

PRECISION DATA PARAMETERS
AND GRAND UNIFICATION PREDICTIONS

Nir Polonsky*

*Department of Physics, University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19104, USA*

UPR-0588T

Abstract

When realizing the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) within a (simple) Grand Unified Theory (GUT), the predicted ranges for the strong coupling and the ratio of two Higgs doublet expectation values are strongly correlated with the weak angle and the t -quark mass. (The latter are extracted from precision data.) We spell out those relations and point out the implication for the mass of the light MSSM (CP even) Higgs boson.

When simultaneously considering coupling constant unification within the MSSM [1]; analysis of electroweak precision data [2] (which recently implied the consistency of the former with the data [3]); and a SU_5 (or similar) symmetry that relates the b -quark and the τ -lepton Yukawa couplings (i.e., $h_b = h_\tau$ at the unification point¹ [5]); then the weak angle, $s^2(M_Z)$ (as constrained by precision data); the strong coupling, $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ (as predicted by coupling constant unification); the t -quark (pole) mass, m_t (as constrained by precision data, by the relation $h_b = h_\tau$, and by requiring a broken $SU_2 \times U_1$); and the allowed range for the ratio of the two Higgs doublet expectation values, $\tan \beta \equiv \nu_{up}/\nu_{down}$ (as constrained by the relation $h_b = h_\tau$, and by requiring a broken $SU_2 \times U_1$); are all strongly correlated. In turn, this implies a constrained scenario, and in particular $m_{h^0} \lesssim 100$ (110) GeV [for $m_t \lesssim 160$ (170) GeV] for the mass of the light

*

¹ This holds if matter couples only to Higgs fields in the fundamental representations – “a simple GUT”. One usually assumes that some perturbation modifies the coupling or the masses of the two light families where, in principle, similar relations should, but do not, hold [4].

MSSM (CP even) Higgs boson. For a complete discussion, we refer the reader to Ref. 2, 6. Similar issues were also studied in Ref. 7, 8.

The ρ -parameter relates $s^2(M_Z)$ and m_t , i.e., (in the \overline{MS} scheme)

$$s^2 = s_0^2 - \left[1 - 2\alpha_s(m_t) \frac{\pi^2 + 3}{9\pi} \right] \frac{3G_F}{8\sqrt{2}\pi^2} s_0^2 \frac{1 - s_0^2}{1 - 2s_0^2} [m_t^2 - m_{t0}^2], \quad (1)$$

where s^2 is $[s^2(M_Z)](m_t)$ and $s_0^2 = s^2(m_{t0})$. The t -quark (pole) mass is independently constrained by the measured value of the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ vertex. A two-parameter fit (allowing m_{h^0} to vary from 50 – 150 GeV with a central value $m_{h^0} = M_Z$) to all Z , W , and neutral-current data yields [2]

$$s^2(M_Z) = 0.2326 \pm 0.0003 - 0.92 \times 10^{-7} \text{ GeV}^{-2} [m_t^2 - (134 \text{ GeV})^2], \quad (2)$$

$$m_t = 134_{-28}^{+23} + 12.5 \ln \frac{m_{h^0}}{M_Z}, \quad (3)$$

where the ± 0.0003 uncertainty in (2) is from logarithmic dependences on m_{h^0} and on m_t , while the leading quadratic dependence on m_t in (2) and the logarithmic dependence on m_{h^0} in (3) are explicitly displayed. (Note that when changing the central value of m_{h^0} , the central value of m_t will change in a correlated manner.)

The above is exact in the heavy MSSM limit, which is applicable in most of the MSSM parameter space. In that limit one has a SM-like light Higgs boson and all other Higgs and supersymmetric particles contribute negligibly to the electroweak observables. Supersymmetric and Higgs particles contributing non-negligibly to the ρ -parameter will reduce, in general, the fitted value of m_t . The same is usually true for contributions to the $Z \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ vertex, unless we are in that region of parameter space where, e.g., both, a chargino and a scalar-top, are light enough [9].

The prediction of the strong coupling reads (using $\alpha(M_Z)^{-1} = 127.9 \pm 0.1$)

$$\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.124 \pm 0.001 \pm 0.008 + H_{\alpha_s} + 3.2 \times 10^{-7} \text{ GeV}^{-2} [m_t^2 - (134 \text{ GeV})^2], \quad (4)$$

where the ± 0.008 (± 0.001) uncertainty in (4) is theoretical (due to the input parameter error bars). The former is due to the unknown values of the matching conditions (i.e., threshold and nonrenormalizable effects) at both scales, which are expected to be non-trivial. We discuss these issues in detail in Ref. 2, where we parametrize and estimate those effects. The function H_{α_s} is negative but negligible, unless some Yukawa couplings are $\gtrsim 1$, where we obtain $H_{\alpha_s} \approx -(0.001 - 0.003)$.

Eq. (4) and requiring $m_b(5 \text{ GeV}) \leq 4.45 \text{ GeV}$ (where m_b is the \overline{MS} b -quark running mass) allow only two regions in the $m_t - \tan \beta$ plane when

imposing the SU_5 relation $h_b = h_\tau$. This is illustrated in Fig. 1. Non-trivial matching corrections can modify that relation by $\lesssim 15\%$ (see Ref. 2), an effect that is accounted for in Fig. 1 (i.e., m_b^0 , which is calculated numerically assuming naive matching conditions, is corrected by a factor of 1 ± 0.15). In order for the rescaling of the mass parameters between the unification² and weak scales to be consistent with a broken $SU_2 \times U_1$ at the weak scale, we have to further constrain the $m_t - \tan \beta$ plane by requiring $\tan \beta \geq 1$ and $h_t \geq h_b$ for the t and b -quark Yukawa couplings [10]. Thus, within one standard deviation of the fit,

$$140 \lesssim m_t \lesssim 160 \text{ GeV}, \quad (5)$$

and

$$\tan \beta = 0.935 + 1.68x - 0.865x^2 + 16.62x^3 - 16.06x^4 \pm \delta_\beta, \quad (6)$$

where $x \equiv [(m_t - 140 \text{ GeV})/(140 \text{ GeV})]$ and $\delta_\beta \approx 0.05$ (0.06) for $m_t \lesssim 160$ GeV ($160 \lesssim m_t \lesssim 180$ GeV). The above formula describes the low- $\tan \beta$ branch for $140 \lesssim m_t \lesssim 180$ GeV. Within two standard deviations (e.g., $m_t \approx 180$ GeV), a solution with a very large $\tan \beta$ (s.t. $h_t \gtrsim h_b \gtrsim 1$) is allowed. Such scenarios (that are compatible with a SO_{10} symmetry) are studied in Ref. 11.

However, if $m_t \lesssim 165$ GeV, then $\tan \beta \approx 1$ and the light (CP even) Higgs boson mass will be determined by the magnitude of the loop correction, Δ_{h^0} . The tree level mass term, $m_{h^0}^T \leq |M_Z \cos 2\beta|$, vanishes in this limit. This was recently pointed out in Ref. 7. We are currently studying the implications of such a scenario to the full MSSM parameter space [6]. We find that due to a possible large mixing in the scalar-top sector Δ_{h^0} may be maximized, and thus m_{h^0} can be (given the above assumptions) slightly above M_Z .

To summarize, we pointed out that an attractive set of ideas – minimal grand unified supersymmetric standard model (as well as some simple extensions) – implies a very constrained parameter space. Note that aside from $\tan \beta \geq 1$ we did not assume any specific structure of the mass parameters in the theory. The effects of these were contained in a set of correction functions that we estimated [2] and found to only slightly affect the results. The effect of the above constraints on the MSSM mass parameters is currently under study [6].

Acknowledgments

This work was done with Paul Langacker, and was supported by the US Department of Energy Grant No. DE-AC02-76-ERO-3071. It is pleasure to

²We assume that to a good approximation all masses are given near the unification scale by a small number of universal parameters [1].

thank J. Erler for useful discussions. I would like to thank also Z. Ajduk, S. Pokorski, and the organizing committee for the warm hospitality during the workshop.

References

- [*] Talk presented at the 16th Kazimierz Meeting on Elementary Particle Physics, Kazimierz, Poland, May 24 - 28, 1993.
- [1] For review, see P. Nath, *these proceedings*, and references therein.
- [2] P. Langacker and N. Polonsky, *Phys. Rev.* **D47** (1993) 4028; P. Langacker, Pennsylvania Report No. UPR-0555T (1993); P. Langacker and N. Polonsky, Pennsylvania Report No. UPR-0556T (1993), *Phys. Rev.* **D** (in press); N. Polonsky, Pennsylvania Report No. UPR-0571T (1993).
- [3] P. Langacker and M. Luo, *Phys. Rev.* **D44** (1991) 817; J. Ellis et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B249** (1990) 441; U. Amaldi et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B260** (1991) 447; F. Anselmo et al., *Nuovo Cimento* **104A** (1991) 1817.
- [4] See, for example, L. J. Hall, *these proceedings*.
- [5] M. S. Chanowitz et al., *Nucl. Phys.* **B128** (1977) 506; A. J. Buras et al., *Nucl. Phys.* **B135** (1978) 66.
- [6] P. Langacker and N. Polonsky, in preparation.
- [7] V. Barger et al., *Phys. Rev.* **D47** (1993) 1093; Wisconsin Report No. MAD/PH/755 (1993).
- [8] M. Carena et al., *Nucl. Phys.* **B406** (1993) 59; W. A. Bardeen et al., Max-Planck Report No. MPI-Ph/93-58 (1993).
- [9] See, for example, M. Drees and K. Hagiwara, *Phys. Rev.* **D42** (1990) 1709; M. Boulware and D. Finnel, *Phys. Rev.* **D44** (1991) 2054; P. Langacker, J. Erler, N. Polonsky, and A. Pomarol, work in progress.
- [10] See, for example, M. Drees and M. M. Nojiri, *Nucl. Phys.* **B369** (1992) 54.
- [11] M. Olechowski and S. Pokorski, *Phys. Lett.* **B214** (1988) 393; *Nucl. Phys.* **B404** (1993) 590; L. J. Hall et al., LBL Report No. LBL-33997 (1993).

Figure 1: The $m_t^{pole} - \tan\beta$ plane is divided into five different regions. Two areas (low- and high- $\tan\beta$ branches) are consistent with perturbative Yukawa unification ($h_b = h_\tau$ at M_G) and with $0.85m_b^0(5 \text{ GeV}) < 4.45 \text{ GeV}$. Between the two branches the b -quark mass is too high. For a too low (high) $\tan\beta$, h_t (h_b) diverges. The strip where all three (third-family) Yukawa couplings unify intersects the allowed high- $\tan\beta$ branch and is indicated as well (dash-dot line). $h_t > h_b$ above that line. Corrections to the h_t/h_b ratio induce a $\sim \pm 5\%$ uncertainty in the m_t^{pole} range that corresponds to each of the points in the three-Yukawa strip. $\alpha_s(M_Z)$, α_G , and the unification scale used in the calculation are the ones predicted by the MSSM coupling constant unification. The upper bound on the m_t^{pole} range suggested by the electroweak data and $\tan\beta = 1$ are indicated (dashed lines). m_t^{pole} is in GeV.

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9310292v1>