

# Brout-Englert-Higgs physics: From foundations to phenomenology

Axel Maas

*Institute of Physics, NAWI Graz, University of Graz, Universitätsplatz 5, A-8010 Graz, Austria*

---

## Abstract

Brout-Englert Higgs physics is one of the most central and successful parts of the standard model. It is also part of a multitude of beyond-the-standard-model scenarios.

The aim of this review is to describe the field-theoretical foundations of Brout-Englert-Higgs physics, and to show how the usual phenomenology arises from it. This requires to give a precise and gauge-invariant meaning to the underlying physics. This is complicated by the fact that concepts like the Higgs vacuum expectation value or the separation between confinement and the Brout-Englert-Higgs effect lose their meaning beyond perturbation theory. This is addressed by carefully constructing the corresponding theory space and the quantum phase diagram of theories with elementary Higgs fields and gauge interactions.

The physical spectrum needs then to be also given in terms of gauge-invariant, i. e. composite, states. Using gauge-invariant perturbation theory, as developed by Fröhlich, Morchio, and Strocchi, it is possible to rederive conventional perturbation theory in this framework. This derivation explicitly shows why the description of the standard model in terms of the unphysical, gauge-dependent, elementary states of the Higgs and  $W$ -bosons and  $Z$ -boson, but also of the elementary fermions, is adequate and successful.

These are unavoidable consequences of the field theory underlying the standard model, from which the usual picture emerges. The validity of this emergence can only be tested non-perturbatively. Such tests, in particular using lattice gauge theory, will be reviewed as well. They fully confirm the underlying mechanisms.

In this course it will be seen that the structure of the standard model is very special, and qualitative changes occur beyond it. The extension beyond the standard model will therefore also be reviewed. Particular attention will be given to structural differences arising for phenomenology. Again, non-perturbative tests of these results will be reviewed.

Finally, to make this review self-contained a brief discussion of issues like the triviality and hierarchy problem, and how they fit into a fundamental field-theoretical formulation, is included.

*Keywords:* Brout-Englert-Higgs effect, Higgs particle, BSM, Lattice gauge theory, Non-Abelian gauge symmetry, Perturbation theory, Confinement, Symmetries, Custodial symmetry, Quantum phase diagram, Flavor symmetry

---

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Global symmetries</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1	Explicit breaking . . . . .	10
2.2	Classical spontaneous breaking . . . . .	11
2.3	Hiding vs. spontaneous breaking . . . . .	14
2.3.1	Metastability . . . . .	14
2.3.2	Hidden symmetry . . . . .	21
2.4	The Goldstone theorem . . . . .	24
2.4.1	Classical Goldstone theorem . . . . .	24
2.4.2	Quantized Goldstone theorem . . . . .	27
2.5	Classification of global symmetry breaking . . . . .	30
<b>3</b>	<b>Brout-Englert-Higgs physics</b>	<b>32</b>
3.1	Formulating the theory . . . . .	32
3.2	At the classical level . . . . .	34
3.3	The quantum level, gauge-fixing and perturbation theory . . . . .	37
3.3.1	Gauge-fixing . . . . .	37
3.3.2	Standard gauge choices . . . . .	40
3.3.3	The gauge-fixed Lagrangian and the mass spectrum at tree-level . . . . .	44
3.3.4	Limits of the 't Hooft gauge . . . . .	47
3.4	The Gribov-Singer ambiguity . . . . .	49
3.5	Lattice formulation . . . . .	52
3.6	The Higgs vacuum expectation value beyond perturbation theory and Elitzur's theorem . . . . .	56
3.7	The phase diagram and the Osterwalder-Seiler-Fradkin-Shenker construction . . . . .	58
3.8	The phase diagram from the lattice . . . . .	63
3.9	The phase diagram for multiple breaking patterns . . . . .	74
<b>4</b>	<b>Mass spectrum and mass gap</b>	<b>78</b>
4.1	A quasi-exact reformulation of the standard model Higgs sector . . . . .	81
4.2	Gauge-invariant classification of states . . . . .	83
4.3	Masses and the Nielsen identities . . . . .	85
4.4	Gauge-invariant perturbation theory . . . . .	87
4.5	Lattice spectra and tests of gauge-invariant perturbation theory . . . . .	94
4.5.1	The ground states of the gauge-invariant spectrum . . . . .	97
4.5.2	The $W/Z$ . . . . .	100

4.5.3	The Higgs . . . . .	104
4.5.4	Other channels . . . . .	107
4.6	The standard model . . . . .	110
4.6.1	QED and mixing . . . . .	111
4.6.2	Flavor symmetries . . . . .	113
4.6.3	QCD and hadrons . . . . .	118
4.7	Beyond the standard model . . . . .	123
4.7.1	Enlarged custodial symmetry . . . . .	125
4.7.2	Enlarged gauge symmetry . . . . .	127
4.7.3	Changing the representation of the Higgs . . . . .	133
4.7.4	Model-building 2.0 . . . . .	139
<b>5</b>	<b>Scattering processes</b>	<b>141</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Further aspects</b>	<b>149</b>
6.1	The triviality problem . . . . .	149
6.2	The hierarchy problem and the Higgs mass . . . . .	151
6.3	Vacuum stability . . . . .	152
6.4	The finite-temperature transition . . . . .	153
6.5	Theories without an elementary Higgs . . . . .	156
<b>7</b>	<b>Summary, conclusion, and future challenges</b>	<b>157</b>

## 1. Introduction

The primary subject of this review is the physics of the Brout-Englert-Higgs (BEH) effect [1–5] in the standard model and beyond.

However, it will become clear that it is actually already very hard to unambiguously and in physical terms define what is meant by this expression. Nonetheless, with the discovery [6, 7] and establishing [8, 9] of the Higgs experimentally, it is necessary to fully understand what is actually meant by this term, and what its implications are for more general theories.

*The aim of this review is to collect what we know on this question and its answer. Both the question and the answer are much more subtle than commonly assumed.*

To approach the difficulties and subtleties involved, it is probably best to define first the class of theories which will be addressed. The central ingredient is a non-Abelian gauge theory of Yang-Mills type, with some gauge group  $G$  and gauge bosons  $W_\mu$ . In addition, there are one or more scalar bosons  $\phi$ , called Higgs bosons, which belong to some representation  $R$  of the gauge group. They can exhibit some global symmetry group  $\mathcal{G}$ , especially if there are more than one of them in the same representation. This global symmetry will be called custodial symmetry in the following.

These Higgs bosons can interact with each other in some way described by the Higgs potential  $V$ , which involves only gauge-invariant combinations of the Higgs bosons, and which may or may not break the global symmetries explicitly in part or fully. There may also be further particles, especially fermions, in the theory, but their structure does not matter right now, and these will be absorbed in a Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_r$ . The theory therefore has the structure

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}W_{\mu\nu}^a W_a^{\mu\nu} + (D_\mu\phi_\alpha)^\dagger D^\mu\phi_\alpha - V(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_r \quad (1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\mu\nu}^a &= \partial_\mu W_\nu^a - \partial_\nu W_\mu^a - gf^{abc}W_\mu^b W_\nu^c \\ D_\mu^{ij} &= \partial_\mu\delta^{ij} - igW_\mu^a T_a^{R_{\alpha ij}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the index  $\alpha$  counts the Higgs particles and representations,  $f^{abc}$  are the structure constants of the gauge group, and  $g$  is the gauge coupling. If the gauge group is not simple, multiple gauge couplings can arise. The  $T^{R_\alpha}$  are the generators of the gauge group  $G$  in the respective representation.

The simplest case is obtained when reducing this theory to the gauge group  $SU(2)$  with a complex doublet of Higgs field in the fundamental representation.

These are in total four real degrees of freedom for the Higgs, which exhibit a custodial symmetry group  $SU(2)$ . Furthermore, a polynomial potential renormalizable by power-counting is chosen, and no other particles are involved. The Lagrangian reduces then to

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}W_{\mu\nu}^a W_a^{\mu\nu} + (D_\mu\phi)^\dagger D^\mu\phi - \lambda \left( (\phi\phi^\dagger)^2 - f^2 \right)^2. \quad (3)$$

The parameters  $f$  and  $\lambda$  are couplings of the potential. This is the prototype theory for BEH physics. Most of the features and problems to be discussed in this review can already be made explicit for this theory, and it will therefore serve as the workhorse throughout this review. Still, some features, especially those discussed in sections 3.2, 4, and 5, will require to return to a more extended theory.

Now, the standard approach to BEH physics [10] is to note that the theory (3) has a classical minimum at  $\phi^\dagger\phi = f^2$ . In the next step the Higgs field is split as

$$\phi(x) = v + \eta(x), \quad (4)$$

with  $\eta$  a new fluctuation field and setting the constant field  $v$  such that  $|v| = f$  and thus  $\langle\eta\rangle = 0$ . The value  $v$  is also called the vacuum expectation value of the Higgs field. Inserting this split into the Lagrangian (3) results at tree-level in the usual phenomenology of massive gauge bosons and a single massive Higgs particle, as well as a number of would-be Goldstone bosons. Performing perturbation theory leads to the quite successful phenomenology of the standard model today [8].

The fundamental field-theoretical problem arising is that  $v$ , in contrast to the parameter  $f$  of the Lagrangian (3), is dependent on the gauge. In fact, it is possible to construct gauges, as will be described in section 3.1, in which it is never possible to split off a non-zero value of  $v$  such that  $\langle\eta\rangle = 0$ . This has been noticed already very early on [11]. In fact, in such gauges it can be proven, using standard methods [10], that the gauge bosons remain massless to all orders in perturbation theory. This immediately implies that perturbative results on the masses of the  $W$  and  $Z$  gauge bosons would be gauge-dependent, and thus potentially unphysical.

This, of course, leaves immediately the question of why it then works so well [8].

The answer to this question has two parts. The first is how to gauge-invariantly formulate the phenomenology of this theory. The second is why the standard approach yields the same result. The second question will not be addressed until section 4.4. In the course of answering the second question, it will be seen that the standard model is quite special, and it is therefore a, fortunate or unfortunate depending on the point of view, coincidence that it was historically not really necessary so far to fully answering the first question.

The whole problem starts when considering what a split like (4) actually means on a field-theoretical level. In classical physics, this is very well defined. In a quantum theory, this is much less so, and requires already in the case of global symmetries a well-defined distinction of what symmetry breaking actually means. This will be discussed in section 2. When then taking the transition to gauge symmetries in section 3.1, it will become clear that there is no gauge-invariant way of how to distinguish the existence or absence of a vacuum expectation value of the Higgs.

If there is no gauge-invariant way of defining the vacuum expectation value of the Higgs, the whole standard procedure [10] of doing BEH physics seems to collapse on itself at first. This seems to question the whole basis of the current theoretical description of experiments, despite its huge success [8]. It is here where the core of this review takes place in section 3. There, a gauge-invariant description of the theory (3) will be set up. This is the first step of developing a comprehensive, field-theoretical consistent view on BEH physics.

This view is continued by establishing the link to phenomenology, and experiment, in section 4. This link was originally devised in [12, 13] by Fröhlich, Morchio, and Strocchi (FMS). This approach will be developed in section 4, and was dubbed gauge-invariant perturbation theory in [14]. It will be used in section 4.4 to determine the static properties of the spectrum, i. e. particle types, multiplicities and masses, in a manifestly gauge-invariant way.

Of course, also the dynamics, and especially scattering processes, have been investigated experimentally exceedingly well, and need to be recovered. While this has not yet been developed as far as the static properties, it is possible to do so, as will be shown in section 5. These results will finally resolve the paradox, as it will show that quantitatively everything reduces (almost) to the results of ordinary perturbation theory, thereby sanctifying what has been done so far. The agreement of this approach with experiment follows therefore immediately.

However, as will be discussed in section 4.7, this is a special feature of the standard model, and in more general theories like (1) the results of both approaches may actually differ qualitatively. This has far reaching implications for BSM phenomenology.

While gauge-invariant perturbation theory actually describes physics quite accurately, it is not obvious that it should work. To test the described framework theoretically requires non-perturbative methods, which can deal, within their systematic limitations, with this type of physics. Most of the support stems from lattice simulations, which will be briefly introduced in section 3.5. The most relevant support for the developed picture of BEH physics will be presented in sections 3.8, 4.5, and 4.7.2. Unfortunately, for reasons to be discussed in section 3.5, lattice simulations cannot yet address the standard model as a whole, much less any extensions

of it. Therefore only subsectors have been investigated with these methods.

As the gauge symmetry is the key to the concepts presented here, only such investigations will be covered which include the gauge nature of the weak interactions. There is a substantial literature on the ungauged Yukawa sector, including extensions, see e. g. [15–21], which will not be covered. Also not reviewed will be many beyond-the-standard model extensions without BEH effect, which have been investigated on the lattice, see e. g. [22] for a review. However, the present subject has also bearings on such scenarios, as will be discussed in section 6.5.

The core of this review is a physical picture of BEH physics. From this somewhat separate stand issues like triviality or the vacuum stability problem. However, they are not entirely disconnected, and this will be discussed in section 6. This includes the questions of the finite-temperature electroweak phase transition and its implications for cosmology. This subject will only be briefly touched upon in section 6.4, and forms a vast enough topic to require an own review.

A summary and a list of open problems and future directions will be provided in section 7.

## 2. Global symmetries

Before embarking to gauge symmetries, it is quite helpful to reconsider global symmetries. Also here a full field-theoretical treatment [23] leads to insights which seem at first counter-intuitive. But in the end, they give a much clearer notion of what symmetry (breaking) at the quantum level really is. At the same time, the standard results and notions will be recovered embedded in a bigger picture.

It should be noted that most of the following depends strongly on the space-time dimension. In particular, most mechanisms do not operate at the quantum level in one and two dimensions [23, 24], due to infrared fluctuations. This the celebrated Coleman-Mermin-Wagner theorem [23, 25, 26]. In the following it will always be implicitly assumed that the dimensionality is sufficient, i. e. usually three or more, to allow for the described phenomena to take place. This is of course with hindsight to the application to particle physics.

### 2.1. Explicit breaking

For simplicity, consider a set of real or complex<sup>1</sup> fields  $\phi_i$ , where  $i$  labels the fields. The theory should be described by a Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \partial_\mu \phi_i^\dagger \partial^\mu \phi_i - V(\phi), \quad (5)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>It is always possible to map a complex representation to a, not necessarily linear, real representation [10, 27, 28], although, as the example of the groups  $SU(2)$  and  $SU(2)/Z_2 \approx SO(3)$  shows, the global structure of the group may induced subtleties [27, 29].



where  $V$  is a potential term. Now, let the kinetic term be invariant under a symmetry transformation  $\phi_i \rightarrow \phi_i + \delta\phi_i$ . These transformations form a group  $\mathcal{G}$ , usually a Lie group, called the symmetry group. The fields are then in a representation  $\mathcal{R}$  of this group.

Assuming that the transformation is linear, it acts as  $\phi \rightarrow g\phi$ , where the matrix  $g$  is a representation of some group element  $\bar{g} \in \mathcal{G}$ . If the representation  $\mathcal{R}$  is not faithful, the related group element is not unique. To avoid this complication, the following will focus on the representation  $g$  of the group element, and identify it with the corresponding group element(s).

For global symmetries the group elements are space-time-independent. Any value of  $\phi$ , which can be related by some  $g$  to a fixed field configuration  $\Phi$ , is said to be in the same orbit as  $\Phi$  [27]. I. e. a (group) orbit is defined as  $O_\Phi = \{\phi = g\Phi, g \in \mathcal{G}\}$ , similar to a ray in linear algebra.  $\Phi$  plays the role of a representative field configuration of the orbit. Of course,  $\Phi$  can be exchanged for any other element of the orbit, and its choice is arbitrary.

For simplicity, it will be assumed in the following that the group is a simple Lie group and that the representation is irreducible, but not necessarily faithful. The latter is necessary to include, e. g., explicitly the adjoint representation of many groups, especially the special unitary groups.

Probably the best known example of a theory like (5) is the linear  $\sigma$ -model [10], where the fields are real and the symmetry group is the orthogonal group  $O(N)$ , with  $N$  the number of real fields. In principle the fields may also be in higher tensor representations of the group, but this does add little conceptually new here, and will therefore not be considered explicitly. Especially as this raises the technical complexity considerably [27].

It is now up to the potential  $V$ , whether the whole Lagrangian is invariant under the symmetry [27, 28]. For the sake of simplicity, let the potential be a polynomial in the fields. If  $V$  can be written as a sum of terms where each term is an invariant of the representation, the potential is invariant. Invariants are (for real fields) expressions  $a_{i_1 \dots i_k} \phi_{i_1} \dots \phi_{i_k}$  such that the expression is invariant under the symmetry transformation, which implies

$$a_{i_1 \dots i_k} g_{i_1 j_1} \dots g_{i_k j_k} \phi_{j_1} \dots \phi_{j_k} = a_{i_1 \dots i_k} \phi_{i_1} \dots \phi_{i_k}.$$

E. g. for the linear- $\sigma$  model  $a\phi^2$  is of this type, but  $a_i\phi_i$ , is not, as it singles out a direction. If the potential is not build from invariants, the Lagrangian is no longer invariant under the symmetry group, and the symmetry is called explicitly broken. If the potential is invariant under some true subgroup  $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{G}$  of the symmetry group only, it is said that the symmetry is explicitly broken down to this subgroup.

## 2.2. Classical spontaneous breaking

Consider now classically the potential

$$V(\phi) = -\frac{\mu^2}{2}\phi^2 + \lambda\phi^4, \quad (6)$$

with  $\mu^2 \geq 0$ ,  $\lambda > 0$ , and with the fields in the fundamental representation of  $\mathcal{G} = \text{O}(N)$ . Then the potential is invariant under  $\mathcal{G}$ .

But orbits can still be distinguished in subclasses. One subclass  $O^{\mathcal{G}}$  are those orbits, which are invariant under the whole group, i. e.

$$O_{\Phi} = O_{\Phi}^{\mathcal{G}} \implies g\Phi = \Phi \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{G}.$$

In the present example, this would only be the orbit characterized by  $\Phi = 0$ . Then there are other orbits  $O^{\mathcal{H}_i}$ , which are invariant under some (maximal) true subgroup  $\mathcal{H}_i \subset \mathcal{G}$ , where  $i$  labels the subgroups of the group  $\mathcal{G}$ , which may be both continuous and discrete. I. e., these orbits satisfy

$$O_{\Phi} = O_{\Phi}^{\mathcal{H}_i} \implies h\Phi = \Phi \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{H}_i.$$

It is important to note that if another representative  $\Phi$  will be chosen, this will lead to a unitarily equivalent subgroup  $\mathcal{H}'_i$ . It is therefore a statement about the whole groups, rather than a particular set of generators. Elements from  $O^{\mathcal{H}_i}$  will not be invariant under any group element of  $\mathcal{G}$  outside the subgroup  $\mathcal{H}_i$ , but trivially so under any subgroups of  $\mathcal{H}_i$ .

For the present example, this would be any field configuration of arbitrary, but fixed, length  $\phi^2 = a^2$ , and the (single) subgroup is  $\mathcal{H} = \text{O}(N-1)$ . Thus, for every orbit the corresponding subgroup may differ, as it will be the one leaving a fixed  $\Phi$  invariant. However, while the particular rotation axis differs for each orbit, the rotation group  $\text{O}(N-1)$  does not. In this example the orbits are also characterized by the length  $|\Phi|$ , as elements with different lengths belong to different orbits.

Note that there can be one or multiple orbits fulfilling the same condition. The collections of orbits invariant under the same subgroup is called stratum,  $\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{H}_i}$ , which includes the case  $\mathcal{H}_i = \mathcal{G}$ . The groups  $\mathcal{H}_i \neq \mathcal{G}$  are in this context called little groups. A complete classification of possible little groups and strata is not entirely trivial, especially for non-simple Lie groups [27], but for any explicit case possible.

Return to the example (6), and consider the classical case. If  $\mu = 0$  the stratum  $\mathcal{S}^{\text{O}(N)}$  is special, as it minimizes the action. If  $\mu \neq 0$ , this changes. Now, those orbits are (classically) preferred which satisfy  $\phi^2 = v^2 = \mu^2/(2\lambda)$ , and thus have a particular length. However, they are still invariant under the little group associated with the stratum the singled out orbit belongs to, in this case  $\mathcal{S}^{\text{O}(N-1)}$ . As a consequence, everything remains still symmetric under the corresponding little group.

This residual symmetry is thus determined by the stratum membership of the classically preferred orbit. Especially, a change of  $\mu^2$ , as long as it remains non-zero, will only select a different orbit from this stratum, but not a different stratum. In this sense, the physics of classical symmetry (breaking) is actually a physics of stratum and orbit selection.

But in classical physics initial (or boundary) conditions are required. The initial conditions will then ultimately not only select an orbit, but actually a member of the orbit. Thus, the existence of the initial conditions can finally select a particular direction and therefore break the little group explicitly. Thus, the necessary initial conditions of classical physics turns spontaneous symmetry breaking into explicit symmetry breaking. Classically, spontaneous symmetry breaking can therefore be considered to be restricting the choice of possible initial conditions to a particular stratum. But such a final solution will never respect the symmetry, even of the associated little group. It is, of course, possible to select symmetric initial conditions, e. g.  $\phi = 0$  for (6). But since all directions are now equally preferred, the system again only moves along trajectories which keep this feature. In this example, it will actually remain at  $\phi = 0$ , as without additional perturbation of the initial conditions or the potential this is the suitable solution to the equations of motion. This is a metastable situation.

The important insight is that symmetry breaking is classically due to either of two reasons. Either the symmetry is intrinsically explicitly broken by a term in the Lagrangian. Or it is after spontaneous breaking explicitly broken by the initial conditions. Since the initial conditions are not predictable from the Lagrangian or equation of motions, they will be considered an external influence.

However, it should be noted that it is possible to demand for a mechanical system that trajectories have to be stable under time evolution [30, 31]. If this additional constraint is imposed, only solutions can be obtained which are not metastable, and therefore correspond to absolute minima of the potential. This demand effectively reduces the space of possible boundary conditions but guarantees a stable time evolution under perturbations. In the following this restriction will not be imposed.

While this is a straightforward example, this is mainly due to the choice of an irreducible representation where there is only the trivial stratum  $\mathcal{S}^G$  and a single non-trivial stratum. The stratum structure becomes quickly more involved in more general cases [27], as does the physics. For now, only the case with a single non-trivial stratum will be considered. The situation with multiple non-trivial strata will be considered again in section 3.9.

### 2.3. Hiding vs. spontaneous breaking

Before discussing the quantum version of the classical situation, it should be noted that there is the additional possibility that the path integral<sup>2</sup> measure can also be non-invariant under a symmetry [10, 34]. This is a so-called anomaly. In the following it will always be assumed that such anomalies do not occur. This is mainly for the purpose of simplicity. Otherwise, they act in the present context of a quantum theory essentially in the same way as an explicit breaking by the Lagrangian, as the symmetry is not realized at the quantum level.

#### 2.3.1. Metastability

Consider now the quantum case [27, 28] without explicit symmetry breaking. Adding explicit symmetry breaking will not change the following, except for reducing the full symmetry group to its unbroken subgroup.

It is best to study an explicit example, and then generalize the concepts. Take, e. g., the same situation as before and thus still with

$$V(\phi) = -\frac{\mu^2}{2}\phi^2 + \lambda\phi^4, \quad (7)$$

being the potential of the (interacting) linear  $\sigma$ -model [10].

Classically, as discussed in section 2.2, the potential (7) is minimized by the orbit with a fixed length<sup>3</sup>  $\phi^2 = v^2 = \mu^2/(2\lambda)$ . However, rather than an individual field configuration, the whole orbit minimizes the potential. As noted before, in classical physics the initial conditions determine which member of an orbit would be chosen, yielding the classical field configuration.

In quantum physics, this is different. This is best understood in the context of a path-integral treatment, and an even more simplified, quantum-mechanical model. Consider the zero-dimensional, i. e. space-time-independent, case of the linear- $\sigma$  model. Then the kinetic part is dropped. The remainder is equivalent to the situation of a constant field, having still the same minimum.

The path integral can then be explicitly evaluated, as can expectation values in-

---

<sup>2</sup>It should be understood that a rigorous definition of the path integral requires infrared and ultraviolet regulation [32, 33]. This can be achieved, e. g., using a lattice as is done in section 3.5. This will be assumed tacitly in the following.

<sup>3</sup>Note that it is often customary to rewrite the parameters of the Lagrangian such that, e. g.,  $\lambda$  is written as a ratio of  $\mu$  and  $v$ . This will not be done here, as this intermingles two independent quantities, the length of an orbit and a parameter of the Lagrangian, which need to be carefully distinguished in the following.

volving an odd or even number of field configurations, yielding

$$\begin{aligned}
Z &= \int d^N \phi e^{-i\left(\frac{\mu^2}{2}\phi^2 + \lambda\phi^4\right)} = \Omega(N) \int r^{N-1} dr e^{-i\left(\frac{\mu^2}{2}r^2 + \lambda r^4\right)} = \Omega(N)f(\mu, \lambda) \\
\langle \phi_j g(\phi^2) \rangle &= \int d^N \phi \phi_j g(\phi^2) e^{-i\left(\frac{\mu^2}{2}\phi^2 + \lambda\phi^4\right)} = 0 \\
\langle g(\phi^2) \rangle &= \int d^N \phi g(\phi^2) e^{-i\left(\frac{\mu^2}{2}\phi^2 + \lambda\phi^4\right)} = \Omega(N)h(\mu, \lambda)
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where  $\Omega(N)$  is the  $N$ -dimensional surface of the unit sphere,  $g$  is some arbitrary function, and the functions  $f$  and  $h$  can be calculated exactly. These results hold always, no matter the values of the parameters. In particular, the vacuum expectation value  $\langle \phi_j \rangle = 0$  for all values, even in cases where a fixed-length field is classically preferred.

This is at odds with the usual picture of spontaneous symmetry breaking in quantum theories, where it is usually assured that a particular direction is ‘chosen’, leading to a non-zero vacuum expectation value [10]. However, both views can be made compatible, provided they are carefully enough defined.

Understanding the result (8) is straightforward from a path-integral perspective. Because the minimization of (7) fixed only the length, but not the direction, of the minimizing field configuration, the path integral (or, in the present case, the integral) still averages over all directions. Since all directions are still equal, any quantity which has no preferred direction still has to vanish. This is essentially the statement that the symmetry is still intact: All expectation values are still invariant under the symmetry.

It should be noted that also the length  $\langle \phi^2 \rangle$  of the field does not distinguish the cases where the minima of (7) are at length zero or at a finite length. In both cases, the explicit evaluation of the integral gives a non-zero value. Thus, the symmetry is never broken.

How can this be reconciled with the conventional view? To do so, introduce an external source,

$$Z[j] = \int d^N \phi e^{-i\left(\frac{\mu^2}{2}\phi^2 + \lambda\phi^4 + j\phi\right)}. \tag{9}$$

Then

$$\langle \phi_i g(\phi^2) \rangle_{j \neq 0} \neq 0,$$

because now a direction is preferred. However, this is because the source breaks the symmetry explicitly, and this leads back to the case of section 2.1. However, the analogy now carries only this far, because the expression (9) is analytic in  $j$ .

Returning therefore back to the field theory case (7), some statements can be carried over [35].

The first is that when classically no spontaneous symmetry breaking occurs, the same argument applies at the quantum level: There is no preferred direction, and thus any expectation value which has a direction, like (8), is necessarily zero.

But in the quantum theory, the situation changes compared to the classical case if spontaneous symmetry breaking could occur. The argument above still holds true in the quantum case, for any value of the parameters of the potential. There is no explicitly preferred direction, and the path integral averages over all possible directions equally, with equal measure, as the action and measure is invariant. To put it differently, the path integral represents here the quantum phenomena of averaging incoherently over all possible breaking patterns. It therefore appears as if the symmetry would be unbroken at the quantum level.

The reason is really the presence of the path integral's measure, and that this measure is invariant under the symmetry and therefore includes all possible field configurations, and thus in particular all possible (global) directions of the field. As this is just the quantum mechanical superposition principle, it can be said that quantum effects restore the classically spontaneously broken symmetry. However, this does not imply that there are no consequences of the classical situation.

To understand how they arise, proceed as in (9). Introduce a source to explicitly break the symmetry, say in the 1-direction, i. e.  $j = j\delta_{i1}$ . Then this direction is preferred, yielding

$$\langle\phi_i\rangle_{j\neq 0} = \delta_{i1}f(j). \quad (10)$$

The big difference is now that there is a non-analyticity of the function  $f$  in  $j$ ,

$$\lim_{j\rightarrow 0} f(j) = v \neq 0. \quad (11)$$

This feature is what can be properly called spontaneous symmetry breaking<sup>4</sup>: This limit does not vanish. Especially, this implies

$$\lim_{j\rightarrow 0} \langle\phi_i\rangle_j = v\delta_{i1}, \quad (12)$$

and there is a conventional vacuum expectation value. The non-analyticity becomes manifest by noting that the value of this limit depends on the source. If, e. g., the source would prefer direction 2, the value would be  $v\delta_{i2}$  instead of  $v\delta_{i1}$ . The same

---

<sup>4</sup>It should be noted that, contrary to expectation, there may also be a non-analyticity in the source even if the symmetry is classically not spontaneously broken [36].

effect can also be achieved by introducing boundary conditions in space and time which break the symmetry explicitly [30, 37].

Note that this does not need to be in one-to-one-correspondence with classical spontaneous symmetry breaking. Quantum effects can lift a classical symmetry breaking, as will be seen in explicit examples in section 3.7. Potentially, also the reverse is possible. This stems from quantum corrections to the potential, but the details play no role for the conceptual considerations of this section.

Nonetheless, since the integration argument above is still valid, this implies

$$0 = f(0) \neq \lim_{j \rightarrow 0} f(j). \quad (13)$$

In addition, because not only the value (13) at the point  $j = 0$  differs from the limit (12), but also the value of the limit (12) differs for different sources,  $\langle \phi \rangle_{j \rightarrow 0}$  is necessarily non-analytic in  $j$  at  $j = 0$ . Since the vacuum expectation value (10) will be non-zero for even an infinitesimally small value of  $j$ , this implies that the system is metastable with respect to external sources in terms of  $j$ . Thus, without an external source, the system should be regarded as metastable, rather than spontaneously broken. Whether there is then a vacuum expectation value in an actual theory depends on whether there is an external influence.

Fortunately, metastability has for phenomenology in many respects exactly the same consequences as spontaneous breaking.

In fact, the metastability can actually also be observed at  $j = 0$  without taking an explicit limit. A possible, non-local, operator to detect it is [38, 39]

$$m_r = \left\langle \left( \int d^d x \phi_i(x) \right)^2 \right\rangle. \quad (14)$$

The important difference between the operator (10) and (14) is that (10) measures the average absolute orientation. Without explicit symmetry breaking it therefore needs to be zero, as all directions are treated equally in the path integral. The expression (14) measures a relative orientation for each field configuration, and therefore tests, whether there is a preference in such a single configuration. The path-integral is then a weighted average only over the yes-or-no statement that there is or is not an orientation in any given configuration. Therefore, it can detect even in the case of all directions equal a potential for a direction, and thus the metastability.

It should be noted that a quantity like  $\langle \phi^2 \rangle$  cannot be used to detect either the presence or absence of metastability. This quantity merely measures the average size of fluctuations. It will therefore only be zero if the field itself is zero except for some measure-zero region of space-time. However, such configurations are only a measure-zero part of the path integral, and therefore this quantity will never vanish.



How to deal with such a theory is now a question of context, and mainly depends on the embedding of a theory. If the theory is considered as part of a larger system, either by having an environment or if it is considered to be a low-energy effective theory, the environment or the overarching theory can provide an infinitesimal external influence. Then a description using a source is surely adequate. If there is no surrounding, or the surrounding itself should not break the symmetry explicitly, then the theory should also not be treated using the limiting procedure<sup>5</sup>. In particular, in particle physics, where there is usually not considered any outside, it is often hard to argue where such an explicit breaking should come from. Subsectors of particle physics may be different. E. g. the quark masses in pure QCD can be taken as an example of such an external source giving the chiral symmetry breaking a preferred direction. Otherwise, chiral symmetry would only be metastable rather than broken.

This is a view driven by phenomenology which aims at considering the system as closed as possible. Alternatively, it is possible to put a mathematical definition of the theory first, which allows for the appearance of boundary conditions and/or limits of external sources as defining properties of a theory [30, 37]. This demands the theory to be stable under unitary time evolution in the presence of external perturbations. In such a case, the theory is defined in terms of a (vanishing) source or boundary conditions. That is the equivalence of restricting to trajectories with stable time evolution in the classical case. However, in the following the phenomenological view will be taken.

Since in the following lattice methods will be used, it is necessary to make a few observations on how the above discussed issues will change if there are only a finite number of degrees of freedom, in particular a finite volume  $V$  [35, 40, 41]. In such systems there is no non-analyticity possible. Therefore, the limit of  $f(j)$  for  $j$  to zero will always vanish. Physically, this is because tunneling processes allow to again sample all possible orientations. Therefore, the order of limits is important. To have a preferred direction requires

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow 0} \lim_{V \rightarrow \infty} f(j).$$

as the appropriate order of limits. Otherwise  $f(j)$  will always vanish. Of course, this plays no role when working in the metastable case, i. e. when evaluating  $f(0)$ .

Summarizing, when performing an unchanged path integral, the incoherent sum restores any symmetry which is not explicitly broken. In this precise sense there is no such thing like spontaneous symmetry breaking in quantum physics. Rather, the symmetry is either intact, metastable against external perturbation, or broken

---

<sup>5</sup>Though this may be still a useful technical trick.



explicitly by an (infinitesimal) external perturbation. However, to keep in line with the standard texts, the last situation will be referred to as ‘spontaneous symmetry breaking’, because this is what is usually meant if it is written about non-explicit symmetry breaking.

This leaves the question, if phenomena associated with spontaneous symmetry breaking, most prominently Goldstone bosons, still occur in the metastable case. The answer to this is that they will not arise in the usual way, as will be discussed in section 2.4. In fact, because the symmetry at  $j = 0$  is unbroken, the Wigner-Eckart theorem requires degeneracies in multiplets of the unbroken symmetry group, and corresponding super-selection sectors should exist. Therefore, a set of massless Goldstones with a smaller degeneracy would not be compatible or would have to reside in some other representation of the unbroken symmetry group. In particular, this does not exclude the existence of massless multiplets, but makes only a statement about their multiplicities and representation. However, for  $j \rightarrow 0$  the symmetry is always broken, and the Wigner-Eckart theorem implies degeneracies in terms of the unbroken subgroup only.

That it is even possible to discuss the difference is due to the global nature of the symmetry. This will change very much for local symmetries in section 3.

But before doing so, it is worthwhile to consider the limit of vanishing external explicit breaking in some more detail. Especially, in the standard treatment the symmetry is not only broken by the source, but the usually employed shift (4) in addition hides it at tree-level. This has profound implications of its own [27].

### 2.3.2. Hidden symmetry

Hiding [27] the symmetry is actually a process in which the symmetry is no longer manifestly present, and only makes itself indirectly felt. It is a concept independent of any kind of breaking, but it is mostly used in the context of metastability and spontaneous symmetry breaking.

Consider for concreteness an  $O(2)$  model with potential<sup>6</sup>

$$V(\phi, \phi^\dagger) = -\frac{1}{2}\mu^2\phi^\dagger\phi + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{f^2}(\phi^\dagger\phi)^2. \quad (16)$$

---

<sup>6</sup>It should be noted, as an aside, that it is always possible to shift the potential such that the lowest energy state has energy zero. In this case, the potential takes the form

$$V = \frac{\mu^2}{2f^2} \left( \phi\phi^\dagger - \frac{f^2}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^2. \quad (15)$$

This is the same as the potential (16), up to a constant term of size  $\mu^2 f^2 / 8$ , which is irrelevant.

The potential is invariant under the transformation

$$\begin{aligned}\phi &\rightarrow e^{-i\theta}\phi \approx \phi - i\theta\phi \\ \phi^\dagger &\rightarrow e^{i\theta}\phi^\dagger \approx \phi^\dagger + i\theta\phi^\dagger.\end{aligned}$$

Hiding proceeds now by rewriting the complex field in terms of its real and imaginary part

$$\phi = \sigma + i\chi,$$

and correspondingly for its hermitian conjugate. The complete Lagrangian then takes the form

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu\sigma\partial^\mu\sigma + \partial_\mu\chi\partial^\mu\chi) + \frac{\mu^2}{2}(\sigma^2 + \chi^2) - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{f^2}(\sigma^2 + \chi^2)^2,$$

and therefore describes two real scalar fields, which interact with each other and having the same (tachyonic) tree-level mass  $\mu$ . The symmetry is still manifest, as only the combination  $\sigma^2 + \chi^2$  enters the Lagrangian. The corresponding transformation takes the (infinitesimal) form

$$\sigma \rightarrow \sigma + \theta\chi \tag{17}$$

$$\chi \rightarrow \chi - \theta\sigma, \tag{18}$$

and therefore mix the two degrees of freedom.

To find the extrema of the potential, it is necessary to inspect the partial derivatives of the potential

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial V}{\partial\sigma} &= -\mu^2\sigma + \frac{\mu^2}{f^2}\sigma(\sigma^2 + \chi^2) \\ \frac{\partial V}{\partial\chi} &= -\mu^2\chi + \frac{\mu^2}{f^2}\chi(\sigma^2 + \chi^2).\end{aligned}$$

The extrema of this potential therefore occur at  $\sigma = \chi = 0$  and at

$$\sigma^2 + \chi^2 = \frac{f^2}{2} = \phi^\dagger\phi.$$

To analyze whether these extrema are maxima or minima the second derivatives of the potential are necessary, reading

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial\sigma^2} &= -\mu^2 + \frac{\mu^2}{f^2}(3\sigma^2 + \chi^2) \\ \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial\chi^2} &= -\mu^2 + \frac{\mu^2}{f^2}(3\chi^2 + \sigma^2) \\ \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial\sigma\partial\chi} &= 2\frac{\mu^2}{f^2}\sigma\chi\end{aligned}$$

At zero field, the second derivatives are smaller or equal to zero, and therefore the potential at zero field is a local maximum. The situation at the minimum is symmetric, so it is possible to make any choice to split the  $f^2/\sqrt{2}$  between  $\sigma$  and  $\chi$ . In this case, the little group is the trivial one.

But without an explicit split all minima are equivalent. At the classical level, it is possible to introduce boundary conditions such that  $\sigma = f/\sqrt{2}$  and  $\chi = 0$ . At the quantum level, it would be possible to introduce an external source and taking afterwards the limit of vanishing source to obtain the same result.

This will not be done here. However, it is still possible to perform a linear field redefinition, by replacing in the Lagrangian the fields by

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma &\rightarrow \sigma + \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \chi &\rightarrow \chi,\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

A new (and equally well-defined) Lagrangian is obtained with the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu\sigma\partial^\mu\sigma + \partial_\mu\chi\partial^\mu\chi) + \frac{\mu^2 v}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{v^2}{f^2} - 1\right)\sigma + \frac{\mu^2 v^2}{4}\left(\frac{v^2}{2f^2} - 1\right) \\ &\quad - \mu^2\left(\frac{3}{2}\frac{v^2}{f^2} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\sigma^2 - \mu^2\left(\frac{1}{2}\frac{v^2}{f^2} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\chi^2 + \frac{\sqrt{2}\mu^2 v}{f}\sigma(\sigma^2 + \chi^2) + \frac{\mu^2}{2f^2}(\sigma^2 + \chi^2)^2 \\ &\stackrel{v=f}{=} \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu\sigma\partial^\mu\sigma + \partial_\mu\chi\partial^\mu\chi) - \mu^2\sigma^2 + \frac{\sqrt{2}\mu^2}{f}\sigma(\sigma^2 + \chi^2) + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu^2}{f^2}(\sigma^2 + \chi^2)^2 - \frac{\mu^2 f^2}{8}.\end{aligned}\tag{20}$$

In the last line, (21), the usual [10] identification  $v = f$  has been done.

This Lagrangian, with the fluctuation field  $\sigma$ , describes two scalar particles. These interact with cubic and quartic interactions. There is no obvious trace at the Lagrangian level left of the original symmetry. It is hidden, but not gone. In fact, it is still perfectly there.

To see this note first that the cubic coupling constant is not a free parameter of the theory, but it is uniquely determined by the other parameters. That is, as it should be, since by a mere field translation no new parameters should be introduced into the theory. Thus, though the symmetry is no longer manifest, it is still present: It ensures a relation between the couplings of various interaction vertices. In the quantum theory, this will resurface in the Ward identities. Thus, even though the shift (19) seems to have manifestly broken the symmetry, this is not the case. If it would truly be broken, the couplings would all be independent. Thereby, the notion of a hidden symmetry arises, which is more apt than that of a spontaneously broken symmetry [27]. In fact, the Lagrangian (21) is still fully symmetric.

This can also be seen in the way the symmetry manifests. After (19) the symme-

try transformation (17-18) actually reads

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma &\rightarrow \sigma + \theta\chi \\ \chi &\rightarrow \chi - \theta(\sigma - v) \\ v &\rightarrow v + \theta\chi,\end{aligned}$$

i. e.  $v$  has actually to be transformed. Therefore, it is useful to work with the Lagrangian (20), to see this. Because the identification has not been done yet it is manifest where changes occur. Note that especially the linear term and even the constant term, which do not participate in the dynamics, are still relevant to maintain the symmetry: Both change under this transformation, as they depend on  $v$ .

The other consequence is that at tree-level both fields are still massive. However, these tree-level masses are not symmetry-invariant quantities, and there is no Goldstone boson.

If, however, the symmetry is explicitly broken by an external source, the particular direction of  $v$  freezes out. Any residual symmetry does no longer change  $v$ . Hence, it can be treated, like in (21), as a parameter of the Lagrangian. Especially, there is now a massless Goldstone boson, and the symmetry transformation under any residual symmetry transformation is once more (17-18).

#### 2.4. The Goldstone theorem

One<sup>7</sup> of the most remarkable consequences of spontaneous symmetry breaking is the masslessness of one of the degrees of freedom in (21). This is a special case of Goldstone's theorem [10, 23, 42]. It is useful to formulate this theorem more generally, both at the classical and quantum level, to fully appreciate how it does not apply to the metastable case. Hence, while metastability can be detected, using e. g. (14), the physics is expressed differently in the metastable theory and the spontaneously broken theory. As will be discussed at the end of section 2.4.2, this is indeed seen in calculations.

##### 2.4.1. Classical Goldstone theorem

The Goldstone theorem [42] states: If a symmetry group  $\mathcal{G}$  of size  $\dim\mathcal{G}$  is spontaneously broken, then there exist as many massless modes as there are generators. If the group is only partly broken then only as many massless modes appear as generators are broken. This theorem only applies if the state space is positive semi-definite, and therefore does not carry over to gauge theories, as will be discussed in chapter 3.

---

<sup>7</sup>For selected steps of the standard treatment I follow here [10].

Take as the symmetry group a (semi-)simple Lie-group  $\mathcal{G}$  and write the fields in real components. Then the symmetry transformation of the associated real fields transforming under a real representation of the symmetry group are given by

$$\delta\phi_i = iT_a^{ij}\phi_j\theta^a \quad (22)$$

with arbitrary infinitesimal parameters  $\theta^a$  and the index  $a$  counting from 1 to  $\dim\mathcal{G}$ . The Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\phi_i\partial^\mu\phi^i - V(\phi)$$

must be invariant under a group transformation. Since the kinetic term is trivially so, this implies for the potential

$$0 = \delta V = \frac{\partial V}{\partial\phi_i}\delta\phi^i = i\frac{\partial V}{\partial\phi_i}T_{ij}^a\phi^j\theta_a.$$

Since the parameters are arbitrary, this can only be satisfied if

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial\phi_i}T_{ij}^a\phi^j = 0$$

holds. Differentiating this equation with respect to  $\phi_k$  yields

$$\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial\phi_k\partial\phi_i}T_{ij}^a\phi^j + \frac{\partial V}{\partial\phi_i}T_{ik}^a = 0.$$

All minima are characterized by an orbit which has some little group as an invariance group [43]. However, not all little groups may be connected to one (or more) minima, depending on the structure of the potential [44–46].

One of the minima and a particular direction  $f$  in it is now selected by the initial conditions, and thus the symmetry is spontaneously broken. This vacuum value  $f$  of the field can then be identified with the parameters of the Lagrangian, as discussed at the end of section 2.3.2. It is then possible to expand around the minimum of the potential, and therefore the first derivatives have all to vanish. The symmetric matrix of second derivatives is positive semi-definite at a minimum, i. e., has only positive or zero eigenvalues

$$\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial\phi_k\partial\phi_i} = (M^2)^{ki}.$$

Expanding now, as before, the field around the selected minimum at  $\psi_i = \phi_i - f_i$ , the quadratic order of the Lagrangian reads

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\psi_i\partial^\mu\psi^i - \frac{1}{2}(M^2)_{ki}\psi_k\psi_i + \dots$$

Since the matrix  $M$  is positive semi-definite, all particles have at tree-level only zero or positive mass<sup>8</sup>.

In terms of this mass matrix the conditional equation for a classical minimum reads

$$(M^2)^{ki} T_{ij}^a f^j = 0. \quad (23)$$

The little group is the invariance group  $\mathcal{H}$  of this minimum. As a consequence for generators  $t_a$  out of  $\mathcal{H}$  the conditional equation reads

$$t_{ij}^a f^j = 0.$$

Therefore, the value of the mass matrix is irrelevant for these directions, and there can be  $\dim \mathcal{H}$  massive modes. However, for the coset space  $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$  with generators  $\tau^a$ , the corresponding equations

$$\tau_{ij}^a f^j \neq 0.$$

are not fulfilled, and therefore the corresponding entries of the mass-matrix have to ensure (23). Especially, if the mass matrix is diagonal they have to vanish. Since these represent  $\dim(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H})$  equations, there must be  $\dim(\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H})$  massless modes, the Goldstone modes.

E. g. for the  $O(N)$  linear  $\sigma$ -model, the generalization of (15), the only non-trivial minimum satisfies

$$\phi^i \phi_i = \frac{f^i f_i}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{f^2}{\sqrt{2}} > 0$$

provided  $f^2$  is greater than zero. This minimum characterizes a vector of length  $f^2$  on the  $N$ -sphere, and is therefore invariant under the group  $O(N-1)$ , being the (only non-trivial) little group of the fundamental vector representation of the theory. Since  $O(N)$  has  $N(N-1)/2$  generators, there are  $N-1$  generators spontaneously broken, and thus there exists  $N-1$  massless modes.

It should be noted that the simplicity of the  $O(N)$  model stems from the fact that the fundamental representation has only a single non-trivial little group. The situation is much more complex if there are multiple little groups, see section 3.9.

#### 2.4.2. Quantized Goldstone theorem

To determine the consequence of hiding a symmetry at the quantum level, it is useful to investigate the normalized partition function

$$\Omega[J_i] = \frac{Z[J_i]}{Z[0]} = \frac{1}{Z[0]} \int \mathcal{D}\phi_i \exp \left( i \int d^4x (\mathcal{L} + J_i \phi_i) \right),$$

---

<sup>8</sup>This neglects the influence of terms beyond quadratic order, which can become relevant [30].

with the same Lagrangian as before. The source  $J_i$ , inducing the spontaneous symmetry breaking, will be send to zero in the end, but it is useful to leave it non-zero for now.

Since the Lagrangian and the measure are invariant under a symmetry transformation<sup>9</sup>, the variation of the partition function must vanish

$$0 = \delta Z[J_i] = \int \mathcal{D}\phi_i e^{iS + i \int d^4x J_i \phi_i} \left( \frac{\partial \delta \phi_i}{\partial \phi_j} + \delta \left( iS + i \int d^4x J_i \phi_i \right) \right).$$

The first term is the deviation of the Jacobian from unity. As the measure is invariant, it vanishes. The second is the variation of the action, which also vanishes. Only the third term can contribute. Since all variations are arbitrary, it thus follows

$$\int d^4x J_i T_{ik}^a \frac{\delta \Omega[J]}{i \delta J_k} = 0,$$

where it has been used that  $Z[0]$  is a constant, and the order of functional and ordinary integration has been exchanged. Furthermore, it has been used that all variations are independent, thus delivering  $\dim \mathcal{G}$  independent equations.

Since

$$\delta \Omega \equiv \delta \left( e^{\Omega_c} \right) = e^{\Omega_c} \delta \Omega_c,$$

this can be rewritten in terms of the generating functional  $\Omega_c$  for connected Green's functions as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int d^4x J_i T_{ik}^a \frac{\delta \Omega_c[J]}{i \delta J_k} \\ \frac{\delta \Omega_c[J]}{i \delta J_i} &= \langle \phi_i \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This can be furthermore transformed into an equation for the vertex (i. e., connected and amputated Green's functions) generating functional  $\Gamma$ , which is related to the connected one by a Legendre transformation

$$\begin{aligned} i\Gamma[\phi] &= -i \int d^4x J_i \phi_i + \Omega_c[J] \\ J_i &= -\frac{\delta \Gamma[\phi]}{i \delta \phi_i}. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

This yields finally

$$\int d^4x \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta \phi_i} T_{ik}^a \langle \phi_k \rangle = 0. \tag{25}$$

---

<sup>9</sup>Assuming once more the absence of anomalies.

To obtain the mass of a particle at the quantum level requires to study the poles of its propagators. The inverse propagator of the fields  $\phi_i$  is given by

$$\frac{i\delta^2\Gamma}{\delta\phi_i(x)\delta\phi_j(y)} = -(D^{-1})_{ik}(x-y). \quad (26)$$

An expression for this object can be obtained by differentiating (25) with respect to the field once more yielding [10]

$$\int d^4x \left( \frac{\delta^2\Gamma}{\delta\phi_i(x)\delta\phi_j(y)} T_{ik}^a \langle \phi_k \rangle \right) = 0,$$

and all other terms vanish. This is just the sought-after Fourier-transform of the inverse propagator at zero momentum, yielding

$$(G^{-1})_{ij}(p=0)T_{ik}^a \langle \phi_k \rangle = 0. \quad (27)$$

Thus, the inverse propagator needs to vanish at zero momentum exactly when the contraction with the vacuum expectation value does not vanish. Thus, the propagator has a pole at zero momentum in these tensor components, and there is one or more massless excitations. But this equation is nothing but the tree-level equation (23) where the mass matrix is replaced by the inverse propagator. Thus, there is the same number of massless particles at the quantum level as there is at tree-level, and in particular with the same quantum numbers.

It remains to understand what happens in the metastable case<sup>10</sup>. Because the vacuum expectation value in equation (27) explicitly vanishes, the equation is already fulfilled without a zero of the inverse propagator. Thus, the same argument for the presence of massless poles can no longer be made. This does not forbid the presence of massless poles, it just no longer implies their existence.

Furthermore, since there is no longer a preferred direction, the only invariant rank two tensor available is  $\delta_{ij}$ , and thus the propagator must be proportional to it,  $G_{ij} = \delta_{ij}g(p^2)$ , where  $g(p^2)$  is a scalar function. The pole structure is then entirely carried by the function  $g$ .

If the degeneracy of a state is counted by the algebraic multiplicity of the eigenvalues with poles of the corresponding propagator this implies that the multiplicities need to be compatible with the representations of the unbroken group. At fixed representation this would be in disagreement with the multiplicity for the case with

---

<sup>10</sup>I am indebted to Jeff Greensite, Christian B. Lang, and Erhard Seiler for discussions on this subject.



breaking with an external source. Especially, if massless states exist, they may appear only in multiplets of the full symmetry, and thus in different representations than suggested by Goldstone's theorem. Hence, the metastable theory may exhibit a different multiplet structure than the spontaneously broken theory. It should be repeated that this does not imply that the number of massless poles is different, just that they need to be arranged differently into the different multiplets. E. g., all massless poles may occur in some group-singlet, with the appropriate degeneracy. If, and how, this occurs can no longer be derived in the same way as Goldstone's theorem.

This has been a long-standing issue in lattice simulations [47]. Standard algorithms tend to get stuck, even with intact symmetry, in large volumes at a fixed value of the vacuum expectation value, thus mimicking an external source. This is either due to non-ergodicity of the algorithms or due to critical slowing down. As this is a systematic error, this is undesirable. If overcome, as discussed above, Goldstone's theorem is no longer applicable, and the symmetry is restored [47, 48]. If it is desired to investigate the Goldstone dynamics, and thus the spontaneously broken theory, it is necessary to introduce an explicit symmetry breaking, typically an external source. This has been done in lattice simulations, especially for the  $O(4)$  case [49–55]. This corresponds to a numerical implementation of the prescription (11).

Thus, in the metastable theory no Goldstone bosons arise, and the theory remains symmetric. Even though, as noticed above, this does not forbid the presence of massless excitations. If and where massless states arise in this case has, unfortunately, not been investigated systematically in lattice simulations yet.

The reason for this difference is because the symmetry is global, and therefore its consequences are observable. This will change for the local, i. e. gauge, symmetries to which we will now turn to.

## 2.5. *Classification of global symmetry breaking*

Before doing so, the classification of symmetry breaking patterns should be collected once more:

Unbroken The classical symmetry exists at the quantum level. Only invariant quantities are non-zero

Hidden By redefining the fields the new fields do no longer possess the original symmetry. However, a, possibly involved and non-linearly realized, version of the original symmetry persists, and the theory exhibits the symmetry as if unbroken

**Metastable** The classical symmetry exists at the quantum level. Only invariant quantities are non-zero. The theory is changing discontinuously when a source is applied which selects a stratum or orbit

**Spontaneously broken** The classical symmetry is explicitly broken by a source which selects a particular stratum. This breaking persists when the source is sent to zero, and the limiting theory does no longer possess the symmetry. Only in this limiting case the Goldstone theorem applies

**Explicitly broken** An external current breaks the symmetry by singling out a stratum or an orbit. The breaking vanishes when taking the source to zero. Otherwise the symmetry is also spontaneously broken

**Anomaly** A classical symmetry is explicitly broken by quantum effects. Usually this comes from the non-invariance of the path integral measure [34]

While the terms above are colloquially often used (partly) interchangeably, this is not really appropriate. Every notion has its very particular, and different, meaning. This has consequences for both calculational purposes and for the observable patterns of degeneracies. This has also important implications for the observable charge structure of states [30]: Superselection sectors arise in context of the intact symmetries of the theory. Thus, a metastable and a spontaneously broken theory have different charge superselection sectors. It should also be noted that there is a deep connection to the existence of long-range order and thus how cluster decomposition operates, when considering the structure of field configurations. This feature could also be used to classify the various possibilities.

### 3. Brout-Englert-Higgs physics

After this preliminary discussion of the global case, the next step is to upgrade the symmetry to a local one. This will have far reaching consequences, especially when it comes to how the symmetry manifests itself. Again, if the dimensionality is too small, this can have far-reaching consequences for the following [56, 57]. And again, with hindsight to the desired applications, the dimensionality is implicitly assumed to be sufficiently large, i. e. usually three or more.

#### 3.1. Formulating the theory

The basic starting point to localize a symmetry will always be a theory with scalar fields and a global symmetry group, i. e. once more

$$\mathcal{L} = \partial_\mu \phi^\dagger \partial^\mu \phi - V(\phi),$$

invariant under some group  $\mathcal{G}$  and the fields in some representation  $\mathcal{R}$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ . For gauging the theory it will be assumed that the symmetry acts linearly on the fields.

The next step is to gauge the theory. Exploiting the linear action on the fields leads to minimal coupling. The gauged theory is then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= -\frac{1}{4}W_{\mu\nu}^a W_a^{\mu\nu} + (D_\mu\phi_\alpha)^\dagger D^\mu\phi_\alpha - V(\phi) \\ W_{\mu\nu}^a &= \partial_\mu W_\nu^a - \partial_\nu W_\mu^a + gf^{abc}W_\mu^b W_\nu^c \\ D_\mu &= \partial_\mu + gT^R,\end{aligned}\tag{28}$$

with the gauge fields  $W_\mu^a$  in the adjoint representation and the  $T$  are suitably normalized generators for the representation of the scalar field and  $g$  is the newly introduced gauge coupling.

It is possible to promote either the full global group  $\mathcal{G}$  to the gauge group  $G$ , or only a subgroup as long as the resulting Lagrangian is gauge-invariant, and thus  $G \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ . This is particularly easy if the group is a product group  $\mathcal{G} = G \times \mathcal{C}$ . Otherwise the remainder will only be a group if the original group was not simple, i. e. has non-trivial invariant subgroups. Simple groups will not have a remaining global group, but only a coset  $\mathcal{G}/G$ .

If the remainder is not just a coset, and hence there exists a group  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{G}/G$ , this global symmetry group will be called the custodial group  $\mathcal{C}$ . If the potential  $V$  in (28) is separately invariant under both groups,  $G$  and  $\mathcal{C}$ , this will be an additional global symmetry group of the theory. Otherwise, the potential breaks the custodial group explicitly, either to a subgroup or completely. Despite its name, this symmetry is not different from, e. g., a flavor symmetry. It merely states that the scalar field has more degrees of freedom than are minimally necessary to write down the theory. Especially, the custodial group can also be a discrete group.

The most prominent example is, of course, the standard model Higgs sector. In this case the scalar is in the fundamental representation of  $\mathcal{G} = O(4)$ . Then<sup>11</sup>  $G = \text{SU}(2)$  and  $\mathcal{C} = \text{SU}(2)$ , since loosely<sup>12</sup>  $O(4) \sim \text{SU}(2) \times \text{SU}(2)$ . The custodial symmetry will be broken explicitly once either QED or fermions are introduced. This may happen also in general if there is an additional sector  $\mathcal{L}_r$  which breaks  $\mathcal{C}$  explicitly, even if  $V$  does not. This will be discussed in sections 4.6.1 and 4.6.2.

The local and global symmetry structure in the standard model case can be made particularly well explicit by switching to a matrix representation, rather than a vec-

<sup>11</sup>Actually, in the standard model  $G = \text{SU}(2)/\mathbb{Z}_2$ , due to the requirement of single-valuedness for the fermion fields [43]. This will not play a significant role in the remainder of this review.

<sup>12</sup>More precisely  $\text{SO}(4) \sim (\text{SU}(2) \times \text{SU}(2))/\mathbb{Z}_2$ .

tor representation. For this write [58]

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1 & -\phi_2^\dagger \\ \phi_2 & \phi_1^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \quad (29)$$

where  $\phi_i$  are the usual components of the complex vector representation. In this representation the field transforms by a left-multiplication under a gauge transformation,  $X \rightarrow gX$  with the matrix  $g \in G$  in the fundamental representation of  $SU(2)$ . Under a custodial transformation  $c$  with the matrix  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  in the fundamental representation of  $SU(2)$  it transforms by a right multiplication,  $X \rightarrow Xc$ . In terms of this representation, and for the standard model Higgs potential [10], the Lagrangian (28) reads [58]

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}W_{\mu\nu}^a W_a^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}\text{tr} \left( (D_\mu X)^\dagger D^\mu X \right) - \lambda \left( \frac{1}{2}\text{tr} (X^\dagger X) - f^2 \right)^2. \quad (30)$$

In this form the Lagrangian is manifestly invariant under both local and global transformations. Though such a manifest rewriting is not possible for general groups  $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow G \times \mathcal{C}$ , it will be very helpful to explicitly demonstrate general properties.

It is also useful to note that, if  $\phi \neq 0$ ,

$$X = \rho \alpha, \quad (31)$$

where  $\rho = (\det X)^{\frac{1}{2}} = (\phi^\dagger \phi)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\alpha$  is a  $SU(2)$  matrix. If  $\phi = 0$ , the transformation is ambiguous, as then  $\rho = 0$ , but  $\alpha$  is arbitrary. The reason is that this transformation corresponds to a mapping from  $\mathbb{C}^2$  to  $\mathbb{R}^1 \times S^3$ , where  $S^3 \sim SU(2)$  is the four-sphere. Both spaces are not topologically equivalent. Therefore, in general a rewriting like (31) modifies the target space of the theory, and both theories are no longer necessarily equivalent. This is irrelevant in perturbation theory, but may become relevant beyond perturbation theory. Note that this problem does not arise for the representation (29).

### 3.2. At the classical level

The first important observation is that the Lagrangian (28) is manifestly gauge-invariant. This is particularly obvious in the standard model case (30), but a necessary, general feature. This is because the potential is necessarily a function of gauge-invariant combinations<sup>13</sup> of the  $\phi$ , most usually of  $\phi^\dagger \phi$ . For simplicity, only this case will be considered in the following.

---

<sup>13</sup>There may be, of course, cases in which the remainder  $\mathcal{L}_r$  in (1) could affect the following. E. g. in the standard model case it explicitly breaks the custodial symmetry [10]. This is at the moment an unnecessary complication, as it does not conceptually alter the following, and will therefore be ignored. This will be taken up again in section 4.6.

The potential may or may not break explicitly  $\mathcal{C}$  to some subgroup, which for simplicity will also be called  $\mathcal{C}$  in the following. This is not the case for the standard model Higgs sector, as can be seen from (30).

Since the potential is, by construction, a function of gauge invariant quantities only, so are the minima given by gauge-invariant conditions. I. e.,

$$\phi^\dagger \phi = f^2 \quad (32)$$

is the usual condition. These minima are for any local potential necessarily translationally invariant, and therefore need to be constant. The minima are also invariant under the custodial symmetry, as the potential is. As discussed in section 2, the minima will never break the global symmetry, but make it at most metastable against external perturbations. It is essentially the existence of this minimum in a gauge theory which is at the root of the BEH effect, and everything else follows from it. The existence of this minimum, both classically or in the quantum effective action, will therefore be taken as being the BEH effect in the following.

In the standard model case (30), this condition takes the form

$$X = v\alpha,$$

with  $v = f$  and  $\alpha$  an arbitrary  $SU(2)$  matrix, since  $\alpha^\dagger \alpha = 1$ . This also shows that the minimum is manifestly invariant under both, gauge transformations and custodial transformations.

In general, the potential can have multiple minima,  $\phi^\dagger \phi = f_i$  where the  $i$  now enumerates the minima, which may be global or local. These belong necessarily to different orbits. This will be considered in section 3.9. In the standard-model case, this is not so, because the Higgs field is in the fundamental representation of  $SU(2)$ , and the only group-invariant from which an invariant potential could be built is  $\phi^\dagger \phi$ . Therefore, in this case the minima necessarily have so far the same symmetry as the original potential, both locally and globally.

The general enumeration of these potentials and their minima is an exercise in group theory. The potential is build from invariants of the full group,  $\mathcal{G}$ . The enumeration of these invariants corresponds to the classification of the invariants of the group and the given representations. The identification of the possible minima is then an exercise in Morse theory [28, 43], which can be used also to prove the statements above. Note, however, that the number and position of minima will be determined also by the parameters. Morse theory will only serve to enumerate all possible minima a potential can have at a given order of group invariants. The subset which are actually realized depends entirely on the potential.

As a consequence, all possible minima belong to some little group of  $G \times \mathcal{C}$ , that is, they are characterized by a stratum. Classically, it is possible to select a particular

orbit from the stratum as an initial condition, just as in the global case, e. g.

$$\phi_i^c = v_j n_i^j$$

where no summation is implied and the  $n_j^i$  is a suitable representative of an orbit. In the standard model case (30), a common choice is

$$X^c = v1.$$

If the little group of the stratum is not just the trivial group consisting only of unity, there is a residual group,

$$G \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow G' \times \mathcal{C}' = \mathcal{H}',$$

which may still have both a local part  $G'$  and a global part  $\mathcal{C}'$ . It is not necessarily true that  $G' \subset G$  and  $\mathcal{C}' \subset \mathcal{C}$ , but only  $\mathcal{H}' \subset G \times \mathcal{C}$ . For any  $g \in \mathcal{H}'$

$$g\phi_i^c = \phi_i^c,$$

showing that a whole orbit is actually selected as a minimum. Note that the index contains both, local and global indices.

As an example, in the standard model case this applies for any SU(2) matrix  $A$  such that

$$A^\dagger X^c A = v A^\dagger 1 A = v1. \quad (33)$$

Thus, the remaining group  $\mathcal{H}'$  requires to choose the same matrix  $A$  from both the local and the global SU(2), but only from the global part of the gauge group. Thus, the remainder group is in this case indeed not a subgroup of either group, but rather a diagonal subgroup of both groups<sup>14</sup>. Colloquial [10], it is said that the condensate  $\phi^c$  breaks the group  $G \times \mathcal{C}$  to  $\mathcal{H}'$ .

It is once more the choice of an orbit by the initial conditions which performed the breaking, and not the dynamics. It is thus a case of spontaneous symmetry breaking.

In other contexts, the same concept is also known as color-flavor locking [59, 60]. Also there similar problems requiring a similar treatment, as discussed in the following, appear when it comes to a manifest gauge-invariant description [60–62].

---

<sup>14</sup>Sometimes it is actually this diagonal subgroup which is referred to as the custodial symmetry. This makes sense in a purely perturbative setting, but would be problematic in section 4, and will therefore not be done here.

### 3.3. The quantum level, gauge-fixing and perturbation theory

#### 3.3.1. Gauge-fixing

Going to the quantum level, the situation is best discussed in a path-integral language,

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}\phi_i \mathcal{D}W_\mu^a e^{i \int d^d x \mathcal{L}}.$$

As in the global case in section 2, the path integral is now over all field configurations. In particular, the Lagrangian is invariant under the full group  $G \times \mathcal{C}$ . Therefore the weight factor treats all orbits, and all strata, equally. Thus, in this form no orbit can be singled out to actually break the symmetry as was done classically by a choice of appropriate boundary conditions. Thus, for any potential, as in the global case, the theory is always invariant under the full group. In particular, any expectation value with one or more open indices

$$\langle O_i(\phi, W) \rangle = \int \mathcal{D}\phi_i \mathcal{D}W_\mu^a O_i(\phi, W) e^{i \int d^d x \mathcal{L}}$$

necessarily vanishes for the same reasons as in the global case.

However, as it stands, these expressions are ill-defined, because of the diverging integral over the gauge-group [10]. It is necessary to fix this. This can be done by performing gauge-fixing or by making the group integral finite by a lattice formulation. The latter will be done in section 3.5. But to study the paradox alluded to in the introduction requires to fix the gauge.

To do so, the standard Faddeev-Popov procedure will be performed [10]. There are a few subtleties, which will become important later on, and therefore it is useful to outline the most important steps. Start by selecting a local gauge condition  $C^a(W_\mu^a, x, \omega) = 0$ , and assume that there is exactly one gauge copy on every orbit which satisfies this condition. The field  $\omega$  here collects all other fields in the theory. I. e., for a set of gauge-fields related by gauge transformations  $g = \exp(iT^a \theta^a / 2) \in G$  as

$$\begin{aligned} W_\mu &\rightarrow g W_\mu g^{-1} - i(\partial_\mu g) g^{-1} \\ &\approx W_\mu^a + D_\mu^{ab} \theta^b + \mathcal{O}(g^2) \\ D_\mu^{ab} &= \delta^{ab} \partial_\mu + g f^{abc} W_\mu^c \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

there is one, and only one, which satisfies the condition  $C^a$ . Herein  $D_\mu^{ab}$  is the usual covariant derivative in the adjoint representation, a specialization of (2). An example of such a condition is, e. g., the Landau gauge

$$C^a = \partial^\mu W_\mu^a. \tag{35}$$



This is actually not possible in general, as will be discussed in section 3.4, but this issue will be ignored for the moment.

To make the path integral well-defined, the next step is to factor off the irrelevant number of field configurations equivalent under the gauge transformation (34), and just remain with the one representative of each gauge orbit satisfying the gauge condition.

To perform this, consider the functional generalization of the Dirac- $\delta$  functional. The expression

$$\Delta^{-1}[W_\mu^a] = \int \mathcal{D}g \delta(C^a[W_\mu^{ag}])$$

is an integration over the gauge group  $G$  for a fixed physical field configuration  $W_\mu^a$ , but by the  $\delta$ -function only the weight of the one configuration satisfying the gauge condition is selected. The measure is taken to be the invariant Haar-measure, making the integral invariant under gauge transformations and therefore  $\Delta$  is gauge-invariant by construction. Inverting  $\Delta$  yields

$$1 = \Delta[W_\mu^a] \int \mathcal{D}g \delta(C^a[W_\mu^{ag}]). \quad (36)$$

Inserting this into the functional integral yields

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int \mathcal{D}W_\mu^a \Delta[W_\mu^a] \int \mathcal{D}g \delta(C^a[W_\mu^{ag}]) \exp(iS[W_\mu^a]) \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}g \int \mathcal{D}W_\mu^a \Delta[W_\mu^a] \delta(C^a[W_\mu^a]) \exp(iS[W_\mu^a]). \end{aligned}$$

This separates the gauge group integration. Note that if the action would be replaced by any gauge-invariant functional, in particular expressions involving some gauge-invariant observable  $f$  in the form  $f[W_\mu^a] \exp(iS[W_\mu^a])$ , the result would remain the same. But it is explicitly used that the measure  $\mathcal{D}W_\mu^a$  is gauge-invariant. Thus, gauge-fixing is not affecting the value of gauge-invariant observables. Due to the  $\delta$ -function, on the other hand, now only one gauge-inequivalent field configuration contributes, making the functional integral well-defined. The integral over the gauge group then drops out, if the measure is normalized by  $Z$  (and thus the partition function equals 1). However, the appearance of the  $\delta$  function becomes part of the measure, which now reads  $\mathcal{D}W_\mu^a \Delta[W_\mu^a] \delta(C^a[W_\mu^a])$ , and this expression is no longer gauge-invariant, and therefore gauge symmetry is explicitly broken by gauge fixing.

Since the functional  $\Delta$  is gauge-invariant, it can be rewritten as an integral over the gauge group, and thus over all gauge transformations,

$$\Delta[W_\mu^a]^{-1} = \int \mathcal{D}\theta^a \delta(C^a[W_\mu^{a\theta}]) = \left( \det \frac{\delta C^a(x)}{\delta \theta^b(y)} \right)_{C^a=0} = \det M^{ab}(x, y),$$



where the matrix  $M$  is the Faddeev-Popov operator, and the determinant is the Faddeev-Popov determinant.

To get a more explicit expression it is useful to use the chain rule

$$M^{ab}(x, y) = \frac{\delta C^a(x)}{\delta \theta^b(y)} = \int d^4z \sum_{ij} \frac{\delta C^a(x)}{\delta \omega_j^i(z)} \frac{\delta \omega_j^i(z)}{\delta \theta^b(y)}. \quad (37)$$

In this case  $i$  counts the field-type, while  $j$  is a multi-index, encompassing gauge indices, Lorentz indices etc.. In the special case that  $C$  only involves the gauge field, this reduces to

$$M^{ab}(x, y) = \frac{\delta C^a(x)}{\delta W_\mu^c(y)} D_\mu^{cb}(y). \quad (38)$$

It is possible to recast the determinant also in the form of an exponential by introducing ghost fields,

$$\det M \sim \int \mathcal{D}c^a \mathcal{D}\bar{c}^a \exp \left( -i \int d^4x d^4y \bar{c}^a(x) M^{ab}(x, y) c^b(y) \right).$$

The Faddeev-Popov ghost fields  $c$  and  $\bar{c}$  are Grassmann-valued scalar fields. The ghost fields are in general gauges not related, but may be so in particular gauges [63]. If the condition  $C^a$  is local in the fields, the Faddeev-Popov operator will be proportional to  $\delta(x - y)$ , and this ghost term will become local. Note that if the gauge conditions involve fields other than the gauge fields this may introduce explicit interactions of these fields with the ghosts. This will happen below in the Lagrangian (40) for the gauge condition (39).

### 3.3.2. Standard gauge choices

It is now useful to discuss a few of the standard gauge conditions employed, as they will be used throughout the rest of this review.

The first is the Landau gauge condition  $C^a = \partial^\mu W_\mu^a$ . In this case

$$M^{ab}(x, y) = \partial^\mu D_\mu^{ab} \delta(x - y),$$

and the gauge is always well-defined. However, the gauge condition has an important incompleteness: It is invariant under global gauge transformations. Since global transformations have a finite volume, this does not impede the purpose of the gauge-fixing. But this implies that no direction is selected. Therefore, the global gauge transformation act like a global symmetry of section 2. Thus, any space-time-independent quantity having an open gauge index will still vanish [60]. In particular, it is impossible to have a non-zero Higgs expectation value in this gauge [11, 12, 60].

A second useful choice is the class of linear covariant gauges. It is a different class of gauges as introduced before. They do not select a single gauge copy. Rather, they average over the complete orbit with a uniquely defined weight, which makes the integral over the orbit finite. However, this is implemented by averaging over gauge choices selecting a single gauge copy. Therefore, they generalize the above construction.

To do so, they are constructed from the choice  $C^a = \partial^\mu W_\mu^a + \Lambda^a$  with  $\Lambda^a$  some arbitrary function. This selects again a single gauge copy for each orbit. Afterwards, the gauge-fixed path integral is averaged with a Gaussian weight over the functions  $\Lambda^a$ , and thus over different gauge-fixings. Performing the Gaussian integral explicitly yields [10]

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}W_\mu^a \mathcal{D}c^a \mathcal{D}\bar{c}^a \exp \left( iS - \frac{i}{2\zeta} \int d^4x (\partial_\mu W_\mu^a)^2 - i \int d^4x \bar{c}^a \partial^\mu D_\mu^{ab} c^b \right).$$

where  $\zeta$  is related to the width of the original Gaussian. Thus, ultimately, this gauge is equivalent to a Gaussian average over the gauge orbit. Again this gauge is well-defined. The limit  $\zeta \rightarrow 0$  recovers formally the Landau gauge condition. Note that also this gauge-fixed Lagrangian remains invariant under arbitrary global gauge transformations, and as before all expectation values not invariant under global gauge transformations still vanish.

It should be noted that just leaving the global gauge degree of freedom untouched is by no means the only way of choosing a gauge with vanishing vacuum expectation values of non-invariant quantities [64]. Certain fully fixed gauges also achieve this by introducing local averages. There is also a connection to the Gribov-Singer ambiguity to be discussed in section 3.4.

Thus, while both gauges are perfectly valid gauges they do have one serious problem, if perturbative calculations should be performed [11]: A perturbative expansion is in its nature a small-field amplitude expansion [33]. Consider a situation with a Higgs potential of the same type as in (16), and such that the situation is metastable. This means that classically the field is close to the minimum, and has therefore a, possibly large, non-zero amplitude. If quantum corrections are small, and do not change this qualitatively<sup>15</sup>, this is a serious problem. Because so far the expansion point with standard perturbative means would be zero fields [10]. Thus, in such a gauge the theory looks perturbatively like a scalar QCD, independent of the potential. In particular, this implies that the masses of the gauge bosons are

---

<sup>15</sup>Of course, the potential needs to be convex at the quantum level, and is thus deformed, but this does not necessarily leads to a change in the size of the fluctuations around the average value of the fields.

necessarily zero to all orders in perturbation theory [10].

This can be remedied by a suitable choice of gauge, which makes a perturbative expansion around a non-zero Higgs field<sup>16</sup> possible [10, 11, 65, 66]. Most suitable for this purpose are so-called 't Hooft gauges [10]

$$C^a = \partial^\mu W_\mu^a + ig\zeta\phi_i T_{ij}^a v_j + \Lambda^a, \quad (39)$$

where the Higgs field  $\phi$  and a constant vector  $v$  in the representation space of the Higgs appear. This implies that only the components of  $\phi$  contribute to the gauge condition which are, in the sense of the product, orthogonal to  $v$ . These will become later the equivalent of the Goldstone bosons of section 2.4. Note that the choice of the direction of  $v$  is purely part of the gauge choice<sup>17</sup>. In particular,  $v$  is not a vacuum expectation value at this level, but rather a fixed parameter of the gauge choice. It is therefore invariant under any transformations.

The corresponding gauge-fixed path integral becomes

$$\begin{aligned} Z = \int \mathcal{D}W_\mu^a \mathcal{D}c^a \mathcal{D}\bar{c}^a \exp \left( iS - \frac{i}{2\zeta} \int d^4x |\partial^\mu W_\mu^a + ig\zeta\phi_i T_{ij}^a v_j|^2 \right. \\ \left. - i \int d^4x \bar{c}^a (\partial^\mu D_\mu^{ab} - \zeta g^2 v_i T_{ij}^a T_{jk}^b \phi_k) c^b \right). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

There are a number of remarks to be made.

The first is that the gauge parameters  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  are independent. However, if  $\xi \neq \zeta$  a mixing term of the gauge field and the Higgs field, or more precisely the Goldstone fields, would appear at tree-level. Therefore, usually both are set equal. But they receive different quantum corrections, and to avoid mixing at loop level requires to enforce the equality by making it part of the renormalization scheme [10]. This will always be done in the following.

The second remark is that the gauge condition reduces to the previous cases if  $v$  is chosen to be zero.

The third is that the gauge now explicitly prefers a particular direction, as  $v$  is a constant vector. It therefore restores the situation of the classical level, but now by a gauge condition, rather than by an initial condition. This implies that a non-vanishing vacuum expectation value of the Higgs,  $\langle \phi \rangle \neq 0$ , is now possible, and will

---

<sup>16</sup>Such an expansion is known as a mean-field expansion. At leading order this is keeping only the vacuum expectation value of the Higgs field and neglecting the fluctuation field. Also alternative expansion schemes than in the couplings are possible.

<sup>17</sup>In fact, it would actually be a valid gauge by setting also the length of  $v$  to an arbitrary value, but then the same problems with perturbative calculation reappear, especially for large discrepancies between  $v^2$  and  $f^2$ .

actually have the value  $v$  at tree-level. In particular, just as in section 2.3.2,  $v^2$  can be identified with the minimum of the potential (32) determined by the parameters of the Lagrangian,  $v^2 = f^2$ . But it needs to be kept in mind that again the vector  $v$  still transforms under a change of gauge, while the number  $f$  is a parameter of the gauge choice. This is not relevant if, after fixing to this gauge, the gauge will no longer be changed, which is the usual approach in perturbation theory [10].

The fourth is that if  $v$  is identified with the vacuum expectation value  $\langle\phi\rangle$  and if the BEH effect is not active, the gauge condition (39) reduce to the linear covariant gauges, as then  $\langle\phi\rangle$  vanishes. Conversely, if  $v$  is set to an arbitrary vector without identification, and if there is no BEH effect active, the condition  $\langle\phi\rangle = v$  cannot be satisfied. Thus, the gauge condition cannot be fulfilled, and therefore this gauge does not create a well-defined quantum theory. It is therefore very important to distinguish how the gauge condition is defined, and what the meaning of  $v$  is. In particular, if  $v$  is a constant vector, it is not affected when performing transformations, while if it is identified with the vacuum expectation value it does change under transformations, e. g. custodial transformations. However, in the latter case it cannot be safely assumed that  $v$  is non-zero, since this is a dynamical result of the theory. Thus, this gauge condition depends on the parameters of theory.

The fifth is that the choice of this direction is not necessarily invariant under the global custodial symmetry. This happens, if  $v$  is not invariant under custodial transformations. This is exactly the same situation as in the classical case, see (33) for an explicit example. To maintain the gauge condition therefore requires every custodial transformation to be accompanied by a compensating (global) gauge transformation. The remainder group is thus partly the (global) gauge symmetry, and therefore not itself observable. Instead, any gauge-invariant quantity constructed in this gauge will combine degrees of freedom such that the diagonal subgroup will be mapped to the custodial symmetry. This will be seen in explicit examples in section 4.

Finally, the interaction between the ghost fields and the scalar arise from the sum over all fields in (37). It is therefore a direct consequence of the gauge condition.

### 3.3.3. The gauge-fixed Lagrangian and the mass spectrum at tree-level

Once this gauge is fixed and  $f = |v|$  is set, it is common to perform in this Lagrangian the split [10, 11]

$$\phi(x) = v + \varphi(x). \quad (41)$$

By construction,  $\langle\varphi\rangle = 0$ , and thus the vacuum expectation value introduced by gauge-fixing is entirely contained in  $v$ . However, fixing the gauge and performing this split are two independent operations and are performed separately, no matter that they are not very useful without each other.

It is important to note that the gauge and global transformation properties of  $\varphi$  are influenced, just as in section 2.3.2, by the fact that  $v$  is not invariant under such transformations. The symmetry has been hidden. In fact, a gauge transformation away from (39) can shift  $v$  even to zero. Thus, two of the mechanisms listed in section 2.5 are here at work simultaneously. The split (41) hides the symmetry. The gauge condition (39) explicitly breaks the gauge symmetry. The resulting theory therefore no longer has the symmetry, and even if it would have it, it would no longer be manifest.

Nonetheless, in this fixed class of gauges, everything is well-defined, with  $\varphi$  being the dynamical degree of freedom. If the fluctuations of  $\varphi$  are now small, i. e.  $\langle |\varphi|^2 \rangle \ll v^2$ , then  $\varphi$  describes small-amplitude fluctuations around zero. The field  $\phi$  fluctuates then also only weakly around  $v$ . Thus, a perturbative description with  $\varphi$  as dynamical variable seems possible [10, 11, 67].

This construction has a number of interesting consequences. It is useful for further reference to give as an explicit example the situation for the standard-model-like case. The starting Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}W_{\mu\nu}^a W_a^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \left( \partial_\mu \delta_{ij} - igW_\mu^a T_{ij}^a \right) \phi_j \right)^\dagger \left( \partial_\mu \delta_{ik} - igW_\mu^b T_{ik}^b \right) \phi - \lambda(\phi^2 - f^2)^2, \quad (42)$$

which has the classical minimum at  $\phi^2 = f^2$ , and thus  $v = fn$  will be set in the 't Hooft gauge condition (39), keeping the actual direction  $n$  arbitrary for the moment. Performing the Faddeev-Popov procedure and the split (41) yields.

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}W_{\mu\nu}^a W_a^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}(D_\mu^{ij}\phi_j)^\dagger (D_{ik}^\mu\phi_k) \quad (43)$$

$$+ \frac{g^2 f^2}{2} T_{ij}^a T_{ik}^b n_j^\dagger n_k W_\mu^a W_\mu^b - \lambda f^2 |n\phi|^2 + \frac{ig^2 \xi f^2}{2} |\phi T^a n|^2 + i\xi g^2 f^2 n_i^\dagger T_{ij}^a T_{jk}^b n_k \quad (44)$$

$$- 2\lambda f((n\phi) + (n\phi)^\dagger)\phi^2 - \lambda(\phi^2)^2 + i\bar{c}^a \xi g^2 f(n_i T_{ij}^a T_{jk}^b \phi_k^\dagger + n_i^\dagger T_{ij}^a T_{jk}^b \phi_k) c^b \quad (45)$$

$$+ g^2 f T_{ij}^a T_{ik}^b (n_j^\dagger \phi_k + n_k \phi_j^\dagger) W_\mu^a W_\mu^b \quad (46)$$

$$- \frac{i}{2\xi} (\partial^\mu W_\mu^a)^2 - i\bar{c}^a \partial^\mu D_\mu^{ab} c^b \quad (47)$$

Since the gauge will now remain fixed, cancellations of the constants  $f^2$  and  $v^2$ , which have the same value, are permissible and have been performed. Also, constant and linear terms have been dropped. This is only possible due to the identification of  $f^2$  with  $v^2$ . The cancellations already imply that the renormalization scheme must ensure that  $f = |\langle \phi \rangle| = |v|$ , as otherwise the cancellation would not be allowed at the quantum level, and additional terms would arise. Furthermore, by dropping terms the gauge is now fixed forever. Since these terms have contributions containing  $v$ , they would transform under a gauge transformation.

If either restriction is not desirable,  $f$  and  $v$  and  $\langle\phi\rangle$  should be kept strictly separated, like in (20). Note that even if they are kept separately a split, i. e. hiding of the gauge symmetry, using (41) could still be done. The full Lagrangian would then be substantially more lengthy, as the comparison of (20) and (21) suggests.

This Lagrangian has a number of features. The terms (43) are the ordinary kinetic terms. These two terms comprise together (massless) scalar QCD. The terms (47) are the corresponding ordinary gauge-fixing terms for linear-covariant gauges. The terms, which are specific to the 't Hooft gauge are the remaining ones involving ghosts.

The terms (45-46) are interactions. However, there are four interactions, which are determined by just three coupling constants, one of them the length of  $v$ . And one of them is the already appeared gauge coupling, and thus not independent. It is actually these relations, which are the manifest sign of a hidden gauge symmetry [27]. In a theory where the symmetry would really be broken, these coupling constants are independent.

The terms (44) are bilinears, and therefore are mass terms. It is quite instructive to study them term by term.

The first term in (44) is the mass of the gauge bosons. It is matrix-valued. In the standard-model it is the remaining diagonal subgroup of the gauge and custodial symmetry which enforces a degeneracy of the eigenvalues of the mass matrix, giving all gauge bosons the same mass. Again, as a hallmark of a hidden symmetry, these masses are not independent, but fixed by the coupling constants, and proportional to  $gf$ . The next term is a mass-term for the fluctuation field in the direction of  $n$ , as only the scalar-product with  $n$  enters. This is an ordinary (correct sign) mass-term proportional to  $\sqrt{\lambda}f$ . This is what is usually called the Higgs mass [8, 10], and the associated field component the Higgs. Note that the Higgs is, by construction, a singlet under the residual symmetry  $\mathcal{H}'$ . As can be seen, the value of the Higgs mass is completely independent of the masses of the gauge bosons, as the two independent couplings  $g$  and  $\lambda$  enter.

The next term contains the projection of the fluctuation field to  $n$ , but twisted by the representation matrices. This yields exactly all other degrees of freedom not contained in the Higgs part, what is usually called the (would-be-)Goldstones. Their mass is proportional to  $\sqrt{\xi}gf$ , and thus depends on the gauge parameter, signaling their unphysical nature. They also form a non-trivial representation of  $\mathcal{H}'$ . Similarly, the last term, involving the ghosts, yields also a gauge-dependent mass for the ghosts of the same size.

In addition, the quadratic term for the gauge bosons in (47) also yields another gauge-dependent pole, which is best seen by writing down its tree-level propagator

[10]

$$D_{\mu\nu}^{ab} = \delta^{ab} \left( \left( \left( g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{k_\mu k_\nu}{k^2} \right) \frac{-i}{k^2 - m_W^2} \right) - \frac{i\tilde{\zeta} k_\mu k_\nu}{k^2(k^2 - m_W^2\tilde{\zeta})} \right). \quad (48)$$

The first contribution is the transverse part of the propagator, which carries the mass pole of line (44). The longitudinal part has the same type of gauge-dependent mass pole as the Goldstone bosons and the ghosts. The set of all of these gauge-dependent poles cancel in any perturbatively physical amplitude, which can be best shown using a BRST construction [10]. This will not be done here, as it will not play any role in the following. The only important statement here is that there is a suitable pole structure for the gauge boson.

Thus, in total, the theory exhibits in 't Hooft gauge a massive Higgs boson and massive (transverse) gauge bosons with independent masses. There are also gauge degrees of freedom, with gauge-dependent masses, but these cancel in perturbatively physical amplitudes.

#### 3.3.4. Limits of the 't Hooft gauge

The 't Hooft gauge has two particular limits. The first is the 't Hooft-Landau-gauge limit  $\tilde{\zeta} \rightarrow 0$ . In this limit all perturbatively unphysical, i. e. non-BRST singlet, degrees of freedom become massless. However, the masses of the Higgs and the (transverse) gauge bosons remain non-zero.

It appears that in this limit the gauge condition (39) would degenerate to the Landau gauge condition (35). This would appear somewhat at odds with the situation discussed above for the ordinary Landau gauge. But this is not quite true. The difference arises from a subtle interchange of limits. In the 't-Hooft-Landau gauge first the global direction is fixed, and then the Landau gauge limit is taken. This corresponds to the sequence (12), while fixing the ordinary Landau gauge corresponds to the limit order (13), yielding the differing results. In this case the explicit breaking by the presence of  $v$  in (39) therefore becomes a spontaneous breaking of the residual global gauge symmetry, in the sense of section 2.5.

As a consequence of the difference between the spontaneously broken case and the metastable case of genuine Landau gauge the masses of the (transverse) gauge bosons in both gauges remain different to all orders in perturbation theory. However, they remain in both gauges also gauge-parameter independent, once zero and once non-zero. But they are not gauge-independent. They can therefore not be physically observable quantities<sup>18</sup>. This fact can be generalized to a larger class of

---

<sup>18</sup>Actually, the Oehme-Zimmermann superconvergence relation [68] suggests also already at the perturbative level that the gauge bosons may not be well-defined observables.



gauges in form of the so-called Nielsen identities [69], which are valid also non-perturbatively: The masses of the gauge bosons are gauge-parameter independent, but not (necessarily) gauge-independent. This will be taken up again in section 4.3.

To distinguish both Landau gauge cases better, it is possible to call the standard gauge a non-aligned gauge and the 't Hooft-Landau gauge limit an aligned gauge, as they differ by the alignment of the (averaged) Higgs field [60].

The other interesting limit of the 't Hooft gauge is the opposite one,  $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ . This gauge sends the masses of the perturbatively unphysical degrees of freedom to infinity, and therefore effectively decouples them from the dynamics of the theory. It is therefore called the unitary gauge<sup>19</sup>. While this procedure is evident at tree-level, this requires great care at loop level. If the masses are sent to infinity before the renormalization scale is removed, the theory is no longer manifestly renormalizable, but requires careful cancellations between newly arising counterterms at every order of perturbation theory [10, 70–74], among other problems [10, 75, 76]. This limit will therefore not be used here, as the emphasis is on non-tree-level physics<sup>20</sup>.

This sets up the perturbative framework to be used in the following. It can be extended along standard lines to include fermions, and other interactions. As this is standard material, it will not be covered here, but can be found, e. g., in [10, 43, 77–80].

### 3.4. The Gribov-Singer ambiguity

While the previous discussion covered fully the gauge-fixed framework in the perturbative case, there is one important problem when continuing it to the non-perturbative case: The Gribov-Singer ambiguity [81–88].

The Gribov-Singer ambiguity is the statement that perturbative gauge-fixing conditions, like the covariant gauges and the 't Hooft gauges, are in general insufficient to define a gauge. The problem is that a condition like the Landau gauge,  $\partial^\mu W_\mu^a = 0$ , has not only one solution, but more than one. This problem

---

<sup>19</sup>In some special cases, like the standard model, the unitary gauge can also be explicitly constructed by performing a special gauge transformation [10]. In the standard-model case, it reads  $\exp(igX/\sqrt{\det X})$ , which explicitly cancels the Goldstone-degrees of freedom. However, this is only possible if the number of gauge bosons matches the number of Goldstone bosons, and will therefore not be used here. It creates unitarity by explicitly compensating the Goldstones and time-like gauge fields by a gauge transformation. Note that it also introduces (gauge) defects at points with  $\det X = 0$ , see also section 4.1. The latter do not arise in the limit prescription, indicating a possibility for a non-analyticity at  $1/\xi = 0$ .

<sup>20</sup>Formally, this gauge can be defined also in non-perturbative calculations, e. g. lattice calculations. But this still requires dealing with the renormalization issues, if not only renormalization-group-invariant quantities are studied.



does not appear in perturbation theory because these additional solutions are field-configurations which cannot be written as a power series in the gauge coupling, and are therefore not seen in perturbation theory [81]. Consequently, this does not affect perturbative calculations, but may be important beyond perturbation theory. Also, this implies that two gauge copies satisfying the same gauge condition, but are not connected by a perturbative gauge transformation, need to be separated by a non-infinitesimal, i. e. large gauge transformation [81].

The origin of the appearance of such gauge transformations can be tracked back to the geometrical properties of non-Abelian gauge theories [82], showing also why it is absent from Abelian gauge theories. This also shows that it is not possible to solve the Gribov-Singer ambiguity using any gauge condition which is local [82], i. e. perturbative. In terms of differential geometry the problem arises because the atlas of non-Abelian Lie groups contains at least two coordinate systems, and the transition functions between the coordinate systems need to be included in the construction of gauge conditions to uniquely single out gauge copies<sup>21</sup>. This is a global problem, and can therefore not be solved by a local gauge condition. In operational terms this is, e. g., seen by the fact that the Faddeev-Popov determinant develops zero modes, and therefore an operation like (36) is no longer admissible without dealing with the zero modes explicitly.

This problem is independent of the matter content of the gauge theory, and therefore also affects the Yang-Mills-Higgs systems. There is no argument known, why the Gribov-Singer ambiguity should be any less relevant [86, 89–97], as long as the BEH effect is not operational, and this is also confirmed by lattice calculations [91].

However, this appears to change when the BEH effect is active [89–98]. While there is not yet a full understanding of why this is the case, the following reasoning can be given [90]. Consider the Landau-gauge condition (35) for a theory in which the gauge group is fully broken, i. e. the little group is trivial. The Landau gauge condition can be reformulated using the functional [86, 99]

$$F[W_\mu^a] = \int d^d x W_\mu^a W_\mu^a. \quad (49)$$

The extrema and inflection points of this functional satisfy the Landau gauge condition [99]. In particular, the gauge orbit containing the trivial vacuum  $W_\mu^a = 0$  is an (absolute) minimum of (49). In fact, every gauge orbit has, up to topological identification, a unique absolute minimum [83–85, 99], which is at the same time also the Gribov copy closest to the trivial vacuum. The set of these absolute minima

---

<sup>21</sup>The simplest example is SU(2), which is isomorphic to the surface of a three-sphere. Any single coordinate system leaves at least one point, usually a pole, ill-defined.

forms the so-called fundamental modular region [84, 85, 99], a convex and bounded region.

Considering now an aligned Landau gauge, the alignment does not change the functional (49), as it is invariant under global gauge transformations. Since all gauge fields received a mass, their long-distance fluctuations are suppressed, up to irrelevant quantum noise. Take the field configuration closest to the vacuum. Taking the limit of infinite gauge boson masses, all gauge transformations

$$W_\mu^a \rightarrow W_\mu^a + \partial_\mu \omega^a + ig f^{abc} W_\mu^b \omega^c$$

become essentially Abelian, as the non-trivial part of the transformation are suppressed, as the gauge-fields fall off very fast due to the large mass. But Abelian transformations cannot create a Gribov copy. And all remaining Abelian gauge transformations are already taken care of by the perturbative gauge condition. Thus, all Gribov copies move, essentially, too infinity, and are no longer reachable. Thus, in the limit of infinite gauge boson mass, the Gribov-Singer ambiguity should become quantitatively irrelevant.

While this argument is more hand-waving, indeed in lattice simulations [91] no Gribov copies are anymore found when the BEH effect is active. However, these investigations have been rather exploratory, and the methods used to search for Gribov copies have been the same as when the BEH effect is not active. It may even be that this is therefore an algorithmic shortcoming. Still, this is the best available evidence in favor of the arguments of [90] so far.

The non-aligned versions will not be different, as the gauge bosons are still found to obtain a non-zero mass [91]. There are not yet systematic investigations what happens when including the Higgs field in the gauge condition, i. e. at  $\xi > 0$ , (39), but there is no obvious argument how this should alter the situation<sup>22</sup>.

If the gauge condition does not fully fix the gauge, there remains a residual gauge group. If the residual gauge group is Abelian, the argument is essentially the same, as Abelian gauge theories have no Gribov-Singer ambiguity<sup>23</sup> [89, 90]. However, if the residual gauge group is non-Abelian, it can be expected that some remnant of the Gribov-Singer ambiguity survives. Which form it then takes has not been investigated, but may be relevant, e. g., for grand-unified theories [79, 102, 103].

All of the above gives only arguments why the Gribov-Singer ambiguity is quan-

---

<sup>22</sup>The special unitary gauge for the standard model case [10] seems to avoid the Gribov problem. However, their role is taken over by the gauge defects, as they have also to be treated to define the gauge fully. In this way the ambiguity arises again, as it does in all purely perturbative gauges.

<sup>23</sup>Note that on a finite lattice even Abelian gauge theories have a Gribov-Singer ambiguity, but this is a lattice artifact vanishing in the thermodynamic limit [100, 101].

tatively irrelevant. Even if this the case, a unique gauge condition can still not be formulated, because the structural reason is not resolved. This has bearing on the spectrum of the theory, as will be discussed in section 4.

### 3.5. Lattice formulation

Yang-Mills-Higgs theories suffer from the same problems as almost all interacting quantum field theories: There are no exact solutions. However, it is possible to obtain a number of exact statements using a lattice-regularized form of it. Also, many of the following results will be genuinely non-perturbative in nature, and thus required corresponding non-perturbative methods. So far, lattice has been the most used method for this purpose. Thus, it is worthwhile to introduce here the lattice regularized version of the theory.

The simplest lattice discretization of the Lagrangian (42) is on an Euclidean hypercubic<sup>24</sup> lattice with lattice spacing  $a$  and size  $N^d$ . A suitable definition of the discretized theory is given by [104]

$$S = \sum_x \left( \phi^\dagger(x)\phi(x) + \gamma(\phi^\dagger(x)\phi(x) - 1)^2 - \kappa \sum_{\pm\mu} \phi(x)^\dagger U_\mu^R(x) \phi(x + \mu) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{\beta}{d_F} \sum_{\mu < \nu} \Re \text{tr} (1 - U(x)_{\mu\nu}) \right) \quad (50)$$

$$U(x)_{\mu\nu} = U_\mu(x) U_\nu(x + \mu) U_\mu(x + \nu)^\dagger U_\nu(x)^\dagger \quad (51)$$

$$U_\mu(x) = \exp(iW_\mu^a \sigma_a) \quad (52)$$

$$\beta = \frac{2C_F}{g^2} \quad (53)$$

$$-a^2(2\lambda v^2) = \frac{1 - 2\gamma}{\kappa} - 2d \quad (54)$$

$$\frac{1}{2\lambda} = \frac{\kappa^2}{2\gamma}. \quad (55)$$

In comparison to (42) some constant terms have been added. Note that also the fields are rescaled by  $1/\sqrt{\beta}$  for the gauge field and  $1/\sqrt{\kappa}$  for the Higgs field. The parameter  $\kappa$  is known as the hopping parameter.  $C_F$  is the fundamental Casimir of the gauge group, for  $SU(N)$   $C_F = N$ . The  $U_\mu^R$  correspond to the group elements, depending on the representation  $R$  of the Higgs fields. For the fundamental representation,  $U^R = U$  and thus are just the ordinary links (52). In the adjoint representation,  $U_{bc}^A = \text{tr} \left( T^b U_\mu^\dagger T^c U_\mu \right) / 2$  holds, where  $T^a$  are the generators of the group in

---

<sup>24</sup>In practice often asymmetric lattices with an elongated time direction are used. This will be noted if relevant.

the fundamental representation, and so on. The notation  $x + \mu$  denotes a lattice site shifted from  $x$  by a vector  $\mu$  of length  $a$ .

Many differences are a straightforward consequence of the discrete lattice. But not all. The most important difference to the continuum formulation is that by (52) the algebra-valued gauge field  $W_\mu^a$  is in the lattice formulation replaced by the group-valued link variables  $U_\mu$  as dynamical variables. This is particularly important as there are different groups belonging to the same algebra, differing by discrete center groups [43]. Thus, a choice must be made which of those different groups is selected.

This is even more relevant, as not every choice gives consistent, single-valued fields [43], depending on the field contents and representations in a theory. This issues becomes constraining for the full standard model, and many extensions of it, as there the choice of group is fixed because of the fermion charge structure [43].

For the particular example (50), this is not a problem, and the usual choice for the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{su}(N)$  is the Lie group  $SU(N)$ . However, in the context of the standard model, it would need to be  $SU(2)/Z_2$  [43]. This subtlety is probably not a quantitatively important effect, as can be seen from the fact that QCD lattice simulations, despite using the group  $SU(3)$  rather than the correct group  $SU(3)/Z_3$  [43], show a remarkable agreement with experiment [105, 106]. But this choice can be quite decisive for the efficiency of numerical simulations, which is e. g., seen when comparing  $SU(2)$  to  $SU(2)/Z_2 \approx SO(3)$  [107–110]<sup>25</sup>. Therefore, almost all lattice simulations of (50) so far used either  $SU(2)$  or  $SU(3)$ , except for a few cases with the exceptional group  $G_2$  [115]. All of these will be discussed in the following sections.

One of the fundamental advantages of a lattice formulation is that it is not necessary to fix a gauge to perform a calculation or numerical simulations [104–106]. The reason is again the use of the group, rather than the algebra. The compact Lie groups, which appear in theories like (1), have a finite volume. Integrals over compact groups are finite, in contrast to the continuum algebra integrals. Thus, the necessary group integral performed at every lattice site is finite. Then the original reason for fixing a gauge is no longer there, and gauge fixing becomes unnecessary. This does not mean it is impossible or irrelevant. If gauge-dependent quantities should be calculated fixing a gauge is still required. This can be done straightforwardly [86]. But since the lattice formulation is non-perturbative, it is necessary to take the Gribov-Singer ambiguity of section 3.4 fully into account.

---

<sup>25</sup>There exist some early numerical results for Yang-Mills theory for gauge groups  $SU(N)/Z_N$  [111–114]. These were exploratory, and no systematic investigations, especially comparing the same lines-of-constant physics between  $SU(N)$  and  $SU(N)/Z_N$  on large volumes and fine discretization, are yet available.

Of course, that finite integrals appear is due to the lattice regularization only. Once the continuum limit is taken, i. e. the lattice spacing  $a$  is send to zero, the original divergence reappears, and need to be treated in one way or the other. Therefore, the lattice can be considered to not only regularize ultraviolet divergences but also the divergence due to the gauge freedom by requiring only a finite number of finite group integrals.

Note that performing the limit of a lattice theory to a continuum theory is not only because of the reappearing divergences not straightforward [104–106]. In particular, the triviality problem [116] can substantially affect even the possibility to perform such a limit. This will be discussed in more detail in section 6.1. Fortunately, even though it is not necessarily formally possible to reach the continuum limit by removing the lattice cutoff, quantitative effects due to this cutoff can still be suppressed like powers of  $a$  [117, 118]. Therefore, at sufficiently small lattice spacings this problem should not be relevant for low energies. In particular, it should be possible to provide reasonably reliable result for experimentally accessible energies. Note that this is not a problem exclusively applying to the lattice formulation, as for a trivial theory also continuum regulators cannot be removed [116]. In the continuum, essentially the Appelquist-Carrazone theorem [10] enables the use of the theory as a low-energy effective theory, in a very similar way as on the lattice. Thus, in the following the problem will be mostly neglected until section 6.1.

In the following both exact calculations on the lattice and results of numerical Monte Carlo simulations will be discussed. There are many possibilities how to perform numerical simulations for theories like (50) [104, 106]. This kind of technical details will not be dwelt on here, but rather the corresponding original literature will be referred too, except when some particular technicality is central to the point at hand. However, it should be noted that the computation time scales like some power of both the physical volume and the cutoff. To achieve the necessary scale separation to avoid contamination by cutoff effects requires to have all relevant energies and masses sufficiently far away from either regulators,  $1/L \ll m \ll 1/a$ . Given current computer resources, mass hierarchies of about one order of magnitude can be covered. This implies that the standard model’s mass hierarchy of at least 12 orders of magnitude between neutrino masses and the top mass will not be accessible in the foreseeable future in numerical simulations, and these have to contend with subsectors of the whole standard model. Especially, the inclusion of fermions also increases computing times substantially compared to purely bosonic theories even at fixed discretization and lattice volume, essentially because of the Pauli principle [105, 106].

However, even if the computing time would not be an issue, there is an even more fundamental problem with regards to fermions: Parity and charge-parity vio-

lation. A lattice regularization breaks chiral symmetry explicitly [104–106]. As long as chiral symmetry is a global symmetry, this problem can be ameliorated by introducing a differing symmetry, which turns into chiral symmetry in the continuum limit [105, 106]. The weak interaction gauges chiral symmetry, and therefore the naive lattice regularization would introduce a gauge anomaly. It has been speculated that it should also be possible to find a replacement gauge symmetry, which becomes the weak interaction in the continuum limit [119]. And although there exists a number of proposals for such a replacement symmetry [120–123], none of them has been unambiguously shown to be a suitable and sufficiently efficient formulation. Therefore, no lattice simulations with fermions and the weak interactions exist. This problem does not exist for pure Higgs-Yukawa theories, and there parity breaking can be and has been investigated on the lattice [15–20], but this is not subject of this review.

### 3.6. The Higgs vacuum expectation value beyond perturbation theory and Elitzur’s theorem

Having now an accessible non-perturbative formulation of the theory at hand, it is possible to make many of the previous statements more precise. The first, and perhaps most central one, is the absence of a Higgs vacuum expectation value without gauge fixing, as argued for in section 3.3. The problem posed by the lack of gauge invariance of the vacuum expectation value was recognized early on [124], and shortly after formalized as Elitzur’s theorem [125]. However, in the original construction of Elitzur’s theorem assumptions are made about the analyticity properties of expectation values in external sources, which especially for gauge sources are not necessarily justified [36].

A reformulation of the same argument without sources can be found in [12]. Consider a gauge-invariant measure  $\mathcal{D}\mu$ , which includes the action, and a gauge-dependent quantity  $f(W) \neq f(W)^g$  without any gauge-invariant contribution. Then [12]

$$\langle f(W) \rangle = \int \mathcal{D}\mu f(W) = \int \mathcal{D}\mu^{g^{-1}} f(W) = \int \mathcal{D}\mu f(W^g) = \int \mathcal{D}\mu f(W)^g = \langle f(W)^g \rangle,$$

where  $g$  is an arbitrary gauge transformation. Since, by assumption,  $f$  is gauge-dependent, the equality can only be satisfied if  $\langle f(W) \rangle = \langle f(W)^g \rangle = 0$ . The Higgs vacuum expectation value is just a particular case, and therefore needs to vanish. Note that gauge-fixing modifies the measure such that it is no longer gauge-invariant, as discussed in section 3.3, and then this argument does no longer hold. On a finite (Euclidean) lattice, this is a well-defined expression, as the path integral can be decomposed into ordinary Riemann integrals. Thus this statement is correct and exact. This has consequently been confirmed in numerical lattice calculations [39, 60].



Even more, with the same argument it can be shown that any quantity which is not invariant under some subgroup or coset of the gauge group also vanishes identically [12]. This will be of particular importance in sections 3.9 and 4.7.2.

Reversing the argument, if a gauge condition leaves some subgroup or coset of the gauge group untouched, the measure is still invariant under this subgroup or coset. Then, by the same argument, any quantity not invariant under the subgroup or coset still vanishes. An example are the non-aligned gauges in section 3.3, where any quantity not invariant under global gauge transformations still vanishes. The latter is consequently also seen in lattice simulations [60].

There is one loophole in this argument. This loophole is whether the result has implications for the continuum theory, provided the latter exists in a mathematically strict sense at all. If the theory exists in the continuum limit, the argument requires that the path integral is well-defined even without gauge-fixing in the continuum<sup>26</sup>. This is yet unknown, and even for non-interacting theories the individual integrals have to be extended from Riemann integrals to Ito integrals [33]<sup>27</sup>. However, this question pertains to all lattice simulations, as they are performed without gauge-fixing [104–106]. It is therefore assumed henceforth that such a construction is possible. Thus, under this assumption, the Higgs vacuum expectation value is indeed zero without gauge-fixing. Support for this assumption is provided by a limited number of investigations in which in continuum theories calculations without gauge fixing have been performed, yielding the same results as in the gauge-fixed setup [126–129]. While this does not constitute a proof, it is encouraging.

### 3.7. The phase diagram and the Osterwalder-Seiler-Fradkin-Shenker construction

The previous section concluded that the Higgs vacuum expectation value is not a suitable order parameter for the Higgs effect, as its value can be zero or non-zero, depending on the choice of gauge. Any other gauge-dependent order parameter for the BEH effect will suffer from the same problem. In particular, for any order parameter constructed by utilizing some remnant (global) symmetry there will always be gauges with or without such a symmetry, and thus different behaviors. In fact, it was found that utilizing different remnant symmetries to detect the BEH effect yields differing points in the phase diagram where the BEH effect appears or vanishes [39, 130].

---

<sup>26</sup>Alternatively, the continuum limit can be defined only for expectation values. Then their calculation can be performed in regularized form, and afterwards the limit is taken [32]. In a sense, this is also what is done in perturbation theory.

<sup>27</sup>Note that also the Wick rotation to Euclidean space-time can only be guaranteed for gauge-invariant quantities [32]. For gauge-dependent quantities the indefiniteness of the state space has yet prevented a final answer.

On the other hand, there are regions in parameter space where the theory is expected to behave like a scalar version of QCD, which is also confirmed in explicit lattice calculations [91, 131–134]. This also includes phenomena like confinement in the same sense as in QCD. In fact, there are multiple arguments both perturbative [10, 67, 135] and non-perturbative [63, 69, 124, 136–141] that, in fixed gauges, both regimes are qualitatively different. Especially, gauge-dependent correlation functions are expected to change discontinuously between the regimes. Even for this lattice support exists [133]. Hence the question remains if there is a physical difference between both cases.

This naturally raises the question whether there is then a gauge-invariant order parameter for the BEH effect. But the answer is no. This hope is shattered conceptually by the Osterwalder-Seiler-Fradkin-Shenker (OSFS) construction [14, 32, 142–144].

To understand the OSFS construction<sup>28</sup>, consider the lattice model<sup>29</sup> (50) in the limit of  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$  for the standard-model case. The Higgs fields are then fixed to be unimodular,  $\phi^\dagger \phi = 1$ , and there are no length fluctuations. Note that the value of  $\gamma$  does never induce an explicit symmetry breaking, and therefore the arguments given in section 2 when taking limits of coupling constants do not apply. Of course, there could be other kinds of non-analyticities, and therefore here explicitly the limit is taken, rather than selecting the unimodular theory from the outset.

Since the length is fixed to be non-zero, it is safe to use the decomposition (31). Thus, the Higgs fields are now  $SU(2)$  group elements. The following argument can be extended to any case where also the links and the Higgs fields can be written as elements of the same group. However, this necessarily implies that it will not be applicable if only a partly breaking, in the sense of perturbation theory and section 3.9, is possible.

In this situation it is possible to perform a gauge transformation

$$g = \alpha^{-1}$$

which implies  $gX = 1$ , and thus this gauge transformation explicitly eliminates all Higgs fields. In vector notation, this is a transformation to a constant vector. This is always possible, and  $\alpha = 1$  can therefore be implemented as a gauge condition. This is equivalent to choosing the unitary gauge. Due to the fixed length, this is possible without gauge defects, and the gauge is also non-perturbatively, and on the lattice,

---

<sup>28</sup>The central arguments are given in [142]. The outline here follows [143].

<sup>29</sup>The same construction can also be performed using the continuum action (30) in continuum notation, but also using implicitly a suitable ultraviolet regulator. To emphasize this necessity here the lattice action is used.



well-defined.

In this way, the action becomes an expression only involving the links. In fact, the theory becomes gauge-fixed and operates on new links defined as  $V_\mu = \alpha(x)U_\mu(x)\alpha(x+\mu)^{-1}$ . This yields

$$S = -\kappa H(V_\mu) - \beta S_{\text{YM}},$$

where  $H$  contains the Higgs part of the action in this gauge, and  $S_{\text{YM}}$  is the ordinary Yang-Mills part of this action. In both cases the parameters are factored out to make them explicit in the following. The expectation value of a gauge-invariant operator takes the form

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \frac{\int \Pi_{x,\mu} dV_\mu(x) \mathcal{O} e^{-\kappa H(V_\mu) - \beta S_{\text{YM}}}}{\int \Pi_{x,\mu} dV_\mu(x) e^{-\kappa H(V_\mu) - \beta S_{\text{YM}}}} = \frac{\int \Pi_{x,\mu} dV_\mu(x) e^{-\kappa H(V_\mu)} \mathcal{O} e^{-\beta S_{\text{YM}}}}{\int \Pi_{x,\mu} dV_\mu(x) e^{-\kappa H(V_\mu)} e^{-\beta S_{\text{YM}}}}.$$

Now, consider the Higgs part of the action. Since the Higgs fields are gone, the expression involving Higgs fields in (50) will give the smallest action for  $V_\mu = 1$ . Thus, for  $\kappa$  large, links close to unity will dominate the action. This incidentally also maximizes the Yang-Mills part of the action, and the expression  $e^{\beta S_{\text{YM}}}$  will be close to one. A similar statement holds also true if  $\beta$  is small. Thus, for now in the following assume that either  $\beta$  is small or  $\kappa$  is large.

Expanding

$$e^{-\beta S_{\text{YM}}} = \Pi_{x,\mu\nu}(1 + \rho_{\mu\nu}),$$

then  $\rho_{\mu\nu}$  is, to leading order, the plaquette (51). Note that on a finite lattice, the action is always finite, and therefore without neglecting terms this expression is well-defined. Thus, the expansion describes all possible, more complicated, plaquettes, very similar to a strong-coupling expansion [104]. In addition, any gauge-invariant operator can necessarily also be written as some expression involving only the plaquettes [104]. This yields [142]

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \frac{\int \Pi_{x,\mu} dV_\mu(x) e^{-\kappa H(V_\mu)} \mathcal{O} \Pi_{x,\mu\nu}(1 + \rho_{\mu\nu})}{\int \Pi_{x,\mu\nu} dV_\mu(x) e^{-\kappa H(V_\mu)} \Pi_{x,\mu\nu}(1 + \rho_{\mu\nu})}$$

Up to the term involving  $H$ , the whole expression can therefore be considered as a sum of expressions involving only some arrangements  $\mathcal{Q}$  of plaquettes, and afterwards summing over all such sets  $\mathcal{Q}$ . The crucial next step is that there is an upper bound [142]

$$\int \Pi_{x,\mu\nu \in \mathcal{Q}} dV_\mu(x) e^{-\kappa H(V_\mu)} \mathcal{O} \Pi_{x,\mu\nu} \rho_{\mu\nu} < c_1 c_2^n,$$

where the  $c_i$  are some finite constants and  $n$  is the number of plaquettes in the set  $\mathcal{Q}$ . On a finite lattice, both  $n$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  are always finite. In particular, the number of sets

$Q$  as well as the number of sets without this set grows less than exponentially fast. That follows from the geometry of the lattice.

The combination of these statements allows to bound the partition function by a geometric series, provided  $\kappa$  is sufficiently large [142, 143]. This implies uniform convergence of the series expansion of the partition function to the infinite-volume, and thus thermodynamic, limit. Therefore the free energy is an analytic function of both  $\beta$  and  $\kappa$  in the infinite-volume limit in the whole quantum phase diagram. However, if it is analytic, there is no phase transition separating the phase diagram in two (or more) parts. It is therefore possible to reach any point from any other point without crossing a phase boundary, and thus there is no qualitative distinction.

This does not imply that there is no phase transition at all in the phase diagram. Only that it can be circumvented, and thus it is either an isolated singularity or a cut with an endpoint, like the liquid-gas transition in nuclear matter or water. Therefore, there can exist no observable order parameter to distinguish BEH effect-type physics and QCD-like physics. Both are physically qualitatively indistinguishable, and any difference can thus only be gauge-dependent and/or quantitative. This picture is confirmed in lattice investigations, as will be discussed in section 3.8. As stated in [14], if driven to the extreme the qualitative distinction between QCD-like physics and BEH physics could be regarded as a pure gauge artifact.

While these insights concur with the picture developed in earlier sections, there are a number of caveats to be made.

The first is that the proof only works for theories in which the gauge group is fully broken by the BEH effect. In theories where this is not possible, the phase diagram can be separated into distinct phases. An example is the case of  $SU(2)$  with an adjoint Higgs, where the phase diagram decomposes into two phases [145]. The two phases are distinguished by a metastability with respect to the global center symmetry, i. e. whether the custodial  $Z_2$  symmetry carried by the adjoint Higgs fields can be broken. The phases with or without show similar behavior like the low-temperature and high-temperature phase of pure  $SU(N)$  Yang-Mills theory, and can therefore be associated with different realizations of confinement in the Wilson sense<sup>30</sup>. The phase with broken center symmetry manifests also features of the BEH effect [93, 145–147]. However, there is still no gauge-invariant Higgs vacuum expec-

---

<sup>30</sup>There exists a recent proposal for a conjectured criterion between the Wilson criterion and the statement that confinement is essentially equivalent to gauge invariance, based on the center of the gauge group [138]. It also implies that there would be a physical distinction between the BEH effect and QCD. However, it yet requires further scrutiny before a final conclusion can be reached, and there are quite substantial hurdles to be taken to achieve this [14].

tation value, and the gauge-invariant physics is quite subtle [148, 149].

Of course, as soon as there are more complicated Higgs sectors, and thus more parameters, the argument also breaks down, even if the gauge group is fully broken by the BEH effect. The theory may then become quite involved with a rich phase structure [78, 150–153]. This issue will be returned to in section 4.7.

The second is that in the construction the length of the Higgs field was frozen, by  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ . No similar proof is available at finite  $\gamma$ . It is therefore possible, at least in principle, that there exists a surface  $\gamma(\beta, \kappa)$ , which cuts through the whole three-dimensional phase diagram of the theory, separating two phases. This does not spoil the general statement that there is no difference between BEH-like physics and QCD-like physics, as both are present at  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ . But it allows for a more complicated structure, and additional phases<sup>31</sup>.

A third important issue is the following: A special role is played by the boundaries of the phase diagram. At  $\beta = 0$  the gauge degrees of freedom decouple, yielding the ungauged  $\phi^4$  theory. At  $\kappa = 0$  the Higgs degrees of freedom decouple, yielding Yang-Mills theory. Only  $\gamma = 0$  does not decouple the two sectors. On a finite lattice, the limit to the first two cases are continuous<sup>32</sup>. In a continuum theory, this cannot be expected, due to Haag’s theorem [154]: The corresponding Hilbert spaces are not unitarily equivalent. Therefore, there can be non-analyticities on the boundaries in the thermodynamics limit. To avoid this unnecessary complication, in the present context only the interior of the phase diagram, including the limits of any of the coupling constants to zero, will be considered.

The fourth is again that this construction was performed using the lattice as a regulator, and the usual caveats concerning the continuum limit apply.

### 3.8. The phase diagram from the lattice

While the arguments of section 3.7 show that the quantum phase diagram, at least for some cases, can have no qualitative distinction, there can be still almost arbitrarily large quantitative distinctions. Thus, the actual form of the phase diagram is very important. Consequently, there is a long history of its investigation, especially with, but not limited to, lattice methods [39, 117, 130–132, 134, 146, 151, 155–177]. These results will be reviewed in the following.

Almost all of these investigations have been performed in four dimensions for the standard model case [39, 117, 130–132, 134, 157–162, 165–171, 174, 175, 177], and

---

<sup>31</sup>Note that the arguments that the gauge symmetry must remain unbroken still apply [125, 154], and thus only gauge-invariant quantities will have non-zero expectation values without gauge fixing.

<sup>32</sup>This has been explicitly seen, e. g. for the finite temperature phase transition, which can be continuously deformed on a finite lattice from the  $\phi^4$  case to the BEH theory to pure Yang-Mills theory [115].

only very few addressed other cases [151, 155, 156, 163, 164, 172, 173, 176, 178–181]. Therefore, this case will be treated first.

The first question is how to define a phase change, if there is no qualitative distinction. This problem can be addressed by using various quantities. Preferable are thermodynamic observables, most of all the free energy but also susceptibilities or generalized heat capacities are valuable. These can be unambiguously defined. But also less well defined, probably even scheme dependent quantities are useful. In




Figure 1: A sketch of the (conjectured) Higgs sector phase diagram. The sheet is a surface of first order transitions, which may terminate in the bulk by a line of second-order phase transitions for all values of  $\gamma$ . Based on the results of subsection 4.5.1, the separation surface shown in the top panel of figure 3 below should actually be the actual sheet.

The first results had been indeed quite similar [157–162, 166] to the expectations of section 3.7<sup>33</sup>. They showed a simply connected phase diagram. However, it was found that there exists still a phase transition of first order, starting at the  $\beta = \infty$  axis, and extending into the phase diagram up to a critical line, but extending through the whole phase diagram as a sheet of transitions. I. e. for every value of  $\gamma$  existed a line  $\beta(\kappa)$ , starting from a critical point  $\beta_c$  to  $\beta = \infty$ .

<sup>33</sup>A similar picture is also found for the Abelian case [183].

Later investigations at  $\gamma = \infty$  showed that finite-volume effects were underestimated, but did not change the picture qualitatively [170, 171]. In these investigations a critical end-point was located at  $\beta_c \approx 2.727$  and  $\kappa_c \approx 0.7089$ , indicating a continuum limit. The nature of this continuum limit, whether trivial or not, has not yet been studied in appreciable detail.

While the value of this endpoint  $\beta_c$  seems to be quite similar at all values of  $\gamma$ , the value for  $\kappa$  seems to decrease with decreasing  $\gamma$ . However, this sheet of phase transitions has not yet been completely charted. A sketch of the phase diagram is shown in figure 1. Note that there are also arguments pointing to a possible second critical end-point, and thus second-order phase transition, at  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ , and  $\gamma \rightarrow 0$  from functional methods [174, 177]. There is not yet any systematic investigation of this using lattice simulation. This point will be taken up again in section 6.1.

Unfortunately, this phase diagram gives very little insight into the distinction of regions of the phase diagram with a BEH-like physics in suitable gauges and regions where QCD-like physics is encountered in (any) fixed gauge.

This is indeed not possible. As alluded to previously, it turns out that the question depends on the choice of gauge [39]. The origin of this comes from the fact that it is possible to define gauges with distinctively different residual global gauge symmetries. An example is given by the case of the non-aligned Landau gauge and the non-aligned Coulomb gauge. As noted in section 3.3, there is never a Higgs vacuum expectation value in non-aligned gauges. But, it is still possible to define a criterion for metastability, as discussed in section 2.3. In non-aligned Landau gauge this is [38, 39]

$$Q_L = \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \left| \sum_x \phi(x) \right|^2 \right\rangle \quad (56)$$

essentially the lattice version of (14). On a finite lattice, this quantity is always finite. If the theory in non-aligned Landau gauge is metastable, this quantity vanishes as the volume goes to infinity, and in fact as  $1/V$ . In Coulomb gauge, it is possible to use [39, 184]

$$Q_C = \frac{1}{2N_t V_{d-1}^2} \sum_t \left\langle \text{tr} \left( \sum_{\vec{x}, \vec{y}} U_0(t, \vec{x})^\dagger U_0(t, \vec{y}) \right) \right\rangle \quad (57)$$

where  $U_0$  are the temporal link variables, and which vanishes as  $1/V_{d-1}$  in the infinite volume limit if there is no metastability. The important difference of both (56) and (57) to  $\langle \phi \rangle$  is that they are inherently non-local.

This behavior is illustrated for the Landau gauge in figure 2. It is also shown that in a non-aligned Landau gauge the Higgs vacuum expectation value always vanishes.




Figure 2: The top left panel shows (56) at a point in the QCD-like domain ( $\beta = 2.4728$ ,  $\kappa = 0.2939$ ,  $\gamma = 1.088$ , closed symbols) and the BEH-like domain ( $\beta = 2.7984$ ,  $\kappa = 0.2954$ ,  $\gamma = 1.370$ , open symbols) [185]. The right-hand side shows the expectation value of the Higgs components in a non-aligned Landau gauge [60, 185] at the same points. Note how indistinguishable the behavior in both cases is. Shown are individually the four real components. Errors are statistical errors only, and are smaller than the symbol size on the left-hand side. The lower panel shows the phase diagram seen from different gauges using (56) and (57), from [39] (Reprinted with permission. Copyright (2007) by the American Physical Society). Note that in this plot  $\gamma = \kappa$  and the investigation is performed in the limit  $\phi^\dagger \phi = 1$ , i. e. proper  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ .

In the bottom panel of figure 2 the result of sketching the phase diagram at  $\gamma = \infty$  in nonaligned Landau gauge and Coulomb gauge, using (56) and (57), respectively, is shown [39]. It is seen that at small  $\beta$ , substantially below the possible critical endpoint, a phase transition is signaled in  $Q_L$  and  $Q_C$  but the location differs. Only if there is actually a physical phase transition at larger  $\beta$  [170, 171], the transition in both gauges start to coincide. This is not unexpected, as here all quantities, gauge-dependent and gauge-invariant, have non-analyticities. On the other hand, this implies that  $Q_C$  and  $Q_L$  show gauge-dependent pseudo-phase transitions even if there is no physical phase transition. Thus, fixed-gauge results on phase transitions do not necessarily coincide with a physical phase transition and/or with transitions in other gauges. Thus, phase transitions need to be seen always in gauge-invariant observables to justify the label of a phase transition.

Note that while this demonstrates that a phase transition in a fixed gauge does not need to coincide with a physical phase transition, this does not necessarily imply the converse. However, it appears likely that if there are non-analyticities in gauge-invariant observables there will also be non-analyticities in gauge-dependent observables, but there is no proof of this yet. In particular, the question is not yet resolved whether there are regions in the phase diagram, where in all gauges metastability is (not) observed. While this would still not deliver an order parameter, this would be an important step in fixing the regions where perturbation theory could be performed [11].

This also implies that the standard methods in perturbation theory to detect a phase transition, i. e. using the Higgs vacuum expectation value [135], cannot be expected to identify the phase transition. That this may still work in some cases and some gauges is due to a subtle effect to be discussed in section 4. From figure 2 it is, however, already clear that this can only work if there is an actual phase transition.

Finally, this emphasizes the results of section 3.7 that there is no qualitative distinction between the two regions in the phase diagram. Therefore, these will not be denoted as phases, but rather as QCD-like domains and BEH-like domains. As is seen, the distinction cannot be sharp, and depends on the gauge at hand.

For theories with a single fundamental Higgs field for the gauge groups SU(2) [134] and SU(3) [176] the phase diagram has been mapped using the order parameter (56) on the lattice. The result is shown in figures 3 and 4. For the range of parameters plotted there is a clear distinction between both regions. Since there is not yet an equally good identification of physical transitions in this theory, or in other gauges, it is hard to predict where a physical separation is. However, this is actually far less of a problem for phenomenology as it may appear at first, as will be discussed in section 4. Also, the results only cover a portion of the phase diagram, and a full map is, naturally, not available from lattice simulations. Interestingly, the






Figure 3: The gauge-fixed phase diagram according to (56) in non-aligned Landau gauge for SU(2) (top panel) and SU(3) (bottom panel). Red points are in the BEH-like domain and blue points in the QCD-like domain [134, 185].






Figure 4: The same as figure 4, but after translating the parameters to the continuum according to (53-55). For SU(2), the dimensionful parameter is normalized to the mass of the lightest excitation in the  $0^+$  singlet channel. For SU(3), it is given in lattice units, as not in all cases spectroscopically data is available. For details on the spectroscopy see section 4.

situation in the snapshots for the phase diagram differs for SU(2) and SU(3). For SU(2), there is a sheet-like separation structure, where the QCD-like domain starts for all  $\gamma$  and  $\beta$  at  $\kappa = 1/8$ , i. e. the tree-level massless case. Then, at larger  $\kappa$ , the Higgs-like domain is present if  $\gamma$  is smaller than a critical value, where the critical value depends on  $\kappa$ . In the SU(3) case, the situation is somewhat similar, but seems to rise more quickly. Qualitatively, both look as in the sketch depicted in figure 1. The situation is similar in the continuum case shown in figure 4. Thus, it is really the strength of the four-Higgs coupling, rather than the gauge-coupling or ‘deepness’ of the potential at tree-level, which determines the domain the theory is in. But, eventually, even in the limit  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ , there is a critical depth of the potential after which the theory is for any  $\kappa$  in the BEH-like domain.




Figure 5: The running gauge coupling in the miniMOM scheme [186] for different physical situations and different lattice cutoffs [133, 185]. Note that the details of the physics in the QCD-like systems and BEH-like systems are not identical, as they do show, e. g., different masses in the spectrum [133], explaining their different behaviors.

Note that while the results are from a gauge-dependent order parameter, this parameter shows to the best of our knowledge also always a transition if there is a true phase transition. This turning into a genuine phase transition will happen for a sufficiently large  $\beta$ , about 2.73, corresponding to a sufficiently weak gauge coupling of  $\alpha = g^2/(4\pi) \approx 0.117$  for SU(2) [170, 171], though the exact value depends also on the other parameters. However, it is important to note that this is a bare (lattice) coupling. The actual running gauge coupling in the miniMOM scheme [186] is shown, for some sample systems, in figure 5. It is noteworthy that, while it is generically larger for the QCD-like cases at low momenta, already at intermediate momenta at about a few hundred GeV there is not necessarily a large difference. In fact, the difference between different BEH-like or QCD-like points in the phase diagram can be

larger than between QCD-like points and Higgs-like points. Nonetheless, it is found that the running coupling at sufficiently large momenta is in all cases entirely determined by one-loop (resummed) perturbation theory [133]. It is therefore important to keep in mind that the bare quantities of figures 3 and 4 do not allow to conclude the physical properties of a point.




Figure 6: A sample lines of constant physics, fixed by the value of the lightest state in the scalar singlet and vector triplet channel (see section 4 for details) and the value of the running coupling in the miniMOM scheme at 200 GeV. The lattice spacing decreases from  $(131 \text{ GeV})^{-1}$  to  $(440 \text{ GeV})^{-1}$  towards larger  $\beta$  values.

It should also be noted that, in principle, it is necessary to construct lines of constant physics [104–106] to follow a fixed set of physical parameters to the continuum limit, or at least to a large cutoff. Unfortunately, the physical properties of the theory turn out to be very sensitive to the values of the bare parameters, especially to  $\kappa$ . This is a sign of the fine-tuning problem to be discussed in section 6.2. It has therefore not yet been possible to follow any line of constant physics for any large number of points. An example of a short trajectory is shown in figure 6. It is noteworthy that in most cases identified short trajectories seem to proceed towards larger  $\beta$ , and  $\kappa$  becoming closer to  $1/8$  for decreasing  $a$ . Such a tendency is actually predicted in

studies using the functional renormalization group [174, 177], which also require  $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ . In fact, they predict an interacting, asymptotically free continuum theory in this limit. Whether this is indeed the case remains to be seen.

Another important lesson to be learned from the results comes from studying the parameter range where QCD-like physics is observed. The plots in figures 2, 3, and 4 all cover only a region of the phase diagram where at the cutoff the classical potential has either a vanishing quadratic term, equivalent to  $\kappa = 1/8$ , or where it has the characteristic wine-bottle-bottom shape. Thus, in a large region of the phase diagram quantum fluctuations drive the system out of the BEH regime and into a QCD-like regime, in contrast to the expectations from perturbation theory [10, 135]. In particular, this occurs for essentially any value of the gauge coupling and the four-Higgs coupling. Thus this happens even at weak coupling, where naively perturbation theory is expected to work. Thus, quantum fluctuations are not negligible, and the decision where BEH-like physics prevails in a given gauge cannot always be answered by a tree-level calculation. Even if quantum corrections are taken into account perturbatively [135, 187] this may still not be sufficient. In such cases non-perturbative methods are necessary. There is not yet any unambiguous prediction under which conditions the quantum fluctuations will alter the physics, and care has to be taken. But this effect was already observed in the earliest lattice calculations [159–161].

Note that if there are additional Higgs fields it is possible to find different physical phases due to a breaking/metastability of the custodial symmetries [78, 150]. This possibility has been confirmed in lattice simulations [151, 172]. However, these various phases may, or may not be connected to the presence of a BEH effect in any given gauge, a question essentially unexplored beyond perturbation theory.

Of course, once even more fields of different types are added, the structure of the phase diagram becomes quickly very involved. Except for some simulations including a U(1) sector [188–191] little exists so far in terms of lattice simulations. At infinite Higgs self-coupling they indicate a separation into two phases with one having the structure expected in the standard model [192]. This problem becomes even more severe when it comes to fermions, where little is known, due to a lack of a lattice representation. There are some investigations using functional methods of such theories, but focusing on a field content which makes the effective interaction strength weak [193, 194]. There are, of course, many results using perturbation theory [78, 135, 150]. But they are, for the reasons discussed above, not suitable as they are in fixed gauges and/or cannot guarantee the absence of a shift of the transition non-perturbatively. There are also many results for supersymmetric theories [195], where such questions can be (partly) solved analytically. This is beyond the scope of this review. However, it is important to note that the arguments about a

lack of gauge invariance also pertains to supersymmetric theories, if only vacuum expectation values are used.

### 3.9. *The phase diagram for multiple breaking patterns*

If the Higgs is not in the fundamental representation then an additional problem arises. Perturbatively, it is now possible that even a potential renormalizable by power counting allows for multiple, different minima. This begs the question whether these multiple minima can be associated with different physical phases.

To understand, how this could come about, consider the following, arguably simplest, case: Take a Higgs field in the adjoint representation, with gauge group  $SU(N \geq 3)$ . Take the potential to explicitly conserve the  $Z_2$  symmetry  $\phi \rightarrow -\phi$ . Given the most general such potential, a perturbative tree-level analysis shows that different Higgs vacuum expectation values are possible, each one leaving a different  $S(U(P) \times U(N - P))$  subgroup of the gauge group invariant [44–46, 148]. Thus, there are  $N/2$ , rounded down, breaking patterns. Note that the ranks of the little groups, and thus the size of the Cartans, play an important role in determining the number of different little groups [43].

Naively applying the arguments of sections 2 and 3.6 would lead one to think at first that an external influence would be necessary to select a particular of these breaking patterns. Thus, without such an external influence their distinction would be entirely unphysical. But it is more subtle than that.

This subtlety arises in the following way. In the fundamental case, every gauge orbit is either only zero field, or belongs to an orbit with symmetry group  $SU(N - 1)$ , as always a gauge transformation exists which rotates a given scalar field locally into a vector with only a single non-zero component. Thus, there are two strata, and the corresponding symmetry groups,  $SU(N)$  for zero scalar field and  $SU(N - 1)$  otherwise, are the little groups [43]. In this case there is only a single special orbit, the vacuum, and all others behave in the same way.

In the adjoint case, there are not only two strata and little groups, but more. E. g. for the  $SU(3)$  case with adjoint Higgs there are three:  $SU(3)$ ,  $SU(2) \times U(1)$ , and  $U(1) \times U(1)$ . Any value of the Higgs field can have only one of these little groups as invariance groups, and the set of all such orbits is again the corresponding stratum of the little group. Thus, there is no gauge transformation moving a value of the Higgs field from one stratum to another, and belonging to a stratum is a gauge-independent statement. Thus, corresponding gauge-invariant quantities to state this fact exist. These are merely the invariant polynomials of the group and the repre-

sentation [43]. E. g.,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(\Sigma^3) \\ \Sigma = T^a \phi^a \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

yields to which stratum a field locally belongs. In fact, the values are discontinuously different if the field length is normalized.

There is now a twist to this group-theoretical observation in a field theory [148]. The distinction is local. The scalar field is a field, and its value changes from point to point. Especially, a scalar field can belong to any stratum at different space-time points. Thus, the distinction is not meaningful in a global way. Still, because a gauge transformation acts on the Higgs field locally, this feature is again locally gauge-invariant. Thus, the function (58) locally characterizes in the example the stratum of the scalar field.

Likewise, it is possible to characterize the space-time average of any scalar field configuration by the stratum to which it belongs. This will be independent under global gauge transformations. The question is now how this affects the phase diagram. Is this sufficient to distinguish phases?

First of all, this does not affect perturbation theory. Because perturbation theory is a small field expansion, perturbation theory will stay inside a given stratum, by definition, as the characterization in terms of invariants is discontinuous [43].

Secondly, any fixed field configuration will therefore belong to a given stratum. But the full average will again vanish, for the following reason. Inside a stratum, the average over the little group will erase any information which is not invariant with respect to the little group. In addition, it will be averaged over all possible orientations of the stratum inside the full group, yielding again zero for any naive vacuum expectation value.

Can then something like (58) be used? This is, unfortunately, not the case. Though (58) is gauge-invariant, its actual value is determined by weighting the value for every gauge orbit by the exponentiated action, and averaging over the orbits of the different strata. The path integral therefore decomposes into a sum of distinct parts. Each term contains the configurations for which the space-time average can be assigned to any of the strata. Consequently, the value of (58). The final value, will be the sum of these terms. Therefore, the expectation value can, in principle, be continuous throughout the phase diagram of the theory<sup>34</sup>. What actually

---

<sup>34</sup>This is not necessarily so, but this requires either zero prefactors or cancellations. This is not impossible. After all, there is always the QCD-like phase, which technically belongs to the maximum little group, as no direction is preferred. However, the corresponding stratum has measure zero, it is only the vacuum, and it can thus not arise by any other means than cancellation.

happens, and what the actual value of (58) is, depends therefore on the dynamics of the theory.

This can become a serious problem when attempting to fix a gauge like the 't Hooft gauge (39) beyond perturbation theory. If the vector  $f$  in (39) belongs to a given stratum, and the Higgs field at a point  $x$  belongs to a different stratum, then the term  $\phi T f$  vanishes at this point. Thus, at this point the gauge condition degenerates to the covariant gauge condition.

Even more problematic is that the gauge was chosen such that the gauge condition rotates the space-time average of the Higgs field into the direction of  $f$ , which is part of a fixed stratum. This is impossible, as noted above, if the average of a gauge orbit belongs to a different stratum. Thus, the gauge condition cannot be fulfilled on this configuration and, in fact, on the whole gauge orbit. Instead, the orientation of the average remains within the stratum and is not affected. Thus, ultimately, an average over the directions inside the stratum is performed, yielding again a zero expectation value for averages on any gauge orbit belonging to this stratum. Hence, on gauge orbits having an average value belonging not to this stratum the gauge condition (39) degenerates into the covariant gauge condition.

For the calculation of gauge-dependent expectation values this has the following consequence. Given the arguments above, the total vacuum expectation value of the Higgs has still the same direction<sup>35</sup>, as all gauge orbits belonging to the corresponding stratum can still be fixed to satisfy the 't Hooft gauge condition. However, fields belonging to a different stratum do not have a small fluctuation around this vacuum expectation value. Thus, for some gauge-dependent operator  $\mathcal{O}$  holds, symbolically,

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \int \mathcal{D}W \left( \int_{\text{Selected stratum}} \mathcal{D}\phi \mathcal{O} e^{iS} + \int_{\text{Other strata}} \mathcal{D}\phi \mathcal{O} e^{iS} \right) = \langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_s + \langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_o, \quad (59)$$

i. e. it decomposes into two expectation values, of which one is in the selected gauge, while the other is in the corresponding covariant gauge.

There are now two possibilities

- The correlation functions  $\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_o$  is negligible, in a suitable sense, with respect to  $\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_s$ , and therefore the expectation value behaves as if (39) was fulfilled
- This is not the case, and the result is therefore a superposition of both results

What actually happens may depend on the theory and parameter values in question. This is yet unknown. E. g., in the adjoint case, if the global  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  parity is explicitly broken, the absolute minimum always favors the maximal little group [43]. Thus, it is

---

<sup>35</sup>Provided there is no measure-zero problem or cancellations, which will be neglected.



entirely possible that if the potential is metastable with respect to the global symmetry the first case may be appropriate, and then only one of the strata contribute, and otherwise the second. This will require a full non-perturbative investigation to understand better. But as of now only very early exploratory investigations have been made using lattice simulations [164, 178, 179, 196, 197]. Of course, though continuum notation has been used above, also these theories are affected by the possibility of triviality, and may require a regulator like the lattice.

It should be noted that this situation is quite prevalent in supersymmetric theories, especially in the presence of more than one supercharge. In this context the Higgs expectation values are also called moduli and the space of possible breaking patterns moduli spaces [195]. Nothing is yet known about the implications of the above considerations for this class of theories.

#### 4. Mass spectrum and mass gap

The phase diagram has already shown that using gauge-dependent quantities is potentially misleading. This repeats itself, in a very subtle way, in the observable, physical spectrum and the dynamics of the theory. This requires a somewhat more extended introduction.

To start out, it is best to consider the standard approach. Usually [10], the gauge bosons and the Higgs particle, up to components belonging to BRST quartets, are considered as physical particles. Especially, it is assumed that these are the particles which are forming final states<sup>36</sup>. Considering again the standard model case but only the Higgs sector alone this would imply that the Higgs and the  $W/Z$  bosons, which are then stable, would be observable particles.

However, these fields carry an open gauge index. In the QCD-like domain, they would act like partons, and would be expected to be confined. Indeed, the corresponding potential and string-tension in the QCD-like domain are quite similar to ones in true QCD [131, 132]. But if the phase diagram is continuously connected, the spectrum can only undergo quantitative, but not qualitative, changes. Thus, states which would be confined in the QCD-like domain should not be part of the physical spectrum anywhere in the phase diagram. Thus ‘colored’ states, i. e. states with an open gauge index, should not be observable [12, 198, 199].

While this may be considered an esoteric problem of this particular theory, it is actually much more general. The reason why this problem becomes aggravated is that in a non-Abelian gauge theory it seems to be impossible to construct a gauge-

---

<sup>36</sup>Of course, most of them decay before reaching the detectors. However, this is an experimental problem, and will therefore be ignored here.



invariant, (almost) local gauge charge [154, 200–202], notwithstanding many attempts over the time [200, 201, 203–210]. Thus, objects with an open gauge index can generally not be observable, and corresponding correlation functions should therefore vanish without gauge fixing.

This is qualitatively different from the Abelian case, where it is possible to construct a physical, observable charge [154, 201, 211]. There, a gauge-invariant charge can be constructed using a Dirac phase factor, which is almost local up to a Dirac string. Still, this means that even in an Abelian gauge theory the elementary fields do not describe physical observable particles, and in fact the corresponding propagators do not have a physical pole structure [63, 212]. Rather, it is necessary to dress them appropriately to obtain gauge-invariant states. Essentially the elementary fields are dressed by a photon cloud. How this explicitly works in Abelian gauge theories can and has been investigated in lattice calculations, including in particular QED and the Abelian Higgs model [143, 211, 213–215]. These confirm the necessity and correctness of this dressing.

That this appears to be not possible [154] in non-Abelian gauge theories can be traced back to the Gribov-Singer ambiguity [200, 201, 210], discussed in section 3.4. Thus, even though this ambiguity seems to be a quantitatively irrelevant problem, its qualitative implications are also felt even when the BEH effect is active. In this section, the focus will be on the non-Abelian case, but the Abelian case will again be relevant in the context of grand-unified theories in section 4.7.

Conversely, objects described by operators which have no open gauge index, and are thus gauge-invariant, should be observable. This means that observable particles need to be described by composite, gauge-invariant operators [12, 13, 23, 198]. Structurally, such operators are the same as bound state operators, e. g. hadron operators in QCD. In fact, on a mathematical level, they are exactly the same. Thus, states described by them should be regarded as bound states<sup>37</sup> of their constituents in the same sense as hadrons are considered as bound states of quarks and gluons [217]. This does not mean that they must have properties like those expected for QCD or QED bound states. As will be discussed below, this is indeed not so [12, 13, 217]. This problem of how physical states should be consistently defined appears to

---

<sup>37</sup>Note that sometimes the argument is raised that the weak interactions cannot sustain bound states. However, it should be noted that the even weaker interacting QED not only sustains a plethora of bound states like atoms and molecules but also exhibits a multitude of other non-perturbative phenomena like phase transitions and even scale separations over many orders of magnitude in solid state systems. Also arguments based on quantum-mechanical approximations of the Higgs sector against the existence of bound states [216] are not applying, as relativistic effects, like very large mass defects, turn out to play a major role.

have been known at the time of the inception of the BEH effect [218–221], but was formalized only almost fifteen years later [12, 198, 199].

But now seemingly a paradox arises: Why is the description of experiments in the Higgs sector, and the whole standard model, using the Higgs and the  $W/Z$  bosons as if they would be physical, observable particles then working so well [8, 10, 222]? The answer to this is quite subtle, and deeply connected with the BEH effect [12, 13]. It will be discussed in general at length in section 4.4.

Before going to the general case, it is in the case of the standard-model Higgs sector actually possible to exemplify the previous discussion by a rewriting of the theory. This will be done now in section 4.1.

Because of the subtlety of the situation, this warrants a special notation in the following. In this, and the next section 5, the names and symbols of the elementary fields, i. e. those appearing in the Lagrangian and the path-integral measure, will be denoted by small (initial) letters, e. g. higgs,  $w$ -boson and  $w_\mu^a$ . The corresponding big (initial) letters will be reserved for gauge-invariant states, which will play the analogue of these elementary particles. What this means will become clearer in the following.

#### 4.1. A quasi-exact reformulation of the standard model Higgs sector

Consider the lattice version of the theory (50) in the standard model case. Define the composite, gauge-invariant operators

$$R(y) = \phi^\dagger(y)\phi(y) = \det x(y) \quad (60)$$

$$\begin{aligned} V_\mu^c(y) &= \frac{1}{\det x(y)} \text{tr} \left( T^c x^\dagger(y) \exp(iT_b w_\mu^b(y)) x(y + e_\mu) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{R(y)} \text{tr} \left( \tau^c x^\dagger(y) D_\mu x(y) \right) + \mathcal{O}(a^2) \\ V_\mu(y) &= T^c V_\mu^c(y) \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where  $c$  is a custodial index, and  $x$  is given in (29). This defines a custodial singlet scalar and a custodial triplet vector. The action can now be rewritten as [12, 13, 160, 223]

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \beta \sum_{y\mu < \nu} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \Re \text{tr} V_{\mu\nu}(y) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_y \left( R^2(y) - 3 \log R(y) + \lambda (R(y) - 1)^2 - \kappa \sum_{\mu > 0} R(y + \mu) R(y) \text{tr} V_\mu(y) \right) \end{aligned}$$

where  $V_{\mu\nu}$  is the plaquette formed from  $V_\mu$ . The  $\log R$  terms originate from the Jacobian when changing the variables to (60–61) [160].

There are several observations. First, the theory has only a global custodial (SU(2)) symmetry, and no longer any gauge symmetry. Thus, the gauge degree of freedom has been completely absorbed in the field redefinitions. At the same time, the field  $V_\mu$  is a massive vector field. This field does not suffer from unitarity problems as ordinary massive vector fields [10], because the term  $\log R$  cancels the corresponding contributions. This term is also the second observation: This theory is no longer superficially renormalizable by power-counting, as the term  $\log R$  corresponds to an infinite power series in  $R$ . However, since the underlying theory is both renormalizable and unitary, these effects must cancel each other making the theory well behaved.

Thus, the gauge theory corresponds to a non-gauge theory, with only physically observable states. These states correspond to composite operators in the original theory, manifesting the qualitative discussion above. In fact, for the parameters of the standard model, the field  $R$  fluctuates weakly, and the  $\log R$  term can be neglected in perturbative calculations, to reasonable accuracy [223].

There is one caveat in this rewriting [133]. To obtain this expression requires the division by  $R$  in (61) and that  $\ln R$  is well-defined. This is only possible for  $R \neq 0$ . Thus, the theory is only equivalent if occurrences of  $R = 0$ , so-called defects, are a measure-zero effect. If the BEH physics is an adequate description and the Higgs field only weakly fluctuates around a non-zero value, this seems to be a reasonable assumption. If not, such defects can play an important role, especially in the QCD-like domain, and possibly in the cross-over region. The origin of the problem is that the target space of theory is modified. The original theory has for the Higgs field  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , while the reformulation maps this target space to  $\mathbb{R} \times S^3$ , which is a topologically different manifold. There are arguments that this will not affect the theory qualitatively [116, 224, 225], but no full proof exists. Thus, when using this reformulation, this issue should be kept in mind<sup>38</sup>. Still, this implies that there is a non-gauge theory which is equivalent to the original theory. The gauge symmetry only served to write the theory in a way which is renormalizable by power counting.

That it is possible to reformulate the theory in terms of gauge-invariant variables is actually not a big surprise. This is already possible for theories like Yang-Mills theory [226]. However, in this case the price to pay is that there are infinite number of variables, Wilson loops [105] of all sizes. The present theory is special, as this is possible with a finite number of variables, albeit at the cost of a superficially non-renormalizable action.

---

<sup>38</sup>To the knowledge of the author, because in the BEH regime there is little influence by the topological defects, it is not yet excluded that the actual Higgs sector of the standard model could have either target space. Barring any final results, here the usual  $\mathbb{R}^4$  target space will be assumed.

Unfortunately, this transformation is no longer possible if either QED or fermions are added. Also, it was not yet possible to find such a rewriting for theories where the number of would-be goldstone bosons does not exactly equal the number of higgs degrees of freedom minus one. If additional Higgs fields besides the singlet (60) exist, it is very likely not possible, as there no fields for there gauge-invariant dressing are available. As will be discussed in section 4.7, in such cases quite intricate spectra are expected.

#### 4.2. Gauge-invariant classification of states

As now discussed at length, the only way to classify observable states is in terms of observable quantum numbers. These quantum numbers need to be carried by gauge-invariant (composite) operators. Thus, only quantum numbers carried by such states appear in the spectrum.

Thus, first and foremost, any operator can be characterized by its spin and parity,  $J^P$ , which is obtained from the corresponding spin and parity of the constituents, as well as possible relative momenta between them. Furthermore, states carrying no further quantum numbers can have a definite charge parity  $C$ , yielding  $J^{PC}$ . This works in the same way as in QCD or QED.

Besides this enter custodial quantum numbers. These are also obtained from the corresponding composite fields. This implies that an operator composed entirely of gauge fields cannot have any custodial quantum number. Since any integer spin, charge parity<sup>39</sup> and parity can be created from pure gauge field operators [227] always all custodial singlet states exist.

Concerning custodial charges, this is somewhat less trivial. Of course, to any pure gauge operator always a factor  $\phi^\dagger\phi$  can be added to have a hidden custodial component. For open custodial charges, this depends on which gauge-invariant combinations of the higgs fields can be created. In the case of the standard-model Higgs sector this implies the absence of custodial doublets [134, 228]: A fundamental charge can only be screened by an anti-fundamental charge, but not by an adjoint charge. Thus, gauge bosons cannot screen the charge of the higgs, and only another (anti)higgs can. Only the higgs carries custodial charge as a doublet. Thus, it is impossible to construct a tensor product which is at the same time a custodial doublet and gauge-invariant. Thus, only custodial singlets or multiplets with an integer representation, i. e. triplets etc., are possible in this theory. Of course, once more fundamental charges, e. g. the standard-model fermions, are introduced into the theory this will no longer be true.

---

<sup>39</sup>Provided distinguishable anti-particle exists, i. e. the gauge group has complex representations.

Likewise, in an  $SU(3)$  gauge theory with a single fundamental higgs, the custodial symmetry is a  $U(1)$ . Since any gauge-invariant states, as in QCD, always contain either a higgs and an anti-higgs or three higgs particles or combinations thereof [148, 176, 229], only states with zero or multiples of three times the higgs particles' custodial charge can be gauge invariant. If the theory has a more complicated custodial structure, the possibilities quickly proliferates [148, 151, 152, 172].

This has far-reaching consequences also for the remainder of the standard model, as will be discussed in sections 4.6.1, 4.6.2, and 4.6.3, but even more so beyond-the-standard model as will be discussed in section 4.7.

#### 4.3. Masses and the Nielsen identities

Before really understanding how the masses of the bound states are related to the masses of the elementary particles, it is necessary to first understand how the masses of the elementary particles have to be understood. In perturbation theory, these are very well defined [10]. However, as discussed in section 3.3, this is insufficient, as already a different choice of gauge leads to a breakdown of perturbation theory. Of course, non-BRST singlets, i. e. already perturbatively unphysical states, have already at tree-level a gauge-dependent masses [10]. Thus, only perturbatively physically, i. e. BRST singlet states, will be discussed in the following.

It is possible to determine the masses using non-perturbative methods, and has been done so using lattice simulations [91, 133, 176, 217, 230] and functional methods [231, 232], in a fixed gauge. This is essentially done as in Yang-Mills theory or QCD alone [86]. However, such calculations are always performed in a fixed gauge, and the question remains whether the results could be gauge-invariant, and thus define physical masses.

This is often argued using the so-called Nielsen identities [69]. They are essentially based on the effective potential in the class of 't Hooft and linear covariant gauges, as discussed in section 3.3. Already in [69] it is pointed out that infrared divergences in linear covariant gauges are problematic, but they may be cured non-perturbatively.

The basic argument on which the identities are based is that any change in the gauge parameter can be compensated for by a non-trivial change in the Higgs vacuum expectation value. This can already be guessed from the corresponding gauge condition (39), where both enter as a product. Then, the actual effective gauge condition remains unchanged. Thus, the theory remains the same and the masses of the elementary particles need to be the same, and thus not dependent on the gauge parameter. Thus, they would be gauge-parameter independent.

However, this is not the same as gauge-invariant. There are two reasons why this does not cover all gauges. First, as was pointed out already in the original work

[69], the same derivation cannot be done in gauges where the gauge condition does not only involve the would-be Goldstone bosons but also the remainder Higgs field in a non-trivial way. Such gauges are also well-defined, and have been considered, e. g. in [233]. Second, and more importantly, the argument requires that there is a non-vanishing vacuum expectation value of the Higgs field, which can be used to offset the change. As has been discussed in section 3.3, and as can be done explicitly in lattice calculations [60], it is possible to construct gauges for which this is not true. Thus, the Nielsen identities do not hold for such gauges.

Thus, the Nielsen identities guarantee gauge-parameter invariance in subclasses of gauges with a Higgs vacuum expectation value. This is actually true even non-perturbatively. But they are not strong enough to ensure gauge invariance.

Note that these arguments only show that the Nielsen identities do not guarantee gauge-invariance, not that the masses are not gauge-invariant. However, there is an argument which also calls this into question. It comes from the analytic connection of the phase diagram. In the QCD-like region, all results so far strongly suggest that no mass pole exist for the gauge bosons, and thus no thing like a mass can be defined [91, 93, 133]. In fact, this may even be true for the higgs boson [230]. At the very least both have negative norm contributions, and thus a non-standard spectral representation. This changes when moving into the BEH-like domain, and at least a conventional mass pole arises, though some negative-norm contribution remain in the spectral function [91, 133]. This is possible, because in a fixed gauge the gauge-dependent correlation functions can change discontinuously. But, since all gauge-invariant quantities remain analytic, a physical mass would need to continue to exist even in the QCD-like domain, which it does not. In addition, the appearance of a mass pole happens in different gauges at different points in the phase diagram [39], as discussed in section 3.8. Thus, also from this point of view a contradiction arises. These arguments makes it also quite unlikely that some improved version of the Nielsen identities exist which could make the poles gauge-invariant. Or, at the very least, in some baroque way the mass pole would need to be carried by different correlation functions in the different regions, depending on the gauge. This seems unlikely.

All of this does not diminish the technical usefulness of the Nielsen identities in fixed classes of gauges, especially in perturbation theory.

#### 4.4. Gauge-invariant perturbation theory

The masses of the bound states are genuine<sup>40</sup> non-perturbative quantities<sup>41</sup> [63, 237]. In principle, non-perturbative methods would therefore be needed to calculate them.

Fortunately, in presence of the BEH effect, there exists a possibility to calculate them analytically [12, 13]. This is done using so-called [14] gauge-invariant perturbation theory. As the name suggests, this is indeed a perturbative approach. This procedure can actually be extended beyond static properties [12, 13, 60, 238], as will be discussed in section 5.

At first, this seems a quite surprising statement, as it was just stated that the masses belong to non-perturbative bound states. However, in a very precise sense [12, 13] the BEH effect can be utilized to determine the masses nonetheless. The basic idea can be outlined in the following way [60, 238, 239].

Consider first the standard-model case. Other cases will be treated in section 4.7. Then, according to section 4.2, physical states are identified by their  $J^{P(C)}$  and custodial quantum numbers.

Consider as the simplest case the scalar singlet. The simplest operator carrying these quantum numbers is the composite operator [12, 13, 198]

$$H(x) = (\phi^\dagger \phi)(x). \quad (62)$$

This operator is manifestly gauge-invariant. The prescription of gauge-invariant perturbation theory [12, 13] is to select a gauge with a higgs vacuum expectation value. The next step is to rewrite the correlator in terms of this vacuum expectation value and the fluctuation field  $\phi_i(x) = n_i v + \eta_i(x)$ . This yields

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (\phi^\dagger \phi)(x) (\phi^\dagger \phi)(y) \rangle = & \quad dv^4 + 4v^2 \left\langle \Re \left[ n_i^\dagger \eta_i \right]^\dagger(x) \Re \left[ n_j^\dagger \eta_j \right](y) \right\rangle \\ & + \quad 2v \left( \left\langle (\eta_i^\dagger \eta_i)(x) \Re \left[ n_j^\dagger \eta_j \right](y) \right\rangle + (x \leftrightarrow y) \right) + \left\langle (\eta_i^\dagger \eta_i)(x) (\eta_j^\dagger \eta_j)(y) \right\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

where terms with vanishing expectation values have been dropped and  $d$  is a constant. So far, this is just an exact rewriting. Note, however, that the individual ex-

---

<sup>40</sup>This is already visible heuristically when considering a stable bound state. In perturbation theory only elementary states are stable, asymptotic states. Therefore, a stable, and thus asymptotic, bound state can never exist in perturbation theory.

<sup>41</sup>It should be noted that even in the perturbative picture of the weak interactions all states receive mass corrections from non-perturbative physics due to QCD. The non-perturbative chiral symmetry breaking acts like the BEH effect, and yields mass corrections, e. g. for the  $w$  and  $z$  boson of order some tens of MeV [234]. In fact, it is a realization of Technicolor [80, 235, 236] within the standard model [234]. This is of the same order as the current experimental precision [8]. Note that unitarity for such a correction can only be restored non-perturbatively.



pectation values on the right-hand side are not separately gauge-invariant, and only their sum is. Thus, it would still be necessary to evaluate them non-perturbatively to get an exact result.

The next step in the FMS prescription is not to do so, but rather to expand the expressions in the usual perturbative series. At lowest order, i. e.  $g^0$  and  $\lambda^0$ , this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle (\phi^\dagger \phi)(x)(\phi^\dagger \phi)(y) \right\rangle &= d'v^4 + 4v^2 \left\langle \Re \left[ n_i^\dagger \eta_i \right]^\dagger (x) \Re \left[ n_j^\dagger \eta_j \right] (y) \right\rangle_{\text{tl}} \\ &+ \left\langle \Re \left[ n_i^\dagger \eta_i \right]^\dagger (x) \Re \left[ n_j^\dagger \eta_j \right] (y) \right\rangle_{\text{tl}}^2 + \mathcal{O}(g^2, \lambda), \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

where  $d'$  is now another constant. The first non-constant term is the tree-level Higgs propagator, and the second term is the square of the Higgs propagator, with both propagators originating at the same space-time point and ending at the same space-time-point. Dropping higher order corrections and the constant, this amounts in Fourier space to

$$D_H(P^2) = D_\eta(P^2) + D_\eta(p^2)D_\eta(q^2) \quad (65)$$

with  $p + q = P$ , and where  $D$  denotes the respective propagators. The masses of the particles can now be read off the respective poles. At this level of expansion, this implies the left-hand side will have a pole whenever the right-hand side has a pole, and vice versa. The right-hand side has a pole at  $P^2 = m_h^2$  as well as at  $P^2 = 4m_h^2$ , the first from the single propagator, and the other one when both of the propagators in the product go on-shell. Thus, this would predict that the bound-state should have a pole at the higgs mass, and a pole at twice the Higgs mass. The latter pole is just a scattering state of twice the ground-state.

Thus, gauge-invariant perturbation theory predicts that the gauge-invariant singlet  $0^+$  state, i. e. the gauge-invariant Higgs state  $H$ , has the same mass as the elementary higgs. Other than that, it will have as next excitation a scattering state of two (gauge-invariant) Higgs particles  $H$ . And yes, this means twice the gauge-invariant Higgs, as two elementary higgs are only gauge-invariant when they form a composite operator, but not in the sense of two independent particles. Equation (65) makes a statement about the pole structure, not the substructure of the state. After all, the right-hand side is now gauge-dependent, while the left-hand side is not. Still, at this level of approximation the Higgs propagator is given by (65). But this should be rather thought of in the same sense as to lowest order a hadron is made up out of quark propagators in the simplest constituent quark model.

It is the left-hand side of (63) which describes an experimentally observable particle. Gauge-invariant perturbation theory was now used, through equation (65),



to predict that the observed scalar particle should have the same mass as the elementary higgs particle. This is exactly what is observed experimentally [8]. Thus, a field-theoretically more strict treatment than the usual perturbative treatment [10] ends up with an equally good determination of the Higgs mass to this order. There are, of course, many further subtleties involved.

The first is with respect to gauge-invariance. At least, due to the Nielsen identities, which hold in such a class of gauges, the determined pole on the right-hand side is gauge-parameter-independent. However, it is not clear to which extent such a relation will actually hold in gauges like those discussed in [233] or in non-covariant gauges with their intricate analytic structures and generically additional singularities [240]. Like perturbation theory in general [11], it should therefore be considered to be an approach working only in suitable gauges, in this case the 't Hooft gauges.

Secondly, there are higher orders in the coupling constant on the right-hand side in (64). Fortunately, higher order perturbative corrections in the coupling constants appear to be small [133, 241], at least for the standard model and the cases studied on the lattice.

However, it is alternatively possible to move from (63) not only forward in this way to (64), but rather to consider an expansion in the couplings and in the vacuum expectation value  $v$  (or alternatively the fluctuation field  $\eta$ ). If then only the leading non-trivial order in  $v$  would be kept, to all orders in perturbation theory the propagator  $D_H$  would equal the propagator  $D_\eta$ , and thus exactly the same results as in ordinary perturbation theory would be obtained for the Higgs' properties. On the other hand, including higher orders in  $v$ , deviations should arise. Since  $v$  is a large number, even a simple estimate using the Appelquist-Carrazzone theorem suggests a suppression like  $s/v^2$ , where  $s$  is the actual involved energy, not necessarily the collider energy. At LEP2, this would be at most a  $2 \times 10^{-3}$  correction<sup>42</sup> to the (at LEP2) unobserved Higgs production. Naively, it would be expected that at the LHC, with substantial parton luminosity at 1 TeV or more, this would be different. But then, the next-to-leading contribution in (64) is vanishing in leading-order perturbation theory, and thus will only contribute at loop order. The second contribution is already evaluated in (65), and thus will only arise for double-Higgs production, which is also not yet reached. Another estimate is the size of the quantum fluctuations with respect to the vacuum expectation value,  $\langle |\eta| \rangle / v$ , which in lattice simulations are found to be tiny [60].

---

<sup>42</sup>This shows for the first time that the standard model is particularly, and frustratingly, unsuited to detect this kind of field-theoretical effect. This insight will be made again and again in the following. In contrast, in many beyond-the-standard model theories differences already arise at the qualitative, rather than the quantitative, level. This will be discussed in section 4.7.

Thus, these corrections are small, but may eventually play a role. An explicit evaluation has not been performed yet, and this requires further issues to consider. This will be returned to in section 5.

Thirdly, another problem arises at loop order. The mass of the elementary higgs is scheme-dependent [10, 242]. Of course, the bound-state mass of the physical Higgs is both renormalization-group-invariant and renormalization-scheme-invariant. Thus, to make a useful association with the actual observed particle the pole scheme [10, 242] seems to be mandatory to keep the relation at loop level. However, this is an issue which has not yet been deeply explored [133]. It will be returned to in section 4.5. In particular, this implies that the actual mass defect of the state becomes dependent on the renormalization. The mass defect is therefore no longer really a physical concept. This also ameliorates to some extent its enormous size, as the size of it becomes arbitrary at loop order. Still, it is a useful concept as also this is a genuine quantum effect. Therefore, the notion of mass defect will be kept in the following, but the issue of renormalization should always be kept in mind.

Finally, there exists other operators with the same quantum numbers. These can be classified into three types.

One are operators which are made up of individually gauge-invariant operators. Physically, they correspond to scattering states of observable particles. In this case, the expansion is applied to every gauge-invariant operator separately. The prediction is then that the scattering of the observable particles is mapped to scatterings of the corresponding elementary particles. The simplest such operator is

$$\mathcal{O}_{2H} = H(y)H(y). \quad (66)$$

It expands to leading order into two independent higgs propagators, thus correctly predicting a mass of twice the higgs, and thus of twice the ground state in the channel described by the operator  $H$ . Since the same scattering pole is already contained in the operator  $H$  this shows that these operators actually do not form at tree-level a mass basis, and would be needed to be rotated to do so. Beyond leading order this operator will create the usual cut structure starting at twice the ground-state mass.

Then, there are operators, which cannot be decomposed into other gauge-invariant operators, but still involve Higgs fields. Such operators can be obtained, e. g., by introducing Wilson lines in (62). They therefore can have a pole at the Higgs mass, just like (63). However, since the full operator has the same quantum numbers, it will again mix with both (62) and (66). Necessarily, such operators need to be included in the operator basis to find the mass eigenbasis in which only a single operator will expand into the higgs propagator, while all other orthogonal combi-

nations expand only to scattering states<sup>43</sup>. This one particular combination would be the ground-state in this channel. Such a basis would be the most suitable one. Fortunately, the few investigations of this question [133, 134, 228] all point towards (62) dominating the ground state, simplifying the problem substantially.

The last type of operators are those which do not involve the Higgs field. In case of the  $0^+$  singlet, this would be the scalar  $w$ -ball, the equivalent of a glueball in Yang-Mills theory or QCD. Its gauge-invariant operator is

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{wball}} = (w_{\mu\nu}^a w_a^{\mu\nu})(y). \quad (67)$$

Such operators would also be needed to form the mass eigenbasis. Of course, also these operators can be generalized in the same way in the sense of the two previous classes.

Since (67) does not involve any Higgs fields, rewriting it as in (63) will just reproduce the operator. However, performing the same type of expansion as in (64) is still possible, yielding at leading order two  $w$  propagators. A single  $w$  propagator has the wrong Lorentz structure, and thus vanishes. With the same logic, this would imply that in the  $0^+$  singlet channel a scattering state involving two  $w$ s would exist<sup>44</sup>. Since the  $w$  mass is as gauge-parameter-independent as the higgs mass due to the Nielsen identities and even scheme-invariant [10], this would imply a scattering state of  $2m_w$  in the  $0^+$  channel. Likewise, more complicated operators would add further scattering states.

If the physical, gauge-invariant state should have such a scattering pole<sup>45</sup>, it would be necessary that a (vector) particle of the  $w$  mass exists in the spectrum. However, the  $w$  is a gauge triplet, and therefore not observable. On the other hand, up to custodial breaking effects, experiments show the existence of a vector triplet [8]. Thus, to accommodate both results, the experimental one and the need for the scattering state, requires that the spectrum has a triplet vector state.

The only possibility to obtain a triplet is to have a global symmetry with triplet representations. The custodial symmetry has exactly this structure. The simplest vector triplet operator is<sup>46</sup> [133, 159, 198, 217]

$$W(x) = \text{tr} \left( T_{ij}^a \alpha_j^\dagger D_\mu \alpha_i \right) (y). \quad (68)$$

---

<sup>43</sup>Here the possibility of additional non-perturbative resonances on the left-hand-side is neglected. This will be considered in section 4.5.

<sup>44</sup>Note that the same reasoning in QCD would lead to a scattering state of two massless states, which is, due to the mass gap not a good approximation.

<sup>45</sup>More precisely: Beyond leading order having a scattering cut starting from this mass.

<sup>46</sup>In [12, 13] an operator based on the field-strength tensor is used, which after contraction with a momentum delivers the same operator.

where  $\alpha$  is defined in (31). Applying the same recipe as in (63) and (64) yields

$$\langle \text{tr}(T_{ij}^a \alpha_j^\dagger D_\mu \alpha_i)(z) \text{tr}(T_{kl}^b \alpha_k^\dagger D_\mu \alpha_l)(y) \rangle = c_{kl}^{ab} \langle w_\mu^k(z) w_\mu^l(y) \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\eta), \quad (69)$$

where  $c_{kl}^{ab} \sim \delta^{ab} \delta_{kl}$ . Alternatively,  $\alpha$  can be replaced by  $x$  of (29), without changing the quantum numbers [159]. However, this would be an operator of the same class as (66).

The expansion in (69) shows that this operator expands to the  $w$  propagator. Therefore, by the same argument as before, the mass of the bound-state operator on the left-hand-side must be the same as the one of the elementary  $w$ . Since the mass of the  $w$  is not affected by renormalization, this statement is even stronger than in the scalar case. Thus, as required, there exists the corresponding vector triplet.

Thus, gauge-invariant perturbation theory precisely predicts the same mass spectrum as perturbation theory: A single massive scalar, and a mass-degenerate vector triplet.

However, to be fully compatible requires the absence of other massive states, except for scattering states. None such are predicted using gauge-invariant perturbation theory. While suggestive, the existence of additional resonances, i. e. internal excitations, of these bound-states cannot be fully excluded in this way, as they can be generated as genuine non-perturbative effects. This requires an actual non-perturbative calculation. Such calculations have been performed using lattice methods. No such resonances have (yet) been found, as will be discussed in section 4.5.

A different question are states in other quantum number channels. For this, note that the matrix  $c$  in (69) cannot carry Lorentz indices, as otherwise Lorentz symmetry would not be manifest. Since only covariant gauges are considered, this should not happen. Thus, an expansion to a single-field operator can only occur for  $J^{P(C)}$  quantum numbers which appear as elementary fields, i. e. scalars and vectors. In all other channels only scattering states involving multiple elementary particles can arise.

The only further alternative are scalars and vectors which have a different custodial structure, e. g. a scalar triplet or a (axial)vectorial singlet. Note that custodial doublets or other half-integer multiples are not possible, as the higgs fields are in the fundamental representation, and therefore a gauge-invariant state always requires an even number of them. Such states can be constructed [228]. However, the particular structure of the theory yields that it is not possible to construct higher tensors in custodial symmetry without at the same time constructing higher tensors also in the gauge symmetry. The reason is that the elementary building block of the custodial symmetry, the higgs field, has the same representation and group for both the custodial symmetry and the gauge symmetry, the fundamental representation of

SU(2). This is a very special situation. Hence, any higher representation of the custodial symmetry can only be build from gauge-invariant operators, and are already in ordinary perturbation theory scattering states [228].

Thus, the prediction of the FMS mechanism is that there should only be at most two states in the physical spectrum, a scalar with a mass corresponding to the (tree-level) mass of the higgs, and an vector triplet with the mass of the  $w$ . Note that this prediction remains true for any mass of the Higgs, and is only limited by the same conditions as ordinary perturbation theory [10].

#### 4.5. Lattice spectra and tests of gauge-invariant perturbation theory

This is a non-trivial prediction. In particular, this implies a very different bound-state structure than in QCD and QED. Probably the most distinguished feature are the large mass-defects, which is one higgs mass for the scalar and even two higgs masses for the vector. Thus, they are 50% and about 76% of the sum of the masses of the constituents. Except for composite Goldstone bosons, like the pions, no other composite particles in QCD or QED do exhibit such large mass defects. This implies that any tests needs to be both non-perturbative and using quantum field theory. In addition, the bound-state poles of the stable states in the correlators (63) and (69) cannot appears as asymptotic states in perturbation theory. Simply because by definition only the elementary states appear as asymptotic states in perturbation theory.

So far, the only method with which the spectrum of these composite operators has been investigated have been lattice methods<sup>47</sup> [118, 133, 134, 159–161, 166, 217, 228]<sup>48</sup>. In addition, only few calculations are available where simultaneously also the gauge-fixed propagators have been obtained [91, 133, 217] to check the FMS mechanism<sup>49</sup>.

---

<sup>47</sup>This has also been done in three [93, 223] and two dimensions [173], which will not be discussed in detail. Note, however, that especially three dimensions is an interesting model system, as the theory is non-trivial and has dynamical gauge degrees of freedom, and all of the arguments given still hold. It may therefore be promising to use this case to understand the continuum limit of the FMS mechanism.

<sup>48</sup>Note that in most lattice publications the gauge-invariant operators of section 4.4 are called already Higgs and  $W/Z$ , rather than the elementary degrees of freedom. The reason is that lattice methods do not (need to) fix a gauge, and therefore these are the only well-defined observables, and therefore have received theses name, without actually establishing their relation to the elementary degrees of freedom [47]. Thus in [118, 159–161, 166, 223, 228], these names already refer to the Higgs and the  $W/Z$  rather than to the higgs and  $w/z$ .

<sup>49</sup>Note that there are non-perturbative calculations which address the masses of the elementary Higgs boson and gauges bosons, see e. g. [94, 174, 231, 232] for recent examples, but they provide not at the same time results for the composite operators, and are therefore not relevant here.

The determination of the masses of the bound states in lattice calculation is quite straightforward [104, 105]. Since lattice simulations are performed in Euclidean space-time, any gauge-invariant correlator in the present class of theories in position space has the form [13, 32]

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathcal{O}(t)\mathcal{O}(0) \rangle &= \sum_n |\langle n|\mathcal{O} \rangle|^2 e^{-E_n t} \stackrel{t \gg E_1^{-1}}{\sim} e^{-E_0 t} \\ \mathcal{O}(t) &= \sum_{\vec{x}} \mathcal{O}(\vec{x}, t),\end{aligned}\tag{70}$$

where the summation projects the states to zero momentum, and thus into the rest frame<sup>50</sup>. In fact, on a finite, periodic lattice the exponentials have to be replaced by coshs. This will not affect the following qualitatively but is taken into account in actual calculations [104, 105].

Then  $E_0$  will be the mass of the lightest state in the corresponding quantum number channel. However, at times  $t \lesssim E_1^{-1}$  the correlator will have contributions also from higher levels. Also, the overlap  $|\langle n|\mathcal{O} \rangle|^2$  needs to be non-zero. All of these issues can [105] and are taken into account [133, 134, 228] for the following results. With this it is possible to isolate the rest masses of particles. Furthermore, various operators can mix, as discussed above. This can also be taken into account [105]. In practice, only an ansatz can be made which operators could have overlap with the ground state. Within this subset of possible operators then the lowest-lying state is isolated. This has been done for various operator bases in practice [133, 134, 228], yielding coinciding results. However, the choice of operators is ad hoc, and therefore cannot be guaranteed to be systematically controlled. The choice is usually to include the operators with the lowest number of elementary fields, up to a certain maximum. This yields good results in QCD, and, as will be discussed now in detail, also yields consistent results for the Higgs sector.

A useful concept is the effective mass, defined as [86, 104, 105]

$$m(t) = -\ln \frac{D(t)}{D(t+a)},\tag{71}$$

where  $a$  is the lattice spacing, and  $D$  a correlator like (70). If a single exponential dominates (70), this effective mass will be just the mass  $E = m$  for this state, and there is no time-dependence. If additional contributions arise, this will give a deviation, which will be stronger the shorter the time, at least for a physical particle.

---

<sup>50</sup>Non-zero momentum is also possible, but again here an unnecessary complication, even though relevant in practice [105, 228].



These increase the effective mass at shorter times. On the other hand, the perturbative contributions will make the effective mass decrease at shorter times [86].

Finally, because of the cosh behavior due to the finite volume, the effective mass will decrease even for a single exponential contributing at times close to the maximum temporal extent of a lattice. In principle, this can be corrected for. However, not doing so shows explicitly at which times finite-volume artifacts start to play a significant role. This will therefore not be done here.

#### 4.5.1. *The ground states of the gauge-invariant spectrum*

Following the prescribed procedure, it is possible to obtain the masses of the ground states in both the scalar and vector triplet channels. This has been done using a variety of operator bases [133, 134, 159–161, 166, 217, 228]. Other channels and possible resonances will be discussed in section 4.5.4. To avoid too much technical details, the various analyses can be found in the corresponding references. However, it should be remarked that, like glueballs in QCD, the operators in the Higgs sector are rather noisy, and thus large statistics and/or advanced noise reduction techniques are necessary to obtain statistically reasonably reliable results [134, 223, 228]. Note that whenever units are given in the following, they are obtained by setting the mass of the lightest state in the spectrum to 80.375 GeV. It turns out that the lightest mass is the scalar singlet mass and the vector triplet mass in the QCD-like domain and the Higgs-like domain, respectively.

Before entering the detailed test of the FMS prediction a few other observations must be listed on this spectrum. They therefore pertain to the physically observable properties of the theory.

First, a quite striking observation [134, 159–161, 166] was that if the vector triplet is lighter than the singlet scalar, the physics is BEH-like, rather than QCD-like. I. e., the phase diagram shown in figure 4, intended as a gauge-dependent statement, actually also says something about gauge-invariant physics. In fact, in the cross-over region the mass of both states seem to become degenerate [134]. This was not expected. In ordinary perturbation theory this ratio is free in presence of the BEH effect, while the gauge boson mass is strictly zero if not [10]. Gauge-invariant perturbation theory only maps this perturbative statement on the gauge-invariant states, and thus inherits this feature. Of course, this is as so far only a numerical result obtained in a certain region of the phase diagram. Also, lattice calculations cannot span a too different sets of scales, as the computation time scales at least as the fourth power of the ratio between the most extreme scales. On a finite lattice, this is the (inverse) lattice extent and the lattice spacing. As corrections due to the volume vanish exponentially with the lattice extent for massive states [243], this will likely not be the relevant problem.




Figure 7: The mass of the singlet scalar, i. e. the Higgs, as a function of the lattice cutoff, defined to be the magnitude of the largest possible four-momentum. Each point corresponds to a fixed set of (lattice) parameters, i. e. to one point in the phase diagram in figure 3. The lower line gives the mass of the vector triplet, which is used to set the scale. If the scalar mass is below this value, the theory becomes QCD-like. The upper line is the elastic threshold, above which yet no reliable data is available. To avoid clutter, lattice errors are not shown. Data is from [134, 185, 239]. Note that this corridor is narrower than the perturbative [244, 245] and non-perturbative [246–248] expectations.



However, as the mass corridor for the possible Higgs masses depends on the cutoff [10, 116, 244–248], the comparatively low cutoff value reachable currently in lattice simulations may be the reason for this. This is shown in figure 7. So far, the available data fill the corridor between the limit to pass into the QCD-like domain and the elastic threshold rather homogeneously. Of course, the selection of which points are included in the simulations is also biased, and represents the points in figure 3.

Thus, this may change if the cutoff is sent to very large values and/or other regions of the phase diagram are sampled. Still, it is quite intriguing, and so far lacks any explanation. Especially, as nothing was done in selecting the points in the parameter space to obtain such a behavior. Furthermore, as will be discussed in section 4.7.2, for gauge groups  $SU(N > 2)$  and a single fundamental higgs gauge-invariant perturbation theory actually predicts this lower mass limit [148].

A second surprising result about the singlet scalar is that in large regions of parameter space it is light, i. e. with a mass below the elastic threshold [133, 134, 159–161, 166, 217, 228]. In figure 3 this applies to about 66% of the points in the Higgs-like domain. Based on fine-tuning, naively it would have been expected that any random set of lattice parameters would not yield a light Higgs. However, this can again be a bias artifact and/or an effect due to the comparatively low cutoff. Still, it is more probable to find a heavier scalar than a lighter scalar, as can already be seen from the clustering of points at larger masses in figure 7.

This does not mean that the theory is not fine-tuned. In fact, the lattice spacing and the mass-ratio depend very sensitively on the hopping parameter  $\kappa$  if  $\kappa$  is close to the boundary of the domains, and even small changes of  $\kappa$  can have substantial effects.

Statements about the Higgs mass above the elastic threshold are more complicated to make. The energy levels appearing in (70) do include any states with the same quantum numbers, and therefore in particular scattering states. Thus, scalars which are only resonances have to be isolated from these scattering states. This is possible using a so-called Lüscher analysis [105, 249, 250], which has been applied successfully to ungauged higgs sectors [18, 251]. This is numerically quite demanding, especially when trying to cross the inelastic threshold [252, 253]. Therefore, not much is known yet about this case. This will be taken up again in section 4.5.4, as will other quantum number channels.

Concerning the QCD-like region, the vector triplet is actually quite heavy [134, 159–161, 166, 185], not dissimilar to the case of the singlet vector glueball in Yang-Mills theory [254]. This is as so far interesting as the custodial quantum numbers carried by the state are conserved. Thus, the lightest non-singlet custodial state is always stable. In the Higgs-like domain, this state is also the lightest state, but not

in the QCD-like domain, where the scalar is lighter.

Another interesting observation is the composition of the scalar. As far as it has been investigated [134, 228], the ground state in the Higgs-like domain is dominated by the operator (62), while in the QCD-like domain it is the  $w$ -ball operator (67).

Both facts together point to a gauge-dynamics-dominated QCD-like domain, as is also the case for QCD itself, provided the number of flavors is small enough.

#### 4.5.2. The $W/Z$

The most simple object to test the FMS prediction is the  $w$  and the custodial triplet [217]. The reason is that the mass of the  $w$  boson does not depend on the renormalization scale and scheme. However, one additional problem arises in this context. Because the  $w$  is not a gauge-invariant state, its propagator in position space does not need to have the form (70). In particular, at short distances, where the mass becomes irrelevant, it will have the same type of (perturbative) shape as a gluon propagator<sup>51</sup>. The gluon propagator has non-positive contributions to its spectral function [10] already in perturbation theory. Therefore it cannot be of the form of a sum of exponentials with positive coefficients. Still, at long distances it should have the behavior of an ordinary massive particle. Rather than just attempting to fit the  $w$  propagator with (70), it is necessary to address these contributions directly. An alternative is to extract the mass from its momentum-space propagator, i. e. the Fourier-transform of (70) [86]. At tree-level, it is just (48), and at least perturbative higher-order contributions can be quantified and included in the fit as well.

Example results are shown in figure 8. These are prototypical, and more can be found in [91, 133, 185, 217]. First, it is visible that the  $w$  propagator only weakly, and only at large momenta or short times, starts to deviate from the tree-level propagator. These are the expected perturbative corrections, which behave logarithmically with momentum [10]. The deviations at long time in position space stem from the finite volume, deforming the exponential to a cosh behavior. As the position-space propagator approaches an exponential only asymptotically with volume, the effective mass (71) will deviate from the actual mass. Because both perturbative and volume effects will reduce it, it will be underestimated, and needs to be extrapolated eventually to infinite volume. However, within statistical errors for lattices with reasonably large physical volumes the mass reaches the asymptotic limit up to a few GeV.

The effective mass for various points in the Higgs-like domain are shown in figure 9. It is seen that they always approach the mass of the vector triplet, up to the artifacts mentioned before. In this plot the extracted mass from the largest

---

<sup>51</sup>Provided the back-coupling of the higgs is weak enough.




Figure 8: The position-space propagator (left panel) and momentum-space propagator (right panel) for the  $w$  for parameters where the mass ratio of the higgs and  $w$  is about the physical one of  $125/80 \approx 1.56$  ( $\beta = 2.4728$ ,  $\kappa = 0.2939$ ,  $\gamma = 1.036$ ). The dashed lines is the (renormalized) tree-level behavior (48). The different symbols correspond to different (lattice) volumes. From [133].




Figure 9: The left panel shows the obtained effective mass (71) of the  $w$  for various ratios of the mass of the vector triplet to the mass of the scalar singlet. The right-hand side gives the mass obtained from the effective mass as a function of the mass ratio of the vector triplet to the scalar mass. Note that at  $1/2$  the elastic threshold is reached. Points below  $1/2$  have been obtained by taking the ratio with the first non-trivial level, but this position should be taken to be illustrative rather than actual. In the right-hand plot, the reliability of the data is indicated by the symbols, where filled symbols are most reliable, and open squares are least reliable. The reliability is assessed by the size of the discretization errors. Data from [133, 185].




Figure 10: The position-space propagator (left panel) and momentum-space propagator (right panel) for the  $w$  for parameters in the QCD-like domain ( $\beta = 2.3724$ ,  $\kappa = 0.125$ ,  $\gamma = 0$ ). The different symbols correspond to different (lattice) volumes. Note that to reach sufficiently long times to show the characteristic zero-crossing of the position-space propagator a rather coarse lattice has been used, though this does not substantially affect this type of long-distance physics [86]. Data from [185].

volume is shown as a function of the ratio of the vector triplet to the scalar mass. The points all cluster in the Higgs-like domain around the predicted mass of the vector triplet, even in those cases where the scalar is no longer stable. Only in the QCD-like domain, i. e. for ratios larger than one, the masses substantially deviate. However, in the latter case often the propagator of the  $w$  exhibits a QCD-like behavior [86] with no discernible exponential behavior at all, and no known association with any kind of mass pole. Such points are therefore not included. An example of this situation is shown in figure 10.

The results are in pretty good agreement with the predictions of the FMS mechanism. The few points, which are not, have rather large error bars, and therefore require further scrutiny. They are also all in regions where the mass of the scalar exceeds the elastic threshold, and furthermore their lattice spacing is comparatively coarse, giving rise to further systematic errors, which have not yet been fully accounted for. In general, however, essentially always gauge-invariant perturbation theory gives the correct predictions. This supports strongly the FMS mechanism, and is a non-trivial field-theoretical test of it.

#### 4.5.3. The Higgs

Because the Higgs mass is not scheme-invariant [10] is not so simple to test the FMS mechanism non-perturbatively. As noted above, the best choice is probably to select a pole scheme, which needs to be defined in the complex momentum plane.

On the lattice, this cannot be directly implemented, as this would require to analytically continue the propagator. Since in an actual simulation only a finite number of points is available, this is not possible unambiguously.

Instead, here a prescription in the space-like domain will be employed [91, 230]. The renormalized propagator has the form [10]

$$D^{ij}(p^2) = \frac{\delta^{ij}}{Z(p^2 + m_r^2) + \Pi(p^2) + \delta m^2},$$

where  $m_r^2$  is the renormalized mass and  $\Pi(p^2)$  is the unrenormalized self-energy. This self-energy is obtained from the unrenormalized propagator. The renormalization scheme is

$$D^{ij}(\mu^2) = \frac{\delta^{ij}}{\mu^2 + m_r^2} \quad (72)$$

$$\frac{\partial D^{ij}}{\partial p}(\mu^2) = -\frac{2\mu\delta^{ij}}{(\mu^2 + m_r^2)^2}, \quad (73)$$

which determines the renormalization constants  $Z$  and  $\delta m^2$  as

$$Z = \frac{2\mu - \frac{d\Pi(p^2)}{dp}(\mu^2)}{2\mu}$$

$$\delta m^2 = \frac{(\mu^2 + m_r^2)\frac{d\Pi(p^2)}{dp}(\mu^2) - 2\mu\Pi(\mu^2)}{2\mu}.$$

In the following, always  $m_\mu = m_r$  will be chosen. Thus, at space-like  $p^2 = m_\mu^2 = m_r^2$  the propagator and its first derivative are forced to be the tree-level ones. If the analytic structure is such that on the circle  $p^2 = m_{\text{Pole}}^2$  a trivial rotation is possible, i. e.  $m_{\text{Pole}} = m_r$ , this is equivalent to the pole scheme.

This can be tested. Once the renormalization has been performed, it is possible to determine the renormalized position-space propagator by a Fourier transform. Then the effective mass (71) can be determined, and thus the pole mass extracted. This has so far been only investigated in great detail in the quenched case, and thus for QCD-like physics [230]. There, it turned out that the pole scheme is not always equivalent to this scheme. In fact, it was found that the pole mass satisfies  $m_{\text{Pole}} \geq m_\Lambda$ , with  $m_\Lambda$  some characteristic mass scale, even if  $m_r \ll m_\Lambda$ . However, if  $m_r \gtrsim m_\Lambda$  it was found that  $m_{\text{Pole}} \approx m_r$  [230]. Thus, only in the latter case both schemes seem to be equivalent when it comes to determining the pole mass.

Similar problems arise whenever an explicit solution in the complex plane is not possible. This also affects functional methods [174, 231, 232], though here progress




Figure 11: An example of the effective mass in units of the renormalized mass (left panel) and propagator (right panel) for the higgs for various renormalized masses  $m_r = 80, 120, 160, 200$ , and  $300$  GeV in the Higgs-like domain. The lattice parameters are the same as in figure 8. Data from [133, 185]. The scalar singlet has a mass of  $120$  GeV. The solid line is the tree-level result for  $m_r = 120$  GeV, as are the solid black circles.

is made [255, 256]. In semi-perturbative calculations [93, 257], this is less of an issue, but here again access to the composite states is far less trivial. Thus, for now the scheme (72-73) will be used here.

A result for various choices of  $m_r$  is shown in figure 11 for the case that  $m_{0+} = 120$  GeV. As is visible, only small deviations from the tree-level behavior are seen. More importantly, the ratio of the effective mass to the renormalized mass is essentially one, up to the expected lattice artifacts and perturbative short-range effects. While this needs much more scrutiny, this suggests that the pole scheme and this scheme are roughly equivalent. Thus, it is possible to find a scheme such that the poles agree.

Now it can be asked, whether this is suitable comparison. However, to what this actually has to be compared to is to the usual way of setting the renormalization scheme in perturbation theory. After all, what is tested here is gauge-invariant perturbation theory, which is a perturbative scheme after all. Thus, the question is, whether this leads to the same result as when using in perturbation theory the pole scheme. In that case, the pole mass is set by the experimentally observed peak in the scattering cross-section [10, 242]. Thus, the question is whether in a scattering process the same kind of peaks and poles arise. This will be discussed in section 5, as this is beyond a lattice question. The answer will be in the affirmative, thus justifying the FMS mechanism even in this case.




Figure 12: An example of the effective mass in units of the renormalized mass (left panel) and propagator (right panel) for the Higgs for various renormalized masses  $m_r = 120, 160, 200, 250$ , and  $300$  GeV in the QCD-like domain. The lattice parameters are  $\beta = 3.9282$ ,  $\kappa = 0.125$ ,  $\gamma = 0$ . Data from [133, 185].

Conversely, choosing deliberately a different scheme will make the FMS mechanism fail. But this is actually not unexpected. After all, the FMS mechanism is a perturbative scheme. Just as bad choice of scheme, and even of the renormalization point, will render perturbative predictions unreliable [258–260], this will certainly also apply to gauge-invariant perturbation theory. E. g., gauge-invariant perturbation theory will necessarily inherit the residual unphysical scheme-dependence at two loop order from ordinary perturbation theory.

Thus, the FMS mechanism can be made correct for the scalar and the higgs. As the situation in the quenched case discussed above shows, this is already a non-trivial statement.

An alternative test would be to determine the renormalization constants  $Z$  and  $\delta m^2$  using different quantities in the pole scheme, and then determine the higgs mass from the such renormalized higgs propagator. Then, the test would be also non-trivial. However, this will necessarily involve higher  $n$ -point functions, and appears to be out of reach of lattice simulations for computer time reasons within the foreseeable future.

The situation in the QCD-like domain is actually not too different from the Higgs-like domain [133, 174, 231, 232], as is shown in figure 12. In fact, the propagator shows a very similar behavior to the quenched case [230]. Given that a mass of the higgs arises always already perturbatively by loop effects, no matter the detailed physics [10], this is not too surprising. However, whether as in the quenched case



also in the dynamical case an explicit minimum mass arises is not yet known.

#### 4.5.4. *Other channels*

Besides the coincidence of the poles in the signal channels, the other prediction of the FMS mechanism is that in the Higgs-like domain in all other channels only scattering states should appear. I. e. states of the type (66), which have the same quantum numbers. Such states are also expected in perturbation theory. Moreover, the prediction is that besides the poles corresponding to the higgs and the  $w$  mass no additional poles in the scalar and triplet vector channel, respectively, should arise, except for scattering states. Or, more directly said, there are no non-trivial additional states. Given the size of the mass defects, this is a surprising result.

This question has been investigated in the Higgs-like domain in [134, 228]. Such investigations are quite expensive in terms of computing time. Therefore only at a few points in parameter space a very detailed investigation was possible [228]. Large-scale scans [134], of which a sample is shown in figure 13, are thus not yet too reliable. Nonetheless, all results are consistent with the absence of low-lying resonances and/or bound states in other channels than the scalar singlet and vector triplet. This agrees with the predictions of gauge-invariant perturbation theory. Especially, the trivial scattering states, as e. g. (65), are explicitly seen. Thus, it is not a problem of seeing additional states. There are just no surplus states which are candidates for additional resonances or bound states (yet?).

The situation seems to change in the QCD-like domain, as is also shown in figure 13 [134]. Here indications of additional stable bound states, especially in the singlet pseudoscalar channel have been seen. In fact, in some cases the pseudoscalar singlet becomes almost degenerate with the scalar. At the same time no very light states in the singlet tensor channel  $2^+$  has been observed. Thus, the spectrum seems to be qualitatively different from the pure Yang-Mills case, where the tensor is lighter than the pseudoscalar [254]. Again, the reliability of this statement is not yet as good as desired.

In particular, in the QCD-like domain the only state investigated carrying a custodial quantum number, the vector triplet, becomes quite heavy. It would be very interesting to see whether this is true for all non-singlet states, since then a non-Yang-Mills spectrum arises but without any open higgs contribution. This is especially interesting as the lightest non-singlet state is necessarily stable. Thus, this would correspond to a large separation between stable states.

This also emphasizes that, as expected, gauge-invariant perturbation theory is not applicable in the QCD-like domain. But, to the extent the spectrum has been explored, it is in full agreement with the gauge-invariant perturbation theory in the BEH-like domain.




Figure 13: The development of various energy levels as a function of the mass ratio of the vector triplet mass to the scalar mass, divided by the expected value if the state is just a scattering state, from [134, 185]. Note that at a ratio smaller than one-half the scalar ground state itself becomes a scattering state, and a ratio larger than one corresponds to being in the QCD-like domain. Open symbols are masses which in lattice units exceed one, and therefore are considered to be strongly affected by discretization artifacts. However, these errors have not yet been quantified, and the displayed errors are statistical only.

#### 4.6. The standard model

The previous sections show that the pure Higgs sector can be well described using gauge-invariant perturbation theory. In the following it will be shown that the FMS mechanism can also be applied to the remainder of the standard model, starting with QED in section 4.6.1, and including flavor in section 4.6.2 and finally QCD in section 4.6.3. However, for these sectors not yet any non-perturbative tests have been performed<sup>52</sup>. Lattice simulations are possible for the Higgs sector and QED together [188–191, 215], but have not yet been done for the purpose of testing the FMS mechanism. Including flavor faces the aforementioned problems of parity violation [119–123]. Not to mention the enormous computing costs given the scale separations involved, which make already the bottom-top mass splitting difficult to cover even without the gauge interactions [16, 18]. Thus, it is likely that other methods will be necessary for a genuine non-perturbative tests of larger fractions of the standard model, e. g. functional methods [63, 86, 262–266].

Thus, the best test to date of gauge-invariant perturbation theory is the fact that to leading order in the quantum fluctuation field of the higgs it agrees with standard perturbation theory, and therefore with experimental results [8]. Similar estimates as in section 4.4 can be made concerning subleading contributions in the fluctuation field to the static properties. Where they have been estimated, they are found to be of the same order. Other estimates of subleading effects will be discussed in section 5.

Still, all of these are estimates. Precise quantitative determinations of these should in principle be possible. Corresponding methods can be developed and tested against lattice data for the Higgs sector alone. Once determined, they will give a prediction for experimental tests of the FMS mechanism, and thus of the underlying quantum field theory of the standard model. Note that exact gauge-invariance in the standard model is the only driving force behind all of the presented material. Thus a failure to comply with predictions, provided they are theoretically sufficiently under control, would likely hint at a problem with the field-theoretical description of the standard model.

##### 4.6.1. QED and mixing

Adding in hypercharge, and thus ultimately QED, makes the situation somewhat more involved. One of the reasons is that hypercharge, as an Abelian gauge theory, yields an observable charge [154], and observable charged states by dressing the gauge-dependent states with a Dirac phase. This structure needs to be recovered for the bound states, as it is experimentally well studied [8]. But, fortunately,

---

<sup>52</sup>Though note attempts like [261].

the FMS mechanism works in a very similar way as before [12, 13, 192, 267].

This appears rather straightforward, but it is not trivial. It works because of the direct product structure of the weak and hypercharge interaction, and because of the structure of standard model. To see this, it is important to consider how custodial symmetry and hypercharge are linked. The kinetic term of (30) is manifestly invariant under custodial symmetry,

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left( (D_\mu x)^\dagger D^\mu x \right).$$

The Higgs field transforms like  $\phi \rightarrow g\phi$  under a hypercharge gauge transformation  $g$ . However,  $x$  does not transform linearly under a hypercharge transformation. Thus, it is not possible to upgrade in this form the covariant derivative to one including hypercharge. In fact, a hypercharge gauge transformation acts like  $\exp(i\alpha\tau^3)$  on  $x$ , explicitly demonstrating that hypercharge is nothing but gauging the U(1) subgroup of the SU(2) custodial symmetry. Since SU(2)/U(1) is merely a coset, but not a group, there is no remainder global symmetry group left. Because an Abelian gauge symmetry allows for the existence of an (almost) global U(1) group, the electric charge still remains to classify states.

Consider first again the observable particles. Neither for the physical  $W^\pm$  nor the Higgs anything changes, as they are either just linear combinations or unchanged compared to the previous case. Their operators are always mapped to the elementary  $w^\pm$  and higgs. Thus, gauge-invariant perturbation theory yields the same results for them as before. The necessary phase factor can be just multiplied to operators like (62) and (68) to yield a gauge-invariant state with respect to hypercharge. This will just push through to the elementary correlators.

The situation is more involved for the physical Z and the physical Photon  $\Gamma$ . Gauge-invariant equivalent states can be constructed as

$$\mathcal{O}_Z = \sin \theta_W \mathcal{O}_{1_3^-}^3 + \cos \theta_W D b \approx \sin \theta_W w^3 + \cos \theta_W b + \mathcal{O}(\eta) \quad (74)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_\Gamma = \sin \theta_W \mathcal{O}_{1_3^-}^3 - \cos \theta_W D b \approx \cos \theta_W w^3 - \sin \theta_W b + \mathcal{O}(\eta) \quad (75)$$

where  $D$  indicates the necessary Dirac phase factor,  $b$  is the hypercharge gauge field, and  $\theta_W$  is the usual Weinberg angle [10]. It should be noted that both terms need to have the same quantum numbers, i. e. gauge-invariant vectors with no conserved quantum numbers. Because the custodial symmetry is now explicitly broken the fact that  $\mathcal{O}_{1_3^-}^3$  carries a custodial charge and  $DB$  does not does no longer matter. The expansion indeed maps this operator to the usual one. Thus, the corresponding propagator also has the correct mass. The same applies to the physical Photon  $\mathcal{O}_\Gamma$ . Thus, the FMS predicts in this form the appearance of two poles in this same

quantum number channel, and (74-75) represents the mass eigenbasis of this channel. This is in as far remarkable, as this is the first example where gauge-invariant perturbation predicts multiple states in the same channel. Many more examples of this arise beyond the standard model [148], as will be discussed in section 4.7.

Moreover, consider the three-point function for the charged  $W$  bosons and Photons. Expanding it in gauge-invariant perturbation theory yields

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_{1_3^-}^+ \mathcal{O}_{1_3^-}^- \mathcal{O}_\gamma \rangle \approx v^4 \langle w_\mu^+ w_\nu^- \gamma_\rho \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\eta^4). \quad (76)$$

The left-hand-side is a combination of three separately gauge-invariant quantities. Following the rules discussed in section 4.4, each of them has been expanded separately. This used that the operator (68) in the standard choice, (33),  $\alpha = 1$  expands like

$$\text{tr} \tau^a \alpha^\dagger D_\mu \alpha = w_\mu^b \text{tr} \tau^a \tau^b = w_\mu^a.$$

Hence, to leading order, the physical  $W^+ W^- \Gamma$  vertex is given by the perturbative one  $w^+ w^- \gamma$ . In the same manner also the other vertices arise. Thus, the electromagnetic interaction is, up to the level of higgs fluctuations, not modified when using the observable particles instead of the elementary degrees of freedom. Thus, the  $W^\pm$  are then the electrically charged vector operators, and the two operators (74) and (75) are electrically uncharged vector singlets. The spectrum observed in experiment is recovered.

The usual singlet scalar, that is the physical Higgs, remains a singlet with respect to electric charge. It would now be possible to construct a non-singlet, gauge-invariant scalar operator, e. g. by a combination of a  $Z$  and a  $W^\pm$ . However, these states will expand under the FMS mechanism only to scattering states, and thus yield no additional states in the physical spectrum. In particular, they do not expand to, e. g., charged Goldstone bosons, as the contribution of Goldstones vanish because they are BRST non-singlets. So far, only exploratory investigations of the spectrum on the lattice are available, but they indicate the emergence of massless photons in the prescribed way [179, 188, 192].

In other theories, this does not need to be true, as will be discussed in section 4.7. Moreover, the subleading corrections in (76), and in other vertices, imply that at some point deviations should become relevant and modify the perturbative results. This would show up eventually in the experimental searches for anomalous gauge couplings [268, 269], as long as the reference gauge couplings are the perturbative ones. Of course, they are not really anomalous and, e. g., will not be a sign of new physics. Especially, any unitarity violation at the perturbative level due to these corrections [10] would again be non-perturbatively compensated.

#### 4.6.2. Flavor symmetries

The situation becomes substantially more involved when introducing fermions.

For simplicity, ignore for now the Yukawa couplings as well as again hypercharge. Also, consider only a single generation of left-handed leptons. The rest will be added later.

In the standard model, these leptons are doublets under the weak interactions [10]. Therefore, these fermions can again not be observable particles, as they depend on the gauge [12, 13]. Gauge-invariant states can be constructed for the fermion spinor  $\psi$  describing these leptons by a dressing with a Higgs field [12, 13, 238],

$$\mathcal{O}_\Psi(y) = (x\epsilon)^\dagger(y)\psi(y), \quad (77)$$

where  $\epsilon$  is the antisymmetric tensor of rank two<sup>53</sup>. This is by construction gauge-invariant, and remains a (left-handed) fermion. It is important to note that every component of the operator  $\mathcal{O}_\Psi$  is a left-handed spinor. Because  $x$  transforms by a left-multiplication under the custodial symmetry, the state is a custodial doublet. Thus, the weak gauge charge, which is perturbatively associated with the up/down or lepton/neutrino distinction [10] is replaced by a custodial charge for the physical states. In fact, the same charge which distinguishes the physical  $W^\pm$  and  $Z$  now distinguishes also the components of a physical fermion. These two custodial charge states are the physically observable fermions, e. g. the Electron  $E$  and the Electron-Neutrino  $N$ .

To identify their connection to the elementary fermions, consider the electron-neutrino case further. Denoting the two fundamental weak states  $\psi^1$  and  $\psi^2$  by  $e$  and  $\nu$  yields [12, 13, 238]

$$\mathcal{O}_{NE} = \begin{pmatrix} N \\ E \end{pmatrix} = (x\epsilon)^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \nu \\ e \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_2\nu - \phi_1e \\ \phi_1^*\nu + \phi_2^*e \end{pmatrix} \approx v \begin{pmatrix} \nu \\ e \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(\eta) \quad (78)$$

Thus, the usual electron and neutrino appear to leading order as the custodial eigenstates. Likewise, forming the propagator from  $\mathcal{O}_{NE}$  this implies that the two custodial states expand to the tree-level propagators of the electron and the neutrino, and therefore have the same mass as the perturbative electron and neutrino. For this identification it is absolutely crucial that the Higgs is a scalar particle, as in any other case this would alter the spin-parity quantum numbers of the fermions. Thus, the perceived flavor symmetry of left-handed fermions needs to be identified with the custodial symmetry  $SU(2)_c$ . In addition, there is a global  $U(1)_l$  fermion num-

---

<sup>53</sup>Alternatively either the assignment of the hypercharge values of the fermions can be reversed, or the convention of [238] can be used to avoid  $\epsilon$ .

ber symmetry, which only affects the fermions. Thus, at this point there is a global  $U(2)_L \sim SU(2)_c \times U(1)_l$  symmetry.

An extension to three generations<sup>54</sup> is straightforward, as a generation index would be just pushed through to the bound state, and pushed back by the expansion. This gives an  $SU(3)_g$  additional global symmetry. Note that the total global symmetry is then  $SU(3)_g \times U(2)_L$ .

However, so far there is no way to generate a tree-level mass for the fermions. This requires the Yukawa interaction. Introduce two right-handed additional fermions, a right-handed electron and a right-handed neutrino<sup>55</sup>, not interacting weakly. Without any further distinguishing feature, this implies an additional  $U(2)_R \sim SU(2)_{\text{flavor}} \times U(1)_{\text{number}}$  flavor and right-handed counting symmetry. Thus at this point the global symmetry of the theory is  $SU(2)_c \times U(1)_l \times U(2)_R = U(2)_L \times U(2)_R$ .

Due to the gauge symmetry at the Lagrangian level no conventional mass-term is allowed for the fermions [10]. By assumption, there are right-handed neutrinos, and thus Majorana masses are also not an option. Combining the two right-handed leptons in a flavor spinor  $\Psi_R$ , a possibility is a Yukawa interaction

$$\mathcal{L}_Y = g_Y (\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{NE} \Psi_R - \bar{\Psi}_R \mathcal{O}_{NE}),$$

with  $g_Y$  the Yukawa coupling. Because this locks the symmetries, this breaks the custodial and flavor symmetries down to a diagonal subgroup  $U(2)_d$ . This diagonal subgroup can be identified with the conventional, physical Flavor group. This group can be further broken down to  $U(1)_E \times U(1)_N$ , separate counting symmetries of both electrons and neutrinos, by introducing a matrix  $\Omega$ , which is not invariant under an  $SU(2)$  transformation, as

$$\mathcal{L}_Y = g_Y (\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{NE} \Omega \Psi_R - \bar{\Psi}_R \Omega^\dagger \mathcal{O}_{NE}). \quad (79)$$

If the matrix  $\Omega$  is diagonal  $\text{diag} = (g_\nu/g_Y, g_e/g_Y)$ , this gives two independent interaction terms

$$\mathcal{L}_Y = g_\nu (\phi_2 \bar{\nu}_L - \phi_1 \bar{e}_L) N_R + g_e (\phi_1^* \bar{\nu}_L + \phi_2^* \bar{e}_L) E_R + \text{h.c.},$$

which for  $x \approx v1$  are nothing but the usual mass terms for the neutrino and the electron of the standard model [10]. Then, the tree-level propagators obtain their usual

---

<sup>54</sup>The following could possibly also have quite interesting implications for the generation structure of the standard model. Since this is highly speculative, this will not be reviewed here, but can be found in [238].

<sup>55</sup>Here for simplicity, as then the quark and lepton sector work in the same way, the existence of a right-handed neutrino will be assumed. If the neutrino sector is different from this minimal version, this would require corresponding amendments to the construction.



mass [10], and by virtue of the FMS mechanism so does the propagator of the bound state (77). If  $\Omega$  is not diagonal, a change of the basis in the fermion fields can make it so, at the expense of introducing a matrix in the weak interactions, in the same way as the CKM/PMNS matrices introduce such an effect at the level of generations [10]. Furthermore, in the presence of multiple generations, intrageneration mixing can be absorbed as usual also in the CKM/PMNS matrices.

Adding further generations proceeds almost as before. However, so far this upgrades the right-handed flavor symmetry to an (S)U(6) symmetry, which is then explicitly broken by the Yukawa terms by selecting individual flavors for the interactions with the three left-handed generation, in contrast to the generation structure before. The global generation structure for left-handed fermions and right-handed fermions can therefore still differ. The same global generation structure for the left-handed and the right-handed symmetry will be enforced by the hypercharge.

Before proceeding, return to the case of a single left-handed doublet. In section 4.6.1 it was pointed out that the hypercharge is actually gauging the custodial symmetry. Thus the composite state (77) would apparently already transform under a hypercharge transformation. Now, in addition the fermions become coupled to the hypercharge, with an arbitrary value. This has to happen with the same hypercharge for both members of the doublet, as it would otherwise break the weak gauge symmetry. Thus,  $\psi$  transforms as  $\psi \rightarrow g\psi$ . Because the hypercharge gauge transformation acts like  $\text{diag}(g, g^\dagger)$  on  $x$  this yields a total transformation like  $\text{diag}(1, g^2)$  for the state (77). With the usual hypercharge assignment for the elementary fields,  $g^2$  is equal to a transformation with twice the hypercharge value, as it is an Abelian group. This shows explicitly that the physical Neutrino state is uncharged under the hypercharge, while the physical Electron is charged, with twice the hypercharge of the elementary electron.

The actual electric charge is then, as in (76), obtained by considering the expansion of  $\langle \bar{\mathcal{O}}_\Psi \mathcal{O}_\Psi \mathcal{O}_\Gamma \rangle$ . This expands for the various combinations of custodial indices to the usual tree-level interactions, yielding the correct assignment of the electromagnetic charges to the various states [10].

The only thing left is the assignment of hypercharge to the right-handed fermions. To make (79) gauge-invariant enforces the standard assignment [10], thereby breaking the right-handed flavor symmetry already down to  $U(1)^3$ , or  $SU(3) \times U(1)^2$  for three generations, as the right-handed neutrino and electron cannot have the same hypercharge value. Therefore the breaking pattern for left-handed and right-handed flavor due to the presence of hypercharge is different, as in one case the custodial symmetry is actually gauged, while in the other case the assignment of the hypercharges breaks the generation symmetry explicitly. Still, it leads to the same remaining global symmetry in the left-handed and the right-handed sec-

tor. Note that differing hypercharge assignments to the differing generations would be compatible with all results, and would merely introduce a different breaking pattern of the generations, though would prevent the introduction of intergeneration transitions except for very special relative values of the hypercharges, just as in perturbation theory.

The quark sector follows exactly the same structure. From the point of view of the electroweak and Higgs interaction, it is just a copy of the lepton sector, and operates, but for different values of the couplings, just like three more generations. But it is distinguished from it by color. Color has no bearing on the FMS mechanism or any of the present results. However, reversely the change of the meaning of flavor and the global symmetry structure of the theory have implications for QCD, as will be discussed in the next section [4.6.3](#).

Before this, it should be noted that also the anomaly cancellation is not altered at all. After all, the anomaly arises from the path integral measure [\[10\]](#), which involves the elementary fields only. The observable, physical states, and the FMS expansion acting on it, are merely expectation values. They therefore never interfere with the mechanism for the intrageneration anomaly cancellation.

There exists exploratory lattice simulations of this theory with vectorial fermions [\[270, 271\]](#), though yet without detailed spectroscopy. In this case it can be expected that the FMS mechanism works in the same way, though with operators representing this vectorial symmetry. This has not yet been investigated in lattice simulations. Note also that if the BEH effect would be switched off, this is the situation encountered in the Abbott-Farhi model [\[272\]](#), except that the fermions would be vectorially coupled instead of chirally. This situation is also relevant to so-called partial compositeness models [\[273, 274\]](#). In this case, the FMS mechanism is not applicable, and the theory can manifest also other phases. Such theories have also been subject to exploratory lattice simulations [\[270, 271, 275, 276\]](#), and may host many interesting phenomena [\[277, 278\]](#).

#### *4.6.3. QCD and hadrons*

As noted before, with respect to the electroweak interactions the same applies to quarks as to leptons. Considering only low-energy QCD, it is possible, because of [\(78\)](#), to first apply the FMS mechanism, to obtain the standard quarks, and then reduce to QCD alone. This leads to the usual QCD, and nothing changes. Thus, QCD in isolation emerges as a low-energy effective theory in the same way as in the standard model. This is therefore not particularly interesting in the present context.

However, this will only be correct as long as it is good to keep just the leading term of [\(78\)](#). As discussed repeatedly, this may only be good for energies below which Higgs production is not appreciable and/or virtual Higgs corrections are

negligible. Since modern experiments probe well into this region, it is worthwhile to have a closer look at how QCD operates within the context of the full standard model.

Still, even in the full standard model confinement is operative<sup>56</sup>, as has been discussed at the beginning of this section. In the present subsection, confinement will be used in the operative sense that quarks and gluons are necessarily bound inside hadrons in such a way that the hadron is gauge-invariant with respect to color.

There are thus three type of gauge-invariant operators describing hadrons, which need to be considered in the following.

One are those involving only gluons, the glueballs. Since no other charges are involved, they work in precisely the same ways as in pure QCD. Most importantly, they are always ‘flavor’ singlets, and do not carry electric charge.

The second type are operators involving quarks, but with quantum numbers which can also be build using only glueballs. Therefore, they do not carry flavor and/or electric charge. With respect to the electroweak sector they are therefore uncharged, and thus completely gauge-invariant. Also for these nothing changes. An example of this is the  $\sigma$  meson, which carries the quantum numbers of the vacuum,

$$\mathcal{O}_\sigma = \bar{u}_L \sigma u_L + \bar{d}_L \sigma d_L + \bar{u}_R \sigma u_R + \bar{d}_R \sigma d_R \quad (80)$$

where the matrix  $\sigma$  transforms the Weyl spinors from left-handed to right-handed, and thus acts only in Dirac space to create Lorentz scalars [280]. Thus, this operator is a singlet for all global symmetries. Another example is the  $\omega$  meson, which is a vector singlet.

It should be noted that such operators mix with all singlet operators, like the Higgs, from the weak interactions. Fortunately, this mixing seems to be small experimentally [8], so this subtlety can be ignored here.

A change happens for the third type of operators, which is any operator not belonging to either of the two previous classes. Thus, these are all flavor-non-singlet operators from the perspective of pure QCD [238].

Consider for the moment the one-generation case only, and ignore both hypercharge and the Yukawa interactions. Then an eight-component spinor can be constructed as

$$\Psi = \begin{pmatrix} (x\epsilon)^\dagger \psi_L \\ U_R \\ D_R \end{pmatrix}, \quad (81)$$

---

<sup>56</sup>It is already in QCD alone not a trivial issue to even phrase the question what confinement is precisely, much less how it operates [138, 279].

where the Weyl spinors are not detailed further. Note that these states are denoted by capital letters as they are gauge-invariant with respect to the weak interaction, but not yet gauge-invariant with respect to the strong interaction.

QCD constructed from these spinors is invariant under a global symmetry of  $SU(2) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ , dropping another  $U(1)$  due to the axial anomaly [10]. The first  $SU(2)$  acts only on the first two components, the custodial symmetry, and the second one only on the right-handed flavor symmetry. Since the custodial and right-handed flavor symmetry are not explicitly broken, the left-handed and right-handed part do not mix under the symmetry transformation. Thus, this symmetry replaces the usual chiral and flavor symmetry of QCD. By a change of basis it is possible to reestablish this symmetry, but this has also impact on the weak gauge boson physical particles, which are charged under the custodial symmetry.

Note that this would-be chiral symmetry is necessarily unbroken, following the arguments of section 2, though in QCD this is a metastable situation.

Consider now a state like a pion, which has the structure

$$\pi^a = \bar{\Psi} \tau^a \gamma_5 \Psi,$$

where the Dirac representation is chosen for the  $\gamma$  matrices. This operator mixes the various states, resulting in

$$\pi^+ = \bar{d}_R((x\epsilon)^\dagger \psi_L)^u + \overline{((x\epsilon)^\dagger \psi_L)^d} u_R \quad (82)$$

$$\pi^- = \bar{u}_R((x\epsilon)^\dagger \psi_L)^d + \overline{((x\epsilon)^\dagger \psi_L)^u} d_L \quad (83)$$

$$\pi^0 = \bar{d}_R((x\epsilon)^\dagger \psi_L)^d + \overline{((x\epsilon)^\dagger \psi_L)^d} u_d - \bar{u}_R((x\epsilon)^\dagger \psi_L)^u - \overline{((x\epsilon)^\dagger \psi_L)^u} u_R, \quad (84)$$

where the indices  $u$  and  $d$  identify the components of the spinors  $(x\epsilon)^\dagger \psi_L$ . The first remarkable insight is that, in contrast to the  $\sigma$  meson (80), such operators always involve three valence particles, the two quarks and a higgs in form of  $x$ . This is necessary as otherwise the mixing of left-handed and right-handed particles to create a pseudo-scalar would not be possible gauge-invariantly.

Of course, applying the FMS expansion of section 4.4 will reduce (82-84) immediately to the usual operators of QCD, reestablishing the pions as quark-anti-quark bound states, but multiplied with the Higgs vacuum expectation value. But this is a statement in a fixed gauge. The genuine gauge-invariant expression inside the standard model have a valence higgs besides the valence quarks. This is remarkable for multiple reasons. One is that the mass defect is actually large. But this also implies that to excite the higgs substructure will require a substantial amount of energy, and the corrections at the sub-leading order are generically small. Whether this could be probed in actual experiments will be discussed in more detail section 5.

Concerning global symmetries, the pions therefore mix already the symmetries, and the operators (82-84) are neither custodial nor right-handed flavor eigenstates. If both would be separately conserved, any pion current would be needed to be decomposed into the two component currents. But this becomes irrelevant as soon as the Yukawa couplings are turned on, as both symmetries are then explicitly broken, and can mix freely. This explicit breaking also translates into the usual explicit breaking of chiral and flavor symmetry in the stand-alone QCD and/or the FMS expansion to QCD.

The introduction of hypercharge emphasizes this even more. Because the left-handed quarks and the right-handed quarks have a different hypercharge just building a Dirac spinor from them is not possible in a gauge-covariant way. However, by the combination with the higgs field in (81) having also hypercharge, (81) transforms in a gauge-covariant fashion, and in particular allows the operators (82-84) to have a well-defined electric charge. Note that any other relative assignments of hypercharges to the higgs and the quarks would not create suitably electrically charged hadrons. That this involves also the higgs and not just the quarks in stand-alone QCD makes the particular assignments of hypercharges to the elementary particles of the standard model even more mysterious than it already is.

All of this becomes much more dramatic for baryons [238]. Because any baryon has an odd number of quarks, it is impossible to couple left-handed fermions together such that they form at the same time a gauge-invariant state under the strong and the weak interaction. Therefore, any baryon involving a left-handed component necessarily involves a valence higgs. Moreover, as hadrons are essentially parity eigenstates [8, 105, 106], any baryon contains such a left-handed component.

Consider for a moment just a system of left-handed fermions. Then [238]

$$N_L = \epsilon^{IJK} c_{ijkl} q_i^I q_j^J q_k^K (x\epsilon)_{il}^\dagger \quad (85)$$

$$\Delta_L = \epsilon^{IJK} q_i^I q_j^J q_k^K (x\epsilon)_{ii}^\dagger (x\epsilon)_{jj}^\dagger (x\epsilon)_{kk}^\dagger \quad (86)$$

form two possible three-quark operators, which are gauge-invariant under both the strong interactions, denoted by capital indices, and the weak interaction. The operator (85) corresponds to cases which have one open custodial index, like the nucleons, while the operator (86) corresponds to cases with three open custodial indices, like the  $\Delta^{++}$  and the  $\Delta^-$ . The matrix  $c$  depends on the other properties of the baryon in question. E. g. for a proton it becomes [238]

$$c_{ijkl}^p = a_1 \epsilon_{ij} \delta_{kl} + a_2 \epsilon_{ik} \delta_{jl} + a_3 \epsilon_{jk} \delta_{il}$$

while for the  $\Delta^{++}$  it suffices to set in (86)  $\tilde{i} = \tilde{j} = \tilde{k} = 1$ .

Returning to the full theory with both left-handed and right-handed quarks, a nucleon operator is, e. g., constructed as [105]

$$N^{rst} = \epsilon^{IJK} F_{uvw}^{rst} \Psi_{Iu} \left( \Psi_{Jv}^T C \gamma_5 \Psi_{Kw} \right) \quad (87)$$

where  $F$  acts in custodial/right-handed flavor space and the charge-conjugation matrix is  $C = i\gamma_2\gamma_0$ . The expression in parentheses is a scalar diquark, and as such mixes left-hand and right-handed components. The fermionic nature is carried entirely by the first quark field. To obtain definite parity states requires projection with a parity operator [105], essentially  $(1 \pm \gamma_0)/2$ . Since parity therefore transforms left-handed to right-handed [281], a parity eigenstate necessarily contains both left-handed and right-handed components. Therefore, in the full standard model there is also a higgs valence contribution in the nucleon. Actually, because the scalar diquark combines products of left-handed and right-handed components of the  $\Psi$  field, the proton, being a positive parity state, operator is a mixture of a state with one and three valence higgs fields.

It is, of course, possible to write down operators with definite valence higgs contributions. However, these are no longer mass eigenstates, and therefore are only of limited use when considering the low-energy limit of stand-alone QCD.

The discussion here used only a particular set of operators for the hadrons. Of course, all operators of the same quantum numbers contribute, and therefore also operators with more fields. However, because of gauge-invariance and the particular quantum numbers they will always involve some higgs component. Thus, for all hadrons, which cannot mix with the glueballs, there is necessarily a valence higgs contribution. The FMS expansion shows that these states have, to leading order in the higgs fluctuations, just their usual masses. However, at some point, the valence higgs contribution should show. Why this has (not yet) any experimental consequences will be discussed in section 5.

There is an important insight here from the quantum numbers. Only because the higgs is a scalar particle its presence does not alter the quantum numbers of the hadrons. If it would be, e. g., a pseudoscalar, stand-alone QCD as the low-energy limit of the standard model would not describe hadron physics correctly. This is consistent with the experimental status that the higgs is indeed most likely a scalar particle [8, 282, 283].

To summarize, the observable standard model spectrum, together with the corresponding operators, is listed in table 1.

#### 4.7. Beyond the standard model

Before going to the consequences of gauge-invariance for dynamical processes, like scattering processes, in section 5, it is worthwhile to first consider its implica-



Name	Spin and Parity	Custodial representation	Example operator	Equation
Higgs	$0^+$	Singlet	$\phi^\dagger \phi$	(62)
$W$	$1^-$	Triplet $\pm 1$	$W^a = \text{tr} \left( T_{ij}^a \alpha_j^\dagger D_\mu \alpha_i \right)$	(68)
$Z$	$1^-$	Mix Triplet 0 and Singlet	$\sin \theta_W \mathcal{O}_{1_3^-}^3 + \cos \theta_W D b$	(74)
$\Gamma$	$1^-$	Mix Triplet 0 and Singlet	$\sin \theta_W \mathcal{O}_{1_3^-}^3 - \cos \theta_W D b$	(75)
$N_R$	$\frac{1}{2}^+$	Singlet	$\nu_R$	
$E_R$	$\frac{1}{2}^+$	Singlet	$D e_R$	
$E_L / N_L$	$\frac{1}{2}^+$	Doublet	$(x\epsilon)^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \nu_L \\ e_L \end{pmatrix}$	(77)
Mesons	Integer $^\pm$	Any integer		(80), (82-84)
Baryons	Half-integer $^\pm$	Any half-integer	$\epsilon^{IJK} F_{uv}^{rst} \Psi_{Iu} \left( \Psi_{Jv}^T C \gamma_5 \Psi_{Kw} \right)$	(85), (86), (87)

Table 1: The gauge-invariant, physical spectrum of the standard model. The custodial symmetry is explicitly broken, but can still serve to order states in multiplets. Note that only the first generation is shown explicitly.

tions for theories of different structure than the standard model [284].

These implications depend on the relative properties of the gauge and custodial symmetries, as well as the involved representations of the Higgs fields. In addition, it is possible to have a custodial symmetry involving also fermions in supersymmetric theories [80, 280]. This is a possibility not yet explored, and which will therefore not be discussed here. And, of course, there is the possibility of the absence of a BEH effect, e. g. in composite models [22, 80, 235, 236, 285, 286]. The latter will be taken up in section 6.5. There is also the possibility of more than four dimensions in form of gauge-Higgs unification [80], which has been studied also in lattice simulations, see e. g. [287–291]. While this scenario certainly increases the technical complexity, because of the anisotropy in space-time, it is not conceptually different with respect to gauge-invariance. However, it has not yet been treated using gauge-invariant perturbation theory to understand the validity of perturbation theory, though the lattice results suggests [288, 289] that this should be possible.

In the following, only the situation for the gauge sector and the Higgs fields will be analyzed. For an enlarged custodial symmetry the remainder of the standard model seems to be possible to include as in the standard model case [152]. This is not even perturbatively true if the gauge group is enlarged beyond a direct-product structure [10, 79]. Then, it is first necessary to somehow decompose the gauge degrees of freedom to arrive at the usual degrees of freedom. This has not yet been studied in detail.



#### 4.7.1. Enlarged custodial symmetry

The simplest case of an enlarged custodial symmetry arises in two-Higgs doublet models (2HDMs) [78, 80, 150]. In such a theory an additional complex doublet of higgs fields is added. Thus, this can enlarge the custodial symmetry up to<sup>57</sup>  $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ , depending on the explicit breakings in the Higgs potential. In addition, there may be further discrete  $Z_N$  symmetries [78], which will be ignored for the moment.

Because the higgs fields in 2HDMs are all in the fundamental representation of the weak gauge group, it is possible to perform field redefinitions by linear field transformations, essentially changes of basis in the higgs fields. Two bases are of particular importance [78, 150]. One is the Higgs basis, in which in perturbation theory all of the vacuum expectation value is pushed into a single higgs doublet. The other is the mass eigenbasis, where the mass matrix in the Higgs sector has no off-diagonal elements.

In the Higgs basis, it is then possible to just copy verbatim for each of the custodial groups the results of section 4.4, as long as the entity is a singlet with respect to the other custodial group [152]. Thus, for the custodial group involving the Higgs condensate this creates again a scalar and a triplet of vector bosons, with the mass of the corresponding higgs and the  $w$  bosons. At the same time, the operators in the second custodial group have no expansion to tree-level propagators, and therefore expand to scattering states.

It becomes more interesting when considering operators which are tensor products, i. e. carrying quantum numbers of both custodial groups. Then, there arises one more operator which expands to a tree-level one [152]

$$\mathcal{O}_{0+}^{ab} = \text{tr} \left( x \tau^a \tau^b y \right) \quad (88)$$

where  $y$  is formed analogously to (29) for the second higgs doublet. This is a bifundamental tensor and therefore has four different states. They expand precisely to the four additional higgs propagators of perturbation theory at tree-level following the rules of section 4.4. Therefore, the additional Higgs particles appear again in the spectrum with the same masses [152] as in perturbation theory [78, 150]. Furthermore, if the second custodial symmetry should be broken<sup>58</sup>, the breaking pattern manifest in the masses carries over to these states [152]. Though not explicitly shown, this was already suspected in [13].

Thus, the prediction of gauge-invariant perturbation theory is that, as for the standard model, perturbative results give the correct leading behavior.

---

<sup>57</sup>The maximum  $SU(4)$  symmetry is not compatible with the standard model.

<sup>58</sup>The first one cannot be broken without contradicting standard-model phenomenology

Lattice simulations of 2HDMs are possible and have been done [151, 153, 172]. But, the predictions of gauge-invariant perturbation theory have not been checked yet, as in none of these simultaneously the physical and elementary spectrum have been determined. Other results have been established, nonetheless. Especially, it has been observed that the custodial symmetry can exhibit metastability (or spontaneous symmetry breaking after introduction of an external source) [151, 172]. This implies a much richer phase diagram than in the standard-model case. How this affects the physical spectrum has not been investigated in detail, though the FMS mechanism predicts that even in this case the physical spectrum should be mappable to the perturbative spectrum [152].

Likewise, so far no predictions exist what will happen with more higgs doublets, so-called  $n$ -Higgs-doublet models [150]. However, the suspicion is that in the Higgs basis the FMS mechanism will again yield agreement with perturbation theory.

It should be noted that it was crucial to use the Higgs basis for this calculation. Using a basis where the vacuum expectation value is spread between different Higgs fields will naively create additional massive particles [284]. However, in such a case these are not in the correct multiplet structure for the symmetry, and must be unmixed first, similar to the case of weak gauge and hypercharge. While this has not been done explicitly, the symmetry of the Higgs basis should be maintained, and therefore this should lead to the same physical spectrum.

#### 4.7.2. Enlarged gauge symmetry

Consider first  $SU(N)$ . This case is relevant, e. g., to grand-unified theories<sup>59</sup> (GUTs) [10, 79].

Note first that, because of its pseudo-reality,  $SU(2)$  is qualitatively different from  $SU(N > 2)$ . This implies in particular that if the gauge group is  $SU(N > 2)$ , it is possible to have a single higgs in the fundamental representation. Thus, the minimal custodial symmetry is reduced to a  $U(1)$  in contrast to the  $SU(2)$  of the standard-model case.

Consider first the simplest case of  $SU(3)$ . This theory is expected to have also a QCD-like and a BEH-like region in the phase diagram, which has also been seen on the lattice [176], and is shown in figure 3. Perturbatively [10, 176], this theory is broken by the gauge condition down to  $SU(2)$ . This leads to a single non-Goldstone scalar degree of freedom, identified as the higgs particle. The unbroken  $SU(2)$  shows up in a triplet of massless gauge bosons, making up the adjoint representation of the

---

<sup>59</sup>Note that non-perturbative investigations yield arguments why GUTs may be problematic due to their large field content [292–296]. These arguments are orthogonal to the discussion here, and are not necessarily connected to BEH physics.




Figure 14: The left panel shows the gauge boson propagators and the corresponding fits, from [176]. The right-hand side shows the running gauge coupling in the miniMOM scheme in the various subsectors, from [297].

SU(2). There is also a quadruplet of heavy gauge bosons, forming a fundamental and an anti-fundamental representation of SU(2), which by pseudoreality once more coincide. Finally, there is a singlet with respect to the SU(2), with a mass which is at tree-level  $\sqrt{4/3}$  larger than that of the quadruplet. Only the higgs carries a U(1) charge, which will by convention set to  $1/3$ .

Lattice simulations in 't Hooft gauge, for parameter values where the BEH mechanism is active, confirm this behavior of the elementary higgs and gauge bosons [176]. This is shown in the left-hand plot of figure 14. The results can be fitted well using a tree-level ansatz for the massive modes. Even the so obtained mass ratio between the SU(2)-quadruplet and the SU(2)-singlet are very close to the tree-level ratio. While stronger affected by finite-volume artifacts, also the massless modes behave as expected. Moreover, even in the unbroken sector the gauge interaction remains weak, as is also shown in figure 14. Thus no interference from strong interactions of the unbroken subgroup will play a role at the typical scale of the BEH effect.

Constructing gauge-invariant states follows the recipe of section 4.2. The gauge-invariant states can either be singlets or charged under the U(1) symmetry [148].

The singlet scalar follows essentially the same line as for the standard-model in section 4.5.3, i. e. (62). In particular, there is a single state, with the same mass as the single Higgs particle of perturbation theory [148, 176, 298]. However, the scheme issues are naturally the same as in the standard model. In addition, so far, in lattice simulations only for some parameter sets indications have been found for




Figure 15: Comparison of the  $1^-$  singlet mass compared to the mass of the heaviest gauge boson as a function of volume, from [176]. The two masses are predicted to be the same in gauge-invariant perturbation theory. There is no significant volume-dependence, indicating that both states are massive and stable [243].

a scalar below the elastic decay threshold. Thus, an explicit test like for the standard model case was not yet completely possible, but should be possible with more data [176, 297].

The situation becomes more interesting for the singlet vector. The simplest operator in the singlet channel and its FMS expansion is [176, 298]

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{O}_\mu^{1^-}(x) \mathcal{O}_\mu^{+1^-}(y) \rangle &= \frac{v^4 g^2}{4} \langle w_\mu^8(x) w_\mu^8(y) \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\eta) \\ \mathcal{O}_\mu^{1^-}(x) &= i(\phi^\dagger D_\mu \phi)(x) \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

where  $w^8$  is the field describing the heaviest gauge boson. Thus, the mass of the singlet vector should be equal to the one of the singlet gauge boson. This is indeed found on the lattice [176], and shown in figure 15. That none of the other states show up is actually not surprising from the point of view of gauge-invariance: After all, there is no global symmetry which could create the necessary degeneracy pattern<sup>60</sup>.

Thus, in this theory the physical spectrum does not coincide with the elementary spectrum. Still, gauge-invariant perturbation theory seems to be still able to predict it correctly.

There are, of course, a multitude of other singlet channels. Some of them have been investigated, but none of them have shown any signal of a state below the

<sup>60</sup>Not withstanding the possibility of an emergent symmetry, but this is not observed.




Figure 16: The left panel shows the effective mass (71) of the open U(1) vector channel and the right panel of the open U(1) scalar channel [297, 299]. In the two predictions no contamination of heavier (scattering) states has been taken into account, yielding the smallest possible effective mass. Allowing for such contributions leads to acceptable agreement [297]. Note that the results are for a different set of lattice parameters, and thus different masses, than in figure 15.

elastic decay threshold in lattice simulations [297].

The situation is quite different for the non-singlet channels. Because the global U(1) is not explicitly broken, there must be a lightest stable state carrying this quantum number. Such additional stable states are usually dark matter candidates [80], emphasizing the importance of understanding such states. Because of gauge-invariance these states will require at least three valence higgs fields, and have at least three times the U(1) charge of the elementary higgs field, in analogy to baryons in QCD in section 4.6.3. The simplest scalar and vector operators of this type are<sup>61</sup> [148]

$$\mathcal{O}_1^{0+} = \epsilon_{abc} \phi_a D_\mu \phi_b D_\mu D_\nu D_\nu \phi_c \quad (90)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_\mu^{1-} = \epsilon_{abc} \phi_a D_\nu \phi_b D_\mu D_\nu \phi_c. \quad (91)$$

These states do not expand to a single elementary particle state in gauge-invariant perturbation theory, but to scattering states. Still, the lightest state is stable, and thus necessarily bound. To estimate its mass, a possibility is to use the approximation of gauge-invariant perturbation theory of it by a scattering state in terms of the elementary states [148]. This can be done in a similar way as determining the mass of

<sup>61</sup>They become much simpler if there are two higgs fields [229]. Note that for the special case of SU(3) there exists also simpler operators [148].

a baryon in QCD using the quark model [258]: There it is to leading order three times the mass of the non-interacting quarks. Here, the higgs fields do not contribute to the scattering state, and it is their vacuum expectation value that carries the global U(1) charge - after all the 't Hooft gauge breaks this symmetry to a diagonal U(1) subgroup of the SU(3) gauge group and the U(1) group. In fact, performing the quite cumbersome expansions explicitly yields that both states should be to leading order mass degenerate, and having the mass of twice the light non-zero  $w$  mass [148]. Thus, they should be about 1.7 times heavier than the singlet vector. Lattice simulations, though expensive and plagued by discretization artifacts and statistical uncertainties for such a heavy state, find indeed for the vector a mass in this range [297], being  $1.0(3)m_{\text{predicted}}$ . It should be noted that a naive counting of masses, like in the quark model, would yield a mass of  $3m_h$  in both (90) and (91). In the corresponding lattice simulations, this provides a lower bound of  $3.5(8)m_{\text{predicted}}$ , substantially above the FMS prediction. A measurement for the non-singlet scalar has not yet been possible. The corresponding results for the effective mass (71) from [297, 299] are shown in figure 16.

Hence, the FMS mechanism and gauge-invariant perturbation theory seem to provide not only for the channels which expand to elementary fields an adequate description, but also for more complicated states. In addition, this is a non-trivial test of the underlying field-theoretical concepts, which are based on the necessity of gauge-invariance. Especially, triply charged stable states do not exist in perturbation theory, and such dark matter candidates would therefore be missed in a perturbative analysis, while incorrectly having a singly charged higgs. The physical spectrum is quite different.

Another remarkable result is the following [148]. Expanding the operator (89) to the next order in the fluctuation field yields

$$\mathcal{O}_\mu^{1_0^-} = -\frac{v^2 g}{2} w_\mu^8 + \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} \partial_\mu \eta - \sqrt{2} g v w_\mu^8 \eta + \mathcal{O}(\eta^2). \quad (92)$$

The third term involves two particles, and will therefore only contribute in scattering states. But the second term involves a single higgs field. Such a term does not arise in the SU(2) case because of the differing custodial structure. The remarkable implication is that there should be a second pole, besides the one at the gauge boson's heaviest mass, at the mass of the higgs. This second pole is therefore degenerate with the scalar. In addition, this implies that the lowest mass in this channel is the minimum of the two masses. This implies that the scalar singlet can never be lighter than the singlet vector.

This is in agreement with what has been seen in lattice simulations, although only in the sense that the lightest state in (92) is given by the mass of  $w^8$ , and the

mass of the higgs is larger than that [297]. Intriguingly, though the FMS mechanism provides no explanation for this, this hierarchy is also observed in lattice simulations for the  $SU(2)$  case, as discussed in section 4.5.2.

This situation with multiple poles identifiable with elementary degrees of freedom is actually not exceptional [148]. This is therefore a fourth possible outcome of the FMS mechanism besides the identification of a single pole with an elementary field, a scattering state, and a non-trivial bound state. Unfortunately, so far no situation has been found in lattice calculations where the second pole was statistically and systematically reliably identifiable, and therefore no positive confirmation has yet been possible. If the pole would be above the elastic threshold, this will require a Lüscher-type analysis [105, 249, 250], but this demands substantially more statistics than currently available.

Enlarging the gauge group to arbitrary  $N > 3$  yields qualitatively the same results [148]. The perturbative spectrum remains essentially the same, up to changes in the degeneracies of multiplets and values of the mass ratios [10, 148]. On the other hand, the physical spectrum keeps its degeneracies, because the global custodial symmetry remains  $U(1)$ . In addition, the predicted mass spectrum is mapped to the same quantities, and thus qualitatively the same physical spectrum arises independently of  $N$ . Unfortunately no lattice tests of this prediction has yet been made. It will be necessary to perform these investigations to see whether this is generically true. But the  $SU(3)$  case is already a highly non-trivial tests of the mechanisms.

Interestingly, when increasing in the  $N = 3$  case the number of higgs fields to two, increasing the global symmetry to a  $SU(2) \times U(1)$  symmetry, gauge-invariant perturbation theory again predicts that more of the perturbative states reappear in the spectrum [148, 298]. Whether it is completely recovered requires further investigations, especially for generalizations of the tensor operator (88). From a group-theoretical point of view, this can be understood. After all, the additional elementary states build  $SU(2)$  representations, which are then mapped on the global  $SU(2)$  representations, provided the latter is not explicitly broken. Thus, this is very similar to what occurs in the 2HDM of section 4.7.1. Whether this actually works in this way has unfortunately not been tested on the lattice yet. If the gauge group becomes again larger but the number of higgs fields is not increased then again the representations do not match, and problems with the degeneracy patterns would be expected. This has not yet been studied in detail.

What happens in case of gauge groups different than  $SU(N)$  has not yet been explored.



#### 4.7.3. Changing the representation of the Higgs

A third possibility to modify the basic setup is to change the representation of one, or more, higgs fields. This arises regularly in grand-unified theories [10, 79].

The simplest change is to use the standard-model  $SU(2)$  case, but to put the Higgs in the adjoint representation<sup>62</sup>. In this case the global symmetry is only a  $Z_2$ , which changes  $\phi \rightarrow -\phi$ . Perturbatively, this theory breaks to a  $U(1)$  gauge theory, and in fact, it is not possible to break the gauge symmetry completely [43]. Thus, the arguments of section 3.7 do not apply. Consequently, non-perturbative studies found a separation of the phase diagram into two phases. One, in which this global symmetry is metastable against breaking, and one in which it is not [93, 145–147, 149]. The phase of broken symmetry exhibits also features like the BEH-like region in the fundamental case, while the other one is QCD-like. This fits with the idea of the Wilson confinement criterion, where an unbroken  $Z_2$  symmetry is connected to a linear rising string tension [105, 279]. Hence, in this theory appears to be a phase separation between both types of physics.

As far as has been investigated, the QCD-like phase is not qualitatively different from the fundamental case when it comes to spectral properties and other physical features. Therefore, nothing new arises in this case. Thus, for the purpose here, the interesting phase is the one in which the BEH effect operates.

As noted, perturbatively there should remain an unbroken  $U(1)$  subgroup. The hallmark of this would be a massless gauge boson. This is especially interesting, as a  $U(1)$  gauge theory allows for a physically observable charge [154]. This would imply that there should be an observable consequence of this breaking. This is even more important as that the hypercharge group of the standard model is expected to be obtained from a GUT in exactly this way [10, 79].

However, from a gauge-invariant perspective, this is not possible. Since the gauge-symmetry is intact, there cannot be a subgroup, which is in any way different from the remainder, for the very same reasons as the unbroken  $SU(N - 1)$  groups in the fundamental case could not be identified. Otherwise, a gauge transformation would need to be able to distinguish between this particular subgroup, and any other possible  $U(1)$  subgroup. Especially, the gauge symmetry remains non-Abelian, and thus no simple gauge-invariant charge is possible.

That said, it is not impossible that the physical spectrum could resemble the

---

<sup>62</sup>This theory, also known as the Georgi-Glashow model, has been variously used as a low-energy effective theory for the gauge-dependent degrees of freedom of pure Yang-Mills theory in monopole confinement/Abelian dominance scenarios [149, 279, 300]. This will not be discussed here. The three-dimensional version is also appearing as the infinite-temperature limit of pure Yang-Mills theory, where then only the QCD-like region is of interest [86, 301, 302].

existence of a U(1) group, without actually having one. Remarkably, this is what seems to happen [148].

This requires two things. First, there must be an observable, massless vector particle. The second is that this massless vector particle interacts with matter particles with an interaction of the kind expected of an Abelian gauge theory. In this way, an effective U(1) arises. Of course, even in the perturbative setting the later emerges also as an effective interaction as being ‘just’ the ordinary non-Abelian interaction evaluated for a particular combination of elements of the representations [10], rather than a genuine independent interaction. This is not unlike how electromagnetism in the standard model arises as a combination of the non-Abelian weak isospin and the Abelian hypercharge interaction.

All of this can be investigated by performing gauge-invariant perturbation theory using the FMS mechanism [148, 149]. The first step is again to classify states by their global quantum numbers. They can therefore be singlets or non-singlets under the  $Z_2$  symmetry. Furthermore, they can be classified according to their spin.

First of all, a singlet scalar arises as in (62), with the mass of the higgs, using essentially the same operator. Everything which has applied to this operator also applies here. A non-singlet scalar operator cannot be constructed in a similar way such that it expands to a single-field operator, because of the pseudoreality of SU(2). This will change for SU( $N > 2$ ) below. Reversely, also no simple singlet vector operator can be constructed. Since, however, a non-singlet vector can be constructed, non-singlet scalar and singlet vector operators can be constructed from gauge-invariant operators with non-trivial momentum configurations, like in the case of (66). However, these operators do only expand to scattering states in terms of the elementary states.

So, the only non-trivial further operator is a non-singlet vector operator. A generalization of (68) does not yield an operator which expands to a scattering state. However, a generalization of the non-local operator used in [13] to construct a gauge-invariant vector in the fundamental case expands non-trivially [148],

$$\mathcal{O}_\mu^\Gamma = \frac{\partial^\nu}{\partial^2} \text{tr} (\phi^a \tau^a w_{\mu\nu}) \approx -v \text{tr} \left( \tau^3 \left( \delta_{\mu\nu} - \frac{\partial_\mu \partial_\nu}{\partial^2} \right) w^\nu \right) + \mathcal{O}(\eta). \quad (93)$$

In the second step the vacuum expectation value in the ‘t Hooft gauge was put into the Cartan direction  $\tau^3$ . This Cartan choice is always possible by a global gauge transformation. Thus, this operator expands to the transverse component of the  $w$  boson in the Cartan direction, which is perturbatively massless [43, 148]. This predicts a massless non-singlet vector, notwithstanding that it is a composite, bound state. It thus acts like a physical Photon. Note that this is not a Goldstone boson, because even if the global  $Z_2$  symmetry would be broken, it is a discrete symmetry,

and thus does not fall under the purview of Goldstone's theorem<sup>63</sup>. Furthermore, as in the case of (92), higher orders in the quantum fluctuations yield additional poles at the masses of the higgs and twice the mass of the massive gauge boson [148].

Note that these results imply that none of the other states can actually be stable, as two non-singlet massless vector bosons can always be coupled to a singlet scalar, and from there all other states become reachable. Unfortunately, this implies that any lattice investigation will be rather complicated, as this implies polynomial volume corrections [105, 243]. Consequently, so far only exploratory investigations for the SU(2) case exists [179], but they support a massless pole in the correlator (93). This is a dramatic confirmation of the sketched scenario.

However, the masslessness of the vector is not sufficient to mimic an Abelian gauge theory at low energies. The low-energy limit of the interactions needs to be also that of an Abelian gauge theory. Concerning a possible interaction vertex between this vector particle and any of the massive particles, in analogy to QED in section 4.6.1, leads unfortunately not to the desired result. Expanding e. g. the scalar channels always reduces to expectation values of fields with the same gauge-indices, which vanish because of the anti-symmetry of the structure constants at tree-level [304]. Thus, the interaction structure needs to arise either at loop-level or in more involved operators. However, if it would arise at loop level this would provide an interesting hint how such an interaction could be weaker than the original gauge interaction. This is still subject of future research.

As noted above, the importance of this observation is that only such a mechanism can actually rescue the idea of GUTs that the hypercharge is part of an overarching single gauge interaction to explain the relative hypercharges of the particles in the standard model [79]. The mechanism outlined above therefore deserves further studies. This is especially true as the GUT scenarios requires larger gauge groups with more involved Higgs sectors [79].

However, when considering large groups with a higgs in the adjoint representation, another problem arises. As was discussed in section 3.9 multiple breaking patterns become possible. Especially, a gauge condition involving an explicit vacuum expectation value can no longer be satisfied for every configuration, if the vacuum expectation value in the gauge condition and the configuration belong to different strata. This also affects gauge-invariant perturbation theory. In analogy to (59), the

---

<sup>63</sup>Note that the masslessness of the photon in massless QED is associated with it being a Goldstone boson of the broken dilatation symmetry [63, 303]. It has not been investigated whether a similar argument could be made here.

following situation arises [148]

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathcal{O}^\dagger(x)\mathcal{O}(y) \rangle &= \int \mathcal{D}w \left( \int_{\text{Selected stratum}} \mathcal{D}\phi \mathcal{O}^\dagger(x)\mathcal{O}(y)e^{iS} + \int_{\text{Other strata}} \mathcal{D}\phi \mathcal{O}^\dagger(x)\mathcal{O}(y)e^{iS} \right) \\ &= \langle \mathcal{O}^\dagger(x)\mathcal{O}(y) \rangle_e + \langle \mathcal{O}^\dagger(x)\mathcal{O}(y) \rangle_n.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, any correlator decomposes into a part ( $e$ ) which is evaluated on those configurations where the gauge condition can be fulfilled, and a part ( $n$ ) in which it is evaluated on configurations for which the gauge condition degenerates to a non-aligned covariant gauge. On the first part gauge-invariant perturbation theory can be applied. This is not true for the second part.

As discussed in section 3.9, it now depends on the actual behavior of the second part what the physics is. For the mass spectrum this boils down to the question what the pole structure of the  $n$ -part is. If there are no poles in it, then the spectrum is determined by the pole structure of the  $e$ -part. However, this implies that for a given set of parameters there is only one gauge condition associated with a particular stratum which can be used for the purpose of gauge-invariant perturbation theory. This seems odd at first. However, when recalling that only aligned gauges can be used in the standard model case for the same end, it does not seem odd that there is a ‘preferred’ gauge. However, it is important to note that this does not physically prefer a gauge, but only technically. After all, perturbation theory is not necessary to evaluate the left-hand side, it is just convenient.

The alternative is that the  $n$ -part exhibits a pole structure determined by some or all other breaking patterns. Then the physical spectrum would be determined by the union of all poles. This union can be determined by applying gauge-invariant perturbation theory to each stratum to determine the set of all poles.

As discussed in section 3.9 the actual correct result will likely depend on the dynamics of the theory. It may remain a non-perturbative question which strata contribute to the union of poles determining the spectrum. This awaits non-perturbative study. Note, however, that the existing quantum number channels do not depend on this. They are only determined by gauge-invariant physics. Thus, even a continuous deformation between different sets contributing to the union could be possible. Therefore, in the following just a few remarks on the situation for  $SU(N > 2)$  will be made. Especially, as the number of breaking patterns quickly proliferates with the size of the gauge group [43–46, 148, 305].

When proceeding to  $N > 2$ , the group  $SU(3)$  is also special. This has to do with the potential structure for the adjoint higgs [43, 148], under the condition of power-counting renormalizability. Only for  $N \geq 4$  the most generic case for the adjoint representation has been reached.

In the  $SU(3)$  case two breaking patterns<sup>64</sup> are possible,  $SU(2) \times U(1)$  and  $U(1) \times U(1)$ . Perturbatively, this gives in the first case rise to a three-fold hierarchy of levels for the gauge bosons, and the second case to a two-fold hierarchy. In both cases also not all components of the higgs field play the role of would-be goldstone bosons, and additional massless higgs bosons remain.

The situation is, however, quantitatively similar in both strata for the gauge-invariant spectrum [148]. First of all, both  $Z_2$  channels harbor now non-trivially expanding operators. Remarkably, the states in both channels are found to be degenerate. In the vector channel the massless mode remains, and thus there are two massless vector bosons in the spectrum. Also, the additional poles show up in both cases. Even more interesting is the scalar case. Here, the massless modes are also pushed through to the physical spectrum, and thus two massless scalars, one in each  $Z_2$  channel, exist. In addition, poles at the higgs mass exist as well. Thus, such a theory yields additional massless degrees of freedom compared to what is needed for a GUT. However, once the potential breaks the  $Z_2$  symmetry explicitly, these vanish again from the spectrum [148].

These quite spectacular results have unfortunately not yet been checked in lattice investigations, and only exploratory simulations of this theory exist so far [178, 196].

In the  $SU(N > 3)$  case the massless scalar states again vanish from the physical spectrum and, depending on the stratum, also the degeneracy between the  $Z_2$  even and odd states are lifted [148]. This shows that  $N = 2$  and  $N = 3$  are special in the adjoint representation. This also gives again hope that a low-energy effective version of the GUT idea can still be realized by a deliberate choice of fields and representations.

Ultimately, the need to have a  $U(1)$  seems to suggest the necessity for an adjoint Higgs field for a GUT setup. Such an adjoint Higgs field also appears in perturbative treatments of most grand-unified theories [10, 79]. However, an explicit test of the standard  $SU(5)$  GUT setup of one higgs in the adjoint representation and one higgs in the fundamental representation [10, 79] showed again a discrepancy in the spectrum of the vector bosons [148]. The reason is that two, instead of one, massless vectors arise as physical Photons, while too few massive degenerate gauge bosons are present which could play the role of the physical  $W$  and  $Z$  bosons. If the  $Z_2$  symmetry is broken explicitly, even the mass hierarchy in the vector boson sector is no longer faithfully reproduced. This seems to indicate that more higgs fields in either representations would be necessary to allow for an adequate degeneracy pattern in the global symmetries.

---

<sup>64</sup>If the  $Z_2$  symmetry is explicitly broken, only  $SU(2) \times U(1)$  remains [43].

Theories with multiple higgs in different representations have been subject of exploratory studies on the lattice [130], but once again so far not including spectroscopy. It therefore remains to be seen whether these theories can sustain a phenomenologically relevant spectroscopy.

#### 4.7.4. Model-building 2.0

Usually, building a new model is based upon the definition of the elementary degrees of freedom and their interactions based on a particular (set of) mechanism(s) [80]. Then, their experimental implications are derived, and checked against experiment.

Taking the results of sections 4.7.1, 4.7.2, and 4.7.3 at face value suggests a somewhat different approach, based upon the available experimental data. Therefore, the first step is defining the physical, observable spectrum. Ideally, the model could then be build led by this physical spectrum of particles. This would suggest the following procedure:

- 1) Choose the desired physical, gauge-invariant particle spectrum in absence of explicit symmetry breakings, and determine a custodial group to sustain the multiplet structure
  - 2) Add explicit breaking to split multiplets
  - 3) Find a group which has a little group sustaining the same multiplet structure [43]
  - 4) Arrange Higgs fields and the Higgs potential such that it has the appropriate custodial group, including multiplet structure [43]
  - 5) Find a gauge with a vacuum-expectation-value which breaks the gauge group to the required little group
  - 6) Use gauge-invariant perturbation theory to verify that the spectrum is correct
- Optional) Use non-perturbative methods to confirm that in the relevant parameter ranges gauge-invariant perturbation theory is applicable, and, if multiple strata are present, the correct union of pole sets contributes

However, this leads to physical mechanisms being a mere consequence of the desired particle spectrum. It therefore does not allow to base a model upon a new mechanism. If this is not desired, it is therefore not a useful procedure. Then, still, it is necessary to first define the model based on the need to realize the new mechanism. But it seems then to be prudent to ensure various properties of the constructed

model as a new intermediate step between defining the model and determining experimental predictions:

- There must be a global symmetry which allows a triplet structure to create the pattern of physical  $W$  and  $Z$  bosons, or some mechanism creating a similar pattern
- Likewise, an explicit breaking of the global symmetry, or some replacement, to create the splitting in the  $W$  and  $Z$  sector
- A global symmetry to provide left-handed flavor, including an explicit breaking mechanism
- If the hypercharge should be realized as a part of an underlying theory a mechanism to obtain a global analogue
- Ensure that the physical states under gauge-invariant perturbation theory expand to the desired masses
- Ensure that no additional light (stable) physical states exist in other channels, except as dark matter candidates, axions or otherwise acceptable candidates

Optional Use non-perturbative methods to confirm the applicability of gauge-invariant perturbation theory and, if necessary, that only the desired strata contribute to the union of poles

Of course, the FMS mechanism only works for BEH physics. For a model without BEH effect, the situation becomes quite different, as will be discussed in section 6.5 [284].

While such programs have yet only been partially followed through [148, 152, 284], these guidelines should be useful to develop model building using gauge-invariant perturbation theory.

## 5. Scattering processes

So far only static properties have been considered. Most of our knowledge stems, however, from dynamic processes, especially scattering experiments. It is therefore necessary to develop a description<sup>65</sup> of scattering processes based on gauge-

---

<sup>65</sup>Interestingly, an approach based on a confining rather than BEH-type physics in the standard model leads to formally quite similar results [306–309], though for completely different physics reasons. Similar lines of arguments [310, 311] also follow in the Abbott-Farhi model [272], but again for different physics reasons.



invariance, which at the same time also explains quantitatively why conventional perturbation theory works so well [8].

Of course, this is not a new problem. After all, bound-state-bound-state scattering is the standard situation in QCD [10, 258, 312]. However, the different type of physics leads to quite different results. Necessarily, it must be explained why in experiments so far no detectable sign of the substructure has been seen [8]. It is here important to remember that the bound-state structure is not speculative new physics, but rather a consequence of the field-theoretical underpinnings of the standard model. In fact, it is a consequence of enforcing strict gauge invariance. Thus, the two decisive questions are: Why has nothing been seen so far? What needs to be done to see something? Both questions, and whatever partial answers are yet available, will be discussed in the following.

The simplest example will be a lepton collider, avoiding the complications due to the QCD background in hadron colliders. The simplest possible process is probably<sup>66</sup>  $E^+E^- \rightarrow \bar{F}F$ , which is at the same time also experimentally reasonably easy to access with high sensitivity. And in fact, this process has been studied intensively up to LEP(2) [8] and this will be continued (hopefully) at ILC, CEPC, CLIC, and FCC-ee in the future.

Given the discussion of section 4.6.2, the incoming Electron and Positron need to be considered as higgs-electron/positron bound states. A hand-waving argument why no effect has been seen so far is that the very massive valence Higgs acts entirely as a spectator particle, like the non-participating quarks and gluons in a hadron collision [258]. Then a picture emerges like it is sketched on the left of figure 17 [217, 238]. The valence higgs simply does not participate in the interaction, and only dresses the initial, the intermediate, and the final state. The actual interaction therefore does not differ to this order from the conventional perturbative picture, and thus should be described to leading order just by ordinary perturbation theory. Only if the higgs does no longer act as a spectator, like it is sketched on the right-hand side, this will change.

Since off-shell contributions are suppressed at leading order, the requirement will be to get the higgs on-shell. Though due to the renormalization-scheme dependence this is a non-trivial statement, this will essentially always be some kind of typical electroweak scale, and in the pole scheme the singlet scalar mass. Since the higgs-electron-Yukawa coupling is tiny in comparison to the electroweak couplings or the three-higgs couplings [8] the most relevant process will require an

---

<sup>66</sup>As noted above, also in this section capital letters denote gauge-invariant, composite states, while small letters denoted the elementary states.




Figure 17: A cartoon of a scattering process in leading order in gauge-invariant perturbation theory for  $E^+E^- \rightarrow \bar{F}F$  with an exchange of a  $Z$  in the  $s$ -channel [313].

interaction involving both higgs from both bound states to participate<sup>67</sup>. This suggests a scale of  $\sim 2m_h$ . Hence, even at LEP2 this process will be strongly suppressed. The Applequist-Carrazone theorem [258] suggests a suppression of at least  $s/(4m_h^2)$ , which is at the working point of LEP2, the  $z$  mass, at least a suppression by a factor ten. This seems at first sight not a sufficiently strong suppression to avoid detection there.

Is it therefore necessary to investigate the process further to see why it is actually even more suppressed. To do so, it is instructive to follow the principles of gauge-invariant perturbation theory of section 4.4. The relevant matrix element is then given by [238]

$$\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{O}_2^{NE}(p_1) \bar{\mathcal{O}}_2^{NE}(p_2) \mathcal{O}_i^F(q_1) \bar{\mathcal{O}}_i^F(q_2) \rangle \quad (94)$$

where only the lower custodial component, i. e. the electron component in the sense of (78), is considered in the initial state. The final-state is defined to be of two fermions of the same type, an exclusive measurement, and therefore the custodial index is not summed over.

<sup>67</sup>Or an experiment sensitive on the level of the higgs-electron-Yukawa coupling.

Applying the FMS mechanism yields to leading order

$$\mathcal{M} \sim v^4 \langle e^+ e^- \bar{f} f \rangle + \mathcal{O}(v^2) \quad (95)$$

and thus corroborates the deduction above. To leading order in  $v$ , or alternatively in the fluctuation field, the matrix element is just the ordinary, full matrix element. Expanding this matrix element in perturbation theory further reproduces the conventional result [10] to all orders in the couplings. Thus, at leading order in the FMS expansion indeed no sign is seen. Note that this result is perturbatively gauge-invariant, though non-perturbatively it is not.

Including further terms yields [238]

$$\mathcal{M} \approx v^4 \langle e^+ e^- \bar{f} f \rangle + v^2 \langle \eta^\dagger \eta e^+ e^- \bar{f} f \rangle + \langle \eta^\dagger \eta \eta^\dagger \eta e^+ e^- \bar{f} f \rangle + \text{rest}. \quad (96)$$

Terms with an odd number of fields will have additional particles in the initial or final state, and will therefore not contribute if an exclusive measurement is done. While, for the sake of brevity, not all terms are written down and arguments are suppressed, all relevant structures appear. It is now seen that the further terms are suppressed by two or four powers in  $v$ . Thus, besides the relative suppression of matrix elements from the Appelquist-Carrazone theorem a suppression of order  $s/v^2$  arises, which is at the  $z$  mass of order ten as well. Both are multiplied, given a total factor 100 of suppression in the matrix element alone on dimensional grounds. This is now much more in-line with the order of sensitivity with which the process has been probed.

However, investigating the present terms further yields even more suppression. The second term in (96) adds a pair of Higgs fluctuation fields. Depending on the arguments, they can form an interaction in the initial or final state, or can add a propagating Higgs. The last term includes all possibilities where the Higgs can contribute in both, initial and final state. However, it is even more suppressed, and will therefore be neglected.

To understand what the processes of the second term in (96) involve, it is useful to further expand the second term further to include only leading interactions [238]

$$\langle \eta^\dagger \eta e^+ e^- \bar{f} f \rangle \approx \langle \eta^\dagger \eta \rangle \langle e^+ e^- \bar{f} f \rangle + \langle e^+ e^- \rangle \langle \eta^\dagger \eta \bar{f} f \rangle + \langle \bar{f} f \rangle \langle e^+ e^- \eta^\dagger \eta \rangle. \quad (97)$$

Thus, there appear three types of corrections to the leading process of (95). The first term adds a correction to the perturbative leading term, which is suppressed by a factor  $1/v^2$  and a non-interacting, spectator higgs. Such a contribution will therefore only affect the process like the presence of a spectator in a hadron collision, and thus is not relevant, except for the formation of the initial and final state, and/or as in QCD by an escape in the beampipe.

The second and third term in (97) correspond to an interaction of the initial state or final state higgs with the corresponding fermions, and the other fermions acting as spectators. The latter two processes therefore correspond to a reaction of the second constituent of the fermionic bound-state in the initial or final state. At leading order perturbative corrections can then be calculated just by expanding all appearing correlation functions to the corresponding order in perturbation theory. Since double-higgs production has not been observed at LEP2, the last matrix element will not be relevant, as it is already negligible as a leading effect. So only the one with a higgs in the initial state could contribute. However, at leading-order this matrix-element is in the  $s$ -channel proportional to the product of the three-higgs coupling and the higgs-fermion Yukawa coupling and in  $t$  and  $u$  channel to the higgs-fermion Yukawa coupling squared. Thus, it is negligible compared to the leading term for anything but the top. Hence, it will again be irrelevant at LEP2.

These considerations show why no contribution at LEP2 of the bound-state structure should be expected. While this was a particular investigation, similar considerations will apply to any other process. And most other processes have not been measured as well at these energies. Thus, this answers the first question from above, why so far nothing has been seen.

Thus, the question remains what is necessary to see something. Performing similar considerations for hadrons at the LHC is highly non-trivial, as the effect of the constituent higgs needs to be isolated somehow from the QCD background. While available parton energies and luminosities do cancel the argument of being off-shell, the suppression by factors of  $v$  remain for sub-leading effects, as does the question which processes have a large coupling to the higgs in the initial state. While processes involving tops are natural candidates, this has not yet been investigated in detail. This is certainly a challenging, but important topic. But this needs to be understood, as if there would be a measurable effect, this would constitute additional, not yet accounted for, standard-model background. Hence, slight deviations at the LHC with respect to a purely perturbative treatment could be not due to new physics but rather due to corrections from these subtle field-theoretical issues.

The situation is a bit better for future lepton colliders. All presently discussed machines will work at, or substantially above,  $\sqrt{s} = 2m_h$ . Therefore, no off-shell suppression will arise. Also, double higgs and/or double top production is reachable with reasonable sensitivity. Hence, they are the perfect machines to look for these processes or at least give a reasonable bound on them.

Of course, it would be good to have a theoretical estimate. One possibility is to evaluate expressions like (97), or even (96), perturbatively. This will give a perturbative estimate of the size of the effect. While straightforward, this has not yet been done given that the number of involved diagrams, especially when it comes

to six-point functions like in (96) is not too small, even at tree-level, not to mention loop-level. This is even more limiting as this cannot account for the bound-state effects in the initial and final states.

An alternative is to take a cue from the situation in QCD, where these kind of problems routinely arise [10, 258, 312, 314]. There, also bound states collide. The only difference in the treatment would be that no alternative path using the FMS expansion is available. In QCD, these effects are directly taken into account starting from an expression like (94), and the bound-state effects are taken care of by parton-distribution functions and fragmentation functions [10, 258, 312].

Such an approach has been explored in [238]. This yields formally

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{E^+E^- \rightarrow \bar{F}F}(s) &= \sum_i \int_0^1 dx \int_0^1 dy f_i(x) f_i(y) \sigma_{\bar{i}i \rightarrow \bar{f}f}(xp_1, yp_2) \\
&= \theta(4m_h^2 - s) \sigma_{e^+e^- \rightarrow \bar{f}f} \\
&\quad + \theta(s - 4m_h^2) \times \sum_i \int_0^1 dx \int_0^1 dy f_i(x) f_i(y) \sigma_{\bar{i}i \rightarrow \bar{f}f}(xp_1, yp_2),
\end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

where the  $f$  are the parton distribution functions, and fragmentation was assumed to be to 100% in the bound-states corresponding to the intermediate elementary fermion  $f$ . In the second step the approximation was made that the elementary particles need to be on-shell in the initial state. Thereby automatically no changes arise if  $s \leq \min(4m_h^2, 4m_f^2)$ , implementing in a hard way the discussion above that below this threshold bound-state effects should be negligible. This assumption could be relaxed using generalized parton distribution functions [315, 316].

Of course, using factorization assumes that  $s \gg \max(4m_h^2, 4m_f^2)$  to be strictly valid, and thus this requires at least the highest energies of the future linear colliders. Otherwise corrections of order  $s / \max(4m_h^2, 4m_f^2)$  are expected to arise, due to the Appelquist-Carrazzone theorem. Furthermore, the higgs interactions are not asymptotically free. While this appears as a subleading problem also in the usual QCD factorization, these interactions contribute here at leading order. But since the scale where this becomes a non-negligible effect is many orders of magnitude larger than currently reachable, this should not yet be a problem. In addition, violations of factorization due to strong interaction, as happen in QCD [314], should not pose a problem.

This still requires to determine the PDFs. The standard approach using experimental input [317] is not yet possible, as so far no effects have been observed. They could therefore only constraint the PDFs. In principle, non-perturbative methods [318–321] and/or a combination of them with experimental data [321, 322] would be possible. But even for QCD these techniques are only developing.




Figure 18: Deviations of the full differential cross section (98) to the perturbative one at rapidity zero for the process  $\sigma_{E^+E^- \rightarrow \bar{T}T}$  (left panel) and for the  $R$  ratio (right panel) as a function of the center-of-mass energy and the higgs contribution in (99) to the bound state structure, using the approximations and assumptions in [238, 313].

Thus, exploratory, in [238] the ansatz

$$f_i(x) = a_i \delta(x) + c_i \delta(x - 1) \quad (99)$$

was made, where  $c_e \gg c_\eta$  was used and the  $a_i$  were then fixed by sum rules, implying  $a_\eta$  quite large. This realizes to some extent the perturbative picture: The electron carries essentially all of the momentum, and acts almost as a single particle. The higgs carries almost no momentum, and thus fills out the bound state almost constantly, just like the vacuum expectation value would. The results for the cross-section  $\sigma_{E^+E^- \rightarrow \bar{T}T}$  and for the  $R$  ratio  $\sigma_{E^+E^- \rightarrow \text{hadrons}} / \sigma_{E^+E^- \rightarrow M^+M^-}$  is shown in figure 18 [238, 313]. While the  $R$ -ratio is essentially not affected, the production cross-section shows a drop, which is well within experimental reach if  $c_\eta$  is not too small.

The study can only be considered exploratory at best and probably with assumptions only valid at higher energies then reachable at the currently planned collider. However, it shows that effects could be limited to only some observables, but it hints where such effects could arise and how to search for them.

Reducing the large amount of approximations needed, especially by getting more information on the PDFs, using off-shell PDFs, and comparing the purely perturbative contribution in (96) and (97) are logical next steps. Applying the same rationale to the LHC is certainly more demanding, but ultimately necessary as this is the currently available machine able to reach into kinematically interesting regions.

## 6. Further aspects

There are a number of further aspects of the BEH effect, which are neither directly affecting the manifestation of the BEH effect, nor the physical spectrum, but

are still very relevant to phenomenology. These will be discussed in the following. For most of these not yet a conclusive final statement can be made beyond perturbation theory, and therefore are rather evolving subjects, in contrast to the main part of this review where the qualitative features are already quite well traced out.

### 6.1. *The triviality problem*

One problem alluded to in section 3 is the question whether the theory itself exists as an interacting quantum-field theory in the continuum, i. e. whether it is not trivial [116]. In the remainder of this text this was taken as an ultraviolet problem, and it was assumed not to be relevant to the low-energy physics mostly treated.

However, this is only true to some extent. If the theory is trivial, it has only interactions as long as an ultraviolet cutoff is in place. Thus, even in the sense of an effective theory, the results will depend on the regulator, e. g. the lattice spacing.

In a perturbative setting, the theory is considered trivial due to the presence of Landau poles [116]. Fully non-perturbative, this is far less clear. Lattice calculation have found indications of a continuum limit at infinite Higgs self-coupling [170]. However, it is not yet clear whether this is an interacting theory [225, 323], and no such strong statements as in case of the  $\phi^4$  theory [49–51, 168, 251, 324, 325] are actually available. In fact, arguments using the functional renormalization group have been given that there should exist an interacting continuum limit at weak Higgs self-coupling [174, 177], which is not excluded by studies of these regions on the lattice [134, 228]. Furthermore, fermions can potentially influence the qualitative behavior already at the perturbative level [116, 193, 194, 326], but also non-perturbatively [327]. This does not even mention the influence of more extreme settings, like extended Higgs potentials<sup>68</sup> [248] or the influence of quantum gravity [294, 295, 329, 330].

In the end, even if the theory is trivial, this does not prevent its usefulness as a low-energy effective theory. In this case the ultraviolet cutoff necessary acts as an additional parameter of the theory, but this does not necessarily affect the low-energy behavior of the theory [117], except possibly for the range of values observable quantities can take [246]. On the other hand, the problem can be turned around. Under the assumption that the theory is trivial, and a firm control over how this manifests, predictions can be made for possibly new physics to achieve non-triviality [326, 329, 331].

There is also a quite subtle issue. Already for the  $\phi^4$  theory Haag’s theorem [154] forbids unitary equivalence between the interacting theory and the non-interacting

---

<sup>68</sup>This possibility has also been studied for the ungauged theory [19, 21, 328], to essentially the same effect.



theory. Thus, the dependence of the regulated theory on the regulator needs to be highly non-trivial, though not necessarily non-analytic [144]. This problem is amplified in the gauged theory. There, the physical and unphysical state space need to change discontinuously in the case of triviality when the regulator is removed: States which were beforehand gauge-dependent, as the Higgs, are no longer so afterwards. Whether this qualitative difference between the ungauged and gauged case is relevant is not yet clear.

## 6.2. The hierarchy problem and the Higgs mass

One issue which has played an important role in phenomenology is the hierarchy problem [80, 332]. In its simplest form it is often stated that the value of the Higgs mass is arbitrary and for random values of the coupling constants it should be of order the cutoff, if the theory should be trivial. At loop level, this problem becomes more intricate, as the Higgs mass becomes scheme-dependent, and a definition of a physical Higgs mass is much less clear.

However, there are two physical ways of posing the same question:

- Why is the scale of standard model physics so small compared to the Planck scale?
- Is the theory very sensitive<sup>69</sup> to small changes of the parameters, and if yes, why? If yes, this requires fine-tuning of the parameters of the theory for particular quantitative features.

The first question is clearly beyond the scope of this review, and is likely requiring a full quantum theory of gravity to answer [293–296].

The second question is, however, directly linked to the present subject. At the perturbative level, it is indeed so [80, 116, 332] that the theory is sensitive, especially to the Higgs mass parameter, i. e. the coefficient of the quadratic term in the Higgs potential in the Lagrangian (28). This seems to be also true non-perturbatively [134, 174, 177], although in quite a different meaning. There it appears that results are indeed very sensitive to the Higgs mass parameter. Especially, realizing large values of the cutoff require a fine-tuning of the parameters of the theory. Thus, from this point of view, also non-perturbatively this theory is fine-tuned. In addition, being fine-tuned is a dynamical feature of the theory. This does not imply that any

---

<sup>69</sup>Phrasing mathematically what ‘very sensitive’ means is always a question of taste. Here, it will be used in the sense of what most people consider to be very sensitive at the time of writing. This amounts to a dependence on the parameters of the theory which for dimensionless quantities is stronger than logarithmically.

overarching theory needs to be not fine-tuned. The theory itself in isolation is just so.

But the low-energy physics of the theory seems to be quite independent of this fine-tuning issue. E. g. finding a light scalar seems not to be connected to finding a small or large cutoff, at least for the standard model case [134]. This shows that the mass of the observed particle is actually not a good argument itself for the existence of fine-tuning. Whether this is true also in more general settings is unclear [297]. This therefore points to a genuine BSM resolution of the fine-tuning problem, if it is not a feature of nature.

### 6.3. Vacuum stability

When regarding the BEH effect from the point of view of spontaneous symmetry breaking, it is at the perturbative level straightforward to find that multiple minima can emerge [333–335]. Consequently, if minima of different depths are found, it is possible that metastability can occur. Strictly perturbatively, the standard model seems to be on the edge of such a scenario [335–339]. If this would be naively true, then, like in a superheated gas, the system can undergo a spontaneous phase transition into a different phase.

However, a purely perturbative setup suffers from a number of conceptual problems [20, 246, 328, 340–343]. It is therefore necessary to perform a full non-perturbative study. These strongly suggest that such a metastability cannot arise [20, 246, 328] in a generic theory with a Higgs potential having at most a  $\phi^4$  term, in case a well-defined partition function is required. Only with higher-dimensional operators at tree-level an instability can be introduced either in the Higgs sector [19, 246, 344] or the Yukawa sector [248]. However, these are so far mostly hints from the ungauged theory or involve some level of other approximations.

Nonetheless, this underlines the importance of non-perturbative effects even at weak coupling.

From the point of view of gauge invariance this problem appears even more unclear. The perturbatively distinct minima arise because of different values of the vacuum expectation value of the Higgs. They do still have the same breaking pattern. The Higgs vacuum expectation value is, however, gauge-dependent, and may differ between different gauges, not only in direction, but also in magnitude. The discussed zero and non-zero values have only been two particular cases.

This does not prevent per se a phase structure with multiple quantum phases coexisting in the vacuum. The phase structure is then just necessarily driven by a different physical mechanism than the BEH effect. Because of the arguments in section 3.7, this is excluded for the Higgs sector alone. Since, however, the problem is driven by the interaction with the top sector [334, 335], this is not a sufficient

argument as long as the argument of section 3.7 cannot be extended to the Higgs-top sector. This seems so far not possible.

Thus, if such a metastability exists, it is not characterized by different values of the Higgs vacuum expectation value, as without gauge fixing it is always zero. Also, as it was discussed at length in section 3.7, gauge-fixed signals do not necessarily imply physical effects [39]. There are, of course, other possible quantities to characterize phases and phase transitions, in particular thermodynamic bulk quantities like the free energy. It thus remains ultimately to determine the free energy as a function of the parameters of the theory to decide this question.

#### 6.4. *The finite-temperature transition*

The vacuum stability problem and the whole phase diagram of sections 3.7 and 3.8 address the quantum aspects of BEH physics. However, also the thermodynamic aspects are of great importance to cosmology [80, 135, 345]. In particular, the question whether there is a (strong) first-order phase transition at finite temperature could be decisive for the baryon abundance problem and baryogenesis in general. If there is none, this would be a strong indication that at this scale new physics needed to be active.

This subject, especially when considering its cosmological implications, is vast, and certainly deserves a review in its own right. But there are also very direct consequences arising from the perspective on BEH physics studied here.

First of all, as has been discussed at length in sections 3.6 and 3.7, it is insufficient to use the Higgs vacuum expectation value as the only indicator of the presence of BEH physics, as is done in the simplest possible perturbative treatments [135]. Otherwise, also at finite temperature it is possible that a phase transition is only present in some gauges. Modern treatments use therefore instead physical observables, like the free energy or other gauge-invariant quantities [115, 346–348].

In fact, investigations [349, 350] showed that no phase transition sufficient to explain the baryon asymmetry is observed for a Higgs mass as large as 125 GeV. Interestingly, one is seen only at or below a Higgs mass around 80 GeV, and thus in a regime which seems to be dominated by QCD-like physics, as discussed in section 3.8. Furthermore, it appears that a Higgs-sector with an extended potential seems to be able to provide a more favorable thermodynamic behavior [348, 351], as is also indicated by non-gauge theories [352–354]. This may indicate a possible gateway to beyond-the-standard model physics or at least to a non-standard realization of BEH physics [348].

However, a few of the standard arguments in this respect will possibly need a reappraisal, when taking the results reviewed here at face value.

One is the expectation that above the phase transition the BEH effect is gone, and thus, up to thermal masses, all particles become essentially massless [135]. But the theory at zero temperature is gapped throughout the phase diagram, as discussed in sections 3.7 and 3.8. Especially, the physical vector states are always massive, while the elementary gauge bosons are also either massive or do not exhibit a mass-pole at all, see section 4.5.2. Of course, this will only affect the situation around the phase transition, as at even higher temperatures any masses become irrelevant compared to thermal effects anyways. But it is precisely this region which is of most interest to baryogenesis. Note that the implications for fermions stand distinct from this, as here too little is yet known, though even there a gapping may still always occur [229]. Also, the fact that there appears to be an endpoint in the Higgs-mass-parameter and temperature plane [135, 349, 350] seems to indicate that there is an analytic connection between the low-temperature phase and the high-temperature phase, and thus no qualitative differences can arise.

The other issue is that the gauge symmetry is restored [135]. As discussed at length in section 3, it is never really broken in the first place<sup>70</sup>. What may happen, however, is that a gauge condition involving explicitly a non-zero Higgs vacuum expectation value can no longer be satisfied at finite temperature, as discussed in section 3.3. This indeed leads to non-analyticities in the gauge-dependent correlation functions, just as is the case in the quantum phase diagram. But as in case of the quantum phase diagram in section 3.7, this does not necessarily imply a physically observable phase transition. Also, because in this case the FMS expansion fails gauge-invariant perturbation theory can no longer be applied. Thus, the physical spectrum may no longer be mapped in a one-to-one way to the elementary degrees of freedom, as is the case also for, e. g., Yang-Mills theory and QCD. In particular, the elementary states may no longer exhibit physical features [86].

Thus, while the quantitative determination of the phase transition temperature from bulk thermodynamics will be accurate, a microscopic description of the dynamics above the phase transition may be much more involved than usually anticipated. Especially, the idea of (almost) non-interacting, massless degrees of freedom above the phase transition may well be as inaccurate as it is in QCD [86], notwithstanding the essentially trivial thermodynamic properties. Thus, full non-perturbative and gauge-invariant calculations involving the gauge degrees of free-

---

<sup>70</sup>Although it is observed that certain features seem to suggest it. E. g. when increasing the Higgs mass the phase transition temperature shifts on the lattice between the two different values of the theories with different gauge groups [115, 156, 196]. However, this is observed when the bare Higgs mass is pushed above the lattice cutoff, and thus the ordering of limits become incorrect and the lattice theory is probed, rather than an approximation of the continuum theory.

dom and the fermions would be desirable to ultimately understand the details of the electroweak phase transition and its implications for baryogenesis<sup>71</sup>.

#### 6.5. Theories without an elementary Higgs

It may not be directly obvious, but the considerations here have also substantial implications for theories without an elementary Higgs, and thus without a BEH effect [284]. Such theories are especially theories like Technicolor or composite Higgs models [80, 235, 236, 285].

The reason is that even in such theories the weak gauge interaction remains. Thus, the necessity to have a gauge-invariant replacement to create an observable, gauge-invariant equivalent to the  $W$  and  $Z$  bosons remains. It is only no longer the case for the Higgs, or, more appropriately, the observed scalar particle. As it is a composite state of additional, new particles in such theories, it can be just a normal, gauge-invariant scalar state, and no issue of gauge-dependence arises for it. So it is actually the Higgs which is least problematic from this point of view.

But the  $W$  and the  $Z$  bosons are a different story entirely. Due to the absence of the Higgs there is no custodial symmetry. And thus no global symmetry to provide the multiplet structure. Still, observation dictates to have a (nearly) degenerate triplet of vector states. But it is not only the degeneracy pattern that is a challenge. Considering only such a new extended (strongly-interacting) sector and the weak interaction in isolation, these vector states need<sup>72</sup> to be the lightest states<sup>73</sup>. Thus, a symmetry with a triplet representation must exist.

In a Technicolor-like scenario, the degeneracy pattern can be provided by a suitable techniflavor symmetry. Then, the observed vector bosons, mimicking the gauge-dependent  $W$  and  $Z$  bosons, will form a techniflavor triplet. However, this still requires to have as lightest, but still massive, particles composite vector states. In theories with (strongly-interacting) fermions so far only either scalars or pseudoscalars have been observed as the lightest particles [105, 236, 355]. However, in all full non-perturbative studies so far only one gauge interaction was considered, and thus the possibility remains that this is a genuine feature of two-gauge-interaction theories. Of course, it is also possible that this will arise in single-gauge interaction theories with parameters and/or particle content not yet studied.

In addition, this implies new problems with the standard model fermions. As discussed in section 4.6.2 the weak isospin needs to be exchanged for a global sym-

---

<sup>71</sup>This is especially true if the generation structure, as speculated e. g. in [238], would be dynamically generated by the gauge dynamics.

<sup>72</sup>Of course, if somehow this is strongly influenced by the standard model fermions this is not necessary. But the author is not aware of any such scenario and would be grateful to hear about it.

<sup>73</sup>Barring the existence of axions or light dark matter particles.

metry to create gauge-invariant states. This cannot be achieved by creating bound states either with the additional gauge bosons nor with single additional fermions. The prior are not suitably charged and the latter would alter the quantum numbers. Thus, they need to form at least more complicated bound-states, including multiple of the new fermions, being effectively mixed baryons with the new states.

Effectively, at low energies, such a construction would still look like the usual standard-model, as long as the substructure of the new bound states cannot be resolved. But then still the substructure of the gauge-invariant standard-model fermions and the scalar would differ compared to the standard model case alone. This may be detectable by precision experiments, as was already argued for in the pure standard-model case in section 5.

Of course, depending on the charge structure, the considerations of section 4.6.2 apply also for additional technifermions.

## 7. Summary, conclusion, and future challenges

Appreciating fully the fact that the weak interactions are a non-Abelian gauge theory leads to a very intricate structure of the standard model as a whole. In particular, it requires to reevaluate our view of what is the structure of the observed particles on a very fundamental level, with the possible exception of right-handed neutrinos. The standard-model then tells a story of intricate cancellations, leading on an effective level to a much simpler theory. In particular, it leads to the usual phenomenology established using perturbation theory, and is thus in beautiful agreement with existing experimental results. However, this is only possible due to the particular structure of the standard model.

While the agreement with current experiments is reassuring, it can only be the first step. Such an intricate interplay on a fundamental level needs to be established in detail theoretically, and eventually experimentally. Lattice calculations and simulations of restricted sectors of the standard model provided so far good confirmation. But as any non-perturbative methods they are yet far from exact. Also, they are limited until now to bosonic sectors. A full non-perturbative analysis of the full standard model, or at least including part of the Yukawa sector, at the level of gauge-invariant and observable quantities remains desirable. But given the inherent technical challenges this will remain a future perspective for some time to come.

A quite different challenge is the fact that such an intricate structure needs to induce eventually deviations from a phenomenology based entirely on perturbation theory. The parameters of the standard model, and the very good agreement to experiment so far, strongly suggest that these will be small, or even tiny, deviations. Thus, true precision measurements will be needed to uncover them. For theoret-



ical calculations it remains a challenge to quantify them, and make a prediction what kind of experimental effort would be needed to detect them. Provided that fermionic corrections are not on a very large quantitative, or even qualitative, level this appears easier and more within reach than a full inclusion of fermions. Methods to calculate the size of bound-states [356, 357] or (quasi) distribution functions [318–320] are available or are being developed, and could be applied in a straight-forward way to the observable scalars and vectors. This should provide a first estimate of the size of the effects.

In total, while quantitatively (yet) a tiny effect, gauge invariance invites us to reevaluate the qualitative way of how we think about the elementary particles we know and we hunt for.

For the standard model, these insights only change the way how we perceive particles. It does not necessarily change how we treat them. And the identification of the elementary particles with the observed particles, while not literally correct, will remain certainly a valid, and pretty good, approximation.

But this is not the case for beyond-the-standard model scenarios.

As has been seen in section 4.7, and has also been supported by first lattice simulations [176, 179], there could be distinct, qualitative differences between the observable and elementary spectrum of such theories. This problem still needs full classification [148]. But it seems likely that a correct prediction of the physical spectra should be rather based on the gauge-invariant perturbation theory of section 4.4 using the FMS mechanism than conventional perturbation theory. The implications moreover also pertain to theories without elementary Higgs, as discussed in section 6.5. Model building needs to take this into account. Fortunately, the technical changes appear to be comparatively small [148], and much what has been done can be reused.

In the end, what remains is that particle physics is on a fundamental level more complex than expected. Recognizing the observed particles for what they are - relatively involved composite objects - may actually be an inspiring principle. Especially, as sections 4.6.1-4.6.3 showed, in the standard model a relatively baroque structure of many wheels interact in a quite intricate pattern. But then, whenever it was understood in particle physics that something has a composite, intricate structure, this gave us a new handle to understand the systematics of what lies below.

## Acknowledgments

Working through five decades of research largely not widely known is always begging for oversights. I apologize to everyone I have missed out, and will be happy to add anything brought to my attention regularly to the arXiv version of



this review. The same goes for any corrections.

I am very grateful to all the people I had the opportunity to discuss with about this topic, and learn from them. After all, the development of these questions has taken now more than fifty years. With much of it being hidden in the literature, as it was not directly relevant to experiment due to the coincidental structure of the standard model, much of preparing this review was as much scientific archeology as it was research.

I am especially grateful to Christian Lang for many important hints, and many insights about lattice gauge theory. His knowledge was indispensable over the last eight years in which I worked on this topic.

Particular thanks go also to my collaborators with whom I worked on this topic, Larissa Egger, Tajdar Mufti, Leonardo Pedro, and especially René Sondenheimer and Pascal Törek.

I am grateful to all those, with whom I could discuss this and related topics, and which helped me to understand it, or which helped me understand aspects which were necessary before understanding this topic. Special thanks should be given here to Reinhard Alkofer, Luigi Del Debbio, Dennis Dietrich, Philippe de Forcrand, Christof Gattringer, Holger Gies, Leonid Glozmann, Jeff Greensite, Jörg Jäckel, Sebastian Jäger, Frank Krauss, Jan Pawłowski, Claudio Pica, Tilman Plehn, Michael Müller-Preussker, Francesco Sannino, Erhard Seiler, Andreas Wipf, Luca Zambelli, Daniel Zwanziger, and Roman Zwicky.

I am grateful to Philippe de Forcrand, Jeff Greensite, Christian Lang, Leonardo Pedro, Erhard Seiler, René Sondenheimer, and Franco Strocchi for a critical reading of the manuscript and helpful comments, corrections, and improvements. I am indebted to Robert Shrock for pointing me to a wealth of additional lattice references.

This work was supported by the DFG under grant numbers MA 3935/5-1, MA-3935/8-1 (Heisenberg program) and the FWF under grant numbers M1099-N16 and W1203-N16. Some of the results were obtained from simulations on the HPC clusters at the Universities of Jena, Graz, TU Graz, and the Vienna Scientific Cluster (VSC). I am grateful for the teams of the HPC centers for the very good support. Partly the ROOT framework was used [358].

Finally, but foremost, I dedicate this work to my beloved wife Renate Knobloch-Maas. Thank you for everything.

## References

## References

- [1] F. Englert and R. Brout, Phys. Rev. Lett. **13**, 321 (1964).
- [2] P. W. Higgs, Phys. Rev. Lett. **13**, 508 (1964).
- [3] P. W. Higgs, Phys. Lett. **12**, 132 (1964).
- [4] P. W. Higgs, Phys. Rev. **145**, 1156 (1966).
- [5] G. S. Guralnik, C. R. Hagen, and T. W. B. Kibble, Phys. Rev. Lett. **13**, 585 (1964).
- [6] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, Phys.Lett. **B716**, 1 (2012), 1207.7214.
- [7] CMS Collaboration, S. Chatrchyan *et al.*, Phys.Lett. **B716**, 30 (2012), 1207.7235.
- [8] Particle Data Group, C. Patrignani *et al.*, Chin. Phys. **C40**, 100001 (2016).
- [9] ATLAS, CMS, G. Aad *et al.*, JHEP **08**, 045 (2016), 1606.02266.
- [10] M. Böhm, A. Denner, and H. Joos, *Gauge theories of the strong and electroweak interaction* (Teubner, Stuttgart, 2001).
- [11] B. Lee and J. Zinn-Justin, Phys.Rev. **D5**, 3137 (1972).
- [12] J. Fröhlich, G. Morchio, and F. Strocchi, Phys.Lett. **B97**, 249 (1980).
- [13] J. Fröhlich, G. Morchio, and F. Strocchi, Nucl.Phys. **B190**, 553 (1981).
- [14] E. Seiler, (2015), 1506.00862.
- [15] Z. Fodor, K. Holland, J. Kuti, D. Nogradi, and C. Schroeder, PoS **LAT2007**, 056 (2007), 0710.3151.
- [16] P. Gerhold and K. Jansen, JHEP **10**, 001 (2007), 0707.3849.
- [17] P. Gerhold and K. Jansen, JHEP **04**, 094 (2010), 1002.4336.
- [18] P. Gerhold, K. Jansen, and J. Kallarackal, Phys.Lett. **B710**, 697 (2012), 1111.4789.
- [19] D. Y. J. Chu, K. Jansen, B. Knippschild, C. J. D. Lin, and A. Nagy, Phys. Lett. **B744**, 146 (2015), 1501.05440.
- [20] J. Bulava *et al.*, Adv. High Energy Phys. **2013**, 875612 (2013), 1210.1798.

- [21] H. Gies and R. Sondenheimer, Eur. Phys. J. **C75**, 68 (2015), 1407.8124.
- [22] T. DeGrand, Rev. Mod. Phys. **88**, 015001 (2016), 1510.05018.
- [23] F. Strocchi, (2015), 1502.06540.
- [24] J. Frohlich, R. Israel, E. H. Lieb, and B. Simon, Commun. Math. Phys. **62**, 1 (1978).
- [25] N. D. Mermin and H. Wagner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **17**, 1133 (1966).
- [26] S. R. Coleman, Commun. Math. Phys. **31**, 259 (1973).
- [27] L. O’Raifeartaigh, Rept.Prog.Phys. **42**, 159 (1979).
- [28] G. Sartori, Riv. Nuovo Cim. **14N11**, 1 (1991).
- [29] C. Heissenberg and F. Strocchi, (2015), 1511.01757.
- [30] F. Strocchi, Lect. Notes Phys. **643**, pp.1 (2005).
- [31] F. Strocchi, Scholarpedia **7**, 11196 (2012), 1201.5459.
- [32] E. Seiler, *Gauge Theories as a Problem of Constructive Quantum Field Theory and Statistical Mechanics* (Lect. Notes Phys., 1982).
- [33] R. J. Rivers, *Path integral methods in quantum field theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987).
- [34] R. A. Bertlmann, *Anomalies in quantum field theory* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996).
- [35] A. Perez and D. Sudarsky, Int.J.Mod.Phys. **A26**, 1493 (2011), 0811.3181.
- [36] A. Maas and D. Zwanziger, Phys.Rev. **D89**, 034011 (2014), 1309.1957.
- [37] J. Frohlich, Acta Phys. Austriaca Suppl. **15**, 133 (1976).
- [38] K. Langfeld, (2002), hep-lat/0212032.
- [39] W. Caudy and J. Greensite, Phys. Rev. **D78**, 025018 (2008), 0712.0999.
- [40] D. P. Landau and K. Binder, *A guide to Monte Carlo simulations in statistical physics*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005).
- [41] J. L. Birman, R. G. Nazmitdinov, and V. I. Yukalov, Phys. Rep. **526**, 1 (2013), 1305.5131.

- [42] J. Goldstone, *Nuovo Cim.* **19**, 154 (1961).
- [43] L. O’Raifeartaigh, *Group structure of gauge theories* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986).
- [44] L.-F. Li, *Phys. Rev.* **D9**, 1723 (1974).
- [45] H. Ruegg, *Phys. Rev.* **D22**, 2040 (1980).
- [46] T. Murphy and L. O’Raifeartaigh, *Nucl. Phys.* **B229**, 509 (1983).
- [47] C. B. Lang, private communication.
- [48] H. Neuberger, *Phys. Lett.* **B199**, 536 (1987).
- [49] M. Lüscher and P. Weisz, *Nucl. Phys.* **B295**, 65 (1988).
- [50] A. Hasenfratz *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B317**, 81 (1989).
- [51] M. Lüscher and P. Weisz, *Phys. Lett.* **B212**, 472 (1988).
- [52] A. Hasenfratz *et al.*, *Z. Phys.* **C46**, 257 (1990).
- [53] A. Hasenfratz *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B356**, 332 (1991).
- [54] M. Göckeler, K. Jansen, and T. Neuhaus, *Phys. Lett.* **B273**, 450 (1991).
- [55] M. Göckeler, H. A. Kastrup, J. Westphalen, and F. Zimmermann, *Nucl. Phys.* **B425**, 413 (1994), hep-lat/9402011.
- [56] T. Kennedy and C. King, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 776 (1985).
- [57] T. Kennedy and C. King, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **104**, 327 (1986).
- [58] M. Shifman, *Advanced topics in quantum field theory: A lecture course* (Cambridge University Press, 2012).
- [59] M. Buballa, *Phys. Rept.* **407**, 205 (2005), hep-ph/0402234.
- [60] A. Maas, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A27**, 1250222 (2012).
- [61] T. Schäfer and F. Wilczek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 3956 (1999), hep-ph/9811473.
- [62] M. G. Alford, J. Berges, and K. Rajagopal, *Nucl. Phys.* **B558**, 219 (1999), hep-ph/9903502.
- [63] R. Alkofer and L. von Smekal, *Phys. Rept.* **353**, 281 (2001), hep-ph/0007355.

- [64] F. Strocchi, Singapore, Singapore: World Scientific ( 1985) 179 P. ( International School For Advanced Studies Lecture Series, 3) (1985).
- [65] B. Lee and J. Zinn-Justin, Phys.Rev. **D5**, 3121 (1972).
- [66] B. Lee and J. Zinn-Justin, Phys.Rev. **D5**, 3155 (1972).
- [67] P. H. Damgaard and U. M. Heller, Phys. Lett. **B164**, 121 (1985).
- [68] R. Oehme and W. Zimmermann, Phys. Rev. **D21**, 471 (1980).
- [69] N. K. Nielsen, Nucl. Phys. **B101**, 173 (1975).
- [70] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **27**, 1688 (1971).
- [71] S. Y. Lee, Phys. Rev. **D6**, 1701 (1972).
- [72] S. Y. Lee, Phys. Rev. **D6**, 1803 (1972).
- [73] T. Appelquist and H. R. Quinn, Phys. Lett. **B39**, 229 (1972).
- [74] N. Irges and F. Koutroulis, Nucl. Phys. **B924**, 178 (2017), 1703.10369.
- [75] I. Bars and M. Yoshimura, Phys. Rev. **D6**, 374 (1972).
- [76] R. Jackiw and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D5**, 2396 (1972).
- [77] R. Barbieri, *Ten Lectures on the ElectroWeak Interactions* Sc. Norm. Sup. (Pisa, Italy, 2007), 0706.0684.
- [78] G. Branco *et al.*, Phys.Rept. **516**, 1 (2012), 1106.0034.
- [79] P. Langacker, Phys. Rept. **72**, 185 (1981).
- [80] D. E. Morrissey, T. Plehn, and T. M. Tait, Phys.Rept. **515**, 1 (2012), 0912.3259.
- [81] V. N. Gribov, Nucl. Phys. **B139**, 1 (1978).
- [82] I. M. Singer, Commun. Math. Phys. **60**, 7 (1978).
- [83] P. van Baal, (1997), hep-th/9711070.
- [84] P. van Baal, Nucl.Phys. **B369**, 259 (1992).
- [85] G. Dell'Antonio and D. Zwanziger, Commun. Math. Phys. **138**, 291 (1991).
- [86] A. Maas, Phys. Rep. **524**, 203 (2013), 1106.3942.

- [87] N. Vandersickel and D. Zwanziger, Phys.Rept. **520**, 175 (2012), 1202.1491.
- [88] R. F. Sobreiro and S. P. Sorella, (2005), hep-th/0504095.
- [89] F. Lenz, H. Naus, K. Ohta, and M. Thies, Annals Phys. **233**, 17 (1994).
- [90] F. Lenz, J. W. Negele, L. O’Raifeartaigh, and M. Thies, Annals Phys. **285**, 25 (2000), hep-th/0004200.
- [91] A. Maas, Eur. Phys. J. **C71**, 1548 (2011), 1007.0729.
- [92] M. Capri *et al.*, Phys.Rev. **D88**, 085022 (2013), 1212.1003.
- [93] M. A. L. Capri *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. **C73**, 2346 (2013), 1210.4734.
- [94] M. Capri *et al.*, Annals Phys. **343**, 72 (2013), 1309.1402.
- [95] M. A. L. Capri *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. **C73**, 2567 (2013), 1305.4155.
- [96] M. A. L. Capri *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D95**, 045011 (2017), 1611.10077.
- [97] J. Greensite, Š. Olejník, and D. Zwanziger, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 074506 (2004), hep-lat/0401003.
- [98] A. Ilderton, M. Lavelle, and D. McMullan, J.Phys.A **A43**, 312002 (2010), 1002.1170.
- [99] D. Zwanziger, Nucl. Phys. **B412**, 657 (1994).
- [100] P. de Forcrand and J. E. Hetrick, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **42**, 861 (1995), hep-lat/9412044.
- [101] L. Giusti, M. L. Paciello, C. Parrinello, S. Petrarca, and B. Taglienti, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A16**, 3487 (2001), hep-lat/0104012.
- [102] H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **32**, 438 (1974).
- [103] H. Georgi, H. R. Quinn, and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **33**, 451 (1974).
- [104] I. Montvay and G. Münster, *Quantum fields on a lattice* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994).
- [105] C. Gattringer and C. B. Lang, *Quantum chromodynamics on the lattice* (Lect. Notes Phys., 2010).
- [106] T. DeGrand and C. E. Detar, *Lattice methods for quantum chromodynamics* (World Scientific, New Jersey, 2006).

- [107] P. de Forcrand and O. Jahn, Nucl. Phys. **B651**, 125 (2003), hep-lat/0211004.
- [108] R. Friedberg, T. D. Lee, Y. Pang, and H. C. Ren, Phys. Rev. **D52**, 4053 (1995), hep-lat/9505010.
- [109] G. Burgio, M. Fuhrmann, W. Kerler, and M. Müller-Preussker, Phys. Rev. **D75**, 014504 (2007), hep-lat/0610097.
- [110] G. Burgio, M. Fuhrmann, W. Kerler, and M. Müller-Preussker, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 071502 (2006), hep-th/0608075.
- [111] J. Greensite and B. E. Lautrup, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 9 (1981).
- [112] I. G. Halliday and A. Schwimmer, Phys. Lett. **101B**, 327 (1981).
- [113] M. Creutz and K. J. M. Moriarty, Nucl. Phys. **B210**, 50 (1982).
- [114] J. M. Drouffe, K. J. M. Moriarty, and G. Munster, Phys. Lett. **115B**, 301 (1982).
- [115] B. H. Wellegehausen, A. Wipf, and C. Wozar, Phys.Rev. **D83**, 114502 (2011), 1102.1900.
- [116] D. J. E. Callaway, Phys. Rept. **167**, 241 (1988).
- [117] A. Hasenfratz and P. Hasenfratz, Phys. Rev. **D34**, 3160 (1986).
- [118] J. Kuti, L. Lin, and Y. Shen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 678 (1988).
- [119] P. Hasenfratz and R. von Allmen, JHEP **02**, 079 (2008), 0710.5346.
- [120] D. M. Grabowska and D. B. Kaplan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 211602 (2016), 1511.03649.
- [121] C. Gattringer and M. Pak, Nucl. Phys. **B801**, 353 (2008), 0802.2496.
- [122] N. Cundy, (2010), 1003.3991.
- [123] Y. Igarashi and J. M. Pawłowski, Nucl. Phys. **B821**, 228 (2009), 0902.4783.
- [124] W. Fischler and R. Brout, Phys. Rev. **D11**, 905 (1975).
- [125] S. Elitzur, Phys. Rev. **D12**, 3978 (1975).
- [126] F. Strocchi and A. Wightman, J.Math.Phys. **15**, 2198 (1974).
- [127] S. Arnone, T. R. Morris, and O. J. Rosten, Eur. Phys. J. **C50**, 467 (2007), hep-th/0507154.



- [128] S. Arnone, T. R. Morris, and O. J. Rosten, *Fields Inst.Comm.* **50**, 1 (2007), hep-th/0606181.
- [129] O. J. Rosten, *Phys.Rept.* **511**, 177 (2012), 1003.1366.
- [130] J. Greensite and B. Lucini, *Phys. Rev.* **D78**, 085004 (2008), 0806.2117.
- [131] ALPHA collaboration, F. Knechtli and R. Sommer, *Phys. Lett.* **B440**, 345 (1998), hep-lat/9807022.
- [132] ALPHA, F. Knechtli, *Phys. Lett.* **B478**, 387 (2000), hep-lat/9912031.
- [133] A. Maas and T. Mufti, *JHEP* **1404**, 006 (2014), 1312.4873.
- [134] A. Maas and T. Mufti, *Phys. Rev.* **D91**, 113011 (2015), 1412.6440.
- [135] J. I. Kapusta and C. Gale, *Finite-temperature field theory: Principles and applications* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006).
- [136] T. Kugo and I. Ojima, *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **66**, 1 (1979).
- [137] V. Mader, M. Schaden, D. Zwanziger, and R. Alkofer, *Eur.Phys.J.* **C74**, 2881 (2014), 1309.0497.
- [138] J. Greensite and K. Matsuyama, (2017), 1708.08979.
- [139] J. Bricmont and J. Fröhlich, *Nucl.Phys.* **B251**, 517 (1985).
- [140] J. Bricmont and J. Fröhlich, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **98**, 553 (1985).
- [141] J. Bricmont and J. Fröhlich, *Nucl.Phys.* **B280**, 385 (1987).
- [142] K. Osterwalder and E. Seiler, *Annals Phys.* **110**, 440 (1978).
- [143] E. H. Fradkin and S. H. Shenker, *Phys. Rev.* **D19**, 3682 (1979).
- [144] J. Glimm and A. M. Jaffe, *Quantum physics: A functional integral point of view* (Springer, New York, 1987).
- [145] R. Baier, R. V. Gavai, and C. B. Lang, *Phys. Lett.* **B172**, 387 (1986).
- [146] C. B. Lang, C. Rebbi, and M. Virasoro, *Phys. Lett.* **104B**, 294 (1981).
- [147] J. M. Drouffe, J. Jurkiewicz, and A. Krzywicki, *Phys. Rev.* **D29**, 2982 (1984).
- [148] A. Maas, R. Sondenheimer, and P. Törek, (2017), 1709.07477.

- [149] K.-I. Kondo, Phys. Lett. **B762**, 219 (2016), 1606.06194.
- [150] I. P. Ivanov, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **95**, 160 (2017), 1702.03776.
- [151] R. Lewis and R. Woloshyn, Phys.Rev. **D82**, 034513 (2010), 1005.5420.
- [152] A. Maas and L. Pedro, Phys. Rev. **D93**, 056005 (2016), 1601.02006.
- [153] A. Maas, Nucl. Part. Phys. Proc. **273-275**, 1604 (2016), 1410.2740.
- [154] R. Haag, *Local quantum physics: Fields, particles, algebras* (Springer, Berlin, 1992).
- [155] M. Kikugawa, T. Maehara, T. Minazuki, J. Saito, and H. Tanaka, Prog. Theor. Phys. **69**, 1207 (1983).
- [156] R. C. Brower, D. A. Kessler, T. Schalk, H. Levine, and M. Nauenberg, Phys. Rev. **D25**, 3319 (1982).
- [157] H. Kuhnelt, C. Lang, and G. Vones, Nucl.Phys. **B230**, 16 (1984).
- [158] V. P. Gerdt, A. S. Ilchev, V. K. Mitryushkin, I. K. Sobolev, and A. M. Zadorozhnyi, Nucl. Phys. **B265**, 145 (1986).
- [159] H. G. Evertz, J. Jersak, C. B. Lang, and T. Neuhaus, Phys. Lett. **B171**, 271 (1986).
- [160] W. Langguth and I. Montvay, Phys. Lett. **B165**, 135 (1985).
- [161] W. Langguth, I. Montvay, and P. Weisz, Nucl. Phys. **B277**, 11 (1986).
- [162] V. P. Gerdt, V. K. Mitryushkin, A. M. Zadorozhnyi, and A. S. Ilchev, Z. Phys. **C29**, 363 (1985).
- [163] V. P. Gerdt, V. K. Mitryushkin, and A. M. Zadorozhnyi, Phys. Lett. **B172**, 65 (1986).
- [164] K. Olynyk and J. Shigemitsu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 2403 (1985).
- [165] T. Muehisa and Y. Muehisa, Z. Phys. **C32**, 531 (1986).
- [166] H. G. Evertz *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B175**, 335 (1986).
- [167] W. Bock *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D41**, 2573 (1990).
- [168] U. M. Heller, M. Klomfass, H. Neuberger, and P. M. Vranas, Nucl. Phys. **B405**, 555 (1993), hep-ph/9303215.

- [169] I. Campos, Nucl. Phys. **B514**, 336 (1998), hep-lat/9706020.
- [170] C. Bonati, G. Cossu, M. D’Elia, and A. Di Giacomo, Nucl. Phys. **B828**, 390 (2010), 0911.1721.
- [171] C. Bonati, G. Cossu, A. D’Alessandro, M. D’Elia, and A. Di Giacomo, PoS **LATTICE2008**, 252 (2008), 0901.4429.
- [172] M. Wurtz, R. Lewis, and T. Steele, Phys.Rev. **D79**, 074501 (2009), 0902.1167.
- [173] S. Gongyo and D. Zwanziger, JHEP **01**, 002 (2015), 1402.7124.
- [174] H. Gies and L. Zambelli, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 025016 (2015), 1502.05907.
- [175] M. Biswal, S. Digal, and P. S. Saumia, Nucl. Phys. **B910**, 30 (2016), 1511.08295.
- [176] A. Maas and P. Törek, Phys. Rev. **D95**, 014501 (2017), 1607.05860.
- [177] H. Gies and L. Zambelli, Phys. Rev. **D96**, 025003 (2017), 1611.09147.
- [178] S. Gupta and U. M. Heller, Phys.Lett. **B138**, 171 (1984).
- [179] I.-H. Lee and J. Shigemitsu, Nucl. Phys. **B263**, 280 (1986).
- [180] R. E. Shrock, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 2124 (1986).
- [181] R. E. Shrock, Nucl. Phys. **B278**, 380 (1986).
- [182] G. Cossu, M. D’Elia, A. Di Giacomo, B. Lucini, and C. Pica, JHEP **10**, 100 (2007), 0709.0669.
- [183] K. Jansen, J. Jersak, C. B. Lang, T. Neuhaus, and G. Vones, Nucl. Phys. **B265**, 129 (1986).
- [184] J. Greensite and S. Olejnik, Phys. Rev. **D67**, 094503 (2003), hep-lat/0302018.
- [185] A. Maas, unpublished.
- [186] L. von Smekal, K. Maltman, and A. Sternbeck, Phys. Lett. **B681**, 336 (2009), 0903.1696.
- [187] S. R. Coleman and E. J. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D7**, 1888 (1973).
- [188] R. E. Shrock, Phys. Lett. **162B**, 165 (1985).
- [189] M. Zubkov, Phys.Rev. **D82**, 093010 (2010), 1008.3076.

- [190] M. Zubkov, Phys.Rev. **D85**, 073001 (2012), 1108.3300.
- [191] M. Zubkov, Proceedings, 15th Lomonosov Conference on Elementary Particle Physics , 425 (2013), 1109.4077.
- [192] R. E. Shrock, Nucl. Phys. **B267**, 301 (1986).
- [193] D. F. Litim and F. Sannino, JHEP **12**, 178 (2014), 1406.2337.
- [194] D. F. Litim, M. Mojaza, and F. Sannino, JHEP **01**, 081 (2016), 1501.03061.
- [195] S. Weinberg, *The quantum theory of fields. Vol. 3: Supersymmetry* (Cambridge, UK: Univ. Pr., 2000).
- [196] M. Kikugawa *et al.*, Prog. Theor. Phys. **74**, 553 (1985).
- [197] V. Azcoiti, G. Di Carlo, A. F. Grillo, A. Cruz, and A. Tarancon, Phys. Lett. **B200**, 529 (1988).
- [198] G. 't Hooft, NATO Adv.Study Inst.Ser.B Phys. **59**, 101 (1980).
- [199] T. Banks and E. Rabinovici, Nucl.Phys. **B160**, 349 (1979).
- [200] A. Ilderton, M. Lavelle, and D. McMullan, JHEP **03**, 044 (2007), hep-th/0701168.
- [201] T. Heinzl, A. Ilderton, K. Langfeld, M. Lavelle, and D. McMullan, Phys. Rev. **D78**, 074511 (2008), 0807.4698.
- [202] F. Strocchi, Int. Ser. Monogr. Phys. **158**, 1 (2013).
- [203] M. Lavelle and D. McMullan, Phys. Rept. **279**, 1 (1997), hep-ph/9509344.
- [204] A. M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. **72B**, 477 (1978).
- [205] L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. **D20**, 2610 (1979).
- [206] D. J. Gross, R. D. Pisarski, and L. G. Yaffe, Rev. Mod. Phys. **53**, 43 (1981).
- [207] G. Marchesini and E. Onofri, Nuovo Cim. **A65**, 298 (1981).
- [208] E. Bagan, M. Lavelle, and D. McMullan, Annals Phys. **282**, 471 (2000), hep-ph/9909257.
- [209] E. Bagan, M. Lavelle, and D. McMullan, Annals Phys. **282**, 503 (2000), hep-ph/9909262.

- [210] M. Lavelle, D. McMullan, and P. Sharma, Phys. Rev. **D85**, 045013 (2012), 1110.1574.
- [211] J. M. Frere and P. Nicoletopoulos, Phys. Rev. **D11**, 2332 (1975).
- [212] P. Maris, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 4049 (1996), hep-ph/9606214.
- [213] R. M. Woloshyn, Phys. Rev. **D95**, 054507 (2017), 1702.01693.
- [214] H. Evertz, K. Jansen, J. Jersak, C. Lang, and T. Neuhaus, Nucl.Phys. **B285**, 590 (1987).
- [215] B. Lucini, A. Patella, A. Ramos, and N. Tantalo, JHEP **02**, 076 (2016), 1509.01636.
- [216] J. Grifols, Phys.Lett. **B264**, 149 (1991).
- [217] A. Maas, Mod.Phys.Lett. **A28**, 1350103 (2013), 1205.6625.
- [218] I. Ivanov, private communication.
- [219] F. Strocchi, Commun. Math. Phys. **56**, 57 (1977).
- [220] F. Englert, Proceedings: 50 years of Yang-Mills theory , 65 (2005), hep-th/0406162.
- [221] F. Englert, Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 843 (2014).
- [222] A. Djouadi, Phys. Rept. **457**, 1 (2008), hep-ph/0503172.
- [223] O. Philipsen, M. Teper, and H. Wittig, Nucl.Phys. **B469**, 445 (1996), hep-lat/9602006.
- [224] R. Kenna and C. Lang, Phys.Rev. **E49**, 5012 (1994), hep-lat/9311029.
- [225] R. Fernandez, J. Fröhlich, and A. Sokal, *Random walks, critical phenomena, and triviality in quantum field theory* (Springer, 1992).
- [226] R. Gambini and J. Pullin, *Loops, knots, gauge theories and quantum gravity* Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000).
- [227] Y. Chen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D73**, 014516 (2006), hep-lat/0510074.
- [228] M. Wurtz and R. Lewis, Phys.Rev. **D88**, 054510 (2013), 1307.1492.

- [229] H. Iida, H. Suganuma, and T. Takahashi, Phys.Rev. **D75**, 114503 (2007), hep-lat/0703019.
- [230] A. Maas, Eur. Phys. J. **C76**, 366 (2016), 1603.07525.
- [231] P. Benes, T. Brauner, and A. Smetana, J.Phys. **G36**, 115004 (2009), 0806.2565.
- [232] L. Fister, R. Alkofer, and K. Schwenzer, Phys. Lett. **B688**, 237 (2010), 1003.1668.
- [233] L. Dolan and R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. **D9**, 2904 (1974).
- [234] C. Quigg and R. Shrock, Phys. Rev. **D79**, 096002 (2009), 0901.3958.
- [235] C. T. Hill and E. H. Simmons, Phys. Rept. **381**, 235 (2003), hep-ph/0203079.
- [236] J. Andersen *et al.*, Eur.Phys.J.Plus **126**, 81 (2011), 1104.1255.
- [237] P. Hoyer, (2014), 1402.5005.
- [238] L. Egger, A. Maas, and R. Sondenheimer, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A32**, 1750212 (2017), 1701.02881.
- [239] P. Törek and A. Maas, PoS **LATTICE2016**, 203 (2016), 1610.04188.
- [240] A. Burnel, *Noncovariant gauges in canonical formalism* (Lect. Notes Phys., 2008).
- [241] F. Csikor, Z. Fodor, and J. Heitger, Phys. Rev. **D58**, 094504 (1998), hep-lat/9804026.
- [242] M. Einhorn and D. Jones, Phys.Rev. **D46**, 5206 (1992).
- [243] M. Lüscher, Commun.Math.Phys. **104**, 177 (1986).
- [244] G. Altarelli and G. Isidori, Phys. Lett. **B337**, 141 (1994).
- [245] A. Djouadi and R. M. Godbole, p. 47 (2009), 0901.2030.
- [246] A. Eichhorn *et al.*, JHEP **04**, 022 (2015), 1501.02812.
- [247] H. Gies and R. Sondenheimer, (2017), 1708.04305.
- [248] H. Gies, R. Sondenheimer, and M. Warschinke, Eur. Phys. J. **C77**, 743 (2017), 1707.04394.
- [249] M. Lüscher, Nucl.Phys. **B354**, 531 (1991).
- [250] M. Lüscher, Nucl.Phys. **B364**, 237 (1991).

- [251] F. Zimmermann, M. Göckeler, H. A. Kastrup, and T. Neuhaus, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **26**, 516 (1992).
- [252] R. A. Briceño, Phys. Rev. **D89**, 074507 (2014), 1401.3312.
- [253] R. A. Briceño, M. T. Hansen, and S. R. Sharpe, Phys. Rev. **D95**, 074510 (2017), 1701.07465.
- [254] V. Mathieu, N. Kochelev, and V. Vento, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **E18**, 1 (2009), 0810.4453.
- [255] S. Strauss, C. S. Fischer, and C. Kellermann, Phys.Rev.Lett. **109**, 252001 (2012), 1208.6239.
- [256] J. M. Pawłowski and N. Strodthoff, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 094009 (2015), 1508.01160.
- [257] M. A. L. Capri, D. Fiorentini, A. D. Pereira, and S. P. Sorella, Eur. Phys. J. **C77**, 546 (2017), 1703.03264.
- [258] F. J. Yndurain, *The Theory of Quark and Gluon Interactions* Theoretical and Mathematical Physics (Springer, Berlin, Germany, 2006).
- [259] J. Baglio, A. Djouadi, S. Ferrag, and R. Godbole, Phys.Lett. **B699**, 368 (2011), 1101.1832.
- [260] J. Baglio, A. Djouadi, and R. Godbole, (2011), 1107.0281.
- [261] S. Aoki, I.-H. Lee, and S.-S. Xue, Phys. Lett. **B229**, 79 (1989).
- [262] H. Gies, Lect. Notes Phys. **852**, 287 (2012), hep-ph/0611146.
- [263] P. Kopietz, L. Bartosch, and F. Schutz, *Introduction to the functional renormalization group* (Lect. Notes Phys., 2010).
- [264] D. Binosi and J. Papavassiliou, Phys. Rept. **479**, 1 (2009), 0909.2536.
- [265] P. Boucaud *et al.*, Few Body Syst. **53**, 387 (2012), 1109.1936.
- [266] C. D. Roberts, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **706**, 022003 (2016), 1509.02925.
- [267] R. E. Shrock, Phys. Lett. **B180**, 269 (1986).
- [268] G. Gounaris *et al.*, p. 525 (1996), hep-ph/9601233.
- [269] M. Baak *et al.*, (2013), 1310.6708.



- [270] I.-H. Lee and R. E. Shrock, Phys. Lett. **B201**, 497 (1988).
- [271] S. Aoki, I.-H. Lee, and R. E. Shrock, Phys. Lett. **B207**, 471 (1988).
- [272] L. Abbott and E. Farhi, Phys.Lett. **B101**, 69 (1981).
- [273] D. B. Kaplan, Nucl. Phys. **B365**, 259 (1991).
- [274] F. Sannino, A. Strumia, A. Tesi, and E. Vigiani, JHEP **11**, 029 (2016), 1607.01659.
- [275] S. Aoki, I.-H. Lee, and R. E. Shrock, Phys. Lett. **B219**, 335 (1989).
- [276] M. Hansen, T. Janowski, C. Pica, and A. Toniato, (2017), 1710.10831.
- [277] I.-H. Lee and R. E. Shrock, Nucl. Phys. **B305**, 305 (1988).
- [278] S. D. H. Hsu, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 4458 (1993), hep-ph/9302235.
- [279] J. Greensite, *An introduction to the confinement problem* volume 821 of *Lect. Notes Phys.* (Springer, 2011).
- [280] I. Aitchison, *Supersymmetry in Particle Physics. An Elementary Introduction* (Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- [281] C. Itzykson and J. Zuber, *Quantum field theory* International Series In Pure and Applied Physics (McGraw-Hill, 1980).
- [282] ATLAS, G. Aad *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. **C75**, 476 (2015), 1506.05669.
- [283] ATLAS, G. Aad *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B726**, 120 (2013), 1307.1432.
- [284] A. Maas, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A30**, 1550135 (2015), 1502.02421.
- [285] F. Sannino, Acta Phys. Polon. **B40**, 3533 (2009), 0911.0931.
- [286] F. Sannino, (2008), 0804.0182.
- [287] C. B. Lang, M. Pilch, and B. S. Skagerstam, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A3**, 1423 (1988).
- [288] F. Knechtli and E. Rinaldi, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A31**, 1643002 (2016), 1605.04341.
- [289] M. Alberti, N. Irges, F. Knechtli, and G. Moir, JHEP **09**, 159 (2015), 1506.06035.
- [290] N. Irges and F. Knechtli, JHEP **06**, 070 (2014), 1312.3142.
- [291] N. Irges, F. Knechtli, and K. Yoneyama, Phys. Lett. **B722**, 378 (2013), 1212.5514.

- [292] F. J. Llanes-Estrada, G. G. Fernandez, and J. G. Rojas, (2017), 1709.07608.
- [293] M. Shaposhnikov and C. Wetterich, Phys.Lett. **B683**, 196 (2010), 0912.0208.
- [294] P. Donà, A. Eichhorn, and R. Percacci, Phys. Rev. **D89**, 084035 (2014), 1311.2898.
- [295] A. Eichhorn, A. Held, and J. M. Pawłowski, Phys. Rev. **D94**, 104027 (2016), 1604.02041.
- [296] D. F. Litim, R. Percacci, and L. Rachwal, Phys.Lett. **B710**, 472 (2012), 1109.3062.
- [297] A. Maas and P. Törek, unpublished.
- [298] P. Törek and A. Maas, PoS **LeptonPhoton2015**, 073 (2016), 1509.06497.
- [299] A. Maas, R. Sondenheimer, and P. Törek, (2017), 1710.01941.
- [300] G. Ripka, Lect. Notes. Phys. **639** (2003), hep-ph/0310102.
- [301] K. Kajantie, M. Laine, K. Rummukainen, and M. E. Shaposhnikov, Nucl. Phys. **B458**, 90 (1996), hep-ph/9508379.
- [302] A. Hart and O. Philipsen, Nucl. Phys. **B572**, 243 (2000), hep-lat/9908041.
- [303] F. Lenz, H. Naus, K. Ohta, and M. Thies, Annals Phys. **233**, 51 (1994).
- [304] R. Sondenheimer, private communication.
- [305] K. Kojima, K. Takenaga, and T. Yamashita, Phys. Rev. **D95**, 015021 (2017), 1608.05496.
- [306] X. Calmet and H. Fritzsche, Phys. Lett. **B496**, 161 (2000), hep-ph/0008243.
- [307] X. Calmet and H. Fritzsche, Phys. Lett. **B525**, 297 (2002), hep-ph/0107085.
- [308] X. Calmet and H. Fritzsche, Phys. Lett. **B526**, 90 (2002), hep-ph/0103333.
- [309] X. Calmet, (2002), hep-ph/0206251.
- [310] H. G. Dosch, M. Kremer, and M. Schmidt, Phys.Lett. **B137**, 88 (1984).
- [311] H. G. Dosch, M. Kremer, and M. Schmidt, Z.Phys. **C26**, 569 (1985).
- [312] G. Dissertori, I. G. Knowles, and M. Schmelling, *Quantum Chromodynamics: High energy experiments and theory* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003).

- [313] A. Maas and L. Egger, PoS **EPS-HEP2017**, 450 (2017), 1710.01182.
- [314] S. J. Brodsky, AIP Conf.Proc. **1348**, 11 (2011), 1012.0553.
- [315] C. Lorcé and B. Pasquini, JHEP **09**, 138 (2013), 1307.4497.
- [316] M. Diehl, Eur. Phys. J. **A52**, 149 (2016), 1512.01328.
- [317] J. Gao, L. Harland-Lang, and J. Rojo, (2017), 1709.04922.
- [318] T. Nguyen, A. Bashir, C. D. Roberts, and P. C. Tandy, Phys.Rev. **C83**, 062201 (2011), 1102.2448.
- [319] H.-W. Lin, J.-W. Chen, S. D. Cohen, and X. Ji, Phys. Rev. **D91**, 054510 (2015), 1402.1462.
- [320] J.-W. Chen, S. D. Cohen, X. Ji, H.-W. Lin, and J.-H. Zhang, Nucl. Phys. **B911**, 246 (2016), 1603.06664.
- [321] H.-W. Lin *et al.*, (2017), 1711.07916.
- [322] E. R. Nocera, H.-W. Lin, F. Olness, K. Orginos, and J. Rojo, (2017), 1709.01511.
- [323] R. F. Dashen and H. Neuberger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1897 (1983).
- [324] M. Lüscher and P. Weisz, Nucl. Phys. **B290**, 25 (1987).
- [325] M. Lüscher and P. Weisz, Nucl. Phys. **B318**, 705 (1989).
- [326] F. Bezrukov, M. Yu. Kalmykov, B. A. Kniehl, and M. Shaposhnikov, JHEP **10**, 140 (2012), 1205.2893.
- [327] H. Gies, S. Rechenberger, M. M. Scherer, and L. Zambelli, Eur.Phys.J. **C73**, 2652 (2013), 1306.6508.
- [328] J. Borchardt, H. Gies, and R. Sondenheimer, Eur. Phys. J. **C76**, 472 (2016), 1603.05861.
- [329] A. Eichhorn and A. Held, (2017), 1707.01107.
- [330] S. Gonzalez-Martin and C. P. Martin, (2017), 1707.06667.
- [331] N. Christiansen, D. F. Litim, J. M. Pawłowski, and M. Reichert, (2017), 1710.04669.
- [332] J. L. Feng, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **63**, 351 (2013), 1302.6587.

- [333] M. Sher, Phys. Rept. **179**, 273 (1989).
- [334] J. Elias-Miro *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B709**, 222 (2012), 1112.3022.
- [335] S. Alekhin, A. Djouadi, and S. Moch, Phys. Lett. **B716**, 214 (2012), 1207.0980.
- [336] D. Buttazzo *et al.*, JHEP **12**, 089 (2013), 1307.3536.
- [337] E. Gabrielli *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D89**, 015017 (2014), 1309.6632.
- [338] A. V. Bednyakov, B. A. Kniehl, A. F. Pikelner, and O. L. Veretin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 201802 (2015), 1507.08833.
- [339] G. Iacobellis and I. Masina, Phys. Rev. **D94**, 073005 (2016), 1604.06046.
- [340] K. Holland and J. Kuti, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **129**, 765 (2004), hep-lat/0308020.
- [341] V. Branchina and H. Faivre, Phys. Rev. **D72**, 065017 (2005), hep-th/0503188.
- [342] V. Branchina, H. Faivre, and V. Pangon, J. Phys. **G36**, 015006 (2009), 0802.4423.
- [343] V. Branchina, E. Messina, and M. Sher, Phys. Rev. **D91**, 013003 (2015), 1408.5302.
- [344] R. Sondenheimer, (2017), 1711.00065.
- [345] A. D. Dolgov, Phys. Atom. Nucl. **71**, 651 (2008), hep-ph/0606230.
- [346] M. D’Onofrio and K. Rummukainen, Phys. Rev. **D93**, 025003 (2016), 1508.07161.
- [347] M. Laine and M. Meyer, JCAP **1507**, 035 (2015), 1503.04935.
- [348] M. Reichert *et al.*, (2017), 1711.00019.
- [349] K. Kajantie, M. Laine, K. Rummukainen, and M. E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2887 (1996), hep-ph/9605288.
- [350] F. Csikor, Z. Fodor, and J. Heitger, Phys. Lett. **B441**, 354 (1998), hep-lat/9807021.
- [351] C. Grojean, G. Servant, and J. D. Wells, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 036001 (2005), hep-ph/0407019.
- [352] D. Y. J. Chu, K. Jansen, B. Knippschild, and C. J. D. Lin, (2017), 1710.09737.

- [353] P. Hegde, K. Jansen, C. J. D. Lin, and A. Nagy, PoS **LATTICE2013**, 058 (2014), 1310.6260.
- [354] O. Akerlund and P. de Forcrand, Phys. Rev. **D93**, 035015 (2016), 1508.07959.
- [355] J. Kuti, PoS **LATTICE2013**, 004 (2014).
- [356] J. Koponen, F. Bursa, C. T. H. Davies, R. J. Dowdall, and G. P. Lepage, Phys. Rev. **D93**, 054503 (2016), 1511.07382.
- [357] QCDSF, M. Göckeler *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 034508 (2005), hep-lat/0303019.
- [358] R. Brun and F. Rademakers, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. **A389**, 81 (1997).