i^{(q)}, W^{(q)}$  which define the effective SBGT of the perturbative GUT for any other GAM type model with a degree  $n + 1$  superpotential but different gauge group, different base representation and different choices of  $\{N_i\}$  are almost identical. It is only the group theoretic analysis of the breaking patterns produced by placement of the derived VEVs on the  $\Phi$  diagonals, and of course- should one ever actually dare to calculate them - the derivation of the input dynamical condensate,  $R_{0,1}$  etc., that differ in each particular case. For example consider a different GAM say  $r_G = 10_{SU(5)}$  and GAM  $\Phi \sim 10 \times \overline{10} = 1 + 24 + 75$ , with cubic superpotential. Then we only need to reanalyse the allowed placement patterns of  $v_{1,2}^{(q)}$  on the diagonal of  $\Phi$  and the resultant little groups while using the different values of  $N_1$  allowed by  $d(r) = 10$ . The expressions for the evaluation of the VEVs  $v_i^{(q)}$  suffer only trivial modifications. Thus rather than regarding the pure GAM case as a toy model for a GUT it should be seen as a common structural component for all ASGUTs based on GAMs.

### 3.2 Spontaneous Fractionation of the Gaugino condensate

The physical gaugino condensate defined by the UV condensed phase is G-invariant and thus cannot discriminate between different gauge equivalent gauginos. However in any given spontaneously broken phase a distinction between gauginos associated with the little group ( $H$ ) and coset ( $G/H$ ) generators is meaningful. The ur-gaugino condensates ( $R_{0,1}$  for a cubic GAM model) are physical G-singlet quantities that are backgrounds relevant for the computation of quantum VEVs in the spontaneously broken phases of the system in Regime II. We cannot compute them and thus they are input dimensionful parameters for the phases decided by the VEVs of the chiral supermultiplets. On the other hand the CDSW formalism computes contour integrals of the resolvents  $R(z), T(z)$  (that can be solved for in terms of the input parameters  $R_{0,1}, \lambda$  etc.) around the A-cycles of the Riemann surface defined by the quantum dynamics or, in more prosaic terms, around the branch cuts defined by the “quantum superpotential derivative” ( $y(z) = \sqrt{W'(z)^2 + f(z)}$  in the GAM case). In the IR strong models the coset ( $G/H$ ) gauginos decouple from the low energy physics and these integrals give the gaugino condensates  $\mathcal{S}_i$  corresponding to the different  $U(N_i) \in H$  factors.

*Now in the AS case the situation is radically different.* All the gauginos are still in play in the full spontaneously broken gauge theory of Regime II i.e. at and just below Grand Unified scales  $\sim M_X$ . However the SSB pattern coded in the  $\{N_i\}$  partition of  $d(r)$  assumed as dynamically invariant input implies that the integrals of the resolvent  $R(z)$  will now yield

the condensates of certain characteristic combinations of gaugino bilinears since the contour integral  $\oint_{A_i} dz Tr(T_r^A T_r^B (z - \Phi)^{-1})$  will give a non-zero result only for the  $i$ -th VEV/branch cut. This implies that only certain combinations of the gauginos will contribute to the integral computed using the solution for  $R(z)$ . The peculiar indirect manner in which the little group is specified by the placement of  $v_i^{(q)}$  on the diagonal of  $\langle \Phi \rangle$  determines the combinations. Thus for example in Case A where  $\Phi = Diag(V_1 \mathcal{I}_5, V_3)$  the relevant combinations are determined by the partial traces defined by including a projector on to the subspace corresponding to the cycle  $A_i$  :

$$\begin{aligned} W_\alpha^A W^{B\alpha} Tr T_{(r)}^A T_{(r)}^B Diag(\mathcal{I}_5, 0) &= \frac{5}{2} \vec{W}^2 + 2 \sum_{\bar{A}=4}^7 W_{\bar{A}}^2 + \frac{7}{6} W_8^2 \\ W_\alpha^A W^{B\alpha} Tr T_{(r)}^A T_{(r)}^B Diag(\emptyset_5, 1) &= 0 \vec{W}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\bar{A}=4}^7 W_{\bar{A}}^2 + \frac{4}{3} W_8^2 \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

The gaugino sub-condensate patterns are described by the values of the  $SU(2)$  triplet condensate  $\kappa \vec{W}^2$ ,  $SU(3)/(SU(2) \times U(1)_Y)$  coset condensate  $\kappa \sum_{\bar{A}=4}^7 W_{\bar{A}}^2$  and the hypercharge gaugino condensate  $\kappa W_8^2$ . The total of the coefficients of each gaugino squared is equal to  $S_2(6_{SU(3)}) = 5/2$  as expected, confirming that the division corresponds to a fractionation of the gauge singlet condensate following the SSB pattern of the phase in question. The computation of the trace can be easily carried out by setting up the  $6 \times 6$  generators of  $SU(3)$  in the 6-plet representation using the symmetric 6-plet generators obtained from the symmetrized tensor product:  $T^{(6)A}_{(ij)(kl)} = (1/2)(\delta_{lj} T^{(3)A}_{ik} + \delta_{kl} T^{(3)A}_{il})$ . These combinations are denoted compactly by giving the coefficients for each of these VEVs : In Case A (5/2,2,7/6) for  $V_1 = V_3$  and (0,1/2,4/3) for  $V_2$ . Case B : coefficients (2,5/4,7/3) for  $V_1 = V_3$  and (1/2,5/4,1/6) for  $V_2$  and in Case C (1/2,7/4,3/2) for  $V_2 = V_3$  and (2,3/4,1) for  $V_1$ .

### 3.3 Numerical investigation of semi-classicality

In Table 1 we give instances of the calculation of the vacuum expectation values for this model taking  $m = \mu = 0$ , for simplicity, for which  $\delta_{SC}$  defined in eqn(21) is indeed small and the semiclassical approximation  $R_1 \simeq \sum_j R_{0j} v_j$  is good. Note that the nonzero values of  $v_i^{(q)}$  obtained are in units of  $R_0^{1/3}$  and there are no nonzero VEVs at the classical level. It is convenient to rescale to dimensionless (hatted) variables in units of  $R_0^{1/3}$  thus :  $z = \hat{z} R_0^{1/3}$ ,  $f_0 = \hat{f}_0 R^{4/3}$  and so on. It is easy to find values of the free parameter  $(\lambda, \hat{R}_1)$  sets for which accurate semi-classicality(i.e.  $\delta_{SC} \ll 1$ ) can be attained. However a numerical calculation of the condensate values actually obtained in the strong coupling region is beyond our abilities at this stage.

## 4 Rank Reduction

### 4.1 $r$ based rank reduction

Since the elements of  $\Phi \sim r \otimes \bar{r}$  with VEVs are neutral w.r.t. all the Cartan subalgebra generators the gauge group rank cannot decrease due to symmetry breaking in any purely

$N_1$	$d(r)$	$\lambda$	$\hat{R}_1$	$\hat{t}_1$	$\hat{v}_1$	$\hat{v}_2$	$\hat{R}_0^{(1)}$	$\hat{R}_0^{(2)}$	$\delta_{SC}$
4	6	$-1.582 - .295i$	$.247 + .374i$	$-.0328 + .443i$	$-.220 + .630i$	$.424 - 1.038i$	$.772 - .192i$	$.228 + .192i$	0.000
4	6	$1.381 - .0680i$	$-1.001 + .487i$	$-1.322 + .241i$	$-.782$	$.904 + .135i$	$1.124 - .299i$	$-.124 + .299i$	.0009
2	6	0.4	$0.595 + 0.995i$	$-3.540 + 4.186i$	$0.201 + 2.72i$	$-.986 - .312i$	$0.566 - 0.293i$	$.434 + .293i$	.003
2	6	0.4	$0.595 - 1.005i$	$-3.489 - 4.169i$	$0.180 - 2.704i$	$-0.962 + 0.310i$	$0.566 + 0.299i$	$0.434 - 0.299i$	.002

Table 1: Illustrative values obtained by searching for values of  $\hat{R}_1$  that minimize  $\delta_{SC}$  given  $N_1, \lambda$  for the classically mass scale free model with  $d(r) = 6$  and symmetry breaking  $SU(3) \rightarrow SU(2) \times U(1)_Y$ . All dimensionful quantities are in units of  $R_0^{1/3} = 5^{1/3}\Lambda$  and the vacuum expectation values are due purely to quantum effects. The occurrence of such regions of parameter space supports the possibility of solutions where the quantum corrections driven by the gluino condensate are captured by the quantum VEVs in the sense that  $R_1 \simeq \sum R_0^{(j)} v_j$ .

AM type model. However GUT models (such as those based on  $SO(10)$ ) with rank  $\geq 5$  require rank reduction to break the gauge symmetry to the SM gauge group which has rank 4. In the Minimal  $SO(10)$  GUT [2, 3], just such a rank reduction is achieved by including a pair of conjugate representations  $(126, \overline{126})$  whose role is precisely to break  $SO(10) \rightarrow SU(5)$ . The authors of [14] have also provided [15, 16] an analysis for Adjoint-SYM with Flavours, i.e. super  $SU(N_c)$  YM with an adjoint as well as  $N_f$  pairs of Quark and anti-Quark chiral multiplets  $Q_f, \bar{Q}^f, f = 1 \dots N_f$ . Such models possess ‘‘Higgs vacua’’ with  $\langle Q_f \rangle, \langle \bar{Q}^f \rangle \neq 0, f = 1 \dots n$ , which imply rank reduction  $N_c - 1 \rightarrow N_c - n - 1$  which is unachievable with AM type fields alone.

Consider  $N_f = 1$  i.e. with a pair of complex representations  $Q, \bar{Q}$  transforming as  $r, \bar{r}$  added to GAM  $\Phi \sim r \times \bar{r}$ . For this simple extension the extra Chiral ring generators  $\bar{Q}\Phi^n Q, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  may all be solved for. On the other hand by defining an GAM type composite field  $\chi \equiv Q\bar{Q}$  and considering  $Tr \Pi_{n_i}(\chi \Phi^{n_i})$  as well as similar expressions with an insertion of  $W_\alpha W^\alpha$  it is clear that one can write down a much larger set of Chiral operators than we can easily solve for. The size of the Chiral ring increases rapidly with each new chiral multiplet introduced to the model and the GKA procedures do not permit solution for the full set of Chiral operator VEVs. Nevertheless we shall see that one can still extract the information required to define the effective perturbative SB GUT generated by dynamical symmetry breaking driven by gaugino condensation at the UV Landau pole.

We modify the superpotential while maintaining renormalizability by adding gauge invariant terms ( $\Delta W = W_Q = -\eta \bar{Q} \cdot \Phi \cdot Q$ ). We have omitted a Quark mass term by shifting  $\Phi$ . The model then admits semi-classical ‘‘Higgs vacua’’ in which parallel components of the complex multiplets  $Q, \bar{Q}$ , say  $Q_1, \bar{Q}_1$ , obtain VEVs (of equal magnitude to cancel the D term contributions) leading to a lowering of the rank of the little group by one :

$$\langle \Phi_{11} \rangle = z_1 = 0 \quad ; \quad \langle Q_1 \rangle = \sigma, \quad \langle \bar{Q}_1 \rangle = \bar{\sigma}$$



$$|\sigma| = |\bar{\sigma}| \quad ; \quad \sigma\bar{\sigma} = \frac{W'(0)}{\eta} \quad (29)$$

Since  $W_\alpha^A(T^A)_{ij}Q_j = W_\alpha^A(T^A)_{ij}\bar{Q}_i \simeq 0$  in the Chiral ring, the loop equation containing  $R^2(z)$  is unchanged from the pure AM case (eqns(7,10)) but the equation for  $T(z)$  is modified to :

$$(2R(z) - W'(z))T(z) + \eta S(z) - \frac{c(z)}{4} = 0$$

$$S(z) \equiv \bar{Q} \cdot \frac{1}{z - \Phi} \cdot Q \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{S_n}{z^{n+1}} \quad (30)$$

The GKA for  $\delta Q \equiv \frac{1}{z - \Phi} \cdot Q$  or  $\delta \bar{Q} \equiv \bar{Q} \cdot \frac{1}{z - \Phi}$  give

$$S(z) = \frac{-R(z) + \eta \bar{Q} \cdot Q}{\eta z} \quad (31)$$

Then if we impose

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_{z_1}} T(z) dz = 1 \quad (32)$$

we find

$$\bar{Q}_1 Q_1 = \frac{R(0)}{2\eta} = \frac{W'(0) + y(0)}{2\eta} \quad (33)$$

Which reverts to its classical value  $W'(0)/\eta$  as  $y(z) \rightarrow W'(z)$  i.e. in the absence of quantum effects a.k.a gluino condensate. The VEVs of  $Q, \bar{Q}$  lead to useful mass matrix contributions. For example for a SU(3) model based on the 6-plet (i.e  $\phi \sim 6 \otimes \bar{6}$ ) discussed above we take  $Q_6 = Q_{(33)} = \sigma, \bar{Q}_6 = \bar{Q}^{(33)} = \bar{\sigma}$ . These VEVs Dirac-pair  $Q_{(33)}, Q_{(\alpha 3)}$  with gauginos  $\lambda_3^3, \lambda_3^\alpha$  respectively. Moreover they modify the masses of the putative pseudo-Goldstone (PPG) multiplets. For example in case A where  $V_{(\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta})} = V_{\bar{\alpha}3} \neq V_{(33)}$ , the PPGs  $\Phi_{(\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta})}^{(33)}, \Phi_{(33)}^{(\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta})}$  Dirac-pair with  $\bar{Q}^{(\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta})}, Q_{(\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta})}$  and become massive.

We can define an effective cubic superpotential that works to reproduce the quantum VEVs along the same lines as in the pure adjoint case by modifying the parameters of the cubic superpotential so as to support a Higgs vacuum solution with  $\Phi_{11} = 0$  even in the quantum case but with:

$$\lambda^{(q)} = \lambda \quad ; \quad m^{(q)} = -2\lambda(v_+^{(q)} + v_-^{(q)})$$

$$\mu_{(q)}^2 = \lambda v_+^{(q)} v_-^{(q)} \quad ; \quad \eta^{(q)} = \frac{2\mu_{(q)}^2}{W'(0) + y(0)} \eta \quad (34)$$

which reproduces  $v_\pm^{(q)}$  as possible solutions for  $\Phi_{nn}, n \geq 2$  but also eqn(33) for  $\langle Q_1, \bar{Q}_1 \rangle$ .

## 4.2 $r \times r$ based rank reduction

Besides rank reduction based on complex representations  $\sim r, \bar{r}$ , one can also consider more complicated scenarios based upon pairs of symmetric representations  $\sim (r \times r)_s, (\bar{r} \times \bar{r})_s$

which prove useful in realistic scenarios(see the next section). Following and extending [17,22], we survey the solution of the resolvent system for this case. Introduce a pair of chiral supermultiplets  $\Sigma_{ij} = \Sigma_{ji}, \bar{\Sigma}_{ij} = \bar{\Sigma}_{ji}; i, j = 1 \dots d(r)$  transforming as  $(r \times r)_{\text{symm}}, (\bar{r} \times \bar{r})_{\text{symm}}$  and an additional superpotential

$$W_{\Sigma} = -\eta \bar{\Sigma}^{ij} \Phi_j^k \Sigma_{ki} \quad (35)$$

As in the  $Q\bar{Q}\Phi$  case there is a semiclassical Higgs vacuum where one conjugate component pair from  $\Sigma, \bar{\Sigma}$  (say  $(\Sigma_{MM}, \bar{\Sigma}^{MM})$ ) gets a VEV :

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{MM} &= \sigma \quad ; \quad \bar{\Sigma}^{MM} = \bar{\sigma} \quad ; \quad |\sigma| = |\bar{\sigma}| \\ \Phi_M^M &\equiv z_{\sigma} = 0 \quad ; \quad \sigma \bar{\sigma} = \frac{W'(0)}{\eta} \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

For example in the case of the SU(3) model based on the 6-plet  $S_{ij} = S_{ji}$ ,  $\Sigma, \bar{\Sigma}$  are  $6 \times 6$  symmetric matrices and we can break  $SU(3) \rightarrow SU(2)$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &= \text{Diag}(V_1, V_1, V_1, V_2, V_2, 0) \quad ; \quad V_i \in \{v_+^{(q)}, v_-^{(q)}\} \\ \Sigma &= \text{Diag}(0, 0, 0, 0, 0, \sigma) \quad ; \quad \bar{\Sigma} = \text{Diag}(0, 0, 0, 0, 0, \bar{\sigma}) \\ \underline{6} &= \{(11), (22), (12), (13), (23), (33)\} \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Since  $S_{(33)}$  is an SU(2) singlet but has  $Y = -4$  it is clear that the VEVs of  $\sigma, \bar{\sigma} \neq 0$  reduce the rank by 1. As in the case with  $d(r)$ -plet rank-breaker pairs  $\bar{Q}, Q$  the PPG spectrum becomes massive due to the rank breaking VEVs.

By considering a combination of the loop equations for GKA variations

$$\delta\Phi = \kappa W_{\alpha} W^{\alpha} (z \pm \Phi)^{-1} \quad ; \quad \delta\Sigma = 2\kappa W_{\alpha} (z - \Phi)^{-1} \cdot \Sigma \cdot (W^{\alpha} (z + \Phi)^{-1})^T \quad (38)$$

and using the Chiral ring constraints  $W^{\alpha j}_{(i} \Sigma_{k)j} = 0$  (and similarly for  $\bar{\Sigma}$ ) one derives [17] the loop equation (notation  $\bar{F}(z) \equiv F(-z)$ )

$$R(z)^2 + \bar{R}(z)^2 + R(z)\bar{R}(z) - W'(z)R(z) - \bar{W}'(z)\bar{R}(z) = r_1(z) \equiv \frac{f(z) + \bar{f}(z)}{4} \quad (39)$$

For a cubic superpotential  $r_1 = f_0/2 = -2\kappa \text{Tr}(\lambda \Phi + m)W_{\alpha}W^{\alpha}$ . Due to branch cuts in the  $z$  plane (that emerge further on) the resolvent function  $R(z)$  is *not* even in  $z$ . Introducing a new resolvent (the analogue was automatically zero in the previous case due to the Chiral ring constraint  $W_{\alpha} \cdot Q \simeq 0$ ) :

$$U(z) \equiv \kappa \bar{\Sigma} \cdot \frac{W_{\alpha} W^{\alpha}}{z - \Phi} \cdot \Sigma \quad (40)$$

we obtain a modified equation for  $R^2$  :

$$R^2 - W'(z)R = \frac{f(z)}{4} - \eta U(z) \quad (41)$$

and a similar equation for  $\bar{R}$ . One can then show [17, 22] that by substituting  $R(z) = \omega(z) + \omega_r(z), \bar{R}(z) = \omega(-z) + \omega_r(-z)$  ;  $\omega_r(z) \equiv (2W'(z) - \bar{W}'(z))/3$ , eqn(39) simplifies

to just  $\omega^2 + \bar{\omega}^2 + \omega\bar{\omega} = r(z) = r_0(z) + r_1(z)$ ;  $r_0 \equiv (W'^2 + \bar{W}'^2 + W'\bar{W}')/3$ . Then we obtain  $\omega = u_1(z), \bar{\omega} = u_3(z), -(\omega + \bar{\omega}) = u_2(z)$  where  $u_a, a = 1, 2, 3$  are solutions of a cubic equation of a special form

$$u^3(z) - r(z)u(z) - s(z) = \prod_{a=1}^{a=3} (u - u_a(z)) = 0 \quad (42)$$

Here  $s(z) = s_0(z) + s_1(z)$  and  $s_0, s_1$  are polynomials of degree  $3n, 2n - 2$  which can be explicitly calculated [17] given  $W(z)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} s_0(z) &= \omega_r \bar{\omega}_r (\omega_r + \bar{\omega}_r) = \frac{2}{27} (\lambda z^2 + \mu^2) ((\lambda z^2 + \mu^2)^2 - 9m^2 z^2) \\ s_1(z) &= 2\eta(m U_0 + \lambda U_1) + \frac{1}{4} (\omega_r \bar{f}(z) + \bar{\omega}_r f(z)) \\ &= 2\eta(m U_0 + \lambda U_1) - \frac{2}{3} (m R_0 (\mu^2 - 2\lambda z^2) + R_1 \lambda (\mu^2 + \lambda z^2)) \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Thus one finds

$$\omega(z) = e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{3}} \omega_+ + e^{+\frac{2\pi i}{3}} \frac{r(z)}{3\omega_+} \quad ; \quad \omega_+ = \left( \frac{s(z)}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{s^2}{4} - \frac{r(z)^3}{27}} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \quad (44)$$

In spite of the cube root, the Riemann surface branching structure for  $\omega(z), \bar{\omega}(z)$  is still two sheeted provided  $\omega_-(z) = \omega_+(-z) = \frac{r(z)}{3\omega_+}$ . The third root  $\omega(z) + \bar{\omega}(z)$  occupies an isolated ‘singleton sheet’. Since  $s(z), r(z)$  are even polynomials the condition on  $\omega_{\pm}$  can be satisfied provided  $\sqrt{\Delta} \equiv \sqrt{\frac{s^2}{4} - \frac{r^3}{27}}$  is an odd function. This can be ensured by imposing a constraint fixing a higher  $R_n$  coefficient in terms of a lower  $R_n$  coefficient. Writing  $\Delta(z) = z^2 Q(z^2) = z^2 P(z)$ , one finds that for non-zero  $m, \mu^2$  the polynomial  $P(z)$  defining the branch cuts and Riemann surface is quartic in  $z^2$  i.e. even and of degree 8 in  $z$  and has 4 square-root branch cuts defining a Riemann surface of genus 3. Contour integrals around these branch cuts play the same role as in the pure AM case. *Thus we expect 4 possible quantum VEVs* when the tree level superpotential is cubic, even though at tree level there are just two semi-classical VEVs  $v_{\pm} \neq 0$  besides the vanishing VEV of  $\Phi_{11}$ . This indicates that the effective superpotential in the general case with  $m, \mu^2 \neq 0$  will need to be quintic in  $\Phi$ .

Since the analysis becomes quite involved for the general case we here present the explicit solution of the resolvent system only for  $m = \mu^2 = 0$ . In some sense this solution is more interesting since it eliminates all explicit mass scales completely so that all masses arise purely by dimensional transmutation and the classical theory will be superconformal. Moreover, since  $\Delta(z)$  is sextic and  $P(z)$  is quartic, there are only two branch cuts and thus two quantum VEVs. A cubic quantum effective super-potential can still be defined as in the earlier cases studied.

We now trace the determination of resolvent coefficients  $\{U, R, T, S\}_n$  using the available GKA equations. Firstly the expansion of eqn(40) and then eqn(39) for large  $z$  determines  $U_n, R_{2n+3}, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  in terms of  $R_{2n}, R_1$ :

$$U_0 = \frac{\lambda R_2}{\eta} \quad ; \quad U_1 = -\frac{R_0^2}{2\eta}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
U_2 &= \frac{\lambda R_4 - 2R_0 R_1}{\eta} \quad ; \quad U_3 = \frac{R_1^2 - 2R_2 R_0}{2\eta} \\
R_3 &= \frac{R_0^2}{2\lambda} \quad ; \quad R_5 = \frac{(3R_1^2 + 2R_0 R_2)}{2\lambda} \dots
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

Next imposing  $\Delta(0) = 0$  fixes  $R_1$  and with  $\Delta(z) = z^2 P_4(z)$  we have ( $s_{1,2} = \pm 1$ )

$$\begin{aligned}
R_1 &= \left(-\frac{27}{32\lambda} R_0^4\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \\
P_4(z) &= -\frac{1}{432} R_0^2 \lambda^{\frac{8}{3}} (108(2R_0^4)^{\frac{1}{3}} + 9(2\lambda R_0)^{\frac{2}{3}} z^2 + 16z^4 \lambda^{\frac{4}{3}}) \\
&= -\frac{\lambda^4 R_0^2}{27} \prod_{s=\pm} (z - z^{(+s)})(z - z^{(-s)}) \quad ; \quad z^{(s_1, s_2)} = \frac{s_1}{4} \left(\frac{R_0}{\sqrt{2}\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \sqrt{-9 + s_2 15 i \sqrt{15}}
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

Thus the two branch cuts in this (degenerate) case run between  $z^{++}, z^{+-}$  and  $z^{-+}, z^{--}$ . We emphasize that the determination of  $R_1$  in terms of  $R_0$  is a novel consequence of adding  $\Sigma, \bar{\Sigma}$ . This simplifies the numerical analysis significantly since-after rescaling to dimensionless form- only the dimensionless coupling  $\lambda$  remains free. Contrast this with the pure AM case where  $R_1$  was to be dynamically determined.

Now we can also obtain all the even coefficients  $R_{2n}, n = 1, 2, \dots$  by expanding the cubic equation for  $\omega(z) = R(z) - \omega_r(z)$  for large  $z$ . This gives

$$R_2 = 9\left(\frac{R_0^5}{2^{13}\lambda^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \quad ; \quad R_4 = -\frac{1233}{512}\left(\frac{R_0^7}{4\lambda^4}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \quad ; \dots \tag{47}$$

Finally we define the pure rank-breaker resolvent  $S(z) \equiv \bar{\Sigma} \cdot (z - \Phi)^{-1} \cdot \Sigma$ . As in the  $\Phi Q \bar{Q}$  case one derives the system of GKA resolvents

$$\eta S(z) = \frac{c(z)}{4} + (W'(z) - 2R(z))T(z) \tag{48}$$

where  $f(z), c(z)$  are as before. Thus given  $T(z)$  one can derive  $S(z)$ . To find  $T(z)$  we use [17] the equation which is the analogue of eqn(39) derived using the same  $\Phi$  variations but with  $\kappa W_\alpha W^\alpha$  factors omitted :

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{c(z) + \bar{c}(z)}{4} &= (2R(z) - W'(z))T(z) + (2\bar{R}(z) - \bar{W}'(z))\bar{T}(z) \\
&\quad + (R(z)\bar{T}(z) + \bar{R}(z)T(z)) + 2\frac{\bar{R}(z) - R(z)}{z}
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

Motivated by the solution of the  $\bar{Q}Q\Phi$  case where the corresponding equation differs only by the absence, on the r.h.s., of the mixing (third) term and the factor of 2 in the fourth term and has solution  $T(z) = (2R - W'(z))^{-1}((R - \eta \bar{Q}Q)/z + c(z)/4)$  we propose

$$T(z) = \frac{1}{(2R - W'(z) + \bar{R})} \left( \frac{c(z)}{4} + \frac{2R(z)}{z} + \zeta(z) \right) \tag{50}$$

where  $\zeta(z)$  is to begin with an arbitrary *odd* function of  $z$ . However the behaviour of  $T(z)$  as  $z \rightarrow \infty$  allows only  $\zeta(z) = -\lambda T_2/z$ . Here  $c(z) = -4\lambda(T_1 + T_0 z)$ . By expanding eqn(50)

for large  $z$  we get  $T_{n>3}$ . If, following the pattern of the Higgs vacuum solution in the  $\bar{Q}Q\Phi$  case we demand that the residue of  $T(z)$  at  $z = 0$  be unity, corresponding to the rank breaking Higgs vacuum, we determine  $T_2$  :

$$T_2 = (-\frac{R_0^2}{2\lambda^2})^{\frac{1}{3}} \quad ; \quad T_3 = \frac{(T_0 - 2)R_0}{\lambda} \quad ; \quad T_4 = \frac{R_0 T_1}{\lambda} - 3(3T_0 - 2)(\frac{R_0^4}{32\lambda^4})^{\frac{1}{3}} \dots \quad (51)$$

Just as in the  $\bar{Q}Q\Phi$  case eqn(50) gives the correct  $T(z)$  in the semiclassical limit where  $R, \bar{R} \rightarrow 0$ . Of course the semi-classical limit is trivial in this massless case in the sense that all VEVs are then zero. The quantum superpotential derivative is now

$$y(z) \equiv W'(z) - 2R(z) - \bar{R}(z) = -(2e^{-\frac{2i\pi}{3}} + e^{\frac{2i\pi}{3}})\omega_+(z) - (2e^{\frac{2i\pi}{3}} + e^{-\frac{2i\pi}{3}})\omega_-(z) \quad (52)$$

Note that the square root branching structure of  $y$  is now hidden inside the expressions for  $\omega_{\pm}$  which contain  $\sqrt{P(z)}$ . Where  $P(z)$  is the quartic( $m = \mu = 0$ )/octic ( $m, \mu$  non-zero) polynomial which defines the branch cuts. The resolvent for  $S(z)$  is also determined via eqn(48) once  $R(z), T(z)$  are known so that the coefficients  $S_n$  of  $z^{-n-1}$  in the large  $z$  expansion can be read off. Thus we get

$$\begin{aligned} \eta S_0 &= \lambda T_2 = (-\frac{R_0^2 \lambda}{2})^{\frac{1}{3}} \quad ; \quad \eta S_1 = -R_0(T_0 + 2) \\ \eta S_2 &= R_0 T_1 - 3(T_0 - 2)(\frac{R_0^4}{32\lambda})^{\frac{1}{3}} \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

and so on. The residue of  $\eta S(z)$  at  $z = 0$  is  $(-4\lambda R_0^2)^{1/3}$ .

Since  $T_0 = d(r)$  we have only  $R_0, T_1$  left undetermined. The former is set by the gaugino condensation  $\mathcal{S} = \Lambda^3$ . The same argument as for the case with the Adjoint gives

$$T_1 = \frac{2\pi i N_1 - \oint dz (\lambda d(r)z + (\lambda T_2 - 2R(z))/z)y^{-1}}{\oint dz \lambda y^{-1}} \quad (54)$$

where  $y(z)$  was given explicitly above. Thus with input parameters  $\lambda, N_1$  ( $N_2 \equiv d(r) - N_1 - 1$ ) and using units of  $R_0^{\frac{1}{3}} \sim \Lambda$  for dimensionful quantities we can evaluate the quantum VEVs by performing the contour integrals numerically. Details will be given in a sequel.

Although we also defer detailed consideration of the case with  $m, \mu \neq 0$  to the sequel it is important to underline that it presents new features not observed in the degenerate case described above. One finds  $\sqrt{\Delta} = z\sqrt{Q_4(z^2)} = z\sqrt{P_8(z)}$  so that one has 4 rather than 2 branch cuts. This opens the possibility of cases where the quantum spontaneous symmetry breaking includes VEV patterns with no semi-classical antecedent. With cubic  $W(z)$  and thus two critical points, the contour integrals around the 4 branch cuts define 4 different VEVs : which may be placed at will on the diagonal of the quantum corrected VEV of  $\Phi$  giving a symmetry breaking pattern without a semi-classical analog. Thus the corresponding ‘‘perturbative effective quantum superpotential’’ will need to be quintic rather than cubic.

By solving the Loop equations we have determined most elements of the infinite sets of Chiral VEVs  $\{R_n, T_n, S_n, U_n\}$ . This is sufficient for the purpose of defining the effective perturbative SYMH theories with gauge symmetries broken by VEVs driven by gaugino condensation and dimensional transmutation. However, as remarked earlier for the case of Quark type additions, one can define a further vast set of Chiral invariants by defining  $\chi_i^j \equiv \Sigma_{ik} \bar{\Sigma}^{kj}$  and then considering  $Tr \Pi_{n_i, m_i} \chi^{n_i} \Phi^{m_i}$  as well as similar expressions with an insertion of  $W_\alpha W^\alpha$ . The determination of these VEVs is beyond the scope of this paper.

## 5 Realistic MSGUT type model

We next come full circle and consider our motivating problem: the gauge UV Landau pole in the successful MSGUT [3]. To illustrate how the AS dynamics permits novel realistic GUT scenarios with dimensional transmutation and dynamical symmetry breaking, we propose a realistic Spin(10) gauge model with 3 matter 16-plets and a Higgs structure generated by base representation  $r = 16$ . We take  $\Phi \sim 16 \times \overline{16} = 1 + 45 + 210$ ,  $\Sigma \sim 16 \times 16 = 10 + 120 + 126$ ,  $\overline{\Sigma} = \overline{16} \times \overline{16} = 10 + 120 + \overline{126}$ . Thus the sub-irreps present cover all the irreps used in MSGUT type models [2, 3]. As before we note that one may choose to work with just the irreps of the MSGUT, or some extended set thereof, by applying projectors to select only the irreps one wishes to keep. In the case at hand one specifies  $\Phi \sim 210$  by imposing  $Tr\Phi = TrT_{(16)}^A = 0$  and similarly on its variations when deriving the GKA relations. Similarly we can extract the 10, 120, 126-plet from  $(16 \times 16)_s$  and 10, 120,  $\overline{126}$ -plet from  $(\overline{16} \times \overline{16})_s$  using the Clifford algebra matrices for Spin(10) [23]. This implies a great increase in the number and types of resolvents that one must consider and the methods for handling them do not yet exist. Thus we stick with the full tensor product reps, specially since this entails no cost in terms of additional parameters.

The superpotential for the complete model as

$$W = \frac{m}{2} Tr\Phi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{3} Tr\Phi^3 + \mu^2 Tr\Phi - \eta \overline{\Sigma} \cdot \Phi \cdot \Sigma + h_{AB} \Psi_A \cdot \overline{\Sigma} \cdot \Psi_B + h'_{AB} \Psi_A \cdot \Sigma \cdot \Psi_B \quad (55)$$

where  $\Psi_A$ ,  $A = 1, 2, 3$  are the three matter 16-plets and it is understood that in the last term only the real 10-plet and 120-plet parts of the tensor product will be present since there is no invariant between two matter 16-plets ( $\Psi_A$ ) and a 126-plet. Notice the remarkable economy of AM type couplings. We recall our proposal [24] to further reduce the number of matter Yukawa couplings by making  $\Sigma, \overline{\Sigma}$  carry the generation indices. The analysis of the SSB associated with the first line of eqn(55) closely follows the method for GAM in Section 2 and symmetric tensor product based rank reduction in Section 4 and the case with  $m = \mu = 0$  is equally interesting for the realistic MSGUT type model. The common skeleton of the EV extraction process has already been described. Thus we need to indicate only the group theoretic features particular to the determination of possible little groups for this model.

The Yukawa coupling of  $\Sigma, \overline{\Sigma}$  in the second line of eqn(55) presents distinct new features. 16-plet VEVs break SM symmetry except for right handed sneutrino VEVs and those still violate R-parity destroying one of the most signal and phenomenologically desirable features of MSGUTs [3]. Thus we shall assume that the matter 16-plets have no VEVs. However the Konishi anomaly will also force the development of large purely quantum trilinear condensates involving  $\Psi_A \cdot \overline{\Sigma} \cdot \Psi_B, \Psi_A \cdot \Sigma \cdot \Psi_B$ , even assuming the solution has no 16-plet VEVs. The theoretical and phenomenological implications of such condensates are not clear to us.

Moreover the presence of 16-plets further expands the already vast set of Chiral invariants that can be formed from  $\Phi, \Sigma, \overline{\Sigma}$  by forming composite 10, 120 and 126-plets from bilinears of spinors and then contracting powers of these with powers of  $\Phi, \Sigma, \overline{\Sigma}, \Sigma \cdot \overline{\Sigma}$  and so on. We will not attempt to enumerate these new invariants and only note that, for our immediate purpose of characterising dynamical GUT breaking VEVs, the solution for the

VEVs of the full chiral Ring is not required. Thus the complexity of the full Chiral Ring is *not* an obstruction to working with this model.

For analysing the  $SO(10)$  VEVs decompositions w.r.t. the maximal sub-group  $G_{PS} \in SO(10)$  are explicitly available in [23] and prove very useful. We use the conventions and results of [23] to explicitly calculate the decomposition of  $Spin(10)$  invariants. Here  $\mu = \bar{\mu}, 4; \bar{\mu} = 1, 2, 3$  refer to the  $SU(4)$  indices of the Pati-Salam maximal subgroup  $G_{422} = SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \subset SO(10)$ . Barred mid-Greek indices ( $\bar{\mu}$  etc.) are colour indices. The fundamental doublet indices of  $SU(2)_L(SU(2)_R)$  are referred to as  $\alpha, \beta(\dot{\alpha}, \dot{\beta}) = 1, 2(\dot{1}, \dot{2})$ . It is convenient to order the elements of the 16-plet according to their SM quantum numbers (denoted compactly by the relevant MSSM left-chiral fermion symbol) as

$$\begin{aligned} 16 = & \psi_{\mu, \alpha}(4, 2, 1) \oplus \psi_{\dot{\alpha}}^{\mu}(\bar{4}, 1, 2) = \{\nu^c[1, 1, -1/2, 1](4^*, \dot{2}), e^c[1, 1, 1/2, 1](4^*, \dot{1}), \\ & u^c[\bar{3}, 1, -1/2, -\frac{1}{3}](\bar{\mu}^*, \dot{2}), d^c[\bar{3}, 1, 1/2, -\frac{1}{3}](\bar{\mu}^*, \dot{1})\}_L \\ & \oplus \{L[1, 2, 0, -1](4, \alpha), Q[3, 1, 0, \frac{1}{3}](\bar{\mu}, \alpha)\}_L \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where we have also given the dimensions/quantum numbers w.r.t  $[SU(3), SU(2)_L, T_{3R}, B-L]$  and the  $G_{422}$  indices of each left-chiral matter field. Apart from matter 16-plet VEVs, which must vanish in viable vacua, the VEV patterns which can develop will follow the earlier discussion in Sections 2. and 4 of the generic form of VEV generation for  $\Phi, \Sigma, \bar{\Sigma}$ . The features particular to the model in hand are just group theoretic tracing of the pattern of SSB given the quantum VEVs that can result from the cubic superpotential. As already noted, in the massless case, there are only two non-zero VEVs even when  $\Sigma, \bar{\Sigma}$  are present. The labelling of the diagonal elements of  $\Phi = 16 \times \bar{16}$  that follows from eqn(57) above is :

$$\Phi = \text{Diag}(V_{4^*2} = V_1, V_{4^*1} = V_2, V_{\bar{\mu}^*2} = V_3 \mathcal{I}_3, V_{\bar{\mu}^*1} = V_4 \mathcal{I}_3, V_{4\alpha} = V_5 \mathcal{I}_2, V_{\bar{\mu}\alpha} = V_6 \mathcal{I}_6) \quad (57)$$

with  $\Phi_{11} \equiv \Phi_{\nu^c \nu^{c*}} = V_1 = 0$  as per the 16-plet labels introduced above. Then the rank breaking VEVs will be  $\Sigma = \text{Diag}(\sigma, \emptyset_{15})$  i.e.  $\Sigma_{4^*2, 4^*2} = \sigma$ ,  $\bar{\Sigma} = \text{Diag}(\bar{\sigma}, \emptyset_{15})$ , i.e.  $\bar{\Sigma}_{\bar{4}2^*, \bar{4}2^*} = \bar{\sigma}$ , all other component VEVs zero. If we insist on a cubic tree level superpotential for  $\Phi$  and set also  $m = \mu = 0$  then in addition to the vanishing singleton VEV in the rank breaking ( $\Phi_{\nu^c}^{\nu^c} = \Phi_{\nu^c \nu^{c*}}$ ) sector we will have only two possible VEVs emerging from the pair of branch cuts that develop. This case will be the easiest to analyse. Moreover the quantum superpotential  $W^{(q)}$  can then also be chosen to be just cubic.

The symmetry breaking patterns corresponding to the various VEV distribution possibilities can be easily worked out. The easiest way of identifying the unbroken symmetry is to look at the gaugino masses that arise for a given distribution of  $v_{\pm}^{(q)}$  over the 5 VEVs  $V_{2-6}$  with  $V_1 = 0, \sigma, \bar{\sigma} \neq 0$  fixed by the Higgs vacuum structure necessary to reduce the gauge group rank from 5 to 4 without breaking the Standard Model. Firstly it is clear that the nonzero VEVs  $\sigma, \bar{\sigma}$  break  $SO(10) \rightarrow SU(5)$  since 16 decomposes as  $16 = 10_1(u^c, e^c, Q_L) + \bar{5}_{-3}(d^c, L_L) + 1_5(\nu^c)$  w.r.t.  $SU(5) \times U(1)_X, X = 3(B-L) - 4T_{3R}$ . Thus the VEVs of  $\Sigma, \bar{\Sigma}$  give masses to the 21 gauginos of the coset  $SO(10)/SU(5)$  ( $\lambda_{\bar{\kappa}}^4, \lambda_4^4, \lambda_{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}}, \lambda_{\bar{\kappa}4\dot{1}}^{\alpha}, \lambda_2^{\bar{\kappa}4\alpha}$  are 22 independent fields but  $\lambda_Y(Y \equiv 2T_{3R} + B - L)$  remains massless). The remaining 12 coset gauginos of  $SU(5)/G_{321}$  obtain masses unless  $V_2 = V_3 = V_6$  and  $V_4 = V_5$ . The logic of these conditions is transparent once we note that

$16 \times \overline{16} = 1 + 45 + 210$  and 45 and 210 each contain  $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$  singlets corresponding to the diagonal terms of the product  $\bar{5}(-3) \times 5(3) = 1(0) + \dots$  in the 45-plet getting equal VEVs ( $V_4 = V_5$ ) and the diagonal terms of product  $10(1) \times \overline{10}(-1) = 1(0) + \dots$  in the 210-plet getting equal VEVs  $V_2 = V_3 = V_6$ . Thus *any* distribution of the quantum VEVs  $v_{\pm}^{(q)}$  over the last 5 ( $\Phi_{11} = \Phi_{\nu^c \nu^c *} = 0$  for the Higgs vacuum solution we are focussed on here) diagonal blocks of  $\Phi$  that violates these equalities will break  $SO(10) \rightarrow G_{123}$ . For instance  $\Phi = \text{Diag}(0, v_+^{(q)} \mathcal{I}_4, v_-^{(q)} \mathcal{I}_{11})$  has  $V_2 - V_6, V_3 - V_6$  both non zero while  $\Phi = \text{Diag}(0, v_+^{(q)}, v_-^{(q)} \mathcal{I}_{14})$  has  $V_3 - V_6 = 0$  but  $V_2 - V_6 \neq 0$ . Thus *both* break to the same SM little group even though the mass patterns are dissimilar.

The mass spectrum is straightforward to evaluate given the contractions ( $A_{\mu\nu\alpha\dot{\beta}}$  is the (6,2,2) of  $G_{422}$  and  $A_{\alpha\dot{\beta}}^{\mu\nu}$  is its  $SU(4)$  dual) [23]

$$\begin{aligned} 16 \cdot 16^* &= 16_{\mu\alpha}(16^*)_{\mu^*\alpha^*} + 16_{\mu^*\dot{\alpha}}(16^*)_{\mu\dot{\alpha}^*} \\ 16(\psi) \cdot 16^*(\phi^*) \cdot 45(A) &= 2A_{\kappa}^{\mu}(\psi_{\mu\beta}\phi_{\kappa^*\beta^*}^* + \psi_{\dot{\beta}}^{\kappa}\phi_{\mu\dot{\beta}^*}^*) - \sqrt{2}A_{\dot{\gamma}}^{\dot{\alpha}}\psi_{\dot{\alpha}}^{\mu}\phi_{\mu\dot{\gamma}^*}^* \\ &+ \sqrt{2}A_{\gamma}^{\alpha}\psi_{\mu\alpha}\phi_{\mu^*\gamma^*}^* - A_{\dot{\beta}}^{\mu\nu\alpha}\psi_{\mu\alpha}\phi_{\nu\dot{\beta}^*}^* + A_{\mu\nu\beta}^{\dot{\alpha}}\psi_{\dot{\alpha}}^{\mu}\phi_{\nu^*\beta^*}^* \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

which can be easily deduced from equations (116)(117) of [23] provided we consistently identify

$$\overline{16}_{\alpha}^{\mu} = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta} 16_{\mu^*\beta^*}^* \quad ; \quad \overline{16}_{\mu\dot{\alpha}} = -\epsilon_{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}} 16_{\mu\dot{\beta}^*}^* \quad (59)$$

The analysis is straightforward and similar to the adjoint ( $r = N$ ) of  $SU(N)$  together with symmetric representations  $((N \times N)_s, (\bar{N} \times \bar{N})_s)$  except for the crucial fact that the base representation 16-plet is *not* the fundamental of  $\text{Spin}(10)$ . The evaluation of the resolvents  $R(z), T(z), S(z), U(z)$  and quantum VEVs proceeds along the lines discussed above leading again to spontaneous breaking  $SO(10) \rightarrow G_{321}$  via dimensional transmutation. Details will be given in the sequel. We note that the general features of the model are similar to the MSGUT except for the extreme economy with regard to superpotential parameters since the cubic potential for  $\Phi$  has just 3 (if  $m \neq 0$ ) complex parameters and just one in the massless case. Since the matter Yukawa couplings  $h_{AB}, h'_{AB}$  include couplings of pairs of 16-plets to both 10,  $\overline{126}$ -plets (symmetric Yukawas) and to 120-plets (antisymmetric Yukawas) they are general  $3 \times 3$  complex matrices and thus have ample scope for fitting the observed matter fermion mass parameters and mixings. Note again the new feature, not present in the MSGUT, that  $\Sigma \sim 16 \times 16 = 10 + 126 + 120$  and it is possible to couple the 10, 120-plets generated in this way to the matter 16 bilinear although  $16 \cdot 16 \cdot 126 \equiv 0$  as before.

## 6 Discussion

Using Generalized Konishi Anomaly relations obeyed by gluino and scalar condensates in supersymmetric vacua we have shown that *asymptotically strong* Supersymmetric Yang Mills Higgs theories with matrix type Higgs multiplets transforming as general matrix type base  $r$  tensors of  $G$  provide a calculable implementation of spontaneous symmetry breaking of the gauge group, including rank reduction, via dimensional transmutation. This breaking is driven by the formation of gaugino condensates in the microscopic/high energy coupled phase : which therefore forms an ineluctable background at all larger length scales. As



such they provide a robust and novel method of making sense of AS SuSy GUT models and justify the surmise that the UV strong gauge coupling exhibited by phenomenologically successful and minimal models such as the MSGUT is a signal of nontrivial UV behaviour that makes the theory consistent and yields a sensible low energy limit. This demonstration calls for deep revision of our notions of the relation between strong coupling behaviour in the microscopic theory and a phenomenologically acceptable low energy effective theory.

For any given YM gauge group  $G$ , the number of asymptotically free models is strictly limited, whereas we have shown that the number of asymptotically strong models with sensible low energy limits is essentially unlimited. Thus our approach points the way to a vast expansion of admissible microscopic theories beyond the narrow set of currently canonical AF type models. The signal successes of QCD and the amiable ease of analysis of AF models have led, over the half century since their discovery and dominance, to the hardening of a Dogma that sees AF as the necessary condition for a field theory to be physically sensible and relevant as a fundamental microscopic theory. On the other hand we continue, especially in Condensed matter Physics, to be challenged by the need to tackle quantum systems that are strongly correlated or massively entangled at the microscopic level. The success of the AdS-CFT [26] conjecture, and the Seiberg-Witten analysis [25] of monopole condensation leading to confinement in  $N = 2$  supersymmetric YMH theories, has provided fruitful working paradigms in manifold non-supersymmetric strongly coupled contexts. This suggests that even our analysis which is rooted in supersymmetry may, in the long run, motivate a more broad minded view of the way in which microscopic condensation due to strong coupling can generate sensible low energy behaviour. After all, the strong coupling dynamics underlying satisfaction of the “kinematic” GKA constraints must enforce the development of VEVs driven by the physical G-invariant gaugino condensate present at all scales. This phenomenon may well persist even when one moves off the supersymmetric point in coupling space, and even, perhaps, for “small” structural differences w.r.t the fields present. These matters require the development of Lattice methods applicable to AS theories for their definitive resolution. The recent development of Lattice methods [27] applicable to supersymmetric gauge theories encourages us to hope that such methods will be developed. Workers on the lattice will then have a plethora of AS toy models to choose from. For example even the behaviour of our original  $SU(2)$  model with a 5-plet of  $SU(2)$  (projected out of the  $SU(2)$  GAM with  $r = 3$ ), which is AS, awaits investigation.

The knowledgeable reader will inquire about the operation of Seiberg duality [7] in realistic AS models as also the relation to the “Asymptotic safety” program which has attracted much attention lately [28, 29]. In [30] Seiberg duals to AF  $SO(10)$  models with several vectors and spinors were found but extensions to more general representations arising from tensor products of several vectors/spinors have remained elusive. As in Seiberg duality for models in the conformal window [7], also in the Asymptotic Safety program a non-Gaussian fixed point in the UV flow of AF of YMH models is required. Recently the possibility of conformal fixed points in AS  $SO(10)$  models such as MSGUT type models was also considered using the so called ‘a-theorem and c-theorem’ constraints [31]. However these attempts did not meet any success in finding phenomenologically viable or plausible cases. We [20] had earlier shown that RG fixed points associated with perturbative gauge beta function zeros or even Ross-Pendleton type fixed points (in the evolution of ratios of couplings) do not exist in MSGUT type models because of the huge positive beta functions at one loop. Even in the absence of non-Gaussian fixed points one may still hope that

AF ‘magnetic’ Seiberg duals to ‘electric’ AS MSGUT type models might exist. Such an AF dual might well exhibit a superconformal fixed point in its IR evolution. However, as mentioned, there has been little progress in finding duals of  $SO(N)$  models with matter in non-fundamental and non-spinor representations so far.

We have emphasised that in SuSy GUTs, in sharp contrast to say SQCD, the smallness of the ratio of the SuSy breaking scale  $M_S$  to the GUT scale  $M_X$  implies that Supersymmetry may be assumed to be essentially exact at the scales where the theory becomes strongly coupled. Nevertheless it is clear that the issue of supersymmetry breaking must be tackled for such AS GUT models to make contact with reality. The soft supersymmetry breaking terms typically invoked in the MSSM and SuSy GUTs, can be introduced by spurion Chiral supermultiplets that take fixed values thus breaking supersymmetry ( $S_D = \theta^2 \bar{\theta}^2 m_{\tilde{f}}^2, S_M = \theta^2 M_{\tilde{g}}, S_F = \theta^2 A$  etc. ) and coupling these spurions to Chiral multiplets and Gauge Chiral Field strength appropriately ( $[S_D \Phi^\dagger \Phi]_D, [S_M W_\alpha W^\alpha]_F, [S_A W(\Phi)]_F$  etc.) yielding SuSy breaking soft terms for the propagating fields. Since the Konishi anomaly relations involve the lowest components of Chiral multiplets the new terms should not affect the GKA relations directly. After carrying out the GUT SSB using the quantum VEVs computed by using the CDSW formalism and thus achieving robust dimensional transmutation we define a consistent “quantum superpotential”  $W^{(q)}$  which encodes the quantum VEVs. Using the heavy-light spectrum evaluated therefrom we can define an effective low energy supersymmetric model (with exotic operators), add in the RG run down small SuSy breaking terms for light fields, and proceed as usual to study electroweak breaking and low energy phenomenology.

A related issue is the effect of coupling SYMH to gravity. Coupling a hidden sector with SuSy breaking to the observable sector via gravity, i.e. by considering  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  SuperGravity(SuGry) with YMH, was the earliest (and still most attractive) method of introducing phenomenologically mandatory superpartner mass splitting and SuSy breaking trilinear scalar interactions [32]. Gaugino masses then arise at two loops from the scalar masses and trilinear couplings even with a standard SYM gauge kinetic function [33]. On the other hand, in a *fermionic* background provided by a non-vanishing Gravitino Field strength (the lowest member of the so called  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  Weyl multiplet  $G_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$  ) the Chiral ring is modified and the factorization of correlators receives [34] corrections of  $O(G^2)$ . However such backgrounds are hardly of any phenomenological interest from the point of view of GUTs since they can presumably be significant only in regions of Planck density. On the other hand, with the quantum corrected superpotential  $W^{(q)}$  we may proceed in the standard way by embedding in  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  SuGry and deriving soft SuSy breaking terms as usual by adding say a Polonyi SuSy breaking superpotential using a singlet scalar field. No modification of the GKA analysis is called for in such a hybrid approach.

One novel and mysterious implication of the GKA relations is that even the superpotential terms containing matter chiral multiplets(along with Higgs multiplets) must participate at least in trilinear condensates with superheavy values, even though VEVs for the smatter fields are phenomenologically unacceptable. The phenomenological implications of such three point correlators are not clear to us. Perhaps such novel quantum background contaminations of the perturbative theory will eventually yield novel signals of the dynamical symmetry breaking origin of GUT spontaneous symmetry breaking.

**Acknowledgment :** It is a pleasure to thank P.Ramadevi, T.Enkhbat, K.S. Narain, A. Joseph, K.P. Yogendran and especially B. Bajc for discussions, and P. Guptasarma for encouragement. The support of the ICTP, Trieste Senior Associates program through an award during 2013-2019 and the hospitality of the ICTP High Energy Group, and in particular G. Senjanovic, both when this idea was first conceived in 2002 and during the summer of 2019, is gratefully acknowledged.

## References

- [1] E. Witten, *Mass Hierarchies in Supersymmetric Theories*, Phys. Lett. **105B** (1981) 267.
- [2] C. S. Aulakh and R. N. Mohapatra, *Implications of Supersymmetric  $SO(10)$  Grand Unification*, CCNY-HEP-82-4 April 1982, CCNY-HEP-82-4-REV, Jun 1982, Phys. Rev. D **28**, 217 (1983) ; T. E. Clark, T. K. Kuo and N. Nakagawa, *A  $SO(10)$  Supersymmetric Grand Unified Theory*, Phys. Lett. B **115**, 26 (1982)
- [3] C. S. Aulakh, B. Bajc, A. Melfo, G. Senjanovic and F. Vissani, *The Minimal supersymmetric grand unified theory*, Phys. Lett. B **588** (2004) 196 [hep-ph/0306242] ; C. S. Aulakh and A. Girdhar,  *$SO(10)$  MSGUT: Spectra, couplings and threshold effects*, Nucl. Phys. B **711** (2005) 275 [hep-ph/0405074]; B. Bajc, A. Melfo, G. Senjanovic and F. Vissani, *The Minimal supersymmetric grand unified theory. 1. Symmetry breaking and the particle spectrum*, Phys. Rev. D **70** (2004) 035007 [hep-ph/0402122].
- [4] C. S. Aulakh, *Truly minimal unification: Asymptotically strong panacea?*, hep-ph/0207150.
- [5] C. S. Aulakh, *Taming asymptotic strength*, hep-ph/0210337.
- [6] N. Seiberg, *Naturalness versus supersymmetric nonrenormalization theorems*, Phys. Lett. B **318**, 469 (1993) [hep-ph/9309335]; N. Seiberg, *Exact results on the space of vacua of four-dimensional SUSY gauge theories*, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 6857 (1994) [hep-th/9402044]; See K. A. Intriligator and N. Seiberg, *Lectures on Supersymmetry Breaking*, Class. Quant. Grav. **24** (2007) S741 [Les Houches **87** (2008) 125] [hep-ph/0702069] for a review and references.
- [7] N. Seiberg, *Electric -magnetic duality in supersymmetric non-Abelian gauge theories*, Nucl. Phys. B **435**, 129 (1995) [hep-th/9411149].
- [8] S. Dimopoulos and H. Georgi, *Softly Broken Supersymmetry and  $SU(5)$* , Nucl. Phys. B **193** (1981) 150.
- [9] G. Veneziano and S. Yankielowicz, *An Effective Lagrangian for the Pure  $N=1$  Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theory*, Phys. Lett. **113B** (1982) 231.
- [10] F. Buccella, J. Derendinger, S. Ferrara and C. A. Savoy, *Patterns of Symmetry Breaking in Supersymmetric Gauge Theories*, Phys. Lett. B **115** (1982), 375-379.

- [11] I. Affleck, M. Dine and N. Seiberg, *Dynamical Supersymmetry Breaking in Supersymmetric QCD*, Nucl. Phys. B **241** (1984), 493-534
- [12] M. A. Luty and W. Taylor, *Varieties of vacua in classical supersymmetric gauge theories*, Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 3399, [hep-th/9506098].
- [13] K. i. Konishi and K. i. Shizuya, *Functional Integral Approach to Chiral Anomalies in Supersymmetric Gauge Theories*, Nuovo Cim. A **90** (1985) 111.
- [14] F. Cachazo, M. R. Douglas, N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *Chiral rings and anomalies in supersymmetric gauge theory*, JHEP **0212** (2002) 071 [hep-th/0211170].
- [15] N. Seiberg, *Adding fundamental matter to Chiral rings and anomalies in supersymmetric gauge theory*, JHEP **0301** (2003) 061 [hep-th/0212225] ;
- [16] F. Cachazo, N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *Chiral rings and phases of supersymmetric gauge theories*, JHEP **0304** (2003) 018 [hep-th/0303207].
- [17] S. G. Naculich, H. J. Schnitzer and N. Wyllard, *Cubic curves from matrix models and generalized Konishi anomalies*, JHEP **0308** (2003) 021 [hep-th/0303268].
- [18] A. Brandhuber, H. Ita, H. Nieder, Y. Oz and C. Romelsberger, *Chiral rings, superpotentials and the vacuum structure of  $N=1$  supersymmetric gauge theories*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **7** (2003) no.2, 269 [hep-th/0303001].
- [19] S. R. Coleman and E. J. Weinberg, *Radiative Corrections as the Origin of Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking*, Phys. Rev. D **7** (1973) 1888.
- [20] C. S. Aulakh, I. Garg and C. K. Khosa, *New minimal supersymmetric GUT emergence and sub-Planckian renormalization group flow*, Phys. Rev. D **98** (2018) no.7, 075006 [arXiv:1509.00422 [hep-ph]].
- [21] F. Cachazo, N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *Phases of  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  supersymmetric gauge theories* JHEP **02** (2003) 042.
- [22] B. Eynard and J. Zinn-Justin, *The  $O(n)$  model on a random surface: Critical points and large order behavior*, Nucl. Phys. B **386** (1992) 558 [hep-th/9204082].
- [23] C. S. Aulakh and A. Girdhar,  *$SO(10)$  a la Pati-Salam*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **20** (2005) 865 [hep-ph/0204097].
- [24] C. S. Aulakh and C. K. Khosa, *Grand Yukawonification :  $SO(10)$  grand unified theories with dynamical Yukawa couplings*, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 045008 (2014) [arXiv:1308.5665 [hep-ph]];
- [25] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *Electric-magnetic duality, monopole condensation, and confinement in  $N=2$  supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory*, Nucl. Phys. B **426** (1994) 19  
Erratum: [Nucl. Phys. B **430** (1994) 485]
- [26] J. M. Maldacena, *The Large  $N$  limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity*, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **38** (1999) 1113 [Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2** (1998) 231]

- [27] The following reviews cover these advances : S. Catterall, D. B. Kaplan and M. Unsal, *Exact lattice supersymmetry* Phys. Rept. **484**, 71-130 (2009), [arXiv:0903.4881 [hep-lat]]; A. Joseph, *Supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories with exact supersymmetry on the lattice*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **26**, 5057-5132 (2011), [arXiv:1110.5983 [hep-lat]]; A. Joseph, *Review of Lattice Supersymmetry and Gauge-Gravity Duality*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **30**, no.27, 1530054 (2015), [arXiv:1509.01440 [hep-th]]; G. Bergner and S. Catterall, *Supersymmetry on the lattice*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **31**, no.22, 1643005 (2016) [arXiv:1603.04478 [hep-lat]].
- [28] D. F. Litim and F. Sannino, *Asymptotic safety guaranteed*, JHEP **12** (2014), 178 [arXiv:1406.2337 [hep-th]].
- [29] K. Intriligator and F. Sannino, *Supersymmetric asymptotic safety is not guaranteed*, JHEP **11** (2015), 023, [arXiv:1508.07411 [hep-th]].
- [30] M. Berkooz, P. L. Cho, P. Kraus and M. J. Strassler, *Dual descriptions of  $SO(10)$  SUSY gauge theories with arbitrary numbers of spinors and vectors*, Phys. Rev. D **56** (1997), 7166-7182, [arXiv:hep-th/9705003 [hep-th]].
- [31] B. Bajc and F. Sannino, *Asymptotically Safe Grand Unification*, JHEP **12** (2016), 141, [arXiv:1610.09681 [hep-th]].
- [32] E. Cremmer , S. Ferrara , L. Girardello , Antoine Van Proeyen, *Yang-Mills Theories with Local Supersymmetry: Lagrangian, Transformation Laws and SuperHiggs Effect*, Nucl.Phys.B 212 (1983) 413; Nobuyoshi Ohta, *Grand Unified Theories based on Local Supersymmetry*, Prog.Theor.Phys. 70 (1983) 542; Ali H. Chamseddine, Richard L. Arnowitt, Pran Nath, *Locally Supersymmetric Grand Unification*, Phys.Rev.Lett. 49 (1982) 970; Steven Weinberg, *Does Gravitation Resolve the Ambiguity Among Supersymmetry Vacua?*, Phys.Rev.Lett. 48 (1982) 1776-1779 Lawrence J. Hall , Joseph D. Lykken , Steven Weinberg , *Supergravity as the Messenger of Supersymmetry Breaking*, Phys.Rev.D 27 (1983) 2359-2378.
- [33] C. Aulakh and R. N. Mohapatra, *Supersymmetry and the Calculation of Neutrino Masses*, Phys. Lett. B **121** (1983), 147-150.
- [34] R. Dijkgraaf and C. Vafa, *A Perturbative window into nonperturbative physics*, [arXiv:hep-th/0208048 [hep-th]]; H. Ooguri and C. Vafa, *The  $C$  deformation of Gluino and nonplanar diagrams*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **7** (2003) no.1, 53-85 [arXiv:hep-th/0302109 [hep-th]]; J. R. David, E. Gava and K. Narain, *Konishi anomaly approach to gravitational  $F$  terms*, JHEP **09** (2003), 043 [arXiv:hep-th/0304227 [hep-th]].