Leptonic CP violation and the matter/antimatter asymmetry of the Universe

26 May 2014 2nd ESSnuSB 2014 Open Meeting CERN

Silvia Pascoli IPPP – Durham University











stablished by the European Commission

Outline

I. The facts: neutrino masses and the baryon asymmetry

2. Baryogenesis and Leptogenesis

3. Leptogenesis in BSM models of neutrino masses

4. Is there a connection between low energy CPV and leptogenesis?

3. Conclusions

The facts

I. Neutrino oscillations imply that **neutrinos have mass and mix (CPV?)!** This requires new physics BSM which might be lepton number violating.

| | Free Fluxes + RSBL | | Huber Fluxes, no RSBL | |
|--|--|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| | bfp $\pm 1\sigma$ | 3σ range | bfp $\pm 1\sigma$ | 3σ range |
| $\sin^2 \theta_{12}$ | $0.302\substack{+0.013\\-0.012}$ | $0.267 \rightarrow 0.344$ | $0.311\substack{+0.013\\-0.013}$ | $0.273 \rightarrow 0.354$ |
| $	heta_{12}/^{\circ}$ | $33.36^{+0.81}_{-0.78}$ | $31.09 \rightarrow 35.89$ | $33.87^{+0.82}_{-0.80}$ | $31.52 \rightarrow 36.49$ |
| $\sin^2 	heta_{23}$ | $0.413^{+0.037}_{-0.025} \oplus 0.594^{+0.021}_{-0.022}$ | $0.342 \rightarrow 0.667$ | $0.416^{+0.036}_{-0.029} \oplus 0.600^{+0.019}_{-0.026}$ | $0.341 \rightarrow 0.670$ |
| $	heta_{23}/^{\circ}$ | $40.0^{+2.1}_{-1.5} \oplus 50.4^{+1.3}_{-1.3}$ | $35.8 \rightarrow 54.8$ | $40.1^{+2.1}_{-1.6} \oplus 50.7^{+1.2}_{-1.5}$ | $35.7 \rightarrow 55.0$ |
| $\sin^2 	heta_{13}$ | $0.0227\substack{+0.0023\\-0.0024}$ | $0.0156 \rightarrow 0.0299$ | $0.0255\substack{+0.0024\\-0.0024}$ | $0.0181 \rightarrow 0.0327$ |
| $	heta_{13}/^{\circ}$ | $8.66\substack{+0.44\\-0.46}$ | $7.19 \rightarrow 9.96$ | $9.20\substack{+0.41 \\ -0.45}$ | $7.73 \rightarrow 10.42$ |
| $\delta_{ m CP})^{\circ}$ | 300^{+66}_{-138} | $0 \rightarrow 360$ | 298^{+59}_{-145} | $0 \rightarrow 360$ |
| $\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{10^{-5} \ \mathrm{eV}^2}$ | $7.50_{-0.19}^{+0.18}$ | 7.00 ightarrow 8.09 | $7.51^{+0.21}_{-0.15}$ | $7.04 \rightarrow 8.12$ |
| $\frac{\Delta m_{31}^2}{10^{-3} \ {\rm eV}^2} \ ({\rm N})$ | $+2.473^{+0.070}_{-0.067}$ | $+2.276 \rightarrow +2.695$ | $+2.489^{+0.055}_{-0.051}$ | $+2.294 \rightarrow +2.715$ |
| $\frac{\Delta m_{32}^2}{10^{-3} \ {\rm eV}^2} \ {\rm (I)}$ | $-2.427^{+0.042}_{-0.065}$ | $-2.649 \rightarrow -2.242$ | $-2.468^{+0.073}_{-0.065}$ | $-2.678 \rightarrow -2.252$ |

2 other CPV Majorana phases.

M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia et al., 1209.3023

The facts

2. There is evidence of the baryon asymmetry:

In the Early Universe



As the temperature drops, only quarks are left:

$$\eta_B \equiv \frac{n_B - n_{\bar{B}}}{n_{\gamma}} = (6.14 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-10}$$
Planck, I 303.5076

Is there a link between light neutrino physics and the baryon asymmetry?

In order to generate dynamically a baryon asymmetry, the Sakharov's conditions need to be satisfied:

- B (or L) violation;
- C, CP violation;
- departure from thermal equilibrium.

In order to generate dynamically a baryon asymmetry, the Sakharov's conditions need to be satisfied:

- B (or L) violation;

If neutrinos are Majorana particles, L is violated. Conversely, Majorana masses require L violation.

See-saw models require L violation (typically the Majorana mass of a heavy right-handed neutrino). They can be embedded in GUT or at the TeV scale or below.

In the SM also L is violated at the non-perturbative level. A lepton asymmetry is partially converted into a baryon asymmetry for T>100 GeV by sphaleron effects.

In order to generate dynamically a baryon asymmetry, the Sakharov's conditions need to be satisfied:

- C, CP violation;

If C were conserved: $\Gamma(X^c \to Y^c + B^c) = \Gamma(X \to Y + B)$ and no baryon asymmetry generated:

$$\frac{dB}{dt} \propto \Gamma(X^c \to Y^c + B^c) - \Gamma(X \to Y + B)$$

We have observed CPV in quark sector (too small) and we can search for it in the leptonic sector.

In order to generate dynamically a baryon asymmetry, the Sakharov's conditions need to be satisfied:

- out of equilibrium

In equilibrium

$\Gamma(X \to Y + B) = \Gamma(Y + B \to X)$

A generated baryon asymmetry is cancelled exactly by the antibaryon asymmetry. When particles get out of equilibrium, this does not happen.

$$T < M_X$$

A successful model of baryogenesis:

Leptogenesis in models at the origin of neutrino masses

A successful model of baryogenesis:

Leptogenesis in models at the origin of neutrino masses Provides a source of L violation

Neutrino masses BSM

In the SM, neutrinos do not acquire mass and mixing:



11

 $M\nu_L^T C\nu_L$

Majorana mass

Dirac Masses: $\mathcal{L} = -y_{\nu}\bar{L}\cdot\tilde{H}\nu_{R} + h.c.$ $y_{\nu} \sim \frac{\sqrt{2m_{\nu}}}{m_{\mu}} \sim \frac{0.2 \text{ eV}}{200 \text{ GeV}} \sim 10^{-12}$ Lepton number violation! Majorana Masses: $-\mathcal{L} = \lambda \frac{\nu_L H \nu_L H}{M} = \frac{\lambda v^2}{M} \nu_L^T C \nu_L$ A D=5 Majorana mass can arise as the low energy realisation of a higher energy theory (new mass scale!).



 $\mathcal{L} \propto G_F(\bar{e}_L \gamma_\mu \nu_L)(\bar{\nu}_L \gamma^\mu e_L)$



Neutrino mass

 $-\mathcal{L} = \lambda \frac{\nu_L H \,\nu_L H}{M} = \frac{\lambda v^2}{M} \nu_L^T C \nu_L$





 $\mathcal{L} \propto G_F(\bar{e}_L \gamma_\mu \nu_L)(\bar{\nu}_L \gamma^\mu e_L)$



Neutrino mass

 $-\mathcal{L} = \lambda \frac{\nu_L H \,\nu_L H}{M} = \frac{\lambda v^2}{M} \nu_L^T C \nu_L$



Fermion singlet N VL

> Minkowski, Yanagida, Glashow, Gell-Mann, Ramond, Slansky, Mohapatra, Senjanovic

The simplest see saw mechanism: type I



Introduce a right
 handed neutrino N
 Couple it to the Higgs
 and left handed neutrinos

 $\mathcal{L} = -Y_{\nu}\bar{N}L \cdot H - 1/2\bar{N}^{c}M_{R}N$

When the Higgs gets a vev:

 $\mathcal{L} = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_L^T & N^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & Y_\nu v \\ Y_\nu^T v & M \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_L \\ N \end{pmatrix}$ $m_\nu = U^* m_i U^\dagger = -Y_\nu^T M_R^{-1} Y_\nu v^2 \sim \frac{1 \,\mathrm{GeV}^2}{10^{10} \,\mathrm{GeV}} \sim 0.1 \,\mathrm{eV}$

The light neutrino acquires a tiny mass!

Leptogenesis

At T>M, the right-handed neutrinos N are in equilibrium thanks to processes which produce and destroy them:

 $N \leftrightarrow \ell H$

When T<M, N drops out of equilibrium

 $N \to \ell H$

A lepton asymmetry can be generated if



 $\Gamma(N \to \ell H) \neq \Gamma(N \to \ell^c H^c)$

Sphalerons convert it into a baryon asymmetry.

Fukugita, Yanagida, PLB 174; Covi, Roulet, Vissani; Buchmuller, Plumacher; Abada et al., ...

In order to compute the baryon asymmetry:

I. evaluate the CP-asymmetry

$$\epsilon \equiv \frac{\Gamma(N \to \ell H) - \Gamma(N^c \to \ell^c H^c)}{\Gamma(N \to \ell H) + \Gamma(N^c \to \ell^c H^c)}$$

2. solve the Boltzmann equations to take into account the wash-out of the asymmetry

$$\eta_L = \tilde{k}\epsilon$$

3. convert the lepton asymmetry into the baryon one

$$\eta_B = \frac{\tilde{k}}{g^*} c_s \epsilon \sim 10^{-3} - 10^{-4} \epsilon$$

For $T < 10^{12}$ GeV, flavour effects are important.

Is there a connection between low energy CPV and the baryon asymmetry?

The general picture

 ϵ depends on the CPV phases in Y_{ν} $\epsilon \propto \sum_{j} \Im(Y_{\nu}Y_{\nu}^{\dagger})_{1j}^{2} \frac{M_{j}}{M_{1}}$

and in the U mixing matrix via the see-saw formula.

$$m_{\nu} = U^* m_i U^{\dagger} = -Y_{\nu}^T M_R^{-1} Y_{\nu} v^2$$

Let's consider see-saw type I with 3 NRs.

| High energy | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|--------|--|--|--|
| M_R Y_{ν} | $\frac{3}{9}$ | 0 6 | | | |

Low energy m_i 30U33

3 phases missing!

Specific flavour models

In understanding the origin of the flavour structure, the see-saw models have a reduced number of parameters.

It may be possible to predict the baryon asymmetry from the Dirac and Majorana phases.



Does observing low energy CPV imply a baryon asymmetry?

It has been shown that, thanks to flavour effects, the low energy phases enter directly the baryon asymmetry.

In see-saw type I with flavour effects, if we observe CPV, can we conclude that a lepton asymmetry was generated? And that this could be as large as what observed?

 $\rightarrow \delta, \alpha_{31}, \alpha_{32}$ 6 CPV phases 3 phases at high energy, not observable

$$\epsilon_{1} = -\frac{3M_{1}}{16\pi v^{2}} \frac{\operatorname{Im}\left(\sum_{\rho} m_{\rho}^{2} R_{1\rho}^{2}\right)}{\sum_{\beta} m_{\beta} \left|R_{1\beta}\right|^{2}}$$
No flavour effects

20

$$\epsilon_{\alpha} = -\frac{3M_1}{16\pi v^2} \frac{\operatorname{Im}\left(\sum_{\beta\rho} m_{\beta}^{1/2} m_{\beta}^{2/2} U_{\alpha\beta}^* U_{\alpha\rho} R_{1\beta} R_{1\rho}\right)}{\sum_{\beta} m_{\beta} |R_{1\beta}|^2}$$

With flavour effects, mi<5 io^{11} GeV

The CP-asymmetry can depends only on the low energy CPV phases:

in the NH spectrum (mI << m2 << m3), with MI << M2 << M3 and MI <5 10^11 GeV,



Large theta 13 implies that delta can give an even dominant contribution to the baryon asymmetry. Large CPV and NH are needed. For IH or QD spectrum, the CP-asymmetry is suppressed. A more detailed numerical study is ongoing.

21

Conclusions

- Leptogenesis requires
- L violation (nu-less double beta decay, colliders...)
- C/CPV (LBL and nu-less double beta decay (?))
- out-of-equilibrium (expansion of the Universe)
- In presence of flavour effects (see-saw type I, M< 10¹² GeV), low energy phases enter directly in leptogenesis.

The observation of L violation and of CPV in the lepton sector would be a strong indication (even if not a proof) of leptogenesis as the origin of the baryon asymmetry. The CP-asymmetry in one-flavour approximation

For high T > 10^{12} GeV, charged lepton Yukawa interactions are out-of-equilibrium and flavours are indistinguishable. Only the total decay asymmetry is relevant.

 ϵ depends on the CPV phases in

$$\epsilon \propto \sum_{j} \Im(Y_{\nu}Y_{\nu}^{\dagger})_{1j}^{2} \frac{M_{j}}{M_{1}}$$

and therefore in the U mixing matrix (but not directly) via the see-saw formula.

$$m_{\nu} = U^* m_i U^{\dagger} = -Y_{\nu}^T M_R^{-1} Y_{\nu} v^2$$

Taking flavour into account

The different charged lepton enter in equilibrium when

$\Gamma \sim H$

for taus: $T \sim 10^{12}$ GeV for muons: $T \sim 10^{9}$ GeV.

In this case, each lepton asymmetry needs to be evaluated separately:

$$\epsilon_{\ell} \propto \frac{1}{(Y_{\nu}Y_{\nu}^{\dagger})_{11}} \sum_{j} \Im(Y_{1\ell}(Y_{\nu}Y_{\nu}^{\dagger})_{1j}Y_{j\ell}^{*}) \frac{M_{1}}{M_{j}}$$

and then summed.