

Anthropic prediction in a large toy landscape

Ken D. Olum and Delia Schwartz-Perlov

*Institute of Cosmology, Department of Physics and Astronomy
Tufts University, Medford, MA 02155, USA*

Abstract

The successful anthropic prediction of the cosmological constant depends crucially on the assumption of a flat prior distribution. However, previous calculations in simplified landscape models showed that the prior distribution is staggered, suggesting a conflict with anthropic predictions. Here we analytically calculate the full distribution, including the prior and anthropic selection effects, in a toy landscape model with a realistic number of vacua, $N \sim 10^{500}$. We show that it is possible for the fractal prior distribution we find to behave as an effectively flat distribution in a wide class of landscapes, depending on the regime of parameter space. Whether or not this possibility is realized depends on presently unknown details of the landscape.

I. INTRODUCTION

The observed value of the cosmological constant Λ is about 120 orders of magnitude smaller than theoretically expected¹

$$\Lambda_0 \sim 10^{-120}. \quad (1)$$

One explanation for this observation assumes that Λ is an environmental parameter which has different values in different parts of the “multiverse” [1–8]. The probability for a randomly picked observer to measure a given value of Λ can then be expressed as [3]

$$P_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda) \propto P(\Lambda)n_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda), \quad (2)$$

where $P(\Lambda)$ is the prior distribution or volume fraction of regions with a given value of Λ and $n_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda)$ is the anthropic factor, which is proportional to the number of observers that will evolve per unit volume. If we assume that Λ is the only variable “constant”, then the density of observers is roughly proportional to the fraction of matter clustered in large galaxies, $n_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda) \propto f_G(\Lambda)$. Using the Press-Schechter approximation [9] for $f_G(\Lambda)$ we can write [10]

$$n_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda) \sim \text{erfc} \left[\left(\frac{\Lambda}{\Lambda_c} \right)^{1/3} \right] \quad (3)$$

where we have normalized n_{obs} to be 1 for $\Lambda = 0$. We have parameterized the anthropic suppression with a value Λ_c , which depends on such things as the amplitude of primordial fluctuations and the minimum size of galaxy that can contain observers. For the parameters used in Refs. [10, 11], Λ_c is about 10 times the observed value of Λ ,

$$\Lambda_c \sim 6 \times 10^{-120}. \quad (4)$$

For the qualitative arguments and toy model of the present paper, the precise value of Λ_c will not matter, and we can use a Gaussian instead of erfc, to get

$$n_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda) = e^{-(\Lambda/\Lambda_c)^{2/3}} \quad (5)$$

The prior distribution $P(\Lambda)$ depends on the unknown details of the fundamental theory and on the dynamics of eternal inflation. However, it has been argued [12, 13] that it should be well approximated by a flat distribution,

$$P(\Lambda) \approx \text{const}, \quad (6)$$

because the window where $n_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda)$ is substantially different from zero, is vastly less than the expected Planck scale range of variation of Λ . Any smooth function varying on some large characteristic scale will be nearly constant within a relatively tiny interval. Thus from Eq. (2),

$$P_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda) \propto n_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda). \quad (7)$$

¹ Here and below we use reduced Planck units, $M_{RP} \equiv M_p^2/8\pi = 1$, where M_p is the Planck mass. The theoretical expectation could be as “large” as 10^{-56} , for example because of supersymmetry. However, a discrepancy of 56 orders of magnitude still needs to be explained.

Indeed the observed value of Λ is reasonably typical of values drawn from the distribution of Eq. (3). This successful prediction for Λ depends on the assumption of a flat volume distribution (6). If, for example, one uses $P(\Lambda) \propto \Lambda$ instead of (6), the 2σ prediction would be $\Lambda/\Lambda_0 < 500$, giving no satisfactory explanation for why Λ is so small [14].

A specific class of multiverse models is given by the landscape of string theory [15–17]. In such models there are of order 10^{500} different vacua with various cosmological constants [18–20]. The dynamics of eternal inflation populates the multiverse with all possible vacua (or bubbles) by allowing for the nucleation of one vacuum within the other, according to transition rates which determine the probability of going from one vacuum to another.

Given a specific string theory landscape, we would like to be able to predict the cosmological constant that we should expect to observe according to Eq. (2). We will assume the prior probability $P(\Lambda)$ is given by the relative bubble abundances of different vacua. Since an eternally inflating multiverse contains an infinite number of each type of vacuum allowed in the landscape, it is necessary to use some regularization procedure to compute the prior probability distribution. Many such regularization procedures, or probability measures, have been proposed [21–25]. For a more complete and up to date account see Ref. [26] and the references therein. Here we will use the pocket-based measure introduced in Refs. [27, 28]. Refs. [29, 30] computed prior probabilities² of different vacua in toy models [15, 17] and did not find a smooth distribution of possible cosmological constants. Instead, for the specific models and parameters they studied, there were variations of many orders of magnitude in the prior probabilities of different vacua. However, to allow for numerical solution, Refs. [29, 30] used models with a relatively small number of vacua and worked only in a first-order approximation.

Here we will consider a toy model in which transition probabilities are computed as though all changes in Λ were by some fixed amount c . In this simple model, we can analytically study probability distributions for a realistic number of vacua, $N \sim 10^{500}$. We find that when c is around 1, there is a smooth distribution of vacua in the anthropic range, and the anthropic prediction of Eq. (7) applies. But when c is smaller by a few orders of magnitude, the behavior is very different. In this case, the $P(\Lambda)$ factor is more important than $n_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda)$ in Eq. (2). Thus we would expect to live in a region with large Λ , and so only a few galaxies. In such a multiverse, the anthropic procedure would not explain the observed small value of Λ .

The plan of this paper is as follows: In section II we will outline the method used to calculate bubble abundances. Additional details of the bubble abundance calculation are presented in the appendix. We will then define our model in section III, and calculate the prior probability distribution. In section IV we will investigate the behavior of $P_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda)$. We end with a discussion in section V.

II. BUBBLE ABUNDANCES

We review here the procedure for calculating the volume fraction of vacua of a given kind, using the “pocket-based measure” formalism of Refs. [27, 29].

Vacua with $\Lambda \leq 0$ are said to be terminal. There are no transitions out of them. Vacua with $\Lambda > 0$ are recyclable. If j labels such a vacuum, it may be possible to nucleate bubbles

² Strictly speaking bubble abundances were calculated.

of a new vacuum, say i , inside vacuum j . The transition rate κ_{ij} for this process is defined as the probability per unit time for an observer who is currently in vacuum j to find herself in vacuum i . Using the logarithm of the scale factor as our time variable,

$$\kappa_{ij} = \Gamma_{ij} \frac{4\pi}{3} H_j^{-4}, \quad (8)$$

where Γ_{ij} is the bubble nucleation rate per unit physical spacetime volume (same as λ_{ij} in [27]) and

$$H_j = (\Lambda_j/3)^{1/2} \quad (9)$$

is the expansion rate in vacuum j .

Transition rates depend on the details of the landscape. However, if $\Lambda_i < \Lambda_j$, the rate of the transition upward from i to j is suppressed relative to the inverse, downward transition, by a factor which does not depend on the details of the process [31]³,

$$\kappa_{ji} = \kappa_{ij} \exp \left[-24\pi^2 \left(\frac{1}{\Lambda_i} - \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} \right) \right] \quad (10)$$

Given the entire set of rates κ_{ij} , we can in principle compute the bubble abundance p_α for each vacuum α , following the methods of Refs. [27, 29]. An exact calculation would require diagonalizing an $N \times N$ matrix. But as in Ref. [29], we can make the approximation that all upward transition rates are tiny compared to all downward transition rates from a given vacuum (see also the appendix). In that approximation, we can compute probabilities as follows.

First, define the total down-tunneling rate for a vacuum j ,

$$D_j = \sum_{\Lambda_i < \Lambda_j} \kappa_{ij}. \quad (11)$$

Then define the dominant vacuum, referred to as vacuum $*$, as that recyclable vacuum whose D_j is the smallest. Since bubble nucleation rates are suppressed in low-energy vacua, we expect Λ_* to be fairly small, however we would not expect it to be so small as to be in the anthropic range. In Bousso-Polchinski and Arkani-Hamed-Dimopolous-Kachru type landscapes [15, 17] it can be shown that this vacuum will have no downward transitions to vacua with positive Λ . To see that this is true, imagine that in some direction Λ_* can jump downward to $\Lambda_\alpha > 0$. Now if we compare D_α to D_* we see that each term contributing to D_α is less than the corresponding term (i.e., the transition rate in the same direction) in D_* because $\Lambda_\alpha < \Lambda_*$ and jump sizes in the same direction are the same. This implies $D_\alpha < D_*$ which contradicts our definition of D_* as the vacuum with the smallest sum of downward transition rates.

Once we have identified the dominant vacuum, the probability for any vacuum α is given by (see Appendix)

$$p_\alpha = \sum \frac{\kappa_{\alpha a} \kappa_{ab} \cdots \kappa_{z*}}{(D_a - D_*)(D_b - D_*) \cdots (D_z - D_*)} \quad (12)$$

where the sum is taken over all chains of intermediate vacua a, b, \dots, z that connect the vacuum α to the dominant vacuum.

³ We assume only Lee-Weinberg tunnelings and do not consider Farhi-Guth-Guven (FGG) tunnelings [32]. These FGG tunnelings may be faster in upward transition rates, but their interpretation is unclear [33, 34], and the resulting spacetime cannot be directly handled by the ‘‘pocket-based’’ measure we employ here.

III. TOY MODEL

A. Model

We will consider a toy version of the Arkani-Hamed-Dimopolous-Kachru (ADK) model [17]. We let there be $2J$ directions and so $N = 2^{2J}$ vacua. We will choose $J \approx 800$, so that $N \sim 10^{500}$. Each vacuum can be specified by a list of numbers $\{\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{2J}\}$, where $\eta_i = \pm 1$, and the cosmological constant is

$$\Lambda = \bar{\Lambda} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \eta_i c \quad (13)$$

The “toy” feature of this model is that all jumps have the same size, c .

We will take the average cosmological constant $\bar{\Lambda}$ to be in the range $(0, c)$. All vacua with $J +$ coordinates and $J -$ coordinates will have $\Lambda = \bar{\Lambda}$. Each vacuum has $2J$ neighbors to which it can tunnel by bubble nucleation. Each nucleation event either increases or decreases the cosmological constant by c .

The model as given above is of no use for anthropic reasoning. Vacua exist only with widely separated cosmological constants, $\bar{\Lambda}, \bar{\Lambda} + c, \dots$, therefore we would not expect any in the anthropic range. So we will modify the model by artificially perturbing the Λ of each vacuum to produce a smooth number distribution. Vacua originally clustered at $\bar{\Lambda}$ will be spread out over the range from 0 to c . This will cover the anthropic range of vacua with $\Lambda > 0$, and so if the vacua are dense enough we will find some anthropic vacua. We will not, however, take account of these perturbations in computing probabilities.

We will only be interested in the vacua near $\Lambda = 0$, which are those at $\bar{\Lambda}$ before the perturbation procedure above. All these have exactly the same transition rates, and thus there is no single dominant vacuum. So, in addition to the “smearing” above, we will make a small perturbation to decrease the total tunneling rate of some specific vacuum Λ_* , so that it is the dominant one and the procedures of the last section can be applied.

B. Distribution of vacua

The dominant vacuum, and all other vacua of interest have $J +$ coordinates and $J -$ coordinates. Thus the other vacua are reached from the dominant vacuum by taking an equal number of up jumps and down jumps. We will classify the vacua by a parameter n , the minimum number of up jumps required to reach a given vacuum from the dominant vacuum. We will call n the level of the vacuum. Thus a vacuum of level n differs from the dominant vacuum in $2n$ coordinates, n of which are $+$ where the dominant vacuum had $-$, and another n vice versa.

The total number of vacua of level n is thus

$$N_n = \binom{J}{n}^2 = \left(\frac{J!}{n!(J-n)!} \right)^2 \quad (14)$$

We imagine these to be smeared over a range c , so their density is

$$\rho_n = N_n/c = 1/\Delta_n. \quad (15)$$

The likelihood that there is no vacuum in a range of size x is $\exp(-\rho_n x)$, thus the median Λ of the lowest- Λ vacuum is

$$\Lambda_n = (\ln 2)/\rho_n = c(\ln 2)/N_n \quad (16)$$

We will take a typical realization to be one whose lowest- Λ vacuum is at this median position. Above the lowest- Λ vacuum of level n , there are $N_n - 1$ more with higher Λ , with the typical interval in Λ being Δ_n . For a typical realization it is sufficient to take these vacua as evenly spaced, so that they are at

$$\Lambda_{n,\ell} = \Lambda_n + (\ell - 1)\Delta_n \quad (17)$$

where $1 \leq \ell \leq N_n$.

C. Probabilities

We now use the formalism of Sec. II to calculate the relative abundances of different vacua in our toy model.

The relative abundance of each vacuum α is given by a sum over all chains that connect it to the dominant vacuum, Eq. (12). The minimum number of transitions in such a chain is $2n$. Longer chains can be formed by jumping one way and then later the opposite way in the same direction. But these chains will have extra suppression factors because of the extra jumps, so the probability will be accurately given by including only minimum-length chains. Furthermore, the paths that maximize the bubble abundances are those that entail first making all the up jumps and then following with a sequence of down jumps. The reason is that the up-jump suppression factor, Eq. (10), is least when the starting Λ for the jump is highest. Thus it is best not to jump down until one has made all the necessary up-jumps. So we only consider the contribution of paths which consist of making all upward jumps first and then following with downward jumps. In this case, we can reorganize Eq. (12),

$$p_\alpha = \sum \frac{\kappa_{\alpha a}}{D_a - D_*} \frac{\kappa_{ab}}{D_b - D_*} \cdots \frac{\kappa_{rs}}{D_s - D_*} \kappa_{st} \frac{\kappa_{tu}}{D_t - D_*} \cdots \frac{\kappa_{z*}}{D_z - D_*} \quad (18)$$

The transition rates to the right of the factor κ_{st} in Eq. (12) are upward rates, and those to the left are downward rates. κ_{st} represents the first downward jump after having made n upward jumps from the dominant vacuum.

Now we will approximate $D_* \ll D_j$, since the transition rates are suppressed for low Λ vacua. Furthermore, in our single jump size model, all downward jumps from the same site have the same transition rate, so for $\Lambda_i < \Lambda_j$,

$$\frac{\kappa_{ij}}{D_j - D_*} \simeq \frac{1}{J_j} \quad (19)$$

where J_j is the number of + coordinates in vacuum j .

Using Eq. (10),

$$\frac{\kappa_{ji}}{D_j - D_*} = \frac{\kappa_{ij}}{D_j - D_*} \exp \left[-24\pi^2 \left(\frac{1}{\Lambda_i} - \frac{1}{\Lambda_j} \right) \right] \quad (20)$$

The product of all such suppression factors is just

$$S = \exp \left[-24\pi^2 \left(\frac{1}{\Lambda_*} - \frac{1}{\Lambda_n} \right) \right] \quad (21)$$

where $\Lambda_n = nc$ is the maximum Λ reached.

Factoring out the suppression factors, we find n terms given by Eq. (19) for the up jumps. The first one has $J_j = J + 1$, since there are $J + 1$ coordinates in the dominant vacuum. The next has $J + 2$, and so on up to $J + n$. Thus the product is

$$\frac{\kappa_{tu}}{D_t - D_*} \cdots \frac{\kappa_{z*}}{D_z - D_*} = J!/(J + n)! \quad (22)$$

The down-jumps are similar, except that the one at n is missing, giving

$$\frac{\kappa_{\alpha a}}{D_a - D_*} \cdots \frac{\kappa_{rs}}{D_s - D_*} = J!/(J + n - 1)! \quad (23)$$

The up- and the down-jumps can be taken in any order, so there are $(n!)^2$ equally weighted paths to reach the same vacuum. Thus the prior probability of a vacuum of level n is

$$P_n \propto (n!)^2 \left[\frac{J!}{(J + n)!} \right]^2 (J + n) \kappa_{st} \exp \left[24\pi^2 \left(\frac{1}{cn} - \frac{1}{\Lambda_*} \right) \right] \quad (24)$$

We set the first downward jump rate, which has no canceling denominator,

$$\kappa_{st} \approx \exp \left[-\frac{6\sqrt{3}c\pi^2}{\Lambda_n^{3/2}} \right] = \exp \left[-\frac{6\sqrt{3}\pi^2}{cn^{3/2}} \right] \quad (25)$$

which is the rate we would have for a Bousso-Polchinski(BP) type model [29] with $\Lambda_j \gg \Delta\Lambda$.

IV. DISTRIBUTION FOR THE OBSERVED Λ

Given the above, we are in a position to calculate the probability of observing each value $\Lambda_{n,\ell}$ in a typical realization of our toy model. These are given by

$$P_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda_{n,\ell}) \propto P_n n_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda_{n,\ell}) \quad (26)$$

The chance that we live in a world of a given level n is then given by

$$P_{\text{obs}}(n) \propto P_n \sum_{\ell} n_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda_{n,\ell}) \quad (27)$$

We will consider two cases. When $\Lambda_n \ll \Lambda_c$, the sum can be approximated by an integral,

$$\sum_{\ell} n_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda_{n,\ell}) \approx \frac{1}{\Delta_n} \int_0^{\infty} d\Lambda n_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda) = \frac{3\sqrt{\pi}\Lambda_c}{4\Delta_n} = \frac{3\sqrt{\pi}N_n\Lambda_c}{4c} = \frac{3\sqrt{\pi}\Lambda_c \ln 2}{4\Lambda_n} \quad (28)$$

Including Eqs. (14, 24, 25), we find

$$P_{\text{obs}}(n) \propto \frac{3\sqrt{\pi}\Lambda_c}{4c} \left(\frac{J!^2}{(J - n)!(J + n)!} \right)^2 (J + n) \exp \left[\frac{24\pi^2}{cn} - \frac{6\sqrt{3}\pi^2}{cn^{3/2}} \right] \quad (29)$$

We have not included the term involving Λ_* , which is the same for all $P_{\text{obs}}(n)$. In Eq. (29), $P_{\text{obs}}(n)$ is a decreasing function of n .

On the other hand, when $\Lambda_n > \Lambda_c$, Eq. (27) will be dominated by the first term, and we can write

$$\sum_{\ell} n_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda_{n,\ell}) \approx e^{-(\Lambda_n/\Lambda_c)^{2/3}} \quad (30)$$

Including Eqs. (24, 25), we find

$$P_{\text{obs}}(n) \propto \left(\frac{J!n!}{(J+n)!} \right)^2 (J+n) \exp \left[\frac{24\pi^2}{cn} - \frac{6\sqrt{3}\pi^2}{cn^{3/2}} - \left(\frac{\Lambda_n}{\Lambda_c} \right)^{2/3} \right] \quad (31)$$

In Eq. (31), $P_{\text{obs}}(n)$ increases with increasing n while n is small and the last term in the exponent is dominant, but it decreases when n is larger and the other terms are dominant.

The division between regimes occurs when $\Lambda_n \sim \Lambda_c$, i.e.,

$$\left(\frac{J}{n} \right)^{-2} c \ln 2 \sim \Lambda_c \sim 6 \times 10^{-120} \quad (32)$$

With $c \sim 1$, we find $n \sim 34$. The dependence on c is weak, with $c \sim 10^{-3}$ corresponding to $n \sim 33$. For n in this range, changing n by one unit changes Λ_n by a factor of about 500. Thus there is at most one n with $\Lambda_n \sim \Lambda_c$.

If we compare Eq. (29) and Eq. (31) for the same n , we see that they differ by a factor of $\Lambda_c N_n / c \exp(\Lambda_n/\Lambda_c)^{2/3} \sim 1$ if $\Lambda_n \sim \Lambda_c$, so there is no big jump due to switching regimes.

Now let us start with $n = 1$ and increase n . Certainly with $n = 1$, $\Lambda_n \gg \Lambda_c$ by a huge factor, we are in the regime of Eq. (31), and P_{obs} is infinitesimal. As we increase n , P_{obs} increases. Once n is significantly above 1, we can approximate the increase from one step to the next as

$$\frac{P_{\text{obs}}(n+1)}{P_{\text{obs}}(n)} \approx \left(\frac{n}{J} \right)^2 \exp \left[-\frac{24\pi^2}{cn^2} + \frac{9\sqrt{3}\pi^2}{2cn^{5/2}} + \left(\frac{\Lambda_n}{\Lambda_c} \right)^{2/3} \right] \quad (33)$$

where we have ignored $(\Lambda_{n+1}/\Lambda_c)^{2/3}$ as much less than $(\Lambda_n/\Lambda_c)^{2/3}$. The ratio of the middle term in the exponent to the first term is $3\sqrt{3}/(16\sqrt{n}) \approx 0.05$ for $n \sim 33$, so we will ignore the middle term.

For sufficiently small n , the last term in the exponent dominates and $P_{\text{obs}}(n+1)/P_{\text{obs}}(n) \gg 1$. There is only an infinitesimal probability that we will be in a vacuum of level n , because there are others that are much more probable. As we increase n , $P_{\text{obs}}(n)$ will continue to increase. What happens next depends on the magnitude of c .

A. Small c

First suppose c is small, in particular that

$$c < \frac{24\pi^2}{n^{2/3} J^{4/3}} \quad (34)$$

for relevant values of n . For $J = 800$, $n \sim 33$, the right hand side is about 3×10^{-3} . From Eq. (34),

$$\frac{24\pi^2}{cn^{2/3} J^{4/3}} > 1. \quad (35)$$

Now $\Lambda_{n+1}/\Lambda_n \approx (n/J)^2$, and so successive values of $\Lambda_n^{2/3}$ differ by a factor about $n^{4/3}/J^{4/3}$.

Thus we can find a value of n such that

$$1 < \frac{24\pi^2}{cn^{2/3}J^{4/3}} < \left(\frac{\Lambda_n}{\Lambda_c}\right)^{2/3} < \frac{24\pi^2}{cn^2} \quad (36)$$

We will now show that for this n ,

$$P_{\text{obs}}(n+1) \ll P_{\text{obs}}(n), \quad (37)$$

so that we should find ourselves in a vacuum of at most level n .

It is not clear from Eq. (36) whether Λ_{n+1}/Λ_c is more or less than 1, so we might need to use either Eq. (29) or Eq. (31) for $P_{\text{obs}}(n+1)$. We will prove the claim using Eq. (29). Since this gives a larger value than Eq. (31), if Eq. (37) holds using Eq. (29), it will certainly hold using Eq. (31). Thus we will take

$$\frac{P_{\text{obs}}(n+1)}{P_{\text{obs}}(n)} \approx \frac{3\sqrt{\pi}\Lambda_c}{4\Lambda_{n+1}} \left(\frac{n}{J}\right)^2 \exp\left[-\frac{24\pi^2}{cn^2} + \left(\frac{\Lambda_n}{\Lambda_c}\right)^{2/3}\right] \quad (38)$$

Now from Eq. (35), we find that

$$\frac{24\pi^2}{cn^2} > \left(\frac{J}{n}\right)^{4/3} \quad (39)$$

For $J = 800$, $n \sim 33$, the right hand side is about 70. Thus unless $(\Lambda_n/\Lambda_c)^{2/3}$ is extremely close to the upper bound in Eq. (36), the exponential term in Eq. (38) will be infinitesimal, and Eq. (37) will follow. If we do have $(\Lambda_n/\Lambda_c)^{2/3} \approx 24\pi^2/(cn^2)$, then $\Lambda_{n+1}/\Lambda_c \gtrsim 1$. Then the prefactors in Eq. (38) are at most about $(n/J)^2$, about 2×10^{-3} for parameters of interest, and again Eq. (37) follows.

Thus we can say with great confidence that we live in a universe with level n or lower. From Eq. (36), we see immediately that we should observe $\Lambda \geq \Lambda_c$, whereas in fact we observe $\Lambda_0 \approx 0.1\Lambda_c$. If c is significantly smaller than the limit in Eq. (34), then we will see a very “non-anthropic” universe. We will be able to find Λ_n with $(\Lambda_n/\Lambda_c)^{2/3} > 24\pi^2/(cn^{2/3}J^{4/3})$, and thus

$$n_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda) \lesssim n_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda_n) < e^{-24\pi^2/(cn^{2/3}J^{4/3})} \quad (40)$$

will be tiny, meaning that only an infinitesimal fraction of matter has coalesced into galaxies. For example, with $c = 10^{-3}$, we would find $n_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda) \lesssim e^{-3} \approx 0.05$, in contrast to the observed value (in our approximation) $n_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda) \approx 0.85$. With $c = 10^{-4}$, we would find $n_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda) \lesssim e^{-30} \approx 10^{-13}$: a universe utterly unlike our own.

B. Large c

Now suppose instead that

$$c > 24\pi^2/n^2 \quad (41)$$

For $J = 800$, $n \sim 33$, the right hand side is about 0.2. Then we will reach the point where $\Lambda_n \sim \Lambda_c$ before $24\pi^2/(cn^2)$ (or the variation due to κ_{st}) is significant. In that case, we switch to the regime of Eq. (29), where P_{obs} decreases only slowly with increasing n . In this regime,

$$\frac{P_{\text{obs}}(n+1)}{P_{\text{obs}}(n)} \approx \frac{(J-n)^2}{(J+n+1)^2} \approx \left(1 - \frac{n}{J}\right)^4, \quad (42)$$

which is about 0.85 for parameters of interest. Thus we find that several values of n contribute nearly equally to the total probability. The first of these might be dominated by a single Λ_n , but the others will have a large number of closely spaced Λ . These vacua have similar n_{obs} and identical prior probability, so we could easily be in any of them.⁴

Thus when c is large, we recover approximately the original anthropic predictions with a smooth prior $P(\Lambda)$. There might be an effect due to the discrete nature of the vacua associated with the smallest n , where $P_{\text{obs}}(n)$ has its peak, but this effect is small because level n does not dominate the probability distribution. Instead the probability is divided across many different levels, while only level n has the above effect.

V. DISCUSSION

A key ingredient in the anthropic prediction of the cosmological constant is the assumption of a flat prior distribution. However, the first attempt to calculate this distribution for the Bousso-Polchinski and Arkani-Hamed-Dimopolous-Kachru landscape models [29, 30] revealed a staggered distribution, suggesting a conflict with anthropic predictions.

These calculations have been constrained by computational limitations and reveal only the probabilities of a handful of the most probable vacua⁵. In this paper we have gone beyond these first order perturbative results by studying a simple toy model which permits analytic calculation with a large, realistic number of vacua, $N \sim 10^{500}$. We have found an interesting fractal distribution for the prior $P(\Lambda)$. When including anthropic selection effects to determine $P_{\text{obs}}(\Lambda)$, we find that agreement with observation depends on the only free parameter of the model, the jump size c .

We have shown that when $c \sim 1$, anthropic reasoning does indeed solve the cosmological constant problem. Even though the prior distribution has a rich fractal structure, the states of interest have similar vacua sufficiently closely spaced to approximate the flat distribution well enough to give the usual anthropic results.

Bousso and Yang [35] discuss the probability distribution resulting from the pocket-based measure of Garriga *et al* [27]. They claim that it cannot solve the cosmological constant problem, because the Shannon entropy, $S = -\sum p \ln p$, computed from the prior probabilities will never obey $\exp(S) \gg 10^{120}$. We feel that a better test is to compute the entropy using the same formula with the probabilities taking into account n_{obs} , and then to demand that $S \gg 1$, so the effective number of places in the landscape in which we might find ourselves is large. This condition is clearly obeyed in the case where $c \sim 1$.

On the other hand, if c is small, of order 10^{-3} for $J = 800$, then the agreement with observation breaks down. In this case, we should expect to find ourselves in a universe with quite a large cosmological constant. Even though the anthropic factor strongly disfavors such universes, their volume fraction is so much higher that in the overall probability they are greatly preferred.

⁴ The identical prior probabilities are a toy feature of the model. But even if we were to distribute these probabilities between P_n and P_{n+1} , we would still find many vacua with similar probabilities. If level n has 1 vacuum that is not significantly suppressed by n_{obs} , then level $n+1$ will have N_{n+1}/N_n such vacua. These vacua will be distributed in a range of probabilities with $P_n/P_{n+1} \sim N_{n+1}/N_n$, so it is not possible to have a single one of them strongly dominant.

⁵ It is extremely unlikely that any of these vacua should lie in the anthropic range.

Of course these results apply directly to our toy model with nearly identical jumps, and there is no reason that the real landscape of string theory should have this property. What would happen in a more realistic theory, which would have many different-sized jumps in Λ ?

Consider first what happens when we rescale our theory by changing all jump sizes by a constant factor. Suppose, for example, that all different jump sizes are proportional to a parameter c .⁶ The transition rates between vacua all have terms proportional to $1/c$ in the exponent. Thus when c is small, the transition rates and thus the probabilities of different vacua are very sensitive to the details of the transition rates. When c is large, all rates are larger and less variable. Thus we conjecture that, as a general rule, landscapes with large jumps are more likely to give the standard anthropic results, while those with small jumps are likely to predict universes unlike ours.

Regardless of the details of the theory, there is always a factor proportional to $\exp(24\pi^2/\Lambda_{\max})$, where Λ_{\max} is the maximum cosmological constant reached in the series of vacua between the dominant vacuum and ours. If it is necessary to jump up to a high value of Λ_{\max} in order to have a large enough number of possibilities to expect any vacuum near the anthropic range, then the exact value of Λ_{\max} will not be so important. If, however, enough vacua can be reached with very small Λ_{\max} , then this factor will depend strongly on their exact values of Λ_{\max} .

If this effect is the dominant one (which is not clear in a realistic model), then what matters is not the average size of the jumps, but the number of small jumps. If there are enough small jumps to produce some near-anthropic vacua, then these vacua will be preferred, because of their small Λ_{\max} , and there may be disagreement with observation. The existence of large jumps in addition is then not important. Work is underway to study models with different jump sizes.

Appendix A: Bubble abundances by perturbation theory

As shown in Ref. [27], the calculation of bubble abundances p_j reduces to finding the smallest eigenvalue q and the corresponding eigenvector s for a huge $N \times N$ recycling transition matrix \mathbf{R} . Bubble abundances are given by

$$p_j \propto \sum_{\alpha} H_{\alpha}^q \kappa_{j\alpha} s_{\alpha} \approx \sum_{\alpha} \kappa_{j\alpha} s_{\alpha}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

where the summation is over all recyclable vacua which can directly tunnel to j . H_{α} is the Hubble expansion rate in vacuum α and we take $H_{\alpha}^q \approx 1$ because q is an exponentially small number.

In a realistic model, we expect N to be very large. In the numerical example of Ref. [29] $N \sim 10^7$, while for a realistic string theory landscape we expect $N \sim 10^{500}$ [16, 18–20]. Solving for the dominant eigenvector for such huge matrices is numerically impossible. However, in Ref. [29, 36] the eigenvalue problem was solved via perturbation theory, with the upward transition rates (see Eq. (10)) playing the role of small expansion parameters. Here we extend this procedure to all orders of perturbation theory.

⁶ For example, consider a model with $|\Delta\Lambda_i| = ci$ where $1 \leq i \leq 2J$. $2J$ is the number of directions and c is still some overall scale.

We represent our transition matrix as a sum of an unperturbed matrix and a small correction,

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{R}^{(0)} + \mathbf{R}^{(1)}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $\mathbf{R}^{(0)}$ contains all the downward transition rates and $\mathbf{R}^{(1)}$ contains all the upward transition rates. We will solve for the zero'th order dominant eigensystem $\{q^{(0)}, \mathbf{s}^{(0)}\}$ from $\mathbf{R}^{(0)}$ and then include contributions from $\mathbf{R}^{(1)}$ to all orders of perturbation theory.

If the vacua are arranged in the order of increasing Λ , so that

$$\Lambda_1 \leq \Lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \Lambda_N, \quad (\text{A3})$$

then $\mathbf{R}^{(0)}$ is an upper triangular matrix. Its eigenvalues are simply equal to its diagonal elements,

$$R_{\alpha\alpha}^{(0)} = - \sum_{j < \alpha} \kappa_{j\alpha} \equiv -D_\alpha. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Hence, the magnitude of the smallest zeroth-order eigenvalue is

$$q^{(0)} = D_* \equiv \min\{D_\alpha\}. \quad (\text{A5})$$

Downward transitions from $*$ will bring us to the negative- Λ territory of terminal vacua [29]. Terminal vacua do not belong in the matrix \mathbf{R} ; hence, $R_{\beta*} = 0$ for $\beta \neq *$, and we see that the zeroth order eigenvector has a single nonzero component,

$$s_\alpha^{(0)} = \delta_{\alpha*}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

Thus, in fact, we could have included only the diagonal elements of $\mathbf{R}^{(0)}$ and still obtained the correct $q^{(0)}$ and $\mathbf{s}^{(0)}$.

Now we would like to include the effect of the upward transition rates in the lower triangular matrix $\mathbf{R}^{(1)}$, to any given order of perturbation theory. To organize the calculation, we note that the eigenvalues of an upper triangular matrix are just the diagonal elements, and the eigenvectors are given exactly by the perturbation series, which terminates after N terms. Thus we will take just the diagonal elements of $\mathbf{R}^{(0)}$ as our unperturbed matrix, and consider the rest of $\mathbf{R}^{(0)}$ and $\mathbf{R}^{(1)}$ as a perturbation. By summing all terms in the perturbation series for this perturbation that involve n elements of $\mathbf{R}^{(1)}$, we find the perturbation term of order n in the small upward jump rates.

The procedure is the same as that involved in finding an eigenstate of the Schrödinger equation in n th-order perturbation theory, working in a basis of wavefunctions which diagonalize the unperturbed equation. See for example Eq. (9.1.16) of Ref. [37]. Including all orders of perturbation theory, we find the result

$$s_a = \sum_{b=1}^N \dots \sum_{z=1}^N \frac{\kappa_{ab}}{(D_a - D_*)} \dots \frac{\kappa_{z*}}{(D_z - D_*)} + \text{additional terms} \quad (\text{A7})$$

where there can be any number of terms in the sum and the vacuum $*$ is not summed over.

The “additional terms” are those which have products of at least two elements of the perturbation matrix with index $*$. We can write such a term as a sequence of transitions which returns to the vacuum $*$ (perhaps several times) before finally going on to the vacuum a . By keeping only the final part of the path from $*$ to a , we get a related term which occurs in the sum in Eq. (A7). The deleted part of the path must contain at least one matrix

element of the form κ_{i*} , which is an upward jump, or if both indices are $*$, the matrix element (called U_* in [29]) is the sum of all upward jump rates from $*$. Since all upward jumps are highly suppressed, the additional term is tiny compared to the related term in the sum in Eq. (A7). So, ignoring the additional terms, Eq. (A7) gives each s_a correct at first nonvanishing order in the number of upward jumps.

Combining Eqs. (A7) and (A1) gives Eq. (12).

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Alex Vilenkin for many key discussions and ideas, and Claire Zukowski for pointing out the need for the additional terms in Eq. (A7). K.D.O. was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grant 0353314. D. S.-P. was supported in part by grant RFP1-06-028 from The Foundational Questions Institute (fqxi.org).

-
- [1] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 2607 (1987).
 - [2] A.D. Linde, in *300 Years of Gravitation*, ed. by S.W. Hawking and W. Israel, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987); A. D. Linde, Rept. Prog. Phys. **47** 925 (1984); A. D. Sakharov, Sov. Phys. JETP **60**, 214 (1984) [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **87**, 375 (1984)]; T. Banks, Nucl. Phys. B249, 332, (1985).
 - [3] A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 846 (1995).
 - [4] G. Efstathiou, M.N.R.A.S. **274**, L73 (1995).
 - [5] H. Martel, P. R. Shapiro and S. Weinberg, Ap.J. **492**, 29 (1998).
 - [6] J. Garriga, M. Livio and A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. **D61**, 023503 (2000).
 - [7] S. Bludman, Nucl. Phys. **A663-664**,865 (2000).
 - [8] For a review, see, e.g., A. Vilenkin, “Anthropic predictions: the case of the cosmological constant”, astro-ph/0407586.
 - [9] W. H. Press and P. Schechter, Astrophys. J. **187**, 425 (1974).
 - [10] L. Pogosian and A. Vilenkin, JCAP **0701**, 025 (2007).
 - [11] M. Tegmark, JCAP **0504**, 001 (2005).
 - [12] A. Vilenkin, in *Cosmological Constant and the Evolution of the Universe*, ed by K. Sato, T. Sugihara and N. Sugiyama (Universal Academy Press, Tokyo, 1996).
 - [13] S. Weinberg, in *Critical Dialogues in Cosmology*, ed. by N. G. Turok (World Scientific, Singapore, 1997).
 - [14] L. Pogosian, private communication (2005).
 - [15] R. Bousso and J. Polchinski, JHEP **0006**, 006 (2000).
 - [16] L. Susskind, “The anthropic landscape of string theory”, hep-th/0302219.
 - [17] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and S. Kachru, “Predictive landscapes and new physics at a TeV”, hep-th/0501082.
 - [18] M.R. Douglas, JHEP **0305**, 046 (2003).
 - [19] S. Ashok and M.R. Douglas, JHEP **0401**, 060 (2004).
 - [20] F. Denef and M.R. Douglas, JHEP **0405**, 072 (2004).
 - [21] A. D. Linde, D. A. Linde, and A. Mezhlumian, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 1783 (1994).
 - [22] R. Bousso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 191302 (2006), hep-th/0605263.

- [23] A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5501 (1998), hep-th/9806185; V. Vanchurin, A. Vilenkin and S. Winitzki, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 083507 (2000), gr-qc/9905097; J. Garriga and A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 023507 (2001), gr-qc/0102090; A. Vilenkin, “Probabilities in the landscape”, hep-th/0602264; V. Vanchurin, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 023524 (2007), hep-th/0612215; A. Vilenkin, JHEP **0701**, 092 (2007), hep-th/0611271.
- [24] A. Aguirre, S. Gratton and M. C. Johnson, “Measures on transitions for cosmology in the landscape”, hep-th/0612195.
- [25] A. Linde, JCAP **0701**, 022 (2007), hep-th/0611043.
- [26] A. Linde, “Towards a gauge invariant volume-weighted probability measure for eternal inflation”, hep-th/0705.1160.
- [27] J. Garriga, D. Schwartz-Perlov, A. Vilenkin and S. Winitzki, JCAP **0601**, 017 (2006), hep-th/0509184.
- [28] R. Easther, E.A. Lim and M.R. Martin, JCAP **0603**, 016, (2006), astro-ph/0511233.
- [29] D. Schwartz-Perlov and A. Vilenkin, JCAP **0606**, 010, (2006), hep-th/0601162.
- [30] D. Schwartz-Perlov, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **40**, 7363 (2007), hep-th/0611237.
- [31] K. M. Lee and E. J. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **36**, 1088 (1987).
- [32] E. Farhi, A. H. Guth and J. Guven, Nucl. Phys. B **339**, 417 (1990).
- [33] A. Aguirre and M. C. Johnson, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 123529 (2006) [arXiv:gr-qc/0512034].
- [34] A. Aguirre, S. Gratton and M. C. Johnson, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 123501 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0611221].
- [35] R. Bousso and I.-Sheng Yang, “Landscape Predictions from Cosmological Vacuum Selection” hep-th/0703206.
- [36] D. Schwartz-Perlov, “Probabilities in the Inflationary Multiverse”, PhD Thesis, Tufts University, August 2006.
- [37] P. M. Morse and H. Feshbach, “Methods of Theoretical Physics”, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1953.