

Leptogenesis with heavy neutrino flavours: from density matrix to Boltzmann equations

Steve Blanchet^a, Pasquale Di Bari^b, David A. Jones^b, Luca Marzola^b

^a *Institut de Théorie des Phénomènes Physiques, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne,
CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland*

^b *School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, U.K.*

October 16, 2018

Abstract

Leptogenesis with heavy neutrino flavours is discussed within a density matrix formalism. We write the density matrix equation, describing the generation of the matter-antimatter asymmetry, for an arbitrary choice of the right-handed (RH) neutrino masses. For hierarchical RH neutrino masses lying in the fully flavoured regimes, this reduces to multiple-stage Boltzmann equations. In this case we recover and extend results previously derived within a quantum state collapse description. We confirm the generic existence of phantom terms. However, taking into account the effect of gauge interactions, we show that they are washed out at the production with a wash-out rate that is halved compared to that one acting on the total asymmetry. In the N_1 -dominated scenario they cancel without contributing to the final baryon asymmetry. In other scenarios they do not in general and they have to be taken into account. We also confirm that there is a (orthogonal) component in the asymmetry produced by the heavier RH neutrinos which completely escapes the washout from the lighter RH neutrinos and show that phantom terms additionally contribute to it. The other (parallel) component is washed out with the usual exponential factor, even for weak washout. Finally, as an illustration, we study the two RH neutrino model in the light of the above findings, showing that phantom terms can contribute to the final asymmetry also in this case.

1 Introduction

Leptogenesis [1] is a direct cosmological application of the see-saw mechanism [2] for the explanation of neutrino masses and mixing and it realises a highly non trivial link between cosmology and neutrino physics. The discovery of neutrino masses and mixing in neutrino oscillation experiments [3] has drawn great attention on leptogenesis that became one of the most attractive models of baryogenesis for the explanation of the matter-antimatter asymmetry of the Universe.

In most cases, classical Boltzmann equations are sufficient for the calculation of the final asymmetry [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. However, when lepton flavour effects are taken into account [6, 10, 11], different sets of classical Boltzmann equations apply depending whether the asymmetry is generated in the one-flavour regime, when the mass of the decaying RH neutrinos M_i is much above 10^{12} GeV, in the two-flavour regime, for 10^{12} GeV $\gg M_i \gg 10^9$ GeV, or in the three-flavour regime for $M_i \ll 10^9$ GeV. Moreover classical Boltzmann equations fail in reproducing the correct result in the transition regimes for $M_i \sim 10^9$ GeV and for $M_i \sim 10^{12}$ GeV. However, in the case that only the lightest RH neutrino species is assumed to be responsible for the generation of the asymmetry, classical Boltzmann equations provide quite a convenient description in phenomenological investigations, since the final asymmetry can be expressed in terms of simple analytical expressions that well approximate the numerical solutions [9, 12].

On the other hand, the contribution from heavier RH neutrinos can also relevantly contribute to the final asymmetry (heavy neutrino flavour effects) and has, therefore, consistently to be taken into account in general [13]. When lepton flavour effects are jointly considered [6, 14], a reliable calculation of the asymmetry cannot neglect the contribution from the heavier RH neutrinos even in the two RH neutrino model [15] usually considered as a paradigmatic case for the validity of the traditional N_1 -dominated scenario. It has also been shown that a successful N_2 -dominated scenario is naturally realised in the interesting class of $SO(10)$ inspired models [16].

When heavier RH neutrinos are included, one has to distinguish quite a large number of possible mass patterns with different corresponding sets of classical Boltzmann equations for the calculation of the final asymmetry. For example, in the typical case of three RH neutrinos one has ten different possible mass patterns [17] shown in Fig. 1. In addition, the requirement that all RH neutrino masses do not fall in a transition regime becomes clearly much more restrictive.

Moreover new effects arise when heavy neutrino flavours are taken into account. First, part of the asymmetry generated by a heavier RH neutrino species, the flavour orthogonal




Figure 1: The ten different three RH neutrino mass patterns requiring 10 different sets of Boltzmann equations for the calculation of the asymmetry [17].

component, escapes the washout from a lighter RH neutrino species [6]. Second, parts of the flavour asymmetries (phantom terms) produced in the one or two flavour regimes do not contribute to the total asymmetry at the production but can contribute to the final asymmetry [18].

Therefore, it is necessary to extend the density matrix formalism beyond the traditional N_1 -dominated scenario [6, 11, 19] and account for heavy neutrino flavours effects in order to calculate the final asymmetry for an arbitrary choice of the RH neutrino masses. This is the main objective of this paper. At the same time we want to show how Boltzmann equations can be recovered from the density matrix equations for the hierarchical RH neutrino mass patterns shown in Fig. 1 allowing an explicit analytic calculation of the final asymmetry. In this way we will confirm and extend results that were obtained within a simple quantum state collapse description. For illustrative purposes, we will proceed in a modular way, first discussing the specific effects in isolation within simplified cases and then discussing the most general case that includes all effects. The paper is organised in the following way.

In Section 2 we discuss the derivation of the kinetic equations for the N_1 -dominated scenario in the absence of heavy neutrino flavours. This is useful both to show the extension from classical Boltzmann to density matrix equations and to highlight some

features that will prove to be quite important when, in the following Sections, we will include heavy neutrino flavour effects. In particular we show the existence of phantom terms and how the expression for the CP asymmetry matrix can be unambiguously derived from the flavoured CP asymmetries, taking into account the different flavour compositions of the lepton and anti-lepton quantum states produced in RH neutrino decays.

In Section 3 we start discussing the case where two heavy RH neutrino flavours are involved directly in the generation of the asymmetry, considering a simplified case with only two charged lepton flavours. In this way we simplify the notation and we better highlight the main results. In this Section we are particularly interested to show two effects that specifically arise when the interplay between heavy neutrino and charged lepton flavours is considered. The first one is phantom leptogenesis [18]. The second, that we call projection effect, is how part of the asymmetry generated by a heavy RH neutrino, the component orthogonal to the heavy neutrino flavour associated to a lighter RH neutrino, is not washed out by the inverse processes of the latter [6, 20]. We also show that these two effects, phantom leptogenesis and projection effect, in general combine with each other.

In Section 4 we extend the discussion to the general case with three heavy neutrino flavours and three charged lepton flavours. In this section we finally obtain general density matrix equations for the calculation of the asymmetry for an arbitrary choice of the RH neutrino masses. From these equations we derive the classical Boltzmann equations for a particularly interesting case: the two RH neutrino model. The derivation can be easily extended to all ten hierarchical RH neutrino mass patterns shown in Fig. 1. In Section 5 we draw the conclusions.

2 Kinetic equations for the N_1 dominated scenario

We discuss leptogenesis within a minimal type I seesaw mechanism with three RH neutrino species, N_1 , N_2 and N_3 , with masses $M_1 \leq M_2 \leq M_3$ respectively where one adds right-handed neutrinos N_{iR} to the SM lagrangian with Yukawa couplings h and a Majorana mass term that violates lepton number

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} + i \overline{N_{iR}} \gamma_\mu \partial^\mu N_{iR} - \overline{\ell_{\alpha L}} h_{\alpha i} N_{iR} \tilde{\Phi} - \frac{1}{2} M_i \overline{N_{iR}^c} N_{iR} + \text{h.c.} \quad (1)$$

After spontaneous symmetry breaking, a neutrino Dirac mass term $m_D = v h$ is generated by the Higgs vev v . In the seesaw limit, $M \gg m_D$, the spectrum of neutrino masses splits

into a light set given by the eigenvalues $m_1 < m_2 < m_3$ of the neutrino mass matrix

$$m_\nu = -m_D \frac{1}{M} m_D^T, \quad (2)$$

and into a heavy set $M_1 < M_2 < M_3$ coinciding to a good approximation with the eigenvalues of the Majorana mass matrix corresponding to eigenstates $N_i \simeq N_{iR} + N_{iR}^c$.

In this section we review the main steps underlying the derivation of the kinetic equations in leptogenesis when heavy neutrino flavours are neglected, assuming that only the lightest RH neutrino decays and inverse processes contribute to the final asymmetry: the traditional N_1 -dominated scenario.

We first derive the Boltzmann (rate) equations and then we extend them writing the density matrix equations, accounting for quantum decoherence, flavour oscillations and gauge interactions. This discussion will prove to be useful not only to setup the notation but also to highlight some basic features of the kinetic equations in leptogenesis that will be relevant when we will include heavy neutrino flavour effects in the next section.

We will neglect different effects, processes and corrections that have been studied during the last years and that will not play a relevant role in our discussion. These include for example $\Delta L = 2$ washout [4, 8], $\Delta L = 1$ scatterings [5], momentum dependence [21], thermal corrections [8, 22], flavour coupling from the Higgs and quark asymmetries [6, 23, 10, 24, 18], quantum kinetic effects [25].

We will moreover always assume vanishing pre-existing asymmetry though notice that the results that we will obtain in Section 3 on the projection effect, are also important in order to describe the evolution of a non-vanishing pre-existing asymmetry [20, 17].

2.1 Boltzmann equations

If we indicate with Γ_1 the decay rate of the lightest RH neutrinos into leptons, $N_1 \rightarrow \ell_1 + \Phi^\dagger$, and with $\bar{\Gamma}_1$ the decay rate into anti-leptons, $N_1 \rightarrow \bar{\ell}_1 + \Phi$, we can introduce the decay term D_1 and the washout term W_1 given respectively by

$$D_1(z) \equiv \frac{\Gamma_1 + \bar{\Gamma}_1}{H z} = K_1 z \left\langle \frac{1}{\gamma_1} \right\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad W_1(z) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Gamma_1^{ID} + \bar{\Gamma}_1^{ID}}{H z} = \frac{1}{4} K_1 \mathcal{K}_1(z) z^3, \quad (3)$$

where $z \equiv M_1/T$, $K_1 \equiv (\Gamma_1 + \bar{\Gamma}_1)_{T=0}/H_{T=M_1}$ is the decay parameter, H is the expansion rate and the averaged dilution factor, in terms of the Bessel functions, is given by $\langle 1/\gamma_1 \rangle = \mathcal{K}_1(z)/\mathcal{K}_2(z)$. Under the fore-mentioned assumptions and approximations and considering the unflavoured regime, the calculation of the asymmetry is described by the most traditional set of kinetic equations for leptogenesis from the decays of the lightest

RH neutrinos N_1 [5, 6, 7, 8, 9]

$$\frac{dN_{N_1}}{dz} = -D_1 (N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}), \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{dN_{B-L}}{dz} = \varepsilon_1 D_1 (N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}) - W_1 N_{B-L}, \quad (5)$$

where with N_X we indicate any particle number or asymmetry X calculated in a portion of co-moving volume containing one heavy neutrino in ultra-relativistic thermal equilibrium, in a way that $N_{N_i}^{\text{eq}}(T \gg M_i) = 1$. In this way the baryon-to-photon number ratio at recombination is related to the final $B - L$ asymmetry by

$$\eta_B = a_{\text{sph}} \frac{N_{B-L}^{\text{f}}}{N_{\gamma}^{\text{rec}}} \simeq 0.01 N_{B-L}^{\text{f}}, \quad (6)$$

to be compared with the value measured from the CMB anisotropies observations [26]

$$\eta_B^{\text{CMB}} = (6.2 \pm 0.15) \times 10^{-10}. \quad (7)$$

Let us very shortly recall the basic steps for the derivation of the Eq. (5) for the $B - L$ asymmetry. Ignoring the reprocessing action of sphalerons, we can write

$$\frac{dN_{B-L}}{dz} = \frac{dN_{\bar{\ell}_1}}{dz} - \frac{dN_{\ell_1}}{dz}. \quad (8)$$

The net production rate of leptons and anti-leptons is then given by the difference between the production rate due to decays and the depletion rate due to inverse decays, for leptons

$$\frac{dN_{\ell_1}}{dz} = \frac{\Gamma_1}{H z} N_{N_1} - \frac{\Gamma_1^{ID}}{H z} N_{\ell_1} \quad (9)$$

and for anti-leptons

$$\frac{dN_{\bar{\ell}_1}}{dz} = \frac{\bar{\Gamma}_1}{H z} N_{N_1} - \frac{\bar{\Gamma}_1^{ID}}{H z} N_{\bar{\ell}_1}. \quad (10)$$

The inverse decay rates are related to the decay rates by [5]¹

$$\Gamma_1^{ID} = \Gamma_1 \frac{N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}}{N_{\ell_1}^{\text{eq}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\Gamma}_1^{ID} = \bar{\Gamma}_1 \frac{N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}}{N_{\bar{\ell}_1}^{\text{eq}}}, \quad (11)$$

¹This expression directly accounts for the resonant $\Delta L = 2$ contribution that is needed not to violate the Sakharov condition on the necessity of a departure from thermal equilibrium for the generation of an asymmetry [4]. Here we are interested in showing the separate Boltzmann equations for lepton anti-lepton numbers that we will use in the next subsection to derive the CP violating term in the density matrix equations.

where $N_{\ell_1}^{\text{eq}} = N_{\bar{\ell}_1}^{\text{eq}} \equiv N_\ell^{\text{eq}} = 1$ is the number of leptons ℓ_1 and of anti-leptons $\bar{\ell}_1$ in thermal equilibrium for vanishing asymmetry. The number of leptons and anti-leptons can then be recast as

$$N_{\ell_1} = \frac{1}{2} (N_{\ell_1} + N_{\bar{\ell}_1}) + \frac{1}{2} (N_{\ell_1} - N_{\bar{\ell}_1}) = N_\ell^{\text{eq}} - \frac{1}{2} N_{B-L} + \mathcal{O}(N_{B-L}^2) \quad (12)$$

and

$$N_{\bar{\ell}_1} = \frac{1}{2} (N_{\ell_1} + N_{\bar{\ell}_1}) - \frac{1}{2} (N_{\ell_1} - N_{\bar{\ell}_1}) = N_\ell^{\text{eq}} + \frac{1}{2} N_{B-L} + \mathcal{O}(N_{B-L}^2). \quad (13)$$

Inserting these last expressions into the Eq. (8) and neglecting terms $\mathcal{O}(N_{B-L}^2)$, the Eq. (5) is obtained, with D_1 and W_1 given by the Eqs. (3).

The solution for the final asymmetry has a very simple analytical expression [9]

$$N_{B-L}^{\text{f}} = \varepsilon_1 \kappa(K_1), \quad \text{with } \kappa(x) \equiv \frac{2}{x z_B(x)} \left[1 - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} x z_B(x)\right) \right], \quad (14)$$

where $\kappa(K_1)$ is the final efficiency factor that here we have written, for simplicity, in the case of initial thermal N_1 -abundance. For $K_1 \gtrsim 3$, the strong wash-out regime favoured by neutrino oscillation experiments, the asymmetry is generated in quite a narrow interval of temperatures around $T_{B1} \equiv M_1/z_{B1}$, where $z_{B1} \equiv z_B(K_1) = \mathcal{O}(1 \div 10)$ [9].

The unflavoured assumption, underlying the Eqs. (4) and (5), proves to describe the correct final asymmetry only for masses $M_1 \gtrsim 10^{13}$ GeV [19, 27]. In this range of masses, during all the relevant period of the asymmetry production, the lepton and anti-lepton quantum states produced from the decays of the N_1 , that we will indicate respectively simply with $|1\rangle$ and $|\bar{1}\rangle$, can be treated, in flavour space, as pure states between their production at decay and their absorption at a subsequent inverse decay. They can be expressed as a linear combination of flavour eigenstates ($\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$),

$$|1\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} \mathcal{C}_{1\alpha} |\alpha\rangle, \quad \mathcal{C}_{1\alpha} \equiv \langle \alpha | 1 \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad |\bar{1}\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\bar{1}\alpha} |\bar{\alpha}\rangle, \quad \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\bar{1}\alpha} \equiv \langle \bar{\alpha} | \bar{1} \rangle. \quad (15)$$

Notice that in general, even though in order to simplify the notation we are indicating the final anti-leptons produced by the N_1 decays with $\bar{\ell}_1$, they do not coincide with the CP conjugated of the final lepton states. This means that, introducing the CP conjugated states

$$CP|\bar{1}\rangle = \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1\tau} |\tau\rangle + \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1\tau^\dagger} |\tau^\dagger\rangle, \quad \text{with } \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1\alpha} = \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\bar{1}\alpha}^*, \quad (16)$$

in general one has $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1\alpha} \neq \mathcal{C}_{1\alpha}$ [10].

It will prove useful to introduce the branching ratios $p_{1\alpha} \equiv |\mathcal{C}_{1\alpha}|^2$ and $\bar{p}_{1\alpha} \equiv |\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1\alpha}|^2$ giving respectively the probabilities that a lepton ℓ_1 or an anti-lepton $\bar{\ell}_1$ is found either in a flavour eigenstate α or $\bar{\alpha}$ in a flavour measurement process. It is also useful to recast the branching ratios as

$$p_{1\alpha} = p_{1\alpha}^0 + \delta p_{1\alpha}, \quad \bar{p}_{1\alpha} = \bar{p}_{1\alpha}^0 + \delta \bar{p}_{1\alpha}, \quad (17)$$

where, in general, the tree level values $p_{1\alpha}^0 \neq (p_{1\alpha} + \bar{p}_{1\alpha})/2$ and, therefore, in general, $\delta p_{1\alpha} \neq -\delta \bar{p}_{1\alpha}$. The deviations from the tree level values, $\delta p_{1\alpha} = p_{1\alpha} - p_{1\alpha}^0$ and $\delta \bar{p}_{1\alpha} = \bar{p}_{1\alpha} - \bar{p}_{1\alpha}^0$, originate from the CP violating contributions due to the interference with loop diagrams (see discussion in the Appendix).

If the charged lepton interactions are negligible during the period of generation of the asymmetry (one-flavour regime), for $z \simeq z_B$, the lepton flavour compositions do not play any role since the only other relevant interactions, the gauge interactions, are flavour blind and lepton and anti-lepton quantum states propagate coherently between production from decays and absorption from inverse decays. However, we will notice that gauge interactions have some important interplay with lepton flavour compositions. This situation is realised for $M_1 \gtrsim 10^{13}$ GeV. On the other hand, for masses 10^{12} GeV $\gg M_1 \gg 10^9$ GeV, the coherent evolution of the $|1\rangle$ and $|\bar{1}\rangle$ quantum states breaks down before they can inverse decay interacting with the Higgs bosons, due to collisions with right-handed tauons. At the inverse decays, lepton quantum states can then be described as an incoherent mixture of tauon eigenstates $|\tau\rangle$ and of $|\tau_1^\perp\rangle$ quantum states. These second ones are a coherent superposition of muon and electron eigenstates that can be regarded as the projection of the lepton quantum states $|1\rangle$ on the plane orthogonal to the tauon flavour (see Fig. 2). In this two-fully flavored regime, classical Boltzmann equations can be still used as in the unflavored regime, with the difference, in general, that now the flavour compositions of leptons and anti-leptons do play a role in the generation of the asymmetry. In this case each single flavour asymmetry has to be tracked independently and the total final $B - L$ asymmetry has to be calculated after freeze-out as the sum of the two flavoured asymmetries, a τ asymmetry and a τ_1^\perp asymmetry. To this extent, we have to introduce the flavoured CP asymmetries

$$\varepsilon_{i\alpha} \equiv \frac{\bar{p}_{i\alpha} \bar{\Gamma}_i - p_{i\alpha} \Gamma_i}{\Gamma_i + \bar{\Gamma}_i} = \frac{\bar{p}_{i\alpha} + p_{i\alpha}}{2} \varepsilon_i - \frac{\Delta p_{i\alpha}}{2}, \quad (18)$$

where we defined $\Delta p_{i\alpha} \equiv p_{i\alpha} - \bar{p}_{i\alpha}$ and all other quantities are a straightforward generalisation of the quantities previously defined for the lightest RH neutrino species N_1 to the case of a generic RH neutrino species N_i . Since sphaleron processes conserve the




Figure 2: For $10^{12} \text{ GeV} \gg M_1 \gg 10^9 \text{ GeV}$, the lepton quantum states $|1\rangle$ can be treated as an incoherent mixture of a τ and of a τ_1^\perp component during the generation of the asymmetry and a two fully flavoured regime applies.

quantities $\Delta_\alpha \equiv B/3 - L_\alpha$ ($\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$) [6], these are the convenient independent variables to be used in the set of Boltzmann equations that can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{dN_{N_1}}{dz} &= -D_1 (N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}), \\
 \frac{dN_{\Delta_\tau}}{dz} &= \varepsilon_{1\tau} D_1 (N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}) - p_{1\tau}^0 W_1 N_{\Delta_\tau}, \\
 \frac{dN_{\Delta_{\tau_1^\perp}}}{dz} &= \varepsilon_{1\tau_1^\perp} D_1 (N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}) - p_{1\tau_1^\perp}^0 W_1 N_{\Delta_{\tau_1^\perp}},
 \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where $p_{1\tau_1^\perp}^0 \equiv p_{1e}^0 + p_{1\mu}^0$ and $\varepsilon_{1\tau_1^\perp} \equiv \varepsilon_{1e} + \varepsilon_{1\mu}$ and where we neglected terms $\mathcal{O}(\Delta p N_{\Delta_\alpha})$.

Using the decomposition of the flavoured CP asymmetries in terms of $p_{i\alpha}^0$ and $\Delta p_{i\alpha}$ (cf. Eq. (18)) and assuming strong washout for both flavours (i.e. $K_{1\tau}, K_{1\tau_1^\perp} \gg 1$), the final asymmetry is approximated by the expression

$$N_{B-L}^f \simeq 2\varepsilon_1 \kappa(K_1) + \frac{\Delta p_{1\tau}}{2} \left[\kappa(K_{1\tau_1^\perp}) - \kappa(K_{1\tau}) \right], \tag{20}$$

where $K_{i\alpha} \equiv p_{i\alpha}^0 K_i$. This approximated expression shows how, compared to the expression obtained in the unflavoured case, *large lepton flavour effects can arise only when leptons and anti-leptons have a different flavour composition*, for non-vanishing $\Delta p_{1\tau}$ ².

²Notice that relaxing the assumption of strong washout for both flavours one can only get an asymmetry that is even closer to the unflavoured calculation. Indeed in the limit of no washout ($K_{1\tau}, K_{1\tau_1^\perp} \ll 1$) one exactly recovers the unflavoured expression for the final asymmetry.

In the Appendix we further discuss some interesting aspects and consequences of this point that is crucial for flavour effects to have a strong impact on the final asymmetry and that, as we will see, will play a very important role in the results discussed in this paper. The most extreme case is realized when $\varepsilon_1 = 0$ [10]. In the unflavoured case this would imply a vanishing final asymmetry but in the flavoured case it does not. It should be indeed noticed that when flavour effects are considered, $B - L$ violation is not a necessary condition for the generation of a baryon asymmetry via leptogenesis, it is sufficient to have a Δ_α violation accompanied by an asymmetric washout between the two flavours, that in this context corresponds to the requirement of departure from thermal equilibrium.

For $M_1 \ll 10^9$ GeV muon interactions are able to break the coherent evolution also of the $|\tau_1^\perp\rangle$ quantum states between decays and inverse decays during the period of the generation of the asymmetry. In this case a three-fully flavoured regime is realised and the set of classical Boltzmann equations is a straightforward generalisation of that one written in the two fully flavoured regime. In the N_1 -dominated scenario with hierarchical RH neutrinos, because of the lower bound $M_1 \gtrsim 10^9$ GeV for successful leptogenesis [28, 7], a three fully flavoured regime is not relevant for the calculation of the final asymmetry. On the other hand, in a N_2 -dominated scenario, a three flavoured regime has to be considered in the calculation of the lightest RH neutrino washout [14].

2.2 Density matrix equations

Within a density matrix formalism [6, 11, 29, 19], the description of leptogenesis is more general than with classical Boltzmann equations, since it makes possible to calculate the asymmetry in those intermediate regimes where lepton quantum states interact with the thermal bath via charged lepton interactions between decays and inverse decays though not so efficiently that a quantum collapse approximation can be applied in a statistical description. In this case the ensemble of lepton quantum states cannot be described neither in terms of pure states nor as an incoherent mixture. Yukawa interactions and charged lepton interactions compete with each other in the determination of the average properties of the lepton quantum states. We will show that also gauge interactions play an active, though indirect, role. A statistical quantum-mechanical description of lepton flavour cannot treat leptons as decoupled from the thermal bath. Therefore, the concept of lepton quantum states itself is blurred since one should consistently describe together leptons and thermal bath. A density matrix formalism [30] is then particularly convenient since it still allows to describe the leptonic subsystem in a separate way, neglecting back-

reaction effects and encoding the coupling with the thermal bath in the evolution of the off-diagonal terms of the lepton density matrices.

Let us see how a density matrix equation for the $B - L$ asymmetry can be obtained starting first from the case where charged lepton interactions are negligible. In this case we just expect to reproduce the Eq. (5).

Let us consider a simple two lepton flavour case able to describe the intermediate regime between the unflavoured case and the two fully flavoured regime that are recovered as asymptotic limits. The two relevant flavours are then τ and τ_1^\perp (see Fig. 2). In this two flavour space the flavour composition of the lepton quantum states produced by the N_1 decays can be written as ($\alpha = \tau, \tau_1^\perp$)

$$|1\rangle = \mathcal{C}_{1\tau} |\tau\rangle + \mathcal{C}_{1\tau_1^\perp} |\tau_1^\perp\rangle, \quad \mathcal{C}_{1\alpha} \equiv \langle \alpha | 1 \rangle, \quad (21)$$

$$CP|\bar{1}\rangle = \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1\tau} |\tau\rangle + \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1\tau_1^\perp} |\tau_1^\perp\rangle, \quad \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1\alpha} \equiv \langle \alpha | CP|\bar{1}\rangle. \quad (22)$$

This definition can be straightforwardly generalised to the lepton quantum states produced by a generic RH neutrino species N_i that can be written in terms of amplitudes $\mathcal{C}_{i\alpha}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{i\alpha}$. At tree level, the amplitudes $\mathcal{C}_{i\alpha}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{i\alpha}$ are given by ($i = 1, 2, 3$)

$$\mathcal{C}_{i\alpha}^0 = \frac{h_{\alpha i}}{\sqrt{(h^\dagger h)_{ii}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{i\alpha}^0 = \frac{h_{\alpha i}}{\sqrt{(h^\dagger h)_{ii}}}. \quad (23)$$

Including one-loop CP -violating corrections, these amplitudes become

$$\mathcal{C}_{i\alpha} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(h^\dagger h)_{ii} - 2 \operatorname{Re}(h^\dagger h \xi_u)_{ii}}} (h_{\alpha i} - (h \xi_u)_{\alpha i}), \quad (24)$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{i\alpha} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(h^\dagger h)_{ii} - 2 \operatorname{Re}(h^\dagger h \xi_v^*)_{ii}}} (h_{\alpha i} - (h \xi_v^*)_{\alpha i}). \quad (25)$$

This shows explicitly that the flavour compositions of leptons ℓ_i and of the (CP conjugated) anti-leptons $\bar{\ell}_i$ are different, provided $\xi_v^* \neq \xi_u$, which has to be the case for CP violation to be non-zero, as we show below. We are following here the notation and formalism introduced in [31] and more recently in [32]. The one-loop corrections are included in the ξ_u and ξ_v functions, which are given by

$$\begin{aligned} [\xi_u(M_i^2)]_{ki} &\equiv [u(M_i^2) + Mb(M_i^2)(h^\dagger h)^T M]_{ki}, \\ [\xi_v(M_i^2)]_{ki} &\equiv [v(M_i^2) + Mb(M_i^2)(h^\dagger h)M]_{ki}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

The first term on the right-hand side describes the self-energy correction, whereas the second one is the vertex correction. Note that the mass matrix being diagonal, we simply

have $M_{ki} = M_i \delta_{ki}$. The u and v terms in Eq. (26) are given by

$$\begin{aligned} u_{ki}(M_i^2) &= \omega_{ki}(M_i^2) [M_i \Sigma_{N,ki}(M_i^2) + M_k \Sigma_{N,ik}(M_i^2)] , \\ v_{ki}(M_i^2) &= \omega_{ki}(M_i^2) [M_i \Sigma_{N,ik}(M_i^2) + M_k \Sigma_{N,ki}(M_i^2)] . \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

They depend on the propagator ω_{ik} and self-energy $\Sigma_{N,ki}(M_i^2) = a(M_i^2)(h^\dagger h)_{ki}$, where a is a loop factor, both evaluated on mass-shell for the RH neutrino N_i .

It can be easily checked that the difference of branching ratios, $\Delta p_{i\alpha} \equiv |\mathcal{C}_{i\alpha}|^2 - |\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{i\alpha}|^2$, does not vanish in general, implying different flavour compositions of leptons and anti-leptons. This can be indeed expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{C}_{i\alpha}|^2 - |\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{i\alpha}|^2 &= \frac{1}{(h^\dagger h)_{ii}} \sum_k \left\{ 4M_i M_k \text{Im} [b_{ki}(M_i^2)] \text{Im} [h_{\alpha i}^* h_{\alpha k} (h^\dagger h)_{ik}] \right. \\ &\quad + 4M_k \text{Re} [\omega_{ki}(M_i^2)] \text{Im} [a(M_i^2)] \text{Im} [h_{\alpha i}^* h_{\alpha k} (h^\dagger h)_{ik}] \\ &\quad + 4M_i \text{Re} [\omega_{ki}(M_i^2)] \text{Im} [a(M_i^2)] \text{Im} [h_{\alpha i}^* h_{\alpha k} (h^\dagger h)_{ki}] \\ &\quad \left. - 4 \frac{|h_{\alpha i}|^2}{(h^\dagger h)_{ii}} M_k (M_i \text{Im} [b_{ki}(M_i^2)] + \text{Re} [\omega_{ki}(M_i^2)] \text{Im} [a(M_i^2)]) \text{Im} [(h^\dagger h)_{ik}^2] \right\} , \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where $\text{Im} [a(M_i^2)] = -1/(16\pi)$, and the imaginary part of the other loop factor $b(M_i^2)$ evaluated on mass shell for the RH neutrino N_i is given by

$$\text{Im} [b_{ki}(M_i^2)] = \frac{1}{16\pi M_i M_k} f(x_k/x_i) , \quad (29)$$

where $x_i \equiv M_i^2/M_1^2$ and $f(x) = \sqrt{x} (1 - (1+x) \log(\frac{1+x}{x}))$. Lastly, the real part of the propagator ω , evaluated on shell, is found to be

$$\text{Re} [\omega_{ki}(M_i^2)] = \frac{M_i(M_k^2 - M_i^2)}{(M_k^2 - M_i^2)^2 + (M_k \Gamma_i - M_i \Gamma_k)^2} . \quad (30)$$

It can now be easily checked that the expression Eq. (28) consistently satisfies the decomposition Eq. (18), explicitly

$$|\mathcal{C}_{i\alpha}|^2 - |\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{i\alpha}|^2 \equiv \Delta p_{i\alpha} = (p_{i\alpha} + \bar{p}_{i\alpha}) \varepsilon_i - 2 \varepsilon_{i\alpha} , \quad (31)$$

where $(p_{i\alpha} + \bar{p}_{i\alpha}) \simeq 2 |h_{\alpha i}|^2 / (h^\dagger h)_{ii}$, the flavoured CP asymmetries [33]

$$\varepsilon_{i\alpha} = \frac{3}{16\pi (h^\dagger h)_{ii}} \sum_{j \neq i} \left\{ \text{Im} [h_{\alpha i}^* h_{\alpha j} (h^\dagger h)_{ij}] \frac{\xi(x_j/x_i)}{\sqrt{x_j/x_i}} + \frac{2}{3(x_j/x_i - 1)} \text{Im} [h_{\alpha i}^* h_{\alpha j} (h^\dagger h)_{ji}] \right\} , \quad (32)$$

with

$$\xi(x) = \frac{2}{3} x \left[(1+x) \ln \left(\frac{1+x}{x} \right) - \frac{2-x}{1-x} \right] , \quad (33)$$

and, finally, the total CP asymmetries

$$\varepsilon_i = \frac{3}{16\pi (h^\dagger h)_{ii}} \sum_{j \neq i} \text{Im} [(h^\dagger h)_{ij}^2] \frac{\xi(x_j/x_i)}{\sqrt{x_j/x_i}}. \quad (34)$$

Let us now focus again on the N_1 -dominated scenario. We can introduce the quantum states $|1^\perp\rangle$ and $CP|\bar{1}^\perp\rangle$ orthogonal, in flavour space, respectively to the lepton quantum states $|1\rangle$ and $CP|\bar{1}\rangle$ and with flavour compositions

$$|1^\perp\rangle = -\mathcal{C}_{1\tau_1^\perp}^* |\tau\rangle + \mathcal{C}_{1\tau}^* |\tau_1^\perp\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad CP|\bar{1}^\perp\rangle = -\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1\tau_1^\perp}^* |\tau\rangle + \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1\tau}^* |\tau_1^\perp\rangle. \quad (35)$$

In the two flavour bases $\ell_1-\ell_1^\perp$ and $CP(\bar{\ell}_1-\bar{\ell}_1^\perp)$, the lepton and anti-lepton density matrices are respectively simply given by the projectors $\rho_{ij}^\ell = \mathcal{P}_{ij}^{(1)} = \text{diag}(1, 0)$ and $\rho_{ij}^{\bar{\ell}} = \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{ij}^{(1)} = \text{diag}(1, 0)$, where $i, j = 1, 1^\perp$ if, for the time being, we assume that there are no other leptons beyond the ℓ_1 's produced by the RH neutrino decays and that they are thermalised just by the Yukawa interactions. This is clearly not true either if one starts from vanishing RH neutrino abundances or if Yukawa interactions are weak or both. We will discuss in a moment how gauge interactions are able to thermalise the leptons and will play a role, affecting the results on the asymmetries. Notice that, for matrices, we indicate the heavy neutrino flavour index with a superscript in round brackets. Since we are dealing with CP conjugated anti-lepton states, we can use the same flavour indices for the matrix entries of leptons and anti-leptons. However, it is important to notice that, because of the different flavour composition of leptons and anti-leptons, the two bases do not coincide.

If we introduce the lepton and anti-lepton number density matrices, respectively $N_{ij}^\ell \equiv N_{\ell_1} \rho_{ij}^\ell$ and $N_{ij}^{\bar{\ell}} \equiv N_{\bar{\ell}_1} \rho_{ij}^{\bar{\ell}}$, their evolution at $T \sim T_L$ is given by

$$\frac{dN_{ij}^\ell}{dz} = \left(\frac{\Gamma_1}{H z} N_{N_1} - \frac{\Gamma_1^{ID}}{H z} N_{\ell_1} \right) \rho_{ij}^\ell, \quad \frac{dN_{ij}^{\bar{\ell}}}{dz} = \left(\frac{\bar{\Gamma}_1}{H z} N_{N_1} - \frac{\bar{\Gamma}_1^{ID}}{H z} N_{\bar{\ell}_1} \right) \rho_{ij}^{\bar{\ell}}. \quad (36)$$

In order to obtain an equation for the total $B - L$ asymmetry matrix $N_{B-L} \equiv N^{\bar{\ell}} - N^\ell$, we have first to write these two equations in the same flavour basis, for convenience the lepton flavour basis $\tau-\tau_1^\perp$, and then subtract them. The rotation matrices are then given by

$$R_{\alpha i}^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C}_{1\tau} & -\mathcal{C}_{1\tau_1^\perp}^* \\ \mathcal{C}_{1\tau_1^\perp} & \mathcal{C}_{1\tau}^* \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{R}_{\alpha i}^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1\tau} & -\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1\tau_1^\perp}^* \\ \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1\tau_1^\perp} & \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1\tau}^* \end{pmatrix}, \quad (37)$$

for leptons and anti-leptons respectively. Also notice that at tree level, corresponding to neglect CP violation, they simply coincide, i.e.

$$R_{\alpha i}^{(1)0} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C}_{1\tau}^0 & -\mathcal{C}_{1\tau_1^\perp}^{0*} \\ \mathcal{C}_{1\tau_1^\perp}^0 & \mathcal{C}_{1\tau}^{0*} \end{pmatrix} = \bar{R}_{\alpha i}^{(1)0}. \quad (38)$$

In the charged lepton flavour basis one can finally write the equation for the $B - L$ asymmetry matrix as

$$\frac{dN_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}}{dz} = \bar{R}_{\alpha i}^{(1)} \frac{dN_{ij}^{\bar{\ell}}}{dz} \bar{R}_{j\beta}^{(1)\dagger} - R_{\alpha i}^{(1)} \frac{dN_{ij}^{\ell}}{dz} R_{j\beta}^{(1)\dagger}, \quad (39)$$

whose trace gives the $B - L$ asymmetry N_{B-L} . In the charged lepton flavour basis the two projectors become

$$\mathcal{P}_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} \equiv R_{\alpha i}^{(1)} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} R_{j\beta}^{(1)\dagger} = \begin{pmatrix} p_{1\tau} & \mathcal{C}_{1\tau} \mathcal{C}_{1\tau\perp}^* \\ \mathcal{C}_{1\tau}^* \mathcal{C}_{1\tau\perp} & p_{1\tau\perp} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (40)$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} \equiv \bar{R}_{\alpha i}^{(1)} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \bar{R}_{j\beta}^{(1)\dagger} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{p}_{1\tau} & \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1\tau} \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1\tau\perp}^* \\ \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1\tau}^* \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1\tau\perp} & \bar{p}_{1\tau\perp} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (41)$$

which, at tree level, simply coincide and are given by

$$\mathcal{P}_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)0} = R_{\alpha i}^{(1)0} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} R_{j\beta}^{(1)0\dagger} = \begin{pmatrix} p_{1\tau}^0 & \mathcal{C}_{1\tau}^0 \mathcal{C}_{1\tau\perp}^{0*} \\ \mathcal{C}_{1\tau}^{0*} \mathcal{C}_{1\tau\perp}^0 & p_{1\tau\perp}^0 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{(h^\dagger h)_{11}} \begin{pmatrix} |h_{\tau 1}|^2 & h_{\tau 1} h_{\tau\perp 1}^* \\ h_{\tau 1}^* h_{\tau\perp 1} & |h_{\tau\perp 1}|^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (42)$$

Using these results, we can now rewrite Eq. (39) as

$$\frac{dN_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}}{dz} = \left(\frac{\bar{\Gamma}_1}{H z} N_{N_1} - \frac{\bar{\Gamma}_1^{ID}}{H z} N_{\bar{\ell}_1} \right) \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} - \left(\frac{\Gamma_1}{H z} N_{N_1} - \frac{\Gamma_1^{ID}}{H z} N_{\ell_1} \right) \mathcal{P}_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)}, \quad (43)$$

that can be recast, using eqs. (12) and (13) assuming thermal abundances, first as

$$\frac{dN_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}}{dz} = \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} D_1 (N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}) - W_1 N_{B-L} \left[\frac{\mathcal{P}_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} \Gamma_1 + \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} \bar{\Gamma}_1}{\Gamma_1 + \bar{\Gamma}_1} \right] \quad (44)$$

and then, neglecting terms $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_1 N_{B-L})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\Delta p N_{B-L})$, as

$$\frac{dN_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}}{dz} = \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} D_1 (N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}) - W_1 N_{B-L} \mathcal{P}_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)0}. \quad (45)$$

Notice that this result has been obtained assuming that there are only ℓ_1 leptons and $\bar{\ell}_1$ anti-leptons. Notice that we defined the CP asymmetry matrix for the lightest RH neutrino N_1 as

$$\varepsilon^{(1)} = \frac{\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)} \bar{\Gamma}_1 - \mathcal{P}^{(1)} \Gamma_1}{\Gamma_1 + \bar{\Gamma}_1} = \varepsilon_1 \frac{\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)} + \mathcal{P}^{(1)}}{2} - \frac{\Delta \mathcal{P}^{(1)}}{2}, \quad (46)$$

where $\Delta \mathcal{P}^{(1)} \equiv \mathcal{P}^{(1)} - \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)}$. This expression [6] generalises the eq. (18) that is obtained for the diagonal terms in the charged lepton flavour basis where the diagonal terms simply

correspond to the flavoured CP asymmetries, $\varepsilon_{\alpha\alpha}^{(1)} = \varepsilon_{1\alpha}$, while the off-diagonal terms obey $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} = (\varepsilon_{\beta\alpha}^{(1)})^*$ and are not necessarily real. This expression can be generalised to the CP asymmetry matrix $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(i)}$, of any RH neutrino species N_i that in terms of the Yukawa couplings can be written as

$$\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(i)} = \frac{3}{32\pi(h^\dagger h)_{ii}} \sum_{j \neq i} \left\{ i [h_{\alpha i} h_{\beta j}^* (h^\dagger h)_{ji} - h_{\beta i}^* h_{\alpha j} (h^\dagger h)_{ij}] \frac{\xi(x_j/x_i)}{\sqrt{x_j/x_i}} \right. \\ \left. + i \frac{2}{3(x_j/x_i - 1)} [h_{\alpha i} h_{\beta j}^* (h^\dagger h)_{ij} - h_{\beta i}^* h_{\alpha j} (h^\dagger h)_{ji}] \right\}, \quad (47)$$

where the ξ function was defined in Eq. (33). This expression slightly differs from that one in [11, 19] (simply, there, the first term is minus the imaginary part of the first term written here, so that the off-diagonal terms are real) while it agrees with the expression given in [27]. The diagonal components of the Eq. (39) can be explicitly written as

$$\frac{dN_{\tau\tau}^{B-L}}{dz} = \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}^{(1)} D_1 (N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}) - p_{1\tau}^0 W_1 N_{B-L}, \quad (48)$$

$$\frac{dN_{\tau_1^\perp \tau_1^\perp}^{B-L}}{dz} = \varepsilon_{\tau_1^\perp \tau_1^\perp}^{(1)} D_1 (N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}) - p_{1\tau_1^\perp}^0 W_1 N_{B-L}. \quad (49)$$

Summing these two equations, one finally recovers the usual Eq. (5) for the total $B - L$ asymmetry $N_{B-L} = \text{Tr}[N_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}]$, which is washed out in the usual way at the production. On the other hand, from Eqs. (48) and (49), one finds the relation

$$\frac{1}{p_{1\tau}^0} \frac{dN_{\tau\tau}^{B-L}}{dz} - \frac{1}{p_{1\tau_1^\perp}^0} \frac{dN_{\tau_1^\perp \tau_1^\perp}^{B-L}}{dz} = -\frac{\Delta p_{1\tau}}{2} \left(\frac{1}{p_{1\tau}^0} + \frac{1}{p_{1\tau_1^\perp}^0} \right) D_1 (N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}) \quad (50)$$

which, together with Eq. (4), forms a system of equations that can be solved analytically. At low temperatures $T \ll T_{B1} = M_1/z_{B1} \ll M_1$, the final values are then found to be

$$N_{\tau\tau}^{B-L,f} \simeq p_{1\tau}^0 N_{B-L}^f - \frac{\Delta p_{1\tau}}{2} N_{N_1}^{\text{in}}, \quad (51) \\ N_{\tau_1^\perp \tau_1^\perp}^{B-L,f} \simeq p_{1\tau_1^\perp}^0 N_{B-L}^f + \frac{\Delta p_{1\tau}}{2} N_{N_1}^{\text{in}}.$$

This solution shows that the flavoured asymmetries contain terms that escape the washout at the production and are proportional to the initial abundance of RH neutrinos: these are the phantom terms [18]. If one only considers the one-flavour regime, where charged lepton interactions can be neglected as we have done so far, the flavoured asymmetries are not themselves measured and the phantom terms cannot give any physical effect, in particular they cannot affect the baryon asymmetry.

We want now to consider the effect of charged lepton interactions and of gauge interactions. When charged lepton interactions become effective, at $T \sim 10^{12}$ GeV, tauon lepton interactions start to be in equilibrium breaking the coherence of the lepton quantum states.

Charged lepton interactions and gauge interactions are described by additional terms in Eqs. (36), which then generalise into [34, 11, 35, 27]

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dN_{\alpha\beta}^\ell}{dz} &= \frac{\Gamma_1}{Hz} N_{N_1} \mathcal{P}_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Gamma_1^{ID}}{Hz} \{ \mathcal{P}^{(1)}, N^\ell \}_{\alpha\beta} + \Lambda_{\alpha\beta} + G_{\alpha\beta}, \\ \frac{dN_{\alpha\beta}^{\bar{\ell}}}{dz} &= \frac{\bar{\Gamma}_1}{Hz} N_{N_1} \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\bar{\Gamma}_1^{ID}}{Hz} \{ \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)}, N^{\bar{\ell}} \}_{\alpha\beta} + \bar{\Lambda}_{\alpha\beta} + \bar{G}_{\alpha\beta}.\end{aligned}\quad (52)$$

where $\Lambda_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\bar{\Lambda}_{\alpha\beta}$ are the terms describing the effect of charged lepton interactions,

$$\Lambda_{\alpha\beta} = -i \frac{\text{Re}(\Lambda_\tau)}{Hz} \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, N^\ell \right]_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{\text{Im}(\Lambda_\tau)}{Hz} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & N_{\tau\tau_1^\perp}^\ell \\ N_{\tau_1^\perp\tau}^\ell & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (53)$$

$$\bar{\Lambda}_{\alpha\beta} = +i \frac{\text{Re}(\Lambda_\tau)}{Hz} \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, N^{\bar{\ell}} \right]_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{\text{Im}(\Lambda_\tau)}{Hz} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & N_{\tau\tau_1^\perp}^{\bar{\ell}} \\ N_{\tau_1^\perp\tau}^{\bar{\ell}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (54)$$

The real and imaginary parts of the tau-lepton self-energy are respectively given by [36, 37]

$$\text{Re}(\Lambda_\tau) \simeq \frac{f_\tau^2}{64} T \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Im}(\Lambda_\tau) \simeq 8 \times 10^{-3} f_\tau^2 T, \quad (55)$$

where f_τ is the tauon Yukawa coupling. The commutator structure in the third term on the RHS of Eq. (52) accounts for oscillations in flavor space driven by the real part of the self energy, and the second terms damp of the off-diagonal terms driven by the imaginary part of the self energy. The terms $G_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\bar{G}_{\alpha\beta}$ describe the gauge interactions and have the effect to thermalise leptons and anti-leptons so that kinetic and chemical equilibrium can be assumed during all the transition from the unflavoured regime to the two fully flavoured regime. Since they are CP conserving, they cannot change the total and flavour asymmetries while thermalising the asymmetries but, as we are going to discuss, they play an active, though indirect, role in the final values of the asymmetries.

Let us show how, from the set of density matrix equations (52), one can derive correctly both the one-flavour (cf. eq. (45)) and the (two) fully flavoured regime (cf. eq. (19)).

In *the one-flavour case* we have seen that neglecting gauge interactions corresponds to have $N^\ell = N_{\ell_1} \mathcal{P}^{(1)}$ and $N^{\bar{\ell}} = N_{\bar{\ell}_1} \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)}$, where we had to assume that N_{ℓ_1} and $N_{\bar{\ell}_1}$ are thermalised by the same Yukawa interactions, an assumption that does not describe the case either when Yukawa interactions are weak or if one starts from a non-thermal RH neutrino abundance.

If we now take into account the effect of gauge interactions, these will thermalise not only the abundances of the leptons ℓ_1 and of the anti-leptons $\bar{\ell}_1$, independently of the strength of the Yukawa interactions and of the RH neutrino abundance, but also the abundances of their orthogonal states $\ell_{1\perp}$ and $\bar{\ell}_{1\perp}$. Since they are flavour blind and CP conserving, their presence is described by an additional unflavoured term in the lepton and anti-lepton abundance matrices that in this way get generalised as

$$\begin{aligned} N^\ell &= N_\ell^{\text{eq}} I + N_{\ell_1} \mathcal{P}^{(1)} - \frac{N_{\ell_1} + N_{\bar{\ell}_1}}{2} \mathcal{P}^{(1)0}, \\ N^{\bar{\ell}} &= N_{\bar{\ell}}^{\text{eq}} I + N_{\bar{\ell}_1} \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)} - \frac{N_{\ell_1} + N_{\bar{\ell}_1}}{2} \mathcal{P}^{(1)0}. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

The third terms in the right-hand side describe how annihilations mediated by gauge interactions drag out of the ℓ_1 and $\bar{\ell}_1$ their tree-level components, CP conjugated of each other, that are thermalised. In this way the gauge interactions annihilations act as a sort of detector of the differences of flavour compositions of leptons and anti-leptons, though they cannot measure the flavour compositions themselves, as implied by the term $N_\ell^{\text{eq}} I$ that is invariant under rotations in flavour space. If we linearise N_{ℓ_1} and $N_{\bar{\ell}_1}$ using the eqs. (12) and (13) respectively, they can be recast as ^{3 4}

$$\begin{aligned} N^\ell &= N_\ell^{\text{eq}} I + \left(\frac{N_{\ell_1} + N_{\bar{\ell}_1}}{2} \right) \delta \mathcal{P}^{(1)} - \frac{1}{2} N_{B-L} \mathcal{P}^{(1)}, \\ N^{\bar{\ell}} &= N_{\bar{\ell}}^{\text{eq}} I + \left(\frac{N_{\ell_1} + N_{\bar{\ell}_1}}{2} \right) \delta \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)} + \frac{1}{2} N_{B-L} \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

³Notice that now these equations also describe consistently the case of vanishing initial RH neutrino abundance that would yield seemingly unphysical negative values of $N_{\ell_1} + N_{\bar{\ell}_1}$. Indeed now negative values correspond to the production of orthogonal states $\ell_{1\perp}$ and $\bar{\ell}_{1\perp}$, considering that $\mathcal{P}^{(1)} = I - \mathcal{P}_\perp^{(1)}$, $\mathcal{P}^{(1)0} = I - \mathcal{P}_\perp^{(1)0}$ and analogously for the anti-leptons.

⁴One could wonder whether instead of terms proportional to the tree level components $\mathcal{P}^{(1)0}$, one should subtract in the eqs. (56) terms proportional to the average components $(\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)} + \mathcal{P}^{(1)})/2$. However, one can verify that one would anyway obtain in the end the same result eq. (64) unless $\mathcal{O}(\Delta P^2)$ terms. Notice also that with this modification (and neglecting terms $\mathcal{O}(N_{B-L} \Delta \mathcal{P}^{(1)})$) the expressions (59) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} N^\ell &= N_\ell^{\text{eq}} I + \left(\frac{N_{\ell_1} + N_{\bar{\ell}_1}}{2} \right) \frac{\Delta \mathcal{P}^{(1)}}{2} - \frac{1}{2} N_{B-L} \frac{\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)} + \mathcal{P}^{(1)}}{2}, \\ N^{\bar{\ell}} &= N_{\bar{\ell}}^{\text{eq}} I - \left(\frac{N_{\ell_1} + N_{\bar{\ell}_1}}{2} \right) \frac{\Delta \mathcal{P}^{(1)}}{2} + \frac{1}{2} N_{B-L} \frac{\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)} + \mathcal{P}^{(1)}}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

respecting the constraint [27]

$$N^\ell - N_\ell^{\text{eq}} I = -(N^{\bar{\ell}} - N_{\bar{\ell}}^{\text{eq}} I), \quad (58)$$

that would be a matrix generalisation of the thermal equilibrium conditions Eqs. (12) and (13).

where we defined $\delta\mathcal{P}^{(1)} \equiv \mathcal{P}^{(1)} - \mathcal{P}^{(1)0}$ and $\delta\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)} \equiv \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)} - \mathcal{P}^{(1)0}$. From these equations one can find an expression for the asymmetry matrix,

$$N^{B-L} = N_{B-L} \frac{\mathcal{P}^{(1)} + \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)}}{2} - (N_{\ell_1} + N_{\bar{\ell}_1}) \frac{\Delta\mathcal{P}^{(1)}}{2}, \quad (60)$$

that has to be compared with the eq. (46) for the CP asymmetry matrix: the first term is the usual contribution proportional to the total asymmetry, while the second term is the contribution to the flavour asymmetry matrix coming from the difference in flavour compositions yielding the phantom terms. Notice that the quantity $(N_{\ell_1} + N_{\bar{\ell}_1})/2$ has to be regarded as a dynamical quantity, like the total asymmetry N_{B-L} . We can also write an expression for the sum

$$N^{\ell+\bar{\ell}} \equiv N^\ell + N^{\bar{\ell}} = 2 N_{\text{eq}}^\ell I + \frac{N_{\ell_1} + N_{\bar{\ell}_1}}{2} \left(\delta\mathcal{P}^{(1)} + \delta\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)} \right) - \frac{N_{B-L}}{2} \Delta\mathcal{P}^{(1)}. \quad (61)$$

Considering that in the tree level basis one has $(i_0, j_0 = 1_0, 1_0^\perp)$

$$\delta\mathcal{P}_{i_0 j_0}^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \delta p^* \\ \delta p & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (62)$$

with $\delta p = -\mathcal{C}_{1\tau^\perp}^0 \delta\mathcal{C}_{1\tau} + \mathcal{C}_{1\tau}^0 \delta\mathcal{C}_{1\tau^\perp}$ and $\delta\mathcal{C}_{1\alpha} \equiv \mathcal{C}_{1\alpha} - \mathcal{C}_{1\alpha}^0$, one obtains the equalities

$$\{\mathcal{P}^{(1)}, \delta\mathcal{P}^{(1)}\} = \delta\mathcal{P}^{(1)} + \mathcal{O}(\delta\mathcal{P}^2), \quad \{\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)}, \delta\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)}\} = \delta\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)} + \mathcal{O}(\delta\bar{\mathcal{P}}^2), \quad (63)$$

and neglecting terms $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon \Delta P)$ and $\mathcal{O}(\delta\mathcal{P}^2)$, one arrives at the following equation

$$\frac{dN^{B-L}}{dz} = \varepsilon^{(1)} D_1 (N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}) - \frac{1}{2} W_1 \frac{N_{\ell_1} + N_{\bar{\ell}_1}}{2} \left(\bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)} - \mathcal{P}^{(1)} \right) - W_1 \frac{N_{B-L}}{2} \left(\mathcal{P}^{(1)} + \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)} \right). \quad (64)$$

Using the eqs. (63), it can be also recast more compactly as ⁵

$$\frac{dN^{B-L}}{dz} = \varepsilon^{(1)} D_1 (N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}) - \frac{1}{2} W_1 \{ \mathcal{P}^{(1)0}, N^{B-L} \}. \quad (65)$$

The Eq. (64) implies that, having accounted for the unflavoured thermal bath from gauge interactions, phantom terms are washed out contrarily to the previous calculation where it was neglected. However, non trivially, the wash-out term acting on phantom terms is half compared to that one acting on the total asymmetry. Let us show this result explicitly, finding the solutions for the diagonal components in the charged lepton flavour

⁵We wish to thank M. Herranen and B. Garbrecht for pointing out to us that the eq. (65) implies some wash-out of the phantom terms and that, therefore, is not equivalent to the eq. (45) when the differences between lepton and anti-lepton flavour compositions are taken into account.

basis, $N_{\tau\tau}^{B-L}$ and $N_{\tau_1^\perp\tau_1^\perp}^{B-L}$. If one first considers the eq. (65) in the tree level basis, in this basis the decomposition of $\varepsilon^{(1)}$ in the right-hand side of eq. (46) specialises into

$$\varepsilon_{i_0j_0}^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Delta\varepsilon^* \\ \Delta\varepsilon & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (66)$$

where $\Delta\varepsilon = (\delta\bar{p} - \delta p)/2 \equiv -\Delta p/2$. In this way in this basis the 1_01_0 term is just the total asymmetry N_{B-L} that gets washed out by W_1 . Instead the off-diagonal terms, upon rotation to the charged lepton flavour basis, give the phantom terms that are washed by $W_1/2$. In this way, in the charged lepton flavour basis, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\tau\tau}^{B-L,f} &\simeq p_{1\tau}^0 N_{B-L}^f - \frac{\Delta p_{1\tau}}{2} \kappa(K_1/2), \\ N_{\tau_1^\perp\tau_1^\perp}^{B-L,f} &\simeq p_{1\tau_1^\perp}^0 N_{B-L}^f + \frac{\Delta p_{1\tau}}{2} \kappa(K_1/2). \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

This result confirms the presence of phantom terms but it also clearly shows how the effect of the gauge interactions annihilations in detecting the differences between lepton and anti-lepton flavour compositions results into a wash-out of the phantom terms, though with a wash-out rate that is halved compared to the wash-out rate acting on the total asymmetry.

Let us now consider the (two) fully flavoured regime. This can be recovered more conveniently considering that in the eqs. (52) the off-diagonal terms are damped by the charged lepton interactions [6]. Therefore, one has that N^ℓ and $N^{\bar{\ell}}$ are diagonal in the charged lepton flavour basis, so that $N_{\alpha\beta}^\ell = \text{diag}(N_{\tau\tau}^\ell, N_{\tau_1^\perp\tau_1^\perp}^\ell)$ and $N_{\alpha\beta}^{\bar{\ell}} = \text{diag}(N_{\tau\tau}^{\bar{\ell}}, N_{\tau_1^\perp\tau_1^\perp}^{\bar{\ell}})$. The gauge interactions thermalise the τ and the τ_1^\perp abundances. In this way, taking the diagonal components, one straightforwardly recovers the eqs. (19).

Notice that one could also try to get this result from a closed differential equation for $N_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}$. Subtracting the two equations (52) one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dN_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}}{dz} &= \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} D_1 N_{N_1} - \frac{1}{2} D_1 \left[\frac{\bar{\Gamma}_1^{\text{ID}}}{\Gamma_1 + \bar{\Gamma}_1} \left\{ \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)}, N^{\bar{\ell}} \right\}_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{\Gamma_1^{\text{ID}}}{\Gamma_1 + \bar{\Gamma}_1} \left\{ \mathcal{P}^{(1)}, N^\ell \right\}_{\alpha\beta} \right] \\ &\quad + \Delta\Lambda_{\alpha\beta} + \Delta G_{\alpha\beta}. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

Recasting then

$$N^\ell = \frac{N^\ell + N^{\bar{\ell}}}{2} - \frac{N^{B-L}}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad N^{\bar{\ell}} = \frac{N^\ell + N^{\bar{\ell}}}{2} + \frac{N^{B-L}}{2}, \quad (69)$$

one obtains first

$$\frac{dN_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}}{dz} = \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} D_1 N_{N_1} - \frac{1}{4} D_1 \frac{N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}}{N_\ell^{\text{eq}}} \left\{ \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)}, N^{\ell+\bar{\ell}} \right\}_{\alpha\beta} \quad (70)$$

$$-\frac{1}{4} D_1 \left[\frac{\bar{\Gamma}_1^{\text{ID}}}{\Gamma_1 + \bar{\Gamma}_1} \left\{ \bar{\mathcal{P}}^{(1)}, N^{B-L} \right\}_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{\Gamma_1^{\text{ID}}}{\Gamma_1 + \bar{\Gamma}_1} \left\{ \mathcal{P}^{(1)}, N^{B-L} \right\}_{\alpha\beta} \right] + \Delta\Lambda_{\alpha\beta} + \Delta G_{\alpha\beta}.$$

and then, neglecting terms $\mathcal{O}(\Delta P N_{B-L})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dN_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}}{dz} &= \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} D_1 N_{N_1} - \frac{1}{4} D_1 \frac{N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}}{N_\ell^{\text{eq}}} \left\{ \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)}, N^{\ell+\bar{\ell}} \right\}_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2} W_1 \left\{ \mathcal{P}^{0(1)}, N^{B-L} \right\}_{\alpha\beta} \\ &+ i \frac{\text{Re}(\Lambda_\tau)}{H z} \left[\left(\begin{array}{cc} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right), N^{\ell+\bar{\ell}} \right]_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{\text{Im}(\Lambda_\tau)}{H z} \left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & N_{\tau\tau_1^\perp}^{B-L} \\ N_{\tau_1^\perp\tau}^{B-L} & 0 \end{array} \right) + \Delta G_{\alpha\beta}. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

A Boltzmann equation for the quantity $N_{\ell+\bar{\ell}}$ is given by

$$\frac{dN_{\alpha\beta}^{\ell+\bar{\ell}}}{dz} \simeq -\frac{\text{Re}(\Lambda_\tau)}{H z} (\sigma_2)_{\alpha\beta} N_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L} - S_g (N_{\alpha\beta}^{\ell+\bar{\ell}} - 2 N_\ell^{\text{eq}} \delta_{\alpha\beta}), \quad (72)$$

where $S_g \equiv \Gamma_g/(H z)$ accounts for gauge interactions. As shown in [27], this term has the effect of damping the flavour oscillations. This is because the gauge interactions force $N_{\alpha\beta}^{\ell+\bar{\ell}} \simeq 2 N_{\ell_1}^{\text{eq}} \delta_{\alpha\beta}$ [6, 35, 27], as it can be seen explicitly from eq. (61). This in turn makes in a way that the oscillatory term becomes negligible and that the second term on the right-hand side can be approximated with the usual inverse decay CP violating term, obtaining in the end

$$\frac{dN_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}}{dz} = \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} D_1 (N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}) - \frac{1}{2} W_1 \left\{ \mathcal{P}^{0(1)}, N^{B-L} \right\}_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{\text{Im}(\Lambda_\tau)}{H z} (\sigma_1)_{\alpha\beta} N_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}, \quad (73)$$

that generalises the Eq. (65). When the off-diagonal terms are fully damped, one again correctly obtains the Eqs. (19) in the fully flavoured regime and the usual Eq. (5) for the total asymmetry in the unflavoured regime. Notice that we have now shown that the eq. (73) holds also starting from the Eqs. (56), taking into account differences between lepton and anti-lepton flavour compositions. This is because they anyway respect the approximation $N_{\alpha\beta}^{\ell+\bar{\ell}} \simeq 2 N_{\ell_1}^{\text{eq}} \delta_{\alpha\beta}$ (cf. 61).

Suppose now that the asymmetry was generated in the unflavoured regime at temperatures $T \gg 10^{12}$ GeV. Let us indicate with $T_\star \ll 10^{12}$ GeV that value of the temperature below which one can approximate, with the desired precision, the lepton quantum states as a fully incoherent mixture of $|\tau\rangle$ and $|\tau_1^\perp\rangle$ quantum states corresponding to a complete damping of the off-diagonal terms in the lepton density matrix (analogously for anti-leptons). This means that for $T \lesssim T_\star$ the τ and τ_1^\perp lepton asymmetries, given by the diagonal entries of $N_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}$, are fully measured by the thermal bath and reprocessed by sphaleron processes conserving the Δ_τ and $\Delta_{\tau_1^\perp}$ asymmetries, so that at T_\star

one has $N_{\Delta_\tau}^{T^*} = N_{\tau\tau}^{B-L}(z_B)$ and $N_{\Delta_{\tau_1^\pm}}^{T^*} = N_{\tau_1^\pm\tau_1^\pm}^{B-L}(z_B)$. However, notice that since in the case $M_1 \gg 10^{12}$ GeV the total $B - L$ asymmetry got already produced and frozen in the unflavoured regime, this fully flavoured regime stage does not affect the final total $B - L$ asymmetry. Therefore, phantom terms do not contribute to the final asymmetry because they cancel with each other. In other words, within the N_1 -dominated scenario, phantom terms have no effect on the final asymmetry⁶. Therefore, phantom terms do not have any consequence on the final asymmetry in the N_1 -dominated scenario, in the absence of heavy neutrino flavour effects.

Our results show explicitly the presence of the phantom terms extending previous results where this had not been noticed [19, 27]. In particular, in [19], the lepton and anti-lepton density matrices were assumed to be diagonalisable in bases that are CP conjugated of each other precluding the derivation of the phantom terms. However, as we have seen, as far as the N_1 -dominated scenario is concerned, phantom terms can be safely neglected in the calculation of the final asymmetry, and therefore there is no contradiction between our results and previous ones where phantom terms have not been identified [19, 27].

On the other hand, we are interested in accounting for heavy neutrino flavour effects. On this case we cannot neglect the phantom terms since in this case, as we discuss in the next Section, they can contribute to the total final asymmetry and even dominate (phantom leptogenesis [18]).

3 A simplified case with two charged lepton flavours

In this section we account for heavy neutrino flavour effects considering a simplified two charged lepton flavour case. This will greatly simplify the notation making the new results more easily readable. It will be then quite straightforward in the next Section to generalise all the equations to a realistic three lepton flavour case.

For definiteness we consider masses $M_i \gg 10^9$ GeV, when only tauon lepton interactions have to be taken into account. We also assume that the heaviest RH neutrinos

⁶On the other hand, as discussed, if one considers 10^9 GeV $\ll M_1 \ll 10^{12}$ GeV, the two fully flavoured regime holds during the period of leptogenesis and the density matrix equations reduce to the set of classical Boltzmann equations Eqs. (19). The terms in the flavoured asymmetries coming from CP violating terms due to a different flavour composition of leptons and anti-leptons are still present but they are not phantom, since they are measured directly at production and undergo washout. Therefore, if there is a flavour-asymmetric production, they contribute to the final asymmetry, yielding the second term in the Eq. (20), and can even dominate.




Figure 3: Flavour configuration of the two heavy neutrino lepton flavours, ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 , leading to the simplified two charged lepton neutrino flavour case considered in this section.

N_3 do not contribute to the final asymmetry. This is in any case a valid assumption if $M_3 \gg T_{RH} \gg M_2$, since in this way the N_3 's would not thermalise. As for lepton flavours, we will extend the results to the three heavy neutrino flavour case in the next Section.

Notice that with these assumptions, the two charged lepton flavour case can be regarded as a special case where the two heavy neutrino lepton flavours, ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 , lie on the same plane orthogonal to the $e - \mu$ plane and therefore $\tau_2^\perp = \tau_1^\perp = \tau^\perp$ (see Fig. 3). Correspondingly the two anti-lepton flavours, $\bar{\ell}_1$ and $\bar{\ell}_2$, also lie on the same plane orthogonal to the $e - \mu$ plane and therefore $\bar{\tau}_2^\perp = \bar{\tau}_1^\perp \equiv \bar{\tau}^\perp$ with $\bar{\tau}^\perp$ that is now assumed to be CP conjugated of τ^\perp . In this way, in the whole following discussion in this Section, we will have only two charged lepton flavours, τ and τ^\perp .

The density matrix equation Eq. (73), valid for N_1 leptogenesis, gets then generalised into ($\alpha, \beta = \tau, \tau^\perp$)

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dN_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}}{dz} &= \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} D_1 (N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}) - \frac{1}{2} W_1 \{ \mathcal{P}^{(1)0}, N^{B-L} \}_{\alpha\beta} \\
&+ \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(2)} D_2 (N_{N_2} - N_{N_2}^{\text{eq}}) - \frac{1}{2} W_2 \{ \mathcal{P}^{(2)0}, N^{B-L} \}_{\alpha\beta} \\
&- \frac{\text{Im}(\Lambda_\tau)}{H z} (\sigma_1)_{\alpha\beta} N_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L},
\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

where N_{N_2} is described, as N_{N_1} , by an analogous eq. (4). We now discuss the three asymptotic cases, the first one for $M_2 \gg 10^{12} \text{ GeV} \gg M_1$, the second for $M_2, M_1 \gg$

10^{12} GeV and the third for $M_1, M_2 \ll 10^{12}$ GeV, where Boltzmann equations are recovered. In this way we will derive, within a density matrix formalism, results that were already obtained within an instantaneous collapse of the quantum state formalism: the first is phantom leptogenesis [18], the second is the heavy neutrino flavour projection [6, 20].

3.1 Case $M_2 \gg 10^{12}$ GeV $\gg M_1$: three stages phantom leptogenesis

Let us consider the asymmetry production from the N_2 's at $T \sim M_2$. This is basically described by the same equations that we wrote in the previous section for the N_1 -dominated scenario where now simply all quantities have to be relabelled in a way that $1 \rightarrow 2$. Since charged lepton interactions are negligible, we can use the Eq. (65) for the calculation of $N_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}$, that now, in the charged lepton flavoured basis, simply becomes

$$\frac{dN_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}}{dz} = \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(2)} D_2 (N_{N_2} - N_{N_2}^{\text{eq}}) - \frac{1}{2} W_2 \{ \mathcal{P}^{(2)0}, N^{B-L} \}_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (75)$$

with an obvious re-definition of all quantities that now refer to N_2 . At $T \simeq T_{B2} \equiv M_2/z_{B2}$, the τ and τ^\perp asymmetries are described by the Eqs. (76) with $1 \rightarrow 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\tau\tau}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B2}) &\simeq p_{2\tau}^0 N_{B-L}^{T \simeq T_{B2}} - \frac{\Delta p_{2\tau}}{2} \kappa(K_2/2), \\ N_{\tau^\perp\tau^\perp}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B2}) &\simeq p_{2\tau^\perp}^0 N_{B-L}^{T \simeq T_{B2}} + \frac{\Delta p_{2\tau}}{2} \kappa(K_2/2). \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

Again, at temperatures below $T_\star \ll 10^{12}$ GeV, the $N_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}$ off-diagonal terms are fully damped by the tauon charged interactions, so that the $N_{\Delta\tau}$ and $N_{\Delta\tau^\perp}$ asymmetries, corresponding to the diagonal terms, can be treated as measured quantities.

At $T \sim T_{B2}$, the phantom terms in the eq. (76) cancel with each other and they do not contribute to the total asymmetry. Therefore, so far, the description of the asymmetry evolution is completely analogous to that one discussed in the N_1 -dominated scenario.

However, there is still a third stage to be taken into account: the lightest RH neutrino washout. For $T \sim M_1$, the tauon and the τ^\perp asymmetries are washed out by the lightest RH neutrino inverse processes. At $T \simeq T_{B1} = M_1/z_{B1}$, they get frozen to their final values

$$N_{\Delta\tau}^f \simeq \left[p_{2\tau}^0 N_{B-L}^{T \simeq T_{B2}} - \frac{\Delta p_{2\tau}}{2} \kappa(K_2/2) \right] e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8} K_{1\tau}}, \quad (77)$$

$$N_{\Delta\tau^\perp}^f \simeq \left[p_{2\tau^\perp}^0 N_{B-L}^{T \simeq T_{B2}} + \frac{\Delta p_{2\tau}}{2} \kappa(K_2/2) \right] e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8} K_{1\tau^\perp}}, \quad (78)$$

so that the final total asymmetry $N_{B-L}^f \simeq N_{\Delta\tau}^f + N_{\Delta\tau^\perp}^f$. If for the flavour $\alpha = \tau$ (τ^\perp) one has $K_{1\alpha} \lesssim 1$, while for the other flavour $\beta = \tau^\perp$ (τ) one has $K_{1\beta} \gg 1$, the final asymmetry will be dominated by the α asymmetry,

$$N_{B-L}^f \simeq p_{2\alpha}^0 N_{B-L}^{T \simeq T_{B2}} - \frac{\Delta p_{2\alpha}}{2} \kappa(K_2/2). \quad (79)$$

Interestingly the phantom term is affected by a washout at the production that is half that one acting on the final asymmetry. Since in the strong wash-out regime approximately $\kappa(K_2) \propto 1/K_2^{1.2}$, the phantom term contribution gets enhanced by a factor 3 compared to that one proportional to the total asymmetry at the production and this could make it dominant. Having included the effect of gauge interactions, now in the strong wash-out regime ($K_2 \gg 1$) the phantom terms are independent of the initial conditions. Therefore, phantom terms have to be included even in the case of initial vanishing abundance.

Phantom leptogenesis was first discussed within an instantaneous quantum state collapse description without gauge interactions [18]. Here we have re-derived it within a density matrix formalism showing the importance of gauge interactions that determine a wash-out of the phantom terms, though halved. Notice that there are three well separated stages: N_2 asymmetry production at $T \simeq T_{B2}$, decoherence at $T \sim T_\star$ and flavour asymmetric N_1 washout at $T \sim M_1$.

Notice also that phantom leptogenesis has some analogies with the scenario of N_1 -leptogenesis with $\varepsilon_1 = 0$ [10] that we discussed in the previous section. In both cases the final asymmetry originate from the CP violating terms $\propto \Delta p_{i\alpha}$ due to a different flavour composition of leptons and anti-leptons. In both cases a non-vanishing final asymmetry relies on an asymmetric washout acting on the two flavour asymmetries. There are however important differences. In the case of N_1 leptogenesis with $\varepsilon_1 = 0$ one has that production, decoherence and washout occur simultaneously, while in the case of phantom leptogenesis they occur at different stages and between the production and the N_1 washout stage the phantom terms they cancel in the final asymmetry. Another important difference is that in the case of phantom leptogenesis one has not to assume the special assumption ε_1 or $\varepsilon_2 = 0$ ($B - L$ conservation): if the washout at the production is sufficiently strong phantom terms can potentially dominate because of the reduced wash-out compared to the total asymmetry.

As we are going to show, phantom leptogenesis is even more general and it does not necessarily require that the N_2 production and the N_1 washout stages occur in two different fully flavoured regimes.

3.2 Case $M_2 \gtrsim 3 M_1 \gg 10^{12}$ GeV: heavy neutrino flavour projection and two stages phantom leptogenesis

Let us now consider the case when both heavy neutrino masses $M_2, M_1 \gg 10^{12}$ GeV and charged lepton interactions do not affect the final asymmetry. This can be called the heavy flavoured scenario [17] since the only lepton flavours that affect the final asymmetry are those produced from the heavy RH neutrinos. The density matrix equation (74) can then be recast simply as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dN_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}}{dz} &= \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} D_1 (N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}) - \frac{1}{2} W_1 \{ \mathcal{P}^{(1)0}, N^{B-L} \}_{\alpha\beta} \\ &+ \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(2)} D_2 (N_{N_2} - N_{N_2}^{\text{eq}}) - \frac{1}{2} W_2 \{ \mathcal{P}^{(2)0}, N^{B-L} \}_{\alpha\beta}. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

3.2.1 Projection effect (in isolation)

For illustrative purposes, we want first to describe just the N_1 washout of the asymmetry produced by the N_2 decays, without any additional effect. Therefore, we first neglect the different flavour compositions of leptons and anti-leptons assuming that $\Delta p_{1\alpha} = \Delta p_{2\alpha} = 0$.

With such a simplifying assumption, the lepton quantum states are given by

$$|1\rangle = \mathcal{C}_{1\tau} |\tau\rangle + \mathcal{C}_{1\tau^\perp} |\tau^\perp\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad |\bar{1}\rangle = \mathcal{C}_{1\tau}^* |\bar{\tau}\rangle + \mathcal{C}_{1\tau^\perp}^* |\bar{\tau}^\perp\rangle \quad (CP|\bar{1}\rangle = |1\rangle), \quad (81)$$

$$|2\rangle = \mathcal{C}_{2\tau} |\tau\rangle + \mathcal{C}_{2\tau^\perp} |\tau^\perp\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad |\bar{2}\rangle = \mathcal{C}_{2\tau}^* |\bar{\tau}\rangle + \mathcal{C}_{2\tau^\perp}^* |\bar{\tau}^\perp\rangle \quad (CP|\bar{2}\rangle = |2\rangle). \quad (82)$$

Assuming the hierarchical limit, $M_2 \gtrsim 3 M_1$ [40], there are two well distinguished different stages. In a first stage at $T \sim M_2$, an asymmetry is produced from N_2 decays. The lepton density matrix is then given by $\rho_{ij}^\ell = \text{diag}(1, 0)$ in the basis $\ell_2 - \ell_2^\perp$. Analogously the anti-lepton density matrix is given by $\rho_{ij}^{\bar{\ell}} = \text{diag}(1, 0)$ in the basis $\bar{\ell}_2 - \bar{\ell}_2^\perp$ that at the moment we are assuming to be CP conjugated of $\ell_2 - \ell_2^\perp$. As in the previous subsection, the asymmetry production from N_2 decays is again described by the Eq. (75) with vanishing phantom terms so that we simply have

$$N_{\tau\tau}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B2}) \simeq p_{2\tau}^0 N_{B-L}^{T \simeq T_{B2}}, \quad N_{\tau^\perp\tau^\perp}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B2}) \simeq p_{2\tau^\perp}^0 N_{B-L}^{T \simeq T_{B2}}, \quad (83)$$

where $N_{B-L}^{T \simeq T_{B2}} \simeq \varepsilon_2 \kappa(K_2)$. We have now to consider the N_1 washout stage at $T \sim M_1$. Since at the moment we are just interested in describing the N_1 washout, we also neglect the N_1 asymmetry production assuming a vanishing $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)}$. Moreover let us first further assume, just for simplicity, $|1\rangle = |\tau\rangle$ and correspondingly $|\bar{1}\rangle = |\bar{\tau}\rangle$.

In this way, at $T \sim M_1$, the Eqs. (80) for the asymmetry evolution in the charged lepton flavour basis can be simply rearranged as ($\alpha, \beta = \tau, \tau^\perp$)

$$\frac{dN_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}}{dz} = -W_1 \begin{pmatrix} N_{\tau\tau}^{B-L} & \frac{1}{2} N_{\tau\tau^\perp}^{B-L} \\ \frac{1}{2} N_{\tau^\perp\tau}^{B-L} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (84)$$

and, at the end of the N_1 -washout at $T \simeq T_{B1}$, one simply finds

$$N_{\tau\tau}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B1}) \simeq e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8} K_1} p_{2\tau}^0 N_{B-L}^{T \simeq T_{B2}}, \quad N_{\tau^\perp\tau^\perp}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B1}) \simeq p_{2\tau^\perp}^0 N_{B-L}^{T \simeq T_{B2}}. \quad (85)$$

Finally, at $T \sim 10^{12}$ GeV, the charged lepton interactions damp the off-diagonal terms measuring the tauon and the ‘non-tauon’ (i.e. the τ^\perp) asymmetries.

This result can be easily generalised. Let us, first of all, allow an arbitrary $|1\rangle$ flavour composition but continuing, for the time being, to neglect the N_1 asymmetry production, at $T \sim T_{B1}$. The Eq. (84) has now to be written in the basis $\ell_1 - \ell_1^\perp$,

$$\frac{dN_{i_1 j_1}^{B-L}}{dz} = -W_1 \begin{pmatrix} N_{11}^{B-L} & \frac{1}{2} N_{11^\perp}^{B-L} \\ \frac{1}{2} N_{1^\perp 1}^{B-L} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (i_1, j_1 = 1, 1^\perp). \quad (86)$$

The solution is again quite trivial in this basis: the 11 term is washed out,

$$N_{11}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B1}) = e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8} K_1} N_{11}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B2}), \quad (87)$$

together with the off-diagonal terms, while the $1^\perp 1^\perp$ term is unwashed. The asymmetry matrix at $T \sim T_{B2}$, in the $\ell_1 - \ell_1^\perp$ basis, can now be calculated in terms of the rotation matrices (cf. Eq. (38)) as

$$N_{i_1 j_1}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B2}) = N_{B-L}^{T \simeq T_{B2}} R_{i_1 \alpha}^{(1)0\dagger} R_{\alpha i_2}^{(2)0} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} R_{j_2 \beta}^{(2)0\dagger} R_{\beta j_1}^{(1)0}. \quad (88)$$

In a more compact way, considering that $N^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B2}) = N_{B-L}^{T \simeq T_{B2}} |2\rangle\langle 2|$, this can be more conveniently written as

$$N_{i_1 j_1}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B2}) = N_{B-L}^{T \simeq T_{B2}} \begin{pmatrix} p_{12} & \langle 1|2\rangle\langle 2|1^\perp\rangle \\ \langle 1^\perp|2\rangle\langle 2|1\rangle & 1 - p_{12} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (89)$$

where [17]

$$p_{12} \equiv |\langle \ell_1 | \ell_2 \rangle|^2 = \frac{|(h^\dagger h)_{12}|^2}{(h^\dagger h)_{11} (h^\dagger h)_{22}}. \quad (90)$$

The final asymmetry can then be calculated as

$$N_{B-L}^f = \text{Tr}[N_{i_1 j_1}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B1})] = e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8} K_1} p_{12} N_{B-L}^{T \simeq T_{B2}} + (1 - p_{12}) N_{B-L}^{T \simeq T_{B2}}. \quad (91)$$

The asymmetry can be also rotated in the charged lepton flavour basis,

$$N_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B1}) = R_{\alpha i_1}^{(1)0} N_{i_1 j_1}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B1}) R_{j_1 \beta}^{(1)0\dagger}. \quad (92)$$

At $T \simeq 10^{12}$ GeV the charged lepton interactions just damp the off-diagonal terms without affecting the total asymmetry given by the trace and for this reason we could directly write the Eq. (91).

This result fully confirms what one expects within an instantaneous quantum state collapse description. It is not only confirmed that just the ℓ_1 -parallel component of the asymmetry undergoes the N_1 washout while the orthogonal component completely escapes it [6, 20], but also that the washout of the parallel component is exactly described by the factor $\exp[-(3\pi K_1/8)]$, independently of the value of K_1 [17]. Notice that in an intermediate regime $K_1 \sim 1$, the quantum states at $T \simeq T_{B1}$ are left in a sort of partially incoherent mixture, with some residual flavour oscillations that however do not affect the total asymmetry.

Notice that this result also applies to a possible pre-existing asymmetry produced by some other external mechanism [20, 17]. Therefore, the conclusions of [17], employing this result in various situations, are also confirmed.

One can then easily further generalise this result accounting also for a possible N_1 asymmetry generation, simply obtaining for the final asymmetry

$$N_{B-L}^f = \varepsilon_1 \kappa(K_1) + \left(e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8} K_1} p_{12} + 1 - p_{12} \right) \varepsilon_2 \kappa(K_2). \quad (93)$$

3.2.2 Projection effect in combination with phantom leptogenesis

We still miss a last step. We have so far assumed that the flavour compositions of the ℓ_2 and (CP conjugated) $\bar{\ell}_2$ quantum states are the same. We want now to show that, when this additional flavoured CP violation contribution is taken into account, phantom terms contribute to the final asymmetry and the eq. (93) gets generalised. Notice that this time the role played by the charged lepton flavour basis in the previous subsection, is replaced by the heavy neutrino lepton basis $\ell_1 - \ell_1^\perp$. Notice that in general now also the basis $\ell_1 - \ell_1^\perp$ does not coincide with $\bar{\ell}_1 - \bar{\ell}_1^\perp$ and therefore there can be an ambiguity about the basis on which one should project. However, one can calculate the wash-out in the tree-level basis $1^0 - 1^{0\perp}$, so that the eq. (45) can be still used also in this case.

Therefore, the quantum states $|2\rangle$ and $|\bar{2}\rangle$ have now to be projected, more generally, on the tree-level basis $1^0 - 1^{0\perp}$ so that they can be written as

$$|2\rangle = \langle 1^0|2\rangle |1^0\rangle + \langle 1^{0\perp}|2\rangle |1^{0\perp}\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad |\bar{2}\rangle = \langle \bar{1}^0|\bar{2}\rangle |\bar{1}^0\rangle + \langle \bar{1}^{0\perp}|\bar{2}\rangle |\bar{1}^{0\perp}\rangle. \quad (94)$$

Therefore, writing the Eq. (75) in this basis, we have at the production ($i_1^0, j_1^0 = 1^0, 1^{0\perp}$)

$$\frac{dN_{i_1^0 j_1^0}^{B-L}}{dz} = \varepsilon_{i_1^0 j_1^0}^{(2)} D_2 (N_{N_2} - N_{N_2}^{\text{eq}}) - \frac{1}{2} W_2 \{ \mathcal{P}^{(2)0}, N^{B-L} \}_{i_1^0 j_1^0}, \quad (95)$$

where as usual the superscript “0” indicates the tree level quantities that can be approximately fully employed in the calculation of the washout term. In this way we obtain expressions for the heavy neutrino lepton flavour asymmetries, that are analogous to the eqs. (76-83) for the charged lepton flavoured asymmetries,

$$N_{1^0 1^0}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B2}) \simeq p_{12}^0 \varepsilon_2 \kappa(K_2) - \frac{\Delta p_{21^0}}{2} \kappa(K_2/2), \quad (96)$$

$$N_{1^{0\perp} 1^{0\perp}}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B2}) \simeq (1 - p_{12}^0) \varepsilon_2 \kappa(K_2) + \frac{\Delta p_{21^0}}{2} \kappa(K_2/2). \quad (97)$$

The quantity Δp_{21^0} is defined analogously to the $\Delta p_{i\alpha}$'s (cf. eqs. (17), (18)), explicitly $\Delta p_{21^0} \equiv |\langle 1^0 | 2 \rangle|^2 - |\langle \bar{1}^0 | \bar{2} \rangle|^2$. Finally, taking into account the lightest RH neutrino washout and asymmetry production, we obtain for the final asymmetry

$$N_{B-L}^f = \varepsilon_1 \kappa(K_1) + \left[p_{12}^0 e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8} K_1} + (1 - p_{12}^0) \right] \varepsilon_2 \kappa(K_2) + \left(1 - e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8} K_1} \right) \frac{\Delta p_{21^0}}{2} \kappa(K_2/2). \quad (98)$$

Therefore, the phantom terms give an additional contribution to both components and in particular to the orthogonal component. If $K_1 \ll 1$, both the parallel and the orthogonal components are unwashed and the phantom terms cancel with each other. On the other hand, in the opposite case, for $K_1 \gg 1$, the parallel component is completely washed out so that only the orthogonal one survives (together with the additional N_1 -unwashed phantom term contribution).

This result shows that phantom leptogenesis goes even beyond the case where the two RH neutrino masses fall into two different flavour regimes [18].

Finally, it should be clear that an account of the different flavour compositions of the ℓ_1 and $\bar{\ell}_1$ quantum states at the production from N_1 , would lead to additional phantom terms. These, however, cancel with each other and do not contribute to the final asymmetry, as already discussed in section 2.

3.3 Case $10^{12} \text{ GeV} \gg M_1, M_2$

When $M_1, M_2 \ll 10^{12} \text{ GeV}$ both RH neutrinos produce their asymmetry in the two-flavour regime. The production from the heavier RH neutrinos is given by the usual result

$$N_{\tau\tau}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B2}) = \varepsilon_{2\tau} \kappa(K_{2\tau}), \quad N_{\tau^\perp \tau^\perp}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B2}) = \varepsilon_{2\tau^\perp} \kappa(K_{2\tau^\perp}). \quad (99)$$

In the strong washout regime for both flavours, $K_{2\tau^\perp}, K_{2\tau} \gg 1$, the sum, i.e. the total asymmetry, can be approximated by the Eq. (20) rewritten for the heavier RH neutrino. When the temperature drops down to $T \sim T_{B1}$, the washout from the lighter RH neutrino starts to act. Similarly to the previous cases, this washout factorizes from the general expression and can be expressed as a simple exponential pre-factor so that

$$N_{\tau\tau}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B2}) = \varepsilon_{2\tau} \kappa(K_{2\tau}) e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8} K_{1\tau}}, \quad (100)$$

$$N_{\tau^\perp\tau^\perp}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B2}) = \varepsilon_{2\tau^\perp} \kappa(K_{2\tau^\perp}) e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8} K_{1\tau^\perp}}. \quad (101)$$

The production of the asymmetry from the N_1 decays is then added to what is left from the N_2 production, so that we finally obtain

$$N_{\tau\tau}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B1}) = \varepsilon_{2\tau} \kappa(K_{2\tau}) e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8} K_{1\tau}} + \varepsilon_{1\tau} \kappa(K_{1\tau}), \quad (102)$$

$$N_{\tau^\perp\tau^\perp}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B1}) = \varepsilon_{2\tau^\perp} \kappa(K_{2\tau^\perp}) e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8} K_{1\tau^\perp}} + \varepsilon_{1\tau^\perp} \kappa(K_{1\tau^\perp}). \quad (103)$$

It should be noticed that there are no phantom terms in this case because of the assumption made at the beginning of the Section that $\tau_2^\perp = \tau_1^\perp \equiv \tau^\perp$. In this case, we have an effective two-flavour problem and there are no phantom terms cancelling out. If we relax the two-flavour assumption allowing $\tau_2^\perp \neq \tau_1^\perp$, we have to work in a full three-flavour basis, and, as we will see, phantom terms appear again in the final asymmetry. We discuss this more general case in the next Section.

4 General case with three charged lepton flavours and three heavy neutrino flavours

If we consider the general realistic case with three lepton flavours, the density matrix equations have to be written in terms of 3×3 matrices. In general the three heavy neutrino flavours have no particular flavour orientations in the three charged lepton flavour space (see Fig. 4). If we also consider generic three RH neutrinos mass patterns with masses $M_i \gg 10^6$ GeV, the density matrix equation eq. (74) further generalises into ($\alpha, \beta = \tau, \mu, e$)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dN_{\alpha\beta}^{B-L}}{dz} &= \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} D_1 (N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}) - \frac{1}{2} W_1 \{ \mathcal{P}^{(1)0}, N^{B-L} \}_{\alpha\beta} \\ &+ \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(2)} D_2 (N_{N_2} - N_{N_2}^{\text{eq}}) - \frac{1}{2} W_2 \{ \mathcal{P}^{(2)0}, N^{B-L} \}_{\alpha\beta} \\ &+ \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{(3)} D_3 (N_{N_3} - N_{N_3}^{\text{eq}}) - \frac{1}{2} W_3 \{ \mathcal{P}^{(3)0}, N^{B-L} \}_{\alpha\beta} \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$




Figure 4: A generic three heavy neutrino lepton flavour configuration.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & - \text{Im}(\Lambda_\tau) \left[\left(\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right), \left[\left(\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right), N^{B-L} \right] \right]_{\alpha\beta} \\
 & - \text{Im}(\Lambda_\mu) \left[\left(\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right), \left[\left(\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right), N^{B-L} \right] \right]_{\alpha\beta} .
 \end{aligned} \tag{105}$$

We have implied the effect of gauge interactions in setting the condition of thermal equilibrium on the lepton abundances.

If one of the three masses is lower than $\sim 10^6$ GeV, electron flavour interactions terms have to be included as well, though they have no real impact, within this framework, on the final asymmetry. This is because the electron asymmetry is in any case already measured as a ‘neither-muon-nor-tauon’ asymmetry.

This master equation can now be used to calculate the final asymmetry not only for all the ten mass patterns shown in Fig. 1, but also when the M_i ’s fall in one of the flavour transition regimes.

Notice that, though in this paper we are only considering hierarchical RH neutrino mass patterns, this equation can also be used to calculate the asymmetry beyond the hierarchical limit [40] and even in the resonant case [41]. In this latter case, however, many different effects can become important and should be included [42].

Solutions of this set of equations are particularly difficult when at least two of the five kinds of interactions are simultaneously effective, something that goes beyond our objectives. Here, as an example with three flavours, we want to show a particularly interesting asymptotic limit that cannot be described within the simplified two-flavour case discussed in the previous section: the two RH neutrino model [15]. We will show that, even in this case, phantom terms have in general to be taken into account.

4.1 Boltzmann equations for the two RH neutrino model

We consider a two RH neutrino model [43] corresponding to a situation where M_3 is sufficiently large ($M_3 \gg 10^{14}$ GeV) to decouple in the seesaw formula for the calculation of the neutrino masses [44]. In order to reproduce the observed baryon asymmetry one has to impose $M_1 \gtrsim 10^9$ GeV so that the muon interactions can be neglected in the Eq. (104). On the other hand, in order to have M_1 and M_2 as low as possible, it is interesting to consider the case 10^{12} GeV $\gg M_2 \gtrsim 3 M_1 \gg 3 \times 10^9$ GeV in a way to obtain a RH neutrino mass spectrum corresponding to the third panel (from upper left) in Fig. 1.

This model has been recently revisited in [15]. We want here to re-derive, starting from the density matrix equation (104), the Boltzmann kinetic equations and the consequent formula for the final asymmetry that in [15] has been used to calculate the value of M_1 necessary to reproduce the observed baryon asymmetry ⁷.

Thanks to the hierarchical limit, we can again introduce different simplifications. First of all we can impose the complete damping of the $\tau\alpha$ and $\alpha\tau$ ($\alpha \neq \tau$) off-diagonal terms in the asymmetry matrix.

Second, we can consider the N_2 production at $T \simeq T_{B2}$. With these assumptions, only the N_2 -terms can be considered in the Eq. (104) and the asymmetry matrix can be treated as a 2×2 matrix in $\tau\text{-}\tau_2^\perp$ flavour space. In this way the density matrix equation reduce to a set of two Boltzmann equations in an effective two fully flavoured regime,

$$\frac{dN_{\tau\tau}^{B-L}}{dz} = \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}^{(2)} D_2 (N_{N_2} - N_{N_2}^{\text{eq}}) - p_{2\tau}^0 W_2 N_{\tau\tau}^{B-L}, \quad (106)$$

$$\frac{dN_{\tau_2^\perp\tau_2^\perp}^{B-L}}{dz} = \varepsilon_{\tau_2^\perp\tau_2^\perp}^{(2)} D_2 (N_{N_2} - N_{N_2}^{\text{eq}}) - p_{2\tau_2^\perp}^0 W_2 N_{\tau_2^\perp\tau_2^\perp}^{B-L}. \quad (107)$$

As usual, assuming first for simplicity that the $|\tau_2^\perp\rangle$ and the $|\bar{\tau}_2^\perp\rangle$ quantum states have the same flavour compositions, one finds

$$N_{\tau\tau}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B2}) = \varepsilon_{2\tau} \kappa(K_{2\tau}) \quad \text{and} \quad N_{\tau_2^\perp\tau_2^\perp}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B2}) = \varepsilon_{2\tau_2^\perp} \kappa(K_{2\tau^\perp}). \quad (108)$$

⁷It has been shown in [15] that even the N_2 contribution to the asymmetry depends just on M_1 and not on M_2 , provided that this is much smaller than 10^{12} GeV.




Figure 5: Relevant lepton flavours in the two RH neutrino model.

These values of the asymmetries at the end of the N_2 production stage have to be used as initial values in the set of equations describing the evolution of the asymmetries during the N_1 production,

$$\frac{dN_{\tau\tau}^{B-L}}{dz} = \varepsilon_{\tau\tau}^{(1)} D_1 (N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}) - p_{1\tau}^0 W_1 N_{\tau\tau}^{B-L}, \quad (109)$$

$$\frac{dN_{\tau_1^\perp \tau_1^\perp}^{B-L}}{dz} = \varepsilon_{\tau_1^\perp \tau_1^\perp}^{(1)} D_1 (N_{N_1} - N_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}) - p_{1\tau_1^\perp}^0 W_1 N_{\tau_1^\perp \tau_1^\perp}^{B-L}. \quad (110)$$

The τ_2^\perp component of the asymmetry at the end of the N_2 production has to be decomposed into a τ_1^\perp parallel component and into a τ_1^\perp orthogonal component that we indicate with the symbol $\tau_{1^\perp}^\perp$. In this way one finds that the final asymmetry is the sum of three flavour components (see Fig. 5),

$$N_{B-L}^f = N_{\tau\tau}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B1}) + N_{\tau_1^\perp \tau_1^\perp}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B1}) + N_{\tau_{1^\perp}^\perp \tau_{1^\perp}^\perp}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B1}), \quad (111)$$

where

$$N_{\tau\tau}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B1}) = \varepsilon_{1\tau} \kappa(K_{1\tau}) + \varepsilon_{2\tau} \kappa(K_{2\tau}) e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8} K_{1\tau}}, \quad (112)$$

$$N_{\tau_1^\perp \tau_1^\perp}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B1}) = \varepsilon_{1\tau_1^\perp} \kappa(K_{1\tau_1^\perp}) + p_{\tau_1^\perp \tau_2^\perp}^0 \varepsilon_{2\tau_2^\perp} \kappa(K_{2\tau_2^\perp}) e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8} K_{1\tau_1^\perp}}, \quad (113)$$

$$N_{\tau_{1^\perp}^\perp \tau_{1^\perp}^\perp}^{B-L}(T \simeq T_{B1}) = \left(1 - p_{\tau_1^\perp \tau_2^\perp}^0\right) \varepsilon_{2\tau_2^\perp} \kappa(K_{2\tau_2^\perp}). \quad (114)$$

This expression coincides with the result found in [15] and is valid neglecting phantom terms. If one takes into account the different flavour compositions between the $|\tau_2^\perp\rangle$ and the $|\bar{\tau}_2^\perp\rangle$ quantum states, then phantom terms are, in general, present. The procedure is essentially the same discussed in Section 3.2, with the only difference that now the phantom terms will appear only in the τ_1^\perp and $\tau_{1\perp}^\perp$ components but not in the measured tauon component. We can therefore directly write the final result,

$$\begin{aligned}
N_{B-L}^f &= \varepsilon_{1\tau} \kappa(K_{1\tau}) + \varepsilon_{2\tau} \kappa(K_{2\tau}) e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8} K_{1\tau}} \\
&+ \varepsilon_{1\tau_1^\perp} \kappa(K_{1\tau_1^\perp}) + \left(p_{\tau_1^\perp \tau_2^\perp}^0 \varepsilon_{2\tau_2^\perp} \kappa(K_{2\tau_2^\perp}) - \frac{\Delta p_{\tau_2^\perp \tau_{10}^\perp}}{2} \kappa(K_{2\tau_2^\perp}/2) \right) e^{-\frac{3\pi}{8} K_{1\tau_1^\perp}} \\
&+ \left(1 - p_{\tau_1^\perp \tau_2^\perp}^0 \right) \varepsilon_{2\tau_2^\perp} \kappa(K_{2\tau_2^\perp}) + \frac{\Delta p_{\tau_2^\perp \tau_{10}^\perp}}{2} \kappa(K_{2\tau_2^\perp}/2),
\end{aligned} \tag{115}$$

where each of the three lines corresponds respectively to the τ , τ_1^\perp and $\tau_{1\perp}^\perp$ components and where now $\Delta p_{\tau_2^\perp \tau_{10}^\perp} \equiv |\langle \tau_{10}^\perp | \tau_2^\perp \rangle|^2 - |\langle \bar{\tau}_{10}^\perp | \bar{\tau}_2^\perp \rangle|^2$. This last example shows, once more, how phantom terms are present whenever the production occurs either in one or in a two flavour regime, though only those generated by the heavier RH neutrinos can be afterwards asymmetrically washed out by the lighter RH neutrinos and contribute to the final asymmetry without cancelling with each other.

5 Final discussion

Within a Boltzmann classical kinetic formalism one has to distinguish the ten different RH neutrino mass patterns shown in Fig. 1. These are obtained in the limits where the masses M_i are hierarchical and do not fall in the transition regimes. We have extended the density matrix formalism for the calculation of the matter-anti matter asymmetry in leptogenesis including heavy neutrino flavours. In this way we obtained a density matrix equation for the calculation of the asymmetry for any choice of the RH neutrino masses, even beyond the hierarchical limit.

Within this more general description, the ten hierarchical RH neutrino mass patterns of Fig. 1 correspond to those cases where the (five) different interactions are only one by one effective within a given range of temperatures. In this way the evolution of the asymmetry can be described in well separated stages where the density matrix equations greatly simplify reducing to multiple sets of Boltzmann equations, one for each stage. In these cases we recovered or extended results that had already been derived within a simpler description based on an instantaneous collapse of lepton quantum states.

The flavour projection effect, where the orthogonal component of a previously produced asymmetry escapes the RH neutrino washout, is fully confirmed. We have also shown that the washout of the parallel component is exactly described by the usual exponential washout factor independently of the washout regime.

Phantom terms emerge as quite a generic feature of flavoured leptogenesis and have to be taken into account even for vanishing initial RH neutrino abundances. They can contribute to the final asymmetry even if the production from an heavier RH neutrino species and the washout from a lighter RH neutrino species occur in the same fully flavoured regime and so their presence goes beyond the N_2 -dominated scenario where they were originally discussed [18]. However, we have shown that, when the effect of gauge interactions in thermalising the lepton abundances is taken into account, phantom terms get washed-out at the production, though their wash-out rate is halved compared to that one acting on the final asymmetry. In this way, in the strong wash-out regime, phantom terms give a contribution that is also independent of the initial conditions.

Even though we have explicitly calculated the final asymmetry only in one of the ten asymptotic limits RH neutrino mass patterns shown in Fig. 1, in the case of the two RH neutrino model, the procedure can be easily extended to all others neutrino mass patterns. For example one can easily show the expression for the final asymmetry in the N_2 -dominated scenario, when $M_1 \ll 10^9$ GeV [13, 14, 24, 18].

It would be desirable in future to calculate the asymmetry beyond these ten asymptotic limits, solving the full density matrix equation. In this way the calculation of the matter-anti matter asymmetry would be extended to a generic RH neutrino mass pattern, including the cases where the RH neutrino masses fall in the transition regimes where quantum decoherence from charged lepton interactions acts simultaneously with asymmetry generation and wash-out. This would make possible to interpolate between the asymptotic limits, finding the exact conditions on the RH neutrino masses for the validity of the solutions that we have discussed here.

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank Stefan Antusch and Steve King for many useful discussions. PDB and LM acknowledge financial support from the NExT Institute and SEPnet. SB acknowledges support from the Swiss National Science Foundation under the Ambizione grant PZ00P2_136947. DAJ is thankful to the STFC for providing studentship funding.

Appendix

In this Appendix we review and discuss some insightful aspects and properties of the heavy neutrino lepton and anti-lepton bases, respectively $\{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3\}$ and $\{\bar{\ell}_1, \bar{\ell}_2, \bar{\ell}_3\}$.

At tree level the two bases are CP conjugated of each other and the probabilities $p_{ij}^0 \equiv |\langle \ell_1^0 | \ell_2^0 \rangle|^2 = |\langle \bar{\ell}_1^0 | \bar{\ell}_2^0 \rangle|^2$ can be expressed as [17]

$$p_{ij}^0 = \frac{|(m_D^\dagger m_D)_{ij}|^2}{(m_D^\dagger m_D)_{ii} (m_D^\dagger m_D)_{jj}} = \frac{|\sum_h m_h \Omega_{hi}^* \Omega_{hj}|^2}{\tilde{m}_i \tilde{m}_j}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $\tilde{m}_i \equiv (m_D^\dagger m_D)_{ii}/M_i$. In the last expression we expressed the terms $(m_D^\dagger m_D)_{ij}$ through the orthogonal matrix Ω providing a useful parameterisation of the neutrino Dirac mass matrix given by $m_D = U \sqrt{D_m} \Omega \sqrt{D_M}$ [45], where U is the leptonic mixing matrix, $D_M \equiv \text{diag}(M_1, M_2, M_3)$ and $D_m \equiv \text{diag}(m_1, m_2, m_3)$.

In general, the (tree level) bases $\{\ell_1^0, \ell_2^0, \ell_3^0\}$ and $\{\bar{\ell}_1^0, \bar{\ell}_2^0, \bar{\ell}_3^0\}$ are not orthonormal (see Fig. 4) [10], i.e. in general $p_{ij}^0 \neq \delta_{ij}$. This case would indeed correspond to special forms of the Dirac mass matrices where the orthogonal matrix is either the identity ($\Omega_{ij} = \delta_{ij}$), or one of the other five special forms obtained from the identity permuting rows or columns. These six special forms imply [13] that the see-saw formula reduces to the case where each light neutrino mass m_j proportional to a different inverse RH neutrino mass M_i , so called form dominance models [46]. However, when one of these six special cases are exactly realised and the two bases are orthonormal, both the total and the flavoured CP asymmetries exactly vanish for the simple reason that in this case there is no interference between the tree level and the one loop graphs, since this requires that in the decay of a RH neutrino N_i a virtual RH neutrino $N_{j \neq i}$ couples to a lepton ℓ_i while orthonormality implies that it does not.

This means that for these six special forms, even including perturbative effects, the heavy neutrino lepton and anti-lepton bases remain equal to the tree level bases and, therefore, they are still orthonormal. Therefore, in order to have successful leptogenesis, the heavy neutrino lepton and anti-lepton bases have necessarily to be non-orthonormal to some level.

When some interference between tree level and one loop graphs is turned on, implying non-orthonormality of the two bases, then in general this will induce both non-vanishing total CP asymmetries, with proportional contributions in the flavoured CP asymmetries given by the first terms in the eq. (20), but also different flavour compositions between the heavy neutrino lepton basis and heavy neutrino anti-lepton basis. This can be seen easily from the expressions for the flavoured CP asymmetries recast in the orthogonal

parameterisation and for example in [12] it was noticed how $\Delta p_{1\alpha} \neq 0$, with a strong enhancement of the asymmetry compared to the unflavoured case (cf. eq. (20)) can be induced by the presence of low energy phases. As a matter of fact, it is well known that the total CP asymmetry depends only on a subset of phases (3) compared to the flavoured CP asymmetries. This difference can be precisely traced back to the presence of the $\Delta p_{1\alpha}$ in Eq. (20), which includes the dependence on the additional three phases. One can wonder why the flavour composition of the final leptons and anti-leptons is affected by an account of the interference between tree level and one loop graphs. In particular the neutrino Yukawa matrix can be always brought to a triangular form $h = V^\dagger h_\Delta$, where V is a unitary matrix. One can then switch from the weak basis to another orthonormal basis $\ell_{\Delta i} = V_{i\alpha} \ell_\alpha$. In this basis one has that at tree level $N_1 \rightarrow \ell_{\Delta 1} = \ell_1^0 = V_{1\alpha} \ell_\alpha$. However, this does not remain valid accounting for the interference with one loop graphs that make now possible to have $N_1 \rightarrow \ell_{j \neq 1}^0$. This clearly shows that, going beyond tree level, the final ℓ_1 is a linear combination of all three ℓ_i^0 , with a dominance of ℓ_1^0 but also with a small contamination of ℓ_2^0 and ℓ_3^0 . If one considers the anti-leptons there is also a deviation from $\bar{\ell}_1^0$ due to a contamination of $\bar{\ell}_2^0$ and $\bar{\ell}_3^0$ that, however, is in general not CP conjugated of the deviation in the ℓ_1 from ℓ_1^0 . At one loop these deviations are exactly described by the loop functions ξ_u and ξ_v in the eq. (26). Since we have that $\xi_u \neq \xi_v^*$, it is clear from the eqs. (24)-(25) that the the flavour compositions of the lepton ℓ_1 and of the antilepton $\bar{\ell}_1$ are different from each other, as explicitly shown by the eq. (28).

References

- [1] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **174**, 45 (1986).
- [2] P. Minkowski, Phys. Lett. B **67**, 421 (1977); M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, *Proceedings of the Supergravity Stony Brook Workshop*, New York 1979, eds. P. Van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Freedman; T. Yanagida, *Proceedings of the Workshop on Unified Theories and Baryon Number in the Universe*, Tsukuba, Japan 1979, eds. A. Sawada and A. Sugamoto; R. N. Mohapatra, G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 912 (1980).
- [3] Y. Fukuda *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **81** (1998) 1562-1567 [hep-ex/9807003].
- [4] A. D. Dolgov and Ya. B. Zeldovich, Rev. Mod. Phys. **53** (1981) 1; E. W. Kolb and S. Wolfram, Nucl. Phys. B **172** (1980) 224, *ibid.* B **195** (1982) 542 (E).

- [5] M. A. Luty, Phys. Rev. **D45** (1992) 455-465; M. Plumacher, Z. Phys. **C74** (1997) 549-559; W. Buchmuller, M. Plumacher, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A15** (2000) 5047-5086.
- [6] R. Barbieri, P. Creminelli, A. Strumia, N. Tetradis, Nucl. Phys. **B575** (2000) 61-77.
- [7] W. Buchmuller, P. Di Bari and M. Plumacher, Nucl. Phys. B **643** (2002) 367 [Erratum-ibid. B **793** (2008) 362].
- [8] G. F. Giudice, A. Notari, M. Raidal, A. Riotto and A. Strumia, Nucl. Phys. B **685** (2004) 89.
- [9] W. Buchmuller, P. Di Bari, M. Plumacher, Annals Phys. **315** (2005) 305-351.
- [10] E. Nardi, Y. Nir, E. Roulet, J. Racker, JHEP **0601** (2006) 164. [hep-ph/0601084].
- [11] A. Abada, S. Davidson, F. -X. Josse-Michaux, M. Losada, A. Riotto, JCAP **0604**, 004 (2006). [hep-ph/0601083].
- [12] S. Blanchet, P. Di Bari, JCAP **0703** (2007) 018. [hep-ph/0607330].
- [13] P. Di Bari, Nucl. Phys. **B727** (2005) 318-354. [hep-ph/0502082].
- [14] O. Vives, Phys. Rev. **D73** (2006) 073006. [hep-ph/0512160].
- [15] S. Antusch, P. Di Bari, D. A. Jones, S. F. King, Phys. Rev. **D 86**, (2012) 023516 [arXiv:1107.6002 [hep-ph]].
- [16] P. Di Bari, A. Riotto, Phys. Lett. **B671** (2009) 462-469; JCAP **1104** (2011) 037.
- [17] E. Bertuzzo, P. Di Bari, L. Marzola, Nucl. Phys. **B849** (2011) 521-548.
- [18] S. Antusch, P. Di Bari, D. A. Jones and S. F. King, Nucl. Phys. B **856** (2012) 180.
- [19] A. De Simone, A. Riotto, JCAP **0702** (2007) 005. [hep-ph/0611357].
- [20] G. Engelhard, Y. Grossman, E. Nardi, Y. Nir, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99** (2007) 081802.
- [21] A. Basboll and S. Hannestad, JCAP **0701** (2007) 003; F. Hahn-Woernle, M. Plumacher and Y. Y. Y. Wong, JCAP **0908** (2009) 028.
- [22] C. P. Kiessig, M. Plumacher and M. H. Thoma, Phys. Rev. D **82** (2010) 036007.
- [23] W. Buchmuller and M. Plumacher, Phys. Lett. B **511** (2001) 74.

- [24] S. Blanchet and P. Di Bari, Nucl. Phys. B **807** (2009) 155.
- [25] A. De Simone and A. Riotto, JCAP **0708** (2007) 002; M. Beneke, B. Garbrecht, M. Herranen and P. Schwaller, Nucl. Phys. B **838** (2010) 1; A. Anisimov, W. Buchmuller, M. Drewes and S. Mendizabal, arXiv:1012.5821.
- [26] E. Komatsu *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], Astrophys. J. Suppl. **192** (2011) 18. [arXiv:1001.4538 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [27] M. Beneke, B. Garbrecht, C. Fidler, M. Herranen, P. Schwaller, Nucl. Phys. **B843** (2011) 177-212. [arXiv:1007.4783 [hep-ph]].
- [28] S. Davidson, A. Ibarra, Phys. Lett. **B535** (2002) 25-32.
- [29] S. Blanchet, P. Di Bari, G. G. Raffelt, JCAP **0703** (2007) 012. [hep-ph/0611337].
- [30] Feynman, Richard P. , “Statistical Mechanics: A Set of Lectures”, Addison Wesley (1981).
- [31] W. Buchmuller, M. Plumacher, Phys. Lett. **B431**, 354-362 (1998). [hep-ph/9710460].
- [32] A. Anisimov, A. Broncano, M. Plumacher, Nucl. Phys. **B737**, 176-189 (2006).
- [33] L. Covi, E. Roulet and F. Vissani, Phys. Lett. B **384**, 169 (1996) [hep-ph/9605319].
- [34] G. Sigl and G. Raffelt, Nucl. Phys. B **406** (1993) 423.
- [35] S. Blanchet, “A New Era of Leptogenesis”, Ph.D thesis, [arXiv:0807.1408 [hep-ph]].
- [36] H. A. Weldon, Phys. Rev. **D26**, 2789 (1982).
- [37] J. M. Cline, K. Kainulainen, K. A. Olive, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 6394-6409 (1994).
- [38] A. D. Dolgov, S. H. Hansen, S. Pastor, S. T. Petcov, G. G. Raffelt and D. V. Semikoz, Nucl. Phys. B **632** (2002) 363.
- [39] R. Foot and R. R. Volkas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75** (1995) 4350; P. Di Bari, P. Lipari and M. Lusignoli, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **15** (2000) 2289; D. Kirilova, JCAP **1206** (2012) 007.
- [40] S. Blanchet, P. Di Bari, JCAP **0606** (2006) 023.
- [41] A. Pilaftsis and T. E. J. Underwood, Nucl. Phys. B **692** (2004) 303 [hep-ph/0309342].

- [42] A. De Simone and A. Riotto, JCAP **0708** (2007) 013 [arXiv:0705.2183 [hep-ph]].
- [43] S. F. King, Nucl. Phys. B **576** (2000) 85; P. H. Frampton, S. L. Glashow and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **548** (2002) 119.
- [44] S. F. King, Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003) 113010 [arXiv:hep-ph/0211228]; P. H. Chankowski and K. Turzyski, Phys. Lett. B **570** (2003) 198 [arXiv:hep-ph/0306059]; A. Ibarra and G. G. Ross, Phys. Lett. B **591** (2004) 285 [arXiv:hep-ph/0312138].
- [45] J. A. Casas and A. Ibarra, Nucl. Phys. B **618** (2001) 171.
- [46] M. C. Chen and S. F. King, JHEP **0906** (2009) 072 [arXiv:0903.0125 [hep-ph]].