

LANCASTER-TH/9617

September 1996

$u^c d^c d^c$ -Based Asymmetric Baryogenesis

John McDonald

School of Physics and Chemistry,

Lancaster University,

Lancaster,

LA1 4YB

United Kingdom ^{1 2}

¹Address from 1st October 1996: Dept. of Physics, P.O. Box 9, University of Helsinki, FIN-00014 Helsinki, Finland

²e-mail: jmc@laxa.lancs.ac.uk

Abstract

We consider the possibility of a successful Affleck-Dine mechanism along the $u^c d^c d^c$ direction in R-parity symmetric extensions of the minimal supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) which contain a gauge singlet superfield $\hat{\Phi}$. Such gauge singlets commonly occur in extensions of the MSSM, for example in models which seek to account for neutrino masses. We consider a two scalar Affleck-Dine mechanism, with the flat direction stabilized by a non-renormalizable superpotential term of the form $\frac{1}{M} u^c d^c d^c \hat{\Phi}^3$, where $\hat{\Phi}$ corresponds to the gauge non-singlet flat direction. We give approximate solutions of the scalar field equations of motion which describe the evolution of the condensates and show that the final baryon asymmetry in this case is suppressed relative to that expected from the conventional single scalar Affleck-Dine mechanism, based on a superpotential term of the form $\frac{1}{4M} \hat{\Phi}^4$, by a factor $\frac{m_s}{m + m_s}^{1/2}$, where m_s is the soft supersymmetry breaking scalar mass and m is the supersymmetric mass. It is possible for the model to generate a baryon asymmetry even in the limit of unbroken B-L, so long as the gauge singlet condensate doesn't decay until after anomalous electroweak B+L violation is out of equilibrium following the electroweak phase transition. This condition is generally satisfied if all Dirac neutrino masses are less than around 10keV. This class of Affleck-Dine models can, in principle, be experimentally ruled out, for example by the observation of a Dirac mass for the ν_τ or ν_μ neutrino significantly larger than around 10keV together with a mostly Higgsino LSP.

1. Introduction

In supersymmetric (SUSY) models [1], the occurrence of flat directions in the renormalizable scalar potential of the minimal SUSY Standard Model (MSSM) and in many of its extensions naturally leads to the possibility of generating the baryon asymmetry of the Universe via the decay of scalar field oscillations along such flat directions. This possibility is the well-known Affleck-Dine (A-D) mechanism for baryogenesis [2]. Although in the limit of unbroken SUSY the renormalizable potential along these flat directions is completely flat, once soft SUSY breaking terms and non-renormalizable terms consistent with the symmetries of the model are added there will be a non-trivial potential. In the original A-D scenario [2] it was assumed that the soft SUSY-breaking terms are the same as the zero temperature SUSY-breaking terms, which are characterized by a mass scale m_s of the order of 100 GeV – 1 TeV [1]. However, it has recently become clear that the large energy density which exists in the early Universe will also break SUSY, resulting in soft SUSY breaking terms characterized by a mass scale typically of the order of the Hubble parameter H [3]. This large mass scale for the SUSY breaking terms radically alters the evolution of the scalar fields during and after inflation [4]. In the original A-D mechanism, because the scalar field masses are much smaller than H during inflation, the classical scalar fields are overdamped and effectively frozen in at their initial values on horizon crossing, as generated by quantum fluctuations [2, 5]. Therefore on the scale of the observable Universe there is a large constant scalar field over the whole Universe with an essentially random phase. This then evolves into a coherently oscillating scalar field, corresponding to a Bose condensate with a roughly maximal asymmetry in the condensate particle number density. The subsequent decay of the condensate was shown to be easily able to account for the baryon asymmetry of the Universe [2]. However, once mass terms of the order of H for the scalar particles are introduced, this picture completely changes [4]. Now the classical scalar fields can evolve to the minimum of their potentials on a time scale of the order of H^{-1} . As a result, at the end of inflation, all the scalar fields will be at the minimum of

their potentials, with quantum fluctuations having an effect only on the scale of the horizon at the end of inflation, which is much smaller than the scale of the observable Universe. Therefore the baryon asymmetry coming from the A-D condensate in this case will be determined dynamically by the evolution of the scalar fields during the post-inflation era, with the scalar fields starting out at the minimum of their potentials at the end of inflation. Since the A-D mechanism is now dependent upon the details of the scalar potential, one has to consider each case individually in order to determine the magnitude of the resulting asymmetry. The asymmetry will be particularly sensitive to which flat direction the scalar fields oscillate along and to the form of the non-renormalizable superpotential terms which determine the minimum of the scalar potential and introduce the CP violation necessary in order to generate the baryon asymmetry [4].

In order to generate a baryon asymmetry from a condensate which decays prior to the electroweak phase transition (when anomalous B + L violation is in thermal equilibrium [6]) it is necessary for the condensate to carry a non-zero B-L asymmetry. The lowest dimension operators which characterize the B-L violating flat directions in the MSSM are the dimension 2 ($d=2$) operator LH_u and the $d=3$ operators $u^c d^c d^c$, $d^c Q L$ and $e^c L L$ [4]. (These operators may be thought of as the superpotential terms responsible for lifting the flat directions or as the scalar field operators which are responsible for introducing explicit B-L violation into the scalar field equations of motion. These are naturally connected by the relationship between the soft SUSY breaking terms and the superpotential terms [1, 4]). These operators characterize the flat directions in the sense that the scalar field operator characterizing a particular flat direction will have a non-zero expectation value along that direction. We will refer to the flat direction which gives a non-zero expectation value to LH_u and to $u^c d^c d^c$ as the " LH_u direction" and the " $u^c d^c d^c$ direction" respectively. (The A-D mechanism along the $d^c Q L$ and $e^c L L$ directions will be essentially the same as that along the $u^c d^c d^c$ direction; we will concentrate on the $u^c d^c d^c$ direction in the following). The LH_u direction and the $u^c d^c d^c$ direction are orthogonal in the sense

that they cannot both be at simultaneously [4]. The LH_u direction has recently been considered by a number of authors [4, 7]. In the present paper we will focus on the $u^c d^c d^c$ direction.

The simplest implementation of the A-D mechanism along the $u^c d^c d^c$ direction would involve adding to the MSSM superpotential a $d=3$ term of the form $u^c d^c d^c$. However, this term would be phenomenologically dangerous, as it would introduce large B violation into the MSSM unless its coupling was extremely small. (For a review of the constraints on B and L violating couplings in the MSSM see reference [8]). For example, squark mediated proton decay imposes the constraint $j^0 j^0 < 10^{-24}$ for the light quark generations, where j^0 is the $d^c Q L$ coupling and j^0 is the $u^c d^c d^c$ coupling [8]. Such dangerous B and L violating terms are usually eliminated from the MSSM by imposing R-parity (R_p) [1, 8]. Imposing R_p implies that the first B-L violating operator in the MSSM which is nonzero along the $u^c d^c d^c$ direction is a dimension 6 operator, $u^c u^c d^c d^c d^c d^c$ [4]. However, as discussed in reference [4] (and briefly reviewed in the present paper), in A-D models where the natural scale of the non-renormalizable terms is the Planck scale, $d=6$ A-D models can have an acceptably low B asymmetry only for very low reheating temperatures T_R , $T_R < 10 \text{ GeV}$, where θ is a CP violating phase. $d=4$ A-D models, on the other hand, can be compatible with a much wider range of reheating temperatures, up to 10^9 GeV or more [4]. Thus with only the particle content of the MSSM, the $u^c d^c d^c$ direction would be disfavoured in the simplest models (those based on Planck scale non-renormalizable terms) relative to the LH_u direction, which can utilize the R_p -conserving $d=4$ operator $(LH_u)^2$. However, if we were to consider extensions of the MSSM which involve the addition of an R_p -odd gauge singlet superfield, then we could form the R_p conserving $d=4$ operator $u^c d^c d^c$. The addition of such a gauge singlet superfield to the MSSM is a very common and natural feature of many extensions of the MSSM. In particular, in models which seek to account for neutrino masses, the gauge singlet superfield would correspond to a right-handed neutrino superfield. It is the purpose of the present paper to determine whether it

is possible to generate the observed B asymmetry along the $u^c d^c d^c$ direction via the operator $u^c d^c d^c$ and, if so, to compare the resulting asymmetry with that coming from the more conventional LH_u direction.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we discuss the model and the minimization of its scalar potential. In section 3 we consider the scalar field equations of motion and the formation of the coherently oscillating scalar field condensates. In section 4 we discuss the condensate particle asymmetries and the resulting baryon asymmetry. In section 5 we discuss the constraints on the reheating temperature after inflation. In section 6 we discuss the thermalization and decay of the condensates and the upper limits on Dirac neutrino masses in the limit of unbroken $B-L$. In section 7 we give our conclusions.

2. $d=4$ A ϕ -D ine mechanism along the $u^c d^c d^c$ direction

We will consider throughout the simplest scenario, in which it is assumed that inflation occurs with an energy density consistent with the density perturbations observed by COBE, corresponding to $H \approx 10^{14} \text{ GeV}$ [9], with the inflation subsequently undergoing coherent oscillations about the minimum of its potential. We will also require that the reheating temperature T_R is low enough not to thermally regenerate gravitinos [10], which implies that T_R is less than about 10^{10} GeV , corresponding to H not much larger than 1 GeV . After reheating we will assume that the Universe is radiation dominated throughout, with no further significant increase in entropy. In general, when inflation ends H will not be much smaller than its value during inflation (even in 2 chaotic inflation, the value of H when the inflation starts oscillating is not much smaller than 10^{13} GeV [11]). Therefore the coherent oscillations of the A-D field, which will begin once $H \approx m_s \approx 100 \text{ GeV}$, will begin during a matter dominated era, with the energy density of the Universe dominated by inflation oscillations [4].

It is now understood that in most supergravity models, the energy density that exists in the early Universe will break SUSY, introducing soft SUSY breaking terms characterized by a mass scale typically of the order of H [3]. We will therefore consider in the following soft SUSY breaking terms of the form

$$V_{\text{soft}} = (m_s^2 - cH^2) \sum_i f_i^2 + (B_a W_{2a} + \text{h.c.}) + (A_a W_{na} + \text{h.c.}) \quad (2.1);$$

where W_{2a} are superpotential terms bilinear in the fields and W_{na} are terms of order n in the fields. A_a and B_a are defined by $A_a = A_{as} + a_a H$ and $B_a = B_{as} + b_a H$, where A_{as} and B_{as} may be thought of as the zero temperature soft SUSY breaking terms from a hidden sector of $N=1$ supergravity [1] whilst $a_a H$ and $b_a H$ are due to SUSY breaking by the energy density in the early Universe. We will assume throughout that $A_{as} \approx B_{as} \approx m_s$. We will also assume that $a_a^2 \approx b_a^2 \approx f_a^2$. In most supergravity models we expect that $f_a \approx 1$ [4], although in some models f_a may be smaller; for example $f_a \approx 10^{-2}$ occurs in supergravity models with a Heisenberg symmetry [12]. Then for the case with $c_a > 0$ the A-D scalar, corresponding to a renormalizable

at direction in the scalar potential, will have a non-zero value at the minimum of its scalar potential at the end of inflation, with the potential being stabilized by the contribution from the non-renormalizable terms in the superpotential [4].

To implement the $d=4$ A-D mechanism along the $u^c d^c d^c$ direction we will consider an R_p symmetric extension of the M SSM defined by the superpotential $W = W_{\text{SM}} + W^0 + W$, where W_{SM} is the M SSM superpotential, W^0 is defined by

$$W^0 = \frac{m}{2} \phi^2 + \frac{1}{M} u^c d^c d^c + \frac{1}{4M} \phi^4 \quad (2.2)$$

and W is given by

$$W = H_u L \quad (2.3):$$

In addition to these terms we would expect terms of the form $d^c Q L$ and $e^c L L$. For simplicity we will not include these terms explicitly. The operator $u^c d^c d^c$

(where i, j and h are colour indices and generation indices are, for now, suppressed) is antisymmetric in the d^c scalar fields. Therefore the d^c should be from different generations, which we will denote as d^c and d^{c^0} . With u^c, d^c and d^{c^0} having different colour indices, the F-term contribution to the scalar potential is then given by

$$\begin{aligned} V_F = \sum_i \left(\frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi_i} \right)^2 &= m^2 j^j j^j + \frac{j^j j^j}{M^2} j^i d^c d^{c^0} j^j + \frac{j^j j^j}{M^2} j^j j^j \\ &+ \frac{j^j j^j}{M^2} j^j j^h j^i d^{c^0} j^j + j^i d^c j^j + j^i d^{c^0} j^j \\ &+ m^y y \left(\frac{1}{M} u^c d^c d^{c^0} + \frac{1}{M} \phi^3 \right) + \frac{y}{M^2} (u^c d^c d^{c^0})^y \phi^3 + \text{h.c.} \quad (2.4): \end{aligned}$$

The direction with only $\langle u^c \rangle, \langle d^c \rangle, \langle d^{c^0} \rangle$ and $\langle \phi \rangle$ non-zero is F-flat in the M SSM, with only the terms in W^0 lifting this flatness. The D-term contribution to the scalar potential,

$$V_D = \sum_i \frac{g_i^2}{2} j^y T_i^a j^2 \quad (2.5);$$

where the T_i^a are the multiplets of the gauge group with generators T_i^a , also vanishes so long as u^c, d^c and d^{c^0} have different colour indices and $j^i d^c j^j = j^i d^{c^0} j^j = j^i d^c j^j = v^2$. The phases of u^c, d^c and d^{c^0} are not, however, fixed by the M SSM F- and D-flatness

conditions. We will see in the following that the important phases for the A-D mechanism are φ_ν and φ_e , where $\langle u^c d^c d^{c^0} \rangle = v^3 e^{i\varphi_\nu}$ and $\langle \bar{u}^c \bar{d}^c \bar{d}^{c^0} \rangle = v^3 e^{i\varphi_e}$.

2.1. Potential minimization in the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit

We first note that in the SUSY limit with $H=0$ and with $m \neq 0$, there is a minimum with $v \neq 0$ which is degenerate with the $v = 0$ minimum and which could be phenomenologically dangerous. To be precise, from equation (2.4) we see that the SUSY minima correspond to $\phi = 0$ and $\phi^2 = \frac{m}{M}$ (with $u^c = d^c = d^{c0} = 0$ at both minima). The $\epsilon \neq 0$ minimum results in a dangerous $u^c d^c d^c$ superpotential term with coupling $\frac{j_j}{j_{j=2}} \frac{j_{n-j}^{1=2}}{M}$. (In general we would expect similar couplings for the $d^c Q L$ and $e^c L L$ terms). Thus, if we consider $M < M_{Pl}$ (where M_{Pl} is the Planck scale) and $j_{n-j} > m_s > 10^2 \text{ GeV}$, then we see that $\frac{j_j}{j_{j=2}} \frac{j_{n-j}^{1=2}}{M} > \frac{j_j}{j_{j=2}} 10^{-8}$, which, for j_j and $j_{j=2}$ not much smaller than 1, would result in an unacceptable squark mediated proton decay rate [8]. In order to avoid this danger we must therefore ensure that there exists a minimum of the scalar potential which has $v \neq 0$ for large H but which evolves to the $v = v_0 = 0$ minimum as H tends to zero.

With regard to the scale of the non-renormalizable terms M , we will set this to equal the Planck scale by convention. Then the coupling can take values small or large compared with 1, depending on the natural mass scale of the non-renormalizable terms. Values much larger than 1 would correspond to the case where the natural mass scale of the non-renormalizable terms is much smaller than the Planck scale, for example a grand unification scale. On the other hand, if the natural mass scale of the non-renormalizable terms was of the order of the Planck scale, then we would expect that $j_j < 1$.

Typically, we would not expect ϕ and ϕ^2 to be very different in magnitude. However, we would like to be able to minimize the potential analytically. We find that we can do this for the case of j_j small compared with $j_{j=2}$ ($j_j \lesssim 0.1 j_{j=2}$ is sufficient), in which case it may be shown that the terms in the scalar potential proportional to ϕ^3 can, to a good approximation, be neglected. We expect that the possibly more likely case with $j_j \sim j_{j=2}$ will be qualitatively similar. In the following we will consider the minimization of the potential in the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit.

In the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit the scalar potential becomes

$$V = (\mu^2 + m_s^2 - cH^2)v^2 + (\mu_s^2 - \zeta H^2)v^2 + 3\frac{j\bar{j}}{M^2}v^2v^4 + \frac{j\bar{j}}{M^2}v^6 + \frac{B\mu}{2}v^2e^{2i\theta} + \text{h.c.} \\ + 4\frac{m_y}{M}v^3e^{i(\theta - \phi)} + \text{h.c.} + \frac{A}{M}v^3e^{i(\theta + \phi)} + \text{h.c.} \quad (2.6):$$

By an choice of the phases of the scalar fields we can make μ and μ_s real. We may also choose μ to be positive. To a reasonable approximation we can neglect the term proportional to B . This only contributes a term of the order of $(\mu_s + a_i H)v^2$, which is less than or of order of the $(\mu^2 + m_s^2 - cH^2)v^2$ term. The phases θ and ϕ will then adjust to minimize the cross-terms (where we use "cross-terms" to denote terms which are the sum of a term and its hermitian conjugate). The potential will then have the form

$$V = (\mu^2 + m_s^2 - cH^2)v^2 + (\mu_s^2 - \zeta H^2)v^2 + \frac{3}{M^2}v^2v^4 + \frac{1}{M^2}v^6 - 2\mu\frac{j\bar{j}}{M}v^3 \quad (2.7);$$

where $\mu = \mu + jA$. In general, the minimum of this potential is given by

$$v = \frac{j\bar{j}}{M} \frac{\mu v^3}{(\mu^2 + m_s^2 - cH^2) + \frac{3}{M^2}v^4} \quad (2.8)$$

and

$$v(v^4 - \frac{\mu M}{j\bar{j}}v + 2v^2v^2 + \frac{M^2}{3}(\mu_s^2 - \zeta H^2)) = 0 \quad (2.9):$$

We next consider how the minimum evolves from an initially large value of cH^2 .

$$(i) \quad \underline{cH^2 > \mu^2 + m_s^2}$$

In general the minimum in this case is given by

$$v^4 = \frac{c}{(1 - \frac{c}{\mu^2 + m_s^2})} \frac{M^2 H^2}{3} \quad (2.10)$$

and

$$v = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{\mu}{H} \frac{(1 - \frac{c}{\mu^2 + m_s^2})^{1/2}}{c^{1/2}} v = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{a}{c^{1/2}} \frac{(1 - \frac{c}{\mu^2 + m_s^2})^{1/2}}{c^{1/2}} v \quad (2.11);$$

where a is the solution of

$$3 \left(1 - \frac{a^2}{c_v} - \frac{c}{c_v}\right)^2 - \frac{5a^2}{3c_v} + \frac{2a^2}{3c_v} = 0 \quad (2.12);$$

as may be seen by taking the H^2 terms large compared with the mass terms and substituting (2.10) into (2.9) and (2.8). Typically (1) is of the order of 1. For example, if a^2 is small compared with c_v then $\beta = (1 - \frac{c}{c_v})$, whilst if $a^2 = c = c_v$ then $\beta = 2$. Therefore we can roughly say, with $c_v \sim c \sim a^2$, that

$$v \sim v \sim \frac{1}{c_v} \frac{(M H)^{1/2}}{j^{1/2}} \quad (2.13):$$

Thus v and v are initially of the same order of magnitude.

(ii) $\frac{c H^2 < m^2 + m_s^2}{m^2 + m_s^2}$

In this case we find that it is consistent to assume that $m^2 + m_s^2 > \frac{3}{M^2} v^4$, in which case v is given by

$$v \sim \frac{j}{M} \frac{m v^3}{m^2 + m_s^2} \quad (2.14):$$

Solving (2.9) for v , we find solutions v given by

$$v^4 = \frac{1}{4} \frac{M^2 (m^2 + m_s^2)^2}{m^2} \pm \frac{m^2}{(m^2 + m_s^2)} \pm \frac{8}{3} \frac{m^2 (m_s^2 - c H^2)}{(m^2 + m_s^2)^2} \quad (2.15):$$

For $c_v H^2 > m_s^2$, v^4 is negative, and so there is a minimum at v_+ with no barrier between $v = 0$ and $v = v_+$. Once $c_v H^2$ is less than m_s^2 , a barrier appears at v . The minimum at v_+ subsequently becomes unstable once

$$m_s^2 - c_v H^2 > \frac{3}{8} \frac{(2j m + j^2 m_s^2)^2}{(m + j^2)^2} \quad (2.16):$$

For m large compared with $j^2 m_s$ and m_s we see that we must have $m_s^2 > \frac{3}{2} j^2 m_s j$ in order that the dangerous $v_+ \neq 0$ minimum becomes destabilized as $H \rightarrow 0$. As $m \rightarrow 0$, this condition becomes $m_s^2 > \frac{3}{8} \frac{(j^2 m_s^2 - m_s^2)^2}{j^2 m_s j}$. Thus we see that it is non-trivial for the dangerous $v \neq 0$ minimum to become destabilized as $H \rightarrow 0$. So long as the potential can be destabilized, however, it will generally destabilize once m_s^2 is greater than $c_v H^2$ up to a factor of order 1. The values of the fields when the v_+ minimum becomes unstable are then given by

$$v_+^4 = \frac{1}{4} \frac{M^2}{m^2} \frac{m^2 + m_s^2}{m^2} (m^2 - m^2 - m_s^2) \quad (2.17)$$

and

$$v = \frac{1}{2} \frac{(m^2 - m_s^2)^{1/2}}{(m^2 + m_s^2)^{1/2}} v \quad (2.18);$$

Noting that $\lambda > m_s$ for $c_v H^2 < m_s^2$, we find that, for $m > m_s$,

$$v = \frac{1}{2} \frac{m_s}{m} v \quad (2.19);$$

whilst for $m < m_s$ $v = v$. So for $m > m_s$ we find that v becomes suppressed relative to v .

3. Bose condensate formation

To discuss the formation of the Bose condensates, that is to say, the way in which the scalar fields start oscillating freely about the minimum of their potentials, we consider the equations of motion of the scalar fields. Strictly speaking we have four scalar fields; u^c, d^c, d^{c^0} and \tilde{u} . However, since we are considering the evolution of the classical fields along a D – at direction, we may impose that the u^c, d^c and d^{c^0} fields have the same magnitude. Although the phases of these fields could be different, the equations for u^c, d^c and d^{c^0} are identical and the initial values of the fields are the same. Therefore we may assume that their phases remain equal throughout. The equations of motion are then given by,

$$\ddot{R} + 3H_{-R} = [(m_s^2 - \frac{1}{2}g^2 H^2) R + \frac{2}{M^2} \frac{R^2}{R} \frac{R^3}{R} + \frac{2}{M^2} \frac{R^5}{R}] \quad (3.1);$$

$$\ddot{I} + 3H_{-I} = [(m_s^2 - \frac{1}{2}g^2 H^2) I + \frac{2}{M^2} \frac{R^2}{R} \frac{R^2}{R} I + \frac{2}{M^2} \frac{R^4}{R} I] \quad (3.2);$$

$$\ddot{R} + 3H_{-R} = [(m^2 + m_s^2 - \frac{1}{2}g^2 H^2) R - \frac{3}{R} + \frac{3}{M^2} \frac{R^4}{R} R] \quad (3.3);$$

and

$$\ddot{I} + 3H_{-I} = [(m^2 + m_s^2 - \frac{1}{2}g^2 H^2) I - \frac{3}{R} \frac{R^2}{R} I + \frac{3}{M^2} \frac{R^4}{R} I] \quad (3.4);$$

where \tilde{u} represents the u^c, d^c and d^{c^0} fields and we define $\tilde{u} = \frac{A}{M}$, $\tilde{d} = \frac{B}{M}$ and $\tilde{d}^0 = \frac{C}{M}$ where $\frac{m}{M} = \frac{m}{M}$ (we choose this to be real and negative by a choice of phase), $(\frac{A}{M})^y = e^{iy}$ and $(\frac{B}{M})^y = e^{iy}$. $c = \cos(\theta)$ and $s = \sin(\theta)$ denote $\cos(\theta)$ and $\sin(\theta)$ respectively. In writing these equations we have assumed that the real parts of the fields are large compared with the imaginary parts, which turns out to be a reasonable approximation. Throughout our discussion of the equations of motion we will focus on the most likely form for the soft SUSY

breaking terms in the early Universe, corresponding to the case $a_1^2 = b_1^2 = c = 1$ [3, 4].

Before the $v \neq 0$ minimum is destabilized, the fields will be at the minimum of their potentials, corresponding to setting the right hand side (RHS) of the equations of motion to zero. The $v \neq 0$ minimum at $v = v_+$ will become destabilized once $c_v H^2 < m_s^2$ and the ϕ_R field will begin to roll once $H^2 < m_s^2$. Once ϕ_R starts to roll, we will see that the other fields follow the minimum of their potentials as a function of $\phi_R(t)$ and oscillate about this minimum until they become freely oscillating about the $v = 0$ minimum of their potentials.

We first consider the evolution of the real parts of the fields, beginning with ϕ_R . We consider the solution of the ϕ_R equation of motion in the limit where the terms proportional to ϕ_R^4 , ϕ_R^2 and s are neglected, which turns out to be a reasonable approximation. We will also treat c as a time-independent constant. (We will comment on this later). The ϕ_R equation of motion is then approximately given by

$$\ddot{\phi}_R + 3H \dot{\phi}_R = -(m^2 + m_s^2 - cH^2) \phi_R - (c + \frac{1}{2}) \phi_R^3 \quad (3.5):$$

From now on we will neglect the cH^2 mass terms in the equation of motion as these will quickly become negligible as the Universe expands. We will also neglect the $3H \dot{\phi}_R$ and $3H \ddot{\phi}_R$ damping terms, since we are considering $m_s > H$. The effects of damping will, however, be included in the time dependence of the amplitude of oscillation of the fields.

We wish to show that in the solution of this equation ϕ_R oscillates around the minimum of its potential as a function of ϕ_R . To see this let $\phi_R = \bar{\phi}_R + \delta\phi_R$, where

$$\bar{\phi}_R = \frac{(c + \frac{1}{2})}{m^2 + m_s^2} \phi_R^3 \quad (3.6)$$

is the minimum of the potential as a function of $\phi_R(t)$. Then the ϕ_R equation of motion is given by

$$\ddot{\delta\phi}_R + 6\delta\phi_R \ddot{\phi}_R = (m^2 + m_s^2) \delta\phi_R + 3m_s^2 \phi_R^3 \quad (3.7):$$

In this we have used $\phi_R^2 = m_s^2 \phi_R$, which will be shown later to be true. ϕ_R will then grow from an initial value of zero until the mass term on the RHS of

(3.7) proportional to ϕ_R becomes dominant, after which ϕ_R will oscillate about the minimum $\phi_R = \phi_R^-$ with frequency $(m^2 + m_s^2)^{1/2}$, the terms on the RHS proportional to ϕ_R^3 being rapidly damped by the expansion of the Universe. The initial value of the ϕ_R oscillation amplitude is therefore given by ϕ_{R0} , where

$$\phi_{R0} = \frac{3 m_s^2}{m^2 + m_s^2} \phi_{R0} \quad (3.8):$$

It is straightforward to show that $\frac{\phi_{R0}}{\phi_{R-}} = \frac{m_s^2}{m^2 + m_s^2}$, which is less than or about equal to 1. Eventually the amplitude of ϕ_R will become larger than that of ϕ_R^- , in which case ϕ_R will effectively oscillate freely around $\phi_R = 0$ with frequency $(m^2 + m_s^2)^{1/2}$.

We next consider the solution of the ϕ_R equation of motion. On introducing $\phi_R = \phi_R + \phi_R^-$, we find that, for $m_s^2 > c_v H^2$, ϕ_R begins oscillating with a frequency approximately equal to m_s . This is not at first obvious since the ϕ_R^2 and ϕ_R^5 terms on the RHS of the ϕ_R equation of motion are initially large ($(m_s m_{Pl}) \phi_R$) compared with the $m_s^2 \phi_R$ term. However, it turns out that there is a cancellation between these higher-order terms, such that the sum of these terms on the RHS of (3.1) contributes initially only $m_s^2 \phi_R$ and then rapidly becomes small compared with the $m_s^2 \phi_R$ term as ϕ_R decreases with the expansion of the Universe. Therefore ϕ_R will essentially oscillate with frequency approximately equal to m_s once the $v = v_+$ minimum becomes unstable.

Thus we can summarize the evolution of the real parts of the fields by

$$\phi_R(t) = A(t) \cos(m_s t) \quad (3.9)$$

and

$$\phi_R(t) = \phi_R^- + \phi_R^3(t) + A(t) \sin((m + m_s)t) \quad (3.10);$$

where the time dependence of $A(t)$ and $A(t)$ is due to the expansion of the Universe during inflation matter domination, $A(t) \propto a(t)^{-3/2}$, where $a(t)$ is the scale factor.

We next consider the evolution of the imaginary parts of the fields. The evolution of ϕ_I and ϕ_I is similar to the evolution of ϕ_R i.e. they follow the minimum of their

potentials as a function of $\phi_R(t)$. We first consider the solution of the ϕ_I equation of motion.

In the ϕ_I equation of motion we may roughly absorb the terms proportional to ϕ into the terms proportional to ϕ^2 . Thus we may neglect these terms for now. We will also set the ϕ_R^2 term to zero for now. With these assumptions only the phase ϕ contributes to the imaginary parts of the fields. We will comment on these assumptions later.

Suppose the ϕ_R field starts oscillating at t_0 . (For convenience we will set t_0 equal to 0 throughout). Initially, by a choice of the phase of the scalar fields, we can set the phase ϕ to zero at t_0 . The subsequent evolution of the phase $\phi(t)$ is then found from

$$e^{i\phi(t)} = \frac{(A_s + a_o H e^i)^{1/2}}{M} (1 + a_o e^i)^{-1/2} \quad (3.11);$$

where ϕ is the phase difference between the A_s and $a_o e^i$ terms. Since during matter domination

$$H = \frac{H_0}{(1 + \frac{3}{2}H_0 t)} \quad (3.12)$$

where $H_0 = H(t_0) = m_s$, we see that the phase $\phi(t)$ will reach its maximum roughly during the first ϕ_R oscillation cycle, in a time $t \sim H_0^{-1} \sim m_s^{-1}$. Since the condensates will form during the first few oscillations of ϕ_R , it is a reasonable approximation to set $\phi(t)$ to its constant maximum value throughout. With the above assumptions the ϕ_I equation of motion can be reasonably approximated by

$$m_s^2 \phi_I + \frac{2}{M^2} \phi_R^4 \phi_I = s \phi_R^5 \quad (3.13):$$

From this we see that the minimum of the ϕ_I potential as a function of ϕ_R is given by

$$\phi_I = \frac{s M^2}{2 \left(1 + \frac{m_s^2 M^2}{2 \phi_R^4} \right)} \phi_R \quad (3.14):$$

Thus, noting that, at $H = m_s$, $\frac{m_s^2 M^2}{2 \phi_R^4}$ is small compared with 1, we see that ϕ_I is initially proportional to ϕ_R . This will continue until ϕ_R decreases during its oscillation to the point where $\frac{m_s^2 M^2}{2 \phi_R^4} > 1$.

To understand the evolution of I let $I = \bar{I} + \delta I$. Substituting into the I equation of motion, we find that, for $\frac{m_s^2 M^2}{2R^4} < 1$, δI satisfies

$$\delta \ddot{I} + \frac{3M^2}{2} m_s^2 \delta I = -\frac{2}{M^2} \delta R^4 \quad (3.15):$$

Thus δI will grow from $\delta I = 0$ to a value given by

$$\delta I = \frac{3}{4} \frac{m_s^2 M^4}{R^3} \quad (3.16):$$

We see that the condition $\frac{m_s^2 M^2}{2R^4} < 1$ is equivalent to $\delta I < \bar{I}$. Initially δI has a value

$$\delta I_0 = \frac{3}{4} \frac{(\dot{R}^2 + \dot{m}^2)}{(m^2 + m_s^2)} \frac{m_s}{m + m_s} \quad (3.17):$$

Thus initially $\frac{\delta I_0}{\bar{I}} = \frac{m_s}{m + m_s} \frac{3}{4} \frac{\dot{R}^2 + \dot{m}^2}{m^2 + m_s^2}$, which is small compared with 1 for m large compared with m_s or small compared with 1. During the subsequent R oscillation, we see that, so long as $\frac{m_s^2 M^2}{2R^4} < 1$, δI will be proportional to R^4 . Therefore δI will initially be in phase with R . However, as R decreases, for a period t during the R oscillation δI will become larger than \bar{I} and the approximate equation of motion (3.15) will no longer be valid. During this time the $m_s^2 \delta I$ term in the I equation of motion will dominate and the δI oscillation will continue with frequency

m_s . However, since during this period the effective mass term in the I equation of motion will differ from m_s by a factor of order 1, it will be possible for the δI phase to shift relative to R by approximately $m_s t$. As a result, for a fraction $m_s t$ of the total I oscillation, there will be a phase shift approximately given by $m_s t$. Thus the average phase shift between δI and R over the period of the δI oscillation, which, as discussed in the next section, is relevant for determining the asymmetry, is given by $\phi = (m_s t)^2$. t corresponds to the time during which $\frac{4}{R} < \frac{m_s^2 M^2}{2}$. For

a matter dominated Universe, with $R \propto a(t)^{3/2}$, we find that $\phi = (m_s t)^2 = \frac{m_s}{m + m_s} \frac{1}{H^2} \frac{1}{R^4} \frac{1}{m_s^2} = \frac{m_s}{H^2} \frac{1}{R^4} \frac{1}{m_s^2} m_s$.

We also note that for small compared with 1, $\frac{\delta I}{\bar{I}} = \frac{m_s}{m + m_s} \frac{3}{4} \frac{\dot{R}^2 + \dot{m}^2}{m^2 + m_s^2}$ is small compared to 1, as has been assumed throughout.

These results hold if (i) δI is small compared with \bar{I} and (ii) if the δI^2 term in the I equation of motion can be neglected. The effect of the terms proportional

to ϕ_c will be to effectively multiply the terms proportional to ϕ_c by a factor $(1 + \frac{m_s}{m} \phi_c)$. However, we can still reasonably ignore the $\phi_R \phi_I \phi_R$ term in the ϕ_I equation of motion, even with this factor. The effect of including the $\phi_I^2 \phi_R$ term in the ϕ_I equation of motion (together with the factor from (i)) turns out to be to approximately replace s by s_* , where $s_* = s + \frac{m}{m + m_s} s$. Thus an imaginary part for ϕ_c can also be generated by the phase so long as ϕ_c has a mass term in the superpotential.

We finally consider ϕ_I . With $\phi_I = \bar{\phi}_I + \phi_I$, where

$$\bar{\phi}_I = \frac{(k s + \frac{s}{m})}{(m^2 + m_s^2)} \phi_R^3 \quad (3.18)$$

and

$$k = 1 + \frac{3(A \phi_c + m)}{(m_s^2 + m^2)} m \quad (3.19);$$

the ϕ_I equation of motion can be written approximately as

$$\phi_I + 6 \frac{(k s + \frac{s}{m})}{(m^2 + m_s^2)} \phi_R^2 \phi_I - (m^2 + m_s^2) \phi_I + 3m_s^2 \frac{(k s + \frac{s}{m})}{(m^2 + m_s^2)} \phi_R^3 = 0 \quad (3.20):$$

Thus ϕ_I will increase from zero to an initial oscillation amplitude given by

$$\phi_{I0} = \frac{3m_s^2 (k s + \frac{s}{m})}{(m^2 + m_s^2)^2} \phi_R^3 \quad (3.21)$$

and will subsequently oscillate freely with frequency $(m^2 + m_s^2)^{1/2}$. In general

$\phi_{I0} < \bar{\phi}_{I0}$. It is straightforward to show that ϕ_R and ϕ_I reach their maximum values and begin oscillating in a time $t = (m^2 + m_s^2)^{-1/2} < m_s^{-1}$ and so will become freely oscillating within the first few oscillations of the ϕ_R field.

It is important to emphasize that it is the oscillations of ϕ_R and ϕ_I about the $\bar{\phi}_R$ and $\bar{\phi}_I$ minima which evolve into the Bose condensate as $\bar{\phi}_R$ and $\bar{\phi}_I$ become smaller than ϕ_R and ϕ_I . This occurs once $H < \frac{m_s}{m + m_s} m_s$. We will show in the next section that the average asymmetry over the oscillation period m_s comes purely from ϕ_c and not from ϕ_I .

In summary, the ϕ_R and ϕ_I fields will begin to oscillate at $H = m_s$, with the initial values of the oscillating scalar field amplitudes relevant for the formation of

condensate particle asymmetries given by

$$\rho_R \approx \frac{M^{1=2}}{j \cdot j=2} (m_s^2 + m_s m)^{1=4} \quad (322);$$

$$\rho_I \approx \frac{s \cdot M^2}{2} \approx \rho_R \approx s \frac{m_s}{m + m_s} \approx \rho_R \quad (323);$$

$$\rho_R \approx \frac{3 m_s^2}{m^2 + m_s^2} \approx \rho_R \approx \frac{m_s^2 (m_s^2 + m_s m)^{1=2}}{(m + m_s)^3} \approx \rho_R \quad (324);$$

and

$$\rho_I \approx \frac{(k s + s)}{(m^2 + m_s^2)} \approx \rho_R \approx \frac{s m_s^3 (m_s^2 + m_s m)^{1=2}}{(m_s^2 + m^2)^2} \approx \rho_R \quad (325);$$

where in the final expressions we have set $\tilde{A}_j = \tilde{B}_j = m_s$ in order to show the dependence on m_s and m . However, as noted above and discussed further in the next section, although the scalar begins oscillating at $H = m_s$, for the case where $m > m_s$ the full phase difference ϕ between ρ_R and ρ_I and the associated particle asymmetry will only form once H is smaller than $\frac{m_s}{m + m_s}^{1=4} m_s$.

The approximations used in obtaining these results are good for $m > m_s$. For $m < m_s$ some of the assumptions made are only marginally satisfied or even slightly violated (although not strongly violated). However, we expect that the above results for the initial amplitudes will still be qualitatively correct, giving the correct order of magnitude for the resulting particle asymmetries.

4. Particle and Baryon Asymmetries.

In the limit where we retain only the mass terms in the ψ and $\bar{\psi}$ equations of motion, there is a global $U(1)$ symmetry. This is broken by the B and L violating terms coming from the non-renormalizable terms in the scalar potential, which give rise to a non-zero $U(1)$ charge in the condensate, corresponding to an asymmetry in the number of ψ and $\bar{\psi}$ particles. We first consider the ψ asymmetry. The asymmetry in the number density of ψ particles is given by

$$n_{\psi} = i \left(\psi \frac{d}{dt} \bar{\psi} - \frac{d}{dt} \psi \bar{\psi} \right) = 2(\psi_R \bar{\psi}_L - \psi_L \bar{\psi}_R) \quad (4.1):$$

Note that in the case where ψ_R and ψ_L oscillate with the same frequency, there must be a phase difference between the oscillating ψ_R and ψ_L fields in order to have a non-zero asymmetry. As discussed in the last section, there is a time-dependent phase difference ϕ_p between ψ_R and ψ_L (averaged over the period of oscillation m_s^{-1}), which for the case $\phi_p < 1$ is given by

$$\phi_p = \frac{m_s}{m + m_s} \quad \text{if } 1=2 \quad \frac{m_s}{H} \quad (4.2)$$

and by $\phi_p = 1$ otherwise. We can characterize the ψ particle asymmetry by the asymmetry at $H = m_s$ that would evolve to the correct asymmetry at present,

$$n_{\psi} = 2\phi_p m_{\psi} \quad (4.3);$$

where the value of ϕ_p is determined by the value of H at which the condensate thermalizes or decays.

For the case of the $\bar{\psi}$ asymmetry, since, for $m > m_s$, the $\bar{\psi}_{R;L}$ oscillate with a greater frequency than the $\psi_{R;L}$, substituting $\bar{\psi} = \bar{\psi} + \psi$ into (4.1) shows that the non-zero average asymmetry over the period $H^{-1} > m_s^{-1} > (m^2 + m_s^2)^{-1/2}$ will be that purely due to ψ_R and ψ_L . Thus we find that the number density asymmetry in $\bar{\psi}$ particles is given by

$$n_{\bar{\psi}} = \frac{m_s}{m + m_s} \quad \text{if } 5 \quad \frac{n_{\psi}}{\phi_p} \quad (4.4):$$

The suppression of n relative to n_0 when $m > m_s$ is significant, since in the limit where $m \rightarrow 0$ and $p \rightarrow 1$ we may define an unbroken B-L asymmetry by assigning $B=1$ to ϕ . This is broken by m_s , suppressing n and so preventing any possibility of a cancellation between the B-L asymmetries coming from decay of the ϕ and condensates.

We next compare the asymmetry from the above $\frac{1}{M^3}$ -type model with that expected from the more conventional A-D mechanism based on a single field with a B violating term of the form $\frac{1}{4M^4}$ together with the above form of H corrections to the SUSY breaking terms. In this case the initial values of the ϕ_R and ϕ_I fields are given by

$$\phi_R \simeq \frac{1}{48} \frac{1}{j} \frac{(m_s M)^{1=2}}{j^{1=2}} \quad (4.5);$$

and

$$\phi_I \simeq \frac{4}{m_s^2} \frac{s_R^3}{m_s^2} \quad (4.6);$$

with ϕ_R and ϕ_I subsequently oscillating with a phase difference of the order of 1. Thus in this case we find that

$$n \simeq \frac{s_R M}{j} \frac{1}{j} \quad (4.7);$$

with the asymmetry being fully formed at $H \sim m_s$. Therefore, for the case where the CP violating phases s and s_R and the coupling λ have the same values in both cases, we find that the asymmetry from the $\frac{1}{M^3}$ -type superpotential term is related to that from the $\frac{1}{4M^4}$ term by

$$n \simeq p \frac{m_s}{m + m_s} \frac{1}{j} \frac{1}{j^{1=2}} \quad (4.8);$$

where n_0 is the asymmetry expected from the conventional single field A-D mechanism. Thus we see that, even with $p \rightarrow 1$, for $m > m_s$ there is a suppression of the asymmetry by a factor $\frac{m_s}{m + m_s} \frac{1}{j} \frac{1}{j^{1=2}}$ relative to that expected from the conventional single field A-D mechanism.

The baryon asymmetry from the ϕ condensate is simply the asymmetry n multiplied by a factor for the number of baryons produced per ϕ decay. Since we

have in fact three condensates, corresponding to u^c , d^c and d^{c^0} , each of which carries baryon number $1/3$, we see that $n_B = n$. The baryon asymmetry to entropy ratio after reheating is then found by noting that the ratio of the number asymmetry to the in-aton energy density during in-aton oscillation domination is constant. Since the reheating temperature is given by $T_I = k_T T_R^4$ and the entropy density by $s = k_s T_R^3$ (with $k_T = \frac{2g(T)}{30}$ and $k_s = \frac{2}{45} \frac{2g(T)}{45}$, where $g(T) = g_b(T) + \frac{7}{8}g_f(T)$ and $g_b(T)$ ($g_f(T)$) are the number of bosonic (fermionic) degrees of freedom in thermal equilibrium at temperature T [5]), it follows that the baryon-to-entropy ratio is given by

$$\frac{n_B}{s} = \frac{k_s}{k_T T_R} \frac{n_B}{T_I} \quad (4.9)$$

Thus, with the energy density dominated by in-aton oscillations when the Bose condensate forms at $H = m_s$ and with $n_B = n = \frac{s_p m_s^2 M_{Pl}}{3 j j} \frac{m_s}{m + m_s}^{1=2}$, we find that

$$\frac{n_B}{s} = \frac{8}{3 j j} \frac{s_p}{M_{Pl}} \frac{m_s}{m + m_s} \quad (4.10);$$

where we have used $M = M_{Pl}$ and $\mathcal{A} j = m_s$. Therefore

$$\frac{n_B}{s} = \frac{2}{3 j j} \frac{s_p}{M_{Pl}} \frac{m_s}{m + m_s} \frac{T_R}{M_{Pl}} \quad (4.11):$$

Comparing this with the observed asymmetry, $\frac{n_B}{s} = 10^{-10}$, and noting that the thermal gravitino regeneration constraint implies that $\frac{T_R}{M_{Pl}} < 10^{-9}$ [10], we see that m cannot be too large compared with m_s if $\frac{s_p}{j j}$ is not large compared with 1, as we would expect if the natural scale of the non-renormalizable terms was less than or of the order of M_{Pl} . On the other hand, even if $\frac{s_p}{j j}$ is large compared with 1, the suppression factor $\frac{m_s}{m + m_s}^{1=2}$ would still allow T_R to be consistent with the observed B asymmetry for values of T_R up to the gravitino constraint, so long as m was sufficiently large.

Thus we can conclude that, in the R_p symmetric MSSM extended by the addition of a gauge singlet scalar, it is indeed possible to have a successful $d=4$ two-scalar 3 -type A-D mechanism along the $u^c d^c d^c$ direction. The resulting baryon asymmetry, assuming that the asymmetries are able to fully form and do not thermalize or

decay before the phase $\varphi_p(t)$ has reached its maximum value (we discuss this possibility in the next section), receives an overall suppression by a factor approximately $\frac{m_s}{m + m_s}^{1=2}$ relative to that expected in the case of a conventional $d=4$ -type A-D mechanism based on a single A-D scalar field. This suppression factor allows for a wider range of non-renormalizable couplings and reheating temperatures to be compatible with the observed baryon asymmetry than in the case of the conventional A-D mechanism.

5. No-Evaporation Constraint

An important constraint on the reheating temperature comes from the requirement that the interaction of the condensate scalars with the radiation energy density due to inflation decays prior to reheating does not lead to the condensate thermalizing via scattering with the background plasma before the particle asymmetries can be established [4]. We refer to this as the no-evaporation constraint.

We first consider the ϕ condensate. In general, there are two ways in which the condensate can be destroyed at a given value of H ; thermalization and decay. Thermalization of the condensate will occur if (i) the rate of scattering of the thermal plasma particles from the condensate scalars, Γ_s , is greater than H and (ii) if the mass of the initial and final state particles are such that the scattering process is kinematically allowed and the scattering particles in the plasma are not Boltzmann suppressed. Decay of the condensate via tree level two-body decays will occur if (i) the decay rate of the condensate scalars in their rest frame, Γ_d , is greater than H and (ii) if the final state particles, of mass $m_1 < m_2$, where λ is a gauge or Yukawa coupling and $\langle \phi \rangle$ is the amplitude of the oscillation, are lighter than the condensate scalars. Since the time over which the real and imaginary parts of the fields start rolling and so the asymmetries start to develop is of the order of H^{-1} at $H = m_s$, we must ensure that thermalization and decay does not occur on a time scale small compared with m_s^{-1} .

Prior to reheating, the radiation energy density coming from inflation decays during inflation matter domination corresponds to a background plasma of particles at a temperature T_r , where, assuming that the decay products thermalize, T_r is given by [4, 5]

$$T_r = k_r (M_{\text{Pl}} H T_R^2)^{1/4} \quad (5.1);$$

$$\text{where } k_r = \frac{3}{50} \frac{1}{k_T} \approx 0.4 \text{ (using } g(T) = 100\text{)}.$$

For the case of the ϕ condensate, the particle asymmetry begins to form at $H = m_s$, at which time $p(t) = \frac{m_s}{m_s + m} \frac{1}{H} \frac{m_s^2}{H} = \frac{m_s}{m_s + m} \frac{1}{H}$, and subsequently grows until $p = 1$ at $H = \frac{m_s}{m + m_s} m_s$.

Thermalization of the condensate is possible if the rate of scattering of the plasma particles in equilibrium at temperature T_r from the condensate scalars is sufficiently large. For the case of t-channel scattering of condensate scalars from plasma fermions via SU(3) gauge boson or Yukawa fermion exchange interactions, the scattering rate is given by $\Gamma_s \sim k^4 T_r$, where Γ is the gauge or Yukawa coupling, $\Gamma = \frac{1}{x(1+2x)}$ for the gauge boson exchange and $\Gamma = \frac{1}{4} \log \frac{1}{x}$ for the Yukawa fermion exchange, with $x = \frac{m_A^2}{9T^2}$ and m_A the mass of the exchanged gauge boson or fermion, and where for scattering from a single Dirac fermion $k = \frac{1}{12^{1/3}} \sim 3 \times 10^{-3}$. The condition for the plasma to be able to thermalize the condensate is then that $\Gamma_s > H$, which implies that

$$\Gamma > 5 \times 10^{-2} \frac{H}{m_s} \stackrel{3=16}{=} \frac{10^{10} \text{ GeV}}{T_R} \stackrel{1=8}{=} \frac{1}{12} \stackrel{1=4}{=} \quad (5.2):$$

We see that this will be satisfied by the gauge couplings, the top quark Yukawa coupling and, marginally, the bottom quark Yukawa coupling. Thus, in order to prevent the thermalization of the condensate, we must require that $\Gamma > 3T$ for these couplings, to ensure that the associated scattering processes are kinematically suppressed. To be safe, we will conservatively require that

$\Gamma > 30T$, in order to suppress scattering from plasma particles with energy larger than the mean thermal energy $3T$. For the case of the $u^c d^c d^c$ direction, we note that the smallest Yukawa coupling to the condensate scalar, which will typically involve a linear combination of all three generations of down squark, will equal the b quark Yukawa coupling up to a factor of the order of 1. Thus, in general, kinematically suppressing the b quark Yukawa interaction will ensure that the condensate is not thermalized. Although the b quark Yukawa coupling, $\Gamma_b \sim 4 \times 10^{-2}$ for the MSSM with equal Higgs doublet expectation values, only marginally satisfies the condition for thermalization, and so might allow the condensate to form without large suppression of the asymmetry, if we were to consider t-channel fermion exchange scattering from light gauginos and squarks in the plasma, then the constraint (5.2) would apply to the combination $(g_b)^{1=2}$, where g is a gauge coupling. This would exceed the lower bound (5.2). Thus we will conservatively

assume that the b quark Yukawa interaction must be kinematically suppressed in order to avoid thermalization of the condensate on a time scale small compared with H^{-1} and so to allow the asymmetries to form.

The condition $\langle \chi \rangle > T_R$ corresponds to

$$T_R < \frac{2}{2k_r^2} ((m_b + m_s)M_{Pl})^{1=2} \frac{H}{m_s}^{3=2} \quad (5.3);$$

where during matter domination,

$$\langle \chi \rangle = \frac{a(t)^{1=3=2}}{a_0} R_0 \frac{M^{1=2} (m_s^2 + m_s m)}{1=2} \frac{H}{m_s} \quad (5.4);$$

with a_0 the scale factor at $H = m_s$. Using equation (4.11) together with the observed B asymmetry, $\frac{n_B}{s} = 10^{-10}$, we find that

$$T_R < \frac{10^{-5} M^{3=4} m_s^{1=4}}{2 s_p} \frac{m_b + m_s}{k_r m_s} \frac{H}{m_s}^{3=4} \quad (5.5);$$

Thus, with $k_b = 4 \times 10^2$ for the b quark Yukawa coupling and with $\beta = 30$, we find that the condensate will survive if

$$T_R < \frac{1}{p_{sc}} \frac{m_b + m_s}{m_s}^{3=4} \frac{H}{m_s}^{7=4} 10^7 \text{ GeV} \quad (5.6);$$

where we have used $m_s = 10^2 \text{ GeV}$. The form of this constraint depends on whether we impose the no-evaporation constraint before the asymmetry has fully formed or not. If we consider the constraint to apply at $H = m_s$, when the asymmetry is minimal, then the T_R upper bound is proportional to $\frac{m_b + m_s}{m_s}^{3=4}$. On the other hand, if we allow the asymmetry to grow to its maximum value before thermalization, then the T_R upper bound is proportional to $\frac{m_b + m_s}{m_s}^{5=16}$. In both cases the upper bound on T_R is weakened by having $m_b > m_s$. We see that, with $m_b < m_s$, T_R can take values up to around $\frac{10^7 \text{ GeV}}{p_{sc}}$ without preventing the formation of the asymmetry. With $m_b > m_s$ this constraint becomes weaker, allowing any reheating temperature up to the thermal gravitino limit to be compatible with the no-evaporation constraint, regardless of the value of β , so long as m_b is sufficiently large.

We also have to check that the condensate does not decay before the condensates fully form at $H = \frac{m_s}{m + m_s}^{1/4} m_s$. If $\langle \sigma \rangle > m_s$, then the two-body tree-level decay will be kinematically suppressed. This occurs if

$$\langle \sigma \rangle > \frac{m_s}{M_{Pl}}^{1/2} \quad (5.7);$$

which will almost certainly be satisfied. The higher-order decay modes will then be suppressed by a factor of at least $\frac{m_s}{\langle \sigma \rangle}^4$, which gives $\langle \sigma \rangle > H$ at $H = m_s$. Thus decay is ineffective at $H = m_s$ and the no-evaporation constraint is the correct condition for the initial asymmetry to be able to form.

A second, perhaps less important, constraint on the reheating temperature comes from the requirement that $\frac{n_B}{s} \approx 10^{-10}$ can be consistent with non-renormalizable operators whose natural mass scale is the Planck scale, corresponding to $j < 1$. In fact, from (4.11), we see that, with $\frac{n_B}{s} \approx 10^{-10}$, the reheating temperature is given by

$$T_R = \frac{j}{2} \frac{j}{s_p} \frac{m + m_s}{m_s}^{1/2} 10^9 \text{ GeV} \quad (5.8):$$

(The conventional $d=4$ models give the same result but with $m \rightarrow 0$ and $s_p \rightarrow 1$ [4]). Thus we see that $j < 1$ is necessary in order for T_R to be consistent with the thermal gravitino bound. Although $j < 1$ is possible even if the mass scale of the non-renormalizable operators is small compared with M_{Pl} , it is most natural for the case of Planck scale operators. Thus $d=4$ models are most naturally consistent with the thermal gravitino bound when the mass scale of the non-renormalizable operators corresponds to the Planck mass. For the case of a conventional single field A-D mechanism with $d=6$ operators, the reheating temperature is given by [4]

$$T_R = \frac{j}{s} \frac{j^{1/2}}{s^{1/2}} 10 \text{ GeV} \quad (5.9):$$

Thus in this case the reheating temperature is expected to be very low compared with the thermal gravitino bound for the case of Planck scale non-renormalizable operators, although for non-renormalizable operators with a smaller mass scale, which would naturally have $j > 1$, larger reheating temperatures would be possible.

Therefore we see that $d=4$ models are favoured for the case of Planck scale operators, naturally allowing for a much wider range of reheating temperatures than $d=6$ models, whilst $d=6$ models are favoured if the natural mass scale of the non-renormalizable operators is much smaller than the Planck scale.

6. Condensate Thermalization and Decay after Reheating and an Upper Limit on Dirac Neutrino Masses.

After the inflation decays, the Universe will be radiation dominated with $H = \frac{k_H T^2}{M_{Pl}}$, where $k_H = \frac{4\sqrt{3}g(T)}{45}^{1/2}$. We first show that ϕ will typically thermalize at a temperature large compared with the temperature of the electroweak phase transition $T_{EW} \approx 10^2 \text{ GeV}$. $\phi \rightarrow H$ occurs if $\frac{m_\phi}{m_s} > \frac{k_H}{k}^{1/4} \frac{T}{M_{Pl}}^{1/4} \frac{1}{m_s}^{1/4}$. Since $T_R < 10^{10} \text{ GeV}$, this will be satisfied if $\frac{m_\phi}{m_s} > 5 \times 10^{-2} \frac{1}{m_s}^{1/4}$. Thus so long as the scattering process is not kinematically or Boltzmann suppressed, corresponding to $\frac{\langle \sigma \rangle}{3T}$ smaller than 1, the condensate will thermalize. With, for $T < T_R$,

$$\langle \sigma \rangle > \frac{10^{-2}}{1/2} \frac{T_R^{1/2}}{10^{10} \text{ GeV}} \frac{m_\phi + m_s}{m_s}^{1/4} \frac{T}{m_s}^{3/2} \quad (6.1);$$

where we are using $m_s \approx 10^2 \text{ GeV}$ throughout, $\frac{\langle \sigma \rangle}{T} < 1$ requires that

$$m_\phi < 10^4 \frac{m_s}{m_\phi + m_s}^{1/4} \frac{10^{10} \text{ GeV}}{T_R}^{1/2} \frac{m_s}{T}^{1/2} \quad (6.2):$$

This will typically be satisfied for some value of T larger than T_{EW} .

For the case of the gauge singlet condensate, we first note that since the scalar is R_p odd, it can decay only if it is not the lightest supersymmetric partner (LSP). The most rapid possible decay will correspond to a tree-level two-body decay to a left-handed neutrino and a neutralino via the neutrino Yukawa coupling. This will be kinematically allowed so long as one of the neutralinos has a mass less than the scalar mass. In particular, this will occur if one of the neutralinos is the LSP, as is strongly favoured by the possibility of neutralino cold dark matter. The decay rate will then depend on the proportion of light mass eigenstate neutralino(s) contained in the weak eigenstate fermion in H_u . This will in turn depend on whether the light neutralino in question is mostly gaugino or Higgsino. If it is mostly Higgsino, then the decay will occur via the neutrino Yukawa coupling with coupling strength approximately equal to y_ν . On the other hand, if it is mostly gaugino, then we would expect the coupling of the scalar to the light neutralino to have an additional suppression factor of the order of $\frac{m_W}{m_\phi}$, where ϕ corresponds to the $H_u H_d$ term in

the MSSM superpotential [1]. Typically, for $\sqrt{s} < 1\text{TeV}$, this factor will not be much smaller than about 0.1.

Thus in the case of a mostly Higgsino light neutralino (or, more generally, for the case where the mass term is small compared with the scalar mass), tree-level two-body decay will occur via the neutrino Yukawa coupling if $\sqrt{s} > \frac{1}{4}(m^2 + m_s^2)^{1/2} > H$, where $\frac{1}{4} > \frac{1}{4}$. This is satisfied if

$$\sqrt{s} > \frac{16 k_H}{(m + m_s) M_{Pl}} T^{1/2} \quad (6.3):$$

The decay is kinematically allowed so long as $\sqrt{s} > \sqrt{(m^2 + m_s^2)^{1/2}}$. With, for $T < T_R$,

$$\sqrt{s} > \frac{T_R^2}{m_s M_{Pl}} \frac{m_s^2 (m_s^2 + m^2)^{3/4}}{(m + m_s)^3} \frac{M_{Pl}^{1/2}}{T^{3/2}} \quad (6.4);$$

this condition requires that

$$\sqrt{s} < 10^4 \frac{10^{10} \text{GeV}}{T_R} \frac{(m + m_s)^{1/4}}{m_s} \frac{m_s^{3/2}}{T} \quad (6.5):$$

It is straightforward to show that, in the cases of most interest to us here, the decay of the condensate typically occurs before it can thermalize by scattering. The condition for the condensate to thermalize by scattering via the Yukawa coupling

is that $\sqrt{s} > H = \frac{k_H T^2}{M_{Pl}}$, where $\frac{1}{2} \log \frac{3T}{\sqrt{s}} > 0$. This implies that

$$\sqrt{s} > 5 \times 10^{-4} \frac{T^{1/4}}{m_s} \frac{1}{T^{1/4}} \quad (6.6):$$

This lower bound is typically larger than the lower bound on \sqrt{s} coming from decay. It is possible that thermalization could occur by scattering from light sleptons and SU(2) gauginos in the plasma, which would replace \sqrt{s} by $(g)^{1/2}$, where $g = 0.6$ is the SU(2) gauge coupling. However, the lower bound on \sqrt{s} will still typically be larger than that coming from decay. In particular, this is true for the important case of decay below the temperature of the electroweak phase transition, which we discuss below. Another possibility for thermalizing the condensate is via inverse decays and related $2 \rightarrow 1$ processes, which are expected to have a rate $\Gamma_{inv} \sim T^2$,

where $\lambda \ll 1$. Although at high temperature this rate can be large compared with the decay rate, for temperatures at or below the electroweak phase transition temperature, which are of most interest to us here, the direct decay rate will be much larger than the rate of thermalization via inverse decays. In all this we have assumed that the decay occurs via the neutrino Yukawa coupling. It is also possible that the condensate could decay via the non-renormalizable superpotential coupling $\frac{1}{M} u^c d^c d^c$ once $\langle \phi \rangle$ is introduced, which gives an effective coupling. However, it is straightforward to check that this effective coupling is in general much smaller than the typical values of λ considered in neutrino mass models, and so may be neglected when discussing condensate decay.

Thus we see that the condensate can evade decay until $T < T_{EW}$ if λ is sufficiently small. To see what this implies for the baryon asymmetry and for neutrino masses, we first note that the gauge singlet scalar ϕ will typically correspond to a linear combination of the three right-hand sneutrino generations. Thus ϕ will typically correspond to the largest neutrino Yukawa coupling up to a factor of around $\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$. In the $m \rightarrow 0$ limit, corresponding to the case where the neutrinos have Dirac masses, we can define an unbroken B-L asymmetry by defining ϕ to have $B = 1$. However, so long as the condensate decays after the electroweak phase transition has occurred, the effect of anomalous electroweak B + L violation [6], which is in thermal equilibrium at temperatures larger than T_{EW} , will be to alter only the B asymmetry coming from the thermalized condensate and so prevent a cancellation of the B asymmetry coming from the ϕ and condensate, even though the net B-L asymmetry will be zero. Thus so long as the condensate decays at $T_d < T_{EW}$ in the limit $m \rightarrow 0$, there will still be a B asymmetry. The magnitude of the B asymmetry will be essentially the same as that previously calculated from the decay of the condensate alone, since the magnitude of the net B asymmetry will, up to a factor of the order of 1, equal that of the B-L asymmetry coming from thermalization at $T > T_{EW}$. The coupling λ is related to the heaviest neutrino mass in the $m \rightarrow 0$ limit by $m \approx 10^2 \lambda \text{ GeV}$. From this and (6.3) we find that, for the case of a mostly

Higgsino light neutralino, the condensate decays at a temperature $T_d \sim 10^4$. Thus the condition $T_d < T_{EW}$ implies that all Dirac neutrino masses should satisfy

$$m < 10\text{keV} \quad (6.7);$$

assuming that corresponds to a roughly equal combination of the three sneutrino generations, as we would generally expect. This is true for the case of a light neutralino which is mostly Higgsino, or more generally for the case where the decay via the Yukawa coupling is completely unsuppressed. From this we see that so long as the Dirac neutrino masses are all below about 10keV, the condensate will generally decay below the temperature of the electroweak phase transition and so a baryon asymmetry will be generated even in the limit of B-L conservation. On the other hand, for the case of, for example, a mostly gaugino LSP this upper bound could be increased to around 100keV or more, depending on the particular gaugino LSP mass eigenstate and the parameter. These upper bounds should be compared with the present experimental upper bounds on the neutrino masses, $m < 24\text{MeV}$, $m < 160\text{keV}$ and $m_e < 5.1\text{eV}$ [13]. From these we see that the requirement that a non-zero B asymmetry can be generated in the limit of unbroken B-L in the case where the LSP is a neutralino imposes a non-trivial upper bound on m and m . In particular, we see that it would be possible, in principle, to experimentally rule out this class of Aeck-Dine models, for example if neutrinos with Dirac masses significantly larger than around 10keV were found to exist together with an LSP which was mostly Higgsino. We also note that an unbroken B-L asymmetry would rule out the possibility of the $d=4$ LH_u direction, leaving the $d=4$ $u^c d^c d^c$ direction as the unique $d=4$ possibility in the case of B-L conserving models with non-zero neutrino masses.

For the case with $m \neq 0$, the neutrinos will gain Majorana masses via the see-saw mechanism [14], with $m = \frac{(\frac{100\text{GeV}}{m})^2}{m}$. Thus in this case T_d is given by

$$T_d \sim 10^4 \frac{m}{1\text{eV}}^{1/2} \frac{m}{100\text{GeV}}^{1/2} \frac{m + m_s}{100\text{GeV}}^{1/2} \text{GeV} \quad (6.8):$$

Therefore typically the condensate will decay at $T > T_{EW}$ in this case.

Throughout the above discussion we have assumed that the Universe is radiation dominated. It is straightforward to show that this is indeed the case. The condensate would dominate the energy density only once T satisfies

$$T < \frac{(m_s^2 + m_s m)^{1/2}}{M_{Pl}} T_R \quad (6.9);$$

which is typically satisfied only for temperatures less than around 10^{-7} GeV . For the condensate the energy density is even less than the condensate, by a factor $\frac{m_s}{m + m_s}^3$. Thus the Universe will be radiation dominated when the condensates thermalize or decay.

7. Conclusions

We have considered the possibility of generating the observed baryon asymmetry via an Affleck-Dine mechanism based on the renormalizable F - and D -flat $u^c d^c d^c$ direction of the SUSY Standard Model. In order to avoid breaking R_p whilst allowing a $d=4$ superpotential term to lift the flatness and drive baryogenesis, we considered extensions of the SUSY Standard Model which have additional gauge singlets, such as comm only occur in models which seek to account for neutrino masses. In such models the $u^c d^c d^c$ direction becomes potentially as important as the more comm only considered LH_u direction. We have shown that the Affleck-Dine mechanism based on the $d=4$ operator \mathcal{O}^3 , where \mathcal{O} is a gauge non-singlet Affleck-Dine field, can indeed (for an appropriate choice of parameters) generate the baryon asymmetry whilst allowing the scalar fields to evolve to a phenomenologically acceptable minimum. The resulting asymmetry is suppressed relative to the asymmetry coming from the more conventional \mathcal{O}^4 -based Affleck-Dine mechanism (such as the LH_u direction) by a factor $\frac{m_s}{m + m_s}^{1=2}$, all couplings and CP phases being taken equal, where m is the SUSY mass term and m_s is the soft SUSY breaking mass scale. This suggests that m cannot be much larger than m_s , if the observed baryon asymmetry is to be generated without requiring very small couplings in the non-renormalizable terms. The requirement that the initial condensate particle asymmetry can form before the condensate is thermalized imposes an upper bound on the reheating temperature of $\frac{10^7 \text{ GeV}}{f}$ in the limit where $m < m_s$, where f is the CP violating phase responsible for the baryon asymmetry. The upper bound becomes weaker if $m > m_s$. Thus with a sufficiently large m or small f the whole range of reheating temperatures up to the thermal gravitino constraint can be compatible with the initial formation of an asymmetry. The condensate will typically thermalize before the electroweak phase transition occurs. Then in the limit of unbroken $B-L$ (for which case the $u^c d^c d^c$ direction is the unique $d=4$ possibility), which corresponds to $m \neq 0$, a B asymmetry can be generated only if the condensate decays below the temperature of the electroweak phase transition, when anomalous electroweak $B+L$ violation is

out of thermal equilibrium. This will generally be true if all neutrino masses are less than around 10 keV. In the case where the LSP is a neutralino, or more generally where there is a neutralino mass eigenstate lighter than the scalar, the decay condition imposes a non-trivial upper limit on Dirac neutrino masses. For example, for the case of a mostly Higgsino LSP, the upper bound is around 10 keV, whilst for a mostly gaugino LSP this bound could increase to around 100 keV or more, depending on the parameter of the MSSM and the particular gaugino LSP mass eigenstate. Thus the observation of a Dirac mass for the ν_τ or ν_μ neutrino significantly larger than 10 keV together with a mostly Higgsino LSP, for example, would experimentally rule out this class of A \tilde{e} -D ine models.

The author would like to thank Kari Enqvist for useful comments. This research was supported by the PPARC.

References

- [1] H P Nilles, *Phys.Rep.* 110 (1984) 1
- [2] I A Heck and M Dine, *NuclPhys. B* 249 (1985) 361
- [3] E Copeland, A Liddle, D Lyth, E Stewart and D Wands, *Phys.Rev.D* 49 (1994) 6410,
M Dine, L Randall and S Thomas, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* 75 (1995) 398,
G Dvali, preprint hep-ph/9503259 (1995),
E D Stewart, *Phys.Rev.D* 51 (1995) 6847
- [4] M Dine, L Randall and S Thomas, *NuclPhys. B* 458 (1996) 291
- [5] E W Kolb and M S Turner, *The Early Universe*, (Addison-Wesley, Reading M A (1990))
- [6] V A Kuzm in, V A Rubakov and M E Shaposhnikov, *Phys.Lett.* 155B (1985) 36
- [7] E D Stewart, M Kawasaki and T Yanagida, preprint hep-ph/9603324 (1996)
- [8] The phenomenology of B and L violating coupling in the M SSM was first discussed by F Zwimer, *Phys.Lett.* 135B (1984) 516. For a review of the constraints on R_p violating couplings see F Vissani, preprint hep-ph/9602395
- [9] R K Schaefer and Q Sha , *Phys.Rev.D* 47 (1993) 1333,
A R Liddle, *Phys.Rev.D* 49 (1994) 739
- [10] J Ellis, A Linde and D Nanopoulos, *Phys.Lett.* 118B (1982) 59,
M Yu Khlopov and A Linde, *Phys.Lett.* 138B (1984) 265,
J Ellis, J E Kim and D V Nanopoulos, *Phys.Lett.* 145B (1984) 181
- [11] A D Linde, *Phys.Lett.* 129B (1983) 177
- [12] M K Gaillard, H Murayama and K A Olive, *Phys.Lett.* 355B (1995) 71
- [13] Particle Data Group, *Phys.Rev.D* 50 (1994) 1173

- [14] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, in: *Supergravity*, eds. D. Z. Freedman and P. van Nieuwenhuizen (North-Holland, Amsterdam (1980)).