

Phase Transitions in the Early Universe

W-Y. Pauchy Hwang^{1,1} and Sang Pyo Kim²

¹*Asia Pacific Organization for Cosmology and Particle Astrophysics,
Center for Theoretical Sciences, Institute of Astrophysics,*

and Department of Physics, National Taiwan University, Taipei 106, Taiwan

²*Department of Physics, Kunsan National University, Kunsan 573-701, Korea, and
Asia Pacific Center for Theoretic Physics, Pohang 790-784, Korea*

(25 August 2011; Revised: 13 January 2017)

Abstract

The physics of the 20th Century is governed by two pillars, Einstein's relativity principle and the quantum principle. At the beginning of the 21st Century, it becomes clear that there exist the smallest units of matter, such as electrons, neutrinos, and quarks; their behaviors are described by the Standard Model.

It was believed that the temperature of the early Universe was once 300 GeV , or higher, at 10^{-11}sec , and then going through the electroweak phase transition. But the mass phase transition happens in the purely imaginary temperature. Later on, its temperature was 150 MeV at $3.3 \times 10^{-5}\text{sec}$, and then going through the "QCD cosmological phase transition". We attempt to use the Standard Model, a completely dimensionless theory apart from the negative "ignition" term, to conclude that the EW or mass phase transition *does not exist*.

On the front of QCD cosmological phase transition, the intriguing question about the latent heat (energy) is discussed and its role is speculated.

PACS Indices: 05.30.Ch (Quantum ensemble theory); 98.80.Bp (Origin and formation of the Universe); 98.80.-k (Cosmology).

Keywords: Origin and formation of the Universe; Cosmology; Observational cosmology.

1 Introduction

Cosmological phase transitions, either electroweak or QCD, play the intriguing and magic roles in our Universe (or, our World). Mathematics-wise, it is based on the *same* lagrangian but, to us inside, the worlds before and after are completely different (physics-wise).

Lately, there were several progresses in the development of the standard model (i.e., the ultimate theory of elementary particles), culminating the final form of the Standard Model [1]. Even though the ultimate final form of the Standard Model might still vary, the current form of the Standard Model [1] is consistent and perhaps also complete, since it is well behaved as the relevant distance goes to zero; also, and it is free from Landau ghosts, as the momentum-transfer-squared Q^2 goes to infinite.

Apart from the "ignition" term, the Standard Model [1] turns out to be completely dimensionless in the quantum 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time. In this paper, we wish to perform some initial analysis of this remarkable aspect, along the line of phase transitions.

¹Email: wyhwang@phys.ntu.edu.tw

By "quantum" of "the quantum 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time", we mean at least that the anti-commuting entities, which might carry some burden of the quantum principle, also are our main concerns in this space-time. The meaning of "the quantum 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time" is certainly different from that of "the 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time" - since the quantum principle also allows a lot of anti-commuting objects. It is different far from something derived from the n -dimensional complex number system. In other words, the domain of our interest is greatly enlarged by the quantum principle.

Thus, the analysis in this paper could be very different from what was in our earlier investigations [2] for the cosmological QCD phase transition. Namely, we focus on the dimensionless nature of the Standard Model [1], i.e., on the "mass" phase transition (or the "electroweak" transition in the old terminology).

It is in fact remarkable to realize that, apart from some Higgs "ignition" term, the Standard Model [1] is a completely dimensionless theory - it seems like that, above some critical temperature T_c , it is a completely dimensionless theory; only below T_c , the term "mass" assumes its presence and things become rather messy. We might call it as "the mass phase transition"; we can accomplish this phase transition by the Higgs spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB). Thus, we could re-name "the EW phase transition" as "the mass phase transition".

In a much earlier publication [2], we show the importance of the latent heat, basing on the MIT or Friedberg-Lee bag model. It was also suggested that the latent "heat" or latent energy released, of course evolving into different forms of matter, could be linked with dark matter - an argument only by a simple arithmetic.

In this paper, we characterize the "mass" phase transition as the spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB), related to the "origin of mass" [3]. That is, the phase transition in the purely imaginary temperature (as accomplished by the hand of the God), related to "mass", and the spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB), related to the origin of mass, amounts to the same thing.

Mathematics-wise, the spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB) in the Standard Model cannot happen in real temperature - rather, if there would be the purely imaginary temperature, then it would go. Either the electroweak phase transition or the mass phase transition *simply does not exist*, if we would take the hint of our presentation of the Standard Model [1] - apart from the negative "ignition" term, it is simply a dimensionless theory.

2 The Standard Model on the Smallest Units of Matter

What is the Standard Model on the smallest units of matter? It is a theory [1] that describes the behaviors of the point-like particles such as electrons, neutrinos, quarks, etc. The *existence* of the *smallest* units of matter, that is, these point-like particles, a finite number of them, is so well-established that it should be next to the two basic pillars, i.e., Einstein's relativity principle and the quantum principle.

These particles are "point-like" since the quantum principle is there; they would be "points" if Newton's classic thinking would still be there.

What is the Standard Model of All Centuries? We believe that the description of the point-like particles, the smallest units of matter in our Universe, on the basis of the Einstein's

relativity principle and the quantum principle is so fundamental; and it is so consistent and (perhaps) so complete, that this Standard Model would stay there longer than Newton's classic era (of over four hundred years).

In 1970's, S. Weinberg called such theory "the Standard Model". Since then, such name sticks.

Back in the 20th Century, we didn't realized that there is something special for the complex scalar fields in the quantum 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time. A complex scalar field $\phi(x)$ is in fact born to be self-repulsive, due to the $\lambda(\phi^\dagger\phi)^2$ interaction with the positive dimensionless coupling λ . With a negative λ , the system will collapse. Thus, if alone, *such field cannot exist*.

For the two complex scalar fields, the attractive mutual interaction $-2\lambda(\phi_1^\dagger\phi_2)(\phi_2^\dagger\phi_1)$ would be enough to overcome the self-repulsiveness of the two individual complex scalar fields. The λ -interaction, $\lambda(\phi^\dagger\phi)^2$, in fact re-writes the story for everything.

The story which one of us put forward above about the *nonexistence* of a single complex scalar field rather striking - whether it is right or not is still waiting for a clear-cut mathematical proof. Basically, λ cannot be negative since the system would collapse to the negative infinity. It cannot be zero since this would be meta-stable. We suspect $\lambda = \frac{1}{8}$ in our notations, but we have to admit that it is still lack of rigorous proof.

Among the force fields or gauge fields, most of the gauge fields, upon spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB), become massive, including weak bosons and family gauge bosons, if we assume the standard wisdom [1]. That calls for the Standard-Model (SM) Higgs $\Phi(1, 2)$, the purely family Higgs $\Phi(3, 1)$, and the mixed family Higgs $\Phi(3, 2)$ - they interact maximally attractively whenever possible, i.e., between $\Phi(1, 2)$ and $\Phi(3, 2)$, and between $\Phi(3, 1)$ and $\Phi(3, 2)$. Here the two numbers/labels are referred to $SU_f(3)$ and $SU_L(2)$ - that is, triplets, doublets, or singlets.

So, if there would be only the SM Higgs $\Phi(1, 2)$, then *it cannot exist*. The self-repulsive interaction $\lambda(\phi^\dagger\phi)^2$ (with $\lambda > 0$) would make it non-existent. As said earlier, $\lambda = 0$ would be meta-stable while $\lambda < 0$ would collapse. The question is why it is $\lambda = \frac{1}{8}$ and it is dimensionless, and thus that should be determined *globally* by the quantum 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time.

The algebra among the three Higgs $\Phi(1, 2)$, $\Phi(3, 2)$, and $\Phi(3, 1)$ arises *only* when it is in the quantum 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time. If the space-time differs from the 4-dimensional, the algebra simply doesn't apply.

The next question associated with the Higgs fields is to understand "the origin of mass" - a question that we have recently gained some understanding [3]. In that [3], we may set all the mass terms of the various Higgs to identically zero, except one spontaneous-symmetry-breaking (SSB) ignition term. All the mass terms are the results of this SSB, when switched on. Apart from "ignition" term, the theory is completely dimensionless in the 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time.

The set of the "various" Higgs includes the Standard-Model (SM) Higgs $\Phi(1, 2)$, the mixed family Higgs $\Phi(3, 2)$, and the pure family Higgs $\Phi(3, 1)$. The "ignition" could be on the pure family Higgs $\Phi(3, 1)$ [3], and it is clear that that it may not be on the SM Higgs $\Phi(1, 2)$.

To make it clear, as the temperature is high enough, we are dealing with the completely dimensionless theory, implied by the Standard Model. All the complications, including some

dimensional couplings (or, the interactions), is the result of switching-on the "ignition" term.

We are dealing with the phase transition of the Standard Model [1] - before SSB, it is by a set of "pure" numbers (i.e., dimensionless couplings) in the quantum 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time. After SSB, the real world of the Standard Model shows up. Though it is completely clear to us, the fundamental secrets about this set of pure numbers should eventually be understood. The hypothetical "mass" phase transition as represented by the Standard Model [1] happens on the axis of the purely imaginary temperature.

2.1 The Dimensionless Lepton World

The overall background in our world is the quantum 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time with the force-field gauge-group structure $SU_c(3) \times SU_L(2) \times U(1) \times SU_f(3)$ imprinted at the very beginning. It sees the lepton world, of atomic sizes. It also sees the quark world, of much smaller nuclear sizes.

It is of importance to recognize that the $SU_L(2) \times U(1) \times SU_f(3)$ symmetry is realized in the lepton world, through the proposal [4] $((\nu_\tau, \tau)_L, (\nu_\mu, \mu)_L, (\nu_e, e)_L)$ (*columns*) ($\equiv \Psi(3, 2)$) as the $SU_f(3)$ triplet and $SU_L(2)$ doublet. In particular, it is important to realize the role of neutrino oscillations - it is the change of a neutrino in one generation (flavor) into that in another generation; or, we need to have the coupling similar to $ih\bar{\Psi}_L(3, 2) \times \Psi_R(3, 1) \cdot \Phi(3, 2)$, as introduced by Hwang and Yan [4]. Then, it is clear that the mixed family Higgs $\Phi(3, 2)$ must be there. The remaining purely family Higgs $\Phi(3, 1)$ helps to complete the picture, so that the eight gauge bosons are massive in the $SU_f(3)$ family gauge theory [5].

Usually in an old textbook [6], the QCD chapter precedes the one on Glashow-Weinberg-Salam (GWS) electroweak theory, but we are talking about the $SU_c(3) \times SU_L(2) \times U(1) \times SU_f(3)$ Minkowski space-time and what happens in it. The so-called "basic units of motion" are made up from quarks (of six flavors, of three colors, and of the two helicities) and leptons (of three generations and of the two helicities). We use these basic units (of motion) in writing down the lagrangian, etc. - the starting point of our formalism(s).

If we look at the basic units of motion as compared to the original particle, i.e. the electron, the starting basic units are all "point-like" Dirac particles. Dirac invented the Dirac equation for the electron eighty years ago and surprisingly enough these "point-like" Dirac particles are the basic units of the Standard Model. Thus, one of us (Hwang) called it "Dirac Similarity Principle" - a salute to Dirac; a triumph to mathematics. Our world could indeed be described by the proper mathematics.

For the lepton world or the quark world, the story is fixed if the so-called "gauge-invariant derivative", i.e. D_μ in the kinetic-energy term $-\bar{\Psi}\gamma_\mu D_\mu\Psi$, is given for a given basic unit, one on one [6].

On the lepton world, we introduce the family triplet, $(\nu_\tau^R, \nu_\mu^R, \nu_e^R)$ (column), under $SU_f(3)$. We write, for $(\nu_\tau^R, \nu_\mu^R, \nu_e^R)$,

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu - i\kappa \frac{\bar{\lambda}^a}{2} F_\mu^a. \quad (1)$$

and, for the left-handed $SU_f(3)$ -triplet and $SU_L(2)$ -doublet $((\nu_\tau^L, \tau^L), (\nu_\mu^L, \mu^L), (\nu_e^L, e^L))$ (all columns),

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu - i\kappa \frac{\bar{\lambda}^a}{2} F_\mu^a - ig \frac{\vec{\tau}}{2} \cdot \vec{A}_\mu + i\frac{1}{2}g' B_\mu. \quad (2)$$

The right-handed charged leptons form the triplet $\Psi_R^C(3, 1)$ under $SU_f(3)$, since it were singlets their common factor $\bar{\Psi}_L(\bar{3}, 2)\Psi_R(1, 1)\Phi(3, 2)$ for the mass terms would involve the cross terms such as $\mu \rightarrow e$.

The neutrino mass term assumes a new form [4]:

$$i\frac{h}{2}\bar{\Psi}_L(3, 2) \times \Psi_R(3, 1) \cdot \tilde{\Phi}(3, 2) + h.c., \quad (3)$$

where $\Psi(3, i)$ are the neutrino triplet just mentioned above (with the first label for $SU_f(3)$ and the second for $SU_L(2)$). The cross (curl) product is somewhat new [5], referring to the singlet combination of three triplets in $SU(3)$. The Higgs field $\tilde{\Phi}(3, 2)$ is new in this effort, because it carries some nontrivial $SU_L(2)$ charge.

Note that, for charged leptons, the Standard-Model choice is $\bar{\Psi}(\bar{3}, 2)\Psi_R^C(3, 1)\Phi(1, 2)+c.c.$, which gives three leptons an equal mass. But, in view of that if (ϕ_1, ϕ_2) is an $SU(2)$ doublet then $(\phi_2^\dagger, -\phi_1^\dagger)$ is another doublet, we could form $\tilde{\Phi}(3, 2)$ from the doublet-triplet $\Phi(3, 2)$. The notations in $\Phi(1, 2)$, $\Phi(3, 2)$, and $\Phi(3, 1)$ should be consistent and thus the $\tilde{\Phi}(3, 2)$, used in the above equation, should have the tilde operation, for the consistency in notations.

So, we have [1]

$$i\frac{h^C}{2}\bar{\Psi}_L(3, 2) \times \Psi_R^C(3, 1) \cdot \Phi(3, 2) + h.c., \quad (4)$$

which gives rise to the imaginary off-diagonal (hermitian) elements in the 3×3 mass matrix, so removing the equal masses of the charged leptons. Note that the couplings h , h^C , and κ all are dimensionless.

The expressions for neutrino oscillations and the off-diagonal mass term are in $i\epsilon_{abc}$, or curl-dot, product - it is allowed for $SU(3)$. Note that such coupling has nothing to do with the kinetic-energy term of the particle, though the coupling h (and h^C) might be related to the gauge coupling κ .

It is essential to note that all the couplings introduced above all are dimensionless in the 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time. This is a basic characteristic of the lepton world in the Standard Model.

2.2 The Dimensionless Quark World

We now turn our attention to the quark world, which our special gauge-group Minkowski space-time supports. Thus, we have, for the up-type right-handed quarks u_R , c_R , and t_R ,

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu - ig_c \frac{\lambda^a}{2} G_\mu^a - i\frac{2}{3}g' B_\mu, \quad (5)$$

and, for the rotated down-type right-handed quarks d'_R , s'_R , and b'_R ,

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu - ig_c \frac{\lambda^a}{2} G_\mu^a - i(-\frac{1}{3})g' B_\mu. \quad (6)$$

On the other hand, we have, for the $SU_L(2)$ quark doublets,

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu - ig_c \frac{\lambda^a}{2} G_\mu^a - ig \frac{\vec{\tau}}{2} \cdot \vec{A}_\mu - i\frac{1}{6}g' B_\mu. \quad (7)$$

There are the standard way to generate mass for the various quarks. For these quarks, we use the "old-fashion" way as in the Standard Model, since quarks do not couple to the family Higgs fields. We have, for the generation of the various quark masses,

$$\begin{aligned} & G_1 \bar{U}_L(1, 2) u_R \tilde{\Phi}(1, 2) + G'_1 \bar{U}_L(1, 2) d'_R \Phi(1, 2) + h.c. + \\ & G_2 \bar{C}_L(1, 2) c_R \tilde{\Phi}(1, 2) + G'_2 \bar{C}_L(1, 2) s'_R \Phi(1, 2) + h.c. + \\ & G_3 \bar{T}_L(1, 2) t_R \tilde{\Phi}(1, 2) + G'_3 \bar{T}_L(1, 2) b'_R \Phi(1, 2) + h.c., \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

with the tilde's defined as before.

Again, all the couplings in the quark world are dimensionless in the 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time. Surprisingly, the natural scale for the quark world is of fermi scales, which is five orders smaller than the natural scale of the lepton world, of atomic scales.

It might be essential to realize that the dimensionless couplings g_c , g , g' (hence α), and κ (in the strengths of the fundamental interactions) and the dimensionless mass parameters h , h^C , $G_{1,2,3}$, $G'_{1,2,3}$ (in describing the masses of point-like particles) have a complete equal status in the philosophy of concepts.

The overall background, i.e., the quantum 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time with the force-fields gauge-group structure $SU_c(3) \times SU_L(2) \times U(1) \times SU_f(3)$ built-in from the very beginning, supports the "dimensionless" lepton world and it also supports the "dimensionless" quark world. It seems that there might be many elegant stories associated with the Standard Model [1].

When we see the Standard Model [1] from the World of the high-enough temperature (such as from the early Universe), it is a completely dimensionless theory in the quantum 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time. It is quite remarkable, indeed !!

2.3 The Almost-Dimensionless Overall Background

We are in fact living in the quantum 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time with the force-fields gauge-group structure $SU_c(3) \times SU_L(2) \times U(1) \times SU_f(3)$ built-in from the very beginning [1]. This is the "overall background" of our World, or of our Universe. That is why, in our Universe, we have $3^\circ K$ Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) as well as the clustered Cosmic Background (CB) ν 's and they were there since the early Universe.

We may talk about "The Origin of Mass" [3]. It stresses that, before the spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB), the Standard Model does not contain any parameter that is pertaining to "mass", but, after the SSB, all particles in the Standard Model acquire the mass terms as it should - a way to explain "the origin of mass". Without the "ignition" term, the Standard Model is completely dimensionless in the 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time, including the lepton world, the quark world, and the "overall background". In other words, when the temperature of our Universe is high enough, the Standard Model is completely dimensionless.

A complex scalar field in our space-time has the dimensionless coupling:

$$V(x) = \lambda(\phi^\dagger(x)\phi(x))^2. \quad (9)$$

The space-time integral of $L = T - V$ gives the action. In our 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time, we find that $\lambda = \frac{1}{8}$ numerically. This number should come out topologically

(after the normalizations of the various fields in a given space [6]), although, at this point, we don't know why this is the case.

If there are more than a complex scalar field, we should have

$$V(x) = \lambda\{(\phi_a^\dagger \phi_a)^2 + (\phi_b^\dagger \phi_b)^2 + \dots\}. \quad (10)$$

There should be only one λ .

For the two related complex fields, we propose to write

$$V(x) = \lambda\{(\phi_a^\dagger \phi_a + \phi_b^\dagger \phi_b)^2 - 4(\phi_a^\dagger \phi_b) \cdot (\phi_b^\dagger \phi_a)\}, \quad (11)$$

to signify the mutual attraction on top of the universal repulsive interactions. Thus, a complex scalar field by itself is self-repulsive and cannot exist; but with two complex scalar fields their mutual interactions change the story.

Now we return to the Standard Model [1]. We have the Standard-Model Higgs $\Phi(1, 2)$, the purely family Higgs $\Phi(3, 1)$, and the mixed family Higgs $\Phi(3, 2)$, with the first label for $SU_f(3)$ and the second for $SU_L(2)$. We need another triplet $\Phi(3, 1)$ since all eight family gauge bosons are massive [5].

It is clear that $\Phi(1, 2)$ would interact with $\Phi(3, 2)$ while $\Phi(3, 1)$ would also interact with $\Phi(3, 2)$. These interactions should be attractive to explain why they are showing up together.

We could use the so-called "U-gauge" (unitary gauge). In the U-gauge, every particle is a real particle (not a ghost). We find it to be useful in the analysis of the situation with the spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB). For the overall background, we have, in the U-gauge, W^\pm , Z^0 , and eight massive family gauge bosons, one Standard-Model Higgs and four neutral family Higgs (three mixed plus one pure).

Thus, we choose to have, in the U-gauge, as in [3],

$$\Phi(1, 2) = (0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v + \eta)), \quad \Phi^0(3, 2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(u_1 + \eta'_1, u_2 + \eta'_2, u_3 + \eta'_3), \quad \Phi(3, 1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(w + \eta', 0, 0), \quad (12)$$

all in columns. The five components of the complex triplet $\Phi(3, 1)$ get absorbed by the $SU_f(3)$ family gauge bosons and the neutral part of $\Phi(3, 2)$ has three real parts left - together making all eight family gauge bosons massive.

To understand the origin of mass [3], we find that the ignition term would better be in the purely family sector, i.e., the μ_2^2 term. When $\mu_2^2 = 0$, the $\Phi(3, 2)$ is equally partitioned between $\Phi(1, 2)$ and $\Phi(3, 1)$.

It is easy to see that only one SSB-driving term is enough for all the three Higgs fields - there may be several SSB's for the neutral fields - in our case, it works for all of them. SSB for one Higgs but is driven by other Higgs - a unique feature for the complex scalar fields. Or, we have [3]

$$\begin{aligned} V_{Higgs} = & \mu_2^2 \Phi^\dagger(3, 1) \Phi(3, 1) + \lambda(\Phi^\dagger(1, 2) \Phi(1, 2) + \cos\theta_P \Phi^\dagger(3, 2) \Phi(3, 2))^2 \\ & + \lambda(-4\cos\theta_P)(\Phi^\dagger(\bar{3}, 2) \Phi(1, 2))(\Phi^\dagger(1, 2) \Phi(3, 2)) \\ & + \lambda(\Phi^\dagger(3, 1) \Phi(3, 1) + \sin\theta_P \Phi^\dagger(3, 2) \Phi(3, 2))^2 \\ & + \lambda(-4\sin\theta_P)(\Phi^\dagger(\bar{3}, 2) \Phi(3, 1))(\Phi^\dagger(3, 1) \Phi(3, 2)). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

These are two perfect squares minus the other extremes, to guarantee the positive definiteness, when the minus μ_2^2 was left out.

From the expressions of $u_i u_i$ and v^2 , we obtain

$$v^2(3\cos^2\theta_P - 1) = \sin\theta_P \cos\theta_P w^2. \quad (14)$$

And the SSB-driven η' yields

$$w^2(1 - 2\sin^2\theta_P) = -\frac{\mu_2^2}{\lambda} + (\sin 2\theta_P - \tan\theta_P)v^2. \quad (15)$$

These two equations show that it is necessary to have the driving term, since $\mu_2^2 = 0$ implies that everything is zero. Also, $\theta = 45^\circ$ is the (lower) limit.

The mass squared of the SM Higgs η is $2\lambda\cos\theta_P u_i u_i$, as known to be $(125 \text{ GeV})^2$. The famous v^2 is the number divided by 2λ , or $(125 \text{ GeV})^2/(2\lambda)$. Using PDG's for e , $\sin^2\theta_W$, and the W -mass [7], we find $v^2 = 255 \text{ GeV}$. So, $\lambda = \frac{1}{8}$, a simple model indeed.

The ratio of the VEV to its Higgs mass is determined by 2λ , whether the channel is not ignited or not. We might choose the channel of η' (the purely family Higgs) or that of η (the SM Higgs) as the ignition channel, but three Higgs channels have different labels. The three Lorentz-invariant scalar fields have different internal structures - an amusing question for further investigation.

The mass squared of η' is $-2(\mu_2^2 - \sin\theta_P u_1^2 + \sin\theta_P(u_2^2 + u_3^2))$. The other condensates are $u_1^2 = \cos\theta_P v^2 + \sin\theta_P w^2$ and $u_{2,3}^2 = \cos\theta_P v^2 - \sin\theta_P w^2$ while the mass squared of η'_1 is $2\lambda u_1^2$, those of $\eta'_{2,3}$ be $2\lambda u_{2,3}^2$. The mixings among η'_i themselves are neglected in this paper.

There is no SSB for the charged Higgs $\Phi^+(3, 2)$. The mass squared of ϕ_1 is $\lambda(\cos\theta_P v^2 - \sin\theta_P w^2) + \frac{\lambda}{2}u_i u_i$ while $\phi_{2,3}$ be $\lambda(\cos\theta_P v^2 + \sin\theta_P w^2) + \frac{\lambda}{2}u_i u_i$. (Note that a factor of $\frac{1}{2}$ appears in the kinetic and mass terms when we simplify from the complex case to that of the real field; see Ch. 13 of the Wu-Hwang book [6].)

A further look of these equations tells that $3\cos^2\theta_P - 1 > 0$ and $2\sin^2\theta_P - 1 > 0$. A narrow range of θ_P is allowed (greater than 45° while less than 57.4° , which is determined by the group structure). For illustration, let us choose $\cos\theta_P = 0.6$ and work out the numbers as follows: (Note that $\lambda = \frac{1}{8}$ is used.)

$$\begin{aligned} 6w^2 &= v^2, & -\mu_2^2/\lambda &= 0.32v^2; \\ \eta : & 2\lambda\cos\theta_P u_i u_i = (125 \text{ GeV})^2, & v^2 &= (250 \text{ GeV})^2; \\ \eta' : & \text{mass}^2 = (51.03 \text{ GeV})^2, & w^2 &= v^2/6; \\ \eta'_1 : & \text{mass}^2 = (107 \text{ GeV})^2, & u_1^2 &= 0.7333v^2; \\ \eta'_{2,3} : & \text{mass}^2 = (85.4 \text{ GeV})^2, & u_{2,3}^2 &= 0.4667v^2; \\ \phi_1 : & \text{mass} = 100.8 \text{ GeV}; & \phi_{2,3} : \text{mass} &= 110.6 \text{ GeV}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

All numbers appear to be reasonable. In the above, $\cos\theta_P$ is the only free parameter until one of the family Higgs particles $\eta'_{1,2,3}$ and η' is found experimentally. Since the new objects need to be accessed in the lepton world, it would be a challenge for our experimental colleagues.

As a footnote, our Standard Model predicts that the mass of the SM Higgs η is a half of the vacuum expectation value v - a prediction in the origin of mass [3].

As for the range of validity, $\frac{1}{3} \leq \cos^2 \theta_P \leq \frac{1}{2}$. The first limit refers to $w^2 = 0$ while the second for $\mu_2^2 = 0$.

We may fix up the various couplings, using our common senses. The cross-dot products would be similar to κ , the basic coupling of the family gauge bosons. The electroweak coupling g is 0.6300 while the strong QCD coupling $g_s = 3.545$; my first guess for κ would be about 0.1. The masses of the family gauge bosons would be estimated by using $\frac{1}{2}\kappa \cdot w$, so slightly less than 10 GeV . (In the numerical example with $\cos \theta_P = 0.6$, we have $6w^2 = v^2$ or $w = 102 \text{ GeV}$. This gives $m = 5 \text{ GeV}$ as the estimate.) So, the range of the family forces, existing in the lepton world, would be 0.02 fermi .

In [3], the term that ignites the SSB is chosen to be with η' , the purely family Higgs. This in turn ignites EW SSB and others. It explains the origin of all the masses, in terms of the spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB). SSB in $\Phi(3, 2)$ is driven by $\Phi(3, 1)$, while SSB in $\Phi(1, 2)$ from the driven SSB by $\Phi(3, 2)$, as well. The different, but related, scalar fields can accomplish so much, to our surprise.

We note that, at the Lagrangian level, the $SU_c(3) \times SU_L(2) \times U(1) \times SU_f(3)$ gauge symmetry is protected but the symmetry is violated via spontaneous symmetry breaking (via the Higgs mechanisms).

We iterate that the mathematics of the three neutral Higgs, $\Phi(1, 2)$ (Standard-Model Higgs), $\Phi(3, 1)$ (purely family Higgs), and $\Phi^0(3, 2)$ (mixed family Higgs), subject to the renormalizability (up to the fourth power), turns to be rather rich. In our earlier work regarding the "colored Higgs mechanism" [8], we show how the eight gauge bosons in the $SU(3)$ gauge theory become massive using two complex scalar triplet fields (with the resultant four real Higgs fields), with a lot of choices. We suspect that, even within QCD, there might be some elegant choice of "colored" Higgs, or there must be a good reason for massless gluons.

2.4 The Standard Model as a dimensionless theory

In the $\hbar = c = 1$ unit system, the Standard Model [1], apart from the "ignition" term, is a collection of a few pure numbers; that all couplings are dimensionless. That is, in each interaction, the overall dimension of all field variables just cancels out the overall dimension of the 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time.

This is a remarkable property of the Standard Model. We should follow this line to examine the problem of infinities (i.e. ultraviolet divergences). So, the Standard Model is basically a dimensionless theory; in which the term "mass" still does not assume the meaning [3].

To re-iterate what we have for the Standard Model: The lepton world is dimensionless in the 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time. The quark world is also dimensionless in the 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time. Except the SSB "ignition" term, the overall background is also dimensionless in the 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time. "Dimensionless in the 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time" might mean that it is determined *globally* by the quantum 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time.

In other words, a set of pure numbers in the 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time, $\{g, g', \kappa, h, h^c, \dots\}$, characterizes the lepton world, there is another set of pure numbers, $\{g_c, g, g', G_1, \dots, G'_1, \dots\}$, defines the quark world, and $\{\lambda, \theta_P\}$ and μ_2^2 characterize the over-

all background. When the temperature is high enough (in comparison with $-\mu_2^2$), it is a completely pure-number game in the quantum 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time.

This may lead to a complete ball game for the overall treatment of ultraviolet divergences - the headache problem of infinities [6, 9].

Thus, the Standard Model is a dimensionless theory [1], if we forget about the "ignition" term or, equivalently, if we go to the temperature high enough. Just looking at those integrals for $m = 0$, we have some yet-to-be-defined integrals to investigate. Anyway, the Standard Model, as a dimensionless theory, should be used, by mathematicians or theoretical physicists, to investigate the problem of ultraviolet divergences. Upon the SSB or the generalized Higgs mechanism, the problem becomes so involved and so complicated. Thus, we should deal directly with the Standard Model in the dimensionless phase; there the mass still does not assume its meaning [3].

2.5 Phase Transitions in View of the Standard Model

If we look at the Standard Model before the spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB), it is a completely dimensionless theory [1] - i.e., a complete collection of pure numbers in the quantum 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time. Before SSB, "mass" does not assume its meaning since there are no mass terms.

The critical temperature seems to play a similar role as the spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB). In the early Universe, the temperature lowered as the time passed - at the critical temperature T_c , a phase transition of certain sort takes place. But SSB happens because of some negative energy that is "igniting" from the hand of the God. This sounds like some pure imaginary temperature working for us; in reality, we can not tune our environment in that way.

When we are talking about the Standard Model above the critical temperature T_c , we are dealing, *effectively* with a dimensionless theory in the quantum 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time. Then, all the masses become vary small and *effectively* could be neglected. This is still very different from the imaginary temperature (such as SSB).

At the time approximately 10^{-11} sec in the early Universe, our Universe underwent the so-called "mass phase transition". Just after the mass phase transition, our Universe remained as the "quark soup" till a little after 10^{-5} sec - then, it experienced the cosmological QCD phase transition. From there on, the clustering processes set in, first in abundance in cosmic microwave background (CMB), cosmic background (CB) ν 's, electrons, and the light elements (such as p , d , etc.), through the dark age, and finally resulting in formation of stars and galaxies.

When the density is so high such as being compatible even in the Schwarzschild metric, the term in "mass" should have to be re-interpreted otherwise. In our real Universe, each visual ordinary-matter object, such as the Earth, the Venus, the Sun, etc., should have the 25% dark matter, which is recently identified as a neutrino halo [10]. Neutrinos are fermions, possessing the Fermi-Dirac sphere [11]. The surface Fermi energy would be 600 GeV for the neutrino halo of the Earth [12] - the large Fermi energy is due to the tiny mass(es) of the neutrinos. So, the system is jacking up via Pauli's exclusion principle (i.e., the quantum principle) while the tiny size related to the Schwarzschild metric (i.e., for black holes) becomes irrelevant.

On the other hand, when we are talking about infinities (ultraviolet divergences), if it is coming from a theory with the mass terms ($m \neq 0$) or it is from a completely massless theory, the distinction may be rather fundamental. Thus, in the early Universe, there is the period with a completely massless theory (above the critical temperature T_c); then, eventually, with a theory with the meaningful mass terms. The treatments of the various ultraviolet divergences in the two cases are completely different.

We wish to make a fundamental note that the phase transitions of the Standard Model are "irreversible" in the sense of thermodynamics. The sign of the "ignition" term is negative in the Standard Model [1] and, so, it can be achieved only through the hand of the God.

So, the phase transition at high temperature of the Standard Model only has the imaginary image of the mass "phase transition", or SSB, of the Standard Model.

3 Our Universe

Our Universe is defied as the world described by the Standard Model [1]. So, our Universe is the quantum 4-dimensional Minkowski space-time with the force-fields gauge-group structure $SU_c(3) \times SU_L(2) \times U(1) \times SU_f(3)$ built-in from the very beginning. The Universe accepts the lepton world, of atomic sizes. The Universe also accepts the quark world, of nuclear sizes.

Our Universe has, as its contents, the 5% visual ordinary matter, the 25% dark matter, and the 70% dark energy. According to the Standard Model, electrons, quarks, and photons are visual ordinary-matter particles while neutrinos (of three flavors, and all antineutrinos) are the *only long-lived* invisible particles. The 70% dark energy is probably uniformly distributed in our Universe.

In terms of the smallest units of matter, a star of five solar mass would be an aggregate of 10^{60} smallest units of matter (in terms of the number of electrons) - a gigantic number! The approximate Newton's gravitational law is used to describe the gravity between two aggregates of such gigantic numbers of the smallest units of matter.

This gigantic number of 10^{60} (in the smallest units of matter) does tell us a lot of things. For example, the theory of gravity is far from the Standard Model. The existence of the smallest units of matter carries the implication that mutual unification is among $SU_c(3) \times SU_L(2) \times U(1) \times SU_f(3)$ and that it should not extend to cover the theory of gravity.

Neutrinos (hereafter used to represent "neutrinos of all three flavors, and all antineutrinos"), together with photons, were produced in abundance in the early Universe, forming the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) and the Cosmic Background (CB) ν 's.

$CB\nu$'s, owing to the neutrino mass, tend to cluster, forming the so-called "neutrino halos", each for a visual ordinary-matter object such as the Earth, or the Venus, or the Sun (the star). Because the mass of the neutrino is tiny, the neutrino halo should not exist by itself.

If we examine the Standard Model closely, we could safely conclude that neutrinos would be the *only* long-lived dark-matter particles [10] and that the 25% dark matter should be the clustered neutrino halos [11, 12].

So, the early stage of our Universe should have the very early Universe, which was not

yet clusterized, and the clustered early Universe, which already exhibited the lumps and clusters. The (dark-matter) neutrino halos and the lumps of the visual ordinary-matter objects are the major products, during the clustered early Universe.

If we look at Newton's universal gravitational law,

$$ma = \text{force} = G'_N \frac{mM}{r^2}, \quad (17)$$

the m could be applied to some visible object or to some invisible object (though not seen by us), and the M should also contain the visual part in ordinary matter and the invisible part in dark matter (neutrino halo). Since a neutrino halo cannot form the center of weight (because of the tiny masses of neutrinos) and it has to follow a visual ordinary-matter object (as the center of weight). This is the consequence of Newton's universal gravitational law.

The existing prevailing view regarding our Universe is that it originates from the joint making of Einstein's general relativity and the cosmological principle. Based upon the cosmological principle which states that our universe is homogeneous and isotropic, we use the Robertson-Walker metric to describe our Universe [13].

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - R^2(t) \left\{ \frac{dr^2}{1 - kr^2} + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2 \right\}. \quad (18)$$

Here the parameter k describes the spatial curvature with $k = +1, -1$, and 0 referring to an open, closed, and flat universe, respectively. The scale factor $R(t)$ describes the size of the universe at time t .

Assuming that the very early Universe can be described by a perfect fluid, i.e., a fluid with the energy-momentum tensor $T^\mu{}_\nu = \text{diag}(\rho, -, -p, -p, -p)$ where ρ is the energy density and p the pressure (both as functions of t), then the Einstein equation, $G^\mu{}_\nu = 8\pi G_N T^\mu{}_\nu + \Lambda g^\mu{}_\nu$, gives rise to only two independent equations, i.e., from $(\mu, \nu) = (0, 0)$ and (i, i) components, The two equations can be combined to yield

$$\frac{\ddot{R}}{R} = -\frac{4\pi G_N}{3}(\rho + 3p) + \frac{\Lambda}{3}. \quad (19)$$

This last equation shows either that there is a positive cosmological constant or that $\rho + 3p$ must be somehow negative, if the major conclusion of the Supernovae Cosmology Project is correct [14], i.e. the expansion of our universe still accelerating ($\ddot{R}/R > 0$).

Alternately, assuming a simple equation of state, $p = w\rho$, we obtain, from the two independent equations,

$$2\frac{\ddot{R}}{R} + (1 + 3w)\left(\frac{\dot{R}^2}{R^2} + \frac{k}{R^2}\right) - (1 + w)\Lambda = 0, \quad (20)$$

which can easily be solved for a constant w .

For example, let us assume for $t \geq T_0$ (T_0 a few times the age of our Universe) that it is dominated by the matter with a constant w_0 . We could write

$$R = e^{-at} + ce^{at}, \quad (21)$$

with the proportional constant fixed up if necessary. We obtain

$$a^2 = \Lambda, \quad c = \frac{k}{4a^2}. \quad (22)$$

Note that we try to fix the constants a^2 and c in the asymptotic solution.

It is interesting to note, in this asymptotic solution ($t \rightarrow +\infty$), that (1) w is dropped out completely, (2) Λ is better to be nonnegative (and very small), (3) to describe an expanding Universe, a should be negative, and (4) it is better to be the case that $ck \geq 0$. Asymptotically, this would be the solution as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

The above situation applies to $t \rightarrow \infty$ and NOT in the very early Universe. For the very early Universe, we may set Λ and k both to zero. Or, we have

$$2\ddot{R}R + (1 + 3w)\dot{R}^2 = 0, \quad \text{or, } R \propto t^n, \quad n = \frac{2}{3(1+w)}. \quad (23)$$

The exception is at $w = -1$, for the inflation era. To describe the Inflation Era, we use $p = -\rho$ so that

$$\ddot{R} - \frac{\dot{R}^2}{R} = 0, \quad (24)$$

which has an exponentially growing, or decaying, solution $R \propto e^{\pm \alpha t}$, compatible with the so-called "inflation" or "big inflation". In fact, considering the simplest case of a real scalar field $\phi(t)$, we have

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 + V(\phi), \quad p = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2 - V(\phi), \quad (25)$$

so that, when the "kinetic" term $\frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2$ is negligible, we have an equation of state, $p \sim -\rho$. In addition to its possible role as the "inflaton" responsible for inflation. Such field has also been invoked to explain the accelerating expansion of the present universe, as dubbed as "quintessence" or "complex quintessence" [15].

Let's look at the standard textbook argument leading to the radiation-dominated universe and the matter-dominated universe:

For the *Radiation-Dominated Universe*, we have $p = \rho/3$. For simplicity, we assume that the curvature is zero ($k = 0$) and that the cosmological constant is negligible ($\Lambda = 0$). In this case, we find from Eq. (23)

$$R \propto t^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (26)$$

Another simple consequence of the homogeneous model is to derive the continuity equation:

$$d(\rho R^3) + p d(R^3) = 0. \quad (27)$$

Accordingly, we have $\rho \propto R^{-4}$ for a radiation-dominated universe ($p = \rho/3$) while $\rho \propto R^{-3}$ for a matter-dominated universe ($p \ll \rho$). The present universe is believed to have a matter content of about 5%, or of the density of about $5 \times 10^{-31} g/cm^3$, much bigger than its radiation content $5 \times 10^{-35} g/cm^3$, as estimated from the 3° black-body radiation. However, as $t \rightarrow 0$, we anticipate $R \rightarrow 0$, extrapolated back to a very small universe as compared to the present one. Therefore, the universe is necessarily dominated by the radiation during its early enough epochs.

For the radiation-dominated early epochs of the universe with $k = 0$ and $\Lambda = 0$, we could deduce,

$$\rho = \frac{3}{32\pi G_N} t^{-2}, \quad T = \left\{ \frac{3c^2}{32\pi G_N a} \right\}^{\frac{1}{4}} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cong 10^{10} t^{-1/2} (^\circ K). \quad (28)$$

These equations tell us a few important times in the early universe, such as $10^{-11}sec$ when the temperature T is around $300 GeV$ during which the electroweak (EW) phase transition is expected to occur, or somewhere between $10^{-5}sec$ ($\cong 300 MeV$) and $10^{-4}sec$ ($\cong 100 MeV$) during which quarks and gluons undergo the QCD confinement phase transition.

For the *Matter-Dominated Universe*, we have $p \approx 0$, together with the assumption that $k = 0$ and $\Lambda = 0$. Eq. (23) yields

$$R \propto t^{\frac{2}{3}}. \quad (29)$$

As mentioned earlier, the matter density ρ_m scales like R^{-3} , or $\rho_m \propto t^{-2}$, the latter similar in the radiation-dominated case.

When $t = 10^9 sec$, we have $\rho_\gamma = 6.4 \times 10^{-18} gm/cm^3$ and $\rho_m = 3.2 \times 10^{-18} gm/cm^3$, which are close to each other and it is almost near the end of the radiation-dominated universe. The present age of the Universe is 13.7 billion years - for a large part of it, it is matter-dominated although now we have plenty of dark energy (65% \sim 70%).

However, it is generally believed that our present universe is already dominated by the dark energy (the simplest form being of the cosmological constant; about 70%) and the dark matter (about 25%). The question is when this was so - when the dark part became dominant.

In other words, the proper language should include (1) the radiation density, (2) the matter density, (3) the dark-matter density, and (4) the dark-energy density - and it determines the evolution of the Universe. Apparently, the entry of dark matter and of dark energy only makes the study of evolution of the Universe much more interesting.

4 The Mathematical Domain of the Lorentz Symmetry

There is a fundamental question regarding the mathematical domain of the space-time coordinates (x, y, z, ct) - are they the pure numbers or the partially-commuting operators? Of course, we could always implement the Lorentz symmetry.

As a matter of fact, we did not ask ourselves whether the coordinates (x, y, z, ct) are four pure numbers. This would be the basic question that we're trying to ask. In fact, the answer is that we do not know.

Usually, we go to the extreme limits when we start asking such question. In fact, the question is always there, except that we are used to the "normal" working situations and then forgetting the right to ask.

What do we anticipate well above the critical temperature T_c of the mass phase transition? The Standard Model [1] describes electrons, neutrinos, quarks, etc., so well. The Standard Model should yield the equation of state (*EoS*), which we could use for the problem.

The other important question is what we might have to do by going to the extremely high matter densities, while keeping the Lorentz symmetry. In what follows, we try to figure out if we are hitting the so-called "**super-quantum**" regime. Let us try to explain the underlying idea, while remembering that the Standard Model and the Lorentz symmetry works extremely well. (We may call it "super-quantum" or "sub-quantum"; we prefer to use "super-quantum" in what follows.)

Suppose that the formulae in the last section are correct; then at time $t = 10^{-15} \text{ sec}$ we could determine T , ρ_m , and ρ_γ as follows:

$$T = 32 \text{ TeV} : \quad \rho_m = 3.2 \times 10^{18} \text{ gm/cm}^3, \quad \rho_\gamma = 6.4 \times 10^{30} \text{ gm/cm}^3. \quad (30)$$

To get the feeling of these numbers, suppose that we stack the entire Solar mass into a small sphere that it becomes a black hole: $\rho_m = 1.843 \times 10^{16} \text{ gm/cm}^3$ at $R_s = 2.953 \text{ km}$. The nuclear matter density ρ_N is $2 \times 10^{14} \text{ gm/cm}^3$.

The "mass" no longer has its meaning; ρ_m has to be re-interpreted as some form of "clustered energy" - visible rather than invisible. But ρ_γ , the energy carried by the bulk of photons, does not suffer from the same ambiguity.

So, at time 10^{-15} sec , the "matter" density $3.2 \times 10^{18} \text{ gm/cm}^3$ is already many orders of magnitude denser (or higher) than that below the critical temperature T_c of the mass phase transition (at about 10^{-11} sec). But this is what is predicted by our standard theory (i.e. the Friedman-Robertson-Walker metric and the equation of state for ordinary matter). Of course, the radiation density (the boson's density) is even more ridiculously higher.

At this point, we have some ideas about ρ_{DM} of our Universe; presumably it all depends on how the majority of dark matter gets manufactured - neutrino halos as the 25% dark matter [11, 12]. So, neutrino halos scale like the visual ordinary-matter objects, such as the Earth, the Sun, and stars.

On the dark energy of our Universe, it would be tiny at time $t = 10^{-15} \text{ sec}$, if it is indeed described by the cosmological constant, and alike.

At this juncture we could remind ourselves the so-called "quantum regime", where the momenta \vec{p} do not commute with the coordinates \vec{x} . The quantum regime is relevant when we deal with ordinary atomic or subatomic scale (or, distances). When the Universe was 10^{-15} second old (or, earlier), we are dealing with sizes much smaller than the size of each individual hadron - it might be safe to introduce the "super-quantum regime": At these scales, the basic variables are still the coordinates (\vec{x}, t) but we could generalize them by making them non-commuting, or operators, by keeping intact the Lorentz symmetry. (What else?)

The presence of the quantum regime at the atomic or subatomic scale suggests the "existence" of the "super-quantum" regime, perhaps 10^{-20} cm away. Again, the concept of "point-like" in physics could be different from the ideological mathematical "point-like". In fact, the thoughts are similar to those suggested from a lot of physicists, famous or not. It is the very fundamental difference between the physicists and the mathematicians, such as the meaning of "point-like-ness" and others.

Why do we have to worry about the super-quantum regime well ahead of the Planck era? To say that from the Planck length $1.616 \times 10^{-33} \text{ cm}$ to 10^{-18} cm (10^{-5} fm), or from the Planck time 10^{-43} sec to 10^{-15} sec , there is nothing (desert) - nobody would believe in it. In other words, we should worry about the "super-quantum" era if we analyze the "size" and the matter together and the "contradiction" (or the paradox) that we have.

The "size" of an object, such as an electron or a hadron, is not a well-defined concept. LEP at CERN allowed us to accelerate the electrons to 100 GeV , or let us probe 10^{-6} fermi without the need to take into account the "size" of the electron. But how small could we go in this direction? For hadrons, the "size" is dictated by the strong interactions, or QCD. Analogously, maybe the "size" of an electron is dictated by the electroweak theory, in the

TeV regime. Maybe the "super-quantum" regime could be set in after that, or orders after that, but definitely well before the Planck scale.

It is well-known from the textbooks on quantum statistical mechanics that the scale or distance for the spacing of particles should be larger than the intrinsic distance of the individual particle (or the de Broglie wavelength of the molecule) - clearly, we eventually would go to the regime that this very basic fact would be contradicted in defining the quantum statistical mechanics. In other words, we have no basis to "derive" the equation of state (EoS), to be used together with the Einstein equation (on general relativity, something alike). In our opinion, we should try to face this difficult situation instead of entertaining ourselves that we already have solved a complete set of equations for cosmology.

What would be the algebra, or the graded Lie algebra, among (x, y, z) or among (x, y, z, ict) ? Let's try to argue in the following way. In going from the "classical" regime to the "quantum" regime, we make the quantities (\vec{x}, \vec{p}) noncommutative and thus obtain the operator algebra. Now in the "quantum" regime, the basic variables are (x, y, z, ct) and the most general, and perhaps the only, way in the "super-quantum" regime is trying to introduce some noncommutative algebra among these variables (x, y, z, ct) while keeping the Lorentz symmetry.

As mentioned earlier, the "matter" density is predicted to be $3.2 \times 10^{18} \text{ gm/cm}^3$ when the Universe was 10^{-15} sec . This means that a volume of one hadron size (judging from the nuclear matter density) would accommodate 16,000 hadrons or matter particles. (Some people wouldn't worry about the situation until the Planck time or the Planck distance is reached.) Our thinking is as follows: As we go to smaller and smaller such that a volume of one hadron size has to accommodate thousands or more hadrons, the size by itself does not assume the meaning and instead the size and the matter may jointly have the meaning. The size without the matter, or the matter without the size (defined through its space-time), maybe lacks the (physics) meaning.

In the simple case, we need to take the coordinates (x, y, z, ct) as from the operators and to the first approximation to implement Lorentz symmetry in some way. Since Lorentz invariance is known to be true to our experimental accuracy, we are lucky to have this important guideline. The next question is to define the "operations" among \hat{x} , \hat{y} , \hat{z} , and \hat{ct} such that d^2s and others may have their meanings.

We could put more thoughts along this line. Let (x, y, z, ct) be the Cartesian variables, which we need to label the coordinates (operators). The coordinates $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{z}, \hat{ct})$ may be regarded as mappings from R^4 to C^4 (or something else). The next thing is to implement Lorentz symmetry - to define the ten operators, i.e. the Hamiltonian H , the three momentum \vec{P} , the three angular momentum \vec{J} , and the three Lorentz-boost operators \vec{K} or \vec{M} . These ten operators should be the mappings from the coordinates (operators themselves). Fortunately, the idea was already suggested much early on by H. Snyder [16], for a different basic motivation.

In other words [16], \hat{x} , \hat{y} , \hat{z} , and \hat{t} are hermitian operators for the space-time coordinates of a particular Lorentz frame; the operators \hat{x} , \hat{y} , \hat{z} , and \hat{t} are such that the spectra of the operators \hat{x}' , \hat{y}' , \hat{z}' , \hat{t}' formed by taking linear combinations of \hat{x} , \hat{y} , \hat{z} , \hat{t} , which leaves invariant the quadratic form, $s^2 = x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - c^2t^2$, shall be the same as the spectra of \hat{x} , \hat{y} , \hat{z} , and \hat{t} .

To find operators \hat{x} , \hat{y} , \hat{z} , and \hat{t} possessing Lorentz invariant spectra, we may consider

the homogeneous quadratic form [16]:

$$\eta^2 = -\eta_0^2 + \eta_1^2 + \eta_2^2 + \eta_3^2 + \eta_4^2, \quad (31)$$

in which the η 's are assumed to be real variables and they may be regarded as the homogeneous projective coordinates of a real four-dimensional space of constant curvature (a de Sitter space).

We may define [16]

$$\hat{x} = ia(\eta_4 \partial / \partial \eta_1 - \eta_1 \partial / \partial \eta_4), \quad (32)$$

and analogously for \hat{y} , \hat{z} , and \hat{ct} , where a is some unit length (defined in the super-quantum regime; it was the nature unit in the Snyder's discrete space-time). Accordingly, we introduce three angular-momentum operators and three Lorentz-boost operators as follows:

$$L_x = i\hbar(\eta_3 \partial / \partial \eta_2 - \eta_2 \partial / \partial \eta_3) \quad (33)$$

and analogously for L_y and L_z .

$$M_x = i\hbar(\eta_0 \partial / \partial \eta_1 + \eta_1 \partial / \partial \eta_0) \quad (34)$$

and similarly for M_y and M_z . Thus, we have

$$[\hat{x}, \hat{y}] = (ia^2/\hbar)L_z, \quad [c\hat{t}, \hat{x}] = (ia^2/\hbar)M_x, \quad (35)$$

and so on (noncommutative geometry in terms of six relations).

There may exist an interesting connection for this de Sitter space. We know that the cosmology written on the 4-dimensional hyper-surface $-\eta_0^2 + \eta_1^2 + \eta_2^2 + \eta_3^2 + \eta_4^2 = \alpha^2$ would possess the cosmological constant $\Lambda = 3/\alpha^2$. In the Snyder's language the interchange $\eta_4 \rightarrow \eta$ is in fact optional. Therefore, we have the most basic "prediction" - the cosmological constant Λ is connected with the physics of the "super-quantum" era. Now we have [7]

$$\rho_c \Omega_\Lambda = 7.20565 \times 10^{-30} \text{ gm} \cdot \text{cm}^{-3} = 4.0421 \times 10^{-6} (\text{GeV}/c^2) \cdot \text{cm}^{-3}, \quad (36)$$

which explains the current dark energy density (74% of the critical energy density). Equating this to $\Lambda/(8\pi G_N)$, we obtain

$$\Lambda = 1.2087 \times 10^{-35} \text{ sec}^{-2}. \quad (37)$$

Hence, we have

$$\alpha^2 = 3/\Lambda = 2.4820 \times 10^{35} \text{ sec}^2, \quad \text{or} \quad \alpha = 4.98 \times 10^{17} \text{ sec}. \quad (38)$$

It is quite amazing to be close to the age of our Universe: 13.69 Gyr ($= 4.3202 \times 10^{17} \text{ sec}$). Since what we do is to specify a four-dimensional surface in a de Sitter space, these numbers could be taken as the consistency of these thoughts.

Surprisingly enough, the value of de Sitter α as derived from the tiny Λ (previously coming from nowhere) is remarkably close to the age of our Universe - this might take as the clue to resolve the problems of small cosmological constant, etc.

Our discussion indicates that there are other ways to introduce the noncommutative algebra [16, 17] but there are reasons to try out the Snyder's option.

The concrete example [16] which we try to show, in light of the Standard Model [1], is that, assuming Einstein's relativity principle and the quantum principle, the underlying algebra still has a big room to vary. Assuming even in addition that there exist the smallest units of matter such as electrons, neutrinos, quarks, etc. (a finite of them), we are not so sure if the book of Snyder is already closed. In our own opinion, thinking of this kind is the right way which the physics should go.

5 On the Cosmological QCD Phase Transition

After presenting the perfect phase transition, the mass phase transition of the Standard Model [1], the room left for the QCD cosmological phase transition [18] seems to be rather limited. But it is an unsolved problem so far.

In an early paper [18], we present our thoughts about the cosmological QCD phase transition. It happened at between $10^{-5}sec$ and $10^{-4}sec$, when the densities appear to be "normal" for the hadron matter. That is, we don't have to worry about "super-quantum" physics. However, the real story about the QCD phase transition is rather complicated but may be truly important for phase transitions in the early Universe. The question in mind has to do with the latent heat (energy) of the phase transition of first-order - similar to the zero-point energy, or the Cosmological Constant, or that, when we differentiate, it disappears; supposedly that it is no longer relevant but it is not true.

To describe the cosmological QCD phase transition, it is unlikely that we would wait for until we have solved QCD itself - often a formidable task. In this case, we could use bag models as the first approximation but maybe the phase transition in question is described as the first-order transition while in reality a second-order one. Then, solving QCD exactly becomes very important. Of course, we all know that the MIT bag model [19] or the Frieberg-Lee non-topological soliton model [20] invokes the bag constant, or the "zero-point" energy, which implies the first order for phase transition.

In what follows, we use the "bubble dynamics" in Frieberg-Lee non-topological soliton model - to describe what is going on in the formation and evolution of many bubbles, trying to model the dynamics in the cosmological QCD phase transition.

At the temperature $T > T_c \sim 150MeV$, i.e., before the phase transition takes place, free quarks and gluons can roam anywhere. As the Universe expands and cools, eventually passing the critical temperature T_c , the bubbles nucleate here and there. These bubbles "explode", as we call it "exploding solitons" (or "low-temperature solitons"). When it reaches the "supercooling" temperature, T_s , or something similar, the previous bubbles become too many and in fact most of them become touched each other - now the false vacua or "bubbles" of different kind (where quarks and gluons can move freely) start to collapse - or we call it "imploding solitons" (or "high-temperature solitons"). When all these bubbles of different kind implode completely, the phase transition is now complete.

The "imploding" solitons with boundaries should find a way to "glue" together, such as the formation of domain walls, vortices, etc., sometimes with nontrivial topology.

There is some specialty regarding the cosmological QCD phase transition. Namely,

the collapse of the false vacuum does depend on the inside quark-gluon content - e.g., if we have a three-quark color-singlet combination inside, the collapse of the false vacuum would stop (or stabilize) at a certain radius (we called the bag radius, like in the MIT bag radius); of course, there are meson configurations, glueballs, hybrids, six-quark or multi-quark configurations, etc. The cosmological QCD phase transition does not eliminate all the false vacua; rather, the end state of the transition could have at least lots of baryon or meson states, each of them has some false vacuum to stabilize the system.

How big can a bubble grow? It is with the fastest speed which the bubble can grow is through the speed of light or close to the speed of light. The bubble could sustain from the moment it creates, say, $T \approx T_c$ to the moment of supercooling, $T_s \sim 0.95 \cdot T_c$, or during the time span $t \sim 3 \times 10^{-5} \times 0.05 \text{ sec}$ (or $1.5 \times 10^{-7} \text{ sec}$). So, the bubble can at most grow into $c \cdot 1.5 \times 10^{-7} \text{ sec}$ or $4.5 \times 10^3 \text{ cm}$.

How many ("low-temperature") bubbles are there of the entire Universe when the space were filled up by the bubbles (when the phase transition was complete)? The point is that two bubbles are separated by the domain wall of certain structure (with some energy deposited in there - some surface energy). The domain walls cannot disappear completely - not only sometime because of the possible nontrivial topology but that there should be some QCD dynamics to annihilate the walls.

As a yardstick, we note that, at $t \sim 10^{-5} \text{ sec}$ or $T \sim 300 \text{ MeV}$, we have

$$\rho_\gamma \sim 6.4 \times 10^{10} \text{ gm/cm}^3, \quad \rho_m \sim 3.2 \times 10^3 \text{ gm/cm}^3. \quad (39)$$

Or, slightly later when QCD phase transition has completed, at $t \sim 10^{-4} \text{ sec}$ or $T \sim 100 \text{ MeV}$, we have

$$\rho_\gamma \sim 6.4 \times 10^8 \text{ gm/cm}^3, \quad \rho_m \sim 1.0 \times 10^2 \text{ gm/cm}^3. \quad (40)$$

When the low-temperature bubbles fill up the space, the neighboring two bubbles would in general be labeled by different $\theta_{i,j}$ representing different but degenerate vacua - we assume that there are infinite many choices of θ ; they are degenerate but complete equivalent. As example, see [2, 18]. Note that the internal structure of QCD is complicated enough to disfavor the non-degeneracy of the vacuum. The domain wall is used to separate the two regions. Three different regions would meet in a line - which we call a vortex. We have to estimate the total energy associated with the domain walls and the vortices - particularly when these objects persist to live on for a "long" time - say, $\tau \gg 10^{-4} \text{ sec}$. These domain walls and vortices are governed, in the QCD phase transition in the early Universe, by the QCD dynamics.

We may start with a simple estimate - the expansion factor since the QCD phase transition up to now. The present age of the Universe is 13.7 billion years or $13.7 \times 10^9 \times 365.25 \times 24 \times 3600$ or 4.323×10^{17} seconds. About the first 10^9 sec period of the hot big bang is previously-believed radiation-dominated. Consider the length 1.0 fermi at $t \sim 10^{-5} \text{ sec}$, it will be expanded by a factor of 10^7 up to $t \sim 10^9 \text{ sec}$ (radiation-dominated) and expanded further by another factor of 5.7×10^5 until the present time - so, a total expansion factor of 5.7×10^{12} ; changing a length of 2 fermi at $t \sim 10^{-5} \text{ sec}$ into a distance of 1 cm now. A proton presumably of $R = 1 \text{ fermi}$ at $t \sim 10^{-5} \text{ sec}$ should be more or less of the same size now; or, the bag constant or the energy associated with the false vacuum should remain the same.

What would happen to the pasted or patched domain walls as formed during the cosmological QCD phase transition? According to [2, 18], we note that the solutions in previously two different true-vacuum regions cannot be matched naturally - unless the K values match accidentally. But it is clear that the system cannot be stretched or over-stretched by such enormous factor, 10^{12} or 10^{13} . We believe that the field ϕ , being effective, cannot be lonely; that is, there are higher-order interactions such as

$$c_0\phi G_\mu^a G^{\mu,a}, \quad c_1\phi GGG, \dots, \quad d_0\phi\bar{\psi}\psi, \quad (41)$$

some maybe being absent because of the nature of ϕ . In other words, we may believe that the strong interactions are primarily responsible for the phase transition in question, such that the effective field ϕ couples to the gluon and quark fields; the details of the coupling are subject to further investigations.

That is, when the field ϕ responsible for the pasted or patched domain walls is *effective* - the ϕ field couples, in the higher-order (and thus weaker) sense, to the gluon and quark fields. It is very difficult to estimate what time is needed for pasted domain walls to disappear, if there are no nontrivial topology involved. If there is some sort of nontrivial topology present, there should left some kind of topological domain nugget - however, energy conservation should tell us that it cannot be expanded by too many orders.

In other words, the energy associated with the cosmological QCD phase transition, mainly the vacuum energy associated with the false vacuum, disappeared in several ways, viz.: (1) the bag energies associated with the baryons and all the other color-singlet objects, (2) the energies with all kinds of topological domain nuggets or other topological objects, and (3) the decay products from pasted or patched domain walls with trivial topology.

Considering just before the critical temperature $T = T_c \approx 150 \text{ MeV}$ or $t \approx 3.30 \times 10^{-5} \text{ sec}$, we have

$$\rho_{vac} = 1.0163 \times 10^{14} \text{ gm/cm}^3, \quad \rho_\gamma = 5.88 \times 10^9 \text{ gm/cm}^3, \quad \rho_m = 6.51 \times 10^2 \text{ gm/cm}^3. \quad (42)$$

Here the first term is what we expect the system to release - the so-called "latent heat"; we call it "latent energy" for obvious reasons. The identification of the latent "heat" with the bag constant is well-known in MIT and Coulomb bag models [19, 20].

This can be considered just before the cosmological QCD phase transition which took place.

As time went on, the Universe expanded and the temperature cooled further - from the critical temperature to the supercooling temperature ($T_s \sim 0.95 \times T_c$ with the fraction 0.95 in fact just a common estimate) and even lower, and then the cosmological QCD phase transition was complete. When the phase transition was complete, we should estimate how the energy ρ_{vac} is to be divided.

Let's assume that the QCD phase transition was completed at the point T_s (in fact maybe a little short after T_s). Let's take $T_s = 0.95 T_c$ for simplicity. We would like to know how the energy ρ_{vac} is to be divided. First, we can estimate those remained with the baryons and other color-singlet objects - the lower limit is given by the estimate on the baryon number density: $\rho_m = 6.51 \times 10^2 \text{ gm/cm}^3$ or $3.65 \times 10^{26} \text{ GeV}/c^2/\text{cm}^3$. So, in the volume 1.0 cm^3 or 10^{39} fermi^3 , we have at least 3.65×10^{26} baryons. One baryon has the volume energy (i.e. the bag energy or the false vacuum energy) $57 \text{ MeV}/\text{fermi}^3 \times \frac{4}{3}\pi(1.0 \text{ fermi})^3$

(which is $238.8 MeV$). So, in the volume $1.0 cm^3$, we have at least $238.8 MeV \times 3.65 \times 10^{26}$ or $8.72 \times 10^{25} GeV$ in baryon bag energy. Or, in different units $8.72 \times 10^{25} / (0.5609 \times 10^{24}) gm/c^2$ or $155.5 gm/c^2$, compared to ρ_{vac} above ($\cong 10^{10} gm/cm^3$). Thus, only a tiny fraction of ρ_{vac} is to be hidden in baryons or other color-singlet objects after the QCD phase transition in the early Universe.

Where did the huge amount of the energy ρ_{vac} go? In the beginning of the end of the phase transition, the pasted domain walls with the huge kinetic energies seem to be the main story. A pasted domain wall is forming by colliding two domain walls while eliminating the false vacuum in between. The kinetic energies associated with the previously head-on collision become vibration, center-of-mass motion, etc. Of course, the pasted domain walls would evolve much further such as through the decaying interactions given earlier or forming the "permanent" structures. In any case, the total energy involved is known reasonably - a large fraction of ρ_{vac} , much larger than the radiation ρ_γ (with ρ_m negligible at this point).

Shown in Fig. 1 is the key result of the previous papers [2, 18] - we wish to use it to explain the important result. At $t \sim 3.30 \times 10^{-5} sec$, where did the latent energy $10^{14} gm/cm^3$ evolve into? We should know that the curve for ρ_γ , for massless relativistical particles, is the steepest in slope. The other curve for ρ_m is the other limit for matter (which $P \approx 0$). In this way, the latent energy is connected naturally with, or partially connected with, the curve for ρ_{DM} - in fact, there seems to be no other choice.




FIG. 3 (color). The positron fraction above 10 GeV, where it begins to increase. The present measurement extends the energy range to 500 GeV and demonstrates that, above ~ 200 GeV, the positron fraction is no longer increasing. Measurements from PAMELA [21] (the horizontal blue line is their lower limit), Fermi-LAT [22], and other experiments [17–20] are also shown.

Figure 1: The various densities of our universe versus time.

Coming back to Eq. (23), we could assume for simplicity that when the cosmological QCD just took place the system follows with the relativistic pace (i.e. $P = \rho/3$) but when

the system over-stretched enough and had evolved long enough it was diluted enough and became non-relativistic (i.e. $P \approx 0$). It so happens that in both cases the density to the governing equation, Eq. (23), always looks like $\rho \propto t^{-2}$, although it is $R \propto t^{\frac{1}{2}}$ followed by $R \propto t^{\frac{2}{3}}$.

It is so accidental that what we call "the radiation-dominated universe" is in fact dominated by the latent energy from the cosmological QCD phase transition in the form of "pasted" or "patched" domain walls and the various evolved objects. In our case, the transition into the "matter-dominated universe", which happened at a time slightly different from $t \sim 10^9 \text{ sec}$, occurred when all the evolutions of the pasted domain walls ceased or stopped. In other words, it is NOT the transition into the "matter-dominated universe", as we used to think of.

In fact, the old way of thinking of the "dark matter", or the significant portion of it, turns out to be very natural. Otherwise, where did the 25% content of our universe come from? Of course, one could argue about the large amount of the cosmological QCD phase transition, in terms of the largeness of the latent energy. The curves in Fig. 1 might make a lot of sense [2, 8].

Of course, neutrino halos could naturally be identified with the large portion of the 25% dark matter [11, 12]. The latent heat (energy), on the other hand, should have some place to go - if it does not belong to the 25% dark matter, it has to go somewhere visually, i.e., in the visual ordinary-matter way.

The role of the latent heat(energy) in the cosmological phase transitions poses a fundamental question that deserves our further thoughts.

6 The Outlook

In this paper, we use the Standard Model [1] to analyze possible phase transition(s). For what is called "electroweak" phase transition, it *does not exist*. The setting-in of the spontaneous symmetry breaking (*SSB*) is equivalent to the change of the purely imaginary temperature. Besides that, it is a completely dimensionless theory - there is no way to maneuver on the theory.

We also argue that from the macroscopic scale (1 cm) to the microscopic scale (10^{-8} cm) the variables get reduced (elimination from momenta/coordinates to coordinates) by the quantum principle and so, at the level of the distance 10^{-20} cm or so, further reduction comes from changing commutative coordinates to noncommutative coordinates when the quantum era (10^{-8} cm) has changed to the super-quantum era (10^{-20} cm or small). In fact, we realize that H. Snyder [16], in as early as 1947, already tried to extend the space-time to a discrete one while observing Lorentz symmetry - it provides a nice formulation of our "super-quantum" idea. The noncommutative idea comes from [16, 17], which may have a natural place to enter in our thinking.

We also have a few remarks on an approximate way to treat the cosmological QCD phase transition, a result that indicates the basic importance of the latent heat (energy) if the phase transition would be first-order in nature. In view of the complicated nature of the subject, we suspect that it will remain the unsettled case for a while for many years or decades to come. In the case of the "mass" phase transition, it is important realize that

there is no real phase transition, according to the Standard Model [1].

We hope that our investigations would shed light on the fundamental questions regarding the phase transitions in our Universe, and in particular at the level of the smallest units of matter.

Acknowledgments

The Taiwan CosPA project is funded by the Ministry of Education (89-N-FA01-1-0 up to 89-N-FA01-1-5) and the National Science Council (NSC 95-2752-M-002-007-PAE). This research is also supported in part as another National Science Council project (NSC 99-2112-M-002-009-MY3).

References

- [1] W-Y. Pauchy Hwang, arXiv:1304.4705v2 [hep-ph] 25 Aug 2015; "The Standard Model".
- [2] W-Y. P. Hwang, Internat'l J. Mod. Phys. **A23**, 4757 (2008).
- [3] W-Y. Pauchy Hwang, The Universe, **2-2**, 47 (2014); "The Origin of Mass".
- [4] W-Y. Pauchy Hwang and Tung-Mow Yan, The Universe, Vol. 1, No. 1, 5 (2013); arXiv:1212.4944v1 [hep-ph] 20 Dec 2012.
- [5] W-Y. Pauchy Hwang, Nucl. Phys. **A844**, 40c (2010); W-Y. Pauchy Hwang, International J. Mod. Phys. **A24**, 3366 (2009); the idea first appeared in hep-ph, arXiv: 0808.2091; talk presented at 2008 CosPA Symposium (Pohang, Korea, October 2008), Intern. J. Mod. Phys. Conf. Series **1**, 5 (2011); plenary talk at the 3rd International Meeting on Frontiers of Physics, 12-16 January 2009, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, published in American Institute of Physics 978-0-7354-0687-2/09, pp. 25-30 (2009).
- [6] Ta-You Wu and W-Y. Pauchy Hwang, "Relativistic Quantum Mechanics and Quantum Fields" (World Scientific 1991); Francis Halzen and Alan D. Martin, "Quarks and Leptons" (John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1984); E.D. Commins and P.H. Bucksbaum, "Weak Interactions of Leptons and Quarks" (Cambridge University Press 1983). We use the first book for the notations and the metric(s).
- [7] Particle Data Group, "Review of Particle Physics", J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. **37**, 1 (2010); and its biennial publications.
- [8] W-Y. P. Hwang, Phys. Rev. **D32**, 824 (1985).
- [9] W-Y. Pauchy Hwang, The Universe, **2-1**, 41 (2014).
- [10] W-Y. Pauchy Hwang, arXiv:1012.1082v4 [hep-ph] 13 Jan 2016; "Cosmology: Neutrinos as the Only Final Dark Matter".

- [11] W-Y. Pauchy Hwang, *The Universe*, **3-4**, 7 (2015).
- [12] W-Y. Pauchy Hwang, *The Universe*, **4-1**, 7 (2016).
- [13] E.W. Kolb and M.S. Turner, *The Early universe*, *Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.* (1994).
- [14] S. Perlmutter *et al.* [Supernova Cosmology Project], *Astrophys. J.* **517**, 565 (1999); A. G. Riess *et al.* [Supernova Search Team], *Astron. J.* **116**, 1009 (1998).
- [15] R.R. Caldwell, R. Dave, and P.J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 1582 (1998); Je-An Gu and W-Y. P. Hwang, *Phys. Lett.* **B517**, 1 (2001).
- [16] H.S. Snyder, *Phys. Rev.* **71**, 38 (1947); **72**, 68 (1947).
- [17] A. Connes, *Non-Commutative Geomerty* (Academic Press, New York, 1994); M. Li and T. Yoneya, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 1219 (1997); C.-S. Chu and P.-M. Ho, *Nucl. Phys.* **B550**, 151 (1999); A. Connes, M.R. Douglas, A. Schwarz, *J. High Energy Phys.* **02**, 003 (1998); M.R. Douglas and C. Hull, *ibid.* **02**, 008 (1998); N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *ibid.* **09**, 032 (1999); M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari, *Phys. Lett.* **B455**, 129 (1999); J.L.F. Barbon and E. Rabinovici, *ibid.* **486**, 202 (2000); R. Gopakumar, J. Maldacena, S. Minwalla, and A. Strominger, *J. High Energy Phys.* **06**, 036 (2000); D. Bigatti and L. Susskind, *Phys. Rev.* **D62**, 066004 (2000); N. Seiberg, L. Susskind, and N. Toumbas, *J. High Energy Phys.* **06**, 021 (2000); D.J. Gross, A. Hashimoto, and N. Itzhaki, hep-th/0008075; T. Pengpan and X. Xiong, *Phys. Rev.* **D63**, 085012 (2001); F. J. Petriello, *Nucl. Phys.* **B601**, 169 (2001).
- [18] W-Y. P. Hwang, *J. Korean Phys. Society*, **53-2**, Aug. 2008, pp. 1115-1125.
- [19] A. Chodos, R.L. Jaffe, K. Johnson, C.B. Thorn, and V.F. Weisskopf, *Phys. Rev.* **D9**, 3471 (1974); T.A. DeGrand, R.L. Jaffe, K. Johnson, and J. Kiskis, *Phys. Rev.* **D12**, 2060 (1975). For the bag model parameters, see, e.g., W-Y. P. Hwang, *Phys. Rev.* **D31**, 2826 (1985).
- [20] R. Friedberg and T.D. Lee, *Phys. Rev.* **D16**, 1096 (1977); **D18**, 2623 (1978). For generalizations, see, e.g., W-Y. P. Hwang, *Phys. Lett.* **116B**, 37 (1982) and *Phys. Rev.* **D29**, 1465 (1984).