

BU-HEPP-02/08
 CTP-TAMU-02/03
 hep-ph/0210093n
 October 2002

Parameter Space Investigations of Free Fermionic Heterotic Models

Gerald B. Cleaver,¹

Center for Astrophysics, Space Physics & Engineering Research
 Department of Physics, P.O. Box 97316, Baylor University
 Waco, Texas 76798, USA

and

Astro Particle Physics Group, Houston Advanced Research Center (HARC),
 The Mitchell Campus, Woodlands, TX 77381, USA

Abstract

I survey the parameter space of NAHE-based free fermionic heterotic string models. First, I discuss flat directions of the low energy effective field theories and show that D-flat directions need not be isomorphic to gauge invariant superpotential terms. Next, I review recent studies of three generation $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$, $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$, $SU(4)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_{Y'}$, and flipped $SU(5)$ models, constructed by Wilson breaking of the underlying $SO(10)$ observable sector gauge group of the NAHE $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ basis.

Based on talk presented at the First International Conference on String Phenomenology.

¹Gerald_Cleaver@baylor.edu

1 NAHE-based $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ Heterotic Models

The NAHE-based [1] free fermionic [2] approach to heterotic superstring model building has proven very successful phenomenologically. This construction yielded Flipped SU(5) [3] around 1988, several standard-like models in the 1990's [4], the Minimal Supersymmetric Heterotic Standard Model (MSHM) [5] in 1999–2000, and in 2002 a standard-like model with the potential for optical unification [6].

The NAHE set of basis vectors is composed of 5 sectors, $f_1; S; b_1; b_2; b_3$. The antiperiodic sector $0 = 1 + 1$ yields the massless generators of the gauge group $SO(10) \times SO(6)^3 \times E_8$, and S generates $N = 1$ spacetime supersymmetry (SUSY), while each b_i produces 2 copies of $(16; 4)$ and $(16; \bar{4})$ of $SO(10) \times SO(6)_i$, respectively. Thus, the NAHE set contains $2 \times (4 + 4) \times 3 = 48$ generations of $SO(10)$. Additional sectors, acting like Wilson loops, can reduce both the gauge group and the number of copies of each generation. For (quasi)-realistic models, $SO(10)$ is broken to a smaller gauge group containing $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)_{Z^0}$, where $U(1)_Y = U(1)_C + U(1)_L$ and $U(1)_{Z^0} = U(1)_C - U(1)_L$, while each b_i is constrained to produce only a single copy of a generation. This reduction occurs at the expense of many new Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) charged exotics appearing from Wilson loop sectors. Further, an extra $U(1)$ usually becomes anomalous. This $U(1)_A$ has its origin either from E_6 decomposition into $SO(10) \times U(1)$ or from one of the $U(1)$'s generated by $D = 10 \rightarrow D = 4$ compactification. The two distinct $U(1)_A$ types have different phenomenological implications.

2 Flat Directions in the Low Energy Effective Field Theory

For quasi-realistic models, Wilson lines can break $SO(10)$ into $SU(5) \times U(1)$, $SO(6) \times SO(4) \times SU(4)_C \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$, $SU(4)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$, $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$, or $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$. These gauge groups are found in models at various points in the NAHE-based free fermionic parameter space. In the low energy effective field theory it is possible to move away from free fermionic points through vacuum expectation values (VEVs) of scalar fields. When an Abelian anomaly ex-

ists, the Green-Schwarz-Dine-Seiberg-Witten mechanism eliminates it and in the process generates a Fayet-Iliopoulos (F-I) D-term, $\mathcal{D} = \frac{g^2(\text{Tr} Q_A)}{192\pi^2} M_{\text{Pl}}^2$.

It imposes a VEV at a scale near $\frac{1}{10} M_{\text{string}}$ through the D-flatness constraints, $D_A \sum_P Q_A^m \Phi_m = 0$ (for the anomalous Abelian symmetry), $D_i \sum_P Q_A^m \Phi_m = 0$ (for the non-anomalous Abelian symmetries), and $D_a \sum_m h_a^Y T_a \Phi_m = 0$ (for the non-Abelian symmetries). For anomaly-free models, a D-flat VEV is perturbatively allowed, but its scale is not specified. A D-flat VEV must also be F-flat to at least 17th order in W for SUSY to remain unbroken down to ~ 10 TeV.

For VEVs involving only non-Abelian singlets, all D-flat directions correspond to gauge invariant superpotential terms. In ref. [7] we show that flatness is much more involved for non-Abelian fields, specially that D-flat directions do not necessarily correspond to gauge invariant superpotential terms. Take, for example, SU(2) doublets, L_i , where $R_i \cos \frac{i}{2} \exp f \frac{i}{2} g$ and $R_i \sin \frac{i}{2} \exp f \frac{i}{2} g$ are the "up" and "down" VEV components. Then a D-flat solution can be formed from three doublets $L_{i=1,2,3}$ of equal norms, $\mathcal{R}_1 f = \mathcal{R}_2 f = \mathcal{R}_3 f$, when $\phi_1 = 0$; $\phi_2 = \phi_3 = \frac{2}{3}$ and $\phi_2 = 0$, $\phi_3 = \frac{2}{3}$. In contrast, the only superpotential term containing three unique doublets is (up to an overall power) $L_1 L_2 (L_3)^2 = (L_1 - L_3)(L_2 - L_3)$, which corresponds to the norms $\mathcal{R}_1 f = \mathcal{R}_2 f = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{R}_3 f$. For D-flat VEVs lacking superpotential correspondence, we present a geometric language for which there is intuitive and immediate recognition of when D- and F-conditions are simultaneously compatible. Our method provides a tool for comprehensive classification of flat directions.

3 Optical Unification

An enduring issue in string theory has been the discrepancy between the $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ ([321]) gauge coupling unification scale, $\mu \sim 2.5 \times 10^{16}$ GeV [8], for the the MSSM with intermediate scale desert and the string scale, $\mu_H \sim 5 \times 10^{17}$ GeV [9], for the weakly coupled heterotic string.

One explanation is that intermediate scale exotics could shift the MSSM unification scale upward to the string scale [10]. If MSSM exotics exist with intermediate scale masses of order μ_H , then the actual [321] running couplings are altered above μ_H . It is then, perhaps, puzzling that the illusion of MSSM unification should still be maintained when the intermediate scale MSSM

exotics are ignored [11]. Maintaining this illusion likely requires very fine tuning of α_I for a generic exotic particle set and α_H . Slight shifting of α_I would, with high probability, destroy appearances. Thus, in some sense, the apparent MSSM unification below the string scale might be viewed as accidental [12, 11].

Joel Giedt recently discussed a mechanism, entitled "optical unification," whereby the appearance of a U is not accidental [11]. Optical unification results in U not disappearing under shifts of α_I . Instead, U likewise shifts in value. This effect is parallel to a virtual image always appearing between a diverging lens and a real object. Hence, Giedt's choice of appellation for this mechanism.

Successful optical unification requires three things [11]. First, the effective level of the hypercharge generator must be the standard $k_Y = \frac{5}{3}$. This is a strong constraint on string-derived [321] models, for the vast majority have non-standard hypercharge levels. Only select classes of models, such as the NAHE-based free fermionic class, can yield $k_Y = \frac{5}{3}$. Second, optical unification imposes the relationship $b_2 = \frac{7}{12} b_3 + \frac{1}{4} b_4$, between the exotic particle contributions b_3 , b_2 , and b_4 to the [321] beta function coefficients. Each $SU(3)_C$ exotic triplet or anti-triplet contributes $\frac{1}{2}$ to b_3 ; each $SU(2)_C$ doublet contributes $\frac{1}{2}$ to b_2 . With the hypercharge of a MSSM quark doublet normalized to $\frac{1}{6}$, the contribution to b_4 from an individual particle with hypercharge Q_Y is Q_Y^2 . $b_3 > b_2$ is required to keep the virtual unification scale below the string scale. Combining this with the second constraint imposes $b_3 > b_2 - \frac{7}{12} b_3$, since $b_4 \geq 0$.

To acquire intermediate scale mass, the exotic triplets and anti-triplets must be equal in number. Similarly, the exotic doublets must be even in number. Hence, b_3 and b_2 must be integer [11]. As Giedt pointed out, the simplest solution to optical unification is a set of three exotic triplet/anti-triplet pairs and two pairs of doublets. One pair of doublets can carry $Q_Y = \frac{1}{2}$, while the remaining exotics carry no hypercharge. Alternately, if the doublets carry too little hypercharge, some exotic $SU(3)_C \rightarrow SU(2)_L$ singlets could make up the hypercharge deficit. The next simplest solution requires four triplet/anti-triplet pairs and three pairs of doublets that yield $b_3 = 2\frac{2}{3}$ either as a set, or with the assistance of additional non-Abelian singlets. In ref. [6], we present a standard-like model that has the potential to realize the latter optical unification solution, with the required hypercharge carried by the (anti)-triplets and one additional pair of singlets. Detailed analysis of

this model is underway.

4 Left-Right Symmetric Models

Our parameter space investigations have led to the discovery of four models with left-right symmetry, two lacking [13] and two containing an anomalous $U(1)$ [13, 14]. The first non-anomalous model has gauge group $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L} \times \prod_{i=1}^6 U(1)_i \times SU(3)_{H_1} \times SU(3)_{H_2} \times \prod_{i=7}^{10} U(1)_i$, while the second has both observable and hidden sector symmetries enhanced by Wilson loops, $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times SU(2)_{B-L} \times U(1)_{Y^0} \times \prod_{i=1}^7 U(1)_i \times SU(4)_{H_1} \times SU(4)_{H_2} \times \prod_{i=8}^9 U(1)_i$. The lack of an anomaly in these models is related to neither model having its basis in $SO(12) \times E_8 \times E_8$ nor in $SO(12) \times SO(16) \times SO(16)$, but rather in $SO(16) \times E_7 \times E_7$.

Being non-anomalous, these models have no inherent F-IVEV scale. Both models contain a neutral SM singlet in a $\mathbf{16}$ of $SO(10)$ which can break $SU(2)_R$, but the corresponding component in a $\overline{\mathbf{16}}$ is absent. Instead the $\overline{\mathbf{16}}$ carries a $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L$ -singlet with non-zero electromagnetic charge. Further, all other $SU(2)_R$ exotic doublets carry fractional electromagnetic charge. Thus, $SU(2)_R$ cannot be broken along a SUSY-stable direction in these two models. However, Model 2 contains $SU(2)_{B-L}$ doublets that break $SU(2)_{B-L}$ along stable directions.

An interesting feature of Model 1 is that its entire hidden sector matter spectrum can get superheavy along some stable directions, while the hidden sector gauge bosons remain massless. Thus, the lightest hidden sector states can be glueballs that only interact with SM states via superheavy fermions. This makes for interesting dark matter candidates. In both models, all mass couplings involve Higgs bi-doublets. This implies a danger of inducing FCNC's at an unacceptable rate.

The two anomalous models have gauge groups identical to Models 1 and 2, respectively, except that $U(1)_1$ becomes $U(1)_A$. Here the anomaly does not arise from a $U(1)$ within E_6 , but from six-dimensional compactification. Model 3 contains Higgs bi-doublets, while Model 4 does not. Model 4 also lacks Abelian stable directions. In fact, the anomaly can only be cancelled by $SU(2)_L$ and/or $SU(2)_R$ doublets taking on VEVs. Thus, at least one of $SU(2)_L$ or $SU(2)_R$ must be broken in Model 4.

$SU(4)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_{Y^0}$ models are also under investigation. Detailed

properties of these models will appear in an upcoming paper [15].

5 Flipped SU (5)

Heterotic flipped SU (5) had its origin back in the late 1990's [3] and is the most developed of all string models. The complete gauge group for this model is $SU(5) \times U(1) \times \prod_{i=1}^4 U(1)_i \times SO(10)_H \times SO(6)_H$. The hidden sector states are the $T_{i=1 \text{ to } 5}$ (10 reps of $SO(10)_H$), $\tilde{T}_{i=1 \text{ to } 5}$ (6 reps of $SO(6)_H$), and the $\tilde{F}_{j=1 \text{ to } 6}$ and $\tilde{\bar{F}}_{j=1 \text{ to } 6}$ (4 and $\bar{4}$ reps of $SO(6)_H$, respectively). Flat directions for $U(1)_A$ cancellation generally induce near string-scale mass for some, but not all, of these states [16]. Depending on the number of T_i and $\tilde{T}_i$ remaining massless, the $SO(10)$ condensate scale is around $10^{14 \text{ to } 15}$ GeV and that for $SO(6)$ is around $10^{12 \text{ to } 13}$ GeV.

The $\tilde{F}_{3,5}$ and $\tilde{\bar{F}}_{3,5}$ states always remain massless down to the condensate scales, where they may form four-eld "tetron" condensates [17]. Uncharged tetrons could make good dark matter candidates [17]. Coriano et al. has recently raised the issue of the relative lifetimes of the electromagnetically charged to uncharged tetrons [18]. The related decay terms for charged and uncharged tetrons are currently under investigation [19].

6 Conclusion

The parameter space of NAHE-class [1] free fermionic [2] heterotic strings has, over the last 15 years, provided (quasi)-realistic models with very interesting combinations of phenomenological features. Many features of a given model are generally very dependent upon choice of perturbative direction. Some of the most desired properties, such as a standard hypercharge embedding, are very difficult to find in the parameter space of other model classes. The flipped SU (5) model [3], the MSHSM [5], and the recently-discovered optical unification model [6], have especially interesting properties. There is ongoing work to embed these models in M-theory [20].

Acknowledgments

G.C. sincerely thanks his collaborators of the various papers discussed herein: D. Clements, J. Ellis, A.E. Faraggi, E. Mayes, D.V. Nanopoulos, S. Nooij, J. Perkins, C. Savage, T. Velhuis, and J. Walker (listed alphabetically). The research leading to these papers was partially supported by DOE grant DE-FG-0395ER40917 (G.C., D.V.N., J.W.).

References

- [1] A.E. Faraggi & D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Rev. D 48 (1993) 3288; A.E. Faraggi, [hep-th/9511093]; [hep-th/9708112].
- [2] I. Antoniadis, C. Bachas, & C. Kounnas, Nucl. Phys. B 289 (1987) 87; H. Kawai, D.C. Lewellen, & S.H.-H. Tye, Nucl. Phys. B 288 (1987) 1.
- [3] I. Antoniadis, J. Ellis, J. Hagelin, & D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B 231 (1989) 65; J. Lopez, D.V. Nanopoulos & K. Yuan, Nucl. Phys. B 399 (1993) 654.
- [4] A.E. Faraggi, D.V. Nanopoulos, & K. Yuan, Nucl. Phys. B 335 (1990) 347; A.E. Faraggi, Phys. Rev. D 46 (1992) 3204; Phys. Lett. B 278 (1992) 131; Nucl. Phys. B 403 (1992) 101; Phys. Lett. B 274 (1992) 47; Phys. Lett. B 339 (1994) 223; Phys. Lett. B 302 (1993) 202; Phys. Lett. B 339 (1994) 223.
- [5] G.B. Cleaver, A.E. Faraggi & D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B 455 (1999) 135; G.B. Cleaver, "Influences on String Model Building," CTP-TAMU-46/98, [hep-ph/9901203]; G.B. Cleaver, A.E. Faraggi & D.V. Nanopoulos, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 16 (2001) 425, [hep-ph/9904301]; G.B. Cleaver, A.E. Faraggi, D.V. Nanopoulos, & J.W. Walker, Nucl. Phys. B 593 (2001) 471, [hep-ph/9910230]; Mod. Phys. Lett. A 15 (2000) 1191, [hep-ph/0002060]; Nucl. Phys. B 620 (2002) 259, [hep-ph/0104091]; G.B. Cleaver, [hep-ph/0003208]; Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 16S1C (2001) 949, [hep-ph/0011020].
- [6] G. Cleaver, V. Desai, H. Hanson, J. Perkins, D. Robbins, & S. Shields, On the Possibility of Optical Unification in Heterotic Strings, BU-HEPP-02/02, CASPER-02/02, [hep-ph/0209050].

- [7] G . C leaver, D . V . Nanopoulos, J. Perkins, & J W . W alker, "Geometrical Interpretation of Non-Abelian D - and F -Flat D irection Constraints," In preparation.
- [8] J. Ellis, S. Kelley & D . V . Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B 249 (1990) 441; U . Amaldi, W . de Boer & F. Furstenau, Phys. Lett. B 260 (1991) 447; P. Langacker & M . Luo, Phys. Rev. D 44 (1991) 817; A E . Faraggi & B . Grinstein, Nucl. Phys. B 422 (1994) 3, [[hep-th/9308329](#)]; D M . Ghilencea & G . G . Ross, Nucl. Phys. B 606 (2001) 101, [[hep-ph/0102306](#)].
- [9] V . S. Kaplunovsky, Nucl. Phys. B 307 (1988) 145; Erratum Nucl. Phys. B 382 (1992) 436.
- [10] See for example, S. Chang, C . Coriano, & A E . Faraggi, Phys. Lett. B 397 (1997) 76, [[hep-ph/9603272](#)].
- [11] J. Giedt, "Optical Unification," LBNL-50358, UCB-PTH-02/23, [[hep-ph/0205224](#)].
- [12] D . Ghilencea, Phys. Lett. B 456 (1999) 540, [[hep-ph/9904293](#)].
- [13] G . C leaver, A E . Faraggi, & C . Savage, Phys. Rev. D 63 (2001) 066001, [[hep-ph/0006331](#)].
- [14] G . C leaver, D . Clements, & A . Faraggi, Phys. Rev. D 65 (2002) 106003, [[hep-ph/0106060](#)].
- [15] G . C leaver, A E . Faraggi, & S. Nooij, Research in progress.
- [16] G . C leaver, J. Ellis, & D . V . Nanopoulos, Nucl. Phys. B 600 (2001) 315, [[hep-ph/0009338](#)] and references therein.
- [17] D . V . Nanopoulos, [[hep-ph/9809546](#)]; K . Benakli, J. Ellis, & D . V . Nanopoulos, Phys. Rev. D 59 (1999) 047301, [[hep-ph/9803333](#)].
- [18] C . Coriano, A E . Faraggi, & M . Plumacher, Nucl. Phys. B 614 (2001) 233, [[hep-ph/0107053](#)].
- [19] G . C leaver, J. Ellis, E . M ayes, D . V . Nanopoulos, & J. W alker, Research in progress.

[20] See for example, A. E. Faraggi, R. Garavuso, & J. Isidro, Nucl. Phys. B 641 (2002) 111, [[hep-th/0204080](#)].