Non-geometric Strings and Axion Inflation

Ralph Blumenhagen

Max-Planck-Institut für Physik, München





(RB, Font, Fuchs, Herschmann, Plauschinn, arXiv:1503.01607, to be replaced)(RB, Font, Fuchs, Herschmann, Plauschinn, Sekiguchi, Wolf, to appear))





Moduli stabilization in string theory:

- Race-track scenario
- KKLT
- LARGE volume scenario

Based on instanton effects \to exponential hierarchies \to can generate $M_{\rm susy} \ll M_{\rm Pl}$

Experimentally:

- Supersymmetry not found at LHC with M < 2 TeV.
- Large field inflation: $M_{\rm inf} \sim M_{\rm GUT}$

Contemplate scenario of moduli stabilization with only polynomial hierarchies \rightarrow string tree-level with fluxes





PLANCK 2015 results:

- upper bound: r < 0.113
- spectral index: $n_s = 0.9667 \pm 0.004$ and its running $\alpha_s = -0.002 \pm 0.013$.
- amplitude of the scalar power spectrum $\mathcal{P} = (2.142 \pm 0.049) \cdot 10^{-9}$

Best fit to the data with plateau-like potentials. Example: Starobinsky potential:

$$V(\Theta) \simeq \frac{M_{\rm Pl}^4}{4\alpha} \left(1 - e^{-\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\Theta}\right)^2,$$

with $\alpha \sim 10^8$. Admits large-field inflation with r = 0.003.



Inflationary mass scales:

- Hubble constant during inflation: $H \sim 10^{14} \, {\rm GeV}$.
- mass scale of inflation: $V_{inf} = M_{inf}^4 = 3M_{Pl}^2 H_{inf}^2 \Rightarrow M_{inf} \sim 10^{16} \,\text{GeV}$
- mass of inflaton during inflation: $M_{\Theta}^2 = 3\eta H^2 \Rightarrow M_{\Theta} \sim 10^{13} \,\text{GeV}$

Large field inflation:

- Makes it important to control Planck suppressed operators (eta-problem)
- Invoking a symmetry like the shift symmetry of axions helps

Axion inflation



Axion inflation

Axions are ubiquitous in string theory so that many scenarios have been proposed

- Natural inflation with a potential $V(\theta) = V_0(1 \cos(\theta/f))$. Hard to realize in string theory, as f > 1 lies outside perturbative control. (Freese, Frieman, Olinto)
- Aligned inflation with two axions, $f_{eff} > 1$. (Kim,Nilles.Peloso)
- N-flation with many axions and $f_{eff} > 1$. (Dimopoulos,Kachru,McGreevy,Wacker)
- Monodromy inflation: Shift symmetry is broken by branes or fluxes unwrapping the compact axion \rightarrow polynomial potential for θ . (Silverstein, Westphal)



Proposal: Realize axion monodromy inflation via the F-term scalar potential induced by background fluxes.

(Marchesano.Shiu,Uranga)

Advantages

- Avoids the explicit supersymmetry breaking of models with the monodromy induced by branes
- Supersymmetry is broken spontaneously by the very same effect by which usually moduli are stabilized
- Generic in the sense that the potential for the the axions arise from the type II Ramond-Ramond field strengths $F_{p+1} = dC_p + H \wedge C_{p-2}$ involving the gauge potentials C_{p-2} explicitly.



Recently, a couple of a priori possible string realizations have been discussed. To name a few, the inflaton was given by:

- Wilson line and (B_2, C_2) modulus with potential generated by geometric flux (Marchesano.Shiu,Uranga)
- The universal axion c in type IIB flux compact. \rightarrow natural reheating mechanism (Bhg, Plauschinn)
- D7-brane deformation modulus in the large complex structure limit (Hebecker, Kraus, Wittkowski)
- Higgs inflation (Ibanez, Valenzuela)

More proposals by Mc Allister, Gao, Grimm, Ibanez, Li, Long, Mc Guirk, Shukla, Silverstein, Valenzuela, Westphal,..





Objective

For a controllable single field inflationary scenario, all moduli need to be stabilized such that

 $M_{\rm Pl} > M_{\rm s} > M_{\rm KK} > M_{\rm inf} > M_{\rm mod} > H_{\rm inf} > |M_{\Theta}|$

Aim: Systematic study of realizing single-field fluxed F-term axion monodromy inflation, taking into account the interplay with moduli stabilization.

Continues the studies from (Bhg, Herschmann, Plauschinn), (Hebecker, Mangat, Rombineve, Wittkowsky) by including the Kähler moduli.

Note:

 There exist a no-go theorem for having an unconstrained axion in supersymmetric minima of N = 1 supergravity models (Conlon)





Objective

Framework: Type IIB orientifolds on CY threefolds with geometric and non-geometric fluxes. (Shelton, Taylor, Wecht), (Aldazabal, Camara, Ibanez, Font), (Grana, Louis, Waldram), (Micu, Palti, Tasinato) Kähler potential

$$K = -\log\left(-i\int\Omega\wedge\overline{\Omega}\right) - \log\left(S+\overline{S}\right) - 2\log\mathcal{V},$$

and the flux-induced superpotential

$$W = -\left(\mathfrak{f}_{\lambda}X^{\lambda} - \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}^{\lambda}F_{\lambda}\right) + iS\left(h_{\lambda}X^{\lambda} - \tilde{h}^{\lambda}F_{\lambda}\right)$$
$$-iG^{a}\left(f_{\lambda a}X^{\lambda} - \tilde{f}^{\lambda}{}_{a}F_{\lambda}\right) + iT_{\alpha}\left(q_{\lambda}{}^{\alpha}X^{\lambda} - \tilde{q}^{\lambda\alpha}F_{\lambda}\right)$$
$$+ \left(ST_{\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{\alpha b c}G^{b}G^{c}\right)\left(p_{\lambda}{}^{\alpha}X^{\lambda} - \tilde{p}^{\lambda\alpha}F_{\lambda}\right)$$

Scalar potential: $V = V_{N=2 \text{ GSUGRA}}$.

Bad Honnef, 18.03.2015 – p.9/20







Scheme of moduli stabilization such that the following aspects are realized:

- There exist non-supersymmetric minima stabilizing the saxions in their perturbative regime.
- All mass eigenvalues are positive semi-definite, where the massless states are only axions.
- For both the values of the moduli in the minima and the mass of the heavy moduli one has parametric control in terms of ratios of fluxes.
- One has either parametric or at least numerical control over the mass of the lightest (massive) axion, i.e. the inflaton candidate.
- The moduli masses are smaller than the string and the Kaluza-Klein scale.





Kähler potential is given by

$$K = -3\log(T + \overline{T}) - \log(S + \overline{S}).$$

Fluxes generate superpotential

$$W = -i\tilde{\mathfrak{f}} + ihS + iqT \,,$$

with $\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}, h, q \in \mathbb{Z}$. Resulting scalar potential

$$V = \frac{(hs + \tilde{\mathfrak{f}})^2}{16s\tau^3} - \frac{6hqs - 2q\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}}{16s\tau^2} - \frac{5q^2}{48s\tau} + \frac{\theta^2}{16s\tau^3}$$

 Δ_{Apst} Bad Honnef, 18.03.2015 – p.11/20



Non-supersymmetric, tachyon-free minimum with

$$\tau_0 = \frac{6\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}}{5q}, \quad s_0 = \frac{\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}}{h}, \quad \theta_0 = 0.$$

D3- and a D7-brane tadpole:

$$N_{\mathrm{D3}} = -\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}h, \qquad N_{\mathrm{D7}} = -\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}q$$

Mass eigenvalues

$$M_{\text{mod},i}^2 = \mu_i \frac{h q^3}{16\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}^2} \frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{4\pi} ,$$

with $\mu_i > 0$.







Mass scales

Gravitino-mass scale: $M_{\frac{3}{2}} \simeq M_{\text{mod}}$

Cosmological constant in AdS minimum:

$$V_0 = -\mu_C \frac{h q^3}{16 \,\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}^2} \, \frac{M_{\rm Pl}^4}{4\pi}$$

Perturbative regime: $\tau, s, v \gtrsim p 1 \Rightarrow$ relation for the mass scales

$$M_{\rm up}^2 \simeq M_{\rm mod} M_{\rm Pl}, \qquad M_{\rm up} \sim M_{\rm s}.$$

with uplift scale $M_{\rm up} = (-V_0)^{\frac{1}{4}}$.







Mass scales

String and KK-scale

$$M_{\rm s} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi} M_{\rm Pl}}{s^{\frac{1}{4}} \mathcal{V}^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \qquad M_{\rm KK} = \frac{M_{\rm Pl}}{\sqrt{4\pi} \mathcal{V}^{\frac{2}{3}}},$$

so that for the ratio

$$\frac{M_{\rm s}}{M_{\rm KK}} = 2\pi \left(\frac{12}{5}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{h}{q}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Ratio of KK-scale to the moduli mass scale:

$$\frac{M_{\rm KK}}{M_{\rm mod}} = \frac{10}{6\sqrt{\mu_i \, hq}} \,,$$

Thus,

$$M_{\rm s} \stackrel{>}{\underset{p}{\sim}} M_{\rm KK} \stackrel{\simeq}{\underset{p}{\sim}} M_{\rm mod}$$

Bad Honnef, 18.03.2015 - p.14/20

Generalizations



Generalizations

Analyzed more models of this flux scaling type:

- complex structure U
- orientifold odd moduli G
- more Kähler moduli, $h^{11} > 1$ like K3 fibration or swiss cheese
- with non-geometric P-flux

Features: more details in D. Herschmann's talk

- there exist non-supersymmetric, non-tachyonic minima
- except some axions, all moduli are stabilized
- For $h^{11} > 1$, new tachyons appear \rightarrow tachyon-uplift via D-term
- With P-flux all moduli can be stabilized
- Uplift to de Sitter subtle: $V_{\rm up} \sim \frac{\epsilon}{\tau^{\beta}}$, $0 < \beta < 1/4$.

Bad Honnef, 18.03.2015 – p.15/20



10D Einstein-frame DFT action including also the non-geometric *Q*-flux

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-g} \Big(\mathcal{L}^{HH} + \mathcal{L}_1^{QQ} + \mathcal{L}_2^{QQ} + \mathcal{L}^{HQ} + \mathcal{L}^{RR} \Big)$$

with the kinetic terms given as

$$\mathcal{L}^{HH} \sim -e^{-\phi} H_{ijk} H_{i'j'k'} g^{ii'} g^{jj'} g^{kk'}$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{QQ}_{1} \sim -e^{\phi} Q_{k}{}^{ij} Q_{k'}{}^{i'j'} g_{ii'} g_{jj'} g^{kk'}$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{QQ}_{2} \sim -e^{\phi} Q_{m}{}^{ni} Q_{n}{}^{mi'} g_{ii'}$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{HQ} \sim H_{mni} Q_{i'}{}^{mn} g^{ii'}$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{RR} \sim -e^{\phi} \mathfrak{F}_{ijk} \mathfrak{F}_{i'j'k'} g^{ii'} g^{jj'} g^{kk'}.$$
Bad Honnef, 18.03.2015 - p.16/20



Flux scaling of dilaton and metric:

$$e^{-\phi} \sim s \sim \frac{\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}}{h}, \qquad g \sim \sqrt{\tau} \sim \frac{\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}^{\frac{1}{2}}}{q^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \qquad g^{-1} \sim \frac{q^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

so that

$$\mathcal{L}^{HH} \sim \mathcal{L}_1^{QQ} \sim \mathcal{L}_2^{QQ} \sim \mathcal{L}^{HQ} \sim \mathcal{L}^{\mathrm{RR}} \sim \frac{hq^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

To control the backreaction of the fluxes, the energy-momentum tensor $T_{ij} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial g^{ij}}$ is essential:

$$T_{ij}^{HH} \sim T_{1\,ij}^{QQ} \sim T_{2\,ij}^{QQ} \sim T_{ij}^{HQ} \sim T_{ij}^{RR} \sim h \, q \, .$$

Axion inflaton



Axion inflaton

Generate a non-trivial scalar potential for the massless axion Θ by turning on additional fluxes f_{ax} and deform

$$W_{\text{inf}} = \lambda W + f_{\text{ax}} \Delta W$$
.

Concrete example with $h^{21} = 1$:

$$W_{\rm inf} = \lambda \left(\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_1 U + i \, \tilde{\mathfrak{f}}^0 U^3 + 3i \, \tilde{h}^1 U^2 \, S + 3i \, \tilde{q}^1 U^2 \, T \right) + i (h_0 S + q_0 T) \, .$$

Integrating out + uplift \rightarrow effective quadratic potential

$$V_{\rm eff}(c) = \frac{1}{2^7} \left(A\theta^2 + O(\mathfrak{f}_1^{-\frac{3}{2}}) \right)$$

Backreaction: Starobinsky-like behaviour for large θ



Axion inflation



Axion inflation

Moduli mass hierarchy:

$$\frac{M_{\Theta}^2}{M_{\rm mod}^2} \sim \frac{(\tilde{h}^1 q_0 - \tilde{q}^1 h_0)^2 \,(\tilde{\mathfrak{f}}^0)^2}{\lambda^2 (\tilde{h}^1 \, \tilde{q}^1)^2 \,\hat{\mathfrak{f}}_1^2} \,,$$

For
$$\lambda \hat{\mathfrak{f}}_1 \ll 1$$
, one controls $M_{\text{mod}} \gtrsim M_{\Theta}$.

KK-scale: one finds the relation

$$\frac{M_{\Theta}^2}{M_{\text{mod}}^2} \cdot \frac{M_{\text{mod}}^8}{M_{\text{KK}}^8} \sim \lambda^6 (\tilde{h}^1)^2 (\tilde{q}^1)^2 (\tilde{h}^1 q_0 - \tilde{q}^1 h_0)^2 \ge 1.$$

Thus,

 $M_{\text{mod}} \gtrsim_p M_{\Theta} \Longrightarrow M_{\text{mod}} \gtrsim_p M_{\text{KK}}$





Conclusions

- Systematically investigated the flux induced scalar potential for non-supersymmetric minima, where we have parametric control over moduli and the mass scales.
- All moduli are stabilized at tree-level \rightarrow the framework for studying F-term axion monodromy inflation.
- As all mass scales are close to the Planck-scale, it is difficult to control all hierarchies. Does large field inflation necessarily must include stringy/KK effects?
- More technical details and application to phenomenology are discussed in D. Herschmann's talk.