

hep-ph/9502201
 M P I-P h T /95-9
 February 1995

Coupling Constant Unification in Extended SU SY Models

Ralf Hemping

Max-Planck-Institut für Physik, Werner-Heisenberg-Institut,
 D-80805 München, Germany

E-mails: hempf@iws186.mppmu.mpg.de

Abstract

The unification of gauge coupling constants in the minimal supersymmetric model (MSSM) is unaffected at the one-loop level by the inclusion of additional mass-degenerate SU(5) multiplets. Perturbativity puts an upper limit on the number of additional fields. We analyse the evolution of the gauge coupling constants in all models satisfying these criteria using two-loop functions and including low energy threshold effects. We find that similarly to the minimal supersymmetric model (MSSM) unification takes place within the theoretical and experimental errors. The dominant proton decay mode is more suppressed in all extended models as opposed to the MSSM due to renormalization group effects. However, the prediction for the bottom to mass ratio becomes worse in all models under consideration.

The prediction of the strong coupling constant, α_s , within the framework of the minimal supersymmetric model (MSSM) assuming gauge coupling unification without any intermediate scale is in acceptable agreement with experiment [1]. In addition, the unification of top and bottom Yukawa couplings is quite promising [2].

Despite these successes of supersymmetric grand unified theories (SUSY GUTs) based on SU(5) [3] there remain still some problems. For example, the prediction for the down type quarks from Yukawa unification of the first two generations is off by a factor $(m_{dm})/(m_{em_s}) = O(10)$. Maybe the most severe challenge is the so-called doublet/triplet problem [4] of giving the colored Higgs triplet a mass of the order of M_{GUT} while retaining the Higgs doublets responsible for the electro-weak symmetry breaking at the electroweak scale. There have been many attempts to try and solve these problems all of which have one thing in common: they require the introduction of new fields. Thus, an extension of the particle content of the MSSM is inevitable and one might ask whether some of these new particles are present in the low energy effective theory. This idea has already been explored in ref. [5, 6] and will be reconsidered here in view of the improved experimental limits on the gauge coupling constants. In addition, we will relax the constraint for perturbativity and as a result obtain models that have not been considered before.

From the severity of the doublet/triplet problem we know how hard it is to construct a model with a large mass hierarchy between different SU(3) SU(2) U(1) members of the same SU(5) multiplet. Therefore, we can expect that the most natural extensions of the MSSM will come as complete SU(5) multiplets in the low energy effective theory. It is a simple exercise to show that all such extensions will preserve gauge coupling unification at the one-loop level.

The renormalization group equations (RGEs) for these models can be written as

$$\frac{d}{dt} g_i = -\beta_i [g_i + \sum_j \gamma_{ij} g_j + O(g^2)]: \quad (1)$$

Here, $t = (2)^{-1} \ln(\text{scale})$, the indices $i, j = 1, 2, 3$ refer to the U(1), SU(2) and SU(3) gauge group and summation over twice occurring indices is assumed. Furthermore, the one-loop β functions for the gauge couplings are [7]

$$\beta_i = -\frac{3}{16\pi^2} \left[\frac{1}{9} C_A + N_H \frac{1}{2} C_A + 2N_G + \sum_{\text{matter}} \gamma_i \right]; \quad (2)$$

where the three contributions to β_i come from the gauge sector, the Higgs doublets (in the MSSM the number of Higgs doublets, $N_H = 2$) and the contribution of complete SU(5) multiplets. The contributions of the gauge/gaugino sector to β_i are non-universal since some gauge bosons and their superpartners acquire a mass via the Higgs mechanism while others stay massless due to gauge invariance. The contributions of the Higgs bosons are also non-universal because the doublets are responsible for the electro-weak symmetry breaking and should have a mass of the order of 100 GeV while the Higgs triplets have to acquire a mass at M_{GUT} in order to sufficiently suppress the rate for proton-decay. This doublet/triplet splitting [4] is solely motivated by experiment and has no satisfying

theoretical solution yet. The last term which also contains the contribution of $N_G = 3$ generations of quarks and leptons is universal for all three couplings. (Note, that one family of quarks and leptons can be embedded in a $\bar{5} = d^c(\bar{3}; 1; 2=3) \quad 1(1; 2; -1)$ and a $10 = q(3; 2; 1=3) \quad u^c(\bar{3}; 1; -4=3) \quad e(1; 1; -2)$; the numbers in brackets indicate the transformation properties under the SU(3), SU(2) and U(1) gauge symmetries, respectively.) The reason is that the inclusion of a full SU(5) multiplets with a mass m , does not break the SU(5) gauge symmetry and should yield a universal contribution to all three functions at any scale above m at the one-loop level. The contributions of the extensions of the MSSM can be written as

$$\alpha^X = \sum T(\rho) \quad (3)$$

where the sum is over all SU(5) multiplets ρ . The values of $T(\rho) = d(\rho)C_2(\rho)/r$ are listed in Table 1 for the four smallest representations of SU(5). Here, $r = 24$ is the number of generators of SU(5) and $C_2(\rho) [d(\rho)]$ is the quadratic Casimir operator [dimension] of the SU(5) representation [8]. By imposing gauge coupling unification at M_{GUT} i.e.

$$\alpha_{GUT} = \alpha_1(M_{GUT}) = \alpha_2(M_{GUT}) = \alpha_3(M_{GUT}); \quad (4)$$

and solving eq. 1 to first order in perturbation theory we obtain

$$t_0 = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{M_{GUT}}{m_z} = \frac{\alpha_1^{-1}(m_z) - \alpha_2^{-1}(m_z)}{\alpha_3^{-1}(m_z) - \alpha_2^{-1}(m_z)}, \quad 5/3; \quad (5)$$

where we have used

$$\alpha_1^{-1}(m_z) = \frac{5}{3} \frac{\alpha_{em}}{\cos^2 \frac{\theta}{M_S}}; \quad \alpha_2^{-1}(m_z) = \frac{\alpha_{em}}{\sin^2 \frac{\theta}{M_S}}; \quad (6)$$

and $\alpha_{em}^{-1} = 127.9$ and $\sin^2 \frac{\theta}{M_S} = 0.2319$ [9] as the low energy input values. The prediction of the strong coupling constant, $\alpha_s(m_z) = \alpha_3(m_z) \approx 0.125$ is in quite good agreement with the world average $\alpha_s(m_z) = 0.117 \pm 0.005$ [9]. In deriving eq. 5 we have assumed that there is no intermediate scale but it also holds in the case of a widely spread particle spectrum as long as the members of the different SU(5) multiplets lie close together.

Note, that the right hand side of eq. 5 is independent of α^X . This means that any extension of the MSSM by full SU(5) multiplets will maintain the property of gauge coupling unification at one loop. The unification scale $M_{GUT} \approx 2 \cdot 10^6 \text{ GeV}$ remains also unchanged and for the unified gauge coupling we obtain

$$\alpha^{-1} \approx 24 - t_0 \alpha^X; \quad (7)$$

By requiring that the right hand side of eq. 7 is larger than zero we find $\alpha^X < 4.5$ but many models with $\alpha^X = 5$ are still acceptable due to higher order corrections or threshold corrections etc. and shall be included into our considerations.

	5; $\bar{5}$	10; $\bar{10}$	15; $\bar{15}$	24
T ()	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{2}$	$\frac{7}{2}$	5

Table 1: The contribution of various SU (5) multiplets to χ .

In order to derive a viable model, we have to impose additional constraints. The cancellation of triangle anomalies implies that complex representations only occur in pairs. Thus, there are four types of extensions satisfying the above requirements

n additional pairs of 5 and $\bar{5}$, where $n = 1; 2; 3; 4; 5$,

one additional pair of 10 and $\bar{10}$,

n additional pairs of $\bar{5}$ and 10 where $n = 1; 2$,

one additional adjoint representation, $24 = g(8; 1; 0) + w(1; 3; 0) + b(1; 1; 0) + x(3; 2; 5=3) + \bar{x}(\bar{3}; 2; -5=3)$.

Experimental lower limits on the additional particle masses can be satisfied by adding explicit dirac or majoana mass terms into the superpotential such as

$$W = \bar{5}_5 5; \bar{10}_{10} 10; 24 24^2; \quad (8)$$

allowed by gauge invariance in models of type 1, 2 and 4. Models of type 3 correspond to the MSSM with four or five generations. For the invisible width of the Z boson at LEP experiments we know that the number of (almost) massless neutrinos is 3 and a mechanism has to be introduced in order to give mass to the additional neutrinos larger than about $m_z=2$. Also, a lower limit on the mass of an additional lepton of $m_l > m_z=2$ at LEP and a lower limit on the mass of an additional down type quark of $m_b > 85$ GeV at CDF have been established [9]. This implies that the Yukawa couplings for the additional fermions are bound from below since no explicit gauge invariant mass term exists. On the other hand, there is an upper limit on the masses from the infra-red fixed-point behaviour of the Yukawa couplings leaving only a very constrained region in parameter space. The four generation model has been studied recently and found to be quite constrained but could still be feasible if a right-handed neutrino is introduced to raise the mass of the left-handed neutrino above the experimental bounds [10]. The five generation model is even more constrained and might already be ruled out by present data. However, the model with additional $5; \bar{5}; 10; \bar{10}$ with the possibility for a explicit dirac mass for all the additional particles is still allowed. It also does not require any additional fields to generate mass for the unseen neutrinos.

The assumption that all the members, ψ_i , of one SU (5) multiplet, ψ , are mass degenerate is protected by gauge invariance. It acquires corrections below M_{GUT} where the gauge symmetry is broken through one-loop RG evolution

$$\frac{d}{dt} = \sum_i \chi_i \psi_i; \quad (9)$$

i	1	d^c	e^c	u^c	q	b	w	g	x	\bar{x}
U (1)	$\frac{3}{10}$	$\frac{2}{15}$	$\frac{6}{5}$	$\frac{8}{15}$	$\frac{1}{30}$	0	0	0	$\frac{5}{6}$	$\frac{5}{6}$
SU (2)	$\frac{3}{2}$	0	0	0	$\frac{3}{2}$	0	4	0	$\frac{3}{2}$	$\frac{3}{2}$
SU (3)	0	$\frac{8}{3}$	0	$\frac{8}{3}$	$\frac{8}{3}$	0	0	6	$\frac{8}{3}$	$\frac{8}{3}$

Table 2: The β functions for the additional elds,

where the β_i are listed in Table. 2. The solution of eq. 9 can be written as

$$\frac{(\beta_i)}{\beta_{GUT}} = \beta_i \frac{\beta_{GUT}}{\beta_i(\beta_i)} \quad ; \quad (10)$$

where we have assumed that all possible additional couplings of the superpotential are much smaller than β_{GUT} and can be neglected in the evolution of the β_i 's. Furthermore, we assume that the complex (real) multiplets are odd (even) under R-parity so that proton decay mediating interactions are forbidden. We see that the splitting between the various members of an SU (5) multiplet is quite considerable and gives rise to significant threshold corrections. If we decouple the elds from the RGEs at M_{GUT} we obtain the improved one-loop formulas

$$\beta_i^{-1}(m_z) = \beta_{GUT}^{-1} + t_0 \beta_i^{-1} \frac{M_{SSM}}{M_{GUT}} \frac{1}{2} N_i \ln \frac{M_{GUT}}{m_z} \quad ; \quad (11)$$

where N_i is the contribution of the eld, ϕ_i to β_i listed in Table 3 [11]. Furthermore,

$$N = \begin{pmatrix} 8 & 9 \\ N_5 & \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 8 \\ \beta_{d^c} \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad (12)$$

is the number of the elds. The M SSM threshold corrections, $\beta_i^{M_{SSM}}$, studied in ref. [12] raise the predicted value of $\beta_s(m_z)$ by about 10% and spoil the success of the GUT prediction to some degree.

For the computation of $\beta_i^{M_{SSM}}$ we have assumed that the effects of SUSY breaking are parameterized in the standard fashion by including explicit soft SUSY breaking terms assumed to be universal at M_{GUT} . Thus, at M_{GUT} we have only four independent soft SUSY parameters: the coefficients multiplying the trilinear and quadratic terms of the superpotential, A and B , which are irrelevant for the mass spectrum and, thus, for the value of the gauge couplings at the leading log level, the mass for all spin 0 particles m_0 , and the gaugino mass parameter, $m_{1/2}$. (We refrain from a more sophisticated treatment of the SUSY threshold corrections since here we only care about the changes of extended models with respect to the M SSM.) From the last two parameters we can derive the full low energy mass spectrum via RG evolution.

In deriving eq. 11 we have also made the assumption that the mass splitting between spin 0 and spin 1/2 components due to soft SUSY breaking mass terms can be neglected. This

i_j	1	d^c	e^c	u^c	q	b	w	g	x	\bar{x}
U (1)	$\frac{3}{10}$	$\frac{1}{5}$	$\frac{3}{5}$	$\frac{4}{5}$	$\frac{1}{10}$	0	0	0	$\frac{5}{2}$	$\frac{5}{2}$
SU (2)	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	0	$\frac{3}{2}$	0	2	0	$\frac{3}{2}$	$\frac{3}{2}$
SU (3)	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	0	0	3	1	1

Table 3: The one-loop β functions for the SU (3) SU (2) U (1) gauge couplings due to the individual representations. Note that by summing over a complete SU (5) multiplet we recover the universal coefficients of Table 1

is motivated by the observation that the Higgs mass parameter m_h has to be of the order of the top squark mass for correct radiative electro-weak symmetry breaking. However, from eq. 10 we see that $\beta^2(\mu) \propto \mu^2(m_z)$ if \tilde{q} carries color. Also, $\mu^2(m_z)$ is additionally suppressed by the effect of the large top Yukawa coupling, μ_t . We will return to this point in the context of radiative electro-weak symmetry breaking.

Additional effects on the unification of the gauge couplings arise because the universality of β^x in eq. 2 is violated at the two-loop level. The two-loop β functions of these models can easily be derived from ref. [13]

$$\beta_{ij}^x = N_5 \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & \frac{7}{30} & \frac{9}{10} \\ \frac{3}{10} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ \frac{2}{15} & 0 & \frac{17}{3} \end{array} \right) \frac{1}{\Lambda^2} + N_{10} \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & \frac{23}{10} & \frac{3}{10} \\ \frac{1}{10} & \frac{21}{2} & \frac{9}{15} \\ \frac{1}{10} & \frac{21}{2} & \frac{9}{15} \end{array} \right) \frac{1}{\Lambda^2} + N_{24} \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & \frac{25}{3} & 15 \\ 5 & 33 & 16 \\ \frac{10}{3} & 6 & \frac{68}{3} \end{array} \right) \frac{1}{\Lambda^2} : \quad (13)$$

Here we have not separated out the contributions of the individual representations since the two-loop threshold corrections analogous to the one-loop corrections of eq. 11 are negligible.

In minimal SU (5) SUSY-GUTs the down-type quark fields d and the left-handed lepton fields l are embedded in one representation and as a result the top and bottom Yukawa couplings are unified at M_{GUT} . In the limit of negligible top and bottom Yukawa couplings (i.e. $\mu_t, \mu_b \ll M_{GUT}$) we can write in the one-loop approximation

$$\frac{m_b(m_z)}{m_t(m_z)} = \mu_b \frac{g_{GUT}}{g_t(\mu)} \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mu_0}^{\mu} \frac{dt}{t} \right] ; \quad (14)$$

where $\mu_b = (7=18; 3=2; 8=3)$ and $\mu_t = (3=2; 3=2; 0)$. It is easy to see that m_b/m_t increases with g_{GUT} and hence also with β^x . This increase can be compensated by an increase in the top Yukawa coupling, μ_t . However, μ_t quickly approaches its IR fixed-point $\mu_t' = (8=9)_s$ (near M_{GUT} : $\mu_t' = (44=27)_{GUT}$). Hence, any significant increase of the value of the integral in eq. 14 can only come from the integration close to M_{GUT} and requires unperturbatively large values of $\mu_t(M_{GUT})$. Thus, in our numerical work we have used $\mu_t(M_{GUT}) = g_{GUT}$ in order to obtain a natural upper limit for the integral in eq. 14 and, hence, a natural lower bound on m_b/m_t for a particular model assuming top-bottom Yukawa unification.

Another important constraint on SUSY-GUT models comes from non-observation of proton-decay. In the MSSM the dominant decay proceeds via $p \rightarrow K^+ \pi^0$ [14] by dressing

	N_5	N_{10}	N_{24}	r		$s = s_{\text{in}}\%$		M_{GUT}		$m_b = m$		$X = M_{\text{SSM}}$	
MSSM	0	0	0	.72	1.00	6.4	0.0	.040	.042	1.80	1.87	1.0	1.0
1	2	0	0	.75	1.11	4.8	.1	.050	.053	1.88	1.96	.86	.79
2	4	0	0	.79	1.29	2.7	.1	.066	.073	1.99	2.09	.70	.57
3	6	0	0	.85	1.59	.43	.1	.096	.118	2.15	2.30	.51	.34
4	8	0	0	.97	2.16	6.3	1.8	.175	.333	2.44	2.65	.29	.13
5	1	1	0	.71	1.63	6.1	1.3	.070	.081	2.08	2.31	.71	.38
6	3	1	0	.76	2.23	3.7	1.5	.104	.149	2.28	2.64	.51	.18
7	5	1	0	.83	4.20	.73	2.1	.203	1.68	2.64	3.36	.27	.03
8	0	2	0	.48	1.57	9.3	.2	.088	.118	2.01	2.28	1.0	.35
9	2	2	0	.46	2.16	7.6	1.6	.144	.332	2.18	2.62	.79	.14
10	0	0	1	.49	.72	3.3	26.1	.280	2.38	2.32	3.26	.52	.18

Table 4: The one-loop (left column) and two-loop (right column) results for the ratio, $r = M_{\text{GUT}}^X / M_{\text{GUT}}^{M_{\text{SSM}}}$, $s = s_{\text{in}}\%$, M_{GUT} , the ratio $m_b = m$ and the ratio $X = M_{\text{SSM}}$. We have chosen $m_0 (M_{\text{GUT}}) = 200 \text{ GeV}$, $(M_{\text{GUT}}) = 1 \text{ TeV}$ for all additional fields, μ , and $t(M_{\text{GUT}}) = M_{\text{GUT}}$. Furthermore, we have fixed $m_{1=2}$ such that $M_g(M_g) = 200 \text{ GeV}$.

of the dimension 5 operators obtained from the non-renormalizable term of the superpotential

$$W_{\text{NR}} = (qq)(ql); \quad (15)$$

where the SU(2) indices are contracted inside the brackets and flavor and color indices are omitted. At the one-loop level we find

$$\frac{1}{M_{\text{GUT}}} m_u m_d \epsilon_i \frac{(\epsilon_z)^{(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2})} \epsilon_i}{M_{\text{GUT}}}; \quad (16)$$

Here, we have defined $\epsilon_d = \epsilon_b$, $\epsilon_u = (13=18; 3=2; 8=3)$, $\epsilon_q = (1=10; 3=2; 8=3)$, and $\epsilon_l = (1=2; 3=2; 0)$. Of course, a precise determination of the value of ϵ_i is problematic without a self-consistent model for the origin of the Yukawa couplings for all three generations. However, we do not worry about any overall factors since we are only interested in the ratio $X = M_{\text{SSM}}$.

In Table 4 we have summarized our results for the MSSM and 8 extended models characterized by N_5 , N_{10} , and N_{24} . We have chosen the somewhat large values of $M_{\text{GUT}} = 1 \text{ TeV}$ for all additional fields in order to exploit as many models as possible. The parameter independent lower limit on the gluino mass of $M_g > 100 \text{ GeV}$ has been established from direct particle search at CDF [15]. However, stronger limits can be derived from the chargino/neutralino search by imposing GUT constraints and we chose $M_g = 200 \text{ GeV}$ in order to safely avoid all the present bounds.

The first row corresponds to the MSSM where we have $M_s^{M_{\text{SSM}}} = 0.124$ and $M_{\text{GUT}}^{M_{\text{SSM}}} = 2.3 \cdot 10^6 \text{ GeV}$ for our choice of parameters. In the different columns we present the

result for the unification scale divided by the two-loop MSSM value and denoted by r , the relative change in the prediction of α_s with respect to the two-loop MSSM value, the unified gauge coupling, g_{GUT} , and the ratio of $m_b(m_Z)$ to $m_t(m_Z)$. The two values correspond to the results obtained by using one-loop and two-loop β functions. We see that already for the MSSM the value of m_b/m_t for $t(M_{\text{GUT}}) = g_{\text{GUT}}$ is slightly above its experimental value of $m_b/m_t \approx 1:6$ but can still be brought in agreement with experiment by a modest increase of t or by choosing $\beta_b = 0(t)$ [2]. The situation becomes more problematic in all extended models where this ratio increases even more.

Furthermore, we see that the models 4, 7, 9 and 10 become non-perturbative at M_{GUT} . This scenario of non-perturbative unification was already advocated in ref. [16] in non-SUSY models and in ref. [17] extended to SUSY models as being particularly attractive. The reason is that the dependence of α_s on g_{GUT} in eq. 11 vanishes in the large g_{GUT} limit. In the presence of explicit mass terms this argument becomes more complicated.

From eq. 10 we see that the low energy particle spectrum becomes non-predictive when g_{GUT} vanishes. However, we will still be able to use perturbation theory to predict certain trends in these models. For example, at the one-loop level the gluino mass satisfies

$$M_g(M_g) = \frac{s(M_g)}{g_{\text{GUT}}} m_{1=2}; \quad (17)$$

and thus we find $M_g(M_g) \propto m_{1=2}$ in all models with non-perturbative gauge unification. On the other hand, we have for the squark masses

$$M_Q^2 = C m_{1=2}^2 + \dots; \quad (18)$$

where $C \approx 6 \cdot 0.8^X > 2$ and we have dropped irrelevant terms. Thus, by imposing $M_g(M_g) = 200 \text{ GeV}$ we find typically that all the squark masses have to be in the TeV region or higher depending on g_{GUT} . Such a large hierarchy between the squark masses and the electro-weak scale requires fine-tuning and is problematic as we will see in the following. In the limit of small gluino mass the soft SUSY breaking top squark mass parameters, $M_{\tilde{t}_P}^2$ ($P = L, R$) and the Higgs mass parameter, M_{H_2} , are closely related by the solution to their RG equations

$$\frac{(m_Z)}{(M_{\text{GUT}})} = \exp \int_0^Z \frac{t_0}{6} dt; \quad (19)$$

where we have defined $M_{\tilde{t}_L}^2 + M_{\tilde{t}_R}^2 + M_{H_2}^2$. In the limit of large t the right hand side of eq. 19 vanishes and we find

$$M_{H_2}^2 \approx M_{\tilde{t}_L}^2 + M_{\tilde{t}_R}^2 > (1 \text{ TeV})^2; \quad (20)$$

The correct electro-weak symmetry breaking then implies that we have to fine-tune α_s and $M_{H_2}^2$ over several orders of magnitude in order to satisfy

$$M_{H_2}^2 + \alpha_s^2 = 0(m_Z^2); \quad (21)$$

This heavy SUSY particle spectrum and the associated fine-tuning is a generic problem in all models with non-perturbative unification over the entire parameter space.

$1 = g_{\text{GUT}}$	$2 = g_{\text{GUT}}$	$3 = g_{\text{GUT}}$	g_{em}^1	$\sin^2 \theta_{\text{MS}}$	s
1	1	1	127.9	232	156
0.1	1	1	132.5	224	158
1	0.1	1	130.2	246	161
1	1	0.1	126.3	229	112
10	1	1	127.6	232	155
1	10	1	127.9	231	154
1	1	10	128.7	234	155

Table 5: The prediction of the low energy gauge coupling constants for various boundary conditions at M_{GUT} in model 10

It is interesting to note that model 10 automatically provides a solution to this problem. Here, the gluino can acquire a mass via mixing with the octet of the 24 dimensional representation [5] and as a result the mass parameter M_g (M_g) can be much smaller than the lower bound on the gluino mass. Such a Dirac mass term can be compatible with R symmetry [18] and was already advocated in ref. [19] as the origin of the gluino mass. Furthermore, a model with an approximate R symmetry naturally yields large value of Higgs vacuum expectation values, $\tan \beta$, which explains the large ratio of m_t to m_b . In the MSSM this can only be achieved by fine-tuning [20].

In order to see how far we can trust perturbation theory in the case of non-perturbative unification we will modify the boundary condition of eq. 4 for model 10. In Table 5 we have listed the prediction for $g_{\text{em}}(m_Z)$, $\sin^2 \theta_{\text{MS}}$, and $s(m_Z)$. We have used $M_{\text{GUT}} = 1.6 \times 10^6$ and $g_{\text{GUT}} = 3.2$.

We find indeed that if M_{GUT} is close to a Landau pole any potentially large threshold corrections get washed out via RG evolution into the perturbative region below M_{GUT} . We see that changes of the GUT input parameters by a factor of 10 only changes the low energy values by typically a few % (the exception is the case where $g_3 \ll g_1, g_2$ because here, the splitting of the 24 due to eq. 10 is only mild). As a result, a theory that is non-perturbative at M_{GUT} might still allow for reliable low energy predictions. In fact, in model 10 the three gauge couplings are completely fixed by only one input parameter, M_{GUT} , rather than two as in the MSSM. However, it is somewhat surprising that the predictability of the model is not so much limited by non-perturbative effects at M_{GUT} but rather by the low energy threshold corrections in eq. 11. The reason is that the particle spectrum derived in eq. 10 becomes non-predictive in the large M_{GUT} limit and can only provide us with a qualitative understanding. In general, we expect colored particles to be much heavier than the electro-weak scale and to decouple at a higher scale. This predicts an decrease of g_3^1 due to eq. 11 which for our particular choice of parameters and using our two-loop RG approach results in an overestimate of s by about 30%. This number should not be interpreted as a prediction but rather as an indication for how the unpredictability of the particle spectrum feeds into the prediction of the coupling constants.

In summary, we have investigated 10 extensions of the MSSM with additional SU(5) multiplets. We find that in all models where $g_{\text{GUT}} < 1$ the prediction of α_s only changes by a few %. Furthermore, the ratio m_b/m_t increases and the proton decay rate decreases with increasing g_{GUT} . We point out that models with non-perturbative unification predict in general a large squark to gluino mass ratio which leads to a fine-tuning problem once we impose the experimental lower limit on the gluino mass. The exception is the model with an additional 24 dimensional representation where the gluino can have a Dirac mass. However, SUSY threshold corrections to α_s are positive and large due to large multiplet splitting and in general raise α_s significantly above the experimental limit.

References

- [1] U. Amaldi, W. de Boer and H. Furstenau, Phys. Lett. B 260, 443 (1991); J. Ellis, S. Kelley and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B 260, 131 (1991); P. Langacker and M. X. Lou, Phys. Rev. D 44, 817 (1992).
- [2] S. Dimopoulos, L. J. Hall and S. Raby, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 1984 (1992); Phys. Rev. D 45, 4192 (1992); V. Barger, M. S. Berger and P. Ohmann, Phys. Rev. D 47, 1093 (1993); M. Carena, S. Pokorski and C. E. M. Wagner, Nucl. Phys. B 406, 59 (1993); P. Langacker and N. Polonsky, Phys. Rev. D 47, 1093 (1993); W. A. Bardeen, M. Carena, S. Pokorski and C. E. M. Wagner, Phys. Lett. B 320, 110 (1994).
- [3] for a review of GUT theories see: R. Mohapatra, Unification and Supersymmetry, 2nd ed. (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1992); G. G. Ross, Grand Unified Theories (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1984).
- [4] S. Dimopoulos and H. Georgi, Nucl. Phys. B 193, 150 (1981).
- [5] L. Ibanez, Phys. Lett. B 126, 196 (1983); (E) B 130, 463 (1983).
- [6] J. E. Bjorkman and D. R. T. Jones, Nucl. Phys. B 259, 533 (1985).
- [7] M. B. Einhorn and D. R. T. Jones, Nucl. Phys. B 196, 475 (1981).
- [8] For a review of group theory for unified model building, see: R. Slansky, Phys. Rep. 79, 1 (1981).
- [9] Particle Data Group, L. Montanet et al., Phys. Rev. D 50, 1173 (1994).
- [10] J. F. Gunion, D. W. McKay and H. Pois, Phys. Lett. B 334, 339 (1994).
- [11] K. Inoue, A. Kakuto, H. Komatsu and S. Takeshita, Prog. Theor. Phys. 67, 1889 (1982); J. P. Derendinger and C. A. Savoy, Nucl. Phys. B 253, 285 (1985); N. K. Falck, Z. Phys. C 30, 247 (1986).
- [12] G. G. Ross and R. G. Roberts, Nucl. Phys. B 377, 571 (1992); P. Langacker and N. Polonsky, Phys. Rev. D 47, 4029 (1993); M. Carena, S. Pokorski and C. E. M. Wagner, Nucl. Phys. B, (1993).
- [13] D. R. T. Jones, Phys. Rev. D 25, 581 (1982).
- [14] J. Hisano, H. Murayama and T. Yanagida, Nucl. Phys. B 402, 46 (1993) and references therein.
- [15] F. Abe et al [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 3439 (1992).
- [16] L. Maiani, G. Parisi and R. Petronzio, Nucl. Phys. B 136, 115 (1978);
- [17] N. Cabibbo and G. R. Farrar, Phys. Lett. B 110, 107 (1982).

- [18] A . Salam and J. Strathdee, Nucl. Phys. B 87, 85 (1995); P . Fayet, Nucl. Phys. B 90, 104 (1975).
- [19] L . J. Hall and L . Randall, Nucl. Phys. B 352, 289 (1991).
- [20] A . E . Nelson and L . Randall, Phys. Lett. B 316, 516 (1993); L . J. Hall, R . Rattazzi and U . Sarid, LBL preprint LBL-33997 (1993), Phys. Rev. D , to be published; R . Hemping, DESY preprint, DESY 94-078.