

Soft Terms in M-theory

Tianjun Li

Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706

Abstract

We discuss dilaton and moduli dominant SUSY breaking scenarios in M-theory. In addition, for the nonperturbative superpotential from gaugino condensation, we discuss the soft terms in the simplest model (only S and T moduli fields) and in the $T^6 = \mathbb{Z}_{12}$ model from M-theory. From the phenomenology consideration, we suggest massless scalar SUSY breaking scenario.

April 1998

1 Introduction

M-theory on S^1/Z_2 suggested by Horava and Witten [1] seems to be a better candidate than the weakly coupled string to explain the low energy physics and unification of all the fundamental interactions [2]. Many recent studies in M-theory compactification and its phenomenology implications [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23] suggest that this may be the right track for superunification.

In this paper we discuss the soft terms in M-theory derived models. In supergravity Grand Unified Theory (GUT) models, there are several soft terms to determine the low energy physics: universal gaugino mass $M_{1=2}$, universal scalar mass m_0 , trilinear coupling A-term, bilinear coupling B-term(s). Compared to the spectrum of low energy super particles, the input parameters are really very few. However, a further reduction of parameters may be realized in string theory. In the weakly coupled string, there are two simplifying choices: (1) No-scale scenario [24, 25] with $m_0 = A = 0$; (2) Dilaton scenario [26, 27] with $M_{1=2} = A = M_0 = \sqrt{3}$. In our present discussion, we consider dilaton and moduli dominant SUSY breaking scenarios in M-theory. In addition, with the non-perturbative superpotential from the gaugino condensation [7, 21], we obtain the soft terms: $M_{1=2}$, M_0 and A in terms of the hidden sector gauge coupling (at the scale of M_{GUT}) in units of the gravitino mass. We find no consistent solution for moduli dominant SUSY breaking and only one choice of dilaton dominant supersymmetry breaking, the latter gives

$$M_{1=2} = 2M_0 = A ; \quad (1)$$

which differs from previously obtained results [26, 27]. There might exist further Moduli or other Dilaton dominant SUSY breaking models, for there might exist other trigger of the SUSY breaking and we do not have a realistic model yet. Furthermore, we suggest a massless scalar SUSY breaking scenario. Because the gauge coupling in the hidden sector can not be too small, this scenario does not have flavour changing neutral current (FCNC) problem because derivations from zero mass for the scalar masses in different families are much smaller than the gaugino mass [9]. In this scenario, the soft terms are:

$$A = 0.77M_{1=2} ; M_0 = 0 ; \quad (2)$$

where $i = 1, 2, 3$ for three families.

2 Dilaton/Moduli Dominant SUSY Breaking

The Lagrangian for the Yang-Mills field in M-theory is [1]:

$$L_B = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{(4\pi^2)^{\frac{2}{3}}} \frac{1}{M_{\text{Pl}}^{10}} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-g} \frac{1}{4} F_{AB}^a F^{aAB} ; \quad (3)$$

where κ^2 denotes the 11-dimensional gravitational coupling and $i=1,2$ for the observable sector, hidden sector. In the simplest model, the GUT scale coupling is related to moduli fields S and T by [9, 18]:

$$\kappa_{\text{GUT}}^2 = \frac{1}{4 \text{Re}(S + T)} ; \quad (4)$$

The definition of κ is [18]:

$$\kappa^2 = \frac{1}{16V} \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{2=3} \int \text{tr}(R \wedge R) ; \quad (5)$$

and κ is the 11th (or eleventh) dimension radius, V is the internal Calabi-Yau volume and \int is the Kahler form. Similarly, the gauge coupling in the hidden sector at the GUT scale is

$$\kappa_{\text{H}}^2 = \frac{1}{4 \text{Re}(S - T)} ; \quad (6)$$

Inverting the relations in Eqs (4) and (6), we obtain:

$$\text{Re}S = \frac{1}{8} \left(\frac{1}{\kappa_{\text{GUT}}^2} + \frac{1}{\kappa_{\text{H}}^2} \right) ; \quad (7)$$

and

$$\text{Re}T = \frac{1}{8} \left(\frac{1}{\kappa_{\text{GUT}}^2} - \frac{1}{\kappa_{\text{H}}^2} \right) ; \quad (8)$$

The Kahler potential K , the gauge kinetic function f and the superpotential W in the simplest compactification of M-theory are [9, 18]:

$$K = \hat{K} + \kappa^2 \mathcal{F}^2 ; \quad (9)$$

$$\hat{K} = -3 \ln [S + \bar{S}] - 3 \ln [T + \bar{T}] ; \quad (10)$$

$$\kappa^2 = \left(\frac{3}{T + \bar{T}} + \frac{3}{S + \bar{S}} \right) \mathcal{F}^2 ; \quad (11)$$

$$\text{Re}f^0 = \text{Re}(S + T) ; \quad (12)$$

$$\text{Re}f^H = \text{Re}(S - T) ; \quad (13)$$

$$W = d_{xyz} C^x C^y C^z ; \quad (14)$$

where C^\times are the matter vevs. We do not specify the exact trigger of the SUSY breaking, but just assume SUSY breaking by the F terms of the dilaton and moduli. Then, we obtain the gaugino mass $M_{1=2}$, scalar mass M_0 and the trilinear parameters A by standard soft term formulae [26, 27]. We introduce the following parametrizations of F^S and F^T :

$$F^S = \frac{P_-}{3} M_{3=2} C (S + \bar{S}) \sin \alpha; \quad (15)$$

$$F^T = M_{3=2} C (T + \bar{T}) \cos \alpha; \quad (16)$$

where C is given in terms of the tree-level vacuum energy density V given by $C^2 = 1 + \frac{V}{3M_{3=2}^2}$. After normalizing the observable vevs, the soft terms are given by [8, 9, 7]¹:

$$M_{1=2} = \frac{P_-}{1+x} \frac{3C M_{3=2}}{3} (\sin \alpha + \frac{x}{3} \cos \alpha); \quad (19)$$

$$M_0^2 = V + M_{3=2}^2 + \frac{3C M_{3=2}^2}{(3+x)^2} (x(6+x)\sin^2 \alpha + (3+2x)\cos^2 \alpha - 2 \frac{P_-}{3} x \sin \alpha \cos \alpha); \quad (20)$$

$$A = \frac{P_-}{(3+x)} \frac{3C M_{3=2}}{3} ((3-2x)\sin \alpha + \frac{P_-}{3} x \cos \alpha); \quad (21)$$

Here, the quantity x is defined as

$$x = \frac{(T + \bar{T})}{S + \bar{S}} = \frac{\frac{1}{G_{UTH}}}{\frac{1}{G_{UTH}} + 1}; \quad (22)$$

¹Because the bilinear parameter B depends on the specific mechanism which could generate the associated term [8], we do not discuss it here. In fact, if we had such term, we can discuss it by the same way in this paper. It is [20]

$$B = M_{3=2} \left(-3C \cos \alpha - \frac{P_-}{3} 3C \sin \alpha + \frac{6C \cos \alpha}{3+x} + \frac{2 \frac{P_-}{3} 3C \sin \alpha x}{3+x} \left(1 + F^S \frac{S}{S + \bar{S}} + F^T \frac{T}{T + \bar{T}} \right) \right); \quad (17)$$

where $\frac{S}{S + \bar{S}} = \theta_S$ and $\frac{T}{T + \bar{T}} = \theta_T$. If one consider $\frac{S}{S + \bar{S}} = \frac{T}{T + \bar{T}} = 0$, then one obtain:

$$B = M_{3=2} \left(-3C \cos \alpha - \frac{P_-}{3} 3C \sin \alpha + \frac{6C \cos \alpha}{3+x} + \frac{2 \frac{P_-}{3} 3C \sin \alpha x}{3+x} \right); \quad (18)$$

Because $\lambda > 0$ and the gauge coupling in the hidden sector can not be infinity or negative, we have

$$1 - x > 0 : \quad (23)$$

Taking the Cosmology constant is zero, i. e., $V = 0$, we have $C = 1$. We choose $g_{UT} = 1/25$ for the following discussion. Generically, the dynamics of the hidden sector may give rise to both $\langle F^S \rangle$ and $\langle F^T \rangle$, but one type of F term often dominates. Therefore, we concentrate on the two limiting cases: dilaton dominant SUSY breaking ($F^T = 0$) and the moduli dominant SUSY breaking ($F^S = 0$) [26, 27]:

(I) Dilaton dominant SUSY breaking scenario ($F^T = 0$). In this case, the soft terms relations become²

$$M_{1=2} = \frac{p_{-3} M_{3=2}}{1+x} ; \quad (25)$$

$$M_0^2 = M_{3=2}^2 \frac{3M_{3=2}^2}{(3+x)^2} x (6+x) ; \quad (26)$$

$$A = \frac{p_{-3} M_{3=2}}{3+x} (3-2x) : \quad (27)$$

The values of $M_{1=2}$, M_0 and A versus x_H are plotted in Fig. 1 in units of gravitino mass. When $x_H = g_{UT}$, we obtain the predicted relation in the weakly coupled string [26, 27]. When the gauge coupling in the hidden sector increases, $M_{1=2}$, M_0 and A decrease. From the requirement $M_0^2 > 0$, we obtain that x is smaller than $3 + 3\sqrt{6} \approx 2$ or 0.67423. In the limit of $M_0 = 0$, we find that $A = M_{1=2} \approx 0.77$, and the x_H is about 0.2056.

(II) Moduli dominant SUSY breaking scenario ($F^S = 0$). In this case, the soft terms relations become³

$$M_{1=2} = \frac{x}{1+x} M_{3=2} ; \quad (29)$$

² If one consider $\frac{s}{s} = \frac{t}{t} = 0$, then one obtain:

$$B = \frac{3 + 3\sqrt{3} \left(\frac{p_{-3}}{3} - 1 \right) x}{3+x} M_{3=2} : \quad (24)$$

³ If one consider $\frac{s}{s} = \frac{t}{t} = 0$, then one obtain:

$$B = \frac{6 + 4x}{3+x} M_{3=2} : \quad (28)$$

$$M_0 = \frac{x}{3+x} M_{3=2} ; \quad (30)$$

$$A = \frac{3x}{3+x} M_{3=2} ; \quad (31)$$

Therefore, we have

$$M_0/A = 1/3 ; 3 \quad M_{1=2}/M_0 = 2 ; \quad (32)$$

From Fig. 2, we see that if the coupling in the hidden sector is strong enough (i. e., $g_H > 0.4$), $M_{1=2}/M_0$ is about 2. In addition, $M_{1=2}$, M_0 and A increase with the gauge coupling in the hidden sector.

3 Hidden Sector Gauge Condensation

The nonperturbative superpotential in the simplest model was calculated recently, and its form is [7]:

$$W_{np} = h \exp\left(\frac{8}{C_2(Q)} (S - T)\right) ; \quad (33)$$

where the gauge group in the hidden sector is Q (we do not consider massless Q matter fields except gluons and gluinos). In the simplest model Q is E_8 . $C_2(Q)$ is the quadratic Casimir of Q and for E_8 , $C_2 = 30$.

Next, we can calculate F^S and F^T from W_{np} [26; 27]. Noticing that $\langle C^a \rangle = 0$, we have

$$F^S = e^{K/2} W_{np} (S + \bar{S})^2 \left(\frac{8}{C_2(Q)} + \frac{1}{S + \bar{S}} \right) ; \quad (34)$$

$$F^T = e^{K/2} W_{np} (T + \bar{T})^2 \left(\frac{8}{3C_2(Q)} + \frac{1}{T + \bar{T}} \right) ; \quad (35)$$

Taking the ratio F^S/F^T , we obtain the value of $\tan \beta$ in terms of g_H

$$\tan \beta = \frac{1}{3} \frac{1 + \frac{2}{C_2(Q)} \left(\frac{1}{g_{UT}} + \frac{1}{g_H} \right)}{\frac{2}{3C_2(Q)} \left(\frac{1}{g_{UT}} + \frac{1}{g_H} \right)} ; \quad (36)$$

We now discuss the soft terms of compactification of M-theory on T^6/Z_{12} [21, 22]. Although this is a toy model, it has three families, so it may shed light on the realistic model. The Kahler potential is :

$$K = \hat{K} + K_{i\bar{j}} C_{i\bar{a}} C_{\bar{j}}^a ; \quad (37)$$

where $i = 1, 2, 3$ is the family index,

$$\hat{K} = -\ln[S + S] - \sum_{i=1}^3 \ln[T_i + T_i] ; \quad (38)$$

and

$$K_{ii} = \left(2 + \frac{2}{3} \frac{1}{S + S} \sum_{j=1}^3 (T_j + T_j)\right) \frac{1}{T_i + T_i} ; \quad (39)$$

The gauge kinetic function in this model is

$$\text{Re} f^0 = \text{Re}(S + T_1 + T_2 + T_3) ; \quad (40)$$

$$\text{Re} f^H = \text{Re}(S - T_1 - T_2 - T_3) ; \quad (41)$$

and the superpotential is ⁴

$$W = d_{xyz} C_1^x C_2^y C_3^z + h \exp\left(\frac{8}{C_2(Q)} (S - T_1 - T_2 - T_3)\right) ; \quad (42)$$

We parametrize F^S and F^{T_i} as follows:

$$F^S = \sqrt{\frac{P}{3}} \sin M_{3=2} (S + S) ; \quad (43)$$

$$F^{T_1} = \sqrt{\frac{P}{3}} \cos \sin M_{3=2} (T_1 + T_1) ; \quad (44)$$

$$F^{T_2} = \sqrt{\frac{P}{3}} \cos \cos M_{3=2} (T_2 + T_2) ; \quad (45)$$

$$F^{T_3} = \sqrt{\frac{P}{3}} \cos \cos M_{3=2} (T_3 + T_3) ; \quad (46)$$

Then the normalized soft gaugino masses $M_{1=2}$, the un-normalized soft scalar masses M_0^{i2} , and the trilinear parameters A_{abc} are given by [21]:

$$M_{1=2} = \frac{F^S + \sum_{i=1}^3 F^{T_i}}{(S + S) + \sum_{j=1}^3 (T_j + T_j)} ; \quad (47)$$

$$M_0^{i2} = (m_{3=2}^2 + V) K_{ii} F^m (\partial_m \partial_n K_{ii} - \partial_m K_{ii} \frac{1}{K_{ii}} \partial_n K_{ii}) F^n ; \quad (48)$$

⁴We use this form of the non-perturbative superpotential, because the calculation in [7] should be general.

$$A_{abc} = F^m (\hat{K}_m^{X^3} \frac{1}{\tilde{K}_{ii}} \mathcal{O}_m \tilde{K}_{ii}) ; \quad (49)$$

The non-zero \hat{K}_m , $\mathcal{O}_m \tilde{K}_{ii}$ and $\mathcal{O}_m \mathcal{O}_n \tilde{K}_{ii}$ were calculated in Ref. [21].

To discuss the number of variables in this model, we introduce:

$$x_i = \frac{i(T_i + T_i)}{S + S} ; \quad (50)$$

where $i = 1, 2, 3$, with the condition that

$$x = x_1 + x_2 + x_3 : \quad (51)$$

Thus only two of the x_i are independent variables when we consider θ_H as a fundamental variable. The angles θ_1 and θ_2 can be calculated in a way similar to the simplest model. We can express the 5 soft terms ($M_{1=2}, M_0^i$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$), A) in terms of four variables ($\theta_H, M_{3=2}$ and two of the x_i (for example: x_1 and x_2)). The problem with this general model is that the universality of scalar masses may be violated and there are too many variables to make predictions. To obtain universal scalar masses, we assume that:

$$x_i = x_{i=3} ; i = 1, 2, 3 : \quad (52)$$

From the result

$$F^{T_i} = e^{\hat{K}=2} W_{np} (T_i + T_i)^2 \left(\frac{8^2}{C_2(Q)} \frac{1}{T_i + T_i} \right) : \quad (53)$$

the ratios $F^{T_2}=F^{T_3}$ and $F^{T_1}=F^{T_2}$ lead to

$$\tan \theta_2 = 1 ; \tan \theta_1 = \frac{p}{2} : \quad (54)$$

Therefore, we can write the F^{T_i} as

$$F^{T_i} = \cos M_{3=2} (T_i + T_i) : \quad (55)$$

After some calculations, we are able to show that the scalar masses are universal and that the soft terms are given by Eqs.(19), (20), (21) and θ_H is given by Eq. (36).

Because x is a function of $\theta_H, M_{1=2}; M_0$ and A are given by θ_H in units of the gravitino mass. In addition, it is obvious that moduli dominant SUSY breaking scenario does not exist for the numerator in $\tan \theta$ is larger than zero. In the simplest model and the T^6/Z_{12} model, the gauge group in the hidden sector is E_8 , for which $C_2(Q) = 30$. The result is shown in the Fig. 3. In order that the scalar mass square non negative, θ_H can not be larger than about 0.18. There is only one choice of exact dilaton dominant SUSY breaking, which is:

$$M_{1=2} = 1.236 M_{3=2} ; M_0 = 0.5776 M_{3=2} ; \quad (56)$$

$$A = 1.119M_{3=2} ; \quad m_H = 0.09 : \quad (57)$$

In order to avoid FCNC problems that might arise from the violation of the universal scalar masses in three families (although this kind of the violation might be very small), it is reasonable assume that:

$$m_1(T_1 + T_1)' = m_2(T_2 + T_2)' = m_3(T_3 + T_3) : \quad (58)$$

If the gaugino mass is very large compared to the scalar masses, i. e., $M_{1=2} \gg M_0$, the universal radiative contribution to the scalar masses from the gaugino mass by RGE running may wash out the non-universal scalar masses and avoid FCNC [9]. In addition, the gauge coupling in the hidden sector can not be too small as to go to the weakly coupled case and can not be too large, because the gaugino condensation scale is [7, 9]

$$M_{3=2}^3 \exp\left(\frac{2}{C_2(Q)_H}\right) ; \quad (59)$$

and the gravitino mass is about

$$M_{3=2} = \frac{m_{3/2}}{M_{Pl}^2} : \quad (60)$$

In order to have the gravitino mass at TeV or hundred GeV range, we can not have large m_H or too small m_H for a realistic model where $C_2(Q)$ might be about 12 as Q is E_6 , and when one consider the massless Q matter fields in hidden sector, the total factor may be smaller. We propose the scalar massless scenario (strictly speaking, very small scalar masses scenario) as the most realistic. In this case, the soft terms and m_H are given by:

$$M_{1=2} = 1.022M_{3=2} ; M_0 = 0.003M_{3=2} ; \quad (61)$$

$$A = 0.776M_{3=2} ; \quad m_H = 0.1801 : \quad (62)$$

In a realistic model, the gauge group in the hidden sector might not be E_8 . If consider E_6 as the gauge group in the hidden sector, the quadratic Casimir of E_6 is 12. In this case that m_H can not be larger than 0.151, and the scalar massless scenario is:

$$M_{1=2} = 0.989M_{3=2} ; M_0 = 0.008M_{3=2} ; \quad (63)$$

$$A = 0.761M_{3=2} ; \quad m_H = 0.1522 : \quad (64)$$

In comparison, the dilaton dominant SUSY breaking in this case is:

$$M_{1=2} = 1.534M_{3=2} ; M_0 = 0.870M_{3=2} ; \quad (65)$$

$$A = 1.517 M_{3=2} ; \quad H = 0.052 : \quad (66)$$

From above discussion, in the dilaton dominant SUSY breaking scenario, the approximate soft term relations are

$$M_{1=2} \approx 2 M_0 \approx A : \quad (67)$$

In the massless scalar scenario, the soft term relations are

$$A \approx 0.77 M_{1=2} ; \quad M_0 \approx 0 : \quad (68)$$

It will be interesting to explore the phenomenology consequences of these relationships which are under investigations.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank V. Barger very much for helpful discussion and comments. This research was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy under Grant No. DE-FG 02-95ER 40896 and in part by the University of Wisconsin Research Committee with funds granted by the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation.

R e f e r e n c e s

- [1] P. Horava and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B 475 (1996) 94.
- [2] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B 471 (1996) 135.
- [3] P. Horava, Phys. Rev. D 54 (1996) 7561.
- [4] I. Antoniadis and M. Quiros, hep-th/9705037, hep-th/9707208, hep-th/9709023.
- [5] E. Dudas and J. C. Grojean, hep-th/9704177; E. Dudas, hep-th/9709043.
- [6] Z. Lalak and S. Thomas, hep-th/9707223.
- [7] A. Lukas, B. A. Ovrut and D. Waldram, hep-th/9711197.
- [8] K. Choi, H. B. Kim and C. Munoz, hep-th/9711158
- [9] H. P. Nilles, M. Olechowski and M. Yamaguchi, hep-th/9707143, Phys. Lett. B 415 (1997) 24; hep-th/9801030.
- [10] T. Banks and M. Dine, Nucl. Phys. B 479 (1996) 173 and hep-th/9609046.
- [11] K. Choi, Phys. Rev. D 56 (1997) 6588.
- [12] I. Antoniadis and M. Quiros, Phys. Lett. B 392 (1997) 61.
- [13] E. Caceres, V. S. Kaplunovsky and I. M. Mandalberg, Nucl. Phys. B 493 (1997) 73.
- [14] J. Ellis, A. E. Faraggi and D. V. Nanopoulos, hep-th/9709049.
- [15] E. A. Mirabelli and M. E. Peskin, hep-th/9712214.
- [16] T. Li, J. L. Lopez and D. V. Nanopoulos, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 12 (1997) 2647.
- [17] T. Li, J. L. Lopez and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Rev. D 56 (1997) 2602.
- [18] A. Lukas, B. A. Ovrut and D. Waldram, hep-th/9710208, hep-th/9803235.
- [19] D. V. Nanopoulos, hep-th/9711080.
- [20] D. Bailin, G. V. Kaniotis and A. Love, hep-ph/9803274.
- [21] T. Li, hep-th/9801123, Phys. Rev. D to appear.
- [22] T. Li, in preparation.
- [23] J. Ellis, P. Kanti, N. E. Mavrouatos and D. V. Nanopoulos, hep-th/9711163.
- [24] E. Cremmer, S. Ferrara, C. Kounnas, and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B 133 (1983) 61; J. Ellis, A. Lahanas, D. V. Nanopoulos and K. Tamvakis, Phys. Lett. B 134 (1984) 429; J. Ellis, C. Kounnas, and D. V. Nanopoulos, Nucl. Phys. B 241 (1984) 406 and B 247 (1984) 373. For a review see A. Lahanas and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Rep. 145 (1987) 1.
- [25] J. L. Lopez and D. V. Nanopoulos, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 11 (1996) 3439.




Figure 1: The gaugino mass M , scalar mass m , and the trilinear coupling A versus h in units of the gravitino mass in the dilaton dominant SUSY Breaking scenario,.

[26] A. Brignole, I. E. Ibanez and C. Munoz, hep-ph/9707209; Nucl. Phys. B 422 (1994) 125.

[27] V. S. Kaplunovsky and J. Louis, Phys. Lett. B 306 (1993) 269.




Figure 2: The gaugino mass M , scalar mass m , and the trilinear coupling A versus m_0 in units of the gravitino mass in the moduli dominant SUSY Breaking scenario.




Figure 3: In M-theory model with E_8 as hidden sector group, the gaugino mass M , scalar mass m , and the trilinear coupling A versus h in units of the gravitino mass.




Figure 4: In M-theory model with E_6 as hidden sector group, the gaugino mass M , scalar mass m , and the trilinear coupling A versus h in units of the gravitino mass.