# Large scale magnetic fields as the origin of baryon asymmetry

based on: T. Fujita (Stanford) & KK, PRD93 (2016) 083520 [arXiv:1602.02109 (hep-ph)] KK & A.J.Long (Chicago), arXiv:1606.08891[astro-ph.CO]



**S T A T E** 

ARIZONA

# Kohei Kamada (Arizona State University)

DESY theory seminar 25/7/2016 @ DESY, Hamburg

UNIVERSITY

## Today's message is...

- The existence of intergalactic magnetic fields (MFs) are indicated recently.

- If they have originated from a mechanism before or around EWPT, they might be related to baryon asymmetry of the Universe (BAU).

- The parameter space that can explain the present BAU is on the edge of the constraints, in other words, the sweet spot is indicated.

- BSM (BGR?) might not be needed for baryogenesis but for magnetogenesis!

## 1. Magnetic fields in the Universe

2. Baryon asymmetry of the Universe

# 3. Baryogenesis from helical MFs

## Magnetic fields in the Universe



## Magnetic fields in the Universe



Courtesy H.Oide

## Evidence (?) of large scale magnetic fields

## Evidence (?) of large scale magnetic fields : Y-ray from Blazars (theory)



## Evidence (?) of large scale magnetic fields : $\Upsilon$ -ray from Blazars (theory)

(from nasa.gov)





(from nasa.gov)

GeV



~TeV Y

TeV





Intrinsic spectrum

F

**Ex-galactic** 

e

## Evidence (?) of large scale magnetic fields : Υ-ray from Blazars (theory)



# Evidence (?) of large scale magnetic fields

:  $\Upsilon$ -ray from Blazars (observation)



## Evidence (?) of large scale magnetic fields

#### : $\Upsilon$ -ray from Blazars (observation)



Evidence (?) of large scale magnetic fields Most convincing explanation: Extragalactic MFs Evidence (?) of large scale magnetic fields Most convincing explanation: Extragalactic MFs

(from nasa.gov) AGN/Blazar (from esa.int) CMB **Ex-galactic** 10<sup>-4</sup>~eV BG Light ~eV ~GeV Y ~TeV Y inverse compton (Fermi) pair creation Intergalactic MFs (from nasa.gov) Intrinsic (from nasa.gov) spectrum F F TeV GeV GeV TeV

Courtesy H.Oide

#### Constraints on the magnetic fields



Courtesy H.Oide

#### Constraints on the magnetic fields



If we believe the existence of such MFs, they are likely originated from very early Universe.

What kind of feature do they have in the Early Universe? Especially before the electroweak phase transition (EWPT)? If we believe the existence of such MFs, they are likely originated from very early Universe.

What kind of feature do they have in the Early Universe? Especially before the electroweak phase transition (EWPT)?

They interact with turbulent plasma nontrivially and evolve following complicated magnetohydro dynamics (MHD) equations.

need MHD simulations

## MHD simulation tells...



## MHD simulation tells...



small scale structure is erased by charged plasma and energy of MFs is easily deprived.

## MFs produced by a causal process will stay at:



Courtesy H.Oide

## MHD simulation tells...



small scale structure is erased by charged plasma and energy of MFs is easily deprived. This is the case with non-helical MFs.

## Helicity of MFs

$$\mathcal{H} \equiv \int_{V} d^{3}x \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{B}$$
 or  $h \equiv \frac{1}{V} \int_{V} d^{3}x \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{B}$ 

## Expanding Ai w.r.t. helicity eigenstate,

$$A_{i}(t,\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\pm} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}k}{(2\pi)^{3}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} e_{i}^{(\pm)}(\hat{\mathbf{k}}) \left[ a_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\pm)} \mathcal{A}_{(\pm)}(k,t) + a_{-\mathbf{k}}^{(\pm)\dagger} \mathcal{A}_{(\pm)}^{*}(k,t) \right]$$
$$\stackrel{\bullet}{\longrightarrow} h = \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3}k}{(2\pi)^{3}} k \left( |\mathcal{A}_{+}|^{2} - |\mathcal{A}_{-}|^{2} \right).$$
$$\simeq \pm a^{3} \lambda_{B} B_{p}^{2}$$

Helicity (density) is a good conserved quantity for large electric conductivity.

$$\dot{h} = -a^2 \frac{2}{\sigma} \langle \mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla \times \mathbf{B} \rangle \simeq -a^3 \frac{4\pi}{\sigma} \frac{B_p^2}{\lambda_B}$$

(Assumed h > 0)

For thermal plasma with charged particles:

 $\sigma \simeq 100 T$  ('97 Baym+)

Large electric conductivity prevents MFs' helicity from decaying.

 $h \simeq \pm a^3 \lambda_B B_p^2$  can be treated as an approximate conserved quantity.





## MFs produced by a causal process will stay at:



'13 Durrer and Neronov

Courtesy H.Oide







#### Before and after EWPT

...originally hypermagnetic fields turn to magnetic fields associated with Z-boson part decay



Figure 1: A cartoon of the Z-decay, which is modeled in this section.

## Before and after EWPT

...originally hypermagnetic fields turn to magnetic fields associated with Z-boson part decay

Figure 1: A cartoon of the Z-decay, which is modeled in this section.

#### What is the origin of such MFs (magnetogenesis)?

#### Related to inflation?

e.g. '88 Turner+, '06 Anber+, '09 Demozzi+, '12 Bernaby+, '14 Ferreira+,'15 Fujita+,...

Phase transition? e.g. '89 Vachaspati, '89 Quashnock+, '97 Sigl+,...

# at present there are no satisfactory models.

But see '16 Fujita+ '16 Adshead+

#### What is the origin of such MFs (magnetogenesis)?

#### Related to inflation?

e.g. '88 Turner+, '06 Anber+, '09 Demozzi+, '12 Bernaby+, '14 Ferreira+,'15 Fujita+,...

Phase transition? e.g. '89 Vachaspati, '89 Quashnock+, '97 Sigl+,...

# at present there are no satisfactory models.

But see '16 Fujita+ '16 Adshead+

Axionic coupling of pseudoscalar?

$$\frac{\alpha}{8\pi}C_{\alpha\gamma}\frac{a}{f_a}F^{\mu\nu}\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}$$

Chiral asymmetry induced by bubbles from 1st order PT?

 $\Delta n_5 = \# \Delta \mathcal{H} + \# \Delta \mathcal{N}_{\rm CS}$ 

Or other mechanism???

Here I do NOT pursue model buildings. But give a "sweet spot" of the parameter space, not specifying their origin.



## The hint is baryogenesis.

# Baryon asymmetry of the Universe (BAU)



We live in a matter-antimatter asymmetric Universe.
BBN and CMB can evaluate it quantitatively.


#### Inflation dilutes the preexisting asymmetry.



WMAP team

#### After inflation before BBN, asymmetry must be generated.



In order to generate baryon asymmetry... Sakharov's condition is required. ('67 Sakharov)

1. B-violation

2. C & CP-violation

3. Deviation from thermal equilibrium



In order to generate baryon asymmetry... Sakharov's condition is required. ('67 Sakharov)

1. B-violation

2. C & CP-violation

3. Deviation from thermal equilibrium

#### BSM is required!?

- Leptogenesis ('85 Fukigita&Yanagida)
- Affleck-Dine ('85 Affleck&Dine)
- EW baryogenesis

('85 Kuzmin, Rubakov&Shaposhnikov)

- : RH neutrinos
- : SUSY with B and CP op.
- : 1st order EWPT + CP op.



Chiral anomaly in SM  $\nabla_{\mu} j_{f}^{\mu} \propto \frac{\alpha}{8\pi} \operatorname{Tr} W_{\mu\nu} \tilde{W}^{\mu\nu}$  breaks B and L - Nontrivial vacuum structure of SU(2) - Sphaleron (B-L preserved; B+L) => EW baryogenesis

Leptogenesis

Sphaleron (+charge conservation & Yukawa)

washes out preexisting B+L asymmetry before EWPT.



('85 Kuzmin, Rubakov & Shaposhnikov)

Non-BAU if B-L=0

Sphaleron (+charge conservation & Yukawa)

washes out preexisting B+L asymmetry before EWPT.



#### Successful BAU <-> B-L genesis.

Sphaleron (+charge conservation & Yukawa)

washes out preexisting B+L asymmetry before EWPT.



Successful BAU <-> B-L genesis.

It is often considered that...

"For the present BAU, not B but B-L is needed."

## Baryogenesis from helical MFs

(hyper)MFs and U(1)Y/EM charged chiral fermions interact in two ways.

(hyper)MFs and U(1)Y/EM charged chiral fermions interact in two ways.

- chiral anomaly ('76 't Hooft)

- chiral magnetic effect (CME)

('80 Vilenkin)

## 















Note that:

$$\int_{V} d^{3}x Y_{\mu\nu} \tilde{Y}^{\mu\nu} = -4 \int_{V} d^{3}x \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B} = -2 \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}$$

- If there are time-dependent helical hypermagnetic fields, it will affect the fermion number density.

# Full chiral anomaly in SM $\nabla_{\mu}j_{f}^{\mu} = C_{y}^{f}\frac{\alpha_{y}}{4\pi}Y_{\mu\nu}\tilde{Y}^{\mu\nu} + C_{w}^{f}\frac{\alpha_{w}}{8\pi}\text{Tr}W_{\mu\nu}\tilde{W}^{\mu\nu} + C_{s}^{f}\frac{\alpha_{s}}{8\pi}\text{Tr}G_{\mu\nu}\tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}$ Trivial vacuum structure: EW sphaleron (B+L) Strong sphaleron (B,L) Situation will change for nonvanishing BG hyperfield

Note that:

$$\int_{V} d^{3}x Y_{\mu\nu} \tilde{Y}^{\mu\nu} = -4 \int_{V} d^{3}x \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B} = -2 \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}$$

- If there are time-dependent helical hypermagnetic fields, it will affect the fermion number density.

- This is another source of B+L!!!,

'98 Giovanninni & Shaposhnikov

## Full chiral anomaly in SM $\nabla_{\mu} j_{f}^{\mu} = C_{y}^{f} \frac{\alpha_{y}}{4\pi} Y_{\mu\nu} \tilde{Y}^{\mu\nu} + C_{w}^{f} \frac{\alpha_{w}}{8\pi} \operatorname{Tr} W_{\mu\nu} \tilde{W}^{\mu\nu} + C_{s}^{f} \frac{\alpha_{s}}{8\pi} \operatorname{Tr} G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}$ Trivial vacuum structure: EW sphaleron (B+L) Strong sphaleron (B,L) Situation will change for nonvanishing BG hyperfield

Note that:

$$\int_{V} d^{3}x Y_{\mu\nu} \tilde{Y}^{\mu\nu} = -4 \int_{V} d^{3}x \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B} = -2 \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}$$

- If there are time-dependent helical hypermagnetic fields, it will affect the fermion number density.

- This is another source of B+L!!! '98 Giovanninni & Shaposhnikov # Both B+L processes (sphalerons and U(1)y anomaly) are active until EWPT.

Courtesy H.Oide



#### Chiral Magnetic Effect (CME) ('80 Vilenkin)



In the presence of MFs, magnetic moments of fermions aligned along MFs. This generates electric current oppositely for left and right-handed fermions.

> Electric current proportional to the chiral asymmetry is induced:  $j_{CME} = \frac{2}{\pi} \alpha \mu_5 B$  $\chi_{\omega} \text{ effect}_{\mu_5} = \sum_{i} q_i^2 \mu_{R_i} - \sum_{j} q_j^2 \mu_{L_j} \text{ : Magreentialized chiral chemical potential}$  $i = \int_{i}^{j} (1 - \sum_{j} q_j^2) \mu_{L_j} \text{ : Magreentialized chiral chemical potential}$

#### Chiral Magnetic Effect (CME) ('80 Vilenkin)



In the presence of MFs, magnetic moments of fermions aligned along MFs. This generates electric current oppositely for left and right-handed fermions.

Electric current proportional to the chiral asymmetry is induced:  $j_{CME} = \frac{2}{\pi} \alpha \mu_5 B$  $\chi_{\omega} \text{ effect} = \int_{i} q_i^2 \mu_{R_i} - \int_{j} \mu_j^2 \mu_{L_j} + Magnentianted chiral chemical potential of the structure differs, but this effect exists both before and after EWPT.$  Modified Ampere's law

 $\nabla \times \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{j}_{Ohm} + \mathbf{j}_{CME} + \dot{\mathbf{E}} = \sigma(\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}) + \frac{2}{\pi} \alpha \mu_5 \mathbf{B} + \dot{\mathbf{E}}$ 

$$\mathbf{E} = \frac{1}{\sigma} \left( \nabla \times \mathbf{B} - \frac{2}{\pi} \alpha \mu_5 \mathbf{B} + \dot{\mathbf{E}} \right) - \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{B}$$

$$\langle \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B} \rangle \simeq \frac{1}{\sigma} \langle \mathbf{B} \cdot \nabla \times \mathbf{B} \rangle - \frac{2\alpha}{\pi\sigma} \mu_5 \langle \mathbf{B}^2 \rangle$$
$$\simeq \frac{2\pi}{\sigma} \frac{B_p^2(T)}{\lambda_B(T)} - \frac{2\alpha}{\pi\sigma} \mu_5 B_p^2(T)$$

 $x \equiv T/H$  $\eta_f = n_f/s$ 

 $\frac{d\eta_{u_L^i}}{dx} = N_c y_{Q_L}^2 \mathcal{S}_Y + \cdots$ 

 $S_Y = -\frac{2\alpha}{\sigma sT} \frac{B_p^2(T)}{\lambda_B(T)} + \frac{12\alpha^2}{\pi^2 \sigma T^3} B_p^2(T) \eta_5$  $\equiv -\gamma_Y(x) + \gamma_Y^{\rm CME}(x)\eta_5$ 

$$x \equiv T/H$$
  
 $\eta_f = n_f/s$ 

$$\frac{d\eta_{u_L^i}}{dx} = N_c y_{Q_L}^2 \mathcal{S}_Y - \gamma_W (\eta_{u_L^i} - \dots) - \dots$$

$$S_Y = -\frac{2\alpha}{\sigma sT} \frac{B_p^2(T)}{\lambda_B(T)} + \frac{12\alpha^2}{\pi^2 \sigma T^3} B_p^2(T) \eta_5$$
$$\equiv -\gamma_Y(x) + \gamma_Y^{\text{CME}}(x) \eta_5$$

 $x \equiv T/H$  $\eta_f = n_f/s$ 

1

$$\begin{split} \frac{\partial \eta_{u_{L}^{i}}}{\partial x} &= -N_{c}q_{Q}^{2}(\gamma_{y} - \gamma_{y}^{\text{CME}}\mu_{5}^{Y}) - N_{c}\frac{\gamma_{w}}{2}\sum_{j}(\eta_{u_{L}^{j}} + \eta_{d_{L}^{j}} + \eta_{e_{L}^{j}} + \eta_{\nu_{L}^{j}}) - \frac{\gamma_{s}}{2}\sum_{j}(\eta_{u_{L}^{j}} + \eta_{d_{L}^{j}} - \eta_{u^{j}} - \eta_{d^{j}}) \\ &- \sum_{j}\frac{\gamma_{u^{ij}}}{2}\left(\frac{\eta_{u_{L}^{i}}}{3} + \frac{\eta_{\varphi^{0}}}{2} - \frac{\eta_{u_{R}^{j}}}{3}\right) - \sum_{j}\frac{\gamma_{d^{ij}}}{2}\left(\frac{\eta_{u_{L}^{i}}}{3} - \frac{\eta_{\varphi^{+}}}{2} - \frac{\eta_{d_{R}^{j}}}{3}\right) \\ &- \sum_{j}\gamma_{u^{ij}}^{M}\left(\frac{\eta_{u_{L}^{i}}}{3} - \frac{\eta_{u_{R}^{i}}}{3}\right) - \gamma_{2}(\eta_{u_{L}^{i}} - \eta_{d_{L}^{i}}), \\ \frac{\partial \eta_{d_{L}^{i}}}{\partial x} &= -N_{c}q_{Q}^{2}(\gamma_{y} - \gamma_{y}^{\text{CME}}\mu_{5}^{Y}) - N_{c}\frac{\gamma_{w}}{2}\sum_{j}(\eta_{u_{L}^{i}} + \eta_{d_{L}^{i}} + \eta_{e_{L}^{i}} + \eta_{\nu_{L}^{i}}) - \frac{\gamma_{s}}{2}\sum_{j}(\eta_{u_{L}^{j}} + \eta_{d_{L}^{j}} - \eta_{u^{j}} - \eta_{d^{j}}) \\ &- \sum_{j}\frac{\gamma_{u^{ij}}}{2}\left(\frac{\eta_{d_{L}^{i}}}{3} + \frac{\eta_{\varphi^{+}}}{2} - \frac{\eta_{u_{R}^{i}}}{3}\right) - \sum_{j}\frac{\gamma_{d^{ij}}}{2}\left(\frac{\eta_{d_{L}^{i}}}{3} - \frac{\eta_{e^{0}}}{2} - \frac{\eta_{d_{R}^{j}}}{3}\right) \\ &- \sum_{j}\gamma_{d^{ij}}^{M}\left(\frac{\eta_{d_{L}^{i}}}{3} - \frac{\eta_{e^{1}}}{3}\right) - \gamma_{2}(\eta_{d_{L}^{i}} - \eta_{u_{L}^{i}}), \\ \frac{\partial \eta_{\nu_{L}^{i}}}{\partial x} &= -q_{L}^{2}(\gamma_{y} - \gamma_{y}^{\text{CME}}\mu_{5}^{Y}) - \frac{\gamma_{w}}{2}\sum_{j}(\eta_{u_{L}^{i}} + \eta_{d_{L}^{i}} + \eta_{e_{L}^{i}} + \eta_{\nu_{L}^{i}}) - \sum_{j}\frac{\gamma_{e^{ij}}}{2}\left(\eta_{\nu_{L}^{i}} - \frac{\eta_{e^{i}}}{2} - \eta_{e^{i}_{R}}\right) - \gamma_{2}(\eta_{\nu_{L}^{i}} - \eta_{u_{L}^{i}}), \\ \frac{\partial \eta_{\nu_{L}^{i}}}{\partial x} &= -q_{L}^{2}(\gamma_{y} - \gamma_{y}^{\text{CME}}\mu_{5}^{Y}) - \frac{\gamma_{w}}{2}\sum_{j}(\eta_{u_{L}^{i}} + \eta_{d_{L}^{i}} + \eta_{e_{L}^{i}} + \eta_{\nu_{L}^{i}}) - \sum_{j}\frac{\gamma_{e^{ij}}}{2}\left(\eta_{\nu_{L}^{i}} - \frac{\eta_{e^{i}}}{2} - \eta_{e^{i}_{R}}\right) \\ \sum_{j}(M_{u_{L}^{i}} - \eta_{u_{L}^{j}} + \eta_{d_{L}^{j}} + \eta_{u_{L}^{j}} + \eta_{u_{L}^{j}} + \eta_{\nu_{L}^{j}}) - \sum_{j}\frac{\gamma_{e^{ij}}}{2}\left(\eta_{e_{L}^{i}} - \frac{\eta_{e^{j}}}{2} - \eta_{e^{i}_{R}}\right) \\ \end{array}$$

 $x \equiv T/H$  $\eta_f = n_f/s$ 

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \eta_{u_{L}^{i}}}{\partial x} &= -N_{c}q_{Q}^{2}(\gamma_{y} - \gamma_{y}^{CME}\mu_{5}^{Y}) - N_{c}\frac{\gamma_{w}}{2}\sum_{j}(\eta_{u_{L}^{i}} + \eta_{d_{L}^{i}} + \eta_{e_{L}^{i}} + \eta_{e_{L}^{i}}) - \frac{\gamma_{s}}{2}\sum_{j}(\eta_{u_{L}^{i}} + \eta_{d_{L}^{i}} - \eta_{u^{j}} - \eta_{d^{j}}) \\ &= \sum_{j}\frac{\gamma_{u^{i}j}}{2} \\ \frac{\partial \eta_{d_{L}^{i}}}{\partial x} &= -N_{c}q_{Q}^{2}(\gamma_{u} - \gamma_{u}^{CME}(x), \gamma_{W}(x), \gamma_{u} \cdots \\ &: \text{Washout term} \Rightarrow \text{BAU} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \sum_{j}\frac{\gamma_{u^{i}j}}{2} \\ &= \sum_{j}\gamma_{d^{i}j}^{M} \left(\frac{\eta_{d_{L}^{i}}}{3} - \frac{\eta_{d_{R}^{i}}}{3}\right) - \gamma_{2}(\eta_{d_{L}^{i}} - \eta_{u_{L}^{i}}), \end{aligned}$$

 $x \equiv T/H$  $\eta_f = n_f/s$ 

$$\frac{\partial \eta_{u_{L}^{i}}}{\partial x} = -N$$
Analytic solution
$$-\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \begin{array}{c} -\eta_{u^{j}} - \eta_{d^{j}} \right) \\ -\eta_{u^{j}} - \eta_{d^{j}} \\ -\gamma_{u^{j}} - \eta_{d^{j}$$







## After EWPT (T~160 GeV)... The structure of kinetic equations are similar: Just U(1) $_{Y}$ -> U(1)EM

## After EWPT (T~160 GeV)... The structure of kinetic equations are similar: Just U(1)<sub>Y</sub> -> U(1)<sub>EM</sub>

- Chiral anomaly of U(1)EM does not break baryon #

-10 pure gauge multicanonical 0000 -15 standard 0 perturbative -20 -25  $\log \Gamma/T^4$ -30 standard 0 multicanonical fit perturbative -35  $\log[\alpha H(T)/T]$ -40 000000 ('14 D'Onofrio+) 0 -45 170 180 160 130 140 150 170 160

150

T / GeV

still lasts until T~135 GeV

T / GeV

Courtesy H.Oide

## After EWPT (T~160 GeV)... The structure of kinetic equations are similar: Just U(1)<sub>Y</sub> -> U(1)<sub>EM</sub>

- Chiral anomaly of U(1)EM does not break baryon #

still lasts until T~135 GeV










## After EWPT (T~160 GeV)...

The structure of kinetic equations are similar:







## Parameter spaces...



Courtesy H.Oide

Parameter spaces...



Ruled out? But constraints are not so precise.

Parameter spaces...



## Ruled out? But constraints are not so precise.

Courtesy H.Oide



- The existence of intergalactic magnetic fields (MFs) are indicated recently.

- If they have originated from a mechanism before EWPT, they might be related to baryon asymmetry of the Universe (BAU).

- The parameter space that can explain the present BAU is on the edge of the constraints, in other words, the sweet spot is indicated.

 $B_0 \sim 10^{-14 \sim 15} \text{G}, \quad \lambda_0 \sim 0.1 - 1 \text{pc}$ 

- Precise determination of constraint as well as transport coefficients  $\gamma_{\text{CME}}^{\text{EM}}, \gamma_{e^{11}}, \gamma_{e^{11}}^{M}$  at T~135 GeV are needed.
- BSM might not be needed for baryogenesis but for magnetogenesis!



Backreaction to the B-field dynamics from CME We evaluate the B-field evolution as

 $\dot{B}_p \simeq HB_p$ 

through Inverse Cacade

CME w/o IC leads

$$\dot{B}_{p} \simeq \frac{2\alpha}{\pi\sigma}\mu_{5}\nabla \times B_{p} \sim \frac{2\alpha}{\pi\sigma}\mu_{5}\frac{B_{p}}{\lambda_{B}}$$
For
$$H > \frac{\alpha}{\sigma}\frac{\mu_{5}}{\lambda_{B}}$$
CME is negligible.
$$10^{-14}\left(\frac{T}{10^{2}\text{GeV}}\right)^{2}\text{GeV}$$

$$10^{-24}\left(\frac{\mu_{5}/T}{10^{-10}}\right)\left(\frac{T}{10^{2}\text{GeV}}\right)^{5/3}\left(\frac{\lambda_{0}}{1\text{pc}}\right)^{-1}\text{GeV}$$