The S-parameter with Many Fermions on the Lattice

Ethan T. Neil (Fermilab) <u>eneil@fnal.gov</u> on behalf of the LSD Collaboration

arXiv:1009.5967 (PRL, in press)

Lattice Strong Dynamics (LSD) Collaboration



James Osborn



Ron Babich Rich Brower Saul Cohen Claudio Rebbi David Schaich







Ethan Neil



Mike Clark

Michael Cheng Pavlos Vranas Michael Buchoff

Joe Kiskis

Tom Appelquist George Fleming Meifeng Lin Gennady Voronov



One example: technicolor

- Technicolor theories replace the Higgs scalar field with new strong dynamics. Chiral symmetry breaking also breaks electroweak symmetry.
- Minimal or one-doublet technicolor is QCD, rescaled: $\Lambda_{QCD} \sim 1 \text{ GeV} \rightarrow \Lambda_{TC} \sim 1 \text{ TeV}.$



 Generically, technicolor models are in tension with precision EW, especially the S-parameter:

$$S \simeq 0.25 \frac{N_{TF}}{2} \frac{N_{TC}}{3} + \frac{1}{12\pi} \left(\frac{N_{TF}^2}{4} - 1\right) \log\left(\frac{m_{\rho_T}^2}{m_{\pi_T}^2}\right)$$

(experiment: S=0 or slightly negative)

One example: technicolor

- Technicolor theories replace the Higgs scalar field with new strong dynamics. Chiral symmetry breaking also breaks electroweak symmetry.
- Minimal or one-doublet technicolor is QCD, rescaled: $\Lambda_{QCD} \sim 1 \text{ GeV} \rightarrow \Lambda_{TC} \sim 1 \text{ TeV}.$

relies on QCD pheno!



 Generically, technicolor models are in tension with precision EW, especially the S-parameter:

$$S \simeq 0.25 \frac{N_{TF}}{2} \frac{N_{TC}}{3} + \frac{1}{12\pi} \left(\frac{N_{TF}^2}{4} - 1\right) \log\left(\frac{m_{\rho_T}^2}{m_{\pi_T}^2}\right)$$

(experiment: S=0 or slightly negative)

A roadmap in N_c and N_f



Large N_c expansion works well for QCD, but for large N_f, things change drastically (IR fixed point.) Lattice can be applied anywhere with AF!

A roadmap in N_c and N_f



Large N_c expansion works well for QCD, but for large N_f, things change drastically (IR fixed point.) Lattice can be applied anywhere with AF!

Going to the Lattice

 $\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}} \int \mathcal{D}U \mathcal{D}\overline{\psi} \mathcal{D}\psi \ \mathcal{O}(U,\overline{\psi},\psi) \exp\left(-S[U,\overline{\psi},\psi]\right)$





Discretize to make the path integral finite-dimensional (but sharply peaked!)

Importance sampling and Monte Carlo techniques give us an ensemble of field configurations, weighted by exp(-S)

Most of the computational cost is in ensemble generation, so measure many different <0>

Lattice Ensembles

- This talk: two sets of ensembles with N_f=2,6 fermions (all with mass m)
- Ensembles are tuned to hold IR scale(s) fixed in chiral limit
- Goldstone mass kept small compared to box size



	$N_f = 2$		$N_f = 6$	
a <i>m</i> f	" <i>M</i> _π "L	N _{cfg}	" <i>M</i> _π "L	N _{cfg}
0.005	3.5	1430	4.7	1350
0.010	4.4	2750	5.4	1250
0.015	5.3	1060	6.6	550
0.020	6.5	720	7.8	400
0.025	7.0	600	8.8	420
0.030	7.8	400	9.8	360

S-parameter

S is sensitive to electroweak "oblique corrections", i.e. vacuum polarization of EW gauge bosons. Can express using V/A currents:

Overview of lattice measurement:
Measure VV, AA correlators on chosen ensembles
Fit to Pade-(m,n) approximants:
Extract slope of (VV-AA) at zero q², convert to S-parameter

$$\mathcal{F}_{VV}(0) - \Pi_{AA}'(0)$$

$$\Pi_{V-A}(q^2) = \frac{\sum_m a_m q^{2m}}{\sum_n b_n q^{2n}}$$

Correlator fits



$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{From slope to S} \\ S &= \frac{1}{3\pi} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{ds}{s} \left\{ (N_{f}/2) \left[R_{V}(s) - R_{A}(s) \right] \right\}^{\sim 4\pi \Pi'_{V-A}(0)} \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \right\}^{\sim (eI \operatorname{TeV}, \operatorname{roughly})} \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \right\}^{\circ (eI \operatorname{TeV}, \operatorname{roughly})} \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \right\}^{\circ (eI \operatorname{TeV}, \operatorname{roughly})} \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right)^{3} \Theta(s - m_{h}^{2}) \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s} \right] \\ & -\frac{1}{4} \left[1 - \frac{m_{h}^{2}}{s}$$

From slope to S



At two flavors, S(m=0) = 0.35(6) - consistent with other results



- • N_f =6 result is much smaller than naive scaling predicts! (But still much too large compared to experiment.)
- •This is a "worst-case" S, assuming a model with all techni-doublets EW charged.

Conclusion

- Smaller S-parameter than expected for N_f=6 theory, compared to N_f=2
- Hints of dynamics unlike QCD, effects in the right direction to reduce tension with precision experiment in EWSB models
- Simulations underway at Nf=8, 10; initial setup for SU(2) gauge group started

Backup Slides

Condensate Enhancement



(at 3.85 GeV!)

Simulation Details

 We use domain wall fermions to preserve as much chiral, flavor symmetry as possible. Residual χSB is small:

$$m_{res} = \begin{cases} 2.6 \times 10^{-5}, & N_f = 2\\ 8.2 \times 10^{-4}, & N_f = 6 \end{cases}$$

•All volumes are 32³x64, lattice spacing tuned to $a \sim 5m_{\rho}$. At 2-flavors, this gives $a \sim 0.06 \text{ fm} = 3.6 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$, $L \sim 1.8 \text{ fm}$.

	$N_f = 2$		$N_f = 6$	
a <i>m</i> f	" M_{π} " L	N _{cfg}	" M_{π} " L	N _{cfg}
0.005	3.5	1430	4.7	1350
0.010	4.4	2750	5.4	1250
0.015	5.3	1060	6.6	550
0.020	6.5	720	7.8	400
0.025	7.0	600	8.8	420
0.030	7.8	400	9.8	360



NNLO chiral fits



Momentum dependence



Excellent agreement between direct measurement and OPE