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## Convention

SM field content: $H, Q, L, u, d, e, B_{\mu}, W_{\mu}^{\prime}, G_{\mu}^{A}$
Symmetry: Poincare $\otimes$ Gauge $=T_{1,3} \ltimes S O_{+}^{\uparrow}(1,3) \otimes S U(3)_{c} \otimes S U(2)_{\llcorner } \otimes U(1)_{\curlyvee}$ The SM Lagrangian:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{SM}}= & -\frac{1}{4} G_{\mu \nu}^{A} G^{A \mu \nu}-\frac{1}{4} W_{\mu \nu}^{\prime} W^{\prime \mu \nu}-\frac{1}{4} B_{\mu \nu} B^{\mu \nu}+\left(D_{\mu} H\right)^{\dagger}\left(D^{\mu} H\right)+\lambda \nu^{2}\left(H^{\dagger} H\right) \\
& -\lambda\left(H^{\dagger} H\right)^{2}+\sum_{\psi=Q, L, u, d, e} \bar{\Psi} i \not D \Psi-\left[\bar{Q} Y_{u} u \tilde{H}+\bar{Q} Y_{d} d H+\bar{L} Y_{e} e H+\text { h.c. }\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

$A$ and $I$ : the adjoint indices of the $S U(3) c$ and $S U(2)\llcorner$ group;
$Y_{u}, Y_{d}, Y_{e}$ : the Yukawa couplings in flavor space;

$$
\tilde{H}_{i}=\epsilon_{i j} H_{j}^{*}, \quad D_{\mu}=\partial_{\mu}-i g_{3} T^{A} G_{\mu}^{A}-i g_{2} T^{\prime} W_{\mu}^{\prime}-i g_{1} Y B_{\mu},
$$

$T^{A}, T^{\prime}, Y$ : the generator matrices appropriate for the fields to be acted on.

## From SM to SMEFT

- SMEFT is the one which extends the SM by including higher dimensional operators with SM field contents and admits that the NP scale $\Lambda$ is on top of electroweak scale.

$$
\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{SM}}+\frac{1}{\Lambda^{D-4}} \sum_{D \geq 5} C_{i}^{D} \mathcal{O}_{i}^{D}
$$

Wilson coefficients $C_{i}^{D}$ encode the contribution from unknown NP.

- SMEFT is powerful because it is model-independent.
- For a given specific model, the operator coefficients can easily be matched by integrating out the heavy degrees of freedom.


## From SM to SMEFT

- The complete basis of higher dimensional operators have been determined up to dim-7.
- Dim-5: $1 \rightarrow$ neutrino mass operator $\rightarrow$ unique in dim- D (odd):

$$
\mathcal{O}_{\mathrm{n} . \mathrm{m} .}^{D}=\left[\left(L^{\top} \epsilon H\right) C\left(L^{\top} \epsilon H\right)^{\top}\right]\left(H^{\dagger} H\right)^{\frac{D-5}{2}}+\text { h.c. }
$$

- Dim-6: $59+4$ (皮: $\Delta B-\Delta L=0)$
- Higgs physics dominated by dim-6 operators: Higgs production at LHC $g g \rightarrow h$ and decay $h \rightarrow \gamma \gamma, h \rightarrow \gamma Z, \ldots$
- Proton decay with $\Delta B-\Delta L=0$.
- Dim-7: $12+6$ (办: $\Delta B-\Delta L=2$ )
- Exotic proton decay with $\Delta B-\Delta L=2$, etc.


## Basis for dim-7 operators

| $\psi^{2} H^{4}+$ h.c. |  | $\psi^{2} H^{3} D+$ h.c. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathcal{O}_{\text {LH }}$ | $\epsilon_{i j} \epsilon_{m n}\left(L^{i} C L^{m}\right) H^{j} H^{n}\left(H^{\dagger} H\right)$ | $\mathcal{O}_{\text {LeHD }}$ | $\epsilon_{i j} \epsilon_{m n}\left(L^{i} C \gamma_{\mu} e\right) H^{j} H^{m} i D^{\mu} H^{n}$ |
| $\psi^{2} H^{2} D^{2}+$ h.c. |  | $\psi^{2} H^{2} X+$ h.c. |  |
| $\mathcal{O}_{\text {LHD1 }}$ | $\epsilon_{i j} \epsilon_{m n}\left(L^{i} C D^{\mu} L^{j}\right) H^{m}\left(D_{\mu} H^{n}\right)$ | $\mathcal{O}_{\text {LHB }}$ | $\epsilon_{i j} \epsilon_{m n}\left(L^{i} C \sigma_{\mu \nu} L^{m}\right) H^{j} H^{n} B^{\mu \nu}$ |
| $\mathcal{O}_{\text {LHD } 2}$ | $\epsilon_{i m} \epsilon_{j n}\left(L^{i} C D^{\mu} L^{j}\right) H^{m}\left(D_{\mu} H^{n}\right)$ | $\mathcal{O}_{\text {LHW }}$ | $\epsilon_{i j}\left(\epsilon \tau^{\prime}\right)_{m n}\left(L^{i} C \sigma_{\mu \nu} L^{m}\right) H^{j} H^{n} W^{\prime \mu \nu}$ |
|  |  | $\psi^{4} H+$ h.c. |  |
|  |  | $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{e} \text { ellLh }}$ | $\epsilon_{i j} \epsilon_{m n}\left(\bar{e} L^{i}\right)\left(L^{j} C L^{m}\right) H^{n}$ |
| $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{L} Q d d D}$ | $\left(\bar{L} \gamma_{\mu} Q\right)\left(d C i D^{\mu} d\right)$ | $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{d} \angle Q L H 1}$ | $\epsilon_{i j} \epsilon_{m n}\left(\bar{d} L^{i}\right)\left(Q^{j} C L^{m}\right) H^{n}$ |
| $\mathcal{O}$ ēeddd | $\left(\bar{e} \gamma_{\mu} d\right)\left(d C i D^{\mu} d\right)$ | $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{d} L Q L H 2}$ | $\epsilon_{i m} \epsilon_{j n}\left(\bar{d} L^{i}\right)\left(Q^{j} C L^{m}\right) H^{n}$ |
|  |  | $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{d} L \text {-ueH }}$ | $\epsilon_{i j}\left(\bar{d} L^{i}\right)(u C e) H^{j}$ |
|  |  | $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{Q} u L L H}$ | $\epsilon_{i j}(\bar{Q} u)\left(L C L^{i}\right) H^{j}$ |
|  |  | $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{L} d u d \tilde{H}}$ | $(\bar{L} d)(u C d) \tilde{H}$ |
|  |  | $\mathcal{O}_{\text {Lddd }}$ | $(\bar{L} d)(d C d) H$ |
|  |  | $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{e} Q d d}{ }^{\text {en }}$ | $\epsilon_{i j}\left(\bar{e} Q^{i}\right)(d C d) \tilde{H}^{j}$ |
|  |  | $\mathcal{O}_{\text {L̇dQQ }}$ | $\epsilon_{i j}(\bar{L} d)\left(Q C Q^{i}\right) \tilde{H}^{j}$ |
|  | $\epsilon_{i j}\left(\bar{d} \gamma_{\mu} u\right)\left(L^{i} C \sigma^{\mu \nu} D_{\nu} L^{j}\right)$ | $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{L} d Q d D}$ | $\left(\bar{L} i D^{\mu} d\right)\left(Q C \gamma_{\mu} d\right)$ |

$13(B)+7(B)$ given by [L. Lehman:1410.4193].
Dim-7 Majorana neutrino mass operator;
Baryon number violating operators with $\Delta B=-\Delta L=1$;
Redundant operators.

## Proof for redundancies: EoMs + Fierz identities

© EoMs from SM Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{4}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
i \not \square L & =Y_{e} e H \\
i \not D d & =Y_{d}^{\dagger} H^{\dagger} Q
\end{aligned}
$$

© Feriz identities for charge conjugated fields

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\Psi_{1 L} C \gamma_{\mu} \Psi_{2 R}\right)\left(\overline{\Psi_{3 R}} \gamma^{\mu} \Psi_{4 R}\right) & =2\left(\overline{\Psi_{3 R}} \Psi_{1 L}\right)\left(\Psi_{4 R} C \Psi_{2 R}\right) \\
\left(\overline{\Psi_{1 L}} \gamma_{\mu} \Psi_{2 L}\right)\left(\Psi_{3 R} C \Psi_{4 R}\right) & =\left(\overline{\Psi_{1 L}} \Psi_{3 R}\right)\left(\Psi_{2 L} C \gamma_{\mu} \Psi_{4 R}\right)+\left(\overline{\Psi_{1 L}} \Psi_{4 R}\right)\left(\Psi_{2 L} C \gamma_{\mu} \Psi_{3 R}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the notation $\Psi^{C}=C \bar{\Psi}^{T}$ is used in actual calcution, and the charge conjugated field is defined by $(\Psi C \chi)=\overline{\Psi^{C}} \chi$ with $\left(\Psi^{C}\right)^{C}=\Psi$, where the matrix $C$ satisfies the relations $C^{T}=C^{\dagger}=-C$ and $C^{2}=-1$.
© Linear dependent operators

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}_{\overline{d u L L D}}^{(2) p r s t} & =2\left(Y_{e}\right)_{t u} \mathcal{O}_{\overline{d L L u e H}}^{\text {psru }}-\mathcal{O}_{\bar{d} u L L D}^{p r s t} \\
\mathcal{O}_{\bar{L} d Q d D}^{\text {prst }} & =\mathcal{O}_{\bar{L} Q d d D}^{\text {pstr }}-\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger}\right)_{r u} \mathcal{O}_{\bar{L} d Q Q Q \tilde{H}}^{\text {ptsu }}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Number of independent operators with flavor indices added

| Class Operator | [Yi Liao:1607.07309]-Direct counting |  |  | [H. Murayama:1512.03433]-Hilbert series |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $n_{f}$ | 1 | 3 | $n_{f}$ | 1 | 3 |
| $\psi^{2} H^{4} \quad \mathcal{O}_{L H}$ | $\frac{1}{2} n_{f}\left(n_{f}+1\right)$ | 1 | 6 | $\frac{1}{2} n_{f}\left(n_{f}+1\right)$ | 1 | 6 |
| $\psi^{2} H^{3} D \quad \mathcal{O}_{\text {LeHD }}$ | $n_{f}^{2}$ | 1 | 9 | $n_{f}^{2}$ | 1 | 9 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\psi^{2} H^{2} D^{2} & \mathcal{O}_{L H D 1} \\ & \mathcal{O}_{L H D 2}\end{array}$ | $\frac{1}{2} n_{f}\left(n_{f}+1\right)$ $\frac{1}{2} n_{f}\left(n_{f}+1\right)$ | 1 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 6 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $n_{f}\left(n_{f}+1\right)$ | 2 | 12 |
| $\psi^{2} H^{2} X \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathcal{O}_{\text {LHB }} \\ & \\ & \\ & \mathcal{O}_{L H W}\end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \frac{1}{2} n_{f}\left(n_{f}-1\right) \\ n_{f}^{2} \end{gathered}$ | 0 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{1}{2} n_{f}\left(3 n_{f}-1\right)$ | 1 | 12 |
|  $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{e} L L L L H}$ <br> $\psi^{4} H$ $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{d} L Q L H 1}$ <br>  $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{d} L Q L H 2}$ <br>  $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{d} L L e H}$ <br>  $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{Q} u L L H}$ | $\begin{gathered} \frac{1}{3} n_{f}^{2}\left(2 n_{f}^{2}+1\right) \\ n_{f}^{4} \\ n_{f}^{4} \\ n_{f}^{4} \\ n_{f}^{4} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1 1 1 1 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 57 \\ & 81 \\ & 81 \\ & 81 \\ & 81 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{1}{3} n_{f}^{2}\left(14 n_{f}^{2}+1\right)$ | 5 | 381 |
| $\psi^{4} D \quad \mathcal{O}_{\bar{d} u L L D}$ | $\frac{1}{2} n_{f}^{3}\left(n_{f}+1\right)$ | 1 | 54 | $\frac{1}{2} n_{f}^{3}\left(n_{f}+1\right)$ | 1 | 54 |
| Total: $B$ | $\frac{31}{6} n_{f}^{4}+\frac{1}{2} n_{f}^{3}+\frac{13}{3} n_{f}^{2}+n_{f}$ | 11 | 474 | $\frac{31}{6} n_{f}^{4}+\frac{1}{2} n_{f}^{3}+\frac{13}{3} n_{f}^{2}+n_{f}$ | 11 | 474 |
| B: $\psi^{4} H \quad$$\mathcal{O}_{\bar{L} d u d \tilde{H}}$ <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{L} d d d H}$ <br> $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{L} Q d d Q \tilde{H}}$ | $\begin{gathered} n_{f}^{4} \\ \frac{1}{3} n_{f}^{2}\left(n_{f}^{2}-1\right) \\ \frac{1}{2} n_{f}^{3}\left(n_{f}-1\right) \\ n_{f}^{4} \end{gathered}$ | 1 0 0 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 81 \\ & 24 \\ & 27 \\ & 81 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{1}{6} n_{f}^{2}\left(17 n_{f}^{2}-3 n_{f}-2\right)$ | 2 | 213 |
| B: $\psi^{4} D \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathcal{O}_{\bar{L} Q d d D} \\ & \mathcal{O}_{\bar{e} d d d D}\end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \frac{1}{2} n_{f}^{3}\left(n_{f}+1\right) \\ \frac{1}{6} n_{f}^{2}\left(n_{f}^{2}+3 n_{f}+2\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54 \\ & 30 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{1}{6} n_{f}^{2}\left(4 n_{f}^{2}+6 n_{f}+2\right)$ | 2 | 84 |
| Total: B | $\frac{7}{2} n_{f}^{4}+\frac{1}{2} n_{f}^{3}$ | 4 | 297 | $\frac{7}{2} n_{f}^{4}+\frac{1}{2} n_{f}^{3}$ | 4 | 297 |
| Total: $B+B$ | $\frac{26}{3} n_{f}^{4}+n_{f}^{3}+\frac{13}{3} n_{f}^{2}+n_{f}$ | 15 | 771 | $\frac{26}{3} n_{f}^{4}+n_{f}^{3}+\frac{13}{3} n_{f}^{2}+n_{f}$ | 15 | 771 |

Table: Comparison of operator counting: direct counting vs Hilbert series.

## 1-loop RGE of dim-7 operators

- RGE preserves the operator symmetry, e.g. B operators do not mix with $B$-conserving operators.
- RG running of six dim-7 both $L$ and $B$ operators: all correction calculated.
- RG running of twelve dim-7 $L$ but $B$-conserving operators: part of them finished.
- Operator mixing is ubiquitous among different classes.
- Interesting cancellation takes place between different diagrams.
- The rich and non-trivial flavor mixing.


## 1-loop RGE of dim-7 operators

Dimensional regularizaton $+\overline{\mathrm{MS}}$ scheme $+R_{\xi}$-gauge

$$
16 \pi^{2} \beta_{i}=16 \pi^{2} \frac{d}{d \mu} C_{i}=\sum_{j} \gamma_{i j} C_{j}
$$

- Calculate the $\beta$-function or the anomalous dimension matrix $\gamma$ is boiling down to determine the counterterm.
- Extracting counterterm by computing the generated amplitude with an insertion of dim-7 operator at 1-loop order.
- Also needing to include field strength renormalization constants.
- $\xi$ independent as a check for the calculation.
- Promote flavor symmetry as an another check.


## 1-loop RGE of six dim-7 both $L$ and $\notin$ operators(part)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\dot{C}_{1}^{p r s t}= & +\left(-4 g_{3}^{2}-\frac{9}{4} g_{2}^{2}-\frac{17}{12} g_{1}^{2}+W_{H}\right) C_{1}^{p r s t}-\frac{10}{3} g_{1}^{2} C_{1}^{p t s r}-\frac{3}{2}\left(Y_{e} Y_{e}^{\dagger}\right)_{p v} C_{1}^{v r s t} \\
& +3\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger} Y_{d}\right)_{v r} C_{1}^{p v s t}+3\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger} Y_{d}\right)_{v t} C_{1}^{p r s v}+2\left(Y_{u}^{\dagger} Y_{u}\right)_{v s} C_{1}^{p r v t}-2\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger} Y_{u}\right)_{v s}\left(C_{2}^{p v r t}+v \leftrightarrow r\right) \\
& +4\left(Y_{e}\right)_{p v}\left(Y_{u}\right)_{w s} C_{3}^{v w r t}-2\left(\left(Y_{u}\right)_{v s}\left(Y_{d}\right)_{w t}+s \leftrightarrow t\right) C_{4}^{p r v w}-\frac{1}{6}\left(11 g_{1}^{2}+24 g_{3}^{2}\right)\left(Y_{u}\right)_{v s} C_{5}^{p v r} \\
& +\frac{1}{6}\left(13 g_{1}^{2}+48 g_{3}^{2}\right)\left(Y_{u}\right)_{v s} C_{5}^{p v t r}-\frac{3}{2}\left(Y_{d}\right)_{v t}\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger} Y_{u}\right)_{w s} C_{5}^{p v r w} \\
& -3\left(Y_{u}\right)_{v s}\left(\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger} Y_{d}\right)_{w t} C_{5}^{p v r w}-r \leftrightarrow t\right)+\frac{3}{2}\left(Y_{e}\right)_{p v}\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger} Y_{u}\right)_{w s} C_{6}^{v r t w}, \\
\dot{C}_{2}^{p r s t}= & +\left(-4 g_{3}^{2}-\frac{9}{4} g_{2}^{2}-\frac{13}{12} g_{1}^{2}+W_{H}\right) C_{2}^{p r s t}+\frac{5}{2}\left(Y_{e} Y_{e}^{\dagger}\right)_{p v} C_{2}^{\text {rrst }} \\
& +2\left(\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger} Y_{d}\right)_{v r} C_{2}^{p v s t}+\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger} Y_{d}\right)_{v s} C_{2}^{p r v t}+\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger} Y_{d}\right)_{v t} C_{2}^{p r s v}\right) \\
& -\frac{1}{4}\left[\left(\left(Y_{u}^{\dagger} Y_{d}\right)_{v s} C_{1}^{p r v t}+\left(Y_{u}^{\dagger} Y_{d}\right)_{v r} C_{1}^{p s v t}+\left(Y_{u}^{\dagger} Y_{d}\right)_{v s} C_{1}^{p t v r}\right)-s \leftrightarrow t\right] \\
& +\left\{\left[\left(\frac{1}{3}\left(g_{1}^{2}-6 g_{3}^{2}\right)\left(Y_{d}\right)_{v r} C_{5}^{p v s t}-\frac{1}{4} g_{1}^{2}\left(Y_{d}\right)_{v s} C_{5}^{p v r t}-\frac{3}{4}\left(Y_{d}\right)_{v r}\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger} Y_{d}\right)_{w t} C_{5}^{p v s w}\right)+r \leftrightarrow t\right]-s \leftrightarrow t\right\} \\
& +\frac{1}{2}\left(Y_{e}\right)_{p v}\left\{\left[g_{1}^{2}\left(C_{6}^{v r s t}+r \leftrightarrow s\right)+\frac{3}{4}\left(\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger} Y_{d}\right)_{w t}\left(C_{6}^{v r s w}+r \leftrightarrow s\right)+\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger} Y_{d}\right)_{w r} C_{6}^{v t s w}\right)\right]-s \leftrightarrow t\right\}, \\
= & +\left(-4 g_{3}^{2}-\frac{9}{4} g_{2}^{2}+\frac{11}{12} g_{1}^{2}+W_{H}\right) C_{3}^{p r s t} \\
\dot{C}_{3}^{p r s t} & +\left[\left(\left(Y_{e}^{\dagger} Y_{e}\right)_{p v} C_{3}^{v r s t}+\frac{5}{4}\left(Y_{u} Y_{u}^{\dagger}+Y_{d} Y_{d}^{\dagger}\right)_{v r} C_{3}^{p v s t}+3\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger} Y_{d}\right)_{v s} C_{3}^{p r v t}-\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger}\right)_{w r}\left(Y_{d}\right)_{v s} C_{3}^{p v w t}\right)-s \leftrightarrow t\right] \\
& -\frac{1}{2}\left(Y_{e}^{\dagger}\right)_{p v}\left[\left(\left(Y_{u}^{\dagger}\right)_{w r} C_{1}^{v t w s}+2\left(Y_{d}\right)_{w s} C_{4}^{v t w r}+\left(Y_{d}\right)_{w t} C_{4}^{v s r w}+3 g_{1}^{2} C_{5}^{v r s t}+3\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger} Y_{d}\right)_{w t} C_{5}^{v r s w}\right)-s \leftrightarrow t\right] \\
& +\frac{1}{4}\left(g_{1}^{2}+12 g_{3}^{2}\right)\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger}\right)_{v r}\left[\left(C_{6}^{p v s t}+C_{6}^{p s v t}+C_{6}^{p s t v}\right)-s \leftrightarrow t\right] \\
& -\frac{3}{4}\left\{\left[\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger} Y_{d}\right)_{v s}\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger}\right)_{w r}\left(C_{6}^{p t v w}-r \leftrightarrow v\right)+\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger} Y_{d}\right)_{w s}\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger}\right)_{v r}\left(C_{6}^{p t v w}+2 C_{6}^{p v t w}\right)\right]-s \leftrightarrow t\right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

## Renormalize dim- 7 neutrino mass operator


(1)

(3)
(2)

(7)

(8)


(9)

$$
\mathcal{M}_{(7)}=0, \quad \mathcal{M}_{(8)}+\mathcal{M}_{(9)}=\text { finite }
$$

And the $\beta$-function is

$$
16 \pi^{2} \mu \frac{d}{d \mu} C_{L H}^{p r}=\left(40 \lambda+4 Y-\frac{3}{2} g_{1}^{2}-\frac{15}{2} g_{2}^{2}\right) C_{L H}^{p r}-\frac{3}{2}\left[\left(Y_{e} Y_{e}^{\dagger}\right)_{v p} C_{L H}^{v r}+p \rightarrow r\right]+\ldots
$$

where ... stands for contributions from all other $11 /$ but $B$-conserving operators. Comparing it with dim-5 neutrino mass operator[S. Antusch et al:0108005]

$$
\begin{aligned}
16 \pi^{2} \mu \frac{d}{d \mu} C_{5}^{p r} & =\left(4 \lambda+2 Y-3 g_{2}^{2}\right) C_{5}^{p r}-\frac{3}{2}\left[\left(Y_{e} Y_{e}^{\dagger}\right)_{v p} C_{5}^{v r}+p \rightarrow r\right] \\
Y & \equiv \operatorname{Tr}\left[3\left(Y_{u}^{\dagger} Y_{u}\right)+3\left(Y_{d}^{\dagger} Y_{d}\right)+\left(Y_{e}^{\dagger} Y_{e}\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

## Operator mixing

Example: From class $\Psi^{4} H$ to $\Psi^{4} H, \Psi^{2} H^{4}$ and $\Psi^{2} H^{2} X$
Consider the following diagrams with an insertion of the operator $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{e} L L L H}$


$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum \text { diagrams } & \propto L^{2} H D^{2} H+\mathcal{O}_{L H X} \\
& \propto L^{2} H^{4}+\Psi^{4} H+L^{2} H^{2} X
\end{aligned}
$$

EoM: $D^{2} H=\lambda v^{2} H-2 \lambda\left(H^{\dagger} H\right) H-\epsilon^{\top} \bar{Q} Y_{u}^{\dagger} u-\bar{d} Y_{d} Q-\bar{e} Y_{e} L$

## Structure of $\gamma$-matrix

Based on nonrenormalization theorem[C. Cheung:1505.01844], one can understand the structure of anomalous dimension matrix $\gamma_{i j}$. First define the holomorphic and anti-holomorphic weights of an operator $\mathcal{O}$ by

$$
\omega(\mathcal{O})=n(\mathcal{O})-h(\mathcal{O}), \bar{\omega}(\mathcal{O})=n(\mathcal{O})+h(\mathcal{O})
$$

$n(\mathcal{O})$ : the minimal number of fields the operator $\mathcal{O}$ generates; $h(\mathcal{O})$ : the total helicity of the operator $\mathcal{O}$. And the SM field weights are as follows:

| SM "fields" | $D_{\mu}$ | $H$ | $\Psi$ | $X_{\mu \nu}$ | $\bar{X}_{\mu \nu}$ | $\bar{\Psi}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| weights $(\omega, \bar{\omega})$ | $(0,0)$ | $(1,1)$ | $\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}\right)$ | $(0,2)$ | $(2,0)$ | $\left(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$ |

Left-handed and right-handed fermion fields: $\Psi$ and $\bar{\Psi}$;
Dual field strength tensor: $\tilde{X}_{\mu \nu}=\frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{\mu \nu \rho \sigma} X^{\rho \sigma}$.

## Structure of $\gamma$-matrix

The nonrenormalization theorem dictates that an operator $\mathcal{O}_{i}$ can only be renormalized by an operator $\mathcal{O}_{j}$ if $\omega_{i} \geq \omega_{j}$ and $\bar{\omega}_{i} \geq \bar{\omega}_{j}$, and absent of non-holomorphic Yukawa couplings.

|  | weights | $(3,5)$ | $(3,5)$ | $(3,7)$ | $(4,6)$ | $(4,6)$ | $(5,7)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| weights | $\gamma_{i j}$ | $\Psi^{2} H^{2} D^{2}$ | $\psi \Psi^{3} D$ | $\Psi^{2} H^{2} X$ | $\psi^{2} H^{3} D$ | $\Psi \Psi^{3} \mathrm{H}$ | $\psi^{2} \mathrm{H}^{4}$ |
| $(3,5)$ | $\Psi^{2} H^{2} D^{2}$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $(3,5)$ | $\Psi \Psi^{3} D$ | $\sqrt{ }$ | $\sqrt{ }$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $(3,7)$ | $\psi^{2} H^{2} X$ | $\checkmark$ | $\times$ | $\checkmark$ | 0 | ¢y | 0 |
| $(4,6)$ | $\psi^{2} H^{3} D$ | $\checkmark$ | $\times$ | $\emptyset y$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 0 |
| $(4,6)$ | $\Psi \Psi^{3} \mathrm{H}$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\emptyset y$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | 0 |
| $(5,7)$ | $\Psi^{2} H^{4}$ | $\sqrt{ }$ | $\times$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |

$\overline{0}$ : vanishing due to nonrenormalization theorem
$x$ : vanishing because no corresponding diagrams
$\phi y$ : nonvanishing due to nonholomorphic Yukawa coupling y
$\sqrt{ }$ : surviving pieces

## Proton decay with $\Delta L=-\Delta B=1$

Consider the dominant operator relating with proton decay after symmetry breaking,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{\overline{L d u d \tilde{H}}}^{p 111}=v\left(\bar{\nu}_{p} P_{R} d\right)\left(u C P_{R} d\right) \\
& \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{\bar{L} d Q Q \tilde{H}}^{p 111}=-v\left(\bar{\nu}_{p} P_{R} d\right)\left(u C P_{L} d\right)
\end{aligned}
$$



Figure: $p \rightarrow \pi^{+} \nu$ with $\Delta L=-\Delta B=1$

Their Wilson coefficients decouple when we only keep gauge and top-Yukawa couplings,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu \frac{d}{d \mu} C_{\tilde{L d u d \tilde{H}}}^{p 111} & =\frac{1}{4 \pi}\left[-4 \alpha_{3}-\frac{9}{4} \alpha_{2}-\frac{57}{12} \alpha_{1}+3 \alpha_{t}\right] C_{\tilde{L d u d \tilde{H}}}^{p 111} \\
\mu \frac{d}{d \mu} C_{\tilde{L} d Q Q \tilde{H}}^{p 111} & =\frac{1}{4 \pi}\left[-4 \alpha_{3}-\frac{27}{4} \alpha_{2}-\frac{19}{12} \alpha_{1}+3 \alpha_{t}\right] C_{\tilde{L} d Q Q \tilde{H}}^{p 111}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\alpha_{i} \equiv g_{i}^{2} / 4 \pi$ and $\alpha_{t} \equiv y_{t}^{2} / 4 \pi$.

## Proton decay with $\Delta L=-\Delta B=1$

Estimating the coefficients from GUT scale $\left(M 10^{15} \mathrm{GeV}\right)$ to proton mass scale $\left(m_{p} 1 \mathrm{GeV}\right)$, The overall RGE running results are

$$
\begin{aligned}
C_{\bar{L} d u d \tilde{H}}^{p 111}\left(m_{p}\right) & =(2.034)(1.158)(1.262)(0.787) C_{\tilde{L d u d \tilde{H}}}^{p 111}(M) \\
& =2.34 C_{\tilde{L} d u d \tilde{H}}^{p 111}(M), \\
C_{\bar{L} d Q Q \tilde{H}}^{p 111}\left(m_{p}\right) & =(2.034)(1.551)(1.081)(0.787) C_{\tilde{L} d Q Q \tilde{H}}^{p 111}(M) \\
& =2.68 C_{\tilde{L} d Q Q \tilde{H}}^{p 111}(M),
\end{aligned}
$$

$g_{3}, \quad g_{2}, \quad g_{1}, \quad y_{t}$
They receive an enhancement factor of about 2 .

## Summary

- Basis of dim-7 operator determined: $12+6($ 价.
- 1-loop RGE of six dim-7 both $L$ and $B$ operators calculated.
- 1-loop RGE of twelve dim-7 $L$ but $B$-conserving operators calculated in part.
- The structure of anomalous dimensional matrix- $\gamma$ determined.
- Proton exotic decay with $\Delta B-\Delta L=2$ discussed.

