## Analytic gravitational-wave spectrum from bubble collisions

Masahiro Takimoto (KEK)

Based on arXiv:1605.01403 (by Rysuke Jinno & MT)

## Introduction

## FIRST DECECTION OF GWS

- LIGO announcement @ 2016/2/11
  - Black hole binary

36M⊙ + 29M⊙ →62M⊙

with  $3.0M\odot$  radiated in GWs

- Frequency ~ 35 to 250 Hz
- Significance > 5.1 $\sigma$



## FIRST DECECTION OF GWS



#### EXPERIMENTAL PROSPECTS



From Ando-san's talk @日本物理学会2014年秋季大会

#### COSMOLOGICAL SOURCES OF GWS

- Cosmological sources of GWs
  - Inflationary quantum fluctuations ("Primordial GWs")
  - Preheating
  - Cosmic string
  - First-order phase transition

#### COSMOLOGICAL SOURCES OF GWS

Cosmological sources of GWs

- Inflationary quantum fluctuations ("Primordial GWs")
- Preheating
- Cosmic string

- First-order phase transition

#### TALK PLAN

#### **0.** Introduction

- I. Phase transition in the early universe
- 2. GWs produced in phase transition
- 3. GWs from bubble collision

-What is usually done -What we did -What we will do

I. Phase transition in the early universe

Particle physics which may accompany phase transition

- Electroweak

- Physics related to the naturalness of EW scale

(e.g. SUSY, classical conformality, ...)

- Peccei-Quinn PT
- GUT

... and so on

- How (first order) phase transition occurs
  - High temperature

- Low temperature

Time



- How first order phase transition occurs
  - Field space

- Position space

false

false vacuum true vacuum



Quantum tunneling



- How first order phase transition occurs
  - Field space

- Position space



How first order phase transition occurs





- How long first order phase transition lasts
  - Duration of PT is determined by the changing rate of  $\Gamma$  ( =  $\beta$  )

 $\Gamma = \Gamma_* e^{\beta(t - t_*)}$ : Taylor exp. around transition time  $t_*$ 

because

I.Γ significantly changes

with time interval  $\delta t \sim 1/\beta$ 

2. So, the first bubble typically collides with others δt after nucleation



- How long first order phase transition lasts
  - Duration of PT is determined by the changing rate of  $\Gamma$  ( =  $\beta$  )

 $\Gamma = \Gamma_* e^{\beta(t - t_*)}$  : Taylor exp. around transition time  $t_*$ 

To summarize, duration of PT is  $\delta t \sim 1/\beta$ 

large  $\beta$  (fast-changing  $\Gamma$ ) : short duration

small  $\beta$  (slowly-changing  $\Gamma$ ) : long duration



Duration of phase transition  $\delta t \sim 1/\beta$ 

- Transition occurs at  $\Gamma \sim H^4$ 

- Estimation of the transition rate
  - Then we can calculate  $\beta$

(= how fast transition rate changes,  $\Gamma \sim \Gamma_* e^{\beta(t - t_*)}$ )  $\Gamma \sim O(T^4) e^{-S_3/T}$ 

since it is just Taylor expansion coefficient

bounce action

$$\beta \simeq \frac{d(S_3/T)}{dt} \simeq H \frac{d(S_3/T)}{d\ln T}$$

普通は β/H ≳ 1

Note again: small beta → Large gravitational waves

2. GWs produced in phase transition

What do we need to calculate GW production ?



- Transition rate (considered before)
- Energy momentum tensor of the system

Single bubble profile





Single bubble profile



Not this simple

- Single bubble profile
  - Main players : scalar field & plasma
  - Wall (where the scalar field value changes) wants to expand ("pressure")





- Wall is pushed back by plasma ("friction")
- These dynamics are generally complicated & hard to solve, so, let's try some qualitative classification

#### Single bubble profile : Qualitative classification

- Roughly speaking,

 $\alpha \equiv \epsilon_* / \rho_{\text{radiation}}$ 

determines the late-time behavior of the bubble wall



(R) Runaway case  $\alpha \gtrsim O(1)$  $\alpha \leq O(1)$ 

: Pressure dominates friction

 $\rightarrow$  Wall velocity approaches speed of light Energy is dominated by scalar motion (wall itself) Terminal velocity case : Pressure & friction are in balance  $\rightarrow$  Bubble walls reach a terminal velocity (<c) Energy is dominated by plasma around walls

- Gravitational-wave sources
  - Usually categorized into 3 classes
    - (1) Bubble wall collision : Scalar field dynamics (& also plasma)
       (2) Sound wave : Plasma dynamics after collision
    - (3) Turbulence : Plasma dynamics after collision



- Which is important in (R)Runaway & (T)Terminal vel. cases?
  - (R)  $\rightarrow$  (I) Bubble wall collision
  - (T)  $\rightarrow$  (2,3) Sound wave (& Turbulence)

- Gravitational-wave sources
- Usually categorized into 3 classes

(1) Bubble wall collision : Scalar field dynamics

- (2) Sound wave : Plasma dynamics after collision
- (3) Turbulence : Plasma dynamics after collision



- Which is important in (R)Runaway & (T)Terminal vel. cases?

 $(R) \rightarrow (I)$  Bubble wall collision

(T)  $\rightarrow$  (2,3) Sound wave (& Turbulence)

- Why do we focus on bubble wall collision?
  - For any GW sources, following factor exists

$$\Omega_{\rm GW} \propto \left(\frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}\right)^2 \quad (\alpha \equiv \epsilon_* / \rho_{\rm radiation})$$



- Taking future observations into account, it would be reasonable to focus on large  $\,\alpha\,$  case
  - ( = (R)Runaway case for the bubble wall behavior)

- Why do we focus on bubble wall collision?
  - For any GW sources, following factor ovicto



参考までに、、 **Rough estimation of GW amplitude**  $\Omega_{\mathrm{GW}}$ **Detector** sensitivities Present GW amplitude & frequency 10-7 are obtained just by redshifting  $10^{-9}$ ~quadrupole factor ~radiation fraction today  $10^{-11}$  $h^2 \Omega_{\rm GW,peak} \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-2}) \mathcal{O}(10^{-5}) \left(\frac{\beta}{H_*}\right)^2 \left(\frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}\right)^2 10^{-13}$ f[Hz] duration time  $10^{-4}$  0.001 0.01 0.1 1 10 100 : eLISA  $f_{\text{peak}} \sim \frac{\beta}{H_*} \frac{T_*}{10^8 \text{GeV}} [\text{Hz}]$   $\Omega_{\text{GW}} = \rho_{\text{GW}} / \rho_{\text{tot}}$  $T_* : \text{temp. just after tr$ : LISA  $T_*$  : temp. just after transition : DECIGO  $H_*$ : H just after transition To have large GW, : BBO small  $\beta/H_*$  and large  $\alpha$  are preferred!!

cf. SM with  $m_H \sim 10 \text{ GeV} \rightarrow \beta/H \sim \mathcal{O}(10^5), \ \alpha \sim \mathcal{O}(0.001)$ 

## 3. GWs from bubble collisions

- What is usually done - What we did - What we will do

- What is usually done
  - Following system is solved

 $\begin{array}{ll} \underline{\text{Def. of GWs}} & ds^2 = -dt^2 + (\delta_{ij} + 2h_{ij})dx^i dx^j & \prod_{ij}(t,k) \\ & \parallel \\ \underline{\text{Evolution eq. of GWs}} & \ddot{h}_{ij}(t,k) + k^2 h_{ij}(t,k) = 8\pi G K_{ij,kl}(\hat{k}) T_{kl}(t,k) & \text{source} \end{array}$ 

K: projection to tensor mode T: energy-momentum tensor

Energy density of GWs

$$\rho_{\rm GW} = \frac{\langle \dot{h}_{ij} \dot{h}_{ij} \rangle}{8\pi G} \quad \left( \text{or GW spectrum } \Omega_{\rm GW} \equiv \frac{1}{\rho_{\rm tot}} \frac{d\rho_{\rm GW}}{d\ln k} \right)$$

 $\langle \cdots \rangle$  : oscillation & ensemble average

- What is usually done
  - Following system is solved

 $\begin{array}{ll} \underline{\text{Def. of GWs}} & ds^2 = -dt^2 + (\delta_{ij} + 2h_{ij})dx^i dx^j & \prod_{ij}(t,k) \\ & \parallel \\ \underline{\text{Evolution eq. of GWs}} & \ddot{h}_{ij}(t,k) + k^2 h_{ij}(t,k) = 8\pi G K_{ij,kl}(\hat{k}) T_{kl}(t,k) & \text{source} \end{array}$ 

K: projection to tensor mode T: energy-momentum tensor

Energy density of GWs

ρ

$$_{\rm GW} = \frac{\langle \dot{h}_{ij} \dot{h}_{ij} \rangle}{8\pi G} \quad \left( \text{ or GW spectrum } \Omega_{\rm GW} \equiv \frac{1}{\rho_{\rm tot}} \frac{d\rho_{\rm GW}}{d\ln k} \right)$$

 $\langle \cdots \rangle$  : oscillation & ensemble average

- What is usually done
  - With thin-wall & envelope approximations for bubble walls, ...

#### Thin-wall





$$T_{ij}(t,x) = \frac{4\pi}{3} r_B(t)^3 \frac{\kappa \epsilon_*}{4\pi r_B(t)^2 l_B} \times \hat{x}_i \hat{x}_j$$

%Note :
 Valid for (R)Runaway case



[Kosowsky, Turner, Watkins, PRD45 ('92)]

\*Note : Valid for (R)Runaway case with some assumptions

- What is usually done
  - ... and assuming flat background during PT, ...



- What is usually done
  - ... they do numerical simulation



[Huber, Konstandin, JCAP0809 ('08)]

- What is usually done
  - ... they do numerical simulation Peak amplitude?



[Huber, Konstandin, JCAP0809 ('08)]





# 

# 解けません?

(Can't we solve it analytically?)

What we did - why analytically calculable ?

Step I : GW spectrum is essentially "expectation value" of EM tensor

$$\Omega_{\rm GW} \equiv \frac{1}{\rho_{\rm tot}} \frac{d\rho_{\rm GW}}{d\ln k} \propto \int dt_x \int dt_y \cos(k(t_x - t_y)) \Pi(t_x, t_y, k)$$

with 
$$\langle \Pi_{ij}(t_x, \vec{k})\Pi_{ij}^*(t_y, \vec{q}) \rangle = (2\pi)^3 \delta^3 (\vec{k} - \vec{q}) \Pi(t_x, t_y, k)$$
 &  $\Pi_{ij} = K_{ij,kl} T_{kl}$   
 $\langle T(x)T(y) \rangle \quad x, y : \text{spacetime points}$ 

- Assumption  $\Gamma = \Gamma_* e^{\beta(t t_*)}$ 
  - With thin-wall & envelope approximations for bubble walls, ...



Thin-wall

$$T_{ij}(t,x) = \frac{4\pi}{3} r_B(t)^3 \frac{\kappa \epsilon_*}{4\pi r_B(t)^2 l_B} \times \hat{x}_i \hat{x}_j$$

%Note :
 Valid for (R)Runaway case



Envelope

[Kosowsky, Turner, Watkins, PRD45 ('92)]

\*Note : Valid for (R)Runaway case with some assumptions

What we did - why analytically calculable ?

Step 2 : When does T(x)T(y) has nonzero value ?



What we did - why analytically calculable ?

Step 2 : When does T(x)T(y) has nonzero value ?

- First, x & y must be in false vac. before  $t_x$ ,  $t_y$ , respectively

Probability for x & y to be in false vacuum

$$P(x,y) = \prod_{i} (1 - \Gamma dV_4^i) = e^{-\int d^4 z \ \Gamma(z)}$$



What we did - why analytically calculable ?

Step 2 : When does T(x)T(y) has nonzero value ?

- First, x & y must be in false vac. before  $t_x$ ,  $t_y$ , respectively

Probability for x & y to be in false vacuum

$$P(x,y) = \prod_{i} (1 - \Gamma dV_4^i) = e^{-\int d^4 z \ \Gamma(z)}$$
  
calculable



What we did - why analytically calculable ?

Step 2 : When does T(x)T(y) has nonzero value ?



What we did - why analytically calculable ?

Step 2 : When does T(x)T(y) has nonzero value ?

- Second, one single bubble must be nucleated in region,

or two different bubbles must be nucleated in \_\_\_\_\_ region





What we did - why analytically calculable ?

Step 2 : When does T(x)T(y) has nonzero value ?

- Second, one single bubble must be nucleated in region,

or two different bubbles must be nucleated in **region** 





- What we did why analytically calculable ?
  - Explicit expression (single-bubble case



$$\langle T_{ij}T_{kl} \rangle^{(s)}(t_x, t_y, \vec{r}) = P(t_x, t_y, r) \int_{-\infty}^{t_{xy}} dt \ \mathcal{T}_{ij,kl}^{(s)}(t, t_x, t_y, \vec{r})$$
Expectation val.  
of energy-momentum  
tensor
$$False \text{ vac. probability} \\ for spacetime points} \\ x \& y \end{aligned}$$
Value of T(x)T(y)  
if single bubble is nucleated  
and passed through x \& y \end{aligned}

- What we did why analytically calculable ?
  - The rest is trivial



- What we did why analytically calculable ?
  - Final expression

 $\Omega_{\rm GW} \propto \Delta$ 

$$\frac{\text{single}}{\Delta^{(s)} = \frac{k^3}{12\pi} \int_0^\infty dt_d \int_{t_d}^\infty dr \, \frac{e^{-r/2} \cos(kt_d)}{r^3 \mathcal{I}(t_d, r)}}{\sum \left[ j_0(kr)F_0 + \frac{j_1(kr)}{kr}F_1 + \frac{j_2(kr)}{k^2r^2}F_2 \right]} \qquad F_0 = 2(r^2 - t_d^2)^2(r^2 + 6r + 12), F_1 = 2(r^2 - t_d^2)^2(r^3 + 4r^2 + 12r + 24) + t_d^2(r^3 + 12r^2 + 60r + 120)], F_1 = 2(r^2 - t_d^2)^2(r^4 + 4r^3 + 20r^2 + 72r + 144) + t_d^2(r^3 + 12r^3 + 84r^2 + 360r + 720) + t_d^4(r^4 + 20r^3 + 180r^2 + 840r + 1680)]$$

$$\frac{\text{double}}{\Delta^{(d)} = \frac{k^3}{96\pi} \int_0^\infty dt_d \int_{t_d}^\infty dr \, \frac{e^{-r} \cos(kt_d)}{r^4 \mathcal{I}(t_d, r)^2} + \frac{j_2(kr)}{k^2r^2} G(t_d, r)G(-t_d, r) = (r^2 - t_d^2) \left[ (r^3 + 2r^2) + t_d(r^2 + 6r + 12) \right]$$



#### What we did

- Wall velocity dependence



## Wall velocity dependence determined

- What we will do (we can extend our method to more general setups)
  - How is envelope approximation good ?
  - Effect of cosmic expansion
  - Validity of "long-lasting"

\*some people say that sound-wave can be a long-lasting source by a factor of  $\beta/H$ 



What we will do

- How is envelope approxima Let's prepare for GW observation

- Effect of

-Va

with precise theoretical prediction sound-wave can be a long-lasting source by a factor of  $\beta/H$ 

