Single Top Quark Production in $e\gamma$ Collisions and Testing Technicolor Models
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We study the single top quark production process $e^+\gamma \rightarrow t\bar{b}\bar{\nu}_e$ in various kinds of technicolor models in high energy $e\gamma$ collisions at the future $e^+e^-$ linear colliders. It is shown that if there is certain charged pseudo Goldstone boson (PGB) coupling to $t\bar{b}$, the $t\bar{b}$-channel PGB contribution is dominant, but the situation is quite different from that in the neutral channel $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow t\bar{t}$ due to the destructive nature of different amplitudes. At the DESY linear collider TESLA, the event rates in models with $t\bar{b}$-channel PGB contributions, such as the top-color-assisted technicolor model, etc. are experimentally measurable. The $e^+\gamma \rightarrow t\bar{b}\bar{\nu}_e$ process provides a feasible test of technicolor models with $t\bar{b}$-channel charged PGB contributions.
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I. INTRODUCTION

So far the most unclear part of the standard model is its symmetry breaking sector. Probing the electroweak symmetry breaking mechanism will be one of the most important tasks at future high energy colliders. Dynamical electroweak symmetry breaking, for example technicolor type theories, is an attractive idea that it avoids the shortcomings of triviality and unnaturalness arising from the elementary Higgs field. The simplest QCD-like extended technicolor model \[1\] leads to a too large oblique correction $S$ parameter \[2\], and is already ruled out by the recent LEP precision electroweak measurement data \[3\]. Various improvements have been made to make the predictions consistent with the LEP precision measurement data and even to give possible dynamical explanation of the heavienss of the top quark, for example the walking technicolor models \[4\], the Appelquist-Terning one-family model \[5\], the multiscale walking technicolor models (TC2) \[6\], the top-color-assisted technicolor models (TC2) \[7\], the non-commuting extended technicolor model \[8\], etc. This kind of dynamical electroweak symmetry breaking theory is one of the important candidates of the electroweak symmetry breaking mechanism. Due to the strong interaction nature, it is hard to make precise calculations in such dynamical electroweak symmetry breaking theories. However, there are some characteristic features in this kind of models, for instance the prediction for certain pseudo Goldstone bosons (PGB’s) in the few hundred GeV region. It is thus interesting to find experimentally measurable processes which are sensitive to the PGB’s to test this kind of models.

The top quark is the heaviest particle yet experimentally discovered and its mass 175 GeV \[11\] is close to the electroweak symmetry breaking scale 246 GeV. Thus processes containing the top quark may be sensitive to the electroweak symmetry breaking mechanism, and top quark productions at high energy colliders can be good processes for probing the electroweak symmetry breaking mechanism. There have been many papers studying the test of new physics via top quark productions at high energy colliders in the literatures. For instance, the model-independent studies in the effective Lagrangian formalism have been given in Refs. \[12\], supersymmetric corrections to top quark productions at hadron colliders and electron (photon) lin-
ear colliders (LC) have been studied in Ref. [18], top quark pair productions at hadron colliders and photon colliders in various technicolor models have been studied in Refs. [16,17]. Recently, there have been a lot of interests in studying single top quark productions which provides a sensitive measurement of the $W\bar{t}b$ coupling [19]. There have been many papers studying single top quark productions in new physics models [20], and also model-independent study as well [14]. In Refs. [16,17] it is shown that, in the $tt$ productions, once there is a neutral PGB coupling strongly to $t\bar{t}$, the $tt$-channel PGB contribution is large and dominant over all other loop corrections, and thus such processes can be sensitive tests of the neutral PGB effects. In this paper, we shall study the $e^+\gamma \rightarrow \bar{t}b\bar{v}_e$ process at the high energy $e\gamma$ colliders in various technicolor models, and we shall show that this process is sensitive to the $tb$-channel charged PGB effects if there is certain charged PGB(s) coupling strongly to $t\bar{t}$. We shall see that the $e^+\gamma \rightarrow \bar{t}b\bar{v}_e$ process at the $e\gamma$ colliders based on the LC, especially the DESY TeV Superconducting Linear Accelerator (TESLA), is a feasible test of the charged PGB effects, and the situation is quite different from that in the neutral $\gamma \gamma \rightarrow t\bar{t}$ channel due to the large mass difference between the top quark and the bottom quark and the destructive nature of different amplitudes. Of special interest is the test of the charged top-pion in the TC2 models. The recent Fermilab CDF data on $t\bar{t}$ production at the Fermilab Tevatron show that the branching fraction for a top quark decaying into a final state $e$ or $\mu$ is consistent with the tree-level standard model prediction up to a certain uncertainty [13]. Future improved experiments may lead to more precise conclusion. As has been discussed in Ref. 8 this means that a charged top-pion lighter than the top quark may not be favored, and a charged top-pion heavier than the top quark will have a broad width so that it is difficult to detect. Our result shows that the $e^+\gamma \rightarrow \bar{t}b\bar{v}_e$ process at the DESY TESLA provides a possible test of the charged top-pion effect.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we shall present the calculations of the $e^+\gamma \rightarrow \bar{t}b\bar{v}_e$ production amplitudes in several currently improved technicolor models. We take the TC2 model as a typical example of models containing charged PGB’s strongly coupling to $t\bar{t}$. The numerical results of the cross sections will be presented in Sec. III, and Sec. IV is a concluding remark.

II. THE $e^+\gamma \rightarrow \bar{t}b\bar{v}_e$ PRODUCTION AMPLITUDES

The tree-level standard model contributions to the process

$$e^+ + \gamma \rightarrow t + \bar{b} + \bar{v}_e$$

are shown in Fig. 1(a)-(1c). The momenta of these particles will be denoted by $p_{e^+}$, $p_\gamma$, $p_t$ and $p_\bar{v}$, respectively. In high energy processes, the effects of $m_e$ is negligibly small. Thus we neglect it in the following calculations. We take the unitary gauge. The obtained tree-level standard model amplitude is explicitly

$$\mathcal{M}_0 = \mathcal{M}_0^{(1a)} + \mathcal{M}_0^{(1b)} + \mathcal{M}_0^{(1c)} + \mathcal{M}_0^{(1d)},$$

where

$$\mathcal{M}_0^{(1a)} = -\frac{8i\sqrt{2}\pi M_0^2 G_F}{6} G(p_\gamma - p_\gamma; m_b)$$

$$G(p_{e^+} - p_\gamma; M_W) \bar{u}_t \gamma_\mu L(\bar{p}_b - \bar{p}_\gamma + m_b) \gamma_\mu v_b$$

$$T_{\mu\lambda}^{W}(p_{e^+} - p_\gamma) \bar{v}_e \gamma_\lambda L v_{\bar{v}_e},$$

$$\mathcal{M}_0^{(1b)} = -\frac{8i\sqrt{2}\pi M_0^2 G_F}{3} G(p_\gamma - p_\gamma; m_e)$$

$$G(p_{e^+} - p_\gamma; M_W) \bar{u}_t \gamma_\mu L(\bar{p}_b - \bar{p}_\gamma + m_e) \gamma_\mu v_b$$

$$T_{\mu\lambda}^{W}(p_{e^+} - p_\gamma) \bar{v}_e \gamma_\lambda L v_{\bar{v}_e},$$

$$\mathcal{M}_0^{(1c)} = \frac{8i\sqrt{2}\pi M_0^2 G_F}{2} G(p_t + p_\gamma; 0)$$

$$G(p_{e^+} + p_\gamma; M_W) \bar{u}_t \gamma_\rho L v_b T_{\rho\sigma}^{W}(p_t + p_\gamma) \bar{v}_e (p_{e^+} + p_\gamma) \gamma_\lambda L v_{\bar{v}_e},$$

$$\mathcal{M}_0^{(1d)} = -\frac{8i\sqrt{2}\pi M_0^2 G_F}{2} G(p_t + p_\gamma; M_W)$$

$$G(p_{e^+} - p_\gamma; M_W) \bar{u}_t \gamma_\mu L v_b T_{\mu\sigma}^{W}(p_t + p_\gamma) \bar{v}_e (p_{e^+} - p_\gamma + p_\gamma + p_\gamma) \gamma_\lambda L v_{\bar{v}_e},$$

with the propagator $\frac{1}{(p-\mu)^2 - M_0^2}$.
The Feynman diagrams for PGB contributions to the process $e^+\gamma \to t\bar{b}e^-$ are shown in Fig. 2-Fig. 3. Fig. 2, enhanced by the PGB resonance effects, are the most important $t\bar{b}$-channel PGB contributions. The contributions from Fig. 3, without PGB resonance enhancements, are only of the order of ordinary radiative corrections (less than 1%) and is negligibly small compared with those from Fig. 2.

The technifermion triangle loop contribution to the $\Pi^+ - W^+ - \gamma$ vertex [Fig. 2(a)] in extended technicolor models can be approximately evaluated \footnote{There are additional loop diagrams with the photon line attached to the PGB line and the external $t$ and $\bar{b}$ lines which vanish in the approximation $m_c \approx 0$ in our calculation, so that they are not shown in Fig. 1-Fig. 3.} from the formulae for the Adler-Bell-Jackiw anomaly \footnote{There are additional loop diagrams with the photon line attached to the PGB line and the external $t$ and $\bar{b}$ lines which vanish in the approximation $m_c \approx 0$ in our calculation, so that they are not shown in Fig. 1-Fig. 3.}. The result has been given in Ref. \cite{24}. The $\Pi^+ - W^+ - \gamma$ coupling is:

\begin{equation}
S_{\Pi^+ W^+ \gamma} = \frac{e^2}{2\sqrt{3}s_w} N_{TC},
\end{equation}

where the technicolor number is taken to be $N_{TC} = 4$.

The quark triangle loops [Fig. 2(b)-Fig. 2(c)] are more complicated. They contain both the top quark and the bottom quark propagators with the masses of these quarks relatively light and significantly different. The contributions of these triangle loops are thus essentially different from the result of the Adler-Bell-Jackiw anomaly, and they actually contain logarithmic ultraviolet divergences. There are no corresponding tree-level terms to absorb these divergences. However, to guarantee $U(1)_{em}$ gauge invariance, we should also take account of Fig. 2(d)-Fig. 2(e) [nonvanishing as $m_c \approx 0$] which also contain logarithmic ultraviolet divergences, and cannot be absorbed into tree-level terms. Explicit results show that these two kinds of ultraviolet divergences just cancel each other and the total result is finite as it should be. Because of the destructive nature of these two kinds of amplitudes, there is a significant cancellation between the finite corrections from these two kinds of amplitudes. This makes the charged channel $e^+\gamma \to t\bar{b}e^-$ very different from the neutral channel $\gamma\gamma \to t\bar{t}$, and the detection of the charged channel needs a larger integrated luminosity as we shall see in Sec. III.

To explicitly calculate the contributions of Fig. 2(b)-Fig. 2(c), we need the couplings of the technipion $\Pi^+$.
and the top-pion $\Pi^+_t$ to quarks. In the original extended technicolor models without top-color, the coupling of $\Pi^+$ to quarks has been given in Ref. [2] which is

$$ i c_f \frac{m_t}{F_{\Pi}} \bar{u}_t L u_b \, \Pi^+ + h.c. , \quad (11) $$

where $c_f = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$. In TC2 models, the extended technicolor dynamics only provides a small part of the top quark mass $m'_t$. For reasonable range of the parameters in TC2 models, $m'_t \sim 5 - 20 \text{ GeV}$ [22]. Thus the coupling of the technipion $\Pi^+$ to quarks in TC2 models can be obtained by replacing $m_t$ by $m'_t$ in (11), i.e.

$$ i c_f \frac{m'_t}{F_{\Pi}} \bar{u}_t L u_b \, \Pi^+ + h.c. . \quad (12) $$

Similarly, the coupling of the top-pion $\Pi^+_t$ to quarks is of the following form

$$ i \frac{m_t - m'_t}{F_{\Pi}} \bar{u}_t L u_b \, \Pi^+_t + h.c. . \quad (13) $$

In the $\Pi^+ (\Pi^+_t)$-propagator in Fig. 2(a)-Fig. 2(e), the time-like momentum may hit the $\Pi^+ (\Pi^+_t)$-pole. So we should take into account the effects of the widths of $\Pi^+$ and $\Pi^+_t$ in the calculation. For the $\Pi^+ (\Pi^+_t)$-propagator in (7), we take the complex mass term $M^2 - i M \Gamma$ instead of the simple mass term $M^2$ to include the effect of the width $\Gamma$ of $\Pi^+ (\Pi^+_t)$. The $-i M \Gamma$ term is important in the vicinity of the resonance. It is this resonance contribution that enhances the amplitudes of Fig. 2(a)-Fig. 2(e). When $M_{\Pi_t}, M_{\Pi_t} > m_t$, the dominant decay mode of $\Pi^+$ and $\Pi^+_t$ is $t \bar{b}$. So, in this case the widths $\Gamma_{\Pi}$ and $\Gamma_{\Pi_t}$ are

$$ \Gamma_{\Pi_t} \approx \Gamma_{\Pi} (\Pi \to t \bar{b}) = c_f^2 \frac{m_t^2 (m_t^2 - m_b^2)^2}{16 \pi^2 F_{\Pi}^2 M_{\Pi_t}^3} \quad (14) $$

and

$$ \Gamma_{\Pi_t} \approx \Gamma_{\Pi_t} (\Pi_t \to \bar{t} \bar{b}) = \frac{(m_t - m'_t)^2 (m_t^2 - m_b^2)^2}{16 \pi^2 F_{\Pi}^2 M_{\Pi_t}^3} . \quad (15) $$

When $M_{\Pi_t}, M_{\Pi_t} < m_t$, $\Pi^+_t$ and $\Pi^+$ decay dominantly into $c \bar{s}$. For small $m_b, m_s$, we can approximately take $\Gamma_{\Pi_t}$ and $\Gamma_{\Pi}$ to be zero.

With (12)-(15), we can do the explicit calculation of the contributions of Fig. 2(b)-Fig. 2(e) to the amplitude. In the calculation, we take dimensional regularization and the on-shell renormalization scheme. The obtained amplitude with technicolor corrections is

$$ \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_0 + \Delta \mathcal{M}_{TC}^{(2a)} + \Delta \mathcal{M}_{TC}^{(2b-2c)} (\Pi^+) + \Delta \mathcal{M}_{TC}^{(2b-2c)} (\Pi^+_t) + \Delta \mathcal{M}_{TC}^{(3a-3c)} , \quad (16) $$

where the superscripts denote the corresponding Feynman diagrams in Fig. 2. The explicit formulae for $\Delta \mathcal{M}_{TC}^{(2a)}$, $\Delta \mathcal{M}_{TC}^{(2b-2c)} (\Pi^+)$, and $\Delta \mathcal{M}_{TC}^{(2b-2c)} (\Pi^+_t)$ are

$$ \Delta \mathcal{M}_{TC}^{(2a)} = - i c_f \frac{m'_t M_{W}}{F_{\Pi}} \sqrt{2 \sqrt{2 G_F}} \quad (17) $$

$$ G(p_t + p_b; M_{\Pi}) G(p_{e+} - p_{\nu}; M_W) \, \bar{u}_t L v_b \left[ \bar{e}_{\nu} T^{W}_{\mu \lambda} (p_{e+} - p_{\nu}) \bar{v}_e \gamma_\lambda L_{\nu e} \right] + i c_f \frac{m'_t M_{W}}{F_{\Pi}} \sqrt{8 \pi \sqrt{2 G_F}} \alpha \quad (18) $$

$$ \Delta \mathcal{M}_{TC}^{(2b-2c)} (\Pi^+) = - i \frac{(m_t - m'_t) M_{W}}{F_{\Pi}} \sqrt{2 \sqrt{2 G_F}} (19) $$

$$ G(p_t + p_b; M_{\Pi}) G(p_{e+} - p_{\nu}; M_W) \bar{u}_t L v_b \left[ \bar{e}_{\nu} T^{W}_{\mu \lambda} (p_{e+} - p_{\nu}) \bar{v}_e \gamma_\lambda L_{\nu e} \right] + i \frac{(m_t - m'_t) M_{W}}{F_{\Pi}} \sqrt{8 \pi \sqrt{2 G_F}} \alpha \quad (19) $$

$$ G(p_t + p_b; M_{\Pi}) G(p_{e+} - p_{\nu}; M_W) \bar{u}_t L v_b \left[ - i \Sigma_{\mu} (\Pi) \right] T^{W}_{\mu \nu} (p_t + p_b) \bar{v}_e \gamma_\nu L_{\nu e} \right] . \quad (19) $$

In (18)-(19) the functions $\Gamma^{(2b)}_{\mu \nu}$, $\Gamma^{(2c)}_{\mu \nu}$, $\Gamma^{(2d)}_{\mu \nu}$, and $\Sigma_{\mu}$ are given in the Appendix in terms of the standard 2-point and 3-point functions $B_{\mu \nu}$, $B_{\mu \nu}$, and $C_{\mu \nu}$. The formula for $\Delta \mathcal{M}_{TC}^{(3a-3c)}$ is quite lengthy and we are not going to show it since its contribution is only of the order of ordinary radiative corrections (less than 1%) and is negligibly small compared with those shown in eqs. (17)-(19) which are enhanced by the PGB resonance effects.

b. Model TC2-II

In model TC2-II, the extended technicolor sector is taken to be the multiscale walking technicolor model [3] in which the technipion $\Pi^+$ is almost composed of
pure techniquarks \([28]\), Thus the relevant changes in the above formulæ are:

\[
c_f = \frac{2}{\sqrt{6}}, \quad S_{H+W+\gamma} = \frac{e^2}{4\sqrt{3}s_w}.
\] (20)

The smallness of the decay constant \(F_\Pi\) in this model [cf. Table 1] will enhance the \(\Pi^+\) contribution [cf. eqs.(17)-(19)].

2. The Appelquist-Terning One Family Extended Technicolor Model

This model describes the custodial \(SU(2)\) symmetry, while the technilepton sector is custodial \(SU(2)\) violating. The vacuum expectation value (VEV) \(F_L\) of the techniquark condensate is much larger than the VEV \(F_F\) of the technilepton condensate \([3]\). There are 36 PGB’s in this model, and the color singlet PGB’s are mainly composed of technileptons which is irrelevant to the production of \(tb\). Thus in this model there are no \(\Delta M_{TC}^{(2a)}(\Pi^+)\) and \(\Delta M_{TC}^{(2b-2c)}(\Pi^+)\). The only technicolor contribution to the \(e^+\gamma \to t\bar{b}\nu_e\) is \(\Delta M_{TC}^{(3a-3b)}\) which is much smaller than those in (17)-(19). Thus the cross sections in this model will be much smaller than those in the previous models.

We shall see from the numerical results in the next section that, for certain parameter range, these models can all be measured and distinguished by their \(e^+\gamma \to t\bar{b}\nu_e\) rates at the DESY TESLA.

III. THE CROSS SECTIONS

The hard photon beam of the \(e^+\gamma\) collider can be obtained from laser backscattering at the \(e^+e^-\) linear collider \([29]\). Let \(\hat{s}\) and \(s\) be the center-of-mass energies of the \(e^+\gamma\) and \(e^+e^-\) systems, respectively. After calculating the cross section \(\sigma(\hat{s})\) for the subprocess \(e^+\gamma \to t\bar{b}\nu_e\), the total cross section at the \(e^+e^-\) linear collider can be obtained by folding \(\sigma(\hat{s})\) with the photon distribution function \(f_\gamma(s)\) with \(\hat{s} = sx\)

\[
\sigma_{tot} = \int_{(m_t+m_b)^2/s}^{x_{max}} dx \hat{\sigma}(\hat{s}) f_\gamma(x),
\] (21)

where

\[
f_\gamma(x) = \frac{1}{D(\xi)} \left[ 1 - x + \frac{1}{1 - x} - \frac{4x}{\xi(1 - x)} \right]^2
\] (22)

with \(\xi = 4E_\gamma/\omega_0/m_\nu^2\) in which \(m_\nu\) and \(E_\gamma\) stand, respectively, for the incident electron mass and energy, \(\omega_0\) stands for the laser photon energy, and \(x = \omega/E_\gamma\) stands for the fraction of energy of the incident electron carried by the back-scattered photon. \(f_\gamma\) vanishes for \(x > x_{max} = \omega_{max}/E_\gamma = \xi/(1 + \xi)\).

In order to avoid the creation of \(e^+e^-\) pairs by the interaction of the incident and back-scattered photons, we require \(\omega_{max} x_{max} \leq m_\nu^2/E_\gamma\) which implies that \(\xi \leq 2 + 2\sqrt{2} \approx 4.8\). For the choice of \(\xi = 4.8\), we obtain

\[
x_{max} \approx 0.83, \quad D(\xi) \approx 1.8.
\] (23)

In the calculation of \(\sigma(\hat{s})\), instead of calculating the square of the renormalized amplitude \(\mathcal{M}\) analytically, we calculate the amplitudes numerically by using the method of Ref. \([3]\). This greatly simplifies our calculations. Care must be taken in the calculation of the form factors expressed in terms of the standard loop integrals defined in Ref. \([27]\). In the numerical calculation, we used the formulæ for the tensor loop integrals given in Ref. \([27]\) in which the stability of the numerical calculation is poor when the scattering is forwards or backwards \([31]\). This problem can be avoided by taking certain kinematic cuts on the rapidity \(y\) and the transverse momentum \(p_T\) of the final states which are also needed in experimental detections. In order to compare with the corresponding results in the neutral channel, we take, in this paper, the same kinematic cuts as in Ref. \([17]\), i.e.

\[
|y| < 2.5, \quad p_T > 20 \text{ GeV}.
\] (25)

The cuts will also increase the relative correction \([32]\).

In our calculation, we take \(m_t = 176\) GeV, \(m_b = 4.9\) GeV, \(M_W = 80.33\) GeV, \(G_F = 1.19347 \times 10^{-5}\) (GeV\(^{-2}\)), \(s^2_w = 0.23\). The electromagnetic fine structure constant \(\alpha\) at certain energy scale is calculated from the simple QED one-loop evolution formula with the boundary value \(\alpha = 1/137.04\) \([33]\), and we will not consider the hadronic corrections here since it does not affect the conclusions in this paper to the present precision.

For estimating the event rates, we take the following integrated luminosities corresponding to a one-year run at the DESY TESLA \([34]\):

\[
\sqrt{s} = 0.5\ \text{TeV}: \quad \int L dt \approx 500\ \text{fb}^{-1}
\] (26)
\[ \sqrt{s} = 0.8 \text{ TeV} : \int L dt = 500 \text{ fb}^{-1} \]
\[ \sqrt{s} = 1.6 \text{ TeV} : \int L dt \geq 500 \text{ fb}^{-1}. \]

Our numerical results show that the contributions from the diagrams in Fig. 3 to the production cross section are negligibly small in all models considered in this paper. Therefore we simply ignore them.

In model TC2-I, the numerical results show that the technicolor PGB contributions to the production cross section are negligibly small compared with the contributions from the top-pion for \( m_{\Pi} \lesssim 220 \) GeV. In Table 2, we list the correction to the production cross section \( \Delta \sigma_{\Pi} \) (from the top-pion contributions) and the total cross section \( \sigma \) with 150 GeV \( \lesssim m_{\Pi} \lesssim 380 \) GeV, \( m_I' = 5 \), 20 GeV at the 0.5 and 1.6 TeV LC. We see that the correction with \( m_{\Pi} = 150 \) GeV is significantly smaller than those with larger \( m_{\Pi} \). This is due to the \( t \bar{b} \) threshold effect in the \( \Pi_t \) resonance contribution. For \( \sqrt{s} = 0.5 \) TeV, we see from Table 2 that the relative correction \( \Delta \sigma_{\Pi}/\sigma_0 \) is around 0.1% if \( m_{\Pi} \) is smaller than the threshold and around \( (2 \sim 4)\% \) if \( m_{\Pi} \) is larger than the threshold. For \( \sqrt{s} = 1.6 \) TeV, \( \Delta \sigma_{\Pi}/\sigma \) is around \((0.3 \sim 0.8)\% \). These technicolor PGB corrections are quite small compared with those in the neutral channel through the threshold. This is because that the contributions of Fig. 2(b)-Fig. 2(c) and Fig. 2(d)-Fig. 2(e) are destructive, which makes the charged channel very different from the neutral channel. With the integrated luminosity in (26), we see from the values of \( \sigma \) in Table 2 that, for a four-year run, there can be about \( 7000 \) events for \( \sqrt{s} = 0.5 \) TeV, and \( \geq 30000 \) events for \( \sqrt{s} = 1.6 \) TeV. The corresponding statistical uncertainties at the 95% C.L. are then 2% for \( \sqrt{s} = 0.5 \) TeV, and \( \lesssim 1\% \) for \( \sqrt{s} = 1.6 \) TeV. Thus the effect of the top-pion corrections can hardly be experimentally detected if \( m_{\Pi} \) is smaller than the threshold and for \( \sqrt{s} = 1.6 \) TeV, but there is a possibility of detecting the signal for \( \sqrt{s} = 0.5 \) TeV if \( m_{\Pi} \) is larger than the threshold in the sense of statistical uncertainty \( [3] \). To show the above results more intuitively, we plot, in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5, the number of events in a four-year run of the DESY TESLA at 0.5 TeV and 1.6 TeV, respectively, with \( m_{\Pi} \) in the range 180 GeV \( \lesssim m_{\Pi} \lesssim 380 \) GeV. In the figures, the solid line stands for the total number of events, the dashed line stands for the number of events corresponding to the tree-level standard model contribution, and the dotted lines indicate the bounds of the statistical uncertainty at the 95% C.L. We see that the signal of \( \Pi_t \) contribution can possibly be detected in the range 200 GeV \( \lesssim m_{\Pi} \lesssim 320 \) GeV at \( \sqrt{s} = 0.5 \) TeV, while it cannot be detected at the 95% C.L. at \( \sqrt{s} = 1.6 \) TeV.

In model TC2-II, the top-pion contributions are similar, while the \( \Pi^+ \) contributions are more significant than that in model TC2-I due to the smallness of \( F_{\Pi} \) in model TC2-II. The numerical results in model TC2-II are listed in Table 3 with the same ranges of \( m_{\Pi} \) and \( m'_I \), and with \( m_{\Pi} = 100 \) and 220 GeV at the \( \sqrt{s} = 0.5 \) TeV and \( \sqrt{s} = 1.6 \) TeV LC. We see that the corrections are also significantly different for \( m_{\Pi} \) lying below or above the threshold. We see from Table 3 that the effect of \( \Pi^+ \) contributions, \( \Delta \sigma_{\Pi} \), is negligibly small for \( m_{\Pi} = 100 \) GeV, while it is almost dominant for \( m_{\Pi} = 220 \) GeV due to the effect of the tail of the \( \Pi^+ \) resonance. Take the \( m'_I = 5 \) GeV case as an example. For \( m_{\Pi} = 220 \) GeV, the relative correction \( \Delta \sigma/\sigma \) (\( \Delta \sigma = \Delta \sigma_{\Pi} + \Delta \sigma_{\Pi_t} \)) is around 16% for \( \sqrt{s} = 0.5 \) TeV and is around 10% for \( \sqrt{s} = 1.6 \) TeV, both for \( m_{\Pi} \) smaller or larger than the threshold, i.e. the corrections are much larger in this model due to the \( \Pi^+ \) contributions. For \( m_{\Pi} = 220 \) GeV, the relative difference between the cross sections in model TC2-II and model TC2-I [\( \sigma(\text{TC} \ 2 - \Pi) - \sigma(\text{TC} \ 2 - I))/\sigma(\text{TC} \ 2 - I) \)] is about 15% when \( \sqrt{s} = 0.5 \) TeV and about 12% when \( \sqrt{s} = 1.6 \) TeV. In this example, the number of events in a four-year run are about 7800 for \( \sqrt{s} = 0.5 \) TeV, and about 33000 for \( \sqrt{s} = 1.6 \) TeV. The corresponding statistical uncertainties at the 95% C.L. are then 2% for \( \sqrt{s} = 0.5 \) TeV and 1% for \( \sqrt{s} = 1.6 \) TeV. Thus the effect of the technicolor corrections in model TC2-II can be clearly detected both at \( \sqrt{s} = 0.5 \) TeV and \( \sqrt{s} = 1.6 \) TeV energies. The difference between models TC2-I and TC2-II can also be clearly detected at \( \sqrt{s} = 0.5, 1.6 \text{ TeV} \). So we conclude that models TC2-I and TC2-II can even be experimentally distinguished at the \( \sqrt{s} = 0.5, 1.6 \text{ TeV} \) TESLA via \( e^+\gamma \rightarrow t\bar{b}e^{-} \) if \( m_{\Pi} \) is around 220 GeV. The plots corresponding to Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 for model TC2-II are given in Fig. 6 and Fig. 7, respectively.

As has been mentioned in Sec. II-2, the special arrangement of \( F_Q \) and \( F_L \) in the Appelquist-Terning one-family walking technicolor model causes that the color-singlet technipions are mainly composed of the technileptons, so that they do not couple to \( t \bar{b} \). Thus there is no \( t \bar{b} \)-channel PGB contribution to the pro-

\[ ^4 \text{Since the ordinary one-loop radiative corrections, such as the contributions from Fig. 3(a)-Fig. 3(i), are already less than 1%, the theoretical uncertainty of this calculation (higher loop effects) is expected to be unimportant relative to the statistical uncertainty. A practical analysis of the detectability concerns also the systematic error and the detection efficiency in the experiments, but this is beyond the scope of this paper.} \]
duction cross section, and the technicolor corrections are only from the diagrams in Fig. 3 which are negligibly small. Numerical calculation shows that the relative correction is smaller than 1%. So the effect of the technicolor corrections cannot be detected via the process \(e^+\gamma \rightarrow \bar{t}b\nu_e\). This is significantly different from the above two top-color-assisted technicolor models.

**IV. CONCLUSIONS**

In this paper, we have studied the possibility of testing different Currently interesting improved technicolor models in the process \(e^+\gamma \rightarrow \bar{t}b\nu_e\) at the \(\sqrt{s} = 0.5\) TeV and \(\sqrt{s} = 1.6\) TeV LC, especially the DESY TESLA, via the effects of their typical PGB’s. We see that the \(tb\)-channel PGB contributions play a dominant role in this production process and their effects are experimentally detectable for certain reasonable parameter range in the sense of the statistical uncertainty. However, due to the destructive nature of the contributions of Fig. 2(b)-Fig. 2(c) and Fig. 2(d)-Fig. 2(e), the relative corrections in this charged channel are much smaller than those in the neutral channel \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \bar{t}t\) [17], so that larger integrated luminosity is needed in the detection.

Specifically, in a four-year run of the DESY TESLA, the effects of the \(tb\)-channel PGB’s in models TC2-I and TC2-II are all experimentally detectable for reasonable parameter range, and these models can be experimentally distinguished through the differences of their cross sections. The Appelquist-Terning model, as a typical example of models without a \(tb\)-channel PGB, is not detectable in the \(e^+\gamma \rightarrow \bar{t}b\nu_e\) process at the LC. Thus the \(e^+\gamma \rightarrow \bar{t}b\nu_e\) process at the LC provides a feasible test of the \(tb\)-channel charged PGB’s in various technicolor models.

Since the recent Fermilab CDF data on \(\bar{t}t\) production at the Fermilab Tevatron show that the branching fraction for a top quark decaying into a final state \(e\) or \(\mu\) is consistent with the standard model prediction up to certain uncertainty [13], a charged top-pion lighter than the top quark may not be favored [8], and a charged top-pion heavier than the top quark will have a broadwidth that is difficult to detect directly. Our results in model TC2-I show that the \(e^+\gamma \rightarrow \bar{t}b\nu_e\) process at the DESY TESLA provides feasible tests of the charged top-pion effect.
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**APPENDIX**

Here we give the explicit expressions for \(\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{(tb)}(\Pi), \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{(2c)}(\Pi), \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{(2c)}(\Pi), \Sigma_{\mu}(\Pi), \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{(2b)}(\Pi), \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{(2c)}(\Pi), \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{(2c)}(\Pi), \Sigma_{\mu}(\Pi), \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{(2b)}(\Pi), \) which can be obtained by direct calculations of the Feynman diagrams in Figs. 2(c)-2(e). The explicit expressions are

\[
\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{(2b)}(\Pi) = -c_f \frac{M_W m_t m_{\mu} m_{\nu}}{12\pi^2 F_{\Pi}} \sqrt{2\sqrt{2} G_F} \alpha \{2[(p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\mu} + (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\nu} C_{21} + (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e}) C_{22} + (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\mu} p_{\gamma\nu} C_{23} + p_{\gamma\mu}(p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\nu} C_{23} + g_{\mu\nu} C_{24} - g_{\mu\nu} B_0(p_{\gamma}, m_b, m_b) - g_{\mu\nu} m_{\mu}^2 C_0 + (2p_{e+} - 2p_{\bar{\nu}_e} + p_{\gamma})_{\mu} (p_{e+} C_{11} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e} C_{11} + p_{\gamma} C_{12})_\nu + (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_\nu (p_{e+} C_{11} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\mu} (2p_{e+} - 2p_{\bar{\nu}_e} + p_{\gamma})_\nu - (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e}) (2p_{e+} + 2p_{\nu_e} + p_{\gamma})_{\mu} (p_{e+} C_{11} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_\nu + g_{\mu\nu} p_{\bar{\nu}_e} C_{11} + p_{\gamma} C_{12} + C_{12})_\nu - i \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\rho} g_{\mu\nu} + (2p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\mu} (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_\nu - (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e}) C_{11} + p_{\gamma} C_{12} \}
\]

\[
\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{(2c)}(\Pi) = c_f \frac{M_W m_t m_{\mu} m_{\nu}}{6\pi^2 F_{\Pi}} \sqrt{2\sqrt{2} G_F} \alpha \{2[(p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\mu} + (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\nu} C_{21} + (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\mu} p_{\gamma\nu} C_{23} + p_{\gamma\mu}(p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\nu} C_{23} + g_{\mu\nu} C_{24} + (p_{e+} C_{11} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\nu} C_{11} + p_{\gamma} C_{12} + C_{12})_\nu + g_{\mu\nu} (p_{e+} + 2p_{\bar{\nu}_e} + p_{\gamma})_{\nu} - i \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\rho} p_{\bar{\nu}_e} \}
\]

\[
p_{\nu_e} C_{10},
\]

\[
\frac{\Delta F_{\Pi}(\Pi)}{12\pi^2 F_{\Pi}} \sqrt{2\sqrt{2} G_F} \alpha \{2[(p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\mu} + (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\nu} C_{21} + (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\mu} p_{\gamma\nu} C_{23} + p_{\gamma\mu}(p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\nu} C_{23} + g_{\mu\nu} C_{24} + (p_{e+} C_{11} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\nu} C_{11} + p_{\gamma} C_{12} + C_{12})_\nu + g_{\mu\nu} (p_{e+} + 2p_{\bar{\nu}_e} + p_{\gamma})_{\nu} - i \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\rho} p_{\bar{\nu}_e} \}
\]

\[
\frac{\Delta F_{\Pi}(\Pi)}{12\pi^2 F_{\Pi}} \sqrt{2\sqrt{2} G_F} \alpha \{2[(p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\mu} + (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\nu} C_{21} + (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\mu} p_{\gamma\nu} C_{23} + p_{\gamma\mu}(p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\nu} C_{23} + g_{\mu\nu} C_{24} + (p_{e+} C_{11} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\nu} C_{11} + p_{\gamma} C_{12} + C_{12})_\nu + g_{\mu\nu} (p_{e+} + 2p_{\bar{\nu}_e} + p_{\gamma})_{\nu} - i \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\rho} p_{\bar{\nu}_e} \}
\]

\[
\frac{\Delta F_{\Pi}(\Pi)}{12\pi^2 F_{\Pi}} \sqrt{2\sqrt{2} G_F} \alpha \{2[(p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\mu} + (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\nu} C_{21} + (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\mu} p_{\gamma\nu} C_{23} + p_{\gamma\mu}(p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\nu} C_{23} + g_{\mu\nu} C_{24} + (p_{e+} C_{11} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\nu} C_{11} + p_{\gamma} C_{12} + C_{12})_\nu + g_{\mu\nu} (p_{e+} + 2p_{\bar{\nu}_e} + p_{\gamma})_{\nu} - i \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} (p_{e+} - p_{\bar{\nu}_e})_{\rho} p_{\bar{\nu}_e} \}
\]
\[ -\epsilon_{\mu\rho\sigma\tau} \left( p_{e^+} - p_{\bar{e}^-} \right) C_{11}^{\mu} + p_{\nu} C_{12}^{\nu} p_{\gamma}^{\sigma} \]  

\[ \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{(2d)} = c_f \frac{M_W m_t m_b'}{4 \pi^2 F_W} \sqrt{2} G_F \alpha \]

\[ B_1 \left( p_t + p_b, m_t, m_b \right) + B_0 \left( p_t + p_b, m_t, m_b \right) \]

\[ \left\{ \left( p_{e^+} - p_{\bar{e}^-} \right) \mu \left( p_{e^+} - p_{\bar{e}^-} \right)_{\nu} - \gamma_{\mu} \gamma_{\nu} \right\} \]

\[ -g_{\mu\nu} \left( p_{e^+} - p_{\bar{e}^-} \right)^2 \]  

\[ -i \Sigma_{\mu} (\Pi) = c_f M_W m_t m_b' \frac{8 \pi^2 F_W}{\sqrt{2} G_F (p_t + p_b)_{\mu}} \]

\[ \left\{ B_1 \left( p_t + p_b, m_t, m_b \right) + B_0 \left( p_t + p_b, m_t, m_b \right) \right\} \]

\[ C_{ij} = C_{ij} \left( p_{\bar{e}^-} - p_{e^+}, -p_{\gamma}, m_t, m_b \right) \]

\[ C_{ij}^{*} = C_{ij} \left( p_{e^+} - p_{\bar{e}^-}, p_{\gamma}, m_t, m_b \right) \]

where \( C_{ij} \)'s are the standard 3-point functions given in Ref. [27].

The expressions for \( \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{(2b)} (\Pi_t) \), \( \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{(2b)} (\Pi_t) \), \( \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{(2d)} (\Pi_t) \), and \( \sigma_{\mu} (\Pi_t) \) can be obtained by simply replacing \( m_b' \) by \( m_t - m_t' \), \( F_W \) by \( F_W \), and taking \( c_f = 1 \).
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**TABLES**

**Table 1:** The masses $m_{\Pi_t}$, $m_{\Pi}$ and the decay constants $F_{\Pi_t}$, $F_{\Pi}$ of the top-pion and the technipion in the TC2-I and TC2-II models.

| Model  | $m_{\Pi_t}$ (GeV) | $F_{\Pi_t}$ (GeV) | $m_{\Pi}$ (GeV) | $F_{\Pi}$ (GeV) |
|--------|------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|
| TC2-I  | 150 ~ 380        | 50               | 100 ~ 220       | 123            |
| TC2-II | 150 ~ 380        | 50               | 100 ~ 220       | 40             |

**Table 2:** Top-pion corrections to the $e^+\gamma \rightarrow t\bar{b}\nu_e$ production cross section $\Delta\sigma_{\Pi_t}$ and the total production cross section $\sigma = \sigma_0 + \Delta\sigma_{\Pi_t} + \Delta\sigma_{\Pi}$ in model TC2-I with $m_{\Pi} = 220$ GeV and various values of $m_{\Pi_t}$. The technipion corrections are negligibly small. The tree level production cross section $\sigma_0 = 3.25 fb$ for $\sqrt{s} = 0.5$ TeV, $\sigma_0 = 14.73 fb$ for $\sqrt{s} = 1.6$ TeV.

| $\sqrt{s}$ (TeV) | $m_\ell' = 5$ GeV | $\Delta\sigma_{\Pi_t}$ (fb) | $\sigma$ (fb) | $m_\ell' = 20$ GeV | $\Delta\sigma_{\Pi_t}$ (fb) | $\sigma$ (fb) |
|------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|
| 0.5              | 150              | 0.0025         | 3.25         | 150              | -0.004         | 3.25         |
|                  | 180              | 0.083          | 3.26         | 180              | 0.06           | 3.26         |
|                  | 200              | 0.081          | 3.33         | 200              | 0.062          | 3.31         |
|                  | 240              | 0.12           | 3.37         | 240              | 0.096          | 3.35         |
|                  | 300              | 0.098          | 3.35         | 300              | 0.083          | 3.33         |
|                  | 380              | 0.058          | 3.31         | 380              | 0.052          | 3.30         |
| 1.6              | 150              | -0.12          | 14.61        | 150              | -0.11          | 14.62        |
|                  | 180              | -0.11          | 14.62        | 180              | -0.099         | 14.63        |
|                  | 200              | 0.05           | 14.78        | 200              | 0.039          | 14.77        |
|                  | 240              | 0.086          | 14.82        | 240              | 0.061          | 14.79        |
|                  | 300              | 0.082          | 14.81        | 300              | 0.058          | 14.79        |
|                  | 380              | 0.05           | 14.78        | 380              | 0.042          | 14.77        |
Table 3: Top-pion and technipion corrections to the $e^+\gamma \to t\bar{b}\nu_e$ production cross section $\Delta\sigma_{\Pi_{T}}, \Delta\sigma_{\Pi}$ and the total production cross section $\sigma = \sigma_{0} + \Delta\sigma_{\Pi_{T}} + \Delta\sigma_{\Pi}$ in model TC2-II with $\sqrt{s} = 0.5, 1.6$ TeV and various values of $m_{\Pi_{T}}, m_{\Pi}, m'_{T}$. The tree level production cross section $\sigma_{0} = 3.25$ fb for $\sqrt{s} = 0.5$ TeV, $\sigma_{0} = 14.73$ fb for $\sqrt{s} = 1.6$ TeV.

| $\sqrt{s}$ (TeV) | $m_{\Pi}$ (GeV) | $m_{\Pi_{T}}$ (GeV) | $m'_{T}$ (GeV) | $\Delta\sigma_{\Pi_{T}} (fb)$ | $\Delta\sigma_{\Pi} (fb)$ | $\sigma (fb)$ | $\Delta\sigma_{\Pi_{T}} (fb)$ | $\Delta\sigma_{\Pi} (fb)$ | $\sigma (fb)$ |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|
| 0.5              | 100             | 150                 | 0.0025       | 3.25             | -0.004           | 3.25           | 180              | 0.0083           | 3.26             |
|                  |                 | 200                 | 0.081        | 3.33             | 0.062            | 3.31           | 240              | 0.12             | 3.37             |
|                  |                 | 300                 | 0.098        | 3.35             | 0.083            | 3.33           | 380              | 0.058            | 3.31             |
| 220              |                 | 150                 | 0.0025       | 3.77             | -0.004           | 6.63           | 180              | 0.0083           | 3.78             |
|                  |                 | 200                 | 0.081        | 3.85             | 0.062            | 3.38           | 240              | 0.12             | 3.89             |
|                  |                 | 300                 | 0.098        | 3.87             | 0.083            | 3.73           | 380              | 0.058            | 3.83             |
| 1.6              | 100             | 150                 | -0.12        | 14.56            | -0.11            | 14.46          | 180              | -0.11            | 14.57             |
|                  |                 | 200                 | 0.05         | 14.73            | 0.039            | 14.61          | 240              | 0.086            | 14.77            |
|                  |                 | 300                 | 0.082        | 14.76            | 0.058            | 14.63          | 380              | 0.05             | 14.73            |
| 220              |                 | 150                 | -0.12        | 16.39            | -0.11            | 26.14          | 180              | -0.11            | 16.40             |
|                  |                 | 200                 | 0.05         | 16.56            | 0.039            | 26.31          | 240              | 0.086            | 16.60            |
|                  |                 | 300                 | 0.082        | 16.59            | 0.058            | 26.34          | 380              | 0.05             | 16.56            |
FIG. 1. Tree-level Feynman diagrams contributing from various technicolor models to the process $e^+\gamma \rightarrow t\bar{b}\nu_e$. The dashed lines denote color-singlet technipions or top-pions.

FIG. 2. One-loop Feynman diagrams for resonance contributing from various technicolor models to the process $e^+\gamma \rightarrow t\bar{b}\nu_e$. The dashed lines denote color-singlet technipions or top-pions.
FIG. 3. One-loop Feynman diagrams for non-resonance contributing from various technicolor models to the process $e^+\gamma \rightarrow t\bar{b}\nu$. The dashed lines denote color-singlet technipions or top-pions.
FIG. 4. The number of events $N$ (4-year run at the TESLA) versus $M_{\Pi}$, for $m'_t = 5$ GeV and $M_R = 220$ GeV at $\sqrt{s} = 0.5$ TeV in model TC2-I. The solid line is the total number of events, the dashed line is the number of events corresponding to the tree-level standard model contribution, the dotted lines indicate the statistical uncertainty bounds at 95% C.L.

FIG. 5. The number of events $N$ (4-year run at the TESLA) versus $M_{\Pi}$, for $m'_t = 5$ GeV and $M_R = 220$ GeV at $\sqrt{s} = 1.6$ TeV in model TC2-I. The solid line is the total number of events, the dashed line is the number of events corresponding to the tree-level standard model contribution, the dotted lines indicate the statistical uncertainty bounds at 95% C.L.
FIG. 6. The number of events $N$ (4-year run at the TESLA) versus $M_{H}$, for $m'_{t} = 5$ GeV and $M_{H} = 220$ GeV at $\sqrt{s} = 0.5$ TeV in model TC2-II. The solid line is the total number of events, the dashed line is the number of events corresponding to the tree-level standard model contribution, the dotted lines indicate the statistical uncertainty bounds at 95% C.L.

FIG. 7. The number of events $N$ (4-year run at the TESLA) versus $M_{H}$, for $m'_{t} = 5$ GeV and $M_{H} = 220$ GeV at $\sqrt{s} = 1.6$ TeV in model TC2-II. The solid line is the total number of events, the dashed line is the number of events corresponding to the tree-level standard model contribution, the dotted lines indicate the statistical uncertainty bounds at 95% C.L.