Renorm alisation-group invariance and universal soft supersymmetry-breaking

I. Jack and D. R. T. Jones

DAMTP, University of Liverpool, LiverpoolL69 3BX, U.K.

We show that a particular \universal" form for the soft-breaking couplings in a softly broken N = 1 supersymmetric gauge theory is renormalisation-group invariant through two loops, provided we impose one simple condition on the dimensionless couplings. The universal form for the trilinear couplings and mass terms is identical to that found in popular derivations of the soft-breaking terms from strings or supergravity.

January 1995

If we take the standard m odel, generalize to two H iggs doublets, supersymmetrize, in pose R-parity, and add all possible soft supersymmetry breaking terms then we have the supersymmetric standard m odel. The resulting theory has an alarming number of arbitrary parameters; farmore than the standard model. It is customary to assume that the plethora of possible independent soft terms undergo a form of unication, at the same scale where the gauge couplings meet. At this scale it is supposed that the soft terms consist simply of a common scalar mass, a common gaugino mass, and ³ and ² interactions proportional to the analogous terms in the superpotential; the constants of proportionality being denoted A and B respectively. This simplication can be motivated to some extent by appeal to N = 1 supergravity, and in particular to the idea that the supersymmetry breaking occurs in a hidden sector and is communicated to the observable sector via gravitational interactions (for a review, see [1]). It also arises in superstring phenomenology [2] [3].

In this note we attempt to motivate a simple form for the soft breakings in a dierent way. We explore the consequences of imposing that the soft breakings in the theory at the unit cation scale be form invariant under renorm alisation. In other words we require that the theory be renorm alisable, in the usual sense that counter-terms generated by shifting parameters and elds in the Lagrangian su ce to remove the divergences encountered in perturbation theory. In general, of course, imposing strict renorm alisability requires us to write down all interactions permitted by the symmetries. We will nd, however, that a particular universal form for the soft-breaking couplings (one which is compatible with the desired pattern of supersymmetry breaking described above) is renorm alisation-group (RG) invariant at least through two bops provided we impose one simple condition on the dimensionless coupling sector of the theory. Theories with this property would have the attractive feature that the universal form of the soft breaking terms (which is presumably generated by supersymmetry breaking of the underlying supergravity or superstring theory at or near the P lanck scale) would be exactly preserved down to the gauge unit cation scale. The Lagrangian L_{SUSY} (W) is defined by the superpotential

$$W = \frac{1}{6} Y^{ijk}_{i j k} + \frac{1}{2}^{ij}_{i j} + L^{i}_{i}$$
(1)

 L_{SUSY} is the Lagrangian for the N = 1 supersymmetric gauge theory, containing the gauge multiplet fA; g (being the gaugino) and a chiral super eld i with component elds f i; ig transforming as a (in general reducible) representation R of the gauge group G.

W e assume that there are no gauge-singlet elds and that G is simple. (The generalisation to a sem i-simple group is trivial.) The soft breaking is incorporated in L_{SB} , given by

$$L_{SB} = (m^2)_{i}^{j i}_{j} + \frac{1}{6}h^{ijk}_{i j k} + \frac{1}{2}b^{ij}_{i j} + \frac{1}{2}M + hc:$$
(2)

(Here and elsewhere, quantities with superscripts are complex conjugates of those with subscripts; thus ⁱ (_i) .) A side from the term s included in L_{SB} in Eq. (2), one might in general have ² -type couplings, mass term s or -mixing terms (as long as they satisfy a constraint that quadratic divergences are not produced). However, the soft-breaking terms we have included are those which would be engendered by an underlying supergravity theory and which are therefore considered most frequently in the literature.

The non-renormalisation theorem tells us that the superpotential W undergoes no in nite renormalisation so that we have, for instance

where is the anom alous dimension for . The one-loop results for the gauge coupling -function $_{\rm q}$ and for are given by

16
$${}^{2}_{g} {}^{(1)} = g^{3}Q$$
; and 16 ${}^{2}_{j} {}^{(1)i} = P^{i}_{j};$ (4)

where

$$16^{2}Q = T(R) \quad 3C(G); \text{ and}$$
 (5a)

16
$${}^{2}P_{j}^{i} = \frac{1}{2}Y_{jkl}^{ikl}Y_{jkl} \quad 2g^{2}C (R)_{j}^{i}$$
 (5b)

Here

$$T(R)_{AB} = Tr(R_A R_B); C(G)_{AB} = f_{ACD} f_{BCD} \text{ and } C(R)_{j}^{1} = (R_A R_A)_{j}^{1};$$
 (6)

The one-loop -functions for the soft-breaking couplings are given by

$$16 {}^{2}{}^{(1)ijk}_{h} = U^{ijk} + U^{kij} + U^{jki};$$
(7a)

$$16 {}^{2} \left[{}^{(1)}_{m^{2}} \right]^{i}_{j} = W {}^{i}_{j} + 2g^{2} (R_{A})^{i}_{j} tr [R_{A} m^{2}];$$
(7b)

$$16 {}^{2} {}^{(1)ij}_{b} = V^{ij} + V^{ji};$$
(7c)

$$16 {}^{2} {}^{(1)}_{M} = 2g^{2}QM;$$
 (7d)

where

$$U^{ijk} = h^{ijl}P^{k}_{l} + Y^{ijl}X^{k}_{l};$$
(8a)

$$V^{ij} = b^{il}P^{k}_{l} + \frac{1}{2}Y^{ijl}Y_{lm n}b^{m n} + {}^{il}X^{j}_{l};$$
(8b)

$$W_{i}^{j} = \frac{1}{2} Y_{ipq} Y_{pqn}^{pqn} (m^{2})_{n}^{j} + \frac{1}{2} Y_{pqn}^{jpq} Y_{pqn} (m^{2})_{i}^{n} + 2 Y_{ipq} Y_{ipq}^{jpr} (m^{2})_{r}^{q} + h_{ipq} h^{jpq} 8g^{2} M M C (R)_{i}^{j};$$
(8c)

with

$$X_{j}^{i} = h^{ikl}Y_{jkl} + 4M g^{2}C (R)_{j}^{i}$$
(9)

Our assumption that the group G is sem i-simple implies that the tr $\mathbb{R}_A m^2$] term in Eq. (7b) is zero, while the absence of gauge singlets m eans that (for instance in Eq. (8b)) we have

$$Y_{ijk}b^{jk} = Y_{ijk}^{\ jk} = 0$$
: (10)

W e then claim that the conditions

$$h^{ijk} = M Y^{ijk}; \qquad (11a)$$

$$(m^2)_{j}^{i} = \frac{1}{3} (1 - \frac{1}{16^2} \frac{2}{3} g^2 Q) M M_{j}^{i};$$
 (11b)

$$b^{ij} = \frac{2}{3}M^{ij}$$
(11c)

are RG invariant through at least two loops, provided we impose the condition

$$P_{j}^{i} = \frac{1}{3}g^{2}Q_{j}^{i}$$
 (12)

(The idea of seeking relations amongst dimensionless couplings which are preserved by renorm alisation has been explored in the coupling constant reduction program m e of Z im - m erm ann et al.[4].) We rst demonstrate the RG invariance of the conditions Eq. (11). The invariance of Eq. (11a) requires

$${}^{ijk}_{h} = {}_{M} Y^{ijk} M {}^{i}_{m} Y^{m jk} M {}^{j}_{m} Y^{im k} M {}^{k}_{m} Y^{ijm} :$$
(13)

The strategy we adopt to verify equations such as Eq. (13) is to simplify the -functions and anom alous dimensions as follows: rstly we use Eq. (12) to replace P_j^i by Q. We also use Eqs. (11) to replace h^{ijk} , m² and b wherever they occur. Having done this, we nd that any occurrences of $Y_{ikl}Y^{jkl}$, C (R), C (G) or T (R) can be written in term s of P and Q according to Eq. (5). We can now use Eq. (12) again if necessary to replace P by Q. For instance, we nd, applying our strategy of imposing the condition Eq. (11a) in Eq. (9), and using Eqs. (5b), (12),

$$X^{i}_{j} = M Y^{ikl}Y_{jkl} + 4g^{2}M C (R)^{i}_{j}$$

= $\frac{2}{3}g^{2}QM^{i}_{j}$ (14)

Henceforth we shall simply assume that this procedure is followed where possible. For instance, from Eqs. (8a), (14), we nd

$$U^{ijk} = q^2 Q M Y^{ijk}$$
(15)

which, using Eqs. (7a;d), ensures that Eq. (13) is satisfied at one loop. The RG invariance of Eq. (11b) requires that

$$(_{m^2})^{i}_{j} = \frac{1}{3} \left[\left[1 - \frac{1}{16^2} \frac{2}{3} g^2 Q \right] \left[_{M} M + M (_{M}) \right] - \frac{1}{16^2} \frac{4}{3} g_{g} Q M M \right]^{i}_{j} :$$
 (16)

At one loop we readily nd, from Eqs. (7b), (8c),

$$W^{i}_{j} = M M (4P^{i}_{j} \frac{1}{16^{2}} \frac{2}{3} g^{2} Q Y_{ikl} Y^{jkl})$$

= $g^{2} Q M M (\frac{4}{3}^{i}_{j} \frac{1}{16^{2}} \frac{2}{3} Y_{ikl} Y^{jkl});$ (17)

which, with Eqs. (7b;d) implies Eq. (16) at one loop. (The additional, two-loop term in Eq. (17) will be required later.) Finally, for the RG invariance of Eq. (11c) we need

$${}^{ij}_{b} = \frac{2}{3} (M^{ij} + M^{i}_{k} {}^{kj} + M^{j}_{k} {}^{ik}):$$
 (18)

From Eqs. (8b), (14), we obtain

$$V^{ij} = \frac{8}{9}g^2 Q M^{ij};$$
 (19)

which, using Eqs. (7c;d), leads im mediately to Eq. (18) at one loop. Finally, it behaves us to check that the condition Eq. (12) is itself RG invariant. This amounts to the condition

$$\frac{1}{2} \quad {}^{i}_{m} Y^{m \ k \ l} Y_{jkl} + \quad {}^{m}_{j} Y^{ikl} Y_{m \ k \ l} + 4 Y^{ikl \ m}_{l} Y_{jkm} \qquad 4g_{g} C \ (R)^{i}_{j} = \frac{2}{3} g_{g} Q^{i}_{j}; \quad (20)$$

which is easily veri ed at one loop using Eqs. (4). The fact that the conditions Eq. (11), (12) are preserved by renorm alisation at one loop seems to us remarkable enough; how ever,

they are actually preserved even at the two-loop level as well. The two-loop -functions for the dimensionless couplings were calculated in Ref. [5]; they can be written in the form

$$(16^{2})^{2}_{g} = 2g^{5}C (G)Q = 2g^{3}r^{1}C (R)^{i}_{j}P^{j}_{i}$$
 (21a)

$$(16^{2})^{2} {}^{(2)i}{}_{j} = [Y_{jm n} Y^{m p i} 2g^{2}C (\mathbb{R})^{p}{}_{j} {}^{i}{}_{n} \mathbb{P}^{n}{}_{p} + 2g^{4}C (\mathbb{R})^{i}{}_{j}Q; \qquad (21b)$$

where Q and P $_{j}^{i}$ are given by Eq. (5), and r = AA.

The calculation of the two-loop -functions for the soft breaking couplings raises interesting issues concerning the use of dimensional reduction in non-supersymmetric theories [6].

The results are as follow $s[7]{[10]}$:

$$(16^{2})^{2} {}_{h}^{(2)ijk} = {}^{h} {}^{hijl}Y_{lm n}Y^{m pk} + 2Y^{ijl}Y_{lm n}h^{m pk} 4g^{2}M Y^{ijp}C (R)^{k}{}_{n}P^{n}{}_{p} 2g^{2}U^{ijl}C (R)^{k}{}_{1} + g^{4} (2h^{ijl} 8M Y^{ijl})C (R)^{k}{}_{1}Q Y^{ijl}Y_{lm n}Y^{pm k}X^{n}{}_{p} + (k \$ i) + (k \$ j);$$
(22a)
$$(16^{2})^{2} [{}^{(2)}{}_{m^{2}}]^{j}{}_{i} = {}^{h} {}^{m^{2}})_{i}^{1}Y_{lm n}Y^{m pj} + \frac{1}{2}Y_{ilm}Y^{jpm} (m^{2})^{1}{}_{n} + \frac{1}{2}Y_{inm}Y^{jlm} (m^{2})^{p}{}_{1} + Y_{iln}Y^{jrp} (m^{2})^{1}{}_{r} + h_{iln}h^{jlp} + 4g^{2}M M C (R)^{j}{}_{n} {}^{p}{}_{i} + 2g^{2} (R_{A})^{j}{}_{i} (R_{A} m^{2})^{p}{}_{n} {}^{p}{}^{n}{}_{p} + 2g^{2}M C (R)^{p}{}_{i} {}^{j}{}_{n} h_{iln}Y^{jlp} X^{n}{}_{p} - \frac{1}{2}Y_{iln}Y^{jlp} + 2g^{2}C (R)^{p}{}_{i} {}^{j}{}_{n} W^{n}{}_{p} + 12g^{4}M M C (R)^{j}{}_{i}Q + 4g^{4}SC (R)^{j}{}_{i} + hx;;$$
(22b)
$$(16^{2})^{2} {}^{(2)ij}{}_{b} = {}^{h} {}^{bil}Y_{lm n}Y^{m pj} 2^{il}Y_{lm n}h^{m pj} Y^{ijl}Y_{lm n}B^{n p} + 4g^{2}M C (R)^{i}{}_{k} {}^{kp}{}^{j}{}_{n} {}^{p}{}_{p}^{n} - \frac{ii}{2}Y_{im n}Y^{m pj} + \frac{1}{2}Y^{ijl}Y_{lm n} {}^{mp} X^{n}{}_{p} 2g^{2}C (R)^{i}{}_{k}V^{kj} + g^{2}C (R)^{i}{}_{k}Y^{kjl}Y_{lm n}B^{n n} + 2g^{4} (b^{ik} 4M {}^{ik})C (R)^{j}{}_{k}Q + (i \$ j);$$
(22c)
$$(16^{2})^{2} {}^{(2)}{}_{m} = g^{2} 8g^{2}C (G)QM 4r^{1}C (R)^{j}{}_{i}P^{j}{}_{i}M + 2r^{1}X^{i}{}_{j}C (R)^{j}{}_{i};$$
(22d)

where

$$S_{AB} = (m^2)^{i}{}_{j}(R_A R_B)^{i}{}_{j} M M C (G)_{AB}$$
 (23)

The expressions given in Eq. (22) (and in particular Eq. (22b)) correspond to the use of a particular subtraction scheme whereby the mass of the -scalars decouples from the evolution of the other parameters. For a discussion, see refs. [9], [10].

At two loops we nd, applying the usual procedure to Eqs. (21), (22d),

$$(16^{2})^{2} {}^{(2)i}{}_{j} = \frac{2}{9}g^{4}Q^{2} {}^{i}{}_{j}; \qquad (24a)$$

$$(16^{2})^{2} g^{(2)} = \frac{2}{3}g^{5}Q^{2};$$
 (24b)

$$(16^{2})^{2} M_{M}^{(2)} = \frac{8}{3}g^{4}Q^{2}M$$
: (24c)

Now we can go on to check the RG invariance of Eqs. (11) to two-loop order. Using Eqs. (14), (15) in Eq. (22a), we nd

$$(16^{2})^{2} {}_{h}^{(2)ijk} = \frac{10}{3} g^{4} Q^{2} M Y^{ijk}$$
: (25)

Inserting Eqs. (24a;c), and (25) into Eq. (13), we immediately verify the two-loop RG-invariance of Eq. (11a). Now using Eqs. (14), (17) in Eq. (22b), we obtain

$$(16^{2})^{2} \left({}^{(2)}_{m^{2}} \right)^{i}_{j} = 4Q g^{2} M M \quad (Y_{ikl}Y^{jkl} + \frac{14}{3}g^{2}C (R)^{i}_{j}):$$
(26)

Hence, from Eqs. (7b), (17), (26), we obtain

$$\binom{(1)}{m^2} + \binom{(2)}{m^2} \overset{i}{_{j}} = \frac{1}{16^2} Q g^2 M M (\frac{4}{3} - \frac{1}{16^2} \frac{28}{9} g^2 Q):$$
 (27)

Using Eqs. (10), (27), (24c), (7d), (4) in Eq. (16), we see that Eq. (11b) is RG invariant throughtwo loops. Using Eqs. (14), (19), (12), (4) in Eq. (22c), we nd

$$(16^{2})^{2}_{b} = \frac{56}{27} g^{4} Q^{2} M^{ij}$$
 (28)

On substituting Eqs. (28) and (24a;c) into Eq. (18), we see that Eq. (11c) is RG invariant at two bops. Finally, using Eqs. (24a;b), we verify Eq. (20) at two bops, ensuring the RG invariance of Eq. (12) at this level. Thus we have demonstrated the RG invariance of Eqs. (11) and (12) through two bops.

We turn now to the possibility of constructing realistic models satisfying our constraints. The main impact on low-energy physics, is that from Eq. (11) we have (in the usual notation) a universal scalar mass m₀ and universal A and B parameters related (to low est order in g^2) to the gaugino mass M as follows:

$$m_0 = \frac{1}{p-M}$$
; (29a)

$$A = M ;$$
 (29b)

$$B = \frac{2}{3}M :$$
 (29c)

Evidently it will be interesting to explore the region of the usual supersymmetric standard model parameter space consistent with Eq. (29); current experimental constraints will probably not rule out the scenario per se, but the various super-partner masses will be more tightly correlated than in the usual approach.

It follows from our results that if $P_{i}^{i} = Q = 0$, (quaranteeing that the dimensionless coupling -functions are zero to two loops) then soft-breaking couplings related by Eq. (29) will also have vanishing -functions, leading to the possibility of nite softly-broken supersymmetric theories. This has already been pointed out at the one-loop level in Ref. [11] and at the two-loop level in Ref. [9]. In Ref. [11] it was remarked that Eqs. (29a; b) are consistent with the pattern of soft-breaking term swhich emerges from supersymmetry breaking in the hidden sector of an underlying supergravity theory with a \m inim al" Kahler potential. Even m ore interestingly, Eqs. (29a; b) are identical to relations which arise in e ective supergravity theories m otivated by superstring theory, where supersymmetry breaking is assum ed to occur purely via a vacuum expectation value for the dilaton [2][3]. M ore general scenarios involving vacuum expectation values for otherm oduli elds are also possible. To be more specic, we follow Ref. [3] in concentrating on the modulus T whose classical value gives the size of the manifold, and parametrising the ratio of the auxiliary elds F^S and F^{T} for the dilaton S and for T by an angle {so that characterises the extent to which supersymmetry-breaking is dominated by S or T. We also simplify still further by assuming a vanishing cosm ological constant and by ignoring string loop corrections, and also the phases of F $^{\rm S}$ and F $^{\rm T}$. In this m ore general case, the gaugino m ass is related to the gravitino m ass m $_{\frac{3}{2}}$ by M = $3m_{\frac{3}{2}}$ sin , and the soft-breaking parameters m₀ and A are still given by Eqs. (29a; b), while B is either given by [3]

$$B = \frac{M(1 + \frac{p_{\overline{3}}\sin + \cos}{p_{\overline{3}}\sin})}{p_{\overline{3}}\sin}$$
(30)

or[12]

$$B = \frac{2M}{9 - 3\sin^2}; \qquad (31)$$

depending on whether the term is generated by an explicit -term in the supergravity superpotential, or by a special term in the Kahler potential. In the rst case the value $=\frac{4}{3}$ reproduces our constraint Eq. (29c); however, in the second case there is no value of which is consistent with this constraint.

In addition to Eq. (29), we also need to to impose Eq. (12) as a condition on the theory at the unication scale. It is not clear at present how such a constraint would

naturally emerge from string theory. The special case $P_j^i = Q = 0$, corresponding, as we have remarked, to two-loop nite theories, was tabulated in Ref. [13]. They found a fair number of possibilities, including a few of phenom enological interest: in particular a simple SU₅ model [14] [15].

We can anticipate, therefore, that it will be possible to construct uni ed models satisfying Eq. (12). The obvious try is a simple generalisation of the nite SU_5 model rst analysed in ref. [14]. The superpotential is

$$W = \frac{1}{2} A_{ij} \ 10_i 10_j H \ + B_{ij} \ 10_i 5_j H \ + C \ H \ 24H \ + D \ 24^3$$
(32)

where i; j:1:::x and ; :1:::y so that we have x generations, y sets of H iggs multiplets (H + H) and a single adjoint (24). It is straightforward to write down Eq. (12) for this model; tracing on all indices we obtain the relations:

$$A\dot{f} + \frac{8}{5}\dot{f}c\dot{f} = g^2y + \frac{8}{5} + \frac{1}{9}Q$$
; (33a)

$$\beta \hat{j} + \frac{6}{5} \hat{j} \hat{c} \hat{j} = g^2 y \quad \frac{6}{5} + \frac{1}{12} Q \quad ; \tag{33b}$$

$$B J^{2} = g^{2}x \frac{6}{5} + \frac{1}{12}Q \quad ; \qquad (33c)$$

$$3AJ + 2BJ = g^2 x \frac{36}{5} + \frac{1}{3}Q$$
; (33d)

$$\frac{189}{5}D^{2} + C^{2} = g^{2} \quad 10 + \frac{1}{3}Q \quad : \tag{33e}$$

where here Q = 2x + y 10. It is easy to show, however, that Eqs. (33) do not have a solution unless Q = 0, which corresponds to the nite case. This outcome is not generic, however, and it is easy to modify the theory so as to produce candidate theories that do satisfy Eq. (12), for example by including one or more sets of 10 + 10 multiplets. It remains to be seen, however, whether there exists a compelling united theory with universal soft breaking terms. Meanwhile, if we conjecture that such a theory leads to the same low energy physics as the supersymmetric standard model, we can at least explore the consequences of Eq. (29) for the super-particle spectrum. We will report on these calculations elsewhere.

A cknow ledgem ents

We thank Luis Ibanez for communications, and in particular for drawing Ref [12] to our attention. IJ thanks Carlos Munoz and Dennis Silverm an for useful conversations, and also thanks PPARC for nancial support.

References

- [1] H.-P.Nilles, Phys. Reports C 110 (1984) 1.
- [2] L.E. Ibanez and D. Lust, Nucl. Phys. B 382 (1992) 305;
 V.Kaplunovsky and J. Louis, Phys. Lett. B 306 (1993) 269;
 R.Barbieri, J.Louis and M. Moretti, Phys. Lett. B 312 (1993) 451; erratum -ibid 316 (1993) 632.
- [3] A.Brignole, L.E. Ibanez and C.M unoz, Nucl. Phys. B 422 (1994) 125.
- [4] N.P.Chang, Phys. Rev. D 10 (1974) 2706;
 J.Kubo, K.Sibold and W.Zimmermann, Nucl. Phys. B 259 (1985) 331;
 R.Oehme, K.Sibold and W.Zimmermann, Phys. Lett. B 153 (1985) 142;
 K.Sibold and W.Zimmermann, Phys. Lett. B 191 (1987) 427;
 J.Kubo, K.Sibold and W.Zimmermann, Phys. Lett. B 220 (1989) 185;
 O.Piguet and K.Sibold, Phys. Lett. B 229 (1989) 83;
 W.Zimmermann, Phys. Lett. B 311 (1993) 249.
- [5] D.R.T. Jones, Nucl. Phys. B 87 (1975) 127;
 A.J. Parkes and P.C. West, Phys. Lett. B 138 (1984) 99; Nucl. Phys. B 256 (1985) 340;
 P.West, Phys. Lett. B 137 (1984) 371;
 D.R.T. Jones and L.Mezincescu, Phys. Lett. B 136 (1984) 242; ibid 138 (1984) 293.
- [6] I. Jack, D. R. T. Jones and K. L. Roberts, Z. Phys. C 62 (1994) 161; ibid 63 (1994) 151.
- [7] S.P.M artin and M.T.Vaughn Phys.Lett.B 318 (1993) 331; Phys.Rev.D 50 (1994) 2282.
- [8] Y.Yam ada, Phys.Lett. B 316 (1993) 109; Phys.Rev.Lett. 72 (1994) 25; Phys.Rev. D 50 (1994) 3537.
- [9] I. Jack and D. R. T. Jones, Phys. Lett. B 333 (1994) 372.
- [10] I. Jack, D.R.T. Jones, S.P. Martin, M.T. Vaughn and Y. Yamada, Phys. Rev. D 50 (1994) R 5481.
- [11] D.R.T. Jones, L.M. ezincescu and Y.-P.Yao, Phys. Lett. B 148 (1984) 317.
- [12] A.Brignole, L.E. Ibanez and C.Munoz, erratum to Nucl. Phys. B 422 (1994) 125.
- [13] S.Hamidi, J.Patera and J.H. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. B 141 (1984) 349.
- [14] D.R.T. Jones and S.Raby, Phys. Lett. B 143 (1984) 137.
- [15] S.Ham idi and J.H.Schwarz, Phys.Lett. B 147 (1984) 301;
 J.E.B jorkman, D.R.T.Jones and S.Raby, Nucl. Phys. B 259 (1985) 503;
 J.Leon et al, Phys.Lett. B 156 (1985) 66;
 D.R.T.Jones and A.J.Parkes, Phys.Lett. B 160 (1985) 267;
 D.R.T.Jones, Nucl. Phys. B 277 (1986) 153;
 - A.V. Emushev, D.J. Kazakov and O.V. Tarasov, Nucl. Phys. B 281 (1987) 72;
 - D.Kapetanakis, M.Mondragon and G.Zoupanos, Z.Phys.C 60 (1993) 181;
 - M .M ondragon and G . Zoupanos, CERN-TH .7098/93;
 - N.G. Deshpande, X iao-G ang H e and E. Keith, Phys. Lett. B 332 (1994) 88;
 - J.Kubo, M.Mondragon and G.Zoupanos, Nucl. Phys. B 424 (1994) 291.