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Introduction

• Little Higgs models: solve Little Hierarchy (Little Fine Tuning) Problem
  • Higgs as PGB with decay constant $f$
  • If 1-loop divergent mass then $f = v$ (= EW vev)
  • Collective Symmetry Mechanism forbids 1-loop divergent mass, hence $f = 4\pi v$

• Collective Symmetry Mechanism:

$L$ with symmetry $G \rightarrow H \quad \Pi :$ coordinates on $G/H$

$$\delta \Pi \sim \epsilon + \epsilon \Pi + \cdots \Rightarrow \text{no potential for } \Pi$$

Break $G$ explicitly: $L \rightarrow L + g_1 \delta L_1 \Rightarrow$ generate $V_1$ but if $G_1 \subset G$, $H_1 \subset H$, $G_1 \rightarrow H_1$

is still an exactly symmetry, spontaneously broken $\Rightarrow$ some GBs, including $h$, are still exact, no potential for them

Repeat with $L \rightarrow L + g_2 \delta L_2$ and $G_2 \subset G$, $H_2 \subset H$, $G_2 \rightarrow H_2$ still exact AND with $h$ among its exact GBs

$L \rightarrow L + g_1 \delta L_1 + g_2 \delta L_2$ No exact GBs. BUT any term in $V(h)$ must vanish as either $g_1, g_2 \rightarrow 0$

At 1-loop, (divergent) mass term is from single particle exchange, $m_h^2 \sim g_1^2$ or $g_2^2 \Rightarrow m_h^2 = 0$ (up to finite terms)
Littlest Higgs (only to establish notation):

- SU(5) → SO(5)
- Order parameter: 2-index symmetric tensor: \( \Sigma = \Sigma^T, \Sigma^\dagger \Sigma = 1 \)
- 14 Goldstone Bosons, 10 unbroken generators

\[
\Sigma_0 = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 
1 \\
1 &
\end{pmatrix}
\]

unbroken: \( T^a \Sigma_0 + \Sigma_0 T^{aT} = 0 \)

\[
\Sigma(x) = e^{i \Pi/\Lambda} \Sigma_0 e^{i \Pi^T/\Lambda} = e^{2i \Pi/\Lambda} \Sigma_0,
\]

notation:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
2 \times 2 & 2 \times 1 & 2 \times 2 \\
1 \times 2 & 1 \times 1 & 1 \times 2 \\
2 \times 2 & 2 \times 1 & 2 \times 2 \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
\Pi = \begin{pmatrix}
h & \phi \\
h^\dagger & h^T \\n\phi^* & h^*
\end{pmatrix}
\]

- Break symmetry explicitly: Gauge \([SU(2) \times U(1)]_1 \times [SU(2) \times U(1)]_2\)
- As SU(5) → SO(5), gauge group breaks to diagonal \(SU(2) \times U(1) = \text{electroweak}\)
- 4 Goldstone bosons are eaten (higgs mechanism)
- Remaining 10 are pseudo-GBs, acquire potential
- Anatomy of collective symmetry:

\[
Q_1^a = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{1}{2} \tau^a & 0_{2 \times 3} \\
0_{3 \times 2} & 0_{3 \times 3}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
Y_1 = \frac{1}{10} \text{diag}(-3, -3, 2, 2, 2)
\]

\[
Q_2^a = \begin{pmatrix}
0_{3 \times 3} & 0_{3 \times 2} \\
0_{2 \times 3} & -\frac{1}{2} \tau^a
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
Y_2 = \frac{1}{10} \text{diag}(-2, -2, -2, 3, 3).
\]
Littlest Higgs (only to establish notation):

- $SU(5) \rightarrow SO(5)$
- Order parameter: 2-index symmetric tensor: $\Sigma = \Sigma^T$, $\Sigma^\dagger \Sigma = 1$
- 14 Goldstone Bosons, 10 unbroken generators

$$\Sigma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mathbb{1} \\ \mathbb{1} & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

unbroken: $T^a \Sigma_0 + \Sigma_0 T^{aT} = 0$
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notation:
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Littlest Higgs (only to establish notation):

- SU(5) → SO(5)
- Order parameter: 2-index symmetric tensor: \( \Sigma = \Sigma^T, \Sigma^\dagger \Sigma = 1 \)
- 14 Goldstone Bosons, 10 unbroken generators

\[
\Sigma_0 = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 \\
1 & \mathbb{1}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

unbroken: \( T^a \Sigma_0 + \Sigma_0 T^a T = 0 \)

\[
\Sigma(x) = e^{i \Pi / f} \Sigma_0 e^{i \Pi^T / f} = e^{2i \Pi / f} \Sigma_0,
\]

\[
\Pi = \begin{pmatrix}
h & h^T \\
\phi^* & h^*
\end{pmatrix}
\]

both produce non-linear shifts of \( h \)

- Break symmetry explicitly: Gauge \([SU(2) \times U(1)]_1 \times [SU(2) \times U(1)]_2\)
- As SU(5) → SO(5), gauge group breaks to diagonal SU(2) x U(1) = electroweak
- 4 Goldstone bosons are eaten (higgs mechanism)
- Remaining 10 are pseudo-GBs, acquire potential
- Anatomy of collective symmetry:

\[
Q_1^a = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{1}{2} \tau^a & 0_{2 \times 3} \\
0_{3 \times 2} & 0_{3 \times 3}
\end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_1 = \frac{1}{10} \text{diag}(-3, -3, 2, 2, 2)
\]

\[
Q_2^a = \begin{pmatrix}
0_{3 \times 3} & 0_{3 \times 2} \\
0_{2 \times 3} & -\frac{1}{2} \tau^a^*
\end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_2 = \frac{1}{10} \text{diag}(-2, -2, -2, 3, 3).
\]

\( G_1 = SU(3) \) on lower 3x3 block

\( G_2 = SU(3) \) on upper 3x3 block
The Hidden Fine Tuning

top-quark sector of Littlest Higgs model:
Field content (SU(2)_{U(1)}): \( q_L (2/6), \quad q_R (1/2), \quad u_L (1/2), \quad u_R (1/2) \)

“royal triplet”: \( \chi_L = \begin{pmatrix} q_L \\ u_L \end{pmatrix} \)

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{top}} = -\frac{1}{2} \lambda_1 f \bar{\chi}_L \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{xy} \sum_{jx} \sum_{kx} q_R - \lambda_2 f \bar{u}_L u_R \]

\( i, j, k = 1, 2, 3 \)
\( x, y = 4, 5 \)
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top-quark sector of Littlest Higgs model:
Field content (SU(2)\textsubscript{U(1)}): \( q_L (2/6), \quad q_R (1/2), \quad u_L (1/2), \quad u_R (1/2) \)

“royal triplet”: \( \chi_L = \left( \begin{array}{c} q_L \\ u_L \end{array} \right) \)
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\mathcal{L}_{\text{top}} = - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_1 \int \bar{\chi}_{Li} \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{xy} \sum_j x \sum_k y q_R - \lambda_2 \int \bar{u}_L u_R \\
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x, y = 4, 5
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top-quark sector of Littlest Higgs model:
Field content (SU(2)\text{U}(1)): \quad q_L \ (2/6), \quad q_R \ (1/3), \quad u_L \ (1/3), \quad u_R \ (1/3)

“royal triplet”: \quad \chi_L = \begin{pmatrix} q_L \\ u_L \end{pmatrix}

\begin{align*}
\mathcal{L}_\text{top} &= -\frac{1}{2} \lambda_1 \int \bar{\chi}_L \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{xy} \Sigma_{jx} \Sigma_{ky} q_R - \lambda_2 \int \bar{u}_L u_R \\
i, j, k &= 1, 2, 3 \\
x, y &= 4, 5
\end{align*}

Trivial observations: this is a symmetry breaking term; SU(3)_{\text{upper}} does not commute with G_{\text{EW}}
There is no reason to preserve part of the global symmetry; only gauged subgroups survive.
The Hidden Fine Tuning

top-quark sector of Littlest Higgs model:
Field content (SU(2)_U(1)): \( q_L \ (2/6), \ q_R \ (1/3), \ u_L \ (1/3), \ u_R \ (1/3) \)

“royal triplet”: \( \chi_L = \begin{pmatrix} q_L \\ u_L \end{pmatrix} \)

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{top}} = -\frac{1}{2} \lambda_1 \int \bar{\chi}_L i \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{xy} \Sigma_{jx} \Sigma_{ky} q_R - \lambda_2 \int \bar{u}_L u_R \quad i, j, k = 1, 2, 3 \\
x, y = 4, 5
\]

Trivial observations: this is a symmetry breaking term; SU(3)_{upper} does not commute with G_{EW}.
There is no reason to preserve part of the global symmetry; only gauged subgroups survive.

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{top}} = -\lambda_1 \int \bar{q}_L i \epsilon_{xy} \Sigma_{ix} \Sigma_{3y} q_R - \frac{1}{2} \lambda'_1 \int \bar{u}_L \epsilon_{3jk} \epsilon_{xy} \Sigma_{jx} \Sigma_{ky} q_R - \lambda_2 \int \bar{u}_L u_R + \text{h.c.}
\]

There is an implicit (hidden) fine tuning \( \lambda_1 = \lambda'_1 \)

Does it make sense to impose this as a flavor symmetry?
Forced on the theory by gauge interactions:

\[
\frac{\lambda_1(\mu)}{\lambda'_1(\mu)} = \frac{\lambda_1(\Lambda)}{\lambda'_1(\Lambda)} \left( \frac{g'_1(\mu)}{g'_1(\Lambda)} \right)^{\frac{2-3y}{b}}
\]

where

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(q_\alpha L)</th>
<th>(q_\alpha R)</th>
<th>(d_\alpha R)</th>
<th>(u_L)</th>
<th>(u_R)</th>
<th>(H)</th>
<th>(\phi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Y_1)</td>
<td>(\frac{11}{30} - y)</td>
<td>(\frac{2}{3} - y)</td>
<td>(\frac{11}{15} - y)</td>
<td>(\frac{13}{15} - y)</td>
<td>(\frac{13}{15} - y)</td>
<td>(1/4)</td>
<td>(1/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y_2)</td>
<td>(y - \frac{1}{5})</td>
<td>(y)</td>
<td>(y - \frac{2}{5})</td>
<td>(y - \frac{1}{5})</td>
<td>(y - \frac{1}{5})</td>
<td>(1/4)</td>
<td>(1/2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[b = \frac{1}{360} \left( 2737 - 8832y + 10080y^2 \right) \geq 46/105.\]

Moreover, this running must occur in the UV completion as well. So there is no natural way of justifying \(\lambda_1(\Lambda) = \lambda'_1(\Lambda)\)

How bad is it?

\[
\delta m_h^2 = \frac{12}{16\pi^2} (\lambda_1^2 - \lambda'_1^2) \Lambda^2
\]

\[
\delta \lambda_1 \approx \frac{1}{24} \frac{m_h^2}{f^2} \sim \frac{1}{24} \left( \frac{100 \text{ GeV}}{1 \text{ TeV}} \right)^2 \sim 0.04\%
\]

Note: This is \(\Delta = 2400\) in the Ellis, Enqvist, Nanopoulos, Zwerner/Barbieri, Giudice measure of fine tuning.
Note:

- If you fine tune $\lambda' = \lambda$ at the cutoff scale: running is a 1-loop effect and contributes to mass through a 1-loop graph. Hence the actual correction to the higgs mass is a 2-loop effect. If you don’t fine tune $\lambda' = \lambda$ it is really a 1-loop effect.

- Numerically, effect is large (much larger than 2-loops):
  Needed $\lambda' - \lambda \leq 4 \times 10^{-4}$, while 1-loop is $\approx 1/16\pi^2 \approx 63 \times 10^{-4}$

- $y = 2/3$ gives no 1-loop logarithmic running, but one cannot ignore finite, non-logarithmic corrections (We computed the log corrections because they are universal. But there is no reason to expect that the running above $\Lambda$ plus the matching at $\Lambda$ will keep $\lambda' = \lambda$ even at $y = 2/3$).
Note:

• If you fine tune $\lambda' = \lambda$ at the cutoff scale: running is a 1-loop effect and contributes to mass through a 1-loop graph. Hence the actual correction to the higgs mass is a 2-loop effect. If you don’t fine tune $\lambda' = \lambda$ it is really a 1-loop effect.

• Numerically, effect is large (much larger than 2-loops):
  Needed $\lambda' - \lambda \leq 4 \times 10^{-4}$, while 1-loop is $\approx 1/16\pi^2 \approx 63 \times 10^{-4}$

• $y = 2/3$ gives no 1-loop logarithmic running, but one cannot ignore finite, non-logarithmic corrections (We computed the log corrections because they are universal. But there is no reason to expect that the running above $\Lambda$ plus the matching at $\Lambda$ will keep $\lambda' = \lambda$ even at $y = 2/3$).

• Can one impose a symmetry in the underlying UV theory that enforces $\lambda' = \lambda$ to high accuracy in spite of the fact that the symmetry is broken by gauge interactions?
  • Isn’t it just like flavor in QCD?
What are Flavor symmetries in QCD?
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ii. count how many, say $K$, are very light compared to the QCD scale

iii. an approximate SU($K$) symmetry follows
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In particular consider SU(3) as an approximate flavor symmetry of QCD.

This is a \textit{natural} symmetry, in the sense that it appears \textit{automatically}:

i. choose randomly masses of $N$ quarks, without insisting in any relation among them

ii. count how many, say $K$, are very light compared to the QCD scale

iii. an approximate SU($K$) symmetry follows

The symmetry does not commute with $G_{em}$ yet it remains good because it is natural (as above). (Even if electromagnetic corrections rendered the masses larger than the QCD scale, the resulting masses would be nearly degenerate and there would still be an SU($K$) symmetry).

We do not and cannot insist in, say, $m_u = m_d$, to have isospin symmetry, corrected by $G_{em}$. (We could, however, insist on $m_s = m_d$, because then V-spin is an \textit{exact} symmetry.)
What are Flavor symmetries in QCD?

In particular consider SU(3) as an approximate flavor symmetry of QCD.

This is a *natural* symmetry, in the sense that it appears *automatically*:

i. choose randomly masses of $N$ quarks, without insisting in any relation among them

ii. count how many, say $K$, are very light compared to the QCD scale

iii. an approximate SU($K$) symmetry follows

The symmetry does not commute with $G_{em}$ yet it remains good because it is natural (as above). (Even if electromagnetic corrections rendered the masses larger than the QCD scale, the resulting masses would be nearly degenerate and there would still be an SU($K$) symmetry).

We do not and cannot insist in, say, $m_u = m_d$, to have isospin symmetry, corrected by $G_{em}$. (We could, however, insist on $m_s = m_d$, because then V-spin is an *exact* symmetry.)

**Moral:** *in the absence of fine tuning,* *flavor-symmetry breaking interactions in a phenomenological lagrangian take the most general form consistent with gauge invariance (and exact unbroken symmetries).*
Can we get around it by clever model building?
No. Generalize to any Little Higgs model:
Assumptions:

1. $G \rightarrow H$
2. Weakly gauged $G_w \subset G$, contains $G_{ew}$, $G_{ew} \subset H$
3. There is a higgs, $h$, in $G/H$
4. Collective symmetry group $G^c \subset G$, with $h$ transforming nonlinearly
5. There is a term in the lagrangian that is symmetric under both $G_{ew}$ and $G_c$
Can we get around it by clever model building?
No. Generalize to any Little Higgs model:
Assumptions:

1. $G \rightarrow H$
2. Weakly gauged $G_w \subset G$, contains $G_{ew}$, $G_{ew} \subset H$
3. There is a higgs, $h$, in $G/H$
4. Collective symmetry group $G^c \subset G$, with $h$ transforming nonlinearly
5. There is a term in the lagrangian that is symmetric under both $G_{ew}$ and $G^c$

Assumptions 1 - 4 give:

$$\delta_\epsilon h = i\epsilon^a \frac{\tau^a}{2} h + i\epsilon \frac{1}{2} h \quad \delta_\eta h = \eta^m x^m + \cdots$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad (\delta_\eta \delta_\epsilon - \delta_\epsilon \delta_\eta) h = i\epsilon^a \eta^m \frac{\tau^a}{2} x^m + i\epsilon \eta^m \frac{1}{2} x^m + \cdots$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad [Q^a, X^i] = \frac{i}{2} (\tau^a)^{ij} X^j, \quad [Y, X^i] = \frac{i}{2} X^i \quad \text{for } i, j = 1, \ldots, 4$$
Can we get around it by clever model building?
No. Generalize to any Little Higgs model:
Assumptions:

1. \( G \to H \)
2. Weakly gauged \( G_w \subset G \), contains \( G_{\text{ew}} \), \( G_{\text{ew}} \subset H \)
3. There is a higgs, \( h \), in \( G/H \)
4. Collective symmetry group \( G^c \subset G \), with \( h \) transforming nonlinearly
5. There is a term in the lagrangian that is symmetric under both \( G_{\text{ew}} \) and \( G^c \)

Assumptions 1 - 4 give:

\[
\delta_\epsilon h = i\epsilon^a \frac{\tau^a}{2} h + i\epsilon \frac{1}{2} h \quad \quad \delta_\eta h = \eta^m x^m + \cdots
\]

\[
\Rightarrow (\delta_\eta \delta_\epsilon - \delta_\epsilon \delta_\eta) h = i\epsilon^a \eta^m \frac{\tau^a}{2} x^m + i\epsilon \eta^m \frac{1}{2} x^m + \cdots
\]

\[
\Rightarrow [Q^a, X^i] = \frac{i}{2} (\tau^a)^{ij} X^j, \quad [Y, X^i] = \frac{i}{2} X^i \quad \quad i, j = 1, \ldots, 4
\]

That is, \( X^i \) are tensors under \( SU(2) \times U(1) \), transforming just like the higgs doublet.
Can we get around it by clever model building? No. Generalize to any Little Higgs model:
Assumptions:

1. \( G \rightarrow H \)
2. Weakly gauged \( G_w \subset G \), contains \( G_{ew}, \ G_{ew} \subset H \)
3. There is a higgs, \( h \), in \( G/H \)
4. Collective symmetry group \( G^c \subset G \), with \( h \) transforming nonlinearly
5. There is a term in the lagrangian that is symmetric under both \( G_{ew} \) and \( G_c \)

Assumptions 1 - 4 give:

\[
\delta_\epsilon h = i \epsilon^a \frac{\tau^a}{2} h + i \frac{1}{2} h \quad \quad \delta_\eta h = \eta^m x^m + \cdots
\]

\[
\Rightarrow \quad (\delta_\eta \delta_\epsilon - \delta_\epsilon \delta_\eta) h = i \epsilon^a \eta^m \frac{\tau^a}{2} x^m + i \epsilon \eta^m \frac{1}{2} x^m + \cdots
\]

\[
\Rightarrow \quad [Q^a, X^i] = \frac{i}{2} (\tau^a)^{ij} X^j, \quad [Y, X^i] = \frac{i}{2} X^i \quad \quad i, j = 1, \ldots, 4
\]

That is, \( X^i \) are tensors under \( SU(2) \times U(1) \), transforming just like the higgs doublet.

No semi-simple Lie algebra of rank 4 \( \Rightarrow \) commutators don’t close: \( \hat{X}^{ij} \equiv [X^i, X^j] \)

\[
[Q^a, \hat{X}^{ij}] = \frac{i}{2} (\sigma^a)^{jk} \hat{X}^{ik} - \frac{i}{2} (\sigma^a)^{ik} \hat{X}^{jk} \quad \text{and so on until closure}
\]

Hence, the generators of \( G^c \) form a \textit{reducible} representation of \( G_{ew} \).

Hence the invariant under \( G^c \) is a sum of 2 or more terms separately invariant under \( G_{ew} \).
Complete the NoGo argument:

1. $G_w \subset G$ is of the form $\prod_i G_i$

2. For each $G_i$, assume a collective symmetry, $G^c_i$, such that $[G_i, G^c_i] = 0$

3. Yukawa term invariant under a collective symmetry group $G^c_Y$ and under $G_w$

Then, if $X^*_Y$ are the collective symmetry generators of the Yukawa term

$$[Q^a, X^*_Y] = \frac{i}{2} (\sigma^a)^{nm} X^*_Y$$

is inconsistent with $[Q^a_i, X^*_Y] = 0$

Hence an invariant Yukawa either

- sums over terms related by $G^c_Y$ that are independently gauge invariant
- has $G^c_Y$ as subgroup of the gauge group that hence does not commute with $G^c_Y$
  (hence gauging $X$, hence higgs eaten unless doubling as in KS model)

The Kaplan-Schmaltz model evades the no-go argument.
It gauges $G^c_Y$ and avoids eating the higgs by having extra doublets.
Custodial symmetry does not arise by turning off the gauge coupling.
The End
How does Kaplan-Schmaltz evade the theorem?

Review the model: \( SU(3) \times SU(3)/SU(2) \times SU(2) \) by \((3,1) + (1,3)\)

gauge diagonal \( SU(3) \) subgroup

Yukawa coupling is invariant under the full gauged symmetry: no fine tuning

- The proof above assumes there is one custodial symmetry group for each gauged subgroup
- For that specific custodial symmetry there is one specific higgs-shift generator

- KS has two different custodial groups for the same gauge subgroup
  - there is no obvious collective symmetry
  - the two custodial groups appear by turning off the coupling of either \( (3,1) \) or \( (1,3) \) independently to the gauge vector bosons (not by taking \( g \to 0 \))
  - by construction our proof (that considers each gauge group separately) works by turning off all but one gauge couplings