## Superheavy fermions and proton lifetime

A. Yu. Smirnov

Institute of Nuclear Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences

(Submitted 6 April 1980)

Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 31, No. 12, 781-783 (20 June 1980)

The grand unification models can contain superheavy fermions ( $m \approx 10^{15}$  GeV) in addition to superheavy vector and scalar bosons. An introduction of multiplets with such fermions changes the unification energy and the proton lifetime ( $\tau_p$ ). Specifically, it makes it possible to increase  $\tau_p$  in the  $SU_5$  model by two to three orders of magnitude.

PACS numbers: 14.80.Kx, 14.20.Ei, 13.30. - a, 12.20.Hx

The hierarchy of particle masses is an important feature of grand unification models.<sup>1</sup> One multiplet of vector bosons (this also pertains to scalar bosons) includes both light particles with masses  $m \le 100$  GeV ( $W^{\pm}$ ,  $Z^{0}$ ) and superheavy particles:  $m \sim 10^{14}-10^{15}$  GeV. Do superheavy fermions exist together with the light fermions?

The structure of fermion multiplets in the examined  $(SU_5, SO_{10})$  models is such that the gauge-invariant interaction of fermions with Higgs multiplets that have large vacuum expectations  $(v \approx 10^{15} \text{ GeV})$  cannot be constructed and also the ordinary mass terms cannot be introduced. The fermion masses  $(m_f)$  arise here as a result of interactions with the scalar multiplets that acquire vacuum expectations of  $\sim 300 \text{ GeV}$ , where  $m_f \lesssim 250 \text{ GeV}$ .

Using the  $SU_5$  model we examine in this paper some consequences of introducing superheavy fermions, focusing attention first on their effect on the proton lifetime. This is of special interest for the  $SU_5$  model, since the most probable predictions based on this model,  $\tau_{\rho} = 10^{30 \pm 2}$  years, are already at the lower experimental limits,  $\tau_{\rho} \gtrsim 10^{30}$  years, and the implementation of new projects in the next few years involving the search for proton instability will make it possible to increase the lower limits

to  $10^{33}$ - $10^{34}$  years. Moreover, the most recent estimates of the QCD parameter,  $\Lambda = 0.20 \pm 0.06$  GeV<sup>6</sup> (see also Ref 7), give  $\tau_p = (0.6-7.0) \times 10^{29}$  years, consistent with that in Ref. 3, which indicates that the standard  $SU_5$  model must be modified.

Note that the superheavy fermions can play a specific role in forming baryon asymmetry in the universe annual also in further unifying the particles and interactions (unification of fermion generation, inclusion of gravitation).

1. The superheavy fermions in  $SU_5$ . The simplest possibility is an additional (one or generally several), two-sides 5-multiplet  $\Psi_{L(R)} = (q_1, q_2, q_3, l^+, l^0)_{L(R)}$ . The general form of interactions that give mass to the particles in  $\Psi$  is

$$h \, \overline{\Psi}_L^{\alpha} \Psi_{R\beta} \, \Phi_{\alpha}^{\beta} + M \, \overline{\Psi}_L^{\alpha} \, \Psi_{R\alpha} + \lambda.c., \tag{1}$$

where  $\Phi_{\beta}^{\alpha}$  is the Higgs 24-multiplet with vacuum expectations  $\langle \Phi_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \rangle_0 = (2v, 2v, 2v, -3v, -3v)v \sim 10^{15}$  GeV. Thus, we obtain from Eq (1)

$$m_{lo} = m_l + = M - 3hv$$
  $m_q = M + 2hv$ . (2)

By combining the parameters in Eq. (2) we can obtain arbitrary relationships between the masses  $m_l$  and  $m_q$ .

As a result of a lepton-quark transition due to X or Y boson exchange, the heavier components of the 5-multiplet experience a fast, three-particle decay: for example, for  $m_q < m_l \approx m_x \approx 10^{15}$  GeV  $l^+ \rightarrow qX \rightarrow quu$  with  $\tau \approx 192\pi^3 [\alpha_{GU} m_x N]^{-1} \approx 10^{-36}$  sec (N=12) is the number of decay channels X.

The light components of the 5-multiplet are stable: for  $m_l > m_q$  they are the q quarks which form stable hadrons with  $m \gtrsim m_q$ , and  $m_q > m_l$  it is the l lepton. The cosmological exclusions of these particles and the upper limits for their masses<sup>8</sup> are missing if they are mixed with the known light fermions (for example, q with d quarks) and hence they experience weak decays  $(q \rightarrow uev_e)$ . Such mixing occurs in the  $SU_5$  model by introducing an additional 45-multiplet of the Higgs particles.  $\tau_q = 192\pi^3 \left[G_F^2 m_q^5 s^2 N\right]^{-1} \approx 10^{-18}$  sec for the mixing parameter s = 0.01 and  $m_q \approx 100$  GeV.

2. Behavior of constants, unification point  $(q_{GU})$ , and proton lifetime. The introduction into a unified model of additional fermion or Higgs multiplets  $\Psi$  with small mass splitting:  $m_{\text{max}}/m_{\text{min}} \approx 1$  changes  $q_{GU}$  very little (a special case of this is the independence of  $q_{GU}$  of the fermion generation number). If, however, there is a large splitting within the multiplet  $m_{\text{max}}/m_{\text{min}} > 1$ , then the additional contributions from  $\Psi$  to the different coupling constants in the region  $m_{\text{min}} < q < m_{\text{max}}$  will be different and the unification energy will change. Thus, for the 5-multiplet with  $m_q < m_l$  a slowing down in the decrease of  $\alpha_c$  ( $SU_3^c$  constant) is greater as q increases due to the q-quark effects at  $m_q < q < m_l$  than the additional increase of  $\alpha_{em}$ , since there is no contribution from the  $l^+$  lepton in this region, and hence the unification point of the  $\alpha_c$  and  $\alpha_{em}$  constants  $\left[\alpha_{em}(q_{GU}) \approx 3/8\alpha_c(q_{GU})\right]$  is shifted in the direction of higher energies. At  $m_q > m_l$  the opposite occurs:  $q_{GU}$  and  $\tau_p$  decrease.

Generally, a variation of the unification energy  $q_{GU}^n$  of the  $\alpha_c$ ,  $\alpha_{em}$ , and  $\tau_n^n(\tau_n-q_{GU}^4)$  constants as a result of introduction of n 5-multiplets:

$$\lg \frac{q_{GU}^{n}}{q_{GU}^{o}} = \frac{1}{4} \lg \frac{r_{p}^{n}}{t_{p}^{o}} = \frac{2}{33} | \lg \frac{m_{l}}{m_{q}} | \frac{n\epsilon}{1 - \frac{2}{33} n\epsilon}$$

$$\epsilon = \begin{cases} +: 1 & m_{l} > m_{q} \\ -1 & m_{l} < m_{q} \end{cases}$$
(3)

We shall assume that  $\max(m_l, m_q) \approx q_{GU} \sim 10^{15}$  GeV. At n=1,  $m_{\min} \sim 100$  GeV we have from Eq. (3):  $q_{GU}^n/q_{GU}^0 = 6.8$  and  $\tau_p^n/\tau_p^0 = 10^{\pm 3}$ . The unification point and  $\tau_p$  can vary continuously by decreasing the mass splitting (for example, by increasing  $m_{\min}$ ). For n=1 lg  $g_{GU}/m_{\min} \approx 3.9$  lg  $(\tau_p^1/\tau_p^0)$  and a variation of  $\tau_p$  by an order of magnitude corresponds to  $m_{\min} \approx 10^{11}$  GeV and by two orders of magnitude, to  $10^7$  GeV.

The discussed 5-multiplets also modify the behavior of  $\alpha_w/q$  and hence the predictions for  $\sin^2\theta_w$ :

$$\Delta \sin^2 \theta_W = \sin^2 \theta_W |_{n} - \sin^2 \theta_W |_{o} = \frac{2}{99} \left( 1 - \frac{8}{3} \frac{\alpha_c^{-1}(m_{min})}{\alpha_{em}^{-1}(m_{min})} \right) \frac{n\epsilon}{1 - \frac{2}{33} n\epsilon}$$

$$= \frac{11}{3\pi} \alpha_{em} (m_{min}) \ln \frac{q_{GU}^n}{q_{GU}^n} = 0.0056 \lg \frac{r_p^n}{r_p^n}.$$
(4)

As seen in Eq. (4), a variation of  $\sin^2\theta_w$  is directly related to the variation for  $q_{GU}$  or  $\tau_p$ . The experimental values of  $\sin^2\theta_w$  (0.19–0.25) give an upper limit to a possible increase of  $\tau_p$  in the  $SU_5$  model using the superheavy fermions. Since  $\tau_p = 10^{29} - 10^{30}$  years in the standard time model corresponds to  $\sin^2\theta_w \approx 0.21$ , a permissible decrease of  $\Delta \sin^2\theta_w = 0.015 - 0.020$  gives [see Eq. (4)]  $\tau_p^n/\tau_p^0 \sim 10^3$  and  $\tau_{p_{\rm max}}^n \sim 10^{32} - 10^{33}$  years. Such an increase of  $\tau_p$ , according to Eq. (3), can be achieved by introducing a single 5-multiplet with  $m_q \sim 100$  GeV and  $m_l \sim 10^{15}$  GeV. The same result can be reproduced for  $\tau_p$  and  $\sin^2\theta_w$  by increasing the numbr of 5-multiplets n fold and by concurrently decreasing the mass splitting  $m_l/m_q$ . In the case of three 5-multiplets (one for each generation of known particles)  $m_q \sim 10^{11}$  GeV.

The author thanks V. S. Berezinskiĭ, G. T. Zatsepin, and M. E. Shaposhnikov for a discussion of this work.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. 32, 138 (1974); H. Fritzsch and P. Minkowski, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 93, 193 (1975).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>N. Cabibbo et al., Nucl. Phys. **B158**, 295 (1979).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>T. J. Goldman and D. A. Ross, Phys. Lett. 84B, 208 (1979); J. Ellis et al., Phys. Lett. 88B, 320 (1979).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>J. Learned, F. Reines, and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. Lett. 43, 90 (1979).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>J. Blandino et al., Harvard-Minnesota-Purdue-Wisconsin Report, 1979; M. Goldhaber et al., Irvine-Michigan-Brookhaven Report, 1979.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>A. Gonzalez-Arroyo et al., Nucl. Phys. B159, 512 (1979).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>B. A. Gordon et al., Phys. Rev. **D20**, 2645 (1979).

- - <sup>8</sup>M. I. Vysotskiĭ, A. D. Dolgov, and Ya. B. Zel'dovich, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 26, 200 (1977) [JETP
- - Lett. 26, 188 (1977)]; C. B. Dover, T. K. Gaisser, and G. Steigman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 42, 1117 (1979) (and

references therein).