

Cohen-Kaplan-Nelson Bound and Minimum Coupling in Effective Field Theories

Hooman Davoudiasl^{1,*}

¹*High Energy Theory Group, Physics Department
Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973, USA*

Based on various dynamical arguments, we motivate a relation among the coupling strength, ultraviolet (UV), and infrared (IR) cutoff scales of an effective field theory. This relation, in conjunction with the Cohen-Kaplan-Nelson (CKN) bound connecting the UV and IR cutoff scales, implies a *Minimum Coupling Condition* (MCC). The derived MCC is much stronger than the analogue condition resulting from the *Weak Gravity Conjecture*. This can be traced to the more stringent nature of the CKN UV-IR relation compared to that obtained from Bekenstein's maximal entropy requirement. The MCC would not allow for Dirac neutrinos in the Standard Model and suggests its UV cutoff scale is below $\sim 10^4$ TeV, from the inferred size of the electron Yukawa coupling. We also slightly extend the CKN bound, by accounting for the effective degrees of freedom, and examine some of its phenomenological implications.

Modern quantum field theory (QFT) has proven itself to be a predictive and systematic framework for understanding numerous physical phenomena, at microscopic distances. Similarly, for over a century, General Relativity (GR) has been the state-of-the-art in describing gravitational interactions, from everyday distances to the largest structures in the Universe. However, QFT has not been successfully combined with GR to allow a proper and predictive understanding of quantum gravity, though string theory appears to be a promising framework in this direction. Perhaps, once that work is complete, we will understand some of the puzzles which QFT seems to leave unresolved. Of these, the cosmological constant problem - why the theory expectation for its size fails so overwhelmingly - is a glaring one [1]. One is then tempted to ask whether what we seem to understand about gravity could indicate how QFT should be modified to get us closer to a more complete description of physical laws.

In the above spirit, Cohen, Kaplan, and Nelson (CKN) made an intriguing proposal [2] that drew on insights regarding properties of black holes [3–8]. They argued that a well-behaved effective field theory (EFT) cannot give rise to black hole states whose horizon size is larger than the length L that defines the infrared (IR) cutoff scale $\sim L^{-1}$ of the theory. Since an EFT with ultraviolet (UV) cutoff Λ is expected to be valid up to energy densities $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda^4)$, demanding that a space-time region of size L not include any such black holes then suggests [2]

$$L \Lambda^2 \lesssim M_{\text{P}}, \quad (\text{CKN}) \quad (1)$$

where $M_{\text{P}} \sim 10^{19}$ GeV is the Planck mass. Here and in what follows we only consider the main parametric dependencies.

As pointed out in Ref. [2], for L^{-1} set by the Hubble rate $H_0 \sim 10^{-33}$ eV [9], the UV cutoff of the corresponding EFT is given by

$$\Lambda \sim 3 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}. \quad (\text{Cosmic EFT}) \quad (2)$$

This scale turns out to be near the inferred scale $\sim 10^{-3}$ eV of a cosmological constant, the simplest explanation of the “dark energy” responsible for the accelerated expansion of the Universe [9]. In this interpretation, the QFT expectation for

the value of vacuum energy setting the cosmological constant does not seem fine-tuned, which can possibly address a long-standing conceptual problem.

The CKN bound is stronger than that obtained from Bekenstein's requirement

$$L \Lambda^3 \lesssim M_{\text{P}}^2, \quad (\text{Bekenstein}) \quad (3)$$

demanding the maximal entropy of a region of size L be smaller than its surface area in fundamental units $\sim M_{\text{P}}^{-2}$, *i.e.*, the entropy of a black hole of the same size.

The derivation leading to the CKN relation above is premised on the assumption that an EFT cutoff at scale Λ can describe thermal ensembles up to temperatures $T \sim \Lambda$, corresponding to energy densities $\rho \sim \Lambda^4$ [2]. This compels us to ask what conditions are required for achieving the assumed thermal ensemble. It seems reasonable to demand that for a particle to establish a thermal population, its mean free path λ must be smaller than the IR length scale of the EFT:

$$\lambda \lesssim L. \quad (4)$$

Let us denote a generic interaction strength by g . Here, we will consider interactions that describe a force and will limit our discussion to gauge interactions mediated by a vector boson or Yukawa interactions associated with a scalar. At $T \sim \Lambda$, defining the UV scale, we have $\lambda \sim (g^2 \Lambda)^{-1}$ which provides a minimal criterion, corresponding to soft scattering (see, *e.g.*, Ref. [10]). From Eq. (4), we then get

$$g^2 L \Lambda \gtrsim 1. \quad (\text{ECR}) \quad (5)$$

We will refer to the above as the *Effective Coupling Relation* (ECR), which we propose as a general relationship among the coupling strength, the UV, and the IR scales in an EFT. From a thermodynamic point of view, the ECR indicates that in order to have a thermal ensemble at highest temperatures $T \sim \Lambda$ over a region of size L , a minimum interaction strength g is required. Lowering g would necessarily imply enlarging the size of the region.

One could also find non-thermal motivation for the ECR in Eq. (5). For example, one may define a “Bohr Radius”

for a particle of mass m , which interacts with strength g , by $R_B(m) \sim (g^2 m)^{-1}$. Hence, the smallest dynamical length scale of the EFT, defined by heavy states of mass $m \sim \Lambda$, is given by $R_B(\Lambda) \sim (g^2 \Lambda)^{-1}$. It makes sense then to demand any interaction that is part of the EFT to have a minimal ‘‘Bohr Radius’’ smaller than the IR cutoff length, $R_B(\Lambda) \lesssim L$, which is the same as the above Eq. (5).

More generally, one may consider the potential energy $E \sim g^2/R$ associated with interactions at the shortest EFT distance $R \sim \Lambda^{-1}$, given by

$$E(\Lambda) \sim g^2 \Lambda. \quad (6)$$

The $1/R$ dependence implies a force mediated by a light boson, which should be a valid description when considering distances near the UV cutoff scale. Since $E(\Lambda)$ defines the largest energy scale of the EFT defined by the assumed interaction, we must have $E(\Lambda) \gtrsim L^{-1}$, which together with Eq. (6) again yields Eq. (5).

There can potentially be other physical arguments that motivate the ECR relation, but we take the above lines of reasoning as sufficient to make it plausible. We will also show in the following that Eq. (5) can lead to a well known result that was arrived at through other arguments. This gives us further evidence that the ECR proposed here is a valid requirement for an EFT.

Equation (5) describes a relation among three parameters of an EFT $\{g, \Lambda, L\}$, describing the strength of its interactions (g), the shortest (Λ^{-1}), and the longest (L) distance over which it is defined. We could then use a relationship between the UV and IR scales to eliminate one parameter. The choice of the UV-IR relation, based on other fundamental considerations, would then determine a specific relation between the coupling g and the UV cutoff scale, as we will show below.

Using the CKN UV-IR relation (1), the ECR yields

$$g^2 \gtrsim \frac{\Lambda}{M_P}. \quad (\text{MCC}) \quad (7)$$

We will refer to the above Eq. (7) as the *Minimum Coupling Condition (MCC)* for an EFT. This bound is a physical requirement for EFTs that satisfy the CKN bound and do not lead to black holes, for a chosen value of Λ .

The MCC derived here is reminiscent of a similar, but much less constraining bound associated with the *Weak Gravity Conjecture (WGC)* [11]. In its simplest expression, the WGC posits that EFTs can descend from a proper UV quantum theory of gravity if they exclude interactions that are weaker than gravity. This was originally conjectured for the particular case of an Abelian $U(1)$ gauge theory with coupling g . In the same notation as the above, WGC implies that the EFT must break down below a scale $\sim g M_P$ [11].

One of the original arguments for the WGC was based on avoiding a large numbers of stable extremal black holes in a physical theory. The mass of an extremal black hole, assuming quantized charges q for a $U(1)$ gauge interaction, is given by

$$M_{\text{eBH}} \sim g q M_P. \quad (8)$$

In order for this black hole to decay, a particle of mass m and charge q must exist such that $m < M_{\text{eBH}}$. Assuming $q \sim 1$ one then finds [11]

$$m \lesssim g M_P, \quad (9)$$

which is often quoted as the WGC, since it implies that the gravitational coupling strength m/M_P must be smaller than g , making gravity the weakest force in the EFT.

Generalization of the above relation to magnetic monopoles can then be shown to imply the UV scale for the theory must satisfy $\Lambda \lesssim g M_P$ [11], as quoted above. We can derive this well-known condition from the ECR, as a physical requirement for an EFT. Many aspects of the WGC have been studied, including its connection with black hole entropy [12]. Therefore, it is quite natural to assume the Bekenstein bound Eq. (3) to be associated with this conjecture. Using the Bekenstein condition of Eq. (3) to eliminate L in Eq. (5), we then find

$$g \gtrsim \frac{\Lambda}{M_P}, \quad (\text{WGC}) \quad (10)$$

which is the bound obtained from the WGC.

It is interesting to consider what the MCC, as a consequence of the ECR and CKN bound, may imply about the SM as an EFT. We note that requirement on the size of the coupling gets stronger as the cut off scale is increased. Given that the present experimental data, generally speaking, do not yet provide significant evidence for an extension of the SM below $\Lambda \sim \text{TeV}$, we find

$$g_{\text{SM}} \gtrsim 10^{-8}, \quad (\text{MCC for SM}) \quad (11)$$

for any interaction that is part of the SM.

This bound (11) seems to rule out the possibility of Dirac neutrino masses in the SM. To see this, note that above the scale of electroweak symmetry breaking (EWSB), Dirac masses are associated with the dimension-4 operator

$$y_\nu H^* \epsilon \bar{l} \nu_R + \text{H.C.}, \quad (\text{Dirac}), \quad (12)$$

where y_ν is a Yukawa coupling, H is the SM Higgs doublet, ϵ is the two-dimensional Levi-Civita tensor, l is an SM lepton doublet, and ν_R is a right-handed neutrino. Upon EWSB, the Higgs gets a vacuum expectation value (vev) given by $\langle H \rangle = v/\sqrt{2}$, where $v \approx 246$ GeV. Currently, we do not know the scale m_ν of neutrino masses, but neutrino oscillation data require $\Delta m_{21}^2 \approx 7.5 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$ and $|\Delta m_{32}^2| \approx 2.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$, with the sign dependent on mass ordering [9]. Therefore, at least one neutrino mass needs to satisfy $m_\nu \gtrsim 0.05 \text{ eV}$ and in principle one neutrino can have zero mass, given the available data. The possibility of having an absolute mass scale $m_\nu \gg \text{eV}$, corresponding to degenerate neutrinos, is ruled out by cosmological observations that require the sum of neutrino masses be below $\sim 1 \text{ eV}$ [9]. Therefore, we need $y_\nu \lesssim 10^{-11}$, which is not consistent with the MCC condition for the SM in Eq. (11).

Setting aside neutrinos, whose mass generation mechanism is not known, the smallest Yukawa coupling of the SM is that of the electron $y_e \sim 10^{-6}$. According to the MCC, this leads to a *maximum* UV cutoff scale for the SM given by

$$\Lambda_{\text{SM}} \lesssim y_e^2 M_P, \quad (\text{SM UV cutoff}) \quad (13)$$

which yields $\Lambda_{\text{SM}} \lesssim 10^4$ TeV. While this is still a high scale, it suggests that new physics may not be too far from the reach of precision experiments that can potentially probe scales well beyond TeV energies. The above leads us to the conclusion that a single EFT cannot describe the SM all the way up to near M_P , at variance with what is often assumed. A possible interpretation of this result is that quantum corrections in electroweak symmetric EFT should be cut off at $\sim 10^4$ TeV. In particular, quadratically UV sensitive quantum corrections to the SM Higgs mass parameter $\mu_H \sim 100$ GeV would be smaller by $(\Lambda/M_P)^2 \sim 10^{-24}$, significantly alleviating the usual SM weak-Planck ‘‘hierarchy problem’’ (see also Ref. [13] for a different discussion of the hierarchy in the CKN framework).

Discussion: We derived the ECR in Eq. (5), via very general arguments applied to EFTs that are defined by a gauge or Yukawa interaction. The logic of the ECR is quite simple and basic: an EFT should not have a dynamical UV scale smaller than its IR cutoff scale. In essence, the content of the ECR is captured by the well-known quantum uncertainty relation $\Delta E \Delta t \gtrsim 1$; if the dynamics leads to a small energy scale $\Delta E \sim g^2 \Lambda$, one would need a sufficiently long time $\Delta t \sim L$ to probe the corresponding process. We then showed that applying a UV-IR relation, motivated by black hole properties, could lead to a lower limit on the size of the interaction coupling constant g .

Using the Bekenstein relation (3) leads to the limit implied by WGC. We note that the arguments provided in Ref. [11] for the WGC were special to a $U(1)$ gauge interaction and made connections with considerations from a UV gravity theory. In that sense, our ECR apparently suggests a general condition for EFTs that contain boson mediated forces, not necessarily limited to $U(1)$ gauge interactions. The ECR does not follow from any obvious relation to a more fundamental theory, but perhaps it may be possible to find evidence for it from such a framework, such as quantum gravity.

Here, we also provide some other examples of the implications of the ECR. One example is to consider QCD, describing quark interactions mediated by gluons. The IR scale in this theory is given by the energy scale of confinement $L^{-1} \sim 200$ MeV. Given that the theory has been tested up to energies of $\mathcal{O}(\text{TeV})$, we may assume that $\Lambda \gtrsim \text{TeV}$. Hence, at the cutoff, ECR demands $g^2 \gtrsim 10^{-4}$ which is well-satisfied for the TeV scale value of the SM $SU(3)_c$ coupling constant $g_s \sim 1$ [9]. We may further invoke a UV-IR condition, leading to MCC (CKN) or WGC (Bekenstein). For QCD, or any gauge theory, the MCC implies $g^2 \gtrsim 10^{-16}$, for $\Lambda \sim \text{TeV}$, while WGC yields $g \gtrsim 10^{-16}$, which does not constrain any of the SM gauge interactions.

One may also examine the implications of the ECR proposed here for the extremely stringent experimental limits on long range forces. Current bounds require that macroscopic forces acting on baryons or electrons interact with a strength $g \lesssim 10^{-24}$ [14, 15]. If we take the maximal value $\Lambda \sim M_P$, then for $g \sim 10^{-24}$ we will have $L \gtrsim 100$ AU. Hence, for g near current limits, ECR suggests the range of the force needs to be large than the solar system scale. For smaller choices of Λ , the range of the force should be larger. However, invoking the above UV-IR relations, we find that for $g \sim 10^{-24}$ MCC demands $\Lambda \lesssim 10^{-20}$ eV, while WGC [as derived here based on ECR and Eq. (3)] yields $\Lambda \lesssim 10$ keV. Either range for Λ seems to exclude nucleons or the electron in an EFT that describes a feeble interaction associated with a long range force.

As we argued in the above, the MCC yields a stronger condition on an EFT than the WGC, because the CKN bound (1) is more stringent than that obtained from Bekenstein’s requirement (3). So, whether one should take the MCC or the WGC as a criterion for a valid EFT with cutoff scale Λ depends on whether the CKN bound or the relation in Eq. (3) defines the proper UV-IR relation in an EFT. Interestingly, the CKN bound may be testable in precision measurements of the electron anomalous magnetic moment $a_e \equiv (g_e - 2)/2$ [2, 16], as we will summarize below.

In Ref. [2], CKN concluded that the possible effect from Eq. (1) on a_e scales like $(m_e/M_P)^{2/3}$, too small to be tested in experiments. However, later work suggested a less suppressed parametric dependence $\sim \sqrt{m_e/M_P}$ [13, 17]. Reference [16] has recently revisited the possibility of probing the CKN UV-IR bound in a_e measurements and concluded that the effect $\sim \alpha/(2\pi)\sqrt{m_e/M_P} \sim 10^{-14}$, which may be accessible to experiments in the foreseeable future.

Here, we will slightly extend the CKN derivation [2] to include N_* degrees of freedom in the EFT, which would yield an energy density $\rho \sim N_* \Lambda^4$ at the UV cutoff. Using this expression, we obtain

$$L \Lambda^2 \lesssim M_P / \sqrt{N_*}. \quad (14)$$

We will assume this modified relation in the following. One can interpret the above dependence on N_* as running of M_P [18–20]. This effectively lowers M_P which can significantly strengthen the bound for $N_* \gg 1$; in the SM and its typical extensions $N_* \sim 100$. (For some of the phenomenological implications of very large numbers of states in particle physics and astrophysics, see Ref. [21].)

Let us briefly consider the effect of the modified relation in Eq. (14) for electron $g_e - 2$. This is easily done by rescaling the result for $a_e \equiv (g_e - 2)/2$ obtained in Ref. [16] which yields

$$\frac{\alpha}{2\pi} \left(m_e \sqrt{N_*} / M_P \right)^{1/2}. \quad (15)$$

Here, the inclusion of $N_*^{1/4} \sim 3$ increases the predicted CKN uncertainty slightly and makes it closer to the sensitivity of the currently most precise measurement $\delta a_e^{\text{exp}} =$

2.8×10^{-13} [22]. The current best predictions of a_e differ by $\sim 1.4 \times 10^{-12}$, which corresponds to more than 5σ , due to a discrepancy in the measured values of α [23, 24]. However, the a_e predictions do not deviate from experiment by more than 2.5σ . We thus take the gravitational uncertainty to be $\lesssim 10^{-12}$. This suggests that the number of unknown degrees of freedom, potentially contributing to the running of M_P , below $\Lambda \sim \mathcal{O}(100 \text{ GeV})$ is roughly bounded by

$$N_* \lesssim 10^9. \quad (\text{Theory Error on } a_e) \quad (16)$$

Summary: In this letter, we derived a general relation among the UV and IR scales and the interaction strength in an EFT, the ‘‘Effective Coupling Relation (ECR).’’ This relation was motivated by dynamical arguments. We then showed that using the CKN bound, a new ‘‘Minimum Coupling Condition (MCC)’’ on the EFT interaction strength is derived. This condition is much stronger than that obtained from the ‘‘Weak Gravity Conjecture,’’ which can follow from the ECR via the less stringent Bekenstein maximal entropy UV-IR relation. The MCC applied to the SM seems to indicate that Dirac neutrino masses are not part of a consistent EFT description. Similar application of MCC to the electron Yukawa coupling suggests that the UV cutoff scale of the SM should be below $\sim 10^4 \text{ TeV}$. We also introduced the effect of EFT degrees of freedom N_* in the CKN bound, which can make it much stronger for $N_* \gg 1$. The implications of the modified CKN bound for the electron magnetic moment measurements were also briefly discussed.

This work is supported by the US Department of Energy under Grant Contract DE-SC0012704.

* hooman@bnl.gov

- [1] S. Weinberg, The Cosmological Constant Problem, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **61**, 1 (1989).
- [2] A. G. Cohen, D. B. Kaplan, and A. E. Nelson, Effective field theory, black holes, and the cosmological constant, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 4971 (1999), [arXiv:hep-th/9803132](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9803132).
- [3] J. D. Bekenstein, Black holes and entropy, *Phys. Rev. D* **7**, 2333 (1973).
- [4] J. D. Bekenstein, Generalized second law of thermodynamics in black hole physics, *Phys. Rev. D* **9**, 3292 (1974).
- [5] S. W. Hawking, Particle Creation by Black Holes, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **43**, 199 (1975), [Erratum: *Commun. Math. Phys.* **46**, 206 (1976)].
- [6] S. W. Hawking, Black Holes and Thermodynamics, *Phys. Rev. D* **13**, 191 (1976).
- [7] G. ’t Hooft, Dimensional reduction in quantum gravity, *Conf. Proc. C* **930308**, 284 (1993), [arXiv:gr-qc/9310026](https://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/9310026).
- [8] L. Susskind, The World as a hologram, *J. Math. Phys.* **36**, 6377 (1995), [arXiv:hep-th/9409089](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/9409089).
- [9] P. A. Zyla *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Review of Particle Physics, *PTEP* **2020**, 083C01 (2020).
- [10] P. B. Arnold, G. D. Moore, and L. G. Yaffe, Transport coefficients in high temperature gauge theories. 2. Beyond leading log, *JHEP* **05**, 051, [arXiv:hep-ph/0302165](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0302165).
- [11] N. Arkani-Hamed, L. Motl, A. Nicolis, and C. Vafa, The String landscape, black holes and gravity as the weakest force, *JHEP* **06**, 060, [arXiv:hep-th/0601001](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0601001).
- [12] C. Cheung, J. Liu, and G. N. Remmen, Proof of the Weak Gravity Conjecture from Black Hole Entropy, *JHEP* **10**, 004, [arXiv:1801.08546](https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.08546) [hep-th].
- [13] T. Banks and P. Draper, Remarks on the Cohen-Kaplan-Nelson bound, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 126010 (2020), [arXiv:1911.05778](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.05778) [hep-th].
- [14] S. Schlamminger, K. Y. Choi, T. A. Wagner, J. H. Gundlach, and E. G. Adelberger, Test of the equivalence principle using a rotating torsion balance, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 041101 (2008), [arXiv:0712.0607](https://arxiv.org/abs/0712.0607) [gr-qc].
- [15] P. Fayet, MICROSCOPE limits for new long-range forces and implications for unified theories, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 055039 (2018), [arXiv:1712.00856](https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.00856) [hep-ph].
- [16] A. G. Cohen and D. B. Kaplan, Gravitational contributions to the electron g -factor, (2021), [arXiv:2103.04509](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.04509) [hep-ph].
- [17] Z. Davoudi and M. J. Savage, Finite-Volume Electromagnetic Corrections to the Masses of Mesons, Baryons and Nuclei, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 054503 (2014), [arXiv:1402.6741](https://arxiv.org/abs/1402.6741) [hep-lat].
- [18] S. L. Adler, Order R Vacuum Action Functional in Scalar Free Unified Theories with Spontaneous Scale Breaking, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **44**, 1567 (1980).
- [19] G. Dvali, Black Holes and Large N Species Solution to the Hierarchy Problem, *Fortsch. Phys.* **58**, 528 (2010), [arXiv:0706.2050](https://arxiv.org/abs/0706.2050) [hep-th].
- [20] X. Calmet, S. D. H. Hsu, and D. Reeb, Quantum gravity at a TeV and the renormalization of Newton’s constant, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 125015 (2008), [arXiv:0803.1836](https://arxiv.org/abs/0803.1836) [hep-th].
- [21] H. Davoudiasl, P. B. Denton, and D. A. McGady, Ultraviolet fermionic dark matter, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 055014 (2021), [arXiv:2008.06505](https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.06505) [hep-ph].
- [22] D. Hanneke, S. Fogwell, and G. Gabrielse, New Measurement of the Electron Magnetic Moment and the Fine Structure Constant, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 120801 (2008), [arXiv:0801.1134](https://arxiv.org/abs/0801.1134) [physics.atom-ph].
- [23] R. H. Parker, C. Yu, W. Zhong, B. Estey, and H. Müller, Measurement of the fine-structure constant as a test of the Standard Model, *Science* **360**, 191 (2018), [arXiv:1812.04130](https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.04130) [physics.atom-ph].
- [24] L. Morel, Z. Yao, P. Cladé, and S. Guellati-Khélifa, Determination of the fine-structure constant with an accuracy of 81 parts per trillion, *Nature* **588**, 61 (2020).