

Title: Cosmic superstrings: observable relics of brane inflation

Date: Jan 20, 2006 02:30 PM

URL: <http://pirsa.org/06010011>


Abstract: Cosmic strings are a generic by-product of string theory models of the inflationary epoch. These new cosmic "superstrings," as they are called, are distinct from the grand unified strings once thought to generate large scale structure. I will discuss what limits the WMAP and SDSS data have already placed on the properties of networks of cosmic strings, as well as avenues for their direct detection. I will also introduce cosmic superstrings' distinctive properties: they can bind into a possibly infinite number of higher-tension states, leading to the possibility of network frustration and for a high- string-tension UV-catastrophe. An analytical model constructed by myself and others has shown that superstring networks can evade these catastrophes under certain assumptions for the dynamics of string binding. I will describe ongoing work to verify numerically these binding dynamics. Finally, I will characterize several observational signatures that I and collaborators have identified that could allow us to discriminate between cosmic superstrings and other kinds of cosmic strings.

# Outline

- Background and current observational limits on cosmic strings
- Cosmic superstring network modeling and observational signatures

# Brane Inflation: New Source for Cosmic Strings?

(Tye and Sarangi 2002, Jones, Stoica, and Tye 2002,  
Copeland, Myers, and Polchinski 2004 )



- Annihilation of inflating branes can produce strings (actual 1-D objects or “wrapped” higher-D objects)


- Predicts:  $\text{few} \times 10^{-7} > G\mu > 10^{-11}$

- caveat: possible stability problems

- Not ruled out; potentially detectable

# Brane Inflation: New Source for Cosmic Strings?

(Tye and Sarangi 2002, Jones, Stoica, and Tye 2002,  
Copeland, Myers, and Polchinski 2004 )



- Annihilation of inflating branes can produce strings (actual 1-D objects or “wrapped” higher-D objects)

- Predicts:  $\text{few} \times 10^{-7} > G\mu > 10^{-11}$


- caveat: possible stability problems

- Not ruled out; potentially detectable

# Cosmic Strings: What Are They?

Kibble Mechanism for defect formation:

Regions larger than  $H^{-1}$  are out of causal contact!



Cosmic string defect for U(1) symmetry

# Cosmic Strings

$G\mu$ : Key Dimensionless Parameter

$G$  = Newton's constant ( $\hbar = c = 1$ )


$\mu$  = string tension

$G\mu \sim$  string tension in Planck units

$\sim$  gravitational coupling of string = size of  
metric perturbation.

$\sim 10^{-6}$  for  $\mu$  at GUT scale

# How do Strings Interact?




nothing:  
probability  $1-P$

reconnection:  
probability  $P$

$P = 1$  for non-string-theory  
cosmic strings

# String Network Evolution: Scaling

Simplest one-scale model: energy lost in loops (Kibble)





Naively,  $\Omega_{\text{strings}} \sim \frac{G\mu}{a^2}$

Simulations find  $\Omega_{\text{strings}} \sim \frac{G\mu}{P}$

# Strings vs. Data: Review

Alone: Strings *FAIL*

(Albrecht, Battye, & Robinson, PRL 79 (1997) 4736)



Strings ARE allowed  
at a subdominant level:

(Bouchet, Peter, Riazuelo, Sakellariadou,  
PRD 65 (2002) 021301)

Question: how much?

# Our Modeling Parameters

- Standard Cosmological Parameters:  $A_s, n_s, h, \Omega_B h^2, \Omega_M h^2, \tau$

- Cosmic String Model “Weight”  $B \equiv \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu_0}\right)^2$   
 $G\mu_0 = 2 \times 10^{-6}$


- Incoherently add String and Adiabatic Power Spectra:

$$C_l = C_l^{adiabatic} + C_l^{strings}$$


$$P(k)^{linear} = P(k)^{adiabatic} + P(k)^{strings}$$

- Vary 7 Parameters using Markov Chain Monte Carlo  
 (+ overall  $P(k)$  normalization and “string wiggleness”,  $\alpha$ )
  - Use SDSS and WMAP Likelihood Functions to construct a multi-dimensional posterior distribution function (pdf)

# WMAP and SDSS Bounds: Summary of our Work



# WMAP and SDSS Bounds: String power less than 14%




- CS fractional power  $f < 0.14$  (95% c.l.)
- also: “test” of adiabatic model

$$I^{cs} = \sum_l \frac{(2l+1)}{4\pi} C_l^{cs}(\vec{s})$$


$$I^{ad} = \sum_l \frac{(2l+1)}{4\pi} C_l^{ad}(\vec{s})$$

$$\vec{s} = (n, h, \Omega_m, \Omega_b, \tau, \alpha)$$

# WMAP and SDSS Bounds: Summary of our Work



# WMAP and SDSS Bounds: String power less than 14%




- CS fractional power  $f < 0.14$  (95% c.l.)
- also: “test” of adiabatic model

$$I^{cs} = \sum_l \frac{(2l+1)}{4\pi} C_l^{cs}(\vec{s})$$


$$I^{ad} = \sum_l \frac{(2l+1)}{4\pi} C_l^{ad}(\vec{s})$$

$$\vec{s} = (n, h, \Omega_m, \Omega_b, \tau, \alpha)$$

# WMAP and SDSS Bounds: Summary of our Work



# WMAP and SDSS Bounds: String power less than 14%




- CS fractional power  $f < 0.14$  (95% c.l.)
- also: “test” of adiabatic model

$$I^{cs} = \sum_l \frac{(2l+1)}{4\pi} C_l^{cs}(\vec{s})$$


$$I^{ad} = \sum_l \frac{(2l+1)}{4\pi} C_l^{ad}(\vec{s})$$

$$\vec{s} = (n, h, \Omega_m, \Omega_b, \tau, \alpha)$$

# WMAP and SDSS Bounds: Summary of our Work



# WMAP and SDSS Bounds: String power less than 14%




- CS fractional power  $f < 0.14$  (95% c.l.)
- also: “test” of adiabatic model

$$I^{cs} = \sum_l \frac{(2l+1)}{4\pi} C_l^{cs}(\vec{s})$$

$$I^{ad} = \sum_l \frac{(2l+1)}{4\pi} C_l^{ad}(\vec{s})$$

$$\vec{s} = (n, h, \Omega_m, \Omega_b, \tau, \alpha)$$

# WMAP and SDSS Bounds: Direct limits on string tension



- Fix parameters at WMAP values
- *Define*


$$B \equiv \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu_0}\right)^2$$

$$I^{CS}(\mu_0, \vec{s}_{WMAP}) \equiv I^{AD}(\vec{s}_{WMAP})$$

$$\rightarrow G\mu_0 = 2 \times 10^{-6}$$

$$G\mu < 3.4(5.0) \times 10^{-7}$$

# String Wiggleness



- String gravity:

$$ds^2 = (1 + 2\phi) ds_f^2 + (1 - 2\phi) dz^2$$


$$ds_f^2 = -dt^2 + dr^2 + (1 - 8G\tilde{\mu}) d\theta^2$$

$$\phi = 2G(\tilde{\mu} - \tilde{T}) \ln(r/r_o)$$

$$\tilde{\mu}\tilde{T} = \mu^2 \quad \tilde{\mu} \equiv \alpha\mu$$


- *Weak Upper Bound*

# B-Mode Polarization in the CMB



- Odd parity
- Adiabatic:  
Tensor mode fraction,  $r = 0.1$  in graph
- Strings:  $f = 0.1$  in graph;  
2 different alpha values

# String B-Mode in Context



# Outline

- Background and current observational limits on cosmic strings
- **Cosmic Superstring network modeling and observational signatures**


# Cosmic Superstrings: How Are They Different?

- Multi- $\mu$  networks: F, D, (p,q) bound states
- p F-strings + q D-strings = (p,q) string

$$G\mu_F \sim 10^{-12} - 10^{-6} \quad \mu_D = g_s \mu_F$$


$$\mu_{(p,q)} = \mu_F \sqrt{(p - Cq)^2 + q^2} / g_s^2$$

- Scaling? Tension Distribution??



(Copeland, Myers,  
and Polchinski, 2004)

# New Interaction Physics



$$\frac{dN_{\alpha}}{d\eta} = FL \sum_{\beta\gamma} \left[ \frac{1}{2} P_{\beta+\gamma \rightarrow \alpha} N_{\beta} N_{\gamma} - P_{\alpha+\gamma \rightarrow \beta} N_{\alpha} N_{\gamma} \right]$$

(Note: hide dynamics / cosmology  
in conformal time,  $\eta$ )

$$N_{\alpha} \eta^2 \rightarrow \text{Constant?}$$

Interaction Rules:

- $p$  and  $q$  must be coprime to be stable
- $(k, 0)$  and  $(0, k)$  strings decay instantly  
Become  $k$   $(1, 0)$  or  $(0, 1)$  strings
- All interactions **lose energy**

# N+1 Length Scales, One Velocity

- Multiple tensions:  $\mu_{(p,q)} = \mu_F \sqrt{p^2 + q^2} / g_s^2$
- L, v evolution similar to Martins / Shellard VOS Model

$$\dot{v} = (1 - v^2) \left( -2Hv + \frac{c_2}{L} \right) \quad \dot{L} = HL + c_1 v$$

- Densities  $n_{(p,q)}$  evolve via ...
  - Dilution (2H) and straightening ( $-c_2 v / L$ )
  - Self-interaction ( $-P n_{(p,q)}^2 v L$ )
  - Reactions and breakup as in previous slide
- P: self-interaction parameter;  
F: inter-string-interaction parameter (massive simplification of collision physics)

# Possible Catastrophes

- Low  $P$  + reactions: leads to frustration (over-density, string domination)
- Low  $F$ : many tensions go to scaling ...


A Multi-Tension UV Catastrophe:

$$\left( \frac{\Omega_a^{strings}}{\mu_a} \right) \rightarrow \text{constant independent of } \mu_a!$$

# Networks Go To Scaling

convergence  
test

$$\frac{3\Omega_{cs}}{8\pi G\mu(0,1)}$$




Cosmological scale factor, a

# Networks Go To Scaling

convergence  
test

$$\frac{3\Omega_{cs}}{8\pi G\mu_{(0,1)}}$$




Scaling  
without  
Loop  
Formation!

Cosmological scale factor,  $a$

# Few Tensions are Populated

$N(\mu)$




$(g_s = 1.0)$

# Few Tensions are Populated

(0,1) (1,0) (1,1)

$N(\mu)$




$(g_s = 1.0)$

Current Work:

# Interaction Dynamics



Modeling binding with a  $U(1) \times U(1)$  gauge theory



To test our analytic model's quick zip approximation

$$V(|\phi|, |\psi|) = \frac{\lambda_1}{4} (\bar{\phi}\phi - \eta^2)^2 + \frac{\lambda_2}{4} (\bar{\psi}\psi - v^2)^2 - \kappa (\bar{\phi}\phi - \eta^2) (\bar{\psi}\psi - v^2)$$

# String Gravitational Lensing



Conical spacetime:


$$\text{deficit angle} \sim 8\pi G\mu$$

$$\delta\phi = 1.0'' \leftrightarrow G\mu = 4 \times 10^{-7} \quad (\sim \text{State of the art})$$

Full formula (Shlaer and MW, 2005):

$$|\vec{\delta\phi}| = 8\pi G\mu \sqrt{\gamma^2 (1 + \hat{n} \cdot \mathbf{v})^2 - \cos^2 \theta} \frac{D_{s,cs}}{D}$$



# Lensing at a Binding Vertex



Simulated image

Distinctive, but probably *very rare*

# String Gravitational Lensing



Conical spacetime:


$$\text{deficit angle} \sim 8\pi G\mu$$

$$\delta\phi = 1.0'' \leftrightarrow G\mu = 4 \times 10^{-7} \quad (\sim \text{State of the art})$$

Full formula (Shlaer and MW, 2005):

$$|\vec{\delta\phi}| = 8\pi G\mu \sqrt{\gamma^2 (1 + \hat{n} \cdot \mathbf{v})^2 - \cos^2 \theta} \frac{D_{s,cs}}{D}$$

# Lensing at a Binding Vertex




Simulated image

Distinctive, but probably *very rare*

A cautionary tale:

# CSL-1: A Detection?


(Sazhin et al, 2002)



$z = 0.46$


Separation  $\sim 20$  Kpc  
 $\sim 1.9''$

$\rightarrow G\mu \sim \text{few} \times 10^{-7}$



Hot from the satellite (Jan. 12 2006) ...

# What the HST Saw




# Conclusions


- Cosmic string power: <14% of total  
Tension limit:  $G\mu < (\text{few}) \times 10^{-7}$ 
  - Possible source for B-mode polarization in CMB
- (p,q) network interpretation:
  - Few string tensions populated; successful scaling
  - Distinctive signatures
- Direct observational windows: lensing, gravity waves

Hot from the satellite (Jan. 12 2006) ...

# What the HST Saw



# Lensing at a Binding Vertex



Distinctive, but probably *very rare*

# Conclusions

- Cosmic string power: <14% of total  
Tension limit:  $G\mu < (\text{few}) \times 10^{-7}$ 
  - Possible source for B-mode polarization in CMB
- (p,q) network interpretation:
  - Few string tensions populated; successful scaling
  - Distinctive signatures
- Direct observational windows: lensing, gravity waves