

arXiv:hep-ph/0612232v1 19 Dec 2006

Microphysics of Cosmic Strings in Supersymmetric and Grand Unified Theories

Stephen Christopher Davis

Trinity College, Cambridge

A dissertation submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Cambridge

September 1998

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank my supervisor, Dr. Anne C. Davis, for all her advice and support. I am also grateful to Dr. Mark Trodden and Dr. Warren B. Perkins for useful discussions.

Declaration

Apart from the introductory sections, including chapter 1, and where indicated in the text, the work presented is my own. The material in chapters 2–5 is published as follows: Parts of chapters 2 and 3 appeared in Physical Review D 55 (1997) 1879–1895 (with Dr. A. C. Davis), most of chapter 3 appeared in Physics Letters B 408 (1997) 81–90 (with Dr. A. C. Davis and Dr. W. B. Perkins), chapter 4 was published in Physics Letters B 405 (1997) 257–264 (with Dr. A. C. Davis and Dr. M. Trodden), and chapter 5 was published in Physical Review D 57 (1998) 5184–5188 (with Dr. A. C. Davis and Dr. M. Trodden). The work contained in chapter 6 is in a preliminary form. Whilst the papers have been published in collaboration, I have only included my own contributions in this dissertation.

To the best of my knowledge, the work presented as my own is original.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Particle Cosmology and Cosmic Strings	1
1.2	Grand Unification and Symmetry Breaking	3
1.3	Topological Defects	6
1.4	The Abelian Cosmic String Model	7
1.5	Determination of the String Field Profiles	9
1.6	String Superconductivity	11
1.7	Evolution of Cosmic String Networks	13
1.8	Overview	15
2	Microphysics of SO(10) Cosmic Strings	18
2.1	Introduction	18
2.2	An SO(10) Grand Unified Theory	19
2.3	GUT Strings	21
2.4	Cosmic Strings and Multiple Higgs Fields	25
2.5	The Electroweak Symmetry Breaking	26
2.6	Electroweak Cosmic String Solutions	30
2.6.1	The Abelian U(1) String	30
2.6.2	X_S and X' SU(2) Strings	32
2.6.3	W_R SU(2) Strings	33
2.6.4	Y' SU(2) Strings	35

2.6.5	Summary	39
2.7	Other Symmetry Restorations	40
2.7.1	The Intermediate Symmetry Restoration	40
2.7.2	The Minimal Energy Choice of T_s	41
2.7.3	Non-gauge field symmetry restoration	41
2.8	Other Related Grand Unified Theories	42
2.9	Conclusions	44
3	A Fermion Zero Mode Index Theorem	47
3.1	Introduction	47
3.2	Zero Mode Index	48
3.3	Fermion Zero Modes on SO(10) Cosmic Strings	55
3.3.1	Zero Modes for the Abelian String	56
3.3.2	Zero Modes of the SU(2) Strings	59
3.3.3	Summary	63
3.4	Index Theorems and Spectral Flow	64
3.5	Fermion Zero Modes in Other Theories	65
3.6	A Model with Persistent Zero Modes	66
3.7	Conclusions	67
4	$N = 1$ Supersymmetric Abelian Cosmic Strings	70
4.1	Introduction	70
4.2	Supersymmetric Abelian Higgs Models and Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking	72
4.3	Theory F: Vanishing Fayet-Iliopoulos Term	74
4.4	Theory D: Non-vanishing Fayet-Iliopoulos Term	78
4.5	The Super-Bogomolnyi Limit	79
4.6	Concluding Remarks	80
5	Cosmic Strings and Supersymmetry Breaking	82
5.1	Introduction	82
5.2	An SU(2) $\times$ U(1) Model	84

5.3	SUSY Transformations and Zero Modes	85
5.3.1	Abelian string	85
5.3.2	Nonabelian string	86
5.4	Soft SUSY Breaking	87
5.5	SUSY breaking and an Abelian String Model	88
5.6	Fermion Zero Modes after SUSY breaking	90
5.6.1	U(1) Abelian models	91
5.6.2	SU(2) $\times$ U(1) model	92
5.7	Comments and Conclusions	92
6	Massive Fermion Bound States	95
6.1	Introduction	95
6.2	Field Equations and a Positivity Condition	96
6.3	Bound States in the Abelian String Model	98
6.4	Bound States in Other Theories	99
6.5	Summary	103
7	Summary and Future Work	104
7.1	Summary	104
7.2	Future Work	106
A	An SO(10) Grand Unified Theory	110
A.1	Fermion and Gauge Fields	110
A.2	Higgs Fields	112
A.3	Fermion Masses	113

List of Figures

1.1	Finite temperature effective potential.	5
1.2	Plot of abelian string field profiles with $m_s = m_v = 1$	10
2.1	$SU(2)$ string field profiles, with $\eta_G = \lambda_G = g = 1$ and $\lambda'_G = 5$	23
2.2	Plot of electroweak field profiles for abelian string.	32
2.3	Plot of electroweak field profiles for W_R -string.	35
2.4	Variation of electroweak Higgs field at the centres of the abelian and W_R strings.	36
3.1	The Dirac spectrum of cosmic strings with a zero mode and a very low lying bound state.	64
6.1	Spectrum of $l = 0 \dots 3$ fermion bound states.	99
6.2	Spectrum of $l = 4 \dots 7$ fermion bound states.	100
6.3	Fermion bound state solutions in the abelian string model with $m_f/m_s = 2.3$	101

Abstract

In this thesis we investigate the microphysics of cosmic strings in non-minimal quantum field theories. In particular we consider theories in which fermion fields couple to the strings, and those with larger symmetry groups, such as grand unified and supersymmetric theories. By considering these extensions to the minimal model, we obtain a more realistic picture of the properties of cosmic strings.

In considering grand unified theories, which have multiple phase transitions, we show that a cosmic string formed at one phase transition can cause the creation of another string-like solution at a later transition. This string-like solution will have many of the properties and implications of a normal cosmic string. We consider this effect for a general string solution, and illustrate it with a realistic $SO(10)$ unified theory. As well as the usual abelian strings, this theory also contains more exotic string solutions. We consider both types of cosmic string. Separately, we examine the form of cosmic string solutions in supersymmetric theories, and the effect of soft supersymmetry breaking on them.

We investigate the existence of conserved fermion currents in a variety of cosmic string models. We show that supersymmetry may be used to find the form of some solutions analytically. We also derive an expression for the number and type of massless fermion currents in a general model. The existence of conserved currents can conflict with observations, so these results may be used to constrain models. We find the number of massless currents in the $SO(10)$ and supersymmetric theories mentioned above. We show that currents present on a string can be destabilised by later phase transitions or supersymmetry breaking. This may allow any conflict that the current's existence has with observations to be avoided. We also examine massive fermion currents in a simple model, and determine the spectrum of such states.

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Particle Cosmology and Cosmic Strings

In the last twenty years there have been many significant developments in our understanding and approach to cosmology. In the past, the evolution of the universe was mainly studied through Einstein's equations of General Relativity. Modern cosmology also makes use of quantum field theory. This is particularly important when considering the early universe. According to the big bang model, the universe was once very small and at a very high temperature. Since classical approximations will certainly break down under these conditions, the investigation of quantum effects is vital.

The combination of General Relativity and Particle Physics has led to a very accurate model known as the Standard Cosmology. This successfully predicts many phenomena, such as the expansion of the universe, light element abundances, and the uniformity of the cosmic microwave background. Despite its successes, there are still many unanswered questions. It is not clear how structures such as galaxies formed in a universe which seems to have been homogeneous and isotropic at very early times, nor how the universe became so uniform in the first place. There are also the questions of the origin of galactic magnetic fields, and why there is more matter than anti-matter in the universe.

The Standard Model of particle physics does not provide answers to these and other questions. It is therefore necessary to go beyond the Standard Model and consider more

speculative ideas in quantum field theory, such as unification of the fundamental forces, or supersymmetry. Unfortunately, testing some of these ideas is beyond current particle accelerators. However, as well as predicting cosmology from quantum field theory, it is possible to use cosmological observations to make predictions about high energy quantum field theory. Study of the early universe can thus give insight into particle physics as well as cosmology.

Topological defects (such as cosmic strings) are one example of quantum field theory's contribution to cosmology [1, 2]. They provide possible explanations for structure formation [3], baryogenesis [4], cosmic microwave background anisotropies [5], and the origin of high energy cosmic rays [6, 7]. Once formed, a defect will not decay (unless it collides with another similar defect). Thus even though any defect formation will be restricted to the early universe, their effects will continue to the present.

Topological defects form at phase transitions [8]. It is believed that the universe passed through several phase transitions shortly after it came into existence. These transitions reduced the symmetry of the field theory and gave mass to certain fundamental particles. This causes their interactions to be suppressed, and explains why they are not observed at everyday temperatures. Inside a defect the transition does not occur, so the laws of physics there resemble those of the universe before the phase transition at which they formed. This allows interactions to occur inside the defect which are heavily suppressed in today's universe. For example, if baryon violating processes were unsuppressed proton decay would occur more frequently [9]. This property of defects could provide an important window into the physics of the very early universe.

In the past few years it has been realised that cosmic strings may have considerably richer microstructure than previously thought [10]. In particular, the presence of conserved currents in the spectrum of a cosmic string has profound implications for the cosmology of the defects. If the particles making up the current carry electric charge, and the string was formed at a mass scale of 10^{16}GeV (a reasonable value for grand unification) the string could carry an electric current of up to 10^{20}A [11]. There are many candidates for such a current, one class of which is introduced in section 1.6.

Another important consequence of cosmic strings is their gravitational effects. The mass per unit length of a string formed at an energy scale around 10^{16}GeV would be 10^{22}g/cm . The gravitational field of the string is such that although matter is not attracted to a stationary string, it is attracted to the wake of a moving string. The evolution of a network of cosmic strings produced at high energy scales thus provides a possible origin for the seed density perturbations which became the large scale structure of the observed universe [3]. The gravitational effects of the string could also explain anisotropies in the cosmic microwave background [5].

The occurrence of phase transitions and defect formation is not restricted to quantum field theory. They also occur in condensed matter systems such as superconductors, ^4He and ^3He superfluids, and nematic liquid crystals [12]. Defects have actually been observed in these cases, and have been used to gain insight into the evolution of cosmological defects.

1.2 Grand Unification and Symmetry Breaking

In the Standard Model the weak and electromagnetic forces are unified at energies of order 10^2GeV . This idea can be extended to give a Grand Unified Theory (GUT) in which the strong force is also unified with the electroweak force. If this is the case, then it is believed that unification will occur at an energy scale of order 10^{16}GeV . The unified theory will be based on a simple continuous Lie group, G . At high energies the vacuum state of the theory respects the full symmetry of the Lagrangian. Such a situation occurs in the early universe, when its temperature is extremely high. As it cools, the gauge theory undergoes a series of spontaneous symmetry breakings, until it becomes $SU(3)_c \times U(1)_Q$, which are the gauge groups of QCD and QED. This can be represented by

$$G \rightarrow H \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \rightarrow SU(3)_c \times U(1)_Q , \quad (1.1)$$

where the first breaking occurs around 10^{16}GeV . Unfortunately modern particle accelerators cannot hope to access energies above 1TeV . The only place where suitable energies are likely to be reached is the early universe, so cosmology may provide evidence for unification.

The spontaneous symmetry breaking mechanism works as follows: At high temperatures

the vacuum state, $|0\rangle_{\text{GUT}}$, is invariant under G , so $g(x)|0\rangle_{\text{GUT}} = |0\rangle_{\text{GUT}}$ for all $g(x) \in G$. At a lower temperature the theory's potential changes, and a different vacuum state, $|0\rangle$, becomes energetically favourable. This new state is only invariant under H , a subgroup of G , so the symmetry has been broken from G to H .

Although the vacuum state is no longer invariant under G , the theory itself must still be. Thus if $|0\rangle$ is a minimal energy vacuum state, so is $g|0\rangle$, hence the vacuum is degenerate. The vacuum manifold then consists of all the distinct states of the form $g|0\rangle$. Since $g_1|0\rangle = g_2|0\rangle$ if $g_1^{-1}g_2 \in H$, the vacuum manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is equal to the coset space G/H .

The different vacuum states can be labelled by the expectation value of a scalar Higgs field. In a general GUT there will be several Higgs fields, each associated with a subsequent phase transition at which symmetry is broken. As a simple example consider a model with $G = U(1)$ and $H = I$. It has the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = (D_\mu \phi)^* (D^\mu \phi) - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} - V(\phi) , \quad (1.2)$$

where ϕ is the (complex) Higgs field, $D_\mu \phi = (\partial_\mu - ieA_\mu) \phi$ and $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$. V is the potential energy of ϕ . It is equal to $(\lambda/4)(|\phi|^2 - \eta^2)^2$ at zero temperature. When thermal corrections are added, its minimum varies with temperature. Above some critical temperature T_c the vacuum energy is minimised by $\phi = 0$. Below this temperature the minimum has $\phi \neq 0$. T_c is the temperature at which the phase transition occurs. If T is the temperature of the universe, a suitable V is

$$V = \frac{\lambda}{4} \left(|\phi|^4 - 2\eta^2 \left[1 - \frac{T^2}{T_c^2} \right] |\phi|^2 + \eta^4 \right) . \quad (1.3)$$

Thus the vacuum states have $\phi = 0$ for $T > T_c$ and $\phi = \eta e^{i\alpha} \sqrt{1 - T^2/T_c^2} = \text{constant}$ for $T < T_c$ (see figure 1.1). $\phi = \eta e^{i\alpha}$ when $T = 0$. The above potential gives a second order phase transition.

The gauge and fermion fields of a GUT will couple to the Higgs fields. When a Higgs field gains a non-zero vacuum expectation value (VEV), it gives masses to some of the gauge and fermion fields via this coupling. The masses from a GUT scale phase transition will be enormous, and so the corresponding particles and their interactions will not be observed. This explains why we do not observe significant proton decay in today's universe. However,




Figure 1.1: Finite temperature effective potential.

such forces must have been unsuppressed at some time in the early universe, since the universe could not have reached its current state without them. Experimental measurements of the variation of gauge couplings suggest that they converge at high energies [13]. This is further circumstantial evidence for unification.

In a grand unified theory there will be one unified force, and one unified fermion field. The idea of supersymmetry (SUSY) is a natural extension of this, in which the gauge and Higgs fields are unified with the fermion fields [14]. If the strengths of the fundamental forces are carefully extrapolated to high energies, they do not quite converge, as would be required in a GUT. This problem is solved if SUSY is added to the theory, suggesting it does have physical relevance. Furthermore, supersymmetry and grand unification form a central part of superstring theory, which is the most promising theory to describe gravity on the quantum scale. Since any full theory of everything includes quantum gravity, it seems likely that SUSY must play some role in a realistic quantum field theory. Another motivation for supersymmetry is its solution to the hierarchy problem [15]. We expect the high energy scale GUT fields to couple to the low energy scale Higgs field of the Standard Model. The mass of this Higgs field receives quadratically divergent radiative corrections from these couplings, which will generally lead to conflict with experiment. The symmetry

of a supersymmetric theory ensures that the contributions from the fermion and boson fields cancel each other exactly, avoiding the problem.

1.3 Topological Defects

Phase transitions would have occurred in the early universe as it cooled down. Because information can travel no faster than the speed of light, ϕ would gain different vacuum expectation values in parts of the universe that were not in causal contact [8]. It is energetically favourable for these variations to disappear. However if $\mathcal{M}$ has any non-trivial homotopy groups it is possible that topologically stable configurations with ϕ not constant will form. These are called topological defects. The type of defect depends on the non-trivial homotopy group.

If $\pi_0(\mathcal{M}) \neq I$ then $\mathcal{M}$ is disconnected. Suppose that $\phi \in \mathcal{M}_A$ at $x = \infty$ (cartesian coordinates) and $\phi \in \mathcal{M}_B$ at $x = -\infty$, where $\mathcal{M}_A$ and $\mathcal{M}_B$ are disconnected components of $\mathcal{M}$. By continuity there must be a region where $\phi \notin \mathcal{M}$. This region is called a domain wall. In three dimensions it will be a two dimensional surface.

In the model given by (1.2), $\pi_1(G/H) = Z \neq I$, so $\mathcal{M}$ contains non-contractible loops. In two dimensions, a configuration with $\phi = \eta e^{in\theta}$ at infinity (with n any integer) cannot be continuously deformed to $\phi = \text{constant}$, and so is topologically stable. Regularity will force ϕ to leave $\mathcal{M}$ in some region (see next section). Such defects are called cosmic strings, as in three dimensions they are one dimensional. For topological reasons it is not possible for cosmic strings to have ends, so they must either be infinitely long, or a closed loop. Suppose a cosmic string did have an end. Consider the variation of the Higgs field along a closed path around a string. This variation corresponds to a non-contractible loop in $\mathcal{M}$. By sliding it off the string we can continuously change this path to one which corresponds to a contractible loop in $\mathcal{M}$. This is equivalent to continuously moving between the disconnected parts of H , which is not possible. Hence strings cannot have ends.

In three dimensions, if $\pi_2(G/H) \neq I$ the corresponding point-like defects are called monopoles. In this case there are mappings of S^2 to itself which cannot be continuously deformed to the identity. Thus if $\mathcal{M}$ is equal to S^2 , and ϕ at $r = \infty$ is such a map, the

resulting configuration will be topologically stable. As with strings, there will be a region in which $\phi \notin \mathcal{M}$.

The size of a defect can be estimated by balancing the potential and kinetic terms of its Lagrangian (1.2). The potential energy is of order $\lambda\eta^4$ inside the defect. If δ is the width of the defect, the kinetic terms $(\partial\phi)^2$ are of order $(\eta/\delta)^2$. Equating these terms gives $\delta \sim 1/(\sqrt{\lambda}\eta) \sim m_s^{-1}$, where m_s is the mass of the Higgs field.

The cosmological consequences of domain walls and monopoles strongly conflict with observations. Domain walls will come to dominate the energy density of the universe [16], and the predicted monopole density is unacceptably high [17]. Thus any GUT which predicts them must also have a mechanism which ensures most of them are destroyed. The properties of cosmic strings do not conflict with observations (see section 1.7). Furthermore they provide explanations of many phenomena, so cosmic strings are the most cosmologically significant defect.

1.4 The Abelian Cosmic String Model

As it stands, the string solution described in the previous section has a non-vanishing covariant derivative which gives an infinite contribution to the energy. This is avoided by having a non-zero gauge term. The resulting solution is a cosmic string. More precisely (taking $T = 0$), it has the form

$$\phi = \eta f(r) e^{in\theta} , \quad (1.4)$$

$$A_\mu = n \frac{a(r)}{er} \delta_\mu^\theta . \quad (1.5)$$

In order for the solution to be regular at the origin $f(0) = a(0) = 0$. If the solution is to have finite energy, $f(r)$ and $a(r)$ must tend to 1 as $r \rightarrow \infty$. Substituting (1.4) and (1.5) into the theory's field equations gives

$$f'' + \frac{f'}{r} - n^2 \frac{(1-a)^2}{r^2} f = \frac{\lambda}{2} \eta^2 (f^2 - 1) f , \quad (1.6)$$

$$a'' - \frac{a'}{r} = -2e^2 \eta^2 (1-a) f^2 . \quad (1.7)$$

The resulting string is the well known Nielsen-Olesen vortex [18]. It turns out that f and a take their asymptotic values everywhere outside of a small region around the string. Thus $|\phi|$ is constant and A_μ is pure gauge away from the string. The sizes of the regions in which the magnetic field is non-zero and $|\phi|$ is not constant (r_v and r_s) are roughly the inverses of the masses of the corresponding particles. Thus if m_s and m_v are the Higgs and gauge field masses,

$$r_s^{-1} \approx m_s = \sqrt{\lambda}\eta, \quad r_v^{-1} \approx m_v = \sqrt{2}e\eta. \quad (1.8)$$

By rescaling r , the e and η dependence can be removed from (1.6) and (1.7). The form of the solutions then only depends on only one parameter: $\beta = (m_s/m_v)^2$.

The above solution is a point-like defect in two dimensions. If it is extended to three dimensions it will take the form of an infinite line, or a closed loop. The defect is now one dimensional and string shaped, hence its name. There is a non-zero magnetic field inside the string. Its flux is

$$\Phi_B = \int_{r=\infty} A_\mu dx^\mu = \frac{2\pi n}{e}. \quad (1.9)$$

Many of the observational consequences of cosmic strings arise from their gravitational effects. Defining μ to be the mass per unit length of the string, the size of these effects is proportional to the dimensionless quantity $G\mu \sim (T_c/m_{\text{pl}})^2$, where G is Newton's constant and m_{pl} is the Planck mass. We find that $\mu \sim \eta^2$, so for a grand unification scale string $G\mu \sim 10^{-6}$. This is the right magnitude to explain the fluctuations in the cosmic microwave background and the matter distribution of the observed universe.

The spacetime around a string is approximately conical. It resembles a flat space with a wedge of angular size $8\pi G\mu$ [19] removed, and the two faces of the wedge identified. If two objects travelling on parallel paths pass each side of a string, they will begin moving towards each other despite having experienced no force. The result of this effect is that as a string moves about, it increases the density of the regions through which it passes. This is an example of how cosmic strings provide a mechanism for structure formation.

At the centre of an abelian cosmic string ϕ is zero. Since the breaking of G to H is caused by ϕ being non-zero, this means that G is not broken inside the string. The result is also true for other types of defects (monopoles and domain walls). Thus the grand unified

theory is restored inside the string, even though the universe has cooled to temperatures that would usually break it.

The above ansatz (1.4,1.5) describes an infinite number of string solutions since the winding number, n , can be any non-zero integer. Although they are all topologically stable with respect to the vacuum and other strings, it is possible for $|n| > 1$ strings to decay by splitting into several strings with smaller winding numbers [1].

If $\beta > 1$ (where $\beta = (m_s/m_v)^2$) this does happen, since the force between the strings is repulsive. The reverse is true when $\beta < 1$. In this case strings will tend to combine to produce a single string with a larger winding number. The situation is similar in superconductors. In this case $\beta < 1$ and $\beta > 1$ correspond to type I and type II superconductors respectively.

When $\beta = 1$ there is no force between strings. It is then possible to reduce (1.6) and (1.7) to first order equations:

$$f' = |n| \frac{f}{r} (1 - a) , \quad (1.10)$$

$$|n| \frac{a'}{r} = \frac{\lambda}{2} \eta^2 (1 - f^2) . \quad (1.11)$$

1.5 Determination of the String Field Profiles

Although full analytic solutions of the string field equations have not been found, their asymptotic forms are easily determined. For large r , $f(r) \approx 1$ and (1.7) can be reduced to the equation for a modified Bessel function. The solution is

$$1 - a(r) \sim r K_1(m_v r) . \quad (1.12)$$

When $\beta > 4$ the gauge term in (1.6) determines the behaviour of $f(r)$ [20]. Otherwise it can be dropped and

$$1 - f(r) \sim K_0(m_s r) . \quad (1.13)$$

The forms of $f(r)$ and $a(r)$ at small r are

$$f(r) \sim r^{|n|} , \quad a(r) \sim r^2 . \quad (1.14)$$




Figure 1.2: Plot of abelian string field profiles with $m_s = m_v = 1$.

It is possible to find solutions of the string field equations numerically. One suitable method is shooting. In this method, values for the free parameters in the small r solution (1.14) are guessed, and the equations are then integrated out to large r . The values of $f(r)$ and $a(r)$ are then compared with the required values. This is repeated several times, with the choice of free parameters being adjusted each time to get closer to the required solution at large r .

Rather than trying to match boundary conditions at infinity, a large finite value of r will do. In fact, as well as the required solution, (1.6) and (1.7) have an exponentially increasing large r solution. Thus the accuracy of the computer will severely limit the range of r which can be sensibly used. Alternatively it is possible to shoot from both small and large r , using (1.12,1.13), and require that the solutions meet at some point in the middle.

A better, but more complex and memory intensive approach is relaxation. The idea is to start with an approximate solution for all r , and then see how closely it satisfies the field equations. The difference from the required values of the field equations is then used to calculate an adjustment to the guessed solution. This is repeated several times until the modified guess satisfies the field equations closely enough. Unlike shooting, the whole solution is stored in the computer's memory, so this approach uses more resources. In the case of cosmic string field equations, it is very reliable. An example of solutions obtained

by relaxation is shown in figure 1.2.

1.6 String Superconductivity

In the core of a cosmic string the Higgs and gauge fields do not take their usual values. It is possible that other fields will also have different VEVs, resulting in the string having additional properties. The first example of this was discussed by Witten [11]. He considered an abelian string theory with an extra scalar field, σ , whose usual VEV is zero. For a suitable choice of potential this scalar field gains a non-zero VEV in the core of a string (due to the variation of ϕ). Since σ is charged, its non-zero VEV will break electromagnetism. If z and t dependence are added to σ , the resulting solution is a superconducting current, which is conserved. Since σ is electrically charged, the current will have long range effects.

It is also possible to have currents made up of fermions or gauge bosons. Gauge boson superconductivity only occurs in more complex nonabelian theories, and will not be discussed here. Fermion superconductivity can occur in simpler models, such as the abelian model discussed in section 1.4. The fermion superconductivity arises from Yukawa couplings, and unlike scalar boson superconductivity, it is not necessary to use a specific potential, so fermion superconductivity is more generic. Strictly, cosmic strings with fermion currents are not superconductors since electromagnetism is not broken inside the string. The strings act as perfect conductors, since the current flows without resistance. However, the term ‘superconductivity’ is often used for both cases.

If charged currents can exist on a cosmic string, they will be generated when the string passes through an electric or magnetic field. Currents can also be generated by interaction with the plasma, particularly when the string forms, or by string collisions. It has been suggested that internal phase transitions occurring on the string could generate currents too [21]. The presence of a current will alter the evolution of a string network. Decaying currents may explain observed high energy cosmic rays [7, 11], and could also provide a mechanism for baryogenesis [22]. Charged currents on a fast moving string can create shockwaves in the plasma, which has implications for structure formation [23]. It is also possible that currents could stabilise loops of cosmic string [24]. Such configurations are

called ‘vortons’. If they form at high energy scales they can have dramatic consequences (see next section). Vortons formed at low energies may provide a dark matter candidate [1].

The maximum fermion current on a string is restricted by the mass of the corresponding particle off the string. If the current’s momentum exceeds this it can escape from the string. The ease with which the current then escapes will depend on the curvature of the cosmic string. For a string with radius of curvature R , the following bound on the current is obtained [25]

$$J_{\max} \sim em^2 R . \quad (1.15)$$

In fact the maximum value the current will reach is likely to be less than this, and will depend on the details of the model.

Consider an extension of (1.2) to include a two-component fermion, with charge 1/2. The extra terms in the Lagrangian will then be

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{fermions}} = \bar{\psi} i \sigma^\mu D_\mu \psi - \frac{1}{2} [ig_Y \bar{\psi} \phi \psi^c + (\text{h. c.})] , \quad (1.16)$$

where $\sigma^\mu = (-I, \sigma^i)$, $D_\mu \psi = \left(\partial_\mu - \frac{1}{2} i e A_\mu \right) \psi$, and $\psi^c = i \sigma^2 (\bar{\psi})^T$ is the charge conjugate of ψ . This gives the field equations

$$\begin{pmatrix} -e^{i\theta} \left[\partial_r + \frac{i}{r} \partial_\theta + n \frac{a(r)}{2r} \right] & \partial_z + \partial_t \\ \partial_z - \partial_t & e^{-i\theta} \left[\partial_r - \frac{i}{r} \partial_\theta - n \frac{a(r)}{2r} \right] \end{pmatrix} \psi - m_f f(r) e^{in\theta} \psi^* = 0 , \quad (1.17)$$

where the expressions (1.4,1.5) have been substituted for ϕ and A_μ , and $m_f = g_Y \eta$.

Non-trivial solutions of (1.17) with only r and θ dependence exist. It has been shown that there are $|n|$ such solutions which are normalisable, in the sense that $\int |\psi|^2 d^2x$ is finite [26]. They have zero energy, and are referred to as zero modes. If $n = 1$ the single solution can be found analytically,

$$\psi(r, \theta) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \exp \left(- \int_0^r m_f f(s) + \frac{a(s)}{2s} ds \right) . \quad (1.18)$$

For higher $|n|$ it is not generally possible to determine all such solutions analytically, although some of their properties can be found. Like (1.18), they are all eigenstates of σ^3 . Their eigenvalues are +1 if $n > 0$, and -1 if $n < 0$. All the solutions decay exponentially

outside the string, and so are confined to it. They can be regarded as fermions trapped on the string.

The solutions can be extended to include z and t dependence. This is achieved by multiplying ψ by $\alpha(z, t)$, which satisfies $(\partial_z \mp \partial_t)\alpha = 0$, depending on whether $\sigma^3\psi = \pm\psi$. Thus the trapped fermions move at the speed of light, in the $\pm z$ direction. Other fermions which couple to ϕ^* can be added to the theory. ϕ^* has the opposite winding number to ϕ , and the fermion currents flow in the opposite direction. Considering both sets of fermions, currents can flow in both directions.

Although $\psi(r, \theta)$ was easy to find for $n = 1$, this is not generally the case for other winding numbers, or for more complex theories with several fermion fields (but see chapter 4). More realistic grand unified theories will have several Higgs fields, and possibly more complex string solutions than the abelian case discussed in section 1.4. It is still possible to determine the existence of fermion zero modes in such cases. This is done for a general theory in chapter 3. A specific grand unified theory is also considered there.

In supersymmetry the fermion and boson fields are related by a symmetry. This means that the properties of a cosmic string (which is a bosonic object) can be used to make predictions about the fermion solutions on the string. This is a useful idea, and it is investigated in chapters 4 and 5.

1.7 Evolution of Cosmic String Networks

Although cosmic strings form in the early universe, many of their observable effects will take place in the later universe. It is therefore important to know how a network of cosmic strings will evolve.

When considering a network of cosmic string it is useful to define a characteristic length scale ξ . There are various possible choices of ξ , for instance ξ^3 can be the volume of space which contains cosmic string of average length ξ . Initially ξ will grow faster than the size of the universe [2]. This cannot continue for long since causality implies that $\xi < t$.

Logically, ξ can do one of two things after this point. It can either approach a scaling solution where ξ/t is constant, or it can grow less quickly, so ξ/t decreases. If ξ grows

more slowly, the strings will come to dominate the energy density of the universe. This is sometimes referred to as ‘overclosing’ the universe. This would substantially alter its evolution. Such evolution is strongly ruled out by observations.

The most obvious way for a string network to evolve is to just stretch with the expansion of the universe. Unfortunately this implies $\xi \propto \sqrt{t}$, and so the strings dominate the energy density. To avoid this, there must be some mechanism for transferring energy away from the string network.

Strings can lose energy by radiating particles. Unfortunately strings are not usually charged, and their interactions with other fields are likely to be weak. Strings formed at high energy scales will emit significant amounts of gravitational radiation, although not enough to solve the problem with the network evolution.

For topological reasons, strings are either infinite or closed loops. String loops provide a solution to the energy density problem. When a string intersects itself, a loop will break off. The loop will then start losing energy by gravitational radiation. It will begin to contract, and will eventually disappear. Unless this loop rejoins the string network, its contribution to the network energy density is lost. Smaller loops are unlikely to do this, and loop formation provides a substantial enough energy loss mechanism to ensure the string network has a scaling solution. The decay of string loops can also explain the observed baryon asymmetry [27].

If conserved currents exist on the strings, such as those discussed in section 1.6, the above solution fails. It is possible for string loops to be stabilised by the angular momentum of the trapped charge carriers [24]. Such stable loops are called vortons. The loops do not decay, so they will continue to contribute to the energy density of the cosmic string network. Since it no longer has a sufficiently strong mechanism of energy loss, the string network will no longer be able to reach a scaling solution. The universe will then become dominated by vortons. The possibility of this happening allows the underlying particle physics to be cosmologically constrained [28]. The study of fermion (and other) currents will give insight into the possibility of vorton formation.

When strings collide they will intercommute. It is because of this that a loop is formed

when a string intersects itself. Some strings, such as type I ($m_s^2/m_v^2 < 1$) abelian strings, do not intercommute [29]. In order for such strings to be cosmologically viable, they must either form late in the universe (and so not have time to dominate it), or possess a new mechanism for energy loss. Because of this, type II strings are likely to be more physically significant than type I strings.

Similar arguments can be applied to domain walls and monopoles. There is no equivalent of loop formation for domain walls. These defects would be sure to dominate the energy density of the universe, hence they are ruled out [16]. The monopole density evolves the same way as the matter density. However, monopoles have long range effects which strongly conflict with observations [17]. Thus they are ruled out too.

1.8 Overview

Although a simple $U(1)$ model is useful for illustrating the existence of strings and their basic properties, a more realistic theory is needed to get accurate phenomenological results. Furthermore, strings in such theories will have a richer microstructure, which can give rise to additional properties and phenomena. It may also alter, or even remove, some of the properties suggested by the simplest models. In this thesis we will consider cosmic strings in grand unified and supersymmetric theories. Perhaps the most natural place for cosmic strings to arise is in unified theories, so it is important to consider the implications of their more complex symmetry breaking for strings. Many credible extensions of the Standard Model involve supersymmetry, and so its effects should also be examined.

In chapter 2 a grand unified theory which has cosmic strings is outlined. Its unifying symmetry group is $SO(10)$. There is a wider range of string solutions in this theory than the $U(1)$ model. Many of these have a more complex internal structure. Instead of just one winding number, their Higgs fields will have several. We show that a cosmic string can affect subsequent phase transitions, forcing other Higgs fields to take string-like solutions. We investigate this effect in the $SO(10)$ theory. Generalisation of the results to other related theories is also discussed.

As was mentioned in section 1.6, precise determination of fermion zero modes is rarely

possible. Their existence can be determined by examining the field equations, but this is time-consuming for more complex theories. In chapter 3 an index theorem is found which gives the number of zero modes for a general theory. Whilst index theorems have been found previously, they only give the difference between the number of left and right moving currents. Ours is more general, and gives the total number of massless currents. By applying the theorem before and after a phase transition we can investigate the fate of fermion zero modes during sequences of phase transitions in a variety of models. Depending on the couplings that the breaking introduces, the zero modes may be destroyed and the superconductivity of the string removed. Vortons will then dissipate, relaxing the constraints on the theory. We discuss the features of the theory that are required to produce this behaviour and consider the implications of spectral flow. We apply the theorem to the unified theory of chapter 2. It is applied to other theories in sections 4.3 and 5.3.

In chapter 4, the microphysics of supersymmetric cosmic strings is discussed. For simplicity two $N = 1$ supersymmetric abelian Higgs models are considered. The vortex solutions are found, and it is shown that the two simplest supersymmetric cosmic string models admit fermionic conductivity. In a SUSY theory, fermion and boson fields can be transformed into each other. This allows string solutions with non-zero fermion fields to be found analytically. These solutions are fermion zero modes, and are found to first order explicitly. We note that this constrains all supersymmetric grand unified theories with abelian strings.

In chapter 5 we extend the results of the previous chapter to a model with abelian and nonabelian strings. The strings in this model have some resemblance to those of the $SO(10)$ model discussed in chapter 2, and so may give some insight into the properties of SUSY GUT strings. We give the string solutions, and find analytic fermion zero mode solutions using SUSY transformations. We consider the effects of soft supersymmetry breaking on these cosmic string solutions, as well as those in the previous chapter. We also examine the implications of SUSY breaking for the fermion zero modes. Soft SUSY breaking terms are those which break SUSY without giving quadratically divergent corrections to the electroweak Higgs field.

So far we have only considered massless fermion currents, arising from zero modes. In

chapter 6 we look for massive currents arising from bound states. We show that there are no space-like fermion currents in any model. In contrast to the null (or light-like) currents, it is difficult to determine the existence of the time-like currents analytically, so we use numerical methods instead. We determine the spectrum of fermion bound states and currents in the abelian string model. We also speculate about similar states in other theories.

Finally, in chapter 7, the various results are summarised, and possible future work is discussed.

Chapter 2

Microphysics of $SO(10)$ Cosmic Strings

2.1 Introduction

As was discussed in chapter 1, many significant cosmological properties of cosmic strings arise from their microstructure. In particular, at subsequent phase transitions the core of the cosmic string acquires additional features. For example, the string can cause electroweak symmetry restoration in a much larger region around it, proportional to the electroweak scale itself [10, 30]. This microphysical structure has been used to provide a new scenario for electroweak baryogenesis [31], and to investigate the current-carrying properties of cosmic strings [32, 33].

Previous work considered the simplest extension to the Standard Model that would allow the formation of strings. A $U(1)$ symmetry, whose breaking produced an abelian string, was added to the usual Standard Model symmetries. The resulting theory had two coupling constants, of arbitrary ratio. It was shown that if the ratio was large enough, the electroweak Higgs field would not only be zero at its centre, but would also wind like a string. Whether this is likely to happen with phenomenological strings can be found by considering a realistic grand unified theory, where there is less arbitrariness.

By using a larger gauge group it is also possible to consider the effects of nonabelian

strings, which could not occur in the theories considered in refs. [10, 30]. Nonabelian strings have significantly different behaviour to abelian strings, since the associated string generators do not all commute with the Standard Model fields, or the other gauge fields. It is thus necessary to approach them in a slightly different way.

In this chapter we examine these issues in detail for strings formed in a realistic grand unified theory (GUT) based on $SO(10)$. In section 2.2 the theory to be used is outlined. The possible strings that form in it prior to the electroweak phase transition are discussed in section 2.3. The effects of a cosmic string on the subsequent phase transitions of a general theory are considered in section 2.4. In section 2.5 we consider these effects in greater detail for the electroweak phase transition of the $SO(10)$ GUT, and examine the various electroweak string solutions in section 2.6. The form of the electroweak fields, and numerical solutions of the corresponding field equations, are found. In section 2.7 some other, simpler symmetry restorations occurring in the theory are discussed, in particular that of the intermediate $SU(5)$ symmetry. Although one specific theory is considered, many of the results generalise to other theories. The implications of our results for such theories are discussed in section 2.8. In section 2.9 we summarise our results and discuss the conclusions.

2.2 An $SO(10)$ Grand Unified Theory

A realistic GUT which has a symmetry breaking pattern which produces strings is $SO(10)$. Its properties have a reasonable agreement with physical results. Consider the symmetry breaking

$$\begin{aligned}
SO(10) &\xrightarrow{\Phi_{126}} SU(5) \times Z_2 \\
&\xrightarrow{\Phi_{45}} SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times Z_2 \\
&\xrightarrow{\Phi_{10}} SU(3)_c \times U(1)_Q \times Z_2 ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\Phi_{\mathbf{N}}$ transforms under the $\mathbf{N}$ representation of $SO(10)$. The actual grand unified gauge group is $Spin(10)$, the covering group of $SO(10)$, but for simplicity the symmetry breaking is shown in terms of the Lie algebras. The discrete Z_2 symmetry left by the Φ_{126}

Higgs field leads to the formation of a variety of cosmic strings. Comparison of the effects of the various symmetry breakings is simplified by expressing everything in terms of the same representation. Since $\mathbf{126} + \mathbf{10} = (\mathbf{16} \times \mathbf{16})_S$ this is possible. Conveniently, $\mathbf{16}$ is also the representation that acts on the fermions. The $SO(10)$ fermions consist of the usual standard model fermions, plus a right handed neutrino. The fermionic part of the theory is then expressed in terms of the left-handed fermions and the charge conjugates of the right-handed fermions. The fields of the theory are discussed in more detail in appendix A.

The maximal subgroup of $SO(10)$ is actually $SU(5) \times U(1)_P$, and P can be used to decompose $SO(10)$ into representations of $SU(5)$

$$\mathbf{16} \longrightarrow \mathbf{1}_5 + \mathbf{10}_1 + \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{-3} , \quad (2.2)$$

where the subscripts are the eigenvalues of P . $\mathbf{126}$ and $\mathbf{10}$ can be similarly decomposed by considering symmetric products of $\mathbf{16}$.

$$\mathbf{126} \longrightarrow \mathbf{1}_{10} + \dots , \quad \mathbf{10} \longrightarrow \mathbf{5}_{-2} + \bar{\mathbf{5}}_2 . \quad (2.3)$$

P can also be used to describe the non-trivial element of the discrete symmetry of (2.1), which is $d = \exp(2\pi i P/10)$.

Defining Φ_N^{vac} to be the usual constant vacuum expectation value of Φ_N , Φ_{126}^{vac} has a magnitude of η_G , which is of order 10^{16}GeV . It is in the $\mathbf{1}_{10}$ component of $\mathbf{126}$, and so must be equal to $\eta_G(\mathbf{e}_1 \times \mathbf{e}_1)$, where $\mathbf{e}_1$ is in the $\mathbf{1}_5$ component of the $\mathbf{16}$ representation (the corresponding field in the fermion representation is the charge conjugate of the right-handed neutrino). Φ_{10}^{vac} is made up of both the chargeless components of $\mathbf{10}$. If H_d^0 and H_u^0 are the chargeless components of $\mathbf{5}_{-2}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{5}}_2$ respectively, $\Phi_{10}^{\text{vac}} = \eta_d H_d^0 + \eta_u H_u^0$. Since $\mathbf{10}$ is contained in $(\mathbf{16} \times \mathbf{16})_S$, Φ_{10} can be expressed as a sum of symmetric products of components of $\mathbf{16}$ s. The $\mathbf{45}$ is contained in $\mathbf{16} \times \bar{\mathbf{16}}$. Φ_{45} 's effect on the form of the cosmic string solutions is far less significant than the other Higgs fields, so we will ignore it for now.

Strings can form at the first $SO(10) \longrightarrow SU(5) \times Z_2$ symmetry breaking. In this case Φ_{126} is not constant, and takes the form $e^{i\theta T_s} \Phi_{126}^{(0)}(r)$. $\Phi_{126}^{(0)}$ is independent of θ , and satisfies the boundary condition $\Phi_{126}^{(0)}(\infty) = \Phi_{126}^{\text{vac}}$. T_s is made up of the broken generators of $SO(10)$,

and must give a single-valued Φ_{126} . If $e^{2\pi iT_s} = U \times d$ (for some U in $SU(5)$), then while Φ_{126} will be single valued, it will not be topologically equivalent to $\Phi_{126} = \text{constant}$, and so the string will be topologically stable. If $e^{2\pi iT_s} = U \times I$ the string is not topologically stable, but may have a very long lifetime, and so still be physically significant [11].

The Lagrangian of the system is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & (D_\mu \Phi_{126})^* (D^\mu \Phi_{126}) + (D_\mu \Phi_{10})^* (D^\mu \Phi_{10}) + (D_\mu \Phi_{45})^* (D^\mu \Phi_{45}) \\ & - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^a F^{\mu\nu a} - V(\Phi_{126}, \Phi_{45}, \Phi_{10}) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{fermions}} , \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

where $D_\mu = \partial_\mu - \frac{1}{2}igA_\mu$ and $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu - \frac{1}{2}ig[A_\mu, A_\nu]$. There are 45 gauge fields in all, most of which acquire superheavy masses and so are not observed at everyday temperatures. They consist of the usual standard model fields, with the W -bosons denoted by W_L^i ; W_R^i , which are right-handed versions of the W_L^i , coupling right handed neutrinos to electrons; some leptoquark bosons: $Y_i^\pm$, $X_i^\pm$, $X_{S_i}^\pm$, where $Y_i^\pm$ and $X_i^\pm$ are $SU(5)$ gauge fields; some more general gauge fields $X_i'^\pm$ and $Y_i'^\pm$, which couple quarks to leptons and different coloured quarks; and a fifth uncharged field, B' . The index i takes the values 1, 2, 3, and is related to colour. Two uncharged diagonal fields, Z' and B , are made up of orthogonal linear combinations of W_R^3 and B' . Linear combinations of B and W_L^3 produce the Z boson and the photon, A . At the first symmetry breaking Z' , $W_R^\pm$, $X_i^\pm$, $Y_i'^\pm$, and $X_{S_i}^\pm$ are all given superheavy masses. The second stage gives high masses to $X_i^\pm$, $Y_i^\pm$, and additional masses to $W_R^\pm$, $X_i'^\pm$, $Y_i'^\pm$ and $X_{S_i}^\pm$. Finally the third symmetry breaking gives masses to $W_L^\pm$ and Z , with further masses being given to the Z' , $W_R^\pm$, $Y_i^\pm$ and $Y_i'^\pm$ fields.

2.3 GUT Strings

Neglecting fermions, the Euler-Lagrange equations obtained from (2.4) are

$$D_\mu D^\mu \Phi_i = -\frac{\partial V}{\partial \Phi_i^*} , \quad (2.5)$$

$$(D_\mu F^{\mu\nu})^a = -g \text{Im} \sum_i (D^\nu \Phi_i)^* (\tau^a \Phi_i) , \quad (2.6)$$

where $D_\mu F^{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu F^{\mu\nu} - i\frac{g}{2}[A_\mu, F^{\mu\nu}]$. At high temperatures V is such that Φ_{126} is the only non-zero Higgs field. (2.5) and (2.6) have various cosmic string solutions. The different

solutions correspond to different choices of T_s . In the $SO(10) \rightarrow SU(5) \times Z_2$ symmetry breaking, 21 of $SO(10)$'s 45 generators are broken, and T_s will be a linear combination of them. One of them, P , corresponds to the $U(1)$ symmetry not embedded in $SU(5)$. The corresponding string is abelian, and has the solution

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{126} &= f(r)e^{in\theta T_s}\Phi_{126}^{\text{vac}} , \\ A_\theta &= n\frac{2a(r)}{gr}T_s , \quad A_\mu = 0 \text{ otherwise} ,\end{aligned}\tag{2.7}$$

where T_s , the string generator, equals $P/10$, and n is an integer. The non-zero gauge field is required to give a zero covariant derivative, and hence zero energy, at $r = \infty$. It corresponds to a non-zero Z' field. (2.7) can be simplified using $Pe_1 = 5e_1$, to give $e^{in\theta T_s}\Phi_{126}^{\text{vac}} = e^{in\theta}\Phi_{126}^{\text{vac}}$. Substituting (2.7) into (2.5) and (2.6) gives the Nielsen-Olesen vortex equations, as would be expected. Regularity at the centre of the string, and finite energy due to a vanishing covariant derivative and potential at infinity, imply the boundary conditions $f(0) = a(0) = 0$ and $f(\infty) = a(\infty) = 1$.

The situation for the other generators is more complicated. For a general string generator T_s , the left and right hand sides of (2.5) are proportional to $T_s^2\Phi_{126}^{(0)}$ and $\Phi_{126}^{(0)}$ respectively, which in general are not proportional [34]. Thus the solution (2.7) will not work. This is resolved by expressing Φ_{126}^{vac} in terms of the eigenstates of T_s^2 , to give $\Phi_{126}^{\text{vac}} = \sum_m \phi_m$, where $T_s^2\phi_m = m^2\phi_m$. Since T_s is Hermitian, m^2 will be positive and real. A suitable string solution can now be constructed

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{126} &= e^{in\theta T_s} \sum_m f_m(r)\phi_m , \\ A_\theta &= n\frac{2a(r)}{gr}T_s , \quad A_\mu = 0 \text{ otherwise} .\end{aligned}\tag{2.8}$$

In order for Φ_{126} to be single valued the various m must all be integers, and $T_s\phi_0$ must be zero. The boundary conditions on a and f_m will be the same as those for (2.7), except that f_0 need not be zero at $r = 0$. The simplest examples of such solutions occur when $T_s^2e_1 = \frac{1}{4}e_1$, in which case

$$\phi_1 = \frac{\eta_G}{2} [(e_1 \times e_1) + 4(T_se_1 \times T_se_1)] ,\tag{2.9}$$

$$\phi_0 = \frac{\eta_G}{2} [(e_1 \times e_1) - 4(T_se_1 \times T_se_1)] .\tag{2.10}$$




Figure 2.1: $SU(2)$ string field profiles, with $\eta_G = \lambda_G = g = 1$ and $\lambda'_G = 5$.

$T_s e_1$ and e_1 are orthogonal, so ϕ_0 and ϕ_1 are orthogonal. In this case only part of the Higgs field winds around the string. This type of string was first suggested by Aryal and Everett [35], and has been examined in detail by Ma [34]. It turns out to have lower (about half as much) energy than the abelian string (2.7). This is because the Higgs field is not forced to be zero at the string's centre, which reduces the contribution to the energy from the potential terms. Also since Φ_{126} varies less, the covariant derivative terms are smaller.

Of course, such vortex-like solutions are only topological strings if $e^{2\pi i T_s}$ is not contained in $SU(5)$. If n is even this is not the case, and the solution is topologically equivalent to the vacuum. Similarly, odd values of n are all topologically equivalent to each other, so there is only one topologically distinct type of string of this form. Strings with higher n can unwind into strings with lower n . The same is true of the abelian string. However it is possible that the lifetime of an $n > 1$ string will be very long, so in a general theory all values of n should be considered.

As shown in [34] the most general potential reduces to a different form to that of the abelian case, and leads to these equations for a and the f_m 's

$$f_0'' + \frac{f_0'}{r} = \frac{\eta_G^2}{4} \left[\lambda_G (f_1^2 + f_0^2 - 2) - \lambda'_G (f_1^2 - f_0^2) \right] f_0, \quad (2.11)$$

$$f_1'' + \frac{f_1'}{r} - n^2 \frac{(1-a)^2}{r^2} f_1 = \frac{\eta_G^2}{4} \left[\lambda_G (f_1^2 + f_0^2 - 2) + \lambda'_G (f_1^2 - f_0^2) \right] f_1, \quad (2.12)$$

$$a'' - \frac{a'}{r} = -g^2 \eta_G^2 (1-a) f_1^2 . \quad (2.13)$$

λ_G and λ'_G are such that $f_1(\infty)$ and $f_0(\infty)$ will both be 1. A numerical solution of the above equations is shown in figure 2.1. Since $f_0 \neq 0$ at the string's centre, symmetry is still broken there (although the VEV of Φ_{126} is lower). The value of $f_0(0)$ depends on the ratio of λ_G and λ'_G . If $\lambda'_G > \lambda_G$, $f_0(0) < 1$ while $\lambda'_G < \lambda_G$ gives $f_0(0) > 1$. If $\lambda'_G = \lambda_G$, $f_0 = 1$ everywhere, and (2.12,2.13) reduce to abelian string field equations.

The corresponding equations for the abelian string ($T_s = P/10$) are

$$f'' + \frac{f'}{r} - n^2 \frac{(1-a)^2}{r^2} f = \frac{1}{2} \eta_G^2 \lambda_G (f^2 - 1) f , \quad (2.14)$$

$$a'' - \frac{a'}{r} = -5g^2 \eta_G^2 (1-a) f^2 . \quad (2.15)$$

The above nonabelian strings are in fact all $SU(2)$ strings. There are other more complicated possibilities, for which $T_s^2 e_1$ is not proportional to e_1 , but none of these are topologically stable. We shall only consider topologically stable strings, and the closely related solutions with higher winding numbers. We will consider the strings corresponding to each of the broken generators. These are all equivalent under $SU(5)$, but not under $SU(3)_c \times U(1)_Q$, so they will be distinct after the electroweak symmetry breaking. Apart from the abelian string the four cases correspond to non-zero $W_R^\pm$, $X_{Si}^\pm$, $X_i'^\pm$ and $Y_i'^\pm$ fields. Under $SU(3)_c \times U(1)_Q$ any linear combination of $X_{Si}^\pm$ generators can be gauge transformed into any other combination, thus they are equivalent. The same is true for the other generators, so there are just 5 distinct types of string at low temperatures. The 4 nonabelian strings can be labelled by their gauge fields. Under $U(1)_Q$, nonabelian strings with winding number $-n$ are gauge equivalent to ones with winding number n (for any choice of T_s), so it is sufficient to consider only $n > 0$ strings.

Since all the nonabelian strings are gauge equivalent under $SU(5)$, they have the same energy, which is about half that of the abelian string [34]. Later phase transitions will alter the string solutions and remove this degeneracy.

2.4 Cosmic Strings and Multiple Higgs Fields

Before examining the effect of the other phase transitions on the $SO(10)$ cosmic strings, we will consider a general GUT. Suppose it has the symmetry breaking

$$G_0 \xrightarrow{\Phi_0} G_1 \times D \xrightarrow{\Phi_1} G_2 \times D \cdots G_{n-1} \times D \xrightarrow{\Phi_{n-1}} G_n \times D \quad (2.16)$$

where D is a discrete group, such as Z_N . Define Φ_i^{vac} to be the usual constant vacuum expectation value of Φ_i , and $D_\mu = \partial_\mu - i\frac{g}{2}A_\mu$ to be the covariant derivative. Because of the discrete group cosmic strings can form at the first phase transition. Away from the string core the solution will take the form

$$\Phi_0 = R_0(\theta)\Phi_0^{\text{vac}}, \quad A_\theta = \frac{2}{igr}R_0^{-1}(\theta)\partial_\theta R_0(\theta), \quad (2.17)$$

where $R_0(\theta) \in G_0$. We will choose $R_0(0) = I$. Since Φ_0 is single valued, R must obey $R_0(2\pi)\Phi_0^{\text{vac}} = \Phi_0^{\text{vac}}$, thus $R_0(2\pi) = U_1 \times d$, where $U_1 \in G_1$ and $d \in D$. If the string is to be topologically stable d must not be equal to I . The gauge field ensures a vanishing covariant derivative, and thus finite energy.

At the next phase transition Φ_1 gains a VEV. If its covariant derivative is also to vanish, Φ_1 must wind like Φ_0 , so

$$\Phi_1 = R_0(\theta)\Phi_1^{\text{vac}}. \quad (2.18)$$

Unfortunately if $R_0(2\pi)\Phi_1^{\text{vac}} \neq \Phi_1^{\text{vac}}$, then Φ_1 is not single valued. The same is true of gauge and fermion fields who get their masses from Φ_1 . Therefore this ansatz is unacceptable.

If the product $G_1 \times D$ is a direct product, it is possible to alter the above ansatz to give a single valued Φ_1 , without changing Φ_0 . This is achieved by applying an extra (singular) gauge transformation that has no effect on Φ_0 , but ensures the values of Φ_1 at 0 and 2π match up. A corresponding gauge term is then added so the covariant derivative vanishes.

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1 &= R_0(\theta)R_1(\theta)\Phi_1^{\text{vac}}, \\ A_\theta &= \frac{2}{igr} \left\{ R_0^{-1}(\theta)\partial_\theta R_0(\theta) + R_0(\theta)[R_1^{-1}(\theta)\partial_\theta R_1(\theta)]R_0^{-1}(\theta) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

where $R_1(\theta)$ is chosen so that $R_1(\theta) \in G_1$, $R_1(0) = I$ and $R_0(2\pi)R_1(2\pi) = U_2 \times d$, with $U_2 \in G_2$. All the fields are now single valued, and since $R_1(\theta)$ annihilates Φ_0^{vac} , the form of the original part of the string solution is unaffected.

The same arguments apply to the subsequent symmetry breakings, leading to the ansatz

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_i &= \prod_{j=0}^i R_j(\theta) \Phi_i^{\text{vac}} , \\ A_\theta &= \frac{2}{igr} \sum_{i=0}^n \left\{ \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} R_j(\theta) [R_i^{-1}(\theta) \partial_\theta R_i(\theta)] \prod_{j=i-1}^0 R_j^{-1}(\theta) \right\} ,\end{aligned}\quad (2.20)$$

where the gauge transformations R_i , $i = 0 \dots n-1$, satisfy $R_i(\theta) \in G_i$, $R_i(0) = I$ and $\prod_{j=0}^i R_j(2\pi) = U_{i+1} \times d$ for some $U_{i+1} \in G_{i+1}$.

If we define G_{n+1} to be I , and choose an R_n which satisfies the above conditions, the theory's gauge fields can be defined as

$$A_\mu(\theta) = \prod_{j=0}^n R_j(\theta) A_\mu(0) \prod_{j=n}^0 R_j^{-1}(\theta) . \quad (2.21)$$

Such a definition is single valued for all $A_\mu \in L(G_1)$, and so the resulting cosmic string is not an Alice string.

Although the conditions after (2.20) restrict the choice of R_i , they do not generally determine it uniquely. Thus it is necessary to look at the string field equations in detail.

In the above discussion we have only considered the form of the string solution away from the string core. In some string solutions different parts of the Higgs fields have different radial and angular dependence (see section 2.3). In these cases the angular dependence of each part must be such that it is single valued. Also, since the solution must regular, all the winding parts of the Higgs fields must be zero at the string's centre.

We will now apply the above arguments to the $SO(10)$ cosmic strings discussed in section 2.3. These have $R_0(\theta) = e^{inT_s\theta}$. For all choices of T_s , $e^{2\pi inT_s} \Phi_{45}^{\text{vac}} = \Phi_{45}^{\text{vac}}$, so we can put $R_1(\theta) = I$, which is the minimal energy choice. However $e^{2\pi inT_s} \Phi_{10}^{\text{vac}} \neq \Phi_{10}^{\text{vac}}$ for some T_s , so a non-trivial choice of $R_2(\theta)$ may be required. To determine the most favourable choice we have to look at the form of the possible solutions close to the cosmic string.

2.5 The Electroweak Symmetry Breaking

Topological strings only form in a symmetry breaking $G \longrightarrow H$ if $\pi_1(G/H) \neq I$. This is not the case at the electroweak (Φ_{10}) symmetry breaking, so such strings do not form there.

It is still possible for Φ_{10} to wind, and for string-like solutions to appear [36]. However, since it is energetically favourable for the Higgs field to unwind, they are not completely stable (although they could take a long time to decay).

The situation is different in the presence of a topological string, formed at a previous symmetry breaking. As we discussed in section 2.4 the string gauge field may force a Higgs field to wind and take a string-like solution. Unlike the electroweak strings considered by Vachaspati [36], such solutions would be stable.

As we discussed in the previous section, we need to add an extra singular gauge transformation to the cosmic string ansatz in order to give a single valued electroweak Higgs field (Φ_{10}). We will define it to be $e^{iT_{\text{ew}}\theta}$. Thus at large r

$$\Phi_{10} = e^{inT_s\theta} e^{iT_{\text{ew}}\theta} (\eta_u H_u^0 + \eta_d H_d^0) , \quad (2.22)$$

$$A_\theta = \frac{2n}{gr} T_s + \frac{2}{gr} e^{inT_s\theta} T_{\text{ew}} e^{-inT_s\theta} . \quad (2.23)$$

Before we consider the radial dependence of the solution, we need to express Φ_{10} and T_{ew} in terms of eigenstates of the string generators (as we did with Φ_{126} in section 2.3). Thus we set $\eta_{u,d} H_{u,d}^0 = \sum_{j,k} \phi_{jk}^{u,d}$, with $T_s \phi_{jk}^{u,d} = j \phi_{jk}^{u,d}$, $T_{\text{ew}} \phi_{jk}^{u,d} = k \phi_{jk}^{u,d}$, and $T_{\text{ew}} = \sum_j T_j$, with $[T_s, T_j] = j T_j$. A suitable ansatz is then

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{10} &= e^{inT_s\theta} e^{iT_{\text{ew}}\theta} \sum_{j,k} \left(\phi_{jk}^u h_{jk}^u(r) + \phi_{jk}^d h_{jk}^d(r) \right) \\ &= \sum_{j,k} e^{i(nj+k)\theta} \left(\phi_{jk}^u h_{jk}^u(r) + \phi_{jk}^d h_{jk}^d(r) \right) , \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

$$A_\theta = \frac{2na(r)}{gr} T_s + \sum_j \frac{2b_j(r)}{gr} e^{inT_s\theta} T_j e^{-inT_s\theta} . \quad (2.25)$$

If $[T_s, T_{\text{ew}}] = 0$ the second gauge term reduces to $2b_0(r)T_{\text{ew}}/(gr)$. If $[T_s, T_{\text{ew}}] \neq 0$ the r component of the gauge field equations (2.6) becomes non-trivial and we also need to introduce a non-zero A_r field, made up of $e^{inT_s\theta} j T_j e^{-inT_s\theta}$ terms. At $r = 0$ the functions $b_j(r)$ and $h_{jk}^{u,d}(r)$ take values which give a regular solution, and at $r = \infty$ they are all equal to 1. Since Φ_{10} is single valued, $nj + k$ must be an integer whenever $\phi_{jk}^{u,d} \neq 0$. Any A_r field must be zero at $r = \infty$.

We can now construct an approximate solution and use this to get an estimate of the energy. Defining r_s to be the radius of the string (outside of which $|\Phi_{126}|$ takes its usual

VEV), and r_{ew} to be the radius of the region in which $|\Phi_{10}|$ does not take its usual VEV, the solution can be approximated separately in three regions. If all the coupling constants are of order 1, r_s will be of order $|\Phi_{126}^{\text{vac}}|^{-1} = \eta_G^{-1}$ and r_{ew} will be of order $|\Phi_{10}^{\text{vac}}|^{-1} = \eta_E^{-1}$, with $\eta_E^2 = \eta_u^2 + \eta_d^2$. Φ_{10} takes the role of the Weinberg-Salam Higgs field and so $\eta_E \sim 10^2 \text{ GeV}$.

We will set all fields to their asymptotic values for $r > r_{\text{ew}}$. For $r_s < r < r_{\text{ew}}$ we set $a(r)$ and Φ_{126} to their asymptotic values, and assume all other fields to be small. To first order the field equations are

$$(h_{jk}^{u,d})'' + \frac{(h_{jk}^{u,d})'}{r} - \frac{k^2}{r^2} h_{jk}^{u,d} = 0 \quad , \quad b_j'' - \frac{b_j'}{r} = 0 \quad . \quad (2.26)$$

These are solved by $h_{jk}^{u,d}(r) \sim r^{\pm|k|}$ and $b_j(r) \sim r^2$ or $b_j(r) = \text{constant}$. For $r < r_s$ we take all fields to be small, and the field equations reduce to

$$(h_{jk}^{u,d})'' + \frac{(h_{jk}^{u,d})'}{r} - \frac{(nj+k)^2}{r^2} h_{jk}^{u,d} = 0 \quad , \quad b_j'' - \frac{b_j'}{r} = 0 \quad . \quad (2.27)$$

These are solved by $h_{jk}^{u,d}(r) \sim r^{|nj+k|}$ and $b_j(r) \sim r^2$ (the other solutions are not regular at $r = 0$). Requiring continuity of the solution and its first derivative at $r = r_s$, reveals that the $h_{jk}^{u,d}(r) \sim r^{-|k|}$ and $b_j(r) = \text{constant}$ solutions can be neglected outside the string core.

Requiring continuity at $r = r_{\text{ew}}$ gives the trial solution

$$h_{jk}^{u,d}(r) = h_k(r) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{r}{r_{\text{ew}}}\right)^{|k|} & r_s < r < r_{\text{ew}} \\ 1 & r > r_{\text{ew}} \end{cases} \quad b_j(r) = b(r) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{r}{r_{\text{ew}}}\right)^2 & r_s < r < r_{\text{ew}} \\ 1 & r > r_{\text{ew}} \end{cases} \quad . \quad (2.28)$$

We assume any A_r field is negligible. An estimate of the energy of this string-like solution can now be found by substituting the trial solution into the Lagrangian. The contribution from the region $r < r_s$ is suppressed by powers of $r_s/r_{\text{ew}} \sim 10^{-14}$ and can be neglected. All the contributions are zero for $r > r_{\text{ew}}$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} E &= 2\pi \int_0^\infty r dr \left\{ |\partial_r \Phi_{10}|^2 + |D_\theta \Phi_{10}|^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_r A_\theta^a)^2 + V \right\} \\ &\approx 2\pi \int_{r_s}^{r_{\text{ew}}} r dr \sum_k \left(h_k'^2 + \frac{k^2}{r^2} (1-b)^2 h_k^2 \right) |\phi_k^u + \phi_k^d|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2b'}{gr} \right)^2 \text{Tr}(T_{\text{ew}}^2) + V \\ &\approx 2\pi \left(\frac{|k|}{2} + \frac{|k|}{2} - \frac{2k^2}{2+2|k|} + \frac{k^2}{4+2|k|} \right) |\phi_k^u + \phi_k^d|^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{4}{g^2 r_{\text{ew}}^2} \text{Tr}(T_{\text{ew}}^2) + 2\pi \int_{r_s}^{r_{\text{ew}}} V r dr \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (2.29)$$

where $\phi_k^{u,d} = \sum_j \phi_{jk}^{u,d}$.

The generator T_{ew} should annihilate Φ_{126}^{vac} , since any change to the GUT string will give a large increase in energy. It is therefore a combination of electroweak generators. Gluon and photon generators do not affect Φ_{10}^{vac} , so the most energetically favourable choice will be of the form

$$T_{\text{ew}} = z\tau[Z] + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(w\tau[W_L^+] + w^*\tau[W_L^-]) , \quad (2.30)$$

where $\tau[Z]$ is the generator of the Z boson field, etc. z (which is real) and w (complex) are parameters to be determined. We will now find the eigenstates $(\phi_k^{u,d})$ of T_{ew} which make up H_u^0 and H_d^0 , and the corresponding eigenvalues $(\lambda_k^{u,d})$.

Defining $z' = \sqrt{\frac{5}{8}}z$, their eigenvalues are

$$\lambda_{\pm}^u = \frac{3}{5}z' \pm \sqrt{z'^2 + |w|^2} , \quad \lambda_{\pm}^d = -\frac{3}{5}z' \pm \sqrt{z'^2 + |w|^2} , \quad (2.31)$$

and the eigenstates are

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\pm}^u &= \left(\left[z' \pm \sqrt{z'^2 + |w|^2} \right] H_u^0 + w H_u^- \right) \frac{\eta_u}{2\sqrt{z'^2 + |w|^2}} , \\ \phi_{\pm}^d &= \left(\left[-z' \pm \sqrt{z'^2 + |w|^2} \right] H_d^0 + w^* H_d^+ \right) \frac{\eta_d}{2\sqrt{z'^2 + |w|^2}} . \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

Thus

$$\Phi_{10} = e^{inT_s} \sum_k \left(e^{i\lambda_k^u \theta} \phi_k^u h_k^u(r) + e^{i\lambda_k^d \theta} \phi_k^d h_k^d(r) \right) \quad (2.33)$$

outside the string core.

Substituting these results into (2.29), and taking $gr_{\text{ew}}/2 = \eta_E^{-1}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} E &\approx 2\pi \left[\sum_{\pm} \left(|\lambda_{\pm}^u| |\phi_{\pm}^u|^2 + |\lambda_{\pm}^d| |\phi_{\pm}^d|^2 \right) + \eta_E^2 \text{Tr}(T_{\text{ew}}^2) \right] \\ &= 10\pi\eta_E^2(z^2 + |w|^2) . \end{aligned} \quad (2.34)$$

Thus the minimal energy solution will have z and $|w|$ as small as possible, subject to $e^{inT_s}\phi_{\pm}^{u,d}$ being single valued. If $\phi_{\pm}^{u,d}$ is made up of eigenstates of T_s with eigenvalues $\mu_{\pm,j}^{u,d}$ then this is true if $\lambda_{\pm}^{u,d} + \mu_{\pm,j}^{u,d}$ are all integers.

If $|w| = 0$ the situation is slightly different. In this case Φ_{10}^{vac} is composed of 2 eigenstates of T_{ew} , and not 4. They are H_u^0 and H_d^0 , and have eigenvalues

$$\lambda^u = \frac{8}{5}z' , \quad \lambda^d = -\frac{8}{5}z' . \quad (2.35)$$

If H_u^0 and H_d^0 are made up of eigenstates of T_s with eigenvalues $\mu_j^{u,d}$, then it is only necessary for $\lambda^{u,d} + \mu_j^{u,d}$ to all be integers if Φ_{10} is to be single valued.

2.6 Electroweak Cosmic String Solutions

Using the results of section 2.5 we can now find the form of the electroweak Higgs and gauge fields around the various $SO(10)$ cosmic string solutions.

2.6.1 The Abelian U(1) String

With the abelian string, $T_s H_u^{0,-} = \frac{1}{5} H_u^{0,-}$ and $T_s H_d^{0,+} = -\frac{1}{5} H_d^{0,+}$. Thus $e^{inT_s\theta} \Phi_{10}^{\text{vac}} = \eta_u H_u^0 e^{in\theta/5} + \eta_d H_d^0 e^{-in\theta/5}$ is not generally single valued, so a non-zero T_{ew} is needed.

The most general suitable T_{ew} is given by (2.30). We can see that the eigenstates of T_{ew} which make up Φ_{10}^{vac} (given by (2.32)) are also eigenstates of T_s . The minimal energy choice of T_{ew} must minimise $\text{Tr}(T_{\text{ew}}^2)$, while satisfying the conditions after (2.34) (or after (2.35) if $|w| = 0$). For this string the conditions are that

$$\lambda_{\pm}^d - n/5 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{\pm}^u + n/5 \quad (\text{if } w \neq 0), \quad (2.36)$$

$$\lambda^d - n/5 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda^u + n/5 \quad (\text{if } w = 0), \quad (2.37)$$

are all integers. This occurs when $w = 0$ and $\sqrt{8/5}z + n/5$ is an integer, or when $3z/(2\sqrt{10}) \pm \sqrt{5z^2/8 + |w|^2} + n/5$ are integers. The choice which minimises (2.34) is $w = 0$, $z = -\sqrt{5/8}\{n/5\}$, where $\{x\}$ is defined as x minus the nearest integer. Thus if n is a multiple of 5, $T_{\text{ew}} = 0$.

Since $[T_s, T_{\text{ew}}] = 0$ the electroweak string solution can be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{10} &= \left(\eta_u H_u^0 e^{im\theta} h_u(r) + \eta_d H_d^0 e^{-im\theta} h_d(r) \right), \\ A_{\theta} &= \frac{2na(r)}{gr} T_s + \frac{2b(r)}{gr} T_{\text{ew}} \quad A_{\mu} = 0 \quad \text{otherwise}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.38)$$

where $m = n/5 - \{n/5\}$. The solution has the boundary conditions $h_{u,d}(\infty) = b(\infty) = 1$, $b(0) = 0$, and if $m \neq 0$ then $h_{u,d}(0) = 0$ too. If $m = 0$, which occurs when $|n| < 3$, Φ_{10} need not be zero at the string's centre. We can get an estimate of its value using a trial solution

like that in section 2.5. The solution has $h_{u,d}(r) \approx (r/r_{\text{ew}})^{|\{n/5\}|}$ for $r_s < r < r_{\text{ew}}$ and $h_{u,d}(r)$ constant for $r < r_s$. By continuity at $r = r_s$, $h_{u,d}(0) \approx (r_s/r_{\text{ew}})^{|\{n/5\}|} \sim 10^{-14|\{n/5\}|}$. Thus electroweak symmetry is almost fully restored for abelian strings even when Φ_{10} does not wind. Although symmetry is restored, Φ_{10} will only wind like a string if the GUT string has a high winding number ($|n| > 2$). This is in agreement with earlier work by Alford and Wilczek [37].

Taking Φ_{45} to be constant, the Φ_{10} terms of the potential will reduce to

$$V = \frac{\lambda_E}{4} (|\Phi_{10}|^2 - \eta_E^2)^2 + \frac{\lambda'_E}{4} |\Phi_{10} \tilde{C} \Phi_{10} - 2\eta_u \eta_d|^2 + \lambda_\times (|\Phi_{126}|^2 - \eta_G^2) (|\Phi_{10}|^2 - \eta_E^2) \quad (2.39)$$

for the above string solution. $\tilde{C}$ is a conjugation matrix which maps $H_{u,d}^\alpha$ to $H_{d,u}^\alpha$. In general the full potential will contain various cross terms such as $|\Phi_{10} \cdot \Phi_{45}|^2$. With a suitable choice of parameters these terms will ensure that Φ_{10} breaks $SU(2)_L$ rather than $SU(3)_c$ [13]. The resulting field equations are

$$h_{u,d}'' + \frac{h'_{u,d}}{r} - \frac{[\{\frac{n}{5}\}(1-b) - \frac{n}{5}(1-a)]^2}{r^2} h_{u,d} = \lambda_\times \eta_G^2 (f^2 - 1) h_{u,d} + \frac{\lambda_E}{2} (\eta_u^2 h_u^2 + \eta_d^2 h_d^2 - \eta_E^2) h_{u,d} + \lambda'_E \eta_{d,u}^2 (h_u h_d - 1) h_{d,u} , \quad (2.40)$$

$$b'' - \frac{b'}{r} = -\frac{4}{5} g^2 \left[(1-b) - \frac{n/5}{\{n/5\}} (1-a) \right] (\eta_u^2 h_u^2 + \eta_d^2 h_d^2) . \quad (2.41)$$

The electroweak string will also contribute terms to the GUT string field equations. There will be an additional $\lambda_\times (\eta_u^2 h_u^2 + \eta_d^2 h_d^2 - \eta_E^2) f$ on the right hand side of (2.14) and a $-g^2 [(1-a)/5 - (1-b)\{\frac{n}{5}\}/n] (\eta_u^2 h_u^2 + \eta_d^2 h_d^2)$ term on the right hand side of (2.15). These extra terms are far smaller than those already present in (2.14,2.15), so the back reaction from the electroweak string will be negligible.

The field equations (2.40,2.41) can be solved numerically. The electroweak fields are shown in figure 2.2. The parameters used were $\eta_d/\eta_G = 10^{-14.5}$, $\eta_u = 3\eta_d$, $g = \lambda_E = \lambda'_E = \lambda_G = 1$ and $\lambda_\times = 0$. As expected, the effect of the electroweak fields on the GUT string was negligible.

In general the size of the region of electroweak symmetry restoration is far greater than the GUT symmetry restoration, since $r_{\text{ew}}/r_s \sim 10^{14}$. If n is a multiple of 5 then $T_{\text{ew}} = 0$ (as




Figure 2.2: Plot of electroweak field profiles for abelian string.

would be expected). In this case $|\Phi_{10}|$ will take its usual constant value for $r > r_s$, and while the electroweak symmetry is still restored, it is over a much smaller region. When $m = 0$ the electroweak Higgs field is non-zero at the string's centre. Its value can be evaluated numerically, and figure 2.4 shows its variation with respect to η_G/η_E . It can be seen that $h_{u,d}(0) \sim \eta_G/\eta_E$ when $\eta_G \gg \eta_E$, which is less than the value suggested by the trial solution.

2.6.2 X_S and X' $SU(2)$ Strings

Although at the GUT scale all the $SU(2)$ strings have the same properties, this is not true at low temperatures, since they affect Φ_{10} differently. The generators corresponding to the $X_{S_i}^\pm$ and $X'_i{}^\pm$ both annihilate the usual vacuum expectation value of Φ_{10} , and so the string gauge fields have no effect on this symmetry breaking, and Φ_{10} can be constant everywhere. There is still the possibility of symmetry restoration from potential terms, which is due to variation of the Φ_{126} and Φ_{45} fields (see section 2.7.3), although this is less significant. The other generators do have a non-trivial effect.

2.6.3 W_R SU(2) Strings

Different combinations of $W_R^\pm$ generators give strings like those in section 2.3, but they are all gauge equivalent under $U(1)_Q$. Without loss of generality we can take $T_s = (\tau[W_R^+] + \tau[W_R^-]) / (2\sqrt{2})$ and $n > 0$. For such a string,

$$\begin{aligned} T_s(H_u^0 \mp H_d^+) &= \pm \frac{1}{2}(H_u^0 \mp H_d^+) , \\ T_s(H_d^0 \pm H_u^-) &= \pm \frac{1}{2}(H_d^0 \pm H_u^-) . \end{aligned} \quad (2.42)$$

Thus $e^{2\pi i n T_s} \Phi_{10}^{\text{vac}} = (-1)^n \Phi_{10}^{\text{vac}}$, and so $e^{in T_s \theta} \Phi_{10}^{\text{vac}}$ is not single valued for odd n . As with the $U(1)$ string we need a non-zero T_{ew} . Again the most energetically favourable choice will minimise $\text{Tr}(T_{\text{ew}}^2)$, while ensuring that Φ_{10} is single valued. If we split the eigenstates of T_{ew} (2.32) up into eigenstates of T_s , then Φ_{10} will be single valued if the sum of the T_s and T_{ew} eigenvalues for each eigenstate are integers (see section 2.5).

From (2.42) we can see that the T_s eigenvalues are $\pm 1/2$. Thus we require that

$$\lambda_\pm^{u,d} - n/2 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_\pm^{u,d} + n/2 \quad (\text{if } w \neq 0) , \quad (2.43)$$

$$\lambda^{u,d} - n/2 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda^{u,d} + n/2 \quad (\text{if } w = 0) , \quad (2.44)$$

are all integers. The T_{ew} eigenvalues are $\lambda_\pm^{u,d}$ or $\lambda^{u,d}$ and are given by (2.31,2.35). These conditions are satisfied by $T_{\text{ew}} = 0$ if n is even (as expected). If n is odd then $\lambda_\pm^{u,d} + 1/2$ (or just $\lambda^{u,d} + 1/2$ if $w = 0$) must be integers. The choice which minimises $\text{Tr}(T_{\text{ew}}^2)$ is $z = 0$, $|w| = 1/2$.

Using the trial solution (2.28) does not tell us what phase of w will give the lowest energy. We can find this by considering the contribution to the energy from the region $r < r_s$. If $|w| = 1/2$, the electroweak Higgs field is given by

$$\Phi_{10} = \sum_{j,k=\pm 1} \phi_k^j h_{jk}(r) e^{i \frac{n j + k}{2} \theta} , \quad (2.45)$$

where

$$\phi_k^j = \frac{1}{4}(\eta_u - 2jkw\eta_d) \left[H_u^0 - 2kw^* H_u^- - 2jkw^* H_d^0 - jH_d^+ \right] . \quad (2.46)$$

Matching solutions at $r = r_s$ gives $h_{jk}(r) \approx \sqrt{r_s/r_{\text{ew}}}(r/r_s)^{|nj+k|/2}$. Its contribution to the energy in the string core is then

$$\begin{aligned}
E &\approx 2\pi \int_0^{r_s} r dr |\partial_r \Phi_{10}|^2 + |D_\theta \Phi_{10}|^2 \\
&\approx \pi \sqrt{\frac{r_s}{r_{\text{ew}}}} \left[|n+1| |\phi_+^+ + \phi_-^-|^2 + |n-1| |\phi_-^+ + \phi_+^-|^2 \right] \\
&= \pi \sqrt{\frac{r_s}{r_{\text{ew}}}} \left[(\eta_u^2 + \eta_d^2)n - 2\eta_u \eta_d (w + w^*) \right] .
\end{aligned} \tag{2.47}$$

This is minimised by $w = 1/2$. For a more general choice of T_s , this implies the gauge fields are related by $W_R^+/W_R^- = W_L^+/W_L^-$. Combining the above results, and noting that $[T_s, T_{\text{ew}}] = 0$, leads to the ansatz

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{10} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i(nT_s + T_{\text{ew}})\theta} \left[(H_u^0 - H_d^0) \eta_+ h_+(r) + (H_u^0 + H_d^0) \eta_- h_-(r) \right] \\
&= \left(e^{im'\theta} \phi_+^+ + e^{-im'\theta} \phi_-^- \right) h_+(r) + \left(e^{im\theta} \phi_-^+ + e^{-im\theta} \phi_+^- \right) h_-(r) , \\
A_\theta &= \frac{2na(r)}{gr} T_s + \frac{2b(r)}{gr} T_{\text{ew}} \quad A_\mu = 0 \text{ otherwise} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.48}$$

where $\eta_\pm = (\eta_u \mp \eta_d)/\sqrt{2}$, $m = (n-1)/2$ and $m' = (n+1)/2$. For the solution to have the correct asymptotic form and to be regular at $r = 0$ the required boundary conditions are $h_\pm(\infty) = b(\infty) = 1$, $h_+(0) = b(0) = 0$, and also $h_-(0) = 0$ if $n \neq 1$. Ignoring any potential terms which couple Φ_{10} to any of the other Higgs fields, the field equations for odd n are

$$\begin{aligned}
h_\pm'' + \frac{h_\pm'}{r} - \frac{[(1-b) \pm n(1-a)]^2}{4r^2} h_\pm &= \\
&\left[\frac{\lambda_E}{2} (\eta_+^2 h_+^2 + \eta_-^2 h_-^2 - \eta_E^2) \pm \frac{\lambda_E'}{2} (\eta_+^2 h_+^2 - \eta_-^2 h_-^2 + 2\eta_u \eta_d) \right] h_\pm ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.49}$$

$$b'' - \frac{b'}{r} = -\frac{1}{2} g^2 \left\{ [(1-b) + n(1-a)] \eta_+^2 h_+^2 + [(1-b) - n(1-a)] \eta_-^2 h_-^2 \right\} . \tag{2.50}$$

The field equations (2.49, 2.50) can be solved numerically. The electroweak fields are shown in figure 2.3. The parameters used were the same as those for figure 2.2, thus $\eta_+ = \sqrt{2} \times 10^{-14.5}$, $\eta_- = 2\eta_+$, and all coupling constants were set to 1.

If $n = 1$, $h_-(0)$ need not be zero. As with the $U(1)$ string we can estimate its value by extending the trial solution (2.28) to $r < r_s$. This gives $h_-(0) \approx \sqrt{r_s/r_{\text{ew}}} \sim 10^{-7}$, so $\Phi_{10} \approx 0$ inside the string when $n = 1$. Thus electroweak symmetry is fully or almost fully




Figure 2.3: Plot of electroweak field profiles for W_R -string.

restored there for all n . In contrast, the symmetry breaking caused by the GUT Higgs fields is only partially restored at the centre of the string, because $|\Phi_{126}|$ is about $\eta_G/\sqrt{2}$ there. Figure 2.4 shows the numerically determined variation of $h_-(0)$ with respect to η_G/η_E . As with the abelian string, $h_-(0) \sim \eta_G/\eta_E$ when $\eta_G \gg \eta_E$, which is less than the value suggested by the trial solution.

If $\eta_u = \eta_d$, (2.48) simplifies, and

$$\Phi_{10} = e^{i(nT_s + T_{\text{ew}})\theta} \Phi_{10}^{\text{vac}} h_-(r), \quad (2.51)$$

so Φ_{10} has just one winding number, instead of the usual two. In this respect it resembles the equivalent abelian case. The field equations for h_- and b are then the same as (2.49, 2.50), but with $\eta_+ = 0$.

If n is even an electroweak gauge field is not required. Putting $T_{\text{ew}} = 0$ into (2.48) gives a suitable solution. In this case $m = m' = n/2$. The resulting field equations are then (2.49) with $b = 1$. In this case the region of electroweak symmetry restoration is limited to the string core.

2.6.4 Y' SU(2) Strings

The fourth type of nonabelian string has T_s proportional to an appropriate linear combination of the generators of the $Y_i'^{\pm}$ gauge fields. The different combinations are all




Figure 2.4: Variation of electroweak Higgs field at the centres of the abelian and W_R strings.

equivalent under $SU(3)_c \times U(1)_Q$, and so without loss of generality we can take $T_s = (\tau[Y_1'^+] + \tau[Y_1'^-]) / (2\sqrt{2})$, and $n > 0$. As with the W_R -string $e^{2\pi i n T_s} \Phi_{10}^{\text{vac}} = (-1)^n \Phi_{10}^{\text{vac}}$, so we will need a non-zero T_{ew} . Using

$$\begin{aligned} T_s(H_u^0 \mp H_d^1) &= \pm \frac{1}{2}(H_u^0 \mp H_d^1) , \\ T_s(H_d^0 \pm H_u^1) &= \pm \frac{1}{2}(H_d^0 \pm H_u^1) , \\ T_s H_u^- &= T_s H_d^+ = 0 , \end{aligned} \tag{2.52}$$

we can split $\phi_{\pm}^{u,d}$ into eigenstates of T_s . This can then be used to determine the winding number of each component, and hence conditions for Φ_{10} to be single valued (as we did with the other strings). For a general T_{ew} with $w \neq 0$ the required conditions are that

$$\lambda_{\pm}^{u,d} + \frac{n}{2} , \quad \lambda_{\pm}^{u,d} , \quad \lambda_{\pm}^{u,d} - \frac{n}{2} , \tag{2.53}$$

are all integers. If n is odd, no choice of T_{ew} satisfies them. If however we take T_{ew} to be proportional to the generator of the Z boson, then $\phi_{u,d}^{u,d} = H_{u,d}^0$ and there are no H_u^- or H_d^+

components to worry about. This reduces the number of constraints. Now only $\lambda^{u,d} + \frac{n}{2}$ and $\lambda^{u,d} - \frac{n}{2}$ need to be integers. These conditions are satisfied by $|z| = \sqrt{10}/8$.

Unlike all the other cosmic strings we have considered, $[T_s, T_{\text{ew}}] \neq 0$ for this string generator. This introduces several complications. As with the Higgs fields we have to split T_{ew} up into eigenvalues of T_s^2 . If we define $T_1 = [T_s, [T_s, T_{\text{ew}}]]$ and $T_0 = T_{\text{ew}} - T_1$, then $[T_s, [T_s, T_j]] = T_j$, as required. The angular dependence of A_θ leads to a non-trivial r component of the gauge field equations (2.6). In order for them to be satisfied a non-zero A_r field proportional to $[T_s, T_{\text{ew}}]$ is needed.

Additionally, we need to alter the angular dependence of Φ_{10} . Although introducing T_{ew} terms gives a single valued Φ_{10} away from the string, it does not ensure that the eigenstates of T_s^2 which make it up are single valued. If $T_{\text{ew}} = \sigma\sqrt{10}\tau[z]/8$, with $\sigma = \pm 1$, a suitable ansatz is

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{10} &= e^{inT_s\theta} e^{iT_{\text{ew}}\theta} e^{iT'_{\text{ew}}\theta} \sum_{\pm} \left(\psi_u^\pm h_{u\pm}(r) + \psi_d^\pm h_{d\pm}(r) \right) \\
&= \psi_u^+ h_{u+}(r) e^{i\sigma m'\theta} + \psi_u^- h_{u-}(r) e^{-i\sigma m\theta} + \psi_d^+ h_{d+}(r) e^{i\sigma m\theta} + \psi_d^- h_{d-}(r) e^{-i\sigma m'\theta} , \\
A_\theta &= \frac{2na(r)}{gr} T_s + \frac{2b_0(r)}{gr} T_0 + \frac{2b_1(r)}{gr} e^{inT_s\theta} T_1 e^{-inT_s\theta} , \\
A_r &= -i \frac{2k(r)}{g} \frac{8}{3} e^{inT_s\theta} [T_s, T_{\text{ew}}] e^{-inT_s\theta} , \quad A_\mu = 0 \quad \text{otherwise} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.54}$$

where $m = (n-1)/2$, $m' = (n+1)/2$, and

$$\psi_u^\pm = \frac{\eta_u}{2} \left(H_u^0 \mp \sigma H_d^1 \right) , \quad \psi_d^\pm = \frac{\eta_d}{2} \left(H_d^0 \pm \sigma H_u^1 \right) . \tag{2.55}$$

T'_{ew} is chosen to give a single valued Φ_{10} inside the string, without altering the solution (2.20) outside the string. Thus it must be a combination of gluon and photon generators. $T'_{\text{ew}} = \left(\tau[G_8]/\sqrt{3} + \tau[G_3] - \tau[A]/\sqrt{6} \right) / 4$ is a suitable choice.

As with the other strings we expect the back-reaction of the electroweak string on the GUT string to be small. For simplicity we will neglect it. We will also ignore all the cross terms in the potential, and the effects of Φ_{45} (which couples to A_r , but not the other electroweak fields). The field equations for the electroweak Higgs field and the additional gauge fields are

$$h''_{u\pm} + \frac{h'_{u\pm}}{r} \mp \frac{1}{2} \left[2kh'_{u\mp} + \left(k' + \frac{k}{r} \right) h_{u\mp} \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{4} \left(k^2 + \frac{[n(1-a) \pm (1 - \frac{5}{8}b_0)]^2 + (\frac{3}{8}b_1)^2}{r^2} \right) h_{u\pm} + \frac{3(1 - \frac{5}{8}b_0)b_1}{16r^2} h_{u\mp} \\
& = \frac{\lambda_E}{4} \left[\eta_u^2(h_{u+}^2 + h_{u-}^2) + \eta_d^2(h_{d+}^2 + h_{d-}^2) - 2\eta_E^2 \right] h_{u\pm} \\
& \quad + \frac{\lambda'_E}{2} [h_{u+}h_{d-} + h_{d+}h_{u-} - 2] \eta_d^2 h_{d\mp} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.56}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& h''_{d\pm} + \frac{h'_{d\pm}}{r} \pm \frac{1}{2} \left[2kh'_{d\mp} + \left(k' + \frac{k}{r} \right) h_{d\mp} \right] \\
& - \frac{1}{4} \left(k^2 + \frac{[n(1-a) \mp (1 - \frac{5}{8}b_0)]^2 + (\frac{3}{8}b_1)^2}{r^2} \right) h_{d\pm} + \frac{3(1 - \frac{5}{8}b_0)b_1}{16r^2} h_{d\mp} \\
& = \frac{\lambda_E}{4} \left[\eta_u^2(h_{u+}^2 + h_{u-}^2) + \eta_d^2(h_{d+}^2 + h_{d-}^2) - 2\eta_E^2 \right] h_{d\pm} \\
& \quad + \frac{\lambda'_E}{2} [h_{u+}h_{d-} + h_{d+}h_{u-} - 2] \eta_u^2 h_{u\mp} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.57}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& b''_1 - \frac{b'_1}{r} - k^2 b_1 + \frac{8n}{3} \left[2a'k - (1-a) \left(k' - \frac{k}{r} \right) \right] = \\
& -g^2 \left\{ \eta_G^2 [2f_0 f_1 b_0 - (f_0^2 + f_1^2) b_1] + [\eta_u^2 h_{u+} h_{u-} + \eta_d^2 h_{d+} h_{d-}] \frac{8-5b_0}{6} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{1}{4} [\eta_u^2(h_{u+}^2 + h_{u-}^2) + \eta_d^2(h_{d+}^2 + h_{d-}^2)] b_1 \right\} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.58}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& b''_0 - \frac{b'_0}{r} = -\frac{g^2}{31} \left\{ 9\eta_G^2 [2f_0 f_1 b_1 - (f_1^2 + f_0^2) b_0] \right. \\
& \quad + 10 [\eta_u^2(h_{u+}^2 + h_{u-}^2) + \eta_d^2(h_{d+}^2 + h_{d-}^2)] \left(1 - \frac{5}{8}b_0 \right) \\
& \quad - \frac{15}{2} [\eta_u^2 h_{u+} h_{u-} + \eta_d^2 h_{d+} h_{d-}] b_1 \\
& \quad \left. + 10n [\eta_u^2(h_{u+}^2 - h_{u-}^2) - \eta_d^2(h_{d+}^2 - h_{d-}^2)] (1-a) \right\} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.59}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{r^2} \left\{ \left[n^2(1-a)^2 + \left(\frac{3}{8}b_1 \right)^2 \right] k - \frac{3n}{8} (b_1 a' + b'_1(1-a)) \right\} = \\
& -g^2 \left\{ \left(\eta_G^2 f_0^2 + \frac{1}{4} [\eta_u^2(h_{u+}^2 + h_{u-}^2) + \eta_d^2(h_{d+}^2 + h_{d-}^2)] \right) k \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{\eta_u^2}{2} (h_{u+} h'_{u-} - h_{u-} h'_{u+}) - \frac{\eta_d^2}{2} (h_{d+} h'_{d-} - h_{d-} h'_{d+}) \right\} .
\end{aligned} \tag{2.60}$$

The boundary conditions of the above functions are $b_i(0) = h_{u+}(0) = h_{d-}(0) = k(0) = k(\infty) = 0$, $b_i(\infty) = h_{u,d\pm}(\infty) = 1$, and if $n \neq 1$ then $h_{u-}(0) = h_{d+}(0) = 0$ too. The potential terms considered in deriving the above equations are not enough to give the required boundary conditions at $r = \infty$. The effect of Φ_{45} 's coupling to Φ_{10} also needs to be considered, although for simplicity we have neglected it in the derivation of the field equations.

We find that the above equations are independent of σ , the sign of T_{ew} . The energy of the string is also independent, so the most favourable choice of electroweak gauge field is degenerate. As with the W_R -string, if n is even no extra gauge fields are needed. The field equations are then the same as above, but with $k = 0$, $b_i = 1$, $h_{u+} = h_{u-}$ and $h_{d+} = h_{d-}$ everywhere. The resulting electroweak symmetry restoration will be restricted to the string core.

2.6.5 Summary

Electroweak symmetry is restored and electroweak string gauge fields are present around the abelian and the W_R and Y' nonabelian GUT strings. This generally occurs in a region around the string whose size is inversely proportional to the electroweak Higgs VEV, and is much bigger than the string core. If n is a multiple of 5 for the abelian, or 2 for the nonabelian strings, the region is approximately the same as the string core, and there are no extra string gauge fields.

It is also possible that Φ_{10} will wind. For the abelian string its winding number is the closest integer to $n/5$, and hence zero for $n = 1$. For the W_R and Y' nonabelian strings it is $n/2$ for even n . For odd n , different parts of Φ_{10} have different winding numbers, a bit like the corresponding GUT string. They are $(n-1)/2$ and $(n+1)/2$. The remaining two nonabelian strings (X_S and X') have no effect on Φ_{10} at all.

With the Y' -string the electroweak gauge field has angular dependence, which leads to a non-zero radial gauge field component. Also, the choice of electroweak gauge field varies with distance from the string's centre. Both these additional effects are restricted to the string core.

2.7 Other Symmetry Restorations

2.7.1 The Intermediate Symmetry Restoration

So far the effect of the string on the second Higgs field Φ_{45} has been neglected, because it is far less significant. Φ_{45} is in the adjoint representation, and so its covariant derivative takes the form $D_\mu \Phi_{45} = \partial_\mu \Phi_{45} - \frac{1}{2}ig[A_\mu, \Phi_{45}]$. The generator corresponding to the Z' particle (P) commutes with Φ_{45} , so the gauge fields of the abelian string will not stop Φ_{45} from taking its usual vacuum expectation value everywhere. Thus it has no effect on the electroweak symmetry breaking, and gives no additional contribution to the energy. The other strings will give non-vanishing covariant derivatives at infinity. This is avoided by allowing Φ_{45} to wind like a string

$$\Phi_{45} = e^{in\theta T_s} \Phi_{45}^{(0)}(r) e^{-in\theta T_s} , \quad (2.61)$$

where $\Phi_{45}^{(0)}(\infty)$ is equal to the usual vacuum expectation value of Φ_{45} . Conveniently $e^{2\pi n i T_s}$ (for all choices of T_s) and $\Phi_{45}^{(0)}$ commute, so Φ_{45} will be single valued for all n , and no extra gauge terms are needed. As with the Φ_{126} and Φ_{10} fields it is necessary to split Φ_{45} up into eigenstates of T_s^2 . Thus, using the fact that Φ_{45}^{vac} and T_s^2 commute, and that $T_s^3 = \frac{1}{4}T_s$

$$\Phi_{45} = e^{in\theta T_s} \psi_1 s_1(r) e^{-in\theta T_s} + \psi_0 s_0(r) \quad (2.62)$$

with

$$\psi_1 = 2T_s^2 \Phi_{45}^{\text{vac}} - 2T_s \Phi_{45}^{\text{vac}} T_s , \quad (2.63)$$

$$\psi_0 = \Phi_{45}^{\text{vac}} - \psi_1 . \quad (2.64)$$

The field equations for $s_{0,1}(r)$ will be similar to (2.11) and (2.12), with the similar boundary conditions $s_{0,1}(\infty) = 1$ and $s_1(0) = 0$. Since the gauge contribution $(1 - a(r))$ vanishes for $r > r_s$, $\Phi_{45}^{(0)}(r) = \Phi_{45}^{\text{vac}}$ is a solution outside the string. Thus the region of symmetry restoration will be of radius r_s (order $|\Phi_{126}^{\text{vac}}|^{-1}$). This is in contrast to the other Higgs fields, which restore symmetry in regions of order the reciprocal of their own values at $r = \infty$.

After the electroweak symmetry breaking the form of the solution for the Y' -string will be altered slightly due to the effect of the non-zero A_r field. As with Φ_{126} , we expect the effect to be tiny.

2.7.2 The Minimal Energy Choice of T_s

After the first symmetry breaking, there were only two gauge inequivalent possible strings, and the nonabelian strings had the lowest energy. After the second symmetry breaking there are 3 inequivalent types of nonabelian string. The W_R -string has the highest energy, the X_S -string has less, while the X' and Y' strings, which are gauge equivalent under $SU(2)_L$, have the lowest energy. The final symmetry breaking gives an additional contribution to the Y' -string, so the most energetically favourable choice of string generator is made up of $\tau[X_i^{\pm}]$, and does not have any effect on electroweak symmetry. Just because the other strings are not energetically favourable does not mean that they will not form, just that they are less likely to form (but see section 2.8).

2.7.3 Non-gauge field symmetry restoration

Even when a Higgs field is unaffected by a string's gauge fields, it is still possible for symmetry restoration to occur via the potential terms. This has previously been discussed for an abelian string in [30]. For example, before electroweak symmetry restoration occurs and in the absence of strings (so $\Phi_{10} = 0$), the potential takes the form

$$V(\Phi_{126}, \Phi_{45}) = \frac{\lambda_G}{4} (|\Phi_{126}|^2 - \eta_G^2)^2 + \frac{\lambda_M}{4} (|\Phi_{45}|^2 - \eta_M^2)^2 + \lambda'_\times (|\Phi_{126}|^2 - \eta_G^2) (|\Phi_{45}|^2 - \eta_M^2) , \quad (2.65)$$

where η_M is the usual VEV of Φ_{45} , and $|\Phi_{126} \cdot \Phi_{45}|^2$ -like cross terms have been ignored. This is minimised by setting Φ_{126} and Φ_{45} to their usual VEVs. However, in the presence of an abelian string $|\Phi_{126}|$ is proportional to $f(r)$, so writing $|\Phi_{45}| = s(r)\eta_M$, the potential becomes

$$\frac{\lambda_M \eta_M^4}{4} \left(s^2 - 1 - \frac{2\lambda'_\times \eta_G^2 (1 - f^2)}{\lambda_M \eta_M^2} \right)^2 + \frac{\lambda_G \lambda_M - 4(\lambda'_\times)^2}{4\lambda_M} \eta_G^4 (f^2 - 1)^2 , \quad (2.66)$$

which for small r is no longer minimised by $s = 1$, if $\lambda'_\times \neq 0$. Thus if the theory's parameters take appropriate values, $|\Phi_{45}|$ will be lower than usual, or even zero at the string's centre. Alternatively $|\Phi_{45}|$ could be higher than usual there.

If symmetry restoration by this mechanism occurs at all, it will only be in the region $r < r_s$, since $|\Phi_{126}|$ and hence $V(\Phi_{126}, \Phi_{45})$ take their usual values at larger r . Unlike the corresponding symmetry restoration by gauge fields, Φ_{45} will not wind. If there is a very strong $|\Phi_{126} \cdot \Phi_{45}|^2$ term present, Φ_{45} may be forced to wind. Such terms cause Φ_{45} to be orthogonal to Φ_{126} , so it may be more favourable for $\Phi_{45} \cdot \Phi_{126}$ to remain zero than for Φ_{45} to have no angular dependence. When Φ_{10} is not equal to its usual VEV, it could also cause $|\Phi_{45}|$ to vary, although this effect will be very small for most parameter ranges. In this case the symmetry restoration could take place in the larger $r < r_{ew}$ region.

A similar situation can occur with Φ_{10} in the presence of an X' or X_S string. In this case both $|\Phi_{45}|$ and $|\Phi_{126}|$ are lower than usual for $r < r_s$. For nonabelian strings the potential is more complicated since it involves f_1 and f_0 terms, as well as the corresponding Φ_{45} terms. Even inside the string, f_0 and s_0 are non-zero, so the variation of the potential is likely to be less substantial than the abelian case, and hence extra symmetry restoration is less likely to occur. Even if it does, Φ_{10} will take its usual VEV outside the string. Again we do not expect Φ_{10} to wind, unless there is a very large $|\Phi_{10} \cdot \Phi_{45}|^2$ term, or something similar.

2.8 Other Related Grand Unified Theories

Although only one particular $SO(10)$ GUT has been discussed, many of the results apply to different symmetry breakings. Any theory of the form

$$SO(10) \cdots \xrightarrow{\Phi_{126}} \cdots SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times Z_2 \xrightarrow{\Phi_{10}} SU(3)_c \times U(1)_Q \times Z_2 \quad (2.67)$$

could have string solutions of the form (2.7) or (2.8), which would cause electroweak symmetry restoration at low temperatures in the same way as (2.1). The form of the other Higgs fields will not make much difference, as long as they are single valued in the presence of a string (like Φ_{45}). If they are, it will not be necessary to add extra gauge fields, and so Φ_{10} will have the same behaviour as in (2.1).

The Higgs fields which gain their VEVs after Φ_{126} will determine the most energetically favourable choice of string generator, as Φ_{45} did in (2.1). If a GUT of the form (2.67) has

Higgs fields which take non-zero VEVs before Φ_{126} , the choice of T_s will be more restricted. If a generator has already been broken, the formation of the corresponding string will not occur.

One theory of the form (2.67) is

$$\begin{aligned}
SO(10) &\xrightarrow{\Phi_A} SU(5) \times U(1)_P \xrightarrow{\Phi_{45}} SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)_P \\
&\xrightarrow{\Phi_{126}} SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times Z_2 \\
&\xrightarrow{\Phi_{10}} SU(3)_c \times U(1)_Q \times Z_2 .
\end{aligned} \tag{2.68}$$

The Φ_A Higgs field transforms under either the **45** or **210** representation of $SO(10)$, and is an $SU(5)$ singlet. Unlike (2.1), only abelian strings can form in this theory, since the only generator that Φ_{126} breaks is P . This means that electroweak symmetry restoration will always occur in the presence of a string. Φ_A and Φ_{45} will both take their usual VEVs, so the only symmetries restored in the string core will be $U(1)_P$, and the electroweak symmetry. Another interesting feature of this theory is that strings can form at energies close to the electroweak scale, and so r_s could be of similar size to r_{ew} , although still smaller. This string is a candidate for defect mediated electroweak baryogenesis [31]. Switching the second and third symmetry breakings also gives a theory with similar solutions.

A different unifying gauge group (instead of $SO(10)$), with similar properties to (2.68) is $SU(5) \times U(1)_P$. It was suggested in ref. [11], and has two independent gauge coupling constants. Unlike (2.68), strings of all winding numbers will be topologically stable, since $U(1)_P$ is broken to Z instead of Z_2 . They could still decay by splitting into several strings with lower winding numbers. The field equations for the electroweak fields will be the same as (2.40) and (2.41), but with $1/5$ the ratio of the two couplings instead of just $1/5$. If the ratio is α , then Φ_{10} 's winding number will be the nearest integer to $\alpha n/5$ (with half integers rounded towards zero), so if $|\alpha| > \frac{5}{2}$, Φ_{10} will always wind in the presence of a string.

A theory which is substantially different from (2.1) starts with the symmetry breaking $SO(10) \xrightarrow{\Phi_{54}} SU(4) \times SU(2)^2 \times Z_2^C$. The Z_2^C symmetry is not the Z_2 symmetry in (2.67). Φ_{10} is not invariant under it, so it must be broken during or before the electroweak symmetry breaking. This will lead to formation of domain walls, and so such a theory will have

substantially different properties to (2.1), and is ruled out cosmologically [16].

Another type of theory closely related to (2.67) occurs when Φ_{126} is replaced by Φ_{16} , where the usual VEV of Φ_{16} is proportional to e_1 . The gauge fields all gain masses in the same way as the equivalent theory involving Φ_{126} , but there will be no discrete Z_2 symmetry, so there will be no topological strings. However, solutions of the form (2.7,2.8) can still form, although since $e^{2\pi i n T_s}$ will need to map e_1 to e_1 to give a single valued Φ_{16} , only solutions with even n will occur. Of course, if such strings are to be observed, they will need to be stable, which will only happen for certain values of the theory's parameters. Embedded defects similar to these have been discussed previously [36, 38].

Yet another set of related theories can be obtained from (2.1) by choosing a different VEV of Φ_{45} . Adding a multiple of P to it will not affect any of the $SU(5)$ symmetry breaking since all the $SU(5)$ fields commute with it, thus it will not alter which gauge bosons become superheavy. It will alter the sizes of the masses of the $SO(10)$ fields. The most energetically favoured choice of nonabelian string will be the one with the lowest energy contribution at the Φ_{45} symmetry breaking. This will be the one whose string generator corresponds to gauge fields with the lowest mass. So by choosing Φ_{45} appropriately, a different nonabelian string could become most favourable. The X' and Y' strings are gauge equivalent at this stage, but since the X' string contributes nothing at the electroweak symmetry breaking, it will always be more favourable than the Y' string. Thus any of the X' , X_S or W_R -strings could be energetically favourable. If it is the W_R -string, then it is most probable that electroweak symmetry restoration will occur. The same sort of freedom does not exist with Φ_{126} and Φ_{10} , since any such change will give different fermion mass terms, and radically alter the theory.

2.9 Conclusions

In this chapter we have uncovered a very rich microstructure for $SO(10)$ cosmic strings. In particular, we have found four nonabelian strings as well as one abelian string. We have examined the effect of the strings on the subsequent symmetry breakings. Our results are summarised in the table

Gauge field	Type	Symmetry restoration			EW fields	EW windings
		$SO(10)$	$SU(5)$	EW		
Z'	$U(1)$	yes	no	yes	Z	$\pm(n/5 - \{n/5\})$
$X_{S_i}^\pm$	$SU(2)$	partial	partial	no	—	0
$X'_i{}^\pm$	$SU(2)$	partial	partial	no	—	0
$W_R^\pm$	$SU(2)$	partial	partial	yes	$W_L^\pm$	$\pm(n/2 \pm \{n/2\})$
$Y_i{}^\pm$	$SU(2)$	partial	partial	yes	Z (+ others)	$\pm(n/2 \pm \{n/2\})$

We have defined $\{x\}$ to be the fractional part of x , with $|\{x\}| \leq 1/2$. It seems that electroweak symmetry restoration by GUT strings is quite likely. The exact results are dependent on the details of the theory and the choice of string generator. For the $SO(10)$ theory considered, electroweak symmetry is restored for the abelian string, and half the possible nonabelian strings, although the most energetically favourable of these does not restore electroweak symmetry. However, other closely related $SO(10)$ GUTs have different minimal energy string solutions, which will restore the symmetry, such as (2.68), or (2.1) with a different choice of Φ_{45} . Thus our results generalise to a range of theories.

The size of the region of electroweak symmetry restoration for the topologically stable ($n = 1$) strings is determined by the electroweak scale, and is much larger than the string core. For nonabelian strings, with higher winding number, the region will be the same if they are topologically equivalent to the $n = 1$ string (i.e. odd n), and restricted to the string core if they are topologically equivalent to the vacuum (i.e. even n). There is no such distinction between topological and non-topological abelian strings, which restore symmetry in the larger region if the winding number is not a multiple of 5. Some of the $SU(5)$ symmetry is also restored by all of the nonabelian strings, but not the abelian string. This is only within the string core, irrespective of the string winding number, and since Φ_{45} is not zero there, the restoration is only partial.

For any choice of T_s , ignoring possible potential driven symmetry restoration, the GUT will not be fully restored at the string's centre. All the nonabelian strings have non-zero (although smaller than usual) Φ_{126} and Φ_{45} fields at their centre, so the $SO(10)$ (apart from the electroweak fields) symmetry is only partially restored inside the string. For the abelian

string Φ_{126} is zero in the string core, but Φ_{45} takes its usual value, so with the exception of $U(1)_P$, most of the $SO(10)$ symmetry is broken. The resulting gauge boson masses are smaller, but still superheavy. However, for the abelian and the W_R and Y' nonabelian strings, there is almost full restoration of electroweak symmetry in a larger region than the string core.

It is also possible for additional symmetry to be restored by the potential terms of the theory. However this is far less significant than that arising from the string gauge field, and will require some tuning of parameters.

Although the profile of the electroweak Higgs field obeys the same boundary conditions as a string, its exact form has a closer resemblance to a string with non-integer winding number. For the abelian string the actual winding number of Φ_{10} is less than that of the GUT string (about $1/5$). The same is true for the nonabelian string, which has the winding number (or numbers if n is odd) of Φ_{10} about $1/2$ that of the string itself. The winding of the electroweak Higgs field has implications for the existence of massless fermion currents, as we will discuss in chapter 3.

In our analysis we have only considered terms occurring in the tree level Lagrangian. One-loop corrections are likely to induce couplings between the nonabelian string field and the electroweak Higgs. This may result in electroweak symmetry restoration around the X' and X_S strings. However, the electroweak Higgs field is unlikely to wind in this region.

Chapter 3

A Fermion Zero Mode Index Theorem

3.1 Introduction

It has been realised in the past few years that many cosmologically significant effects take place inside the core of strings [10]. One example is the formation of currents. These may provide a method of detecting strings. If they form at high energy scales, and are charged, the resulting electromagnetic field may be detectable [11]. It is also possible that currents will allow vortons (stable string loops) to exist. This may conflict with observations, in which case the corresponding theory can be ruled out [28]. There are several processes which can create currents on strings. These include interaction with the plasma, and collisions between cosmic strings. Charged currents can also be generated by magnetic or electric fields.

In this chapter we investigate massless fermion currents. We do this by looking for non-trivial zero energy fermion solutions, or zero modes [26]. If they exist it is trivial to show that the string has light-like fermion currents (see section 1.6).

As has been shown in chapter 2, subsequent phase transitions can have a considerable effect on the microphysics of cosmic strings. Zero modes on cosmic strings can be both created [32] and destroyed, thus creating or destroying the currents on the strings. If the

current is destroyed by subsequent microphysical processes, then loops of cosmic string will no longer be stable, and vorton bounds on the theory will be evaded. In this chapter we discuss the fate of vortons and string superconductivity as the strings encounter subsequent phase transitions in a systematic fashion.

In section 3.2 we derive an index theorem giving the number of zero modes for a general mass matrix. Whilst index theorems have been derived before [39, 40] they have been more restrictive in their validity and have only been able to determine the difference in right-moving and left-moving zero modes. Our index theorem has much more general applicability and can give a bound on the number of zero modes.

In section 3.3 we discuss the existence of zero modes on all the different strings formed at the breaking of the $SO(10)$ Grand Unified symmetry discussed in chapter 2. We show that at the electroweak phase transition zero modes can acquire a small mass which leads to dissipation of the string current. This allows vortons to decay and weakens the cosmological bounds on such models [41].

In section 3.4 we consider the implications of spectral flow. An important feature that allows zero modes to be removed is the presence of a massless particle (possibly another zero mode) that mixes with the zero mode after the transition. The implications of such couplings for current build up before the transition are also considered.

We generalise some of the results of section 3.3 to other related theories in section 3.5. In other models the zero modes survive subsequent transitions allowing the associated vortons to persist. Such behaviour is displayed by a toy model discussed in section 3.6, where we explicitly construct the zero mode solutions after the symmetry breaking. Finally, we summarise our conclusions in section 3.7.

3.2 Zero Mode Index

Cosmic strings form in models with vacuum manifolds which are not simply connected. For example in a $U(1)$ model, with potential $(|\phi|^2 - \eta^2)^2$, stable solutions exist with $\phi = \eta e^{i\theta}$ at $r = \infty$. In order for the total energy to be finite, a non-zero gauge field is needed to give a vanishing covariant derivative at $r = \infty$. In a more general theory, involving a larger

group, G , string solutions take the form

$$\phi(r, \theta) = e^{iT_s \theta} \phi(r) \quad , \quad A_\theta = \frac{1}{er} T(r) \quad , \quad (3.1)$$

where T_s is a generator of G that is broken by ϕ . The choice of T_s is restricted by the fact that ϕ must be single valued. $\phi(r)$ is equal to the usual VEV of ϕ at $r = \infty$, and must be regular at $r = 0$. $T(r)$ obeys $T(0) = 0$, $T(\infty) = T_s$.

In a general theory, T_s will affect different components of ϕ differently. This means that the various parts of ϕ can have a wide range of winding numbers. In a theory with multiple phase transitions, the additional Higgs fields will be affected in the same way. It may also be necessary to alter T_s at phase transitions to make the new Higgs fields single valued.

In a theory with n_f two-component fermions, the fermionic part of the Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{fermions}} = \bar{\psi}_\alpha i \sigma^\mu D_\mu \psi_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} i \bar{\psi}_\alpha M_{\alpha\beta} \psi_\beta^c + (\text{h. c.}) \quad , \quad (3.2)$$

where $\psi_\beta^c = i \sigma^2 \psi_\beta^*$. If $M_{\alpha\beta}$ depends on θ , as would be expected if $M_{\alpha\beta}$ arose from the Higgs field of the string, then it is possible that the field equations will have non-trivial zero energy solutions. Solutions with only r and θ dependence can be split up into eigenstates of σ^3 : ψ_α^L , ψ_α^R . Such solutions have zero energy. If we solve the equations of motion in the background of a cosmic string, the field equations become

$$e^{i\theta} \left(\partial_r + \frac{i}{r} \partial_\theta + e A_\theta \right) \psi_\alpha^L + M_{\alpha\beta} \psi_\beta^{L*} = 0 \quad , \quad (3.3)$$

$$e^{-i\theta} \left(\partial_r - \frac{i}{r} \partial_\theta - e A_\theta \right) \psi_\alpha^R - M_{\alpha\beta} \psi_\beta^{R*} = 0 \quad , \quad (3.4)$$

where A_θ is the string gauge field. If z and t dependence is added to the solutions they will correspond to currents flowing along the string. Their direction is left for those corresponding to (3.3), and right for (3.4). In order to be physically relevant the solutions must be normalisable. Let N_L and N_R be the number of such solutions to (3.3) and (3.4) respectively. We attempt to derive an expression for them by generalising the analysis in ref. [26], which involves removing the θ dependence of the problem, and then considering solutions near $r = \infty$ and $r = 0$.

Choose the ψ_α s to be eigenstates of the string gauge field, with eigenvalues q_α . The q_α will depend on the fermion charges and the winding numbers of the various components of

the Higgs fields. Since the mass terms in (3.2) are gauge invariant, the angular dependence of the mass matrix must be

$$M_{\alpha\beta}(r, \theta) = C_{\alpha\beta}(r) e^{i(q_\alpha + q_\beta)\theta} \quad (\text{no summation}) . \quad (3.5)$$

The θ dependence can also be factored out of the ψ_α s.

$$\psi_\alpha^L = e^{i(q_\alpha - \frac{1}{2})\theta} (U_\alpha^L(r) e^{il\theta} + V_\alpha^{L*}(r) e^{-il\theta}) , \quad (3.6)$$

$$\psi_\alpha^R = e^{i(q_\alpha + \frac{1}{2})\theta} (U_\alpha^R(r) e^{il\theta} + V_\alpha^{R*}(r) e^{-il\theta}) . \quad (3.7)$$

l can take any value which gives a single valued ψ . Thus l is integer or half-integer when the q_α are half-integer or integer respectively.

First consider left moving zero modes. Putting (3.5,3.7) into (3.3) gives equations for U_α^L and V_α^L . As $r \rightarrow \infty$, $C_{\alpha\beta} = O(1)$ and $eA_\theta \rightarrow T_s/r$, so

$$\left(\partial_r + \frac{1}{2r} - \frac{l}{r} \right) U_\alpha^L + C_{\alpha\beta}(\infty) V_\beta^L = 0 , \quad (3.8)$$

$$\left(\partial_r + \frac{1}{2r} + \frac{l}{r} \right) V_\alpha^L + C_{\alpha\beta}(\infty) U_\beta^L = 0 . \quad (3.9)$$

Diagonalising $C_{\alpha\beta}$, we find that the $2n_f$ solutions to these equations are modified Bessel functions. To leading order they are proportional to $e^{\pm\lambda_i r}/\sqrt{r}$, where λ_i are $C_{\alpha\beta}$'s eigenvalues. Half of these large r solutions are normalisable at $r = \infty$. If $\lambda_i = 0$ the corresponding solutions are $r^{\pm l - 1/2}$. If $l \neq 0$ (which is certain if the q_α are not half integer), half of these solutions are acceptable. If $l = 0$ the states corresponding to the solutions are physical, but are not localised to the string, and so are not of interest to us.

Thus if all $\lambda_i \neq 0$ or the q_α are not half integer, exactly n_f of the large r solutions are normalisable at $r = \infty$. We will assume that this is the case in the following analysis. If these conditions do not hold, the index theorem derived below may overestimate the number of allowed solutions, and so will only provide an upper bound for the number of zero mode solutions.

The Higgs fields, and hence $M_{\alpha\beta}$, are regular at the origin, so as $r \rightarrow 0$, $C_{\alpha\beta} = O(1)$, and $eA_\theta = O(r)$. Thus

$$\left(\partial_r - \frac{q_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} + l}{r} \right) U_\alpha^L + C_{\alpha\beta} V_\beta^L = 0 , \quad (3.10)$$

$$\left(\partial_r - \frac{q_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} - l}{r}\right) V_\alpha^L + C_{\alpha\beta} U_\beta^L = 0 . \quad (3.11)$$

To leading order, the small r solutions are

$$\begin{aligned} U_\alpha^L &\sim r^{q_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} + l} , \\ V_\beta^L &\sim O(1) r^{q_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} + l} \quad \forall \beta , \\ U_\beta^L &\sim O(1) r^{q_\alpha + \frac{3}{2} + l} \quad \forall \beta \neq \alpha , \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

where each choice of $\alpha = 1 \dots n_f$ gives one complex solution, and

$$\begin{aligned} V_\alpha^L &\sim r^{q_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} - l} , \\ U_\beta^L &\sim O(1) r^{q_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} - l} \quad \forall \beta , \\ V_\beta^L &\sim O(1) r^{q_\alpha + \frac{3}{2} - l} \quad \forall \beta \neq \alpha . \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

This gives a total of $2n_f$ independent complex solutions. For given l and α , (3.12) will be normalisable (for small r) if $l \geq -q_\alpha + 1/2$. If $l \leq q_\alpha - 1/2$ then (3.13) will be normalisable. Thus for a given l the number of well behaved small r solutions is

$$N_L^0(l) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n_f} \mathbf{I} \left[l \leq q_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} \right] + \mathbf{I} \left[l \geq -q_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \right] \quad (3.14)$$

where $\mathbf{I}[X]$ equals 1 if X is true, and 0 if X is false. What we are actually interested in is the number of solutions that are normalisable for all r ($N_L(l)$). Each such solution will be equal to some combination of the n_f well behaved solutions to (3.8,3.9) at large r , and a combination of the $N_L^0(l)$ suitable solutions to (3.10,3.11) for small r . If there are only n_f , or less, suitable small r solutions, then in general any combination of the large r solutions will not be well behaved at $r = 0$. If there are $n_f + k$ suitable small r solutions, then k independent combinations of the large r solutions will be well behaved everywhere. It may be possible to get more solutions by fine tuning the theory, in which case the index derived would be a lower bound.

The number of normalisable solutions for a given l is

$$N_L(l) = \left[N_L^0(l) - n_f \right]_+ , \quad (3.15)$$

where $[x]_+$ is defined to be equal to zero if $x < 0$, and x if $x \geq 0$.

This is not true if the equations obtained from (3.3) can be split into several independent sets. This will occur when $M_{\alpha\beta}$ is a direct sum of mass matrices. In this case the mass matrix can be split up into smaller matrices, which can be analysed individually. Even when $M_{\alpha\beta}$ is not a direct sum of other matrices, it may still be possible to split the equations into two independent sets. This case will be considered separately later.

Since U_α^L and V_α^L are determined by real equations, each complex solution gives two real solutions. This suggests that the total number of left moving zero modes, N_L , is $2 \sum_l N_L(l)$. However, as can be seen from (3.7), solutions for $l = k$ and $l = -k$ are equal. For $l = 0$ $U_\alpha^L = \pm V_\alpha^L$, so one of ψ_α^L 's solutions is zero. Thus the total number of independent real solutions is

$$N_L = \sum_l N_L(l) = \sum_l \left[\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n_f} \left(\text{I} \left[l \leq q_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} \right] + \text{I} \left[l \geq -q_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \right] \right) - n_f \right]_+ . \quad (3.16)$$

The summation is over all values of l that give single valued ψ . Since all the Higgs fields which make up $M_{\alpha\beta}$ are single valued, (3.5) implies all q_α or all $q_\alpha - 1/2$ are integers (assuming $M_{\alpha\beta}$ is not a direct sum of smaller matrices), in which case respectively $l - 1/2$ or l is an integer.

A similar analysis can be applied to right moving zero modes. For large r the behaviour is the same. For small r , solutions are well behaved if $l \geq q_\alpha + 1/2$ or $l \leq -q_\alpha - 1/2$. This gives

$$N_R = \sum_l N_R(l) = \sum_l \left[\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n_f} \left(\text{I} \left[l \leq -q_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} \right] + \text{I} \left[l \geq q_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \right] \right) - n_f \right]_+ . \quad (3.17)$$

If q_α is positive then one or two of the $\text{I}[\dots]$ terms in (3.16) will be non-zero. If q_α is negative, one or zero of them will be non-zero. By splitting q_α into positive and negative eigenvalues, and ordering them, (3.16) and (3.17) can be simplified. If there are n_+ positive and n_- negative q_α s then, after reordering, $q_\alpha = (q_1^+, q_2^+ \dots q_{n_+}^+, q_1^-, q_2^- \dots q_{n_-}^-, 0 \dots 0)$, where $q_j^+ > 0$, $q_j^- < 0$. Clearly if the string gauge eigenvalues are not integer, there are no zeros. The $\text{I}[\dots]$ terms in (3.16) and (3.17) can be combined to give

$$N_L = \sum_l \left[\sum_{j=1}^{n_+} \text{I} \left[-q_j^+ + \frac{1}{2} \leq l \leq q_j^+ - \frac{1}{2} \right] - \sum_{j=1}^{n_-} \text{I} \left[q_j^- - \frac{1}{2} < l < -q_j^- + \frac{1}{2} \right] \right]_+ , \quad (3.18)$$

$$N_R = \sum_l \left[\sum_{j=1}^{n_-} \mathbf{I} \left[q_j^- + \frac{1}{2} \leq l \leq -q_j^- - \frac{1}{2} \right] - \sum_{j=1}^{n_+} \mathbf{I} \left[-q_j^+ - \frac{1}{2} < l < q_j^+ + \frac{1}{2} \right] \right]_+ . \quad (3.19)$$

These expressions can be further simplified if the eigenvalues are ordered. If $q_1^+ \geq q_2^+ \geq \dots \geq q_{n_+}^+ > 0$ and $q_1^- \leq q_2^- \leq \dots \leq q_{n_-}^- < 0$, it is possible to evaluate the l summation by considering cancellation of the q_j^+ and q_j^- terms. This gives

$$N_L = \sum_{j=1}^{\min(n_-, n_+)} 2 \left[q_j^+ + q_j^- \right]_+ + \sum_{j=n_-+1}^{n_+} 2q_j^+ , \quad (3.20)$$

$$N_R = \sum_{j=1}^{\min(n_-, n_+)} 2 \left[-q_j^- - q_j^+ \right]_+ - \sum_{j=n_++1}^{n_-} 2q_j^- . \quad (3.21)$$

Taking the difference of these results gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_\Delta &= N_L - N_R \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\min(n_-, n_+)} 2(q_j^+ + q_j^-) + \sum_{j=n_-+1}^{n_+} 2q_j^+ + \sum_{j=n_++1}^{n_-} 2q_j^- \\ &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n_f} 2q_\alpha = \frac{1}{2\pi i} [\ln \det M]_{\theta=0}^{2\pi} . \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

This is in agreement with other index theorems obtained elsewhere [39, 40]. The other index theorems were obtained by a different method and only gave $\mathcal{I}_\Delta$, not N_L and N_R .

The total number of zero modes is

$$\mathcal{I} = N_L + N_R = \sum_{j=1}^{\min(n_-, n_+)} 2 \left| q_j^+ + q_j^- \right| + \sum_{j=n_-+1}^{n_+} 2q_j^+ - \sum_{j=n_++1}^{n_-} 2q_j^- , \quad (3.23)$$

where only one of the last 2 terms contributes, depending on whether n_+ or n_- is bigger. This is also true of (3.22) and (3.20, 3.21).

If $\mathcal{I}$ is to be zero, then for every positive q_α there must be one negative q_β with the same magnitude. If every fermion field couples to a Higgs field with winding number zero, this will be the case.

The above approach fails if $C_{\alpha\beta}$ is of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & A_{\alpha\beta} \\ B_{\alpha\beta} & 0 \end{pmatrix} . \quad (3.24)$$

If $C_{\alpha\beta}$ is assumed to have no zero eigenvalues, $A_{\alpha\beta}$ and $B_{\alpha\beta}$ are both $n \times n$ matrices, where $n = n_f/2$. In this case when (3.5,3.7) are substituted into (3.3), two independent sets of equations are obtained. Expressions for N_L and N_R can found by considering just one set of these solutions. Putting

$$\psi_\alpha^L = e^{i(q_\alpha - \frac{1}{2})} \begin{cases} U_\alpha^L(r) e^{il\theta} & \alpha = 1 \dots n \\ V_\alpha^{L*}(r) e^{-il\theta} & \alpha = n + 1 \dots n_f \end{cases} \quad (3.25)$$

and (3.5) into (3.3) gives (3.8,3.9) for large r and (3.10,3.11) for small r , but with a more restricted range on the indices. In this case the allowed values of l need no longer be integers or half-integers, but the difference between any 2 values is still an integer. For large r , n of the n_f complex solutions are normalisable. For a given l at small r , there is one normalisable solution for each q_α satisfying $l \geq -q_\alpha + 1/2$ ($\alpha = 1 \dots n$) or $l \leq q_\alpha - 1/2$ ($\alpha = n + 1 \dots n_f$).

Matching the solutions for large and small r gives

$$N_L(l) = \left[\sum_{\alpha=1}^n \left(\text{I} \left[l \leq q_{\alpha+n} - \frac{1}{2} \right] + \text{I} \left[l \geq -q_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \right] \right) - n \right]_+ . \quad (3.26)$$

The solutions for different l are independent (unlike the previously considered cases), so the total number of real solutions (N_L) is just twice the number of complex solutions, thus $N_L = 2 \sum_l N_L(l)$. A similar expression can be obtained for N_R .

The $\text{I}[\dots]$ terms in (3.26) can be combined. Defining $q_j^B = -q_j$ and $q_j^A = q_{j+n}$ for $j = 1 \dots n$, (3.26) and the corresponding expression for N_R , become

$$N_L = 2 \sum_l \left[\sum_{j=1}^n \left(\text{I} \left[-q_j^B + \frac{1}{2} \leq l \leq q_j^A - \frac{1}{2} \right] - \text{I} \left[q_j^A - \frac{1}{2} < l < -q_j^B + \frac{1}{2} \right] \right) \right]_+ , \quad (3.27)$$

$$N_R = 2 \sum_l \left[\sum_{j=1}^n \left(\text{I} \left[q_j^A + \frac{1}{2} \leq l \leq -q_j^B - \frac{1}{2} \right] - \text{I} \left[-q_j^B - \frac{1}{2} < l < q_j^A + \frac{1}{2} \right] \right) \right]_+ . \quad (3.28)$$

If the string gauge eigenvalues are reordered, so that $q_1^A \geq \dots \geq q_n^A$ and $q_1^B \leq \dots \leq q_n^B$, the expressions reduce to

$$N_L = \sum_{j=1}^n 2 \left[q_j^A + q_j^B \right]_+ , \quad (3.29)$$

$$N_R = \sum_{j=1}^n 2 \left[-q_j^B - q_j^A \right]_+ , \quad (3.30)$$

which are similar to (3.20) and (3.21), with $n_+ = n_- = n$. This is not identical to the previous result, since the q_α are divided up differently.

When there are just two fermion fields involved, all the results reduce to

$$\mathcal{I}_\Delta = 2(q_1 + q_2) , \quad (3.31)$$

$$\mathcal{I} = |\mathcal{I}_\Delta| . \quad (3.32)$$

3.3 Fermion Zero Modes on $SO(10)$ Cosmic Strings

One example of a phenomenologically credible grand unified theory (GUT) has the symmetry breaking

$$SO(10) \xrightarrow{\Phi_{126}} SU(5) \times Z_2 \quad (3.33)$$

$$\xrightarrow{\Phi_{45}} SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times Z_2 \quad (3.34)$$

$$\xrightarrow{\Phi_{10}} SU(3)_c \times U(1)_Q \times Z_2 . \quad (3.35)$$

This theory was discussed in greater detail in chapter 2. Appendix A contains details of the fermion fields and their mass terms. A significant feature of its fermions are the massive neutrinos. It has been conjectured that rather than being massless, the left-handed neutrino actually has a very small mass. It would then provide a dark matter candidate. Recent experimental results suggest that neutrinos are massive, giving further credibility to the above model and those like it [42]. We can use these results to obtain an estimate of the right-handed neutrino mass and the $SO(10)$ breaking scale. We will consider the top quark/tauon family, since renormalisation effects (which we will neglect) are likely to be less significant. The left-handed neutrino mass is approximately equal to $m_t^2/m_{\nu(\tau R)}$. The results of ref. [42] indicate that ν_μ mixes with another type of neutrino which has a different mass, thus at least one of these neutrinos must be massive. Assuming the detected mass difference is the result of $\nu_\tau \leftrightarrow \nu_\mu$ mixing, $\Delta m^2 = m_{\nu(\tau L)}^2 - m_{\nu(\mu L)}^2 = (5 \times 10^{-4} - 6 \times 10^{-3})\text{eV}^2$. We will assume that $m_{\nu(\mu)} \ll m_{\nu(\tau)}$, and so $m_{\nu(\tau R)}^2 \approx m_t^4/\Delta m^2$.

Taking $m_t = (180 \pm 12)\text{GeV}$ [43], we obtain $m_{\nu(\tau R)} \approx (4 - 16) \times 10^{14}\text{GeV}$, suggesting that the ratio of the grand unification and electroweak scales is approximately $(2 - 9) \times 10^{12}$.

We will now apply the results of the previous section to the various cosmic strings of this model. In several cases the string Higgs field (Φ_{126}) causes the electroweak Higgs field (Φ_{10}) to take a string-like solution. It is then possible that Φ_{10} , like Φ_{126} will give rise to fermion zero modes [11, 32, 44]. The fermionic part of this theory's Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{fermions}} = \bar{\Psi}_L i\sigma^\mu D_\mu \Psi_L - \frac{1}{2}ig_E \bar{\Psi}_L \Phi_{10} \Psi_L^c - \frac{1}{2}ig_G \bar{\Psi}_L \Phi_{126} \Psi_L^c + (\text{h. c.}) , \quad (3.36)$$

where $\sigma^\mu = (-I, \sigma^i)$ since Ψ_L is a two component spinor. For simplicity we will only consider one family of fermions. Varying $\bar{\Psi}_L$ in (3.36) gives the field equations

$$i\sigma^\mu D_\mu \Psi_L - ig_E \Phi_{10} i\sigma^2 \Psi_L^* - ig_G \Phi_{126} i\sigma^2 \Psi_L^* = 0 . \quad (3.37)$$

In section 3.2, an expression for the number of zero mode solutions to this type of equation was derived. The numbers and types of fermion zero modes can easily be found once (3.36) is put into the same form as (3.2). This involves calculating the mass matrix, M , for each type of string, and splitting it up into irreducible parts. Then the fermion fields coupling to each part, ψ , need to be expressed in terms of eigenstates of T_s . The eigenvalues of these states are then divided into two sets and inserted into the appropriate expressions (3.20,3.21,3.23) and (3.29,3.30). The way the eigenvalues are divided up depends on the mass matrix. Usually they will be split into positive and negative eigenvalues (see remarks before (3.20)), but if the mass matrix has the same type of degeneracy as (3.24), they are split according to which part of the matrix they couple to (see remarks before and after (3.27,3.28)).

3.3.1 Zero Modes for the Abelian String

High Temperature Neutrino Zero Modes

At high temperatures Φ_{10} is zero, and so with the exception of ν^c , none of the fermion fields are affected by Higgs fields. Thus the relevant part of the theory is just a two-component spinor coupling to an abelian string. This case has been discussed in section 1.6, and in greater detail in ref. [26].

There are $|n|$ normalisable zero energy solutions. If z and t dependence are added, they all move to the left along the string if $n > 0$. If $n < 0$ they move to the right. Thus conjugate neutrino zero modes always exist at high temperatures in the presence of an abelian string. For $r > r_s$ (assuming, for simplicity, that all coupling constants are approximately 1) the solutions decrease exponentially, so the zero modes are confined to the string core.

High Temperature Non-Neutrino Zero Modes

Although there is no Higgs field acting on the other fermion fields, it is possible for zero modes to be generated by the string gauge fields, as discussed by Stern and Yajnik [44]. The index theorem discussed in section 3.2 does not apply in this case, since it assumes that all the fermions considered couple to Higgs fields.

Labelling the upper and lower components of the fermion fields λ^L and λ^R respectively (as in (3.3,3.4)), where $\lambda = u_i, d_i^c$, etc. (not ν^c), the fermion field equations reduce to

$$\left(\partial_r + \sigma^{L,R} \left[\frac{i}{r} \partial_\theta + p_\lambda n \frac{a(r)}{r} \right] \right) \lambda^{L,R} = 0 , \quad (3.38)$$

where $\sigma^{L,R} = \pm 1$, according to which component is being used. p_λ is the eigenvalue of the field with respect to $P/10$: $p_{e-} = p_\nu = p_{d_i^c} = -3/10$, $p_{u_i^c} = p_{u_i} = p_{d_i} = p_{e+} = 1/10$. There are normalisable solutions if $|np_\lambda| > 1$, all of which can be found analytically. The number of solutions is equal to the highest integer that is less than $|np_\lambda|$. Thus $|n|$ must be at least 4 for any zero modes of this type to exist. If the only stable strings have winding number 1, then only conjugate neutrino zero modes will be present at high temperatures around an abelian string.

Low Temperature Non-Neutrino Zero Modes

At lower temperatures Φ_{10} is non-zero and couples to all the fermion fields. Now none of the particles are massless, and all zero modes can be found using the index theorem. The electroweak phase transition changes the string generator used in section 3.2 to $T_s + T_{ew}$, with T_{ew} defined in section 2.6.1. Before applying the theorem, the mass matrix needs to be split into irreducible parts. In this case there are 8 of them, one for each particle type.

With the exception of the neutrino fields, there is just one Higgs field coupling to them. The Lagrangians for the non-neutrino fields are then (3.2), with

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_\lambda h_\lambda(r) e^{\pm i m \theta} \\ m_\lambda h_\lambda(r) e^{\pm i m \theta} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^c \\ \lambda \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.39)$$

where λ can be d_i , u_i , or e^- . We have defined $m_u = g_E \eta_u / 4$, $m_e = m_d = g_E \eta_d / 4$, and $h_e(r) = h_d(r)$. The upper sign is taken for the u_i and u_i^c fields, which couple to the H_u^0 component of Φ_{10} . The lower sign applies for the d_i , d_i^c and $e^\pm$ fields, since they couple to the H_d^0 component. Applying (3.32) reveals that there are $2|m|$ solutions per particle type ($14|m|$ total, not counting neutrinos). The field equations have previously been discussed in ref. [44].

If n is not a multiple of 5, the solutions decay exponentially outside $r = r_{\text{ew}}$. When n is a multiple of 5 (in which case $m = n/5$), they decay outside $r = r_s$. Thus the zero modes are confined to the region of symmetry restoration. The difference in sign between up and down quarks in (3.39) has physical significance when z and t dependence are added to the solutions. The up quark currents flow in the opposite direction to the down quark and electron currents.

Low Temperature Neutrino Zero Modes

The situation is more complex for the neutrino fields since they are affected by two Higgs fields at the same time. In this case (3.39) is replaced by

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} m_G f(r) e^{i n \theta} & m_u h_u(r) e^{i m \theta} \\ m_u h_u(r) e^{i m \theta} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi = \begin{pmatrix} \nu^c \\ \nu \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.40)$$

where $m_G = g_G \eta_G$. This case is more complex than (3.39), although (3.32) still applies. It implies there are $2|m|$ zero modes. Surprisingly this does not depend directly on n . As with the other particle zero modes, they will be confined to the region of symmetry restoration. They move left if $m > 0$ (which only happens if $n \geq 3$), or right if $m < 0$ ($n \leq -3$).

Considering all fermions, there are a total of $16|m|$ zero modes, half of which are left moving, half are right moving. For a topologically stable string $m = 0$, so there are no

zero electroweak modes. In the case of the neutrinos this is slightly surprising, since at higher temperatures when Φ_{10} is zero, the abelian string does have neutrino zero modes. Intuitively, since $\Phi_{10} \sim (\eta_E/\eta_G)\Phi_{126} \sim 10^{-14}\Phi_{126}$, the situation could be expected to be the same for lower temperatures.

Since $|2m| < |n|$, some of the neutrino zero modes will be destroyed by the electroweak phase transition. For a stable $n = 1$ string all zero modes are destroyed. Thus, since higher n strings usually decay, there are zero modes before, but not after the electroweak phase transition. It is expected that the neutral current in the string will disperse [45] in which case any vortons formed will dissipate after about 10^{-10} sec [41]. Before the electroweak phase transition from about $10^{10}\text{GeV} - 10^2\text{GeV}$ the universe would undergo a period of matter domination. Once the vortons dissipate there would be some reheating of the universe. However the electroweak interactions and physics below the phase transition would be unaffected.

3.3.2 Zero Modes of the SU(2) Strings

There are two additional complications with nonabelian strings. Firstly the particle states are not eigenstates of the string generator, although this is easily solved by re-expressing the problem in terms of gauge eigenstates. Secondly, there are effectively twice as many Higgs fields, since each Higgs field has parts with two different winding numbers and different profiles.

High Temperature Neutrino Zero Modes

At high temperatures the gauge fields are proportional to T_s . Since ν^c is not an eigenstate of T_s , the problem must be expressed in terms of $\chi^{c(\pm)} = (\nu^c \pm 2T_s\nu^c)/\sqrt{2}$, which are eigenvectors of T_s . Their eigenvalues are $\pm 1/2$. The relevant part of the Lagrangian is (3.2), with

$$M = \frac{m_G}{2} \begin{pmatrix} f_1(r)e^{in\theta} & f_0(r) \\ f_0(r) & f_1(r)e^{-in\theta} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi = \begin{pmatrix} \chi^{c(+)} \\ \chi^{c(-)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.41)$$

Since $f_1(\infty) = f_0(\infty) = 1$ one of the fermion fields is massless at large r . This means that (3.32) does not apply in this case, as its derivation assumed that either the mass matrix has no zero eigenvalues at large r , or that T_s does not have half integer eigenvalues. However, (3.32) can still be used to give an upper bound on the number of zero modes. Applying it to (3.41) reveals the upper bound to be zero. Hence there are no neutrino zero modes on the $SU(2)$ strings for any values of n .

High Temperature Non-Neutrino Zero Modes

For the fermion fields that do not couple to Φ_{126} it is possible for zero modes to exist by the same mechanism as (3.38). However, unlike the abelian case, some fermion fields are annihilated by T_s , so p_λ is effectively zero, and they cannot have zero energy solutions for any value of n . For instance, the u_i , d_i , ν and e^- fields are all zero eigenstates of the string generator for the high temperature W_R -string. Thus, in the presence of this type of string, solutions can only occur for the conjugate fields. Defining $\chi^{(\pm)} = (\lambda \pm 2T_s\lambda)/\sqrt{2}$, where $T_s\lambda$ is not proportional to ν^c or $T_s\nu^c$, or equal to zero, the nonabelian equivalent of (3.38) is

$$\left(\partial_r + \sigma^{L,R} \left[\frac{i}{r} \partial_\theta \pm \frac{1}{2} n \frac{a(r)}{r} \right] \right) \chi^{(\pm)L,R} = 0 . \quad (3.42)$$

It has the solutions

$$\chi^{(\pm)L,R} = r^l \exp \left(\sigma^{L,R} \left\{ i l \theta \mp \frac{n}{2} \int_0^r ds \frac{a(s)}{s} \right\} \right) . \quad (3.43)$$

The solutions are normalisable if $0 \leq l < \pm n \sigma^{L,R}/2 - 1$. Thus the total number of solutions, per number of particles (6 in this case), will be the largest integer below $n/2$. In order for any such solutions to exist n must be at least 3, so they do not occur for topologically stable strings.

Low Temperature X_S and X' String Zero Modes

At low temperatures Φ_{10} is non-zero and couples to all the fermion fields. When T_s is made up of generators of the X_S or X' fields, Φ_{10} just takes its usual vacuum expectation value. For the fermion fields that are not affected by Φ_{126} there is effectively no string and so no

zero modes. For the fields affected by Φ_{126} the solutions of the field equations will be at least as divergent as those of (3.41), so there will no normalisable solutions.

Low Temperature W_R -String Non-Neutrino Zero Modes

The neutrino and electron fields all couple to Φ_{126} in the presence of a W_R -string, while the quark fields are only affected by Φ_{10} . The string generator is now of $T_s + T_{ew}$. Its non-neutrino fermion eigenstates are $\chi_i^{(\pm)} = (u_i \pm d_i)/\sqrt{2}$ and $\chi_i^{c(\pm)} = (u_i^c \mp d_i^c)/\sqrt{2}$, where $i = 1 \dots 3$. They are eigenstates of both T_s and T_{ew} , with T_{ew} defined in section 2.6.3. The fermion mass matrix is obtained from (2.48). It is reducible into 4 parts. One couples the neutrino and electron fields, and the others couple the $\chi_i^{(\pm)}$ to the corresponding $\chi_i^{c(\pm)}$. The appropriate expressions to insert into (3.2) are then

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & m_+ h_+ e^{im'\theta} & m_- h_- e^{im\theta} \\ 0 & 0 & m_- h_- e^{-im\theta} & m_+ h_+ e^{-im'\theta} \\ m_+ h_+ e^{im'\theta} & m_- h_- e^{-im\theta} & 0 & 0 \\ m_- h_- e^{im\theta} & m_+ h_+ e^{-im'\theta} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.44)$$

$$\psi^T = \begin{pmatrix} \chi_i^{c(+)} & \chi_i^{c(-)} & \chi_i^{(+)} & \chi_i^{(-)} \end{pmatrix}^T.$$

where $m_{\pm} = (m_u \mp m_d)/2$. When n is odd the winding numbers of the Higgs components are $m = (n-1)/2$ and $m' = (n+1)/2$

In this case the second version of the index theorem is needed since (3.45) is in the same form as (3.24). If $m_u \neq m_d$, (3.29,3.30) reveal that there are $2m = n-1$ left moving and $2m$ right moving zero modes. If $m_u = m_d$, the $e^{\pm im'\theta}$ terms are not present in (3.45), since $m_+ = 0$. The mass matrix is then reducible. Applying (3.32) to the 2 parts shows there are $2m$ left and right moving modes in this case as well.

Since there are 3 choices of i there are a total of $12m$ different zero modes for the W_R -string after electroweak symmetry breaking (assuming no neutrino zero modes). The solutions are contained in the $r < r_{ew}$ region. Since $m = 0$ for the energetically stable $n = 1$ string, it has no fermion zero modes.

When n is even (so the string is actually topologically equivalent to the vacuum), M

takes the same form as above, but with $m = m' = n/2$. Thus the results for the odd n strings can be applied to even n strings, and there are $12(n/2)$ normalisable solutions.

Low Temperature Y' -String Non-Neutrino Zero Modes

The Y' -string can be approached in a similar way to the W_R -string, although there are additional complications due to the form of the gauge fields. To put the problem in the same form as (3.2), it needs to be expressed in terms of the fermion eigenstates of the string generator, which in this case is $T_s + T_{\text{ew}} + T'_{\text{ew}}$. T_{ew} and T'_{ew} are defined in section 2.6.4. Defining $v_i = (u_1, u_2^c, u_3^c, \nu)$ and $w_i = (e^+, -d_3, d_2, -d_1^c)\sigma$ (where σ is the sign of $T_{\text{ew}} + T'_{\text{ew}}$), the eigenstates are v_i , w_i and $\chi_i^{(\pm)} = (v_i^c \pm w_i^c)/\sqrt{2}$. Obtaining the fermion mass matrix from (2.54) we find, for $i = 1 \dots 3$, that

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{m_u}{\sqrt{2}}h_{u+}e^{i\sigma m'\theta} & \frac{m_d}{\sqrt{2}}h_{u-}e^{-i\sigma m\theta} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{m_u}{\sqrt{2}}h_{d+}e^{i\sigma m\theta} & -\frac{m_d}{\sqrt{2}}h_{d-}e^{-i\sigma m'\theta} \\ \frac{m_u}{\sqrt{2}}h_{u+}e^{i\sigma m'\theta} & \frac{m_d}{\sqrt{2}}h_{d+}e^{i\sigma m\theta} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{m_u}{\sqrt{2}}h_{u-}e^{-i\sigma m\theta} & -\frac{m_d}{\sqrt{2}}h_{d-}e^{-i\sigma m'\theta} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.45)$$

$$\psi = \begin{pmatrix} v_i & w_i & \chi_i^{(+)} & \chi_i^{(-)} \end{pmatrix}^T.$$

This is similar to the mass matrix for the W_R -string. However in this case the electroweak gauge fields couple $\chi_i^{(+)}$ to $\chi_i^{(-)}$. Although their effect is zero away from the string, they still mix the fermion solutions. Thus, unlike (3.45), the first form of the index theorem (3.23) is used. We find there are no normalisable zero mode solutions. If n is even there are no electroweak gauge fields, and the situation is the same as the W_R -string. There are then $6n$ zero modes.

Low Temperature W_R and Y' String Neutrino Zero Modes

For the fields affected by both Φ_{126} and Φ_{10} in the presence of a W_R -string, the mass matrix is (3.45), with the M of (3.41) replacing the top left 2×2 submatrix. The eigenstates are now $\chi_i^{(\pm)} = (\nu \pm e^-)/\sqrt{2}$ and $\chi_i^{c(\pm)} = (\nu^c \mp e^+)/\sqrt{2}$. This time however, the first version

of the index theorem (3.23) is used. It implies that there are no normalisable zero mode solutions for any choice of the parameters.

For the Y' -string we take the fermion eigenstates to be v_4 , w_4 and $\chi_4^{(+)}$ (defined above). The situation is similar to the W_R -string, and so none of the $SU(2)$ cosmic strings have low temperature zero modes involving the conjugate neutrino field.

3.3.3 Summary

The only fermion zero modes that form at high temperatures are ν^c zero modes around abelian strings (in which case there are $|n|$ of them), or those that involve fermion fields that just couple to the string gauge fields, and not Φ_{126} . This latter type of solution will only occur for higher n strings ($n \geq 3$ for $SU(2)$ strings, $|n| \geq 4$ for abelian strings).

At low temperatures there are a total of $16|m|$ different zero modes on an abelian string ($|m|$ for each particle type), where m is the winding number of Φ_{10} . $m = 0$ when $|n| < 3$, so there are no zero modes around topologically stable abelian strings, and hence they can only be superconducting at low temperatures in the presence of an unusual Higgs potential [11].

If $m \neq 0$, and z and t dependence are added to the solutions, they will correspond to massless fermion currents. The electron and down quark currents will then flow in the opposite direction to the neutrino and up quark currents.

In the presence of a X' or X_S nonabelian string there are no zero modes at any temperature. After the electroweak phase transition the W_R -string has $12m$ zero modes (m for each particle type not coupling to Φ_{126}), where m is the winding number of the part of Φ_{10} which winds least. $m = n/2$ for even n , and $m = (n - 1)/2$ for odd n . The Y' -string has same number of zero modes as the W_R -string if n is even, and zero if n is odd. Thus for a minimal energy, topologically stable string there are no fermion zero modes, although there is still the possibility of superconductivity due to gauge boson zero modes. Thus even the X' and X_S -strings may be superconducting [46]. Indeed, it has been shown that such strings do become current carrying by gauge boson condensation [47].

The currents corresponding to any fermion zero modes present on the $SU(2)$ strings do not consist of single particle types, as those around an abelian string do. Instead they




Figure 3.1: The Dirac spectrum of cosmic strings with a zero mode (left) and a very low lying bound state (right). Both spectra also have a bound state and continuum.

are made up of eigenstates of the string generator. Also, unlike the abelian case, currents containing each particle type flow in both directions along the string.

3.4 Index Theorems and Spectral Flow

We have shown that zero modes can acquire masses at subsequent phase transitions. No matter how small this mass is, the spectrum of the Dirac operator changes significantly. If we compare the Dirac spectrum with a zero mode and a low lying bound state with infinitesimal mass (fig. 3.1), we see that an arbitrarily small perturbation to the zero mode introduces an entire new branch to the spectrum. Any massive state gives a spectrum that is symmetric about both the w and k axes, there is always a reference frame in which the particle is at rest and others where it is moving up or down the string. Conversely the zero mode, which is massless, can only move in one direction along the string and its spectrum is asymmetric. The transition from zero mode to low lying bound state causes drastic changes in the spectrum and can be brought about by infinitesimal changes in the value of one Higgs field. If we consider the species with the zero mode alone, this infinite susceptibility to the background fields appears unphysical. However, when we include the

massless neutrino in the $SO(10)$ model the spectral changes are less worrying. For a small coupling between the two neutrinos, both the before and after spectra have a continuum of massless or nearly massless states. These states can be used to build the extra branch of the perturbed zero mode spectrum, allowing small changes in the overall spectrum for small changes in the background fields.

This observation leads us to conjecture that zero modes can be removed only if they become mixed with other massless states.

The coupling between the left and right handed neutrinos and the electroweak Higgs field need not be artificially small, the small mass of the light neutrino can be generated by the seesaw mechanism [48]. This coupling is present prior to the electroweak phase transition and allows transitions of the form $\nu_L + \bar{\nu}_R \rightarrow f\bar{f}$, where f is any light fermion from the standard model and the intermediate state is an electroweak Higgs. Such interactions allow zero modes on the string to scatter from massless neutrinos in the surrounding plasma and provide a current damping mechanism that affects current build up prior to the electroweak transition.

3.5 Fermion Zero Modes in Other Theories

As discussed in section 2.8, various symmetry breaking schemes give rise to the type of strings considered in section 3.3. The resulting strings will have the same kind of zero modes as theory (2.1), provided none of the other Higgs fields couple to the fermions. The only Higgs fields that can couple to fermions are those which transform under a representation contained in the $\mathbf{16} \times \mathbf{16}$, since fermion mass terms transform as a product of $\mathbf{16}$ s. The only such representations are $\mathbf{126}$, $\mathbf{10}$, and $\mathbf{120}$ (which is antisymmetric), so the results of this section apply to a wide range of $SO(10)$ theories.

One alternative symmetry breaking is to use Φ_{16} instead of Φ_{126} . Since Φ_{16} does not couple to the fermions, g_G will be zero in (3.36), and so the neutrinos will have the same kind of zero modes as all the other particles (As would be the case if Φ_{126} were present, but g_G were zero). However such a theory has left-handed neutrinos with significant masses, and an observable right-handed neutrino, so it is not compatible with the standard model

(unless some other mechanism is introduced to alter the neutrino masses).

If the size of the coupling of the string gauge field to the electroweak Higgs field were different (as in the $SU(5) \times U(1)_P$ theory mentioned in section 2.8), it is possible for $|m|$ to be non-zero on a topological string. In this case fermion zero modes can be present. This also means that neutrino zero modes may survive the electroweak phase transition. In fact if $|2m/n| > 1$, extra neutrino zero modes will be created at the phase transition.

Although we have concentrated on $SO(10)$, many of the results apply to a very wide range of theories. For example, we expect the destruction of zero modes at phase transitions will frequently occur. In a theory with Majorana mass terms, such as the right handed neutrino term in section 3.3.1, the first version of the index theorem can be used (3.23). After a phase transition, if every fermion couples to a non-winding Higgs field, such as Φ_{10} , then all previously formed zero modes will be destroyed (see remarks after (3.23)).

Another type of GUT with cosmic string solutions which couple to fermions are those with the symmetry group E_6 [11, 49]. Such theories have a larger fermion sector (27 fields rather than 16), more phase transitions, and can have far more Yukawa couplings. E_6 also has massive neutrinos, a total of 5 compared to $SO(10)$'s 2. The details will be more complicated, but we expect currents to be formed and destroyed as in the $SO(10)$ theories. We also expect the $SU(2)$ strings of the theory to have zero, or very few, massless fermion currents.

3.6 A Model with Persistent Zero Modes

In this section we consider a model in which a zero mode survives a subsequent symmetry breaking, despite coupling to a Higgs field with a non-winding component. Consider a Majorana fermion similar to that in (1.16), but with a different Higgs field. In this case the Higgs field has two parts, a winding part from the string and a constant part from a second symmetry breaking,

$$\phi = \eta \left(f(r) e^{i\theta} + p \right) . \quad (3.46)$$

Such a Higgs field could only occur as the result of a global symmetry being broken. Note that because of this the above ϕ cannot be written in the form used in (3.5), so the index theorem developed in section 3.2 does not apply in this case. We take only the upper component of ψ to be non-zero, in which case its field equations reduce to

$$e^{i\theta} \left(\partial_r + \frac{i}{r} \partial_\theta \right) \psi + m_f \left(f(r) e^{i\theta} + p \right) \psi^* = 0 . \quad (3.47)$$

Changing variables to X ,

$$X = \int_0^r f(\rho) d\rho + pr \cos \theta + c , \quad (3.48)$$

we have

$$\left(\frac{\partial X}{\partial r} + \frac{i}{r} \frac{\partial X}{\partial \theta} \right) = f(r) + p \left[\cos \theta + \frac{i}{r} (-r \sin \theta) \right] . \quad (3.49)$$

Thus

$$\left(f(r) e^{i\theta} + p \right) (\partial_X \psi + m_f \psi^*) = 0 . \quad (3.50)$$

This is solved by

$$\psi = e^{-m_f X} . \quad (3.51)$$

We have explicitly constructed a zero mode after the second phase transition. The X coordinate is similar to the usual radial coordinate, but ‘centres’ on the effective zero of the resultant Higgs field, rather than the core of the string.

3.7 Conclusions

In this chapter we have seen that the microphysics of cosmic strings can be influenced by subsequent phase transitions. Fermion zero modes, and consequently superconductivity, of the strings can be created or destroyed by such phase transitions. In determining whether or not a cosmic string is superconducting it is not enough to just consider this at formation, but to follow the microphysics through the multiple phase transitions that the system undergoes.

The existence of fermion zero modes at high temperatures enables the string to carry a current, and thus leads to the formation of vortons [24]. Normally, vortons formed at such high temperatures result in the theory being ruled out cosmologically [24, 28]. We have

shown that it is possible for currents formed at high energy to dissipate after a subsequent phase transition if the relevant fermion zero mode does not survive the phase transition. The vortons then cease to be stable, and cannot be used to rule out the theory [41]. This is the case with ν_R zero modes on an $SO(10)$ string. Prior to dissipation there could be a period of vorton domination. After the phase transition the universe would reheat and then evolve as normal.

To enable a systematic analysis of this effect we have derived a generalised index theorem. Our index theorem is especially applicable to theories where the fermions acquire mass from more than one Higgs field. We applied the index theorem and also considered spectral flow. As a result we conjecture that zero modes are destroyed when they mix with other fermions that acquire mass at a subsequent phase transition from a non-winding Higgs field.

We applied the index theorem to a realistic GUT, with an $SO(10)$ symmetry group. The theory has 5 distinct types of string, all of which we considered.

For the abelian string it is the winding number of Φ_{10} that determines the existence of fermion zero modes after electroweak symmetry breaking. The number of zero modes is 16 times its winding number, so there will be none for topologically stable strings, which have $|n| = 1$ and $m = 0$. Neutrino zero modes can always exist at high temperatures, but they do not survive the electroweak phase transition (for $|n| = 1$). This has interesting implications as mentioned above.

In the presence of a nonabelian string, different parts of Φ_{10} can have different winding numbers. In the cases considered it is generally the part with the lowest winding number which determines the number of zero modes. Its winding number is equal to $n/2$ rounded down to the nearest whole integer for W_R -strings, and for the Y' -strings with even n . The other strings have no zero modes. When present there are a total of 12 times this number of possible fermion zero modes. The fields coupling to Φ_{126} (part of which has winding number 0) do not have such solutions at any temperature. As with the abelian string there are no zero energy fermion solutions for topologically stable strings, and so fermion zero modes on strings are not as common as would be expected.

At high temperatures, it is also possible (for higher n) for fermion fields which couple to the string gauge fields (but not the Higgs fields) to have zero modes. The number of such zero modes is not determined by the index theorem as it only considers the effect of the Higgs field. However, such zero modes are easy to spot from the field equations. This can occur for the nonabelian strings, and for the non-conjugate neutrino fields around abelian strings. This effect is always overridden if the fermion field couples to a non-zero Higgs field.

We expect qualitatively similar results in most other grand unified theories.

Chapter 4

$N = 1$ Supersymmetric Abelian Cosmic Strings

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, we investigate the microphysics of cosmic string solutions admitted by supersymmetric (SUSY) field theories [14]. This is important for at least two reasons. First, SUSY field theories include many popular candidate theories of physics above the electroweak scale. Second, the recent successes of duality in SUSY Yang-Mills theories may mean that the physics of nonperturbative solutions such as topological solitons may be easier to understand than in non-supersymmetric theories. As in early studies of non-SUSY defects [8], we work in the context of the simplest models and in particular with versions of the abelian Higgs model obeying the supersymmetry algebra with one SUSY generator ($N = 1$). We demonstrate that the particle content and interactions dictated by SUSY naturally give rise to cosmic string superconductivity in these models. Furthermore, by using SUSY transformations, we are able to find solutions for the fermion zero modes responsible for superconductivity in terms of the background string fields. A special case of the solutions discussed in this chapter has been obtained in a similar model by other authors using different techniques [50].

The effect of supersymmetry on the $U(1) \times U(1)$ bosonic superconducting Witten model

has been discussed by Morris [51]. The conclusion there is that simple bosonic superconducting strings do not survive in the transition to the supersymmetric theory. Instead, in order to implement bosonic superconductivity in these theories, it is necessary to construct quite complicated models with a minimum of five chiral superfields. In the present chapter we study a different aspect of supersymmetric cosmic strings, namely the fermionic sector of the theories. In contrast to the results of ref. [51], we find that, even in the simplest SUSY abelian Higgs models, fermionic superconductivity is an inevitable result of the couplings and particle content required by the SUSY algebra. This powerful result leads us to the strong conclusion that all supersymmetric abelian cosmic strings are superconducting.

The structure of the chapter is as follows. In section 4.2 we present the $N = 1$ SUSY abelian Higgs models. Such simple SUSY models are well-known in particle physics (for example see ref. [52]). However, we believe the cosmological relevance of the solutions we explore here to be new. In order to make contact with both the supersymmetry and cosmology literature, we employ both the superfield and component formalisms and repeat a number of well-established facts and conventions for the sake of clarity. Spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB) in these models can be implemented in two distinct ways, leading to different theories with different particle content. We call these distinct models theory F and theory D respectively to refer to the origin of the SSB term in the Higgs potential. In section 4.3 we focus on theory F. We demonstrate how the cosmic string solution can be constructed in the bosonic sector, and determine the number of fermion zero modes using the index theorem in section 3.2. We then employ SUSY transformations to solve these equations in terms of the background string fields. In section 4.4 we repeat the analysis for theory D. The type of symmetry breaking in theory D is peculiar to theories with an abelian gauge group and we therefore expect theory F to be more representative of models with nonabelian gauge groups, such as grand unified theories. In section 4.5 we check our results for the special case discussed in ref. [50]. In fact, for theory D, the solutions are already of this special form. Finally, in section 4.6, we comment on the possible implications of our findings.

4.2 Supersymmetric Abelian Higgs Models and Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking

Let us begin by defining our conventions. Throughout this chapter we use the Minkowski metric with signature -2 , the antisymmetric 2-tensor $\epsilon_{21} = \epsilon^{12} = 1$, $\epsilon_{12} = \epsilon^{21} = -1$ and the Dirac gamma matrices in the representation

$$\gamma^\mu = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma^\mu \\ \bar{\sigma}^\mu & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.1)$$

with $\sigma^\mu = (-I, \sigma^i)$ and $\bar{\sigma}^\mu = (-I, -\sigma^i)$, where σ^i are the Pauli matrices.

We consider supersymmetric versions of the spontaneously broken gauged $U(1)$ abelian Higgs model. These models are related to or are simple extensions of those found in ref. [52]. In superfield notation, such a theory consists of a vector superfield V and m chiral superfields Φ_i , ($i = 1 \dots m$), with $U(1)$ charges q_i . In the Wess-Zumino gauge these may be expressed in component notation as

$$\begin{aligned} V(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= -(\theta\sigma^\mu\bar{\theta})A_\mu(x) + i\theta^2\bar{\theta}\bar{\lambda}(x) - i\bar{\theta}^2\theta\lambda(x) + \frac{1}{2}\theta^2\bar{\theta}^2D(x), \\ \Phi_i(x, \theta, \bar{\theta}) &= \phi_i(y) + \sqrt{2}\theta\psi_i(y) + \theta^2F_i(y), \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

where $y^\mu = x^\mu + i\theta\sigma^\mu\bar{\theta}$ [14]. Here, ϕ_i are complex scalar fields and A_μ is a vector field. These correspond to the familiar bosonic fields of the abelian Higgs model. The fermions $\psi_{i\alpha}$, $\bar{\lambda}_\alpha$ and λ_α are Weyl spinors and the complex bosonic fields, F_i , and real bosonic field, D , are auxiliary fields. Finally, θ and $\bar{\theta}$ are anticommuting superspace coordinates. In the component formulation of the theory one eliminates F_i and D via their equations of motion and performs a Grassmann integration over θ and $\bar{\theta}$. Now define

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha &= \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta^\alpha} + i\sigma_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}^\mu\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}\partial_\mu, \\ \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}} &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}} - i\theta^\alpha\sigma_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}^\mu\partial_\mu, \\ W_\alpha &= -\frac{1}{4}\bar{D}^2D_\alpha V, \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

where D_α and $\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}$ are the supersymmetric covariant derivatives and W_α is the field strength

chiral superfield. The superspace Lagrangian density for the theory is then given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = \frac{1}{4} \left(W^\alpha W_\alpha|_{\theta^2} + \bar{W}_{\dot{\alpha}} \bar{W}^{\dot{\alpha}}|_{\bar{\theta}^2} \right) + \bar{\Phi}_i e^{gq_i V} \Phi_i|_{\theta^2 \bar{\theta}^2} + W(\Phi_i)|_{\theta^2} + \bar{W}(\bar{\Phi}_i)|_{\bar{\theta}^2} + \xi D . \quad (4.4)$$

In this expression W is the superpotential, a holomorphic function of the chiral superfields (i.e. a function of Φ_i only and not $\bar{\Phi}_i$) and $W|_{\theta^2}$ indicates the θ^2 component of W . The term linear in D is known as the Fayet-Iliopoulos term [53]. Such a term can only be present in a $U(1)$ theory, since it is not invariant under more general gauge transformations.

For a renormalizable theory, the most general superpotential is

$$W(\Phi_i) = a_i \Phi_i + \frac{1}{2} b_{ij} \Phi_i \Phi_j + \frac{1}{3} c_{ijk} \Phi_i \Phi_j \Phi_k , \quad (4.5)$$

with the constants b_{ij} , c_{ijk} symmetric in their indices. This can be written in component form as

$$W(\phi_i, \psi_j, F_k)|_{\theta^2} = a_i F_i + b_{ij} \left(F_i \phi_j - \frac{1}{2} \psi_i \psi_j \right) + c_{ijk} (F_i \phi_j \phi_k - \psi_i \psi_j \phi_k) \quad (4.6)$$

and the Lagrangian (4.4) can then be expanded in Wess-Zumino gauge in terms of its component fields using (4.2). The equations of motion for the auxiliary fields are

$$F_i^* + a_i + b_{ij} \phi_j + c_{ijk} \phi_j \phi_k = 0 , \quad (4.7)$$

$$D + \xi + \frac{g}{2} q_i \bar{\phi}_i \phi_i = 0 . \quad (4.8)$$

Using these to eliminate F_i and D we obtain the Lagrangian density in component form as

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_B + \mathcal{L}_F + \mathcal{L}_Y - U , \quad (4.9)$$

with

$$\mathcal{L}_B = (D_\mu^{i*} \bar{\phi}_i)(D^{i\mu} \phi_i) - \frac{1}{4} F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} , \quad (4.10)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_F = -i \psi_i \sigma^\mu D_\mu^{i*} \bar{\psi}_i - i \lambda \sigma^\mu \partial_\mu \bar{\lambda} , \quad (4.11)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_Y = \frac{ig}{\sqrt{2}} q_i \bar{\phi}_i \psi_i \lambda - \left(\frac{1}{2} b_{ij} + c_{ijk} \phi_k \right) \psi_i \psi_j + (\text{c. c.}) , \quad (4.12)$$

$$U = |F_i|^2 + \frac{1}{2} D^2 = |a_i + b_{ij} \phi_j + c_{ijk} \phi_j \phi_k|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\xi + \frac{g}{2} q_i \bar{\phi}_i \phi_i \right)^2 , \quad (4.13)$$

where $D_\mu^i = \partial_\mu + \frac{1}{2}igq_i A_\mu$ and $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$.

Now consider spontaneous symmetry breaking in these theories. Each term in the superpotential must be gauge invariant. This implies that $a_i \neq 0$ only if $q_i = 0$, $b_{ij} \neq 0$ only if $q_i + q_j = 0$, and $c_{ijk} \neq 0$ only if $q_i + q_j + q_k = 0$. The situation is a little more complicated than in non-SUSY theories, since anomaly cancellation in SUSY theories implies the existence of more than one chiral superfield (and hence Higgs field). In order to break the gauge symmetry, one may either induce SSB through an appropriate choice of superpotential, or, in the case of the $U(1)$ gauge group, one may rely on a non-zero Fayet-Iliopoulos term.

We shall refer to the theory with superpotential SSB (and, for simplicity, zero Fayet-Iliopoulos term) as theory F and the theory with SSB due to a non-zero Fayet-Iliopoulos term as theory D. Since the implementation of SSB in theory F can be repeated for more general gauge groups, we expect that this theory will be more representative of general defect-forming theories than theory D for which the mechanism of SSB is specific to the $U(1)$ gauge group.

4.3 Theory F: Vanishing Fayet-Iliopoulos Term

The simplest model with vanishing Fayet-Iliopoulos term ($\xi = 0$) and spontaneously broken gauge symmetry contains three chiral superfields. It is not possible to construct such a model with fewer superfields which does not either leave the gauge symmetry unbroken or possess a gauge anomaly. The fields are two charged fields $\Phi_\pm$, with respective $U(1)$ charges $q_\pm = \pm 1$, and a neutral field, Φ_0 . A suitable superpotential is then

$$W(\Phi_i) = c\Phi_0(\Phi_+\Phi_- - \eta^2) , \quad (4.14)$$

with η and c real. The potential U is minimised when $F_i = 0$ and $D = 0$. This occurs when $\phi_0 = 0$, $\phi_+\phi_- = \eta^2$, and $|\phi_+|^2 = |\phi_-|^2$. Thus we may write $\phi_\pm = \eta e^{\pm i\alpha}$, where α is some function. It is interesting to note that U also has a local minimum at $\phi_+ = \phi_- = 0$. ϕ_0 is undetermined. This minimum has non-zero vacuum energy, and will cause the universe to expand exponentially. This process is called inflation [54], and is a potential solution to

many cosmological problems. It will stop as ϕ_0 approaches 0.

We shall now seek the Nielsen-Olesen [18] solution corresponding to an infinite straight cosmic string. We proceed in the same manner as for non-supersymmetric theories. Consider only the bosonic fields (i.e. set the fermions to zero) and in cylindrical polar coordinates (r, φ, z) write

$$\phi_0 = 0 , \quad (4.15)$$

$$\phi_+ = \phi_-^* = \eta e^{in\varphi} f(r) , \quad (4.16)$$

$$A_\mu = -\frac{2}{g} n \frac{a(r)}{r} \delta_\mu^\varphi , \quad (4.17)$$

$$F_\pm = D = 0 , \quad (4.18)$$

$$F_0 = c\eta^2(1 - f(r)^2) , \quad (4.19)$$

so that the z -axis is the axis of symmetry of the defect. The profile functions, $f(r)$ and $a(r)$, obey

$$f'' + \frac{f'}{r} - n^2 \frac{(1-a)^2}{r^2} = c^2 \eta^2 (f^2 - 1) f , \quad (4.20)$$

$$a'' - \frac{a'}{r} = -g^2 \eta^2 (1-a) f^2 , \quad (4.21)$$

with boundary conditions $f(0) = a(0) = 0$ and $f(\infty) = a(\infty) = 1$. Note here, in passing, an interesting aspect of topological defects in SUSY theories. The ground state of the theory is supersymmetric but spontaneously breaks the gauge symmetry, while in the core of the defect the gauge symmetry is restored but, since $|F_i|^2 \neq 0$ in the core, SUSY is spontaneously broken there.

We have constructed a cosmic string solution in the bosonic sector of the theory. Now consider the fermionic sector. With the choice of superpotential (4.14) the component form of the Yukawa couplings becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_Y = i \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} (\bar{\phi}_+ \psi_+ - \bar{\phi}_- \psi_-) \lambda - c (\phi_0 \psi_+ \psi_- + \phi_+ \psi_0 \psi_- + \phi_- \psi_0 \psi_+) + (\text{c. c.}) \quad (4.22)$$

As with a non-supersymmetric theory, non-trivial zero energy fermion solutions can exist around the string. The number of solutions can be determined with the index theorem derived in section 3.2. z and t dependence can easily be added to the solutions. They

then correspond to massless currents flowing along the string. The index theorem also determines their direction of travel. When the string solution (4.19) is substituted into (4.22), the non-zero terms can be written in the same form as (3.2), with

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -ce^{-i\varphi} & i\frac{g}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-i\varphi} \\ 0 & 0 & -ce^{i\varphi} & -i\frac{g}{\sqrt{2}}e^{i\varphi} \\ -ce^{-i\varphi} & -ce^{i\varphi} & 0 & 0 \\ i\frac{g}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-i\varphi} & -i\frac{g}{\sqrt{2}}e^{i\varphi} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \eta f(r) , \quad \psi = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_+ \\ \psi_- \\ \psi_0 \\ \lambda \end{pmatrix} . \quad (4.23)$$

This mass matrix is in the same form as (3.24), so the second form of the theorem (3.29,3.30) is used. It shows that there are $2|n|$ complex (or $4|n|$ real) solutions. Half their corresponding currents move left along the string, and the other half move right.

In general, in non-supersymmetric theories, it is difficult to find solutions for fermion zero modes in string backgrounds. However, in the supersymmetric case, SUSY transformations relate the fermionic components of the superfields to the bosonic ones and we may use this to obtain the fermion solutions in terms of the background string fields. A SUSY transformation is implemented by the operator $G = e^{\epsilon Q + \bar{\epsilon} \bar{Q}}$, where ϵ_α are Grassmann parameters and Q_α are the generators of the SUSY algebra which we may represent by

$$Q_\alpha = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^\alpha} - i\sigma_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}^\mu \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}} \partial_\mu , \quad (4.24)$$

$$\bar{Q}^{\dot{\alpha}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}_{\dot{\alpha}}} - i\bar{\sigma}^{\mu\dot{\alpha}\alpha} \theta_\alpha \partial_\mu . \quad (4.25)$$

In general such a transformation will induce a change of gauge. It is then necessary to perform an additional gauge transformation to return to the Wess-Zumino gauge in order to easily interpret the solutions. For an abelian theory, supersymmetric gauge transformations are of the form

$$\Phi_i \longrightarrow e^{-i\Lambda q_i} \Phi_i , \quad (4.26)$$

$$\bar{\Phi}_i \longrightarrow e^{i\bar{\Lambda} q_i} \bar{\Phi}_i , \quad (4.27)$$

$$V \longrightarrow V + \frac{i}{g} (\Lambda - \bar{\Lambda}) , \quad (4.28)$$

where Λ is some chiral superfield.

Consider performing an infinitesimal SUSY transformation on (4.19), using $\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$. The appropriate Λ to return to Wess-Zumino gauge is

$$\Lambda = ig\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\sigma}^\mu\theta A_\mu(y) \quad (4.29)$$

The component fields then transform in the following way

$$\phi_\pm(y) \longrightarrow \phi_\pm(y) + 2i\theta\sigma^\mu\bar{\epsilon}D_\mu\phi_\pm(y) , \quad (4.30)$$

$$\theta^2 F_0(y) \longrightarrow \theta^2 F_0(y) + 2\theta\epsilon F_0(y) , \quad (4.31)$$

$$-\theta\sigma^\mu\bar{\theta}A_\mu(x) \longrightarrow -\theta\sigma^\mu\bar{\theta}A_\mu(x) + \frac{1}{2}i\theta^2\bar{\theta}\bar{\sigma}^\mu\sigma^\nu\bar{\epsilon}F_{\mu\nu}(x) - \frac{1}{2}i\bar{\theta}^2\theta\sigma^\mu\bar{\sigma}^\nu\epsilon F_{\mu\nu}(x) . \quad (4.32)$$

Writing everything in terms of the background string fields, only the fermion fields are affected to first order by the transformation. They are given by

$$\lambda_\alpha \longrightarrow \frac{2na'}{gr}i(\sigma^z)_\alpha^\beta\epsilon_\beta , \quad (4.33)$$

$$(\psi_\pm)_\alpha \longrightarrow \sqrt{2}\left(if'\sigma^r \mp \frac{n}{r}(1-a)f\sigma^\varphi \right)_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}\bar{\epsilon}^{\dot{\alpha}}\eta e^{\pm in\varphi} , \quad (4.34)$$

$$(\psi_0)_\alpha \longrightarrow \sqrt{2}c\eta^2(1-f^2)\epsilon_\alpha , \quad (4.35)$$

where we have defined

$$\sigma^\varphi = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -ie^{-i\varphi} \\ ie^{i\varphi} & 0 \end{pmatrix} , \quad (4.36)$$

$$\sigma^r = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e^{-i\varphi} \\ e^{i\varphi} & 0 \end{pmatrix} . \quad (4.37)$$

Let us choose ϵ_α so that only one component is non-zero. Taking $\epsilon_2 = 0$ and $\epsilon_1 = -i\delta/(\sqrt{2}\eta)$, where δ is a complex constant, the fermions become

$$\lambda_1 = \delta \frac{n\sqrt{2}a'}{g\eta} \frac{1}{r} , \quad (4.38)$$

$$(\psi_+)_1 = \delta^* \left[f' + \frac{n}{r}(1-a)f \right] e^{i(n-1)\varphi} , \quad (4.39)$$

$$(\psi_0)_1 = -i\delta c\eta(1-f^2) , \quad (4.40)$$

$$(\psi_-)_1 = \delta^* \left[f' - \frac{n}{r}(1-a)f \right] e^{-i(n+1)\varphi} . \quad (4.41)$$

It is these fermion solutions which are responsible for the string superconductivity. Similar expressions can be found when $\epsilon_1 = 0$. It is clear from these results that the string is not invariant under supersymmetry, and therefore breaks it. However, since $f'(r)$, $a'(r)$, $1 - a(r)$ and $1 - f^2(r)$ are all approximately zero outside of the string core, the SUSY breaking and the zero modes are confined to the string. We note that this method gives us two zero mode solutions. Thus, for a winding number one string, we obtain the full spectrum, whereas for strings of higher winding number, only a partial spectrum is obtained.

4.4 Theory D: Non-vanishing Fayet-Iliopoulos Term

Now consider theory D in which there is just one primary charged chiral superfield involved in the symmetry breaking and a non-zero Fayet-Iliopoulos term. In order to avoid gauge anomalies, the model must contain other charged superfields. These are coupled to the primary superfield through terms in the superpotential such that the expectation values of the secondary chiral superfields are dynamically zero. One simple way to do this is add 8 charge 1/2 chiral fields, X_a , and a superpotential term:

$$\sum_a g_a \Phi X_a X_a \quad (4.42)$$

The extra fermions cancel the anomaly, and the scalar potential makes the bosonic parts of X_a zero [55]. The secondary superfields have no effect on SSB and are invariant under SUSY transformations. Therefore for the rest of this section we shall concentrate on the primary chiral superfield which mediates the gauge symmetry breaking.

Defining $\xi = -\frac{1}{2}g\eta^2$, the theory is spontaneously broken and there exists a string solution obtained from the ansatz

$$\phi = \eta e^{i\varphi} f(r) , \quad (4.43)$$

$$A_\mu = -\frac{2}{g} n \frac{a(r)}{r} \delta_\mu^\varphi , \quad (4.44)$$

$$D = \frac{1}{2} g \eta^2 (1 - f^2) , \quad (4.45)$$

$$F = 0 . \quad (4.46)$$

Taking $n > 0$, the profile functions $f(r)$ and $a(r)$ obey the first order equations

$$f' = n \frac{(1-a)}{r} f , \quad (4.47)$$

$$n \frac{a'}{r} = \frac{1}{4} g^2 \eta^2 (1 - f^2) . \quad (4.48)$$

Now consider the fermionic sector of the theory, and apply the index theorem (3.32). For $n > 0$ there are $2n$ zero modes, which move left. Performing a SUSY transformation, again using Λ as the gauge function to return to Wess-Zumino gauge, gives to first order

$$\lambda_\alpha \longrightarrow \frac{1}{2} g \eta^2 (1 - f^2) i (I + \sigma^z)_\alpha^\beta \epsilon_\beta , \quad (4.49)$$

$$\psi_\alpha \longrightarrow \sqrt{2} \frac{n}{r} (1 - a) f (i \sigma^r - \sigma^\varphi)_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \bar{\epsilon}^{\dot{\alpha}} \eta e^{in\varphi} . \quad (4.50)$$

If $\epsilon_1 = 0$ both these expressions are zero. The same is true of all higher order terms, and so the string is invariant under the corresponding transformation. For other ϵ , taking $\epsilon_1 = -i\delta/\eta$ gives

$$\lambda_1 = \delta g \eta (1 - f^2) , \quad (4.51)$$

$$\psi_1 = 2\sqrt{2} \delta^* \frac{n}{r} (1 - a) f e^{i(n-1)\varphi} . \quad (4.52)$$

Similar results are obtained when $n < 0$. In this case the zero modes move right, and the non-zero fields are λ_2 and ψ_2 .

In this theory supersymmetry is only half broken inside the string. This is in contrast to theory F which fully breaks supersymmetry in the string core. The theories also differ in that theory D's zero modes will only travel in one direction, while the zero modes of theory F (which has twice as many) travel in both directions. In both theories the zero modes and SUSY breaking are confined to the string core.

4.5 The Super-Bogomolnyi Limit

In non-supersymmetric theories it is usually difficult to find solutions for fermion zero modes on cosmic string backgrounds. In such theories one can, however, often obtain solutions in the *Bogomolnyi limit* which, in our theory, corresponds to choosing

$$2c^2 = g^2 . \quad (4.53)$$

In this limit, the energy of the vortex saturates a topological bound, there are no static forces between vortices and the equations of motion for the string fields reduce to a pair of coupled first order differential equations. It is a useful check of the solutions obtained in the previous sections to confirm that they reduce to those already known in the Bogomolnyi limit.

Imposing (4.53) equations (4.20,4.21), together with the requirement of finite energy, become

$$f' = n \frac{f}{r} (1 - a) , \quad (4.54)$$

$$n \frac{a'}{r} = c^2 \eta^2 (1 - f^2) . \quad (4.55)$$

Note that these are similar to (4.47,4.48). We see that all solutions to theory D are automatically Bogomolnyi solutions. Imposing (4.53) on (4.41) gives the following solutions.

$$\lambda_1 = \delta c \eta (1 - f^2) , \quad (4.56)$$

$$(\psi_+)_1 = 2\delta^* n \frac{f}{r} (1 - a) e^{i(n-1)\varphi} , \quad (4.57)$$

$$(\psi_0)_1 = -i\delta c \eta (1 - f^2) , \quad (4.58)$$

$$(\psi_-)_1 = 0 . \quad (4.59)$$

This limit, with $n = 1$, was considered for a similar theory by Garriga and Vachaspati [50] and the above results are in agreement with theirs. This is a useful check of the techniques we use.

4.6 Concluding Remarks

We have investigated the structure of cosmic string solutions to supersymmetric abelian Higgs models. For completeness we have analysed two models, differing by their method of spontaneous symmetry breaking. However, we expect theory F to be more representative

of general defect forming theories, since the SSB employed there is not specific to abelian gauge groups.

We have shown that although SUSY remains unbroken outside the string, it is broken in the string core (in contrast to the gauge symmetry which is restored there). In theory F supersymmetry is broken completely in the string core by a non-zero F -term, while in theory D supersymmetry is partially broken by a non-zero D -term. We have demonstrated that, due to the particle content and couplings dictated by SUSY, the cosmic string solutions to both theories are superconducting in the Witten sense. We believe this to be quite a powerful result, that all supersymmetric abelian cosmic strings are superconducting due to fermion zero modes. Note that this result is in contrast to those obtained in earlier analyses of purely bosonic superconductivity in Witten-type SUSY models [51]. An immediate and important application of the results of the present chapter is that SUSY GUTs which break to the standard model and yield abelian cosmic strings (such as some breaking schemes of $SO(10)$) may face strong constraints from cosmology [28]. The existence of zero modes around SUSY monopoles has been investigated previously [56]. However, in this chapter we have considered cosmic strings since, unlike monopoles, supercurrents on strings are cosmologically significant.

Although explicitly solving for such zero modes in the case of non-supersymmetric theories is difficult, in the models we study it is possible to use SUSY transformations to relate the functional form of the fermionic solutions to those of the background string fields, which are well-studied. For theory D the solutions all obey the Bogomolnyi equations exactly, and for theory F we have also checked that the solutions we find reduce to those already known in the special case of the Bogomolnyi limit.

While we have performed this first analysis for the toy model of an abelian string, we expect the techniques to be quite general and in fact to be more useful in nonabelian theories for which the equations for the fermion zero modes are significantly more complicated. The question of superconductivity in nonabelian SUSY cosmic strings is considered in the next chapter. We also examine the effect of soft SUSY breaking in all of the models.

Chapter 5

Cosmic Strings and Supersymmetry Breaking

5.1 Introduction

In recent years, supersymmetry (SUSY) has become increasingly favoured as the theoretical structure underlying fundamental particle interactions. In this light it is natural to investigate possible cosmological implications of SUSY.

In chapter 4 we discussed the effect of SUSY on the microphysics of simple cosmic string solutions of abelian field theories. In particular we developed and applied the technique of SUSY transformations to investigate the form of fermionic zero modes, required by SUSY, which lead to cosmic string superconductivity. In the present work we extend our original ideas to a more general class of field theories, namely those with a nonabelian gauge group. Since nonabelian gauge theories underlie modern particle physics and, in particular, unified field theories, this class of theories is a realistic toy model for grand unified theories (GUTs). The particular example we examine, $SU(2) \times U(1) \rightarrow U(1) \times Z_2$, admits two types of string solution, one abelian and the other nonabelian. This model has a similar structure to $SO(10)$ and should provide insight into cosmic strings in SUSY GUTs. Most of the features exhibited by this theory will also appear in larger nonabelian theories. We apply the technique of SUSY transformations to the nonabelian case and extract the

behaviour of the zero modes as functions of the background string fields. We then compare the results to those obtained in chapter 4 for abelian strings.

Since SUSY is clearly broken in the universe today, it is important to know how the SUSY zero modes behave when soft-SUSY breaking occurs. We investigate this for both the abelian and nonabelian strings by explicitly introducing soft-SUSY breaking terms into the theory. The result is that all the zero modes are destroyed in almost all the theories, the exception being when a Fayet-Iliopoulos term is used to break the gauge symmetry in an abelian model. We briefly comment on the physical reasons for this and show how the effect may be seen through the breakdown of an appropriate index theorem.

These results have a cosmological significance since fermion zero modes on the string can be excited, causing a current to flow along the string. The string then behaves as a perfect conductor. The existence of charge carriers changes the cosmology of cosmic strings. In particular, they can stabilise string loops, resulting in the production of vortons [24]. Such vortons can dominate the energy density of the Universe, and have been used to constrain GUT models with current-carrying strings [28]. However, if the zero modes are destroyed at the SUSY breaking energy scale, then the current, and hence vortons, can dissipate. Thus, the underlying theory may be cosmologically viable.

The plan of this paper is as follows. In section 5.2 we construct a simple supersymmetric model based on the group $SU(2) \times U(1)$ and display the abelian and nonabelian string solutions. In section 5.3, we use an index theorem to find its fermion zero modes. We then use SUSY transformations to obtain the zero modes in terms of the background string fields. Soft SUSY breaking terms are introduced in section 5.4, and their effect on the string solution is considered in section 5.5. In section 5.6 the effect of SUSY-breaking on the zero modes is analysed using the index theorem. In this section we consider both string solutions for the $SU(2) \times U(1)$ model and also for the $U(1)$ theories discussed in chapter 4. For the nonabelian string the SUSY breaking terms destroy the zero modes, while for the other string solutions the situation is more complicated.

5.2 An $SU(2) \times U(1)$ Model

There exist many nonabelian theories with breaking schemes giving rise to cosmic strings. In general both abelian and nonabelian strings can be produced in such a process, depending on which part of the vacuum manifold is involved in the winding.

In this section we consider a simple example in which the gauge group $SU(2) \times U(1)$ is spontaneously broken down to the group $U(1) \times Z_2$ via the superpotential

$$W = c_1 S_0(\Phi \cdot \tilde{\Phi} - \eta^2) + c_2(S\Phi^T \Lambda \Phi + \tilde{S}\tilde{\Phi}^T \Lambda \tilde{\Phi}) . \quad (5.1)$$

The chiral superfields $\Phi_i(\phi_i, \psi_i, F_i)$ and $\tilde{\Phi}_i(\tilde{\phi}_i, \tilde{\psi}_i, \tilde{F}_i)$ are $SU(2)$ triplets with $U(1)$ charges ± 1 respectively. The other chiral superfields, $S_0(s_0, \omega_0, F_{S_0})$, $S(s, \omega, F_S)$ and $\tilde{S}(\tilde{s}, \tilde{\omega}, F_{\tilde{S}})$, are $SU(2)$ scalars with $U(1)$ charges 0, -2 and $+2$ respectively. Finally, defining $T^4 = \sqrt{2/3}I$, the vector supermultiplets are $V^a(A_\mu^a, \lambda^a, D^a)$, $a = 1, \dots, 4$. Since the constant matrix Λ satisfies $\Lambda T^i = -(T^i)^* \Lambda$ ($i = 1, \dots, 3$), and the $SU(2)$ gauge transformations are $\delta\Phi = iT^a n^a \Phi$ and $\delta\tilde{\Phi} = -iT^{a*} n^a \tilde{\Phi}$, the superpotential is gauge invariant. The scalar potential, derived in the standard manner [14], is then

$$\begin{aligned} U = & c_1^2 |\phi \cdot \tilde{\phi} - \eta^2|^2 + c_2^2 |2\phi_1 \phi_3 - \phi_2^2|^2 + c_2^2 |2\tilde{\phi}_1 \tilde{\phi}_3 - \tilde{\phi}_2^2|^2 \\ & + |c_1 s_0 \tilde{\phi} + 2c_2 s \Lambda \phi|^2 + |c_1 s_0 \phi + 2c_2 \tilde{s} \Lambda \tilde{\phi}|^2 + \frac{e^2}{3} (|\phi|^2 - |\tilde{\phi}|^2 - 2|s|^2 + 2|\tilde{s}|^2)^2 \\ & + e^2 |(\phi_1 + \phi_3)\phi_2^* - (\tilde{\phi}_1 + \tilde{\phi}_3)\tilde{\phi}_2^*|^2 + \frac{e^2}{2} (|\phi_1|^2 - |\phi_3|^2 - |\tilde{\phi}_1|^2 + |\tilde{\phi}_3|^2)^2 . \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

This is minimised when all fields are zero except $\phi_1 = \tilde{\phi}_1 = \eta$ or at any (broken) gauge transformation of this. We note also that the theory has a local minimum with $\phi = \tilde{\phi} = 0$ and that this structure can give rise to hybrid inflation [54]. This is true even for the abelian theory described in chapter 5. In both cases inflation ends with defect formation.

As we mentioned above, there are abelian and nonabelian string solutions to this theory. The abelian solution is obtained from the ansatz

$$\phi_1 = \tilde{\phi}_1^* = \eta f(r) e^{i\varphi} , \quad (5.3)$$

$$A_\varphi = \frac{a(r)}{er} \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}} T^G , \quad (5.4)$$

$$F_{S_0} = c_1 \eta^2 (1 - f(r)^2) , \quad (5.5)$$

where $T^G = \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}T^3 + \sqrt{\frac{2}{5}}T^4$. All other fields are zero and the profile functions a and f obey the boundary conditions $f(0) = a(0) = 0$ and $f(\infty) = a(\infty) = 1$.

The nonabelian solution is obtained from the ansatz

$$\phi = \tilde{\phi}^* = \eta \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(e^{i\varphi}\mathbf{e}_+ + e^{-i\varphi}\mathbf{e}_-)f(r) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\mathbf{e}_0g(r) \right\}, \quad (5.6)$$

$$A_\varphi = \frac{a(r)}{er}T^1, \quad (5.7)$$

$$F_{S_0} = \frac{1}{2}c_1\eta^2(2 - f(r)^2 - g(r)^2), \quad (5.8)$$

$$F_S = F_{\tilde{S}} = \frac{1}{2}c_2\eta^2(f(r)^2 - g(r)^2), \quad (5.9)$$

where $\mathbf{e}_k$ are unit vectors obeying $T^1\mathbf{e}_k = k\mathbf{e}_k$. In this case $g(0)$ is finite, $g(\infty) = 1$ and f and a obey the same boundary conditions as in the abelian case.

Note that f , g and a are solutions to simple coupled second order ordinary differential equations. Their forms can be obtained numerically and are well known [34].

5.3 SUSY Transformations and Zero Modes

The string solutions obtained above have all the fermion fields set to zero. In this section we investigate what happens when these fields are excited in the background of the cosmic string. We can find the number of zero modes with the index theorem in chapter 3.

We already know that there must exist fermion zero modes on the string. Rather than attempting to solve the difficult fermion equations of motion to obtain them, we shall use the technique described in section 4.3 which exploits the power of SUSY to obtain some of the solutions.

5.3.1 Abelian string

The relevant part of the Lagrangian is the Yukawa sector which is entirely determined by supersymmetry. In the abelian case, the non-zero Yukawa couplings are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_Y = & - \left[c_1(e^{i\varphi}\tilde{\psi}_1 + e^{-i\varphi}\psi_1)\omega_0 + \sqrt{\frac{5}{6}}ie(e^{-i\varphi}\psi_1 - e^{i\varphi}\tilde{\psi}_1)\lambda^G \right. \\ & \left. + 2c_2(e^{i\varphi}\psi_3\omega + e^{-i\varphi}\tilde{\psi}_3\tilde{\omega}) \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \frac{ie}{\sqrt{2}}(e^{-i\varphi}\lambda_+\psi_2 + e^{i\varphi}\lambda_-\tilde{\psi}_2) \Big] \eta f(r) + (\text{c. c.}) , \quad (5.10)$$

where $\lambda_{\pm} = (\lambda^1 \mp i\lambda^2)/\sqrt{2}$. With respect to the string generator, the only fields with non-zero eigenvalues are ψ_1 and λ_+ (eigenvalue 1) and $\tilde{\psi}_1$ and λ_- (eigenvalue -1). The Yukawa Lagrangian can be split up into 5 independent parts. Applying the index theorem (3.29,3.30) to these reveals that there are a total of three left moving and three right moving complex zero modes.

Now, following the techniques in section 4.3, we perform an infinitesimal SUSY transformation (with Grassmann parameter ϵ_{α}) followed by a gauge transformation to return to the Wess-Zumino gauge. The string fields all transform quadratically and so are unchanged to first order. However, the fermions transform linearly and, in terms of the background string fields, it is possible to find two complex (or 4 real) fermion zero mode solutions given by

$$\omega_0 = \sqrt{2}c_1\eta^2(1-f^2)\epsilon , \quad (5.11)$$

$$\lambda^G = -i\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}\frac{a}{er}\sigma^z\epsilon , \quad (5.12)$$

$$\psi_1 = i\sqrt{2}\eta e^{i\varphi} \left(f'\sigma^r + i\frac{1-a}{r}f\sigma^{\theta} \right) \bar{\epsilon} , \quad (5.13)$$

$$\tilde{\psi}_1 = i\sqrt{2}\eta e^{-i\varphi} \left(f'\sigma^r - i\frac{1-a}{r}f\sigma^{\theta} \right) \bar{\epsilon} . \quad (5.14)$$

Setting either component of ϵ to zero gives one of the zero modes. One is left moving, the other moves right.

5.3.2 Nonabelian string

In the nonabelian case it is convenient to split ψ , $\tilde{\psi}$ and λ^i into eigenvectors of T^1 , and label them by their eigenvalues. Defining $\chi_i = (\psi_i + \tilde{\psi}_i)/\sqrt{2}$, $\zeta_i = (\psi_i - \tilde{\psi}_i)/\sqrt{2}$ and $\omega_{(\pm)} = (\omega \pm \tilde{\omega})/\sqrt{2}$, the non-zero Yukawa couplings are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_Y = & -c_1\eta \left[\chi_0 g(r) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\chi_+ e^{-i\varphi} + \chi_- e^{i\varphi})f(r) \right] \omega_0 - \frac{ie\eta}{2}(\chi_+ e^{-i\varphi} - \chi_- e^{i\varphi})f(r)\lambda^0 \\ & - c_2\eta \left[-\sqrt{2}\chi_0 g(r) + (\chi_+ e^{-i\varphi} + \chi_- e^{i\varphi})f(r) \right] \omega_{(+)} \\ & - c_2\eta \left[-\sqrt{2}\zeta_0 g(r) + (\zeta_+ e^{-i\varphi} + \zeta_- e^{i\varphi})f(r) \right] \omega_{(-)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{e\eta}{2} \left[\sqrt{2}(\zeta_- \lambda^+ - \zeta_+ \lambda^-)g(r) + \zeta_0(\lambda^+ e^{-i\varphi} - \lambda^- e^{i\varphi})f(r) \right] \\
& - \frac{ie\eta}{\sqrt{6}} \left[\sqrt{2}\zeta_0 g(r) + (\zeta_+ e^{-i\varphi} + \zeta_- e^{i\varphi})f(r) \right] \lambda^4 + (\text{c. c.}) .
\end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

In this case $\chi_\pm$, $\zeta_\pm$ and $\lambda^\pm$ have eigenvalues ± 1 . Applying (3.29,3.30) to the two irreducible parts of (5.15) shows that there are just two complex zero modes, moving in opposite directions.

Once again performing an infinitesimal SUSY transformation and a (nonabelian) gauge transformation we obtain two complex zero modes

$$\omega_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_1\eta^2(2 - g^2 - f^2)\epsilon , \tag{5.16}$$

$$\omega_{(+)} = c_2\eta^2(g^2 - f^2)\epsilon , \tag{5.17}$$

$$\lambda^0 = -i\frac{a}{er}\sigma^z\epsilon , \tag{5.18}$$

$$\chi_+ = i\eta e^{i\varphi} \left(f'\sigma^r + i\frac{1-a}{r}f\sigma^\theta \right) \bar{\epsilon} , \tag{5.19}$$

$$\chi_- = i\eta e^{-i\varphi} \left(f'\sigma^r - i\frac{1-a}{r}f\sigma^\theta \right) \bar{\epsilon} , \tag{5.20}$$

$$\chi_0 = i\sqrt{2}\eta g'\sigma^r\bar{\epsilon} . \tag{5.21}$$

Thus in this case there are no zero modes beyond those implied by SUSY, in contrast to the abelian case. This is related to the fact that there are components of the Higgs fields that do not wind in the nonabelian case.

5.4 Soft SUSY Breaking

Perhaps the most attractive feature of supersymmetry arises from the non-renormalisation theorems, which provide a solution to the hierarchy problem. The mass of the electroweak Higgs field receives quadratically divergent radiative corrections from the particles which it couples to. In general this leads to conflict with experiment. In a supersymmetric theory the contributions from the fermion and boson fields cancel each other exactly. This ensures that quadratic divergences are absent, and so any tree-level hierarchy of scales is protected from receiving quantum corrections.

Supersymmetry is not observed at everyday temperatures, and so must have been broken as the universe cooled. It is crucial that the quadratic divergences remain absent from the theory, so that the hierarchy problem is still avoided. This is achieved by adding only ‘soft’ SUSY breaking terms. These are all either mass terms, or couplings with positive mass dimension [15]. Obviously they must be non-invariant under SUSY too. All the allowed terms are equivalent to one of three types. They lead to the following changes to the Lagrangian

1. Arbitrary mass terms for scalar particles are added to the scalar potential.
2. Bilinear and trilinear scalar terms in the superpotential, plus their Hermitian conjugates, are added to the scalar potential with arbitrary coupling.
3. Mass terms for the gauginos are added to the Lagrangian density.

For a general theory the allowed terms are

$$-\mathcal{L}_{\text{soft}} = m_{ij}^2 \phi_i^* \phi_j + \left(b'_{ij} \Phi_i \Phi_j + c'_{ijk} \Phi_i \Phi_j \Phi_k + (\text{c. c.}) \right) + m_\lambda \lambda^a \lambda^a + (\text{c. c.}) . \quad (5.22)$$

Of course, only those soft SUSY breaking terms which respect the gauge and other symmetries of the theory are allowed. Because of this the bilinear and trilinear terms resemble those of the superpotential, and are conventionally written as multiples of them. Experiment suggests that the SUSY breaking scale is around 1 TeV.

5.5 SUSY breaking and an Abelian String Model

In section 4.3 we referred to an abelian theory in which the gauge symmetry is broken via an F term as ‘theory F ’. The corresponding superpotential was

$$W = c\Phi_0(\Phi_+\Phi_- - \eta^2) . \quad (5.23)$$

The allowed soft SUSY breaking contributions to the potential are

$$m_i^2 |\phi_i|^2 + c\mathcal{A}\phi_0\phi_+\phi_- + (\text{c. c.}) . \quad (5.24)$$

Defining $m^2 = (m_+^2 + m_-^2)/2$ and $\xi = (m_+^2 - m_-^2)/g$, the scalar potential becomes

$$V = c^2|\phi_+\phi_- - \eta^2|^2 + |\phi_0|^2(c^2(|\phi_-|^2 + |\phi_+|^2) + m_0^2) + m^2(|\phi_+|^2 + |\phi_-|^2) + \frac{g^2}{8} \left(|\phi_+|^2 - |\phi_-|^2 + \frac{2}{g}\xi \right)^2 + c\mathcal{A}\phi_0\phi_+\phi_- + c\mathcal{A}(\phi_0\phi_+\phi_-)^* - \frac{\xi^2}{2} . \quad (5.25)$$

We see that ξ acts like a Fayet-Iliopoulos term. Any stationary points of the potential will have

$$\phi_0 = -\frac{c\mathcal{A}\phi_+^*\phi_-^*}{m_0^2 + c^2(|\phi_+|^2 + |\phi_-|^2)} . \quad (5.26)$$

Thus ϕ_0 will acquire a non-zero expectation value if the trilinear term is present.

It is not generally possible to find the minimum of (5.25) analytically. Instead we will consider a couple of special cases. It is convenient to define $\tilde{m} = m/(c\eta)$, $\tilde{\xi} = \xi/(g\eta^2)$ and $\beta = 2c^2/g^2$.

If $\mathcal{A} = 0$ the potential has stationary points at $\phi_i = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\pm} &= \eta e^{\pm ia} \sqrt{1 - \frac{\tilde{m}^2}{\cosh \chi}} e^{\pm \chi/2} , \\ \phi_0 &= 0 , \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

where a is real and χ satisfies

$$\sinh \chi + \tilde{m}^2(\beta - 1) \tanh \chi + \tilde{\xi} = 0 \quad (5.28)$$

and

$$\cosh \chi - \tilde{m}^2 > 0 . \quad (5.29)$$

If $\tilde{m}^2 \geq 1$ and $|\tilde{\xi}/\beta|^2 \leq (\tilde{m}^4 - 1)$ then (5.28) has no real solutions which also satisfy (5.29). The only minimum of V is then $\phi_i = 0$, and so the SUSY-breaking terms restore the broken $U(1)$ gauge symmetry.

If $\tilde{m}^2 < 0$, $\tilde{m}^2(\beta - 1) < -1$ and $|\tilde{\xi}|^{2/3} < [-\tilde{m}^2(\beta - 1)]^{2/3} - 1$ then (5.28) has 3 solutions, two of which are minima. Since the potential has disconnected minima, it is possible for domain walls to form. Domain wall formation occurs when a discrete vacuum symmetry is broken. In this case it is the $\phi_+ \leftrightarrow \phi_-^*$ symmetry. If $\xi = 0$ the minima have the same energy. The domain walls are then stable, and will come to dominate the energy density

of the universe as it evolves, conflicting with observations [16]. If $\xi \neq 0$ the minima will have different energies, and the walls can decay by quantum tunnelling. If this happened rapidly enough, conflict with observations could be avoided.

Other values of the parameters give a unique global minimum with $\phi_{\pm} \neq 0$. Since we require the phase transition not to be reversed, and that no domain walls form, the range of allowed parameters is restricted. However, we expect $\tilde{m}, \tilde{\xi} \ll 1$ in general, so these restrictions are not very significant. If the phase transition and supersymmetry breaking occur close together then $\tilde{m}, \tilde{\xi} \sim 1$, and the allowed parameter range may be significantly reduced.

If $\xi = m_0^2 = 0$, the vacuum is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{\pm} &= \eta e^{\pm ia} \sqrt{1 + \frac{\mathcal{A}^2 - 4m^2}{(2c\eta)^2}}, \\ \phi_0 &= -\frac{\mathcal{A}}{2c}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.30}$$

If $\mathcal{A} = 0$ and $m_0^2 < 0$ the potential (5.25) resembles that of the bosonic superconductivity model in ref. [11]. Although $\phi_0 = 0$ outside of a cosmic string, it may be energetically favourable for it to be non-zero inside. Excitations of this condensate could then form currents flowing along the string, although these are likely to be small.

5.6 Fermion Zero Modes after SUSY breaking

We will now consider the effect of soft SUSY breaking on the fermion zero modes. Since the techniques we have used for finding the zero modes are strictly valid only when SUSY is exact, it is necessary to investigate the effect of these soft terms on the zero modes we have identified. As we have already commented, the existence of the zero modes can be seen as a consequence of the index theorem in section 3.2. The index is insensitive to the size and exact form of the Yukawa couplings, as long as they are regular for small r , and tend to a constant at large r . In fact, the existence of zero modes relies only on the existence of the appropriate Yukawa couplings and that they have the correct φ dependence. Thus there can only be a change in the number of zero modes if the soft breaking terms induce

specific new Yukawa couplings in the theory and it is this that we must check for. Further, it was conjectured in section 3.4 that the destruction of a zero mode occurs only when the relevant fermion mixes with another massless fermion.

5.6.1 U(1) Abelian models

Theory F

We saw in section 5.5 that although the scalar mass terms will alter the values of ϕ_+ and ϕ_- , they do not generally produce any new Yukawa terms. Thus these soft SUSY-breaking terms have no effect on the existence of the zero modes. The possible exception was a negative m_0^2 term. This may lead to a ϕ_0 condensate inside the string which will produce a $\psi_+\psi_-$ term.

The presence of the trilinear term gives ϕ_0 a non-zero expectation value everywhere, and hence produces a Yukawa term coupling the ψ_+ and ψ_- fields. This destroys all the zero modes in the theory since the left and right moving zero modes mix.

For completeness note that a gaugino mass term also mixes the left and right zero modes, aiding in their destruction.

In terms of the index theorem, the change in the number of zero modes arises because (3.20,3.21) applies after the SUSY breaking, while (3.29,3.30) applied before it. Although the fermion eigenvalues do not change, the expression relating them to the zero modes does.

Theory D

The $U(1)$ theory with gauge symmetry broken via a Fayet-Iliopoulos term and no superpotential is simpler to analyse. New Higgs mass terms have no effect on the number of zero modes, as in the above case, and there are no trilinear terms. Further, although the gaugino mass terms also affect the form of the zero mode solutions, they do not affect their existence, and so in theory D the zero modes remain even after SUSY breaking.

5.6.2 $SU(2) \times U(1)$ model

Abelian strings

The effect of soft SUSY breaking terms on the zero modes which were found analytically in (5.14) is identical to the equivalent $U(1)$ theory. Thus, all SUSY zero modes are destroyed in this case. In this larger theory there are also other, non-SUSY, zero modes. Not all of these are destroyed by a gaugino mass term, as some do not involve the gaugino fields. However, if the trilinear terms (or possibly a negative m_0^2 term) give s_0 a non-zero expectation value, all the zero modes are destroyed. The extra Yukawa terms mean there are fewer irreducible parts to the fermion mass matrices. This results in more terms cancelling in (3.29,3.30), reducing the number of zero modes. As in the other cases, the physical reason behind the destruction of the zero modes is that left and right movers mix.

Nonabelian strings

As in the other cases above, non-zero gaugino mass or trilinear terms destroy the zero modes that were found with SUSY transformations (5.21). Similarly (3.20,3.21) are required instead of (3.29,3.30), implying that the left and right moving modes mix. For nonabelian strings these are the only zero modes and so none remain after SUSY breaking.

5.7 Comments and Conclusions

We have examined the microphysics of abelian and nonabelian cosmic string solutions to the $SO(10)$ inspired supersymmetric $SU(2) \times U(1)$ model. By performing infinitesimal SUSY transformations on the background string fields we have obtained the form of the fermionic zero modes responsible for cosmic string conductivity. These solutions may be compared to those found in chapter 4.

Our results mean that fermion zero modes are always present around cosmic strings in SUSY. We conjecture that in theories with F -term gauge symmetry breaking, the zero modes given by SUSY always occur in pairs, one left and one right moving. It also seems likely that such theories always have hybrid inflation.

Furthermore, in the abelian case there were additional zero modes that were not a consequence of supersymmetry. We expect that similar extra zero modes will be present in a larger theory, even in the nonabelian case.

We have also analysed the effect of soft SUSY breaking on the existence of fermionic zero modes. The $SU(2) \times U(1)$ model and two simple abelian models were examined. In all cases Higgs mass terms did not affect the existence of the zero modes. In the theories with F -term symmetry breaking, gaugino mass terms destroyed all zero modes which involved gauginos and trilinear terms created extra Yukawa couplings which destroyed all the zero modes present.

All the theories with F -term symmetry breaking feature a chargeless scalar field. If the SUSY-breaking contribution to its mass term is negative, a chargeless condensate may form inside the string. This would allow bosonic currents to flow along the string. Additionally the condensate would destroy the fermion zero modes, in a similar way to any trilinear terms.

In the abelian theory with D -term symmetry breaking, the zero modes were unaffected by the SUSY breaking terms. It was conjectured in section 3.4 that zero modes would only disappear when they mixed with another massless fermion field and this is consistent with the results obtained in this chapter. If the remaining zero modes survive subsequent phase transitions, then stable vortons could result. Such vortons would dominate the energy density of the universe, rendering the underlying GUT cosmologically problematic.

Therefore, although SUSY breaking may alleviate the cosmological disasters faced by superconducting cosmic strings [28], there are classes of string solution for which zero modes remain even after SUSY breaking. It remains to analyse all the phase transitions undergone by specific SUSY GUT models to see whether or not fermion zero modes survive down to the present time. If the zero modes do not survive SUSY breaking, the universe could experience a period of vorton domination beforehand, and then reheat and evolve as normal afterwards.

If the zero modes do occur in pairs (one left and one right moving) in F -term gauge symmetry breaking, it is possible that they could scatter off each other [57]. This would

cause the current to decay, and could stop vorton domination.

There is the possibility that even if zero modes are destroyed they become low-lying bound states. Such bound states may still be able to carry a persistent current. If this is the case, even such theories may not be safe cosmologically. Work on this is under investigation (and see chapter 6).

It may also be possible to extend our analysis of the effect of SUSY breaking on the bosonic fields. The full potential is very complex, even in the abelian case. It may be worth using some sort of approximation or a numerical solution. We have already seen that domain walls can form in some special cases, allowing the corresponding parameter range to be ruled out. Other parameter ranges could be ruled out in the same way.

Chapter 6

Massive Fermion Bound States

6.1 Introduction

In section 1.6 and chapter 3 we investigated fermion zero modes and massless currents on cosmic strings. It is reasonable to expect that cosmic strings may also have massive bound states and currents. It is possible that such currents occur in models without zero modes, in which case a greater range of models will have conducting strings. We expect the maximum size of these currents to be smaller than the massless case, since they will require less momentum to escape from the string.

If the theory contains particles which are massless off the string, and these interact with the current carriers, we expect them to scatter into those states and thus the current will dissipate. This is most likely to happen in a GUT at high temperatures, since all the Standard Model fields are massless then. This is not the case after the electroweak phase transition, suggesting that massive currents will be most significant at low temperatures.

In chapter 4 we showed that fermion zero modes occur in all supersymmetric cosmic string theories. It seems that they will gain a mass when supersymmetry is broken (see chapter 5), suggesting that massive fermion currents will occur in models with broken supersymmetry.

The existence of bound states will also affect scattering off the string. A stable bound state may help to catalyse certain interactions. This could provide a way to probe a string's

internal structure, and determine the properties of the GUT in which it formed.

We found that each of massless fermion currents considered in chapter 3 only moved in one direction along a cosmic string. If a massive fermion current exists on a string, there will be equal numbers of left and right moving states. If lower energy states are always filled before higher energy ones, there will be equal amounts of left and right movers. The total current is then zero. The fermion states will still have non-zero angular momentum, and so they may still stabilise string loops to form vortons. A net current will develop if the states are not filled evenly, due to difficulties in dissipating momentum.

In section 6.2 we will derive the field equations for fermion bound states in a general theory, and use them to show that such states are always time or light like. We solve these equations numerically for an abelian model in section 6.3. In section 6.4 we speculate about the existence and type of bound states in some other theories. The results are summarised in section 6.5.

6.2 Field Equations and a Positivity Condition

Consider a general fermion Lagrangian,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{fermions}} = \bar{\psi}_\alpha i\sigma^\mu D_\mu \psi_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} i\bar{\psi}_\alpha M_{\alpha\beta} \psi_\beta^c + (\text{h. c.}) . \quad (6.1)$$

The field equations for ψ_α can be found by varying (6.1) with respect to $\bar{\psi}_\alpha$. We can then separate variables with the aid of similar expressions to those used in chapter 3

$$\psi_\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i(q_\alpha - \frac{1}{2})\theta} \left[A_1^\alpha(r) e^{il\theta + i(wt + kz)} + A_2^{\alpha*}(r) e^{-il\theta - i(wt + kz)} \right] \\ -i e^{i(q_\alpha + \frac{1}{2})\theta} \left[A_3^\alpha(r) e^{il\theta + i(wt + kz)} - A_4^{\alpha*}(r) e^{-il\theta - i(wt + kz)} \right] \end{pmatrix} . \quad (6.2)$$

q_α are the charges of ψ_α with respect to the string generator. l can take any value which gives a single valued ψ_α , so it must be an integer if $2q_\alpha$ are odd and a half integer if $2q_\alpha$ are even. Using the gauge invariance of (6.1), we deduce that the angular dependence of the mass term is

$$M_{\alpha\beta}(r, \theta) = C_{\alpha\beta}(r) e^{i(q_\alpha + q_\beta)\theta} \quad (\text{no summation}) . \quad (6.3)$$

We will define the following operators

$$\mathcal{D}_T^{(\alpha)} = \partial_r + \frac{1}{2r} + \text{diag} \left(-\frac{l+q_\alpha}{r} + eA_\theta, \frac{l-q_\alpha}{r} + eA_\theta, \frac{l+q_\alpha}{r} - eA_\theta, -\frac{l-q_\alpha}{r} - eA_\theta \right) ,$$

$$\mathcal{D} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (w+k)I \\ (w-k)I & 0 \end{pmatrix} , \quad \mathcal{M}_{\alpha\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma^1 & 0 \\ 0 & -\sigma^1 \end{pmatrix} C_{(\alpha\beta)} . \quad (6.4)$$

Using (6.2) the field equations reduce to

$$(-\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{D}_T + \mathcal{M}) \mathbf{A} = 0 , \quad (6.5)$$

where $(\mathcal{D}_T \mathbf{A})^\alpha = \mathcal{D}_T^{(\alpha)} \mathbf{A}^\alpha$. These have equal numbers of real and imaginary solutions. If $l = 0$ (which is only possible if $2q_\alpha$ are odd) these equations are reducible. We will consider real and imaginary solutions separately, and set $A_2^\alpha = \pm A_1^\alpha$ and $A_4^\alpha = \pm A_3^\alpha$. Defining $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^\alpha = (A_1^\alpha, A_3^\alpha)^T$, (6.5) becomes

$$(-\tilde{\mathcal{D}} + \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_T \pm \tilde{\mathcal{M}}) \tilde{\mathbf{A}} = 0 , \quad (6.6)$$

with

$$\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_T^{(\alpha)} = \partial_r + \frac{1}{2r} + \frac{1}{r} \text{diag} \left(-\frac{q_\alpha}{r} + eA_\theta, \frac{q_\alpha}{r} - eA_\theta \right) ,$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{D}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & w+k \\ w-k & 0 \end{pmatrix} , \quad \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\alpha\beta} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} C_{(\alpha\beta)} . \quad (6.7)$$

The upper and lower choices of sign correspond to real and imaginary solutions respectively.

Now consider $\mathbf{A}^T \mathcal{D}^2 \mathbf{A}$. Using (6.5) and the definition of $\mathcal{D}$, we find

$$\mathbf{A}^T \mathcal{D}^2 \mathbf{A} = (w^2 - k^2) |\mathbf{A}|^2 = \mathbf{A}^T (\mathcal{D}_T + \mathcal{M})^2 \mathbf{A} . \quad (6.8)$$

We will now define the constant orthogonal matrix

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix} . \quad (6.9)$$

Any physical solutions must be normalisable. We will scale $\mathbf{A}$ so that $\int |\mathbf{A}|^2 r dr = 1$. Now (6.8) implies

$$w^2 - k^2 = \int \mathbf{A}^T (\mathcal{D}_T + \mathcal{M}) K^T K (\mathcal{D}_T + \mathcal{M}) \mathbf{A} r dr = \int |K (\mathcal{D}_T + \mathcal{M}) \mathbf{A}|^2 r dr . \quad (6.10)$$

We have integrated by parts, and used the fact that $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{D}_T$ are symmetric. We see that $w^2 \geq k^2$, with equality occuring only when $(\mathcal{D}_T + \mathcal{M})\mathbf{A} = 0$. Similar arguments apply to $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$. Thus there are no space-like fermion currents, and the only light-like ones are generalisations of zero modes. This is in contrast to the case of bosonic currents, where space-like currents exist and are the most favoured [58].

6.3 Bound States in the Abelian String Model

For simplicity we will consider currents in the $U(1)$ model described in chapter 1. The fermionic part of its Lagrangian is given by (1.16), which leads to the field equations (1.17). In this case there is only one fermion field, so the index α in (6.2) can be dropped. For a string with winding number n , $q = n/2$ and $M = m_f f(r) e^{in\theta}$.

Since there are no space-like currents we can set $k = 0$ without loss of generality. By changing the signs of A_3 and A_4 , $w > 0$ solutions can be changed into $w < 0$ solutions, thus only positive w need be considered. We will take the string's winding number (n) to be 1, so $q = 1/2$ in (6.2). By interchanging $A_{1,3}$ and $A_{2,4}$ negative l solutions can be obtained from the positive l solutions. Thus it is only necessary to look for $l \geq 0$ solutions.

We will use a variation of the shooting method to determine the values of w which have normalisable fermion solutions on the string. At large r the solutions of (6.5) have exponential behaviour. Two of them decay and so are acceptable. In the case of the small r solutions, only two of them give a normalisable state.

Each of these 4 solutions can be numerically extended to some intermediate value of r (of order the string width). We can then see if any non-trivial combinations of the large and small r solutions match up there. Since the equations are linear, this is sufficient to determine if there are normalisable solutions for a given value of w . Thus we need only consider variations of w . The special $l = 0$ case can be treated similarly. There is then just one large r and one small r acceptable solution.

Figures 6.1 and 6.2 show the variation of the number of bound states with respect to the Yukawa coupling (m_f/m_s). Each line corresponds to one real and one imaginary solution. For simplicity we have taken the Higgs and gauge field masses (m_s and m_v) to be equal.




Figure 6.1: Spectrum of $l = 0 \dots 3$ fermion bound states.

The string field profiles are shown in figure 1.2.

Plots of the solutions for $m_f/m_s = 2.3$ are shown in figure 6.3. As expected they decay outside the string (which is approximately of radius 3 on the plots).

6.4 Bound States in Other Theories

We know that the right-handed neutrino zero modes on an $SO(10)$ abelian string do not survive the electroweak phase transition (see section 3.3.1). Considering the form of the mass terms in the theory will give some insight into what happens to them.

After the electroweak phase transition the left and right neutrino fields (ν and ν^c) receive masses from both Φ_{10} and Φ_{126} . In the absence of cosmic strings, Φ_{10} contributes a Dirac mass term $m_u = g_E \eta_u$ and Φ_{126} contributes a Majorana mass term $m_G = g_G \eta_G$. Assuming $m_G \gg m_u$ the neutrino mass eigenvalues are

$$m_R = \frac{\sqrt{m_G^2 + 4m_u^2} + m_G}{2} \approx m_G$$




Figure 6.2: Spectrum of $l = 4 \dots 7$ fermion bound states.

$$m_L = \frac{\sqrt{m_G^2 + 4m_u^2} - m_G}{2} \approx \frac{m_u^2}{m_G}. \quad (6.11)$$

The mass eigenstates are then approximately $\nu^c + \epsilon\nu$ and $\nu - \epsilon\nu^c$, with $\epsilon = m_u/m_G$.

Since $|\Phi_{126}|$ and $|\Phi_{10}|$ vary inside a cosmic string, the neutrino masses will too. In section 2.6.1 we showed that there is a region around the string core in which $|\Phi_{10}|$ is reduced but $|\Phi_{126}|$ takes its usual VEV. Thus m_L will be lower in this region. At the centre of the string $\Phi_{126} = 0$ and $|\Phi_{10}| \sim m_u/m_G$ (see figure 2.4), thus $m_L = m_R \sim m_u^2/m_G$ there.

We see that there is a potential well inside the string, which suggests that neutrino bound states will be present. As with the abelian string, we can investigate the existence of bound states by examining the approximate large and small r solutions of (6.5), and then trying to match them at intermediate r . The 8 small r solutions have the same behaviour as the small r zero mode solutions given by (3.12,3.13) and their right moving equivalents. Four of them have acceptable small r behaviour. Of the 8 large r solutions 4 decay outside the string (as required) if $w^2 - k^2 < m_L^2$, so bound states could exist. If $w^2 - k^2 > m_L^2$ no more than 2 of the solutions are acceptable, and so there are no bound states. Thus any




Figure 6.3: Fermion bound state solutions in the abelian string model with $m_f/m_s = 2.3$.

fermion solutions which are localised to the string will have $w^2 - k^2 < m_L^2$. The maximal current in this case will be tiny.

At the phase transition the right-handed neutrino zero modes will mix with the left-handed neutrinos to produce the bound states. Any currents with rest mass greater than the left-handed neutrino mass will be able to escape from the string. The remaining current will be far too small to stabilise vortons, so they will certainly collapse. Furthermore we expect the bound state to be spread over the region of electroweak symmetry restoration. This is far larger than the size of a vorton, which is a couple of orders of magnitude greater than the GUT string radius [24]. The current on one part of the string will then interact with current on the opposite side of the loop, increasing the vorton's instability. Thus we conjecture that vortons in $SO(10)$ will decay at the electroweak phase transition, even though currents may continue to exist.

The electron and quark masses are also reduced inside the string, so they may have bound state solutions too. Their off-string mass is far greater than the neutrinos, so these currents may become large enough to have detectable effects. Since they are charged they will produce a wider range of effects than the neutrino currents. Even so, they will still be far smaller than the GUT currents that were present before the electroweak phase transition.

The situation is likely to be different in supersymmetric theories. Here, SUSY-breaking destroys the zero modes by mixing them with other zero modes, rather than massless fields. Again we expect the current to be limited by the off-string mass of the particles it is composed of. SUSY-breaking does not significantly alter this, so the current will not fly off the string as it could in the $SO(10)$ model. Additionally, extra symmetry restoration does not occur, so the width of the string will not increase and the current on a vorton will not scatter off itself. This suggests vortons arising in supersymmetric theories are more stable than those in ordinary GUTs. Since the mass of the SUSY bound states will be of order the SUSY breaking scale, it is still possible the currents could decay into Standard Model particles. This will depend on the couplings of the theory. Hence fermion currents may provide constraints on SUSY models after all.

6.5 Summary

The existence and form of fermion bound states and their corresponding currents on cosmic strings were investigated in this chapter. We have shown that only time-like and light-like currents can occur. Using numerical methods, the discrete spectrum of states for the abelian string model was determined. We found that it varied with the magnitude of the Yukawa coupling of the theory. For very low values there is just one bound state and a zero mode.

Since the bound states can carry angular momentum, they will contribute to vorton formation. However, unless interactions between the states and the electroweak sector are suppressed, they will decay.

We also speculated about the existence of massive fermion currents in models whose fermion zero modes are destroyed by a phase transition or supersymmetry breaking. We conjecture that when the zero mode mixes with a massless field, the size of the current will be reduced. If the energy scale at which this mixing occurs is much lower than that at which the string formed (as in the GUT considered), the current will be drastically reduced. Any vortons will then certainly decay. If the zero mode mixes with another zero mode (as in the SUSY theories considered), the current will not be significantly altered. Any such vortons must decay by another mechanism.

Chapter 7

Summary and Future Work

7.1 Summary

In this thesis we have investigated cosmic strings in realistic particle physics theories. We have seen that these strings have a far richer microstructure than their counterparts in the simple abelian string model. This microstructure can lead to observational consequences, and will change the physical predictions of the theory. The additional properties of these strings can help to provide explanations for cosmological phenomena. They may also be used to constrain the underlying theory.

We began by looking at cosmic strings in theories with several phase transitions. In chapter 2 we showed that a string formed at one phase transition could affect future phase transitions, and force their Higgs fields to take string-like solutions. Even if string-like solutions formed at such transitions would normally decay, the presence of the GUT defect stabilises them. The existence of these string-like solutions leads to extra symmetry restoration.

This effect was considered in detail for a realistic grand unified theory with an $SO(10)$ symmetry group. After the electroweak phase transition there are a total of five distinct types of cosmic string in this model. Three of them restored electroweak symmetry in a region around the string core. The size of this region is of the same order as the electroweak scale, so it is far greater (about 10^{14} times bigger) than the string width. Profiles of the

electroweak fields were found numerically.

Previous work suggests that if fermions couple to the Higgs field of an abelian cosmic string, fermion zero modes (and hence massless currents) will exist on the strings [26]. In chapter 3 the existence of these currents in a general theory was investigated. We considered theories with more exotic cosmic strings whose Higgs fields can have more than one winding number. An index theorem giving the number and type of massless fermion currents was derived. The theorem depends only on the type of Yukawa terms present, and their angular dependence. It does not depend on the size of the Yukawa couplings, or the radial dependence of the string solution. This allows a wide range of theories to be examined with relative ease. We showed that massless currents can be created or destroyed at phase transitions. This provides a solution to the potential vorton problem.

The index theorem was applied to the strings discussed in chapter 2. We found that for topologically stable strings, only the abelian ones had massless currents at high temperatures. In this case the current carriers were right handed neutrinos. Following the electroweak phase transition, no topologically stable strings admitted massless currents. Thus fermion superconductivity is unlikely to occur in this model at low temperatures. The model provides an example of massless current destruction. Some of the strings with higher winding numbers did have fermion currents, although such strings are unlikely to be stable.

The idea that particle physics theories are supersymmetric above the electroweak scale has become increasingly favoured in recent years. In chapter 4 the implications of supersymmetry for abelian cosmic strings were investigated. Two methods of gauge symmetry breaking were considered, giving two types of string. The strings broke (fully in one theory, partially in the other) supersymmetry in their cores. Applying supersymmetry transformations did not therefore leave the solution invariant. However, since the field equations were still invariant under supersymmetry, the transformed solutions still solved them. These new solutions corresponded to strings with fermion zero modes on them. Furthermore these solutions were expressed in terms of the background string fields, whose properties have been extensively studied.

Supersymmetry is clearly broken in the present universe. We examined the effects of soft supersymmetry breaking terms on cosmic strings in chapter 5. A theory with abelian and nonabelian cosmic strings was considered. Soft terms are those which break supersymmetry, but do not give quadratically divergent contributions to the electroweak Higgs field mass. Some of them destroyed the zero modes. There is some similarity between this mechanism and the destruction of high temperature neutrino zero modes in chapter 3. The effects of soft supersymmetry breaking on the abelian strings in chapter 4 were also considered. The results were the same for the F -term symmetry breaking, but the zero modes on strings formed by D -term symmetry breaking were unaffected.

Lastly, in chapter 6, we investigated the spectrum of massive fermion bound states and currents in an abelian string model. We found that unlike the massless currents, the number of massive currents is dependent on the strength of the couplings in the theory. We also showed that space-like fermion currents do not exist on cosmic strings in any model.

We have shown that cosmic strings in realistic models can be significantly different to those in simple abelian models. If quantum field theory is supersymmetric at high temperatures cosmic strings are certain to have conserved currents. This can radically alter the cosmological implications of the strings. We have also found that the properties of realistic strings are not constant, but change as the universe passes through phase transitions (or as supersymmetry is broken). For example, the stability of currents on the strings can be changed.

7.2 Future Work

There are clearly many extensions of the work on fermion bound states started in chapter 6. The destruction of massless fermion currents at gauge and supersymmetry breakings has been seen in chapters 2 and 5. It seems likely that they turn into bound states, which may then decay. I will examine this conjecture in more detail. If such currents do decay, analysis of the bound states will help determine the decay products. Such decays may help provide a mechanism for baryogenesis.

Although the existence of conserved fermion currents on strings could stabilise loops,

there is still debate about this. The currents are not topologically conserved, and there are possible mechanisms that could destabilise them. One possibility is the interaction of the current carriers with plasma particles or other current carriers. These interactions can also create currents. The presence of fermion bound states on a string may alter these processes. I will investigate these ideas.

The only GUTs considered in chapter 2 involved $SO(10)$ (or a subgroup), but many of the results can be generalised to other theories, such as E_6 . Chapter 3 could be extended in a similar way. I am currently investigating the zero modes in an axion cosmic string theory [59], which can arise naturally in superstring theory. It is possible that phase transitions will also affect gauge boson currents, in a similar way to fermion currents. Such currents are a common feature of nonabelian theories.

Another possible area of investigation is the effect of the other symmetry restorations (particularly the $SU(5)$ restoration) on monopoles. In the $SO(10)$ GUT considered, monopoles form when $SU(5)$ is broken [60]. It is credible that it would be energetically favourable for monopoles to sit on nonabelian strings, since this would reduce the variation in Φ_{45} , and so possibly the total energy. If this does happen, the likelihood of monopole collision will be greatly increased, as collisions in one dimension are far more frequent than in three. Since they are Z_2 monopoles (and hence monopoles are topologically equivalent to anti-monopoles), this results in a higher annihilation rate. While monopoles occur in most GUTs, their properties conflict with observations, so a mechanism is required to get rid of them. Since cosmic strings could reduce the number of monopoles they could solve, or help to solve, this problem. I will see if this mechanism works, and then determine its effectiveness. I will also see how the presence of a gauge boson current on the cosmic string affects it. This mechanism has similarities to the Langacker-Pi mechanism [61], in which strings form that link the monopoles together. The monopoles are then ends to the strings. These rapidly contract, pulling the monopoles into each other, causing them to annihilate. This mechanism is different because the strings are attached to the monopoles for topological reasons rather than just dynamical ones. While the Langacker-Pi mechanism is very efficient, it requires the breaking and later restoration of electromagnetism, which is hard

to reconcile with experiment.

One more aspect of GUT strings that I intend to examine is the interaction of several strings. Collisions between abelian strings have been extensively studied, while those between the more exotic string solutions have received less attention. I will look at these in more detail, particularly in realistic GUTs. Previously, strings that form in a $G \longrightarrow H \times D$ symmetry breaking, where the discrete group D is nonabelian, have been considered. These strings cannot intercommute for topological reasons [62]. This leads to a very different evolution of cosmic string networks [63]. Unfortunately such strings are generally Alice strings, and so are not physical. It is possible similar effects will occur in more realistic theories, although for dynamical rather than topological reasons. Even the simplest abelian strings do not intercommute in some cases [29]. If strings do not intercommute, loop production will be suppressed. A different mechanism for energy loss is then needed if the universe is not to become string dominated. If there are significant differences with GUT strings, they will have implications for the evolution of string networks. This is particularly important given that recent simulations with abelian strings [64] indicate that they produce too little temperature anisotropy at small angular scales to explain the observed data. The cosmology of more exotic cosmic strings remains an open question.

The effects of soft SUSY breaking have only been partially explored in chapter 5, and I will be considering them further. It is not clear what form the minimum of a general scalar potential takes when soft SUSY breaking terms are present. It appears that it may have a flat direction (in addition to the one arising from the gauge symmetry). This could be of interest, since it has been suggested that it could lead to a force between strings. Flat directions are not uncommon in SUSY theories, and a more approachable theory which also has strings has been considered in [65]. If a similar mechanism can be found for monopoles, it could provide a possible solution to the monopole problem. It is also possible the flat direction will give some kind of inflation (rapid expansion of the universe, which could solve many cosmological problems), as it does in unbroken supersymmetry. I hope to extend this work to supergravity theories.

Another interesting property of SUSY is that inflation and cosmic strings frequently

occur together. When cosmic strings are formed because of F -terms in the potential, hybrid inflation also occurs. When a D -term is used to produce inflation, the breaking of the $U(1)$ will result in string formation. I will look at the implications these two theories have for each other. In particular, the cosmological predictions are likely to be much richer than those resulting from strings or inflation alone.

Appendix A

An SO(10) Grand Unified Theory

A.1 Fermion and Gauge Fields

Under $SO(10)$, all left-handed fermions transform under one representation, and right-handed fermions transform under its conjugate [13]. It is convenient to use just one representation. This can be achieved by using the charge conjugates of the fermions ($\psi_R^c = C\bar{\psi}_R^T$, $\psi_L^c = C\bar{\psi}_L^T$). The charge conjugate of a right handed fermion transforms as a left handed fermion, and vice versa. Thus $\Psi_L = \psi_L + \psi_R^c$ is left handed. For $SO(10)$ this definition is necessary, as well as convenient. ψ_L could be gauge transformed to ψ_R^c , so any gauge invariant quantities will have to involve just Ψ_L and Ψ_R (right-handed equivalent of Ψ_L). However, Ψ_R is superfluous, since it is equal to $i\sigma^2\Psi_L^* = \Psi_L^c$, so the theory can be described entirely in terms of Ψ_L . For the electron family, it can be written as

$$\Psi_L^{(e)} = (u_1, u_2, u_3, \nu_e, d_1, d_2, d_3, e^-, d_1^c, d_2^c, d_3^c, e^+, -u_1^c, -u_2^c, -u_3^c, -\nu_e^c)^T, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $d_i = d_{iL}$, $d_i^c = i\sigma^2 d_{iR}^*$, etc. so all the fields are left handed. The other two families of fermions can be described similarly. Adapting work by Rajpoot [66], the gauge fields can

be expressed explicitly as 16×16 matrices, which act on the fermion fields.

$$A^a \tau^a = \sqrt{2} \begin{pmatrix} H_{16} & W_L^+ & & & \\ & W_L^- & H_{16} & & \\ & & M_{16}^\dagger & -H_{16}^* & W_R^+ \\ & & & W_R^- & -H_{16}^* \end{pmatrix} + \Lambda_{16} , \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where

$$M_{16} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -Y_3'^+ & Y_2'^+ & -Y_1^- & 0 & X_3^+ & -X_2^+ & -X_1'^+ \\ Y_3'^+ & 0 & -Y_1'^+ & -Y_2^- & -X_3^+ & 0 & X_1^+ & -X_2'^+ \\ -Y_2'^+ & Y_1'^+ & 0 & -Y_3^- & X_2^+ & -X_1^+ & 0 & -X_3'^+ \\ Y_1^- & Y_2^- & Y_3^- & 0 & X_1'^+ & X_2'^+ & X_3'^+ & 0 \\ 0 & -X_3'^- & X_2'^- & X_1^- & 0 & Y_3^+ & -Y_2^+ & Y_1'^- \\ X_3'^- & 0 & -X_1'^- & X_2^- & -Y_3^+ & 0 & Y_1^+ & Y_2'^- \\ -X_2'^- & X_1'^- & 0 & X_3^- & Y_2^+ & -Y_1^+ & 0 & Y_3'^- \\ -X_1^- & -X_2^- & -X_3^- & 0 & -Y_1'^- & -Y_2'^- & -Y_3'^- & 0 \end{pmatrix} , \quad (\text{A.3})$$

and

$$H_{16} = \begin{pmatrix} & & & X_{S1}^+ \\ & G & & X_{S2}^+ \\ & & & X_{S3}^+ \\ X_{S1}^- & X_{S2}^- & X_{S3}^- & 0 \end{pmatrix} . \quad (\text{A.4})$$

G is a 3×3 matrix of containing the gluon fields. It is hermitian, and so H is too. The other fields are contained in the diagonal matrix Λ_{16}

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{16} &= \text{diag} \left(\left(\frac{B'}{\sqrt{6}} + W_L^3 \right)_3, -3 \frac{B'}{\sqrt{6}} + W_L^3, \left(\frac{B'}{\sqrt{6}} - W_L^3 \right)_3, -3 \frac{B'}{\sqrt{6}} - W_L^3, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(-\frac{B'}{\sqrt{6}} + W_R^3 \right)_3, 3 \frac{B'}{\sqrt{6}} + W_R^3, \left(-\frac{B'}{\sqrt{6}} - W_R^3 \right)_3, 3 \frac{B'}{\sqrt{6}} - W_R^3 \right) \\ &= \text{diag}((s + 2a + 2z)_3, -3s + 4z, (s - 3z - a)_3, -3s - 3a - z, \\ &\quad (-3s + a - z)_3, s + 3a - 3z, (s - 2a + 2z)_3, 5s) . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

The subscripts indicate repeated values, and

$$s = \frac{1}{5} \left(-W_R^3 + \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} B' \right) , \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$B = \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}W_R^3 + \sqrt{\frac{2}{5}}B' , \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$z = \frac{1}{4} \left(W_L^3 - \sqrt{\frac{3}{5}}B \right) , \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$a = \frac{1}{4} \left(W_L^3 + \sqrt{\frac{5}{3}}B \right) . \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$Z = \sqrt{10}z$ and $A = \sqrt{6}a$ are the unrenormalised electroweak Z^0 boson and photon respectively. $Z' = -\sqrt{10}s$ is a high energy $SO(10)$ boson. The generator P is obtained by putting $s = 1$ and $a = z = 0$ in the expression for Λ_{16} . The substitutions $s = z = 0$ and $a = 1/3$ give the charge operator.

A.2 Higgs Fields

The electroweak Higgs field transforms under the $\mathbf{5}_{-2}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{5}}_2$ representations of $SU(5)$. They are contained in the $\mathbf{10}$ of $SO(10)$, and so the components of Φ_{10} can be expressed as symmetric products of spinors transforming under the $\mathbf{16}$ representation. Thus Φ_{10} can be expressed as $\phi_d^\alpha H_d^\alpha + \phi_u^\alpha H_u^\alpha$, where H_d^α ($\alpha = 0, \pm, 1, 2, 3$), are the five components of $\mathbf{5}_{-2}$, and H_u^α are the corresponding components of $\bar{\mathbf{5}}_2$. (H_d^0, H_d^+) and (H_u^0, H_u^-) form $SU(2)_L$ doublets, while H_d^i and H_u^i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) form an $SU(3)_c$ triplet and anti-triplet.

Expressing these components of $\mathbf{10}$ in terms of symmetric products of $\mathbf{16}$ s gives

$$\begin{aligned} H_u^0 &= \frac{1}{4}[(\hat{u}_j \times \hat{u}_j^c)_S + (\hat{\nu} \times \hat{\nu}^c)_S] , \\ H_u^- &= -\frac{1}{4}[(\hat{u}_j^c \times \hat{d}_j)_S + (\hat{e}^- \times \hat{\nu}^c)_S] , \\ H_u^i &= -\frac{1}{4}[\epsilon_{ijk}(\hat{u}_j \times \hat{d}_k)_S + (\hat{d}_i^c \times \hat{\nu}^c)_S - (\hat{u}_i^c \times \hat{e}^+)_S] , \\ H_d^0 &= \frac{1}{4}[(\hat{d}_j \times \hat{d}_j^c)_S + (\hat{e}^+ \times \hat{e}^-)_S] , \\ H_d^+ &= \frac{1}{4}[(\hat{u}_j \times \hat{d}_j^c)_S + (\hat{e}^+ \times \hat{\nu})_S] , \\ H_d^i &= \frac{1}{4}[\epsilon_{ijk}(\hat{u}_j^c \times \hat{d}_k^c)_S + (\hat{d}_i \times \hat{\nu})_S - (\hat{u}_i \times \hat{e}^-)_S] , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where $\hat{\nu}$ is the basis vector corresponding the ν field, etc. The gauge fields can also be

expressed as 10×10 matrices, which will that act on $(\phi_d^\alpha, \phi_u^\alpha)$.

$$A^a \tau^a = \sqrt{2} \begin{pmatrix} H_{10} & M_{10} \\ M_{10}^\dagger & -H_{10}^* \end{pmatrix} + \Lambda_{10} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

with

$$H_{10} = \begin{pmatrix} & & & X_1^- & Y_1^- \\ & G & & X_2^- & Y_2^- \\ & & & X_3^- & Y_3^- \\ X_1^+ & X_2^+ & X_3^+ & 0 & W_L^+ \\ Y_1^+ & Y_2^+ & Y_3^+ & W_L^- & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$M_{10} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -X_{S3}^- & X_{S2}^- & X_1'^+ & -Y_1'^- \\ X_{S3}^- & 0 & -X_{S1}^- & X_2'^+ & -Y_2'^- \\ -X_{S2}^- & X_{S1}^- & 0 & X_3'^+ & -Y_3'^- \\ -X_1'^+ & -X_2'^+ & -X_3'^+ & 0 & -W_R^+ \\ Y_1'^- & Y_2'^- & Y_3'^- & W_R^+ & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{10} &= \text{diag} \left(\left(-2 \frac{B'}{\sqrt{6}} \right)_3, W_L^3 + W_R^3, -W_L^3 + W_R^3, \left(2 \frac{B'}{\sqrt{6}} \right)_3, -W_L^3 - W_R^3, W_L^3 - W_R^3 \right) \\ &= \text{diag} ((-2s - a + z)_3, -2s + 3a + z, -2s - 4z, \\ &\quad (2s + a - z)_3, 2s - 3a - z, 2s + 4z). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

The second Higgs field Φ_{45} is in the **24**₀ component of the **45** representation, and its usual vacuum expectation value is proportional to the generator of the B field. In the absence of a string, Φ_{126} is proportional to $(e_1 \times e_1)_S$, with $e_1 = -\hat{\nu}^c$.

A.3 Fermion Masses

The masses of the fermions arise from Yukawa couplings to the Higgs fields. These must of course be Lorentz and gauge invariant. Since the theory contains only left handed spinors the only possible Lorentz invariant mass terms are Majorana masses $(\bar{\psi}_L^c \psi_L + \bar{\psi}_L \psi_L^c + \text{right-hand terms})$. The Majorana masses transform as a product of **16**s, and so can be

coupled to similarly transforming Higgs fields, Φ_{126} and Φ_{10} , but not Φ_{45} . This gives the fermionic Lagrangian (3.36). We have considered only one family of fermions for simplicity.

Of course, since (3.36) is invariant under $SO(10)$, it must be invariant under $SU(5)$ as well. Thus Φ_{126}^{vac} can only couple to $SU(5)$ singlets (i.e. products of the conjugate neutrino field). The two components of Φ_{10}^{vac} couple to $\mathbf{5}_{-2}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{5}}_2$ products of fermions. Under $SU(5)$, the remaining fermions transform under $\mathbf{10}_1$ and $\bar{\mathbf{5}}_{-3}$ representations. To find allowable mass terms, products of these representations need to be expressed in terms of irreducible representations. $\mathbf{10}_1 \times \mathbf{10}_1$ and $\mathbf{15} \times \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{-3}$ both contain $\bar{\mathbf{5}}_2$ s, and $\mathbf{10}_1 \times \bar{\mathbf{5}}_{-3}$ contains a $\mathbf{5}_{-2}$. Thus, for the usual VEVs of the Higgs fields, the mass terms are written in terms of particle fields as

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\Psi}_L H_d^0 \Psi_L^c &= \frac{1}{8} \left[d_i^\dagger i \sigma^2 d_i^{c*} + e^{-\dagger} i \sigma^2 e^{+*} + d_i^{c\dagger} i \sigma^2 d_i^* + e^{+\dagger} i \sigma^2 e^{-*} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \left[\bar{d}_{iL} d_{iR} + \bar{e}_L^- e_R^- \right],\end{aligned}\tag{A.15}$$

and similarly for H_u^0 , so

$$\bar{\Psi}_L \Phi_{10}^{\text{vac}} \Psi_L^c = \frac{\eta_d}{4} \left[\bar{d}_{iL} d_{iR} + \bar{e}_L^- e_R^- \right] + \frac{\eta_u}{4} \left[\bar{u}_{iL} u_{iR} + \bar{\nu}_L \nu_R \right],\tag{A.16}$$

$$\bar{\Psi}_L \Phi_{126}^{\text{vac}} \Psi_L^c = \eta_G \nu^{c\dagger} i \sigma^2 \nu^{c*} = \eta_G \nu_R^T i \sigma^2 \nu_R.\tag{A.17}$$

This model, unlike the standard model, has non-zero neutrino masses. If the $\nu_R^T i \sigma^2 \nu_R$ term is much larger than the $\bar{\nu}_L \nu_R$ term, the mass eigenstates will be approximately ν_L and ν_R , and have very small and very large mass eigenvalues respectively, giving an almost massless left-handed neutrino.

Bibliography

- [1] A. Vilenkin and E.P.S. Shellard, *Cosmic Strings and Other Topological Defects* (Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- [2] M.B. Hindmarsh and T.W.B. Kibble, Rep. Prog. Phys. **58** (1995) 477.
- [3] A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **46** (1981) 1169, Erratum: Phys. Rev. Lett. **46** (1981) 1496;
R.H. Brandenberger, L. Perivolaropoulos and A. Stebbins, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A5** (1990) 1633;
T. Vachaspati and A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67** (1991) 1057;
D. Vollick, Phys. Rev. D **45** (1992) 1884.
- [4] R.H. Brandenberger, A.C. Davis and A.M. Matheson, Phys. Lett. **218B** (1988) 304;
M.G. Alford, J. March-Russell and F. Wilczek, Nucl. Phys. **B328** (1989) 140.
- [5] N. Kaiser and A. Stebbins, Nature **310** (1984) 391;
J.R. Gott, Ap. J. **288** (1985) 422.
- [6] P. Bhattacharjee, Phys. Rev. D **40** (1989) 3968.
- [7] E.M. Chudnovsky, G.B. Field, D.N. Spergel and A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. D **34** (1986) 944.
- [8] T.W.B. Kibble, J. Phys. **A9** (1976) 1387.
- [9] R.H. Brandenberger, A.C. Davis and A. Matheson, Nucl. Phys. **B307** (1988) 909;
W.B. Perkins *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B353** (1991) 237.

- [10] W.B. Perkins and A.C. Davis, Nucl. Phys. **B406** (1993) 377.
- [11] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B249** (1985) 557.
- [12] A.J. Gill, T.W.B. Kibble *et al.*, Nature **382** (1996) 334;
P.C. Hendry, N.S. Lawson, R.A.M. Lee, P.V.E. McClintock and C.D.H. Williams,
Nature **368** (1994) 315;
I. Chuang, R. Durrer, N. Turok and B. Yurke, Science **251** (1991) 1336.
- [13] G.G. Ross, *Grand Unified Theories* (The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company, Inc. 1984).
- [14] J. Wess and J. Bagger, *Supersymmetry and Supergravity*, 2nd ed. (Princeton University Press, 1992).
- [15] S.P. Martin, *hep-ph/9709356*.
- [16] Ya.B. Zel'dovich, I.Yu. Kobzarev and L.B. Okun, Sov. Phys. JETP **40** (1975) 1.
- [17] Ya.B. Zel'dovich and M.Yu. Khlopov, Phys. Lett. **79B** (1978) 239;
J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43** 1365.
- [18] H.B. Nielsen and P. Olesen, Nucl. Phys. **B61** (1973) 45.
- [19] W.A. Hiscock, Phys. Rev. D **31** (1985) 3288.
- [20] L. Perivolaropoulos, CfA preprint no. 3707 (1993).
- [21] S.M. Barr and A.M. Matheson, Phys. Rev. D **39** (1989) 412.
- [22] R.H. Brandenberger and A. Riotto, *hep-ph/9801448*.
- [23] J.P. Ostriker, C.Thompson, E.Witten, Phys. Lett. **180B** (1986) 231.
- [24] R.L. Davis, Phys. Rev. D **38** (1988) 3722;
R.L. Davis and E.P.S. Shellard, Nucl. Phys. **B323** (1989) 209.
- [25] S.M. Barr and A.M. Matheson, Phys. Lett. **198B** (1987) 146.

- [26] R. Jackiw and P. Rossi, Nucl. Phys. **B190**[FS3] (1981) 681.
- [27] R.H. Brandenberger, A.C. Davis and M.B. Hindmarsh, Phys. Lett. **263B** (1991) 239.
- [28] R.H. Brandenberger, B. Carter, A.C. Davis and M. Trodden, Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 6059.
- [29] L.M.A. Bettencourt, P. Laguna and R.A. Matzner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997) 2066.
- [30] M. Goodband and M. Hindmarsh, Phys. Lett. **370B** (1996) 29.
- [31] R.H. Brandenberger, A.C. Davis and M. Trodden, Phys. Lett. **335B** (1994) 123;
R.H. Brandenberger *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 4257.
- [32] A.C. Davis and W.B. Perkins, Phys. Lett. **390B** (1997) 107.
- [33] A.C. Davis and P. Peter, Phys. Lett. **358B** (1995) 197.
- [34] C.P. Ma, Phys. Rev. D **48** (1993) 530.
- [35] M. Aryal and A. Everett, Phys. Rev. D **35** (1987) 3105.
- [36] T. Vachaspati, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68** (1992) 1977.
- [37] M.G. Alford and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62** (1989) 1071.
- [38] A.C. Davis and N.F. Lepora, Phys. Rev. D **52** (1995) 7265; N.F. Lepora, PhD thesis (1996).
- [39] E.J. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **24** (1981) 2669.
- [40] N. Ganoulis and G. Lazarides, Phys. Rev. D **38** (1988) 547.
- [41] A.C. Davis and W.B. Perkins, Phys. Lett. **393B** (1997) 46.
- [42] Y. Fukuda *et al.* (Super-Kamiokande Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **81** (1998) 1562.
- [43] R.M. Barnett *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 1.
- [44] A. Stern and U.A. Yajnik, Nucl. Phys. **B267** (1986) 158.

- [45] C.T. Hill and L.M. Widrow, Phys. Lett. **189B** (1987) 17;
M. Hindmarsh, Phys. Lett. **200B** (1988) 429.
- [46] M.G. Alford, K. Benson, S. Coleman, J. March-Russell and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** (1990) 1632, Erratum: Phys. Rev. Lett. **65** (1990) 668;
M.G. Alford *et al.*, Nucl. Phys **B349** (1991) 414.
- [47] A. Yates, Conference talk, Capri 1996;
T.W.B. Kibble, G. Lozano and A. Yates, Phys. Rev. D **56** (1997) 1204.
- [48] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, in *Supergravity*, ed. D.Z. Freedman and P. van Nieuwenhuizen (North-Holland Publishing Company, 1979).
- [49] Y. Achiman and B. Stech, Phys. Lett. **77B** (1978) 389;
R. Barbieri and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. **91B** (1980) 369.
- [50] J. Garriga and T. Vachaspati, Nucl. Phys. **B438** (1995) 161.
- [51] J.R. Morris, Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 2078.
- [52] P. Fayet, Nuovo Cimento **A31** (1976) 626.
- [53] P. Fayet and J. Iliopoulos, Phys. Lett. **51B** (1974) 461.
- [54] A.D. Linde, Phys. Lett. **259B** (1991) 38;
A.D. Linde, Phys. Rev. D **49** (1994) 748;
E.J. Copeland *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **49** (1994) 6410.
- [55] G. Dvali and M. Shifman, Nucl. Phys. **B504** (1997) 127.
- [56] M. Claudson and M.B. Wise, Nucl. Phys. **B221** (1983) 461.
- [57] S.M. Barr and A.M. Matheson, Phys. Rev. D **36** (1987) 2905.
- [58] P. Peter, Phys. Rev. D **46** (1992) 3322.
- [59] A. Vilenkin and A.E. Everett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48** (1982) 1867.

- [60] C.P. Dokos and T.N. Tomaras, Phys. Rev. D **21** (1980) 2940.
- [61] P. Langacker and S.Y. Pi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45** (1980) 1.
- [62] F.A. Bais, Nucl. Phys. **B170**[FS1] (1980) 32.
- [63] P. McGraw, Phys. Rev. D **57** (1998) 3317.
- [64] N.G. Turok, U.L. Pen and U. Seljak, Phys. Rev. D **58** (1998) 023506.
- [65] A.A. Penin, V.A. Rubakov, P.G. Tinyakov and S.V. Troisky, Phys. Lett. **389B** (1996) 13.
- [66] S. Rajpoot, Phys. Rev. D **22** (1980) 2244.