

UPR-709-T
August, 1996

Is the vacuum stable?

Alexander Kusenko* and Paul Langacker†

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6396

Abstract

The experimental data, as well as theoretical considerations allow (and, in some cases, require) the Universe at present to rest in a false vacuum, whose approximate stability imposes constraints on the model parameters. Under very general and mild conditions, the Universe would have ended up in the standard vacuum even if the potential has deeper minima, provided there was a period in which the temperature was $\gtrsim 1$ TeV. In many cases, the zero temperature tunneling rate is much smaller than the inverse age of the Universe. Future experiments may reveal that the physical vacuum is not entirely stable. Implications for the cosmological constant are discussed.

* email address: sasha@langacker.hep.upenn.edu; address after October 1, 1996: Theory Division, CERN, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland

† email address: pgl@langacker.hep.upenn.edu

The question of the stability of the physical vacuum is of fundamental importance and has obvious scientific and cultural implications. If the Universe at present is in a metastable state with a lifetime of order billions of years, then its future evolution may be determined by a catastrophic phase transition into a lower-energy state. The past history of the big bang Universe would also be elucidated if we knew that it ended up in a false vacuum.

This fundamental question has received a lot of attention since the advent of supersymmetry, which allows for a complicated structure of false vacua at the electroweak scale. When future experiments unveil the structure of the potential at the scale ~ 1 TeV, we may learn about the existence of states with lower energy density than that of the present vacuum. It is timely, therefore, to examine this issue in the light of recent theoretical developments.

A generic feature of theories with (softly broken) supersymmetry is a scalar potential, $V(\phi)$, that depends on a large number of scalar fields $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$. For this reason, the scalar potential of the MSSM, unlike that of the Standard Model, may have a number of local minima characterized by different gauge symmetries. In particular, the supersymmetric partners of quarks, \tilde{Q}_L and \tilde{q}_R , may have non-zero vev in some minima, where the tri-linear terms $AH_2\tilde{Q}_L\tilde{q}_R$ and $\mu H_1\tilde{Q}_L\tilde{t}_R$ are large and negative (here $H_{1,2}$ denote Higgs fields, A is the SUSY breaking parameter, and μ is the coefficient of H_1H_2 in the superpotential). These color and charge breaking (CCB) minima may be local or global, depending on the values of the MSSM parameters. There might also be directions along which the effective potential is unbounded from below¹ (UFB), in which case all the minima are local.

Any of these local minima may serve as the ground state for the Universe at present, provided that the lifetime of the metastable state is large in comparison to the age of the Universe. The latter is plausible [1, 2, 3] because the tunneling rate in quantum field theory is naturally suppressed by the exponential of a typically large dimensionless number, the saddle point value of the Euclidean action [4]. The probability of the first-order phase transition does not necessarily increase with the depth of the true vacuum relative to that of the false vacuum. In fact, there is a natural scale, the so called “escape point”, which serves as an

¹ In such a case the effective potential would presumably receive large positive contributions near the Planck scale or next physics threshold, so that the apparently UFB direction would really correspond to a very deep minimum.

ultraviolet cutoff, such that physics at larger energy scales does not affect the tunneling probability (in semiclassical approximation). This non-perturbative decoupling allows one to treat the UFB directions on the same footing as the very deep minima of the potential [3].

It is possible to detect the metastability of the false vacuum empirically, at least in principle. The most direct way is to infer the structure of the scalar potential near its minimum from future collider experiments. Renormalizability forces $V(\phi)$ to be a fourth degree polynomial, up to the terms that are suppressed by the powers of some large scale. Supersymmetry imposes further constraints on V . The global structure of the potential can then be derived in principle from its local properties near the minimum, possibly revealing new deeper minima.

One can imagine a Gedanken experiment to determine directly whether the vacuum is true or false. The metastability implies that the scalar potential has a non-zero imaginary part [4]. Therefore, in principle, one could expect small breaking of T and CP, as well as SUSY, were they not already broken. However, if a metastable vacuum has existed for $\tau_U = 10$ billion years, then any effects of the metastability [5] would be characterized by the scale $< 1/\tau_U \sim 10^{-33}$ eV, beyond any hope of being observable. These effects may, however, play a role in the early Universe in the false vacuum at the brink of a first order phase transition [5].

Different minima of the scalar potential are characterized by different values of the cosmological constant. However, contrary to recent claims [6, 7], the cosmological constant problem is just as severe in the stable vacuum as it is in a metastable one. In fact, in a large class of Unified theories with unbroken local supersymmetry the cosmological constant can be fine-tuned to zero in any of the *local* minima, but not in the global minimum [8], where the vacuum energy does not vanish even at the expense of naturalness. The cosmologically acceptable false vacuum is absolutely stable in this case because of the Coleman — De Luccia [9] suppression of tunneling.

Similarly, many models with dynamical breaking of supersymmetry predict the existence of a global supersymmetry preserving vacuum in addition to the standard vacuum with the correct pattern of gauge and supersymmetry breaking (see Ref. [10] and references therein). Since this may be the way SUSY is broken in the real world, the idea that we live in a

metastable vacuum appears rather plausible.

Just about any of the proposed solutions [11] to the cosmological constant problem (none of which is fully satisfactory) would work equally well in a local, or global minimum. Clearly, all the anthropic considerations depend exclusively on the physical properties of the vacuum and its accessibility (discussed below) in the course of the evolution of the Universe. An intriguing possibility is some kind of an adjustment mechanism, similar to those discussed in Refs. [11, 12], which would naturally set the cosmological constant to zero regardless of its initial value. A mechanism of this sort would also be largely independent of whether the vacuum is true, or false. Finally, the cosmological constant may vanish because of some exact symmetry [11, 13], which may or may not require the system to be in its true ground state.

Therefore, based on all the empirical and theoretical considerations, if the scalar potential has more than one minimum, the physical vacuum at present should be determined by the evolution of the Universe.

We concentrate on the TeV-scale CCB minima. Nontrivial minima of the scalar potential usually disappear at temperatures T much larger than the mass scales in the potential. In a general quantum field theory with several scalar fields, it is sometimes possible to find small regions of parameter space which evade this result, *e. g.*, for a gauge symmetry to be broken by the finite-temperature corrections [14]. However, this does not occur in softly broken SUSY theories, because the mass matrix of scalars always receives a positive definite contribution [15] $\Delta M^2(T)$ proportional to T^2 , as long as T is larger than all the masses in the theory. (The latter also ensures that the high-temperature expansion, used here implicitly, is well defined.) At the temperature ~ 1 TeV, the supertrace sum rule implies that the scalar mass matrix, in the basis of eigenvectors of $\Delta M^2(T)$, receives the following contribution [16]:

$$M_{ij}^2 \equiv \frac{\partial^2 V(\phi, T)}{\partial \phi_i \partial \phi_j} \rightarrow M_{ij}^2 + \Delta M^2(T) = M_{ij}^2 + \frac{\delta_{ij}}{8} \left\{ \sum_{kl} |W_{ikl}|^2 + 4 \sum_a g_a^2 C_a(R_i) \right\} T^2, \quad (1)$$

where $W_{ikl} = \partial^3 W / \partial \phi_i \partial \phi_j \partial \phi_k$ are the Yukawa couplings in the superpotential W , g_a are the gauge couplings and $C_a(R_i) = (T^a)_{ii}^2$ are the corresponding Casimir invariants.

Since the one-loop thermal corrections in equation (1) are positive, the symmetry will be restored at a sufficiently high value of the temperature; in the case of the electroweak scale CCB minima, this will happen at $T > M_s \sim \text{few TeV}$. If the reheating temperature after inflation is higher than a few TeV, then the $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ -symmetric phase will be the starting point of the electroweak phase transition. The same is also true [17] if the preheating via parametric resonance decay of the inflaton [18] follows inflation.

As was argued in Ref. [3], at the temperature just above the electroweak phase transition there are two possibilities: (i) that of a likely nearly-second-order phase transition into a standard minimum, or (ii) a far less probable first order phase transition into a CCB minimum. The difference is that transition (i) is associated with T -dependent scalar masses, and is second order at tree level, while the CCB minima are driven by large cubic terms in the effective potential and are usually strongly first order². Therefore, the evolution of the early Universe, under some very general and not very restrictive conditions, appears to favor the color and charge conserving minimum. This *a priori* unexpected benefit of the low-energy supersymmetry is remarkable and intriguing. Similar arguments apply to the UFB directions.

For the Universe to remain in a metastable state, the latter should have a lifetime of order billions of years. The tunneling rate can be evaluated in the semiclassical approximation [4, 19] and is proportional to $\exp(-S[\bar{\phi}])$, where $S[\bar{\phi}]$ is the Euclidean action of the so called “bounce”, $\bar{\phi}(x)$, a solution of the classical Euclidean field equations. In practice, however, finding $\bar{\phi}(x)$ numerically is very difficult (or nearly impossible), especially in the case of a potential that depends on more than one scalar field. This is because $\bar{\phi}(x)$ is an unstable solution, as it must be to be a saddle point of the functional $S[\phi]$. An effective alternative to solving the equations of motion is to use the method of Ref. [20]. The idea is to replace the action S with a different functional, \tilde{S} , for which the same solution, $\bar{\phi}(x)$, is a minimum, rather than a saddle point. Then $\bar{\phi}(x)$ can be found numerically using a straightforward relaxation technique to minimize \tilde{S} .

² The requirement that the second-order transition into a CCB minimum be impossible imposes relatively weak constraints on the scalar mass terms [3].

A number of constraints arise from requiring the standard vacuum to be the global minimum of the potential [6, 7, 21]. However, it is clear from the discussion above that such a requirement is too extreme and unjustified. It was shown in Ref. [3] that allowing metastability relaxes the constraints on the tri-linear couplings for the third generation of squarks, those associated with large Yukawa couplings.

At the same time, cosmological considerations leave no room for constraints on the MSSM parameters from the CCB minima related to smaller Yukawa couplings. As an example, let us consider the constraints on flavor-violating terms advocated in Ref. [6]. It was argued that the tri-linear coupling A that enters in the soft SUSY-breaking term $AHe\tau$ cannot exceed the bound

$$|A|^2 \leq y_\tau^2(m_e^2 + m_\tau^2 + m_H^2), \quad (2)$$

which is more stringent than the experimental limit from the absence of FCNC. Here y_τ is the τ Yukawa coupling; e , τ , and H are the left-handed electron, right-handed τ , and Higgs fields, respectively; and m 's are their mass terms. The constraint (2) results from the requirement that there be no minimum of V in the direction $|e| = |\tau| = |H| = a$, along which

$$V = (m_e^2 + m_\tau^2 + m_H^2)a^2 - 2Aa^3 + y_\tau^2a^4 \quad (3)$$

If the potential (3) has a global minimum at $a > 0$, this minimum will disappear at sufficiently high temperature. By virtue of the same argument as in Ref. [3], we expect a nearly-second-order transition into the standard electroweak vacuum to occur before the tunneling into a charge-breaking minimum can take place. In fact, since the Yukawa coupling is small, the tunneling probability at both finite and zero temperature will be suppressed by the exponential of $(-1/y_\tau^2)$. This makes tunneling practically impossible at $T = 0$, as well as at $T > 0$.

The CCB minima associated with small Yukawa couplings appear to be completely isolated and unreachable except if the scalar mass matrix in the $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ -symmetric

phase acquires a negative eigenvalue at $T > T_c$, where T_c is the electroweak phase transition temperature. The latter requires mass-squared terms which are large in magnitude and opposite in sign [3], not a generic set of parameters by any means. In addition, the F-term contribution of the form $|yH\tilde{f}|^2$ to the sfermion \tilde{f} mass matrix at the standard vacuum must be larger [3] than cT_c^2 , where $c \sim 1$. Since $|yH|^2 = m_f^2$, the corresponding fermion mass, the condition $|yH|^2 = m_f^2 > cT_c^2$ cannot be satisfied for light fermions. Therefore, the CCB minimum associated with a small Yukawa coupling would not be populated either before (via a second-order transition or thermal tunneling) or after (by means of tunneling) the breaking of the electroweak symmetry. We conclude that cosmological considerations do not support a bound of the type (2).

Tunneling into a UFB direction can be treated on the same footing with that into a deep CCB minimum [3]. Therefore, all the above arguments apply to the UFB bounds provided that the UFB directions are lifted in the early Universe and the vev's are driven towards the $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ -symmetric minimum. A combined effect of the effective mass terms proportional to the Hubble parameter, finite-temperature contributions and supersymmetry breaking by the large density scalar condensates during the preheating is to restore the electroweak symmetry at temperatures ~ 1 TeV, unless the reheating temperature is unacceptably low [17]. Thus no constraints result from considering the UFB directions related to the small Yukawa couplings.

In summary, we find that only the CCB minima associated with the large Yukawa couplings provide some constraints on the MSSM parameters, as one requires the standard model-like vacuum to be stable with respect to tunneling.

On the other hand, the existence of vacua with negative energy density is acceptable, natural and, in some cases, desirable from a theoretical point of view, and is in agreement with all the present data. It is possible, therefore, that, as the future experiments yield information about the scalar potential at the TeV energy scale, we may learn that the Universe is resting in a false vacuum, — a discovery of Kopernikan importance with far-reaching scientific and cultural ramifications.

We thank the Aspen Center for Physics for its hospitality. This work was supported by

the U. S. Department of Energy Contract No. DE-AC02-76-ERO-3071.

References

- [1] M. S. Turner and F. Wilczek, *Nature* **298** (1982) 633.
- [2] M. Claudson, L. J. Hall and I. Hinchliffe, *Nucl. Phys.* **B228** (1983) 501.
- [3] A. Kusenko, P. Langacker and G. Segrè, *Phys. Rev.* **D**, in print, UPR-0677-T (hep-ph/9602414).
- [4] M. B. Voloshin, I. Yu. Kobzarev and L. B. Okun', *Yad. Fiz.* **20** (1974) 1229 [*Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **20** (1975) 644]; S. Coleman, *Phys. Rev.* **D15** (1977) 2929.
- [5] A. Kusenko, *Phys. Lett.* **B377** (1996) 245 (hep-ph/9509275).
- [6] J. A. Casas and S. Dimopoulos, CERN-TH-96-116 (hep-ph/9606237).
- [7] H. Baer, M. Brhlik and D. Castano, FSU-HEP-960801 (hep-ph/9607465).
- [8] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48** (1982) 1776.
- [9] S. Coleman and F. De Luccia, *Phys. Rev.* **D21** (1980) 3305.
- [10] I. Dasgupta, B. A. Dobrescu and L. Randall, BUHEP-96-25, MIT-CTP-2555 (hep-ph/9607487).
- [11] S. Weinberg, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **61** (1989) 1.
- [12] L. Abbott, *Phys. Lett.* **B150** (1985) 427.
- [13] E. Witten, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A10** (1995) 2153.
- [14] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **D9** (1974) 3357; R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanović, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42** (1979) 1651; *Phys. Rev.* **D20** (1979) 3390; P. Langacker and S.-Y. Pi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **45** (1980) 1; G. Dvali and K. Tamvakis, CERN-TH-96-45 (hep-ph/9602336); A. Melfo and G. Senjanović, IC/96/76 (hep-ph/9605284).

- [15] M. Mangano, Phys. Lett. **B147** (1984) 307.
- [16] D. Comelli and J. R. Espinosa, DESY 96-114, FTUV/96-37 (hep-ph/9606438).
- [17] A. Riotto, E. Roulet and I. Vilja, FERMILAB-PUB-96-170-A (hep-ph/9607403).
- [18] L. Kofman, A. Linde and A. A. Starobinskii, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73** (1994) 3195.
- [19] C. G. Callan and S. Coleman, Phys. Rev. **D16** (1977) 1762; A. Kusenko, Phys. Lett. **B358** (1995) 47; A. Kusenko, K. Lee and E. J. Weinberg, to appear.
- [20] A. Kusenko, Phys. Lett. **B358** (1995) 51.
- [21] L. Alvarez-Gaume, J. Polchinski and M. Wise, Nucl. Phys. **B221** (1983) 495; J. M. Frere, D. R. T. Jones and S. Raby, Nucl. Phys. **B222** (1983) 11; M. Drees, M. Gluck and K. Grassie, Phys. Lett. **B157** (1985) 164; J. F. Gunion, H. E. Haber and M. Sher, Nucl. Phys. **B306** (1988) 1; H. Komatsu, Phys. Lett. **B215** (1988) 323; P. Langacker and N. Polonsky, Phys. Rev. **D 50** (1994) 2199; A. J. Bordner, KUNS-1351 (hep-ph/9506409); J. A. Casas, A. Lleyda and C. Muñoz, Nucl. Phys. **B471** (1996) 3.