

Astro 596/496 NPA

Lecture 24

Oct. 19, 2009

Announcements:

- Problem Set 4 due in class Friday

Last time: cosmic matter asymmetry

Q: what's the evidence for a matter (baryon) asymmetry?

Q: what quantifies the baryon/antibaryon excess?

cosmic baryon asymmetry exists

$$Y_B = n_B/s \simeq n_B/7n_\gamma = \eta/7 \sim 10^{-10}$$

at $T \gtrsim \Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \simeq 200 \text{ MeV}$, $q\bar{q}$ pairs abundant,

$n_q \simeq n_{\bar{q}} \sim n_\gamma$, so asymmetry was

$$\frac{n_q - n_{\bar{q}}}{n_q + n_{\bar{q}}} \sim \frac{n_B}{n_\gamma} \sim 6 \times 10^{-10} \quad (1)$$

for every 1,000,000,000 antiquarks

there were 1,000,000,001 quarks

a tiny but crucial excess!

but on theoretical grounds, expect particle creation in pairs

so how did this happen?

A Baryon Symmetric Universe

If start baryon symmetric ($n_B = n_{\bar{B}}$)

what is relic abundance?

⇒ apply freezeout technology

assume nucleons are a **symmetric cold relic**

predict relic abundance after $N\bar{N}$ annihilation freezeout:

$$\langle\sigma v\rangle_{\text{ann}} \sim r_p^2 c \sim 1 \text{ fm}^2 c \sim 10^{-15} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$$

$$\Rightarrow T_f \sim m/40 \sim 20 \text{ MeV}$$

$$Y_{B,\infty} \sim (m/T_f)e^{-m/T_f} \simeq 10^{-19}$$

⇒ if U baryon symmetric, predict $\eta_{\text{sym}} \sim 10^{-18} \ll \eta_{\text{obs}}$

- ω Universe must have been baryon **asymmetric**
how did this arise?

Baryogenesis Ingredients: A. Sakharov (1967)

Assume: initially, $n_B = n_{\bar{B}}$

then Universe generated asymmetry (i.e., asymm is *dynamical*)

Requirements:

1. **Baryon number non-conservation**

not yet observed: e.g., $\tau_p > 10^{33}$ yr (!)

but theoretically expected (GUT theories)

but: B violation *necessary* but not *sufficient*

consider B -violating rxns

Rxn	B change	Rate
$a + b \rightarrow c + d$	ΔB	Γ
$\bar{a} + \bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{c} + \bar{d}$	$-\Delta B$	$\bar{\Gamma}$

↳

net baryon production rate: $\Gamma_{\text{net}} = \Delta B(\Gamma - \bar{\Gamma})$

Q: *which means we need what?*

we need: $\Gamma_{\text{net}} = \Delta B(\Gamma - \bar{\Gamma}) > 0$

- baryon non-conservation gives $\Delta B \neq 0$
- but *also* need $\Gamma > \bar{\Gamma}$
set by particle (discrete) symmetries

Transformations

C = charge conjugation: particle \leftrightarrow antiparticle

P = parity: space inversion $\vec{x} \rightarrow -\vec{x} \Rightarrow \vec{p} \rightarrow -\vec{p}$

Weak interaction: P *maximally* violated:

ν_e measured as *left-handed only*

www: Lee, Yang, Wu

$P\nu_L = \nu_R$ not made via weak int

but $CP\nu_L = C\nu_R = \bar{\nu}_R$ OK

neutrino helicity sketch

if CP conserved:

$$CP(a + b \rightarrow c + d) = \bar{a} + \bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{c} + \bar{d}$$

i.e., identical quantum probabilities,

in particular (anti)baryon number production $\bar{\Gamma} = \Gamma$
generate new antibaryons as fast as baryons! aargh!

→ can't have this symmetry/conservation

2. *CP (and C) Violation*

1964: *CP* violation show for K^0, \bar{K}^0 decays

www: Fitch & Cronin Nobel prize

current precision limits: KTeV Fermilab

2001: " " " " B^0, \bar{B}^0 decays ($B = \bar{b}d$)

www: BaBar, Belle

www: B^0 vs \bar{B}^0 decay asymmetries: matter/antimatter difference!

o

...but *still* not guaranteed B excess!

3. Departure from thermal equilibrium

basic idea: in thermodynamic equilib., reaction details irrelevant

$\mu_B = \mu_{\bar{B}} = 0$ since B violated, and so

$$f_b(p) = \frac{1}{e^{E_b/T} + 1} \quad f_{\bar{b}} = \frac{1}{e^{E_{\bar{b}}/T} + 1} \quad (2)$$

but $E_b(p) = \sqrt{p^2 + m_b^2} = E_{\bar{b}}(p)$ since $m_b = m_{\bar{b}}$
so therm eq. $\Rightarrow f_b = f_{\bar{b}} \Rightarrow n_b = n_{\bar{b}}$

But we know the U leaves eq. sometimes – *freezeouts!*

Baryogenesis models have been constructed
with GUT particle theories

can get $\eta \sim 10^{-10}$: encouraging!

\Rightarrow need more particle physics data to test

✓

Other unfinished business:

Fortune Cookie

Early Universe: Some Highlights

Energy/Temperature T	Event
$\sim m_\mu \sim 100$ MeV	$\mu^+ \mu^-$ abundant
$\sim m_\pi \sim 140$ MeV	π abundant
$\sim \Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \sim 200$ MeV	quark-hadron transition: baryons + mesons \leftrightarrow “plasma” of unbound quarks + gluons
$\sim \text{few} \times M_W, M_Z \sim 300$ GeV	Electroweak transition: EM + weak forces unified
$\sim 10^{15}$ GeV (?)	Grand Unified Theory (GUT) transition: strong + electroweak forces unified Inflation (accelerated expansion, $\Omega \rightarrow 1$) after Inflation: Baryogenesis matter vs antimatter excess created
$\sim 10^{19}$ GeV	Planck epoch: quantum gravity; all forces unified (?)

Interlude

Cosmologist W. Allen

Annie Hall (1977)

STELLAR EVOLUTION AND NUCLEOSYNTHESIS

Stellar Evolution and Nucleosynthesis

Overview

Star structure, evolution, nuke
all determined by:

- mass
- composition
- (binarity)

theory:

inputs: M , composition determine

output: structure and evolution; history of

L, T_{eff}, τ , nucleosynthesis

recall:

τ stellar lifetimes $\tau(M)$ very strongly *inverse* with mass

Q: implications for stellar populations and nucleosynthesis?

Stellar Lifetimes and Nucleosynthesis Roles

mass M	lifetime $\tau(M)$	fate
$\lesssim 0.9M_{\odot}$	$\gtrsim t_0$	“never” die
1 to $\sim 10M_{\odot}$	10 Gyr to 30 Myr	red giant \rightarrow AGB \rightarrow white dwarf + PN
$\gtrsim 10M_{\odot}$	$\lesssim 30$ Myr	supernova

- low-mass stars just “accumulate”
 - \Rightarrow “sinks” for baryons and nucleosynthesis products
- high-mass stars rapidly die:
 - \rightarrow first sources of post-big bang elements
 - \rightarrow many supernova “generations” till today
- different nucleosynthesis roles for different masses