

# Spontaneous symmetry breaking in gauge theories via Bose-Einstein condensation

Francesco SANNINO\* and Kimmo TUOMINEN†  
NORDITA, Blegdamsvej 17, DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark  
(Dated: March 2002)

We propose a mechanism naturally leading to the spontaneous symmetry breaking in a gauge theory. The Higgs field is assumed to have global and gauged internal symmetries. We associate a non zero chemical potential to one of the globally conserved charges commuting with all of the gauge transformations. This induces a negative mass squared for the Higgs field triggering the spontaneous symmetry breaking of the global and local symmetries. The mechanism is general and we test the idea for the electroweak theory in which the Higgs sector is extended to possess an extra global Abelian symmetry. To this symmetry we associate a non zero chemical potential. The Bose-Einstein condensation of the Higgs leads, at tree level, to modified dispersion relations for the Higgs field while the dispersion relations of the gauge bosons and fermions remain undisturbed. The latter are modified through higher order corrections. We have computed some corrections to the vacuum polarizations of the gauge bosons and fermions. To quantify the corrections to the gauge boson vacuum polarizations with respect to the Standard Model we considered the effects on the  $T$  parameter. We finally derive the one loop modified fermion dispersion relations.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Standard Model of particle interactions has been much studied and has passed numerous experimental tests [1]. Despite its experimental successes it is commonly believed that it is yet an incomplete model. Within the Standard Model, for example, one does not know what controls the spontaneous breaking of the electroweak symmetry since the negative mass squared of the Higgs particle is simply assumed. Different models have been proposed to address the problem of electroweak symmetry breaking. Technicolor theories [2] and supersymmetric extensions [3] of the Standard Model are two relevant examples.

In this paper we explore the possibility that the relativistic Bose-Einstein phenomenon, much studied in the literature [4, 5], is the source of spontaneous symmetry breaking of a generic gauge theory. We introduce a chemical potential  $\mu$  for some global symmetries of the Higgs field. The generators associated to these symmetries are chosen to commute with the gauge transformations. A relevant property of the theory is that the chemical potential induces a negative mass squared for the Higgs field at the tree level hence destabilizing the symmetric vacuum and triggering symmetry breaking. The local gauge symmetries are broken spontaneously and the associated gauge bosons acquire a standard mass term. This is so since we have chosen the global generator associated with the chemical potential to commute with the gauge transformations. In this way the mass of the Higgs boson is intrinsically related to a given charge density while its potential is in fact (at zero temperature) the thermodynamical potential. While the properties of the massive gauge bosons at the tree level are identical to the ones induced by the conventional Higgs mechanism, the Higgs field encodes all of the information associated to this different way of symmetry breaking. It has specific non Lorentz covariant dispersion relations since the introduction of the chemical potential differentiates between space and time. However the directly observable part of the theory feels Lorentz breaking effects via radiative corrections involving the Higgs field. The size of the corrections to the dispersion relations of a given particle is controlled by the relative coupling strength of the various particles with the Higgs.

We start our analysis in a pedagogical way by first reviewing how spontaneous symmetry breaking manifests itself in a relativistic non ideal (i.e. self-interacting) bosonic  $U(1)$  invariant theory with an associated non zero chemical potential. Via this simple model we familiarize with the scalar field dispersion relations in the spontaneously broken phase. We then consider an example of a gauge theory in which spontaneous symmetry breaking is entirely due to the introduction of a specific chemical potential. The gauge symmetry is taken to be identical to the one of the Standard Model i.e.  $SU_L(2) \times U_Y(1)$ .

The Higgs sector of the theory is minimally extended to enable the inclusion of a chemical potential not associated with any of the gauge generators. In the Standard Model the Higgs sector has an accidental  $SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2)$  global symmetry where the  $SU_L(2)$  is gauged and the hypercharge is associated to the diagonal  $SU_R(2)$  generator. We

---

\*Electronic address: francesco.sannino@nbi.dk

†Electronic address: tuominen@nordita.dk

consider the extension where the Higgs sector contains an extra  $U_A(1)$  symmetry. To this extra global symmetry we then associate a non zero chemical potential which enters with a negative mass squared term in the Lagrangian for the Higgs leading to the destabilization of the vacuum and spontaneous symmetry breaking. So the  $U_A(1) \times SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2)$  breaks to an unbroken  $SU_V(2)$  with three of the gauge bosons acquiring a mass term while the photon remains massless.  $SU_V(2)$  is the custodial symmetry which at the tree level guarantees the relation  $M_W^2 = M_Z^2 \cos^2 \theta_W$ , where  $M_W$  is the mass of the electromagnetically charged gauge bosons,  $M_Z$  is the  $Z$  neutral gauge boson mass and  $\theta_W$  is the Weinberg angle. Three of the four goldstone bosons, in the unitary gauge, become the longitudinal components of the massive gauge bosons while we are left with an extra massless (i.e. gapless) degree of freedom  $\eta$ . In the theory we have one more singlet field which is the neutral Higgs  $h$ . Due to the presence of the chemical potential a time dependent Lorentz breaking mixing term between the  $h$  and the  $\eta$  field emerges. This is the term responsible for non conventional dispersion relations for the  $h$  and  $\eta$  field. The  $\eta$  gap (the energy at zero momentum) is still zero while the  $h$  gap is slightly higher than the mass associated to the potential curvature evaluated on the vacuum of the theory. Hence we predict a Higgs sector with very specific dispersion relations and mass spectrum. Different models where the  $\eta$  field is not light can also be constructed.

All of the gauge bosons, at the tree level, possess standard Lorentz covariant dispersion relations and the Lorentz breaking effects for those are felt only via radiative corrections. The diagrams inducing Lorentz breaking include the exchange of the Higgs and/or  $\eta$  particles. We have computed the relevant zero momentum one loop contribution to the  $W$  and  $Z$  vacuum polarizations. The details of the computation are in the appendix. Since the chemical potential differentiates between time and space and we have a scalar vacuum the dispersion relations are isotropic. Theories with condensates of vectorial type have been studied in different realms of theoretical physics [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. To quantify the corrections with respect to the Standard Model, we have generalized the oblique parameter  $T$  [15, 16] to have a Lorentz structure  $T^{\mu\nu} \propto (\Pi_{11}^{\mu\nu new}(0) - \Pi_{33}^{\mu\nu new}(0))$  where  $\Pi^{new}$  indicates the new physics contributions to the vacuum polarization of the vector bosons. The Lorentz breaking sector preserves the custodial symmetry and we find  $T^{\mu\nu} = T g^{\mu\nu}$ . However there is an effect on  $T$  due to the fact that the  $h$  gap is different than the ordinary mass in the Standard Model yielding  $T \simeq -0.048$ . The fermionic sector of the Standard Model has also been investigated. We have shown that for a generic fermion the dispersion relations are  $E^2 = v_f^2 p^2 + m_f^2$ . At the one loop level due to the smallness of the Yukawa coupling  $v_f$  is small.

Effects of a large lepton number on the spontaneous gauge symmetry breaking for the electroweak theory at high temperature relevant for the early universe have been studied in the literature [6, 7, 8, 17, 18].

The issue of Lorentz breaking has attracted recently theoretical [19, 20, 21] and experimental attention [22]. For example in [20] possible extensions of the Standard Model were studied in which Lorentz symmetry is violated. In [19, 20] the authors investigate possible phenomenological consequences due to explicit Lorentz breaking terms added to the Standard Model Lagrangian. In the present case Lorentz breaking is due to a net background charge density.

In section II we briefly summarize the basic properties of Bose-Einstein condensation relevant for our theory. We investigate spontaneous symmetry breaking in a gauge theory due to Bose-Einstein condensation in section III. The electroweak gauge sector of the Standard Model is chosen as a fundamental example to test our idea. We analyze the tree level and some of the higher order corrections in section IV. We finally compute the general structure of the corrections to the fermion dispersion relations and predict the size of the corrections within our framework. Experiments studying the dispersion relations for different fermions may be able to test our predictions. Finally we summarize in V while suggesting different possible investigations and/or extensions. An appendix in which we provide some useful results and explicit evaluations of diagrams concludes the paper.

## II. BOSE-EINSTEIN CONDENSATION IN A NUTSHELL

The effects of a net background charge on ideal and interacting relativistic Bose gases with Abelian and non Abelian symmetries have been investigated in the literature [4, 5]. In this section we briefly review the basic aspects related to the introduction of a net background charge for a bosonic theory with  $U(1)$  invariance which we will then use when extending the theory to describe the electroweak symmetry breaking sector of the Standard Model. It has been shown that the chemical potential associated to a net background charge for a charged scalar field must be introduced at the Lagrangian level as follows[4, 5]:

$$\mathcal{L} = D_\mu \phi^* D^\mu \phi - m^2 |\phi|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{4} |\phi|^4, \quad (1)$$

with  $m^2$  and  $\lambda$  positive constants and

$$D_\nu \phi = \partial_\nu \phi - i A_\nu \phi, \quad A_\nu = \mu \left(1, \vec{0}\right), \quad (2)$$

and  $\mu$  the associated chemical potential. Substituting eq.(2) in eq.(1) we have:

$$\mathcal{L} = \partial_\mu \phi^* \partial^\mu \phi + i \mu (\phi^* \partial_0 \phi - \partial_0 \phi^* \phi) - (m^2 - \mu^2) |\phi|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{4} |\phi|^4 . \quad (3)$$

The grand canonical partition function is:

$$Z = \int [d\phi] [d\phi^*] \exp \left[ \int_0^\beta d\tau \int_V d^3x \mathcal{L} \right] , \quad (4)$$

where  $\tau$  is euclidian time and  $\beta = 1/T$  is the inverse of the temperature. We will be working in the following at zero temperature. The introduction of the chemical potential has broken Lorentz invariance  $SO(1, 3)$  to  $SO(3)$  while providing a *negative* mass squared contribution to the boson. This is at the heart of the Bose-Einstein condensation phenomenon. When  $\mu > m$  we have spontaneous breaking of  $U(1)$  invariance. We will later on exploit this basic feature to provide an alternative way for spontaneously breaking a local rather than global internal symmetry. Defining

$$\phi = \langle \phi \rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (h + i \eta) , \quad (5)$$

the quadratic term in the fields reads:

$$L_{quadratic} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} h & \eta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -\partial^2 - (m^2 - \mu^2) - \frac{3\lambda}{2} \langle \phi \rangle^2 & -2\mu \partial_0 \\ 2\mu \partial_0 & -\partial^2 - (m^2 - \mu^2) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \langle \phi \rangle^2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} h \\ \eta \end{bmatrix} \quad (6)$$

where we have chosen  $\langle \phi \rangle$  real.  $\langle \phi \rangle = 0$  for  $\mu \leq m$  while

$$\langle \phi \rangle^2 = \frac{2}{\lambda} (\mu^2 - m^2) , \quad (7)$$

for  $\mu > m$ . In the broken phase we have a gapless (i.e. the energy at zero momentum) excitation as well as a gapped excitation. The kinetic term matrix in the momentum space is:

$$L_{quadratic} = \frac{1}{2} [h(-p), \eta(-p)] D(p) \begin{bmatrix} h(p) \\ \eta(p) \end{bmatrix} , \quad (8)$$

$$D(p) = \begin{bmatrix} p_0^2 - \mathbf{p}^2 - (m^2 - \mu^2) - \frac{3\lambda}{2} \langle \phi \rangle^2 & 2i\mu p_0 \\ -2i\mu p_0 & p_0^2 - \mathbf{p}^2 - (m^2 - \mu^2) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \langle \phi \rangle^2 \end{bmatrix} . \quad (9)$$

Imposing, as customary, the vanishing of the determinant of  $D(p)$  one determines the tree level dispersion relations. In the broken phase after expanding in the momentum we have:

$$E_h^2 = \Delta^2 + \left( 1 + 4 \frac{\mu^2}{\Delta^2} \right) p^2 - \frac{\mu^4}{\Delta^6} p^4 + \dots , \quad (10)$$

$$E_\eta^2 = \left( 1 - 4 \frac{\mu^2}{\Delta^2} \right) p^2 + 16 \frac{\mu^4}{\Delta^4} p^4 + \dots , \quad (11)$$

with  $\Delta^2 = 2(3\mu^2 - m^2)$ . We note that for  $p_0$  and  $p$  very large we recover the propagators of the free theory for massless particles. So that all of the ultraviolet properties of the theory are identical to the one before adding the chemical potential at zero temperature. This observation allows us immediately to conclude that if a theory were renormalizable before adding the chemical potential it will remain renormalizable after having introduced it. On the other hand for small momenta and large  $\mu$  we have a static field of mass squared  $\Delta^2 = 6\mu^2$  and a massless state with  $E_\eta^2 = \mathbf{p}^2/3$  dispersion relation. Rotational symmetry remains intact here. However theories in which rotational symmetry breaks together with some internal global symmetries due to the introduction of a chemical potential have been studied in some detail in [11]. The propagator matrix is simply  $i D(p)^{-1}$ . It is instructive to see, in some detail, how the  $h$  decoupling works in the broken phase. Indeed for large  $\mu$  (setting  $m = 0$ ) the part of the Lagrangian quadratic in the fields is:

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu h \partial^\mu h + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \eta \partial^\mu \eta - 2\mu h \partial_0 \eta - 2\mu^2 h^2 . \quad (12)$$

In the limit  $\mu \rightarrow \infty$  we neglect the  $h$  kinetic term and the Euler-Lagrange equation for  $h$  is:

$$h = -\frac{1}{\mu} \partial_0 \eta . \quad (13)$$

Substituting this back into the previous expression leads to the following  $\eta$  Lagrangian:

$$\frac{1}{2} (3 \partial_0 \eta \partial_0 \eta - \nabla \eta \cdot \nabla \eta) . \quad (14)$$

Which leads correctly to the dispersion relation for  $\eta$  at small momenta with respect to the chemical potential, i.e.  $E_\eta^2 = \mathbf{p}^2/3$ . Note though that the  $h$  gap is not the curvature evaluated on the minimum which is  $2\mu^2$  but is  $\Delta^2 = 6\mu^2$ . Our discussion, clearly, does not depend on the specific  $U(1)$  charge assignment for  $\phi$ . However it is important that the vev is in the  $h$  direction.

At the tree level and at zero temperature the thermodynamic potential is simply:

$$V[\langle \phi \rangle(\mu), \mu] = \frac{\lambda}{4} \langle \phi \rangle^4 + (m^2 - \mu^2) \langle \phi \rangle^2 = -\frac{1}{\lambda} (\mu^2 - m^2)^2 . \quad (15)$$

In the standard Higgs mechanism the negative mass squared parameter is not automatically linked to any underlying physical quantity. In the Bose-Einstein case instead the chemical potential driving spontaneous symmetry breaking is necessarily linked to the following net charge density:

$$\rho = -\frac{\partial V[\langle \phi \rangle(\mu), \mu]}{\partial \mu} = \frac{4\mu}{\lambda} (\mu^2 - m^2) . \quad (16)$$

We now extend the internal symmetries of the present bosonic field to the case in which some of the new internal symmetries are gauged. We choose the gauged symmetries to be identical to the ones associated to the electroweak sector of the Standard Model. The spontaneous symmetry breaking in the gauge theory becomes driven by the presence of a net background charge which manifests itself via a non zero chemical potential.

### III. THE $SU_L(2) \times U_Y(1)$ GAUGE THEORY

The Higgs sector of the Standard Model possesses, when the gauge couplings are switched off, an  $SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2)$  symmetry. The full symmetry group is mostly easily recognized when the Higgs doublet field

$$H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \pi_2 + i \pi_1 \\ \sigma - i \pi_3 \end{pmatrix} \quad (17)$$

is represented as a two by two matrix in the following way:

$$[i \tau_2 H^* , H] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\sigma + i \vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{\pi}) \equiv M . \quad (18)$$

The  $SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2)$  group acts linearly on  $M$  according to:

$$M \rightarrow g_L M g_R^\dagger \quad \text{and} \quad g_{L/R} \in SU_{L/R}(2) . \quad (19)$$

It is easy to verify that:

$$M \frac{(1 - \tau^3)}{2} = [0 , H] . \quad M \frac{(1 + \tau^3)}{2} = [i \tau_2 H^* , 0] . \quad (20)$$

The  $SU_L(2)$  symmetry is gauged by introducing the weak gauge bosons  $W^a$  with  $a = 1, 2, 3$ . The hypercharge generator is taken to be the third generator of  $SU_R(2)$ . The ordinary covariant derivative acting on the Higgs, in the present notation, is:

$$D_\mu M = \partial_\mu M - i g W_\mu M + i g' M B_\mu , \quad \text{with} \quad W_\mu = W_\mu^a \frac{\tau^a}{2} , \quad B_\mu = B_\mu \frac{\tau^3}{2} . \quad (21)$$

At this point one simply *assumes* that the mass squared of the Higgs field is negative and this leads to the electroweak symmetry breaking and more generally to the successful Standard Model as we know. However, theoretically a more

satisfactory explanation of the origin of the Higgs mechanism is needed. In the literature many models have been proposed in order to explain the emergence of such a negative mass squared. Technicolor theories, for example, assume a dynamical mechanism identical to spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking in quantum chromodynamics [2]. The strength of technicolor relies on the fact that this mechanism has already been observed in nature. However the simplest technicolor models lead to a too large  $S$  parameter [15]. The  $S$ -parameter is not a problem in the case of extended technicolor theories [23, 24] allowing for new technicolor models [25]. Supersymmetric extensions of the Standard Model [3] explain the negative mass squared as due to the running of the masses from high scales down to the electroweak one. The models mentioned above are, at the moment, the generalizations of the Standard Model able to explain the origin of electroweak symmetry breaking.

Here we propose a new mechanism based on the previously explained Bose-Einstein phenomenon. To illustrate our idea we consider a Higgs sector with the symmetry group  $SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2) \times U_A(1)$  where the  $SU_L(2)$  is later on gauged and the  $U_Y(1)$  is associated to the  $T^3 = \frac{\tau^3}{2}$  generator of  $SU_R(2)$  while  $U_A(1)$  remains a global symmetry. Now we introduce a chemical potential  $\mu_A$  associated to  $U_A(1)$ . When the chemical potential is sufficiently large  $SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2) \times U_A(1)$  breaks spontaneously to  $SU_V(2)$  and we have four goldstones. It is advantageous to use non linear realizations for the Higgs field with:

$$M = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{2}} U_\eta U \quad \text{with} \quad U_\eta = e^{i\frac{\eta}{v}} \quad U = e^{i\frac{\pi}{v}} \quad , \quad \text{and} \quad \pi = \tau^a \pi^a \quad . \quad (22)$$

In the above equation  $v$  is the vacuum expectation value of  $\sigma$ . In the linearly realized case we should also include the heavy  $U_A(1)$  partners of the  $\pi$  field which we have taken to be more massive than the neutral Higgs particle and hence we have decoupled them. The  $\eta$  field is the the goldstone boson associated to the spontaneous breaking of the global  $U_A(1)$  symmetry.

The gauge interactions as well as the chemical potential are introduced via the following covariant derivative:

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu M = \partial_\mu M - i g W_\mu M + i g' M B_\mu - i \mathcal{A}_\mu M \equiv D_\mu M - i \mathcal{A}_\mu M \quad , \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{A}_\mu = \mu_A(1, \vec{0}) \quad . \quad (23)$$

Substituting the covariant derivative in the generalized kinetic term yields:

$$\text{Tr} [\mathcal{D}_\mu M^\dagger \mathcal{D}^\mu M] = \text{Tr} [D_\mu M^\dagger D^\mu M] - i \mu_A \text{Tr} [M D_0 M^\dagger - M^\dagger D_0 M] + \mu_A^2 \text{Tr} [M^\dagger M] \quad . \quad (24)$$

Electroweak breaking is now forced by the introduction of the chemical potential for the extra global symmetry due to the emergence of the third term in eq. (24). Adding a general Higgs potential the terms for the scalar sector of the electroweak Lagrangian are:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [D_\mu M^\dagger D^\mu M] - i \frac{\mu_A}{2} \text{Tr} [M D_0 M^\dagger - M^\dagger D_0 M] - \frac{1}{2} (m^2 - \mu_A^2) \text{Tr} [M^\dagger M] - \frac{\lambda}{4} \text{Tr} [M^\dagger M]^2 \quad (25)$$

For  $\mu_A^2 > m^2$  we have Bose-Einstein condensation together with the ordinary spontaneous breaking of the internal symmetry  $SU_L(2) \times SU_R(2) \times U_A(1) \rightarrow SU_V(2)$  with 4 null curvatures corresponding to the four broken generators. In the unitary gauge the three fields  $\pi^a$  are absorbed into the longitudinal components of the three massive gauge boson fields while the field  $\eta$  remains massless. In the unitary gauge the quadratic terms are:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{quadratic}} &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu h \partial^\mu h + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \eta \partial^\mu \eta - \mu_A (h \partial_0 \eta - \eta \partial_0 h) \\ &+ \frac{v^2}{8} \left[ g^2 (W_\mu^1 W^{\mu,1} + W_\mu^2 W^{\mu,2}) + (g W_\mu^3 - g' B_\mu)^2 \right] - \frac{1}{2} (\mu_A^2 - m^2) h^2 \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

with

$$\langle \sigma \rangle^2 = v^2 = \frac{\mu_A^2 - m^2}{\lambda} \quad , \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma = v + h \quad , \quad (27)$$

where  $h$  is the Higgs field. The  $Z_\mu$  and the photon  $A_\mu$  gauge bosons are:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_\mu &= \cos \theta_W W_\mu^3 - \sin \theta_W B_\mu \quad , \\ A_\mu &= \cos \theta_W B_\mu + \sin \theta_W W_\mu^3 \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

with  $\tan \theta_W = g'/g$  while the charged massive vector bosons are  $W_\mu^\pm = (W^1 \pm i W^2)/\sqrt{2}$ . The bosons masses  $M_W^2 = g^2 v^2/4$  due to the custodial symmetry satisfy the tree level relation  $M_Z^2 = M_W^2/\cos^2 \theta_W$ .

Except for the presence of an extra degree of freedom and the  $h-\eta$  mixing term one recovers the correct electroweak symmetry breaking pattern. The third term in the Lagrangian signals an explicit breaking of the Lorentz symmetry in the Higgs sector. Such a breaking is due to the introduction of the chemical potential and hence it happens in a very specific and predictive way so that all of the features can be studied. Note that in our theory Lorentz breaking, at the tree level, is confined only to the Higgs sector of the theory which is also the least known experimentally. The rest of the theory is affected via weak radiative corrections. As previously emphasized, in general, the introduction of the chemical potential at zero temperature does not introduce new ultraviolet divergences and hence does not spoil renormalizability. Besides, diagonalizing the quadratic terms the spectrum and the propagators for  $h$  and  $\eta$  are identical to the one presented in the first section with the replacement  $\mu \rightarrow \mu_A$ , i.e.:

$$E_h^2 = \Delta^2 + \left(1 + 4\frac{\mu_A}{\Delta^2}\right)p^2 - \frac{\mu_A^4}{\Delta^6}p^4 + \dots, \quad (29)$$

$$E_\eta^2 = \left(1 - 4\frac{\mu_A^2}{\Delta^2}\right)p^2 + \dots. \quad (30)$$

with

$$\Delta^2 = 2(3\mu_A^2 - m^2) = 4\mu_A^2 + 2(\mu_A^2 - m^2). \quad (31)$$

The second term in the expression for  $\Delta^2$  is the potential curvature evaluated on the ground state which in the absence of the chemical potential is the mass of  $h$ . Note that the energy gap (energy at zero momentum) of the Higgs  $\Delta$  is larger than the one predicted by just assuming a change in the sign of the mass squared coefficient. If phenomenologically needed it is possible to add a mass, small with respect to the chemical potential, for the  $\eta$  field. Such a mass would induce a small breaking of the  $U_A(1)$  of the type:

$$\mathcal{L}_{m_\eta} = -\frac{m_\eta^2}{2}\eta^2. \quad (32)$$

The new gaps for  $h$  and  $\eta$  are:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2 &= 6\mu_A^2 \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{9} \frac{m_\eta^2}{\mu_A^2} + O\left(\frac{m_\eta^4}{81\mu_A^4}\right) \right], \\ \Delta_\eta^2 &= \frac{2}{3}m_\eta^2 \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{9} \frac{m_\eta^2}{\mu_A^2} + O\left(\frac{m_\eta^4}{81\mu_A^4}\right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where we have set  $m = 0$ . Interestingly the corrections to the gaps due to the  $U_A(1)$  breaking term are further suppressed due to an extra factor of 9 appearing in the argument of the power series expansion in  $m_\eta^2/9\mu_A^2$ . In the following we study the theory with intact  $U_A(1)$  and hence set  $m_\eta = 0$ .

#### IV. THE NON HIGGS SECTOR

We have shown that, at the tree level, the gauge bosons acquire the ordinary electroweak masses and dispersion relations while we argued that deviations with respect to the ordinary Higgs mechanism, in our theory, arise when considering higher order corrections. In this section we analyze some of the effects of spontaneous symmetry breaking via a non zero  $U_A(1)$  charge density on the non Higgs sector of the electroweak theory due to such higher order effects. We first investigate the gauge boson sector and then the fermion one. On general grounds we expect the presence of the chemical potential to induce different time and spatial corrections while keeping rotational invariance intact.

##### A. The Gauge Bosons

The Higgs propagator is modified in the presence of the chemical potential and assumes the form:

$$----- = i \frac{p^2}{p^4 - 2(\mu_A^2 - m^2)p^2 - 4\mu_A^2 p_0^2}. \quad (34)$$


All of the loops containing this propagator are affected by the presence of the chemical potential. The Landau gauge [26] is chosen to evaluate the relevant contributions although our results are gauge independent. To set the conventions the vacuum polarizations are defined as:

$$i\Pi_{XY}^{\mu\nu}(q^2) = \int d^4x e^{-iq\cdot x} \langle J_X^\mu(x) J_Y^\nu(0) \rangle, \quad (35)$$

where  $XY$  stands for the gauge boson indices 11, 22, 33, 3Q and QQ [15]. The new contributions to the vacuum polarizations are deduced by dividing  $\Pi_{XY}^{\mu\nu}(q^2)$  into two parts [16]:

$$\Pi_{XY}^{\mu\nu}(q^2) = \Pi_{XY}^{\mu\nu SM}(q^2) + \Pi_{XY}^{\mu\nu new}(q^2). \quad (36)$$

The first term is the contribution of the Standard Model physics to  $\Pi_{XY}^{\mu\nu}$  and the second term is the contribution of the new Higgs sector physics. We are interested in computing the new physics corrections for the  $W$  vacuum polarization due to a different Higgs sector with respect to the conventional Standard Model one. The diagrams needed are [15, 16]:



The major difference with respect to known possible extensions is the appearance of a new type of dispersion relations for the Higgs. The  $\eta$  particle does not appear in the previous diagrams since we used a polar decomposition for the  $M$  field. In the appendix we explicitly compute the diagrams while here we report the results for the vacuum polarizations, in the leading logarithmic approximation[30], when the external momentum vanishes and assuming an expansion in the gauge bosons masses with respect to the Higgs mass. We also set without loss of generality  $m = 0$ , the result is:

$$\Pi_{WW}^{\mu\nu}(0) = \frac{3g^2}{4(4\pi)^2} \log\left(\frac{\mu_A^2(2+\sqrt{3})}{\Lambda^2}\right) \left[ g_{\mu\nu} \left( M_W^2 + \frac{\mu_A^2}{9} \right) - \frac{4\mu_A^2}{9} V_\mu V_\nu \right] + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{M_W^2}{\mu_A^2}\right), \quad (38)$$

where  $\Lambda$  is the renormalization scale and  $V_\mu = (1, \mathbf{0})$ . The photon vacuum polarization is not affected at zero momentum due to the ordinary Ward identities [16]. The first diagram on the right hand side of eq. (37) does not spoil the Lorentz covariance of the vacuum polarization which is due to the second and third diagrams. Note that the specific combination  $\mu_A^2(2+\sqrt{3})$  appearing in any logarithmic corrections is consequence of the fact that in the presence of the chemical potential the particle gaps are not the curvatures evaluated on the minimum.

It is interesting to directly compare our results with the same vacuum polarizations at zero momentum predicted in the Standard Model [27]:

$$\Pi_{WW}^{\mu\nu SM}(0) = \frac{3g^2}{4(4\pi)^2} g_{\mu\nu} M_W^2 \log\left(\frac{M_H^2}{\Lambda^2}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{M_W^2}{M_H^2}\right). \quad (39)$$

$M_H$  is the conventional Higgs mass corresponding to the curvature of the Higgs potential evaluated at the minimum i.e.  $2\mu_A^2$  (for  $m = 0$ ). The contribution to the  $Z$  vacuum polarization is obtained by replacing in the previous expressions  $g^2$  with  $g^2/\cos^2\theta_W$  and  $M_W^2$  with  $M_Z^2$ . The onset of Lorentz breaking in this sector is small especially if one chooses  $\Lambda$  of the order of  $\mu_A$ . In general it is possible to define a new set of oblique parameters capable to capture the relevant corrections due to this type of spontaneous symmetry breaking. Here, for illustration, we consider the following straightforward extension of the parameter which measures deviations with respect to the breaking of the custodial symmetry i.e. the parameter  $T$  [15]:

$$\alpha T^{\mu\nu} = \frac{e^2}{\sin^2\theta_W \cos^2\theta_W M_Z^2} \left( \Pi_{11}^{\mu\nu new}(0) - \Pi_{33}^{\mu\nu new}(0) \right), \quad (40)$$

with  $\alpha = e^2/4\pi$  the fine structure constant. We also used  $g^2 \Pi_{11}^{\mu\nu}(0) = \Pi_{WW}^{\mu\nu}(0)$  and  $g^2 \Pi_{33}^{\mu\nu}(0) = \cos^2\theta_W \Pi_{ZZ}^{\mu\nu}(0)$  since the photon vacuum polarization at zero momentum vanishes.

This parameter is equal to  $\alpha T g^{\mu\nu}$  for any Lorentz preserving extension of the Higgs sector. The newly defined parameter is not directly a measure of the amount of Lorentz breaking but rather it estimates the amount of custodial symmetry breaking for the different space time components of the vacuum polarizations. Here we still have  $T^{\mu\nu} =$

$T g^{\mu\nu}$  but due to the fact that we have different dispersion relations and a different gap structure with the respect to the Standard Model masses  $T$ , although very small, is not zero:

$$T \approx -\frac{3}{16\pi} \frac{1}{\cos^2 \theta_W} \log \left( 1 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right) \approx -0.048 . \quad (41)$$

Here we assumed the Standard Model Higgs mass to be given by the expression  $M_H^2 = 2\mu_A^2$  which is the curvature evaluated on the minimum.

## B. The Fermions

The fermions constitute a very interesting sector to be explored since it can be used experimentally to test the idea presented in this paper. In order to understand the type of corrections we start with recalling that the chemical potential explicitly breaks  $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$  to  $SO(3)$ . So the corrections must differentiate time from space in the fermion kinetic term according to:

$$(1 - a_0) \bar{f} \gamma^0 \partial_0 f + (1 - a) \bar{f} \gamma^i \partial_i f \rightarrow \bar{f} \gamma^0 \partial_0 f + v_f \bar{f} \gamma^i \partial_i f , \quad \text{with} \quad v_f \simeq 1 - (a - a_0) , \quad (42)$$

where  $a$  and  $a_0$  are the corrections induced by loop contributions and  $f$  represents a generic Standard Model fermion. In the last expression we have rescaled the fermion wave function and used the fact that the  $a$ 's are small calculable corrections. In the difference  $a - a_0$  all of the Lorentz covariant corrections disappear while only the Lorentz breaking terms survive.

In order for the fermions to receive one loop corrections sensitive to the chemical potential they need to couple at the tree level with the Higgs. This is achieved via the Yukawa interactions:

$$\tilde{Y}_f h \bar{f} f , \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{Y}_f \simeq \frac{m_f}{v} . \quad (43)$$

To determine  $v_f$  at the one loop we need to compute only the contributions to the fermion self energy which break Lorentz invariance. In the present case the one loop diagram is



where the solid line represent the fermion and the dashed the Higgs field. The diagram is evaluated in detail in the appendix and yields the following contribution to the  $a$  and  $a_0$  coefficients:

$$a = \frac{\tilde{Y}_f^2}{2(4\pi)^2} \left[ \log \left( \frac{\mu_A^2 (2 + \sqrt{3})}{\Lambda^2} \right) - \frac{1}{6} \right] , \quad (45)$$

$$a_0 = \frac{\tilde{Y}_f^2}{2(4\pi)^2} \left[ \log \left( \frac{\mu_A^2 (2 + \sqrt{3})}{\Lambda^2} \right) + 4\sqrt{3} - \frac{15}{2} \right] , \quad (46)$$

If only the leading logarithmic corrections are kept we have that the fermions still obey standard Lorentz covariant dispersion relations. The dispersion relations are modified when considering the finite contributions. To estimate the size of possible departures from the standard dispersion relations we keep the constant terms and determine

$$v_e \simeq 1 - \tilde{Y}_e^2 \frac{0.4}{2(4\pi)^2} \simeq 1 - 5 \times 10^{-15} , \quad (47)$$

where the numerical evaluation has been performed for the electron. The present formula is valid practically for all of the fermions. For the muon the corrections to its velocity are of the order of  $8 \times 10^{-10}$ . The induced corrections for the photon due to fermion loops are further suppressed by powers of the fine structure constant  $\alpha = e^2/4\pi$ .

We briefly address how to construct the Yukawa terms for the fermions in the present model. We assume the Standard Model fermions not to carry the  $U_A(1)$  charge since if they did they would also couple directly to the



chemical potential and hence would develop a large Fermi surface. At this point there are several possibilities to provide a mass to the fermions. It is still possible to use the Standard Model term

$$\tilde{Y}_e \bar{E}_L M \frac{(1 - \tau^3)}{2} E_R + \text{h.c.} = \tilde{Y}_e (v + h) \bar{e} e , \quad (48)$$

with

$$E_L = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_L \\ e_L \end{pmatrix} , \quad E_R = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_R \\ e_R \end{pmatrix} . \quad (49)$$

Since the Yukawa couplings are small (except for the top quark) these terms would induce an explicit but small  $U_A(1)$  breaking. However, higher dimensional operators preserving the  $U_A(1)$  can be constructed:

$$Y_e \bar{E}_L M \frac{(1 - \tau^3)}{2} E_R \frac{\det M^{\dagger \frac{1}{2}}}{\tilde{\Lambda}} + \text{h.c.} = \tilde{Y}_e \left( v + h + \frac{h^2}{v} \right) \bar{e} e , \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{Y}_e = Y_e \frac{v}{\tilde{\Lambda}} = \frac{m_e}{v} . \quad (50)$$

We used a doublet notation for the right fields for esthetic reasons and  $\tilde{\Lambda}$  is an energy scale larger or of the order of the electroweak scale  $v$ . For illustration we have taken  $Y_e$  to be real and  $e$  is the electron. To provide a Dirac mass to the upper component field we need to replace  $1 - \tau^3$  with  $1 + \tau^3$ . In the last step of eq. (50) we expanded  $M$  around the vacuum value in the unitary gauge and used the polar decomposition of  $M$ . Any other fermion  $f$  can acquire mass in a similar way.

Other ways of providing a mass term to the fermions can be explored. We expect, though, that the corrections to the fermion dispersion relations induced by the Higgs sector under consideration to be valid in general.

Another class of indirect corrections to the fermion sector are the ones induced by modified gauge vector propagators discussed in the previous section. To illustrate these effects we use the low energy electroweak effective theory for the charged currents. The neutral currents will be affected in a similar way. The chemical potential leaves intact the rotational subgroups of the Lorentz transformations, so the effective Lagrangian modifies as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Eff}}^{\text{CC}} = -2\sqrt{2} G J_\mu^+ J^{\mu -} \Rightarrow -2\sqrt{2} G \left[ J_\mu^+ J^{\mu -} + \delta J_i^+ J^{i -} \right] , \quad (51)$$

where  $\delta$  is a coefficient effectively measuring the corrections due to modified dispersion relations for the gauge vectors. Using the previous Lagrangian the decay rate for the process  $\mu \rightarrow e \bar{\nu}_e \nu_\mu$  is:

$$\Gamma[\mu \rightarrow e \bar{\nu}_e \nu_\mu] = \frac{G^2 M_\mu^5}{192\pi^3} \left( 1 + \frac{3}{2} \delta \right) , \quad (52)$$

where  $M_\mu$  is the muon mass and we neglected the electron mass. However the effects of a non zero electron mass are as in the Standard Model case [1]. The parameter  $\delta$  can be estimated using the vacuum polarizations presented in the previous section yielding:

$$\delta \approx \frac{g^2}{3(4\pi)^2} \frac{\mu^2}{M_W^2} \log \left( \frac{(2 + \sqrt{3})\mu^2}{\Lambda^2} \right) . \quad (53)$$

By choosing the renormalization scale  $\Lambda$  to be of the order of the electroweak scale  $\sim M_Z$  and  $\mu \simeq 150$  GeV we determine  $\delta \simeq 0.007$ . Precise and independent measurements of  $M_W$  and the muon decay rate may observe deviations with respect to the Standard Model. Finally we expect sizable corrections to the fermion dispersion relations in eq. (42) induced by the gauge boson exchanges. These arise in the fermion vacuum polarization at the two loop level and are expected to be of the order of  $g^2\delta/(4\pi)^2$ .

## V. DISCUSSION

We have studied some of the effects of a net background charge associated to the global symmetry  $U_A(1)$ . When considering possible non Abelian extensions of the Higgs sector such as the ones naturally present in grand unified theories only chemical potentials corresponding to mutually commuting charges can be introduced. One also has to differentiate between chemical potentials introduced for global and local symmetries. The main difference relies on the fact that given a generic thermodynamic potential  $\Omega[T; \mu_G, \mu]$  we need to impose the following constraints:

$$\rho = -\frac{\partial \Omega[T; \mu_G, \mu]}{\partial \mu} , \quad 0 = \frac{\partial \Omega[T; \mu_G, \mu]}{\partial \mu_G} , \quad (54)$$

where  $T$  is the temperature,  $\mu$  is a generic chemical potential associated to a globally conserved charge and  $\mu_G$  is related to a gauge symmetry. These relations express the fact that for charges associated with a global symmetry there is no particular reason why the universe should be neutral. The situation is more delicate for a gauge symmetry [4] for which it is usually assumed that the universe must be globally neutral. Actually this is strictly true only if the universe is gravitationally closed. We however take, following the literature, the second equation to hold. So, after having determined the thermodynamical potential evaluated on the physical vacuum of the theory one should determine the relations between the various chemical potentials. In general, a non zero  $\mu_G$  chemical potential is induced to insure gauge neutrality. The gauge group  $SU_L(2) \times U_Y(1)$  admits two mutually commuting charges which are any linear combination of the hypercharge and weak isospin [5]. It can be shown that in the present case, at zero temperature and in the absence of the chemical potential for the fermions [28, 29], electroweak neutrality is guaranteed for a zero value of the chemical potentials associated to the two commuting gauge charges and hence our results are unaffected. We also stress that it is not possible to directly compare the Higgs vacuum energy with the cosmological constant since other contributions are supposed to be present in the theory. Due to these other unknown contributions a large chemical potential alone does not imply either a large charge or energy density.

We have introduced a new mechanism able to explain the spontaneous symmetry breaking in a generic gauge theory as due to the presence of a net charge density background in the universe. The present mechanism requires the Higgs field to possess global and gauged internal symmetries. To some of the globally conserved charges commuting with all of the gauge transformations we associate a non zero chemical potential. This induces a negative type mass squared triggering spontaneous symmetry breaking of the global and local gauge transformations. We have studied the effects on the electroweak sector of the Standard Model as a relevant example in which the Higgs sector is minimally extended to have an extra global  $U_A(1)$  symmetry with a non zero chemical potential. The Bose-Einstein condensation of the Higgs induces new type of tree level dispersion relations specific for the Higgs field while the dispersion relations of the gauge bosons and fermions remain unmodified. The latter are affected when considering higher order corrections involving the Higgs field. To show how this occurs we explicitly evaluated them for the vacuum polarizations of the gauge bosons at zero external momentum. These corrections, due entirely to the new Higgs sector of the theory, are known to affect some of the oblique parameters. We first suggested how to generalize the parameter  $T$  to be applicable to our new Higgs sector and then have shown that the value of  $T$  is tiny and negative in sign. This is so since our model preserves the custodial symmetry. What is interesting is that  $T$  is sensitive to the new way of breaking the symmetry.

The fermion sector of the Standard Model is, on general grounds, affected by the new mechanism via higher order corrections. We expect for a generic fermion the appearance of modified dispersion relations of the type  $E^2 = v_f^2 p^2 + m_f^2$ . At the one loop level due to the smallness of the Yukawa coupling  $v_f$  is small.

Spontaneous breaking of a gauge theory via Bose-Einstein condensation necessarily introduces Lorentz breaking since a frame must be specified differentiating time from space. This must be contrasted with different type of Lorentz violation due to an intrinsically modified gravitational theory. The advantage with our proposal is that it leads to distinctive and computable corrections.

We recall that the issue of Lorentz breaking has recently attracted much theoretical [19, 20, 21] and experimental attention [22]. For example in [20] possible extensions of the Standard Model were studied in which Lorentz symmetry is violated. In [19, 20] the authors investigate in some detail theoretical extensions and possible observational consequences of the Standard Model in the presence of Lorentz breaking. Here the underlying gravitational theory is not the cause of Lorentz breaking which is due instead to having immersed the theory in a background charge.

Many new avenues are left unexplored. For example, one can imagine different types of Higgs scenarios where the chemical potential effects and hence the Lorentz breaking is more or less felt by the Standard Model particles. A very interesting possibility would be to study supersymmetric extensions of our model. Since fermions and bosons have different statistics the chemical potential would also behave as an explicit source of supersymmetry breaking. Cosmological consequences are currently under exploration.

### Acknowledgments

We are very happy to thank P.H. Damgaard, H.B. Nielsen and J. Schechter for discussions and comments. P.H. Damgaard and J. Schechter also for encouragements and a critical reading of the manuscript. We acknowledge discussions with S. Dawson, S. Hannestad, A. Mócsy and P. Olesen. The work of F.S. is supported by the Marie-Curie fellowship under contract MCFI-2001-00181.

## APPENDIX A: EVALUATING FEYNMAN DIAGRAMS

In this section we evaluate some of the Feynman diagrams. The set of diagrams needed to estimate the corrections due to our modified Higgs sector to the  $W$  vacuum polarization at the one loop order is:

(A1)

The dashed (dotted) line in the following equations stand for  $h$  ( $\eta$ ) propagator while the dashed-dotted line connects an  $h$  to an  $\eta$  field:

$$\text{-----} = i \frac{p^2}{p^4 - 2(\mu_A^2 - m^2)p^2 - 4\mu_A^2 p_0^2} \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\text{.....} = i \frac{p^2 - 2(\mu_A^2 - m^2)}{p^4 - 2(\mu_A^2 - m^2)p^2 - 4\mu_A^2 p_0^2} \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\text{---.....} = \frac{2p_0\mu_A}{p^4 - 2(\mu_A^2 - m^2)p^2 - 4\mu_A^2 p_0^2} \quad (\text{A4})$$

In the last line we have a negative sign if we have a dotted-dashed line instead.

We now evaluate in some detail the following diagram where without any loss of generality we set  $m = 0$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= i \frac{g^2 g_{\mu\nu}}{4} \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{p^2}{p^4 + 2p^2\mu_A^2 + 4\mu_A^2 p_0^2} \\
 &= i \frac{g^2 g_{\mu\nu}}{4} \frac{4\pi}{(2\pi)^4} \int_0^\infty dp p^3 \int_0^\pi d\theta \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{p^2 + 2\mu_A^2 + 4\mu_A^2 \cos^2 \theta} \\
 &= i \frac{g^2 g_{\mu\nu}}{4\mu_A^2} \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \int_0^\infty dp p^3 \left[ \sqrt{\frac{p^2 + 6\mu_A^2}{p^2 + 2\mu_A^2}} - 1 \right] \\
 &= i \frac{g^2}{4(4\pi)^2} g_{\mu\nu} \left[ \Lambda^2 + 3\mu_A^2 \left( \log \left( \frac{(2 + \sqrt{3})\mu_A^2}{\Lambda^2} \right) - \frac{1}{6} \right) \right] + O(1/\Lambda). \quad (\text{A5})
 \end{aligned}$$

We euclideanized the time  $p_0 \rightarrow ip_0$ , used the spherical coordinates and denoted an ultraviolet cutoff by  $\Lambda$ . The previous diagram is independent of the external momentum and is quadratically divergent. This divergence is identical to the one within the Standard Model. When adding together the other contributions the quadratic divergence disappears as expected. The other diagrams depend on the external momentum and we evaluated them in the zero external momentum limit. The following diagrams are evaluated in the Landau gauge [26]

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= g^2 M_W^2 \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{p^2}{(p^2 - M_W^2)(p^4 - 2\mu_A^2 p^2 - 4\mu_A^2 p_0^2)} \left[ -g_{\mu\nu} + \frac{p_\mu p_\nu}{p^2} \right] \\
 &\equiv g_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{I}_{\mu\nu}, \quad (\text{A6})
 \end{aligned}$$

where we find

$$\mathcal{I} = i \frac{g^2}{(4\pi)^2} M_W^2 \left[ \log \left( \frac{(2 + \sqrt{3})\mu_A^2}{\Lambda^2} \right) + \sqrt{3} - 2 \right] + \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{M_W^2}{\mu_A^2} \right). \quad (\text{A7})$$

$\mathcal{I}_{\mu\nu}$  has non vanishing components only for  $\mu = \nu$ :

$$\mathcal{I}_{00} = -i \frac{g^2}{4(4\pi)^2} M_W^2 \left[ \log \left( \frac{(2 + \sqrt{3})\mu_A^2}{\Lambda^2} \right) - 2\sqrt{3} + \frac{7}{2} \right] + \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{M_W^2}{\mu_A^2} \right), \quad (\text{A8})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{11} &= i \frac{g^2}{4(4\pi)^2} M_W^2 \left[ \log \left( \frac{(2 + \sqrt{3})\mu_A^2}{\Lambda^2} \right) + 2\sqrt{3} - \frac{23}{6} \right] + \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{M_W^2}{\mu_A^2} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{I}_{22} = \mathcal{I}_{33} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A9})$$

The next diagram completes the vacuum polarization:

$$\begin{array}{c} \pi \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \bullet \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \bullet \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ h \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ W \end{array} = g^2 \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{p_\mu p_\nu}{p^2} \frac{p^2}{p^4 - 2\mu_A^2 p^2 - 4\mu_A^2 p_0^2} \equiv \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{\mu\nu} , \quad (\text{A10})$$

where we find

$$\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{00} = -i \frac{g^2}{4(4\pi)^2} \left[ \Lambda^2 + 4\mu_A^2 \left( \log \left( \frac{(2 + \sqrt{3})\mu_A^2}{\Lambda^2} \right) - \sqrt{3} + \frac{11}{6} \right) \right] , \quad (\text{A11})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{11} &= i \frac{g^2}{4(4\pi)^2} \left[ \Lambda^2 + \frac{8}{3}\mu_A^2 \left( \log \left( \frac{(2 + \sqrt{3})\mu_A^2}{\Lambda^2} \right) + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} - \frac{7}{6} \right) \right] \\ &= \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{22} = \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{33} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A12})$$

The corrections to a generic Standard Model fermion can be determined by computing the following one loop diagram:

$$\begin{array}{c} h \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \bullet \text{---} \text{---} \bullet \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ f \end{array} = i\tilde{Y}_f^2 \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{(k^2 + 2\mu_A^2 + 4\mu_A^2 \cos^2 \theta)} \frac{(p-k)_\mu \bar{f}_p \gamma^\mu f_p + m_f \bar{f}_p f_p}{((p-k)^2 + m_f^2)} \equiv \mathcal{F}_\mu . \quad (\text{A13})$$

Where the solid line denotes a fermion and  $f_p$  is the associated Dirac spinor. Note that the numerator contains an implicit factor of  $i$  for the  $\mu = 0$  component. We are using an Euclidean metric and to compute the diagram we choose a frame in which the incoming fermion has momentum  $p = (p_0, P, 0, 0)$ . Since we are interested in the small (with respect to the Higgs scale) external momentum we expand the fermion propagator as follows:

$$\frac{1}{k^2 - 2k \cdot P} \approx \frac{1}{k} \left( \frac{1}{k} + \frac{2(\cos \theta + \sin \theta \cos \phi)}{k^2} P \right) + \mathcal{O}(P^2) \quad (\text{A14})$$

These limits allows us to explicitly perform all of the integrals (A13) leading to:

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = -iV \frac{p_0}{32\pi^2} \left[ -\frac{15}{2} + 4\sqrt{3} + \ln \frac{(2 + \sqrt{3})\mu_A^2}{\Lambda^2} \right] + i \frac{m_f}{32\pi^2} \left( 4 - 2\sqrt{3} - 2 \ln \frac{(2 + \sqrt{3})\mu_A^2}{\Lambda^2} \right) \quad (\text{A15})$$

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = iV \frac{P}{32\pi^2} \left[ -\frac{1}{6} + \ln \frac{(2 + \sqrt{3})\mu_A^2}{\Lambda^2} \right] + i \frac{m_f}{32\pi^2} \left( 4 - 2\sqrt{3} - 2 \ln \frac{(2 + \sqrt{3})\mu_A^2}{\Lambda^2} \right) \quad (\text{A16})$$

$$\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{F}_3 = i \frac{m_f}{32\pi^2} \left( 4 - 2\sqrt{3} - 2 \ln \frac{(2 + \sqrt{3})\mu_A^2}{\Lambda^2} \right) , \quad (\text{A17})$$

where  $p_0 = P$  if  $m_f = 0$  and  $p_0 = m_f$  for a massive heavy fermion and used the tree level on shell relations. Other diagrams can be computed following the outlined procedure.

---

[1] K. Hagiwara *et al.* [Particle Data Group Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **66**, 010001 (2002).

- [2] See for a recent review: C. T. Hill and E. H. Simmons, arXiv:hep-ph/0203079 and references therein.
- [3] See for a recent review: G. L. Kane, arXiv:hep-ph/0202185 and references therein.
- [4] H. E. Haber and H. A. Weldon, Phys. Rev. D **25** (1982) 502.
- [5] J. I. Kapusta, Phys. Rev. D **24** (1981) 426.
- [6] A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. B **86**, 39 (1979).
- [7] E. J. Ferrer, V. de la Incera and A. E. Shabad, Phys. Lett. B **185**, 407 (1987).
- [8] E. J. Ferrer, V. de la Incera and A. E. Shabad, Nucl. Phys. B **309**, 120 (1988).
- [9] J. Ambjorn and P. Olesen, Phys. Lett. B **218**, 67 (1989) [Erratum-ibid. B **220**, 659 (1989)], ibid. B **257**, 201 (1991), Nucl. Phys. B **330**, 193 (1990).
- [10] K. Kajantie, M. Laine, J. Peisa, K. Rummukainen and M. E. Shaposhnikov, Nucl. Phys. B **544**, 357 (1999) [arXiv:hep-lat/9809004].
- [11] F. Sannino, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 054006 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0211367].
- [12] N. S. Manton, Nucl. Phys. B **158**, 141 (1979).
- [13] Y. Hosotani, Annals Phys. **190**, 233 (1989).
- [14] L. F. Li, arXiv:hep-ph/0210063.
- [15] M. E. Peskin and T. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. D **46** (1992) 381.
- [16] T. Takeuchi, SLAC-PUB-5730 *Presented at Int. Workshop on Electroweak Symmetry Breaking, Hiroshima, Japan, Nov 12-15, 1991*. T. Takeuchi, SLAC-PUB-5619 *Presented at 1991 Nagoya Spring School on Dynamical Symmetry Breaking, Nakatsugawa, Japan, Apr 23-27, 1991*.
- [17] B. Bajc and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Lett. B **472**, 373 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/9907552].
- [18] B. Bajc, A. Riotto and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1355 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9710415].
- [19] V. A. Kostelevy and M. Mewes, Phys. Rev. D **66** (2002) 056005 [arXiv:hep-ph/0205211]; R. K. Mittleman, I. I. Ioannou, H. G. Dehmelt and N. Russell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** (1999) 2116; D. F. Phillips, M. A. Humphrey, E. M. Mattison, R. E. Stoner, R. F. Vessot and R. L. Walsworth, Phys. Rev. D **63** (2001) 111101 [arXiv:physics/0008230]; D. Bear, R. E. Stoner, R. L. Walsworth, V. A. Kostelevy and C. D. Lane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85** (2000) 5038 [Erratum-ibid. **89** (2002) 209902] [arXiv:physics/0007049].
- [20] S. M. Carroll, J. A. Harvey, V. A. Kostelevy, C. D. Lane and T. Okamoto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** (2001) 141601 [arXiv:hep-th/0105082]; V. A. Kostelevy and S. Samuel, Phys. Rev. D **39** (1989) 683.
- [21] G. Amelino-Camelia, arXiv:gr-qc/0212002. G. Amelino-Camelia, J. R. Ellis, N. E. Mavromatos, D. V. Nanopoulos and S. Sarkar, Nature **393**, 763 (1998) [arXiv:astro-ph/9712103].
- [22] S. M. Carroll, G. B. Field and R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. D **41** (1990) 1231;
- [23] T. Appelquist and F. Sannino, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 067702 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9806409].
- [24] T. Appelquist, P. S. Rodrigues da Silva and F. Sannino, Phys. Rev. D **60** (1999) 116007 [arXiv:hep-ph/9906555].
- [25] T. Appelquist and R. Shrock, arXiv:hep-ph/0301108.
- [26] T.P. Cheng and L.F. Li, *Gauge Theory of elementary particle physics*, Oxford University Press, New York, Reprinted 1989.
- [27] D. C. Kennedy and B. W. Lynn, Nucl. Phys. B **322** (1989) 1.
- [28] J. I. Kapusta, Phys. Rev. D **42** (1990) 919.
- [29] A. Gynther, arXiv:hep-ph/0303019.
- [30] The finite contributions are shown in the appendix.