

# WEAK GRAVITY CONJECTURE(S)

Karim Benakli

CNRS, Sorbonne Université

March 29th, 2021

Based on works with Carlo Branchina + Gaëtan Lafforgue-Marmet

## Looking for firm grounds in the Swampland:

Among the consistent QFTs, which ones can descend from a quantum theory of gravity?

The briefest glance at the  
**Weak Gravity Conjecture**

**The weak gravity conjecture is easy to state in an asymptotically flat space-time. In fact, there are several ways to formulate it:**

- The simplest is the following: The attractive gravitational interaction (think: Newton's force) is weaker than the repulsive gauge interaction (think: Coulomb's force).

**But there are also other formulations. For example:**

- Extremal black holes decay completely, leaving no remnants.
- A super-extremal state exists.

Arkani-Hamed, Motl, Nicolis, Vafa '06

- All these formulations lead to the following practical statement about the charge/mass ratio: Arkani-Hamed, Motl, Nicolis, Vafa '06

In flat space-time, for any theory with  $U(1)$  gauge symmetry with coupling  $g$ , a state of charge  $q(> 0)$  and mass  $m$  satisfying the inequality

$$\sqrt{2}gq \geq \frac{m}{M_{Pl}}$$

must exist.

All the above conditions are the same in flat space-time

The WGC implies the non-existence of global symmetries in quantum gravity.

## I would like to make a couple of points about this conjecture:

- First: not only is it easy to state but it is the most verified conjecture of the Swampland. **It has been shown to be valid in many vacua of string theory.**
- Second, on closer inspection, there is something troubling. All these conditions are equivalent when we are in an asymptotically flat space-time. **The question then arises as to what the real fundamental criterion is.**

I will not discuss cosmology, where we are not in a flat space-time, and where we can study a form like the one presented by Ignatios for de Sitter space.

Instead I can examine how this criterion is applied by a phenomenologist, **beyond the fact, well known since decades, that there is no global symmetry.**

Let us look at some examples.

## Let's put numbers to see how it impacts phenomenology

- For electromagnetism:  $U(1)_{em}$ . Mass of the electron  $m_e = 511$  keV. Coupling  $g_{em} \sim 0.3$ .

$$0.3 \gtrsim 10^{-21}$$

- For a TeV scale new state ( $q = 1$ ):

$$g \gtrsim 10^{-15}$$

- For a meV scale new state ( $q = 1$ ):

$$g \gtrsim 10^{-30}$$

## Let's put numbers to see how it impacts phenomenology

- For electromagnetism:  $U(1)_{em}$ .  
Mass of the electron  $m_e = 511$  keV. Coupling  $g_{em} \sim 0.3$ .

$$0.3 \gtrsim 10^{-21}$$

- For a TeV scale new state ( $q = 1$ ):

$$g \gtrsim 10^{-15}$$

- For a meV scale new state ( $q = 1$ ):

$$g \gtrsim 10^{-30}$$

**USELESS**

In flat space-time: not the most useful constraint ...



The WGC applied for the corresponding magnetic monopole leads to:

In flat space-time, for any theory with  $U(1)$  gauge symmetry with coupling  $g$ , there is an ultraviolet scale

$$\Lambda_{UV} \sim g M_{Pl}$$

which sets the cut-off of the Effective Field Theory (EFT).

- This is the **Magnetic Weak Gravity Conjecture**.
- It obviously implies the non-existence of global symmetries (forbids  $g \rightarrow 0$ ).

Thus, if we have a model with very small  $g$ ,  $\Lambda_{UV}$  will fall within the range of energies accessible to experiments. New states are necessarily present in this model at this scale.

I will illustrate this on a simple example.

**The XENON1T example:** K. B., Branchina, Lafforgue-Marmet '20 - Anchordoqui, Antoniadis, K.B., Lust '20

- The example is provided by an attempt to fit the Xenon1T anomaly.
- One possibility that could explain the Xenon1T anomaly is the presence of a dark photon at the keV scale that couples very weakly to electrons.
- This coupling can be either direct or through kinetic mixing. Then, the mixing of the dark photon  $X$  and SM photon  $\gamma$  needs to be very small

$$\epsilon_{\gamma X} \sim \frac{eg_X}{16\pi^2} C_{\text{Log}} \lll 1 \quad \rightarrow \quad g_X \lll 1$$

- In any case, the coupling must be tiny and the "model" should have a UV cut-off:

$$g_X \lesssim \mathcal{O}(10^{-13} - 10^{-12}) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Lambda_{UV} \lesssim 10 - 100 \text{ TeV}$$

- What kind of stuff can appear at the  $\Lambda_{UV}$ ?

**The XENON1T example:** K. B., Branchina, Lafforgue-Marmet '20 - Anchordoqui, Antoniadis, K.B., Lust '20

- A way to get a tiny coupling in string theory is by using Large Extra-Dimensions or Low String Scale:

$$g_X = \sqrt{\frac{16 \pi}{g_s}} \frac{M_s}{M_{\text{Pl}}} \sim 4 \times 10^{-14} \left(\frac{0.2}{g_s}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{M_s}{10 \text{ TeV}}\right),$$

\* The coupling needed to fit XENON1T is the *weakest one can get this way*.

It corresponds to extra-dimensions or a string scale of order 10 – 100 TeV

⇒ A case for a 100 TeV collider.

## The WGC + (massless) scalars:

The Repulsive Force Conjecture (RFC): taken far apart, two copies of the RFC state feel a repulsive force between them.

Palti '17 - Heidenreich, Reece and Rudelius '19

- RFC avoids gravitational bound states.
- RFC involves forces from: gravitons +  $U(1)$  gauge bosons + massless scalars
- What about cases with only scalar bosons i.e. without gauge bosons?

- Problem 1: Moduli exchange lead to attractive forces.
- Problem 2: Dealing with scalars having non-vanishing potentials.

A very brief overview of the

# Scalar Weak Gravity Conjecture

Many attempts for a **Scalar Weak Gravity Conjecture (SWGC)**. In particular:

- [1] Palti '17 → attempts to generalize the RFC to scalars → the **SWGC**
- [2] Gonzalo, Ibanez '19 → self-interacting scalars → some relation between the derivatives of the scalar potential.
- [3] Freivogel, Gasenzer, Hebecker and Leonhardt '19 → criticize [2] → size of gravitational bound state (No functional relation).
- [4] K. B., Branchina, Lafforgue-Marmet '20 → Gravity is the weakest interaction.
- [5] Gonzalo, Ibanez '20 → 2 to 2 processes → recovers [4] in their explicit example.

Many attempts for a **Scalar Weak Gravity Conjecture (SWGC)**. In particular:

- [1] **Palti '17** → attempts to generalize the RFC to scalars → the **SWGC**
- [2] **Gonzalo, Ibanez '19** → self-interacting scalars → some relation between the derivatives of the scalar potential.
- [3] **Freivogel, Gasenzer, Hebecker and Leonhardt '19** → criticize [2] → size of gravitational bound state (No functional relation).
- [4] **K. B., Branchina, Lafforgue-Marmet '20** → Gravity is the weakest interaction.
- [5] **Gonzalo, Ibanez '20** → 2 to 2 processes → recovers [4] in their explicit example.

**We try to formulate the weakness of gravity as:**

*For any scalar  $\Phi$ , there exist at least one state  $X$  such that the leading interaction between  $X$  and  $\Phi$  is stronger than the gravitational one.*

K. B., Branchina, Lafforgue-Marmet



**Case  $X = \phi$ :**

We consider a real scalar  $\phi$  with the potential:

$$V(\phi) = \frac{1}{2}m_0^2\phi^2 + \frac{\mu}{3!}\phi^3 + \frac{\lambda}{4!}\phi^4.$$

At energy scales  $E \sim m_0$ , the theory is *non-relativistic*. We study fluctuations around  $\phi = 0$  and make the field redefinition:

$$\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m_0}} \left( \psi(\mathbf{x}, t)e^{-im_0t} + \psi^*(\mathbf{x}, t)e^{im_0t} \right)$$

The potential for the non-relativistic field  $\psi$  should be of the form

$$V_{eff}(\psi\psi^*) = m_0\psi\psi^* + \frac{\tilde{\lambda}}{16m_0^2}(\psi\psi^*)^2.$$

where:

$$\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda - \frac{5}{3} \frac{\mu^2}{m_0^2}.$$

The resulting sign of  $\tilde{\lambda}$  tells us about the attractive ( $< 0$ ) or repulsive ( $> 0$ ) nature of the effective interaction and, in the case where they are in competition, which one of the two terms dominate at energies  $E \sim m_0$ .

- It is essential in the comparison to fix the energy scale, and naturally it is given by the mass of the scalar particle, and consider the gravitational scattering in the s-channel at  $s \sim 4m_0^2$ .

Requiring that gravity is the weakest force at low energy amounts then to impose:

$$|\tilde{\lambda}| = \left| \lambda - \frac{5}{3} \frac{\mu^2}{m_0^2} \right| \geq \frac{m_0^2}{M_{Pl}^2}.$$

We have put an absolute value on the left hand side so that it holds independently of the sign of the self-interaction.

- The quantity  $\sqrt{|\tilde{\lambda}|} M_{Pl}$ , could be interpreted as an ultra-violet cut-off scale.

In more generic field case, we will impose a stronger condition

$$4m_0^2 \left| \frac{\partial^4 V_{eff}}{\partial^2 \psi \partial^2 \psi^*} \right|_{\psi=0} \geq \frac{\tilde{c}}{M_{Pl}^2} \left| \frac{\partial^2 V_{eff}}{\partial \psi \partial \psi^*} \right|_{\psi=0}^2$$

and take the order one constant  $\tilde{c}$ .

- We consider the quartic scalar potential

$$V(\phi, \bar{\phi}) = -m^2 \bar{\phi} \phi + \lambda (\bar{\phi} \phi)^2.$$

with  $\lambda > 0$ , insuring stability, and  $m^2 > 0$ .

- It is convenient to use the parametrization  $\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \rho(x) e^{i\pi(x)}$ . The gravitational interaction is subdominant for:

$$\frac{m^2}{3\lambda} < \rho^2 \leq \frac{14}{3} \tilde{M}_{Pl}^2 + \frac{17}{21} \frac{m^2}{\lambda} + \mathcal{O}(\tilde{M}_{Pl}^{-2})$$

- At the minimum, where  $\rho^2 = \frac{m^2}{\lambda} \equiv v$ , we get  $\tilde{\lambda} = -24\lambda$ , and the conjecture is then verified in the case:

$$\lambda \geq \frac{1}{12} \frac{m^2}{\tilde{M}_{Pl}^2} \sim 10^{-17}$$

If we take  $m$  to be the electroweak scale.

$$v^2 \leq 12 \tilde{M}_{Pl}^2 \sim 10^{37} GeV^2$$

## Multiple Scalar and Moduli Fields

Consider the case of a massive complex scalar  $X$ :

$$\mathcal{L}_{int} = \mu\phi|X|^2 + \dots$$

where the dots stand for sub-leading higher order terms. We can write the potential as:

$$V(X, \phi) = m_X^2(\phi) |X|^2, \quad \mu = \partial_\phi m_X^2$$

The preeminence of scalar interactions must be taken at the mass scale  $\sim 2m_X$  and reads then:

$$|\partial_\phi m_X| \geq \frac{m_X}{\tilde{M}_{Pl}}$$

## Newton vs Scalar interactions

We can square the above three-point amplitudes on each side,  $2X \rightarrow \phi$  on the left and  $2X \rightarrow G$ , on the right side, where  $G$  is the graviton. The comparison concerns then two  $XX^* \rightarrow XX^*$  processes, at the energy scale  $m_X$ , one through scalar and the other through graviton exchange. This leads to the following potentials for  $X$ :

$$V_{scalar}(r) = -\frac{\mu^2}{4m_X^2} \frac{1}{r}, \quad V_{grav}(r) = -\frac{m_X^2}{\tilde{M}_{Pl}^2} \frac{1}{r}$$

Now, both scalar and gravitational interactions have similar dependence in the inter-particles distance and the comparison is straightforward:

$$\frac{\mu^2}{4m_X^2} \geq \frac{m_X^2}{\tilde{M}_{Pl}^2}$$

which can be written:

$$\partial_\phi m_X \partial_\phi m_X \geq \frac{m_X^2}{\tilde{M}_{Pl}^2}$$

In the extremal case saturating the above inequality, the solution is given by:

$$m_X^2(\phi) = m_0^2 e^{\pm 2\phi/\tilde{M}_{Pl}}.$$

This is the Swampland Distance Conjecture (SDC).

## Example 2: Complex Moduli Fields

Complex modulus  $\Phi$  and scalar field  $X$  with a potential of the form:

$$V(X, \Phi) = m_X^2(\Phi)|X|^2 + \dots \quad m_X^2 = m_{X0}^2 + \lambda_\Phi |\Phi|^2 + \dots$$

where

$$\lambda_\Phi = \partial_\Phi \partial_{\bar{\Phi}} m_X^2(\Phi, \bar{\Phi})$$

The weakness of gravitational interaction:

$$\left| \Phi\Phi^* \leftrightarrow XX^* \right|_{E \sim 2m_X} \geq \left| \Phi\Phi^* \leftrightarrow \text{graviton} \leftrightarrow XX^* \right|_{E \sim 2m_X}$$

$$\partial_\Phi \partial_{\bar{\Phi}} m_X^2 \geq 2 \frac{m_X^2}{\tilde{M}_{Pl}^2}$$

If the state  $X$  has a self-quartic interaction, then we will also have to check a similar constraint on the self coupling  $|\tilde{\lambda}_4| \tilde{M}_{Pl}^2 \geq m_X^2$ .

## Extremal states

The extremal case that corresponds to the case of equality is solved for:

$$m_X^2(\Phi, \bar{\Phi}) = m_-^2 e^{-\sqrt{2} \frac{\Phi + \bar{\Phi}}{M_{Pl}}} + m_+^2 e^{\sqrt{2} \frac{\Phi + \bar{\Phi}}{M_{Pl}}}$$

We can use the following parametrization:

$$\Phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\phi + i\chi), \quad e^{\sqrt{2} \frac{\Phi + \bar{\Phi}}{M_{Pl}}} = e^{2 \frac{\phi}{M_{Pl}}}, \quad \text{and} \quad e^{\frac{\phi}{M_{Pl}}} = R$$

then:

$$m_X^2(R) = \frac{m_-^2}{R^2} + m_+^2 R^2$$

which is the well known formula for string states squared masses with the  $\frac{m_-^2}{R^2}$  as the low energy Kaluza-Klein modes and  $m_+^2 R^2$  the winding modes.

## Looks like the Refined de Sitter Swampland Conjecture

Now, consider the case where the field  $\phi$  is a modulus appearing only as a parameter in the couplings of the massive scalar  $X$  ( $\langle X \rangle = 0$ ), through

$$V(X, \phi) = m_X^2(\phi)X^2 + \sum_{n \geq 4} \lambda_n(\phi)X^n$$

Then, the first condition can be written as:

$$\left. \frac{|\partial_\phi V(X, \phi)|}{V} \right|_{X=0} \geq \frac{\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}{M_{Pl}}$$

while the other condition reads now:

$$\left. \frac{|\partial_\phi \partial_{\bar{\phi}} V(X, \phi)|}{V} \right|_{X=0} \geq \frac{2\tilde{c}}{M_{Pl}^2}$$

where we note the similarity with the Refined de Sitter Conjectures when the second derivative is negative.



# Conclusions

- The **Magnetic Weak Gravity Conjecture**: a hyper-weak  $U(1)$  coupling predicts new physics at low energy.  
Example: fitting the XENON1T with a very weakly coupled dark photon predicts extra dimensions accessible at a 100 TeV collider.
- We have investigated the implication that "**For any scalar field its leading interaction is never gravity**".
- We have recovered in some way the Axionic WGC, the Swampland Distance Conjecture and that the Refined de Sitter Conjecture.