Next Frontiers in the Search for Dark Matter GGI, 10/10/2019

Composite Dynamics in the Early Universe

Luigi Delle Rose

S. De Curtis, LDR, G. Panico, arXiv:1909.07894





Outline

☑ The Standard Model (and beyond) at finite temperature

M The ElectroWeak Phase Transition

I Composite Higgs models at finite temperature

M Gravitational wave spectrum and baryogenesis

The Standard Model at finite temperature



- **M** The SM phase transition is a smooth crossover
- $\mathbf{\overline{M}}$ The EW symmetry is restored at T > T_c
- \bigcirc Different scenario if $m_h \lesssim 70 \text{ GeV}$

The effective potential at finite temperature

$$V_{eff}(\phi, T) = V_0(\phi) + V_1(\phi) + V_1^T(\phi, T) + V_{ring}^T(\phi, T)$$

finite temperature one-loop corrections

$$V_1^T(\phi, T) = \sum_b \frac{n_b T^4}{2\pi^2} J_B\left(\frac{m_b^2(\phi)}{T^2}\right) + \sum_f \frac{n_f T^4}{2\pi^2} J_F\left(\frac{m_f^2(\phi)}{T^2}\right)$$

the thermal integrals $J_{B,F}(y) = \pm \int_0^\infty dx x^2 \log \left[1 \mp e^{-\sqrt{x^2 + y}}\right]$

resummation of daisy diagrams

$$V_{ring}^{T}(\phi, T) = \sum_{b} \frac{n_{b}T}{12\pi} \left[m_{b}^{3}(\phi) - (m_{b}^{2}(\phi) + \Pi_{b}(T))^{3/2} \right]$$

high-temperature expansion

$$J_B(y) = -\frac{\pi^4}{45} + \frac{\pi^2}{12}y - \frac{\pi}{6}y^{3/2} + \dots$$
$$J_F(y) = -\frac{7\pi^4}{360} + \frac{\pi^2}{24}y + \dots$$

New Physics at finite temperature



- $\mathbf{\overline{M}}$ The EW symmetry is restored at T > T_o, below T_o a new (local) minimum appears
- \mathbf{V} At a critical T_c the two minima are degenerate and separated by a barrier (two phases coexist)
- \mathbf{V} The transition starts at the nucleation temperature $T_n < T_c$



A barrier in the effective potential

Tree level effects

 \Box renormalizable terms: *new scalars coupling to the Higgs* $\lambda_{h\eta} h^2 \eta^2$

D non-renormalizable operators: $c |H|^6$

Thermal effects

$$V(h,T) \simeq \frac{1}{2}(-\mu_h^2 + cT^2)h^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}h^2 - ETh^3$$

- *E* gets contributions from all the bosonic dof coupled to the Higgs
- *E* arises from the non-analyticity of $J_B(y)$ at y = 0

typical BSM scenario realising 1st order EWPhT: light stops in the MSSM

\mathbf{V} T = 0 loop effects:

large loop corrections from the Coleman-Weinberg potential can generate $h^4 \log h^2$



New Physics in the Higgs sector

First order phase transitions



Collider - cosmology synergy

Gravitational wave spectrum

observables at future interferometers deviations in the Higgs couplings

> observables at future colliders



First order phase transitions

key parameters

- **Solution** Nucleation probability (per unit time and volume) **P**: $P = T^4 e^{-S_3/T}$
- $\mathbf{\overline{M}}$ Nucleation temperature $\mathbf{T_n}$:

 $\int_{T_n}^{\infty} \frac{dT}{T} V_H^4 P \simeq O(1) \qquad \text{for phase transitions at the EW scale} \\ S_3/T_n \approx 140$

- \mathbf{V} Vacuum expectation value in the broken phase at T_n : $\mathbf{v_n}$
- \square Vacuum energy released in the plasma: $\alpha = \epsilon / \rho_{rad}$
- $\mathbf{\underline{M}}$ Time duration of the phase transition: β/H_n

$$\frac{\beta}{H_n} = T \frac{d}{dT} \frac{S_3}{T} \bigg|_{T_n}$$

 $\mathbf{\overline{M}}$ Bubble wall velocity: $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{w}}$

highly non-trivial: requires hydrodynamics modelling of the bubble wall moving in the plasma

extracted from the solution of the bounce equation

$$\frac{d^2\phi}{dr^2} + \frac{2}{r}\frac{d\phi}{dr} = \nabla V(\phi, T)$$
$$d\phi/dr|_{r=0} = 0 \phi|_{r=\infty} = 0$$

The bounce equation

single-field equation

can be solved with the *overshoot-undershoot method*

classical motion analogy: particle at position ϕ moving in time runder the potential -V and a time-dependent friction term



0.5

 ϕ_1

0.0

1.0

1.5

multi-field equation

0.0

0

2

1.5 trajectory not known: the path is deformed from an initial guess until convergence is reached 1.0 1.2 Φ_2^2 1.0 the bounce is 0.5 0.8 0.6 **ل** recomputed along each path 0.4 0.2 0.0

4

r

6

8

Higgs + singlet effective potential (Z₂ symmetric) in the high-temperature limit $V(h, \eta, T) = \frac{\mu_h^2}{2}h^2 + \frac{\lambda_h}{4}h^4 + \frac{\mu_\eta^2}{2}\eta^2 + \frac{\lambda_\eta}{4}\eta^4 + \frac{\lambda_{h\eta}}{2}h^2\eta^2 + \left(c_h\frac{h^2}{2} + c_\eta\frac{\eta^2}{2}\right)T^2$

thermal masses (count the dof coupled to the scalars) $c_h = \frac{1}{48}(9g^2 + 3g'^2 + 12y_t^2 + 24\lambda_h + 2\lambda_{h\eta}) \qquad c_\eta = \frac{1}{12}(4\lambda_{h\eta} + \lambda_\eta)$

W EW symmetry restored at very high T: $\langle h, \eta \rangle = (0,0)$

two interesting patterns of symmetry breaking (as the Universe cools down)

- 1. (0,0) -> (v,0) 1-step PhT
- 2. $(0,0) \rightarrow (0,w) \rightarrow (v,0)$ 2-step PhT

2-step more natural as, typically, $c_{\eta} < c_{h}$ and the singlet is destabilised before the Higgs



phenomenology

Higgs + singlet (with Z_2 symmetry and $m_\eta > m_h/2$) poorly constrained

 $\mathbf{M} m_{\eta} < m_h/2$ excluded by the invisible Higgs decay

 \checkmark direct searches very challenging: need for a 100TeV collider. interesting channel: qq -> qq $\eta\eta$ (VBF)

 \mathbf{v} indirect searches:

modification to the triple Higgs coupling



- corrections to the Zh cross section at lepton colliders
- ☑ dark matter direct detection
 - the singlet can be a DM candidate
 - constraints are very model dependent. the cosmological history depends on the hidden sector



Curtin, Meade, Yu, 2015



In the Z₂ symmetric model, the singlet scalar cannot account for all the DM without any new dark sector

Beniwal et al., 2017

EWPhT in Composite Higgs models

the basic idea: Higgs as Goldstone boson of G/H of a strong sector

PhTs in Composite Higgs models



* phase transition G -> H in the strongly coupled sector

* EW phase transition

multiple peaks in the GW spectrum?

Basic rules for Composite Higgs models



- ☑ a global symmetry G above f (~ TeV) is spontaneously broken down to a subgroup H
- ☑ the structure of the Higgs sector is determined by the coset G/H
- **M** H should contain the custodial group
- ☑ the number of NGBs (dim G dim H) must be larger than (or at least equal to) 4
- the symmetry G must be explicitly broken to generate the mass for the (otherwise massless)
 NGBs



we borrow the idea from QCD where we observe that the (pseudo) scalars are the lightest states

0

π

~ GeV

~ 100 MeV

the Higgs could be a kind of pion arising from a new strong sector





Symmetry structure of the strong sector

G	Н	N_G	NGBs rep. $[H] = \operatorname{rep.}[\operatorname{SU}(2) \times \operatorname{SU}(2)]$
SO(5)	SO(4)	4	${\bf 4}=({\bf 2},{\bf 2})$
SO(6)	$\mathrm{SO}(5)$	5	${f 5}=({f 1},{f 1})+({f 2},{f 2})$
SO(6)	$SO(4) \times SO(2)$	8	$\mathbf{4_{+2}} + \mathbf{\bar{4}_{-2}} = 2 \times (2, 2)$
$\mathrm{SO}(7)$	SO(6)	6	${f 6}=2 imes ({f 1},{f 1})+({f 2},{f 2})$
$\mathrm{SO}(7)$	G_2	7	${f 7}=({f 1},{f 3})+({f 2},{f 2})$
$\mathrm{SO}(7)$	$SO(5) \times SO(2)$	10	${f 10_0}=({f 3},{f 1})+({f 1},{f 3})+({f 2},{f 2})$
$\mathrm{SO}(7)$	$[SO(3)]^3$	12	(2 , 2 , 3)=3 imes(2 , 2)
$\operatorname{Sp}(6)$	$\operatorname{Sp}(4) \times \operatorname{SU}(2)$	8	$(4, 2) = 2 \times (2, 2), (2, 2) + 2 \times (2, 1)$
SU(5)	$SU(4) \times U(1)$	8	${f 4}_{-5}+{f ar 4}_{+{f 5}}=2 imes ({f 2},{f 2})$
SU(5)	$\mathrm{SO}(5)$	14	${f 14}=({f 3},{f 3})+({f 2},{f 2})+({f 1},{f 1})$

Mrazek et al., 2011

Symmetry structure of the strong sector

Minimal scenario: SO(5)/SO(4)

one Higgs doublet



Symmetry structure of the strong sector

Next to minimal scenario: SO(6)/SO(5)

one Higgs doublet + a scalar singlet

\overline{G}	H	N_G	NGBs rep. $[H] = $ rep. $[SU(2) \times SU(2)]$
SO(5)	SO(4)	4	$oldsymbol{4}=(oldsymbol{2},oldsymbol{2})$
SO(6)	SO(5)	5	${f 5}=({f 1},{f 1})+({f 2},{f 2})$
SO(6)	$SO(4) \times SO(2)$	8	${f 4_{+2}}+{f ar 4_{-2}}=2 imes ({f 2},{f 2})$
$\mathrm{SO}(7)$	SO(6)	6	${f 6}=2 imes ({f 1},{f 1})+({f 2},{f 2})$
$\mathrm{SO}(7)$	G_2	7	${f 7}=({f 1},{f 3})+({f 2},{f 2})$
$\mathrm{SO}(7)$	$SO(5) \times SO(2)$	10	${f 10_0}=({f 3},{f 1})+({f 1},{f 3})+({f 2},{f 2})$
$\mathrm{SO}(7)$	$[SO(3)]^{3}$	12	$({f 2},{f 2},{f 3})=3 imes({f 2},{f 2})$
$\operatorname{Sp}(6)$	$\operatorname{Sp}(4) \times \operatorname{SU}(2)$	8	$(4, 2) = 2 \times (2, 2), (2, 2) + 2 \times (2, 1)$
$\mathrm{SU}(5)$	$SU(4) \times U(1)$	8	$4_{-5} + \mathbf{\bar{4}}_{+5} = 2 \times (2, 2)$
SU(5)	$\mathrm{SO}(5)$	14	${f 14}=({f 3},{f 3})+({f 2},{f 2})+({f 1},{f 1})$

the scalar potential

$$V(h,\eta) = \frac{\mu_h^2}{2}h^2 + \frac{\lambda_h}{4}h^4 + \frac{\mu_\eta^2}{2}\eta^2 + \frac{\lambda_\eta}{4}\eta^4 + \frac{\lambda_{h\eta}}{2}h^2\eta^2$$

Partial compositeness

linear interactions between composite and elementary operators

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} = g J_{\mu} W^{\mu}$$
$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} = y_L q_L \mathcal{O}_L + y_R t_R \mathcal{O}_R$$



in the IR $-\mathcal{L} = m^* \overline{T} T + y f \overline{t} T$ \longrightarrow partial compositeness

SO(6) representation decompositions under $SU(2)_L \otimes SU(2)_R \otimes U(1)_n$

$$egin{array}{rll} 4&=&(2,1)_{+1}\oplus(1,2)_{-1}\;,\ 6&=&(2,2)_0\oplus(1,1)_{+2}\oplus(1,1)_{-2}\;,\ 10&=&(2,2)_0\oplus(3,1)_{+2}\oplus(1,3)_{-2}\;,\ 15&=&(1,3)_0\oplus(3,1)_0\oplus(1,1)_0\oplus(2,2)_{+2}\oplus(2,2)_{-2}\;,\ 20'&=&(3,3)_0\oplus(2,2)_{+2}\oplus(2,2)_{-2}\oplus(1,1)_{+4}\oplus(1,1)_{-4}\oplus(1,1)_0\;. \end{array}$$

Classification of representations

 $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{4} - \text{not suitable for the top quark: large } Zb_L b_L \text{ coupling}$

 $\mathbf{V} \mathbf{10}$ – no potential for the scalar singlet η

 \mathbf{V} 6, 15, 20' – viable representations for the top quark

 \mathbf{M} (*q*_L, *t*_R) ~ (**6**, **6**)

typically predicts $\lambda_{\eta} \simeq 0$, $\lambda_{h\eta} \simeq \lambda_h/2$ unless we consider:

- large tuning in bottom quark and gauge sectors
- * elementary-composite mixings λ_{qL} , λ_{tR} , up to the fourth power

 \mathbf{M} (*q*_L, *t*_R) ~ (**15**, **6**)

less-tuned scenario: no need to rely on bottom and gauge but λ_ψ still at the fourth power

 \mathbf{M} (q_L, t_R) ~ (**6**, **20'**)

large parameter space available without large tuning

angles $\theta_{q_{15}}$ and θ_{u_6} . Once the Higgs mass is tuned, a cancellation in the representation of the present of the present of the transmission of the transm

 \mathbf{H}

Classification of representations

 $0.0 \gtrsim v_{q_{15}} \gtrsim 1.11$ nou cancellations are present, it is then easy interaction can not surparate this. to satis Sin Bott Ip, howe conditions in eq. (9), through a positive In this set-up, range of $\theta_{g_{15}}$ values interaction carried surpass the Higgs quartic co orte of th the As a consequence finds that for both account the restricted range of $\theta_{a_{15}}$ invariants $\Delta \lambda_{h\eta} < \Delta \lambda_{h\eta}$ As a consequence one also gets $m_{\eta} < m_{h/\sqrt{2}}$. In the light-partner case, additional to the Higgs mass from the $\mathcal{O}_{q_L u_R}^{(4)}$ operator, interaction are quarter only mildly suppressed with interaction are only mildly suppress on with vieble Higgsher as a taget ber these freasons a viable Higgs mass geogetinge with a uso of the Ewiperday for a larger range of values as intel evalued or gthing portal interaction iso maxing al value for the pother in the single tis paleways lighter than the AH Athat the singlet is always ighter ithenathio Hisgsbrained when the maxima pqrtaPinteraction is obtained when the dominant of the transformation to a set of the transformation to a set of the transformation of the transformatioinvariant and $\theta_{q_{15}} \simeq \pi/2$, in which marcising differently from the previou Summarising different Softon, the here is a case deit bild he constiguted SQ(6), (6), (15, 6) model viable contractions with a Two-staning Weht at the price of some tuning set for leading contribution to the potential comin sector can be enough to obtain a sufficiently larger value for the portal of sizeable contributions from the bottom of the gauge) sectors are not strie $m_{\eta} [\text{GeV}]$

4.1.3 Fermions in the (20') representation

____ The last case we consider is the one with top

Properties of the EWPhT



 v_n/T_n : strength of the PhT a crucial parameter for EWBG

Properties of the EWPhT





Nucleation and critical temperatures

Inverse time duration of the phase transition



Gravitational waves

1st order phase transitions are sources of a stochastic background of GW:

- bubble collision
- sound waves in the plasma
- turbulence in the plasma

$$f_{\text{peak}} = f_* \frac{a_*}{a_0} \sim 10^{-3} \,\text{mHz}\left(\frac{f_*}{\beta}\right) \left(\frac{\beta}{H_*}\right) \left(\frac{T_*}{100 \,\text{GeV}}\right) \left(\frac{g_*}{100}\right)^{1/6} \qquad f_*/\beta \equiv (f_*/\beta)(v_w)$$
$$\beta/H_* \simeq \mathcal{O}(10^2) - \mathcal{O}(10^3)$$



peak frequencies within the sensitivity reach of future experiments for a significant part of the parameter space

GW spectra with non trivial structure

bubble velocity v_w taken from Dorsch, Huber, Konstandin, No, 2017

EW Baryogenesis

 \mathbf{V} explain matter - antimatter asymmetry $\eta = \frac{n_B - n_{\bar{B}}}{n_{\gamma}} \simeq 6 \times 10^{-10}$

☑ baryogenesis at the EW scale is testable (by definition)



CP violation from the scalar singlet

an additional source of CPV is present in CHMs due to the non-linear dynamics of the GBs: dim-5 operator can have a complex coefficient

$$\mathcal{O}_t = y_t \left(1 + i\frac{b}{f}\eta\right) \frac{h}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{t}_L t_R + \text{h.c.}$$

A phase in the quark mass is generated. The phase becomes physical during the EW phase transition at T \neq 0, when η changes its vev this is realised in the two-step phase transition $(0,0) \rightarrow (0,w) \rightarrow (v, 0)$

details depend on the fermion embeddings, for instance in the $(q_L, t_R) \sim (\mathbf{6}, \mathbf{6})$ case

$$\frac{y_t}{\sqrt{2}}h\,\bar{t}\left(\cos\theta\sqrt{1-\frac{h^2}{f^2}-\frac{\eta^2}{f^2}}+i\sin\theta\frac{\eta}{f}\gamma^5\right)t$$

a phase in the top mass is generated only when η gets a vev

E





е

n be ends on the elocity

ed to

EWBG

e the

and

caution: if Z_2 is broken (w \neq 0) at T = 0 constrains on the EDM can challenge EWBG

Some future developments

Next to minimal scenario: SO(6)/SO(4)xSO(2) 2 Higgs doublets

G	Н	N_G	NGBs rep. $[H]$ = rep. $[SU(2) \times SU(2)]$
$\mathrm{SO}(5)$	SO(4)	4	${\bf 4}=({\bf 2},{\bf 2})$
SO(6)	SO(5)	5	${f 5}=({f 1},{f 1})+({f 2},{f 2})$
SO(6)	$SO(4) \times SO(2)$	8	$4_{+2} + \bar{4}_{-2} = 2 \times (2, 2)$
$\mathrm{SO}(7)$	SO(6)	6	${f 6}=2 imes ({f 1},{f 1})+({f 2},{f 2})$
$\mathrm{SO}(7)$	G_2	7	${f 7}=({f 1},{f 3})+({f 2},{f 2})$
$\mathrm{SO}(7)$	$SO(5) \times SO(2)$	10	${f 10_0}=({f 3},{f 1})+({f 1},{f 3})+({f 2},{f 2})$
$\mathrm{SO}(7)$	$[SO(3)]^3$	12	$({f 2},{f 2},{f 3})=3 imes({f 2},{f 2})$
$\operatorname{Sp}(6)$	$\operatorname{Sp}(4) \times \operatorname{SU}(2)$	8	$(4, 2) = 2 \times (2, 2), (2, 2) + 2 \times (2, 1)$
$\mathrm{SU}(5)$	$SU(4) \times U(1)$	8	${f 4}_{-5}+{f ar 4}_{+{f 5}}=2 imes ({f 2},{f 2})$
$\mathrm{SU}(5)$	$\mathrm{SO}(5)$	14	${f 14}=({f 3},{f 3})+({f 2},{f 2})+({f 1},{f 1})$

Composite 2HDM

Custodial symmetry

The predicted leading order correction to the T parameter arises from the non-linearity of the GB Lagrangian. In the SO(6)/SO(4)xSO(2) model is

$$\hat{T} \propto 16 \times \frac{v^2}{f^2} \times \frac{\mathrm{Im}[\langle H_1 \rangle^{\dagger} \langle H_2 \rangle]^2}{(|\langle H_1 \rangle|^2 + |\langle H_2 \rangle|^2)^2}$$

no freedom in the coefficient, fixed by the coset



inert C2HDM

(not considered here)

• C₂: $(H_1 \rightarrow H_1, H_2 \rightarrow -H_2)$ which forbids H₂ to acquire a vev

Higgs-mediated FCNCs

FCNCs can be removed by

1. assuming C₂ in the strong sector and in the mixings

 $Y_1^{IJ} \propto Y_2^{IJ}$ 2. requiring (flavour) alignment in the Yukawa couplings

 $Y_{u}^{ij}Q^{i}u^{j}(a_{1u}H_{1} + a_{2u}H_{2}) + Y_{d}^{ij}Q^{i}d^{j}(a_{1d}H_{1} + a_{2d}H_{2}) + Y_{e}^{ij}L^{i}e^{j}(a_{1e}H_{1} + a_{2e}H_{2}) + h.c.$ the ratio a_1/a_2 is predicted by the strong dynamics

C2HDM - the scalar potential



the potential up to the fourth order in the Higgs fields: $V = m_1^2 H_1^{\dagger} H_1 + m_2^2 H_2^{\dagger} H_2 - \left[m_3^2 H_1^{\dagger} H_2 + \text{h.c.} \right] \\
+ \frac{\lambda_1}{2} (H_1^{\dagger} H_1)^2 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} (H_2^{\dagger} H_2)^2 + \lambda_3 (H_1^{\dagger} H_1) (H_2^{\dagger} H_2) + \lambda_4 (H_1^{\dagger} H_2) (H_2^{\dagger} H_1) \\
+ \frac{\lambda_5}{2} (H_1^{\dagger} H_2)^2 + \lambda_6 (H_1^{\dagger} H_1) (H_1^{\dagger} H_2) + \lambda_7 (H_2^{\dagger} H_2) (H_1^{\dagger} H_2) + \text{h.c.}$

the entire effective potential is fixed by the parameters of the strong sector and the scalar spectrum is entirely predicted by the strong dynamics

C₂ breaking in the strong sector induces:

$$m_3^2 \neq 0, \lambda_6 \neq 0, \lambda_7 \neq 0$$
$$\lambda_6 = \lambda_7 = \frac{5}{3} \frac{m_3^2}{f^2}$$

it is not possible to realise a 2HDM-like scenario with a softly broken Z_2

very strong correlations among several parameters



Conclusions

Higgs as a pseudo Nambu-Goldstone Boson is a compelling possibility for stabilising the EW scale

Non-minimal CHMs can link the dynamics of a strong first order
 EWPhT to the structure of GW spectrum and the possibility to realise
 EW Baryogenesis

Future collider and space-based gravitational interferometry
 experiments can provide complementary ways to test the Higgs sector