Lattice simulations of the strange quark mass and Fritzsch texture

Biswajoy Brahm achari

Physics Department, Indiana University, Bloom ington IN-47405, USA

Abstract

A number of numerical simulations of lattice gauge theory have indicated a low mass of strange quark in 100 MeV range at the scale of = 2 GeV. In the unquenched case, which is improved over the simulation in the quenched approximation by the inclusion of u and d sea quark elects, one sees a further downward trend. Here the ferm ion mass spectrum of the Fritzsch texture is recalculated. In a single step supersymmetric GUT with M_X 10^{16} GeV such values of the strange quark mass can be obtained for low values of tan . Experimental numbers m^{pole}_t = 173 6 GeV and 4:1 < m_b(m_b) < 4:4 GeV are used in this study. Since the scenario is supersymmetric, gaugino loop diagram s contribute to the masses in addition to usual tree level Yukawa contributions. Upper bound of the mixing parameter V_{cb} is taken at 0.045

The strange quark mass has been traditionally calculated using the current algebra mass ratio [1]

$$\frac{m_{s}}{m_{u} + m_{d}} = 12.6 \quad 0.5$$
(1)

Equation (1) is evaluated using values of $(m_u + m_d)$ which are reported in calculations of QCD nite energy sum-rules (FESR). At the two-loop level of perturbative QCD calculations which include non-perturbative corrections up to dimension six one has the result[2]

$$(m_u + m_d)(1 \text{ GeV}) = 15.5 2.0 \text{ MeV}$$
 (2)

For $_{s}$ (m $_{Z}$) = 0:118 results of (1) and (2) together lead to

$$m_s (1 \text{ GeV}) = 195 \quad 28 \text{ MeV} \text{ or } m_s (2 \text{ GeV}) = 150 \quad 21 \text{ MeV}$$
: (3)

The ratio

$$m_{s}(2 \text{ GeV}) = m_{s}(1 \text{ GeV}) = 0.769 \text{ for } m_{z}) = 0.118$$
 (4)

can be obtained by solving renorm alization group equations [3]. A system atic uncertainty in this result remains in reconstruction of so called Spectral function' from experimental data of resonances. When a dimensional form of the resonance is adopted, and three loop order perturbative QCD theory is used one obtains [4]

$$(m_u + m_d) (1 \text{ GeV}) = 12:0 \quad 2:5 \text{ MeV}$$
 (5)

W ith (5) and (1) one gets

$$m_{s}(1G eV) = 151$$
 32 M eV or $m_{s}(2G eV) = 116$ 24 M eV: (6)

Again this translation from the scale of 1 GeV to the scale of 2 GeV is obtained for the case $_{\rm s}$ = 0.118. It has been remarked in Ref.[5] that it is indeed di cult to account for vacuum uctuations, or sea quark e ects generated by quarks of sm allm asses in perturbative QCD calculations. Thus, num erical simulations of strange quark mass on a lattice becomes rather attractive, especially if the simulation includes virtual light quark loop e ects.

Up and down type quarks di er only in the U (1), quantum numbers in an e ective theory where the gauge symmetry is SU (3). U (1) $_{em}$. Lattice calculations in current literature have neglected e ects of U $(1)_{m}$ which distinguishes up quarks from down quarks. Let us note that we are describing the lattice in terms of a theory at the scale of a few GeVs where light quark masses are to be described in terms of observables relevant to their own scales, which are meson masses and decay constants. Thus, lattice sim ulation determ ines m_{s} , $\frac{m_u + m_d}{2}$ and the lattice spacing a using three hadronic observables. They can be chosen, for example, M ; M $_{K}$, and f . Due to the structure of equations which are to be tted, the scale a can also be taken as a function of som e other observable, for example, it may be chosen as a (M_n) or a (M) etc. The result depend on the choice of the observable that ts the lattice spacing. The best choice would be the one which has minimum experimental uncertainty and the best result would be a clever weighted average of results from various choices. A test of the simulation is obviously to see whether results from various observables are statistically consistent with each other.

Next question is how do we describe quark masses when the theory is living on a discritized lattice. Various de nitions or formalisms of quark masses on a lattice have been suggested. Ref.[6] uses the de nition in terms of hopping parameter of the lattice

$$a m_{bare} = log (1 + (1=2 1=2_{c}));$$
 (7)

for a W ilson-like ferm ion. In the continuum limit we have a ! 0, and there one gets the hopping parameter $=_{c} = 1=8$. A sm aller hopping parameter makes the lattice more sticky, and ferm ions remain on lattice points for a longer time. This make them look as if they were more massive.

There are various other form alism sofdening the mass of fermions on the lattice such as stagenred fermions or domain wall fermions. Most calculations, however, use the W ilson action for various denitions of the fermion mass. Next, to compare the result with experiment, one has to calculate the \overline{MS} mass at a scale starting from the lattice estimate of the bare mass (7) using, for example, the mass renormalization constant Z_m () relating the lattice regularization scheme to the continuum regularization scheme. The lattice regularization prescription is given in Ref[7]. The Z_m constant for various formalisms such as W ilson-like or Staggered are given in table1 of

[6]. Final results of the physical quark mass for various de nitions of the ferm ion on a lattice di er 0 (a) among each other and one expects to get the same result of the physical quark mass in the continuum limit when a ! 0.

Beyond the m inim al lattice simulation of light quark m asses using the heavy quark e ective theory, the next step would be to incorporate sea quark e ects. From the conservation of energy it can be understood that it is easiest to produce lightest of the quarks virtually. Indeed such simulations have been performed. They are term ed $n_f = 2$ unquenched lattice simulations. The detailed processes of num erical simulations are described by respective authors. However, we have sum marized the results of recent studies are in table 1 in the order: (A)[8], (B)[9], (C)[10], (D)[11], (E)[6], (F)[12], and (G)[13].

referenæ	quenched	dynam ical	(1=a)callibration	m _s (M eV)
A	yes		m	143 6 & 115 2
В	yes		m _K	130 20
С	yes		m _K	122 20
D	yes		m _K	111 12
E	yes		m	110 31
F	yes		m	108 4
G	yes		1P 1S splitting	95 16
A		yes	m	70 & 80
E		yes	m	68 19
G		yes	1P 1S splitting	54 92

Table 1: Ref. G uses 1P-1S splitting of the charm onium system to calibrate (1/a). Reference A quotes two di erent results for two sets of parameters. All results are at the scale = 2 GeV

On the experim ental front the bottom quark mass is in the range

$$4:1 < m_{b}(m_{b}) < 4:4 GeV$$
 (8)

according to the review of particle physics (PDG) tables[14]. Theoretically, one re-expresses the bottom quark mass in terms of parameters of the M inim al Supersymmetric Standard M odel(M SSM). The tree level contribution which is related straight to the Yukawa texture, and the one loop contribution due to the dom inant gaugino loop can be accounted individually. Then one can write down the relation [15]

$$m_{b} = m_{b}^{\text{texture}} + m_{b}^{\text{SUSY}}$$

= $h_{b} \frac{V_{F}}{2} \cos + m_{b} \frac{8}{3} g_{3}^{2} \frac{\tan}{16^{-2}} \frac{m_{g}}{m_{off}^{2}}$: (9)

Here m_g is the gluino mass is the parameter and m_{eff} is averaged supersymmetry breaking mass scale. This paper discusses a scenario where the rst term of the RHS of (9) comes from diaginalizing a Fritzsch Yukawa texture. The second term can be estimated to be around 2 GeV. In the supersymmetric case it will be satisfactory if the Fritzsch Yukawa contribution is in the range

$$2:1 < m_{b}^{\text{texture}} < 6:4 \text{ GeV}$$
(10)

Next question is concerning tan . Supersymmetry, together with the gauge quantum number structure of fermions demands that at least two H iggs doublets are necessary. Hence the ratio of the VEVs of two H iggs doublets is an unavoidable parameter given the value of the elective four-Fermi coupling V_F . There are perturbative bounds on tan in the context of grand unied theories (They can be extended to supersymmetric theories without grand unication if M SSM is valid up to a certain high scale, say 10^9 GeV). In practice the very low-valued regions of the parameter space for tan are forbidden from perturbative considerations. See [16] for example. Furtherm ore high values of tan have constraints from charge and color breaking [17, 18]. This is especially true if Y ukaw a couplings are at the xed point region. The intermediate regions of the purpose of this paper

$$\tan = 2 \quad 30:$$
 (11)

Now let us focus on the texture. It has been noted that the quark m ixing angle V_{us} , which is a dimension-less quantity, can be thought of as a ratio of the mass scales of avor symmetry breaking. These symmetries lead to the mass hierarchy between families. Phenomenologically of course, the ratio of the masses of the mass of the second generation satis are well the relation

$$\tan_{c} = \frac{m_{d}}{m_{s}}$$
(12)

If there are two H iggs doublets instead, (12) remains untouched as the ratio of the VEVs of the doublets cancel in the ratio on the RHS. Thus it cannot feeltan \cdot .

Suppose in a two generation case rotation angles of the up and the down sectors are $_{u}$ and $_{d}$. Then the combined quark mixing matrix $V = O_{u}O_{d}^{y}$ will give $_{c} = _{u}$ $_{d}$. This observation plays a role in the Fritzsch mass matrices. Fritzsch mass matrices can be thought of as a set of mass matrices which generalizes (12) to the following form [19, 20]

$$_{c} = _{d} \quad _{u} = \tan^{1} \frac{s}{\frac{m_{d}}{m_{s}}} \quad \tan^{1} \frac{s}{\frac{m_{u}}{m_{c}}}$$
(13)

W here m $_i$ are eigenvalues of Fritzsch m ass m atrices. In the three generation case Fritzsch textures for up and down sectors are given by

$$M_{U} = \overset{0}{\underline{e}} a e^{ir} 0 \overset{1}{\underline{e}} M_{D} = \overset{0}{\underline{e}} A e^{iR} 0 \overset{1}{\underline{e}} M_{D} = \overset{0}{\underline{e}} A e^{iR^{0}} 0 B e^{iH} \overset{1}{\underline{A}}$$
(14)
$$0 b e^{ih^{0}} e^{iq} 0 B e^{iH^{0}} C e^{iQ}$$

The phases $r;R;r^0;R^0;h;H;h^0;H^0;q;Q$ can be absorbed in the rede nition of quark elds and individual mass matrices can be made real. However the weak charge changing current consists of (couples to) gauge eigenstates. Furtherm one the structure of the weak charge changing current is $_{L}^{U}$ $_{L}^{D}$. Consequently the weak mixing matrix must contain some combination of phases. It can be shown that residual phases of the weak mixing matrix are

$$= (r R) (h H) (h^{0} H^{0}) + (q Q)$$

= (r R) (h^{0} H^{0}): (15)

when the weak m ixing matrix is expressed as

In (16) O_U and O_D diagonalizes M $_U$ and M $_D$ which are precisely those in (14) but in the lim it when all the phases vanish. W hich are very simply

$$M_{U} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & a & 0^{1} & & 0 & A & 0^{1} \\ B & a & 0 & b^{C}_{A} & ; & M_{D} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A & 0 & B & C^{C} \\ B & A & 0 & B & A^{C} & ; \\ 0 & b & c & & 0 & B & C \end{bmatrix}$$
(17)

Let us consider the lim it m $_{\rm u}$ << m $_{\rm c}$ << m $_{\rm t}$ and m $_{\rm d}$ << m $_{\rm s}$ << m $_{\rm b}.$ W e can approximately re-write (17) as following

$$M_{U} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & 1 & & 0 & & & 1 \\ 0 & a & 0 & & & 0 & A & 0 \\ B & m_{c} & 0 & A & ; M_{D} = \begin{bmatrix} B & A & m_{d} & 0 & A \\ B & A & m_{d} & 0 & A \end{bmatrix}$$
(18)

Now we easily see that M $_{\rm U}\,$ can be diagonalized by the rotation

where $\tan \frac{u}{1} = \frac{q}{\frac{m_u}{m_c}}$ and $\tan \frac{u}{2} = \frac{q}{\frac{m_c}{m_t}}$. M_D can be diagonalized similarly. In the limit of strongly hierarchical eigenvalues one may use the approximation

$$\cos_{i}^{u} 1 \cos_{i}^{a} 1$$
: (20)

Furtherm ore let us de ne the quantities

$${}_{1} = \frac{s}{\frac{m_{u}}{m_{c}}} \qquad {}_{2} = \frac{s}{\frac{m_{c}}{m_{t}}} \qquad {}_{1} = \frac{s}{\frac{m_{d}}{m_{s}}} \qquad {}_{2} = \frac{s}{\frac{m_{s}}{m_{b}}}$$
(21)

Then the mixing matrix (16) takes the following form

A detailed derivation of these relations are given in Ref[21]. A cancelation among two terms in the expression for V_{cb} in (22) is needed. To achieve this one can choose

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{ this gives } V_{cb} \qquad \frac{s}{m_{s}} \qquad \frac{s}{m_{s}} \qquad \frac{m_{s}}{m_{t}}$$
(23)

It is easy to check that (23) m akes the top quark m ass too light to be experim entally true. Thus, it is worth asking the question whether if the Fritzsch texture were valid at the GUT scale instead, in other words, if the avor sym m etries were exact only above the GUT scale, could a m iracle of renorm alization group evolution of the m assess and m ixing angles m ake the Fritzsch relations valid at low energy [22]. Here we study their idea.

The renorm alization of the full 3 3 com plex Yukawa m atrices and their renorm alization up to the GUT scale M_X = 10^{16} GeV is what follows. Let us set our notations of m ixing angles, the non-rem ovable phase and eigenvalues of the Yukawa m atrices. We adopt the parameterization [23]

~

There is a detailed proof in Ref.[23] that in this param eterization <u>eigenvalues</u> y_i of the Yukawa textures, three CKM mixing angles and the CP violating phase satisfy the renormalization group equations

$$16 \ {}^{2}\frac{d}{dt} = 0 ;$$

$$16 \ {}^{2}\frac{d}{dt} \ln \tan_{1} = \ y_{t}^{2} \sin^{2}_{3} ;$$

$$16 \ {}^{2}\frac{d}{dt} \ln \tan_{2} = \ y_{b}^{2} \sin^{2}_{3} ;$$

$$16 \ {}^{2}\frac{d}{dt} \ln \tan_{3} = \ y_{t}^{2} \ y_{b}^{2} ;$$

$$16 \ {}^{2}\frac{d}{dt} \ln \tan_{3} = \ y_{t}^{2} \ y_{b}^{2} ;$$

$$16 \ {}^{2}\frac{d}{dt} \ln y_{u} = \ c_{i}^{u}g_{i}^{2} + 3y_{t}^{2} + y_{b}^{2} \cos^{2}_{2} \sin^{2}_{3} ;$$

$$16 \ {}^{2}\frac{d}{dt} \ln y_{c} = \ c_{i}^{u}g_{i}^{2} + 3y_{t}^{2} + y_{b}^{2} \sin^{2}_{2} \sin^{2}_{3} ;$$

$$16 \ {}^{2}\frac{d}{dt} \ln y_{c} = \ c_{i}^{u}g_{i}^{2} + 6y_{t}^{2} + y_{b}^{2} \cos^{2}_{3} ;$$

$$16 \ {}^{2}\frac{d}{dt} \ln y_{t} = \ c_{i}^{d}g_{i}^{2} + y_{t}^{2} \sin^{2}_{1} \sin^{2}_{3} + 3y_{b}^{2} + y^{2} ;$$

$$16 \ {}^{2}\frac{d}{dt} \ln y_{s} = \ c_{i}^{d}g_{i}^{2} + y_{t}^{2} \cos^{2}_{1} \sin^{2}_{3} + 3y_{b}^{2} + y^{2} ;$$

$$16 \ {}^{2}\frac{d}{dt} \ln y_{b} = \ c_{i}^{d}g_{i}^{2} + y_{t}^{2} \cos^{2}_{3} + 6y_{b}^{2} + y^{2} ;$$

$$16 \ {}^{2}\frac{d}{dt} \ln y_{b} = \ c_{i}^{d}g_{i}^{2} + 3y_{b}^{2} + y^{2} ;$$

$$16 \ {}^{2}\frac{d}{dt} \ln y_{b} = \ c_{i}^{d}g_{i}^{2} + 3y_{b}^{2} + y^{2} ;$$

$$16 \ ^{2}\frac{d}{dt}\ln y = c_{i}^{e}g_{i}^{2} + 3y_{b}^{2} + y^{2} ;$$

$$16 \ ^{2}\frac{d}{dt}\ln y = c_{i}^{e}g_{i}^{2} + 3y_{b}^{2} + 4y^{2} ; \qquad (25)$$

Multipliers c_j^i of gauge couplings in (18) are well known. They can be found in [23]. We have solved these one-loop equations numerically using M athematica ND Solve subroutine. The ow chart follows this line. Taking all experimentally possible values of the eigenvalues but only central values of the angles at low energy, we have evolved the set to the GUT scale using (18). At the GUT scale predictions for $V_{cb} V_{us}$ and V_{ub} are calculated assuming that Fritzsch relations are valid only at the GUT scale and beyond. While translating predictions of CKM entries back to low energy using (18), we have used exact values of the angles not central values. Thereafter we have checked whether each individual value of m asses and m ixings remain within experimentally allowed ranges. For the strange quark m ass values quoted in table1 are used. For all other m asses and m ixings the experimental values are taken from the review of particle physics[14]. Our results are given in table2

S	tan	m $_{\rm s}$ (2 G eV)	
0:118	2	59 : 90	MeV
0:118	10	61:52	MeV
0:118	20	63 : 05	M eV
0:118	30	66 : 90	M eV

Table 2: Our results are quoted for $m_t^{\text{pole}} = 173 \text{ GeV}$. All other m asses and m ixings remain within the ranges quoted by the Review of Particle Physics.

In conclusion, implications of results of $n_f = 2$ unquenched lattice simulations of the strange quark mass in the context of the Fritzsch texture are studied. Previous calculations in this line exist in the literature. We have two new aspects. Because the combined e ect of charge and color breaking and perturbative unitarity of the Yukawa couplings may rule out the large tan scenario we have studied the low tan scenario. Moreover, we have included corrections of supersymmetric origin in the study.

Supersymmetric corrections to the bottom quark mass and the bw tan scenario goes hand in hand. This is in the sense that in the low tan regime Fritzsch texture dem ands a large Yukawa contribution to the bottom quark mass. This is partially canceled by the supersymmetric bop corrections. Thus, the original Fritzsch texture is consistent with experimental data if it holds at the GUT scale. The strange quark mass emerges in the range 60–70 M eV at = 2 G eV for the central values of $_{\rm s}$ = 0:118 and m $_{\rm t}^{\rm pole}$ = 173 G eV. This range is consistent with $n_{\rm f}$ = 2 sea quark elect in proved (unquenched) lattice simulations of the strange quark mass.

We thank S.G ottlieb for discussions and M.S.Berger for lending his Fortran routine to calculate the $_{\rm i}$ scaling factors of Ref.[3]. This research was supported by U S D epartment of Energy under the grant number DE-FG 02-91ER 40661.

References

- [1] H. Leutwyler, Phys. Lett. B 378, 313 (1996).
- [2] C.A.Dom inguez and E.de Rafael, Ann. Phys (NY), 174, 372 (1987).
- [3] V.Barger, M.S.Berger and P.Ohm ann, Phys. Rev. D 47, 1093 (1993).
- [4] J. Binnens, J. Prades and E. de Rafael, Phys. Lett B 348, 226 (1995).
- [5] H. Leutwyler, Proceedings of Cargese 1996, Masses of fundamental particles, 149–164; e-Print Archive: hep-ph/9609467.
- [6] R.Gupta and T.Bhattacharya, Phys. Rev. D 55, 7203 (1997).
- [7] P. Lepage and P. Mackenzie, Phys. Rev. D 48, 2250 (1993).
- [8] CP-PACS Collaboration (K.Kanaya et al.).UTCCP-P-45, Aug 1998.
 Presented at 16th International Symposium on Lattice Field Theory (LATTICE 98), Boulder, CO, 13-18 Jul 1998. Published in Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 73, 192 (1999).
- [9] V.G im enez et al, Nucl. Phys. B 540, 472 (1999).
- [10] C.R.Allton et al, Nucl. Phys. B 489, 427 (1997).

- [11] D.Becirevic et al. Talk given at 16th International Sym posium on Lattice Field Theory (LATTICE 98), Boulder, CO, 13 Jul 1998. Published in Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 73, 222 (1999).
- [12] M. Gockeler et al. Talk given at the 16th International Symposium on Lattice Field Theory (LATTICE 98), Boulder, CO, 13-18 Jul1998.Published in Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 73, 237 (1999); Phys. Rev. D 57, 5562 (1998).
- [13] B.J.Gaugh et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 1622 (1997).
- [14] The Review of Particle Physics, Particle Data Group, C.Caso et al. The European Physical Journal C 3, 1 (1998).
- [15] R. Rattazzi, U. Sarid and L. J. Hall. SU-TP-94-15, May 1994. 20pp. Presented at 2nd IFT Workshop on Yukawa Couplings and the Origins of Mass, Feb. 11-13, 1994, Gainesville, Florida. In *Gainesville 1994, Yukawa couplings and the origin of mass* 232-250.e-Print Archive: hepph/9405313.
- [16] B.Brahm achari, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 12, 1969 (1997).
- [17] JA. Casas, A. Lleyda and C. Munoz, Nucl. Phys. B 471, 3 (1996).
- [18] M. Bastero-Giland B. Brahm achari, e-Print Archive: hep-ph/9907318.
- [19] S.W einberg (Harvard U.). HUTP-77-A 057, Trans. New York Acad. Sci. 38, 185 (1977).
- [20] H.Fritzsch, Phys.Lett. B 70, 436 (1977); Nucl. Phys. B 155, 189 (1979).
- [21] M. Shin, Phys. Lett. B 145, 285 (1984). See also H. Geogi and D. V. Nanopoulos, Nucl. Phys. B 155, 52 (1979); L.F. Li, Phys. Lett 84B, 461 (1979).
- [22] K S.Babu and Q.Sha , Phys. Rev. D 47, 5004 (1993).
- [23] S.Naculich, Phys. Rev. D 48, 5293 (1993).