Chiral-symmetry breaking in a composite model with scalars based on lattice gauge theory

Pisin Chen*

Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305

Charles B. Chiu

Center for Particle Theory, Department of Physics, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712

(Received 27 January 1984)

In a composite model, based on the SO(3) gauge group, in which there are both fermion and scalar fundamental fields, we determine whether there is spontaneous breaking of chiral symmetry and look for the mass gap between the ground state and the one composite-fermion state. The chiral symmetry is realized in the strong-coupling lattice Hamiltonian with the fundamental fermions being massless and fundamental scalars being massive. This calculation is based on the mean-field approximation to the state wave functions. Similar to the calculations of Quinn, Drell, and Gupta in models without scalars, we also find that the chiral symmetry is spontaneously broken, and the composite fermions are massive. The extension of our calculation to SO(N) cases is shown to be straightforward.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the context of strong-coupling lattice gauge theories, Quinn, Drell, and Gupta[1] (QDG) have shown that the chiral symmetry is spontaneously broken and composite leptons and quarks, which are made out of fundamental fermions, are always massive. They argue that in going to the continuum limit there can only be two alternatives, either the chiral symmetry is realized in the Nambu-Goldstone mode with massive leptons and quarks, or there is a phase transition at some finite coupling. In the first case, the masslessness of leptons and quarks cannot be achieved, whereas in the second case the desired property of confinement and asymptotic freedom is lost.

Our goal in this paper is to extend this no-go scenario to the type of composite models in which the fundamental matter fields involve both scalars and fermions. Due to the limitation of our technical tools, we can only deal with those models having SO(N) as their gauge groups. A generalization to SU(N) groups awaits future efforts.

We shall first briefly review the QDG scenario, then go to an SO(3) model and demonstrate that the no-go scenario can be extended to the case involving fermion and scalar fundamental fields. We then argue that this can be straightforwardly extended to SO(N) cases. Although we are not able to cover the no-go scenario to all models of this type [in particular, the SU(N) cases like the Fritzsch-Mandelbaum model[2] or the Abbott-Farhi model[3]], the implication is already interesting. Some discussions are given at the end.

II. THE QUINN-DRELL-GUPTA NO-GO SCENARIO

As mentioned previously, Quinn, Drell, and Gupta consider the composite models in strong-coupling lattice gauge theories. They use the long-range form of the lattice gradient operator (the SLAC gradient), which for an infinite-volume lattice is

$$\partial_\mu \psi(\vec{j}) \equiv \sum_{\vec{j}'} \left[\prod_{\hat{\eta} \neq \hat{\mu}} \delta_{j_{\hat{\eta}} j'_{\hat{\eta}}} \right] \frac{(-1)^{j'_{\hat{\mu}} - j'_{\hat{\mu}}}}{j_{\hat{\mu}} - j'_{\hat{\mu}}} \psi(\vec{j}') , \qquad (2.1)$$

in order to explicitly maintain chiral symmetry without the fermion "doubling" problem. Consider the problem of a simple hypercolor gauge group, say SU(N), with fermions (preons) assigned to some set of representations R with dimension d_R and number of flavors f_R. The Hamiltonian in the $A_0 = 0$ gauge is given by

$$H = \frac{1}{a} \left\{ \sum_{\text{links}} g^2 E^2 + \frac{1}{g^2} \sum_{\text{plaquettes}} \sum_R [\text{Tr}_\square(U^R U^R U^{R\dagger} U^{R\dagger}) + \text{H.c.}] \right.$$

$$\left. + \sum_R \sum_{a=1}^{f_R} \sum_{\vec{j},\hat{\mu},l} \left[\frac{(-1)^l}{l} \bar{\psi}_R^a(\vec{j}) \alpha_\mu \sum_{\vec{j}'=\vec{j}}^{\vec{j}+(l-1)\hat{\mu}} U^R(\vec{j}',\hat{\mu}) \psi_R^a(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu}) \right] \right\} , \qquad (2.2)$$

where the lattice spacing a is the only dimensionful quantity and α_μ is the Dirac matrix $\gamma_0 \gamma_\mu$. For a strong-coupling effective Hamiltonian we separate H into

$$H_0 = \sum g^2 E^2 \text{ and } V = H - H_0 \qquad (2.3)$$

and perform degenerate perturbation theory in the sector of flux-free states. This requires that the fermion states at every site is a gauge group singlet. By retaining the terms only up to order $1/g^2$, which corresponds to acting with V twice, exciting a flux then annihilating it, gives[4]

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{g^2} \sum_R \sum_{\vec{j},l,\hat{\mu}} \psi_{R\alpha}^{\dagger a}(\vec{j}) \alpha_\mu \psi_R^{\beta a}(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu}) \psi_{R\beta}^{\dagger b}(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu}) \alpha_\mu \psi_R^{\alpha b}(\vec{j}) \left| \frac{(-1)^l}{l} \right|^2 \frac{N_R}{g^2 C_R l} + O\left[\frac{1}{g^4}\right] , \tag{2.4}$$

where

$$^\alpha U_\mu^R (^\sigma U_\nu^R)^\dagger = N_R \delta_\sigma^\alpha \delta_\mu^\nu + \text{nonsinglet pieces}$$

and $g^2 C_R l$ is the energy denominator from H_0 corresponding to a string of length l in representation $R - \bar{R}$.

Notice that the Hamiltonian has a nearest-neighbor symmetry

$$S_{\text{nn}} = \prod_R [\text{SU}(4f_R) \otimes \text{U}(1)_R] . \tag{2.5}$$

The U(1) charge is

$$Q_R(\vec{j}) = b_R^\dagger(\vec{j}) b_R(\vec{j}) - d_R^\dagger(\vec{j}) d_R(\vec{j}) = \tilde{\psi}_R^\dagger(\vec{j}) \tilde{\psi}_R(\vec{j}) - 2f_R d_R ,$$

$$Q_R = \sum_j Q_R(\vec{j}) , \tag{2.6}$$

where

$$\tilde{\psi}_R(\vec{j}) \equiv \alpha_x^{j_x} \alpha_y^{j_y} \alpha_z^{j_z} \psi_R(\vec{j}), \quad \tilde{\psi}_R^{\alpha a} = \begin{bmatrix} b_R^{\alpha a} \\ d_R^{\dagger \alpha a} \end{bmatrix} ,$$

and b and $d^\dagger$ are two-component spinors. The generators of the SU($4f_R$) are

$$Q_R^k(\vec{j}) = \tilde{\psi}_R^\dagger(\vec{j}) M^k \tilde{\psi}_R(\vec{j}) , \quad Q_R^k = \sum_{\vec{j}} Q_R^k(\vec{j}) , \tag{2.7}$$

where M^k are the ($4f_R \times 4f_R$) Hermitian unitary matrix representations of SU($4f_R$). By performing a Fierz transformation and using Eqs. (2.6) and (2.7), we can rewrite (2.4) in a compact form

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{g^2} \sum_R \sum_{\vec{j},l,\hat{\mu}} \frac{N_R}{4f_R C_R} \left[Q_R(\vec{j}) Q_R(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu}) + \chi^2 \sum_k (\eta^{\mu k})^{l+1} Q_R^k(\vec{j}) Q_R^k(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu}) \right] \frac{1}{l^3} , \tag{2.8}$$

where

$$\alpha_\mu M^k \alpha_\mu = \eta^{\mu k} M^k \quad (\eta^{\mu k} = \pm 1) \tag{2.9}$$

and χ is a normalization factor. Since the interactions fall off rapidly as $(l)^{-3}$, the odd-neighbor terms ($l=1$) provide the dominant part of H_{eff}. The smaller terms ($l=2$) provide the symmetry-breaking perturbations. The odd terms are of the form

$$\chi^2 \sum_k Q_R^k(\vec{j}) Q_R^k(\vec{j}+(2n+1)\hat{\mu})$$

$$+ Q_R(\vec{j}) Q_R(\vec{j}+(2n+1)\hat{\mu})$$

and hence are antiferromagnetic in character, tending to antialign SU($4f_R$)$\times$U(1) spins on sites separated by odd numbers of lattice spacings. The even-l terms tend to reinforce or compete with this antialignment depending on whether the sign $\eta^{\mu k}$ is negative or positive. By using the mean-field ansatz with two overlapping sublattices (see Ref. 4, and more specifically the simplified version in Ref. 5), QDG showed that the states that develop an expectation value for $M^k = \gamma_0$, that is, for the operator

$$\bar{\psi}(\vec{j}) \psi(\vec{j}) = (-1)^{j_x + j_y + j_z} \tilde{\psi}^\dagger(\vec{j}) \gamma_0 \tilde{\psi}(\vec{j}) , \tag{2.10}$$

are among the degenerate set of possible ground states that minimize the energy density

$$\mathscr{E} = \frac{\langle \phi | H_{\text{eff}} | \phi \rangle}{\text{volume}} . \tag{2.11}$$

Any infinitesimal mass term added to the Hamiltonian will select this chiral-symmetry-breaking state about which the mass acts as a perturbation.

QDG also showed that by acting on any site of the lattice with a composite fermion operator on the chosen ground state, there will be a mass gap created and of order $1/g^2$. Hence the composite leptons and quarks are massive. This conclusion does not change for any choice of fermion representation content and gauge group for four-component fermions. And the no-go scenario of QDG as stated at the beginning of this paper follows.

III. THE GROUND-STATE STRUCTURE IN AN SO(3) LATTICE GAUGE THEORY

Now we extend the above no-go scenario to composite models involving fermions and scalars as fundamental constituents. We begin with the model where the hypercolor SO(3) is the gauge group, both fermions and scalars

are assigned to the fundamental triplet representations.

The Hamiltonian in the continuum limit is given by

$$H_c = -\tfrac{1}{4}G_{\mu\nu}G^{\mu\nu} + \bar{\psi}^\alpha D\psi_\alpha + (D_\mu\phi^\alpha)^\dagger(D^\mu\phi_\alpha)$$

$$+ \mu^2\phi^{\dagger\alpha}\phi_\alpha + \frac{\lambda}{4!}(\phi^{\dagger\alpha}\phi_\alpha)^2 \qquad (3.1)$$

with $\lambda > 0$. Notice that the Yukawa term $\phi\bar{\psi}\psi$ is not allowed due to the assignment of the representations. The quartic coupling between scalars and fermions is purposely avoided by assuming that the scalars and fermions interact only through the gauge fields.

Although the Hamiltonian H_c thus constructed preserves chiral symmetry, one may suspect that when $\phi^{\alpha\dagger}\phi_\alpha$ obtains a nonzero vacuum expectation value the fermions may still acquire masses through the box diagram and its higher-order iterations (see Fig. 1), as a result the chiral symmetry of the system will be broken explicitly. We argue that this worry is unnecessary, because the contributions of these diagrams have an explicit dependence on the fermion mass m (see Appendix A). Since we assume $m = 0$ in the first place, these contributions should vanish.

Let us now consider a lattice Hamiltonian, which preserves chiral symmetry and it will reduce to Eq. (3.1) as the lattice size $a \to 0$. Recall that in the standard construction of the Hamiltonian in a lattice gauge theory, one assigns the matter fields on lattice sites and the gauge


(a)

(b)

FIG. 1. (a) The box diagram that could give rise to an effective $\phi^\dagger\phi\bar{\psi}\psi$ term; and (b) its higher-order iterations.

fields on the links connecting the sites. Within the SLAC long-range gradient formalism,[4,6] the present Hamiltonian in the $A_0 = 0$ gauge can be written as

$$H = \frac{1}{a}\left\{ \sum_{\text{links}} \tfrac{1}{2}g^2(E^\alpha)^2 - \frac{1}{g^2}\sum_{\text{plaquettes}} [\text{Tr}(UUU^\dagger U^\dagger) + \text{H.c.}] \right.$$

$$+ \sum_{\vec{j},l,\hat{\mu}}\left[\frac{(-1)^l}{l}\psi^{\dagger\alpha}(\vec{j})\alpha_\mu\left[\prod_{\vec{j}'=\vec{j}}^{\vec{j}+(l-1)\hat{\mu}}U_{\alpha\beta}(\vec{j}',\hat{\mu})\right]\psi^\beta(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu}) + \text{H.c.}\right]$$

$$+ \sum_{\vec{j}}\left[\sum_{l,\hat{\mu}}\frac{2(-1)^l}{l}\phi^{\dagger\alpha}(\vec{j})\left[\prod_{\vec{j}'=\vec{j}}^{\vec{j}+(l-1)\hat{\mu}}U_{\alpha\beta}(\vec{j}',\hat{\mu})\right]\phi^\beta(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu}) + D(0)\phi^{\dagger\alpha}(\vec{j})\phi_\alpha(\vec{j}) + \text{H.c.}\right]$$

$$\left. + \sum_{\vec{j}}\left[\pi^{\dagger\alpha}(\vec{j})\pi_\alpha(\vec{j}) + \mu_0^2\phi^{\dagger\alpha}(\vec{j})\phi_\alpha(\vec{j}) + \frac{\lambda_0}{4!}[\phi^{\dagger\alpha}(\vec{j})\phi_\alpha(\vec{j})]^2 + \text{H.c.}\right]\right\}. \qquad (3.2)$$

Notice that the term $D(0)\phi^{\dagger\alpha}(\vec{j})\phi_\alpha(\vec{j})$ comes from the spatial derivative of the scalars at the same site. Numerically $D(0) = \pi^2$ in three spatial dimensions. The scalar momentum $\pi_\alpha(\vec{j})$ is defined as

$$i\pi_\alpha(\vec{j}) = [\kappa(\vec{j})/2]^{1/2}[-a^\dagger_{+\alpha}(\vec{j}), a_{-\alpha}(\vec{j})] \qquad (3.3)$$

so that

$$[\pi_\alpha(\vec{j}), \phi_\beta(\vec{j}')] = \delta_{\alpha\beta}\delta(\vec{j} - \vec{j}'). \qquad (3.4)$$

All the fields and parameters in Eq. (3.2) have been properly redefined in such a way that the lattice spacing a is the only dimensional quantity.

In the strong-coupling limit, we neglect the plaquette terms and separate the rest of the Hamiltonian into two parts:

$$H_0 = \frac{1}{a}\sum\tfrac{1}{2}g^2E^\alpha E_\alpha \text{ and } V = H_l - H_0. \qquad (3.5)$$

Since $E^\alpha(\vec{j},\hat{\mu})$ measures hypercolor flux excitations, the ground state of H_0 corresponds to that sector of the Hilbert

space, which does not involve flux excitations. So we are looking for perturbative effects due to V. Rewrite V as

$$V = V_m + V_s + V_f , \tag{3.6}$$

where

$$V_m = \frac{1}{a} \sum_j \left[\pi_\alpha^\dagger(\vec{j})\pi^\alpha(\vec{j}) + D(0)\phi_\alpha^\dagger(\vec{j})\phi^\alpha(\vec{j}) + \mu_0^2\phi_\alpha^\dagger(\vec{j})\phi^\alpha(\vec{j}) + \frac{\lambda_0}{4!}[\phi_\alpha^\dagger(\vec{j})\phi^\alpha(\vec{j})]^2 + \text{H.c.} \right] ,$$

$$V_s = \frac{1}{a} \sum_{\vec{j},l,\hat{\mu}} \left[\frac{2(-1)^l}{l}\phi^{\dagger\alpha}(\vec{j}) \left[\prod_{\vec{j}'=\vec{j}}^{\vec{j}+(l-1)\hat{\mu}} U_{\alpha\beta}(\vec{j},\hat{\mu}) \right] \phi^\beta(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu}) + \text{H.c.} \right] ,$$

$$V_f = \frac{1}{a} \sum_{\vec{j},l,\hat{\mu}} \left[\frac{(-1)^l}{l}\psi^{\dagger\alpha}(\vec{j})\alpha_\mu \left[\prod_{\vec{j}'=\vec{j}}^{\vec{j}+(l-1)\hat{\mu}} U_{\alpha\beta}(\vec{j},\hat{\mu}) \right] \psi^\beta(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu}) + \text{H.c.} \right] .$$

Since we are working in the strong-coupling limit, we retain the perturbative Hamiltonian only up to the second order. In other words,

$$H_{\text{eff}} \approx H^{(1)} + H^{(2)} , \tag{3.7}$$

with

$$H^{(1)} = V_m$$

and

$$H^{(2)} = \sum \frac{1}{E_0 - E_l}(V_f^2 + V_s^2 + 2V_f V_s)$$

$$= \sum_{\vec{j},l,\hat{\mu}} -\frac{2N}{ag^2lC_F} \left[\frac{(-1)^{2l}}{l^2}\psi^{\dagger\alpha}(\vec{j})\alpha_\mu\psi^\beta(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu})\psi_\beta^\dagger(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu})\alpha_\mu\psi_\alpha(\vec{j}) + \text{H.c.} \right.$$

$$+ \frac{4(-1)^{2l}}{l^4}\phi^{\dagger\alpha}(\vec{j})\phi^\beta(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu})\phi_\beta^\dagger(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu})\phi_\alpha(\vec{j}) + \text{H.c.}$$

$$\left. + \frac{4(-1)^{2l}}{l^3}\psi^{\dagger\alpha}(\vec{j})\alpha_\mu\psi^\beta(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu})\phi_\beta(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu})\phi_\alpha^\dagger(\vec{j}) + \text{H.c.} \right]$$

$$\equiv H_f + H_s + H_{fs} .$$

After a Fierz transformation, H_{eff} can be expressed as

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{a} \sum_{\vec{j}'} \left[\pi^{\dagger\alpha}(\vec{j})\pi_\alpha(\vec{j}) + [D(0)+\mu_0^2]\phi^{\dagger\alpha}(\vec{j})\phi_\alpha(\vec{j}) + \frac{\lambda_0}{4!}[\phi^{\dagger\alpha}(\vec{j})\phi_\alpha(\vec{j})]^2 + \text{H.c.} \right]$$

$$+ \frac{2N}{ag^2C_F} \sum_{\vec{j},l,\hat{\mu}} \left[\frac{1}{4l^3} \left[Q_f(\vec{j})Q_f(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu}) + \chi^2\sum_{k=1}^{15}(\eta^{\mu k})^{l+1}Q_k(\vec{j})Q_k(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu}) + \text{H.c.} \right] \right.$$

$$\left. - \frac{4}{l^5}\{[\phi^{\dagger\alpha}(\vec{j})\phi_\alpha(\vec{j})][\phi^{\dagger\alpha}(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu})\phi_\alpha(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu})] + \text{H.c.}\} - \frac{4}{l^4}\{[F^\dagger(\vec{j})\alpha_\mu^{l+1}F(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu}) + \text{H.c.}\} \right] ,$$

$$\tag{3.8}$$

where

$$F^\dagger(\vec{j}) \equiv \phi_\alpha^\dagger(\vec{j})\psi^{\dagger\alpha}(\vec{j}) \equiv \vec{\phi}^\dagger(\vec{j})\cdot\vec{\psi}^\dagger(\vec{j}) \tag{3.9}$$

is the creation operator for the composite fermions.

Let us compare our H_{eff} in Eq. (3.8) with the H_{eff} in (2.8). The U(1)×SU(4) charges in H_f are identical to those in Eq. (2.8). But, in addition to the H_s terms, there are two main differences between the two effective Hamiltonians: First, there are zeroth-order (in $1/g^2$) contributions $H^{(1)}$ to H_{eff} due to the scalar fields in our case. This plays a dominant role in the construction of the ground-state bosonic wave function. Second, H_{fs} corresponds to the kinetic energy

term which moves the composite fermion from site $\vec{j} + l\hat{\mu}$ to site $\vec{j}$. While the kinetic term in QDG's case is of order $1/g^4$, our kinetic term is of order $1/g^2$ and can in principle compete with the potential terms in H_f. Next we proceed to construct the ground state of the system.

A. A general trial state for the vacuum

We anticipate that the trial state for the ground state or the vacuum should take the general form

$$|\Omega\rangle = \sum_{l,\{\alpha,\beta\}} C_{\alpha\beta}^l \left[\sum_m (2l+1)^{1/2} \langle 0,0 \,|\, l,m\,;l,-m \rangle \Phi_{lm}^{(\alpha)\dagger} \Psi_{l-m}^{(\beta)\dagger} \right] |0\rangle$$

$$= \sum_{l,\{\alpha,\beta\}} C_{\alpha\beta}^l (\Phi_l^{(\alpha)\dagger} \cdot \Psi_l^{(\beta)\dagger}) |0\rangle ,$$

(3.10)

where the SO(3) scalar product is defined and where Φ's are functions of boson field operators with l,m being the SO(3) hypercolor labels and (α) some additional labels, and Ψ's are the corresponding hypercolor conjugated functions of fermion field operators. Summing over m above amounts to taking the scalar product in the hypercolor space to ensure hypercolor singlet states. The C's are numerical weight factors for different assignments of $l, \{\alpha,\beta\}$.

1. The boson wave functions

The first-order Hamiltonian for the scalar part has the form [cf. Eq. (3.6)]

$$H^{(1)} = \frac{1}{a} \sum_{\vec{j}} \left[\pi_\alpha^\dagger(\vec{j})\pi^\alpha(\vec{j}) + D(0)\phi_\alpha^\dagger(\vec{j})\phi^\alpha(\vec{j}) + \mu_0^2\phi_\alpha^\dagger(\vec{j})\phi^\alpha(\vec{j}) + \frac{\lambda_0}{4!}[\phi_\alpha^\dagger(\vec{j})\phi^\alpha(\vec{j})]^2 + \text{H.c.} \right] .$$

Our present problem may be mapped to the nonrelativistic quantum-mechanics problem with

$$H^{(1)} \rightarrow \frac{p^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2}m\omega^2 r^2 + \frac{\lambda_0 r^4}{4!} .$$

(3.11)

In particular all we need is to make the identification

$$2m = a, \quad \frac{\omega^2}{4} = \frac{D_0 + \mu_0^2}{a^2}, \quad r^2 = \phi_\alpha^\dagger \phi^\alpha = \vec{\phi} \cdot \vec{\phi} ,$$

and

$$p^2 = \pi_\alpha^\dagger \pi^\alpha = \vec{\pi} \cdot \vec{\pi} .$$

(3.12)

Now we consider the case where λ_0 is sufficiently small, so that we may make use of the perturbation approach and describe the complete set of the orthonormal wave functions for the tensor products of $\vec{\phi}$, in terms of eigenfunctions of the Hamiltonian:

$$H^{(1)} \simeq \frac{p^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2}m\omega^2 r^2 .$$

(3.13)

Later we shall determine the range of λ_0 such that our perturbation approach can be justified.

Next we proceed to discuss the solutions for $H^{(1)}$ of Eq. (3.13). The radial part of the Schrödinger equation for $H^{(1)}$ is given by

$$-\frac{1}{2\mu}\frac{d^2u}{dr^2} + \left[\frac{l(l+1)}{2\mu r^2} + \frac{1}{2}\mu\omega^2 r^2 \right] u = Eu ,$$

(3.14)

where the full wave function is

$$\Phi \sim \frac{u(r)}{r} Y_{lm}(\theta,\phi) ,$$

(3.15)

which satisfies $H^{(1)}\Phi = E\Phi$. Following the standard approach (see, for example, Ref. 7), let

$$u = r^{l+1}\exp\left[-\frac{\mu\omega^2}{2}r^2 \right]f(r)$$

(3.16)

and denote $z = m\omega r^2$. Substituting Eq. (3.16) into (3.14), we get

$$z\frac{d^2f}{dz^2} + \frac{df}{dz}\left[l+\frac{3}{2}-z \right] + \left[\frac{E}{2\omega} - \left[\frac{l}{2}+\frac{3}{4} \right] \right]f = 0 .$$

(3.17)

Recall that the associated Laguerre polynomial satisfies the differential equation

$$z\frac{d^2w}{dz^2} + \frac{dw}{dz}(p+1-z) + qw = 0 .$$

(3.18)

Comparing Eqs. (3.17) and (3.18), one obtains

$$f(z) = L_q^{l+1/2}(z) \text{ and } E = (2q+l+\tfrac{3}{2})\omega .$$

(3.19)

Denote $z = (D_0 + \mu_0^2)^{1/2}\phi^2$. For our present complete orthonormal set of bosonic functions, we write

$$\Phi_{lm}^{(\alpha)} \equiv \Phi_{lm}^{(q)} \sim z^{1/2}\exp\left[-\frac{z}{2} \right]L_q^{l+1/2}(z)Y_{lm}(\theta,\phi) ,$$

(3.20)

where the overall constant can be specified through normalization of the states.

2. The fermion wave functions

To describe fermion states we must take into account the 2 degrees of freedom for spin $\frac{1}{2}$ and make the particle-antiparticle distinctions. Denote the field operators for the creation of fermions by $b_{+,m}^\dagger, b_{-,m}^\dagger$ and for

the antifermions $d^\dagger_{+,-m}$ and $d^\dagger_{-,-m}$. Here the subscript m takes the value $m = -1, 0, 1$, since all these particles are in $l = 1$ triplet states. Note also a particle in the m state is color conjugate to an antiparticle in the $-m$ state.

The resultant color content of the products of fermionic field operators can now be defined through the usual procedure of the Clebsch-Gordan additions. More explicitly one would write

$$\Psi^\beta_{lm} \equiv \Psi^{(n_+,n_-,\bar{n}_+,\bar{n}_-)}_{lm}$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{l_1 m_1 \\ l_2 m_2}} \psi^{(n_+,n_-)}_{l_1 m_1} \psi^{(\bar{n}_+,\bar{n}_-)}_{l_2 m_2} \langle lm \mid l_1 m_1; l_2 m_2 \rangle \; , \quad (3.21)$$

with

$$\psi^{(n_+,n_-)}_{l_1 m_1} = \sum_{l'm', l''m''} \psi^{n_+}_{l'm'} \psi^{n_-}_{l''m''} \langle l_1 m_1 \mid l'm', l''m'' \rangle \; ,$$

and a similar definition for the antiparticles. The general trial state of Eq. (3.10) is now defined through (3.20) and (3.21).

B. The inclusion of the $\lambda_0 r^4$ term

Now we return to the full expression of $H^{(1)}$ [cf. Eq. (3.11)] by adding in the $\lambda_0 r^4$ term as a perturbation to the previous treatment.

By invoking WKB approximation for the harmonic oscillators (see Appendix B), we have, for $l = 0$, the phase condition without the $\lambda_0 r^4$ term

$$\sqrt{2m} \int dr (E_0 - \tfrac{1}{2} m\omega^2 r^2)^{1/2} = \frac{3\pi}{4}$$

$$\text{gives } E_0 = \frac{3\omega}{2} \; , \quad (B4)$$

and for $l > 0$, the phase condition

$$\sqrt{2m} \int dr \left[E_0 - \tfrac{1}{2} m\omega^2 r^2 - \frac{l(l+1)}{2mr^2} \right]^{1/2} = \frac{\pi}{2}$$

$$\text{gives } E_l \approx E_0 + l\omega \; . \quad (B10)$$

Now we proceed to consider the effect of including the $\lambda_0 r^4$ term. Denote the eigenvalues we are looking for by

$$E'_0 = E_0 + \Delta_0 \text{ and } E'_l = E_l + \Delta_l \; . \quad (3.22)$$

They satisfy the corresponding conditions

$$\sqrt{2m} \int dr (E'_0 - \tfrac{1}{2} m\omega^2 r^2 - \lambda_0 r^4)^{1/2} = \frac{3\pi}{4} \quad (3.23)$$

and

$$\sqrt{2m} \int dr \left[E'_0 - \tfrac{1}{2} m\omega^2 r^2 - \frac{l(l+1)}{2mr^2} - \lambda_0 r^4 \right]^{1/2} = \frac{\pi}{2} \; . \quad (3.24)$$

Application of the mean-value theorem on Eqs. (3.23) and (3.24) reveals the following crucial properties for the energy shifts. For $\lambda_0 > 0$, the Δ_l's are all positive quantities and are monotonic functions of λ_0. Since $E'_l - E'_0 = l\omega + \Delta_l - \Delta_0$, so long as Δ_0 is maintained with some finite value below ω, E'_l for $l > 0$ would always be at least a

finite gap away from E'_0. In other words, we have now arrived at a sufficient condition which ensures a finite gap between E'_0 and E'_l for $l > 0$. To reiterate, this is achieved when λ_0 is kept in the range such that

$$\Delta_0 < (1-\eta)\omega \quad (3.25)$$

with η being some arbitrary finite fraction.

Now we proceed to make a quantitative estimate on the range of λ_0. First we calculate the approximate ground-state energy based on the variational technique. We choose the form of the ground-state wave function for the harmonic oscillator to be that for the trial wave function. We get

$$\langle 0 \mid H^{(1)} \mid 0 \rangle = \frac{\int r^2 dr \exp\left[-\frac{\beta}{4} r^2 \right] H^{(1)} \exp\left[-\frac{\beta}{4} r^2 \right]}{\int r^2 dr \exp\left[-\frac{\beta}{2} r^2 \right]} \; ,$$

$$\quad (3.26)$$

with

$$H^{(1)} = -\frac{1}{r^2} \frac{d}{dr} r^2 \frac{d}{dr} + \frac{\omega^2}{4} r^2 + \frac{\lambda_0}{4!} r^4 \quad (3.27)$$

and

$$H^{(1)} \exp\left[-\frac{\beta}{4} r^2 \right]$$

$$= \left[\frac{3\beta}{2} + \frac{\omega^2 - \beta^2}{4} r^2 + \frac{\lambda_0}{4!} r^4 \right] \exp\left[-\frac{\beta}{4} r^4 \right] \; . \quad (3.28)$$

By use of the mathematical identity

$$\int_0^\infty r^n dr \exp\left[-\frac{\beta r^2}{2} \right] = \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{2}{\beta} \right]^{(n+1)/2} \Gamma\left[\frac{n+1}{2} \right] \; , \quad (3.29)$$

Eq. (3.26) becomes

$$\langle H^{(1)} \rangle = \frac{3}{4} \left[\beta + \frac{\omega^2}{\beta} + \frac{5\lambda_0}{6\beta^2} \right] = f(\beta) \; . \quad (3.30)$$

Now let us allow β to be a parameter. The minimum value of $\langle H^{(1)} \rangle$ is obtained by minimizing $f(\beta)$. As a rough estimate on λ_0, we solve for $\langle H^{(1)} \rangle$ iteratively. To zeroth order in λ_0, the stationary point occurs at $\beta \sim \omega$, so

$$\langle H^{(1)} \rangle \sim \frac{3\omega}{2} + \frac{5\lambda_0}{8\omega^2} \; . \quad (3.31)$$

The condition of Eq. (3.25) now gives

$$\lambda_0 < \tfrac{8}{5}(1-\eta)\omega^3 \; . \quad (3.32)$$

It is important to point out that while from Eq. (3.26) onward we have used the perturbative method to estimate the quantitative range of λ_0, our argument in arriving at the finite-gap conclusion is independent of the perturbation theory.

IV. CHIRAL-SYMMETRY BREAKING
AND COMPOSITE FERMION MASS

Recall that the full effective Hamiltonian H_{eff} includes $H^{(1)}$ and $H^{(2)}$, where $H^{(2)}$ is of order $1/g^2$. The fact that the eigenvalues of $H^{(1)}$ are separated by finite gaps suggests that the $l=0$ component in the ground state $|\Omega\rangle$ [defined in Eq. (3.10)] dominates over other components.

A. The mixing angle in the ground state

We shall simplify our ground-state structure by truncating away all the $\Phi_{lm}^{\dagger}, \Psi_{l,-m}^{\dagger}$ components for $l \geq 2$. Meanwhile we introduce a mixing angle θ to parametrize the relative weight between the $\Phi_0^{\dagger} \cdot \Psi_0^{\dagger}$ components:

$$|\Omega\rangle = [\cos\theta \Phi_0^{\dagger} \cdot \Psi_0^{\dagger} + \sin\theta \Phi_1^{\dagger} \cdot \Psi_1^{\dagger}] |0\rangle$$

$$\equiv |\Omega_0\rangle + |\Omega_1\rangle . \tag{4.1}$$

Note that the normalization for these states are $\langle\Omega|\Omega\rangle = \langle\Omega_0|\Omega_0\rangle = \langle\Omega_1|\Omega_1\rangle = 1$. Let us define

$$\langle\Omega_0|H_f|\Omega_0\rangle = \cos^2\theta E_{f0} ,$$

$$\langle\Omega_1|H_f|\Omega_1\rangle = \sin^2\theta E_{f1} ,$$

$$\langle\Omega_0|H_s|\Omega_0\rangle = \cos^2\theta E_{s0} , \tag{4.2}$$

$$\langle\Omega_1|H_s|\Omega_1\rangle = \sin^2\theta E_{s1} ,$$

and

$$\langle\Omega_0|H_{fs}|\Omega_1\rangle = \langle\Omega_1|H_{fs}|\Omega_0\rangle$$

$$= \cos\theta \sin\theta E_{fs} .$$

Notice that all E_{fi}'s E_{si}'s, and E_{fs} are at least of order $1/g^2$ inherited from their corresponding Hamiltonians. Recall that

$$\langle\Omega_0|H^{(1)}|\Omega_0\rangle = \cos^2\theta E_0 ,$$

$$\langle\Omega_1|H^{(1)}|\Omega_1\rangle = \sin^2\theta E_1 , \tag{4.3}$$

where E_0 and E_1 are given according to Eq. (3.22), and the energy gap between E_0 and E_1 is finite (of order zero in $1/g^2$).

Putting everything together we have

$$\mathscr{E} \equiv \langle\Omega|H_{\text{eff}}|\Omega\rangle$$

$$= \langle\Omega|(H^{(1)}+H^{(2)})|\Omega\rangle$$

$$= \cos^2\theta(E_0+E_{f0}+E_{s0}) + \sin^2\theta(E_1+E_{f1}+E_{s1})$$

$$+ 2\cos\theta \sin\theta E_{fs} . \tag{4.4}$$

Minimize this vacuum expectation value by varying θ,

$$\frac{\partial\mathscr{E}}{\partial\theta} = 0 ,$$

we get

$$\tan 2\theta = -\frac{E_{fs}}{(E_1-E_0)+(E_{f1}-E_{f0})+(E_{s1}-E_{s0})}$$

$$\sim O\left[\frac{1}{g^2}\right] , \tag{4.5}$$

or

$$\theta \sim O\left[\frac{1}{g^2}\right] . \tag{4.6}$$

If we were to include the $l \geq 2$ contributions in Eq. (4.1) it could be shown that our conclusion of (4.6) still prevails.

B. Chiral-symmetry breaking

Now that $\theta \sim O(1/g^2)$, we know that $\cos^2\theta \sim O(1-1/g^4)$ and $\sin^2\theta \sim O(1/g^4)$. Thus

$$\langle\Omega_0|H_f|\Omega_0\rangle = \cos^2\theta E_{f0} \sim O\left[\frac{1}{g^2}\right]$$

and $\tag{4.7}$

$$\langle\Omega_1|H_f|\Omega_1\rangle = \sin^2\theta E_{f1} \sim O\left[\frac{1}{g^6}\right] .$$

Since the part of the Hamiltonian H_{eff} which deals with chiral-symmetry breaking is H_f [see Eq. (3.8)], we see from Eq. (4.7) that the part of the vacuum which dominates this breaking situation comes from $|\Omega_0\rangle \equiv \cos\theta \Phi_0^{\dagger} \cdot \Psi_0^{\dagger} |0\rangle$ where $\Psi_0^{\dagger}$ corresponds to creating all possible fermionic hypercolor singlets in SO(3). On the other hand, $|\Omega_1\rangle$, which consists of fermionic hypercolor nonsinglets, will contribute only up to order $1/g^6$.

In the context of our present discussion, we remind the reader of an important point: In QDG's argument for chiral-symmetry breaking, they consider the case where there are only colorless fermionic states present, that is, the state $|\Omega_0\rangle = |\Psi_0\rangle$. (Note for $l=0$ chiral-symmetry breaking is independent of the scalar contribution.) Their chiral-symmetry-breaking conclusion is arrived at by showing that a certain nonchiral symmetric ground state gives the lowest energy expectation value E_{f0}. At the same time the chiral-symmetric trial states give expectation values at least of the order $1/g^2$ higher. For our case, from Eq. (4.7) one sees that the $|\Omega_1\rangle$ state contribution is suppressed by an additional factor of $1/g^4$ and can be ignored. So our conclusion of the spontaneous breaking of chiral symmetry now follows in the same way as that of QDG.

C. The composite fermion mass

In the case of QDG, the "potential energy" for creating a composite fermion from the mean-field state is positive and of order $1/g^2$:

$$|\langle Q_R^k \rangle| > |\langle F Q_R^k F^{\dagger} \rangle| \sim O\left[\frac{1}{g^2}\right] . \tag{4.8}$$

On the other hand, the "kinetic energy" terms that move composite fermions (made of three or more fermionic preons) from one site to another are able to reduce the mass gap but only to leading order $1/g^4$. Hence one cannot alter the mass-gap result by making a zero-momentum superposition of local composite fermion states. We now turn to our case.

The evaluation of the composite fermion mass for our case is complicated by two additional effects. First the

presence of the composite fermion kinetic term H_{fs}, which as we shall see gives rise to an $O(1/g^2)$ effect. Second, even more importantly, the presence of the scalar term which gives rise to an $O(1)$ effect.

(i) General considerations involving composite fermion operators

Define a composite fermion state as a composite creation operator acting on the mean-field ground state:

$$F^\dagger(\vec{j})|\Omega\rangle \equiv |F(\vec{j})\rangle \prod_{\substack{even \\ i\neq j}} |\Omega_e(\vec{i})\rangle \prod_{\substack{odd \\ k\neq j}} |\Omega_o(\vec{k})\rangle ,$$

(4.9)

where $|\Omega_e\rangle$ and $|\Omega_o\rangle$ are the even- and odd-site mean-field ground states, respectively, and $F^\dagger \equiv \vec{\phi}^{\dagger}\cdot\vec{\psi}^{\dagger}$.

In momentum space, introduce

$$|\mathscr{F}(\vec{k})\rangle \equiv \sum_j \exp(i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{j})F^\dagger(\vec{j})|\Omega\rangle ,$$

$$0 \leq |\vec{k}| \leq \frac{\pi}{a} . \quad (4.10)$$

The expectation value of the kinetic term defined by the momentum state is given by

$$\langle\mathscr{F}(\vec{k})|F^\dagger(\vec{j})F(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu})|\mathscr{F}(\vec{k})\rangle + \text{H.c.}$$

$$= \sum_{\vec{m},\vec{m}'} \{\exp[-i\vec{k}\cdot(\vec{m}-\vec{m}')]\delta(\vec{m}-\vec{j})$$

$$\times \delta(\vec{j}+l\hat{\mu}-\vec{m}')+\text{H.c.}\}$$

$$= 2\cos(\vec{k}\cdot l\hat{\mu}) . \quad (4.11)$$

Clearly, the maximum value corresponds to $\vec{k}=0$, i.e.,

$$|\mathscr{F}(\vec{k}=0)\rangle = \sum_{\vec{j}} F^\dagger(\vec{j})|\Omega\rangle . \quad (4.12)$$

This turns out to lower the expectation value of H_{eff} the most. So the $|\mathscr{F}(\vec{k}=0)\rangle$ state is appropriate for the evaluation of the mass gap.

(ii) Evaluation of the mass gap

The Hamiltonian of the kinetic terms is H_{fs} and can be expressed in terms of the composite fermion operators

$$H_{fs} = -\frac{2N}{ag^2C_F} \sum_{\hat{\mu}} (4F_e^\dagger F_o + \tfrac{1}{4}F_e^\dagger \alpha_\mu F_e) , \quad (4.13)$$

where the first term on the right-hand side, $F_e^\dagger F_o$, corresponds to movings between nearest neighbors, and the second term corresponds to hoppings between next-to-the-nearest neighbors. These are all along the $\hat{\mu}$ direction.

In Appendix D we find that

$$(\phi_1^\dagger\cdot\psi_1^\dagger)(\Phi_0^\dagger\cdot\Psi_0^\dagger)=\Phi_1'^{\dagger}\cdot\Psi_1'^{\dagger} ,$$

$$(\phi_1^\dagger\cdot\psi_1^\dagger)(\Phi_0^\dagger\cdot\Psi_0^\dagger)=\Phi_0''^{\dagger}\cdot\Psi_0''^{\dagger}+\Phi_1''^{\dagger}\cdot\Psi_1''^{\dagger}+\Phi_2''^{\dagger}\cdot\Psi_2''^{\dagger} .$$

(4.14)

Again, keeping only $l<2$ terms then the state $|\mathscr{F}(\vec{k}=0)\rangle$ is approximately equal to

$$|\mathscr{F}(\vec{k}=0)\rangle \simeq (\phi_1^\dagger\cdot\psi_1^\dagger)(\cos\theta\Phi_0^\dagger\cdot\Psi_0^\dagger+\sin\theta\Phi_1^\dagger\cdot\Psi_1^\dagger)|0\rangle$$

$$\simeq \sin\theta|\Omega_0''\rangle+\cos\theta|\Omega_1'\rangle , \quad (4.15)$$

where $|\Omega_0''\rangle\equiv\Phi_0''^{\dagger}\cdot\Psi_0''^{\dagger}|0\rangle$ and $|\Omega_1'\rangle\equiv\Phi_1'^{\dagger}\cdot\Psi_1'^{\dagger}|0\rangle$. The superscript states are not properly normalized (see Appendix D). Denote some normalization factor $N_F=\langle\mathscr{F}(\vec{k}=0)|\mathscr{F}(\vec{k}=0)\rangle^{-1}$,

$$N_F\langle\mathscr{F}(\vec{k}=0)|H_f\mathscr{F}(\vec{K}=0)\rangle\simeq\sin^2\theta E_{f0}''+\cos^2\theta E_{f1}' ,$$

with E_{f0}'' defined to be equal to $N_F\langle\Omega_0''|H_f|\Omega_0''\rangle$, and is of order $O(1/g^2)$, E_{f1}' equal to $N_F\langle\Omega_1'|H_f|\Omega_1'\rangle$, also of order $O(1/g^2)$. Then

$$N_F\langle\mathscr{F}(\vec{k}=0)|H_f|\mathscr{F}(\vec{k}=0)\rangle\sim O\left[\frac{1}{g^2}\right] , \quad (4.16)$$

whereas for H_{fs},

$$N_F\langle\mathscr{F}(\vec{k}=0)|H_{fs}|\mathscr{F}(\vec{k}=0)\rangle\sim\sin\theta\cos\theta E_{fs}$$

$$\sim O\left[\frac{1}{g^4}\right] . \quad (4.17)$$

To arrive at Eq. (4.17), note that for the expectation value of the second term on the right-hand side of (4.13) upon averaging over the spin orientations of the composite fermions, this term vanishes. So in our case of kinetic energy is also of order $1/g^4$ and cannot help to close the mass gap for the composite fermion state.

Now we come to the second effect mentioned earlier. The fact that there exists a $H^{(1)}$ part in the total Hamiltonian and that $H^{(1)}$ is of zeroth order in $1/g^2$ expansion tells us that the mass gap for the composite fermion state is of zeroth order in $1/g^2$. To be more specific,

$$N_F\langle\mathscr{F}(\vec{k}=0)|H_{\text{eff}}|\mathscr{F}(\vec{k}=0)\sim\sin^2\theta E_0''+\cos^2\theta E_1' ,$$

and using the notation of Eq. (3.22), we have

$$\langle\Omega|H_{\text{eff}}|\Omega\rangle\sim\cos^2\theta(E_0+\Delta_0)+\sin^2\theta(E_1+\Delta_1) .$$

Thus to leading order in $1/g^2$

$$\Delta\mathscr{E}=N_F\langle\mathscr{F}|H_{\text{eff}}|\mathscr{F}\rangle-\langle\Omega|H_{\text{eff}}|\Omega\rangle$$

$$\sim\cos^2\theta(E_1''-E_0-\Delta_0)\sim O(1) . \quad (4.18)$$

In the last step we have used $E_1''\simeq E_1+\Delta_1$. Note in general to zeroth order in $1/g^2$, for fixed l the corresponding energy eigenvalue for $|\Omega_l\rangle$ is the same as that for $|\Omega_l''\rangle$. We thus conclude that, in the case of SO(3) composite model involving both fermionic and scalar preons, the chiral symmetry is also spontaneously broken and the composite fermions (leptons and quarks) are massive in the strong-coupling lattice calculation.

D. Generalization to other cases

(i) Extension to the case with Higgs phase

For $D_0+\mu_0^2<0$, the minimum of the expectation value is

$$H_\phi = \pi^2 + (D_0 + \mu_0{}^2)\phi^2 + \frac{\lambda_0}{4!}\phi^2 , \qquad (4.19)$$

and occurs at

$$\phi^2 = v^2 = \frac{|a|}{2\lambda_0}, \quad \text{with } |a| = -(D_0 + \mu_0{}^2) . \qquad (4.20)$$

With the usual redefinition of the dynamical fields $\tilde{\phi} = \phi - v$, we have

$$H_\phi = \tilde{\pi}^2 + 2|a| \tilde{\phi}^2 + 4\lambda_0 v \tilde{\phi}^3 + \lambda_0 \tilde{\phi}^4 . \qquad (4.21)$$

Now we can apply the procedure as before to evaluate the energy of the trial ground state as a function of the parameter β. After a similar manipulation, we arrive at

$$E_0 = \tfrac{3}{2}\omega \left\{ 1 + \lambda_0 \left[\frac{4}{3} \left[\frac{2}{3} \right]^{1/2} \frac{1}{\omega^{5/2}} + \frac{5}{12\omega^3} \right] \right\} . \qquad (4.22)$$

The absence of $l > 0$ components in the ground state can be ensured when

$$\lambda_0 \ll \frac{2}{3} \left[\frac{4}{3} \left[\frac{2}{3} \right]^{1/2} \frac{1}{\omega^{5/2}} + \frac{5}{12\omega^3} \right]^{-1} . \qquad (4.23)$$

(ii) Extension from SO(3) to SO(N)

So far for definiteness, we have considered the SO(3) case, which is locally isomorphic to SU(2). Our considerations can, in a straightforward manner, be extended to the general case of SO(N). A particular case which might be of physical interest is to assign the fermions and the scalars and their correpsonding antiparticles to the irreducible representations of SO(6), which contains SU(3) as a subgroup. Here we will be looking at a theory which has a symmetry slightly larger than that of QCD and it has additional scalars.

Bander and Itzykson[8] have shown that for SO(N) the corresponding Laplacian operator is given by

$$\nabla^2 = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} - \frac{N-1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r} - \frac{L^2}{r^2} , \qquad (4.24)$$

where L^2 is the generalization of the total angular momentum and it operates on angular variables with

$$L^2 Y_{l,\{m_i\}}^{(N)}(\hat{n}) = l(l + N - 2) Y_{l,\{m_i\}}^{(N)}(\hat{n}) , \qquad (4.25)$$

where $\hat{n}$ is an arbitrary unit vector in the N-dimensional space.

Define the reduced radial function by

$$u = r^a R, \quad a = -\frac{N-1}{2} . \qquad (4.26)$$

The present SO(N) theory can now be associated with radial equation:

$$-\frac{1}{2\mu}\frac{d^2u}{dr^2} + \left[\frac{4l(l+N-2)-(N-1)(N-3)}{8\mu r^2} + \tfrac{1}{2}\mu\omega^2 r^2 + \frac{\lambda_0 r^4}{4!} \right] u = Eu . \qquad (4.27)$$

The WKB approximation can again be applied to solve for the energy eigenvalues. Once again one concludes that as long as the parameter λ_0 is kept below a certain value, the nonhypercolor-singlet ($l > 0$) components in Φ_l and Ψ_l are appropriately suppressed in the ground state. In turn the no-go scenario advocated in Ref. 1, is also applicable here.

V. FURTHER REMARKS

So far we have demonstrated that the QDG no-go scenario extends to the composite models based on SO(N) groups. Note that our result follows rather trivially once one recognizes the smallness of the mixing angle θ. On the other hand we find that without the explicit calculations of the eigenvalues E_1 and E_0, it would be difficult to argue *a priori* about the smallness of θ and thus the breaking of chiral symmetry.

Unfortunately we are not able to enlarge the scope to those models based on SU(N) local gauge groups, be it either having both scalars and fermions assigned to the fundamental representations (as the Fritzsch-Mandelbaum model), or having right-handed and left-handed fermions transform differently under the gauge group (as the Abbott-Farhi model), or other constructions. But the message we get from the previous sections is quite clear. For composite models based on QCD-like non-Abelian gauge theories, the chiral symmetry is very hard, if not impossible, to be retained. There is, however, an exception suggested by Banks and Kaplunovsky,[9] who use a variant of a Kogut-Susskind gradient which is only possible for groups with real representations, such as O(n), and with a single flavor of fermion. But these theories would give massive composite fermions when treated using any of the standard lattice gradients.[1]

An interesting alternative is given by Buchmüller, Peccei, and Yanagida,[10] in which the lightness of leptons and quarks is not supposed to be protected by the chiral symmetry of a "normal" Yang-Mills gauge theory. Rather, the light composite leptons and quarks are quasi-Goldstone fermions arising from the spontaneous breaking of a global symmetry in a supersymmetric theory. In this framework they treat the weak interactions as residual interactions of the quasi-Goldstone fermions. The simplest preon model realizing this global symmetry breakdown leads to the supersymmetric extension of the standard model of electroweak interactions. So this model can be viewed as a supersymmetric generalization of the model of Abbott and Farhi.[3] But there are shortcomings in this supersymmetric model. Namely, there is only one family of leptons and quarks realizing in the coset space U(6)/U(4)×SU(2) that they suggest. Thus the main theoretical motivation for lepton-quark substructure, namely, the family (or generation) replication and the fermion mass spectrum, is far from being addressed. Despite the fact that no realistic composite model has been advanced thus far, the notion that quarks and leptons are composite particles remains to be intriguing.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

APPENDIX A: THE ABSENCE OF $\phi^\dagger \phi \bar{\psi} \psi$ TERM IN EFFECTIVE HAMILTONIAN

We argue that the Hamiltonian H_c will not develop an effective $\phi^\dagger \phi \bar{\psi} \psi$ term. Since we assume that ϕ and ψ can interact only through the gauge fields, the lowest-order contribution is the box diagram in Fig. 1(a). The scattering amplitude in the U(1) case is

$$A_2 \propto \int d^4q \frac{(2k-1)_\mu [\gamma^\mu (\not{p}+\not{q}+m)\gamma^\nu](2k-q)_\nu}{[(k-q)^2 - M^2][(p+q)^2 - m^2]q^4} , \quad \text{(A1)}$$

where k and p are the momenta of the scalar and the fermion, respectively. The quantity q is the hypergluon momentum, M and m are the scalar and fermion masses, respectively. The resulting terms in the effective Hamiltonian are given by

$$\sum_\lambda \text{Tr}(\Gamma_\lambda A_2)\phi^\dagger \phi \bar{\psi} \Gamma^\lambda \psi . \quad \text{(A2)}$$

The candidate mass term is $\phi^\dagger \phi \bar{\psi} \psi$, with its coefficient given by the trace of A_2,

$$\text{Tr}A_2 \propto \int d^4q \frac{(2k-q)_\mu \text{Tr}(\gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu m)(2k-q)_\nu}{[(k-q)^2 - M^2][(p+q)^2 - m^2]q^4}$$

$$= 4m \int d^4q \frac{(2k-q)^2}{[(k-q)^2 - M^2][(p+q)^2 - m^2]q^4} . \quad \text{(A3)}$$

We see that $\text{Tr}A_2$ depends explicitly on the fermion mass m. Since we assume $m=0$ to begin with, this box diagram does not contribute to an effective $\phi^\dagger \phi \bar{\psi} \psi$ term.

Next we look at the higher-order iterations, which is diagrammatically shown in Fig. 1(b). The corresponding coefficient for its contribution to the mass term is proportional to $\text{Tr}A_N$,

$$\text{Tr}A_N \propto \int d^4q_1 \cdots d^4q_{N-1}(\cdots)\text{Tr}[\gamma^{\mu_1}(\not{p}'_1+m)\gamma^{\mu_2}(\not{p}'_2+m)\cdots \gamma^{\mu_{N-1}}(\not{p}'_{N-1}+m)\gamma^{\mu_N}] . \quad \text{(A4)}$$

Notice that the mass term should be associated with even charge-conjugation configurations, so N must be even. This in turn tells us that there are an odd number of $(\not{p}'_i + m)$ terms inside the trace. As a result the only term which is independent of m [i.e., $\text{Tr}(\gamma^{\mu_1}\not{p}'_1\gamma^{\mu_2}\not{p}'_2 \cdots \gamma^{\mu_{N-1}}\not{p}'_{N-1}\gamma^{\mu_N})$] should vanish. All other expansions depend at least on one power of m, and should be zero when $m=0$. So we conclude that the term $\phi^\dagger \phi \bar{\psi} \psi$ should never occur in the effective Hamiltonian.

APPENDIX B: WKB APPROXIMATION FOR THE HARMONIC-OSCILLATOR PROBLEM

In this appendix we illustrate that the WKB approximation does indeed reproduce, at least approximately, the spectrum of Eq. (3.19). We shall illustrate the effect of the perturbative terms in this context.

1. WKB approximation for the ground-state energy

Consider Eq. (3.14). With $l=0$, the WKB approximation gives[7] for $0 < r < a$,

$$u \sim \frac{2}{\sqrt{k}}\cos\left[\phi_{ra} - \frac{\pi}{4}\right]$$

$$\text{where } k = [E - V(r)]^{1/2} , \quad \text{(B1)}$$

and for $r > a$,

$$u \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}}\exp\left[-\int_a^r \kappa \, dr\right]$$

$$\text{where } \kappa = [V(r) - E]^{1/2} . \quad \text{(B2)}$$

In these equations, a is the classical turning point. For the present case

$$a = (2E/m\omega^2)^{1/2}, \quad V(r) = \frac{1}{2}m\omega^2 r^2 + \frac{l(l+1)}{2mr^2} ,$$

$$\phi_{12} = \int_{r_1}^{r_2} k \, dr .$$

To ensure the vanishing of u at $r=0$, we need the condition

$$\phi_{0a} - \frac{\pi}{4} = (2q+1)\frac{\pi}{2} . \quad \text{(B3)}$$

The ground state corresponds to $q=0$ or the condition

$$\int_0^a dr[2m(E - \frac{1}{2}m\omega^2 r^2)]^{1/2} = \frac{3}{4}\pi . \quad \text{(B4)}$$

Evaluating the left-hand side of Eq. (B4) gives

$$\text{LHS} = a\sqrt{2mE}\,\frac{\pi}{4} .$$

This leads to $E = \frac{3}{2}\omega$ in agreement with the exact solution given in Eq. (3.19).

2. To verify the WKB method for $l \geq 1$

For $l \geq 1$, the WKB method gives

$$u \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}}\exp\left[-\int_r^b \kappa \, dr\right] \text{ for } 0 < r < b \quad \text{(B5a)}$$

and

$$u \sim \frac{2}{\sqrt{k}}\cos\left[\phi_{br} - \frac{\pi}{4}\right] \text{ for } b < r < a . \quad \text{(B5b)}$$

As usual, we rewrite the right-hand side of Eq. (B5b) as

$$\frac{2}{\sqrt{k}}\cos\left[\phi_{br}-\frac{\pi}{4}\right]$$

$$=\frac{2}{\sqrt{k}}\left[\cos\left[\phi_{ba}-\frac{\pi}{2}\right]\cos\left[\phi_{xa}-\frac{\pi}{4}\right]\right.$$

$$\left.+\sin\left[\phi_{ba}-\frac{\pi}{2}\right]\sin\left[\phi_{xa}-\frac{\pi}{4}\right]\right]. \qquad (B6)$$

Now we recall that the connection formulas in the WKB method give

$$\frac{2}{\sqrt{k}}\cos\left[\phi_{ra}-\frac{\pi}{4}\right]\to\frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}}\exp\left[-\int_a^r\kappa\,dr\right], \qquad (B7)$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\sin\left[\phi_{ra}-\frac{\pi}{4}\right]\to-\frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}}\exp\left[+\int_a^r\kappa\,dr\right]. \qquad (B8)$$

Equation (B8) shows that the appearance of the $\sin[\phi_{xa}-(\pi/2)]$ factor in Eq. (B6) is not acceptable. This could be avoided with

$$\phi_{ba}-\frac{\pi}{2}=q\pi$$

or

$$\phi_{ba}=(q+\tfrac{1}{2})\pi, \quad q=0,1,2,\ldots. \qquad (B9)$$

For arbitrary l and q, Eq. (B9) takes the form

$$\int_b^a dr\left[2\mu\left[E-\tfrac{1}{2}\mu\omega^2 r^2-\frac{l(l+1)}{2\mu r^2}\right]\right]^{1/2}=(q+\tfrac{1}{2})\pi. \qquad (B10)$$

Rewrite LHS in the form

$$\text{LHS}=\frac{\mu\omega}{2}\int_{b^2}^{a^2}\frac{dr^2}{a^2}\frac{dr^2}{r^2}[(r^2-b^2)(a^2-r^2)]^{1/2}$$

$$=\frac{\mu\omega}{2}\frac{\pi}{2}(a-b)^2=(q+\tfrac{1}{2})\pi. \qquad (B11)$$

The second equality can be proven by means of, among other things, hypergeometric function identities.[11] Some details are given in Appendix C.

Comparing Eqs. (B10) and (B11), we get

$$ab=\frac{[l(l+1)]^{1/2}}{\mu\omega}\quad\text{and}\quad a^2+b^2=\frac{2E}{\mu\omega^2}. \qquad (B12)$$

From Eqs. (B11) and (B12)

$$(a-b)^2=\frac{2}{\mu\omega}\left[\frac{E}{\omega}-[l(l+1)]^{1/2}\right]=\frac{4}{\mu\omega}(q+\tfrac{1}{2}) \qquad (B13)$$

or

$$E=2q+1+[l(l+1)]^{1/2}\approx 2q+l+\tfrac{3}{2}. \qquad (B14)$$

Some observant reader might have already noticed that the WKB wave functions given in Eq. (B5a) does not have the correct near $r=0$ behavior for $l\geq 1$. Despite this discrepancy, we observe that so far as the eigenvalues of

(3.19) are concerned, the WKB method does a reasonable job in reproducing the spectrum. Notice that for $l=1$,

$$[l(l+1)]^{1/2}=1.41,$$

our approximation in (B14) amounts to replacing this value by 1.5, which is a reasonable approximation. Furthermore the approximation in replacing $[l(l+1)]^{1/2}$ by $l+\tfrac{1}{2}$ becomes more and more accurate as l increases.

APPENDIX C: DERIVATION OF EQ. (B11)

Mathematical identities (all quotations are referred to those given in Ref. 11) that we need are as follows:

I1

$$\int_a^b dx\,\frac{(x-a)^{\nu-1}(b-x)^{\mu-1}}{x}$$

$$=\frac{(b-a)^{\mu+\nu-1}}{b}B(\mu,\nu)\,{}_2F_1\left[1,\mu;\mu+\nu;\frac{b-a}{b}\right],$$

$$\text{for }b>a>0. \qquad (3.228.3)$$

I2

$${}_2F_1(\alpha,\beta;2\beta;z)$$

$$=\left[1-\frac{z}{2}\right]^{-\alpha}F\left[\frac{\alpha}{2},\frac{\alpha+1}{2};\beta+\tfrac{1}{2};\left[\frac{z}{2-z}\right]^2\right],$$

$$(9.134.1)$$

I3

$${}_2F_1(\tfrac{1}{2},1;2;4z(1-z))=\frac{1}{1-z},\quad |z|\leq\tfrac{1}{2},$$

$$|z(1-z)|\leq\tfrac{1}{4}. \qquad (9.121.25)$$

We begin with the LHS of Eq. (3.11). From (I1)

$$\text{LHS}=\frac{\mu\omega}{2}\frac{(a^2-b^2)^2}{a^2}\frac{\pi}{8}\,{}_2F_1\left[1,\tfrac{3}{2};3;\frac{a^2-b^2}{a^2}\right]. \qquad (C1)$$

From (I2)

$${}_2F_1\left[1,\tfrac{3}{2};3;\frac{a^2-b^2}{a^2}\right]$$

$$=\frac{2a^2}{a^2+b^2}\,{}_2F_1\left[\tfrac{1}{2},1;2;\left[\frac{a^2-b^2}{a^2+b^2}\right]^2\right]. \qquad (C2)$$

Identify

$$4z(1-z)=\left[\frac{a^2-b^2}{a^2+b^2}\right]^2. \qquad (C3)$$

This gives

$$\frac{1}{1-z}=\frac{2(a^2+b^2)}{(a+b)^2}. \qquad (C4)$$

From Eqs. (C2), (C3), and (I3), Eq. (C1) can be written as

$$\text{LHS}=\frac{\mu\omega\pi}{4}(a-b)^2, \qquad (C5)$$

and the expression in Eq. (B11) follows.

APPENDIX D: DERIVATION OF EQ. (4.14)

To arrive at Eq. (4.14), we need to reexpress each relevant bilinear form of scalar products of SO(3) vectors in terms of linear forms of scalar products of new SO(3) vectors. Consider the general expression

$$P = (a \cdot b)(c \cdot d)$$
$$= \sum_{m,n} [(-1)^{1-m} a_{1m} b_{1-m}][(-1)^{1-n} c_{1n} d_{1-n}] , \quad \text{(D1)}$$

where a, b, c, and d are vectors in the triplet representation. Introduce the new SO(3) vector $A_{JM}, B_{J'M'}$ defined as

$$a_{1m} c_{1n} = \sum_{JM} A_{JM} \langle J,M \mid 1,m;1,n \rangle ,$$
$$b_{1-m} d_{1-n} = \sum_{J'M'} B_{J'M'} \langle J',M' \mid 1,-m;1,-n \rangle \quad \text{(D2)}$$

with J ranging from 0 to 2. Now the Clebsch-Gordan identities imply that

$$\langle J'M' \mid 1,-m;1,-n \rangle = (-1)^{J'} \langle J',-M' \mid 1,m;1,n \rangle , \quad \text{(D3)}$$
$$\sum_{m,n} \langle J,M \mid 1,m;1,n \rangle \langle J',-M' \mid 1,m;1,n \rangle = \delta_{JJ'} \delta_{M-M'}$$

with $M = m + n$. Substituting Eq. (D2) and (D3) into (D1) we get

$$P = (a \cdot b)(c \cdot d)$$
$$= \sum_{JM} A_{JM} B_{J-M} (-1)^{J-M}$$
$$= A_0 \cdot B_0 + A_1 \cdot B_1 + A_2 \cdot B_2$$
$$= 1 . \quad \text{(D4)}$$

Now we introduce Φ_l' and Φ_l'' through the expressions

$$\phi_1^\dagger \Phi_0^\dagger = \Phi_1'^\dagger ,$$

$$a_{1m} c_{1n} = \phi_{1m}^\dagger \Phi_{1n}^\dagger$$

$$= \Phi_0''^\dagger \langle 0,0 \mid l,m;l,n \rangle$$

$$+ \sum_M \Phi_{1M}''^\dagger \langle 1,M \mid 1,m;1,n \rangle$$

$$+ \sum_{M'} \Phi_{2M'}''^\dagger \langle 2,M' \mid 1,m;1,n \rangle , \quad \text{(D5)}$$

and similar expressions for Ψ_l' and Ψ_l''. Substituting Eq. (D5) and the corresponding expressions into (D4) one arrives at (4.14).

Consider the case when $a \cdot a = b \cdot b = c \cdot c = d \cdot d = 1$. Note that for this case by setting A_J equal to B_J in Eq. (D4), A_J and B_J are not properly normalized. However, note that the multiplicative factor needed to restore the normalization is some finite factor of $O(1)$. For example,

$$A_0 = \sum_{m,n} a_{1m} c_{1n} \langle 0,0 \mid 1,m;1,n \rangle$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} a_1 \cdot c_1 . \quad \text{(D6)}$$

When $a_1 = c_1$, $A_0 = 1/\sqrt{3}$. In general, $a_1 \cdot c_1$ deviates from unity by some finite amount. One can easily see that this complies with the above statement of normalization.

*Present address: Department of Physics, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90024.

[1]H. R. Quinn, S. D. Drell, and S. Gupta, Phys. Rev. D **26**, 3689 (1982).

[2]H. Fritzsch and G. Mandelbaum, Phys. Lett. **102B**, 319 (1981).

[3]L. Abbott and E. Farhi, Phys. Lett. **101B**, 69 (1981); Nucl. Phys. **B189**, 547 (1981). Note that although the Abbott-Farhi model is also based on fundamental fermion and scalar fields, the left-handed and right-handed fermions transform differently under the gauge group.

[4]B. Svetitsky, S. Drell, H. R. Quinn, and M. Weinstein, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 490 (1980).

[5]J. Greensite and J. Primack, Nucl. Phys. **B180**, 170 (1981).

[6]S. Drell, M. Weinstein, and S. Yankielowicz, Phys. Rev. D **14**, 487 (1976).

[7]E. Merzbacher, *Quantum Mechanics* (Wiley, New York, 1970).

[8]M. Bander and C. Itzykson, Rev. Mod. Phys. **38**, 346 (1966). One of us (C.B.C.) would like to thank P. Moylan for calling his attention to this reference.

[9]T. Banks and V. Kaplunovsky, Nucl. Phys. **B192**, 270 (1981); see also T. Banks and A. Zaks, *ibid.* **B206**, 23 (1982).

[10]W. Buchmüller, R. D. Peccei, and T. Yanagida, Nucl. Phys. **B231**, 53 (1984); Phys. Lett. **124B**, 67 (1983); Nucl. Phys. **B227**, 503 (1983).

[11]I. S. Gradshteyn and I. W. Ryzhik, *Tables of Integrals, Series and Products* (Academic, New York, 1965).