Harm less R-parity violation from Z_{12} I compactic cation of E_8 E_8^0 heterotic string

Ian-W oo K im $^{(a)}$, Jihn E.K in $^{(a)\,y}$ and Bum seek K yae $^{(b)\,z}$

^(a)D epartm ent of P hysics and A stronom y and C enter for T heoretical P hysics,

Seoul National University, Seoul 151-747, Korea

^(b) School of Physics, K orea Institute for Advanced Study,

207-43 Cheongryangri-dong, Dongdaem un-gu, Seoul 130-722, Korea

Abstract

In a recent Z_{12 I} orbifold model, an approximate Z₂ symmetry which forbids the baryon number violating operators up to sulciently high orders is found. The dimension-4 B \notin 0 operators of the M SSM elds occur at dimension 10. The elds ective dimension-5 B \notin 0 operators derived from these are harm less if some VEVs of neutral singlets are 0 ($\frac{1}{10}$) times the string scale. The main reason for forbidding these B \notin 0 operators up to such a high order is the large order N = 12 of Z_N since the H-momentum rule is (1;1;1) mod (12, 3, 12). For a lower order N < 12, the B \notin 0 operators would appear at lower dimensions.

PACS num bers: 1125W x, 1130Er, 12.60 Jv, 1130Fs

Keywords: R-parity, Yukawa couplings, H-m om entum, String com pacti cation

iw kim @ phya.snu.ac.kr

^y jekim (phyp.snu.ac.kr

^z bkyae@ kias.re.kr

I. IN TRODUCTION

The main reason for imposing the R-parity in the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) is to forbid the dangerous $B \notin 0$ superpotential terms. As a bonus, the exact R-parity ensures an absolutely stable lightest supersymmetric particle (LSP) as a candidate for cold dark matter. The R-parity is a simple discrete symmetry in the MSSM to forbid dangerous (renormalizable) $B \notin 0$ operators. However, as for the condition on proton longevity, other discrete symmetries in addition to the R-parity can be possible. All possible candidates are classified in Refs. 1, 2]. In this paper, we search for a scheme to obtain such a discrete symmetry in compactific cations of $E_6 E_8^0$ heterotic string.

The well known R-parity in SO (10) grand uni ed theory (GUT) is by assigning {1 for the spinor 16 and + 1 for the vector 10. This kind of spinor-vector disparity can be adopted in the untwisted sector of heterotic string also, in particular in the phenom enologically attractive $E_8 = E_8^0$ heterotic string [3]. Let us consider only the E_8 part for an illustration. The untwisted sector massless matter spectrum in E_8 can be $P^2 = 2$ weights distinguished by the spinor or the vector property

S: ([+ + + + + + + +]) V: (1 100000)

where represents $\frac{1}{2}$, the notation [] means including even number of sign ips inside the bracket, and the underline means permutations of the entries on the underline. Since two spinors in the group space can transform as a tensor in the group space, cubic Yukawa couplings arising from the untwisted sector involving two spinors are of the form SSV, which can be used to assign a kind of matter parity. For this scheme to work, 48 fermions of the three families (including the singlet neutrinos to generate neutrino masses) must belong to the untwisted sector S and Higgs doublets must belong to the untwisted sector V. This requirement is nontrivial as one inds that the standard-like models of 4] do not satisfy this condition. On the other hand, a part of the spectrum of the Z₁₂ model of [5] satis es this condition. But this spinor-vector disparity condition alone is not enough to guarantee a harm less discrete symmetry in supersymmetric standard models because there are twisted matter, and Yukawa couplings are more constrained than this simple spinor{vector disparity.

The twisted matter is more complicated because of the form (internal momenta) plus (shift vectors), P + kV (k = 1;2; ;N 1 in a Zorbifold). Except in the Z₂ orbifold,

there appear fractional numbers such as $\frac{1}{3}$; $\frac{1}{4}$; . So, in general it is very much involved to nd a discrete parity if one includes interactions of twisted matter.

GUTs allow ham less proton decay via gauge interactions if the GUT scale M_{GUT} is greater than 10^{15} GeV. String models in addition contain proton decay operators through Yukawa couplings which are measured by the string scale M_s being considered to be 0 (10) larger than the GUT scale. If these proton decay operators occur at dimension 4 and 5, they can dominate over the proton decay operators via gauge interactions [6]. The Rparity forbids dimension-4 B \notin 0 operators, but does not forbid dimension-5 B \notin 0 operators. So, in some supergravity GUT models dimension-5 B \notin 0 operators are considered to be the dominant ones of proton decay, predicting p ! K + (antilepton).¹ In string compactic cations, however, the dimension-5 operators are considered to be dangerous because the coel cients are considered to be 0 (1) in general [1]. So, if we introduce a kind of matter parity, it must work very ingeniously to forbid the dimension-4 and dimension-5

B € 0 operators.

If a parity is introduced, it is better to be a discrete gauge sym metry [8], otherwise large gravitational corrections such as through worm hole processes may violate it. Even if the discrete sym metry is broken as we consider in this paper, it is better to be a discrete gauge sym metry to free us from gravitational corrections. The reason for anticipating a broken parity in string compactic cations is that we will embed the parity in a global U (1) which is not an exact symmetry in string compactic cations. But the breaking of the parity will be considered to be harm less if the $B \notin 0$ operators derived from breaking that parity is su ciently suppressed or suppressed by masses greater than 10^{17} GeV since anyway $B \notin 0$ operators are present in the gauge sector of string GUTs.

Suppose an approximate global symmetry U (1) and its discrete Z_2 subgroup P. It is a kind generalizing the R-parity. In this paper, we use the word R-parity' even though we restrict the discussion to the matter parity.

The parity we consider cannot be put in a general form but must be discussed based on speci c models. Restricting to speci c models is obvious because the approximate global

¹ O ne of simple ways to forbid the dimension-4 and -5 $B \notin 0$ operators in supergravity is to introduce a U (1) R-symmetry. However, it should be broken to a discrete symmetry in orbifold string compactic cations. It is known that in a supergravity model [2], a Z₆ symmetry also forbids such $B \notin 0$ operators. In Ref. [7], for instance, an anomalous U (1)_{an} is employed for the R-parity and also for the proton longevity.

V isible states	SU(5) U(1) _X		V isible states	SU(5) U(1) _k	
(<u>+</u> ;+++)	5_{3}^{L} (U ₃)	3	$(\underline{1;0;0;0;0}; \frac{1}{3}; 0^2)$	3 5 ₂ (T 4 ⁰)	{2
(<u>+ + + </u> ;+)	$\overline{10}^{\rm L}_{1}$ (U ₃)	{1	$(1;0;0;0;0;\frac{1}{3};0^2)$	2 $-\frac{L}{2}$ (T 4 ⁰)	2
(+ + + + + ; + + +)	1^{L}_{5} (U $_{3}$)	{5	(<u>+</u> ;+ 0 0)	2 § (T 6)	4
(<u>1;0;0;0;0</u> ; 1;0;0)	$\overline{5}_{2}^{L}$ (U ₂)	2	(<u>+ + +</u> ;+ 0 0)	4 10 ₁ (T 6)	{2, {1
(<u>+ </u>	5_{3}^{L} (U ₁)	3	(+ + + + + ; + 0 0)	2 [‡] ₁ ₅ (T 6)	{6
(<u>+ + +</u> ;+ + +)	$\overline{10}^{L}_{1}$ (U ₁)	{1	(<u>+ + + +</u> ; 0 0)	2 [—] 5 ₃ (T 6)	{4
(+ + + + + ;+)	1 ^L ₅ (U ₁)	{5	(<u>+ +</u> ; 0 0)	3 1∳(T6)	2
(<u>+; 1</u> 0 0)	5_3^{L} (T 2 ⁰)	3	(; 00)	2 🗄 (T 6)	6
$(+ + + + + ; \frac{1}{6} 0 0)$	1^{L}_{5} (T 2^{0})	{5			

TABLE I: Relevant visible sector chiral elds. The multiplicity is shown as the coe cients of representations. + and { represent $+\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$, respectively. The values of {2 and {1 for $\overline{10}_{1}^{L}$ (T 6) are those for the vectorlike ones and for the t-quark family, respectively.

symmetry U(1) must be given in a speci cmodel. This leads us to the discussion of the speci cmodel, Ref. §].

II. CONTINUOUSU (1) SYMMETRIES

We observe that a discrete subgroup of the anom alous U $(1)_{an}$ of Ref. [5] is not good for the R-parity because neutral singlets carry even and odd U $(1)_{an}$ charges. A good candidate for housing a part of R-parity is U $(1)_X$ of ipped SU (5). In Table I, we list X charges of the non-exotic elds as subscripts. We do not list exotic elds and X = 0 singlet elds.

The key representations of the ipped SU (5), i.e. SU (5) U $(1)_k$, are

m atter:
$$\overline{10}_{1}$$
; 5_{3} ; 1_{5} (1)
8
Higgs: $\frac{5_{2}}{5_{2}}$; 5_{2} ; electroweak scale
: $\overline{10}_{1}^{H}$; 10_{1}^{H} ; GUT scale (2)

If we restrict to matter and the electroweak scale H iggs elds only, the Z_2 subgroup of U (1)_X is a good candidate for the prime source of the R-parity since matter elds, Eq. (1), carry odd X quantum numbers and the electroweak scale H iggs 5 and $\overline{5}$ (the rst line of Eq. (2))

carry even X quantum numbers. Singlets with X = 0 (5) are neutral ($Q_{em} = 1$) singlets. To break the ipped SU (5) down to the standard model, the GUT scale H iggs 10^{H} and $\overline{10}^{H}$ develop GUT scale VEV s.

In fact, the $\rm Z_2$ subgroup of U (1)_x distinguishes the spinor or the vector origin of our spectrum since we assign

$$X = (2; 2; 2; 2; 2; 0; 0; 0):$$
(3)

For example, $\overline{10}$ from spinor of the form (<u>+++</u>) has an odd X, while 5 from vector of the form (<u>10000</u>) has an even X. This shows that both^H16 and $\overline{10}^{H}$ having odd X s. Therefore, for the light elds we have a perfect de nition for the R-parity, but including heavy elds 10^{H} and $\overline{10}^{H}$ make us rethink on the R-parity.

The basic di erence between Higgs $\overline{10}^{H}$ and m atter $\overline{10}$ in T 6 is that the form er form s a vectorlike representation with 10^{H} in T 6 and is removed at the GUT scale, while the latter remains as a chiral one. From Table I, there appear four $\overline{10}^{L}_{1}$ s and three 10^{L}_{1} s in the twisted sector T 6. One unmatched $\overline{10}^{L}_{1}$ is interpreted as belonging to the t-quark fam ily. The gauge sector of four $\overline{10}^{L}_{1}$ s and three 10^{L}_{1} s has the symmetry U (4) U (3). We factor out one U (1) belonging to the t-quark fam ily. The remaining symmetry of three $\overline{10}^{H}$ and three 10^{H} is U (1)_{V10} SU (3)_L SU (3)_R U (1)_A. The U (1)_A symmetry is broken by the anomaly and hence we do not consider it. We are interested only in U (1)s because we will assign the parity as a subgroup of a U (1). Thus, we do not consider the nonabelian symmetry SU (3)_L SU (3)_R. Then, we are left with the global symmetry U (1)_{V10}. This choice of anomaly free U (1)_{V10} is consistent with the discrete gauge symmetry [8]. We de ne V_{10} charges of 10^{H} and $\overline{10}^{H}$ are + 1 and {1, respectively. Matter $\overline{10}$ corresponding to the t-quark fam ily carries the vanishing V_{10} . O f course, this global symmetry U (1)_{V10}, not protected in string m odels, is broken by Yukawa couplings.

From T 6 sector in Table I, we also $\operatorname{nd} \frac{4}{3}$ s and $\overline{5}_{3}^{L}$ s carrying odd-X quantum num – bers. Again, we call these two vectorlike pairs as 5^{H} and $\overline{5}^{H}$, for which we de ne another vector global symmetry U $(1)_{V_{5}}$. Let V_{5} charges of the vectorlike 5^{H} and $\overline{5}^{H}$ be + 1 and {1, respectively. On the other hand, matter 5s which are chiral, carry the vanishing V_{5} charge. Again, this global symmetry U $(1)_{V_{5}}$ is broken by Yukawa couplings in our string compacti-

cation. For two vectorlike pairs of 5 and $\overline{5}$ of T 4, carrying even-X quantum numbers, we can consider such a U (1) symmetry but the X charges are already even and we do not need

another manipulation for these even-X vectorlike pairs.

Before continuing discussion on V₁₀ and V₅ charges, let us brie y comment on vectorlike representations of exotics. There are two kinds of exotics. One kind is E-exotics which carry $X = \frac{5}{2}$ charges, and hence they are $Q_{em} = \frac{1}{2}$ exotics. The other kind is G-exotics which carry SU (5) charges also: $5_{+\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\overline{5}_{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Being vectorlike, the E-exotics and G-exotics can be assigned respective U (1)_V quantum numbers as discussed in the preceding paragraph. But they are more restricted than the global charges we discussed for U (1)_{V10} and U (1)_{V5}. The U (1)_V symmetry for exotics is identical to U (1)_{em} and it is not broken. The electrom agnetic charges of G-exotics are $\frac{1}{6}$ for colored ones in $\overline{5}_{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $5_{+\frac{1}{2}}$. The color singlet bound states composed of colored ones of G-exotics carry Q_{em} = $-\frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, all color singlet exotics, elementary and composite, carry Q_{em} = $-\frac{1}{2}$. Because of the exact U (1)_{em}, the lightest Q_{em} = $-\frac{1}{2}$ exotics are absolutely stable. Therefore, we separate out the exotics from the rest integer charged sector and do not consider the vectorlike exotics any ore.

Going back to the vectorlike representations of 10^{H} , $\overline{10}^{H}$, 5^{H} , and $\overline{5}^{H}$, let us de ne a global charge as

$$= X + V_{10} + V_5:$$
 (4)

These charges are shown in Table I. The U $(1)_X$ symmetry is a gauge symmetry and exact, and U $(1)_{V_{10}}$ and U $(1)_{V_5}$ are global symmetries and approximate. When we break these gauge and global symmetries spontaneously by one direction in the U (1) spaces, the gauge symmetry is considered to be broken and a global symmetry remains. The surviving global symmetry is U (1). This is the so-called 't Hooft mechanism [9]. In our case, the gauge symmetry U (1)_X is broken by the VEVs 10^{H} and $\overline{10}^{H}$. Because 10^{H} carries = 2 and $\overline{10}^{H}$ carries = 2, VEVs of 10^{H} and $\overline{10}^{H}$ do not break the Z₂ subgroup of U (1). At this level, the continuous symmetry is broken

U (1)
$$! P :$$
 (5)

III. HARM LESS R-PARITY AS A DISCRETE SUBGROUP OF U (1)

Of course, the continuous global symmetry U (1) is not exact, being broken by superpotential terms. But, $\$ being broken by superpotential term s?" It is not so. However, this is harm less in the proton decay problem . To show this, let us note possible superpotential terms in the MSSM, generating $B \notin 0$ operators,

$$D = 4 : u^{c} d^{c} d^{c};$$
(6)

$$D = 5: qqql; u^{c}u^{c}d^{c}e^{+}$$
(7)

where q and 1 are quark and lepton doublets, respectively. The dimension-4 operator of Eq. (6) alone does not lead to proton decay, but that term together with the L \leq 0 superpotential qd^c1 leads to a very fast proton decay and the product of their couplings must satisfy a very stringent constraint, < 10²⁶. The D = 5 operators in (7) are not that much dangerous, but still the couplings must satisfy constraints, < 10⁸ [1, 6].

Therefore, we must forbid the D = 4 operator. So let us look for possibilities of generating the u^cd^cd^c superpotential term. In the ipped SU (5), it is contained in $5_3\overline{10}_1\overline{10}_1$, which is how ever forbidden by the SU (5) U (1)_x gauge symmetry. In the ipped SU (5), the D = 4;5 operators are generated by

$$D = 4 :$$

$$[d^{c}d^{c}u^{c}]_{F}; [qd^{c}]_{F} (h\overline{10}^{H} i \overline{10} \overline{10} 5; (8))$$

and

D - E .

$$D = 5.$$

$$O_{1} = [qqql]_{F} (\overline{10} \overline{10} \overline{10} \overline{5}; O_{2} = [u^{c}u^{c}d^{c}e^{+}]_{F} (55 \overline{10} 1)$$

$$O_{3} = [qqqH_{d}]_{F} (hl0^{H}i\overline{10} \overline{10} \overline{10} \overline{5}_{2}; O_{4} = [qu^{c}e^{+}H_{d}]_{F} (hl0^{H}i\overline{10} 51 \overline{5}_{2})$$

$$O_{5} = [lH_{u}H_{u}]_{F} (h\overline{10}^{H}i\overline{10}^{H}i555_{2} 5_{2} 5_{2}; O_{6} = [lH_{d}H_{u}H_{u}]_{F} (h\overline{10}^{H}i5\overline{5}_{2} 5_{2} 5_{2})$$
(9)

In our model, even with including the possibilities of multiplying a number of neutral singlets, we not that some of the above operators are forbidden up to very high orders.

Since there are num erous neutral singlets which can acquire GUT or string scale VEVs, we must consider all higher order terms also. u^c appears from 5_3 in $U_3;U_1$ and T2. d^c appears from $\overline{10}_1$ in $U_3;U_1$ and T6. Note that matter $\overline{10}_1$ in T6 is the chiral one and does not carry a V_{10} charge, and it is the = 1 part out of four $\overline{10}s$ in T6. At D = 3 level, there does not appear $u^c d^c d^c$ due to the ipped SU (5) gauge symmetry before considering any superstring property. One may consider $u^c d^c d^c$ (neutral singlets). Neutral singlets carry X = 0 and hence the possibility $u^{c}d^{c}d^{c}$ (neutral singlets) is forbidden. On the other hand, $5_{3}\overline{10}_{1}\overline{10}_{1}\overline{10}_{1}\overline{10}_{1}$ is allowed by the gauge symmetry. Giving a GUT scale VEV to one of $\overline{10}_{1}$ s, we obtain the term $u^{c}d^{c}d^{c}$. It is a very dangerous R-parity violating term. The $\overline{10}_{1}$ obtaining a GUT scale VEV is $\overline{10}^{H}$. So, electively, we need a coupling $5\overline{10}\overline{10}\overline{10}^{H}$ 100 hich breaks the R-parity P (5 and $\overline{10}$ carry P = 1 while $\overline{10}^{H}$ carries P = 0 according to (4) and (5)). Thus the lipped SU (5) model at the supergravity level is in jeopardy if the couplings of the form $5_{3}\overline{10}_{1}\overline{10}_{1}\overline{10}_{1}$ (neutral singlets) are allowed. The only cure of this problem at the supergravity level is in posing the R-parity by assumption. But superstring models are free from such an assumption except for choosing the vacuum. It must be shown that such dangerous term s are electively forbidden in a superstring model, since the prime motivation tow and supersymmetry and superstring was to understand the hierarchy of order 10²⁶.

We checked the coupling $5_3\overline{10}_1\overline{10}_1\overline{10}_1$ attached with singlets, and we do not indiany such term up to D = 9 with the application of the program of Ref. [10]. This invites for a careful check of the individual H -m om enta of the elds so that the computing time is drastically reduced. The needed H -m om enta are

$$U_{1}: (1;0;0); \quad U_{2}: (0;1;0); \quad U_{3}: (0;0;1);$$

$$T2: (\frac{1}{6}; \frac{4}{6}; \frac{1}{6}); \quad T4: (\frac{1}{3}; \frac{1}{3}; \frac{1}{3}); \quad T6: (\frac{1}{2}; 0; \frac{1}{2})$$
(10)

Since 5_3 has three possible locations $U_1; U_3$ and T_2 , and $\overline{10}_1$ has three possible locations $U_1; U_3$ and T 6, the possible combinations to be considered are 18 if we require one $\overline{10}_1$ must be in T 6. These are tabulated in Table II. Now a function of neutral singlets must be found so that the total H -m om entum together with those of Table II becomes ({1, 1, 1}) m od (12, 3, 12).

The neutral singlets appear from the sectors of U_2 ; T2; T4; and T6. The numbers of neutral singlets from U_2 ; T2; T4; and T6 are nonnegative u_2 ; $t = \begin{bmatrix} P \\ t_i \end{bmatrix}$; $f = \begin{bmatrix} P \\ f_i \end{bmatrix}$; and $s = \begin{bmatrix} P \\ P \end{bmatrix}$

 s_i , respectively. The subscripts in the twisted sector distinguishes the neutral singlets due to the oscillator contributions. A ll neutral singlets in T 6 carry oscillators and there are four kinds of oscillators in neutral singlets in T 6 [5]; thus we consider s_i (i = 1; ;4). In T 2, neutral singlets appear with or without oscillators. There are seven di erent H -m om enta due to their oscillator contributions; thus t_i (i = 1; ;7). In T 4, neutral singlets have four di erent oscillator contributions; thus f_i (i = 1; ;4). Thus, in T 2; T 4, and T 6 sectors, in

5 ₃	10 1	10 1	10 1	H-mom.	N	5 ₃	10 1	10 1	10 1	H-mom.	N
U ₁	U ₁	U ₁	Τ6	$(\frac{7}{2};0;\frac{1}{2})$	11	U ₃	U ₃	U ₃	Τ6	$(\frac{1}{2};0;\frac{7}{2})$	11
U ₁	U ₁	U ₃	Τ6	$(\frac{5}{2};0;\frac{3}{2})$	11	U ₃	U ₃	Τ6	Τ6	(1;0;3)	12
U ₁	U ₁	Τ6	Τ6	(3;0;1)	12	U ₃	Τ6	Τ6	Τ6	$(\frac{3}{2};0;\frac{5}{2})$	11
U ₁	U ₃	U ₃	Τ6	$(\frac{3}{2};0;\frac{5}{2})$	11	т2	U ₁	U ₁	Τ6	$(\frac{8}{3};\frac{2}{3};\frac{2}{3})$	10
U ₁	U ₃	Т6	Τ6	(2;0;2)	12	Т2	U ₁	U ₃	Т6	$(\frac{5}{3};\frac{2}{3};\frac{5}{3})$	10
U ₁	Т6	Т6	Τ6	$(\frac{5}{2};0;\frac{3}{2})$	11	Т2	U ₁	Т6	Τ6	$(\frac{13}{6};\frac{2}{3};\frac{7}{6})$	11
U ₃	U ₁	U ₁	Τ6	$(\frac{5}{2};0;\frac{3}{2})$	11	Т2	U ₃	U ₃	Τ6	$(\frac{2}{3};\frac{2}{3};\frac{8}{3})$	10
U ₃	U ₁	U ₃	Τ6	$(\frac{3}{2};0;\frac{5}{2})$	11	Т2	U ₃	Т6	Τ6	$(\frac{7}{6};\frac{2}{3};\frac{13}{6})$	11
U ₃	U ₁	Т6	Τ6	(2;0;2)	12	Т2	Τ6	Т6	Τ6	$(\frac{5}{3};\frac{2}{3};\frac{5}{3})$	10

TABLE II: Possible assignments of 5_3 and $\overline{10}_1$ s. N denotes the dimension of the lowest dimensional breaking operators.

addition we must add oscillator contributions for neutral singlets

$$T2: (0;0;0)t_{1}; (1;0;0)t_{2}; (0;1;0)t_{3}; (0;0; 1)t_{4};$$

$$(2;0;0)t_{5}; (0;0; 2)t_{6}; (1;0; 1)t_{7}$$
(11)

$$T 4 : (0;0;0)f_1; (1;0;0)f_2; (0; 1;0)f_3; (0;0; 1)f_4;$$
(12)

$$T 6: (1;0;0)s_1; (1;0;0)s_2; (0;0;1)s_3; (0;0; 1)s_4:$$
(13)

Thus, we require three equations from the entries of H -m om enta

$$(0;1;0)u_{2} + (\frac{1}{6};\frac{2}{3};\frac{1}{6})t + (\frac{1}{3};\frac{1}{3};\frac{1}{3})f + (\frac{1}{2};0;\frac{1}{2})s \\ + (0;0;0)t_{1} + (1;0;0)t_{2} + (0;1;0)t_{3} + (0;0; 1)t_{4} \\ + (2;0;0)t_{5} + (0;0; 2)t_{6} + (1;0; 1)t_{7} \\ + (0;0;0)f_{1} + (1;0;0)f_{2} + (0; 1;0)f_{3} + (0;0; 1)f_{4} \\ + (1;0;0)s_{1} + (1;0;0)s_{2} + (0;0;1)s_{3} + (0;0; 1)s_{4} \\ + (the entries of H momenta) = (1;1;1) mod: (12;3;12): (14)$$

The stentry equation is

$$\frac{1}{6} (t_1 \quad 5t_2 + t_3 + t_4 \quad 11t_5 + t_6 \quad 5t_7) \quad \frac{1}{3} (f_1 \quad 2f_2 + f_3 + f_4)$$
$$\frac{1}{2} (s_1 + 3s_2 + s_3 + s_4) + (\text{the rst entry of H momenta}) = 1; \text{ mod: } 12 \quad (15)$$

The third entry equation is

$$\frac{1}{6}(t_1 + t_2 + t_3 \quad 5t_4 + t_5 \quad 11t_6 \quad 5t_7) + \frac{1}{3}(f_1 + f_2 + f_3 \quad 2f_4) \\ + \frac{1}{2}(s_1 + s_2 + 3s_3 \quad s_4) + \text{ (the third entry of H momenta)} = +1; \text{ mod:} 12: \quad (16)$$

The second entry equation is

$$u_{2} + \frac{2}{3}(t_{1} + t_{2} + 5t_{3} + t_{4} + t_{5} + t_{6} + t_{7}) + \frac{1}{3}(f_{1} + f_{2} - 2f_{3} + f_{4}) + (\text{the second entry of H momenta}) = +1; \text{ mod: 3:}$$
(17)

Adding Eqs. (15) and (16), we obtain

$$t_{2} \quad t_{4} + 2t_{5} \quad 2t_{6} + f_{2} \quad f_{4} + s_{1} \quad s_{2} + s_{3} \quad s_{4}$$

+ (sum of the 1st and 3rd entries of H m om enta) = 0; m od:12: (18)

Consider the st case $(U_1U_1U_1T_6)$ of Table II. We nd a minimum order solution as $u_2 = 2$; $t_2 = 3$, which would give a dimension-9 operator. By the computer program, we checked that there is no operators up to dimension-9. So, this solution must be forbidden by the gauge symmetry. To check this, let us note that the gauge U (1) charges of these singlets are [5]

$$u_{2} : (0^{8}) (1;1;0^{6})^{0};$$

$$t_{2} : (1_{0}; \frac{2}{3};\frac{1}{2};\frac{1}{2}) (\frac{1}{3};\frac{1}{3};0^{6})^{0}$$

The gauge charge $(0^8)(2;2;0^6)^0$ of two u_2s , i.e. two $s^u s$ of [5], cannot be canceled by three t_2s . Thus, even if the H -m om entum rule allows it, the gauge invariance forbids it. Another H -m om entum solution $u_2 = 2; t_1 = 1; t_2 = 1; t_5 = 1$ does not satisfy the gauge invariance either.

We looked for gauge invariant solutions satisfying Eqs. (15,17,16). The restriction from the H-m om entum rule saved computing time and we not that the lowest order B $\stackrel{6}{\leftarrow}$ 0

operators occur at D = 10. There are thirty-four operators at D = 10.

$$W = T2_5U I_{1\overline{10}}U I_{1\overline{10}}T 6_{\overline{10}} \frac{9}{1} = \frac{9}{10} + C_9^2 C_9^2$$

Thus, for Table II the couplings $5_3\overline{10}_1\overline{10}_1\overline{10}_1$ are of the form

$$W \qquad \frac{hS^{0}i}{M_{s}} \stackrel{6}{\longrightarrow} \frac{h\overline{10}^{H}i}{M_{s}} u^{c}d^{c}d^{c} \qquad (20)$$

(19)

where M_s is the string scale close to O (10) times the GUT scale. The upper bound of the coeccient is the squareroot of 10²⁶ since 10²⁶ is on the product of coeccients of two e ective operators [fd^cu^c]_F and [gd^c]_F out of the same coupling h10^H i 10 10 5 in ipped SU (5). Thus a coeccient of u^cd^cd^c less than 10¹³ is easily achievable for hS⁰ i $(\frac{1}{100})M_s$ with h10^H i M_{GUT} . The number $\frac{1}{100}$ is understood as an average number if we choose the overall coeccient as 1. However, it should be noted that some singlet VEVs can be much smaller than 10² and the overall coeccient can be a relatively small number,² in which case

 $^{^2}$ If the nonrenorm alizable couplings appear as connected cubic diagram s, dimension-10 couplings would

other singlet VEVs can be closer to M_s . This shows that the dangerous D = 4 operators of Eq. (10) are not harm ful in some vacua, $hS^{0}i$ $(\frac{1}{100})M_s$, of the $Z_{12 I}$ compactication of the heterotic string [5]. This proof also shows that the operators O_1 of Eq. (9) is perfectly harm less since one requires the coeccient of O_1 being less than 10^8 . The operator O_3 is not dangerous since the $B \notin 0$ process with O_3 also needs the second operator of Eq. (8).

Thus, for dangerous $B \notin 0$ processes we are left with O_2 of Eq. (9). The phenom enological bound on the coe cient of dimension-5 operator O_2 is taken as order 10^8 . The relevant ipped SU (5) term $55\overline{10}1$ needs $U_1;U_3;T2$ (for matter 5), $U_1;U_3;T6$ (for matter $\overline{10}$), and $U_1;U_3;T2$ (for matter 1). Possible cases are 54, which are listed in Table III.

We analyzed also violating or R-parity violating O_2 terms. In this case, we have the lowest order R-parity violating O_2 terms at dimension 8. They are

$$W = T 2_5 T 2_5 T 6_{\overline{10}} T 2_1 \underbrace{+ C_3 D_2^+ d_3^+ s_3 + C_7 C_6^0 s_5^0 s_3^0}_{+ C_7 C_5^0 s_8^0 s_1^0} \underbrace{+ C_3 D_2^+ d_3^+ s_3 + C_7 C_6^0 s_5^0 s_3^0}_{+ C_7 C_5^0 s_8^0 s_1^0} \underbrace{; \qquad (21)}_{+ C_7 C_5^0 s_8^0 s_1^0}$$

As commented earlier, the phenomenological constraint on the coe cient of O_2 is rather mid, < 10⁸, and dimension-8 operator can be easily below this bound satisfying the bound on O_1 . Note that all terms in Eqs. (19) and (21) include C_7^0 or C_3 . So relatively small values of hC_7^0 i and hC_3 i are helpful to full the constraints.

Therefore, the R-parity violating term s of [5] can be made harm less.

O ther possible B $\stackrel{6}{=}$ 0 operators m ay be present. For example, we m ay consider a P breaking $h\overline{10}^{H}$ $ih\overline{10}^{H}$ $i\overline{10}$ $\overline{10}$ 5 5 $_{2}$, $h\overline{10}^{H}$ $ih\overline{10}^{H}$ $i\overline{10}^{H}$ $\overline{10}$ 5^{H} 5 5 $_{2}$, etc. The form er one leads to dimension-6 operators suppressed by M $_{S}^{4}$, and the second one leads to dimension-5 operators with heavy particle attached. Here, if any R-parity violating operator occurs, it must involve su cient suppression by M $_{S}$ powers or inclusion of heavy elds. The baryon number violations with such operators involving the heavy eld 5^{H} are safe phenom enologically. It is not any m ore dangerous than the standard baryon number violation in GUTs.

In sum, the parity P which is a subgroup of an (approximate) continuous global symmetry is an exact symmetry for operators involving the MSSM elds only, but is not an exact symmetry of the full theory. Nevertheless, it is good enough to forbid dangerous proton

involve an extra factor of (cubic couplings)⁷ power. For cubic couplings of $(\frac{1}{5})$, the average VEV ratio can be made small to $(\frac{1}{10})$.

5 ₃ 5 ₃	10 1	1 5	H-mom.	Ν	5 ₃	5 ₃	10 1	1 5	H-mom.	Ν	5 ₃	5 ₃	10 1	1 5	H-mom.	N
U ₁ U ₁	U ₁	U ₁	(4;0;0)	12	U ₁	Т2	U ₁	U ₁	$(\frac{19}{6};\frac{2}{3};\frac{1}{6})$	11	U ₃	т2	U ₁	U ₁	$(\frac{13}{6};\frac{2}{3};\frac{7}{6})$	11
U ₁ U ₁	U ₁	U ₃	(3;0;1)	12	U ₁	Т2	U ₁	U ₃	$(\frac{13}{6};\frac{2}{3};\frac{7}{6})$	11	U ₃	т2	U ₁	U ₃	$(\frac{7}{6};\frac{2}{3};\frac{13}{6})$	11
U ₁ U ₁	U1	Т2	$(\frac{19}{6};\frac{2}{3};\frac{1}{6})$	11	U1	Т2	U ₁	Т2	$(\frac{7}{3};\frac{4}{3};\frac{1}{3})$	10	U ₃	т2	U ₁	Т2	$(\frac{4}{3};\frac{4}{3};\frac{4}{3})$	10
U ₁ U ₁	U ₃	U ₁	(3;0;1)	12	U1	Т2	U ₃	U ₁	$(\frac{13}{6};\frac{2}{3};\frac{7}{6})$	11	U ₃	т2	U ₃	U ₁	$(\frac{7}{6};\frac{2}{3};\frac{13}{6})$	11
U ₁ U ₁	U ₃	U ₃	(2;0;2)	12	U1	Т2	U ₃	U ₃	$(\frac{7}{6};\frac{2}{3};\frac{13}{6})$	11	U ₃	т2	U ₃	U ₃	$(\frac{1}{6};\frac{2}{3};\frac{19}{6})$	11
U ₁ U ₁	U ₃	Т2	$(\frac{13}{6};\frac{2}{3};\frac{7}{6})$	11	U ₁	Т2	U ₃	Т2	$(\frac{4}{3};\frac{4}{3};\frac{4}{3})$	10	U ₃	т2	U ₃	Т2	$(\frac{1}{3};\frac{4}{3};\frac{7}{3})$	10
U ₁ U ₁	Т6	U ₁	$(\frac{7}{2};0;\frac{1}{2})$	11	U ₁	Т2	Τ6	U ₁	$(\frac{8}{3};\frac{2}{3};\frac{2}{3})$	10	U ₃	т2	Τ6	U ₁	$(\frac{5}{3};\frac{2}{3};\frac{5}{3})$	10
U ₁ U ₁	Т6	U ₃	$(\frac{5}{2};0;\frac{3}{2})$	11	U ₁	Т2	Τ6	U ₃	$(\frac{5}{3};\frac{2}{3};\frac{5}{3})$	10	U ₃	т2	Τ6	U ₃	$(\frac{2}{3};\frac{2}{3};\frac{8}{3})$	10
U ₁ U ₁	T 6	Т2	$(\frac{8}{3};\frac{2}{3};\frac{2}{3})$	10	U1	Т2	Τ6	Т2	$(\frac{11}{6};\frac{4}{3};\frac{5}{6})$	9	U ₃	т2	Τ6	Т2	$(\frac{5}{6};\frac{4}{3};\frac{11}{6})$	9
U ₁ U ₃	3 U ₁	U ₁	(3;0;1)	12	U ₃	U ₃	U ₁	U ₁	(2;0;2)	12	Т2	т2	U ₁	U ₁	$(\frac{7}{3};\frac{4}{3};\frac{1}{3})$	10
U ₁ U ₃	3 U ₁	U ₃	(2;0;2)	12	U ₃	U ₃	U ₁	U ₃	(1;0;3)	12	Т2	т2	U ₁	U ₃	$(\frac{4}{3};\frac{4}{3};\frac{4}{3})$	10
U1 U3	3 U1	Т2	$(\frac{13}{6};\frac{2}{3};\frac{7}{6})$	11	U ₃	U ₃	U ₁	Т2	$(\frac{7}{6};\frac{2}{3};\frac{13}{6})$	11	Т2	т2	U ₁	Т2	$(\frac{3}{2};2;\frac{1}{2})$	9
U ₁ U ₃	3 U 3	U ₁	(2;0;2)	12	U ₃	U ₃	U ₃	U ₁	(1;0;3)	12	Т2	Т2	U ₃	U ₁	$(\frac{4}{3};\frac{4}{3};\frac{4}{3})$	10
U ₁ U ₃	3 U 3	U ₃	(1;0;3)	12	U ₃	U ₃	U ₃	U ₃	(0;0;4)	12	Т2	т2	U ₃	U ₃	$(\frac{1}{3};\frac{4}{3};\frac{7}{3})$	10
U ₁ U ₃	3 U ₃	Т2	$(\frac{7}{6};\frac{2}{3};\frac{13}{6})$	11	U ₃	U ₃	U ₃	Т2	$(\frac{1}{6};\frac{2}{3};\frac{19}{6})$	11	Т2	т2	U ₃	Т2	$(\frac{1}{2};2;\frac{3}{2})$	9
U ₁ U ₃	3 T 6	U ₁	$(\frac{5}{2};0;\frac{3}{2})$	11	U ₃	U ₃	Τ6	U ₁	$(\frac{3}{2};0;\frac{5}{2})$	11	Т2	т2	Τ6	U ₁	$(\frac{11}{6};\frac{4}{3};\frac{5}{6})$	9
U ₁ U ₃	3 T 6	U ₃	$(\frac{3}{2};0;\frac{5}{2})$	11	U ₃	U ₃	Τ6	U ₃	$(\frac{1}{2};0;\frac{7}{2})$	11	Т2	Т2	Τ6	U ₃	$(\frac{5}{6};\frac{4}{3};\frac{11}{6})$	9
U ₁ U ₃	з Тб	Т2	$(\frac{5}{3};\frac{2}{3};\frac{5}{3})$	10	U ₃	U ₃	Τ6	Т2	$(\frac{2}{3};\frac{2}{3};\frac{8}{3})$	10	Т2	т2	Τ6	Т2	(1 ; 2;1)	8

TABLE III: Possible assignments for O_2 of Eq. (9). N denotes the dimension of the lowest dimensional breaking operators.

decay operators.

There may be B = 0 and still P violating operators. One well known example is the lepton number violating operators. Since there is no quadratic superpotential term, P violation with B = 0 must be looked where superpotential terms have D 3. The phenom enological constraints on B = 0 and still P violating operators are not so serious [11]. Indeed, the lepton number violating operator lle⁺ in the MSSM is generated also through $h\overline{10}^{H}$ i551 in the ipped SU (5), which is discussed above. Thus, lle[±] is also strongly suppressed.

IV. CONCLUSION

In the $Z_{12 I}$ m odel of Ref. [5], a discrete parity P which is a discrete subgroup of U (1) is found. U (1) contains the U (1)_X symmetry of the ipped SU (5). If the SU (5) breaking components $\overline{10}^{H}$ and 10^{H} are found to carry even X quantum numbers, then we m ight have achieved an exact discrete parity as a subgroup of U (1)_X of ipped SU (5). But in our model these $\overline{10}^{H}$ and 10^{H} carry odd X quantum numbers and hence we must resort to an approximate U (1) and the resulting approximate P. Nevertheless, the dangerous dimension-4 and dimension-5 B \notin 0 operators are forbidden up to su ciently high dimensions, and the discrete R-parity P is harm less. We also noted that this very high order constraint occurs from the high order 12 of Z_{12} .

A cknow ledgm ents

This work is supported in part by the KRF G rants No. R14-2003-012-01001-0, No. R02-2004-000-10149-0 and No. KRF-2005-084-C 00001.

- [1] L.E. Ibanez and G.Ross, Nucl. Phys. B 368 (1992) 3.
- [2] H.K.Dreiner, C.Luhn and M.Thormeier, Phys. Rev. D 73 (2006) 075007.
- [3] D.J.Gross, J.A.Harvey, E.J.Martinec, and R.Rohm, Phys. Rev. Lett. 54 (1985) 502.
- [4] L.E. Ibanez, J.E.Kim, H.P.Nilles, and F.Quevedo, Phys. Lett. B 191 (1987) 282.
- [5] J.E.K im and B.K yae, arX iv hep-th/0608085; J.E.K im and B.K yae, arX iv hep-th/0608086.
- [6] N.Sakaiand T.Yanagida, Nucl. Phys. B 197 (1982) 533; S.W einberg, Phys. Rev. D 26 (1982)
 287.
- [7] H.K.Dreiner, H.Murayam a and M.Thorm eier, Nucl. Phys. B 729 (2005) 278. See also
 H.K.Dreiner, C.Luhn, H.Murayam a and M.Thorm eier, arX is hep-ph/0610026.
- [8] L.Krauss and F.W ilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62 (1989) 1221; T.Banks, Nucl. Phys. B 323 (1989) 90; S.P.M artin, Phys. Rev. D 46 (1992) 2769.
- [9] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B 35 (1971) 167.
- [10] K.-S.Choi, I.-W. Kim and J.E.Kim, hep-ph/0612107.
- [11] B.C.Allanach, A.Dedes and H.K.Dreiner, Phys.Rev.D 60 (1999) 075014.