

# Electrodynamic Metanuclei

Gregory Gabadadze and Rachel A. Rosen

*Center for Cosmology and Particle Physics*

*Department of Physics, New York University, New York, NY, 10003, USA*

## Abstract

A relativistic system of electrically charged fermions and oppositely charged massive scalars with no self-interactions, is argued to have a long-lived collective state with a net charge. The charge is residing near the surface of the spherically-symmetric state, while the interior consists of the condensed scalars, that are neutralized by the fermions. The metastability is achieved by competition of the negative pressure of the scalar condensate, against the positive pressure, mainly due to the fermions. We consider such metanuclei made of helium-4 nuclei and electrons, below nuclear but above atomic densities. Typical metanuclei represent charged balls of the atomic size, colossal mass, electric charge and excess energy. Unlike an ordinary nucleus, the charge of a metanucleus scales proportionately to its radius. The quantum mechanical decay through tunneling, and vacuum instability via pair-creation, are both suppressed for large values of the electric charge. Similar states could also be composed of other charged (pseudo)scalars, such as the pions, scalar supersymmetric partners, or in general, spin-0 states of new physics.

# 1 Introduction and summary

The purpose of this work is to show that in a relativistic system of  $N + Q$  fermions, each of charge  $g$ , and  $N$  oppositely charged massive scalars, with no non-linear self-interactions, there may exist a metastable long-lived spherically symmetric ball with the following identity: The excess charge  $gQ$  is residing on a surface of the ball, while in its neutral interior there are  $N$  condensed scalars, that act collectively as a macroscopic state of a large occupation number, and also the  $N$  fermions playing the role of spectators that neutralize the bulk scalar charge<sup>1</sup>. The radius of the ball  $R$  scales linearly with the charge  $gQ$ , and the electric field near its surface,  $gQ/(4\pi R^2)$ , decreases with increasing charge.

The physical reason for (meta)stability of such a ball is that the scalar condensate gives an attractive negative pressure which balances against the repulsive pressure, mainly due to the fermions. As a result, the energy functional has a minimum around the point of balance. However, the total energy stored in the ball is greater than the energy of  $N$  neutral scalar-fermion atoms plus free  $Q$  fermions. Hence, the minimum of the energy functional is only a local one – the condensate ball can decay into the atomic state by tunneling. For large values of the charge, both the tunneling and the vacuum instability through quantum pair-creation, are suppressed.

The spectrum of small perturbations above the scalar condensate in the bulk of the ball has a mass gap that equals to  $2m_H$ , where  $m_H$  is the mass of the scalar. Moreover, the photon becomes massive, with its Compton wavelength smaller than the size of the condensate ball [1]. We refer to these balls as metanuclei.

In a certain respect, the metanuclei resemble properties of a metallic ball with an excess charge. In metals, the excess charge resides on the surface because it's energetically favorable to maintain zero electric field in the bulk. The surface charge, in spite of its mutual repulsion, is not escaping the metallic ball because of the energetics reasons. In our case similar properties are due to the relativistic effects of a strong electrostatic potential.

The above construction seems generic. It could be applicable to systems that are described by a relativistic Abelian gauge theory. The scalars and fermions could be fundamental particles or composite states.

One application is to the system of  $2N + Q$  electrons,  $e^-$ , and  $N$  helium-4 nuclei,  $He^{++}$ . We consider this system below the nuclear but above atomic densities, so that the nuclear effects are negligible and atoms are dissolved. We show that long-lived charged metanuclei, made of the electrons and condensed  $He^{++}$  states, may exist. These metanuclei are truly colossal—of the size of the Hydrogen atom or even greater – and carry enormous charge and excess energy. Such giant nuclei cannot form neutral atoms, making their survival in the Universe difficult.

The metanuclei could also be “made of” other existing particles, such as pions, or still hypothetical particles, such as sleptons or squarks, if captured in the condensate

---

<sup>1</sup>We should also make sure that the fermions and scalars don't form neutral atoms, this could be arranged by increasing density and/or temperature of the system.

before they decayed.

The organization of the paper is as follows: in section 2 we zoom onto the interior of the condensate ball assuming that it fills entire space (this is a good approximation for the ball as long as its size is much greater than the width of its boundary region). We briefly summarize the results of [1] on condensation of charged scalars. In section 3 we discuss the surface-bulk connection and show that the condensate ball is a (local) minimum of the energy functional. In section 4 we discuss energetics of the charged condensate balls and study why a few possible decay channels of these balls can be suppressed. In section 5 we give some examples.

The metanuclei resemble a non-topological soliton (see, e.g., [2, 3, 4]) of a  $Q$ -ball type [2, 4, 5] with a local charge (charged  $Q$ -balls) [6] – especially the charged  $Q$ -balls with fermions [7]. However, there are important differences: the  $Q$ -balls require a special form of the non-linear potential for the scalar [2, 4, 6], while in our case the non-linear scalar self-potential plays no role – it is the scalar mass term and its interactions with the gauge field that are crucial.  $Q$ -balls could form due to a global minimum of the energy functional, while the metanuclei would form due to a local minimum.

## 2 Dynamics in the interior (bulk) of the ball

We start by considering a simple model of charged scalars and oppositely charged fermions at zero temperature. The classical Lagrangian contains a gauge field  $A_\mu$ , a charged scalar field  $\phi$  with mass  $m_H$ , and fermions  $\Psi^+, \Psi$  with mass  $m_J$

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^2 + |D_\mu\phi|^2 - m_H^2\phi^*\phi + \bar{\Psi}(i\gamma^\mu D_\mu - m_J)\Psi. \quad (1)$$

The covariant derivatives in (1) are defined as  $\partial_\mu - igA_\mu$  for the scalars and  $\partial_\mu + igA_\mu$  for the fermions. Although, for simplicity we have assumed that the scalar and fermion charges are equal,  $g \equiv g_\psi = -g_\phi$ , our results apply to a general case<sup>2</sup>.

We introduce the following notations for the scalar, fermion, and gauge fields:  $\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sigma e^{i\alpha}$ ,  $\Psi = \psi e^{-i\beta}$ ,  $B_\mu \equiv A_\mu - \frac{1}{g}\partial_\mu\alpha$ , and  $\gamma \equiv \alpha - \beta$ . In terms of the *gauge invariant* variables  $\sigma$ ,  $\psi$ ,  $B_\mu$  and  $\gamma$ , the Lagrangian takes the form

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu\sigma)^2 + \frac{1}{2}g^2B_\mu^2\sigma^2 - \frac{1}{2}m_H^2\sigma^2 + \bar{\psi}(i\gamma^\mu D_\mu - m_J)\psi - (\partial_\mu\gamma)\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\psi, \quad (2)$$

where now  $F_{\mu\nu}$  and  $D_\mu$  are the field-strength and covariant derivative for  $B_\mu$ , respectively. The key point for our discussions is that the third term in the Lagrangian (2) gives rise to a tachyonic mass for the scalar  $\sigma$  if the field  $gB_0$  acquires a vacuum expectation value [8, 9]. Moreover, when  $\langle gB_0 \rangle = m_H$ , the scalar field condenses.

To reach the condensate point, following Ref. [1], we consider a system with a uniform background of fermions:  $J_\mu \equiv \bar{\psi}\gamma_\mu\psi = J_0\delta_{\mu 0}$ . We assume that the fermions

---

<sup>2</sup>The conditions under which the other possible interactions in the Lagrangian (1) won't affect our conclusions were discussed in Ref. [1]

can be averaged over, and that their dynamics is insignificant. The equations of motion derived from (2) are:

$$-\partial^\mu F_{\mu\nu} = g^2 B_\nu \sigma^2 - g J_\nu, \quad \square \sigma = g^2 B_\mu^2 \sigma - m_H^2 \sigma. \quad (3)$$

The theory admits a static solution with constant  $B_0$ ,  $\sigma$ :

$$\langle gB_0 \rangle = m_H, \quad \langle \sigma \rangle = \sqrt{\frac{J_0}{m_H}}. \quad (4)$$

The quantity  $\langle gB_0 + \dot{\gamma} \rangle$  acts as a dynamically induced chemical potential for the fermions, implying  $\epsilon_F = \langle gB_0 + \dot{\gamma} \rangle$ , where  $\epsilon_F$  is the Fermi energy. This fixes the value of  $\dot{\gamma} \equiv \partial_0 \gamma$ . For the scalars, it is the quantity  $\langle gB_0 \rangle = m_H$  that acts as an effective chemical potential<sup>3</sup>.

The bulk of the condensate is electrically neutral due to the compensation between the fermion and scalar charge densities:  $gJ_0 - g^2 B_0 \sigma^2 = 0$ . However, a nonzero  $gB_0$  implies an uncompensated charge on a surface enclosing the condensate [1]. The spectrum of small perturbations above the condensate is composed of a scalar of mass  $m_s = 2m_H$ , and a photon that has acquired the mass  $m_g = g\sqrt{J_0/m_H}$  (see, Ref. [1] for details).

The purpose of the present work is to show that such objects, with the surface charge and condensate bulk, can be long-lived. For notational simplicity, from now on we will be dropping the brackets,  $\langle \cdot \rangle$ , denoting the condensates.

### 3 Surface-bulk connection

We now consider a spherically symmetric system of a finite radius  $R$  and look for a (meta)stable solution. We include the dynamics of the fermions in our considerations. The Hamiltonian derived from (2) is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= \mathcal{H}_\psi + \frac{1}{4} F_{ij}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \pi_j^2 + B_0 \left( \partial_j \pi_j + gJ_0 - \frac{1}{2} g^2 B_0 \sigma^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} P_\sigma^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} (\partial_j \sigma)^2 + \frac{1}{2} g^2 B_j^2 \sigma^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_H^2 \sigma^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $\pi_j \equiv -F_{0j}$ ,  $P_\sigma = \dot{\sigma}$ , are the canonical momenta for the  $B_j$  and  $\sigma$  fields respectively, and  $\mathcal{H}_\psi \equiv i\bar{\psi}\gamma_j(\partial_j + igB_j + i\partial_j\gamma)\psi + m_J\bar{\psi}\psi$ , denotes the Hamiltonian density of the fermions.

As mentioned above, a nonzero  $gB_0 + \dot{\gamma}$  acts as an effective chemical potential for the fermions in the ball:

$$\epsilon_F \equiv \sqrt{(3\pi^2 J_0)^{2/3} + m_J^2} = gB_0 + \dot{\gamma}. \quad (6)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>One could have also introduced a chemical potential  $\mu_s$  for the scalars by adding the terms  $+\mu_s(-gB_0\sigma^2) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_s^2\sigma^2$  to (2). However, we can absorb these terms into a redefinition of  $B_0$ :  $B'_0 = B_0 - \frac{1}{g}\mu_s$ .

This defines the value of  $\dot{\gamma}$  in the bulk to be  $\dot{\gamma} = \epsilon_F - m_H$ . It can be put to zero outside of the ball.

As  $\dot{B}_0$  does not appear in the Lagrangian, the equation of motion for  $B_0$  gives us Gauss's law:

$$-\nabla^2 B_0 + \partial_0 \partial_j B_j = gJ_0 - g^2 B_0 \sigma^2 \equiv gJ_0^{\text{total}}. \quad (7)$$

Equation (7) has two important implications for the value of the fields in the bulk. The first is that in the bulk of the condensate where gradients are zero we have

$$gB_0 = \frac{J_0}{\sigma^2}. \quad (8)$$

Secondly, equation (7) determines the value of  $B_0$  in the bulk in terms of the conserved charge  $Q$  and the radius  $R$ . Taking  $\partial_0 \partial_j B_j$  to be zero everywhere, we solve equation (7):

$$B_0(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{gQ}{4\pi R} & \text{for } r \leq R, \\ \frac{gQ}{4\pi r} & \text{for } r > R, \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where  $Q \equiv \int d^3r J_0^{\text{total}}$ . We have set  $B_0 \rightarrow 0$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  as  $B_0$  is a gauge invariant variable and a nonzero  $B_0$  in the vacuum (i.e., far away from the condensate ball) would imply a different spectrum of the theory - a different mass for  $\sigma$  and Lorentz violating interactions of  $\sigma$  with the gauge field.

Therefore, we can use (7) to integrate out  $B_0$  from the Hamiltonian. Equation (6) becomes

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_\psi + \frac{1}{2} \frac{J_s^2}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{2} m_H^2 \sigma^2 + \mathcal{H}_{\text{surface}}, \quad (10)$$

where  $J_s = J_0 + g^{-1} \partial_j \pi_j$  is the scalar charge density, and  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{surface}}$  refers to all surface and gradient terms. In order not to select a preferred direction we set  $B_j, J_j$  to zero.

At this point we have used every equation of motion except for the equation of  $\sigma$ . For fixed scalar charge density  $J_s$ , the second and third terms on the r.h.s. of (10) could be thought of as an effective potential for the  $\sigma$  field, in the regime where the field does not change significantly. In that regime, the above potential has a minimum. We vary (10) with respect to  $\sigma$ , ignoring all the gradient terms, and find,  $\sigma = (J_0/m_H)^{1/2}$ . Using this in equation (8) we find that  $gB_0 = m_H$ . This is consistent with the solution of the previous section. Moreover, from (9) we deduce

$$R_c = \frac{\alpha_g Q}{m_H}, \quad \text{where } \alpha_g \equiv \frac{g^2}{4\pi}. \quad (11)$$

Thus, for a given  $Q$ , the radius of a ball of condensate is completely determined.

As a complementary check, we wish to show that the radius (11) minimizes the energy of the condensate ball as a function of  $R$ . The above formalism does not allow us to do so as  $R$  is fixed on the solution. Instead we relax our enforcement of the equation for  $\sigma$ , and vary w.r.t.  $R$ . Our logic is as follows: In the bulk  $B_0 = gQ/(4\pi R)$ . In addition to the charge  $Q$  being conserved, the total number of scalars  $N_s$  is also conserved:

$$N_s = \int d^3r g B_0 \sigma^2. \quad (12)$$

Then, from the scaling of  $B_0$  in the bulk,  $B_0 = gQ/(4\pi R)$ , it follows that  $\int d^3r \sigma^2 \sim R$ . Using these scalings in (10), the total energy dependence on  $R$  can be read from:

$$E = E_\psi + \frac{N}{2} \left( \frac{\alpha_g Q}{R} + \frac{m_H^2 R}{\alpha_g Q} \right) + E_{\text{surface}}, \quad (13)$$

where  $N \equiv \int d^3r J_0$  is the total number of fermions and  $N \simeq N_s$  as long as  $Q \ll N$ . The first term on the r.h.s. of equation (13) is the energy of the free fermions which, due to their degeneracy pressure, tend to expand the ball of condensate. The first term in the parenthesis comes from the scalar-gauge and fermion-gauge field interaction terms and also provides positive pressure. The term  $E_{\text{surface}}$  contains the non-relativistic part of the energy due to the surface charge, which works to expand the ball as well. It is only the second term in the parenthesis in (13), however, that provides the negative pressure and wants to contract the ball. Because this term contains  $\sim \int d^3r \sigma^2$ , it scales as  $R$ . We can use this negative pressure to stabilize the ball against the other terms.

We chose to consider solutions where the repulsive term  $\sim NQ/R$ , and the attractive negative pressure term  $\sim m_H^2 NR/Q$  are dominant<sup>4</sup>. In the limit that the fermions are relativistic, this is true when  $\alpha_g Q \gg N^{1/3}$ . For non-relativistic fermions, the bound is  $\alpha_g Q \gg (m_H/m_J)^{1/2} N^{1/3}$ . In either case, the critical radius is in agreement with (11), obtained previously from the variation w.r.t.  $\sigma$ .

The exact static solution of the equations of motion (3) is hard to obtain. In Ref. [1] we found approximate solutions in the interior and exterior of the condensate ball. For generic values of the parameters, the obtained solutions are valid everywhere except near the boundary of the ball, where our approximations break down<sup>5</sup>. Nevertheless, we matched the asymptotic solutions and their derivatives across the surface, demonstrating that with the asymptotic boundary conditions that we used, there are enough integration constants for the matching to be possible. The matching gave a relation between the critical radius  $R_c$  and charge  $gQ$  which closely approximates (11).

---

<sup>4</sup> We could also stabilize the negative pressure term against any other positive pressure terms in the above expression, e.g., against the fermion degeneracy pressure term. However, the solutions obtained by stabilizing against  $E_\psi$  or  $E_{\text{surface}}$  do not recover the infinite volume solution in the bulk of the ball. Thus, these solutions, although they may well exist, we have no analytic tools to our disposal to study them.

<sup>5</sup> The solutions are valid near the boundary as well only for particular values of the parameters.

## 4 Energetics

In order to determine whether the condensate ball can be absolutely stable or not we should compare its energy with the total energy of  $N$  neutral atoms formed by the scalars and fermions, and  $Q$  free fermions. This energy is:

$$E_a = (m_H - E_b)N + m_J Q, \quad (14)$$

where the binding energy is determined by  $E_b \simeq (\alpha_g)^2 m_J m_H / 2(m_J + m_H)$ .

The energy of the condensate ball can be calculated from (13) using (11):

$$E_c = E_\psi + m_H N + E_{\text{surface}}. \quad (15)$$

The latter would always exceed (14). However, even when  $E_c$  is greater than  $E_a$  the condensate ball could be a long-lived as it represents a local minimum of the energy functional. In this case, it will be classically stable, however, would be able to decay through tunneling. To estimate the probability of the tunneling one could use an analog quantum mechanical decay rate,

$$\Gamma \propto \exp\left(-\int_{R_c}^{R_b} dR (E(R) - E_c)\right), \quad (16)$$

where  $R_b$  is an initial radius of the ball after the tunneling. The ball could tunnel, while radiating away energy, directly into the size  $R_b \sim R_a \equiv N^{1/3}/(\alpha_g m_J)$  that would allow the state of  $N$  neutral atoms and  $Q$  free charges to form. However,  $R_a$  is much greater than  $R_c$  according to our construction, and such a process would be highly suppressed. Instead, the ball could first tunnel into a state of a radius smaller than  $R_a$  but greater than  $R_c$ , and then expand toward the state with neutral atoms. An estimate of the tunneling rate for the latter process could be obtained by assuming that  $(R_b - R_c) \sim R_c$  and  $(E(R_b) - E_c) \sim E_c$ , this being justified when  $m_H$  is the heaviest mass scale. Then, using the expressions  $E_c \simeq m_H N$  and  $R_c = \alpha_g Q / m_H$ , we get the following scaling for the decay rate,  $\Gamma \propto \exp(-k \alpha_g N Q)$ , where  $k$  is some undetermined positive numerical coefficient, presumably of the order  $k \sim (0.01 - 100)$ . For large values of  $N$  and  $Q$  the decay is strongly suppressed. Note that in this case the global and local vacua are not described by the same low-energy degrees of freedom. The processes in which small regions of the true vacuum (i.e., the atomic phase, that necessarily has a lower particle number density) could materialize within the ball, would create local overdensities in the ball because of the particle number conservation, and would be exponentially suppressed at low temperatures.

There are other channels through which a ball of condensate could decay. We start with the decay through the evaporation of surface charges or, similarly, the accretion of nearby charges, if the latter are present. On the solution the ratio  $Q/R$  is fixed,  $Q/R = m_H/\alpha_g$ . A spontaneous emission of a single charge from the surface would result in a new radius  $R' = (Q - 1)R/Q$ , with reduced surface energy.

However, this would lead the growth of the bulk Fermi degeneracy energy. To study systematically whether the emission process is favorable or not, we fix the ratio  $Q/R$  and vary the energy with respect to  $R$ . Including the energy of the fermions and of the surface charge, the total energy (in the relativistic approximation for the fermions) is

$$E = \frac{3}{4} \left( \frac{9\pi}{4} \right)^{1/3} \frac{N^{4/3}}{R} + \frac{m_H^2}{\alpha_g} R + m_H N. \quad (17)$$

We have ignored the gradient of  $\sigma$  in the bulk and near the surface, which in any event are smaller than  $\sim N/R$ , and, hence negligible.

Varying with respect to  $R$  gives  $R_{\text{optimal}} \propto \alpha_g^{1/2} N^{2/3} / m_H$ . Since emitting a charge decreases  $R$ , we want  $R_c < R_{\text{optimal}}$  in order for the condensate ball to be stable with respect to emission. This implies that  $\alpha_g Q \lesssim \alpha_g^{1/2} N^{2/3}$ . Thus our solution is valid as long as

$$1 \ll N^{1/3} \lesssim \alpha_g Q \lesssim \alpha_g^{1/2} N^{2/3}. \quad (18)$$

For  $Q > \alpha_g^{1/2} N^{2/3}$  the condensate ball will emit charges until  $R_c = R_{\text{optimal}}$ . If other charges are present nearby, it is possible for the condensate ball to accrete charge until the stable radius is reached<sup>6</sup>.

The above results imply that for (18) there is a local attraction of like charges near the surface of the ball. This is a consequence of a known effect, that the relativistic correction, determined by minus the potential square, is attractive for all charges, and becomes dominant for strong fields at short distances.

Another potential decay channel is through Schwinger pair-creation of the fermions (we assume that the fermions are lighter than the scalars in our case) or other light charged particles, due to the electric field near the surface of the ball. The standard textbook formula for the pair-creation in a constant electric field is not applicable here. However, one can estimate the pair-creation rate of a particle of mass  $m < m_H$  by the quasi-classical exponent,  $\mathcal{W} \propto \exp(-S)$ , where

$$S = \int_{R_0}^{\infty} |p(R)| dR, \quad |p(R)| \equiv \sqrt{(2m\alpha_g Q/R) - (\alpha_g^2 Q^2/R^2)}, \quad (19)$$

and  $R_0 \equiv \alpha_g Q / 2m$ . The exponential factor scales as  $S \propto \alpha_g Q$ . Therefore, for  $Q \gg 1/\alpha_g$  the pair-creation is suppressed. This condition is already satisfied as long as (18) remains valid. This is consistent, since there is no spontaneous emission of even a single charge, as argued in the previous paragraph.

---

<sup>6</sup>In the limit that the fermions are nonrelativistic the condition for stability (18) becomes  $Q \lesssim \left( \frac{m_H}{m_f} \right)^{1/3} N^{5/9}$ .



## 5 Metanuclei from electrons and helium nuclei

The results of the previous sections can be adopted to the system of charged helium-4 nuclei  $He^{++}$ , and electrons  $e^-$  (the scalar charge  $g_\phi$  is twice as large as the fermion charge  $g_\psi$ ). We consider such a system below the nuclear but above the atomic density. The former condition sets  $Q \gg \frac{m_H}{200 \text{ MeV}} \frac{N^{1/3}}{\alpha_{\text{em}}}$ , and the latter gives  $Q \ll \frac{1}{\alpha_{\text{em}}} \frac{m_H}{m_J} N^{1/3}$ .

Taking  $m_H = 4 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $m_J = 0.5 \text{ MeV}$ , we find that the system with  $N \sim (10^{12} - 10^{15})$  and  $Q \sim (10^8 - 10^9)$  satisfies all the constraints discussed in the previous sections <sup>7</sup>. The size of the condensate ball in this case is  $R_c \sim (10^5 - 10^6) \text{ fm}$ , with the average inter-particle separation  $\sim (10 - 100) \text{ fm}$ , the number-density of particles  $\sim (2 - 20 \text{ MeV})^3$ , and the total energy  $E_c \sim 4 \cdot (10^{12} - 10^{15}) \text{ GeV}$ . These objects have a huge energy excess – almost 40 MeV per  $He^{++}$  particle, in the simplest case. The excess energy per particle scales as  $\sim m_H \frac{N^{1/3}}{\alpha_{\text{em}} Q}$ . There'll be huge energy liberated in decays of such metanuclei.

As long as temperature of the interior of the metanuclei is small enough that the  $He^{++}$  de Broglie wavelengths still overlap, the above described properties are expected to remain valid. For instance, for the number density  $\sim (10 \text{ MeV})^3$ , at temperatures below  $10^{-2} \text{ MeV} \sim 10^8 \text{ K}$ , the above described properties should be expected to hold. Such metanuclei may have formed after the nucleosynthesis (temperatures  $\lesssim 0.1 \text{ MeV}$ ) and before the recombination (temperatures  $\gtrsim 0.1 \text{ eV}$ ), if there were isolated dense enough regions of space with huge charge excess. They would represent a new state of matter. One should expect, though, that their formation and survival probability in the Universe to be rather low.

Similar condensate balls can be “made of” other scalars and fermions. Some examples are: (i) The scalars are  $He^{++}$  nuclei and fermions are anti-protons; (ii) The scalars are condensed composite states such as Cooper pairs, or charged pions  $\pi^\pm$  and fermions are anti-protons/protons or electrons/positrons; (iii) In supersymmetric models the role of the scalars could be played by squarks or sleptons. The helium-4 nuclei have an advantage that they are stable states. All the particles that can decay, such as the pions, squarks and sleptons, should be captured/produced in the condensate before they could decay.

The survival probability of some of the metanuclei would increase if they could form neutral meta-atoms by dressing up with electron/positrons on their quantized atomic shells.

*Acknowledgments.* We'd like to thank Savas Dimopoulos, Lance Dixon, Misha Shifman, Matt Kleban, and especially, Andrei Gruzinov for valuable comments. The work of GG is supported by NASA grant NNGG05GH34G. RAR is supported by James Arthur graduate fellowship.

---

<sup>7</sup>There are other allowed possibilities for  $N$  and  $Q$ . We choose the above numbers for simplicity.

## References

- [1] G. Gabadadze and R. A. Rosen, arXiv:0706.2304 [hep-th]; Phys Lett. **B** 658 (2008), 266.
- [2] G. Rosen J. Math. Phys. **9** (1968) 996.
- [3] R. Friedberg, T. D. Lee and A. Sirlin, Nucl. Phys. B **115**, 1 (1976). *ibid.* B **115**, 32 (1976)
- [4] S. R. Coleman, Nucl. Phys. B **262**, 263 (1985) [Err-ibid. B **269**, 744 (1986)].
- [5] A. Kusenko, Phys. Lett. B **404**, 285 (1997) [arXiv:hep-th/9704073].
- [6] K. M. Lee, J. A. Stein-Schabes, R. Watkins and L. M. Widrow, Phys. Rev. D **39**, 1665 (1989).
- [7] K. N. Anagnostopoulos, M. Axenides, E. G. Floratos and N. Tetradis, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 125006 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0109080].
- [8] A. D. Linde, Phys. Rev. D **14**, 3345 (1976).
- [9] J. I. Kapusta, Phys. Rev. D **24** (1981) 426.