

$\pi^+ - \pi^0$ Mass Difference in the Hidden Local Symmetry: A Dynamical Origin of Little Higgs

Masayasu Harada^(a), Masaharu Tanabashi^(b), and Koichi Yamawaki^(a)

^(a) *Department of Physics, Nagoya University, Nagoya, 464-8602, Japan, and*

^(b) *Department of Physics, Tohoku University, Sendai, 980-8578, Japan.*

We calculate $\pi^+ - \pi^0$ mass difference $\Delta m_\pi^2 \equiv m_{\pi^+}^2 - m_{\pi^0}^2$ in the Hidden Local Symmetry (HLS) model, based on the Wilsonian matching and Wilsonian renormalization-group equations. Even without a_1 meson the result agrees well with the experiment in sharp contrast to the conventional approach where the a_1 meson plays a crucial role. For large N_f QCD, there arises a large hierarchy between Δm_π^2 and the π decay constant F_π^2 , $\Delta m_\pi^2/F_\pi^2 \ll 1$, near the critical point where the chiral symmetry gets restored as the vector manifestation and the HLS model becomes a little Higgs model with two sites and two links, with the dynamically generated gauge coupling of the composite ρ becoming vanishingly small.

The $\pi^+ - \pi^0$ mass difference $\Delta m_\pi^2 \equiv m_{\pi^+}^2 - m_{\pi^0}^2$ was first successfully calculated [1] by the current algebra in conjunction with the Weinberg's spectral function sum rules [2]. Since then it has been a prototype of the mass calculation of pseudo Nambu-Goldstone (NG) bosons in strong coupling gauge theories such as those in the technicolor theories [3] and more recently in the little Higgs models [4]. Hence this type of calculation plays a central role of the model buildings.

The basic technology to calculate those pseudo NG bosons up to the present has been an ancient one through the Weinberg's first and second sum rules [2] saturated by the π , ρ and a_1 meson poles. Then the calculation heavily depends on the somewhat elusive broad resonance of a_1 meson whose mass however substantially deviates from the prediction of the Weinberg's sum rules. The reason why the method remains so awkward is due to our ignorance of the strong coupling dynamics of QCD and QCD-like theories and their effective field theory. Then the calculation is also challenging for theorists to construct the effective field theory of hadrons.

Recently two of the authors (M.H. and K.Y.) developed an effective field theory at loop order based on the Hidden Local Symmetry (HLS) model [5, 6]: The bare parameters of the HLS model was determined by those of the underlying QCD through the matching of current correlators of both theories at a certain scale Λ ($\simeq 1.1$.GeV) which is the cutoff for the HLS model ("Wilsonian matching") [7]. Once the bare parameters of the HLS model defined at Λ were so determined, we did uniquely predict the low energy hadron physics by the one-loop renormalization group equations (RGEs) due to the π and ρ loops including quadratic divergences ("Wilsonian RGEs") [7, 8]. The results were in remarkable agreement with experiments. (For a detailed review of the whole approach see Ref. [9].)

In this paper we shall apply the same method of HLS model to the calculation of the $\pi^+ - \pi^0$ mass difference Δm_π^2 . The method is straightforward and has essentially

no ambiguity once we fixed the Λ which was already fixed to be $\simeq 1.1$ GeV in the previous analyses. Remarkably, we can successfully reproduce the experimental value *without introducing the a_1 meson* whose mass is higher than our matching scale $\Lambda \simeq 1.1$ GeV.

Moreover, there occurs *cancellation of the quadratic divergences* in Δm_π^2 arising from the π and ρ loops which in the usual approach is to be canceled by the conspiracy between the π , ρ and a_1 mesons as required by the pole-saturated form of the Weinberg's first sum rule. It was shown in Refs. [7, 9] that the *bare* Lagrangian of our HLS model, when the photon and ρ gauge couplings are switched off, is very close to the Georgi's vector limit [10], which corresponds to locality of the theory space of the little Higgs model of two sites and two links, and hence the one-loop absence of quadratic divergence takes place for the same reason as in the little Higgs. So this type of *little Higgs is already realized in the real-life QCD* !

Although the dynamically generated HLS gauge coupling of the composite ρ is rather strong, $g^2(\Lambda) \gg 1$, in the real-life QCD with $N_f = 3$, it was found [9, 11] that when N_f is increased in the underlying QCD so that the chiral symmetry is expected to get restored at certain critical value N_f^{crit} [12, 13], the corresponding HLS model goes over to the Vector Manifestation (VM) [11] where the ρ coupling as well as the ρ mass and F_π becomes vanishingly small; $g^2 \rightarrow 0$, $m_\rho^2/\Lambda^2 \rightarrow 0$ and $F_\pi^2/\Lambda^2 \rightarrow 0$. Then the VM will in fact provides a toy model for the dynamical generation of the little Higgs models out of strongly interacting underlying gauge theories. We shall also demonstrate a large hierarchy $\Delta m_\pi^2/F_\pi^2 \ll 1$ near the VM point as desired in the little Higgs model building. However, we do not attempt here to construct a realistic model for the little Higgs. The quartic coupling as well as the Yukawa coupling is not considered either. We do instead demonstrate a concrete example for a possibility to dynamically generate a class of little Higgs models, with the locality of the theory space explicitly broken only by *weakly coupled* gauge interactions, out of *strongly coupled*

underlying gauge theories.

Let us start with briefly explaining the HLS model and its loop calculations (For a detailed review see [9]). The HLS model [5, 6] is an extension of the nonlinear sigma model based on the $G_{\text{global}} \times H_{\text{local}}$ symmetry, where $G = \text{SU}(N_f)_L \times \text{SU}(N_f)_R$ is the global chiral symmetry and $H = \text{SU}(N_f)_V$ the HLS whose gauge bosons are identified with the ρ meson and its flavor partners (to be denoted as ρ hereafter). Here N_f denotes the number of massless quark flavors in the underlying QCD (We take $N_f = 3$ for the real-life QCD. See [7, 9]). The basic dynamical variables in the HLS model are gauge bosons $\rho_\mu = \rho_\mu^a T_a$ of the HLS and two $\text{SU}(N_f)$ -matrix-valued variables ξ_L and ξ_R parameterized as $\xi_{L,R} = e^{i\sigma/F_\sigma} e^{\mp i\pi/F_\pi}$ which transform as $\xi_{L,R}(x) \rightarrow \xi'_{L,R}(x) = h(x)\xi_{L,R}(x)g_{L,R}^\dagger$, where $h(x) \in H_{\text{local}}$ and $g_{L,R} \in G_{\text{global}}$. Here $\pi = \pi^a T_a$ denotes the NG bosons (π meson and its flavor partners) associated with the spontaneous breaking of G and $\sigma = \sigma^a T_a$ (with $J^{PC} = 0^{+-}$) the NG bosons absorbed into the (longitudinal) HLS gauge bosons ρ (not to be confused with the scalar boson ‘‘sigma’’ in the linear sigma model which has $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$). F_π and F_σ are the relevant decay constants, with a ratio a defined by

$$a \equiv F_\sigma^2/F_\pi^2. \quad (1)$$

The covariant derivatives of $\xi_{L,R}$ are defined by $D_\mu \xi_L = \partial_\mu \xi_L - ig\rho_\mu \xi_L + i\xi_L \mathcal{L}_\mu = \mathcal{D}_\mu \xi_L - ig\rho_\mu \xi_L$, and similarly for $L \rightarrow R$, where g is the HLS gauge coupling. \mathcal{L}_μ and \mathcal{R}_μ denote the external gauge fields (such as the photon and W and Z bosons) gauging the G_{global} symmetry.

The (bare) HLS Lagrangian at $\mathcal{O}(p^2)$ is given by [5, 6]

$$\mathcal{L}_{(2)} = F_\pi^2 \text{tr} [\hat{\alpha}_\perp \hat{\alpha}_\perp^\dagger] + F_\sigma^2 \text{tr} [\hat{\alpha}_\parallel \hat{\alpha}_\parallel^\dagger] + \mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}}(\rho_\mu), \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}}(\rho_\mu)$ denotes the kinetic term of ρ_μ . In the unitary gauge $\sigma = 0$, the second term, containing $\hat{\alpha}_\parallel^\mu = (D_\mu \xi_L \cdot \xi_L^\dagger + D_\mu \xi_R \cdot \xi_R^\dagger)/(2i) = \mathcal{D}_\mu \xi_L \cdot \xi_L^\dagger + \mathcal{D}_\mu \xi_R \cdot \xi_R^\dagger - g\rho_\mu$, yields the ρ mass term $M_\rho^2 = (gF_\sigma)^2$ as well as the $\rho\pi\pi$ coupling $g_{\rho\pi\pi} = (a/2)g$, $\rho - \gamma$ mixing $g_\rho = gF_\sigma^2$, and the direct 4π coupling, etc., while the first term containing $\hat{\alpha}_\perp^\mu = (D_\mu \xi_L \cdot \xi_L^\dagger - D_\mu \xi_R \cdot \xi_R^\dagger)/(2i) = (\mathcal{D}_\mu \xi_L \cdot \xi_L^\dagger - \mathcal{D}_\mu \xi_R \cdot \xi_R^\dagger)/(2i)$ is identical to the usual nonlinear chiral Lagrangian based on G/H , with G being gauged by the external gauge bosons \mathcal{L}_μ and \mathcal{R}_μ , where the flavor chiral symmetry G is given by the diagonal sum of G_{global} and H_{local} , with the flavor vector symmetry H being the diagonal sum of $H_{\text{global}} (\subset G_{\text{global}})$ and H_{local} . In the low energy, $p^2 \ll M_\rho^2$, where the ρ kinetic term can be ignored, the equation of motion of ρ from the second term simply gives zero for the second term, thus the HLS model is reduced to the first term, namely the usual (gauged) nonlinear chiral Lagrangian based on G/H .

Let us now calculate $\pi^+ - \pi^0$ mass difference or its N_f generalization, Δm_π^2 , the mass of the pseudo-NG boson associated with the T_1 generator in the QCD with N_f

massless quarks. The photon field A_μ reads $\mathcal{L}_\mu = \mathcal{R}_\mu = eQ A_\mu$, where e is the electromagnetic coupling and Q the electromagnetic charge matrix of the diagonal form: $\text{diag}(Q) = (2/3, -1/3, \dots)$. In order to include the photon loop, we need to add the kinetic term of the photon field to the $\mathcal{O}(p^2)$ Lagrangian in Eq. (2). The HLS Lagrangian further needs a *bare* term proportional to: $\alpha_{\text{em}} \Omega \text{tr} [QUQU^\dagger]$, where $U = \xi_L^\dagger \xi_R = e^{2i\pi/F_\pi(\Lambda)}$ and $\alpha_{\text{em}} = e^2/4\pi$ is the fine structure constant. The bare Δm_π^2 defined at Λ is then given by

$$\Delta m_\pi^2|_{\text{bare}} = \alpha_{\text{em}} \Omega(\Lambda)/F_\pi^2(\Lambda) \equiv \alpha_{\text{em}} \omega(\Lambda). \quad (3)$$

Such a bare term arises from integrating out the quark and gluon fields down to the matching scale Λ in the presence of dynamical photon field and can be determined by the Wilsonian matching proposed in Refs. [7, 9]. To estimate it, we rewrite [14] the usual current algebra formula [1] for Δm_π^2 in terms of the full current correlators instead of the spectral functions: $\Delta m_\pi^2 = (3\alpha_{\text{em}}/4\pi) \int_0^\infty dQ^2 Q^2 \Delta\Pi(Q^2)/F_\pi^2(0)$, where $\Delta\Pi(Q^2) \equiv \Pi_A(Q^2) - \Pi_V(Q^2)$ is the difference between the axialvector correlator $\Pi_A(Q^2)$ and the vector current correlator $\Pi_V(Q^2)$, and $F_\pi(0) (\neq F_\pi(\Lambda))$ the physical decay constant of π . Now we identify the high energy part of the integral for $Q^2 > \Lambda^2$ as the bare term Eq. (3):

$$\omega(\Lambda) = \frac{3}{4\pi} \int_{\Lambda^2}^\infty dQ^2 Q^2 \frac{\Delta\Pi^{(\text{QCD})}(Q^2)}{F_\pi^2(0)} = \frac{8}{3} \frac{\alpha_s \langle \bar{q}q \rangle^2}{F_\pi^2(0)\Lambda^2}, \quad (4)$$

where $\Delta\Pi^{(\text{QCD})}(Q^2)$ is given by the operator product expansion (OPE) in QCD [15]: $\Delta\Pi^{(\text{QCD})}(Q^2) = [4\pi(N_c^2 - 1)/N_c^2][(\alpha_s \langle \bar{q}q \rangle^2)/Q^6]$ and we set $N_c = 3$. Note that Eq. (4) is positive and hence the *OPE gives a clear picture that the QCD vacuum is aligned by the photon coupling in the desired direction* as far as the bare ω is concerned.

In the real-life QCD with $N_f = 3$, Eq. (3) with Eq. (4) is estimated as:

$$\Delta m_\pi^2|_{\text{bare}} = \alpha_{\text{em}} \omega(\Lambda) = 211 \pm 47 \pm 140 \text{ MeV}^2 \quad (5)$$

for a typical value of $(\Lambda, \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}) = (1.1, 0.4) \text{ GeV}$, where the first error comes from $F_\pi(0) = 86.4 \pm 9.7 \text{ MeV}$ (the value at chiral limit of $N_f = 3$) [9] and the second one from $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_{1\text{GeV}} = -(225 \pm 25 \text{ MeV})^3$ [16].

Now we calculate one-loop contribution Σ_{ab} (divergent part) to the $\pi_a - \pi_b$ two point function from the photon loop in the HLS (For the Feynman rule see Ref. [9]). In Landau gauge for the photon, the only relevant diagrams are a quadratically divergent γ loop with the $\pi\pi\gamma\gamma$ vertex proportional to $(1-a)$, and a logarithmically divergent $\rho - \gamma$ loop (via $\rho - \gamma$ mixing) with the $\pi\pi\rho\gamma$ vertex, which is proportional to $[ag^2 + (a-1)e^2]F_\pi^2 \simeq ag^2 F_\pi^2 = M_\rho^2$ (for $ag^2 \gg (a-1)e^2$): $\Sigma_{ab}|_{\text{div}} = 2 \text{tr} [[T_a, Q][T_b, Q]] \alpha_{\text{em}} \omega|_{\text{div}}$, where $\omega|_{\text{div}} = \frac{1}{4\pi} [(1-a)\Lambda^2 + 3aM_\rho^2 \ln \Lambda^2]$ [17]. Here we used as in

Refs. [7, 8, 9] the dimensional regularization and identify the quadratic divergences with the $n = 2$ pole (Note that the coefficient of the quadratic divergence is 1/3 of that of the naive cutoff) [18]. The RGE for ω thus reads

$$\mu \frac{d\omega}{d\mu} = -\frac{1}{2\pi} [(1-a)\mu^2 + 3aM_\rho^2] . \quad (6)$$

We first solve Eq. (6), with the boundary condition Eq. (4), from Λ to m_ρ , with the physical mass m_ρ defined by $m_\rho^2 = M_\rho^2(\mu = m_\rho) = a(\mu = m_\rho)g^2(\mu = m_\rho)F_\pi^2(\mu = m_\rho)$, which yields $\omega(m_\rho)$. Here the RGEs of other parameters F_π , a and g were already solved in the previous analyses [7, 9] in excellent agreement with the experiments, with their bare values determined by the Wilsonian matching of the HLS model with the underlying QCD through the OPE for the current correlators.

At $\mu = m_\rho$ the ρ gets decoupled, so that the RGE for $0 < \mu < m_\rho$ should be changed to that of ChPT without ρ loop where we change the notation of ω to $\omega^{(\pi)}$. Then the RGE for $\omega^{(\pi)}$ takes the form of that obtained by setting $a = 0$ in Eq. (6), which is readily solved as $\omega^{(\pi)}(\mu) = \omega(0) - \mu^2/4\pi$ where $\omega(0) \equiv \omega^{(\pi)}(0)$. Then we get $\omega(0) = \omega^{(\pi)}(m_\rho) + m_\rho^2/4\pi$. Actually, we needed to include finite renormalization effects to match the HLS with ChPT in the previous work [7, 9]. Similarly to F_π^2 at $\mu = m_\rho$, there exists a finite renormalization effect also for ω : Comparing the quadratic divergence of each RGE, we have $\omega^{(\pi)}(m_\rho) = \omega(m_\rho) - a(m_\rho)m_\rho^2/4\pi$. Then,

$$\omega(0) = \omega(m_\rho) + [1 - a(m_\rho)]m_\rho^2/4\pi , \quad (7)$$

which yields $\Delta m_\pi^2 = \alpha_{\text{em}}\omega(0)$.

As shown in the previous works [7, 9], the real-life QCD is close to the choice $a(\Lambda) \simeq 1$. We thus first demonstrate a simplified analysis for an ideal case $a(\Lambda) = 1$, which was explicitly shown [9] to yield a reasonable agreement with the ρ and π experiments: $F_\pi(0) = 73.6 \pm 5.7$ MeV (compared with 86.4 ± 9.7 MeV [9]) and other quantities such as g_ρ , $g_{\rho\pi\pi}$, L_9 , L_{10} . Moreover, in spite of the bare value $a(\Lambda) = 1$, the physical value defined as $a(0) \equiv F_\sigma^2(m_\rho)/F_\pi^2(0)$ was predicted to be $\simeq 2.0$, very close to the successful value of the tree-level phenomenology [5, 6]. Note that the quadratic divergence for ω is proportional to $(1-a)$ which is canceled for $a = 1$ without invoking the Weinberg's first sum rule.

Since $a = 1$ is the fixed point of the RGE [8, 9], we have $a(m_\rho) = 1$ and hence $\omega(0) = \omega(m_\rho)$. If we neglected the running of M_ρ^2 in Eq. (6), the RGE (6) would be readily solved to give $\Delta m_\pi^2 = \alpha_{\text{em}}\omega(m_\rho) = (3\alpha_{\text{em}}/4\pi)M_\rho^2 \cdot \ln(\Lambda^2/M_\rho^2) + \Delta m_\pi^2|_{\text{bare}}$, with $\Delta m_\pi^2|_{\text{bare}} = 290 \pm 149$ MeV² (for $F_\pi(0) = 73.6 \pm 5.7$ MeV above), which would yield $\Delta m_\pi^2 \simeq 1006$ MeV² if we took M_ρ^2 as m_ρ^2 [19]. Amazingly, even such a crude estimate is in rough agreement with the experiment $\Delta m_\pi^2|_{\text{exp.}} = 1261$ MeV². Actually, the running effect of $M_\rho^2(\mu)$ boosts up the above quantum corrections: Solving Eq.(6) together with RGEs for

other parameters as in [9], we have

$$\Delta m_\pi^2 = \alpha_{\text{em}}\omega(0) = 1223 \pm 263 \text{ MeV}^2 , \quad (8)$$

for a typical case $(\Lambda, \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}) = (1.1, 0.4)$ GeV [20], where the error comes from the $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_{1\text{GeV}}$ input.

Now in the full analysis of $N_f = 3$ case [7, 9], we used as an input the experimental value $F_\pi(0) = 86.4 \pm 9.7$ MeV instead of the ansatz $a(\Lambda) = 1$, and predicted the low energy quantities in remarkable agreement with the experiments. The bare parameter $a(\Lambda)$ in this case was determined as $a(\Lambda) \simeq 1.3$ for $(\Lambda, \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}) = (1.1, 0.4)$ GeV. Under this full analysis setting, we compute Δm_π^2 as

$$\Delta m_\pi^2 = 1129 \pm 18 \pm 218 \text{ MeV}^2 , \quad (9)$$

where the first error comes from the $F_\pi(0)$ input. This is in good agreement with the experiment.

Thus we have successfully reproduced the experimental value of Δm_π^2 in the HLS model with $a(\Lambda) \simeq 1$, *without introducing the a_1 meson and without invoking the Weinberg's spectral function sum rules.*

Now we discuss our result in connection with the little Higgs models. We have seen that the real-life QCD is very close to $a(\Lambda) = 1$, which implies that the quadratic divergence of Δm_π^2 in the HLS model, Eq. (6), does disappear in accord with the little Higgs [4]. The HLS model with $a = 1$ actually corresponds to the locality of the theory space in the little Higgs models: When the gauge couplings of both ρ and photon are switched off, $g = e = 0$, the HLS Lagrangian takes the Georgi's vector limit [10] $G_1 \times G_2/G_{1+2}$ with $G = \text{SU}(N_f)_L \times \text{SU}(N_f)_R$, which is nothing but a little Higgs model with two sites and two links. This implies that the locality of the theory space is violated only by the gauge couplings g and e even for the real-life QCD with $N_f = 3$: G_1 is explicitly broken by the ρ coupling down to H_{local} and G_2 becomes G_{global} of the HLS model, while G_2 (and hence G_{global}) is also explicitly broken by the photon coupling down to $\text{U}(1)_Q$, with those gauge symmetries spontaneously broken in the Higgs mechanism: $H_{\text{local}} \times \text{U}(1)_Q \rightarrow \text{U}(1)_{\text{em}}$. Then, as we have seen, some of the NG bosons acquire a mass

$$\Delta m_\pi^2 \sim (3/4\pi)\alpha_{\text{em}}m_\rho^2 \sim (1/4\pi)\alpha_{\text{em}}\alpha_{\text{HLS}}\Lambda^2 \quad (10)$$

(up to $\Delta m_\pi^2|_{\text{bare}}$), where, however, $\alpha_{\text{HLS}} = g^2(m_\rho)/4\pi$ is rather large ~ 1 in the real-life QCD, $\Delta m_\pi^2/\Lambda^2 \sim 0.001$, in contrast to the setting of the little Higgs for the natural hierarchy, $\Delta m_\pi^2/\Lambda^2 \sim (100\text{GeV}/10\text{TeV})^2 \sim 0.0001$, which corresponds to $\alpha_{\text{HLS}} \sim 0.1$.

At first sight it looks rather difficult to have weakly coupled gauge theory of composite ρ induced by the underlying strong coupling gauge theory. However, it was recently found [9, 11] that the ρ gauge coupling becomes vanishingly small, $\alpha_{\text{HLS}} \rightarrow 0$, when we increase N_f ($< 11N_c/2$) from 3 to a certain critical point N_f^{crit} where

the chiral symmetry in the underlying QCD was shown to get restored in various approaches including the lattice simulation [12], Schwinger-Dyson equation [13], etc. (“Large N_f QCD”). Accordingly the ρ mass goes to zero at the critical point and hence the (longitudinal) ρ becomes the chiral partner of the NG boson π , which we called “Vector Manifestation (VM)” of the Wigner realization of chiral symmetry [9, 11], characterized by

$$F_\pi^2(0) \rightarrow 0, \quad m_\rho^2 \rightarrow m_\pi^2 = 0, \quad a(0) \rightarrow 1. \quad (11)$$

Through the Wilsonian matching, the chiral restoration in the underlying large N_f QCD actually dictates that the bare parameters of the HLS model should take the following conditions called “VM conditions” [9, 11]:

$$g(\Lambda) \rightarrow 0, \quad a(\Lambda) \rightarrow 1, \quad (12)$$

which coincide with the Georgi’s vector limit, plus $F_\pi^2(\Lambda) \rightarrow (F_\pi^{\text{crit}})^2 = \frac{N_f^{\text{crit}}}{2(4\pi)^2} \Lambda^2$, with $N_f^{\text{crit}} \simeq 5.0 \frac{N_c}{3}$ being estimated through OPE in the underlying QCD. [21]

Since $(a, g) = (1, 0)$ is a fixed point of the RGEs, we have $\omega(0) = \omega(m_\rho \rightarrow 0) = \omega(\Lambda)$, where $\omega(\Lambda)$ is given by Eq. (4)[22]: $\omega(\Lambda) \sim \langle \bar{q}q \rangle^2 / F_\pi^2(0)$ which is expected to vanish near the critical point, since $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle^2 \sim m^{6-2\gamma_m}$ and $F_\pi(0) \sim m$ near the critical point, where γ_m is the anomalous dimension and $m(\rightarrow 0)$ the dynamical mass of the fermion in the underlying large N_f QCD. Actually, we expect [13] that the large N_f QCD becomes a walking gauge theory [23] near the critical point, which implies $\gamma_m \simeq 1$. Thus we have

$$\Delta m_\pi^2 / F_\pi^2(0) \sim \alpha_{\text{em}} \langle \bar{q}q \rangle^2 / F_\pi^4(0) \sim m^{2-2\gamma_m} \rightarrow c, \quad (13)$$

where $c = 0$ ($\gamma_m < 1$), and $c \simeq 0.024 \ll 1$ ($\gamma_m = 1$) if estimated through a simple ansatz about the N_f dependence made in Ref. [9]. Thus the desired hierarchy in the little Higgs can naturally be realized near the critical point of strongly coupled underlying gauge theory.

We would like to thank Andy Cohen, Howard Georgi and Michio Hashimoto for useful discussions. The work is supported in part by the JSPS Grant-in-Aid for the Scientific Research (B)(2) 14340072.

-
- [1] T. Das, G.S. Guralnik, V.S. Mathur, F.E. Low and J.E. Young, Phys. Rev. Lett. **18**, 759 (1967).
[2] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **18**, 507 (1967).
[3] S. Dimopoulos, Nucl. Phys. B **168**, 69 (1980); M.E. Peskin, Nucl. Phys. B **175**, 197 (1980); J. Preskill, Nucl. Phys. B **177**, 21 (1981).

- [4] N. Arkani-Hamed, A.G. Cohen and H. Georgi, Phys. Lett. **B513**, 232 (2001).
[5] M. Bando, T. Kugo, S. Uehara, K. Yamawaki and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 1215 (1985); M. Bando, T. Kugo and K. Yamawaki, Nucl. Phys. B **259**, 493 (1985).
[6] M. Bando, T. Kugo and K. Yamawaki, Phys. Rept. **164**, 217 (1988).
[7] M. Harada and K. Yamawaki, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 014023 (2001).
[8] M. Harada and K. Yamawaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3374 (1999); *ibid* **87**, 152001 (2001).
[9] M. Harada and K. Yamawaki, to appear in Physics Reports. arXiv:hep-ph/0302103.
[10] H. Georgi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 1917 (1989); Nucl. Phys. B **331**, 311 (1990).
[11] M. Harada and K. Yamawaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 757 (2001).
[12] Y. Iwasaki, K. Kanaya, S. Kaya, S. Sakai and T. Yoshie, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **131**, 415 (1998).
[13] T. Appelquist, J. Terning and L.C.R. Wijewardhana, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1214 (1996).
[14] K. Yamawaki, Phys. Lett. B **118**, 145 (1982).
[15] M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein and V.I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B **147**, 385 (1979); Nucl. Phys. B **147**, 448 (1979); W.A. Bardeen and V.I. Zakharov, Phys. Lett. B **91**, 111 (1980).
[16] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Phys. Rept. **87**, 77 (1982).
[17] In the usual calculation of Δm_π^2 [1], the gauge for the photon is taken as $g^{\mu\nu} - 4q^\mu q^\nu / q^2$ in order to drop the “seagull term” proportional to $g^{\mu\nu}$. However, in the HLS model we computed Δm_π^2 in arbitrary (covariant) gauge, the result being gauge-independent as it should.
[18] M. Veltman, Acta Phys. Polon. B **12**, 437 (1981).
[19] This is compared with the conventional formula [1], $(3\alpha_{\text{em}}/4\pi)m_\rho^2 \cdot 2 \ln(m_{a_1}^2/m_\rho^2) \simeq 1432 \text{ MeV}^2$, where we put $m_{a_1}^2 \simeq 2m_\rho^2 (\simeq \Lambda^2)$.
[20] We have checked the values of these bare parameters for several choices of Λ and Λ_{QCD} , the result being fairly stable against these changes.
[21] The RGE for F_π^2 is readily solved under Eq. (12) [8, 11] as $F_\pi^2(0) = (F_\pi^{\text{crit}})^2 - \frac{N_f}{2(4\pi)^2} \Lambda^2 \simeq \frac{N_f}{2(4\pi)^2} \Lambda^2 (N_f^{\text{crit}}/N_f - 1)$, where the second term is the quadratic divergence whose “fine tuning” to get a hierarchy more than the naive dimensional analysis, $F_\pi^2(0)/\Lambda^2 \ll (1/4\pi)^2$, may be naturally realized, if we arrange the N_f in the underlying theory as $N_f^{\text{crit}}/N_f - 1 \ll 1$.
[22] The quantum corrections of the form in Eq. (10) vanish much faster than the bare term $\omega(\Lambda)$, since α_{HLS} vanishes as $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle^2$ [9].
[23] B. Holdom, Phys. Lett. B **150**, 301 (1985); K. Yamawaki, M. Bando and K. Matumoto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 1335 (1986); T. Akiba and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **169**, 432 (1986); T.W. Appelquist, D. Karabali and L.C.R. Wijewardhana, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 957 (1986).