

# Self Consistent $1/N_c$ Expansion In The Presence Of Electroweak Interactions

Chi-Keung Chow and Tung-Mow Yan

*Newman Laboratory of Nuclear Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853.*

(October 17, 2018)

## Abstract

In the conventional approach to the  $1/N_c$  expansion, electroweak interactions are switched off and large  $N_c$  QCD is treated in isolation. We study the self-consistency of taking the large  $N_c$  limit in the presence of electroweak interaction. If the electroweak coupling constants are held constant, the large  $N_c$  counting rules are violated by processes involving internal photon or weak boson lines. Anomaly cancellations, however, fix the ratio of electric charges of different fermions. This allows a self-consistent way to scale down the electronic charge  $e$  in the large  $N_c$  limit and hence restoring the validity of the large  $N_c$  counting rules.

Typeset using REVTeX

The  $1/N_c$  expansion is now generally recognized as an invaluable tool in our handling of the non-perturbative nature of hadron dynamics. The pioneer work of 't Hooft [1] has proven that the large  $N_c$  limit is the weak coupling limit of meson dynamics. Quantitatively, a graph with  $k$  external meson legs can be *at most* of order  $N_c^{1-k/2}$ . For example, meson masses, described by graphs with two external meson legs, are of order  $N_c^0$ , while the “meson  $\rightarrow$  meson + meson” decay amplitudes are suppressed by  $N_c^{-1/2}$ . As a result, mesons are stable and non-interacting in the large  $N_c$  limit. The generalization to include baryons was made by Witten [2], who had shown that a graph with two external baryon legs and  $k$  external meson legs are *at most* of order  $N_c^{1-k/2}$ . Hence the baryon masses ( $k = 0$ ) and Yukawa couplings ( $k = 1$ ) grow like  $N_c$  and  $N_c^{1/2}$  respectively.

In the real world, however, hadrons experience not only QCD but also electroweak interactions. In the conventional approach to the  $1/N_c$  expansion, one simply ignores the electroweak interactions and treats large  $N_c$  QCD in isolation. The results obtained for large  $N_c$  are then extrapolated back to  $N_c = 3$  and applied to electroweak processes. This practice is permissible since electroweak coupling constants are independent parameters. It is interesting to ask what happens to the large  $N_c$  counting rules described above if the electroweak interactions are not switched off<sup>1</sup>. If the electroweak theory is not modified, it is easy to see that these counting rules will be violated by graphs involving electroweak currents.

One possible violation is the  $\rho$  meson two point function induced by  $\rho$ - $\gamma$  mixing. As mentioned above, the  $\rho$  meson mass should be of order  $N_c^0$ . The  $\rho$ - $\gamma$  mixing parameter, however, is just governed by the  $\rho$  meson decay constant  $f_\rho$ , which grows like  $N_c^{1/2}$ . It

---

<sup>1</sup>We believe we are not the first ones to raise this question. In Chapter 7 of Ref. [3] Marshak made a cautionary remark about taking the large  $N_c$  limit “when the leptonic and quark sectors are both involved in the process” (pg. 450). We are, however, not aware of any systematic discussion on this topic in the literature.

follows that the contribution to the  $\rho$  mass by the  $\rho$ - $\gamma$ - $\rho$  mixing diagram grows like

$$m_\rho \sim f_\rho^2 \sim N_c^1, \quad (1)$$

violating the counting rule above. Another example is the  $\pi^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$  decay amplitude by the Adler–Bell–Jackiw anomaly [4,5],

$$A_{\pi^0} \sim N_c/f_\pi \sim N_c^{1/2}, \quad (2)$$

which diverges in the large  $N_c$  limit, in contradiction with the claim of meson stability made above. Moreover, such  $\pi^0\gamma\gamma$  vertices can induced large  $\pi^0\pi^0$  elastic scattering (through photon loops) amplitude of order  $N_c^2$ , violating the counting rule requirement that meson-meson elastic scattering amplitude should decrease like  $N_c^{-1}$ .

Such violations are also present in the baryon sector. Consider baryons with  $N_c$  quarks with the same flavor and hence the same electric charge. (For up and down quarks they are the large  $N_c$  generalizations of the  $\Delta^{++}$  and  $\Delta^-$  baryons respectively.) The electrostatic energies carried by such baryons grow like  $N_c^2$ , in violation of the counting rule that baryon masses should grow like  $N_c^1$  only. These examples of violations of large  $N_c$  counting rules reflect the unsmoothness of the large  $N_c$  limit in the presence of electroweak interactions. Electromagnetic interactions introduce a correction of relative order  $e^2 N_c$  to some strong processes. These effects vanish if we set  $e^2 = 0$ , but otherwise they diverge in the large  $N_c$  limit, independent of the particular values taken by  $e$ .

In this paper, we will try to show that the success of the  $1/N_c$  expansion is no accident. There exists a well-behaved large  $N_c$  limit even in the presence of electroweak interactions. We will show that the ratio of electric charges carried by quarks and leptons are fixed by anomaly cancellation [6,7] of the underlying  $SU(N_c)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  gauge theory. To achieve a smooth large  $N_c$  limit one can consistently scale down the electric charges carried by all the particles by a common power of  $N_c$ . This will introduce extra powers of  $1/N_c$  to graphs involving photon currents and keep them in agreement with the large  $N_c$  counting rules. In addition, the modified electroweak interactions will remain a small perturbation to QCD, as they are in the real world.

For the  $SU(N_c)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  gauge theory to be renormalizable, it is necessary to have all chiral anomalies cancelled. For example, the triangular anomalies [8], describing the interaction of three gauge bosons interaction through fermion loops, must be cancelled exactly. In one generation standard model, the fermions fall into the representations listed below:

Fields	$SU(N_c)_c$	$SU(2)_L$	$U(1)_Y$
$\begin{pmatrix} u_L \\ d_L \end{pmatrix}$	3	2	$Y_Q$
$u_R$	3	1	$Y_u$
$d_R$	3	1	$Y_d$
$\begin{pmatrix} \nu_L \\ e_L \end{pmatrix}$	1	2	$Y_L$
$e_R$	1	1	$Y_e$

Only the following triangular anomalies do not cancel trivially and provide constraints on the hypercharges of different fermions.

$$U(1)_Y^3 : \quad 2N_c Y_Q^3 - N_c Y_u^3 - N_c Y_d^3 + 2Y_L^3 - Y_e^3 = 0, \quad (3a)$$

$$U(1)_Y SU(2)_L^2 : \quad N_c Y_Q + Y_L = 0, \quad (3b)$$

$$U(1)_Y SU(N_c)_c^2 : \quad 2Y_Q - Y_u - Y_d = 0, \quad (3c)$$

and the mixed gauge-gravitational anomaly [9–11] provide a fourth constraint<sup>2</sup>:

$$U(1)_Y(\text{graviton})^2 : \quad 2N_c Y_Q - N_c Y_u - N_c Y_d + 2Y_L - Y_e = 0. \quad (3d)$$

One can eliminate  $Y_L$  and  $Y_e$  from Eq. (3a) by Eq. (3b) and Eq. (3d). With  $Y = \frac{1}{2}(Y_u - Y_d)$ , Eq. (3c) gives  $Y_u = Y_Q + Y$  and  $Y_d = Y_Q - Y$ , and Eq. (3a) becomes

$$2N_c Y_Q^3 - N_c (Y_Q + Y)^3 - N_c (Y_Q - Y)^3 + 2(-N_c Y_Q)^3 - (-2N_c Y_Q)^3 = 0, \quad (4)$$

which can be further reduced to

---

<sup>2</sup>Yet another chiral anomaly, the global chiral  $SU(2)$  anomaly [12], constrain the number of left-handed fermion doublets to be even, hence requiring  $N_c$  to be odd and leaving the baryons as fermions.

$$Y_Q(N_c^2 Y_Q^2 - Y^2) = 0. \quad (5)$$

There are clearly two solutions to this equation. The “bizarre” solution [13] with  $Y_Q = 0$  which gives

$$Y_Q = Y_L = Y_e = 0, \quad Y_u = -Y_d, \quad (6)$$

is phenomenologically uninteresting for reasons detailed in Ref. [14]. That leaves us with the “standard” solution with  $Y = N_c Y_Q$  (choosing  $Y = -N_c Y_Q$  just reverses the labels “up” and “down” quarks),

$$(Y_Q, Y_u, Y_d, Y_L, Y_e) = (1, N_c + 1, -N_c + 1, -N_c, -2N_c)Y_Q. \quad (7)$$

All the hypercharges are fixed up to an overall proportionality constant.

The electric charge is defined as,

$$Q = e(I_3 + Y/Y_0). \quad (8)$$

Since electromagnetic interactions conserves parity, the left-handed quarks and leptons must carry the same electric charges as their right-handed counterparts. This fixes  $Y_0 = 2N_c Y_Q$  and

$$(Q_u, Q_d, Q_e, Q_\nu) = \left(\frac{N_c + 1}{2N_c}, \frac{-N_c + 1}{2N_c}, -1, 0\right)e. \quad (9)$$

By putting  $N_c = 3$ , the normal charge assignments are recovered. Hence we have shown that charge quantization follows from anomaly cancellations for arbitrary odd  $N_c$ . This observation is crucial for our later discussion as it provides a unique way to scale down all the charges of the quarks by scaling down the electronic charge  $e$  with anomaly cancellation all the way.

The world described by Eq. (9) shares many features of the real world. The neutrino is still electrically neutral, and the  $Q_u - Q_d = -Q_e$  equality is preserved so that  $\beta$ -decays can still happen. In the large  $N_c$  limit, the up and down quarks carry charges  $+e/2$  and  $-e/2$  respectively ( $2e/3$  and  $-e/3$  in the real world), but the  $q\bar{q}$  mesons still have charges  $e, 0$ , or

$-e$  as in the real world. The proton has  $(N_c + 1)/2$  up quarks and  $(N_c - 1)/2$  down quarks and hence its charge is

$$Q_p = e \left( \frac{N_c + 1}{2} \frac{N_c + 1}{2N_c} - \frac{N_c - 1}{2} \frac{N_c - 1}{2N_c} \right) = e, \quad (10)$$

and the hydrogen atom stays neutral. The neutron, on the other hand, carries no electric charge as usual.

$$Q_n = e \left( \frac{N_c - 1}{2} \frac{N_c + 1}{2N_c} - \frac{N_c + 1}{2} \frac{N_c - 1}{2N_c} \right) = 0. \quad (11)$$

Coming back to large  $N_c$  counting rules, the  $\pi^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$  decay is given by,

$$A_\pi^0 \sim \frac{N_c(Q_u^2 - Q_d^2)}{f_\pi}. \quad (12)$$

As mentioned above,  $N_c/f_\pi \sim N_c^{1/2}$  but now we have an additional suppression factor from the electric charges,  $Q_u^2 - Q_d^2 = e^2/N_c$ . Hence

$$A_\pi^0 \sim \frac{e^2}{f_\pi} \sim N_c^{1/2}, \quad (13)$$

and the counting rules are satisfied.

The  $\rho$ - $\gamma$  mixing problem, however, still persists. The  $\rho$ - $\gamma$  mixing amplitude  $A_{\rho\gamma}$  is given by,

$$A_{\rho\gamma} = f_\rho(Q_u - Q_d) = ef_\rho, \quad (14)$$

which diverges as before. Also, the  $\Delta$  baryon self-energy still diverges as  $N_c^2$ , violating the counting rules.

As suggested before, one of the possible remedies to the situation is to scale down the electronic charge  $e$  in the large  $N_c$  limit, providing extra suppression factors. Since we are scaling the strong coupling constant  $g_3$  by keeping  $g_3^2 N_c = \text{constant}$ , it is natural to impose the electric charge scaling condition as

$$e^2 N_c = \text{constant}, \quad \text{as } N_c \rightarrow \infty. \quad (15)$$

With  $e^2 \sim N_c^{-1}$ ,  $A_{\rho\gamma}$  is suppressed in the large  $N_c$  limit,

$$A_{\rho\gamma} = ef_\rho \sim N_c^0, \quad (16)$$

and the  $\Delta$  baryon electrostatic self energy is

$$M_{elec} \sim e^2 N_c^2 \sim N_c, \quad (17)$$

exactly as specified by the counting rules. In general, it is easy to prove that Eq. (15) is sufficient to keep all the large  $N_c$  counting rules intact even in the presence of photons. We first note that the  $q\bar{q}\gamma$  vertex is of the same order as the  $q\bar{q}g$  vertex (both of order  $N_c^{-1/2}$ ), and replacing an internal gluon line from a planar diagram with a photon line does not produce additional powers of  $N_c$ . An analysis similar to the one given by Witten [2] can be readily carried out. Moreover, the couplings of quarks to leptons or  $W^\pm$  via exchange of photons present no difficulties as a consequence of Eq. (15). Thus the graphs with photon lines are either of the same order in  $N_c$  as the leading planar diagrams, or are simply dominated by the latter. Hence condition (15) is sufficient to guarantee the validity of the large  $N_c$  counting rules.

Our conclusions can be easily generalized to the case of weak currents. The graphs with  $W^\pm$  and  $Z^0$  lines can violate the large  $N_c$  counting rules unless the conditions like

$$g_2^2 N_c = \text{constant}, \quad \text{as } N_c \rightarrow \infty, \quad (18)$$

are imposed, where  $g_2$  is the  $SU(2)_L$  coupling constant. It is a general feature that *all* coupling constants must be scaled down correspondingly even though we are taking the large  $N_c$  limit of only *one* of the gauge groups.

One should also note that the large  $N_c$  scaling conditions Eq. (15) and (18) are not the only ones which lead to a smooth large  $N_c$  limit. It is easy to see that any scaling conditions like

$$e^2 \sim N_c^{-m}, \quad \text{as } N_c \rightarrow \infty, \quad (19)$$

with  $m \geq 1$  is going to give a smooth  $1/N_c$  limit. Conditions (15) and (18) are just the critical cases with  $m = 1$ . A large suppression power  $m$ , on the other hand, will lead to severe

suppression of electroweak effects in the large  $N_c$  limit. It is noted that the conventional approach of switching off the electroweak interaction before taking the large  $N_c$  limit is equivalent to taking  $m \rightarrow \infty$  in this formalism.

Lastly, it is natural to ask if there exists any well-defined limit of the weak mixing angle  $\theta_W$  in the large  $N_c$  limit. It seems to us that, since the coupling constants of  $U(1)_Y$  and  $SU(2)_L$  are independent quantities, the value of  $\theta_W$  is not constrained unless we start with some grand unified gauge group. It turns out that no simple analogs of  $SU(5)$  or  $SO(10)$  grand unifications exist for  $SU(N_c)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ . Hence  $\theta_W$  is unconstrained in the present stage of our understanding of the large  $N_c$  limit.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

C.K.C. would like to thank Dan Pirjol for asking about the  $\pi^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$  process in the large  $N_c$  limit, which initiates this study. This work is supported in part by the National Science Foundation.



## REFERENCES

- [1] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. **B72** 461 (1974).
- [2] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B160** 57 (1979).
- [3] R.E. Marshak, “Conceptual Foundations of Modern Particle Physics”, World Scientific, Singapore (1993).
- [4] S.L. Adler, Phys. Rev. **177** 2426 (1969).
- [5] J.S. Bell and R. Jackiw, Nuovo Cim. **A60** 47 (1969).
- [6] D. Gross and R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. **D6** 47 (1972).
- [7] C.Q. Geng and R.E. Marshak, Phys. Rev. **D39** 693 (1989).
- [8] W.A. Bardeen, Phys. Rev. **184** 1848 (1969).
- [9] R. Delbourgo and A. Salem, Phys. Lett. **B40** 381 (1972).
- [10] T. Eguchi and P. Freund, Phys. Rev. Lett. **37** 1251 (1976).
- [11] L. Alvarez-Gaumé and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B234** 269 (1983).
- [12] E. Witten, Phys. Lett. **B117** 324 (1982).
- [13] J.A. Minahan, P. Ramons and R.C. Warner, Phys. Rev. **D41** 716 (1990).
- [14] C.Q. Geng and R.E. Marshak, Phys. Rev. **D41** 717 (1990).