

H-dibaryons and Primordial Nucleosynthesis

J.A.de Freitas Pacheco¹, S. Stoica^{1,2}, F. Thévenin¹ and J.E. Horvath^{1,3}

¹ Observatoire de la Côte d’Azur

P.O. Box 4229, F-06304 Nice Cedex 4, France

² Institute of Physics and Nuclear Engineering

P.O. Box MG-6, 76900-Bucharest, Romania

³ Instituto Astronômico e Geofísico

Av. Miguel Stefano 4200, S. Paulo 01060-970, Brazil

May 7, 2021

Abstract

The apparent discrepancy between abundances of light nuclides predicted by the standard Big-Bang and observational data is explained, by assuming the presence of metastable H dibaryons at the nucleosynthesis era. These dibaryons could be formed out of a small fraction of strange quarks at the moment of the confinement transition. For a primordial deuterium abundance of the order of 3×10^{-5} , the measured differences in the ${}^4\text{He}$ abundances requires a relative abundance of H dibaryons of the order of $n_H/n_B \sim 0.07$, decaying in a timescale of the order of 10^5 s.

Pacs : 14.20.Pt -Dibaryons, 98.80.Ft -Origin and formation of the elements

98.80.Es -Observational Cosmology

The abundances of D and ${}^3\text{He}$ in the solar system and in the interstellar medium (ISM) [1]- [2], of ${}^7\text{Li}$ in metal-poor halo stars [4], as well as of ${}^4\text{He}$ in low-metallicity extragalactic HII regions [2] have been until recently in quantitative agreement with the standard Big-Bang nucleosynthesis (SBBN) predictions. However, recent observations reveal a possible conflict between the abundances of the above species predicted by SBBN and those inferred from observational data. This situation has been generated by the new determinations of the deuterium abundance at high red-shift, low metallicity quasar (QSO) absorption clouds. On the one hand, there is evidence in favor of a high value of the D abundance (high-D), $(D/H) \sim 2 \times 10^{-4}$ and, on the other hand, there is evidence for a low D abundance (low-D), $(D/H) \sim 2.3 \times 10^{-5}$. The former was derived from Keck data on QSO 0014+813 [5], and it seems to be confirmed by new data with better Signal to Noise ratio [6], whilst the latter was obtained from the analysis of two QSO spectra [7], [8], [3]. At present, no convincing arguments were given in favor of one or other value, or even if these quite different measurements indicate a non-homogeneous distribution.

From the SBBN, high-D values are consistent with primordial abundances of ${}^4\text{He}$ and ${}^7\text{Li}$ provided the baryon-to-photon ratio η is about 3×10^{-10} and three neutrino flavors [2]. Note that low-D values imply a conflict between the predicted ${}^4\text{He}$ abundance and observations. More precisely, to have a consistency with SBBN, low-D values require ${}^4\text{He}$ abundances (by mass) in the range 0.247–0.250, whereas extragalactic HII regions data indicate a primordial abundance of 0.230 ± 0.003 [2].

Several explanations for this apparent conflict have been proposed, including corrections to the HeI effective line recombination coefficient, uncertainties in the astration amount (model-dependent), and modification of the effective neutrino number. Basically, the predicted ${}^4\text{He}$ abundance Y_P depends on the number of neutrinos with variations of the value as $\Delta Y_P \sim 0.01(N_\nu - 3)$. SBBN is based on the hypothesis of three neutrino flavors ($N_\nu=3$). However, if $N_\nu = 2$, this will lead to negative correction and thus, a smaller value of Y_P , which could restore the consistency. An argument for a smaller N_ν would be the existence of a massive ν_τ . For instance, a ν_τ which would decay with a lifetime of ~ 0.1 s, reduces respectively N_ν by ~ 0.5 –1 and Y_P by ~ 0.006 –0.013 if its mass is 20–30 MeV and solves the apparent conflict between theory and observations [9]. But, the most recent estimation of the upper limit of the mass of ν_τ (18.2 MeV) weakens this argument [10].

In this Letter we propose an alternative solution for this problem, by assuming the presence of heavy metastable hadrons at the nucleosynthesis era. These particles will eventually decay into protons, modifying the original relative abundances. The presence of massive and unstable particles X, formed just after the quark-hadron phase transition (QHT), and with lifetimes longer than the nucleosynthesis era, was also recently claimed as a possible mechanism to modify the original SBBN abundances [11]. However, in such a scenario, these unknown particles decay and give rise to both electromagnetic and hadronic cascades. The resulting high-energy photons would disintegrate a fraction of the original ${}^4\text{He}$, whereas the high-energy hadrons would produce light nuclides by spallation reactions.

Our scenario supposes the presence of a small fraction of s-quarks at the moment of the QHT, which occurred when the temperature of the quark-gluon plasma was about $T \sim 100$ –150 MeV. In our picture, the strange quarks will confine into dibaryons (H particles) [13], after the QHT. The fraction of dibaryons just after the QHT is determined by the density of s-quarks, conservation of electric and baryonic charge as well as strangeness. Most of baryons will be annihilated at $T \sim 40$ MeV and, as a consequence, the baryonic charge excess is the most important thermodynamic parameter, implying non-zero chemical potentials for quarks. The u and d quark flavor excess density, considering only first order terms in the chemical potential is ($\hbar=c=1$) [12]

$$n_f = 2T^3 \left(1 - \frac{2\alpha_c}{\pi}\right) \frac{\mu_f}{T}, \quad (1)$$

where α_c is the strong color coupling constant, and we have assumed zero rest masses for these light quarks. Since the mass of the s quark is still uncertain, its flavor density excess is defined with respect to the u and d density by $n_s = f_s(n_u + n_d)$.

The baryon excess is $\varepsilon_B = \frac{1}{3} \sum \frac{n_f}{n_\gamma}$, where n_γ is the photon density. By using (1), this excess reads

$$\varepsilon_B = \frac{\pi^2}{3\zeta(3)}(1 + f_s)\left(\frac{\mu_u}{T} + \frac{\mu_d}{T}\right)\left(1 - \frac{2\alpha_c}{\pi}\right). \quad (2)$$

The baryon excess must be followed by a lepton excess, which will be assumed here to be carried only by electrons. Electrical charge neutrality in the quark phase implies that

$$[(2 - f_s)\frac{\mu_u}{T} - (1 - f_s)\frac{\mu_d}{T}]\left(1 - \frac{2\alpha_c}{\pi}\right) = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mu_e}{T}, \quad (3)$$

where μ_e is the electron chemical potential associated to the lepton excess.

The H-dibaryon excess density with respect to the photon density is fixed by strangeness conservation, i.e.,

$$\frac{n_H}{n_\gamma} = \frac{\pi^2}{2\zeta(3)}f_s\left(1 - \frac{2\alpha_c}{\pi}\right)\left(\frac{\mu_u}{T} + \frac{\mu_d}{T}\right). \quad (4)$$

The excess of baryonic charge and electrical neutrality just after the QHT give respectively the conditions

$$\frac{n_p}{n_\gamma} + \frac{n_n}{n_\gamma} + \frac{2n_H}{n_\gamma} = \varepsilon_B, \quad (5)$$

and

$$\frac{n_p}{n_\gamma} = \frac{\pi^2}{6\zeta(3)}\frac{\mu_e}{T}, \quad (6)$$

where n_p and n_n are respectively the proton and the neutron density excess. This system of equations determines the initial abundance of dibaryons as a function of the parameter f_s , which will mostly contribute to the appearance of H particles after hadronization. After decay of H's, the dilution of helium can be inferred and compared to the measured abundances.

An initial H fraction of about 7% is sufficient to explain the apparent ^4He discrepancy, without modifying considerably the abundances of the other nuclides. We now address the crucial question regarding the ability of H dibaryon to survive until the nucleosynthesis era ($T \sim 1 \text{ MeV}$). We recall that the existence of the H-hadron was first suggested by Jaffe [13] in 1977, as a double strange ($\Lambda\Lambda$), flavor-singlet six-quark state ($uuddss$), with spin and parity $J^\pi = 0^+$ and isospin $I = 0$, which would be stable against strong decay. Concerning the H dibaryon mass, theoretical estimations [16]-[17] vary from a very bound state with respect to the $\Lambda\Lambda$ threshold, i.e. $\simeq 2231 \text{ MeV}$, (within a quark cluster model) [14] to a slightly bound state (within the chiral quark model) [15], or even an unbound state (from a lattice QCD calculation) [18]. The latter case seems unrealistic. Experiments are not yet decisive [19]-[20], and speculations on the dibaryon mass are still possible.

If the H dibaryon mass is smaller than the $\Lambda\Lambda$ -threshold, then it does not decay by strong interactions. Thus, its lifetime is not related to the lifetime of free Λ hyperons (which is of the order of $\sim 10^{-10} \text{ s}$). If the H dibaryon is regarded as a six-quark composite particle, described by a wave function involving the symmetry properties of the ground

state configuration, the picture of its weak decay and lifetime will be different from that of a two-hyperon decay. In this case H can decay through the nonleptonic modes $\Delta S = 1, 2$ (S is the strangeness quantum number). If $m_\Lambda + m_n < m_H < 2m_\Lambda$, the H decays through the $\Delta S = 1$ mode into the following three channels : $n\Lambda$, $n\Sigma^0$ and $p\Sigma^-$. A small contribution can also be the $\Lambda N\pi$ channel. The lifetime for this channel has been calculated in detail in Ref. [21]. The authors first build up a six-quark wave functions and then construct the $\Delta S = 1, 2$ nonleptonic weak Hamiltonians and compute the decay rates. They have found for this mode lifetimes between $3 \times 10^{-9} - 7 \times 10^{-7}$, for a mass interval between 2.22 and 2.06 GeV. These lifetimes are too short to permit dibaryons to survive during the nucleosynthesis era. However, if the H dibaryon has a mass below the $n + \Lambda$ threshold, i.e. $m_H \leq m_n + m_\Lambda$ (i.e. $m_H \leq 2054$ MeV), all $\Delta S = 1$ decay channels are forbidden and they can decay only by the $\Delta S = 2$ mode. In this case, the expected lifetimes are of the order of a few days ($\sim 10^5$ s) [21], sufficient for their survival during the entire period of formation of the light nuclides.

Another important question concerns the survival of dibaryons against collisions with other more abundant baryons. If their relative abundance with respect to photons is $X_H = \frac{n_H}{n_\gamma}$, then their evolution is governed by the equation $\frac{\partial X_H}{\partial t} = -X_H \nu_i$ where ν_i is the collision frequency with other nucleons (protons and neutrons). The relevant energy scale is the difference between the actual H mass and the minimum energy that would make the excited dibaryon to decay on a timescale $\tau \ll 10^5$ s. Even if the typical thermal energies of the nucleons stay always less than the difference $\Delta \geq 175 \text{ MeV}$ between two lambdas and the H mass, this does not guarantee the survival of a sufficient number of H's until the nucleosynthesis era. If the QHT occurs at about $\frac{1}{H_H(t)} \approx 10 \mu\text{s}$ ($H_H(t)$ being the Hubble parameter), then the inelastic cross section must satisfy $\sigma < 10^{-10}$ barn, to avoid a significant destruction.

Finally it is worth mentioning that H decays into two neutrons with energies of the order of hundred MeV, and these in turn decay into two protons, two electrons and two anti-neutrinos. Such processes contribute to a heat input in the primordial plasma, but with negligible consequences. H-dibaryons with a lifetime of about 10^5 s will decay when the primordial plasma reaches a temperature of about 1.5 keV, corresponding to an energy density of about $7 \times 10^{14} \text{ erg.cm}^{-3}$. The H decay implies an energy input of about $1.4 \times 10^9 \text{ erg.cm}^{-3}$, which will introduce a quite small correction into the plasma temperature. Then the possible presence of strange hadrons (H-dibaryons) able to survive from the QHT until the nucleosynthesis epoch in the early universe, could be an alternative solution keeping compatible the predictions of the SBBN and observational data. Our scenario would implies $\eta \approx 5 \times 10^{-10}$, or equivalently $\Omega_b \approx 0.04$ ($H_0 = 65 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$).

References

- [1] P. Bonifacio and P. Molaro, MNRAS **285** 847, (1997).
- [2] G. Steigman, astro-ph/9803055, (1998).

- [3] S. Burles and D. Tytler, *Astrophys.J.* **499** 699, (1998).
- [4] F. Spite and M. Spite, *Astron. Astrophys.* **115** 357 (1982).
- [5] A. Songaila et al., *Nature* **368** 599, (1994).
- [6] D. Tytler et al., astro-ph/9612121 - *Astrophys.J.*, in press (1998).
- [7] S.Burles and D. Tytler, astro-ph/9712265, (1997).
- [8] D. Tytler et al., *Nature* **381** 207, (1996).
- [9] N. Hata et al., *Phys. Rev. D* **55** 540, (1997).
- [10] C. Caso et al., *The Eur. Phys. Jour.* **C3** 1, (1998).
- [11] S. Dimopoulos et al., *Astrophys.J.* **330**, 545, (1988).
- [12] E.V. Shuryak, *Phys. Rep.* **61**, 71, (1980).
- [13] R.L. Jaffe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38** 195, (1977).
- [14] T. Sakai et al., *Nucl. Phys. A* **625** 192, (1997)
- [15] A.P. Balachandran, A. Barducci, F. Lizzi, V.G.J. Rodgers and A. Stern, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52** (1984) 887.
- [16] J.L. Jaffe and C.L. Korpa, *Nucl. Phys.* **B258** (1985) 468.
- [17] Y. Iwasaki, T. Yoshie and Y. Tsuboi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60** 1371, (1988).
- [18] P.B. Mackenzie and H.B. Thacker, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55** 2539, (1985).
- [19] K. Imai, *Nucl. Phys.* **A527** 181, (1991).
- [20] J.K. Ahn et al., *Phys. Lett.* **378** 53, (1996).
- [21] J.F. Donoghue, E. Golowich and B.R. Holstein, *Phys. Rev. D* **34** 3434, (1986).