

**Miniworkshop on**  
**“Supersymmetry, Supergravity**  
**and Superstrings”**

Dipartimento di Fisica,  
Pisa, March 19-21 2007

**Thermal de Sitter Solutions**  
**from String Effective Theories**

Costas Kounnas

Laboratoire de Physique Théorique,  
Ecole Normale Supérieure, Paris

**In collaboration with:**

**Hervé Partouche**

[In effective supergravities from Strings]

**and**

**Nicolaos Toumbas, Jan Troost**

[In Superstrings with broken SUSY]

## 1. Introduction

- Superstrings and M-theory compactifications can give 4d vacua with **exact or spontaneously broken** supersymmetries.
- The most interesting phenomenologically are those where

$$N = 8, 4 \rightarrow N = 1 \rightarrow N = 0$$

- **The underlying D = 10 theories** encode  $N \geq 4$  constrained structure which can be used to obtain **useful information** on the effective  $N = 1$  **supergravity**.
- The 4d  $N = 1$  theories, typically include moduli fields whose **vacuum expectation values are undetermined**.

Some of these moduli come from the : dilaton field  $\Phi$ , internal metric  $G_{IJ}$ , and  $p$ -form fields  $F^p$ .

Generating a potential for the moduli is essential in order

(i) to reduce the number of massless scalars

(ii) to induce supersymmetry breaking

(iii) to determine the space-time background geometry

In  $N \geq 4$  supergravities, the only known available tool for generating a potential is the “gauging” which is induced by:

i) Non trivial Fluxes and Branes

ii) Non-perturbative corrections

iii) Perturbative Radiative Corrections

iv) Thermal Corrections

## 2. $N = 4$ Gauging $\leftrightarrow$ $N = 1$ Superpotential

“Gauging”  $\longrightarrow$  We introduce in the theory a gauge group  $G$  acting on the vector fields in the **gravitational and/or vector super-multiplets**.

**The important fact is:** The kinetic terms of the fields in the **gauged theory, remain the same** as in the **ungauged theory**.

When translated into the language of the “daughter  $N = 1$ ” obtained from the “mother  $N \geq 4$ ” by a consistent orbifold (CY) truncation, **the gauging gives non-trivial modifications to the structure of the superpotential  $W$** , whereas the **Kähler potential  $K$  remains the same**.

To be more precise consider the case of  **$N = 4$  theory** constructed either on:

- Heterotic on  $T^6$
- Type IIA or IIB on  $K3 \times T^2$
- Type IIA, IIB on orientifolds
- ...

Independently of our starting point, the  $N = 4$  scalar manifold is identical for all cases.

$$M = \left( \frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)} \right)_S \times \left( \frac{SO(6,6+n)}{SO(6) \times SO(6+n)} \right)_{T_A, U_A, Z_I}$$

After  $Z^2 \times Z^2$  orbifold (CY) projections

$$N = 4 \rightarrow N = 1 \text{ and } M \rightarrow K$$

$$K = \left( \frac{SU(1,1)}{U(1)} \right)_S \times \left( \frac{SO(2, 2 + n_1)}{SO(2) \times SO(2 + n_1)} \right)_{T_1, U_1, Z_1^I} \times$$

$$\left( \frac{SO(2, 2 + n_2)}{SO(2) \times SO(2 + n_2)} \right) \times \left( \frac{SO(2, 2 + n_3)}{SO(2) \times SO(2 + n_3)} \right)$$

$$K = -\log (S + \bar{S})$$

$$-\log \left( (T_1 + \bar{T}_1)(U_1 + \bar{U}_1) - (Z_1 + \bar{Z}_1)^2 \right)$$

$$-\log \left( (T_2 + \bar{T}_2)(U_2 + \bar{U}_2) - (Z_2 + \bar{Z}_2)^2 \right)$$

$$-\log \left( (T_3 + \bar{T}_3)(U_3 + \bar{U}_3) - (Z_3 + \bar{Z}_3)^2 \right).$$

**The above choice of parametrization is a solution to the  $N = 4$  constraints after  $Z^2 \times Z^2$  orbifold projections  $N = 4 \rightarrow N = 1$**

## **$S$ -manifold**

$$|\phi_0|^2 - |\phi_1|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \quad \longrightarrow$$
$$\phi_0 - \phi_1 = \frac{1}{(S + \bar{S})^{1/2}}, \quad \phi_0 + \phi_1 = \frac{S}{(S + \bar{S})^{1/2}}$$

## **$T_A, U_A, Z_A^I$ -manifolds**

$$|\sigma_A^1|^2 + |\sigma_A^2|^2 - |\rho_A^1|^2 - |\rho_A^2|^2 - |\Phi_A^I|^2 = \frac{1}{2}$$
$$(\sigma_A^1)^2 + (\sigma_A^2)^2 - (\rho_A^1)^2 - (\rho_A^2)^2 - (\Phi_A^I)^2 = 0$$

$$\sigma_A^1 = \frac{1 + T_A U_A - (Z_A^I)^2}{2Y_A^{1/2}}, \quad \sigma_A^2 = i \frac{T_A + U_A}{2Y_A^{1/2}}$$

$$\rho_A^1 = \frac{1 - T_A U_A - (Z_A^I)^2}{2Y_A^{1/2}}, \quad \rho_A^2 = i \frac{T_A - U_A}{2Y_A^{1/2}}$$

$$\Phi_A^I = \frac{i Z_A^I}{2Y_A^{1/2}}, \quad K_A = -\log Y_A$$

The superpotential of the  $N = 1$  supergravity is determined by the gravitino mass terms in  $N = 4$  after the  $Z^2 \times Z^2$  orbifold projections.

$$e^{K/2}W = (\phi_0 - \phi_1) f_{IJK} \Phi_1^I \Phi_2^I \Phi_3^I \\ + (\phi_0 + \phi_1) \bar{f}_{IJK} \Phi_1^I \Phi_2^I \Phi_3^I$$

$$\Phi_A^I = \{ \sigma_A^1, \sigma_A^2; \rho_A^1, \rho_A^2, \Phi_A^I \}$$

$f_{IJK}$  and  $\bar{f}_{IJK}$  are the gauge structure constants of the  $N = 4$  “mother” theory.

In the heterotic, the contributions from  $f_{IJK}$  give rise to a perturbative “electric gauging”. The contributions from  $\bar{f}_{IJK}$  provide the non-perturbative “magnetic gauging”.



In general, the breaking of SUSY requires a gauging with **non-zero  $f_{IJK}$  involving the fields**

$\sigma_A^1, \sigma_A^2; \rho_A^1, \rho_A^2 \longrightarrow$  gauging involving the  $N = 4$  graviphotons  $\longrightarrow$  gauging of the R-symmetry.

In string and M-theory,  $f_{IJK}$  and  $\bar{f}_{IJK}$  are generated by **non-zero electric and magnetic fluxes; RR and fundamental  $p$ -form fields:**

- **3-form fluxes  $H^3$** , in the NS-sector of heterotic, type IIA and type IIB
- **$F^p$ ,  $p$ -form fluxes**, in M-theory and in the RR sector of type IIA and type IIB
- **$F^2$  2-form fluxes**, in heterotic ( $E_8 \times E_8$  or  $SO(32)$ ) as well as in type I

- $\omega^3$  spin connection, 3-form geometrical fluxes, in all strings and M-theory.

Many special cases have been studied in the literature .

- $H^3$  in heterotic

Derendinger, Ibanez, Nilles, 85, 86;

Dine, Rohm, Seiberg, Witten, 85;

Strominger, 86; Rohm, Witten, 86;

Derendinger, Kounnas, Petropoulos, 06;

...

- $\omega^3, H^3, F^2$ , exact string solution via freely acting orbifold.

Generalization of the Scherk–Schwarz gauging to superstring theory.

Rohm, 84; Kounnas, Porrati, 88

Ferrara, Kounnas, Porrati, Zwirner, 89

Kounnas, Rostand, 90

Kiritsis, Kounnas, Petropoulos, Rizos, 99

Antoniadis, Dudas, Sagnotti, 99  
Antoniadis, Derendinger, Kounnas, 99  
Derendinger, Kounnas, Petropoulos,  
Zwirner, 04  
Derendinger, Kounnas, Petropoulos,  
05,06

...

- Simultaneous presence of NS, RR  $H^3$  and  $F^3$ .

Frey, Polchinski, 02  
Giddings, Kachru, Polchinski, 02  
Kachru, Schulz, Trivedi, 03  
Kachru, Schulz, Tripathy, Trivedi, 03  
Derendinger, Kounnas, Petropoulos,  
Zwirner, 2004

...

### 3. Combined Fluxes, Gauging and Moduli Stabilization.

- **Flat gaugings, no-scale models;** stabilization of the four moduli out of the seven main moduli.

(i) **Scherk–Schwarz, perturbative,  $\omega^3$ -fluxes.**

$$W = a ( T_2 U_1 + T_1 U_2 )$$

**$V \geq 0$ , flat in  $S, T_3, U_3$  directions**

$$m_{3/2}^2 = \frac{|a|^2}{st_3 u_3}$$

(ii) **Scherk–Schwarz non-perturbative,  $\omega^3, F^2, H^3, F^6$  -fluxes in type IIA**

$$W = a( ST_1 + T_2 T_3 ) + ib( S + T_1 T_2 T_3 )$$

$$m_{3/2}^2 = \frac{|2a|^2 + |2b|^2}{u_1 u_2 u_3}$$

(iii)  $F^3, H^3$ -fluxes in type IIB

$$W = a( SU_1 + U_2U_3 ) + ib( S + U_1U_2U_3 )$$

$$m_{3/2}^2 = \frac{|2a|^2 + |2b|^2}{t_1t_2t_3}$$

The stabilization of  $U_I$  moduli is a generic situation in type IIB  $\longrightarrow$  No-scale models.

The vanishing of the potential in the flat direction of the  $T_I$ -moduli can be modified only by (non-) perturbative and/or thermal corrections.

(iv)  $SO(3) \times SO(1,2), E_3^c \times E_3^{nc}$  gaugings  
 $\omega^3, F^2, H^3, F^6$  -fluxes

$$W = a( ST_1 + ST_2 + ST_3 ) + a( T_1T_2 + T_2T_3 + T_3T_1 ) \\ + i3b( S + T_1T_2T_3 )$$

$$m_{3/2}^2 = \frac{|6a|^2 + |6b|^2}{u_1u_2u_3}$$

- **Non-compact gaugings,  $SO(1, 2)$ ,  $E_3^{nc}$**   
 $V > 0$  , runaway solutions.

**(i) No-modulus stabilization**

$$W = F_0$$

$$m_{3/2}^2 = \frac{|F_0|^2}{st_1 t_2 t_3 u_1 u_2 u_3}, \quad V = 4m_{3/2}^2$$

**(ii) Two-moduli stabilization**

$$W = F_0 + F_2 T_1 T_2,$$

$$m_{3/2}^2 = \frac{|2F_0|^2}{st_3 u_1 u_2 u_3}, \quad V = 2m_{3/2}^2$$

**(iii) Three-moduli stabilization  $E_3^{nc}$**   
**gauging  $F_0, F_2, F_4, F_6$  -fluxes**

$$W = a( 1 + T_1 T_2 + T_2 T_3 + T_3 T_1 ) \\ + ib( T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + T_1 T_2 T_3 )$$

$$m_{3/2}^2 = \frac{|4a|^2 + |4b|^2}{su_1u_2u_3}, \quad V = m_{3/2}^2$$

• Compact gaugings  $SU(2)$ ,  $E_3^C$

(i) Stabilization of six-moduli,  
 $NS_5$  brane solution + linear dilaton

$$W = \omega_3( T_1U_1 + T_2U_2 + T_3U_3 ) - F_0$$

$$V = -2m_{3/2}^2, \quad m_{3/2}^2 = \frac{|2F_0|^2}{s}$$

(ii) Stabilization of all moduli,  $AdS_4$ -solution

$$W = iB[ 2S + 5T_1T_2T_3 + 2(U_1 + U_2 + U_3) - 3(T_1 + T_2 + T_3) ] +$$

$$A[ 2S(T_1 + T_2 + T_3) - (T_1T_2 + T_2T_3 + T_3T_1) + 6(T_1U_1 + T_2U_2 + T_3U_3) - 9 ]$$

$$S = T_A = U_A = 1, \quad m_{3/2}^2 = \frac{25|B|^2}{128}, \quad V = -3m_{3/2}^2$$

**\*\*\* Fluxes/Branes  $\leftrightarrow$  Gaugings \*\*\***

→

**Explicit Superstring Constructions  
with different interesting features:**

- **Stabilization of four moduli,  $V \geq 0$ :  
No-scale models.**
- **Stabilization of less than four moduli,  
 $V > 0$ : de Sitter like, runaway solutions  
with possible cosmological interest.**
- **Models based on compact “gaugings”,  
 $V < 0$ : Domain-Wall Solutions, Five-brane  
solutions with non trivial Dilaton or else.**
- **Models with all seven moduli stabilized  
and which admit a supersymmetric  $AdS_4$   
vacuum.**



## 4. Cosmological-Inflationary Solutions

• I would like to show here, that several **String Effective No-scale Supergravities** admit

**de Sitter-like Backgrounds**

once the

i) Radiative Corrections,

and

ii) Temperature Corrections

are both included in the

**effective potential** of the theory.

**the cosmological term  $\Lambda$**

and

**the curvature term  $\frac{k}{a^2}$**

will be both generated, in an elegant way, in the effective no-scale supergravities.

- Due to the presence of non trivial fluxes the supersymmetry is generally broken.

In the case of no-scale models however, the potential is semi-positive definite

$$V \geq 0$$

with at least one flat direction  $\Phi$  in the scalar field space.

The field  $\Phi$  is the supersymmetric partner of the Goldstino and defines the gravitino mass term  $m_{3/2}$ .

$$m_{3/2}^2 = |W|^2 e^K = e^{2\alpha\Phi}, \quad \text{with } V \equiv 0.$$

We are working in unites of the gravitation scale  $M = 2.4 \times 10^{18} \text{ GeV}$ .

At the quantum level, the potential gets corrections because of the supersymmetry breaking.

The masses of the bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom differ by an amount proportional to  $m_{3/2}$ .

What we know about the quantum structure of the corrected potential ?

1. Assuming an **ultraviolet cutoff**  $\Lambda$ , the terms proportional to  $\Lambda^4$  are proportional to the **difference of the bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom**:

$$n_B - n_F \equiv 0$$

2. The term proportional to  $\Lambda^2$  is **always proportional to  $m_{3/2}^2$** .

The numerical coefficient **depends only on the geometry of the Kähler potential and the gauge kinetic function  $f$  of the effective supergravity theory.**

**At the string level the exact form of this term is calculable!**

Here, for our purpose, it is sufficient to absorb this coefficient to the definition of  $\Lambda^2$

$$\Delta V = \Lambda^2 m_{3/2}^2$$

$\Lambda^2$  can be positive or negative depending of the model under consideration.

3. The remaining corrections scale logarithmically with respect to the supersymmetry breaking scale,  $m_{3/2}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta V = & \alpha \left( m_{3/2}^4 + A \log \frac{m_{3/2}}{\mu} \right) \\ & + Q_2^2 m_{3/2}^2 \left( q_2 + \log \frac{m_{3/2}}{\mu} \right) \\ & + Q_0^4 \left( q_0 + \log \frac{m_{3/2}}{\mu} \right) + \dots \end{aligned}$$

Where  $Q_{2,4}$  denotes supersymmetric mass terms and  $\mu$  the renormalization scale.

The dots denote threshold terms that their role will be specified later.

- The other corrections we need are those which are due to the **thermal fluctuation of the fields**.

Thus, it is necessary to evaluate the **effective potential at finite temperature  $T$** .

**The physical scale  $T$  naturally sets the strength of the thermal fluctuations.**

Utilizing the appropriate renormalization group arguments, we must identify the scale

$$\mu \equiv T.$$

This identification **resumes in an efficient way the logarithmic corrections.**

The threshold corrections are organized in terms of  $\mathbf{O}\left(\frac{m_i}{T}\right)$  -**expansion**.

$m_i$  are the physical masses defined at the temperature scale  $T$ .

Summarizing, **the effective potential at finite temperature takes the form:**

$$V_T = -p(m_i, T) + V(m_{3/2}, \Lambda, \mu = T)$$

where  $p(m_i, T)$  is the pressure density:

$$p(m_i, T) = \sum_i p_i(m_i, T), \quad \rho(m_i, T) = \sum_i \rho_i(m_i, T)$$

$$T \frac{\partial}{\partial T} p_i(m_i, T) = p_i(m_i, T) + \rho_i(m_i, T),$$

$$-m_i \frac{\partial}{\partial m_i} p_i(m_i, T) = \rho_i(m_i, T) - 3p_i(m_i, T)$$

$$p_i(m_i, T) = T^4 f_p^{B,F} \left( \frac{m_i}{T} \right),$$

$$\rho_i(m_i, T) = T^4 f_\rho^{B,F} \left( \frac{m_i}{T} \right)$$

$$\rho_i(m_i, T) - 3p_i(m_i, T) = m_i^2 T^2 \Delta^{B,F} \left( \frac{m_i}{T} \right)$$

## 5. Gravitational Equations

*The energy density equation*

$$3H^2 = \rho + \frac{1}{2}\dot{\Phi}^2 + V - \frac{3k}{a^2}$$

*The conservations equation*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left( \rho + \frac{1}{2}\dot{\Phi}^2 + V \right) + 3H (\rho + p + \dot{\Phi}^2) = 0$$

*The scalar-modulus equation*

$$\ddot{\Phi} + 3H\dot{\Phi} + \frac{\partial}{\partial\Phi} (V - p) = 0$$

The above equations are the independent ones. Some other useful combinations are:

*The trace equation*

$$6 \dot{H} + 12 H^2 = (\rho - 3p + 4V - \dot{\Phi}^2) - \frac{6k}{a^2}$$

*The entropy equation*

$$\dot{H} = -\frac{1}{2}(\rho + p + \dot{\Phi}^2) + \frac{k}{a^2}$$

We find convenient, for the derivation of the solution, to organize the potential  $V$  and the thermal functions  $\rho, p$  terms according to their scaling properties with respect to  $m_{3/2}$  and  $T$ .

$$V_4 = A m_{3/2}^4 \log \left( \frac{m_{3/2}}{c_4 T} \right) ,$$

$$V_4' \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi} V_4 = 4\alpha V_4 + \alpha A m_{3/2}^4$$

$$V_2 = \Lambda^2 m_{3/2}^2 + Q_2^2 m_{3/2}^2 \log \left( \frac{m_{3/2}}{c_2 T} \right) ,$$

$$V_2' = 2\alpha V_2 + \alpha Q_2^2 m_{3/2}^2$$

$$V_0 = Q_0^4 \log \left( \frac{m_{3/2}}{c_0 T} \right) ,$$

$$V_0' = \alpha Q_0^4$$



The thermal potential  $-p(m_i, T)$  can be separated naturally in three classes:

i) The first class consists of all massless states:  $\rho - 3p = 0, p' = 0$

ii) The second class consists of states with (supersymmetric masses) *independent of  $m_{3/2}$ .*

→

• If the temperature scale  $T$  is above their masses, their contribution to  $p$  and  $\rho$  is proportional to  $\sim T^4$   
their contribution to  $\rho - 3p \sim m_i^2 T^2$

• If the temperature scale  $T$  is below their masses, then their contribution is exponentially suppressed  $\sim e^{-m/T}$  and thus they are effectively decouple from the thermal system.

iii) The third class consists of states where their masses are *mainly proportional to*  $m_{3/2}$ .

$$\longrightarrow p' = -\alpha(\rho - 3p)_\Phi.$$

**The  $\Phi$ -modulus equation:**

$$\ddot{\Phi} + 3H\dot{\Phi} + \alpha(4V_4 + (\rho - 3p)_\Phi)$$

$$+ \alpha(Am_{3/2}^4 + 2V_2 + Q_2^2 m_{3/2}^2 + Q_0^4) = 0$$

**Using the trace equation:**

$$6\dot{H} + 12H^2 = (\rho - 3p + 4V - \dot{\Phi}^2) - \frac{6k}{a^2}$$

**the modulus equation becomes:**

$$0 = \ddot{\Phi} + 3H\dot{\Phi} + \alpha\dot{\Phi}^2 + \alpha\left(6\dot{H} + 12H^2 + \frac{6k}{a^2}\right) + \alpha\left(Am_{3/2}^4 - 2V_2 + Q_2^2 m_{3/2}^2 - 4V_0 + Q_0^4 - (\rho - 3p)_r\right)$$

## *Critical Solution*

$$\alpha\dot{\Phi} = -H, \quad T = \frac{x}{a} \quad \text{and} \quad e^{\alpha\Phi} = m_{3/2} = \eta T$$

Assuming for the moment the absence of the logarithmic dependence in the  $V_4$ -term, (equivalent to the absence of  $Am_{3/2}^4$ )

and using

$$(\rho - 3p)_r = M_2^2 T^2$$

**$M_2^2$  is independent of  $\Phi$ , SUSY mass term.**

- **The existence of the critical solution:**

$$0 = (6\dot{H} + 12H^2) + \frac{6\alpha^2}{6\alpha^2 - 1} \left[ Q_0^4 \left( 1 - 4 \log \frac{\eta}{c_0} \right) \right] + \frac{6\alpha^2}{6\alpha^2 - 1} \left[ \frac{6k}{a^2} + \frac{1}{a^2} \left( x^2 \eta^2 Q_2^2 \left( 1 - 2 \log \frac{\eta}{c_2} \right) - x^2 M_2^2 \right) \right]$$

- the consistency of the **energy equation**,
- the **conservations equation**, and
- the **modulus equation**

imply that:

$$\Lambda_{cosm} = \frac{3}{2} \alpha^2 Q_0^4,$$

$$k = \alpha^2 x^2 \left[ -\eta^2 Q_2^2 \left( 1 - 2 \log \frac{\eta}{c_2} \right) + M_2^2 \right]$$

The lesson of this exercise is that :

- the cosmological constant scale,  $\Lambda_{cosm}$
- the curvature scale,  $k$

both are generated by :

“the scaling violating terms”

of the thermal effective potential.

- In the **absence** of the scaling violating terms (or when these terms are negligible) the modulus  $\Phi$  couples to the total trace of the energy momentum tensor.

- This special case was studied in 1986 by I. Antoniadis and C. Kounnas. They found that the **the critical trajectory is the only stable solution** under any field fluctuation and that this trajectory is an **attractor at late times** to a radiation evolving universe with :

$$a^2 \sim t, \quad T^2 \sim m_{3/2}^2 \sim 1/t, \quad V \sim 1/t^2.$$

## 6. The time trajectory of $a$ , $T$ and $\Phi$

*The energy density equation*

$$3H^2 = \rho + \frac{1}{2}\dot{\Phi}^2 - V - \frac{3k}{a^2}$$

in the background of the **critical solution** becomes:

$$\left( \frac{6\alpha^2 - 1}{6\alpha^2} \right) 3H^2 = \rho + V - \frac{3k}{a^2}$$

OR

$$\left(\frac{6\alpha^2 - 1}{6\alpha^2}\right) 3H^2 = \frac{C_\rho}{a^4} + \Lambda_{cosm} - \frac{3k'}{a^2}$$

The dilatation factor in front of  $3H^2$ ,  
can be absorbed by a redefinition of :

$C_\rho$ ,  $\Lambda_{cosm}$  and  $k' \longrightarrow$

The time dependence of  $a$  is similar to  
the radiation-deformed de Sitter Solutions!

$$a_+^2 = \frac{3}{\Lambda} \left( ch^2 \left( \sqrt{\frac{\Lambda}{3}} t \right) + \epsilon_\rho^2 \right)$$

$$a_-^2 = \frac{3}{\Lambda} \left( -sh^2 \left( \sqrt{\frac{\Lambda}{3}} t \right) + \epsilon_\rho^2 \right)$$

H.Firouzjahi, S.Sarangi, S.H.H.Tye, 04 ;

S.Sarangi, S.H.H.Tye, 05;

R. Brustein, S.P. de Alvis, 06;

C. Kounnas, H. Partouche, 07; ...

It is interesting that the  $a_-$  and  $a_+$  are connected by a **Gravitational ( $\Phi$ -Dilatonic) Instanton**

$$a_E^2 = \frac{3}{\Lambda} \left( \cos^2 \left( \sqrt{\frac{\Lambda}{3}} \tau \right) + \epsilon_\rho^2 \right)$$

with a transition probability ( $a_- \rightarrow a_+$ )

$$\langle \Psi_- || \Psi_+ \rangle = P \sim e^{\left( \frac{3}{\Lambda} - \frac{\chi_\rho}{\Lambda^2} \right)}$$

- Where  $\Psi_\pm$  is the wave-function of the universe.

J.B. Hartle, S.W. Hawking, 83;

A. Vilenkin, 82, 83;

A.D. Linde, 84;

H.Firouzjahi, S.Sarangi, S.H.H.Tye, 04;

S.Sarangi, S.H.H.Tye, 05;

R. Brustein, S.P. de Alvis, 06;

C. Kounnas, H. Partouche, 07; . . . . .;

- $\chi_\rho$  is proportional to the number of the effective **marginal and/or thermal degrees of freedom** at the temperature scale  $T_0$ , defined **at the transition point**.

C. Kounnas, H. Partouche, 07;

## 7. String Perspectives and Conclusion

At classical string level it seems that it is **difficult** to construct **exact cosmological string solutions** and is even more difficult to obtain **de Sitter like inflationary solutions** **even in lower than four dimensions**.

- Consider for instance the **euclidian version of  $dS^3$**  which is **an exact conformal field theory base on  $SU(2)_k$  WZW model**. However, **it does not admit any real-time analytic continuation** due to the existence of a non trivial torsion  $H_{ijk}$  **which becomes imaginary!!**



I.Antoniadis, C.Bachas, A.Sagnotti, 90;

P.K Townsend 01;

J. Sonner, P.K Townsend 06;

C.Bachas, C.Kounnas,

D.Orlando, M.Petropoulos 07;

...

- Indeed **the only known cosmological solution** based on an **exact** conformal field theory is that of  $SL(2, R)/U(1)_{-|k|} \times K$ .

Its euclidian version is also well defined by **the gauged WZW parafermionic T-fold**  $SU(2)/U(1)_k$ .

C.Kounnas, D.Luest 92;

L.Coralba, M.S.Costa, C.Kounnas 02;

C.Kounnas, N.Toumbas, J.Troost 07;

...

- In all String cosmological models with a **well define euclidian version**,  
(like for instance the  $SL(2, R)/U(1)_{-|k|} \times K$ ),

the super-string analog of:

“the Stringy wave function of the universe”  
can be unambiguously defined.

Furthermore the transition probabilities  
can be easily calculated at the string level.

C.Kounnas, N.Toumbas, J.Troost O7.

### *Concluding Remark*

- Our proposal however goes even beyond  
the scope of the above statement; namely  
*towards to :*

*The plausible existence of cosmological  
super-string solutions (Inflationary or not)*

*which are generated dynamically*

*at the quantum sting level*

*from a flat classical space-time and  
spontaneously broken supersymmetry  
(no-scale radiative-induced cosmology).*