

The Scalar–Tensor Theory of Gravitation

YASUNORI FUJII
Nihon Fukushi University

KEI-ICHI MAEDA
Waseda University, Tokyo



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa
<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Yasunori Fujii and Kei-ichi Maeda 2003

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2003

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Computer Modern 11/13pt *System* L^AT_EX 2_ε [TB]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Fujii, Yasunori.

The scalar-tensor theory of gravitation / Yasunori Fujii, Kei-ichi Maeda.

p. cm. – (Cambridge monographs on mathematical physics.)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0 521 81159 7

1. Gravitation. I. Maeda, Kei-ichi, 1950– II. Title. III. Series.

QC178 .F85 2003

531'.14–dc21 2002067367

ISBN 0 521 81159 7 hardback

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Conventions and notation</i>	<i>xiv</i>
1 Introduction	1
1.1 What is the scalar–tensor theory of gravitation?	2
1.2 Where does the scalar field come from?	9
1.2.1 The scalar field arising from the size of compactified internal space	9
1.2.2 The dilaton from string theory	12
1.2.3 The scalar field in a brane world	16
1.2.4 The scalar field in the assumed two-sheeted structure of space-time	22
1.3 Comments	25
1.3.1 The weak equivalence principle	25
1.3.2 The value of ω and mass of the scalar field	28
1.3.3 Conformal transformation	29
1.3.4 Mach’s principle and Dirac’s suggestion for time-dependent G	31
1.3.5 Does the scalar–tensor theory have any advantage over simple scalar theories?	34
2 The prototype Brans–Dicke model	37
2.1 The Lagrangian	38
2.2 Field equations	40
2.3 The weak-field approximation	43
2.4 The parameterized post-Newtonian approximation	47

2.5	A spinor field as matter	53
2.6	The mechanism of mixing	57
3	Conformal transformation	61
3.1	What is a conformal transformation?	62
3.2	Nonminimal coupling	66
3.3	Coupling to matter	71
3.4	The geodesic in the E frame	74
4	Cosmology with Λ	77
4.1	How has the cosmological constant re-emerged?	77
4.2	The standard theory with Λ	82
4.3	The prototype BD model without Λ	84
4.4	The prototype BD model with Λ	88
	4.4.1 Solution in the J frame	88
	4.4.2 Solution in the E frame	91
	4.4.3 A proposed revision and remarks	101
5	Models of an accelerating universe	105
5.1	Dark energy	106
5.2	Quintessence	110
5.3	Quintessence in the brane world	115
	5.3.1 A scalar field in the brane world	116
	5.3.2 Quintessence in the brane world	118
5.4	Scalar–tensor theory	124
	5.4.1 Hesitation behavior	124
	5.4.2 A two-scalar model	128
	5.4.3 Qualitative features unique to the two-scalar model	139
6	Quantum effects	145
6.1	Scale invariance	147
6.2	The dilaton as a Nambu–Goldstone boson	151
6.3	The contribution from loops	155
	6.3.1 The coupling to matter of σ , a self-coupled scalar field	155
	6.3.2 The coupling to matter of σ , scalar QED	160
6.4	Non-Newtonian gravity	168
6.5	A consequence of the suspected occurrence of the scalar field in the Maxwell term	177
6.6	Time-variability of the fine-structure constant	179
	6.6.1 Electromagnetic coupling of Φ_*	180
	6.6.2 The behavior of the scalar field	184

Appendix A: The scalar field from Kaluza–Klein theory	187
Appendix B: The curvature scalar from the assumed two-sheeted space-time	192
Appendix C: The field equation of gravity in the presence of nonminimal coupling	195
Appendix D: The law of conservation of matter	198
Appendix E: Eddington’s parameters	200
Appendix F: Conformal transformation of a spinor field	204
Appendix G: Conformal transformation of the curvature scalar	209
Appendix H: A special choice for conformal invariance	214
Appendix J: The matter energy–momentum nonconservation law in the E frame	216
Appendix K: A modification to the Λ term	217
Appendix L: Einstein’s equation in the brane world	219
Appendix M: Dilatation current	223
Appendix N: Loop integrals in continuous dimensions	225
Appendix O: A conformal frame in which particle masses are finally constant	227
<i>References</i>	230
<i>Index</i>	237

1

Introduction

We begin this chapter with an overview in section 1 of how the scalar–tensor theory was conceived, how it has evolved, and also what issues we are going to discuss from the point of view of such cosmological subjects as the cosmological constant and time-variability of coupling constants. In section 2 we provide a simplified view of fundamental theories which are supposed to lie behind the scalar–tensor theory. Section 3 includes comments expected to be useful for a better understanding of the whole subject. This section will also summarize briefly what we have achieved.

In section 1 we emphasize that the scalar field in what is qualified to be called the scalar–tensor theory is not simply added to the tensor gravitational field, but comes into play through the nonminimal coupling term, which was invented by P. Jordan. Subsequently, however, a version that we call the prototype Brans–Dicke (BD) model has played the most influential role up to the present time. We also explain the notation and the system of units to be used in this book.

The list of the fundamental ideas sketched in section 2 includes the Kaluza–Klein (KK) theory, string theory, brane theory as the latest outgrowth of string theory, and a conjecture on two-sheeted space-time. Particular emphasis is placed on showing how closely the scalar field can be related to the “dilaton” as a partner of the graviton in string theory that emerged from an entirely different point of view.

Section 3 will be a collection of comments. We wish to answer potential questions that might be asked by readers who have not yet entered the main body of the book but have nonetheless heard something about the scalar–tensor theory. We also embed certain abstracts or advertisements of the related subjects which will be discussed later in detail. As a result of our doing so we expect that readers may be acquainted beforehand with

our achievements from a wider perspective of the whole development. The topics will cover the weak equivalence principle (WEP), parameters of the prototype BD model, conformal transformation, Mach's principle and variable G , and a question about whether there is any advantage to be gained from sticking to a complicated scalar–tensor theory instead of less constrained theories of scalar fields, like the quintessence model.

1.1 What is the scalar–tensor theory of gravitation?

Einstein's general theory of relativity is a geometrical theory of space-time. The fundamental building block is a metric tensor field. For this reason the theory may be called a "tensor theory." A "scalar theory" of gravity had earlier been attempted by G. Nodström by promoting the Newtonian potential function to a Lorentz scalar. Owing to the lack of a geometrical nature, however, the equivalence principle (EP), one of the two pillars supporting the entire structure of general relativity, was left outside the aim of the theory in the early 1910s. This did not satisfy Einstein, who eventually arrived at a dynamical theory of space-time geometry. His theory must have appeared highly speculative at first, but proved later to be truly realistic, since it was supported by observations of diverse physical phenomena, including those in modern cosmology. It also served as an excellent textbook showing how a new way of thinking develops to reality.

In spite of the widely recognized success of general relativity, now called the standard theory of gravitation, the theory has also nurtured many "alternative theories" for one reason or another. Among them we focus particularly on the "scalar–tensor theory." It might appear as if the old idea of scalar gravity were being resurrected. In fact, however, this type of theory does not merely combine the two kinds of fields. It is built on the solid foundation of general relativity, and the scalar field comes into play in a highly nontrivial manner, specifically through a "nonminimal coupling term," as will be explained shortly.

The scalar–tensor theory was conceived originally by Jordan, who started to embed a four-dimensional curved manifold in five-dimensional flat space-time [1]. He showed that a constraint in formulating projective geometry can be a four-dimensional scalar field, which enables one to describe a space-time-dependent gravitational "constant," in accordance with P. A. M. Dirac's argument that the gravitational constant should be time-dependent [2], which is obviously beyond what can be understood within the scope of the standard theory. He also discussed the possible connection of his theory with another five-dimensional theory, which had been offered by Th. Kaluza and O. Klein [3]. On the basis of these

considerations he presented a general Lagrangian for the scalar field living in four-dimensional curved space-time:

$$\mathcal{L}_J = \sqrt{-g} \left[\varphi_J^\gamma \left(R - \omega_J \frac{1}{\varphi_J^2} g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \varphi_J \partial_\nu \varphi_J \right) + L_{\text{matter}}(\varphi_J, \Psi) \right], \quad (1.1)$$

where $\varphi_J(x)$ is Jordan’s scalar field, while γ and ω_J are constants, also with Ψ representing matter fields collectively. The introduction of the *nonminimal coupling term*, $\varphi_J^\gamma R$, the first term on the right-hand side, marked the birth of the scalar–tensor theory. The term $L_{\text{matter}}(\varphi_J, \Psi)$ was for the matter Lagrangian, which depends generally on the scalar field, as well.

For later convenience, we here explain the unit system we are going to use throughout the book. Since we always encounter relativity and quantum mechanics in the area of particle physics, it is convenient to choose a unit system in which c and \hbar are set equal to unity. By doing so we can express all three fundamental dimensions only in terms of one remaining dimension, which may be chosen as length, time, mass, or energy. In particular, the gravitational constant, or Newton’s constant, G turns out to have a mass dimension -2 , or length squared. We then write

$$8\pi G = c\hbar M_{\text{P}}^{-2}, \quad (1.2)$$

with M_{P} called the *Planck mass*, which is estimated to be 2.44×10^{18} GeV, which is quite heavy compared with other ordinary particles. We hereafter choose $M_{\text{P}} = 1$. In this way we can express every quantity as if it were dimensionless. This unit system is called the *reduced Planckian unit system*, though $G = 1$ is often chosen in the *plain Planckian unit system*. We prefer the former system with the difference of $\sqrt{8\pi}$. We show units of length, time, and energy in this system expressed in conventional units:

$$8.07 \times 10^{-33} \text{ cm}, \quad 2.71 \times 10^{-43} \text{ s}, \quad 2.44 \times 10^{18} \text{ GeV}. \quad (1.3)$$

Sometimes, however, it is convenient to leave one of the dimensions still “floating,” not necessarily set fixed. We choose it to be mass, for example, as was shown in (1.2). In the same context, the Lagrangian is found to have a mass dimension 4, while a derivative contributes a mass dimension 1. The metric tensor is dimensionless. If a scalar field has a conventional canonical kinetic term, then we conclude that the field has a mass dimension 1.

Now the second term on the right-hand side of (1.1) resembles a kinetic term of φ_J . Requiring this term to have a correct mass dimension 4 yields the result that φ_J has mass dimension $2/\gamma$. It then follows that φ_J^γ , which

multiplies R in the first term on the right-hand side of (1.1), has mass dimension 2, the same as G^{-1} . In this way we re-assure ourselves that the first two terms on the right-hand side of (1.1) contain no dimensional constant. This remains true for any value of γ , although this “invariance” under a change of γ need not be respected if φ_J enters the matter Lagrangian, in general.

Jordan’s effort was taken over particularly by C. Brans and R. H. Dicke. They defined their scalar field φ by

$$\varphi = \varphi_J^\gamma, \quad (1.4)$$

which simplifies (1.1) by making use of the fact that the specific choice of the value of γ is irrelevant, as explained above. This process is justified only because they demanded that the matter part of the Lagrangian $\sqrt{-g}L_{\text{matter}}$ be decoupled from $\varphi(x)$ as an implementation of their requirement that the WEP be respected, in contrast to Jordan’s model. The reason for this crucial decision, after the critical argument by Fierz [4] and others, will be made clear soon.

In this way they proposed the basic Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{BD}} = \sqrt{-g} \left(\varphi R - \omega \frac{1}{\varphi} g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \varphi \partial_\nu \varphi + L_{\text{matter}}(\Psi) \right). \quad (1.5)$$

We call the model described by (1.5) the *prototype BD model* throughout this book [5]. The adjective “prototype” emphasizes the unique features that characterize the original model compared with many extended versions. The dimensionless constant ω is the only parameter of the theory.

Note that we left out the factor 16π that multiplied the whole expression on the right-hand side in the original paper, to make the result appear in a more standard fashion. For this reason our φ is related to their original scalar field, denoted here by ϕ_{BD} , by the relation

$$\varphi = 16\pi\phi_{\text{BD}}. \quad (1.6)$$

We now take a special look at the nonminimal coupling term, the first term on the right-hand side of (1.5). This replaces the Einstein–Hilbert term,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{EH}} = \sqrt{-g} \frac{1}{16\pi G} R, \quad (1.7)$$

in the standard theory, in which R is multiplied by a constant G^{-1} . By comparing (1.5) and (1.7) we find that this model has no gravitational “constant,” but is characterized by an *effective gravitational constant* G_{eff} defined by

$$\frac{1}{16\pi G_{\text{eff}}} = \varphi, \quad (1.8)$$

as long as the dynamical field φ varies sufficiently slowly. In particular we may expect that φ is spatially uniform, but varies slowly with cosmic time, as suggested by Dirac. We should be careful, however, to distinguish G_{eff} , the gravitational constant for the tensor force only, from the one including the possible contribution from the scalar field, as will be discussed later.

As another point, we note that the second term on the right-hand side of (1.5) appears to be a kinetic term of the scalar field φ , but looks slightly different. First, the presence of φ^{-1} seems to indicate a singularity. Secondly, there is a multiplying coefficient ω . These are, however, superficial differences. The whole term can be cast into the standard *canonical* form by redefining the scalar field.

For this purpose we introduce a new field ϕ and a new dimensionless constant ξ , chosen to be positive, by putting

$$\varphi = \frac{1}{2}\xi\phi^2 \quad (1.9)$$

and

$$\epsilon\xi^{-1} = 4\omega, \quad (1.10)$$

in terms of which the second term on the right-hand side of (1.5) is re-expressed in the desired form;

$$\sqrt{-g} \left(-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu\phi \partial_\nu\phi \right), \quad (1.11)$$

with $\epsilon = \pm 1 = \text{Sign } \omega$.

No singularity appears, as suggested. $\epsilon = +1$ corresponds to a normal field having a positive energy, in other words, not a *ghost*. Note that (1.11) becomes $\dot{\phi}^2/2$ for $\epsilon = +1$ in the limit of flat space-time where $g^{00} \sim \eta^{00} = -1$. The choice $\epsilon = -1$ seems to indicate a negative energy, which is unacceptable physically. As will be shown later in detail, however, this need not be an immediate difficulty owing to the presence of the nonminimal coupling. We will show in fact that some of the models do require $\epsilon = -1$. Even the extreme choice $\epsilon = 0$, corresponding to choosing $\omega = 0$ in the original formulation, according to (1.10), leaving ξ arbitrary, may not be excluded immediately. Note also that (1.9) shows that ϕ has a mass dimension 1, as in the usual formulation.

In this way (1.5) is cast into the new form

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{BD}} = \sqrt{-g} \left(\frac{1}{2}\xi\phi^2 R - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu\phi \partial_\nu\phi + L_{\text{matter}} \right). \quad (1.12)$$

Discussing consequences of (1.12) will be the main purpose of Chapter 2. We briefly outline here subjects of particular interest.

Obviously (1.12) describes something beyond what one would obtain simply by adding the kinetic term of the scalar field to the Lagrangian

with the Einstein–Hilbert term. We reserve the term “scalar–tensor theory” specifically for a class of theories featuring a nonminimal coupling term or its certain extension.

As we explain in the subsequent section, there are theoretical models to be categorized in this class. More general models have also been discussed. The prototype BD model still deserves detailed study, from which we may learn many lessons useful in analyzing other models.

Deriving field equations from (1.12) is a somewhat nontrivial task, as we elaborate in Chapter 2. In particular, we obtain

$$\square\varphi = \zeta^2 T, \quad (1.13)$$

where T is the trace of the matter energy–momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$, while ζ is a constant defined by

$$\zeta^{-2} = 6 + \epsilon\xi^{-1} = 6 + 4\omega. \quad (1.14)$$

Notice that φ in (1.13) is the BD scalar field, now given by the combination of ϕ as given by (1.9), though the field equation itself was derived by considering ϕ as an independent field. The fact that the right-hand side of (1.13) is given in terms of the matter energy–momentum tensor guarantees that the force mediated by the scalar field respects the WEP, or universal free-fall (UFF). This is because, in the limit of zero momentum transferred, the source of the scalar field is given by the integrated T_{00} , which is the total energy of the system independent of what the content is.

One might be puzzled to see how the scalar field decoupled from the matter at the level of the Lagrangian comes to have a coupling at the level of the field equations. The underlying mechanism is provided by the nonminimal coupling term which acts as a mixing interaction between the scalar field and the spinless component of the tensor field, as will be elaborated toward the end of Chapter 2.

From (1.13) we expect that the scalar field mediates a long-range force between massive objects in the same way as the Newtonian force does in the weak-field limit of Einstein’s gravity. The coupling strength is essentially of the same order of magnitude as that of the Newtonian force as long as ξ or ω is roughly of the order of unity, as we can see by restoring $8\pi G$ in the conventional unit system. Equation (1.14) also shows that the coupling vanishes as $\omega \rightarrow \infty$, or $\xi \rightarrow 0$. It is often stated that the theory reduces to Einstein’s theory in this limit.

According to (1.13) the scalar field does not couple to the photon, for example, indicating that the light-deflection phenomenon will remain

unaffected by the scalar force. This is an example displaying how the scalar force makes a difference from general relativity. On re-examining what had been done in general relativity, Brans and Dicke discovered room for the scalar component to be accommodated within the limit $\omega \gtrsim 6$ or $|\xi| \lesssim 0.042$ [5].

Shapiro time-delay measurements during the Viking Project in the 1970s, however, yielded the constraint $\omega \gtrsim 1000$, or $\xi \lesssim 2.5 \times 10^{-4}$ [6]. Two decades later, the latest bound from the VLBI experiments, basically concerning the light-deflection phenomenon involving light from extragalactic radio sources, is even stronger [7]:

$$\omega \gtrsim 3.6 \times 10^3, \quad \text{or} \quad \xi \lesssim 7.0 \times 10^{-5}, \quad (1.15)$$

severer than that expected initially by nearly three orders of magnitude. Notice that $\epsilon = +1$ is also implied. There has been no unambiguous evidence for the presence of the additional scalar field, only certain bounds of the parameter having been obtained.

It seems as if Brans and Dicke wished naturally to find positive evidence right at the very beginning. At one time, Dicke, as an experimentalist, wondered whether there was a flaw in comparing theory and observation. He specifically suspected that the Sun is not completely spherically symmetric, which property was used extensively to derive the Schwarzschild solution. He performed his own experiment to re-measure the Sun’s oblateness. If the quadrupole moment J_2 turned out to be as large as $\sim 10^{-5}$, as he and Goldenberg reported [8], it would have allowed more deviation from general relativity, resulting in $\omega \sim 5$ or ~ 0.2 for $\epsilon = 1$ or -1 , respectively.

Unfortunately, however, subsequent re-measurements by other groups yielded values mostly as small as $\sim 10^{-6}$ for J_2 , including the latest even smaller value [7]. In this sense, there seems to be little hope that ω or ξ is close to anywhere around unity. The smallness of ξ has affected considerably the development of the theory during the years that followed. It appeared as if the theory were destined to grow only to occupy an ever smaller territory without an obvious reason, although Dicke himself worked actively on initiating a new era of “experimental relativity.” In some sense, the scalar–tensor theory served as an explicit model illustrating what the world could be like if Einstein were not entirely right.

In spite of all these circumstances surrounding the scalar–tensor theory, however, there have been some people who were deeply impressed by the idea that nature’s simplest phenomenon, a scalar field, plays a major role, and tried to modify the prototype BD model in such a way that the constraint (1.15) could be evaded. V. Wagoner suggested extending

the original model by introducing arbitrary functions of the scalar field, including a mass term as well [9], though without well-defined physical principles to determine those functions.

One of the present authors (Y. F.) proposed that a dilaton, a Nambu–Goldstone (NG) boson of broken scale invariance, might mediate a finite-range gravity (non-Newtonian force) based on an idea in particle physics [10]. O’Hanlon [11], and Acharia and Hogan [12] showed immediately that the dilaton can be identified as the scalar field of a version of the prototype BD model, hence finding that the massive scalar field does have a place in the theory of gravity.

A crucial point in these approaches is that the scalar field is naturally not immune against acquiring a nonzero mass. If the corresponding force-range of the scalar force turns out to be smaller than the size of the solar system, it no longer affects the perihelion advance of Mercury, for example, thus leaving a constraint like (1.15) irrelevant. This will free us from a long-standing curse.

More recently, T. Damour and A. Polyakov showed that extending the prototype BD model in a way allowing the scalar field to enter in a more complicated manner is rather natural from the viewpoint of string theory [13]. They specifically proposed the “least-coupling principle” (LCP) according to which one might be able to understand why the deviation from general relativity is so small if there is any, though the idea is still short of being implemented from a realistic point of view.

In this book we will be interested also in the cosmological constant, which seems to be one of the hot topics at the present time [14, 15]. Although this subject has a long but widely known history, what we face today is quite new, and appears to be a challenge that probably requires something beyond the standard theory. Today might be a time when the discovery of an accelerating universe [14, 15] is in fact a crisis on which physics will thrive [16]. We may more specifically expect this issue to be a fresh ground to which the scalar–tensor theory applies. The situation might provide a chance to go beyond an “alternative theory,” suggesting phenomena that had never been thought of in general relativity.

Ideas based on scalar fields have already been attempted, particularly under the name of “quintessence” [17]. Some of these theories are not necessarily related to the scalar–tensor theory. One has more flexibility, but to some extent they are more phenomenological. After giving a brief overview of the recent developments on these subjects, we will see how we reach an understanding of the accelerating universe in terms of the scalar–tensor theory, which has been extended minimally from the prototype BD model, from our point of view. As a further attempt, we apply the theory also to the reported time-dependence of α , the fine-structure constant [18].

As one of the conclusions that has emerged from our efforts, our classical solutions of the cosmological equations are partially chaotic, with very sensitive dependence on the initial values. Closely connected with this is the great likelihood that we are in a transient state before reaching a final, asymptotic state. All these things may alter our traditional view that the universe we see at the present time should have an attractor solution that depends on the initial values supposedly as little as possible. The universe after all might also be like many natural phenomena around us.

1.2 Where does the scalar field come from?

As we stated before, Brans and Dicke assumed that decoupling of the scalar field from the matter part of the Lagrangian occurs. As we see in the following, this is an assumption that hardly seems to be supported by any of the examples of more fundamental theories. They never made it clear how they could avoid this. It appears as if they had never been particularly concerned about whether there were any theories at a deeper level behind their model, which they viewed as an alternative theory in its own right.

It is nevertheless hard to deny that the scalar–tensor theory has attracted wide interest because it appears to provide a small window through which one can look into phenomenological aspects of more fundamental theories to which one is still denied any direct access otherwise.

It is truly remarkable and even surprising to find that a candidate scalar field of the desired nature is provided by the string theory of the late twentieth century, not to mention the KK theory of the 1920s. We will discuss briefly such candidates, starting from a reasonably detailed account of the KK approach. We then move on to the “dilaton” expected from string theory, and further to the recent development of the “brane,” which has become a focus of attention even though it is still highly speculative. We also sketch another highly hypothetical idea that is closely related to “noncommutative geometry,” which turns out to be yet another supplier of a scalar field.

1.2.1 *The scalar field arising from the size of compactified internal space*

Shortly after the advent of general relativity, the historic attempts at unification appeared, first due to H. Weyl [19], and then due to Kaluza. Weyl’s theory eventually laid the foundation for what was later called gauge theory, the heart of the contemporary version of unification theories, whereas Kaluza’s proposal, later known as the KK theory, played a

decisive role in making clear the importance of higher-dimensional space-time in string theory, not to mention serving as an ancestor of the scalar-tensor theory.

Kaluza envisioned five-dimensional space-time to which general relativity was applied. One of the spatial dimensions was assumed to be “compactified” to a small circle leaving four-dimensional space-time extended infinitely as we see it. The size of the circle is so small that no phenomena of sufficiently low energies can detect it.

He started with the metric in five dimensions, of which the “off-diagonal” components connecting the four dimensions with the fifth dimension behave as a 4-vector that has been shown to play the role of the electromagnetic potential. In this way the theory offered the unified Einstein–Maxwell theory. The gauge transformation for the potential is interpreted as an isometry transformation along the circle.

The idea was re-discovered later from a more contemporary point of view [20], in particular in connection with the realization that string theory requires higher-dimensional space-time [21]. We outline briefly how the size of compactified internal space behaves as a four-dimensional scalar field precisely of the nature of the prototype BD model, with the parameter determined uniquely in terms of the dimensionality of space-time. See Appendix A for more details of derivations.

Let us assume the “*Ansatz*” for the $D = (4 + n)$ -dimensional metric with n -dimensional compactified space:

$$g_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}} = \begin{pmatrix} g_{\mu\nu}(x) & 0 \\ 0 & A(x)^2 \tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}(\theta) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1.16)$$

with the radius A , while $\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}(\theta)$ means the purely geometrical portion described by the coordinates θ_α with $\alpha, \beta = 1, 2, \dots, n$. We choose θ_α to be dimensionless, like angles. Notice that we omitted, for the moment, the off-diagonal components for the gauge fields, focusing on the scalar field.

We also have

$$\sqrt{-^{(D)}g} = \sqrt{-g} A^n \sqrt{\tilde{g}}, \quad (1.17)$$

where g is the four-dimensional determinant, while $\sqrt{\tilde{g}}$ is related to the volume V_n of compactified space by

$$V_n = A^n \tilde{V}_n, \quad (1.18)$$

where

$$\tilde{V}_n = \int \sqrt{\tilde{g}} d^n \theta. \quad (1.19)$$

We then compute the Einstein–Hilbert term in D dimensions, obtaining the effective Lagrangian in four dimensions, by dividing by $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_n$ for later convenience;

$$\mathcal{L}_4 = \sqrt{-g}L_4, \quad (1.20)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L_4(x) &= A^n \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_n^{-1} \int \sqrt{\tilde{g}} \frac{1}{2} R d^n \theta, \\ &= \frac{1}{8} \frac{n}{n-1} \phi^2 R + \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{4} \frac{n}{n-1} \phi^2 \right)^{1-2/n} \tilde{R}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.21)$$

for $n > 1$, with ϕ defined by

$$\phi = 2 \sqrt{\frac{n-1}{n}} A^{n/2}. \quad (1.22)$$

It should be noticed that the sign of the second term on the right-hand side of (1.21) shows that the field ϕ is a *ghost*, corresponding to

$$\epsilon = -1, \quad (1.23)$$

in (1.12) [22]. We will show in later chapters, however, that this does not imply physical inconsistencies; the energy of the whole system remains positive due to the mixing interaction with the spinless component of the metric field, a crucial role played by the nonminimal coupling term.

The first term on the right-hand side of (1.21), with R for a curvature scalar in four dimensions, is the nonminimal coupling term shown in (1.12) with a special choice:

$$\xi = \frac{1}{4} \frac{n}{n-1}. \quad (1.24)$$

Notice that this is certainly in conflict with the constraint obtained from the solar-system experiment (1.15), and will be discussed in connection with the idea of spontaneously broken scale invariance.

We further point out that the scalar field enters the nonminimal coupling term always in the form of ϕ^2 in any dimensionality $n > 1$. For the underlying reason, see Appendix A.

In the last term on the right-hand side of (1.21), \tilde{R} is a curvature scalar computed in terms of $\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}$, giving a potential of the scalar field unless it

gives a cosmological constant for $n = 2$, or $D = 6$. Notice also that no mass term ($\sim\phi^2$) is present.

Obviously (1.21) and (1.22) lose their meaning if $n = 1$, for which there is no kinetic term for the scalar field. We simply choose

$$\phi = \xi^{-1/2}A, \tag{1.25}$$

with $\epsilon = 0$ and $\xi > 0$ in (1.12). Also we have $\tilde{R} = 0$ for $n = 1$. We do not use (1.10), but (1.13) is still obtained with $\zeta^2 = \frac{1}{6}$, which agrees with what we find by using $\epsilon = 0$ in (1.14). This shows that ϕ still has a dynamical degree of freedom in spite of the absence of the kinetic term. This is again due to the nonminimal coupling term that induces mixing with the tensor gravitational field.

It might be relevant here to add a remark in passing on the absence of the kinetic term of the scalar field if $D = 5$. This is in an apparent contradiction with (1.1) proposed by Jordan, who based his conclusion on the analysis of his five-dimensional theory. This indicates that he dealt with something that is not exactly the same as what we understand as the KK theory with a recipe for compactification, as we find today. It nonetheless still seems true that he was greatly inspired by the KK theory.

We point out that the nonminimal coupling term arises because of the occurrence of A in the determinant, as given by (1.17). This indicates that the scalar field should likely appear in the matter Lagrangian as well, unless there is a special mechanism to prohibit it. From this point of view, it seems difficult for one of the BD requirements to be implemented in the KK approach.

1.2.2 The dilaton from string theory

We find a new breed of scalar fields emerging from string theory, which has been the focus of extensive studies for the past few decades, as one of the most promising approaches toward unification.

It was shown that a closed string has a zero mode described by a symmetric second-rank tensor that behaves in the low-energy limit like the space-time metric. This was done by demonstrating that the interaction among strings occurs in the same way as that in which gravitons interact with each other according to general relativity. It was also shown that the graviton in this context has companions, a scalar field Φ , coming from the trace of a symmetric second-rank tensor, and an antisymmetric second-rank tensor field $B_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}}$.

The field equations of these zero-mode fields were derived explicitly as shown in Eq. (3.4.56) in [23]:

$$R_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}} = -2\nabla_{\bar{\mu}}\nabla_{\bar{\nu}}\Phi + \frac{1}{4}H_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\rho}\bar{\sigma}}H_{\bar{\nu}}^{\bar{\rho}\bar{\sigma}}, \quad (1.26)$$

$$\nabla_{\bar{\lambda}}H^{\bar{\lambda}\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}} - 2(\partial_{\bar{\lambda}}\Phi)H^{\bar{\lambda}\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}} = 0, \quad (1.27)$$

$$R = 4\left(\square\Phi + (\partial\Phi)^2\right) + \frac{1}{12}(HH), \quad (1.28)$$

re-expressed according to our own sign convention, with an obvious notation (HH) . We are in the critical dimension $D = 10$ or 26 , depending on whether supersymmetry is included or not, respectively. Also the totally antisymmetric field strength is defined by

$$H_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\lambda}} = \partial_{\bar{\mu}}B_{\bar{\nu}\bar{\lambda}} + \text{cyclic permutation}, \quad (1.29)$$

while $H^{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\lambda}}$ is given by raising indices with the help of the inverse metric in D dimensions.

The equations (1.26)–(1.28) can be shown to be derived from the Lagrangian;

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{st}} = \sqrt{-g}e^{-2\Phi} \left(\frac{1}{2}R + 2g^{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}} \partial_{\bar{\mu}}\Phi \partial_{\bar{\nu}}\Phi - \frac{1}{12}H_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\lambda}}H^{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\lambda}} \right). \quad (1.30)$$

The second term on the right-hand side resembles the kinetic term of Φ , except for the multiplicative factor $e^{-2\Phi}$. This term can be converted into the standard kinetic term if we introduce the field ϕ by putting

$$\phi = 2e^{-\Phi}, \quad (1.31)$$

as one can easily show by recognizing that $d\phi = -2e^{-\Phi}d\Phi$. In fact we re-express (1.30) as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{st}} = \sqrt{-g} \left(\frac{1}{2}\xi\phi^2R - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon g^{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}} \partial_{\bar{\mu}}\phi \partial_{\bar{\nu}}\phi - \frac{1}{24}\xi\phi^2(HH) \right), \quad (1.32)$$

where

$$\xi^{-1} = 4 \quad (1.33)$$

and

$$\epsilon = -1. \quad (1.34)$$

Here the first two terms on the right-hand side of (1.32) agree with the D -dimensional version of the BD Lagrangian (1.12) [24, 25]. The factor

ζ^{-2} defined in (1.14) in four dimensions is replaced by its D -dimensional version given by (6.36):

$$\zeta_D^{-2} = 4 \frac{D-1}{D-2} + \epsilon \xi^{-1}. \quad (1.35)$$

For $\epsilon \xi^{-1} = -4$, this reduces to

$$\zeta_D^{-2} = \frac{4}{D-2}, \quad (1.36)$$

which is always positive for any $D > 2$, satisfying the condition that the “diagonalized” scalar field be a nonghost field.

Suppose that we are simple-minded enough to expect that each of the $D - 4$ dimensions is compactified trivially with a common radius $A = \text{constant}$. Then (1.32), except for the last term for the moment, reduces to the four-dimensional Lagrangian (1.12). Positivity for the physical mode is assured, but the result $\xi = \frac{1}{4}$, (1.33), is in contradiction with the observational constraint (1.15), as shown in the model of the KK theory, suggesting again the need for a departure from the original model.

We point out, however, that it is still not entirely clear how one can go to four dimensions from D dimensions. There might be some other way of compactification by which the effective coefficient ξ in four dimensions can be made sufficiently smaller than the “original” $\xi = \frac{1}{4}$.

Before going into any such details, one might ask what the underlying reason for the prototype BD model to have emerged from string theory is. The question may be traced back to why the overall common factor $e^{-2\Phi}$ appeared in (1.30). The answer will be given below.

String theory offers a way to avoid the divergences that have plagued traditional field theory for decades. Obviously this is primarily because a string is an extended object, which is contrary to the concept of point particles upon which field theory is based. From a more technical point of view, however, finiteness is due to an invariance under conformal transformation in two-dimensional space-time in which propagating strings reside. Moreover, one has to protect this classical invariance from being broken by quantum effects. A fully consistent theory of strings can be obtained only if what are known as quantum anomalies are removed. In fact, the field equations we mentioned before can be derived also as anomaly-free conditions.

The two-dimensional conformal invariance has its descendant in D -dimensional field theory, namely dilatation invariance, which is implemented with the help of the scalar field in precisely the same way as in the prototype BD model. The relevant transformations are simple extensions

of (1.73) and (1.74);

$$g_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}} \rightarrow g_{*\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}} = \Omega^2 g_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}}, \quad (1.37)$$

$$\phi \rightarrow \phi_* = \Omega^{1-d} \phi, \quad (1.38)$$

$$B_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}} \rightarrow B_{*\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}} = \Omega^2 B_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}}, \quad (1.39)$$

with $d = D/2$, where we restricted ourselves to $\Omega = \text{constant}$.

Under (1.37), we find

$$\sqrt{-g}R = \Omega^{2-D} \sqrt{-g_*}R_*, \quad (1.40)$$

which implies that the Einstein–Hilbert term is *not* invariant unless $D = 2$.

Also, comparing (1.38) and (1.39) reveals that the present transformation is different from the scale transformation involving the mass dimension of fields, as was mentioned before. The field ϕ or Φ is naturally called a *dilaton*.

Another point to be discussed is the question of whether the dilaton couples to matter fields, like gauge fields and fermions, at the level of the Lagrangian. The same argument that led to dilatation invariance on the zero modes of closed strings likely applies to other matter fields coming from open strings, hence yielding direct dilaton–matter coupling. According to the analyses available so far, it does not seem that there is any simple way to forbid this coupling to matter, though details have yet to be worked out. In this sense one might have to accept the possibility of violation of the WEP as one of the natural consequences of string theory as well as of the KK model. This was what Jordan must have realized from the KK approach, was also noted by Fierz, but was rejected by Brans and Dicke, who chose to appreciate the validity of the WEP as an empirical fact. We also suggest that the coupling to matter can be closely connected with the mechanism by which the massless dilaton acquires a nonzero mass, as shown by an explicit model to be elaborated in Chapter 6.

As we saw above, a major limitation to this approach lies in complications and ambiguities in implementing realistic compactification to four-dimensional space-time. For this reason, we are still not sure whether the simple scale invariance like (1.37)–(1.39) descends to four dimensions. We have no reliable way of knowing how large the effects of violation of the WEP should be either.

For the same reason, we have no way to reject the scenario of the LCP due to Damour and Polyakov [13], who tried to derive a model of the scalar–tensor theory in which the nonminimal coupling term is more complicated than ϕ^2 as in the prototype BD model. They expect instead a function $F(\phi)$ that has a maximum at $\phi = \phi_1$, a certain constant.

Since this maximum serves eventually as a minimum in the potential, one expects that ϕ tends to ϕ_1 , for which ϕ is decoupled from the rest of the system, thus leaving the world of general relativity. In the present epoch we are coming close to this asymptotic state, having only a small amount of time-variation of coupling constants and WEP-violating phenomena.

As we are going to show later, on the other hand, we raise the possibility that we are not in the asymptotic state, but still in a transient state, which allows an understanding of the accelerating universe and a time-dependent fine-structure constant, for example. We accept the prototype BD model with certain modifications as an “empirical” rule, which may well not allow immediate derivation from string theory, but offers a suggestion regarding the fundamental theory of what the desired compactification should be like.

1.2.3 The scalar field in a brane world

String theory predicts a new type of nonlinear structure, which is called a *brane*, a nomenclature created artificially from “membrane” [26]. It is a boundary layer on which edges of open strings stand. The idea of a brane with duality plays an important role in the statistical derivation of the entropy of a black hole. This also suggests a new perspective in cosmology; we are living in a brane world, which is a three-dimensional hypersurface in a higher-dimensional space-time [27]. In contrast to the already familiar notion that we live in four-dimensional space-time with n dimensions compactified as an “internal space,” which we inherited from the KK theory, our worldview appears to be changed completely. In the following, we are going to review briefly what we should expect to see, though it is not entirely clear for the moment how this picture is related to the scalar–tensor theory.

According to the results of recent progress in superstring theory, different string theories are connected with each other via dualities, making them unified to the *M-theory* in 11 dimensions [28]. Among string theories, the ten-dimensional $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic string theory is a strong candidate for our real world because the theory may contain the standard model. Hořava and Witten showed that this heterotic string model is equivalent to an 11-dimensional realization of M-theory compactified on the orbifold $R^{10} \times S^1/Z_2$ [29]. Each gauge field on E_8 is confined to the ten-dimensional boundary brane of S^1/Z_2 . The ten-dimensional space-time is compactified to $M^4 \times CY^6$, where M^4 and CY^6 are four-dimensional Minkowski space-time (our universe) and Calabi–Yau space, respectively. Particles in the standard model are expected to be confined

to this four-dimensional Minkowski space-time, whereas the gravitons propagate in the entire *bulk* space-time.

A new type of KK cosmology based on this brane world picture was proposed by Arkani-Hamed *et al.* [30]. Ordinary matter fields are confined on the brane which is infinitesimally “thin” mathematically, though it may be thick physically, probably of the order of the Planck length. Compared with this thickness, on the other hand, the extra dimensions where only gravitons propagate could be larger. How large it is can be ascertained only by gravitational experiments [31]. Since all of the experiments performed to confirm Newtonian gravity have been carried out above the 1-mm scale, the laws of gravity might be different only below this scale. We re-emphasize that the extra-dimensional space was a tiny internal space of matter fields in the KK approach, but is now a larger space wherein only gravity resides.

Suppose that the fundamental theory of gravity is given by the Einstein–Hilbert term in $D (= 4 + n)$ dimensions and the entire space-time is compactified into four-dimensional space-time times n extra dimensions. This scenario might be formulated by writing an equation for the action:

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{1}{16\pi G_D} \int d^D x \sqrt{-^{(D)}g} R \\ &= \frac{1}{16\pi G_D} V_n \int d^4 x \sqrt{-g} R = \frac{1}{16\pi G} \int d^4 x \sqrt{-g} R, \end{aligned} \quad (1.41)$$

where V_n is the volume of extra dimensions given by (1.18), while G_D is a gravitational constant in D -dimensional space-time. In an analogy with (1.2) we may define the D -dimensional Planck mass $M_{\text{P}}^{(D)}$ by

$$8\pi G_D = \left(M_{\text{P}}^{(D)}\right)^{-(n+2)}. \quad (1.42)$$

Notice that, in D dimensions, G_D^{-1} has mass dimension $D - 2 = n + 2$. Using this in (1.41) we obtain

$$(M_{\text{P}})^2 = \left(M_{\text{P}}^{(D)}\right)^{(n+2)} V_n. \quad (1.43)$$

According to the old KK idea, the size of extra dimensions should be much smaller than 10^{-17} cm ($\sim 1 \text{ TeV}^{-1}$), so that they remain undetected by low-energy experiments. We have even assumed that the size is nearly as small as the Planck length, the inverse of M_{P} . In the language of $M_{\text{P}}^{(D)}$, this corresponds to the choice $M_{\text{P}}^{(D)} = M_{\text{P}}$.

If we believe, on the other hand, that ordinary matter fields are confined on a brane world, the extra dimensions are not necessarily required to be so small. This might also be connected with a conjecture that the mass scale $M_{\text{P}}^{(D)}$ in D -dimensional space-time at the more fundamental level

is as low as ~ 1 TeV, nearly the same as the electroweak mass scale. This is expected to remove what is called a “hierarchy problem,” which has loomed all the time whenever we try to understand a huge difference between M_{P} and the energy scale of particle physics in the usual sense. In other words, the hierarchy problem is now interpreted as being present only because we live in four-dimensional space-time which is so “distant” from the fundamental space-time in D dimensions.

Once we accept this idea, we use (1.43) to derive a typical size r_0 of the extra dimensions in the following way:

$$r_0 \sim (V_n)^{1/n} \sim 10^{(30/n)-17} \text{ cm}, \quad (1.44)$$

where we have used the values given by (1.3).

If $n = 1$, we expect $r_0 \sim 10^{13}$ cm (~ 1 astronomical unit), which is not possible. If $n = 2$, on the other hand, we find $r_0 \sim 1$ mm, precisely the shortest distance only above which the Newtonian inverse-square law has been tested to within a certain precision, as stated before. In addition to this interesting possibility with the unification scale within reach of our experiments in the near future, also still in accordance basically with the KK approach, there is another alternative scenario based on the brane world picture.

According to the proposal made by Randall and Sundrum [32, 33], the Hořava–Witten model just mentioned can be simplified to a five-dimensional theory in which matter fields are confined to four-dimensional space-time while gravity acts in five dimensions, because the six-dimensional Calabi–Yau space is smaller by at least an order of magnitude than the remaining five-dimensional space-time [34]. They simplified the model further by assuming that our brane is identical to a domain wall in five-dimensional anti-de Sitter space-time with a negative cosmological constant Λ . The five-dimensional space-time is described by the metric, which is not factorizable:

$$ds^2 = e^{-2|y|/\ell} g_{\mu\nu}(x) dx^\mu dx^\nu + dy^2, \quad (1.45)$$

where $\ell = \sqrt{-6/\Lambda}$. To find the Minkowski space on the brane ($g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu}$), the tension \mathcal{T} of the brane must satisfy $|\mathcal{T}| = 3/(4\pi\ell G_5)$. The “warp” factor $e^{-2|y|/\ell}$ which is rapidly changing in the extra dimension plays a very important role, in contrast to the usual KK compactification. They discussed two models.

In their first model (the Randall–Sundrum type-I model) [32], they proposed a mechanism to solve the hierarchy problem by incorporating a small extra dimension bounded by two boundary branes, with positive and negative tension, located at $y = 0$ and $y = s$, respectively, as illustrated in Fig. 1.1.




Fig. 1.1. The Randall–Sundrum type-I model. Since gravity is confined on the brane \mathcal{B} , it can be described by the induced metric of \mathcal{B} . The circles describe the warp factor $e^{-2|y|/\ell}$.

By assuming that we are living in a negative-tension brane, we find a solution to the hierarchy problem. We first estimate the four-dimensional Planck mass scale by integrating the five-dimensional action in the fifth direction as

$$\begin{aligned} S_g^{\text{eff}} &= \int d^4x \int_0^s dy \frac{1}{16\pi G_5} \sqrt{-^{(5)}g^{(5)}} R \\ &\sim \frac{1}{16\pi G_5} \int_0^s dy e^{-2|y|/\ell} \cdot \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} R, \end{aligned} \quad (1.46)$$

where we made an approximate estimate $^{(5)}R \sim e^{2|y|/\ell} R$, without solving Einstein's equation in five dimensions rigorously. Note also that the separated fifth dimension has no curvature. We then find

$$M_{\text{P}}^2 = \frac{1}{8\pi G} \sim \frac{1}{8\pi G_5} \int_0^s dy e^{-2|y|/\ell} = \frac{\ell}{16\pi G_5} (1 - e^{-2s/\ell}). \quad (1.47)$$

This means that M_{P} depends weakly on the distance s , as long as $e^{-s/\ell} \ll 1$. To show how the hierarchy problem is resolved, we consider a fundamental Higgs field confined in the visible brane with negative tension. The action is given by

$$S_{\text{vis}} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g_{\text{vis}}} \left[g_{\text{vis}}^{\mu\nu} D_\mu H^\dagger D_\nu H - \lambda (|H|^2 - v_0^2)^2 \right], \quad (1.48)$$

where $g_{\mu\nu}^{\text{vis}}$ denotes the four-dimensional components of the five-dimensional metric evaluated at $y = s$, i.e. $g_{\mu\nu}^{\text{vis}} = e^{-2s/\ell} g_{\mu\nu}$. This, together with redefinition of the Higgs field, $H \rightarrow e^{s/\ell} H$, leads to

$$S_{\text{vis}}^{\text{eff}} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[g^{\mu\nu} D_\mu H^\dagger D_\nu H - \lambda (|H|^2 - v_{\text{eff}}^2)^2 \right], \quad (1.49)$$

where $v_{\text{eff}} = e^{-s/\ell} v_0$ gives the physical symmetry-breaking energy scale, which could be much smaller than the original energy scale v_0 . In fact, if $s/\ell \sim 35$, this produces a TeV energy scale from the four-dimensional Planck scale M_{P} . This may be a natural explanation of the hierarchy problem. In this discussion, although we assumed that $M_{\text{P}}^{(5)} = (8\pi G_5)^{-1/3} \approx M_{\text{P}}$ is the fundamental energy scale, we are allowed to consider that the TeV scale is fundamental and the Planck scale is induced, contrary to the conventional wisdom.

In their second model (the Randall–Sundrum type-II model) [33], on the other hand, we assume that we are living in the positive-tension brane surrounded by $A dS$. There is no second brane with negative tension, which is obtained from a two-brane model in the limit of $s \rightarrow \infty$. Although hierarchy is still left unsolved, four-dimensional Newtonian gravity is recovered at low energies even if the extra dimension is not compact. This is proved by applying a perturbation approximation to the above solution (1.45) with a positive-tension Minkowski brane at $y = 0$. Consider perturbation to the four-dimensional components, ${}^{(5)}g_{\mu\nu} = e^{-2|y|/\ell} \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}$. By setting $h(x, y) = \hat{\psi}(z) e^{-|y|/(2\ell)} e^{ipx}$ with $z = \ell(e^{|y|/\ell} - 1)$ and $p^2 = -m^2$, we find the perturbation equation of the graviton to be

$$\left[-\frac{1}{2} \partial_z^2 + V(z) \right] \hat{\psi} = m^2 \hat{\psi}, \quad (1.50)$$

where

$$V(z) = \frac{15}{8\ell^2(|z|/\ell + 1)} - \frac{3}{2\ell} \delta(z) \quad (1.51)$$

is a volcano-shaped potential. Note that the indices of metric perturbations are the same in all terms when one is working in the gauge of $\partial^\mu h_{\mu\nu} = h_\mu{}^\mu = 0$. The volcano-shaped potential confines a massless mode on the brane. As a result, even if the fifth dimension is not compact, the Newtonian gravitational potential is recovered in the low-energy limit as

$$V(r) \sim G \frac{m_1 m_2}{r} \left(1 + \frac{\ell^2}{r^2} \right), \quad (1.52)$$

where m_1 and m_2 are masses of two particles on the brane. This ‘‘compactification’’ is completely different from the KK-type compactification.

Although there are many interesting ideas in this new field, we will focus here on the possibility of the occurrence of a scalar field in the brane world. The scalar field may arise in two different forms, either the one similar to ordinary moduli fields associated with the process of compactification, such as in the manner of the conventional KK approach and in superstring