

Vector-like Quarks at the Origin of Light Quark Masses and Mixing

Francisco J. Botella ^{a 1}, G. C. Branco ^{b 2}, Miguel Nebot ^{b 3}, M. N. Rebelo ^{b 4}
and J. I. Silva-Marcos ^{b 5},

^a *Departament de Física Teòrica and IFIC, Universitat de València-CSIC,
E-46100 Burjassot, Spain.*

^b *Departamento de Física and Centro de Física Teórica de Partículas (CFTP),
Instituto Superior Técnico (IST), Universidade de Lisboa (UL), Av. Rovisco Pais,
P-1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal.*

Abstract

We show how a novel fine-tuning problem present in the Standard Model can be solved through the introduction of a single flavour symmetry G , together with three $Q = -1/3$ quarks, three $Q = 2/3$ quarks, as well as a complex singlet scalar. The symmetry G is extended to the additional fields and it is an exact symmetry of the Lagrangian, only spontaneously broken by the vacuum. Specific examples are given and a phenomenological analysis of the main features of the model is presented. It is shown that even for vector-like quarks with masses accessible at the LHC, one can have realistic quark masses and mixing, while respecting the strict constraints on process arising from flavour changing neutral currents (FCNC). The vector-like quark decay channels are also described.

¹Francisco.J.Botella@uv.es

²gbranco@tecnico.ulisboa.pt

³nebot@cftp.tecnico.ulisboa.pt

⁴rebelo@tecnico.ulisboa.pt

⁵juca@cftp.tecnico.ulisboa.pt

1 Introduction

In the framework of the Standard Model (SM), the Brout-Englert-Higgs mechanism is responsible not only for the breaking of the gauge symmetry but also for the generation of fermion masses, through the Yukawa interactions of the scalar doublet with quarks and leptons. Understanding the observed pattern of fermion masses and mixing remains a fundamental open question in Particle Physics. On the experimental side, there has been great progress and at present the moduli of the Cabibbo Kobayashi Maskawa (CKM) matrix, V_{CKM} , are reasonably well known [1–3] with clear evidence that the mixing matrix is non-trivially complex, even if one allows for the presence of New Physics (NP) beyond the SM [4–6]. The discovery of the Higgs particle at LHC [7, 8] renders specially important the measurement of the Higgs couplings to quarks and charged leptons. The strength of these couplings is fixed within the SM, but at present we have a poor knowledge of their actual value.

Recently, it has been pointed out [9] that there is a novel fine-tuning problem in the SM. Contrary to conventional wisdom, in the SM without extra flavour symmetries, quark mixing is naturally large, in spite of the large quark mass hierarchy. In fact, even in the extreme chiral limit, where only the third family acquires mass, mixing is meaningful, and in general of order one. It is possible to solve this fine-tuning problem through the introduction of a simple flavour symmetry which leads to $V_{CKM} = \mathbb{1}$. The challenge is then to achieve quark mixing and masses for the first two generations.

In this paper we face this challenge and put forward a framework where a flavour symmetry leads to $V_{CKM} = \mathbb{1}$ in leading order, with light quark masses and mixing being generated by the presence of vector-like quarks (VIQ). We introduce three up-type VIQ and three down-type VIQ and derive effective mass squared Hermitian mass matrices for the standard quarks. In this framework one finds a natural explanation why $|V_{13}|^2 + |V_{23}|^2$ is very small, while allowing for an adequate Cabibbo mixing. In this model there are Z-mediated and Higgs-mediated Flavour Changing Neutral Currents (FCNC) which are naturally suppressed. The VIQs can have masses of the order of one TeV which are at the reach of the second run of LHC [10–19]. At this stage, it is worth emphasising that VIQs have been extensively studied in the literature [20–48] and arise in a variety of frameworks, including E6 GUTS, models with extra-dimensions, models providing solutions to the strong CP problem without axions, etc. It has also been pointed out [49] that non-supersymmetric extensions of the SM with VIQs can achieve unification of gauge couplings.

The paper is organised as follows: in the next section we briefly review a novel fine-tuning problem of the Standard Model and illustrate how it can be solved through the addition of a flavour symmetry. In section 3, we show how a realistic quark mass spectrum and pattern of mixing can be generated through the introduction of vector-like quarks and a complex scalar singlet. In section 4 we give specific examples examining the constraints arising from various FCNC processes and describing the vector-like quark decay channels. Finally, our conclusions are presented in section 5.

2 Hierarchy and Alignment through a Flavour Symmetry

2.1 A Novel Fine-Tuning Problem in the Standard Model

Recently, it has been pointed out [9] that in the SM there is a novel fine-tuning problem which stems from the fact that the natural value of $|V_{13}|^2 + |V_{23}|^2$ is of order one in the SM, to be compared to the experimental value of 1.6×10^{-3} . In order to obtain this result, one can examine the extreme chiral limit where only the third family of quarks has mass while all other quarks are massless. In this limit, the general quark mass matrices can be written

$$M_d = U_L^{d\dagger} \text{diag}(0, 0, m_b) U_R^d, \quad M_u = U_L^{u\dagger} \text{diag}(0, 0, m_t) U_R^u \quad (1)$$

where $U_{L,R}^{d,u}$ are arbitrary unitary matrices. The quark mixing matrix is then $V^0 = U_L^{u\dagger} U_L^d$. Using the freedom to redefine the quark fields of the massless quarks through two-by-two unitary matrices one can show that the quark mixing can be described by an orthogonal two-by-two rotation connecting only the (c, t) and (s, b) quarks. This angle is arbitrary and expected to be of order one.

2.2 A Flavour Symmetry Leading to Small Mixing

Let us consider the SM and introduce the following symmetry:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{L1}^0 &\rightarrow e^{i\tau} Q_{L1}^0 & Q_{L2}^0 &\rightarrow e^{-2i\tau} Q_{L2}^0 & Q_{L3}^0 &\rightarrow e^{-i\tau} Q_{L3}^0 \\ d_{R1}^0 &\rightarrow e^{-i\tau} d_{R1}^0 & d_{R2}^0 &\rightarrow e^{-i\tau} d_{R2}^0 & d_{R3}^0 &\rightarrow e^{-2i\tau} d_{R3}^0 \\ u_{R1}^0 &\rightarrow e^{i\tau} u_{R1}^0 & u_{R2}^0 &\rightarrow e^{i\tau} u_{R2}^0 & u_{R3}^0 &\rightarrow u_{R3}^0 \quad ; \quad \Phi \rightarrow e^{i\tau} \Phi \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the Q_{Lj}^0 are left-handed quark doublets, d_{Rj}^0 and u_{Rj}^0 are right-handed quark singlets and Φ denotes the Higgs doublet. The Yukawa interactions are given by:

$$\mathcal{L}_Y = \left[-\bar{Q}_{Li}^0 \Phi Y_d d_{Rj}^0 - \bar{Q}_{Li}^0 \tilde{\Phi} Y_u u_{Rj}^0 \right] + \text{h.c.}, \quad (3)$$

and this symmetry leads to the following pattern of texture zeros for the Yukawa couplings:

$$Y_d = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \times \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y_u = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \times \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

which lead to V_{CKM} equal to the identity with only one non-zero quark mass in each charge sector.

3 Vector-like quarks and generation of realistic quark masses and mixing

A possible mechanism to generate masses for the light standard-like quarks is to introduce vector-like quarks. In our examples we particularise for the case of three down (D_{Li}^0, D_{Ri}^0) and three up (U_{Li}^0, U_{Ri}^0) vector-like isosinglet quarks. With the introduction of these additional isosinglet quarks the Yukawa interactions can now be denoted as:

$$\mathcal{L}_Y = \left[-\bar{Q}_{Li}^0 \Phi (Y_d)_{i\alpha} d_{R\alpha}^0 - \bar{Q}_{Li}^0 \tilde{\Phi} (Y_u)_{i\beta} u_{R\beta}^0 \right] + \text{h.c.}, \quad (5)$$

here the index i runs from 1 to 3, as in the SM, while the indices α and β cover all right-handed quark singlets of the down and up sector, respectively. The following generic bare mass terms must also be introduced in the Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}_{b.m.} = \left[-\bar{D}_{Lj}^0 (\eta_d)_{j\alpha} d_{R\alpha}^0 - \bar{U}_{Lk}^0 (\eta_u)_{k\beta} u_{R\beta}^0 \right] + \text{h.c.} \quad (6)$$

here the indices j and k run over all left-handed vectorial quarks in each sector. As mentioned before, in all examples that follow i, j and k run from 1 to 3 and therefore α and β run from 1 to 6 (obviously $D_{Ri}^0 \equiv d_{Ri+3}^0$ and $U_{Ri}^0 \equiv u_{Ri+3}^0$). In what follows we extend the discrete flavour symmetry introduced in subsection 2.2 and we introduce a complex scalar singlet S . This scalar singlet will couple to the quark singlets in the following way:

$$\mathcal{L}_g = \left[-\bar{D}_{Lj}^0 [(g_d)_{j\alpha} S + (g'_d)_{j\alpha} S^*] d_{R\alpha}^0 - \bar{U}_{Lk}^0 [(g_u)_{k\beta} S + (g'_u)_{k\beta} S^*] u_{R\beta}^0 \right] + \text{h.c.} \quad (7)$$

We assume that the modulus of the vacuum expectation value of the field S is of an order of magnitude higher than the electroweak scale. After spontaneous symmetry breaking the following mass terms are generated:

$$\mathcal{L}_M = \left[-\frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{d}_{Li}^0 (Y_d)_{i\alpha} d_{R\alpha}^0 - \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{u}_{Li}^0 (Y_u)_{i\alpha} u_{R\alpha}^0 - \bar{D}_{Li}^0 (\mu_d)_{i\alpha} d_{R\alpha}^0 - \bar{U}_{Li}^0 (\mu_u)_{i\alpha} u_{R\alpha}^0 \right] + \text{h.c.} \quad (8)$$

These terms can be written in a more compact form, as:

$$\mathcal{L}_M = - \left(\bar{d}_L^0 \bar{D}_L^0 \right) \mathcal{M}_d \begin{pmatrix} d_R^0 \\ D_R^0 \end{pmatrix} - \left(\bar{u}_L^0 \bar{U}_L^0 \right) \mathcal{M}_u \begin{pmatrix} u_R^0 \\ U_R^0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (9)$$

with 6×6 mass matrices, \mathcal{M}_d and \mathcal{M}_u , denoted as:

$$\mathcal{M}_d = \begin{pmatrix} m_d & \omega_d \\ X_d & M_d \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathcal{M}_u = \begin{pmatrix} m_u & \omega_u \\ X_u & M_u \end{pmatrix} \quad (10)$$

3.1 Structure of Charged and Neutral currents

The matrices \mathcal{M}_d and \mathcal{M}_u will be diagonalised through the following unitary transformations:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} d_L^0 \\ D_L^0 \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} A_{dL} \\ B_{dL} \end{pmatrix} (d_L) \equiv \mathcal{U}_L^d d_L & \begin{pmatrix} u_L^0 \\ U_L^0 \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} A_{uL} \\ B_{uL} \end{pmatrix} (u_L) \equiv \mathcal{U}_L^u u_L \\ \begin{pmatrix} d_R^0 \\ D_R^0 \end{pmatrix} &\equiv \mathcal{U}_R^d d_R & \begin{pmatrix} u_R^0 \\ U_R^0 \end{pmatrix} &\equiv \mathcal{U}_R^u u_R \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where A_{dL} , B_{dL} , A_{uL} and B_{uL} are 3×6 matrices; the matrices \mathcal{U}_L^d , \mathcal{U}_R^d , \mathcal{U}_L^u and \mathcal{U}_R^u are unitary 6×6 matrices and (d_L) , (d_R) , (u_L) and (u_R) stand for the components of the six down and six up mass eigenstate quarks. Unitarity implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} A_{dL} \\ B_{dL} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_{dL}^\dagger & B_{dL}^\dagger \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} A_{dL} A_{dL}^\dagger & A_{dL} B_{dL}^\dagger \\ B_{dL} A_{dL}^\dagger & B_{dL} B_{dL}^\dagger \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1}_{3 \times 3} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{1}_{3 \times 3} \end{pmatrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} A_{dL}^\dagger & B_{dL}^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_{dL} \\ B_{dL} \end{pmatrix} &= A_{dL}^\dagger A_{dL} + B_{dL}^\dagger B_{dL} = \mathbb{1}_{6 \times 6} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

with similar relations for the up-type matrices. The charged currents are given by:

$$\mathcal{L}_W = -\frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} (\bar{u}_L^0 \gamma^\mu d_L^0) \mathbf{W}_\mu^+ + \text{h.c.} = -\frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} (\bar{u}_L V \gamma^\mu d_L) \mathbf{W}_\mu^+ + \text{h.c.} \quad (13)$$

with $V = A_{uL}^\dagger A_{dL}$. The couplings of the Z boson are of the form:

$$\mathcal{L}_Z = \frac{g}{\cos \theta_W} Z_\mu \left[\frac{1}{2} (\bar{u}_L W^u \gamma^\mu u_L - \bar{d}_L W^d \gamma^\mu u_L) - \sin^2 \theta_W \left(\frac{2}{3} \bar{u} \gamma^\mu u - \frac{1}{3} \bar{d} \gamma^\mu d \right) \right] \quad (14)$$

with $W^d = V^\dagger V$ and $W^u = V V^\dagger$. After spontaneous symmetry breaking, Eqs. (5), (6) and (7) give rise to the physical quark masses, which together with the couplings to the SM-like Higgs can be denoted as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{Mh}} &= -\bar{d}_L \mathcal{D}_d d_R - \bar{u}_L \mathcal{D}_u u_R - \frac{\sqrt{2} G^+}{v} [\bar{u}_L V \mathcal{D}_d d_R - \bar{u}_R \mathcal{D}_u V d_L] \\ &- i \frac{G^0}{v} [\bar{d}_L W^d \mathcal{D}_d d_R - \bar{u}_L W^u \mathcal{D}_u u_R] - \frac{h}{v} [\bar{d}_L W^d \mathcal{D}_d d_R + \bar{u}_L W^u \mathcal{D}_u u_R] + \text{h.c.} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where h is the Higgs field, v is the vacuum expectation value of the neutral component of the Higgs doublet and G^+ and G^0 are the would-be Goldstone bosons, \mathcal{D}_d and \mathcal{D}_u are the six by six diagonal quark mass matrices.

3.2 Extension of the symmetry to the full Lagrangian

In the fermion sector, as mentioned above, we introduce three down-type and three up-type vector-like quarks. In the scalar sector, in addition to the standard Higgs,

we introduce a complex scalar S . We extend the symmetry to the full Lagrangian, with the new fields transforming in the following way under the family symmetry:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{L1}^0 &\rightarrow e^{-3i\tau} D_{L1}^0 & D_{L2}^0 &\rightarrow e^{-2i\tau} D_{L2}^0 & D_{L3}^0 &\rightarrow e^{-i\tau} D_{L3}^0 \\
D_{R1}^0 &\rightarrow e^{-2i\tau} D_{R1}^0 & D_{R2}^0 &\rightarrow e^{-3i\tau} D_{R2}^0 & D_{R3}^0 &\rightarrow D_{R3}^0 \\
U_{L1}^0 &\rightarrow e^{-i\tau} U_{L1}^0 & U_{L2}^0 &\rightarrow U_{L2}^0 & U_{L3}^0 &\rightarrow e^{i\tau} U_{L3}^0 \\
U_{R1}^0 &\rightarrow U_{R1}^0 & U_{R2}^0 &\rightarrow e^{-i\tau} U_{R2}^0 & U_{R3}^0 &\rightarrow e^{2i\tau} U_{R3}^0 \quad ; \quad S \rightarrow e^{i\tau} S
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

together with the transformations for the standard-like quarks specified in Eq. (2). The singlet scalar S is introduced in order to be able to obtain realistic quark masses and mixing, without breaking the symmetry at the Lagrangian level. An alternative option would be to softly break the symmetry through the introduction of bare mass terms for the heavy fermions. Since the symmetry would be only softly broken, the model would maintain its renormalizability. We find it more appealing to have the symmetry exact, at the Lagrangian level. We assume that the scale of spontaneous symmetry breaking of the S fields is higher than the electroweak scale.

Table 1 and Table 2 summarise the information on the combination of the different fermionic charges and allow to infer what is the pattern of the mass matrices. The first three rows come from Yukawa terms of the form given by Eq. (5) and therefore are only allowed when the fermionic charge cancels the one coming from the scalar doublet. In these cases we write this charge explicitly. In the forbidden terms we put a bullet sign. The last three rows come from bare mass terms of the form given by Eq. (6) or else from couplings to the field S . We denote with 1 the entries corresponding to allowed bare mass terms and by the fermionic charges those terms that allow coupling to either S or S^* . Again we use bullets for the forbidden terms. The introduction of these singlet scalar field provides a rationale for the choice of terms that would otherwise softly break the symmetry and would look arbitrary.

3.3 Effective Hermitian squared mass matrix

The 6×6 mass matrices $\mathcal{M}_d, \mathcal{M}_u$ are diagonalised through the bi-unitary transformations:

$$\mathcal{U}_L^{d\dagger} \mathcal{M}_d \mathcal{U}_R^d = \mathcal{D}_d \equiv \text{diag}(d_d, D_d) \tag{17}$$

where $d_d \equiv \text{diag}(m_d, m_s, m_b)$, $D_d \equiv \text{diag}(M_{D1}, M_{D2}, M_{D3})$ and with M_{Di} standing for the heavy $Q = -1/3$ quark masses. An analogous equation holds for \mathcal{M}_u . In our examples the diagonalisation of \mathcal{M}_d and \mathcal{M}_u is done through an exact numerical calculation. However, in order to have an idea of the main physical features involved, it is useful to perform an approximate evaluation of $\mathcal{U}_L^d, \mathcal{U}_L^u$ and of the quark mass eigenvalues. For this purpose, it is useful to write $\mathcal{U}_L^d, \mathcal{U}_L^u$ in block form:

$$\mathcal{U}_L = \begin{pmatrix} K & R \\ S & T \end{pmatrix} \tag{18}$$

Table 1: Down sector, summary of transformation properties

	$\begin{pmatrix} d_{R1}^0 \\ -\tau \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} d_{R2}^0 \\ -\tau \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} d_{R3}^0 \\ -2\tau \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} D_{R1}^0 \\ -2\tau \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} D_{R2}^0 \\ -3\tau \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} D_{R3}^0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$
$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{Q}_{L1}^0 \\ -\tau \end{pmatrix}$	•	•	•	•	•	$-\tau$
$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{Q}_{L2}^0 \\ 2\tau \end{pmatrix}$	•	•	•	•	$-\tau$	•
$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{Q}_{L3}^0 \\ \tau \end{pmatrix}$	•	•	$-\tau$	$-\tau$	•	•
$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{D}_{L1}^0 \\ 3\tau \end{pmatrix}$	•	•	τ	τ	1	•
$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{D}_{L2}^0 \\ 2\tau \end{pmatrix}$	τ	τ	1	1	$-\tau$	•
$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{D}_{L3}^0 \\ \tau \end{pmatrix}$	1	1	$-\tau$	$-\tau$	•	τ

where K, R, S, T are 3×3 matrices. For simplicity, we drop the indices d , and u . In Appendix A we show that the deviations of the unitarity of the matrix K are naturally small:

$$KK^\dagger = \mathbb{1} - RR^\dagger \quad (19)$$

with

$$R \approx \frac{(mX^\dagger + \omega M^\dagger)T}{D^2} \approx (m/M) \quad (20)$$

and

$$K^\dagger K = \mathbb{1} - S^\dagger S \quad (21)$$

with

$$S \approx \left(\frac{Xm^\dagger + M\omega^\dagger}{XX^\dagger + MM^\dagger} \right) K \quad (22)$$

The matrices K_d, K_u can be evaluated from an effective Hermitian squared matrix \mathcal{H}_{eff} through:

$$K^{-1}\mathcal{H}_{eff}K = d^2 \quad (23)$$

with

$$\mathcal{H}_{eff} = (mm^\dagger + \omega\omega^\dagger) - (mX^\dagger + \omega M^\dagger)(XX^\dagger + MM^\dagger)^{-1}(Xm^\dagger + M\omega^\dagger) \quad (24)$$

The derivation of \mathcal{H}_{eff} is given in Appendix A.

Table 2: Up sector, summary of transformation properties

	$\begin{pmatrix} u_{R1}^0 \\ \tau \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} u_{R2}^0 \\ \tau \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} u_{R3}^0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} U_{R1}^0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} U_{R2}^0 \\ -\tau \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} U_{R3}^0 \\ 2\tau \end{pmatrix}$
$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{Q}_{L1}^0 \\ -\tau \end{pmatrix}$	•	•	•	•	•	τ
$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{Q}_{L2}^0 \\ 2\tau \end{pmatrix}$	•	•	•	•	τ	•
$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{Q}_{L3}^0 \\ \tau \end{pmatrix}$	•	•	τ	τ	•	•
$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{U}_{L1}^0 \\ \tau \end{pmatrix}$	•	•	τ	τ	1	•
$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{U}_{L2}^0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$	τ	τ	1	1	$-\tau$	•
$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{U}_{L3}^0 \\ -\tau \end{pmatrix}$	1	1	$-\tau$	$-\tau$	•	τ

4 Realistic Examples

Following the notation in Eq. (10) we present one full realistic example; mass matrices are given at the M_Z scale in units of GeV. Among the matrices coming from electroweak symmetry breaking we have (i) the mass matrices that connect light (ordinary) quarks among themselves m_d and m_u ; they should contain the dominant contributions to the b and t quarks masses -allowed by the symmetry in Eq. (2) -

$$m_d = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 3.07015 \end{pmatrix}, \quad m_u = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 185.142 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (25)$$

and (ii) the upper right off-diagonal blocks of the quark mass matrices that read

$$\omega_d = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0.061403 \\ 0 & 0.39912 & 0 \\ 0.39912 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \omega_u = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0.00925708 \\ 0 & 3.70283 & 0 \\ 185.142 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (26)$$

The matrices in Eqs. (25), (26) are proportional to the Higgs vacuum expectation value, therefore its matrix elements should be of the same order of magnitude or smaller than the corresponding bottom or top mass. The heavy vectorial quarks

mass sectors M_d and M_u are

$$M_d = \begin{pmatrix} 767.538 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1535.08 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1842.09 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M_u = \begin{pmatrix} 1295.99 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1481.13 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2221.7 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (27)$$

These matrices fix approximately the masses of the new heavy vectorial singlet quarks. Finally, the other matrices that connect the heavy sector with the light one are

$$X_d = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -115.131 \\ -262.498i & 46.0523 & 460.523 - 230.261i \\ 486.312 & 0 & 368.418 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (28)$$

$$X_u = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 68.4281 \\ -212.913 & -185.142 & 0 \\ 416.569 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (29)$$

The scale of the matrices in Eqs. (27), (28) and (29) is, for most entries similar or higher than the electroweak scale: the off-diagonal matrices being always smaller than the heavy mass matrix sectors in order to be the responsible of giving mass to the light quark masses and generating the CKM mixing. Following the standard diagonalization of \mathcal{M}_d and \mathcal{M}_u the quark mass spectrum (in GeV at the M_Z scale) is:

$$\begin{pmatrix} m_d \\ m_s \\ m_b \\ m_{D_1} \\ m_{D_2} \\ m_{D_3} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.0027 \\ 0.068 \\ 2.9 \\ 775 \\ 1621 \\ 1957 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} m_u \\ m_c \\ m_t \\ m_{U_1} \\ m_{U_2} \\ m_{U_3} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.0011 \\ 0.69 \\ 173 \\ 1313 \\ 1507 \\ 2261 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (30)$$

It is clear that the light masses agree with the light masses of the SM [50, 51]. From the diagonalization of \mathcal{M}_d and \mathcal{M}_u we also obtain the non unitary 6×6 CKM matrix V . Its moduli are given by

$$|V| = \begin{pmatrix} 0.97446 & 0.22459 & 0.003631 & 2.2 \cdot 10^{-6} & 9.8 \cdot 10^{-6} & 2.9 \cdot 10^{-5} \\ 0.22446 & 0.97361 & 0.041118 & 2.8 \cdot 10^{-5} & 2.3 \cdot 10^{-4} & 3.7 \cdot 10^{-5} \\ 0.00850 & 0.039901 & 0.987685 & 1.4 \cdot 10^{-5} & 4.9 \cdot 10^{-4} & 3.7 \cdot 10^{-4} \\ 1.3 \cdot 10^{-3} & 6.1 \cdot 10^{-3} & 0.150913 & 2.1 \cdot 10^{-6} & 7.5 \cdot 10^{-5} & 5.7 \cdot 10^{-5} \\ 5.4 \cdot 10^{-4} & 2.4 \cdot 10^{-3} & 1.0 \cdot 10^{-4} & 6.7 \cdot 10^{-8} & 5.5 \cdot 10^{-7} & 9.0 \cdot 10^{-8} \\ 8.5 \cdot 10^{-6} & 3.3 \cdot 10^{-5} & 1.4 \cdot 10^{-6} & 9.2 \cdot 10^{-10} & 7.6 \cdot 10^{-9} & 1.2 \cdot 10^{-9} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (31)$$

and the arguments of its matrix elements are given in leading order by

$$\arg(V) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 6.4 \cdot 10^{-4} & -1.197 & -8.2 \cdot 10^{-3} & -3.109 & -2.3 \cdot 10^{-3} \\ \pi & 0 & 0 & 1.22 & 0.668 & 0.666 \\ -0.393 & \pi + 0.0188 & 0 & -1.93 & -2.54 & -2.13 \\ 1.63 & -1.10 & 2.02 & 0.091 & -0.516 & -0.107 \\ 1.57 & -1.56 & -1.56 & -0.345 & -0.895 & -0.896 \\ -1.09 & 1.55 & 1.57 & 2.79 & 2.25 & 2.17 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (32)$$

This generalized non-unitary CKM matrix V deserves several comments:

1. The first upper left 3×3 block reproduces to a great extent the SM CKM mixing matrix, including the phases.
2. It is remarkable that all the moduli - except $|V_{tb}|$ - of the 3×3 light sector of V agree with the SM fitted values within 1.5σ , in fact most are within 1σ .
3. A very important difference is in the element $|V_{tb}|$ that is incompatible with the SM value. Disentangling this value from the SM one is certainly an experimental challenge for single top production.
4. Looking at the four independent phases that can be defined in the 3×3 light sector β, γ, β_s and χ' - related to the phases of V_{td}, V_{ub}, V_{ts} and V_{us} , see references [35,52] - we cannot find any relevant difference among the phases of this example and the phases of the SM. We get in our model:

$$\beta = 0.393, \quad \gamma = 1.197, \quad \beta_s = 0.0188, \quad \chi' = 0.000636 \quad (33)$$

5. Since the new quark singlets do not couple directly to the $SU(2)_L$ gauge bosons, in the limit of no mixing among chiral and vectorial singlet quarks only the upper left 3×3 sector of V is different from zero. This explains the smallness of the entries in the other sectors of V and indicates that the elements $V_{U_i d}, V_{U_i s}$ and $V_{U_i b}$ can induce new physics effects that could appear for example in $b \rightarrow d, b \rightarrow s$ or $s \rightarrow d$ transitions. Transitions induced by $V_{u D_i}, V_{c D_i}$ and $V_{t D_i}$ should be smaller than the latter.

In summary, the CKM sector of our mixing matrix V reproduces very well the SM case except for a minor but definite deviation in V_{tb} at the 1% level.

4.1 The FCNC structure

In spite of the great similarity between the 3×3 sector of our mixing matrix V and the SM CKM matrix, we know that in this model we will have FCNC at tree level both in the up and in the down sectors. Of course we expect to have these FCNC highly suppressed, but to check these expectations we present the matrices that control these

FCNC both in the couplings to the Z and to the Higgs h bosons. The moduli of the matrix elements that control the FCNC in the up sector are given by $W^u = VV^\dagger$:

$$|W^u| = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1.1 \cdot 10^{-8} & 2.9 \cdot 10^{-17} & 4.5 \cdot 10^{-18} & 4.7 \cdot 10^{-6} & 4.0 \cdot 10^{-6} \\ 1.1 \cdot 10^{-8} & 1 & 2.2 \cdot 10^{-17} & 5.7 \cdot 10^{-17} & 2.4 \cdot 10^{-3} & 3.4 \cdot 10^{-5} \\ 2.9 \cdot 10^{-17} & 2.2 \cdot 10^{-17} & 0.977 & 0.149 & 1.7 \cdot 10^{-16} & 2.2 \cdot 10^{-18} \\ 4.5 \cdot 10^{-18} & 5.7 \cdot 10^{-17} & 0.149 & 2.28 \cdot 10^{-2} & 2.6 \cdot 10^{-17} & 3.3 \cdot 10^{-19} \\ 4.7 \cdot 10^{-6} & 2.4 \cdot 10^{-3} & 1.7 \cdot 10^{-16} & 2.6 \cdot 10^{-17} & 5.8 \cdot 10^{-6} & 8.1 \cdot 10^{-8} \\ 4.0 \cdot 10^{-6} & 3.4 \cdot 10^{-5} & 2.2 \cdot 10^{-18} & 3.3 \cdot 10^{-19} & 8.1 \cdot 10^{-8} & 1.1 \cdot 10^{-9} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (34)$$

In the light sector $|W_{uc}^u| = 1.1 \cdot 10^{-8}$ is too small to be in conflict with $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing or $D^0 \rightarrow \mu\bar{\mu}$. Values like $|W_{qt}^u| \sim 10^{-17}$ make $t \rightarrow Zu, Zc$ extremely suppressed. The reminiscent of $V_{tb} \neq 1$ is here $|W_{tt}^u| = 0.977$ another challenging deviation from the SM to be checked more likely in loops. It is important to realize that the light 3×3 sector resembles very much the identity matrix $\mathbb{I}_{3 \times 3}$ except for $|W_{tt}^u|$. Values like $|W_{U_1 t}^u| = 0.149$ will dictate the neutral current dominant decay channels of the heavy quark U_1 of mass $m_{U_1} = 1313$ GeV: $U_1 \rightarrow tZ$ and $U_1 \rightarrow th$. The moduli of the matrix elements that control the FCNC in the down sector are given by $W^d = V^\dagger V$:

$$|W^d| = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1.4 \cdot 10^{-8} & 3.0 \cdot 10^{-8} & 6.0 \cdot 10^{-16} & 6.3 \cdot 10^{-5} & 2.3 \cdot 10^{-5} \\ 1.4 \cdot 10^{-8} & 1 & 1.4 \cdot 10^{-7} & 2.8 \cdot 10^{-5} & 2.4 \cdot 10^{-4} & 5.6 \cdot 10^{-5} \\ 3.0 \cdot 10^{-8} & 1.4 \cdot 10^{-7} & 1 & 1.3 \cdot 10^{-5} & 4.9 \cdot 10^{-4} & 3.7 \cdot 10^{-4} \\ 6.0 \cdot 10^{-6} & 2.8 \cdot 10^{-5} & 1.3 \cdot 10^{-5} & 9.6 \cdot 10^{-10} & 1.3 \cdot 10^{-8} & 6.3 \cdot 10^{-9} \\ 6.3 \cdot 10^{-5} & 2.4 \cdot 10^{-4} & 4.9 \cdot 10^{-4} & 1.3 \cdot 10^{-8} & 3.0 \cdot 10^{-7} & 1.9 \cdot 10^{-7} \\ 2.3 \cdot 10^{-5} & 5.6 \cdot 10^{-5} & 3.7 \cdot 10^{-4} & 6.3 \cdot 10^{-9} & 1.9 \cdot 10^{-7} & 1.4 \cdot 10^{-7} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (35)$$

Owing to the fact that W^d can induce $K^0 - \bar{K}^0, B_d^0 - \bar{B}_d^0$ and $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$ mixing at tree level through Z exchange, the off-diagonal elements W_{ds}^d, W_{db}^d and W_{sb}^d cannot be too large. But as we can see they are well below (two to three orders of magnitude) the values from previous analyses [32, 33] that avoid conflicting with meson mixing constraints. The bottom line is that the 3×3 light sector of $|W^d|$ is very well approximated by $\mathbb{I}_{3 \times 3}$.

But this is not the end of the story. We have now an enlarged 6×6 CKM matrix V with elements connecting light and heavy quarks of order 10^{-3} to 10^{-4} . These matrix elements enter into the loops that generate FCNC with heavy quarks running inside the loop and with several Inami-Lim (IL) functions [53] growing with the square of the heavy quark masses. So, a priori, one has to check that the product of these heavy masses with these suppressed couplings does not spoil the great success of the SM in FCNC processes. At this point it is worthwhile recalling that we have fixed our model with vectorial quarks by demanding that a particular texture mass structure, imposed by symmetries, should reproduce the light quark masses and the dominant CKM mixing matrix. On the other hand, the symmetry does not impose any constraint on the product of heavy masses square and mixing between light and heavy fermions. Therefore we should check the relevant constraints.

4.2 Loop FCNC constraints

In general the structure of FCNC at one loop level in this model can be quite involved. But, as we have seen, the tree level flavour changing coupling are very much suppressed. So let us comment on the different processes where, as we will see, tree level FCNC contributions can be safely neglected:

1. The contributions that go with W_{ij}^u and W_{ij}^d in FCNC tree level contributions to $\Delta F = 1$ processes like $B_q \rightarrow \mu\bar{\mu}$. These NP pieces are proportional to W_{bq}^d to be compared with $\alpha_{em}V_{tb}^*V_{tq}$ times an IL function of order one coming from the SM piece. The transitions where these NP contributions are the largest ones are rare kaon decays where we have $W_{ds}^d/\alpha_{em}V_{td}^*V_{ts} \lesssim 10^{-2}$. So for example $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ or $K_L \rightarrow \mu\bar{\mu}$ are not affected by these tree level contributions. The corresponding decays in the B meson systems are even less affected.
2. The contributions that go with $(W_{ij}^u)^2$ and $(W_{ij}^d)^2$ in FCNC tree level contributions to $\Delta F = 2$ processes like $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ or $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$, $B_d^0 - \bar{B}_d^0$ and $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$. In these cases, we are neglecting W_{ds}^d with respect to $\sqrt{\alpha_{em}}V_{td}^*V_{ts}$ and similarly for the B_d , B_s and D neutral meson systems. The largest NP correction appears in the kaon case and is of order 10^{-6} times the SM contribution.
3. When the tree level FCNC are small, Barenboim and Botella [54] showed that the leading NP contribution to meson mixing, induced by this FCNC enters at order $\alpha_{em}W_{ds}^dV_{td}^*V_{ts}$, to be compared with $\alpha_{em}(V_{td}^*V_{ts})^2$. So, in our example, these contributions are at most of order 10^{-4} . Again, we can neglect these contributions.

Taking into account the previous considerations, we can analyze all the $\Delta F = 1, 2$ processes neglecting the tree level FCNC effects.

4.2.1 $\Delta F = 2$ pure loop constraints

The neutral meson mixing is therefore dominated by the box diagrams that generalize the SM one, with all species of heavy quarks plus the top and the charm quarks - or the bottom and the strange quarks for $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing - running inside the loop⁶. If we define as usual $\lambda_{qq'}^a = V_{aq'}^*V_{aq}$ - for mesons with down quarks -, the dominant corrections to the mixing $(M_{12})_{qq'}$ of the meson with quark content (qq') , with respect

⁶Note that in the SM, the Inami-Lim function that appears in the box runs for c and t quarks after using unitarity 3×3 . In our case we have for the kaon system, for example, $\sum_{i=1}^6 V_{id}V_{is}^* = (V^\dagger V)_{ds} = W_{ds}^d$, so there is an additional contribution - to what we are considering in the main text - proportional to the quark u contribution and to W_{ds}^d , and therefore negligible. So we can extend the sum from c, t to c, t, U_1, U_2, U_3 .

to the SM box diagram with internal top quarks, can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(M_{12})_{qq'}}{(M_{12}^{SM})_{qq'}} &\sim 1 + \sum_{i=1}^3 \left(\frac{\lambda_{qq'}^{U_i}}{\lambda_{qq'}^t} \right)^2 \frac{S(x_{U_i})}{S(x_t)} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^3 \left(\frac{\lambda_{qq'}^{U_i}}{\lambda_{qq'}^t} \right) \frac{S(x_{U_i}, x_t)}{S(x_t)} \\ &+ 2 \sum_{i<j}^3 \frac{\left(\lambda_{qq'}^{U_i} \lambda_{qq'}^{U_j} \right)}{(\lambda_{qq'}^t)^2} \frac{S(x_{U_i}, x_{U_j})}{S(x_t)} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where $S(x_t)$, $S(x_{U_i}, x_t)$ are the IL functions defined as in [52] and $x_t, x_{U_i} = (m_t/M_W)^2, (m_{U_i}/M_W)^2$. In our case we have for the first and second corrections in the kaon system

$$\left| \frac{\lambda_{sd}^{U_1}}{\lambda_{sd}^t} \right|^2 \frac{S(x_{U_1})}{S(x_t)} = 1.6 \times 10^{-2}, \quad 2 \left| \frac{\lambda_{sd}^{U_1}}{\lambda_{sd}^t} \right| \frac{S(x_{U_1}, x_t)}{S(x_t)} = 0.13. \quad (37)$$

Including the charm and the leading QCD corrections, and defining the corrections with respect the SM,

$$\Delta(P^0) = \left| \left(\frac{M_{12}}{M_{12}^{SM}} \right)_{P^0} \right| - 1, \quad \delta\phi(P^0) = \left(\frac{\arg(M_{12})}{\arg(M_{12}^{SM})} \right)_{P^0} - 1, \quad (38)$$

we get for the K^0, B_d and B_s mixings

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Delta(K^0) \\ \Delta(B_d^0) \\ \Delta(B_s^0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.02 \\ 0.12 \\ 0.12 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \delta\phi(K^0) \\ \delta\phi(B_d^0) \\ \delta\phi(B_s^0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.12 \\ 0.01 \\ 0.01 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (39)$$

We conclude that these kinds of models are compatible with the actual analysis beyond the SM, but they can have sizeable effects. For example this model does not modify $\Delta M_{B_d}/\Delta M_{B_s}$ but can give 12% corrections to ΔM_{B_d} and ΔM_{B_s} . Furthermore, ϵ_K can have 12% corrections.

4.2.2 $\Delta F = 1$ pure loop constraints

In these processes - for example $q \rightarrow q' \mu \bar{\mu}$ - the corrections to the top dominated SM amplitudes (when necessary charm has to be taken into account) are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{A(q \rightarrow q' \mu \bar{\mu})}{A(q \rightarrow q' \mu \bar{\mu})_{SM}} &\sim 1 + \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{\lambda_{qq'}^{U_i} Y(x_{U_i})}{\lambda_{qq'}^t Y(x_t)} \\ &- \sum_{i,j=c,t,U_1,U_2,U_3} \frac{V_{iq'}^* (W^u - I)_{ij} V_{jq} N(x_i, x_j)}{\lambda_{qq'}^t Y(x_t)} \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

The IL functions $Y(x_{U_i})$ grow with the square of the quark mass U_i - also $N(x_{U_i}, x_{U_i})$ -. This fact, apparently, will make the second term more relevant than the corresponding one in $\Delta F = 2$ processes: here there is only a $\lambda_{qq'}^{U_i}/\lambda_{qq'}^t$ suppression and not a

$(\lambda_{qq'}^{U_i}/\lambda_{qq'}^t)^2$ suppression as in Eq. (36). But $W_{U_i U_i}^u$ are very small - the new quarks are singlets under $SU(2)_{L^-}$, therefore the last term has a piece enforcing decoupling and cancelling partially the second piece⁷. For more details one can see references [55–59]. A similar structure appears in $q \rightarrow q' \nu \bar{\nu}$. If we define, as in the $\Delta F = 2$ processes, the deviation from the SM model

$$r(A \rightarrow B) = \frac{\Gamma(A \rightarrow B)}{\Gamma(A \rightarrow B)_{SM}} - 1,$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} r(K_L \rightarrow \mu \bar{\mu})_{SD} &= 0.32, & r(B_d \rightarrow \mu \bar{\mu}) &= 0.31, & r(B_s \rightarrow \mu \bar{\mu}) &= 0.30, \\ r(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) &= 0.20, & r(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) &= 0.21, & r(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) &= 0.20. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Some of these predictions can be definitely excluded or verified very soon by the LHC experiments.

We also have analyzed other loop mediated processes and, for example, we get for the oblique corrections [60, 61]:

$$\Delta T = 0.22, \quad \Delta S = 0.06, \quad \Delta U = 0.003. \quad (42)$$

4.3 The heavy vector-like quark decay channels

In our model the new heavy quarks decay mainly throughout charged or neutral currents. The decays can be characterized by $Q_j \rightarrow q_i B$, where $Q_j = U_j, D_j$, is the new heavy fermion, $B = Z, h, W^\pm$ and q_i the final state fermion, namely u, c, t, d, s or b . The different partial decay widths can be written as

$$\Gamma(Q_j \rightarrow q_i B) = \xi_B \frac{m_{Q_j}^2}{32\pi v^2} |X_{ij}^{B, Q_j}|^2 f_B(x_j^B, r_{ij}) \quad (43)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} x_j^B &= \frac{M_B^2}{m_{Q_j}^2}, \quad r_{ij} = \frac{m_{q_i}^2}{m_{Q_j}^2}, \quad \xi_Z = \xi_h = 1, \quad \xi_{W^\pm} = 2, \\ \text{and } X_{ij}^{B, Q_j} &= \begin{cases} V_{ij} & \text{for } B = W^-, \\ V_{ji} & \text{for } B = W^+, \\ W_{ij}^Q & \text{for } B = h, Z, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

and finally,

$$f_{W^\pm}(x, r) = f_Z(x, r), \quad f_h(x, r) \sim f_Z(x, r) \sim 1, \quad (45)$$

where the last two relations are valid when $m_{q_i}, M_Z, M_W, M_h \ll m_{Q_j}$. Detailed formulas are included in Appendix B. In this regime, to a very good approximation [25],

$$\Gamma(Q_j \rightarrow q_i Z) \simeq \Gamma(Q_j \rightarrow q_i h). \quad (46)$$

⁷Note that this term is usually overlooked in the literature.

	Width (MeV)	Branching ratio to channel (%):								
		Zd	Zs	Zb	hd	hs	hb	Wu	Wc	Wt
D_1	$2.9 \cdot 10^{-4}$	0.9	20.3	4.4	0.9	19.3	4.2	0.2	40.7	8.8
D_2	0.81	0.3	4.9	20.4	0.3	4.9	20.2	0	8.9	40.0
D_3	0.69	0	0.5	24.9	0	0.5	24.7	0.3	0.5	48.1

Table 3: Decays of new down type quaks

	Width (GeV)	Branching ratio to channel (%):								
		Zu	Zc	Zt	hu	hc	ht	Wd	Ws	Wb
U_1	32.9	0	0	23.9	0	0	24.7	0	0	51.4
U_2	$1.3 \cdot 10^{-2}$	0	25.1	0	0	24.7	0	2.5	47.6	0
U_3	$8.6 \cdot 10^{-6}$	0.3	24.7	0	0.3	24.5	0	3.2	46.8	0

Table 4: Decays of new up type quaks

Furthermore, under the same conditions, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma(U_j \rightarrow d'_i W) &\simeq 2 \frac{|V_{ji}|^2}{|W_{ij}^u|^2} \Gamma(U_j \rightarrow u_i Z), \\
\Gamma(D_j \rightarrow u'_i W) &\simeq 2 \frac{|V_{ij}|^2}{|W_{ij}^d|^2} \Gamma(D_j \rightarrow d_i Z),
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

for q_i and q'_i in the same generation, as suggested by the subindex i : for example c and s . It turns out that, under reasonable conditions explained in Appendix B, it is quite common to have $|V_{ji}|^2 \sim |W_{ij}^u|^2$ and $|V_{ij}|^2 \sim |W_{ij}^d|^2$. Therefore we also have

$$\Gamma(Q_j \rightarrow q'_i W) \simeq 2\Gamma(Q_j \rightarrow q_i Z). \tag{48}$$

Although many searches for new heavy quarks assume $\Gamma(Q_j \rightarrow q_i Z) : \Gamma(Q_j \rightarrow q_i h) : \Gamma(Q_j \rightarrow q'_i W) = 1 : 1 : 2$ and $B_r(Q_j \rightarrow q_i Z) + B_r(Q_j \rightarrow q_i h) + B_r(Q_j \rightarrow q'_i W) \simeq 1$, the later is unjustified and the total Q_j decay width can be distributed among the decay channels to different generations while the 1 : 1 : 2 pattern of branching ratios “per generation” is maintained [30]. This fact happens in the present model and we show in Tables 3 and 4 the dominant decay channels of the heavy quarks.

For example, D_1 - the lightest of the heavy vector-like quarks in this model - has around 20% of its branching ratio to decay channels in the third generation and some 80% decaying to the second generation (Zs, hs, Wc). These are not the most common ways of searching for this down type vector-like quarks although the different results by ATLAS and CMS can be adapted. Note that neither the decay to the third family is the dominant one nor there is a unique family entering in the dominant decay products. Similar patterns appear in D_2 decays. As far as the up vector-like quarks are concerned the lightest U_1 decays dominantly to the third family while the other (heavier) two decay to the second family.

4.4 Other examples

We have presented a paradigmatic example to show that it is possible and even relatively easy to accomplish our goal. Indeed, in our example the light quark masses and CKM mixing are generated from the couplings of ordinary quarks to the new heavy vector-like quarks, keeping the extended symmetry that explains why to first order the CKM matrix is the identity. In addition, we predict in the flavour electroweak phenomenology many deviations from the SM, some of them at 2σ level or more. Note that we have also a definite deviation of 3×3 unitarity, albeit very difficult to disentangle experimentally: $|V_{tb}| \sim 0.9877$. Also we have six new heavy quarks that can be seen at LHC, some of them with very peculiar characteristic decays. From the present example, one can get the wrong impression that if these new quarks are not discovered at the LHC and if the different deviations predicted in the flavour and electroweak sectors are not established, the main ideas of this paper are no longer relevant. This is not the case. On the contrary, we will show that there are many additional solutions which, without spoiling the main characteristics of the low mass sector, have the feature that New Physics effects smoothly decouple in the low energy phenomenology. In order to see how this decoupling arises, let us consider Eq. (10) and label our explicit example in Eqs. (25) to (29) with a superscript “(1)”, i.e., the matrices in Eqs. (25) to (29) are

$$\mathcal{M}_d^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} m_d & \omega_d \\ X_d^{(1)} & M_d^{(1)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{M}_u^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} m_u & \omega_u \\ X_u^{(1)} & M_u^{(1)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (49)$$

Let us construct a second solution, labelled “(2)” that differ by the real numbers ρ_d and ρ_u :

$$\mathcal{M}_d^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} m_d & \omega_d \\ \rho_d X_d^{(1)} & \rho_d M_d^{(1)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{M}_u^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} m_u & \omega_u \\ \rho_u X_u^{(1)} & \rho_u M_u^{(1)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (50)$$

Now, for $\rho_d, \rho_u > 1$ we obtain another solution which reproduces “essentially” the same light quark masses and mixings, while deviations from the SM decouple as ρ_d and ρ_u are increased. The basic equations are Eqs. (19) to (24). Equation (24) shows that \mathcal{H}_{eff}^u does not change at leading order in going from $\mathcal{M}_u^{(1)}$ to $\mathcal{M}_u^{(2)}$ and so $K_u^{(2)} \sim K_u^{(1)}$. At the same time Eqs. (20) to (22) tell us that $R_u^{(1)}$ and $S_u^{(1)}$ scale as $R_u^{(2)} \sim \rho_u^{-1} R_u^{(1)}$ and $S_u^{(2)} \sim \rho_u^{-1} S_u^{(1)}$ which leads to a small change in $K_u^{(2)}$ taking it closer to unitarity. The invariance of $\mathcal{H}_{eff}^{u(1)} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{eff}^{u(2)}$ under the scaling in Eq. (50) is at the origin of the fact that, once we have a solution of the type presented here, we have a continuous of solutions with essentially the same light quark masses and mixing and with heavy quarks much heavier and more decoupled. It remains to check that the effects from heavy quarks running inside the loops also decouple. This can be easily seen by realizing that our CKM matrix can also be written:

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} K_u^\dagger \\ R_u^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} K_d & R_d \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} K_u^\dagger K_d & K_u^\dagger R_d \\ R_u^\dagger K_d & R_u^\dagger R_d \end{pmatrix} \quad (51)$$

From here it is evident that the submatrix $R_u^\dagger K_d$ scales to $\rho_u^{-1} R_u^\dagger K_d$ and consequently we have a very simple scaling law from the up heavy sector scaling:

$$\begin{aligned} X_u &\rightarrow \rho_u X_u & , & & M_u &\rightarrow \rho_u M_u, \\ V_{U_i d_j} &\rightarrow \rho_u^{-1} V_{U_i d_j} & , & & \lambda_{d_i d_j}^{U_i} &\rightarrow \rho_u^{-2} \lambda_{d_i d_j}^{U_i}, \\ m_{U_i} &\rightarrow \rho_u m_{U_i}. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

This scaling is sufficient - if needed - to suppress all loop induced effects. For example, in the case of $\Delta F = 2$ processes, the first correction in Eq. (36) scales as $(\lambda_{qq'}^{U_i})^2 S(x_{U_i}) \sim (\lambda_{qq'}^{U_i})^2 m_{U_i}^2$ and therefore it decreases as ρ_u^{-2} . The second correction scale as $\rho_u^{-2} \ln \rho_u$ according to the behaviour of the IL function $S(x_{U_i}, x_t)$. Behaviour similar to the last one appear in the $\Delta F = 1$ processes following the cancellations explained in Eq. (40).

To be more specific we present briefly the results for a second example with $\mathcal{M}_u^{(2)}$ constructed with $\rho_u = 2$ and keeping the rest of the model unchanged. For $\Delta F = 2$ processes we get, instead of the results in Eq. (39), the following

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Delta(K^0) \\ \Delta(B_d^0) \\ \Delta(B_s^0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.01 \\ 0.07 \\ 0.06 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \delta\phi(K^0) \\ \delta\phi(B_d^0) \\ \delta\phi(B_s^0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.06 \\ 0.01 \\ 0.01 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (53)$$

On average, the corrections to the SM mixing values get reduced from a 12% to some 6%. In the case of $\Delta F = 1$ processes instead of Eq. (41) we get

$$\begin{aligned} r(K_L \rightarrow \mu\bar{\mu})_{SD} &= 0.16, & r(B_d \rightarrow \mu\bar{\mu}) &= 0.16, & r(B_s \rightarrow \mu\bar{\mu}) &= 0.16, \\ r(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}) &= 0.11, & r(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}) &= 0.11, & r(B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}) &= 0.10. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

In this sector, the deviation from the SM model gets reduced by a factor of 2. In this model “(2)” the deviations in these processes are at the 11% to 16% level, showing a smooth decoupling of the effects while at the same time the heavy up-type quarks get heavier masses: $(m_{U_1}, m_{U_2}, m_{U_3}) \sim (2.6, 3, 4.5)$ TeV. As for the oblique corrections, they have the following values:

$$\Delta T = 0.11, \quad \Delta S = 0.05, \quad \Delta U = 0.004. \quad (55)$$

Finally for $(|V_{td}|, |V_{ts}|, |V_{tb}|)$ we get $(0.008575, 0.040258, 0.99632)$ since K_u deviates less from unitarity as consequence of the reduction of $R_u^\dagger K_d$ by a factor of 2.

5 Conclusions

We have presented a simple solution to a novel fine-tuning problem present in the SM. The solution involves the introduction of a flavour symmetry G, together with vector-like quarks of $Q = -1/3$ and $Q = 2/3$ charges, as well as a complex singlet scalar. In the absence of vector-like quarks only the bottom and the top quarks

acquire mass and $V_{CKM} = \mathbb{1}$. We have shown that in the presence of the vector-like quarks which mix with the standard quarks, a realistic quark mass spectrum can be obtained and a correct CKM matrix can be generated. It is remarkable that these results are obtained in a framework where G is an exact symmetry of the Lagrangian, only spontaneously broken by the vacuum. We have presented specific realistic examples and have analysed various FCNC processes as well as the decay channels of the vector-like quarks. It is also remarkable that in the framework of fully realistic models, some of these vector-like quarks are at the reach of the second LHC run.

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge financial support from the Spanish MINECO under grant FPA2015-68318-R, by the Severo Ochoa Excellence Center Project SEV-2014-0398, by Generalitat Valenciana under grant PROMETEOII/ 2014/049 and by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT, Portugal) through the projects CERN/FIS-NUC/0010/2015, and CFTP-FCT Unit 777 (UID/FIS/00777/2013) which are partially funded through POCTI (FEDER), COMPETE, QREN and EU. M.N. acknowledges support from FCT through the postdoctoral grant SFRH/BPD/112999/2015. The authors also acknowledge the hospitality of Universidad de Valencia, IFIC, and CFTP at IST Lisboa during visits for scientific collaboration.

Appendix A. Derivation of effective Hermitian squared mass matrix

In order to derive the expression given for \mathcal{H}_{eff} in Eq. (24) we start from:

$$\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}^\dagger\mathcal{U}_L = \mathcal{U}_L \begin{pmatrix} d^2 & o \\ 0 & D^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (56)$$

using the notation of Eq. (17), where for simplicity, we have dropped the indices d and u for down and up. We can rewrite this equation explicitly, in terms of each one of the four 3×3 blocks, using Eq. (10) for the matrix \mathcal{M} :

$$(mm^\dagger + \omega\omega^\dagger) K + (mX^\dagger + \omega M^\dagger) S = K d^2, \quad (57)$$

$$(mm^\dagger + \omega\omega^\dagger) R + (mX^\dagger + \omega M^\dagger) T = R D^2, \quad (58)$$

$$(Xm^\dagger + M\omega^\dagger) K + (XX^\dagger + MM^\dagger) S = S d^2, \quad (59)$$

$$(Xm^\dagger + M\omega^\dagger) R + (XX^\dagger + MM^\dagger) T = T D^2. \quad (60)$$

Since the term $S d^2$ is much smaller than the other two, Eq. (59) can be approximated by:

$$(XX^\dagger + MM^\dagger) S \simeq -(Xm^\dagger + M\omega^\dagger) K \quad (61)$$

or else

$$S \simeq -(XX^\dagger + MM^\dagger)^{-1}(Xm^\dagger + M\omega^\dagger) K \quad (62)$$

Replacing S in Eq. (57) we obtain to a good approximation:

$$[(mm^\dagger + \omega\omega^\dagger) - (mX^\dagger + \omega M^\dagger)(XX^\dagger + MM^\dagger)^{-1}(Xm^\dagger + M\omega^\dagger)] K = K d^2 \quad (63)$$

implying:

$$K^{-1}\mathcal{H}_{eff}K = d^2 \quad (64)$$

with \mathcal{H}_{eff} given by Eq. (24).

Appendix B. Vector-like quark decays

The functions that appear in section 4.3 that are needed for the heavy quark decays are

$$\begin{aligned} f_h(x, y) &= (1 + y - x)f(x, y), \\ f_V(x, y) &= ((1 - y^2) + x(1 + y) - 2x^2) f(x, y), \quad V = Z, W^\pm, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where

$$f(x, y) = \sqrt{1 - (\sqrt{y} + \sqrt{x})^2} \sqrt{1 - (\sqrt{y} - \sqrt{x})^2} \quad (66)$$

Let us explain the origin and validity of the relations

$$|V_{ji'}|^2 \sim |(W^u)_{ij}|^2, \quad |V_{i'j}|^2 \sim |(W^d)_{ij}|^2, \quad (67)$$

where the prime means that i and i' correspond to the same generation number, $i = i'$. For that purpose we introduce, in a self explanatory matrix notation,

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{uD} \\ V_{Ud} & V_{UD} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (68)$$

where each submatrix connects the corresponding types of quarks u, U and d, D (in the present model, all four submatrices are 3×3). Similarly, we also introduce

$$W^u = \begin{pmatrix} W_{uu}^u & W_{uU}^u \\ W_{Uu}^u & W_{UU}^u \end{pmatrix}, \quad W^d = \begin{pmatrix} W_{dd}^d & W_{dD}^d \\ W_{Dd}^d & W_{DD}^d \end{pmatrix}. \quad (69)$$

Following again the notation in section 3.3 for the up and down sectors, we have

$$V_{Ud} = R_u^\dagger K_d, \quad W_{Uu}^u = R_u^\dagger K_u, \quad (70)$$

so we can write

$$V_{Ud} = W_{Uu}^u K_u^{-1} K_d \quad (71)$$

At leading order $K_u^{-1} \sim K_u^\dagger$ and we get, to a high accuracy (and similarly for V_{uD} and W_{dD}^d)

$$V_{Ud} \sim W_{Uu}^u V_{ud}, \quad V_{uD} \sim V_{ud} W_{dD}^d \quad (72)$$

From these expressions it is easy to prove that relations in Eq. (67) hold, at least for the dominant decay channel of the corresponding heavy up or down quark. The key ingredient is that $V_{ud} \sim \mathbb{I}$, in Eq. (68), with corrections at most of order $\lambda = 0.22$.

References

- [1] K. A. Olive *et al.* [Particle Data Group Collaboration], *Chin. Phys. C* **38** (2014) 090001. doi:10.1088/1674-1137/38/9/090001
- [2] Y. Amhis *et al.* [Heavy Flavor Averaging Group (HFAG) Collaboration], “Averages of b -hadron, c -hadron, and τ -lepton properties as of summer 2014,” arXiv:1412.7515 [hep-ex].
- [3] F. C. Porter, “Experimental Status of the CKM Matrix,” arXiv:1604.04940 [hep-ex].
- [4] F. J. Botella, G. C. Branco, M. Nebot and M. N. Rebelo, “New physics and evidence for a complex CKM,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **725** (2005) 155 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2005.07.006 [hep-ph/0502133].
- [5] J. Charles *et al.* [CKMfitter Group Collaboration], “CP violation and the CKM matrix: Assessing the impact of the asymmetric B factories,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **41** (2005) no.1, 1 doi:10.1140/epjc/s2005-02169-1 [hep-ph/0406184].
- [6] M. Bona *et al.* [UTfit Collaboration], “The 2004 UTfit collaboration report on the status of the unitarity triangle in the standard model,” *JHEP* **0507** (2005) 028 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2005/07/028 [hep-ph/0501199].
- [7] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], “Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC,” *Phys. Lett. B* **716** (2012) 1 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.020 [arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex]].
- [8] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], “Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV with the CMS experiment at the LHC,” *Phys. Lett. B* **716** (2012) 30 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.021 [arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex]].
- [9] F. J. Botella, G. C. Branco, M. N. Rebelo and J. I. Silva-Marcos, “What if the Masses of the First Two Quark Families are not Generated by the Standard Higgs?,” arXiv:1602.08011 [hep-ph].
- [10] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], “Search for pair production of a new heavy quark that decays into a W boson and a light quark in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector,” *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) no.11, 112007 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.112007 [arXiv:1509.04261 [hep-ex]].
- [11] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], “Search for vector-like B quarks in events with one isolated lepton, missing transverse momentum and jets at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector,” *Phys. Rev. D* **91** (2015) no.11, 112011 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.91.112011 [arXiv:1503.05425 [hep-ex]].

- [12] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], “Search for production of vector-like quark pairs and of four top quarks in the lepton-plus-jets final state in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector,” JHEP **1508** (2015) 105 doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2015)105 [arXiv:1505.04306 [hep-ex]].
- [13] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], “Search for the production of single vector-like and excited quarks in the Wt final state in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector,” JHEP **1602** (2016) 110 doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2016)110 [arXiv:1510.02664 [hep-ex]].
- [14] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], “Search for single production of vector-like quarks decaying into Wb in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector,” Eur. Phys. J. C **76** (2016) no.8, 442 doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4281-8 [arXiv:1602.05606 [hep-ex]].
- [15] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], “Search for single production of a vector-like quark via a heavy gluon in the $4b$ final state with the ATLAS detector in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV,” Phys. Lett. B **758** (2016) 249 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2016.04.061 [arXiv:1602.06034 [hep-ex]].
- [16] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], “Inclusive search for a vector-like T quark with charge $\frac{2}{3}$ in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV,” Phys. Lett. B **729** (2014) 149 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2014.01.006 [arXiv:1311.7667 [hep-ex]].
- [17] V. Khachatryan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], “Search for vector-like T quarks decaying to top quarks and Higgs bosons in the all-hadronic channel using jet substructure,” JHEP **1506** (2015) 080 doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2015)080 [arXiv:1503.01952 [hep-ex]].
- [18] V. Khachatryan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], “Search for pair-produced vector-like B quarks in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV,” Phys. Rev. D **93** (2016) no.11, 112009 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.112009 [arXiv:1507.07129 [hep-ex]].
- [19] V. Khachatryan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], “Search for vector-like charge $2/3$ T quarks in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV,” Phys. Rev. D **93** (2016) no.1, 012003 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.012003 [arXiv:1509.04177 [hep-ex]].
- [20] F. del Aguila, M. K. Chase and J. Cortes, “Vector-like fermion contributions to epsilon-prime, Nucl. Phys. B **271** (1986) 61. doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(86)80004-9, 10.1016/0550-3213(86)90354-8
- [21] G. C. Branco and L. Lavoura, “On the Addition of Vector Like Quarks to the Standard Model,” Nucl. Phys. B **278** (1986) 738. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(86)90060-X

- [22] F. del Aguila, E. Laermann and P. M. Zerwas, “Exotic $E(6)$ Particles in e^+e^- Annihilation,” Nucl. Phys. B **297** (1988) 1. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(88)90197-6
- [23] F. del Aguila, G. L. Kane and M. Quiros, “Could the Quark Electroweak and Mass Eigenstates Coincide?,” Phys. Lett. B **196** (1987) 531. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(87)90815-X
- [24] P. Langacker and D. London, “Mixing Between Ordinary and Exotic Fermions,” Phys. Rev. D **38** (1988) 886. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.38.886
- [25]
- [25] F. del Aguila, L. Ametller, G. L. Kane and J. Vidal, “Vector Like Fermion and Standard Higgs Production at Hadron Colliders,” Nucl. Phys. B **334** (1990) 1. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(90)90655-W
- [26] L. Bento, G. C. Branco and P. A. Parada, “A Minimal model with natural suppression of strong CP violation,” Phys. Lett. B **267** (1991) 95. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(91)90530-4
- [27] T. P. Cheng and L. F. Li, “Suppression of flavor changing neutral current effects due to mixings with a heavy singlet fermion,” Phys. Rev. D **45** (1992) 1708. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.45.1708
- [28] L. Lavoura and J. P. Silva, “Bounds on the mixing of the down type quarks with vector - like singlet quarks,” Phys. Rev. D **47** (1993) 1117. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.47.1117
- [29] G. C. Branco, T. Morozumi, P. A. Parada and M. N. Rebelo, “CP asymmetries in B_0 decays in the presence of flavor changing neutral currents,” Phys. Rev. D **48** (1993) 1167. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.48.1167
- [30] V. D. Barger, M. S. Berger and R. J. N. Phillips, “Quark singlets: Implications and constraints,” Phys. Rev. D **52** (1995) 1663 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.52.1663 [hep-ph/9503204].
- [31] G. Barenboim, F. J. Botella, G. C. Branco and O. Vives, “How sensitive to FCNC can B_0 CP asymmetries be?,” Phys. Lett. B **422** (1998) 277 doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(97)01515-3 [hep-ph/9709369].
- [32] G. Barenboim, F. J. Botella and O. Vives, “Tree level FCNC in the B system: From CP asymmetries to rare decays,” Phys. Rev. D **64** (2001) 015007 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.64.015007 [hep-ph/0012197].
- [33] G. Barenboim, F. J. Botella and O. Vives, “Constraining models with vector - like fermions from FCNC in K and B physics,” Nucl. Phys. B **613** (2001) 285 doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(01)00390-X [hep-ph/0105306].

- [34] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, “Effects of mixing with quark singlets,” Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003) 035003 Erratum: [Phys. Rev. D **69** (2004) 099901] doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.69.099901, 10.1103/PhysRevD.67.035003 [hep-ph/0210112].
- [35] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, F. J. Botella, G. C. Branco and M. Nebot, “The Size of $\chi = \arg(-V(ts)V^*(tb)V^*(cs)V(cb))$ and physics beyond the standard model,” Nucl. Phys. B **706** (2005) 204 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2004.11.024 [hep-ph/0406151].
- [36] F. J. Botella, G. C. Branco and M. Nebot, “Small violations of unitarity, the phase in $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$ and visible $t \rightarrow cZ$ decays at the LHC,” Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 096009 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.096009 [arXiv:0805.3995 [hep-ph]].
- [37] K. Higuchi and K. Yamamoto, “Flavor-changing interactions with singlet quarks and their implications for the LHC,” Phys. Rev. D **81** (2010) 015009 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.81.015009 [arXiv:0911.1175 [hep-ph]].
- [38] G. Cacciapaglia, A. Deandrea, D. Harada and Y. Okada, “Bounds and Decays of New Heavy Vector-like Top Partners,” JHEP **1011** (2010) 159 doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2010)159 [arXiv:1007.2933 [hep-ph]].
- [39] F. J. Botella, G. C. Branco and M. Nebot, “The Hunt for New Physics in the Flavour Sector with up vector-like quarks,” JHEP **1212** (2012) 040 doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2012)040 [arXiv:1207.4440 [hep-ph]].
- [40] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, R. Benbrik, S. Heinemeyer and M. Perez-Victoria, “Handbook of vectorlike quarks: Mixing and single production,” Phys. Rev. D **88** (2013) no.9, 094010 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.094010 [arXiv:1306.0572 [hep-ph]].
- [41] M. Buchkremer, G. Cacciapaglia, A. Deandrea and L. Panizzi, “Model Independent Framework for Searches of Top Partners,” Nucl. Phys. B **876** (2013) 376 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2013.08.010 [arXiv:1305.4172 [hep-ph]].
- [42] S. Fajfer, A. Greljo, J. F. Kamenik and I. Mustac, “Light Higgs and Vector-like Quarks without Prejudice,” JHEP **1307** (2013) 155 doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2013)155 [arXiv:1304.4219 [hep-ph]].
- [43] S. A. R. Ellis, R. M. Godbole, S. Gopalakrishna and J. D. Wells, “Survey of vector-like fermion extensions of the Standard Model and their phenomenological implications,” JHEP **1409** (2014) 130 doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2014)130 [arXiv:1404.4398 [hep-ph]].
- [44] A. K. Alok, S. Banerjee, D. Kumar, S. U. Sankar and D. London, “New-physics signals of a model with a vector-singlet up-type quark,” Phys. Rev. D **92** (2015) 013002 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.013002 [arXiv:1504.00517 [hep-ph]].

- [45] G. Cacciapaglia and A. Parolini, “Light \acute{t} Hooft top partners,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) no.7, 071701 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.071701 [arXiv:1511.05163 [hep-ph]].
- [46] K. Ishiwata, Z. Ligeti and M. B. Wise, “New Vector-Like Fermions and Flavor Physics,” *JHEP* **1510** (2015) 027 doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2015)027 [arXiv:1506.03484 [hep-ph]].
- [47] C. Bobeth, A. J. Buras, A. Celis and M. Jung, “Patterns of Flavour Violation in Models with Vector-Like Quarks,” arXiv:1609.04783 [hep-ph].
- [48] M. Buchkremer and A. Schmidt, “Long-lived heavy quarks : a review,” *Adv. High Energy Phys.* **2013** (2013) 690254 doi:10.1155/2013/690254 [arXiv:1210.6369 [hep-ph]].
- [49] R. Dermisek, “Unification of gauge couplings in the standard model with extra vectorlike families,” *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) no.5, 055008 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.055008 [arXiv:1212.3035].
- [50] Z. z. Xing, H. Zhang and S. Zhou, “Updated Values of Running Quark and Lepton Masses,” *Phys. Rev. D* **77** (2008) 113016 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.77.113016 [arXiv:0712.1419 [hep-ph]].
- [51] Z. z. Xing, H. Zhang and S. Zhou, “Impacts of the Higgs mass on vacuum stability, running fermion masses and two-body Higgs decays,” *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 013013 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.013013 [arXiv:1112.3112 [hep-ph]].
- [52] G. C. Branco, L. Lavoura and J. P. Silva, “CP Violation,” *Int. Ser. Monogr. Phys.* **103** Oxford University Press (1999).
- [53] T. Inami and C. S. Lim, “Effects of Superheavy Quarks and Leptons in Low-Energy Weak Processes $K_L \rightarrow \mu\bar{\mu}$, $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ and $K^0 \leftrightarrow \bar{K}^0$,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **65** (1981) 297 Erratum: [Prog. Theor. Phys. **65** (1981) 1772]. doi:10.1143/PTP.65.297
- [54] G. Barenboim and F. J. Botella, “Delta F=2 effective Lagrangian in theories with vector - like fermions,” *Phys. Lett. B* **433** (1998) 385 doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(98)00695-9 [hep-ph/9708209].
- [55] E. Nardi, “Top - charm flavor changing contributions to the effective b s Z vertex,” *Phys. Lett. B* **365** (1996) 327 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(95)01308-3 [hep-ph/9509233].
- [56] M. I. Vysotsky, “New (virtual) physics in the era of the LHC,” *Phys. Lett. B* **644** (2007) 352 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2006.12.003 [hep-ph/0610368].

- [57] P. N. Kopnin and M. I. Vysotsky, “Manifestation of a singlet heavy up-type quark in the branching ratios of rare decays $K \rightarrow \pi\nu\bar{\nu}$, $B \rightarrow \pi\nu\bar{\nu}$ and $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$,” JETP Lett. **87** (2008) 517 doi:10.1134/S0021364008100019 [arXiv:0804.0912 [hep-ph]].
- [58] I. Picek and B. Radovicic, “Nondecoupling of terascale isosinglet quark and rare K- and B-decays,” Phys. Rev. D **78** (2008) 015014 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.78.015014 [arXiv:0804.2216 [hep-ph]].
- [59] Work in progress
- [60] M. E. Peskin and T. Takeuchi, “Estimation of oblique electroweak corrections,” Phys. Rev. D **46** (1992) 381. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.46.381
- [61] L. Lavoura and J. P. Silva, “The Oblique corrections from vector - like singlet and doublet quarks,” Phys. Rev. D **47** (1993) 2046. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.47.2046