

ILL-(TH)-94-15  
hep-ph/9501256  
Phys. Lett. B 340, 236 (1994)

## Can the Electroweak Interaction Break Itself?

S. Willenbrock

Physics Department  
University of Illinois  
1110 W. Green Street  
Urbana, IL 61801

### Abstract

I examine the possibility that the electroweak interaction breaks itself via the condensation of fermions in large representations of the weak  $SU(2)_L$  gauge group.

The strong and electroweak interactions are described by gauge theories, based on the gauge groups  $SU(3)_C$ ,  $SU(2)_L$ , and  $U(1)_Y$ , acting on three generations of quarks and leptons. At an energy scale  $(\sqrt{2}G_F)^{1/2} \approx 250 \text{ GeV}$ , the groups  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  are spontaneously broken to electromagnetism,  $U(1)_{EM}$ , giving rise to masses for three of the electroweak gauge bosons, the  $W^+$ ,  $W^-$ , and  $Z$ . To produce the spontaneous breaking of the electroweak symmetry, an additional ingredient must be added to the theory. In the standard Higgs model, an  $SU(2)_L$  doublet,  $Y = +\frac{1}{2}$  scalar field is introduced, with a self interaction which forces the field to acquire a non-zero vacuum expectation value [1]. This breaks the  $SU(2)_L$  and  $U(1)_Y$  symmetries, leaving the unbroken subgroup  $U(1)_{EM}$  with generator  $Q = T_{3L} + Y$ .

An alternative mechanism for electroweak symmetry breaking invokes dynamical symmetry breaking. In these models, fermion fields which carry  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  quantum numbers interact via a force which produces a fermion-bilinear condensate. This condensate is constructed to be an  $SU(2)_L$  doublet, thereby breaking the electroweak gauge group to electromagnetism. An unbroken, global "custodial"  $SU(2)$  symmetry is sufficient to ensure that  $M_W = M_Z \cos \theta_W$ , a relation that is otherwise not automatic in models of dynamical electroweak symmetry breaking [2, 3]. An example of a model of dynamical electroweak symmetry breaking is technicolor, in which a non-Abelian gauge interaction produces a condensate of technifermions [2].

The ordinary strong interaction can dynamically break the electroweak symmetry at the scale  $(\sqrt{2}G_F)^{1/2} \approx 250 \text{ GeV}$  if it acts on fermions in larger representations of  $SU(3)_C$  than the fundamental representation, such as color sextets, octets, or decuplets [4, 5]. In the one-gluon-exchange approximation, the force between fermions in complex-conjugate representations  $R$  and  $\bar{R}$  forming a color singlet is proportional to

$$F \propto -\frac{1}{s} C_2(R) \quad (1)$$

where  $C_2(R)$  is the quadratic Casimir operator of the representation  $R$  ( $R$  denotes the dimension of the representation). Since  $C_2(R)$  generally increases with  $R$ , the effective force

is increased between fermions in larger representations of  $SU(3)_C$ . Condensation occurs when  $s(C_2(R)) \geq 1$ , which is potentially consistent with  $\sim 250 \text{ GeV}$  for  $R = 6, 8$ , or  $10$ .

In this paper I explore the possibility that the electroweak interaction is broken by itself via the condensation of fermions in large representations of  $SU(2)_L$ . The main attraction of this approach is that it potentially requires no new forces beyond the known electroweak interaction. An obstacle to the realization of this scenario is the loss of asymptotic freedom of the  $SU(2)_L$  gauge coupling. However, I will argue that this obstacle may be surmountable.

Gauge theories break themselves if the fermions condense to a non-singlet representation of the gauge group [6, 7]. The generalization of Eq. (1) to fermions in the representations  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  forming a state in the representation  $R_C$  is

$$F = -\frac{1}{2} [C_2(R_1) + C_2(R_2) - C_2(R_C)] \quad (2)$$

for a gauge group with coupling  $g$ .

To explore the possibilities, let's construct a simple model of electroweak selfbreaking. Consider a left-handed Weyl fermion,  $\psi$ , in the representation  $R$  of  $SU(2)_L$ , and a pair of left-handed Weyl fermions,  $\psi_a$  ( $a = 1, 2$ ), in the  $R-1$  representation of  $SU(2)_L$ .<sup>1</sup> Cancellation of gauge anomalies demands that  $\psi$  have  $Y = 0$ , and the  $\psi_a$  have equal and opposite hypercharges. The global symmetries of the massless theory, in the limit of zero hypercharge coupling, are

$$SU(2)_L \times SU(2) \times U(1) \quad (3)$$

where  $SU(2)_L$  is the gauge symmetry and  $SU(2)$  is the flavor symmetry of the  $\psi_a$  fields (the global  $U(1)$  symmetry will be discussed later). Write the representation  $R$  as  $\psi^{ij}$  with  $R-1$  totally symmetric  $SU(2)_L$  (upper) indices, and one (lower) Lorentz index. Similarly, write the pair of  $R-1$  representations as  $\psi_a^{ij}$  with  $R-2$  totally symmetric  $SU(2)_L$  indices. The  $SU(2)_L$ -doublet, Lorentz-scalar condensate which breaks the electroweak interaction to electromagnetism is

$$\langle \psi_a^{ij} \psi_b^{kl} \rangle = \epsilon^{ijkl} \psi_a^i \psi_b^j \quad (4)$$

---

<sup>1</sup> $R$  denotes the dimension of the representation; the corresponding weak "spin" is  $T_L = (R-1)/2$ .

where  $\epsilon$  is the  $2 \times 2$  antisymmetric tensor and  $\Lambda$  is of order 250 GeV. This condensate respects the diagonal subgroup of  $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ , which serves as the custodial  $SU(2)$ . The fields  $\chi_a$  must have hypercharge  $-\frac{1}{2}$  to maintain  $Q = T_{3L} + Y$ . The fields and their  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  quantum numbers are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1:  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  quantum numbers of the left-handed Weyl-fermion fields in a model of electroweak selfbreaking.

	<u><math>SU(2)_L</math></u>	<u><math>U(1)_Y</math></u>
$\chi$	$R$	$0$
$\psi_1$	$R \quad 1$	$+\frac{1}{2}$
$\psi_2$	$R \quad 1$	$-\frac{1}{2}$

The quadratic Casimir operator of the representation  $R$  is  $C_2(R) = \frac{1}{4}(R^2 - 1)$ . The coefficients of the effective force between the fermions, Eq. (2), in various channels are listed in Table 2. The condensate  $R \times R \rightarrow 1$  is the most-attractive channel and, for  $R \geq 4$ ,  $R \times R \rightarrow 3$  is the next-most-attractive channel. Thus our first obstacle is the fact that the desired condensate, Eq. (4), corresponding to  $R \times (R - 1) \rightarrow 2$ , is not the most-attractive channel.

Table 2: Coefficient of the effective force between fermions in the representations  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  of  $SU(2)_L$  forming a state in the representation  $R_c$ , in the one-gauge-boson-exchange approximation.

<u><math>R_1</math></u>	<u><math>R_2 \rightarrow R_c</math></u>	<u><math>C_2(R_1) + C_2(R_2) - C_2(R_c)</math></u>
$R$	$R \rightarrow 1$	$\frac{1}{2}(R^2 - 1)$
$R$	$R \rightarrow 3$	$\frac{1}{2}(R^2 - 1) - 2$
$R$	$(R - 1) \rightarrow 2$	$\frac{1}{2}(R^2 - 1) - \frac{1}{2}(R - 1)$
$(R - 1)$	$(R - 1) \rightarrow 1$	$(R - 1) - \frac{1}{2}$

Before we confront this obstacle, let's estimate the dimensions of the representations needed for the electroweak interaction to break itself. For the channel  $R \times (R - 1) \rightarrow 2$ , the

effective weak force is (see Eq. (2) and Table 2)

$$F = \frac{g^2}{4} [R^2 - R - 2] \quad (5)$$

where  $\sin^2 \theta_W = (M_Z^2 - M_W^2)/M_Z^2 = 0.23$ . The critical coupling for the channel  $R = R - 1$  to condense is calculated in Ref. [8] to be  $C_2(R) = 0.3$ . Thus we expect the channel  $R = (R - 1) - 2$  to condense when

$$\frac{1}{4} (R^2 - R - 2) = 0.3 \quad (6)$$

which implies  $R = 7$ , that is,  $T_L = 3$ .

In the case of odd  $R$ , fermion masses are allowed by the  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  gauge symmetries. The  $\psi$  field has a mass term of the form

$$\bar{\psi}_i \psi_j \epsilon_{kl} = \bar{\psi}_i \psi_j \quad (7)$$

and the  $\phi_a$  fields have a mass term

$$\bar{\phi}_a \phi_b \epsilon_{kl} = \bar{\phi}_a \phi_b \quad (8)$$

which respects  $SU(2)$ . Thus the  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  and  $SU(2)$  symmetries are vector-like. Since vector symmetries are preserved in vector-like gauge theories [9], the weak interaction cannot break itself if  $R$  is odd.

For even  $R$ , a mass term for the  $\psi$  field is forbidden by the  $SU(2)_L$  gauge symmetry. This term would be of the form Eq. (7), which vanishes for even  $R$ , keeping in mind that the fermion fields anticommute. A mass term is allowed for the  $\phi_a$  fields of the form

$$\bar{\phi}_1 \phi_2 \epsilon_{kl} = \bar{\phi}_1 \phi_2 \quad (9)$$

which violates the global  $SU(2)$  symmetry and thus violates the custodial  $SU(2)$ . We can forbid this term by requiring global  $SU(2)$  symmetry (in the limit of vanishing hypercharge), promoting it from an "accidental" symmetry to a fundamental one, perhaps left over from a previous stage of symmetry breaking.

If we assume that fermion condensation does not break Lorentz invariance, then a condensate in the channel  $R \otimes R \rightarrow 1$  cannot form, since it is proportional to the expectation value of Eq. (7), which vanishes. For  $R = 4$ , the most-attractive Lorentz-scalar channel is  $R \otimes R \rightarrow 3$ , corresponding to the condensate

$$\chi_{ij} = \langle \psi_{ik} \psi_{jl} \psi_{mn} \psi_{km} \psi_{ln} \rangle : \quad (10)$$

This condensate is an  $SU(2)_L$  triplet, and thus does not yield  $M_W = M_Z = \cos \theta_W$ . Since it is more attractive than the desired condensate, Eq. (4), it is difficult to see how it could be sufficiently suppressed not to conflict with phenomenology.

Let us nevertheless assume that this condensate is suppressed, and that the desired condensate, Eq. (4), breaks the electroweak symmetry. In the limit of vanishing hypercharge coupling and vanishing mass term for the  $\psi_a$  fields, Eq. (9), the model has an  $SU(2)_L$ -anomaly-free global  $U(1)$  symmetry, with the  $\psi_a$  fields of unit charge and  $\phi$  of charge  $2(R+2) = (R+1)$ . This symmetry is broken by the condensate Eq. (4), yielding a massless Goldstone boson. This symmetry has a  $U(1)_Y$  anomaly, but since there are no Abelian instantons, this Goldstone boson remains massless.

The spontaneous symmetry breaking also leaves massless fermions. Under the unbroken custodial  $SU(2)$  symmetry, the fermions  $\psi_a$  and  $\psi_{\bar{a}}$  decompose as shown below:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \underline{SU(2)_L} & \underline{SU(2)} & \rightarrow \underline{SU(2)} \\ & R \otimes 1 \rightarrow R & \\ \psi_a & (R+1) \otimes 2 \rightarrow R + (R+2) & \end{array} \quad (11)$$

The custodial- $SU(2)$   $R$  representations pair up to produce massive Dirac fermions, but there are  $R+2$  massless fields left over from the condensation. When hypercharge is turned on the model has no unbroken global symmetries (besides  $U(1)_{EM}$ ), so these fermions presumably obtain a small mass, but they are potentially too light to be phenomenologically acceptable.

The Goldstone boson and the light fermions can be avoided by explicitly breaking the chiral symmetries from which they arise, for example by coupling the fermions to additional gauge fields, or by introducing a mass term for the  $\psi_a$  fields, Eq. (9). However, the light-

fermion masses are protected by the custodial  $SU(2)$ , and there is a limitation on the amount of explicit custodial- $SU(2)$  breaking which is phenomenologically acceptable.

A truly realistic theory must also account for the generation of quark and lepton masses. This is where models based on dynamical electroweak symmetry breaking may run into phenomenological difficulties. It is not clear how the present approach could help alleviate those problems.

Another obstacle to electroweak self-breaking is the loss of asymptotic freedom of the  $SU(2)_L$  interaction in the presence of fermions in large representations. The one-loop  $SU(2)_L$  beta-function coefficient for three generations of quarks and leptons, a Weyl fermion in the  $R$  representation and two in the  $(R-1)$  representation, is<sup>2</sup>

$$b_2 = \frac{1}{(4)^2} - \frac{10}{3} + \frac{1}{6}R(R-1)^2 \quad (12)$$

and asymptotic freedom is lost for  $R \geq 4$ . Without asymptotic freedom, it is difficult to understand why the condensate forms at the electroweak scale, and not at some higher scale, where the coupling is even larger.

A possible route around this obstacle is to hypothesize that a gauge theory with fermions in large representations possesses a non-trivial ultraviolet fixed point. A similar hypothesis has been studied for QED [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16] and for a non-Abelian gauge theory with a large number of fermions [17, 18, 19, 20]. The one-loop beta function is positive, but for fermions in large representations perturbation theory may be unreliable, even for  $w = \frac{1}{30}$ . The ratio of the beta-function coefficients for the  $(n+1)^{\text{th}}$  and  $n^{\text{th}}$  loops ( $n \geq 2$ ) is proportional to  $T(R)/w = 4$  in the large- $R$  limit ( $T(R)$  is the Dynkin index of the  $R$  representation<sup>1</sup>), and can be of order unity for sufficiently large  $R$ . For a Weyl fermion in the representation  $R$  and two in the representation  $R-1$ , the ratio of the three-loop and two-loop beta-function coefficients in the large- $R$  limit (in the  $\overline{MS}$  scheme) is [21]

$$\frac{11}{72}R^3 \frac{w}{4} \quad (13)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>The Dynkin index for the  $R$  representation of  $SU(2)_L$  is  $T(R) = \frac{1}{12}R(R^2 - 1)$ .

which is approximately of unit magnitude for  $R = 13$ . For  $R = 8$ , the smallest acceptable value, this ratio is about 0.21, which suggests that perturbation theory is valid. Additional large- $R$  representations may be necessary in this case to produce the desired breakdown of perturbation theory.

The model considered in this paper is free of gauge anomalies. However, one must also consider the discrete  $SU(2)_L$  anomaly [22]. This anomaly vanishes if the sum of the Dynkin indices of the left-handed fermions is an integer. For the above model,

$$\sum_r T(r) = \frac{1}{4}R(R-1)^2 \quad (14)$$

where the sum is over the representations. This is half-integer only for  $R = 4N + 2$ , where  $N$  is an integer. Thus the case of  $R = 4N$  is free of anomalies, which includes  $R = 8$ .

In this paper I have suggested that the electroweak symmetry can break itself via the condensation of fermions in the  $R$  and  $R-1$  representations of  $SU(2)_L$ , for  $R$  even and  $\geq 8$ . I hope this will provide motivation for the investigation of the non-perturbative behaviour of non-Abelian gauge theories with fermions in large representations. If the answer to the question posed in the title should prove to be affirmative, the next question will be: Does the electroweak interaction break itself?

## Acknowledgements

I am grateful for conversations with W. Bardeen, E. Eichten, A. El-Khadra, H. Georgi, A. Kocic, J. Kogut, S. Raby, and J. Shigemitsu. I am grateful for the hospitality of the high-energy theory groups at Ohio State University and Fermilab, where part of this work was performed.

## References

- [1] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 19, 1264 (1967); A. Salam, in Elementary Particle Theory: Relativistic Groups and Analyticity (Nobel Symposium No. 8), edited by N. Svartholm (Almqvist and Wiksell, Stockholm, 1968), p. 367.



- [2] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D 19, 1277 (1979); L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. D 20, 2619 (1979).
- [3] P. Sikivie, L. Susskind, M. Voloshin, and V. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B 173, 189 (1980).
- [4] W. Marciano, Phys. Rev. D 21, 2425 (1980).
- [5] J. Kogut, J. Shigemitsu, and D. Sinclair, Phys. Lett. 145B, 239 (1984).
- [6] S. Raby, S. Dimopoulos, and L. Susskind, Nucl. Phys. B 169, 373 (1980).
- [7] For a pedagogic treatment, see M. Peskin in Recent Advances in Field Theory and Statistical Mechanics, Les Houches, 1982, edited by J.-B. Zuber and R. Stora (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984), p. 217.
- [8] J. Kogut, M. Stone, H. W. Yild, S. Shenker, J. Shigemitsu, and D. Sinclair, Nucl. Phys. B 225, 326 (1983).
- [9] C. Vafa and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B 234, 173 (1984).
- [10] R. Fukuda and T. Kugo, Nucl. Phys. B 117, 250 (1976).
- [11] P. Fomin, V. Gusynin, V. Miransky, and Yu. Sitenko, Riv. Nuovo Cimento 6, 1 (1983); V. Miransky, Nuovo Cimento 90A, 149 (1985).
- [12] C. Leung, S. Love, and W. Bardeen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56, 1230 (1986); Nucl. Phys. B 273, 649 (1986).
- [13] J. Kogut, E. Dagotto, and A. Kocic, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 772 (1988); 61, 2416 (1988); Nucl. Phys. B 317, 253 (1989); B 317, 271 (1989).
- [14] A. Horowitz, Phys. Lett. B 219, 329 (1989).
- [15] M. Gockeler, R. Horsley, E. Laermann, P. Rakow, G. Schierholz, R. Sommer, and U. Wiese, Nucl. Phys. B 334, 527 (1990); M. Gockeler, R. Horsley, P. Rakow, G. Schierholz, and R. Sommer, Nucl. Phys. B 371, 713 (1992).

- [16] A . A zcoiti, B . D i Carlo, and A . G rillo, M od. Phys. Lett. A 7, 3561 (1992); Int. Jour. M od. Phys. A 8, 4235 (1993).
- [17] T . Banks and A . Zaks, Nucl. Phys. B 196, 189 (1982).
- [18] J. K ogut and D . Sinclair, Nucl. Phys. B 295, 465 (1988).
- [19] S. M eyer and B . Pendleton, Phys. Lett. 241B , 397 (1990).
- [20] G . G iudice and S. R aby, Nucl. Phys. B 368, 221 (1992).
- [21] O . Tarasov, A . V ladim irov, and A . Zharkov, Phys. Lett. 93B , 429 (1980).
- [22] E. W itten, Phys. Lett. 117B , 324 (1982).