Leptogenesis and neutrino param eters

D.Falcone and F.Tram ontano

D ipartim ento di Scienze F isiche, Universita di Napoli, Com plesso di Monte Sant'Angelo, Via Cintia, Napoli, Italy e-mail: falcone@na.infn.it; tramontano@na.infn.it

We calculate the baryonic asymmetry of the universe in the baryogenesis-via-leptogenesis fram ework, assuming rstaquark-lepton symmetry and then a charged-neutral lepton symmetry. We match the results with the experimentally favoured range. In the rst case all the oscillation solutions to the solar neutrino problem, except the large mixing matter solution, can lead to the allowed range, but with ne tuning of the parameters. In the second case the general result is quite similar. Some related theoretical hints are discussed.

I. IN TRODUCTION

Strong indications for nonzero neutrino m ass and m ixing com e from solar and atm ospheric neutrino experiments. In fact, if interpreted in terms of neutrino oscillations, such experiments, together with the tritium beta decay endpoint, imply small neutrino m asses [1].

In the m inim al standard m odel (M SM) the neutrino is m assless because there are no right-handed neutrino singlets and there is no Higgs scalar triplet. The simplest way to get a mass for the neutrino eld is by adding the right-handed state $_{\rm R}$, the analogue of the quark state $u_{\rm R}$ in the leptonic sector, in which case it becomes possible to build both a D irac m ass term m $^{-1}_{\rm L}$ and a M a prana m ass term (1=2)m $_{\rm R}$ $^{-1}_{\rm L}$ $_{\rm R}$ for the right-handed neutrino. The D irac m ass m is expected to be of the same order of magnitude of the quark or charged lepton m asses, while the M a prana m ass is the seesaw mechanism [2], where the right-handed neutrino m ass is very large and as a consequence a very light left-handed M a prana neutrino appears, with a mass m $_{\rm L}$ ' m 2 =m $_{\rm R}$.

The M SM plus the right-handed neutrino (which we would like to call SM) is also a minim al scenario to produce a baryonic asymmetry in the universe, according to the Fukugita-Yanagida baryogenesis-via-leptogenesis mechanism [3,4]. In this framework the out-of-equilibrium decays of right-handed neutrinos generate a leptonic asymmetry which is partially transformed into a baryonic asymmetry by electroweak sphaleron processes [5].

The baryonic asymmetry depends on both the D irac and the right-handed M a jorana neutrino m ass matrices. Therefore, assuming a quark-lepton symmetry or a charged-neutral lepton symmetry, we should be able to determ ine the value of the baryonic asymmetry, and to match it with the experimental bounds coming from nucleosynthesis in the standard big bang theory. This is the main subject of the present paper, already discussed by several authors [6{9]. However, our approach is quite dierent, more general and direct. We scan over the neutrino parameter space, using several forms to the solar neutrino problem. A graphical representation of

2

the results is given, from which one can eventually infer approximate bounds on neutrino parameters. Both the nonsupersymmetric (SM) and the supersymmetric (SSM) cases are considered.

Section II is about neutrino oscillation data, from which one may obtain light neutrino masses and mixings. Section III deals with the quark-lepton symmetry, which allows to get the D irac and heavy neutrino mass matrices. In section IV, after a short collection of the relevant form ulas of the baryogenesis-via-leptogenesis mechanism, the calculation of the baryonic asymmetry is carried out, based on the content of sections II and III. In section V the same calculation is done assuming a charged-neutral lepton symmetry. Finally, in section V I, we give our conclusions and a brief discussion.

II.NEUTRINO PARAMETERS

From the phenom enological point of view the baryonic asymmetry also depends on which solution for solar neutrinos is taken into account. Therefore, in this section we summarize the neutrino oscillation data that we will use in our analysis. For atm ospheric neutrinos the best t is [10]

$$m_{a}^{2} = 3.5 \quad 10^{3} \text{ eV}^{2}$$

 $\sin^{2} 2_{a} = 1.0;$

that is maxim alm ixing. For solar neutrinos we have three matter (M SW) solutions [11]: the smallm ixing angle (SM A)

$$m_{s}^{2} = 5.4 \quad 10^{6} \text{ eV}^{2}$$

 $\sin^{2} 2_{s} = 0.006;$

the large m ixing angle (LMA)

m
$$_{s}^{2} = 1.8$$
 10⁵ eV²
sin² 2 _s = 0.76;

and the low - m 2 (LOW) solution

m
$${}^{2}_{s} = 7:9$$
 10⁸ eV²
sin² 2 ${}_{s} = 0:96:$

M oreover, we also have the vacuum oscillation (VO) solution [11]

m
$$_{\rm s}^2 = 8:0$$
 10¹¹ eV²
sin² 2 _s = 0:75:

The latest day-night and spectral data favour the LM A and LOW solutions, but do not exclude the others [12]. A further information on neutrino oscillations comes from the CHOOZ experiment [13] which gives sin $_{c}$. 0:16 for m $_{c}^{2} > 1 = 10^{3} \text{ eV}^{2}$.

Therefore, neutrinos do have m asses and m ixings, and a unitary m atrix U $_{i}$ (= e; ; ;i= 1;2;3) relates the m ass eigenstates $_{i}$ to the weak eigenstates ,

$$L_{L} = \bigcup_{i \text{ if } L} I_{i}$$

It is clear that $m_s^2 = m_a^2$. A coording to ref. [14] we assume

$$m_{s}^{2} = m_{2}^{2} m_{1}^{2}; m_{a}^{2} = m_{3}^{2} m_{2}^{2}$$

where the numbering corresponds to the family index. Moreover, we work with the hierarchical spectrum of light neutrinos, $m_1 \qquad m_2 \qquad m_3$. Then, $m_3^2 ' \qquad m_a^2$, $m_2^2 ' \qquad m_2^2$, and for m_1 we take 10 $^4 m_2 < m_1 < 10^{1} m_2$.

The mixing matrix U (the MNS matrix [15]) can be written as the standard parametrization of the CKM matrix (including one phase ⁰) times a diagonal phase matrix D = diag($e^{i'_1};e^{i'_2};1$) [16,17]. Hence, it depends on three angles and three phases. From neutrino oscillation data we can determ ine the three angles [14,16]. For $j_{P_3}j$ related to the result of the CHOOZ experiment, we use the bound

while U_{e2} and U_{3} are obtained from the best ts of atm ospheric and solar neutrinos. Then we are left with ve free neutrino parameters: $jU_{e3}j_{e3}j_{e3}=arg(U_{e3})$, m_{1} , $'_{1}$, $'_{2}$. Choosing values for the free parameters leads to a complete determ ination of light m asses and the m ixing m atrix U. These will be used in the following section, together with the quark-lepton symmetry, to obtain the heavy neutrino m assmatrix. The Lagrangian for the relevant lepton sector is (for simplicity we do not write the 1/2 factor in the M a prana term s)

$$\mathbf{L} = \overline{\mathbf{e}}_{\mathrm{L}} \mathbf{M}_{\mathrm{e}} \mathbf{e}_{\mathrm{R}} + \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{L}} \mathbf{M}_{\mathrm{R}} + \mathbf{g}_{\mathrm{L}}^{-} \mathbf{e}_{\mathrm{L}} \mathbf{W} + \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{L}}^{-} \mathbf{M}_{\mathrm{R}}$$
(1)

where M_e is the mass matrix of charged leptons, M_e is the mass matrix of D irac neutrinos, and M_R the mass matrix of right-handed M a jorana neutrinos. The elective Lagrangian of the seesaw mechanism is

$$L_{ss} = \overline{e}_{L}M_{e}e_{R} + -L_{L}M_{L} + -C_{R}M_{R} + -C_{L}M_{R}$$
(2)

with the light neutrino m ass matrix M $_{\rm L}\,$ given by

$$M_{\rm L} = M M_{\rm R}^{-1} M^{\rm T} :$$
 (3)

Setting

$$U_{L}M_{L}U_{L}^{T} = D_{L}; U_{eL}M_{e}U_{eR}^{Y} = D_{e};$$
(4)

where D $_{\rm L}$, D $_{\rm e}$ are diagonalm atrices, we obtain the M N S m atrix as

$$U = U_{\rm L} U_{\rm el}^{\rm Y} :$$
 (5)

Inverting eqn.(3) we get the heavy neutrino m ass m atrix

$$M_{R} = M^{T} M_{L}^{1} M :$$
 (6)

Now, assuming a quark-lepton symmetry, we take the pair of hermitian matrices

$$M = \frac{m}{m_{b}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & p_{m_{u}m_{t}} \\ 0 & 0 & p_{m_{u}m_{t}} \\ 0 & m_{c} & 0 \\ p_{m_{u}m_{t}} & 0 & m_{t} \end{bmatrix}$$
(7)

$$M_{e} = \frac{m}{m_{b}} \frac{B}{Q} p \frac{p_{m_{d}m_{s}}e^{i}}{m_{d}m_{s}e^{i}} \frac{0}{3m_{s}} p \frac{C}{m_{d}m_{b}} \frac{C}{Q}; \qquad (8)$$

with one phase = =2 in M $_{e12}$. These lepton mass matrices are obtained in the following way. We take the ve texture zero model for the quark mass matrices M $_{u}$ and M $_{d}$ from ref. [18], which studies the phenomenologically viable textures. The quark mass matrices are related to the lepton mass matrices by an approximate running factorm $_{b}$ =m from the high scale where the quark-lepton symmetry should hold [19], and in addiction a factor 3 is included in M $_{e22}$ in order to have a good relation between charged lepton and down quark masses [20]. For ve texture zeros the matrices M $_{u}$, M $_{d}$ lead to the simple meaningful relations

$$V_{us}' \stackrel{r}{=} \frac{\overline{m_{d}}}{\overline{m_{s}}}; V_{db}' \stackrel{r}{=} \frac{\overline{m_{d}}}{\overline{m_{b}}}; V_{ub}' \stackrel{r}{=} \frac{\overline{m_{u}}}{\overline{m_{t}}}:$$
(9)

In this way, by means of eqns.(4)–(8), we can calculate M_R and then its eigenvalues M₁; M₂; M₃ [21]. The quark-lepton symmetry is usually obtained within united theories such as SU (5) and mostly SO (10), where quarks and leptons belong to the same multiplets. In particular, the factor 3 in M_{e22} is due to suitable Yukawa couplings of these multiplets with the 45 (in SU (5)) or 126 (in SO (10)) Higgs representations. However, here we can also regard the quark-lepton symmetry as a phenom enological feature.

IV.THE BARYON IC ASYM METRY

A baryonic asymmetry can be generated from a leptonic asymmetry β . In order to study this baryogenesis-via-leptogenesis mechanism we diagonalize M $_{e}$:

$$L^{0} = \overline{e}_{L} D_{e} e_{R} + \overline{L} M^{0}_{R} + g_{L} \overline{e}_{L} W + \overline{L} M_{R}_{R} ;$$

where

$$M^{0} = U_{eL}M$$
; (10)

and also M $_{\rm R}$ by means of U $_{\rm R}$ M $_{\rm R}$ U $_{\rm R}^{\rm T}$ = D $_{\rm R}$:

$$L^{00} = \overline{e}_{L}D_{e}e_{R} + -_{L}M^{00}_{R} + g_{L}e_{L}W + -_{L}^{c}D_{R}R$$

where

$$M^{0} = M^{0}U_{R}^{T} \qquad M_{D}$$
: (11)

D ue to electroweak sphaleron e ect, the baryonic asymmetry Y_B is related to the leptonic asymmetry Y_L by [22]

$$Y_{\rm B} = aY_{\rm B L} = \frac{a}{a 1}Y_{\rm L}$$
(12)

with

$$a = \frac{8N_{f} + 4N_{H}}{22N_{f} + 13N_{H}};$$

where N_f is the number of families (three) and N_H the number of H iggs doublets (one in the SM and two in the SSM ; a ' 1=3 in both cases). Remember that

$$Y_{\rm B} = \frac{n_{\rm B}}{7.04n}$$

where $n_{B,\overline{B}}$; are number densities. The leptonic asymmetry can be written as [4]

$$Y_{L} = d \frac{1}{g}$$
(13)

where, in the SM , the CP-violating asymmetry $_1$ is given by [23,24]

$$_{1} = \frac{1}{8 v^{2} (M_{D}^{Y} M_{D})_{11}} \sum_{j=2,3}^{X} \operatorname{Im} [(M_{D}^{Y} M_{D})_{j1}]^{2} f \frac{M_{j}^{2}}{M_{1}^{2}}; \qquad (14)$$

with

$$f(x) = \frac{p}{x} 1$$
 $(1 + x) \ln \frac{1 + x}{x} \frac{1}{x - 1}$;

g (SM) = 106:75; v is the VEV of the SM Higgs doublet. In the SSM, v! v sin, f(x)! g(x), g (SSM) = 228:75,

$$g(x) = \frac{p}{x} \ln \frac{1+x}{x} + \frac{2}{x-1}$$
;

and a factor 4 is included in $_1$ [23], due to more decay channels. For a hierarchical spectrum of heavy neutrinos f ' $3M_1=2M_j$, g ' $3M_1=M_j$ ' 2f, with a very good accuracy. Eqn.(14) arises from the interference between the tree level and one loop decay amplitudes of the lightest heavy neutrino, and includes vertex and self-energy corrections. The latter m ay be dom inant if M₁ and M_j are nearly equal, so that an enhancem ent of the asym m etry m ay occur.

A good approximation for d, the dilution factor, is inferred from refs. [25{27]:

$$d = (0.1 \text{ k})^{1-2} \exp\left[(4-3) (0.1 \text{ k})^{1-4} \right]$$
(15)

for k $\& 10^6$,

$$d = 0.24 = k (\ln k)^{3=5}$$
(16)

for 10. k. 10^6 , and

$$d = 1 = 2k; d = 1$$
 (17)

for 1. k. 10, 0. k. 1, respectively, where the parameter k is

$$k = \frac{M_{P}}{1.7v^{2}32} p_{\overline{g}} \frac{(M_{D}^{Y}M_{D})_{11}}{M_{1}};$$
(18)

and M_P is the Planck mass. In the SSM the critical value 10^6 for k is lowered, but in our calculation k remains always much smaller. The presence of the dilution factor in eqn.(13) takes into account the washout e ect produced by inverse decay and lepton number violating scattering.

W e make a random extraction of the free neutrino parameters for a total of 8000 points and we plot Y_B versus such parameters. As expected, about 4000 points give a negative Y_B . Only $jJ_{e3}j$ and show a major e ect and the results for the ve texture zero model are presented in gs. 1-4, according to the four di erent solar neutrino solutions. Changing the other parameters, in particular U_{e2} and m_2 , within the allowed experimental limits, does not a ect the general result. Since the favoured range for the baryonic asymmetry is [28]

$$Y_{\rm B} = (1:7 \ 8:9) \ 10^{11};$$

one can bok at the region of Y_B between 10¹¹ and 10¹⁰. The SM A, VO and LOW solutions can produce the required amount of baryonic asymmetry, but with ne tuning of the parameters. Notice that we plot $Log_{10}Y_B$, which is negative. However, the trend is clear. For example, we nd the phase tuned around , which corresponds to $^0 =$, sin $_{e3} < 0$. Moreover, according to ref. [9], we nd an enhancement of the asymmetry for $jJ_{e3}j'$ $V_{D 12}U_3$, where $V_D = U_L U_{eL}^{y}$ is the

m ixing matrix in the D irac sector (the analogue of $V_{CKM} = V_u V_d^y$). Since V_{D12} ' (1=3) $p m_d = m_s$ ' 0:07, we get the maximum of Y_B around $j U_{e3} j$ ' 0:07 0:7' 0:05. In a similar way one can explain why the SMA solution shows an enhancement, contrary to the LMA solution. In fact, the further condition is U_{e2} ' $V_{D12}U_2$, which is compatible with the SMA but not with the LMA. The two conditions correspond to the decoupling of M_1 from m_3 and m_2 , respectively. Note that in ref. [9] V_{D12} ' 0:21 because there the factor 3 in our M_{e22} is absent. In this case one has a di erent enhancement value for U_{e2} , $j U_{e3} j$ so that the SMA is also excluded. The presence of the factor 3 allows the SMA to be reliable for leptogenesis, for the matrix texture (7),(8).

In the supersymmetric case the calculated baryonic asymmetry is increased by a factor nearly 6. In fact, going from the SM to the SSM, there is a factor 4 due to p_1 , a factor $1=\frac{p}{2}$ due to g (for d 1=k) and a factor 2 due to g (x): 4 (1=2) 2' 6. Hence, in the present context, the SSM works better for leptogenesis, with respect to the SM.

To test the dependence of Y_B on matrix texture, let us consider a second pair of herm itian matrices [18], with four texture zeros, which is formed by the same matrix M_e as in eqn.(8), but with a further phase =2 in M_{e23}, and

$$M = \frac{m}{m_{b}} \frac{B}{Q} p \frac{p_{m_{u}m_{c}}}{m_{u}m_{c}} m_{c} p \frac{C}{m_{u}m_{t}} \frac{C}{Q}$$
(19)

Note that this form for M has entries 1-2 and 2-3 led in, with respect to matrix (7), while M $_{13} = 0$. Results useful are in gs. 5, 6, for the SMA, LOW and VO solutions, while the LMA gives very small asymmetry as in the foregoing case. For SMA, LOW to work one has $jJ_{e3}j'$ 0.01, and for VO also ' =2.

V.THE CASE OF A CHARGED NEUTRAL LEPTON SYMMETRY

If there is a charged-neutral lepton symmetry, the D irac neutrino m ass m atrix is related to the charged lepton m ass m atrix rather than to the up quark m ass m atrix:

$$M_{e} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & p_{\overline{m_{e}m}} & 1 \\ B & p_{\overline{m_{e}m}} & m & p_{\overline{m_{e}m}} & C \\ 0 & p_{\overline{m_{e}m}} & m & C \\ 0 & p_{\overline{m_{e}m}} & p_{\overline{m_{e}m}} & m \\ 0 & p_{\overline{m_{e}m}} & p_{\overline{m_{e}m}} & m \\ 0 & p_{\overline{m_{e}m}} & p_{\overline{m_{e}m}} & m \\ 0 & p_{\overline{m_{e}m}} & p_{\overline{m_{e}$$

for example (four texture zeros). This form for M_e is obtained by analogy to M_d in ref. [18]. There are some theoretical (left-right) models [29] with a charged-neutral lepton symmetry, along with an up-down symmetry. However, again, we can also assume it as a phenom enological hypothesis. The position of phases is somewhat arbitrary. We put phases =2 in M_{e12}, M_{e23} in order to have a mixing in the D irac sector similar to the previous case. The value of the baryonic asymmetry Y_B is quite analogous to the case of a quark-lepton symmetry, see gs. 7, 8. However, the maximum level of asymmetry is now reached for $jJ_{e3}j'$ 0.

A loo for this case, we have checked the dependence on m atrix texture by using the herm itian m atrices form ed by six texture zeros

with a single phase =2 in M $_{e13}$, but we have found no relevant di erence with the asymmetry generated by matrix (20).

VI.CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The baryonic asymmetry Y_B has been calculated using a random extraction for veofthe nine neutrino parameters (three light masses; three angles and three phases in the mixing matrix) and assuming quark-lepton symmetry or charged-neutral lepton symmetry for the D irac mass matrices. O ther parameters have been checked. As a result, for quark-lepton symmetry, we not that the SMA, VO, and LOW solutions for solar neutrinos are able to generate enough asymmetry, especially in the supersymmetric case, but with ne tuning and selected values of the parameters \mathbf{j}_{e3} jand . For charged-neutral lepton symmetry the general results are similar.

Let us discuss som e related theoretical issues. Uni ed theories such as SO (10), or left-right models such as SU (3) $_{\rm c}$ SU (2) SU (2) U (1) $_{\rm L}$, naturally contain heavy M a prana neutrinos, generated at the uni cation or left-right scale [30], but also contain other particles, for example additional gauge bosons. U sually these particles are much heavier than the lightest heavy M a prana neutrino, so that they are su ciently decoupled from the leptogenesis process, as con m ed in ref. [31]. In this way, the idea of baryogenesis through leptogenesis may be attractive also within uni ed or left-right m odels. The VO solution with quark-lepton sym m etry gives the scale of M $_{\rm R}$ around the P lanck mass, while the SM A and LM A solutions give the scale of M $_{\rm R}\,$ near the uni cation scale (10 16 GeV) [21]. Also the LOW solution m ay be consistent with the uni cation scale. Thus, it is hard to reconcile the VO solution with quark-lepton symmetry, in the context of unied theories, whereas for the SM A and perhaps the LOW solutions this is possible. We point out that if the LMA is the right solution to the solar neutrino problem, then the fram ework used in this paper does not work for leptogenesis. If the VO solution is right, then a good am ount of leptogenesis can be obtained, but with ne tuning and outside norm al uni ed models. The SM A and LOW solutions may be consistent with both uni ed theories and leptogenesis bounds, for selected values of the complex parameter U_{e3} .

In the case of charged-neutral lepton symmetry the VO solution gives M_R around the uni cation scale, while the SM A and LM A solutions give M_R near the intermediate (left-right) scale (10^{12} GeV) [21]. The LOW solutions lies between the two. Hence, the VO solution m ay be consistent with both the uni cation scale and leptogenesis, and the SM A with both the intermediate scale and leptogenesis. Since the quark-lepton symmetry is natural in uni ed models, while the charged-neutral (up-down) symmetry is natural in left-right models, in the present context the preferred solution for solar neutrinos could be the SM A. However, neutrino data slightly favour the LM A solution [32]. A possible alternative for the baryogenesis-via-leptogenesism echanism to work more extensively is by means of horizontal symmetries [33].

We thank G. Covone for a quick help to M athematica and F. Buccella for comments on the manuscript.

- [1] V.Barger, T.J.Weiler, and K.W hisnant, Phys. Lett. B 442, 255 (1998)
- [2] M. Gell-M ann, P. Ram ond, and R. Slansky, in Supergravity, eds. P. van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Freedm an (North Holland, Am sterdam, 1979)

T.Yanagida, in Proceedings of the W orkshop on Unified Theories and Baryon N um ber in the Universe, eds.O.Sawada and A.Sugam oto (KEK, Tsukuba, 1979)

R N.M ohapatra and G.Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. 44, 912 (1980)

- [3] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B 174, 45 (1986)
- [4] M A.Luty, Phys.Rev.D 45, 455 (1992)
- [5] V A. Kuzmin, V A. Rubakov, and M E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B 155, 36 (1985)
- [6] W .Buchmuller and M .Plum acher, Phys.Lett.B 389, 73 (1996)

M.Plum acher, Z.Phys.C 74, 549 (1997); Nucl.Phys.B 530, 207 (1998)

- [7] M S.Berger and B.Brahm achari, Phys.Rev.D 60, 073009 (1999)
- [8] H.Goldberg, Phys. Lett. B 474, 389 (2000)

K.Kang, SK.Kang, and U.Sarkar, Phys. Lett. B 486, 391 (2000)

- [9] E. Nezri and J. Orlo, hep-ph/0004227
- [10] K. Scholberg, hep-ex/9905016
- [11] JN.Bahcall, P.I.K rastev, and A.Yu.Sm imov, Phys. Rev. D 58, 096016 (1998)
- [12] J.Ellis, hep-ph/0008334
- [13] CHOOZ Collaboration, M. Apollonio et al., Phys. Lett. B 420, 397 (1998); Phys. Lett. B 466, 415 (1999). These results are con med by the Palo Verde experiment:
 F.Boehm et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 3764 (2000); Phys. Rev. D 62, 072002 (2000)
- [14] S.T. Petcov, hep-ph/9907216
- [15] Z.Maki, M.Nakagawa, and S.Sakata, Prog. Theor. Phys. 28, 870 (1962)
- [16] SM.Bilenky, C.Giunti, and W.Grimus, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 43, 1 (1999)

[17] H.Georgiand S.L.Glashow, Phys. Rev. D 61, 097301 (2000)

JA.Aguilar-Saavedra and G C.Branco, Phys.Rev.D 62,096009 (2000)

- [18] JK. Chkareuli and C D. Froggatt, Phys. Lett. B 450, 158 (1999)
 B R. Desai and A R. Vaucher, hep-ph/0007233
 H. Nishiura, K. M atsuda, and T. Fukuyam a, Phys. Rev. D 60, 013006 (1999)
- [19] H.Arason, D.J.Castano, E.J.Piard, and P.Ramond, Phys. Rev. D 47, 232 (1993)
- [20] H.Georgi and C.Jarlskog, Phys.Lett.B 86, 297 (1979)
- [21] D.Falcone, Phys.Lett.B 479,1 (2000); Phys.Rev.D 61,097302 (2000)
- [22] J.A. Harvey and M.S. Tumer, Phys. Rev D 42, 3344 (1990)
- [23] L.Covi, E.Roulet, and F.Vissani, Phys. Lett. B 384, 169 (1996)
- [24] W .Buchmuller and M.Plumacher, hep-ph/0007176
- [25] EW. Kolb and M.S. Turner, The Early Universe (Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1990)
- [26] A.Pilaftsis, Int.J.M od.Phys.A 14, 1811 (1999)
- [27] M.Flanz and E.A.Paschos, Phys. Rev. D 58, 113009 (1998)
- [28] K A.O live, G. Steigm an, and T P.W alker, Phys. Rep. 333-334, 389 (2000)
- [29] K S. Babu, B. Dutta, and R N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. D 60, 095004 (1999); Phys. Lett. B 458, 93 (1999)
 - C.Ham zaouiand M.Pospelov, Eur.Phys.J.C 8, 151 (1999)
 - D. Chang, RN. Mohapatra, PB. Pal, and JC. Pati, Phys. Rev. Lett. 55, 2756 (1985)
- [30] R N. M ohapatra and P B. Pal, M assive N eutrinos in P hysics and A strophysics (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1991)
- [31] S.Carlier, JM. Frere, and F.S.Ling, Phys. Rev. D 60, 096003 (1999)
 E.Ma, S.Sarkar, and U.Sarkar, Phys. Lett. B 458, 73 (1999)
- [32] G L.Fogli, E.Lisi, D.Montanino, and A.Palazzo, Phys. Rev. D 62, 113003 (2000)
- [33] W .Buchmullerand M .Plumacher, Phys.Rep. 320, 329 (1999)
 - R.Barbieri, P.Crem inelli, A.Strum ia, and N.Tetradis, Nucl. Phys. B 575, 61 (2000) M.S.Berger, Phys. Rev. D 62, 013007 (2000)





FIG .2. The baryonic asymmetry $Y_B~vs.~j\!J_{e3}\,jand~$ for LM A , quark-lepton symmetry, ve texture zeros



FIG .3. The baryonic asymmetry $Y_B\,$ vs. $\mathbf{j}J_{e3}\,\mathbf{j}\,and$ $\,$ for VO , quark-lepton symmetry, ve texture zeros



FIG .4. The baryonic asym m etry $Y_B ~vs.~jJ_{e3}\,jand~$ for LOW , quark-lepton sym m etry, ve texture zeros



FIG .5. The baryonic asymmetry $Y_B\,$ vs. ${\rm j}J_{e3}\,{\rm j}\,{\rm for}\,SM\,A\,$ and LOW , quark-lepton symmetry, four texture zeros



FIG.6. The baryonic asymmetry $Y_B\,$ vs. $j\!J_{e3}\,j$ and $\,$ for VO , quark-lepton symmetry, four texture zeros



FIG.7. The baryonic asymmetry Y_B vs. $\mathbf{j}J_{e3}\mathbf{j}$ for SMA and LMA, charged-neutral lepton symmetry, four texture zeros



FIG .8. The baryonic asym m etry $Y_B~vs.~j\!J_{e3}\,jfor\,VO$ and LOW , charged-neutral lepton sym m etry, four texture zeros