
A holographic composite Higgs model

Roberto Contino

Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma “La Sapienza” and
INFN Sezione di Roma, Piazzale Aldo Moro 2, I-00185 Roma, Italy
roberto.contino@roma1.infn.it

Composite Higgs models [1] represent an attractive variation of the Technicolor paradigm [2]. In these theories the Standard Model (SM) Higgs doublet is the bound state of a strongly interacting sector with flavor symmetry G . It forms at a scale f_π , the analog of the QCD pion decay constant, as the Goldstone boson associated with the dynamical breaking of the global symmetry G . The couplings of the SM matter and gauge fields to the strong sector break G explicitly, and induce a one-loop Higgs potential that triggers the electroweak symmetry breaking (EWSB) at the scale $v \leq f_\pi$. In the limit of a large separation $\epsilon = v/f_\pi \ll 1$, all the massive bound states of the strong sector decouple, and one is left with the low-energy spectrum of the Standard Model. This means that all corrections to the electroweak precision observables constrained by LEP and SLD experiments will be suppressed by powers of ϵ .

In this talk I will discuss an interesting realization of this old idea which has been recently found in the framework of extra-dimensional warped models [3, 4] defined on AdS_5 spacetime with two boundaries [5]. The main virtue of these models is their calculability as effective field theories: various physical quantities, like for example the Higgs potential and the electroweak precision observables, can be computed in 5D in a perturbative expansion. A minimal model was introduced in [4], where a bulk $\text{SO}(5) \times \text{U}(1)_X \times \text{SU}(3)_c$ gauge symmetry is reduced to the SM group $G_{\text{SM}} = \text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{U}(1)_Y \times \text{SU}(3)_c$ on the UV boundary and to $\text{SO}(4) \times \text{U}(1)_X \times \text{SU}(3)_c$ on the IR boundary. Hypercharge is defined as $Y = T_R^3 + X$, where $\text{SO}(4) \sim \text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{SU}(2)_R$. According to the AdS/CFT correspondence [6], such 5-dimensional scenario is equivalent to a 4D composite Higgs theory where the $\text{SO}(5)$ flavor symmetry of the strong sector is spontaneously broken to $\text{SO}(4)$ in the infrared. This delivers 4 Goldstone bosons that transform as a $\mathbf{4}$ of $\text{SO}(4)$ (a real bidoublet of $\text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{SU}(2)_R$) and are identified with the Higgs doublet. They correspond, in the 5D theory, to the $\text{SO}(5)/\text{SO}(4)$ degrees of freedom of the fifth component A_5 of the bulk gauge field.

In [4] the SM fermions were embedded in spinorial representations of the bulk SO(5) gauge symmetry. This choice leads to a generically large modification of the $Zb\bar{b}$ coupling, which in turn rules out a large portion of the parameter space [7]. A more natural model, however, can be simply obtained if the bulk SO(5) symmetry is reduced to O(4) on the IR brane, instead of SO(4), and by embedding the SM fields in fundamental (**5**) or antisymmetric (**10**) representations of SO(5). In this case, indeed, a subgroup of the custodial symmetry O(3) that protects the electroweak ρ parameters from large corrections, also protects the $Zb\bar{b}$ coupling [8]. A possible choice of bulk fields and boundary conditions is the following [9]:

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{q_1}(\mathbf{5}_{+2/3}) &= \begin{bmatrix} q'_{1L}(-+) & q'_{1R}(+-) \\ q_{1L}(++) & q_{1R}(--) \\ s_L^u(--) & s_R^u(++) \end{bmatrix}, & \xi_u(\mathbf{5}_{+2/3}) &= \begin{bmatrix} q_L^u(+-) & q_R^u(+-) \\ q_L^u(+-) & q_R^u(-+) \\ u_L(-+) & u_R(+-) \end{bmatrix}, \\ \xi_{q_2}(\mathbf{5}_{-1/3}) &= \begin{bmatrix} q_{2L}(++) & q_{2R}(--) \\ q'_{2L}(-+) & q'_{2R}(+-) \\ s_L^d(--) & s_R^d(++) \end{bmatrix}, & \xi_d(\mathbf{5}_{-1/3}) &= \begin{bmatrix} q_L^d(+-) & q_R^d(-+) \\ q_L^d(+-) & q_R^d(-+) \\ d_L(-+) & d_R(+-) \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Chiralities under the 4D Lorentz group have been denoted with L , R , and (\pm, \pm) is a shorthand notation to denote Neumann (+) or Dirichlet (−) boundary conditions. The fields ξ_{q_1} , ξ_u (ξ_{q_2} , ξ_d) transform as $\mathbf{5}_{2/3}$ ($\mathbf{5}_{-1/3}$) of $\text{SO}(5) \times \text{U}(1)_X$, and their zero modes are identified with a full generation of SM quarks. In particular, only a linear combination of q_{1L} and q_{2L} has Neumann boundary condition on the UV brane – its zero mode is identified with the SM quark doublet q_L – the other combination being Dirichlet.¹ A fundamental of SO(5) decomposes as $\mathbf{5} = \mathbf{4} + \mathbf{1} = (\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2}) + (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})$ under $\text{SO}(4) \sim \text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{SU}(2)_R$, and we have defined the (q, q') fields to transform as $(\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2})$'s, while s^u , s^d , u , d transform as singlets. A similar 5D embedding also works for the SM leptons, although with different $\text{U}(1)_X$ charges. Localized on the IR brane, we consider the most general O(4)-invariant set of mass terms:

$$\tilde{m}_u (\bar{q}_{1L} q_R^u + \bar{q}'_{1L} q_R^u) + \tilde{M}_u \bar{s}_R^u u_L + \tilde{m}_d (\bar{q}_{2L} q_R^d + \bar{q}'_{2L} q_R^d) + \tilde{M}_d \bar{s}_R^d d_L + h.c.$$

The most general low-energy Lagrangian for the SM fermions that follows from the embedding (1) is, in momentum-space and at the quadratic order [9]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{eff} &= \bar{q}_L \not{p} \left[\Pi_0^q + \frac{s^2}{2} \left(\Pi_1^{q1} \hat{H}^c \hat{H}^{c\dagger} + \Pi_1^{q2} \hat{H} \hat{H}^\dagger \right) \right] q_L + \bar{u}_R \not{p} (\Pi_0^u + c^2 \Pi_1^u) u_R \\ &+ \bar{d}_R \not{p} (\Pi_0^d + c^2 \Pi_1^d) d_R + \frac{sc}{\sqrt{2}} M_1^u \bar{q}_L \hat{H}^c u_R + \frac{sc}{\sqrt{2}} M_1^d \bar{q}_L \hat{H} d_R + h.c. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

¹ The same can be obtained by starting with both q_{1L} and q_{2L} having Neumann UV boundary conditions and by adding a mass mixing term on the UV brane.

Here $c = \cos(h/f_\pi)$, $s = \sin(h/f_\pi)$, and $h = \sqrt{(h^a)^2}$, where h^a denote the four real components of the Higgs field:

$$\hat{H} = \frac{1}{h} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{h}_1 - i\hat{h}_2 \\ \hat{h}_3 - i\hat{h}_4 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{H}^c = \frac{1}{h} \begin{bmatrix} -(\hat{h}_3 + i\hat{h}_4) \\ \hat{h}_1 + i\hat{h}_2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

The form factors $\Pi(p^2)$, $M(p^2)$ can be computed in terms of 5D propagators using the holographic approach of [4]. The analog low-energy Lagrangian for the SM gauge fields can be found in [4]; its form implies the following relations:

$$v \equiv \epsilon f_\pi = f_\pi \sin \frac{\langle h \rangle}{f_\pi} = 246 \text{ GeV}, \quad f_\pi = \frac{2}{\sqrt{g_5^2 k}} \frac{1}{L_1}, \quad (4)$$

where g_5 is the SO(5) gauge coupling in the bulk, k is the AdS₅ curvature, and L_1 is the position of the IR brane which sets the mass scale of the new particles ($1/L_1 \sim \text{TeV}$).

The Higgs potential is generated at one loop from the virtual exchange of SM fields. The largest contribution comes from those fields that couple more strongly to the Higgs, namely t_R , t_L and b_L :

$$V(h) = (-6) \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \left\{ \log \left(\Pi_0^q + \frac{s^2}{2} \Pi_1^{q2} \right) + \log \left[p^2 \left(\Pi_0^u + c^2 \Pi_1^u \right) \left(\Pi_0^q + \frac{s^2}{2} \Pi_1^{q1} \right) - \frac{s^2 c^2}{2} (M_1^u)^2 \right] \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where the form factors refer to $q_L = (t_L, b_L)$ and t_R . Since Π_1 and M_1 drop exponentially for $pL_1 \gg 1$, the logarithm in Eq. (5) can be expanded and the potential is well approximated by:

$$V(h) \simeq \alpha \sin^2 \frac{h}{f_\pi} + \beta \sin^4 \frac{h}{f_\pi}, \quad (6)$$

where α and β are integral functions of the form factors. For $\alpha < 0$ and $2\beta > |\alpha|$ the electroweak symmetry is broken, and the minimum is at

$$\sin \frac{\langle h \rangle}{f_\pi} = \epsilon = \sqrt{\frac{-\alpha}{2\beta}}. \quad (7)$$

If $\alpha < 0$ and $2\beta \leq |\alpha|$, on the other hand, $\cos \langle h \rangle / f_\pi = 0$ and the EWSB is maximal: $\epsilon = 1$. In this limit an O(4) chiral symmetry is restored, and all the Yukawa couplings (hence the fermion masses) vanish, as one can explicitly see from the effective Lagrangian (2). The model is thus realistic only for $0 < \epsilon < 1$, which can be obtained for natural values of the 5D input parameters [9]. Determining how much of this region is excluded by the electroweak precision constraints gives a measure of how natural is the model in reproducing the EWSB. The strongest bound comes from the Peskin-Takeuchi S parameter:

$$S = \frac{6\pi}{g_5^2 k} \epsilon^2. \quad (8)$$

A rough estimate using Eq. (8) suggests that imposing $S \leq 0.3$ excludes $\sim 50\%$ ($\sim 75\%$) of the $0 < \epsilon < 1$ region for $1/N = 1/5$ ($1/N = 1/10$), where $1/N \equiv (g_5^2 k / 16\pi^2)$ is the 5D expansion parameter. A detailed numerical analysis gives similar results [9]. This shows that a sizable portion of the parameter space is still allowed, and that no large fine-tuning is required in this model to pass all electroweak precision tests. Moreover, the model predicts a light physical Higgs: $100 \text{ GeV} \lesssim m_{\text{Higgs}} \lesssim 150 \text{ GeV}$. This is possible, and the “little hierarchy” puzzle is resolved, since the spectrum of the new vectorial states (which enter the oblique precision observables) is predicted to be heavier than the fermionic resonances (which are responsible for cutting off the SM top loop). In fact, the most important prediction of the model is that, due to the heaviness of the top quark, at least one among its Kaluza-Klein partners is relatively light, with a mass of order $500 - 1500 \text{ GeV}$. These new fermions transform as $SU(2)_L$ doublets with hypercharge $Y = 1/6$ or $7/6$, and singlets with $Y = 2/3$. They will be both singly and pair produced at the LHC, decaying to final states populated mostly by tops, bottoms and SM gauge and Higgs bosons. Studying their phenomenology at the LHC will be certainly exciting and challenging at the same time.

Acknowledgement. I would like to thank K. Agashe, A. Pomarol and R. Sundrum for the numerous inspiring discussions and an always stimulating collaboration. I also thank the organizers of IFAE 2006 for inviting me to this interesting conference.

References

1. D. B. Kaplan and H. Georgi, Phys. Lett. B **136**, 183 (1984); B **136**, 187 (1984); H. Georgi, D. B. Kaplan and P. Galison, Phys. Lett. B **143**, 152 (1984); H. Georgi and D. B. Kaplan, Phys. Lett. B **145**, 216 (1984); M. J. Dugan, H. Georgi and D. B. Kaplan, Nucl. Phys. B **254**, 299 (1985).
2. S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **13**, 974 (1976); Phys. Rev. D **19**, 1277 (1979); L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. D **20**, 2619 (1979).
3. R. Contino, Y. Nomura and A. Pomarol, Nucl. Phys. B **671**, 148 (2003).
4. K. Agashe, R. Contino and A. Pomarol, Nucl. Phys. B **719**, 165 (2005).
5. L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3370 (1999).
6. J. M. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 231 (1998) [Int. J. Theor. Phys. **38**, 1113 (1999)]; S. S. Gubser, I. R. Klebanov and A. M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. B **428**, 105 (1998); E. Witten, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 253 (1998).
For a review see: O. Aharony, S. S. Gubser, J. M. Maldacena, H. Ooguri and Y. Oz, Phys. Rept. **323** (2000) 183.
7. K. Agashe and R. Contino, Nucl. Phys. B **742** (2006) 59.
8. K. Agashe, R. Contino, L. Da Rold and A. Pomarol, arXiv:hep-ph/0605341.
9. R. Contino, L. Da Rold and A. Pomarol, to appear.