Precision Gauge Unification from Extra Yukawas

Ivan Donkin and Arthur Hebecker

(Heidelberg)

Outline

- The 2-loop problem of SUSY GUTs
- Analytical understanding of the problem
- The effect of extra multiplets and extra Yukawas
- An analytically calculable model at strong GUT coupling

Weakly coupled models

The 2-loop problem of SUSY GUTs

• With $\alpha_3 = 0.118$, the numbers look perfect at 1-loop:

$$\left(\frac{2\pi}{\alpha_3(m_Z)}\right)_{\text{exp}} = 53.2$$
 vs. $\left(\frac{2\pi}{\alpha_3(m_Z)}\right)_{1-\text{loop}} = 53.7$

• At 2-loop, one finds

$$\Delta\left(\frac{2\pi}{\alpha_3(m_Z)}\right)_{2-\mathrm{loop}}=-5.4\,,$$

which is not easy to compensate by thresholds. For example,

$$\Delta \left(\frac{2\pi}{\alpha_3(m_Z)}\right)_{\rm Higgs-triplets} = \frac{9}{7} \ln \frac{m_{X,Y}}{m_3}$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

requires $m_{X,Y}/m_3 \sim 50$.

2-loop problem of SUSY GUTs (continued)

• Another possibility are SUSY thresholds:

$$\Delta \left(\frac{2\pi}{\alpha_3}\right)_{\rm SUSY} = \frac{19}{14} \ln \frac{M_{\rm SUSY}}{m_Z} \qquad \text{with} \qquad M_{\rm SUSY} \sim \left(\frac{m_{\tilde{W}}}{m_{\tilde{g}}}\right)^{\frac{29}{19}} m_{\tilde{H}}$$
Langacker, Polonsky '92...'95
Carena, Pokorski, Wagner '93

- In general, it is difficult to get a sufficiently large correction since gluinos tend to be heavy
- However, if one is willing to use several competing contributions to gaugino masses, precision unification can be realized

Raby, Ratz, Schmidt-Hoberg '09

2-loop effect in the holomorphic approach

- Let us understand the origin of the problem in detail.
- It is covenient to use a holomorphic Wilsonian action, where gauge couplings run only at 1-loop.

NSVZ '83...'86; Shifman '96 Arkani-Hamed, Murayama '97

- One gets a low-energy action with (1-loop) gauge couplings and (all-loop) Z-factors for matter fields
- To compare with data, one converts to the canonical scheme (accounting for vector and Konishi anomaly)
- The resulting 2-loop correction to the α_3 prediction is

$$\Delta\left(\frac{2\pi}{\alpha_{3}}\right) = \frac{24}{7} \ln g_{2}^{2} - 3 \ln g_{3}^{2} + \sum_{f} c_{f} \ln Z_{f}$$

2-loop effects in the holomorphic approach (continued)

• The required 1-loop Z factors are known analytically, e.g.

$$Z_D = \left(\frac{\alpha_{\rm GUT}}{\alpha_1}\right)^{-2/99} \left(\frac{\alpha_{\rm GUT}}{\alpha_3}\right)^{8/9}$$

• Putting everything together, one finds

$$\Delta\left(\frac{2\pi}{\alpha_3}\right) = -\underbrace{4.08}_{vectors} -\underbrace{0.65}_{L} -\underbrace{5.51}_{Q} +\underbrace{0.21}_{E} +\underbrace{3.21}_{U} +\underbrace{1.82}_{D} -\underbrace{0.44}_{H}$$
$$= -5.4$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Thus, we just need to change one of those Z factors contributing negatively from Z < 1 to Z ≫ 1.

Extra Yukawa couplings

- The Z factors (assumed to be O(1) at the GUT scale) are driven to smaller values by gauge interactions
- Yukawas have the opposite effect, but even the top contribution is far too small
- However, we can introduce extra multiplets $(5 + \overline{5} \text{ or } 10 + \overline{10})$ with extra Yukawa couplings
- An independent motivation of extra multiplets is the **messenger sector** of gauge mediation
- Another motivation is the fine tuning of the MSSM, which can be improved using precisely the extra Yukawa couplings we need Moroi, Okada '91

Babu, Gogoladze, Rehman, Shafi '08 Martin '09 Graham, Ismail, Rajendran, Saraswat '09...

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

see also: Barbieri, Hall, Papaioannou, Pappadopulo, Rychkov '07

An analytically calculable model

- Extra multiplets do not affect the 1-loop prediction for α_3
- The valua of α_{GUT} grows with $n = n_{5+\overline{5}} + 3n_{10+\overline{10}}$
- If the mass of the extra multiplets is low, $M \sim m_Z$, one formally finds $\alpha_{GUT} = 1$ for n = 4.45 (corresponding to n = 5and some $M > m_Z$)
- This enhances the 2-loop correction from -5.4 to -7.9
- Let us assume strong GUT coupling and at least one pair $10+\overline{10}$ with

 $W \supset \kappa Q_e U_e H_u + \bar{\kappa} \bar{Q}_e \bar{U}_e H_d$

• The Higgs Z-factor is corrected by Z_H^{γ} with

$$2\pi \frac{d\ln Z_H^Y}{dt} = -3\alpha_\kappa$$

Analytically calculable model (continued)

• The extra Yukawa obeys

$$2\pi \frac{d\ln \alpha_{\kappa}}{dt} = 6\alpha_{\kappa} - \frac{16}{3}\alpha_3 - 3\alpha_2 - \frac{13}{15}\alpha_1$$

 For strong GUT coupling, at all lower scales we have approximately

 $\alpha_2 = (b'_3/b'_2)\alpha_3 \qquad , \qquad \alpha_1 = (b'_3/b'_1)\alpha_3 \, ,$

• This gives an RGE for α_{κ}/α_3 with a fixed point:

$$2\pi \frac{d\ln(\alpha_{\kappa}/\alpha_{3})}{dt} = 6\alpha_{\kappa} - \alpha_{3}\left(\frac{16}{3} + \frac{3b'_{3}}{b'_{2}} + \frac{13b'_{3}}{15b'_{1}} + b'_{3}\right)$$

Analytically calculable model (continued)



▲ロト ▲圖 ▶ ▲ 臣 ▶ ▲ 臣 ▶ ● 臣 ■ ● の Q (2)

Analytically calculable model (continued)

- If α_{κ} is also large at $M_{\rm GUT}$, the fixed point regime $\alpha_{\kappa} = 1.4\alpha_3$ is quickly reached
- The Yukawa correction to the Higgs Z factor can then be obtained by simple integration:

 $\ln Z_{H}^{Y}(m_{Z}) = 2.8 \ln(\alpha_{GUT}/\alpha_{3}(m_{Z})) = 6.0.$

This gives the 'Yukawa correction'

$$\Delta\left(\frac{2\pi}{\alpha_3}\right)_Y = \frac{9}{7} \ln Z_H^Y(m_Z) = 7.8,$$

precisely compensating the gauge-2-loop correction

On the strong-coupling assumption

• Going to strong(ish) GUT coupling has been discussed before

Kolda, March-Russell '96 Ghilencea, Lanzagorta, Ross '97 Amelino-Camelia, Ghilencea, Ross '98 ... J.L. Jones '08

- Calculability is clearly a critical issue
- We argue against 'precision loss' using the stringy relation

$$f_i(S,T) = k_i S + \Delta_i(T)$$

Nilles '86

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

• Based on this, one can shift *S* to strong coupling without enhancing threshold effects

On the strong coupling assumption (continued)

• However, non-perturbative effects can provide corrections

 $\sim C_i \exp(-a_i S)$

- Thus, we probably need at least the exponential of $-4\pi/lpha_{\rm GUT}$ to remain small
- This may be (at least marginally) consistent with our 'analytical model' discussed above

Weakly coupled scenarios

- Let us finally dump the strong-coupling assumption and analytical calculability
- We now do a 'proper job' solving (Yukawa) RGEs numerically, varying *n* and *M* and including the top effect
- For example, with n = 4 and M = 500 GeV we get $\alpha_{\rm GUT} = 0.23$
- Using $\alpha_{\kappa}(M_{\rm GUT}) = 0.9$, we find $(2\pi/\alpha_3) = 52.0$
- If we are willing to go up to $\alpha_{\kappa}(M_{\rm GUT}) = 6$, we find $(2\pi/\alpha_3) = 53.2$
- Using n = 5 and M = 250 TeV, very similar numbers are obtained

Weakly coupled scenarios (continued)

- Finally, for n = 6, we can have two pairs $10 + \overline{10}$ and double the Yukawa effect.
- However, except for the increased mass scale of the extra multiplets, $M = 17 \times 10^3$ TeV, the α_3 predictions remain roughly unchanged.
- Thus, quite generically, scenarios with large GUT coupling and large extra Yukawa couplings (but with both couplings still perturbative) bring the α_3 prediction in line with experiment
- Interestingly, they can not move it 'beyond' the experimental value

Summary

- Extra GUT multiplets can be used to make the GUT coupling stronger without sacrificing precision
- Large extra top-like Yukawa couplings to the MSSM Higgs fields bring the α_3 prediction in line with experiment
- The actual 'strong coupling regime' is distinguished by (easy) analytical calculability
- It may also be 'natural' (e.g. in the string theory 'landscape')
- However, the numerical effect does not rely on the strongly coupled regime