

Department of Physics
Kyoto University

KUNS-1360
March 25, 2024

Quantum Decoherence of Subcritical Bubble in Electroweak Phase Transition

Tetsuya Shiromizu

Department of Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-01, Japan

to appear in Progress of Theoretical Physics

In a weakly first order phase transition the typical scale of a subcritical bubble calculated in our previous papers turned out to be too small. At this scale quantum fluctuations may dominate and our previous classical result may be altered. So we examine the critical size of a subcritical bubble where quantum-to-classical transition occurs through quantum decoherence. We show that this critical size is almost equal to the typical scale which we previously obtained.

I. INTRODUCTION

Non-equilibrium electroweak phase transition is crucial for successful electroweak baryogenesis [1]. So far, there are three aspects for clarifying the structure of this first order phase transition {1) calculations of higher loop corrections [2], 2) lattice calculations [3] and 3) subcritical bubbles [4]}. The first two aspects are necessary for the quantitative construction of the potential. However, the last aspect is the most important for clarifying the non-equilibrium nature of the phase transition.

In this paper therefore we shall discuss the phase transition with a given potential and concentrate on the third aspect. Existence and nature of supercooling is clarified through the strength of the thermal fluctuation in the symmetric phase. In a familiar example, thermal fluctuations yield "bubbles" in boiled water. The bubbles perpetually repeat expansion and collapse by strong surface tensions. If the occupation ratio is too large, further critical bubble cannot be created even if the potential has barrier between two vacua. A model of the thermal fluctuation has been first proposed by Gleiser et al [4]. They assumed $O(3)$ -symmetric configuration with the spatial scale of the order of the correlation length. After this work fundamental problems have been actively investigated [5] [6] [7].

Recently, we have estimated the typical size and the strength of the thermal fluctuation in the minimal standard model by using the subcritical bubble of $O(3)$ -symmetric configuration and statistical averaging method [6] [7]. The typical size of the bubble turns out to be small compared with the correlation length and thus the strength of the thermal fluctuation becomes large. The conclusion is that the electroweak phase transition is first order one without

supercooling and therefore the ordinary electroweak baryogenesis cannot work.

However, we must worry about the smallness of the bubble because, as we will see soon, the number of states inside a bubble calculated in the thermal state is $O(1)$ at critical temperature. This might imply that the classical treatment is incomplete. So we must estimate the critical size where quantum-to-classical transition occurs. (If the size is small the bubble is quantum and if large it is classical).

The rest of the present paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we review our previous study in which the typical scale of a bubble is estimated and we point out that the number of states inside a bubble is too small for its classicality. Further, we estimate the life time of subcritical bubbles. In Sec. III we derive the master equation for the reduced density matrix to discuss the classicality of a bubble. In Sec. IV, we give the lower bound of the radius for classicality comparing these time scales and show that the critical size is the same order as the previous one. Finally, we give a summary and discussion in Sec. V.

Hereafter the concrete values will be calculated assuming the Higgs mass is 60 GeV and the temperature is the critical one at which two vacua degenerate.

II. THE TYPICAL SIZE AND THE LIFE TIME OF SUBCRITICAL BUBBLES

We review our estimation of the typical size of the thermal fluctuation and estimate the mean life time of the subcritical bubbles. The Lagrangian of the Higgs field is given by

$$L = \int d^3x \left[\frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \phi)^2 - \frac{D}{2} (T^2 - T_2^2)^2 + E T^3 - \frac{1}{4} T^4 \right]; \quad (2.1)$$

Around the critical temperature (T_c) the ansatz,

$$\phi(x) = \phi_+ \exp \left[-\frac{r^2}{R^2(t)} \right]; \quad (2.2)$$

is reasonable because ϕ_+ is the asymmetric value of the field which is most expectable value. Inserting this into the original Lagrangian,

$$L_e(R; \dot{R}) = L[\phi] = \int d^3x \left[\frac{1}{2} \dot{\phi}^2 + e^{-\frac{r^2}{R^2(t)}} \right]; \quad (2.3)$$

we obtain the Hamiltonian,

$$\begin{aligned}
H_e(R;P) &= P^2 R - L_e \\
&= \frac{1}{2M} P^2 + \frac{2}{5} M + \frac{1}{3} M (T) R^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2M} P^2 + V(R);
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

where P is the canonically conjugate momentum of R and $M(T;R) = \frac{15}{8} \frac{3=2}{2} \frac{R}{2}$. In the case of the minimal standard model, becomes

$$\epsilon_{ew}(T) = \frac{4}{5} D (T^2 - T_2^2) - \frac{8}{15} \frac{2}{3} E T + \frac{1}{10} \frac{2}{2} T; \tag{2.5}$$

where D , E and T are determined by one-loop corrections of electroweak particles, respectively; $D = 0.17$, $E = 0.01$ and $T_c = 0.035$. Further, $\mu = \frac{3E}{2T} [1 + \frac{8}{9E^2 T^2} (T^2 - T_2^2)] = 51.4 \text{ GeV}$ and $T_2 = 92.7 \text{ GeV}$.

In the high temperature phase ($T > T_c$) the thermal average of R is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle R \rangle_T &= \frac{\int dP dR R \exp[-\frac{H_{eff}}{T}]}{\int dP dR \exp[-\frac{H_{eff}}{T}]} \\
&= \frac{\int_0^{R_1} dR R^{3=2} \exp[-\frac{2M}{5T} - \frac{M_{ew}}{3T} R^2]}{\int_0^{R_1} dR R^{1=2} \exp[-\frac{2M}{5T} - \frac{M_{ew}}{3T} R^2]} \\
&= \frac{2}{3=2} \frac{2}{2} T \quad \langle R \rangle = \frac{1}{2D(T^2 - T_2^2)};
\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

where $\langle R \rangle$ is the correlation length. One can easily see that the averaged radius is smaller than the correlation length.

As the Gaussian ansatz is imposed on the Higgs field, the number of the state inside a bubble of this radius becomes

$$n(T) = \frac{1}{(4\pi \langle R \rangle^2)^3} \int_0^{R_1} d^3k \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\exp[-\frac{k^2 \hbar R_1^2}{4}]}{\exp[-\frac{k^2 + m^2}{T}]} \tag{2.7}$$

in the thermal state. Around $T = T_c$ the number is $O(1)$ and it might imply that our classical treatment is not complete.

Next, let us estimate the lifetime of the subcritical bubble. This time scale will be compared with the decoherence time in Sec. IV. As

$$\begin{aligned}
M \dot{V}^2 = P \dot{V} &= \frac{d}{dt} (P R) - \frac{dP}{dt} R \\
&= \frac{d}{dt} (P R) + V^0(R) - \frac{1}{R} \frac{1}{2} M \dot{V}^2 R
\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

holds from the Euler-Lagrange equation, we obtain the virial relation by taking the long time average on this equation;

$$\frac{1}{2} M \dot{V}^2 = \frac{2}{15} M + \frac{1}{3} \epsilon_{ew}(T) M R^2; \tag{2.9}$$

the propagator of the reduced density matrix becomes

$$J(R_f; R_f^0; t; R_i; R_i^0; 0) = \exp \left[i \int_0^{Z_t} ds \left[\frac{1}{2} M(R) \left(\frac{dR}{ds} \right)^2 + V(R) \right] \right] \int_0^{Z_t} ds \left[\frac{1}{2} M(R^0) \left(\frac{dR^0}{ds} \right)^2 + V(R^0) \right] \\ - \frac{i}{4} \int_0^{Z_t} ds \int_0^{Z_t} ds^0 \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} X_k(s) X_k(s^0) [A(k; s, s^0) - B(k; s, s^0)] ; \quad (3.11)$$

where

$$A(k; s, s^0) = f^2 \frac{3}{2} \int_0^{Z_t} \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} \text{Re} \left[i S(p; s, s^0) S(p-k; s^0, s) \right]; \quad (3.12)$$

$$B(k; s, s^0) = f^2 \frac{3}{2} \int_0^{Z_t} \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} \text{Im} \left[i S(p; s, s^0) S(p-k; s^0, s) \right] \quad (3.13)$$

and

$$X_k(s) = R^3(s) \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} k^2 R^2(s) \right] R^3(s) \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} k^2 R^2(s) \right] ; \quad (3.14)$$

In order to eliminate the radius dependence of the mass $M(R)$ we introduce new non-dimensional variables:

$$z = \frac{R}{R_0} \quad \text{and} \quad t = \frac{9}{4} \frac{t}{R_0} ; \quad (3.15)$$

where $R_0 = (R=M)^{1/2}$. Defining $U(z) = (4/9)R_0 V(R)$, we obtain the action,

$$S[z] = \int_0^{Z_t} dz \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{dz}{d\tau} \right)^2 + U(z) \right] ; \quad (3.16)$$

In the high temperature limit, the master equation becomes

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \rho(z; z^0; \tau) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \rho - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \rho - iU(z) \rho + iU(z^0) \rho - \frac{2}{3} R_0 z \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial}{\partial z^0} \right) \rho \\ - \frac{2}{3} \frac{b R_0^4}{16^{3/2}} z^2 + z^0 - 2z^2 z^0 - \frac{2}{z^{4/3} + z^{0/3}} \rho ; \quad (3.17)$$

where $b = (f^2 T^2 = 48 \frac{p}{2})$ and $b = (f^2 T^3 = 12 \frac{p}{2})$. The derivation of this master equation is tedious, but simple, and is performed by the same procedure of Ref. [10]. The last term in the right hand side is complicated compared with the ordinary cases. However, only the region $z \approx z^0$ is relevant for our purpose:

$$z^2 + z^0 - 2z^2 z^0 - \frac{2}{z^{4/3} + z^{0/3}} \approx \frac{1}{3} (z - z^0)^2 + O((z - z^0)^4) ; \quad (3.18)$$

Thus we obtain the familiar result with small extra terms. These extra terms might have appeared because the ansatz of a subcritical bubble is not an exact solution of the field equation.

In this section, we examine the validity of the classical treatment for the evaluation of the typical scale of the thermal fluctuation. First we must give the quantum decoherence condition. Here we define the following quantity [11];

$$\rho_D = \text{Tr}(\rho_r^2) \quad (4.1)$$

This is a definite measure of classicality: ρ_D becomes 1 for the pure state and 0 if the quantum coherence is completely destroyed. This measure satisfies the equation

$$\frac{d\rho_D}{dt} = -2\rho_D \left[\frac{4}{9} \frac{\hbar^2 R_0^3}{8} \frac{1}{3} \frac{d^2}{dz^2} \rho_r(z; z^0; \dots) \rho_r(z^0; z; \dots) \right] \quad (4.2)$$

From this one can read that the friction protects the quantum coherence and the diffusion destroys it. The time scales for these two effects are given by

$$\tau_{QC}^{-1} \sim 2 \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$\tau_{QD}^{-1} \sim \frac{4}{9} \frac{\hbar^2 R_0^3}{8} \frac{1}{3} \frac{d^2}{dz^2} \rho_r = \frac{2}{27} \frac{\hbar^2}{T} \frac{1}{3} R^3; \quad (4.4)$$

respectively. τ_{QC} is the time scale that the friction recovers the quantum coherence and τ_{QD} is that the diffusion destroys the quantum coherence.

For decoherence and complete classicalization, $\tau_{QD} < \tau_{QC}$ must be satisfied and this inequality implies the lower bound for the radius of a bubble,

$$R > \left(\frac{27}{2T} \frac{\hbar^2}{3} \right)^{1/3} =: R_1 \approx 0.084 \text{ GeV}^{-1}; \quad (4.5)$$

Furthermore one note that the life time of subcritical bubbles should be longer than the time scale of the complete quantum decoherence. The inequality $\tau_{QD} < \tau_{\text{life}}$ must be also satisfied, that is

$$R > \left(\frac{27}{30T} \frac{\hbar^2}{3} \right)^{1/3} =: R_2 \approx 0.046 \text{ GeV}^{-1}; \quad (4.6)$$

The both time scales do not depend on the coupling constant. This comes from the high temperature limit and the fact that we take account into only the coupling with the one fermion. If one consider the interaction with gauge fields, the dependence of coupling constant appear.

Unfortunately, in the above argument it has been a simple order estimation and therefore we cannot determine the exact value for the critical size. On the other hand the average radius is $\langle R \rangle_T = 0.012 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$. Thus the critical size where quantum-to-classical transition occurs is roughly given by $\langle R \rangle_T$.

The above result suggests that subcritical bubbles should be treated by quantum mechanics and the typical size should be calculated using the Wigner function.

V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

We estimated the critical size where quantum-to-classical transition occurs. It turned out to be the same order as the classical statistical averaged radius. This means that subcritical bubbles should be treated as quantum systems with dissipation at the critical temperature.

Although we have treated the fluctuations as classical in our previous papers, at least in the minimal standard model with $m_H = 60 \text{ GeV}$, they are quantum rather than classical. Fortunately, one can guess that the quantitative result calculated based on quantum mechanics does not have drastic change on the typical size (beside a factor of order one) because the bubble is in the boundary between classical and quantum region and then both results should be the same order with each other. Hence we might conclude again that electroweak phase transition in minimal standard model cannot accompany any supercooling even if the potential is the first order type.

In order to obtain the exact value for the typical size of the thermal fluctuation one must solve the master equation or follow the time evolution of the Wigner function. As one cannot take the limit $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ in the present problem, the equation for the Wigner function does not coincide with the classical Fokker-Planck equation obtained by reading the imaginary part of the effective potential as noise in the previous paper [7]. Some higher derivative terms appear and left for the case in which one cannot $\hbar \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, despite the term (3.18) gives the diffusion term in quantum Fokker-Planck equation, the corresponding noise is not Gaussian as in the previous paper. These problems will be investigated in our future study.

Acknowledgment

The author would like to thank H. Sato, M. Sasaki and K. Nakao for their continuous encouragements and educational advises. He also thanks M. Morikawa, J. Yokoyama, T. Tanaka and S. Mukohyama for their discussions and

careful readings of this manuscript. This work was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research Fellowship, No. 2925.

-
- [1] A. G. Cohen, D. B. Kaplan and A. E. Nelson, *Ann. Rev. and Part. Sci.*, 43 (1993), 27;
M. Shaposhnikov, *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)* 37A (1994), 117;
A. G. Cohen, D. B. Kaplan and A. E. Nelson, *Phys. Lett.*, B 336 (1994), 41;
G. R. Farrar and M. Shaposhnikov, *Phys. Rev. D* 50 (1994), 744
 - [2] W. Buchmüller, Z. Foldor, A. Hebecker, *Nucl. Phys. B* 477 (1995), 317; and references therein.
 - [3] K. Jansen, *Preprint DESY 95-169 (hep-lat/9509018)*; and references therein.
 - [4] M. G. Leiser, E. W. Kolb and R. W. Atkins, *Nucl. Phys. B* 364 (1991), 411;
M. G. Leiser and E. W. Kolb, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 69 (1992), 1304;
M. G. Leiser and E. W. Kolb, *Phys. Rev. D* 48 (1993), 1560
 - [5] M. G. Leiser and R. O. Ramos, *Phys. Lett.* 300B (1993), 271;
G. Gelmini and M. G. Leiser, *Nucl. Phys.* 419B (1994), 129;
M. G. Leiser and R. O. Ramos, *Phys. Rev. D* 50 (1994), 2441;
M. G. Leiser, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 73 (1994), 3495;
J. Borrill and M. G. Leiser, *Phys. Rev. D* 51 (1995), 4111;
K. Enqvist, A. Riotto and I. Vilja, *Preprint TURKU-FL-P 18-95*
 - [6] T. Shiromizu, M. Morikawa and J. Yokoyama, *Preprint KUNS-1297* (to appear in *Prog. Theor. Phys.*)
 - [7] T. Shiromizu, M. Morikawa and J. Yokoyama, *Preprint KUNS-1327* (to appear in *Prog. Theor. Phys.*)
 - [8] W. H. Zurek, *Phys. Rev. D* 24 (1981), 1516; *ibid D* 26 (1982), 1862;
E. Joos and H. D. Zeh, *Z. Phys. B* 59 (1985), 223 ;
W. G. Unruh and W. H. Zurek, *Phys. Rev. D* 40 (1989), 1071
 - [9] R. P. Feynman and F. L. Vernon, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* 24 (1963), 118
 - [10] A. O. Caldeira and A. J. Leggett, *Physica* 121A (1983), 587
H. Grabert, P. Schramm and G. L. Ingold, *Phys. Rep.* 168 (1988), 115;
B. L. Hu, J. P. Paz and Y. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* 45 (1992), 2843; *ibid D* 47 (1993), 1576
 - [11] For example, M. Morikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* 42 (1990), 2929