

Cosmology with Unparticles

Bohdan GRZADKOWSKI

Institute of Theoretical Physics, University of Warsaw, Hoza 69, PL-00-681 Warsaw, Poland

Jose WUDKA^y

Department of Physics and Astronomy,
University of California, Riverside CA 92521-0413, USA
and

Departamento de Física Teórica y del Cosmos
Universidad de Granada E-18071, Granada, Spain

We discuss cosmological consequences of the existence of physics beyond the standard model that exhibits Banks-Zaks and unparticle behavior in the UV and IR respectively. We first derive the equation of state for unparticles and use it to obtain the temperature dependence of the corresponding energy and entropy densities. We then formulate the Boltzmann and Kubo equations for both the unparticles and the Banks-Zaks particles, and use these results to determine the equilibrium conditions between the standard model and the new physics. We conclude by obtaining the constraints on the effective number of degrees of freedom of unparticles imposed by Big-Bang nucleosynthesis.

PACS numbers: 11.15.-q, 98.80.Cq

Keywords: unparticles, cosmology

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently Georgi [1, 2]¹ raised the interesting possibility that physics beyond the Standard Model (SM) may contain a sector that is conformally invariant in the IR region (guaranteed by a zero of the beta function), and classically scale-invariant in the UV; we refer to these as the unparticle (U) and Banks-Zaks (BZ) phases, respectively. The transition region between the two phases is characterized by the scale of dimensional transmutation. A specific realization of this idea can be found in [4]; following this reference we will assume that the new sector is described as an asymptotically free gauge theory in the BZ phase.

This novel idea has received substantial attention within the high-energy community, mainly in connection with the phenomenology of such models. Here we discuss some fundamental issues in the evolution of the Universe in the presence of this type of new physics (though studies of the cosmological consequences of the proposal have appeared in the literature [5]–[9], these publications ignore several essential aspects which are discussed below). In sec. II we derive an approximate equation of state for the NP sector. Then, in sec. III we use this together with the expected SM–NP interactions [1, 2] to determine the conditions under which the SM and NP sectors were in equilibrium. In sec. IV, using the experimental constraints derived from Big-Bang Nucleosynthesis (BBN) we obtain non-trivial bounds on the parameters of the theory. The Appendices A and B are devoted to presentation of two alternative derivations of the Boltzmann equation.

II. THERMODYNAMICS OF UNPARTICLES

In order to understand the thermodynamic behavior of the new sector² we use the expression for the trace anomaly of the energy momentum tensor of a gauge theory where all the renormalized masses vanish [11]:

$$= -\frac{N}{2g} [F_a F_a]; \quad (1)$$

Electronic address: bohdan.grzadkowski@fuw.edu.pl

^yElectronic address: jose.wudka@ucr.edu

¹ A similar idea was discussed also in [3].

² The thermodynamics of conformal theories has been studied extensively [10], but these results have been apparently ignored where unparticles are concerned.

where β denotes the beta function for the coupling g and N stands for the normal product.

The basic assumption for the unparticle phase is that the β function has a non-trivial IR fixed point at $g = g_f \neq 0$. Modeling the unparticle sector by a gauge theory, we assume that for low temperatures³

$$\beta(g) = a(g - g_f); \quad a > 0; \quad (2)$$

in which case the running coupling reads

$$g(\mu) = g_f + u \mu^{-a}; \quad [g(\mu)] = a u \mu^{-a}; \quad (3)$$

where u is an integration constant and μ is the renormalization scale.

We look for the lowest-order corrections to the conformal limit (where $a = 0$) when the system is in thermal equilibrium at temperature T , is isotropic and homogeneous, and does not have any net conserved charge. Since β vanishes in the conformal limit, in (1) we can take $\langle F_a F_a \rangle$ equal to its conformal value (we denote the thermal average by $\langle \dots \rangle$); taking the renormalization scale $\mu = T$ we then expect

$$\langle F_a F_a \rangle = b T^{4+a}; \quad (4)$$

where a is the anomalous dimension of the operator. Using $\epsilon = \mu^{-3} 3P_U$, where μ and P_U denote the energy density and pressure of the unparticle phase, together with (3) and (4) then gives

$$\mu^{-3} 3P_U = A T^{4+a}; \quad A = \frac{a b}{2 g_f}; \quad a > 0; \quad (5)$$

where we took $\mu = T$.

Combining (5) with the thermodynamic relation $d(\mu V) + P dV = T d(SV)$ (S is the entropy density), when μ and P are functions of T only⁴, and integrating, we find,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= T^4 + A \left(1 + \frac{3}{4+a}\right) T^{4+a} \\ P_U &= \frac{1}{3} T^4 + \frac{A}{4+a} T^{4+a} \\ S_U &= \frac{4}{3} T^3 + A \left(1 + \frac{4}{4+a}\right) T^{3+a} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where A is an integration constant and we assumed $a \neq 0$.

It is worth noticing that the terms S/A correspond to deviations from the standard relativistic relation $V \propto T^{-3}$. The behavior at low temperatures depends on the sign of a , we will assume $a > 0$. Then

$$3P_U = \mu \left(1 - \frac{A}{\mu^{4+a}}\right); \quad B = \frac{A}{1+a} \quad (7)$$

exhibiting the lowest-order corrections to the often-used expression $P = w \mu$, $w = \text{const.}$ This effect might be of interest in the discussion of the possible dark-energy effects contained in this model, but will not be discussed here.

Elucidating the cosmological effects of the modified equation of state (6) lies beyond the scope of the present paper, we merely remark that the NP increases the coefficient of the T^4 term in ϵ and induces $O(T^a)$ corrections; e.g. in the radiation-dominated era the scale parameter behaves as $(1 + cT)^{1/3} = T$ ($c = \text{const.}$).

In general we expect $A \propto \mu$ since μ is the scale associated with broken scale invariance; then the energy density for the new sector in the unparticle phase equals

$$\epsilon_U = \frac{3}{2} T^4 g_{\text{IR}} + \frac{T}{\mu} f; \quad T \propto \mu \quad (8)$$

where we replaced $\mu = 3g_{\text{IR}} = 2$ (hereafter we use the normalization from Maxwell-Boltzmann statistics) and g_{IR} , the effective number of relativistic degrees of freedom (RDF), will be estimated below.

³ The cases where β has a higher-order zero at g_f can be treated similarly.

⁴ A consequence of having assumed the absence of net charges.

In the BZ phase we assume the theory is asymptotically free so that, up to logarithmic corrections,

$$g_{BZ} = \frac{3}{2} g_{BZ} T^4; \quad T \rightarrow U \quad (9)$$

where g_{BZ} denotes the RDF in this phase.

For intermediate temperatures the explicit form of the thermodynamic functions requires a complete non-perturbative calculation and the choice of a specific model; fortunately we will not need to consider the detailed behavior of the system. Given that $\rho \propto T^4$ in both the IR and UV regions, for our purposes it will be sufficient to use the interpolation

$$g_{NP} = \frac{3}{2} g_{NP} T^4; \quad g_{NP} = g_{BZ}(T \rightarrow U) + g_U(U \rightarrow T) \quad (10)$$

where $g_U = g_{IR} + (T \rightarrow U) f$ while NP stands for ‘new physics’; g_{NP} will be continuous at $T = U$ when $f = g_{BZ} - g_{IR}$, which we now assume. It is worth noting that a mass distribution of unparticles with the spectral density $\rho \propto (q^2)^{(d_U-2)}$ [1] generates the term ρ/f in (10) with $d_U = 2(d_f - 1)$, assuming that the contributions with $d_f > T$ decouple. We emphasize that (10) will be used only as a rough but convenient approximation that reproduces the expected behavior at low and high temperatures. In cases of interest we expect $g_{IR} \approx g_{BZ}$ so that the terms ρ/T are subdominant.

Estimating g_{IR} directly from the model Lagrangian is a non-trivial exercise, due to the expected strong-coupling nature of the theory in the infrared. Using, however, the AdS-CFT correspondence [12] we find

$$g_{IR} = \frac{5}{8} (LM_{Pl})^2 \quad (11)$$

where L denotes the AdS radius of curvature and M_{Pl} is the Planck mass. Given that L is expected [12] to be significantly smaller than $1/M_{Pl}$, it is justified to expect that

$$g_{IR} > 0 \quad (100) \quad (12)$$

In the following we will use this as our estimate for the RDF in the unparticle phase.

In order to estimate g_{BZ} one must specify the details of the non-Abelian theory in the ultraviolet regime. For the models considered in [4] we find

$$g_{BZ} \approx 100 \quad (13)$$

This result is based on a model for which the coupling constant stays within the perturbative regime throughout its evolution. There is also non-perturbative lattice evidence [13] that gauge theories exhibiting an infrared fixed point obey (13). In the following we will adopt this estimate.

The energy density ρ_U was also discussed in [8], however the expression presented in this reference agrees with (8) only when $g_{IR} = 0$ and therefore does not include the leading low-temperature behavior of the theory.

III. SM-NP INTERACTIONS AND EQUILIBRIUM

The presence of a NP sector of the type considered here can have important cosmological consequences since, even when weakly coupled to the SM, its energy density will affect the expansion rate of the universe; this can then be used to obtain useful limits on the effective number of degrees of freedom g_{NP} . This calculation requires a determination of the relationship between the temperature of the NP and SM sectors to which we now turn.

The interactions we will consider have the generic form

$$L_{int} = O_{SM} O_{NP} \quad (14)$$

where the first term is a gauge invariant operator composed of SM fields (possible Lorentz indices have been suppressed), while the second operator is either composed of BZ fields or is an unparticle operator, depending on the relevant phase of the NP sector. The coupling λ in general has dimensions and is assumed to be small. For the specific calculations presented below we will assume for simplicity that O_{SM}, O_{NP} are both scalar operators.

Leading interactions involve SM operators that can generate 2 particle states since states with higher particle number will be phase-space suppressed. From such interactions we obtain the NP $\leftrightarrow$ SM reaction rate Γ , which will be

precisely defined below. The two sectors will then be in equilibrium whenever $\beta > H$, where H denotes the Hubble parameter [14], and decouple at the transition temperature T_f :

$$T = T_f : \quad \beta > H; \quad H^2 = \frac{8}{3M_{\text{Pl}}^2} g_{\text{tot}}; \quad (15)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\text{tot}} &= g_{\text{SM}} + g_{\text{NP}} \\ &= \frac{3}{2} g_{\text{SM}} T_{\text{SM}}^4 + g_{\text{NP}} T_{\text{NP}}^4 \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

We denote by T_{SM} and T_{NP} the temperatures for the SM and NP sectors which can be different when these sectors are not in equilibrium.

The approach to equilibrium can be described using either the Kubo formalism (appendix A) or a suitable extension of the Boltzmann equation formalism (appendix B). It follows from the expressions derived in the appendices that the conditions near equilibrium are determined by the equation

$$\beta \dot{+} 4H\beta = \beta; \quad \beta = T_{\text{NP}} - T_{\text{SM}} \quad (17)$$

where, using the Kubo formalism,

$$= \frac{2}{12T^4} \left(\frac{1}{g_{\text{SM}}} + \frac{1}{g_{\text{NP}}} \right) \int_0^\infty ds \int_0^\infty dt \int d^3x \left(\mathcal{O}_{\text{SM}}(is; \mathbf{x}) \mathcal{O}_{\text{SM}}(t; 0) - \mathcal{O}_{\text{NP}}(is; \mathbf{x}) \mathcal{O}_{\text{NP}}(t; 0) \right) \quad (18)$$

The Boltzmann equation (BE) calculation also yields (17) with the rate given by

$$= \frac{2}{12T^3} \left(\frac{1}{g_{\text{SM}}} + \frac{1}{g_{\text{NP}}} \right) \frac{1}{2T} \sum_{\mathbf{x}^0, \mathbf{x}} \int d_{\text{NP}} d_{\text{SM}} (E_{\text{SM}} - E_{\text{SM}}^0)^2 e^{-E_{\text{SM}}} M^2 (2)^4 (K_{\text{SM}} - K_{\text{NP}}) \quad (19)$$

where M is the matrix element (with no spin averaging) derived from the SM-NP interaction Lagrangian⁵, E_{SM} and E_{SM}^0 denote the initial and final energies of the Standard Model particles in the reaction, and $K_{\text{SM}}, K_{\text{NP}}$ the total 4-momenta of each sector for the reaction; we have also assumed the Boltzmann approximation (neglecting Pauli blocking or Bose-Einstein enhancement) and denoted by $d_{\text{SM}}, d_{\text{NP}}$ the appropriate phase-space measures (without any spin factors). In particular, for the unparticle phase we use [1]

$$d_U = A_{d_U} (q^0)^{d_U} (q^2)^{d_U} (q^2)^{d_U-2} \frac{d^4 q}{(2)^4} \quad (20)$$

where $A_n = (4)^{3-2n} \Gamma(n-1) \Gamma(n-1)$. We show in appendix B that (18) and (19) are, in fact, equal.

The solutions to (17) yields β/R^4 in the absence of the collision term (proportional to β), as expected for a scale invariant theory. It is also important to note that, in contrast to other authors ([5]–[7]), (19) contains an unparticle-decay term (see appendix B), as we find the arguments (based on the deconstruction picture [15]) for neglecting these contributions unjustified⁶.

The detailed calculation of β requires a specific form of the interaction $\mathcal{O}_{\text{SM}} \mathcal{O}_{\text{NP}}$ (see above for a specific example). However for the purposes of the remaining calculations only the basic properties of β , such as its dependence on T and the relevant RDF will be needed. These properties can be obtained using dimensional analysis: if the dimensions of the operators are, respectively d_{SM} and d_{NP} and if the number of degrees of freedom involved in this interaction are g_{SM}^0 and g_{NP}^0 , then, including a phase-space factor we find

$$\frac{2}{(4)^{n_{\text{SM}} + n_{\text{NP}} - 1}} T^{2d_{\text{SM}} + 2d_{\text{NP}} - 7}; \quad \frac{g_{\text{SM}}^0 g_{\text{NP}}^0}{g_{\text{SM}} g_{\text{NP}}}; \quad (21)$$

⁵ The SM-SM and NP-NP interactions are not included because of our assumption that each sector is in equilibrium: these processes are much faster than the ones generated by (14) and insure that each sector has a well-defined temperature at all times.

⁶ (19) gives the same result within the unparticle scenario or the deconstruction approach; in the latter case the vanishingly small coupling constant of the deconstructed field is compensated by the large number of particles of the same invariant mass in the initial state. Unparticle decay was discussed recently in [16].

where n_{SM} and n_{NP} denote numbers of SM and NP fields in the corresponding operators; in the unparticle phase we take $g_{NP}^0 = d_U$ and $n_{NP} = 2(d_U - 1)$, where d_U denotes the dimension of O_U .

The value of β depends on the details of the model. Above the Higgs (v) mass (we assume $m_v \ll v$) the most important operator is $O_{SM} = \bar{\psi}\psi$; in this case $g_{SM}^0 = 4$, so $(4=g_{SM}) \cdot (g_{NP}=g_{NP})$. Below m_v there are many dimension 4 SM operators relevant for the SM-NP equilibration, e.g. $\bar{\psi}\psi$ (containing an extra suppression by the factor $v=M_U$; $\bar{\psi}\psi$ denote a lepton isodoublet and isosinglet respectively), or $B\bar{B}$ (where B is the hypercharge gauge field), in this case we expect $g_{SM}^0 = g_{SM}$, so that $g_{NP}^0 = g_{NP}$.

A. The Banks-Zaks phase.

We will assume that the BZ sector corresponds to an $SU(n_c)$ Yang-Mills theory with n_f vector-like massless fermions in the fundamental representation (denoted by ψ_B). Assuming that $M_U > v$, the leading SM-NP interaction is of the form

$$L = \frac{1}{M_U} \bar{\psi}_B \psi_B (O_{BZ} O_U) \quad (22)$$

where we assume that all flavors in the BZ sector couple with the same strength. In this case ($\beta = 1/M_U$)

$$T_{BZ} \sim \frac{g_{tot}}{(4\pi)^3 M_U^2} T^3 \quad (23)$$

Denoting by T_{BZ-f} the solution to (15) when β is given by (23), and imposing also the consistency conditions $M_U > T_{BZ-f} > v$, we obtain (g_{tot} is evaluated at T_{BZ-f})

$$1 > \frac{T_{BZ-f}}{M_U} = \frac{P \frac{(8\pi)^5 g_{tot}}{g_{tot}} \frac{M_U}{M_{Pl}}}{g_{tot}} > \frac{v}{M_U} \quad (24)$$

B. The unparticle phase.

In this case we will consider only interactions of the form [1] ($k = d_{SM} + d_{BZ} - 4$)

$$L = \frac{d_{BZ} - d_U}{M_U^k} O_{SM} O_U \quad (25)$$

Using (21) we obtain (here we use $n_{NP} = 2(d_U - 1)$)

$$\frac{T_U}{M_U} = \frac{g_{tot} \frac{v}{(4\pi)^{n_{SM} + 2d_U - 3}}}{M_U} \frac{M_U^{2k}}{M_{Pl}} \frac{T^{2d_{SM} + 2d_U - 7}}{M_U} \quad (26)$$

Denoting by T_{U-f} the solution to (15) when β is given by (26), and imposing also the consistency condition $M_U > T_{U-f}$, we obtain (here g_{tot} is evaluated at T_{U-f})

$$\frac{T_{U-f}}{M_U} = \frac{(4\pi)^{n_{SM} + 2d_U - 3}}{P \frac{g_{tot}=8}{g_{tot}=8}} \frac{M_U^{2k}}{M_{Pl}} \frac{T^{2k}}{M_U} \stackrel{\#1=(2d_{SM} + 2d_U - 9)}{< 1} \quad (27)$$

For $d_U < 4.5 - d_{SM}$, β has the singular property of increasing as T drops, whence SM and NP will equilibrate for $T < T_{U-f}$ (thaw-in); due to the constraints⁷ on d_U ($d_U < 1$ is excluded [17]) this can only happen for $O_{SM} = \bar{\psi}\psi$. The opposite occurs if $d_U > 4.5 - d_{SM}$ (freeze-out). For $d_U = 4.5 - d_{SM}$, the approximations (16), (21) are insufficient and a detailed calculation is required to determine freeze-out and/or thaw-in conditions; we will not consider this special case further.

There are various possible scenarios for decoupling of the NP sector. The situation in the very early Universe ($T > M_U$) depends on the UV completion (including the mediator interactions) of the NP and will not be considered

⁷ The bounds on d_U strictly hold in the conformal limit; we expect deviations $\propto g(T)/g(T_U) \propto (T/M_U)^a$ which we neglect.




FIG. 1: Regions in the $(\log(M_U), \log(\Lambda_U))$ plane corresponding to various freeze-out and thaw-in scenarios for $d_U = 3/2, 2, 3, 7/2$. Dark grey: SM-NP decoupling in the unparticle phase only; light grey: no SM-NP decoupling; in the white regions $T_{U-f} < v$ ($\log(M_U), \log(\Lambda_U)$ are in TeV units). We assumed $g_{SM} = g_{BZ} = g_U = 100$, $g_{SM}^0 = 4$, $g_{BZ}^0 = 50$ and $g_U^0 = d_U$. For the BZ phase: $n_{SM} = n_{NP} = 2$, $d_{SM} = 2$ and $d_{NP} = 3$, while for the U phase: $n_{SM} = 2$, $n_{NP} = 2(d_U - 1)$, $d_{SM} = 2$ and $d_{NP} = d_U$.

here. If (24) holds then we have a standard freeze-out scenario: the SM and NP sectors will be in equilibrium down to $T = T_{BZ-f}$ and decouple below this value; thereafter the two sectors evolve keeping their entropies separately conserved. Since no mass thresholds or phase transitions are crossed⁸ the SM and NP temperatures remain equal down to T_{U-f} .

The situation for $U > T$ is more complicated. If (27) holds (which defines a region in the $(\log(M_U), \log(\Lambda_U))$ plane), decoupling occurs in the unparticle phase. For $T > v$ the most relevant operator is $O_{SM} = \bar{\psi}\psi$, and both thaw-in (for $d_U < 2.5$) and freeze-out (for $d_U > 2.5$) may be present. For $v > T$ all the relevant SM operators have $d_{SM} = 4$, and only freeze-out is possible; in this case T_{U-f} may be significantly smaller than v .

Other parameter values lead to more complicated scenarios, e.g. a double decoupling: freeze-out in the BZ, thaw-in in the unparticle phase and then freeze out below v . In spite of the many possibilities, there is always a temperature below which the SM and NP decouple.

In Fig. 1 we show regions in the $(\log(M_U), \log(\Lambda_U))$ space that correspond to various freeze-out and thaw-in scenarios for a reasonable parameter choice. For this calculation we assumed that $O_{SM} = \bar{\psi}\psi$ is responsible for maintaining the equilibrium between the SM and NP (so $d_{SM} = 2$). For consistency that choice implied an additional constraint $T_{U-f} > v$ (below v other SM operators are relevant). For interactions with the BZ phase an operator $(\bar{\psi}\psi)(\bar{\chi}_{BZ}\chi_{BZ})$, was adopted (in which case $d_{BZ} = 3$).

⁸ We neglect the possibility of right-handed neutrino decoupling.

IV . BIG BANG NUCLEOSYNTHESIS

The light-element abundances resulting from BBN are sensitive to the expansion rate that determines the temperature of the universe (see e.g. [18]), which can be used to restrict possible additional RDF, or, in our case, g_{IR} . We express our results in terms of the number of extra neutrino species, N , defined through

$$g_{\text{NP}} = \frac{3}{2} \frac{7}{4} \frac{4}{11} N T^4; \quad (28)$$

which is valid for T below the e^+e^- annihilation (T stands for the photon temperature). For N we adopt the recent bounds obtained in [18]: $N = 0.0 - 0.3_{\text{stat}} (2) - 0.3_{\text{yst}}$.

We first consider the case where SM and NP were in equilibrium down to a temperature $T_f > \nu$, and decoupled thereafter. Then the entropy conservation for the NP and SM sectors implies

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\text{NP}}^2(T_f)(T_f R_f)^3 &= g_{\text{NP}}^2(T_{\text{NP}})(T_{\text{NP}} R)^3 \\ g_{\text{SM}}^2(T_f)(T_f R_f)^3 &= g_{\text{SM}}^2(T)(T R)^3 \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where R_f is the scale factor at the decoupling while R corresponds to temperature of photons T (T_{NP} is the corresponding NP temperature); g_{NP}^2 and g_{SM}^2 stand for the NP and SM effective numbers of RDF conventionally [14] adopted for the entropy density. After e^+e^- annihilation neutrinos and photons generate the dominant SM contribution, but their temperatures differ. Using standard expressions [14] we find

$$g_{\text{SM}}^2(T) = g \frac{g + g_e + g}{g + g_e}; \quad (30)$$

where g_i stands for the number of RDF corresponding to the species i . Assuming that g_{NP} is almost constant in the temperature range we are interested in and neglecting possible right-handed neutrino decoupling effects, the two sectors had the same temperature down to the electroweak phase transition; thereafter the temperatures split as the SM crossed its various mass thresholds and the entropy was pumped into remaining species. Entropy conservation (29) in both sectors then implies

$$T_{\text{NP}} = T \frac{g}{g + g_e} \frac{g(\nu; e;)}{g_{\text{SM}}(\nu)}^{1/3} \quad (31)$$

where $g_{\text{SM}}(\nu; e;) = g + g_e + g$, while $g_{\text{SM}}(\nu)$ stands for the total number of SM RDF active above $T = \nu$. Note that the above relation holds regardless if the decoupling happened during the BZ or unparticle phase. Then combining with (28) we obtain

$$g_{\text{IR}} = \frac{7}{4} \frac{g_{\text{SM}}(\nu)}{g_{\text{SM}}(\nu; e;)}^{4/3} N \quad (32)$$

Using the standard expressions for the SM quantities [14] the BBN constraint on N then implies $g_{\text{IR}} < 20$ at 95% CL. It is worth mentioning here that Γ measures the decay rate of unparticles into SM states. After decoupling, when $\Gamma < H$ these decays become very rare (the NP $\rightarrow$ SM lifetime becomes larger than the age of the universe $\Gamma^{-1} = H$).

More severe constraints could be obtained if NP and SM remained in equilibrium down to the BBN temperature. That occurs for $\nu; M_\nu \lesssim \text{TeV}$ and $q_\nu \ll 1$; the relevant operator being $B \bar{B} O_\nu$. Then, since temperatures of the NP and SM sectors are the same, one obtains

$$g_{\text{IR}} = \frac{7}{4} \frac{g}{g + g_e}^{4/3} N \quad (33)$$

which leads to $g_{\text{IR}} < 0.25$ at 95% CL.

When decoupling occurs between ν and T_{BBN} the bound on g_{IR} lies between 0.25 and 20. When the SM and NP are never in equilibrium the BBN constraints can be used to bound g_{NP} , but not g_{IR} since T_{NP} is then not known. These bounds should be compared to $g_{\text{IR}} > 100$ typical of specific models [4] e.g. for an $SU(3)$ gauge theory with 16 fundamental fermion multiplets, and expected from AdS/CFT correspondence [12]. We conclude that many unparticle models will have difficulties accounting for the observed light-element abundances.

V . S U M M A R Y

Using the trace anomaly we argue for a form of the equation of state for unparticles that contains power-like corrections to the expression for relativistic matter; this allows us to determine temperature dependence of the energy and entropy density for unparticles. We then derive the Boltzmann equation for the BZ phase and postulate a plausible form for this equation for unparticles; using this we determine the conditions for NP-SM equilibrium. Finally we derive useful constraints on the NP effective number of degrees of freedom imposed by the BBN.

A c k n o w l e d g m e n t s

This work was supported in part by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education (Poland) as research projects N 202 176 31/3844 (2006-8) and N N 202 006334 (2008-11) and by the U.S. Department of Energy grant No. DEFG 03-94ER 40837; J.W. was also supported in part by MICINN under contract SAB 2006-0173. B.G. acknowledges support of the European Community within the Marie Curie Research & Training Networks: "HEPTOOLS" (MRTN-CT-2006-035505), and "UniverseNet" (MRTN-CT-2006-035863), and through the Marie Curie Host Fellowships for the Transfer of Knowledge Project MKD-CT-2005-029466. J.W. acknowledges the support of the MICINN project FPA 2006-05294 and Junta de Andaluc a projects FQM 101, FQM 437 and FQM 03048.

A P P E N D I X A : D E R I V A T I O N O F T H E R E A C T I O N R A T E U S I N G T H E K U B O F O R M A L I S M

In this section we follow closely the arguments presented in [19]. We consider a thermodynamic system, not necessarily in equilibrium, with macroscopic observables f_i associated with operators a_i . We assume the thermodynamics of the system is described by a density matrix

$$\rho = \exp \left(-H + \sum_i \lambda_i a_i \right) \quad (A1)$$

where the λ_i and λ_i are parameters, and $\lambda_i = (\lambda_i; \lambda_i)$ is a function chosen such that $\text{tr} \rho = 1$, that is

$$e^{-\lambda_i} = \text{Tr} \left(e^{H + \sum_i \lambda_i a_i} \right) \quad (A2)$$

The λ_i are determined by the condition

$$\lambda_i = \text{Tr} a_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_i} \quad (A3)$$

It is important to note that ρ differs from the usual grand-canonical density operator in that the a_i are not assumed to be conserved, so the λ_i will not be constant:

$$\lambda_i(t) = \text{Tr} f a_i(t) g = \text{Tr} f(t) a_i g; \quad a_i(t) = e^{iH t} a_i e^{-iH t}; \quad f(t) = e^{iH t} f e^{-iH t} \quad (A4)$$

$\lambda_i(t)$ denotes the average of a_i at time t for a distribution for which the average of a_i at $t=0$ is $\lambda_i = \lambda_i(0)$.

We now assume the λ_i are small, then a straightforward calculation yields

$$\lambda_i = \lambda_i^0 + \sum_j \lambda_j^1 h_{ij} + \dots; \quad (A5)$$

where, for any operator O ,

$$h_{ij} = \text{Tr} O a_j; \quad \lambda_i^0 = e^{-(H)}; \quad e^{-H} = \text{Tr} e^{-H}; \quad (A6)$$

Now let

$$\lambda_i^0(t) = \text{Tr} a_i^0(t) = \text{Tr} e^{iH t} a_i^0 e^{-iH t}; \quad a_i^0 = a_i - h_{ij}; \quad (A7)$$

so that, to first order in λ ,

$$\dot{a}_i^0(t) = \sum_j \int_0^Z ds a_j^0(-is) \dot{a}_i^0(t) \quad (A 8)$$

Using now the cyclic property of the trace, $\text{tr}(z) \text{tr}(z^0) = \text{tr}(z z^0) = \text{tr}(z^0 z)$ for any operators z ; and any complex times z, z^0 . From this it follows that

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} a_i^0(-is) \dot{a}_j^0(t) = \dot{a}_i^0(-is) \ddot{a}_j^0(t); \quad (A 9)$$

hence

$$\int_0^Z dt \left(1 - \frac{t}{Z}\right) \ddot{a}_i^0(-is) \dot{a}_j^0(t) = \dot{a}_i^0(-is) \ddot{a}_j^0(0) - \frac{1}{Z} \dot{a}_i^0(-is) \dot{a}_j^0(0) - \dot{a}_i^0(-is) \dot{a}_j^0(Z); \quad (A 10)$$

Next, using the definition

$$-i(t) = i[H; a_i(t)] \quad (A 11)$$

and the cyclic property of the trace,

$$\int_0^Z ds a_i^0(-is) \ddot{a}_j^0 = i [a_i^0; a_j^0] = i \hbar [a_i; a_j]; \quad (A 12)$$

Collecting all results and using $\dot{a}_i^0 = \dot{a}_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\dot{a}_i^0(-is) \dot{a}_i^0(0)}{\dot{a}_i^0(-is) \dot{a}_i^0(0)} &= \sum_j \int_0^Z ds \int_0^Z dt \left(1 - \frac{t}{Z}\right) \hbar a_j^0(-is) \dot{a}_i(t) + i \hbar [a_i; a_j] \\ G_{ij} &= \int_0^Z ds \int_0^Z dt \left(1 - \frac{t}{Z}\right) \hbar a_j^0(-is) \dot{a}_i(t) + i \hbar [a_i; a_j] \end{aligned} \quad (A 13)$$

which is the celebrated Kubo equation. It is important to note that the $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0}$ is subtle [19].

Suppose that the system is composed of two sub-systems, labeled '1' and '2' with a Hamiltonian

$$H = H_1 + H_2 + H^0; \quad [H_1, H_2] = 0; \quad 1 \quad (A 14)$$

and take $a_1 = H_1$; $a_2 = H_2$; in this case H^0 describes two systems at different temperatures that weakly interact through H^0 . Then

$$\dot{a}_i = \hbar H_i \dot{a}_i = V \dot{a}_i \quad (A 15)$$

where $\dot{a}_i$ denotes the energy density and V the space volume of the system. We imagine that each subsystem has a well defined temperature T_i but that these change slowly due to the presence of H^0 ; we also require the systems to be close to equilibrium with each other so that $|T_1 - T_2| \ll T$. In this case the left hand side of (A 13) corresponds to $\dot{a}_i^0$ while on the right hand side we can take the $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0}$ since the integrand is damped at times larger than the characteristic times of systems 1 and 2; see Ref. [19] for details. In this case

$$\dot{a}_i = c_i T_i; \quad T_i = T \quad (A 16)$$

where c_i denote the heat capacities per unit volume at temperature T .

When $\lambda = 0$, the density matrix (A 1) becomes

$$\rho_{\lambda=0} = e^{-(1-\lambda)H_1 - (1-\lambda)H_2} \quad (A 17)$$

which corresponds to non-interacting subsystems at temperatures $T_1 = T = (1 - \lambda)$, whence

$$\dot{a}_i = \frac{1}{T} T_i; \quad T = \frac{1}{\lambda}; \quad (\lambda = 0) \quad (A 18)$$

Then (A 13) gives

$$V c_1 T_1 = \frac{1}{T} \sum_j X_{G_{ij}} T_j; \quad G_{ij} = \int_0^Z ds \int_0^{Z_1} dt \int_0^D H_j(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{H}_1(t)) \quad (\text{A } 19)$$

where

$$H_1 = i[H; H_1] = i[H^0; H_1] \quad H_1(z) = e^{izH} H_1 e^{-izH} = O(\epsilon); \quad (\text{A } 20)$$

so that G is of order ϵ^2 ; since we work to the lowest non-trivial order in H^0 , this also justifies the use of (A 18).

Now we need to evaluate G . Following (14), we assume

$$H^0 = \int_0^Z d^3x O_1 O_2 \quad (\text{A } 21)$$

then

$$i[H^0; H_1] = 0 = \int_0^Z d^3x i[H_1; O_1] O_2 = \int_0^Z d^3x O_1 O_2 \quad (\text{A } 22)$$

and, similarly, $i[H^0; H_2] = 0 = \int_0^Z d^3x O_2 O_1$. From this

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^D H_1(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{H}_1(t)) &= \int_0^Z d^3x \int_0^D O_1(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{D}_1(t; \mathbf{y})) \int_0^E h_2(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{O}_2(t; \mathbf{y})) i \\ \frac{1}{2} \int_0^D H_1(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{H}_2(t)) &= \int_0^Z d^3x \int_0^D O_1(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{O}_1(t; \mathbf{y})) \int_0^{ED} O_2(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{D}_2(t; \mathbf{y})) \\ \frac{1}{2} \int_0^D H_2(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{H}_1(t)) &= \int_0^Z d^3x \int_0^D O_1(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{D}_1(t; \mathbf{y})) \int_0^{ED} O_2(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{O}_2(t; \mathbf{y})) \\ \frac{1}{2} \int_0^D H_2(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{H}_2(t)) &= \int_0^Z d^3x \int_0^D h_1(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{O}_1(t; \mathbf{y})) \int_0^D O_2(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{D}_2(t; \mathbf{y})) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A } 23)$$

where the h_i separates into a product because when $\epsilon = 0$ averages separate into averages over systems 1 and 2 which are independent. For the case where the O_i are scalars and even under time reversal all the above correlators are equal up to a sign, so that

$$G = \frac{1}{2} G V \quad \frac{1}{1} \quad \frac{1}{1} \quad (\text{A } 24)$$

where V denotes the volume of space and

$$G = \int_0^Z ds \int_0^{Z_1} dt \int_0^D d^3x O_1(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{D}_1(t; 0)) \int_0^{ED} O_2(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{D}_2(t; 0)) \quad (\text{A } 25)$$

Substituting (A 24) in (A 19) gives $c_1 T_1 = c_2 T_2 = (\frac{1}{2} G = T) (T_1 T_2)$, then

$$\partial_t (T_1 T_2) = (T_1 T_2); \quad = \frac{1}{c_1} + \frac{1}{c_2} \frac{(\frac{1}{2} G)}{T} \quad (\text{A } 26)$$

The quantity G can be evaluated using the tools of finite-temperature field theory. To facilitate this let

$$J_0 = i O_1 \partial_t O_2 \quad (\text{A } 27)$$

then, setting $\epsilon = 0$ and using invariance under space translations,

$$\begin{aligned} G &= \frac{1}{4} \int_0^Z ds \int_0^{Z_1} dt \int_0^Z d^3x h J_0(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{J}_0(t; 0)) i \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \langle \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_0^Z ds \int_0^Z d^3x dt e^{i(\int_0^t k \cdot x)}(t) h J_0(\mathbf{x}; 0) J_0(t; \mathbf{x}) i \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A } 28)$$

In this form G can be evaluated in terms of the correlator of two J_0 currents. We took the real part, which is the one that yields the relevant width, and introduced k as a regulating momentum. The limit $k \rightarrow 0$ requires care, for the present case one should first set $k = 0$ and then take ϵ to zero [21].

In order to compare this result to the one derived using the Boltzmann equation it proves convenient to do a Lehmann expansion of G , which involves matrix elements of the form $\langle n | J_0 | n' \rangle$. In terms of Feynman graphs, such matrix elements will include pieces that are not connected to J_0 ; these disconnected pieces factorize and cancel the factor $\exp(-\beta_0)$ [21] that appears in the definition of the average (A 6). We then find

$$G = \frac{1}{8} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{E}_n)} \langle n | J_0 | n' \rangle^2 (2)^4 (4) (p_n - p_{n'}) \quad (\text{A } 29)$$

Up to now we have assumed that the volume of the system is kept fixed, but this can be easily relaxed. The calculation involves obtaining the thermodynamic potential to order ϵ^2 and will not be presented here, the final result is the expected one: the time evolution equation becomes $\partial_t \rho + 4H \rho = -\nabla_{ij} T_j = T$ where $V = V = 3H$.

APPENDIX B: THE BOLTZMANN EQUATION

We again imagine two sectors, labeled 1 and 2; within each the interactions are strong enough to maintain equilibrium at temperatures $T_{1,2}$; the sectors interact only through (14). We denote by $\rho_{a(i)}$ the distributions of particles a in sector i ; the corresponding Boltzmann equation is

$$p \frac{\partial \rho_{a(i)}}{\partial x} + p \frac{\partial \rho_{a(i)}}{\partial p} = C[\rho_{a(i)}] \quad (\text{B } 1)$$

where the right hand side denotes the collision term.

We consider first a process of the form $X_1 + X_2 \rightarrow X_1^0 + X_2^0$, where X_i, X_i^0 ($i = 1, 2$) denote states in system i . If a particle labeled by $a^{(1)}$ is in X_1 , then the corresponding collision term $C[\rho_{a^{(1)}}]$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} C_{X;X^0}[\rho_{a^{(1)}}] &= \int \frac{d^3X}{2} \frac{d^3X^0}{2} M(X \rightarrow X^0)^2 (2)^4 (K_1 + K_2 - K_1^0 - K_2^0) N_{X;X^0} \\ N_{X;X^0} &= 4 \int \frac{d^3X_1}{2} \frac{d^3X_2}{2} \frac{d^3X_1^0}{2} \frac{d^3X_2^0}{2} (1 - b^{(1)}) (1 - c^{(2)}) (1 - d^{(1)}) (1 - e^{(1)}) \\ &\quad (1 - b^{(1)}) (1 - c^{(2)}) (1 - d^{(1)}) (1 - e^{(1)}) \\ &\quad (1 - b^{(1)}) (1 - c^{(2)}) (1 - d^{(1)}) (1 - e^{(1)}) \\ K_i &= (E_i; K_i); \quad E_i = \frac{E_{a(i)}}{X} \quad K_i = \frac{k_{a(i)}}{X} \\ K_i^0 &= (E_i^0; K_i^0); \quad E_i^0 = \frac{E_{a(i)}}{X^0} \quad K_i^0 = \frac{k_{a(i)}}{X^0} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B } 2)$$

where $d^3X;X^0$ denotes the corresponding invariant phase space measure for all particles except $a^{(1)}$ (as indicated by the prime), M the Lorentz-invariant matrix element, and E_a, k_a denote the energy and momentum of particle a . The upper sign corresponds to bosons, the lower to fermions.

We will assume spatial homogeneity, so that the ρ will depend only on time and energy, and also assume kinetic equilibrium, so that the density functions take the usual Fermi-Dirac or Bose-Einstein form, but with time dependent temperature and, possibly, chemical potential. Then

$$\begin{aligned} N_{X;X^0} &= e^{E_1=T_1} e^{E_2=T_2} e^{E_1^0=T_1} e^{E_2^0=T_2} X;X^0; \\ X;X^0 &= (1 - b^{(2)}) (1 - c^{(1)}); \\ &\quad b^{(2)} = \frac{d^3X_2}{2} \frac{d^3X_2^0}{2} \quad c^{(1)} = \frac{d^3X_1}{2} \frac{d^3X_1^0}{2} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B } 3)$$

Using this we can derive the time dependence of the energy density; for simplicity we will carry out the calculation in flat space. The energy density associated with the $a^{(1)}$ is

$$\rho_{a^{(1)}} = \int \frac{d^3p}{(2)^3} E_{a^{(1)}} \rho_{a^{(1)}} = 2 \int \frac{d^3p}{(2)^3} E_{a^{(1)}}^2 \rho_{a^{(1)}} \quad (\text{B } 4)$$

Integrating (B1) over p we find

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle a^{(1)} \rangle_{X;X^0} = \sum_X \frac{d}{dX;X^0} E_{a^{(1)}} \mathcal{M}(X \rightarrow X^0) \frac{1}{2} (2)^4 (K_1 + K_2 - K_1^0 - K_2^0) N_{X;X^0}; \quad \frac{d}{dX;X^0} = \frac{d}{dX;X^0} \frac{d}{da^{(1)}}; \quad (B5)$$

where the notation on the left hand side indicates that this corresponds to the change in $a^{(1)}$ generated by this particular $X \rightarrow X^0$ reaction. The total time derivative is obtained by summing over all states $X;X^0$ such that $a^{(1)} \geq X_1$:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle a^{(1)} \rangle = \sum_{X;X^0; (a^{(1)} \geq X_1)} \frac{d}{dX;X^0} E_{a^{(1)}} \mathcal{M}(X \rightarrow X^0) \frac{1}{2} (2)^4 (K_1 + K_2 - K_1^0 - K_2^0) N_{X;X^0} \quad (B6)$$

The time derivative of the total energy density for each sector is then obtained by now summing over all $a^{(1)}$:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle E \rangle = \sum_{X;X^0} \frac{d}{dX;X^0} E_1 \mathcal{M}(X \rightarrow X^0) \frac{1}{2} (2)^4 (K_1 + K_2 - K_1^0 - K_2^0) N_{X;X^0} \quad (B7)$$

To make this look more symmetric consider the contribution with X and X^0 exchanged. Since $\mathcal{M}$ is the same but N changes sign we can write

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle E \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{X;X^0} \frac{d}{dX;X^0} (E_1 - E_1^0) \mathcal{M}(X \rightarrow X^0) \frac{1}{2} (2)^4 (K_1 + K_2 - K_1^0 - K_2^0) N_{X;X^0} \quad (B8)$$

The corresponding expression for $\frac{d}{dt} \langle E_2 \rangle$ is obtained by switching the 1 and 2 subscripts.

We are interested in cases where the Maxwell-Boltzmann statistics are adequate, so $N_{X;X^0} \ll 1$, and when the temperatures are similar: $T_1 = T + \Delta T_1$. Using the energy conservation condition $E_1 + E_2 = E_1^0 + E_2^0$, we find

$$N_{X;X^0} \ll 1 \quad e^{(E_1 + E_2)/T} \frac{E_1 - E_1^0}{T^2} (\Delta T_1 - \Delta T_2) \quad (B9)$$

Also, ignoring non-relativistic contributions to the energy density

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle E \rangle = c_1 - T_1 \quad (B10)$$

where c_1 is the heat capacity per unit volume. Collecting all expressions gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \langle E \rangle &= (T_1 - T_2); \\ &= \frac{1}{c_1} + \frac{1}{c_2} - \frac{1}{2T} \sum_{X;X^0} \frac{d}{dX;X^0} (E_1 - E_1^0)^2 e^{-E/X} \mathcal{M}(X \rightarrow X^0) \frac{1}{2} (2)^4 (K_X - K_{X^0}); \end{aligned} \quad (B11)$$

In order to compare this with the Kubo formula we use

$$\mathcal{M}(X \rightarrow X^0) = \hbar X^0 \mathcal{J}_{int} \mathcal{K}_i = \hbar X^0 \mathcal{D}_{102} \mathcal{K}_i \quad (B12)$$

where we work to lowest non-trivial order in the interaction. Using $\mathcal{J}_0$, defined in (A27), we find

$$\hbar X^0 \mathcal{J}_0 \mathcal{K}_i = 0 = 2(E_1 - E_1^0) \hbar X^0 \mathcal{D}_{102} \mathcal{K}_i = 0 \quad (B13)$$

where we took $\mathcal{K}_i = 0$ since we are interested only in the leading contributions to $\frac{d}{dt} \langle E \rangle$. Then

$$= \frac{1}{c_1} + \frac{1}{c_2} - \frac{2}{8} \sum_{X;X^0} \frac{d}{dX;X^0} e^{-E/X} \mathcal{J}_0^2 \mathcal{K}_i^2 \frac{1}{2} (2)^4 (K_X - K_{X^0}) \quad (B14)$$

Using then the Lehmann expansion (A29) we find

$$= \frac{1}{c_1} + \frac{1}{c_2} - \frac{2 \mathcal{J}^2}{T} \quad (B15)$$

exactly as in the Kubo formalism⁹.

Despite its intuitive appeal the Boltzmann approach contains conceptual difficulties for the case of strongly interacting theories, for which concepts such as the particle densities n_a are ill defined. In this case the definition of (A 26) obtained through the Kubo equation is preferable where the relevant matrix elements can, at least in principle, be obtained numerically.

-
- [1] H. Georgi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 221601 (2007)
 - [2] H. Georgi, Phys. Lett. B 650, 275 (2007)
 - [3] J. J. van der Bij and S. D. Ilcher, Phys. Lett. B 638, 234 (2006)
 - [4] T. Banks and A. Zaks, Nucl. Phys. B 196, 189 (1982).
 - [5] H. Davoudiasl, arXiv:0705.3636 [hep-ph].
 - [6] J. McDonald, arXiv:0709.2350 [hep-ph].
 - [7] I. Lewis, arXiv:0710.4147 [hep-ph].
 - [8] S. L. Chen, X. G. He, X. P. Hu and Y. Liao, arXiv:0710.5129 [hep-ph].
 - [9] T. Kikuchi and N. Okada, arXiv:0711.1506 [hep-ph].
 - [10] See, e.g., J. M. Maldacena, arXiv:hep-th/0309246; O. Aharony, S. S. Gubser, J. M. Maldacena, H. Ooguri and Y. Oz, Phys. Rept. 323, 183 (2000) and references therein.
 - [11] J. C. Collins, A. Duncan and S. D. Joglekar, Phys. Rev. D 16, 438 (1977).
 - [12] S. S. Gubser, Phys. Rev. D 63, 084017 (2001)
 - [13] B. Svetitsky, arXiv:0901.2103 [hep-lat].
 - [14] E. W. Kolb and M. S. Turner, Addison-Wesley (1990)
 - [15] M. A. Stephanov, Phys. Rev. D 76, 035008 (2007)
 - [16] A. Rajaraman, arXiv:0806.1533 [hep-ph].
 - [17] B. Grinstein, K. Intriligator and I. Z. Rothstein, Phys. Lett. B 662, 367 (2008) G. Mack, Commun. Math. Phys. 55, 1 (1977).
 - [18] F. Iocco, G. Mangano, G. Miele, O. Pisanti and P. D. Serpico, arXiv:0809.0631 [astro-ph].
 - [19] R. Kubo, J. Phys. Soc. Jap. 12, 570 (1957). R. Kubo, M. Yokota and S. Kajima, J. Phys. Soc. Jap. 12, 1203 (1957).
 - [20] J. Bernstein, Kinetic theory in the expanding universe Cambridge monographs on mathematical physics, (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1988).
 - [21] G. D. Mahan, Many-particle physics (Plenum, New York, 1990)

⁹ We have used the Boltzmann approximation in identifying E_n in (A 29), which is the total energy of state $|n\rangle$, with E_x which is the sum of the energies of the particles in state $|x\rangle$. These energies are approximately equal for a sparse system, where this approximation holds.