Little H iggs and Custodial SU (2)

Spencer Chang and Jay G.W acker

Je erson Physical Laboratory Harvard University Cambridge, MA 02138

Abstract

In this note we present a little H iggs m odel that has custodial SU (2) as an approximate symmetry. This theory is a simple modil cation of the M inimal M oose" with SO (5) global symmetries protecting the H iggs mass. This allows for a simple limit where TeV physics makes small contributions to precision electroweak observables. The spectrum of particles and their couplings to Standard M odel elds are studied in detail. At low energies this m odel has two H iggs doublets and it favours a light H iggs from precision electroweak bounds, though for di erent reasons than in the Standard M odel. The limit on the breaking scale, f, is roughly 700 G eV, with a top partner of 2 TeV, W ⁰ and B ⁰ of 2.5 TeV, and heavy H iggs partners of 2 TeV. These particles are easily accessible at hadron colliders.

1 Introduction

Recently the little Higgs mechanism has been proposed as a way to stabilise the weak scale from the radiative corrections of the Standard M odel. In little Higgs models the Standard M odel Higgs boson is a pseudo-G oldstone and is kept light by approximate non-linear sym metries [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7], see [8, 9] for summaries of the physics and [13, 14, 15, 16] for more detailed phenomenology. The little Higgs mechanism requires that two separate couplings communicate to the Higgs su cient breaking of the non-linear symmetry to generate a Higgs mass. The weak scale is radiatively generated two loop factors beneath the cut-o

10 30 TeV.Little Higgs models predict a host of new particles at the TeV scale that cancel the low energy quadratic divergences to the Higgs mass from Standard Model elds. The little Higgs mechanism has particles of the same spin cancel the quadratic divergences to the Higgs mass, i.e. a ferm ion cancels a quadratic divergence from a ferm ion. In models described by \theory space," such as the M inim al Moose, particles of the same spin and quantum numbers cancel quadratic divergences, for example a TeV scale vector that transforms as a SU (2)_L triplet cancels the W quadratic divergence. To avoid ne-tuning the Higgs potential by more then O (20%) the top quark one loop quadratic divergence should be cut o by roughly 2 TeV, the quadratic divergence from SU (2) should be cut o by 8 TeV.

These TeV scale particles are heavier than the current experimental limits on direct searches, however these particles may have elects at low energy by contributing to higher dimension operators in the Standard M odel after integrating them out. The elects of integrating out the TeV scale partners have been considered in [10, 11, 12] and have provided constraints on some little H iggs models from precision electrow eak observables. Understanding what constraints are placed on each little H iggs model is a detailed question but their them es are the same throughout. The arguments for the most severe constraints on the <code>\littlest H iggs" model discussed in [11, 12] arise from the massive vector bosons interactions because they can contribute to low energy four Ferm i operators and violate custodial SU (2). C onsider the B⁰ which cancels the quadratic divergence of the B, the gauge eigenstates are related to the physical eigenstates by:</code>

$$B = \cos^{0}B_{1} + \sin^{0}B_{2} \qquad B^{0} = \cos^{0}B_{2} \sin^{0}B_{1} \qquad (1.1)$$

where the mixing angles are related to the high energy gauge couplings through:

$$g_1^0 = \frac{g^0}{\cos^0}$$
 $g_2^0 = \frac{g^0}{\sin^0}$ (1.2)

where g^0 is the low energy U (1)_Y gauge coupling. W ith the Standard M odel ferm ions charged only under U (1)₁, the coupling to the B⁰ is:

$$L_{B^{0}F Int} = g^{0} tan {}^{0}B^{0} j_{U(1)_{Y}}$$
(1.3)

where $j_{U(1)_{Y}}$ is the U (1)_Y current. The mass of the B⁰ goes as:

$$m_{B^0}^2 = \frac{g^{02} f^2}{\sin^2 2^0}$$
 (1.4)

where f is the breaking scale. A fler integrating out the B $^{\rm 0}$ there is a four Ferm i coupling of the form :

$$L_{4 \text{ Ferm i}} = \frac{\sin^4 0}{f^2} \dot{J}_{U(1)_Y}^2$$
 (1.5)

The coe cient of this operator needs to be roughly less than (6 TeV) 2 and can be achieved keeping f xed as 0 ! 0.

The little H iggs boson also couples to the B $^{\rm 0}$ through the current:

$$L_{B^{0}H Int} g^{0} \cot 2 {}^{0}B^{0} (ih^{y}\dot{D} h):$$
 (1.6)

Integrating out the B⁰ induces several dimension 6 operators including:

$$L_{(h^{y}D h)^{2}} = \frac{\cos^{2} 2^{0}}{f^{2}} (h^{y}D h)^{2} + h.c.$$
 (1.7)

This operator violates custodial SU (2) and after electroweak symmetry breaking it lowers the mass of the Z⁰ and gives a positive contribution to the T parameter. This operator needs to be suppressed by (5 TeV)². Thus the Higgs coupling prefers the limit ⁰! $\frac{1}{4}$. There are additional contributions to the T parameter that can negate this elect, this argument shows the potential tension in little Higgs models that could push the limits on f to 3 { 5 TeV.

The reason why the B⁰ contributes to an SU (2)_c violating operator is because it, like the B, couples as the T³ generator of SU (2)_r¹ and its interactions explicitly break SU (2)_c. The most straight-forward way of softening this e ect is to complete the B⁰ into a full triplet of SU (2)_c². This modi cation adds an additional charged vector boson W^r. By integrating out these charged gauge bosons there is another dimension 6 operator that gives a mass to the W compensating for the e ect from the B⁰. This can be implemented by gauging SU (2)_r instead of U (1)₂. At the TeV scale SU (2)_r U (1)₁ ! U (1)_Y. W ith these additional vector bosons, it is possible to take the ⁰ ! 0 lim it without introducing large SU (2)_c violating e ects while simultaneously decoupling the Standard M odel ferm ions from the B⁰ and keeping the breaking scale f xed. Thus the lim its on the m odel will roughly reduce to lim its on the SU (2)_r coupling and the breaking scale.

 $^{^{1}}$ R ecall that in the lim it that g^{0} ! 0 there is an SU (2)₁ SU (2)_r symmetry of the Higgs and gauge sector. Only the T³ generator is gauged inside SU (2)_r and g^{0} can be viewed as a spurion parameterising the breaking. A fler electroweak symmetry breaking SU (2)₁ SU (2)_r ! SU (2)_c.

 $^{^2 {\}rm T\,he\,W}^{0}$ transforms as a triplet of SU (2) $_{\rm C}\,$ so no SU (2) $_{\rm C}\,$ violating operators are generated by its interactions.

It is not necessary to have a gauged SU (2)_r for the little H iggs mechanism to be viable because the constraining physics is not crucial for stabilising the weak scale. The B⁰ is canceling the U (1)_Y quadratic divergence that is only borderline relevant for a cut-o < 10 15 TeV but is providing some of the main limits through its interactions with the H iggs and the light ferm ions. The light ferm ions play no role in the stability of the weak scale, therefore the limits from their interactions can be changed without altering the little H iggs mechanism. It is straightforward to avoid the strongest constraints [17]. The easiest possibility is to only gauge U (1)_Y and accept its quadratic divergence with a cut-o at 10 { 15 TeV. Another way of dealing with this issue is to have the ferm ions charged equally under both U (1) gauge groups. W ith this charge assignment the ferm ions decouple from the B⁰ when ⁰ ! $\frac{1}{4}$ which also decouples the little H iggs from the B⁰. There are other ways of decoupling the B⁰ by m ixing the Standard M odel ferm ions with multi-TeV D irac ferm ions in a sim ilar fashion as [7]. H ow ever having a gauged SU (2)_r allows for a particularly transparent limit where TeV scale physics is param etrically safe and does not add signi cant com plexity.

In this note a new little H iggs m odel is presented that has the property that it has custodial SU (2) as an approximate symmetry of the H iggs sector by gauging SU (2)_r at the TeV scale. To construct a little H iggs theory with an SU (2)_c symmetry we can phrase the model building issue as: F ind a little H iggs theory that has the H iggs boson transform ing as a 4 of SO (4)." This is precisely the same challenge as noting a little H iggs theory that has a H iggs transform ing as a $2\frac{1}{2}$ of SU (2)_L U (1)_Y. In the latter case it was necessary to

nd a group that contained SU⁽²⁾ U (1) and where the adjoint of the group had a eld transform ing as a $2_{\frac{1}{2}}$ and the simplest scenario is SU (3) where 8 ! $3_0 + 2_{\frac{1}{2}} + 1_0$. For a 4 of SO (4) the simplest possibility is SO (5) where an adjoint of SO (5) decomposes into 10 ! 6 + 4. The generators of SO (5) are labeled as T¹, T^r, and T^v for the SU (2)₁, SU (2)_r and SO (5)=SO (4) generators respectively.

The model presented in this paper is a slight variation of the M in in alM oose" [3] that has four non-linear sigm a model elds, X_i :

$$X_{i} = \exp(ix_{i}=f)$$
(1.8)

where x_i is the linearised eld and f is the breaking scale associated with the non-linear sign a model. The M in in al M oose has an [SU (3)]⁸ global sym m etry associated with transform ations on the elds:

$$X_{i} ! L_{i} X_{i} R_{i}^{\gamma}$$
(1.9)

with L_i ; $R_i 2$ SU (3). To use the SO (5) group theory replace the SU (3) ! SO (5) keeping the \M inim alM oose module" of four links with an [SO (5)]⁶. The M inim alM oose had an SU (3) [SU (2) U (1)] gauged where the [SU (2) U (1)] was embedded inside SU (3) while this model has an SO (5) [SU (2) U (1)] gauge symmetry, using the T^{la} generators for SU (2) and T^{r3} generator for U (1).

The primary precision electroweak constraints arise from integrating out the TeV scale vector bosons. In this model there is a full adjoint of SO (5) vector bosons. Under SU $(2)_1$

SU $(2)_r$ they transform as:

$$W^{1}$$
 (3₁;1_r) W^{r} (1₁;3_r) V (2₁;2_r) (1.10)

Because only U $(1)_{Y}$ is gauged inside SU $(2)_{r}$ the W^{ra} split into W^r and W^{r3}. The W^{r3} is the mode that is responsible for canceling the one loop quadratic divergence of the U $(1)_{Y}$ gauge boson and is denoted as the B⁰. Finally the V has the same quantum numbers as the Higgs boson but has no relevant interactions to Standard M odel elds.

In the lim it where the SO (5) gauge coupling becomes large the Standard M odel W and B gauge bosons become large admixtures of the SU (2) U (1) vector bosons. This means that the orthogonal combinations, the W⁰ and B⁰, are dominantly admixtures of the SO (5) vector bosons. The Standard M odel fermions are charged only under SU (2) U (1) which means that the TeV scale vector bosons decouple from the Standard M odel fermions in this lim it.

In the remaining portion of the paper the explicit model is presented and the spectrum is calculated along with the relevant couplings for precision electroweak observables in Section 2. This model has two light Higgs doublets with the charged Higgs boson being the heaviest of the physical Higgs states because of the form of the quartic potential. This potential is di erent than the quartic potential of the M SSM and has the property that it forces the H iggs vacuum expectation values to be complex, breaking SU $(2)_{\rm C}$ in the process. This will result in the largest constraint on the model. In Section 3 the TeV scale particles are integrated out and their e ects discussed in terms of the dimension 6 operators that are the primary precision electroweak observables. For an SO (5) coupling of q_5 3 and f 700 G eV and for tan < 0:3 the model has no constraints placed on it. The limit on tan ensures a light Higgs with mass in the 100 { 200 GeV range. With the rough limits on the parameters, the m asses for the relevant TeV scale elds are roughly 2.5 TeV for the gauge bosons, 2 TeV for the top partner, and 2 TeV for the Higgs partners. Finally in Section 4 the outlook for this model and the state of little Higgs models in general is discussed.

2 SO (5) M in im al M oose

Little Higgs models are theories of electroweak symmetry breaking where the Higgs is a pseudo-G oldstone boson and can be described as gauged non-linear sigm a models. In this model there is an SO (5) [SU (2) U (1)] gauge symmetry with standard gauge kinetic terms with couplings g_5 and g_2 ; g_1 , respectively. There are four non-linear sigm a model elds, X_i , that transform under the global [SO (5)]⁸ = [SO (5)]_L]⁴ [SO (5)_R]⁴ as:

$$X_{i}! L_{i}X_{i}R_{i}^{Y}:$$
 (2.1)

Under a gauge transform ation the non-linear sigm a model elds transform as:

$$X_{i} ! G_{2,1} X_{i} G_{5}^{Y}$$
 (2.2)

where G_5 is an SO (5) gauge transform ation and $G_{2;1}$ is an SU (2) U (1) gauge transform ation with SU (2) U (1) embedded inside SO (4) ' SU (2)₁ SU (2)_r, see Appendix A for a sum mary of the conventions. The gauge symmetries explicitly break the global [SO (5)]⁸ symmetry and the gauge couplings g_5 and $g_{2;1}$ can be viewed as spurions. Notice that g_5 only breaks the [SO (5)_R]⁴ symmetry, while $g_{2;1}$ only breaks the [SO (5)_L]⁴ symmetry.

The non-linear sign a model elds, X_i , can be written in terms of linearised uctuations around a vacuum h X_i = 1:

$$X_{i} = \exp(ix_{i} = f)$$
(2.3)

where f is the breaking scale of the non-linear sigm a model and x_i are adjoints under the diagonal global SO (5). The interactions of the non-linear sigm a model become strongly coupled at roughly '4 f where new physics must arise. The kinetic term for the non-linear sigm a model elds is:

$$L_{nlmKin} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i}^{X} f^{2} TrD X_{i}D X_{i}^{Y}:$$
 (2.4)

where the covariant derivative is:

$$D X_{i} = Q X_{i} i g_{5} X_{i} T^{[m n]} W_{SO(5)}^{[m n]} + i g_{2} T^{la} W^{la} + g_{1} T^{r3} W^{r3} X_{i}$$
(2.5)

where $\mathbb{W}_{SO(5)}^{[mn]}$ are the SO (5) gauge bosons, \mathbb{W}^{la} are the SU (2) gauge bosons and \mathbb{W}^{r3} is the U (1) gauge boson. One linear combination of linearised uctuations is eaten:

$$/ x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4$$
 (2.6)

leaving three physical pseudo-G oldstone bosons in adjoints of the global SO (5) that decom – pose under SU (2)₁ SU (2)_r as:

¹
$$(3_1;1_r)$$
 ^r $(1_1;3_r)$ h $(2_1;2_r)$ (2.7)

Under U $(1)_{\rm Y}$, ^r splits into ^{r0} and ^r.

R adiative C orrections

There are no one loop quadratic divergences to the masses of the pseudo-G oldstone bosons from the gauge sector because all the non-linear sigm a model elds are bi-fundamentals of the gauge groups. This occurs because the g_5 gauge couplings break only the SO (5)_{Ri} global symmetries, while the $g_{2;1}$ couplings only break the SO (5)_{Li} symmetries. To generate a mass term it must arise from an operator $jTrX_iX_j^{\gamma}f$ and needs to simultaneously break both the left and right global symmetries. This requires both the g_5 and $g_{2;1}$ gauge couplings which cannot appear as a quadratic divergence until two loops. This can be veried with the C olem an-W einberg potential [18]. In this case the mass squared matrix is:

$$W_{5}^{A} W_{2;1}^{A^{0}} \qquad g_{5}^{2}f^{2}TrT^{A}X_{i}X_{i}^{Y}T^{B} g_{5}g_{2;1}f^{2}TrT^{A}X_{i}T^{B^{0}}X_{i}^{Y} \qquad W_{5}^{B} \\ g_{5}g_{2;1}f^{2}TrT^{A^{0}}X_{i}^{Y}T^{B}X_{i} g_{2;1}^{2}f^{2}TrT^{A^{0}}X_{i}^{Y}X_{i}T^{B^{0}} \qquad W_{2;1}^{B^{0}} \qquad (2.8)$$

Because the elds are unitary matrices, the entries along the diagonal are independent of the background eld, x_i , and so is the trace of the mass squared. Therefore:

$$V_{1 \text{ loop CW}} = \frac{3}{32^2} \, ^2 \, \text{TrM}^2 \, [x_i] = \text{Constant}$$
 (2.9)

There are one loop logarithm ically divergent, one loop nite and two loop quadratic divergences from the gauge sector. All these contributions result in masses for the pseudo-G oldstone bosons that are parametrically two loop factors down from the cut-o and are O ($g^2 f=4$) in size.

2.1 Vector Bosons: M asses and Couplings

The masses for the vector bosons arise as the lowest order expansion of the kinetic terms for the non-linear sigm a model elds. The SO (5) and SU (2) W¹ vector bosons mix as do the SO (5) and U (1) W^{r_3} vector bosons. They can be diagonalised with the following transform ations:

$$B = \cos^{6} W^{r3} \sin^{6} W^{r3}_{SO(5)} \qquad B^{0} = W^{0r3} = \sin^{6} W^{r3} + \cos^{6} W^{r3}_{SO(5)}$$
$$W^{a} = \cos^{6} W^{la} \sin^{6} W^{la}_{SO(5)} \qquad W^{0a} = W^{0la} = \sin^{6} W^{la} + \cos^{6} W^{la}_{SO(5)}$$

where the mixing angles are related to the couplings by:

$$cos^{0} = g^{0} = g_{1} \qquad sin^{0} = g^{0} = g_{5}$$

$$cos^{0} = g = g_{2} \qquad sin^{0} = g = g_{5} \qquad (2.10)$$

The angles and 0 are not independent and are related through the weak m ixing angle by:

$$\tan_{w} = \frac{\sin^{0}}{\sin}$$
(2.11)

and since $\sqrt{30}$, sin $\sqrt{\frac{p}{3}}$ sin $^{\circ}$.

The masses for the vectors can be written in terms of the electroweak gauge couplings and mixing angles:

$$m_{W^{0}}^{2} = \frac{16g^{2}f^{2}}{\sin^{2}2} \qquad m_{B^{0}}^{2} = \frac{16g^{0}f^{2}}{\sin^{2}2^{0}} \qquad m_{W^{r}}^{2} = \frac{16g^{0}f^{2}}{\sin^{2}2^{0}}\cos^{2^{-0}}$$
(2.12)

These can be approximated in the 0! 0 lim it as:

$$m_{B^{0}}^{2}$$
 $m_{W^{0}}^{2}$ $(1 \frac{2}{3}\sin^{2})$ $m_{W^{r}}^{2}$ $m_{W^{0}}^{2}$ $(1 \sin^{2})$ (2.13)

Note that the B⁰, the mode that is canceling the quadratic divergence of the B, is not anom alously light³. The U (1)_Y quadratic divergence is borderline relevant for naturalness

 $p = \frac{{}^{3}The B^{0}}{3}$ in the \littlest H iggs" is a factor of $\frac{p}{5}$ lighter and in the SU (3) M in in al M oose it is a factor of 3 lighter.

and could be neglected if the cut-o $\ < 10 \ 15 \ {\rm TeV}$. The corresponding m ode is contributing to electroweak constraints but doing little to stabilise the weak scale quantitatively.

The Higgs boson couples to these vector bosons through the currents:

$$j_{W_{0}}^{a} = g \cot 2 \quad j_{H}^{a} = \frac{g \cos 2}{2 \sin 2} \quad ih^{y} \quad a \stackrel{!}{D} \quad h$$

$$j_{B_{0}} = g^{0} \cot 2 \quad {}^{0}j_{H} = \frac{g^{0} \cos 2 \quad {}^{0}}{2 \sin 2 \quad {}^{0}} \quad ih^{y} \stackrel{!}{D} \quad h \quad (2.14)$$

where D is the Standard M odel covariant derivative and j_{H}^{a} is the SU (2)_L current that the H iggs couples to and j_{H} for U (1)_Y.

The H iggs also couples to the charged SU (2) $_{\rm r}$ vector bosons through:

$$j_{W^{r+}} = \frac{p \frac{g^0 \cos^0}{2 \sin 2^0}}{j_{W^{r+}}} = j_{W^{r+}}^{p}; \qquad (2.15)$$

where the SU (2)_L indices are contracted with the alternating tensor. Notice that this interaction is not invariant under rephasing of the Higgs: h ! e^i h sends $j_{M^{r+}}$! e^{2i} $j_{M^{r+}}$.

2.2 Scalar M asses and Interactions

In order to have viable electroweak symmetry breaking there must be a signi cant quartic potential amongst the light elds. It is useful to de ne the operators:

$$W_{i} = X_{i}X_{i+1}^{Y}X_{i+2}X_{i+3}^{Y}$$
(2.16)

where addition in i is modulo 4. There is a potential for the non-linear sigm a model elds:

$$L_{Pot.} = {}_{1}f^{4}TrW_{1} + {}_{2}f^{4}TrW_{2} + h.c.$$
 (2.17)

There is a Z_4 symmetry where the link elds cycle as $X_i ! X_{i+j}$ that forces $_1 = _2$. This is an approximate symmetry that is kept to 0 (10%). This potential gives a mass to one linear combination of linearised elds:

$$u_{\rm H} = \frac{1}{2} (x_1 \quad x_2 + x_3 \quad x_4):$$
 (2.18)

The other two physical modes are the little Higgs and are classically massless:

$$u_1 = \frac{1}{p_2} (x_1 \quad x_3)$$
 $u_2 = \frac{1}{p_2} (x_2 \quad x_4)$: (2.19)

The potential in Eq. 2.17 can be expanded out in terms of these physical eigenmodes using the Baker-Campbell-Hausdor formula:

$$L_{Pot.} = {}_{1}f^{4} \operatorname{Tr} \exp 2i\frac{u_{H}}{f} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{[u_{1};u_{2}]}{f^{2}} +$$

+ {}_{2}f^{4} \operatorname{Tr} \exp 2i\frac{u_{H}}{f} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{[u_{1};u_{2}]}{f^{2}} + + h.c. (2.20)

The low energy quartic coupling is related to the previous couplings through:

$$1^{1} = 1^{1} + 2^{1} = \cos^{2} \# 2^{2} = \sin^{2} \#$$

The approximate Z_4 symmetry sets $\frac{1}{4}$ and the symmetry breaking parameter is $\cos 2\#$ 0 (10¹). The mass of the heavy scalar is:

$$m_{u_{\rm H}}^2 = \frac{16 \ f^2}{\sin^2 2\#} : \tag{2.21}$$

A fler integrating out the massive mode the resulting potential for the little Higgs is the typical commutator potential:

$$V(u_1;u_2) = Tr[u_1;u_2]^2 + (2.22)$$

In order to have stable electroweak symmetry breaking it is necessary to have a mass term $ih_1^yh_2 + h.c.$. This can arise from a potential of the form :

$$L_{T^{r^3}Pot.} = i f^4 Tr T^{r^3} W_1 + W_2 + W_3 + W_4 + h.c.$$
 (2.23)

where T^{r3} is the U (1) generator. The size of the e ects are radiatively stable and they are set to be a loop factor less than , 10^2 . The coe cients are taken to be pure in aginary because the in aginary coe cient will be necessary to ensure stable electroweak symmetry breaking while the real parts are small SO (5) splittings amongst the various modes. Expanding this out to quadratic order:

$$V_{T^{r_3}Pot.} = 4 f^2 TrT^{r_3}i[u_1;u_2] +$$
 (2.24)

In term s of the H iggs doublets, $h_{1,2} \ge u_{1,2}$, the potentials are:

$$V (h_1;h_2)' = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} h_1^y h_2 + h_1^y h_2 f + 4 h_1 h_2 f + (4i f^2 h_1^y h_2 + h.c.)$$
 (2.25)

where the h_1h_2 term is contracted with the SU (2) alternating tensor. This potential is not the same as the M SSM potential and will lead to a dierent Higgs sector⁴. There are radiative corrections to this potential whose largest e ect gives soft masses of O (100 G eV) to the doublets:

$$V_{e} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{h_{1}^{y}h_{2}}{h_{1}h_{2}h_{1}f_{2}} + 4h_{1}h_{2}f_{1} + (ib + m_{12}^{2})h_{1}^{y}h_{2} + h.c. + m_{11}^{2}h_{1}f_{2} + m_{2}^{2}h_{2}f_{2}$$
(2.26)

where b $4 f^2$. Typically m $^2_{12}$ is taken to be small to simplify the phenom enology so that the H iggs states fall into CP eigenstates.

 $^{^{4}}$ In the SU (3) M inim al M oose the H iggs potential was identical to the the M SSM because of the close relation between little H iggs theories and orbifolded extra dimensions, see [4] for the precise relation.

R adiative C orrections

There are no one loop quadratic divergences to the H iggs mass from the scalar potential². The symmetry breaking pattern in the potential is more dicult to see, but notice that if either $_1$ or $_2$ vanished then there is a non-linear symmetry acting on the elds:

$${}_{1}u_{1} = {}_{1} + {}_{1}u_{2} = {}_{1} + {}_{1}u_{H} = \frac{i}{4f} [{}_{1};u_{1} \quad u_{2}] + {}_{2}u_{1} = {}_{2} + {}_{2}u_{2} = {}_{2} + {}_{2}u_{H} = +\frac{i}{4f} [{}_{2};u_{1} \quad u_{2}] + : (2.27)$$

 TrW_1 preserves the rst non-linear symmetry but breaks the second, while TrW_2 preserves the second but breaks the rst. Either symmetry is su cient to keep u_1 and u_2 as exact Goldstones, this is why ! 0 as $_1$ or $_2$! 0.

There are one loop logarithm ically divergent contributions to the masses of the little H iggs as well as one loop nite and two loop quadratic divergences. These are all positive and parametrically give masses of the order of ${}^2f=4$.

2.3 Electroweak Symmetry Breaking

At this point electroweak symmetry can be broken. The little Higgs are classically massless but pick up 0 (100 G eV) masses from radiative corrections to the tree-level Lagrangian. The gauge and scalar corrections to the little Higgs masses give positive contributions to the mass squared of the little Higgs while fermions give negative contributions. The mass matrix for the Higgs sector is of the form :

$$L_{\text{Soft M ass}} = h_1^{\text{Y}} \quad h_2^{\text{Y}} \qquad \begin{array}{c} m_1^2 & 2 & h_1 \\ 2 & m_2^2 & m_2^2 & h_2 \end{array}$$
(2.28)

where $^2 = m_{12}^2 + ib$. To have viable electroweak symmetry breaking requires:

$$m_{1}^{2} > 0 \qquad m_{2}^{2} > 0$$

$$m_{1}^{2}m_{2}^{2} \qquad m_{12}^{4} > 0$$

$$m_{1}^{2}m_{2}^{2} \qquad m_{12}^{4} \qquad b^{2} < 0: \qquad (2.29)$$

The vacuum expectation values are:

$$h_{1}i = \frac{1}{p} \frac{0}{2} v \cos \qquad h_{2}i = \frac{1}{p} \frac{0}{2} v \sin e^{i}$$
 (2.30)

⁵M ore generally potentials that only contain any non-linear sigm a model eld at most once can only give a quadratically divergent contribution to them selves.

The potential has a st direction when $= 0_{\frac{1}{2}}$ and when = 0. Unfortunately when $\neq 0$ custodial SU (2) is broken⁶. The phase can be solved for in term s of the soft masses as:

$$\cos = \frac{m_{12}^2}{m_1 m_2}; \qquad (2.31)$$

The breaking of SU (2)_c by the Higgs sector provides one of the strongest limits on the model. For simplicity 2 = ib is taken to be pure in aginary forcing $= \frac{1}{2}$. Taking $= \frac{1}{2}$ is clearly the worst-case scenario for SU (2)_c and not generic because there is no reason for m₁₂ to be signil cantly smaller than any of the other masses.

The parameters of electroweak symmetry breaking can be solved for readily in the limit $= \frac{1}{2}$ in terms of the masses:

$$2 v^{2} = (m_{1}^{2} + m_{2}^{2}) \frac{Dj}{m_{1}m_{2}} 1$$

$$\tan = \frac{m_{1}}{m_{2}}$$

$$\tan 2 = 1 \frac{2m_{1}m_{2}}{Dj} \tan 2 : \qquad (2.32)$$

where is the mixing angle for the h^0 H⁰ sector. The soft masses should not be much larger than v otherwise it either requires some tuning of the parameters so that b' m₁m₂ or becoming large. These arguments will change when m²₁₂ \notin 0: The masses for the ve physical H iggs are:

$$m_{A^{0}}^{2} = m_{1}^{2} + m_{2}^{2}$$

$$m_{H}^{2} = m_{1}^{2} + m_{2}^{2} + 2 v^{2} = x m_{A^{0}}^{2}$$

$$m_{h^{0}}^{2} = m_{H}^{2} \frac{1}{p \frac{1}{1 m_{0}^{2} = m_{H}^{2}}}{\frac{1}{1 m_{0}^{2} = m_{H}^{2}}} = m_{H}^{2} m_{h^{0}}^{2}$$

$$m_{H^{0}}^{2} = m_{H}^{2} \frac{1 + \frac{p_{H^{0}}^{2} = m_{H}^{2}}{2}}{2} = m_{H}^{2} m_{h^{0}}^{2}$$
(2.33)

where

$$x = j_0 j_m m_2$$
 $m_0^2 = \frac{8 v^2 \sin^2 2}{x}$ (2.34)

The heaviest Higgs is the charged H and this has consequences for precision electroweak observables. The mass of the lightest Higgs is bounded by:

$$\frac{1}{4}m_0^2 m_{h^0}^2 \frac{1}{2}m_0^2$$
(2.35)

where the lower bound is saturated as m_{H}^{2} ! 1 and the upper bound is saturated as m_{H}^{2} ! m_{0}^{2} .

 $^{^6} T$ his can be seen by going back to the SO (4) description. By having a phase it is the same as having two SO (4) vectors acquire vacuum expectation values in di erent directions leaving only SO (2) ' U (1)_Y unbroken.

2.4 Fermions

The Standard M odel ferm ions are charged only under the SU (2) U (1) gauge group. Since all the ferm ions except the top quark couple extrem ely weakly to the Higgs sector, the standard Y ukawa coupling to the linearised Higgs doublets can be used without destabilising the weak scale. These sm all Y ukawa couplings are spurions that sim ultaneously break avour sym m etries as well as the chiral sym m etries of the non-linear sigm a m odel. There are m any ways to covariantise these couplings but they only di er by irrelevant operators.

$$L_{Yuk} = y_u qhu^c + y_d qh^y d^c + y_e \ln^y e^c$$
(2.36)

There is no symmetry principle that prefers type I or type IIm odels. This can have signicant implications for H iggs searches.

The couplings of the Standard M odel ferm ions to the heavy gauge bosons is:

$$L_{Int} = g \tan W^{0a} j_{Fa} + g^{0} \tan^{0} B^{0} j_{F}$$
(2.37)

where j_{F}^{a} is the SU (2)_L electroweak current involving the Standard M odel ferm ions and j_{F} is the U (1)_Y electroweak current involving the Standard M odel ferm ions. In the lim it g_{5} ! 1 both ; ⁰! 0 and the TeV scale gauge bosons decouple from the Standard M odel ferm ions.

Top Yukawa

The top quark couples strongly to the H iggs and how the top Yukawa is generated is crucial for stabilising the weak scale. The top sector must preserve some of the $[SO(5)]^3$ global sym m etry that protects the H iggs m ass. There are m any ways of doing this but generically the mechanism s involve adding additional D irac ferm ions. To couple the non-linear sigm a model elds to the quark doublets it is necessary to transform the bi-vector representation to the bi-spinor representation, see Appendix A. The linearised elds are re-expressed as:

$$\mathbf{x}_{i} = \mathbf{x}_{i \text{ [m n]}} \tag{2.38}$$

where m;n are SO (5) vector indices running from 1 to 5, ; are SO (5) spinor indices running from 1 to 4 and [mn] are generators of SO (5) in the spinor representation. The exponentiated $eld_{X_{i}} = exp(ix_{i}=f)$, has well-de ned transform ation properties under the global SO (5)'s and the operator, $X = (X_{1}X_{3}^{Y})$, transform s only under the SU (2) U (1) gauge symmetry:

X !
$$G_{2,1} X G_{2,1}^{Y}$$
 (2.39)

where $G_{2,1}$ is an [SU (2) U (1)] SO (5) gauge transform at ion in the spinor representation of SO (5).

It is necessary to preserve some of the global SO (5) symmetry in order to remove the one loop quadratic divergence to the Higgs mass from the top. As in the M inim al M oose,

it is necessary to add additional ferm ions to $11 \text{ out a full representation, in this case a 4 of SO (5) for either the q_b or the u^c₃. The large top coupling is a result of m ixing with this TeV scale ferm ion. The m ost m inim al approach is to complete the q_b into:$

$$Q = (q_3; \alpha; d)$$
 $U^c = (0_2; u_3^c; 0)$ (2.40)

where α $(3_c; 1_{+\frac{2}{3}})$ and $\tilde{\alpha}$ $(3_c; 1_{\frac{1}{3}})$ with charge conjugate elds of and $\tilde{\alpha}^c$ canceling the anomalies. The top Yukawa coupling is generated by:

$$L_{top} = y_1 f U^{c} X Q + y_2 f \alpha \alpha^{c} + y_2 f \alpha \alpha^{c} + h.c.$$
 (2.41)

The u and u_3^c m ix with an angle $\#_y$ and after integrating out the massive combination the low energy top Yukawa is given by:

$$y_{top}^{2} = 2(jy_{1}j^{2} + jy_{2}j^{2}) \qquad \tan \#_{y} = \frac{jy_{1}j}{jy_{2}j}$$
 (2.42)

A fter electroweak symmetry breaking the top quark and the top partner pick up a mass:

$$m_{t} = \frac{y_{top} v \cos}{\frac{p}{2}} \qquad m_{t^{0}} = \frac{2^{F} \overline{2} y_{top} f}{\sin 2\#_{y}} \quad 1 \quad \frac{v^{2} \cos^{2} \sin^{2} 2\#_{y}}{32f^{2}} \quad : \qquad (2.43)$$

The decoupling lim it is the $y_2 ! 1$ lim it where $\#_v ! 0$.

R adiative C orrections

The top coupling respects a global SO (5) symmetry. This ensures that there are no one loop quadratically divergent contributions to the H iggs m ass and can be seen through the C olem an-W einberg potential. The one loop quadratic divergence is proportional to TrM M y , where M $P_{U^{\circ}}X$ is the mass matrix for the top sector in the background of the little H iggs and $P_{U^{\circ}} = \text{diag}(0;0;1;0)$ is a projection matrix from the U^c. Expanding this out:

$$V_{1 \text{ bop } CW} = \frac{12^{2}}{32^{2}} \operatorname{TrP}_{U^{\circ}} X X^{Y} P_{U^{\circ}}$$
$$\operatorname{TrP}_{U^{\circ}} = C \text{ onstant}$$
(2.44)

which gives no one bop quadratic divergences to any of the x_i elds. One bop logarithm ically divergent, one bop nite and two bop quadratically divergent masses are generated at the order O ($y_{top}^2 f=4$). Since the top only couples to h_1 amongst the light elds, it only generates a negative contribution to m_1^2 . This drives tan to be small since this is the only interaction that breaks the h_1 \$ h_2 symmetry explicitly.

Note that the \tilde{a} can be decoupled without a coting naturalness. This is because there is an accidental SU (3) symmetry that is identical to the SU (3) symmetry of the M inimal M cose.

$$L_{Top} = y_1 f u^c u + \frac{i}{2} y_1 u^c h_1 q - \frac{1}{4} \frac{y_1}{f} u^c h_1^y h_1 u +$$
(2.45)

is invariant under:

$$h_{1} = q = \frac{i \overline{2}}{f} \alpha \qquad \alpha = \frac{i \overline{2}}{f} q; \qquad (2.46)$$

This can be seen by in agining an SU (4) symmetry acting on X. With only the a there is an SU (3) acting in the upper components. The SU (4) symmetry is just the SO (6) SO (5): The SU (3) is not exact but to quadratic order in hit is an accidental symmetry. This means that in principle it is possible to send y_2 ! 4 without a exting naturalness and therefore it is safe to ignore this eld. Performing the same calculation as above, the charged singlet, $\frac{r}{1}$, gets a quadratically divergent m ass and is lifted to the TeV scale.

3 Precision Electroweak Observables

Throughout this note the scalings of the contributions of TeV scale physics to precision electroweak observables have been discussed. The contributions to the higher dimension operators of the Standard M odel are calculated in this section. Them ost physically transparent way of doing this is to integrate out the heavy elds and then run the operators down to the weak scale. The most di cult contribution to calculate is the custodial SU (2) violating operator because there are several sources. Beyond that there are four Ferm i operators and corrections to the Z⁰ and W interactions. There are no important contributions to the S parameter besides the constraints on the model from precision electroweak observables and state the lim its on the m asses.

3.1 Custodial SU (2)

Custodial SU (2) provides limits on beyond the Standard M odel physics. When written in terms of the electroweak chiral Lagrangian, violations of SU $(2)_c$ are related to the operator:

$$O_4 = c_4 v^2 \text{ Tr}T_3 ! VD !^2$$
 (3.1)

where ! are the G oldstone bosons associated with electroweak symmetry breaking. The coe cient of this operator is calculated in this section. This is directly related to . However, typically limits are stated in terms of the T parameter which is related to which diers from when there are modications to the W and Z⁰ interactions with Standard M odel fermions. In Sec 3.4 this dierence is accounted for.

There are typically ve new sources of custodial SU (2) violation in little H iggs models. The rst is from the non-linear sign a model structure itself. By expanding the kinetic term s to quartic order there are operators that give the W and Z⁰ m asses. If SU (2)_c had not been broken by the vacuum expectation values of the H iggs, then there could not be any operators that violate SU (2)_c. Custodial SU (2) is only broken with the combination of the two vacuum expectation values which means that the only possible operator that could

violate SU (2)_c must be of the form $(h_2^y D h_1)^2$. However, the kinetic term s for the non-linear sigm a model elds never contain h_1 and h_2 simultaneously meaning that any operator of this form is not present.

Vector Bosons

The second source of custodial SU (2) violation is from the TeV scale gauge bosons. The massive W⁰ never gives any SU (2)_c violating contributions to the W and Z⁰ mass. The B⁰ typically gives an SU (2)_c violating contribution to the electroweak gauge boson masses but the additional contributions from the W^r vector bosons largely cancel this. Summing the various contributions:

$$= \frac{v^2}{64f^2} \sin^2 2 \,^0 + \frac{v^2}{64f^2} \sin^2 2 \,\sin^2 \, ; \qquad (3.2)$$

The second term is a result of the phase in the H iggs vacuum expectation value that breaks the SU (2)_c and arises because the W^r interactions are not invariant under rephasing of the H iggs. The phase is generally taken to be $\frac{1}{2}$ to have the H iggs states fall into CP eigenstates. This is not generic and requires tuning m²₁₂ to be sm all. Num erically this contribution is:

¹
$$\frac{1}{8}\sin^2 2 \frac{(1 \text{ TeV})^2}{f^2}$$
 (3.3)

where the $\sin^2 2$ ⁰ term has been dropped because it cancels in the conversion to as will be shown in Sec. 3.4. This prefers to be small which is the direction that is radiatively driven by the top sector. For instance at $\sin 2$ $\frac{1}{3}$, this contribution to is negligibly small for f 700 GeV. By going to small tan the mass of the lightest H iggs becomes rather light, for instance, for $\sin 2$ $\frac{1}{3}$ the mass of the lightest H iggs is bounded by m_{h⁰} v with most of the parameter space dominated by m_{h⁰} 150 GeV.

Triplet VEV

A nother possible source of SU $(2)_c$ violation is from a triplet vacuum expectation value. The form of the plaquette potential in Eq. 2.20 ensures that the tri-linear couplings are of the form :

$$h_{1 \ H}^{y \ l} h_{2} \quad h_{2 \ H}^{y \ l} h_{1}$$
: (3.4)

There are two equivalent ways of calculating the e ect, either integrating out $\frac{1}{H}$ to produce higher dimension operators or by calculating its vacuum expectation value. The operator appears as:

$$L_{u_{H} u_{1} u_{2}} = \cot 2\# f i Tru_{H} [u_{1}; u_{2}]$$
(3.5)

A fter integrating out u_H the leading derivative interaction is:

$$L_{e} = \frac{\cos^{2} 2\#}{16f^{2}} \operatorname{TrD} [u_{1}; u_{2}] D [u_{1}; u_{2}]$$
(3.6)

where D $\,$ are the Standard M odel covariant derivatives. Expanding this out there is a term that gives a contribution to $\,$:

$$=\frac{v^2}{4f^2}\cos^2 2\# \sin^2 2 \sin^2$$
(3.7)

The approximate Z_4 symmetry of the scalar and gauge sectors that sets $\#'_{\frac{1}{4}}$ with $\cos 2\#$ 10¹ meaning that this contribution is adequately sm all.

O nem ight also worry that the light triplets in $u_{1,2}$ get tadpoles after electroweak symmetry breaking (through radiatively generated h^y h terms), which due to their relatively light masses could lead to phenom enologically dangerous triplet vevs.⁷ However, these light scalars are not involved in canceling of the quadratic divergences to the higgs masses. Thus these triplets can be safely raised to the TeV scale by introducing $\$ plaquettes" as described in [4], where $= \exp(2 \ iT^{r3}) = \operatorname{diag}(1; 1; 1; 1; 1; 1)$: These operators suitably suppress the magnitudes of the light triplet vevs and do not a fect naturalness.

Two Higgs Doublets

^ SM

The parameter also receives contributions from integrating out the Higgs bosons. It is known that this contribution can be either positive or negative. It is positive generically if the H states are either lighter or heavier than all the neutral states, while it is negative if there are neutral Higgs states lighter and heavier than it. The Higgs potential of this theory generically predicts that the charged Higgs is the heaviest Higgs boson. There are four parameters of the Higgs potential: m_1^2 , m_2^2 , b, and where one combination determ ines v = 247 GeV: If $\frac{6}{2}$ then this analysis becomes much more complicated. The contribution to from vacuum polarisation diagrams is:

$$= \frac{16 \sin^{2} w m_{W}^{2}}{16 \sin^{2} w m_{W}^{2}} F(m_{A^{0}}^{2}; m_{H}^{2}) + \sin^{2}() F(m_{H}^{2}; m_{h^{0}}^{2}) F(m_{A^{0}}^{2}; m_{h^{0}}^{2}) + \hat{s}_{M}(m_{H^{0}}^{2}) + \cos^{2}() F(m_{H}^{2}; m_{H^{0}}^{2}) F(m_{A^{0}}^{2}; m_{H^{0}}^{2}) + \hat{s}_{M}(m_{h^{0}}^{2})$$
(3.8)

where

$$F(x;y) = \frac{1}{2}(x+y) - \frac{xy}{x-y}\log\frac{x}{y}$$
 (3.9)

$$(m^{2}) = F(m^{2};m_{W}^{2}) F(m^{2};m_{Z^{0}}^{2}) + \frac{4m^{2}m_{W}^{2}}{m^{2}} \log \frac{m^{2}}{m_{W}^{2}} \frac{4m^{2}m_{Z^{0}}^{2}}{m^{2} m^{2} m_{Z^{0}}^{2}} \log \frac{m^{2}}{m_{Z^{0}}^{2}}$$
(3.10)

In two H iggs doublet m odels setting an upper lim it on the lightest H iggs m ass from precision electroweak m easurements is less precise. There can be cancellations but it appears as though

⁷W e thank C.Csaki for pointing out that integrating out heavy quarksm ight generate these term s.

the T parameter is quadratically sensitive to the mass of the heaviest H iggs. The spectrum of H iggs generated by the H iggs potential keeps the splittings between the masses of the H iggs bosons constant:

 m_{H}^{2} $m_{A^{0}}^{2} = 2 v^{2}$ m_{H}^{2} $m_{H^{0}}^{2} = m_{h^{0}}^{2}$

with $m_{h^0}^2$ 4 $v^2 \sin^2 2$. This means that if is kept small then the T parameter is insensitive to the overall mass scale of the Higgs. With $= \frac{1}{4}$ the contribution to goes as:

$${}^{1} \qquad \prime \quad \frac{1}{10} \quad \frac{m_{h^{0}}^{2}}{(500 \text{ GeV})^{2}} \quad \frac{1}{4} \frac{m_{h^{0}}^{2}}{m_{H}^{2}} \quad \frac{1}{30} \log \frac{m_{H}^{2}}{(500 \text{ GeV})^{2}} = \frac{1}{2}$$

$$\prime \quad \frac{1}{3} \quad \frac{m_{h^{0}}^{2}}{(500 \text{ GeV})^{2}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{m_{h^{0}}^{2}}{m_{H}^{2}} \quad \frac{1}{30} \log \frac{m_{H}^{2}}{(500 \text{ GeV})^{2}} = 1: \quad (3.11)$$

As becomes larger the contributions to the T parameter typically become larger, positive and favouring heavier H iggs with smaller mass splittings to satisfy precision electroweak ts. Notice that even for $=\frac{1}{2}$ where the contributions to are quite small the mass of the lightest H iggs is only bounded by m_{h⁰} 350 G eV. However the contributions to from the gauge boson sector prefer a small to keep the contributions small, thus favouring a light H iggs.

Top Partners

The top partners provide another source of SU $(2)_{c}$ violating operators arising from integrating out the partners to the top quark: α and α^{c} . Since this is a D irac ferm ion it decouples in a standard fashion as y_{2} becomes large [19]. The contribution after subtracting of the Standard M odel top quark contribution is:

$$t^{0} = \frac{N_{c} \sin^{2} L}{8^{2} v^{2}} \sin^{2} LF(m_{t^{0}}^{2};m_{t}^{2}) + F(m_{t^{0}}^{2};m_{b}^{2}) F(m_{t}^{2};m_{b}^{2}) F(m_{t}^{2};m_{t}^{2})$$

$$r \frac{N_{c} \sin^{2} L}{16^{2} v^{2}} \sin^{2} Lm_{t^{0}}^{2} + 2\cos^{2} L\frac{m_{t^{0}}^{2}m_{t}^{2}}{m_{t^{0}}^{2}} \log \frac{m_{t^{0}}^{2}}{m_{t}^{2}} \log \frac{m_{t^{0}}^{2}}{m_{t}^{2}} (2 \sin^{2} L)m_{t}^{2} (3.12)$$

where $_{L}$ is the t⁰ and t m ixing angle after electroweak symmetry breaking and can be expressed in terms of the original Yukawa and the m ixing angle $\#_{y}$:

$$\sin_{\rm L} \prime \frac{v \sin^2 \#_{\rm y} \cos}{2f} \tag{3.13}$$

U sing this and the expressions for the mass of the t and t^0 in Eq. 2.43 the expression for the t^0 parameter reduces to:

$$t^{0} \quad \prime \quad \frac{3y_{top}^{2}v^{2}\sin^{4}\#_{y}\cos^{4}}{128^{2}f^{2}} \quad \tan^{2}\#_{y} \quad 2 \quad \log\frac{v^{2}\sin^{2}\#_{y}\cos^{2}\#_{y}\cos^{2}}{4f^{2}} + 1 \quad (3.14)$$

This contribution vanishes as $\#_y ! 0$ which is the lim it $y_1 ! 0$ while keeping y_{top} xed. In the lim it of $\#_y = \frac{1}{4}$ $\#_y$ near where m_{t^0} is minimised, the contribution for small goes as:

$${}^{1}_{t^{0}} ' \frac{(1 \ 4.4 \ \#_{y} + 7.5 \ \#_{y}^{2})}{25} \ 1 \ 1.8 \sin^{2} \ + \ 0.7 \sin^{4} \ \frac{(1 \ \text{TeV} \)^{2}}{f^{2}} : \qquad (3.15)$$

This is adequately small for any and the contribution quickly drops with $\#_y$. For instance, with $\#_y$ ' 0:1, t^0 drops by 40% while m_{t^0} only rises by 2%. This means that this contribution can be taken to be a subdom inant elect.

3.2 S param eter

The main source for contributions to the S parameter is from integrating out the physical Higgs bosons. As for the case with the parameter, a two Higgs doublet spectrum leaves a great deal of room for even a heavy spectrum where all the states are above 200 G eV. G enerically the S parameter does not lead to any constraints in the Higgs spectrum because of cancellations:

$$S = \frac{1}{12} \sin^{2}() \log \frac{m_{H^{0}}^{2}}{m_{h^{0}}^{2}} \frac{11}{6} + \cos^{2}() \operatorname{G}(m_{H^{0}}^{2}; m_{H^{0}}^{2}; m_{H^{0}}^{2}) + \sin^{2}() \operatorname{G}(m_{h^{0}}^{2}; m_{H^{0}}^{2}; m_{H^{0}}^{2})$$
(3.16)

where

$$G(x;y;z) = \frac{x^2 + y^2}{(x + y)^2} + \frac{(x + 3y)x^2 \log \frac{x}{z}}{(x + y)^3} (y + 3x)y^2 \log \frac{y}{z}}{(x + y)^3}:$$
 (3.17)

This can be approximated by expanding around large m_{H}^{2} masses and taking $= \frac{1}{4}$:

$$S = S_{SM} - \frac{5}{144} - \frac{1}{16} \frac{2}{m_{H}^{2}} + \frac{1}{48} \frac{m_{h^{0}}^{2}}{m_{H}^{2}} + \frac{1}{24} \log \frac{m_{H}^{2}}{m_{h^{0}}^{2}}$$
(3.18)

These are adequately small in general for all reasonable values of \inf_{h^0} .

3.3 Electroweak Currents

The last source of electroweak constraints comes from the modi cations to electroweak currents and four Fermi operators at low energies. These come from two primary sources, the Higgs Fermion interactions from the current interactions in Eqs. 2.14 and 2.37:

$$L_{HF} = \frac{j^{a}_{W0H} j^{a}_{W0F}}{M_{W0}^{2}} \frac{j_{B0H} j_{B0F}}{M_{B0}^{2}}$$

= $\frac{\sin^{2} \cos 2}{8f^{2}} j_{H}^{a} j_{Fa} \frac{\sin^{2} \cos 2^{0}}{8f^{2}} j_{H} j_{F}$ (3.19)

and the direct four Ferm i interactions:

$$L_{FF} = \frac{(j^{a}_{W^{0}F})^{2}}{2M_{W^{0}}^{2}} \frac{(j_{B^{0}F})^{2}}{2M_{B^{0}}^{2}}$$
$$= \frac{\sin^{4}}{8f^{2}} j_{F}^{a} j_{Fa} \frac{\sin^{4}}{8f^{2}} j_{F} j_{F} ; \qquad (3.20)$$

It requires a full t to know what the lim its on these interactions are, but to rst approxim ation these interactions are ne if they are suppressed by roughly $_{lim}$ 6 TeV [22]. Since sin $\sqrt{3} \sin^{0}$, the biggest constraints come from the elects of the W⁰. The constraints reduce to a lim it on the g_{5} f plane of:

$$\frac{2^{p} - \frac{1}{2f}}{\sin} > \lim_{lm} :$$
(3.21)

C learly for f 2:5 TeV there are no limits on g_5 , for f 1:5 TeV, g_5 1:5 and for f 0:7 TeV, g_5 3.⁸ These are clearly all in the natural regime for the little H iggs mechanism to be stabilising the weak scale. This limit is very closely related to the mass of the W⁰:

$$M_{W^{0}} > \frac{g}{\overline{2}\cos} \qquad (3.22)$$

Thus, the mass of the W 0 > $\frac{2}{5}$ lim. This sets a lower limit on the mass of the W 0 of 2.5 TeV.

3.4 Summary of Limits

To state the limits it is necessary to convert to which is related to the T parameter. While is related to custodial SU (2), is related to physical results and di ers from when there are modi cations to electroweak current interactions. The di erence is due to the discrepancy between the pole mass of the W and the way that the mass of the W is extracted through muon decay.

In this model the Standard M odel ferm ions couple to the W 0 and B 0 and integrating out the heavy gauge bosons generates both four Ferm i interactions and corrections to the $J_{\rm Y}$; $J_{\rm W}$ ferm ionic currents after electroweak symmetry breaking. Following the analysis in [12, 21], the Ferm i constant is corrected by:

$$\frac{1}{G_{\rm F}} = {}^{\rm p} \frac{1}{2} {\rm v}^2 + \frac{M_{\rm W}^2}{M_{\rm W}^2} - \frac{{\rm v}^2}{64{\rm f}^2} \sin^2 2 \quad : \tag{3.23}$$

To determ ine $\,$, it is necessary to integrate out the Z 0 and express the four Ferm ioperators as

$$\frac{4G_{F}}{P} (J_{3} s^{2} J_{Q})^{2} + J_{Q}^{2}$$
(3.24)

⁸ It is not possible to push g_5 much larger than 3 because perturbativity is lost when the loop factor suppression $T_2(A)g_5^2=8^{-2}$ becomes roughly 1. This requires $g_5 < 5$.

which gives us to order $(v^2=f^2)$

$$= T = \frac{M_{W}^{2}}{M_{W_{0}}^{2}} \frac{M_{Z}^{2}}{M_{Z_{0}}^{2}} + \frac{v^{2}}{64f^{2}} \sin^{2} 2^{0}$$
$$= + \frac{v^{2}}{64f^{2}} \sin^{2} 2^{0} : \qquad (3.25)$$

Because all the other contributions to are sm all, the primary limit on the theory comes from the SU (2)_c violation in the gauge sector.

At this point the lim its can be sum marised for the masses of the particles. The lim it on the breaking scale, f, is roughly 700 GeV from the contributions to T from the gauge bosons. The Higgs contributions to could have been large, but because tan is small it turns out to be subdom inant. The mass of the lightest Higgs is bounded to be less than 250 GeV with most of the parameter space dom inated by masses less than 150 GeV. The TeV scale vector bosons are all roughly degenerate with masses greater than 2.5 TeV. The mass of the top partner is roughly 2 TeV. While the mass of the heavy Higgs are roughly 2 TeV from the lim its on f.

If we chose to exclude the A_b^{FB} m easurement as an outlier, the implications for this model are signi cant. Discarding this measurement might be reasonable since it deviates from other Standard M odelm easurem ents by roughly 3 . This m odel does not signi cantly alter the physics of A_b^{FB} from the Standard Model. This measurement is not generally excluded because doing so pulls the t for the T parameter positive which favours a very light Higgs in the Standard M odel and is excluded by direct searches. However there are additional positive contributions that m in ic a light H iggs boson in this m odel. On a general principle, the connection between a light Higgs boson and a positive contribution to the T parameter does not hold in two Higgs doublet models and it is quite easy to have the 02. By ignoring A_b^{FB} the best t for the S Higgs sector produce T T plane m oves 0:1. See [23, 24] for m ore details. This signi cantly reduces the constraints to T 0:15 on this model because all TeV scale physics pulls towards positive T. The contribution from the gauge bosons becomes roughly about the best t for T even with tan 1 and f 700 GeV. This in turn can lower the lim it on m $_{t^2}$ and also remove the preference for lighter Higgs.

4 Conclusions and Outlook

In this paper we have found a little H iggs m odel with custodial SU (2) symmetry that is easily seen to be consistent with precision electroweak constraints. This demonstrated that little H iggs m odels are viable m odels of TeV scale physics that stabilise the weak scale and that the breaking scale, f, can be as low as 700 G eV without being in contradiction to precision electroweak observables. This theory is a smallm odi cation to the M inim alM oose having global SO (5) symmetries in comparison to SU (3). M ost of the qualitative features of the M inim alM oose carried over into this m odel including that it is a two H iggs doublet model with a coloured D irac ferm ion at the TeV scale that cancels the one loop quadratic divergence of the top and several TeV scale vector bosons. By having custodial SU (2) it is possible to take the simple lim it where the g_5 coupling is large where the contributions from TeV scale physics to precision electroweak observables become small. In the model presented, a breaking scale as low as f = 700 GeV was allowed by precision electroweak observables. The lim its on the W⁰ and B⁰ are around 2:5 TeV and them assofthe top partner is roughly 2 TeV . These are the states that cancel the one loop quadratic divergences from the Standard M odel's gauge and top sectors and their m asses are where naturalness dictates. The charged Higgs boson was typically the heaviest amongst the light Higgs scalars this resulted in a positive contribution to T. The limits from custodial SU (2) violating operators favoured a light Higgs boson coming not from the standard oblique corrections from the Higgs boson, but indirectly from integrating out the TeV scale gauge bosons. These already m ild lim its might be reduced by going away from a maxim al phase. Changing this phase would also require recalculating the contributions to from the Higgs sector when the states do not fall into CP eigenstates. There are additional scalars that could be as light as 100 GeV that came as the SO (5) partners to the Higgs. As mentioned earlier in the section on triplet vevs, these states can be lifted by \ plaquettes" to the multi-TeV scale and therefore their relevance for phenom enology is model dependent.

This model predicts generically a positive contribution to T m in idking the e ect of a light H iggs in the Standard M odel. This is interesting because if one excludes the A_b^{FB} m easurem ent as an outlier then the t to precision electrow eak observables favours a positive T 0:15 0:1. This is generally stated as the Standard M odel has a best t for a H iggs m ass of 40 G eV if the A_b^{FB} m easurem ent is excluded.

There has been recent interest in the phenom enology of the Higgs bosons inside little Higgs models. Most of the recent work we believe carries over qualitatively including the suppression of h! gg; [15, 16]. The LHC should be able to produce copious numbers of the TeV scale partners in the top and vector sectors [13].

A nother possible way of removing limits arising from the phase in the Higgs vacuum expectation value is to construct a model that has only one Higgs doublet. All theory space" models automatically have two Higgs doublets so one possibility would be to follow the example of the littlest Higgs" and construct a coset model such as SO (9)=(SO (5) SO (4)) [25]. There may be other two Higgs doublet models that have a gauged SU (2)_r that do not force the Higgs vacuum expectation value to break SU (2)_c.

To sum marise the larger context of this model, it provides a simple realistic little H iggs theory that is parametrically safe from precision electroweak measurements. While it is not necessary to have a gauged SU $(2)_r$, it allows for transparent limits to be taken where the TeV scale physics decouples from the physics causing constraints while still cutting of the low energy quadratic divergences. There are other ways of avoiding large contributions to electroweak precision observables without a gauged SU $(2)_r$. The important issue is that the physics that is stabilising the weak scale from the most important interactions is not providing significant constraints on little H iggs models. This is the deeper reason why the model presented worked in such a simple fashion. Precision electroweak constraints are

com ing from the interactions of either the B 0 or the interactions of the light ferm ions. The quadratic divergence from U (1)_Y only becomes relevant at a scale of 10 { 15 TeV and is offentimes above the scale of strong coupling for little Higgs models. The interactions of the light ferm ions with the TeV scale vector bosons is not determined by electroweak gauge symmetry and can be altered by either changing the charge assignments or by mixing the ferm ions with multi-TeV scale D irac fermions.

In a broader view little Higgs models o er a rich set of models for TeV scale physics that stabilise the weak scale. Each little Higgs model has slightly di erent contributions to precision electroweak observables, but they do not have parametric problems string current experimental measurements. In the next ve years the LHC will provide direct probes of TeV scale physics and determine whether little Higgs models play a role in stabilising the weak scale.

A cknow ledgm ents

W e would like to thank N. A rkaniH am ed, T. G regoire, C. Kilic, R. M ahbubani, and M. Schm altz for useful discussions and comments on this work. We would also like to thank C. C saki for pointing out that radiatively generated tadpoles could give additional triplet vevs. S.C. is supported through an NSF graduate student fellow ship.

A Generators

The SO (5) commutation relations are:

$$[T^{mn};T^{op}] = \frac{p_{\overline{2}}}{2} ({}^{mo}T^{np} {}^{mp}T^{no} {}^{no}T^{mp} + {}^{np}T^{mo})$$
 (A.1)

where m;n;o;p run from 1;:::;5. These generators can be broken up into

$$T^{la} = \frac{1}{2^{l} \overline{2}} {}^{abc}T^{bc} + \frac{1}{\overline{2}}T^{a4} \qquad T^{ra} = \frac{1}{2^{l} \overline{2}} {}^{abc}T^{bc} \frac{1}{\overline{2}}T^{a4} T^{v0} = T^{45} \qquad T^{va} = T^{a5}$$
(A.2)

The commutation relations in this basis are of SO (5) are

$$[T^{la};T^{lb}] = i^{abc}T^{lc}; \qquad [T^{ra};T^{rb}] = i^{abc}T^{rc}; \qquad [T^{la};T^{rb}] = 0;$$

$$[T^{v0};T^{la}] = [T^{v0};T^{ra}] = \frac{i}{2}T^{va}; \qquad [T^{v0};T^{va}] = \frac{i}{2}(T^{ra} T^{la});$$

$$[T^{va};T^{lb}] = \frac{i}{2}T^{v0} a^{ab} + \frac{i}{2} a^{bc}T^{vc}; \qquad [T^{va};T^{rb}] = \frac{i}{2}T^{v0} a^{b} + \frac{i}{2} a^{bc}T^{vc};$$

$$T^{va};T^{vb} = \frac{i}{2} a^{bc}(T^{lc} + T^{rc}): \qquad (A 3)$$

Vector Representation

The vector representation of SO (5) can be realised as:

$$T^{mn op} = \frac{i}{2} \begin{pmatrix} mo & np & no & mp \end{pmatrix}$$
 (A.4)

where m; n; o; p again run over 1; :::; 5 and m; n label the SO (5) generator while o; p are the indices of the vector representation. In this representation:

$$\operatorname{Tr} \operatorname{T}^{\mathrm{A}} \operatorname{T}^{\mathrm{B}} = \overset{\mathrm{AB}}{:}$$
 (A.5)

Spinor R epresentation

The spinor representation is given by the form

$${}^{1a} = \begin{array}{c} {}^{a=2} & 0 & {}^{ra} = \begin{array}{c} 0 & 0 & {}^{a=2} & i \\ 0 & 0 & {}^{a=2} & i \end{array}$$

In this representation

$$\operatorname{Tr} \operatorname{T}^{A} \operatorname{T}^{B} = \frac{1}{2}^{AB}$$
: (A.7)

References

- [1] N.ArkaniHamed, A.G.Cohen and H.Georgi, Phys. Lett. B 513, 232 (2001)
- [2] N.Arkani-Hamed, A.G.Cohen, T.Gregoire and J.G.Wacker, arXiv:hep-ph/0202089.
- [3] N.Arkani Hamed, A.G.Cohen, E.Katz, A.E.Nelson, T.Gregoire and J.G.Wacker, arXiv:hep-ph/0206020.
- [4] T.G regoire and J.G.W acker, arX iv hep-ph/0206023.
- [5] N.ArkaniHamed, A.G.Cohen, E.Katz and A.E.Nelson, JHEP 0207, 034 (2002)
- [6] I.Low, W. Skiba and D.Smith, Phys. Rev. D 66,072001 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0207243].
- [7] D.E.Kaplan and M.Schmaltz, arX iv hep-ph/0302049.
- [8] J.G.W acker, arX iv hep-ph/0208235.
- [9] M. Schmaltz, arX iv hep-ph/0210415.
- [10] R.S.Chivukula, N.Evans and E.H.Simmons, arX iv hep-ph/0204193.

- [11] J.L.Hewett, F.J.Petriello and T.G.Rizzo, arX iv hep-ph/0211218.
- [12] C.Csaki, J.Hubisz, G.D.Kribs, P.Meade and J.Teming, arX iv hep-ph/0211124.
- [13] G.Burdman, M. Perelstein and A. Pierce, arX iv hep-ph/0212228.
- [14] T.Han, H.E.Logan, B.M cE lrath and L.T.W ang, arX iv hep-ph/0301040.
- [15] C.Dib, R.Rosenfeld and A.Zerwekh, arXiv:hep-ph/0302068.
- [16] T.Han, H.E.Logan, B.M cE lrath and L.T.W ang, arX iv hep-ph/0302188.
- [17] N.Arkani-Hamed, Private communciation.
- [18] S.R.Colem an and E.W einberg, Phys. Rev. D 7 (1973) 1888.
- [19] H. Collins, A. K. Grant and H. Georgi, Phys. Rev. D 61, 055002 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/9908330].
- [20] B.Grinstein and M.B.W ise, Phys. Lett. B 265, 326 (1991).
- [21] C.P.Burgess, S.Godfrey, H.Konig, D.London and I.Maksymyk, Phys. Rev. D 49, 6115 (1994) [arX iv:hep-ph/9312291].
- [22] R. Barbieri and A. Strum ia, arX iv hep-ph/0007265.
- [23] M.S.Chanowitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 231802 (2001) [arX iv hep-ph/0104024].
- [24] M.S.Chanowitz, Phys. Rev. D 66, 073002 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0207123].
- [25] S. Chang, \A Littlest Higgs' M odel with Custodial SU (2) Symmetry," to appear.