A strophysical constraints on superlight gravitinos¹

J.A.Grifols

Grup de F sica Teorica and Institut de F sica d'Altes Energies Universitat Autonom a de Barcelona 08193 Bellaterra, Barcelona, Spain

Abstract

I review the constraints on the mass of gravitinos that follow from considerations on energy loss in stars and from B ig B ang N ucleosynthesis arguments.

¹ Invited talk at the 5th W orkshop on H igh Energy Physics Phenom enology (W HEPP-5), Pune, India, 12-26 January 1998.

1. STELLAR ENERGY LOSS[1]

1a. The Sun

Them al stars like our sun are systems where them al pressure balances gravity. An in portant feature of these stars is their negative speci c heat. They heat up when the system looses energy. Indeed, when the star gives o energy, its internal plus gravitational energy goes down and as a cosequence the star contracts. This is so because the gravitational energy itself dim inishes, as required by the virial theorem. Contraction, in turn, in plies a rise in tem perature and extra nuclear burning because the internal energy has to com pensate for the decrease of gravitational energy (virial theorem, again). Now, the added nuclear energy supply leads to an opposite cycle of expansion and cooling (negative speci c heat) and hence to a lesser nuclear burning. This is a self-regulating mechanism where equilibrium is maintained by balancing the energy loss with nuclear fusion.

Weakly interacting particles, if not trapped in the interior of stars, drain energy. Hence they lead to accelerated consumption of nuclear fuel. Models of stellar evolution tolerate non-standard exotic energy drain mechanisms as long as their associated lum inosity does not exceed the solar lum inosity, i.e.

L
$$10^{33}$$
erg=s (1)

1b.Degenerate Stars

These are systems dominated by the Ferm i pressure of electrons (white dwarfs) or of nucleons (neutron stars). In this case the internal energy (Ferm ienergy) is nearly independent of the tem perature and a loss of energy is at the expense of gravitational contraction (which increases the the internal Ferm ienergy but not the tem perature). In fact the system actually cools.

Here also, new hypothetical particles provide for extra energy depletion which should not exceed

$$5 \ 10^{3} \text{erg}=\text{g}=\text{s}$$
 (2)

for white dwarfs.

1c. Type II supernovae

Very massive stars (much heavier than the sun) ignite all nuclear fuels up to iron. Beyond this point nom ore nuclear energy is available. When the iron core reaches its Chandrasekhar limit, the star enters an unstable catastrophical regime: gravitational collapse follows. G ravitational collapse

A fler the therm onuclear cycle is completed, Si having transformed into Fe, collapse is triggered by the photodissociation of Fe⁵⁶ and electron capture on nuclei. The core loses Ferm i pressure from the electrons which no longer hold gravitational pressure and the core implodes. Hence, e emission dominates during infall. As the core collapses temperature and density rise. For densities above 2 10^{11} g=cm³ neutrinos become trapped in the core. When the inner core reaches nuclear densities (3 10^{4} g=cm³) a nuclear phase transition occurs, i.e. bound nuclei become free nucleons. This has a dram atic electron for relativistic electrons and electron neutrinos could not halt collapse). The inner core bounces generating a shock wave which is responsible for the ejection of the mantle of the star.

The hydrodynam ical core collapse happens in less than a second. The relevant dynam ic tim e scales are on the order of 10 to 100 m iliseconds (alm ost free-fall). For instance, the initial electron-neutrino burst lasts for about 5 m s. F inally, the proto-neutron star originated that way cools o to a cold neutron star in a tim e scale of several seconds.

Independently of the details of collapse, to form a neutron star

$$E_{\rm B} \, {\rm G\,M^{2}=}R \, 3 \, 10^{3} {\rm erg}$$
 (3)

have been released. The total lum inosity in electrom agnetic radiation plus kinetic energy of the ejecta in a supernova explosion is 10^{51} erg. Em ission in gravitational radiation is at most 1%. THE BULK OF THE BINDING ENERGY (99%) IS EM IITED IN FORM OF NEUTRINOS. In the neutronization burst 10^{52} erg (10% of the total energy) are em itted. The rest of the energy is radiated essentially as therm al neutrinos.

Observational data from Supernova 1987A (IMB, Kamiokande) [2] in ply

em itted over a di usion period of the order of ten seconds. Com paring equations (4) and (3) we see that any additional energy drain is allowed whenever

$$L_X = 10^{52} erg = s$$
 (5)

2. A CASE STUDY: BOUNDS ON GRAVITINO MASSES

The Gravitino

The gravitino is the spin 3/2 partner of the graviton. It is a M a prana particle with only transverse degrees of freedom before supersymmetry breakdown. A fler eating the goldstino,

it acquires the longitudinal degrees of freedom, i.e. the 1/2 helicities. In some recent models the gravitino can be superlight. Indeed, models where gauge interactions mediate the breakdown of supersymmetry [3], models where an anomalous U (1) gauge symmetry induces SU SY breaking [4], and no-scale models are all examples of models where a superlight gravitino can be accommodated [5]. In all of them, the gravitino is the LSP and, furthermore, its couplings to matter and radiation are inversely proportional to its mass. For very small gravitino masses, the longitudinal components of the gravitino dominate the interactions with matter so that electively,

$$G = \frac{3}{3} \frac{1}{3} m_{3=2}^{1} \theta$$
 (6)

In a subclass of the m odels m entioned above, the scalar and pseudoscalar partners of the goldstino are also ultralight. Their couplings do also show the enhancing m $\frac{1}{3=2}$ factor[6].

2a. A strophysics[7]

Supernova constraints [8, 9, 10, 11]

A coording to Luty and Ponton [12], photons have an elective coupling to gravitinos with the following structure

$$L = \frac{e}{2} (M = {}^{2})^{2} (0 = F + h c: (7))$$

where M is a model dependent supersymmetric mass parameter and is the supersymmetry breaking scale. This interaction provides the leading contribution to gravitino pair emissivity via electron-positron annihilation, nucleon-nucleon bremsstrahlung, plasmon decay, and photon-electron scattering followed by radiation of the gravitino pair.

The energy-loss rate (per unit volume) via pn ! pnGG is,

$$Q = \frac{Z}{(2)^{3}2k_{1}^{0}} \frac{d^{3}k_{2}}{(2)^{3}2k_{2}^{0}} \frac{d^{3}k_{2}}{(2)^{3}2k_{2}^{0}} \frac{d^{3}p_{i}}{d^{2}} \frac{d^{3}p_{i}}{(2)^{3}2p_{i}^{0}} f_{1}f_{2} (1 f_{3}) (1 f_{4}) (2)^{4} (P_{f} P_{i}) \sum_{\text{spins}}^{X} jM_{fi} f_{1} f_{2} (k_{1}^{0} + k_{2}^{0})$$
(8)

where $(p^0;p)_i$ are the 4-m on enta of the initial and nal state nucleons, $(k^0;\tilde{k})_{1;2}$ are the 4m on enta of the gravitinos and $f_{1;2}$ are the Ferm i-D irac distribution functions for the initial proton and neutron and $(1 \quad f_{2;4})$ are the nalPauliblocking factors for the nalproton and neutron. The squared matrix element can be factorised as follows,

^X
$$jM_{fi} \stackrel{2}{J} = (2)^{2} (M = {}^{2})^{4} N G_{3=2}$$
 (9)
spins

where N is the nuclear (OPE) tensor and G $_{3=2}$ is the gravitino tensor in the matrix element squared. The factor N is common to any brem sstrahlung process involving nucleons. It appears, e.g., in neutrino brem sstrahlung calculations and in axion brem sstrahlung calculations,

and is given explicitly in ref [1]. On the other hand, $G_{3=2}$ is a tensor speci c to gravitino brem satrahlung. It reads,

$$G_{3=2} = k_1 k_2 + k_2 k_1 \qquad k_1 k_2 g \tag{10}$$

The integration of N over the phase-space of the nucleons can be performed explicitly and the details can be found in Ra elt's book [1]. When we contract the result with the gravitino tensor $G_{3=2}$ and perform the integrals over gravitino momenta to complete the energy depletion rate, we are led to the following emissivity:

$$Q_{brem s}^{N D} = (8192 = 385^{-3=2})^{-2-2} (M = {}^{2})^{4} Y_{e} n_{B}^{2} T^{11=2} = m_{p}^{5=2}$$
 (11)

for non-degenerate and non-relativistic nucleons (is the pionic ne-structure constant, n_B is the num ber density of baryons, and Y_e is the mass fraction of protons). However, nucleons are moderately degenerate in the SN core. The emissivity in the (extreme) degenerate case is calculated to be,

$$Q_{brem s}^{D} = (164^{-3} = 4725)^{-2} (M = {}^{2})^{4} p_{F} T^{8}$$
 (12)

with p_F , the Ferm im on entum of the nucleons. Numerically, for the actual conditions of the star, both emissivities dier by less than an order of magnitude (about a factor of three). Since the actual emissivity interpolates between these two values, we shall adopt the smallest of the two (i.e. $Q_{brem s}^{ND}$) to make our (conservative) estimates. We turn next to the annihilation process.

The energy loss for the process $e^+(p_1) + e^-(p_2) ! G^-(k_1) + G^-(k_2)$ can be calculated along similar lines as above. The spin averaged matrix element squared is in this case,

$$\int_{\text{spins}}^{X} jM_{\text{fi}} \int_{-\infty}^{2} = (2)^{2} (M = 2)^{4} E (p_{1}; p_{2}) G_{3=2} (k_{1}; k_{2})$$
(13)

where E $(p_1;p_2)$ equals form ally the tensor G₃₌₂ in eq.(10) with $k_1;k_2$ replaced by $p_1;p_2$. The lum inosity then is found to be,

$$Q_{ann} = 8^{-2} M = {}^{2})^{4} T^{4} e^{-T} b(=T) = 15^{-3}$$
 (14)

with b(y) (5=6) $e^{y}y^{5}(F_{5}^{+}F_{4} + F_{4}^{+}F_{5})$ where $F_{m}(y) = {R_{1} \atop 0} dxx^{m-1} = (1 + e^{x-y})$ (is the demical potential of the electrons). The function b(y) ! 1 in the degenerate limit. Finally, our estimate of the plasm on decay luminosity is,

$$Q_{\rm P} = 16$$
 (3) ${}^{4}{\rm T}^{3} {}^{6}{\rm (M} = {}^{2}{\rm)}^{4} = 81 {}^{5}$ (15)

(where only transverse plasm ons have been taken into account).

The process e! eGG has not been evaluated analitically but numerically has been seen to be of the same order as $e^+e ! GG$ [11]. Taken at face value, the brem sstrahlung rate is the largest of the four. However, $Q_{\text{brem s}}$ is overestimated since we did not consider multiple scattering e ects which are present in a dense medium [1]. Indeed, as for the axion case[1], the gravitino brem sstrahlung rate probably saturates around 20% nuclear density and this should be taken into account when evaluating eq.(6). If we use now the values T = 50M eV,

= 300M eV , and $Y_e = 0.3$, eqs. (6) (with $n_B = 0.2 n_{huc}$), (9) and (10) give

$$Q_{ann} : Q_{brem s} : Q_P \quad 12 \quad 10:3 \quad 10:1$$
 (16)

Therefore, a limit on will follow from the requirement that $L_{3=2} = V Q_{ann}$ (V is the volume of the stellar core) should not exceed 10^{52} ergs=s. This constraint on the gravitino luminosity $L_{3=2}$ implies, in turn,

$$300G \text{ eV} (M = 43G \text{ eV})^{1=2} (T = 50M \text{ eV})^{11=16} (R_c = 10K \text{ m})^{3=8}$$
 (17)

or, using $m_{3=2} = 2.5$ 10 ⁴eV (=1TeV)²,

$$m_{3=2}$$
 2:3 10⁵ eV: (18)

Of course, the previous calculation m akes sense only if gravitinos, once produced, stream freely out of the star w ithout rescattering. That they actually do so, for 300G eV, can be easily checked by considering their m ean-free path in the core. The m ain source of opacity for gravitinos is the elastic scattering of the Coulomb eld of the protons:

$$= 1 = n = (4 = {}^{2})Y_{e}^{1} {}^{1}m_{p}^{1} ({}^{2}=M)^{4}$$
(19)

The therm ally averaged cross-section for elastic gravitino scattering on electrons is roughly a factor $T = m_p^2$ sm aller than that on protons and thus it does not contribute appreciably to the opacity. Putting numbers in eq.(19) we nd:

$$' 1:4 10^{\circ} \text{ cm} (43 \text{GeV}=M)^4 (=300 \text{GeV})^8$$
 (20)

On the other hand, the calculation of Q breaks down for 10K m, i.e. for 220 GeV, when gravitinos are trapped in the SN core. In this case, gravitinos di use out of the dense stellar interior and are thermally radiated from a gravitino-sphere $R_{3=2}$. Because in this instance the lum inosity is proportional to T^4 , only for a su ciently large $R_{3=2}$ (where the temperature is correspondingly lower), the emitted power will fall again below the nom inal

10⁵²erg=s. Consequently, gravitino em ission will be energetically possible, if is smallenough. The gravitino-sphere radius can be computed from the requirement that the optical depth

$$= \int_{R}^{Z_{1}} dr = (r)$$
 (21)

be equal to 2=3 at $R = R_{3=2}$. Here, (r) is given in eq.(19) with the density pro le ansatz:

$$(r) = {}_{c} (R_{c} = r)^{m}$$
 (22)

with $_{c} = 8 \quad 10^{4}$ g=cm³, R_c = 10K m and m = 5 7 and which satisfactorily parameterises the basic properties of SN 1987A [13]. An explicit calculation renders:

$$R_{3=2} = R_{c} [(8Y_{e}=3^{2})(^{2}=M)^{4} (m 1) = {}_{c}R_{c}m_{p}]^{1=1}$$
(23)

Stefan-Boltzm ann's law implies for the ratio of gravitino to neutrino lum inosities,

$$L_{3=2}=L = (R_{3=2}=R)^2 [T (R_{3=2})=T (R)]^4$$
 (24)

where R is the radius of the neutrinosphere. To proceed further we use the temperature pro le:

$$T = T_{c} (R_{c} = r)^{m} = 3$$
 (25)

which is a consequence of eq.(22) and the assumption of local therm all equilibrium. Now, taking m = 7 [14], we obtain

$$L_{3=2}=L = (R = R_c)^{22=3} [(16Y_e = ^2) (^2=M)^4 = {}_cR_cm_p]^{1=9}$$
 (26)

By dem anding that ${\rm L}_{\rm 3=2}$ $\,$ 0:1L and using R $\,$ ' 30K m , we get

This in turn implies m₃₌₂ 10^{6} eV. Since, on the other hand, the anom alous magnetic moment of the muon already requires m₃₌₂ to be larger than 10^{6} eV [15, 16], we are forced to conclude that

or, equivalently,

$$m_{3=2}$$
 2:2 10°eV: (29)

In conclusion, we have carefully derived the bounds on the superlight gravitino m ass (i.e. the SUSY scale) that follow from SN physics. These limits are completely general in the sense that they do not rely on other particles in a given particular model being light.

Should other particles such as the scalar partners of the goldstino also be light, then the resulting bounds are necessarily tighter. In such clearly less general fram e, constraints have also been derived in the literature. Before reviewing these bounds, let us refer to the very recent claim by C lark et al.[17] that the dimension 6 operator GG in L_{eff} derived by Luty and Ponton is actually not there. If true, the bounds derived above are 1 to 2 orders of m agnitude worse[18].

Suppose now that the gravitino and S and/or P are very light (T). Because now these scalars can be emitted by astrophysical bodies, one has to consider additional energy-loss channels [7, 9]. The relevant interaction is given by

$$e^{1}L_{int} = -\frac{s}{4} \frac{2}{3} (\frac{m}{m_{3=2}}) (SF F + PF F)$$
 (30)

where $(8)^{1=2} M_{Pl}^{1}$.

The main energy drain mechanism is the Primako process e ! eS=P via one photon exchange in the t channel. Calculation of lum inosities in the supernova goes along the same lines as before using, of course, the Primako cross section and which was derived in reference[7]. The restriction

L
$$10^{52}$$
erg (31)

then im plies

$$m_{3=2} = 30 \frac{m_{\sim}}{100 \text{G eV}} \text{eV}$$
 (32)

Sinœ

$$(S=P ! 2)' \frac{2}{96} (\frac{m_{\sim}}{m_{3=2}})^2 m_{S=P}^3$$
(33)

su ciently heavy S/P will decay inside the core. For this NOT to happen, it is required that

$$m_{S=P}$$
 10M eV (34)

A lso, S/P leave the supernova core without further rescattering provided

(because their m .fp. is $10^0 \left(\frac{m_{3=2}}{30 eV}\right)^2 cm$).

For m asses below about 0.3 eV, S/P get trapped and their energy is radiated from a S/P – sphere following the Stefan-Boltzm ann law L / $R_{S=P}^2 T_{S=P}^4$. The lum inosity L is compatible again with observation (SN 1987A) for m₃₌₂ 10^{1:5}eV.

Lim its from the Sun [9]

Should $m_{S=P} < 1$ keV then these particles could be emitted from the sun and the lower limits to their masses are in this case slightly di erent. In the sun, the m.fp. of S/P is

$$_{S=P}$$
 10⁴¹ $\left(\frac{m_{3=2}}{m_{2}}\right)^{2}$ cm (36)

 $_{S=P}$ exceeds the solar radius for m $_{3=2}$ 10 $^{3.5}$ eV

(for m _ = 100G eV). The em issivity via Prim ako scattering turns out to be

²
$$\left(\frac{m_{\sim}}{m_{3=2}}\right)^2 T^7 F$$
 (_D = T)V_{Sun} (37)

where the function F (x) (see [1], p. 169) takes care of plasm a e ects characterized by the D ebye m om entum $_{\rm D}$. This em issivity is bounded above by the sun lum inosity, i.e. 10^{33} erg=s. As a consequence, the gravitino m ass should verify

$$m_{3=2}$$
 50eV (38)

On the other hand, in the trapping regime (i.e. $m_{3=2} < 10^{-3:5}$), S/P em ission is allowed as long as $m_{3=2} = 10^{-6}$ for in this case their therm all radiation is su ciently slowed down. Since (g 2) implies already $m_{3=2} = 10^{-6}$ [16] we conclude

$$m_{3=2}$$
 50eV (39)

form $_{3=2}$ < 1keV and form $_{\sim}$ 0 (100)GeV.

2b. Big Bang Nucleosynthesis

Prim ordial H elium -4 abundance depends on the elium do.f. at nucleosynthesis because $H = g^{1=2}M_{p_1}^{-1}T^2$ and, the larger H the sconer do weak interactions decouple. Hence, the neutron to proton ratio is larger and the helium yield rises accordingly.

The e ective number of d.o.f. for a given species i is

$$g^{i}\left(f_{\text{bosons}}^{\text{ferm ions}}\right) = \left(f_{7=8}^{1}\right)g_{i}\left(\frac{T_{i}}{T}\right)^{4}$$

$$\tag{40}$$

Bounds from Y_P are usually presented as bounds on N (i.e. number of extra equivalent neutrino species). It is explicitly given by the form ula

$$N = \begin{pmatrix} f_{\text{boson}}^{\text{ferm ion}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 8^{-7} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \frac{g_{i}}{2} \left[\frac{g(T)}{g(T_{D_{i}})} \right]^{4-3}$$
(41)

where T_{D_i} is the decoupling tem perature of species i.

The latest analysis from the group in Chicago [19] sets the lim it

which implies NO bound for the superlight gravitino (equivalent to one neutrino species). That is, the gravitino does not have to decouple from the cosm ological therm all bath prior to the BBN era. On the other hand, if the particles S/P are light ($m_{S=P} < 1M \text{ eV}$, i.e. relativistic at nucleosynthesis) then, they should freeze out before the Universe cools down to T 200M eV so that N is very small (i.e. g (T)=g (T_{D i}) 1).

S/P are kept in equilibrium through e $\$ S=P e and this rate falls below the Hubble rate H when

²
$$\left(\frac{m}{m}_{3=2}\right)^2 T^3 = g^{1=2} \frac{T^2}{M_{Pl}}$$
 (43)

Taking T 200M eV (and $m_{\sim} = 100G \text{ eV}$) we get [9]

$$m_{3=2}$$
 leV: (44)

3. SUM M ARY

In a wide class of supergravity models with a supersymmetry breaking scale in the TeV range, the gravitino can be very light. In fact, its mass could lie anywhere between 1 eV and 1keV. It is also a generic feature of some of the recently considered models that the superlight gravitino is accompanied by a superlight scalar S and pseudoscalar P particles, which are the neutral scalar partners of the goldstino. For energy scales such that $E = m_{3=2}$ the longitudinal component of the gravitino dom inates and the gravitino e ectively behaves as a spin-1/2 G oldstino. The neutral scalars and the gravitino are coupled to matter with strength inversely proportional to the gravitino mass and, hence, they can be abundantly produced in the interior of stellar cores. By requiring that the radiated power does not overcom e 10^{52} erg=s in a supernova explosion and 10^{33} erg=s in the case of solar emission, we obtain the following results.

$$m_{3=2} = 10^{5} eV$$
 (45)

independently of m $_{3=2}$. A lso,

or

ifm $_{S=P}$ 10M eV and,

for $m_{S=P}$ lkeV.

Finally, from Big Bang Nucleosynthesis arguments we infer the limit

$$m_{3=2}$$
 1eV (49)

should m $_{\mbox{\scriptsize S=P}}$ be lighter than about 1 M eV .

I am grateful to the organizers of the W orkshop for the friendly hospitality and for the nice atm osphere provided in Pune.

W ork partially supported by the CICYT Research Project AEN 95-0882.

- G.G.Ra elt, Stars as Laboratories for Fundam ental Physics, Chicago University Press (1996).
- [2] K.Hirata et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 58, 1490 (1987); R.Bionta et al, Phs. Rev. Lett. 58, 1494 (1987).
- [3] M. Dine, A. E. Nelson, Y. Nir, Y. Shim an, Phys. Rev. D 53, 2658 (1996) M. Dine, A. E. Nelson, Y. Shim an, Phys. Rev. D 51, 1362 (1995).
- [4] P.Binetruy, E.Dudas, Phys. Lett.B 389, 303 (1996); G.Dvali, A.Pom arol, Phys. Rev.
 Lett.77, 3728 (1996); R.N.Mohapatra, A.Riotto, hep-ph/9611273.
- [5] J.Ellis, K. Enqvist, D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B 147, 99 (1984).
- [6] for early work on gravitino phenom enology, see e.g.: T.Bhattacharya, P.Roy, Phys.Rev.
 D 38, 2284 (1988); Phys. Lett. B 206, 655 (1988); Nucl. Phys. B 328, 469 (1989); Nucl.
 Phys. B 328, 481 (1989).
- [7] for early work on astrophysical lim its on the gravitino see: M . Now akow ski, S D . R indani, Phys. Lett. B 348, 115 (1995).
- [8] JA.Grifols, RN.Mohapatra, A.Riotto, Phys. Lett. B 401, 283 (1997).
- [9] JA.Grifols, RN.Mohapatra, A.Riotto, Phys. Lett. B 400, 124 (1997).
- [10] JA.Grifols, E.Masso, R.Toldra, PhysRev.D 57, 614 (1998).
- [11] D A.Dicus, R N.M ohapatra, V L. Teplitz, hep-ph/9707536.
- [12] M A.Luty, E.Ponton, hep-ph/9706268.
- [13] M S.Tumer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 1797 (1988).
- [14] R N.M ohapatra, IZ. Rothstein, Phys. Lett. B 247, 593 (1990); JA.G rifols, E.M asso, Nucl. Phys. B 331, 244 (1990).
- [15] A.Mendez, F.X.Orteu, Nucl. Phys. B 256, 181 (1985).
- [16] F.Ferrer, JA.Grifols, Phys. Rev. D 56, 7466 (1997); T.Li, JL.Lopez, D.V. Nanopoulos, hep-ph/9704439.
- [17] T E.C lark, T. Lee, S.T. Love, G-H.W u, hep-ph/9712353.

- [18] A.Brignole, F.Feruglio, F.Zwimer, hep-ph/9703286.
- [19] C.J.Copi, D.N.Schramm, M.S.Turner, Ferm ilab-Pub-96/122-A.