

# Mass hierarchy and string phenomenology in the LHC era

I. Antoniadis<sup>1</sup>

Department of Physics, CERN - Theory Unit, 1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland

E-mail: [ignatios.antoniadis@cern.ch](mailto:ignatios.antoniadis@cern.ch)

**Abstract.** I will discuss the status of the mass hierarchy problem and prospects for beyond the Standard Model physics in the light of the Higgs scalar discovery at the LHC and the experimental searches for new physics. In particular, I will discuss in this context low energy supersymmetry, living with the fine tuning and strings at the TeV scale.

## 1. Introduction

During the last few decades, physics beyond the Standard Model (SM) was guided from the problem of mass hierarchy. This can be formulated as the question of why gravity appears to us so weak compared to the other three known fundamental interactions corresponding to the electromagnetic, weak and strong nuclear forces. Indeed, gravitational interactions are suppressed by a very high energy scale, the Planck mass  $M_P \sim 10^{19}$  GeV, associated to a length  $l_P \sim 10^{-35}$  m, where they are expected to become important. In a quantum theory, the hierarchy implies a severe fine tuning of the fundamental parameters in more than 30 decimal places in order to keep the masses of elementary particles at their observed values. The reason is that quantum radiative corrections to all masses generated by the Higgs vacuum expectation value (VEV) are proportional to the ultraviolet cutoff which in the presence of gravity is fixed by the Planck mass. As a result, all masses are “attracted” to about  $10^{16}$  times heavier than their observed values.

Besides compositeness, there are two main theories that have been proposed and studied extensively during the last years, corresponding to different approaches of dealing with the mass hierarchy problem. (1) Low energy supersymmetry with all superparticle masses in the TeV region. Indeed, in the limit of exact supersymmetry, quadratically divergent corrections to the Higgs self-energy are exactly cancelled, while in the softly broken case, they are cutoff by the supersymmetry breaking mass splittings. (2) TeV scale strings, in which quadratic divergences are cutoff by the string scale and low energy supersymmetry is not needed. Both ideas are experimentally testable at high-energy particle colliders and in particular at LHC. Another option is to live with the hierarchy, addressing differently questions such as gauge coupling unification, dark matter candidate and electroweak (EW) vacuum stability. Split supersymmetry is an interesting example of such a possibility. All these ideas are experimentally testable at high-energy particle colliders and in particular at the LHC.

<sup>1</sup> On leave from CPHT (UMR CNRS 7644) Ecole Polytechnique, F-91128 Palaiseau.



On the other hand, the recent major discovery of the Higgs boson at the LHC with a mass around 126 GeV is so far compatible with the Standard Model within  $2\sigma$  and its precision tests. It is also compatible with low energy supersymmetry, although with some degree of fine-tuning in its minimal version. Indeed, in the minimal supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM), the lightest Higgs scalar mass  $m_h$  satisfies the following inequality:

$$m_h^2 \lesssim m_Z^2 \cos^2 2\beta + \frac{3}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{m_t^4}{v^2} \left[ \ln \frac{m_t^2}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} + \frac{A_t^2}{m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \left( 1 - \frac{A_t^2}{12m_{\tilde{t}}^2} \right) \right] \lesssim (130 \text{ GeV})^2, \quad (1)$$

where the first term in the r.h.s. corresponds to the tree-level prediction and the second term includes the one loop corrections due to the top and stop loops. Here,  $m_Z, m_t, m_{\tilde{t}}$  are the  $Z$ -boson, the top and stop quark masses, respectively,  $v = \sqrt{v_1^2 + v_2^2}$  with  $v_i$  the VEVs of the two higgses,  $\tan \beta = v_2/v_1$ , and  $A_t$  the trilinear stop scalar coupling. Thus, a Higgs mass around 126 GeV requires a heavy stop  $m_{\tilde{t}} \simeq 3$  TeV for vanishing  $A_t$ , or  $A_t \simeq 3m_{\tilde{t}} \simeq 1.5$  TeV in the ‘best’ case. These values are obviously consistent with the present LHC bounds on supersymmetry searches, but they will certainly be probed in the next run at double energy. Theoretically, they imply a fine-tuning of the EW scale at the percent to per mille level. This fine-tuning can be alleviated in supersymmetric models beyond the MSSM, as discussed in the next session.

## 2. MSSM Higgs sector with dimension-five and dimension-six operators

Although extremely successful, the Standard Model or its supersymmetric version (MSSM) is not a fundamental theory, and this motivated the theoretical efforts to understand the nature of new physics beyond it. This search can be done using an effective field theory approach, in which the “new physics” is parametrised by effective operators. The power of this approach resides in arranging these operators in powers of  $1/M_*$  where  $M_*$  is the scale of new physics that generated them. To improve the predictive power, one considers additional organising principles, such as: (i) symmetry constraints that these operators should respect, often inspired by phenomenology (for example: R-parity, lepton or baryon number conservation, etc). (ii) a truncation of the series of operators to a given order in the power of the inverse scale  $1/M_*$ . The effective low-energy Lagrangian then takes the form

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \sum_{i,n} \frac{c_{n,i}}{M_*^n} \mathcal{O}_{n,i} \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_0$  is the SM or the MSSM Lagrangian;  $\mathcal{O}_{n,i}$  is an operator of dimension  $d = n + 4$  with the index  $i$  running over the set of operators of a given dimension;  $c_{n,i}$  are some coefficients of order  $\mathcal{O}(1)$ . This description is appropriate for scales  $E$  which satisfy  $E \ll M_*$ . Constraints from phenomenology can then be used to set bounds on the scale of new physics  $M_*$ .

Regarding the origin of operators  $\mathcal{O}_{n,i}$ , they can be generated classically or at the quantum level. At the classical level, this can happen by integration of some new massive states, via the equations of motion and one then generates an infinite series. This can happen even in 4D renormalisable theories; indeed, even though the low energy interaction looks nonrenormalisable, it may actually point to a renormalisable theory valid up to a much higher scale (a familiar example is the Fermi interaction). Such effective operators are also generated at the quantum level, for example following compactification of a higher dimensional theory, by the radiative corrections associated with momentum and winding modes of the compactification [1, 2, 3, 4, 5].

The effects of these operators on the low energy observables can be comparable to the radiative effects of light states in the SM/MSSM [6] and this shows the importance of their study. In the following we shall study these effects to the case of the MSSM Higgs sector with additional operators of dimensions  $d = 5$  and  $d = 6$ . In particular we show that the mass of lightest SM-like Higgs can easily be increased above the LEP bound by new physics in the region of few TeV. We then discuss the nature of the “new physics” behind the effective operators.

### 2.1. MSSM with $d=5$ operators.

As an application, consider the MSSM extended by all possible  $d = 5$  operators that respect R-parity, baryon and lepton number symmetry. The Lagrangian is  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}^{(5)}$  where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0 &= \int d^4\theta \sum_{i=1,2} Z_i(S, S^\dagger) H_i^\dagger e^{V_i} H_i + \left\{ \int d^2\theta \mu_0 (1 + B_0 S) H_1 \cdot H_2 + h.c. \right\} + \dots \\ &+ \int d^2\theta \left[ Q \lambda_U(S) U^c H_2 - Q \lambda_D(S) D^c H_1 - L \lambda_E(S) E^c H_1 \right] + h.c. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The dots stand for Higgs-independent terms and  $Z_i(S, S^\dagger) = 1 - c_i S^\dagger S$ ,  $c_i \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ . Further

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{(5)} &= \frac{1}{M_*} \int d^4\theta \left[ H_1^\dagger e^{V_1} Q Y_U U^c + H_2^\dagger e^{V_2} Q Y_D D^c + H_2^\dagger e^{V_2} L Y_E E^c \right. \\ &\left. + a D^\alpha [b H_2 e^{-V_1}] D_\alpha [c e^{V_1} H_1] + \delta(\bar{\theta}^2) [Q U^c T_Q Q D^c + Q U^c T_L L E^c + \lambda_H (H_1 H_2)^2] + h.c. \right] \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

with a standard notation. We introduced here some spurion dependent functions:  $a, b, c, Z_{1,2}, Y_F$ ,  $F = U, D, E$ , which are general functions of  $(S, S^\dagger)$  while  $T_Q, T_L, \lambda_H$ , are holomorphic functions of  $S$ . Here  $S = m_0 \theta^2$  is the spurion superfield and  $m_0$  the supersymmetry breaking scale, with  $m_0 = \langle F_{hidden} \rangle / M_P$ , so supersymmetry breaking is transmitted via gravitational interaction. Any supersymmetry breaking associated with the presence of the above interactions is included using the spurion field technique. Not all operators in (4) are independent [6]. To remove the redundant operators we use field re-definitions:

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &\rightarrow H_1 - \frac{1}{M_*} \bar{D}^2 \left[ \Delta_1 H_2^\dagger e^{V_2} (i\sigma_2) \right]^T + \frac{1}{M_*} Q \rho_U U^c \\ H_2 &\rightarrow H_2 + \frac{1}{M_*} \bar{D}^2 \left[ \Delta_2 H_1^\dagger e^{V_1} (i\sigma_2) \right]^T + \frac{1}{M_*} Q \rho_D D^c + \frac{1}{M_*} L \rho_E E^c \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $\rho_F = \rho_F(S)$ ,  $F = U, D, E$ ,  $\Delta_i = \Delta_i(S, S^\dagger)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , can be chosen arbitrarily. To avoid the presence of flavour changing neutral currents, the following simple ansatz can be made:

$$\begin{aligned} T_Q(S) &= c_Q(S) \lambda_U(0) \otimes \lambda_D(0), & T_L(S) &= c_L(S) \lambda_U(0) \otimes \lambda_E(0), \\ \rho_F(S) &= c_F(S) \lambda_F(0), & Y_F(S, S^\dagger) &= y_F(S, S^\dagger) \lambda_F(0), \quad F = U, D, E. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

and, as usual  $\lambda_F(S) = \lambda_F(0) (1 + A_F S)$ . Using a suitable choice for the (otherwise arbitrary) coefficients of the spurion entering in  $\Delta_{1,2}$ , one can set  $T_Q = T_L = 0$  also  $a = b = c = 0$  and  $Y_F \rightarrow y_F(S^\dagger) \lambda_F(0)$ . Then one finds [6]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{(5)} &= \frac{1}{M_*} \int d^4\theta \left[ H_1^\dagger e^{V_1} Q Y'_U(S^\dagger) U^c + H_2^\dagger e^{V_2} Q Y'_D(S^\dagger) D^c + H_2^\dagger e^{V_2} L Y'_E(S^\dagger) E^c + h.c. \right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{M_*} \int d^2\theta \lambda'_H(S) (H_1 H_2)^2 + h.c. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Detailed calculations show[6] that the new Yukawa couplings  $Y'_F(S^\dagger)$  now depend on  $S^\dagger$  only,  $Y'_F(S^\dagger) = \lambda_F(0) (x_0^F + x_2^F S^\dagger)$ . After (5), the couplings of  $\mathcal{L}_0$  also acquired, at tree level, threshold corrections which depend on  $M_*$  [6]. The new form of  $\mathcal{L}^{(5)}$  in (7) gives the minimal irreducible set of R-parity, B, L conserving  $d=5$  operators that can be present beyond MSSM.

A consequence of this analysis is the generation of new couplings, beyond those in the MSSM at the tree level. For example there is a “wrong”-Higgs Yukawa coupling, that exchanges the holomorphic dependence on one Higgs by that on the hermitian conjugate of the other [8, 9].

Such couplings do arise in the MSSM at one-loop, after integrating out massive squarks and are suppressed by  $m_0^2/M_*^2 \times (\text{loop-factor})$ . Here they are suppressed by  $m_0/M_*$  only, as seen below:

$$\frac{M_s}{M_*} \left[ x_2^U [\lambda_U(0)]_{ij} (h_1^\dagger q_{Li}) u_{Rj}^c + x_2^D [\lambda_D(0)]_{ij} (h_2^\dagger q_{Li}) d_{Rj}^c + x_2^E [\lambda_E(0)]_{ij} (h_2^\dagger l_{Li}) e_{Rj}^c + h.c. \right] \quad (8)$$

These couplings bring a  $\tan \beta$  enhancement of a prediction for a physical observable, such as the bottom quark mass, relative to bottom quark Yukawa coupling:

$$m_b = (1/\sqrt{2}) v \cos \beta (\lambda_b + \delta \lambda_b + \Delta \lambda_b \tan \beta) \quad (9)$$

Here  $\lambda_b$  is the usual bottom quark Yukawa coupling,  $\delta \lambda_b$  is its one-loop correction in MSSM and  $\Delta \lambda_b$  is a “wrong”-Higgs coupling’ corrections, obtained after integrating out at one-loop massive squarks in MSSM; in our case  $\Delta \lambda_b$  receives an extra correction from (8), which can actually be larger than its one-loop-generated MSSM counterpart [8, 10, 11, 12]. This can bring a  $\tan \beta$  enhancement of the Higgs decay rate into bottom quarks pairs (for further details see [6]).

## 2.2. MSSM Higgs sector with $d=5$ and $d=6$ operators

We can extend the previous discussion by including all effective operators of both dimension  $d = 5$  and  $d = 6$  that can exist beyond the MSSM Higgs sector. This can be motivated in various ways. The MSSM Higgs sector is a minimal construction and extension of that of the SM. It does not take into account possible non-perturbative effects [13] or additional massive states that can couple to the Higgs sector and generate, when integrated out, new contributions. The fine tuning [14, 15] needed to have the SM-like Higgs mass well above the LEP bound [16] can also be a problem and it may indicate the existence of new physics beyond the Higgs sector. Such problems may be addressed by using a model-independent approach, using the effective operators. In the leading order, new physics beyond the MSSM Higgs sector can manifest itself as operators of either  $d = 5$  [6, 17, 18, 19] or  $d = 6$  [7, 20] or both. If generated by the same new physics, by comparing  $\mathcal{O}(1/M^*)$  and  $\mathcal{O}(1/M_*^2)$  terms one can estimate when the series expansion in  $1/M_*$  breaks down. The operators in the Higgs sector of dimension  $d = 5$  were:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1 &= \frac{1}{M_*} \int d^2\theta \lambda'_H(S) (H_2 \cdot H_1)^2 + h.c. = 2\zeta_{10} (h_2 \cdot h_1)(h_2 \cdot F_1 + F_2 \cdot h_1) + \zeta_{11} m_0 (h_2 \cdot h_1)^2 + h.c., \\ \mathcal{L}_2 &= \frac{1}{M_*} \int d^4\theta \left\{ a(S, S^\dagger) D^\alpha \left[ b(S, S^\dagger) H_2 e^{-V_1} \right] D_\alpha \left[ c(S, S^\dagger) e^{V_1} H_1 \right] + h.c. \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where

$$\lambda'_H(S)/M_* = \zeta_{10} + \zeta_{11} m_0 \theta\theta, \quad \zeta_{10}, \zeta_{11} \sim 1/M_*, \quad (11)$$

$\mathcal{L}_1$  can be generated by integrating out a massive gauge singlet or  $SU(2)$  triplet. Indeed, in the MSSM with a massive gauge singlet, with an F-term of type  $M_* \Sigma^2 + \Sigma H_1 H_2$ , when integrating out  $\Sigma$  generates  $\mathcal{L}_1$ .  $\mathcal{L}_2$  can be generated in various ways (see Appendix A, B in [6]) but perhaps the simplest way is via an additional pair of massive Higgs doublets of mass of order  $M_*$ . As already discussed,  $\mathcal{L}_2$  can be removed by general spurion-dependent field redefinitions, up to soft terms and  $\mu$  term renormalisation and  $\mathcal{O}(1/M_*^2)$  corrections [6].

We assume that  $m_0 \ll M_*$ , so that the effective approach is reliable. If this is not respected and the “new physics” is represented by “light” states (like the MSSM states), the  $1/M_*$  expansion is not reliable and one should work in a setup where these are not integrated out.

The list of  $d = 6$  operators is longer [21]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}_1 &= \frac{1}{M_*^2} \int d^4\theta \mathcal{Z}_1 (H_1^\dagger e^{V_1} H_1)^2, & \mathcal{O}_5 &= \frac{1}{M_*^2} \int d^4\theta \mathcal{Z}_5 (H_1^\dagger e^{V_1} H_1) H_2 \cdot H_1 + h.c. \\
\mathcal{O}_2 &= \frac{1}{M_*^2} \int d^4\theta \mathcal{Z}_2 (H_2^\dagger e^{V_2} H_2)^2, & \mathcal{O}_6 &= \frac{1}{M_*^2} \int d^4\theta \mathcal{Z}_6 (H_2^\dagger e^{V_2} H_2) H_2 \cdot H_1 + h.c. \\
\mathcal{O}_3 &= \frac{1}{M_*^2} \int d^4\theta \mathcal{Z}_3 (H_1^\dagger e^{V_1} H_1) (H_2^\dagger e^{V_2} H_2), & \mathcal{O}_7 &= \frac{1}{M_*^2} \int d^2\theta \mathcal{Z}_7 \text{Tr} W^\alpha W_\alpha (H_2 H_1) + h.c. \\
\mathcal{O}_4 &= \frac{1}{M_*^2} \int d^4\theta \mathcal{Z}_4 (H_2 \cdot H_1) (H_2 \cdot H_1)^\dagger, & \mathcal{O}_8 &= \frac{1}{M_*^2} \int d^4\theta \mathcal{Z}_8 (H_2 H_1)^2 + h.c.
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where  $W^\alpha = (-1/4) \bar{D}^2 e^{-V} D^\alpha e^V$  is the chiral field strength of  $SU(2)_L$  or  $U(1)_Y$  vector superfields  $V_w$  and  $V_Y$  respectively. Also  $V_{1,2} = V_w^a (\sigma^a/2) + (\mp 1/2) V_Y$  with the upper (minus) sign for  $V_1$ . The remaining  $d = 6$  operators involve extra space-time derivatives:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}_9 &= \frac{1}{M_*^2} \int d^4\theta \mathcal{Z}_9 H_1^\dagger \bar{\nabla}^2 e^{V_1} \nabla^2 H_1 & \mathcal{O}_{12} &= \frac{1}{M_*^2} \int d^4\theta \mathcal{Z}_{12} H_2^\dagger e^{V_2} \nabla^\alpha W_\alpha^{(2)} H_2 \\
\mathcal{O}_{10} &= \frac{1}{M_*^2} \int d^4\theta \mathcal{Z}_{10} H_2^\dagger \bar{\nabla}^2 e^{V_2} \nabla^2 H_2 & \mathcal{O}_{13} &= \frac{1}{M_*^2} \int d^4\theta \mathcal{Z}_{13} H_1^\dagger e^{V_1} W_\alpha^{(1)} \nabla^\alpha H_1 \\
\mathcal{O}_{11} &= \frac{1}{M_*^2} \int d^4\theta \mathcal{Z}_{11} H_1^\dagger e^{V_1} \nabla^\alpha W_\alpha^{(1)} H_1 & \mathcal{O}_{14} &= \frac{1}{M_*^2} \int d^4\theta \mathcal{Z}_{14} H_2^\dagger e^{V_2} W_\alpha^{(2)} \nabla^\alpha H_2
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Also  $\nabla_\alpha H_i = e^{-V_i} D_\alpha e^{V_i} H_i$  and  $W_\alpha^i$  is the field strength of  $V_i$ . To be general, in the above operators one should include spurion ( $S$ ) dependence under any  $\nabla_\alpha$ , of arbitrary coefficients, to account for supersymmetry breaking effects associated to them. Finally, the wavefunction coefficients are spurion dependent and have the structure

$$(1/M_*^2) \mathcal{Z}_i(S, S^\dagger) = \alpha_{i0} + \alpha_{i1} m_0 \theta\theta + \alpha_{i1}^* m_0 \bar{\theta}\bar{\theta} + \alpha_{i2} m_0^2 \theta\theta\bar{\theta}\bar{\theta}, \quad \alpha_{ij} \sim 1/M_*^2. \tag{14}$$

Regarding the origin of these operators:  $\mathcal{O}_{1,2,3}$  can be generated in the MSSM by an additional, massive  $U(1)'$  gauge boson or  $SU(2)$  triplets, when integrated out [17].  $\mathcal{O}_4$  can be generated by a massive gauge singlet or  $SU(2)$  triplet, while  $\mathcal{O}_{5,6}$  can be generated by a combination of  $SU(2)$  doublets and massive gauge singlet.  $\mathcal{O}_7$  is essentially a threshold correction to the gauge coupling, with a moduli field replaced by the Higgs.  $\mathcal{O}_8$  exists only in non-susy case, but is generated when removing the  $d = 5$  derivative operator  $\mathcal{L}_2$  by field redefinitions [6], so we keep it.

It can be shown that operators  $\mathcal{O}_{9,\dots,14}$ , can be eliminated along the lines discussed in the previous sections. For example, in the absence of gauge interactions,  $\mathcal{O}_9$  is similar to the operator in eq.(7) and only brings a wavefunction renormalisation,  $\mathcal{O}_9 \sim |\mu|^2/M_*^2 \int d^4\theta H_1^\dagger H_1$ , and similar for  $\mathcal{O}_{10}$ . Regarding  $\mathcal{O}_{11,12}$ , in the supersymmetric case they vanish, following the definition of  $\nabla^\alpha$  and an integration by parts. Further,  $\mathcal{O}_{13,14}$  are similar to  $\mathcal{O}_{9,10}$ , which can be seen by using the definition of  $W_\alpha^{(i)}$  and the relation between  $\nabla^2$ ,  $(\bar{\nabla}^2)$  and  $D^2$ ,  $(\bar{D}^2)$ . In the presence of supersymmetry breaking, elimination of these operators and their supersymmetry breaking contribution is still possible, up to a renormalisation of the soft terms and  $\mu$  term [6].

### 2.3. Higgs mass corrections from $d = 5$ and $d = 6$ operators.

With the remaining set of independent, effective operators  $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{O}_{1,\dots,8}$  of dimensions  $d = 5$  and  $d = 6$ , one finds the scalar potential  $V$  and its EW minimum; this is perturbed by  $\mathcal{O}(1/M_*^2)$

corrections from that of the MSSM. The expression of  $V$  is long and it is not given here (see [7] for its form). From  $V$  one computes the mass of CP-odd/even Higgs fields. One has:

$$m_A^2 = (m_A^2)_{\text{MSSM}} - \frac{2\zeta_{10}\mu_0 v^2}{\sin 2\beta} + 2m_0\zeta_{11}v^2 + \delta m_A^2, \quad \delta m_A^2 = \mathcal{O}(1/M_*^2) \quad (15)$$

for the pseudoscalar Higgs, with  $(m_A^2)_{\text{MSSM}}$  the MSSM value, with  $\delta m_A^2$  due to  $\mathcal{O}(1/M_*^2)$  corrections from  $d = 5$  and  $d = 6$  operators. For the CP-even Higgs one has [6, 17, 19]

$$\begin{aligned} m_{h,H}^2 &= (m_{h,H}^2)_{\text{MSSM}} \\ &+ (2\zeta_{10}\mu_0)v^2 \sin 2\beta \left[ 1 \pm \frac{m_A^2 + m_Z^2}{\sqrt{\tilde{w}}} \right] + \frac{(-2\zeta_{11}m_0)v^2}{2} \left[ 1 \mp \frac{(m_A^2 - m_Z^2) \cos^2 2\beta}{\sqrt{\tilde{w}}} \right] \\ &+ \delta m_{h,H}^2, \quad \text{where} \quad \delta m_{h,H}^2 = \mathcal{O}(1/M_*^2) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The upper (lower) signs correspond to  $h$  ( $H$ ), and  $\tilde{w} \equiv (m_A^2 + m_Z^2)^2 - 4m_A^2 m_Z^2 \cos^2 2\beta$ . With this result one can show that the mass  $m_h$  can be increased above the LEP bound, also with the help of quantum corrections [6, 17, 18, 19].

Regarding the  $\mathcal{O}(1/M_*^2)$  corrections of  $\delta m_{h,H}^2$ ,  $\delta m_A^2$  and  $\delta m_{h,H}^2$  of (15), (16), in the general case of including all operators and their associated supersymmetry breaking, they have a complicated form. Exact expressions can be found in [7, 20]. For most purposes, an expansion of these in  $1/\tan\beta$  is accurate enough. At large  $\tan\beta$ ,  $d = 6$  operators bring corrections comparable to those of  $d = 5$  operators. The relative  $\tan\beta$  enhancement of  $\mathcal{O}(1/M_*^2)$  corrections compensates for the extra suppression that these have relative to  $\mathcal{O}(1/M_*)$  operators (which involve both  $h_1$ ,  $h_2$  and are not enhanced in this limit). Note however that in some models only  $d = 6$  operators may be present, depending on the details of the “new physics” generating the effective operators.

Let us present the correction  $\mathcal{O}(1/M^2)$  to  $m_{h,H}^2$  for the case  $m_A$  is kept fixed to an appropriate value. The result is, assuming  $m_A > m_Z$ , (otherwise  $\delta m_h^2$  and  $\delta m_H^2$  are exchanged):

$$\begin{aligned} \delta m_h^2 &= -2v^2 \left[ \alpha_{22}m_0^2 + (\alpha_{30} + \alpha_{40})\mu_0^2 + 2\alpha_{61}m_0\mu_0 - \alpha_{20}m_Z^2 \right] - (2\zeta_{10}\mu_0)^2 v^4 (m_A^2 - m_Z^2)^{-1} \\ &+ v^2 \cot\beta \left[ (m_A^2 - m_Z^2)^{-1} \left( 4m_A^2 ((2\alpha_{21} + \alpha_{31} + \alpha_{41} + 2\alpha_{81})m_0\mu_0 + (2\alpha_{50} + \alpha_{60})\mu_0^2 + \alpha_{62}m_0^2) \right. \right. \\ &- (2\alpha_{60} - 3\alpha_{70})m_A^2 m_Z^2 - (2\alpha_{60} + \alpha_{70})m_Z^4 \left. \right) + 8(m_A^2 + m_Z^2)(\mu_0 m_0 \zeta_{10} \zeta_{11})v^2 / (m_A^2 - m_Z^2)^2 \left. \right] \\ &+ \mathcal{O}(1/\tan^2\beta) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

A similar formula exists for the correction to  $m_H$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \delta m_H^2 &= \left[ -2(m_0\mu_0(\alpha_{51} + \alpha_{61}) + \alpha_{82})m_0^2 v^2 + (2\zeta_{10}\mu_0)^2 v^4 (m_A^2 - m_Z^2)^{-1} \right] \\ &+ v^2 \cot\beta \left[ (m_A^2 - m_Z^2)^{-1} \left( 2m_A^2 (2(\alpha_{11} - \alpha_{21})m_0\mu_0 + (\alpha_{60} - \alpha_{50})\mu_0^2 + (\alpha_{52} - \alpha_{62})m_0^2 - \alpha_{60}m_A^2) \right. \right. \\ &- [4(\alpha_{11} + \alpha_{21} + \alpha_{31} + \alpha_{41} + 2\alpha_{81})m_0\mu_0 + 6(\alpha_{50} + \alpha_{60})\mu_0^2 + 2(\alpha_{52} + \alpha_{62})m_0^2 \\ &- (\alpha_{50} + 5\alpha_{60} - 2\alpha_{70})m_A^2 m_Z^2 - (\alpha_{50} - \alpha_{60})m_Z^4 \left. \right) - 8(m_A^2 + m_Z^2)(\mu_0 m_0 \zeta_{10} \zeta_{11})v^2 / (m_A^2 - m_Z^2)^2 \left. \right] \\ &+ \mathcal{O}(1/\tan^2\beta) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The mass corrections in (17), (18) must be added to the rhs of eqs.(16) to obtain the full value of  $m_{h,H}^2$ . Together with (12), (14), these corrections identify the operators of  $d = 6$  with the

largest contributions, which is important for model building beyond the MSSM Higgs sector. These operators are  $\mathcal{O}_{2,3,4}$  in the absence of supersymmetry breaking and  $\mathcal{O}_{2,6}$  when this is broken. It is preferable, however, to increase  $m_h^2$  by supersymmetric rather than supersymmetry-breaking effects of the effective operators, because the latter are less under control in the effective approach; also, one would favour a supersymmetric solution to the fine-tuning problem associated with increasing the MSSM Higgs mass above the LEP bound. Therefore  $\mathcal{O}_{2,3,4}$  are the leading operators, with the remark that  $\mathcal{O}_2$  has a smaller effect, of order  $(m_Z/\mu_0)^2$  relative to  $\mathcal{O}_{3,4}$  (for similar  $\alpha_{j0}$ ,  $j = 2, 3, 4$ ). At smaller  $\tan\beta$ ,  $\mathcal{O}_{5,6}$  can also give significant contributions, while  $\mathcal{O}_7$  has a relative suppression factor  $(m_Z/\mu_0)^2$ . Note that we kept all operators  $\mathcal{O}_i$  independent. By doing so, one can easily single out the individual contribution of each operator, which helps in model building, since not all operators are present in a specific model.

One limit to consider is that where the operators of  $d = 6$  have coefficients such that their contributions add up to maximise  $\delta m_h^2$ . Since  $\alpha_{ij}$  are not known, one can choose:

$$-\alpha_{22} = -\alpha_{61} = -\alpha_{30} = -\alpha_{40} = \alpha_{20} > 0 \quad (19)$$

In this case, at large  $\tan\beta$ :

$$\delta m_h^2 \approx 2v^2 \alpha_{20} [m_0^2 + 2m_0\mu_0 + 2\mu_0^2 + m_Z^2] \quad (20)$$

A simple numerical example is illustrative. For  $m_0 = 1$  TeV,  $\mu_0 = 350$  GeV, and with  $v \approx 246$  GeV, one has  $\delta m_h^2 \approx 2.36 \alpha_{20} \times 10^{11} (\text{GeV})^2$ . Assuming  $M_* = 10$  TeV and ignoring  $d = 5$  operators, with  $\alpha_{20} \sim 1/M_*^2$  and the MSSM value of  $m_h$  taken to be its upper classical limit  $m_Z$  (reached for large  $\tan\beta$ ), we obtain an increase of  $m_h$  from  $d = 6$  operators alone of about  $\Delta m_h = 12.15$  GeV to  $m_h \approx 103$  GeV. An increase of  $\alpha_{20}$  by a factor of 2.5 to  $\alpha_{20} \sim 2.5/M_*^2$  would give  $\Delta m_h \approx 28$  GeV to  $m_h \approx 119.2$  GeV, which is already above the LEP bound. Note that this increase is realised even for a scale  $M_*$  of “new physics” beyond the LHC reach.

The above choice of  $M_* = 10$  TeV was partly motivated by the fine-tuning results [18] (for  $d = 5$  operators) and on convergence grounds: the expansion parameter of our effective analysis is  $m_q/M_*$  where  $m_q$  is any scale of the theory, in particular it can be  $m_0$ . For a susy breaking scale  $m_0 \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$  TeV (say  $m_0 = 3$  TeV) and  $c_{1,2}$  or  $\alpha_{ij}$  of  $\mathcal{Z}_i(S, S^\dagger)$  of order unity (say  $c_{1,2} = 2.5$ ) one has for  $M_* = 10$  TeV that  $c_{1,2} m_0/M_* = 0.75$  which is already close to unity, and at the limit of validity of the effective expansion in powers of  $1/M_*$ . To conclude, even for a scale of “new physics” above the LHC reach, one can still classically increase  $m_h$  to the LEP bound.

#### 2.4. Final remarks

The final step is to identify the nature of “new physics” that generated the operators with the largest correction to  $m_h$ , ideally from a renormalisable model. At the level of dimension  $d = 5$  operators, this is clear from previous discussion: a massive gauge singlet can generate operator  $\mathcal{L}_1$  of (10) and the needed increase of  $m_h$ , for a scale  $M_* \sim 5 - 10$  TeV [18]; this can provide a solution to the little hierarchy problem, provided that one can fix dynamically the scale  $M_*$ .

For dimension-six operators, from the above discussion one finds that to increase  $m_h$  it is needed that one or more of the following conditions are satisfied:

$$\alpha_{20} > 0, \alpha_{30} < 0, \alpha_{40} < 0 \quad (21)$$

First recall that  $\mathcal{O}_{1,2,3}$  can be most easily generated by integrating out a massive gauge boson  $U(1)'$  or  $SU(2)$  triplets [17], while  $\mathcal{O}_4$  can be generated by a massive gauge singlet or  $SU(2)$  triplets. Let us discuss the signs of the operators when they are generated as above:

**(a):** Integrating out a massive vector superfield  $U(1)'$  under which Higgs fields have opposite charges (to avoid a Fayet-Iliopoulos term), one finds  $\alpha_{20} < 0$  and  $\alpha_{30} > 0$  (also  $\alpha_{10} < 0$ ) [17],

which is opposite to what we need. This can be changed, if for example there are additional pairs of massive Higgs doublets also charged under new  $U(1)'$ ; then  $\mathcal{O}_3$  could be generated with  $\alpha_{30} < 0$ .

**(b):** Integrating massive  $SU(2)$  triplets that couple to the MSSM Higgs sector would bring  $\alpha_{20} > 0$ ,  $\alpha_{40} < 0$ ,  $\alpha_{30} > 0$ , so the first two relations agree with what we need.

**(c):** Integrating a massive gauge singlet would bring  $\alpha_{40} > 0$ , which would instead decrease  $m_h$ .

Finally, at large  $\tan\beta$ , due to additional corrections that effective operators bring to the  $\rho$  parameter [22], it turns out that  $\alpha_{40}$  and  $\alpha_{30}$  can have the largest correction to  $m_h^2$ , while avoiding  $\rho$ -parameter constraints. The case of a massive gauge singlet or additional  $U(1)'$  vector superfield (giving  $\mathcal{O}_{3,4}$ ) have the advantage of preserving gauge couplings unification at one-loop. Following the above information, one can proceed to construct explicit models with additional states that can generate these effective operators.

Let us mention that the method provided here to reduce the fine tuning in the MSSM for  $m_h$  larger than the LEP bound, relies on introducing an additional scale in the visible sector, due to “new physics” in this sector. Other solutions to this problem may exist, which essentially rely on a low scale in the hidden sector of supersymmetry breaking [23]. In this case the quartic coupling and the mass of the SM-like Higgs are increased by a factor proportional to  $(\mu^2/f)^2$ , where  $f$  is the hidden sector supersymmetry breaking scale. While not without problems, the advantage of this latter method is that it does not pay the “cost” of an additional parameter (scale) in the visible sector, as models with effective operators do.

### 3. Strings and extra dimensions


The appropriate and most convenient framework for low energy supersymmetry and grand unification is the perturbative heterotic string. Indeed, in this theory, gravity and gauge interactions have the same origin, as massless modes of the closed heterotic string, and they are unified at the string scale  $M_s$ . As a result, the Planck mass is predicted to be proportional to  $M_s$ :

$$M_P = M_s/g, \quad (22)$$

where  $g$  is the gauge coupling. In the simplest constructions all gauge couplings are the same at the string scale, given by the four-dimensional (4d) string coupling, and thus no grand unified group is needed for unification. In our conventions  $\alpha_{\text{GUT}} = g^2 \simeq 0.04$ , leading to a discrepancy between the string and grand unification scale  $M_{\text{GUT}}$  by almost two orders of magnitude. Explaining this gap introduces in general new parameters or a new scale, and the predictive power is essentially lost. This is the main defect of this framework, which remains though an open and interesting possibility.

The other other perturbative framework that has been studied extensively in the more recent years is type I string theory with D-branes. Unlike in the heterotic string, gauge and gravitational interactions have now different origin. The latter are described again by closed strings, while the former emerge as excitations of open strings with endpoints confined on D-branes [24]. This leads to a braneworld description of our universe, which should be localized on a hypersurface, i.e. a membrane extended in  $p$  spatial dimensions, called  $p$ -brane (see Fig. 1). Closed strings propagate in all nine dimensions of string theory: in those extended along the  $p$ -brane, called parallel, as well as in the transverse ones. On the contrary, open strings are attached on the  $p$ -brane. Obviously, our  $p$ -brane world must have at least the three known dimensions of space. But it may contain more: the extra  $d_{\parallel} = p - 3$  parallel dimensions must have a finite size, in order to be unobservable at present energies, and can be as large as  $\text{TeV}^{-1} \sim 10^{-18} \text{ m}$  [25]. On the other hand, transverse dimensions interact with us only gravitationally and experimental bounds are much weaker: their size should be less than about 0.1 mm [26]. In the following, I review the main properties and experimental signatures of low string scale models [27].





**Figure 1.** D-brane world universe in type I string framework.

### 3.1. Framework of low scale strings

In type I theory, the different origin of gauge and gravitational interactions implies that the relation between the Planck and string scales is not linear as (22) of the heterotic string. The requirement that string theory should be weakly coupled, constrain the size of all parallel dimensions to be of order of the string length, while transverse dimensions remain unrestricted. Assuming an isotropic transverse space of  $n = 9 - p$  compact dimensions of common radius  $R_{\perp}$ , one finds:

$$M_P^2 = \frac{1}{g_s^2} M_s^{2+n} R_{\perp}^n, \quad g_s \simeq g^2. \quad (23)$$

where  $g_s$  is the string coupling. It follows that the type I string scale can be chosen hierarchically smaller than the Planck mass [28, 27] at the expense of introducing extra large transverse dimensions felt only by gravity, while keeping the string coupling small [27]. The weakness of 4d gravity compared to gauge interactions (ratio  $M_W/M_P$ ) is then attributed to the largeness of the transverse space  $R_{\perp}$  compared to the string length  $l_s = M_s^{-1}$ .

An important property of these models is that gravity becomes effectively  $(4+n)$ -dimensional with a strength comparable to those of gauge interactions at the string scale. The first relation of Eq. (23) can be understood as a consequence of the  $(4+n)$ -dimensional Gauss law for gravity, with  $M_*^{(4+n)} = M_s^{2+n}/g^4$  the effective scale of gravity in  $4+n$  dimensions. Taking  $M_s \simeq 1$  TeV, one finds a size for the extra dimensions  $R_{\perp}$  varying from  $10^8$  km, .1 mm, down to a Fermi for  $n = 1, 2$ , or 6 large dimensions, respectively. This shows that while  $n = 1$  is excluded,  $n \geq 2$  is allowed by present experimental bounds on gravitational forces [26, 29]. Thus, in these models, gravity appears to us very weak at macroscopic scales because its intensity is spread in the “hidden” extra dimensions. At distances shorter than  $R_{\perp}$ , it should deviate from Newton’s law,

which may be possible to explore in laboratory experiments.

### 3.2. Large number of species

Here, we open a parenthesis to describe that low scale gravity with large extra dimensions is actually a particular case of a more general framework, where the ultraviolet (UV) cutoff is lower than the Planck scale due to the existence of a large number of particle species coupled to gravity [30]. Indeed, it was shown that the effective UV cutoff  $M_*$  is given by

$$M_*^2 = M_P^2/N, \quad (24)$$

where the counting of independent species  $N$  takes into account all particles which are not broad resonances, having a width less than their mass. The derivation is based on black hole evaporation but here we present a shorter argument using quantum information storage [31]. Consider a pixel of size  $L$  containing  $N$  species storing information. The energy required to localize  $N$  wave functions is then given by  $N/L$ , associated to a Schwarzschild radius  $R_s = N/LM_P^2$ . The latter must be less than the pixel size in order to avoid the collapse of such a system to a black hole,  $R_s \leq L$ , implying a minimum size  $L \geq L_{min}$  with  $L_{min} = \sqrt{N}/M_P$  associated precisely to the effective UV cutoff  $M_* = L_{min}$  given in eq. (24). Imposing  $M_* \simeq 1$  TeV, one should then have  $N \sim 10^{32}$  particle species below about the TeV scale!

In the string theory context, there are two ways of realizing such a large number a particle species by lowering the string scale at a TeV:

- (i) In large volume compactifications with the SM localized on D-brane stacks, as described in the previous section. The particle species are then the Kaluza-Klein (KK) excitations of the graviton (and other possible bulk modes) associated to the large extra dimensions, given by  $N = R_\perp^n l_s^n$ , up to energies of order  $M_* \simeq M_s$ .
- (ii) By introducing an infinitesimal string coupling  $g_s \simeq 10^{-16}$  with the SM localized on Neveu-Schwarz NS5-branes in the framework of little strings [32]. In this case, the particle species are the effective number of string modes that contribute to the black hole bound [33]:  $N = 1/g_s^2$  and gravity does not become strong at  $M_s \sim \mathcal{O}(\text{TeV})$ .

Note the both TeV string realizations above are compatible with the general expression (23), but in the second case there is no relation between the string and gauge couplings.

### 3.3. Experimental implications in accelerators

We now turn to the experimental predictions of TeV scale strings. Their main implications in particle accelerators are of three types, in correspondence with the three different sectors that are generally present:

- (i) New compactified parallel dimensions; In this case  $RM_s \gtrsim 1$ , and the associated compactification scale  $R_\parallel^{-1}$  would be the first scale of new physics that should be found increasing the beam energy [25, 34]. The main consequence is the existence of KK excitations for all SM particles that propagate along the extra parallel dimensions. These can be produced on-shell at LHC as new resonances [35].
- (ii) New extra large transverse dimensions and low scale quantum gravity,. The main experimental signal is gravitational radiation in the bulk from any physical process on the world-brane [36].
- (iii) Genuine string and quantum gravity effects. Direct production of string resonances in hadron colliders leads generically to a universal deviation from Standard Model in jet distribution [37]. In particular, the first Regge excitation of the gluon has spin 2 and a width an order of magnitude lower than the string scale, leading to a characteristic peak in dijet production; similarly, the first excitations of quarks have spin 3/2.

- (iv) Concerning possible micro-black hole production, note that a string size black hole has a horizon radius  $r_H \sim 1$  in string units, while the Newton's constant behaves as  $G_N \sim g_s^2$ . It follows that the mass of a  $d$ -dimensional black hole is [38]:  $M_{\text{BH}} \sim r_H^{d/2-1}/G_N \simeq 1/g_s^2$ . Using the value of the SM gauge couplings  $g_s \simeq g^2 \sim 0.1$ , one finds that the energy threshold  $M_{\text{BH}}$  of micro-black hole production is about four orders of magnitude higher than the string scale, implying that one would produce  $10^4$  string states before reaching  $M_{\text{BH}}$ .

### 3.4. Electroweak symmetry breaking

Non-supersymmetric TeV strings offer also a framework to realize gauge symmetry breaking radiatively. Indeed, from the effective field theory point of view, one expects quadratically divergent one-loop contributions to the masses of scalar fields. The divergences are cut off by  $M_s$  and if the corrections are negative, they can induce electroweak symmetry breaking and explain the mild hierarchy between the weak and a string scale at a few TeV, in terms of a loop factor [39]. More precisely, in the minimal case of one Higgs doublet  $H$ , the scalar potential is:

$$V = \lambda(H^\dagger H)^2 + \mu^2(H^\dagger H), \quad (25)$$

where  $\lambda$  arises at tree-level. Moreover, in any model where the Higgs field comes from an open string with both ends fixed on the same brane stack, it is given by an appropriate truncation of a supersymmetric theory. Within the minimal spectrum of the SM,  $\lambda = (g_2^2 + g'^2)/8$ , with  $g_2$  and  $g'$  the  $SU(2)$  and  $U(1)_Y$  gauge couplings. On the other hand,  $\mu^2$  is generated at one loop:

$$\mu^2 = -\varepsilon^2 g^2 M_s^2, \quad (26)$$

where  $\varepsilon$  is a loop factor that can be estimated from a toy model computation and varies in the region  $\varepsilon \sim 10^{-1} - 10^{-3}$ .

Indeed, consider for illustration a simple case where the whole one-loop effective potential of a scalar field can be computed. We assume for instance one extra dimension compactified on a circle of radius  $R > 1$  (in string units). An interesting situation is provided by a class of models where a non-vanishing VEV for a scalar (Higgs) field  $\phi$  results in shifting the mass of each KK excitation by a constant  $a(\phi)$ :

$$M_m^2 = \left( \frac{m + a(\phi)}{R} \right)^2, \quad (27)$$

with  $m$  the KK integer momentum number. Such mass shifts arise for instance in the presence of a Wilson line,  $a = q \oint \frac{dy}{2\pi} gA$ , where  $A$  is the internal component of a gauge field with gauge coupling  $g$ , and  $q$  is the charge of a given state under the corresponding generator. A straightforward computation shows that the  $\phi$ -dependent part of the one-loop effective potential is given by [40]:

$$V_{eff} = -Tr(-)^F \frac{R}{32\pi^{3/2}} \sum_n e^{2\pi i n a} \int_0^\infty dl l^{3/2} f_s(l) e^{-\pi^2 n^2 R^2 l} \quad (28)$$

where  $F = 0, 1$  for bosons and fermions, respectively. We have included a regulating function  $f_s(l)$  which contains for example the effects of string oscillators. To understand its role we will consider the two limits  $R \gg 1$  and  $R \ll 1$ . In the first case only the  $l \rightarrow 0$  region contributes to the integral. This means that the effective potential receives sizable contributions only from the infrared (field theory) degrees of freedom. In this limit we would have  $f_s(l) \rightarrow 1$ . For example, in the string model considered in [39]:


$$f_s(l) = \left[ \frac{1}{4l} \frac{\theta_2}{\eta^3} \left( il + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right]^4 \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{for} \quad l \rightarrow 0, \quad (29)$$

and the field theory result is finite and can be explicitly computed. As a result of the Taylor expansion around  $a = 0$ , we are able to extract the one-loop contribution to the coefficient of the term of the potential quadratic in the Higgs field. It is given by a loop factor times the compactification scale [40]. One thus obtains  $\mu^2 \sim g^2/R^2$  up to a proportionality constant which is calculable in the effective field theory. On the other hand, if we consider  $R \rightarrow 0$ , which by  $T$ -duality corresponds to taking the extra dimension as transverse and very large, the one-loop effective potential receives contributions from the whole tower of string oscillators as appearing in  $f_s(l)$ , leading to squared masses given by a loop factor times  $M_s^2$ , according to eq. (26).

More precisely, from the expression (28), one finds:

$$\varepsilon^2(R) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{dl}{(2l)^{5/2}} \frac{\theta_2^4}{4\eta^{12}} \left( il + \frac{1}{2} \right) R^3 \sum_n n^2 e^{-2\pi n^2 R^2 l}, \quad (30)$$

which is plotted in Fig. 2. For the asymptotic value  $R \rightarrow 0$  (corresponding upon  $T$ -duality to



**Figure 2.** The coefficient  $\varepsilon$  of the one loop Higgs mass (26).

a large transverse dimension of radius  $1/R$ ),  $\varepsilon(0) \simeq 0.14$ , and the effective cut-off for the mass term is  $M_s$ , as can be seen from Eq. (26). At large  $R$ ,  $\mu^2(R)$  falls off as  $1/R^2$ , which is the effective cut-off in the limit  $R \rightarrow \infty$ , as we argued above, in agreement with field theory results in the presence of a compactified extra dimension [41, 42]. In fact, in the limit  $R \rightarrow \infty$ , an analytic approximation to  $\varepsilon(R)$  gives:

$$\varepsilon(R) \simeq \frac{\varepsilon_\infty}{M_s R}, \quad \varepsilon_\infty^2 = \frac{3\zeta(5)}{4\pi^4} \simeq 0.008. \quad (31)$$

The potential (25) has the usual minimum, given by the VEV of the neutral component of the Higgs doublet  $v = \sqrt{-\mu^2/\lambda}$ . Using the relation of  $v$  with the  $Z$  gauge boson mass,  $M_Z^2 = (g_2^2 + g'^2)v^2/4$ , and the expression of the quartic coupling  $\lambda$ , one obtains for the Higgs

mass a prediction which is the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) value for  $\tan \beta \rightarrow \infty$  and  $m_A \rightarrow \infty$ :  $m_H = M_Z$ . The tree level Higgs mass is known to receive important radiative corrections from the top-quark sector and rises to values around 120 GeV. Furthermore, from (26), one can compute  $M_s$  in terms of the Higgs mass  $m_H^2 = -2\mu^2$ :

$$M_s = \frac{m_H}{\sqrt{2} g \varepsilon}, \quad (32)$$

yielding naturally values in the TeV range.

## Acknowledgments

Work supported in part by the European Commission under the ERC Advanced Grant 226371 and the contract PITN-GA-2009-237920.

## References

- [1] D. M. Ghilencea and H. M. Lee, JHEP **0509** (2005) 024.
- [2] D. M. Ghilencea, Phys. Rev. D **70** (2004) 045018.
- [3] S. Groot Nibbelink, M. Hillenbach, Phys. Lett. B **616** (2005) 125.
- [4] S. Groot Nibbelink, M. Hillenbach, Nucl. Phys. B **748** (2006) 60.
- [5] J. F. Oliver, J. Papavassiliou and A. Santamaria, Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003) 125004.
- [6] I. Antoniadis, E. Dudas, D. Ghilencea, P. Tziveloglou, Nucl. Phys. B **808** (2009) 155.
- [7] I. Antoniadis, E. Dudas, D. Ghilencea, P. Tziveloglou, Nucl. Phys. B **831** (2010) 133.
- [8] H. E. Haber, J. D. Mason, Phys. Rev. D **77** 115011 (2008).
- [9] S. P. Martin, Phys. Rev. D **61** 035004 (2000).
- [10] M. S. Carena, H. E. Haber, H. E. Logan, S. Mrenna, Phys. Rev. D **65** 055005 (2002).
- [11] D. M. Pierce, J. A. Bagger, K. T. Matchev, R. J. Zhang, Nucl. Phys. B **491** 3-67 (1997).
- [12] L. J. Hall, R. Rattazzi and U. Sarid, Phys. Rev. D **50** 7048-7065 (1994).
- [13] G. F. Giudice, C. Grojean, A. Pomarol and R. Rattazzi, JHEP **0706** (2007) 045.
- [14] S. Cassel, D. M. Ghilencea, G. G. Ross, Nucl. Phys. B **835** (2010) 110.
- [15] S. Cassel, D. M. Ghilencea and G. G. Ross, Phys. Lett. B **687** (2010) 214.
- [16] R. Barate *et al.* [LEP Working Group for Higgs boson searches and ALEPH, DELPHI, L3, OPAL Collaborations, Phys. Lett. B **565** (2003) 61; S. Schael *et al.* ALEPH, DELPHI, L3, OPAL and LEP Working Group for Higgs Boson Searches, Eur. Phys. J. **C47**(2006)547
- [17] M. Dine, N. Seiberg, S. Thomas, Phys. Rev. D **76** (2007) 095004.
- [18] S. Cassel, D. Ghilencea, G. G. Ross, Nucl. Phys. B **825** (2010) 203.
- [19] K. Blum, C. Delaunay and Y. Hochberg, arXiv:0905.1701 [hep-ph].
- [20] M. Carena, K. Kong, E. Ponton and J. Zurita, arXiv:0909.5434 [hep-ph].  
M. Carena, E. Ponton and J. Zurita, arXiv:1005.4887 [hep-ph].
- [21] D. Piriz and J. Wudka, Phys. Rev. D **56** (1997) 4170.
- [22] A. Brignole, J. A. Casas, J. R. Espinosa and I. Navarro, Nucl. Phys. B **666** (2003) 105.
- [23] I. Antoniadis, E. Dudas, D. M. Ghilencea and P. Tziveloglou, arXiv:1006.1662 [hep-ph].
- [24] C. Angelantonj and A. Sagnotti, Phys. Rept. **371** (2002) 1 [Erratum-ibid. **376** (2003) 339] [arXiv:hep-th/0204089].
- [25] I. Antoniadis, Phys. Lett. B **246** (1990) 377.
- [26] D. J. Kapner, T. S. Cook, E. G. Adelberger, J. H. Gundlach, B. R. Heckel, C. D. Hoyle and H. E. Swanson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98** (2007) 021101.
- [27] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. R. Dvali, Phys. Lett. B **429** (1998) 263 [arXiv:hep-ph/9803315];  
I. Antoniadis, N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. R. Dvali, Phys. Lett. B **436** (1998) 257 [arXiv:hep-ph/9804398].
- [28] J. D. Lykken, Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 3693 [arXiv:hep-th/9603133].
- [29] J.C. Long and J.C. Price, Comptes Rendus Physique **4** (2003) 337; R.S. Decca, D. Lopez, H.B. Chan, E. Fischbach, D.E. Krause and C.R. Jamell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94** (2005) 240401; R.S. Decca *et al.*, arXiv:0706.3283 [hep-ph]; S.J. Smullin, A.A. Geraci, D.M. Weld, J. Chiaverini, S. Holmes and A. Kapitulnik, arXiv:hep-ph/0508204; H. Abele, S. Haeßler and A. Westphal, in 271th WE-Heraeus-Seminar, Bad Honnef (2002).
- [30] G. Dvali, arXiv:0706.2050 [hep-th]; Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **25** (2010) 602 [arXiv:0806.3801 [hep-th]]; G. Dvali and M. Redi, Phys. Rev. D **77** (2008) 045027 [arXiv:0710.4344 [hep-th]]; R. Brustein, G. Dvali and G. Veneziano, JHEP **0910** (2009) 085 [arXiv:0907.5516 [hep-th]].

- [31] G. Dvali and C. Gomez, *Phys. Lett. B* **674** (2009) 303.
- [32] I. Antoniadis and B. Pioline, *Nucl. Phys. B* **550** (1999) 41; I. Antoniadis, S. Dimopoulos and A. Giveon, *JHEP* **0105** (2001) 055 [arXiv:hep-th/0103033]; I. Antoniadis, A. Arvanitaki, S. Dimopoulos and A. Giveon, arXiv:1102.4043.
- [33] G. Dvali and D. Lust, arXiv:0912.3167 [hep-th]; G. Dvali and C. Gomez, arXiv:1004.3744 [hep-th].
- [34] I. Antoniadis and K. Benakli, *Phys. Lett. B* **326** (1994) 69.
- [35] I. Antoniadis, K. Benakli and M. Quirós, *Phys. Lett. B* **331** (1994) 313 and *Phys. Lett. B* **460** (1999) 176; P. Nath, Y. Yamada and M. Yamaguchi, *Phys. Lett. B* **466** (1999) 100 T. G. Rizzo and J. D. Wells, *Phys. Rev. D* **61** (2000) 016007; T. G. Rizzo, *Phys. Rev. D* **61** (2000) 055005; A. De Rujula, A. Donini, M. B. Gavela and S. Rigolin, *Phys. Lett. B* **482** (2000) 195.
- [36] G.F. Giudice, R. Rattazzi and J.D. Wells, *Nucl. Phys. B* **544** (1999) 3; E.A. Mirabelli, M. Perelstein and M.E. Peskin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82** (1999) 2236; T. Han, J.D. Lykken and R. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **59** (1999) 105006; K. Cheung, W.-Y. Keung, *Phys. Rev. D* **60** (1999) 112003; C. Balázs *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** (1999) 2112; J.L. Hewett, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82** (1999) 4765.
- [37] L.A. Anchordoqui, H. Goldberg, D. Lust, S. Nawata, S. Stieberger and T.R. Taylor, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101** (2008) 241803 [arXiv:0808.0497 [hep-ph]].
- [38] G.T. Horowitz and J. Polchinski, *Phys. Rev. D* **55** (1997) 6189.
- [39] I. Antoniadis, K. Benakli and M. Quirós, *Nucl. Phys. B* **583** (2000) 35.
- [40] I. Antoniadis, K. Benakli and M. Quiros, *New Jour. Phys.* **3** (2001) 20.
- [41] I. Antoniadis, C. Muñoz and M. Quirós, *Nucl. Phys. B* **397** (1993) 515; I. Antoniadis and M. Quirós, *Phys. Lett. B* **392** (1997) 61; A. Pomarol and M. Quirós, *Phys. Lett. B* **438** (1998) 225; I. Antoniadis, S. Dimopoulos, A. Pomarol and M. Quirós, *Nucl. Phys. B* **544** (1999) 503; A. Delgado, A. Pomarol and M. Quirós, *Phys. Rev. D* **60** (1999) 095008; R. Barbieri, L. J. Hall and Y. Nomura, *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2001) 105007.
- [42] I. Antoniadis, S. Dimopoulos and G. Dvali, *Nucl. Phys. B* **516** (1998) 70; S. Ferrara, C. Kounnas and F. Zwirner, *Nucl. Phys. B* **429** (1994) 589.