

*Department of Physics
The University of Tokyo*

UTAP-231, RESCEU-17/96
OCHA-PP-65
January 5, 2018

Small Thermal Fluctuations on a Large Domain

Tetsuya Shiromizu

*Department of Physics, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113, Japan
and*

*Research Center for the Early Universe(RESCEU),
The University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113, Japan*

Masahiro Morikawa

Department of Physics, Ochanomizu University, Tokyo 112, Japan

Abstract

Weak first-order phase transitions proceed with percolation of new phase. The kinematics of this process is clarified from the point of view of subcritical bubbles. We examine the effect of small subcritical bubbles around a large domain of asymmetric phase by introducing an effective geometry. The percolation process can be understood as a perpetual growth of the large domain aided by the small subcritical bubbles.

Recently crucial effects of small rapid fluctuations -subcritical bubbles[1] are actively investigated for the electroweak baryogenesis[2] and for the inflationary cosmology. We could previously show, by studying the effect of subcritical bubbles, that the phase mixing is achieved in weakly first order phase transitions. However the global achievement of the phase transition -percolation- has not yet been explained from the point of view of subcritical bubbles. The difficulty lies on the previous treatment of subcritical bubbles; one always assumed spherically symmetry for the configuration of subcritical bubbles and interactions among them were neglected. However, it is possible to consider these effects easily within the point of view of subcritical bubbles. After the phase mixing is attained, there appear large and stable domains of asymmetric phase. If this domain were isolated in thermal fluctuations, then this domain would eventually collapse due to the surface tension of itself. However if we properly consider the effect of small fluctuations of subcritical bubbles around the large domain, this domain is stabilized against the collapse and eventually grows. This is the mechanism which we would like to clarify in this paper. This growth can be seen as the process of percolation of the system. Our study has been inspired by the interesting work by Gleiser et al.[3]. However in our case, both the collapse and growth of the domain are automatically taken into account and we worry about the introducing an extra term which guarantees the decay as claimed in [3].

In this letter, we first show that a large asymmetric domain is stabilized by subcritical bubbles around the wall. For simplicity, we assume that the shape of the large domain

is spherical with radius $R(t)$ and volume $V_+(t)$. Hereafter we simply call the subcritical bubbles as bubbles. The time variation of the volume $V_+(t)$ is composed from the kinematical and subcritical bubble contributions¹. ;

$$\frac{dV_+(t)}{dt} = 4\pi R^2 \frac{dR}{dt} + (\Gamma_+ \Delta V) \frac{4\pi}{3} \langle R \rangle_+^3 - (\Gamma_0 \Delta V') \frac{4\pi}{3} \langle R \rangle_0^3, \quad (2)$$

where only the contribution from bubbles near wall of the large domain is included in the second and third terms in the right-hand-side of this equation. Γ_+ and Γ_0 are the creation rates per unit volume of a bubble and an anti-bubble, respectively:

$$\Gamma_+ \simeq m_+^4(T) \exp[-\beta F_+(\langle R \rangle_+)] \quad (3)$$

and

$$\Gamma_0 \simeq m_0^4(T) \exp[-\beta F_0(\langle R \rangle_0)], \quad (4)$$

where $F_{0,+}$ and $\langle R \rangle_{0,+}$ are the free energy and the averaged size of a bubble and an anti-bubble, respectively. As $F_0 \simeq F_+$, $m_0(T) \simeq m_+(T)$ and $\langle R \rangle_+ \simeq \langle R \rangle_0 := \langle R \rangle$ near $T = T_c$ at which two vacua degenerate, approximately $\Gamma_+ = \Gamma_0 =: \Gamma$ holds and therefore

$$\frac{dV_+(t)}{dt} = 4\pi R^2 \frac{dR}{dt} + \Gamma (\Delta V - \Delta V') \frac{4\pi}{3} \langle R \rangle^3. \quad (5)$$

Furthermore, as $\Delta V - \Delta V' \simeq 32\pi R \langle R \rangle^2$, this equation reduces to

$$\frac{dV_+(t)}{dt} = 4\pi R^2 \frac{dR}{dt} + \frac{128\pi^2}{3} \Gamma R \langle R \rangle^5. \quad (6)$$

This is the relation between the spherical symmetric volume and its radius modified by the bubbles around the large domain. A cute and elegant way to express this important relation is to introduce a fictitious geometry of non-Euclidean space whose metric is given by

$$d\ell^2 = dr^2 + a(t)r^2 d\Omega_2^2. \quad (7)$$

Deviation of the ‘‘scale factor’’ a from 1 represents the non-trivial effect from the last term in eq.(6). The time variation of the volume in this geometry (7) becomes

$$\frac{dV_+}{dt} = \frac{d}{dt} \left(4\pi \int_0^{R(t)} dr r^2 a(t) \right) = \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{4\pi}{3} R^3(t) a(t) \right). \quad (8)$$

¹As we stated Gleiser et al. have considered that a domain without bubbles always collapses; in place of the first term on the right-hand side of this equation, they put a term $-4\pi R^2 v$ where v is the wall velocity of the collapsing domain. We suspect this treatment; actual thermal fluctuations around a domain have both collapsing and expanding effects on the domain. Furthermore, they compare their results with computer simulations[5]. In this simulation the ‘‘final’’ fraction(γ_f) of the symmetric phase depends on the strength of the self-coupling λ of the Higgs field which determines the mass. For sufficiently large λ , this fraction becomes 0.5 within the Hubble time. However for smaller values of λ , it never reach 0.5. In this latter case, the system is always in non-equilibrium state. On the other hand, they compare the *thermal equilibrium* value estimated through the Boltzmann equation with the above *non-equilibrium* value. The Boltzmann equation they use is given by

$$\partial_t F(\phi, R) \simeq -v \partial_R F(\phi, R) + (1 - 2f)G(\phi, R), \quad (1)$$

where F and G are the number density and the creation rate of the subcritical bubble inside the range ($\phi \sim \phi + \delta\phi, R \sim R + \delta R$), respectively. In the usual case, the first term of the right-hand side in the above equation vanishes and the equilibrium value should be $\gamma_{\text{eq}} = 1/2$. Of course the result in the simulation is $\gamma^{\text{simul.}} = 1/2$ if one continues the numerical calculation sufficiently beyond the Hubble time.

Equating eq.(6) and eq.(8), one obtains an ‘Einstein’ equation for a ‘scale’ factor $a(t)$;

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{4\pi}{3} R^3(t)[a(t) - 1] \right) = \frac{128\pi^2}{3} \Gamma R \langle R \rangle^5. \quad (9)$$

The solution of this equation is

$$a(t) = 1 + \frac{32\pi\Gamma\langle R \rangle^5}{R^3(t)} \int_0^t dt' R(t') = 1 + \gamma x^{-3}(\tau) \int_0^\tau d\tau' x(\tau'), \quad (10)$$

where $\gamma := 32\pi\Gamma\langle R \rangle^4$, $x := R/\langle R \rangle$ and $\tau := t/\langle R \rangle$.

Next, we construct an equation of motion for ‘matter’($R(t)$). It is obvious that its Lagrangian is given by

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \int d^3x \sqrt{q} \mathcal{L} \\ &= 4\pi a(t) \int_0^\infty dr r^2 \mathcal{L} \\ &= a(t) L_0, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where

$$L_0 = \frac{1}{2} M(R) \left(\frac{dR}{dt} \right)^2 - V_0(R) \quad (12)$$

and $M(R) := \frac{15\pi^{3/2}\phi_+^2 R}{8\sqrt{2}}$. Here we have used the form $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \phi_+ \exp[-|\mathbf{x}|^2/R^2(t)]$ for the large domain as previously[4]². Near the critical temperature the potential becomes

$$V(R) = a(t)V_0(R) \simeq \frac{2}{5}a(t)M(R). \quad (13)$$

Let us define a new variable: $q(\tau) := \int_0^\tau d\tau' x(\tau')$. Then the Lagrangian becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} \left(q, \frac{dq}{d\tau}, \frac{d^2q}{d\tau^2} \right) &:= \frac{1}{M(\langle R \rangle)} L \\ &= \left[1 + \gamma \left(\frac{dq}{d\tau} \right)^{-3} q \right] \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{dq}{d\tau} \left(\frac{d^2q}{d\tau^2} \right)^2 - \frac{2}{5} \frac{dq}{d\tau} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The corresponding Euler-Lagrange equation becomes

$$\begin{aligned} 10 \left(\frac{dq}{d\tau} \right)^5 \frac{d^4q}{d\tau^4} &+ 10\gamma q \left(\frac{d^2q}{d\tau^2} \right)^2 \frac{d^4q}{d\tau^4} + 20 \left(\frac{dq}{d\tau} \right)^4 \frac{d^2q}{d\tau^2} \frac{d^3q}{d\tau^3} \\ &- 40\gamma q \frac{dq}{d\tau} \frac{d^2q}{d\tau^2} \frac{d^3q}{d\tau^3} + 20\gamma \left(\frac{dq}{d\tau} \right)^3 \frac{d^3q}{d\tau^3} \\ &+ 30\gamma q \left(\frac{d^2q}{d\tau^2} \right)^3 - 15\gamma \left(\frac{dq}{d\tau} \right)^2 \left(\frac{d^2q}{d\tau^2} \right)^2 \\ &+ 24\gamma q \frac{d^2q}{d\tau^2} - 12\gamma \left(\frac{dq}{d\tau} \right)^2 = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

² For simplicity, we assumed that the configuration is Gaussian, but this is true if the domain has the thick wall. In general, the wall can be thin. However we expect that the non-Gaussian extension cannot give the drastic change on the present qualitative result.

It is hopeless to solve this equation analytically; numerical calculation is necessary. The results of numerical calculations are depicted in Fig. 1 and 2. They show the time evolution of x the radius R normalized by $\langle R \rangle$. In Fig. 1, we changed γ fixing the initial velocity $\dot{x}(0)$. In Fig. 2, we fixed γ and changed the initial velocity. From the figures one easily see that the domain always bounces by the fluctuation of bubbles. Actually we have always observed the bounce of the domain in a wide parameter range. Here, we note that we assumed $d^2x/d\tau^2(0) = 0$ in these figures because we could not observe the drastic modification from the above qualitative results in another reasonable cases with $d^2x/d\tau^2(0) \neq 0$. Therefore it seems that the bounce is a universal phenomena. Of course, the domain always collapses in the limit $\gamma \rightarrow 0$. Our approximation is meaningful only for $R > \langle R \rangle$ when the domain is well distinguished from bubbles. Therefore we have restricted the parameter range which respects this constraint.³

To understand the bounce of the domain, we concentrate on the behavior of the solution around the radius-minimum. We expand the ‘scale factor’ $a(\tau)$ as $a(\tau) \simeq 1 + \gamma\tau x^{-2} + \dots$, and neglect the velocity $\dot{x}(t) \simeq 0$. Then the Euler-Lagrange equation reduces to a simple form

$$\ddot{x} + \frac{2}{5} \left[\frac{2x}{x^2 + \gamma\tau} - \frac{1}{x} \right] =: \ddot{x} + \partial_x V(x, \tau) \simeq 0, \quad (16)$$

where $V(x, \tau) = (2/5)\ln[(x^2 + \gamma\tau)/x]$. Explicit time dependence in this equation prevents us to use energy conservation law for the analysis of kinematics of the domain. However, one can see rough behavior using the ‘potential’ $V(x, \tau)$. The minimum of the potential is at $x_m(\tau) = (\gamma\tau)^{1/2}$ and the orbit of a domain is always bounded. The energy changing rate is given by

$$\frac{dH}{dt} \simeq \frac{2}{5} M(\langle R \rangle) (32\pi \langle R \rangle^3 \Gamma) \frac{\langle R \rangle}{R} \sim \frac{2}{5} M(\langle R \rangle) \frac{\frac{4\pi}{3} \langle R \rangle^3}{\Delta V} (\Delta V - \Delta V') \Gamma, \quad (17)$$

where $(\Delta V - \Delta V')\Gamma$ is the number of bubbles generated per unit time in the volume $\Delta V - \Delta V'$. The factor $(2/5)M(\langle R \rangle)$ is the free energy of one bubble. The factor $\frac{4\pi}{3}\langle R \rangle^3/\Delta V$ is the minimum fraction which can contribute to the energy of the domain. Thus we find that the above equation is quite reasonable!

Though we have shown that a large domain always bounces and perpetually grows, it does not mean that the asymmetric domain eventually covers all the region of space. Actually the same argument is applicable for the domain composed of the symmetric phase instead of the asymmetric phase if the phase mixing is well established. The effect of small bubbles are the same and they stabilize both types of large domains. This domain growth can be regarded as the percolation process that a macroscopic order appears and grows in the system. Let us clarify this point further.

We have considered the spherical symmetric domain in this letter. This analysis is also applicable for the evolution of the local curvature of a boundary between the symmetric and asymmetric phases instead of the radius a domain. The essential point in our argument was that the effect of bubble attachment is different in the convex side and in the concave side of the domain wall; the bubble attachment rate is higher in the convex side than that in the concave side. Especially for a small domain, bubbles attach almost only in the outside and this is the reason that all the domain bounces. Therefore

³We took the variable γ as a parameter in this letter. In principle this is determined by the scale $\langle R \rangle$ of the bubbles as in [4].

we can conclude that a large boundary wall always tend to become straight irrespect of the symmetry. This is the percolation process from the point of view of subcritical bubbles. We would like to report much quantitative results of percolation in our future publications based on the present argument.

Acknowledgment

TS thanks Humitaka Sato for his valuable comments. We would like to thank Jun'ich Yokoyama, Takahiro Tanaka and Masahide Yamaguchi for useful discussions in the initial stage of our study. This work is partly supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research Fellowship, No. 2925 (TS).

References

- [1] M. Gleiser, E. W. Kolb and R. Watkins, Nucl. Phys. **B364**(1991),411;
M. Gleiser and E. W. Kolb, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**(1992),1304;
M. Gleiser and E. W. Kolb, Phys. Rev. **D48**(1993),1560;
M. Gleiser and R. O. Ramos, Phys. Lett. **300B**(1993),271;
G. Gelmini and M. Gleiser, Nucl. Phys. **419B**(1994),129;
M. Gleiser and R. O. Ramos, Phys. Rev. **D50**(1994),2441;
M. Gleiser, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**(1994),3495
- [2] A. G. Cohen, D. B. Kaplan and A. E. Nelson, Ann. Rev. and Part. Sci., **43**(1993),27
- [3] M. Gleiser, A. F. Heckler, and E. W. Kolb, Preprint(cond-mat/9512032)
- [4] T. Shiromizu, M. Morikawa and J. Yokoyama, Prog. Theor. Phys. **94**(1995),795; 805;
K. Enqvist, A. Riotto and I. Vilja, Phys. Rev. **D52**(1995), 5556
- [5] J. Borrill and M. Gleiser, Phys. Rev. **D51**(1995),4111

Figure Captions

Fig. 1.

The variable $x \equiv R/\langle R \rangle$ vs time $\tau \equiv t/\langle R \rangle$. We fixed the initial velocity $x'(\tau) = -1$ and changed the parameter γ : The parameter γ is 0.016, 0.16, 1.6, and 16 in the order of increasing thickness of the curve. All domain solutions bounce and grows.

Fig. 2.

The same as Fig. 1, but we fixed γ and changed the initial velocity $x'(\tau) = -1$ for each figures. $\gamma = 0.16$ for Fig. 2-a, $\gamma = 1.6$ for Fig. 2-b, and $\gamma = 16$ for Fig. 2-c. The parameter $x'(\tau)$ is -1, -0.5, 0, 0.5, and 1 in the order of decreasing length of dashing.