

Probing the first order electroweak phase transition by measuring gravitational waves in scalar extension models

Toshinori Matsui

KIAS



Collaborators: Katsuya Hashino¹, Mitsuru Kakizaki¹, Shinya Kanemura¹, Pyungwon Ko²

¹University of TOYAMA, ²KIAS

M.Kakizaki, S.Kanemura, T.Matsui, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 11, 115007 (2015),
K.Hashino, M.Kakizaki, S.Kanemura, T.Matsui, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 1, 015005 (2016),
K.Hashino, M.Kakizaki, S.Kanemura, T.Matsui, P.Ko, arXiv:1609.00297

Probing the first order electroweak phase transition by measuring gravitational waves in scalar extension models

Contents


- Motivation: EWBG is detectable at future colliders and GW observations
- Review: GWs from 1stOPT
- Three models:
 - “ $O(N)$ models w/ & w/o Classical Scale Invariance” & “Higgs singlet model”

Probing the first order electroweak phase transition by measuring gravitational waves in scalar extension models

Contents

- Motivation: EWBG is detectable at future colliders and GW observations
- Review: GWs from 1stOPT
- Three models:
 - “ $O(N)$ models w/ & w/o Classical Scale Invariance” & “Higgs singlet model”

Physics behind EWSB




- Discovery of the Higgs boson
 - Mass generation mechanism is confirmed
 - The Standard Model (SM) as the effective theory is established
- Shape of the Higgs potential
 - SM have minimal Higgs potential...no principle
 - The nature of EW symmetry breaking is not yet understood because Higgs self-couplings have not been measured
 - BSM phenomena might be described by extended Higgs sector
- Exploring the structure of the Higgs sector is important to understand physics behind EWSB.

Electroweak Baryogenesis

~ Importance to understand the Higgs potential ~

- Observed Baryon number: $n_B/s \simeq \mathcal{O}(10^{-10})$
- Sakharov's 3 conditions
 1. $\#B$ violation, 2. CP violation, 3. Departure from equilibrium

→ Strongly 1st order PT




$$\varphi_c/T_c \gtrsim 1$$

- SM cannot satisfy these conditions ($m_h=125\text{GeV}$).

Triple Higgs boson (hhh) coupling

1stOPT is realized by models with extended Higgs sector.

→ 2HDM : as an example of the extended Higgs sector



$$\Delta\lambda_{hhh}^{2\text{HDM}}/\lambda_{hhh}^{\text{SM}} \equiv (\lambda_{hhh}^{2\text{HDM}} - \lambda_{hhh}^{\text{SM}})/\lambda_{hhh}^{\text{SM}}$$

$$m_{\Phi} \simeq M^2 + \lambda_i v^2$$

$$\Phi = H, A, H^{\pm}$$


Kanemura, Okada, Senaha,
PLB606 (2005) 361

The scenario of EWBG require $\Delta\lambda_{hhh}/\lambda_{hhh} > O(10)\%$.

Triple Higgs boson (hhh) coupling

1stOPT is realized by models with extended Higgs sector.


→ 2HDM : as an example of the extended Higgs sector



ILC1000-up (500/1000GeV, 1600+2500fb⁻¹)

$\Delta\lambda_{hhh}/\lambda_{hhh} \sim 10\%$ (ee→vvhh) [K.Fujii *et al.*, arXiv:1506.05992]

EWBG can be tested at ILC!



$$m_\Phi \simeq M^2 + \lambda_i v^2$$

$$\Phi = H, A, H^\pm$$

Kanemura, Okada, Senaha,
PLB606 (2005) 361

The scenario of EWBG require $\Delta\lambda_{hhh}/\lambda_{hhh} > O(10)\%$.

Gravitational waves

~ Probing the Higgs potential by GW observations ~

- **LIGO have detected GWs directly.**

“GW150914”, PRL. **116**, 061102 (2016)

“GW151226”, PRL. **116**, 241103 (2016)



- Ground exp.: aLIGO[USA], KAGRA[JPN], aVIRGO[ITA•FRA], ...
→ Just now observing GWs directly from astronomical phenomena such as the binary of black holes, neutron stars, etc.


The era of GW astronomy will come true!

- Future space exp.: **eLISA[EU]**, **DECIGO[JPN]**, ...
→ Will be exploring phenomena at the very early stage of the Universe such as EW phase transition, cosmic inflation, topological defects, etc.

**We expect GWs as a new technique to explore the BSM,
in addition to the collider experiments!**

Sensitivity of GW detectors

<http://rhcole.com/apps/GWplotter/>



Sensitivity of GW detectors


<http://rhcole.com/apps/GWplotter/>

Red shifted frequency

$$f_0 = \frac{a_t}{a_0} f_t$$

▪ EWPT ($\sim 100\text{GeV}$) : $f_0 \simeq 10^{-5}\text{Hz} \frac{T_t}{100\text{GeV}} \frac{f_t}{H_t} \quad (f_t \simeq 10^9\text{Hz})$



EWPT can be explored by eLISA!



Properties of the representative eLISA configurations

eLISA cosmology WG report, JCAP**1604**, 001 (2016) [arXiv:1512.06239]

- **Number of laser links** : 4 or 6, corresponding to 2 or 3 interferometer arms
- **Arm length** : 1 / 2 / 5 million km
- **Duration** : 2 / 5 years data taking
- **Noise level** : N2 (LISA pathfinder expected) is 10 times larger than N1 (LISA pathfinder required)




Name	C1	C2	C3	C4
Full name	N2A5M5L6	N2A1M5L6	N2A2M5L4	N1A1M2L4
# links	6	6	4	4
Arm length [km]	5M	1M	2M	1M
Duration [years]	5	5	5	2
Noise level	N2	N2	N2	N1

eLISA design decided


Extra budget (partially because of re-analyses of costs, partially because of NASA+Japan)

- **Number of laser links** : ~~4 or 6~~, corresponding to ~~2 or 3~~ interferometer arms
→ Determined at eLISA symposium (Sept. 2016, U. of Zurich) <http://www.physik.uzh.ch/events/lisa2016>
- **Arm length** : ~~1/2/5~~ **2 - 5** million km
- **Duration** : ~~2/5~~ **3 - 10** years data taking
- **Noise level** : **N2** (LISA pathfinder expected) is 10 times larger than N1 (LISA pathfinder required)
→ Determined by receiving the pathfinder result [PRL116, 231101 (2016)]

ESA approval : 2017, eLISA launch : 2028



Name	C1	C2	C3	C4
Full name	N2A5M5L6	N2A1M5L6	N2A2M5L4	N1A1M2L4
# links	6	6	4	4
Arm length [km]	5M	1M	2M	1M
Duration [years]	5	5	5	2
Noise level	N2	N2	N2	N1



C1 corresponds to the old LISA configuration

Probing the first order electroweak phase transition by measuring gravitational waves in scalar extension models


Contents

- Motivation: EWBG is detectable at future colliders and GW observations
- Review: GWs from 1stOPT
- Three models:
 - “ $O(N)$ models w/ & w/o Classical Scale Invariance” & “Higgs singlet model”

Origin of GWs from 1stOPT

C.Caprini *et al.*, JCAP**1604**, 001 (2016) [review]


**Expanding
bubbles of the broken phase**



**Bubble is spherical
No GW occurs**

Origin of GWs from 1stOPT

C.Caprini *et al.*, JCAP1604, 001 (2016) [review]




Origin of GWs from 1stOPT

C.Caprini *et al.*, JCAP1604, 001 (2016) [review]

**“Magnetohydrodynamic
turbulence in the plasma”**


**“Sound waves”
(Compressional plasma)**

**“Bubble collision”
(Envelope approximation)**



GWs from 1stOPT


(*)C.Caprini *et al.*, arXiv:1512.06239 [astro-ph.CO]





Relic abundance of GWs @ peak frequency

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Omega}_{\text{sw}} h^2 &\simeq 2.65 \times 10^{-6} \frac{v_b}{\tilde{\beta}} \left(\frac{\kappa(v_b, \alpha) \alpha}{1 + \alpha} \right)^2 & @ \tilde{f}_{\text{sw}} &\simeq 1.9 \times 10^{-5} \text{ Hz} \frac{\tilde{\beta}(T_t/100 \text{ GeV})}{v_b} \\ \tilde{\Omega}_{\text{env}} h^2 &\simeq \frac{1.84 \times 10^{-6} v_b^3}{(0.42 + v_b^2) \tilde{\beta}^2} \left(\frac{\kappa(v_b, \alpha) \alpha}{1 + \alpha} \right)^2 & @ \tilde{f}_{\text{env}} &\simeq 1.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{ Hz} \frac{\tilde{\beta}(T_t/100 \text{ GeV})}{1.8 - 0.1 v_b + v_b^2} \\ \tilde{\Omega}_{\text{turb}} h^2 &\simeq \frac{9.35 \times 10^{-8} v_b^2}{0.00354 v_b \tilde{\beta} + \tilde{\beta}^2} \left(\frac{\epsilon \kappa(v_b, \alpha) \alpha}{1 + \alpha} \right)^{3/2} & @ \tilde{f}_{\text{turb}} &\simeq 2.7 \times 10^{-5} \text{ Hz} \frac{\tilde{\beta}(T_t/100 \text{ GeV})}{v_b} \end{aligned}$$

GWs from 1stOPT



GWs from 1st OPT



“Definition of phase transition temperature T_t ”


$$\left. \frac{\Gamma}{H^4} \right|_{T=T_t} \simeq 1$$

(H: Hubble parameter)


Phase transition completes when the probability for the nucleation of 1 bubble per 1 horizon volume and horizon time is of order 1.

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{- Bubble nucleation rate: } \Gamma(T) \simeq T^4 e^{-\frac{S_3(T)}{T}} \\ \text{- 3-dim. Euclidean action: } S_3(T) = \int dr^3 \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (\vec{\nabla} \varphi)^2 + V_{\text{eff}}(\varphi, T) \right\} \end{array} \right.$$

GWs from 1st OPT



“Definition of phase transition temperature T_t ”




$$\left. \frac{\Gamma}{H^4} \right|_{T=T_t} \simeq 1 \Leftrightarrow \left. \frac{S_3(T)}{T} \right|_{T=T_t} \simeq 140 - 150$$

$$\Gamma(T) \simeq T^4 e^{-\frac{S_3(T)}{T}}$$

$$S_3(T) = \int dr^3 \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (\vec{\nabla} \varphi)^2 + V_{\text{eff}}(\varphi, T) \right\}$$


GWs from 1stOPT



Characteristic parameters of GWs

- α is defined as $\alpha \equiv \frac{\epsilon}{\rho_{\text{rad}}} \Big|_{T=T_t}$. (ρ_{rad} is energy density of rad.)
 - Latent heat: $\epsilon(T) \equiv -\Delta V_{\text{eff}}(\varphi_B(T), T) + T \frac{\partial \Delta V_{\text{eff}}(\varphi_B(T))}{\partial T}$ cf. $U = -F + T(dF/dT)$
 - β is defined as $\beta \equiv \frac{1}{\Gamma} \frac{d\Gamma}{dt} \Big|_{t=t_t} \rightarrow \tilde{\beta} \left(\equiv \frac{\beta}{H_t} \right) = T_t \frac{d(S_3(T)/T)}{dT} \Big|_{T=T_t}$
- $(\Gamma(T) \simeq T^4 e^{-\frac{S_3(T)}{T}})$: Bubble nucleation rate, H_t : Hubble parameter @ T_t

GWs from 1stOPT



Characteristic parameters of GWs

- α is defined as $\alpha \equiv \frac{\epsilon}{\rho_{\text{rad}}} \Big|_{T=T_t}$. (ρ_{rad} is energy density of rad.)

“Normalized difference of the potential minima”

- β is defined as $\beta \equiv \frac{1}{\Gamma} \frac{d\Gamma}{dt} \Big|_{t=t_t} \rightarrow \tilde{\beta} \left(\equiv \frac{\beta}{H_t} \right) = T_t \frac{d(S_3(T)/T)}{dT} \Big|_{T=T_t}$

“~How fast the minimum goes down”

Probing the first order electroweak phase transition by measuring gravitational waves in scalar extension models

Contents

- Motivation: EWBG is detectable at future colliders and GW observations
- Review: GWs from 1stOPT
- Three models:
 - “ $O(N)$ models w/ & w/o Classical Scale Invariance” & “Higgs singlet model”

Models of 1stOPT

Higgs potential by high temperature approximation

$$V_{\text{eff}} = D(T^2 - T_0^2)\varphi^2 - (ET - e)\varphi^3 + \frac{\lambda(T)}{4}\varphi^4 \rightarrow \frac{\varphi_c}{T_c} = \frac{2E}{\lambda} \left(1 - \frac{e\lambda}{ET}\right)$$


- E : thermal coupling (the non-decoupling effects due to the additional boson loop)
- $-e$: non-thermal coupling (the field mixing of the Higgs boson with additional scalar fields)

Models of 1stOPT

Higgs potential by high temperature approximation

$$V_{\text{eff}} = D(T^2 - T_0^2)\varphi^2 - (\underbrace{ET}_{\uparrow} - e)\varphi^3 + \frac{\lambda(T)}{4}\varphi^4 \rightarrow \frac{\varphi_c}{T_c} = \frac{2\overset{\downarrow}{E}}{\lambda} \left(1 - \frac{e\lambda}{ET}\right)$$

- E : thermal coupling (the non-decoupling effects due to the additional boson loop)
- $-e$: non-thermal coupling (the field mixing of the Higgs boson with additional scalar fields)



As the simplest model,
we have investigated
the **O(N)** model.

Models of 1stOPT

Higgs potential by high temperature approximation

$$V_{\text{eff}} = D(T^2 - T_0^2)\varphi^2 - (\underbrace{ET}_{\uparrow} - e)\varphi^3 + \frac{\lambda(T)}{4}\varphi^4 \rightarrow \frac{\varphi_c}{T_c} = \frac{2\overset{\downarrow}{E}}{\lambda} \left(1 - \frac{e\lambda}{ET}\right)$$

- E : thermal coupling (the non-decoupling effects due to the additional boson loop)
- $-e$: non-thermal coupling (the field mixing of the Higgs boson with additional scalar fields)

Model A

“O(N) model”


N iso-singlet fields with O(N) sym. $\vec{S} = (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N)^T$

M.Kakizaki, S.Kanemura, T.Matsui, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 11, 115007 (2015)

$$V_0(\Phi, \vec{S}) = -\mu^2|\Phi|^2 + \frac{\mu_S^2}{2}|\vec{S}|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}|\Phi|^4 + \frac{\lambda_S}{4}|\vec{S}|^4 + \frac{\lambda_{\Phi S}}{2}|\Phi|^2|\vec{S}|^2$$


- O(N) is not broken $\rightarrow$ Common mass of S_i : $m_S^2 = \mu_S^2 + \frac{\lambda_{\Phi S}}{2}v^2$
- Model parameters: (N, m_S, μ_S)
- 1stOPT: $E = \frac{1}{12\pi v^3} \left\{ 6m_{W^\pm}^3 + 3m_Z^3 + N m_S^3 \left(1 - \frac{\mu_S^2}{m_S^2}\right)^3 \left(1 + \frac{3}{2} \frac{\mu_S^2}{m_S^2}\right) \right\}$

$$\varphi_c/T_c \nearrow \Rightarrow \Delta\lambda_{hhh} \nearrow \text{ \& } \Omega_{\text{GW}} h^2 \nearrow$$





M.Kakizaki, S.Kanemura, T.Matsui, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 11, 115007 (2015)

$$\varphi_c/T_c \nearrow \Rightarrow \Delta\lambda_{hhh} \nearrow \text{ \& } \Omega_{\text{GW}} h^2 \nearrow$$






M.Kakizaki, S.Kanemura, T.Matsui, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 11, 115007 (2015)

$$\varphi_c/T_c \nearrow \Rightarrow \Delta\lambda_{hhh} \nearrow \text{ \& } \Omega_{\text{GW}} h^2 \nearrow$$



M.Kakizaki, S.Kanemura, T.Matsui, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 11, 115007 (2015)



DECIGO [Class. Quant. Grav. 28, 094011 (2011)],
eLISA [arXiv:1512.06239]

M.Kakizaki, S.Kanemura, T.Matsui, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 11, 115007 (2015)

The other example: 1stOPT by **the non-decoupling effects**

Model B

$$\vec{S} = (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_N)^T$$

“O(N) models with Classical Scale Invariance”

- Mass parameters are forbidden at tree level.
- EWSB is directly caused by radiative corrections.

$$V_{\text{eff}}(\varphi) = \sum_i \frac{n_i}{64\pi^2} M_i^4(\varphi) \left(\ln \frac{M_i^2(\varphi)}{Q^2} - \frac{3}{2} \right)$$

Coleman, Weinberg '73; Gildener, Weinberg '76

Characteristic predictions

- Higgs mass: $m_h^2 = (6m_{W^\pm}^4 + 3m_Z^4 - 12m_t^4 + Nm_S^4)/(8\pi^2 v^2)$

- hhh coupling: $\Delta\lambda_{hhh}^{\text{O(N)SI}} / \lambda_{hhh}^{\text{SMtree}} \simeq 66.7\%$


(N, m_S) are strongly constrained.

Deviation from the SM is universally independent of (N, m_S) .

Endo, Sumino, 2015; Fuyuto, Senaha, 2015; Hashino, Kanemura, Orikasa, 2015

- 1stOPT: $E = \frac{1}{12\pi v^3} \{6m_{W^\pm}^3 + 3m_Z^3 + Nm_S^3\}$ $\frac{\varphi_c}{T_c} = \frac{2E}{\lambda} (1 - \frac{e\lambda}{ET})$



Predicted parameter region



Predicted parameter region

Model A


M.Kakizaki, S.Kanemura, T.Matsui, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 11, 115007 (2015)



Predicted parameter region



Model A

M.Kakizaki, S.Kanemura, T.Matsui, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 11, 115007 (2015)




Predicted parameter region

Model A




Predicted parameter region

Model A




Predicted parameter region

Model A




Even if $\Delta\lambda_{hhh}/\lambda_{hhh} \sim 67\%$ is measured at ILC

K.Hashino, M.Kakizaki, S.Kanemura, T.Matsui, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 1, 015005 (2016)



Even if $\Delta\lambda_{hhh}/\lambda_{hhh} \sim 67\%$ is measured at ILC

K.Hashino, M.Kakizaki, S.Kanemura, T.Matsui, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 1, 015005 (2016)



Model A

(O(N) models without CSI)

Model B

(CSI O(N) models)

Models with and without CSI can be distinguished at future GW interferometers.

Sensitivities

- DECIGO [S.Kawamura, et al., Class. Quant. Grav. 28, 094011 (2011)]
- eLISA [C.Caprini et al., arXiv:1512.06239 [astro-ph.CO]]

Models of 1stOPT

Higgs potential by high temperature approximation

$$V_{\text{eff}} = D(T^2 - T_0^2)\varphi^2 - (ET - e)\varphi^3 + \frac{\lambda(T)}{4}\varphi^4 \rightarrow \frac{\varphi_c}{T_c} = \frac{2E}{\lambda} \left(1 - \frac{e\lambda}{ET}\right)$$


- E : thermal coupling (the non-decoupling effects due to the additional boson loop)
- $-e$: non-thermal coupling (the field mixing of the Higgs boson with additional scalar fields)

Models of 1stOPT

Higgs potential by high temperature approximation

$$V_{\text{eff}} = D(T^2 - T_0^2)\varphi^2 - (ET - \underset{\uparrow}{\overline{e}})\varphi^3 + \frac{\lambda(T)}{4}\varphi^4 \rightarrow \frac{\varphi_c}{T_c} = \frac{2E}{\lambda} \left(1 - \overset{\downarrow}{\overline{e}} \frac{\lambda}{ET}\right)$$

- E : thermal coupling (the non-decoupling effects due to the additional boson loop)
- $-\overline{e}$: non-thermal coupling (the field mixing of the Higgs boson with additional scalar fields)



As the simplest model,
we have investigated
**the Higgs singlet
model (HSM).**

Models of 1stOPT

Higgs potential by high temperature approximation

$$V_{\text{eff}} = D(T^2 - T_0^2)\varphi^2 - (ET - \underset{\uparrow}{e})\varphi^3 + \frac{\lambda(T)}{4}\varphi^4 \rightarrow \frac{\varphi_c}{T_c} = \frac{2E}{\lambda} \left(1 - \overset{\downarrow}{\frac{e\lambda}{ET}}\right)$$

- E : thermal coupling (the non-decoupling effects due to the additional boson loop)
- $-e$: non-thermal coupling (the field mixing of the Higgs boson with additional scalar fields)

Model C

“Higgs singlet model (HSM)”

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} G^+ \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v_\Phi + \phi_1 + iG^0) \end{pmatrix}, \quad S = v_S + \phi_2$$

K.Hashino, M.Kakizaki, S.Kanemura, T.Matsui, P.Ko, arXiv:1609.00297

$$V_0 = -\mu_\Phi^2 |\Phi|^2 + \lambda_\Phi |\Phi|^4 + \mu_{\Phi S} |\Phi|^2 S + \frac{\lambda_{\Phi S}}{2} |\Phi|^2 S^2 + \mu_S^3 S + \frac{m_S^2}{2} S^2 + \frac{\mu'_S}{3} S^3 + \frac{\lambda_S}{4} S^4$$

eight parameters $\mu_\Phi^2, m_S^2, \lambda_\Phi, \lambda_S, \lambda_{\Phi S}, \mu_{\Phi S}, \mu'_S$ and μ_S^3


- Tadpole conditions $\rightarrow (v_\Phi, v_S)$
- Diagonalized mass matrix in $(\phi_1, \phi_2) \rightarrow (m_h, m_H)$ and θ
- 1stOPT is calculated by two-field analysis @finite T .

Constraints

- **Higgs couplings:** $\kappa \equiv \kappa_V = \kappa_F = \cos \theta$
 - recent LHC data: $\kappa_Z = 1.03^{+0.11}_{-0.11}, \kappa_W = 0.91^{+0.10}_{-0.10}$
(1 σ ; combination of ATLAS and CMS) [ATLAS-CONF-2015-044]
 - Expected accuracy: 2%@HL-LHC 14TeV 3000fb⁻¹ [1307.7135],
0.37% (0.51%) for κ_Z (κ_W)@ILC 500GeV 500fb⁻¹ [1506.05992]
- **Deviation of hhh coupling from SM:** $\Delta\lambda_{hhh} \equiv \frac{\lambda_{hhh}^{\text{HSM}} - \lambda_{hhh}^{\text{SM}}}{\lambda_{hhh}^{\text{SM}}}$
 - Expected accuracy: 54%@HL-LHC 14TeV 3000fb⁻¹ [CMS-PAS-FTR-15-002],
27%@ILC 500GeV 4000fb⁻¹ [1506.05992],
16% (10%)@ILC 1TeV 2000fb⁻¹ (5000fb⁻¹) [1506.05992]
- **Benchmark points** K. Fuyuto and E. Senaha, PRD 90, 015015 (2014)

v_Φ [GeV]	v_S [GeV]	m_h [GeV]	$\mu_{\Phi S}$ [GeV]	μ'_S [GeV]	μ_S [GeV]	m_H [GeV]	θ [degrees]
246.2	90	125.5	-80	-30	0	[160, 240]	[-15, -35]


K.Hashino, M.Kakizaki, S.Kanemura, [T.Matsui](#), P.Ko, arXiv:1609.00297



DECIGO [Class. Quant. Grav. 28, 094011 (2011)], eLISA [arXiv:1512.06239]

eLISA or DECIGO is capable of detecting GWs
in the most of the HSM parameter region with 1st OPT.

K.Hashino, M.Kakizaki, S.Kanemura, T.Matsui, P.Ko, arXiv:1609.00297



DECIGO [Class. Quant. Grav. 28, 094011 (2011)], eLISA [arXiv:1512.06239]

The synergy between the precision measurements of the Higgs boson couplings and GWs at future experiments are shown.

Conclusions

- Exploring the structure of the Higgs sector is important to understand physics behind EWSB.
- We have investigated various models of 1stOPT.
- The strongly 1stOPT of EWSB can be tested by the measurements of various Higgs boson couplings @LHC, the hhh coupling @ILC and GWs @future space-based interferometers.


Back Up

Triple Higgs boson coupling measurements

- HL-LHC (14TeV, 3000fb⁻¹)

$$\Delta\lambda_{hhh}/\lambda_{hhh} \sim \textcolor{red}{50\%} (gg \rightarrow hh)$$


Snowmass Higgs working group,
arXiv:1310.8361 [hep-ex]




- ILC1000-up (500/1000GeV, 1600+2500fb⁻¹)

$$\Delta\lambda_{hhh}/\lambda_{hhh} \sim \textcolor{red}{10\%} (ee \rightarrow \nu hh)$$

K.Fujii *et al.*, arXiv:1506.05992 [hep-ex]




LIGO have detected GWs



- “GW150914” LIGO Scientific and Virgo Collaborations, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no. 6, 061102 (2016)
 - BH merger ($36+29 \rightarrow 62$ in the unit of solar mass)
 - 410Mpc (1.3 billion years ago)
 - Signal/Noise=24 ($>5.1\sigma$), frequency: 35-250 Hz
- “GW151226” LIGO Scientific and Virgo Collaborations, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no. 24, 241103 (2016)
 - BH merger ($14+8 \rightarrow 21$ in the unit of solar mass)
 - 440Mpc (1.4 billion years ago)
 - Signal/Noise=13 ($>5\sigma$), frequency: 35-450 Hz,

Prospects for LIGO/Virgo

- LIGO 1st RUN
(2015/09/12-2016/01/19)
- LIGO 2nd RUN (from the fall 2016)
 - 15-25% improvement in sensitivity performance over 1st RUN
 - The event rate will be increased by 1.5-2 times




Observing run	Epoch	Duration (months)	aLIGO sensitivity	AdVirgo sensitivity
O1	2015–2016	4	Early	—
O2	2016–2017	6	Mid	Early
O3	2017–2018	9	Late	Mid
O4	2019	12	Design	Late
O5	2020+	—	Design	Design

1602.03847


50 / 25

Pulsar Timing Array



- The main idea behind pulsar timing array (PTA) is to use ultra-stable millisecond pulsars as beacons for detecting GW in the nano-Hz range ($10^{-9} - 10^{-7}$ Hz).
- Pulsars are neutron stars with rapid rotation and strong magnetic field. Period from few seconds to few milliseconds.

Pulsar Timing Array



- Current limit: $\Omega_{\text{GW}} h^2 > \sim 10^{-9}$

EPTA Collaboration [Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **453**, no. 3, 2576 (2015) [arXiv:1504.03692]]

NANOGrav Collaboration [Astrophys. J. **821**, no. 1, 13 (2016) [arXiv:1508.03024]]

- **International Pulsar Timing Array (IPTA):** combined three PTAs

[PPTA (Australian), EPTA (European)*, NanoGrav (North American)]. *EPTA consists of 5 radio telescopes

1st data release Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **458**, 1267 (2016) [arXiv:1602.03640]

Expected limit: $\Omega_{\text{GW}} h^2 > \sim 10^{-12}$ Publ. Astron. Soc. Austral. **30**, 17 (2013) [arXiv:1210.6130]

- **Square Kilometre Array (SKA)**

: The next great advancement in radio astronomy

Expected limit: $\Omega_{\text{GW}} h^2 > \sim 10^{-15}$ <https://www.skatelescope.org>

Multi-field analysis of EWPT


K. Funakubo, S. Tao and F. Toyoda, Prog. Theor. Phys. 114, 369 (2005) (NMSSM)

K. Fuyuto and E. Senaha, Phys. Rev. D 90, no. 1, 015015 (2014) (HSM)

- EWPT:

$$(\varphi_\Phi, \varphi_S)_{\text{SYM}} \rightarrow (\varphi_\Phi, \varphi_S)_{\text{EW}} @ T=T_c, \varphi_c \equiv \varphi_\Phi(T_c)$$

- Diverse patterns of the EWPT:



- EW phase needs to be the global min.:

$$V_{\text{eff}, T=0}(\text{EW phase}) < V_{\text{eff}, T=0}(\text{other phases})$$

- Public tool “CosmoTransition” (Python code) is used.

Theoretical constraints

- Perturbative unitarity: $|a_0(W_L^+ W_L^- \rightarrow W_L^+ W_L^-)| \leq 1$

$$m_h^2 \cos^2 \theta + m_H^2 \sin^2 \theta \leq \frac{4\pi\sqrt{2}}{3G_F} \approx (700\text{GeV})^2$$

- Vacuum stability:

$$\lambda_\Phi(\mu) > 0, \quad \lambda_S(\mu) > 0, \quad 4\lambda_\Phi(\mu)\lambda_S(\mu) > \lambda_{\Phi S}^2(\mu)$$

- Landau pole:

$$|\lambda_{\Phi,S,\Phi S}(\Lambda_{\text{LP}})| = 4\pi$$

- Oblique parameters (S, T, U):

$$\cos \theta \gtrsim 0.92 \quad \text{when } m_H \gtrsim 400\text{GeV} \quad (m_h \approx 125\text{GeV})$$

S. Baek, P. Ko, W. I. Park and E. Senaha, JHEP 1211, 116 (2012)



Singlet extension of the SM (non-thermal)

A.Ashoorioon, T.Konstandin, JCAP**0809**, 022 (2008)

- Potential $S = s + \underline{x}$

$$V_0(\Phi, S) = V_{\text{SM}}(\Phi) + b_1 S + \frac{b_2}{2} S^2 + \frac{b_3}{\underline{3}} S^3 + \frac{b_4}{4} S^4 + \frac{a_1}{2} |\Phi|^2 S + \frac{a_2}{2} |\Phi|^2 S^2$$

- An example of the paths ([assumption](#))




Singlet extension of the SM (non-thermal)


A.Ashoorioon, T.Konstandin, JCAP**0809**, 022 (2008)

$\bar{\mu}_s / \text{GeV}$	α	β/H	v/T	T / GeV
190	0.14	121	3.1	75
186	0.18	88	3.4	69
183	0.25	53	3.7	63
181	0.33	25	4.0	57
180	0.42	8	4.2	54
179	symmetric phase stable			


Results(↑,→)



GWs from 1st OPT



“Definition of phase transition temperature T_t ”



$$\left. \frac{\Gamma}{H^4} \right|_{T=T_t} \simeq 1 \Leftrightarrow \left. \frac{S_3(T)}{T} \right|_{T=T_t} \simeq 140 - 150$$


Model parameters are constrained.

R.Apreda et al., NPB**631**, 342 (2002)

Estimation of the relic abundance

M.Kamionkowski, PRD**49**, 2837 (1994)

- Wave eq. from Einstein eq. in weak field approximation
 - Stochastic backgrounds of GWs
- $$-\square \left(h_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \eta_{\mu\nu} h^\alpha{}_\alpha \right) = 16\pi G T_{\mu\nu}$$
- $$\rho_{\text{GW}} = \frac{1}{32\pi G} \langle \dot{h}_{\alpha\beta} \dot{h}^{\alpha\beta} \rangle \sim \frac{8\pi G \rho_{\text{kin}}^2}{\beta^2}$$
- $$\begin{cases} T_0^0 = \rho_{\text{kin}} + \dots \\ \frac{d}{dt} \simeq \beta \end{cases}$$



$$\rho_{\text{tot}} (= \frac{\rho_{\text{vac}}}{(=\epsilon)} + \rho_{\text{rad}}) = \frac{3H^2}{8\pi G}$$

$$\alpha = \frac{\rho_{\text{vac}}}{\rho_{\text{rad}}}$$

$$\kappa = \frac{\rho_{\text{kin}}}{\rho_{\text{vac}}}$$

Efficiency factor

$$\Omega_{\text{GW}} = \frac{\rho_{\text{GW}}}{\rho_{\text{tot}}} \simeq \left(\frac{H}{\beta} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\kappa \alpha}{1 + \alpha} \right)^2$$

$$= \tilde{\beta}^{-2} \sim (H \langle R \rangle)^2$$

Origins of GWs from EWPT

C.Caprini *et al.*, arXiv:1512.06239 [astro-ph.CO] (review)

2.1 Contributions to the Gravitational Wave Spectrum

To varying degrees, three processes are involved in the production of GWs at a first-order PT:

- Collisions of bubble walls and (where relevant) shocks in the plasma. This can be treated by a technique now generally referred to as the ‘envelope approximation’ [10–15]. As described below, this approximation can be used to compute the contribution to the GW spectrum from the scalar field, ϕ , itself.
- Sound waves in the plasma after the bubbles have collided but before expansion has dissipated the kinetic energy in the plasma [16–19].
- Magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) turbulence in the plasma forming after the bubbles have collided [20–25].

We improve our analysis in accordance with the recent simulation result.

Recent work of other source of GW “sound wave”

M.Hindmarsh, *et al.*, PRL **112**, 041301 (2014); arXiv:1504.03291 [astro-ph.CO].

Numerical simulations of acoustically generated gravitational waves at a first order phase transition

Mark Hindmarsh,^{1,2,*} Stephan J. Huber,^{1,†} Kari Rummukainen,^{2,‡} and David J. Weir^{3,§}

¹ *Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton BN1 9QH, U.K.*

² *Department of Physics and Helsinki Institute of Physics, PL 64, FI-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland*

³ *Institute of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, University of Stavanger, 4036 Stavanger, Norway*

(Dated: April 14, 2015)

We present details of numerical simulations of the gravitational radiation produced by a first order thermal phase transition in the early universe. We confirm that the dominant source of gravitational waves is sound waves generated by the expanding bubbles of the low-temperature phase. We demonstrate that the sound waves have a power spectrum with power-law form between the scales set by the average bubble separation (which sets the length scale of the fluid flow L_f) and the bubble wall width. The sound waves generate gravitational waves whose power spectrum also has a power-law form, at a rate proportional to L_f and the square of the fluid kinetic energy density. We identify a dimensionless parameter $\tilde{\Omega}_{\text{GW}}$ characterising the efficiency of this “acoustic” gravitational wave production whose value is $8\pi\tilde{\Omega}_{\text{GW}} \simeq 0.8 \pm 0.1$ across all our simulations. We compare the acoustic gravitational waves with the standard prediction from the envelope approximation. Not only is the power spectrum steeper (apart from an initial transient) but the gravitational wave energy density is generically two orders of magnitude or more larger.

Origins of GWs from EWPT

C.Caprini *et al.*, arXiv:1512.06239 [astro-ph.CO] (review)

- Vacuum bubble velocity v_b
- Efficiency factor $\kappa(v_b, \alpha)$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\Omega}_{\text{sw}} h^2 &\simeq 2.65 \times 10^{-6} \frac{v_b}{\tilde{\beta}} \left(\frac{\kappa(v_b, \alpha) \alpha}{1 + \alpha} \right)^2 & @ \tilde{f}_{\text{sw}} &\simeq 1.9 \times 10^{-5} \text{Hz} \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{v_b} \\ \tilde{\Omega}_{\text{env}} h^2 &\simeq \frac{1.84 \times 10^{-6} v_b^3}{(0.42 + v_b^2) \tilde{\beta}^2} \left(\frac{\kappa(v_b, \alpha) \alpha}{1 + \alpha} \right)^2 & @ \tilde{f}_{\text{env}} &\simeq 1.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{Hz} \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{1.8 - 0.1 v_b + v_b^2} \\ \tilde{\Omega}_{\text{turb}} h^2 &\simeq \frac{9.35 \times 10^{-8} v_b^2}{0.00354 v_b \tilde{\beta} + \tilde{\beta}^2} \left(\frac{\epsilon \kappa(v_b, \alpha) \alpha}{1 + \alpha} \right)^{3/2} & @ \tilde{f}_{\text{turn}} &\simeq 2.7 \times 10^{-5} \text{Hz} \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{v_b}\end{aligned}$$

Origins of GWs from EWPT

C.Caprini *et al.*, arXiv:1512.06239 [astro-ph.CO] (review)

- Vacuum bubble velocity v_b

- Efficiency factor $\kappa(v_b, \alpha)$

$$\kappa(v_b, \alpha) \simeq O(0.01 - 0.1)$$

J.R.Espinosa, *et al*, JCAP **1006**, 028 (2010)

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Omega}_{\text{sw}} h^2 &\simeq 2.65 \times 10^{-6} \frac{v_b}{\tilde{\beta}} \left(\frac{\kappa(v_b, \alpha) \alpha}{1 + \alpha} \right)^2 & @ \tilde{f}_{\text{sw}} &\simeq 1.9 \times 10^{-5} \text{Hz} \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{v_b} \\ \tilde{\Omega}_{\text{env}} h^2 &\simeq \frac{1.84 \times 10^{-6} v_b^3}{(0.42 + v_b^2) \tilde{\beta}^2} \left(\frac{\kappa(v_b, \alpha) \alpha}{1 + \alpha} \right)^2 & @ \tilde{f}_{\text{env}} &\simeq 1.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{Hz} \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{1.8 - 0.1 v_b + v_b^2} \\ \tilde{\Omega}_{\text{turb}} h^2 &\simeq \frac{9.35 \times 10^{-8} v_b^2}{0.00354 v_b \tilde{\beta} + \tilde{\beta}^2} \left(\frac{\kappa(v_b, \alpha) \alpha}{1 + \alpha} \right)^{3/2} & @ \tilde{f}_{\text{turn}} &\simeq 2.7 \times 10^{-5} \text{Hz} \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{v_b} \end{aligned}$$

Origins of GWs from EWPT

C.Caprini *et al.*, arXiv:1512.06239 [astro-ph.CO] (review)

• Vacuum bubble velocity v_b

• Efficiency factor $\kappa(v_b, \alpha)$

$$\kappa(v_b, \alpha) \simeq O(0.01 - 0.1)$$

J.R.Espinosa, *et al*, JCAP **1006**, 028 (2010)

• The fraction of bulk motion from the bubble walls



The result from resent simulation

$$\epsilon \simeq 0.05 - 0.10$$


Hindmarsh, Huber, Rummukainen, Weir,
PRD **92**, no. 12, 123009 (2015)

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Omega}_{\text{sw}} h^2 &\simeq 2.65 \times 10^{-6} \frac{v_b}{\tilde{\beta}} \left(\frac{\kappa(v_b, \alpha) \alpha}{1 + \alpha} \right)^2 & @ \tilde{f}_{\text{sw}} &\simeq 1.9 \times 10^{-5} \text{Hz} \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{v_b} \\ \tilde{\Omega}_{\text{env}} h^2 &\simeq \frac{1.84 \times 10^{-6} v_b^3}{(0.42 + v_b^2) \tilde{\beta}^2} \left(\frac{\kappa(v_b, \alpha) \alpha}{1 + \alpha} \right)^2 & @ \tilde{f}_{\text{env}} &\simeq 1.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{Hz} \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{1.8 - 0.1 v_b + v_b^2} \\ \tilde{\Omega}_{\text{turb}} h^2 &\simeq \frac{9.35 \times 10^{-8} v_b^2}{0.00354 v_b \tilde{\beta} + \tilde{\beta}^2} \left(\frac{\epsilon \kappa(v_b, \alpha) \alpha}{1 + \alpha} \right)^{3/2} & @ \tilde{f}_{\text{turn}} &\simeq 2.7 \times 10^{-5} \text{Hz} \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{v_b} \end{aligned}$$


$$(\alpha, \tilde{\beta}) \leftrightarrow (f, \Omega_{\text{GW}} h^2)_{\text{new}}$$



$(\alpha, \tilde{\beta})_{\text{exp. by New spectra}} (T_t=50\text{GeV})$




$(\alpha, \tilde{\beta})_{\text{exp. by New spectra}} (T_t=100\text{GeV})$



Efficiency factor $\kappa(v_b, \alpha)$

J.R.Espinosa, *et al*, JCAP **1006**, 028 (2010)



A Numerical fits to the efficiency coefficients *J.R.Espinosa, et al.*

In this section we provide fits to the numerical results of section 4. These fits facilitate the functions $\kappa(\xi_w, \alpha_N)$ and $\alpha_+(\xi_w, \alpha_N)$ without solving the flow equations and with a precision better than 15% in the region $10^{-3} < \alpha_N < 10$.

In order to fit the function $\kappa(\xi_w, \alpha_N)$, we split the parameter space into three regions and provide approximations for the four boundary cases and three families of functions that interpolate in-between: For small wall velocities one obtains ($\xi_w \ll c_s$)

$$\kappa_A \simeq \xi_w^{6/5} \frac{6.9\alpha_N}{1.36 - 0.037\sqrt{\alpha_N} + \alpha_N}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

For the transition from subsonic to supersonic deflagrations ($\xi_w = c_s$)

$$\kappa_B \simeq \frac{\alpha_N^{2/5}}{0.017 + (0.997 + \alpha_N)^{2/5}}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

For Jouguet detonations ($\xi_w = \xi_J$), as stated in eq. (4.2)

$$\kappa_C \simeq \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_N}}{0.135 + \sqrt{0.98 + \alpha_N}} \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_J = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}\alpha_N + \alpha_N^2} + \sqrt{1/3}}{1 + \alpha_N}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

And finally for very large wall velocity, ($\xi_w \rightarrow 1$) as stated in eq. (4.4)

$$\kappa_D \simeq \frac{\alpha_N}{0.73 + 0.083\sqrt{\alpha_N} + \alpha_N}.$$

For subsonic deflagrations a good fit to the numerical results is provided by

$$\kappa(\xi_w \lesssim c_s) \simeq \frac{c_s^{11/5} \kappa_A \kappa_B}{(c_s^{11/5} - \xi_w^{11/5}) \kappa_B + \xi_w c_s^{6/5} \kappa_A},$$

and for detonations by


$$\kappa(\xi_w \gtrsim \xi_J) \simeq \frac{(\xi_J - 1)^3 \xi_J^{5/2} \xi_w^{-5/2} \kappa_C \kappa_D}{[(\xi_J - 1)^3 - (\xi_w - 1)^3] \xi_J^{5/2} \kappa_C + (\xi_w - 1)^3 \kappa_D}.$$

The numerical result for the hybrid (supersonic deflagration) region is well described by a cubic polynomial. As boundary conditions, one best uses the two values of κ and the first derivative of κ at $\xi_w = c_s$. Notice that the derivative of κ in ξ_w is not continuous at the point ξ_J . The derivative at $\xi_w = c_s$ is approximately given by


$$\delta\kappa \simeq -0.9 \log \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_N}}{1 + \sqrt{\alpha_N}}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

This differs from the derivative one would obtain from the fit in the region $\xi_w < c_s$, but mostly for values $\alpha \gtrsim 1$, where no solutions exist for $\xi_w < c_s$. The expression for supersonic deflagrations then reads

$$\kappa(c_s < \xi_w < \xi_J) \simeq \kappa_B + (\xi_w - c_s) \delta\kappa + \frac{(\xi_w - c_s)^3}{(\xi_J - c_s)^3} [\kappa_C - \kappa_B - (\xi_J - c_s) \delta\kappa]. \quad (\text{A.8})$$




$$\tilde{\Omega}_{\text{coll}} h^2 \simeq \frac{1.8 \times 10^{-6} (\kappa(\alpha, \xi_w))^2 \xi_w^3}{0.42 + \xi_w^2} \times \left(\frac{\alpha}{1 + \alpha} \right)^2 \tilde{\beta}^{-2} \quad (\text{A.4})$$




Contour plot of α on (ξ_w, v_+) plane

α is given by effective potential.



Contour plot of v_+ on (ξ_w, α) plane

α is given by effective potential.



EWBG requires small ξ_w
 $\leftrightarrow$ GW requires large

Foreground noise from white dwarf binaries

R.Schneider, S.Marassi, V.Ferrari, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **27**, 194007 (2010)

Stochastic backgrounds of gravitational waves from extragalactic sources

R Schneider¹, S Marassi², V Ferrari²

¹ INAF, Osservatorio Astrofisico di Arcetri, Largo Enrico Fermi 5, 50125, Firenze, Italy

² Dipartimento di Fisica G.Marconi, Sapienza Universit'a di Roma and Sezione INFN ROMA1, piazzale Aldo Moro 2, I-00185 Roma, Italy

E-mail: raffa@arcetri.astro.it

Abstract.

Astrophysical sources emit gravitational waves in a large variety of processes occurred since the beginning of star and galaxy formation. These waves permeate our high redshift Universe, and form a background which is the result of the superposition of different components, each associated to a specific astrophysical process. Each component has different spectral properties and features that it is important to investigate in view of a possible, future detection. In this contribution, we will review recent theoretical predictions for backgrounds produced by extragalactic sources and discuss their detectability with current and future gravitational wave observatories.