

Brany cosmology in the Horava-Witten heterotic M-Theory on S^1/Z_2

Qiang Wu* and Anzhong Wang†

GCAP-CASPER, Physics Department, Baylor University, Waco, TX 76798-7316

(Dated: February 6, 2020)

The radion stability and radion mass are calculated in the setup of Lucak *et al* in the framework of the HW heterotic M-Theory on S^1/Z_2 , by using the Goldberger-Wise mechanism. It is shown explicitly that the radion is stable and the radion mass can be of order of TeV. It is also shown that the gravity is localized in the visible brane located at $Y = Y_c > 0$, and the corrections to the 4D Newtonian potential from the higher order of the gravitational KK modes are exponentially suppressed. Applying such a setup to cosmology, we find the general generalized Friedmann equations on each of the two branes. Fitting the model to the reduced Union compilation of 307 SNe supernova data and the BAO measurement from the SDSS data, we find the best fitting value of the matter, among others, is $\Omega_m^{(0)} = 0.22_{-0.03}^{+0.03}$. With these best fitting values as the initial conditions, we numerically integrate the field equations, and find that the late transient acceleration of the universe is a generic feature of the HW heterotic M Theory on S^1/Z_2 .

PACS numbers: 98.80.Cq,11.25.Mj,11.25.Y6

Introduction: Recent observations of supernova (SN) Ia reveal the striking discovery that our universe has lately been in its accelerated expansion phase [1]. Cross checks from the cosmic microwave background radiation (CMB) and large scale structure all confirm it [2, 3]. While the late cosmic acceleration of the universe is now well established, the underlying physics remains a complete mystery [4]. Since the precise nature and origin of the acceleration have profound implications, understanding them is one of the biggest challenges of modern cosmology. As the Dark Energy Task Force (DETF) stated [5]: “Most experts believe that nothing short of a revolution in our understanding of fundamental physics will be required to achieve a full understanding of the cosmic acceleration.”

A cosmological constant (CC) is well consistent with all observations carried out so far [1, 2, 3], and could represent one of the simplest resolutions of the crisis. However, considerations of its origin lead to other severe problems: (a) Its theoretical expectation values exceed observational limits by 120 orders of magnitude [6]. Even if such high energies are suppressed by supersymmetry, the electroweak corrections are still 56 orders higher. (b) Its corresponding energy density is comparable with that of matter only recently. Otherwise, galaxies would have not been formed. (c) Once the CC dominates the evolution of the universe, it dominates forever. An eternally accelerating universe seems not consistent with string/M-Theory, because it is endowed with a cosmological event horizon that prevents the construction of a conventional S-matrix describing particle interaction [7]. In view of the above, dramatically different models have been proposed, including quintessence [8], the DGP brane [9], and $f(R)$ models [10]. For details, see [4]. However, it is fair to say that so far no convincing model has been constructed.

Since the cosmological problem is intimately related to quantum gravity, its solution is expected to come from quantum gravity, too. At the present, string/M-Theory is our best bet for a consistent quantum theory of gravity, so it is reasonable to ask what string/M-Theory has to say about the cosmological constant. In the string landscape [11], it is expected there are many different vacua with different local cosmological constants [12]. Using the anthropic principle, one may select the low energy vacuum in which we can exist. However, many theorists still hope to explain the problem without invoking the existence of ourselves.

Recently, we [13] studied the CC problem and the late transient acceleration of the universe in the framework of the Horava-Witten (HW) heterotic M-Theory on S^1/Z_2 [14]. Using the ADD mechanism of large extra dimensions [15], we showed that the effective CC on each of the two branes can be easily lowered to its current observational value. The domination of this term is only temporary. Due to the interaction of the bulk and the brane, the universe will be in its decelerating expansion phase again, whereby the problems [7] connected with a far future de Sitter universe are resolved. Such studied were further generalized to string theory [16], and showed that the same mechanism is also viable in all of the five versions of string theory.

In this Letter, our goals are three-fold. First, we show that the radion is stable in the setup of Lukas *te al* (LOSW) [17] of the HW heterotic M-Theory on S^1/Z_2 , by using the GW mechanism [18]. We also calculate the radion mass and show that it can be of order of TeV, which places the theory directly under the current exploration of LHC. Second, we show the gravity is localized in the visible brane located at $Y = Y_c > 0$, in contrast to the RS1 model where the gravity is localized in the invisible (Planck) brane [19]. In addition, we also show that the corrections to the Newtonian potential from the higher order KK modes are exponentially suppressed. Third, applying such a setup to cosmology, we find the gen-

*Electronic address: qiang.wu@baylor.edu

†Electronic address: anzhong.wang@baylor.edu

eral generalized Friedmann equations on each of the two branes. Fitting the model to the reduced Union compilation of 307 SNe supernova data [20] and the BAO measurement from the SDSS data [21], we find the best fitting value of each matter component. In particular, the matter is $\Omega_m^{(0)} = 0.22_{-0.03}^{+0.03}$. With these best fitting values as the initial conditions, we numerically integrate the field equations, and find the future evolution of the matter components and acceleration, as shown in Fig. 1, from which it can be seen that the late transient acceleration of the universe is a generic feature of the HW heterotic M Theory on S^1/Z_2 . It should be noted that brane worlds have intensively been studied [22]. However, to our knowledge, such studies in the LOSW setup have not been carried out in details [23].

The Model: The 11D spacetime of the Horava-Witten (HW) M-Theory is described by the metric [17], $ds_{11}^2 = V^{-2/3} g_{ab} dx^a dx^b - V^{1/3} \Omega_{ij} dz^i dz^j$, where $ds_{CY}^2 \equiv \Omega_{ij} dz^i dz^j$ denotes the Calabi-Yau (CY) 3-fold, and $V(x^a)$ is its volume modulus that measures the deformation of the CY space, with $a = 0, \dots, 4$. By integrating the 11D action over the CY 3-fold, the 5D effective action of the HW theory is given by [13, 17, 23]

$$S_5 = - (4\kappa_5^2)^{-1} \int_{M_5} \sqrt{g} \left(2R[g] - (\nabla\phi)^2 + 12\alpha^2 e^{-2\phi} \right) - \sum_{I=1}^2 \epsilon_I 6\alpha \kappa_5^{-2} \int_{M_4^{(I)}} \sqrt{-g^{(I)}} e^{-\phi}, \quad (1)$$

where $I = 1, 2$, $\epsilon_1 = -\epsilon_2 = 1$, ∇ denotes the covariant derivative with respect to g_{ab} , $\phi \equiv \ln(V)$, and $\kappa_5^2 \equiv \kappa_{11}^2/v_{CY}$, with $v_{CY} \equiv \int_X \sqrt{\Omega}$. $g^{(I)}$'s are the reduced metrics on the two boundaries $M_4^{(I)}$. Note that in this paper we shall use some notations slightly different from the ones used in [13].

LOSW showed that the 5D static metric with a 4D Poincaré symmetry exists and can be written as [17],

$$ds_5^2 = e^{-2A(Y)} \eta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu - dY^2, \quad (2)$$

where $A(Y) = -(1/6) \ln[6(|Y| + Y_0)/(5L)]$, $\phi(Y) = -6A(Y) + \ln(5\alpha L)$, with L and Y_0 are positive constants. The two orbifold branes are located, respectively, at $Y_2 = 0$ and $Y_1 = Y_c > 0$.

The radion stability: In the studies of orbifold branes, an important issue is the radion stability [22]. To address this problem, let us consider a massive scalar field Φ with the actions [18], $S_b = \int d^4x \int_0^{Y_c} dY \sqrt{-g_5} \left((\nabla\Phi)^2 - M^2\Phi^2 \right)$, and $S_I = -\alpha_I \int_{M_4^{(I)}} d^4x \sqrt{-g_4^{(I)}} (\Phi^2 - v_I^2)^2$, where α_I and v_I are real constants. For the sake of simplicity, we shall not consider the backreaction of this field. In RS1 model, it was shown that the main conclusions remain the same, even after such effects were taken into account [24]. We expect that similar conclusion holds here, too. Then, in the background of Eq.(2), the

massive scalar field Φ satisfies the Klein-Gordon equation $\Phi'' - 4A'\Phi' - M^2\Phi = 0$, ($0 < Y < Y_c$), with the boundary conditions, $\Phi'(Y_I) = -\epsilon_I \alpha_I \Phi_I (\Phi_I^2 - v_I^2)$, where $\Phi_I \equiv \Phi(Y_I)$, $\Phi'(Y_c) \equiv \lim_{Y \rightarrow Y_c^-} d\Phi(Y)/dY$, and $\Phi'(0) \equiv \lim_{Y \rightarrow 0^+} d\Phi(Y)/dY$. The general solution is given by $\Phi = (z/M)^{1/6} (aI_{1/6}(z) + bK_{1/6}(z))$, where $z \equiv M(Y + Y_0)$, $I_\nu(z)$ and $K_\nu(z)$ denote the modified Bessel functions, and a and b are the integration constants, which are uniquely determined by the boundary conditions. Inserting the above solution back to the actions, and then integrating them with respect to Y , we obtain the effective potential for the radion Y_c , given by $V_\Phi(Y_c) = -\sum_{I=1}^2 \alpha_I v_I^2 (\Phi_I^2 - v_I^2) e^{-4A(Y_I)}$. In the limit of large α_I 's [18], the boundary conditions tell us that there are solutions only when $\Phi_2 = v_2$ and $\Phi_1 = v_1$. When $Y_0 \gg M^{-1}$, we have $z \gg 1$, $I_{1/6}(z) \simeq e^z/\sqrt{2\pi z}$ and $K_{1/6}(z) \simeq \sqrt{\pi/(2z)} e^{-z}$. In this limit the radion potential takes the form,

$$V_\Phi \simeq M \left(\frac{6Y_0}{5L} \right)^{2/3} \left((v_1^2 + v_2^2) \coth z_c - \frac{2v_1 v_2}{\sinh z_c} \right), \quad (3)$$

where $z_c \equiv MY_c$. Clearly, for any given L , Y_0 and v_I , V_Φ always has a minimal at $z_c = z_c^{min} \equiv |\ln(v_1/v_2)|$. Therefore, the radion is stable in the LOSW setup [17].

It should be noted that, in the RS1 setup [19], Y_c is required to be $Y_c \simeq 40$ in order to solve the hierarchy problem. However, in the current setup the problem can be solved by combining the ADD [15] and the RS1 warped factor mechanisms [19], so that such a requirement can be relaxed [16]. But, the radion does need to be stabilized so that the mass of the radion is of at least 10^{-4} eV [22]. To find the radion mass, let us consider the following perturbations [25], $ds_5^2 = e^{-2A(Y)+2F(x)} \eta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu - (1 + 2F(x))^2 dY^2$, for which we obtain $\delta S = \kappa_5^{-2} \int dY dx^4 \sqrt{g_5} \delta R_5 = -\frac{1}{2} \int d^4x (\nabla\varphi)^2$, where $\varphi = \sqrt{12f(1-2F)} e^{-F}$ and $f \equiv k_5^{-2} \int_0^{Y_c} e^{-2A} dY$. Then, we find $\varphi^2(Y_c) \simeq M_5^3 L \left([(Y_c + Y_0)/L]^{4/3} - (Y_0/L)^{4/3} \right)$. Hence, we obtain

$$m_\varphi^2 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 V_\Phi}{\partial \varphi^2} \Big|_{z_c^{min}} \simeq \frac{Y_0^{1/3} z_c^{min} (v_1 v_2)^4}{ML^{1/3} |v_1^2 - v_2^2|^3}, \quad (4)$$

for $MY_0 \gg 1$. Clearly, by properly choosing the free parameters, it is always possible to have $m_\varphi \simeq TeV$.

Localization of Gravity and 4D Effective Newtonian Potential: It is found convenient to study tensor perturbations in the conformal coordinates,

$$ds_5^2 = e^{2\sigma(y)} ((\eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}) dx^\mu dx^\nu - dy^2), \quad (5)$$

where $\sigma(y) = (1/5) \ln[(|y| + y_0)/L]$, $\phi(y) = (6/5) \ln[(|y| + y_0)/L + (5L\alpha)]$. Since such perturbations are not coupled with scalar ones [26], without loss of generality, we can set the perturbations of the scalar fields ϕ to zero, $\delta\phi = 0$. Then, choosing the RS1 gauge $h_\lambda^\lambda = 0 = \partial^\lambda h_{\mu\lambda}$, it can be shown that in the present case there is only one

independent equation, which can be written in the form of a supersymmetric quantum mechanics problem,

$$Q^\dagger \cdot Q\psi = m^2\psi, \quad (6)$$

where $h_{\mu\nu} \equiv e^{-3\sigma/2}\hat{h}_{\mu\nu}(x)\psi(y)$, $\square_4\hat{h}_{\mu\nu}(x) = m^2\hat{h}_{\mu\nu}(x)$, and $Q \equiv \nabla_y - 3\sigma'/2$, $Q^\dagger \equiv -\nabla_y - 3\sigma'/2$. To guarantee that the operator $Q^\dagger \cdot Q$ is Hermitian, we need to show that Eq.(6) has Hermitian boundary conditions [27],

$$\begin{aligned} \psi'_n(0)\psi_m(0) - \psi_n(0)\psi'_m(0) &= \psi'_n(y_c)\psi_m(y_c) \\ -\psi_n(y_c)\psi'_m(y_c), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

for any two solutions. Integration of Eq.(6) in the neighbourhood of $y = 0$ and $y = y_c$ yields, respectively, the conditions,

$$\psi'(y_c^-) = \frac{3\psi(y_c^-)}{10(y_c + y_0)}, \quad \psi'(0^+) = \frac{3\psi(0^+)}{10y_0}. \quad (8)$$

Clearly, any solution of Eq.(6) that satisfies the above boundary conditions also satisfies Eq.(6). That is, the operator $Q^\dagger \cdot Q$ is indeed a positive definite Hermitian operator. Then, all eigenvalues m_n^2 are non-negative, and their corresponding wave functions $\psi_n(y)$ are orthogonal to each other and form a complete basis.

The 4D gravity is given by the existence of the normalizable zero mode, for which the corresponding wavefunction is given by $\psi_0(y) = N_0((|y| + y_0)/L)^{3/10}$, which is increasing as y increases from 0 to y_c , where N_0 is a finite constant. Therefore, the gravity is indeed localized near the $y = y_c$ brane. Note that in the RS1 model $\psi_0(y)$ decreases as y increases, so that the gravity is localized in the Planck brane located at $y = 0$ [19].

In order to have localized 4D gravity, we require that the corrections to the Newtonian law from the non-zero modes of Eq.(6) be very small, so that they will not lead to contradiction with observations. It can be shown that Eq.(6) has the general solution $\psi = x^{1/2}(cJ_{1/5}(x) + dY_{1/5}(x))$, where $x \equiv m(y + y_0)$, $J_\nu(x)$ and $Y_\nu(x)$ denote the Bessel functions, with c and d being the integration constants. The boundary conditions (8) require the spectrum of the gravitational KK modes be discrete, and for $z_0 \gg 1$ can be well approximated by

$$m_n \simeq n\pi \left(\frac{l_{pl}}{y_c} \right) M_{pl}, \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots), \quad (9)$$

where $y_c/L \equiv (6(Y_c + Y_0)/(5L))^{5/6} - (6Y_0/(5L))^{5/6}$. For $y_c \simeq 10^{-19} m$, we find $m_1 \simeq TeV$.

To calculate the 4D effective Newtonian potential and its corrections, let us consider two point-like sources of masses M_1 and M_2 , located on the brane at $y = y_c$. Then, the discrete eigenfunction $\psi_n(x)$ of mass m_n has an Yukawa correction to the 4D gravitational potential between the two particles [28]

$$U(r) = G_4 \frac{M_1 M_2}{r} + \frac{M_1 M_2}{M_3^2 r} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-m_n r} |\psi_n(x_c)|^2. \quad (10)$$




FIG. 1: The evolution of Ω 's and a^{**} , where $\Omega_a = \Omega_a^{(0)}a^{-12}$, and $\Omega_\phi = \tau_\phi/\rho_{cr}$.

When $x_0 = m_n y_0 \gg 1$, we have $N_n \simeq \sqrt{\pi^2/(50x_c y_c)}$ and $\psi_n(x_c) \simeq \sqrt{2/y_c}$. Then, we can see that all terms except for the first one in Eq.(10) are exponentially suppressed, and have negligibly contributions to $U(r)$.

Cosmological Models: In the above, when we studied the radion stability and the 4D effective Newtonian potential, we assumed that the two orbifold branes are static. In the following, we shall relax this assumption and consider the two branes moving along the curves, $y_I = y_I(\tau_I)$, while the bulk are still described by the 5D metric (5). To study cosmology, we also add matter fields on each of the two branes [13],

$$S_{4,m}^{(I)} = \int_{M_4^{(I)}} \sqrt{-g^{(I)}} \left[\mathcal{L}_{4,m}^{(I)}(\phi, \chi) - g_k^{(I)} - V_4^{(I)}(\phi) \right], \quad (11)$$

where χ collectively denotes the SM fields localized on the branes, $V_4^{(I)}(\phi)$ and $g_k^{(I)}$ are, respectively, the potential of the scalar field and a coupling constant of the I-th brane. As to be shown below, $g_k^{(I)}$ is directly related to the four-dimensional Newtonian constant G_4 [29]. Clearly, these actions in general make the two branes no longer supersymmetric, although the bulk still is. On each of the two branes, the metric reduces to $ds_5^2|_{M_4^{(I)}} = d\tau_I^2 - a^2(\tau_I) d\Sigma_k^2$, where $\xi_{(I)}^\mu \equiv \{\tau_I, r, \theta, \varphi\}$, and τ_I denotes the proper time of the I-th brane. Then, on each of the two branes, the field equations have two-independent components,

$$\begin{aligned} H^2 &= \frac{8\pi G}{3} (\rho + \tau_\phi + \rho_\Lambda) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{25L^2 a^{12}} + \frac{2\pi G}{3\rho_\Lambda} (\rho + \tau_\phi)^2, \\ \frac{\ddot{a}}{a} &= -\frac{8\pi G}{3} \left(\frac{1}{2}\rho + \frac{3}{2}p - \tau_\phi - \rho_\Lambda \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{25L^2 a^{12}} - 6H^2 - \frac{2\pi G}{3\rho_\Lambda} [2\rho^2 \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

$$+3\rho p + \tau_\phi(\rho + 3p) - \tau_\phi^2], \quad (13)$$

where $\tau_\phi^{(I)} \equiv 6\epsilon_I \alpha \kappa_5^{-2} e^{-\phi} + V_4^{(I)}(\phi)$, and $\kappa_4^2 = g_k \kappa_5^4/6$, $\Lambda_4 = g_k^2 \kappa_5^4/12$. Note that in writing Eqs.(12) and (13) we had dropped the super indices “(I)” without causing any confusions.

Choosing the potentials as $\tau^{(I)}(\phi) = V_4^{(I,0)}(\phi^2 - \phi_I^2)^2$, it can be shown that the fitting parameters can be chosen as $\{\Omega_\Lambda, \Omega_m^{(0)}, \Omega_a^{(0)}, \phi_I\}$, where $\Omega_a^{(0)} \equiv -(25H_0^2 L^2)^{-1}$. Fitting the above model with the reduced Union compilation of 307 SNe supernova data [20] and BAO measurement from the SDSS data [21], we find that the best fitting is around $v \simeq 10$, for which we have $\Omega_m^{(0)} = 0.22_{-0.03}^{+0.03}$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.003_{-0.001}^{+0.001}$, and $\Omega_a^{(0)} = 0.000_{-0.0025}^{+0.0000}$ with $\chi^2 =$

383.1. With these best fitting values of Ω 's as our initial conditions, we evolution of the matter components, Ω 's and the acceleration $a^{**} \equiv (d^2 a/d(H_0 \tau)^2)$ are shown in Fig. 1.

All the above show that it is very promising to solve the CC problem and obtain a late cosmic transient acceleration of the universe in the LOSW setup [17] of the HW heterotic M-Theory on S^1/Z_2 [14]. It is extremely interesting to see how the hierarchy problem is solved in such a setup, due to the particular role of the constant g_k in Eq.(11) [29]. It is also very important to consider the couplings among the radion, the SM fields, and the gravitational KK modes, and other constraints on the model, such as those from the solar system.

-
- [1] A.G. Riess *et al.*, *Astron. J.* **116**, 1009 (1998); S. Perlmutter *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **517**, 565 (1999); P. Astier *et al.*, *Astron. & Astrophys.* **447**, 31 (2006); and M. Kowalski, *et al.*, arXiv:0804.4142.
- [2] C. L. Bennett *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **148**, 1 (2003); *ibid.*, **608**, 10 (2004); D. N. Spergel *et al.*, *ibid.*, **148**, 175 (2003); **170**, 377 (2007); and E. Komatsu, *et al.*, arXiv:0803.0547.
- [3] L. Verde *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, **335**, 432 (2002); E. Hawkins *et al.*, *ibid.*, **346**, 78 (2003); K. Abazajian *et al.*, *Astron. J.* **126**, 2081 (2003); **128**, 502 (2004); M. Tegmark *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 103501 (2004).
- [4] V. Sahni and A. A. Starobinsky, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **9**, 373 (2000); P.J.E. Peebles and B. Ratra, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 559 (2003); T. Padmanabhan, *Phys. Rep.* **380**, 235 (2003); V. Sahni, arXiv:astro-ph/0403324 (2004); E.J. Copeland, M. Sami, and S. Tsujikawa, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **15**, 1753 (2006); E. Linder, arXiv:0801.296; and J.A. Frieman, M.S. Turner, and D. Huterer, arXiv:0803.0982.
- [5] A. Albrecht, *et al.*, “*Report of the dark energy task force*,” arXiv:astro-ph/0609591.
- [6] S. Weinberg, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **61**, 1 (1989); and T. Padmanabhan, *Phys. Rept.* **380**, 235 (2003).
- [7] W. Fischler, *et al.*, *JHEP*, **07**, 003 (2001); J.M. Cline, *ibid.*, **08**, 035 (2001); E. Halyo, *ibid.*, **10**, 025 (2001); and S. Hellerman, *ibid.*, **06**, 003 (2003).
- [8] R. R. Caldwell, R. Dave and P. J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 1582 (1998); A. R. Liddle and R. J. Scherrer, *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 023509 (1999); and P. J. Steinhardt, L. M. Wang and I. Zlatev, *ibid.*, **59**, 123504 (1999).
- [9] G. R. Dvali, G. Gabadadze and M. Porrati, *Phys. Lett. B* **484**, 112 (2000); C. Deffayet, *ibid.*, **502**, 199 (2001); V. Sahni and Y. Shtanov, *JCAP*, **0311**, 014 (2003); K. Koyama, arXiv:0709.2399; and W. Fang, *et al.*, arXiv:0808.2208.
- [10] S. Capozziello, S. Carloni, and A. Troisi, arXiv:astro-ph/0303041; S.M. Carroll, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 043528 (2003); S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, *ibid.*, **68**, 123512 (2003); T. P. Sotiriou and V. Faraoni, arXiv:0805.1726; and references therein.
- [11] L. Susskind, arXiv:hep-th/0302219.
- [12] R. Bousso and J. Polchinski, *JHEP*, **006**, 006 (2000).
- [13] Y.-G. Gong, A. Wang, and Q. Wu, *Phys. Lett. B* **663**, 147 (2008).
- [14] H. Horava and E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys. B* **460**, 506 (1996); **475**, 94 (1996).
- [15] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. Dvali, *Phys. Lett. B* **429**, 263 (1998); *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 086004 (1999); and I. Antoniadis, *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.*, **B436**, 257 (1998).
- [16] A. Wang and N.O. Santos, *Phys. Lett. B* **669**, 127 (2008); arXiv:0808.2055; and Q. Wu, N.O. Santos, P. Vo, and A. Wang, *JCAP*, **09**, 004 (2008).
- [17] A. Lukas, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 086001 (1999); *Nucl. Phys. B* **552**, 246 (1999).
- [18] W.D. Goldberger and M.B. Wise, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 4922 (1999); *Phys. Lett. B* **475**, 275 (2000).
- [19] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 3370 (1999).
- [20] M.Kowalski *et al.*, arXiv: 0804.4142.
- [21] D.J.Eisenstein *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **633**, 560 (2005); and E.Komatsu *et al.*, arXiv: 0803.0547.
- [22] V.A. Rubakov, *Phys. Usp.* **44**, 871 (2001); R. Maartens, *Liv. Rev. Relativ.* **7** (2004); arXiv:astro-ph/0602415; C. Csaki, arXiv:hep-ph/0404096; P. Brax, C. van de Bruck and A. C. Davis, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **67**, 2183 (2004); V. Sahni, arXiv:astro-ph/0502032 (2005); R. Durrer, arXiv:hep-th/0507006 (2005); and A. Lue, *Phys. Rept.* **423**, 1 (2006).
- [23] K. Benakli, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **8**, 153 (1999); H.S. Reall, *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 103506 (1999); W. Chen, *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **732**, 118 (2006); and J.-L. Lehners, P. McFadden, and N. Turok, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 103510 (2007).
- [24] O. DeWolfe *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 046008 (2000).
- [25] C. Charmousis, R. Gregory and V.A. Rubakov, *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 067505 (2000).
- [26] J. Garriga and T. Tanaka, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 2778 (2000); T. Tanaka and X. Montes, *Nucl. Phys. B* **582**, 259 (2000).
- [27] C. Csaki, M.L. Graesser, and G.D. Kribs, *Phys. Rev. D* **63**, 065002 (2001).
- [28] C. Csaki *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **581**, 309 (2000); A. Brandhuber and K. Sfetsos, *JHEP*, **10**, 013 (1999).
- [29] J. Cline, C. Grojean, and G. Servant, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 4245 (1999); C. Csaki *et al.*, *Phys. Lett. B* **462**, 34 (1999).