

Techni-Chiral-Color

Thomas W. Kephart* and HoSeong La†

*Department of Physics and Astronomy,
Vanderbilt University,,
Nashville, TN 37235, USA*

Chiral Color is extended by incorporating Technicolor, which induces dynamical breaking of the Electroweak symmetry as well as Chiral Color to Quantum Chromodynamics. Gauge anomalies are cancelled by introducing two generations of technifermions, and the fourth generation of quarks and leptons is required. Each technifermion generation is coupled to only two Standard Model generations by the Yukawa interaction. Various phenomenological implications are explained.

PACS: 12.60.-i, 12.90.+b, 12.15.-y

*tom.kephart@gmail.com

†hsla.avt@gmail.com

The model introduced here is a hybrid between Chiral Color (CC)[1, 2] and Technicolor (TC)[3, 4]. Neither of these have any evidence of their existence. However, there are good reasons why these could be the immediate future of new physics beyond the Standard Model (SM).

First, the nature of chirality has been fascinating us since the discovery of parity violation and the V-A theory. The correct identification of quarks and leptons in the SM based on anomaly cancellation proves the value of the chiral nature of the Electroweak theory. Yet, eventually the low energy world of unbroken symmetry is vector-like. One cannot help but raising the further question of why Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) (i.e. $SU(3)_C$) is vector-like, while part of the Electroweak theory (i.e. $SU(2)_L$) is chiral. In fact, as a global flavor symmetry, chiral symmetry is introduced in QCD to explain the origin of (light) quark masses. We can go one step further and ask if QCD itself is a result of spontaneous breaking of local chiral symmetry. Indeed this question was asked before and the model constructed is known as the Chiral Color[1].

Second, the existence of the Higgs to provide the electroweak symmetry breaking (EWSB) in terms of an elementary scalar is still elusive and it is possible that we may face the situation of no discovery. If there is no Higgs, the most obvious alternative is clearly dynamical symmetry breaking[5] and there are active investigations going on in the context of TC[6, 7, 8].

Furthermore, we will break both CC and EW symmetry dynamically at the same time. Then we can resolve many outstanding issues. To name a few, formulation of a realistic CC with sufficiently heavy axiguons, heavy top-quark mass and fermion mass hierarchy, small mixing between top-quark and others in the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) mixing matrix, suppression of of the flavor changing neutral current (FCNC), etc. The cost of doing this is the addition of two technifermion generations and a fourth generation of quarks and leptons.

The model we consider is based on the (relevant) gauge group¹

$$G = SU(2)_{TC} \times SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y, \quad (1)$$

where quarks and leptons are $SU(2)_{TC}$ singlets and given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q &: (1, 3, 1, 2, 1/6)_L, (1, 1, 3, 1, 2/3)_R, (1, 1, 3, 1, -1/3)_R, \\ L &: (1, 1, 1, 2, -1/2)_L, (1, 1, 1, 1, -1)_R \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

¹The gauge group is actually $G \times SU(2)'$. However, no matter fields carry $SU(2)'$ charges so that $SU(2)'$ is decoupled from the matter sector. The role of $SU(2)'$ is to be clarified later.

where we suppress family indices.

In the CC case there is an anomaly due to the chiral nature of SU(3)'s. There are various ways of canceling the SU(3) anomaly by introducing additional fermions, as presented in [1]. However, there is also a rather trivial way of canceling SU(3) anomalies by simply adding anti-generations. One may think this is not quite an innovative idea, but if we treat these anti-generations as technifermions with additional strong SU(2)_{TC} interaction, then it gets interesting. (See [9] for another way of incorporating TC with CC.) So, we are led to include

$$\begin{aligned} T_Q^* &: (2, \bar{3}, 1, 2, -1/6)_L, (2, 1, \bar{3}, 1, -2/3)_R, (2, 1, \bar{3}, 1, 1/3)_R, \\ T_L &: (2, 1, 1, 2, 1/2)_L, (2, 1, 1, 1, 0)_R, (2, 1, 1, 1, 1)_R, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the asterisk is added to indicate $\bar{3}$. Notice that we still define the electric charge as $Q_{\text{EM}} = I_{L3} + Y/2$ because SU(2)_{TC} will remain unbroken but confined. Since the T_Q 's are doublet under SU(2)_{TC}, to cancel SU(3) anomalies we need to match one generation of technifermions with two generations of Q, L 's. Therefore, in total we have two generations of technifermions and four generations of Q, L , hence the fourth generation is needed. This distinguishes the top-quark (and t') generation from the two light generations as in the Topcolor model[10, 11].

The T_Q 's and T_L 's will condense due to strong SU(2)_{TC} interactions, and this should break the EW symmetry as well as CC. We will count Nambu-Goldstone bosons (NGB) slightly differently, but it is equivalent to a total of 255 NGB's due to the $SU(16)_L \times SU(16)_R$ chiral symmetry breaking down to $SU(16)_V$ ². Because of four different colored T_Q 's, there are sixteen condensates formed by T_Q 's under SU(2)_{TC}. However, to be more precise, all of these have $(3, \bar{3})$ degrees of freedom according to CC. Upon twisting CC to QCD times the axial SU(3), these degrees of freedom separate into SU(3) singlets and octets, 144 in total. In addition to these, there are another fifteen condensates formed by T_L 's under SU(2)_{TC} and sixteen colored condensates of $\langle \overline{T_Q} T_L \rangle$ and their conjugates, in total 111. Out of sixteen SU(3) octets, one will be eaten to break SU(3)_L × SU(3)_R to the SU(3)_C of QCD to make eight axigluons massive. The remaining fifteen octets will form condensates due to SU(3)_C which could have properties similar to glueballs in QCD after confinement. Three combinations of $\langle \overline{T_L} T_L \rangle$ and the singlet $\langle \overline{T_Q} T_Q \rangle$ will be eaten to break the electroweak symmetry. The remainders are psuedo-Nambu-Goldstone bosons (PNGB) and techniaxions[8].

²Note that the global symmetry is not SU(32) due to CC charges. The extra 240 condensates which could have appeared under enhanced global symmetry SU(32) breaking to Sp(32) are not Lorentz scalars, although they are SU(2) singlets. So they should not be counted as NGB's in our case.

To match the EWSB scale the technipion (i.e. singlet) decay constant is given by $F_{\pi_{\text{TC}}} = (246 \text{ GeV})/\sqrt{8} = 87 \text{ GeV}$, which leads to the correct weak boson masses[7, 8]. Notice that, for axigluons, the octet decay constant $F_{g_{\text{TC}}}$ does not have to be the same as $F_{\pi_{\text{TC}}}$, depending on the detail of flavor symmetry breaking. They may be related, but we do not have any experimental data to use to fix parameters needed to specify the relationship at this moment. Since we can construct an effective lagrangian in which (color) singlet and octet technimesons have independent kinetic energy terms with their own decay constants, e.g. $(F_{\pi_{\text{TC}}}^2/4)\text{tr}|D_\mu U_1|^2 + (F_{g_{\text{TC}}}^2/4)\text{Tr}|D_\mu U_8|^2$, where U_1 is given in terms of isospin triplet π_T as $U_1 \equiv \exp(i\sigma \cdot \pi_T/F_{\pi_{\text{TC}}})$ and U_8 is in terms of color octet Π_8 as $U_8 \equiv \exp(i\lambda \cdot \Pi_8/F_{g_{\text{TC}}})$, we can safely assume they are independent at this moment. So, the axigluon mass is given by

$$m_{g_A} \sim \frac{1}{2}g_s\sqrt{8C_2}F_{g_{\text{TC}}} \quad (4)$$

where g_s is the QCD coupling constant and $C_2 = 3$ is the second Casimir invariant for the adjoint representation of SU(3). If we choose $F_{g_{\text{TC}}} \sim \Lambda_{\text{TC}}/2 \sim 0.5 \text{ TeV}$, then the axigluon mass becomes about 1.2 TeV.

We will generate fermion masses without introducing Extended Technicolor (ETC)[4], but in terms of strongly interacting scalars and sterile scalars. (Generating mass via color singlet scalars in TC was investigated in [12, 13, 14].)

The necessary scalar field for generating quark masses is

$$\Phi : (2, 1, 1, 1, 0). \quad (5)$$

which only carries TC charge. If this scalar field interacts with fermions according to Yukawa couplings of

$$\lambda_Q \Phi_A \bar{Q}^a T_{Q_a}^A + \text{h.c.}, \quad (6)$$

where the label ‘A’ is an $\text{SU}(2)_{\text{TC}}$ index and ‘a’ is a CC index, then condensations of T_Q ’s and Φ ’s will generate masses. Motivated by the anomaly cancellation structure, we assume that the first (second) generation of T_Q couples only to the first and second (third and fourth) generations of Q . This assumption can be justified either by imposing restrictions on Yukawa coupling constants or by imposing a discrete symmetry. In the case of the discrete symmetry Γ , we assume that Yukawa couplings respect Γ , while the TC gauge interaction is allowed to violate Γ because T_{Q_1} and T_{Q_2} are identified as weak eigenstates, so that there is no reason why TC should have the same eigenstates. The simplest example is $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}_2$ such that different technifermions have different \mathbb{Z}_2 -parities and others are assigned accordingly, then no Yukawa

coupling mixing will be allowed. The scalar Φ is also assumed to be non-self-interacting for simplicity and it will be confined.

The mass matrix for, say, up-quarks, is a 4×4 matrix with 2×2 blocks that can be expressed as

$$M_Q = (M_{IJ}), \quad (7)$$

where I, J identify the technifermion generations and each block is given by 2×2 matrix of the form

$$M_{IJ} = \left(\sum_{\ell=1} m_{ij}^{(\ell)} \right), \quad (8)$$

where i, j identify the quark generations. Notice that for $I(J) = 1$ $i(j) = 1, 2$, while for $I(J) = 2$, $i(j) = 3, 4$.




Figure 1: Feynman diagram for diagonal block quark mass at the lowest order.




Figure 2: An example of Feynman diagram for higher order contributions. Those inside brackets are for off-diagonal-block quark mass. c_{IJ} indicate technifermion mixings.

We will consider only the two leading order contribution to the diagonal block

$$M_{II} = (m_{ij}^{(1)} + m_{ij}^{(2)}). \quad (9)$$

The condensations of T_Q 's and Φ 's in the dimension eight operator of an effective action represented by Fig.1 lead to the first term

$$m_{ij}^{(1)} \sim \lambda_i \lambda_j \frac{\langle \Phi^2 \rangle \langle T_{QI}^2 \rangle}{\Lambda_{TC}^4} \sim \frac{1}{16\pi^4} \lambda_i \lambda_j m_{T_{QI}}. \quad (10)$$

A contribution for the diagonal block at the two-loop level generated by Fig.2 gives

$$m_{ij}^{(2)} \sim \frac{1}{256\pi^8} c_{II} g_{\text{TC}}^2 \lambda_i \lambda_j \frac{m_{T_{QI}}^2}{\Lambda_{\text{TC}}}, \quad (11)$$

where $c_{II} = 1$.

Similarly, the leading order of the off-diagonal-block components is generated at the two-loop level (Fig.2 with those fields inside the bracket) from a dimension sixteen operator such that

$$M_{IJ} = (m_{ij}^{(2)}) \sim \left(\frac{1}{256\pi^8} c_{IJ} g_{\text{TC}}^2 \lambda_i \lambda_j \frac{m_{T_{Q1}} m_{T_{Q2}}}{\Lambda_{\text{TC}}} \right), \quad (12)$$

where c_{IJ} is the technifermion mixing, hence suppressed by order $m_{T_Q}/\Lambda_{\text{TC}}$ compared to the diagonal ones. For $c_{IJ} \neq 0$ when $I \neq J$, we need T_{Q1} and T_{Q2} mixing for their couplings to TC gauge fields. This is because T_{Q1} and T_{Q2} are weak eigenstates, hence there is no reason for them to interact with $\text{SU}(2)_{\text{TC}}$ in the same way. This mixing indicates that $\text{SU}(2)_{\text{TC}}$ is not the entire gauge symmetry, but in fact part of a larger gauge symmetry as follows: Let $\text{SU}(2)_{\text{TC}}$ be a (properly) twisted part as in $\text{SU}(2)_1 \times \text{SU}(2)_2 \simeq \text{SU}(2)_{\text{TC}} \times \text{SU}(2)'$ with coupling constants given by $g_1 = (1 + c_{12})g_{\text{TC}}$ and $g_2 = (1 - c_{12})g_{\text{TC}}$, where $\text{SU}(2)'$ is confining and no matter fields carry $\text{SU}(2)'$ charges so that $\text{SU}(2)'$ decouples, then we only have $\text{SU}(2)_{\text{TC}}$ coupled to matter in the Λ_{TC} region. So, the gauge invariance under $\text{SU}(2)_1 \times \text{SU}(2)_2$ can be demonstrated by untwisting as follows. Let $T_Q = (T_{Q1} + T_{Q2})/\sqrt{2}$ and $\tilde{T}_Q = (T_{Q1} - T_{Q2})/\sqrt{2}$ such that $g_1 \overline{T_Q} A_\mu^{(1)} T_Q + g_2 \overline{\tilde{T}_Q} A_\mu^{(2)} \tilde{T}_Q$, then this leads to gauge invariance. Rewrite in terms of T_{Q1} and T_{Q2} and, since they only carry $\text{SU}(2)_{\text{TC}}$ charges, identifying $A_\mu^{\text{TC}} = A_\mu^{(1)} = A_\mu^{(2)}$, we get the technifermion mixing terms. Notice that $T_Q(\tilde{T}_Q)$ couples to $\text{SU}(2)_1(\text{SU}(2)_2)$ only. This mixing is crucial to generate the desired mass matrix and CKM-like mixing, and in fact is the origin of the mixing in the SM in this context. In the gauge sector the gauge fields of $\text{SU}(2)'$ behave like vector “matter” fields with respect to $\text{SU}(2)_{\text{TC}}$ upon twisting $\text{SU}(2)_1 \times \text{SU}(2)_2$ [15]. So, the evidence of $\text{SU}(2)'$ will show up in the TC gauge sector only, e.g., to modify Ward identities of $\text{SU}(2)_{\text{TC}}$ in some cases.

The mass matrix given in terms of Eqs.(10)-(12) has two zero eigenvalues. To avoid these zero eigenvalues we need to add a flavor diagonal term and the tadpole contribution can take care of this. So, we are led to introduce two sterile scalar fields in the same spirit of grouping generations as prescribed (one is sufficient too if we allow much larger hierarchy of Yukawa coupling constants)

$$\Phi_I^0 : (1, 1, 1, 1, 0) \quad (13)$$




Figure 3: Tadpole diagram for flavor diagonal masses.

such that they only interact with (techni)fermions via Yukawa couplings as

$$\lambda_{TI}\Phi_I^0\overline{T_{QI}}T_{QI}, \quad \lambda_i\Phi_I^0\overline{Q_i}Q_i. \quad (14)$$

Notice that Φ_I^0 interacts only with $Q_{1,2}$, etc., as before due to restrictions on Yukawa coupling constants. Then the tadpole contribution from Fig.3 generates the diagonal contribution

$$m_{ii} \sim \frac{1}{2\pi^2}\lambda_i\lambda_{TI}m_{T_{QI}} \left(\frac{\Lambda_{TC}}{m_{\Phi_I^0}^2} \right)^2, \quad (15)$$

where their masses are free parameters in this context. However, the mass can be easily generated dynamically by assuming another strong interaction, e.g. $SU(2)'$ mentioned before, whose charge only these scalars carry and the radial components become Φ_I^0 .

The down-quarks mass matrix can be generated similarly and the difference compared with the up-quarks mass matrix will be due to the difference in Yukawa couplings and technifermion masses.

Let V_u and U_d be the matrices which diagonalize the up-quarks and down-quarks mass matrices, respectively. Since the initial mass matrices are of block-form, V_u and U_d will also naturally be of block-form. However different blocks can have different phase ambiguities so that mixing matrix can have different phases for different blocks. Hence, we can construct the mixing matrix as

$$K = V_u^\dagger U_d, \quad (16)$$

where

$$V_u = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\delta_{11}}V_{11} & e^{i\delta_{12}}V_{12} \\ e^{-i\delta_{12}}V_{21} & e^{i\delta_{22}}V_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad U_d = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\tilde{\delta}_{11}}U_{11} & e^{i\tilde{\delta}_{12}}U_{12} \\ e^{-i\tilde{\delta}_{12}}U_{21} & e^{i\tilde{\delta}_{22}}U_{22} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (17)$$

In principle, a 4×4 unitary matrix can have three independent phases. So, we identify $\delta_{11} = \tilde{\delta}_{11}$ and $\delta_{22} = \tilde{\delta}_{22}$, then there remain three independent phases, namely, $\delta_{12} - \tilde{\delta}_{12}$, $\delta_{11} - \delta_{12}$, and

$\delta_{22} + \delta_{12}$. The first 3×3 submatrix of this 4×4 matrix can be identified as the usual CKM matrix, albeit parametrized in terms of the usual Eulerian angles. Needless to say, there is a unitary transformation changing this to the standard CKM parametrization. Due to the structure of the mass matrix, the off-diagonal-blocks are smaller by order of $c_{12}m_{T_Q}/\Lambda_{\text{TC}}$ than the diagonal blocks, and so is the mixing matrix. This can easily explain why in the CKM matrix, the top mixings to the first two generations are smaller by order of 10^{-2} than the mixing of the first with the second generations. This in turn explains the suppression of FCNC.

To leading order the diagonalized masses are (assuming all Yukawa couplings are of order unity) of the form

$$m_u : m_c : m_t : m_{t'} \\ \sim m_{T_{Q1}} \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{TC}}}{m_{\Phi_1^0}} \right)^2 : m_{T_{Q1}} : m_{T_{Q2}} \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{TC}}}{m_{\Phi_2^0}} \right)^2 : m_{T_{Q2}}. \quad (18)$$

There are seven unknowns including $m_{t'}$ and only four relations, so there are three free parameters (in addition to Yukawa coupling constants). Using known masses of quarks and assuming $\Lambda_{\text{TC}} \sim 1$ TeV, we can immediately estimate $m_{\Phi_1^0} \sim 23$ TeV for $m_u \sim 2.5$ MeV. If we further assume $m_{T_{Q2}} \sim m_{t'} \gtrsim 300$ GeV, then $m_{T_{Q1}} \sim m_c$ and $m_{\Phi_2^0} \sim 1.3$ TeV. This in turn will fix the down-quarks masses with suitable Yukawa coupling constants. The mass of the strongly interacting scalar Φ is missing here because the corresponding contribution only shows up at higher orders. These are not strong constraints, and there is much room for variations, including different Yukawa coupling constants. For example, if we have only one sterile scalar coupling universally to all (techni)fermions, then $\lambda_t^0/\lambda_u^0 \sim m_t/m_u$ as in SM, etc., can generate the same mass hierarchy. But we find this quite uninspiring. On the contrary, in our model it is easy to generate the heavy top quark mass and explain the known mass hierarchies in terms of Yukawa coupling constants of similar order of magnitude.

For lepton masses, we can use the same strongly interacting Φ such that the necessary Yukawa couplings are given by

$$\lambda_L \Phi_A \bar{L} T_L^{*A} + \text{h.c.}, \quad (19)$$

where the label ‘A’ is an $\text{SU}(2)_{\text{TC}}$ index. The flavor diagonal contribution is again due to the sterile scalars given in Eq.(13), then, the lepton masses can be generated accordingly. The difference compared to the quark masses is now that the lepton masses are generated by condensation of technileptons T_L ’s so that it can easily accommodate the quark-lepton mass hierarchy. For given Λ_{TC} and $m_{\Phi_1^0}$ estimated from the quark mass hierarchy, we can generate the

lepton mass hierarchy based on the limit on the fourth generation leptons, without unreasonably small or large Yukawa coupling constants. Lepton mixing matrix can be similarly constructed from this lepton mass matrix.

In fact, the structure we have introduced in this letter is fairly generic. As long as one technifermion generation (with or without technileptons) couples to two SM generations as prescribed, all phenomenological outcomes are similar. We can do this even without CC, although less motivated coupling one technifermion generations to two SM model generations. We suspect there might be a larger framework from which this structure can be inherited and justified.

The electroweak precision constraints ruled out QCD-like TC models with degenerate technifermion doublets, but we have good reasons why our model should be safe. The details will be presented elsewhere[16]. First, it is known that massive scalars and extra nondegenerate heavy fermions can contribute to meet the precision data[13, 17, 18, 19, 20]. We have three massive scalars and fourth SM generation, in addition to technifermions that can be non-degenerate. Second, the precision data test is based on TC×SM, not TC×CC×EW. So, it is possible that CC may modify the outcome. Third, strictly speaking, our model is not QCD-like because of technifermion mixing.

Since T_{Q1} or T_{L1} is the lightest technifermion, it is a good place to look for a signal to distinguish this model. Both interact with known world particles above the TC scale, while emitting a strongly interacting scalar, which could lead to a monojet. One may think their masses may be too low, but it is acceptable because neither of them will show up as a quark or a lepton below Λ_{TC} due to $SU(2)_{TC}$. What we observe at low energy will be their (doubly for T_{Q1}) confined objects, whose mass can be quite high beyond the present measured scale. Furthermore, the mass can always be raised by increasing Λ_{TC} or adjusting Yukawa coupling constants.

Both strongly interacting and sterile neutral scalar fields could be candidates for the dark matter. Their masses can be at least of order TeV, which is well beyond the current limit of about 500 - 600 GeV set by LHC[21]. These scalars interact with the known world particles only in terms of Yukawa interactions. The lowest level flavor changing effective Yukawa couplings generated by technifermion condensation appear only at two-loop level, and their contribution to FCNC amplitudes below Λ_{TC} is suppressed at least, even for tree-level Yukawa couplings of order unity, by $\mathcal{O}((m_{TQ}/2\pi\Lambda_{TC})^{2(\ell+1)})$, where $\ell = 2$ is the lowest number of TC loops needed.

Hence, the mass bounds on these scalars are even lower by $\mathcal{O}((m_{T_Q}/2\pi\Lambda_{\text{TC}})^3)$ than those of Yukawa coupled non-Higgs scalars'. The highest mass bound of the latter from flavor physics is about 1 TeV[22]. Then the bound on scalars in our case is at most about one tenth of that, which is lower than the bound set by LHC. Since we have $\text{SU}(2)_{\text{TC}}$, we do not expect the technibaryon problem[23].

The mixing matrix we proposed here accommodates the CKM matrix, yet goes further so that it is a good place to look for clues of physics beyond the SM. There are two additional CP-violating phases involving the fourth generation, hence the model allows much more room for CP-violation. The SM has a difficulty explaining the baryon asymmetry due to insufficient CP-violation. Our current work certainly opens the door to resolving this issue.

One shortcoming of our model is that we still cannot avoid the large number of PNCB's and techniaxions as in most of TC models. The only way to reducing the number is reducing that of technifermions. The possibility of eliminating technileptons based on [15] is under investigation. Also, it will be nice to generate flavor diagonal masses without sterile scalar fields so that we can reduce free parameters.

We have presented our basic ideas briefly in this letter, but more details and variant models will be presented elsewhere[16].

HL thanks the theory group of the Department of Physics & Astronomy at Vanderbilt University for their hospitality while this work is completed. We thank Alex Kagan for bringing references [14], [18] and [19] to our attention. TWK is supported by US DOE grant number DE-FG05-85ER40226.

References

- [1] P.H. Frampton and S.L. Glashow, Phys. Lett. **190B** (1987) 157; Phys. Rev. Lett. **58** (1987) 2168.
- [2] J. Pati and A. Salam, Phys. Rev. **D10** (1974) 275.
- [3] Steven Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D13**, 974-996 (1976); Leonard Susskind, Phys. Rev. **D20**, 2619 (1979).
- [4] E. Eichten and K. Lane, Phys. Lett. **90B**, 125-130 (1980); Savas Dimopoulos and Leonard Susskind, Nucl. Phys. **B155**, 237 (1979).

- [5] Y. Nambu and G. Jona-Lasinio, Phys. Rev. **122**, 345 (1961); J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. **125**, 397 (1962); 128, 2425 (1962); R. Jackiw and K. Johnson, Phys. Rev. **D8**, 2386 (1973); J. M. Cornwall and R. E. Norton, Phys. Rev. **D8**, 3338 (1973).
- [6] E. Farhi and L. Susskind, Phys. Rep. **74** (1981) 277-321;
- [7] K. Lane, arXiv:hep-ph:9401324; arXiv:hep-ph/0202255.
- [8] C. T. Hill and E. H. Simmons, Phys. Rept. **381**, 235 (2003) [Erratum-ibid. **390**, 553 (2004)] [arXiv:hep-ph/0203079].
- [9] W. -C. Kuo, D. Slaven, B. -L. Young, Phys. Lett. **B202**, 353 (1988).
- [10] C. T. Hill, Phys. Lett. B **266**, 419 (1991).
- [11] C.T. Hill, "Topcolor," hep-ph/9702320 and references therein.
- [12] E. H. Simmons, Nucl. Phys. **B312**, 253 (1989); S. Samuel, *ibid.* **B347**, 625 (1990); A. Kagan and S. Samuel, Phys. Lett. B **252**, 605 (1990); **270**, 37 (1991);
- [13] C. D. Carone, H. Georgi, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 1427-1436 (1994) [arXiv:hep-ph/9308205].
- [14] A. Kagan, *Proceedings of the 15th Johns Hopkins Workshop on Current Problems in Particle Theory*, G. Domokos and S. Kovesi-Domokos eds. (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992), p.217, and *Phys. Rev.* **D51** (1995) 6196, hep-ph/9409215; B. A. Dobrescu, *Nucl. Phys.* **B449** (1995) 462, hep-ph/9504399.
- [15] H. S. La, hep-ph/0306223.
- [16] H. S. La, in preparation.
- [17] M. E. Peskin and T. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 381 (1992).
- [18] B. A. Dobrescu and J. Terning, Phys. Lett. B **416**, 129 (1998) [hep-ph/9709297].
- [19] B. A. Dobrescu and E. H. Simmons, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 015014 (1999) [hep-ph/9807469].
- [20] J. Erler and P. Langacker, in Particle Data Group (<http://pdg.lbl.gov/2011/reviews/rpp2011-rev-standard-model.pdf>).
- [21] ATLAS and CMS Talks presented at CERN on Dec. 13th, 2011.
- [22] J. M. Arnold, M. Pospelov, M. Trott and M. B. Wise, JHEP **1001**, 073 (2010) [arXiv:0911.2225 [hep-ph]]; B. Grinstein, A. L. Kagan, J. Zupan and M. Trott, JHEP **1110**, 072 (2011) [arXiv:1108.4027 [hep-ph]].
- [23] R. S. Chivukula and T. P. Walker, Nucl. Phys. B **329**, 445 (1990).