

UOA/NPPS-07/04

February 8, 2020

N=1 Supersymmetric Standard Models from Intersecting Branes

Christos Kokorelis

Institute of Nuclear Physics, N.C.S.R. Demokritos, GR-15310, Athens, Greece

and

Nuclear and Particle Physics Sector, Univ. of Athens, GR-15771 Athens, Greece

We construct the first examples of four dimensional three generation N=1 supersymmetric $SU(3)_c \otimes SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$ intersecting D6-brane models, that have the spectrum of the N=1 supersymmetric SM and have only a minimal number of (four) massless exotics that constitute a non-chiral set and also have all complex structure moduli naturally fixed by the orbifold symmetry. These models are based on orientifolds of $\mathbf{T}^6/(\mathbf{Z}_3 \times \mathbf{Z}_3)$ compactifications of IIA theory. The full spectrum of the three generation models accommodates also ν_R^c 's and three pairs of MSSM Higgs multiplets. Baryon number is not gauged but as the string scale is geometrically close to the Planck scale proton stability and a solution to the gauge hierarchy problem is guaranteed. A superpotential μ -term is always present. We also find three stack non-supersymmetric vacua with only the chiral spectrum and gauge group of the SM and no exotics, that possess a N=1 SUSY sector associated with the ν_R^c 's which is being used to break the extra U(1) surviving massless the GS mechanism. Also we find five stack non-supersymmetric vacua with exactly the massless chiral spectrum of the N=1 Standard Model + exotic matter, which using tachyonic Higgs excitations flow to only the SM. We point out that in all constructions there is no tree level mass term for the up-quarks.

1 INTRODUCTION

Model building attempts in the context of string theory have by far been explored both into the context of heterotic string compactifications (HSC) and in $N=1$ orientifolds (OR) where a number of semirealistic models have been explored and analyzed [1]. In the absence of a dynamical principle for selecting a particular string vacuum and simultaneously fix all moduli, the standard lore is to systematically analyze on phenomenological grounds the different string compactifications.

Over the last few years, model building attempts coming from intersecting branes (IB's) [2]-[33] have received a lot of attention as it become possible to construct ¹ - for the first time in string theory - non-supersymmetric (non-SUSY) four dimensional (4D) vacua with only the SM at low energy using intersecting D6-branes [8, 9, 10] from 4D toroidal orientifolds of type IIA. We note that constructions with D6-branes intersecting at angles are T-dual to constructions with magnetic deformations (MD) [3, 4], even though the intersecting D-brane models has not yet been shown to be reproducible by the MD side. These IB models have interesting properties like, a stable proton, mass terms for all SM matter and also incorporate right handed neutrinos. In this context, vacua based on non-SUSY Pati-Salam GUT constructions (with a stable proton), which break to the SM at low energy, giving masses to all exotics, have been also constructed and analyzed [11]. All the above models have vanishing RR tadpoles and uncanceled NS-NS tadpoles (coming from the closed string sector), the latter acting as an effective cosmological constant [6]. On phenomenological grounds the string scale may be at the TeV; however as the D6-branes wrap the whole of internal space and there are no dimensions transverse to all branes, the presence of a TeV scale cannot be explained according to the AADD mechanism [30]. Nevertheless, we note that intersecting brane worlds accommodate nicely the AADD [30] solution to the gauge hierarchy problem by providing us with the only known string realization of this mechanism, that is toroidal models with large extra dimensions that break only to the SM at low energy (these models have broken supersymmetry). The latter models are based on D5-branes intersecting at angles in the compact part of $T^4 \times C/Z_N$ [12, 13].

Non-supersymmetric semirealistic GUTS in Z_3 orientifolds [6] of intersecting branes have been also analyzed and $SU(5)$ and flipped $SU(5)$ GUTS has also been shown to exist

¹In IB's chiral fermions get localized in the open string sector of the theory

[17] that break only to the SM at low energies ².

Moreover, the construction of vacua which have only the MSSM at low energies, has been also studied using either N=1 supersymmetric models or N=0 models that localize in part of their spectrum the MSSM. In the latter case, the MSSM is localized as part of the non-supersymmetric open string spectrum [15, 16]. In the former case, N=1 semirealistic supersymmetric vacua based on intersecting D6-branes has also been explored in four dimensional orientifolds of type IIA on $\mathbf{T}^6/\mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{Z}_2$ [7], $\mathbf{T}^6/\mathbf{Z}_4$ [20], $\mathbf{T}^6/\mathbf{Z}_2 \times \mathbf{Z}_4$ [21], and $\mathbf{T}^6/\mathbf{Z}_6$ [22], where also GUT constructions have been analyzed [7, 23, 25]. The main characteristics of all the models is that not all complex structure moduli are fixed and in some of these constructions part of their spectrum includes those of the N=1 SM in addition to extra massless chiral exotics [7], [22] or massless non-chiral exotics [20] [We also note that there are model building attempts from orientifolds of Gepner models where also the N=1 SM, with three pairs of H_u , H_d MSSM Higgs multiplets, was found but in the presence of extra massless non-chiral exotics [34].]. In the contrary in the N=1 intersecting D6-brane models presented in this work we have the following different features than other intersecting brane constructions (IBC's): a) the N=1 models have the spectrum of the N=1 SM in the presence of three pairs of MSSM Higgs multiplets H_u , H_d in addition to massless non-chiral exotics (as in Gepner type models [34]), b) we have all complex structure moduli fixed, something which is known to be happening only to models with fluxes. A comment is in order. In [22] the spectrum of the N=1 SM with no Higgs multiplets appears. The required 3 pairs of Higgs doublets H_u , H_d appear in [22] only after brane recombination (BR) is used. BR corresponds to processes that are not described by a free world-sheet CFT and thus CFT methods cannot be applied (rather string field theory may be used) in the calculation of spectrum and interactions. In those cases, brane recombination (BR) proceeds via flat directions that involve the presence of Higgs multiplets in previously massive N=2 sectors. BR can also may be used to perform similar transition examples in the five stack N=0 SM constructions of the present work. BR models can not be considered as realistic at present.

Leaving aside the cosmological constant problem - that no model of particle physics can offer a satisfactory solution - the most difficult issue that N=1 intersecting D-brane model building constructions face today is the lack of a construction (or a mechanism) that eliminates the bifundamental massless exotics from their spectrum.

²For some attempts to derive the SM but not based in a string construction see [35].

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the appearance of (8-stack) N=1 supersymmetric models that have only a minimal number of non-chiral massless exotics and simultaneously localize the massless spectrum of the N=1 SM at low energies. These models are based on four dimensional type IIA orientifolds on $\mathbf{T}^6/\mathbf{Z}_3 \times \mathbf{Z}_3$ with D6-branes intersecting at angles. During this investigation we also find 3- and 5-stack non-supersymmetric models which break to only the SM at low energy. In N=1 models most of the extra matter will become massive leaving only the massless spectrum of the MSSM below M_s in addition to two (2) non-chiral pairs of massless exotics. In the following, where we will refer to the MSSM we will mean not the usual global N=1 SUSY version of the SM with one pair of Higgs multiplets, but the intersecting brane version of it, that is associated with three families of right handed neutrinos and three pairs of Higgs multiplets.

In section 2 we will present the key features of the $\mathbf{T}^6/\mathbf{Z}_3 \times \mathbf{Z}_3$ constructions, including the gauge group structure and spectrum rules. The details of the construction together with examples for GUT model building will be presented in a companion paper [18]. In section 3 we discuss N=0 three generation (3G) supersymmetric models with the chiral spectrum of the N=1 SM that localize only the SM chiral spectrum after tachyonic Higgs excitations are used to make massive the extra exotic fermions. In section 4 we also discuss the deformation of these N=0 3G models to other N=0 3G models, by describing three stack intersecting D6-models which localize the directly only the SM. In section 5, we examine whether or not it is possible to construct N=1 models by using 4-stacks of D6's. We find that only N=0 models are possible to be constructed. In section 6 we present more possibilities for constructing N=0 3G models by using five stacks of intersecting D6-branes. Here it is also possible to construct N=0 vacua with only the SM at low energy. In section 7 we construct N=1 models by using eight (8) stacks of D6-branes. All models have the N=1 SM and two massless non-chiral pair of exotics surviving to low energies. We also discuss alternative possibilities for phenomenologically successful semirealistic N=1 models which may also solve the μ -problem. Section 8 contains our conclusions.

2 SPECTRUM ON $T^6/Z_3 \times Z_3$ ORIENTIFOLDS, RR TADPOLES & ANOMALY CANCELLATION

Our orientifold constructions originate from IIA theory compactified on the $\mathbf{T}^6/(\mathbf{Z}_3 \times \mathbf{Z}_3)$ orbifold, where the latter symmetry is generated by the twist generators (where $\alpha =$

$e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}} \theta : (z_1, z_2, z_3) \rightarrow (\alpha z_1, \alpha^{-1} z_2, z_3)$, $\omega : (z_1, z_2, z_3) \rightarrow (z_1, \alpha z_2, \alpha^{-1} z_3)$, where θ, ω get associated to the twists $v = \frac{1}{3}(1, -1, 0)$, $u = \frac{1}{3}(0, 1, -1)$. Here, $z^i = x^{i+3} + ix^{i+5}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ are the complex coordinates on the T^6 , which we consider as being factorizable for simplicity, e.g. $T^6 = T^2 \otimes T^2 \otimes T^2$. In addition, to the orbifold action the IIA theory is modded out by the orientifold action ΩR that combines the worldsheet parity Ω and the antiholomorphic operation $R : z^i \rightarrow \bar{z}^i$. Because the orbifold action has to act crystallographically on the lattice the complex structure on all three T^2 tori is fixed to be $U_A^I = 1/2 + i\sqrt{3}/2$. The model contains nine kinds of orientifold planes, that get associated to the orbit \mathcal{O} consisting of the actions of ΩR , $\Omega R\theta$, $\Omega R\omega$, $\Omega R\theta^2$, $\Omega R\omega^2$, $\Omega R\theta\omega$, $\Omega R\theta^2\omega$, $\Omega R\theta\omega^2$, $\Omega R\theta^2\omega^2$. We will be interested on the open string spectrum and not discuss the closed string spectrum that contains gravitational multiplets and orbifold moduli. In order to cancel the RR crosscap tadpoles introduced by the introduction of the orientifold planes we introduce N D6_{*a*}-branes wrapped along three-cycles that are taken to be products of one-cycles along the three two-tori of the factorizable T^6 . A D6-brane a is associated with the equivalence class of wrappings (n^I, m^I) , $I = 1, 2, 3$, and is mapped under the orbifold and orientifold action to its images

$$a \leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} n_a^1, m_a^1 \\ n_a^2, m_a^2 \\ n_a^3, m_a^3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \theta a \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} -m_a^1, (n-m)_a^1 \\ (m-n)_a^2, -n_a^2 \\ n_a^3, m_a^3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Omega R a \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} (n-m)_a^1, -m_a^1 \\ (n-m)_a^2, -m_a^2 \\ (n-m)_a^3, -m_a^3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.1)$$

In ΩR orientifolds the twisted disk tadpoles vanish [28]. The $Z_3 \times Z_3$ orientifold models are subject to the cancellation of untwisted RR tadpole conditions [18] given by

$$\sum_a N_a Z_a = 4, \quad (2.2)$$

where

$$Z_a = 2m_a^1 m_a^2 m_a^3 + 2n_a^1 n_a^2 n_a^3 - n_a^1 n_a^2 m_a^3 - n_a^1 m_a^2 n_a^3 - m_a^1 n_a^2 n_a^3 - m_a^1 m_a^2 n_a^3 - m_a^1 n_a^2 m_a^3 - n_a^1 m_a^2 m_a^3 \quad (2.3)$$

The gauge group $U(N_a)$ supported by N_a coincident D6_{*a*}-branes comes from the $a(\mathcal{O}a)$ sector, the sector made from open strings stretched between the a -brane and its images under the orbifold action. In addition, we get three adjoint $N=1$ chiral multiplets. The $a(\mathcal{O}b)$ sector, strings stretched between the brane a and the orbit images of brane b , will give I_{ab} fermions in the bifundamental (N_a, \bar{N}_b) where

$$I_{ab} = 3(Z_a Y_b - Z_b Y_a), \quad (2.4)$$

and (Z, Y) are the effective wrapping numbers with Y given by

$$Y_a = m_a^1 m_a^2 m_a^3 + n_a^1 n_a^2 n_a^3 - n_a^1 n_a^2 m_a^3 - n_a^1 m_a^2 n_a^3 - m_a^1 n_a^2 n_a^3 \quad (2.5)$$

The sign of I_{ab} denotes the chirality of the associated fermion, where we choose positive intersection numbers for left handed fermions. In the sector ab' - strings stretching between the brane a and the orbit images of brane b , there are $I_{ab'}$ chiral fermions in the bifundamental (N_a, N_b) , with

$$I_{ab'} = 3(Z_a Z_b - Z_a Y_b - Z_b Y_a), \quad (2.6)$$

The theories also accommodate the following numbers of chiral fermions in symmetric (S) and antisymmetric (A) representations of $U(N_a)$, open strings stretching between the brane a and its orbit images ($\mathcal{O}a$),

$$(A_a) = 3(Z_a - 2Y_a), \quad (2.7)$$

$$(A_a + S_a) = \frac{3}{2}(Z_a - 2Y_a)(Z_a - 1) \quad (2.8)$$

Finally, from open strings stretched between the brane a and its orbifold images we get non-chiral massless fermions in the adjoint representation,

$$(Adj)_L : \prod_{i=1}^3 (L_{[a]}^I)^2, \quad (2.9)$$

where

$$L_{[a]}^I = \sqrt{(m_a^I)^2 + (n_a^I)^2 - (m_a^I)(n_a^I)} \quad (2.10)$$

Adjoint massless matter, including fermions and gauginos, is expected to become massive from loops once supersymmetry is broken ³, leaving only the gauge bosons massless, and we will not discuss it further. Supersymmetry may be preserved by a system of branes if each stack of D6-branes is related to the $O6$ -planes by a rotation in $SU(3)$, that is the angles $\tilde{\theta}_i$ of the D6-branes with respect to the horizontal direction in the i -th two-torus obeys the condition $\tilde{\theta}_1 + \tilde{\theta}_2 + \tilde{\theta}_3 = 0$. In the low energy theory, cubic gauge anomalies automatically cancel, due to the RR tadpole conditions (2.2). Mixed $U(1)$ -gauge anomalies also cancel due to the existence of a generalized Green-Schwarz mechanism (see [18] for further details) that makes massive only one $U(1)$ gauge field given by

$$\sum_a N_a (Z_a - 2Y_a) F_a \quad (2.11)$$

³See the discussion in the appendix of [8].

3 THE $N=0$ “MINIMAL” SUPERSYMMETRIC STANDARD MODEL

The minimal choice of obtaining an extension of the Standard model (SM) is obtained using three stacks of D6-branes. The spectrum of open strings stretching between intersecting D6-branes is calculated by the use of rules (2.4 - 2.8). To examine whether or not $N=1$ susy models are allowed we have to examine the wrappings (n, m) associated to these spectra. Next, we obtain non-supersymmetric models which localize the fermion spectrum of the intersecting brane $N=1$ MSSM. By using tachyon singlets fields we can reduce the non-supersymmetric chiral spectrum of the $N=1$ SM to only the SM at low energy.

3.1 $N=0$ SM's with the $N=1$ MSSM chiral spectrum from three stacks

The minimal choice of obtaining the SM gauge group and chiral spectrum is to start from a three stack $U(3)_a \times U(2)_b \times U(1)_c$ D6-brane construction at the string scale.

The choice of wrapping numbers

$$(Z_a, Y_a) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, (Z_b, Y_b) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, (Z_c, Y_c) = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.1)$$

satisfies the RR tadpoles and corresponds to the spectrum seen in table (1). We recognize in table (1), the chiral spectrum of the $N=1$ MSSM with three generations of right handed neutrinos (N_R) and three pairs of ‘Higgsinos’⁴. Also one $U(1)$ gauge field becomes massive through its BF couplings, namely $3F_a - 2F_b - 3F_c$, while there are two $U(1)$ ’s that survive massless the GS mechanism (2.11),

$$U(1)^Y = -(1/3)F_a - (1/2)F_b, \quad U(1)^{add} = F_a - (2/3)F_b - (10/12)F_c. \quad (3.2)$$

If we could find (n^i, m^i) wrappings that would make these models $N=1$ SUSY, then S_R could be used to break $U(1)^{add}$. In this case the following superpotential could be allowed:

$$W = H_u H_d N_R + Q_L d_L^c H_d N_R / M_s + L N_R H_u + L E_R H_d N_R / M_s + C_1 C_2 N_R \quad (3.3)$$

We observe that the μ -problem could be solved by the first term in (3.3) while the exotics C_1, C_2 form a massive Dirac pair. As the D6-branes involved wrap on generic angles the

⁴Instead of one Higgsino H_u, H_d pair in the standard global SUSY version of the MSSM

Matter	$(SU(3) \times SU(2))_{(Q_a, Q_b, Q_c)}$	$U(1)^Y$
$\{Q_L\}$	$3(3, 2)_{(1, -1, 0)}$	1/6
$\{u_L^c\}$	$3(3, 1)_{(2, 0, 0)}$	-2/3
$\{d_L^c\}$	$3(3, 1)_{(-1, 0, -1)}$	1/3
$\{L + H_d\}$	$6(1, 2)_{(0, 1, -1)}$	-1/2
$\{H_u\}$	$3(1, \bar{2})_{(0, -1, -1)}$	1/2
$\{e_L^+\}$	$3(1, 1)_{(0, -2, 0)}$	1
$\{N_R\}$	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 2)}$	0
$\{C_1\}$	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, -1)}$	1/3
$\{C_2\}$	$3(\bar{3}, 1)_{(-1, 0, -1)}$	-1/3
$\{S_R\}$	$6(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 2)}$	0

Table 1: A three generation N=0 model with the chiral context of N=1 MSSM, in addition to three N_R 's and three pairs of H_u, H_d chiral multiplets.

spectrum of table (1) is non-supersymmetric. Unfortunately, we were only able to find the wrappings of table (2) that could only make only the particles localized between the a, b branes N=1 supersymmetric ⁵. These non-supersymmetric models can still break to only the SM at low energy as the previously massive superpartner excitations of N_R 's can serve as tachyonic Higgs singlets. In this case, both the μ -term and $C_1 C_2$ term, form Dirac pairs through their Yukawa couplings to the tachyonic Higgs superpartner of N_R .

Brane	$(n^1, m^1) \times (n^2, m^2) \times (n^3, m^3)$
$\{a\}$	$(1, 0) \times (0, 1) \times (0, -1)$
$\{b\}$	$(0, 1) \times (1, 0) \times (0, 1)$
$\{c\}$	$(0, -1) \times (1, 1) \times (0, -1)$

Table 2: Wrapping numbers responsible for the generation of the N=0 models of table (1), that have the chiral spectrum of the intersecting brane N=1 MSSM.

⁵These choices have at least one zero entry among the (n, m) wrappings.

One can also check that the choice of effective wrappings

$$(Z_a, Y_a) = \begin{pmatrix} 1, & 0 \end{pmatrix}, (Z_b, Y_b) = \begin{pmatrix} 1, & 1 \end{pmatrix}, (Z_c, Y_c) = \begin{pmatrix} -1, & -2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.4)$$

gives us also the N=0 chiral SM spectrum ⁶ of table (1) with the same hypercharge assignments.

4 EXACTLY THE SM FROM THREE STACKS

In this section, we will construct non-supersymmetric models which have exactly the SM gauge group and chiral spectrum and have no exotics present. These models will be constructed as a deformation of the models of the previous section in table (1).

4.1 SM Deformations of N=0 SM'S from three stacks

Let us make the choice of wrapping numbers

$$(Z_a, Y_a) = \begin{pmatrix} 1, & 0 \end{pmatrix}, (Z_b, Y_b) = \begin{pmatrix} 1, & 1 \end{pmatrix}, (Z_c, Y_c) = \begin{pmatrix} -1, & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.1)$$

This choice satisfies the RR tadpoles and corresponds to the spectrum seen in table (3). The intersection numbers are

$$\begin{aligned} I_{ab} &= 3, & (A)_a &= 3, & I_{bc^*} &= 3, \\ (A)_b &= -3, & I_{ac} &= -3, & (A + S)_c &= -3 \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

From (2.11) there is one anomalous U(1) which becomes massive

$$U(1)^{massive} = 3F_a - 2F_b + F_c \quad (4.3)$$

and two anomaly free U(1)'s that correspond to the hypercharge and an extra U(1)

$$U(1)^Y = -\frac{1}{3}F_a - \frac{1}{2}F_b, \quad U(1)^{ex} = -\frac{3}{13}F_a + \frac{2}{13}F_b + F_c \quad (4.4)$$

We recognize in table (3) exactly the chiral spectrum of the SM as at this point the spectrum for generic angles is non-supersymmetric. Exactly the same - but with opposite U(1) charges - non-supersymmetric chiral spectrum construction was found in [6] from intersecting D6-branes in Z_3 orientifolds. In this work, we succeed to find the same

⁶Apart for some differences in the U(1) charges involved

Matter	$(SU(3) \times SU(2))_{(Q_a, Q_b, Q_c)}$	$U(1)^Y$
$\{Q_L\}$	$3(3, 2)_{(1, -1, 0)}$	$1/6$
$\{u_L^c\}$	$3(\bar{3}, 1)_{(2, 0, 0)}$	$-2/3$
$\{d_L^c\}$	$3(3, 1)_{(-1, 0, 1)}$	$1/3$
$\{L\}$	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 1)}$	$-1/2$
$\{e_L^+\}$	$3(1, 1)_{(0, -2, 0)}$	1
$\{N_R\}$	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, -2)}$	0

Table 3: A three generation chiral (open string) spectrum accommodating the SM. The required Higgs may come from bifundamental N=2 hypermultiplets in the N=2 bc , bc^* sectors [8, 9, 10] that may trigger brane recombination.

chiral content as the Standard Models found in [6]. In [6] the breaking of the extra U(1) surviving massless the Green-Schwarz mechanism proceeds via tachyonic excitations in the sector accommodating the right handed neutrino. In the present models we don't have to use Higgs tachyons as the N_R sector is N=1 supersymmetric - no tachyons present in this sector - and thus its superpartner can be used to break the extra U(1) - beyond hypercharge - that survives massless the Green-Schwarz mechanism. Thus the extra U(1) associated to $U(1)^{ex}$ may be broken from the vev of the superpartner of N_R .

Choices of wrappings satisfying the constraints (4.1) and respecting a N=1 SUSY can be seen in table (4). Other choices preserving the same or a different supersymmetry for the c-brane may be easily found. We note that is is also possible for the c-brane to preserve N=2 supersymmetry, while the rest of the branes being non-supersymmetric. These examples may be seen in table (5). We also note that for the choices of wrappings seen in tables (4), (5), the matter field Q_L belongs to a N=1 supermultiplet as the intersection ab preserves the r_2 susy. Baryon (and lepton) number is not conserved but as the string scale in these models is naturally close to Planck scale we do expect a natural enhancement of gauge mediated proton decay modes and thus proton stability is guaranteed.

The exchange of wrappings

$$(Z_a, Y_a) \leftrightarrow (Z_b, Y_b) \quad (4.5)$$

is a symmetry of the theory as the spectrum and hypercharge of table (3) do not change under the exchange (4.5), which just reverses the $U(1)_a$, $U(1)_b$ charges ⁷.

There is another symmetry under which the spectrum remains invariant. The spectrum remains invariant under the interchanges

$$(n, m)_a \leftrightarrow (n, m)_b, \quad (n, m)_a \leftrightarrow (n, m)_c, \quad (n, m)_b \leftrightarrow (n, m)_c \quad (4.6)$$

applied in the wrappings of tables (4), (5), ⁸ thus resulting in new N=0 models. Some examples of this spectrum symmetry applied in the wrappings of table (5) may be seen in appendix A. We also note that there are no massless N=1 Higgs multiplets that can serve as Higgs fields for electroweak symmetry breaking (ESB). Instead the only Higgs

<i>Brane</i>	$(n^1, m^1) \times (n^2, m^2) \times (n^3, m^3)$	SUSY preserved
$\{a\}$	$(1, 0) \times (0, 1) \times (0, -1)$	—
$\{b\}$	$(1, 1) \times (1, 0) \times (-1, -1)$	—
$\{c\}$	$(1, 1) \times (-1, 0) \times (-1, -1)$	r_2

Table 4: Wrapping numbers responsible for the generation of the three stack D6-brane non-supersymmetric Standard Models of table (3), where the c-brane preserves N=1 supersymmetry. The ab intersection is also N=1 supersymmetric for this choice of wrappings.

available for this model may come from bifundamental scalars that are part of the massive spectrum of the N=2 sector of open strings stretched between the U(2) brane and the brane and/or the orientifold image of the U(1) c-brane ; as the b,c and b,c^{*} branes are parallel in at least one complex plane along the different orbits. The available electroweak Higgs have the quantum numbers

$$h_1 = (1, 2)_{(0, 1, -1)}, \quad h_2 = (1, \bar{2})_{(0, -1, 1)}, \quad h_3 = (1, 2)_{(0, 1, 1)}, \quad h_4 = (1, \bar{2})_{(0, -1, -1)} \quad (4.7)$$

⁷obviously leaving invariant the hypercharge under field redefinition

⁸As matter as it concerns the type of N=1 supersymmetries preserved, we follow the notation of the first reference of [11].

<i>Brane</i>	$(n^1, m^1) \times (n^2, m^2) \times (n^3, m^3)$	SUSY preserved
$\{a\}$	$(1, 0) \times (0, 1) \times (0, -1)$	—
$\{b\}$	$(1, 1) \times (1, 0) \times (-1, -1)$	—
$\{c\}$	$(1, 1) \times (1, 1) \times (1, 0)$	r_2, r_0

Table 5: Wrapping numbers responsible for the generation of the three stack non-supersymmetric D6-brane Standard Models of table (3), where the c-brane preserves N=2 supersymmetry. The ab intersection is also N=1 supersymmetric for this choice of wrappings.




Figure 1: Brane positions in the SM's of table (3) for the wrapping choices of table (4).

We note [see also [8, 9, 10]] that since our theory is N=0 SUSY, as there are no massless Higgsinos, the Higgs scalars become tachyonic by varying the distance between the parallel branes.

Another three stack N=0 model with the chiral spectrum of only the SM can be derived from the wrapping numbers (4.1) by deforming around the Y_c wrapping number. Thus the choice of wrappings

$$(Z_a, Y_a) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, (Z_b, Y_b) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, (Z_c, Y_c) = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.8)$$

provide us with the spectrum of table (3) but with reversed $U(1)_c$ charge. In this case the $U(1)$ gauge field which becomes massive through its nonzero coupling to the RR fields is given by $3F_a - 2F_b - F_c$. Also the hypercharge and the extra $U(1)$ are given respectively by

$$U(1)^Y = -\frac{1}{3}F_a - \frac{1}{2}F_b, \quad U(1)^{add} = -\frac{3}{13}F_a + \frac{2}{13}F_b + F_c \quad (4.9)$$

A set of wrappings for which only the c-brane preserves N=1 supersymmetry in the models associated with the effective wrappings (4.8) is given in table (6). A different set of wrappings for which the brane preserves instead a N=2 susy may be seen in table (7).

<i>Brane</i>	$(n^1, m^1) \times (n^2, m^2) \times (n^3, m^3)$	SYSY preserved
$\{a\}$	$(1, 0) \times (0, 1) \times (0, -1)$	—
$\{b\}$	$(1, 1) \times (1, 0) \times (-1, -1)$	—
$\{c\}$	$(0, -1) \times (0, 1) \times (-1, 0)$	r_0

Table 6: Wrapping numbers in the three stack non-supersymmetric D6-brane Standard Models of the wrapping choices (4.8). The c-brane preserves a N=1 susy.

One can also check that the wrapping solutions of table (6) have a S3 permutational symmetry that allows the individual pairs of wrappings (n^i, m^i) of the T_i^2 tori to permute with the wrappings of the other T_i^2 , $i \neq j$, tori. We also note that in all models there is no mass term for the up-quarks.

<i>Brane</i>	$(n^1, m^1) \times (n^2, m^2) \times (n^3, m^3)$	SYSY preserved
$\{a\}$	$(1, 0) \times (0, 1) \times (0, -1)$	—
$\{b\}$	$(1, 1) \times (1, 0) \times (-1, -1)$	—
$\{c\}$	$(0, 1) \times (0, 1) \times (1, 0)$	r_0, r_2

Table 7: Wrapping numbers responsible for the non-supersymmetric three stack D6-brane Standard Models of the wrapping choices (4.8). The c-brane preserves a N=2 susy.

5 FOUR STACKS OF D6-BRANES and MASSIVE EXOTICS

In this section, we will exhibit the appearance of three generation non-supersymmetric models by using four stacks of D6-branes. We will not give a very detail description of

these models as the issue of whether the SM gauge group survives massless to low energies is plagued due to existence of multiwrappings. We are considering a system of four stacks of D6-branes, namely we start with a gauge group $U(3)_a \times U(2)_b \times U(1)_c \times U(1)_d$ at the string scale M_s .

5.1 The N=0 Standard Models

We choose the effective wrappings

$$\begin{aligned} (Z_a, Y_a) &= \begin{pmatrix} 1, & 1 \end{pmatrix}, (Z_b, Y_b) = \begin{pmatrix} 1, & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ (Z_c, Y_c) &= \begin{pmatrix} 1, & 1 \end{pmatrix}, (Z_d, Y_d) = \begin{pmatrix} -2, & -2 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

This set of wrappings satisfies the RR tadpole conditions (2.2) and for the choice of wrappings seen in table (8) the models are non-supersymmetric [Further choices of wrappings generating non-supersymmetric models with the same spectrum may be seen in appendix B]. The chiral spectrum of the set of wrappings (5.1) that is associated with the hypercharge assignment $U(1)^Y = (1/3)F_a + (1/2)F_b$ may be seen in table (9). At this point a comment is in order. The value of the wrappings of the d-brane across the third tori corresponds to twice multiwrapping across the wrappings (1, 1). The general meaning of such multiwrappings is unclear in the literature, as the presence of the multiwrapping $(2, 2) = 2(1, 1)$ is claimed by some authors that corresponds to a gauge group enhancement $U(1)_d \rightarrow U(1) \times U(1)$ [We will see in the next section that such multiwrappings are absent from the five stack intersecting D6-brane constructions].

<i>Brane</i>	$(n^1, m^1)(n^2, m^2)(n^3, m^3)$	SUSY preserved
$\{a\}$	$(1, 1)(1, 0)(-1, -1)$	—
$\{b\}$	$(1, 0)(0, 1)(0, -1)$	—
$\{c\}$	$(1, 1)(1, 0)(-1, -1)$	—
$\{d\}$	$(1, 1)(1, 0)(2, 2)$	r_1, r_2

Table 8: Wrapping numbers in the four stack D6-brane Standard Models that are generated by the choice of effective wrappings (5.1).

These N=0 SMs are indistinguishable under the exchange

$$d_L^c \leftrightarrow X_2, \quad L \leftrightarrow H_d. \quad (5.2)$$

Matter for \mathbf{Y}^1	Y^1	$(SU(3) \times SU(2))_{(Q_a, Q_b, Q_c, Q_d)}$
$\{Q_L\}$	1/6	$3(\bar{3}, 2)_{(-1, 1, 0, 0)}$
$\{u_L^c\}$	-2/3	$3(\bar{3}, 1)_{(-2, 0, 0, 0)}$
$\{d_L^c\}$	1/3	$3(1, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 1)}$
$\{L\}$	-1/2	$3(1, 2)_{(0, -1, 0, 1)}$
$\{H_u\}$	1/2	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, -1, 0)}$
$\{H_d\}$	-1/2	$3(1, 2)_{(0, -1, 0, 1)}$
$\{e_L^+\}$	1	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 2, 0, 0)}$
$\{S_1 \equiv \nu_L^c\}$	0	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 0, -2)}$
$\{S_2\}$	0	$6(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 0, -2)}$
$\{S_3\}$	0	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 1)}$
$\{X_1\}$	-1/3	$3(\bar{3}, 1)_{(-1, 0, -1, 0)}$
$\{X_2\}$	1/3	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 1)}$

Table 9: The three generation N=0 SM from four stacks of intersecting branes with its chiral spectrum with three pairs of matter Higgses and right handed neutrinos. Either one of the gauge multiplets S_I could be identified as the one associated with the right handed neutrino. The exotics triplets X_I receive a Dirac mass only with the choice of hypercharge associated to Y^1 . The massive superpartners of the singlets S_2, S_3 may be used to break the extra U(1)'s. However, the issue of whether or not the only the SM survives only at low energy is diluted from the existence of multiwrappings in table (8).

For completeness reasons we list the Yukawa couplings

$$Y_{(table\ 9)} = \lambda_d Q_L d_L^c H_d^H S_2^H / M_s + \lambda_e L e_L^+ H_d^H S_2^H / M_s + \lambda_\nu L \nu_L^c H_u^H S_3^H / M_s + \lambda_\mu^{(4)} H_u H_d S_3^H S_2^H / M_s + \lambda_{(12)} X_1 X_2 S_3^H S_2^H / M_s, \quad (5.3)$$

where by H_d^H , H_u^H , S_3^H , S_2^H we denote the massive 'superpartners' of the matter H_d , H_u , S_3 , S_2 respectively. The $H_u H_d$, $X_1 X_2$ exotic pairs form Dirac mass terms respectively, that receive a non-zero mass from the combined effect of the vevs of the scalar superpartners of S_2 , S_3 which become tachyonic.

All SM multiplets but the one associated to u_L^c transform in bifundamentals. Moreover the Yukawa couplings give masses to all quarks and leptons but the u-quark, for which the relevant term is excluded from charge conservation.

We however note that under the brane recombination (BR) $\tilde{c} = c + d$, the four stack models of table (9) flow to the non-supersymmetric three stack models of table (10).

Matter	$(SU(3) \times SU(2))_{(Q_a, Q_b, Q_c)}$	$U(1)^Y$
$\{Q_L\}$	$3(\bar{3}, 2)_{(-1, 1, 0)}$	1/6
$\{u_L^c\}$	$3(\bar{3}, 1)_{(-2, 0, 0)}$	-2/3
$\{d_L^c\}$	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, -1)}$	1/3
$\{L\}$	$3(1, 2)_{(0, -1, 1)}$	-1/2
$\{e_L^+\}$	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 2, 0)}$	1
$\{N_R\}$	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, -2)}$	0
$\{S_0\}$	$6(1, 1)_{(0, 0, -2)}$	0

Table 10: A three generation non-supersymmetric chiral (open string) spectrum accommodating the SM that result from brane recombination on the SMs of table (9). The extra singlet becomes massive by its coupling to the tachyonic scalar superpartner. The latter may be also be used to break the extra U(1), beyond hypercharge, surviving massless the Green-Schwarz mechanism.

In appendix B, we exhibit that the interchanges (4.6) are still a symmetry of the spectrum.

6 ONLY THE (N=0) SM FROM FIVE STACKS OF D6-BRANES

In this section, we will investigate the possibility to construct N=1 models by using a higher numbers of stacks, namely five stack vacua. The models we found by using five stacks will only be non-supersymmetric, even though some part of the spectrum will preserve some amount of supersymmetry. In these models the SM will survive massless below the string scale to low energies. After the Green-Schwarz anomaly cancellation the N=0 models will localize the massless chiral spectrum of the MSSM, which in turn will be reduced with the help of Higgs tachyons to that of only the SM at low energies. The five stack configuration involves the initial localization of chiral models with a $U(3)_a \times U(2)_b \times U(1)_c \times U(1)_d \times U(1)_e$ gauge group at the string scale.

6.1 The N=0 Models

These models are constructed from the effective wrapping numbers

$$\begin{aligned} (Z_a, Y_a) &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (Z_b, Y_b) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (Z_c, Y_c) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ (Z_d, Y_d) &= \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (Z_e, Y_e) = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

The above choice of wrapping numbers satisfies the RR tadpole cancellation condition (2.2). The corresponding three generation chiral spectrum can be seen in table (11).

The analysis of U(1) anomalies in the models shows that there is a massive U(1) given by the combination $U(1)^{(1)} = -3F_a + 2F_b - F_c + F_d + F_e$ and also another four U(1)'s - including the hypercharge - which survive massless the Green-Schwarz mechanism, namely the following

$$\begin{aligned} U(1)^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{3}F_a + \frac{1}{2}F_b, \quad U(1)^{(3)} = 3F_a - 2F_b - 13F_c \\ U(1)^{(4)} &= 3F_a - 2F_b + F_c + 7F_d + 7F_e, \quad U(1)^{(5)} = F_d - F_e. \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

The extra U(1)'s may be broken by the vevs of vevs of the superpartners of the S_1, S_2, S_4, S_5 , namely the $S_1^H, S_2^H, S_4^H, S_5^H$. Thus for example S_4^H may be used to break $U(1)^{(3)}$, S_5^H may be used to break $U(1)^{(5)}$, while S_1^H, S_2^H could be used to break $U(1)^{(4)}$. Thus at low energies only the SM gauge group survives.

We construct N=0 models with the spectrum of table (11). A choice of wrappings can be seen in table (12). Further examples of wrappings which describe equivalent models can be seen in appendix C, in tables (27), (28) and (29). These models of appendix C

Matter for Y^1	Y^1	$(SU(3) \times SU(2))_{(Q_a, Q_b, Q_c, Q_d, Q_e)}$
$\{Q_L\}$	1/6	$3(3, \bar{2})_{(-1, 1, 0, 0, 0)}$
$\{u_L^c\}$	-2/3	$3(\bar{3}, 1)_{(-2, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$
$\{e_L^\pm\}$	1	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 2, 0, 0, 0)}$
$\{d_L^c\}$	1/3	$3(1, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 1, 0)}$
$\{H_u\}$	1/2	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, -1, 0, 0)}$
$\{L\}$	-1/2	$3(1, 2)_{(0, -1, 0, 1, 0)}$
$\{H_d\}$	-1/2	$3(1, 2)_{(0, -1, 0, 0, 1)}$
$\{S_3 \equiv \nu_L^c\}$	0	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 1, 0)}$
$\{S_1\}$	0	$3(3, 1)_{(0, 0, 0, -2, 0)}$
$\{S_2\}$	0	$3(3, 1)_{(0, 0, 0, 0, -2)}$
$\{S_4\}$	0	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 0, 1)}$
$\{S_5\}$	0	$6(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 0, -1, -1)}$
$\{X_1\}$	-1/3	$3(\bar{3}, 1)_{(-1, 0, -1, 0, 0)}$
$\{X_2\}$	1/3	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 0, 1)}$

Table 11: On the top of the table the N=0 models with the three generation MSSM chiral spectrum with three pairs of Higgses and right handed neutrinos. Either one of the gauge multiplets S_I could be identified as the one associated with the right handed neutrino. The exotics triplets X_I form a Dirac mass term, leaving only the SM at low energy.

are constructed by the application of the interchange of wrappings - the latter being a symmetry of the spectrum - in (4.6) to the wrappings of table (12). The models of table (12) are non-susy ⁹. An interesting observation is that there is a subset of the spectrum of table (11), made of the S_3, S_1, X_1, u_L^c that respects a N=2 supersymmetry.

• Model A

The Yukawa couplings of the models appearing in table (11) are given by

$$Y^{(table\ 11)} = \lambda_d Q_L d_L^c H_d^H S_4^H / M_s + \lambda_e L e_L^\pm H_d^H S_5^H / M_s + \lambda_\nu L \nu_L^c H_u^H S_1^H / M_s +$$

⁹We follow the notation of the first reference of [11].

<i>Brane</i>	$(n^1, m^1)(n^2, m^2)(n^3, m^3)$	SUSY Preserved
$\{a\}$	$(1, 1)(1, 0)(-1, -1)$	—
$\{b\}$	$(1, 0)(0, 1)(0, -1)$	—
$\{c\}$	$(1, 1)(1, 0)(-1, -1)$	—
$\{d\}$	$(1, 1)(1, 0)(1, 1)$	r_1, r_2
$\{e\}$	$(1, 1)(1, 1)(1, 0)$	r_0, r_2

Table 12: Wrapping numbers responsible for N=0 supersymmetry in the five stack 4D three generation intersecting D6-brane models.

$$H_u H_d (\lambda_\mu^{(1)} S_4^H S_2^H / M_s + \lambda_\mu^{(2)} S_3^H S_5^H / M_s) + \lambda_x X_1 X_2 S_4^H, \quad (6.3)$$

There is a mass term for the exotic triplets which couples to the vev of the superpartner of S_4 . As the presence of these triplets can mediate scalar mediated proton decay modes such as the

$$((\bar{u}_L^c)_\alpha (d_L)_\beta) ((\bar{d}_L^c)_\gamma \nu_L) \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}, \quad (6.4)$$

it is necessary that they receive a mass which it is at least 10^{16} GeV or higher, such as proton decay is enhanced beyond the observable present limit $\Gamma_{expected}^{-1}(p \rightarrow e_L^+ \pi_o) \geq 10^{33}$ yrs [See also [14] for the calculation of proton decay rate for a virtual N=1 SU(5) model in the context of $Z_2 \times Z_2$ orientifolds.]. In this case, it is guaranteed that the scalar mediated proton decay modes are suppressed. Also a bilinear term coupled to the chiral matter H_u, H_d is present -which in a N=1 susy model would have played the role of a superpotential μ -term - is present in all models and detailed calculations of the effective action corrections are needed to fix $\lambda_\mu^{(1)}, \lambda_\mu^{(2)}$. Also there is no mass term for the up-quarks which is excluded from charge conservation.

• Model B

An alternative class of N=0 supersymmetric models, where also all exotics are massive, can be derived from the models appearing in table (11) by the exchanges

$$L \leftrightarrow H_d, \quad d_L^c \leftrightarrow X_2, \quad (6.5)$$

which can be obviously be chosen due to the degeneracy of their hypercharge. The spectrum of the new models can be seen in table (13). The Yukawa couplings of these

models are

Matter for \mathbf{Y}^1	Y^1	$(SU(3) \times SU(2))_{(Q_a, Q_b, Q_c, Q_d, Q_e)}$
$\{Q_L\}$	1/6	$3(3, \bar{2})_{(-1, 1, 0, 0, 0)}$
$\{u_L^c\}$	-2/3	$3(\bar{3}, 1)_{(-2, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$
$\{e_L^+\}$	1	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 2, 0, 0, 0)}$
$\{d_L^c\}$	1/3	$3(1, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 0, 1)}$
$\{H_u\}$	1/2	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, -1, 0, 0)}$
$\{H_d\}$	-1/2	$3(1, 2)_{(0, -1, 0, 1, 0)}$
$\{L\}$	-1/2	$3(1, 2)_{(0, -1, 0, 0, 1)}$
$\{S_3 \equiv \nu_L^c\}$	0	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 1, 0)}$
$\{S_1\}$	0	$3(3, 1)_{(0, 0, 0, -2, 0)}$
$\{S_2\}$	0	$3(3, 1)_{(0, 0, 0, 0, -2)}$
$\{S_4\}$	0	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 0, 1)}$
$\{S_5\}$	0	$6(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 0, -1, -1)}$
$\{X_1\}$	-1/3	$3(\bar{3}, 1)_{(-1, 0, -1, 0, 0)}$
$\{X_2\}$	1/3	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 1, 0)}$

Table 13: The three generation N=0 SM from from five stacks of intersecting branes with its chiral spectrum and three pairs of Higgses. On the top of the table the chiral structure of N=1 SM. The middle part exhibits the gauge singlets while the bottom part includes the triplet exotics. These models can come from the models of table (11) by the exchange (6.5). At low energy only the SM survives.

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{(table\ 13)} = & \lambda_d Q_L d_L^c H_d^H S_5^H / M_s + \lambda_e L e_L^+ H_d^H S_5^H / M_s + \lambda_\nu L \nu_L^c H_u^H S_5^H / M_s + \\
& H_u H_d (\lambda_\mu^{(1)} S_3^H S_1^H / M_s + \lambda_\mu^{(2)} S_4^H S_5^H / M_s) + X_1 X_2 (\lambda_x^{(1)} S_3^H S_1^H + \lambda_x^{(2)} S_4^H S_5^H) ,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

We observe that there is a universality in the dependence of the mass terms for the down quark, the electron and the neutrino mass on the vev of the S_5 previously massive superpartner. The latter Higgs tachyonic field could receive a vev of the order of the string

scale and can generate natural mass scales of the electroweak order in the following sence. Take for example the mass for the d-quark. Its mass is $m_d = \lambda_d u_d$, where $\langle H_d^H \rangle = v_d$. Thus the required hierarchy for the mass of the d-quark, $m_d^{exp} = 0.05$ GeV, may be generated from the exponential suppression generated by the Yukawa coupling factor λ_d of the relevant four point function. We hope to return to this issue in the future. We note that there is no mass term for the up-quarks.

- **Model C**

Another interesting class of N=0 supersymmetric models, where also all exotics are massive, can be derived from the models of table (11) by the exchanges

$$L \leftrightarrow H_d \tag{6.7}$$

These models are further analyzed in appendix D.

- **Model D**

A further N=0 3G 4D model, with the chiral spectrum of the intersecting brane N=1 SM at the string scale, is obtained by the exchange

$$d_L^C \leftrightarrow X_2 \tag{6.8}$$

on the particle spectrum of table (11). These models are examined in appendix E.

- **Brane recombination**

The string theory recombination process (BR) should be better described by string field theory. For some examples with BR involving classical methods at the level of gauge theory, see [19]. In the present models, BR works as follows : a) Under the BR $\tilde{c} = c+d+e$, the 5-stack models of table (13), flow to the three stack models of table (14).

b) Under the BR $\tilde{d} = d+e$, the 5-stack models of table (13), flow to the 4-stack models of table (15).

7 The Construction of N=1 Supersymmetric Models

We succeed in constructing N=1 supersymmetric models by using eight stacks of intersecting D6-branes.

Matter	$(SU(3) \times SU(2))_{(Q_a, Q_b, Q_{\bar{c}})}$	$U(1)^Y$
$\{Q_L\}$	$3(\bar{3}, 2)_{(-1, 1, 0)}$	1/6
$\{u_L^c\}$	$3(\bar{3}, 1)_{(-2, 0, 0)}$	-2/3
$\{d_L^c\}$	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, 1)}$	1/3
$\{L\}$	$3(1, 2)_{(0, -1, 1)}$	-1/2
$\{e_L^+\}$	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 2, 0)}$	1
$\{N_R\}$	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, -2)}$	0
$\{S_0\}$	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, -2)}$	0

Table 14: A three generation non-supersymmetric chiral (open string) spectrum accommodating the SM that comes from brane recombination on the 5-stack SM with massive exotics of table (9).

7.1 The first example of a N=1 Standard-like model

The simplest model satisfying the RR tadpole conditions and preserving N=1 supersymmetry is an eight stack model with its effective wrappings given by

$$\begin{aligned}
(Z, Y)_a &= (-1, -1), (Z, Y)_b = (-1, -1), (Z, Y)_{a_1} = (-1, -1), (Z, Y)_{c_1} = (-1, -1), \\
(Z, Y)_{c_2} &= (2, 1), (Z, Y)_{c_3} = (2, 1), (Z, Y)_{c_4} = (2, 1), (Z, Y)_{c_5} = (2, 1). \quad (7.1)
\end{aligned}$$

The initial gauge group is based on the structure $U(3)_a \times U(2)_b \times U(1)_{a_1} \times U(1)_{c_1} \times U(1)_{c_2} \times U(1)_{c_3} \times U(1)_{c_4} \times U(1)_{c_5}$. The full chiral spectrum of the N=1 models can be seen in table (19).

- Preserving N=1 SUSY

As we have seen in (7.1) the N=1 models are constructed by combining mainly two different (Z, Y) pairs. Regarding the wrappings (n, m) associated to (Z, Y) , we find a number of solutions which can preserve either a N=1 or a N=2 supersymmetry on a single D6-brane. They are listed in table (16). We classify the effective wrappings (Z, Y) by the set (s_i, l_j) for convenience. We note that even the sets of (s_i, l_j) appear to be different, they all give rise to N=1 models with the same spectrum as it is seen in table

Matter	$(SU(3) \times SU(2))_{(Q_a, Q_b, Q_c, Q_{\bar{d}})}$	$U(1)^Y$
$\{Q_L\}$	$3(\bar{3}, 2)_{(-1, 1, 0)}$	1/6
$\{u_L^c\}$	$3(\bar{3}, 1)_{(-2, 0, 0)}$	-2/3
$\{X_1 + d_L^c\}$	$6(3, 1)_{(-1, 0, 0, -1)}$	1/3
$\{X_2\}$	$3(\bar{3}, 1)_{(-1, 0, -1, 0)}$	-1/3
$\{H_d + L\}$	$6(1, 2)_{(0, -1, 0, 1)}$	-1/2
$\{H_u\}$	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, -1, 0)}$	1/2
$\{e_L^+\}$	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 2, 0)}$	1
$\{S_1\}$	$6(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 1)}$	0
$\{S_2\}$	$6(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 0, -2)}$	0

Table 15: A three generation non-supersymmetric chiral (open string) spectrum accommodating the SM that comes from brane recombination on the 5-stack SM with massive exotics of table (9).




Figure 2: Brane positions in the N=1 supersymmetric Standard-like Models of table (3) for the wrapping choices of the set solution (s_3, l_4) .

(19). The N=1 models are constructed by choosing sets of D6-brane (Z, Y) wrappings that satisfy the RR tadpoles and are associated to the sets (s_i, l_j) . Thus choosing for example the N=1 model associated to the set (s_3, l_4) we can see that all multiplets preserve the same N=1 susy. In this case all sectors of the N=1 models are N=1 supersymmetric. The brane configuration described by these N=1 models can be seen in figure 2.

If we choose the N=1 model which is described by the set (s_2, l_3) , then all sectors, but the one's localizing $X_0, Q_1, Q_2, P_1, P_2, S_0, Q_L, u_L^c, H_u, e_L^+$ which respect the supersym-

Solution	(Z, Y)	$(n^1, m^1)(n^2, m^2)(n^3, \tilde{m}^3)$	SUSY Preserved
s_1	$(2, 1)$	$(1, 1)(0, 1)(-1, 0)$	r_1
s_2	$(2, 1)$	$(0, 1)(-1, 0)(1, 1)$	r_0
s_3	$(2, 1)$	$(-1, 0)(1, 1)(0, 1)$	r_2
s_4	$(2, 1)$	$(1, 1)(0, -1)(1, 0)$	r_1, r_3
s_5	$(2, 1)$	$(0, -1)(1, 1)(1, 0)$	r_1, r_3
s_6	$(2, 1)$	$(1, 0)(0, -1)(1, 1)$	r_2, r_3
s_7	$(2, 1)$	$(0, 1)(-1, -1)(1, 0)$	r_1, r_3
s_8	$(2, 1)$	$(-1, -1)(0, 1)(1, 0)$	r_1, r_3
s_9	$(2, 1)$	$(1, 0)(0, -1)(1, 1)$	r_2, r_3
l_1	$(-1, -1)$	$(1, 1)(1, 0)(1, 1)$	r_1, r_2
l_2	$(-1, -1)$	$(1, 0)(1, 1)(1, 1)$	r_0, r_1
l_3	$(-1, -1)$	$(1, 1)(1, 1)(1, 0)$	r_0, r_2
l_4	$(-1, -1)$	$(1, 1)(-1, 0)(-1, -1)$	r_2
l_5	$(-1, -1)$	$(-1, 0)(1, 1)(-1, -1)$	r_0
l_6	$(-1, -1)$	$(-1, -1)(-1, 0)(1, 1)$	r_1
l_7	$(-1, -1)$	$(-1, -1)(-1, -1)(1, 0)$	r_0, r_2
l_8	$(-1, -1)$	$(-1, -1)(1, 0)(-1, -1)$	r_1, r_2
l_9	$(-1, -1)$	$(1, 0)(-1, 0)(1, 1)$	r_0, r_1

Table 16: Wrapping number solutions responsible for preserving either a N=1 or N=2 supersymmetries in the eight stack 4D N=1 three generation intersecting D6-brane models.

metries r_0, r_2 , respect the supersymmetry r_0 . A survey of all the N=1 supersymmetries preserved by the pairs (s_i, l_j) can be seen in table (17).

The exchange symmetries (4.6) are also in operation in the N=1 models. Let us examine the N=1 models assigned to the pair (s_1, l_6) . We apply the symmetry exchange $(n^1, m^1) \leftrightarrow (n^2, m^2)$ to the wrappings associated to (s_1, l_6) . The new wrappings (n^i, m^i) associated to (s_1, l_6) still respect the same N=1 susy. Further examples may be seen in table (18).

- U(1) anomalies

The analysis of U(1) anomalies shows that there is one U(1) which becomes massive though its couplings to RR fields, namely

$$U(1)^{mas} = 3F_a + 2F_b + F_{a_1} , \quad (7.2)$$

(s_i)	(l_j)	SUSY Preserved
$i = 1, 4, 5, 7, 8$	$j = 1, 2, 6, 8, 9$	r_1
$i = 2$	$j = 2, 3, 5, 7, 9$	r_0
$i = 3, 6, 9$	$j = 1, 3, 4, 7, 8$	r_2

Table 17: Wrapping number sets of solutions responsible for preserving a N=1 supersymmetry in the 4D N=1 three generation intersecting D6-brane models.

$N = 1$ Models	$(n^1, m^1)(n^2, m^2)(n^3, m^3)$	Rotation	SUSY Preserved
$\{l_6\}$	$(-1, -1)(-1, 0)(1, 1)$	—	r_1
$\{l_6^1\}$	$(1, 1)(-1, -1)(1, 0)$	$(n^1, m^1) \leftrightarrow (n^2, m^2)$	r_1
$\{l_6^2\}$	$(1, 1)(-1, -1)(1, 0)$	$(n^1, m^1) \leftrightarrow (n^3, m^3)$	r_2
$\{l_6^3\}$	$(1, 1)(-1, -1)(1, 0)$	$(n^2, m^2) \leftrightarrow (n^3, m^3)$	r_0
$\{s_1\}$	$(1, 1)(0, 1)(-1, 0)$	—	r_1
$\{s_1^1\}$	$(0, 1)(1, 1)(-1, 0)$	$(n^1, m^1) \leftrightarrow (n^2, m^2)$	r_1
$\{s_1^2\}$	$(-1, 0)(0, 1)(1, 1)$	$(n^1, m^1) \leftrightarrow (n^3, m^3)$	r_2
$\{s_1^3\}$	$(1, 1)(-1, 0)(0, 1)$	$(n^2, m^2) \leftrightarrow (n^3, m^3)$	r_0

Table 18: Pairs of wrappings (s_i, l_j) that - are associated with the same N=1 model - are being subject to the same rotation continue to preserve the same N=1 supersymmetry. The N=1 pairs are (l_6, s_1) , (l_6^1, s_1^1) , (l_6^2, s_1^2) , (l_6^3, s_1^3) .

while the hypercharge which remains massless is given by $(1/3)F_a - (1/2)F_b$. There is also a third $U(1)^c = (3/2)F_a + F_b - (13/2)F_{a_1}$ which is broken by the vev of the singlet S_0 , and also five more $U(1)$'s which are linear combinations of all five $U(1)$'s, $U(1)^{c_1}, \dots, U(1)^{c_5}$ and can be broken e.g. by the vev's of one of the singlets of S_1, \dots, S_5 . As there are more singlets available in the models e.g. S_1, \dots, S_9 , there are different choices of singlets that could be used to break the extra, beyond the hypercharge, surviving massless the Green-Schwarz mechanism $U(1)$'s.

- Chiral Spectrum

Most of the matter becomes massive by appropriate superpotential terms - denoted in

table (19) by using the “+” sign - while there are only ¹⁰ 2 pairs of chiral fields, *forming a non-chiral set under the surviving gauge group* $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ that we were not able to find a superpotential mass term, denoted in table (19) by using the “-” sign.

The superpotential of the models is given by

$$W = W_{(N=1 \text{ SM})} + W_\mu + W_{X_0} + W_{X_i}, \quad (7.3)$$

where

$$W_{(N=1 \text{ SM})} = \lambda_d Q_L d_L^c H_d^2 + \lambda_e L e_L^+ H_d^2 + \lambda_\nu L N_R H_u, \quad (7.4)$$

$$W_\mu = \lambda_{H_d^1} H_u H_d^1 S_2 + \lambda_{H_d^2} H_u H_d^2 S_1 + \lambda_{H_d^3} H_u H_d^3 S_4 + \lambda_{H_d^4} H_u H_d^4 S_3 + \lambda_{H_d^5} H_u H_d^5 S_6 + \\ \lambda_{H_d^6} H_u H_d^6 S_5 + \lambda_{H_d^7} H_u H_d^7 S_8 + \lambda_{H_d^8} H_u H_d^8 S_7 + \lambda_{H_d^9} H_u H_d^9 S_{10} + \lambda_{H_d^{10}} H_u H_d^{10} S_9 \quad (7.5)$$

$$W_{X_0} = \lambda_{X_1^m} X_0 X_1 S_1 + \lambda_{X_2^m} X_0 X_2 S_4 + \lambda_{X_3^m} X_0 X_3 S_3 + \lambda_{X_4^m} X_0 X_4 S_6 + \\ \lambda_{X_5^m} X_0 X_5 S_5 + \lambda_{X_6^m} X_0 X_6 S_8 + \lambda_{X_7^m} X_0 X_7 S_7 + \lambda_{X_8^m} X_0 X_8 S_{10} + \lambda_{X_9^m} X_0 X_9 S_9 \quad (7.6)$$

$$W_{X_i} = \lambda_{X_1} Q_L X_1 H_d^1 + \lambda_{X_2} Q_L X_2 H_d^4 + \lambda_{X_3} Q_L X_3 H_d^3 + \lambda_{X_4} Q_L X_4 H_d^6 + \\ \lambda_{X_5} Q_L X_5 H_d^5 + \lambda_{X_6} Q_L X_6 H_d^8 + \lambda_{X_7} Q_L X_7 H_d^7 + \\ \lambda_{X_8} Q_L X_8 H_d^{10} + \lambda_{X_9} Q_L X_9 H_d^9 \quad (7.7)$$

- Quark, lepton and extra matter masses:

The first superpotential term $W_{(N=1 \text{ SM})}$ in (7.3) generates mass terms for all SM matter multiplets but the up-quarks, where we have identify the right neutrinos with the singlet S_2 . Only the H_u , H_d^2 Higgs multiplets, the usual N=1 MSSM multiplets, couple to the N=1 SM matter at tree level. The W_{X_i} term mixes the d-quarks with the triplets X_i generating an extended see-saw mechanism for d - and X_i - quark masses. In the lowest order ¹¹ the see-saw generates masses e.g. of order $\lambda_d \langle H_d^2 \rangle$ and $(\lambda_{X_1}^2 / \lambda_d) (\langle H_d^1 \rangle^2 / \langle H_d^2 \rangle)$ for the d -quark, X_1 respectively. A rough estimate on the size of the mass scales involved could be found by e.g. assuming that $\lambda_{X_1}^2 \approx \lambda_d$. In this case, the masses of the triplets are of order of electroweak symmetry breaking as the instanton suppression cancels out, while the d-quarks receive the exponential suppression which could be of the required size

¹⁰apart from the up -quarks which are massless

¹¹and assuming that we neglect the couplings λ_{X_i} , $i \neq 1$; e.g. $\lambda_{X_i} \rightarrow 0$

Matter	Massive	$(SU(3) \times SU(2))_{(Q_a, Q_b, Q_{a1}, Q_{c1}, Q_{c2}, Q_{c3}, Q_{c4}, Q_{c5})}$	$U(1)^Y$
$\{Q_L\}$	+	$3(3^*, 2^*)_{(-1, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	1/6
$\{u_L^c\}$	-	$3(3, 1)_{(2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	-2/3
$\{d_L^c\}$	+	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	1/3
$\{H_u\}$	+	$3(1, 2^*)_{(0, -1, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	1/2
$\{H_d^2\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	-1/2
$\{e_L^+\}$	+	$3(1, 1)_{(0, -2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	1
$\{X_1\}$	+	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	1/3
$\{X_2\}$	+	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 0, -1, 0, 0, 0)}$	1/3
$\{X_3\}$	+	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0)}$	1/3
$\{X_4\}$	+	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1, 0, 0)}$	1/3
$\{X_5\}$	+	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0)}$	1/3
$\{X_6\}$	+	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1, 0)}$	1/3
$\{X_7\}$	+	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0)}$	1/3
$\{X_8\}$	+	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1)}$	1/3
$\{X_8\}$	+	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1)}$	1/3
$\{H_d^1 \equiv L\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	-1/2
$\{H_d^3\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, 0, -1, 0, 0, 0)}$	-1/2
$\{H_d^4\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0)}$	-1/2
$\{H_d^5\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, 0, 0, -1, 0, 0)}$	-1/2
$\{H_d^6\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0)}$	-1/2
$\{H_d^7\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1, 0)}$	-1/2
$\{H_d^8\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0)}$	-1/2
$\{H_d^9\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1)}$	-1/2
$\{H_d^{10}\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1)}$	-1/2
$\{S_0\}$	+	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, -2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	0
$\{S_1\}$	+	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	0
$\{S_2 \equiv N_R\}$	+	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	0
$\{S_3\}$	+	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 0, -1, 0, 0, 0)}$	0
$\{S_4\}$	+	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0)}$	0
$\{S_5\}$	+	$3(1, 1)_{(1, 0, 1, 0, 0, -1, 0, 0)}$	0
$\{S_6\}$	+	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0)}$	0
$\{S_7\}$	+	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, -1, 0)}$	0
$\{S_8\}$	+	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0)}$	0
$\{S_9\}$	+	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1)}$	0
$\{S_{10}\}$	+	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1)}$	1/3
$\{X_0\}$	+	$3(3, 1)_{(-1, 0, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	-1/3
$\{Q_1\}$	-	$3(3, 1)_{(2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	2/3
$\{Q_2\}$	-	$3(6^*, 1)_{(-2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	-2/3
$\{P_1\}$	-	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	-1
$\{P_2\}$	-	$3(1, 3^*)_{(0, -2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	+1

Table 19: A three generation N=1 SM on top of the table, in addition to three N_R 's and three pairs of H_u , H_d chiral multiplets.

if $m_d = \lambda_d \langle H_d^2 \rangle$.

The superpotential term W_{X_0} generates Dirac mass term couplings of the triplet X_0 to the rest of the triplets X_i after the singlets S_i , $i = 1, \dots, 9$, which are flat directions, obtain a vev. The present mechanism of generating a Dirac mass of the triplets, is identical to the one appearing in models of the fermionic formulation [36]. As we already have seen in (7.7) there are already contributions to the mass terms that are being generated by trilinear Yukawa type couplings in W for X_i , $i=1, \dots, 9$. Thus whether or not (7.7) is also present when the W -terms (7.6) are, will be decided when the relevant string amplitudes will be calculated. If for example it is found that $\lambda_{X_i^m} \neq 0$, $i \neq 1$; $\lambda_{X_i} \neq 0$, $i \neq 1$ then all extra triplets X_0 , X_i , $i = 1, \dots, 9$ obtain a mass; the pair (X_1, X_0) by forming a Dirac term while the rest of the X_i triplets by mixing with the first term in (7.4).

The neutrinos get also a tree level mass from a superpotential term. If for example we had identify N_R with e.g. S_0 , the only mass term for the neutrinos would have been the term $LN_R \langle Q_L d_L^c \rangle S_2^2 / M_s^3$ which depends on the vev of the chiral condensate $d_R d_L$ and is obviously very suppressed. The W_μ -term in (7.10) represents the μ -terms that are being generated from all the Higgs multiplets H_d^i , $I = 1, \dots, 9$. This μ -term is necessary to avoid a massless axion and its natural mass scale should be of the order of the electroweak symmetry breaking. In such a case, a disk instanton generated exponential area suppression factor that appears in the Yukawa couplings from intersecting branes could be responsible for the generation of the suppression factor that identifies e.g. $\lambda_{H_d^1} \langle S_2 \rangle \approx v$, etc.

Apart from the u-quark for which there is no mass term, we also find that there are no mass terms for the Q_1 , Q_2 , P_1 , P_2 , multiplets. They are obviously non-chiral with respect to the surviving gauge group $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)_Y$.

7.2 A second example of a N=1 Standard-like model

An alternative example of a N=1 supersymmetric Standard-like models is obtained by changing the identification of fields that appear in table (19). For this purpose we identify the lepton field as $L \equiv H_d^3$. In table (20), we list the N=1 multiplet structure of the N=1 models, where we have not include the S_i , X_i , Q_i , P_i fields which remain the same as the ones appearing in table (19).

The superpotential of the models is given by

$$\tilde{W} = \tilde{W}_{(N=1 \text{ SM})} + \tilde{W}_\mu + \tilde{W}_{X_0} + \tilde{W}_{X_i}, \quad (7.8)$$

Matter	Massive	$(SU(3) \times SU(2))_{(Q_a, Q_b, Q_{a1}, Q_{c1}, Q_{c2}, Q_{c3}, Q_{c4}, Q_{c5})}$	$U(1)^Y$
$\{Q_L\}$	+	$3(3^*, 2^*)_{(-1, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	1/6
$\{u_L^c\}$	-	$3(3, 1)_{(2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	-2/3
$\{d_L^c\}$	+	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	1/3
$\{H_u\}$	+	$3(1, 2^*)_{(0, -1, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	1/2
$\{H_d^2\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	-1/2
$\{e_L^+\}$	+	$3(1, 1)_{(0, -2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	1
$\{H_d^3 \equiv L\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, 0, -1, 0, 0, 0)}$	-1/2
$\{S_2 \equiv N_R\}$	+	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	-1/2
$\{H_d^1\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$	-1/2
$\{H_d^4\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0)}$	-1/2
$\{H_d^5\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, 0, 0, -1, 0, 0)}$	-1/2
$\{H_d^6\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0)}$	-1/2
$\{H_d^7\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1, 0)}$	-1/2
$\{H_d^8\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0)}$	-1/2
$\{H_d^9\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1)}$	-1/2
$\{H_d^{10}\}$	+	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1)}$	-1/2

Table 20: A three generation N=1 Standard-like model where only the 2 pairs of exotics Q_i , P_i remain massless (and u_L^c). The N=1 SM on top of the table. Also present the X_i , S_i , Q_i , P_i N=1 multiplets seen in table (19).

where

$$\tilde{W}_{(N=1 \text{ SM})} = \lambda_d Q_L d_L^c H_d^2 + \lambda_e L e_L^+ H_d^4 + \lambda_\nu L N_R H_u S_0 S_1 S_4 / M_s^3, \quad (7.9)$$

$$\tilde{W}_\mu = W_\mu, \quad \tilde{W}_{X_0} = W_{X_0}, \quad \tilde{W}_{X_i} = W_{X_i}, \quad (7.10)$$

As in the N=1 models of the previous section, the non-chiral fields Q_i , P_i remain massless, in addition to the u_L^c which remain massless in all constructions.

Other N=1 models can be obtained from the one's in tables (19), (20) by changing the assignment of the right handed neutrinos to any of the singlets S_i and/or the identification of leptons with any of the fields H_d^i .

7.3 SUPPRESSED FCNC'S in N=1 Standard-like models

Flavour changing neutral current (FCNC) processes like the ones described by the superpotential terms

$$u_L^c d_L^c d_L^c, \quad Q_L d_L^c L, \quad L L e_L^+ \quad (7.11)$$

are prevented by the imposition of an unbroken R-parity symmetry in MSSM gauge theory considerations not involving string theory. However, in string theories there are

no discrete symmetries allowed and necessarily any kind of existing discrete symmetries should be gauged. In this respect the models include naturally an R-parity which prevents the appearance of these tree level FCNC terms. FCNC processes do appear in suppressed form, as they are generated by the following superpotential terms

$$W_{(table\ 19)} = \left(\lambda'_{ijk}(L)_i(Q_L)_j(d_L^c)_k + \frac{1}{2}\lambda_{ijk}(L)_i(L)_j(e_L^+)_k \right) S_2 S_2 S_0 / M_s^3 , \quad (7.12)$$

and

$$W_{(table\ 20)} = \left(\lambda'_{ijk}(L)_i(Q_L)_j(d_L^c)_k S_0 S_2 S_4 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda_{ijk}(L)_i(L)_j(e_L^+)_k S_0 S_4^2 \right) / M_s^3 , \quad (7.13)$$

where we have suppressed weak SU(2) indices everywhere and have included generation and SU(3) colour indices of the fundamental representation. The interactions (7.12), (7.13) are valid for the N=1 models of tables (19), (20). Also because of jk antisymmetry, in the lepton number violating second term of (7.12), (7.13), $i \neq j$. String theories from intersecting branes have a natural mechanism for suppressing unwanted interactions as the Yukawa couplings depend exponentially on the area stretching between the worldsheet crossing at these intersections. In order to prove that the present modes are free of dangerous FCNC effects we have to show that the Yukawa couplings take values that are smaller than the one's allowed by the bounds on FCNC processes. However, as this is not the purpose of this work, we will treat these issues elsewhere.

8 CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we have examined the construction of three family N=1 semi-realistic supersymmetric models in intersecting brane worlds in the context $Z_3 \times Z_3$ orientifolds [18] with D6-branes intersecting at angles and starting gauge groups in the form $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)^n$. We have also constructed non-supersymmetric models which have only the SM at low energy. In all constructions, N=1 supersymmetric or non-supersymmetric, the u_L^c - is in the antisymmetric representation of SU(3) - and the d-quark mass term is not allowed by charge conservation.

As far as it concerns the N=1 models, we find (eight stack) semirealistic vacua with the spectrum of the N=1 SM with 3 species of right handed neutrinos and 3 pairs of Higgses H_u , H_d of the MSSM. Apart from massive exotics we also find only 2 pairs of non-chiral fields - with respect to the surviving $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)_Y$ gauge group - that survive massless to low energies in addition to u_L^c .

We started our investigation for the construction of three generation $N=1$ models by starting with the simplest construction that could accommodate the Standard Model gauge group that is using three stacks. We found that at three stacks we can build only non-susy models. In fact, we have been able to construct vacua with only the SM at low energy [in table (3)]. These models are non-supersymmetric and still preserve a $N=1$ supersymmetry in only one sector of the theory, the one associated with the right handed neutrino. This $N=1$ sector is used to create the gauge singlet superpartner of ν_R^c , that breaks an extra, beyond the hypercharge, $U(1)$ that survives massless the Green-Schwarz mechanism. At four stacks of D6-branes we found vacua that include multiwrappings and thus definite results could not be decided upon the nature of these models. At five stacks of D6-branes, we also find $N=0$ models, with break to only the SM at low energy. In fact these models, if we could find wrappings that could make them $N=1$ susy, may have all extra exotics becoming massive by appropriate superpotential terms [as it is easily observed by looking at the Yukawa structure of (6.3)].

We note that, during our search for $N=1$ models with three, four and five stacks of D6-branes, we have used wrappings with at least one or two zero entries. Unfortunately these wrappings don't realize $N=1$ supersymmetric models. Thus a computer search that will search for wrappings with all six (n, m) entries being non-zero remains to be performed in order to prove that these models could be $N=1$ supersymmetric. We leave this task for future work.

We have presented three generation $N=1$ Standard-like models where, using eight stack constructions of D6-branes, it is possible to accommodate in addition to the $N=1$ supersymmetric Standard Model spectrum - with $3\nu_R$'s and three pairs of Higgses H_u, H_d - at low energies, only two pairs of massless non-chiral exotics. These models include several promising features, including the presence of μ -terms and suppressed FCNC.

Due to the nature of the factorized forms of spectrum rules described in section 2 in terms of the effective wrappings (Z_a, Y_a) , model building in the $Z_3 \times Z_3$ constructions is particularly straightforward.

- Comparison to Models with Fluxes

In the present $N=1$ perturbative string models, all complex structure moduli are fixed, while all tadpoles RR and NSNS, including the dilaton disappear. Thus, the effect of the orbifold symmetries that fix moduli is equivalent to the effects of models with fluxes [37]. The clear advantage of the present approach over the

flux picture is that in the present constructions one is able to use perturbative string theory to fix the various terms in the effective theory.

The present constructions have very promising features, as they represent the first examples of intersecting brane N=1 models with all complex structure moduli fixed. Even though the present N=1 models do not allow a mass term for the u-quarks and also two pairs of non-chiral exotics, we hope in the future to be able to construct models where these problems are solved. The present constructions open a number of remarkable possibilities for further model building investigations. We briefly mention the construction of GUTS with no or with hidden sector gauge groups. In particular, in the latter models we hope to be able to show that, if the extra exotics may be found to be massive, and the hidden sector gauge groups are chosen to be confining, then the Kähler moduli may also be fixed from gaugino condensation. Also, another particularly important issue is to examine the gauge coupling unification of the N=1 supersymmetric models which in the MSSM occurs at $\sim 10^{16}$ GeV. These issues will be addressed elsewhere.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Ignatios Antoniadis, Gregory Athanasiu, Ralph Blumenhagen, Savas Dimopoulos, Michael Douglas, Emmanuel Floratos, Gabriele Honecker, Gordon Kane, Igor Klebanov, Boris K rs, Athanasios Lahanas, Carlos Munoz, Tassilo Ott, and Angel Uranga for useful discussions. The author wishes to thank the High Energy groups of Harvard, Princeton, Rutgers, Stanford, Kavli/UCSB, UCSB and Caltech for their warm hospitality where this work was completed. This work was supported by the programme ‘‘Pythagoras’’.

9 Appendix A

The different amount of supersymmetry respected under the interchanges (4.6) for the models of table (5) may be seen in tables (21), (22), (23) respectively.

10 Appendix B

In this appendix we exhibit the wrappings, in N=0 4D 3G models with the spectrum of table (9). These wrappings, are derived by the application of the symmetry exchange

<i>Brane</i>	$(n^1, m^1) \times (n^2, m^2) \times (n^3, m^3)$	SUSY preserved
$\{a\}$	$(0, 1) \times (1, 0) \times (0, -1)$	—
$\{b\}$	$(1, 0) \times (1, 1) \times (-1, -1)$	—
$\{c\}$	$(1, 1) \times (1, 1) \times (1, 0)$	r_2, r_0

Table 21: Wrapping numbers in the three stack D6-brane N=0 SMs of table (3). These wrappings come from the change $(n, m)_a \leftrightarrow (n, m)_b$ in the wrappings of table (5).

<i>Brane</i>	$(n^1, m^1) \times (n^2, m^2) \times (n^3, m^3)$	SUSY preserved
$\{a\}$	$(0, -1) \times (0, 1) \times (1, 0)$	—
$\{b\}$	$(-1, -1) \times (1, 0) \times (1, 1)$	—
$\{c\}$	$(1, 0) \times (1, 1) \times (1, 1)$	r_0, r_1

Table 22: Wrapping numbers in the three stack N=0 SMs of table (3). These wrappings come from the change $(n, m)_a \leftrightarrow (n, m)_c$ in the wrappings of table (5).

(4.6) to the reference wrappings (5.1), and can be seen in tables (24), (25) and (26).

11 Appendix C

In this appendix, we apply the exchanges (4.6) to the table of wrappings (12). The models have the same spectrum as the N=0 five stack Standard Models of table (11). These choices of wrappings can be seen in tables (27), (28), (29).

<i>Brane</i>	$(n^1, m^1) \times (n^2, m^2) \times (n^3, m^3)$	SUSY preserved
$\{a\}$	$(1, 0) \times (0, -1) \times (0, 1)$	—
$\{b\}$	$(1, 1) \times (-1, -1) \times (1, 0)$	—
$\{c\}$	$(1, 1) \times (1, 0) \times (1, 1)$	r_2, r_1

Table 23: Wrapping numbers in the three stack SMs of table (3). These wrappings come from the change $(n, m)_b \leftrightarrow (n, m)_c$ in the wrappings of table (5).

<i>Brane</i>	$(n^1, m^1)(n^2, m^2)(n^3, m^3)$	SUSY Preserved
$\{a\}$	$(1, 0)(1, 1)(-1, -1)$	—
$\{b\}$	$(0, 1)(1, 0)(0, -1)$	—
$\{c\}$	$(1, 0)(1, 1)(-1, -1)$	—
$\{d\}$	$(1, 0)(1, 1)(2, 2)$	r_0, r_1

Table 24: Wrapping numbers responsible for N=0 supersymmetry in the four stack 4D three generation intersecting D6-brane models. These models are derived from table (8) by the interchange $(n, m)_a \leftrightarrow (n, m)_b$.

<i>Brane</i>	$(n^1, m^1)(n^2, m^2)(n^3, m^3)$	SUSY Preserved
$\{a\}$	$(-1, -1)(1, 0)(1, 1)$	—
$\{b\}$	$(0, -1)(0, 1)(1, 0)$	—
$\{c\}$	$(-1, -1)(1, 0)(1, 1)$	—
$\{d\}$	$(2, 2)(1, 0)(1, 1)$	r_1, r_2

Table 25: Wrapping numbers responsible for N=0 supersymmetry in the four stack 4D three generation intersecting D6-brane models. These models are derived from table (8) by the interchange $(n, m)_a \leftrightarrow (n, m)_c$.

12 Appendix D

• Model C

The spectrum of the new N=0 three generation models appearing in this appendix is derived from the exchange (6.7) on the five stack models of table (11). It can be seen in table (30). The Yukawas are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{(table\ 30)} = & \lambda_d Q_L d_L^c H_d^H S_5^H / M_s + \lambda_e L e_L^+ H_d^H S_5^H / M_s + \lambda_\nu L \nu_L^c H_u^H S_5^H / M_s + \\
& H_u H_d (\lambda_\mu^{(1)} S_3^H S_1^H + \lambda_\mu^{(2)} S_4^H S_5^H) / M_s + X_1 X_2 (\lambda_x^{(1)} S_4^H S_2^H + \lambda_x^{(2)} S_3^H S_5^H) / M_s ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{12.1}$$

These models allow for a different moduli dependence on the μ -term and the mass of the triplets, thus the sizes of these scales can be different. These models allow for a universal

<i>Brane</i>	$(n^1, m^1)(n^2, m^2)(n^3, m^3)$	SUSY Preserved
$\{a\}$	$(1, 1)(-1, -1)(1, 0)$	—
$\{b\}$	$(1, 0)(0, -1)(0, 1)$	—
$\{c\}$	$(1, 1)(-1, -1)(1, 0)$	—
$\{d\}$	$(1, 1)(2, 2)(1, 0)$	r_0, r_1

Table 26: Wrapping numbers responsible for N=0 supersymmetry in the four stack 4D three generation intersecting D6-brane models. These models are derived from table (8) by the interchange $(n, m)_b \leftrightarrow (n, m)_c$.

<i>Brane</i>	$(n^1, m^1)(n^2, m^2)(n^3, m^3)$	SUSY Preserved
$\{a\}$	$(1, 0)(1, 1)(-1, -1)$	—
$\{b\}$	$(0, 1)(1, 0)(0, -1)$	—
$\{c\}$	$(1, 0)(1, 1)(-1, -1)$	—
$\{d\}$	$(1, 0)(1, 1)(1, 1)$	r_0, r_1
$\{e\}$	$(1, 1)(1, 1)(1, 0)$	r_0, r_2

Table 27: Wrapping numbers responsible for the N=0 five stack 4D three generation intersecting D6-brane models of table (11). These models are derived from table (12) by the interchange $(n, m)_a \leftrightarrow (n, m)_b$.

dependence of the masses of all the quarks and leptons on the tachyonic Higgs vev of the superpartner of S_5 . We remind that if the vevs of the $S_2^H, S_3^H, S_4^H, S_5^H$ are of the order of the string scale then it should be the case that the Yukawa's $\lambda_\mu^{(1)}, \lambda_\mu^{(2)}, \lambda_x^{(1)}, \lambda_x^{(2)}$ that are responsible for generating the correct order of scales for the models to be phenomenologically viable.

13 Appendix E

• Model D

The spectrum of the new N=0 three generation models appearing in this appendix is

<i>Brane</i>	$(n^1, m^1)(n^2, m^2)(n^3, m^3)$	SUSY Preserved
$\{a\}$	$(-1, -1)(1, 0)(1, 1)$	—
$\{b\}$	$(0, -1)(0, 1)(1, 0)$	—
$\{c\}$	$(-1, -1)(1, 0)(1, 1)$	—
$\{d\}$	$(1, 1)(1, 0)(1, 1)$	r_1, r_2
$\{e\}$	$(1, 0)(1, 1)(1, 1)$	r_1, r_0

Table 28: Wrapping numbers responsible the N=0 five stack 4D three generation intersecting D6-brane models of table (11). These models are derived from table (12) by the interchange $(n, m)_a \leftrightarrow (n, m)_c$.

<i>Brane</i>	$(n^1, m^1)(n^2, m^2)(n^3, m^3)$	SUSY Preserved
$\{a\}$	$(1, 1)(-1, -1)(1, 0)$	—
$\{b\}$	$(1, 0)(0, -1)(0, 1)$	—
$\{c\}$	$(1, 1)(-1, -1)(1, 0)$	—
$\{d\}$	$(1, 1)(1, 1)(1, 0)$	r_2, r_0
$\{e\}$	$(1, 1)(1, 0)(1, 1)$	r_2, r_1

Table 29: Wrapping numbers responsible for the N=0 five stack 4D three generation intersecting D6-brane models of table (11). These models are derived from table (12) by the interchange $(n, m)_b \leftrightarrow (n, m)_c$.

derived from the exchange (6.8) on the five stack models of table (11). It can be seen in table (31). The Yukawa's for these models are

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{(table\ 31)} = & \lambda_d Q_L d_L^c H_d^H S_2^H / M_s + \lambda_e L e_L^+ H_d^H S_5^H / M_s + \lambda_\nu L \nu_L^c H_u^H S_1^H / M_s + \\
& H_u H_d (\lambda_\mu^{(1)} S_4^H S_2^H + \lambda_\mu^{(2)} S_3^H S_5^H) / M_s + X_1 X_2 (\lambda_x^{(1)} S_4^H S_5^H + \lambda_x^{(2)} S_3^H S_1^H) / M_s .
\end{aligned}
\tag{13.1}$$

A different moduli dependence appears on the bilinear μ -like mass term and the mass of the triplets. Thus the sizes of these scales can be in principle different once the relevant interaction terms are calculated in string perturbation theory. These models also allow

Matter for \mathbf{Y}^1	Y^1	$(SU(3) \times SU(2))_{(Q_a, Q_b, Q_c, Q_d, Q_e)}$
$\{Q_L\}$	1/6	$3(3, \bar{2})_{(-1, 1, 0, 0, 0)}$
$\{u_L^c\}$	-2/3	$3(\bar{3}, 1)_{(-2, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$
$\{e_L^\pm\}$	1	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 2, 0, 0, 0)}$
$\{d_L^c\}$	1/3	$3(1, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 1, 0)}$
$\{H_u\}$	1/2	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, -1, 0, 0)}$
$\{H_d\}$	-1/2	$3(1, 2)_{(0, -1, 0, 1, 0)}$
$\{L\}$	-1/2	$3(1, 2)_{(0, -1, 0, 0, 1)}$
$\{S_3 \equiv \nu_L^c\}$	0	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 1, 0)}$
$\{S_1\}$	0	$3(3, 1)_{(0, 0, 0, -2, 0)}$
$\{S_2\}$	0	$3(3, 1)_{(0, 0, 0, 0, -2)}$
$\{S_4\}$	0	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 0, 1)}$
$\{S_5\}$	0	$6(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 0, -1, -1)}$
$\{X_1\}$	-1/3	$3(\bar{3}, 1)_{(-1, 0, -1, 0, 0)}$
$\{X_2\}$	1/3	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 0, 1)}$

Table 30: The three generation N=0 SM chiral spectrum from from five stacks of intersecting branes with its chiral spectrum with three pairs of Higgses. On the top of the table the chiral structure of N=1 SM with right handed neutrinos. The middle part exhibits the extra gauge singlets while the bottom part includes the triplet exotics. These models can come from the models of table (11) by the exchange (6.7).

for a universal dependence of all the quarks and charged leptons on the vevs of S_5^H . In fact, if the $\langle S_5^H \rangle \approx \langle S_2^H \rangle \approx \langle S_1^H \rangle \approx M_s$, then the masses of the quarks and leptons depend universally on the scale of the electroweak symmetry breaking, assuming $H_u \approx H_d$. Also in this case, the two bilinear exotics in the second line of (13.1) have a mass term that receives the same dependence on the singlet vevs.

Matter for \mathbf{Y}^1	Y^1	$(SU(3) \times SU(2))_{(Q_a, Q_b, Q_c, Q_d, Q_e)}$
$\{Q_L\}$	1/6	$3(3, \bar{2})_{(-1, 1, 0, 0, 0)}$
$\{u_L^c\}$	-2/3	$3(\bar{3}, 1)_{(-2, 0, 0, 0, 0)}$
$\{e_L^\pm\}$	1	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 2, 0, 0, 0)}$
$\{d_L^c\}$	1/3	$3(1, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 0, 1)}$
$\{H_u\}$	1/2	$3(1, 2)_{(0, 1, -1, 0, 0)}$
$\{H_d\}$	-1/2	$3(1, 2)_{(0, -1, 0, 0, 1)}$
$\{L\}$	-1/2	$3(1, 2)_{(0, -1, 0, 1, 0)}$
$\{S_3 \equiv \nu_L^c\}$	0	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 1, 0)}$
$\{S_1\}$	0	$3(3, 1)_{(0, 0, 0, -2, 0)}$
$\{S_2\}$	0	$3(3, 1)_{(0, 0, 0, 0, -2)}$
$\{S_4\}$	0	$3(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 1, 0, 1)}$
$\{S_5\}$	0	$6(1, 1)_{(0, 0, 0, -1, -1)}$
$\{X_1\}$	-1/3	$3(\bar{3}, 1)_{(-1, 0, -1, 0, 0)}$
$\{X_2\}$	1/3	$3(3, 1)_{(1, 0, 0, 1, 0)}$

Table 31: The three generation N=1 SM from from five stacks of intersecting branes with its chiral spectrum with three pairs of Higgses and right neutrinos. On the top of the table the chiral structure of N=1 SM. The middle part exhibits the gauge singlets while the bottom part includes the triplet exotics. These models can come from the models of table (11) by the exchange (6.8).

References

- [1] For reviews see : C. Angelantonj and A. Sagnotti, Phys. Rept. 371 (2002) 1: Er-ibid. 376 (2003) 339, [arXiv:hep-th/0204089]; K. R. Dienes, Phys. Rept. 287 (1997) 447, [arXiv:hep-th/9602045]; A. Faraggi, [arXiv:hep-ph/9707311]
- [2] R. Blumenhagen, B. K rs and D. L st, “Type I Strings with F and B-flux”, JHEP 0102 (2001) 030, [arXiv:hep-th/0012156]

- [3] C. Angelantonj, I. Antoniadis, E. Dudas and A. Sagnotti, Phys. Lett. B489 (2000) 223, [arXiv:hep-th/0007090]
- [4] M. Larosa and G. Pradisi, “Magnetized Four-Dimensional $Z_2 \otimes Z_2$ Orientifolds”, [arXiv:hep-th/0305224]
- [5] G. Aldazabal, S. Franco, L. E. Ibanez, R. Rabadan, A. M. Uranga J.Math. Phys. 42 (2001) 3103, hep-th/0011073
- [6] R. Blumenhagen, B. Körs, D. Lüst and T. Ott, “The Standard Model from Stable Intersecting Brane World Orbifolds”, Nucl. Phys. B616 (2001) 3, [arXiv:hep-th/0107138]
- [7] M. Cvetič, G. Shiu, A. M. Uranga, Nucl.Phys. B615 (2001) 3, [arXiv:hep-th/0107166];
M. Cvetič, G. Shiu, A. M. Uranga, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87 (2001) 201801, [arXiv:hep-th/0107166]
- [8] L. E. Ibáñez, F. Marchesano and R. Rabadán, “Getting just the standard model at intersecting branes” JHEP, 0111 (2001) 002, [arXiv:hep-th/0105155]
- [9] C. Kokorelis, “New Standard Model Vacua from Intersecting Branes”, JHEP 09 (2002) 029, [arXiv:hep-th/0205147]
- [10] C. Kokorelis, “Exact Standard Model Compactifications from Intersecting Branes”, JHEP 08 (2002) 036, [arXiv:hep-th/0206108]
- [11] For detailed realizations of the Pati-Salam structure $SU(4)_c \otimes SU(2)_L \otimes SU(2)_R$ in intersecting brane worlds and its phenomenological consequences see :
C. Kokorelis, “GUT model Hierarchies from Intersecting Branes”, JHEP 08 (2002) 018, [arXiv:hep-th/0203187]; “Deformed Intersecting D6-Branes I”, JHEP 0211 (2002) 027, [arXiv:hep-th/0209202]; “Exact Standard Model Structures from Intersecting Branes”, Proc. of the 1st International Conference on Superstring Phenomenology, SP02 (Oxford, U.K), [arXiv:hep-th/0210004]; “Deformed Intersecting D6-Branes II”, [arXiv:hep-th/0210200]; Standard Model Compactifications from Intersecting Branes, Proc. of the 10th International Conference on Supersymmetry and the Unification of Fundamental Interactions, SUSY02, (DESY), [arXiv:hep-th/0211091]; “Deformed Intersecting D6-Branes and N=1 SUSY”, [arXiv:hep-th/0212281]

- [12] D. Cremades, L. E. Ibáñez and F. Marchesano, Nucl. Phys. B643 (2002) 93, [arXiv:hep-th/0205074]
- [13] C. Kokorelis, “Exact Standard model Structures from Intersecting D5-branes”, Nucl. Phys. B677 (2004) 115, [arXiv:hep-th/0207234]
- [14] I. Klebanov and E. Witten, ”Proton Decay in Intersecting D-brane Models”, [arXiv:hep-th/0304079]
- [15] D. Cremades, L. E. Ibáñez, F. Marchesano, “Yukawa couplings in intersecting D-brane models”, JHEP 0307 (2003) 038, [arXiv:hep-th/0302105];
- [16] C.Kokorelis, “N=1 Locally Supersymmetric Standard Models from Intersecting Branes”, by C. Kokorelis, hep-th/0309070
- [17] M. Axenides, E. Floratos and C. Kokorelis, “SU(5) Unified Theories from Intersecting Branes”, JHEP 0310 (2003) 006, [arXiv:hep-th/0307255];
See also for a review: C. Kokorelis, “Beyond the SM; Model building from intersecting brane worlds”, Proc. SUSY 2003, [arXiv:hep-th/0402087]
- [18] C. Kokorelis, “N=1 Supersymmetric Standard Model Compactifications of IIA Orientifolds from Intersecting D6-branes”, in preparation
- [19] S. Nagaoka, JHEP 0402 (2004) 063, [arXiv:hep-th/0312010]; F. Epple, D. Lüst, hep-th/0311182; J. Erdmenger, Z. Guralnik, R. Helling, I. Kirch, [arXiv:hep-th/0309043]; K. Hashimoto, S. Nagaoka, [arXiv:hep-th/0303024]; T. Sato, [arXiv:hep-th/0308203]; H. Sato, [arXiv:hep-th/0304237]; W. Huang, [arXiv:math-ph/0310005]; K. Takahashi, [arXiv:hep-ph/0404205]
- [20] R. Blumenhagen, L. Görlich, T. Ott, Supersymmetric Intersecting Branes on the Type IIA T^6/Z_4 orientifold, JHEP 0301 (2003) 021, [arXiv:hep-th/0211059]
- [21] G. Honecker, “Chiral supersymmetric models on an orientifold of $Z_4 \times Z_2$ with intersecting D6 branes”, arXiv: Nucl. Phys. B666 (2003) 175, [arXiv:hep-th/0303015]
- [22] G. Honecker and T. Ott, “Getting just the Supersymmetric Standard Model at Intersecting Branes on the Z_6 -orientifold”, [arXiv:hep-th/0404055]

- [23] Cvetič, P. Langacker, G. Shiu, Nucl. Phys. B 642 (2002) 139, [arXiv:hep-th/0206115];
M. Cvetič, I. Papadimitriou, G. Shiu, “Supersymmetric Three Family SU(5)
Grand Unified Models from Type IIA Orientifolds with Intersecting D6-Branes”,
[arXiv:hep-th/0212177];
- [24] D. Lüst and S. Stieberger, “Gauge threshold corrections in intersecting D-brane mod-
els”, [arXiv:hep-th/0302221]
- [25] M. Cvetič, T. Li, T. Liu, “Supersymmetric Pati-Salam models from intersecting
D6-branes: A Road to the Standard Model”, [arXiv:hep-th/0403061]; “D6-brane
splittings on type IIA orientifolds”, [arXiv:hep-th/0407178]
- [26] B. K rs and P. Nath, “Effective Action and Soft Supersymmetry Breaking for Inter-
secting D-brane Models”, Nucl.Phys. B681 (2004) 77, [arXiv:hep-th/0309167]
- [27] S. A. Abel, A. W. Owen, “Interactions in Intersecting Brane Models”, Nucl.Phys.
B663 (2003) 197, [arXiv:hep-th/0303124]; “N-point amplitudes in intersecting brane
models”, Nucl.Phys. B682 (2004) 183, [arXiv:hep-th/0310257]
- [28] R. Blumenhagen, L. G rlich, B. K rs, Nucl. Phys. B 569 (2000) 209; S. Forste, G.
Honecker, R. Schreyer, Nucl. Phys. B593 (2001) 127, [arXiv: hep-th/0008250]
- [29] S. A. Abel, M. Masip, J. Santiago, JHEP 0304 (2003) 057, [arXiv:hep-ph/0303087]
S. Abel, O. Lebedev, J. Santiago, [arXiv:hep-ph/0312157]; S. Abel, J. Santiago,
J.Phys.G30:R83-R111, 2004, [arXiv:hep-ph/0404237]
- [30] I. Antoniadis, N. Arkadi-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, G. Dvali, Phys. Lett.B436 (1999)
257, hep-ph/9804398
- [31] T. Li, T. Liu, “Quasi-Supersymmetric G^3 Unification from Intersecting D6-Branes
on Type IIA Orientifolds”, Phys.Lett. B573 (2003) 19, [arXiv:hep-th/0304258]
- [32] N. Charmoun, S. Khalil, E. Lashin, “Fermion Masses and Mixing in Intersecting
Branes Scenarios”, Phys. Rev. D69 (2004) 095011, [arXiv:hep-ph/0309169]
- [33] D. Lust, P. Mayr, R. Richter, S. Stieberger, “Scattering of Gauge, Matter and Moduli
fields from Intersecting Branes”, [arXiv:hep-th/04040134]

- [34] T.P.T. Dijkstra, L.R. Huiszoon and A.N. Schellekens, “Chiral Supersymmetric Standard Model Spectra from Orientifolds of Gepner Models”, [arXiv:hep-th/0403196]
- [35] I. Antoniadis, E. Kiritsis, T. Tomaras, Phys. Lett. B486 (2000) 186, “D-branes and the Standard Model”, [arXiv:hep-ph/0004214]; E. Kiritsis, “D-branes in Standard Model Building, Gravity and Cosmology”, Fortsch.Phys. 52 (2004) 200, [arXiv:hep-th/0310001]
- [36] I. Antoniadis, J. Ellis, J.S. Hagelin, D.V. Nanopoulos, “The flipped $SU(5) \times U(1)$ model revamped”, Phys. Lett. B231 (1989) 65
- [37] S. Giddings, S. Kachru, J. Polchinski, Phys. Rev. D 66:106006, 2002, [arXiv:hep-th/0105097]; S. Kachru, R. Kallosh, A. Linde, J. Maldacena, L. McAllister, S. Trivedi, [arXiv:hep-th/0308055]; R. Blumenhagen, D. Lust, T. Taylor, [arXiv:hep-th/0303016]; J.F.G. Cascales and A. Uranga, [arXiv:hep-th/0303024]; B.S. Acharya, “A moduli fixing mechanism in M-theory”, [arXiv:hep-th/0212224]; G. Curio, A. Krause, “G-fluxes and non-perturbative stabilization of heterotic M-theory”, Nucl. Phys. B643 (2002) 131; M. Becker, G. Curio, A. Krause, “de Sitter vacua in heterotic M-theory”, hep-th/0403027