MITP, Mainz, 28 July – 8 August 2014

Thermal leptogenesis facing neutrino experiments

Pasquale Di Bari
(University of Southampton)

The double side of Leptogenesis

Cosmology (early Universe) ← → **Neutrino Physics, models of mass**



- *Cosmological Puzzles :*

1. Dark matter
2. Matter - antimatter asymmetry
3. Inflation
4. Accelerating Universe

- *New stage in early Universe history :*



Leptogenesis complements low energy neutrino experiments testing the seesaw high energy parameters and providing a guidance toward the model underlying the seesaw mechanism

Two important questions:

1. Can leptogenesis help to understand neutrino parameters?

2. Vice-versa: can we probe leptogenesis with low energy neutrino data?

A common approach in the LHC era: "TeV Leptogenesis"

Is there an alternative approach based on high energy scale leptogenesis?



- No new physics at LHC (not so far);
- New scale ~ 10^{16} GeV if BICEP2 will be confirmed would typically imply very high reheat temperatures;
- Discovery of a non-vanishing reactor angle opening the door to further information on mixing parameters;
- Cosmological observations start to have the sensitivity to either rule our or discover quasi-degenerate neutrino masses

Neutrino mixing parameters

Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata matrix

$$|\nu_\alpha\rangle = \sum U_{\alpha i} |\nu_i\rangle$$

$$U_{\alpha i} = \begin{pmatrix} U_{e1} & U_{e2} & U_{e3} \\ U_{\mu 1} & U_{\mu 2} & U_{\mu 3} \\ U_{\tau 1} & U_{\tau 2} & U_{\tau 3} \end{pmatrix}$$

NuFIT 1.3 (2014)

$$|U|_{3\sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.801 \to 0.845 & 0.514 \to 0.580 & 0.137 \to 0.158 \\ 0.225 \to 0.517 & 0.441 \to 0.699 & 0.614 \to 0.793 \\ 0.246 \to 0.529 & 0.464 \to 0.713 & 0.590 \to 0.776 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_{23} & s_{23} \\ 0 & -s_{23} & c_{23} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} c_{13} & 0 & s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -s_{13}e^{i\delta} & 0 & c_{13} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} c_{12} & s_{12} & 0 \\ -s_{12} & c_{12} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\rho} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\sigma} \end{pmatrix}$$

Atmospheric, LB | Reactor, Accel.,LB CP violating phase | Solar,Reactor | bb0ν decay

$$c_{ij} = \cos\theta_{ij},\ and\ s_{ij} = \sin\theta_{ij}$$

3σ ranges(NO):

$$\theta_{23} \simeq 38^\circ - 53^\circ$$
$$\theta_{12} \simeq 32^\circ - 38^\circ$$
$$\theta_{13} \simeq 7.5^\circ - 10^\circ$$
$$\delta, \rho, \sigma = [-\pi, \pi]$$

(Forero, Tortola, Valle '14; Capozzi, Fogli, Lisi, Palazzo '14)

Neutrino masses: $m_1 < m_2 < m_3$



$$m_{\rm atm} \equiv \sqrt{\Delta m^2_{\rm atm} + \Delta m^2_{\rm sol}} \simeq 0.05\,{\rm eV}$$

$$m_{\rm sol} \equiv \sqrt{\Delta m^2_{\rm sol}} \simeq 0.009\,{\rm eV}$$

Tritium β decay : $m_e < 2$ eV
(Mainz + Troitzk 95% CL)

ββ0ν: $m_{\beta\beta} < 0.34 - 0.78$ eV
(CUORICINO 95% CL, similar from Heidelberg-Moscow)
$m_{\beta\beta} < 0.12 - 0.25$ eV
(EXO-200+Kamland-Zen 90% CL)
$m_{\beta\beta} < 0.2 - 0.4$ eV
(GERDA+IGEX 90% CL)

CMB+BAO+H0 : $\Sigma\, m_i < 0.23$ eV
(Planck+high-l+WMAPpol+BAO 95%CL)
$\Rightarrow m_1 < 0.07$ eV
(some analyses find $m_1 \sim 0.1$eV???)



Minimal scenario of Leptogenesis

(Fukugita, Yanagida '86)

• Type I seesaw

$$\mathcal{L}^{\nu}_{\rm mass} = -\frac{1}{2}\left[(\bar{\nu}_L^c, \bar{\nu}_R)\begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_D^T \\ m_D & M \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \nu_L \\ \nu_R^c \end{pmatrix}\right] + h.c.$$

In the see-saw limit ($M \gg m_D$) the mass spectrum splits into 2 sets:

- 3 light(Majorana) neutrinos with masses $\mathrm{diag}(m_1, m_2, m_3) = -U^\dagger\, m_D\, \frac{1}{M}\, m_D^T\, U^\star$
- 3 very heavy Majorana RH neutrinos N_1, N_2, N_3 with masses $M_3 > M_2 > M_1 \gg m_D$

On average one N_i decay produces a B-L asymmetry given by its

total CP asymmetry	$\varepsilon_i \equiv -\frac{\Gamma_i - \bar{\Gamma}_i}{\Gamma_i + \bar{\Gamma}_i}$

• Thermal production of RH neutrinos

$$\Rightarrow T_{RH} \gtrsim M_i / (2\div 10) \gtrsim T_{sph} \simeq 100\ \mathrm{GeV}$$

Seesaw parameter space

Imposing $\eta_B = \eta_B^{CMB}$ one would like to get information on U and m_i

Problem: too many parameters

(Casas, Ibarra'01) $m_\nu = -m_D \frac{1}{M} m_D^T \Leftrightarrow \Omega^T \Omega = I$

Orthogonal parameterisation

$$m_D = U \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{m_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{m_2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{m_3} \end{pmatrix} \Omega \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{M_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{M_2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{M_3} \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} U^\dagger U & = & I \\ U^\dagger m_\nu U^\star & = & -D_m \end{pmatrix}$$

(in a basis where charged lepton and Majorana mass matrices are diagonal)

The **6 parameters in the orthogonal matrix Ω** encode the 3 life times and the 3 total CP asymmetries of the RH neutrinos

A parameter reduction would help and can occur in various ways:

- $\eta_B = \eta_B^{CMB}$ is satisfied around "peaks"
- some parameters cancel in the asymmetry calculation
- imposing independence of the initial conditions
- imposing some condition on m_D
- additional phenomenological constraints (e.g. Dark Matter)

Vanilla leptogenesis

1) Flavor composition of final leptons is neglected

$$N_i \xrightarrow{\Gamma} l_i\, H^\dagger \qquad N_i \xrightarrow{\bar{\Gamma}} \bar{l}_i\, H$$

Total CP asymmetries $\varepsilon_i \equiv -\frac{\Gamma_i - \bar{\Gamma}_i}{\Gamma_i + \bar{\Gamma}_i}$

$$N_{B-L}^{\rm fin} = \sum_i \varepsilon_i\, \kappa_i^{\rm fin} \Rightarrow \eta_B = a_{\rm sph}\, \frac{N_{B-L}^{\rm fin}}{N_\gamma^{\rm rec}}$$ baryon-to-photon number ratio

Successful leptogenesis : $\eta_B = \eta_B^{CMB} = (6.2 \pm 0.15) \times 10^{-10}$

2) Hierarchical heavy RH neutrino spectrum: $M_2 \gtrsim 3\, M_1$

3) N_3 does not interfere with N_2-decays: $(m_D^\dagger\, m_D)_{23} = 0$

From the last two assumptions $\Rightarrow \quad N_{B-L}^{\rm fin} = \sum_i \varepsilon_i\, \kappa_i^{\rm fin} \simeq \varepsilon_1\, \kappa_1^{\rm fin}$

4) Barring fine-tuned mass cancellations in the seesaw

$$\varepsilon_1 \le \varepsilon_1^{\max} \simeq 10^{-6} \left(\frac{M_1}{10^{10}\,\mathrm{GeV}}\right) \frac{m_{\mathrm{atm}}}{m_1 + m_3}$$

(Davidson, Ibarra '02)

5) Efficiency factor from simple Boltzmann equations

$$\frac{dN_{N_1}}{dz} = -D_1\,(N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\mathrm{eq}})$$

$$\frac{dN_{B-L}}{dz} = -\varepsilon_1\,\frac{dN_{N_1}}{dz} - W_1\,N_{B-L}$$

$$z \equiv \frac{M_1}{T}$$

decays

inverse decays

wash-out

decay parameter

$$K_1 \equiv \frac{\Gamma_{N_1}(T=0)}{H(T=M_1)}$$

Rates recently revised (Bodeker, Wormann, 2014)

$$\kappa_1(z; K_1, z_{\mathrm{in}}) = -\int_{z_{\mathrm{in}}}^{z} dz' \left[\frac{dN_{N_1}}{dz'}\right] e^{-\int_{z'}^{z} [illegible]}$$

(Garbrecht, Glowna, Schwaller '13)

Neutrino mass bounds in vanilla leptog.

(Davidson, Ibarra '02; Buchmüller, PDB, Plümacher '02, '03, '04; Giudice et al. '04)

$$\eta_B \simeq 0.01\,\varepsilon_1(m_1, M_1, \Omega)\,\kappa_1^{\rm fin}(K_1) \leq \eta_B^{\max} = 0.01\,\varepsilon_1^{\max}(m_1, M_1)\,\kappa_1^{\rm fin}(K_1^{\max})$$

Imposing: $\eta_B^{\max}(m_1, M_1) \geq \eta_B^{CMB}$



No dipendence on the leptonic mixing matrix U

Vanilla leptogenesis

(Buchmüller, PDB, Plümacher '04; Giudice et al. '04; Blanchet, PDB '07)

1) Lepton flavor composition is neglected

$$N_i \xrightarrow{\Gamma} l_i\, H^\dagger \qquad N_i \xrightarrow{\bar{\Gamma}} \bar{l}_i\, H$$

$$N_{B-L}^{\rm fin} = \sum \varepsilon_i\, \kappa_i^{\rm fin}$$

$$\Rightarrow \eta_B = a_{\rm sph}\, \frac{N_{B-L}^{\rm fin}}{N_\gamma^{\rm rec}} = \eta_B^{CMB} = (6.1 \pm 0.1) \times 10^{-10}$$

$$\eta_B^{\max}(m_1, M_1) \geq \eta_B^{CMB}$$



2) Hierarchical spectrum ($M_2 \gtrsim 2M_1$)

3) N_3 do not interfere with N_2:

$$(m_D^\dagger\, m_D)_{23} = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad N_{B-L}^{\rm fin} = \sum_i \varepsilon_i\, \kappa_i^{\rm fin} \simeq \varepsilon_1\, \kappa_1^{\rm fin}$$

4) Barring fine-tuned cancellations

(Davidson, Ibarra '02)

$$\varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon_1^{\rm max} \simeq 10^{-6} \left(\frac{M_1}{10^{10}\,{\rm GeV}}\right) \frac{m_{\rm atm}}{m_1 + m_3}$$

No dependence on the leptonic mixing matrix U

5) Efficiency factor from simple Boltzmann equations $\left(z \equiv \frac{M_1}{T}\right)$

$$\kappa_1^{\rm fin}(K_1, z_{\rm in}) = -\int_{z_{\rm in}}^{\infty} dz'\, \frac{dN_1}{dz'}\, e^{-\int_{z'}^{\infty} dz''\, W(z'')}$$

decay parameter: $K_1 \equiv \dfrac{\Gamma_{N_1}(T=0)}{H(T=M_1)}$

Total CP asymmetries

(Flanz,Paschos,Sarkar'95; Covi,Roulet,Vissani'96; Buchmüller,Plümacher'98)



$$\varepsilon_i \simeq \frac{1}{8\pi v^2 (m_D^\dagger m_D)_{ii}} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathrm{Im}\left[(m_D^\dagger m_D)^2_{ij}\right] \times \left[f_V\left(\frac{M_j^2}{M_i^2}\right) + f_S\left(\frac{M_j^2}{M_i^2}\right)\right]$$

It does not depend on U !

A pre-existing asymmetry?



Gravitational Baryogenesis

(Davoudiasl, Kribs, Kitano, Murayama, Steinhardt '04)

The key ingredient is a CP violating interaction between the derivative of the Ricci scalar curvature $\mathcal{R}$ and the baryon number current J^m:

$$\frac{1}{M_*^2}\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}(\partial_\mu \mathcal{R})J^\mu$$

Cutoff scale of the effective theory



This operator emerges naturally in quantum gravity and in supergravity

It works efficiently and asymmetries even much larger than the observed one are generated for $T_{RH} \gg 100$ GeV

Affleck-Dine Baryogenesis

(Affleck, Dine '85)

In the Supersymmetric SM there are many "flat directions" in the space of a field composed of squarks and/or sleptons

$$V(\phi) = \sum_i \left| \frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi_i} \right|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_A \left(\sum_{ij} \phi_i^* (t_A)_{ij} \phi_j \right)^2$$



F term D term

A flat direction can be parametrized in terms of a complex field (AD field) that carries a baryon number that is violated dynamically during inflation

$$\frac{n_B}{s} \sim 10^{-10} \left(\frac{m_{3/2}}{m_\Phi} \right) \left(\frac{m_\Phi}{\mathrm{TeV}} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{M}{M_P} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{T_R}{10\,\mathrm{GeV}} \right)$$

The final asymmetry is $\propto T_{RH}$ and the observed one can be reproduced for low values $T_{RH} \sim 10$ GeV !

Independence of the initial conditions

The early Universe „knows" the neutrino masses ...

(Buchmüller, PDB, Plümacher '04)

$$\eta_B \simeq 0.01\, \varepsilon_1(m_1, M_1, \Omega)\, \kappa_1^{\rm fin}(K_1)$$

decay parameter

$$K_1 \equiv \frac{\Gamma_{N_1}}{H(T=M_1)} \sim \frac{m_{\rm sol,atm}}{m_\star \sim 10^{-3}\,{\rm eV}} \sim 10 \div 50$$

Independence of the initial abundance of N_1

wash-out of a pre-existing asymmetry



$$K_{\rm sol} \simeq 9 \lesssim K_1 \lesssim 50 \simeq K_{\rm atm}$$

$$N_{B-L}^{\rm p,final} = N_{B-L}^{\rm p,initial}\, e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}\,K_1} \ll N_{B-L}^{\rm f,N_1}$$

$$K_1 \gtrsim K_{\rm st}(N_{B-L}^{\rm p,i}) \simeq 16 + 0.85\,\ln(|N_{B-L}^{\rm p,i}|)$$

Since $K_1 \gtrsim m_1/10^{-3}$ eV

$\Rightarrow$ optimal neutrino mass window:

0.1 eV $\gtrsim m_1 \gg 10^{-3}$ eV

The N_2-dominated scenario

(PDB '05)

If light flavour effects are neglected the asymmetry from the next-to-lightest (N_2) RH neutrinos is typically washed-out:

$$N_{B-L}^{\rm f,N_2} = \varepsilon_2 \kappa(K_2)\, e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}\,K_1} \ll N_{B-L}^{\rm f,N_1} = \varepsilon_1\, \kappa(K_1)$$

...except for a special choice of $\Omega = R_{23}$ when $K_1 = m_1/m_* \ll 1$ and $\varepsilon_1 = 0$:

$$\Rightarrow \boxed{N_{B-L}^{\rm fin} = \sum_i \varepsilon_i\, \kappa_i^{\rm fin} \simeq \varepsilon_2\, \kappa_2^{\rm fin}} \qquad \varepsilon_2 \lesssim 10^{-6} \left(\frac{M_2}{10^{10}\,{\rm GeV}}\right)$$

- The lower bound on M_1 disappears and is replaced by a lower bound on M_2 …
  ….that however still implies a lower bound on T_{reh}



- Having $K_1 \lesssim 1$ is a special case.
  How special? $P(K_1 \lesssim 1) \simeq 0.2\%$ (random scan)

- In the limit $K_1 \to 0$ ($K_1 \lesssim 10^{-30}$!) N_1 is stable on cosmological times and might be the DM particle if one finds a way to produce it (e.g. during or at the end of inflation or from the mixing with N_2) (Anisimov, PDB)

SO(10)-inspired leptogenesis

(Branco et al. '02; Nezri, Orloff '02; Akhmedov, Frigerio, Smirnov '03)

Expressing the neutrino Dirac mass matrix m_D (in the basis where the Majorana mass and charged lepton mass matrices are diagonal) as:

$$m_D = V_L^\dagger \, D_{m_D} \, U_R \qquad D_{m_D} = \mathrm{diag}\{m_{D1}, m_{D2}, m_{D3}\}$$

SO(10) inspired conditions*:

$$m_{D1} = \alpha_1 \, m_u \, , \; m_{D2} = \alpha_2 \, m_c \, , \; m_{D3} = \alpha_3 \, m_t \, , \quad (\alpha_i = \mathcal{O}(1)) \qquad V_L \simeq V_{CKM} \simeq I$$

From the seesaw formula one can express:

$U_R = U_R\,(U, m_i; \alpha_i, V_L)$, $M_i = M_i\,(U, m_i; \alpha_i, V_L)$ $\Rightarrow$ $\eta_B = \eta_B\,(U, m_i; \alpha_i, V_L)$

one typically obtains (barring fine-tuned 'crossing level' solutions):

$$M_1 \simeq \alpha_1^2 \, 10^5 \mathrm{GeV} \, , \; M_2 \simeq \alpha_2^2 \, 10^{10} \, \mathrm{GeV} \, , \; M_3 \simeq \alpha_3^2 \, 10^{15} \, \mathrm{GeV}$$

since $M_1 \ll 10^9$ GeV and $K_1 \gg 1$ $\Rightarrow$ $\eta_B^{(N1)}, \eta_B^{(N2)} \ll \eta_B^{CMB}$

* Note that SO(10)-inspired consditions can be realized also beyond SO(10) and even beyond GUT models (e.g. "Tetraleptogenesis", King '13)

Crossing level solutions

(Akhmedov, Frigerio, Smirnov '03)

$$M_1 \simeq \frac{\alpha_1^2\, m_u^2}{|m_{\nu ee}|} \qquad M_2 \simeq \frac{\alpha_2^2\, m_c^2}{m_1\, m_2\, m_3}\, \frac{|m_{\nu ee}|}{|(m_\nu^{-1})_{\tau\tau}|} \qquad M_3 \simeq \alpha_3^2\, m_t^2\, (m_\nu^{-1})_{\tau\tau}$$

$\rho = \pi/2,\ \sigma = 0,\ s_{13} = 0.1$



- At the crossing the CP asymmetries undergo a resonant enhancement (Covi, Roulet, Vissani '96; Pilaftsis '98; Pilaftsis, Underwood '04; ...)

- The correct BAU can be attained for a fine tuned choice of parameters: many models have made use of these solutions
  (e.g. Buccella, Falcone, Nardi, '12; Altarelli, Meloni '14)
- These, however, have to be strongly fine tuned to reproduce the observed asymmetry. As we will see there is another solution not relying on resonant leptogenesis.

Lepton flavour effects

(Abada, Davidson, Losada, Josse-Michaux, Riotto'06; Nardi, Nir, Roulet, Racker '06; Blanchet, PDB, Raffelt '06; Riotto, De Simone '06)

Flavor composition of lepton quantum states:

$$|l_1\rangle = \sum_\alpha \langle l_\alpha | l_1 \rangle \, |l_\alpha\rangle \qquad (\alpha = e, \mu, \tau) \qquad P_{1\alpha} \equiv |\langle \ell_1 | \alpha \rangle|^2$$

$$|\bar{l}_1'\rangle = \sum_\alpha \langle l_\alpha | \bar{l}_1' \rangle \, |\bar{l}_\alpha\rangle \qquad \bar{P}_{1\alpha} \equiv |\langle \bar{\ell}_1' | \bar{\alpha} \rangle|^2$$

- For $M_1 \lesssim 10^{12}$ GeV τ-Yukawa interactions ($\bar{l}_{L\tau}\, \phi\, f_{\tau\tau}\, e_{R\tau}$) are fast enough to break the coherent evolution of $|l_1\rangle$ and $|\bar{l}_1'\rangle$ that become a incoherent mixture of a τ and of a μ+e component
  $\Rightarrow$ 2- flavour regime

- For $M_1 \lesssim 10^9$ GeV also μ- Yukawa interactions are fast enough
  $\Rightarrow$ 3-flavor regime



Additional contribution to CP violation:

(Nardi, Racker, Roulet '06)

($\alpha = \tau, e+\mu$)

$$\varepsilon_{1\alpha} = P^0_{1\alpha}\,\varepsilon_1 + \frac{\Delta P_{1\alpha}}{2}$$

depends on U !

1) $\Gamma \neq \bar{\Gamma}$



$\Rightarrow\ P^0_{1\alpha}\,\varepsilon_1$

2) $|\bar{l}'_1\rangle \neq CP|l_1\rangle$

+



$\Rightarrow\ \frac{\Delta P_{1\alpha}}{2}$

Two fully flavoured regime

- Classic Kinetic Equations (in their simplest form)

$$\frac{dN_{N_1}}{dz} = -D_1\,(N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\rm eq})$$

$$\frac{dN_{\Delta_\alpha}}{dz} = -\varepsilon_{1\alpha}\,\frac{dN_{N_1}}{dz} - P_{1\alpha}^0\,W_1\,N_{\Delta_\alpha}$$

$$\Rightarrow\quad N_{B-L} = \sum_\alpha N_{\Delta_\alpha} \qquad (\Delta_\alpha \equiv B/3 - L_\alpha)$$

($\alpha = \tau$, $e+\mu$)

$$P_{1\alpha} \equiv |\langle l_\alpha | l_1\rangle|^2 = P_{1\alpha}^0 + \Delta P_{1\alpha}/2 \qquad \left(\textstyle\sum_\alpha P_{1\alpha}^0 = 1\right)$$

$$\bar{P}_{1\alpha} \equiv |\langle \bar{l}_\alpha | \bar{l}_1'\rangle|^2 = P_{1\alpha}^0 - \Delta P_{1\alpha}/2 \qquad \left(\textstyle\sum_\alpha \Delta P_{1\alpha} = 0\right)$$

$$\Rightarrow\quad \boxed{\varepsilon_{1\alpha} \equiv -\frac{P_{1\alpha}\Gamma_1 - \bar{P}_{1\alpha}\bar{\Gamma}_1}{\Gamma_1 + \bar{\Gamma}_1} = P_{1\alpha}^0\,\varepsilon_1 + \Delta P_{1\alpha}(\Omega, U)/2}$$

$$\Rightarrow N_{B-L}^{\rm fin} = \sum_\alpha \varepsilon_{1\alpha}\,\kappa_{1\alpha}^{\rm fin} \simeq 2\,\varepsilon_1\,\kappa_1^{\rm fin} + \frac{\Delta P_{1\alpha}}{2}\,[\kappa^{\rm f}(K_{1\alpha}) - \kappa^{\rm fin}(K_{1\beta})]$$

Flavoured decay parameters: $K_{i\alpha} \equiv P_{i\alpha}^0\,K_i = \left|\sum_k \sqrt{\frac{m_k}{m_\star}}\,U_{\alpha k}\Omega_{ki}\right|^2$

Neutrino mass bounds and role of PMNS phases

(Abada et al.' 07; Blanchet,PDB,Raffelt;Blanchet,PDB '08)



PMNS phases off



Imposing the validity of the Boltzmann equations





Low energy phases can be the only source of CP violation

(Nardi et al.'06;Blanchet,PDB'06;Pascoli,Petcov,Riotto '06;Anisimov,Blanchet,PDB '08)

- Assume real $\Omega \Rightarrow \varepsilon_1 = 0 \Rightarrow$ $\varepsilon_{1\alpha} = P^0_{1\alpha}\,\varepsilon_1 + \frac{\Delta P_{1\alpha}}{2}$

$\Rightarrow N_{B-L} \Rightarrow 2\varepsilon_1 \kappa_1^{fin} + \Delta P_{1\alpha}(\kappa_{1\alpha}^{fin} - \kappa_{1\beta}^{fin})$ ($\alpha = \tau, e+\mu$)

- Assume even vanishing Majorana phases

$\Rightarrow$ δ with non-vanishing θ_{13} ($J_{CP} \neq 0$) would be the only source of CP violation (and testable)



Green points: only Dirac phase with $\sin\theta_{13} = 0.2$ $|\sin\delta| = 1$

Red points: only Majorana phases

- No reasons for these assumptions to be rigorously satisfied (Davidson, Rius et al.'07)
- In general this contribution is *overwhelmed* by the high energy phases
- But they can be approximately satisfied in specific scenarios for some regions
- It is in any case by itself interesting that CP violation in neutrino mixing could be sufficient to have successful leptogenesis

The N_2-dominated scenario (flavoured)

(Vives '05; Blanchet, PDB '06; Blanchet, PDB '08, PDB, Fiorentin '14)

Flavour effects strongly enhance the importance of the N_2-dominated scenario

A two stage process:

M_2

N_2 - Asymmetry Production

in the 1 flavour regime

~ 10^{12} GeV

or in the 2 flavour regime

~ 10^{9} GeV

M_1

N_1 - washout in the 3 fl. regime

N_1 wash-out is neglected

$\Omega = R_{12}(\omega_{12})\, R_{13}(\omega_{13})$



Both wash-out and flavor effects

Unflavored case

$$N_{B-L}^{\rm f}(N_2) = P^0_{2e}\,\varepsilon_2\,\kappa(K_2)\,e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}\,K_{1e}} + P^0_{2\mu}\,\varepsilon_2\,\kappa(K_2)\,e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}\,K_{1\mu}} + P^0_{2\tau}\,\varepsilon_2\,\kappa(K_2)\,e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}\,K_{1\tau}}$$

- $K_1 = K_{1e} + K_{1\mu} + K_{1\tau}$; $P(K_1 \lesssim 1) \sim 0.2\%$; $P(K_{1e} \lesssim 1) \sim 2\,P(K_{1\mu,\tau} \lesssim 1) \sim 15\%$ $\Rightarrow \Sigma_\alpha P(K_{1\alpha} \lesssim 1) = 30\%$
- With flavor effects the domain of applicability goes much beyond the special choice $\Omega = R_{23}$
- **Existence of the heaviest RH neutrino N_3 is necessary for the $\varepsilon_{2\alpha}$'s not to be negligible**

More generally one has to distinguish 10 different RH neutrino mass patterns (Bertuzzo,PDB,Marzola '10)



N_2 dominated scenario



For each pattern a specific set of Boltzmann equations has to be considered

The problem of the initial conditions in flavoured leptogenesis

(Bertuzzo,PDB,Marzola '10)

Residual "pre-existing" asymmetry possibly generated by some external mechanism

$$N_{B-L}^{\rm f} = N_{B-L}^{\rm p,f} + N_{B-L}^{\rm lep,f}$$

Asymmetry generated from leptogenesis



The conditions for the wash-out of a pre-existing asymmetry ('**strong thermal leptogenesis**') can be realised only within a N_2-dominated scenario where the final asymmetry is dominantly produced in the tauon flavour

Flavour projection and wash-out of a pre-existing asymmetry

(Barbieri et al. '99; Engelhard, Nir, Nardi '08; Blanchet, PDB, Jones, Marzola '10)

$M_i \gtrsim 10^{12}$ GeV





$$N_{B-L}^{\rm p}(T \ll M_i) = (1 - P_{{\rm p}i})N_{B-L}^{\rm p,i} + P_{{\rm p}i}\, e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}\,K_i}\, N_{B-L}^{\rm p,i}$$

$M_i \ll 10^9$ GeV





$$N_{B-L}^{\rm p}(T \ll M_i) = P_{\rm pe}\, e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}\,K_{ie}}\, N_{B-L}^{\rm p,i} + P_{{\rm p}\mu}\, e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}\,K_{i\mu}}\, N_{B-L}^{\rm p,i} + P_{{\rm p}\tau}\, e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}\,K_{i\tau}}\, N_{B-L}^{\rm p,i}$$

Successful strong thermal leptogenesis



Strong thermal leptogenesis conditions

Courtesy of Michele Re Fiorentin

Density matrix formalism with heavy neutrino flavours

(Barbieri et al.'00; Blanchet,PDB, Jones, Marzola '11)

For a thorough description of all neutrino mass patterns including transition regions and all effects (flavour projection, phantom leptogenesis,...) one needs a description in terms of a density matrix formalism



$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dN^{B-L}_{\alpha\beta}}{dz} &= \varepsilon^{(1)}_{\alpha\beta}\, D_1\,(N_{N_1} - N^{\rm eq}_{N_1}) - \frac{1}{2}\,W_1\,\{\mathcal{P}^{0(1)}, N^{B-L}\}_{\alpha\beta} \\
&+ \varepsilon^{(2)}_{\alpha\beta}\, D_2\,(N_{N_2} - N^{\rm eq}_{N_2}) - \frac{1}{2}\,W_2\,\{\mathcal{P}^{0(2)}, N^{B-L}\}_{\alpha\beta} \\
&+ \varepsilon^{(3)}_{\alpha\beta}\, D_3\,(N_{N_3} - N^{\rm eq}_{N_3}) - \frac{1}{2}\,W_3\,\{\mathcal{P}^{0(3)}, N^{B-L}\}_{\alpha\beta} \\
&+ {\rm i\,Re}(\Lambda_\tau)\left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, N^{\ell+\bar\ell}\right]_{\alpha\beta} - {\rm Im}(\Lambda_\tau)\left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, N^{B-L}\right]\right]_{\alpha\beta} \\
&+ {\rm i\,Re}(\Lambda_\mu)\left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, N^{\ell+\bar\ell}\right]_{\alpha\beta} - {\rm Im}(\Lambda_\mu)\left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, N^{B-L}\right]\right]_{\alpha\beta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

Strong thermal leptogenesis and the absolute neutrino mass scale

(PDB, Sophie King, Michele Re Fiorentin 2014)

Final asymmetry from leptogenesis

Phantom terms

$$N_{B-L}^{\rm lep,f} \simeq \left[\frac{K_{2e}}{K_{2\tau_2^\perp}}\,\varepsilon_{2\tau_2^\perp}\,\kappa(K_{2\tau_2^\perp}) + \left(\varepsilon_{2e} - \frac{K_{2e}}{K_{2\tau_2^\perp}}\,\varepsilon_{2\tau_2^\perp}\right)\,\kappa(K_{2\tau_2^\perp}/2)\right]\,e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}\,K_{1e}} + \left[\frac{K_{2\mu}}{K_{2\tau_2^\perp}}\,\varepsilon_{2\tau_2^\perp}\,\kappa(K_{2\tau_2^\perp}) + \left(\varepsilon_{2\mu} - \frac{K_{2\mu}}{K_{2\tau_2^\perp}}\,\varepsilon_{2\tau_2^\perp}\right)\,\kappa(K_{2\tau_2^\perp}/2)\right]\,e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}\,K_{1\mu}} + \varepsilon_{2\tau}\,\kappa(K_{2\tau})\,e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}\,K_{1\tau}}\,,$$

Relic value of the pre-existing asymmetry:

$$N_{\Delta_\tau}^{\rm p,f} = (p_{\rm p\tau}^0 + \Delta p_{\rm p\tau})\,e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}\,(K_{1\tau}+K_{2\tau})}\,N_{B-L}^{\rm p,i}\,, \tag{18}$$

$$N_{\Delta_\mu}^{\rm p,f} = \left\{(1-p_{\rm p\tau}^0)\,\left[p_{\mu\tau_2^\perp}^0\,p_{\rm p\tau_2^\perp}^0\,e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}\,(K_{2e}+K_{2\mu})} + (1-p_{\mu\tau_2^\perp}^0)\,(1-p_{\rm p\tau_2^\perp}^0)\right] + \Delta p_{\rm p\mu}\right\}\,e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}\,K_{1\mu}}\,N_{B-L}^{\rm p,i},$$

$$N_{\Delta_e}^{\rm p,f} = \left\{(1-p_{\rm p\tau}^0)\,\left[p_{e\tau_2^\perp}^0\,p_{\rm p\tau_2^\perp}^0\,e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}\,(K_{2e}+K_{2\mu})} + (1-p_{e\tau_2^\perp}^0)\,(1-p_{\rm p\tau_2^\perp}^0)\right] + \Delta p_{\rm pe}\right\}\,e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}\,K_{1e}}\,N_{B-L}^{\rm p,i}\,.$$

Successful strong thermal leptogenesis then requires:

$$K_{1e}, K_{1\mu} \gtrsim K_{\rm st}(N_{\Delta_{e,\mu}}^{\rm p,i}),\; K_{2\tau} \gtrsim K_{\rm st}(N_{\Delta_\tau}^{\rm p,i}),\; K_{1\tau} \lesssim 1\,.$$

A lower bound on neutrino masses (NO)

(PDB, Sophie King, Michele Re Fiorentin 2014)

Starting from the flavoured decay parameters:

$$K_{i\beta} \equiv p^0_{i\beta}\, K_i = \left|\sum_k \sqrt{\frac{m_k}{m_\star}}\, U_{\beta k}\, \Omega_{ki}\right|^2$$

and imposing $K_{1\tau} \gtrsim 1$ and $K_{1e},\ K_{1\mu} \gtrsim K_{st} \simeq 10$ (α=e,μ)

$$m_1 > m_1^{\rm lb} \equiv m_\star \max_\alpha \left[\left(\frac{\sqrt{K_{\rm st}} - \sqrt{K^{0,\rm max}_{1\alpha}}}{\max[|\Omega_{11}|]\, \left|U_{\alpha 1} - \frac{U_{\tau 1}}{U_{\tau 3}}\, U_{\alpha 3}\right|}\right)^2\right]$$

$$K^{0,\rm max}_{1\alpha} \equiv \left(\max[|\Omega_{21}|]\, \sqrt{\frac{m_{\rm sol}}{m_\star}}\, \left|U_{\alpha 2} - \frac{U_{\tau 2}}{U_{\tau 3}}\, U_{\alpha 3}\right| + \left|\frac{U_{\alpha 3}}{U_{\tau 3}}\right|\, \sqrt{K^{\rm max}_{1\tau}}\right)^2$$

- The lower bound exists if $\max[|\Omega_{21}|]$ is not too large)

$N^{P,i}_{B-L}$ = 0.001, 0.01, 0.1

$\max[|\Omega_{21}|^2]$ =2



$m_1 \gtrsim 10$ meV$\Rightarrow \Sigma_i\, m_i \gtrsim 75$ meV

A lower bound on neutrino masses (NO)

The lower bound would not have existed for large θ_{13} values



It is modulated by the Dirac phase and it could become more stringent when δ will be measured



A new neutrino mass window for leptogenesis



$$0.01\ \text{eV} \lesssim m_1 \lesssim 0.1\ \text{eV}$$

A lower bound on neutrino masses (IO)

(NO→ IO ⇒ analytically: $m_{sol} \to m_{atm}$, 1→2, 2→3, 3→1)

$N^{P,i}_{B-L}$ = 0.001, 0.01, 0.1 $\max[|\Omega^2_{21}|] = 2$ INVERTED ORDERING



$m_1 \gtrsim 3$ meV ⇒ $\Sigma_i\, m_i \gtrsim 100$ meV (not necessarily deviation from HL)

N_2-dominated scenario rescues SO(10)-inspired leptogenesis

(PDB, Riotto '08,'10)

$$N^{\rm f}_{B-L} \simeq \varepsilon_{2e}\,\kappa(K_{2e+\mu})\,e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}K_{1e}} + \varepsilon_{2\mu}\,\kappa(K_{2e+\mu})\,e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}K_{1\mu}} + \varepsilon_{2\tau}\,\kappa(K_{2\tau})\,e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8}K_{1\tau}}$$

Independent of $\alpha_1 = m_{D1}/m_u$ and $\alpha_3 = m_{D3}/m_t$

$\alpha_2 = m_{D2}/m_c = 5$ $\alpha_2 = 4$ $\alpha_2 = 3$

NORMAL ORDERING







- $T_{RH} \gtrsim 5\times10^{10}$ GeV
- $m_1 \gtrsim 10^{-3}$ eV
- Majorana phases constrained around specific values
- Very marginal allowed regions for INVERTED ORDERING
- Alternative way to rescue SO(10) inspired models is by considering a left-right symmetric seesaw (Abada, Hosteins, Josse-Michaux, Lavignac'08)
- Most of the solutions are tauon dominated as needed for strong thermal leptogenesis: can SO(10)-inspired thermal leptogenesis be also STRONG?

Strong thermal SO(10)-inspired solution

(PDB, Marzola '11; '13)

- YES the strong thermal leptonesis condition can be also satisfied for a subset of the solutions (red, green, blue regions) only for NORMAL ORDERING

$\alpha_2=5$ $N^{p,i}_{B-L}$ = 0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 0 $I \leq V_L \leq V_{CKM}$



- The lightest neutrino mass respects the general lower bound but is also upper bounded $\Rightarrow$ $15 \lesssim m_1 \lesssim 25$ meV;
- The reactor mixing angle has to be non-vanishing (first results presented before Daya Bay discovery);
- The atmospheric mixing angle falls strictly in the first octant;
- The Majorana phases are even more constrained arounds special values

SO(10)-inspired+strong thermal leptogenesis

(PDB, Marzola '11-'12)

Imposing successful strong thermal leptogenesis condition:

$$N_{B-L}^{\rm f} = N_{B-L}^{\rm p} + N_{B-L}^{\rm lep}, \quad |N_{B-L}^{\rm p}| \ll N_{B-L}^{\rm lep} \simeq 100\, \eta_B^{CMB}$$

Link between the sign of J_{CP} and the sign of the asymmetry

$\eta_B = \eta_B^{CMB}$



$\eta_B = -\,\eta_B^{CMB}$



A Dirac phase $\delta \sim -45^\circ$ is favoured: sign matters!

Strong thermal SO(10)-inspired leptogenesis: the atmospheric mixing angle test

arXiv:1308.1107



NuFIT 1.2 (2013)

v1.2: Three-neutrino results after the 'TAUP 2013' conference [September 2013]



http://www.nu-fit.org/sites/default/files/v12.fig-dlthie-glob.pdf

For values of $\theta_{23} \gtrsim 36^0$ the Dirac phase is predicted to be $\delta \sim -45^0$

It is interesting that low values of the atmospheric mixing angle are also necessary to reproduce b-τ unification in SO(10) models (Bajc, Senjanovic, Vissani '06)

Experimental test on the way: NOνA



Strong thermal SO(10)-inspired solution

SO(10)-inspired+strong thermal leptogenesis

(PDB, Marzola '11-'12)

Sharp predictions on the absolute neutrino mass scale including $0\nu\beta\beta$ effective neutrino mass m_{ee}

N_{B-L}= 0
0.001
0.01
0.1

α_2=5



$m_{ee} \simeq 0.8 m_1 \simeq 15$ meV

Strong thermal SO(10)-inspired leptogenesis: on the right track?

(PDB, Marzola '13)

If we do not plug any experimental information (mixing angles left completely free) : 1 excluded + 1 allowed region



2 RH neutrino scenario revisited

(King 2000; Frampton, Yanagida, Glashow '01, Ibarra, Ross 2003; Antusch, PDB, Jones, King '11)

In the 2 RH neutrino scenario the N_2 production has been so far considered to be safely negligible because $\varepsilon_{2\alpha}$ were supposed to be strongly suppressed and very strong N_1 wash-out. But taking into account:

- the N_2 asymmetry N_1-orthogonal component
- an additional unsuppressed term to $\varepsilon_{2\alpha}$

New allowed N_2 dominated regions appear



These regions are interesting because they correspond to light sequential dominated neutrino mass models realized in some grandunified models

Flavour coupling

(Buchmuller, Plumacher '01; Barbieri et al.'01; Nardi et al.'06;Blanchet, PDB '08)

Taking into accounts that an Higgs boson asymmetry is also produced in the decays of the RH neutrinos and that the lepton asymmetries are redistributed by gauge interactions into quarks and charged leptons as well, the set of kinetic equations becomes:

$$\frac{dN_{N_i}}{dz} = -D_i\left(N_{N_i} - N_{N_i}^{\rm eq}\right) \quad (i = 1, 2, 3),$$

$$\frac{dN_{\Delta_\alpha}}{dz} = \sum_i \varepsilon_{i\alpha} D_i\left(N_{N_i} - N_{N_i}^{\rm eq}\right) - \sum_{i,\beta} P_{i\alpha}^0 \left(C_{\alpha\beta}^{\ell} + C_{\beta}^{H}\right) W_i^{\rm ID} N_{\Delta_\beta},$$

$$\Delta_\alpha \equiv B/3 - L_\alpha \; (\alpha = e, \mu, \tau)$$

The flavored asymmetries dynamics couple !

A pictorial representation

Let us give a pictorial description focusing on the dominant Higgs asymmetry and disregarding the asymmetries in quarks and charged lepton singlets

Assume $K_{2\alpha} \lesssim 1$ while $K_{2\beta} \gg 1$



This β-asymmetry is induced by the “thermal contact” with the α-leptons via the Higgs

Flavour coupling in the N_2-dom.scenario

(Antusch, PDB, Jones, King '10)

Flavor coupling does not relevantly affect the final asymmetry In N_1-leptogenesis (Abada, Josse-Michaux '07) but a strong enhancement is possible in N_2-leptogenesis because here now there are three stages to be taken into account:

1) Production at 10^{12} GeV >> $T \sim M_2 \gtrsim 10^9$ GeV (2-flavour regime):

$$\frac{dN_{N_2}}{dz_2} = -D_2\,(N_{N_2} - N_{N_2}^{\rm eq})\,,$$

$$\frac{dN_{\Delta_\gamma}}{dz_2} = \varepsilon_{2\gamma}\,D_2\,(N_{N_2} - N_{N_2}^{\rm eq}) - P_{2\gamma}^0\,W_2 \sum_{\alpha=\gamma,\tau} C_{\gamma\alpha}^{(2)}\,N_{\Delta_\alpha}\,,(\gamma \equiv e+\mu)$$

$$\frac{dN_{\Delta_\tau}}{dz_2} = \varepsilon_{2\tau}\,\Delta_2\,(N_{N_2} - N_{N_2}^{\rm eq}) - P_{2\tau}^0\,W_2 \sum_{\alpha=\gamma,\tau} C_{\tau\alpha}^{(2)}\,N_{\Delta_\alpha}\,.$$

2) Decoherence at $T \sim 10^9$ GeV : $N_{\Delta_\gamma}^{T\sim M_2}$ splits into $N_{\Delta_\mu}^{T\sim M_2}$ and $N_{\Delta_e}^{T\sim M_2}$

3) Lightest RH neutrino wash-out at $T \sim M_1 \ll 10^9$ GeV (3-fl. regime):

$$\frac{dN_{\Delta_\alpha}}{dz_1} = -P_{1\alpha}^0 \sum_\beta C_{\alpha\beta}^{(3)}\,W_1\,N_{\Delta_\beta}\,, \qquad (\alpha,\beta = e,\mu,\tau)$$

Production stage

We have to solve :

$$\frac{dN_{N_2}}{dz_2} = -D_2\,(N_{N_2} - N_{N_2}^{\rm eq})\,,$$

$$\frac{dN_{\Delta_\gamma}}{dz_2} = \varepsilon_{2\gamma}\,D_2\,(N_{N_2} - N_{N_2}^{\rm eq}) - P_{2\gamma}^0\,W_2 \sum_{\alpha=\gamma,\tau} C_{\gamma\alpha}^{(2)}\,N_{\Delta_\alpha}\,,$$

$$\frac{dN_{\Delta_\tau}}{dz_2} = \varepsilon_{2\tau}\,\Delta_2\,(N_{N_2} - N_{N_2}^{\rm eq}) - P_{2\tau}^0\,W_2 \sum_{\alpha=\gamma,\tau} C_{\tau\alpha}^{(2)}\,N_{\Delta_\alpha}\,.$$

Defining U as the matrix that diagonalizes: $P_2^0 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} P_{2\gamma}^0\,C_{\gamma\gamma}^{(2)} & P_{2\gamma}^0\,C_{\gamma\tau}^{(2)} \\ P_{2\tau}^0\,C_{\tau\gamma}^{(2)} & P_{2\tau}^0\,C_{\tau\tau}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}$

$$U\,P_2^0\,U^{-1} = {\rm diag}(P_{2\gamma'}^0, P_{2\tau'}^0)$$

The asymmetry at $T \sim M_2$ is then given by :

$$N_{\Delta_\gamma}^{T\sim M_2} = U_{\gamma\gamma'}^{-1}\,[U_{\gamma'\gamma}\,\varepsilon_{2\gamma} + U_{\gamma'\tau}\,\varepsilon_{2\tau}]\cdot(K_{2\gamma}) + U_{\gamma\tau'}^{-1}\,[U_{\tau'\gamma}\,\varepsilon_{2\gamma} + U_{\tau'\tau}\,\varepsilon_{2\tau}]\cdot(K_{2\tau})\,,$$

$$N_{\Delta_\tau}^{T\sim M_2} = U_{\tau\gamma'}^{-1}\,[U_{\gamma'\gamma}\,\varepsilon_{2\gamma} + U_{\gamma'\tau}\,\varepsilon_{2\tau}]\cdot(K_{2\gamma}) + U_{\tau\tau'}^{-1}\,[U_{\tau'\gamma}\,\varepsilon_{2\gamma} + U_{\tau'\tau}\,\varepsilon_{2\tau}]\cdot(K_{2\tau})\,,$$

$$N_{B-L}^{T\sim M_2} = N_{\Delta_\gamma}^{T\sim M_2} + N_{\Delta_\tau}^{T\sim M_2}\,.$$

Final Remarks

- Thermal leptogenesis: problem of the independence of the initial conditions
- Solution: N_2-dominated scenario (minimal seesaw, hierarchical N_i)
- Deviations of neutrino masses from the hierarchical limits are expected
- SO(10)-inspired models are rescued by the N_2-dominated scenario and can also realise strong thermal leptogenesis

Strong thermal SO(10)-inspired leptogenesis solution

ORDERING	NORMAL
θ_{13}	$\gtrsim 3^\circ$
θ_{23}	$\lesssim 42^\circ$
δ	$\sim -45^\circ$
$m_{ee} \simeq 0.8\, m_1$	$\simeq 15$ meV

Still many Labors to come!

Some insight from the decay parameters

At the production ($T \sim M_2$)





At the wash-out ($T \sim M_1$)







Density matrix and CTP formalism to describe the transition regimes

(De Simone, Riotto '06; Beneke, Gabrecht, Fidler, Herranen, Schwaller '10)

$$\frac{dY_{\alpha\beta}}{dz} = \frac{1}{szH(z)}\left[(\gamma_D + \gamma_{\Delta L=1})\left(\frac{Y_{N_1}}{Y_{N_1}^{eq}} - 1\right)\epsilon_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2Y_\ell^{eq}}\left\{\gamma_D + \gamma_{\Delta L=1}, Y\right\}_{\alpha\beta}\right] - \left[\sigma_2 \mathrm{Re}(\Lambda) + \sigma_1 |\mathrm{Im}(\Lambda)|\right] Y_{\alpha\beta}$$



Fully two-flavoured regime limit

Unflavoured regime limit

Scale of transition to the two flavoured recently claimed to be a factor 2-3 lower: interesting issue to be discussed!

(Garbrecht, Glowna, Schwaller '13)

Heavy flavoured scenario in models with A4 discrete flavour symmetry

(Manohar, Jenkins'08; Bertuzzo, PDB, Feruglio, Nardi '09; Hagedorn, Molinaro, Petcov '09)



$$m_i = \frac{y^2 \, v_u^2}{M_j}$$



$m_1 \simeq 5 \times 10^{-3}\,\mathrm{eV}$

$m_1 \gtrsim 0.017\,\mathrm{eV}$

imposing successful leptogenesis



η → Symmetry Breaking parameter



The different lines correspond to values of y between 0.3 and 3

Example: The heavy neutrino flavored scenario cannot satisfy the strong thermal leptogenesis condition



The pre-existing asymmetry (yellow) undergoes a 3 step flavour projection



(a) $T \gg M_3$

(b) $T \sim M_3$

(c) $T \sim M_2$

(d) $T \sim M_1$