La Thuile, 7-12th March 2022



New ideas on the hierarchy problem

Tevong You



Outline

- Motivation
- Cosmological Relaxation
- Cosmological Self-Organised Criticality
- Cosmological Censorship
- Conclusion

Outline

Motivation

- Cosmological Relaxation
- Cosmological Self-Organised Criticality
- Cosmological Censorship
- Conclusion

Introduction

- Empirical fact (1): descriptions of nature are self-contained within their respective scales
- Empirical fact (2): as we go to smaller scales, these descriptions unify more and more into increasingly tightly knit, rigid frameworks
- This did not have to be so, but appears to be how nature is organised
- The hierarchy problem is a *deep conflict* between (1) and (2): if the Higgs emerges from a more fundamental theory, as expected from (2), then it violates (1) if the scale of new physics is too high

Effective Field Theory

$$\mathcal{L} = \Lambda^4 + \Lambda^2 \mathcal{O}^{(2)} + m \mathcal{O}^{(3)} + \mathcal{O}^{(4)} + \frac{1}{\Lambda^2} \mathcal{O}^{(6)} + \frac{1}{\Lambda^4} \mathcal{O}^{(8)} + \dots$$

- Incredibly successful
- Explains many features of our theories
- Natural expectations for sizes of parameters
- Sound reasoning, vindicated many times in the past
- However: hierarchy problem and cosmological constant defy EFT logic

The Hierarchy Problem

• Hierarchy problem is still a problem: $(m_h)^2_{tree} + (m_h)^2_{radiative} = (m_h)^2_v$

$$\delta m_{\phi}^2 \propto m_{
m heavy}^2, \quad \delta m_{\psi} \propto m_{\psi} \log\left(rac{m_{
m heavy}}{\mu}
ight)$$

[If Higgs mass is *calculable* in underlying UV theory]

Historical precedent

• Earliest example of an unnatural, **arbitrary** feature of a fundamental theory:

 $m_{inertial} = q_{gravity}$

• Classical electromagnetism fine-tuning:

$$(m_ec^2)_{
m obs} = (m_ec^2)_{
m bare} + \Delta E_{
m coulomb},$$

$$\Delta E_{\rm coulomb} = \frac{e^2}{4\pi\epsilon_0 r_e}$$

• Pions, GIM mechanism, etc.

• Higgs? Expect new physics close to weak scale

Understanding the origin of EWSB

- The SM has many *arbitrary* features put in by hand which hint at **underlying structure**
 - Pattern of Yukawa couplings, CKM
 - QCD Theta term
 - Neutrino mass
 - Higgs potential
 - ...
- Maybe it just is what it is ⁻_(ン)_/⁻
- but we would like a **deeper understanding** i.e. an *explanation* for why things are the way they are
 - e.g. PQ axion for Theta term, see-saw for neutrino mass, Froggat-Nielsen for Yukawas...
- In SM, no understanding of Higgs sector: Higgs potential and couplings put in by hand and unexplained
- We feel there must be some underlying system that **explains the origin of EWSB**
- In any such theory *in which the Higgs potential is calculable*, there is a **UV sensitivity** to the Higgs mass (*that is no longer a free parameter*) which requires fine-tuned cancellations

Natural electroweak symmetry breaking?

• A priori many ways to break electroweak symmetry



- **Tension** between *simplicity* and *naturalness*
- Driven by lack of new physics at weak scale
- How to reconcile this with naturalness?

Natural electroweak symmetry breaking?

• Cosmological evolution may play a key role!



Outline

- Motivation
- Cosmological Relaxation
- Cosmological Self-Organised Criticality
- Cosmological Censorship
- Conclusion

• Assume Higgs mass is naturally large at cut-off M

$$\mathcal{L} \supset (M^2 + \epsilon M\phi)|h|^2 + \epsilon M^3\phi + \dots + \Lambda_p^{4-n}v^n \cos\left(\frac{\phi}{f_p}\right)$$

- Higgs quadratic term scanned by axion-like field φ during inflation
- φ protected by shift symmetry, explicitly broken by small parameter ε
- Backreaction when $< h > \sim v$ stops φ evolution at small electroweak scale v

P. W. Graham, D. E. Kaplan and S. Rajendran, [arXiv:1504.07551]





• Assume Higgs mass is naturally large at cut-off M

$$\mathcal{L} \supset (M^2 + \epsilon M\phi)|h|^2 + \epsilon M^3\phi + \dots + \Lambda_p^{4-n}v^n \cos\left(\frac{\phi}{f_p}\right)$$

- Higgs quadratic term scanned by axion-like field φ during inflation
- φ protected by shift symmetry, explicitly broken by small parameter ε
- Backreaction when $< h > \sim v$ stops φ evolution at small electroweak scale v

P. W. Graham, D. E. Kaplan and S. Rajendran, [arXiv:1504.07551]





• Assume Higgs mass is naturally large at cut-off M

$$\mathcal{L} \supset \left(M^2 + \epsilon M\phi\right)|h|^2 + \epsilon M^3\phi + \dots + \Lambda_p^{4-n}v^n \cos\left(\frac{\phi}{f_p}\right)$$

- Higgs quadratic term scanned by axion-like field φ during inflation
- φ protected by shift symmetry, explicitly broken by small parameter ε
- Backreaction when $< h > \sim v$ stops ϕ evolution at small electroweak scale v

P. W. Graham, D. E. Kaplan and S. Rajendran, [arXiv:1504.07551]





• Assume Higgs mass is naturally large at cut-off M

$$\mathcal{L} \supset \left(M^2 + \epsilon M \phi \right) |h|^2 + \epsilon M^3 \phi + \dots + \Lambda_p^{4-n} v^n \cos \left(\frac{\phi}{f_p} \right)$$

- Higgs quadratic term scanned by axion-like field φ during inflation
- φ protected by shift symmetry, explicitly broken by small parameter ε
- Backreaction when $< h > \sim v$ stops φ evolution at small electroweak scale v

P. W. Graham, D. E. Kaplan and S. Rajendran, [arXiv:1504.07551]





• Assume Higgs mass is naturally large at cut-off M

$$\mathcal{L} \supset (M^2 + \epsilon M\phi)|h|^2 + \epsilon M^3\phi + \dots + \Lambda_p^{4-n}v^n \cos\left(\frac{\phi}{f_p}\right)$$

- Higgs quadratic term scanned by axion-like field φ during inflation
- φ protected by shift symmetry, explicitly broken by small parameter ϵ
- Backreaction when $< h > \sim v$ stops ϕ evolution at small electroweak scale v

P. W. Graham, D. E. Kaplan and S. Rajendran, [arXiv:1504.07551]





Constraints: H < v, classical rolling vs quantum, inflaton energy density dominates relaxion, etc.

• Assume Higgs mass is naturally lexc

Very small ε and natural scanning range lead to super-planckian field excursions, exponential e-foldings...

$$\mathcal{L} \supset (M^2 + \epsilon M\phi)|h|^2 + \epsilon M^3\phi + \dots + \Lambda_p^{4-n}v^n \cos\left(\frac{\phi}{f_p}\right)$$

- Higgs quadratic term scanned by axion-like field φ during inflation
- φ protected by shift symmetry, explicitly broken by small parameter ε
- Backreaction when $< h > \sim v$ stops ϕ evolution at small electroweak scale v





$$\mathcal{L} \supset (M^2 + \epsilon M\phi)|h|^2 + \epsilon M^3\phi + \dots + \Lambda_p^{4-n}v^n \cos\left(\frac{\phi}{f_p}\right)$$

- **n=1** models Graham et al [1504.07551]
 - Confining gauge group G=QCD: Need additional ingredients to overcome strong-CP problem
 - New gauge group G: new physics at weak scale + coincidence problem
- **n=2** models Espinosa et al [1506.09217]
 - G can be at higher scales, raises M cut-off too
 - **Requires second scalar** to relax relaxion barriers: double-scanning mechanism
- **n=0** models Hook and Marques-Tavares [1607.01786], **TY** [1701.09167]
 - More promising, make use of axial gauge coupling
 - Connection to dark photons Domcke, Schmitz, TY [2108.11295]

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \frac{a}{f} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \mathrm{Tr} G_{\mu\nu} G_{\rho\sigma}$$

Outline

- Motivation
- Cosmological Relaxation
- Cosmological Self-Organised Criticality
- Cosmological Censorship
- Conclusion

Critical points

• To be at the **critical point** of a classical phase transition **requires tuning**





• Living **near criticality** is highly **non-generic**!

• 1) Higgs potential **metastability** in SM



• Living on critical boundary of two phases coexisting

• 1) Higgs potential **metastability** in SM



• Living on critical boundary of two phases coexisting

• 2) Higgs mass



• Tuned close to boundary between ordered and disordered phase

• 2) Higgs mass



• Tuned close to boundary between ordered and disordered phase

• 3) Cosmological constant



• Tuned close to boundary between implosion and explosion

• 3) Cosmological constant



• Tuned close to boundary between implosion and explosion

• Why do we appear to live at a **special point** close to criticality?

• Hints of a **new principle** beyond EFT expectations at play?

Self-Organised Criticality

• Many systems in nature **self-tuned** to live near criticality





Self-Organised Criticality

- Fundamental self-organised criticality in our universe?
- Need a mechanism for self-organisation of fundamental parameters determined by scalar fields

e.g. Self-Organized Criticality in eternal inflation landscape: J. Khoury et al [1907.07693, 1912.06706, 2003.12594]

- Self-Organised Localisation (SOL):
 - cosmological quantum phase transitions localise fluctuating scalar fields during inflation at critical points

Giudice, McCullough, TY [2105.08617]

Phase Transitions (PT)

• Classical PT: varying background temperature

• Quantum PT: varying background field

$$V = \frac{\lambda}{4} \left(\psi^2 - \rho^2\right)^2 + \kappa \phi \psi$$





Toy example



- ϕ triggers 1st order **quantum phase transition** of another field at ϕ_c
- Distribution of ϕ values **peaked at critical point**:



Toy example



- ϕ triggers 1st order **quantum phase transition** of another field at ϕ_c
- Distribution of ϕ values **peaked at critical point**:





- ϕ triggers 1st order **quantum phase transition** of another field at ϕ_c
- Distribution of ϕ values **peaked at critical point**:





- ϕ triggers 1st order **quantum phase transition** of another field at ϕ_c
- Distribution of ϕ values **peaked at critical point**:





- ϕ triggers 1st order **quantum phase transition** of another field at ϕ_c
- Distribution of ϕ values **peaked** at critical point:



Outline

- Motivation
- Cosmological Relaxation
- Cosmological Self-Organised Criticality
- Cosmological Censorship
- Conclusion

Cosmological Censorship

- Weinberg's **anthropic argument**: censor all cosmological constant values leading to expansion rate *incompatible with life*
- Sliding naturalness: censor all parameter values leading to vacuum crunch incompatible with life
- N-naturalness: censor all Higgs mass values too large to reheat universe Arkani-Hamed et al [1607.06821]
- Many more ideas, cosmological and non-cosmological...

[Apologies for incomplete references]

Outline

- Motivation
- Cosmological Relaxation
- Cosmological Self-Organised Criticality
- Cosmological Censorship
- Conclusion

Conclusion

- Naturalness is an **aesthetic argument** but an *important piece of the puzzle*
- Symmetry-based solutions don't seem to be enough
- Keep an open mind for **new principles** e.g. cosmological dynamics, landscape selection rules, UV-IR mixing...
- Exciting times—may be analogous to early 20th century revolution

Conclusion

- **1900**: Almost all data agree spectacularly with the fundamental framework of the time, *no reason to doubt its universal applicability or completeness*.
- 1920s: A combination of precision measurements (Mercury), aesthetic arguments (relativity) supported by null experimental results (Michelson-Morley), and theoretical inconsistencies (Rayleigh-Jeans UV catastrophe) lead to an overhaul of the fundamental picture at smaller scales and higher energies after pushing the frontiers of technology and theory into new regimes.

Conclusion

- **2020**: Almost all data agree spectacularly with the fundamental framework of the time, *no reason to doubt its universal applicability or completeness*.
- 2050s: A combination of precision measurements (B mesons, Hubble), aesthetic arguments (naturalness) supported by null experimental results (LHC), and theoretical inconsistencies (black hole information paradox) lead to an overhaul of the fundamental picture at smaller scales and higher energies after pushing the frontiers of technology and theory into new regimes.

Backup

Outline

Motivation

- EFT
- Criticality
- Quantum phase transitions (QPT)

• Fokker-Planck Volume (FPV) equation

- FPV dynamics
- FPV + QPT = SOL
 - Discontinuity
 - Flux conservation
- SOL solutions
 - Metastability
 - Higgs mass
 - Cosmological constant
- Conclusion
 - Measure problem

Fokker-Planck Volume (FPV) equation

- Langevin equation: classical slow-roll + Hubble quantum fluctuations $\phi(t + \Delta t) = \phi(t) - \frac{V'}{3H}\Delta t + \eta_{\Delta t}(t)$
- Volume-averaged Langevin trajectories: **FPV for volume distribution** $P(\phi, t)$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\hbar}{8\pi^2} \frac{\partial (H^3 P)}{\partial \phi} + \frac{V'P}{3H} \end{bmatrix} + 3HP = \frac{\partial P}{\partial t} \qquad H(\phi) = \sqrt{\frac{V(\phi)}{3M_p^2}}$$
Quantum diffusion term
$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Classical drift} \\ \text{term} \end{array} \quad \text{Volume term} \end{array}$$

Fokker-Planck Volume (FPV) equation

- Langevin equation: classical slow-roll + Hubble quantum fluctuations $\phi(t + \Delta t) = \phi(t) - \frac{V'}{3H}\Delta t + \eta_{\Delta t}(t)$
- Volume-averaged Langevin trajectories: **FPV for volume distribution** $P(\phi, t)$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} \left[\frac{\hbar}{8\pi^2} \frac{\partial (H^{2+\xi} P)}{\partial \phi} + \frac{V' P}{3H^{2-\xi}} \right] + 3H^{\xi} P = H_0^{\xi-1} \frac{\partial P}{\partial t_{\xi}}$$

• **Ambiguity** in choosing time "gauge" $dt_{\xi}/dt = (H/H_0)^{1-\xi}$

- ϕ is *not* the inflaton: **apeiron** field scanning parameters
- Restrict to **EFT** field range f $\varphi \equiv \frac{\phi}{f}$ $V = 3H_0^2 M_P^2 + g_\epsilon^2 f^4 \omega(\varphi)$, $\omega(\varphi) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_n}{n!} \varphi^n$
- Assume sub-dominant energy density
- Expand around constant inflationary background H_0 $H(\varphi) \simeq H_0 \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon^2 f^4 \omega(\varphi)}{6M_{\pi}^2 H_0^2}\right)$

• FPV becomes

$$\frac{\alpha}{2} \frac{\partial^2 P}{\partial \varphi^2} + \frac{\partial(\omega' P)}{\partial \varphi} + \beta \omega P = \frac{\partial P}{\partial T}$$

$$\alpha \equiv \frac{3\hbar H_0^4}{4\pi^2 \epsilon^2 f^4} \quad , \quad \beta \equiv \frac{3}{2} \frac{\xi f^2}{M_p^2} \quad , \quad T \equiv \frac{t}{t_R} \quad , \quad t_R \equiv \frac{3H_0}{g_\epsilon^2 f^2} = \frac{\alpha\beta S_{ds}}{3\xi H_0} \qquad S_{ds} = \frac{8\pi^2 M_p^2}{\hbar H^2}$$

$$(1)$$

$$(1)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

$$(2)$$

- ϕ is *not* the inflaton: **apeiron** field scanning parameters
- Restrict to EFT field range f $\varphi \equiv \frac{\phi}{f}$ $V = 3H_0^2 M_P^2 + g_\epsilon^2 f^4 \omega(\varphi)$, $\omega(\varphi) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_n}{n!} \varphi^n$
- Assume sub-dominant energy density
- Expand around constant inflationary background H_0 $H(\varphi) \simeq H_0 \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon^2 f^4 \omega(\varphi)}{6M_n^2 H_0^2}\right)$

• FPV becomes
$$\frac{\alpha}{2} \frac{\partial^2 P}{\partial \varphi^2} + \frac{\partial(\omega' P)}{\partial \varphi} + \beta \omega P = \frac{\partial P}{\partial T}$$
$$\alpha \equiv \frac{3\hbar H_0^4}{4\pi^2 \epsilon^2 f^4} \quad , \quad \beta \equiv \frac{3}{2} \frac{\xi f^2}{M_p^2} \quad , \quad T \equiv \frac{t}{t_R} \quad , \quad t_R \equiv \frac{3H_0}{g_\epsilon^2 f^2} = \frac{\alpha\beta S_{ds}}{3\xi H_0} \qquad S_{ds} = \frac{8\pi^2 M_p^2}{\hbar H^2}$$

• Maximum number of e-folds for non-eternal inflation: $N_{e-folds} < S_{ds} = \frac{8\pi^2 M_p^2}{\hbar H^2}$

• Stationary FPV distributions $P(\varphi, T) = \sum_{\lambda} e^{\lambda T} p(\varphi, \lambda)$

$$\frac{\alpha}{2}p'' + \omega'p' + (\omega'' + \beta\omega - \lambda)p = 0$$

$$\alpha \equiv \frac{3\hbar H_0^4}{4\pi^2 \epsilon^2 f^4} \quad , \quad \beta \equiv \frac{3}{2} \frac{\xi f^2}{M_p^2} \quad , \quad T \equiv \frac{t}{t_R} \quad , \quad t_R \equiv \frac{3H_0}{g_\epsilon^2 f^2} = \frac{\alpha\beta S_{ds}}{3\xi H_0} \qquad S_{ds} = \frac{8\pi^2 M_p^2}{\hbar H^2}$$

• Largest eigenvalue $\lambda = \lambda_{max}$ inflates most

- Eigenvalue determines peak location
- Note: boundary conditions necessary input for solution

• Stationary FPV distributions $P(\varphi, T) = \sum_{\lambda} e^{\lambda T} p(\varphi, \lambda)$ $\frac{\alpha}{2} p'' + \omega' p' + (\omega'' + \beta \omega - \lambda) p = 0 \Rightarrow Discriminant D>0 for positive solution:$ $D = \omega'^2 + 2\alpha(\lambda - \beta \omega - \omega'')$ $\alpha \equiv \frac{3\hbar H_0^4}{4\pi^2 \epsilon^2 f^4}$, $\beta \equiv \frac{3}{2} \frac{\xi f^2}{M_c^2}$, $T \equiv \frac{t}{t_R}$, $t_R \equiv \frac{3H_0}{q^2 f^2} = \frac{\alpha\beta S_{ds}}{3\xi H_0}$, $S_{ds} = \frac{8\pi^2 M_p^2}{\pi H^2}$

- Largest eigenvalue $\lambda = \lambda_{max}$ inflates most
- Eigenvalue determines peak location
- Note: boundary conditions necessary input for solution

- Stationary FPV distributions $P(\varphi, T) = \sum_{\lambda} e^{\lambda T} p(\varphi, \lambda)$ **Discriminant** D>0 for **positive** solution: $\frac{\alpha}{2} p'' + \omega' p' + (\omega'' + \beta \omega - \lambda) p = 0 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad D = \omega'^2 + 2\alpha(\lambda - \beta \omega - \omega'')$ $\alpha \equiv \frac{3\hbar H_0^4}{4\pi^2 \epsilon^2 f^4} \quad , \quad \beta \equiv \frac{3}{2} \frac{\xi f^2}{M_p^2} \quad , \quad T \equiv \frac{t}{t_R} \quad , \quad t_R \equiv \frac{3H_0}{g_\epsilon^2 f^2} = \frac{\alpha\beta S_{ds}}{3\xi H_0} \qquad S_{ds} = \frac{8\pi^2 M_p^2}{\hbar H^2}$ e.g. D=0 at $\varphi = 1 \implies \lambda_{\max} = \beta - \frac{\omega_1'^2}{2\alpha}$ • Largest eigenvalue $\lambda = \lambda_{max}$ inflates most
- Eigenvalue determines peak location
- Note: boundary conditions necessary input for solution

- Stationary FPV distributions $P(\varphi, T) = \sum_{\lambda} e^{\lambda T} p(\varphi, \lambda)$ **Discriminant** D>0 for **positive** solution: $\frac{\alpha}{2} p'' + \omega' p' + (\omega'' + \beta \omega - \lambda) p = 0 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad D = \omega'^2 + 2\alpha(\lambda - \beta \omega - \omega'')$ $\alpha \equiv \frac{3\hbar H_0^4}{4\pi^2 \epsilon^2 f^4} \quad , \quad \beta \equiv \frac{3}{2} \frac{\xi f^2}{M_p^2} \quad , \quad T \equiv \frac{t}{t_R} \quad , \quad t_R \equiv \frac{3H_0}{g_\epsilon^2 f^2} = \frac{\alpha\beta S_{ds}}{3\xi H_0} \qquad S_{ds} = \frac{8\pi^2 M_p^2}{\hbar H^2}$ e.g. D=0 at $\varphi = 1 \implies \lambda_{\max} = \beta - \frac{\omega_1'^2}{2\alpha}$ • Largest eigenvalue $\lambda = \lambda_{max}$ inflates most
- Eigenvalue determines peak location

$$\frac{\alpha}{2}p'' + \omega'p' + (\omega'' + \beta\omega - \lambda)p = 0 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \lambda = \beta\omega(\bar{\varphi}) + \omega''(\bar{\varphi}) - \frac{\alpha}{2\sigma^2}$$

• Note: boundary conditions necessary input for solution

• Stationary FPV distributions $P(\varphi, T) = \sum e^{\lambda T} p(\varphi, \lambda)$ **Discriminant** D>0 for **positive** solution: $\frac{\alpha}{2} p'' + \omega' p' + (\omega'' + \beta \omega - \lambda) p = 0 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad D = \omega'^2 + 2\alpha (\lambda - \beta \omega - \omega'')$ $\alpha \equiv \frac{3\hbar H_0^4}{4\pi^2 \epsilon^2 f^4} \quad , \quad \beta \equiv \frac{3}{2} \frac{\xi f^2}{M_p^2} \quad , \quad T \equiv \frac{t}{t_R} \quad , \quad t_R \equiv \frac{3H_0}{g_\epsilon^2 f^2} = \frac{\alpha\beta S_{ds}}{3\xi H_0} \qquad S_{ds} = \frac{8\pi^2 M_p^2}{\hbar H^2}$ e.g. D=0 at $\varphi = 1 \implies \lambda_{\max} = \beta - \frac{\omega_1'^2}{2\alpha}$ • Largest eigenvalue $\lambda = \lambda_{max}$ inflates most Eigenvalue determines peak location $\omega(\bar{\varphi}) = 1 - \frac{\omega_1'^2}{2\omega'^2}$ $\frac{\alpha}{2}p'' + \omega'p' + (\omega'' + \beta\omega - \lambda)p = 0 \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad \lambda = \beta\omega(\bar{\varphi}) + \omega''(\bar{\varphi}) - \frac{\alpha}{2\sigma^2}$ • Note: boundary conditions necessary input for solution





• C regime: $\alpha\beta \ll 1$. Peak is located as far down the potential as allowed by boundary condition.

- QV regime: $\alpha\beta \gg 1$, $\alpha^2\beta \ll 1$. Peak is a distance $1/(\alpha\beta)$ from the top with width $\sigma \simeq 1/\sqrt{\beta}$.
- $Q^2 V$ regime: $\alpha^2 \beta \gg 1$. Peak as close to the top as possible, with a distance comparable to the width $\sigma \simeq (\alpha/\beta)^{1/3}$.

FPV dynamics

$$\alpha \equiv \frac{3\hbar H_0^4}{4\pi^2\epsilon^2 f^4} \quad , \quad \beta \equiv \frac{3}{2}\frac{\xi f^2}{M_p^2}$$

 $S_{ds} = \frac{8\pi^2 M_p^2}{\hbar H^2}$



Outline

Motivation

- EFT
- Criticality
- Quantum phase transitions (QPT)
- Fokker-Planck Volume (FPV) equation
 - FPV dynamics

• FPV + QPT = SOL

- Discontinuity
- Flux conservation
- SOL solutions
 - Metastability
 - Higgs mass
 - Cosmological constant
- Conclusion
 - Measure problem



• ϕ triggers 1st order **quantum phase transition** at ϕ_c

- **Discontinuity** in V' leads to discontinuous P'
- Requiring continuity of FPV across the critical point gives a junction condition to satisfy



• ϕ triggers 1st order **quantum phase transition** at ϕ_c

- **Discontinuity** in V' leads to discontinuous P'
- Requiring continuity of FPV across the critical point gives a junction condition to satisfy



• ϕ triggers 1st order **quantum phase transition** at ϕ_c

- **Discontinuity** in V' leads to discontinuous P'
- Requiring continuity of FPV across the critical point gives a junction condition to satisfy



• **Coexistence** of branches of different phases, require continuity of P_V and $P_V + P_h$ in FPV at ϕ_T : **flux conservation** junction conditions

$$P_h(\phi_T) = 0 \qquad \Delta P'_v = -P'_h(\phi_T) \qquad \Delta P_v = 0$$



- **Phase v** must be in C regime

 Boundary conditions pick out diffusionless solution over Gibbs solution

-Require flux at boundary

Solve FPV: $\frac{\alpha}{2}p'' + \omega'p' + (\omega'' + \beta\omega - \lambda)p = 0$, $\omega_h(\varphi) = 0$, $\omega_v(\varphi) = \varphi$.

Phase h: $p_h(\varphi_E^+) = 0$, $p_h(\varphi_T) = 0$. $p'_h(\varphi_T) = \kappa_h$. $p_h(\varphi) = \frac{(\varphi_E^+ - \varphi_T)}{\pi} \kappa_h \sin\left(\frac{\pi(\varphi - \varphi_T)}{\varphi_E^+ - \varphi_T}\right)$, $(\varphi > \varphi_T)$. $\lambda = -\frac{\alpha}{2} \frac{\pi^2}{(\varphi_E^+ - \varphi_T)^2}$. Phase v: 1) $P_v^-(-1) = 0$, 2) $P_v^{+\prime}(1) = -k_v$, 3) $P_v^+(\varphi_T) = P_v^-(\varphi_T)$, 4) $P_v^{+\prime}(\varphi_T) = P_v^{-\prime}(\varphi_T) - k_h$, $P_v^{\pm}(\varphi, \lambda) = e^{-\frac{\varphi}{\alpha}} \left[g_a^{\pm}(\lambda) Ai(x) + g_b^{\pm}(\lambda) Bi(x) \right]$, $x = \frac{1 + 2\alpha\lambda - 2\alpha\beta\varphi}{(2\alpha^2\beta)^{2/3}}$.

Outline

Motivation

- EFT
- Criticality
- Quantum phase transitions (QPT)
- Fokker-Planck Volume (FPV) equation
 - FPV dynamics
- FPV + QPT = SOL
 - Discontinuity
 - Flux conservation

SOL solutions

- Metastability
- Higgs mass
- Cosmological constant

Conclusion

• Measure problem

Higgs metastability

$$V(\varphi,h) = \frac{M^4}{g_*^2} \,\omega(\varphi) + \frac{\lambda(\varphi,h)}{4} \left(h^2 - v^2\right)^2$$

$$\lambda(\varphi, M/g_*) = -g_*^2 \varphi$$



Higgs metastability



 φ

Higgs metastability



 $\lambda(\varphi, M/g_*) = -g_*^2 \varphi$



Higgs mass naturalness

$$V(\varphi,h) = \frac{M^4}{g_*^2} \,\omega(\varphi) - \frac{\varphi M^2 h^2}{2} + \frac{\lambda(h) h^4}{4}$$

$$\frac{V(\varphi, \langle h \rangle)}{M^4} = \begin{cases} \kappa_{\rm EW} \varphi + \kappa_2 \varphi^2 + \dots & \text{for } \varphi < 0 & (\text{unbroken EW: } \langle h \rangle = 0) \\ \kappa_{\rm EW} \varphi + \kappa_{\rm IR} \varphi^2 + \dots & \text{for } 0 < \varphi < \varphi_+ & (\text{IR phase: } \langle h \rangle = v) \\ -\kappa_0 + \kappa_{\rm UV} \varphi + \kappa_2 \varphi^2 + \dots & \text{for any } \varphi & (\text{UV phase: } \langle h \rangle = c_{\rm UV} M) \end{cases}$$
$$\kappa_{\rm EW} = \frac{\omega'(0)}{g_*^2} , \quad \kappa_2 = \frac{\omega''(0)}{2g_*^2} , \quad \kappa_{\rm IR} = \kappa_2 - \Delta \kappa , \quad \kappa_0 = \frac{-\lambda_{\rm UV} c_{\rm UV}^4}{4} , \quad \kappa_{\rm UV} = \kappa_{\rm EW} - \frac{c_{\rm UV}^2}{2} \end{cases}$$



- Use broken IR to broken UV phase transition

- Need lower instability scale Λ_I : ~TeV through VL fermions

 - (Naturalness motivation: scalars and vectors heavy, only VL fermions at TeV scale)



Higgs mass naturalness



Cosmological constant

- Hidden phase: vanishing cosmological constant by R-symmetry
- Visible phase: SOL localises at vacuum degeneracy point



Solution must be in C regime with appropriate boundary conditions

Outline

Motivation

- EFT
- Criticality
- Quantum phase transitions (QPT)
- Fokker-Planck Volume (FPV) equation
 - FPV dynamics
- FPV + QPT = SOL
 - Discontinuity
 - Flux conservation
- SOL solutions
 - Metastability
 - Higgs mass
 - Cosmological constant

Conclusion

• Measure problem

Take-home message

- Scalar fields undergoing quantum fluctuations during inflation can be localised at the critical points of quantum phase transitions: SOL
- SOL suggests our Universe lives at the critical boundary of coexistence of phases
- Measure problem: ambiguous choice of time parametrisation (recall $\beta \equiv \frac{3}{2} \frac{\xi f^2}{M^2}$
- Related to regularisation of infinite reheating surface
- We have not specified the inflaton sector: decoupled from our scalar
- SOL prediction is quantitative but dependent on chosen solution of measure problem: exponential localisation can remain a feature

Introduction

