We study the implementation of the type III seesaw in the ordinary nonsupersymmetric SU(5) grand unified theory. This allows for an alternative description of the minimal SU(5) model with the inclusion of the adjoint fermionic multiplet. The main prediction of the theory is the light fermionic SU(2) triplet with mass at the electroweak scale. Due to their gauge couplings, these triplets can be produced pair-wise via Drell-Yan, and due to the Majorana nature of the neutral component their decays leave a clear signature of same-sign dileptons and four jets. This allows for their possible discovery at LHC and provides an example of directly measurable seesaw parameters.

A. Introduction. We know today that neutrinos are massless (at least two of them). This implies that the minimal standard model cannot be the whole story. If one is not to change its low energy structure, one is led to a higher dimensional operator

\[ Y_{ij} \frac{H H}{M} ; \]

where \( Y_{ij} \) is the usual left-handed lepton doublet and \( H \) the Higgs doublet of the SM. Demanding perturbativity, i.e. \( Y_{ij} < 1 \) implies \( M < 10^{14} \text{ GeV} \), much below the Planck scale. In other words, gravity does not see and one must introduce new heavy states to be integrated out. This is called the seesaw mechanism. There are only three possible ways of implementing the seesaw:

I. one introduces right-handed neutrinos (at least two);

II. one utilizes a heavy SU(2) triplet with an appropriate hypercharge and a small vev;

III. one introduces heavy triplet fermions with zero hypercharge (at least two of them).

The first two possibilities, called type I and type II are being pursued daily, whereas the third one, called type III, has been very little discussed. The reason could be the necessity of having a number of such triplets, but even then, the model remains viable, if one accepts a combination of seesaw mechanisms. For example, for a triplet and a singlet of fermions, one can give two massless light neutrinos. Still, at first glance, it seems rather ad-hoc to use such a strange combination.

By itself, the seesaw mechanism sheds no light on neutrino mass, for it is equivalent to the effective operator written above. It is indispensable to have a theory beyond the standard model that predicts at least the scale \( M \), if not the couplings themselves. The natural framework for such a theory is grand unification and the minimal grand uni ed group, as well known, is based on SU(5). Suppose that one wants to study the minimal such theory without introducing supersymmetry, i.e. the original theory with \( 24_{U} \) and \( 5_{R} \) and the three generations of \( 10_{F} \) and \( \overline{5}_{F} \). This theory is ruled out since the couplings of the standard model do not unify and further, the neutrinos are massless. Adding I) righthanded neutrinos does not help, unification still fails. When introducing the minimal nonsupersymmetric SU(5) (type I) model, one adds the \( 15_{H} \) to the minimal SU(5). This has been studied recently at length.

The third possibility was not studied at all and this is the scope of our work. It amounts to adding a new set of fermions, \( 24_{F} \), and can be considered as an alternative minimal nonsupersymmetric SU(5) (type III) model. This cures the unification problem and accounts for a realistic neutrino spectrum. The reason for the latter is that \( 24_{F} \) contains both triplet and singlet fermions, and thus utilizing type III seesaw gives also type I as a bonus.

Although the theory will require substantial re-tuning, it turns out to be remarkably predictive. The combination of proton decay and unification constraints predicts the mass of the triplet fermion in \( 24_{F} \) and the mass of the triplet scalar in \( 24_{H} \) below \( 1 \text{ TeV} \), likely to be found at LHC. This is the main and the most interesting prediction of the theory. The stability of the proton prefers these particles to lie as close as possible to \( M_{Z} \).

The masses of the other particles are also restricted. The colour octets are seen to 3 to 6 orders of magnitude heavier than the triplets, while the fermionic leptoquarks turn out to be at the intermediate scale \( 10^{10} \) GeV.

In short, this theory provides an interesting example of seesaw particles predicted to be detectable at LHC and their Yukawa couplings directly accessible.

B. The model. The minimal plenification of the type III seesaw in nonsupersymmetric SU(5) (type III) requires a fermionic adjoint \( 24_{F} \), in addition to the usual adjoint \( 24_{H} \), \( 5_{R} \) and three generations of \( 10_{F} \) and \( \overline{5}_{F} \). The consistency of the charged fermion mass requires higher dimensional operators in the usual Yukawa sector. One must add the new Yukawa interactions
\[ L_Y = y_0^{\Delta} \delta_{P} (24_{\tau}) 5_{H} + \frac{1}{M_{p1}} y_1^{24_{\tau}} 24_{H} + y_2^{24_{H}} 24_{\tau} + y_3^{24_{\tau}} (24_{\tau} 24_{H}) 5_{H} \]  

(2)

After the SU(5) breaking (for later use \( h_{24_{\nu}} i = \text{diag}(2;2;2;3;3)\)) one obtains the following physical relevant Yukawa interactions for neutrino with the triplet \( y_0^{\Delta} \delta_{P} \) (type III) and singlet \( y_0 \) (type I) fermions:

\[ L_Y = L_1 y_0^{\Delta} \delta_{P} \delta_{P} \delta_{P} H ; \]  

(3)

where \( y_0^{\Delta} \delta_{P} \), \( y_0 \) are two different linear combinations of \( y_0^{\Delta} \delta_{P} \) and \( a = 1;2;3 \). It is clear from the above formula that besides the new appearance of the triplet fermions, the singlet fermion in 24\( \tau \) acts precisely as the righthanded neutrino; it should not come out as a surprise, as it has the right SM quantum numbers.

Even before we discuss the physical consequences in detail, one important prediction emerges: only two light neutrinos get mass, while the third one remains massless.

In order to discuss the masses of the new fermions, we need the new Yukawa couplings between 24\( \tau \) and 24\( H \):

\[ L_{F} = m_{F} Tr 24_{\tau} + \frac{1}{M_{p1}} a_{1} Tr 24_{\tau} Tr 24_{H} + a_{2} (Tr (24_{\tau} 24_{H}))^{2} + a_{3} Tr 24_{\tau} 24_{\tau} + a_{4} Tr (24_{\tau} 24_{H} 24_{H} 24_{H}) ; \]  

(4)

where we include the higher dimensional terms for the sake of consistency. The masses of the new fermions are

\[ m_{\sigma}^{2} = m_{F} \frac{\delta_{P} \delta_{P} \delta_{P}}{30} + \frac{\delta_{P} \delta_{P} \delta_{P}}{30} a_{1} + a_{2} + \frac{7}{30} (a_{3} + a_{4}) ; \]  

(5)

\[ m_{\sigma}^{2} = m_{F} \frac{\delta_{P} \delta_{P} \delta_{P}}{30} + \frac{\delta_{P} \delta_{P} \delta_{P}}{30} a_{1} + \frac{3}{10} (a_{3} + a_{4}) ; \]  

(6)

\[ m_{\sigma}^{2} = m_{F} \frac{\delta_{P} \delta_{P} \delta_{P}}{30} + \frac{\delta_{P} \delta_{P} \delta_{P}}{30} a_{1} + \frac{2}{15} (a_{3} + a_{4}) ; \]  

(7)

\[ m_{\sigma}^{2} (3,2) = m_{F} \frac{\delta_{P} \delta_{P} \delta_{P}}{30} + \frac{\delta_{P} \delta_{P} \delta_{P}}{30} a_{1} + \frac{(13a_{3} + 12a_{4})}{60} ; \]  

(8)

Next we turn to the bosonic sector of the theory. We will need the potential for the heavy left 24\( H \):

\[ V_{24_{H}} = m_{F}^{2} Tr 24_{H} 24_{H} + (1_{\tau} \tau_{\tau} 24_{H} 24_{H}) 24_{\nu} + \frac{1}{24_{\nu}} (1_{\tau} \tau_{\tau} 24_{H} 24_{H}) 24_{\nu} ; \]  

(9)

and its interaction with the light e-like quarks

\[ V_{5_{H}} = \frac{1}{M_{p1}} y_{1}^{24_{\nu}} 5_{H} + \frac{1}{M_{p1}} y_{2}^{24_{H}} 5_{H} + \frac{1}{M_{p1}} y_{3}^{24_{\nu}} 5_{H} + \frac{1}{M_{p1}} y_{4}^{24_{H}} 5_{H} ; \]  

(10)

It is straightforward to exercise to show that the masses of the bosonic triplet and octet are arbitrary and that one can perform the doublet-triplet splitting through the usual renormalization.

We are now fully armed to study the constraints on the particle spectrum by performing the renormalization group analysis.

C. Proton decay and unification constraints. Before getting lost in the numerics, it is useful to recall the failure of the SM unification. The weak and strong couplings actually unify at the scale around \( 10^{16} \) GeV, just as in the supersymmetric version of the theory. This is ideal for the proton decay point of view, but the trouble is that the \( U(1) \) coupling hits the weak coupling too soon, at the scale of about \( 10^{12-13} \) GeV. This indicates that the weak triplets are expected to be light in order to slow down the decrease of the weak coupling. It is easy to see that the fermionic leptoquark makes things worse and, as we show carefully below, they should be as heavy as possible. However splitting its mass from the triplet and the octet fermion mass requires the inclusion of higher dimension terms, which in turn gives an upper bound on the mass of the leptoquark

\[ m_{\sigma}^{2} (3,2) < \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{p1}} ; \]  

(11)

For the sake of illustration we present the one-loop analysis. The renormalization group equations at this level are

\[ 2 \frac{1}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{T}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{T}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{T}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{T}} ; \]  

(12)

\[ 2 \frac{1}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} ; \]  

(13)

\[ 2 \frac{1}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} \frac{M_{GUT}}{M_{Z}} ; \]  

(14)

where \( m_{3}, m_{3}, m_{(3,2)}, m_{(3,2)} \) and \( m_{(3,2)} \) are the masses of weak triplets, colour octets, (only fermionic) leptoquarks and (only bosonic) colour triplets respectively.
From the above a straightforward computation gives
\[
\text{exp } 30 \quad \frac{1}{1} \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad (M_z) = \frac{M_{\text{GUT}}}{M_z} \quad (15)
\]
\[
\text{M}_{\text{GUT}} \quad \frac{m_F}{M_z} \quad \frac{m_B}{m_2} \quad \frac{m_R}{m_1} \quad (\text{exp } 30)
\]
where we still keep all the masses generic, including the one of the leptoquark. As we argued before, its mass must be at most of order \( M_{\text{GUT}} = M_F \), which simplifies the analysis. From the well known problem in the standard model of the low meeting scale of 1 and \( Z \), it is clear that the SU(2) triplet should be as light as possible and the colour triplet as heavy as possible. In order to illustrate the point, take \( m_3 = m_B = M_z \) and \( m_1 = m_{\text{GUT}} \). This gives \( \frac{1}{1} \quad (M_z) = 59 \), \( \frac{1}{2} \quad (M_z) = 2957 \), \( \frac{1}{3} \quad (M_z) = 855 \) \( M_{\text{GUT}} \), \( 10^{15.2} \) GeV. Increasing the triplet mass \( m_B \) reduces \( M_{\text{GUT}} \) dangerously, making the same time proton decay too fast and higher dimension operators (needed to correct the second generation charged fermion mass) too small.

The two loop eects [3] relax this somewhat and for the above example of the GUT scale the triplet mass increases to about 500 GeV. Even if one allows \( M_{\text{GUT}} \) as low as \( 10^{15} \) GeV, one gets the triplet mass about 1000 GeV. In this extreme case this particle would not be produced at LHC, but would make leptogenesis easier to function. We should stress though that one is really stretching the parameters in order to avoid this triplet to be discovered at LHC.

We can safely conclude that the SU(2) triplets, especially the fermionic one responsible for the type III seesaw, should be close to \( M_z \) and possibly be detectable at LHC. This is the main result of our work. Unfortunately proton lifetime is predicted to be close to the experimental limit, since the GUT scale must lie below \( 10^{16} \) GeV. This makes a strong case for the new generation of proton decay experiments.

From eq. (10) one finds the fermion octet mass in the range \( 10^5 \) to \( 10^6 \) GeV, beyond experimental reach. The bosonic equivalent is actually not constrained by RGE at all and can be as light as \( M_z \). The solution we described here reminds us the so-called split supersymmetry [10] in the limit of very large higgsino mass. Due to their absence here the colour octet (the gluino in split supersymmetry) is much heavier than the weak triplet (the wino in split susy).

D. Phenomenological implications. The simplicity of the theory is reected in the neutrino sector too. As we remarked, one neutrino is massless. This is true up to possible eects of gravity [11], but gravity can only give a mass of about \( 10^5 \) to \( 10^6 \) eV, effectively zero for all practical purposes. The six complex paramters in \( y^{(3)} \), \( y^{(0)} \) become only nine real paramters after the redefinition of the leptonic phases. The model is thus similar to an often-imagined situation of two righthanded neutrinos, only here it is predicted by the structure of the theory.

Since the triplet \( \eta \) is at the weak scale, the couplings \( y^{(3)} \) are generically of the order of \( 10^{-6} \) to \( 10^{-7} \) (barring accidental cancellations), whereas the couplings \( y^{(0)} \) depend on the mass of the singlet \( \eta \). This mass cannot be determined by the unification constraints, because \( \eta \) is a SM gauge singlet. In any case, since one of the masses vanishes, the spectrum of light neutrinos corresponds either to the normal or inverse hierarchy.

The most interesting predictions of the theory regards LHC. The fact that seesaw is achieved through a triplet has a remarkable impact. Since its mass is close to \( M_z \), its Yukawa couplings are very small and thus if it were a standard model singlet, it would be basically invisible. However, as an SU(2) triplet, it can be easily produced (if \( m_3 < 500 \text{ GeV} \)) through the gauge interactions, and in this sense it behaves very much as a wino without higgsinos. These leptons would be produced in pairs through a Drell-Yan process. The production cross section for the sum of all three possible neutral states, \( \eta^0 \), \( \eta^+ \), \( \eta^- \), is given by eq. (2) of ref. [13]:

\[
\frac{1}{2} \quad (\text{exp } 30) \quad (2) \quad (W \cdot \eta) \quad (Z) \quad (\text{TeV}) \quad (\text{sec})
\]

One can estimate
\[
\frac{1}{2} \quad (\text{exp } 30) \quad (2) \quad (W \cdot \eta) \quad (\text{TeV}) \quad (\text{sec})
\]

which gives \( \frac{1}{2} \quad (\text{exp } 30) \quad (2) \quad (W \cdot \eta) \quad (\text{TeV}) \quad (\text{sec}) \). This leaves a clear signature at LHC, providing an important example of the seesaw mechanism being testable at TeV energies. The clearest signature is the three charged lepton decay of the charged triplet, but it has only a 3% branching ratio. A more promising situation is the decay into two jets with heavy gauge boson invariant mass plus a charged lepton; this happens in approximately 23% of all decays. The main point here is that the neutral component of the triplet decays as often into a charged lepton as into an antilepton due to its Majorana nature (just like right handed neutrinos).
The signatures in this case would be two same charge leptons plus two pairs of jets having the $W$ or $Z$ mass and peaks in the lepton-jet mass. From the above estimations the cross section for such events is around 2 pb (5 fb) for 100 (500) GeV triplet mass. Such signatures were suggested originally in the case of the type I seesaw in L-R symmetric theories [14], but are quite generic of the seesaw mechanism. The only difference in the type I case is that the dileptons are accompanied by two jets instead of four for the type III.

The colour octet fermions and bosons must decay before nucleosynthesis. It is easy to see that the bosonic octet decays through $1=1 m_3$ Yukawa couplings, which sets a limit $m_3^3 > 10^5$ GeV. If the fermionic octet is heavier than the bosonic one and the fermionic singlet together, then it can decay into them through the couplings in $\mathcal{L}$ in (1). If the opposite is true, the fermionic octet can decay through the exchange of the heavy colour triplet in $\Sigma_\ell$, which requires $m_\ell < 10^{13}$ GeV. This would be yet another hope for an observable proton decay in the future.

Although somewhat less firmly, the theory also predicts a light scalar triplet $\tilde{B}_{1/3}$ from $24_\ell$. If stable, this would provide a classical example of an ideal dark matter candidate (WIMP). Can it be stable? The answer is no due to the unavoidable presence of higher dimensional operators that correct the bad SU(5) fermion mass relations [3].

E. Summary and outlook. In this letter we have constructed the minimal predictive SU(5) theory. It is based on the addition of an adjoint fermionic multiplet to the already existing bosonic adjoint and fundamental Higgses. Through the existence of the standard model fermionic singlet and weak triplet, one obtains a combination of the type I and type III seesaw and thus one massless neutrino. The scale is too low for all leptogenesis [15] to work (for a generic discussion of leptogenesis with type III seesaw see [16]) unless the singlet and triplet fermions are almost degenerate (resonant leptogenesis) as explicitly shown for the case of right-handed neutrinos in [17].

The crucial prediction of the theory is the light weak fermionic and bosonic SU(2) triplets with masses around $M_\gamma$. Probably the most exciting aspect of this theory is that the decays of possibly observable seesaw particles will probe directly the Yukawa Dirac couplings of neutrinos. Thus the neutrino masses are correlated with observable phenomena at the TeV energies. Last but not least, this is in ultrasafe tied to the prediction of proton decay being observable in the next generation of experiments. We postpone the detailed phenomenological and cosmological analysis of all these issues for the future.
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