

A Brief Introduction to the Strong CP Problem *

Dan-di Wu **

Superconducting Super Collider Laboratory[†], 2250 Beckleymeade Avenue, Dallas TX 75237, USA

Z. Naturforsch. **52a**, 179–181 (1997)

The present status of the strong CP problem is briefly reviewed in a heuristic way. A crisis in EDMN calculation is explained. The equation of vacuum alignment obtained by the author and collaborators last year put a constraint on strong CP parameters. Thus the strong CP will be forced to vanish in one of the three scenarios characterized respectively by axion, zero quark mass and vanishing quark condensate.

I shall try to explain what is the strong CP problem and what are the possible solutions in 20 minutes.

The strong CP problem is a serious sickness of the standard model (SM), especially of its strong interaction section. This problem has been attacked for 15 years. Some solutions have been found, however none of them is conclusive. It might mean that there is a deep defection in our basic understanding of SM, if it turns out that none of them works.

The electro-weak section of SM with three generations of quarks may explain the observed CP violating process $K_L \rightarrow 2\pi$ very well. The essential quantity appears in the calculation is the rephasing (vector like) invariant [1] of the Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix

$$t = S_1^2 S_2 S_3 C_1 C_2 C_3 \sin \delta. \quad (1)$$

Noting that the decay width of the kaon is proportional to S_1^2 , the expected CP violating rate $\varepsilon = (K_L \rightarrow 2\pi)/(K_S \rightarrow 2\pi)$ is then about $S_2 S_3 C_1 C_2 C_3 \sin \delta$ which, according to the present knowledge collected from other experiments is about 10^{-3} , to be compared with the experimental value $\varepsilon = 2.7 \times 10^{-3}$. It is remarkable that the correct order of magnitude of ε can be obtained so easily.

In contrast to this success of the electroweak theory, the possible strong CP violating effects, such as the electric dipole moment of the neutron (EDMN), de-

scribed by the allowed parameter $\bar{\theta}$ (to be defined later) have been ruled out to a very high precision. This requires $\bar{\theta}$ to be extremely small. The question of why $\bar{\theta}$ should be so small is studied under the title “strong CP problem”.

Limited by the space, let us concentrate on a QCD model with only one quark. The mass term of the fermion is usually written as $-\bar{\psi} m \psi$. Since QCD is part of SM and there is CP violation in SM anyway, therefore the mass term

$$\mathcal{L}_m = -\bar{\psi} \tilde{m} \psi \quad (2)$$

is in general allowed, where $\tilde{m} = m e^{i\gamma_5 \phi}$ is called the fermion mass with a chiral phase, or sometimes, complex mass. Please be careful not to confuse \tilde{m} with the effective complex mass of a decaying particle $m + i\gamma/2$. The γ_5 part of (2) is P and T odd and is hermitian. The intrusion of the new parameter ϕ did not cause attention until the importance of another term in the pure gauge part of the QCD Lagrangian was noticed [2, 3]. This term is called the θ -term,

$$\mathcal{L}_\theta = \theta G \bar{G}, \quad (3)$$

where

$$G \bar{G} = \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} G_a^{\mu\nu} G_a^{\rho\sigma}. \quad (4)$$

This term is also P and T odd. Furthermore, the two terms are related by chiral rotation due to the triangle anomaly [4]. That is when

$$\psi \rightarrow \psi' = e^{i\alpha\gamma_5/2} \psi \quad (5)$$

we shall have

$$\phi \rightarrow \phi' = \phi + \alpha, \quad \theta \rightarrow \theta' = \theta - \alpha. \quad (6)$$

Note that

$$\bar{\theta} = \theta + \phi \quad (7)$$

* Presented at a Workshop in honor of E. C. G. Sudarshan's contributions to Theoretical Physics, held at the University of Texas in Austin, September 15–17, 1991.

** On leave of absence from the School of Physics, University of Melbourne, Parkville Vic. 3052, Australia. Present address: HEP, Prairie View A+M University, Prairie View, TX 77446-0355, USA.

[†] Operated by the University Research Association, Inc., for the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC 35-89ER 40486.

Reprint requests to Prof. Dr. Dan-di Wu.
E-mail: WU@HP75.PVAMU.EDU



will not be changed under chiral rotations. Therefore, it is impossible to “turn away” CP violation terms by a chiral rotation once $\bar{\theta}$ is fixed. Besides, chiral rotation is not the symmetry of the system. The general equivalence of the different lagrangian related by chiral rotation is under question, unless a corresponding adjustment of vacuum is made (see later).

The question of what physical effects could be due to the above strong CP violation is somehow subtle. Since the strong CP violating terms do not change the flavors of the quarks as the weak interaction does, so the strong CP violation will certainly not be the leading effect in weak decays. Attention has been put on the process $\eta \rightarrow 2\pi$ and EDMN; both need P and T violation to happen. Since EDMN has been experimentally pinned down to a very small number, it was claimed that the measured bound on EDMN puts a stringent bound on the value of $\bar{\theta}$. However the celebrated calculation to relate EDMN to $\bar{\theta}$ by Crewther et al. [5] (CDVW) has been recently criticized by Banerjee, Chatterjee, and Mitra [6] (BCM) and by Gupta, McKellar, and Wu [7] (GMW). If strong CP does contribute to EDMN, from a dimensional argument

$$\text{EDMN} \sim e \bar{\theta}/m_N \sim 10^{-14} \bar{\theta} e \cdot c m \quad (8)$$

is expected. To meet the experimental bound, $\bar{\theta}$ has to be extremely small:

$$\bar{\theta} \leq 10^{-11}. \quad (9)$$

The method of CDVW can be sketched as the following. They first shift $\bar{\theta}$ to the mass term, so that superficially all strong CP comes from the mass term. They then use the chiral perturbation theory (the current algebra) to calculate EDM in terms of $\bar{\theta}$. In doing so, the possible complex mass of the neutron caused by the complex mass of the constituent quarks has not been consistently handled. To make the story short, there is a risk that the final result takes the form

$$\bar{N} (\tilde{m}_N/m_N) (m_N + i g \pi \gamma_5 + a \sigma_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + \dots) N. \quad (10)$$

It seems that there is an $i a \gamma_5 \sin \phi \sigma_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}$ term in this formula, which can be identified as EDMN. However this is a fake, because the common phase (the phase of the mass) is protected by a perturbative symmetry of the original QCD effective Lagrangian. This phase will disappear if a suitable wave function of the neutron, which satisfies the Dirac equation with a complex neutron mass, is chosen. Therefore, unless non-perturbative effects are explicitly included, it is impossible to produce a non-zero EDMN.

Though the result of CDVW is criticized, it does not mean that the strong CP effects do not exist. A common wisdom tells us that if we can establish a meaningful relation among some theoretical parameters, such as mass and the strong CP parameters, these parameters must not be redundant ones. They must have some effects. I shall introduce you to such a relation called the equation of vacuum alignment (EVA) established by Huang, Viswanathan and Wu [8] (HVW).

Now let us discuss the promised equation of vacuum alignment. The EVA can be obtained by the use of invariance of the functional under chiral transformation, as all fermion fields are integrated out in the functional. It reads

$$\langle G \tilde{G} \rangle = \langle \bar{\psi}_L i \gamma_5 f \varphi \psi_R + h.c. \rangle, \quad (11)$$

where $m e^{i\phi}$ is replaced by $f \varphi$ with φ the Higgs field and f the Yukawa coupling constant. Let us specify the vacuum by the equations

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi \rangle &= \langle G_{\mu\nu} \rangle = 0, & \langle \bar{\psi}_L \psi_R \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} C_d \neq 0, \\ \langle \varphi \rangle &= v e^{ia} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

with C_d the dynamical condensate of the quark. Ngee Pong has just discussed this quantity in this session. By choosing C_d to be real and negative, as people usually do, we actually choose a specific vacuum orientation in the chiral frame. Generally speaking, C_d can have an arbitrary phase and be non-zero even when $m \rightarrow 0$. When $m \neq 0$, we renormalize C_d by subtracting the contribution due to the current mass. With (12), (11) is expressed at the tree level of the Higgs interactions as

$$\langle G \tilde{G} \rangle = m C_d \sin \phi, \quad (13)$$

where

$$m = |f| v, \quad f = |f| e^{i\phi_f}, \quad \phi = \phi_f + a. \quad (14)$$

Equation (13) is the EVA of the question. A slightly different equation for light quarks only has been found by Crewther, Di Vicchia, and Veneziano, Witten, and 't Hooft [9] using low energy effective theories of QCD. Unfortunately, their equation was not seriously considered in the calculation of strong CP effects mentioned before.

We find from EVA that the values of the phase of the mass ϕ are constrained (so is θ) if $\bar{\theta}$ is fixed. The strong interaction dynamics comes into play in EVA as represented by C_d , the dynamical condensate. The vacuum specification (12) accompanies EVA and makes it im-

possible to shift $\bar{\theta}$ arbitrarily without changing the phase of C_d at the same time. As we pointed out before [10], it is impossible to shift the strong CP completely to the θ -term without changing the condition of C_d being real at the same time. Different lagrangians related by chiral rotations are generally not equivalent unless corresponding rotations of the vacuum is taken into account by changing the phase of C_d .

EVA also show three possible scenarios in which $\langle G \tilde{G} \rangle$ is forced to vanish. The first is the famous Peccei-Quinn (PQ) scenario [3]. The so called PQ symmetry makes the phase a of the Higgs field an arbitrary parameter. In this one quark model the PQ symmetry can be reached by one Higgs field. But when there are quarks with two different electric charges, two Higgs fields are needed to meet the PQ symmetry. One then can always choose a to make $\phi=0$. The consequence of the PQ symmetry is the necessity of the ghost particle called axion [12], which is a pseudoscalar particle, predicted but never been found after ten years of exhaustive search. "Invisible" axion models have been invented which are complicated and unappealing. The second is $m=0$, e.g. for the u quark. Since there is no reasons why the u quark should not

obtain a small mass, this scenario is regarded unnatural. The third, which is newly proposed by HVW, is $C_d=0$, e.g. for a heavy quark, the b or t quark. Of course, the t quark should not be too heavy, if we assume it is the one to take the responsibility. Because if m_t is too large, it will meet the condition for the $t\bar{t}$ condensate to form due to the Yukawa-like interaction, as described by Professor Nambu this morning. The third scenario needs phase transition in dynamical chiral symmetry breakdown, when the current mass of the quark increases to exceed a certain value. While C_d for the light quarks must be non-zero, as indicated by the success of the current algebra, C_d might vanish when the current mass of the quark becomes too heavy. To actually prove this phase transition [12] needs a deep commitment in the strong interaction dynamics. The solution of the strong CP problem (if there is the problem) probably lies in the dynamics of QCD itself if the phase transition does exist.

I thank George for his encouragement and the organizer for an instantaneous arrangement of this talk. Comments on the manuscript from B. Grinstein are appreciated.

- [1] Dan-di Wu, Phys. Rev. **D33**, 860 (1986); High Energy Phys. Nucl. Phys. **10**, 684 (1986).
- [2] A. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. **59B**, 82 (1975); A. Belavin, A. Polyakov, A. Schwartz, and Yu. Tyupkin, *ibid* 85 (1975); G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rev. Lett. **37**, 8 (1976).
- [3] R. Peccei and H. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 1440 (1977); Phys. Rev. **D16**, 1796 (1977).
- [4] J. Steinberger, Phys. Rev. **76**, 1180 (1949); S. Adler, Phys. Rev. **177**, 2426 (1969); J. Bell and R. Jackiw, Nov. Cim. **60**, 47 (1969).
- [5] R. Crewther, P. Di Vicchia, G. Veneziano, and E. Witten, Phys. Lett. **88B**, 123 (1979).
- [6] H. Banerjee, D. Chatterjee, and P. Mitra, Saha Institute Preprint, **SINP-TNP-90/5**; **SINP-TNP-90/17**. See also, A. Abada, J. Galand, A. Le Yaouanc, L. Oliver, O. Pene and J.-C. Raynal, Orsay preprint, **LPTHE 90/53**; Phys. Lett. **256B**, 508 (1991).
- [7] V. Gupta, B. J. H. McKellar, and Dan-di Wu, Melbourne Univ. Preprint, **UM-P-91/13**; **UM-P-91/49**.
- [8] Z. Huang, K. S. Viswanathan, and D. D. Wu, Simon Fraser Univ. Preprint, **SFU-July-90-1**; Mod. Phys. Lett. **A6**, 711 (1991); **SFU-July-91-4** and **UM-P-90/91**, *ibid*, **7** **1992**, 3147.
- [9] R. Crewther, in Field Theor. Methods in Part. Phys., Nato Advanced Study P. Di Vicchia and G. Veneziano, Nucl. Phys. **B171** 253 (1980); E. Witten, Ann. Phys. (NY) **128**, 363 (1980); G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rep. **142**, 357.:160 (1986).
- [10] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **40**, 223 (1978).
- [11] Z. Huang and K. S. Viswanathan, Simon Fraser Univ. Preprint.

