FTUAM 05/12
IFT-UAM/CSIC-05-33
KAIST-TH 2005/14

August 27, 2005

Proposal for a New Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model

D.E. López-Fogliani[a,b] and C. Muñoz[a,b,c]

[a] *Departamento de Física Teórica C-XI, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Cantoblanco, E-28049 Madrid, Spain*

[b] *Instituto de Física Teórica C-XVI, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Cantoblanco, E-28049 Madrid, Spain*

[c] *Department of Physics, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Daejeon 305-701, Korea*

Abstract

The fact that neutrinos are massive suggests that the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) might be extended in order to include three gauge-singlet neutrino superfields with Yukawa couplings of the type $H_2 \, L \, \nu^c$. We propose to use these superfields to solve the μ problem of the MSSM without having to introduce an extra singlet superfield as in the case of the Next-to-MSSM (NMSSM). In particular, terms of the type $\nu^c H_1 H_2$ in the superpotential may carry out this task spontaneously through sneutrino vacuum expectation values. In addition, terms of the type $(\nu^c)^3$ avoid the presence of axions and generate effective Majorana masses for neutrinos at the electroweak scale. On the other hand, these terms break lepton number and R-parity explicitly implying that the phenomenology of this New MSSM is very different from the one of the 'old' MSSM. For example, the usual neutralinos are now mixed with the neutrinos. For Dirac masses of the latter of order 10^{-4} GeV eigenvalues reproducing the correct scale of neutrino masses are obtained.

PACS: 12.60.Jv, 14.60.St

Neutrino experiments have confirmed during the last years that neutrinos are massive [1]. As a consequence all theoretical models must be modified in order to reproduce this result. In particular, in the context of the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) [2], the ordinary neutrino superfields, $\hat{\nu}_i$, contained in the $SU(2)_L$-doublet, $\hat{L}_i$, with $i = 1, 2, 3$, might be supplemented with gauge-singlet neutrino superfields, $\hat{\nu}^c_i$. Once experiments induce us to introduce these new superfields, and given the fact that sneutrinos are allowed to get vacuum expectation values (VEVs), we may wonder why not to use terms of the type $\hat{\nu}^c \hat{H}_1 \hat{H}_2$ to produce an effective μ term. This would allow us to solve the naturalness problem of the MSSM, the so-called μ problem [3], without having to introduce an extra singlet superfield as in case of the Next-to-Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (NMSSM) [4]. It is true that in the model with Bilinear R-parity Violation (BRpV) [5], the bilinear terms $\hat{H}_2 \hat{L}_i$ induce neutrino masses through the mixing with the neutralinos (actually only one mass at tree level and the other two at one loop) without using the superfields $\hat{\nu}^c_i$, however the μ problem is augmented with the three new bilinear terms.

Thus the aim of this paper is to analyse the New Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (NewMSSM) arising from this proposal: minimal particle content without μ problem.

In addition to the MSSM Yukawa couplings for quarks and charged leptons, the NewMSSM superpotential contains Yukawa couplings for neutrinos, and two additional type of terms involving the Higgs doublet superfields, $\hat{H}_1$ and $\hat{H}_2$, and the three neutrino superfields, $\hat{\nu}^c_i$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
W = & \ \epsilon_{ab} \left(Y_u^{ij} \, \hat{H}_2^b \, \hat{Q}_i^a \, \hat{u}_j^c + Y_d^{ij} \, \hat{H}_1^a \, \hat{Q}_i^b \, \hat{d}_j^c + Y_e^{ij} \, \hat{H}_1^a \, \hat{L}_i^b \, \hat{e}_j^c + Y_\nu^{ij} \, \hat{H}_2^b \, \hat{L}_i^a \, \hat{\nu}_j^c \right) \\
& - \epsilon_{ab} \lambda^i \, \hat{\nu}_i^c \, \hat{H}_1^a \hat{H}_2^b + \frac{1}{3} \kappa^{ijk} \hat{\nu}_i^c \hat{\nu}_j^c \hat{\nu}_k^c \,, \qquad (1)
\end{aligned}
$$

where we take $\hat{H}_1^T = (\hat{H}_1^0, \hat{H}_1^-)$, $\hat{H}_2^T = (\hat{H}_2^+, \hat{H}_2^0)$, $\hat{L}_i^T = (\hat{\nu}_i, \hat{e}_i)$, a, b are $SU(2)$ indices, and $\epsilon_{12} = 1$. In this model, the usual MSSM bilinear μ term is absent from the superpotential, and only dimensionless trilinear couplings are present in W (as actually happens for example in the low energy limit of string constructions). However, when the scalar components of the superfields $\hat{\nu}^c_i$, denoted by $\tilde{\nu}^c_i$, acquire VEVs of order the electroweak scale, an effective interaction $\mu \hat{H}_1 \hat{H}_2$ is generated through the fifth term in (1), with $\mu \equiv \lambda^i \langle \tilde{\nu}^c_i \rangle$. The last type of terms in (1) is allowed by all symmetries, and avoids the presence of an unacceptable axion associated to a global $U(1)$ symmetry. In addition, it generates effective Majorana masses for neutrinos at the electroweak scale. These two type of terms replace the two NMSSM terms $\hat{S}\hat{H}_1\hat{H}_2$, $\hat{S}\hat{S}\hat{S}$, with $\hat{S}$ an extra singlet superfield.

It is worth noticing that these terms break explicitly lepton number, and therefore, after spontaneous symmetry breaking, a massless Goldstone boson (Majoron) does not appear. On the other hand, R-parity (+1 for particles and -1 for superpartners) is also explicitly broken and this means that the phenomenology of the NewMSSM is going to be very different from the one of the MSSM. Needless to mention, the lightest R-odd particle is not stable. It is also interesting to realise that the Yukawa couplings producing Dirac masses for neutrinos, the fourth term in (1), generate through the VEVs of $\tilde{\nu}^c_i$, three effective bilinear terms $\hat{H}_2\hat{L}_i$. As mentioned above these characterize the BRpV.

In order to discuss in more detail the phenomenology of the NewMSSM let us write first the soft SUSY-breaking terms appearing in the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{\text{soft}}$, which in our conventions is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\mathcal{L}_{\text{soft}} &= (m^2_{\tilde{Q}})^{ij}\,\tilde{Q}^{a^*}_i\,\tilde{Q}^a_j + (m^2_{\tilde{u}^c})^{ij}\,\tilde{u}^{c^*}_i\,\tilde{u}^c_j + (m^2_{\tilde{d}^c})^{ij}\,\tilde{d}^{c^*}_i\,\tilde{d}^c_j + (m^2_{\tilde{L}})^{ij}\,\tilde{L}^{a^*}_i\,\tilde{L}^a_j + (m^2_{\tilde{e}^c})^{ij}\,\tilde{e}^{c^*}_i\,\tilde{e}^c_j \\
&+ m^2_{H_1}\,H^{a*}_1\,H^a_1 + m^2_{H_2}\,H^{a*}_2 H^a_2 + (m^2_{\tilde{\nu}^c})^{ij}\,\tilde{\nu}^{c^*}_i\tilde{\nu}^c_j \\
&+ \epsilon_{ab}\Big[(A_uY_u)^{ij}\,H^b_2\,\tilde{Q}^a_i\,\tilde{u}^c_j + (A_dY_d)^{ij}\,H^a_1\,\tilde{Q}^b_i\,\tilde{d}^c_j + (A_eY_e)^{ij}\,H^a_1\,\tilde{L}^b_i\,\tilde{e}^c_j \\
&+ (A_\nu Y_\nu)^{ij}\,H^b_2\,\tilde{L}^a_i\,\tilde{\nu}^c_j + \text{H.c.}\Big] \\
&+ \left[-\epsilon_{ab}(A_\lambda\lambda)^i\,\tilde{\nu}^c_i\,H^a_1 H^b_2 + \frac{1}{3}(A_\kappa\kappa)^{ijk}\tilde{\nu}^c_i\tilde{\nu}^c_j\tilde{\nu}^c_k\ + \text{H.c.}\right] \\
&- \frac{1}{2}\left(M_3\,\tilde{\lambda}_3\,\tilde{\lambda}_3 + M_2\,\tilde{\lambda}_2\,\tilde{\lambda}_2 + M_1\,\tilde{\lambda}_1\,\tilde{\lambda}_1 + \text{H.c.}\right)\,. \qquad (2)
\end{aligned}
$$

In addition to terms from $\mathcal{L}_{\text{soft}}$, the tree-level scalar potential receives the usual D and F term contributions. Once the electroweak symmetry is spontaneously broken, the neutral scalars develop in general the following VEVs:

$$
\langle H^0_1\rangle = v_1\,, \quad \langle H^0_2\rangle = v_2\,, \quad \langle\tilde{\nu}_i\rangle = \nu_i\,, \quad \langle\tilde{\nu}^c_i\rangle = \nu^c_i\,. \qquad (3)
$$

In what follows it will be enough for our purposes to neglect mixing between generations in (1) and (2), and to assume that only one generation of sneutrinos gets VEVs, ν, ν^c. The extension of the analysis to all generations is straightforward, and the conclusions are similar. We then obtain for the tree-level neutral scalar potential:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\langle V_{\rm neutral}\rangle &= \frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{8}\left(|\nu|^2+|v_1|^2-|v_2|^2\right)^2 \\
&+ |\lambda|^2\left(|\nu^c|^2|v_1|^2+|\nu^c|^2|v_2|^2+|v_1|^2|v_2|^2\right)+|\kappa|^2|\nu^c|^4 \\
&+ |Y_\nu|^2\left(|\nu^c|^2|v_2|^2+|\nu^c|^2|\nu|^2+|\nu|^2|v_2|^2\right) \\
&+ m_{H_1}^2|v_1|^2+m_{H_2}^2|v_2|^2+m_{\tilde\nu^c}^2|\nu^c|^2+m_{\tilde\nu}^2|\nu|^2 \\
&+ \Big(-\lambda\kappa^* v_1 v_2 \nu^{c*2}-\lambda Y_\nu^*|\nu^c|^2 v_1\nu^*-\lambda Y_\nu^*|v_2|^2 v_1\nu^*+kY_\nu^* v_2^*\nu^*\nu^{c2} \\
&- \lambda A_\lambda \nu^c v_1 v_2+Y_\nu A_\nu \nu^c \nu v_2+\frac{1}{3}\kappa A_\kappa \nu^{c3}+\text{H.c.}\Big)\,. \qquad (4)
\end{aligned}
$$

In the following, we assume for simplicity that all parameters in the potential are real. One can derive the four minimization conditions with respect to the VEVs v_1, v_2, ν^c, ν, with the result

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{4}(g_1^2+g_2^2)(\nu^2+v_1^2-v_2^2)v_1+\lambda^2 v_1\left(\nu^{c2}+v_2^2\right)+m_{H_1}^2 v_1-\lambda\nu^c v_2\left(\kappa\nu^c+A_\lambda\right) \\
&\qquad -\lambda Y_\nu \nu\left(\nu^{c2}+v_2^2\right)=0\,, \\
&-\frac{1}{4}(g_1^2+g_2^2)(\nu^2+v_1^2-v_2^2)v_2+\lambda^2 v_2\left(\nu^{c2}+v_1^2\right)+m_{H_2}^2 v_2-\lambda\nu^c v_1\left(\kappa\nu^c+A_\lambda\right) \\
&\qquad +Y_\nu^2 v_2\left(\nu^{c2}+\nu^2\right)+Y_\nu\nu\left(-2\lambda v_1 v_2+\kappa\nu^{c2}+A_\nu\nu^c\right)=0\,, \\
&\lambda^2\left(v_1^2+v_2^2\right)\nu^c+2\kappa^2\nu^{c3}+m_{\tilde\nu^c}^2\nu^c-2\lambda\kappa v_1 v_2\nu^c-\lambda A_\lambda v_1 v_2+\kappa A_\kappa \nu^{c2} \\
&\qquad +Y_\nu^2\nu^c\left(v_2^2+\nu^2\right)+Y_\nu\nu\left(-2\lambda\nu^c v_1+2\kappa v_2\nu^c+A_\nu v_2\right)=0\,, \\
&\frac{1}{4}(g_1^2+g_2^2)(\nu^2+v_1^2-v_2^2)\nu+m_{\tilde\nu}^2\nu \\
&\qquad +Y_\nu^2\nu^{c2}\nu+Y_\nu\left(-\lambda\nu^{c2}v_1-\lambda v_2^2 v_1+\kappa v_2\nu^{c2}+A_\nu\nu^c v_2\right)=0\,. \qquad (5)
\end{aligned}
$$

As discussed in the context of R-parity breaking models with extra singlets [6], the VEV of the left-handed sneutrino, ν, is in general small. Here we can use the same argument. Notice that in the last equation in (5) $\nu\to 0$ as $Y_\nu\to 0$, and since the coupling Y_ν determines the Dirac mass for the neutrinos, $m_D\equiv Y_\nu v_2$, ν has to be very small. Using this rough argument we can also get an estimate of the value, $\nu\lesssim m_D$. This also implies that we can approximate the other three equations as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}M_Z^2\cos 2\beta+\lambda^2\left(\nu^{c2}+v^2\sin^2\beta\right)+m_{H_1}^2-\lambda\nu^c\tan\beta\left(\kappa\nu^c+A_\lambda\right) &=0\,, \\
-\frac{1}{2}M_Z^2\cos 2\beta+\lambda^2\left(\nu^{c2}+v^2\cos^2\beta\right)+m_{H_2}^2-\lambda\nu^c\cot\beta\left(\kappa\nu^c+A_\lambda\right) &=0\,, \\
\lambda^2 v^2+2\kappa^2\nu^{c2}+m_{\tilde\nu^c}^2-\lambda\kappa v^2\sin 2\beta-\frac{\lambda A_\lambda v^2}{2\nu^c}\sin 2\beta+\kappa A_\kappa\nu^c &=0\,, \qquad (6)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\tan\beta \equiv v_2/v_1$, $2M_W^2/g_2^2 = v_1^2 + v_2^2 + \nu^2 \approx v_1^2 + v_2^2 \equiv v^2$, and we have neglected terms proportional to Y_ν. It is worth noticing that these equations are the same as the ones defining the minimization conditions for the NMSSM, with the substitution $\nu^c \leftrightarrow s$. Thus one can carry out the analysis of the model similarly to the NMSSM case, where many solutions in the parameter space $\lambda, \kappa, \mu(\equiv \lambda s), \tan\beta, A_\lambda, A_\kappa$, can be found [7].

Once we know that solutions are available in this model, we have to discuss in some detail the important issue of mass matrices. Concerning this point, the breaking of R-parity makes the NewMSSM very different from MSSM and NMSSM. In particular, neutral gauginos and Higgsinos are now mixed with the neutrinos. Not only the fermionic component of $\tilde{\nu}^c$ mixes with the neutral Higgsinos (similarly to the fermionic component of S in the NMSSM), but also the fermionic component of $\tilde{\nu}$ enters in the game, giving rise to a sixth state. Of course, now we have to be sure that one eigenvalue of this matrix is very small, reproducing the experimental results about neutrino masses. In the weak interaction basis defined by $\Psi^{0^T} \equiv \left(\tilde{B}^0 = -i\tilde{\lambda}', \tilde{W}_3^0 = -i\tilde{\lambda}_3, \tilde{H}_1^0, \tilde{H}_2^0, \nu^c, \nu\right)$, the neutral fermion mass terms in the Lagrangian are $\mathcal{L}^{\rm mass}_{\rm neutral} = -\frac{1}{2}(\Psi^0)^T \mathcal{M}_{\rm n} \Psi^0 + {\rm H.c.}$, with $\mathcal{M}_{\rm n}$ a 6×6 (10×10 if we include all generations of neutrinos) matrix,

$$\mathcal{M}_{\rm n} = \left(\begin{array}{cc} M & m \\ m^T & 0 \end{array} \right), \tag{7}$$

where

$$M = \left(\begin{array}{ccccc} M_1 & 0 & -M_Z\sin\theta_W\cos\beta & M_Z\sin\theta_W\sin\beta & 0 \\ 0 & M_2 & M_Z\cos\theta_W\cos\beta & -M_Z\cos\theta_W\sin\beta & 0 \\ -M_Z\sin\theta_W\cos\beta & M_Z\cos\theta_W\cos\beta & 0 & -\lambda\nu^c & -\lambda v_2 \\ M_Z\sin\theta_W\sin\beta & -M_Z\cos\theta_W\sin\beta & -\lambda\nu^c & 0 & -\lambda v_1 + Y_\nu\nu \\ 0 & 0 & -\lambda v_2 & -\lambda v_1 + Y_\nu\nu & 2\kappa\nu^c \end{array} \right), \tag{8}$$

is very similar to the neutralino mass matrix of the NMSSM (substituting $\nu^c \leftrightarrow s$ and neglecting the contributions $Y_\nu\nu$), and

$$m^T = \left(\begin{array}{ccccc} -g_1\nu & g_2\nu & 0 & Y_\nu\nu^c & Y_\nu v_2 \end{array} \right). \tag{9}$$

Matrix (7) is a matriz of the see-saw type that will give rise to a very light eigenvalue if the entries of the matrix M are much larger than the entries of the matrix m. This is generically the case since the entries of M are of order the electroweak scale, but for the entries of m, ν is small and $Y_\nu v_2$ is the Dirac mass for the neutrinos m_D as discussed above ($Y_\nu\nu^c$ has the same order of magnitude of m_D). We have checked numerically that correct neutrino masses can easily be obtained. For example, using typical electroweak-scale values in (8), and a Dirac mass of order 10^{-4} GeV in (9), one obtains that the lightest eigenvalue of (7) is of order 10^{-2} eV. Including the three generations in the analysis we can obtain different neutrino mass hierarchies playing around with the hierarchies in the Dirac masses.

On the other hand, the charginos mix with the charged leptons and therefore in a basis where $\Psi^{+T} \equiv \left(-i\tilde{\lambda}^{+}, \tilde{H}_2^{+}, e_R^{+}\right)$ and $\Psi^{-T} \equiv \left(-i\tilde{\lambda}^{-}, \tilde{H}_1^{-}, e_L^{-}\right)$, one obtains the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} M_2 & g_2 v_2 & 0 \\ g_2 v_1 & \lambda\nu^c & -Y_e\nu \\ g_2\nu & -Y_\nu\nu^c & Y_e v_1 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{10}$$

Here we can distinguish the 2×2 submatrix which is is similar to the chargino mass matrix of the NMSSM (substituting $\nu^c \leftrightarrow s$). Clearly, given the entries proportional to ν and Y_ν, there will always be a light eigenvalue corresponding to the electron mass. The extension of the analysis to three generations is again straightforward.

Of course, other mass matrices are also modified. This is the case for example of the Higgs boson mass matrices. The presence of the VEVs ν, ν^c, leads to mixing of the neutral Higgses with the sneutrinos. Likewise the charged Higgses will be mixed with the charged sleptons. On the other hand, when compared to the MSSM case, the structure of squark mass terms is essentially unaffected, provided that one uses $\mu = \lambda\nu^c$, and neglects the contribution of the fourth term in (1).

Obviously, the phenomenology of the NewMSSM is very rich and different from other models, and therefore many more issues might have been addressed, such as possible experimental constraints, implications for accelerator physics, analysis of the (modified) renormalization group equations, study of the neutrino masses in detail, etc. However, these are beyond the scope of this paper, and we leave this necessary task for a future work [8]. Our main interest here was to introduce the characteristics of this new model, and sketch some important points concerning its phenomenology.

Acknowledgements

D.E. López-Fogliani is grateful to the members of the Theoretical High Energy Physics Group at KAIST for their kind hospitality during the months of June-August 2005, when this project was started. He also acknowledges the financial support of the Spanish DGI through a FPU grant. The work of C. Muñoz was supported in part by the

Spanish DGI of the MEC under Proyectos Nacionales BFM2003-01266 and FPA2003-04597; also by the European Union under the RTN program MRTN-CT-2004-503369, and under the ENTApP Network of the ILIAS project RII3-CT-2004-506222; and also by KAIST under the Visiting Professor Program.

References

[1] Super-Kamiokande collaboration, Y. Fukuda et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81** (1998) 1562 [arXiv:hep-ex/9807003]; SNO collaboration, Q.R. Ahmad et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89** (2002) 011301 [arXiv:nucl-ex/0204008]; KamLAND collaboration, K. Eguchi et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90** (2003) 021802 [arXiv:hep-ex/0212021].

[2] For reviews, see H.P. Nilles, *Phys. Rep.* **110** (1984) 1; H.E. Haber and G.L. Kane, *Phys. Rep.* **117** (1985) 75.

[3] J.E. Kim and H.P. Nilles, *Phys. Lett.* **B138** (1984) 150.

[4] P. Fayet, *Nucl. Phys.* **B90** (1975) 104; H. P. Nilles, M. Srednicki and D. Wyler, *Phys. Lett.* **B120** (1983) 346; J. M. Frere, D. R. T. Jones and S. Raby, *Nucl. Phys.* **B222** (1983) 11; J. P. Derendinger and C. A. Savoy, *Nucl. Phys.* **B237** (1984) 307; J. R. Ellis, J. F. Gunion, H. E. Haber, L. Roszkowski and F. Zwirner, *Phys. Rev.* **D39** (1989) 844; M. Drees, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A4** (1989) 3635; U. Ellwanger, M. Rausch de Traubenberg and C. A. Savoy, *Phys. Lett.* **B315** (1993) 331 [arXiv:hep-ph/9307322]; P.N. Pandita, *Phys. Lett.* **B318** (1993) 338, *Z. Phys.* **C59** (1993) 575; S. F. King and P. L. White, *Phys. Rev.* **D52** (1995) 4183 [arXiv:hep-ph/9505326]; U. Ellwanger and C. Hugonie, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C13** (2000) 681 [arXiv:hep-ph/9812427].

[5] See e.g., M. Hirsch and J.W.F. Valle, *New J. Phys.* **7** (2004) 76 [arXiv:hep-ph/0405015], and references therein.

[6] A. Masiero and J.W.F. Valle, *Phys. Lett.* **B251** (1990) 273.

[7] See e.g., D.G. Cerdeño, C. Hugonie, D. E. López-Fogliani, C. Muñoz and A. M. Teixeira, *J. High Energy Phys.* **12** (2004) 048 [arXiv:hep-ph/0408102], and references therein.

[8] D. E. López-Fogliani and C. Muñoz, in preparation.