

Neutrino Masses in E_6 UnificationMasako Bando and Taichiro Kugo^{1,y}

Physics Division, Aichi University, Aichi 470-02

¹Physics Department, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502

Abstract

We show that the neutrino masses with large mixing between ν_e and ν_μ are naturally reproduced in a supersymmetric E_6 grand unification model with an anomalous $U(1)_X$ symmetry. We propose a simple scenario which incorporates a novel mechanism called 'E-twisting' by which all the characteristic features of the fermion mass matrices, not only the quark/lepton's Dirac masses but also the neutrino's Majorana masses, can be well reproduced despite all the members in 27 of each generation are assigned a common $U(1)_X$ charge.

E-mail address: bando@aichi-u.ac.jp

^y E-mail address: kugo@gauge.sophys.kyoto-u.ac.jp

x1. Introduction

Recent report from Superkamiokande strongly indicates two important facts,¹⁾ which have driven us to the unification groups including left-right symmetry. The first fact is the extremely small masses of the neutrinos, which is most naturally explained by the existence of right-handed neutrinos with their Majorana masses of order of 10^{13} GeV.²⁾ The existence of the right-handed neutrinos implies that Nature prefers left-right symmetry and we are led to the left-right symmetric unification group like $SO(10)$. The second fact is the large neutrino mixing angle which is needed to explain the zenith angle dependence of the observed atmospheric muon neutrino spectrum. If one wishes to understand the mass matrices in the unified theories larger than $SU(5)$, this large neutrino mixing angle apparently seems unnatural compared with the ordinary quark-lepton mass matrices. In $SO(10)$ GUT, for instance, quarks and leptons appear on the same footing and the Dirac-type masses for the neutrinos and charged leptons should be parallel to those for the up- and down-type quarks, respectively. So the most natural prediction would be that the neutrino mixing would also be very small with hierarchical mass structure among generations. This naive prediction of parallelism between quark and lepton sectors, however, was found to be maximally violated in the neutrino sector. Thus the neutrino masses and mixings seem to require something beyond even $SO(10)$.^z

Here we would like to remark also that the up and down quark mass matrices are already violating the parallelism: the hierarchical structure of the up quark sector is far stronger than that of down quark sector. Also it has long been one of the most important problems to answer the question "why is the top quark far heavier than the bottom quark?"

If one wishes to explain the inter-generation hierarchical mass structure, one natural possibility will be the Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism⁴⁾ using an anomalous $U(1)_X$ charge. However, if the unified gauge group is $SO(10)$ or larger, all the fermion members in each generation has a common $U(1)_X$ charge quantum number, so that the naive application of the Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism will predict a completely parallel hierarchical mass matrix for all the quarks and leptons, contradicting the observations. The naive prediction of this complete parallelism between quark and lepton mass matrices is, however, a result of our prejudice that the three generations of fermions are a mere repetition of the same structure, namely, a parallel family structure. If the parallelism between families is broken, then the paral-

^z If the right-handed neutrino Majorana mass matrix M_R can be chosen freely, then we can have any desired form for the left-handed neutrino Majorana mass matrix $M = M_D^T M_R^{-1} M_D$, whatever Dirac mass matrix M_D is given to the neutrino in the GUT. But the problem is whether the form of M_R can be derived in a given GUT framework.³⁾ In the scenarios which use the Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism, it seems that M_R always has hierarchical structure.

lelism between mass matrices of quarks and leptons can also be avoided. The importance of breaking parallel family structure was first emphasized by Yanagida.⁵⁾ Then the question is how the unification model, and what unification group, can avoid this parallel family structure. Among the simple groups larger than $SO(10)$, E_6 is essentially the unique group that admits complex representations in a consistent manner with the chiral structure of our low-energy fermions. The exceptional group E_6 has been investigated by many authors^{(6);(7);(8);(9);(10);(11);(12);(13)} as an attractive unification group so far, because of its good features; 1) automatically anomaly-free, 2) all the basic fermions of one generation belong to a single irreducible representation 27 and lastly 3) all the Higgs fields necessary for symmetry breaking are supplied by the fermion bilinears. On the other hand, 10 dimensional E_8 heterotic string theory has been thought to be very attractive as a unified theory including gravity from which the low energy $N = 1$ supersymmetric standard model may be derived.¹⁴⁾ The Calabi-Yau compactification into 4 dimensions may naturally produce E_6 gauge symmetry. In this kind of string models there exists an anomalous $U(1)$ which is to be cancelled by the so-called Green-Schwarz mechanism.¹⁵⁾ In supersymmetric model this anomalous $U(1)$ was found to play an essential role for explaining the hierarchy of fermion masses via Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism.¹⁶⁾

The purpose of this paper is to show that there is a novel and natural mechanism in a supersymmetric E_6 grand unification model with an anomalous $U(1)_X$ symmetry, with which the parallel family structure can be avoided and all the characteristic features of the fermion mass matrices, not only the quark/lepton's Dirac masses but also the neutrino's Majorana masses, can be reproduced. We propose and examine a very simple scenario which incorporates this novel mechanism called 'E-twisting'.

In §2 we present the basic framework of our E_6 model and point out that there is a freedom of $SU(2)_E$ inner automorphism in E_6 in embedding $SO(10)$ such that $SU_{GG}(5) \subset SO(10) \subset E_6$. As a reflection of this $SU(2)_E$ symmetry, the fundamental representation 27 contains two $SU(5)$ 5 and two 1 components, both giving spinor representations of $SU(2)_E$. This $SU(2)_E$ transformation plays an important role in explaining the large mixing angle of neutrinos while keeping very small family mixings in the quark sector. In §3 we determine the $U(1)_X$ charges assigned to the three generation matter superfields $\psi_i(27)$ belonging to 27 of E_6 . In §4 we discuss 5 family structure, namely, which three 5's become the usual down-quarks and charged leptons among six 5's in the three 27's. Describing three typical options, parallel family structure, nonparallel family structure and E-twisted structure, we argue that the E-twisted structure gives the simplest option which can reproduce the down quark spectrum and Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) mixings, and, at the same time, the large lepton mixing angle. In §5 we examine the right-handed neutrino Majorana masses

which naturally come from higher dimensional operators in the present scenario. Section 6 is devoted to the summary and discussions.

2. E_6 Unification Model and E -symmetry

We consider here the simplest example of supersymmetric E_6 unification model which reproduces the large neutrino mixing angle as well as the quark and lepton masses and mixings.

Aside from E_6 gauge vector multiplet, we introduce several chiral multiplets which belong to the fundamental representation 27 or $\bar{27}$, or singlet 1 and carry a quantum number, denoted by X , of an abelian $U(1)_X$.

1. The quarks and the leptons of three generations are included in three chiral multiplets ψ_i 's ($i = 1, 2, 3$) of 27 representation, to which we assign odd R -parity and $U(1)_X$ charges $X = f_i$. (The values f_i will be determined later.)
2. We introduce two pairs of Higgs fields, $(H^h; H^{\bar{h}})$, and $(\phi^x; \phi^{\bar{x}})$, of 27 and $\bar{27}$ chiral multiplets, which are R -parity even and carry the $U(1)_X$ charges $X = h$ and $X = x$, respectively. Their neutral components develop vacuum expectation values (VEV's) and provide superheavy masses for the fermions other than the usual low-energy quarks and leptons and the light masses for the ordinary fermions.
3. In addition to these, we introduce an E_6 singlet field ϕ with $X = 1$ and R -parity even, which supplements the Yukawa couplings so as to match the $U(1)_X$ charge.

Then R -parity, $U(1)_X$ and E_6 invariant superpotentials giving Yukawa interactions are,

$$\begin{aligned} W_Y(H) &= y_{ij}(27)_j(27)_i H(27) (\equiv M_P)^{f_i + f_j + h}; \\ W_Y(\phi) &= y^0_{ij}(27)_j(27)_i \phi(27) (\equiv M_P)^{f_i + f_j + x}; \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

The coupling constants y and y^0 may generally depend on $(i; j)$, but we assume they are all of order 1 and so we can suppress the $(i; j)$ dependence in the present discussion of order of magnitude. The hierarchical mass structure of fermions are explained via Frogatt-Nielsen mechanism; that is, the powers of E_6 singlet field ϕ in this higher dimensional Yukawa coupling (2.1) are required by the $U(1)_X$ quantum number matching and the effective Yukawa couplings are suppressed by corresponding powers of $\phi = h \equiv M_P^{-1}$. We assume $h \equiv M_P^{-1} \sim 10^{-22}$ henceforth.

Each fundamental representation (27) is decomposed under $SO(10) \times U(1) \subset E_6$ as

$$\begin{aligned} 27 &= 16_1 + 10_2 + 1_4 & (X = 1/2; & & ; 16) \\ A : & & M & 0 & (M = 1/2; & & ; 10) \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

and under $SU(5) \times U(1) \times SO(10)$ as

$$16 = \begin{matrix} 10 \\ 1 \\ \# \end{matrix} + \begin{matrix} 5_3 \\ + \\ 1_5 \end{matrix} \quad (2.3)$$

$$: \begin{matrix} u_i^{ci}; \\ d_i \end{matrix}; e^c \quad (d_i^{ci}; e_i^c)$$

$$10 = \begin{matrix} 5_2 \\ 1 \\ D_i \end{matrix} + \begin{matrix} 5_2 \\ + \\ 5_2 \end{matrix} \quad (2.4)$$

$$M : \begin{matrix} B \\ B \\ C \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} E^c \\ E^c \\ A \end{matrix} \quad (D^{ci}; E; N) \quad N^c$$

$$1 = 1_0$$

$$0 : S \quad (2.5)$$

Note that the representations 5 and 1 of $SU(5)$ appear twice here, while 10 and 5 appear only once. This suggests that we can define a parity-like transformation, which we call 'E-parity',

$$\text{E-parity transformation:} \quad \begin{matrix} (16; 5) \rightarrow (10; 5) \\ (16; 1) \rightarrow (1; 1) \end{matrix}; \quad (2.6)$$

and the other $SU(5)$ components $(16; 10)$ and $(10; 5)$ remain intact. Actually, this E-parity turns out to be a rotation of a certain $SU(2) \subset E_6$: indeed, even if we fix the $SU(5)$ subgroup in E_6 as the usual $SU(5)_{GG}$ of Georgi-Glashow, the embedding of $SO(10)$ into E_6 such that $SU(5)_{GG} \subset SO(10) \subset E_6$, is not unique, but possesses a freedom of rotations of an $SU(2)$.^{*}

To see this fact would be easiest if we consider another maximal subgroup $SU(6) \times SU(2)_E \subset E_6$ where the former $SU(6)$ contains $SU(5)_{GG} \times U(1)$ such that the first 5 entries of the fundamental representation 6 gives the fundamental representation 5 of $SU(5)_{GG}$. Under this $SU(5)_{GG} \times SU(2)_E \times U(1) \subset SU(6) \times SU(2)_E \subset E_6$, the 27 is decomposed into

$$27 = \underbrace{(5; 2)_1 + (1; 2)_5}_{(6; 2)} + \underbrace{(10; 1)_2 + (5; 1)_4}_{(15; 1)} \quad (2.7)$$

This decomposition of 27 clearly shows that the two 5's as well as 1 belong to a doublet of $SU(2)_E$, and so are rotated into each other as a spinor by this $SU(2)_E$. In view of the $U(1)_{V0}$

^{*} So-called 'ipped $SU(5)$ ' gives another example similar to this situation. There, the embedding of $SU(5)$ into $SO(10)$ such that $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \subset SU(5) \subset SO(10)$ holds, is not unique but possesses a freedom of rotations of an $SU(2)$. This $SU(2)$ is in fact the usual $SU(2)_R$ of $SU(4)_{\text{Pati-Salam}} \times SU(2)_L \subset SU(5) \subset SO(10)$. The $SU(5)$ group of the 'ipped $SU(5)$ model is given from the usual $SU(5)_{GG}$ by a rotation of $SU(2)_R$. This can be understood by a very similar argument to that given in the next paragraph, by considering the decomposition of $SO(10)$ 16 under the subgroups $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \subset SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$; $16 = (4; 2_L; 1_R) + (4; 1_L; 2_R) = (3_C; 2_L; 1_R) + (1_C; 2_L; 1_R) + (3_C; 1_L; 2_R) + (1_C; 1_L; 2_R)$.

and $U(1)_V$ charges of 5 appearing in Eqs. (2.2), (2.3) and (2.4) and the $U(1)_Z$ charge here, we can see that the following identifications are possible between these $U(1)$ charges and the third component E_3 of $SU(2)_E$ generators E_j ($j = 1; 2; 3$):

$$V = 5E_3 - \frac{1}{2}Z; \quad V^0 = 3E_3 + \frac{1}{2}Z: \quad (2.8)$$

Collecting the representation components carrying the same V^0 charge, we easily find that $SO(10)$ multiplets $16; 10$ and 1 are formed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} 16_1 &= (5; E_3 = +1/2)_1 + (1; E_3 = -1/2)_5 + (10; 1)_2 \\ 10_2 &= (5; E_3 = -1/2)_1 + (5; 1)_4 \\ 1_4 &= (1; E_3 = +1/2)_5: \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

But this identification of $SO(10)$ must be possible even after performing an arbitrary $SU(2)_E$ rotation $\exp(i\theta E_j)$. Then the $SO(10)$ generators $T_{MN}(\theta)$ for the case of angle θ are given by $\exp(i\theta E) T_N \exp(-i\theta E)$ in terms of the original $SO(10)$ generators T_N . This $\exp(i\theta E)$ defines an inner automorphism of E_6 which gives a three parameter family of embeddings of $SO(10)$ into E_6 such that $SU(5)_{GG} \subset SO(10) \subset E_6$ holds. We may call this $\exp(i\theta E)$ E -symmetry and the E -parity transformation introduced above is merely a special case of $\exp(i\theta E_1)$, $\exp(i\theta E_2)$ (or $\exp(i\theta E_3)$).[†] Indeed, with this $\exp(i\theta E_1)$ rotation, the E_3 generator is rotated into $E_3^0 = E_3$ and hence the $E_3 = \pm 1/2$ eigenstates of spinor representation are interchanged, implying that the two 5 states in 16 and 10 , as well as the two 1 states in 16 and 1 , in Eq. (2.9) are interchanged.

In Eq. (2.1) the Yukawa couplings for individual components are determined by the E_6 group relation: the E_6 invariant trilinear in 27 is given by a totally symmetric tensor ϵ^{ABC} in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^{ABC} \psi_{1A} \psi_{2B} \psi_{3C} &= \psi_{1M} \psi_{2M} \psi_{30} + \frac{1}{2} \psi_{1M} \psi_{2M} \frac{C}{2} \psi_{30} \\ &+ [\text{cyclic permutations of } (1; 2; 3)] \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

where ψ_M , ψ_j and ψ_0 are $SO(10)$ vector, spinor and singlet components of ψ_j defined in Eq. (2.2), and ψ_M and C are 16×16 matrix and charge conjugation matrix of $SO(10)$, respectively. (See Appendix for more explicit component expression of Eq. (2.10).) For our

[†] It may worth noting that this E -symmetry group $SU(2)_E$ is identical with an $SU(2)$ subgroup of $SU(3)_R$ which appears in the famous maximal subgroup $SU(3)_C \times SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R$ of E_6 . But $SU(2)_E$ is the $SU(2)$ subgroup of $SU(3)_R$ acting on the second and third entries of 3 of $SU(3)_R$, while the usual $SU(2)_R$ of left-right symmetric theory is another $SU(2)$ subgroup of $SU(3)_R$ acting on the first and second entries of 3. See Appendix for details.

present purpose to discuss the fermion masses and mixings coming from the VEV's of the Higgs fields, we list here the explicit forms for the terms in $\mathcal{L}_{H C}^{A B C}$ containing neutral Higgs components $H(1); H(16;1); H(16;5); H(10;5)$ and $H(10;5)$ which correspond to the components $S; \bar{c}; \bar{N}$ and \bar{N} , respectively, of (27) in Eqs. (2.2) - (2.4):

$$H(1) \quad \left(D_i^{c1} E \quad N \right)_1 \begin{matrix} 0 \\ B \\ C \\ A \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} 1 \\ D_i \\ E^c \\ N^c \end{matrix} + (1 \otimes 2) \quad \# \quad (2.11)$$

$$H(16;1) \quad \left(D_i E^c \quad N^c \right)_1 \begin{matrix} 0 \\ B \\ C \\ A \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} 1 \\ d^{c1} \\ e \\ e \end{matrix} + (1 \otimes 2) \quad \# \quad (2.12)$$

$$H(16;5) \quad \begin{matrix} h \\ 16(1) \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} 10(5) \\ 10(5) \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} 16(5) \\ 16(10) \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} S_1 N_2^c \\ (D_1^{c1} d_{12} + E_1 e_2^c) \end{matrix} + (1 \otimes 2) \quad \# \quad (2.13)$$

$$H(10;5) \quad \begin{matrix} h \\ 1 \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} 10(5) \\ 16(5) \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} 16(10) \\ 16(10) \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} S_1 N_2^c \\ (d_1^{c1} d_{12} + e_1 e_2^c) \end{matrix} + (1 \otimes 2) \quad \# \quad (2.14)$$

$$H(10;5) \quad \begin{matrix} h \\ 1 \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} 10(5) \\ 16(10) \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} 16(10) \\ 16(5) \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} S_1 N_2 \\ (u_1^{c1} u_{12} + e_1 e_2^c) \end{matrix} + (1 \otimes 2) \quad \# \quad (2.15)$$

3. Determination of $U(1)_X$ Charges

In 27, $SU(5)$ 10 and 5 components appear once, so the mass matrix of the up quark sector uniquely comes from the term $(16;10)(16;10)H(10;5)$ in Eq. (2.15), which always yields a symmetric matrix. Let $H(10;5)$ develops a VEV, $\langle H(10;5) \rangle = v_u$, giving the up sector masses. We can take the $U(1)_X$ charge of the Higgs fields H to be $h = 0$ without loss of generality. With this convention, we now determine the $U(1)_X$ charges f_i for the three families of ψ_i (27).

Experimentally the up sector mass matrix is known to take the following form :

$$M_u = m_t \begin{matrix} 0 & 10_1 & 10_2 & 10_3 \\ 10_1 & 7 & (5) & (3) \\ 10_2 & (5) & 4 & (2) \\ 10_3 & (3) & (2) & 1 \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} B \\ C \\ A \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} C \\ C \\ A \end{matrix}; \quad (3.1)$$

where θ_{22} is the order of Cabibbo angle and the bracket $()$ means the corresponding matrix element may be less than the order indicated, since the CKM angles are the difference

between the up and down sectors. We take $f_3 = 2$, which is zero by our convention for h . Then, in view of the diagonal 33, 22 and 11 elements of this mass matrix, we see that we must take $f_2 = 2$ and f_1 should be either 3 or 4.

In order to fix the $U(1)_X$ charge to either 3 or 4, we use the information of the Cabibbo angle. But to discuss the Cabibbo angle, we need the information of the down sector mass matrix. The mass matrix of the down sector has, however, a complication owing to the mixing of the two 5 representations in 27 both for the right-handed down quark d^c and Higgs H , and comes from the Yukawa couplings of two types, Eqs. (2.14) and (2.13). We shall discuss this problem in detail in the next section. The Cabibbo angle is given by $M_{u12}=M_{u22}$ $M_{d12}=M_{d22}$ with M_u and M_d are mass matrices of the up and down quark sectors. We will see that, in the scenario to be discussed there, $M_{d12}=M_{d22}$ as well as $M_{u12}=M_{u22}$ is of the order $f_1 f_2$, determined by the $U(1)_X$ charge assignment to the first and second families. Thus the Cabibbo angle of order $\sqrt{2}$ requires $f_1 = f_2 = 1$, from which we must uniquely choose $f_1 = 3$.

Now we have fixed the $U(1)_X$ charge as

$$X(H) = 0; \quad X(1_1); X(2); X(3) = (3; 2; 0); \quad (3.2)$$

from which we have

$$M_u = m_t \begin{array}{ccc} & 10_1 & 10_2 & 10_3 \\ \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 10_1 \\ 10_2 \\ 10_3 \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} 6 \\ 5 \\ 3 \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} 5 \\ 4 \\ 2 \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} 3 \\ 2 \\ 1 \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ C \\ C \\ A \end{array}; \quad (3.3)$$

with $m_t = y_t v_t$. The u quark mass of order 6 is a bit large so that a small cancellation should occur in the computation of the correct eigenvalue for u .

4. 5 Family Structure

Now that we have determined the $U(1)_X$ charges of three families $\psi_i(27)$, our next task is to look for a possible 5 family structure which can reproduce the down quark spectrum and CKM mixings, and, at the same time, the large lepton mixing angle.

As already mentioned above, there are two 5 's in each 27 . The Higgs doublet, which survives down to the low energy region, can in general be an arbitrary mixed state of the two 5 's in $H(27)$:

$$H(5) = H(10;5) \cos \theta + H(16;5) \sin \theta; \quad (4.1)$$

which is just an $H(10;5)$ of the E-rotated $SO(10)$ by angle 2θ , corresponding to generators $T_{MN}(2\theta) = \exp(2iE_2)T_{MN}\exp(-2iE_2)$. Of course, it should be noted that this angle itself has no physical meaning, but becomes meaningful once the other down quarks or Higgs specify the direction of the $SO(10)$. In the conventional treatment, the low energy Higgs doublet is identified with $H(10;5)$ corresponding to the choice $\cos\theta = 1$, which implies that the $SO(10)$ direction is specified by the Higgs veld. Here, in our scheme, $SO(10)$ direction will be determined by the down quark sector.

So let us proceed to the three families of (right-handed) down quarks, they can in general be any three linear combinations of the six 5 's in the three 15 's (27). We here consider three typical scenarios:

1. Parallel family structure:

Each family of low energy fermions 5 and 10 are contained in a 16 representation of (a fixed) $SO(10)$.

$$(5_1; 5_2; 5_3) = (1_1(16;5); 2_1(16;5); 3_1(16;5)) : \quad (4.2)$$

2. Nonparallel family structure:

Inter-generation mixings are so large that the three 5 's do not come from $1_1, 2_1$ and 3_1 , one from each. Such an example is

$$(5_1; 5_2; 5_3) = (1_1(16;5); 2_1(16;5); 2_2(10;5)) : \quad (4.3)$$

The structure similar to this was first proposed by Yanagida.^{5);12);17)}

3. E-twisted structure:

Some of the $1_1(16;5)$'s are replaced by $1_1(10;5)$ in the parallel family structure (4.2). For example E-twisted version of the third family is given by

$$(5_1; 5_2; 5_3) = (1_1(16;5); 2_1(16;5); 3_1(10;5)) : \quad (4.4)$$

This structure implies that the third family falls into 16 of an E-twisted $SO(10)$ compared to the other two families.^k

Among these three possibilities, it is obvious that the first option (the parallel family structure) predicts completely parallel mass matrices for all the fermions, the up and down quarks, leptons and neutrinos. Thus it can reproduce neither the down quark masses nor the large neutrino mixing angle.

^k In terms of the component notation in Eqs. (2.3) and (2.4), our E-twisted scenario is to take $(d_1^c; d_2^c; D_3^c)$ for down quarks and $(e_1; e_2; E_3)$ for leptons. A bit similar twisting in down quark and lepton sectors was ever considered by Haba et. al.¹³⁾ in the $SU(6)^0 \times SU(2)_R$ unified theory, in which they took essentially $(0(1)d_1^c + 0(1)d_2^c; D_1^c; D_3^c)$ and $(e_1; E_1; 0(1)E_2 + 0(1)E_3)$.




Fig. 1. Nonparallel family structure in which the 5's enclosed by circles are the dominant components which remain light. The solid and dotted lines denote heavy mass terms given by $h^{x=3}(1)i$ and $h^{x=2}(16;1)i$, respectively. The $U(1)_X$ -suppressed terms with higher powers of $h \equiv M_P$ are indicated by thinner lines. The bracketed line connecting 5 to 5 in the 2nd generation 10 should be absent for this scenario to work, which can be realized if $x=3$ is 351 coupling to $(27 - 27)_A$ anti-symmetrically.

As for the second option (nonparallel family structure), it turns out that we need a higher representation Higgs field in order to make the other fermion components superheavy, as is seen as follows: we need to make $1(10;5)$, $3(16;5)$ and $3(10;5)$, as well as all the 5 components, $1(10;5)$, superheavy. This could be most economically achieved as shown in Fig. 1; namely, we first introduce a Higgs field $x=3$ with the $U(1)_X$ charge 3 such that its VEV $h^{x=3}(1)i = M = y^0$ in the $SO(10)$ singlet component can yield mass terms $M_3(10;5)1(10;5)$ and $M_1(10;5)3(10;5)$ via the Yukawa coupling in Eqs. (2.1) and (2.11). This VEV also yields other mass terms by the Yukawa interactions (2.1) which are generally allowed by supplementing powers of $(=M_P)$ to match the $U(1)_X$ quantum number:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & 1(10;5) & 2(10;5) & 3(10;5) \\
 & 0 & & & 1 \\
 1(10;5) & & 4 & 2 & 1 \\
 2(10;5) & & 2 & () & 0 \\
 3(10;5) & & 1 & 0 & 0
 \end{array}
 \begin{array}{c}
 C \\
 C \\
 C \\
 A
 \end{array}
 ; \quad (4.5)$$

The 22 matrix element is bracketed here by the reason which becomes clear shortly. Next we add another Higgs field $x=2$ with the $U(1)_X$ charge 2 such that its VEV $h^{x=2}(16;1)i = M^0 = y^0$ in the $SO(10)$ 16 $SU(5)$ singlet component can give a mass term $M^0_3(16;5)2(10;5)$ via the coupling (2.12). Of course, this coupling simultaneously yields an (unwanted) mass term $M^0_2(16;5)3(10;5)$ with the same strength M^0 . Including also the subdominant

$$M^0 = \begin{matrix} & & {}_1(16;5) & {}_2(16;5) & {}_3(16;5) \\ & {}_0 & & & & {}_1 \\ {}_1(10;5) & & 4 & 2 & & C \\ {}_2(10;5) & & 2 & 2 & 1 & A \\ {}_3(10;5) & & & 1 & 0 & \end{matrix}; \quad (4-6)$$

The simplest and most attractive option is thus the third one, E-twisted structure, which we shall investigate in the following sections.

Let us investigate the case of E-twisted structure. In this case, we need only one Higgs field other than the usual Higgs and suppose that they develop the following VEV's:

These give the following superheavy mass terms via the yukawa coupling (2.1) with Eqs. (2.11) and (2.12) (See Fig. 2):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & {}_1(16;5) & {}_2(16;5) & {}_3(16;5) & {}_1(10;5) & {}_2(10;5) & {}_3(10;5) & \\
{}_0 & & & & & & & & \\
{}_1(10;5) & {}^6M^0 & {}^5M^0 & {}^3M^0 & {}^2M & M & 0 & & \\
{}_2(10;5) & {}^5M^0 & {}^4M^0 & {}^2M^0 & M & M & 0 & & \\
{}_3(10;5) & {}^3M^0 & {}^2M^0 & M^0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & &
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
1 \\
C \\
C \\
A
\end{array}
; \quad (5.2)$$




Fig. 2. E-twisted structure in which the 5's enclosed by circles are the dominant components which remain light. The solid and dotted lines denote heavy mass terms given by $h^{x=4}(1)i$ and $hH(16;1)i$, respectively. The $U(1)_X$ -suppressed terms with higher powers of h are indicated by thinner lines, as in Fig. 1.

Let us again assume that $M = M^0$, namely the breaking scale of E_6 down to $SO(10)$ is higher than the breaking scale of $SO(10)$ down to $SU(5)$. This option has very simple structure in which $h^{x=4}(1)i = M = y^0$ gives superheavy masses to $\psi_i(10;5)$ and $\psi_i(10;5)$ with $i=1$ and 2 , while $hH(16;1)i = M^0 = y$ gives a bit smaller superheavy mass to $\psi_3(16;5)$ and $\psi_3(10;5)$. This now leaves us with the following three light (massless at this stage) eigenstates:

$$\begin{aligned} 5_1 &= \psi_1(16;5) + O(\epsilon^3) \psi_3(16;5); \\ 5_2 &= \psi_2(16;5) + O(\epsilon^2) \psi_3(16;5); \\ 5_3 &= \psi_3(10;5) \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

up to unimportant mixings with heavier components. These three states are essentially $\psi_1(16;5)$; $\psi_2(16;5)$; $\psi_3(10;5)$ as desired. Then, taking the Higgs mixing (4.1) into account, the Yukawa couplings Eqs. (2.13) and (2.14) lead to the following form of down sector mass matrix:

$$M_d^T = y v_d \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 5_1 & 5_2 & 5_3 \\ 10_1 & 6 \cos & 5 \cos & 3 \sin \\ 10_2 & 5 \cos & 4 \cos & 2 \sin \\ 10_3 & 3 \cos & 2 \cos & \sin \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ C \\ C \\ A \end{pmatrix}; \quad (5.4)$$

where $v_d = hH(5)i$ and θ is the Higgs mixing angle. Our convention for the Dirac mass matrix M_{ij} is that the fermion mass term is given by $L_m = \overline{(R_i)} M_{ij} L_j + h.c.$. Note

The transpose T attached to M_d in Eq. (5.4) is due to this convention. Since $\psi^c = \psi^c$ in two-component notation equals $\overline{\psi}^T$ in the usual four-component notation, our Dirac mass term $\overline{(R_i)} M_{ij} L_j$ equals $\psi_i^c M_{ij} \psi_j = \psi_i^c M_{ij}^T \psi_j^c$, and hence corresponds to $d^2 (\psi_i^c M_{ij} \psi_j^c) = d^2 (\psi_i^c M_{ij}^T \psi_j^c)$ written in terms of chiral superfields ψ_i^c and ψ_j^c . This explains the transpose in Eq. (5.4).

that the mixing terms retained in Eq. (5.3), although being small, are also contributing to the j_1 and j_2 ($j = 1; 2; 3$) matrix elements with the same order amounts as indicated. So they should be taken into account properly if we wish to calculate not only the orders of magnitude but also the coefficients of the matrix elements correctly. If we take $\sin^2 \theta_{13} \approx 0.02$, then

$$M_d^T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 4 & 3 & 3 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} B \\ B \\ B \\ C \\ A \end{matrix} : \quad (5.5)$$

So we have $2y_{vd} = m_b$. This factor 2 came from the Higgs mixing $\sin \theta_{13}$ in the present E-twisted structure, and provides a natural explanation for the reason why the bottom mass is very small compared with the top quark mass, in the small $\tan \beta = 1$ scenario.

This mass matrix M_d is common to the down quark and lepton sectors at the GUT scale in the present approximation, and keeps almost the same form (aside from the overall normalization) down to our low energy regime even after the renormalization group evolution; so we have $M_l = (m_t/m_b)M_d^T$. (The reason why the transposition T appears relatively is because the left-handed and right-handed components are contained in the $SU(5)_5$ and 10 oppositely for the lepton and down-quark cases.) It is important that the 32 and 33 elements have become of the same order. This gives a large mixing angle in the charged lepton sector:

$$M_l^Y M_l = (m_t/m_b)^2 M_d M_d^T = m^2 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} B \\ B \\ B \\ C \\ A \end{matrix} ; \quad (5.6)$$

and small mixing angles for down quark sector,

$$M_d^Y M_d = m_b^2 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 6 & 5 & 3 \\ 5 & 4 & 2 \\ 3 & 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} B \\ B \\ B \\ C \\ A \end{matrix} ; \quad (5.7)$$

The CKM and Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata (MNS) matrices¹⁸⁾ are given by

$$U_{CKM} = U_u U_d^Y; \quad U_{MNS} = U_l U^Y; \quad (5.8)$$

with $U_u; U_d; U_l$ and U which make the matrices $U_u (M_u^Y M_u) U_u^Y; U_d (M_d^Y M_d) U_d^Y, U_l (M_l^Y M_l) U_l^Y$ and $U M U^Y$ diagonal, respectively. The M is the Majorana mass matrix of the light (almost) left-handed neutrinos, which we discuss in the next section.

The remarkable fact is that the mass matrix in the down sector is not symmetric even in such a large unification group as E_6 and that it has led to the quite different lepton and down quark mixing angles. This was achieved by the E-twisted structure of the third generation.

We have shown that the mass matrix form (5.5) surely reproduces the usual small down quark mixings on the one hand and very large lepton 2-3 mixing on the other. However, to show that the MNS matrix really gives the large 2-3 mixing, we have to examine the neutrino mass matrix M and turn to this task now.

6. Neutrino Masses in E-Twisted Structure

The Majorana mass matrix for the light neutrino is given by

$$M = M_D^T M_R^{-1} M_D; \quad (6.1)$$

where M_D is the neutrino Dirac mass matrix and M_R is the Majorana mass matrix for the right-handed neutrinos.²⁾

Neutrino Dirac masses come from the same Yukawa coupling Eq. (2.15) as for the up quark masses:

$$\begin{aligned} 27 \otimes 27 H_{27} = & H(10;5) \quad (16;10) \quad (16;10) \quad ! \quad \text{up quark mass} \\ & + (16;5) \quad (16;1) \quad ! \quad \quad \quad ! \\ & + (10;5) \quad (1) \quad ! \quad \text{NS} \quad : \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

Since our three left-handed neutrinos are $\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3 (16;5)$, $\nu_2, \nu_3 (16;5)$ and $N_3 (10;5)$ in the present E-twisted structure,^{yy} the corresponding three right-handed neutrinos, which become their Dirac mass partners, are

$$(\bar{\nu}_1; \bar{\nu}_2; S_3): \quad (6.3)$$

So the Dirac mass matrix is found to take the form

$$(\bar{\nu}_1 \bar{\nu}_2 S_3) M_D \begin{pmatrix} B \\ B \\ C \\ A \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad M_D = m_t \begin{pmatrix} B \\ B \\ B \\ C \\ A \end{pmatrix} \quad (6.4)$$

N_3
 $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 6 & 5 & 0 \\ 5 & 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$

which is in parallel with the up quark mass matrix except for the 3rd generation and shows a hierarchical structure. The coefficient m_t is $m_t=3$ where the factor 1/3 represents the effect of renormalization group flow.

^{yy} Precisely, there are $O(3)$ and $O(2)$ mixings of the component ν_3 to the first and second generation left-handed neutrinos, respectively, as indicated in Eq. (5.3). Here, however, we neglect this since the mixing only affects the coefficients but does not change the order of magnitude of the matrix elements by the same reason as for the down quark masses.

Next we study the right-handed neutrino Majorana masses, which come from the higher dimensional interactions:

$$M_P^{-1} \psi_i(27) \psi_j(27) \psi_k(\overline{27}) \psi_l(\overline{27}) (\phi_P)^{f_i+f_j+x_k+x_l}; \quad (6.5)$$

where $\psi_k(\overline{27})$ stands for $\psi_{k+4}(\overline{27})$ and $\phi_P^{h=0}(\overline{27})$, the partners of four Higgs fields $\psi_{k+4}(27)$ and $\phi_P^{x=0}(27)$.

Suppose that the $SO(10)$ singlet component of ψ_{k+4} and $(16;1)$ component of $\phi_P^{x=0}$ develops VEV's:

$$\langle \psi_{k+4} \rangle = M_P; \quad \langle \phi_P^{x=0} \rangle = M_H; \quad (6.6)$$

All the six right-handed neutrinos $(\psi_i; S_i)$ ($i=1,2,3$) acquire superheavy masses from this interaction and mix one another. Now define a 6×6 matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} M_H^2 & M_H M_P^4 \\ M_H M_P^4 & M_P^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} M_1^2 & M_1 M_2 \\ M_1 M_2 & M_2^2 \end{pmatrix} : \quad (6.7)$$

Then, the 6×6 Majorana mass matrix for the six right-handed neutrinos $(\psi_i; S_i)$ ($i=1,2,3$) can be written in the following tensor product form:

$$\begin{aligned} M_R &= M_P^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 1 & 6 & 5 & 3 \\ 2 & 5 & 4 & 2 \\ 3 & 3 & 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} S_1 \\ S_2 \\ S_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{M_P^2}{M_2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 6 & 5 \\ 2 & 5 & 4 \\ 3 & 3 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} S_1 \\ S_2 \\ S_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} M_1^2 \\ M_1 M_2 \\ M_2^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (6.8) \end{aligned}$$

Its inverse is given by

$$M_R^{-1} = \frac{M_P}{M_2^2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 6 & 5 \\ 2 & 5 & 4 \\ 3 & 3 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} S_1 \\ S_2 \\ S_3 \end{pmatrix}; \quad (6.9)$$

so that the 3×3 submatrix for the three right-handed neutrinos $(\psi_i; S_i)$, which are Dirac mass partners of our left-handed neutrinos $(\psi_i; N_i)$, reads

$$M_{R33}^{-1} = \frac{M_P}{M_2^2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 6 & 5 \\ 2 & 5 & 4 \\ 3 & 3 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} S_1 \\ S_2 \\ S_3 \end{pmatrix}; \quad (6.10)$$

From this and Eq. (6.4), we find the induced left-handed Majorana mass matrix M as

$$M = M_D^T M_{R33}^{-1} M_D = \frac{m_t^2 M_P}{M_2^2} \begin{matrix} & 0 & 1 & 2 & N_3 \\ \begin{matrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ N_3 \end{matrix} & \begin{matrix} 2 & 6 \\ 2 & 5 \\ 1 & 3 \end{matrix} & \begin{matrix} 2 & 5 \\ 2 & 4 \\ 1 & 2 \end{matrix} & \begin{matrix} 1 & 3 \\ 1 & 2 \\ 1 \end{matrix} \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} 1 \\ 3 \\ 2 \\ 1 \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} C \\ C \\ C \\ A \end{matrix} \quad (6.11)$$

If the parameter $x = M_1/M_2$ is larger than 2 , this left-handed neutrino mass matrix M shows hierarchical structure, implying small mixing angles in the neutrino sector. Therefore the large 2-3 mixing angle in the MNS matrix suggested in the recent atmospheric neutrino experiment can be explained for a wide range of parameters.

Finally, we add some phenomenology for the absolute values of light neutrino masses. Suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} M_2 &= M_1^4 = 5 \cdot 10^8 \text{ GeV} \quad (2 \cdot 10^3) = 10^{16} \text{ GeV}; \\ M_1 &= M_H = M_2 \cdot 10^6 \text{ GeV} \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

which correspond to the following reasonable order of VEV's:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{D}{x=4} \frac{E}{(S)} &= M_1 = 5 \cdot 10^8 \text{ GeV} = M_P; \\ \frac{D}{x=0} \frac{E}{(C)} &= M_H = 10^6 \text{ GeV}; \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

If we take x , larger than 2 , then, with $M_P = 10^{19} \text{ GeV}$ and $m_t = m_t = 3 \cdot 60 \text{ GeV}$, this yields the left-handed Majorana mass matrix M :

$$M = \frac{m_t^2 M_P}{M_2^2} \begin{matrix} & 0 & 1 & 2 & N_3 \\ \begin{matrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ N_3 \end{matrix} & \begin{matrix} 4 & 3 \\ 3 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 \end{matrix} & \begin{matrix} 4 & 3 \\ 3 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 \end{matrix} & \begin{matrix} 1 & 3 \\ 1 & 2 \\ 1 \end{matrix} \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} 1 \\ 3 \\ 2 \\ 1 \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} C \\ C \\ C \\ A \end{matrix} \quad (6.14)$$

with the eigenvalues

$$\begin{aligned} m_3 &= 4 \cdot 10^2 \text{ eV}; \\ m_2 &= 2 \cdot 10^3 \text{ eV}; \\ m_1 &= 1 \cdot 10^4 \text{ eV}; \end{aligned} \quad (6.15)$$

These mass eigenvalues are consistent with the experimental data.

In the above, the x was put by hand. There is another option which gives this factor more naturally. That is to adopt Higgs fields ϕ^x and χ^x which carry $x = 5$ in

place of the above scenario $x = 4$. This change causes essentially no changes to the mass matrix structure for the down quarks and charged leptons, but leads to some difference in the neutrino sector. In this case, we have to interchange the role of χ^x and $H^{x=0}$; namely, the $SO(10) (16;1)$ component of $\chi^{x=5}$ and singlet component of $H^{x=0}$ develops VEV's:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^{x=5} (c) &= M_2 = 5 \cdot 10^8 \text{ GeV} = M_P; \\ H^{x=0} (S) &= M_H = 10^6 \text{ GeV} : \end{aligned} \quad (6.16)$$

then, the above 2×2 matrix in Eq. (67) is replaced by

$$\begin{pmatrix} c & S \\ \chi^c & M_2 = 10^8 \text{ GeV} \\ S & M_H = 10^6 \text{ GeV} \end{pmatrix} \quad (6.17)$$

and leads to

$$\begin{aligned} M_2 &= M_H = 10^6 \text{ GeV}; \\ M_1 &= M_2 = 5 \cdot 10^8 \text{ GeV} = (2 \cdot 10^3) = 10^6 \text{ GeV} : \end{aligned} \quad (6.18)$$

These values of M_2 and M_1 are the same as before. Thus this also yields the same left-handed Majorana mass matrix M as the previous case. Note that $M = M_1 = M_2$ was supplied from the one of the fifth power χ^5 which came from the $U(1)_X$ charge assignment $x = 5$ to χ . One problem in this scenario which seems unnatural is, however, that $SO(10) (16;1)$ VEV of $\chi^{x=5}$ must be larger than the $SO(10)$ singlet VEV of $H^{x=0}$, quite oppositely to the VEV's of their partner Higgs fields $H^{x=0}$ and $\chi^{x=5}$.

7. Discussion and Further Problems

We have presented a supersymmetric E_6 GUT model with anomalous $U(1)_X$, which incorporates a novel mechanism for yielding nonparallel mass structures between up-quark and down-quark/charged-lepton sectors.

The hierarchical mass structure is basically explained by the Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism using the $U(1)_X$ quantum numbers. However, in large unification models with gauge group larger than $SO(10)$, the whole members of each generation fall into a single multiplet and hence must carry a common value of the $U(1)_X$ charge. Therefore a straightforward application of the Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism would yield a common hierarchical mass matrix to all the up-, down- and lepton sectors, in contradiction to the observation. It seems due to this 'difficulty' that many authors who try to explain the mass hierarchy by the Froggatt-Nielsen

mechanism adopt smaller unification gauge groups, or even discard the grand unification framework.

However we have proposed a novel mechanism which can overcome this difficulty in an E_6 GUT framework. We pointed out that there is a freedom of $SU(2)_E$ inner automorphism in E_6 in embedding $SO(10)$ in such a way that $SU_{GG}(5) \subset SO(10) \subset E_6$. As a reflection of this, the fundamental representation 27 contains two $SU(5)$ 5 (and 1) components, giving a spinor representation of $SU(2)_E$, and an arbitrary linear combination of those two together with 10 and a 1 can form a 16 multiplet of an $SU(2)_E$ -rotated $SO(10)$. Our low energy fermions plus a right-handed neutrino just give an $SO(10)$ 16 at each generation. However, the $SO(10)$'s chosen by three generations need not be the same but may be $SU(2)_E$ rotated from one another. Moreover yet another $SU(2)_E$ rotation can occur also in the Higgs 27. Based on this observation, we examined the simplest and typical version in which the $SO(10)$'s chosen by the first and second families coincide but the $SO(10)$ of the third family is rotated by angle θ from it.

It is remarkable that this simplest E-twisted scenario can reproduce all the characteristic features of the fermion masses, not only the Dirac masses but also the Majorana masses, by introducing only two Higgs fields $H(27)$ and $H^c(27)$, paired with $H(\overline{27})$ and $H^c(\overline{27})$. The small $SU(2)_E$ rotation with $\sin^2 \theta$ in the Higgs sector explains why the bottom quark is $\frac{1}{2}$ times lighter than the top quark, and why the mixing between the second and third generation neutrinos is very large. The high mass scale M and M^0 for the superheavy fermions are supplied by the two Higgs fields H and H^c , and their partners H and H^c at the same time give the right handed neutrino masses.

We here did not use any higher representations for Higgs fields. Note, however, that 27 of E_6 contains no $SU(5)$ nonsinglet component which is standard gauge group singlet. So, to break $SU(5)$ symmetry, we need at least one Higgs field of higher representations, as far as we stick to the conventional GUT framework. Another possibility is to use the symmetry breaking mechanism by Wilson lines, as suggested by string theory. We also did not discuss the detailed differences between the down-quark and charged-lepton mass matrices. If one wishes to utilize Georgi-Jarlskog type mass matrix, one needs 45 representation of $SU(5)$ which is not included in 27.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Takeo Matsuoka, Naotoshi Okamura, Joe Sato, Tsutomu Yanagida and Koichi Yoshioka for stimulating discussions. They also thank Summer Institute '98 held at Kyoto, where this work has been started inspired by the stimulating seminars

and discussions there. One of the authors (M.B.) would like to thank the Aspen Center for Physics for its hospitality and Pierre Ramond for valuable discussions. M.B. and T.K. are supported in part by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research No. 09640375 and No. 10640261, respectively, from the Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture, Japan.

Appendix A

Representation 27 and Maximal Subgroups of E_6

The adjoint representation 78 of E_6 is decomposed under its maximal subgroup $SO(10) \times U(1)_{V^0}$ as $78 = 16_3 + \overline{16}_3 + 45_0 + 1_4$ (The subscripts denote the values of the $U(1)_{V^0}$ charge), so that the E_6 generators are given by $SO(10)$ 16 Weyl-spinor generators $E_{\pm}^{\pm} (= 1; \pm 16)$ and their complex conjugates $\overline{E}^{\pm} = (E^{\pm})^{\dagger}$ in addition to the 45 $SO(10)$ generators T_{MN} and one $U(1)$ generator T . The algebra is given by¹⁹⁾

$$\begin{aligned} [T_{MN}; T_{KL}] &= i(NK T_{ML} - ML T_{NK} - MK T_{NL} - NL T_{MK}); \\ [T_{MN}; \frac{E}{E}] &= \begin{pmatrix} (MN) & 0 \\ 0 & (MN) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} E \\ \overline{E} \end{pmatrix}; \\ [T; \frac{E}{E}] &= \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \begin{pmatrix} E \\ \overline{E} \end{pmatrix}; \\ [E; \overline{E}] &= \frac{1}{2} (MN) T_{MN} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} T; \end{aligned} \quad (A.1)$$

(The $U(1)_{V^0}$ charge V^0 is related to T by $V^0 = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} T$, and T here is normalized comm only to the other charges; $\text{Tr}(T^2) = \text{Tr}(T_{MN}^2) = \text{Tr}(\overline{E} E)$ (not summed over M, N)). The simplest representation 27 of E_6 is decomposed into $1_4 + 16_1 + 10_2$ under $SO(10) \times U(1)_{V^0}$, and so can be denoted $\psi_A (0; \pm \frac{1}{2})$ with ψ and M being $SO(10)$ (Weyl)-spinor and vector indices, respectively. The E_6 generators act on this representation as¹⁹⁾

$$\begin{aligned} T + \frac{1}{2} K_L T_{KL} + E + \overline{E} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \psi_B & \psi_C \\ \psi_A & \psi_A \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} K_L (K_L) & \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{3} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} (T C^Y_M) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} (N C^T) & \psi_A & \psi_A \\ i_{MN} & \frac{1}{3} M_N & N \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (A.2)$$

where $i_{MN} = (M^Y_N - N^Y_M) = 4i$ is a 16×16 spinor representation matrix of the $SO(10)$ generators T_{MN} . The ψ_M and C are the 16×16 matrices with which the $SO(10)$ -

matrices M and the charge conjugation matrix $C_{(10)}$, satisfying $M_N + N_M = 2\delta_{MN}$ and $C_{(10)}^{-1} M C_{(10)} = M^T$ and $C_{(10)} = C_{(10)}^T$, are given in the form :

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (M) \\ (Y_M) & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad C_{(10)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & C^T \\ C & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad (A.3)$$

Note that $C_{(10)}^{-1} M C_{(10)}$ and $M C_{(10)}$ are symmetric matrices.

An E_6 invariant can be constructed using three 27's and is given by the formula Eq. (2.10), $^{ABC}{}_{1A}{}_{2B}{}_{3C}$, where ABC is a totally symmetric tensor⁸⁾

$$^{ABC} : \text{totally symmetric in } (A; B; C); \quad \begin{cases} ^{OMN} = \frac{1}{2} \delta^{MN} \\ ^{MN} = \frac{1}{2} (C^{-1})^M_N \\ \text{otherwise } 0 \end{cases} \quad (A.4)$$

By taking a concrete representation for M and C ,⁸⁾ in which the $SO(10)$ spinor 16, ψ , is represented in the form

$$(16) = \begin{pmatrix} u_j \\ d_j \\ e \\ d^{cj} \\ u^j \\ e^c \end{pmatrix}; \quad (A.5)$$

the explicit form for the $SO(10)$ invariant $16 \otimes 10 \otimes 16$, $\frac{1}{1} (C H_M M)_{27}$, which appears in $^{ABC}{}_{1A}{}_{2B}{}_{3C} H_C (27)$ is replaced by $H_C (27)$, for easiness to see) is given as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{1} (16) C H_M (10) \frac{1}{2} (16) \\ & = (u_1^{ci} H^T + d_1^{ci} H^0) \begin{pmatrix} u_i \\ d_i \\ u^{ci} \\ d^{ci} \end{pmatrix} + (e_1^T H + e_1^0 H^0) \begin{pmatrix} e \\ d^{cj} \\ u^j \\ e^c \end{pmatrix} \\ & + H_i (e^c)_{1j} \begin{pmatrix} u_i \\ d_i \end{pmatrix} + H^{0i} (e^c)_{1j} \begin{pmatrix} u_i \\ d_i \end{pmatrix} \\ & + \epsilon_{ijk} H^{0i} u_1^{cj} d_2^{ck} + \epsilon^{ijk} H_i u_{1j} d_{2k} + (1 \leftrightarrow 2) \end{aligned} \quad (A.6)$$

where $i; j; k$ refers to $SU(3)$ color and the components of $H_M (10)$ are denoted by

$$\begin{aligned} H(5) &= \begin{pmatrix} H_i \\ H_x \\ H_y \end{pmatrix}; \quad \begin{cases} H_i = \frac{1}{2} (H_{M=i+3} + iH_{M=i}) \\ H_x = \frac{1}{2} (iH_7 - H_8) \\ H_y = \frac{1}{2} (H_0 + iH_9) \end{cases} \\ H(5^0) &= \begin{pmatrix} H^{0i} \\ H^0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad \begin{cases} H^{0i} = \frac{1}{2} (H_{M=i+3} - iH_{M=i}) \\ H_x^0 = \frac{1}{2} (iH_7 - H_8) \\ H_y^0 = \frac{1}{2} (H_0 - iH_9) \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (A.7)$$

These $SU(5)$ 5 and 5 components, $H(5)$ and $H(5)$, corresponds to the decomposition $10 = 5_2 + 5_2$ given in Eq. (24) for $M(10)$. Then $SO(10)$ invariant $H_M M$ is given

$$H_M(10) M(10) = (H^{0i} H^{0j}) \begin{pmatrix} B \\ C \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} D_i \\ E^c \\ N^c \end{pmatrix} + (D^{ci} (E; N)) \begin{pmatrix} H_i \\ H \end{pmatrix} \quad (A-8)$$

In connection with this $SU(5)$ decomposition, we note that the above $SO(10)$ invariant $16 \cdot 10 \cdot 16$ given in Eq. (A6) is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} (16) C H_M(10) \frac{1}{2} (16) &= \frac{1}{2^2} \epsilon^{ijklm} \epsilon_{1ij}(10) \epsilon_{2kl}(10) H_m(5) \\ &+ \epsilon_{1ij}(10) H^i(5) \epsilon_j(5) \epsilon^c H_i(5) \epsilon^i(5) + (1 \otimes 2)^0 \end{aligned} \quad (A-9)$$

in terms of $SU(5)$ components, $\epsilon_{1ij}(10)$, $\epsilon^i(5)$ and $\epsilon^c(1)$ contained in (16):

$$\epsilon_{ij}(10) = \begin{pmatrix} B \\ C \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_j \\ d_j \\ e^c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ e^c \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad \epsilon^i(5) = \begin{pmatrix} B \\ C \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e^c \\ e^c \\ e^c \end{pmatrix} \quad (A-10)$$

Under a maximal subgroup $SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R \times SU(3)_C \subset E_6$, the $A(27)$ is decomposed into the following three irreducible components

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{i_L j_C} (3; 1; 3) &= \begin{pmatrix} B \\ C \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_j \\ d_j \\ e^c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ e^c \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad \epsilon_{i_C j_R} (1; 3; 3) = (u^{ci} d^{ci} D^{ci}); \\ \epsilon_{i_R j_L} (3; 3; 1) &= \begin{pmatrix} 1_L \\ 2_L \\ 3_L \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} N^c \\ E^c \\ e \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e^c \\ e^c \\ e^c \end{pmatrix}; \end{aligned} \quad (A-11)$$

where the subscripts L, R, C are attached to the indices i, j to distinguish which of $SU(3)$'s the indices refer to, and the component fields are those defined in Eqs. (2-3) - (2-5). In terms of these $SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R \times SU(3)_C$ component fields, the E_6 invariant (2-10), $A^{ABC} \epsilon_{1A} \epsilon_{2B} \epsilon_{3C}$, trilinear in 27 can be written in the form:

$$\begin{aligned} A^{ABC} \epsilon_{1A} \epsilon_{2B} \epsilon_{3C} &= \epsilon_{i_C j_R}^{1_L} \epsilon_{2_L}^{k_L} \epsilon_{3_L}^{i_C} + (3! - 1 \text{ permutations of } (1; 2; 3)) \\ &+ \epsilon_{i_L j_C}^{1_L} \epsilon_{2_L}^{m_C} \epsilon_{3_L}^{n_C} + \epsilon_{i_R j_R}^{1_C} \epsilon_{2_C}^{m_C} \epsilon_{3_C}^{n_C} \\ &+ \epsilon_{i_R j_R}^{1_C} \epsilon_{2_C}^{m_C} \epsilon_{3_C}^{n_C} \end{aligned} \quad (A-12)$$

Under another maximal subgroup $SU(6) \supset SU(2)_E \times E_6$ discussed in Eq. (2.7), the $A(27)$ is decomposed into the following two irreducible components

$$_{ij}(15;1) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ u_j \\ d_j \\ D_j \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_{ijk} u^k \\ 0 \\ e^c \\ E^c \\ E^c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} D_i \\ u_i \\ d_i \\ N^c \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ A \end{pmatrix}; \quad _i(6;2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ e \\ N^c \\ S \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d^{ci} \\ E^c \\ E^c \\ N^c \\ S^c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} D^{ci} \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ A \end{pmatrix} \quad (A.13)$$

In terms of these, the same E_6 invariant (2.10) can be written in the form :

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{ABC} \epsilon_{1A} \epsilon_{2B} \epsilon_{3C} &= \frac{1}{2^3} \epsilon^{ijklmn} \epsilon_{1ij} \epsilon_{2kl} \epsilon_{3mn} \\ &+ \epsilon^{ab} \epsilon_{1ij} \epsilon_{2a}^i \epsilon_{3b}^j + (\text{cyclic permutations of } (1;2;3)) : \end{aligned} \quad (A.14)$$

It is clear from Eq. (A.13) that the $SU(2)_E$ is an $SU(2)$ subgroup of $SU(3)_R$ which acts on the second and third entries of the fundamental representation 3 of $SU(3)_R$. Note also that $SU(5)_{GG}$ and $SU(3)_L$ are regular subgroups of this $SU(6)$ such that the first five entries and the last three entries of the 6 of $SU(6)$ are the fundamental representations 5 and 3 of $SU(5)_{GG}$ and $SU(3)_L$, respectively.

Another interesting $SU(6) \supset SU(2)$ subgroup, discussed by Haba et. al.¹³⁾, is $SU(6)^0 \supset SU(2)_R \times E_6$, where $SU(6)^0 \supset SU(4)_{\text{ati-Salam}} \supset SU(2)_L$ and $SU(2)_R$ is an $SU(2)$ subgroup of $SU(3)_R$ which acts on the first and second entries of the fundamental representation 3 of $SU(3)_R$. Under this subgroup $SU(6)^0 \supset SU(2)_R$, the $A(27)$ is decomposed into the following two irreducible components

$$_{ij}(15;1) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ D_j \\ u_j \\ d_j \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_{ijk} D^k \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ e \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} D_i \\ u_i \\ d_i \\ N^c \\ S \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ A \end{pmatrix}; \quad _i(6;2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ N^c \\ E^c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d^{ci} \\ e^c \\ e^c \\ N^c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u^{ci} \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ A \end{pmatrix} \quad (A.15)$$

This subgroup $SU(6)^0 \supset SU(2)_R$ can essentially be obtained from the above $SU(6) \supset SU(2)_E$ by an inner automorphism by an element $\exp(-i J_2^{R0})$ where J_2^{R0} is the second generator of an yet another $SU(2)$ subgroup of $SU(3)_R$ which acts on the first and third entries of the fundamental representation 3 of $SU(3)_R$. Indeed, under this rotation $\exp(-i J_2^{R0})$, doublets 2 of this $SU(2)$ are changed as $(u; d) \rightarrow (d; u)$ so that the $SU(3)_R$ non-singlet components in the $SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R \times SU(3)_E$ decomposition Eq. (A.11) are transformed as

$$\begin{aligned} (u^{ci} d^{ci} D^{ci}) &\rightarrow (D^{ci} d^{ci} u^{ci}); \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 1_R \\ 2_R \\ 3_R \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1_L \\ N^c \\ E^c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2_L \\ E^c \\ N^c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 3_L \\ \epsilon \\ S \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ A \end{pmatrix} &\rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 1_R \\ 2_R \\ 3_R \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1_L \\ e \\ N^c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2_L \\ e \\ E^c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 3_L \\ S^c \\ \epsilon \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ A \end{pmatrix} : \end{aligned} \quad (A.16)$$

The field contents in Eq. (A.15) is actually obtained from Eq. (A.13) with this replacement for the component fields together with relabeling the last three indices of $SU(6)$, $(4;5;6) \rightarrow (6;4;5)$. By this inner automorphism, it is clear that the E_6 invariant trilinear in 27 is given by the same formula Eq. (A.14) also in this case. (If one wishes to have $SU(4)_{\text{ Pati-Salam}}$ which has $(u_i;)$ and $(\bar{d}_i^c; e^c)$ as its 4 and $\bar{4}$, instead of $(u_i;)$ and $(\bar{d}_i; \bar{e})$ in the Eq. (A.15), one can easily achieve it using another suitable inner automorphism by an element of $SU(2) \times SU(3)_L$, since $SU(2)$ spinors change signs under 2 rotation.)

Finally, as is now clear, yet another $SU(6) \times SU(2)$ subgroup,²⁰⁾ $SU(6)^0 \times SU(2)_R^0$, can be obtained from the $SU(6) \times SU(2)_L$ by an inner automorphism by rotation $\exp(i J_2^R)$ of $SU(2)_R$. Doing this transformation $\exp(i J_2^R)$ to Eq. (A.13), we find that the $\mathbf{A}(27)$ is decomposed under this subgroup $SU(6)^0 \times SU(2)_R^0$ into

$$_{ij}(15;1) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ u_j \\ d_j \\ D_j \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{u}_i^c \bar{d}^c \bar{c} \\ 0 \\ c \\ N \\ E \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} D_i^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} C \\ C \\ C \\ C \\ A \end{pmatrix}; \quad \mathbf{A}(6;2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ e \\ \bar{e} \\ S \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u^c i \\ N^c \\ E^c \\ \bar{e} \end{pmatrix} D^{ci-1} \begin{pmatrix} C \\ C \\ C \\ C \\ A \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Clearly the $SU(5)$ subgroup of this $SU(6)^0$, acting to the first five entries, is the flipped $SU(5)$.

References

- [1] Y. Fukuda et al, Phys. Lett. B 436 (1998), 133; *ibid.* Phys. Rev. Lett. 81 (1998) 1158.
- [2] T. Yanagida, in Proceedings of the Workshop on the Unified Theory and Baryon Number in the Universe, eds. O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto (KEK report 79-18, 1979); M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, in Supergravity, eds. P. van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Z. Freedman (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1979).
- [3] A. Yu. Smirnov, Nucl. Phys. B 466 (1996) 25; M. Bando, T. Kugo and K. Yoshioka, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1998) 3004.
- [4] C. D. Froggatt and H. B. Nielsen, Nucl. Phys. B 147 (1979), 277.
- [5] T. Yanagida, Talk given at 18th International Conference on Neutrino Physics and Astrophysics (NEUTRINO 98), Takayama, Japan, 4-9 Jun 1998; hep-ph/9809307.
- [6] F. G. Gursey, P. Ramond and P. Sikivie, Phys. Lett. 60B (1976), 177.
Y. Achiman and B. Stech, Phys. Lett. 77B (1978), 389.
P. Ramond, Sanibel Symp. (Florida, 1979) CALT-68-709.
- [7] R. Barbieri and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B 91B (1980), 369.
- [8] T. Kugo and J. Sato, Prog. Theor. Phys. 91 (1994), 1217.

- [9] N. Irges, S. Lavignac and P. Ramond, *PhysRev.D* 58 (1998) 35003.
- [10] P. Binétruy, C. Dèry, E. Dudas and P. Ramond, *PhysRevLett.* 81 (1998) 5060.
- [11] J.K. Elwood, N. Nikolaos and P. Ramond, Talk given at 6th International Symposium on Particles, Strings and Cosmology (PASCOS 98), Boston, MA, 22-27 Mar 1998; hep-ph/9808489.
- [12] J. Sato and T. Yanagida, *Phys. Lett. B* 430 (1998), 123.
- [13] N. Haba, C. Hattori, M. Matsuda and T. Matsuoka, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* 96 (1996), 1249.
- [14] P. Horava and E. Witten, *NuclPhys. B* 475 (1996) 94-114, 1996; hep-ph/9603142.
- [15] P. Binétruy, C. Dèry, E. Dudas and P. Ramond, hep-th/9807079.
- [16] I. Ibanez and G.G. Ross, *Phys. Lett.* 332B (1994), 100.
- [17] Y. Nomura and T. Yanagida, *Phys. Rev. D* 59 (1998), 17303.
- [18] Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa and S. Sakata, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* 28 (1962), 870.
- [19] K. Ito, T. Kugo and H. Kunitomo, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* 75 (1986), 386.
- [20] Y. Kawamura and M. Tanaka, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* 91 (1994), 949.