On the cosm ological dom ain wall problem in supersymmetric models

Tom ohiro M atsuda ¹

Department of physics, Tokyo institute of technology Oh-okayama, Meguro, Tokyo 152-8551, Japan

Abstract

M any m odels for dynam ical supersymmetry breaking have the domain wall solution of the K owner-Shifm an type and therefore contain the potential cosm ological domain wall problem. We show that the degeneracy of the vacua is lifted in any m odel in which the cosm ological constant is ne-tuned to zero through an explicit Z_n^R symmetry breaking constant in the superpotential. In this respect, we do not have to add unnatural non-renorm alizable terms which explicitly break the symmetry. We also discuss the conditions for the safe decay of the walls for several concrete examples.

¹m atsuda@ th phys.titech ac.jp

1 Introduction

In general m any m odels for supersymmetry breaking have domain wall solutions of the K owner-Shifm an type[1] in their dynamical sectors where the discrete symmetry is implemented by their anomalies. A domain wall conguration may also appear as the consequence of spontaneous symmetry breaking of the explicit Z_n^R symmetry which is im – posed by hand in order to solve the phenomenological discutties such as the -problem [2] or the cosmological moduli problem [3]. These domain walls are generally dangerous from the cosmological point of view. If the Universe undergoes a phase transition associated with the spontaneous symmetry breaking, domain walls will inevitably form and in most cases these domain walls are very dangerous for the standard evolution of the Universe.

In this paper we study the properties of the K owner-Shifm an dom ain walls in general supersymmetric models. We show that the degeneracy of the vacua is always lifted by a constant term when supergravity is turned on. The magnitude of the energy dimension is estimated to be ${}^{2}=M_{p}^{2}$ where is the surface energy density of the wall. This value is su cient for the safe decay of the cosm ological dom ain wall provided is larger than $(10^{5}\text{GeV})^{3}$. A lthough the model is technically non-generic because it includes a single term which explicitly breaks the Z_{n}^{R} symmetry, it is still a reasonable model for a vanishing cosm ological constant.

The basic idea is very similar to the well-known mechanism for the mass generation of the R-axion [4]

2 Kovner-Shifm an Domain walls

In this section we explain the basic idea of the K ovner-Shiffm an dom ain wall[1]. The K ovner-Shiffm an dom ain wall is a con guration which preserves a half of the supersym – metry. The key ingredient is the central extension of the N = 1 superalgebra

$$f\overline{Q}_{;}\overline{Q}_{g} = 2i(^{0})^{Z} d^{3}x f\overline{D}_{D} \overline{D}_{J} g_{=0}: \qquad (2.1)$$

The contribution to the central extension is due to the non-conservation of the current multiplet J. The lowest component of J is the U $(1)_R$ -current which is broken classically

(in W ess-Zum ino model with more than two terms in the superpotential) or by quantum anomaly (U $(1)_R$ anomaly in gauge theories). A lthough the current multiplet J have anomaly, the supersymmetry current is conserved thus supersymmetry is still unbroken. W hat is not conserved in this case is not the supersymmetry current but the superconformal current.

Domain wall in non-gauge theories

The simplest example for the K ovner-Shifm an dom ain wall is the W ess-Zum ino m odel with only a super eld . In non-gauge theories, the presence of the central extension can be seen at the tree level. The W ess-Zum ino Lagrangian in term s of a super eld has the following form,

$$L = \frac{1}{4}^{Z} d^{4} + \frac{1}{2}^{Z} d^{2} W () + hc;;$$

$$W () = \frac{2}{3} - \frac{3}{3}^{3};$$
(2.2)

W hen = 0, the Lagrangian is invariant under the U $(1)_R$ rotation

d !
$$e^{1} d;$$

! $e^{\frac{2i}{3}}$: (2.3)

However, if $\mathbf{6}$ 0, this U (1)_R invariance is broken and only the discrete part $\mathbb{Z}_2^{\mathbb{R}}$ persists,

$$d^2 ! d^2;$$

! : (2.4)

W hen < > 6 0, the Z^R₂ symmetry is spontaneously broken and the corresponding dom ain wall which interpolates between two degenerate vacua

$$< > = = \stackrel{p_{-}}{=};

 $< W > = \frac{2}{3} \stackrel{3}{p_{-}}$
 (2.5)$$

appears. In this case the supersymmetric current multiplet J has the anomaly of the following form,

$$\overline{D}^{-}J_{-} = \frac{1}{3}D_{-}^{''}3W_{-} \frac{@W_{-}^{\#}}{@}^{\#}: \qquad (2.6)$$

Substituting the anomaly equation into the central extension of the superalgebra (2.1), one obtains

fQ ;Q g = 4(~)
$$d^{3}x\tilde{r} = \frac{1}{W} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{W} + \frac{1}{W} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2$$

where the right hand side of the equation is related to the central charge of the wall con guration therefore it represents the surface energy density of the wall con guration. It is apparent that the contribution is non-zero when the dom ain wall interpolates the two diment vacuum con gurations of eq. (2.5).

The dom ain wall solution for such non-gauge theories can easily be extended to more general theories such as an elective theory of SQCD or some other complicated theories. For later convenience we show one of such examples which contains explicit cut-o parameter of the theory and have the superpotential with discrete Z_n^R symmetry,

$$d^{2} ! d^{2} e^{\frac{2a i}{n}}$$

$$X ! X e^{\frac{2i}{n}}:$$
(2.8)

The superpotential takes a form

$$W = \frac{k}{nk+a} X^{nk+a} M^{nk+a+3}; \qquad (2.9)$$

where $_{k}$ and M denotes the coupling constants and the cut-o scale of the model. a is an integer which will be xed in the corresponding phenom enological models. If the coupling constants are assigned so that the scalar potential exhibits non-trivialm inim a at $< X > M e^{\frac{2 - i}{n}k}$ (k = 1;:n), the discrete symmetry is spontaneously broken. A dom ain wall solution which interpolates the degenerated Z_{n}^{R} vacuum con gurations appears and the wall have the surface energy density of order M³.

Domain wall in gauge theories

Now let us discuss the supersymmetric QCD (SQCD) with or without the superpotential. As we have stated above, this theory have an anomaly which contributes to the central extension. The Lagrangian is

$$L = \frac{1}{4g^2} d^2 T rW^2 + hc: + \frac{1}{4} d^2 \overline{Q}^i e^V Q^i + \overline{Q}^i e^V Q^i : \qquad (2.10)$$

In super eld notation the anom aly in the supermultiplet of current is

$$\overline{D}^{-}J_{-} = \frac{1}{3} D_{3W} \overset{X}{}_{i} Q_{i} \frac{@W}{@Q_{i}}^{\#}$$

$$\frac{3T (G)^{P} (G)^{P} (R_{i})}{16^{2}} T rW^{2} + \frac{1}{8} \overset{X}{}_{i} Z_{i} (D)^{2} (Q_{i} e^{V} Q_{i}) \qquad (2.11)$$

where in SQCD, T (G) = N_c and T (R_i) = 1 for each avor. Substituting the anomaly equation into the superalgebra (2.1) and using the K onishi anomaly equation, one gets

$$f\overline{Q}$$
; \overline{Q} g = 4(~)_{-}^{Z} d^{3}x \tilde{r} W = \frac{T(G)^{P} T(R_{i})}{16^{2}} TrW^{2}; (2.12)

For pure SYM without matter eld, it is easy to nd that the domain wall have nonzero central charge. The contribution to the central charge appears because gaugino condensation has the phase. To be more precise, the surface energy density takes a form ³jl $e^{\frac{2}{N_c}j}$ jfor nonchiral-nonchiral con gurations or ³jD $e^{\frac{2}{N_c}j}$ jfor chiral-nonchiral con guration. For N_f < N_c SQ CD the dom ain wall solution is form ulated for the elective superpotential which looks like a extended W ess-Zum ino model. It is easy to understand from eq.(2.12) that there is always a contribution to the central charge as far as gaugino condensation is non-zero. (Note that the coel cient in front of gaugino condensation does not vanish for N_f < N_c.) A librough the contribution from anomally vanishes for N_f = N_c massless SQ CD, the central charge does not vanish for massive SQ CD because there is a contribution from the mass term [5].

3 Cosmological problem of the Kovner-Shifm an domain wall

In this section we discuss the cosm ological problem of K ovner-Shiffm an dom ain walls and nd their solutions.

It is well known that whenever the Universe undergoes a phase transition associated with the spontaneous symmetry breaking, domain walls will inevitably form. In most cases the domain walls are dangerous for the standard evolution of the universe.

As we have discussed in the previous section, the models for dynamical supersymmetry breaking or the models with explicit Z_n^R symmetry should have the Kovner-Shifm an domain wall solution.

5

<u>Hidden sector models</u>

As the rst example, let us consider the hidden sector models in which the supersymmetry breaking is triggered by gaugino condensation in the hidden sector. The typical scale of the surface energy density of the domain wall is related to gaugino condensation in the hidden sector and is estimated to be 10^{12} G eV which is high enough to avoid the production of the cosm ological domain wall during the reheating of the Universe.

Gauge mediated supersymmetry breaking models

The second example is the gauge mediated supersymmetry breaking model[7]. Although this type of models have so many variants, most of the models are inspired by the dynamical analysis of SQCD with $N_f N_c$ fundamental elds. In this respect, here we may focus our attention only to SQCD with $N_f N_c$ without loss of generality. Contrary to the hidden sector models, the surface energy density of the domain wall in the dynamical sector is very low. The walls can easily be produced during the reheating of the Universe thus needs some mechanism which makes the wall collapse in the proper time scale. The pressure which is required for the safe decay of the wallmust be induced by the explicit breaking of the degeneracy of the vacuum energy. In the crudest estimate, the required value for the pressure is [6]

$$\frac{2}{M_{p}^{2}}$$
 (3.1)

where represents the pressure corresponding to the di erence of the energy density between the corresponding vacua. represents the surface energy density of the dom ain wall.

The most natural and simplest candidate for the source of is the constant term which arises from the general requirement that the cosm ological constant must be canceled in any successful theory of dynamical supersymmetry breaking. In supergravity theories, at the tree level the scalar potential takes the following form

$$V = V_{D} + V_{F}$$

$$V_{D} = \frac{1}{2}g^{2}D^{a}D^{a}$$

$$W_{I} + \frac{K_{I}}{M_{p}^{2}}W^{I} + \frac{K_{I}}{M_{$$

where W and K are the superpotential and the Kahler potential. In general models

for supersymmetry breaking, a constant term W₀ is added and is adjusted to cancel the vacuum energy. Because we are assuming that W₀ is a constant, this netuning works only for one vacuum.² W hen the cancelation occurs for the k₀-th vacuum, the situation is schematically given as:

$$V_{T rue} = \mathbf{f} \mathbf{j}^{2} \ 3 \frac{\mathbf{j} \mathbf{v}_{0} + \mathbf{k}^{2} \mathbf{e}^{\frac{2}{n} \mathbf{k}_{0}} \mathbf{j}}{M_{p}^{2}}$$

$$= 0 \qquad (3.3)$$

$$V_{F alse} = \mathbf{f} \mathbf{j}^{2} \ 3 \frac{\mathbf{j} \mathbf{v}_{0} + \mathbf{k}^{2} \mathbf{e}^{\frac{2}{n} \mathbf{k}_{1}} \mathbf{j}}{M_{p}^{2}}$$

$$\in 0 \qquad \text{for } \mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{k}_{0} \qquad (3.4)$$

$$= V_{F alse} \quad V_{T rue}$$

$$= 3 \frac{\mathbf{j} \mathbf{v}_{0} + \mathbf{k}^{2} \mathbf{e}^{\frac{2}{n} \mathbf{k}_{1}} \mathbf{j}}{M_{p}^{2}} + 3 \frac{\mathbf{j} \mathbf{v}_{0} + \mathbf{k}^{2} \mathbf{e}^{\frac{2}{n} \mathbf{k}_{0}} \mathbf{j}}{M_{p}^{2}}$$

(3.5)

Here and F denotes the scale of the dynam ical sector and the supersymmetry breaking parameter. (Note that the above equation gives the essential part of the scalar potential for our discussion but is not the full description of the exact scalar potential.) O ther vacua $(k \in k_0)$ must have non-zero vacuum energy and it is estimated to be of order $^{2}=M_{p}^{2}$. In fact, this satis es the required condition (3.1) for the safe decay of the cosm ological dom ain wall. In this case, the dom ain wall problem is solved without introducing an extra breaking term nor the ne-tuning of the parameter.

 $\overline{M_{p}^{2}}$:

<u>Model for in ation</u>

The third example is the therm al in ation model of A saka et al β]. This model is proposed by T A saka, J H ashiba, M K awasaki and T Y anagida as a solution for the cosmological moduli problem in gauge-mediated supersymmetry breaking theories. In ref.[3], Z_{n+3} symmetry is imposed on the superpotential for the aton. The vacua are degenerated and has Z_{n+3} phase thus an explicit breaking of the discrete symmetry is needed to remove the domain wall. In ref.[3] a small term X was added by hand to the superpotential so that the discrete symmetry is explicitly broken. However, as we have seen

²To avoid the appearance of the negative energy state, supersymmetry breaking parameter F should satisfy the condition $V = f f - 3 f + f = M_p^2 = 0$ for any k-th vacuum. It is also required that the cancellation works for the lowest energy state of the k-th vacuum.)

above, such an unnatural term is not necessitated if Z_n^R is assigned instead of Z_{n+3} . (See eq.(2.9).)

Next-to-m in in al supersym m etric Standard M odel

The last example is the next-to-m inim al supersymmetric Standard M odel (NM SSM). This model contains an additional singlet Higgs super eld and Z $_3^{\rm R}\,$ symmetry which transforms every chiral super eld . The -term is generated because the singlet that parametrizes the -term gains non-zero vacuum expectation value. In this model, the natural scale for the dom ain wall is the weak scale. A though the energy gap is produced in the same way by the constant term in the superpotential, one should consider further constraint coming from primordial nucleosynthesis because the scale of the wall is smaller than 10^5 G eV (see ref.[2]). In fact the weak-scale walls decay after nucleosynthesis and the entropy produced when the wall collide is dumped into all the decay products. In this case, because of this additional constraint, the solution is not autom atic. One possibility is to raise the surface energy density of the wall above 10^5GeV . However, it requires ne-tuning of parameters because the -term is already xed at the weak scale. A nother possibility is to introduce a non-renorm alizable term that explicitly breaks the symmetry. On the whole, unlike other walls discussed above, the domain wall in NM SSM requires additionalm echanism s or ne-tunings of the param eters to evade the cosm ological dom ain wallproblem.

The origin of the constant term

A lthough we did not mentioned about the origin of the constant term W₀ in the above discussions, it would be fair to say that such contribution is very common. One may think that the constant term appears from another dynamical sector which have the potential ${}^{3}e^{\frac{2}{n}}$. The most obvious example is the simple SYM with the product gauge group SU(N₁) SU(N₂). The resulting superpotential is expected to be of the form: W = ${}^{3}e^{\frac{2}{N_{1}}k_{1}} + {}^{3}2e^{\frac{2}{N_{2}}k_{2}}$, where 1,2 is the dynam ical scale of each gauge sector. A lthough we did not introduced an explicit constant term in this case, the vacuum degeneracy is obviously lifted when supergravity is turned on.

4 Conclusion and discussions

In general it is quite di cult to nd a successful model for supersymmetry breaking without introducing unnatural components. In this paper we have shown that the existence of the domain wall does not further constrain these models provided the surface energy density of the wall is not so low as the weak scale. Our point is that the cosm obgical constant should be cancelled by adding a constant term to the superpotential. This constant explicitly breaks any continuous or discrete R-symmetry, and lifts the degenerated vacua.

In this paper we have concerned with two types of walls that is related to two kinds of Z_n^R symmetry. One is the explicit symmetry of the Lagrangian, and the other appears as the consequence of the breakdown of the continuous U (1)_R symmetry through anom aly. The wall of the latter type is especially important because it appears in almost all the dynamical supersymmetry breaking models.

5 A cknow ledgm ent

W e are very grateful to T A saka for m any useful discussions.

References

- B.Chibisov and M.Shifm an, hep-th/9706141; A.Kovner, M.Shifm an and A.Smilga, PhysRev D 56 (1997)7990; G.D vali and M.Shifm an, PhysLett B 396 (1997)64
- [2] SA Abel, SSarker and PLW hite, NuclPhysB454 (1995)663
- [3] T A saka, J.H ashiba, M K awasaki and T Yanagida, hep-ph/9711501
- [4] J.Bagger, E. Poppitz and L. Randall, Nucl. Phys. B 426 (1994) 3
- [5] T M atsuda, hep-ph/9710230
- [6] A.V. ilenkin, PhysRevD 23 (1981)852

[7] M D ine and A E Nelson, PhysRev D 48 (1993)1277; M D ine, A E Nelson and Y Shirman, PhysRev D 51 (1995); M D ine, A E Nelson, Y N ir and Y Shirman, PhysRev D 53 (1996)2658