Horava-Lifshitz cosmology revisited

Shinji Mukohyama (YITP, Kyoto U)

Implication of GW170817 on gravity theories

- $|c_{gw}^2 c_{\gamma}^2| < 10^{-15}$
- Horndeski theoy (scalar-tensor theory with 2nd-order eom): Among 4 free functions, $G_4(\phi, X) \& G_5(\phi, X)$ are strongly constrained. Still $G_2(\phi, X) \& G_3(\phi, X)$ are free.
- Generalized Proca theory (vector-tensor theory): Among 6 (or more) free functions, G₄(X) & G₅(X) are strongly constrained. Still G₂(X,F,Y,U), G₃(X), G₆(X), g₅(X) are free.
- Horava-Lifshitz theory (renormalizable quantum gravity): The coefficient of R⁽³⁾ is strongly constrained \rightarrow IR fixed point with $c_{gw}^2 = c_{\gamma}^2$? How to speed up the RG flow?
- Ghost condensation (simplest Higgs phase of gravity): No additional constraint
- Massive gravity (simplest modification of GR): Upper bound on graviton mass ≈ 10⁻²²eV Much weaker than the requirement from acceleration
- c.f. "All" gravity theories (including general relativity): The cosmological constant is strongly constrained ≈ 10⁻¹²⁰.

Power counting

 $I \supset \int dt dx^3 \dot{\phi}^2$

• Scaling dim of ϕ $t \rightarrow b t \ (E \rightarrow b^{-1}E)$ $x \rightarrow b x$ $\phi \rightarrow b^{s} \phi$ 1+3-2+2s = 0s = -1

 $dt dx^3 \phi^n$

 $\propto E^{-(1+3+ns)}$

- Renormalizability $n \le 4$
- Gravity is highly nonlinear and thus nonrenormalizable

Abandon Lorentz symmetry?

 $I \supset \int dt dx^3 \dot{\phi}^2$

- Anisotropic scaling $t \rightarrow b^{z} t \quad (E \rightarrow b^{-z}E)$ $x \rightarrow b x$ $\phi \rightarrow b^{s} \phi$ z+3-2z+2s = 0s = -(3-z)/2
- s = 0 if z = 3

 $\int dt dx^3 \phi^n$

 $\propto E^{-(z+3+ns)/z}$

- For z = 3, any nonlinear interactions are renormalizable!
- Gravity becomes renormalizable!?

Horava-Lifshitz gravity

- HL gravity realizes z=3 scaling @ UV and thus is powercounting renormalizable
- Renormalizability was recently proved [Barvinsky, et al. 2016]
- Ostrogradsky ghost is absent and thus HL gravity is likely to be unitary
- Lorentz-invariance is broken @ UV
- Lorentz-invariant IR fixed-point is generic [Chadha & Nielsen 1983] (and may apply to GW as well; cf. $|c_{gw}^2 c_{\gamma}^2| < 10^{-15}$ from GW170817) but running is slow (logarithmic)
- SUSY or/and strong dynamics can speed-up the RG running towards Lorentz-invariant IR fixed-point

Cosmological implications

Horava-Lifshitz Cosmology: A Review, arXiv: 1007.5199

My talk

- The z=3 scaling solves the horizon problem and leads to (almost) scale-invariant cosmological perturbations without inflation (Mukohyama 2009).
- Higher curvature terms lead to regular bounce (Calcagni 2009, Brandenberger 2009).
- Higher curvature terms (1/a⁶, 1/a⁴) might make the flatness problem milder (Kiritsis&Kofinas 2009). Yota's talk
- The initial condition with z=3 scaling may actually solve the flatness problem. (Bramberger, Coates, Magueijo, Mukohyama, Namba and Watanabe 2017)
- Absence of local Hamiltonian constraint leads to DM as integration "constant" (Mukohyama 2009).

Where are we from?

Primordial Fluctuations

Horizon Problem & Scale-Invariance

Horizon @ decoupling << Correlation Length of CMB

3.8 x 10⁵ light years << 1.4 x 10¹⁰ light years

(1 light year ~ 10¹⁸ cm)

Scale-invariant spectrum $\Delta \sim \text{constant}$

 $\left\langle \zeta_{\vec{k}}\zeta_{\vec{k}'}\right\rangle = (2\pi)^3 \delta^3 (\vec{k} + \vec{k}') \frac{\Delta}{|\vec{k}|^3}$

Usual story

- $\omega^2 >> H^2$: oscillate H = (da/dt) / a $\omega^2 << H^2$: freeze a: scale factor oscillation \rightarrow freeze-out iff $d(H^2/\omega^2)/dt > 0$ $\omega^2 = k^2/a^2$ leads to $d^2a/dt^2 > 0$ Generation of super-horizon fluctuations requires accelerated expansion, i.e. inflation.
- Scaling law

Scale-invariance requires almost const. H, i.e. inflation.

New story with z=3 Mukohyama 2009

- oscillation \rightarrow freeze-out iff d(H²/ ω^2)/dt > 0 $\omega^2 = M^{-4}k^6/a^6$ leads to d²(a³)/dt² > 0 OK for a~t^p with p > 1/3
- Scaling law
 - $t \rightarrow b^3 t \ (E \rightarrow b^{-3}E)$
 - $x \rightarrow b x$ $\phi \rightarrow b^{0} \phi$ Scale-invariant fluctuations!
- Tensor perturbation $P_h \sim M^2/M_{Pl}^2$

New Quantum Gravity

New Mechanism of Primordial Fluctuations

Horizon Problem Solved.
Scale-Invariance Guaranteed
Slight scale-dependence calculable
Predicts relatively large non-Gaussianity

"Vainshtein screening" in projectable (N=N(t)) HL gravity

- Perturbative expansion breaks down in the λ \rightarrow 1+0 limit.
- Non-perturbative analysis shows continuity and GR is recovered in the $\lambda \rightarrow 1+0$ limit.

Screening scalar graviton $L = \left[f\left(\frac{\zeta_T}{\lambda - 1}\right) + g\left(\zeta_T, \lambda\right) \right] \frac{M_{Pl}^2 \dot{\zeta}_T^2}{\lambda - 1} - V\left(\zeta_T, D_i\right) + \text{matter}$ $\int \int \text{subleading} \text{Independent of } \lambda$ No time derivative Local in time, no time derivative Non-local in space, each term has the same # of spatial derivatives in denominator and numerator $\lambda \rightarrow 1$ $L \sim \zeta_c^2$ + matter "Canonically normalized" scalar graviton decouples from the rest of the world. Analogue of Vainshtein screening

"Vainshtein screening" in projectable (N=N(t)) HL gravity

- Perturbative expansion breaks down in the λ \rightarrow 1+0 limit.
- Non-perturbative analysis shows continuity and GR is recovered in the $\lambda \rightarrow 1+0$ limit.
 - ✓ Spherically-sym, static, vacuum (Mukohyama 2010)
 - ✓ Spherically-sym, dynamical, vacuum (Mukohyama 201?)
 - ✓ Spherically-sym, static, with matter (Mukohyama 201?)
 - ✓ General super-horizon perturbations with matter (Izumi-Mukohyama 2011; Gumrukcuoglu-Mukohyama-Wang 2011)
- "Vainshtein radius" can be pushed to infinity in the $\lambda \rightarrow 1+0$ limit.

Cosmological implications

Horava-Lifshitz Cosmology: A Review, arXiv: 1007.5199

- The z=3 scaling solves the horizon problem and leads to (almost) scale-invariant cosmological perturbations without inflation (Mukohyama 2009).
- Higher curvature terms lead to regular bounce (Calcagni 2009, Brandenberger 2009).
- Higher curvature terms (1/a⁶, 1/a⁴) might make the flatness problem milder (Kiritsis&Kofinas 2009). Yota's talk
- The initial condition with z=3 scaling may actually solve the flatness problem. (Bramberger, Coates, Magueijo, Mukohyama, Namba and Watanabe 2017)
- Absence of local Hamiltonian constraint leads to DM as integration "constant" (Mukohyama 2009).