The Status of Flavor in Randall-Sundrum Models

Andreas Weiler (CERN)

Ringberg Workshop on New Physics, Flavors and Jets

April 28th, 2009

Fermion masses & mixings



The SM flavor puzzle $Y_D = (m_d, m_s, m_b)/v$ $Y_U = V_{\text{CKM}}^{\dagger}(m_u, m_c, m_t)/v$

$$Y_D \approx (10^{-5}, 0.0005, 0.026)$$

$$Y_U \approx \begin{pmatrix} 10^{-5} & -0.002 & 0.007 + 0.004i \\ 10^{-6} & 0.007 & -0.04 + 0.0008i \\ 10^{-8} + 10^{-7}i & 0.0003 & 0.96 \end{pmatrix}$$

The SM quark flavor parameters have structure: small & hierarchical. Why?

Compare to: $g_s \sim I$, $g \sim 0.6$, $g \sim 0.3$, $\lambda_{Higgs} \sim I$

Bounds on generic flavor violation



Origin of flavor

Dominating idea for a long time:

Hierarchies from symmetries (⇒ Graham Ross)

Alternative:

Hierarchies from geometrical sequestering (⇒ this talk and Stefania Gori)

Geometrical sequestering Arkani-Hamed, Schmaltz 5D bulk Higgs light heavy 10 15 20 25 30 35 5 0

Localization depends exponentially on O(I) parameter

Geometrical sequestering

Arkani-Hamed, Schmaltz



New sources for FCNCs







Potential problems

Flat extra dimensions:

Delgado, Pomarol, Quiros '99

o KK exchange induces unsuppressed FCNCs $\Rightarrow M_{KK} \sim 1/R > 5000 \text{ TeV}$

o Flat ED's are EFT's with $\Lambda \sim \text{few} \times 10/\text{R}$

Even if KK mode coupling flavor universal/MFV \Rightarrow What explains 10⁵ GeV suppression of $\mathcal{L}_{eff} = \frac{1}{\Lambda^2} (\bar{s}d)(\bar{s}d) + \dots$?

 $ds^2 = dx_\mu dx_\nu - dy^2$

Randall, Sundrum

Randall, Sundrur $ds^2 = \left(rac{R}{z}
ight)^2 \left(dx_\mu dx_
u - dz^2
ight)$

 $ds^2 = dx_\mu dx_\nu - dy^2$

Randall, Sundrum

 $ds^2 = \left(\frac{R}{\gamma}\right)^2 \left(dx_\mu dx_\nu - dz^2\right)$

 ✓ solution to the hierarchy problem
 ✓ AdS/CFT description of holographic technicolor, composite Higgs, pGB composite Higgs
 ✓ high scale unification, log running of gauge couplings







Fermion-KK coupling almost universal!



Fermion-KK coupling almost universal!

Anarchy & Location, Location, Location

Zero mode wave function on IR brane $F(c) \sim (TeV/Planck)^{c-1/2}, c_i \sim O(1)$

$$m_{ij}^{(u)} = \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} F_{Q_i}(Y_u)_{ij} F_{uj} \quad m_{ij}^{(d)} = \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} F_{Q_i}(Y_d)_{ij} F_{dj}$$

 Y_u , $Y_d \sim O(1)$: anarchic

Hierarchical mass spectrum for $F_{I} \ll F_{2} \ll F_{3}$ $\Rightarrow m_{ui} \sim F_{Qi} F_{ui} (vY) \qquad m_{di} \sim F_{Qi} F_{di} (vY)$

Hierarchical mixing angles Huber; Agashe, Perez, Soni $U_L^d m_{ij}^{(d)} U_R^d = \operatorname{diag}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{d}},\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{s}},\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}}\right)$

CKM matrix $V_{\text{CKM}}^{ij} \sim (U_L^{u,d})^{ij} \sim F_{Q_i}/F_{Q_j}$

with i < j

Hierarchical mixing angles Huber; Agashe, Perez, Soni $U_L^d m_{ij}^{(d)} U_R^d = \operatorname{diag}\left(\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{d}},\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{s}},\mathsf{m}_{\mathsf{b}}\right)$ CKM matrix $V_{\rm CKM}^{ij} \sim (U_L^{u,d})^{ij} \sim F_{Q_i}/F_{Q_i}$ with i < j $F_{OI} / F_{O3} \sim \theta_{13} \sim \lambda^3$ $F_{O2}/F_{O3} \sim \theta_{23} \sim \lambda^2$ Check: $\Rightarrow \theta_{12} \sim F_{01} / F_{02} \sim F_{01} / F_{03} \cdot F_{03} / F_{02} \sim \lambda$ Non-trivial prediction.

FCNC bounds satisfied?

F_Q , F_u , $F_d \neq I_{3x3}$ will lead to FCNCs

$$g_5 \int dz \left(\frac{R}{z}\right)^4 G^{(1)}(z) f_L(z)^2 \approx g_4 \sqrt{\log \frac{R'}{R}} \left(-\frac{1}{\log \frac{R'}{R}} + F(c)^2\right)$$

c-dependent fermion KK-gauge coupling (same F_i as in Yukawa)

in **CFT** picture mass ~ compositeness ~ F(c) mixing with CFT excitation





Masses, mixings and FCNCs



Gherghetta, Pomarol; Huber; Agashe, Perez, Soni;

Masses and mixings from hierarchical overlaps

 $m_d \sim v F_{d_L} Y^* F_{d_R}$

Masses, mixings and FCNCs



Gherghetta, Pomarol; Huber; Agashe, Perez, Soni;

Masses and mixings from hierarchical overlaps

 $m_d \sim v F_{d_L} Y^* F_{d_R}$



KK gluon FCNCs due to the same small overlaps F_i :

$$\sim \frac{(g^*)^2}{M_{KK}^2} F_{d_L} F_{d_R} F_{s_L} F_{s_R}$$

 $\sim \frac{(g^*)^2}{M_{KK}^2} \frac{m_d m_s}{(vY^*)^2}$

Masses, mixings and FCNCs



Gherghetta, Pomarol; Huber;Agashe, Perez, Soni; Massos and mixings from biorarchica

Masses and mixings from hierarchical overlaps

 $m_d \sim v F_{d_L} Y^* F_{d_R}$ **RS G**



KK gluon FCNCs due to the same small overlaps F_i:

$$\sim \frac{(g^*)^2}{M_{KK}^2} F_{d_L} F_{d_R} F_{s_L} F_{s_R}$$

 $\sim \frac{(g^*)^2}{M_{KK}^2} \frac{m_d m_s}{(vY^*)^2}$

Integrating out the KK gluon

Effective 4 fermi operators generated

 $\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{M_G^2} \left[\frac{1}{6} g_L^{ij} g_L^{kl} (\bar{q}_L^{i\alpha} \gamma_\mu q_{L\alpha}^j) (\bar{q}_L^{k\beta} \gamma^\mu q_{L\beta}^l) - g_R^{ij} g_L^{kl} \left((\bar{q}_R^{i\alpha} q_{L\alpha}^k) (\bar{q}_L^{l\beta} q_{R\beta}^j) - \frac{1}{3} (\bar{q}_R^{i\alpha} q_{L\beta}^l) (\bar{q}_L^{k\beta} q_{R\alpha}^j) \right) \right]$ $= C^1 (M_G) (\bar{q}_L^{i\alpha} \gamma_\mu q_{L\alpha}^j) (\bar{q}_L^{k\beta} \gamma^\mu q_{L\beta}^l) + C^4 (M_G) (\bar{q}_R^{i\alpha} q_{L\alpha}^k) (\bar{q}_L^{l\beta} q_{R\beta}^j) + C^5 (M_G) (\bar{q}_R^{i\alpha} q_{L\beta}^l) (\bar{q}_L^{k\beta} q_{R\alpha}^j)$

In particular

$$C_{4K}^{RS} \sim \frac{g_{s*}^2}{M_G^2} \frac{1}{Y_*^2} \frac{2m_d m_s}{v^2}$$

Has both real and O(I) imaginary part.

3 TeV KK gluon mass

Parameter	Limit on Λ_F (TeV)	Suppression in RS (TeV)
${ m Re}C^1_K$	$1.0 \cdot 10^{3}$	$\sim r/(\sqrt{6} V_{td}V_{ts} f_{q_3}^2) = 23 \cdot 10^3$
${ m Re}C_K^4$	$12 \cdot 10^{3}$	$\sim r(vY_*)/(\sqrt{2 m_d m_s}) = 22 \cdot 10^3$
${ m Re}C_K^5$	$10 \cdot 10^{3}$	$\sim r(vY_*)/(\sqrt{6 m_d m_s}) = 38 \cdot 10^3$
$\mathrm{Im}C^1_K$	$15 \cdot 10^{3}$	$\sim r/(\sqrt{6} V_{td}V_{ts} f_{q_3}^2) = 23 \cdot 10^3$
$\mathrm{Im}C_K^4$	$160 \cdot 10^{3}$	$\sim r(vY_*)/(\sqrt{2 m_d m_s}) = 22 \cdot 10^3$
$\mathrm{Im}C_K^5$	$140 \cdot 10^3$	$\sim r(vY_*)/(\sqrt{6 m_d m_s}) = 38 \cdot 10^3$
$ C_D^1 $	$1.2 \cdot 10^{3}$	$\sim r/(\sqrt{6} V_{ub}V_{cb} f_{q_3}^2) = 25 \cdot 10^3$
$ C_D^{\overline{4}} $	$3.5 \cdot 10^{3}$	$\sim r(vY_*)/(\sqrt{2m_u m_c}) = 12 \cdot 10^3$
$ C_D^{\overline{5}} $	$1.4 \cdot 10^{3}$	$\sim r(vY_*)/(\sqrt{6 m_u m_c}) = 21 \cdot 10^3$
$\overline{ C_{B_d}^1 }$	$0.21 \cdot 10^{3}$	$\sim r/(\sqrt{6} V_{tb}V_{td} f_{q_3}^2) = 1.2 \cdot 10^3$
$ C_{B_d}^4 $	$1.7 \cdot 10^{3}$	$\sim r(vY_*)/(\sqrt{2m_b m_d}) = 3.1 \cdot 10^3$
$ C_{B_d}^{5^{a}} $	$1.3 \cdot 10^3$	$\sim r(vY_*)/(\sqrt{6 m_b m_d}) = 5.4 \cdot 10^3$
$\overline{ C^1_{B_s} }$	30	$\sim r/(\sqrt{6} V_{tb}V_{ts} f_{q_3}^2) = 270$
$ C_{B_{s}}^{\bar{4}} $	230	$\sim r(vY_*)/(\sqrt{2m_bm_s}) = 780$
$ C_{B_s}^{\bar{5}} $	150	$\sim r(vY_*)/(\sqrt{6m_bm_s}) = 1400$





KK gluon mass bound in RS

Csaki, Falkowski, A.W.; Buras et. al.



KK gluon mass bound in RS

Csaki, Falkowski, A.W.; Buras et. al.



Some points are ok: any rationale to live here? Radiative stability? Bound depends on bulk QCD coupling **g**s* and **Y***

Bounds with caveats

Main problem is CPV LR contribution to $\epsilon_K : (\overline{s}_L d_R)(\overline{s}_R d_L)$

$$C_{4K}^{RS} \sim \frac{g_{s*}^2}{M_G^2} \frac{1}{Y_*^2} \frac{2m_d m_s}{v^2} \qquad C_{4K}^{pGB} \sim \frac{g_{s*}^2}{M_G^2} \frac{1}{g_*^2} \frac{8m_d m_s}{v^2} \frac{1+m^2}{\tilde{m}_d^2}$$

Csaki, Falkowski, A.W.

o Reduce bulk QCD coupling g_{s*} by loop level matching $\times \frac{1}{2}$ and assume vanishing UV boundary kinetic terms Agashe, Azatov, Zhu o Larger Y* allowed if Higgs in the bulk, more perturbative $\times \frac{1}{2}$ control **but** $Br(B \rightarrow X_s \gamma) \sim Y^{*6}$ $m_G \sim 5-7 \text{ TeV}$? Uncomfortable corner of parameter space: Little hierarchy? Fine tuning? Perturbativity? Still no signal at LHC?

How can we evade the RS flavor problem?

Main message

Total anarchy does not seem to work

o Finetuned scales? Raise the scale to $M_G \sim 20-30 \text{ TeV}$

o Finetuned Yukawas? Yukawas could miraculously give accidental cancellations Buras et. al ⇒ Stefania's talk

o No tuning, we need to add more structure: Alignment and flavor symmetries

> Fitzpatrick, Randall, Perez; Santiago; Csaki Falkowski, A.W; Csaki, Grossman, Perez, Surujon, A.W. ; Agashe;

Spurion analysis

Without the Yukawas SM has

 $SU(3)_{Q_L} \times SU(3)_{u_R} \times SU(3)_{d_R}$

global flavor symmetry. alternative picture: Davidson, Isidori, Uhlig

In RS broken by $Y_u^*, Y_d^* + F_Q, F_d, F_u$

No dangerous FCNCs in the down sector if

 $Y_d^* + F_Q$, F_d aligned (diagonal in the same basis)

Anarchy



Align down sector

similar to Nir, Seiberg '93 for MSSM



Aligning 5D MFV

Fitzpatrick, Randall, Perez; Csaki, Grossman, Perez, Surujon, A.W., in progress

 $c_Q \sim Y_d Y_d^{\dagger} + \epsilon Y_u Y_u^{\dagger}$ $c_d \sim Y_d^{\dagger} Y_d$ $c_u \sim Y_u^{\dagger} Y_u$ for $\epsilon \to 0$ no FCNCs in the down sector.



Effective suppression, scan over 5D CKM keeping $\mathbf{\epsilon} = 0.2$ fixed.

Need $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$: points to symmetry

Alignment due to shining

Csaki, Grossman, Perez, Surujon, A.W., in progress

In the bulk: gauged $SU(3)_Q \times SU(3)_d$ flavor symmetry.

$$F(c_Q) = F(Y_{*d}Y_{*d}^{\dagger}), \qquad F(c_d) = F(Y_{*d}^{\dagger}Y_{*d})$$

Rattazzi, Zafaroni Breaking shines into the bulk by vev of dynamical Yukawa field Y*d only (marginal operator)

 $\Phi_{d}: (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{I}, \mathbf{\underline{3}}), \quad \langle \Phi_{d} \rangle = Y_{*d} (z/R)^{-\varepsilon}$

Large effects in up-FCNCs expected!

Alternative: horizontal U(I)'s $C_{Saki, Falkowski, A.W.}$

Alignment due to horizontal flavor symmetries

split doublet natural candidate for pGB Higgs (Zbb protection)

$$\begin{split} & U(1)_{q} \text{ protects UV mixing } \quad \theta q_{u,L}(0) - q_{d,L}(0) = 0 \\ & U(1)_{d} \text{ alignes } Y_{d^{*}}, c_{qd}, c_{d} \end{split}$$

Predictions of U(I) solution

Gauged flavor symmetries : flavor bosons at the LHC?

Large (but controlled) flavor violation in the upsector D-<u>D</u> mixing general discussion: Blum, Grossman, Nir, Perez

Parameter	Suppression	$f_{q_u^3} = 0.3$	$f_{q_{u}^{3}} = 1$	Bound (TeV)
$ C_D^1 $	$\frac{\sqrt{6}}{g_{s*}\lambda^5 f_{q_y^3}^2} M_G$	$7.8 \cdot 10^3 M_G$	$0.7 \cdot 10^3 M_G$	$1.2 \cdot 10^{3}$
$ C_D^1 $	$\frac{\sqrt{3}Y_{*}^{2}v^{2}\lambda^{5}f_{q_{u}}^{2}}{\sqrt{2}q_{*}m_{u}m_{c}}M_{G}$	$1.2 \cdot 10^3 M_G$	$1.3 \cdot 10^5 M_G$	$1.2\cdot 10^3$
$ C_D^4 $	$\frac{vY_*}{g_{s*}\sqrt{2m_um_c}}M_G$	$1.2 \cdot 10^3 M_G$	$1.2 \cdot 10^3 M_G$	$3.5 \cdot 10^3$
$ C_K^1 $	$\frac{\sqrt{6}}{g_{s*}\lambda^5 f_{a^3}^2 \delta} M_G$	$3.0 \cdot 10^{6} M_{G}$	$2.7 \cdot 10^5 M_G$	$1.5 \cdot 10^4$
$ C_K^1 $	$\frac{\sqrt{3}Y_*^2 v^2}{\sqrt{2}q_{**}m_d m_s \lambda \delta} M_G$	$1.5 \cdot 10^{10} M_G$	$1.5 \cdot 10^{10} M_G$	$1.5\cdot 10^4$
$ C_K^4 $	$\frac{Y_*v}{g_{s*}\sqrt{2m_dm_s}\lambda^3 f_{q_u^3}\delta}M_G$	$2.8 \cdot 10^7 M_G$	$8.5 \cdot 10^6 M_G$	$1.6 \cdot 10^{5}$

Conclusions

RS provides an interesting theory of flavor, dual to partial compositeness.

RS-GIM suppresses dangerous FCNCs, tension with CPV in Kaon sector

Anarchy alone needs fine-tuning to survive, additional structure in the flavor sector required ⇒ large FCNCs in the up-sector predicted

Back-up slides



Neutrino wave function picks up UV tail of Higgs Agashe, Sundrum, Okui

Exponential suppression of overall mass scale **but** O(I) **v** mixing angles.

Remark on lepton flavor

$$Y_{4\mathrm{D},ij} \sim \int_{0}^{a} dy \, Y_{5\mathrm{D},ij}(y) \, e^{-(M_{L_{i}} + M_{R_{j}})y + M_{H}(y-a)}$$

$$(M_{L_{i}} + M_{R_{j}} > M_{H}) \bigvee \qquad \bigvee \qquad \bigvee \qquad (M_{L_{i}} + M_{R_{j}} < M_{H})$$

$$\sim \widetilde{Y}_{0,ij} \, e^{-M_{H}a} \ll \qquad \widetilde{Y}_{a,ij} \, e^{-(M_{L_{i}} + M_{R_{j}})a}$$

Neutrino wave function picks up UV tail of Higgs Agashe, Sundrum, Okui Exponential suppression of overall mass scale **but** O(1) v mixing angles.

 $M_i \equiv c_i$

Remark on lepton flavor

Neutrino wave function picks up UV tail of Higgs Agashe, Sundrum, Okui Exponential suppression of overall mass scale **but** O(1) v mixing angles.

 $M_i = c_i$

Possible fermion embedding: 4 of SO(5)



 $|) \qquad = chiral zero modes$

Possible fermion embedding: 4 of SO(5)



= chiral zero modes
 <A₅> marries fields in same multiplet

Possible fermion embedding: **4** of SO(5)



Possible fermion embedding: **4** of SO(5)





Bound for pGB Higgs



FCNC constraint more severe in composite pGB! Why? $\Upsilon^* \rightarrow g_* / 2$ & fermionic kinetic mixings

Bound for pGB Higgs



FCNC constraint more severe in composite pGB! Why? $\Upsilon^* \rightarrow g_* / 2$ & fermionic kinetic mixings