

Natural scale of cosmological constant in seesaw mechanism with broken SUSY

V.V.Kiselev^{1,2} and S.A.Timofeev²

¹*Russian State Research Center "Institute for High Energy Physics",
Pobeda 1, Protvino, Moscow Region, 142281, Russia
Fax: +7-4967-744937*

²*Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Institutskii per. 9, Dolgoprudnyi, Moscow Region, 141700, Russia*

The cosmological constant is inherently determined by the scale of breaking down supersymmetry in the mechanism of seesaw fluctuations of two vacuum-states.

PACS numbers: 98.80.-k

The evolution of flat Universe is well described by the introduction of cosmological constant [1] that determines the energy density $\rho_\Lambda = \mu_\Lambda^4$ at the artificially small scale

$$\mu_\Lambda \approx 0.25 \cdot 10^{-11} \text{ GeV}. \quad (1)$$

Indeed, due to the vacuum (zero-point) modes of quantum fields one could expect the energy density

$$\rho = \sum_{\text{modes}} (-1)^F \hat{\rho}, \quad \text{with} \quad \hat{\rho} = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \omega(\mathbf{k}), \quad (2)$$

where $F = \{0, 1\}$ denotes the fermion number for bosonic or fermionic mode, correspondingly, while the dispersion law is given by $\omega(\mathbf{k}) = \sqrt{m^2 + \mathbf{k}^2}$ in the free-field approximation. So, exact supersymmetry (SUSY) guarantees the balance of bosonic and fermionic modes with $\omega > 0$ as well as the equality of masses for superpartners, i.e.

$$I_W = \sum_{\text{modes}} (-1)^F = 0, \quad \{m_B = m_F \Leftrightarrow \omega_B(\mathbf{k}) = \omega_F(\mathbf{k})\}.$$

Hence, the supersymmetric vacuum state $|\Phi_S\rangle$ has zero energy density $\rho_S = 0$, and $\mu_\Lambda \mapsto 0$ would be natural. The Witten's index I_W [3] would differ from zero in the supersymmetric theory [4], if one introduces different numbers of bosonic and fermionic modes with zero energy $\omega = 0$, but such the situation would correspond to the case, when due to the conservation law for the number of unpaired zero-energy modes, the supersymmetry cannot be spontaneously broken in evident contradiction with observations.

A loss of balance in the dispersion laws of modes produces a non-zero cosmological constant, when SUSY is broken down as we observe in practice. Then, different masses are generated for superpartners at scales below the characteristic energy of SUSY breaking μ_X , while SUSY is restored at scales higher than μ_X . Therefore, the integration in the energy density of single zero-point mode $\hat{\rho}$ in (2) is actually cut off by μ_X because of exact cancelling by the superpartner contribution at higher scales¹.

In the matter sector various scenarios of breaking down SUSY [4] give masses m essentially less than μ_X in the observable sector of the Standard Model, while in a hidden sector, vacuum expectations values (VEV) of auxiliary scalar fields produce masses $m_{\text{hid.}} \sim \mu_X$. So, the contribution of observable-matter sector to vacuum energy is suppressed with respect to μ_X^4 at least by powers of ratio m/μ_X . In contrast, the hidden sector provides the vacuum energy about $\rho \sim \pm \mu_X^4$.

In the gravity sector, SUSY breaking leads to the massive goldstino with spirality $\pm \frac{1}{2}$ complementing the gravitino modes with spirality $\pm \frac{3}{2}$ to the full set, while the gravitino-superpartner, i.e., the graviton with spirality ± 2 remains massless. Therefore, the goldstino breaks the balance in the gravity sector, and the vacuum energy gains the large negative contribution of two goldstino-modes with the mass essentially less than the scale of SUSY breaking [4]

$$\sum_{\text{gravity}} (-1)^F \hat{\rho} \approx - \sum_{\text{goldstino}} \hat{\rho} \approx - \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \mu_X^4, \quad (3)$$

to the leading order in m/μ_X . However, such the disbalance in Witten's index for gravity modes considers to be artificial in global sense, since the goldstino is formed by a superposition of spinor modes from the hidden sector, or equivalently the spinor modes of superfields with non-zero VEV for their auxiliary scalar fields are expanded in terms of goldstino and other unitary fields, whereas the coefficients of expansion are given by the VEV [4]. Then, the goldstino has two bosonic-superpartner modes in the hidden sector, which produce a positive contribution to the vacuum energy. Nevertheless, Eq.(3) demonstrates a possibility to get the definite sign of vacuum energy, which is *negative*. More strictly, W. Nahm has algebraically found [5] that SUSY is forbidden in four-dimensional (4D) spacetime with a positive density of vacuum energy, while it is permitted in 4D spacetime with a negative density of vacuum energy.

Thus, the vacuum modes in supergravity with SUSY broken below μ_X give the *negative* cosmological constant, that corresponds to Anti-de Sitter spacetime (AdS). We denote such the state by $|\Phi_X\rangle$ with $\rho = -\rho_X \sim -\mu_X^4$ naturally setting $\mu_X \gg \mu_\Lambda$ in phenomenology of particle physics.

However, since the zero-point modes with momenta

¹ See notes on the scheme of regularization in [2].

greater than μ_X are common for both $|\Phi_S\rangle$ and $|\Phi_X\rangle$ states, they are not completely independent. Hence, dynamical processes at characteristic distances less than $\lambda_X = 1/\mu_X$ involve the correlation of two vacuum-states with zero and negative cosmological constants.

The overlapping of two vacua is associated with a domain wall separating the bubble of lower energy AdS-vacuum from the exterior of higher energy flat-vacuum. A decay of unstable false vacuum into the stable state [6] is described in terms of *bounce* being the solution of 4D-Euclidean spherically-symmetric field-equations for a scalar field interpolating between local minima of its potential in the region of domain wall. The bounce determines the quasiclassical exponent of penetration between two levels of vacuum. Coleman and De Luccia [7] shown that the bounce is essentially modified by gravity that introduces a critical surface tension of domain wall, while S. Weinberg [8] found that the real surface density of energy exceeds the critical one in supergravity. Thus, the decay does not take place². Therefore, we focus on stationary 3D spherically symmetric fluctuations of scalar field, that provide the *mixing of two vacuum-states*, if such the domain wall cannot evolve to spatial infinity.

In this letter we find that the correlation of two states, $|\Phi_S\rangle$ and $|\Phi_X\rangle$ corresponding to the exact and broken SUSY, leads to a fine mixing that produces the stationary vacuum with a naturally small positive cosmological constant related with the scale of SUSY breaking μ_X .

Consider action S for fields independent of time. Then, we can introduce the static potential U^{stat} by expression

$$S = \int \mathcal{L} \sqrt{-g} \, d^4x \mapsto S^{\text{stat}} = -U^{\text{stat}} \int dt, \quad (4)$$

while the metric takes the form consistent with the spherical symmetry

$$ds^2 = \tilde{B}(r) dt^2 - \frac{1}{B(r)} dr^2 - r^2(d\vartheta^2 + \sin^2\vartheta d\varphi^2). \quad (5)$$

The lagrangian of real scalar $\mathcal{L}_f = \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi - V(\phi)$ includes the gradient term $g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi \mapsto -(\phi')^2 B$, where the prime denotes the derivative with respect to the distance r . Then, the field equation reads as follows

$$\phi'' + u' \phi' + \frac{2}{r} \phi' = \frac{1}{B} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi} \quad (6)$$

with $u = \frac{1}{2} \ln(\tilde{B}B)$.

The energy-momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi - g_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{L}_f$ is composed by diagonal elements

$$\begin{aligned} T_t^t &= +\frac{1}{2} (\phi')^2 B + V, \\ T_r^r &= -\frac{1}{2} (\phi')^2 B + V, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

and $T_\vartheta^\vartheta = T_\varphi^\varphi = T_t^t$, which enter the Einstein equations $R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} R = 8\pi G T_{\mu\nu}$.

Then, summing up the static actions of general relativity with the lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{GR} = -R/16\pi G$ and of static field with the lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_f = -T_t^t$ under the relation of scalar curvature with the trace of energy-momentum tensor $R = -8\pi G T$, we get U^{stat} depending on the size of sphere r_A inside of which the matter has a non-zero energy,

$$U^{\text{stat}}(r_A) = -4\pi \int_0^{r_A} V(\phi) \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{B}}{B}} r^2 dr. \quad (8)$$

The static potential U^{stat} equals zero if the scalar field is global and it is positioned at a local minimum of its potential with $V = 0$. If the local minimum has negative $V = -\rho_X$, then we arrive to Anti-de Sitter spacetime with

$$\tilde{B}_{\text{AdS}} = B_{\text{AdS}} = 1 + \frac{r^2}{\ell^2}, \quad \frac{1}{\ell^2} = \frac{8\pi G}{3} \rho_X, \quad (9)$$

and the *positive* static potential

$$U_{\text{AdS}}^{\text{stat}} = \frac{4\pi}{3} r_A^3 \rho_X. \quad (10)$$

Let $\phi(r)$ be the solution, which interpolates between two local minima of potential with zero energy and negative $V = -\rho_X$. In this letter we restrict ourselves by the consideration of thin domain wall, so that the field is essentially changing in a narrow layer of width δr near the sphere of radius r_A and $\delta r \ll r_A$. Then,

$$U^{\text{stat}}(r_A) = \frac{4\pi}{3} r_A^3 \rho_X - 4\pi r_A^2 W_A, \quad (11)$$

where W_A determines the surface energy per unit area

$$W_A(r_A) = \frac{1}{r_A^2} \int_{r_A}^{r_A + \delta r} V(\phi) \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{B}}{B}} r^2 dr, \quad (12)$$

and it is positive if the local minima are separated by sufficiently high potential barrier.

For instance, at $\delta r \ll r_A \ll \ell$ we can safely neglect the contribution of first-derivative terms in the field equation (6), since by the order of magnitude $\phi'' \sim \delta\phi/(\delta r)^2$, while the spatial term is at the level of $\phi'/r \sim \delta\phi/(\delta r)^2 \cdot \delta r/r_A \ll \phi''$, and the metric elements $\tilde{B}, B$ are infinitely close to unit, so that $u' \phi' \sim r_A^2/\ell^2 \cdot 1/\delta r \cdot \delta\phi/\delta r \ll \phi''$. Therefore, in this limit the field equation does not involve any scale parameter external with respect to the potential V and it reproduces the “kink” solution with the small value of r_A and the width δr determined by a mass parameter in V , since the field equation yields $1/(\delta r)^2 \sim \delta V/(\delta\phi)^2 \sim \partial^2 V/\partial\phi^2$. Note, that the gradient contribution to the energy density T_t^t equals the potential term. The kink sets the distribution of matter determining the behavior of metric. Thus, the thin domain wall

² See some further arguments in [9].

can be established in the limit of small bubble, at least. The domain wall can remain thin at $r_A \sim \ell$ or $r_A \gg \ell$ if the gravitational term in the field equation is suppressed, and hence, $W_A \approx \text{const.}$

Setting $\tilde{B} \sim B$ and $V \sim (\phi')^2$, we roughly find $W_A \sim \int \sqrt{V} \phi' dr \sim \int \sqrt{V} d\phi$, while in the supersymmetric theory with the chiral superfield the potential is determined by the superpotential f as $V = |\partial f / \partial \phi|^2$, hence, $W_A \sim |f_0|$, where f_0 is the superpotential value at the vacuum. In supergravity the *negative* vacuum energy at the extremal of superpotential is assigned to the superpotential itself in the linear order in Newton constant G

$$\rho_X = 24\pi G |f_0|^2, \quad (13)$$

that yields

$$W_A \sim m_{\text{Pl}} \mu_X^2, \quad (14)$$

where $m_{\text{Pl}} = 1/\sqrt{G} \sim 10^{19}$ GeV is the Planck mass.

The materialization of bubble with zero static potential can take place in the vacuum with zero density of energy at the characteristic size given by solving $U^{\text{stat}} = 0$, hence,

$$r_A = \frac{3W_A}{\rho_X} \sim \ell. \quad (15)$$

The materialization of bubble in the flat vacuum results in the instability, since it takes place at the size r_A , that is not positioned at the local minimum of static potential: *the domain wall begins to move to the bubble center* in agreement with (11). Furthermore, the zero size of bubble is also unstable: the flat vacuum suffers from fluctuations due to the bubbles of AdS vacuum.

This situation is opposite to the case of *switching off the gravity*, when the domain wall can materialize after the penetration through the potential barrier, so that it will move to spatial infinity, that means the *decay* of flat vacuum to the AdS one.

As we have just shown the gravity induces the materialization of 3D spherical bubble not propagating to infinity, that means the *mixing* of two levels, but *not the decay*. Thus, due to the unstable bubbles the vacua are not eigenstates of true hamiltonian.

Let us consider the quantum system of two stationary vacuum-levels described by the hamiltonian density in the volume restricted by the domain wall,

$$\mathcal{H} = -\rho_X |\Phi_X\rangle \langle \Phi_X| + \rho_S |\Phi_S\rangle \langle \Phi_S| + \tilde{\rho} \{ |\Phi_X\rangle \langle \Phi_S| + |\Phi_S\rangle \langle \Phi_X| \}, \quad (16)$$

where $\rho_X \sim \mu_X^4$ in the AdS vacuum with broken SUSY, while in the supersymmetric vacuum $\rho_S = 0$, and $\tilde{\rho}$ takes a real positive value due to the freedom in the definition of vacuum states. Let us, first, evaluate the width of domain wall δr and, second, estimate the mixing matrix element $\tilde{\rho} = \langle \Phi_S | \mathcal{H} | \Phi_X \rangle$.

If the domain wall is thin, its mass is given by the expression $M_{\text{dw}} = 4\pi r_A^2 W_A \sim 4\pi \ell^2 \delta r V_0$, where V_0 is the characteristic height of potential barrier inside the wall. This mass is compensated by the negative mass of bubble $M_b = -4\pi r_A^3 \rho_X / 3 \sim -\mu_X^4 \ell^3$, so that under $\ell \sim m_{\text{Pl}} / \mu_X^2$ we get

$$\delta r \cdot V_0 \sim \ell \rho_X \sim m_{\text{Pl}} \mu_X^2. \quad (17)$$

Furthermore, for the chiral superfield due to (13) one finds

$$f_0 \sim m_{\text{Pl}} \mu_X^2 \Rightarrow V_0 \sim \frac{f_0^2}{(\delta\phi)^2} \sim \frac{m_{\text{Pl}}^2 \mu_X^4}{(\delta\phi)^2}, \quad (18)$$

where $\delta\phi$ is the characteristic change of field in the domain wall, i.e. the “distance” between two extremal points of the field. Hence, we evaluate the width of thin domain wall in terms of evolution change of the field,

$$\delta r \sim \frac{(\delta\phi)^2}{m_{\text{Pl}} \mu_X^2}. \quad (19)$$

Putting $\delta r \ll r_A \sim \ell$, we find $\delta\phi \ll m_{\text{Pl}}$. Therefore, the domain wall is thin, if the field dynamics is essentially sub-Planckian. For instance, we get

$$\delta\phi \sim \mu_X \Rightarrow \delta r \sim \frac{1}{m_{\text{Pl}}}, \quad (20)$$

$$\delta\phi \sim \sqrt{m_{\text{Pl}} \mu_X} \Rightarrow \delta r \sim \lambda_X = \frac{1}{\mu_X}. \quad (21)$$

The case of $\delta r \sim \lambda_X$ looks the most natural situation, since the domain wall has the size of correlation length of two vacua. Note, that at $\sqrt{m_{\text{Pl}} \mu_X} \ll \delta\phi \ll m_{\text{Pl}}$ the width of thin domain wall becomes much greater than the correlation length λ_X , that requires especial consideration, which can be presented elsewhere.

The correlation energy of two states can be estimated in terms of mixing density of energy multiplied by the volume of the bubble,

$$E_{\text{corr.}} \sim \tilde{\rho} \cdot \ell^3. \quad (22)$$

On the other hand, it is determined by the energy in the overlapping region restricted by the correlation length λ_X , i.e. in the element of thin domain wall with the area of the order of λ_X^2 . Hence, $E_{\text{corr.}}$ is given by the surface tension $W_A \sim \delta r \cdot V_0$ in the area of correlation

$$E_{\text{corr.}} \sim W_A \cdot \lambda_X^2. \quad (23)$$

In other words, the correlation energy is determined by the mass of domain wall with size λ_X , that could be considered as a bare AdS-bubble in the beginning of materialization. Therefore, under $W_A \sim f_0 \sim m_{\text{Pl}} \mu_X^2$ we get the estimate

$$\tilde{\rho} \sim \frac{\mu_X^2}{\ell^2} \sim \frac{\mu_X^6}{m_{\text{Pl}}^2}, \quad (24)$$

implying $\tilde{\rho} \ll \rho_X$. Then, the matrix of two-level hamiltonian of vacuum has the form

$$\mathcal{H} = \begin{pmatrix} -\rho_X & \tilde{\rho} \\ \tilde{\rho} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{at} \quad \tilde{\rho} \ll \rho_X, \quad (25)$$

so that such the texture is well known in the particle phenomenology as the “seesaw mechanism” for describing the mixing of charged currents, for instance [10]. Some applications of seesaw mechanism to the cosmological constant problem and quintessence dynamics have been studied in [11] and [12]. The eigenvalues are equal to

$$\rho_\Lambda = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\rho_X \pm \sqrt{\rho_X^2 + 4\tilde{\rho}^2} \right), \quad (26)$$

and due to $\tilde{\rho} \ll \rho_X$ they are reduced to

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\Lambda^{\text{dS}} &\approx \frac{\tilde{\rho}^2}{\rho_X}, \\ \rho_\Lambda^{\text{AdS}} &\approx -\rho_X, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

that corresponds to expanding de Sitter universe and collapsing AdS universe. Both vacua are stationary levels with no mixing or decay. We are certainly living in the Universe with the dS vacuum.

The eigenstates are described by superposition of initial non-stationary vacua

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{vac}\rangle &= \cos \theta_K |\Phi_S\rangle + \sin \theta_K |\Phi_X\rangle, \\ |\text{vac}'\rangle &= \cos \theta_K |\Phi_X\rangle - \sin \theta_K |\Phi_S\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

with the mixing angle equal to

$$\tan 2\theta_K = \frac{2\tilde{\rho}}{\rho_X}, \quad (29)$$

well approximated by

$$\sin \theta_K \approx \frac{\tilde{\rho}}{\rho_X} \ll 1. \quad (30)$$

The thin domain wall determines

$$\rho_\Lambda^{\text{dS}} \sim \frac{\mu_X^8}{m_{\text{Pl}}^4}, \quad (31)$$

and due to $\rho_\Lambda = \mu_\Lambda^4$ we get the estimate

$$\mu_X \sim \sqrt{m_{\text{Pl}} \mu_\Lambda} \sim 10^4 \text{ GeV}. \quad (32)$$

Thus, the thin domain wall is relevant to the low scale of SUSY breaking. Note, that estimate (32) was obtained by T.Banks in [13] in other way of physical argumentation for the mechanism of SUSY breaking.

The relation of SUSY breaking scenario with different regimes of domain wall fluctuations can be clarified by considering some typical properties of scalar field potential, that would be presented elsewhere [14].

For thin domain wall, the mixing angle of two levels θ_K takes the value about

$$\theta_K \approx \frac{\tilde{\rho}}{\rho_X} \sim \frac{\mu_X^2}{m_{\text{Pl}}^2} \sim \frac{\mu_\Lambda}{m_{\text{Pl}}}. \quad (33)$$

Therefore, it is certainly fixed by present day data on the cosmological constant, $\theta_K \sim 10^{-30}$.

In conclusion, we have described the mechanism for dynamical generation of small cosmological constant due to seesaw mixing of two initial vacuum-states describing the phases of exact and broken supersymmetry. The current value of cosmological constant is consistent with phenomenological estimates of SUSY broken scale in particle physics. The mechanism works due to fluctuations formed by bubbles of AdS vacuum separated by thin domain walls from the flat vacuum.

The work of V.V.K. is partially supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, grant 07-02-00417.

-
- [1] S. Weinberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 1 (1989).
 - [2] A. A. Andrianov, F. Cannata, P. Giacconi, A. Y. Kamenshchik and R. Soldati, Phys. Lett. B **651**, 306 (2007) [arXiv:0704.1436 [gr-qc]].
 - [3] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **202**, 253 (1982).
 - [4] S. Weinberg, “The quantum theory of fields”, Volume III “Supersymmetry”, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
 - [5] W. Nahm, Nucl. Phys. B **135**, 149 (1978).
 - [6] I. Y. Kobzarev, L. B. Okun and M. B. Voloshin, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **20**, 644 (1975) [Yad. Fiz. **20**, 1229 (1974)]; S. R. Coleman, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 2929 (1977) [Erratum-ibid. D **16**, 1248 (1977)]; C. G. Callan and S. R. Coleman, Phys. Rev. D **16**, 1762 (1977).
 - [7] S. R. Coleman and F. De Luccia, Phys. Rev. D **21**, 3305 (1980).

- [8] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1776 (1982).
- [9] T. Banks, arXiv:hep-th/0211160.
- [10] H. Fritzsch, Phys. Lett. B **70**, 436 (1977); H. Harari, H. Haut and J. Weyers, Phys. Lett. B **78**, 459 (1978); H. Fritzsch, Nucl. Phys. B **155**, 189 (1979); Y. Koide, Phys. Rev. D **28**, 252 (1983); P. Kaus and S. Meshkov, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **3**, 1251 (1988) [Erratum-ibid. A **4**, 603 (1989)]; Y. Koide, Phys. Rev. D **39**, 1391 (1989); H. Fritzsch and J. Plankl, Phys. Lett. B **237**, 451 (1990).
- [11] M. McGuigan, arXiv:hep-th/0602112; hep-th/0604108.
- [12] K. Enqvist, S. Hannestad and M. S. Sloth, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 031301 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0702236].
- [13] T. Banks, arXiv:hep-th/0007146.
- [14] V.V. Kiselev and S.A. Timofeev, in preparation.