# Anthropic predictions: the case of the cosm ological constant

A lexander V ilenkin

Institute of Cosm obgy, D epartm ent of P hysics and A stronom y, Tuffs U niversity, M edford, M A 02155, U SA

# Abstract

A nthropic models can give testable predictions, which can be con med or falsi ed at a speci ed con dence level. This is illustrated using the successful prediction of the cosm ological constant as an example. The history and the nature of the prediction are reviewed. Inclusion of other variable parameters and im plications for particle physics are brie y discussed.

## I. IN TRODUCTION

The parameters we call constants of N ature m ay in fact be stochastic variables taking dimensional dimensi dimensi di dimensi dimensiona

These arguments have not been taken very seriously and have often been ridiculed as handwaving and unpredictive. For one thing, the anthropic worldview assumes some sort of a \multiverse" ensemble, consisting of multiple universes or distant regions of the same universe, with constants of Nature varying from one member of this ensemble to another. Quantitative results cannot be obtained without a theory of the multiverse. A nother criticism is that the anthropic approach does not make testable predictions; thus it is not falsi able, and therefore not scienti c.

W hile both of these criticisms had some force a couple of decades ago, much progress has been made since then, and the situation is now completely dierent. The enter rest criticism no longer applies, because we now do have a theory of the multiverse. It is the theory of in ation. A remarkable feature of in ation is that, generically, it never ends completely. The end of in ation is a stochastic process; it occurs at dierent times in dierent parts of the universe, and at any time there are regions which are still in ating [6,7]. If some \constants" of Nature are related to dynamical elds and are allowed to vary, they are necessarily random ized by quantum uctuations during in ation and take dierent values in dierent parts of the universe. Thus, in ationary cosmology gives a specie crealization of the multiverse ensemble, and makes it essentially inevitable. (For a review see, e.g., [8].)

In this paper I am going to address the second criticism, that anthropic arguments are unpredictive. I will try to dispel this notion and outline how anthropic models can be used to make quantitative predictions. These predictions are of a statistical nature, but they still allow models to be con med or falsi ed at a speci ed con dence level. I will focus on the case of the cosm obgical constant, whose nonzero value was predicted anthropically well before it was observed. This case is of great interest in its own right and is well suited to illustrate the issues associated with anthropic predictions.

### II. ANTHROPIC BOUNDS VS. ANTHROPIC PREDICTIONS

For term inological clarity, it is important to distinguish between anthropic bounds and anthropic predictions. Suppose there is some parameter X, which varies from one place in the universe to another. Suppose further that the value of X a exts the chances for intelligent observers to evolve, and that the evolution of observers is possible only if X is within some interval

$$X_{m in} < X < X_{m ax}$$
(1)

C learly, values of X outside the interval (1) are not going to be observed, because such values are inconsistent with the existence of observers. This statement is often called  $\$ the anthropic principle".

A lthough anthropic bounds, like Eq.(1), can have considerable explanatory power, they can hardly be regarded as predictions: they are guarranteed to be right. And the \anthropic principle", as stated above, hardly deserves to be called a principle: it is trivially true. This is not to say, how ever, that anthropic argum ents cannot yield testable predictions.

Suppose we want to test a theory according to which the parameter X varies from one part of the universe to another.<sup>1</sup> Then, instead of looking for the extrem e values  $X_{m in}$  and  $X_{m ax}$  that make observers in possible, we can try to predict what values of X will be measured by typical observers. In other words, we can make statistical predictions, assigning probabilities P (X) to di erent values of X. P (X) is the probability that an observer random ly picked in the universe will measure a given value of X. J f any principle needs to be invoked here, it is what I called \the principle of mediocrity" [9] { the assumption that we are typical among the observers in the universe. Quantitatively, this can be expressed as the expectation that we should not ourselves, say, within the 95% range of the distribution. This can be regarded as a prediction at a 95% condence level. If instead we measure a value outside the expected range, this should be regarded as evidence against the theory.

#### III. THE COSMOLOGICAL CONSTANT PROBLEM

The cosm obgical constant is (up to a factor) the energy density of the vacuum,  $_v$ . Below, I do not distinguish between the two and use the term s \cosm obgical constant" and \vacuum energy density" interchangeably. By Einstein's mass-energy relation, the energy density is simply related to the mass density, and I will often express  $_v$  in units of g/cm<sup>3</sup>.

The gravitational properties of the vacuum are rather unusual: for positive  $_v$ , its gravitational force is repulsive. This can be traced to the fact that, according to Einstein's G eneral

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>I assume for simplicity that X is variable only in space, but not in time.

Relativity, the force of gravity is determ ined not solely by the energy (m ass) density , but rather by the combination ( + 3P), where P is the pressure. In ordinary astrophysical objects, like stars or galaxies, pressure is much smaller than the energy density, P , and its contribution to gravity can be neglected. But in the case of vacuum, the pressure is equal and opposite to  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ 

$$P_v = v;$$
 (2)

so that  $_v + 3P_v = 2_v$ . Pressure not only contributes signi cantly to the gravitational force produced by the mass, it also changes its sign.

The cosm obgical constant was introduced by Einstein in his 1917 paper [10], where he applied the newly developed theory of General Relativity to the universe as a whole. E instein believed that the universe was static, but to his dism ay he found that the theory had no static cosm obgical solutions. He concluded that the theory had to be modiled and introduced the cosm obgical term, which amounted to endowing the vacuum with a positive energy density. Them agnitude of  $_v$  was chosen so that its repulsive gravity exactly balanced the attractive gravity of matter, resulting in a static world. More than a decade later, after Hubble's discovery of the expansion of the universe, Einstein abandoned the cosm ological constant, calling it the greatest blunder of his life. But once the Genie was out of the bottle, it was not so easy to put it back.

Even if we do not introduce the vacuum energy \by hand", uctuations of quantum elds, like the electrom agnetic eld, would still make this energy nonzero. Adding up the energies of quantum uctuations with shorter and shorter wavelengths gives a form ally innite answer for v. The sum has to be cut o at the Planck length,  $10^{33}$  cm, where quantum gravity e ects become important and the usual concepts of space and time no longer apply. This gives a nite, but absurdly large value,  $v = 10^{94}$  g/cm<sup>3</sup>. A cosm ological constant of this magnitude would cause the universe to expand with a stupendous acceleration. If indeed our vacuum has energy, it should be at least 120 orders of magnitude smaller in order to be consistent with observations. In supersymmetric theories, the contributions of di erent elds partially cancel, and the discrepancy can be reduced to 60 orders of magnitude. This discrepancy between the expected and observed values of v is called the cosm ological constant problem. It is one of the most intriguing mysteries that we are now facing in theoretical physics.

### IV.THE ANTHROPIC BOUND

A natural resolution to the cosm obgical constant problem is obtained in models where v is a random variable. The idea is to introduce a dynam ical dark energy component X whose energy density x varies from place to place, due to stochastic processes that occured in the early universe. A possible model for x is a scalar eld with a very at potential [11,12], such that the eld is driven to its minimum on an extrem ely long timescale, much longer

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Since the vacuum energy is proportional to the volum  $eV \equiv occupies$ ,  $E = _vV$ , the pressure is  $P_v = dE = dV = _v$ .

than the present age of the universe. A nother possibility is a discrete set of vacuum states. Transitions between di erent states can then occur through nucleation and expansion of bubbles bounded by dom ain walls [13,14]. The elective cosm ological constant is given by v = + x, where is the constant vacuum energy density, which may be as large as (+ or -)10<sup>94</sup> g/cm<sup>3</sup>. The cosm ological constant problem now takes a di erent form : the puzzle is why we happen to live in a region where is nearly cancelled by x.

The key observation, due to W einberg [15] (see also [3,11,16]) is that the cosm ological constant can have a dramatic e ect on the formation of structure in the universe. The observed structures – stars, galaxies, and galaxy clusters – evolved from small initial inhomogeneities, which grew over eons of cosm ic time by gravitationally attracting matter from surrounding regions. As the universe expands, matter is diluted, so its density goes down as

$$_{\rm M} = (1 + z)^3 \,_{\rm M \, 0}; \tag{3}$$

where  $_{M \ 0}$  is the present m atter density and z is the redshift.<sup>3</sup> At the same time, the density contrast = between overdense and underdense regions keeps growing. Gravitationally bound objects form where 1. The rst stars form in relatively small matter clumps of mass  $10^6$  M. The clumps then merge into larger and larger objects, leading to the form ation of giant galaxies like ours and of galaxy clusters.

How is this picture modil ed in the presence of a cosm obgical constant? At early times, when the density of matter is high,  $_{\rm M}$ , the vacuum energy has very little elect on structure formation. But as the universe expands and the matter density decreases, the vacuum density  $_{\rm V}$  remains constant and eventually becomes greater than  $_{\rm M}$ . At this point the character of cosm ic expansion changes. Prior to vacuum domination, the expansion is slowed down by gravity, but afferwards it begins to accelerate, due to the repulsive gravity of the vacuum. We enberg showed that the growth of density inhom ogeneities electively stops at that epoch. If no structures were formed at earlier times, then none will ever be formed.

It seems reasonable to assume that the existence of stars is a necessary prerequisite for the evolution of observers. We also need to require that the stars belong to su ciently large bound objects – galaxies – so that their gravity is strong enough to retain the heavy elements dispersed in supernova explosions. These elements are necessary for the formation of planets and of observers. An anthropic bound on the vacuum energy can then be obtained by requiring that  $_v$  does not dominate before the redshift  $z_m_{ax}$  when the earliest galaxies are formed. W ith the aid of Eq.(3), this gives

$$v < (1 + z_{max})^3 M_0$$
: (4)

The most distant galaxies observed at the tim e when W einberg wrote his paper had redshifts z 4.5. A sum ing that  $z_{max}$  4.5, Eq.(4) yields the bound  $\sqrt{170}_{M0}$ . A more careful analysis by W einberg showed that in order to prevent structure formation,  $\sqrt{170}_{M0}$  needs to be 3 tim es greater than suggested by Eq.(4); hence, a more accurate bound is [15]

$$_{\rm v} < 500 {}_{\rm M 0}$$
: (5)

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>$ The redshift z is de ned so that (1 + z) is the expansion factor of the universe between a given epoch and the present (earlier times correspond to larger redshifts).

O f course, observation of galaxies at z 4:5 m eans only that  $\frac{2}{3} \text{ ax} > 4:5$ , and W einberg referred to (5) as \a lower bound on the anthropic upper bound on  $\sqrt{2}$ ." At present, galaxies are observed at considerably higher redshifts, up to z 10. The corresponding bound on  $\sqrt{2}$  would be

$$_{\rm v}$$
 < 4000  $_{\rm M 0}$ : (6)

For negative values of  $_{v}$ , the vacuum gravity is attractive, and vacuum dom ination leads to a rapid recollapse of the universe. An anthropic low er bound on  $_{v}$  can be obtained in this case by requiring that the universe does not recollapse before life had a chance to develop [3,17]. A ssum ing that the timescale for life evolution is comparable to the present cosm ic time, one nds  $_{v}$   $^{>}$  M  $_{0}$ .

The anthropic bounds are narrower, by many orders of magnitude, than the particle physics estimates for  $_{v}$ . Moreover, as W einberg noted, there is a prediction implicit in these bounds. He wrote [18]: \... if it is the anthropic principle that accounts for the smallness of the cosm ological constant, then we would expect a vacuum energy density  $_{v}$  (10 100)<sub>M 0</sub>, because there is no anthropic reason for it to be any smaller."

O ne has to admit, however, that the anthropic bounds fall short of the observational bound,  $(v_{\rm v})_{\rm obs} < 4_{\rm M}$ , by a few orders of magnitude. If all the values in the anthropically allowed range were equally probable, an additional netuning by a factor of 100 1000 would still be needed.

# V.ANTHROPIC PREDICTIONS

The anthropic bound (4) speci es the value of  $_{v}$  which makes galaxy form ation barely possible. However, if  $_{v}$  varies in space, then most of the galaxies will not be in regions characterized by these marginal values, but rather in regions where  $_{v}$  dominates after a substantial fraction of matter had already clustered into galaxies.

To make this quantitative, we de ne the probability distribution P (v)dv as being proportional to the number of observers in the universe who will measure v in the interval dv. This distribution can be represented as a product [9]

$$P(v_{v})d_{v} = n_{obs}(v_{v})P_{prior}(v_{v})d_{v}:$$
(7)

Here,  $P_{prior}(v)d_v$  is the prior distribution, which is proportional to the volume of those parts of the universe where v takes values in the intervald v, and  $n_{obs}(v)$  is the number of observers that are going to evolve per unit volume. The distribution (7) gives the probability that a random ly selected observer is located in a region where the elective cosm ological constant is in the intervald v.

O fcourse, we have no idea how to calculate  $n_{obs}$ , but what comes to the rescue is the fact that the value of  $_v$  does not directly a ect the physics and chemistry of life. As a rough

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>An important distinction between positive and negative values of  $_{v}$  is that for  $_{v} > 0$ , galaxies that form ed prior to vacuum dom ination can survive inde nitely in the vacuum dom inated universe.

approximation, we can then assume that  $n_{obs}$  ( $_v$ ) is simply proportional to the fraction of matter f clustered in giant galaxies like ours (with mass M > M  $_G$  =  $10^{12}$ M ),

$$n_{obs}(v_{v}) / f(M_{G};v_{v}):$$
 (8)

The idea is that there is a certain number of stars per unit mass in a galaxy and certain number of observers per star. The choice of the galactic mass M  $_{\rm G}$  is an important issue; I will comment on it in next section.

The calculation of the prior distribution P<sub>prior</sub> ( $_{v}$ ) requires a particle physics model which allow s  $_{v}$  to vary and a cosm ological \multiverse" model that would generate an ensemble of sub-universes with di erent values of  $_{v}$ . An example of a suitable particle theory is the superstring theory, which appears to admit an incredibly large number of vacua (possibly as large as  $10^{1000}$  [19{21]) characterized by di erent values of particle m asses, couplings, and other parameters, including the cosm ological constant. When this is combined with the cosm ic in ation scenario, one nds that bubbles of di erent vacua copiously nucleate and expand during in ation, producing exponentially large regions with all possible values of  $_{v}$ . G iven a particle physics model and a model of in ation, one can in principle calculate P<sub>prior</sub> ( $_{v}$ ). Examples of calculation for speci c m odels have been given in [12,22,23]<sup>5</sup>. N eedless to say, the details of the fundam ental theory and of the in ationary dynam ics are too uncertain for a de nitive calculation of P<sub>prior</sub>. W e shall instead rely on the follow ing general argum ent [27,28].

Suppose some parameter X varies in the range X and is characterized by a prior distribution  $P_{prior}(X)$ . Suppose further that X a lects the number of observers in such a way that this number is non-negligible only in a very narrow range  $X_{obs}$  X. Then one can expect that the function  $P_{prior}(X)$  with a large characteristic range of variation should be very nearly a constant in the tiny interval  $X_{obs}$ . In the case of v, the range v is set by the P lanck scale or by the supersymmetry breaking scale, and we have  $(v_{prior})_{obs} = v_{prior}^{20} 10^{-120}$ . Hence, we expect

$$P_{prior}(v)$$
 const: (9)

I emphasize that the assumption here is that the value  $_v = 0$  is not in any way special, as far as the fundamental theory is concerned, and is, therefore, not a singular point of  $P_{prior}(_v)$ .

C om bining Eqs.(7), (8), (9), we obtain

$$P(_{v}) / f(M_{G};_{v}):$$
 (10)

In Ref. [9], where I ist introduced the anthropic probability distributions of the form (7), I did not attempt a detailed calculation of the distribution for  $_v$ , resorting instead to a rough estimate. If we denote by  $z_G$  the redshift at the epoch of galaxy formation, then most of the galaxies should be in regions where the vacuum energy dom inates at  $z_v < z_G$ .

 $<sup>^{5}</sup>$ T here are still som e un resolved issues regarding the calculation of P<sub>prior</sub> form odels with a discrete spectrum of variable \constants". For a discussion see [24{26].

Regions with  $z_v = z_G$  will have very few galaxies, while regions with  $z_v = z_G$  will be rare, simply because they correspond to a very narrow range of v near zero. Hence, we expect a typical galaxy to be located in a region where

$$z_v \quad z_s:$$
 (11)

The expected value of  $\ _{\rm v}$  is then

$$_{\rm v}$$
  $(1 + _{\rm c})^3$   $_{\rm M 0}$ : (12)

The choice of the galaxy form ation epoch  $z_G$  is related to the choice of the galactic mass  $M_G$  in (8). I used  $z_G$  1, obtaining v  $8_{M0}$ .

A similar approach was later developed by Efstathiou [29]. The main dimension is that he calculated the fraction of clustered matter f at the time corresponding to the observed value of the microwave background temperature,  $T_0 = 2:73$  K, while my suggestion was to use the asymptotic value of f at t! 1. The two approaches correspond to dimension of clustered matter f at have expected to be typical. Efstathiou's choice includes (roughly) only observers that have evolved until present, while my choice is to include all observers throughout the history of the universe. If we are truly typical, and live at the time when most observers live, the two methods should give similar results. Indeed, one indicate the probability distributions calculated by these methods are nearly identical [30].<sup>6</sup>

#### VI.COMPARISON W ITH OBSERVATIONS

D espite a num ber of observational hints that the cosm ological constant m ight be nonzero (see, e.g., [31]), its discovery still cam e as a great surprise to m ost physicists and astronom ers. O bservations of distant supernovae by two independent groups in 1997–98 provided strong evidence that the expansion of the universe is accelerating [32]. The sim plest interpretation of the data was in terms of a cosm ological constant with  $_{\rm V}$  2.3 M  $_{\rm 0}$ . Further evidence cam e from the cosm ic m icrow ave background and galaxy clustering observations, and by now the case for the cosm ological constant is very strong.

The discovery of the cosm ological constant was particularly shocking to particle physicists who almost universally believed that it should be equal to zero. They assumed that something so small could only be zero and searched for a new symmetry principle or a dynamical adjustment mechanism that would force  $_v$  to vanish. The observed value of  $_v$  brought yet another puzzle. The matter density  $_M$  and the vacuum energy density  $_v$  scale very dimension of the universe. In the early universe the matter density dominates, while in the asymptotic future it becomes negligible. There is only one epoch in the history of the universe when  $_M$   $_v$ . It is dimensional why we happen to live in this very special epoch. This is the so-called cosm ic coincidence problem.

 $<sup>^{6}</sup>$ The original calculation by E fstathiou gave a di erent result, but that calculation contained an error, which was later pointed out by W einberg [28].



FIG.1. The logarithm ic probability distribution  $dP = d (\log_v)$ . The lightly and densely shaded areas are the regions excluded at 68% and 95% level, respectively. The uncertainty in the observed value v is indicated by the vertical strip.

The coincidence is easily understood in the fram ework of the anthropic approach [33,34]. The galaxy formation epoch,  $z_G = 1 = 3$ , is close to the present cosm ic time, and the anthropic model predicts that the vacuum domination should begin at  $z = z_G$  [see Eq. (11)]. This explains the coincidence.

The probability distribution for  $_{v}$  based on Eq.(10) was extensively analyzed in [35]. The distribution depends on the amplitude of galactic-scale density perturbations, , which can be specified at some suitably selected epoch (e.g., the epoch of recombination). Until recently, significant uncertainties in this quantity complicated the comparison of anthropic predictions with the data [35,23]. These uncertainties appear now to have been mostly resolved [36]. In Fig. 1 we plot, following [37], the resulting probability distribution per logarithm ic interval of  $_{v}$ . Only positive values of  $_{v}$  are considered, so this can be regarded as a conditional distribution, given that  $_{v} > 0.0$  n the horizontal axis,  $_{v}$  is plotted in units of the observed vacuum energy density,  $_{v} = 7 - 10^{30}$  g/cm<sup>3</sup>. The 68% and 95% ranges of the distribution are indicated by light and dark shading, respectively.

We note that the condence level ranges in Fig.1 are rather broad. This corresponds to a genuine large variance in the cosm ic distribution of  $_v$ . The median value of the distribution is about 20 times greater than the observed value. But still, the observed value  $_v$  falls well within the range of anthropic prediction at 95% condence level.

At this point, I would like to comment on two important assumptions that went into the successful prediction of the observed value of  $_v$ . First, we assumed a at prior probability distribution (9). Analysis of speci c models shows that this assumption is indeed valid in a wide class of models, but it is not as automatic as one might expect [12,38,22,39]. In particular, it is not clear that it is applicable to the superstring-inspired models of the type discussed in [19{21] (more on this in Section V IIII).

Second, we used the value of M<sub>G</sub> =  $10^{12}$ M for the galactic m ass in (10). This amounts to assuming that most observers live in giant galaxies like our M ilky W ay. We know from observations that some galaxies existed already at z = 10, and the theory predicts that some dwarf galaxies and dense central parts of giant galaxies could form as early as z = 20. If observers were as likely to evolve in early galaxies as in late ones, the value of  $_{v}$  indicated by Eq.(12) would be far greater than observed. C learly, the agreement is much better if we assume that the conditions for civilizations to emerge arise mainly in galaxies which form at lower redshifts,  $z_{G}$  1.

Following [39], I will now point to some directions along which the choice of  $z_{\rm G}$  1 m ay be justimed. As already mentioned, one problem with dwarf galaxies is that their mass may be too small to retain the heavy elements dispersed in supernova explosions. Numerical simulations suggest that the fraction of heavy elements retained is 30% for a 10<sup>°</sup>M galaxy and is negligible form uch smaller galaxies [40]. Hence, we have to require that the structure form ation hierarchy evolves up to mass scales 10<sup>°</sup>M or higher prior to the vacuum energy domination. This gives the condition  $z_{\rm G}$  3, but falls short of explaining  $z_{\rm G}$  1.

A nother point to note is that smaller galaxies, form ed at earlier times, have a higher density of matter. This may increase the danger of nearby supernova explosions and the rate of near encounters with stars, large molecular clouds, or dark matter clumps. Gravitational perturbations of planetary systems in such encounters could send a rain of comets from the 0 ort-type clouds towards the inner planets, causing mass extinctions.

Our own G alaxy has de nitely passed the test for the evolution of observers, and the principle of mediocrity suggests that most observers may live in galaxies of this type. Our M ilky W ay is a giant spiral galaxy. The dense central parts of such galaxies were formed at a high redshift z > 5, but their discs were assembled at z < 1 [41]. Our Sun is located in the disc, and if this situation is typical, then the relevant epoch to use in Eq.(12) is the epoch  $z_{G}$  1 associated with the formation of discs of galaxies.

These remarks may or may not be on the right track, but if the observed value of v is due to anthropic selection, then, for one reason or another, the evolution of intelligent life should require conditions which are found mainly in giant galaxies, which completed their form ation at z 1. This is a prediction of the anthropic approach. It will be subject to test when our understanding of galactic evolution and of the conditions necessary to sustain habitable planetary system s will reach an adequate level { hopefully in not so distant future.

### VII.PREDICTIONSFOR THE EQUATION OF STATE

A generic prediction of anthropic models for the vacuum energy is that the vacuum equation of state (2) should hold with a very high accuracy [39]. In models of discrete vacua, this equation of state is guaranteed by the fact that in each vacuum the energy density is a constant and can only change by nucleation of bubbles. If  $_{\rm X}$  is a scalar eld potential, it must satisfy the slow-roll condition { that the eld should change slow ly on the time scale of the present age of the universe. The slow-roll condition is likely to be satisfy the slow of magnitude. A lihough it is possible to adjust the potential so that it is only marginally satisfies ed, it is satisfied by a very wide margin in generic models. This im plies the equation of state (2).

There is also a related prediction, which is not likely to be tested anytim e soon. In anthropic models,  $_v$  can take both positive and negative values, so the observed positive dark energy will eventually start decreasing and will turn negative, and our part of the universe will recollapse to a big crunch. Since the evolution of  $_v$  is expected to be very slow on the present H ubble scale, we do not expect this to happen sooner than in a trillion years from now [39].

It should be noted that the situation may be dimensional event in more complicated models, involving more than one scalar edd. It has been shown in [23] that the equation of state in such models may signing cantly deviate from (2), and the recollapse may occur on a time scale comparable to the lifetime of the Sun. Observational tests allowing to distinguish between the two types of models have been discussed in [42[44]. Recent observations yield [36]  $P_{v} = v = 1$  0:1, consistent with the simplest models.

# VIII. IM PLICATIONS FOR PARTICLE PHYSICS

A nthropic models for the cosm ological constant have nontrivial implications for particle physics. Scalar eld models require the existence of elds with extremely at potentials. Models with a discrete set of vacua require that the spectrum of values of  $_v$  should be very dense, so that there are many such values in the small anthropically allowed range. This points to the existence of very small parameters that are absent in familiar particle physics models. Some ideas on how such small parameters could arise have been suggested in [12,38,45[48].

A di erent possibility, which has now attracted much attention, is inspired by superstring theory. This theory presum ably has an enorm ous number of di erent vacua, scattered over a vast \string theory landscape". The spectrum of  $_{v}$  (and of other particle physics constants) can then be very dense without any sm all parameters, due to the sheer number of vacua [19{21]. This picture, however, entails a potential problem. Vacua with close values of  $_{v}$  are not expected to be close to one another in the \landscape", and there seem s to be no reason to expect that they will be chosen with equal probability distribution is at. In fact, since in ation is characterized by an exponential expansion of the universe, and the expansion rate is di erent in di erent parts of the landscape, the probabilities for well separated vacua are likely to di er by large exponential factors. If indeed the prior distribution is very di erent from at, this may destroy the successful anthropic prediction for  $_{v}$ . This issue requires further study, and I am sure we are going to hear m ore about it.

### IX. INCLUDING OTHER VARIABLES

If the cosm ological constant is variable, then it is natural to expect that some other  $\constants"$  could vary as well, and it has been argued that including other variables m ay drastically modify the anthropic prediction for  $_v$  [4,49,50]. The idea is that the adverse e ect on the evolution of observers due to a change in one variable m ay be compensated by an appropriate change in another variable. As a result the peak of the distribution m ay drift into a totally di erent area of the parameter space. W hile this is a legitim ate concern,

speci cm odels with m one than one variable that have been analyzed so far suggest that the anthropic prediction for  $v_v$  is rather robust.

Suppose, for example, that  $_v$  and the prim ordial density contrast (speci ed at recombination) are both allowed to vary. Then we are interested in the joint distribution

$$P(v_{v}; )d_{v}d:$$
 (13)

U sing the same assumptions as in Section V<sup>7</sup> and introducing a new variable  $y = \sqrt{2} = \sqrt{3}$ , one nds [39] that this distribution factorizes to the form<sup>8</sup>

$$^{3}P_{prior}()d f(y)dy;$$
 (14)

where, f(y) is the fraction of matter clustered in galaxies (which depends only on the combination v = 3 = y).

A fler integration over , we obtain essentially the same distribution as before, but for a new variable y. The prediction now is not for a particular value of  $_v$ , but for a relation between  $_v$  and . Comparison of the predicted and observed values of y is given by the same graph as in Fig.1, with a suitable rescaling of the horizontal axis. A s before, the 95% con dence level prediction is in agreement with the data.

Another example is a model where the neutrino masses are assumed to be anthropic variables. Neutrinos are elusive light particles, which interact very weakly and whose masses are not precisely known. The current astrophysical upper bound on the neutrino mass is m < 0.5 eV [36], and the lower bound from the neutrino oscillation data is m > 0.05 eV [51]. (Here and below m denotes the sum of the three neutrino masses.) It has been suggested in [52] that small values of the neutrino masses may be due to anthropic selection. A small increase of m can have a large e ect on galaxy formation. Neutrinos stream out of overdense regions, slowing the growth of density perturbations. The fraction of mass that neutrinos contribute to the total density of the universe is proportional to m . Thus, perturbations will grow slower, and there will be fewer galaxies, in regions with larger values of m . A calculation along the same lines as in Section V yields a prediction 0.07 eV < m < 5.7 eV at 95% con dence level.

In Ref. [37] this model was extended, allowing both m and  $_{v}$  to be anthropic variables. The resulting probability distribution P ( $_{v}$ ; m) is concentrated in a localized region of the parameter space. Its peak is not far o from the peaks of the individual distributions for  $_{v}$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>The assumption that the number of observers is simply proportional to the fraction of matter clustered into galaxies may not give a good approximation in regions where is very large. In such regions, galaxies form early and are very dense, so chances for life to evolve may be reduced. A more accurate calculation should await better estimates for the density of habitable stellar systems.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>N ote that there is no reason to expect the prior distribution for to be at. The amplitude of density perturbations is related to the dynam ics of the in atom eld that drives in ation and is therefore strongly correlated with the amount of in ationary expansion. Hence, we expect  $P_{prior}$  to be a nontrivial function of . In fact, it follows from (14) that  $P_{prior}$  () should decay at least as fast as <sup>3</sup> in order for the distribution to be integrable [33].

and m . In fact, inclusion of m  $\,$  som ewhat improves the agreem ent of the prediction for  $\,_{\rm v}$  with the data.

The parameters v, and m share the property that they do not directly a ect life processes. O ther parameters of this sort include the mass of dark matter particles and of baryons per photon. The e ects of varying these parameters have been discussed in [4,49]. In particular, A guirre [49] argued that values of the baryon to photon ratio much higher than the observed may be anthropically favored. W hat he showed, in fact, is that this proposition cannot at present be excluded. This is an interesting issue and certainly deserves further study. Extensions to parameters like the electron mass or charge, which do a ect life processes, is on a much shakier ground. Untill these processes are much better understood, one will have to resort to qualitative arguments, as in [1{3,5].

#### X.CONCLUDING REMARKS

The case of the cosm ological constant dem onstrates that anthropic models can be subjected to observational tests and can be con med or ruled out at a specified con dence level. It also illustrates the limitations and di culties of anthropic predictions.

The situation we are accustomed to in physics is that the agreement between theory and observations steadily improves, as the theoretical calculations are rended and the accuracy of measurements increases. Not so in anthropic models. Here, predictions are in the form of probability distributions, having an intrinsic variance which cannot be further reduced.

However, there is an ample possibility for anthropic models to be falsi ed. This could have happened in the case of the cosm ological constant if the observed value turned out to be much smaller than it actually is. And this may still happen in the future, with improved understanding of the prior and anthropic factors in the distribution (7). A lso, there is always a possibility that a compelling non-anthropic explanation for the observed value of  $_v$  will be discovered. As of today, no such explanation has been found, and the anthropic model for  $_v$  can certainly be regarded a success. This may be the rst evidence that we have for the existence of a vast multiverse beyond our horizon.

### XI.ACKNOW LEGEMENTS

I am grateful to Jaum e G arriga and K en O lum for comments and to Levon Pogosian for his help with numerical calculations and the gure. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation.

# REFERENCES

- [1] B. Carter, in IAU Symposium 63: Confrontation of Cosmological Theories with Observational Data, ed. by M. Longair (Reidel, 1974).
- [2] B J. Carr and M J. Rees, Nature 278, 605 (1979).
- [3] J.D. Barrow and F.J.Tipler, The Anthropic Cosm obgical Principle (Clarendon, Oxford, 1986).
- [4] M. Tegm ark and M. J. Rees, Ap. J. 499, 526 (1998).
- [5] C J. Hogan, Rev. M od. Phys. 72, 1149 (2000).
- [6] A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. D 27, 2848 (1983).
- [7] A D. Linde, Phys. Lett. B 175, 395 (1986).
- [8] A D. Linde, Particle Physics and In ationary Cosmology (Harwood Academic, Chur, 1990).
- [9] A.Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 846 (1995).
- [10] A.Einstein, Sitz.Ber.Preuss.Akad.W iss., 142 (1917).
- [11] A D.Linde, in 300 Years of Gravitation, ed.by SW.Hawking and W.Israel, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987).
- [12] J.Garriga and A.Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. D 61, 083502 (2000).
- [13] JD. Brown and C. Teitelboim, Nucl. Phys. B 279, 787 (1987).
- [14] L.Abbott, Phys. Lett. B 195, 177 (1987).
- [15] S.W einberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 59, 2607 (1987).
- [16] P.C. W. Davies and S, Unwin, Proc. Roy. Soc. 377, 147 (1981).
- [17] R.Kallosh and A.D.Linde, Phys. Rev. D 67, 023510 (2003).
- [18] S.W einberg, Rev.M od. Phys. 61, 1 (1989).
- [19] R. Bousso and J. Polchinski, JHEP 0006:006 (2000).
- [20] M R. Douglas, JHEP 0305:046 (2003)
- [21] L. Susskind, hep-th/0302219.
- [22] J.Garriga and A.Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. D 64, 023517 (2001).
- [23] J.Garriga, A.D. Linde and A.Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. D 61 063521 (2004).
- [24] A D. Linde, D A. Linde and A. Mezhlum ian, Phys. Rev. D 49, 1783 (1994).
- [25] J.Garcia-Bellido and A.D.Linde, Phys. Rev. D 51, 429 (1995).
- [26] J.Garriga and A.Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. D 64, 023507 (2001).
- [27] A.Vilenkin, in Cosm obgical Constant and the Evolution of the Universe, ed by K.Sato, T.Suginohara and N.Sugiyam a (Universal A cadem y Press, Tokyo, 1996).
- [28] S.W einberg, in CriticalD ialogues in Cosm ology, ed. by N.G.Turok (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1997).
- [29] G.Efstathiou, MNRAS.274, L73 (1995).
- [30] L. Pogosian, private communication.
- [31] M. Fukugita, in Critical Dialogues in Cosmology, ed. by N.G. Turok (World Scientic, Singapore, 1997).
- [32] S.Perlm utter et al, Ap.J. 483, 565 (1997); astro-ph/9812473 (1998); B.Schm idt et al, Ap.J. 507, 46 (1998); A.J.Riess et al, A.J. 116, 1009 (1998); astro-ph/0104455.
- [33] J.Garriga, M. Livio and A.Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. D 61, 023503 (2000).
- [34] S.Bludm an, Nucl. Phys. A 663-664,865 (2000).
- [35] H.Martel, P.R. Shapiro and S.W einberg, Ap.J. 492, 29 (1998).
- [36] M. Tegm ark et. al, Phys. Rev. D 69 103501 (2004).

- [37] L. Pogosian, M. Tegm ark and A. Vilenkin, astro-ph/0404497.
- [38] S.W einberg, Phys. Rev. D 61 103505 (2000); astro-ph/0005265.
- [39] J.G arriga and A.Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. D 67, 043503 (2003) (corrected version at astroph/0210358).
- [40] M. Mac Low and A. Ferrara, Ap. J. 513, 142 (1999).
- [41] R.G. Abraham and S. van der Bergh, Science 293, 1273 (2001).
- [42] S.D in opoulos and S.Thom as, Phys. Lett. B 573, 13 (2003).
- [43] R.Kallosh, J.K ratochvil, A.Linde, E.Linder and M.Shmakova, JCAP 0310:015 (2003).
- [44] J.Gamiga, L.Pogosian and T.Vachaspati, Phys. Rev. D 69, 063511 (2004).
- [45] J.L. Feng, J.M arch-Russell, S. Sethiand F.W ilczek, Nucl. Phys. B 602, 307 (2001).
- [46] T.Banks, M.Dine and L.Motl, JHEP 0101:031 (2001).
- [47] J.D onoghue, JHEP 0008:022 (2000)
- [48] G.D valiand A.Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. D 64, 063509 (2001).
- [49] A. Aguirre, Phys. Rev. D 64, 083508 (2001).
- [50] T. Banks, M. D ine and E. Gorbatov, hep-th/0309170.
- [51] JN.Bahcall, JHEP 0311:004 (2003).
- [52] M. Tegmark, L. Pogosian and A. Vilenkin, astro-ph/0304536.