arXiv:hep-th/0612208v1 19 Dec 2006

M oduli Fields as Quintessence and the Cham eleon

Philippe Brax

Service de Physique Theorique, CEA-Saclay, Gif/Yvette cedex, France F-91191

Jerôm e Martin^y

Institut d'Astrophysique de Paris, UMR 7095-CNRS, Universite Pierre et Marie Curie, 98bis boulevard Arago, 75014 Paris, France (Dated: January 22, 2022)

We consider models where moduli elds are not stabilized and play the role of quintessence. In order to evade gravitational tests, we investigate the possibility that moduli behave as cham eleon elds. We not that, for realistic moduli superpotentials, the cham eleon e ect is not strong enough, im plying that moduli quintessence models are gravitationally nuled out. More generally, we state a no-go theorem for quintessence in supergravity whereby models either behave like a pure cosm olog-ical constant or violate gravitational tests.

PACS num bers: 98.80.Cq, 98.70.Vc

I. IN TRODUCTION

Dark energy and its properties is one of the most intriguing puzzles of present day theoretical physics. Indeed, there is convincing evidence, coming from SN Ia supernovae [1], large scale structures of the universe [2, 3, 4] and the CM B anisotropies [5, 6] which leads to the existence of an acceleration of the universe expansion in the recent past. W hen interpreted within the realm of G eneral Relativity, these results imply the existence of a pervading weakly interacting uid with a negative equation of state and a dom inant energy density. The simplest possibility is of course a pure cosm obgical constant. This has the advantage of both tting the data and incorporating a mild modi cation of the E instein equations. Now it happens that the value of the cosm obgical constant is so sm all com pared to high energy physics scales that no proper explanation for such a ne{tuning has been found except m aybe the anthropic principle [7] used in the context of a stringy landscape [8, 9]. This is all the more puzzling in view of the very diverse sources of radiative corrections in the standard model of particle physics and beyond.

A plausible alternative involves the presence of a scalar eld akin to the in atom of early universe cosm ology and responsible for the tiny vacuum energy scale [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17]. These models of quintessence have nice features such as the presence of long time attractors (tracking elds) leading to a relative insensitivity to initial conditions [10]. In most cases, the quintessence runaway potentials lead to large values of the quintessence eld now, of the order of the P lanck mass. This immediately prompts the necessity of embedding such models in high energy physics where nearly P lanck scale physics is taken into account. The most natural possibility is supergravity as it involves both supersymmetry and gravitational ects [18]. Moreover, superstring theories lead to supergravity models at low energy.

From the model building point of view, the quintessence eld does not belong to the well-known sector of particles of the standard model. Therefore, one has to envisage a dark sector where this eld lives and provide the corresponding K ahler, K quint, and super potentials W quint in order to compute the quintessence scalar potential explicitly. O noe a quintessence model has been built, one must also worry about the coupling to both matter and hidden sector supersymm etry breaking [19]. Indeed the rolling of the quintessence eld can induce variations of constants such as the ne structure constants. Moreover the smallness of the mass of the quintessence eld im plies that its gravitational coupling to matter must be suppressed in order to comply with fith force and equivalence principle violation experiments [20, 21].

The observable sector is fairly well-known and the hidden sector can be parameterized. Therefore, the main uncertainty comes from the dark sector, i.e. from the speci c form chosen for K quint and W quint. Recently, we have investigated this question for a class of models where the K ahler potential and the superpotential can be Taylor expanded or are given by polynom ial functions of the (super) elds [22]. We have shown that this type of models, under the standard assumption of separate sectors (see also our conclusion), is in trouble as either they are uninteresting

E lectronic address: brax@ spht.saclay.cea.fr

^yE lectronic address: jn artin@ iap.fr

from the cosm obgical point of view (typically, in practice, they are equivalent to a cosm obgical constant) or they violate the bounds from gravity experiments (typically, they violate the bound on the fth force and/or on the weak equivalence principle).

The aim of this paper is to study a general class of m odels, probably the most natural one from a string theory point of view [23], where the quintessence eld is a moduli eld (Kahler moduli). Technically, this means that K quint is taken to be a logarithm of the quintessence eld [23]. A lthough the Kahler function is known, there is no speci c standard choice for the superpotential which remains a free function. Therefore, we will derive model independent results and then discuss the various cases that have been envisaged in the literature for W quint (for instance, polynom ial superpotentials and exponential ones a la KKLT [24]). We show that, for reasonable choices of W quint, the corresponding models are also in trouble from the gravity experiments point of view. This last result is in fact more subtle than in the case of the rst class of models treated in Ref. [22]. Indeed, contrary to the polynom ial models, a cham elson mechanism [25] can be present in the no scale case and could be used to protect the quintessence eld from gravity problem s. However, unfortunately, we show that this mechanism is in fact not su ciently e cient to save no scale quintessence in simple cases such as gaugino condensation and polynom ial superpotentials.

The paper is arranged as follows. In Sec. II, we establish some general results relevant to the no-scale models. In particular, in sub-Sec. IIA, we calculate the quintessence potential for a general moduli superpotential and in sub-Sec. IIB, we give the corresponding soft terms in the observable sector. In sub-Sec. IIC, we study how the electrow eak transition is a ected by the no scale dark sector. Then, in Sec. III, we brie y review the cham eleon mechanism. In particular, in sub-Sec. IIIA, we describe the thin shellphenom enon with, in sub-Sec. IIIB, applications to the gaugino condensation case and in sub-Sec. IIIC to the polynom ial case. In Sec. IV, we present our conclusions and state a no-go theorem for the compatibility between quintessence in supergravity and gravity experiments.

II. NO SCALE QUINTESSENCE

A. The Scalar Potential

In this section we collect results related to the dynam ics of K ahler m oduli coming from string compacti cations. In practice we only consider that there is a single m oduli Q which can be seen as the breathing mode of the compacti cation m anifold. The reduction from 10 dimensions to 4 dimensions leads to a no-scale structure for the K ahler potential of the m oduli. The K ahler potential is given by the following expression

$$K_{quint} = \frac{3}{2} \ln^{h} 1 = 2 Q + Q^{\gamma} i;$$
 (1)

where $8 = m_{p_1}^2$. The moduli Q has no potential and is a st direction to all order in perturbation theory. In string theory, the validity of the supergravity approximation is guaranteed provided 1=2Q 1, in plying that the compactication manifold is larger than the string scale. A potential can be generated once non-perturbative e ects are taken into account, this may lead to a superpotential

$$W_{quint} = W_{quint}(Q) \qquad M^{3}W \qquad ^{1=2}Q \qquad (2)$$

which will be discussed later. The advantage of the above writing is that it emphasizes the scale M of the superpotential. The quantity W is dimensionless and of order one. Then, inserting the Kahler and the super potentials into the expression of the scalar potential, one gets

$$V_{\text{quint}}(Q) = \frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{2} \left(Q + Q^{y}\right)^{2}} = W \frac{QW}{Q} + W \frac{y}{Q} + W \frac{y}{Q} + \frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{2} \left(Q + Q^{y}\right)} \frac{QW}{Q}^{2}$$
(3)

The noscale property in plies that the term in $3\sqrt[n]{}$ in the supergravity potential cancels. The kinetic term s of the moduli read $3\sqrt[n]{}$ = $Q + Q^{y^2}$ in plying that Q is not a normalized eld. The normalized eld q is given by

$$r = \frac{r}{3} q$$
: (4)

where q is a dimensionless scalar eld.

As soon as a quintessence eld has a runaway potential and leads to the present day acceleration of the universe expansion, its mass is tiny and may lead to gravitational problem s. In order to minimize this problem, we assume that the quintessence sector is only coupled gravitationally to the observable and hidden sectors [19]. In some sense, this assumption is that of non triviality of the model. The corresponding situation can be described by the following K ahler and superpotentials [19]

$$K = K_{quint} + K_{hid} + K_{obs}; W = W_{quint} + W_{hid} + W_{obs}:$$
(5)

Now the observable sector is known since it comprises the elds of the M inimal Standard Supersymmetric M odel $(M SSM)^{a}$ and the corresponding superpotential can be expressed as [18]

$$W_{obs} = \frac{1}{2} ab^{a b} + \frac{1}{3} abc^{a b c};$$
 (6)

where $_{ab}$ is a supersymmetric mass matrix and $_{abc}$ the Yukawa couplings.

The fact that susy is broken in an hidden sector modi es the shape of the quintessence potential. A nother way to put it is that the susy breaking causes the appearance of soft terms in the dark sector and these soft terms are responsible for the modi cation of the quintessence potential. The new shape has been computed in Ref. [19]. If we parametrise the hidden sector supersymmetry breaking in a model independent way, we have

¹⁼²
$$hz_{i}\dot{j}_{m in} = a_{i}(Q); \quad hW_{hid}\dot{j}_{m in} = M_{s}(Q); \quad \stackrel{1=2}{=} \frac{dW_{hid}}{dz_{i}} = c_{i}(Q)M_{s}(Q); \quad (7)$$

where a_i and c_i are coecients whose values depend on the detailed structure of the hidden sector. Notice that the coupling of the hidden sector to the quintessence sector in plies that the vev's of the hidden sector elds responsible for supersymmetry breaking can depend on the quintessence eld. Taking into account the no scale shape of the K ahler potential, one nds

$$V_{DE} = e^{\sum_{i} j k_{i} j^{2}} M^{6} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} & \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \right\} \left\{ \end{array}\right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \left\{ \end{array} \right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \left\{ \end{array} \right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \left\{ \end{array} \right\} \left\{ \end{array}\right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \left\{ \end{array}\right\} \left\{ \end{array}\right\} \left\{ \end{array}\right\} \left\{ \end{array}\right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array} \left\{ \end{array}\right\} \left\{ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array}\right\} \left\{ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array}\right\} \left\{ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\$$

where F_{z_1} e^{K=2} ($\mathcal{Q}_{z_1}W$ + W $\mathcal{Q}_{z_1}K$). The dynamics of the quintessence eld is determined by both the quintessence and hidden sectors. We also notice that, as expected, the correction coming from the hidden sector is proportional to the susy breaking mass M_s.

B. The Soft Term s

Let us now turn to the calculation of the soft terms in the observable sector. One usually obtains three types of terms. One is cubic in the elds while the others are quadratic. In the present situation, this property is clearly preserved. The new ingredient is that the soft terms become quintessence dependent quantities. Following Ref. [19] and de ning

$$V_{m SUGRA} = K + V_{\Theta_{uSY}} + e^{K} A (Q)_{abc} a b c + y y y + e^{K} B (Q)_{ab} a b + y y + m_{ab}^{2} a b^{Y}; (9)$$

where the soft term s are the term s which are not in V_{susy} , one obtains for the Q {dependent coe cients A, B and m ab in the noscale case

$$A(Q) = M_{s} 1 + \frac{1}{3} X_{i} \dot{p}_{i} \dot{f} + \frac{1}{3} X_{i} a_{i} c_{i} + M^{3} W^{y} 1 + \frac{1}{3} X_{i} \dot{p}_{i} \dot{f} = \frac{1}{3} I^{-2} Q + Q^{y} \frac{QW}{Q I^{-2}Q} ; (10)$$

$$B(Q) = M_{s} 1 + \frac{1}{2} X_{i} \dot{p}_{i} \dot{f} + \frac{1}{2} X_{i} a_{i} c_{i} + M^{3} W^{y} 1 + \frac{1}{2} X_{i} \dot{p}_{i} \dot{f} = \frac{1}{2} I^{-2} Q + Q^{y} \frac{QW}{Q I^{-2}Q} ; (11)$$

$$a_{ab}^{2}(Q) = \frac{Q^{\sum_{i} \dot{p}_{i} \dot{f}}}{I^{-2}(Q + Q^{y})^{3}} M_{s}^{2} + M_{s} M^{3} W + W^{y} + 2M^{6} W W^{y}_{ab} ; (12)$$

At this point, no assumption has been made except, of course, the choice of the Kahler potential. However, it is clear that, in a realistic model, we always have $M_s = M^3$ since the susy breaking scale is much larger than the

n

cosm obgical constant scale, typically M_s 1 TeV while M⁶ 10 ³eV ⁴. Now, the term s coming from F_{z_i} in the scalar potential are of order M_s² = which is intolerably large compared to the cosm ological scales. This is nothing but another manifestation of the cosm ological constant problem which, again, is not solved in the framework of quintessence. This contribution must be taken to vanish and therefore $a_i = c_i = 0$. Interestingly enough, it turns out to be exactly the case when W_{hid} is a constant [22]. Therefore M_s is constant, A and B are constant of the order of M_s, and

$$2B = M_s + 3A; \qquad (13)$$

while the mass m $_{\rm ab}$ acquires a very simple Q -dependence given by

$$m_{ab} = \frac{M_{s}}{1 = 2 (Q + Q^{y})^{3=2} ab} :$$
(14)

It is interesting to compare the above results to those obtained in Ref. [22] in the case of polynom ialK ahler and super potentials. The coe cients A and B were not constant but given by $A = M_s + Q^2 = 3$ and $B = M_s + Q^2 = 2$. We notice that, despite a di erent dependence in the quintessence eld, A and B also satisfy Eq. (13). On the other hand, the dependence of the soft term m_{ab} is the same as in Ref. [22], namely $m_{ab} / M_s \exp(K = 2)$. In the SUGRA case this came from the fact that $hW_{quint}i = 0$ while in the no scale situation this originates from neglecting subdom inant terms thanks to the relation $M_s = M^3$. However, since the K ahler potentials are di erent, the above relation leads to di erent Q-dependence for m_{ab} .

C. The Electro-W eak Transition in Presence of No-Scale Quintessence

We now consider the application of the previous results to the electrow eak sym metry breaking since this is the way ferm ions in the standard model are given a mass. As is well-known, the potential in the Higgs sector which belongs to the observable sector is modiled by the soft terms. Since these soft terms now depend on the quintessence edd, the Higgs potential also becomes a Q-dependent quantity. In the MSSM, there are two SU $(2)_L$ Higgs doublets

$$H_{u} = \begin{array}{c} H_{u}^{+} \\ H_{u}^{0} \\ H_{u}^{0} \end{array} ; \quad H_{d} = \begin{array}{c} H_{d}^{0} \\ H_{u} \\ H_{u} \end{array} ;$$
(15)

that have opposite hypercharges, i.e. $Y_u = 1$ and $Y_d = 1$. The only term which is relevant in the superpotential is $W_{obs} = H_u \quad H + \dots$. This term gives contribution to the globally susy terms. With the F- and D-term s. Then, we have the contribution coming from the soft susy-breaking term s. There is a B-soft susy-breaking term coming from Eq. (11) and a contribution from the soft masses, see Eq. (12). In order to evaluate the latter, one writes $m_{11} = m_{H_u}^2 e^{K_{quint}}$, and $m_{22} = m_{H_d}^2 e^{K_{quint}}$, where $m_{H_u} = m_{H_d} = m_{3=2}^0$ at the GUT scale. This degeneracy is lifted by the renorm alisation group evolution as necessary to obtain the radiative breaking of the electrow eak symmetry [26]. The total H iggs potential, taking H_u^0 and H_d^0 real since they have opposite hypercharges, reads

$$V^{H iggs} = e^{K_{quint}} j j^{2} + m_{H_{u}}^{2} H_{u}^{0} j^{2} + j j^{2} + m_{H_{d}}^{2} H_{d}^{0} j^{2} 2 B (Q) H_{u}^{0} H_{d}^{0} + \frac{1}{8} g^{2} + g^{Q} H_{u}^{0} j^{2} H_{d}^{0} j^{2} i$$
(16)

The next step is to perform the m inim ization of the H iggs potential given by Eq. (16). In presence of dark energy, the m inim um becomes Q {dependent and the particles of the standard m odel acquire a Q -dependent m ass. Straightforw ard calculations give

$$e^{K_{quint}} j_{j}^{2} + m_{H_{u}}^{2} = B(Q) \frac{e^{K_{quint}}}{\tan} + \frac{m_{Z^{0}}^{2}}{2} \cos(2); \qquad (17)$$

$$e^{K_{quint}} j j^{2} + m_{H_{d}}^{2} = B(Q)e^{K_{quint}} tan \frac{m_{Z^{0}}^{2}}{2} cos(2);$$
 (18)

where we have de ned the Higgs vevs as $hH_u^0 i v_d$, $hH_d^0 i v_d$, tan $v_d = v_d$, or $v_u = v \sin$ and $v_d = v \cos$ and m_{Z^0} as the gauge boson Z^0 . Adding the two equations for the minimum, we obtain a quadratic equation determining tan . The solution can easily be found and reads

$$\tan (Q) = \frac{2j f + m_{H_u}^2(Q) + m_{H_d}^2(Q)}{2 B(Q)} 1 \frac{q}{1 + 4^2 B^2(Q) 2j f + m_{H_u}^2(Q) + m_{H_d}^2(Q)} : (19)$$

A priori, this equation is a transcendental equation determ ining tan as tan also appears in the right-hand-side of the above form ula, more precisely in the Higgs masses. Indeed, the two loop expression for the renorm alized Higgs masses gives [27]

$$m_{H_{u}}^{2}(Q) = m_{H_{d}}^{2}(Q) \quad 0.36 \ 1 + \frac{1}{\tan^{2}} \quad \begin{pmatrix} h & i_{2} \\ m_{3=2}^{0}(Q) & 1 & \frac{1}{2} \\ + & 0.28 & \frac{0.72}{\tan^{2}} \quad h \\ + & 0.28 & \frac{0.72}{\tan^{2}} \quad A(Q) + 2m_{1=2}^{0}; \end{pmatrix}$$
(20)

$$m_{H_{d}}^{2}(Q) = m_{3=2}^{h}(Q)^{i_{2}} 1 \frac{0.15}{4} + \frac{1}{2}m_{1=2}^{h}(Q)^{i_{2}}; \qquad (21)$$

where $m_{1=2}^{0}$ is the gaugino m ass at GUT scale. However, Eq. (19) gives the leading order contribution of an expansion in $1=\tan^{2}$. As we have seen in the text, the noscale situation is such that A (Q) and B (Q) are constant in Q and, therefore, the Higgs mass given by Eqs. (20), (21) and hence tan do not depend on Q in this particular case. Again, this is very di erent from the polynomial case where tan is a Q-dependent quantity, see Eq. (2.31) of Ref. [22] for the exact form ula.

From the equations (17) and (18), one can also deduce how the scale v $v_u^2 + v_d^2$ depends on the quintessence eld. This leads to

$$v(Q) = \frac{2e^{K_{quint}=2}}{p} \frac{r}{g^2 + g^{02}} \quad j j^2 + m_{H_u}^2 + 0 \quad \frac{1}{\tan} \quad :$$
(22)

Again, the noscale case is quite particular: the only Q (dependence is given by the factor exp ($K_{quint}=2$) in front of the whole expression.

Then, nally, one has for the vevs of the two Higgs

$$v_u(Q) = \frac{v(Q) \tan(Q)}{1 + \tan^2(Q)} = v(Q) + 0 \frac{1}{\tan^2}$$
; (23)

$$v_{d}(Q) = \frac{v(Q)}{1 + \tan^{2}(Q)} = \frac{v(Q)}{\tan} + 0 \frac{1}{\tan^{2}};$$
 (24)

at leading order in $1=\tan^2$ (but if we insert the expression of v, then v_u and v_d are only determ ined at rst order in $1=\tan$). This allows us to deduce the two kinds of ferm ion m asses, depending on whether the ferm ions couple to H_u or H_d

$$m_{u;a}^{F}(Q) = v_{a}e^{K_{quint}=2}v_{u}(Q); \quad m_{d;a}^{F}(Q) = v_{d;a}e^{K_{quint}=2}v_{d}(Q); \quad (25)$$

where $_{u,a}^{F}$ and $_{d,a}^{F}$ are the Yukawa coupling of the particle $_{a}$ coupling either to H_u or H_d. The masses pick up a exp (K_{quint}=2) dependence from the expression of v(Q) and another factor exp (K_{quint}=2) from the de nition of the mass itself. As a result we have m / exp (K_{quint}) / Q³ in the no scale situation. This Q dependence is the same for particles of type \u" or \d" as tan is a constant. This leads us to the main result of the section: in no scale quintessence the behavior of the standard model particle masses is universal and given by

m (Q) /
$$\frac{1}{1^{-2} (Q + Q^{y})^{3}}$$
 / e^p $\overline{6}q$: (26)

In the next section, we investigate the consequences of this dependence for gravity experiments.

III. GRAVITATIONAL TESTS AND CHAMELEONS

Let us now discuss the consequences of having Q -dependent m asses. This can lead to strong constraints coming from gravitational experiments. Indeed, if the no-scale dark energy potentials obtained in the previous sections, see Eq. (8) for the quantity V_{DE} , are of the runaway type (otherwise, in general, one can show that the corresponding cosm ological model is not interesting since it becomes equivalent to the case of the cosm ological constant, for a speci c example, see Ref. [22]), then this implies that the moduli have a mass m_Q H_0 , i.e. of the order of the Hubble rate now.

6

This implies that the range of the force mediated by the quintessence eld is large and, for instance, it induces a flh force and/or a violation of the weak equivalence principle. In order to satisfy the constraints coming from flh force experiments such as the recent C assini spacecraft experiment, one must require that the Eddington (post-New tonian) parameter j 1j 5 10^5 , see Ref. [20]. If one denes the parameter u_{rd} by

$$u_{id} (Q) \qquad \frac{d \ln m_{u_{id}}^{F}(q)}{dq} ; \qquad (27)$$

where the derivative is taken with respect to the norm alized eld q, then the di culties are avoided by in posing that $\frac{2}{u_{rd}}$ 10⁵ since one has = 1 + 2 $\frac{2}{u_{rd}}$. In our case, Eq. (26) in plies

$$u_{id} = \stackrel{\text{p}}{\overline{6}} : \tag{28}$$

This result is valid for a gedanken experiment involving the gravitational e ects on elementary particles. For macroscopic bodies, the e ects can be more subtle and will be discussed later, see also R ef. [22]. O focurse, the above result is in contradiction with the bounds on the existence of a fin force and on the violation of the weak equivalence principle.

However, the above description is too naive because we have not taken into account the cham eleon e ect in the presence of matter which, in the fram ework used here, is necessarily present. Indeed, in the presence of surrounding matter like the atm osphere or the inter-planetary vacuum, the elective potential for the quintessence eld is modied by matter and becomes

$$V_{e}(Q) = V_{DE}(Q) + A(Q)_{mat};$$
 (29)

where A(Q) is the coupling of the quintessence eld to matter, i.e. the mass of matter is proportional to / A(Q). This can lead to an elective minimum for the potential even though the Dark Energy potential is runaway. In our case, see Eq. (26), we have

$$V_{e} (Q) = V_{DE} (Q) + \frac{Q_{0}}{Q} \int_{mat}^{3} W_{DE} (q) + e^{p \overline{6}(q_{0} q)} M_{mat};$$
(30)

where we have normalized the coupling to its present vacuum value when $Q = Q_0$. For runaway potentials, the e ective potential possesses a minimum where

$$V_{DE}^{0}(q_{m in}) = \frac{p_{\overline{6}}}{6e} e^{p_{\overline{6}}(q_{0} - q_{m in})} m_{at};$$
(31)

and the mass at the minimum is

$$m_{q}^{2} = V_{D_{E}}^{0} (q_{n in}) + \overline{6V}_{D_{E}}^{0} (q_{n in});$$
(32)

which is always of order H $_0$, i.e. an almost massless eld. This would lead an observable fit force if it were not for the possibility of a thin shell e ect.

Before turning to this question, it is worth commenting on the chameleon e ect in the SUGRA case, see Ref. [22]. Since it is a natural consequence of the couplings between the observable and dark sector, the chameleon e ect is also present in this model. However, it is hidden by the susy breaking term $m_{3=2}^2 Q^2$, where $m_{3=2}$ is the gravitino mass which largely dominates the term A (Q) mat. In the no scale case, thanks to the very particular form of the Kahler potential, the above susy breaking term is not present and a priori the chameleon e ect can be e cient. In any case, in order to study whether no scale quintessence is nuled out or not because of the gravity experiments, it is mandatory to take into account the chameleon phenomenon correctly.

A. The Thin ShellM echanism

A theory, as described before in this article, where the particle m ass depends on the quintessence eld becom es a scalar tensor theory with the Lagrangian

$$S = d^{4}x^{p} - g \frac{R}{2} + \frac{1}{2}g @ q@ q V_{D_{E}}(q) + S_{mat} = A^{2}(q)g :$$
(33)

Then, the geodesic equation can be written as

$$\frac{d^2 x}{d^2} + \frac{d x}{d} \frac{d x}{d} + \frac{\theta q}{\theta x} = 0; \qquad (34)$$

where $_q$ (ln A = 0 q. In the above equation, the Christo el sym bols are those associated with the metric g. The last term, which represents the new force originating from the quintessence eld, comes from the fact that the geodesic equation is established for the metric appearing in the matter Lagrangian. As is apparent from Eq. (33), this one is given by A^2 (q)g and the presence of the A^2 (q) factor is responsible for the new term in Eq. (34). A nalyzing this equation in the weak eld regime, one nds that the acceleration felt by a test particle is given by

$$a = a_{N} \qquad q \frac{\partial q}{\partial r}; \qquad (35)$$

where a_{N} is the usual Newtonian acceleration (assuming a spherical body, see below).

Let us now consider a situation where the gravitational experiments are performed on a body embedded in a surrounding medium. The body could be a small ball of metal in the atmosphere or a planet in the inter-planetary vacuum. The elective potential (29) is not the same inside the body and outside because m_{atter} is different. The elective potential can be approximated by

$$V_{\rm e}$$
 ' $\frac{1}{2}m_{\rm q}^2 (q - q_{\rm lin})^2$; (36)

where the minimum q_{min} is determined by $@V_e = @q = 0$ and the mass is $@^2V_e = @q^2$ evaluated at $q = q_{min}$. As already mentioned the minimum and the mass are dimensioned in the model. We denote by q_b and m_b the minimum and the mass in the body and by q_1 and m_1 the minimum and the mass of the elective potential outside the body. Then, the K lein-G ordon equation reads

$$\frac{d^2q}{dr^2} + \frac{2}{r}\frac{dq}{dr} = \frac{@V_e}{@q};$$
(37)

where r is a radial coordinate. Of course, the eld q should be continuous at $r = R_b$ where R_b is the radius of the body. Notice that, in the K lein-G ordon equation, we have used canonical kinetic term s in accordance with the fact that q is a canonically normalized eld. W ith an elective potential given by Eq. (36), the solution of Eq. (37) reads

$$q = q_{n in} + \frac{A}{r} e^{m r} + \frac{B}{r} e^{m r};$$
 (38)

where A and B are two arbitrary constant. Requiring that q remains bounded inside and outside the body and joining the interior and exterior solutions, one can determ ine the complete prole which can be expressed as

$$q_{\rm c} (r) = q_{\rm b} + \frac{R_{\rm b} (q_{\rm l} - q_{\rm s}) (1 + m_{\rm 1} R_{\rm b})}{\sinh (m_{\rm b} R_{\rm b}) [m_{\rm 1} R_{\rm b} + m_{\rm b} R_{\rm b} \coth (m_{\rm b} R_{\rm b})]} \frac{\sinh (m_{\rm b} r)}{r}; r R_{\rm b};$$
(39)

$$q_{b}(\mathbf{r}) = q_{1} + R_{b}(q_{b} - q_{l}) \frac{m_{b}R_{b} \coth(m_{b}R_{b}) - 1}{[m_{1}R_{b} + m_{b}R_{b} \coth(m_{b}R_{b})]} \frac{e^{-m_{1}(\mathbf{r}-R_{b})}}{\mathbf{r}}; \quad \mathbf{r} - R_{b}; \quad (40)$$

A typical pro le is represented in Fig. 1.

We are now in a position to estimate the acceleration caused by the quintessence eld. A ssuming, as is always the case in practice, that $m_b = m_1 , m_b R_b = 1$, one has

$$\frac{\partial q_{p}(\mathbf{r})}{\partial \mathbf{r}} \prime = \frac{R_{b}}{r^{2}} (q_{1} - q_{2}); \qquad (41)$$

from which we deduce that the acceleration felt by a test particle is given by

$$a = \frac{Gm_{b}}{r^{2}} 1 + \frac{q(q_{1} q_{2})}{r}; \qquad (42)$$

where $_{N} = Gm_{b} = R_{b}$ is the New tonian potential at the surface of the body. Therefore, the theory is compatible with gravity tests if

$$\frac{q (q_1 q_3)}{1 : (43)}$$



FIG.1: Pro le of the canonically normalized quintessence eld inside and outside a spherical body according to Eqs. (39) and (40). As explained in the text, R_b is the radius of the body and q_b is the value of the quintessence eld inside the body.

We see that the gravity tests are not sensitive to $_{q}$ but to the combination $_{q}(q_{1} - q_{2}) = _{N}$. Hence, even if $_{q}$ is quite large, if the new factor $(q_{1} - q_{2}) = _{N}$ is small then the model can be compatible. This is the thin shelle ect. In our case, as $_{q} = \frac{1}{6}$, this implies that the moduli elds must be small in order to satisfy the thin shell property. In general, the New ton potential is very small, implying that the moduli eld q must be small too. This strongly depends on the shape of the potential and, therefore, on the superpotential in the moduli sector. In the following we will give two examples which do not lead to a thin shell. These examples have a well-motivated superpotential. In non generic cases, no general obstruction to the existence of a thin shell exists and, therefore, one may not moduli superpotential leading both to quintessence and a thin-shell.

B. Gaugino Condensation and Quintessence

In order to go further, and to perform a quantitative calculation, one must specify the dark energy potential which requires an explicit form for the superpotential.

In string compactications, on top of the K ahler moduli there are complex structure moduli and the string dilaton. These elds can be stabilized once uxes have been introduced. This leads to a superpotential for the complex structure moduli and the dilaton. The complex structure moduli and the dilaton lead to a supersymmetric vacuum where they are xed and the superpotential becomes a constant. We are thus left with the K ahler moduli as a tructure in plex structure of plex structure gauge dynamics such as gaugino condensation in ples that a superpotential for the K ahler moduli is generated. On the whole the dynamics of the K ahler moduli are governed by the following superpotential [28]

$$W = M^{3} w_{0} + cexp \qquad {}^{1=2}Q \qquad ; \qquad (44)$$

where wo, c and are free and positive dimensionless constants. It is immediate to nd that the potential Vquint reads

$$V_{\text{quint}}(Q) = \frac{M^{6}c^{2}}{2^{-1+2}Q^{-2}}e^{-\frac{1+2}{2}Q} \frac{W_{0}}{c} + e^{-\frac{1+2}{2}Q} - \frac{1+2}{3}Q + 1 \quad :$$
(45)

Then, one should take into account the corrections coming from the susy breaking term s. Using Eq. (8), one arrives at

$$V_{DE}(Q) = \frac{M^{6}C^{2}}{2^{1=2}Q^{2}}e^{-\frac{1+2}{Q}}\frac{W_{0}}{C} + \frac{M_{s}}{CM^{3}} + e^{-\frac{1+2}{Q}}\frac{1}{3}e^{-\frac{1+2}{Q}} + 1 \quad :$$
(46)

The elective potential has no minimum so no cham eleon mechanism is possible. Indeed, it is easy to demonstrate that V_{DE} (Q) is a decreasing function (for > 0 which is clearly the case of physical interest) as exp for is. Hence, this model is ruled out gravitationally.

C. Non-Renorm alisable Potential

A class of potential with phenom enological interest can be obtained if the quintessence eld Q has a nonrenorm alisable superpotential. Although this is not what is expected from string theory, we will consider as it leads to very appealing quintessential properties. Therefore, we choose

$$W = \frac{M^{3}}{n} ({}^{1=2}Q)^{n}; \qquad (47)$$

"

U sing Eq. (3), straightforward calculations lead to the following form

$$V_{\text{quint}}(Q) = \frac{M^6}{6n}(n-3)^{-1=2}Q^{-2n-3} = \frac{M^6}{6n}(n-3)\exp((2n-3))\frac{2}{3}q$$
: (48)

This leads to a satisfying exponential potential when n > 3. These potentials have been thoroughly studied and lead to the existence of long time attractors [10, 11]. Again, the runaway feature of the potential in plies that it is a good quintessence candidate. Then, as expressed by Eq. (8), the shape of the quintessence potential is modiled by the soft term s present in the dark sector. One obtains

$$V_{DE}(Q) = \frac{M^{6}}{6n}(n-3) \stackrel{1=2}{=} Q \stackrel{2n-3}{=} + \frac{1}{2}M_{S}M^{3} \stackrel{1=2}{=} Q \stackrel{n-3}{=};$$
(49)

$$= \frac{M^{6}}{6n} (n \quad 3) \exp (2n \quad 3) \frac{2}{3}q + \frac{1}{2}M_{s}M^{3} \exp (n \quad 3) \frac{2}{3}q :$$
(50)

As already discussed, the correction is proportional to the susy breaking scale M_s. It has the structure of a two exponential potential. As q gets large, the second term of the potential dom inates and leads to acceleration in the matter era provided 2=3 (n 3^2 < 4 i.e. n 3 + 6. In this case, the future of our Universe would be with $_Q = 1$ with an equation of state

$$w_Q = 1 + \frac{2(n-3)^2}{9};$$
 (51)

which is close to 1 when n is close to 3. Finally, the e ective potential for this model reads

$$V_{e} (q) = \frac{1}{2} M_{s} M^{3} e^{(n-3)} \frac{p_{\frac{2}{3}q}}{q} + e^{\frac{p}{6}q} e^{\frac{p}{6}q_{0}} m_{at} :$$
(52)

From this expression one can deduce $q_{m in}$ and the mass of the eld at the minimum . One nds

$$q_{\rm m in} = \frac{1}{n} \frac{3}{2} \frac{p}{6} q_0 + \ln \frac{(n-3)M_{\rm s}M^3}{6_{\rm m at}} ; \quad m^2 = \frac{n(n-3)M_{\rm s}M^3}{3 \frac{m^2}{m_{\rm Pl}^2}} \frac{n-3M_{\rm s}M^3}{n \frac{m^2}{m_{\rm at}}} e^{\frac{(3-n)}{6} m} ; \quad (53)$$

As an example, let us consider the Earth in our local neighborhood of the galaxy. We have $M_s = 10^{\circ} \text{GeV}$, $M' = 10^{-12} \text{GeV}$, $4 = 10^{-17} \text{GeV}^4$ and $1 = 4 = 10^{-42} \text{GeV}^4$. For n = 4 and $q_0 = 1$, this gives q' = 115 and q' = 61. Since m' = 33 10°GeV and R' = 6 10°cm , one gets 124 10^{-8} and therefore

$$\frac{q (q_1 q_2)}{N} \cdot 3 \quad 10^9 \quad 1:$$
(54)

Since m_1 ' 2 10²⁸ eV 10³ eV, the range of the corresponding force is very big. The conclusion is that, although we have a cham eleon mechanism which renders the analysis of the gravity tests non trivial, this one is not e cient enough and the corresponding model is ruled out.

We have presented models of moduli quintessence. Despite the large gravitational coupling of the moduli to matter in these models, a cham eleon mechanism is at play and could render the models compatible with gravitational experiments. Unfortunately, in realistic cases such as gaugino condensation or non-renormalisable superpotentials, the cham eleon phenom enon is not strong enough to save the models.

O ne can deduce a no-go theorem (m odulo, of course, the assumptions m ade in this article, in particular that of the separate sectors) showing the incompatibility between quintessence in supergravity and gravity tests. Let us come back to the general structure of the scalar potential. As shown in R ef. [19], see Eq. (2.18), it can always be written as

$$V_{DE}(Q) = M^{6}v_{1}(1^{2}Q) + M_{S}M^{3}v_{2}(1^{2}Q) + \frac{M^{2}}{2}e^{K} K^{QQ^{y}}K_{Q}K_{Q^{y}} 3 + X^{T}F_{z_{1}}J^{2};$$
(55)

where we have chosen to emphasize the various combinations of scales appearing in this expression and where, consequently, v_1 ($^{1=2}Q$) and v_2 ($^{1=2}Q$) are dimensionless functions, a priori of order one at present time. The last term contains the F-term s of the hidden sector.

Let us consider rst m odels where the K ahler potential can be expanded around Q = 0. A fier a K ahler transformation, one can always expand

$$K_{quint} = QQ^{Y} + ;$$
 (56)

where represent P lanck suppressed operators which, at present time, are not necessarily negligible since we have M_{p_1} now. It is immediate to see that at leading order, the quintessence eld picks up a soft breaking mass

$$V_{D_{E}}(Q) = M^{6}v_{1}(1^{2}Q) + M_{s}M^{3}v_{2}(1^{2}Q) + m_{3=2}^{2}D^{2}M_{s}M^{3}v_{2}(1^{2}Q) + m_{3=2}^{2}D^{2};$$
(57)

where we have used that $M_s / m_{3=2}$ and have imposed $P_i \ddagger r_{z_1} f = 3m_{3=2}^2$ 1 in order to cancel the intolerably large contribution to the cosm ological constant coming from the hidden sector. The last equality originates from the condition $M_s = M^3$. From Eq. (57), we see that the potential acquires a minimum since, in general, the functions v_1 and v_2 are of the runaway type, i.e. decreasing with Q. The value of the minimum is controlled by the scales M, M_s and $m_{3=2}$. Due to the large value of $m_{3=2}$ compared to the quintessence ekd, the minimum is generically small in P lanck units. The scale M is tuned to get a minimum value for the potential of order cri. At this minimum, the mass of the quadratic potential in Q implies that the ekd must have settled at the minimum before B ig B ang Nucleosynthesis (BBN). If not, the energy density of the quintessence ekd would exceed the M eV energy scale of BBN. In practice, the potential is constant since BBN, i.e. equivalent to a cosm ological constant. Notice that the coupling of the quintessence ekd to matter induces a correction to the potential in $m_{at} p f$ which is negligible com pared to $m_{3=2} p f$, hence no cham eleon e ect.

O ne can circum vent this argument by taking singular potentials where the potential term in $\mathcal{W} \stackrel{2}{\mathcal{I}}$ is constant. O ne can choose

$$K_{\text{quint}} = \frac{n}{2} \ln^{h} \frac{1}{1-2} Q + Q^{\gamma} :$$
(58)

In this case, n= 3 for m oduli and n= 1 for the dilaton. Fine-tuning of the cosm ological constant requires

$$\mathbf{F}_{z_1} \mathbf{f} = (3 \quad n) \mathbf{m}_{3=2}^2 \quad \mathbf{i} ;$$
(59)

leaving

$$V_{DE} (Q) = M^{6} v_{1} (1^{2} Q) + M_{s} M^{3} v_{2} (1^{2} Q) M_{s} M^{3} v_{2} (1^{2} Q)$$
(60)

No mass term appears for the quintessence eld. The dynamics are similar to the no-scale case with a contribution from the matter density. The mass of the quintessence eld at the minimum of the matter-dependent potential is of order H $_0$. Moreover the thin-shell e ect is only present for small values of the normalized scalar eld q, a situation which requires a non-generic quintessence superpotential (otherwise q 1 generically).

We conclude that under broad circum stances, one cannot obtain a compatibility between quintessence and gravity tests in supergravity. Either the dynamics are equivalent to a cosm ological constant or gravity tests are not evaded. O ne possibility is to relinquish the assumption on the Kahler potential (three decoupled Kahler potentials). Work on this possibility (sequestered models and others) is in progress.

- S. Perknutter S et al, A strophys. J. 517, 565 (1999), astro-ph/9812133; P. M. Gamavich et al, A strophys. J. 493, L53 (1998), astro-ph/9710123; A. G. Riess et al, A stron. J. 116, 1009 (1998), astro-ph/9805201; P. A stier et al, A stron. A strophys. 447, 31 (2006), astro-ph/0510447.
- [2] M. Tegmark M et al, Phys. Rev. D 69, 103501 (2004), astro-ph/0310723.
- [3] P. Solevi, R. Mainini and S.A. Bonom etto, astro-ph/0412054.
- [4] A.Fuzfa and J.M. A lim i in A bert E instein Century International Conference, Paris, 18-22 July 2005, A IP Proceedings Conference 861, 858-866, edited by J.M. A lim i and A.Fuzfa, astro-ph/0611284.
- [5] D. N. Spergel et al., astro-ph/0603449; P. Fosalba, E. G aztanaga and F. Castander, A strophys. J. 597, L89 (2003), astro-ph/0307249; R. Scranton R et al., astro-ph/0307335; S. Boughn and R. Crittenden, Nature (London) 427, 45 (2004), astro-ph/0305001.
- [6] R.Mainini, L.P.L.Colombo and S.A.Bonometto, Astrophys.J.632, 691 (2005), astro-ph/0503036.
- [7] S.W einberg, Rev.M od.Phys.61,1 (1989).
- [8] L. Susskind, hep-th/0302219.
- [9] J. Polchinski, Rapporteur talk at the 23rd Solvay Conference in Physics, December (2005), hep-th/0603249.
- [10] B.Ratra and P.J.E.Peebles, Phys.Rev.D 37, 3406 (1998).
- [11] P.G.Ferreira and M.Joyce, Phys.Rev.D 58, 023503 (1998), astro-ph/9711102.
- [12] P. Binetnuy, Phys. Rev. D 60, 063502 (1998), hep-ph/9810553; P. Binetnuy, Int. J. Theor. Phys. 39, 1859 (2000), hep-ph/0005037.
- [13] P.Brax and J.M artin, Phys.Lett. B 468, 40 (1999), astro-ph/9905040.
- [14] P.Brax and J.Martin, Phys.Rev.D 61, 103502 (2000), astro-ph/9912046.
- [15] P.Brax, J.M artin and A.Riazueb, Phys.Rev.D 62, 103505 (2000), astro-ph/0005428.
- [16] P.Brax, J.M artin and A.Riazuelo, Phys. Rev. D 64, 083505 (2001), hep-ph/0104240.
- [17] J.Martin, C.Schimd and J.P.Uzan, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 061303 (2006), astro-ph/0510208.
- [18] H.P.N illes, Phys. Rept. 101, 1 (1984); S.P.M artin, hep-ph/9709356; I.J.R.A itch ison, Supersym m etry and the M SSM: An E lem entary Introduction, N otes of Lectures for G raduate Students in Particle Physics, O xford, 1004 (2005).
- [19] P.Brax and J.M artin, hep-th/0605228.
- [20] C.M.W ill, Living. Rev. Rel. 9, 2 (2006), gr-qc/0510072; E.F ischbach and C.Talmadge, The Search for non-Newtonian Gravity, Springer-Verlag, New-York, (1999); B.Bertotti, L. Iess and P.Tortora, Nature 425, 374 (2003); G.Esposito-Farese, gr-qc/0409081.
- [21] T.Dam our and A.M. Polyakov, Nucl. Phys. B 423, 532 (1994), hep-th/9401069.
- [22] P.Brax and J.M artin, JCAP 0611,008 (2006), astro-ph/0606306.
- [23] E.W itten, Phys. Lett. B 155, 151 (1985); D.Bailin, A.Love and S.Thom as, Nucl. Phys. B 273, 537 (1986); S.Ferrara, C.Kounnas and M.Porrati, Phys. Lett. B 181, 263 (1986); I.Antoniadis, J.Ellis, E.Floratos, D.V.Nanopoulos and T.Tom aras, Phys. Lett. B 191, 96 (1987).
- [24] S.Kachru, R.Kallosh, A.Linde and S.P.Trivedi, Phys. Rev. D 68, 046005 (2003), hep-th/0301240.
- [25] P.Brax, C.van de Bruck, A.C.Davis, J.K houry and A.Welman, Phys. Rev. D 70, 123518 (2004), astro-ph/0408415.
- [26] J.P.D erendinger and C. Savoy, Nucl. Phys. B 237, 307 (1984).
- [27] P.Brax and C.Savoy, JHEP 0007, 048 (2000), hep-ph/0004133.
- [28] S.Kachru, R.Kallosh, A. Linde and S.P. Trivedi, Phys. Rev. D 68,046005 (2003), hep-th/0301240; S.Kachru, R.Kallosh, A. Linde, J.Maldacena, L.M cAllister and S.P. Trivedi JCAP 0310,013 (2003), hep-ph/0308055.