

Cosmological Evolution of Universal Extra Dimensions

Torsten Bringmann, Martin Eriksson,^y and Michael Gustafsson^z

Department of Physics, AlbaNova, Stockholm University, SE - 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden

(Dated: March 21, 2003)

The lightest Kaluza-Klein particle appearing in models with universal extra dimensions has recently been proposed as a viable dark matter candidate when the extra dimensions are compactified on a scale of the order of 1 TeV. An underlying assumption of this proposal is that the size of the extra dimensions remains constant during the evolution of the universe. Here we investigate whether this is possible without introducing an explicit stabilization mechanism. By analysing Einstein's field equations for a $(3+n+1)$ -dimensional homogeneous, but in general anisotropic universe, we find that approximately static extra dimensions arise naturally during radiation domination. For matter domination however, there are no solutions to the field equations that allow static extra dimensions. In fact, there are not even solutions that reproduce the usual behaviour of the scale factor for ordinary three-dimensional space. We conclude that an explicit mechanism is needed in order to stabilize the extra dimensions and reproduce standard cosmology as we know it.

I. INTRODUCTION

Everyday experience seems to suggest that our world consists of four space-time dimensions. However, already at the beginning of the 20th century Nordstrom, Kaluza and Klein (KK) realized that this may in fact not be the case [1, 2, 3]. In the last few years there has again been a great interest in models with extra dimensions, most notably due to the influence of string (or M-) theory which in its usual formulation requires more than four dimensions (see e.g. [4]). In particular, this has led to a number of brane-world scenarios where all, or only some, of the gauge bosons are allowed to propagate in the extra dimensions while matter fields are restricted to $(3+1)$ -dimensional branes. For a review on different models with extra dimensions see for example [5] and references therein.

In this context, a specific model of so-called universal extra dimensions (UED) has recently been proposed by Appelquist et al. [6], in which all standard model fields are allowed to propagate in the extra dimensions. As usual, quantization of the extra-dimensional momentum leads to a tower of KK-states that appear as new massive particles in the effective four-dimensional theory. The existing constraints on electroweak observables translate into bounds on the compactification scale R which is related to the mass of the lowest excitations by $M \sim \frac{1}{R}$. For one or two UED these bounds are of the order of a few hundred GeV and thus within reach of the LHC or the Tevatron Run II [6, 7, 8].

The UED model is not only of great interest from the point of view of particle physics [9, 10, 11, 12], but it might also provide a solution to one of the most outstanding puzzles in modern cosmology – the nature of dark matter [13, 14]. In the UED scenario the lightest KK particle (LKP) is stable because of KK parity conservation and could therefore still be present today as a thermal relic. Furthermore, if it is also neutral and non-baryonic it has all the properties of a weakly interacting massive particle (WIMP), one of the most promising dark matter candidates (see [15] for a nice introduction to WIMP dark matter). According to [14], both the KK photon ($B^{(1)}$) and the KK neutrino could account for dark matter with $\Omega_M \approx 0.3$, as suggested by the current cosmological concordance model [16], if one assumes a compactification scale of about $R \sim 1 \text{ TeV}^{-1}$ size. Indirect and direct detection properties of such KK dark matter candidates are promising for next generation's detectors [17, 18, 19, 20]. In fact, the KK neutrino seems to be ruled out already by present data [17].

However, when considering the freeze-out process and the further cosmological evolution of thermally produced LKPs, the size of the extra dimensions has so far been assumed to stay constant (though no explicit stabilization mechanism has been given). As already noted in [14, 21], the resulting relic density today depends crucially on this assumption and it is therefore important to investigate whether it can be justified within the UED framework. Since the UED may be relatively large (in fact, they must be if the LKPs are not to overclose the universe), their evolution should be governed by Einstein's field equations. The aim of this work is therefore to carefully study the time evolution of the universe as described by an appropriate extension of the usual Friedmann equations that results from the field

^Electronic address: trom s@physto.se

^yElectronic address: m ate@physto.se

^zElectronic address: m ichael@physto.se

which describes a homogeneous but in general anisotropic perfect fluid in its rest frame. The pressure in ordinary space (UED) is related to the energy density by an equation-of-state $p_a = w_a \rho$ ($p_b = w_b \rho$).

The non-zero components of the field equations (4) are then given by

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + \frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} + n \frac{\dot{a}\dot{b}}{ab} + \frac{n(n-1)}{6} \frac{\dot{b}^2}{b^2} + \frac{k_b}{b^2} = \frac{\rho}{3}; \quad (9a)$$

$$2\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + \frac{\ddot{b}}{b} + \frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} + \frac{\dot{b}^2}{b^2} + n \frac{\dot{b}}{b} + 2n \frac{\dot{a}\dot{b}}{ab} + \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \frac{\dot{b}^2}{b^2} + \frac{k_b}{b^2} = 2w_a \rho; \quad (9b)$$

$$3\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + 3\frac{\ddot{b}}{b} + 3\frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} + 3\frac{\dot{b}^2}{b^2} + (n-1)\frac{\dot{b}}{b} + 3(n-1)\frac{\dot{a}\dot{b}}{ab} + \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2} \frac{\dot{b}^2}{b^2} + \frac{k_b}{b^2} = 2w_b \rho; \quad (9c)$$

where a dot denotes differentiation with respect to cosmic time t . From conservation of energy $T^A_{0;A} = 0$ we find furthermore

$$\dot{\rho} = -3(1+w_a)\frac{\dot{a}}{a} - n(1+w_b)\frac{\dot{b}}{b}. \quad (10)$$

For constant equations-of-state this can be integrated to give

$$\rho = \rho_i \frac{a_i^{3(1+w_a)}}{a^3} \frac{b_i^{n(1+w_b)}}{b^n}. \quad (11)$$

We will use a subscript i to indicate arbitrary initial values throughout.

B. On energy density and pressure

The energy density and pressure appearing in the above equations are not the usual three-dimensional quantities but their higher dimensional analogs. Pressure in some direction X^A is conventionally defined as the momentum flux through hypersurfaces of constant X^A . This can be expressed as:

$$p_A = \frac{k_A^2}{E} \int g \frac{k_A^2}{E} f(k; \mathbf{x}; t) d^{3+n}k; \quad (12)$$

where k_A is the momentum in direction X^A , g is the statistical weight and $f(k; \mathbf{x}; t)$ gives the phase space probability distribution. Isotropy in our model means that $p_a = \frac{k_1^2}{E} = \frac{k_2^2}{E} = \frac{k_3^2}{E}$ and $p_b = \frac{k_4^2}{E} = \dots = \frac{k_{n+3}^2}{E}$. Therefore we find

$$3p_a + np_b = \frac{m^2}{E}; \quad (13)$$

where $E = \hbar \epsilon$ and m is the mass of the particles producing the pressure. In the case of different particle species one has to sum over all of them in Eq. (12) and the mass appearing in Eq. (13) can then be interpreted as the effective mass of all particles. For highly relativistic particles, Eq. (13) reduces to

$$3w_a + nw_b = 1; \quad (14)$$

Setting $w_a = w_b$ (corresponding to a completely isotropic $(3+n+1)$ -dimensional universe) would then result in the equation of state

$$p = \frac{\rho}{3+n}; \quad (15)$$

As expected, for $n = 0$ we find the well-known relation for a relativistic gas in $(3+1)$ dimensions.

How can we recover standard cosmology with this setup? Let us first consider the case of highly relativistic particles and static, compact extra dimensions. Eqs. (9a) and (9b) are then equivalent to the ordinary Friedmann equations with three-dimensional energy density $\rho^{(3)}$, pressure $p^{(3)}$ and an effective cosmological constant ρ_e given by

$$\rho^{(3)} = V_{(n)} \dot{a}^{-3(1+w_a)}; \quad (16a)$$

$$p^{(3)} = w_a \rho^{(3)}; \quad (16b)$$

$$\rho_e = \frac{n(n-1)k_b}{2b^2}; \quad (16c)$$

Moreover, from Eq. (11) we then find the standard cosmological evolution of $\rho^{(3)} / a^{3(1+w_a)}$. For vanishing extra-dimensional curvature, all we need in order to recover the familiar case of (3+1)-dimensional radiation domination is to set $w_a = 1/3$. However, this forces us to allow for different pressures in ordinary space and the UED, since according to Eq. (14) w_b must be close to zero for $w_a = 1/3$. That is, the extra-dimensional pressure (and momentum) must be negligible in order to reproduce standard cosmology for radiation domination in 3D.

We also note that if LKPs do form a substantial part of the dark matter, then from a (3+n+1)-dimensional point of view (ignoring a possible epoch of vacuum energy domination) the universe is always dominated by relativistic particles. This is because any standard model particle with extra-dimensional momentum is automatically relativistic since $m \leq \frac{1}{R} \approx 1 \text{ TeV}$. Therefore, Eq. (14) is always valid in our model. Of course, we still want $w_a = 0$ in order to describe what looks like a 3D matter dominated universe, so we have to set

$$w_b = \frac{1}{n}; \quad (17)$$

in that case.

On the other hand, for a time-dependent scale factor b , Eqs. (9a) and (9b) can still be cast in the standard cosmological form by absorbing all terms containing factors of b and its derivatives into an effective three-dimensional energy density and pressure¹:

$$\rho_e^{(3)} = \frac{M_{P,1}^2}{8} \left[2 \frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} + 3n \frac{\dot{a}\dot{b}}{ab} + \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \frac{\dot{b}^2}{b^2} + \frac{k_b}{b^2} \right]; \quad (18a)$$

$$p_e^{(3)} = w_e \rho_e^{(3)} = \frac{M_{P,1}^2}{8} \left[2w_a + n \frac{\dot{b}}{b} + 2n \frac{\dot{a}\dot{b}}{ab} + \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \frac{\dot{b}^2}{b^2} + \frac{k_b}{b^2} \right]; \quad (18b)$$

Note however that the actual three-dimensional energy density does not evolve in the standard manner:

$$\rho^{(3)} = V_{(n)} / a^{3(1+w_a)} b^{nw_b}; \quad (19)$$

and there is no reason to expect that $\rho_e^{(3)}$ would either, if we at the same time want to keep the standard behaviour of a . Finally, an era of effective radiation (matter) domination corresponding to a \dot{a}^2 / a^2 (\dot{a}^2 / a^2) and $w_e = 1/3$ ($w_e = 0$) need not correspond to actual radiation (matter) domination, i.e. $w_a = w_b$ ($w_b = w_a$).

Finally, we would like to mention that according to Eq. (6), one expects the gravitational coupling constant $M_{P,1}^2$ to vary with a time-dependent $V_{(n)} \dot{b}$. Since in the UED model all particles are allowed to propagate in all dimensions, a similar case can be made for other interactions. Therefore, any non-static solution for b must obey the tight observational bounds on the allowed cosmological variation of the gravitational and electromagnetic coupling constants (see for example [33, 34, 35] and references therein).

III. SOLUTIONS WITH STATIC EXTRA DIMENSIONS

Static extra dimensions is the only case considered so far in the UED context and we saw above that there may be severe problems reproducing standard cosmology otherwise. Let us therefore study whether the field equations (9)

¹ For an alternative definition of the effective pressure see [32].

admit static solutions for b . Taking the difference of two times Eq. (9c) and three times the sum of Eqs. (9a) and (9b) gives

$$\frac{\dot{b}}{b} + 3\frac{\dot{a}\dot{b}}{ab} + (n-1)\frac{\ddot{b}}{b} + (n-1)\frac{k_b}{b^2} + \frac{3w_a - 2w_b}{n+2} \frac{1}{b^2} = 0 : \quad (20)$$

From this we can immediately read off a necessary condition for exactly static extra dimensions:

$$(n+2)(n-1)\frac{k_b}{b^2} = (1-3w_a+2w_b) \frac{1}{b^2} : \quad (21)$$

If the extra dimensions are flat (for $n=1$, the curvature is automatically zero), this requires the universe to be empty ($\rho=0$) or the equations-of-state to satisfy the following constraint:

$$1-3w_a+2w_b=0 : \quad (22)$$

In both cases, setting $\dot{b}=\ddot{b}=0$ reduces Eqs. (9a) and (9b) to the ordinary Friedmann equations for a $(3+1)$ -dimensional universe and Eq. (9c) to a linear combination of these. The static solutions are therefore consistent with the full set of field equations. The particular combination $w_a=1/3, w_b=0$ was also found and verified in [36]. For flat extra dimensions, there are thus two ways of getting static solutions (though the case of an empty universe is, of course, not particularly interesting).

If on the other hand the extra dimensions are curved, Eq. (21) requires k_b to be constant for static b .² Unless a is also static, Eq. (10) then implies $w_a=1$. The origin of such an energy density could for example be a $(3+n+1)$ -dimensional cosmological constant, for which $\rho=\rho_0 a^{-2}$ and $w_a=w_b=1$. Setting $\dot{b}=\ddot{b}=0$ then reduces Eqs. (9) to the ordinary Friedmann equations for a $(3+1)$ -dimensional de Sitter universe, with an effective energy density

$$\rho_e^{(3)} = \frac{M_{P,1}^2}{8} - \frac{n(n-1)k_b}{2b^2} = \frac{M_{P,1}^2}{4(n+2)} ; \quad (23)$$

where the second equality follows from Eq. (21). Curved, static extra dimensions are thus in principle possible, but only for constant k_b .

IV. RADIATION DOMINATION

Recent measurements of the cosmic microwave background indicate that the universe is flat to a high degree of accuracy [16]. We therefore set the 3D curvature to zero. Moreover, we have shown that static extra dimensions are incompatible with extra-dimensional curvature in the case of non-negative pressure in 3D. Although the latest results from type Ia supernovae observations strongly suggest that the presently dominating energy component indeed does have negative pressure [37, 38], such a component, be it a cosmological constant or a quintessence field, is believed to be negligible up until relatively recently and can therefore not provide static, curved extra dimensions at earlier times. Thus we take $k_a=k_b=0$ from here on.

Shortly after LKP freeze-out the energy density of the universe should be dominated by ordinary radiation, i.e. relativistic particles with no extra-dimensional momentum. Eq. (14) then implies that the extra-dimensional pressure should be negligible. Now, combining Eqs. (14) and (22) we find that $w_a=1/3, w_b=0$ is the only choice for the equations-of-state in a universe that is dominated by relativistic particles and has exactly static UED:

$$b(t) = b_i : \quad (24)$$

Furthermore, we have already seen that this choice reproduces standard cosmological radiation domination in that the scale factor and energy density evolve as

$$a(t) = a_i \frac{t}{t_i}^{\frac{1}{2}} ; \quad (25)$$

$$\rho(t) = \rho_i \frac{a(t)}{a_i}^{-4} : \quad (26)$$

² Strictly speaking this is only true for constant w_a , which implies a constant w_b according to Eq. (14). From standard cosmology however, we expect long periods of approximately constant w_a (for example during matter domination).

Thus in the UED scenario, static extra dimensions arise naturally during radiation domination.

However, from our discussion on pressure, we do not expect w_a and w_b to take exactly these values and we must therefore consider perturbations of the static solution. So let us assume that $0 \leq w_b < 1$ and look for solutions of the form

$$a(t) = a^*(t) + \delta a(t); \quad (27a)$$

$$b(t) = b^*(t) + \delta b(t); \quad (27b)$$

$$\dot{t} = \dot{t}^*(t) + \delta \dot{t}(t); \quad (27c)$$

where a star denotes the unperturbed solutions (24-26) and $\delta a, \delta b, \delta \dot{t}; \delta j_a, \delta j_b; \delta j, \delta j^* = 1$, with corresponding relations for the time derivatives of these quantities. The linearized versions of the field equations (9) are then given by

$$\frac{\delta \dot{a}}{a^*} \left(1 + 2 \frac{\dot{a}^*}{a^*} \frac{\delta a}{a^*} + n \frac{\dot{a}^*}{a^*} \frac{\delta b}{b^*} \right) = \frac{2}{3} \delta \dot{t}; \quad (28a)$$

$$\frac{\delta \dot{a}}{a^*} \left(1 + \frac{\dot{a}^*}{a^*} \frac{\delta a}{a^*} + \frac{\dot{a}^*}{a^*} \frac{\delta b}{b^*} \right) + \frac{\delta \dot{a}}{a^*} \left(1 + 2 \frac{\dot{a}^*}{a^*} \frac{\delta a}{a^*} + n \frac{\dot{a}^*}{a^*} \frac{\delta b}{b^*} + 2n \frac{\dot{a}^*}{a^*} \frac{\delta b}{b^*} \right) = \frac{2}{3} (1 - n w_b) \delta \dot{t}; \quad (28b)$$

$$\frac{\delta \dot{a}}{a^*} \left(1 + \frac{\dot{a}^*}{a^*} \frac{\delta a}{a^*} + \frac{\dot{a}^*}{a^*} \frac{\delta b}{b^*} \right) + \frac{\delta \dot{a}}{a^*} \left(1 + 2 \frac{\dot{a}^*}{a^*} \frac{\delta a}{a^*} + \frac{n}{3} \frac{\dot{a}^*}{a^*} \frac{\delta b}{b^*} + (n-1) \frac{\dot{a}^*}{a^*} \frac{\delta b}{b^*} \right) = \frac{2}{3} w_b \delta \dot{t}; \quad (28c)$$

Subtracting the unperturbed equations this can be rewritten as

$$2 \frac{\delta \dot{a}}{a^*} \frac{\dot{a}^*}{a^*} \frac{\delta a}{a^*} + n \frac{\delta \dot{a}}{a^*} \frac{\dot{a}^*}{a^*} \frac{\delta b}{b^*} = \frac{2}{3} \delta \dot{t}; \quad (29a)$$

$$\frac{\delta \dot{a}}{a^*} \frac{\dot{a}^*}{a^*} \frac{\delta a}{a^*} + 2 \frac{\delta \dot{a}}{a^*} \frac{\dot{a}^*}{a^*} \frac{\delta a}{a^*} = \frac{2}{3} n w_b \delta \dot{t}; \quad (29b)$$

$$\frac{\delta \dot{b}}{b^*} + 3 \frac{\delta \dot{a}}{a^*} \frac{\dot{a}^*}{a^*} \frac{\delta b}{b^*} = 2 w_b \delta \dot{t}; \quad (29c)$$

Eqs. (29b) and (29c) are uncoupled differential equations for δa and δb which can be solved after inserting the unperturbed solutions (25, 26). Eq. (29a) can be interpreted as defining $\delta \dot{t}$ and is thus automatically satisfied. The general solutions are found to be:

$$\delta a(t) = A_1 \frac{t}{t_i}^{\frac{1}{2}} + A_2 \frac{t}{t_i}^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{3} n^2 \int_{t_i}^t \frac{1}{t_i^2 a_i} \frac{t}{t_i}^{\frac{1}{2}} w_b(x) (x^{-1} - t^{-1}) dx; \quad (30a)$$

$$\delta b(t) = B_1 + B_2 \frac{t}{t_i}^{\frac{1}{2}} + 2 \int_{t_i}^t \frac{1}{t_i^2 b_i} w_b(x) (x^{-1} - t^{-1} x^{-\frac{1}{2}}) dx; \quad (30b)$$

where A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 are integration constants fixed by the initial conditions at time t_i . Note that A_1 and B_1 can just as well be regarded as part of the initial conditions for the unperturbed solutions a^* and b^* respectively. Thus for $w_b = 0$ we only find decaying solutions for the perturbations in both scale factors (i.e. the static solution given by Eqs. (24-25) is stable under small perturbations, as claimed previously (without proof) in [36].

In the case of $w_b \neq 0$, however, there might also exist a growing solution. For example, a constant w_b gives³

$$\delta a(t) = \frac{1}{3} w_b n^2 \int_{t_i}^t \frac{1}{t_i^2 a_i} \frac{t}{t_i}^{\frac{1}{2}} \ln \frac{t}{t_i}; \quad (31a)$$

$$\delta b(t) = 2 w_b \int_{t_i}^t \frac{1}{t_i^2 b_i} \ln \frac{t}{t_i}; \quad (31b)$$

Since the relative perturbations of the scale factors only grow logarithmically in both cases,

$$\frac{\delta a}{a^*}, \frac{\delta b}{b^*} \sim \ln t; \quad (32)$$

these perturbations can still be expected to remain relatively small during radiation domination after LKP freeze-out.

³ A more realistic time-dependence of w_b is considered in Section VI, where we find a more rapid growth of δb .

V. MATTER DOMINATION

We have shown that there are approximately static solutions for the UED during radiation domination. In fact, we found that $w_a = 1/3$ and $w_b = 0$ is the only possible choice for the equations-of-state which can give exactly static, flat extra dimensions in a universe dominated by relativistic particles. However, as we remarked before, the universe is always dominated by relativistic particles if a significant amount of the dark matter is made up of LKPs. It is therefore clear that there are no exactly static solutions for the UED during matter domination, i.e. $w_a = 0$.

Having excluded exactly static extra dimensions, the next case of interest would be slowly evolving solutions:

$$\frac{\dot{b}}{b} = \frac{\dot{a}}{a} : \quad (33)$$

But what ansatz should we make for a ? A significant, long-term deviation from the usual time-evolution during matter domination would most likely alter the predictions of standard cosmology concerning, e.g. large-scale structure formation. Let us therefore first examine whether there are any solutions to the field equations which give

$$a(t) = a_i \left(\frac{t}{t_i}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}} : \quad (34)$$

We noted before that $w_a = 0$ implies $w_b = 1/n$. The field equations (9) can then be rewritten as two homogeneous equations for a and b and one defining equation for \dot{a} . With the above expression for a we get

$$\frac{\dot{a}}{a} + n \frac{\dot{a}}{a} \frac{\dot{b}}{b} + \frac{n(n-1)}{6} \left(\frac{\dot{b}}{b}\right)^2 = \frac{2}{3} ; \quad (35a)$$

$$\frac{\dot{b}}{b} + 2 \frac{\dot{a}}{a} \frac{\dot{b}}{b} + \frac{n-1}{2} \left(\frac{\dot{b}}{b}\right)^2 = 0 ; \quad (35b)$$

$$\frac{3}{2n} \frac{\dot{a}}{a} + \frac{\dot{b}}{b} = 0 : \quad (35c)$$

Differentiating Eq. (35c) one finds that the last two equations are inconsistent with each other for $n \neq 3$, so there are no solutions with $a(t) = a_i (t/t_i)^{2/3}$ and $w_a = 0$. Neither can there be any solutions with $w_a = 0$ and a of the form

$$a(t) = a_i(t) + a_j(t) ; \quad (36)$$

where $j_a \neq j_a$; $j_a \neq j_a$; $j_a = a_j - 1$. This is because to zeroth order, inserting such an ansatz would leave the unperturbed equations unchanged. Of course, if we allow for rapidly oscillating $a(t)$ then \dot{a} and \ddot{a} need not be small. We do not consider such a behaviour here.

So are there any solutions to the field equations at all during matter domination? With the quite general ansatz

$$a(t) = a_i \left(\frac{t}{t_i}\right)^x ; \quad (37)$$

we find that all solutions are of the form

$$b(t) = b_i \frac{t+B}{t_i+B}^y : \quad (38)$$

Some of these, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\dot{a}}{a} &= \frac{x}{t} \\ \frac{\dot{b}}{b} &= \frac{y}{t+B} \\ B &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

are vacuum solutions. In fact, they are known as Kasner-type solutions and have been found before under the assumption of an empty universe and a power-law behaviour of both scale factors [39]. The only additional solutions appear when $n \neq 1$ and are given by

$$\begin{aligned} x &= 0 \\ y &= \frac{2}{n+1} \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

with B being an arbitrary integration constant. Although they describe a non-empty universe they have a static scale factor a . Of course, for $n = 3$ we knew of this solution beforehand, since $w_a = 0$ and $w_b = \frac{1}{3}$ is the static, radiation dominated solution with a and b interchanged.

With no suitable solutions describing actual matter domination ($w_a = w_b$), we turn to the possibility of an era of effective matter domination, i.e. $p_e^{(3)} = 0$. Inserting the defining Eqs. (18) into the field equations (9) then yields the familiar result $a \propto t^{\frac{2}{3}}$ by construction. Using (14) we can write the remaining equations as:

$$\frac{\dot{b}}{b} = \frac{2}{3nt^2} - \frac{2}{t} \frac{\dot{b}}{b} - \frac{n-1}{2} \frac{\dot{b}}{b} ; \quad (41a)$$

$$w_a = \frac{4(1 + nt\frac{\dot{b}}{b})}{8 + 12nt\frac{\dot{b}}{b} + 3n(n-1)t^2\frac{\dot{b}}{b}} ; \quad (41b)$$

$$\dot{t}^2 = \frac{4}{3t^2} + \frac{2n}{t} \frac{\dot{b}}{b} + \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \frac{\dot{b}}{b} ; \quad (41c)$$

Eq. (41a) has the general solution

$$b = B_1 \frac{t}{t_i} \cos^2 \left[\frac{r}{12n} \ln \frac{t}{t_i} + B_2 \right]^{\frac{1}{n+1}} ; \quad (42)$$

where B_1 and B_2 are integration constants to be fixed by the initial conditions. This corresponds to decaying, bouncing extra dimensions. Although such a behaviour of b might be possible, the corresponding evolution of w_a is not (in fact it is singular). Indeed, in our model there is no physical motivation for why $p_e^{(3)}$ should vanish for non-static b and it is therefore no surprise that we get unphysical solutions from imposing it.

V I. T R A N S I T I O N P E R I O D

So far we have focused on the two extreme cases of having zero pressure in either the UED (radiation domination) or 3D (matter domination). In a final attempt to find solutions which resemble the standard cosmological evolution of a (in particular matter domination), we will now make a more general numerical study of the transition from an era of radiation domination with approximately static UED to one with a sizable energy density contribution from LKPs. In order to do this we make the approximation that the LKPs only have extra-dimensional momentum, which should be valid for temperatures below ~ 1 TeV. This allows us to split the energy density and pressure into two parts:

$$\rho = \rho_r + \rho_m ; \quad (43)$$

$$p_a = w_a^r \rho_r + w_a^m \rho_m = \frac{r}{3} ; \quad (44)$$

$$p_b = w_b^r \rho_r + w_b^m \rho_m = \frac{m}{n} ; \quad (45)$$

where r and m denotes ordinary particles (radiation) and LKPs (matter) respectively. Neglecting interactions, energy-momentum is separately conserved and Eq. (10) gives:

$$\dot{r} = -r_i \frac{a}{a_i}^4 \frac{b}{b_i}^n ; \quad (46a)$$

$$\dot{m} = -m_i \frac{a}{a_i}^3 \frac{b}{b_i}^{(n+1)} ; \quad (46b)$$

Now introduce the dimensionless variable $t^0 = \frac{t}{t_i}$ and rescale

$$a \rightarrow \frac{a}{a_i} ; \quad b \rightarrow \frac{b}{b_i} ; \quad (47)$$




FIG. 1: The evolution of the scale factors a (dashed) and b (dash-dotted), as well as the LKP energy density m (solid) for $n=1$ (thin), 2 (medium) and 7 (thick) with $\frac{m_i}{r_i} = 10^{-7}$. For $m = 0.1$ the extra dimensions are nearly static and the evolution of a reproduces the radiation dominated regime of standard cosmology to a very good approximation. For $m > 0.1$ however, neither a nor b show the desired behaviour.

Using a prime to denote differentiation with respect to t^0 , Eqs. (9b)-(9c) become

$$2\frac{a''}{a} + \frac{a'^2}{a^2} + n\frac{b''}{b} + 2n\frac{a'b'}{ab} + \frac{n(n-1)}{2}\frac{b'^2}{b^2} = \frac{2t_1^2 r_i}{3a^4 b^n}; \quad (48a)$$

$$3\frac{a''}{a} + 3\frac{a'^2}{a^2} + (n-1)\frac{b''}{b} + 3(n-1)\frac{a'b'}{ab} + \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}\frac{b'^2}{b^2} = \frac{2t_1^2 r_i}{na^3 b^{n+1}}; \quad (48b)$$

where $\frac{m_i}{r_i}$, and from Eq. (9a) we get

$$\frac{2t_1^2 r_i}{na^3 b^{n+1}} = \frac{3}{1+m} \left[\frac{a''}{a} + n\frac{a'b'}{ab} + \frac{n(n-1)}{6}\frac{b'^2}{b^2} \right]_{t^0=1}; \quad (49)$$

Starting from the solutions (27, 30) for radiation domination and approximately static extra dimensions, the appropriate initial conditions are given by

$$\begin{aligned} a(1) &= 1; & a'(1) &= \frac{1}{2} - \frac{n}{3}; \\ b(1) &= 1; & b'(1) &= \frac{3}{4}; \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Here, we keep track of terms linear in m in order to be consistent with the expected behaviour of slowly growing extra dimensions (as opposed to the case of exactly static extra dimensions that would result from $m=0$). Of course, one could in principle imagine different initial conditions, but the ones chosen above correspond naturally to the setup presented here and in Section IV.




FIG. 2: This plot shows the evolution of the same quantities as the previous one, this time with $\beta = 10^{-3}$. As expected, a larger value of β gives a shorter period of radiation domination.

The numerical solutions to Eqs. (48) are plotted in Fig. 1 and 2 for different numbers of extra dimensions and values of β . In the beginning, we find the behaviour expected from our discussion in Section IV ⁴ { very slowly growing extra dimensions and an expansion of 3D that corresponds to usual radiation domination $a \propto t^{0.5}$. However, as soon as the LKP smake up roughly 10% of the total energy density of the universe, the extra dimensions start to expand at a rate comparable to a . Such a rapid expansion of the UED is already ruled out by present bounds on the time-variation of the electromagnetic and gravitational coupling constants (see e.g. [33, 34, 35]). Moreover, when the extra dimensions are increasing, our scale factor increases less rapidly than $t^{0.5}$ { instead of approaching $t^{0.5}$ as predicted by standard cosmology.

The behaviour of the scale factors as described above is stable against perturbations in the initial conditions of a^0 and b^0 of the order of β . Allowing for even larger perturbations, the only qualitatively different behaviour we find is collapsing b and collapsing or inflating a – these solutions are obviously no viable alternatives either.

VII. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The identity of dark matter is one of the most challenging puzzles in modern particle physics and cosmology. Recently, it has been noted that models with universal extra dimensions provide a natural WIMP candidate that could make up a significant amount of the dark matter today. This subsequently led to a great interest in studying detection properties of these particles. However, the estimates for today's LKP abundance crucially depend on the underlying assumption of static extra dimensions throughout the whole evolution history of the universe { or at least since the time of freeze-out of these particles.

In this article we have studied in detail whether one can expect such a behaviour of the extra dimensions without adding an explicit stabilization mechanism. To this end we have analyzed cosmological solutions to Einstein's field equations in $(3+n+1)$ dimensions that are appropriate to describe a universe with UED. More specifically, our setup

⁴ With the explicit time-dependence of w_b given by Eq. (45) we find that b grows as $t^{\frac{1}{2}}$, which is much faster than logarithmically. The radiation dominated era is therefore shorter than expected from Eqs. (30), although the qualitative behaviour remains the same.

is given by a FRW metric with two different scale factors and the assumption that LKPs make up the dominant part of the dark matter, i.e. the universe is always dominated by relativistic particles.

We find that a natural (and in fact the only) way to get exactly static extra dimensions in this scenario is to set $w_a = \frac{1}{3}$ and $w_b = 0$. This also reproduces the usual radiation dominated behaviour of the scale factor in 3D. Allowing for $0 \notin w_b < 1$, which is much more realistic in the UED scenario, we still find approximately constant extra dimensions and $a \propto t^{\frac{1}{3}}$.

However, during matter domination ($w_a = 0$) there are no static solutions for the extra dimensions. Even worse, there are no solutions at all that are consistent with the standard matter dominated behaviour of the scale factor in 3D, $a(t) \propto t^{\frac{2}{3}}$. With a more general ansatz $a(t) \propto t^x$ we do find solutions, but for $x \neq 0$ they all describe an empty universe. Demanding $w_e = 0$ instead of $w_a = 0$ we get the usual behaviour of $a(t)$ by construction, but the corresponding solutions for $b(t)$ and \dot{t} are unphysical.

In the reasonable approximation that the LKPs only have extra-dimensional momentum, we have also performed a numerical analysis of the transition from a radiation dominated universe with approximately static UED to one with a sizable energy density contribution from LKPs. The evolution of b is generically found to be much too rapid given the present bounds on the time-variation of the electromagnetic and gravitational coupling constants and a does not show the standard behaviour either.

To summarize, we have shown that within our framework, an explicit mechanism is needed in order to stabilize the UED during matter domination. Although one could consider more complex models, e.g. with different scale factors for each extra dimension, we believe that finding static solutions (or indeed any solutions which reproduce standard cosmology for both radiation and matter domination without obviously violating experimental bounds on the evolution of the extra dimensions) is a generic difficulty of this scenario.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Lars Bergstrom, Joakim Edsjö, Anne Green, Stefan Hofmann and Edvard Mortsell for helpful discussions and careful reading of the manuscript.

-
- [1] G. Nordström, Phys. Z. 15, 504 (1914).
 - [2] T. Kaluza, Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Berlin Kl. 1, 966 (1921).
 - [3] O. Klein, Z. Phys. 37, 895 (1926).
 - [4] J. Polchinski, String Theory (Cambridge University Press, 1998).
 - [5] J. Hewett and M. Spiropulu, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. 52, 397 (2002), hep-ph/0205106.
 - [6] T. Appelquist, H. C. Cheng, and B. A. Dobrescu, Phys. Rev. D 64, 6403002 (2001), hep-ph/0012100.
 - [7] T. G. Rizzo, Phys. Rev. D 64, 095010 (2001), hep-ph/0106336.
 - [8] H. C. Cheng, hep-ph/0206035.
 - [9] N. Arkani-Hamed, H. C. Cheng, B. A. Dobrescu, and L. J. Hall, Phys. Rev. D 62, 096006 (2000), hep-ph/0006238.
 - [10] B. A. Dobrescu and E. Poppitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 031801 (2001), hep-ph/0102010.
 - [11] T. Appelquist, B. A. Dobrescu, E. Ponton, and H. U. Yee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 181802 (2001), hep-ph/0107056.
 - [12] R. N. Mohapatra and A. Perez-Lorenzana, hep-ph/0212254.
 - [13] E. W. Kolb and R. Slansky, Phys. Lett. B 135, 378 (1984).
 - [14] G. Servant and T. M. P. Tait, Nucl. Phys. B 650, 391 (2003), hep-ph/0206071.
 - [15] G. Jungman, M. Kamionkowski and K. Griest, Phys. Rept. 267, 195 (1996), hep-ph/9506380.
 - [16] D. N. Spergel et al., astro-ph/0302209.
 - [17] G. Servant and T. M. P. Tait, New J. Phys. 4, 99 (2002), hep-ph/0209262.
 - [18] D. Hooper and G. D. Kribs, Phys. Rev. D 67, 055003 (2003), hep-ph/0208261.
 - [19] H. C. Cheng, J. L. Feng, and K. T. M. Atchew, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 211301 (2002), hep-ph/0207125.
 - [20] G. Bertone, G. Servant, and G. Sigl, hep-ph/0211342.
 - [21] J. Saito, Prog. Theor. Phys. 77, 322 (1987).
 - [22] P. G. O. Freund, Nucl. Phys. B 209, 146 (1982).
 - [23] T. Appelquist and A. Chodos, Phys. Rev. Lett. 50, 141 (1983).
 - [24] S. Randjbar-Daemi, A. Salam, and J. Strathdee, Phys. Lett. B 135, 388 (1984).
 - [25] K. Maeda, Class. Quant. Grav. 3, 233 (1986).
 - [26] K. Maeda, Class. Quant. Grav. 3, 651 (1986).
 - [27] U. Günther and A. Zhuk, Class. Quant. Grav. 15, 2025 (1998), gr-qc/9804018.
 - [28] U. Günther and A. Zhuk, Phys. Rev. D 61, 124001 (2000), hep-ph/0002009.
 - [29] S. M. Carroll, J. Geddes, M. B. Hoffman, and R. M. Wald, Phys. Rev. D 66, 024036 (2002), hep-th/0110149.
 - [30] Z. Chacko and E. Perazzi, hep-ph/0210254.

- [31] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, and G. Dvali, *Phys. Lett. B* 429, 263 (1998), hep-ph/9803315.
- [32] N. M. Mohammadi, *Phys. Rev. D* 65, 104018 (2002), hep-th/0202119.
- [33] J. P. Uzan, hep-ph/0205340.
- [34] C. J. A. P. Martins et al., astro-ph/0302295.
- [35] J. M. Cline and J. V.inet, hep-ph/0211284.
- [36] J.-A. Gu and W.-Y. P. Hwang, *Phys. Rev. D* 66, 024003 (2002), astro-ph/0112565.
- [37] S. Perlmutter et al. [Supernova Cosmology Project Collaboration], *Astrophys. J.* 517, 565 (1999), astro-ph/9812133.
- [38] A. G. Riess et al. [Supernova Search Team Collaboration], *Astron. J.* 116, 1009 (1998), astro-ph/9805201.
- [39] A. Chodos and S. Detweiler, *Phys. Rev. D* 21, 2167 (1980).