





NNU · 南京师范大学
NANJING NORMAL UNIVERSITY



Hints of an Electroweak Phase Transition?

Peter Athron
(Nanjing Normal University)



Hangzhou: GUTPC 2026

As the temperature cools down
the Universe may undergo
cosmological phase transitions




The **electroweak phase transition**
is a special example of a
cosmological phase transition


The **electroweak phase transition**
is a special example of a
cosmological phase transition

- **Connected to known physics** - Higgs mechanism (2013 Nobel prize)


The **electroweak phase transition**
is a special example of a
cosmological phase transition

- **Connected to known physics** - Higgs mechanism (2013 Nobel prize)
- **Dramatic impact:** Fundamental particles massless  massive


The **electroweak phase transition**
is a special example of a
cosmological phase transition

- **Connected to known physics** - Higgs mechanism (2013 Nobel prize)
- **Dramatic impact:** Fundamental particles massless  massive
- **Matter anti-matter asymmetry:** **If first order** it may have an electroweak baryogenesis explanation of the observed baryon asymmetry

The **electroweak phase transition**
is a special example of a
cosmological phase transition

- **Connected to known physics** - Higgs mechanism (2013 Nobel prize)
- **Dramatic impact:** Fundamental particles massless  massive
- **Matter anti-matter asymmetry:** **If first order** it may have an electroweak baryogenesis explanation of the observed baryon asymmetry
- **Freedom:** More freedom for modifying SM to make this a **first order phase transition** (c.f. QCD phase transitions)


Electroweak
symmetric vacuum




Free energy

Minimum of
the free energy

Electroweak symmetry
breaking vacuum
"Mexican hat potential"




$v = 246 \text{ GeV}$




Phase Transition




Detailed description: A large red arrow pointing from the left graph to the right graph, labeled 'Phase Transition'.



The EWPT connects many different areas of physics




The things I will talk about here are most related to these



PTA anomaly:

A stochastic gravitational wave background has been observed by multiple Pulsar Timing Arrays experiments



ASTRONOMY AND SPACE | RESEARCH UPDATE



Pulsar timing irregularities reveals hidden gravitational-wave background





29 Jun 2023



Cosmic claims: researchers have used radiotelescopes around the world to hunt for gravitational waves using the subtle variations in the timing of pulsars. (Courtesy: Aurore Simonnet for the NANOGrav Collaboration)

Pulsar Timing Array Signal

Pulsars - highly magnetized and rapidly rotating neutron stars emitting radiation from poles

Very stable rotation  regular 'pulses' of radiation  cosmic clocks

Pulsar Timing Array Signal

Pulsars - highly magnetized and rapidly rotating neutron stars emitting radiation from poles

Very stable rotation → regular 'pulses' of radiation → cosmic clocks

Gravitational waves passing between the pulsar and earth shift arrival times

Pulsar timing array → measure spatial **correlations between deviations in arrival times**

Pulsar Timing Array Signal

Pulsars - highly magnetized and rapidly rotating neutron stars emitting radiation from poles


Very stable rotation → regular 'pulses' of radiation → cosmic clocks

Gravitational waves passing between the pulsar and earth shift arrival times

Pulsar timing array → measure spatial **correlations between deviations in arrival times**

A **stochastic gravitational wave background** Gives a particular pattern of correlations


– the Hellings-Downs curve –



Hellings-Downs curve

NANOGrav 15 yr Data Set

Astrophys.J.Lett. 951 (2023) 1, L8




Pulsar Timing Array Signal



Cosmological phase transition interpretations are possible


Conservative interpretation:
“just” a population of
supermassive black holes binaries



Hellings-Downs curve

NANOGrav 15 yr Data Set

Astrophys.J.Lett. 951 (2023) 1, L8



DOUBLE WARNING




For specific models these predictions require great care!

We looked at one model
prominently cited by NANOGRAV
as able to explain nHz signals from PTAs...


Idea:

Take the EW phase transition



Idea:


Take the **EW phase transition**



- ✓ It is one of two phase transitions from known physics
- ✓ Unlike QCD – plenty of room for new physics to make first order
- ✗ But the EW scale is at much higher energies \rightarrow GWs expected to peak at $\sim 10^{-3}$ Hz

Idea:

Take the **EW phase transition**




✓ It is one of two phase transitions from known physics

✓ Unlike QCD – plenty of room for new physics to make first order

✗ But the EW scale is at much higher energies \rightarrow GWs expected to peak at $\sim 10^{-3}$ Hz


However note: All first order phase transitions exhibit some supercooling



Barrier means phase transition happens after critical temperature

Idea:

Take the EW phase transition



Typical EW phase transition occurs at:

$$T_{EW} \sim \mathcal{O}(100\text{GeV}) \longleftrightarrow f^{\text{peak}} \sim 10^{-3} \text{ Hz}$$

But **supercool** down to

$$\mathcal{O}(100 \text{ MeV}) \longleftrightarrow f^{\text{peak}} \sim 10^{-9} \text{ Hz}$$


Archetypical example: A. Kobakhidze, C. Lagger, A. Manning and J. Yue, EPJ.C 77 (2017) 570 [1703.06552] cited by NANOGRAV.

But this is a very large degree of supercooling!

Does the Phase transition complete?

Many studies only check nucleation

Nucleation: one bubble per Hubble volume



Hubble volume

Does the Phase transition complete?

Many studies only check nucleation

Nucleation: one bubble per Hubble volume

Often estimated with simple heuristics


$$S(T_n)/T_n = 140 \text{ "bounce action" in } \Gamma(t) = Ae^{-S(t)}$$

$$\text{Or solve } N(T_n) = 1 \quad N(T) \approx \int_T^{T_c} dT' \frac{\Gamma(T')}{T' H^4(T')}$$

If the barrier dissolves quickly with temperature

→ Exponential nucleation rate → Bubbles rapidly fill space

"Fast transition" or "low supercooling"



Hubble volume


Does the Phase transition complete?

Many studies only check **nucleation**

Nucleation: one bubble per Hubble volume

Not sufficient for scenarios with a lot of **supercooling**,

If the barrier persists to low temperatures,
→ nucleation rate can reach a maximum



Hubble volume


Does the Phase transition complete?

Many studies only check nucleation

Nucleation: one bubble per Hubble volume

Not sufficient for scenarios with a lot of supercooling,

If the barrier persists to low temperatures,
→ nucleation rate can reach a maximum



Hubble volume

For such slow transitions we need the false vacuum fraction $P_f \rightarrow 0$

$$P_f(T) = \exp \left[-\frac{4\pi}{3} \int_T^{T_c} \frac{dT'}{T'^4} \frac{\Gamma(T')}{H(T')} \left(\int_T^{T'} dT'' \frac{v_w(T'')}{H(T'')} \right)^3 \right]$$

Stochastic so
actually check:
 $P_f < \epsilon$


Does the Phase transition complete?

Many studies only check nucleation

Nucleation: one bubble per Hubble volume

Not sufficient for scenarios with a lot of supercooling,

If the barrier persists to low temperatures,
→ nucleation rate can reach a maximum



Hubble volume

For such slow transitions we need the false vacuum fraction $P_f \rightarrow 0$

$$P_f(T) = \exp \left[-\frac{4\pi}{3} \int_T^{T_c} \frac{dT'}{T'^4} \frac{\Gamma(T')}{H(T')} \left(\int_T^{T'} dT'' \frac{v_w(T'')}{H(T'')} \right)^3 \right]$$

Stochastic so actually check:
 $P_f < \epsilon$

Warning: even this is not enough because space is expanding


Does the Phase transition complete?

Many studies only check nucleation

Nucleation: one bubble per Hubble volume

Not sufficient for scenarios with a lot of supercooling,

If the barrier persists to low temperatures,
→ nucleation rate can reach a maximum



Hubble volume


For such slow transitions we need the false vacuum fraction $P_f \rightarrow 0$

$$P_f(T) = \exp \left[-\frac{4\pi}{3} \int_T^{T_c} \frac{dT'}{T'^4} \frac{\Gamma(T')}{H(T')} \left(\int_T^{T'} dT'' \frac{v_w(T'')}{H(T'')} \right)^3 \right]$$


Stochastic so
actually check:
 $P_f < \epsilon$

Account for expansion of space-time and check $\frac{d\mathcal{V}_f^{\text{phys}}}{dT} < 0$

A stochastic gravitational wave background has been observed
by multiple Pulsar Timing Arrays experiments




But for the prototypical model of supercooled PTs cited by NANOgrav as a possible explanation:
GWs can't fit the signal with careful calculation



[PA, A. Fowlie, Chih-Ting Lu, L. Morris, L. Wu, Yongcheng Wu, Zhongxiu Xu, arXiv:2306.17239]

A stochastic gravitational wave background has been observed by multiple Pulsar Timing Arrays experiments

Larger signals are ruled out in this model because the PT does not complete



So the PTA signal seems unlikely to come from an EWPT.

A more likely scenario is that the GW signal from an EWPT would be visible at LISA

→ To really use LISA data to test this we should think more about precision

So the PTA signal seems unlikely to come from an EWPT.

A more likely scenario is that the GW signal from an EWPT would be visible at LISA

→ To really use LISA data to test this we should think more about precision

Large uncertainties from e.g:

- Handling of the perturbative potential (see e.g. Croon, Gould, Schicho, Tenkanen, White, JHEP 04 (2021) 055)

So the PTA signal seems unlikely to come from an EWPT.

A more likely scenario is that the GW signal from an EWPT would be visible at LISA

→ To really use LISA data to test this we should think more about precision

Large uncertainties from e.g:

- Handling of the perturbative potential (see e.g. Croon, Gould, Schicho, Tenkanen, White, JHEP 04 (2021) 055)
- Estimating effect of temperature dependent thermal parameters (see PA, Morris, Xu, JCAP 02 (2024))


Temperature dependence

[PA, L. Morris, Z. Xu, arXiv:2309.05474]

From here
(but plot simplified)

Slow transition, but
percolates and
completes *before*
nucleation

LISA SNR
varies more than
an order of magnitude!



So the PTA signal seems unlikely to come from an EWPT.

A more likely scenario is that the GW signal from an EWPT would be visible at LISA

→ To really use LISA data to test this we should think more about precision

Large uncertainties from e.g:


- Handling of the perturbative potential (see e.g. Croon, Gould, Schicho, Tenkanen, White, JHEP 04 (2021) 055)
- Estimating effect of temperature dependent thermal parameters (see PA, Harries, Xu, JCAP 02 (2024))
- Uncertainties from using fits to simulations:
extrapolations beyond region of validity (e.g. often for small α) and/or
uncertainties associated with models or semi-analytic approaches etc

Gravitational Waves may reveal the EWPT in the future

But could we have some hints now from other data?

Flavour Anomalies

There are long standing anomalies in flavour physics



May seem a weird segue,
but keep listening ;)

Flavour Anomalies


There are long standing anomalies in flavour physics

$b \rightarrow sl^+l^-$ transitions – angular observables and branching ratios have many anomalies that combine to large significance

Many global fits – see e.g. very recent:

Large significances, but....

depends on estimate of unknown non-factorisable power corrections



Flavour Anomalies

There are long standing anomalies in flavour physics

$b \rightarrow sl^+l^-$ transitions – angular observables and branching ratios have many anomalies that combine to large significance **But not clean**

$b \rightarrow sl^+l^-$ transitions – clean test of lepton flavour universality

$$R_{K^{(*)}} = \frac{\Gamma(B \rightarrow K^{(*)} \mu^+ \mu^-)}{\Gamma(B \rightarrow K^{(*)} e^+ e^-)}$$

Flavour Anomalies

There are long standing anomalies in flavour physics

$b \rightarrow sl^+l^-$ transitions – angular observables and branching ratios have many anomalies that combine to large significance **But not clean**

$b \rightarrow sl^+l^-$ transitions – clean test of lepton flavour universality

$$R_{K^{(*)}} = \frac{\Gamma(B \rightarrow K^{(*)} \mu^+ \mu^-)}{\Gamma(B \rightarrow K^{(*)} e^+ e^-)}$$

And they did see a deviation ($\sim 3\sigma$) ...

Supports angular and BR anomalies

Lots of people got very excited



Flavour Anomalies

There are long standing anomalies in flavour physics

$b \rightarrow sl^+l^-$ transitions – angular observables and branching ratios have many anomalies that combine to large significance **But not clean**

$b \rightarrow sl^+l^-$ transitions – clean test of lepton flavour universality

$$R_{K^{(*)}} = \frac{\Gamma(B \rightarrow K^{(*)} \mu^+ \mu^-)}{\Gamma(B \rightarrow K^{(*)} e^+ e^-)}$$

And they did see a deviation ($\sim 3\sigma$)
2013-2022

Supports angular and BR anomalies

$$0.1 < q^2 < 1.1 \begin{cases} R_K & = 0.994^{+0.090}_{-0.082}(\text{stat})^{+0.029}_{-0.027}(\text{syst}), \\ R_{K^*} & = 0.927^{+0.093}_{-0.087}(\text{stat})^{+0.036}_{-0.035}(\text{syst}), \end{cases}$$

Lots of people got very excited

$$1.1 < q^2 < 6.0 \begin{cases} R_K & = 0.949^{+0.042}_{-0.041}(\text{stat})^{+0.022}_{-0.022}(\text{syst}), \\ R_{K^*} & = 1.027^{+0.072}_{-0.068}(\text{stat})^{+0.027}_{-0.026}(\text{syst}), \end{cases}$$


Until... the deviation went away

LHCb, Phys. Rev. Lett. 131 (2023), no. 5 051803

LHCb, Phys. Rev. D 108 (2023), no. 3 032002,

Charged current B-anomalies

There are also anomalies related to $b \rightarrow cl\bar{\nu}_l$



From Moriond 2025

$$R_{D^{(*)}} = \frac{\Gamma(B \rightarrow D^{(*)} \tau \bar{\nu})}{\Gamma(B \rightarrow D^{(*)} l \bar{\nu})}$$

$$R_{D^{(*)}}^{\text{exp}} > R_{D^{(*)}}^{\text{SM}} \quad \text{At } 3.8 \sigma$$

<https://hflav-eos.web.cern.ch/hflav-eos/semi/spring25/html/RDsDsstar/RDRDs.html>

Flavour Anomalies

There are long standing anomalies in flavour physics


$b \rightarrow sl^+l^-$ transitions – angular observables and branching ratios have many anomalies that combine to large significance **But not clean**

$b \rightarrow sl^+l^-$ transitions – clean test of lepton flavour universality

$$R_{K^{(*)}} = \frac{\Gamma(B \rightarrow K^{(*)}\mu^+\mu^-)}{\Gamma(B \rightarrow K^{(*)}e^+e^-)} \quad \text{Now consistent with the Standard Model}$$

$b \rightarrow cl\bar{\nu}_l$ transitions – test of lepton flavour universality

$$R_{D^{(*)}} = \frac{\Gamma(B \rightarrow D^{(*)}\tau\bar{\nu})}{\Gamma(B \rightarrow D^{(*)}l\bar{\nu})} \quad R_D^{\text{exp}} = 0.347 \pm 0.025 \quad R_{D^*}^{\text{exp}} = 0.288 \pm 0.012$$
$$R_D^{\text{SM}} = 0.3296 \pm 0.004 \quad R_{D^*}^{\text{SM}} = 0.254 \pm 0.005$$

 3.8 σ deviation

[HFLAV spring 2025]

Flavour Anomalies

The combination of the neutral $b \rightarrow sl^+l^-$ angular and BR anomalies and the charged current $R_{D^{(*)}}$ anomalies are still very interesting

Flavour Anomalies

The combination of the neutral $b \rightarrow sl^+l^-$ angular and BR anomalies and the charged current $R_{D^{(*)}}$ anomalies are still very interesting

$R_{D^{(*)}}$ alone is 3.8 standard deviations from the standard model estimate

Flavour Anomalies

The combination of the neutral $b \rightarrow sl^+l^-$ angular and BR anomalies and the charged current $R_{D^{(*)}}$ anomalies are still very interesting

$R_{D^{(*)}}$ alone is 3.8 standard deviations from the standard model estimate

But its hard to explain these anomlies in generic BSM physics.

To date it has been unclear why we should expect new physics here, reducing the plausibility of the new physics explanation

Flavour Anomalies

The combination of the neutral $b \rightarrow sl^+l^-$ angular and BR anomalies and the charged current $R_{D^{(*)}}$ anomalies are still very interesting

$R_{D^{(*)}}$ alone is 3.8 standard deviations from the standard model estimate

But its hard to explain these anomlies in generic BSM physics.

To date it has been unclear why we should expect new physics here, reducing the plausibility of the new physics explanation


Here I will address this point

A new theoretical reason for taking these anomalies seriously - EWBG

Electroweak baryogenesis

Departure from thermal equilibrium via the abrupt first order phase transition

The generation of the baryon asymmetry is strongly tied to the **EWPT**




Electroweak baryogenesis

Departure from thermal equilibrium via the abrupt first order phase transition

The generation of the baryon asymmetry is strongly tied to the **EWPT**

CP violation \longrightarrow scattering generates CP asymmetries




Electroweak baryogenesis

Departure from thermal equilibrium via the abrupt first order phase transition

The generation of the baryon asymmetry is strongly tied to the **EWPT**

CP violation \longrightarrow scattering generates CP asymmetries

CP asymmetry with sphaleron process generates more baryon than anti-baryons in symmetric phase



Electroweak baryogenesis


Departure from thermal equilibrium via the abrupt first order phase transition

The generation of the baryon asymmetry is strongly tied to the **EWPT**

CP violation \longrightarrow scattering generates CP asymmetries

CP asymmetry with sphaleron process generates more baryon than anti-baryons in symmetric phase

Baryons swept into EWSB phase as bubble wall expands



Electroweak baryogenesis

Departure from thermal equilibrium via the abrupt first order phase transition


The generation of the baryon asymmetry is strongly tied to the **EWPT**

CP violation \longrightarrow scattering generates CP asymmetries

CP asymmetry with sphaleron process generates more baryon than anti-baryons in symmetric phase

Baryons swept into EWSB phase as bubble wall expands

Sphaleron process is suppressed inside bubble by strength of the first order phase transition, so no inverse process



Electroweak baryogenesis

Departure from thermal equilibrium via the abrupt first order phase transition

The generation of the baryon asymmetry is strongly tied to the **EWPT**


CP violation \longrightarrow scattering generates CP asymmetries

CP asymmetry with sphaleron process generates more baryon than anti-baryons in symmetric phase

Baryons swept into EWSB phase as bubble wall expands

Sphaleron process is suppressed inside bubble by strength of the first order phase transition, so no inverse process

Thus EWBG generates a baryon asymmetry



EWBG

Recently there's been interesting developments regarding the BAU calculation

EWBG

Recently there's been interesting developments regarding the BAU calculation

Traditionally the BAU is computed in either VIA or WKB approximations

VIA BAU prediction is typically larger by orders of magnitude: [Cline, Kainulainen, Phys.Rev. D 101 (2020), no. 6 063525, Basler, Mühlleitner Eur.Phys.J.C 83 (2023) 1, 57]

EWBG

Recently there's been interesting developments regarding the BAU calculation

Traditionally the BAU is computed in either VIA or WKB approximations

VIA BAU prediction is typically larger by orders of magnitude: [Cline, Kainulainen, Phys.Rev. D 101 (2020), no. 6 063525, Basler, Mühlleitner Eur.Phys.J.C 83 (2023) 1, 57]

Recently inconsistencies with VIA approach revealed: [Postma, van de Vis, White, JHEP 12 (2022) 121]

EWBG

Recently there's been interesting developments regarding the BAU calculation

Traditionally the BAU is computed in either VIA or WKB approximations

VIA BAU prediction is typically larger by orders of magnitude: [Cline, Kainulainen, Phys.Rev. D 101 (2020), no. 6 063525, Basler, Mühlleitner Eur.Phys.J.C 83 (2023) 1, 57]

Recently inconsistencies with VIA approach revealed: [Postma, van de Vis, White, JHEP 12 (2022) 121]

But using the VEV resummation (VR) framework, which should avoid the inconsistencies, gives an *even* larger BAU than in VIA [Li, Ramsey-Musolf, Yu, arXiv:2404.19197]

EWBG

Recently there's been interesting developments regarding the BAU calculation

Traditionally the BAU is computed in either VIA or WKB approximations

VIA BAU prediction is typically larger by orders of magnitude: [Cline, Kainulainen, Phys.Rev. D 101 (2020), no. 6 063525, Basler, Mühlleitner Eur.Phys.J.C 83 (2023) 1, 57]

Recently inconsistencies with VIA approach revealed: [Postma, van de Vis, White, JHEP 12 (2022) 121]

But using the VEV resummation (VR) framework, which should avoid the inconsistencies, gives an *even* larger BAU than in VIA [Li, Ramsey-Musolf, Yu, arXiv:2404.19197]

Here we **will not** delve further into these fundamental issues regarding the calculations

Instead we simply use WKB approach as a conservative estimate for proof of principle

EWBG

Recently there's been interesting developments regarding the BAU calculation

Traditionally the BAU is computed in either VIA or WKB approximations

VIA BAU prediction is typically larger by orders of magnitude: [Cline, Kainulainen, Phys.Rev. D 101 (2020), no. 6 063525, Basler, Mühlleitner Eur.Phys.J.C 83 (2023) 1, 57]

Recently inconsistencies with VIA approach revealed: [Postma, van de Vis, White, JHEP 12 (2022) 121]

But using the VEV resummation (VR) framework, which should avoid the inconsistencies, gives an *even* larger BAU than in VIA [Li, Ramsey-Musolf, Yu, arXiv:2404.19197]

Here we **will not** delve further into these fundamental issues regarding the calculations

Instead we simply use WKB approach as a conservative estimate for proof of principle

– if we can fit the BAU using WKB approximation, then it should also be possible with VR

2HDM

2HDM one of simplest extensions of SM – just add an extra Higgs doublet


$$\Phi_i = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_i^+ \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v_i + \rho_i + i\eta_i) \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

General version without adding discrete symmetries has flavour violation, flavour universality violation and CP violation

$$\begin{aligned} V(\Phi_1, \Phi_2) = & m_{11}^2(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1) + m_{22}^2(\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2) - m_{12}^2(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2 + \Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_1) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}\lambda_1(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda_2(\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2)^2 + \lambda_3(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1)(\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2) + \lambda_4(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2)(\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_1) \\ & + \left(\frac{1}{2}\lambda_5(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2)^2 + \left(\lambda_6(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1) + \lambda_7(\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2) \right) (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2) + \text{h.c.} \right), \end{aligned}$$


$$-\mathcal{L}_{Yukawa} = \bar{Q}^0 (Y_u^1 \tilde{\Phi}_1 + Y_u^2 \tilde{\Phi}_2) u_R^0 + \bar{Q}^0 (Y_d^1 \Phi_1 + Y_d^2 \Phi_2) d_R^0 + \bar{L}^0 (Y_l^1 \Phi_1 + Y_l^2 \Phi_2) l_R^0 + \text{h.c.},$$

It has been established that the 2HDM has a first order PT perturbatively and non-perturbatively, e.g.




“Nonperturbative Analysis of the Electroweak Phase Transition in the Two Higgs Doublet Model”, Andersen, Gorda, Helset, Niemi, Tenkanen, Tranberg, Vuorinen, Weir Phys. Rev. Lett. 121, 191802 (2018)

It is established that the 2HDM has a first order PT perturbatively and non-perturbatively, e.g.




Overlaps with a global fit of flavour anomalies in 2HDM



Andersen, Gorda, Helset, Niemi, Tenkanen, Tranberg, Vuorinen, Weir
 Phys. Rev. Lett. 121, 191802 (2018)

PA, Crivellin, Gonzalo, Iguro, Sierra,
 JHEP11(2024)133

Importantly we find a non-zero complex phase in the 2HDM fit



PA, Crivellin, Gonzalo, Iguro, Sierra,
JHEP11(2024)133

Importantly we find a non-zero complex phase in the 2HDM fit

Idea:

maybe the imaginary phase found in the fit
can source sufficient CPV to explain EWBG?

Importantly we find a non-zero complex phase in the 2HDM fit

Idea:

maybe the imaginary phase found in the fit
can source sufficient CPV to explain EWBG?

Strategy to test this:

- Include EDM constraint and $R_{D^{(*)}}$ in full global fit

Importantly we find a non-zero complex phase in the 2HDM fit

Idea:

maybe the imaginary phase found in the fit
can source sufficient CPV to explain EWBG?

Strategy to test this:

- Include EDM constraint and $R_{D^{(*)}}$ in full global fit
- Use PT parameters established from the 2hdm in literature

Importantly we find a non-zero complex phase in the 2HDM fit

Idea:

maybe the imaginary phase found in the fit
can source sufficient CPV to explain EWBG?

Strategy to test this:

- Include EDM constraint and $R_{D^{(*)}}$ in full global fit
- Use PT parameters established from the 2hdm in literature
- Compute BAU using conservative WKB approach

Importantly we find a non-zero complex phase in the 2HDM fit

Idea:


maybe the imaginary phase found in the fit
can source sufficient CPV to explain EWBG?

Strategy to test this:

- Include EDM constraint and $R_{D^{(*)}}$ in full global fit
- Use PT parameters established from the 2hdm in literature
- Compute BAU using conservative WKB approach
- Project contours where we obtain observed BAU onto global fit result
- Check they coincide with the allowed region satisfying all relevant constraints


EWBG - results

Projecting the BAU in the parameter space



- Contours of $Y_B = Y_B^{obs}$ for different v_w .
- Sensitivity from CEPC/FCCee.
- Projection from ACME-III.
- eEDM constraints from JILA-NIST cuts a piece of the “liver-like” plot

$$|d_e| < 4.1 \times 10^{-30} \text{ ecm}$$



PA, Ramsey-Musolf, Sierra, Wu arxiv:2502.00445

Slide stolen from Cristian Sierra

Conclusions

- The EWPT is an incredibly rich and fascinating phenomena linked to Higgs, colliders, flavour physics, EDMs, BAU and GWs
- The PTA nHz signal for a SGWB **does not** seem to originate from a supercooled electroweak phase transition
- Fitting the $R(D^*)$ anomaly **favours** CPV violating Yukawa
- Proof of principle that explanations of the $R(D^*)$ charged flavour anomalies can be the source of sufficient CPV to explain the BAU, given current EDM constraints
- This works in one of the **simplest** extensions of the SM – the 2HDM
- Thus the long standing flavour anomalies could be hints for a successful EWBG mechanism to explain the matter-antimatter asymmetry
... and thus also hints of an EWPT.


The END

Thanks for listening!

Flavour Anomalies


$$R_D = \frac{\Gamma(\bar{B} \rightarrow D\tau\bar{\nu})}{\Gamma(\bar{B} \rightarrow Dl\bar{\nu})} \quad R_{D^*} = \frac{\Gamma(\bar{B} \rightarrow D^*\tau\bar{\nu})}{\Gamma(\bar{B} \rightarrow D^*l\bar{\nu})}$$

$$R_{D^{(*)}}^{\text{exp}} > R_{D^{(*)}}^{\text{SM}} \text{ at } 3.8 \sigma$$



Taken from Moriond 2025

Possible interference with NP?



$$C_L^{cb} = \frac{(V_{tb} \rho_u^{tc} + V_{cb} \rho_u^{cc}) \rho_\ell^{\tau\tau}}{m_{H^\pm}^2}$$


Non-zero ρ_u^{tc} and $\rho_\ell^{\tau\tau}$ are needed.

Slide stolen from Cristian Sierra




Flavour Physics

$$\rho_u = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_u^{uu} & \rho_u^{uc} & \rho_u^{ut} \\ \rho_u^{cu} & \rho_u^{cc} & \rho_u^{ct} \\ \rho_u^{tu} & \rho_u^{tc} & \rho_u^{tt} \end{pmatrix}$$


$-D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing at tree level.



$-D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing at one-loop.




$-B_u \rightarrow \tau \nu$ at tree level.



$$\rho_u = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \rho_u^{ut} \\ 0 & \rho_u^{cc} & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_u^{tc} & \rho_u^{tt} \end{pmatrix}$$

Flavour Physics


(Constrain all four couplings)



$$B_{s,d} - \bar{B}_{s,d}$$

$$b \rightarrow s\gamma$$

$$\rho_d^{bb}$$



$$\rho_u =$$




$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \rho_u^{ut} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_u^{tc} & \rho_u^{tt} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$R(D^{(*)})$$

- Set to zero for simplicity (affects $B_s - \bar{B}_s$ mainly, large uncertainty in the SM)


Flavour Physics

(Constrain all four couplings)



- Set to zero for simplicity (affects $B_s - \bar{B}_s$ mainly, large uncertainty in the SM)

Collider constraints




$$\sigma(gg \rightarrow \phi \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-) = \sigma(gg \rightarrow \phi) \cdot \text{BR}(\phi \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-)$$

- Multi-tau decays from CMS.
- eEDM constrains the imaginary part of $\rho_\ell^{\tau\tau}$.

$m_{H^\pm} = 130 \text{ GeV}$

130 GeV 3σ excess from
ATLAS arXiv:2302.11739 [hep-ex].



Slide stolen from Cristian Sierra

$$\begin{aligned}
-\mathcal{L}_{Yukawa} = & \bar{u}_b \left(V_{bc} \rho_d^{ca} P_R - V_{ca} \rho_u^{cb*} P_L \right) d_a H^+ + \bar{\nu}_b \rho_\ell^{ba} P_R l_a H^+ + \text{h.c.} \\
& + \sum_{f=u,d,\ell} \sum_{\phi=h,H,A} \bar{f}_b \Gamma_f^{\phi ba} P_R f_a \phi + \text{h.c.},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\rho_f^{ba} \equiv \frac{Y_f^{2,ba}}{\cos \beta} - \frac{\sqrt{2} \tan \beta \bar{M}_f^{ba}}{v},$$

$$\Gamma_f^{hba} \equiv \frac{\bar{M}_f^{ba}}{v} s_{\beta\alpha} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \rho_f^{ba} c_{\beta\alpha},$$


$$\Gamma_f^{Hba} \equiv \frac{\bar{M}_f^{ba}}{v} c_{\beta\alpha} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \rho_f^{ba} s_{\beta\alpha},$$

$$\Gamma_f^{Aba} \equiv \begin{cases} -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \rho_f^{ba} & \text{if } f = u, \\ \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \rho_f^{ba} & \text{if } f = d, \ell, \end{cases}$$

$$\rho_u = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_u^{cc} & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_u^{tc} & \rho_u^{tt} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho_d = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \rho_d^{bb} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho_\ell = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \rho_\ell^{e\tau} \\ 0 & \rho_\ell^{\mu\mu} & \rho_\ell^{\mu\tau} \\ 0 & 0 & \rho_\ell^{\tau\tau} \end{pmatrix},$$

GAMBIT: The Global And Modular BSM Inference Tool

gambit.hepforge.org



GAMBIT: The Global And Modular BSM Inference Tool


gambitbsm.org

github.com/GambitBSM

EPJC 77 (2017) 784

arXiv:1705.07908

- Extensive model database, beyond SUSY
- Fast definition of new datasets, theories
- Extensive observable/data libraries
- Plug&play scanning/physics/likelihoods
- Various statistical options (frequentist /Bayesian)
- Fast LHC likelihood calculator
- Massively parallel
- Fully open-source



Members of: ATLAS, Belle-II, CLiC, CMS, CTA, Fermi-LAT, DARWIN, IceCube, LHCb, SHiP, XENON

Authors of: BubbleProfiler, Capt'n General, Contur, DarkAges, DarkSUSY, DDCalc, DirectDM, Diver, EasyScanHEP, ExoCLASS, FlexibleSUSY, gamLike, GM2Calc, HEPLike, IsaTools, MARTY, nuLike, PhaseTracer, PolyChord, Rivet, SOFTSUSY, SuperIso, SUSY-AI, xsec, Vevacious, WIMPSim

Recent collaborators: Peter Athron, Sowmiya Balan, Csaba Balázs, Torsten Bringmann, Christopher Cappiello, Riccardo Catena, Christopher Chang, Andreas Crivellin, Timon Emken, Tomás Gonzalo, Taylor R Gray, Will Handley, Quan Huynh, Syuhei Iguro, Ida-Marie Johansson, Felix Kahlhoefer, Anders Kvellestad, Michele Lucente, Gregory D Martinez, Marco Palmiotta, Are Raklev, Pat Scott, Cristian Sierra, Patrick Stoecker, Wei Su, Aaron Vincent, Martin White, Yang Zhang

70+ participants in many experiments and numerous major theory codes

EWBG

WKB formalism

$$F_z = -\frac{(|m|^2)'}{2E} + s \left[\frac{(|m|^2 \theta')'}{2E E_z} \right]$$


$$E = (\mathbf{p}^2 + |m|^2)^{1/2}, E_z = (p_z^2 + |m|^2)^{1/2}, \text{ and } s = \pm 1$$

The effect of this force can be translated into a CPV source \bar{S}_l in a diffusion equation for the lepton number density l :


$$\bar{D}_l l''(z) + v_w l'(z) + \bar{\Gamma}_l l(z) = \bar{S}_l$$

Diffusion coeff. bubble wall vel. Collision term

The solution for l will depend on a convolution of \bar{S}_l which will be a function of the lepton CPV phase



Higgs plasma and fermion field interactions generate an effective force from space-dependent mass terms



EWBG

WKB formalism

$$S_j = -v_w \gamma_w Q_j^{80} (\text{Im}(A_{22}))', \quad j = 1, 2$$

Lorentz factor

“K” factors from transport equations

Depends on the imaginary part of A

Matrix A borrowed from SUSY solutions for charginos

$$A = U M_l \partial_z M_l^{-1} U^\dagger$$

Lepton mass profile

$$M_l(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\begin{pmatrix} y_{\mu\mu} & y_{\mu\tau} \\ 0 & y_{\tau\tau} \end{pmatrix} h_1 + \begin{pmatrix} y_{\mu\mu} & y_{\mu\tau} \\ 0 & y_{\tau\tau} e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix} h_2 \right]$$

Matrix U diagonalizing the square of the mass profile

$$U = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{\Lambda(\Lambda + \Delta)}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(\Lambda + \Delta) & a \\ -a^* & \frac{1}{2}(\Lambda + \Delta) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\Lambda = \sqrt{\Delta^2 + 4|a|^2}, \quad a = (M_l^\dagger M_l)_{12}$$

$$\Delta = (M_l^\dagger M_l)_{11} - (M_l^\dagger M_l)_{22}$$

Higgs profiles (kink type)

$$h_1(z) = \frac{v_n \cos \beta}{2} \left[1 + \tanh \left(\frac{z}{L_w} \right) \right],$$

$$h_2(z) = \frac{v_n \sin \beta}{2} \left[1 + \tanh \left(\frac{z}{L_w} - \Delta\beta \right) \right],$$

Slide stolen from Cristian Sierra

EWBG

BAU calculation

Diffusion equation for the baryon number density

Weak sphaleron rate

$$n_B''(z) - \frac{v_w}{D_q} n_B'(z) = \frac{\Gamma_{ws}}{D_q} \left(\mathcal{R} n_B(z) + \frac{3}{2} n_L(z) \right)$$

Quarks diffusion coefficient

SM relaxation term (15/4)

Solution with $Y_B \equiv n_B/s$ and $n_L(z) \simeq l(z)$

$$Y_B = -\frac{3\Gamma_{ws}}{2s} \frac{1}{D_q \lambda_+} \int_{-\infty}^{-L_w} l(z) e^{-\lambda_- z} dz$$

Entropy density

Slide stolen from Cristian Sierra

Simplifications for fast analysis

We simplify the calculation based on a finding from

De Vries, Postma, van de Vis, JHEP 04, 024,

→ $n_L(x)$ dominates density of Left-handed leptons $l_L(x)$,

→ To order 10% accuracy can consider only a *single* Boltzmann equation $l_L(x)$

In this treatment:

1) lepton Yukawa interactions assumed slow → inefficient transfer to other species

2) Left handed and right handed diffusion equations approximated as equal

$$D_l \equiv D_L = D_R \simeq 100/T \quad \rightarrow \quad l \equiv l_L = -\tau_R.$$


Shown in De Vries, Postma, van de Vis, JHEP 04, 024, to be within 10% of full treatment

Given orders of magnitude discrepancy to VR treatment is precise enough

From
particle physics theory
to GWs

From particle physics theory to GWs

There is a long chain of steps needed to make GW predictions





- At **every step** there are challenges :
- open questions & active investigation
 - Tensions between rigour and feasibility,
 - Subtle issues leading to common misunderstandings / mistakes

Does the Phase transition complete?

Many studies only check **nucleation**

Nucleation: one bubble per Hubble volume



Hubble volume

If the barrier dissolves quickly with temperature

→ Exponential nucleation rate → Bubbles rapidly fill space

“Fast transition” or **“low supercooling”**

Gravitational wave amplitude and frequency

Each component of the amplitude $h^2\Omega_{\text{GW-tot}} = h^2\Omega_{\text{coll}} + h^2\Omega_{\text{sw}} + h^2\Omega_{\text{turb}}$

is defined in terms of the energy density ρ via $\Omega_{\text{GW}}(f) \equiv \frac{1}{\rho_{\text{tot}}} \frac{d\rho_{\text{GW}}}{d \ln f}$

$$\Omega_{\text{GW}}(f) \propto R_{\Omega} K^n L^m$$

Diagram illustrating the components of the gravitational wave amplitude:

- R_{Ω} is labeled as the **redshift factor** (indicated by a red arrow).
- K^n is labeled as the **Energy fraction** (indicated by a blue arrow).
- L^m is labeled as the **Length scale related to duration** (indicated by a purple arrow).

Redshift factor to account for redshifting from the transition time to today

Energy fraction is the energy that can be available to source GWs

Length scale that is sensitive to the lifetime of the source

Implicit dependence of the transition temperature and the velocity the bubble walls expand also influences things

Powers depend on the source and the modelling, coefficients found in simulation/calculations

The temperature choice really matters
for gravitational wave signatures

The **nucleation temperature** is frequently used for evaluating GW signals

$$N(T_n) = 1$$

$$N(T) = \int_T^{T_c} dT' \frac{\Gamma(T')}{T' H^4(T')}$$

But it may happen long before collisions or long after **or may not even exist...**

The **nucleation temperature** is frequently used for evaluating GW signals

$$N(T_n) = 1$$

$$N(T) \approx \int_T^{T_c} dT' \frac{\Gamma(T')}{T' H^4(T')}$$

But it may happen long before collisions or long after **or may not even exist...**

False vacuum fraction \longrightarrow several important milestone temperatures

Completion temperature: $T_f: P_f(T_f) = 0.01$

Percolation temperature: $T_p: P_f(T_p) = 0.71$

$T_e: P_f(T_e) = 1/e$


Percolation temperature

$$T_p: P_f(T_p) = 0.71$$

- Percolation is when there is a connected path between bubbles across the space
- Strongly linked to bubble collisions
- Good choice for a temperature at which to evaluate the GWs spectrum

Example from simple simulation 

[PA, C. Balázs, L. Morris, JCAP 03 (2023), 006]




Temperature dependence

Point from same paper
(plot made for this talk)

Slow transition,
nucleation
far earlier than
percolation

Detectability
(SNR for LISA)
very different between
percolation vs
nucleation!

Sound shell and **lattice fit**
also very different



Temperature dependence


[PA, L. Morris, Z. Xu, arXiv:2309.05474]



From here
(but plot simplified)

Another slow transition
but **percolates** and
completes *before*
nucleation

LISA SNR
varies more than
an order of magnitude!



Scalar singlet benchmark
with strong supercooling

Temperature dependence


[PA, L. Morris, Z. Xu, arXiv:2309.05474]

$T_f T_e T_p$ T_n

Plot from here 

A **fast** transition still has big variation between T_n & T_p


LISA SNR Still varies more by orders of magnitude!



Temperature dependence

Nucleation temperature is a **bad** temperature to use


- not connected to bubble collisions



Temperature dependence


Nucleation temperature is a **bad** temperature to use

- not connected to bubble collisions



Percolation is directly defined in terms of contact between bubbles


Percolation temperature is **much better**, but...



Temperature dependence

Nucleation temperature is a **bad** temperature to use


- not connected to bubble collisions



Percolation is directly defined in terms of contact between bubbles

Percolation temperature is **much better**, but...


We still don't know exactly correct temperature and...



Temperature dependence

Nucleation temperature is a **bad** temperature to use


- not connected to bubble collisions



Percolation is directly defined in terms of contact between bubbles

Percolation temperature is **much better**, but...

We still don't know exactly correct temperature and...



Percolation criteria $P_f(T_p) = 0.71$ does not account for expanding space time

→ Temperature dependence represents a significant uncertainty

Numerical Packages

[PA, C. Balázs, A. Fowlie, W. Searle, G. White, L. Morris, Y. Xiao and Y. Zhang]

The good news is many of these issues can be avoided with careful numerical implementations

We are developing a set of numerical packages for PhaseTransitions:

[PhaseTracer](#), [BubbleProfiler](#) and [TransitionSolver](#)

$$\hat{V}_{\text{eff}} \longrightarrow \phi_i^{\text{min}}(T) \longrightarrow \Gamma(\phi_i^{\text{min}} \rightarrow \phi_j^{\text{min}}) \longrightarrow P_f(T), N(T) \longrightarrow \alpha, \beta, v_w \longrightarrow h^2\Omega(f)$$

PhaseTracer: handles this part \longrightarrow mapping out the phases


PhaseTracer reveals all potential phase transitions in cosmological history

$$\hat{V}_{\text{eff}} \longrightarrow \phi_i^{\text{min}}(T) \longrightarrow \Gamma(\phi_i^{\text{min}} \rightarrow \phi_j^{\text{min}}) \longrightarrow P_f(T), N(T) \longrightarrow \alpha, \beta, v_w \longrightarrow h^2 \Omega(f)$$


PhaseTracer: handles this part \longrightarrow mapping out the phases

PhaseTracer reveals all potential phase transitions in cosmological history

Critical temperature $T = T_c$



$T < T_c$





Barrier means phase transition happens after critical temperature

$$\hat{V}_{\text{eff}} \longrightarrow \phi_i^{\text{min}}(T) \longrightarrow \Gamma(\phi_i^{\text{min}} \rightarrow \phi_j^{\text{min}}) \longrightarrow P_f(T), N(T) \longrightarrow \alpha, \beta, v_w \longrightarrow h^2\Omega(f)$$

PhaseTracer: handles this part \longrightarrow mapping out the phases

PhaseTracer reveals all potential phase transitions in cosmological history



[PhaseTracer, PA, Csaba Balazs, Andrew Fowlie, Yang Zhang, Eur.Phys.J.C 80 (2020) 6, 567]


Handles multi-dimensional fields

$$\hat{V}_{\text{eff}} \longrightarrow \phi_i^{\text{min}}(T) \longrightarrow \Gamma(\phi_i^{\text{min}} \rightarrow \phi_j^{\text{min}}) \longrightarrow P_f(T), N(T) \longrightarrow \alpha, \beta, v_w \longrightarrow h^2\Omega(f)$$

PhaseTracer: handles this part \longrightarrow mapping out the phases

PhaseTracer reveals all potential phase transitions in cosmological history


Not easy: multiple FOPTs & possible phase histories are common



PhaseTracer works very well **if** the effective potential input is reliable

Pati-Salam two step grand unification

$$\begin{aligned}SO(10) &\rightarrow SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \\ &\rightarrow SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L} \\ &\rightarrow SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y\end{aligned}$$



Pati-Salam two step grand unification

$$\begin{aligned}SO(10) &\rightarrow SU(4) \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \\ &\rightarrow SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L} \\ &\rightarrow SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y\end{aligned}$$

Scalar fields at the Pati-Salam scale

Fields	$SU(4)_c$	$SU(2)_L$	$SU(2)_R$	Purpose
ϕ	1	2	2	Breaks SM
Δ_R	$\overline{10}$	1	3	Breaks LR
Δ_L	$\overline{10}$	3	1	Seesaw
Ξ	15	1	1	Breaks PS
Ω_R	15	1	3	Unification

Gravitational waves and thermal parameters

Lattice fit to single broken power law for sound wave source :

[M. Hindmarsh, S. J. Huber, K. Rummukainen and D. J. Weir, PRD 96 (2017) 103520]

$$h^2 \Omega_{\text{sw}}^{\text{lat}}(f) = 5.3 \times 10^{-2} R_{\Omega} K^2 \left(\frac{H L_*}{c_{s,f}} \right) \Upsilon(\tau_{\text{sw}}) S_{\text{sw}}(f),$$

Speed of sound in false vacuum \rightarrow $c_{s,f}$

$\Upsilon(\tau_{\text{sw}})$ Accounts for finite lifetime of source

$S_{\text{sw}}(f)$ Shape

Sound shell model:

[Hindmarsh PRL 120 (2018) 071301, (+Hijazi) JCAP 12 (2019) 062, + (C. Gowling, D.C. Hooper and J. Torrado), JCAP 04 (2023) 061]

$$h^2 \Omega_{\text{sw}}(f) = 0.03 R_{\Omega} K^2 \left(\frac{H_* L_*}{c_{s,f}} \right) \Upsilon(\tau_{\text{sw}}) \frac{M(s, r_b, b)}{\mu_f(r_b)}$$

$\frac{M(s, r_b, b)}{\mu_f(r_b)}$ Shape

Sound shell model is new but very promising

Turbulence also contributes, but not well modeled



Significant uncertainty!

Comparison of predictions for a weakly supercooled point in SSM

[PA, L. Morris, Z. Xu, arXiv:2309.05474]

Differences in sound wave SNR: latent heat (and pressure) variants give substantial differences

Variation	$h^2\Omega_{\text{sw}}^{\text{lat}}$ ($\times 10^{-13}$)	$h^2\Omega_{\text{sw}}^{\text{ss}}$ ($\times 10^{-14}$)	$f_{\text{sw}}^{\text{lat}}$ ($\times 10^{-5}$)	$f_{\text{sw}}^{\text{ss}}$ ($\times 10^{-4}$)	$h^2\Omega_{\text{turb}}$ ($\times 10^{-16}$)	f_{turb} ($\times 10^{-5}$)	SNR_{lat}	SNR_{ss}	α ($\times 10^{-2}$)	κ	K ($\times 10^{-3}$)
None	3.590	5.673	129.6	60.20	3.898	287.0	10.08	2.031	5.450	0.2074	10.64
$T_* = T_e$	2.552	4.042	159.9	73.75	2.662	354.2	8.763	1.204	5.575	0.2096	10.99
$T_* = T_f$	2.146	3.410	181.7	82.91	2.187	402.5	8.110	0.8892	5.771	0.2129	11.54
$T_* = T_n$	676.5	1046	2.189	1.098	8968	4.849	1.310	5.142	4.297	0.1857	7.597
$R_{\text{sep}}(\beta)$	2.019	3.191	177.5	82.45	2.078	393.1	7.510	0.8449			
$K(\alpha(\theta))$	3.372	5.329			3.676		9.469	1.908	5.362	0.2011	10.23
$K(\alpha(p))$	1.428	2.256			1.649		4.010	0.8081	3.698	0.1682	5.997
$K(\alpha(\rho))$	14.45	22.84			14.61		40.59	8.172	10.35	0.2736	25.68
ϵ_2					11.03		10.11	2.004			
ϵ_3					290.2		11.21	3.406			
ϵ_4					301.7		11.26	3.462			



Comparison of predictions for a strongly supercooled point

[PA, L. Morris, Z. Xu, arXiv:2309.05474]

However the variation in K estimates is much smaller for strongly supercooled scenarios

Variation	$h^2\Omega_{\text{sw}}^{\text{lat}}$ ($\times 10^{-7}$)	$h^2\Omega_{\text{sw}}^{\text{ss}}$ ($\times 10^{-8}$)	$f_{\text{sw}}^{\text{lat}}$ ($\times 10^{-6}$)	$f_{\text{sw}}^{\text{ss}}$ ($\times 10^{-6}$)	$h^2\Omega_{\text{turb}}$ ($\times 10^{-10}$)	f_{turb} ($\times 10^{-6}$)	SNR _{lat}	SNR _{ss}	α	κ	K
None	1.861	3.748	9.345	23.48	6.348	20.70	249.6	307.7	1.651	0.7175	0.4536
$T_* = T_e$	4.318	8.872	7.908	19.12	14.74	17.52	443.7	498.2	4.257	0.8422	0.6950
$T_* = T_f$	17.04	35.42	4.111	9.722	81.84	9.106	864.5	876.4	71.06	0.9831	0.9803
$R_{\text{sep}}(\beta_V)$	1.193	2.402	12.80	32.17	3.394	28.36	222.6	356.9			
$K(\alpha(\theta))$	1.819	3.663			6.227		244.9	301.5	1.605	0.7269	0.4478
$K(\alpha(p))$	1.768	3.560			6.083		239.2	294.2	1.564	0.7269	0.4409
$K(\alpha(\rho))$	1.967	3.962			6.646		261.4	323.0	1.728	0.7383	0.4677
ϵ_2					17.95		700.0	742.2			
ϵ_3					0		18.36	130.9			
ϵ_4					288.4		11210	11230			

Additional check for Percolation / completion



[PA, C. Balázs, L. Morris, JCAP 03 (2023), 006]

To ensure it really completes, also require: $\frac{d\mathcal{V}_f^{\text{phys}}}{dT} < 0$

Non-trivial because whole volume is expanding

The duration affects the of the source of gravitational waves affects the GW signal a lot

This depends on the particle physics model

The duration can be related to a length scale and in hydrodynamical simulations of sound waves contributions the **mean bubble separation** is used:

$$R_{\text{sep}}(T) = (n_B(T))^{-\frac{1}{3}} \quad n_b(T) = T^3 \int_T^{T_c} dT' \frac{\Gamma(T') P_f(T')}{T'^4 H(T')}$$

bubble number density

Best treatment

This can also be estimated by taylor expanding the **bounce action**

$$S(t) \approx S(t_*) + \left. \frac{dS}{dt} \right|_{t=t_*} (t - t_*) + \frac{1}{2} \left. \frac{d^2S}{dt^2} \right|_{t=t_*} (t - t_*)^2 + \dots,$$

1st order \longrightarrow exponential nucleation rate $\Gamma(t) = \Gamma(t_*) \exp(\beta(t - t_*))$,

$$\beta = - \left. \frac{dS}{dt} \right|_{t=t_*} = HT_* \left. \frac{dS}{dT} \right|_{T=T_*}$$

Widely used to replace
mean bubble separation

$$R_{\text{sep}} = (8\pi)^{\frac{1}{3}} \frac{v_w}{\beta}$$

Rough approximation

The duration affects the of the source of gravitational waves affects the GW signal a lot

This depends on the particle physics model

The duration can be related to a length scale and in hydrodynamical simulations of sound waves contributions the **mean bubble separation** is used:

$$R_{\text{sep}}(T) = (n_B(T))^{-\frac{1}{3}} \quad n_b(T) = T^3 \int_T^{T_c} dT' \frac{\Gamma(T') P_f(T')}{T'^4 H(T')}$$

bubble number density

Best treatment

This can also be estimated by taylor expanding the **bounce action**

$$S(t) \approx S(t_*) + \left. \frac{dS}{dt} \right|_{t=t_*} (t - t_*) + \frac{1}{2} \left. \frac{d^2 S}{dt^2} \right|_{t=t_*} (t - t_*)^2 + \dots,$$

2nd order \longrightarrow Gaussian nucleation rate $\Gamma(t) = \Gamma(t_*) \exp\left(\frac{\beta_V^2}{2} (t - t_*)^2\right),$

$$\beta_V = \sqrt{\left. \frac{d^2 S}{dt^2} \right|_{t=t_\Gamma}}$$

Can be used to replace
mean bubble separation

$$R_{\text{sep}} = \left(\sqrt{2\pi} \frac{\Gamma(T_\Gamma)}{\beta_V} \right)^{-\frac{1}{3}}$$

Rough approximation

The **mean bubble separation** varies a lot with temperature

Should not be used until $T \approx T_p$

For fast transitions

Estimating this with $\beta(T_p)$ GW amp. falls by factor 2 (larger variation in SNR)

Worse if using $\beta(T_n)$ as is standard practise

Mean bubble radius is more stable and $\beta(T)$ tracks this better.


For slow transitions

Mean bubble radius varies more as bubbles have longer to grow.

Using $\beta(T_p)$ makes no sense below T_T orders of magnitude errors above

β_V gives a factor 1.5 drop in GW amplitude

[PA, L. Morris, Z. Xu, arXiv:2309.05474]



The **mean bubble separation** varies a lot with temperature

Should not be used until $T \approx T_p$

For fast transitions

Estimating this with $\beta(T_p)$ GW amp. falls by factor 2 (larger variation in SNR)

Worse if using $\beta(T_n)$ as is standard practise

Mean bubble radius is more stable and $\beta(T)$ tracks this better.


For slow transitions

Mean bubble radius varies more as bubbles have longer to grow.

Using $\beta(T_p)$ makes no sense below T_T orders of magnitude errors above

β_V gives a factor 1.5 drop in GW amplitude

[PA, L. Morris, Z. Xu, arXiv:2309.05474]




Milestone temperatures

[PA, C. Balázs, L. Morris, JCAP 03 (2023), 006]

Nucleation temperature is:

- Not related to bubble collisions
- Not related to other temperatures
- **May not even exist**

Percolation temperature
is a better choice
for GWs



From particle physics theory to GWs

$$\hat{V}_{\text{eff}} \longrightarrow \phi_i^{\text{min}}(T) \longrightarrow \Gamma(\phi_i^{\text{min}} \rightarrow \phi_j^{\text{min}}) \longrightarrow P_f(T), N(T) \longrightarrow \alpha, \beta, v_w \longrightarrow h^2 \Omega(f)$$

Effective Potential: can be computed perturbatively with finite temperature quantum field theory

$$\hat{V}_{\text{eff}} = V_0 + V_1^{T=0} + V_{1T}$$

Tree-level \nearrow V_0

\uparrow $V_1^{T=0}$ Zero temperature Coleman-Weinberg corrections

\nwarrow V_{1T} Finite temperature corrections

Effective Potential: can be computed perturbatively with
finite temperature quantum field theory

$$\hat{V}_{\text{eff}} = V_0 + V_{1,T=0} + V_{1T}$$

$$V_{1,T=0}^{R\xi} = \frac{1}{4(4\pi)^2} \left[\sum_{\phi} n_{\phi} m_{\phi}^4(\{\phi_j\}, \xi) \left(\ln \left(\frac{m_{\phi}^2(\{\phi_j\}, \xi)}{Q^2} \right) - k_s \right) \right. \\ \left. + \sum_V n_V m_V^4(\{\phi_j\}) \left(\ln \left(\frac{m_V^2(\{\phi_j\})}{Q^2} \right) - k_V \right) - \sum_V (\xi m_V^2(\{\phi_j\}))^2 \left(\ln \left(\frac{\xi m_V^2(\{\phi_j\})}{Q^2} \right) - k_V \right) \right. \\ \left. - \sum_f n_f m_f^4(\{\phi_j\}) \left(\ln \left(\frac{m_f(\{\phi_j\})^2}{Q^2} \right) - k_f \right) \right],$$

$$V_{1T}^{R\xi} = \frac{T^4}{2\pi^2} \left[\sum_i n_{\phi} J_B \left(\frac{m_{\phi_i}^2(\xi)}{T^2} \right) + \sum_j n_V J_B \left(\frac{m_{V_j}^2}{T^2} \right) - \frac{1}{3} \sum_j n_V J_B \left(\frac{\xi m_{V_j}^2}{T^2} \right) + \sum_l n_f J_F \left(\frac{m_{f_l}^2}{T^2} \right) \right]$$

$$J_B(y^2) = \int_0^{\infty} dk k^2 \log \left[1 - e^{-\sqrt{k^2+y^2}} \right] \quad J_F(y^2) = \int_0^{\infty} dk k^2 \log \left[1 + e^{-\sqrt{k^2+y^2}} \right]$$


Effective Potential

Perturbative estimates of the effective potential can be tricky

Resummation needed to deal with high temperatures spoiling perturbativity

Daisy diagram with N-loops:

Individual petals are inserted
one-loop corrections



Resum daisy diagrams for leading
order $\frac{T^2}{m^2}$

From particle physics theory to GWs

$$\hat{V}_{\text{eff}} \longrightarrow \phi_i^{\text{min}}(T) \longrightarrow \Gamma(\phi_i^{\text{min}} \rightarrow \phi_j^{\text{min}}) \longrightarrow P_f(T), N(T) \longrightarrow \alpha, \beta, v_w \longrightarrow h^2 \Omega(f)$$

Effective Potential: can be computed perturbatively with finite temperature quantum field theory




However there are problems applying this for phase transitions at finite temp

- Unphysical Gauge dependence
- Infrared divergences / problems with perturbativity for large T^2/m^2
- Many different scales in the problem
- thus large dependence on the renormalisation scale

Effective Potential

[PA, C. Balazs, A. Fowlie, L. Morris, G. White and Y.-Zhang, JHEP 01 (2023) 050]




Significant variance from gauge and renormalisation scale



Effective Potential

[PA, C. Balazs, A. Fowlie, L. Morris, G. White and Y.-Zhang, JHEP 01 (2023) 050]

Significant variance from gauge and renormalisation scale



Effective Potential

These issues have substantial impact on uncertainties in GW predictions

[Djuna Croon, Oliver Gould, Philipp Schicho, Tuomas V. I. Tenkanen, Graham White, JHEP 04 (2021) 055]

$\Delta\Omega_{\text{GW}}/\Omega_{\text{GW}}$	4d approach	3d approach
RG scale dependence	$\mathcal{O}(10^2 - 10^3)$	$\mathcal{O}(10^0 - 10^1)$
Gauge dependence	$\mathcal{O}(10^1)$	$\mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$
High- T approximation	$\mathcal{O}(10^{-1} - 10^0)$	$\mathcal{O}(10^0 - 10^2)$
Higher loop orders	unknown	$\mathcal{O}(10^0 - 10^1)$
Nucleation corrections	unknown	$\mathcal{O}(10^{-1} - 10^0)$
Nonperturbative corrections	unknown	unknown

High temperature effects can be resummed by effective field theory techniques

But non-perturbative effects may cause problems

Effective Potential

Most rigorous approach is to do this non-perturbatively on lattice

This is how we know SM **EW** and **QCD** transitions are smooth cross-overs

[K. Kajantie, M. Laine, J. Peisa, K. Rummukainen, M. Shaposhnikov, PRL 77 (1996) 2887-2890,
Y. Aoki, G. Endrodi*, Z. Fodor*, S. D. Katz*, and K. K. Szabo, Nature, 443:675–678, 2006]
[*Eötvös affiliation]

Downside: Very **time consuming** to do this on the lattice

Not feasible in general for new physics, we have:

- many models
- many transitions in specific models
- huge parameter spaces

→ Tension between rigour and feasibility

Effective Potential

- Standard: 4D Perturbative approach with “Daisy resummation”
Easy to implement
Feasible for scans
- Better: 3D EFT Perturbative calculation
Hard to implement*
Feasible for scans
- Gold standard: non-perturbative lattice
Hard to implement
Not feasible for scans

* Very recently **DRalgo code** was developed to make this easier!

[Andreas Ekstedt, Philipp Schicho, Tuomas V. I. Tenkanen, Comp.Phys.Comm. 288 (2023) 108725]

State of the art: match to 3DEFT models with lattice results where possible,
use 3DEFT where not available (or create new lattice results...)

See e.g. [PRD 100 (2019) 11, 115024, Phys.Rev.Lett. 126 (2021) 17, 171802]

From particle physics theory to GWs

$$\hat{V}_{\text{eff}} \longrightarrow \phi_i^{\text{min}}(T) \longrightarrow \Gamma(\phi_i^{\text{min}} \rightarrow \phi_j^{\text{min}}) \longrightarrow P_f(T), N(T) \longrightarrow \alpha, \beta, v_w \longrightarrow h^2 \Omega(f)$$

Phase Tracing

So cubic terms are generated at finite temperature

Tree-level cubic terms can also be introduced in SM extensions

These **may or may not** lead to **first order phase transitions**

Depends on detailed calculation, e.g. SM is a smooth cross-over for the measured Higgs mass..


...but could have been first order if the Higgs mass was much lighter.

From particle physics theory to GWs

$$\hat{V}_{\text{eff}} \longrightarrow \phi_i^{\text{min}}(T) \longrightarrow \Gamma(\phi_i^{\text{min}} \rightarrow \phi_j^{\text{min}}) \longrightarrow P_f(T), N(T) \longrightarrow \alpha, \beta, v_w \longrightarrow h^2 \Omega(f)$$

PhaseTracing

This is not straightforward: multiple FOPTs and possible paths common in realistic models



Careful algorithms needed to handle this, e.g.

- **PhaseTracer** ← *My own code, but I do recommend this one*
- **Cosmotransitions** ← *Tricky to use, often just hangs or exits*
- **BSMPT** ← *Simple and fast but won't get complicated patterns, multiple PTs*

From particle physics theory to GWs

$$\hat{V}_{\text{eff}} \longrightarrow \phi_i^{\text{min}}(T) \longrightarrow \Gamma(\phi_i^{\text{min}} \rightarrow \phi_j^{\text{min}}) \longrightarrow P_f(T), N(T) \longrightarrow \alpha, \beta, v_w \longrightarrow h^2 \Omega(f)$$

Transition rates

Semi-classical approx

$$\Gamma \approx A e^{-B}$$

Action at
saddle point

B solved by finding a “bounce” instanton solution numerically

Tricky numerical problem, many public bounce solvers

Fluctuations
around
saddle point

CosmoTransitions [C. L. Wainwright, CPC 183 (2012) 2006–2013,],

AnyBubble [A. Masoumi, K. D. Olum and B. Shlaer, JCAP 1701 (2017) 051],

BubbleProfiler [PA, Balazs, Bardsley, Fowlie, Harries & White CPC 244 (2019) 448-468]

SimpleBounce [Ryosuke Sato, CPC 258 (2021) 107566]

All bounce solvers to date have some significant drawbacks

(numerical stability, reliability, noise/precision, speed, number of fields)

From particle physics theory to GWs

$$\hat{V}_{\text{eff}} \longrightarrow \phi_i^{\text{min}}(T) \xrightarrow{\text{orange}} \Gamma(\phi_i^{\text{min}} \rightarrow \phi_j^{\text{min}}) \longrightarrow P_f(T), N(T) \longrightarrow \alpha, \beta, v_w \longrightarrow h^2 \Omega(f)$$

Transition rates

Semi-classical approx

$$\Gamma \approx A e^{-B}$$

Action at saddle point

A usually assumed less important,
Often estimated on dimensional grounds

Fluctuations around saddle point

$$A \approx T^4$$

$$A \approx T^4 \left(B / (2\pi T)^{3/2} \right)$$

Problem: what if **A** has exponential dependence?

→ Calculate it directly → **BubbleDet**

[Ekstedt, Gould, and Hirvonen, arXiv:2308.15652]

Bubble nucleation

Bubbles of the new phase form at random locations

The bubbles that already formed grow in size

while more bubbles nucleate

As the bubbles grow, and the number increases, collisions become more likely


And more and more of the space is converted to the true vacuum

[image: from Lachlan Morris]



$$\Omega_{\text{GW}}(f) \equiv \frac{1}{\rho_{\text{tot}}} \frac{d\rho_{\text{GW}}}{d \ln f}$$

$$h^2 \Omega_{\text{GW}} = h^2 \Omega_{\text{coll}} + h^2 \Omega_{\text{sw}} + h^2 \Omega_{\text{turb}}$$



The peak amplitude varies with the frequency

The signal has several contributions:

- 1) the collision of bubbles – which breaks their spherical symmetry.
- 2) waves of plasma accelerated by the bubble wall.
- 3) shocks in the fluid leading to turbulence

Understanding this quantitatively requires hydrodynamical simulations and/or clever modeling of how it happens

Times scales for sources gravitational waves affect the GWs signal

Depends on the particle physics model

Can be related to a length scale, **mean bubble separation** used in hydrodynamical simulations of sound:

$$R_{\text{sep}}(T) = (n_B(T))^{-\frac{1}{3}} \quad n_b(T) = T^3 \int_T^{T_c} dT' \frac{\Gamma(T') P_f(T')}{T'^4 H(T')}$$

bubble number density

Best treatment

Often estimated by taylor expanding the **bounce action** $\Gamma(t) = Ae^{-S(t)}$

$$S(t) \approx S(t_*) + \left. \frac{dS}{dt} \right|_{t=t_*} (t - t_*) + \frac{1}{2} \left. \frac{d^2 S}{dt^2} \right|_{t=t_*} (t - t_*)^2 + \dots,$$

2nd order \longrightarrow Gaussian nucleation rate $\Gamma(t) = \Gamma(t_*) \exp\left(-\frac{\beta_V^2}{2} (t - t_*)^2\right),$

$$\beta_V = \sqrt{\left. \frac{d^2 S}{dt^2} \right|_{t=t_\Gamma}}$$

Can be used to replace mean bubble separation

$$R_{\text{sep}} = \left(\sqrt{2\pi} \frac{\Gamma(T_\Gamma)}{\beta_V} \right)^{-\frac{1}{3}}$$

Rough approximation

Times scales for sources gravitational waves affect the GWs signal

Depends on the particle physics model

Can be related to a length scale, **mean bubble separation** used in hydrodynamical simulations of sound:

$$R_{\text{sep}}(T) = (n_B(T))^{-\frac{1}{3}} \quad n_b(T) = T^3 \int_T^{T_c} dT' \frac{\Gamma(T') P_f(T')}{T'^4 H(T')}$$

bubble number density

One more thing:

Alternative length scale - **mean bubble radius**

$$\bar{R}(T) = \frac{T^2}{n_B(T)} \int_T^{T_c} dT' \frac{\Gamma(T') P_f(T')}{T'^4 H(T')} \int_T^{T'} dT'' \frac{v_w(T'')}{H(T'')}.$$

This has been proposed in the literature but not used in simulations