

The Standard Model of particle physics

CERN summer student lectures ~~2019~~²⁰²¹


Q&A online session

Christophe Grojean

DESY (Hamburg)

Humboldt University (Berlin)

(christophe.grojean@desy.de)



Decay Width and Lifetime

Augustin: “Why can we use "lifetime = 1 / decay width" in our calculations? As far as I remember the energy-time-uncertainty cannot be derived correctly in QM, since time is not an observable, so the "proof" of this connection is performed by analogy. I.e. it is not a proof and hence it would be rather surprising, if it yields correct results. Or is there a new way of showing this with the formalism of QFT?”

▀ The decay width is a microscopic quantity while the lifetime is a macroscopic quantity, computed on average from a large ensemble of many particles.

A particle has **no memory** (decaying probability independent of age)
All particles are **equal**.

Γ
Probability per unit of time
for a given particle to decay

Let us consider a large ensemble of N particles: $dN = -\Gamma N dt$ i.e. $N = N_0 e^{-\Gamma t}$

$t_{1/2}$ time it takes for half of the particles to decay: $t_{1/2} = \frac{\log 2}{\Gamma}$

Probability for one of the N particles to decay between t and $t+dt$ is $p(t) = \frac{N(t+dt) - N(t)}{N_0} = \Gamma e^{-\Gamma t} dt$

Average lifetime of a particle: $\tau = \langle t \rangle = \int_0^\infty t p(t) dt = 1/\Gamma$

In case several decay modes exist: e.g. $\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu_\mu, e^+ \nu_e, \mu^+ \nu_\mu \gamma, e^+ \nu_e \pi^0 \dots$

Partial width Γ_i Total width $\Gamma_{\text{tot}} = \sum_i \Gamma_i$ Branching ratios $\text{Br}_i = \frac{\Gamma_i}{\Gamma_{\text{tot}}}$

Dimensional Analysis

Anna: “This question is about the formula $\Gamma = G_F^2 m^5$. Why is it a mass? And not for example a $(\lambda)^{-5}$ or any combination of different quantities?” & “How were coupling constants calculated?”

$$[G_F] = \text{mass}^{-1} \text{L}^3 \text{T}^{-2} \quad ; \quad [\hbar] = \text{mass} \text{L}^2 \text{T}^{-1}, \quad [c] = \text{L} \text{T}^{-1}$$

In High Energy Physics, it is current to use a system of units for which $\hbar=1$ and $c=1$

$\text{Mass} \sim \text{distance}^{-1} \sim \text{time}^{-1}$

Particle lifetime of a (decaying) particle: $[\tau]_m = -1$

Width: $[\Gamma = 1/\tau]_m = 1$

Cross-section (“area” of the target): $[\sigma]_m = -2$


$$\begin{array}{c}
 \swarrow \quad \mathcal{L} = G_F \psi^4 \quad \nwarrow \\
 [\text{mass}]^4 \quad \uparrow \quad [\text{mass}]^{-2} \quad \uparrow \quad [\text{mass}]^{3/2 \times 4}
 \end{array}$$



$$\begin{array}{c}
 \Gamma \propto G_F^2 m^5 \\
 \uparrow \\
 [\text{mass}]
 \end{array}$$

A priori, the coupling constants are input parameters that need to be taken from experimental measurements

Natural & Planck Units

- $[G_N] = \text{mass}^{-1} \text{L}^3 \text{T}^{-2}$
 - $[\hbar] = \text{mass} \text{L}^2 \text{T}^{-1}$
 - $[c] = \text{L} \text{T}^{-1}$
- 
- Planck mass: $M_{\text{Pl}} = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G_N}} \sim 10^{19} \text{ GeV}/c^2 \sim 2 \times 10^{-5} \text{ g}$
 - Planck length: $l_{\text{Pl}} = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G_N}{c^3}} \sim 10^{-33} \text{ cm}$
 - Planck time: $\tau_{\text{Pl}} = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G_N}{c^5}} \sim 10^{-44} \text{ s}$

In High Energy Physics, it is current to use a system of units for which $\hbar=1$ and $c=1$

Mass \sim distance⁻¹ \sim time⁻¹

Unit conversion: SI \leftrightarrow HEP

E	T	L
1eV	10^{-16}s	10^{-7}m
10^{-16}eV	1s	10^9m
10^{-7}eV	10^{-9}s	1m

- The string theorists will remember:

$$M_{\text{Pl}} \sim 10^{19} \text{ GeV} \quad \leftrightarrow \quad \tau_{\text{Pl}} \sim 10^{-44} \text{ s} \quad \leftrightarrow \quad l_{\text{Pl}} \sim 10^{-33} \text{ cm}$$

- The nuclear physicists will remember:

$$\hbar c \sim 200 \text{ MeV} \cdot \text{fm}$$

$$10^8 \text{ eV} \quad \leftrightarrow \quad 10^{-15} \text{ m} \quad \leftrightarrow \quad 10^{-24} \text{ s}$$

- The others will remember:

average mosquito

$m \sim 10^{-3} \text{ g} = 100 M_{\text{Pl}}$ which corresponds to a distance $0.01 l_{\text{Pl}} = 10^{-35} \text{ cm}$
(much smaller than its physical size, so a mosquito is not a Black Hole)

Lifetime “Computations”

muon and neutron are unstable particles

$$\mu \rightarrow e \nu_\mu \bar{\nu}_e$$

$$n \rightarrow p e \bar{\nu}_e$$

The interactions responsible for the decay of muon and neutron can be described by the Fermi Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = G_F \psi^4 \quad \longrightarrow \quad \Gamma \propto G_F^2 m^5$$

$\begin{matrix} \nearrow & & \nwarrow \\ [\text{mass}]^4 & & [\text{mass}]^{3/2 \times 4} \\ \uparrow & & \downarrow \\ & [\text{mass}]^{-2} & \end{matrix}$

$\begin{matrix} \uparrow \\ [\text{mass}] \end{matrix}$

$$G_F = \text{Fermi constant: } G_F \sim \frac{10^{-5}}{m_{\text{proton}}^2} \sim 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-2}$$

For the **muon**, the relevant mass scale is the muon mass $m_\mu = 105 \text{ MeV}$:

$$\Gamma_\mu = \frac{G_F^2 m_\mu^5}{192\pi^3} \sim 10^{-19} \text{ GeV} \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \tau_\mu \sim 10^{-6} \text{ s}$$

exercise:

For the **neutron**, the relevant mass scale is $(m_n - m_p) \approx 1.29 \text{ MeV}$:

$$\Gamma_n = \mathcal{O}(1) \frac{G_F^2 \Delta m^5}{\pi^3} \sim 10^{-28} \text{ GeV} \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \tau_n \sim 10^3 \text{ s}$$

Higgs Lifetime “Computation”

Higgs couplings proportional are proportional to the mass of the particles it couples to. It will therefore decay predominantly decay into the heaviest particle that is lighter than $m_H/2$

$$\Gamma \sim \frac{1}{8\pi} \left(\frac{m_b}{v}\right)^2 m_h \sim \frac{1}{10} \left(\frac{4 \text{ GeV}}{246 \text{ GeV}}\right)^2 125 \text{ GeV} \sim 1 \text{ MeV}$$

↑
↑
↑

phase space
couplings to b-quark
dimensionally $[\Gamma]_{m=1}$

$\tau \sim 10^{-21} \text{ s}$

Putting all factors and considering the other decay modes, Higgs width = 4MeV in the SM

exercise:

$$\Gamma_Z = \frac{7}{48\pi} g^2 m_Z \sim 2 \text{ GeV} \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \tau_Z \sim 10^{-25} \text{ s}$$

See the exercises for other interesting “computations” relying on dimensional analysis.


Higgs production “Computation”

At the LHC, the dominant Higgs production mode is gluon fusion

strong coupling constant $g_s \sim 1$

$$g_s G_\mu \bar{t} \gamma^\mu t$$

[mass]⁰ [mass]¹ [mass]^{3/2x2}



Higgs coupling proportional to the mass

$$g_{ttH} \bar{t} t H$$

[mass]⁰ [mass]^{3/2x2} [mass]¹

$v = 246 \text{ GeV}$

exercise:

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{8\pi} \frac{1}{16\pi^2} g_s^4 \frac{m_t^2}{v^2} \frac{1}{m_t^2} \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \sigma \sim 10^{-25} \text{ eV}^{-2} \sim 10^{-39} \text{ m}^2 = 10 \text{ pb}$$

flux loop couplings dimensionally $[\sigma]_m = -2$

1 barn = 10^{-28} m^2

One could think that all the quarks should give a similar contribution to the Higgs production since m_t factors cancel. But it can be shown that this cancelation holds only for quarks heavier than the Higgs. Still, a heavy fourth generation is indeed ruled out.

How many Higgs bosons produced at LHC?

$$\sigma \times \int dt \mathcal{L} = 10 \text{ pb} \times 100 \text{ fb}^{-1} \sim 10^6$$

Dimensionality of π

Dauke: “Would you mind elaborating on the dimensionality of pi?”

Anna: “How to explain the $1/16\pi^2$ coefficient in the cross-sections of the decays with loops?”

☛ In HEP natural units, we set $c=\hbar=1$, such that $[\text{length}]=[\text{time}]=[\text{mass}]^{-1}=[\text{energy}]^{-1}$

But these fundamental constants are dimensionful. And it might be useful to keep track of the \hbar -dimensions in addition to the mass dimension of any physical quantity

		M^n	\hbar^n
scalar field	ϕ	1	1/2
fermion field	ψ	3/2	1/2
vector field	A_μ	1	1/2
mass	m	1	0
gauge coupling	g	0	-1/2
quartic coupling	λ	0	-1
Yukawa coupling	y_f	0	-1/2

$$\mathcal{S} = \int d^4x (\mathcal{L}_0 + \hbar\mathcal{L}_1 + \hbar^2\mathcal{L}_2 + \dots)$$

$$[\mathcal{L}_0]_{\hbar} = 1$$

$$[\mathcal{L}_1]_{\hbar} = 0$$

$$[\mathcal{L}_2]_{\hbar} = -1$$

$$[\mathcal{L}_0]_M = 4$$

$$[\mathcal{L}_1]_M = 4$$

$$[\mathcal{L}_2]_M = 4$$

example:
tree-level generated operator

$$[\cdot]_{\hbar} = -1 \quad [\cdot]_{\hbar} = 2$$

$$\frac{1}{M^2} g_*^2 (\partial^\mu |H|^2)^2$$

example:
one-loop generated operator

$$\frac{1}{M^2} \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} g'^2 |H|^2 B_{\mu\nu} B^{\mu\nu}$$

The factors of π are very often associated to loop factors which are counting the \hbar -dimension
Remember the normalisation of the states in QFT: $d^4k/(2\pi)^4$

Lagrangians

Jonathan: “Why is a Lagrangian used to describe particles and their interactions rather than a Hamiltonian?”

▀ The Hamiltonian formalism treats time differently than space coordinates. Therefore it is not so much appropriate to describe a Lorentz-invariant theory. It can be done, of course, but Lorentz invariance is less manifest than in the Lagrangian formalism.

Anna: “When the classical Lagrangian was considered it was a difference between kinetic and potential energies, so $[L]_m = [\text{Energy}]_m = 1$, but then we showed that $[L]_m = 4$. Why is it so?”

▀ In classical physics, the action is the time integral of the Lagrangian:
$$S = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \mathcal{L}(x, \dot{x})$$

Since in natural units, the action is dimensionless, the Lagrangian has a mass-dimension 1

In QFT, the action is the space-time integral of the Lagrangian density:
$$S = \int d^4x \mathcal{L}$$

The Lagrangian density has now a mass-dimension 4

Goldstone Theorem & Higgs Mechanism

Artem: “In the fifth lecture you explained that after ElectroWeak Symmetry Breaking, the $SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauge group is broken i.e. Lagrangian stays the same, but the vacuum changes under the group. Now only $U(1)_Q$ group is unbroken - saves the vacuum. So, we have only one massless particle - photon. This is interesting because Goldstone theorem predicts the number of massless particle to be the number of broken generators $3+1-1 = 3$. But, instead of three massless, we have only one. It seems like Goldstone theorem just can not be applied here for gauge group. Am I wrong? What is the correct explanation?”

▀ The Goldstone th. states that to any broken generator of the *global* continuous symmetry corresponds a massless scalar field (a Goldstone boson). When the symmetry is gauged, like $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$, the Goldstone bosons are “eaten” to become the longitudinal component of the corresponding massive gauge boson.

Remember your QM classes:

“a particle of spin s has $2s+1$ polarisation states”

but you learnt in optics that the photon has only 2 (transverse) polarisation!

Is optics incompatible with QM? No!!

As you might have understood in the QFT lectures, a massless spin-1 field needs to couple to a conserved current, i.e., it is associated to a gauge symmetry. And the Ward identities (=the quantum version of classical symmetry) makes one of the polarisation unphysical. It is only when the symmetry is spontaneously broken that this polarisation remains physical

massless spin-1 field: 2 degrees of freedom massive spin-1 field: 3 degrees of freedom

Higgs Boson

Before EW symmetry breaking

- 4 massless gauge bosons for $SU(2) \times U(1)$: $4 \times 2 = 8$ dofs
- Complex scalar doublet: 4 dofs

After EW symmetry breaking

- 1 massless gauge boson, photon: 2 dofs
- 3 massive gauge bosons, W^\pm and Z : $3 \times 3 = 9$ dofs
- 1 real scalar: 1 dof

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{v+h(x)}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}$$

$h(x)$ describes the Higgs boson
(the fluctuation above the VEV).

The other components of the Higgs doublet H become
the longitudinal polarisations of the W^\pm and Z

EW Symmetry Breaking

Carolina: "In the SM Lagrangian, what we have are the $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ terms? If so, how can we talk about the photon, Z and W bosons when calculating the amplitudes of the processes since they are the results of symmetry breaking and the bosons appearing in the terms would be a "combination" of them?"

Symmetry of the Lagrangian

$$SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$$

Higgs Doublet


$$H = \begin{pmatrix} h^+ \\ h^0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Symmetry of the Vacuum

$$U(1)_{e.m.}$$

Vacuum Expectation Value

$$\langle H \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} \text{ with } v \approx 246 \text{ GeV}$$



$$D_\mu H = \partial_\mu H - \frac{i}{2} \begin{pmatrix} gW_\mu^3 + g'B_\mu & \sqrt{2}gW_\mu^+ \\ \sqrt{2}gW_\mu^- & -gW_\mu^3 + g'B_\mu \end{pmatrix} H \text{ with } W_\mu^\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (W_\mu^1 \mp W_\mu^2)$$

Gauge boson spectrum

- electrically charged bosons
- electrically neutral bosons

$$M_W^2 = \frac{1}{4} g^2 v^2$$

$$Z_\mu = cW_\mu^3 - sB_\mu$$

$$\gamma_\mu = sW_\mu^3 + cB_\mu$$

SM: Q&A

Weak mixing angle

$$c = \frac{g}{\sqrt{g^2 + g'^2}}$$

$$s = \frac{g'}{\sqrt{g^2 + g'^2}}$$

$$M_Z^2 = \frac{1}{4} (g^2 + g'^2) v^2$$

$$M_\gamma = 0$$

CERN, July 2021

SU(2)xU(1) vs SU(2)

Artem: “When deciding between SU(2) or SU(2)xU(1) for electroweak theory. You explained the first experimentally proven wrong. Because SU(2) has traceless generators, sum of the charges should be zero. So not only electron, and neutrino, but also another charged particle X exists. The question is: How they understood that at current collider energies it should be possible to create X (if it existed)? How could one at least roughly predict the mass of X? Or should it manifest itself as a virtual particle, then in what process?”

I. No additional “force”: (Georgi, Glashow '72) ⇒ extra matter

SU(2)

$$[T^a, T^b] = i\epsilon^{abc}T^c$$

$$[T^+, T^-] = Q \quad [Q, T^\pm] = +\pm T^\pm$$

$$T^\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(T^1 \pm iT^2)$$

$$\text{Tr}_{\text{irrep}} T^3 = 0 \Rightarrow \text{extra matter} \begin{pmatrix} X_L \\ \nu_L \\ e_L \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X_R \\ \nu_R \\ e_R \end{pmatrix}$$

SU(1, 1)

$$[T^+, T^-] = -Q$$

$$[Q, T^\pm] = +\pm T^\pm$$

non-compact
unitary rep. has dim ∞

E₂

2D Euclidean group

$$[T^+, T^-] = 0$$

$$[Q, T^\pm] = +\pm T^\pm$$

only one unitary rep.
of finite dim. = trivial rep.

2. No additional “matter” (SM: Glashow '61, Weinberg '67, Salam '68): **SU(2)xU(1)**

⇒ extra force

$$Q = T^3?$$

as Georgi-Glashow
⇒ extra matter

$$Q = Y?$$

$$Q(e_L) = Q(\nu_L)$$

$$Q = T^3 + Y!$$

Gell-Mann '56, Nishijima-Nakano '53

Neutrino Masses

Erdenebulgan: “Should we write Dirac mass term for neutrino? For the Majorana mass term, there is isospin violation. Is it right? If so, how could we solve this problem?”

Dauke: “How does lepton number conservation apply in neutrino oscillations? If neutrinos turn out to be Majorana particles, how would one assign them a lepton number?”

▮ A mass term corresponds in the Lagrangian to an operator that is quadratic in the field. in QFT, this operator needs to be Lorentz invariant and invariant under the local/gauge symmetries. For spin-1/2 field, there are two types of mass terms:

- a Dirac mass:

$$m\bar{\psi}\psi = m (\bar{\psi}_L\psi_R + \bar{\psi}_R\psi_L)$$

- a Majorana mass:

$$m\bar{\psi}_C\psi = m (\bar{\psi}_{L_C}\psi_L + \bar{\psi}_{R_C}\psi_R) \quad \text{where} \quad \psi_C = i\gamma^2\psi^* \quad \text{is the charge conjugated spinor}$$

Fermion Masses

SM is a chiral theory (\neq QED that is vector-like)

$$m_e \bar{e}_L e_R + h.c. \quad \text{is not gauge invariant}$$

\swarrow $Y=1/2$ \nwarrow $Y=-1$

The SM Lagrangian cannot contain fermion mass term.

Fermion masses are emergent quantities
that originate from interactions with Higgs VEV

$$\mathcal{L} = y_e \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\nu}_L \\ \bar{e}_L \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} H^+ \\ H^0 \end{pmatrix} e_R \stackrel{H = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{v+h}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}}{\downarrow} \frac{y_e v}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\bar{e}_L e_R + \frac{1}{v} \bar{e}_L e_R \underbrace{h}_{\text{Higgs Boson}} \right)$$

\uparrow $Y=1/2$ \uparrow $Y=1/2$ \uparrow $Y=-1$

Higgs couplings proportional to the mass of particles

Neutrino Masses

The same construction doesn't work for neutrinos since in the SM there are only Left Handed neutrinos

For a uncharged particle, it is possible to write a Majorana mass another Lorentz-invariant quadratic term in the Lagrangian (it involves the charge-conjugate spinor, see lecture #2)

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Majorana}} = m \bar{\psi}_C \psi = m (\bar{\psi}_{LC} \psi_L + \bar{\psi}_{RC} \psi_R)$$

we can build such a term with LH field only

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{y_\nu}{\Lambda} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_L \\ e_L \end{pmatrix}_C \cdot \begin{pmatrix} H^+ \\ H^0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_L \\ e_L \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} H^+ \\ H^0 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{y_\nu v^2}{\Lambda} \nu_{LC} \nu_L$$

\uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow
 mass^{3/2} mass mass^{3/2} mass

Seesaw: $m_\nu = \frac{y_\nu v^2}{\Lambda}$ Order eV for $y_\nu \sim 1$ and $\Lambda \sim 10^{14} \text{ GeV}$






A Majorana mass violates lepton number ($\Delta L=2$) but it is fully gauge (and isospin) invariant

Symmetries and Diagrams

Anna: “How symmetries can influence the diagrams of the processes? I mean there can be different diagrams with the same cross-sections if an interaction does not distinguish between any particles.”

☛ Gauge invariance is a dynamical principle, i.e., it dictates/predicts some interactions.

$$\mathcal{L} \propto F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} \supset g\partial AAA + g^2 A AAA$$



Symmetries and Diagrams

Joshua: “From gauge theory to Fermi theory” is this a similar process, but in Lagrangian and not Hamiltonian formalism, to taking the phonon-electron scatter and obtaining the electron-electron effective interaction? (i.e. is it equivalent to using a canonical transform on your Hamiltonian to obtain a fermion-fermion interaction from a boson-fermion one?)”

$$\mathcal{L} = G_F J_\mu^* J^\mu \quad \text{with} \quad J^\mu = (\bar{n}\gamma^\mu p) + (\bar{e}\gamma^\mu \nu_e) + (\bar{\mu}\gamma^\mu \nu_\mu) + \dots$$

For the **muon**, the relevant mass scale is the muon mass $m_\mu = 105 \text{ MeV}$:

$$\Gamma_\mu = \frac{G_F^2 m_\mu^5}{192\pi^3} \sim 10^{-19} \text{ GeV} \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \tau_\mu \sim 10^{-6} \text{ s}$$

For the **neutron**, the relevant mass scale is $(m_n - m_p) \approx 1.29 \text{ MeV}$:

$$\Gamma_n = \mathcal{O}(1) \frac{G_F^2 \Delta m^5}{\pi^3} \sim 10^{-28} \text{ GeV} \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \tau_n \sim 10^3 \text{ s}$$

The same interaction describes different physical processes

SM & Gravity

Richik: “Why can gravity not be added to the standard model even though gravity has been reduced to graviton particles?”

It is actually possible to couple the SM to gravity and to quantise the graviton. The issue is that gravity is not renormalisable and to get rid of infinities in loop computation, one needs to add more and more counter-terms that are not present originally in the classical GR Lagrangian. But this is not a problem: gravity can be treated as an effective field theory (there are arguments that show that its UV completion is unlikely to be a quantum field theory but rather a theory of more complicated objects like matrices or strings). There is an important difference between gauge (spin-1) interactions and gravity: the gauge couplings of the former exhibit a logarithmic evolution with the energy of the process, while the strength of gravity grows like E^2 . An important question is to figure out the scale of quantum gravity: is it $M_{\text{Planck}} \sim 10^{19} \text{ GeV}$? it could be lower down to few TeVs if there are (large or highly curved) extra dimensions. In that case, totally new phenomena could be observed at colliders... see the BSM lectures

