

CP violation from spin-1 resonances in a left-right dynamical Higgs context (postprint)

Authors: Kunming Ruan, Jing Shu, Juan Yepes

Date: 2017-08-03T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

New physics field content in the nature, more specifically, from spin-1 resonances sourced by the extension of the SM local gauge symmetry to the larger local group $SU(2)_L SU(2)_R U(1)_{B-L}$, may induce CP-violation signalling NP effects from higher energy regimes. In this work we completely list and study all the CP-violating operators up to the p4-order in the Lagrangian expansion, for a non-linear left-right electroweak chiral context and coupled to a light dynamical Higgs. Heavy right handed fields can be integrated out from the physical spectrum, inducing thus a physical impact in the effective gauge couplings, fermionic electric dipole moment, and CP-violation in the decay $h \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow 4l$ that are briefly analysed. The final relevant set of effective operators have also been identified at low energies.

Full Text

Preamble

New physics field content in nature, specifically spin-1 resonances arising from extending the SM local gauge symmetry to the larger group $SU(2)_L SU(2)_R U(1)_{B-L}$, may induce CP violation that signals new physics effects from higher energy regimes. In this work we provide a complete classification and study of all CP-violating operators up to p-order in the Lagrangian expansion, within a non-linear left-right electroweak chiral context coupled to a light dynamical Higgs. Heavy right-handed fields can be integrated out from the physical spectrum, thereby inducing physical effects in the effective gauge couplings, fermionic electric dipole moments, and CP violation in the decay $h \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow 4l$, which are briefly analyzed. The final relevant set of effective operators at low energies has also been identified.

Introduction

The Standard Model (SM) has been firmly established as a coherent and consistent picture of electroweak symmetry breaking (EWSB) following the LHC experimental confirmation of a new scalar resonance [1, 2] in nature, resembling the long-proposed Higgs boson particle [3–5]. Nevertheless, new physics (NP) effects remain to be discovered, as required by the long-standing hierarchy problem in particle physics. Among possible NP manifestations, CP-violating low-energy effects could reveal the existence of higher energy regimes accessible at the LHC and future facilities. Indeed, electroweak interactions in nature do not perfectly conserve the combined charge conjugation and parity symmetries. Moreover, the observed matter-antimatter asymmetry of our universe compels us to consider new sources of CP violation, as signaled by the extreme fine-tuning entailed by the strong CP problem.

Phenomenological analyses pursuing effective signals have been performed [6–43] to search for anomalous CP-odd fermion-Higgs and gauge-Higgs couplings. Complementary theoretical studies are essential to establish and analyze the complete set of independent CP-violating bosonic operators, as they may directly illuminate the nature of EWSB and pinpoint NP effects from higher energy regimes.

Motivated by these prospects, this work addresses the possibility of detecting non-zero CP-violating signals arising from new physics field content in nature, specifically from spin-1 resonances introduced by extending the SM local gauge symmetry $U(1)$ to the larger local group $U(1)$ (see [44, 45] for left-right symmetric models literature). Such an extended gauge field sector is tackled here through a systematic and model-independent effective field theory (EFT) approach. The basic strategy employs a non-linear χ -model to account for the strong dynamics giving rise to the Goldstone bosons (GB), namely the W^\pm and Z longitudinal components that introduce the Goldstone scale f , together with the corresponding GB from the extended local group, i.e., the additional R and Z longitudinal degrees of freedom and the associated Goldstone scale f . This non-linear χ -model effective Lagrangian is then coupled a posteriori to a scalar singlet h in a general way through powers of h/f [46], with the scale suppression dictated by f , as this is the scale where h is generated as a GB prior to the extension of the SM local group.

In this work we analyze the physical picture of spin-1 resonances dictated by the larger local gauge group with an underlying strongly interacting scenario coupled to a light Higgs particle, via the non-linear EFT construction of the complete tower of pure gauge and gauge-Higgs operators up to p -order in the Lagrangian expansion, restricted to the CP non-conserving bosonic sector. The corresponding CP-conserving counterpart was recently analyzed in [47]. This work enlarges and completes the operator basis previously considered in [48, 49] (for the CP-breaking sector) in the context of left-right symmetric electroweak chiral models, completing and generalizing the work done in [50–54] (for the CP-

violating sector), and extends [55] to the case of a larger local gauge symmetry in the context of non-linear electroweak interactions coupled to a light Higgs particle.

The theoretical framework undertaken here may be considered a generic UV completion of the low-energy non-linear approaches of [50-54] and [55].

Theoretical Framework

The transformation properties of the longitudinal degrees of freedom of the electroweak gauge bosons are parametrized at low energies via dimensionless unitary matrices $U(x)$, specifically through $U(x)$ and $U(x)$ for the symmetry group $SU(2) \times SU(2)$, defined as

$$U(x) = \exp(i \tau^a(x)/f)$$

with τ^a being Pauli matrices and $\tau^a(x)$ the corresponding Goldstone boson fields suppressed by their associated non-linear sigma model scales f , where the scale f comes from the additional Goldstone boson dynamics introduced by the $SU(2)$ group.

It is customary to introduce the corresponding covariant derivative objects for both Goldstone matrices $U(x)$ as

$$D U(x) = U(x) + ig(W^a(x)/2)U(x) + ig' B(x)U(x)^{3/2}$$

with the $SU(2)$, $SU(2)$ and $U(1)$ gauge fields denoted by $W^a(x)$ and $B(x)$ respectively, and the associated gauge couplings g , g and g' respectively. Additionally, it is straightforward to introduce in the framework the adjoint $SU(2)$ covariant vectorial $V^a(x)$ and the covariant scalar $T(x)$ objects as

$$V^a(x) = (D U(x))U(x)^\dagger, \quad T(x) = U(x)^3 U(x)^\dagger$$

all transforming covariantly under local transformations of the larger group.

Notice that the local gauge invariance of the theory allows building operators made from traces depending on products of purely left-handed or right-handed covariant objects. When operators mixing left- and right-handed structures are considered, new covariant objects emerge to guarantee their construction. In fact, considering for instance the simple trace mixing left- and right-handed covariant objects, gauge invariance no longer holds. Proper insertions of the Goldstone matrices U and U make it invariant, motivating the introduction of the following objects:

$$T(x) = U(x)^\dagger T(x) U(x), \quad V^a(x) = U(x)^\dagger V^a(x) U(x)$$

that are required hereafter for constructing operators from mixed $SU(2)$ and $SU(2)$ covariant structures. Notice that under local transformations $L(x)$, $R(x)$ and (x) (space-time dependent variables with (x) parametrizing local rotations), the newly defined objects transform covariantly.

The corresponding definitions for the covariant vectorial $V(\varphi)$ and scalar $T(\varphi)$ objects are:

$$V(\varphi) = U(\varphi)^\dagger (D_\mu U(\varphi)) U(\varphi), \quad T(\varphi) = U(\varphi)^\dagger U(\varphi)^3 U(\varphi) U(\varphi)$$

where the unitary property of the Goldstone matrices $U(\varphi)$ has been employed. Similar definitions for the strength gauge fields $W(\varphi)$ are straightforward:

$$W(\varphi) = U(\varphi)^\dagger U(\varphi) W(\varphi) U(\varphi) U(\varphi)^\dagger U(\varphi)$$

It is therefore mandatory to introduce the covariant objects $V(\varphi)$ and $T(\varphi)$ to construct any operator mixing left- and right-handed operators. As realized in [47], covariant quantities made from products of purely left- or right-handed covariant quantities can also be constructed via the objects $T(\varphi)$ defined above. Henceforth, the set $\{V(\varphi), T(\varphi), \bar{V}(\varphi), \bar{T}(\varphi)\}$ (together with $W(\varphi)$) makes up the building blocks for constructing the effective electroweak non-linear left-right CP-violating approach undertaken in this work, whose CP-conserving counterpart was already explored in Ref. [47].

This construction will be enlarged after accounting for all possible gauge-Higgs couplings arising in this scenario via the generic polynomial light singlet Higgs function $F(h)$ [56], defined through the expansion

$$F(h) = 1 + 2a(h/f) + \dots$$

with dots standing for higher powers in h/f [46], not considered below. The scale suppression for each h -insertion is dictated by f , as this is the scale where h is generated as a GB prior to the extension of the SM local group. Gauge-Higgs interactions arise by letting the non-linear operators be coupled either directly to $F(h)$ or through its derivative couplings, e.g., via $\partial_\mu F(h)$ and $\partial_\mu^2 F(h)$. Thus the building block set is complemented by accounting for all possible interactions with $F(h)$ and its derivative couplings, under the assumption of CP-even behavior for h .

The local gauge symmetry $G_{SM} = SU(2) \times U(1)$ has been demanded throughout the non-linear effective approach considered up to now. Another relevant symmetry emerges once the initial SM local group is extended: the discrete parity symmetry P , related to the exchange of left- and right-handed components of the group $SU(2) \times SU(2)$. This symmetry is useful for protecting the Zbb coupling from large corrections in composite Higgs models [57] and brings additional effective operators to the scenario, as will be realized when listing the operators.

The CP-violating setup described in the next section follows the dynamical Higgs scenario of [55, 56, 58, 59] (see also [61, 62] and the summary [63]), as well as the left-right bosonic CP-conserving picture of [47].

The Effective Lagrangian

The effective CP-violating new physics contributions from the strong dynamics assumed here will lead to non-zero departures from the SM Lagrangian \mathcal{L} and will be encoded in the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{\text{chiral}}$ through

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{chiral}} = \mathcal{L} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{GB}} + \Delta\mathcal{L}_{\text{CP}} + \Delta\mathcal{L}_{\text{CP}},$$

Concerning only the bosonic interacting sector, the first piece in $\mathcal{L}_{\text{chiral}}$ reads as

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}B_{\mu\nu}B^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4}W_{\mu\nu}^a W^{\mu\nu a} - \frac{1}{4}G_{\mu\nu}^A G^{\mu\nu A} + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu h)(\partial^\mu h) - V(h) + (f^2/4)\text{Tr}(V_\mu V^\mu) + (1/32\pi^2) \text{Tr}(G_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu})$$

providing the SM strength gauge kinetic terms canonically normalized in the first line, while the second line contains h kinetic terms and the effective scalar potential $V(h)$ triggering EWSB, plus the W^\pm and Z masses and their couplings to the scalar h together with the GB-fermion kinetic terms. The last term corresponds to the well-known total derivative CP-odd gluonic coupling. Notice that the $SU(2)$ kinetic term and custodial-conserving p^2 -operator $\text{Tr}(V_\mu V^\mu)$ have been properly labeled to maintain clear notation according to the assumed local symmetry group. GB kinetic terms are already canonically normalized from the scale factor of $\text{Tr}(V_\mu V^\mu)$, consistent with the U definition.

Non-zero new physics departures from \mathcal{L} play a role once the symmetric counterpart sourced by the corresponding local $SU(2)$ extension is included, encoded through the remaining pieces of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{chiral}}$, focusing only on CP-violating operators:

- \mathcal{L}_{GB} : accounts for all possible p^2 operators mixing left- and right-handed covariant objects
- $\Delta\mathcal{L}_{\text{CP}}$: encodes all operators up to p contributions made from purely left- or right-handed covariant objects
- $\Delta\mathcal{L}_{\text{CP}}$: parametrizes any possible mixing interactions between $SU(2)$ and $SU(2)$ covariant objects up to p operators permitted by the underlying left-right symmetry

It is worth noting that at leading p^2 -order, the corresponding CP-violating $SU(2)$ strength gauge kinetic term (which would be encoded in \mathcal{L}_{GB}) turns out to be proportional to a total divergence and is thus disregarded from $\mathcal{L}_{\text{chiral}}$. However, once light Higgs couplings are switched on through $F(h)$, such $SU(2)$ kinetic terms must be retained in the effective approach, as will be done later.

A. $SU(2) - SU(2)$ p^2 -interplay: \mathcal{L}_{GB}

The leading-order p^2 Lagrangian for the $SU(2)$ extension brings operators made of mixed products of left- and right-handed objects via the covariant objects T_μ^A and V_μ^A defined previously, specifically from T_μ^A , V_μ^A , and W_μ^A defined in the building block section.

The p^2 -interplaying Lagrangian for these contributions is parametrized by

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = (1/4) \text{Tr}(\mathbb{V} \mathbb{V}^\dagger)$$

Contrary to the case of pure left- or right-handed strength gauge kinetic terms, this operator must be maintained in the effective Lagrangian, as it cannot be expressed as a total divergence due to the mixed fields involved.

At higher orders in the momentum expansion, more interactions are sourced by the local symmetry group, with some accounted for by the third piece of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{chiral}}$, $\Delta\mathcal{L}_{\text{CP}}$, described below.

B. G-extension of $\mathcal{L} + \mathcal{L}_2$: $\Delta\mathcal{L}_{\text{CP}}$

$\Delta\mathcal{L}_{\text{CP}}$ describes deviations from the leading-order Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} + \mathcal{L}_2$, encoding all possible CP-violating gauge-Higgs interactions up to p operators. It is split as

$$\Delta\mathcal{L}_{\text{CP}} = \Delta\mathcal{L}_{\text{CP},L} + \Delta\mathcal{L}_{\text{CP},R},$$

with the suffix L(R) labeling operators built from the $SU(2)$ (\mathbb{V}) building blocks.

In the context of purely electroweak chiral effective theories coupled to a light Higgs, the first contribution $\Delta\mathcal{L}_{\text{CP},L}$ has been provided in Ref. [55], while parts of $\Delta\mathcal{L}_{\text{CP},R}$ and $\Delta\mathcal{L}_{\text{CP},L}$ were analyzed for left-right symmetric frameworks in Refs. [48, 49].

Both contributions can be written as

$$\Delta\mathcal{L}_{\text{CP},L} = c_{\text{GS}_G}(h) + c_{\text{BS}_B}(h) + \sum_{i=\{W,2D\}} c_{i,S_i}(h) + \sum_i c_{i,S_i}(h)$$

$$\Delta\mathcal{L}_{\text{CP},R} = \sum_{i=\{W,2D\}} c_{i,S_i}(h) + \sum_i c_{i,S_i}(h)$$

where the coefficients c_B , c_G and c_i (with $i = L, R$) are model-dependent constants, while the first three terms of $\Delta\mathcal{L}_{\text{CP},L}$ and the first term of $\Delta\mathcal{L}_{\text{CP},R}$ can be jointly expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} S_G(h) &= (g_s^2/32) \text{Tr}[G_\mu\nu G^\mu\nu] F_G(h) & S_B(h) &= (g^2/16) \text{Tr}[B_\mu\nu B^\mu\nu] F_B(h) \\ S_{W_i}(h) &= (g^2/16) \text{Tr}[W_\mu\nu W^\mu\nu] F_{W_i}(h) & S_{2D}(h) &= i \text{Tr}[V_\mu\nu V^\mu\nu] F_{2D}(h) \end{aligned}$$

with suffix $i = L, R$, and the $F_i(h)$ functions of the scalar singlet h defined generically as in Eq. (10). The Higgs-independent terms are physically irrelevant for operators $S_B(h)$ and $S_{2D}(h)$, as the first two can be written as total divergences and the latter vanishes after integration by parts.

The covariant derivative D_μ of a field transforming in the adjoint representation of $SU(2)$ is defined as

$$D_\mu V_\nu = \partial_\mu V_\nu + ig_\mu [V_\nu, V_\mu], \quad i = L, R$$

The complete linearly independent set of 16 CP-violating pure gauge and gauge-Higgs non-linear invariant operators up to p -order in the effective Lagrangian

expansion are encoded by $S_{i, (h)}$ (the fourth term in $\Delta L_{CP, (h)}$) and have been completely listed in Ref. [55].

The symmetric counterpart extending this set, accounting for all possible CP-violating pure gauge and gauge-Higgs interactions up to \mathcal{P} operators, is described by the complete linearly independent set of 16 operators $S_{i, (h)}$ (the second term in $\Delta L_{CP, (h)}$). In total one has 32 non-linear operators, of which 20 ($10 S_{i, (h)} + 10 S_{i, (h)}$) had already been listed in Refs. [48, 49].

Here, 12 additional operators have been found ($6 S_{i, (h)} + 6 S_{i, (h)}$) and are naturally promoted by the symmetries of the model (together with the \mathcal{P} symmetry), such that the complete operator basis $S_{i, (h)} + S_{i, (h)}$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
 S_{i, (h)} &= g_{\pm} g' \text{B Tr}[T_{\pm} W_{\pm},] F, (h) S_{i, (h)} = i g' \text{B Tr}[T_{\pm} V_{\pm},] F, (h) \\
 S_{i, (h)} &= i g_{\pm} \text{Tr}[V, T_{\pm} W_{\pm},] F, (h) S_{i, (h)} = g_{\pm} \text{Tr}[T_{\pm} V, V,] F, (h) \\
 S_{i, (h)} &= i \text{Tr}[T_{\pm} V, V,] F, (h) S_{i, (h)} = i \text{Tr}[T_{\pm} V, V, V_{\pm},] F, (h) S_{i, (h)} \\
 &= g_{\pm} \text{Tr}[T_{\pm} W_{\pm}, V_{\pm},] F, (h) S_{i, (h)} = g_{\pm}^2 \text{Tr}[T_{\pm} W_{\pm},] \text{Tr}[T_{\pm} W_{\pm},] F, (h) \\
 S_{i, (h)} &= i g_{\pm} \text{Tr}[T_{\pm} D V, D V_{\pm},] F, (h) S_{i, (h)} = i \text{Tr}[T_{\pm} V, V, W_{\pm},] F, (h) \\
 S_{i, (h)} &= i \text{Tr}[T_{\pm} V, V,] F, (h) S_{i, (h)} = i \text{Tr}[T_{\pm} V, V, V, V,] F, (h) \\
 S_{i, (h)} &= i \text{Tr}[T_{\pm} V, V, V, V,] F, (h) S_{i, (h)} = i \text{Tr}[T_{\pm} V, V, V, V,] F, (h) \\
 S_{i, (h)} &= i \text{Tr}[T_{\pm} V, V, V, V,] F, (h) S_{i, (h)} = i \text{Tr}[T_{\pm} V, V, V, V,] F, (h)
 \end{aligned}$$

with $W_{\pm} = W_{\pm} / 2$. Operators already listed in the context of CP-violating electroweak chiral effective theories coupled to a light Higgs in Ref. [55] are highlighted in red. Notice that operators $S_{i, (h)}$ and $S_{i, (h)}$ containing double derivatives of $F(h)$ are not present in Refs. [48, 49], and are additional ones arising from extending the SM local symmetry through $SU(2)_{\pm}$, naturally allowed by the local symmetries of the model. The entire basis $S_{i, (h)}$ in Eq. (19) (for $\mathcal{P} = R$) emerges from the straightforward parity action of \mathcal{P} on the operator tower $S_{i, (h)}$ from Ref. [55] (concerning the Goldstone boson part only, i.e., before gauging the scenario).

The number of independent operators in the non-linear expansion turns out to be larger than for the analogous basis in the linear expansion, a generic feature when comparing both types of effective Lagrangians [58, 66]. The basis is also larger than those for chiral expansions developed for a very heavy Higgs particle (i.e., absent at low energies) [50-52, 54], because: (i) terms that were equivalent via total derivatives in the absence of $F_{i, (h)}$ functions are now independent, and (ii) new terms including derivatives of h appear.

The connection between the non-linear framework analyzed here and effective linear scenarios explicitly implementing the SM Higgs doublet has been established for the CP-conserving Lagrangian $L_{\text{chiral}} = L + \Delta L_{CP}$, in [56, 58], where all corresponding non-linear CP-conserving operators were weighted by powers of $\epsilon = v^2/f^2$ to track their operator siblings in the linear side. Likewise, a similar connection was made in [55] for the CP-violating non-linear Lagrangian $L_{\text{chiral}} = L + \Delta L_{CP, (h)}$, where each operator in the tower of Eq. (19) (for $\mathcal{P} = L$) was weighted by corresponding powers of $\epsilon = v^2/f^2$. For the complete

CP-violating Lagrangian in Eq. (11) assumed in this work, such linking between both EFT sides would require accounting for the left-right symmetric extension of the effective linear approaches, which is beyond the scope of this work.

Concerning the symmetry P mentioned in Section II, in the context of a general effective $SO(5)/SO(4)$ composite Higgs model scenario [67], the discrete parity P was shown to be an accidental symmetry up to p^2 -order and broken by several p operators. Exactly the same properties are shared by the non-linear electroweak bosonic $SU(2) \times SU(2) \times SO(4)$ invariant scenario studied recently in [47]. As suspected from the fact that $SU(2) \times SU(2) \times SO(4)$, the corresponding leading-order p^2 Lagrangian analyzed in [47] explicitly exhibited P as an accidental symmetry (before gauging). At higher momentum order, the p operators encoded in ΔL_{CP} did not break P either. Only when p operators made of mixed left- and right-handed covariant structures were included did non-zero contributions appear that trigger the breaking of P (see [47] for details).

All possible CP non-invariant pure gauge and gauge-Higgs interactions allowed by the local symmetry have been encoded up to p non-linear operators in the first three pieces of L_{chiral} , i.e., in $L + L_{\text{NL}} + \Delta L_{CP}$ through Eqs. (12)-(19). In the following section, the $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ interplay is addressed by accounting for all possible left-right symmetric CP-breaking interactions up to p -order in the chiral Lagrangian L_{chiral} , parametrized by the remaining piece in Eq. (11), ΔL_{CP} .

C. $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ interplay: ΔL_{CP} ,

The implementation of the covariant objects $V(\cdot)$, $T(\cdot)$ and $W(\cdot)$ allows building the complete basis of independent CP-violating operators accounting for mixing between $SU(2)$ and $SU(2)$ covariant structures, encoded as

$$\Delta L_{CP} = c_W S_W(h) + \sum_{i=3,13,14}^{16} \sum_j c_{i(j)} S_{i(j)}(h)$$

where index j spans all possible operators $S_{i(j)}(h)$ in Eq. (19) that can be built from each, here labeled as $S_{i(j)}(h)$ (with coefficients $c_{i(j)}$), while the first term encodes the operator

$$S_W(h) = g g \text{Tr}[W_\mu W_\mu] F_W(h)$$

The complete set of operators $S_{i(j)}(h)$ in the second term of ΔL_{CP} are listed as:

$$\begin{aligned} S_3(h) &= ig \text{Tr}[V_\mu V_\mu W_\mu] F_3(h) & S_4(h) &= ig \text{Tr}[V_\mu V_\mu W_\mu] F_4(h) \\ S_5(h) &= g \text{Tr}[T_\mu V_\mu V_\mu] F_5(h) & S_6(h) &= g \text{Tr}[T_\mu V_\mu V_\mu] F_6(h) \\ S_7(h) &= g \text{Tr}[T_\mu V_\mu V_\mu] F_7(h) & S_8(h) &= g \text{Tr}[T_\mu V_\mu V_\mu] F_8(h) \\ S_9(h) &= g \text{Tr}[T_\mu V_\mu V_\mu] F_9(h) & S_{10}(h) &= g \text{Tr}[T_\mu V_\mu V_\mu] F_{10}(h) \\ S_{11}(h) &= i\text{Tr}[T_\mu V_\mu V_\mu] F_{11}(h) & S_{12}(h) &= i\text{Tr}[T_\mu V_\mu V_\mu] F_{12}(h) \\ S_{13}(h) &= i\text{Tr}[T_\mu V_\mu V_\mu] F_{13}(h) & S_{14}(h) &= i\text{Tr}[T_\mu V_\mu V_\mu] F_{14}(h) \\ S_{15}(h) &= i\text{Tr}[T_\mu V_\mu V_\mu] F_{15}(h) & S_{16}(h) &= i\text{Tr}[T_\mu V_\mu V_\mu] F_{16}(h) \end{aligned}$$

its explicit breaking [47], as expected from general composite Higgs model considerations [67, 68].

Some CP non-conserving bosonic operators can be directly translated into pure bosonic operators plus fermionic-bosonic ones. In fact, some operators in Eq. (19) (for $\psi = L$) had not been explored but were instead traded for fermionic ones via equations of motion [61]. This connection can be established through the covariant derivative $D_\mu V$, and the corresponding equation of motion for the light Higgs field, as described in the non-linear left-right CP-conserving treatment of Ref. [47]. Following the same reasoning, it is inferred that for the massless fermion case, operators $\{S_\mu^\psi(h), S_\mu^\psi(h)\}$ containing the contraction $D_\mu V$, can be traded for pure bosonic operators in ΔL_{CP} (Eq. (19)), some with structure $D_\mu V$, and therefore can be disregarded from the final operator basis in ΔL_{CP} . A similar feature applies to ΔL_{CP} , (Eqs. (22)-(23)). For the massive fermion case, all previous operators must be retained in the final basis.

In general, for the vanishing fermion case, operator $S_\mu^\psi(h)$ with double derivatives of $F(h)$ in Eq. (19) is rewritable in terms of bosonic operators, some contained in ΔL_{CP} and others in ΔL_{CP} , and thus can be disregarded from the final operator basis. No operators from ΔL_{CP} are tradeable to bosonic operators as there are no double derivative couplings of $F(h)$ in ΔL_{CP} . When fermion masses are switched on, $S_\mu^\psi(h)$ becomes physical and must be included in the final basis.

Integrating-out heavy right-handed fields

It is possible to integrate out the right-handed gauge fields from the physical spectrum via the equations of motion for the strength gauge fields W_μ^\pm, W_μ^3 , as done for the CP-conserving case in [47, 69]. A non-trivial equation of motion for the CP-violating case is obtained by including the analogous right-handed counterparts for the strength kinetic and custodial-conserving terms of L in (12), together with mixing effects from the term $c_{PC} P_{CR}(h)$, where c_{PC} is the coefficient for the CP-conserving left-right operator $P_{CR}(h) = (f/f_2)\text{Tr}[V_\mu^\dagger V_\mu] F_{CR}(h)$. Accounting for these contributions yields

$$D_\mu V_\nu - (f/f_2)c_{PC} V_\mu^\dagger V_\nu = 0,$$

This relation can be translated into unitary gauge as

$$W_\mu^3 - W_\mu^3, W_\mu^\pm - W_\mu^\pm, B_\mu = (1 + \alpha)B_\mu - W_\mu^3,$$

$$\text{with } \alpha = -(f/f_2)c_{PC}.$$

By substituting Eq. (25) into (16)-(19) (for $\psi = R$) and (20)-(23), all right-handed and left-right operators collapse onto left-handed ones, affecting the global coefficients c_i , generically as

$$\tilde{c}_i = c_i + c_i + \sum_j c_i(j), \quad + \sum_m c_l(m),$$

where the functions encode linear combinations of coefficients $c_{i,j}$, and additional mixing left-right operators via $c_{l(m)}$. The number of fields V , through each right- and left-right operator determines the f/f suppression for contributions induced onto left-handed operators.

Consequently, in the limiting case $f \ll f$ at low energies, the set of non-linear operators $\{S_B(h), S_{2D}(h), S_2(h)\}$ is sensitive to contributions up to order from right-handed operators $\{S_W(h), S_1(h), S_8(h)\}$ and mixing left-right sets $\{S_{2D}(h), S_9(h)\}$. It can also be seen that CP-violating self-couplings of electroweak gauge bosons are sensitive only to left-handed operators at low energies.

Following Ref. [70], the CP-odd sector of the Lagrangian describing triple gauge boson vertices (TGVs) can be parametrized as

$$L_{WWV}^{\text{eff,CP}} = ig_{WWV}[g^{\sim}VW^\dagger W(V_+ + V_-) - \tilde{r}_V W^\dagger W V + (\tilde{r}_V/6) W^\dagger W V_- + g^{\sim}V(W^\dagger W - W W^\dagger)V + g^{\sim}V(W^\dagger - W - W - W^\dagger)V_- + (\tilde{r}_V/2)(W^\dagger - W + W - W^\dagger)V_-]$$

with $g_{WWZ} = e/s_W c_W$ and $g_{WW} = e$, where W^\pm and V stand for the kinetic parts of the implied gauge field strengths. The dual field tensor of any field strength V is defined as $V^{\sim} = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{\mu\nu} V_{\mu\nu}$, with $c_W = \cos \theta_W$ and $s_W = \sin \theta_W$ (θ_W being the Weinberg angle). In writing this we introduced coefficients $\tilde{g}^{\sim}V$, \tilde{g}_V , and \tilde{r}_V associated with operators containing the contraction V ; its part vanishes only for on-shell gauge bosons. In general, V insertions could only be disregarded when fermion masses are neglected.

In the SM all couplings vanish. Electromagnetic gauge invariance requires $\tilde{g}^{\sim} = 0$, $\tilde{g}_- = 0$, and $\tilde{r}_- = 0$. All other effective couplings are given by

$$\tilde{g}^{\sim}Z = (c^2/4e^2 s_W^2)(c_\gamma + 2c_\beta), \tilde{r}_- = c, \tilde{r}_Z = (c^2/4e^2 s_W^2)(c_\gamma - 2c_\beta), \tilde{r}_Z = (c^2/4e^2 s_W^2)(c_\gamma + c_\beta)$$

An additional contribution to the ZZZ vertex arises from operators $S_{ZZ}(h)$ and $S_{ZZ}(h)$ as

$$L_{ZZZ}^{\text{eff,CP}} = \tilde{g}^{\sim}Z Z Z$$

with $\tilde{g}^{\sim}Z = (c^2/4e^2 s_W^2)(c_\gamma + c_\beta + 2c_\beta)$, which, like the phenomenological couplings $\tilde{g}^{\sim}V$ and \tilde{g}_V in the TGV parametrization, vanishes for on-shell Z bosons and can generally be disregarded when fermion masses coupling to the Z are neglected.

The coupling \tilde{r}_- induces one-loop contributions to fermion electric dipole moments (EDMs), which are generically the best probes of beyond-SM CP violation due to stringent experimental bounds and minimal SM background contributions. The amplitude for the one-loop fermionic EDM can be parametrized as

$$A_f = -id_f \bar{u}(p) \gamma_\mu u(p)$$

where d_f denotes the fermionic EDM strength. The one-loop integral diverges logarithmically; assuming a physical cutoff Λ_s for the high-energy BSM theory, following the generic computation in Ref. [72] and implementing \tilde{c}_- from (32), we obtain the EDM coefficient

$$d_f = (e^3 G_{FT} / \sqrt{2} s_W^2) (c_+ + 2c_-) \log(\Lambda_s^2 / m_W^2)$$

where T is the fermion weak isospin and G_F is the Fermi coupling constant. The present experimental bound on the electron EDM [73], $|d_e| < 8.7 \times 10^{-29}$ cm at 90% CL, and the neutron EDM [74], $|d_n| < 2.9 \times 10^{-26}$ cm at 90% CL, entail limits

$$|c_+ + 2c_-| < 5.2 \times 10^{-4} \text{ (electron)} \quad |c_+ + 2c_-| < 2.8 \times 10^{-4} \text{ (neutron)}$$

Direct constraints on CP-violating effects in the WWZ vertex can be imposed by combining LEP collaboration studies on angular distributions of W bosons and their decay products in WW production at LEP2 [76–78]. This combination yields the 1- σ (68% CL) constraints [55]

$$c_+ - 0.50 c_-, \quad -c_+, \quad -0.35$$

Effective CP-violating hVV couplings are also affected in this framework. In particular, the hZZ vertex can be parametrized as

$$\mathcal{L}_{hZZ}^{\text{eff,CP}} = \tilde{g}_{HZZ} h Z Z$$

with tree-level contribution

$$\tilde{g}_{HZZ} = (c^2 / 4e^2 s_W^2) [\tilde{a}_+ + \tilde{a}_W, -\tilde{a}_-, -\tilde{a}_+, +\tilde{a}_-, -\tilde{a}_+, +\tilde{a}_-,]$$

where coefficients \tilde{a}_i are defined as $\tilde{a}_i = c_i a_i$, with a_i from the F(h) definition in (10). This coupling is useful for parametrizing CP violation in the decay $h \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow 4$ [16, 79]. In Ref. [79] a measure of CP violation was defined as

$$f_d = |d| / (|d|^2 + |d'|^2)$$

with $d = 2i$ and $d' = i(f^2 / 4e^2 s_W^2) \tilde{g}_{HZZ}$, where f is the electroweak scale and $\sigma(\gamma\gamma)$ is the cross section for the process $h \rightarrow ZZ^* \rightarrow 4$ when $d = 1$, $d' = 0$ (and vice versa). For $M_h = 125.6$ GeV, $\sigma(\gamma\gamma) = 6.36$ fb.

In Ref. [79], f_d was fitted as one parameter of a multivariable analysis, obtaining the measured value $f_d = 0.00 \pm 0.11$, implying $|d| < 0.51$ at 95% CL, which translates to $|d|/|d'| < 2.57$. These bounds can be directly translated to 68% (95%) CL constraints on the coefficients of relevant CP-violating operators through the coupling in (41) as

$$|\tilde{g}_{HZZ}| < 10.3 \text{ (23.3)}$$

None of the involved coefficients receive contributions at low energies from right-handed or left-right operators. For a high-energy scale f not far above the electroweak scale f , additional operators would contribute to left-handed ones as

the ratio f/f would be non-negligible. Nonetheless, these additional contributions are small because the allowed range $-0.02 < c_C, < 0.02$ [69] suppresses the scale ratio and therefore the parameter ϵ in (25). For the hypothetical case $c_C, = 1$ and $f = f$, right- and left-right operator contributions are enhanced, and all coefficients through the couplings become modified by terms involving c_i , and $c_i(j)$, .

Counting the number of right-handed and left-right operators appearing through the coefficients leads to a final effective set of 40 operators total = 20 left ops. (set in Eq. (17)+Eq. (19)) + 5 right ops. (in Eq. (45)) + 15 left-right ops (in Eq. (45)). A right-handed gauge sector far above the electroweak scale implies a hierarchical case with NP effects parametrized via a much smaller operator basis, as the f/f suppression leaves 25 operators total = 20 left ops. + 3 right ops. (in Eq. (29)) + 2 left-right ops (in Eq. (30)).

Conclusions

Electroweak interactions in nature exhibit non-exact charge conjugation-parity symmetry. Moreover, the observed matter-antimatter asymmetry compels us to consider new sources of CP violation, as signaled by the strong CP problem.

Low-energy effects from a CP-violating sector may be sourced by new physics field content playing a role at high-energy regimes reachable at the LHC and future colliders. An effective approach is thus needed to parametrize these effects. This paper, concerning only the bosonic gauge sector, assumes the NP field content is dictated by spin-1 resonances from extending the SM local gauge symmetry $U(1)$ to the larger group $U(1)$, described via a non-linear electroweak scenario with a light dynamical Higgs, up to p contributions in the Lagrangian expansion, focusing on the CP-violating sector.

This work completes the CP-violating pure gauge and gauge-Higgs operator basis given in Refs. [48, 49] for left-right symmetric electroweak chiral models, generalizing the work of Refs. [50–54] for the CP-violating sector with a heavy Higgs chiral scenario, and extending Ref. [55] for the CP-violating light Higgs dynamical framework to a larger local gauge symmetry in the context of non-linear electroweak interactions coupled to a light Higgs.

The framework may be considered a generic UV completion of low-energy non-linear approaches [50–54, 55], assuming the extended gauge field sector arises from an energy regime above the electroweak scale. The physical effects from integrating out right-handed fields are analyzed, particularly impacts on CP-violating gauge couplings (Eqs. (31)-(34), (37), (39)), EDM observables (Eqs. (36), (38)), effective hZZ coupling, and CP violation in $h \rightarrow 4$ (Eqs. (40)-(41)). The relevant operator set at low energies contains 25 operators total = 20 left ops. + 3 right ops. (in Eq. (29)) + 2 left-right ops (in Eq. (30)).

Further low-energy effects from a higher-energy gauge sector [69, 80] could illuminate the underlying new physics in nature and aid in understanding the

origin of electroweak symmetry breaking.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge valuable comments from R. Alonso, I. Brivio, M. B. Gavela, J. Gonzalez-Fraile, D. Marzocca, L. Merlo, and J. Sanz-Cillero. J.Y. and R.K. acknowledge KITPC financial support during this work.

References

- [1] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad et al., Phys. Lett. B716 (2012) 1-29, [arXiv:1207.7214]. [2] CMS Collaboration, S. Chatrchyan et al., Phys. Lett. B716 (2012) 30-61, [arXiv:1207.7235]. [3] F. Englert and R. Brout, Phys. Rev. Lett. 13 (1964) 321. [4] P. W. Higgs, Phys. Lett. 12 (1964) 132-133. [5] P. W. Higgs, Phys. Rev. Lett. 13 (1964) 508-509. [6] J. R. Dell' Aquila and C. A. Nelson, Phys. Rev. D33 (1986) 80. [7] J. R. Dell' Aquila and C. A. Nelson, Phys. Rev. D33 (1986) 93. [8] J. R. Dell' Aquila and C. A. Nelson, Phys. Rev. D33 (1986) 101. [9] A. Soni and R. Xu, Phys. Rev. D48 (1993) 5259-5263, [hep-ph/9301225]. [10] D. Chang, W.-Y. Keung, and I. Phillips, Phys. Rev. D48 (1993) 3225-3234, [hep-ph/9303226]. [11] T. Arens and L. Sehgal, Z. Phys. C66 (1995) 89-94, [hep-ph/9409396]. [12] S. Choi, D. Miller, M. Muhlleitner, and P. Zerwas, Phys. Lett. B553 (2003) 61-71, [hep-ph/0210077]. [13] C. Buszello, I. Fleck, P. Marquard, and J. van der Bij, Eur. Phys. J. C32 (2004) 209-219, [hep-ph/0212396]. [14] R. M. Godbole, D. Miller, and M. M. Muhlleitner, JHEP 0712 (2007) 031, [arXiv:0708.0458]. [15] Q.-H. Cao, C. Jackson, W.-Y. Keung, I. Low, and J. Shu, Phys. Rev. D81 (2010) 015010, [arXiv:0911.3398]. [16] Y. Gao, A. V. Gritsan, Z. Guo, K. Melnikov, M. Schulze, et al., Phys. Rev. D81 (2010) 075022, [arXiv:1001.3396]. [17] A. De Rujula, J. Lykken, M. Pierini, C. Rogan, and M. Spiropulu, Phys. Rev. D82 (2010) 013003, [arXiv:1001.5300]. [18] T. Plehn, D. L. Rainwater, and D. Zeppenfeld, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88 (2002) 051801, [hep-ph/0105325]. [19] C. Buszello and P. Marquard, hep-ph/0603209. [20] V. Hankele, G. Klamke, D. Zeppenfeld, and T. Figy, Phys. Rev. D74 (2006) 095001, [hep-ph/0609075]. [21] G. Klamke and D. Zeppenfeld, JHEP 0704 (2007) 052, [hep-ph/0703202]. [22] C. Englert, M. Spannowsky, and M. Takeuchi, JHEP 1206 (2012) 108, [arXiv:1203.5788]. [23] K. Odagiri, JHEP 0303 (2003) 009, [hep-ph/0212215]. [24] V. Del Duca, G. Klamke, D. Zeppenfeld, M. L. Mangano, M. Moretti, et al., JHEP 0610 (2006) 016, [hep-ph/0608158]. [25] J. R. Andersen, K. Arnold, and D. Zeppenfeld, JHEP 1006 (2010) 091, [arXiv:1001.3822]. [26] C. Englert, D. Goncalves-Netto, K. Mawatari, and T. Plehn, JHEP 1301 (2013) 148, [arXiv:1212.0843]. [27] A. Djouadi, R. Godbole, B. Mellado, and K. Mohan, Phys. Lett. B723 (2013) 307-313, [arXiv:1303.6591]. [28] M. J. Dolan, P. Harris, M. Jankowiak, and M. Spannowsky, Phys. Rev. D90 (2014) 7, 073008, arXiv:1406.3322. [29] N. D. Christensen, T. Han, and Y. Li, Phys. Lett. B693 (2010) 28-35, [arXiv:1005.5393]. [30] N. Desai, D. K. Ghosh, and B. Mukhopadhyaya, Phys. Rev. D83 (2011) 113004, [arXiv:1104.3327]. [31] J. Ellis, D. S. Hwang, V.

Sanz, and T. You, JHEP 1211 (2012) 134, [arXiv:1208.6002]. [32] R. Godbole, D. J. Miller, K. Mohan, and C. D. White, Phys. Lett. B730 (2014) 275–279, [arXiv:1306.2573]. [33] C. Delaunay, G. Perez, H. de Sandes, and W. Skiba, Phys. Rev. D89 (2014) 035004, [arXiv:1308.4930]. [34] M. Voloshin, Phys. Rev. D86 (2012) 093016, [arXiv:1208.4303]. [35] A. Y. Korchin and V. A. Kovalchuk, Phys. Rev. D88 (2013) 036009, [arXiv:1303.0365]. [36] F. Bishara, Y. Grossman, R. Harnik, D. J. Robinson, J. Shu, et al., JHEP 1404 (2014) 084, [arXiv:1312.2955]. [37] Y. Chen, A. Falkowski, I. Low, and R. Vega-Morales, Phys. Rev. D90 (2014) 113006, arXiv:1405.6723. [38] A. Freitas and P. Schwaller, Phys. Rev. D87 (2013) 055014, [arXiv:1211.1980]. [39] A. Djouadi and G. Moreau, Eur. Phys. J. C73 (2013) 2512, [arXiv:1303.6591]. [40] H. Belusca-Maito, arXiv:1404.5343. [41] J. Shu and Y. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 111 (2013) 091801, arXiv:1304.0773. [42] K. Cheung, J. S. Lee, and P.-Y. Tseng, JHEP 1305 (2013) 134, arXiv:1302.3794. [43] S. Dwivedi, D. K. Ghosh, B. Mukhopadhyaya, and A. Shivaji, arXiv:1505.05844. [44] J. C. Pati and A. Salam, Phys. Rev. D10 (1974) 275. [45] R. N. Mohapatra and J. C. Pati, Phys. Rev. D11 (1975) 566; R. N. Mohapatra and J. C. Pati, Phys. Rev. D11 (1975) 2558; G. Senjanovic and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. D12 (1975) 1502. [46] H. Georgi and D. B. Kaplan, Phys. Lett. B145 (1984) 216. [47] J. Yepes, arXiv:1507.03974. [48] Y. Zhang, S. Z. Wang, F. J. Ge, and Q. Wang, Phys. Lett. B653 (2007) 259, [arXiv:0704.2172]. [49] S. Z. Wang, S. Z. Jiang, F. J. Ge, and Q. Wang, JHEP 0806 (2008) 107, [arXiv:0805.0643]. [50] T. Appelquist and C. W. Bernard, Phys. Rev. D22 (1980) 200. [51] A. C. Longhitano, Phys. Rev. D22 (1980) 1166. [52] A. C. Longhitano, Nucl. Phys. B188 (1981) 118. [53] F. Feruglio, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A8 (1993) 4937–4972, [hep-ph/9301281]. [54] T. Appelquist and G.-H. Wu, Phys. Rev. D48 (1993) 3235–3241, [hep-ph/9304240]. [55] M. B. Gavela, J. Gonzalez-Fraile, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, L. Merlo, S. Rigolin, and J. Yepes, JHEP 1410 (2014) 044, [arXiv:1406.6367]. [56] R. Alonso, M. B. Gavela, L. Merlo, S. Rigolin, and J. Yepes, Phys. Lett. B722 (2013) 330–335, [arXiv:1212.3305]. [57] K. Agashe, R. Contino, L. Da Rold, et al., Phys. Lett. B641 (2006) 62–66, [arXiv:hep-ph/0605341]. [58] I. Brivio, T. Corbett, O. Eboli, M. B. Gavela, J. Gonzalez-Fraile, et al., JHEP 1403 (2014) 024, [arXiv:1311.1823]. [59] R. Alonso, M. B. Gavela, L. Merlo, S. Rigolin, and J. Yepes, Phys. Rev. D87 (2013) 055019, [arXiv:1212.3307]. [60] G. Buchalla and O. Catà, JHEP 1207 (2012) 101, [arXiv:1203.6510]. [61] G. Buchalla, O. Catà, and C. Krause, Nucl. Phys. B880 (2014) 552, [arXiv:1307.5017]. [62] G. Buchalla, O. Catà, and C. Krause, Phys. Lett. B731 (2014) 80, [arXiv:1312.5624]. [63] I. Brivio, arXiv:1505.00637. [64] G. Cvetič and R. Kogerler, Nucl. Phys. B328 (1989) 342. [65] R. Alonso, M. Gavela, L. Merlo, S. Rigolin, and J. Yepes, JHEP 1206 (2012) 076, [arXiv:1201.1511]. [66] I. Brivio, O. J. P. Eboli, M. B. Gavela, J. Gonzalez-Fraile, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, L. Merlo, and S. Rigolin, JHEP 1412 (2014) 004, arXiv:1405.5412. [67] R. Contino, D. Marzocca, D. Pappadopulo, and R. Rattazzi, JHEP 1110 (2011) 081, [arXiv:1109.1570]. [68] R. Alonso, I. Brivio, B. Gavela, L. Merlo, and S. Rigolin, JHEP 1412 (2014) 034, arXiv:1409.1589. [69] J. Shu and J. Yepes, [arXiv:1512.09310]. [70] K. Hagiwara, R. Peccei, D. Zeppenfeld, and K. Hikasa,

Nucl. Phys. B282 (1987) 253. [71] T. Appelquist, M. Piai, and R. Shrock, Phys. Lett. B593 (2004) 175, [arXiv:hep-ph/0401114]. [72] W. J. Marciano and A. Queijeiro, Phys. Rev. D33 (1986) 3449. [73] ACME Collaboration, J. Baron et al., Science 343 (2014) 269-272, [arXiv:1310.7534]. [74] C. Baker et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 97 (2006) 131801, [hep-ex/0602020]. [75] S. Dawson, S. K. Gupta, and G. Valencia, Phys. Rev. D88 (2013) 035008, [arXiv:1304.3514]. [76] OPAL Collaboration, G. Abbiendi et al., Eur. Phys. J. C19 (2001) 229-240, [hep-ex/0009021]. [77] DELPHI Collaboration, J. Abdallah et al., Eur. Phys. J. C54 (2008) 345-364, [arXiv:0801.1235]. [78] ALEPH Collaboration, S. Schael et al., Phys. Lett. B614 (2005) 7-26. [79] CMS Collaboration, S. Chatrchyan et al., Phys. Rev. D89 (2014) 092007, [arXiv:1312.5353]. [80] J. Shu and J. Yepes, [arXiv:1601.06891].

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv – Machine translation. Verify with original.