

Cosmological Higgs fields

J.W. van Holten*

NIKHEF, Amsterdam NL

September 16, 2002

Abstract

We present a time-dependent solution to the coupled Einstein-Higgs equations for general Higgs-type potentials in the context of flat FRW cosmological models. Possible implications are discussed.

*e-mail: v.holten@nikhef.nl

Work supported by the program FP52 of the Foundation for Research of Matter (FOM)

Scalar fields play a fundamental role in the standard model of particle physics, as well as its possible extensions. In particular, scalar fields generate spontaneous symmetry breaking and provide masses to gauge bosons and chiral fermions by the Brout-Englert mechanism [1] using a Higgs-type potential [2]. As observed by Linde [3] and Veltman [4], the scalar-field energy condensed in the vacuum contributes to an effective cosmological constant, with a typical value many orders of magnitude larger than observed. At the same time, the cosmological effects of scalar fields have been proposed as a mechanism to drive the evolution of the universe in various scenarios [5, 6, 7, 8, 9]; for reviews, see e.g. [10, 11, 12, 13]. The nature of the proposed cosmological scalars is unknown. It is the purpose of this paper to investigate the minimal coupling of Higgs scalars to gravity and discuss the solutions from the point of view of cosmology as well as particle physics.

We consider a flat FRW-type universe ($k = 0$) with scale factor $a(t)$, and a set of minimally coupled scalar fields ϕ_i . In the limit in which matter and radiation can be neglected, but maintaining the homogeneity and isotropy of the universe, the dynamics of this system is governed by the equations

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_i \dot{\phi}_i^2 + V[\phi_i] = \frac{3H^2}{8\pi G}, \quad (1)$$

$$\ddot{\phi}_i + 3H\dot{\phi}_i + V_{,i} = 0,$$

where $H = \dot{a}/a$ is the Hubble parameter. Constant scalar fields minimizing the potential solve these equations for constant Hubble parameter:

$$H = H_0 = \sqrt{\frac{8\pi G V_0}{3}}. \quad (2)$$

Such solutions of eqs.(1) are relevant in the context of the standard model of particle physics, and its supersymmetric and/or gauge-unified extensions, in which space-time is taken to be static and globally Lorentz invariant. In fact, in flat space-time $H_0 = V_0 = 0$, which requires a careful tuning of the parameters in the theory. From observations we know, that global Lorentz invariance is actually violated by the expansion of the universe¹. However, the expansion is very slow and the measured present value of the Hubble parameter $H_0 \approx 70$ km/sec/Mpc corresponds to an extremely low energy density V_0 of about 5 GeV/m^3 . This is of the order of 10^{-123} in units of Planck energy per Planck volume, or 10^{-45} in terms of a typical QCD energy density. Therefore the approximation $H_0 = 0$ is excellent on scales relevant to particle physics experiments, and no violations of Lorentz invariance have been observed there. In particular the tuning of parameters in the Higgs potential of the standard model is not affected by the observed expansion of the universe.

In contrast, the expansion of the universe and the associated non-zero energy densities are relevant in a cosmological context. To model the cosmological behaviour of Higgs-type scalars we consider a single field component inducing

¹And locally of course by such gravitational fields as those of the earth and the sun.

spontaneous symmetry breaking; this field is denoted by $\varphi = \phi_1$. We take all other scalar fields ϕ_i to vanish in the vacuum state: $\phi_i = 0$ ($i \neq 1$). The Higgs potential $V(\varphi) = V[\phi_1 = \varphi, \phi_i = 0]$ then reduces to a quartic polynomial of the form

$$V(\varphi) = \varepsilon + \frac{m^2}{2} \varphi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4} \varphi^4. \quad (3)$$

For $m^2 = -\mu^2 < 0$ the minimum of the potential is in the regime of spontaneous symmetry breaking, characterized by

$$\varphi_0^2 = \frac{\mu^2}{\lambda}, \quad V_0 = \varepsilon - \frac{\mu^4}{4\lambda}. \quad (4)$$

This is consistent with eqs.(1) only for $\varepsilon \geq \mu^4/4\lambda$. In particular a static Lorentz-invariant universe requires the parameters of the potential to be related by $\varepsilon = \mu^4/4\lambda$.

With effectively a single minimally coupled scalar field φ , the cosmological Einstein-Higgs equations (1) can be recast into the form

$$\frac{1}{2} \dot{\varphi}^2 = -\frac{\dot{H}}{8\pi G}, \quad V(\varphi) = \frac{3H^2 + \dot{H}}{8\pi G}. \quad (5)$$

Assuming the existence of a well-defined solution in some finite period of time Δt , we can equivalently take the Hubble parameter to be a function of $\varphi(t)$: $H(t) = H[\varphi(t)]$. Then $\dot{H} = H' \dot{\varphi}$, where the prime denotes a derivative w.r.t. φ , and it follows that either φ is constant, or we have non-static fields ($\dot{\varphi} \neq 0$) satisfying the equations

$$4\pi G \dot{\varphi} = -H', \quad 8\pi G V(\varphi) = 3H^2 - \frac{H'^2}{4\pi G}. \quad (6)$$

Comparing with the expression (3), we see that the expressions match if and only if $H[\varphi]$ is of the form

$$H = h + 2\pi G \omega \varphi^2, \quad (7)$$

where h and ω are constant parameters with the dimension of inverse time. The matching again requires a relation between the three parameters ($\varepsilon, \mu^2, \lambda$), implicitly given by

$$\varepsilon = \frac{3h^2}{8\pi G}, \quad m^2 = -\mu^2 = \omega^2 \left(\frac{3h}{\omega} - 1 \right), \quad \lambda = 6\pi G \omega^2. \quad (8)$$

Using expression (7) for H , the first equation (6) then determines the time dependence of the scalar field:

$$\dot{\varphi} = -\omega \varphi \quad \Rightarrow \quad \varphi(t) = \varphi(0) e^{-\omega t}. \quad (9)$$

The explicit form of the constraint (8) is

$$\varepsilon = \frac{\mu^4}{4\lambda} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{6\pi G \mu^2} \right)^2, \quad (10)$$

which is the direct analogue of the relation $V_0 = 0$ above for the existence of a constant solution in a static and Lorentz-invariant universe. This constraint is quite interesting; for instance, we observe that for $\mu^2 > 0$ and

$$0 < \lambda < \frac{3\mu^2}{2M_{Pl}^2}, \quad M_{Pl}^2 = \frac{1}{8\pi G}, \quad (11)$$

the value of the vacuum energy ε for the dynamical scalar field (9) is lower than that for any static field solution (4). In contrast, in the regime without static symmetry breaking ($m^2 = -\mu^2 > 0$), the dynamical solution always requires a value $\varepsilon > 0$, unlike Minkowski space-time with vanishing Higgs field and $\varepsilon = 0$. Thus in this class of models, for given μ^2 and λ it is the value of ε which determines which solution is actually realized.

As concerns the scalar field $\varphi(t)$, for $\omega > 0$ it vanishes asymptotically, even in the case of a potential with non-trivial minima ($m^2 < 0$). In contrast, for $\omega < 0$ the scalar field evolves away from this symmetry point. For the evolution of the Hubble parameter and the scale factor the scalar field solution (9) results in

$$H(t) = h + 2\pi G\omega\varphi^2(0)e^{-2\omega t}, \quad a(t) = a(0)e^{ht+\pi G\varphi^2(0)(1-e^{-2\omega t})}. \quad (12)$$

For the particular case $h = \varepsilon = 0$ these solutions are well-known and have been used e.g. in the context of chaotic inflation models [6].

For $\omega > 0$ and at times $t > 1/\omega$ the solution (12) describes standard exponential expansion, with constant Hubble parameter h ; if this situation is to describe the observed universe, h must be small. For early times the scale factor grows faster, with initial Hubble parameter $H_1 \approx h + 2\pi G\omega\varphi^2(0)$. In contrast, for $\omega < 0$, the Hubble parameter itself decreases exponentially fast until it vanishes, when $a(t)$ reaches its maximum; subsequently $H(t)$ becomes negative and the universe starts to contract in a super-exponential way.

For the further analysis it is convenient to introduce dimensionless fields χ and decay parameter x :

$$\chi^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3}\varphi^2, \quad x = \frac{\omega}{h}. \quad (13)$$

Then for $h \neq 0$ we can define a dimensionless potential

$$\Omega_V = \frac{8\pi GV}{3h^2} = 1 - \frac{1}{2}x(x-3)\chi^2 + \frac{9x^2}{16}\chi^4. \quad (14)$$

which expresses the potential energy density in terms of the asymptotic critical energy density. For $\omega > 0$ this potential has a stable minimum at $\chi^2 = 0$ in the range $0 \leq x \leq 3$, and non-trivial minima for $\chi^2 \neq 0$ in the domain $x > 3$; $\omega < 0$ implies $x < 0$, with non-trivial minima only.

Another quantity of interest is the parameter $N = 3\chi^2(0)/8$; the dynamical solutions for the field and scale factor can then be written as

$$\chi(t) = \chi(0)e^{-xht}, \quad a(t) = a_0e^{ht+N(1-e^{-2xht})}. \quad (15)$$

Furthermore, the Hubble parameter and the potential vary in time as

$$H(t) = h \left(1 + 2xN e^{-2xht} \right), \quad \Omega_V = 1 - \frac{4}{3} (x-3)xN e^{-2xht} + 4x^2 N^2 e^{-4xht}. \quad (16)$$

If h is close to the asymptotic value of $H(t)$, then

$$H(t = h^{-1}) \approx h \quad \Rightarrow \quad e^{2x} > 2xN, \quad (17)$$

which can always be satisfied for large enough x . The quantity N has a simple interpretation: it represents the extra number of e -folds by which the universe inflates between the initial time and the moment at which the expansion becomes dominated by the asymptotic Hubble constant h . Obviously during this period the expansion of the universe is much faster than a pure de Sitter expansion with constant Hubble parameter h . For N to be larger than one, the initial scalar field must take values of the order of the Planck scale:

$$\varphi^2(0) = \frac{N}{\pi G} = N \left(0.7 \times 10^{19} \text{ GeV} \right)^2. \quad (18)$$

In the early universe such large-amplitude scalar fields may have existed, e.g. in the symmetry breaking sector of a unified gauge theory; the classical treatment is still considered reliable, as long as the scalar potential remains well below the Planck scale [6]. For example, scalar neutrino fields of Planck-scale magnitude have been proposed in the context of supersymmetric leptogenesis models [14]. Note that time dependent scalar fields would help to establish non-equilibrium and non time-reversal invariant conditions in the epoch of leptogenesis and baryogenesis.

The coupling of Higgs scalars to vector fields in this scenario induces a time-dependent mass for the vector bosons. With a minimal coupling between scalar and vector field, the vector field equation in the Lorenz gauge in a gravitational and scalar background (9), (12) becomes

$$\left(\frac{1}{a^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} a^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} - \Delta + 2g^2 |\varphi|^2 \right) A_\mu = 0, \quad (19)$$

where η is the conformal time defined by $d\eta = dt/a(t)$. The mass gap is then given by

$$M^2(t) = 2g^2 |\varphi|^2(t) = \frac{2Ng^2}{\pi G} e^{-2xht} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{M^2(t = h^{-1})}{M^2(0)} = e^{-2x}. \quad (20)$$

If the initial value of the vector boson mass is of the order of the Planck mass $M^2(0) = M_{Pl}^2$, then $16Ng^2 = 1$. Such an initial value is consistent with a late value $M_{GUT} \approx 10^{16} \text{ GeV}$ for $x \approx 6$. The inequality (17) then only imposes a very mild restriction on N : $N < 1.4 \times 10^4$.

It is to be observed that if $h = H_0$, the present Hubble parameter, and with x -values of the order 10 or less, the energy density represented by the potential (14) indeed remains small even if N is large: at most a few orders of magnitude more than the present critical density. Hence it can not dominate the energy density in the early universe, and our starting eqs.(1) presumably can hold only

at relatively late times. In contrast, if we take the initial scalar energy density to be the Planck density, then for $h = H_0$ and $N > 1$ we obtain $xN \approx 10^{61}$, or equivalently

$$\omega \approx \frac{10}{N\tau_{Planck}}, \quad \tau_{Planck} = 0.53 \times 10^{-43} \text{ sec.} \quad (21)$$

Such a scalar field disappears within N Planck times; however, the inflation by N e -folds would also happen within this same period.

In the Higgs models defined by (14) there is no compelling reason why h should be taken to represent the presently observed value of the Hubble parameter; actually it represents the asymptotic value of $H(t)$ in the regime where the eqs.(1) are relevant, which may be only in the very early universe. In such a scenario h is determined by the critical density at the beginning of the radiation dominated era, rather than by the present critical density; the asymptotic critical density would then naturally be of the order of the GUT scale.

A special class of potentials arises for $x = 3$. In this case the Higgs mass term vanishes and the number of parameters is reduced. This model was studied as a flat-space quantum field theory by Coleman and Weinberg [15]. The potential Ω_V in (16) then reaches its asymptotic value in a time scale $t = h^{-1}$ if

$$\Omega_V(t = h^{-1}) = \mathcal{O}(1) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad 6Ne^{-6} = 1, \quad (22)$$

which gives $N \approx 70$, as in standard models of inflation [5]. For h in the range of the GUT-scale, the epoch of inflation is sufficiently short: depending on the exact unification scale in the range $\tau = h^{-1} \approx 10^{6-8} \tau_{Planck}$. For the evolution of the vector boson masses we now obtain $M(t = h^{-1}) \approx M(0)/20$, which puts the initial unified gauge boson masses at the string scale, rather than the Planck scale.

In conclusion, the combined FRW-Einstein-Higgs equations (1) allow constant as well as time-dependent solutions for all values of (μ^2, λ) ; which solution is realized depends on the value of ε . The dynamical solutions which satisfy (10) may find application in models of the early universe to bridge the gap between the GUT- and Planck scales, to assist in baryogenesis, or to generate inflation. As soon as matter and radiation contribute substantially to the energy density eqs. (1) are modified. The scalar fields can then become thermalized and finite temperature corrections to the potential have to be included as well (see e.g. [10] and references therein). In a non-equilibrium situation more work is needed to study time-dependent Higgs fields in the presence of macroscopic densities of matter and radiation [16].

References

- [1] F. Englert and R. Brout, Phys. Rev. Lett. 13 (1964), 321
- [2] P.W. Higgs, Phys. Rev. Lett. 13 (1964), 508
- [3] A. Linde, JETP Lett. 19 (1974), 183

- [4] M. Veltman, preprint *Cosmology and the Higgs mechanism* (may 1974, unpublished)
- [5] A. Guth, Phys. Rev. D23 (1981), 347
- [6] A. Linde, Phys. Lett. B129 (1983), 177; Phys. Lett. B162 (1985), 281
- [7] C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. B302 (1988), 668
- [8] P.J.E. Peebles and B. Ratra, Ap. J. Lett. 325 (1988), L17
- [9] R.R. Caldwell, R. Dave and P.J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1998), 1582
- [10] D. Lyth and A. Riotto, Phys. Rep. 314 (1999), 1
- [11] N.A. Bahcall, J. Ostriker, S. Perlmutter and P.J. Steinhard, Science 284 (1999), 1481
- [12] V. Sahni, preprint *The cosmological constant problem and quintessence*, arXiv:astro-ph/0202076
- [13] N. Straumann, *On the Cosmological Constant Problems and the Astronomical Evidence for a Homogeneous Energy Density with Negative Pressure*, arXiv:astro-ph/0203330
- [14] H. Murayama and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B322 (1994), 349
- [15] S. Coleman and E. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D7 (1973), 1888
- [16] J.W. van Holten, Mod. Phys. Lett. A17 (2002), 1383