

Q ball Decay Rates into Gravitinos and Quarks

Masahiro Kawasaki^{a,b} and Masaki Yamada^a

^a *Institute for Cosmic Ray Research, University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Chiba 277-8582, Japan*

^b *Kavli Institute for the Physics and Mathematics of the Universe,
University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Chiba 277-8582, Japan*

(Dated: November 7, 2018)

The Affleck-Dine mechanism, which is one of the most attractive candidates for the baryogenesis in supersymmetric theories, often predicts the existence of baryonic Q balls in the early universe. In this scenario, there is a possibility to explain the observed baryon-to-dark matter ratio because Q balls decay into supersymmetric particles as well as into quarks. If the gravitino mass is small compared to the typical interaction energy, the longitudinal component of the gravitino behaves like the massless goldstino. We numerically calculate the goldstino production rates from Q balls in the leading semi-classical approximation without using large radius limit or effective coupling. We also calculate the quark production rates from Q balls in the Yukawa theory with a massive fermion. In deriving the decay rate we also take into account the scalar field configuration of the Q ball. These results are applied to a realistic model in the gauge-mediated supersymmetry breaking and yield the branching ratio of the Q ball decay into the gravitino. We obtain the branching ratio much smaller than the one estimated in the previous analysis.

I. INTRODUCTION

In cosmology, the origin of dark matter and the baryon asymmetry is very important problem which can not be explained by the Standard Model of elementary particle physics. Supersymmetric (SUSY) extensions of the Standard Model can explain this problem. In minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) the lightest SUSY particle (LSP) is stable and is natural candidate for the dark matter. Besides, the baryon asymmetry can be produced by the Affleck-Dine mechanism [1, 2]. The Affleck-Dine mechanism produces a scalar field condensate with baryon number. In many models such as the gauge-mediated SUSY breaking (GMSB) models, this condensate feels spatial instabilities and fragments into nontopological solitons, Q balls [3–7].

In the GMSB, the LSP is gravitino. If the charge of the Q ball is large enough, the Q ball is stable. Since the stable Q ball has astrophysical problems [8, 9], we do not consider this case. On the other hand, if the charge of the Q ball is small enough, the Q ball decay into hadrons and gravitinos. If Q balls decay only via squark \rightarrow quark + gravitino [10, 11], the produced gravitino number density is equal to the produced quark number density by R-parity conservation. Then the gravitino mass should be $\simeq 1.7\text{GeV}$ to explain the observed baryon-to-dark matter ratio $\simeq 1/5$. However, it is pointed out that the process as squark + squark \rightarrow quark + quark occurs via heavy gluino exchange and is main decay mode if decay into a squark is kinematically forbidden [12]. In this case, it becomes important to calculate the branching ratios into the gravitino and quarks to estimate the baryon-to-dark matter ratio.

In this article, therefore, we derive the production rates of gravitinos and quarks from the Q ball in the GMSB model (the most interesting case) and in the gravity-mediated SUSY breaking model. The Q ball decay was first studied by Cohen *et al.* [13], who considered the Yukawa theory and treated the scalar field as the classical Q ball background field in the leading semi-classical approximation and calculated the fermion production rate by the Bogoliubov transformation between creation and annihilation operators at $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$ [13]. In the case of gravitino, if the gravitino mass is small compared to the typical interaction energy, the longitudinal component of the gravitino behaves like the massless goldstino and has the derivative interactions with chiral multiplets. Therefore we consider fermion fields (one of which is a goldstino) with derivative coupling to a scalar field. Once we treat the scalar field as the classical background field, the interaction terms become at most second order for the fermion fields and this system can be solved numerically in the same way as Cohen *et al.* did. The gravitino production rate from Q balls was first calculated in Ref. [12], where the effective coupling estimated from the decay rate of squark \rightarrow quark + gravitino and large radius limit are used. We derive the gravitino production rate without relying on the effective coupling and large radius limit. We also consider two fermion fields one of which has a mass term in the Yukawa theory. This system is almost equivalent to the one considered in Refs. [8, 14]. The interaction of Q balls with ordinary matter was studied in Ref. [8], which showed that quarks are reflected as antiquarks with a probability ~ 1 but did not refer to the Q ball decay. In Ref. [14], the authors estimated the quark production rate using the effective interaction after integrating out the heavy particle. However, in this paper we calculate the rate of the Q ball decay into quarks without integrating out the heavy particle. Furthermore, in deriving the decay rate we also take the scalar field configuration of the Q ball into account. In most of the previous studies, a step function is used as the scalar field configuration. We carefully examine the differences between the realistic and step-function configurations.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we briefly review the property of Q balls in the GMSB and the gravity

mediated SUSY breaking models. In Sec. III, we review the method to calculate the decay rate of Q balls and discuss the differences among the decay rates for some Q ball configurations in the Yukawa theory. We apply the method to calculate the goldstino production rate from the Q balls in the GMSB and in the gravity mediated SUSY breaking models in Sec. IV. In Sec. V, we also calculate the Q ball decay rate in a theory with a massive fermion. Then, we apply our results to gravitino and quark production from Q balls in Sec. VI. Sec. VII is devoted to the conclusion.

II. Q BALL SOLUTIONS

In this section, we consider a complex scalar field theory with a global $U(1)$ symmetry. The Lagrangian density is written as

$$\mathcal{L} = -\partial_\mu \phi^* \partial^\mu \phi - V(\phi). \quad (1)$$

The conserved $U(1)$ charge and the energy are given by

$$Q = i \int (\phi^* \partial_0 \phi - \phi \partial_0 \phi^*) d^3x, \quad (2)$$

$$E = \int (\partial_0 \phi^* \partial_0 \phi + \partial_i \phi^* \partial_i \phi + V(\phi)) d^3x, \quad (3)$$

respectively. The scalar field configuration which minimizes the energy at a fixed charge Q is obtained by minimizing

$$E + \omega_0 \left(Q - i \int (\phi^* \partial_0 \phi - \phi \partial_0 \phi^*) d^3x \right), \quad (4)$$

where ω_0 is a Lagrange multiplier. We can immediately determine the time dependence of the scalar field configuration and obtain $\phi(\mathbf{r}, t) = \phi(\mathbf{r})e^{-i\omega_0 t}$. Then, taking a spherically symmetric ansatz $\phi(\mathbf{r}) = \phi(r)$, we get the radial part of the configuration by solving the following equation:

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} \phi + \frac{2}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \phi + \omega_0^2 \phi - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} V(\phi) = 0, \quad (5)$$

with the boundary condition $\phi'(0) = 0$. Here, if $\omega_0^2 < \min_\phi \left(\frac{V}{|\phi|^2} \right) < V''(0)/2$, we get the spatially localized configuration, called Q ball [15].

In MSSM, there are many flat directions in the scalar potential. The flat directions are combinations of squarks, sleptons and Higgs, but they are lifted by the SUSY breaking effect. In the early universe, the Affleck-Dine mechanism produces a scalar field condensate with baryon number using one of these flat directions. If a Q ball solution exists for this flat direction, the scalar field condensate fragments into Q balls [16]. In the following subsections, we review the properties of the Q ball in the GMSB and the gravity-mediated supersymmetry breaking models.

A. Properties of the Q ball in gauge mediation

In the GMSB model, the gauge fields acquire large masses for $g\phi \gg M_m$, where M_m is the messenger scale, and g generically stands for the standard model gauge coupling. Then the transmission of SUSY breaking effect is suppressed and the flat directions flatten out for $g\phi \gg M_m$ as [17]

$$V = \frac{2m_s^2 M_m^2}{g^2} \left[\log \left(1 + \frac{g|\phi|}{M_m} \right) \right]^2, \quad (6)$$

where m_s is the soft mass scale. In the GMSB gravitino mass $m_{3/2}$ is much smaller than m_s . In this potential, there always exists a Q ball solution. The mass of Q ball M_Q , the typical size of the Q ball R , ω_0 , and the field value at

the center of the Q ball $\phi_0 \equiv \phi(r=0)$ are written as

$$M_Q \simeq \frac{4\sqrt{2\pi c}}{3} \left(\frac{m_s M_m}{g} \right)^{1/2} Q^{3/4}, \quad (7)$$

$$R \simeq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2c}} \left(\frac{g}{m_s M_m} \right)^{1/2} Q^{1/4} \left(\simeq \frac{\pi}{\omega_0} \right), \quad (8)$$

$$\omega_0 \simeq \sqrt{2\pi c} \left(\frac{m_s M_m}{g} \right)^{1/2} Q^{-1/4}, \quad (9)$$

$$\phi_0 \simeq \sqrt{\frac{c}{2\pi}} \left(\frac{m_s M_m}{g} \right)^{1/2} Q^{1/4} \left(\simeq c \frac{m_s M_m}{g\omega_0} \right), \quad (10)$$

where the parameter c is fitted as [14]

$$c \simeq 4.8 \log(m_s/\omega_0) + 7.4. \quad (11)$$

The scalar field configuration is well approximated by $\phi = \phi_0 \frac{\sin(\omega_0 r)}{\omega_0 r}$ for $r < R$. However, this configuration is not smooth at $r = R$ [see Eq. (8)]. This cause some difficulty in deriving decay rate of the Q ball into goldstinos. Thus in order to obtain the smooth configuration we solve Eqs. (5) and (6) numerically. We show the numerical solution in Fig. 1. The second derivative drastically changes around $r\omega_0 \sim \pi$, but it is finite and nonsingular, as expected.




FIG. 1: Numerical solutions of Eq. (5), $\phi(r)$, $\phi'(r)$ and $\phi''(r)$, in the GMSB with $m_s/\omega_0 = 10^3$. The vertical axis is normalized by $(cm_s M_m/g\omega_0)$ for $\phi(r)$ and $\phi'(r)$, and $(cm_s M_m/g\omega_0 \times 1/10)$ for $\phi''(r)$. The horizontal axis denotes the radius normalized by $1/\omega_0$.

B. Properties of the Q ball in gravity mediation

In the gravity-mediated SUSY breaking model, the flat directions are lifted by the SUSY breaking effect as

$$V = m_s^2 |\phi|^2 \left(1 + K \log \frac{|\phi|^2}{M_G^2} \right), \quad (12)$$

where m_s is the soft mass scale and M_G is the reduced Planck mass. In the gravity-mediated SUSY breaking gravitino mass $m_{3/2}$ is the same order of m_s . The second term in the parenthesis comes from radiative correction, and typically $|K| \sim 0.01-0.1$. It is known that $K < 0$ for the flat directions of the first and second generation squarks, and then there exists a Q ball solution [4]. The scalar field configuration is well approximated by $\phi(r) \simeq \phi_0 \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{2R^2}\right)$, and

M_Q , R , ω_0 and ϕ_0 are written as

$$M_Q \simeq m_s Q, \quad (13)$$

$$R \simeq \frac{1}{|K|^{1/2} m_s}, \quad (14)$$

$$\omega_0 \simeq m_s, \quad (15)$$

$$\phi_0 \simeq (2\pi^{3/2})^{-1/2} |K|^{3/4} m_s Q^{1/2}, \quad (16)$$

III. Q BALL DECAY IN THE YUKAWA THEORY

In this section, we consider the Yukawa theory in the Q ball background field. In this system, Cohen *et al.* proved that the Q ball decay into fermions in the leading semi-classical approximation. Here, we first review the method presented by them and then apply to some cases without using large radius limit.

The Lagrangian density is written as

$$\mathcal{L} = \chi^\dagger i \bar{\sigma}^\mu \partial_\mu \chi + \eta^\dagger i \bar{\sigma}^\mu \partial_\mu \eta - (g \phi^* \chi \eta + h.c.), \quad (17)$$

where χ and η are two-component Weyl spinors, and $\bar{\sigma}^\mu = (\mathbf{1}, -\sigma^i)$, where σ^i 's are the Pauli matrices. We assign the global $U(1)$ charge for ϕ , χ and η as 1, 1 and 0, respectively, and treat the scalar field as the Q ball classical background field $\phi = \phi(r) e^{-i\omega_0 t}$ in the leading semi-classical approximation. The discussion below is also correct for more general interactions like the one used in the following sections.

When we treat the scalar field as the classical background field, this system is invariant under simultaneous time translations and $U(1)$ rotations as

$$\begin{cases} t \rightarrow t + \delta t, \\ \chi \rightarrow \chi e^{-i\omega_0 \delta t}. \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

The associated conserved current is

$$\begin{aligned} j^\mu &= \chi^\dagger i \bar{\sigma}^\mu (\partial_0 + i\omega_0) \chi + \eta^\dagger i \bar{\sigma}^\mu \partial_0 \eta - \delta_0^\mu \mathcal{L}, \\ &= T_0^\mu - \omega_0 j^\mu, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where T_ν^μ is the energy momentum tensor for the fermions and j^μ is the $U(1)$ current. Then, the conserved charge is not the energy E_f itself but $E_f - \omega_0 Q_f$, where Q_f is the $U(1)$ charge for the fermions. Using this conservation law, we can show that the fermion fields are created from the Q ball surface in the leading semi-classical approximation. We have treated the scalar field as the Q ball classical background field and the Lagrangian density is at most second order for the fermion fields, so we can easily solve this quantized fermionic system. Since the conserved charge is not E_f but $E_f - \omega_0 Q_f$, positive and negative modes may mix with each other in this system. Thus, even if an incoming wave is a positive mode (annihilation operator) at $t = -\infty$, the outgoing wave can be a negative mode (creation operator) at $t = \infty$. We can regard this as the Bogoliubov transformation between annihilation and creation operators at $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$, and then we can calculate the non-zero number density of outgoing waves.

We need the free field mode expansions of the fermions to consider the scattering problem of the fermion fields in the Q ball background field. Far away from the Q ball surface, the background field is $\phi = 0$, and then the equation of motion for the mode of $\chi \propto e^{-ik_+ t}$ is

$$(k_+ - i\sigma \cdot \nabla) \chi = 0. \quad (20)$$

In this article, we treat χ_α , $\chi^{\dagger\dot{\alpha}}$, η_α and $\eta^{\dagger\dot{\alpha}}$ as column vectors and neglect the indices. Due to the rotational invariance of this system, we can expand the solutions by the following Pauli spinors:

$$\begin{cases} \Phi(j, m, l = j + 1/2) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{j+1-m}}{\sqrt{2(j+1)}} Y_l^{m-1/2} \\ -\frac{\sqrt{j+1+m}}{\sqrt{2(j+1)}} Y_l^{m+1/2} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \Phi(j, m, l' = j - 1/2) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{j+m}}{\sqrt{2j}} Y_{l'}^{m-1/2} \\ \frac{\sqrt{j-m}}{\sqrt{2j}} Y_{l'}^{m+1/2} \end{pmatrix}, \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

where Y_l^m are the spherical harmonics. Defining $u^{(i)}$ ($i=1, 2$) as

$$u^{(i)}(k, j, m; \mathbf{r}) = \frac{k}{\sqrt{\pi}} [h_l^{(i)}(kr)\Phi(j, m, l') + h_l^{(i)}(kr)\Phi(j, m, l)], \quad (22)$$

where $h_l^{(1)}$ and $h_l^{(2)}$ are the spherical Hankel functions of the first and second kinds, respectively, we have $(k + i\sigma \cdot \nabla) u^{(i)}(k) = 0$. So we obtain the solutions outside the Q ball as

$$\begin{aligned} \chi = \sum_{j,m} \int_0^\infty dk_+ \{ & a_{\text{in}}(k_+, j, m) e^{-ik_+ t} u^{(1)}(-k_+, j, m; \mathbf{r}) \\ & + a_{\text{out}}(k_+, j, m) e^{-ik_+ t} u^{(2)}(-k_+, j, m; \mathbf{r}) + (\text{terms of antiparticles}) \}, \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

where a_{in} and a_{out} are expansion coefficients. We expand η in the same way as χ but denote expansion coefficients as c instead of a . For later use, we write the expansion of $\eta^\dagger \equiv \eta^{\dagger\dot{\alpha}}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \eta^\dagger = i\sigma_2 (\eta_\alpha)^* = \sum_{j,m} \int_0^\infty dk_+ \{ & c_{\text{in}}^\dagger(k_+, j, -m) e^{ik_+ t} (-1)^{m-} u^{(2)}(-k_+, j, m; \mathbf{r}) \\ & + c_{\text{out}}^\dagger(k_+, j, -m) e^{ik_+ t} (-1)^{m-} u^{(1)}(-k_+, j, m; \mathbf{r}) + (\text{terms of antiparticles}) \}, \quad (24) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $i\sigma_2 u^{(1,2)}(k, j, m; \mathbf{r})^* = (-1)^{m+} u^{(2,1)}(k, j, -m; \mathbf{r})$, where $m_\pm \equiv m \pm 1/2$.

When we quantize the fields, a_{in} and a_{out} become the annihilation operators for incoming and outgoing waves, respectively. The operators obey the Heisenberg equations of motion and are scattered by the Q ball at the origin. We shall consider this scattering problem.

First, let us consider the case without Q balls. Since the solution has to be nonsingular at the origin, the radial part of the solution is written by the spherical Bessel functions, $j_l(kr)$, as $\chi \propto u(-k, j, m; \mathbf{r})$, where $u(k, j, m; \mathbf{r})$ is defined by substituting the spherical Bessel functions for the spherical Hankel functions in the definition of $u^{(i)}$. Using this, along with $j_l = (h_l^{(1)} + h_l^{(2)})/2$, we obtain $a_{\text{out}} = a_{\text{in}}$. This means that the incoming wave reflects off the origin and becomes the outgoing wave. Of course, the number density of the outgoing wave is $\langle 0_{\text{in}} | a_{\text{out}}^\dagger a_{\text{out}} | 0_{\text{in}} \rangle = 0$ when the vacuum, $|0_{\text{in}}\rangle$, is defined as the state of no incoming wave, i.e. $a_{\text{in}}|0_{\text{in}}\rangle = 0$.

Next we consider the case with the Q ball background field whose center is located at the origin of the coordinate. The Heisenberg equations of motion are

$$\begin{cases} i\bar{\sigma}^\mu \partial_\mu \chi - g\phi \eta^\dagger = 0, \\ i\sigma^\mu \partial_\mu \eta^\dagger - g\phi^* \chi = 0. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Since this is the combination of the linear differential equations, we can solve these equations with appropriate boundary condition, and then outgoing waves, a_{out} and c_{out} , can be written by incoming waves, a_{in} and c_{in} , like the previous example. However, because the background field depends on the time as $\phi \propto e^{-i\omega_0 t}$, the conserved quantity is not E_f but $E_f - \omega_0 Q_f$. Thus, the modes which mix with each other are

$$\begin{cases} \chi \propto e^{-i\omega t} = e^{-ik_+ t}, \\ \eta^\dagger \propto e^{-i(\omega - \omega_0)t} = e^{ik_- t}. \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

We are interested in situations where positive and negative modes mix with each other, because we derive the fermion production rate through the Bogoliubov transformation between creation and annihilation operators. Thus, we restrict our attention to $0 < \omega < \omega_0$.

Outside the Q ball, the fields satisfy the free equations of motion. The angular momentum conservation implies that the terms which mix with each other can be written by

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_{\text{in}}(k_+, j, m) e^{-ik_+ t} u^{(1)}(-k_+, j, m; \mathbf{r}) + a_{\text{out}}(k_+, j, m) e^{-ik_+ t} u^{(2)}(-k_+, j, m; \mathbf{r}), \\ c_{\text{in}}^\dagger(k_-, j, -m) e^{ik_- t} (-1)^{m-} u^{(2)}(-k_-, j, m; \mathbf{r}) + c_{\text{out}}^\dagger(k_-, j, -m) e^{ik_- t} (-1)^{m-} u^{(1)}(-k_-, j, m; \mathbf{r}), \end{pmatrix} \quad (27)$$

where a_{out} and c_{out}^\dagger can be written by a_{in} and c_{in}^\dagger by matching the interior and exterior solutions. Using the superposition principle, we can write

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_{\text{out}}(k_+, j, m) \\ (-1)^{m-} c_{\text{out}}^\dagger(k_-, j, -m) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} R_\chi(k_+, j) & T_\chi(k_+, j) \\ T_\eta(k_-, j) & R_\eta(k_-, j) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_{\text{in}}(k_+, j, m) \\ (-1)^{m-} c_{\text{in}}^\dagger(k_-, j, -m) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (28)$$

where R_i and T_i are coefficients fixed later by matching the interior and exterior solutions and do not depend on m due to rotational invariance. We can regard this as the Bogoliubov transformation between $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$. The anticommutation relations $\{a_{\text{in}}, a_{\text{in}}^\dagger\} = \{a_{\text{out}}, a_{\text{out}}^\dagger\} = \{c_{\text{in}}, c_{\text{in}}^\dagger\} = \{c_{\text{out}}, c_{\text{out}}^\dagger\}$ imply that this translation matrix is a unitary matrix. Especially, we have

$$\begin{cases} |T_\chi(k_+, j)|^2 = |T_\eta(k_-, j)|^2, \\ |R_i(k_+, j)|^2 + |T_i(k_-, j)|^2 = 1, \end{cases} \quad (i = \chi, \eta). \quad (29)$$

We define the vacuum, $|0_{\text{in}}\rangle$, as $a_{\text{in}}|0_{\text{in}}\rangle = c_{\text{in}}|0_{\text{in}}\rangle = 0$ at $r \rightarrow \infty$, where the incoming waves are not affected by the Q ball. The incoming waves are scattered by the Q ball and this scattering process is described by the Heisenberg equation of motion. Then, we get Eq. (28) and the number density of the outgoing χ waves is

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 0_{\text{in}} | a_{\text{out}}^\dagger(k_+, j, m) a_{\text{out}}(k'_+, j', m') | 0_{\text{in}} \rangle &= (-1)^{m-+m'} T_\chi^*(k_+, j) T_\chi(k'_+, j') \langle 0_{\text{in}} | c_{\text{in}}(k_-, j, -m) c_{\text{in}}^\dagger(k'_-, j', -m') | 0_{\text{in}} \rangle, \\ &= |T_\chi(k_+)|^2 \delta(k_+ - k'_+) \delta_{j, j'} \delta_{m, m'}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

This proves that the outgoing χ waves are created by the presence of the Q ball background field. Similarly, the outgoing η waves are also created. The above unitarity condition, $|T_\chi(k_+, j)|^2 = |T_\eta(k_-, j)|^2$, of Eq. (29) implies that the process can be represented by $\phi_{BG}(E = \omega_0) \rightarrow \chi(E = k_+) + \eta(E = k_- \equiv \omega_0 - k_+)$, where ϕ_{BG} is the Q ball background field, and E is the energy of each field. The second condition, $|R_\chi(k_+, j)|^2 + |T_\chi(k_-, j)|^2 = 1$, of Eq. (29) implies that the production rate is bounded above due to the Pauli exclusion principle. Summing over the states and using $\delta(0) = T/2\pi$, we obtain the following production rates of the fields from the Q ball:

$$\frac{d}{dt} N_i = \sum_{j=1/2} \int_0^{\omega_0} \frac{dk}{2\pi} (2j+1) |T_i(k, j)|^2, \quad (i = \chi, \eta). \quad (31)$$

Finally, we need to determine the coefficients T_i by matching the interior and exterior solutions. Inside the Q ball, the Heisenberg equations of motion are given by Eq. (44). With use of Eq. (26), the equations are rewritten as

$$\begin{cases} (k_+ - i\sigma \cdot \nabla) \chi - g\phi(r)\eta^\dagger = 0, \\ (-k_- + i\sigma \cdot \nabla) \eta^\dagger - g\phi(r)\chi = 0, \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

The conservation of the angular momentum implies that the solutions can be expanded as [18]

$$\begin{cases} \chi = f_\chi(r) \Phi(j, m, l') + ig_\chi(r) \Phi(j, m, l), \\ \eta^\dagger = f_\eta(r) \Phi(j, m, l') + ig_\eta(r) \Phi(j, m, l). \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

Then, using

$$\sigma \cdot \nabla \Phi(j, m, j \pm 1/2) = \Phi(j, m, j \mp 1/2) \times \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{1 \pm (j + 1/2)}{r} \right), \quad (34)$$

we obtain the four first order differential equations. Since the solutions have to be nonsingular at $r = 0$, the boundary conditions are $f'_i(r = 0) = g'_i(r = 0) = 0$ for $i = \chi$ and η . We can get two independent solutions numerically for the given scalar field configuration $\phi(r)$. Then, matching the interior and exterior solutions and using Eqs. (27) and (28), we obtain the coefficients T_i . The matching condition is simply setting the solutions equal to each other at sufficiently large r where $\phi(r) \simeq 0$ is satisfied.

A. Q ball decay rate for $R\omega_0 \rightarrow \infty$ in the Yukawa theory

Using the above technique and the large radius limit ($R\omega_0 \rightarrow \infty$), Cohen *et al.* derived the Q ball decay rate for the Yukawa interaction [13]. The scalar field configuration was taken to be the step function as

$$\phi(r) = \phi_0 \theta(R - r) \equiv \begin{cases} \phi_0, & 0 < r \leq R, \\ 0, & R < r. \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

In the limit of $g\phi_0/\omega_0 \gg 1$, the production rates are saturated by the Pauli exclusion principle and written as

$$\frac{d}{dt}N_i = \left(\frac{dN}{dt}\right)_{\text{sat}} \equiv \frac{\omega_0^3 R^2}{24\pi}, \quad \text{for } \frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0} \gg 1, \quad (36)$$

where $i = \chi, \eta$. On the other hand, in the limit of $g\phi_0/\omega_0 \ll 1$, they showed that the production rates are

$$\frac{d}{dt}N_i \simeq 3\pi \left(\frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0}\right) \times \left(\frac{dN}{dt}\right)_{\text{sat}}, \quad \text{for } \frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0} \ll 1, R\omega_0 \rightarrow \infty. \quad (37)$$

We can see the physical meaning of this behavior in the following way. The penetration length of incoming waves inside the Q ball is $\sim 1/(g\phi_0)$ [13], so the effective volume of the interaction near the surface of the Q ball is $V_{\text{eff}} \sim 4\pi R^2/(g\phi_0)$. Then, the Q ball decay rate, which is roughly the decay rate of the scalar field ($\sim g^2\omega_0$) times the charge density times the effective volume, is $\sim (g^2\omega_0) \times (\omega_0\phi_0^2) \times V_{\text{eff}}$.

B. Q ball decay rate for $R\omega_0 \sim 1$ in the Yukawa theory

In the realistic models of the previous section, the radius of the Q ball R is $\sim 1/\omega_0$, and the effective volume of interaction become the whole region of the Q ball, $V_{\text{eff}} \sim 4\pi R^3/3$ [14]. The parameter dependences of the Q ball decay rate are, therefore, quite different from the previous subsection. We derive a fitting formula for the decay rate in the limit of $g\phi_0/\omega_0 \ll 1$ and $R\omega_0 \sim 1$. The decay rate are shown in Figs. 2 and 3 as a function of R and $g\phi_0/\omega_0$, respectively, and can be fitted as

$$\left(\frac{dN_i}{dt}\right)_{\text{step function}} \simeq 12 \left(\frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0}\right)^2 (R\omega_0 - 1.9) \times \left(\frac{dN}{dt}\right)_{\text{sat}}, \quad \text{for } \frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0} \ll 1, R\omega_0 \gtrsim 2, \quad (38)$$

for the step-function type of scalar field configuration.




FIG. 2: Production rate from the step-function type of Q ball as a function of $R\omega_0$ with $g\phi_0/\omega_0 = 0.01$ in the Yukawa theory. The vertical axis is normalized by the saturated rate of Eq. (36). This result can be fitted as $(dN_i/dt) \simeq 1.2 \times 10^{-3} (R\omega_0 - 1.9) \times (dN/dt)_{\text{sat}}$ for $R\omega_0 \gtrsim 2$. The production rates of $i = \chi$ and η are the same.

We numerically calculate the fermion production rates for not only the step-function type of Q ball configuration but also the two types of Q ball configuration introduced in Sec. II; the numerical configuration shown in Fig. 1 for the GMSB model and $\phi(r) = \phi_0 e^{-r^2/2R^2}$ for the gravity mediated SUSY breaking model. The results are shown in Fig. 3 as a function of $g\phi_0/\omega_0$ with $R\omega_0 = \pi$. We can explain the differences among the production rates for the each type of scalar field configuration. In the limit of $g\phi_0/\omega_0 \ll 1$, Q ball charges should be taken into consideration because Q ball decay can be regarded as a collection of decay of the scalar field. Since the charge density is given by $2\omega_0\phi_0^2$ at the center of the Q ball, the Q ball charge is roughly estimated as $(8\pi/3)R^3\omega_0\phi_0^2$. However, for the realistic

configuration of the Q ball, this estimation is not a good approximation. The ratio of the actual total charge Q to the rough estimation is

$$\frac{3Q}{8\pi\omega_0 R^3 \phi_0^2} \simeq \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for step function,} \\ \frac{3}{2\pi^2}, & \text{for gauge mediation,} \\ \frac{3\sqrt{\pi}}{4}, & \text{for gravity mediation,} \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

for $R\omega_0 = \pi$. Thus, we can approximate the production rates for each type of configuration as

$$\frac{d}{dt}N_i \simeq \begin{cases} \frac{3}{2\pi^2} \times \left(\frac{dN_i}{dt}\right)_{\text{step function}}, & \text{for gauge mediation,} \\ \frac{3\sqrt{\pi}}{4} \times \left(\frac{dN_i}{dt}\right)_{\text{step function}}, & \text{for gravity mediation,} \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

for $g\phi_0/\omega_0 \ll 1$ and $R\omega_0 = \pi$. On the other hand, for $g\phi_0/\omega_0 \gg 1$, the Q ball decay rates are saturated by the Pauli exclusion principle. Since the penetration length of incoming waves inside the Q ball is $\sim 1/(g\phi)$, the Q ball decay rates depend on R' , where R' is determined by $g\phi(R')/\omega_0 \sim 1$. Thus, from Fig. 1, the decay rate for the gauge-mediation type of Q ball becomes the same as that for the step-function type of Q ball in the limit of $g\phi_0/\omega_0 \gg 1$. Since the gravity-mediation type of configuration is $\phi(r) = \phi_0 e^{-r^2/2R^2}$, the effective radius logarithmically increases as $R' \simeq R(2\log(g\phi_0/\omega_0))^{1/2}$ and the decay rate for that of Q ball also increases as $(dN/dt)_{\text{sat}}|_{R \rightarrow R'} \simeq 2\log(g\phi_0/\omega_0) \times (dN/dt)_{\text{sat}}$ in the limit of $g\phi_0/\omega_0 \gg 1$. These considerations explain the decay rate of Fig. 3. The agreement on the decay rate with the step-function type of Q ball is very good for the gauge-mediation type of one. On the other hand, the agreement is not so good for the gravity-mediation type of Q ball. This disagreement comes from the fact that the step-function type and gauge-mediation type of Q ball are thin wall configurations, but the gravity-mediation type of one is a thick wall configuration. We conclude that the decay rate for the gauge-mediation type of Q ball can be approximated as

$$\left(\frac{dN_i}{dt}\right)_{\text{gauge mediation}} \simeq \begin{cases} \frac{3}{2\pi^2} \times \left(\frac{dN_i}{dt}\right)_{\text{step function}}, & \text{for } \frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0} \ll 1, \\ \left(\frac{dN}{dt}\right)_{\text{sat}}, & \text{for } \frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0} \gg 1, \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

where $(dN/dt)_{\text{sat}}$ is given by Eq. (36), and $(dN_i/dt)_{\text{step function}}$ can be fitted as Eq. (38). The decay rate for the gravity-mediation type of Q ball can be fitted as

$$\left(\frac{dN_i}{dt}\right)_{\text{gravity mediation}} \simeq \begin{cases} 3 \times \left(\frac{dN_i}{dt}\right)_{\text{step function}}, & \text{for } \frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0} \ll 1, \\ \left(5.9 + 1.75 \log\left(\frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0}\right) - 0.02 \left[\log\left(\frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0}\right)\right]^2\right) \times \left(\frac{dN}{dt}\right)_{\text{sat}}, & \text{for } \frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0} \gg 1, \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

for $R\omega_0 = \pi$ from our numerical calculation.

IV. Q BALL DECAY RATE INTO GOLDSTINOS

We apply the method reviewed in the previous section to derive the goldstino production rate. When global SUSY is spontaneously broken, there is a goldstino and its interaction with a chiral multiplet at low energy is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} = -\frac{1}{\langle F \rangle} (\eta \partial_\mu ((\sigma^\nu \bar{\sigma}^\mu \chi) \partial_\nu \phi^*) + \partial_\mu (\partial_\nu \phi \chi^\dagger \bar{\sigma}^\mu \sigma^\nu) \eta^\dagger), \quad (43)$$

where $\langle F \rangle$ is the SUSY breaking F term, and $\sigma^\mu = (\mathbf{1}, \sigma^i)$. Here, η , χ and ϕ are the goldstino, the chiral fermion and its superpartner, respectively. We assign the global $U(1)$ charge for ϕ , χ and η such as 1, 1 and 0, respectively, and treat the scalar field as the background field $\phi = \phi(r)e^{-i\omega_0 t}$.




FIG. 3: Production rates from Q ball as a function of $g\phi_0/\omega_0$ with $R\omega_0 = \pi$ in the Yukawa theory. The types of scalar field configurations are taken to be the step-function type (red line), the gauge-mediation type (green dashed line) and the gravity-mediation type (blue dotted line). The vertical axis is normalized by the saturated rate of Eq. (36) with $R\omega_0 = \pi$. The ratio of the step-function type of Q ball to the gauge-mediation rate of one to the gravity-mediation type of one on the production rate is 1 to 1/7 to 3 for $g\phi_0/\omega_0 \ll 1$. The production rate for the gravity-mediation type of Q ball can be approximated as $(dN_i/dt) \simeq (5.9 + 1.75 \log(g\phi_0/\omega_0) - 0.02(\log(g\phi_0/\omega_0))^2) \times (dN/dt)_{\text{sat}}$ for $g\phi_0/\omega_0 \gg 1$. The production rates of $i = \chi$ and η are the same.

The analysis is the same with the previous section once we replace the Heisenberg equations of motion of Eq. (25) with

$$\begin{cases} i\bar{\sigma}^\mu \partial_\mu \chi - \frac{2}{\langle F \rangle} \partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \eta^\dagger - \frac{1}{\langle F \rangle} \partial_\nu \phi \bar{\sigma}^\nu \sigma^\mu \partial_\mu \eta^\dagger = 0, \\ i\sigma^\mu \partial_\mu \eta^\dagger + \frac{1}{\langle F \rangle} (\partial^2 \phi^*) \chi - \frac{1}{\langle F \rangle} (\sigma^\nu \bar{\sigma}^\mu \partial_\mu \chi) \partial_\nu \phi^* = 0. \end{cases} \quad (44)$$

With use of Eq. (26), this equations are rewritten as

$$\begin{cases} (k_+ - i\sigma \cdot \nabla) \chi \\ + \frac{1}{\langle F \rangle} (\omega_0 \phi k_- - 2\phi' \partial_r + \omega_0 \phi (i\sigma \cdot \nabla) + \phi' k_- (i\hat{\sigma}_r) - \phi' (i\hat{\sigma}_r) (i\sigma \cdot \nabla)) \eta^\dagger = 0, \\ (-k_- + i\sigma \cdot \nabla) \eta^\dagger \\ + \frac{1}{\langle F \rangle} \left(\omega_0^2 \phi + \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r^2 \phi') - \omega_0 \phi k_+ + \omega_0 \phi (i\sigma \cdot \nabla) + k_+ \phi' (i\hat{\sigma}_r) - \phi' (i\hat{\sigma}_r) (i\sigma \cdot \nabla) \right) \chi = 0, \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_r \equiv \sigma \cdot \mathbf{r}/r$ and $\phi' \equiv \partial\phi(r)/\partial r$. These equations correspond to Eq. (32) in the previous section. We need the following relation, in addition to Eq. (34), to simplify the equations:

$$\hat{\sigma}_r \Phi(j, m, j \pm 1/2) = \Phi(j, m, j \mp 1/2). \quad (46)$$

In this section, we use the two types of the Q ball configuration $\phi(r)$ introduced in Sec. II; the numerical configuration shown in Fig. 1 for the GMSB model and $\phi(r) = \phi_0 e^{-r^2/2R^2}$ for the gravity mediated SUSY breaking model.

A. Goldstino production rate from the Q ball in gauge mediation

In the GMSB model, the scalar field configuration is taken as the numerical configuration shown in Fig. 1. We show an example of the energy spectrum of outgoing χ waves in Fig. 4. Using $|T_\chi(k_-, j)|^2 = |T_\eta(k_+, j)|^2$ of Eq. (29), along with $k_- \equiv \omega_0 - k_+$, we can also see the η production rate from this figure. The energy dependence of the production rate is slightly asymmetric by the replacement of $k_+ \rightarrow \omega_0 - k_+$, so either χ or η gets more energy from Q ball than the other.




FIG. 4: Energy spectrums of the outgoing χ waves $|T_\chi(k_+, j)|^2$ for $\phi_0\omega_0/\langle F \rangle = 1$ (red line) and $\phi_0\omega_0/\langle F \rangle = 10$ (green dashed line) with $j = 1/2$ in the GMSB.




FIG. 5: Production rate from the gauge-mediation type of Q ball interacting with the goldstino as a function of $\phi_0\omega_0/\langle F \rangle$. The vertical axis is normalized by the saturated rate of Eq. (36) with $R\omega_0 = \pi$. The production rates of $i = \chi$ and η are the same.

The production rate is shown in Fig. 5 as a function of $\phi_0\omega_0/\langle F \rangle$ and it can be written as

$$\frac{d}{dt}N_i \simeq \begin{cases} 0.9 \left(\frac{\phi_0\omega_0}{\langle F \rangle} \right)^2 \times \left(\frac{dN}{dt} \right)_{\text{sat}}, & \text{for } \frac{\phi_0\omega_0}{\langle F \rangle} \ll 1, \\ 0.74 \times \left(\frac{dN}{dt} \right)_{\text{sat}}, & \text{for } \frac{\phi_0\omega_0}{\langle F \rangle} \gg 1, \end{cases} \quad (i = \chi, \eta), \quad (47)$$

where $(dN/dt)_{\text{sat}}$ is given by Eq. (36). We can also get this behavior using Eqs. (38) and (41) if we naively estimate derivatives in the interaction term as $\partial/\partial r \sim 1/R$ and $\partial/\partial t \sim \omega_0$ and use $R\omega_0 \simeq \pi$.

B. Goldstino production rate from the Q ball in gravity mediation

In the gravity-mediated SUSY breaking model, the scalar field configuration is taken as $\phi(r) = \phi_0 \exp(-r^2/2R^2)$, where $R = |K|^{-1/2}\omega_0^{-1}$. We show an example of the energy spectrum of outgoing χ waves in Fig. 6. The production

rate is saturated for $k_+ \sim \omega_0/2$ by the Pauli exclusion principle. Using $|T_\chi(k_-, j)|^2 = |T_\eta(k_+, j)|^2$ of Eq. (29), along with $k_- \equiv \omega_0 - k_+$, we can also see the η production rate from this figure.




FIG. 6: Energy spectrums of the outgoing χ waves $|T_\chi(k_+, j)|^2$ for $\phi\omega_0/\langle F \rangle = 1$ (red line) and $\phi\omega_0/\langle F \rangle = 10$ (green dashed line) with $j = 1/2$ and $R\omega_0 = 1/\sqrt{0.1}$ in the gravity-mediated SUSY breaking.




FIG. 7: Production rate from the gravity-mediation type of Q ball interacting with the goldstino as a function of $\phi_0\omega_0/\langle F \rangle$ for $R\omega_0 = 1/\sqrt{0.2}$ (red line) and $R\omega_0 = 1/\sqrt{0.1}$ (green dashed line). The vertical axis is normalized by the saturated rate of Eq. (36). This result can be fitted as $(dN_i/dt) \simeq (6.3 + 1.6 \log(\phi_0\omega_0/\langle F \rangle) - 0.04(\log(\phi_0\omega_0/\langle F \rangle))^2) \times (dN/dt)_{\text{sat}}$ for $R\omega_0 = 1/\sqrt{0.1}$. The production rates of $i = \chi$ and η are the same.

The production rates are shown in Figs. 7 and 8 as a function of $\phi_0\omega_0/\langle F \rangle$ and $R\omega_0$, respectively, and they can be written as

$$\frac{d}{dt}N_i \simeq \begin{cases} 19(R\omega_0 - 1.3) \left(\frac{\phi_0\omega_0}{\langle F \rangle}\right)^2 \times \left(\frac{dN}{dt}\right)_{\text{sat}}, & \text{for } \frac{\phi_0\omega_0}{\langle F \rangle} \ll 1, \\ \left(6.3 + 1.6 \log\left(\frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0}\right) - 0.04 \left[\log\left(\frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0}\right)\right]^2\right) \times \left(\frac{dN}{dt}\right)_{\text{sat}}, & \text{for } \frac{\phi_0\omega_0}{\langle F \rangle} \gg 1, R\omega_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{10}}, \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

We can also get this behavior using Eqs. (38) and (42) if we naively estimate derivatives in the interaction term as $\partial/\partial r \sim 1/R$ and $\partial/\partial t \sim \omega_0$ and use $\omega_0 \gtrsim 1/R$.




FIG. 8: Production rate from the gravity-mediation type of Q ball interacting with the goldstino as a function of $R\omega_0$ with $\phi_0\omega_0/\langle F \rangle = 0.01$. The vertical axis is normalized by the saturated rate of Eq. (36). This result can be fitted as $(dN_i/dt) \simeq 1.9 \times 10^{-3}(R\omega_0 - 1.3) \times (dN/dt)_{\text{sat}}$. The production rates of $i = \chi$ and η are the same.

V. Q BALL DECAY WITH A MASSIVE FERMION

In this section, we consider the Yukawa interaction with a massive fermion. We are interested in this case because squarks interact with quarks and gluinos which have large masses we can not ignore [8]. The Lagrangian density is written as

$$\mathcal{L} = \chi^\dagger i\bar{\sigma}^\mu \partial_\mu \chi + \eta^\dagger i\bar{\sigma}^\mu \partial_\mu \eta - g\phi^* \chi \eta - g\phi \chi^\dagger \eta^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}M\eta\eta - \frac{1}{2}M\eta^\dagger\eta^\dagger. \quad (49)$$

We assign the global $U(1)$ charge for ϕ , χ and η such as 1, 1 and 0, respectively. The background field is $\phi = \phi(r)e^{-i\omega_0 t}$. In this section, we take the following background field configuration for simplicity:

$$\phi(r) = \phi_0 \theta(R - r) \equiv \begin{cases} \phi_0, & 0 < r \leq R, \\ 0, & R < r. \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

Inside the Q ball, the Heisenberg equations of motion are

$$\begin{cases} i\bar{\sigma}^\mu \partial_\mu \chi - g\phi\eta^\dagger = 0, \\ i\sigma^\mu \partial_\mu \eta^\dagger - g\phi^* \chi - M\eta = 0, \\ i\sigma^\mu \partial_\mu \chi^\dagger - g\phi^* \eta = 0, \\ i\bar{\sigma}^\mu \partial_\mu \eta - g\phi\chi^\dagger - M\eta^\dagger = 0. \end{cases} \quad (51)$$

We want to obtain solutions of these equations by the mode and the angular momentum expansion. The symmetry of the simultaneous time translations and $U(1)$ rotations allows us to expand the solution as

$$\begin{cases} \chi \propto e^{-i\omega t} \equiv e^{-ik_+ t}, \\ \chi^\dagger \propto e^{-i(\omega-2\omega_0)t} \equiv e^{ik_- t}, \\ \eta \propto e^{-i(\omega-\omega_0)t} \equiv e^{-ik_\eta t}, \\ \eta^\dagger \propto e^{-i(\omega-\omega_0)t} \equiv e^{-ik_\eta t}, \end{cases} \quad (52)$$

where we include χ^\dagger and η as well as χ and η^\dagger because they mix with each other through the mass term (see Eq. (51)). We derive the fermion production rate through the Bogoliubov transformation between creation and annihilation operators at $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$. Thus, we restrict our attention to $0 < \omega < 2\omega_0$.

Now, the solutions inside the Q ball can be written by the spinor solutions in the following form:

$$\begin{cases} \chi = Ae^{-ik_+t}u(k, j, m; \mathbf{r}), \\ \chi^\dagger = Be^{ik_-t}u(k, j, m; \mathbf{r}), \\ \eta = Ce^{-ik_\eta t}u(k, j, m; \mathbf{r}), \\ \eta^\dagger = De^{-ik_\eta t}u(k, j, m; \mathbf{r}), \end{cases} \quad (53)$$

where A, B, C, D and k are some constants fixed by solving Eq. (51) up to an overall normalization. When we substitute these into Eq. (51), we find

$$\begin{cases} (k_+ + k)A - g\phi D = 0, \\ (k_\eta - k)D - g\phi A - MC = 0, \\ (-k_- - k)B - g\phi C = 0, \\ (k_\eta + k)C - g\phi B - MD = 0. \end{cases} \quad (54)$$

When we eliminate A, B, C and D from these equations, we find that k obeys

$$((k + k_+)(k - k_\eta) + g^2\phi_0^2)((k + k_-)(k + k_\eta) + g^2\phi_0^2) + M^2(k + k_+)(k + k_-) = 0. \quad (55)$$

Thus, recalling that k_+, k_- and k_η are fixed in Eq. (52), we obtain four independent solutions inside the Q ball. After matching the interior and exterior solutions at $r = R$, we can write annihilation and creation operators of outgoing waves in terms of annihilation and creation operators of incoming waves in the same way as the previous section.

As mentioned above, we are interested in the case that the scalar field interacts with heavy gluinos. Typically, ω_0 is GeV range in the GMSB, and the mass of gluino is TeV range, so $M \gg \omega_0$. Fortunately, in the case of $M > \omega_0$, we can calculate the fermion production rate very easily. However, we also present the calculation in the case of $M < \omega_0$.

A. Case of $M > \omega_0$

In the case of $M > \omega_0$, coefficients T and R of η are irrelevant since η has no degree of freedom outside the Q ball, and the boundary condition is $\eta \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. So, we need to get the coefficients of only χ and χ^\dagger , and the analysis is almost equivalent to the previous section. In this case, however, χ and χ^\dagger are related to each other by hermitian conjugation. Thus, the Bogoliubov transformation can be written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_\chi(k_+, j, m) \\ (-1)^{m-} a_\chi^\dagger(k_-, j, -m) \end{pmatrix}_{\text{out}} = \begin{pmatrix} R_\chi^0(k_+, j) & T_\chi^0(k_+, j) \\ -T_\chi^{0*}(k_-, j) & R_\chi^{0*}(k_-, j) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_\chi(k_+, j, m) \\ (-1)^{m-} a_\chi^\dagger(k_-, j, -m) \end{pmatrix}_{\text{in}}, \quad (56)$$

where R_χ^0 and T_χ^0 are coefficients fixed by matching the interior and exterior solutions with the boundary condition $\eta \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$, and we write the coefficients in order to maintain consistency with hermitian conjugation.

We can calculate the χ production rate in the same way as the previous section once we replace ω_0 with $2\omega_0$ in Eq. (31). The production rate is shown in Fig. 9 as a function of $g\phi_0/\omega_0$, and it can be written as

$$\frac{d}{dt}N_\chi \simeq \begin{cases} 13 \left(\frac{\omega_0}{M}\right)^2 \left(\frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0}\right)^4 \times \left[\left(\frac{dN}{dt}\right)_{\text{sat}} \Big|_{\omega_0 \rightarrow 2\omega_0} \right], & \text{for } \left(\frac{\omega_0}{M}\right) \left(\frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0}\right)^2 \ll 1, R\omega_0 = \pi, \\ 1.1 \times \left[\left(\frac{dN}{dt}\right)_{\text{sat}} \Big|_{\omega_0 \rightarrow 2\omega_0} \right], & \text{for } \left(\frac{\omega_0}{M}\right) \left(\frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0}\right)^2 \gg 1, R\omega_0 = \pi, \end{cases} \quad (57)$$

where we replace ω_0 with $2\omega_0$ in the saturated production rate of Eq. (36) because the energy spectrum of χ is now in the interval $(0, 2\omega_0)$. We can understand the above behavior of the production rate by integrating out the heavy particle. Because the effective interaction after integrating out the heavy particle has the form of the Yukawa interaction as $(g^2\phi_0^2/M)(\chi\chi/2)$, the production rate is $12(\pi - 1.9)(g^2\phi_0^2/M\omega_0)^2 \times (dN/dt)_{\text{sat}}$ from Eq. (38) and $R\omega_0 = \pi$. Thus, we conclude that the production rate calculated in the effective theory is consistent with our numerical result of Eq. (57) if we replace ω_0 with $2\omega_0$ in the saturated production rate.

We can explain the above behavior of the production rate in another way. Recall Eq. (38) which is derived in the massless case can be interpreted as the decay rate Γ_ϕ times the charge density times the effective volume, i.e. $\Gamma_\phi \times (\omega_0\phi_0^2) \times V_{\text{eff}}$. On the other hand, because the reaction we consider here is two particle scattering process $\phi\phi \rightarrow qq$, the Q ball decay rate should be estimated as (flux) \times (cross section) $\times \omega_0\phi_0^2 \times V_{\text{eff}}$. The flux is the number density $\omega_0\phi_0^2$ times the relative velocity and the cross section can be estimated as g^4/M^2 from Fig. 10. Then if we assume the relative velocity as $O(1)$ we can get the same parameter dependences with the first line of Eq. (57).




FIG. 9: Production rates of χ from Q balls as a function of $g\phi_0/\omega_0$ for $M/\omega_0 = 2^4, 2^5$ and 2^6 with $R\omega_0 = \pi$ in the Yukawa theory with a massive fermion. The vertical axis is normalized by the saturated rate of Eq. (36).




FIG. 10: Diagram for $\phi\phi \rightarrow \chi\chi$.

B. Case of $M < \omega_0$

In the case of $M < \omega_0$, η can propagate outside the Q ball and its coefficients are also important. Outside the Q ball, the fields obey the free equations of motion. The free field expansion of the field χ is the same as the previous section, but the expansion of the field η is complicated by the presence of the mass term. The modes of $\eta \propto e^{-ik_\eta t}$ and $\eta^\dagger \propto e^{-ik_\eta t}$ mix with each other by the equations of motion as

$$\begin{cases} -i\sigma \cdot \nabla \eta = -k_\eta \eta + M\eta^\dagger, \\ -i\sigma \cdot \nabla \eta^\dagger = k_\eta \eta^\dagger - M\eta. \end{cases} \quad (58)$$

We define the following linear combinations to make η_1 and η_2 independent from each other:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{M}{A} & \frac{k_\eta + p}{A} \\ -\frac{k_\eta + p}{A} & \frac{M}{A} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \eta \\ \eta^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \quad (59)$$

where $p \equiv \sqrt{k_\eta^2 - M^2}$ and $A \equiv A(k_\eta) \equiv \sqrt{((k_\eta + p)^2 + M^2)} p/k_\eta = \sqrt{(k_\eta + p)^2 - M^2}$. Then, with use of Eq. (22), the solutions are

$$\begin{cases} \eta_1 = c_{\eta_1, \text{in}} u^{(2)}(p, j, m, ; \mathbf{r}) e^{-ik_\eta t} + c_{\eta_1, \text{out}} u^{(1)}(p, j, m, ; \mathbf{r}) e^{-ik_\eta t}, \\ \eta_2 = c_{\eta_2, \text{in}} u^{(1)}(-p, j, m, ; \mathbf{r}) e^{-ik_\eta t} + c_{\eta_2, \text{out}} u^{(2)}(-p, j, m, ; \mathbf{r}) e^{-ik_\eta t}, \end{cases} \quad (60)$$

where c_{η_i} ($i=1, 2$) are arbitrary constants. When $|k_\eta| < M$, p is pure imaginary, and the solutions of η and η^\dagger damp outside the Q ball. This is because there is no degree of freedom for η at an energy scale below the mass of η . Thus,

we can write the mode expansion as

$$\begin{aligned} \eta = \sum_{j,m} \int_M^\infty dk_\eta \left(c_{\eta_{1\text{in}}}(k_\eta, j, m) e^{-ik_\eta t} \frac{M}{A(k_\eta)} u^{(2)}(p, j, m; \mathbf{r}) \right. \\ \left. + c_{\eta_{1\text{in}}}^\dagger(k_\eta, j, -m) e^{ik_\eta t} (-1)^{m+} \frac{k_\eta + p}{A(k_\eta)} u^{(1)}(p, j, m; \mathbf{r}) \right) \Big|_{p=\sqrt{k_\eta^2 - M^2}} \\ + (\text{terms of } c_{\eta_{2\text{in}}}) + (\text{terms of outgoing waves}). \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

When we quantize the field η , we impose the canonical anticommutation relations for η and η^\dagger . Then, the coefficients c_{η_1} and c_{η_2} become operators, and their anticommutation relations are given by $\{c_{\eta_i}^\dagger(k_\eta, j, m), c_{\eta_{i'}}(k'_\eta, j', m')\} = \delta(k_\eta - k'_\eta) \delta_{jj'} \delta_{mm'} \delta_{ii'}$, where we have used $A(k_\eta) = \sqrt{((k_\eta + p)^2 + M^2)} p/k_\eta$ and

$$\int_M^\infty dk_\eta \left[\frac{k_\eta}{p} u^{(i)\dagger}(p; \mathbf{r}) u^{(i)}(p; \mathbf{r}') + (p \rightarrow -p) \right]_{p=\sqrt{k_\eta^2 - M^2}} = \int_{-\infty}^\infty dp u^{(i)\dagger}(p; \mathbf{r}) u^{(i)}(p; \mathbf{r}'). \quad (62)$$

The operator $c_{\eta_i}(k_\eta, j, m)$ is the annihilation operator of the energy $E = k_\eta$, and its normalization is the same as a_χ . Next, we consider the whole system including the Q ball background. We expand the solution as Eq. (52). If $k_\eta > 0$ ($k_\eta < 0$), we take c_{η_1}, c_{η_2} ($c_{\eta_1}^\dagger, c_{\eta_2}^\dagger$) terms in Eq. (61). In the case of $|k_\eta| < M$, η has no degree of freedom outside the Q ball and the analysis is the same as the case of the previous subsection. Thus, the Bogoliubov transformation can be written as Eq. (56). On the other hand, in the case of $|k_\eta| > M$, there are also incoming and outgoing η waves, and so the coefficients of η as well as χ are important. The terms mixing with each other are

$$\begin{cases} a_{\chi_{\text{in}}}(k_+, j, m) e^{-ik_+ t} u^{(1)}(-k_+, j, m; \mathbf{r}) & + (\text{in} \rightarrow \text{out}, \quad u^{(1)} \rightarrow u^{(2)}), \\ a_{\chi_{\text{in}}}^\dagger(k_-, j, -m) e^{ik_- t} (-1)^{m-} u^{(2)}(-k_-, j, m; \mathbf{r}) & + (\text{in} \rightarrow \text{out}, \quad u^{(2)} \rightarrow u^{(1)}), \\ c_{\eta_{1\text{in}}}(k_\eta, j, m) e^{-ik_\eta t} u^{(2)}(p, j, m; \mathbf{r}) & + (\text{in} \rightarrow \text{out}, \quad u^{(2)} \rightarrow u^{(1)}), \\ c_{\eta_{2\text{in}}}(k_\eta, j, m) e^{-ik_\eta t} u^{(1)}(-p, j, m; \mathbf{r}) & + (\text{in} \rightarrow \text{out}, \quad u^{(1)} \rightarrow u^{(2)}), \end{cases} \quad (63)$$

for $k_\eta > M$. After solving the Heisenberg equation of motion and matching the interior and exterior solutions, the outgoing waves can be written by the incoming waves. Thus we write the Bogoliubov transformation for the case of $k_\eta > M$ as

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_{\chi_{\text{out}}}(k_+, m) \\ (-1)^{m-} a_{\chi_{\text{out}}}^\dagger(k_-, -m) \\ c_{\eta_{1\text{out}}}(k_\eta, m) \\ c_{\eta_{2\text{out}}}(k_\eta, m) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} R_{\chi\chi}(k_+) & T_{\chi^\dagger\chi}(k_+) & R_{\eta_1\chi}(k_+) & R_{\eta_2\chi}(k_+) \\ T_{\chi\chi^\dagger}(k_-) & R_{\chi^\dagger\chi^\dagger}(k_-) & T_{\eta_1\chi^\dagger}(k_-) & T_{\eta_2\chi^\dagger}(k_-) \\ R_{\chi\eta_1}(k_\eta) & T_{\chi^\dagger\eta_1}(k_\eta) & R_{\eta_1\eta_1}(k_\eta) & R_{\eta_2\eta_1}(k_\eta) \\ R_{\chi\eta_2}(k_\eta) & T_{\chi^\dagger\eta_2}(k_\eta) & R_{\eta_1\eta_2}(k_\eta) & R_{\eta_2\eta_2}(k_\eta) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_{\chi_{\text{in}}}(k_+, m) \\ (-1)^{m-} a_{\chi_{\text{in}}}^\dagger(k_-, -m) \\ c_{\eta_{1\text{in}}}(k_\eta, m) \\ c_{\eta_{2\text{in}}}(k_\eta, m) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (64)$$

where we omitted the argument j . The coefficients R_i and T_i are fixed by matching the interior and exterior solutions at $r = R$ and do not depend on m due to rotational invariance. The anticommutation relations imply that the matrix of the right hand side is a unitary matrix.

We can calculate the production rates as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} n_\chi(k_+, j, m) &\equiv \frac{2\pi}{T} \langle 0_{\text{in}} | a_{\chi_{\text{out}}}^\dagger(k_+, j, m) a_{\chi_{\text{out}}}(k_+, j, m) | 0_{\text{in}} \rangle, \\ &= \begin{cases} |T_{\chi^\dagger\chi}(k_+, j)|^2, & (M < k_\eta), \\ |T_\chi^0(k_+, j)|^2, & (|k_\eta| < M), \\ (|T_{\chi\chi^\dagger}(k_+, j)|^2 + |T_{\eta_1\chi^\dagger}(k_+, j)|^2 + |T_{\eta_2\chi^\dagger}(k_+, j)|^2), & (k_\eta < -M), \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

for the χ waves and as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} n_{\eta_i}(k_\eta, j, m) &\equiv \frac{2\pi}{T} \langle 0_{\text{in}} | c_{\eta_i, \text{out}}^\dagger(k_\eta, j, m) c_{\eta_i, \text{out}}(k_\eta, j, m) | 0_{\text{in}} \rangle, \\ &= \begin{cases} 0, & (k_\eta < M), \\ |T_{\chi^\dagger\eta_i}(k_\eta, j)|^2, & (M < k_\eta < \omega_0), \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

for the η waves. Due to the unitarity of the Bogoliubov transformation, we can see that the production rates satisfy the Pauli exclusion principle, $n_i \leq 1$ ($i = \chi, \eta_1, \eta_2$). Especially, from the second column and the second row of Eq. (64), we also have

$$|T_{\chi\chi^\dagger}(k_-, j)|^2 + |T_{\eta_1\chi^\dagger}(k_-, j)|^2 + |T_{\eta_2\chi^\dagger}(k_-, j)|^2 = |T_{\chi^\dagger\chi}(k_+, j)|^2 + |T_{\chi^\dagger\eta_1}(k_\eta, j)|^2 + |T_{\chi^\dagger\eta_2}(k_\eta, j)|^2, \quad (67)$$

for $M < k_\eta$. In other words, using $k_+ \equiv \omega$, $k_- \equiv 2\omega_0 - \omega$ and $k_\eta \equiv \omega - \omega_0$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}n_\chi(E = 2\omega_0 - \omega) = \frac{d}{dt}n_\chi(E = \omega) + \sum_{i=1,2} \frac{d}{dt}n_{\eta_i}(E = \omega - \omega_0), \quad (68)$$

where E denotes an energy of each particle and we omitted the argument j and m . From this, we can understand the processes of the Q ball decay as the superposition of

$$\begin{cases} \phi(E = \omega_0) + \phi(E = \omega_0) \rightarrow \chi(E = \omega) + \chi(E = 2\omega_0 - \omega), \\ \phi(E = \omega_0) \rightarrow \chi(E = \omega) + \eta_i(E = \omega_0 - \omega), \quad (i = 1, 2). \end{cases} \quad (69)$$




FIG. 11: Energy spectrums of the outgoing χ (red line), η_1 (blue dashed line) and η_2 (pink dotted line) waves with $g\phi_0/\omega_0 = 10$, $M/\omega_0 = 0.6$, $R\omega_0 = \pi$ and $j = 1/2$. The green dashed line shows $dn_\chi/dt(E) - \sum_i dn_{\eta_i}/dt(\omega_0 - E)$.

Fig. 11 shows an example of the energy spectrum of each field. In this figure, $dn_\chi/dt(E) - \sum_i dn_{\eta_i}/dt(\omega_0 - E)$ is symmetrical; that is, the production rates satisfy Eq. (68).

Figs. 12 and 13 show the production rates of each field as a function of M/ω_0 and $g\phi_0/\omega_0$, respectively. We plot the χ production rate minus the η production rate instead of the total χ production rate; in other words, we plot the contribution of only the first line of Eq. (69). From Figs. 9 and 12, we can see that the production rate is proportional to $g^4\phi_0^4/M^2\omega_0^2$ in the limit of $g\phi_0/\omega_0 \ll 1$ and $M/\omega_0 \gg 1$, and it can be written as Eq. (57). From Figs. 12 and 13, the production rates in the limit of $M/\omega_0 \ll 1$ and $g\phi_0/\omega_0 \gg 1$ can be read as

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}N_\chi \simeq 4 \left(\frac{M}{\omega_0}\right)^2 \times \left[\left(\frac{dN}{dt}\right)_{\text{sat}} \Big|_{\omega_0 \rightarrow 2\omega_0} \right], \\ \frac{d}{dt}N_{\eta_1} \simeq 3 \left(\frac{M}{\omega_0}\right)^2 \times \left(\frac{dN}{dt}\right)_{\text{sat}}, \\ \frac{d}{dt}N_{\eta_2} \simeq 1.4 \times \left(\frac{dN}{dt}\right)_{\text{sat}}, \end{cases} \quad \text{for } \frac{M}{\omega_0} \ll 1, \frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0} \gg 1, R\omega_0 = \pi. \quad (70)$$




FIG. 12: Production rates of χ , η_1 and η_2 from Q balls as a function of M/ω_0 for $g\phi_0/\omega_0 = 0.1$ (left panel) and for $g\phi_0/\omega_0 = 10$ (right panel) with $R\omega_0 = \pi$ in the Yukawa theory with a massive fermion. The vertical axis is normalized by the saturated rate of Eq. (36).




FIG. 13: Production rates of χ , η_1 and η_2 from Q balls as a function of $g\phi_0/\omega_0$ with $R\omega_0 = \pi$ and $M/\omega_0 = 0.01$ in the Yukawa theory with a massive fermion. The vertical axis is normalized by the saturated rate of Eq. (36).

From Figs. 12 and 13, the production rates in the limit of $M/\omega_0 \ll 1$ and $g\phi_0/\omega_0 \ll 1$ can be read as

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}N_\chi \simeq 31 \left(\frac{M}{\omega_0}\right)^2 \left(\frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0}\right)^4 \times \left[\left(\frac{dN}{dt}\right)_{\text{sat}} \Big|_{\omega_0 \rightarrow 2\omega_0} \right], \\ \frac{d}{dt}N_{\eta_1} \simeq 15 \left(\frac{M}{\omega_0}\right)^2 \left(\frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0}\right)^2 \times \left(\frac{dN}{dt}\right)_{\text{sat}}, \\ \frac{d}{dt}N_{\eta_2} \simeq 14 \left(\frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0}\right)^2 \times \left(\frac{dN}{dt}\right)_{\text{sat}}, \end{cases} \quad \text{for } \frac{M}{\omega_0} \ll 1, \frac{g\phi_0}{\omega_0} \ll 1, R\omega_0 = \pi. \quad (71)$$

We can understand the above behavior of the production rates in the following way. Using the Feynman rules in

Fig. 10, we have the effective interaction, which is a good approximation only in the limit of $g\phi_0/\omega_0 \ll 1$, as

$$\frac{1}{2}(g\phi_0)_\chi^{\text{eff}} \chi\chi \simeq \begin{cases} \left(\frac{g^2\phi_0^{*2}}{2M}\right) \chi\chi, & M/\omega_0 \gg 1, \\ \left(\frac{g^2\phi_0^{*2}M}{2\omega_0^2}\right) \chi\chi, & M/\omega_0 \ll 1. \end{cases} \quad (72)$$

Then, substituting this effective coupling $(g\phi_0)_\chi^{\text{eff}}$ into Eq. (38) gives $dN_\chi/dt \simeq 12(g^2\phi_0^2M/\omega_0^3)^2(R\omega_0 - 1.9) \times (dN/dt)_{\text{sat}}$ for $M/\omega_0 \ll 1$. This is consistent with our numerical result of dN_χ/dt in Eq. (71) if we replace $(dN/dt)_{\text{sat}}$ with $[(dN/dt)_{\text{sat}}|_{\omega_0 \rightarrow 2\omega_0}]$. We also consider the behavior of dN_{η_i}/dt . In the limit of $M/\omega_0 \ll 1$, Eq. (59) becomes

$$\begin{pmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \end{pmatrix} \sim \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{M}{2\omega_0} & 1 \\ -1 & \frac{M}{2\omega_0} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \eta \\ \eta^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \quad (73)$$

where we naively take k_η as the typical energy ω_0 . From this and Fig. 14, we have the effective interactions as

$$\begin{cases} ((g\phi_0)_{\eta_1}^{\text{eff}} \chi \eta_1) \sim \left[-M/2\omega_0 ((g\phi_0)_\eta^{\text{eff}} \chi \eta) + ((g\phi_0)_{\eta^\dagger}^{\text{eff}} \chi \eta^\dagger)\right] & \rightarrow (g\phi_0)_{\eta_1}^{\text{eff}} \sim M g \phi_0 / \omega_0, \\ ((g\phi_0)_{\eta_2}^{\text{eff}} \chi \eta_2) \sim -(g\phi_0)_\eta^{\text{eff}} \chi \eta & \rightarrow (g\phi_0)_{\eta_2}^{\text{eff}} \sim g \phi_0, \end{cases} \quad (74)$$

for $M/\omega_0 \ll 1$ and $g\phi_0/\omega_0 \ll 1$. Then, substituting these effective couplings $(g\phi_0)^{\text{eff}}$ into Eq. (38), we obtain $dN_{\eta_1}/dt \simeq 12(g\phi_0 M/\omega_0^2)^2(R\omega_0 - 1.9) \times (dN/dt)_{\text{sat}}$ and $dN_{\eta_2}/dt \simeq 12(g\phi_0/\omega_0)^2(R\omega_0 - 1.9) \times (dN/dt)_{\text{sat}}$. These are consistent with our numerical result of dN_{η_i}/dt in Eq. (71). Our results indicate that the effective theory gives us correct results even for the decay rate of the Q ball.




FIG. 14: Diagrams for $\phi \rightarrow \chi\eta$.

VI. APPLICATIONS

In the GMSB, Q balls can decay only into gravitinos and hadrons if the next LSP mass is larger than ω_0 . We apply our results in the previous sections to gravitino and quark production from Q balls in the GMSB and derive the branching ratio of the Q ball decay into them. If the gravitino mass is small compared to the typical interaction energy, the longitudinal components of the gravitino behaves like the massless goldstino. Since the typical interaction energy is $\omega_0 = O(\text{GeV}) \gg m_{3/2}$ in the GMSB, the effective interaction of Eq. (43) is a good approximation to calculate the gravitino production rate. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\phi_0\omega_0}{\langle F \rangle} &\simeq c \frac{m_s M_m}{g \langle F \rangle}, \\ &\simeq c \frac{g}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{\langle F_s \rangle}{\langle F \rangle}. \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

Here we have used Eq. (10) and $m_s M_m \simeq \alpha \langle F_s \rangle / 4\pi$, where $\alpha = g^2/4\pi$ is the fine structure constant, and $\langle F_s \rangle$ is a vacuum expectation value for the F component of a gauge-singlet chiral multiplet in the messenger sector. The SUSY

breaking scale $\langle F \rangle$ needs not be the same as the scale $\langle F_s \rangle$, i.e. $\langle F_s \rangle \leq \langle F \rangle$. From Eqs. (11) and (47), the gravitino production rate is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} N_{\text{gravitino}} &\simeq 0.9 \left(4.8 \log \frac{m_s}{\omega_0} + 7.4 \right)^2 \left(\frac{g}{(4\pi)^2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\langle F_s \rangle}{\langle F \rangle} \right)^2 \times \left(\frac{dN}{dt} \right)_{\text{sat}}, \\ &\simeq 0.7\alpha \left(\frac{\langle F_s \rangle}{\langle F \rangle} \right)^2 \times \left(\frac{dN}{dt} \right)_{\text{sat}}. \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

Here and hereafter we take $m_s/\omega_0 = 10^3$. There is also massive gluino. The Lagrangian density is written as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{gluino}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{kinetic}} - \sqrt{2}g\phi^* \lambda q - \frac{1}{2}M_g \lambda \lambda + h.c. \quad (77)$$

where λ and q are gluino and quark, respectively, and M_g is the gluino mass. Typically, $M_g = O(\text{TeV})$ and $\omega_0 = O(\text{GeV})$, so we can use Eq. (57). Using $m_s, M_m \gg \omega_0$ and $M_g \sim m_s$ in Eq. (10), we can see that $(\omega_0/M_g) (\sqrt{2}g\phi_0/\omega_0)^2 \sim m_s^2 M_m^2 / (M_g \omega_0^3) \gg 1$. Thus, the quark production rate is calculated from Eqs. (41) and (57) as

$$\frac{d}{dt} N_{\text{quark}} \simeq 1.1 \times \left[\left(\frac{dN}{dt} \right)_{\text{sat}} \Big|_{\omega_0 \rightarrow 2\omega_0} \right]. \quad (78)$$

We conclude that the main decay channel is the decay into quarks and is saturated, and the branching ratio of the decay into the gravitino is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} B_{3/2} &\simeq 0.1 \left(4.8 \log \frac{m_s}{\omega_0} + 7.4 \right)^2 \left(\frac{g}{(4\pi)^2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\langle F_s \rangle}{\langle F \rangle} \right)^2, \\ &\simeq 0.08\alpha \left(\frac{\langle F_s \rangle}{\langle F \rangle} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

This branching ratio can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} B_{3/2} &\simeq 0.1 \left(4.8 \log \frac{m_s}{\omega_0} + 7.4 \right)^2 \left(\frac{m_s M_m}{\sqrt{3} g m_{3/2} M_{\text{P}}} \right)^2, \\ &\simeq \frac{4}{\alpha} \left(\frac{m_s M_m}{m_{3/2} M_{\text{P}}} \right)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

where we use $m_s M_m \simeq g^2 \langle F_s \rangle / (4\pi)^2$ and $\langle F \rangle = \sqrt{3} m_{3/2} M_{\text{P}}$ ($M_{\text{P}} = 2.4 \times 10^{18} \text{GeV}$: the reduced Planck mass).

We compare the above branching ratio with the one estimated in Ref. [12]. The quark production rate was estimated from the effective coupling $g'_{\text{eff}} \simeq g^2 \phi_0 / \sqrt{2\pi} M_g \omega_0$ for the process squark + squark \rightarrow quark + quark via gluino exchange. Since we have $g'_{\text{eff}} \phi_0 / \omega_0 \gg 1$, the quark production rate is saturated. The gravitino production rate was estimated from the effective coupling $g_{\text{eff}} \simeq \omega_0^2 / \sqrt{2} \langle F \rangle$ because the elementary process squark \rightarrow quark + gravitino has the decay rate $\Gamma = m_\phi^5 / (16\pi \langle F \rangle^2)$. Thus, the branching ratio of the decay into the gravitino is estimated from Eq. (37) as [12]

$$B'_{3/2} \simeq 3\pi \frac{g_{\text{eff}} \phi_0}{\omega_0} \simeq 0.7\sqrt{\alpha} \left(\frac{\langle F_s \rangle}{\langle F \rangle} \right) \simeq \frac{5}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \frac{m_s M_m}{m_{3/2} M_{\text{P}}}. \quad (81)$$

However, Eq. (37) can not be applied to the case of $R\omega_0 \sim 1$, which is the case in the GMSB, and we should use Eqs. (38) and (41). In addition, we should use $(dN/dt)_{\text{sat}}|_{\omega_0 \rightarrow 2\omega_0}$ for the quark production rate because the produced quark energy is in the interval $(0, 2\omega_0)$. If we take into account these considerations and use g_{eff} , the branching ratio is estimated as

$$B''_{3/2} \simeq \frac{3}{2\pi^2} 12 \left(\frac{g_{\text{eff}} \phi_0}{\omega_0} \right)^2 (R_Q \omega_0 - 1.9) \times \frac{1}{8} \simeq 0.14 \frac{c^2 g^2}{(4\pi)^4} \left(\frac{\langle F_s \rangle}{\langle F \rangle} \right)^2 \simeq 0.12\alpha \left(\frac{\langle F_s \rangle}{\langle F \rangle} \right)^2, \quad (82)$$

where Eqs. (8) and (10) are used in the second equality. This result has the same parameter dependences with our numerical result of Eq. (79), and the numerical factor is also correct within the order of one. This shows that the naive use of the effective coupling is a good approximation even for the decay rate of the Q ball into gravitinos.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

We have calculated the fermion production rates from the step-function type, the gauge-mediation type and the gravity-mediation type of Q ball in the Yukawa theory. In the limit of $g\phi_0/\omega_0 \ll 1$, we have found that the decay rates can be obtained from the step-function type of Q ball with the correction factors coming from the relations between the total charge Q and the radius $R \simeq 1/\omega_0$. On the other hand, the decay rates in the limit of $g\phi_0/\omega_0 \gg 1$ are saturated and proportional to the square of the effective Q ball radius R' , where R' is determined by $g\phi(R')/\omega_0 \sim 1$.

We have also calculated the goldstino production rates from the gauge-mediation type and the gravity-mediation type of Q ball using the low energy interaction with the supercurrent. Our results can be explained by the production rate through the Yukawa interaction where the Yukawa coupling g is replaced by the effective coupling $g_{\text{eff}} \simeq \omega_0^2/\sqrt{2}\langle F \rangle$. This effective coupling comes from the fact that the elementary process squark \rightarrow quark + gravitino has the decay rate $\Gamma = m_\phi^5/(16\pi\langle F \rangle^2)$ or we can naively estimate derivatives in the interaction term as $\partial/\partial r \sim 1/R$ and $\partial/\partial t \sim \omega_0$.

We have also calculated the Q ball decay rates in the Yukawa theory with a massive fermion. Our results are consistent with the effective theory once we make the replacement $\omega_0 \rightarrow 2\omega_0$ in the saturated rate of the massless fermion, since the produced fermion energy is in the interval $(0, 2\omega_0)$. Especially, when $\omega_0 < M$, we can integrate out the heavy particle and use the effective coupling $(g\phi_0)^{\text{eff}} \simeq g^2\phi_0^2/2M$ in the Yukawa theory with the replacement $\omega_0 \rightarrow 2\omega_0$ in the saturated rate.

In the GMSB model, the branching ratio of the decay into the gravitino has been calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} B_{3/2} &\simeq 0.1 \left(4.8 \log \frac{m_s}{\omega_0} + 7.4 \right)^2 \left(\frac{g}{(4\pi)^2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\langle F_s \rangle}{\langle F \rangle} \right)^2, \\ &\simeq 0.08\alpha \left(\frac{\langle F_s \rangle}{\langle F \rangle} \right)^2, \\ &\simeq \frac{4}{\alpha} \left(\frac{m_s M_m}{m_{3/2} M_{\text{P}}} \right)^2, \end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

for $m_s/\omega_0 = 10^3$. This branching ratio is much less than the one estimated in Ref. [12]. The main reason is that Ref. [12] used the production rate for the limit of $R\omega_0 \rightarrow \infty$ which is not valid in the GMSB. Another reason is that we should take into account the Q ball configuration which is different from a step function. Therefore, the gravitino dark matter from the Q balls in the GMSB should be reconsider using the correct decay rates obtained in the present paper, which will be presented elsewhere [19].

Acknowledgment

We thank Shinta Kasuya for useful discussions. This work is supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific research from the Ministry of Education, Science, Sports, and Culture (MEXT), Japan, No. 14102004 (M.K.), No. 21111006 (M.K.) and also by World Premier International Research Center Initiative (WPI Initiative), MEXT, Japan.

-
- [1] I. Affleck and M. Dine, Nucl. Phys. B **249**, 361 (1985).
 - [2] M. Dine, L. Randall and S. D. Thomas, Nucl. Phys. B **458**, 291 (1996).
 - [3] A. Kusenko and M. E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **418**, 46 (1998).
 - [4] K. Enqvist and J. McDonald, Phys. Lett. B **425**, 309 (1998); Nucl. Phys. B **538**, 321 (1999).
 - [5] S. Kasuya and M. Kawasaki, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 041301(R) (2000).
 - [6] S. Kasuya and M. Kawasaki, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 023512 (2000).
 - [7] S. Kasuya and M. Kawasaki, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 123515 (2001).
 - [8] A. Kusenko, L. Loveridge and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 025015 (2005)
 - [9] A. Kusenko, L. C. Loveridge and M. Shaposhnikov, JCAP **0508**, 011 (2005)
 - [10] I. M. Shoemaker and A. Kusenko, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 075021 (2009).
 - [11] F. Doddato and J. McDonald, JCAP **1106**, 008 (2011).
 - [12] S. Kasuya and M. Kawasaki, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 123528 (2011).
 - [13] A. G. Cohen, S. R. Coleman, H. Georgi and A. Manohar, Nucl. Phys. B **272**, 301 (1986).
 - [14] J. Hisano, M. M. Nojiri and N. Okada, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 023511 (2001).
 - [15] S. Coleman, Nucl. Phys. B **262** (1985) 263.

- [16] A. Kusenko, Phys. Lett. **B405** (1997) 108.
- [17] A. de Gouvêa, T. Moroi and H. Murayama, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 1281 (1997).
- [18] T. Multamaki and I. Vilja, Nucl. Phys. B **574**, 130 (2000).
- [19] S. Kasuya, M. Kawasaki and M. Yamada, in preparation.