

Anomaly-Free Gauged R-Symmetry in Local Supersymmetry

A. H. Cham Seddine and Herbi Dreiner

Theoretische Physik, ETH-Honggerberg, CH-8093 Zurich, Switzerland

Abstract

We discuss local R-symmetry as a potentially powerful new model building tool. We first review and clarify that a $U(1)$ R-symmetry can only be gauged in local and not in global supersymmetry. We determine the anomaly-cancellation conditions for the gauged R-symmetry. For the standard superpotential these equations have no solution, independently of how many Standard Model singlets are added to the model. There is also no solution when we increase the number of families and the number of pairs of Higgs doublets. When the Green-Schwarz mechanism is employed to cancel the anomalies, solutions only exist for a large number of singlets. We find many anomaly-free family-independent models with an extra $SU(3)_c$ octet chiral superfield. We consider in detail the conditions for an anomaly-free family dependent $U(1)_R$ and find solutions with one, two, three and four extra singlets. Only with three and four extra singlets do we naturally obtain sfermion masses of order the weak-scale. For these solutions we consider the spontaneous breaking of supersymmetry and the R-symmetry in the context of local supersymmetry. In general the $U(1)_R$ gauge group is broken at or close to the Planck scale. We consider the effects of the R-symmetry on baryon- and lepton-number violation in supersymmetry. There is no logical connection between a conserved R-symmetry and conserved R-parity. For conserved R-symmetry we have models for all possibilities of conserved or broken R-parity. Most models predict dominant effects which could be observed at HERA.

1 Introduction

Supersymmetry combines fields of different spin into supermultiplets. It includes the special possibility of a symmetry which distinguishes between the fermionic and the bosonic component of a $N = 1$ supersymmetric superfield. Such symmetries are called R-symmetries

and they are particular to supersymmetry. As such, they deserve special attention when considering the implications of supersymmetry. R-parity can be thought of as a discrete R-symmetry and has been widely discussed in the context of the minimal supersymmetric standard model and its extensions. There is also a considerable amount of literature on global R-symmetries and their phenomenological implications. It is the purpose of this paper to reconsider local R-symmetries in the context of local supersymmetry and to make first steps towards a realistic model. It is similar in spirit to [1] where we considered a non-R $U(1)^0$.

R-symmetries were first introduced in global supersymmetry by Salam and Strathdee [2] and by Fayet [3] in order to enforce global lepton- or baryon-number. In the following years, the discrete symmetry R-parity [4] has been imposed to prohibit all dimension four lepton- and baryon-number violating interactions which arise in the supersymmetric extension of the Standard Model. Global R-invariance has been proposed as a solution to the strong CP-problem [5], the μ problem [6, 7, 8], and the problem of the neutron electric dipole moment [5, 9]. Global R-invariance prohibits tree-level gaugino masses. This leads to the interesting possibility that the gaugino masses are generated radiatively or through a dynamical mechanism and thus predicted [10, 8, 11]. If the global R-symmetry remains unbroken to low energies [8] then only the electroweak gaugino masses can be generated after $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ breaking. (A bi-scalar μ -term must be generated or inserted by hand in the soft-susy breaking sector.) The radiative gluino mass is very light [10, 11] and excluded [12]. A heavy gluino can be obtained by adding an $SU(3)_c$ octet chiral superfield [8]. One then loses any prediction for the gluino mass. This is not very natural but it is consistent with experiment. However, the potential of the scalar component of the octet is necessarily unrestricted and typically breaks $SU(3)_c$. If the global R-invariance is spontaneously broken [11] one has an unwanted light pseudo Goldstone boson. The gaugino masses can still be generated radiatively and the gluino is light [11]. One can add explicit R-breaking terms which give mass to the axion. However, if these terms are large this renders the R-symmetry meaningless. Recently global R-symmetries have been seen to arise in so-called generic models of global supersymmetry breaking [13]. The problems of the axion from R-breaking are resolved when embedded into local supersymmetry through explicit breaking terms [14]. Thus models with global R-symmetry suffer from an axion or a light gluino problem.

Beyond the immediate phenomenological problem of constructing a model with global R-symmetry there is a more fundamental problem. Supersymmetry breaking is necessarily embedded in local supersymmetry. Local supersymmetry automatically includes gravity and global symmetries are most likely broken by quantum gravity effects [15]. Thus at low energies we do not expect global symmetries such as baryon- or lepton-number to be fundamental symmetries of nature but only symmetries of the low-energy effective Lagrangian. At high-energy we expect all relevant symmetries to be gauge symmetries. We shall thus

investigate whether an R-symmetry can be gauged. We provide a new local symmetry as a model-building tool.

Our paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we show that an R-symmetry can only be gauged in local supersymmetry. In Section 3 we then consider the conditions for an anomaly-free gauged R-symmetry and find several solutions. In Section 4 we discuss the spontaneous breaking of the R-symmetry and of supersymmetry. We find the important result that the R-symmetry is always broken at or near the Planck scale. In Section 5 we consider the implications for R-parity violation. In Section 6 we offer our conclusions and an outlook.

2 R-invariant Supersymmetric Theories

Below we first discuss R-symmetries in global supersymmetry and in the following subsection extend the discussion to local supersymmetric theories, where R-symmetries have not been as widely discussed.

2.1 Global Supersymmetry

For globally supersymmetric theories the global R-transformations are defined as a transformation on the superfields [2]

$$\begin{aligned} V_k(x; \theta, \bar{\theta}) &\rightarrow V_k(x; e^i \theta^i; \bar{e}^{\bar{i}} \bar{\theta}^{\bar{i}}); \\ S_i(x; \theta, \bar{\theta}) &\rightarrow e^{in_i} S_i(x; e^i \theta^i; \bar{e}^{\bar{i}} \bar{\theta}^{\bar{i}}); \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

where V_k is a gauge vector multiplet with components $V_k;_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}$, and D_k and S_i are left-handed chiral superfields with components $z_i;_{\alpha}$, and F_i . Thus the Grassmann coordinates $\theta^i;_{\alpha}$ have non-trivial R-charge

$$\theta^i \rightarrow e^i \theta^i; \quad \bar{\theta}^{\bar{i}} \rightarrow \bar{e}^{\bar{i}} \bar{\theta}^{\bar{i}}; \quad d \rightarrow e^{\frac{1}{2}} d; \quad \bar{d} \rightarrow \bar{e}^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{d}; \quad d \rightarrow e^{\frac{1}{2}} d; \quad \bar{d} \rightarrow \bar{e}^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{d}; \quad (2.2)$$

The latter two transformations hold since for Grassmann variables integration is like differentiation. The R-transformations act on the components of the superfields as

$$\begin{aligned} V_k &\rightarrow V_k; \\ (\theta^i)_{\alpha} &\rightarrow \exp(-i) (\theta^i)_{\alpha}; & \text{and} & & z_i &\rightarrow \exp(in_i) z_i; \\ (\theta^i)_{\alpha} &\rightarrow \exp(i) (\theta^i)_{\alpha}; & & & \bar{z}_i &\rightarrow \exp(-in_i) \bar{z}_i; \\ D_k &\rightarrow D_k; & & & F_i &\rightarrow \exp(in_i) F_i; \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

We see that all gauginos transform non-trivially and with the same charge. The scalar fermions transform differently from their fermionic superpartners as we expect for an R-symmetry. However, different chiral supermultiplets will in general have different R-charge,

and R-transformations are more general than lepton- or baryon-number. The action for the superpotential

$$\int d^2 \theta \, g(S_i); \quad (2.4)$$

is invariant provided that the superpotential transforms as

$$g(S_i) \rightarrow e^{2i} g(S_i); \quad (2.5)$$

under the transformation (2.1). Here we have made use of (2.2). We see that the superpotential transforms non-trivially. This is one essential fact of R-symmetries. The kinetic terms of the vector and scalar multiplets are of the form

$$\int d^2 \theta \, d^2 \bar{\theta} \, \text{tr} \left(\bar{S}_i \partial^\mu S_i \right) + \int d^2 \theta \, W^\mu W_\mu + \int d^2 \bar{\theta} \, \bar{W}^\mu \bar{W}_\mu; \quad (2.6)$$

where

$$W_\mu = \bar{D}^2 (e^\mu_D e^V); \quad \bar{W}_\mu = D^2 (e^\mu_D \bar{e}^V); \quad (2.7)$$

are automatically invariant under (2.1), i.e.

$$W \rightarrow e^i W; \quad \bar{W} \rightarrow e^i \bar{W}; \quad (2.8)$$

In this paper, we focus on the possibility of locally R-symmetric theories. However, as we now discuss it is not possible in globally supersymmetric theories to promote the global R-invariance to a local one. An easy way to see this is to notice that when the R-parameter becomes x-dependent then the transformations (2.2) change to

$$\theta \rightarrow e^{i(x)} \theta; \quad \bar{\theta} \rightarrow e^{i(x)} \bar{\theta}; \quad (2.9)$$

which is a special form of a local superspace transformation.

In more detail, one can also see this from Eq.(2.3) which implies that all gauginos have R-charge, including the R-gauginos. If the R-symmetry is to become a local symmetry then the R gauge vector boson V^R will have to couple to the R-gauginos λ^R in the form ¹

$$\mathcal{L} \supset \bar{\lambda}^R_L (\not{\partial} + i g_R V^R) \lambda^R_L + \bar{\lambda}^R_R (\not{\partial} + i g_R V^R) \lambda^R_R; \quad (2.10)$$

since the opposite chirality gauginos have non-trivial and opposite R-charge (2.3). The above equation implies the coupling

$$\mathcal{L} \supset g_R \bar{\lambda}^R \gamma_5 \lambda^R V^R; \quad (2.11)$$

in the Lagrangian which is an axial interaction and is not present in the action (2.6). In order to construct a supersymmetric Lagrangian containing (2.11) we must consider its supersymmetric transformation. It contains the term ²

$$g_R \lambda^R \not{V}^R \lambda^R = \lambda^R V^R \lambda^R; \quad (2.12)$$

¹The lower index (L;R) on the gaugino λ is the chirality and the upper index R indicates the gauge group.

²We make use of the identity $\lambda \not{V} \lambda = g \lambda \gamma_5 \lambda + i \lambda \gamma_5 \lambda \gamma_5$.

since the supersymmetric variation of the gaugino term $\int d^4x \text{Tr} F^2$ contains $\int d^4x \text{Tr} F^2$. ϵ is the infinitesimal parameter of the supersymmetry transformation. The above term can not be cancelled without departing from the setting of global supersymmetry.

From Eq.(2.3) it is clear that the R-symmetry generator R does not commute with the supersymmetry generator Q . In the literature this is quoted as an argument that an R-symmetry can not be gauged. Explicitly we have [16]

$$[Q, R] = i(\gamma_5) Q \quad (2.13)$$

Thus R-symmetry is an extension of supersymmetry with the chiral generator and the extension is a graded Lie Algebra. If the R generator of a globally R-supersymmetric theory is promoted to a local symmetry then the above equation can only hold if the transformation parameters of the supersymmetry algebra are x -dependent, i.e. Q is the generator of a local transformation.

Thus R-symmetries are intimately connected with supersymmetry: a locally R-invariant theory can only be constructed in a locally supersymmetric framework; in global supersymmetry only global R-symmetries can be constructed.

2.2 Local Supersymmetry

In local supersymmetry the field content is extended to include a spin 2 graviton and a spin $\frac{3}{2}$ gravitino. From Eq.(2.3) we generalize the R-symmetry to the graviton multiplet as

$$\begin{aligned} e^m_\mu & \rightarrow e^m_\mu \exp(i\alpha \gamma_5) \\ & \rightarrow \exp(i\alpha \gamma_5) e^m_\mu \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

From the above and Eqs.(2.3,2.10) we see that a possible R-gauge boson would couple axially to the gravitino, the gauginos, and the chiral fermions. It was first noticed by Freedman [17] that the axial gauge vector can couple to the gauginos and the gravitinos in an invariant way in local supersymmetry. The variation of (2.11) is then cancelled by the variation of the term

$$e^{\frac{1}{2}} L = \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} F^2 \gamma_5 \quad (2.15)$$

in the action since $\int d^4x \text{Tr} F^2 \gamma_5$. Later, Das et al. [18] extended the Fayet-Iliopoulos model [19] of global supersymmetry to local supersymmetry. They found that the abelian gauge theory was chiral and just that of Freedman [17]. These results [17, 18] were reproduced in [20] including the gravitational auxiliary fields. Stelle and West [21] then derived the action for the Fayet-Iliopoulos term in local supersymmetry in the superconformal framework [22]

$$\int d^4x d^4\theta E e^{g_R V^R} \quad (2.16)$$

where E is the superspace determinant and Λ is the constant of the FI-term. The expression (2.16) is invariant under the $U(1)_R$ gauge transformations

$$V^R \rightarrow V^R + \frac{i}{g_R} (\Lambda - \bar{\Lambda}); \quad D_- = 0; \quad (2.17)$$

$$E \rightarrow E e^{i(\Lambda - \bar{\Lambda})}; \quad (2.18)$$

The superspace determinant transforms non-trivially. In Ref.[17] it was shown that this implies a $U(1)_R$ charge $\frac{3}{2}$ for the gauginos and the gravitino. In the previous section we had a global R -charge +1 for the gauginos which corresponds to the choice $\Lambda = \frac{2}{3}$.

Barbieri et al. [23] extended this analysis to include matter fields in a general superpotential. In the superconformal framework an invariant superpotential is constructed by introducing a compensating superconformal chiral multiplet S_0 which transforms under the $U(1)_R$ gauge group as

$$S_0 \rightarrow e^{+i\Lambda} S_0; \quad \bar{S}_0 \rightarrow e^{-i\Lambda} \bar{S}_0; \quad (2.19)$$

and such that the matter multiplets transform as³

$$S_i \rightarrow e^{in_i \Lambda} S_i; \quad \bar{S}^i \rightarrow e^{-in_i \Lambda} \bar{S}^i; \quad (2.20)$$

with $U(1)_R$ charge n_i . Then the action

$$\int d^4x \int d^4\theta S_0^3 g(S_i) \quad (2.21)$$

is invariant under the gauge transformations (2.7)–(2.9) provided

$$g(S_i) \rightarrow e^{3i\Lambda} g(S_i); \quad (2.22)$$

The superpotential has a net $U(1)_R$ charge just as in Eq.(2.5). We obtain the same charge +2 again for the choice $\Lambda = \frac{2}{3}$. Thus it is found that the generalization of the Fayet-Iliopoulos term to local supersymmetry leads to a gauged R -symmetry!

In Ref.[24] Ferrara et al. showed that any R -invariant gauged action can be put into the canonical form of local supersymmetry [25]. The most general Lagrangian with local R -symmetry (with not more than 2 derivatives for the component fields) and local supersymmetry is given by [24]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \frac{1}{2} \int d^4\theta \bar{S}_0 e^{-g_R V^R} S_0 (S_i; \bar{S}^i e^{n_i g_R V^R}) e^{2g_V} \quad (2.23) \\ & + \int d^4x [g(S_i) S_0^3]_{\mathcal{F}} + \int d^4x (S_i) W_{\mathcal{F}} + \int d^4x (S_i) W_{\mathcal{R}}^2]_{\mathcal{F}} + \text{h.c.}; \end{aligned}$$

where $W_{\mathcal{R}}$ is the field strength of the vector multiplet V^R , a propagating gauge field, and where the function g is invariant under (2.20). W is the field strength of other (non R -)

³Note that the chiral fields S_i transform with Λ and not with $\bar{\Lambda}$. Thus $g(S_i)g(\bar{S}_i)$ is not R -invariant.

gauge groups, e.g. of $SU(2)_L$. To convert (2.23) into the familiar supergravity form, we first rescale the compensating multiplet S_0

$$S_0 \rightarrow S_0 g^{\frac{1}{3}}; \quad (2.24)$$

which reduces the first two terms in (2.23) to

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{S_0^2}{S_0} \frac{(S_i; \bar{S}^i e^{n_i g_R V^R} e^{2gV})}{g(\bar{S}^i) e^{3g_R V^R} g(S_i)} + [S_0^3]_F; \quad (2.25)$$

Using the invariance of the denominator of the first term in (2.25) under gauge transformations (including the R-ones), the denominator can be rewritten in the form

$$g(\bar{S}^i e^{n_i g_R V^R} e^{2gV}) g(S_i)^{\frac{1}{3}}; \quad (2.26)$$

provided that g satisfies the property (2.22). Here g is the gauge coupling of the non-R gauge groups. In the minimal formulation of supergravity the terms in (2.25) take the form

$$\frac{3}{2} \frac{h}{S_0} S_0 e^{\frac{1}{3}G} + [S_0^3]_F; \quad (2.27)$$

which implies that

$$e^{\frac{1}{3}G} = \frac{1}{3} \frac{(S_i; \bar{S}^i e^{n_i g_R V^R} e^{2gV})}{g(S_i) g(\bar{S}^i e^{n_i g_R V^R} e^{2gV})^{\frac{1}{3}}}; \quad (2.28)$$

Then all the results of [25] hold except covariant derivatives include V^R .⁴ The function $G(z_i; z^i)$ can be expressed in the form

$$G(z_i; z^i) = 3 \ln \left(\frac{1}{3} (z_i; z^i) \right) - \ln j(z_i) g(z^i); \quad (2.29)$$

The non-invariance of the term $\ln j(z_i) g(z^i)$ under R-transformations implies the appearance of the Fayet-Iliopoulos term in the potential. This follows because the D-term of the R-multiplet

$$g_R G;^i n_i z_i = g_R \left(3 \frac{z^i}{3} - \frac{g_i^i}{g} \right) n_i z_i; \quad (2.30)$$

has a constant piece as a consequence of the homogeneity of the superpotential g

$$n_i z_i g^i = 3g; \quad (2.31)$$

We will see in Section 4 that this term is very important when considering the scalar potential. It leads to a cosmological constant of order 4 which must be cancelled by an appropriate term. As we will see this fixes the scale of $U(1)_R$ -breaking.

⁴See the addendum in [24] for the special case where the superpotential vanishes.

So far we have started with a superpotential g , holomorphic in z_i and a Kahler potential. When constructing an R -invariant Lagrangian we explicitly included terms coupling V^R to all gauginos (including the R -gaugino) and the gravitino. We then showed how g and V^R can be combined to G . For illustration, we reverse this procedure and start with a $N = 1$ locally supersymmetric action characterised by a function G of the form (2.29) and where the superpotential $g(z_i)$ is homogeneous of degree 3. To obtain the physical couplings we perform the reverse chiral rotations

$$L \rightarrow \frac{g}{g} L; \quad \bar{L} \rightarrow \frac{g}{g} \bar{L}; \quad L_i \rightarrow \frac{g}{g} L_i; \quad \bar{L}_i \rightarrow \frac{g}{g} \bar{L}_i; \quad (2.32)$$

Then the coupling of the vector V^R to the scalars is of the form

$$D z_i = \partial z_i - g_R n_i V^R z_i; \quad (2.33)$$

The coupling to the spinors ψ_i of the chiral superfields is given in terms of G by

$$L_i \bar{\psi}_j \gamma^k_R (G_{jk}^{ij} + \frac{1}{2} G_{jk}^i G^{jj}) + G_{ij}^i L_i \bar{\psi}_j \gamma^k_R; \quad (2.34)$$

For normalized kinetic energies $G_{ij}^i = \frac{1}{2} \gamma^j_i$ this gives an effective V^R coupling to the spinors of the chiral superfields of⁵

$$D \psi_{iL} = \partial \psi_{iL} - i g_R (n_i - \frac{3}{2}) V^R \psi_{iL}; \quad (2.35)$$

The gauginos and gravitinos have "naïve" weight zero in the G formulation. This can be seen in particular from the rotations (2.32) which apparently change the weights of the fermionic fields. Thus the covariant derivative contains no gauge field V^R . However, the full coupling is given by

$$\frac{1}{2} \bar{\psi}_i \gamma^k_L \gamma^i_R D z_i = \frac{1}{2} \bar{\psi}_i \gamma^k_L \gamma^i_R D z_i - i g_R \frac{3}{2} V^R \bar{\psi}_i \gamma^k_L \gamma^i_R; \quad (2.36)$$

$$e^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{1}{4} \bar{\psi}_i \gamma^k_L \gamma^i_R D z_i + \frac{1}{8} \bar{\psi}_i \gamma^k_L \gamma^i_R D z_i \right) = \frac{1}{4} e^{\frac{1}{4}} \bar{\psi}_i \gamma^k_L \gamma^i_R D z_i - i g_R \frac{3}{2} V^R \bar{\psi}_i \gamma^k_L \gamma^i_R; \quad (2.37)$$

where we have made use of (2.31). Therefore, as before, the charge of the gauginos and gravitinos is $\frac{3}{2}$. Note that this applies to all gauginos, including the R -gaugino itself. Thus there is a $R-R-V^R$ coupling even though $U(1)_R$ is an abelian gauge group. The spinors ψ_{iL} have R -charge $(n_i - \frac{3}{2})$ and their scalar superpartners z_i have charge n_i . These numbers coincide with the ones used in the global case for $\frac{2}{3}$ so that any term in the superpotential g must satisfy $\sum n_i = 2$ and the superpotential can not contain a constant term because of (2.31). Throughout the rest of the paper we fix the convention to

$$= \frac{2}{3}; \quad (2.38)$$

⁵We neglect here couplings to other gauge fields.

2.3 Superconformal Approach

To understand what made gauging the R-symmetry possible we consider the embedding in the superconformal approach. The superconformal group has the generators

$$(P_m; M_{mn}; K_m; D); (Q; S); A: \quad (2.39)$$

The first set of four generators form the conformal group of translations, rotations, conformal boosts and dilatations. The second set of two are the fermionic generators of supersymmetry and the "superpartner" of K_m . The last (bosonic) generator A is a continuous chiral $U(1)$ symmetry. However, there is no corresponding kinetic term and thus no propagating gauge boson.

Superconformal gravity is based on gauging the superconformal group and then adding constraints on the field strengths corresponding to $P_m; M_{mn}$, and S . The constraints are solved for the $M_{mn}; K_m$; and S gauge fields and the transformations of the gauge fields are modified so that the constraints are preserved. In Eq.(2.23) we presented the superconformal action with an additional $U(1)_R$ gauge group denoted by W_R . This action thus contains two extra $U(1)$'s beyond those contained in the W , namely $U(1)_R$ and the $U(1)_A$ of the superconformal group.

Multiplets transform under the full superconformal group. The compensating multiplet S_0 in (2.19) transforms under both the $U(1)_R$ and superconformal transformations. Under the chiral A transformations S_i transforms as

$$A Z_i = \frac{i}{2} n_i Z_i \quad (2.40)$$

$$A \chi_L = \frac{i}{2} (n_i - \frac{3}{2}) \chi_L \quad (2.41)$$

where z_i and χ_i are the scalar and spinor components of the chiral multiplets S_i . Reducing the superconformal to superpoincare invariance is done by fixing the real and imaginary part of z_0 , the spinor χ_0 (the components of S_0) and b (the gauge field of dilatation). This, however, will also break the $U(1)_R$ invariance. But a linear combination of $U(1)_R$ and the chiral generator A will survive; the resulting group we again call $U(1)_R$. The transformed S_0 in (2.24) is neutral under the new $U(1)_R$ gauge group as can be seen from Eqs.(2.19) and (2.22). Fixing the superconformal gauge on the transformed S_0 breaks the superconformal group to the superpoincare but leaves the $U(1)_R$ invariant.

3 Conditions for the Cancellation of Anomalies

3.1 Family Independent Gauged R-symmetry

We have seen in the last section that it is only possible to construct a gauged R-invariant theory in the framework of locally supersymmetric theories. To build a realistic model the

new $U(1)_R$ gauge symmetry should be anomaly-free. To be specific we shall take the $N = 1$ locally supersymmetric theory to have the gauge group

$$G_{SM} \times U(1)_R \times SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)_R; \quad (3.1)$$

which is that of the Standard Model extended by $U(1)_R$. The matter chiral multiplets are taken to be the quarks, leptons and a pair of Higgs doublets with the addition of G_{SM} singlets, N ; and z_m . These multiplets are denoted by

$$\begin{aligned} L &: (1; 2; \frac{1}{2}; l); & E &: (1; 1; 1; e); & Q &: (3; 2; \frac{1}{6}; q); \\ U &: (3; 1; \frac{2}{3}; u); & D &: (3; 1; \frac{1}{3}; d); & H &: (1; 2; \frac{1}{2}; h); \\ H &: (1; 2; \frac{1}{2}; h); & N &: (1; 1; 0; n); & z_m &: (1; 1; 0; z_m); \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where we have indicated in parentheses the G_{SM} , and $U(1)_R$ quantum numbers, respectively. The $U(1)_R$ quantum numbers are for the chiral fermions. The bosons will have numbers shifted by one unit, e.g. for the slepton doublet it is $l + 1$ (cf. Eq.(2.3)).

We shall assume that the superpotential in the observable sector has the form

$$g^{(0)} = h_E^{ij} L_i E_j H + h_D^{ij} Q_i D_j H + h_U^{ij} Q_i U_j H + h_N N H H; \quad (3.3)$$

where h_E, h_D, h_U are the generation mixing Yukawa couplings and h_N is an additional Yukawa coupling. So at this stage we assume the theory conserves R -parity. We have added the term $N H H$ instead of $H H$ as in the MSSM, in order to incorporate a possible solution to the μ -problem via a vacuum expectation value $\langle N \rangle$. The singlets z_m only couple in the hidden sector. The only requirement that comes from R -invariance on the form of $g^{(0)}$ is that it should transform with a global phase under the R -transformations as in Eq.(2.22). This implies that

$$l + e + h = 1; \quad (3.4)$$

$$q + d + h = 1; \quad (3.5)$$

$$q + u + h = 1; \quad (3.6)$$

$$n + h + h = 1; \quad (3.7)$$

We have employed our convention (2.38). The 1 corresponds to $\sum_i^P n_i = 2$ since we are now considering the fermionic charges, which are shifted by 1, i.e. $\sum_i^P (n_i^f + 1) = 2$ as seen from Eq.(2.3). At this stage we have also assumed that the R -charges are family independent, e.g. $l_1 = l_2 = l_3 = 1$.

Since the $U(1)_R$ gauge boson is a propagating gauge boson, we must consider the relevant anomaly conditions. These severely constrain the R -numbers appearing in Eq.(3.2). We shall require the $U(1)_R^3$ anomaly, and the mixed $U(1)_R \times U(1)_Y$, $U(1)_R \times SU(2)_L$, and $U(1)_R \times SU(3)_C$ anomalies to vanish. The hypercharge anomalies are satisfied by our

choice of $U(1)_Y$ charges. The equations for the absence of the $U(1)_Y - U(1)_R$ anomalies give

$$C_1 \quad \text{Tr} Y^2 R = 0; \quad (3.8)$$

$$\text{Tr} Y R^2 = 0; \quad (3.9)$$

$$\text{Tr} R^3 = 0; \quad (3.10)$$

These can be rewritten in terms of the R-quantum numbers as

$$3\left[\frac{1}{2}1 + e + \frac{1}{6}q + \frac{4}{3}u + \frac{1}{3}d\right] + \frac{1}{2}(h + h) = 0; \quad (3.11)$$

$$3[l^2 + e^2 + q^2 - 2u^2 + d^2] - h^2 + h^2 = 0; \quad (3.12)$$

$$3[2l^3 + e^3 + 6q^3 + 3u^3 + 3d^3] + 2h^3 + 2h^3 + 16 + n^3 + \sum z_m^3 = 0; \quad (3.13)$$

In the last equation the term $16 = 13 + 3$ is due to the 13 gauginos present in our model ($SU(3)_C : 8$, $SU(2)_L : 3$, $U(1)_Y : 1$, and $U(1)_R : 1$) as well as the gravitino. The gravitino contribution is three times that of a gaugino [27]. As seen in Eqs.(2.36,2.37), they all have R-charge 1. The absence of the mixed $U(1)_R - SU(2)_L$ anomalies implies the condition

$$C_2 \quad \text{Tr}_{fSU(2)_g} R = 0; \quad (3.14)$$

where the trace is limited to the non-trivial $SU(2)$ multiplets. This is evaluated as

$$3\left[\frac{1}{2}1 + \frac{3}{2}q\right] + \frac{1}{2}(h + h) + 2 = 0; \quad (3.15)$$

The constant 2 is due to the $SU(2)$ gauginos. For an arbitrary group $SU(N)$ the trace over the product of the adjoint representation generators is just N . Similarly the absence of the mixed $U(1)_R - SU(3)_C$ anomalies implies

$$C_3 \quad \text{Tr}_{fSU(3)_g} R = 0; \quad (3.16)$$

where now the trace is limited to non-trivial $SU(3)_C$ multiplets,

$$3\left[q + \frac{1}{2}u + \frac{1}{2}d\right] + 3 = 0; \quad (3.17)$$

The cancellation of the mixed gravitational anomaly [26] requires

$$\text{Tr} R = 0; \quad (3.18)$$

where the trace is taken over all states because of the universality of the gravitational coupling. This implies

$$3[2l + e + 6q + 3u + 3d] + 2(h + h) - 8 + n + \sum z_m = 0; \quad (3.19)$$

The term $\delta = 13 - 21$ is due to the 13 gauginos as well as the gravitino. In the gravitational anomaly the gravitino contribution is 21 times the gaugino contribution [27].⁶ To solve the set of ten equations (3.4–3.7), (3.11–3.13), (3.15, 3.17), and (3.19) we note that the seven Eqs. (3.4)–(3.6), (3.11), (3.12), (3.15), and (3.17) form a decoupled system with the seven unknowns l, e, q, u, d, h , and h . It is straight forward to show that these equations are incompatible and do not have a solution. This is independent of whether we replace the $N H H$ term by $H H$ in the superpotential. Therefore we conclude that when the R-numbers of the fields are family independent the $U(1)_R$ extension of the supersymmetric standard model is anomalous.

There are several ways around this problem of which we shall in turn discuss three. First, we shall consider whether the anomaly can be cancelled by the Green-Schwarz mechanism [28]. Second, we shall consider adding additional fields which transform non-trivially under G_{SM} , and third we shall consider a family-dependent $U(1)_R$.

3.2 Green-Schwarz Anomaly Cancellation

The Green-Schwarz mechanism of anomaly cancellation relies on coupling the system to a linear multiplet (B, \dots) where B is an antisymmetric tensor. The field strength of B is given by

$$H = dB; \quad (3.20)$$

and

$$B = B_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu; \quad (3.21)$$

is a two-form. In order to cancel the mixed gauge anomalies the action for B is not given by H^2 , which is gauge and Lorentz invariant, but instead by \hat{H}^2 . \hat{H} is classically gauge and Lorentz non-invariant and is given by

$$\hat{H} = H - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \text{Tr}(F_{\mu\nu} F_{\rho\sigma}) - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \text{tr}(F_{\mu\nu} F_{\rho\sigma}); \quad (3.22)$$

Here

$$\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = \text{Tr}(A dA + \frac{2}{3} A^3); \quad (3.23)$$

$$\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = \text{tr}(d! + \frac{2}{3} !^3); \quad (3.24)$$

$$A = g_a A^a T^a dx^\mu; \quad (3.25)$$

Tr is a trace over the gauge group and tr is a trace over the Lorentz Clifford algebra. A is a one-form and T^a are the generators of $SU(3)_C$, $SU(2)_L$, $U(1)_Y$, and $U(1)_R$, while

$$! = \frac{1}{2} !^{ab}{}_{ab} dx^\mu; \quad (3.26)$$

⁶We thank D. Castano, D. Freedman, and C. M. Ansel for pointing out to us the difference in the anomaly contribution of a gaugino and the gravitino in Eqs. (3.13, 3.19). This was treated incorrectly in an earlier version of this paper.

is the spin connection one-form .

The non-invariant part of the gauge transformations of \hat{H}^2 are of exactly the same form as the mixed gauge anomalies C_1, C_2 ; and C_3 of the previous subsection. The combined action is gauge invariant, i.e. the transformation of \hat{H}^2 cancels the mixed gauge anomalies, provided

$$\frac{C_1}{k_1} = \frac{C_2}{k_2} = \frac{C_3}{k_3} : \quad (3.27)$$

Here the k_i are real constants which take into account the different normalization of the gauge group generators. In string theories the k_i are the Kac-Moody levels of the gauge algebra. In almost all string models we have $k_2 = k_3$. Most string models have been constructed at level $k = 1$ for non-abelian groups. k_1 is not necessarily integer.

For $k_2 = k_3$ (not necessarily = 1) the anomaly cancellation conditions are compatible if and only if

$$C_2 = C_1 + 6 : \quad (3.28)$$

As in reference [29], we can simplify the equations by assuming that

$$\frac{C_2}{C_1} = \frac{3}{5} ; \quad (3.29)$$

which corresponds to the choice $\sin^2 \theta_w = \frac{3}{8}$ at the unification scale. In this case

$$C_1 = 15 ; \quad (3.30)$$

$$C_2 = C_3 = 9 ; \quad (3.31)$$

Then the anomaly cancellation equations can all be expressed in terms of one variable $l^0 = \frac{30}{7} - 1$ beyond the quantum numbers of the singlet fields \mathbb{Z}_m . The remaining equations are

$$80 + \frac{3}{2}l^0 + \sum \mathbb{Z}_m = 0 ; \quad (3.32)$$

$$\frac{8004}{9} - 24l^0 + \frac{19}{5}l^0 + \frac{3}{8}l^0 + \sum \mathbb{Z}_m^3 = 0 ; \quad (3.33)$$

where we have added the contribution of the linear multiplet (1) to both equations.

These equations have no rational solution for zero or one singlet. We have performed a numerical scan for three singlets with charges $m=6$; and m an integer between -200 and 200 and found no solution. It is not clear whether the situation would improve if we allow for different but realistic values for $C_2=C_1$ as the equations become very complicated. String models have also been constructed for level-two Kac-Moody algebras. We have considered the cases $k_2 = 2k_3$ and $k_3 = 2k_2$. The equations are of similar form to those above. There are no rational solutions for one or two singlets.

We conclude that it is not possible to cancel the anomaly via the Green-Schwarz mechanism with a small number of singlets.

3.3 Non-Singlet Field Extensions

We want to briefly investigate what possible extensions of the field content could lead to an anomaly-free family independent R-symmetry. First, we consider fields which transform under the electroweak gauge group. In order to maintain the anomaly cancellation in the Standard Model we allow for extra generations (N_g is the number of generations) and pairs of Higgs doublets N_h . The seven decoupled anomaly equations lead to the equation

$$N_g = \frac{3N_h}{N_h + 3}; \quad (3.34)$$

This has no positive integer solutions. We thus consider the case of an extra $SU(3)$ -octet chiral superfield O_c with $G_{SM} \times U(1)_R$ quantum numbers $(8; 1; 0; o_c)$. Octet extensions have also been considered, for example in [30, 8]. The anomaly equations for (3.17) and (3.19) change, they are now

$$3[q + \frac{1}{2}u + \frac{1}{2}d] + 3 + 3o_c = 0; \quad (3.35)$$

$$3[2l^3 + e^3 + 6q^3 + 3u^3 + 3d^3] + 2h^3 + 2h^3 + 16 + n^3 + \sum_x z_m^3 + 8o_c^3 = 0; \quad (3.36)$$

$$3[2l + e + 6q + 3u + 3d] + 2(h + h) + 8 + n + \sum_x z_m + 8o_c = 0; \quad (3.37)$$

The seven independent equations are now in eight variables and have a solution in terms of two variables which we choose to be l and e ,

$$\begin{aligned} h &= (l + e + 1); & h &= l + e - 1; & q &= \frac{2}{9} - \frac{1}{3}l; \\ d &= \frac{2}{9} + \frac{4}{3}l + e; & u &= \frac{2}{9} - \frac{2}{3}l - e; & n &= 1; & o_c &= -1; \end{aligned} \quad (3.38)$$

The remaining equations involving the singlets are then given by

$$3(2l + e) - 19 + \sum_x z_i = 0; \quad (3.39)$$

$$3(2l + e)^3 + 13 + \sum_i z_i^3 = 0; \quad (3.40)$$

For zero or one singlet this has no rational solution. We performed a numerical scan for singlet charges between -20 and 20 in steps of 1/6. We found no solution for two or three singlets. We found many (sixty-six) solutions with four singlets. Here we present three solutions written in terms of the quantum numbers $(2l + e; z_1; z_2; z_3; z_4)$:

$$(1; \frac{47}{3}; \frac{25}{3}; 3; 13); \quad (3.41)$$

$$(\frac{11}{3}; 11; \frac{7}{3}; \frac{25}{3}; \frac{25}{3}); \quad (3.42)$$

$$(\frac{1}{3}; 20; \frac{20}{3}; \frac{47}{3}; \frac{47}{3}) \quad (3.43)$$

Note in Eq.(3.38) that the fermionic component of the octet chiral superfield has R-charge 1 and thus the spin zero component has R-charge 0. Therefore when supersymmetry is

broken the soft-supersymmetry breaking terms in the scalar potential involving only the spin zero octet are unconstrained. Such a potential typically breaks $SU(3)_c$. We do not consider these solutions any further.⁷

3.4 Family Dependent Gauged $U(1)_R$ Symmetry

The Standard Model has three generations which are only distinguished by their mass. Clearly this structure requires an explanation. One possibility is that the difference in the families are explained by a horizontal symmetry at very high energies. Thus in general we expect at high energies the electron to have different gauge quantum numbers from the muon or the tau and similarly for the quarks. Only at low energies are the gauge quantum numbers in the effective theory family independent. We shall see in Section 4 that R -symmetries are broken close to the Planck scale. In accordance with this philosophy we thus expect the R -symmetry to be family-dependent as well. In this section we investigate the conditions for an anomaly-free family-dependent R -symmetry. We shall denote the R -quantum number of the matter fields by $e_i; l_i; q_i; u_i$, and d_i , $i = 1; 2; 3$. Motivated by the successes of the work on symmetric mass matrices [31] we shall assume a left-right symmetry for the matter fields

$$Q_R (\begin{smallmatrix} a \\ iR \end{smallmatrix}) = Q_R (\begin{smallmatrix} a \\ iL \end{smallmatrix}) : \quad (3.44)$$

Here a is a flavour index. In particular we have

$$e_i = l_i; \quad u_i = d_i = q_i; \quad i = 1; 2; 3 : \quad (3.45)$$

Also motivated by the structure of the quark and lepton masses we shall assume that only the fields of the third generation enter the superpotential. The superpotential for the observable sector is then given by

$$g^{(0)} = h_E^{33} L_3 E_3 H + h_D^{33} Q_3 D_3 H + h_U^{33} Q_3 U_3 H + h_N N H H : \quad (3.46)$$

The masses for the first and second generation will be generated after the breaking of some symmetry, possibly the R -symmetry. We shall here not further consider the problem of fermion mass.

The anomaly cancellation equations will keep the same form as in Eqs.(3.4)–(3.19) but with the factor of 3 outside the quark's and lepton's contributions replaced by $\sum_{i=1}^3$ and Eqs.(3.4)–(3.6) hold only for the third generation. Making use of our assumption (3.44, 3.45) these equations reduce respectively to

$$\frac{3}{2} (l_1 + l_2 + l_3) + \frac{11}{6} (q_1 + q_2 + q_3) + \frac{1}{2} (h + h) = 0; \quad (3.47)$$

⁷After we submitted this paper [40] also considered coloured triplets $D = (3; 1; \frac{1}{3})$, $\bar{D} = (3; 1; \frac{1}{3})$ and obtain anomaly-free solutions.

$$h^2 - h^2 = 0; \quad (3.48)$$

$$3(l_1^3 + l_2^3 + l_3^3) + 12(q_1^3 + q_2^3 + q_3^3) + 2h^3 + 2h^3 - 8 + n^3 + \frac{h^2}{X} z_m^3 = 0; \quad (3.49)$$

$$\frac{1}{2}(l_1 + l_2 + l_3) + \frac{3}{2}(q_1 + q_2 + q_3) + \frac{1}{2}(h + h) + 2 = 0; \quad (3.50)$$

$$2(q_1 + q_2 + q_3) + 3 = 0; \quad (3.51)$$

$$3(l_1 + l_2 + l_3) + 12(q_1 + q_2 + q_3) + 2(h + h) + 16 + n + \frac{h^2}{X} z_m = 0; \quad (3.52)$$

The requirement that the superpotential has homogeneous weight two gives

$$2l_3 + h = 1; \quad (3.53)$$

$$n + h + h = 1; \quad (3.54)$$

$$2q_3 + h = 1; \quad (3.55)$$

$$2q_3 + h = 1; \quad (3.56)$$

Combining all these equations we get

$$\begin{aligned} h = h &= 1; & q_3 = l_3 &= 0; \\ l_2 &= \frac{5}{2} - l_1; & q_2 &= \left(\frac{3}{2} + q_1\right); & n &= 1; \end{aligned} \quad (3.57)$$

The only remaining equations to solve are (3.52) and (3.49) which simplify to

$$\frac{45}{2}l_1 \left(l_1 - \frac{5}{2}\right) - 54q_1 \left(q_1 + \frac{3}{2}\right) + \frac{155}{8} + \frac{h^2}{X} z_m^3 = 0; \quad (3.58)$$

$$\frac{h^2}{X} z_m = \frac{43}{2}; \quad (3.59)$$

We see that at least one singlet must be added. For one extra singlet we find two independent solutions:

$$(q_1; q_2; l_1; l_2) = \left(\frac{76}{3}; \frac{143}{6}; \frac{61}{2}; 33\right); \quad (3.60)$$

$$(q_1; q_2; l_1; l_2) = \left(\frac{46}{3}; \frac{83}{6}; 7; \frac{19}{2}\right); \quad (3.61)$$

Both solutions have $z = \frac{43}{2}$. In the next section we shall discuss the breaking of supersymmetry and of the gauged R-symmetry. We will see that this solution is unsatisfactory in many respects. The charge of the singlet z is positive which leads to an unacceptable cosmological constant. We also see that some of the fermionic charges of the observable fields $(q_i; l_i; h; h)$ are less than -1 ; the bosonic charges are then negative. The potential then requires re-tuning in order to guarantee weak-scale sfermion masses.

For two additional singlets we find many solutions. The two solutions with the smallest $|q_i|$ values are

$$(q_1; q_2; l_1; l_2; z_1; z_2) = \left(\frac{61}{3}; \frac{113}{6}; 1; \frac{7}{2}; 6; \frac{55}{2}\right); \quad (3.62)$$

$$(q_1; q_2; l_1; l_2; z_1; z_2) = \left(\frac{61}{3}; \frac{131}{6}; 6; \frac{17}{2}; 7; \frac{57}{2}\right); \quad (3.63)$$

These solutions have negative singlet charges which makes it possible to cancel the cosmological constant. However, q_1 or $q_2 < -1$. We scanned the three singlet case for appropriate solutions and found one. The fermionic charges are given by

$$f(q_1; q_2; q_3); (l_1; l_2; l_3); (z_1; z_2; z_3)g = (-1; \frac{1}{2}; 0); (\frac{1}{2}; 2; 0); (\frac{115}{3}; 26; \frac{203}{6}) : \quad (3.64)$$

There are three further physically distinct solutions obtained by the interchanges $q_1 \leftrightarrow q_2$ and $l_1 \leftrightarrow l_2$. We study this solution in more detail in the next two sections. However, this solution has very large singlet charges and has a gauge invariant hidden-sector superpotential with very large powers of the singlet fields. We thus also studied the four-singlet solutions.

For four singlets we find very many solutions. The solutions with observable field fermionic charges greater than -1 can be classified in two sets of twelve and ten classes

$$q_1 = -1; \quad l_1 = \frac{n}{6}; \quad n = -6; \dots; 6; n \neq 0 \quad (3.65)$$

$$q_1 = \frac{5}{6}; \quad l_1 = \frac{n}{6}; \quad n = -6; \dots; 6; n \neq -4; 0; 4 \quad (3.66)$$

Physically distinct solutions are again obtained by the interchange $q_1 \leftrightarrow q_2$ and $l_1 \leftrightarrow l_2$. In (3.65, 3.66) we have disregarded the solutions where $l_1 = 0$. These lead to a further term $L_1 H E_1$ in the superpotential in contradiction to our assumption of dominant third generation Higgs Yukawa couplings. As we will see in Section 5 the solutions with $q_1 = -1$ lead to the simultaneous presence of $L_i Q_j D_k$ and $U_l D_m D_n$ in the superpotential. In most cases this leads to an unacceptable level of proton decay. The exceptions are discussed in [32]. We thus focus on the solutions (3.66). In Table 1 we present the complete charges of one representative of each of the ten classes.

In the next section we shall discuss the breaking of supersymmetry and R-symmetry for the three singlet solution of Eq.(3.64) and the four-singlet solutions of Table 1.

4 Supersymmetry and R-symmetry Breaking

To have a realistic model both supersymmetry and R-symmetry must be broken at low energies. Since we have a locally supersymmetric theory, it is possible to break supersymmetry spontaneously. The easiest way is to utilize a hidden sector whose fields are singlets with respect to the Standard Model gauge group. Depending on whether the R-symmetry and supersymmetry are to be broken simultaneously or not, (the bosonic component of) these singlets would have or not have non-trivial R-numbers. In the case of a gauged R-symmetry we have shown that anomaly free models are not possible for leptons and quarks with family independent R-numbers. When we allow for family dependent R-numbers for the leptons and quarks while maintaining a left-right symmetry, we obtain many solutions, including (3.64, 3.66).

The R-number of the superpotential is 2, and a Fayet-Iliopoulos term is necessarily present in the D-term of the scalar potential. The g_R part of this is⁸

$$g_R^2 \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^2 n_i z^i z_i + \frac{4}{2} \quad ; \quad (4.1)$$

and we have a cosmological constant of the order of the Planck scale. In a realistic model we must avoid giving the squarks and sleptons superheavy masses [34], otherwise supersymmetry would be irrelevant at low energies. Thus to lowest order the condition

$$\langle n_i z^i z_i \rangle + \frac{4}{2} = 0; \quad (4.2)$$

must be satisfied. As shown in [40], the first order corrections will be of order $(\frac{m_s}{M_P})^2$, where m_s is the supersymmetry scale of order $10^2 - 10^3$ GeV. From Eq.(4.1) it should be clear that at least one chiral superfield must have negative (bosonic) R-charge. In a realistic model only the singlets should get a vev at the Planck scale. We thus have the necessary requirement of a negatively charged singlet (fermionic charge < -1). This lead us in the previous section to reject the one-singlet solution. In the general minimization of the potential we also expect negatively charged observable chiral superfields to get a vev. In the previous section we thus imposed the additional constraint that the observable fields have semi-positive bosonic charges. This lead us to the three- and four-singlet solutions.

The bosonic components of the only three-singlet solution are given by

$$(z_1; z_2; z_3) = \left(\frac{112}{3}; 27; \frac{209}{6} \right); \quad q_1 = 0; \quad l_1 = \frac{3}{2}; \quad (4.3)$$

We have chosen $z_1; z_2; z_3$ such that $z_1 < z_2 < z_3$. For a realistic model we must have $\langle z_1 \rangle > 0$ ($\frac{1}{2}$). The most general polynomial with R-charge 2 for such three singlets is given by

$$g^0(z_1; z_2; z_3) = \frac{1}{3} a_1 (z_1)^{10} (z_2) (z_3)^{10} + a_2 (z_1)^{25} (z_2)^{14} (z_3)^{16} \quad (4.4)$$

$$+ a_3 (z_1)^{33} (z_2)^7 (z_3)^{30} + a_4 (z_1)^{41} (z_3)^{44} + \dots : \quad (4.5)$$

We have only introduced the Planck scale. We take the arbitrary parameters $a_k = O(1)$.

We can not break supersymmetry via the Polonyi mechanism [33] since a constant is not R-invariant. Instead we find the above superpotential sufficient. When we take at least three non-zero parameters a_k in g^0 then it is possible to find solutions for which the total potential V is positive semi-definite with the value zero at the minimum, and where the

⁸Here we have assumed that the kinetic energy is minimal and of the form

$$y = \frac{1}{2} z_i z^i + \dots$$

D-term is also zero at the minimum. For this we must of course re-tune the parameters a_k .

In this case the R-gauge vector boson mass is of the order of the Planck mass. The total superpotential is then taken to be of the form

$$g = g^0(z_1; z_2; z_3) + g^{(0)}(S_i); \quad (4.6)$$

where $g^{(0)}$ is the observable sector superpotential which only depends on the Standard Model superfields S_i and is given by (3.3).

The most general potential in a locally supersymmetric theory with chiral multiplets S_a is

$$V = \frac{1}{4} e^G G_{,i} G_{,j} G_{,a} G_{,b} + \frac{1}{2} g^2 \text{Re} f^{-1} G_{,i}^a (T - z)_a G_{,j}^b (T - z)_b : \quad (4.7)$$

For the three-singlet model we thus obtain the dependence of the R-symmetry D-term on $z_1; z_2; z_3$ as

$$g_R^2 \left(\frac{1}{8} \left(\frac{2}{3} \right)^2 - \frac{112}{3} j_1^2 + 27 j_2^2 + \frac{209}{6} j_3^2 + \frac{4}{2} \right) \quad (4.8)$$

From the form of g^0 it is clear that there is no symmetry in $z_1; z_2; z_3$ and their vevs will be unequal. For the D-term to vanish at the minimum we must have $j_2 j_3 < \frac{112}{81}$, and $j_3 j_1 < \frac{224}{209} j_1 j_2$. By re-tuning the parameters a_k it might be possible to arrange for $j_2 j_3 = \frac{1}{2} j_1 j_2$ so that $j_1 j_2 = \frac{1}{5}$. Then if we start with the natural Planck scale 1 , the effective value of g^0 will be $\frac{m_s}{2}$, where $m_s = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{5} \right)^{21} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{11}$ is of order $O(10^2 \text{ GeV})$.

To be honest we must stress that studying such potentials is a very difficult task and needs a careful analysis. We shall assume that $z_1; z_2; z_3 = O(1)$ with coefficients less than one, so that when these fields are integrated out one gets $\langle -2g^0 \rangle = m_s$.

By integrating the hidden sector fields $z_1; z_2; z_3$ one obtains the effective potential as a function of the light fields z_i . The general form of the effective potential is [35]

$$V_{\text{eff}} = \hat{g}_{ii}^2 j_i^2 + m_s^2 j_i^2 + m_s (z_i \hat{g}_{ii} + (A - 3)\hat{g} + \text{h.c.}) + \frac{1}{8} g^2 (z^i (T - z)_i)^2; \quad (4.9)$$

where \hat{g} is related to $g^{(0)}$ through a multiplicative factor depending on the details of the hidden sector. Similarly for A and m_s which is given by $m_s = \langle -2g^0 \rangle$. In the observable sector the singlet N has R-number 2, one can show that N can acquire a $\langle N \rangle = O(m_s)$ because it also contributes to the D-term. This can be seen explicitly by minimizing the effective potential

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \hat{g}_{ii}^2 j_i^2 + m_s^2 j_i^2 + m_s (z_i \hat{g}_{ii} + (A - 3)\hat{g} + \text{h.c.}) \\ & + \frac{1}{8} g^2 H^a H^a + H^a H^a + \frac{1}{8} g^2 H^a H^a + \frac{1}{8} g^2 H^a H^a \\ & + \frac{1}{18} g_R^2 2N^2 j^2 + \sum_{j=1}^3 g_j (Q_j^2 j_j^2 + U_j^2 j_j^2 + D_j^2 j_j^2) + l_j (L_j^2 j_j^2 + E_j^2 j_j^2) : \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

The above potential has R-breaking terms present in \hat{g} and $z^i \hat{g}_{,i}$. Together with the terms in $m_s^2 \hat{z}_i^2$ they break supersymmetry softly. We can use the tree-level effective action plus the renormalization group equations to find the radiative corrections and the R-breaking effects present.

The three singlet solution is problematic with the UDD couplings as will be clear in the next section. Therefore we must consider the four singlet solutions which we required to avoid such a problem. The superpotentials for the ten different classes are given in Table 2.

As before we have to tune the parameters a_k so that the potential is positive definite and so that $\hat{z}_1, \dots, \hat{z}_4 \rightarrow 0$ ($\frac{1}{4}$) with coefficients less than one so as to induce a scale such that $\langle z^0 g^0 \rangle = m_s = 0$ (10^2 GeV). The effective potential takes the same form as in the three singlet case, but with different R-numbers for the squarks and sleptons.

It is possible to add direct gaugino masses because the action contains the term

$$e^G G_i^1 G_1^{1k} f_{ijk} \quad (4.11)$$

which for the canonical choice of the kinetic energy becomes

$$\frac{1}{4} e^{\frac{2}{4} z_i z^i} (g_i^1 + \frac{2}{2} z^i g) f_{ijk} \quad (4.12)$$

Thus if we choose

$$f = f(z_i) \quad (4.13)$$

where, e.g. we can take

$$f(z_i) = g^0(z_i) \quad (4.14)$$

which will induce direct gaugino masses of order $\langle z^0 g^0 \rangle = 0$ (m_s) at the tree level. It is clear that gaugino masses will also be induced by radiative corrections [10, 11].

5 Applications to R-parity Violation

When extending the Standard Model to supersymmetry new dimension four Yukawa couplings are allowed which violate baryon- and lepton-number. When determining our solutions to the anomaly equations we have explicitly assumed that the superpotential conserves R-parity and that all these terms were forbidden. However, this was merely a working assumption, since we are mainly interested in an anomaly-free supersymmetric model with a gauged R-symmetry and the superpotentials (3.3) (family-independent) or (3.46) (family-dependent) posed the minimal number of constraints. Whether R_p is conserved or not should only depend on gauge symmetries at the high energy scale. Therefore, we now investigate which R_p violating terms are allowed in the anomaly-free models (3.64, 3.66).

In order to determine the allowed superpotential terms we must consider the charge combinations of the leptons and the quarks. We shall denote by $\vec{I} = (I_1; I_2; I_3)$, and $\vec{q} =$

$(q_1; q_2; q_3)$ the set of family dependent fermionic lepton and quark charges. For the three singlet model they are given in Eq.(3.64). For the four singlet case we had twenty models with $q_1 = (-1; \frac{1}{2}; 0)$ and ten models with $q_1 = (-\frac{5}{6}; \frac{2}{3}; 0)$. The corresponding leptonic charges are given in Table 3. In all three- and four-singlet models $h = h = -1$.

The possible dimension four terms are

$$L_i L_j E_k; \quad L_i Q_j D_k; \quad U_i D_j D_k; \quad \sim L_i H; \quad (5.1)$$

where \sim is a dimensionful parameter. The indices $i; j; k$ are generation indices and we have suppressed the gauge group indices. In the first term we must have $i \neq j$ due to an anti-symmetry in the $SU(2)_L$ indices. Similarly, in the third term we must have $j \neq k$ due to the $SU(3)_C$ structure. We have included the last term because the symmetry $U(1)_R$ distinguishes between the leptonic superfields L_i and the Higgs H and thus can not be rotated away. In our notation and with the left-right symmetry the $U(1)_R$ charges of the above terms are given by

$$Q_R(L_i L_j E_k) = q_i + q_j + q_k = -1; \quad (5.2)$$

$$Q_R(L_i Q_j D_k) = q_i + q_j + q_k = -1; \quad (5.3)$$

$$Q_R(U_i D_j D_k) = q_i + q_j + q_k = -1; \quad (5.4)$$

$$Q_R(L_i H) = q_i + h = 0; \quad (5.5)$$

The last equality in each line is the requirement on the fermionic charges for $U(1)_R$ gauge invariance. The $L_i H$ term is different just because we are considering the fermionic charges. The superfield charges must add to +2 for all terms.

For the three singlet solution we obtain the following $G_{SM} \times U(1)_R$ additional dimension-four terms

$$LLE : \quad \text{none} \quad (5.6)$$

$$LQD : \quad L_1 Q_1 D_2; L_1 Q_2 D_1; L_3 Q_1 D_3; L_3 Q_3 D_1; L_3 Q_2 D_2; \quad (5.7)$$

$$UDD : \quad U_3 D_1 D_3; U_2 D_2 D_3; \quad (5.8)$$

LQD and UDD terms together can lead to a dangerous level of proton decay. Recently Carlson, Roy and Sher [32] studied the proton decay rates from all possible combinations. They found that some of the above combinations are more weakly bound than expected. But for example the product of Yukawa couplings for the operators $U_2 D_2 D_3$ and LQD is restricted to be smaller than 10^{-9} . We thus exclude the three singlet solution. Similarly we also exclude the four singlet solutions with $q_1 = -1$. This is the reason why in the previous section we restricted ourselves to the case $q_1 = -\frac{5}{6}$.

For the ten models of Table 1 we find the following sets of gauge invariant R -parity violating dimension-four terms

$$I : \quad L_1 L_3 E_3; L_1 Q_3 D_3$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{III} : & \quad L_1 L_3 E_1 \\
\text{IV} : & \quad L_1 Q_2 D_3; L_1 Q_3 D_2; \\
\text{V} : & \quad L_1 Q_1 D_3; L_1 Q_3 D_1; \\
\text{VII} : & \quad L_1 Q_2 D_2; \\
\text{VIII} : & \quad L_1 Q_1 D_2; L_1 Q_2 D_1; \\
\text{X} : & \quad L_1 H :
\end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

When determining solutions to the anomaly equations we had an additional set of solutions under the interchange $l_1 \leftrightarrow l_2$ and $q_1 \leftrightarrow q_2$. We can thus obtain a further set of allowed R-parity violating models

$$\begin{aligned}
I^0 : & \quad L_2 L_3 E_3; L_2 Q_3 D_3 \\
\text{III}^0 : & \quad L_2 L_3 E_2 \\
\text{IV}^0 : & \quad L_2 Q_2 D_3; L_2 Q_3 D_2; \\
\text{IV}^\emptyset : & \quad L_2 Q_1 D_3; L_2 Q_3 D_1; \\
\text{IV}^\oplus : & \quad L_1 Q_1 D_3; L_1 Q_3 D_1; \\
V^0 : & \quad L_1 Q_2 D_3; L_1 Q_3 D_2; \\
V^\emptyset : & \quad L_2 Q_1 D_3; L_2 Q_3 D_1; \\
V^\oplus : & \quad L_2 Q_2 D_3; L_2 Q_3 D_2; \\
\text{VII}^0 : & \quad L_1 Q_1 D_1; \\
\text{VII}^\emptyset : & \quad L_2 Q_1 D_1; \\
\text{VII}^\oplus : & \quad L_2 Q_2 D_2; \\
\text{VIII}^0 : & \quad L_2 Q_1 D_2; L_2 Q_2 D_1; \\
X^0 : & \quad L_2 H :
\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

We find the interesting point that we have models with only LLE type couplings, others with only $L_i H$ or LQD couplings. We also have three sets II;VI;IX where R-parity is conserved. Thus there is no logical connection between a conserved R-symmetry and the status of R-parity. They are independent concepts.

The $L_{1,2} H$ term has a dimensionful coupling \sim similar to the μ term of the MSSM. Its natural value in our local supersymmetric models is ~ 1 . At low energies, we can rotate away this term and thus generate LLE;LQD interactions which are strongly constrained experimentally [37]. These bounds translate into $\sim < O(m_s)$. In order to avoid a further hierarchy problem we require the absence of $L_i H$ terms and therefore exclude the models X;X⁰.

Interestingly enough, most of the models (I;I⁰; IV;:::IV[⊕], V;:::V[⊕], VII;:::VII[⊕], VIII;VIII⁰) predict sizeable $L_{1,2} Q_i D_j$ interactions. The first set leads to resonant squark production at HERA which has been investigated in detail in [38]. This should be observable

with an integrated luminosity of about 100pb^{-1} for squark masses below 275GeV . The second set also lead to observable signals at HERA even for very small couplings as discussed in [39].

We point out that only in model I we have additional terms $L_1 H N$. These conserve R-parity provided N is interpreted as a right-handed neutrino. $L_1 H N$ is a Dirac neutrino mass and requires a very small Yukawa coupling. We thus exclude model I.

It is interesting to note that even though for the Higgs Yukawa couplings the third generation is dominant this is not necessarily the case for the R_p violating interactions.

6 Conclusion

The purpose of this paper has been to take a first step towards model building with a gauged R-symmetry. We have discussed in detail that an R-symmetry can only be gauged in local supersymmetry since it does not commute with the supersymmetry generator. We showed that electroweak extensions of the minimal superpotential do not lead to an anomaly-free theory, independently of the number of standard model singlets added. We found anomaly-free family-independent R-symmetric models by adding an $SU(3)_c$ octet chiral superfield. This however typically breaks $SU(3)_c$. We then discussed in detail the family-dependent anomaly-free R-symmetry. Making assumptions based on mass matrix considerations we found solutions with one, two, three and four additional singlets. We discarded the one- and two-singlet solutions based on the symmetry breaking pattern. For the three- and four-singlet solutions we analysed the gauge- and supersymmetry breaking. The $U(1)_R$ symmetry is necessarily broken near the Planck scale because of the Fayet-Iliopoulos term. This could naturally lead after symmetry breaking to an expansion parameter of order the Wolfenstein parameter which is required for a dynamical generation of the correct mass matrix structure. We generated the supersymmetry scale of order the weak-scale because of the large powers in the superpotential. The large powers were determined by the R-symmetry.

We have allowed for the possibility of a solution to the μ problem via an additional singlet. But there is no potential for this singlet. We shall show in [41] how a proper solution to the μ -problem can be obtained.

In the last section we discuss in detail the R_p violating structure of our models. We find that R-symmetry and R-parity are disconnected concepts. We exclude a large class of our models because they lead to an unacceptable level of proton decay. The remaining solutions typically predict LQD R-parity violation which could be observed at HERA.

We expect gauged R-symmetries to be a useful model building tool in the future.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Diego Castano, Dan Freedman and Cristina Manuel for pointing out an error in the original manuscript in the computation of the gravitino contribution to

the anomaly.

We would like to thank Subir Sarkar for discussions on a possible light gluino. We would like to thank Lance Dixon, Jean-Pierre Derendinger, Corinne Heath, Luis Ibanez and Graham Ross for helpful conversations.

Note Added: After submitting our paper we have received the related work of Castano, Freedman and Manuel [40]. We have included a few comments concerning the connection to their work in text. In particular we have modified the D-term of the low-energy effective potential.

References

- [1] A.H. Chamsseddine and H. Dreiner, Nucl. Phys. B 447 (1995) 195; hep-ph/9503454.
- [2] A. Salam and J. Strathdee, Nucl. Phys. B 87 (1975) 85
- [3] P. Fayet Nucl. Phys. B 90 (1975) 104.
- [4] S. Dimopoulos and H. Georgi, Nucl. Phys. B 193 (1981) 150;
N. Sakai, Z. Phys. C 11 (1981) 153;
H.P. Nilles and S. Raby, Nucl. Phys. B 198 (1982) 102;
N. Sakai and T. Yanagida Nucl. Phys. B 197 (1982) 533;
S. Dimopoulos, S. Raby and F.W. Ilczek, Phys. Lett. B 112 (1982) 133.
- [5] W. Buchmüller, D. Wyler, Phys. Lett. B 121 (1983) 321.
- [6] E.J. Chun, J.E. Kim and H.P. Nilles, Nucl. Phys. B 370 (1992) 105;
J.E. Kim and H.P. Nilles, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 9 (1994) 3575.
- [7] M. Dine and D.A. MacIntire, Phys. Rev. D 46 (1992) 2594.
- [8] L. Hall and L. Randall, Nucl. Phys. B 352 (1991) 289.
- [9] I. Aeck and M. Dine, Phys. Lett. B 154 (1985) 368.
- [10] R. Barbieri, L. Girardello and A. Masiero, Phys. Lett. B 127 (1983) 429; R. Barbieri and L. Maiani, Nucl. Phys. B 243 (1984) 429.
- [11] G. Farrar and A. Masiero, Rutgers Preprint RU-94-38, hep-ph/9410401.
- [12] A.M. Cooper-Sarkar et al, Phys Lett B 160 (1985) 212; Howard E. Haber in Super-symmetry and Unification of Fundamental Interactions, World Scientific, Singapore, 1993 and hep-ph/9308235; M. Barnett, talk given at SUSY 95, Paris, May 1995.
- [13] A.E. Nelson and N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. B 416 (1994) 46.

- [14] J. Bagger, E. Poppitz and L. Randall, Nucl. Phys. B 426 (1994) 3.
- [15] For a review see A. Strominger in the Proceedings of the Theoretical Advanced Study Institute Summer School, 1988.
- [16] P. West, Introduction to Supersymmetry and Supergravity, World Scientific, 1986.
- [17] D. Z. Freedman, Phys. Rev. D 15 (1977) 1173.
- [18] A. Das, M. Fischler and M. Rocek, Phys. Rev. D 16 (1977) 3427.
- [19] P. Fayet, and J. Illiopoulos Phys. Lett. B 51 (1974) 461.
- [20] B. DeWitt and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Nucl. Phys. B 139 (1978) 216.
- [21] K. S. Stelle and P. C. West, Nucl. Phys. B 145 (1978) 175.
- [22] For an overview of the superconformal tensor calculus see T. Kugo and S. Uehara, Nucl. Phys. B 226 (1983) 49.
- [23] R. Barbieri, S. Ferrara, D. V. Nanopoulos, and K. S. Stelle, Phys. Lett. B 113 (1982) 219.
- [24] S. Ferrara, L. Girardello, T. Kugo and A. van Proeyen, Nucl. Phys. B (1983) 191.
- [25] E. Cremmer, S. Ferrara, L. Girardello, and A. van Proeyen, Nucl. Phys. B 212 (1983) 413.
- [26] R. Delbourgo and A. Salam, Phys. Lett. B 40 (1972) 381;
T. Eguchi and P. Freund, Phys. Rev. Lett 37 (1976) 1251;
L. Alvarez-Gaume and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B 234 (1983) 269.
- [27] N. K. Nielsen, M. T. Grisaru, H. Romer, and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Nucl. Phys. B 140 (1978) 477; N. K. Nielsen and H. Romer, Phys. Lett. B 154 (1985) 141; the third reference in [26]; J. P. Derendinger, Phys. Lett. B (1985) 203.
- [28] M. B. Green and J. H. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. B 149 (1984) 117.
- [29] L. Ibanez, Phys. Lett. B 303 (1993) 55.
- [30] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev D 26 (1982) 287.
- [31] G. Giudice, Mod Phys. Lett. A 7 (1992) 2429,
H. Dreiner, G. K. Leontaris, and N. D. Tracas, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 8 (1993) 2099; G. Anderson, S. Dimopoulos, L. Hall and S. Raby, Phys. Rev. D 47 (1993) 3702;
P. Ramond, R. G. Roberts and G. G. Ross, Nucl. Phys. B 406 (1993) 19,
L. Ibanez and G. G. Ross, Phys. Lett. B 332 (1994) 100;

- H . D reiner, G . K . Leontaris, S . Lola and G . G . Ross, Nucl. Phys. B 436 (1995) 461;
V . Jain and R . Shrock, Stony Brook preprint ITP-SB-94-55 and hep-ph/9412367.
- [32] C . E . Carlson, P . Roy and M . Sher, Preprint William & Mary WM-95-104, Tata
Institute TIFR/TH/95-20, hep-ph/9506328.
- [33] J . Polanyi, Budapest preprint KFK I-93 (1977).
- [34] A . H . Cham seddine, R . A mow itt, and P . Nath, Phys. Rev. Lett. 50 (1983) 232.
- [35] A . H . Cham seddine, R . A mow itt and P . Nath, Phys. Rev. Lett. 49 (1982) 970.
- [36] E . C rem m er, P . Fayet and L . G irardello, Phys. Lett. B 122 (1983) 41.
- [37] V . B arger, T . H an and G . G iudice, Phys. Rev. D 40 (1989) 2987.
- [38] J . Butterworth and H . D reiner, Nucl. Phys. B 397 (1993) 3; Proc. of the 2nd HERA
Workshop on Physics, 1991.
- [39] H . D reiner and P . M oraw itz, Nucl. Phys. B 428 (1994) 31.
- [40] D . C astano, D . F reedm an, and C . M anuel, hep-ph/9507397.
- [41] A . Cham seddine and H . D reiner, work in progress.

	l_1	z_1	z_2	z_3	z_4
I	1	$\frac{80}{3}$	7	$\frac{53}{3}$	$\frac{47}{2}$
II	$\frac{5}{6}$	$\frac{203}{6}$	21	$\frac{185}{6}$	$\frac{7}{2}$
III	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{131}{2}$	$\frac{95}{6}$	$\frac{391}{6}$	6
IV	$\frac{1}{3}$	24	$\frac{25}{2}$	$\frac{131}{6}$	$\frac{67}{6}$
V	$\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{133}{6}$	$\frac{27}{2}$	$\frac{115}{6}$	11
V I	$\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{263}{6}$	$\frac{25}{6}$	36	$\frac{67}{2}$
V II	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{74}{3}$	$\frac{33}{2}$	$\frac{43}{2}$	$\frac{49}{6}$
V III	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{83}{2}$	$\frac{55}{2}$	37	$\frac{3}{2}$
IX	$\frac{5}{6}$	$\frac{278}{3}$	$\frac{17}{2}$	$\frac{187}{6}$	$\frac{183}{2}$
X	1	$\frac{167}{2}$	24	$\frac{497}{6}$	$\frac{11}{6}$

Table 1: Fermionic charges of the ten four-singlet solutions with $q_1 = \frac{5}{6}$, $q_2 = \frac{2}{3}$, $l_2 = \frac{5}{2}$, $l_4, q_3 = l_3 = 0$.

I	${}^3g^0 = (a_1 (z_1)^2 (z_2)^2 (z_3)^2 + a_2 (z_1)^7 (z_2)^2 (z_3) (z_4)^6$ $+ a_3 (z_1)^8 (z_2)^2 (z_3)^5 (z_4)^4 + a_4 (z_1)^9 (z_2)^2 (z_3)^9 (z_4)^2)$
II	${}^3g^0 = (a_1 (z_1)^4 (z_2)^4 (z_3) (z_4)^3 + a_2 (z_1)^7 (z_3)^7 (z_4)^2$ $+ a_3 (z_1)^5 (z_2)^2 (z_3)^2 (z_4)^{13} + a_4 (z_1)^6 (z_2)^7 (z_4)^{10})$
III	${}^3g^0 = (a_1 (z_1)^5 (z_2)^{11} (z_3)^2 (z_4) + a_2 (z_1)^6 (z_2)^{14} (z_3)^2 (z_4)^3$ $+ a_3 (z_1)^5 (z_3)^3 (z_4)^{18} + a_4 (z_1)^6 (z_2)^3 (z_3)^3 (z_4)^{20})$
IV	${}^3g^0 = (a_1 (z_1)^5 (z_2) (z_3)^4 (z_4) + a_2 (z_1)^6 (z_3)^4 (z_4)^4$ $+ a_3 (z_1)^7 (z_2)^7 (z_3)^3 + a_4 (z_1)^8 (z_2)^6 (z_3)^3 (z_4)^3)$
V	${}^3g^0 = (a_1 (z_1)^5 (z_2)^3 (z_3)^2 (z_4)^2 + a_2 (z_1)^7 (z_2)^4 (z_3) (z_4)^6$ $+ a_3 (z_1)^{10} (z_3)^{10} (z_4) + a_4 (z_1)^{10} (z_2)^5 (z_3)^7)$
VI	${}^3g^0 = (a_1 (z_1)^2 (z_2)^5 (z_4)^3 + a_2 (z_1)^6 (z_3)^7$ $+ a_3 (z_1)^5 (z_2)^8 (z_4)^7 + a_4 (z_1)^4 (z_2)^{13} (z_3)^3 (z_4)^3)$
VII	${}^3g^0 = (a_1 (z_1)^4 (z_2)^5 (z_4) + a_2 (z_1)^9 (z_2)^2 (z_3)^8$ $+ a_3 (z_1)^9 (z_2)^3 (z_3)^6 (z_4)^3 + a_4 (z_1)^9 (z_2)^4 (z_3)^4 (z_4)^6)$
VIII	${}^3g^0 = (a_1 (z_1)^3 (z_2)^3 (z_3) + a_2 (z_1)^2 (z_2)^3 (z_4)^5$ $+ a_3 (z_1)^6 (z_2)^2 (z_3)^5 (z_4)^4 + a_4 (z_1)^6 (z_2)^6 (z_3)^2 (z_4)^4)$
IX	${}^3g^0 = (a_1 (z_1)^4 (z_2)^5 (z_3)^4 (z_4)^3 + a_2 (z_1)^6 (z_2)^2 (z_3)^9 (z_4)^3$ $+ a_3 (z_1) (z_2)^{17} (z_3)^4 (z_4) + a_4 (z_1)^3 (z_2)^{14} (z_3)^9 (z_4))$
X	${}^3g^0 = (a_1 (z_1)^4 (z_3)^4 (z_4)^4 + a_2 (z_1)^{10} (z_2)^3 (z_3)^9 (z_4)^3$ $+ a_3 (z_1)^7 (z_2)^{10} (z_3)^4 (z_4)^7 + a_4 (z_1)^9 (z_3)^9 (z_4)^{12})$

Table 2: R-invariant superpotentials for the ten different classes of anomaly-free solutions with $q_1 = \frac{5}{6}$. We have only kept the lowest four terms.

M odel	Lepton Charges
I	$\Upsilon = (1; \frac{7}{2}; 0)$
II	$\Upsilon = (\frac{5}{6}; \frac{10}{3}; 0)$
III	$\Upsilon = (\frac{1}{2}; 3; 0)$
IV	$\Upsilon = (\frac{1}{3}; \frac{17}{6}; 0)$
V	$\Upsilon = (\frac{1}{6}; \frac{8}{3}; 0)$
V I	$\Upsilon = (\frac{1}{6}; \frac{7}{3}; 0)$
V II	$\Upsilon = (\frac{1}{3}; \frac{13}{6}; 0)$
V III	$\Upsilon = (\frac{1}{2}; 2; 0)$
IX	$\Upsilon = (\frac{5}{6}; \frac{5}{3}; 0)$
X	$\Upsilon = (1; \frac{3}{2}; 0)$

Table 3: Leptonic fermionic charges of the ten four-singlet solutions with $q_1 = \frac{5}{6}$.