Gravitational waves and neutrino masses in conformal models

Scale invariant U(1)' models of neutrino mass

 $\Phi \to \Phi' = \rho^{-a} \Phi$, $x \to x' = \rho x$ a = -1 for bosons, -3/2 for fermions

Forbids mass terms at tree level

Anomaly-free generation-independent U(1)' charges:

$$\frac{\text{Field}}{\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{1})'} \frac{Q}{\frac{1}{3}x_{\mathcal{H}} + \frac{1}{6}x_{\sigma}} \frac{4}{\frac{4}{3}x_{\mathcal{H}} + \frac{1}{6}x_{\sigma}} - \frac{2}{3}x_{\mathcal{H}} + \frac{1}{6}x_{\sigma}} \frac{L}{-x_{\mathcal{H}} - \frac{1}{2}x_{\sigma}} \frac{e_{R}}{-2x_{\mathcal{H}} - \frac{1}{2}x_{\sigma}} \frac{\mathcal{H}}{x_{\mathcal{H}}} - \frac{1}{2}x_{\sigma}} \frac{1}{x_{\sigma}} \frac{1}{2}x_{\sigma}}{x_{\sigma}} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$$

Image: Second state of the second state of

Majoron σ (complex scalar singlet)

 \odot B-L model: $x_{\mathcal{H}} = 0, x_{\sigma} = 2$

$V_0(\mathcal{H},\sigma) = \lambda_h(\mathcal{H}^{\dagger}\mathcal{H})^2 + \lambda_{\sigma}(\sigma^{\dagger}\sigma)^2 + \lambda_{\sigma h}(\mathcal{H}^{\dagger}\mathcal{H})(\sigma^{\dagger}\sigma)$

Conformal anomaly breaks scale invariance and produces Coleman-Weinberg potential

 \odot U(1)' broken radiatively and σ develops a vev

 $\lambda_{\sigma h} \sim - (v/v_{\sigma})^2$ induces a negative mass-squared for Higgs doublet, so SM-like Higgs acquires mass // to EWSB in SM

New CP-even Higgs is pseudo-Goldstone boson of scale symmetry

Scale invariant Type-I seesaw mechanism

$$\mathscr{L}_{\nu} = y_{\nu}^{ij} \bar{N}_i \mathscr{H} L_j + y_{\sigma}^{ij} \bar{N}_i^c N_j \sigma + h.c.$$

$$\boldsymbol{m}_{\nu} \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\boldsymbol{v}^2}{\boldsymbol{v}_{\sigma}} \boldsymbol{y}_{\nu}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{y}_{\sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{y}_{\nu}$$

 $M_N \approx \frac{v_\sigma}{\sqrt{2}} y_\sigma$

Neutrino masses generated by SSB

Assume normal mass hierarchy and diagonal y_{σ}

Require consistency with neutrino oscillation data and cosmological bounds

Minimize potential and evaluate mass spectrum at 1-loop

$$0 = \lambda_h v^3 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\sigma h} v v_{\sigma}^2 + \frac{\partial V_{CW}}{\partial \phi_h} \Big|_{\phi_h = v, \phi_\sigma = v_\sigma} \qquad 0 = \lambda_\sigma v_{\sigma}^3 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\sigma h} v^2 v_{\sigma} + \frac{\partial V_{CW}}{\partial \phi_\sigma} \Big|_{\phi_h = v, \phi_\sigma = v_\sigma}$$

 ${}^{\oslash}$ Fix λ_{σ} and $\lambda_{\sigma h}$

- I parameter in scalar sector: M_{h_2}
- 3 params in gauge sector: g_L, x_H, x_σ . Will focus here on B-L model. See 2412.02645 for generic models
- ③ 3 params in neutrino sector
- No kinetic mixing at EW scale

First order phase transition



- FOPT associated with potential barrier and involves latent heat
- Thermal jump/quantum tunneling lead to true vacuum bubble nucleation
- Bubbles expand, transfer energy to plasma, collide, thereby producing gravitational waves

FOPTs in a conformal dark sector

 $V_{\text{eff}} = V_0(\phi_{\sigma}) + V_{\text{CW}}(\phi_{\sigma}) + V_T(\phi_{\sigma}, T) + V_{\text{Daisy}}(\phi_{\sigma}, T)$

Phase transition governed by φ_σ only ∵ v_σ ≫ v
 Use RG-improved thermal potential (couplings and φ_σ in the potential subject to RG evolution)
 Daisy corrections turn out to be small



$$V_{\text{eff}}^{\text{HT}} = \phi_{\sigma}^{4} \left(\frac{g_{L}^{4}(1 - 3\gamma_{E} + 6\ln2)}{2\pi^{2}} - \frac{g_{L}^{3}}{2\sqrt{2}\pi} + \frac{\lambda_{\sigma}}{4} + \frac{\gamma_{E}\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{y_{\sigma}}^{4})}{64\pi^{2}} \right) - \phi_{\sigma}^{3} \frac{4g_{L}^{3}T}{3\pi} + \phi_{\sigma}^{2} \left(\frac{g_{L}^{2}T^{2}}{2} - \frac{g_{L}^{3}T^{2}}{\sqrt{2}\pi} + \frac{T^{2}}{48}\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{y_{\sigma}}^{2}) \right)$$

- Quadratic and (negative) cubic term generated at finite temperature
- ${\ensuremath{ \circ } }$ Barrier persists as $T \to 0$
- Gauge sector responsible for FOPT since barrier vanishes if $g_L = 0$



Location of minimum determined by RG evolution of \$\lambda_{\sigma}\$
Depth of minimum is greater for smaller \$g_L\$
Larger \$v_{\sigma}\$ for larger \$M_{Z'}\$

Role of neutrino sector



Competition between gauge and Yukawa couplings affects location and depth of minimum

Larger Yukawa pushes the minimum to higher scales and makes the potential deeper

Dark sector fully thermalizes with SM sector: $\Delta N_{
m eff} \simeq 0$



 $h^2 \Omega_{\rm cosmic \ string} \sim 10^{-7} \frac{M_{\rm Z'}}{M_{\rm GUT}}$





Strong supercooling ($\alpha > 10$) testable at LIGO/LISA/ET

• $\beta/H(T_p) \approx \text{constant for } \alpha \gg 1 \implies \Omega_{\text{GW}}^{\text{peak}} \approx \text{constant}$

 ${\it Inside}$ dashed contour, false vacuum volume is decreasing at a temperature below T_p



Peak amplitude set by gauge coupling

 $@ 0.26 \leq g_L \leq 0.63$

Scatter in points in right panels because of competition between gauge and Yukawa couplings

Substitution State And Antipactic State Antipactic State And Antipactic State Antipacti

Solution LVK data exclude part of the parameter space



Peak frequency set by the U(1)' breaking scale
Z' an order of magnitude heavier than h_2



Vertical bands show complementary sensitivity to seesaw scale of LISA ($10^3 - 10^8$ GeV) and LIGO/ET ($10^9 - 10^{15}$ GeV)

IISA: $10^{-6} \leq y_{\nu} \leq 10^{-3}$, LIGO/ET: $10^{-3} \leq y_{\nu} \leq 1$

Decoupled RHNs



In h_2 decays only to SM particles with highly suppressed rate

- Our Universe enters era of matter-domination after percolation
- $\circ T_{\rm RH}$ is lowered \Longrightarrow peak frequency of SGWB is lowered

IISA can detect GWs even if RHNs are decoupled

Signal at LIGO/ET is evidence for coupled RHNs

Generic U(1)' models



Nonobservation of GWs will disfavor $0.5 \leq g_L x_\sigma \leq 0.6$ and $\operatorname{Tr}(y_\sigma) \geq 0.1$ in entire mass range

In and will exclude a seesaw scale $\gtrsim 10^{14}$ GeV for $Tr(y_{\sigma}) \gtrsim 0.1$ and $y_{\nu} \sim O(1)$

Pulsar Timing Arrays



Galactic size GW detector made of millisecond pulsar array

Precise rotation periods and radio pulses from poles of pulsars make them ultra-precise clocks

GW perturbs spacetime between the pulsar and Earth and changes the time of arrival (TOA) of pulses

Measure residuals in TOA: $R^a = TOA^a_{measured} - TOA^a_{model}$

Separated by angle ξ_{ab} Cross-correlate timing residuals of pairs of pulsars

Sensitive to frequencies between 1/(total observation time) and 1/cadence i.e., [1/years, 1/weeks]

Hellings-Downs curve



PTAs see ~ 3σ quadrupole correlation of timing residuals
Smoking gun signal of stochastic GW background



GWs emitted at temperature T have frequency f today



Dark U(1)'

 $V_0(\mathcal{H},\sigma) = -\mu_h^2 \mathcal{H}^\dagger \mathcal{H} + \lambda_h (\mathcal{H}^\dagger \mathcal{H})^2 + \lambda_\sigma (\sigma^\dagger \sigma)^2 + \lambda_{\sigma h} (\mathcal{H}^\dagger \mathcal{H}) (\sigma^\dagger \sigma)$

IO-100 MeV FOPT requires $v_{\sigma} \ll v$

Cannot reproduce 125 GeV Higgs mass without quadratic Higgs term

Only dark sector is conformal

2 parameters in scalar sector: $M_{h_2}, \lambda_{\sigma h}$

Set kinetic mixing ~ 10^{-10} to thermalize dark sector

 $\implies model is valid up to 10^8 GeV$











Summary

LVK data are already constraining these models

- Null signal at LIGO/ET will disfavor type-I seesaw scale above 10^{14} GeV
- Positive signal at LIGO/ET is a signature of RHNs
- IISA sensitive to seesaw scales as low as a TeV
- Supercooled MeV scale FOPTs in conformal dark sectors explain PTA data