

Generalized Clockwork Theory

Ido Ben-Dayan

Department of Physics, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, P.O. Box 653, Be'er-Sheva 8410500, Israel

Physics Department, Ariel University, Ariel 40700, Israel

E-mail: ido.bendayan@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: We generalize the clockwork theory in several directions. First, we consider beyond nearest neighbors interactions. Considering such interactions keeps a larger subgroup of the original $U(1)^{N+1}$ unbroken and can allow for different symmetry breaking patterns. We recover the original clockwork scenario in the presence of these additional interactions. In such case, the masses of the massive modes change, but a single massless mode remains intact. Such interactions are naturally interpreted as higher derivative terms from the point of view of extra dimensions. Second, we generalize the clockwork shift symmetry to non-abelian global groups. Third, trivial embedding of the clockwork scenario in supergravity, yields an AdS minimum as big as the clockwork interaction. An alternative use of a stabilizer field leads to multiple flat directions with no clockwork, or a clockwork only as large as the cosmological constant. We therefore suggest an alternative construction of a supergravity clockwork model with Minkowski supersymmetric vacuum, using a manifestly shift symmetric superpotential. Fourth, we review the extra-dimensional origin of the mechanism and interpretation, in the case of conformal coupling to gravity. Upon deconstruction, the CW massless mode becomes tachyonic. This property is generic to massless modes in negatively curved $5D$ manifolds. Masslessness can be restored by adding a specific $5D$ mass term.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Generalization of the Clockwork Mechanism	4
2.1	Review of the Clockwork Mechanism	4
2.2	Generalization of the Clockwork Mechanism Beyond Nearest Neighbors	5
3	Extra Dimension Interpretation	7
3.1	Alternating Sign	7
3.2	Higher Derivatives in the Extra Dimension	8
4	$O(N)$ Clockwork	10
4.1	Linear Sigma Model	10
5	Clockwork SUGRA	12
5.1	Canonical Kähler Potential	12
5.2	Shift Symmetric Kähler Potential	13
5.3	Shift Symmetric Superpotential	15
6	Conformal Coupling and Mass Terms in the Extra Dimension	17
7	Conclusions	20

1 Introduction

Clockwork Theory (CW) has been proposed as a mechanism of generating light particles with suppressed interactions, while no small parameters exist in the UV theory, [1–3]. An earlier incarnation is actually in the context of having a superplanckian axion decay constant in Natural Inflation models, in the case of many sites [4], or simple two sites case, [5–7]. Given that a large portion of contemporary theoretical physics involves generation of small/large numbers from

$O(1)$ numbers in a 'natural' way, several new applications of the idea have been suggested, like a clockwork WIMP [8], clockwork Inflation [9], clockwork composite Higgs [10], photo-philic QCD axion [11], and a solution to the hierarchy problem, [3].

The basic framework considers $N + 1$ complex scalar fields with global $U(1)^{N+1}$ symmetry. The symmetry is explicitly broken by 'nearest neighbors' interaction to a single $U(1)_{CW}$. Thus, we have a 'theory lattice', where each scalar is sitting on a different site and interacts only with its nearest neighbors. In such case, there is a single massless mode, where its overlap with the j -th site goes like $\sim q^{-j}$, $q > 1$. Hence, if we couple "matter fields" to the N -th site, the massless mode coupling to these matter fields is suppressed by q^{-N} . The idea can be implemented for scalars, fermions, gauge fields and gravitons (at least at the linear level). In all cases a massless particle remains while the other N have a rather dense mass spectrum, all around the fundamental scale of the theory. In [3], it was suggested that such a framework may come from deconstructing a $5D$ scalar, potentially coming from 'Little String Theory'. A recent analysis in [12] has shown that the CW phenomenon is purely abelian, and cannot come from purely geometric extra-dimensional effects. However, see the response [13]. To avoid obscurity, our definition of the clockwork is the following: Considering $N + 1$ fields with charges q , there exists a $U(1)$ residual symmetry and a massless mode, such that its overlap with the other N massive modes behaves as q^{-j} for the j -th field.

Beauty is in the eye of the beholder, and considering multiple fields to explain hierarchies is neither very elegant nor extremely new. The usefulness of CW lies in a natural generation of hierarchy, that goes as $\sim q^N$ rather than $\sim N$ in a theory whose fundamental parameters are of similar size. In this note, we offer several simple generalizations and observations that may be useful for Particle Physics phenomenology and Cosmology.

First, using effective field theory as a guiding principle, nothing forbids additional interactions of the CW mechanism beyond nearest neighbors interactions. We shall demonstrate that interactions of k neighbors results in a residual symmetry group of $U(1)^k$. The low energy theory will have k massless modes. These interactions will show up and modify the mass spectrum of the massive fields in the original CW scenario. We show that these beyond nearest neighbors interactions correspond to higher order derivatives in a $5D$ picture in section 3. In section 4, we generalize the CW mechanism to non-abelian global groups, and specifically to the $O(N)$

vector model.

Second, the CW has been realized in the supersymmetric context in [1]. We discuss the supersymmetric CW in section 5. An immediate generalization to supergravity (SUGRA) with canonical Kähler potential, preserves the $U(1)_{CW}$, but with an AdS supersymmetric vacuum. The AdS minimum is controlled by the CW coupling. Thus, breaking SUSY and lifting the theory to nearly Minkowski, will require explicit breaking of the CW symmetry that is just as large as the CW term itself. Alternatively, using a stabilizer field leads to N flat directions or CW that its energy scale is parametrically the cosmological constant. Instead, we offer a shift symmetric CW superpotential such that the resulting F-term scalar potential has the CW form with SUSY Minkowski minimum.

Third, to diminish the arbitrariness in invoking $N + 1$ scalar fields, one can view the CW as discretizing an extra dimension [3]. In the continuum limit, the theory behaves as a linear dilaton coming from Little String Theory, [14, 15]. This allows the extra dimension to be warped. However, contrary to the Randall-Sundrum case where the warping is exponential, here the warping is polynomial. Thus, for the correct Planck mass, and a new physics scale at $10 TeV$ the proper size of the extra dimension is considerably larger, at the nanometer level [15]. It is interesting to consider whether the explicit breaking of the CW symmetry can arise naturally, rather than adding it by hand according to the problem one wishes to solve. For example, coupling the N th site of the CW sector to another sector like the Standard Model (SM). Therefore, in section 6, after reviewing the 5D picture we conformally couple the 5D free scalar field to the Ricci scalar and/or add a mass term, that provides an explicit breaking term to the CW symmetry. Upon discretization the coupling to the Ricci scalar makes the massless mode tachyonic, while the 5D mass term obviously gives a positive mass to the massless mode. We then conclude.

The outcome of these simple generalizations is a mixed blessing. On the one hand, from a lattice point of view the CW idea can be generalized to any number of neighbors and to global non-abelian symmetry groups. On the other hand, our investigation shows that CW is a rather delicate phenomena, and its embedding in SUGRA or beyond a free scalar field in $5D$ is problematic. The UV origin of CW theory is therefore obscure.

2 Generalization of the Clockwork Mechanism

2.1 Review of the Clockwork Mechanism

The original clockwork considers $N + 1$ complex scalars, ϕ_j , where $j = 0, 1, \dots, N$ with canonical kinetic terms, and a potential:

$$V(\phi_j) = \sum_{j=0}^N \left(-\tilde{m}^2 \phi_j^\dagger \phi_j + \frac{\lambda}{4} |\phi_j^\dagger \phi_j|^2 \right) + \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \left(\epsilon \phi_j^\dagger \phi_{j+1}^3 + h.c \right) \quad (2.1)$$

When $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ we have a global $U(1)^{N+1}$ symmetry. Turning on $\epsilon \ll \lambda < 1$ breaks this symmetry to a $U(1)$. Under the remaining $U(1)$, the fields have charges 3^{-j} . We expand around the vacuum of the spontaneously broken theory $\langle |\phi_j|^2 \rangle = f^2 \equiv 2\tilde{m}^2/\lambda, \forall j$. Below the breaking scale $\sqrt{\lambda}f$, we have a theory of $N + 1$ goldstone bosons with $U_j = e^{i\pi_j(x)/f}$ and $j = 0, \dots, N$:

$$\mathcal{L} = - \sum_{j=0}^N f^2 \partial U_j^\dagger \partial U_j + \frac{m^2 f^2}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \left(U_j^\dagger U_{j+1}^q + h.c \right) \quad (2.2)$$

(2.1) corresponds to $q = 3$, but the U s are dimensionless, so we can consider any q , as is done in [3], and $m^2 = 2\epsilon f^2$. In general, one can assign different masses m_j and different charges q_j to each site. In terms of the low energy effective theory of the pions we have canonical kinetic terms and the following potential:

$$V(\pi_j) = \frac{m^2}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (\pi_j - q\pi_{j+1})^2 + \mathcal{O}(\pi^4) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=0}^N \pi_i M_{ij}^2 \pi_j + \mathcal{O}(\pi^4) \quad (2.3)$$

The theory is invariant under the shift symmetry $\pi_j \rightarrow \pi_j + r/q^j$, where $r \in \mathbb{R}$.

The mass matrix M_π^2 is given by

$$M_\pi^2 = m^2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -q & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -q & 1+q^2 & -q & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & -q & 1+q^2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & & 1+q^2 & -q \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & -q & q^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.4)$$

Diagonalizing the mass matrix gives one massless mode and N massive modes with successive mass splittings:

$$m_{a_0}^2 = 0, \quad m_{a_k}^2 = m^2 \left(1 + q^2 - 2q \cos \frac{k\pi}{N+1} \right), \quad k = 1, \dots, N \quad (2.5)$$

where the interaction basis π_j and mass basis a_j are related by:

$$\pi = \mathcal{O}a, \quad \mathcal{O}^T M_\pi^2 \mathcal{O} = \text{diag}(m_{a_0}^2, \dots, m_{a_N}^2) \quad (2.6)$$

The rotation matrix and normalization are given by:

$$\mathcal{O}_{j0} = \frac{\mathcal{N}_0}{q^j}, \quad \mathcal{O}_{jk} = \mathcal{N}_k \left[q \sin \frac{jk\pi}{N+1} - \sin \frac{(j+1)k\pi}{N+1} \right], \quad j = 0, \dots, N; \quad k = 1, \dots, N \quad (2.7)$$

$$\mathcal{N}_0 \equiv \sqrt{\frac{q^2 - 1}{q^2 - q^{-2N}}}, \quad \mathcal{N}_k \equiv \sqrt{\frac{2}{(N+1)\lambda_k}}. \quad (2.8)$$

\mathcal{O}_{j0} is the amount the of the massless mode a_0 contained in each pion π_j . Because $\mathcal{O}_{j0} \sim q^{-j}$ it becomes smaller by a factor of q as we move away in j . Thus, the overlap with the last site, the N th one, is exponentially suppressed. By coupling a theory like the Standard Model to the N th site, we get an exponentially enhanced decay constant for the Goldstone interactions (with a_0), i.e. a scale exponentially larger than the scale of spontaneous symmetry breaking f :

$$\mathcal{L} \supset -\frac{1}{4g^2} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + \frac{(\phi_N)^2}{8\pi f^2} F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} \Rightarrow \mathcal{L} \supset -\frac{1}{4g^2} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} - \frac{a_0^2}{8\pi f_0^2} F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}, \quad f_0 = q^N f \quad (2.9)$$

2.2 Generalization of the Clockwork Mechanism Beyond Nearest Neighbors

As an effective field theory, there is no reason to limit ourselves to nearest neighbors interactions as in (2.2), since many additional interactions still respect the $U(1)$ symmetry¹. Let us start by considering interactions between each site to the next to nearest neighbors. The potential with such couplings will look like:

$$\frac{m^2 f^2}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{N-2} \left(U_j^\dagger U_{j+1}^q U_{j+2}^p + h.c. \right) \quad (2.10)$$

Notice that since we couple each site to the two consecutive sites, we have to truncate the sum at $N - 2$ instead of $N - 1$. Considering again the pions gives:

$$V(\pi_j) = \frac{m^2}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{N-2} (\pi_j - q\pi_{j+1} - p\pi_{j+2})^2 + \mathcal{O}(\pi^4) \quad (2.11)$$

¹If we wish to follow the original discussion in (2.1), we can still consider tree level interactions of the sort $\phi_j^\dagger \phi_{j+1} \phi_{j+2}^2 + h.c.$ Upon diagonalization, we will still have a massless mode with the overlap of the last site behaving as $2^{-(N-1)}$.

Each term in the potential, is invariant under the transformation $\pi_j \rightarrow \pi_j + \alpha_j$ if:

$$\alpha_j = 2\pi\ell + q\alpha_{j+1} + p\alpha_{j+2} \quad (2.12)$$

for integer j , and integer ℓ . The original clockwork idea is the particular case of $p = 0$. Obviously, we have here a two dimensional space, spanned by $\alpha_{j+1}, \alpha_{j+2}$ and as expected, we have $U(1)^2$ residual symmetry, instead of $U(1)$. We also have two massless modes. To recover the clockwork behaviour we choose $q = \tilde{q}/2$ and $p = \tilde{q}^2/2$, then the potential will be made of terms $V \supset \left(\pi_j - \frac{\tilde{q}}{2}\pi_{j+1} - \frac{\tilde{q}^2}{2}\pi_{j+2}\right)^2$. Let us drop the tildes. In such case the original clockwork symmetry is conserved: $\pi_j \rightarrow \pi_j + 1/q^j$, and there is an additional $U(1)$ symmetry.

$$V(\pi_j) = \frac{m^2}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{N-2} \left(\pi_j - \frac{q}{2}\pi_{j+1} - \frac{q^2}{2}\pi_{j+2}\right)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\pi^4) \quad (2.13)$$

Diagonalizing the mass matrix will give two massless states, one of which is the clockwork with $\mathcal{O}_{j0} = \mathcal{N}_0/q^j$. The second massless eigenstate is given by an alternating vector: $\mathcal{O}_{j1} = \mathcal{N}_1 \times 2j/(-q)^j$. There are $N-1$ massive states, their mass will be dominated by q^4 terms rather than q^2 in the original clockwork. The exact expression for the masses and eigenvectors can be obtained by recursion relations. However, it requires the analytical solution of a fourth order polynomial. While such a solution exists, it is not illuminating to write it down. Coupling more and more neighbors will generate a polynomial of degree larger than four, that does not have an analytical general solution. Even without an analytical expression for the massive modes, the massless mode and the essence of the CW mechanism exists with the q^{-j} overlap.

The generalization to any number of neighbors interactions is straightforward. Considering n nearest neighbors interactions, the lagrangian will look like:

$$\mathcal{L} = -f^2 \sum_{j=0}^N \partial U_j^\dagger \partial U_j + \frac{m^2 f^2}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{N-n} \left(U_j^\dagger U_{j+1}^{q/n} \cdots U_{j+n}^{q^n/n} + h.c \right) \quad (2.14)$$

For n nearest neighbors interactions we will preserve n symmetries and the conserved symmetry group will be some $U(1)^n$. Such a generalization allows for various breaking patterns, not necessarily reaching the $U(1)$ of the clockwork type. If we wish to maintain the same clockwork behaviour of $\alpha_{j+1}/\alpha_j \sim q^{-j}$, then coupling to further neighbors makes the other massless eigenstates expression cumbersome. It requires the simultaneous solution of:

$$\alpha_j = \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_{j+k} \frac{q^{j+k}}{k}, \quad \frac{\alpha_{j+1}}{\alpha_j} = const. \quad (2.15)$$

where n is the number of neighbors that are coupled. Such recursive equations generate higher and higher polynomial equation for α_0, α_1 , that for $n \geq 6$ do not have a general analytic solution. Alternatively, if we wish to write the most general lagrangian that preserves only the original clockwork symmetry, we can add all possible neighbors interactions of this type. Thus, the full clockwork lagrangian is actually:

$$\mathcal{L} = -f^2 \sum_{j=0}^N \partial U_j^\dagger \partial U_j + \frac{m^2 f^2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=0}^{N-k} \left(U_j^\dagger U_{j+1}^{q/k} \cdots U_{j+k}^{q^k/k} + h.c \right) \quad (2.16)$$

In this lagrangian all the $U(1)$ symmetries except the original clockwork are broken, the masses of the massive modes are modified, but a massless mode still remains and the component at each successive site remains $\mathcal{O}_{j0} = \mathcal{N}_0/q^j$.

3 Extra Dimension Interpretation

3.1 Alternating Sign

Considering the CW theory from a 5D point of view, we cannot reproduce neither the full (2.1) nor (2.2). We can however get the mass matrix (2.4) by considering a massless free scalar field in 5D, [3]. We would like to give the generalized clockwork mechanism an extra dimensional interpretation. We therefore introduce alternating signs to the potential and the symmetry. This way, after discretizing the extra dimension, higher derivatives in 5D naturally correspond to couplings beyond nearest neighbors. Without the alternating sign, we will still have couplings beyond nearest neighbors, but we will also have to add additional lower order derivatives to get the correct result. The symmetry and potential are now:

$$\pi_i \rightarrow \pi_i + \frac{1}{(-q)^j} \quad (3.1)$$

$$V(\pi_j) = \frac{m^2}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{N-2} \left(\pi_j + \frac{q}{2} \pi_{j+1} - \frac{q^2}{2} \pi_{j+2} \right)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\pi^4) \quad (3.2)$$

Diagonalizing the mass matrix will give two massless states, one of which is the clockwork with $\mathcal{O}_{j0} = \mathcal{N}_0/(-q)^j$ and $N-1$ massive states, again with the masses distributed with $\Delta m/m_a \sim 1$. The second massless state is simply $\mathcal{O}_{j1} = \mathcal{N}_1 \times 2j/q^j$.

This can again be generalized to any number of neighbors n yielding:

$$V(\pi_j) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-n} \left(\pi_j - \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{(-q)^k}{n} \pi_{j+k} \right)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\pi^4) \quad (3.3)$$

Lifting back to the U_j s is trivial:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{j=0}^N \partial U_j^\dagger \partial U_j - \sum_{j=0}^{N-n} \left(U_j^\dagger \prod_{k=1}^n U_{j+k}^{(-q)^k/n} + h.c \right) \quad (3.4)$$

Again, for n nearest neighbors interaction, we have a residual $U(1)^n$ symmetry, and we can further break it with different breaking patterns. If we wish to maintain only the clockwork shift symmetry, we can again sum all neighbors interactions:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{j=0}^N \partial U_j^\dagger \partial U_j - \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=0}^{N-k} \left(U_j^\dagger \prod_k U_{j+k}^{(-q)^k/k} + h.c \right) \quad (3.5)$$

The generalization provided here and in the previous section can be applied in a straightforward manner to gauge bosons and gravitons at the linear level, as was done in [3].

3.2 Higher Derivatives in the Extra Dimension

Coupling to next to nearest neighbors is a nonlocal interaction, and in the continuum language where $N \rightarrow \infty$, we expect higher order derivatives. Indeed, considering a scalar in $5D$, coupling to two consecutive neighbors will correspond to a $(\partial_y^2 \phi)^2$, and coupling to n neighbors to $(\partial_y^n \phi)^2$, where y is the extra dimension.

To see this, let's rewrite a more general form of the clockwork lagrangian with two nearest neighbors interaction:

$$V(\pi_j) = \frac{m^2}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{N-2} \left(\pi_j - \beta_1 q \pi_{j+1} + \beta_2 q^2 \pi_{j+2} \right)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\pi^4) \quad (3.6)$$

$$\pi_i \rightarrow \pi_i + \frac{\alpha_j}{(-q)^j} \quad (3.7)$$

$$\Rightarrow \alpha_j = \beta_1 \alpha_{j+1} - \beta_2 \alpha_{j+2} \quad (3.8)$$

If the last equation is fulfilled, we have a shift symmetry, similar to clockwork, but with somewhat different transformation laws. Similarly, the massless eigenvector behaves like $(-q)^{-j}$ with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ coefficient. Consider a compact extra dimension $-\pi R \leq y \leq \pi R$, and identifying

$-y$ with y . Starting from a five dimensional free scalar field with higher derivatives in the extra dimension, we get:

$$ds^2 = X(|y|)(-dt^2 + d\vec{x}^2) + Y(|y|)dy^2 \quad (3.9)$$

$$\mathcal{S} = 2 \int d^4x \int_0^{\pi R} dy \sqrt{-g} \left\{ \left(-\frac{1}{2} g^{MN} \partial_M \phi \partial_N \tilde{\phi} \right) - \frac{1}{2\Lambda^2} g^{yy} \left(\partial_y^2 \tilde{\phi} \right)^2 \right\} \quad (3.10)$$

Dimensional analysis requires that the higher derivative term will be suppressed by some dimensionful parameter, like Λ^{-2} . Due to the explicit appearance of only ∂_y^2 Lorentz invariance is broken in the extra dimension. Writing a Lorentz covariant action, for instance $\mathcal{S} \supset (\square_5 \phi)^2$ will result in higher derivative terms from the $4D$ spacetime part in the equations of motion, as well as more complicated coupling between $4D$ spacetime derivatives and the extra dimension. Performing a field redefinition to get canonical kinetic terms we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} &= - \int_0^{\pi R} dy \int d^4x \left\{ (\partial_\mu \phi)^2 + \frac{X^2}{Y^{1/2}} \left(\partial_y \frac{\phi}{X^{1/2} Y^{1/4}} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{\Lambda^2} \frac{X^2}{Y^{1/2}} \left(\partial_y^2 \frac{\phi}{X^{1/2} Y^{1/4}} \right)^2 \right\} \\ &= - \int_0^{\pi R} dy \int d^4x \left\{ (\partial_\mu \phi)^2 + \frac{X^2}{Y^{1/2}} \left(\partial_y \frac{\phi}{X^{1/2} Y^{1/4}} \right)^2 \right\} \\ &\quad - \int_0^{\pi R} dy \int d^4x \frac{X}{\Lambda^2 Y^{1/2}} \left[\phi'' - 2\phi' \frac{(X^{1/2} Y^{1/4})'}{X^{1/2} Y^{1/4}} + \phi \left(-\frac{(X^{1/2} Y^{1/4})'}{(X^{1/2} Y^{1/4})^2} \right)' \right]^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

where prime denotes a derivative w.r.t y . Let us discretize the extra dimension with lattice spacing a , such that $\pi R = Na$ and use the notation $F_j = F(ja)$, where $F = X, Y, \phi$ and j runs from zero to N . The original clockwork scenario comprises of the first terms in the action, provided that we identify:

$$m_j^2 = \frac{N^2 X_j}{\pi^2 R^2 Y_j}, \quad q_j = \frac{X_j^{1/2} Y_j^{1/4}}{X_{j+1}^{1/2} Y_{j+1}^{1/4}} \quad (3.12)$$

Discretizing the new term gives:

$$\mathcal{S} \supset - \sum_{j=0}^N \int d^4x \frac{N^4 X_j}{\pi^4 \Lambda^2 R^4 Y_j} (2/q_j^2 - v_{j+2}) \left\{ \frac{\phi_{j+2}}{(2/q_j^2 - v_{j+2})} - \frac{2/q_j}{(2/q_j^2 - v_{j+2})} \phi_{j+1} + \phi_j \right\}^2 \quad (3.13)$$

where $v_{j+2} \equiv \frac{X_{j+2}^{1/2} Y_{j+2}^{1/4}}{X_j^{1/2} Y_j^{1/4}}$. Requiring the deconstruction to be independent of the specific site, enforces $v_{j+2} = q_j^{-2}$, thence:

$$\mathcal{S} \supset - \int d^4x \sum_{j=0}^N \frac{N^4 X_j}{\pi^4 \Lambda^2 R^4 Y_j q_j^2} \left\{ q_j^2 \phi_{j+2} - 2q_j \phi_{j+1} + \phi_j \right\}^2 \quad (3.14)$$

So to recover (3.6), we demand $\beta_1 = 2, \beta_2 = 1$. The "mass" parameter here is different than the original clockwork scenario, $(M^{(2)})_j^2 = m_j^2 \left(1 + \frac{N^2}{\pi^2 R^2 \Lambda^2}\right)$ but it is just an overall shift. The massless mode remains massless. Notice that no new charges have been introduced, and therefore the solutions for X, Y , giving site independent charges q and masses m for the nearest neighbors interaction are similar to the original proposal [3]²:

$$X_j \propto Y_j \propto e^{\frac{-4k\pi Rj}{3N}}, \quad q = e^{k\pi R/N}, \quad m^2 = \frac{N^2}{\pi^2 R^2} \quad (3.15)$$

The next to nearest neighbors interaction gets a similar mass term of the form:

$$M^2 = \frac{N^4}{\pi^4 R^4 \Lambda^2}. \quad (3.16)$$

One may wonder whether other interesting solutions exist rather than trying to reproduce the original clockwork.

4 O(N) Clockwork

The clockwork mechanism can be implemented for multiple copies of $O(N)$ models and within a single $O(N)$ model as well. Consider $M + 1$ copies of $O(N)$ models:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{j=0}^M -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \vec{\phi})^2 + \epsilon \sum_{j=0}^{M-1} \left[\frac{\tilde{\mu}^2}{2}(\vec{\phi}_j + q\vec{\phi}_{j+1})^2 + \frac{\tilde{g}}{4N}(\vec{\phi}_j + q\vec{\phi}_{j+1})^4 \right] \quad (4.1)$$

For $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ we have a global $O(N)^{M+1}$ symmetry as well as shift symmetry for every vector $(\mathbb{R}^N)^{M+1}$. Turning on ϵ breaks the symmetry down to a single $O(N)$, since all vectors have to be rotated by the same orthogonal matrix. However, there is still a shift symmetry of $\vec{\phi}_j \rightarrow \vec{\phi}_j + \frac{\vec{c}}{(-q)^j}$, where \vec{c} is a constant vector. So the full symmetry group is now $O(N) \times \mathbb{R}^N$. The eigenvector corresponding to the conserved $O(N)$ remains massless, and this vector will have the same q^{-j} suppression in overlap with the different $\vec{\phi}_j$.

4.1 Linear Sigma Model

The original clockwork discusses the breaking of $U(1)^N$ after spontaneous symmetry breaking. We now generalize it to $M + 1$ copies of $O(N)$ models in the broken phase. Consider $M + 1$

²In the continuum, this corresponds to $X(|y|) = Y(|y|) = e^{\frac{-4k|y|}{3}}$.

copies of $O(N)$ models:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{j=0}^M \left(-\frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \vec{\phi})^2 - \frac{\mu^2}{2} (\vec{\phi}_j)^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4} (\vec{\phi}_j^2)^2 \right) + \epsilon \sum_{j=0}^{M-1} \left[\frac{\tilde{\mu}^2}{2} (\vec{\phi}_j + q\vec{\phi}_{j+1})^2 + \frac{\tilde{g}}{4N} (\vec{\phi}_j + q\vec{\phi}_{j+1})^4 \right] \quad (4.2)$$

Notice that here, the shift symmetry from the previous paragraph is gone. We use the conventional parametrization where the N th field gets a vev v_i :

$$\vec{\phi}_i = (\pi_i^k, v_i + \sigma_i), \quad v_i = \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \quad (4.3)$$

For simplicity, we took all the vevs to be the same. It is a trivial generalization to consider for each model a different μ_i, λ_i such that the vevs will be different. In this case, when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ we have $M + 1$ copies of $O(N)$ models in their broken phase, such that there is a global $O(N - 1)^{M+1}$ symmetry, and there are $(M + 1) \times (N - 1)$ massless goldstone bosons. These are the π_i^k . Turning on the clockwork terms induces a coupling will break the symmetry explicitly to a single $O(N - 1)$ and will leave a single linear combination of π_i^k massless, again with overlap suppressed with the standard $(-q)^{-j}$. This is because we can write the quadratic term as follows:

$$\left(\vec{\phi}_0 \cdots \vec{\phi}_M \right)^T \times \begin{pmatrix} 1 & q & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ q & 1 + q^2 & q & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & q & 1 + q^2 & q & 0 \cdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & q & 1 + q^2 & q \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & q & q^2 \end{pmatrix} \left(\vec{\phi}_0 \cdots \vec{\phi}_M \right) \quad (4.4)$$

where each entry in the matrix corresponds to a vector of length N . The eigenvalues of such a matrix will be the same as the clockwork, with a massless $O(N - 1)$ vector.

Considering a global $O(N)$ symmetry, one can still have exponential seclusion of the massless mode, unlike the gauge symmetry result reported in [12]. Considering, for instance,

$$\mathcal{L} \supset -\frac{1}{4g^2} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + \frac{(\vec{\phi}_N)^2}{8\pi f^2} F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} \quad (4.5)$$

the massless mode coupling will behave as

$$\mathcal{L} \supset \frac{a_0^2}{8\pi f_0^2} F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}, \quad f_0 = q^N f \quad (4.6)$$

5 Clockwork SUGRA

5.1 Canonical Kähler Potential

Clockwork mechanism in global SUSY has been suggested in [1]. Considering $3(N+1)$ chiral superfields $S_j, \Phi_j, \tilde{\Phi}_j$. For $q=2$ one can write down the renormalizeable superpotential:

$$W = \sum_{j=0}^N \lambda S_j \left(\Phi_j \tilde{\Phi}_j - v^2 \right) + \epsilon \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \left(\Phi_j \tilde{\Phi}_{j+1}^2 + \tilde{\Phi}_j \Phi_{j+1}^2 \right) \quad (5.1)$$

Taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ reveals a $U(1)^{N+1}$ global symmetry. Turning on ϵ breaks these symmetries into a single $U(1)$ with hierarchical charges with S_j being neutral, Φ_j a charge of 2^{-j} and $\tilde{\Phi}_j$ with charge $-(2)^{-j}$. It is interesting to note, that taking $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, produces *two* $U(1)$ symmetries, unlike the non-supersymmetric case, where there is only a single $U(1)$ [11]. The requirement for a SUSY minimum $W_i = 0$ for all chiral superfields gives the vev $\Phi_j \tilde{\Phi}_j = v^2, S_j = 0$, and masses are generated, while SUSY is conserved. The low energy theory below the scale λv can then be parameterized as $\Phi_j = v e^{\Pi_j/v}, \tilde{\Phi}_j = v e^{-\Pi_j/v}$, yielding:

$$W = 2\epsilon v^3 \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \cosh \left(\frac{\Pi_j - 2\Pi_{j+1}}{v} \right) \quad (5.2)$$

Notice, that we still have a Minkowski SUSY minimum.

The simplest generalization to SUGRA is straightforward. Throughout this section, we consider the Planck mass to be unity. Consider a canonical Kähler potential $K = \sum_{j=0}^N |\Phi_j|^2 + |\tilde{\Phi}_j|^2 + |S_j|^2$. The Kähler potential K is invariant under the same $U(1)^{N+1}$ as the superpotential for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ case, as well as additional $U(1)$ for each chiral superfield, to a total of $U(1)^{3(N+1)}$. The F-term scalar potential reads:

$$V = e^K (D_i W D_{\bar{j}} \bar{W} K^{i\bar{j}} - 3|W|^2) \quad (5.3)$$

The requirement for a supersymmetric minimum is now changed to $D_i W = 0$ for all chiral superfields (no summation):

$$D_{S_j} W = \lambda \left(\Phi_j \tilde{\Phi}_j - v^2 \right) + \bar{S}_j W \quad (5.4)$$

$$D_{\Phi_j} W = \lambda S_j \tilde{\Phi}_j + \epsilon \left(\tilde{\Phi}_{j+1}^2 + 2\Phi_j \tilde{\Phi}_{j-1} \right) + \bar{\Phi}_j W \quad (5.5)$$

K, W are invariant on interchanging $\tilde{\Phi}_j$ and Φ_j , so we just consider the fields without the tilde. Considering the case of $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, it is clear that the only supersymmetric minimum is that of global SUSY with $W_i = W = 0$ at the minimum and $\langle S_j \rangle = 0$, $\langle \Phi_j \tilde{\Phi}_j \rangle = v^2$. We now need to check whether the different terms in the scalar potential are still invariant under the clockwork $U(1)$. Since the Kähler potential K and the superpotential W are invariant, and the Kähler metric is a unit metric, we just need to check the Kähler derivative. The S_j Kähler derivative is invariant. Regarding the Φ_j :

$$\Phi_i \rightarrow e^{i\alpha_i} \Phi_i, \quad \tilde{\Phi}_i \rightarrow e^{-i\alpha_i} \tilde{\Phi}_i, \quad \alpha_i = 2\alpha_{i+1}, \quad D_{\Phi_i} W \rightarrow e^{-i\alpha_i} D_{\Phi_i} W \Rightarrow |D_i W|^2 \rightarrow |D_i W|^2 \quad (5.6)$$

Thus the entire scalar potential and kinetic terms are invariant under the clockwork symmetry. Considering the case of $\epsilon \neq 0$ in (5.1), the SUSY vacuum requirement $D_i W = 0$ does not change the vevs of $\Phi_i, \tilde{\Phi}_i = v$ and $S_i = 0$, provided that we add a constant to the superpotential $W_0 = -\epsilon M_{pl}^2 v (1 + 2Nv/M_{pl})$, where we have reinserted the Planck mass to make the scales participating clear. However, evaluating the scalar potential at the minimum, we will have an AdS minimum.

Hence, at the SUSY minimum, we encounter the well known problem in SUGRA of an AdS minimum,

$$V_{vac.} = -3e^{\langle K \rangle} |\langle W \rangle|^2 \Rightarrow V_{vac., CW} = -27e^{2(N+1)v^2/M_{pl}^2} \epsilon^2 M_{pl}^2 v^2 \quad (5.7)$$

Thus, lifting the minimum to a near Minkowski SUSY breaking one, will require introducing an explicit breaking of the clockwork which is of the same order as the CW term itself! ³ Pursuing such phenomenology, is simply testing of the uplifting term [16, 17], rather than a proper CW construction.

5.2 Shift Symmetric Kähler Potential

The above analysis shows that embedding the CW idea in a SUGRA framework requires a different approach. Shift symmetries in the Kähler potential are abundant in SUGRA con-

³The important point is comparing masses or energy scales before and after the lifting. Before the lifting, all massive modes will have mass of order $\epsilon^2 v^2$. So the lifting is as big as the massive CW modes. As such, even if we still have a massless mode by adding an uplifting term of the desired magnitude, the correction to the massive modes cannot be considered 'small'.

structions, especially in the inflationary literature, [18–20]. A possible construction is by using a so-called ”stabilizer” field, eloquently explained in [19]. Consider a superpotential and Kähler potential of the form:

$$W = Sf(\Phi_i), \quad K = S\bar{S} + \sum_i \frac{1}{2} (\Phi_i + \bar{\Phi}_i)^2 \quad (5.8)$$

In such case, we have a Minkowski SUSY vacuum at $S = f(\Phi_i) = 0$, the kinetic terms of the fields are canonical and the potential at $S = \Re(\Phi_i) = 0$ is simply:

$$V = f^2(\Im\Phi_i) \quad (5.9)$$

Hence, by choosing the function f to have only arguments of the form $f = f(\Phi_i - q\Phi_{i+1})$, we can have potentials that manifestly have the shift symmetry of $\Phi_i \rightarrow \Phi_i + q^{-i}$.

The structure of the vacuum in this case is rather generic. Assuming a Minkowski vacuum, $V|_0 = 0 \Rightarrow f|_0 = 0$. In such a case, at the extremum $V_i = 2ff_i = 0$, and thus the mass matrix at the vacuum becomes:

$$V_{ij}|_0 = 2(ff_{ij} + f_i f_j)|_0 = 2f_i f_j|_0 \quad (5.10)$$

In such case we do not have one flat direction but N flat directions! Hence, there is no hierarchy generated between a single massless mode and N massive states. We can uplift these N flat directions by explicitly breaking SUSY using another CW coupling:

$$V(\Im\Phi_i) = f^2(\Im\Phi_i - q\Im\Phi_{i+1}) + \epsilon(\Im\Phi_i - p\Im\Phi_{i+1})^2 \quad (5.11)$$

where p is the new CW charge, and $\epsilon \ll 1$ is a small SUSY breaking parameter giving us finally, an embedding of CW in SUGRA. This is of course a fine-tuned construction.

Alternatively, we can have a small CC, such that $f|_0 = W_0$.⁴ In such case:

$$\begin{aligned} V|_0 &= W_0^2 \\ V_i|_0 &= 2ff_i|_0 = 0 \Rightarrow f_i|_0 = 0 \\ V_{ij}|_0 &= 2W_0 f_{ij}|_0 \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

⁴ Notice that here, W_0 has mass dimension two, while in the previous subsection, it had mass dimension three.

Arranging f_{ij} to have positive semi-definite mass matrix is easy, for instance, expanding around the minimum, we can simply take $f = W_0 + \sum \alpha(\Phi_i - q\Phi_{i+1})^2$, so we have a massless CW mode and N massive states, according to (2.5)

$$m_{a_0}^2 = 0, \quad m_{a_k}^2 = 2W_0\alpha \left(1 + q^2 - 2q \cos \frac{k\pi}{N+1} \right), \quad k = 1, \dots, N \quad (5.13)$$

However, as we can see the mass is related to the CC $\Lambda^4 \sim W_0^2$. So the fundamental scale of the CW sector is parametrically connected to the CC.

5.3 Shift Symmetric Superpotential

The failure of the two previous sections, suggests giving up the stabilizer or spurion S fields all together and for $N + 1$ chiral superfields consider a manifestly symmetric superpotential of the form:

$$W = \sum_{i=0}^N m(\Phi_i - q\Phi_{i+1})^2 \quad (5.14)$$

The superpotential is invariant under the shift symmetry $\Phi_i \rightarrow \Phi_i + \alpha_i/q^i$. A Minkowski vacua with $W = W_i = 0$ at the minimum exist for vevs $\langle \Phi_i \rangle = q\langle \Phi_{i+1} \rangle$, with some $\langle \Phi_0 \rangle \equiv v \neq 0$. For any Kähler potential, we shall have the following potential and derivatives [17]:

$$V = e^K (D_i W D_{\bar{j}} \bar{W} K^{i\bar{j}} - 3|W|^2) \quad (5.15)$$

$$\partial_k V = e^K (D_k D_i W D_{\bar{j}} \bar{W} K^{i\bar{j}} - 2D_k W \bar{W}) \quad (5.16)$$

$$\nabla_l \partial_k V = e^K (D_l D_k D_i W D_{\bar{j}} \bar{W} K^{i\bar{j}} - D_l D_k W \bar{W}) \quad (5.17)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\bar{l}} \partial_k V = e^K & (-R_{k\bar{l}i\bar{m}} D_n W D_{\bar{j}} \bar{W} K^{i\bar{j}} K^{n\bar{m}} + K_{k\bar{l}} D_i W D_{\bar{j}} \bar{W} K^{i\bar{j}} - D_k W D_{\bar{l}} \bar{W} \\ & + D_k D_i W D_{\bar{l}} D_{\bar{j}} \bar{W} K^{i\bar{j}} - 2K_{k\bar{l}} W \bar{W}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

In the above ∂_i denotes differentiation with respect to a chiral scalar ϕ^i , $K_i = \partial_i K$ etc. and

$$\begin{aligned} D_i X_j &= \nabla_i X_j + K_i X_j \\ \nabla_i X_j &= \partial_i X_j - \Gamma_{ij}^k X_k \\ \Gamma_{ij}^k &= K^{k\bar{l}} \partial_i K_{j\bar{l}} \\ R_{i\bar{j}k\bar{l}} &= K_{m\bar{l}} \partial_{\bar{j}} \Gamma_{ik}^m. \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

Evaluating these quantities at the vacuum for *any* Kähler potential gives:

$$V = \partial_k V = \nabla_l \partial_k V = W = W_i = 0 \quad (5.20)$$

and the only nonzero term is:

$$\nabla_{\bar{i}}\partial_k V|_0 = e^K K^{i\bar{j}} W_{ik} \bar{W}_{\bar{j}l}|_0 \quad (5.21)$$

where W_{ij} is a matrix exactly of the form (2.4), with m as the mass parameter instead of m^2 . Hence, for canonical Kähler, the mass matrix for the scalars will be:

$$m_{i\bar{j}}^2 = e^{K|_0} |m|^2 \left| \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -q & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -q & 1+q^2 & -q & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & -q & 1+q^2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & & 1+q^2 & -q \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & -q & q^2 \end{pmatrix} \right|^2. \quad (5.22)$$

with guaranteed clockworking, a single massless complex superfield $m_{a_0}^2 = 0$ and N parametrically heavy ones. The masses will be the square of the original CW masses for real fields, $m_{a_k}^2 = e^{K|_0} |m|^2 \left(1 + q^2 - 2q \cos \frac{k\pi}{N+1}\right)^2$. The main difference compared to the previous section, was the existence of a scale m instead of the stabilizer field S .

For other Kähler manifolds, one has to look more carefully at the mass matrix. In the most general case, the canonically normalized mass matrix is [17]:

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{pmatrix} K^{i\bar{m}} N_{\bar{m}j} & K^{i\bar{m}} N_{\bar{m}\bar{j}} \\ K^{\bar{i}m} N_{mj} & K^{\bar{i}m} N_{m\bar{j}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (5.23)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} N_{i\bar{j}} &= \nabla_i \partial_{\bar{j}} V \\ N_{ij} &= \nabla_i \partial_j V - \Gamma_{ij}^k \partial_k V. \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

As before $N_{ij} = 0$ at the vacuum, while $N_{i\bar{j}} = m_{i\bar{j}}^2$ from (5.22). Thus, for canonical Kähler, we get the clockwork. For a diagonal Kähler each mode Φ_i will get multiplied by the corresponding inverse Kähler term $K^{\bar{i}i}|_0$ (no summation), and the massless mode will have different weighting of each field. Finally for a general Kähler potential, we are still guaranteed a single complex massless mode, since the Kähler metric $K_{i\bar{j}}$ is invertible, but whether the exponential

suppression exists, and the corresponding overlap of each site depends on the specific Kähler potential considered.

To summarize, embedding the CW mechanism in SUGRA is a problematic issue. Using spirions/stabilizer, we get either a. SUSY breaking that is parametrically the same as the CW sector. This refers both to AdS SUSY, with SUSY breaking uplifting that is as large as the CW term itself, and with the stabilizer field that the CW mass matrix is proportional to the root of the CC. Or b. we get many flat directions and no clockworking. One has to further introduce explicit SUSY breaking CW to generate the desired CW hierarchy.

To avoid such conclusion, we must manifestly build the CW symmetry into the superpotential W along with a scale m that does not come from a VEV of another chiral superfield. In such case, we get the correct CW mass matrix for the case of canonical Kähler potential.

6 Conformal Coupling and Mass Terms in the Extra Dimension

It is interesting to contemplate the possibility of some generic explicit breaking of the residual $U(1)$ symmetry, beyond the direct coupling to the specific sector we are interested in. Such a possibility could come out naturally in the extra dimensional interpretation. Considering again the extra dimensional picture, [3] reproduced the mass matrix of the 4D CW and suggested that the continuum is coming from a linear dilaton model.

Because the main aim of this paper is to generalize CW theory, it makes sense to consider how additional terms in 5D affect the CW structure. Since, we can at most recover the mass matrix of CW, we limit ourselves to terms that are at most quadratic in the 5D scalar field. A free massless scalar field generated the CW mass matrix (2.4). We therefore expect the additional quadratic terms to generate an explicit breaking of the CW symmetry as desired. We explore the effect of a conformal coupling to gravity, as the most minimal variation, where conformal symmetry is maintained. ⁵ Deconstruction will introduce a length scale, the lattice spacing, and will break the conformal symmetry, and generate a 4D mass term. Finally, we consider explicitly adding mass terms in the extra dimension.

⁵Some analysis along these lines with the Randall-Sundrum (RS) metric has been carried out in [21].

Let us write the 5D metric proposal suggested in [3]:

$$ds^2 = e^{\frac{4k|y|}{3}} (\eta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu + dy^2) = \left(\frac{z}{z_0}\right)^2 \eta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu + dz^2 \quad (6.1)$$

where $z_0 \leq z \leq z_\pi$. The 5D dimensional action of a scalar field conformally coupled to gravity is:

$$\mathcal{S} = -2 \int_0^{\pi R} dy \int d^4x \sqrt{-g_5} \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} g^{MN} \partial_M \phi \partial_N \phi \right) + \frac{\xi}{2} \phi^2 \mathcal{R}_5 \right] \quad (6.2)$$

where $\xi = (D-2)/(2(D-1)) = 3/8$. Substituting the CW metric (6.1) the following Ricci curvature and volume element:

$$\mathcal{R}_5 = -\frac{16}{3} \left(\frac{kz}{z_0} \right)^2 \quad (6.3)$$

$$\sqrt{-g_5} = \left(\frac{z}{z_0} \right)^4 \quad (6.4)$$

Notice that the numerical coefficient in $\mathcal{R}_5 = -16/3 = -2/\xi$. The action after canonically normalizing the 4D field is:

$$\mathcal{S} = - \int_0^{\pi R} dy \int d^4x \left\{ (\partial_\mu \phi)^2 + \frac{X^2}{Y^{1/2}} \left(\partial_y \frac{\phi}{X^{1/2} Y^{1/4}} \right)^2 + \xi X \mathcal{R}_5 \phi^2 \right\} \quad (6.5)$$

In any choice of coordinates, substituting (6.1) gives a constant negative mass term due to the conformal coupling:

$$\mathcal{S} = - \int_0^{\pi R} dy \int d^4x \left\{ (\partial_\mu \phi)^2 + \frac{X^2}{Y^{1/2}} \left(\partial_y \frac{\phi}{X^{1/2} Y^{1/4}} \right)^2 - 2k^2 \phi^2 \right\} \quad (6.6)$$

In general, such a term should not necessarily worry us, as this is a negatively curved space-time. However, upon discretization, the 4D metric is Minkowski. In such case we shall still get the same expressions for the charges q_j . But, the masses m_j^2 , are shifted by a negative constant $-2k^2$.

$$\mathcal{S} = \int d^4x \left[\sum_{j=0}^N (\partial_\mu \phi_j)^2 + \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} m_j^2 (\phi_j - q_j \phi_{j+1})^2 - 2k^2 \phi_j^2 \right] \quad (6.7)$$

$$m_j^2 \equiv \frac{N^2 X_j}{\pi^2 R^2 Y_j}, \quad q_j \equiv \frac{X_j^{1/2} Y_j^{1/4}}{X_{j+1}^{1/2} Y_{j+1}^{1/4}}. \quad (6.8)$$

Hence, in the 4D picture, the massless mode becomes tachyonic, with mass $m_{a_0}^2 = -2k^2$.⁶ The tachyon arises due to the negative curvature of the 5D manifold. In RS, we get a similar

⁶In principle, there can be additional negative mass modes depending on k and R , the size of the extra dimension.

negative term, but it will be site dependent, since:

$$\xi X \mathcal{R}_5 \phi^2 = -\frac{15}{2} \hat{k}^2 e^{2\hat{k}z} \phi^2 \quad (6.9)$$

Of course one can consider non-minimal coupling to the 5D Ricci scalar that is not conformal and with the opposite sign, such that it does give a positive mass term.⁷ But it is not clear what we gain from such a coupling that is not already encapsulated in simply adding a mass term to the 5D scalar, since the conformal symmetry is lost.

Hence, let us consider adding an explicit 5D mass term $M^2 \phi^2/2$. This of course breaks the conformal symmetry. In such case, after canonically normalizing the 4D kinetic term we will have:

$$\mathcal{S} = - \int_0^{\pi R} dy \int d^4x \left\{ (\partial_\mu \phi)^2 + \frac{X^2}{Y^{1/2}} \left(\partial_y \frac{\phi}{X^{1/2} Y^{1/4}} \right)^2 + X(M^2 + \xi \mathcal{R}_5) \phi^2 \right\} \quad (6.10)$$

Since in RS the Ricci scalar is constant, the tachyon can be exactly cancelled, or become massive with $M^2 \geq -\xi \mathcal{R}_5 = \frac{15}{2} \hat{k}^2$ upon discretization. Hence, we achieve an explicit breaking at the price of adding another mass scale M to the game.

In the CW case, we first consider minimal coupling to gravity. The contribution of the 5D mass term will be site dependent, according to the value of X_j . Generically, there will be no massless mode. To maintain the massless mode, with minimal coupling to gravity, one has to choose specifically that $M^2 = \alpha(q) m_j^2 = \alpha(q) (N/\pi R)^2$, where $\alpha(q)$ is some function of q that guarantees the vanishing of the determinant. For example, in the case of $N = 2$, we get $\alpha = q^{-4/3} (1 + q^{2/3})$. With the conformal coupling to gravity, the parameter α becomes dependent on k as well in some complicated expression, $\alpha = \alpha(q, k)$.

To summarize, two possible ways to uplift the massless mode from 5D are conformal coupling to gravity or adding a 5D mass term. The 5D mass term generates site-dependent mass terms in 4D, but with a judicious choice of parameters, a massless mode can be maintained. The conformal coupling to gravity makes the CW massless mode tachyonic after discretization. Adding a 5D mass term can remove the tachyonic instability, restoring zero mass for specific values of the parameters q, k , or generate a positive 4D mass term.

⁷It may be that such a change of sign simply means moving the tachyon to the gravitational part of the lagrangian. Let's ignore that for the moment.

Before we conclude, in the above analysis, we have not taken into account effects caused by putting branes in the extra dimension when the continuum limit is discussed, as in [3, 12, 15]. Such construction can have interesting consequences, and we defer such investigation to future work.

7 Conclusions

In this note, we have attempted to generalize the clockwork idea in several directions, while keeping the original notion of natural generation of hierarchy in a theory whose fundamental parameters are of similar size. Or, in mundane terms, getting an exponential hierarchy, at the price of considering $N + 1$ fields. From a lattice point of view, we have demonstrated that coupling beyond nearest neighbors leads to enhanced symmetry, depending on the number of neighbors each site couples to. This is interpreted as higher derivative terms in the extra-dimension point of view. If we allow all possible number of neighbors interactions, the massive eigenstates are shifted considerably, but a massless mode and a residual $U(1)$ remain in tact. We have further generalized the clockwork to global $O(N)$ models. Generalization to SUGRA is a delicate issue. If we use spurions or stabilizers, the SUSY breaking either has to be as large as the clockwork term for viable phenomenology, or more ingredients have to be added, such as further uplifting of $N - 1$ flat directions, or having the same energy scale for the clockwork and the CC. Simple successful SUGRA proceeds by discarding such fields and building a manifestly shift symmetric superpotential. Finally, conformal coupling of the CW metric in 5D, makes the massless mode tachyonic upon discretization. This is a generic property of negatively curved 5D manifolds once we canonically normalize the kinetic terms of the scalar field and discretize. A 5D mass term, generically uplifts the massless mode, though for certain value of parameters the masslessness can be restored. This conclusion is valid also in the presence of conformal coupling to gravity. All in all, it seems we have only started to unravel the various possibilities of the clockwork mechanism.

Acknowledgements

I thank Clemens Wieck for many useful comments on the manuscript.

References

- [1] D. E. Kaplan and R. Rattazzi, “Large field excursions and approximate discrete symmetries from a clockwork axion,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, no. 8, 085007 (2016) [arXiv:1511.01827 [hep-ph]].
- [2] K. Choi and S. H. Im, “Realizing the relaxation from multiple axions and its UV completion with high scale supersymmetry,” *JHEP* **1601**, 149 (2016) [arXiv:1511.00132 [hep-ph]].
- [3] G. F. Giudice and M. McCullough, “A Clockwork Theory,” *JHEP* **1702**, 036 (2017) [arXiv:1610.07962 [hep-ph]].
- [4] K. Choi, H. Kim and S. Yun, “Natural inflation with multiple sub-Planckian axions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 023545 (2014) [arXiv:1404.6209 [hep-th]].
- [5] J. E. Kim, H. P. Nilles and M. Peloso, “Completing natural inflation,” *JCAP* **0501**, 005 (2005) [hep-ph/0409138].
- [6] I. Ben-Dayan, F. G. Pedro and A. Westphal, “Hierarchical Axion Inflation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 261301 (2014) [arXiv:1404.7773 [hep-th]].
- [7] S. H. H. Tye and S. S. C. Wong, “Helical Inflation and Cosmic Strings,” arXiv:1404.6988 [astro-ph.CO].
- [8] T. Hambye, D. Teresi and M. H. G. Tytgat, “A Clockwork WIMP,” arXiv:1612.06411 [hep-ph].
- [9] A. Kehagias and A. Riotto, “Clockwork Inflation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **767**, 73 (2017) [arXiv:1611.03316 [hep-ph]].
- [10] A. Ahmed and B. M. Dillon, “Clockwork Composite Higgses,” arXiv:1612.04011 [hep-ph].
- [11] M. Farina, D. Pappadopulo, F. Rompineve and A. Tesi, “The photo-philic QCD axion,” *JHEP* **1701**, 095 (2017) [arXiv:1611.09855 [hep-ph]].
- [12] N. Craig, I. Garcia Garcia and D. Sutherland, “Disassembling the Clockwork Mechanism,” arXiv:1704.07831 [hep-ph].
- [13] G. F. Giudice and M. McCullough, “Comment on ”Disassembling the Clockwork Mechanism”,” arXiv:1705.10162 [hep-ph].
- [14] I. Antoniadis, A. Arvanitaki, S. Dimopoulos and A. Giveon, “Phenomenology of TeV Little String Theory from Holography,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 081602 (2012) [arXiv:1102.4043 [hep-ph]].

- [15] P. Cox and T. Gherghetta, “Radion Dynamics and Phenomenology in the Linear Dilaton Model,” *JHEP* **1205**, 149 (2012) [arXiv:1203.5870 [hep-ph]].
- [16] R. Brustein and S. P. de Alwis, “Moduli potentials in string compactifications with fluxes: Mapping the discretuum,” *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 126006 (2004) [hep-th/0402088].
- [17] I. Ben-Dayan, R. Brustein and S. P. de Alwis, “Models of Modular Inflation and Their Phenomenological Consequences,” *JCAP* **0807**, 011 (2008) [arXiv:0802.3160 [hep-th]].
- [18] M. Kawasaki, M. Yamaguchi and T. Yanagida, “Natural chaotic inflation in supergravity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 3572 (2000) [hep-ph/0004243].
- [19] R. Kallosh, A. Linde and T. Rube, “General inflaton potentials in supergravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 043507 (2011) [arXiv:1011.5945 [hep-th]].
- [20] I. Ben-Dayan and M. B. Einhorn, “Supergravity Higgs Inflation and Shift Symmetry in Electroweak Theory,” *JCAP* **1012**, 002 (2010) [arXiv:1009.2276 [hep-ph]].
- [21] R. Hofmann and M. Pospelov, “Conformal matter in warped backgrounds,” *Phys. Lett. B* **556**, 203 (2003) [hep-ph/0301075].