

UT-11-30

TU-889

IPMU 11-0146

On the Adiabatic Solution to the Polonyi/Moduli Problem

Kazunori Nakayama^a, Fuminobu Takahashi^{b,c} and Tsutomu T. Yanagida^{a,c}

^a*Department of Physics, University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan*

^b*Department of Physics, Tohoku University, Sendai 980-8578, Japan*

^c*Institute for the Physics and Mathematics of the Universe, University of Tokyo,
Kashiwa 277-8568, Japan*

Abstract

One of the solutions to the cosmological Polonyi problem is to introduce a large coupling between the Polonyi field and the inflaton so that the Polonyi field adiabatically tracks the temporal minimum of the potential. We study general conditions for the adiabatic suppression mechanism to work, and find that a non-negligible amount of the Polonyi field is induced in the form of coherent oscillations at the end of inflation. In the case of low reheating temperature, this contribution is so small that it does not cause cosmological problems. On the other hand, this contribution may be significant for a relatively high reheating temperature and we still need some amount of tuning in order to avoid the Polonyi problem. We also point out that Polonyi particles produced from thermal plasma pose a severe constraint on the reheating temperature. Furthermore, we extend the original framework to include enhanced couplings of the Polonyi field with the visible particles as well as with itself, and derive upper bounds on the reheating temperature after inflation. We also investigate the adiabatic solution to the cosmological moduli problem in gauge and anomaly mediation.

1 Introduction

Supersymmetric (SUSY) extension of the standard model (SSM) is a plausible candidate for physics beyond the standard model since it solves the gauge hierarchy problem and leads to the successful gauge coupling unification at the grand unification scale. It also contains candidates for dark matter (DM).

The gravity-mediation models for SUSY breaking are attractive because of its simplicity: the SSM gaugino masses arise from an F -term of an elementary gauge singlet field Z through Planck-scale suppressed interactions. However, the Polonyi field Z is known to cause a serious cosmological problem. Since it is neutral under any symmetry, there is no special point in its field space. Therefore, the minimum of the effective potential for the Polonyi field during inflation is generically deviated from the one in the low energy. After inflation, the Polonyi starts to oscillate about the minimum with an amplitude of order the Planck scale M_P , and soon dominates the energy density of the Universe. Since its interactions are suppressed by the Planck scale, the lifetime of the Polonyi is very long, leading to an onset of a radiation-dominated Universe with a low temperature, typically below MeV. Such a low temperature would dramatically alter the big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) predictions of light element abundances in contradiction with observations. This is the notorious cosmological Polonyi problem [1].

Even if one gives up the gravity mediation, there may be scalars having similar properties to the Polonyi field. Indeed, there generally appear such scalars, called moduli, associated with the compactification of extra dimensions in the string theory. The moduli have a cosmology similar to the Polonyi, and cause a serious cosmological problem [2].

Some of the solutions to the cosmological Polonyi/moduli problem require significant modification of the conventional cosmological scenarios. One of them is to make the Polonyi/moduli heavy enough to decay well before the BBN begins. In the anomaly-mediated SUSY breaking models [3], the gravitino as well as the moduli are expected to have masses much heavier than the weak scale. However, the solution turned out to be more complicated, because of unsuppressed production of SUSY particles including gravitinos from the modulus decay [4]. The modulus decay also significantly dilutes the pre-existing baryon asymmetry. This makes the most baryogenesis mechanisms unsuc-

cessful, although it is still possible to create the right amount of baryon asymmetry by the Affleck-Dine mechanism [5, 6]. Another solution is to introduce late-time entropy production for diluting the Polonyi/moduli abundance. For instance, the thermal inflation [7] can provide enough dilution. Again, it also dilutes any pre-existing baryon asymmetry to a negligible amount. Considering that thermal inflation should dilute the modulus abundance by up to a factor of $\sim 10^{20}$ in order to solve the moduli problem, it is hopeless to try to create a sufficient amount of baryon asymmetry which survives the huge dilution. Thus we need to create the baryon asymmetry after thermal inflation by an elaborate mechanism [8].

An interesting solution to the Polonyi/moduli problem was proposed long ago by Linde [9]. It was pointed out that, if the modulus field has a mass squared of $\sim c^2 H^2$ before it starts to oscillate, with $c = \mathcal{O}(10)$ and H being the Hubble parameter, the modulus follows the time-dependent potential minimum adiabatically and the resultant amplitude of coherent oscillations is significantly suppressed. This simple solution is attractive since it works for a wide range of the Polonyi/modulus mass, and since there is no need for an additional late-time entropy production, which may make the standard leptogenesis scenario [10] viable. Recently, two of the present authors (FT and TTY) noticed that there is an upper bound on the reheating temperature for the adiabatic solution to work [11] and also showed that such a large Hubble mass may be a consequence of the strong dynamics at the Planck scale [12] or the fundamental cut-off scale one order of magnitude lower than the Planck scale [11].

In this paper we study the adiabatic suppression mechanism in a great detail in order to establish the solution in a complete form and explore parameter space where the Polonyi/moduli problem is solved. First, we carefully investigate the issue of adiabaticity and how the Polonyi/moduli oscillation is induced after inflation. We find that the coherent oscillations of the Polonyi/modulus field are generically induced at the end of inflation where the adiabaticity is violated and the produced amount depends on inflation models. The adiabatic solution may not work without tuning parameters or an additional entropy production for a relatively high reheating temperature, although the required amount of tuning or entropy production is greatly relaxed with respect to the original Polonyi/moduli problem. For a low reheating temperature, on the other hand,

the adiabatic solution can solve the Polonyi/moduli problem without any fine-tuning.

Next, we point out that, even if coherent oscillations of the Polonyi/moduli are reduced to a negligible amount by the adiabatic solution (and some fine-tuning), the Polonyi/moduli are generically produced by particle scatterings in thermal plasma as long as they have (Planck-suppressed) interactions with the SSM particles. In particular, the thermal production of the Polonyi field is inevitable because it must be coupled to the visible sector to mediate the SUSY breaking. We find that the thermal production of the Polonyi/moduli fields leads to non-trivial cosmological constraints. In the gravity mediation, the constraints are so stringent that there is no parameter space where the thermal leptogenesis scenario works, other than the heavy gravitino mass region, $m_{3/2} \gtrsim 10$ TeV.

Then, based on the findings of Refs. [12, 11], we extend the original framework to include an enhanced coupling of the Polonyi field with itself as well as the SSM particles. We will see that a new interesting possibility emerges in this case, where the gravitino is the lightest SUSY particle (LSP) and relatively high-reheating temperature is allowed. The focus-point like mass spectrum is favored in this case.

We will also discuss the implications of the adiabatic solution to the moduli problem in the gauge-mediated SUSY breaking models where the moduli and gravitino are light. For light moduli, $m_z \lesssim 1$ MeV, the adiabatic suppression mechanism can solve the moduli problem without fine-tuning on the modulus potential. However, we show that the reheating temperature is severely bounded from above due to the gravitino thermal production and the condition for the adiabaticity, and the thermal/non-thermal leptogenesis does not work even in a scenario with an extremely light gravitino ($m_{3/2} \lesssim 16$ eV [13]).¹

Lastly we will discuss the adiabatic solution to the moduli problem in the anomaly-mediated SUSY breaking models where the moduli and gravitino are heavy enough to decay before BBN. In this case, the adiabatic suppression can solve the moduli problem for a relatively high reheating temperature once we allow a tuning of $\mathcal{O}(0.01)$ on the modulus potential. The (non-)thermal leptogenesis may work for the gravitino mass of ~ 100 TeV with the Wino LSP with mass of a few hundred GeV.

¹ The extremely light modulus with a mass smaller than $\mathcal{O}(1)$ keV in the form of coherent oscillations contributes to the DM density of the Universe. Hence anthropic arguments may guarantee the smallness of the modulus abundance.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2 we investigate the adiabatic suppression mechanism, and estimate the abundance of the Polonyi/moduli field in the form of coherent oscillations. We also derive an upper bound on the reheating temperature for the mechanism to work [11]. In Sec. 3 we study the Polonyi/moduli oscillation induced at the end of inflation in detail and show that it significantly contributes to the final Polonyi/moduli abundance. We derive the required amount of fine-tuning to solve the moduli problem. In Sec. 4 we study the Polonyi problem in the gravity mediation in detail in order to clarify to what extent the Polonyi abundance is suppressed in the mechanism, taking account of thermal production of the Polonyi field. In Sec. 5 and 6 we will discuss the moduli problem in gauge and anomaly mediation. The last section is devoted to the discussion and conclusions.

2 Adiabatic solution to the Polonyi/moduli problem

2.1 Basic idea

First we briefly review the basic idea to suppress the modulus abundance [9]. Let z denote collectively a modulus field, including the Polonyi field. We set the origin of z so that it coincides with the potential minimum at present. In the early Universe, the effective potential of z could receive various corrections from its interactions with the inflaton and/or SSM particles. In particular, if z has a quartic coupling with the inflaton in the Kähler potential, z receives the so-called Hubble-induced mass term. Here and in what follows, the inflaton also refers to a field which dominates the energy density of the Universe when the modulus starts oscillating.

Let us express the effective potential in the early Universe as

$$V = \frac{1}{2}m_z^2 z^2 + \frac{1}{2}c^2 H^2 (z - z_*)^2, \quad (1)$$

where m_z is the mass of z in the low energy, z_* is the initial displacement during inflation, H is the Hubble parameter and c is a constant. The amplitude z_* is expected to be of order the Planck scale. For simplicity we treat z as a real scalar field when we consider its dynamics, but this does not affect the following argument. We have assumed that the potential can be approximated by a quadratic potential about the origin, at least up to

$z = z_*$. This is expected to be the case for the Polonyi field, but the potential may take a more general form. We will come back to this issue in Sec. 3.

Let us first consider the case of $c = \mathcal{O}(1)$. This is the case if the modulus and the inflaton are coupled by the Planck-suppressed operators with coefficients of order unity. The modulus dynamics is as follows. Assuming that the Hubble parameter during inflation is much larger than m_z , z is stabilized at $z \simeq z_*$ during inflation. After inflation, it begins to oscillate around the minimum $z = 0$ with an amplitude of z_* when $H \sim m_z$. The modulus abundance in the form of coherent oscillations is given by

$$\frac{\rho_z}{s} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{8} T_R \left(\frac{z_*}{M_P} \right)^2 & \text{for } \Gamma_\phi < m_z \\ \frac{1}{8} T_{\text{osc}} \left(\frac{z_*}{M_P} \right)^2 & \text{for } \Gamma_\phi > m_z \end{cases}, \quad (2)$$

where ρ_z is the modulus energy density, s is the entropy density, Γ_ϕ is the inflaton decay rate, $T_R \equiv (10/\pi^2 g_*)^{1/4} \sqrt{\Gamma_\phi M_P}$ denotes the reheating temperature after inflation, and $T_{\text{osc}} \equiv (10/\pi^2 g_*)^{1/4} \sqrt{m_z M_P}$. The above modulus abundance is so large that it causes a serious cosmological problem. For example, we need a tuning of $z_* \lesssim 10^{-10} M_P$ to satisfy the BBN bound for a typical reheating temperature $T_R = 10^6 \text{ GeV}$ and $m_z \sim 1 \text{ TeV}$. If c is much smaller than $\mathcal{O}(1)$, the modulus abundance depends on the initial displacement, which is subject to quantum fluctuations during inflation. As long as it is of order z_* , the resultant modulus abundance is the same order as in the case of $c = \mathcal{O}(1)$.

The situation significantly changes if $c \gg \mathcal{O}(1)$. One might expect that the modulus begins to oscillate when $H \sim c^{-1} m_z$ with an amplitude of z_* , when the potential minimum starts to move from z_* to the origin. However, this is not true. At $H \sim c^{-1} m_z$, the Hubble parameter is much smaller than m_z , which means that the potential minimum moves more slowly than the typical time scale for the modulus dynamics. Thus there is enough time for z to follow the potential minimum, and as a result, the coherent oscillations of z are significantly suppressed.

It is possible to estimate the suppression factor analytically, by solving the equation of motion for the modulus in the potential (1). The final amplitude of the coherent oscillations is suppressed by the following factor [9]

$$\mathcal{S} = \frac{3\sqrt{2p\pi}}{4} c^{(3p+1)/2} \exp\left(-\frac{cp\pi}{2}\right), \quad (3)$$

where p parametrizes the Hubble parameter as $H = p/t$ when $H = c^{-1}m_z$, and it is given by $p = 2/3$ and $p = 1/2$ before and after the reheating, respectively. Thus, as we increase c for fixed m_z and z_* , the final modulus abundance is exponentially suppressed by \mathcal{S}^2 relative to the estimate (2). In Fig. 1 we have shown the numerically obtained evolution of the modulus abundance as a function of time as well as the analytic estimates based on (2) and (3) for $c = 1$ (top) and 10 (bottom). Here we took $z_* = M_P/c$. We can see that in both cases the analytic estimates agree well with the numerical results. In this plot, the entropy density s is defined as $s(t) = s(T_R)[a(T_R)/a(t)]^3$ and $s(T_R) = (2\pi^2 g_{*s}/45)T_R^3$. The definition of s , and hence ρ_z/s , coincides with the standard one at late times after reheating.




Figure 1: Time evolution of the modulus abundance for $c = 1$ and $c = 10$. For comparison, analytic estimations, labeled as (ana), are also plotted. We have taken $\Gamma_\phi = 10^{-2.5}m_z$ and $z_* = M_P/c$.

Thus, we can achieve sufficient suppression of the modulus abundance for $c = O(10)$ because of the exponential factor appearing in Eq. (3), which reflects the fact that the variation of the adiabatic invariant is exponentially suppressed. This is essentially what was pointed out in the pioneering paper [9].

Lastly, we note here that the above estimate (3) is based on the analysis of Ref. [14], in which the initial condition is set to be $z = z_*$ and $\dot{z} = 0$ at $t = 0$ when the Hubble param-

eter is infinitely large. However, we would like to emphasize here that the actual initial condition of the modulus field is set during inflation when the Hubble parameter is finite. In addition, the inflaton dynamics changes the modulus potential at the end of inflation with a time scale of the inflaton mass, which may violate the adiabatic condition. Therefore, the above analytic estimate is only approximate, and there is in general additional contribution to the modulus abundance produced at the end of inflation. That is to say, it is important to follow the modulus dynamics during the first oscillation $\Delta t = \mathcal{O}((cH)^{-1})$ after inflation, and non-negligible amount of the modulus abundance can be generated during the short period. Once the modulus starts to oscillate, the particle production is indeed exponentially suppressed as explained above. This additional particle production at the end of inflation has been overlooked so far in the context of the adiabatic suppression mechanism, although similar kind of particle production was considered in the detailed analysis of thermal inflation [14]. We will come back to this issue in Sec. 3, and derive the condition for the adiabatic suppression to work successfully. For the moment, we will neglect the additional contribution.

2.2 The origin of the enhanced couplings

The essential ingredient for the mechanism described above is the large Hubble mass term with $c \gg 1$. Suppose that the inflaton Φ has a quartic coupling with the modulus in the Kähler potential as [9]

$$K \supset -c_1^2 \frac{|\Phi|^2 |Z|^2}{M_P^2}, \quad (4)$$

where Z and Φ are chiral superfields corresponding to the modulus and the inflaton, respectively. The c is related to c_1 as

$$c^2 = 3(c_1^2 + 1). \quad (5)$$

If c_1 is larger than order unity for some reason, a large Hubble-induced mass term for the modulus is generated. The origin of $c_1 \gg 1$ may be due to a strong dynamics at the Planck scale [12] or a cut-off scale one order of magnitude below the Planck scale [11].

We would like to emphasize here that the Hubble-induced mass term generated by (4) disappears after the reheating, since the energy density of the Universe becomes

dominated by radiation afterward. Therefore, the reheating should occur sufficiently late for the adiabatic solution to work. This places an interesting upper bound on the reheating temperature [11], which we shall derive explicitly in the next subsection.

We note here some subtleties regarding the thermal effects. If the modulus is coupled to the SSM particles in plasma, the modulus potential receives thermal corrections after the reheating. In particular, if the thermal mass is much larger than the Hubble parameter, the modulus adiabatically follows the time-dependent minimum of the potential in a similar way discussed above. The thermal mass is roughly estimated as

$$m_T^2 \sim c'^2 \frac{T^4}{M_P^2} = \mathcal{O}(0.01) \times c'^2 H^2, \quad (6)$$

where we have used $H^2 = (\pi^2 g_*/90)T^4/M_P^2$ with $g_* \sim 230$ in the second equality. Here c' is the coupling constant between the modulus and SSM particles in thermal bath normalized by the Planck scale; it corresponds to e.g. c_3 or c_5 in Eqs. (53) and (54). Thus, if c' is larger than $\mathcal{O}(100)$, the adiabatic solution may work even if the reheating is completed before $H = m_z/c$. However, as we shall see later, such a large coupling between the modulus and the SSM particles leads to problematic thermal production of the modulus. Therefore we assume $c' \lesssim \mathcal{O}(10)$ in the following so that the thermal mass is at most comparable to the Hubble mass with $c = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and it does not affect the modulus dynamics significantly.²

2.3 Upper bound on the reheating temperature

Assuming that the large Hubble-induced mass term arises solely from an enhanced coupling between the modulus and the inflaton, we can derive an upper bound on the reheating temperature for the solution to work. It is important to note that the large Hubble-induced mass term disappears as $e^{-\Gamma_\phi t}$, where Γ_ϕ denotes the decay rate of the inflaton. The temporal minimum moves on a time scale of Γ_ϕ^{-1} at the reheating, which should be smaller than m_z for the adiabatic solution to work. Therefore, we have [11]

$$\Gamma_\phi \ll m_z. \quad (7)$$

It depends on the required suppression factor as well as on the value of c how much the decay rate should be suppressed compared to the modulus mass. From Fig. 2, one can see

² There is also a linear term such as $V \sim T^4 z/M$ [15], whose effects on the modulus abundance were discussed in Ref. [16].

that the adiabatic solution does not work unless $\Gamma_\phi < 0.1m_z$, and that the effect of the reheating becomes practically negligible if $\Gamma_\phi < 0.01m_z$. We therefore adopt $\Gamma_\phi < 0.05m_z$ as a reference value in the following analysis.

We can express the bound in terms of the reheating temperature T_R as [11]

$$T_R \lesssim 3 \times 10^9 \text{ GeV} \left(\frac{g_*}{230} \right)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{m_z}{1 \text{ TeV}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (8)$$

where the reheating temperature T_R is related to the decay rate as

$$T_R \equiv \left(\frac{\pi^2 g_*}{10} \right)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \sqrt{\Gamma_\phi M_P}. \quad (9)$$

The upper bound on the reheating temperature was overlooked so far, but it has a very important implication especially for the baryogenesis scenario such as thermal leptogenesis.

2.4 Suppressing the modulus abundance

We numerically evaluate the suppression factor for the modulus abundance, Δ , which is defined by the ratio of the actual modulus abundance to the analytic estimate for the case of $c = 1$,

$$\Delta \equiv \frac{\rho_z/s}{(\rho_z/s)_{\text{exp}}}, \quad (10)$$

where the denominator is given by Eq. (2).

Contours of the suppression factor Δ in the plane of $(c, \Gamma_\phi/m_z)$ are shown in Fig. 2. The initial amplitude is taken to be $z_* = M_P/c$.³ It is seen that the modulus abundance is highly suppressed for $c > 30$ and $\Gamma_\phi/m_z < 0.05$. Practically, $\Delta \lesssim 10^{-20}$ is sufficient for satisfying the BBN bound on the modulus abundance, that is, $\rho_z/s \lesssim 10^{-14} \text{ GeV}$ for $m_z \sim 1 \text{ TeV}$ [17]. With this amount of suppression, the moduli do not dominate the Universe and therefore do not produce huge entropy with their decays. Thus the baryon asymmetry is not diluted. On the other hand, if we merely demanded that the moduli do not cause entropy production, the required suppression factor would be mild

³ The large c effectively corresponds to a small cutoff scale of order of M_P/c in the non-renormalizable Kähler potential. Thus the amplitude should be smaller than or comparable to this cutoff scale in order for the effective description to be valid.

(say, $\Delta \lesssim 10^{-10}$ for $m_z = 1 \text{ TeV}$ and $T_R \sim 10^6 \text{ GeV}$). Hereafter we regard $\Delta \sim 10^{-20}$ as a typically required suppression factor for solving the cosmological moduli problem, although the precise constraint depends on the modulus mass and couplings, and also the reheating temperature.




Figure 2: Contours of the suppression factor Δ in the plane of $(c, \Gamma_\phi/m_z)$.

3 When does (not) the adiabatic solution work ?

We have seen that the adiabatic solution works for $c = \mathcal{O}(10)$ in the potential (1). However, there is in general an additional contribution to the Polonyi/modulus abundance, and it is necessary to clarify under which conditions the adiabatic solution works.

Before going to concrete models, we give a general discussion on the adiabatic suppression mechanism. Suppose that the scalar potential for a modulus z depends on the Hubble parameter. During inflation the z is stabilized at a point deviated from the low-energy minimum, and the position of the minimum gradually changes as the Hubble parameter decreases after inflation. Then question is in which situation the coherent os-

cillations are induced. The key concept is the adiabaticity of the modulus dynamics in the time-dependent scalar potential. Let us assume that a modulus with a mass larger than the Hubble parameter is oscillating about the potential minimum $z_{\min}(t)$. If the rate of the change of the potential minimum is much smaller than the oscillation frequency, the modulus number density in a comoving volume is conserved. The condition is written as

$$f(H) \equiv \left| \frac{\dot{z}_{\min}}{z_{\min}} \right| \ll \left| \frac{V'(z_{\min} + \delta z)}{\delta z} \right|^{1/2}, \quad (11)$$

where δz denotes an amplitude of oscillations about the potential minimum. If the potential can be approximated with a quadratic potential about z_{\min} , the far right hand side becomes equal to the mass. If this condition is violated, particle production occurs as z_{\min} moves. Thus the condition (11) must be satisfied in order for the modulus amplitude to be suppressed.

A couple of comments are in order. First, the adiabatic suppression mechanism relies on the conservation of the adiabatic invariant (\approx the modulus number density in the comoving volume), which is defined for a periodic motion. In other words, it does not say anything about the initial abundance before the Polonyi/modulus field starts oscillating, which is determined by the dynamics during the first period of oscillation. Therefore, careful case-by-case analysis is needed in order to estimate the initial Polonyi/modulus abundance.

Secondly, if \dot{z}_{\min} suddenly changes, the above condition (11) is not sufficient. (We here assume that z_{\min} does not jump at the end of inflation.) In this case, one should also consider a condition similar to (11) with $f(H)$ replaced with the typical time scale of the dynamics which determines the evolution of the potential minimum. For instance, as we shall see below, in a broad class of inflation models, the potential minimum starts to move at the end of inflation in a time scale of the inflaton mass. In this case one should regard the inflaton mass as the typical time scale. Then the adiabaticity condition is usually violated at the end of inflation, and coherent oscillations of the Polonyi/modulus field are induced. We shall study this effect in Sec. 3.1.

Another issue to be addressed is whether z_{\min} remains same after inflation. As we shall see in Sec. 3.2, in realistic single-field inflation models in supergravity, because of the non-

trivial couplings between the inflaton and the modulus in the supergravity potential, the position of the minimum generically changes in a non-adiabatic way, and some amount of modulus oscillation is induced at the end of inflation. We will also see in Sec. 3.3 that in a class of multi-field inflation models, one (or more) of the fields acquires a non-zero F -term at the end of inflation, which in general changes the position of the potential minimum. For instance, in the hybrid inflation, the waterfall field has a vanishing F -term during inflation, but it starts to oscillate after inflation, acquiring a sizable F -term. The typical time scale of this phenomenon is given by the mass of the waterfall field. If this is shorter than the modulus oscillation period at that time, the adiabaticity condition is violated, unless the modulus is coupled to the waterfall field exactly in the same way as to the inflaton field. Thus, the adiabatic suppression mechanism becomes inefficient and the modulus abundance is not exponentially suppressed.

In the following we study these issues in detail.

3.1 Polonyi/moduli production at the end of inflation

Let us first consider the simple model (1), with the initial condition given at a finite Hubble parameter, $H_i = p/t_i$. The essential difference from (3) is that, after inflation, the potential minimum shifts from z_* by a finite amount during the first period of oscillation $\sim (cH_i)^{-1}$. Note that the shift would be infinitely small if the initial condition was given at $t = 0$ when the Hubble parameter is infinitely large (see Eq. (14)). Once the modulus starts to oscillate about the time-dependent minimum, the particle production is suppressed exponentially afterwards. So let us study the dynamics during the first period of oscillation after the inflation.

Suppose that the minimum changes by δz within $\delta t = (cH_i)^{-1}$ after inflation. If the potential minimum changes proportionally to time in the first period of oscillation, the initial amplitude is given by

$$\delta z(t_i) \sim |\dot{z}_{\min}(t_i)| (cH_i)^{-1}, \quad (12)$$

where $z_{\min}(t)$ denotes the time-dependent potential minimum, and the dot means the derivative with respect to time. The initial abundance of the modulus field created at the

end of inflation is therefore given by

$$\frac{\rho_z^{(i)}}{s} \sim \frac{T_R}{8} \left(\frac{z_{\min}(t_i)}{M_P} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\delta z(t_i)}{z_{\min}(t_i)} \right)^2. \quad (13)$$

In the model (1), we have

$$z_{\min}(t_i) = \frac{c^2 H_i^2}{m_z^2 + c^2 H_i^2} z_* \approx z_*, \quad (14)$$

$$\dot{z}_{\min}(t_i) = -\frac{3m_z^2 H_i}{m_z^2 + c^2 H_i^2} z_{\min}(t_i) \approx -\frac{3m_z^2}{c^2 H_i} z_*, \quad (15)$$

where we used $m_z \ll cH_i$ in the second equalities. The inflaton-matter dominated phase is assumed in Eqs. (13) and (15). (See discussion in Sec. 2.3.) The initial abundance for the model (1) is given by

$$\frac{\rho_z^{(i)}}{s} \sim \frac{9}{8} T_R \left(\frac{z_*}{M_P} \right)^2 \left(\frac{m_z}{cH_i} \right)^5. \quad (16)$$

Note that the condition (11) is satisfied if $c \gg 1$, and therefore the particle production afterward is exponentially suppressed. The final abundance is given by the sum of the estimate given in Sec. 2.1 and (16). Compared to $(\rho_z/s)_{\text{exp}}$ given by Eq. (2), there is a suppression factor, $(m_z/cH_i)^5$ in (16). Thus, the modulus abundance is power suppressed, if this additional contribution is dominant.

We have checked that this analytic estimate agrees well with the numerical results. In Fig. 3, the dependence of the modulus energy abundance on the initial condition H_i for $c = 20$ (top) and $c = 30$ (bottom) are shown. Numerical solutions are compared with analytic estimate of the modulus abundance based on (3) labeled as “analytic1”, and that of the initial modulus abundance based on (16) labeled as “analytic2”. We have taken $\Gamma_\phi = 10^{-2.5} m_z$. It is seen that analytic estimates well reproduce the numerical results and that the initial modulus abundance (16) becomes non-negligible as the ratio H_i/m decreases. This validates our consideration above.

In order for the above modulus abundance to be consistent with observations, the Hubble parameter during (precisely speaking, at the end of) inflation, $H_{\text{inf}} \simeq H_i$, should satisfy

$$H_{\text{inf}} \gtrsim 500 m_z \left(\frac{c}{30} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\Delta}{10^{-20}} \right)^{-\frac{1}{5}}, \quad (17)$$




Figure 3: The dependence of the modulus abundance on the initial condition H_i for $c = 20$ (top) and $c = 30$ (bottom). Numerical solutions are compared with analytic estimate of the modulus abundance (3) labeled as “analytic1”, and that of initial modulus abundance (16) labeled as “analytic2”. We have taken $\Gamma_\phi = 10^{-2.5} m_z$.

where Δ denotes the required suppression factor for the modulus abundance to be consistent with observation, normalized by $(\rho_z/s)_{\text{exp}}$ in Eq. (2). Although this inequality is satisfied for many inflation models, it certainly places a non-trivial lower bound on the inflation scale. The conditions (17) and (8), together with $c \gg 1$, are the necessary conditions for the adiabatic solution to work in the model (1).

In deriving (16), we have implicitly assumed that the modulus does not “see” the inflaton oscillations. This is a valid assumption for low-scale inflation models such as new inflation models, in which $m_\phi \gg H_{\text{inf}}$ is satisfied where m_ϕ is the inflaton mass around the minimum. In this class of models, the modulus minimum starts to move soon after the inflation ends, and the displacement during the first modulus oscillation determines the initial abundance. The particle production at the end of inflation can be understood because there is another time scale, i.e., the inflaton mass, which is lighter than the modulus mass during inflation but becomes much heavier after the end of inflation. As a result, the minimum to start moving in a time scale of m_ϕ . In other words, the decoupling process of the inflaton violates the adiabaticity condition, leading to the particle production.

The situation is slightly different for the chaotic inflation model where $m_\phi \sim H_{\text{inf}}$ and hence $m_\phi \ll cH_{\text{inf}}$ for $c \gg 1$. In this case the modulus remains heavier than the inflaton for a while after inflation, and the adiabaticity is violated at $H \sim H_{\text{ad}} \equiv m_\phi/c$. The modulus abundance produced at H_{ad} is estimated in a similar manner by replacing H_i with H_{ad} , and the result is

$$\frac{\rho_z^{(i)}}{s} \sim \frac{9}{8} T_{\text{R}} \left(\frac{z_*}{M_P} \right)^2 \left(\frac{m_z}{m_\phi} \right)^5. \quad (18)$$

We have confirmed that this agrees with numerical calculation. See Fig. 4. Here the suppression factor is given by $9(m_z/m_\phi)^5$, with respect to (2). Recalling that the suppression factor of $\sim 10^{-20}$ is needed to solve the moduli problem, and that the inflaton mass in the single-field chaotic inflation model is given by $m_\phi \simeq 2 \times 10^{13} \text{ GeV}$, the suppression factor $(m_z/m_\phi)^5$ is so small that the moduli produced in this way is cosmologically harmless.

3.2 Polonyi/moduli production in single-field inflation models

So far we have assumed that the position of the minimum does not jump at the end of inflation. In supergravity based inflation models, however, this is not necessarily the case.




Figure 4: The modulus abundance in the single-field chaotic inflation model. We have taken $c = 20$, $m_\phi = 0.1M_P$, $m_z = 10^{-3}M_P$, $\Gamma_\phi = 10^{-2.5}m_z$. Together shown is the analytic estimate based on (18).

We show below that the minimum actually changes at the end of inflation in general single-field inflation models in supergravity, including the model of Ref. [18].

For illustration, let us consider the Kähler potential as

$$K = |Z|^2 + |\phi|^2 + c^2 \frac{|Z - Z_*|^2 |\phi|^2}{M_P^2}, \quad (19)$$

where $c \gg 1$ and ϕ denotes the inflaton superfield. We generically obtain the following form of the scalar potential from this Kähler potential,

$$V = 3H_\phi^2 |z|^2 + c^2 H^2 |z - z_*|^2, \quad (20)$$

where $3H_\phi^2 M_P^2 \equiv V_\phi$ with V_ϕ being the inflaton potential energy, and $3H^2 M_P^2 = |\dot{\phi}|^2 + V_\phi$. The point is that the first term in (20) depends only on the inflaton potential energy and it rapidly oscillates after inflation. The time averaged value of H_ϕ^2 is given by $\langle H_\phi^2 \rangle = H^2/2$ if the inflaton behaves as matter during the oscillation around its minimum. Therefore, the position of the minimum during inflation is given by $z_{\min} = c^2 z_*/(c^2 + 3)$, while the minimum after inflation is given by $z'_{\min} = c^2 z_*/(c^2 + 3/2)$. Since the time scale of the oscillation of the H_ϕ^2 term, which is determined by the inflaton mass, is much greater than the modulus mass, the modulus does not feel the rapid oscillation of H_ϕ^2 itself but

its time averaged value. Thus the modulus oscillation is induced just after inflation with an amplitude of

$$\delta z = |z_{\min} - z'_{\min}| = \frac{3z_*}{2c^2}. \quad (21)$$

The resulting modulus abundance is estimated as

$$\frac{\rho_z^{(i)}}{s} \sim \frac{9}{32} T_R \left(\frac{z_*}{M_P} \right)^2 \left(\frac{m_z}{c^3 H_{\inf}} \right). \quad (22)$$

Compared with the standard estimation (2), the abundance is suppressed by the factor $\sim m_z/(c^3 H_{\inf})$. This suppression is not sufficient, although the amount of tuning required for solving the moduli problem is significantly relaxed. For example, for $c = 30$, $T_R = 10^6 \text{ GeV}$, $m_z = 1 \text{ TeV}$ and $H_{\inf} = 10^{12} \text{ GeV}$, the tuning of $|z_*| \lesssim 10^{-3} M_P$ is needed for solving the moduli problem. The estimate (22) is similar to that in the multi-field inflation model discussed below. We will show the validity of this estimate numerically in the next subsection.

3.3 Polonyi/moduli production in multi-field inflation models

Now let us discuss multi-field inflation models, where the position of the minimum could drastically change at the end of inflation. The time scale of the change is usually determined by the mass of fields acquiring the F -term after inflation, e.g., the mass of the waterfall fields in the hybrid inflation. Let us consider a class of inflation models with a superpotential

$$W = X f(\phi). \quad (23)$$

Most SUSY inflation models including hybrid inflation [19], smooth-hybrid inflation [20], two-field new inflation [21] chaotic inflation [22] and its variants [23] fall into this category.⁴ Here it is the X whose F -term gives the inflaton potential energy during inflation. In the two-field new and chaotic inflation models, ϕ is regarded as the slowly-rolling inflaton field, while X does not participate in the inflaton dynamics. In the hybrid inflation model, X plays the role of the slowly-rolling inflaton, while ϕ is the waterfall field.

In general, X and ϕ can have different couplings to the modulus field,

$$K = \tilde{c}_X^2 \frac{|X|^2 |Z - Z_X|^2}{M_P^2} + \tilde{c}_\phi^2 \frac{|\phi|^2 |Z - Z_\phi|^2}{M_P^2}, \quad (24)$$

⁴ This form of the superpotential has been recently studied in detail in Ref. [24].

in the Kähler potential. This yields the scalar potential for the modulus as⁵

$$V = \frac{1}{M_P^2} \left[\tilde{c}_X^2 \left(|\dot{X}|^2 + |F_X|^2 \right) |Z - Z_X|^2 + \tilde{c}_\phi^2 \left(|\dot{\phi}|^2 + |F_\phi|^2 \right) |Z - Z_\phi|^2 \right], \quad (25)$$

where X and Z represent the lowest component of the corresponding superfields. During inflation it is F_X that contributes to the Hubble parameter, while F_ϕ and the kinetic energy of X and ϕ are subdominant or negligibly small. In the two-field new and chaotic inflation models, X sits at the origin and does not participate in the dynamics. After the inflation ends, both $|\dot{\phi}|^2$ and $|F_X|^2$ oscillate with the same amplitude and opposite phase, while $|\dot{X}|^2$ and $|F_\phi|^2$ remain negligible. On the other hand, in the hybrid inflation model, all of them oscillates with a time scale of the inflaton mass in a complicated manner.

In order to take into such behavior in the multi-field inflation models, let us parametrize the modulus potential as

$$V = \frac{1}{2} m_z^2 z^2 + \frac{1}{2} c_X^2 H_1^2 (z - z_X)^2 + \frac{1}{2} c_\phi^2 H_2^2 (z - z_\phi)^2, \quad (26)$$

where the Hubble parameter is divided into two parts as $H^2 = H_1^2 + H_2^2$. We assume that $H_1^2 \simeq H^2$ and $H_2^2 \simeq 0$ during inflation and that H_1^2 and H_2^2 oscillate with an opposite phase after inflation. Note that their sum is equal to the Hubble parameter and so it does not oscillate. The time-averaged values of H_1^2 and H_2^2 are given by

$$\langle H_1^2 \rangle = \langle H_2^2 \rangle = \frac{H^2}{2}. \quad (27)$$

During inflation, where the kinetic energy of the inflaton is negligible, the modulus sits at $z = z_X$. After inflation ends, the temporal minimum oscillates around between z_X and z_ϕ , and it is given by

$$z_{\min} = \frac{c_X^2 H_1^2 z_X + c_\phi^2 H_2^2 z_\phi}{c_X^2 H_1^2 + c_\phi^2 H_2^2}. \quad (28)$$

Its time derivative is

$$\dot{z}_{\min} = \frac{2c_X^2 c_\phi^2 H_1 H_2 (H_1 \dot{H}_2 + H_2 \dot{H}_1)}{(c_X^2 H_1^2 + c_\phi^2 H_2^2)^2} (z_X - z_\phi), \quad (29)$$

where we have approximated $m_z^2 \ll c_X^2 H_1^2 + c_\phi^2 H_2^2$. Hereafter we consider the case of $c_X = \mathcal{O}(10)$ and $c_X \gg c_\phi$ since otherwise it is obvious that the coherent oscillations of

⁵ There are other terms for the modulus potential, but (25) is dominant if $c_X^2, c_\phi^2 \gg 1$ and if the other terms are suppressed by the Planck scale with coefficients of order unity.

the modulus with an amplitude of $\sim z_X$ or z_ϕ is induced at the end of inflation, and the cosmological moduli problem is not solved if $z_X \sim z_\phi \sim M_P$.

Let us first consider the case of $c_X H_{\text{inf}} \ll m_\phi$, which is satisfied in the hybrid and new inflation models. In this case the modulus mass is much smaller than the typical frequency of the inflaton oscillations, and so it only feels the time-averaged potential. At the end of inflation, the potential minimum changes instantly (in a time scale of m_ϕ^{-1}) from z_X to \bar{z}_{min} , where the time-averaged potential minimum, \bar{z}_{min} is given by

$$\bar{z}_{\text{min}} \simeq (c_X^2 z_X + c_\phi^2 z_\phi) / (c_X^2 + c_\phi^2). \quad (30)$$

Here we have used Eqs. (27) and (28). Thus the initial amplitude of the modulus oscillation is

$$\delta z(t_i) \sim z_X - \bar{z}_{\text{min}} \sim \frac{c_\phi^2}{c_X^2} (z_X - z_\phi). \quad (31)$$

The modulus abundance produced at the end of inflation in this case is estimated as

$$\frac{\rho_z^{(i)}}{s} \sim \frac{1}{8} T_R \left(\frac{z_X - z_\phi}{M_P} \right)^2 \left(\frac{c_\phi^4 m_z}{c_X^3 H_{\text{inf}}} \right). \quad (32)$$

Although this may be still too large to avoid the cosmological Polonyi/moduli problem, the abundance is suppressed by a huge factor with respect to the original case without the adiabatic suppression mechanism. For example, for $c_X = 30$, $c_\phi = 1$, $T_R = 10^6 \text{ GeV}$, $m_z = 1 \text{ TeV}$ and $H_{\text{inf}} = 10^{12} \text{ GeV}$, the tuning of $|z_X - z_\phi| \sim 10^{-3} M_P$ is sufficient for solving the moduli problem.

In order to check this estimate, we have evaluated the modulus abundance in the SUSY hybrid inflation model with the superpotential [19],

$$W = \kappa X (\phi \bar{\phi} - \mu^2). \quad (33)$$

For simplicity we assume the following form in the potential (26),

$$H_1^2 = \frac{\kappa^2 |\mu^2 - \phi \bar{\phi}|^2 + |\dot{X}|^2}{3M_P^2}, \quad (34)$$

$$H_2^2 = \frac{\kappa^2 |X|^2 (|\phi|^2 + |\bar{\phi}|^2) + |\dot{\phi}|^2 + |\dot{\bar{\phi}}|^2}{3M_P^2}. \quad (35)$$

The modulus abundance in this model is shown in Fig. 5. We have taken $\kappa = 1$, $\mu = 0.1 M_P$, $m_z = 10^{-3} M_P$, $\Gamma_\phi = 10^{-2.5} m_z$ and $z_X = M_P / c_X$ and $z_\phi = z_X / 2$. Results for

$(c_X, c_\phi) = (30, 2)$ and $(40, 5)$ are shown together with the analytic estimate based on (32). We can see that the analytic estimate on the final modulus abundances agree well with the numerical results.




Figure 5: The modulus abundance in the hybrid inflation model. We have taken $\kappa = 1$, $\mu = 0.1M_P$, $m_z = 10^{-3}M_P$, $\Gamma_\phi = 10^{-2.5}m_z$ and $z_X = M_P/c_X$ and $z_\phi = z_X/2$. Results for $(c_X, c_\phi) = (30, 2)$ and $(40, 5)$ are shown together with the analytic estimate based on (32).

Next, we consider the other case : $H_{\text{inf}} \sim m_\phi$ as in the chaotic inflation model in supergravity [22]. The superpotential is given by

$$W = m_\phi X \phi, \quad (36)$$

and the inflaton ϕ starts to oscillate from about the Planck scale. The X is stabilized at the origin during and after inflation. We therefore take

$$H_1^2 = \frac{m_\phi^2 |\phi|^2}{3M_P^2}, \quad (37)$$

$$H_2^2 = \frac{|\dot{\phi}|^2}{3M_P^2}. \quad (38)$$

In this case, the modulus oscillates in a potential which changes with a frequency m_ϕ^{-1} . Since the modulus mass and the inflaton mass become comparable for a certain time, it is likely that resonant particle production occurs, making it difficult to estimate the

modulus abundance analytically. Let us therefore give a very rough estimate on the abundance of the moduli in the form of coherent oscillations. We assume $c_X = \mathcal{O}(10)$ and $c_\phi = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Since both H_1 and H_2 oscillates at a frequency of m_ϕ with an opposite phase, the modulus mass becomes of order the Hubble parameter when H_1 vanishes. During the time of $H^{-1} \sim m_\phi$, the modulus moves from z_X to $\sim z_\phi$. As the modulus mass becomes greater than the Hubble parameter, it comes back to z_X again and starts oscillating with an initial amplitude given by $\sim |z_\phi - z_X|$. Therefore, the Polonyi abundance in the form of coherent oscillations is estimated as

$$\frac{\rho_z^{(i)}}{s} \sim \frac{1}{8} T_R \left(\frac{z_X - z_\phi}{M_P} \right)^2 \left(\frac{m_z}{m_\phi} \right) \quad (39)$$

for $c_X = \mathcal{O}(10)$ and $c_\phi = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Numerical results are shown in Fig. 6. Here the modulus abundance is evaluated as a function of c_X in the multi chaotic inflation model. We have taken $m_\phi = 0.1 M_P$, $m_z = 10^{-3} M_P$, $\Gamma_\phi = 10^{-2.5} m_z$, $c_\phi = 2$ and $z_X = M_P/c_X$ and $z_\phi = z_X/2$. One can see that there is a resonant feature and the analytic estimate roughly agrees with the numerical result. Note however that we have focused on the homogeneous mode of the modulus, and the result might be significantly affected by taking account of the resonant particle production, or preheating. Assuming that the resonant particle production, if any, is just added to the above estimate, the modulus abundance is huge and another solution to the cosmological Polonyi/moduli problem is needed.⁶

After all, in the multi-field inflation models, the adiabatic suppression is inefficient once the modulus production at the end of inflation is taken into account. We need to tune the couplings of the multi-inflaton fields to the Polonyi/moduli so that $z_X \simeq z_\phi$ in order to solve the cosmological Polonyi/moduli problem, although the required amount of tuning is relaxed from 10^{-10} to 10^{-3} compared with the case of $c = \mathcal{O}(1)$.

3.4 Required fine-tuning to solve the Polonyi/moduli problem

In order to see the required amount of tuning more quantitatively, we define the tuning factor ϵ as $|z_X - z_\phi| \equiv \epsilon M_P$ and examine how small ϵ must be in order to solve the cosmological moduli problem. To be concrete, we rely on the estimate (32). This estimate

⁶ If c_ϕ is much smaller than unity for some reason, the modulus abundance is likely suppressed.




Figure 6: The modulus abundance as a function of c_X in the multi chaotic inflation model. We have taken $m_\phi = 0.1M_P$, $m_z = 10^{-3}M_P$, $\Gamma_\phi = 10^{-2.5}m_z$, $c_\phi = 2$ and $z_X = M_P/c_X$ and $z_\phi = z_X/2$. Analytic estimate based on (39) is also shown.

applies almost identically to the case of single-field inflation models if we set $c_\phi = 1$, as shown in Eq. (22). Fig. 7 shows the contours of the required amount of the fine-tuning ϵ for the adiabatic suppression to solve the moduli problem, on the plane of m_z and T_R . Here we have taken $H_{\text{inf}} = 10^{10}$ GeV and $c_X = 30$, $c_\phi = 1$. The required amount of tuning becomes less (more) stringent by one order of magnitude for $H_{\text{inf}} = 10^{12}$ (10^8) GeV. That is to say, ϵ scales as $(H_{\text{inf}}/10^{10}\text{GeV})^{1/2}$. In the shaded region at the upper left corner, the adiabatic suppression does not work. We have used constraints from BBN, diffuse X(γ)-ray and overclosure as done in Ref. [25] with updated BBN constraints. For $m_z > 100$ TeV, we have assumed anomaly mediation relation between the gravitino and the Wino-LSP mass and derived constraints from LSP overproduction by the modulus decay. We assumed that the modulus has couplings with the SM particles as Eq. (53) with $c_3 = 1$. We have also assumed that the modulus mass is comparable to the gravitino mass so that the gravitino production from the modulus decay is inefficient. Notice that upper bounds on the reheating temperature coming from Polonyi/moduli and gravitino thermal production, which will be discussed in the following sections, are not taken into account in this figure. From this figure, it is seen that for wide range of modulus mass and reheating temperature, the required amount of tuning lies in the range of $10^{-4} \lesssim \epsilon \lesssim 1$.




Figure 7: Contours of the required amount of the fine-tuning ϵ for the adiabatic suppression to solve the moduli problem, on the plane of m_z and T_R . Here we have taken $H_{\text{inf}} = 10^{10} \text{ GeV}$ and $c_X = 30$, $c_\phi = 1$. The required amount of tuning becomes less (more) stringent by one order of magnitude for $H_{\text{inf}} = 10^{12}$ (10^8) GeV. That is to say, ϵ scales as $(H_{\text{inf}}/10^{10} \text{ GeV})^{1/2}$. In the shaded region at the upper left corner, the adiabatic suppression does not work. Notice that upper bounds on the reheating temperature coming from Polonyi/moduli and gravitino thermal production, which will be discussed in the following sections, are not taken into account in this figure.

3.5 Other form of the modulus potential

Before closing this section, we comment on whether the adiabatic suppression works in other types of the modulus potential. First we consider the case of a negative Hubble mass squared. The scalar potential is

$$V(z) = \frac{1}{2}(m_z^2 - c^2 H^2)z^2 + \frac{\lambda}{nM_P^{n-4}}z^n, \quad (40)$$

where $n(\geq 4)$ is an even integer and λ is a positive constant. The flat directions in SSM have the potential of this type [5]. The true minimum is obviously $z = 0$. The temporal minimum is given by

$$z_{\min}(H) = \begin{cases} [M_P^{n-4}(c^2 H^2 - m_z^2)/\lambda]^{1/(n-2)} & \text{for } cH > m_z \\ 0 & \text{for } cH < m_z. \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

Hence we obtain

$$f(H) = \frac{3}{n-2} \frac{c^2 H^3}{c^2 H^2 - m_z^2} \quad \text{for } cH > m_z, \quad (42)$$

in the matter-dominated phase. Therefore, $f(H)$ diverges at $H = m_z/c$ and the adiabaticity is always violated independently of the size of c and λ . Thus the adiabatic suppression does not occur for the scalar field of the potential of (40). The z field begins to oscillate at $H \sim m_z/c$ around the minimum $z = 0$ with amplitude of $\sim (M_P^{n-4}m_z^2/\lambda)^{1/(n-2)}$. We have numerically confirmed that the oscillation amplitude is not suppressed regardless of the value of c .

The situation slightly changes if z has the negative mass term around the origin :

$$V(z) = \frac{1}{2}(-m_z^2 - c^2 H^2)z^2 + \frac{\lambda}{nM_P^{n-4}}z^n. \quad (43)$$

The temporal minimum is given by

$$z_{\min}(H) = [M_P^{n-4}(c^2 H^2 + m_z^2)/\lambda]^{1/(n-2)}. \quad (44)$$

It smoothly connects to the true minimum $z_{\min} = (M_P^{n-4}m_z^2/\lambda)^{1/(n-2)}$. In this case we obtain

$$f(H) = \frac{3}{n-2} \frac{c^2 H^3}{c^2 H^2 + m_z^2}, \quad (45)$$

in the matter-dominated phase, hence the time scale of the potential change is roughly given by H . This is always smaller than the mass scale around the temporal minimum

for $c \gg 1$ and hence the adiabaticity condition (11) is met in the oscillation regime. As is already explained, however, z cannot track the temporal minimum at the very beginning of its motion. Thus the coherent oscillation is necessarily induced as explained before. The induced modulus amplitude is estimated as

$$\delta z(t_i) \sim |\dot{z}_{\min}(H_i)|(cH_i)^{-1} \sim z_{\min}(H_i)/c, \quad (46)$$

and the resulting modulus abundance is

$$\frac{\rho_z^{(i)}}{s} \sim \frac{1}{8} T_R \left(\frac{z_{\min}(H_i)}{M_P} \right)^2 \left(\frac{m_z}{cH_i} \right). \quad (47)$$

This is the minimum modulus abundance in this model. By tuning the initial velocity \dot{z} , we can suppress the abundance further, but such a tuning is not likely to occur in a realistic setup starting from inflation. Numerical calculations and analytic estimate are shown in Fig. 8. We have taken $n = 6$ and $\lambda = M_P^2/m_z^2 = 10^6$ and $H_i = 10^3 m_z$. Analytic estimate does not depend on c for $n = 6$. Our estimate fits very well with the numerical results.




Figure 8: Time evolution of the modulus abundance for $c = 1, 10, 100$ for the model (43). We have taken $n = 6$ and $\lambda = M_P^2/m_z^2 = 10^6$, $\Gamma_\phi = 10^{-2.5} m_z$ and $H_i = 10^3 m_z$.

The last example is a very flat potential such as [26]

$$V = V_0 \log \left(1 + \frac{z^2}{M^2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} c^2 H^2 (z - z_*)^2. \quad (48)$$

Time evolution of the modulus abundance for $c = 1, 10$ for the model (48) is shown in Fig. 9. We have taken $z_* = M_P/c$, $M = z_*/10$ and $V_0 = m^2 z_*^2$ with $m = 10^{-3} M_P$. Adiabatic suppression does not work in this case, simply because the mass around the temporal minimum changes the sign at some $z < z_*$ and the adiabaticity is necessarily violated. If, instead, we have chosen $M \gg z_*$, the effective mass is always positive for $z < z_*$ and the model is effectively described by (1), hence the adiabatic suppression occurs for $c \gg 1$.




Figure 9: Time evolution of the modulus abundance for $c = 1, 10$ for the model (48). We have taken $z_* = M_P/c$, $M = z_*/10$ and $V_0 = m^2 z_*^2$ with $m = 10^{-3} M_P$.

3.6 Summary

To summarize, it depends on the behavior of the time-dependent potential minimum whether the adiabatic suppression takes place. In particular, if the curvature of the potential about the minimum vanishes temporarily, or if the position of the minimum changes rapidly compared to the curvature, the adiabatic solution does not work. Therefore it should be kept in mind that the adiabatic solution does not apply to any moduli with an arbitrary potential. Nevertheless, it is remarkable that the adiabatic suppression mechanism works for the simplest example like (1), which includes the Polonyi field.

It should be noted, however, that a considerable amount of modulus oscillation is

generically induced at the end of inflation, as already shown. Some amount of tuning is needed in order to solve the cosmological moduli problem for relatively high reheating temperature, although the required amount of tuning is significantly reduced compared with the ordinary case without the adiabatic suppression.

In the following sections we always assume that the modulus/Polonyi coherent oscillation is somehow suppressed by the adiabatic suppression and some amount of tuning if needed and discuss how the reheating temperature is constrained even in such a case.

4 The Polonyi problem in gravity mediation

Let us consider the Polonyi problem in gravity mediation, where SUSY is broken by the F-term of the Polonyi field Z . We consider the following Kähler potential,

$$K = |\phi|^2 + |Z|^2 - c_1^2 \frac{|\phi|^2 |Z - Z_*|^2}{M_P^2} - \frac{c_2^2}{4} \frac{|Z|^4}{M_P^2}, \quad (49)$$

where Z_* represents the potential minimum during inflation. Here we have omitted interactions like $K \supset \kappa M_P Z + \kappa' |\phi|^2 Z Z / M_P^2 + \dots$. The linear term is necessary to set the origin to be the low-energy minimum, which also shifts the minimum during inflation from Z_* by some factor, but not an order of magnitude. So we drop the linear term since it does not change the modulus dynamics significantly in our context. The latter coupling induces the inflaton decay into a pair of the gravitinos [27], which may impose severe constraints on inflation models if $\kappa' \gg 1$.

The coupling with the inflaton in the Kähler potential (49) induces a Hubble mass correction to the effective potential of the Polonyi field as

$$V(z) \supset c^2 H^2 |z - z_*|^2 \quad (50)$$

where z denotes a scalar component of Z , with

$$c^2 = 3(c_1^2 + 1), \quad (51)$$

which is equivalent to Eq. (1). The Hubble-induced mass term is present during inflation and the inflaton oscillation era, but it disappears after the reheating. The Polonyi mass

around the origin in the low energy is ⁷

$$m_z^2 = (3c_2^2 + 2\sqrt{3})m_{3/2}^2, \quad (52)$$

In order to suppress the coherent oscillations of the Polonyi field, we assume $c = \mathcal{O}(10)$ and $T_R \lesssim 0.05\sqrt{m_z M_P}$. These two conditions must be satisfied for the adiabatic suppression to work, independently of the details of the inflaton dynamics. As shown in the previous section, the Polonyi coherent oscillation is generically induced at the end of inflation. Hereafter we simply assume that this contribution is suppressed at the price of fine-tuning of at most 10^{-4} level (see Fig. 7).

The Polonyi couplings to the SSM fields are parametrized as

$$\int d^2\theta \frac{1}{4} \left(1 + c_3 \frac{Z}{M_P} \right) W_a W^a + \text{h.c.}, \quad (53)$$

$$\int d^4\theta \left\{ -c_4^2 \frac{|Z|^2 |f|^2}{M_P^2} + \left(\frac{c_5}{M_P} Z |f|^2 + \text{h.c.} \right) \right\}. \quad (54)$$

where W_a is a field strength of the gauge supermultiplet, f collectively denotes the chiral matter superfield, and c_3 , c_4 and c_5 are numerical coefficients. In the following we take all the coupling constants c_1, \dots, c_5 to be real, for simplicity. These terms generate the soft SUSY breaking masses as

$$m_{\tilde{g}} = \frac{\sqrt{3}c_3}{2} m_{3/2}, \quad (55)$$

$$m_{\tilde{f}}^2 = (c_4^2 + c_5^2 + 1) m_{3/2}^2, \quad (56)$$

where $m_{\tilde{g}}$ and $m_{\tilde{f}}$ denote the gaugino and sfermion masses, respectively. The above couplings enable the Polonyi field to decay into the SSM particles, and more important, the Polonyi is necessarily produced from particle scattering in thermal plasma through the couplings with c_3 and c_5 . (Note that the origin of Z is set to be the low-energy potential minimum.) Therefore, even if the coherent oscillations of the Polonyi field can be negligibly small by the adiabatic suppression mechanism, its abundance may be still non-negligible if the reheating temperature is high.

⁷ Precisely speaking, this is the mass of the real component of Z in the presence of the linear term with $\kappa = \sqrt{3} - 1$. The imaginary part has a slightly smaller but comparable mass.

parameter	definition	effects
c_1	Eq. (49)	Hubble mass for the Polonyi
c_2	Eq. (49)	Polonyi mass
c_3	Eq. (53)	Gaugino mass, Polonyi abundance
c_4	Eq. (54)	Sfermion mass
c_5	Eq. (54)	Sfermion mass, Polonyi abundance

Table 1: Coefficients of non-renormalizable operators and their effects on masses and the Polonyi abundance from thermal scattering.

In the rest of this section, we consider cases with several different values of c_i . First we consider the case that only c_1 is enhanced while all the other couplings are of order unity. This is the minimal set-up to solve the Polonyi problem using the adiabatic solution. Next we extend the minimal set-up to allow enhancement of other couplings. Such extension may be indeed reasonable; if the enhanced coupling of c_1 is due to an exchange of fields of mass below the Planck scale or due to some strong dynamics at the Planck scale, we naively expect a coupling like c_2 is similarly enhanced. Furthermore, if the SSM particles are involved with the strong coupling at the Planck scale, or if the fundamental cut-off scale of theory is one order of magnitude smaller than the Planck scale, we expect that all the modulus couplings to the SSM particles, c_3 , c_4 and c_5 as well are enhanced. As we will see below, the constraints on the reheating temperature depends on the size of these couplings constants.

4.1 The minimal set-up

First we consider a case that the Polonyi-inflaton coupling (c_1) is enhanced to solve the Polonyi problem, while all the other couplings among the Polonyi and SSM particles are assumed to be Planck-suppressed with coefficients of order unity.

The interaction (53) induces the Polonyi decay into the SM gauge bosons, which is subject to stringent constraints from BBN [17, 28, 29]. The partial decay rate is estimated as

$$\Gamma_{Z \rightarrow gg} \simeq c_3^2 \frac{3m_z^3}{32\pi M_P^2} \simeq (1.3 \times 10^5 \text{sec})^{-1} c_3^2 \left(\frac{m_z}{1 \text{TeV}} \right)^3, \quad (57)$$

where we have considered the decay into all the SM gauge bosons. The partial decay rates

of the Polonyi into SSM gauginos is given by, if kinematically allowed,

$$\Gamma_{Z \rightarrow \tilde{g}\tilde{g}} \simeq c_3^2 \frac{3m_z}{32\pi M_P^2} (m_{3/2}^2 + m_{\tilde{g}}^2), \quad (58)$$

where we have approximated all the gaugino masses are same. The partial decay rates of the Polonyi into sfermions is also close to the above rate. Note that, if the Polonyi mass is much heavier than the gravitino mass (i.e. $c_2 \gg 1$), the decay into the gauge bosons is the dominant decay mode [30].

The Polonyi is necessarily produced by thermal scattering like the gravitino, even if the coherent oscillations are suppressed by the adiabatic suppression mechanism. The gravitino abundance is [31, 32]

$$Y_{3/2} \equiv \frac{n_{3/2}}{s} \sim 2 \times 10^{-12} \left(1 + \frac{m_{\tilde{g}}^2}{3m_{3/2}^2} \right) \left(\frac{T_R}{10^{10} \text{GeV}} \right), \quad (59)$$

where $n_{3/2}$ is the number density of the gravitino, and s the entropy density. The Polonyi abundance is expected to be the same order of that of the transverse component of the gravitinos. So we use the following estimate

$$Y_Z \equiv \frac{n_Z}{s} \sim 10^{-12} (c_3^2 + c_5^2) \left(\frac{T_R}{10^{10} \text{GeV}} \right), \quad (60)$$

where n_Z is the number density of the moduli. Note that there is an uncertainty of order unity in the above estimate.

Using the Polonyi and gravitino abundances, we can derive cosmological constraints on the reheating temperature. We show in Fig. 10 upper bounds on the reheating temperature as a function of the gravitino mass. Here we set $m_z = m_{3/2}$, $c_3 = 1(5)$ and $c_5 = 1$ in the top (bottom) panel. The precise value of c_4 is not relevant for the following arguments as long as $|c_4| \lesssim \mathcal{O}(1)$. Here and in what follows the GUT relation among gaugino masses is assumed, unless otherwise stated. In the top (bottom) panel, the LSP is the bino- or higgsino-like neutralino (gravitino). The constraints on the thermal relic abundance of the SSM LSP are not taken into account in the both panels, which will be discussed shortly. The meaning of each line is as follows. “BBN (TH Polonyi)” and “CMB (TH Polonyi)” refers to the BBN [17, 28, 29] and CMB [33] bounds on the thermally produced Polonyi,

“LSP from TH Polonyi” to the LSP overproduction bound from the Polonyi decay,⁸ “TH Gravitino” to the bound from the gravitino thermal production, taking account of the gravitino decay effects on BBN and LSP overproduction, and “Adiabaticity” to the bound for successful adiabatic suppression on the coherent oscillation of the Polonyi. We can see from Fig. 10 that the Polonyi problem can be solved for a sufficiently low reheating temperature, $T_R \lesssim 10^5$ GeV. The adiabatic solution is therefore an attractive solution to the Polonyi problem. On the other hand, the reheating temperature above 10^9 GeV is not allowed, and therefore the thermal leptogenesis does not work [10], if all the constraints are taken at face value.

Now let us discuss if some of the constraints could be relaxed. In the case of the bino/higgsino LSP (top panel), the BBN constraint on the gravitino decay is so stringent for $m_{3/2} \lesssim 10$ TeV. So let us focus on the heavy gravitino of mass $\gtrsim 10$ TeV, where the most stringent constraint comes from the LSP overabundance (dotted pink). In order to weaken the bound, we need to suppress both the thermal and non-thermal relic of the LSP. (Note that the thermal relic abundance of the LSP is not taken into account in the figure.) In order to suppress the thermal relic abundance, the higgsino component should be sizable. The non-thermal component can be suppressed if the LSP mass is much lighter than the gravitino. Thus, one possibility to relax the constraint in the heavy gravitino region is to assume that the LSP is the light mixed bino-higgsino neutralino, namely, $m_{\text{bino}} \sim \mu \ll m_{3/2}$, which requires $c_3 \ll 1$. Then the SUSY mass spectrum would be similar to the focus point region [34], which is usually considered as a region where thermal leptogenesis works when only the gravitino constraint is considered. The bound can be similarly relaxed for the (purely) higgsino-like LSP, much lighter than the SSM gauginos and sfermions. In both cases the bound can be relaxed by an order of several tens to hundred, and the reheating temperature can be as high as $\mathcal{O}(10^9)$ GeV. Another possibility to relax the bound is to introduce R-parity violation; then the constraint disappears, but another DM candidate such as an axion would be needed.

In the case of the gravitino LSP (bottom panel), the BBN constraint on the Polonyi

⁸ Note that in this figure we do not take into account the thermal relic abundance of the LSP. In order to avoid the overabundance, the LSP mass cannot be arbitrarily large, although the precise thermal abundance depends on other SUSY particle masses.




Figure 10: Upper bounds on the reheating temperature for the Polonyi model with $m_z = m_{3/2}$ ($c_2 = 1$) for $c_3 = 1$ (top) and $c_3 = 5$ (bottom). In the top (bottom) panel, LSP is the bino/higgsino (gravitino). “BBN (TH Polonyi)” and “CMB (TH Polonyi)” refers to the BBN and CMB bounds on the thermally produced Polonyi, “LSP from TH Polonyi” to the LSP overproduction bound from the Polonyi decay, “TH Gravitino” to the bound from the gravitino thermal production, taking account of the gravitino decay effects on BBN and LSP overproduction, and “Adiabaticity” to the bound for successful adiabatic suppression on the coherent oscillation of the Polonyi. Note that in this figure we do not take into account the thermal relic abundance of the bino/higgsino.

decay is so stringent that it is difficult to make the thermal leptogenesis viable. This should be contrasted to the usual case in which the reheating temperature can be as high as $\mathcal{O}(10^9)$ GeV at $m_{3/2} = \mathcal{O}(10^2)$ GeV in the absence of the Polonyi field.

In summary, the adiabatic solution, with fine-tuning on the Polonyi potential at 0.1% level, works in the minimal set-up if T_R is sufficiently low, $T_R \lesssim 10^5$ GeV. The constraint on the reheating temperature can be relaxed in several ways. In the case of the neutralino LSP, the thermal leptogenesis becomes possible for the gravitino mass as heavy as $\mathcal{O}(10)$ TeV, if the lightest neutralino is the mixed bino-higgsino or purely higgsino-like LSP, or if the R-parity is violated. In the case of the mixed bino-higgsino LSP, the SUSY mass spectrum is similar to the focus point region. On the other hand, the thermal leptogenesis [10] does not work in the case of the gravitino LSP because of the stringent BBN bound on the Polonyi decay.

4.2 Extended adiabatic solution

Now let us extend the minimal set-up to allow other parameters to be enhanced. In particular we focus on the case of $c_1 \gg 1$ and $c_2 \gg 1$. Such an enhancement of c_2 is indeed expected in a certain theoretical framework. In this case the Polonyi is much heavier than the gravitino and the cosmological problems associated with the thermally produced Polonyi can be relaxed.

In addition to c_1 and c_2 , the Polonyi may also couple to SSM fields with enhanced interactions. Actually, as shown in Ref. [12], it is conceivable that all the Polonyi couplings are universally enhanced, $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5 = \mathcal{O}(10)$. The gaugino mass is determined by c_3 , while the sfermion mass depends on c_4 and c_5 . If c_3 , c_4 , and/or c_5 are larger than $\mathcal{O}(1)$, the gauginos and sfermions are heavier than the gravitino. On the other hand, the Polonyi abundance (60) depends on c_3 and c_5 . In the following we vary those parameters and analyze how they affect the cosmological bounds.

The Polonyi is much heavier than the gravitino, if $c_2 \gg 1$. Then the Polonyi decays into a pair of the gravitinos, as well as into the gauge bosons.⁹ The decay rate into the

⁹ Decay into gauginos are less efficient for $m_{3/2} \ll m_z$ [30].

gravitino pair is given by

$$\Gamma_{Z \rightarrow 2\psi_{3/2}} = \frac{1}{96\pi} \frac{m_z^5}{m_{3/2}^2 M_P^2}. \quad (61)$$

In fact, $Z \rightarrow 2\psi_{3/2}$ is often the dominant decay mode. If this is the case, the branching fraction of decay into visible particles is suppressed, which relaxes the BBN constraint on the Polonyi decay if the gravitino is the LSP and stable.

The Polonyi and gravitino abundances, given by Eqs. (60) and (59), respectively, are enhanced for $c_3 \gg 1$, namely, $m_{\tilde{g}} \gg m_{3/2}$. Although the partial decay rate of the Polonyi field into gauge bosons is enhanced for $c_3 \gg 1$, the branching fraction remains small if the gravitino production is the main decay mode.

The upper bounds on the reheating temperature are shown for $c_2 = 30$ and $c_3 = c_5 = 1(5)$ in the top(bottom) panel in Fig. 11. The meaning of each line is same as in Fig. 10. In the top panel, the LSP is either bino- or higgsino-like (or mixed bino-higgsino) neutralino, while the gravitino is the LSP in the bottom panel. Compared to Fig. 10, the gravitino constraint is same as before in both cases, while the BBN constraint on the Polonyi decay is significantly relaxed. This is because the Polonyi mass is much heavier than the gravitino and it decays before BBN begins, or at an early stage of BBN where the constraint from the helium overproduction is relatively weak.

In the top panel, the overall constraints are similar to Fig. 10, and the constraint from the LSP overabundance in the heavy gravitino region can be relaxed in a similar way to the previous case. The reheating temperature as high as 10^9 GeV is allowed only for the heavy gravitino case of $m_{3/2} \sim 10$ TeV. Even if we demand a moderate reheating temperature of $T_R \gtrsim 10^6$ GeV for non-thermal leptogenesis [21, 35], we need a relatively heavy gravitino, $m_{3/2} \gtrsim 5$ TeV. On the other hand, in the bottom panel, since the BBN constraint on the Polonyi field is significantly relaxed, there appears an interesting parameter region at $m_{3/2} \sim 100$ GeV with $T_R \sim 10^9$ GeV where the thermal leptogenesis may work successfully. Here it should be noted that c_3 cannot be much larger since it enhances the gaugino mass and hence the gravitino thermal production. If we demand $T_R \gtrsim 10^6$ GeV for non-thermal leptogenesis, a broader region for the gravitino mass $\mathcal{O}(10)\text{GeV}-\mathcal{O}(10)\text{TeV}$ is allowed. In this region gravitino is the LSP, while sfermions are heavier than the gauginos. This resembles the mass spectrum in the so-called focus-

point region [34].




Figure 11: Same as Fig. 10 but for $c_2 = 30$ and $c_3 = 1$ (top) and $c_2 = 30$ and $c_3 = 5$ (bottom) with $c_3 = c_5$. In the top (bottom) panel, LSP is the bino (gravitino).

Note that the effect of the next-to-lightest SUSY particle (NLSP) is not taken into account in the figure. In fact, the long-lived NLSP significantly affects BBN in the case

of gravitino LSP and hence we need a small R -parity violation in order for the NLSP to decay well before BBN begins. The NLSP lifetime depends on the pattern of R -parity violation and its magnitude. In particular, if the R -parity is violated by the tri-linear interaction such as $u^c d^c d^c$ or LLe^c , the NLSP lifetime depends crucially on the sfermion masses. The displaced vertex may give useful information on discriminating the model.

5 The moduli problem in gauge-mediation

The gauge-mediated SUSY breaking (GMSB) models [36] have attractive features that they do not suffer from the SUSY flavor problem. In the GMSB model, the Polonyi-like field is not always required in the SUSY breaking sector. Thus there may not be a Polonyi problem. But even in this case there may exist modulus fields especially if the four dimensional supergravity arises from the compactification of the extra dimensions in string theory. These moduli are expected to have masses of the gravitino and Planck-suppressed interactions, and hence they cause serious cosmological problems.

In this case the relevant parameters are the inflaton-modulus coupling c_1 , which must be enhanced in order to solve the moduli problem. As shown in Fig. 7, the moduli oscillation can be sufficiently suppressed by the adiabatic solution without fine-tuning for $m_z \lesssim 1$ MeV. However, we still need to care about thermally produced moduli. In the GMSB model, the moduli, as well as the gravitino, are light and the lifetime are longer than the case of gravity-mediation. If the modulus survives after the recombination epoch, the decay produced photons contribute to the diffuse X(γ)-ray background [37] which may easily exceed the observational limit [38, 39].

Fig. 12 shows constraints on the reheating temperature in the GMSB model with moduli. We take $m_z = m_{3/2}$ (top) and $m_z = 10m_{3/2}$ (bottom) and $m_{\tilde{g}}=1$ TeV. “BBN (TH moduli)”, “CMB (TH moduli)” and “Diffuse gamma (TH moduli)” refer to the BBN, CMB and diffuse gamma-ray flux bounds on the thermally produced moduli, “Adiabaticity” to the bound in order for suppress the Polonyi abundance and “TH Gravitino” to the usual bound from the gravitino thermal production.

First it is remarkable that the ultra-light gravitino mass region, $m_{3/2} \lesssim 16$ eV, where it was believed that there is no upper bound on the reheating temperature, is clearly

inconsistent with high-reheating temperature scenario once we demand that the adiabatic mechanism suppresses the modulus abundance.¹⁰

For the case of intermediate gravitino mass of $\mathcal{O}(10)$ GeV, the situation is similar to that studied in the previous section. It may be consistent with non-thermal leptogenesis scenario if the modulus mass is enhanced compared to the gravitino mass under the broken R -parity.

6 The moduli problem in anomaly-mediation

Finally we mention the moduli problem in the anomaly-mediated SUSY breaking (AMSB) model [3]. As noted in Introduction, the moduli problem is milder than that in the case of gravity- or gauge-mediation since the moduli are heavy enough to decay before BBN. But it was recognized in Ref. [4] that the gravitinos produced by the modulus decay cause cosmological problems. Even if the gravitinos are also heavy enough, the abundance of LSPs produced by the modulus/gravitino decay is too much. A possible solution is to introduce a small R -parity violation in order for the LSP to decay. In any case, the modulus decay produces huge amount of entropy and the preexisting baryon asymmetry is significantly diluted.¹¹

Here we consider the adiabatic solution to the moduli problem in the AMSB model, which is free from the problems of late-time entropy production and hence the dilution of the baryon asymmetry. As shown in Fig. 7, we need a tuning on the modulus potential at the level of $\mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$ or $\mathcal{O}(10^{-2})$ in order to solve the moduli problem in the original sense for a relatively high-reheating temperature consistent with thermal or nonthermal leptogenesis. Again, however, we still need to take account of thermal production of the moduli. Fig. 13 shows upper bounds on the reheating temperature in AMSB models with moduli. We take $m_z = m_{3/2}$ (top) and $m_z = 10m_{3/2}$ (bottom). The meaning of each line is same as those in Fig. 12, except for the “LSP from TH moduli” which denotes the

¹⁰ The smallness of the modulus abundance in this mass range may be explained by the anthropic arguments without invoking the adiabatic suppression, since in this region the constraint comes from the modulus overabundance as the DM.

¹¹ The amount of dilution factor is roughly given by $\sim T_z/T_R$ where T_z is the modulus decay temperature. The most baryogenesis models do not work under this condition, except for some parameter ranges in the Affleck-Dine mechanism [6].




Figure 12: Upper bounds on the reheating temperature in GMSB models with moduli. We take $m_z = m_{3/2}$ (top) and $m_z = 10m_{3/2}$ (bottom) and $m_{\tilde{g}}=1$ TeV. “BBN (TH moduli)”, “CMB (TH moduli)” and “Diffuse gamma (TH moduli)” refer to the BBN, CMB and diffuse gamma-ray flux bounds on the thermally produced moduli, “Adiabaticity” to the bound in order for suppress the Polonyi abundance, and “TH Gravitino” to the usual bound from the gravitino thermal production.

LSP overproduction bound from the decay of thermally produced moduli. Note that in this case the “TH gravitino” bound includes the LSP overproduction from the gravitino decay. It is found that the gravitino mass of around 100TeV is compatible with the thermal leptogenesis scenario ($T_R \gtrsim 10^9$ GeV). We do not need an R -parity violation in this case.

Notice that the Wino is the LSP in AMSB models and its mass is given by $m_{\tilde{W}} = (g_2^2/16\pi^2)m_{3/2} \sim 2.6 \times 10^{-3}m_{3/2}$. In the parameter region considered above, the Wino produced non-thermally by the gravitino/modulus decay can be the dominant component of DM. But the Wino has rather large annihilation cross section and the Wino DM mass is limited from the observation of light element abundances [40, 41], cosmic microwave background anisotropy [42, 43] and gamma-rays by the Fermi satellite [44]. These constraints demand $m_{\tilde{W}} \gtrsim 200$ GeV which translates into the bound on the gravitino mass as $m_{3/2} \gtrsim 80$ TeV if the DM mainly consists of the Wino.

7 Conclusions and discussion

One of the major obstacles to construct a consistent cosmological scenarios in the most SUSY breaking models is the cosmological Polonyi/moduli problem. We have examined carefully the adiabatic solution to the cosmological Polonyi/moduli problem, and found that the Polonyi/moduli oscillation is necessarily induced at the end of inflation, and its abundance depends on the inflation models. As a result, the Polonyi/moduli problem cannot be solved without further tuning on the potential parameters for a broad range of the modulus mass. The possible ranges of the moduli mass where no severe tuning is needed for solving the moduli problem are either $m_z \lesssim 1$ MeV or $m_z \gtrsim 10$ TeV (see Fig. 7). In the former case, the reheating temperature cannot be larger than ~ 1 TeV from the gravitino constraint (see Fig. 12). In the latter case, the reheating temperature can be as high as $\sim 10^6$ GeV with a mild tuning of $\mathcal{O}(0.1 - 0.01)$ and may be consistent with non-thermal leptogenesis scenario [21, 35]. If we allow a tuning at the 1% level, the thermal leptogenesis requires $m_z \gtrsim 100$ TeV. On the other hand, for a very low reheating temperature of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ MeV, the adiabatic suppression mechanism can solve the Polonyi/moduli problem without tuning for every range of Polonyi/modulus mass.




Figure 13: Upper bounds on the reheating temperature in AMSB models with moduli. We take $m_z = m_{3/2}$ (top) and $m_z = 10m_{3/2}$ (bottom). Meaning of each lines is same as those in Fig. 12, except for the “LSP from TH moduli” which denotes the LSP overproduction bound from the decay of thermally produced moduli.

We have also pointed out that Polonyi/moduli production from scatterings in thermal bath can be relevant, even if the coherent oscillations are suppressed by the adiabatic mechanism. If the Polonyi/moduli have Planck-suppressed interactions with the SSM particles, their abundance is comparable to that of the transverse component of the gravitino. In fact, the cosmological constraint on the Polonyi field produced from thermal scattering has turned out to be stringent for a broad range of the gravitino mass (see Fig. 10).

Since the adiabatic solution necessitates the enhanced Polonyi/moduli-inflaton coupling, other couplings may also be enhanced, depending on the origin of the enhanced coupling. We have studied several cases where the Polonyi self-coupling (c_2) and/or the Polonyi-matter couplings (c_3, c_4, c_5) are enhanced. In the gravity-mediation model, the Polonyi field mainly decays into a pair of gravitinos, if its self-coupling is enhanced. This relaxes the cosmological constraint on the Polonyi abundance when the gravitino is the LSP. Once we allow a fine-tuning on the Polonyi potential at the level of $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$ or $\mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$, the adiabatic solution works in consistent with thermal or nonthermal leptogenesis scenario, for some gravitino mass ranges (see Fig. 7). In particular there appears a new interesting parameter space where the gauginos are relatively light ($\sim \mathcal{O}(100)$ GeV) and the gravitino is the LSP. A small amount of R-parity violation is needed to avoid the BBN constraint on the NLSP decay. Sfermion masses can be comparable to or much heavier than the gaugino mass depending on the parameters c_4 and c_5 . We have also commented that non-thermal gravitino production from the inflaton decay may be enhanced in this setup.

In the gauge-mediated SUSY breaking model, there may also exist light moduli, and we have studied the adiabatic solution to the moduli problem. It is found that the ultra-light gravitino scenario ($m_{3/2} < 16\text{eV}$), where the gravitino problem does not exist, is not consistent with the adiabatic solution unless $T_R \lesssim 1\text{ TeV}$, although the modulus amplitude may be anthropically tuned without the adiabatic suppression mechanism.

In the anomaly-mediation model, once the modulus oscillation is suppressed by the adiabatic suppression mechanism and some tuning, constraints from thermally produced moduli are rather weak. The reheating temperature can be high enough to be consistent with (non-)thermal leptogenesis.

We conclude that there are many non-trivial constraints for the adiabatic suppression on the moduli to work successfully. Even in the presence of adiabatic suppression, we need a tuning on the modulus potential in order to avoid the moduli problem especially for a relatively high reheating temperature (see Fig. 7), although the required amount of tuning is significantly relaxed. For a low reheating temperature, on the other hand, the adiabatic suppression mechanism can solve the Polonyi/moduli problem without any fine-tuning. Thermal production of the moduli also set a severe constraint on the reheating temperature for relatively light moduli of $m_z \lesssim 1 \text{ TeV}$. These aspects of the moduli should be taken into account when the solution to the moduli problem in the adiabatic suppression is discussed.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Innovative Areas (No. 21111006) [KN and FT], Scientific Research (A) (No. 22244030 [KN and FT], 21244033 [FT], 22244021 [TTY]), and JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) (No. 21740160) [FT]. This work was also supported by World Premier International Center Initiative (WPI Program), MEXT, Japan.

References

- [1] G. D. Coughlan, W. Fischler, E. W. Kolb, S. Raby, G. G. Ross, Phys. Lett. **B131**, 59 (1983); J. R. Ellis, D. V. Nanopoulos, M. Quiros, Phys. Lett. **B174**, 176 (1986); A. S. Goncharov, A. D. Linde, M. I. Vysotsky, Phys. Lett. **B147**, 279 (1984).
- [2] T. Banks, D. B. Kaplan, A. E. Nelson, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 779-787 (1994). [hep-ph/9308292]; B. de Carlos, J. A. Casas, F. Quevedo, E. Roulet, Phys. Lett. **B318**, 447-456 (1993). [hep-ph/9308325].
- [3] L. Randall, R. Sundrum, Nucl. Phys. **B557**, 79-118 (1999). [hep-th/9810155]; G. F. Giudice, M. A. Luty, H. Murayama, R. Rattazzi, JHEP **9812**, 027 (1998). [hep-ph/9810442].

- [4] M. Endo, K. Hamaguchi, F. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 211301 (2006). [hep-ph/0602061]; Phys. Rev. **D74**, 023531 (2006). [hep-ph/0605091]; S. Nakamura, M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Lett. **B638**, 389-395 (2006). [hep-ph/0602081]; M. Dine, R. Kitano, A. Morisse, Y. Shirman, Phys. Rev. **D73**, 123518 (2006). [hep-ph/0604140].
- [5] I. Affleck, M. Dine, Nucl. Phys. **B249**, 361 (1985); M. Dine, L. Randall, S. D. Thomas, Nucl. Phys. **B458**, 291-326 (1996). [hep-ph/9507453].
- [6] M. Kawasaki, K. Nakayama, Phys. Rev. **D76**, 043502 (2007). [arXiv:0705.0079 [hep-ph]]; P. Kumar, JHEP **0905**, 083 (2009). [arXiv:0809.2610 [hep-ph]].
- [7] K. Yamamoto, Phys. Lett. **B168**, 341 (1986); G. Lazarides, C. Panagiotakopoulos, Q. Shafi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 557 (1986); D. H. Lyth, E. D. Stewart, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 201-204 (1995). [hep-ph/9502417]; Phys. Rev. **D53**, 1784-1798 (1996). [hep-ph/9510204]; T. Asaka, M. Kawasaki, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 123509 (1999). [hep-ph/9905467].
- [8] E. D. Stewart, M. Kawasaki, T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 6032-6039 (1996). [hep-ph/9603324].
- [9] A. D. Linde, Phys. Rev. **D53**, 4129-4132 (1996). [hep-th/9601083].
- [10] M. Fukugita, T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. **B174**, 45 (1986); For a review, see W. Buchmuller, R. D. Peccei, T. Yanagida, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **55**, 311-355 (2005). [hep-ph/0502169].
- [11] F. Takahashi, T. T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. **B698**, 408-410 (2011). [arXiv:1101.0867 [hep-ph]].
- [12] F. Takahashi and T. T. Yanagida, JHEP **1101**, 139 (2011) [arXiv:1012.3227 [hep-ph]].
- [13] M. Viel, J. Lesgourgues, M. G. Haehnelt, S. Matarrese, A. Riotto, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 063534 (2005). [astro-ph/0501562].
- [14] D. H. Lyth, E. D. Stewart, in [7].
- [15] W. Buchmuller, K. Hamaguchi, O. Lebedev, M. Ratz, Nucl. Phys. **B699**, 292-308 (2004). [hep-th/0404168].

- [16] K. Nakayama, F. Takahashi, Phys. Lett. **B670**, 434-436 (2009). [arXiv:0811.0444 [hep-ph]].
- [17] M. Kawasaki, K. Kohri, T. Moroi, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 083502 (2005). [astro-ph/0408426]; M. Kawasaki, K. Kohri, T. Moroi, A. Yotsuyanagi, Phys. Rev. **D78**, 065011 (2008). [arXiv:0804.3745 [hep-ph]].
- [18] K. -I. Izawa, T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. **B393**, 331-336 (1997). [hep-ph/9608359].
- [19] G. R. Dvali, Q. Shafi, R. K. Schaefer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 1886-1889 (1994). [hep-ph/9406319]; E. J. Copeland, A. R. Liddle, D. H. Lyth, E. D. Stewart, D. Wands, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 6410-6433 (1994). [astro-ph/9401011]; A. D. Linde, A. Riotto, Phys. Rev. **D56**, 1841-1844 (1997). [hep-ph/9703209].
- [20] G. Lazarides, C. Panagiotakopoulos, Phys. Rev. **D52**, R559-563 (1995). [hep-ph/9506325].
- [21] T. Asaka, K. Hamaguchi, M. Kawasaki, T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. **D61**, 083512 (2000). [hep-ph/9907559]; V. N. Senoguz, Q. Shafi, Phys. Lett. **B596**, 8-15 (2004). [hep-ph/0403294].
- [22] M. Kawasaki, M. Yamaguchi, T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3572-3575 (2000). [hep-ph/0004243]; Phys. Rev. **D63**, 103514 (2001). [hep-ph/0011104].
- [23] F. Takahashi, Phys. Lett. B **693**, 140 (2010) [arXiv:1006.2801 [hep-ph]]; K. Nakayama and F. Takahashi, JCAP **1011**, 009 (2010) [arXiv:1008.2956 [hep-ph]].
- [24] R. Kallosh, A. Linde, JCAP **1011**, 011 (2010). [arXiv:1008.3375 [hep-th]]; R. Kallosh, A. Linde, T. Rube, Phys. Rev. **D83**, 043507 (2011). [arXiv:1011.5945 [hep-th]].
- [25] T. Asaka, M. Kawasaki, in [7].
- [26] A. Lukas, A. Niemeyer, M. Yamaguchi, Nucl. Phys. **B481**, 433-452 (1996). [hep-th/9604096].
- [27] M. Kawasaki, F. Takahashi, T. T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. **B638**, 8-12 (2006). [hep-ph/0603265]; Phys. Rev. **D74**, 043519 (2006). [hep-ph/0605297]; T. Asaka, S. Nakamura, M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 023520 (2006). [hep-ph/0604132]; M. Endo, F. Takahashi, T. T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. **B658**, 236-240 (2008). [hep-ph/0701042]; Phys. Rev. **D76**, 083509 (2007). [arXiv:0706.0986 [hep-ph]].

- [28] K. Jedamzik, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 103509 (2006). [hep-ph/0604251].
- [29] R. H. Cyburt, J. Ellis, B. D. Fields, F. Luo, K. A. Olive, V. C. Spanos, JCAP **1010**, 032 (2010). [arXiv:1007.4173 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [30] M. Endo, F. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 063502 (2006). [hep-ph/0606075].
- [31] T. Moroi, H. Murayama, M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Lett. **B303**, 289-294 (1993).
- [32] M. Bolz, A. Brandenburg, W. Buchmuller, Nucl. Phys. **B606**, 518-544 (2001). [hep-ph/0012052]; J. Pradler, F. D. Steffen, Phys. Rev. **D75**, 023509 (2007). [hep-ph/0608344]; Phys. Lett. **B648**, 224-235 (2007). [hep-ph/0612291]; V. S. Rychkov, A. Strumia, Phys. Rev. **D75**, 075011 (2007). [hep-ph/0701104].
- [33] D. J. Fixsen, E. S. Cheng, J. M. Gales, J. C. Mather, R. A. Shafer, E. L. Wright, Astrophys. J. **473**, 576 (1996). [astro-ph/9605054].
- [34] J. L. Feng, K. T. Matchev, T. Moroi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2322-2325 (2000). [hep-ph/9908309]; Phys. Rev. **D61**, 075005 (2000). [hep-ph/9909334].
- [35] K. Hamaguchi, H. Murayama, T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. **D65**, 043512 (2002). [hep-ph/0109030].
- [36] G. F. Giudice, R. Rattazzi, Phys. Rept. **322**, 419-499 (1999). [hep-ph/9801271].
- [37] P. Sreekumar *et al.* [EGRET Collaboration], Astrophys. J. **494**, 523-534 (1998). [astro-ph/9709257].
- [38] M. Kawasaki, T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. **B399**, 45-48 (1997). [hep-ph/9701346].
- [39] M. Kawasaki, K. Nakayama, M. Senami, JCAP **0803**, 009 (2008). [arXiv:0711.3083 [hep-ph]].
- [40] K. Jedamzik, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 083510 (2004). [astro-ph/0405583].
- [41] J. Hisano, M. Kawasaki, K. Kohri, K. Nakayama, Phys. Rev. **D79**, 063514 (2009). [arXiv:0810.1892 [hep-ph]].
- [42] S. Galli, F. Iocco, G. Bertone, A. Melchiorri, Phys. Rev. **D80**, 023505 (2009). [arXiv:0905.0003 [astro-ph.CO]]; [arXiv:1106.1528 [astro-ph.CO]]; T. R. Slatyer, N. Padmanabhan, D. P. Finkbeiner, Phys. Rev. **D80**, 043526 (2009). [arXiv:0906.1197 [astro-ph.CO]].

- [43] T. Kanzaki, M. Kawasaki, K. Nakayama, Prog. Theor. Phys. **123**, 853-865 (2010).
[arXiv:0907.3985 [astro-ph.CO]]; J. Hisano, M. Kawasaki, K. Kohri, T. Moroi,
K. Nakayama, T. Sekiguchi, [arXiv:1102.4658 [hep-ph]].
- [44] A. A. Abdo, M. Ackermann, M. Ajello, W. B. Atwood, L. Baldini, J. Ballet, G. Barbiellini, D. Bastieri *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **712**, 147-158 (2010). [arXiv:1001.4531 [astro-ph.CO]]; A. A. Abdo *et al.* [Fermi-LAT Collaboration], JCAP **1004**, 014 (2010). [arXiv:1002.4415 [astro-ph.CO]].