Domain wall networks and their cosmological signatures

BY U. A. YAJNIK,

Indian Institute of Technology Gandhinagar,



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY BOMBAY

WITH PIYALI BANERJEE AND ZAFRI AHMAD BORBORUAH

International Joint Workshop on SM and Beyond 2024 and 3rd Gordon Godfrey Workshop on Astroparticle Physics UNSW December 9–13 2024 10 December 2024

Overview

- \rightarrow Left-right symmetric model
 - A minimal esthetic extension of the SM
- \rightarrow Limitations of thermal leptogensis
 - Role of domain walls in left-right symmetric models
- \rightarrow Supersymmetric version and SO(10) embedding
 - Relating CP violation to EDM
- → A hybrid phase transition and a two peak Gravitational Wave signal

1 Genesis of baryogenesis

Just a little asymmetry

Annus Mirablis of Cosmology Two discoveries of 1964

- \rightarrow CP violation in $\kappa^0 \overline{\kappa^0}$
- → CMB !!!

Weinberg comment in Brandeis Lectures 1964.

Sakharov model elucidating the criteria 1967



1.1 GUT baryogenesis

- B, C, and CP violation
- Out of equibrium decays of GUT scale leptoquarks
 - The Particle Physics rates and expansion rate of the Universe compete : out-of-equilibrium decays

$$\Gamma_{x} \cong \alpha_{x} m_{x}^{2} / T; \qquad H \cong g_{*}^{1/2} T^{2} / M_{Pl}$$

1.2 Electroweak baryogenesis (Low scale)

- Expansion rate *H* too slow at electroweak scale
 - need another source of out of equilibrium conditions
 - moving phase boundaries of a First Order Phase Transition (FOPT)



 But First order phase transition (FOPT) in SM requires Higgs mass to be ≤90GeV

2 Baryogenesis from leptogenesis

Replay the Baryon asymmetry recipes for Leptons

- Thermal solution : Out of equilibrium decays of Majorana neutrinos – high scale
- Phase transition : Moving phase boundaries of Left-Right symmetric model – can be low scale

2.1 Difficulties of High scale leptogenesis

out-of-equilibrium decays of heavy Majorana neutrinos [see eg. Buchmüller, Di Bari and Plümacher (2004)]

• Getting Majorana neutrinos to be in equilibrium

$$M_N \gtrsim \mathcal{O}(10^9) \text{GeV}\left(\frac{2.5 \times 10^{-3}}{Y_N}\right) \left(\frac{0.05 \text{eV}}{m_V}\right)$$

 Have sufficiently large CP violation – assuming see-saw mechanism and 3 generations

$$|\varepsilon_{_{CP}}| \leq 10^{-7} \left(\frac{M_1}{10^9 \text{GeV}}\right) \left(\frac{m_3}{0.05 \text{eV}}\right)$$

 Preventing washout of the produced asymmetry by the same Majorana neutrino mediated processes

3 Left-right symmetric model

(Mohapatra and Senjanovic 1970's; predecessor Pati and Salam 1974)

			τ_L^3	T_R^3	$\frac{1}{2}X$	Q
ſ	V _L	1	$+\frac{1}{2}$	0	$-\frac{1}{2}$	0
L	e_	J	$-\frac{1}{2}$	0	$-\frac{1}{2}$	-1
ſ	V _R	1	0	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	0
L	e _R	J	0	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	-1
			τ_L^3	T_R^3	$\frac{1}{2}X$	Q
ſ	u]	$+\frac{1}{2}$	0	$+\frac{1}{6}$	$+\frac{2}{3}$
L	d_L	J	$-\frac{\overline{1}}{2}$	0	$+\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{3}$
ſ	u _R	1	0	$+\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{6}$	$+\frac{2}{3}$
l	d _R	J	0	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$+\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{3}$

3.0.1 Higgs sector – suitable for neutrino see-saw

$$\Phi = (1, 2, 2, 0)$$

$$\Delta_{L} = (1, 3, 1, 2), \quad \Delta_{R} = (1, 1, 3, 2)$$

In the notation

Choice of vev

$$\Delta_{L} \equiv \Delta_{L}^{i} \tau_{L}^{i} = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta^{+} & \Delta^{++} \\ \Delta^{0} & \Delta^{-} \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\Delta_{L} \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ l & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \langle \Delta_{R} \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ r & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$
$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \kappa & 0 \\ 0 & \kappa' \end{pmatrix}$$

U A Yajnik Domain Walls

- Introduced new species $V_{p} \rightarrow as$ a partner to e_{p}^{-}
- New gauge symmetry SU(2)
- Need a new hypercharge $X \rightarrow turns$ out to be exactly B L
- In praise of B L ...
 - the only conserved charge of SM which is not gauged!
 - Hereby it gains the status of being gauged
- Emerges naturally in SO(10) unification

4 L-genesis in left-right symmetric world

- Assume flip symmetry $SU(2)_L \leftrightarrow SU(2)_R$ (possible in SO(10))
- B L automatically a local symmetry ensures we start with a clean slate B L = 0 at the Big Bang
- Two kinds of vacua $SU(2)_L$ breaking or $SU(2)_R$ breaking
 - one desirable, the other accidental
- Big Bang universe has horizons
 - patchwork of both kinds of domains
- So we have
 - \rightarrow L number violation for Majorana neutrinos
 - \rightarrow Out of equilibrium wall motion (bring us to SM)
 - \rightarrow CP violation transient values in the core of the DW

Moving phase boundaries at $SU(2)_R$ breaking [Sarkar, Abhishek and UAY (2008)]



How can we verify this? The parable of the cow and the grass. Electroweak baryogenesis models rely on

- a cosmological phase transition
- Movement of bubble walls
- CP violation within the width of the wall

The *CP* phase is transient : both time and space dependent.

Further,

- Thermal letpgenesis with high scale has difficulties
- The EW Bgenesis scenarios can be adapted to BSM for leptogenesis

How to relate transient *CP* violation to low energy physics.

Key issues :

- Bubble walls are solitonic solutions
 - Space dependent *CP* phase is also solitonic
 - Machine errors in end values can produce a completely different curve.
 - Difficulty relating values at a finite boundary to interior values.



• Bubble walls occur at finite temprature. Need to relate finite temprature parameter values to observable zero temperature values.

4.1 Relating CP violation to EDM

In MSSM++ models,



Morrissey and Ramsey-Musolf (2012).. follow up papers for updates

$$d_f \cong \sin \delta_{CP} \left(\frac{m_f}{MeV} \right) \left(\frac{1 \text{TeV}}{M} \right)^2 \times 10^{-26} e \text{ cm}$$

5 A renormalisable SUSY LR model

[Benakli, Aulakh, Senjanovic (1997)]

- Higgs content : superfields Bidoublet Φ , Triplets Δ_L , Δ_R , Δ_L^c , Δ_R^c with $B L = \pm 2$, and new Triplets Ω_L , Ω_R with B L = 0.
 - Renormalisable model
- Two stage gauge symm breaking : $M_R \sim SU(2)_R \rightarrow U(1)_R$ and $M_{B-L} \sim U(1)_R \otimes U(1)_{B-L} \rightarrow U(1)_Y$
- Avoid new mass scale by imposing an R symmetry $\rightarrow M_{B-L}^2 \approx M_{EW} M_R$

$$W = m_{\Delta} \left(\operatorname{Tr} \Delta \,\overline{\Delta} + \operatorname{Tr} \Delta_{c} \,\overline{\Delta}_{c} \right) + \frac{m_{\Omega}}{2} \left(\operatorname{Tr} \Omega^{2} + \operatorname{Tr} \Omega_{c}^{2} \right) + \mu_{ij} \operatorname{Tr} \tau_{2} \,\Phi_{i}^{T} \tau_{2} \,\Phi_{j} + a \left(\operatorname{Tr} \Delta \,\Omega \,\overline{\Delta} + \operatorname{Tr} \Delta_{c} \,\Omega_{c} \,\overline{\Delta}_{c} \right) + \alpha_{ij} \left(\operatorname{Tr} \Omega \,\Phi_{i} \,\tau_{2} \,\Phi_{j}^{T} \,\tau_{2} + \operatorname{Tr} \Omega_{c} \,\Phi_{i}^{T} \,\tau_{2} \,\Phi_{j} \,\tau_{2} \right)$$



Piyali Banerjee and UAY JHEP (2021)

U A Yajnik Domain Walls

5.1 Corroborating with EDM

- Assume all scalar vevs entering the DW are taken to be corrected by temperature correction $O(g^2 \tau^2)$
- In a simple bidouble Higgs model, a 1-loop formula for EDM is

$$\frac{d_e}{e} \sim \frac{\alpha m_e}{4\pi M_h^2} \sin \delta$$

• For large values of M_{B-L} and M_R two loop effects arising from the neutral scalars dominate the one loop

$$(d_e / e)|_{\text{twoloop}} = \frac{G_F m_e \alpha \sin \delta}{\pi^3 \sqrt{2}} (f_{W,HYY} (M_W^2 / M_h^2) + f_{W,HZY} (M_W^2 / M_h^2) + f_{t,HZY} (M_W^2 / M_h^2) + f_{t,HZY} (M_t^2 / M_h^2)).$$



and four other such diagrams

Thus we obtain constraints on the mass scales M_R and M_{B-L} .



- → Interesting lesson : the *R*-symmetry compatible formula of Benaqli, Aulakh and Senjanovic is in tension.
- \rightarrow Can be repaired by including $m_{\Omega}\Omega\Omega$ term in the superpotential

Left – Right models a tale of two phase transitions

6 Phase transition gravitational waves

Caprini, Durrer, Servant, Binétruy, Hindmarsh ... 2009 – 2019 ...

Kosowsky and Turner(1993); Huber and Konstandin(2008); Weir (2016)

1. Bubble collisions

$$h^{2} \Omega_{env}(f) = 1.67 \times 10^{-5} \left(\frac{H_{\star}}{\beta}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{\kappa_{c} \alpha}{1+\alpha}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{100}{g_{\star}}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left(\frac{0.11 \, v_{w}^{3}}{0.42 + v_{w}^{2}}\right)^{\frac{3.8 \, (f/f_{env})^{2.8}}{1+2.8 \, (f/f_{env})^{3.8}}$$

where $H_{\star} = H(T_{n})$

2. Sound waves

Pressure waves created in the plasma by movement of DW

$$h^{2} \Omega_{sw}(f) = 2.65 \times 10^{-6} \left(\frac{H_{\star}}{\beta}\right) \left(\frac{\kappa_{sw} \alpha}{1+\alpha}\right)^{2} \left(\frac{100}{g_{\star}}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} v_{w} \left(\frac{f}{f_{sw}}\right)^{3} \left(\frac{7}{4+3 \left(\frac{f}{f_{sw}}\right)^{2}}\right)^{7/2}$$

with peak frequency

$$f_{sw} = \frac{1.9 \times 10^{-5}}{V_{W}} \left(\frac{\beta}{H_{\star}}\right) \left(\frac{T_{\star}}{100 \text{GeV}}\right) \left(\frac{g_{\star}}{100}\right)^{\frac{1}{6}} \text{Hz}$$

3. MHD turbulence

$$h^{2} \Omega_{\text{turb}}(f) = \left(\frac{H_{\star}}{\beta}\right) \left(\frac{K_{\text{turb}} \alpha}{1+\alpha}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{100}{g_{\star}}\right)^{1/3} v_{w} \frac{3.35 \times 10^{-4} (f/f_{\text{turb}})^{3}}{\left[1 + (f/f_{\text{turb}})\right]^{\frac{11}{3}} (1+8 \pi f/h_{\star})^{\frac{11}{3}}}$$

6.1 The two phase transitions

Zafri A. Borboruah and UAY PRD2024 Tree level Higgs potential for Δ_R vev r

$$V_0(r) \approx \frac{\rho_1}{4} (r^2 - \eta^2)^2$$

and similar for 1.

The effective potential to be used

$$V_{\rm eff}(r, \tau) = V_{\rm O}(r) + V_{\rm CW}(r) + V_{\rm FT}(r, \tau) + V_{\rm D}(r, \tau)$$

including Coleman–Weinberg, Finite temperature and daisy digrams. Finally, with both L and R contributions :

$$V_{eff}^{total}(r, l, T) = V_{eff}(r, T) + V_{eff}(l, T)$$

Two types of phase transitions

I. Kibble mechanism – "Causal horizon limited SOPT"

Characterised by Ginzberg temperature

$$\xi_G^3 \Delta_c V_{eff} = T_G$$

and its length scale ξ_{G} . ρ_{1} a quartic coupling, η a vev

$$\xi_{G} \simeq \frac{1}{2\rho_{1}\eta}$$

Instead of diverging idefinitely, the putative SOPT has a scale

$$\xi_{causal} = \left(\frac{M_{Pl}}{\sqrt{\mathcal{N}} m_r^2 T_c^2}\right)^{1/3}$$

We treat these walls by direct simulation "crumbling walls" by introducing a bias term to break L-R



- II. Degenerate field FOPT
 - → Z_2 of *D*-parity for each *L* and *R* sectors effectively gives a Z_4 with two distinct fields Δ_L and Δ_R
 - → The left-like and the right-like phases percolate individually
 - → Where the two percolated regions meet, there is a domain wall, until the whole Universe is filled with a frustrated network of domain walls
 - \rightarrow This needs to be treated as
 - standard FOPT for bubbles
 - followed by the result of crumbling walls separating percolated regions



6.2 L-R two phase transition results





Benchmark points 1,2,3 $M_R = 10^4$, 10^5 , 10^6 GeV

The Degenerate field FOPT case - two peaked spectrum



U A Yajnik Domain Walls

6.3 GW the observational propsects





6.4 Key experiments beyond LISA range

Already functioning

- Pulsar timing array radio telescopes

 PPTA, IPTA, EPTA –> NANOGrav
 uGMRT (2017) correlated data of 300–500 MHz and 1260–1460
 MHz
- GAIA orbiting sky scanning optical telescope till 2025 Astrometry – µarc-sec accuracy for about 2 billion objects GWs from individually resolvable supermassive black hole binaries

7 Conclusion

- \rightarrow GUT Bgenesis and EW Bgenesis are unrealistic possibilities
- \rightarrow Thermal leptogenesis requires fine tuning
- → Low (TeV to PeV) scale leptogenesis viable through phase transition Domain Walls
- → Presented the case of L-R models transient CP phase relation to its zero temperature value
 - to be verified through Electron EDM
- \rightarrow Two possibilities for the L-R case; 2-peak signal for FOPT.
 - Collider verification of L-R Higgs sector?

Typeset with TEXMACS