The Higgs and other Thorns in the Side of the Swampland

Arthur Hebecker (Heidelberg)

including recent work with F. Denef / T. Wrase

and work in progress with D. Junghans / E. Palti / A. Schachner

#### <u>Outline</u>

- The dS Swampland conjecture, the Higgs potential, and related issues.
- The Swampland Distance Conjecture and axionic field ranges (related to the axionic Weak Gravity Conjecture).

### Landscape vs. Swampland

 String compactifications to d = 4 produce a flux-induced, exponentially large landscape of solutions (EFTs).



Bousso/Polchinski '00, Giddings/Kachru/Polchinski '01 (GKP) Kachru/Kallosh/Linde/Trivedi '03 (KKLT), Denef/Douglas '04 Balasubramanian/Berglund/Conlon/Quevedo '05 (LVS)

• While the simplest solutions are SUSY-Minkowski or -AdS, there is (in my opinion) strong evidence for meta-stable de-Sitter vacua.

## Landscape vs. Swampland (continued)

• However, it is clearly important to keep questioning the constructions and scrutinizing the evidence.

cf. talks and new papers by Danielsson, Van Riet, Bena, ...

• Recently, a stronger version of the doubts concerning metastable dS vacua has been put forward:

|V'|/V > c (in Planck units and with  $c \sim O(1)$ ) Obied/Ooguri/Spodyneiko/Vafa Agrawal/Obied/Steinhardt/Vafa '18

• Intriguingly, this does not imediately clash with late cosmology:

Indeed, a simple quintessence model with  $V \sim e^{c\varphi}$  and  $c \sim O(1)$  can satisfy the conjecture and replace  $\Lambda_{cosm.}$ .

There is unfortunately no time to do justice to all the subsequent related papers...

see, e.g. Ghosh/Kiritsis/Nitti/Witkowski, Andriot, Roupec/Wrase, Ghalee, Paban/Rosati, Brandenberger, Graef/Marozzi/Vacca, Colgain/vanPutten/Yavartanoo, Denef/AH/Wrase, Diaz/Frazer/Retolaza/Westphal, Kehagias/Riotto, Lehners, Grag/Krishnan, Achucarro/Palma, Aalsma/Tournoy/Van der Schaar/Vercnocke Banerjee/Danielsson/Dibitetto/Giri/Schillo, Dvali/Gomez, Conlon, Bartelmann/Brandenberger/Heisenberg/Refregier, Murayama, Kallosh/Linde/McDonough/Scalisi, Kallosh/Wrase, Kachru/Trivedi Murayama/Yamazaki/Yanagida, De Alwis/Maharana/Muia/Quevedo,

...

## dS Swampland Conjecture vs. Higgs

- However, in the presence of the SM, an additive quintessence contribution is not sufficient to save the conjecture.
- Indeed,

$$V = \lambda (h^2 - v^2)^2 + \Lambda_{cosm.}$$

clearly violates the conjecture at h = v.

P P

• An (apparent) remedy is also easily found:

$$V = \left[\lambda(h^2 - v^2)^2 + \Lambda_{cosm.}\right] e^{c\varphi}$$

 An immediate problem is that this is a coupled / interacting quintessence model – extreme tuning (of many operators) is now required.

### dS Swampland Conjecture vs. Higgs (continued)

- Let us for the moment accept the tuning and press ahead. One has to check fifth force constraints.
- Based on Equivalence Principle Violation from diagrams like

we find significant but not (yet) critical constraints

(with a factor of  $\sim 10^4$  missing to rule out the model).

• Using nuclear binding energy effects and diagrams like

this has recently been strengthened.

Choi/Chway/Shin '18

• As we also pointed out, one may consider the maximum at the perturbative vacuum of QCD (before chir.-symm.-breaking).

Unlike the Higgs case, this maximum is very hard to remove by coupling to  $\varphi$ .

 This point has also been strengthened / made more quantitative by considering the potential in the pion sector. Choi/Chway/Shin '18

As a result, the authors claim  $c \leq 10^{-2}$ .

• Returning to the Higgs, one may try to solve the problem by introducing further (non-quintessence) scalars:

 $V = V_h(h) + \Lambda_{cosm.} e^{c\varphi} \rightarrow V_h(h,\chi) + \Lambda_{cosm.} e^{c\varphi}$ 

 The idea would be to use χ to remove the maximum of V<sub>h</sub>(h).
We have argued that this is fundamentally difficult due to unavoidable saddle points:



• The issue of designing suitable potentials  $V_h(h, \chi)$  has recently been discussed in more detail...

Cicoli/De Alwis/Maharana/Muia/Quevedo '18 Murayama/Yamazaki/Yanagida '18

• On the one hand, the dangerous saddles may be avoided by cutting of the  $\chi$ -field-space appropriately.

Cicoli/De Alwis/Maharana/Muia/Quevedo '18

- On the other hand (dismissing the first option) a no-go theorem employing the saddle point idea has been proposed.
  Murayama/Yamazaki/Yanagida '18
- In any case,  $V_h(h, \chi)$  with massive  $\chi$  appears not to provide an easy way out.

dS Swampland vs. Higgs - intermediate summary

- The |V'|/V conjecture might fall on phenomenological grounds.
- As a logical possibility, the conjecture may still hold in string theory (which hence does not describe the real world!).
- However, critical points at V > 0 may exist even in ST.

see work by Lüst, Wrase, Andriot, Shiu, Danielsson, Van Riet, ....

• As a particularly simple, recent argument, recall the potential..



dS Swampland vs. Higgs – intermediate summary (continued)

- One may say 'the conjecture is *really* about forbidding metastable de Sitter' (sacrificing |V'|/V).
- But this puts us 'back to square one': The old debate about KKLT/LVS being controlled, calculating corrections etc. ...
- Such a critical debate is clearly needed, but at this time I do not see strong *new* reasons that the dS landscape must fall.
- In fact, the opposite:

The dS maximum of the Higgs potential suggests that string theory has a way of realizing semi-classical dS solutions.

with Junghans / Palti / Schachner - to appear

- Apart from the dS Swampland Conjecture, a key phenomenol. reason for thinking about the Swampland is inflation
- The key constraints come from the axionic WGC Arkani-Hamed, Motl, Nicolis, Vafa, '06

Cheung/Remmen; de la Fuente/Saraswat/Sundrum ... '14 Rudelius; Ibanez/Montero/Uranga/Valenzuela; Brown/Cottrell/Shiu/Soler/.. ..Staessens/Ye; Bachlechner/Long/McAllister; AH/Rompineve/Witkowski; Junghans; Heidenreich/Reece/Rudelius; Kooner/Parameswaran/Zavala; Harlow; AH/Rompineve/Westphal; Kaloper/Kleban/Lawrence/Sloth ... '15 Conlon/Krippendorf ... '16 Dolan/Draper/Kozaczuk/Patel; AH/Henkenjohann/Witkowski/Soler ... '17

# and Swampland Distance Conjecture

Vafa, Ooguri/Vafa '05/06

Palti/Baume/Klaewer '16, Blumenhagen/Valenzuela/Wolf/Grimm '17/18 ...

### Field Ranges / Inflation (continued)

- As is well-known, the WGC statement m < gM<sub>P</sub> translates, in the axionic case, to S < M<sub>P</sub>/f.
- This forbids transplanckian *f*-values (with important caveats...)
- One apparent loophole is to realize only an effective transplanckian axion.

Kim/Nilles/Peloso '04



Field Ranges / Inflation (continued)



 Concretely, this can be implemented using 3-form-higgsing à la Dvali:

AH/Mangat/Rompineve/Witkowski '16 ('Winding Inflation')

$$\mathcal{L} \supset (\partial \varphi_x)^2 + (\partial \varphi_y)^2 + (F_0 + \varphi_x + N \varphi_y)^2 +$$

see also Saraswat for the analogous trick in the U(1) WGC see Shiu/Staessens/Ye for the 'inverse' higgsing idea Concrete realization at (partially) large complex stucture

 Let z<sub>1</sub>, · · · , z<sub>n</sub>, u, v be complex structure moduli of a type-IIB orientifold, let lm(u) ≫ lm(v) ≫ 1.

 $K = -\log \left( \mathcal{A}(z, \overline{z}, u - \overline{u}, v - \overline{v}) + e^{2\pi i u} + e^{2\pi i v} + \text{c.c.} \right)$ 

$$W = w(z) + f(z)(u + Nv) + e^{2\pi i u} + e^{2\pi i v}$$

- Without exponential terms, it is clear that W leaves one of the originally shift-symmetric directions Re(u) and Re(v) flat
- If  $N \gg 1$ , this direction is closely aligned with Re(u)
- The exponentials induce cosine potential terms for this light field  $\varphi$ :

$$e^{2\pi i u} + e^{2\pi i v} \rightarrow \cos(2\pi \varphi) + \cos(2\pi \varphi/N)$$

### **Disclaimer**

• I will not have time for inflation pheno and for how this model fits the famous 'mild WGC loophole'

by Rudelius and Brown/cottrell/Shiu/Soler

• I will also not discus other interesting work using complex structure moduli to enhance field ranges

e.g. by Palti, Blumenhagen, Ibanez, Landete, Marchesano, Regalado, Valenzuela, Wieck and many others....

#### The 'new twist' on Winding Inflation

- Justified and very inspiring criticism has been raised by Palti:
- Indeed, the flux choice  $N \gg 1$  may affect the stabilization of  $\operatorname{Re}(u)$  and  $\operatorname{Re}(v)$  in an adverse way (preventing  $f_{eff} \gg 1$ ).
- One can show that, in the simplest setting, this is in fact deadly.
- We are still in the process of analyzing whether Large Field Inflation is nevertheless possible in more complicated (e.g. 3-moduli-mixing) scenarios.
- But, crucially, for (non-inflationary) large field ranges the situation looks promising!

The 'new twist' on Winding Inflation (continued)

• To see this, consider a 'misaligned' Winding trajectory:



and compare it to the previously discussed 'aligned' case:



• The enhancement of the field range is similar:  $f \rightarrow f_{eff} \sim Nf$ .

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

The 'new twist' on Winding Inflation (continued)



But, crucially, the flux-realization is through

 $W \supset (N-1)u + Nv$  vs.  $W \supset u + Nv$ .

The corresponding stablization conditions for the saxions are

 $K_u/K_v = (N-1)/N$  vs.  $K_u/K_v = 1/N$ .

 Thus, misalignment allows us to be at a generic point (K<sub>u</sub>/K<sub>v</sub> ~ O(1)) in moduli space and still have extended f !

#### Summary: Field Ranges / Swampland Distance Conjecture

- It appears possible/likely that large axionic field ranges can be realized with full moduli stabilization.
- This is not in conflict with the Swampland Distance Conjecture for moduli spaces. AH/Henkenjohann/Witkowski '17
- It would, however, be in conflict with a possible non-SUSY generalization to EFTs with very light scalar fields.
- Large Field Inflation would, in this approach, *not* yet be established (both cosine terms have short periods!)
- Progress along these line towards inflation is possible, but I have no definite expectation concerning the outcome.

# Summary: |V'|/V and dS Swampland Conjecture

- It is very interesting to explore the phenomenological (Higgs etc.) consequences of the |V'|/V conjecture.
- Based on both the (developing) EPV constraints and the required tuning, I am skeptical. But surprises are of course possible...
- Independently of |V'|/V, it is interesting to imagine living in a non-fully-stablized comactification.
- But: The observed SUSY-breaking-energy can (presumably?) not be the allowed to drive the rolling of a modulus: This effect would be too strong (?)
- If so, why would an extra (very flat) scalar help? How does it overcome the problems of getting (approximate) Minkowski with strong SUSY-breaking?