

DYNAMICAL GENERATION OF THE BARYON ASYMMETRY FROM A SCALE HIERARCHY

Based on arXiv:2401.13734

with Kwang Sik Jeong, Chang Hyeon Lee, and Chang Sub Shin


Jae Hyeok Chang

Fermilab and UIC


01/31/2024 Particle Theory Seminar, University of Chicago

INTRODUCTION

Matter-Antimatter Asymmetry



Matter-Antimatter Asymmetry



$$Y_B \equiv \frac{\bar{n}_B}{s} = (0.82 - 0.92) \times 10^{-10}$$

Too big or Too small?

$$Y_B \equiv \frac{\bar{n}_B}{s} = (0.82 - 0.92) \times 10^{-10}$$

Too Big

- If it comes from SM
- SM CPV is too small to get $Y_B \sim 10^{-10}$
- Need new physics

Too Small

- If it comes from New physics
- Expect $Y_B \sim \frac{1}{g_*} \mathcal{O}(1)$
- Need small couplings or large wash-out effects

Previous baryogenesis models

- Electroweak baryogenesis Rubakov and Shaposhnikov, hep-ph/9603208

$$Y_B \propto \Gamma_{\text{sp}} \sim 20\alpha_W^5 T \sim 10^{-6} T$$

- Thermal leptogenesis Fukugita and Yanagida, 1986

$$Y_B \propto \epsilon = \frac{\Gamma(N_1 \rightarrow lh) - \Gamma(N_1 \rightarrow \bar{l}\bar{h})}{\Gamma(N_1 \rightarrow lh) + \Gamma(N_1 \rightarrow \bar{l}\bar{h})} \sim y_\nu^2 \frac{M_1}{M_2} \sim 10^{-7}$$

- WIMPy baryogenesis Cui et al, 1112.2704, 1212.2973

$$Y_B \propto Y_{WIMP} \sim Y_{eq}(x=15) \sim \exp(-15) \sim 10^{-8}$$

A novel way to get a small number

- Two fundamental mass scales in nature
 - The reduced Planck mass : $M_P = (8\pi G)^{-1/2} = 2.4 \times 10^{18} \text{ GeV}$
 - The electroweak scale : $v = (G_F \sqrt{2})^{-1/2} = 246 \text{ GeV}$
- We propose a model that gives the baryon asymmetry from a hierarchy of these two scales

$$Y_B \propto \sqrt{\frac{v}{M_P}} = \sqrt{\frac{246 \text{ GeV}}{2.4 \times 10^{18} \text{ GeV}}} = 10^{-8}$$

Neutrino-Portal Affleck-Dine Baryogenesis

Neutrino-Portal Affleck-Dine Baryogenesis

- We have ϕ , an AD field that carries a $B - L$ number
- If the AD mechanism happens during the radiation-dominated era, we get

$$Y_\phi = \mathcal{O}(0.01) \sqrt{\frac{m_\phi}{M_P}}$$

Neutrino-Portal Affleck-Dine Baryogenesis

- We have ϕ , an AD field that carries a $B - L$ number
- If the AD mechanism happens during the radiation-dominated era, we get

$$Y_\phi = \mathcal{O}(0.01) \sqrt{\frac{m_\phi}{M_P}}$$

- If $V(\phi) \supset m_\phi^2 |\phi|^2$ is radiatively stable due to the same mechanism for Higgs boson, we can expect

$$m_\phi \sim \nu \Rightarrow Y_\phi \sim 10^{-10}$$

- All the asymmetry of ϕ transfers to B and L sector through the neutrino portal and the weak sphaleron process
- The model predicts a relic Majoron, with $\sim \text{keV}$ mass and $\sim \nu$ decay constant, which contributes to ΔN_{eff}

REVIEW OF AD BARYOGENESIS

Based on “A mini review on Affleck–Dine baryogenesis”
by Rouzbeh Allahverdi and Anupam Mazumdar, 2012

Scalar Potential

$$V = (m_\phi^2 - \kappa_H H^2) |\phi|^2 + \frac{\kappa^2}{M_P^2} |\phi|^6 - \alpha m_\phi \frac{\kappa}{4M_P} (\phi^4 + \phi^{*4})$$

- ϕ is a supersymmetric flat direction with a global $U(1)$ symmetry

Scalar Potential

$$V = (m_\phi^2 - \kappa_H H^2) |\phi|^2 + \frac{\kappa^2}{M_P^2} |\phi|^6 - \alpha m_\phi \frac{\kappa}{4 M_P} (\phi^4 + \phi^{*4})$$

- ϕ is a supersymmetric flat direction with a global $U(1)$ symmetry
- $U(1)$ is explicitly broken by the Planck suppressed operators in the superpotential

$$W = \frac{\kappa}{4 M_P} \phi^4, \quad V = \left| \frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi} \right|^2 - (\alpha m_\phi W + h.c.)$$

$U(1)$ breaking scale

Soft SUSY breaking scale

Scalar Potential

$$V = (m_\phi^2 - \kappa_H H^2) |\phi|^2 + \frac{\kappa^2}{M_P^2} |\phi|^6 - \alpha m_\phi \frac{\kappa}{4M_P} (\phi^4 + \phi^{*4})$$

- ϕ is a supersymmetric flat direction with a global $U(1)$ symmetry
- $U(1)$ is explicitly broken by the Planck suppressed operators in the superpotential




$$W = \frac{\kappa}{4M_P} \phi^4, \quad V = \left| \frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi} \right|^2 - (\alpha m_\phi W + h.c.)$$

- The Hubble induced mass term comes from the Kähler potential,

$$\frac{\rho}{M_P^2} |\phi|^2 \Rightarrow \kappa_H H^2 |\phi|^2$$

Affleck-Dine Mechanism

$$V(r, \theta) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\underbrace{m_\phi^2}_{\text{blue}} - \underbrace{\kappa_H H^2}_{\text{green}} \right) r^2 - \underbrace{\frac{\kappa \alpha m_\phi}{8 M_P}}_{\text{orange}} r^4 \cos 4\theta + \underbrace{\frac{\kappa^2 r^6}{8 M_P^2}}_{\text{green}} + \dots \quad \left(\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} r e^{i\theta} \right)$$




Affleck-Dine Mechanism

$$V(r, \theta) = \frac{1}{2} (m_\phi^2 - \kappa_H H^2) r^2 - \frac{\kappa \alpha m_\phi}{8 M_P} r^4 \cos 4\theta + \frac{\kappa^2 r^6}{8 M_P^2} + \dots \quad \left(\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} r e^{i\theta} \right)$$

- Net number density of ϕ is

$$\bar{n}_\phi = i(\dot{\phi}^* \phi - \phi^* \dot{\phi}) = r^2 \dot{\theta}$$

- Generation of angular momentum gives the asymmetry of ϕ
- AD mechanism happens during early-MD because the thermal potential $\lambda T^2 r^2$ spoils the scalar dynamics
- Final asymmetry depends on the reheating temperature T_{rh}



NEUTRINO-PORTAL AFFLECK-DINE MECHANISM


What's the difference?

$$V(r, \theta) = \frac{1}{2} (m_\phi^2 - \kappa_H H^2) r^2 - \frac{\kappa \alpha m_\phi}{8 M_P} r^4 \cos 4\theta + \frac{\kappa^2 r^6}{8 M_P^2} + \dots \quad \left(\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} r e^{i\theta} \right)$$

- AD mechanism happens during the radiation-dominated era

- $H \sim \frac{T^2}{M_P} \Rightarrow T_{AD} \sim \sqrt{m_\phi M_P} \sim 10^{10} \text{ GeV}$
- $\langle r \rangle \sim \sqrt{H M_P} \sim T \Rightarrow r(T_{AD}) \sim \sqrt{m_\phi M_P}$
- $\dot{\theta} \sim m_\theta^2 / H \sim \frac{\alpha}{M_P} \langle r^2 \rangle \sim \alpha m_\phi$

- $Y_\phi = \frac{\bar{n}_\phi}{s} \sim \frac{r^2 \dot{\theta}}{g_* T^3} \sim \frac{\alpha}{g_*} \sqrt{\frac{m_\phi}{M_P}} \sim 10^{-10}$




More precisely

- The analytic expression for Y_ϕ can be calculated from the equation of motion of Y_ϕ ,

$$\frac{dY_\phi}{dt} = -\frac{1}{s} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \theta} = -\frac{1}{s} \frac{\kappa \alpha m_\phi}{2M_P} r^4 \sin 4\theta$$

- To integrate the e.o.m over t analytically with some assumptions
 - $H > m_\phi$: $r(t) = \langle r \rangle = \left(\frac{4\kappa_H}{3\kappa^2} \right)^{1/4} \sqrt{H M_P}$ and $\theta(t) = \theta_{\text{in}}$
 - $H < m_\phi$: $r(t) = \langle r(t_*) \rangle a^{-3/2} \cos(m_\phi(t - t_*))$ and $\theta(t) = \theta_{\text{in}}$ near maxima (t_* is the time at $H = m_\phi$)



More precisely

- The analytic expression for Y_ϕ can be calculated from the equation of motion of Y_ϕ ,

$$\frac{dY_\phi}{dt} = -\frac{1}{s} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \theta} = -\frac{1}{s} \frac{\kappa \alpha m_\phi}{2M_P} r^4 \sin 4\theta$$

- To integrate the e.o.m over t analytically with some assumptions
 - $H > m_\phi$: $r(t) = \langle r \rangle = \left(\frac{4\kappa_H}{3\kappa^2}\right)^{1/4} \sqrt{H M_P}$ and $\theta(t) = \theta_{\text{in}}$
 - $H < m_\phi$: $r(t) = \langle r(t_*) \rangle a^{-3/2} \cos(m_\phi(t - t_*))$ and $\theta(t) = \theta_{\text{in}}$ near maxima (t_* is the time at $H = m_\phi$)


- The final analytic result is

$$Y_\phi = -0.1 \alpha \frac{\kappa_H}{\kappa} \sin 4\theta_{\text{in}} \left(\frac{200}{g_*}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \sqrt{\frac{m_\phi}{M_P}}$$

- With $g_* = 200$ and $\mathcal{O}(0.1 - 1)$ coefficients, we get $Y_\phi \sim 10^{-10}$

Comparison with numerical results

$$Y_\phi = -0.1\alpha \frac{\kappa_H}{\kappa} \sin 4\theta_{\text{in}} \left(\frac{200}{g_*}\right)^{1/4} \sqrt{\frac{m_\phi}{M_P}}$$



Another difference


- ϕ cannot be MSSM flat directions
 - MSSM flat directions couple to SM with the SM Yukawa couplings
 - In RD, ϕ easily thermalizes with SM bath and develop the thermal potential ($\lambda T^2 r^2$), which spoils the AD mechanism
 - AD mechanism needs to happens during the early matter-domination
- We use the neutrino-portal: $y_\nu \ell h N + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_N \phi N^2$
 - ϕ is a new degree of freedom
 - ϕ was decoupled with the SM bath due to the small Yukawa coupling
 - Initial abundance is negligible and does not develop thermal potential
 - ϕ is thermalized with the SM bath through a right-handed neutrino N much later than the AD mechanism happens

Neutrino-Portal Affleck-Dine Mechanism

$$W = y_\nu \ell h N + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_N \phi N N + \frac{\kappa}{4M_P} \phi^4 + \dots$$

- N is a right-handed neutrino with $B - L = 1$
- ϕ carries $B - L = -2$
- Global $U(1)_{B-L}$ only allows the seesaw operators
- $U(1)_{B-L}$ breaking term arises from quantum gravity effects
- Asymmetry of ϕ transfers to the lepton sector through N
- Asymmetry of the baryon sector is induced from the weak sphaleron process

Cosmological History



ASYMMETRY TRANSFER

Thermalization of N


$$\mathcal{L} \supset \bar{N} i \bar{\sigma}^\mu \partial_\mu N - \left(y_\nu \ell h N + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_N \phi N N + h.c. \right)$$

- The production rate of N from the SM bath

Besak and Bodeker, 1202.1288

Garbrecht, Glowna, and Schwaller, 1303.5498

Ghisoiu and Laine, 1411.1765



$$\Gamma_N \approx 4 \times 10^{-3} y_\nu^2 T$$

$$\Rightarrow T_N \approx 5 m_N \left(\frac{\sum m_\nu}{0.05 \text{eV}} \right) \quad \text{with} \quad m_\nu = \frac{y_\nu^2 v^2}{m_N}, \quad m_N = \lambda_N \langle \phi \rangle_{T=0}$$

- We need $T_{AD} > T_N > T_{sp} \Rightarrow$ weak scale $\langle \phi \rangle$ works well

Thermalizaion of ϕ and Asymmetry transfer

$$\mathcal{L} \supset \bar{N} i \bar{\sigma}^\mu \partial_\mu N - \left(y_\nu \ell h N + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_N \phi N N + h.c. \right)$$

- We assume $\lambda_N \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$
 - ϕ thermalizes with the SM bath as soon as N thermalizes
 - Asymmetry of ϕ transfers to the lepton sector


- Asymmetry transfers to baryon sector through the weak sphaleron process

$$\mu_\phi = 2\mu_L = -2\mu_B$$

- After ϕ decays, the asymmetry of ϕ ($B - L = -2$) evenly distributed to leptons and baryons


$$Y_B = -Y_L = -Y_{\phi, \text{in}}$$

- The sphaleron process ceases at $T_{\text{sp}} \approx 132 \text{ GeV}$, and Y_B freezes out



LATE-TIME PHENOMENOLOGY

Cosmological History



Late-time Scalar Potential

$$\Delta V = (\lambda_N^2 |\phi|^2 - m_{\tilde{N}}^2) |\tilde{N}|^2 + \left(\frac{\alpha \lambda_N m_\phi}{2} \phi \tilde{N}^2 + h.c. \right) + \frac{\lambda_N^2}{4} |\tilde{N}|^4$$

- We have one more scalar in the model: \tilde{N} (a superpartner of N)

Late-time Scalar Potential

$$\Delta V = (\lambda_N^2 |\phi|^2 - m_{\tilde{N}}^2) |\tilde{N}|^2 + \left(\frac{\alpha \lambda_N m_\phi}{2} \phi \tilde{N}^2 + h.c. \right) + \frac{\lambda_N^2}{4} |\tilde{N}|^4$$

- We have one more scalar in the model: \tilde{N} (a superpartner of N)
- We assume \tilde{N} also has a weak scale mass, but with a negative mass-squared
- In the early time $\langle \phi \rangle \gg m_{\tilde{N}}$, \tilde{N} is trapped at the origin
- Late-time when $\langle \phi \rangle$ drops below $m_{\tilde{N}}$, scalar fields get vev, and $U(1)_{B-L}$ is spontaneously broken.
- Assuming $m_{\tilde{N}} \sim m_\phi$, $\langle \phi \rangle \sim \frac{\alpha m_\phi}{\lambda_N}$ and $\langle \tilde{N} \rangle \sim \frac{m_\phi}{\lambda_N}$

Majoron


- Majoron J is a pseudo-Nambu-Goldstone boson associated with $U(1)_{B-L}$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu J)^2 - \frac{1}{2}m_J^2 J^2 - \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{m_\nu}{f_J} J \nu \nu + h.c.\right)$$

$$m_J \sim f_J \sqrt{\frac{\alpha m_\phi}{M_P}} \sim O(0.1 - 1) \text{keV} \left(\frac{f_J}{100 \text{GeV}}\right)$$

$$f_J = \sqrt{4r_\phi^2 + r_N^2} \sim m_\phi$$

$$\Gamma_J(J \rightarrow \nu \nu) = \frac{m_J}{16\pi f_J^2} \sum m_\nu^2$$



- Both baryon asymmetry and m_J come from the $U(1)_{B-L}$ breaking term

$$V_J \sim -\frac{\kappa \alpha m_\phi}{8M_P} r^4 \cos 4\theta$$

Majoron Contribution to ΔN_{eff}

- Majorons decouples with the SM bath at $T = T_d \sim 0.1 m_N$
- Depending on the decoupling time, ΔN_{eff} contribution is

$$\Delta N_{\text{eff}} = \frac{4}{7} \left(\frac{11}{4} \frac{g_{*,S}(T_0)}{g_{*,S}(T_d)} \right)^{4/3}$$

- However, the Majoron can be non-relativistic before it decays. The energy density of non-relativistic matter redshifts slowly, so


$$F_{\text{NR}} \approx \frac{m_J}{T_{J,\text{decay}}} \approx \left(\frac{g_{*,S}(T_0)}{g_{*,S}(T_d)} \right)^{-1/3} \frac{m_J}{T_{\text{decay}}}$$

should be included:

From $\Gamma_J = H$

$$\Delta N_{\text{eff}} = \frac{4}{7} \left(\frac{11}{4} \frac{g_{*,S}(T_0)}{g_{*,S}(T_d)} \right)^{4/3} \max[1, F_{\text{NR}}]$$

ΔN_{eff} Constraints and future sensitivities



ΔN_{eff} Constraints and future sensitivities


Constrained from thermal production $J \leftrightarrow \nu\nu$ by Planck

Sandner et al, 2305.01692

Perturbativity bound on λ_N
 $m_N \sim \lambda_N \langle \phi \rangle$ needs to be larger than $f_J > \langle \phi \rangle$

RH neutrino N thermalizes after the sphaleron process cease, so no Y_B generated



Constrained from $\Delta N_{\text{eff}} > 0.3$



ΔN_{eff} Constraints and future sensitivities

The allowed parameter space is
 $f_J \sim 100 \text{ GeV}, m_J \sim 0.1 - 1 \text{ keV}$

We get $f_J \sim m_\phi \sim \nu$ as
 well from observations,
 independent on the
 theoretical motivation



DISCUSSION

Role of SUSY

- All the results I mentioned yield consistent results as long as we have the same scalar potentials
- SUSY is not necessary, but it's a good tool for organizing scalar potentials
 - e.g. ϕ has a flat direction naturally ($\lambda|\phi|^4$ term doesn't appear)
- With all the superpartners, we have another observable
 - The lightest neutrino should be very light
 - $m_{\text{light}} \sim \frac{m_N}{M_P} \sum m_\nu$
 - We leave this for future work as it is model-dependent

Summary

- We propose a baryogenesis model where baryon asymmetry arises directly from a scale hierarchy between the weak scale and the Plank scale:

$$Y_B = \mathcal{O}(0.01) \sqrt{\frac{\nu}{M_P}}$$

- The model is based on Neutrino-Portal Affleck-Dine mechanism, where AD mechanism happens in RD
- The model predicts a relic Majoron with a keV mass and a weak scale decay constant
- This relic Majoron contributes to ΔN_{eff} and the allowed parameter space agrees with the theoretical prediction
- All allowed parameter space can be probed by near-future CMB observations

THANK YOU