#### Fuzzy dark matter from Strings?

Veronica Guidetti

Università di Bologna, INFN

Fuzzy Dark Matter Workshop 2020





in collaboration with: M. Cicoli, A. Westphal, A. Hebecker

Image: A matched black

# What is FDM?

- DM made of ultra-light particles
- FDM made of axions

 $m\gtrsim 10^{-22}~{\rm eV}~f\sim 10^{16\div 17}~{\rm GeV}$ 

- Solitonic structures, BEC
- Solve Core-Cusp problem
- Reduced abundance of low mass halos



Mocz et al. [1910.01653]

(I) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1))

# FDM from strings?

- High decay constants related to high energy theory
- Possible multiple nature of FDM

Well known that

- String theory predicts the Axiverse
- Axion appear as massless fields
- Axion stabilisation using n.p. correction: instantons, gaugino condensation



[Broadhurst et al. 1811.03771]

Image: Image:

# FDM from type IIB

Convention

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} f^2 (\partial a)^2 - M_P^4 A e^{-S} \cos(a) ,$$
$$\theta = f a$$

DM abundance  $\sim 100\%$  (H < f)

$$\frac{\Omega_{\theta}h^2}{0.112} \simeq 1.4 \times \left(\frac{m_{\theta}}{10^{-22}\mathrm{eV}}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{f}{10^{17}\mathrm{GeV}}\right)^2 \theta_{mi}^2 \sim 1$$

Axion mass

$$m_{\theta}^2 = M_P^4 A e^{-S} / f^2$$

æ

(I) < ((i) <

# FDM against WGC?

#### FDM requirements:

• 
$$m_{\theta}^2 \sim 10^{-22 \div 21} \ \mathrm{eV}$$

•  $f\sim 10^{16\div 17}~{\rm GeV}$ 

#### Axion mass

$$m_{\theta}^2 = M_P^4 A e^{-S} / f^2 \qquad \qquad A = \mathcal{O}(1)$$

Matching right  $m_a$  and f implies  $Sf = f \log \left(\frac{M_P^A A}{f^2 m_a^2}\right) \gtrsim M_P$ 

against WGC!

 $(Sf \lesssim M_P)$ 

#### not easy to realise it in concrete model building

Vor	oniog	(200	otti
vei	UIIICa	aulu	eu

Fuzzy dark matter from Strings?

### **Closed string axion analysis**

We study  $C_0$ ,  $C_2$ ,  $B_2$ ,  $C_4$ 

Axion	Sf
$C_0$	$\sim 1/\sqrt{2} M_P$
$B_2$	$\lesssim M_P$
$C_2$	$\sim \sqrt{g_s} M_P$
$C_4$	$\lesssim \sqrt{3/2} M_P$

 $C_4$  axions seem to be the best canditate:

Axion	Sf
$\begin{array}{l} C_4 \; (1 \; dof) \\ C_4 \; (2 \; dof) \end{array}$	$\sim \sqrt{3/2}  M_P$ < $\sqrt{3}/2  M_P$

- E - N

# $C_4$ axion as FDM



$$m_{\theta}^2 \simeq g_s A_i W_0 \frac{S^3 e^{-S}}{\mathcal{V}^2} M_p^2$$

Predictions coming from these simple geometries

$$\begin{array}{rcl} 1 \ dof: & \rightarrow & \mathcal{V} \sim 10^2; & g_s W_0 A_i \sim 10^{-70} \div 10^{-50} \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ EFT \ \text{not under control} \\ 2 \ dof: & \rightarrow & \mathcal{V} \sim 10^{30}; & g_s W_0 A_i \sim 10^{-13} \div 1 \\ & & \\ &$$

#### TeV string scale

3

(I) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1))

# $C_4$ axion as FDM

Why is it so difficult to reproduce FDM in this context?

For large cycles

$$f = \frac{M_P}{S} \qquad S = c\tau_i$$
$$m_\theta^2 \sim M_P^2 A \frac{S^3 e^{-S}}{\mathcal{V}^2} \qquad c = 2\pi/N$$

- $\bullet$  We assume standard value for  $\langle \theta_{mi}^2 \rangle \sim \pi^2/3$
- Imposing 100% FDM and  $m_{\theta} = 10^{-22} \text{eV} \rightarrow S \simeq 60$
- Right mass with  $A \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$  requires  $S \sim 220$
- 1 dof:  $\mathcal{V} \simeq S^{3/2}$ , fine tuning of A (not under control)
- 2 dof: fine tuning of  $\mathcal{V}$  (anisotropic compactification, TeV string scale)
- 100% of dark matter natural only if  $m_{\theta} = 10^{-19} eV$  and  $f \sim 10^{16} GeV!$
- For multiple FDM axions: heavier axions give higher percentages of DM

#### Open string axion analysis

Open string axion is related to matter field that lives on a collapsed cycle

$$C = |C|e^{i\sigma}$$

Requirements:

- Brane setup + non-zero world-volume gauge flux:  $SU(N) \times U(1)$
- Collapsed cycles carrying U(1) charge: sequestered scenario

$$T_{seq} = \tau_{seq} + i\theta_{seq}; \qquad \tau_{seq} \to 0$$

• PQ mechanism: after supersymmetry breaking we get soft terms for |C|, possible breakdown of the U(1) symmetry related to |C|:  $\langle |C| \rangle \neq 0$ .



# Open string axion analysis

Features of open string axion:

- Decay constant:  $f \sim \frac{M_P}{\mathcal{V}^p}$  p = 1, 2
- Mass through hidden sector strong dynamics instanton effects

$$m_{\sigma}^2 = \Lambda_{hid}^4 / f_{seq}^2$$
  $\Lambda_{hid} = M_P e^{-c/g^2}$ 

c is fixed by 1-loop  $\beta$  function and  $g^{-2}=Re(S)$ 

Using p = 1, imposing 100% FDM and  $m_{\theta} = 10^{-22} \text{ eV}$  $\mathcal{V} \sim 10^2 \qquad \Lambda_{hid} \sim 10^2 \text{ eV}$ 

$$\langle S \rangle = \frac{1}{c} \ln \left( \frac{M_p}{\Lambda_{QCD}} \right) \simeq \frac{59}{c} \qquad \rightarrow \qquad g \simeq 0.13$$

#### Less general setup

# Possible glueballs production: additional DM!

Veronica Guidetti

Fuzzy dark matter from Strings?

#### Accounting for an-harmonicities

We can take care of large misalignment angle (f >> H)

$$\frac{\Omega_{\theta} h^2}{0.112} \simeq 1.4 \times \left(\frac{m_{\theta}}{10^{-22} \, eV}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{f}{10^{17} \, GeV}\right)^2 \theta_{mi}^2 F(\theta_{mi})$$

Form factor

$$F(\theta_{mi}) = \left[ \ln \left( \frac{e}{1 - \theta_{mi}^2 / \pi^2} \right) \right]^a \qquad a = 7/6$$

To avoid fine-tuning we need  $\theta_{mi} \simeq 0.99\pi$ 

A B F A B F

#### Accounting for an-harmonicities

#### Domain walls problem?

Quantum fluctuations << Initial displacement

$$\begin{split} \delta\theta \simeq H/(2\pi f) & \Delta\theta_{in} \simeq 10^{-2}\pi \\ H < 0.1f \sim 10^{15}\,GeV \end{split}$$

#### Boundaries from isocurvature perturbations

$$\begin{split} \left(\frac{\delta T}{T}\right)_{iso} &\sim \left(\frac{f}{10^{12} \, GeV}\right)^{7/12} \left(\frac{H}{\pi f}\right) < 10^{-5} \\ H &< \left(\frac{f}{10^{16} \, GeV}\right)^{5/12} 10^9 \, GeV \end{split}$$

(I) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1))

# Conclusions

Despite the presence of many ultralight axions seems generic in strings FDM with a single axion 100% of DM seems unnatural from strings

 $\bullet$  Not easy to get  $Sf\gtrsim 1$ 

Closed string axions:

- $\bullet$  Fine-tuning of  ${\cal V}$
- Fine-tuning of A ( $W_0, g_s, A(\mathcal{U}, S)$ )
- Fine-tuning of misalignment angle

Open string axions:

- Not general
- Pay attention to glueballs

#### If FDM is detected: real challenge for String Theory!

Veronica Guidetti

A B K A B K

< □ > < 同

#### Thank you!

æ

・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ ヨ ・

# C<sub>4</sub> axion as FDM: further analysis

Considering other scenarios:

- presence of ample divisors
- poly-instantons effects
- turn on worldvolume gauge fluxes

the amount of fine tuning is not reduced!