

# Baryon Asymmetry, Dark Matter and Quantum Chromodynamics

D.H. Oaknin and A. Zhitnitsky

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, V6T 1Z1, CANADA

**Abstract.** We propose a new scenario to explain the observed cosmological asymmetry between matter and antimatter, based on nonperturbative physics at the QCD scale. Our scenario relies on a mechanism of separation of matter and antimatter which would be in two different phases: conventional hadronic phase and novel, color superconducting phase. We argue that chunks of quarks or antiquarks in condensed color superconducting phase may be formed during the QCD phase transition and they may serve as dark matter. All three Sakharov's criteria are satisfied when the condensate forms, and we argue that the mechanism, which produces a separation of baryonic charge, can leave a net asymmetry of baryons in the hadronic phase. We then explain why such a scenario does not contradict the current observational data on antimatter in the Universe. This is due to the specific interaction features of the matter in color superconducting phase with "normal" matter in hadronic phase. A similar property of the interactions at the interface of ordinary metals and superconductors is well known in the literature as "Andreev Reflection". The observed cosmological ratio between the energy densities of dark and baryonic matter,  $\Omega_{DM} \sim \Omega_B$  within an order of magnitude, finds its natural explanation in this scenario: both contributions to  $\Omega$  originated from the same physics at the same instant during the QCD phase transition. The baryon to entropy ratio  $n_B/n_\gamma \sim 10^{-10}$  would also be a natural outcome in this scenario.

## 1. Introduction

The origin of the cosmological asymmetry between baryons and antibaryons, and, more specifically, the origin of the observed baryon to entropy ratio  $n_B/s \sim 10^{-10}$  ( $n_B$  being the net baryon number density in hadrons, and  $s$  the entropy density) remains a mystery and one of the main challenges for particle-cosmology. In order to explain this number from symmetric initial conditions in the very early Universe, it is generally assumed that three criteria, first laid down by Sakharov [1], must be satisfied at the instant when the asymmetry was generated:

- C and CP are not exact symmetries.
- Baryon number violating processes exist.
- The processes take place out of thermal equilibrium.

Here we argue that baryogenesis may be realized at the QCD phase transition without explicit (but rather, due to the spontaneous) violation of baryon number. This scenario is based on the idea that antibaryon charge can be stored in chunks of dense color superconducting (CS) antimatter. In different words, the baryon asymmetry of the universe may not necessarily be expressed as a net baryon number if the anti-baryon charge is accumulated in form of the diquark condensate in CS phase, rather than in form of free anti-baryons in hadronic phase. As we discuss below, in such a form it is not available for annihilation with normal baryons which are in the hadronic phase. One should remark here that CS phase is a novel phase in QCD that is realized when light quarks are squeezed to a density which is a few times the nuclear density and organize a single coherent state that condense in diquark channels, analogous to Cooper pairs of electrons in BCS theory of ordinary superconductors. The study of CS phase received a lot of attention last few years, see original papers [2] and recent reviews [3] on the subject. It has been known that this regime may be realized in Nature in neutron stars interiors and in the violent events associated with collapse of massive stars or collisions of neutron stars, so it is important for astrophysics. We argue here that such conditions may occur in the early universe during the QCD phase transition, so it might be important for cosmology as well.

In this sense, our proposal is a mechanism of charge separation rather than of net charge generation. This proposal is motivated by a recent idea [4] that a chunk of matter in CS phase with sufficiently large baryon charge, the so-called QCD ball, may become an absolutely stable object if it forms. Once QCD-balls are formed, their baryon charge is accumulated in the diquark condensate, rather than in free baryons, and it was argued that in such a form the baryon charge is not available for nucleosynthesis. Therefore, such objects, in spite of their QCD origin, would not contribute to  $\Omega_B h^2 \simeq 0.02$  in nucleosynthesis calculations and may serve as “nonbaryonic” dark matter.

We go further with this idea by suggesting that such dense objects could be configurations with large anti-baryon number ( QCD anti-balls). As we discuss in next sections in details, in such a form the anti-baryon charge can coexist with a net number of hadronic baryons due to the specific properties of the interaction of normal matter with the superconducting state. If a particle made of usual baryons hits an QCD anti-ball with small energy (typical for the present cold universe when  $v/c \sim 10^{-3}$ ), it will be reflected rather than annihilated by the dense color superconductor. A similar feature is well known in the physics of the conventional superconductors, see *e.g.* [5]. More than that, the anti-baryon charge in the QCD anti-ball would not change the nucleosynthesis calculations because in the CS phase it is not available to form nucleons, similar to the QCD -ball case when the baryon charge is locked in the coherent superposition of Cooper pairs.

To conclude this Introduction we should remark here that the idea that some quark matter, such as strange quark “nuggets”, may play the role of dark matter, was suggested long ago [6], see also original papers [7] and relatively recent review [8] on the subject. The idea that soliton (anti-soliton) -like configurations may serve as dark matter, is

also not a new idea [9]. Most noticeable example are Q-balls [10]. The idea that the dark matter may be just solitons containing large baryon (or even antibaryon) charge is, again, an old idea [11], see also [12]. The idea that the baryon density could be very inhomogeneous in space while the global baryonic charge is zero, is also not a new idea, see reviews [13] and references therein. The new element of this proposal is an observation that one can accommodate all the nice properties discussed previously [10]-[13] but without invoking any new fields and particles (apart from the axion field which solves the strong CP problem in QCD, see original papers and reviews in refs.[14]-[18]). Rather, the dense QCD-balls (or QCD anti-balls) are formed from the ordinary light quarks which however are not in the “normal” hadronic phase, but in the color superconducting phase.

We shall not concentrate our discussion in the present paper on the problems of formation of such dense configurations during the QCD phase transition. Instead, we focus on the analysis of the properties of their interaction with the normal matter to argue that the current available observational data neither rule out this picture nor even impose tight constraints on it. On the contrary, the observational values of both cosmological parameters  $\Omega_{DM}/\Omega_B \gtrsim 1$  and  $n_B/n_\gamma \sim 10^{-10}$  fit very naturally in this scenario. The specific structure of the dense quark matter where antibaryons are confined, is not very important in the present work: it could be “nuggets”, Q-balls or any other non-topological solitons which have or have not been discussed previously[6]-[12], with the sole but important condition that the dense quark matter stored in them is organized in a single coherent color superconducting state. However, to be more specific in the calculations below we shall use a specific configuration representing the dense matter when the baryon charge is hidden in the form of the QCD balls[4].

Our presentation is organized as follows. In Section 2 we review the observational data related to the baryogenesis and argue that well-known constraints on anti matter in the universe can not be literally applied to the case when anti-matter is in the form of dense color superconductor. We also argue that the observed relation  $\Omega_B \sim \Omega_{DM}$  is a natural consequence of the underlying QCD physics. Section 3 is devoted to the calculation of the reflection and transmission coefficients of free quarks at the interface of the color superconducting and hadronic phases. These results are used in Section 2 devoted to the analysis of the observational constraints on antimatter in the cold Universe at temperatures well below the QCD phase transition. We also use these results in Section 4 where we discuss some generic aspects of the charge separation mechanism during the QCD phase transition, after noticing that all three Sakharov’s criteria are satisfied (in some weaker sense) if chunks of dense color superconducting matter form during the phase transition. Finally, we estimate the fundamental parameter  $\eta \equiv (n_B - n_{\bar{B}})/n_\gamma$  in this scenario. Section 5 contains our conclusions, where we speculate on possibilities to test the suggested scenario.

## 2. Baryogenesis vs Baryon Separation

### 2.1. Observations and Phenomenology

Baryons in hadronic phase make all the directly observable astronomical objects, from gas and dust to stars and clusters of galaxies, without any significant trace of antibaryons over a spatial domain that could be as large as the present horizon, see reviews and some original papers in [19]. The origin of this asymmetric distribution of baryons and antibaryons remains one of the most fundamental open questions in cosmology in spite of the great theoretical and experimental efforts it has attracted during the last thirty five years, see *e.g* recent review [20].

The baryon-antibaryon asymmetry can be quantified through the ratio  $(n_B - n_{\bar{B}}) / n_\gamma$ , where  $n_B$  and  $n_{\bar{B}}$  are, respectively, the number densities of baryons and antibaryons and  $n_\gamma$  the number density of photons in the cosmic background. Theoretical models predict, and observations confirm, that baryon number  $n_B - n_{\bar{B}}$  is preserved in any comoving volume since the time of nucleosynthesis, at  $T_{nc} \sim 1$  MeV, and probably even earlier, since the instant just after the electroweak phase transition, at  $T_{ew} \sim 100$  GeV. Indeed, the anomalous processes which efficiently violate the baryon number in the electroweak symmetric phase are effectively suppressed soon after the instant of the phase transition when the system is in the spontaneously broken phase. Since the number of photons in a comoving volume is also preserved, the ratio  $(n_B - n_{\bar{B}})/n_\gamma$  remains approximately fixed in physical volumes while the universe is expanding and cooling.

If  $(n_B - n_{\bar{B}}) \ll n_\gamma$ , as it turns out to be the case, the early universe is approximately baryon-antibaryon symmetric until the QCD phase transition  $T_{QCD} \simeq 160$  MeV. This statement remains valid even if some asymmetry was generated at some earlier time. This is due to the strong QCD interactions in the quark-gluon plasma where massless quark/antiquark pairs can easily be produced. Therefore,  $n_B \sim n_{\bar{B}} \sim n_\gamma$  at  $T > T_{QCD}$ . The universe becomes manifestly baryon asymmetric only at the temperatures  $T \lesssim T_{QCD}$ , when strong QCD interactions confine quarks into heavy hadrons, with masses of the order of  $m_N \sim 1$  GeV which, subsequently, annihilate each other leaving only a small excess of hadronic baryons as the remnants,  $n_B - n_{\bar{B}} \sim n_B$ .

The ratio between the number density of this remnant of hadronic baryons and the number density of photons in the cosmic background has been recently measured with high accuracy,  $\eta \equiv n_B/n_\gamma \simeq 6 \times 10^{-10}$  [21]. This parameter can be directly related to the ratio  $\eta \sim \left(\frac{m_N}{T_{eq}}\right)^{-1}$  between the mass of the nucleon and the  $T_{eq} \sim 1$  eV, corresponding to the temperature of matter-radiation equality. This parameter is in excellent agreement, with the present cosmological abundances of light elements predicted by the standard nucleosynthesis scenario, see *e.g* [22].

In generic scenarios of baryogenesis at any time earlier than the QCD phase transition the net asymmetry  $n_B - n_{\bar{B}} = \eta n_\gamma \ll n_\gamma$  should be *fine-tuned* to its observational value, in the sense that  $n_B - n_{\bar{B}} \ll n_B, n_{\bar{B}}$ . In most suggested scenarios

the need of tuning the ratio  $\eta$  (when a natural scale for  $\eta$  is absent) manifests itself by the fact that  $\eta$  can be made either too large or too small by changing a few parameters that in many cases are only loosely constrained. Fine tuning, in general, could happen in physics, but nevertheless, usually it is not considered as an attractive solution of a problem from the theoretical point of view. As we shall see, such kind of fine tuning is not required in the scenario of baryon separation advocated in the present work.

Among the suggested scenarios for baryogenesis the electroweak phase transition has attracted most of the attention mainly because of its experimental accessibility. Soon after the idea of electroweak baryogenesis was formulated, it was realized that in the context of the Standard Model the suggested mechanism cannot provide enough asymmetry because of two main reasons. First, the phase transition is not strong enough; second, the source of CP violation in the standard model is too weak. After these deficiencies were realized, the interest shifted to the higher energy scales mostly motivated by the development in supersymmetry. It is not the place to review all possible scenarios. However as mentioned above, the need of a tuning of some sort is a common feature of almost every model. For example, in supersymmetric electroweak scenarios the Higgs and stop masses must be carefully chosen to lie within narrow intervals to generate the observed value of  $\eta$ . Otherwise, any asymmetry which was developed at the electroweak scale will be washed out at the end of the phase transition. Other scenarios, like leptogenesis which relies on asymmetries generated at higher scales in channels that cannot be erased by electroweak physics, need also be carefully tuned. In Affleck-Dine scenarios the common problem is that too much asymmetry is generated and must be subsequently diluted. In summary, although the general conditions under which the asymmetry could have developed are well-understood, the final word about the specific mechanism and physics involved in it still remains to be found.

## 2.2. Baryon asymmetry and QCD

It is of natural interest to explore the possibility that the baryon asymmetry may have been generated not before the electroweak phase transition (as most scenarios suggest), but after, at the instant of the cosmological QCD phase transition which was the latest phase transition in the history of the Universe. As we have argued, this is a viable scenario that relies on nonperturbative QCD physics and, in principle, does not require the introduction of any new physics beyond the standard model, except for a solution of the strong CP problem. Obviously, in absence of baryon violating interactions at  $T_{QCD}$  the only way to produce a baryon asymmetry is via charge separation. It is to a discussion of such a mechanism in the context of a globally baryon-antibaryon symmetric universe,  $n_B^{tot} = n_{\bar{B}}^{tot}$ , to which we now turn. In such a scenario the ratio  $\eta$  is fixed by the energy scale of the physics involved and the problem of fine tuning mentioned above is automatically resolved, see below.

The baryonic asymmetry of the universe should be examined in the context of recent observations that confirm that baryonic (to be precise: the hadronic) matter

contributes only a fraction of the content of cold matter of the universe, while a much larger fraction is made of some unknown form of *dark* matter which is not apparent to detection through electromagnetic radiation,  $\Omega_B \sim \frac{1}{6}\Omega_{DM}$  [21]. In this context, a net number of hadronic baryons  $n_B - n_{\bar{B}} \neq 0$  can be generated at the QCD phase transition if some mechanism exists that separates baryon and antibaryon charges and stores an excess of the latter in compact objects of non-hadronic, color superconducting phase discussed above. In this case a total baryon-antibaryon annihilation after the QCD phase transition is avoided. The separation process must be completed before the nucleosynthesis starts at  $T_{nc} \sim 1$  MeV, such that only surviving hadronic baryon number  $n_B = \eta n_\gamma$  participates in the composition of light nuclei. The non-hadronic objects (which however carry a large baryon charge  $\pm B$ ) will have heavy mass  $M_{DM}$  and would contribute, instead, to the *dark* matter of the universe. These objects, in spite of being baryonic in nature, will contribute to the “non-baryonic” component according to the standard definition of the “non-baryonic” dark matter  $\Omega_{DM}$ . As the total baryon number is conserved and hadronic baryons have charge  $+1$ , the net number density of non-hadronic antibaryons should be  $\tilde{n}_{\bar{B}} - \tilde{n}_B = \frac{1}{B}(n_B - n_{\bar{B}}) \simeq \frac{1}{B}n_B$ , where we introduce notation  $\tilde{n}$  describing the density of dark matter heavy particles which carry the baryon charge in a hidden form of the diquark condensate (CS phase) rather than in form of free baryons.

Now, let us assume that dark matter indeed consists of heavy objects made of quark matter in color superconducting phase. In order to be more concrete in estimates, we shall identify the dark objects with the QCD balls and (QCD anti-balls) discussed in ref.[4]. What phenomenological consequence can we derive from this assumption? Let consider first the following ratio,

$$\left( \frac{\text{dark matter number density}}{\text{baryon number density}} \right) \simeq \frac{m_N \Omega_{DM}}{M_{DM} \Omega_B}. \quad (1)$$

The *dark matter number density*,  $\tilde{n}_{\bar{B}} + \tilde{n}_B$  could be naturally estimated, without any *fine-tuning* to be  $\tilde{n}_{\bar{B}} + \tilde{n}_B = \#(\tilde{n}_{\bar{B}} - \tilde{n}_B)$ , where  $\#$  is some numerical factor  $\gtrsim 1$ . Here we expect that the excess in the number density,  $(\tilde{n}_{\bar{B}} - \tilde{n}_B)$ , is the same order as the number densities  $\tilde{n}_{\bar{B}}$  and  $\tilde{n}_B$  taken separately. As we will explain later in the text, the excess  $(\tilde{n}_{\bar{B}} - \tilde{n}_B)$  is indeed of order  $\tilde{n}_{\bar{B}}$ ,  $\tilde{n}_B$  if the universe is largely C and CP asymmetric during the formation of the QCD balls. Then, the l.h.s. of the ratio (1) can be estimated to be  $\#/B$  according to our previous relation  $\tilde{n}_{\bar{B}} - \tilde{n}_B = n_B/B$ . Consequently,  $\Omega_{DM}/\Omega_B \sim (\#/B) \times (M_{DM}/m_N)$ . Now, if one demands  $B \simeq (M_{DM}/m_N)$ , which is a condition for the stability of the QCD balls[4], one can immediately derive  $\Omega_{DM}/\Omega_B \sim (\#) \gtrsim 1$ . The point we want to make is: our assumption that the dark matter is originated at the QCD scale from ordinary quarks fits very nicely with  $\Omega_{DM}/\Omega_B \gtrsim 1$  within the order of magnitude, provided that separation of baryon charges is also originated at the same QCD scale. Generally, the relation  $\Omega_B \lesssim \Omega_{DM}$ , within one order of magnitude, between the two different contributions to  $\Omega$  is difficult to explain in models that invoke a dark matter candidate not related to the ordinary quark/baryon degrees of freedom.

### 2.3. Antimatter as dense color superconductor

It is important to remark here that bounds that tightly constraint the presence of significant amount of antimatter in regions of the universe of different scales are mainly derived from the phenomenological signatures of electromagnetic matter-antimatter annihilation processes [19]. Those bounds do not apply to the presence of antimatter stored in color superconducting phases, simply because this kind of objects do not easily annihilate. Here we want to use the physical picture of conventional superconductors to qualitatively explain why normal hadronic matter is not annihilated but reflected by objects made of color superconducting antimatter. Detailed quantitative calculations which support the intuitive arguments of this section, are presented in next Section 3.

The peculiarities of the scattering process of conducting electrons on a metal-superconductor junction are well known to be a consequence of the energy gap  $\Delta$  in the spectrum of single particle excitations of the superconductor above the Fermi surface, see *e.g.* [5]. The phenomenon can be explained in the following simple way. The conducting electrons of the metal, modelled as a gas of free fermions, inciding at the interface with energies much smaller than the energy gap  $\Delta$  cannot go through the interface simply because there is no any kinematically available state in the superconductor for a single electron. Therefore, electrons must be reflected backward into the metal. The only possibility for an incident low energy electron to propagate into the superconductor is to excite an additional electron from the metal “sea” by forming a Cooper pair (which can be excited without surpassing any gap barrier) and leaving a hole that propagates backward into the metal. This peculiar reflection is known in the literature in condensed matter physics as Andreev Reflection [23]. The two processes, the normal reflection of the electron as an electron and Andreev reflection of the electron as a hole, compete and their relative probabilities are determined by the properties of the interface. In the case when the density of electrons in the metal is much lower than in the superconductor, the normal reflection overwhelmingly dominates [5].

Now we want to use this experience gained from analysis of the conventional superconductors for a qualitative discussions of the problem of interaction of “normal” hadronic baryons with a chunk of matter in CS phase. The main feature of interaction between normal baryons and color superconductor is very similar to what was described above in case of conventional superconductors: If the energy of the incoming quark is not sufficiently large (smaller than the gap  $\Delta \sim 100MeV$  of CS phase) it will be completely reflected by a chunk of color superconducting matter. The explanation for such a behavior is very similar to what was discussed above for the conventional superconductors. This feature, as we discussed in the Introduction, plays a crucial role in the phenomenology of the “non-baryonic” dark matter containing a huge baryon charge which is locked in the form of a diquark condensate after the universe cools down to temperatures well below  $T_{QCD}$ .

Now, let us consider a chunk of antiquarks in the condensed CS phase (QCD anti-ball). One could ask the question: why a free quark from the exterior inciding

at the anti ball with low energy cannot annihilate a single antiquark of a Cooper pair in the superconductor? The answer is: such a process would leave the second antiquark of the pair alone. This could only happen if there is enough energy in the process to promote this second antiquark to one of the allowed states above the gap. If the incident quark has energy smaller than this gap the process is kinematically forbidden. Therefore, the annihilation between matter and antimatter segregated in different phases needs a coherent collaboration of two quarks from the exterior, which is highly suppressed. The process is additionally suppressed if we consider the interface between the hadronic phase and the superconductor, because an annihilation demands the coherent collaboration of many quarks with the appropriate quantum numbers. This point (which is discussed in more detail in Section 3) is extremely important for the explanation of the phenomenology of color superconducting QCD anti-balls in the presence of surrounding “normal” baryons in the cold universe.

Therefore, the QCD anti-balls, if formed, would behave as very stable and massive solitons that carry large baryon number, similar to the QCD-balls. For typical QCD balls/anti-balls  $B \sim \pm 10^{32}$  and  $M_B \simeq |B|m_N$ . The number density of solitons and antisolitons  $\tilde{n}_{\bar{B}}, \tilde{n}_B \sim \frac{\eta}{B} n_\gamma$ , can be estimated from the ratio  $\Omega_{DM}/\Omega_B \gtrsim 1$ . The observational constraints on these kind of very heavy objects have been reviewed in [4], and they are neither observationally ruled out nor even tightly bounded at this point. Such features for the interactions imply that if the QCD ball(antiball) with small velocity  $v/c \sim 10^{-3}$  enters the Earth, it will not decay by exploding. Rather it will go through the Earth and exit on the opposite side of the Earth leaving behind the shock waves. It is tempting to interpret the recent seismic event with epiliner source[24] as the process which involves the dark matter particle, such as the QCD ball.

The main moral of this section: we have argued that there is no any contradiction to the proposed scenario when the universe has zero total baryon charge, which however distributed not uniformly. The visible content consists of “normal baryons” which are in the hadronic phase, while the dark content is in the color superconducting phase. Both components of cold matter are formed and originated from the same QCD related physics at the same instant. Such a scenario offers a simple explanation of the ratio  $\Omega_{DM}/\Omega_B \gtrsim 1$  within the order of magnitude which is difficult to explain in models that invoke a dark matter candidate not related to the ordinary quark/baryon degrees of freedom.

### 3. Reflection and Transmission Coefficients

We consider in this section the scattering of quarks and antiquarks off a surface separating color superconducting (CS) and plasma phases and calculate their reflection and transmission (R&T) coefficients. This calculation involves only perturbative dynamics of quarks at the Fermi surface,  $\mu \sim 400$  MeV, while all nonperturbative physics is assumed to be parameterized by the diquark condensate. In order to avoid complications that may not be relevant at this stage the scattering problem is reduced to



a one dimensional calculation of R&T coefficients, assuming that the typical size of the ball of condensed matter is much larger than all other scales involved in the scattering process.

Our goal is twofold. First, we want to demonstrate that the reflection coefficient is exactly one (complete reflection) if the energy of the incoming quark or antiquark is smaller than the energy gap  $\Delta$  in the spectrum of single particle excitations of the CS phase. Such a phenomenon of total reflection of fermions off a superconducting region is well known in condensed matter physics [5] in the interaction of free electrons of a metal at the junction with a conventional superconductor. This feature, as we have remarked in previous sections, is very important for understanding the phenomenology of QCD balls and anti-balls as dark matter during the epoch when the universe has cooled down to temperature well below  $\Delta \sim T_{QCD}$ .

Our second goal is to demonstrate that at larger energies above the gap (such energies are typical when the temperature is high,  $T \simeq \Delta$ ) there can be a net transport of baryon number through the interface into the CS phase. This feature is important in our discussion of the mechanism of charge separation that locks quarks/antiquarks in the form of QCD balls/anti-balls during the phase transition.

We should remark here that a similar scattering problem of particles off the interface region separating CS and hadronic phases was discussed previously in [25]. The analysis of that paper was motivated by the physics of neutron stars where CS phase is very likely to develop. Our context is very different: we study the interactions of heavy objects made of condensed CS matter with the *gas* of hadrons that surround them during and after the cosmological QCD phase transition. However, the technique developed in [25] turned out to be very useful and will be widely used in the analysis which follows. The specific features of the setup in [25] for describing the interface of phases in neutron stars match those we need for studying the process of formation of chunks of condensed color superconducting matter inside dense clouds of quark plasma during the QCD phase transition. At the same time, the features of the setup that appropriately describes the interface of CS and hadronic matter in the cold universe at temperatures well below the phase transition are significantly different, because in such environment the density of quarks outside the “nuggets” of CS matter is much lower than the density of baryon charge inside of the “nuggets” ‡. Besides, the typical energies of quarks outside the “nuggets” are much smaller than the gap  $\Delta$ .

Let us now start our detailed discussion with the effective lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{\psi}_i^a \left( i\partial_\mu \gamma^\mu - m + \mu\gamma^0 \right) \psi_i^a + \{ \Delta_{ij}^{ab} \left( \psi_i^{aT} C \gamma^5 \psi_j^b \right)^\dagger + h.c. \}, \quad (2)$$

which describes the relevant fermionic degrees of freedom at the interface. They are represented by Dirac field operators  $\psi_i^a(\vec{x})$ , with  $SU(3)_c$  color index  $a = 1, 2, 3$ , for red,

‡ Of course, there is no any physical jumps in chemical potentials between these two phases. However, we model the interface region (which probably includes a mixture of hadronic matter as well as nuclear matter) as a sharp  $\theta(x)$  function assuming that the inverse width of the interface region is much larger than any other scales of the problem.

green and blue, and flavour index  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , for the three u,d,s light quarks. The three flavours are assumed, for simplicity, to be degenerate in mass. The matrices  $\gamma^\mu$  are the usual 4D Clifford matrices and  $C = i\gamma^0\gamma^2$  is the charge conjugation matrix. The region outside of the QCD ball is modeled, for simplicity, by a gas of free quarks. The interface region between plasma and CS phases is parameterized by an effective order parameter that is proportional to the expectation value of the diquark condensate,  $\Delta_{ij}^{ab} \propto \langle \psi_i^{aT} C \gamma^5 \psi_j^b \rangle$  in CS phase, and it is zero in the plasma phase. We keep only a single tensor structure

$$\Delta_{ij}^{ab}(\vec{x}) = \Delta(\vec{x}) (\delta_i^a \delta_j^b - \delta_j^a \delta_i^b), \quad (3)$$

relevant for CFL (Color Flavor Locking) phase. In this expression  $\Delta(\vec{x})$  is treated as a background field. In the superconducting phase  $\Delta(\vec{x}) = \Delta_{CS} \sim 100$  MeV is quite large and describes the energy gap in the spectrum of excitations. Outside the QCD ball, where the system is treated as a plasma of free quarks, there is no Bose-condensation and  $\Delta(\vec{x}) = \Delta_{QP} = 0$ .

In the limit of three massless flavours of quarks the symmetry of QCD interactions is enlarged to allow axial and vector  $SU(3)_A \times U(1)_A \times SU(3)_V \times U(1)_B$  flavour rotations, in addition to color gauge transformations  $SU(3)_c$ . Notice that one of the diagonal matrices of  $SU(3)_V$  is the generator of electromagnetic gauge transformations. The diquark condensate spontaneously breaks the symmetry group  $SU(3)_c \times SU(3)_V \times SU(3)_A$  into the global  $SU(3)$  diagonal subgroup of symmetry of lagrangian (2), which locks color and flavour indices[3]. All the gauge bosons acquire masses  $\sim |\Delta|$  via the Anderson-Higgs mechanism, except for a certain linear mix of the photon and one of the gluons that remains massless. Spontaneous breaking of the global symmetries leads to formation of nine pseudogoldstone bosons ( the octet of ‘‘pions’’, and ‘‘ $\eta$ ’’ singlet, analogous to the pseudoscalar mesons in the hadronic phase), and a single massless scalar corresponding to superfluid collective mode of the broken  $U(1)_B$ [3]. These light, spin zero fields can play an important role in transport properties, however they do not carry the baryon charge and, therefore, will be ignored in what follows.

### 3.1. Quasiparticles in the superconducting phase.

The lagrangian density (2) yields to the Dirac equation:

$$(i\partial_\mu \gamma^\mu - m + \mu\gamma^0)\psi_i^a - \Delta_{ij}^{ab} C \gamma_5 \bar{\psi}_j^{bT} = 0. \quad (4)$$

For  $\Delta \neq 0$  the wavefunctions of quark fields and their hermitian conjugates couple together and it is convenient to treat the hermitian conjugate of equation (4) as a second independent equation:

$$\bar{\psi}_i^a (i \overleftarrow{\partial}_\mu \gamma^\mu + m - \mu\gamma^0) - (\Delta_{ij}^{ab})^* \psi_j^{bT} C \gamma_5 = 0. \quad (5)$$

The tensor structure (3) allows to decouple the set of Dirac equations in four sectors:

a) Three two-quarks channels (or 2SC sectors):

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_{green} \\ d_{red} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} u_{blue} \\ 0 \\ s_{red} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ d_{blue} \\ s_{green} \end{pmatrix} \quad (6)$$

b) One three-quarks channel (or CFL sector):

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_{red} \\ d_{green} \\ s_{blue} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

We discuss here the CFL sector, but the analysis of the three 2SC sectors is quite similar, [25]. In the CFL channel the set of Dirac equations can be written:

$$\begin{aligned} (i\partial_\mu\gamma^\mu - m + \mu\gamma^0) \quad u_{red} \quad - \quad \Delta \quad C\gamma_5 \quad (\bar{d}_{green} + \bar{s}_{blue})^T &= 0, \\ (i\partial_\mu\gamma^\mu - m + \mu\gamma^0) \quad d_{green} \quad - \quad \Delta \quad C\gamma_5 \quad (\bar{u}_{red} + \bar{s}_{blue})^T &= 0 \\ (i\partial_\mu\gamma^\mu - m + \mu\gamma^0) \quad s_{blue} \quad - \quad \Delta \quad C\gamma_5 \quad (\bar{u}_{red} + \bar{d}_{green})^T &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

together with the hermitian conjugate expressions

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}_{red} \quad (i \overleftarrow{\partial}_\mu \gamma^\mu + m - \mu\gamma^0) \quad - \quad \Delta^* \quad (d_{green} + s_{blue})^T \quad C\gamma_5 &= 0, \\ \bar{d}_{green} \quad (i \overleftarrow{\partial}_\mu \gamma^\mu + m - \mu\gamma^0) \quad - \quad \Delta^* \quad (u_{red} + s_{blue})^T \quad C\gamma_5 &= 0, \\ \bar{s}_{blue} \quad (i \overleftarrow{\partial}_\mu \gamma^\mu + m - \mu\gamma^0) \quad - \quad \Delta^* \quad (u_{red} + d_{green})^T \quad C\gamma_5 &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

This set of six equations can be decoupled:

$$\begin{aligned} (i\partial_\mu\gamma^\mu - m + \mu\gamma^0)\chi \quad - \quad 2\Delta \quad C\gamma_5 \quad \bar{\chi}^T &= 0, \\ \bar{\chi}(i \overleftarrow{\partial}_\mu \gamma^\mu + m - \mu\gamma^0) \quad - \quad 2\Delta^* \quad \chi^T \quad C\gamma_5 &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (i\partial_\mu\gamma^\mu - m + \mu\gamma^0)\omega_1 \quad + \quad \Delta \quad C\gamma_5 \quad \bar{\omega}_1^T &= 0, \\ \bar{\omega}_1(i \overleftarrow{\partial}_\mu \gamma^\mu + m - \mu\gamma^0) \quad + \quad \Delta^* \quad \omega_1^T \quad C\gamma_5 &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (i\partial_\mu\gamma^\mu - m + \mu\gamma^0)\omega_2 \quad + \quad \Delta \quad C\gamma_5 \quad \bar{\omega}_2^T &= 0, \\ \bar{\omega}_2(i \overleftarrow{\partial}_\mu \gamma^\mu + m - \mu\gamma^0) \quad + \quad \Delta^* \quad \omega_2^T \quad C\gamma_5 &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

for the three independent combinations of fields defined as follows,  $\chi = u_{red} + d_{green} + s_{blue}$ ,  $\omega_1 = u_{red} - d_{green}$  and  $\omega_2 = u_{red} - s_{blue}$ . The three sectors are formally identical except for one important aspect that was already noticed in [25]: in the sector (10) the energy gap, that is, the energy threshold at which single particles can be excited in the superconductor, is  $2|\Delta|$ , twice the energy gap in the other two sectors (11) and (12). We limit our analysis to a single sector (11), so we omit the subscript for  $\omega$ , and introduce the usual notation  $\alpha^i = \gamma_0\gamma^i$  to simplify the equations,

$$\begin{aligned} (i\partial_t + i\partial_i\alpha^i - m\gamma^0 + \mu)\omega \quad + \quad \Delta \quad C\gamma_5 \quad \omega^\dagger{}^T &= 0, \\ \omega^\dagger(i \overleftarrow{\partial}_t + i \overleftarrow{\partial}_i \alpha^i + m\gamma^0 - \mu) \quad + \quad \Delta^* \quad \omega^T \quad C\gamma_5 &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

In the Dirac equations we are dealing with, the fermionic fields are quantum operators. However, in what follows, we neglect many body effects and treat  $\omega \rightarrow \varphi(t, \vec{x})$  and  $\omega^\dagger \rightarrow \zeta^\dagger(t, \vec{x})$  as c-functions describing the single particle states§,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \varphi(t, \vec{x}) \\ \zeta^\dagger(t, \vec{x}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_s u_s(\vec{q}) \alpha_s(\vec{q}) \\ \sum_s v_s^\dagger(-\vec{q}) \beta_s^*(\vec{q}) \end{pmatrix} \exp(-iEt + i\vec{q} \cdot \vec{x}), \quad (14)$$

where  $u_s(\vec{q})$  and  $v_s(-\vec{q})$  are Dirac spinors which describe particles and antiparticle (or holes), respectively, and the subindex  $s = \uparrow, \downarrow$  denotes the two possible components of spin. They obey the equations

$$\begin{aligned} (\vec{\alpha} \cdot \vec{q} + m\gamma^0 - \mu)u_s(\vec{q}) &= +\kappa_{\vec{q}} u_s(\vec{q}), \\ v_s^\dagger(-\vec{q})(\vec{\alpha} \cdot \vec{q} - m\gamma^0 + \mu) &= -v_s^\dagger(-\vec{q}) \kappa_{\vec{q}}, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where  $\kappa_{\vec{q}} = \sqrt{\vec{q}^2 + m^2} - \mu$ . The coefficients  $\alpha_s(\vec{q}), \beta_s(\vec{q})$  are c-numbers in this approach. They obey the Bogolubov - de Gennes equations. For  $\alpha_\uparrow(\vec{q})$  and  $\beta_\downarrow^*(\vec{q})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} E\alpha_\uparrow(\vec{q}) &= +\kappa_{\vec{q}} \alpha_\uparrow(\vec{q}) + \Delta \beta_\downarrow^*(\vec{q}), \\ E\beta_\downarrow^*(\vec{q}) &= -\kappa_{\vec{q}} \beta_\downarrow^*(\vec{q}) + \Delta^* \alpha_\uparrow(\vec{q}), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

and similar equations for  $\alpha_\downarrow(\vec{q})$  and  $\beta_\uparrow^*(\vec{q})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} E\alpha_\downarrow(\vec{q}) &= +\kappa_{\vec{q}} \alpha_\downarrow(\vec{q}) - \Delta \beta_\uparrow^*(\vec{q}), \\ E\beta_\uparrow^*(\vec{q}) &= -\kappa_{\vec{q}} \beta_\uparrow^*(\vec{q}) - \Delta^* \alpha_\downarrow(\vec{q}). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

There are two possible solutions of the uniform equations (14) for the superconductor, characterized by  $|\Delta| \sim 100$  MeV, [25]:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi(t, \vec{x}) \\ \zeta^\dagger(t, \vec{x}) \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} e^{+i\frac{\delta}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{E+\xi}{2E}} (Au_\uparrow(\vec{q}_1) - Bu_\downarrow(\vec{q}_1)) \\ e^{-i\frac{\delta}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{E-\xi}{2E}} (Av_\downarrow^\dagger(-\vec{q}_1) + Bv_\uparrow^\dagger(-\vec{q}_1)) \end{pmatrix} e^{-iEt + i\vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{x}} \\ &+ \begin{pmatrix} e^{+i\frac{\delta}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{E-\xi}{2E}} (Cu_\uparrow(\vec{q}_2) + Du_\downarrow(\vec{q}_2)) \\ e^{-i\frac{\delta}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{E+\xi}{2E}} (Cv_\downarrow^\dagger(-\vec{q}_2) - Dv_\uparrow^\dagger(-\vec{q}_2)) \end{pmatrix} e^{-iEt + i\vec{q}_2 \cdot \vec{x}}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where  $\xi = \sqrt{E^2 - |\Delta|^2}$  and  $\vec{q}_{1,2} = \pm \sqrt{(\mu \pm \xi)^2 - m^2}$  and  $\delta = \arg(\Delta/|\Delta|)$ . They describe single particle excitations in the superconductor.

The qualitative features of the scattering process at the interface between CS and plasma phases can be understood without explicit solving the equations. First of all,  $|\Delta|$  describes a gap in the spectrum of excitations in the CS phase. This is easy to see if we take  $E < |\Delta|$ . In this case  $\vec{q}_{1,2} = \pm \sqrt{\mu^2 - m^2 - |\xi|^2 \pm 2i|\xi|\mu}$  have imaginary parts, which implies an exponential suppression in the wavefunctions. This means that a single quark with low energy cannot propagate in the superconductor because there is no any kinematically available state for such an excitation. At such low energies the quarks from outside can only penetrate into the superconductor if they organize a Cooper pair, which can be excited without surpassing the gap energy. This demands a coherent collaboration between different quarks. A similar phenomenon is known in

§ Similar procedure was adopted in [25] where the c-functions were defined in terms of the corresponding one-particle matrix elements. This procedure is well justified when the chemical potential  $\mu$  is large because the many body effects are strongly suppressed in this case.

condensed matter physics as the Andreev reflection at the interface between a metal and a superconductor [23]. Andreev reflection is an important phenomenon when the density of electrons in the metal is comparable to the density in the superconductor and when the penetrability of the barrier is high.

### 3.2. Physics at the interface. Small energies, $E < \Delta$ .

We now proceed to solve the equations that describe the scattering of free quarks/antiquarks off a color superconductor at small energies lower than the gap,  $E < |\Delta|$ . Such a study is relevant for the understanding of the phenomenology of the QCD balls and anti -balls in the cold Universe at temperatures well below  $T_{QCD} \sim 160$  MeV. Although in this environment the CS balls and anti -balls coexist with a dilute gas of hadrons, rather than free quarks, the simpler description of the plasma phase as a diluted gas of quarks makes easier to understand the basic features of the interaction of real hadrons with the CS matter.

In the cold universe, the density of baryon charge in the plasma surrounding the QCD balls is much lower than the quark density inside the QCD balls. Therefore, in this context we model our system by fixing  $\mu_0 \simeq 0$  to describe the environment of a dilute gas of quarks/antiquarks. This feature of our setup,  $\mu_0 \ll \mu$ , is an essential difference from the setup of ref. [25] where the chemical potentials are identical at both sides of the interface. This is because, the analysis of ref.[25] was motivated by the physics of processes at the CS interface in neutron stars while our motivation is quite different. As we shall see in a moment, the probability of Andreev reflection is suppressed with our setup, while the normal reflection of incident quarks or antiquarks is one for  $E < \Delta$ .

For the sake of simplicity we assume that the background field  $\Delta(\vec{x})$  depends only on the  $z$  spatial coordinate. Then, the wavefunctions  $\varphi(z)$  and  $\zeta^\dagger(z)$  are invariant over the perpendicular spatial plane and the scattering problem can be reduced to a problem in one dimension. We can further simplify the problem while still capturing its essential features by considering a step-function background  $\Delta(z)$  to separate the interface between the phase of free quarks/antiquarks and the superconducting phase:  $\Delta(z) = 0$ , if  $z \leq 0$  and  $\Delta(z) = \Delta_0 \sim 100$  MeV, if  $z > 0$ . Then the set of equations can be solved separately in each of the two phases and the corresponding wavefunctions must be matched at the interface  $z = 0$ . As there is no spin flip in the scattering process, we limit ourselves by considering the case  $B = D = 0$  corresponding to a single spin sector and, moreover, we consider the chiral limit  $m = 0$  to simplify things the most.

In Sector I), which describes the free quarks/antiquarks at  $z < 0$  where  $\Delta = 0$ ,  $\mu_0 = 0$  and  $k = \pm E$ , the solutions to the Dirac equation are:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \varphi_+(z) \\ \zeta_-^\dagger(z) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} X e^{+ikz} \\ Y e^{-ikz} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (19)$$

where subscripts  $\pm$  correspond to two chirality sectors. In this chiral limit we can interpret the incident quark  $\varphi_+(z)$  as a reflected antiquark, and, vice versa, the incident antiquark  $\zeta_-^\dagger(z)$  as a reflected quark. Therefore, eq. (19) allows us to consider the

scattering problem for both types of particles ( quarks as well as antiquarks). The general solution in Sector II) describing the superconductor at  $z > 0$  where  $\Delta \neq 0$  and  $\mu$  is large, is given by eq. (18).

The standard problem of calculation of reflection and transmission coefficients can be easily solved by matching the wave functions at  $z = 0$ . In particular, for the case of the incident quark with energy  $E < \Delta$  falling at the plane boundary from the left, the wave function at  $z > 0$  is given by,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \varphi_+(z) \\ \zeta_-^\dagger(z) \end{pmatrix} = \gamma e^{-\sqrt{1-\rho^2}|\Delta|z} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\Delta}{x|\Delta|} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} e^{+i\mu z}, \quad (20)$$

where  $\rho = E/|\Delta|$  lies in the range  $0 < \rho < 1$  and  $x = \rho - i\sqrt{1-\rho^2}$  is a complex number with  $|x| = 1$ , and  $\gamma$  is a normalization constant. The exponentially suppressed factor in eq. (20) prevents any mode to propagate in the superconductor. Analogous calculations with a similar result can be presented for the incident anti-quark (rather than quark) with energy  $E < \Delta$ . Also, the matching conditions require that  $|X| = |Y|$  which implies that for  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ , incident quarks are completely reflected as quarks and antiquarks are completely reflected as antiquarks.

The situation we just described corresponds to the interface of color superconducting QCD balls (or anti-balls) and a system of free quarks. As we mentioned, the relevant degrees of freedom outside the ball are not really the quarks, but rather, hadrons made of confined quarks. However, the physical arguments we presented above should convince the reader that the total reflection happens at the hadron-superconductor interface when the kinetic energy of a falling hadron is smaller than the superconducting gap. This discussion explains why we claimed in the previous section that the usual baryons falling on the QCD ball with a small energy  $v/c \sim 10^{-3}$ , will be reflected by the QCD ball. Now, let us consider the case when a quark with energy below the energy gap falls into the QCD anti-ball (color superconductor made of antiquarks). This case is equivalent to the scattering of antiquarks off the QCD ball discussed above where the complete reflection was also found.

Such a result when incident quarks as well as antiquarks with  $E < \Delta$  are completely reflected back by the QCD ball can be explained in simple physical terms in the one-particle approximation when all many- body effects are completely ignored. In this case as we demonstrated above the problem is reduced to the quantum mechanical calculations of the quark/antiquark scattering off the QCD ball. In the bulk of a superconductor the quarks are organized in Cooper pairs and low energy quarks cannot propagate because such quasiparticles are not supported: therefore, they will be reflected. For the antiquark the explanation is different because of the possibility of annihilation. If the low energy incident antiquark and a quark from the Cooper pair were to annihilate each other, the second quark of the pair must be promoted above the gap, a process which is kinematically forbidden if there is no enough energy available in the process. Therefore, also the antiquarks will be reflected. Precise calculations given above support this qualitative explanation of the effect of complete reflection.

Many-body effects, which were completely ignored in these calculations, are not expected to change significantly the result of complete reflection of quarks and antiquarks off QCD balls that we have described. Indeed, the annihilation of antiquark with a quark from the Cooper pair could be successful if the energy released from the annihilation is immediately transmitted to the second quark from the Cooper pair. In this case the second quark can receive sufficient energy to overcome the gap and propagate as a quasiparticle in the superconductor. The probability of this to happen is expected to be quite small. The corresponding estimates require the use of quantum field theory methods where the many body effects are properly taken into account. Such estimates are beyond the scope of the present work, and shall not be considered here. We also do not consider in this work the physical interface region which is probably a mixture of different phases including nuclear matter, hadronic matter, CFL... The analysis of scattering in this case could be very complicated problem. However, we expect that for sufficiently small energies the results of complete reflection presented above remain valid.

### 3.3. Physics at the interface. Large energies, $E > \Delta$

We now go on to discuss processes at energies larger than the gap. Such a study is not relevant for the understanding of the phenomenology of the QCD balls (anti -balls) at the present epoch, when the Universe is cold and energies of particles surrounding the QCD balls are very small. However, the study of these processes may give us some insights about the processes of formation of the color superconducting regions during (or shortly after) the cosmological QCD phase transition (at  $T \simeq \Delta$ ) when the typical energies of the particles are quite large. We are not attempting to fully address the problem of formation of the QCD balls, see the next section where some general ideas are formulated. Such a study would necessary include the analysis of the non-perturbative dynamics of strong interaction during the QCD phase transition, which is beyond the scope of the present work. Instead, in the text below we present some results on physics at the interface of superconducting and normal matters. These results strongly suggest that the formation of QCD balls and antiballs could be a common phenomenon during the QCD phase transition.

It seems natural to think that the QCD ball with the ground state to be the diquark condensate can form in a region where there already exists a large baryon density, that is, where  $\mu$  is already locally relatively large. Obviously, anti-balls are more prone to form in regions where there exists a large anti-baryon density. The formation of large fluctuations of baryon number during the cosmological QCD phase transition has been discussed in a number of papers. Such fluctuations could occur due to the axion related physics when the domain wall network with strong CP violation decays[4]. In this case the domain wall representing the soliton/antisoliton has a preference in attracting quarks/antiquarks. This effect obviously leads to the separation of baryon/antibaryon charges.

Large fluctuations could also occur due to the internal QCD physics if the first order phase transition takes place, see [6], [26] where some applications to Big Bang Nucleosynthesis have also been considered. In those papers it was shown that the fluctuations in baryon number in the quark-gluon plasma during the QCD phase transition have a clear tendency to accumulate large number of baryons and become denser with time. Some authors even have suggested that the large fluctuations in baryon charge could result in the formation of the ‘strangelets’. We do not have much new to say on this difficult subject on the QCD phase transition and large fluctuations it produces. It is not the goal of this work to discuss the nature of the fluctuations-seeds which eventually may produce the QCD balls.

Our original remark here is as follows. Due to the special features of CS phase discussed above, a fluctuation with a large baryon number (if it is formed) will continue to grow in size by accumulating the quarks coming from outside the QCD ball. Indeed, one can suggest a simple model to account for this phenomenon by considering the QCD ball surrounded by the dense plasma of quark matter with relatively large  $\mu$ . As we already mentioned, the set of equations that describe such a situation of the scattering of quarks at the interface has been solved previously in [25] in the context of the physics of neutron stars. There the transmission and reflection coefficients of quarks and holes (at high densities holes, rather than antiquarks, are the relevant quasiparticles) were calculated and it was shown that at energies  $E > |\Delta|$  there would be a net current of baryon charge from the quark plasma into the color superconducting phase

$$j_z = 2\mu \frac{2\sqrt{E^2 - |\Delta|^2}}{E + \sqrt{E^2 - |\Delta|^2}}. \quad (21)$$

The important remark here is as follows. A single quark with baryon charge  $B = +1$  falling into the CS region will be reflected as a hole (antiquark) with baryon charge  $B = -1$  and producing the Cooper pair with baryon charge  $B = +2$  in the bulk. At the same time, the hole (with the same quantum numbers of an antiquark) with large probability will be reflected as a hole and, with relatively small probability, can reduce the baryon charge of the bulk by one unit by means of the annihilation. Furthermore, the reverse transport of the baryon charge back from the bulk to the exterior of the ball is not very efficient: the gapped quarks in the bulk of CS phase are quite heavy, and therefore, their density is relatively small. Besides, the local temperature in the CS regions is expected to be smaller than in the exterior<sup>||</sup>. This is due to the very high thermal conductivity of the CFL phase[27]. Therefore, one should expect a fast cooling of the CS regions. It is quite obvious, that the situation just described produces a perfect environment when CS region will grow in an extremely efficient way (a typical event leads to the increase of the baryon charge in the bulk by one unit). This observation is quite important for our qualitative discussions on a possible mechanism of baryon separation at the QCD phase transition, to which we now turn.

<sup>||</sup> We should remind the reader that the process of formation is governed by a non-equilibrium dynamics.



#### 4. Mechanism of Separation of Baryonic Charges

The main point of this work is that formation of the dark matter and baryon asymmetry are closely related phenomena and originated from the same physics during the QCD phase transition. Therefore, the mechanism of formation of the dark matter is essentially the same physical process which produces the baryon-antibaryon separation. The mechanism how a chunk of dense matter (which is identified with the dark matter) is formed during the QCD phase transition might include new particles or fields or might require a strong first order phase transition, but those are questions that shall not be addressed here. We simply assume that such kind of objects made of condensed quark matter can be formed. Our goal here is to discuss some general requirements which should be satisfied to have a successful separation mechanism of the baryon charges. To be more specific in what follows we assume that the chunks of dense matter are the QCD balls[4] which can be formed during the QCD phase transition in a violent collapse of a bubble formed from the axion domain wall. If the number of quarks trapped in the bulk of the bubble is sufficiently large, the collapse stops due to the internal Fermi pressure. In this case the system in the bulk may reach the critical density to condense in the CS phase. We refer the reader to [4] for the details on the structure of the QCD balls.

##### 4.1. Sakharov's Criteria

Now we want to argue that all three Sakharov's criteria [1] are satisfied (with some modifications, see below) during the formation of the QCD balls, without the need to introduce any new physics beyond the standard model (except for the axion physics which resolves the strong CP problem in QCD). Indeed,

1. The diquark condensate  $\langle \psi^T C \gamma^5 \psi \rangle$  formed in CS phase spontaneously breaks C and CP symmetries. These symmetries are also explicitly broken by the electroweak interactions (C -symmetry) and by  $\theta$  parameter (CP-symmetry) which is order of one during the QCD phase transition.

2. The diquark condensate  $\langle \psi^T C \gamma^5 \psi \rangle$  formed in CS phase spontaneously breaks the baryon symmetry.

3. The process of condensation  $\langle \psi^T C \gamma^5 \psi \rangle$  during the violent collapse of a bubble formed from the axion domain wall takes place out of thermodynamic equilibrium.

We comment on these criteria below with some specific emphasis on the spatial correlation scales of the sources of violation (spontaneous vs explicit) of the different symmetries. We remark here that explicit violation of baryon symmetry is not required in this scenario because no net baryon number is generated. The idea that the spontaneous (rather than explicit) breaking of the baryon symmetry can be responsible for the baryogenesis through a mechanism of charge separation has been known for a while, see e.g. [11] and review paper[13], where some simple toy models were discussed to explain the phenomenon of charge separation (see also work by Brandenberger et al in[12] on the subject).

#### 4.2. Hierarchy of scales

In what follows we would like to discuss four fundamentally different scales: the QCD scale  $\sim T_{QCD}^{-1}$ , a typical scale of the QCD balls,  $\sim \sqrt[3]{B} T_{QCD}^{-1}$ , and finally the Hubble scales  $H_{QCD}^{-1} \sim 30km$  at the QCD phase transition and at the present time  $H^{-1} \gg H_{QCD}^{-1}$ .

As we discussed in the previous section, the biased scattering of free quarks and antiquarks off the interface of the superconducting condensed phases at energies of the order of the energy gap  $\Delta \sim 100$  MeV produces a net transport of baryon number through the interface into the condensed phase. From these results we concluded that independently of whatever is the mechanism that creates some fluctuations of baryon density during or immediately after the QCD phase transition the droplets in CS phase will grow if they are formed. The transport of baryon number through the interface must turn off at some temperature below  $T_{QCD}$ , so that the separation of the hadronic and condensed phases is preserved in the following evolution. Indeed, we have found in Section 3.2 that at temperatures much lower than the gap  $\Delta \sim T_{QCD}$ , the interface is completely opaque for the baryon charge in both directions. Our estimations, therefore, suggest that the formation of QCD balls could be a quite natural outcome of the QCD phase transition and it can drive a separation of baryonic charges.

The size of these objects where the baryon, C and CP symmetry are spontaneously broken by the Bose-condensate is macroscopically large  $\sim \sqrt[3]{B} T_{QCD}^{-1} \sim 10^{-3}cm$ , where  $B \sim 10^{32}$  for the configurations discussed in [4], in comparison with the QCD scale  $\sim T_{QCD}^{-1}$ , however is still very small in comparison with the Hubble horizon. Therefore, if our universe were C, CP symmetric on the Hubble scale, equal number of QCD balls and antiballs would be formed in the Hubble volume leaving a net zero baryon number in the hadronic phase. We definitely live in a different world.

In the picture we advocate in this work, the universe carries zero total baryon number but is not invariant under C or CP transformations, because it has an excess of baryons in the hadronic phase (visible matter) and an excess of antibaryon number stored in the CS phase (dark matter). Such C and CP asymmetries must have a very large correlation length  $\sim H^{-1}$  comparable to the present horizon. This is the scale where one observes a homogeneous excess of hadronic baryons,  $n_B = B(\tilde{n}_B - \tilde{n}_{\bar{B}})$ . The same mechanism will also produce a homogeneous excess in the number of anti-balls with locked antibaryonic charge.

What could be the source for the large scale C, CP asymmetries? The important remark here is: the large scale asymmetry must not necessarily be produced at the same instant of the QCD phase transition but could, instead, have been generated at some earlier stages. In particular, the source of the C asymmetry is very natural because C is largely violated by weak interactions and, therefore, there is no reason to expect that the universe would be C invariant when it reaches the QCD phase transition. If the strong CP problem is cured by the axion field (as we assume), the CP asymmetry with large distance correlation length may have been produced by the same axion field,

which at temperature  $T \simeq T_{QCD}$  is not yet in its ground state and thus might be of order unity,  $\theta(T_{QCD}) \sim 1$ , so that CP is also largely broken. It is specifically required that the initial value  $\theta(T_{QCD})$  is the same in the entire observed Universe, in order to get the same sign of the baryon asymmetry everywhere. Note that this will occur, for example, if the Universe undergoes inflation during or after the Peccei-Quinn symmetry breaking, which is the standard assumption in the axion-related physics. As we mentioned, this explicit CP violation is order of one at the time of the QCD phase transition when the QCD balls are formed, but is negligible at present time after the axion field is settled at its minimum  $\theta(T = 0) = 0$ . In conclusion: the universe may naturally become C and CP globally asymmetric before or during the QCD phase transition while the total baryon number remains to be zero.

In presence of 100% broken C and CP symmetries, the excess in the number density of anti-solitons over the number density of solitons is naturally of order one,  $\tilde{n}_{\bar{B}} - \tilde{n}_B \sim \tilde{n}_{\bar{B}}, \tilde{n}_B$ , as we assumed in our estimation of the ratio  $\Omega_{DM}/\Omega_B$  in Section 2. This excess fixes in fact the number density of remnant baryons which are left in the hadronic phase, without any need of fine tuning.

#### 4.3. Estimation of the baryon excess $n_B/n_\gamma$

In what follows we present our rough estimation of the baryon excess  $n_B/n_\gamma$  in the proposed scenario. However, first of all, we want to quote a nice paragraph from the textbook *The Early Universe*, by E. Kolb and M. Turner [28] where the idea on possibility of baryon-antibaryon separation (rather than baryogenesis) is explicitly mentioned,

*“In a locally baryon symmetric universe nucleons and antinucleons remain in chemical equilibrium down to a temperature of  $\sim 22\text{MeV}$ , when  $n_B/n_\gamma = n_{\bar{B}}/n_\gamma \simeq 7 \times 10^{-20}$ , a number that is 9 orders of magnitude smaller than the observed value of  $n_B/n_\gamma$ . In order to avoid the annihilation catastrophe an unknown physical mechanism would have to operate at a temperature greater than  $38\text{MeV}$ , the temperature when  $n_B/n_\gamma = n_{\bar{B}}/n_\gamma \simeq 8 \times 10^{-11}$  and separate nucleons and antinucleons.”* ¶

If there is a mechanism of segregation of quarks and antiquarks (into hadronic and color superconducting phases) during or immediately after the QCD phase transition, and the universe is largely C and CP asymmetric already at that time, it leaves an excess of antiballs over QCD balls of order one  $\tilde{n}_{\bar{B}} - \tilde{n}_B \sim \tilde{n}_{\bar{B}}, \tilde{n}_B$ . The same mechanism produces the excess of hadrons over anti-hadrons of order  $n_B - n_{\bar{B}} \simeq B(\tilde{n}_{\bar{B}} - \tilde{n}_B)$ . This excess is preserved until today as a net remnant density of hadronic baryons once the annihilation has been completed when the temperature reaches  $22\text{MeV}$ ,  $n_B - n_{\bar{B}} \simeq n_B$ . Therefore, the calculation of the present ratio  $n_B/n_\gamma$  is reduced to the calculation of the corresponding time (temperature  $T_{form}$ ) when the QCD balls/antiballs complete their

¶ The value of the baryon to photon ratio stated in this paragraph is, in fact, an old estimation. The value reported by the WMAP collaboration  $n_B/n_\gamma \sim 6 \times 10^{-10}$  is an order of magnitude larger. Therefore, the temperature at which the mechanism of baryon separation should operate need to be somewhat larger  $\sim 41\text{MeV}$  than  $38\text{MeV}$  stated in this paragraph.

formation. This temperature is determined by many factors: transmission/reflection coefficients, evolution of the QCD balls, expansion of the universe, cooling rates, evaporation rates, dynamics of the axion domain wall network, etc. All these effects are, in general, of the same order of magnitude. Therefore, a precise theoretical calculation of  $T_{form}$  is a very difficult task. At the same time, within our scenario, the magnitude  $T_{form}$  is known with very high precision from the observations of  $n_B/n_\gamma$ , as was explained above,

$$T_{form} \simeq 41 \text{ MeV} \quad (\text{observations}). \quad (22)$$

While a precise theoretical calculation of  $T_{form}$  is difficult, an estimation of  $T_{form}$  is possible, and can be easily obtained by noticing that the QCD balls/antiballs become completely opaque for the baryon charge in both directions for incident particles with energies much lower than the gap  $\Delta$ . Independently from that, we know that the BCS type phase transition from quark gluon phase to color superconductivity takes place at temperature  $T_c \simeq 0.6\Delta$  [2, 3]. For the standard value of the energy gap  $\Delta = 100 \text{ MeV}$ ,  $T_c \sim 60 \text{ MeV}$ . The typical energies of particles at this temperature will be also of the same order. Therefore, one should expect that when temperature drops by some factor  $\sim 1/2$  or so, the number of particles with relatively high energy capable to overcome the gap barrier will be tiny. Then, most of the particles will be reflected at such temperature. We expect that at this point the QCD balls complete their formation period, and the thermodynamical equilibrium of the QCD balls with the environment will be settled. Therefore, the temperature of formation  $T_{form}$  can be roughly estimated to lie in the interval,

$$30 \text{ MeV} \simeq \frac{1}{2}T_c \lesssim T_{form} \lesssim T_c \simeq 60 \text{ MeV}, \quad (23)$$

which should be compared with ‘‘observational’’ value (22). The factor  $1/2$  in this estimate is, of course, a quite arbitrary numerical factor which accounts for a suppression of the density of particles with sufficient energy to surpass the energy gap  $\Delta$ .

One should remark here, that the standard explanation of the observed ratio,

$$\eta \equiv \frac{n_B - n_{\bar{B}}}{n_\gamma} \simeq \frac{n_B}{n_\gamma} \sim 10^{-10}, \quad (24)$$

in most suggested scenarios for baryogenesis is based on many factors such as CP violating phases, factors related to the violation of the baryon charge or the strength of phase transition. However, in most cases the models generally lack a natural scale in the problem that fixes the ratio  $\eta$ . Our interpretation of this ratio is quite different: in our scenario, C, CP and the baryon symmetries are largely broken and the observed ratio (24) is fixed by the temperature  $T_{form}$  at which the QCD balls are formed. Once  $T_{form}$  is known precisely, the methods described long ago [28] would allow to calculate the baryon to photon density when the process of charge separation is completed. That will be the ratio (24) preserved till today. Nevertheless, it should be noticed that the ratio (24) is very sensitive to the precise value of the temperature  $T_{form}$  due to the factor  $n_B \sim \exp(-\frac{m_N}{T_{form}})$ : small variation of the temperature by a few MeV would change the

ratio (24) by few orders of magnitude. It is quite obvious that precise calculation of  $T_{form}$  is not feasible at this time. However, the fact that our simple estimate (23) lies in the appropriate range of values to produce the phenomenologically observed value of the ratio  $\frac{n_B}{n_\gamma}$  is very encouraging and suggests that the whole picture may be correct.

## 5. Discussion

We have discussed a cosmological scenario where the universe is largely C and CP asymmetric, but carries zero baryon number. Large amounts of quarks and antiquarks would be stored in very heavy chunks of matter or antimatter in the color superconducting phase that would have formed during the cosmological QCD phase transition. We argue that the process of formation can leave an excess of baryons over antibaryons in the hadronic phase.

We have studied possible phenomenological constraints on this scenario and have concluded that the scenario is not ruled out and even not tightly constrained by available data. In particular, current constraints on antimatter in the universe would not directly apply to our scenario because chunks of antimatter do not easily annihilate with the normal (hadronic) matter. This is a consequence of the well-known features of the interaction of normal matter at the interface with a superconductor.

The chunks of dense matter would contribute to the “nonbaryonic” dark matter of the universe, in spite of their QCD origin, because the baryon charge stored in the diquark condensate would not be available for nucleosynthesis. Therefore the baryon charge locked in the chunks of dense matter does not contribute to  $\Omega_B h^2 \simeq 0.02$ .

The most profound consequences of the scenario are formulated in section 2.2 and section 4.3:

- We have shown in section 2.2 that the ratio  $\Omega_{DM}/\Omega_B \gtrsim 1$  can be naturally understood as a direct consequence of the underlying QCD physics, and it is related to the fact that both contributions are originated at the same instant during the QCD phase transition. As it is known this ratio is very difficult to understand if both contributions to the energy density of the universe do not have the same origin.

- In section 4.3 we have shown that the fundamental ratio (24) can be naturally understood without any fine tuning parameters as a direct consequence of the underlying QCD physics. This ratio is determined by the temperature  $T_{form}$  (22) when the QCD balls complete their formation. This temperature falls exactly into the appropriate range (23) of values where the baryon density can assume its observed value (24).

This scenario with no doubt leads to important consequences for cosmology and astrophysics, which are not explored yet. In particular, the recent detection[24] of the seismic event with epilinear (in contrast with a typical epicentral ) sources may be related to the very dense QCD balls. Also, the “missing” baryons in Galaxy Clusters[29] may also be related to the QCD balls. Finally, the cuspy halo problem in dwarf galaxies might be related to the unstable cold dark matter [30], which, again, could be related to the QCD balls discussed in this work. Indeed, if the QCD ball size exceeds the critical

value, it becomes metastable (rather than stable) configuration. The life time of these metastable QCD balls could be very large. Therefore, they could serve as decaying dark matter particles suggested in[30].

Therefore, the “exotic”, dense color superconducting phase in QCD, might be much more common state of matter in the Universe than the “normal” hadronic phase we know. In conclusion, qualitative as our arguments are, they suggest that baryogenesis can proceed at the QCD scale, and might be tightly connected with the origin of the dark matter in the Universe.

The direct tests of the ideas proposed in this work might be a long and difficult task. Therefore, it would be very interesting to test some of the ideas outlined in this work by doing a laboratory type experiment in the spirit of the Program Cosmology in the Laboratory(COSLAB). In particular, one could test the Andreev Reflection of very low energy holes and electrons by a conventional superconductor in the regime which would be analogous to the cosmological environment. Over the last few years several experiments have been done to test ideas drawn from cosmology and astrophysics(see [31] and web page[32] of the latest COSLAB meeting for further details).

## Acknowledgments

We are thankful to Sasha Dolgov for useful discussions, critical comments and nice remarks. We are also thankful to other participants of the “Baryogenesis Workshop”, (MCTP, Ann-Arbor, June 2003) where this work was presented. One of us (AZ) thanks Michael Dine for the discussions and comments during his visit to UBC.

This work was supported in part by the National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada. The financial support of Michigan Center for Theoretical Physics is greatly appreciated.

## References

- [1] A. Sakharov, *Pisma Zh. Exsp. Teor. Fiz.* **5** (1967) 32.
- [2] M. Alford, K. Rajagopal, and F. Wilczek, *Phys. Lett.* **B422**, 247 (1998); R. Rapp, T. Schäfer, E.V. Shuryak, and M. Velkovsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 53 (1998).
- [3] K. Rajagopal and F. Wilczek, arXiv:hep-ph/0011333 ; M. G. Alford, arXiv:hep-ph/0102047; T. Schafer and E. V. Shuryak, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **578**, 203 (2001) [arXiv:nucl-th/0010049].
- [4] A.R. Zhitnitsky, hep-ph/0202161; “*Dark matter as dense color superconductor*” arXiv:astro-ph/0204218, *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. B* **124**, 99 (2003)
- [5] G.E. Blonder, M. Tinkham and T.M. Klapwijk, *Phys. Rev.* **B 25**, (1982) 4515.
- [6] E. Witten, *Phys. Rev.***D 30** (1984) 279.
- [7] E. Fahri and R. Jaffe, *Phys. Rev.***D 30** (1984) 1601; *Phys. Rev.***D 30** (1984) 2379.
- [8] Jes Madsen, *Physics and Astrophysics of strange Quark Matter*, astro-ph/9809032.
- [9] R. Friedberg, T.D.Lee, A. Sirlin, *Phys. Rev.***D 13** (1976) 2739; T.D.Lee, *Phys. Rev.***D 35** (1987) 3637.
- [10] S. R. Coleman, *Nucl. Phys. B* **262**, 263 (1985) Erratum-ibid. *B 269*, 744 (1985); A. Kusenko and M. E. Shaposhnikov, *Phys. Lett. B* **418**, 46 (1998) arXiv:hep-ph/9709492; A. Kusenko,

- V. Kuzmin, M. E. Shaposhnikov and P. G. Tinyakov Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 3185 (1998) arXiv:hep-ph/9712212.
- [11] S. Dodelson and L. M. Widrow, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 326 (1990);
- [12] K. Enqvist and J. McDonald, Phys. Lett. B **425**, 309 (1998) arXiv:hep-ph/9711514; K. Enqvist and J. McDonald Nucl. Phys. B **538**, 321 (1999) arXiv:hep-ph/9803380 M. Laine and M. E. Shaposhnikov Nucl. Phys. B **532**, 376 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9804237]. R. Brandenberger, I. Halperin and A. Zhitnitsky, hep-ph 9808471, hep-ph/9903318
- [13] A. D. Dolgov, hep-ph/9707419; astro-ph/0207441; F.W.Stecker, hep-ph/0207323.
- [14] R. Peccei and H. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38** (1977) 1440.
- [15] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **40** (1978) 223; F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **40** (1978) 279.
- [16] J.E. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43** (1979) 103; M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein, and V.I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. **B166** (1980) 493(KSVZ-axion).
- [17] M. Dine, W. Fischler, and M. Srednicki, Phys. Lett. **B104** (1981) 199; A.R. Zhitnitsky, Yad.Fiz. **31** (1980) 497; Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **31** (1980) 260 (DFSZ-axion).
- [18] J.E. Kim, Phys. Rept. **150** (1987) 1; H.Y. Cheng, Phys. Rep. **158** (1988) 1; L. J. Rosenberg and K. A. van Bibber, Phys. Rept. **325**, 1 (2000); M. Srednicki, hep-th/0210172.
- [19] A. D. Dolgov, Phys. Rept. **222**, 309 (1992); A. G. Cohen, A. De Rujula and S. L. Glashow, Astrophys. J. **495**, 539 (1998); M. Y. Khlopov, S. G. Rubin and A. S. Sakharov, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 083505 (2000); A. D. Dolgov, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **113**, 40 (2002)
- [20] M. Dine and A. Kusenko, arXiv:hep-ph/0303065.
- [21] D. N. Spergel *et al.*, arXiv:astro-ph/0302209; E. Komatsu *et al.*, arXiv:astro-ph/0302223; C. B. Netterfield *et al.* [Boomerang Collaboration], Astrophys. J. **571**, 604 (2002) [arXiv:astro-ph/0104460]; C. Pryke, N. W. Halverson, E. M. Leitch, J. Kovac, J. E. Carlstrom, W. L. Holzapfel and M. Dragovan, Astrophys. J. **568**, 46 (2002) [arXiv:astro-ph/0104490]; R. Stompor *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **561**, L7 (2001) [arXiv:astro-ph/0105062].
- [22] R. H. Cyburt, B. D. Fields and K. A. Olive, arXiv:astro-ph/0302431.
- [23] A.F. Andreev, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **46** (1964) 1823 [JETP **19** (1964) 1228].
- [24] D. P. Anderson, E. T. Herrin, V. L. Teplitz and I. M. Tibuleac, arXiv:astro-ph/0205089, to appear in the Proceedings DM 2002, February 2002, Marina Del Rey, CA, USA.
- [25] M. Sadzikowski, Acta Phys. Polon. B **33**, 1601 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0201212]; M. Sadzikowski and M. Tachibana, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 045024 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0201223]; M. Sadzikowski and M. Tachibana, Acta Phys. Polon. B **33**, 4141 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0208037].
- [26] J. H. Applegate and C. J. Hogan, Phys. Rev. D **31**, 3037 (1985); K. Kajantie and H. Kurki-Suonio, Phys. Rev. D **34**, 1719 (1986); G. M. Fuller, G. J. Mathews and C. R. Alcock, Phys. Rev. D **37**, 1380 (1988); K. Sumiyoshi, T. Kajino, C.R. Alcock and G.J. Mathews, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 3963 (1990); B. S. Meyer, C. R. Alcock, G. J. Mathews and G. M. Fuller, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 1079 (1991); A. Bhattacharyya, J. e. Alam, S. Sarkar, P. Roy, B. Sinha, S. Raha and P. Bhattacharjee, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 083509 (2000); J. B. Rehm and K. Jedamzik, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 043509 (2001).
- [27] I. A. Shovkovy and P. J. Ellis, Phys. Rev. C **66**, 015802 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0204132].
- [28] E. Kolb and M. Turner, *The Early Universe*, Ed. Perseus Publishing, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- [29] S.Ettori, astro-ph/0305296
- [30] R. Cen, ApJ, **L77**, 546 (2001); F.J.Sanches-Salcedo, ApJ, 2003, in press (astro-ph/0305496); M.Oguri et al. astro-ph/0306020
- [31] G. E. Volovik, Phys. Rept. **351**, 195 (2001) [arXiv:gr-qc/0005091]. G. E. Volovik, *The Universe in a Helium Droplet*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, (2003).
- [32] THIRD COSLAB workshop, July 10-16, 2003, Bilbao, Spain, <http://www.ehu.es/COSLAB>