CERN {TH 6747/92 ULB {TH {07/92 UAB-FT-298/92 hep-ph/9301228

# G eneration of the Baryon A sym m etry of the U niverse within the Left{R ight Sym m etric M odel

J.M. Frere<sup>?a</sup>, L. Houart<sup>Yb</sup>, JM. Moreno<sup>c</sup>, J. Orb<sup>za</sup> and M. Tytgat<sup>xb</sup>

a Theory D ivision, CERN, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland

b Service de Physique Theorique, CP 225, Universite Libre de Bruxelles,

Bld. du Triom phe, B-1050 Bruxelles, Belgium

c Dept. de Fisica Teorica, Univ. Autonom a de Barcelona,

E {08193 Bellaterra, Spain

#### Abstract

Ferm ions scattering o rst-order phase transition bubbles, in the fram ework of SU (2)<sub>L</sub> SU (2)<sub>R</sub> U (1) m odels, may generate the Baryon A symmetry of the Universe (BAU), either at the LR-symmetry-breaking scale, or at the weak scale. In the latter case, the baryon asymmetry of the Universe is related to CP violation in the K<sub>0</sub> {K<sub>0</sub> system.

CERN {TH 6747/92 ULB {TH {07/92 UAB-FT-298/92 December 1992

<sup>?</sup> Ma<sup>t</sup>re de recherches FNRS

y Aspirant FNRS.

z e-m ail: orlo @ cernvm .cern.ch

x A spirant FNRS, e-m ail: m tytgat@ ulb.ac.be

# 1. Introduction

Generation of the BAU at a relatively low scale was a natural response to growing fears that sphaleron-like con gurations at the weak scale would destroy any pre-established baryon asymmetry. In fact two responses are possible and both nd a natural realization in LR models.

In the rst case, one assumes that the existing or generated baryon number is protected by some symmetry immune to the weak forces (a typical exemple is conservation of (B L) as dened in terms of the usual fermions). This is studied in section 2 below, where a non-vanishing (B L) is generated at the R phase transition, i.e. when large masses are induced for bosons associated with the SU  $(2)_R$  group.

A ternatively, the baryon number can be generated at the usual weak scale, while making sure that B-violating interactions quickly œase to be in equilibrium, so that the new ly-born BAU cannot be washed away<sup>[1]</sup>. Several mechanisms have been proposed to generate the baryon asymmetry at this rather low scale  $^{\scriptscriptstyle [2;3;4;5;6]}$ . All of them involve extensions of the Standard Model. This may seem strange, since even the minimum standard model already possesses all the required qualitative ingredients (C and CP violation at the standard Lagrangian level, (B + L)violation through sphaleron-like solutions and, depending upon the scalar mass, departure from equilibrium due to a rst-order phase transition). The main reason of this failure rests in the sm allness of the invariant e ective CP-violation param eter  $_{CP} = 0 (10^{20})^{[2]}$ , where the heavy suppression results not only from the bare CP-violating phase of the K obayashi{M askawa m atrix, but also from the products of mixing angles and mass di erences needed to relect the non-degeneracy of the 3-generation m ixing structure. As  $_{\rm CP}$  is expected to enter as a factor in the calculation of the baryon asymmetry, this falls short by many orders of magnitude. Present data thus strongly suggest and to some extent legitim ize at least some extension of the standard model. Such extensions, usually to the scalar sector, may seem ad hoc, and require the introduction of new sources of CP violation, unrelated to low-energy phenom enology. As we shall see in section 3, LR models o er a natural fram ework for such extensions, with a scalar structure similar to models already suggested. The gauge bosons associated with SU (2)<sub>R</sub> serve as interm ediaries, as they am plify the e ect of the phases, making them detectable in the usual K-system S = 2 am plitudes<sup>[7]</sup>.

### 2.Baryon Number Generation at the Right Scale

We consider in this section the possibility of creating the BAU at the Rsymmetry breaking scale. Various mechanisms have been in agined to produce the asymmetry using (B L)-violating interactions<sup>[3]</sup>, leading to a B L  $\stackrel{\leftarrow}{\bullet}$  0 Universe.

This in turn constrains any left-over (B = L)-violating interactions at lower tem peratures to be out of equilibrium, to prevent them from erasing the BAU<sup>[8]</sup>. Neutrino M a jorana m asses are a typical example.

In the LR sym m etric m odel, all the ingredients to generate the baryon asym m etry are at hand. The spontaneous breakdown of the SU (2)<sub>L</sub> SU (2)<sub>k</sub> U (1)<sub>b L</sub> gauge sym m etry to SU (2)<sub>L</sub> U (1)<sub>r</sub> breaks C and (B L) (through M a jorana m asses for the right-handed neutrinos). Som e CP violation in the leptonic sector is easily included as this phenom enology is rather unconstrained: several R -scalar triplets with non-rem ovable phases between their vacuum expectation values, or two triplets and one pseudoscalar singlet easily foot the bill. This extension is su cient to generate a non-vanishing (L), and has little e ect at low energy as the quarks do not couple to the scalar triplets.

The model also needs some (B + L)-violating processes. Such processes induced by sphaleron-like congurations at equilibrium will convert a fraction of  $L \notin 0$  to  $B \notin 0$ . Two qualitatively different congurations are possible:

the usual sphaleron con guration associated with SU (2), or rather its instantonlike continuation above the electroweak scale, creates or destroys left-handed ferm ions;

3

on the other hand the topological argum ent of M anton and K linkham  $er^{y_1}$  may be extended to the breaking of a SU (2)<sub>R</sub> gauge symmetry.

To verify this last statem ent, let us consider the simple model of SU (2)<sub>R</sub> gauge bosons coupled to a triplet complex scalar eld ( $_{\rm R}$ ). We thus both neglect the couplings (both of the triplet and of the gauge bosons) to the other scalars (bidoublets) | which anyway do not develop a v.e.v. at the right breaking scale| and the mixing with the U (1)<sub>B L</sub> gauge eld (just as  $_{\rm W}$  = 0 was assumed in ref.[9]). The scalar potential then reads

$$V(_{R}) = \frac{2}{2} \operatorname{tr}^{y} + \frac{1}{4} \operatorname{tr}^{y}^{2} + \frac{2}{4} \operatorname{(tr}^{y}) \operatorname{tr}^{y}^{y}$$
(2:1)

where

 $r = r_1 + ir_2$  is a 3-dimensional complex vector and <sub>a</sub> are the Pauli matrices. Expressed in term of r, (2.1) becomes

$$V(\mathbf{r}_{1};\mathbf{r}_{2}) = {}^{2}(\mathbf{r}_{1}^{2} + \mathbf{r}_{2}^{2}) + {}_{1}(\mathbf{r}_{1}^{2} + \mathbf{r}_{2}^{2})^{2} + {}_{2}(\mathbf{r}_{1}^{2} - \mathbf{r}_{2}^{2})^{2} + 4(\mathbf{r}_{1} - \mathbf{r}_{2}^{2})^{2}$$
(2.3)

The potential is m in im ized by the following solutions:

$$\mathbf{r}_{1}^{2} = \mathbf{r}_{2}^{2} = \frac{2}{4_{1}} = \frac{\mathbf{v}_{R}^{2}}{2} \text{ and } \mathbf{r}_{1} \quad 2\mathbf{r} = 0:$$
 (2:4)

Note that the quartic term in  $_2 > 0$  is necessary to break completely the SU (2)<sub>R</sub> symmetry by giving a mass to the otherwise pseudo-Goldstone doubly-charged scalar particles.

The topological argument of Manton<sup>[9]</sup> now applies. The existence of sphalerons | i.e. classical unstable solutions | is related to the possibility of constructing noncontractible loops in conguration space, beginning and ending in the vacuum. Taking the con guration of maximal energy on every loop of a given hom otopy class and then selecting the in mum of this ensemble, yields (modulo the validity of M orse theory on non-compact spaces) such a sphaleron.

For a given con guration on the loop to have a nite energy, the scalar eld must stay in the vacuum at spatial in nity. This de ness a mapping of the boundary of the 3-dimensional space,  $S^2$  (parametrized by ; ), onto the space of the vacuum con gurations of the scalar eld, which is SO (3) since the symmetry is completely broken. W hat is called a closed loop is simply a continuous family of such mappings, parametrized by 2 [0; ], and shrinking to single points of the SO (3) vacuum – space for = 0; . The hom otopy classes of such loops are then isom orphic to those of the maps

$$g(;;):S^{3} ! SO(3):$$
 (2:5)

where  $S^3$  is spanned by ; ; .

Since  $_3$  (SO (3)) = Z, the necessary topological condition for the existence of sphalerons is full led. On top of this topological argum ent, much hard work would still be needed to ind an explicit solution. Unfortunately indeed, the spherical symmetry of the energy functional, used in the complex doublet case, is lost here (it was linked to the custodial SU (2) symmetry in the limit where sin  $_W$  ! 0 with vanishing Yukawa couplings). This complicates matters considerably, as the full set of coupled non-linear partial derivative equations us now be tackled; we will not pursue this study further in the present paper. Nevertheless, with the topological conditions satis ed, we may consider that at high temperature (well above  $v_R$ ), both left- and right-baryon numbers are violated, while between the R scale and the electroweak breaking scale, only \left" con gurations are active.

The last ingredient required to satisfy Sakharov's<sup>[1]</sup> conditions is a departure from equilibrium . We consider the generation of B through the Charge Transport M echanism of C ohen et al.<sup>[3]</sup>, i.e. the rejection of right-handed neutrinos on walls

of expanding bubbles of SU  $(2)_{L}$  U  $(1)_{r}$  \vacuum "<sup>?</sup>. When bubble walls are thin, this mechanism is very elicent as it exploits a large region in front of the wall for biasing baryon number. In contrast, the mechanism known as spontaneous baryogenesis, is only elicent in the walls, which thus have to be thick <sup>[5]</sup>. We restrict this study to a strongly rst-order phase transition, and hence relatively thin walls. This assumption does not upset any phenom enology as the scalar sector at the R scale is anyway barely constrained.

At the R scale rst-order transition, a wall separates two distinct regions : one symmetric under SU (2)<sub>R</sub> SU (2)<sub>L</sub> U (1)<sub>B L</sub> (the symmetric region) and the other, symmetric only under SU (2)<sub>L</sub> U (1)<sub>r</sub> (the broken one). Right-handed neutrinos incident from the symmetric region will interact strongly with the wall and m ay be either rejected or transmitted. If N<sub>R</sub> stands for the eld associated with right-handed neutrinos, it also describes the left-handed anti-neutrinos (their CP-conjugates). Those are also present in the therm albath, and similarly interact with the wall. W hen necessary, we will use the notation (N<sub>R</sub>)<sup>c</sup> to distinguish them . (In this we follow the tradition, although N<sub>R</sub><sup>CP</sup> would seem more appropriate). With R<sub>N<sub>R</sub>! (N<sub>R</sub>)<sup>c</sup> de ned as the probability of rejection of an R-neutrino into anti-R-neutrino, we get, under the C, P and T discrete symmetries<sup>Y</sup></sub>

$$P : R_{N_{R}! (N_{R})^{c}} ! R_{N_{L}! (N_{L})^{c}}$$

$$C : R_{N_{L}! (N_{L})^{c}} ! R_{(N_{R})^{c}! N_{R}}$$

$$T : R_{(N_{R})^{c}! N_{R}} ! R_{(N_{R})^{c}} (N_{R})^{c}$$

$$(2:6)$$

Since only right-handed elds are involved, CPT brings no information, as it merely relates  $R_{N_R! (N_R)^\circ}$  to itself. If CP is not conserved,  $R_{N_R! (N_R)^\circ}$  may dier from  $R_{(N_R)^\circ! N_R}$ . As in [3] we introduce CP violation in the relation on the wall

<sup>?</sup> A nother starting point was used in ref. [10], namely the out-of-equilibrium decay of righthanded M a jorana neutrinos.

y W e nd it easier to picture these symmetries for fermions incident on a spherical bubble rather than on a plane wall.

through a space-dependent unrem ovable phase in the potential. The D irac equations for  $N_R$  then involves a complex, space-dependent m ass m (z):

i 
$$(0 N_R = m (z) (N_R)^c$$
: (2:7)

A detailed calculation can be found in [3] in a slightly dimension, and we don't repeat it here. The ux of leptons in the symmetric region is related to the calculated rejection probabilities as

$$f_{\rm L} = \frac{2}{m} \frac{2^{\rm L}}{{\rm d}k_{\rm L}} \frac{2^{\rm L}}{{\rm d}k_{\rm T}} \frac{2^{\rm L}}{{\rm d}k_{\rm T}} f^{\rm s}(k_{\rm L};k_{\rm T}) f^{\rm b}(k_{\rm L};k_{\rm T})$$

$$m = 0$$

$$R(k_{\rm L})_{N_{\rm R}} (N_{\rm R})^{\circ} R(k_{\rm L})_{(N_{\rm R}})^{\circ} N_{\rm R}$$
(2.8)

where  $f^s$  and  $f^b$  m easure respectively the ux from the symmetric and from the broken regions, obtained by boosting the therm al equilibrium distributions from the rest frame of the plasm at the rest frame of the moving wall.

0 wing to rapid (B + L)-violating interactions in the symmetric region, the generated L-num ber partially converts into a B excess. If therm al equilibrium is satis ed in the symmetric region, this yields [3]

$$(B + L)_{jeq} \times (B L)_{ejq}$$
 (2.9)

with x = 0 (1). A ctually, therm all equilibrium is not perfect and one has to solve the Boltzm an equation for the system [3]. The maximum predicted baryon-to-entropy ratio in the symmetric region is again<sup>2</sup>

$$\frac{n_B}{s} = \frac{f_L}{s} < 10^6$$
: (2:10)

This is a peak value, and the exponent is very sensitive to the param eters involved (wallspeed and thickness, ferm ion mass, criticaltem perature,...), and typicalvalues

z W e have extrapolated this number from the weak scale<sup>[3]</sup> to the LR symmetry-breaking scale. W ithout substantial entropy production, it is essentially scale-independent.

quoted in ref.[3,4] range down to 10  $^{10}$ , while the CP angle com es in as a mere factor.

A fler completion of the phase transition, (B L) is no longer conserved. The right-handed neutrinos have acquired a M a jorana mass through coupling to the vev. of the right scalar triplet that carries a (B L)-charge. Even at scales much below the R transition, some of those interactions feed through to the remaining light sector, for instance by the see-saw induced light M a jorana masses of ordinary (left-handed) neutrinos. M oreover,  $(B + L)_L$  violating processes are still active, and these conjugated e ects endanger the previously created asymmetry.

To simplify the discussion, we will consider an abrupt transition between two qualitatively di erent equilibrium regimes. The rst one was considered above in the \sym metric region": all interactions are supposed to be at least approximately in equilibrium. This yields, through the charge transport mechanism, a non-zero baryon and lepton number excess for all the avours of quarks and leptons. The second regime occurs after the R phase transition: there we assume the heavy particles to be out-of-equilibrium, hence eliminating the R-gauge bosons, the right-handed M a jorana neutrinos and the R-scalar-triplet eld from the therm all bath. We are then essentially in the regime of the Standard M odel above the electroweak breaking scale. The critical di erence is the occurrence of L-num ber-violating processes through the virtual exchange of M a jorana neutrinos. The electrow sections for these processes is

$$L_{i}=2$$
  $\frac{m_{i}^{2}}{2 v_{R}^{4}}$ : (2:11)

As the density of relativistic species is  $n_i = T^3 = 2^2$ , the rate L=2 = h ni is

$$L_{i}=2 \quad \frac{1}{3} \frac{T^{3}m^{2}}{v_{R}^{4}}: \qquad (2.12)$$

In a LR model with scalar triplets, the light neutrino mass moccurs through a

see-saw mechanism<sup>[11]</sup>. Barring ne tuning, this typically leads to:

$$m \qquad m_{\rm D \ irac}^2 = M_{\rm R} \tag{2.13}$$

where  $m_{D \text{ irac}} = m_{\text{charged lepton}}$  .

Setting  $m_e = m_e^2 = M_R$ ,  $m_R = m^2 = M_R$  and  $m_R = m^2 = M_R$ , we check which of the lepton-num ber-violating processes fallout of equilibrium at  $T_c = M_R$  10 TeV, a phenom enologically relevant scale. Using

$$m_e = 0.5 \text{ MeV}; m = 105 \text{ MeV}; m = 1800 \text{ MeV};$$
 (2:14)

we get the comparison with experim ental num bers:

$$m_{e} = 10^{10} \text{ GeV} = 17 \text{ eV}$$
  
 $m = 10^{6} \text{ GeV} = 0.27 \text{ MeV}$  (2.15)  
 $m = 10^{4} \text{ GeV} = 35 \text{ MeV}$ 

C om paring the rates for L  $_i$  = 2; i = e; ; , with the expansion rate of the Universe at T  $T_c M_R^{(12)}$ :

$$L_{i=2}$$
 H = 1:67g<sup>1=2</sup>T<sup>2</sup>=m<sub>pl</sub> (2:16)

where g 100, we nd that for  $m_i$  10<sup>6</sup> GeV the process is out of them al equilibrium. This is certainly not the case for L -changing processes but m ight be the case for L<sub>e</sub>-and even for L -changing reactions. An approximate conservation in one or two of the leptonic avours thus appears possible, provided lepton m ixing is kept under control (see also ref.[13]). One can rest on low -energy phenom enology to argue that those m ixings are much smaller than in the quark sector.

We thus consider a therm al-equilibrium situation with conserved  $L_e$  and L and non-conserved L . Writing all the processes in equilibrium (as are the  $(B + L)_L$  violating processes) generates a set of relations between them ical potentials (see for example Harvey and Turner in ref. [8]) which leads to

$$(B + L)_{jeq} = \frac{288N + 30m + 141}{288N + 78m \quad 147} (B \quad L)_{jq}$$
(2:17)

where N and m count the number of left scalar triplets and scalar bi-doublets still participating in the therm all bath (we expect N ! 0 if explicit LR symmetry is imposed). This number must be understood as the maximum value the asymmetry may reach, since we have neglected non-equilibrium elects between the two regimes, which can only diminish B.

In conclusion, it is possible to generate the baryon number at the R scale through the breaking of (B L) and both left-and right-(B + L)-violating processes. This scale does not need to be very high | 0 (10 TeV) | as conservation of at least one lepton number su ces to protect the baryon number. The predictive power of this R-scale mechanism is unfortunately rather poor, as it requires the introduction of new CP violation in the leptonic sector, without signi cant low-energy in plications. We now turn to the more challenging possibility of creating B at the lower electroweak scale within a LR-symmetric structure.

## 3. Baryon Number Generation at the Weak Scale

The main excitement about this model is that the CP-violating parameters needed in the scalar sector are transferred by R gauge bosons to the K system and thus become accessible to experiment. As we shall see, this model also meets another challenge faced by baryon number generators in their panic fear of therm odynamical equilibrium situations. It is clear indeed that, unless some protection mechanism exists (e.g. non-vanishing (B L), as discussed in the previous section) such therm al equilibrium will tend to wipe out any existing or generated baryon number. The way to prevent a freshly generated baryon number from such fate is thus to require that the phase transition occurs briskly, putting the system out of equilibrium. In particular, the order parameter v(T) must move directly to a large value. The baryon-num ber-violating processes are then quickly turned o at the onset of the phase transition. In the standard model, this translates, as we recall below, into a small value for the mass of the symmetry-breaking scalar. This low-mass scalar can however be avoided if trilinear couplings between the relevant elds are present in the tree Lagrangian, as is the case in the LR model with spontaneous CP violation.

Consider the Boltzm an factor governing the rate of baryon-num ber violation  $_{\rm B}$  :

$$_{\rm B} = 3 \, {}^{4} {\rm T}^{4} \exp \left( {\rm E}_{\rm sph} = {\rm T} \right);$$
 (3.1)

where incorporates uncertainties in the prefactor (= 0 (1)) and  $E_{sph}$  is the energy of the saddle conguration known as the sphaleron. This energy is related to the T-dependent order parameter v(T)

$$E_{sph} = W(T) V(T) B \frac{(T)}{W(T)} : \qquad (32)$$

The numerical value of B (=) varies from 1.5 to 2.7 when the ratio of the quartic scalar coupling to the gauge parameter = varies from 0 to 1. On the other hand, the value of v( $T_c$ ) at the rst-order phase transition is E = ( $T_c$ ) where E is the trilinear coupling coe cient in the elective potential. In the standard m odel this coupling is absent at tree level, and E = 0 ( $g^3$ ). A big jump in v at the phase transition thus in poses a small , whence, as  $m_{higgs}$  v(T = 0), a small scalar m ass.

Imposing  $_{\rm B}$  H, where H is the expansion rate of the Universe at the time of the phase transition leads to the constraint [14],[15]:

$$m ass_{H iggs} < 35 G eV;$$
 (3:3)

which lies  $\mbox{uncom fortably close"}$  to the experimental bound at LEP1<sup>[16]</sup>,

$$m ass_{H iggs} > 48 G eV$$
: (3:4)

Considerations of this kind have been applied to extensions of the Standard M odel such as the two-H iggs m odel [14] and the m inim al supersym m etric m odel [17]. Typically, this stills constrains (som etim es very strongly [17]) the m ass of the lightest scalar. A very interesting m odel from this point of view is the non-m inim al supersym m etric m odel considered in ref.[18]. The constraint on the H iggs m ass is considerably relaxed by the appearance of a \tree level" e ective cubic coupling. A s seen above, the large size of the trilinear coupling rem oves the requirem ent of a tenuous quartic coupling. W e w ill argue that the LR -sym m etric m odel shares the sam e nice feature.

However, one thing struck us in most of these constructions, namely the closeness of the proposed models to the scalar structure traditionnally used in the SU (2)<sub>L</sub> SU (2)<sub>R</sub> U (1) LR model. In bedding the proposed schemes in a fullyedged LR structure would at the same time o er some justication for the doubling of the scalars, and relate baryon-number violation to more mundane CP parameters<sup>2</sup>. What came as a surprise is that the further requirement of spontaneously broken CP also provided the necessary ingredients for a tree-level driven rst-order phase transition. Even independently of the extra nicety of this rstorder phase transition, the LR model, as remarked by Mohapatra<sup>[10]</sup>, o ers to our know ledge the only link between our existence as \baryon beings" and the (m inute) value of CP violation.

Unfortunately, as we shall see below, this link is not so strong as to predict e.g. the sign of  $\subseteq$  from the dom inance of matter over antimatter. This is due to the fact that even the most straightforward model of spontaneous CP violation in LR still allows for (discrete) number of variants, between which the data and the know ledge of the strong matrix elements are currently too unprecise to choose. Nevertheless, it is only a matter of time before this is clarified, and the uniqueness of the link persists.

This situation is in contrast with existing models where the CP violation related

<sup>?</sup> We wish to thank A.Cohen for num erous discussions on this point

to the BAU is disconnected from the K-system, and at most a ect the electric dipole moment of quarks<sup>[19]</sup> and leptons<sup>[20]</sup>.

#### 3.1. A sketch of the LR model with spontaneous CP violation

Them odel we consider is CP-conserving<sup>[21,22,23]</sup> before sym m etry breaking of the electroweak scale. Spontaneous CP violation appears trough a non-zero physical phase in the vev. of the bi-doublet elds:

$$h = \frac{e^{i_{\overline{2}}}}{p_{\overline{2}}} = 0 = \frac{1}{p_{\overline{2}}} = \frac{1}{p_{\overline$$

This, through Yukawa couplings to the quarks:

$$M^{(u)} = \frac{1}{p - 2} (v + w) = UD^{(u)}U^{T}$$

$$M^{(d)} = \frac{1}{p - 2} (w + v) = VD^{(d)}V^{T};$$
(3:6)

leads to CP violation in the K $_0$  {K $_0$  system . One may note the particular form of the diagonalization of the mass matrices that results from imposing explicit CP conservation before symmetry breaking. In this case, the and matrices can be chosen to be real and symmetric.

In a particular basis for the quarks  $\;$  elds, the KM  $\;$  m atrices for the L and R  $\;$  charged currents read

$$K_{L} = U^{Y}V; \qquad K_{R} = K_{L}$$
(3:7)

which are thus not independent matrices. In this convention all the phases in  $K_L$  are observable: their number is  $\frac{n(n+1)}{2}$  for n generations, hence six for the case of interest, all of them related to (of course, for two generations all the phases)

and for three generations all the phases but one, can be rotated away from K<sub>L</sub> into K<sub>R</sub> but this does not make them unobservable). This is the zero-tem perature situation. To bok at the behaviour of at non-zero tem perature, more information is needed on the scalar potential, which is unfortunately not very constrained in the LR model. It contains many unknown couplings between the bi-doublet and the two triplets. One can still show <sup>[24]</sup> that, without ne-tuning, this potential is unable to generate a non-zero value for the phase after SSB. This is easy to cure through the introduction of a singlet neutral pseudo-scalar [24], which couples to the bi-doublet in the follow ing way

$$V(;) = V() + V(;);$$
 (3.8)

$$V = V() + iC_1$$
 (det det ) +  $C_2^2$ tr <sup>y</sup> : (3:9)

Once expressed in polar coordinates, the trilinear term in the potential depends upon sin and will compete with terms even under !, leading to e 0 for a large range of parameters.

#### 3.2. Phase Transition and Baryogenesis

W e will not attempt here to pursue the study of the above potential at nite temperature. Nevertheless reliable hints can be obtained from simpler models. In particular we now argue, in analogy with [18], that a strongly rst-order phase transition may take place.

The argument is based on the existence of a trilinear term (required for natural spontaneous CP violation) in the classical potential. The Higgs eld, i.e. the eld that develops a non-zero ve.v., is a temperature-dependent combination of  $\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$  and , with

$$h_{1}i = hH i \cos_{1} \cos_{2}$$

$$h_{2}i = hH i \cos_{1} \sin_{2} \qquad (3:10)$$

$$h_{1}i = hH i \sin_{1};$$

14

where  $_1$  and  $_2$  are temperature-dependent m ixing angles. These angles will remain sizeable provided the masses and interactions of the involved scalars are not too di erent. This requires a relatively light , associated with the L scale rather than the R scale, as is more usually assumed.

The orthogonal combinations correspond to massive scalars with zero vev. Once substituted in the potential V, (3.10) yields a term trilinear in H. We have thus good indications that a strongly rst-order transition will arise, without seriously constraining the masses of the light scalars. We refer the reader to ref. [18] for an explicit exemple in a more tractable model.

A strongly rst-order phase transition must proceed through the nucleation of bubbles with thin walls<sup>[25]</sup>. The spontaneous baryogenesis mechanism of [10] uses h\_i as a source biasing baryon-num ber-violating processes. In the present case of a thin wall, we turn to the more e cient charge transport mechanism of Cohen, K aplan and N elson<sup>[4]</sup>.

They consider the di usion of a ferm ion (the top quark, as its Yukawa coupling is the largest) by the expanding bubble of true vacuum. An incident top (m assless in the false vacuum) of right chirality ( $t_R$ ) will be rejected as a top of left chirality ( $t_L$ ) or transmitted as a massive top of right helicity<sup>2</sup>. Under C,P and T,  $t_R$  transforms as:

 $P : R_{t_{R}} ! t_{L} ! R_{t_{L}} ! t_{R};$   $C : R_{t_{L}} ! t_{R} ! R_{(t_{R})^{\circ}!} (t_{L})^{\circ};$   $T : R_{(t_{R})^{\circ}!} (t_{L})^{\circ} ! R_{(t_{R})^{\circ}!} (t_{R})^{\circ}:$ (3:11)

The CPT theorem in poses  $R_{t_R} \cdot t_L = R_{(t_L})^{\circ} \cdot (t_R)^{\circ}$ . Only if CP is conserved do we get  $R_{t_R} \cdot t_L \stackrel{CP}{=} R_{(t_R)^{\circ}} \cdot (t_L)^{\circ} \stackrel{CPT}{=} R_{t_L} \cdot t_R$ . If the interaction with the wall violates CP, those two probabilities may dier, as shown in [4]. In the rest frame

<sup>?</sup> One may also expect to see the top transform into a bottom, which interacts much less with the wall. However it is easy to nd a gauge (so-called unitary gauge) in which there is no stationary gauge eld conguration. Any top to bottom transition must then be due to virtual ects in the presence of the walland thus be reduced by some elective  $G_{W}$ , a much smaller elect than the tree-level elect of dilusion considered in [4].

of the wall, an observer in the symmetric region sees a ux of particles with a non-zero axial baryon number:

$$f_{A} = \frac{2}{m} \frac{2^{L}}{dk_{L}} \frac{2^{L}}{dk_{L}} \frac{dk_{T}}{dk_{T}} f^{s}(k_{L};k_{T}) f^{b}(k_{L};k_{T})$$

$$(3:12)$$

$$(R (k_{L})_{t_{L}} + t_{R} R (k_{L})_{t_{R}} + t_{L})$$

where  $f^s$  and  $f^b$  refer respectively to the boosted ux from the symmetric and from the symmetry-broken region. The ux  $f_A$  is non zero if CP is violated and if the wall is moving through the thermal background. This ux carries no net baryonic charge, but is easily shown to carry a hypercharge<sup>Y</sup>.

A shypercharge is conserved in the symmetric region (as well as Q, B = L, ...) but B + L is not<sup>z</sup>, equilibrium processes will lead to a non-zero baryon density excess in front of the wall. A fler completion of the phase transition, this excess of B is transferred to the broken symmetry Universe.

The authors of [4] obtain in this way a baryon to entropy ratio

$$B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{n_{B}}{s} \text{ pred:} 10^{8} \tag{3:13}$$

where is the jump of from the symmetric to the broken region <sup>x</sup>. Below we will take the approximation = (T = 0). We argued indeed that the phase transition may be strongly rst order, which means that the jump in the order parameters must be close to their T = 0 value.

y Actually  $f_Y = \frac{1}{4}f_A$ . It has been critized that D ebye screening of the gauged hypercharge would prevent this current to penetrate far in the symmetric region, thus curbing the mechanism. One should however keep in mind that this current, while carrying some hypercharge, is not identical to the latter, but merely refers to the hypercharge in the top sector. Screening of hypercharge can then occur with the help of all quarks equally without seriously hindering the mechanism, as shown in [26]. For brevity we keep referring to an excess Y.

z The rate of baryon-num ber violation in the sym m etric region has been estimated on dim ensional ground to be of order  $_{\rm B}$   $_{\rm W}^4$  T<sup>4</sup> w here = 0 (1).

x The above result is of course subject to many uncertainties related, on one side to rough estim ates concerning baryon-num ber-violating processes, and on the other side to variations depending on the wall velocity and width them selves.

The above estim ate of B agrees with the value obtained from nucleosynthesis

4 
$$10^{11}$$
 n<sub>B</sub> = s 1.4  $10^{10}$  : (3:14)

even for values of as small as 0:01 to 0:001. Larger values of could of course be accommodated if some later dilution of B occurs (for instance, if the B-violating processes are not fully out of equilibrium in the broken phase).

#### 3.3. Connection to Low Energy CP violation

It is interesting to compare the T = 0 value of obtained above with the bwenergy CP violation. While the comparison should be made to the full model<sup>[27]</sup>, it is informative to rst consider the simple case of two quark generations, where the dependence on the various parm eters is considerably easier to exhibit. The K<sub>L</sub> matrix is parametrized in the following form :

$$K_{\rm L} = e^{i} \qquad \begin{array}{c} e^{i_{2}} \cos c & e^{i_{1}} \sin c \\ e^{i_{1}} \sin c & e^{i_{2}} \cos c \end{array} : \qquad (3.15)$$

The phases appearing in this matrix can be related to and to the measured values of quarks masses and mixings. An exact treatment [27] largely corrobrates Chang's linear development [22] which yields

$$\frac{r \sin}{1 r^{2} \cos^{2}} = \frac{3 m_{c}}{2 m_{s}} \cos^{2} c \frac{1 m_{c}}{2 m_{d}} \sin^{2} c$$
(3:16)
$$\frac{r \sin}{1 r^{2} \cos^{2}} = \frac{1 m_{c}}{2 m_{s}} \cos^{2} c + \frac{1 m_{c}}{2 m_{d}} \sin^{2} c$$

where  $r = j \stackrel{0}{=} j$ . W ith m<sub>s</sub> 200 M eV, m<sub>c</sub> 1:4 G eV, m<sub>d</sub> 8:9 M eV, and sm all , this reduces to by baryogenesis considerations one gets:

Those phases can be related in the minim alLR model to the experim entally well{

known value of :

$$\sum_{\text{LR}} e^{i} = 4 \ 0.36 \sin(1 \ 2) \ (\frac{1.4 \text{ TeV}}{M_{\text{R}}})^2;$$

$$\exp = e^{i} = 4 \ 2.26 \ 10^3:$$
(3.18)

Some bounds on r arise from the inversion procedure, which re-expresses and (cf. eq. (3.6)) in terms of the measured quark masses and mixings (for details see [27]). One typically gets (if we choose arbitrarily <sup>0</sup> to be the smaller of these parameters)

$$r = 0 \quad \frac{m_b}{m_t}$$
 : (3:19)

It is to be noted that this lim it on r, imposed by the existence of the third generation, is a matter of mathematical consitency and must be taken into account even if dominant contributions to the process considered come from the rst two generations.

It is then clear that the values of required to account for , even in a simple 2generation scheme, are if anything more than su cient to account for the observed baryon number of the Universe, thus allowing for some dilution with respect to the mechanism studied.

This is obviously not the complete story, and even the simplest LR model with spontaneous CP violation allows much more freedom in the relation between these parameters. In particular, a discrete set of models is associated with the choice of the relative signs of the masses in ref. [23]: while in the Standard M odel we can always rede ne  $q_R$  !  $q_i$  without observable consequences, this is not possible in the LR model. Furthermore, the range of allowed values is considerably larger in the full 3- avour study | this being in part due to the lack of precise measurements for mixing angles and the unknown mass of the top.

A detailed study of the various observable CP-violating parameters as a function of (,  $^{0}$  and the neutron electric dipole moment) is presented in [27], to

which we refer the reader. From that study it can be seen that the values of needed for high-tem perature CP violation are perfectly compatible with those observables, but that critical tests (e.g. the agreem ent of the sign of  $\stackrel{\circ}{-}$ ) will require m ore precise m easurem ents of the K obayashi{M askawa m ixing angles.

# 4.Conclusions

The minimalLR model considered in this paper has many attractive features for the phenom enology of CP violation both at low energy and at high tem perature. To our know ledge it o ers the rst link <sup>(10)</sup> between previously disconnected sectors: the generation of the baryon number of the Universe and the value of from the K <sup>0</sup> {K <sup>0</sup> system, even if too many uncertainties (both theoretical and experimental) tem porarily prevent us from fully exploiting the real predictive power of the model.

<u>A cknow ledgem ents</u>: W e w ish to thank the O rsay group for a collaboration on the LR m odel to which we refer extensively in the present paper; A ndy C ohen, B elen G avela, O livier P ene and P hilippe Spindel for uncountable and on-going discussions; JM F also w ishes to thank the theory group of BNL, where part of this work was com pleted.

### REFERENCES

- 1. A D. Sakharov, JETP Lett. 6 (1967) 24
- 2. V.Kuzmin, V.Rubakov and M.Shaposhnikov, Phys.Lett.155B (1985) 36
- 3. A G. Cohen, D B. Kaplan and A E Nelson, Nucl. Phys. B 349 (1991) 727
- 4. A G. Cohen, D B. Kaplan and A E. Nelson, Nucl. Phys. B 373 (1992) 453
- 5. N. Turok and J. Zadrozny, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65 (1990) 2331
- 6. M. Dine, P. Huet, R. Singleton and L. Susskind, Phys. Lett. B 257 (1991) 351
- 7. G.C. Branco, J.M. Frere and J.M. Gerard, Nucl. Phys. B 221 (1983) 317
- 8. M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. D 42 (1990) 1285; J. Harvey and M. Tumer, Phys. Rev. D 42 (1990) 3344; B. Campbell, S. Davidson, JEllis and K. Olive, Phys. Lett. B 256 (1992) 457
- 9. F K linkham er and N.M anton, Phys. Rev. D 30 (1984) 2212
- 10. R N.M ohapatra and X.Zhang, UMDHEP preprint (92{230), M ay 1992
- 11. N.G. Deshpande, JF. Gunion, B. Kayser and F. Olness, Phys. Rev. D 44 (1991) 837
- 12. E.Kolb and M. Turner, The Early Universe (Addison {Wesley, New York, 1990)
- 13. B.A. Campbell, S.D avidson, J.Ellis and K.A. Olive, CERN {TH {6646/92,
   A lberta Thy {30 {92, UM N {THH {112/92}
- 14. S.Khlebnikov and M. Shaposhnikov, Nucl. Phys. B 308 (1988) 885
- 15. M. Dine, R.G. Leigh, P. Huet, A. Linde and D. Linde, Phys. Rev. D 46 (1992) 550
- 16. Review of Particles properties, Phys. Rev. D 45, Part 2 (June 1992)
- 17. S.M yint, Phys. Lett. B 287 (1992) 325

- 18. M. Pietroni, DFPD preprint, DFPD /92/TH/36, (1992)
- 19. A G.Cohen and A E.Nelson, UCSD preprint, PTH 92{32, BU {HEP {92{20, August 1992
- 20. A M.Kazarian and M.E.Shaposhnikov, Phys.Lett. 276 (1992) 131
- 21. R N.M ohapatra in \CP violation", C.Jarlskog ed. (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1989) 384
- 22. D. Chang, Nucl. Phys. 214 (1983) 435
- 23. G. Ecker and W. Grimus, Nucl. Phys. 258 (1985) 328
- 24. G C. Branco and L. Lavoura, Phys. Lett. 165B (1985) 327
- 25.G W .Anderson and L.J.Hall, Phys.Rev.D 45 (1992) 2685
- 26. A G. Cohen, D B. Kaplan and A E. Nelson, Phys. Lett. 294 (1992) 57
- 27. J.M. Frere, J.Galand, A. Le Yaouanc, L.O liver, O. Pene and J.C. Raynal, Phys. Rev. D 46 (1992) 337