

MIRROR NEUTRINOS AND THE EARLY UNIVERSE

RAYMOND R VOLKAS

School of Physics, Research Centre for High Energy Physics, The University of Melbourne, Victoria 3010, Australia

I review the construction of the Exact Parity or Mirror Matter Model and explain how it solves the solar and atmospheric neutrino problems. The oscillation driven relic neutrino asymmetry amplification phenomenon is then used to demonstrate the consistency of the model with Big Bang Nucleosynthesis.

1 Lorentz Group: Full and Exact

The Exact Parity Model (EPM) sees the ordinary particle sector reflected, darkly, in a mirror sector.^{1;2;3} It is a phenomenologically acceptable extension of the Standard Model (SM) of particle physics which displays invariance under Improper Lorentz Transformations (Parity and Time-Reversal invariance). Remarkably, the invariance or otherwise of microphysical laws and the physical vacuum under the full Lorentz Group is still an open question, despite the $V-A$ character of weak interactions.

Almost as a byproduct, the EPM furnishes a unified solution to the solar and atmospheric neutrino problems; it can also easily accommodate the LSND result.³ In this talk I will review the resolution of the neutrino anomalies within the EPM. I will also discuss how the oscillation driven relic neutrino asymmetry amplification mechanism⁴ ensures consistency with Big Bang Nucleosynthesis (BBN).⁵

Consider your favourite parity-violating Lagrangian $L(\psi)$ which is invariant under gauge group G . Here I take L to be the Lagrangian of the minimal SM augmented by right-handed neutrinos and nonzero neutrino masses. I also go to the region of parameter space where the see-saw mechanism operates, so the ordinary left-handed neutrinos are naturally very light Majorana particles. For every ordinary field ψ , introduce a mirror or parity partner ψ^0 . All ordinary fields are parity-doubled, including gauge and Higgs bosons. The new Lagrangian

$$L(\psi; \psi^0) = L(\psi) + L(\psi^0) \quad (1)$$

is a parity-invariant extension of L with gauge group $G \times G$. The ordinary and mirror sectors couple by gravitation only at this stage. It is clear, therefore, that the parity-invariant theory has the same particle phenomenology as the original. It is also immediately obvious that the mirror sector is astrophys-

ically and cosmologically dark. At least part of the "missing mass" in the universe may be in the form of mirror gas, mirror stars and the like. It is important to realise that the physical equivalence of the ordinary and mirror sectors at the microscopic level does not inevitably imply equivalent macro-physics. Some of the dark matter can be mirror matter without requiring the universe to at all stages consist of an equal mixture of ordinary and mirror particles. For specific mechanisms see Ref. 1.

In general, the ordinary and mirror sectors will also interact non-gravitationally. The interaction Lagrangian $L_{int}(\psi; \psi^0)$ is the sum of all renormalisable, gauge and parity-invariant terms which couple the ψ to the ψ^0 . In the EPM based on the SM, these terms are proportional to³

$$F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu 0}; \quad \bar{\psi}_L \gamma_{\mu} \psi_L^0; \quad \bar{\psi}_L (\psi_L^0)^c + \bar{\psi}_R^0 (\psi_R^0)^c; \quad \bar{\psi}_R^0 \psi_L^0 + \bar{\psi}_L^0 \psi_R^0; \quad (2)$$

where $F_{\mu\nu}$ is the field strength tensor of the weak hypercharge gauge field, ψ_L is the Higgs doublet, ψ_L is a left-handed lepton doublet while ψ_R is a right-handed neutrino. The primed fields are mirror partners. Thus ψ_L^0 is the mirror partner of ψ_L , and they are both gauge singlets. The leptonic terms have suppressed family indices. Each term in Eq.(2) is multiplied by an a priori arbitrary parameter. The full Lagrangian of the EPM is

$$L(\psi; \psi^0) = L(\psi) + L(\psi^0) + L_{int}(\psi; \psi^0); \quad (3)$$

The parameters controlling the strength of the first two terms in Eq.(2), which induce photon-mirror-photon and Higgs-mirror-Higgs mixing respectively, are constrained to be small by BBN.

The construction above ensures invariance under the non-standard parity transformation \mathbb{P}^0 . By decomposing the standard CPT operator via $CPT = P^0 T^0$, we see that non-standard time reversal under T^0 also follows. The full Lorentz Group is a symmetry of Eq.(3). It is straightforward to check that a large region of Higgs potential parameter space admits a P^0 symmetric vacuum.² For your amusement, observe that the Exact Parity construction is quite similar to supersymmetry in that both involve extensions of the Proper Lorentz Group and both require particle doubling. These "orthogonal" possibilities are summarised in Fig.1.

2 Mirror Neutrino Solution to the Solar and Atmospheric Neutrino Problems

The last two terms in Eq.(2) cause ordinary and mirror neutrinos to mix. For full details about the mass matrix, its diagonalisation and the see-saw mechanism see Ref. 3. It will suffice here to present a fairly model-independent




Figure 1. The Exact Parity construction and supersymmetry are similar in that they both extend the Proper Lorentz Groups and both require particle doubling.

discussion. Suppose some mechanism, for instance the see-saw as considered above, produces three light ordinary neutrinos and three light mirror neutrinos. Mixing will also be present. In the region of parameter space where interfamily mixing is small, three pairs of parity-eigenstate and therefore maximally-mixed ordinary and mirror neutrinos are produced. The pairwise maximal mixing is enforced by the unbroken parity symmetry. The mass eigenstate neutrinos of family i , where $i = e, \mu, \tau$, are given by

$$\nu_{j i} = \frac{\nu_{j i} + \nu_{j^0 i}}{2} \quad (4)$$

This mass eigenstate pattern is identical to the pseudo-Dirac case as far as terrestrial experiments are concerned, because the mirror neutrinos are effectively sterile. The EPM is in part an explicit theory of light sterile neutrinos, with the important additional feature of pairwise maximal mixing with the corresponding ordinary neutrino. The m^2 values are in general arbitrary parameters.

The atmospheric neutrino data can be explained by $\nu_{\mu} \rightarrow \nu_{\tau}$ oscillation with $m^2_{31} = 10^{-3} - 10^{-2} \text{ eV}^2$. The observed $\theta_{13} \approx 4^\circ$ mixing angle is a successful prediction of the EPM. Most of the solar neutrino data can be analogously

explained by maximal $\nu_e - \nu_\mu$ oscillations, with $m_{ee}^2 = 4 \times 10^{10} - 10^3 \text{ eV}^2$ (the Homestake data point is lower than the EPM expectation). Neutral current measurements will further test these hypotheses or rule them out. The LSND results can be accommodated by switching on the appropriate amount of small interfamily mixing.³

3 Early Universe Cosmology

Theories with light sterile or mirror neutrinos give rise to interesting early universe cosmology. It has been shown that ordinary-sterile (or ordinary-mirror) neutrino oscillations can dynamically amplify the CP asymmetry of the primordial plasma through the production of large relic neutrino-antineutrino asymmetries or chemical potentials.^{4;5} The ν_e -like asymmetry L is defined by

$$L = \frac{n_{\nu_e} - n_{\bar{\nu}_e}}{n}; \quad (5)$$

where n_f is the number density of species f . The oscillation-driven amplification mechanism can generate asymmetries as high as about 3–8. This should be compared to the known baryon asymmetry which is at the 10^{-10} level.

A $\nu_e - \nu_\mu$ ordinary-mirror mode will generate a large asymmetry prior to the BBN epoch provided the oscillation parameters satisfy⁵

$$10^{-10} < \sin^2 2\theta_{e\mu} < \text{few} \times 10^{-4} \frac{\text{eV}^2}{j m_{\nu_j}^2}; \quad (6)$$

$$m_{\nu_e}^2 < 0; \quad j m_{\nu_j}^2 > 10^4 \text{ eV}^2:$$

The small vacuum mixing angle required means that only interfamily $\nu_e - \nu_\mu$ ($\nu_e - \nu_\tau$) modes can drive this phenomenon.

Large neutrino asymmetries have two important consequences. First, they suppress ordinary-mirror oscillations and hence mirror neutrino production in the early universe. Such a suppression mechanism is very welcome, because successful BBN will not be achieved if the mirror sector is in thermal equilibrium with the ordinary sector during the BBN epoch. The doubling in the expansion rate of the universe that would result is not compatible with light element abundance observations. Second, a $\nu_e - \bar{\nu}_e$ asymmetry of the correct magnitude will appreciably affect the neutron-proton interconversion rates and hence also the primordial Helium abundance. This can be conveniently quantified by quoting an effective number of relativistic neutrino flavours N_{ν_e} during BBN. Depending on the sign, an ν_e -like asymmetry can increase or decrease N_{ν_e} from its canonical value of 3.

A full analysis within the EPM of neutrino asymmetry generation and implications for BBN can be found in Ref.⁵. I can provide only a very brief summary here.

The mirror neutrino suppression mechanism relies on the effective potential for the ν^0 in primordial plasma. For temperatures between the muon annihilation epoch and BBN it is given by

$$V_e = \frac{p}{2G_F n} L^{(\prime)} L^{0(\prime)} - A \frac{T^2}{M_W^2} \frac{p}{\hbar\pi} ; \quad (7)$$

where G_F is the Fermi constant, M_W is the W-boson mass and A is a numerical factor, p is the neutrino momentum or energy with $\hbar\pi \approx 3.15T$ being its thermal average. The effective asymmetry $L^{(\prime)}$ is given by

$$L^{(\prime)} = L + L_e + L + L + \dots \quad (8)$$

where \dots is a small term due to the baryon and electron asymmetries. If the effective asymmetry is large, then the large matter potential will suppress the associated oscillation mode. Under the conditions discussed above, a small angle ν^0 (ν_e) mode will generate a brief period of exponential growth of L at a critical temperature T_c given approximately by $T_c \approx 16[(j m^2_{\nu^0} / eV^2) \cos^2 \theta]^{1/6} M eV$.

Consider the parameter space region

$$m^2_{\nu^0} < m^2_{\nu^1} < m^2_{\nu_e} \quad (9)$$

with the ν^0 splittings relatively small. Let the interfamily mixing angles be small. Focus on the ν^0 subsystem, set $m^2_{\nu^0}$ to the atmospheric anomaly range, and set $m^2_{\nu^1} = 0$ for simplicity. The ν^0 mode satisfies the conditions for generating a large L . Considered by itself, this generates a large ν^0 -like effective asymmetry $L^{(\prime)} = L^{0(\prime)}$ and so suppresses the maximal ν^0 mode. This prevents the ν^0 from thermally equilibrating. However, it turns out that the ν^0 tries to destroy its effective ν^0 -like asymmetry. For a given $m^2_{\nu^0}$, there is a region of $(m^2_{\nu^1}; \sin^2 2\theta)$ parameter space in which $L^{(\prime)} = L^{0(\prime)}$ is not efficiently destroyed, and another region in which it is. To analyse this complicated dynamics, one must solve a set of coupled Quantum Kinetic Equations. The outcome is displayed in Fig 2. The three solid lines correspond to $m^2_{\nu^0} = 10^{-3}; 10^{-2.5}; 10^{-2} eV^2$ from bottom to top. Above the solid line, ν^0 production via $\nu^0 \rightarrow \nu^0 + \nu^0$ is negligible. Below the line, the ν^0 is brought into thermal equilibrium. The dot-dashed line refers to ν^0 production by the asymmetry-creating mode $\nu^0 \rightarrow \nu^0 + \nu^0$. To the left of the line, $N_{\nu_e} < 3.6$. The BBN "bound" of 3.6 was chosen for illustrative purposes only. It is interesting that the $m^2_{\nu^0}$ values required for consistency with




Figure 2. The region of δm^2 oscillation parameter space which leads to consistency of the ν_e solution of the atmospheric neutrino problem with BBN. See text for full discussion.

BBN are compatible with a mass in the hot dark matter range (shaded band).

A lengthy analysis allows one to also estimate the e-like asymmetry that gets generated if the e family couples non-negligibly with the more massive families.⁵ It turns out that the mass-squared difference between the first and second families, denoted $m_{\text{sm all}}^2$ in Ref.⁵, plays an important role. The results for $N_{\nu_e} - N_{\nu_e} - 3$ depend on the sign of the asymmetry generated, which unfortunately cannot be predicted at present because it depends on the unknown initial values of the asymmetries.⁴ The point is simply that an unknown mechanism, not associated with light neutrino oscillations, may generate nonzero asymmetries at some much earlier epoch. While the final magnitudes of the asymmetries around the time of BBN are insensitive to the initial values provided the latter are small, the same is not true for the overall signs of the asymmetries. The signs could also be affected by spatial inhomogeneities in the baryon asymmetry.⁷ The convenient quantity N_{ν_e} will be greater or less than zero depending on the sign of L_e . The results show that N_{ν_e} gets to the 1 regime for $m_{\text{sm all}}^2$ values in the eV^2 to few eV^2 range. Interestingly, this puts the ν_e mass-squared difference in the LSND regime. Improved primordial abundance measurements are needed

before definite conclusions can be drawn about the cosmologically favoured first-second family mass splitting in the EPM.

At this meeting, A. D. Dolgov⁸ argued that the oscillation-driven neutrino asymmetry amplification mechanism cannot generate asymmetries as high as claimed in Refs.^{4,5}. I do not agree. Space limitations prevent discussion of these issues here. See Ref.⁹ for comments on the criticisms of Dolgov et al.

4 Conclusions

The Mirror or Exact Parity Model solves the solar and atmospheric neutrino problems in a cosmologically consistent way. It is also compatible with the LSND result. The role of neutrino oscillations prior and during BBN is quite remarkable because of the relic neutrino asymmetry amplification phenomenon. If they exist, light mirror neutrinos will make life and the universe even more interesting!

Acknowledgments

I am most grateful to Rachel Jeannerot, Goran Senjanovic and Alexei Smirnov for organising this interesting meeting. I acknowledge lively discussions during the meeting with Z. Berezhiani, A. Dolgov, K. Enqvist, K. Kainulainen, S. Pastor and A. Sorri on topics relevant to this paper. I would like to thank Nicole Bell, Roland Crocker, Pasquale Di Bari, Robert Foot, Keith Lee, Paolo Lipari, Maurizio Lusignoli and Yvonne Wong for their collegiality and their insights. This work was supported by the Australian Research Council.

References

Unfortunately, space does not permit full referencing here. The numbers appearing after references below correspond to the appropriate citations contained in Ref.⁵. [1] 1. [2] 3. [3] 4. [4] 24; 25; 26; 28; 29; P. Di Bari, P. Lipari and M. Lusignoli, hep-ph/9907548, Int. J. Mod. Phys. (in press); P. Di Bari, these proceedings. [5] R. Foot and R. R. Volkas, hep-ph/9904336, Phys. Rev. D (in press). [6] E. W. Kolb, D. Seckel and M. S. Turner, Nature 514, 415 (1985); H. M. Hodges, Phys. Rev. D 47, 456 (1993); V. Berezhinsky and A. Vilenkin, hep-ph/9908257; Z. Berezhiani, these proceedings. [7] P. Di Bari, hep-ph/9911214. [8] A. Dolgov, these proceedings. [9] P. Di Bari and R. Foot, hep-ph/9912215; A. Sorri, hep-ph/9911366.