

# FERMION MASSES IN EXTENDED TECHNI COLOUR

by

Nick Evans

Physics Department

Yale University

P O Box 208120

New Haven

CT 06520

USA

## Abstract

Talks presented at Beyond The Standard Model IV Conference, Lake Tahoe, Dec 94: NEW FERMION FAMILIES AND PRECISION ELECTROWEAK DATA :

We highlight a trend in the precision electroweak data towards light new physics and argue that some spectra of strongly interacting technifamilies are plausibly compatible with the data.

## FERMION MASSES IN EXTENDED TECHNI COLOUR :

An ETC model with a minimal number of operators responsible for fermion masses that break the global symmetries in the observed manner predicts the light quark masses.

The up down mass inversion may be explained by

the inclusion of a family symmetric ansatz for the CKM matrix angles.

# NEW FERMION FAMILIES AND PRECISION ELECTROWEAK DATA

NICK EVANS

Physics Department, Yale University, P O Box 208120,  
New Haven, CT 06520, USA

## ABSTRACT

We highlight a trend in the precision electroweak data towards light new physics and argue that some spectra of strongly interacting technifamilies are plausibly compatible with the data.

In the absence of a theoretical understanding of fermion masses we can not exclude the possibility of extra fermion families though the associated neutrinos must have masses in excess of 45 GeV. Such families occur in strongly interacting models in which electroweak symmetry is broken by fermion condensates such as technicolour<sup>1</sup>. The light fermion masses are generated by interactions with the fermion condensates mediated by massive gauge bosons. If these gauge bosons are EW singlets then there must be a condensing fermion with the same quantum numbers as each of the light fermions that acquires a mass and hence a strongly interacting fourth family.

Such heavy fermions do not decouple from oblique corrections to the broken gauge interactions of the Standard Model<sup>2,3</sup>. We define the contribution to the self energy between gauge bosons X and Y by

$$\frac{1}{i} \int d^4x e^{iqx} \langle J_X(x) J_Y(0) \rangle = i \frac{h}{q^2} \Pi_{XY}(0) + q^2 \frac{0}{q^2} \Pi_{XY}(0) g + q^2 \text{ terms} \quad (1)$$

where we have performed a Taylor expansion (explicitly assuming that the new physics is much more massive than the Z mass) and the prime indicates differentiation with respect to  $q^2$ . There are then two observables in Z pole measurements, Peskin's S and T<sup>3</sup>, which are combinations of  $\Pi_{ZZ}(0)$ ,  $\Pi'_{ZZ}(0)$ ,  $\Pi'_{ZA}(0)$ ,  $\Pi_{AA}(0)$  and  $\Pi_{WW}(0)$  in which divergences cancel. In Fig 1a the right hand region corresponds to the contributions to S and T from a weakly interacting fourth fermion family for all possible mass spectra in excess of 150 GeV. The ellipses are the experimentally viable region of the ST plane<sup>4</sup> at one and two standard deviations assuming a top mass of 150 GeV and a Higgs mass of 300 GeV. Such a scenario is disfavoured by the data.

The experimental lower bound on new fermion masses is, however, 45 GeV. If a member of the extra family has a mass close to this bound then the Taylor expansion will break down. The errors induced may be measured by the parameters<sup>5</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \frac{0}{q^2} \Pi_{ZZ}(0) [\Pi_{ZZ}(M_Z) - \Pi_{ZZ}(0)] = M_Z^2 \\ X &= \frac{0}{q^2} \Pi_{ZA}(0) \Pi_{ZA}(M_Z) = M_Z^2 \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$




Fig. 1. a) ST plane showing contribution from heavy and light 4th family b) S'T' plane showing contribution of technifamily spectra

There are still two observables which may be compared with the data but they are now given by  $S'$  and  $T'$ , linear combinations of  $S, T, V$  and  $X$ . The left hand region in Fig 1a shows the contribution to  $S'$  and  $T'$  from a fourth weakly interacting family of fermions with one or more member with a mass below 150 GeV. The data prefers such models with light new physics.

The dynamics of a strongly interacting technifamily below the confinement scale may be described by a chiral lagrangian. The  $SU(8)_L \times SU(8)_R$  approximate global symmetry of the family is broken to  $SU(8)_V$  by the formation of condensates and the low energy theory will therefore have 63 Goldstone like fields

$$L = \frac{f^2}{4} \text{tr} \left[ \partial_\mu \phi^a \partial^\mu \phi^a + \dots \right] \quad (3)$$

where  $\phi^a = \exp[i \phi^a / f]$  with  $\phi^a$  the Goldstones associated with the generators of  $SU(8)$ ,  $T^a$ . To calculate low energy observables we must match the effective theory to the underlying strong dynamics. If the strong interactions are similar to QCD then we can match the effective theory to a scaled up version of QCD<sup>3</sup> and obtain the contributions from the condensing fields  $T = 0$  and  $S = 0:1 = \text{doublet}$ . Such a one family model gives too large a contribution to the  $S$  parameter. However, QCD is an isospin preserving theory whilst we know that the  $SU(8)$  vector symmetry is badly broken in the third family masses and hence presumably by the electroweak symmetry breaking dynamics. Such symmetry breaking effects will very plausibly feed into the technifermion masses as well. We shall approximate the strong interactions using Dynamical Perturbation Theory<sup>6</sup>; the technifermions acquire momentum dependent mass terms,  $m(k^2)$ , consistent with a gap equation analysis and we use the minimal technifermion-gauge boson couplings consistent with the chiral Ward identities. Estimates of  $T$  in this approximation give  $T_{\text{pert}} < T < 2T_{\text{pert}}$  and in the custodial

$SU(2)$  limit  $S = 0.1 = \text{doublet}$  in agreement with the QCD scale up. DPT estimates for  $S$  are still work in progress but we may bound the solutions by  $2S_{\text{pert}} < S < S_{\text{pert}} + 0.05$ . Both extremes agree with the QCD scale up but whilst one assumes the strong dynamics is blind to isospin breaking the other assumes it is as sensitive as the weakly interacting result.

The  $SU(8)_L \times SU(8)_R$  global symmetry is only an approximate symmetry and hence the Goldstone fields will acquire small masses from the perturbing interactions. These perturbations are the  $SU(3)_C \times U(1)_Y$  Standard Model interactions<sup>7</sup> and the extended gauge interactions responsible for the third family masses<sup>8</sup>. We introduce the former by gauging the chiral lagrangian and the latter by including Yukawa interactions between the third family fermions and the vev of the  $\Sigma$  field. Goldstone boson masses then occur at one loop and give masses from the gauge interactions that are small relative to the strong interaction scale ( $\sim 1\text{TeV}$ ) and from the Yukawa interactions that are small relative to the ETC scale ( $\sim 5\text{TeV}$ ). The lightest Goldstone has a mass very plausibly above the LEP lower bound.

We may now calculate  $S$  and  $T$  including both technifermion and pseudo Goldstone boson loops for a one family technicolour model<sup>9</sup>. We show the numerical results for  $S$  and  $T$  for three strongly interacting  $SU(3)$  technicolour models in Fig 1b. Spectra with technineutrino masses close to the current LEP limit and degenerate techniquarks are plausibly compatible with the data. It is reasonable to ask whether this spectrum is compatible with a technicolour model of the third family masses. In general each technifermion and its third family counterpart may have independent ETC self interactions as well as the sideways interaction that feeds the technifermion condensate down to give the third family mass. There are thus three couplings for each flavour that may be tuned to give the technifermion mass above and the observed third family mass and therefore such a spectrum is not unimaginable. A gap equation analysis of the quark sector<sup>5</sup> shows that the techniquark degeneracy can only be maintained simultaneously with the large top bottom mass splitting if the bulk of the top quark mass is generated by a close to critical top quark self interaction.

## References

1. E. Farhi and L. Susskind, Phys. Report 74 No.3 (1981) 277.
2. D C Kennedy and B W Lynn, Nucl. Phys. B 322 (1989) 1.
3. M E. Peskin and T. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. D 46 (1992) 381.
4. Private communication with Dr F. Caravaglios.
5. I. Maksymyk, C P. Burgess and D. London, Phys. Rev. D 50 (1994) 529; P. Barmert and C P. Burgess, McGill preprint, McGill-94/27 hep-ph 9407203; N. Evans, Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994) 4785.
6. B. Holdom, Phys. Lett. B 226 (1989) 137.
7. M E. Peskin Nucl. Phys. B 175 (1980) 197.
8. R. Casalbuoni et al, Phys. Lett. B 285 (1992) 103.
9. N. Evans, Phys. Lett. B 340 (1994) 81.
10. N. Evans Phys. Rev. D 51 (1995).

# FERMION MASSES IN EXTENDED TECHNICOLOUR

NICK EVANS

Physics Department, Yale University, P.O. Box 208120,  
New Haven, CT 06520, USA

## ABSTRACT

An ETC model with a minimal number of operators responsible for fermion masses that break the global symmetries in the observed manner predicts the light quark masses. The up down mass inversion may be explained by the inclusion of a family symmetric ansatz for the CKM matrix angles.

Dynamical models in which electroweak symmetry (EWS) is broken by a strongly interacting fermion condensate, such as technicolour<sup>1</sup>, are very appealing. These models rely on physics already realized in nature by QCD and, since there are no fundamental scalars, there is no hierarchy problem. The light fermion masses may be included in the theory by extending the gauge sector so that the light fermions may interact with technifermion condensates through the exchange of massive ETC gauge bosons ( $m_f = g_{ETC}^2 \langle TT \rangle = M_{ETC}^2$ ) explaining their masses' suppression relative to the EWS breaking scale. Given the almost maximal breaking of the  $SU(24)_L \times SU(24)_R$  global symmetry of the light fermions we should not expect to immediately understand the extended gauge sector without experimental input.

The large top mass ( $m_t \approx 170 \text{ GeV}$ ) may be such a hint. The standard perturbative ETC mass generation breaks down for the top since the ETC scale must be of order  $1 \text{ TeV}$ , the scale at which technicolour becomes strong. We conclude that the ETC interactions of the third family may themselves be strong. The small deviation of  $\sin^2 \theta_W$  from zero is also hard to reconcile with the large top bottom mass splitting in the standard ETC picture. It has been proposed<sup>2</sup> that the large top mass is the result of a strong self interaction. These ETC interactions can not be fine tuned<sup>3</sup> though since there is an ETC bound state of top that becomes a Goldstone when the coupling rises above critical. Below critical the bound state's mass is  $M = (1 - g/g_c)M_{ETC}$ . Since this light scalar is not observed we must have  $g/g_c < 0.9$ .

It is interesting to build models<sup>4</sup> of the fermion masses with strong ETC interactions. We wish though to avoid specifying the precise extended gauge sector for which we have so little data and concentrate on the light fermion masses. For this reason we shall represent the heavy gauge interactions by 4 Fermi operators. We shall also neglect the neutrino masses in the theory since there is clearly something quirky in this sector and put aside the CKM mixing angles to begin with. Let us start by considering the techi and third families only. Electroweak symmetry will be broken by a technifamily transforming under some  $SU(N)_{TC}$  group. The ETC interactions must then feed mass to the third family from the technifamily, the quarks' masses must be split from the tau and the top from the bottom. We shall

introduce the minimal number of new ETC operators that break these symmetries; a single sideways interaction connecting each of the third family members and their technicounterpart will give the third family mass; quark lepton symmetry will be broken by a quark self interaction shared by all quarks in the model; custodial isospin will be broken in the quark sector by a top self interaction. Explicitly the 4 Fermi operators are

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{g_3^2}{M_{ETC}^2} \bar{L}_L E_R R_{3L} \quad \frac{g_3^2}{M_{ETC}^2} Q_L U_R t_R \bar{Q}_L \quad \frac{g_3^2}{M_{ETC}^2} Q_L D_R b_R \bar{Q}_L \\
& \frac{g_0^2}{M_{ETC}^2} Q_L U_R U_R Q_L \quad \frac{g_0^2}{M_{ETC}^2} Q_L D_R D_R Q_L \quad \frac{g_0^2}{M_{ETC}^2} \bar{Q}_L t_R t_R \bar{Q}_L \quad \frac{g_0^2}{M_{ETC}^2} \bar{Q}_L b_R b_R \bar{Q}_L \\
& \frac{g_t^2}{M_{ETC}^2} \bar{Q}_L t_R t_R \bar{Q}_L
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

The model has four parameters ( $\Lambda_{TC}$ ,  $g_3$ ,  $g_0$  and  $g_t$ ) that may be tuned to give the observed Z, top, bottom and tau masses (any fewer parameters would introduce global symmetries that do not exist in the observed masses). The technifermion masses are therefore predictions of the model.

To estimate these masses we must approximate the non perturbative dynamics. We use the standard malecia, the gap equation. Although the uncertainties associated with the truncation of the Swinger Dyson equations are large the self energies are fixed somewhat by the integral equations for the Z and third family masses. We shall indicate the size of errors by using extreme functions for the technicolour running coupling in the non perturbative regime as an example. Our ansatzes for the coupling are that at high momentum it runs perturbatively to either the critical coupling or three times the critical coupling at  $\Lambda_{TC}$  and then below  $\Lambda_{TC}$  the running is cut off. Solving the gap equations gives for an  $SU(3)_{TC}$  group the technifermion masses

$$300 \text{ GeV} < M_Q < 400 \text{ GeV}; \quad M_Q = 20 - 15 \text{ GeV}; \quad 200 \text{ GeV} < M_E < 300 \text{ GeV} \tag{5}$$

This model with a minimal number of operators may be simply extended to the first and second families by the inclusion of a single extra sideways coupling for each family connecting its members to the associated heavier fermions. For example for the second family

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{g_2^2}{M_{ETC}^2} \bar{L}_L E_R R_{2L} \quad \frac{g_2^2}{M_{ETC}^2} Q_L U_R c_R \bar{Q}_L \quad \frac{g_2^2}{M_{ETC}^2} Q_L D_R s_R \bar{Q}_L \\
& \frac{g_2^2}{M_{ETC}^2} \bar{Q}_L s_R s_R \bar{Q}_L \quad \frac{g_2^2}{M_{ETC}^2} \bar{Q}_L t_R c_R \bar{Q}_L \quad \frac{g_2^2}{M_{ETC}^2} \bar{Q}_L b_R s_R \bar{Q}_L
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

$g_2$  is fixed by requiring that the correct muon mass is obtained (and similarly for the first family by requiring the correct electron mass). The model then postdicts the light quark masses. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
m_c &= 1.5 - 0.8 \text{ GeV}; \quad m_s = 0.32 - 0.02 \text{ GeV}; \\
m_u &= 6.6 - 3.7 \text{ MeV}; \quad m_d = 1.5 - 0.2 \text{ MeV}
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

These estimates are in surprisingly good agreement with the experimental values although the up down mass inversion is not reproduced. Of course there are many models currently in the literature postdicting fermion masses at least some of which must be numerical coincidences but hopefully this model demonstrates that ETC is potentially a predictive model of fermion masses.

Finally let us return to the CKM mixing angles that we have so far neglected. The most plausible explanation of the three family scales is to associate them with three separate ETC breaking scales of some  $SU(N+3)$  ETC group. However, if a single gauge eigenstate is picked out by the breaking at each scale then, since it is the gauge interactions that generate the fermion masses, there will be definite mass eigenstates. In such a model the off diagonal mass term must be generated by additional dynamics. In the spirit of the above analysis let us propose a simple ansatz for this additional mass generation that has an  $SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R$  family symmetry and is flavour blind. The extra contributions to the mass matrices will therefore take the form of some new scale  $(\Lambda)$  times an  $SU(3)$  matrix. This ansatz may be coerced to fit the observed CKM data<sup>5</sup> but of particular interest is its ability to generate the up down mass inversion. Concentrating on the Cabibbo sector and choosing  $\theta_2$  as the  $SU(2)$  subgroup of  $SU(3)$  we have

$$M_U = \begin{pmatrix} 1.5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.005 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad M_D = \begin{pmatrix} 0.3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.002 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (8)$$

where in the first, ETC generated, matrices the up down masses are not inverted. Diagonalizing and searching for a value of  $\Lambda$  compatible with the Cabibbo angle we find

$$\begin{matrix} m_c & 1.5 \text{ GeV}; & m_u & 0.003 \text{ GeV} \\ m_s & 0.3 \text{ GeV}; & m_d & 0.013 \text{ GeV} \end{matrix} \quad \tan \theta = \begin{pmatrix} 0.975 & 0.22 \\ 0.22 & 0.975 \end{pmatrix} \quad (9)$$

Simple models of this form are however flawed since the effective potential receives contributions from loops of light fermions which, if they have two separate contributions to their mass generation, give rise to terms of the form  $\text{tr}(M_1 M_2)$  which prefers to simultaneously diagonalize  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ . More complicated models may though be able to stabilize realistic vacua.

## References

1. E. Farhi and L. Susskind, Phys. Report 74 No.3 (1981) 277.
2. Y. Nambu, Proc. XI Warsaw Symposium on Particle Physics, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989)
3. R.S. Chivukula, A.G. Cohen and K. Lane, Nucl. Phys. B 343 (1990) 554.
4. N. Evans, Phys. Rev. D 51 (1995).
5. N. Evans, Yale Preprint YCTP P12-94.