

# Non-linear Realizations and Higher Curvature Supergravity

F. Farakos<sup>1,2</sup>, S. Ferrara<sup>3,4,5</sup>, A. Kehagias<sup>6</sup> and D. Lüst<sup>7,8</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia “Galileo Galilei”  
Università di Padova, Via Marzolo 8, 35131 Padova, ITALY*

<sup>2</sup>*INFN, Sezione di Padova, Via Marzolo 8, 35131 Padova, ITALY*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Theoretical Physics CH - 1211 Geneva 23, SWITZERLAND*

<sup>4</sup>*INFN - Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati Via Enrico Fermi 40, I-00044 Frascati, ITALY*

<sup>5</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Mani L. Bhaumik Institute for Theoretical Physics  
U.C.L.A., Los Angeles CA 90095-1547, USA*

<sup>6</sup>*Physics Division, National Technical University of Athens,  
15780 Zografou Campus, Athens, GREECE*

<sup>7</sup>*Arnold Sommerfeld Center for Theoretical Physics  
Theresienstraße 37, 80333 München, GERMANY*

<sup>8</sup>*Max-Planck-Institut für Physik Föhringer Ring 6, 80805 München, GERMANY*

---

## Abstract

We focus on non-linear realizations of local supersymmetry as obtained by using constrained superfields in supergravity. New constraints, beyond those of rigid supersymmetry, are obtained whenever curvature multiplets are affected as well as higher derivative interactions are introduced. In particular, a new constraint, which removes a very massive gravitino is introduced, and in the rigid limit it merely reduces to an explicit supersymmetry breaking. Higher curvature supergravities free of ghosts and instabilities are also obtained in this way. Finally, we consider direct coupling of the goldstino multiplet to the super Gauss–Bonnet multiplet and discuss the emergence of a new scalar degree of freedom.

---

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Supergravity, matter, and constrained superfields</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Curvature multiplets, matter multiplets and invariant actions . . . . .	3
2.2	Non-linear realizations . . . . .	5
2.3	Gravitino decoupling . . . . .	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Effective theories</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1	Chiral superfield coupled to super Gauss–Bonnet . . . . .	12
3.2	Gauss–Bonnet–Volkov–Akulov supergravity . . . . .	16
3.3	Chiral superfield coupled to super Weyl square . . . . .	18
<b>4</b>	<b>Concluding remarks</b>	<b>19</b>

## 1 Introduction

Higher curvature supergravity has been revived recently, especially motivated from cosmology [1–5]. In particular,  $R + R^2$  theories have been extensively studied as they propagate besides the spin-2 graviton, also a massive scalar mode [6, 7]. This scalar, often referred to as scalaron, is identified with the inflaton in Starobinsky inflation [8]. Other higher curvature actions, like Weyl square, might give rise to ghost states. For example the latter introduces a massive spin-2 ghost in the spectrum, and therefore is problematic. The embedding of the various cosmological models within a UV complete framework is eventually essential, and might also lead to a deeper understanding of the effective theory of inflation [9]. Four-dimensional N=1 supergravity theories are particularly motivated for such a study, because they arise as the low energy limits of string theory [10]. Once supergravity is treated as an effective theory, then the standard matter-coupled action [11–13] will generically receive higher derivative corrections coming from the UV physics [4, 5]. Therefore their consistent embedding into 4D N=1 supergravity deserves a careful investigation.

When attempting to “supersymmetrize” higher derivative gravity coupled to matter, even only the consistent interactions, on top of the modification of the scalar potential [14–17], one is faced with an unavoidable problem: the new terms added to the action often give rise to ghosts [4, 5, 18]. While this phenomenon does not happen in supersymmetric vacua [4], it manifests when supersymmetry is broken which is always the case when it is non-linearly realized. The ghosts arise from unwanted kinetic mixings of the scalars to gravity, as off-diagonal kinetic terms, or as auxiliary fields which become propagating. Even though there do exist islands of consistent supersymmetric higher derivative theories, one would like to have at hand a tool, which will allow to study the effective description of all the possible higher derivative interactions within supergravity. Essentially, one needs a way to eliminate the ghost states from the spectrum,

which is the basic motivation of the present study. In particular we will focus on the couplings of the inflaton to quadratic curvature of the form

$$a_1(\phi) R_{GB}^2 + a_2(\phi) R_{HP}^2 + a_3(\phi) C^2, \quad (1)$$

where  $R_{GB}^2$  is the Gauss-Bonnet combination,  $R_{HP}^2$  is the Hirzebruch–Pontryagin combination and  $C^2$  is the square of the Weyl tensor. The coupling with  $R^2$  has been extensively studied in the literature, and therefore we will not study it in detail, but we refer the interested reader to [2] and to [19].

In effective supergravity theories where supersymmetry is spontaneously broken and non-linearly realized [20, 21] it is known how to eliminate any unwanted state from the spectrum [22, 23]. Indeed, if the goldstino resides inside the nilpotent chiral superfield  $X$ , which satisfies  $X^2 = 0$ , one can eliminate the lowest component field of a generic superfield  $Q$ , by imposing the constraint  $X\bar{X}Q = 0$ . Constrained superfields have been already extensively studied for the effective description of supersymmetric theories during inflation [24]. This use is justified, because during inflation various component fields will become heavy and decouple from the inflationary sector, and a way to describe this decoupling is by using constrained superfields. Drawing inspiration from this property of constrained superfields, we impose superspace constraints in such a way that the unwanted ghost fields in supersymmetric theories with higher derivatives are eliminated from the spectrum. In particular, we focus on the superspace Lagrangians which contain known consistent terms in their bosonic sector, but due to the supersymmetric completion they contain ghosts as well. We show that the ghosts are eliminated from the spectrum due to the superfield constraints. These constraints are imposed both on the matter multiplets and on the supergravity multiplet. The constraints on the supergravity multiplet are imposed to eliminate the supergravity auxiliary fields which would otherwise give rise to ghosts [4, 5].

Another aspect of our work is related to the gravitino. First, we will construct a new term which generates a pure gravitino mass, and in the global limit it will generate higher order interaction terms for the goldstino. Second, we introduce a new constraint on the nilpotent  $X$  superfield which eliminates the gravitino from the low energy supergravity theory. In the global limit this constraint will essentially eliminate the goldstino therefore will lead to a stronger constraint on  $X$  which will change it into a *spurion*. In other words, the constraint we are presenting here have no analogue in rigid susy. In the absence of the gravitino our constraint makes the goldstino to vanish so only the spurion vev would remain.

This work is organized as follows. In section 2, the basic ingredients of local superspace geometry and the notation are introduced together with non-linear constraints on matter and curvature multiplets. In particular, a new constraint on the Volkov-Akulov multiplet decouples the gravitino. In section 3 couplings of linear and non-linear chiral multiplets to higher curvature invariants are introduced. An extreme case is the Volkov-Akulov Lagrangian augmented by its coupling to the Gauss-Bonnet super invariant. This theory implies the existence of a new scalar degree of freedom, dual to a specific  $f(R)$  gravity encoded as part of the supersymmetrized Gauss-Bonnet invariant. The paper ends with some concluding remarks in section 4.

## 2 Supergravity, matter, and constrained superfields

### 2.1 Curvature multiplets, matter multiplets and invariant actions

In this work we use the superspace formalism of old-minimal supergravity [25]. Our conventions can be found in [13], whereas the complete old-minimal supergravity curvature multiplets can be found in [26]. The construction of supergravity relies on two superspace fields, the super-vielbein  $E_M^A$  and the super-connection  $\phi_{MA}^B$ . The independent and propagating degrees of freedom of the supergravity multiplet are the vielbein  $e_m^a$  and the gravitino  $\psi_m^\alpha$ . From the super-vielbein and the super-connection we can build the torsion tensor superfield  $\mathcal{T}_{NM}^A$  and the curvature tensor superfield  $\mathcal{R}_{NMA}^B$  [27].

The components of the torsion and the curvature superfields are not independent, and they can be expressed in terms of three independent superfields [28]. These superfields are the Ricci superfield  $\mathcal{R}$ , the  $B_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}$  superfield, and the Weyl superfield  $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$  and their properties can be found in [4, 13, 26]. This reduction is achieved by employing the torsion constraints and the Bianchi identities for the torsion and the curvature. Then the solution of the Bianchi identities under the torsion constraints, not only leads to the three aforementioned curvature superfields, but also gives conditions on these superfields among themselves. From the Bianchi identities (the full list can be found in [13]), one can relate the higher components of the irreducible curvature superfields to the fields of the supergravity multiplet. These components are particularly important for our discussion because they contain various curvature tensors. The independent superfields of the supergravity multiplet are:

1. *The Ricci superfield  $\mathcal{R}$ .* It is a chiral superfield

$$\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot{\alpha}}\mathcal{R} = 0, \quad (2)$$

and in the lowest component it contains the scalar auxiliary field of the supergravity multiplet

$$\mathcal{R}| = -\frac{1}{6}M. \quad (3)$$

The highest component of the  $\mathcal{R}$  superfield has bosonic sector

$$\mathcal{D}^2\mathcal{R}| = -\frac{1}{3}R + \frac{4}{9}M\bar{M} + \frac{2}{9}b^a b_a - \frac{2i}{3}e_a{}^m \mathcal{D}_m b^a. \quad (4)$$

Here the abbreviation  $\mathcal{O}|$  stands for  $\mathcal{O}|_{\theta=\bar{\theta}=0}$ , which means to set the Grassmann parameters to vanish.

2. *The  $B_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}$  superfield.* It has the properties

$$(B_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}})^* = B_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}, \quad \bar{\mathcal{D}}^{\dot{\alpha}} B_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} = \mathcal{D}_\alpha \mathcal{R}, \quad (5)$$

and its lowest component is the second auxiliary field of old-minimal supergravity

$$B_a| = -\frac{1}{3}b_a, \quad (6)$$

where  $b_a$  is a real vector. The higher components of the superfield  $B_a$  have bosonic sectors

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}^2 B_a| &= -\frac{2i}{3}\mathcal{D}_a \bar{M} + \frac{2}{3}b_a \bar{M}, \\ \bar{\sigma}_b^{\dot{\alpha}\alpha}\mathcal{D}_\alpha \bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot{\alpha}} B_a| &= \left(\frac{1}{6}R + \frac{1}{9}M\bar{M} + \frac{1}{9}b^e b_c\right)\eta_{ab} - R_{ab} - \frac{2i}{3}\mathcal{D}_b b_a + \frac{2}{9}b_a b_b - \frac{1}{3}\epsilon^{cd}{}_{ab}\mathcal{D}_c b_d, \\ \mathcal{D}^2 \bar{\mathcal{D}}^2 B_a| &= -4i\mathcal{D}_a \mathcal{D}^2 \mathcal{R}| + 4B_a|\mathcal{D}^2 \mathcal{R}| + 16i\bar{\mathcal{R}}|\mathcal{D}_a \mathcal{R}| + 12\mathcal{R}|\mathcal{D}^2 B_a|.\end{aligned}\quad (7)$$

3. *The Weyl superfield  $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$ .* It satisfies

$$\mathcal{W}_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \mathcal{W}_{(\alpha\beta\gamma)}, \quad (\mathcal{W}_{\alpha\beta\gamma})^* = \bar{\mathcal{W}}_{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}\dot{\gamma}}, \quad \bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot{\delta}}\mathcal{W}_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = 0, \quad (8)$$

and there is an algebraic identity which relates it to the other two superfields

$$\mathcal{D}^\alpha \mathcal{W}_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + \frac{i}{2}\left(\epsilon^{\dot{\beta}\dot{\gamma}}\mathcal{D}_{\dot{\beta}\dot{\beta}} B_{\gamma\dot{\gamma}} + \epsilon^{\dot{\beta}\dot{\gamma}}\mathcal{D}_{\gamma\dot{\beta}} B_{\beta\dot{\gamma}}\right) = 0. \quad (9)$$

This superfield has the following pure bosonic contributions

$$\mathcal{D}_\gamma \mathcal{W}_{\delta\epsilon\alpha}| = \frac{1}{6}\left(\frac{i}{4}\epsilon_{\gamma\delta}\mathcal{D}_{\epsilon\dot{\epsilon}} b_{\dot{\alpha}}^{\dot{\epsilon}} - \frac{1}{4}\sigma_{\delta}^{de}{}_{\beta}{}^{\beta}\epsilon_{\beta\epsilon}\sigma_{\alpha}^{\rho}{}_{\rho\gamma}R_{deba}\right) + (\delta\epsilon\alpha), \quad (10)$$

where  $R_{abcd} = e_a^m e_b^n R_{mncd}$  and  $(\delta\epsilon\alpha)$  refers to the symmetrization with respect to the fermionic indices  $\delta, \epsilon$  and  $\alpha$  and contains five terms.

The previous formulae were found at the linearized level in [29] and in the superconformal tensor calculus in [31].

We now turn to the description of *scalar matter*. A generic chiral superfield  $\Phi$  is defined by  $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot{\alpha}}\Phi = 0$ , and the component fields it contains can be defined by projection as

$$\Phi| = A, \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\mathcal{D}_\alpha \Phi| = \chi_\alpha, \quad -\frac{1}{4}\mathcal{D}^2 \Phi| = F. \quad (11)$$

Here  $A$  is a complex scalar,  $\chi$  is a fermion and  $F$  is the matter multiplet auxiliary field. Using the new  $\Theta$  variables expansion we can also write the chiral superfield  $\Phi$  as

$$\Phi = A + \sqrt{2}\Theta^\alpha \chi_\alpha + \Theta^2 F. \quad (12)$$

We will often use the notation  $\psi^2 = \psi\psi = \psi^\alpha \psi_\alpha$  for fermionic objects. In this work we will use only chiral superfields to describe the matter sector.

From any unconstrained Lorentz scalar complex superfield  $U$  we can always construct a chiral superfield  $\Xi$ , with the use of the chiral projection, as

$$\Xi = -\frac{1}{4}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2 - 8\mathcal{R})U. \quad (13)$$

This chiral superfield has component expansion

$$\Xi = A^\Xi + \sqrt{2}\Theta^\alpha \chi_\alpha^\Xi + \Theta^2 F^\Xi. \quad (14)$$

To built actions invariant under the local supersymmetry, one has to employ density superfields. In particular, we will use here the superspace field  $2\mathcal{E}$  which is a chiral density, and is defined as

$$2\mathcal{E} = e \left\{ 1 + i\Theta\sigma^a\bar{\psi}_a - \Theta\Theta\left(\bar{M} + \bar{\psi}_a\bar{\sigma}^{ab}\bar{\psi}_b\right) \right\}. \quad (15)$$

The property of the chiral density is that, when multiplied with chiral superfields, the product is again a chiral density. Then the superspace Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \int d^2\Theta 2\mathcal{E} \Xi + c.c. = \int d^2\Theta 2\mathcal{E} \left[ -\frac{1}{4}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2 - 8\mathcal{R})U \right] + c.c. \quad (16)$$

will be invariant under local supersymmetry up to boundary terms. In component form the Lagrangian (16) will read

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L} = F^\Xi - \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}\chi^\Xi\sigma^a\bar{\psi}_a - \left(\bar{M} + \bar{\psi}_a\bar{\sigma}^{ab}\bar{\psi}_b\right)A^\Xi + c.c. \quad (17)$$

To find the free supergravity for example one has to set  $\Xi = -3\mathcal{R}$ , and for the superspace cosmological constant we have  $\Xi = W_0$ , where  $W_0$  is a complex constant.

The matter sector chiral superfields are denoted collectively as  $\Phi^I$  for  $I = 1, \dots, n$ . The generic coupling (up to two derivatives) of a chiral model is

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \int d^2\Theta 2\mathcal{E} \left[ -\frac{1}{8}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2 - 8\mathcal{R})\Omega(\Phi^I, \bar{\Phi}^{\bar{J}}) + W(\Phi^I) \right] + c.c., \quad (18)$$

where  $\Omega(\Phi^I, \bar{\Phi}^{\bar{J}})$  is a hermitian function and  $W(\Phi^I)$  is a holomorphic function of the chiral superfields. The bosonic sector of (18) is

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_0 = & \frac{1}{6}\Omega R - \frac{1}{9}\Omega b^a b_a - \Omega_{IJ}\partial_m A^I \partial^m \bar{A}^{\bar{J}} - \frac{i}{3}(\Omega_I \partial_m A^I - \Omega_{\bar{J}} \partial_m \bar{A}^{\bar{J}}) b^m \\ & + \frac{1}{9}\Omega M \bar{M} - \frac{1}{3}\Omega_{\bar{J}} \bar{F}^{\bar{J}} \bar{M} - \frac{1}{3}\Omega_I F^I M + \Omega_{I\bar{J}} F^I \bar{F}^{\bar{J}} \\ & - W \bar{M} - \bar{W} M + W_I F^I + \bar{W}_{\bar{J}} \bar{F}^{\bar{J}}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where  $\mathcal{O}_J = \frac{\partial \mathcal{O}}{\partial A^J}$  and so on. Once we integrate out the auxiliary fields and rescale the metric by  $g_{mn} \rightarrow -\frac{3}{\Omega} g_{mn}$  the bosonic sector gets the familiar form which can be found in [13], where the Kähler potential is given by

$$K = -3 \log \left( -\frac{1}{3}\Omega \right). \quad (20)$$

In our discussion though, it is essential to have the matter sector in the original form given by (19). This is because there will be auxiliary fields which cannot be integrated out, but one has to eliminate them by superspace constraints.

## 2.2 Non-linear realizations

In a supergravity setup, it is known that when supersymmetry is spontaneously broken and the goldstino is integrated out<sup>1</sup>, one can effectively describe the supersymmetry breaking sector by

<sup>1</sup>In global supersymmetry for F-term and/or D-term breaking it has been shown in [33] that a chiral superfield with  $X^2 = 0$  always appears at low energy.

the use of the constrained chiral superfield  $X$ , which satisfies [32]

$$X^2 = 0. \quad (21)$$

This superfield has the  $\Theta$  expansion

$$X = \frac{GG}{2F\bar{X}} + \sqrt{2}\Theta^\alpha G_\alpha + \Theta\Theta F^X. \quad (22)$$

The goldstino is the fermion  $G_\alpha$  and to have a consistent non-linear realization it has to satisfy that

$$\langle F^X \rangle \neq 0. \quad (23)$$

The minimal model which can describe this theory is constructed by a flat Kähler potential and a linear superpotential in  $X$  [21]. Once we have a chiral superfield  $X$  with these properties we can eliminate various component fields from other multiplets. These multiplets can be curvature [34] or they can be matter [22, 23]. The underlying principle is that the irreducible constraint

$$X\bar{X}Q = 0, \quad (24)$$

eliminates *only* the lowest component of the superfield  $Q$  from the spectrum without imposing any constraint on the higher component fields [23]. It has been also illustrated in [34] that these constraints are equivalent to eliminating the specific component field by using the CCWZ procedure, therefore providing a non-trivial cross-check for the self-consistency.

In this work we will employ a very specific constrained matter chiral superfield  $\mathcal{A}$  which will contain the real scalar  $\phi$ . In fact this constrained superfield has found its way in many applications of inflation in supergravity [35], and together with  $X$  they provide the minimal setup for our study. It can be written as

$$\mathcal{A} = \phi + ib + \sqrt{2}\Theta\chi^{\mathcal{A}} + \Theta^2 F^{\mathcal{A}}, \quad (25)$$

and we impose the constraint [38]

$$X(\mathcal{A} - \bar{\mathcal{A}}) = 0. \quad (26)$$

As a consequence of (26), the imaginary part of the lowest component of  $\mathcal{A}$ , the auxiliary field  $F^{\mathcal{A}}$ , and the fermionic component field  $\chi_\alpha^{\mathcal{A}}$  are removed from the spectrum. The most convenient way to verify this is to realize that from (26) we can produce the irreducible constraints

$$X\bar{X}(\mathcal{A} - \bar{\mathcal{A}}) = 0, \quad X\bar{X}\mathcal{D}_\alpha\mathcal{A} = 0, \quad X\bar{X}\mathcal{D}^2\mathcal{A} = 0. \quad (27)$$

To summarize, the superfield  $\mathcal{A}$  contains only a real scalar degree of freedom  $\phi = \text{Re}\mathcal{A}$  while the other fields of the  $\mathcal{A}$  multiplet are solved in terms of the goldstino.

As we said, the supergravity multiplet also contains auxiliary degrees of freedom which for the old-minimal formulation are the complex scalar  $M$  and the real vector  $b_m$ . One can also

impose constraints on the multiplets which contain these fields, and thus eliminating them from the spectrum. In particular we may impose

$$X\bar{X}B_a = 0, \quad (28)$$

which implies for the supergravity auxiliary field  $b_a = \mathcal{O}(G, \bar{G})$ . Indeed, following [34] we see that (28) gives the superspace equation

$$B_a = -2\frac{\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot{\alpha}}\bar{X}}{\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2\bar{X}}\bar{\mathcal{D}}^{\dot{\alpha}}B_a - \bar{X}\frac{\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2B_a}{\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2\bar{X}} - 2\frac{\mathcal{D}^{\alpha}X}{\mathcal{D}^2X\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2\bar{X}}\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2(\bar{X}B_a) - \frac{X}{\mathcal{D}^2X\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2\bar{X}}\mathcal{D}^2\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2(\bar{X}B_a). \quad (29)$$

This equation will give an expression for  $b_a$  which has to be solved iteratively. Notice that by expanding the right hand side of (29) we find that it contains terms of the form

$$b_a \supset +\frac{\sqrt{2}G^{\alpha}}{2F}(\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}B_a|) - \frac{1}{2}\frac{G^{\alpha}\bar{G}^{\dot{\alpha}}}{F\bar{F}}(\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot{\alpha}}B_a|), \quad (30)$$

once we turn to its component field expansion. Moreover due to the structure of (28) no other component field, except the lowest one, of the  $B_a$  superfield is constrained. Indeed, as illustrated in [23] for the constraints of the form  $|X|^2Q = 0$ , all the possible projections with any combination of  $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}$  or  $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot{\alpha}}$  will serve only as consistency conditions *except* when acting with the maximum projection  $\mathcal{D}^2\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2$  which gives a single constraint on  $Q|$ . For example if we act with  $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}$  on (28) and projecting to components we find

$$(\sqrt{2}G_{\alpha})\frac{\bar{G}^2}{2\bar{F}}b_a + \frac{G^2\bar{G}^2}{4F\bar{F}}(\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}B_a|) = 0, \quad (31)$$

which is just a consistency condition for the full solution of  $b_a$  and *not* a constraint on  $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}B_a|$ , as can be checked by replacing (30) into (31). Note finally that since the component  $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}B_a|$  is related to the gravitino field strength, it means that if it had been removed from the spectrum it would be a sign of inconsistency. In addition one can have

$$X\left(\mathcal{R} + \frac{c}{6}\right) = 0, \quad (32)$$

where  $c$  is a complex constant, which gives  $M = c + \mathcal{O}(G)$ . These constraints have been studied extensively in [34].

In closing this subsection, let us see how the non-linear realization of supersymmetry allows the construction of a vast number of new terms.<sup>2</sup> Consider a superspace Lagrangian of the form

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Z}} = 16 \int d^4\theta E \frac{X}{\mathcal{D}^2\bar{X}} \frac{\bar{X}}{\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2\bar{X}} \mathcal{Z}(\Phi^I, \mathcal{D}_{\alpha}\Phi^I, \mathcal{D}^2\Phi^I, \mathcal{D}^2X, \dots). \quad (33)$$

Then in the  $G = 0$  gauge we will have

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Z}} = \mathcal{Z}\left(A^I, \sqrt{2}\chi_{\alpha}^I, -4F^I, -4F^X, \dots\right). \quad (34)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>The relation between the formalism with the nilpotent  $X$  and the spinor superfield of [20] (which allows to build a vast number of new terms) has been thoroughly explained in [36, 37].



Such a possibility clearly exists due to the fact that all the goldstino can do is to work as a compensator which can always be used to *dress* any component field and to construct a supersymmetric Lagrangian of generic form. The simplest Lagrangian one can construct is by setting  $\mathcal{Z} = -\Lambda$ , where  $\Lambda$  is a real constant, which would simply give [20]

$$\mathcal{L}_\Lambda = -16\Lambda \int d^4\theta E \frac{X}{\mathcal{D}^2 X} \frac{\bar{X}}{\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2 \bar{X}}. \quad (35)$$

The component form expansion is

$$\mathcal{L}_\Lambda = -e\Lambda - ie\Lambda \left( \frac{G^\alpha}{F} \right) \sigma_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}^m \mathcal{D}_m \left( \frac{\bar{G}_{\dot{\alpha}}}{\bar{F}} \right) + \dots \quad (36)$$

which in the  $G = 0$  gauge will provide only a contribution to the vacuum energy. Notice that the same constant  $\Lambda$  which changes the vacuum energy in (36) multiplies the kinetic term of the goldstino and therefore will change the supersymmetry breaking scale once the goldstino is canonically normalized [14]. In the next subsection we will use this method to construct a pure gravitino mass and study its properties, and we will see how the supersymmetry breaking scale is generically altered.

### 2.3 Gravitino decoupling

Until now we have discussed how to eliminate the bosonic auxiliary fields of the supergravity multiplet. We now discuss the decoupling of the gravitino. As we will see to remove the gravitino from the theory one has to impose a constraint on the nilpotent chiral superfield  $X$ .

Let us first assume that supersymmetry is broken from the nilpotent chiral superfield  $X$ , which is the only chiral multiplet in the theory that is coupled to supergravity. Then we can generically include in our effective Lagrangian a higher derivative term

$$\mathcal{L}_{m_{3/2}} = (16)^2 \zeta \int d^4\theta E \left[ \frac{X}{\mathcal{D}^2 X} \frac{\bar{X}}{\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2 \bar{X}} \mathcal{D}_a \left( \frac{\mathcal{D}^\alpha X}{\mathcal{D}^2 X} \right) \sigma^{ab}{}_\alpha{}^\beta \mathcal{D}_b \left( \frac{\mathcal{D}_\beta X}{\mathcal{D}^2 X} \right) + c.c. \right], \quad (37)$$

where  $\zeta$  is a real constant parameter of mass dimension three:  $[\zeta] = 3$ . In component form we find that

$$e^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{m_{3/2}} = \frac{\zeta}{M_P^2} \psi_a \sigma^{ab} \psi_b + \frac{\zeta}{M_P^2} \bar{\psi}_a \bar{\sigma}^{ab} \bar{\psi}_b + \mathcal{O}(G, \bar{G}), \quad (38)$$

where we have restored the Planck scale  $M_P$ . One can easily verify that (37) gives (38) by taking into account that

$$\mathcal{D}_a \left( \frac{\mathcal{D}^\alpha X}{\mathcal{D}^2 X} \right) = \frac{1}{4M_P} \psi_a^\alpha - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} e_a^m D_m \left( \frac{G^\alpha}{FX} \right) + \dots \quad (39)$$

This term now introduces a non-supersymmetric mass term to the gravitino. Independent gravitino mass terms giving (38) were also constructed in [37] using different methods. Notice that in the global limit the superspace Lagrangian (37) becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_{m_{3/2}} = (16)^2 \zeta \int d^4\theta \left[ \frac{X}{\mathcal{D}^2 X} \frac{\bar{X}}{\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2 \bar{X}} \partial_m \left( \frac{\mathcal{D}^\alpha X}{\mathcal{D}^2 X} \right) \sigma^{mn}{}_\alpha{}^\beta \partial_n \left( \frac{\mathcal{D}_\beta X}{\mathcal{D}^2 X} \right) + c.c. \right], \quad (40)$$

therefore it will contribute to higher order goldstino interactions. If for example we have a supergravity coupled to  $X$  of the standard form (18) with

$$K = X\bar{X}, \quad W = fX + W_0, \quad (41)$$

and the additional term (37), the component form of the total Lagrangian turns out to be (in the  $G = 0$  gauge)

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-1}\mathcal{L} = & -\frac{1}{2}M_P^2 R + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{klmn}(\bar{\psi}_k\bar{\sigma}_l\mathcal{D}_m\psi_n - \psi_k\sigma_l\mathcal{D}_m\bar{\psi}_n) \\ & - \left(\frac{W_0 - \bar{\zeta}}{M_P^2}\right)\bar{\psi}_a\bar{\sigma}^{ab}\bar{\psi}_b - \left(\frac{\overline{W_0} - \zeta}{M_P^2}\right)\psi_a\sigma^{ab}\psi_b - |f|^2 + 3\frac{|W_0|^2}{M_P^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Notice that the mass dimensions are:  $[f] = 2$  and  $[W_0] = 3$ .

We set  $M_P = 1$  from now on. In the Lagrangian (42) one can easily integrate out the gravitino by taking the parameter  $\zeta$  to be large. In this case the mass term dominates over the momenta and in this limit  $\psi_m$  appears algebraically and can be integrated out. The constraint we need to impose in order to describe this decoupling is

$$X\bar{X}\mathcal{D}_b\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}_\beta X}{\mathcal{D}^2 X}\right) = 0. \quad (43)$$

The consistency of the constraint (43) is guaranteed by the fact that the lowest component of  $\mathcal{D}_a(\mathcal{D}_\beta X/\mathcal{D}^2 X)$  starts with the component field  $\psi_m^\alpha$  and not with derivatives. By studying the highest component field of (43) one finds the full constraint, which then has to be solved iteratively, and is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_b\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}_\beta X}{\mathcal{D}^2 X}\right) = & -2\frac{\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot{\alpha}}\bar{X}}{\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2\bar{X}}\bar{\mathcal{D}}^{\dot{\alpha}}\mathcal{D}_b\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}_\beta X}{\mathcal{D}^2 X}\right) - \frac{\bar{X}}{\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2\bar{X}}\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2\mathcal{D}_b\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}_\beta X}{\mathcal{D}^2 X}\right) \\ & - 2\frac{\mathcal{D}^\alpha X}{\mathcal{D}^2 X\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2\bar{X}}\mathcal{D}_\alpha\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2\left[\bar{X}\mathcal{D}_b\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}_\beta X}{\mathcal{D}^2 X}\right)\right] \\ & - \frac{X}{\mathcal{D}^2 X\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2\bar{X}}\mathcal{D}^2\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2\left[\bar{X}\mathcal{D}_b\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}_\beta X}{\mathcal{D}^2 X}\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

To illustrate the properties of the constraint (43), the lowest component is

$$G^2\bar{G}^2\left(\psi_a^\alpha - \sqrt{2}e_a^m\partial_m G^\alpha/F^X\right) = 0, \quad (45)$$

which means that once the gravitino will be eliminated in this way, it will have the form

$$\psi_a^\alpha = \sqrt{2}\mathcal{D}_a\left(\frac{G^\alpha}{F^X}\right) + \dots \quad (46)$$

where the dots stand for higher order goldstino terms. In the rest of the work we will therefore not discuss the gravitino, because it may be always eliminated from the spectrum in this way.

Notice that (43) is a constraint on the  $X$  superfield, nevertheless its effect is to eliminate the gravitino from the supergravity multiplet. Moreover in the global limit  $M_P \rightarrow \infty$ , Eq.(43) leads

to an *explicit* supersymmetry breaking because it will imply  $G_\alpha = 0$ , and therefore  $X$  will be a spurion superfield

$$X = \theta^2 \langle F^X \rangle. \quad (47)$$

We see that if supersymmetry is spontaneously broken, one can construct a gravitational multiplet which will contain only the metric  $g_{mn}$  (or the vielbein). The other component fields which are needed for the closure of the algebra will be replaced with composite operators of the metric and the goldstino. From the properties of the supersymmetry transformations one can still go to a gauge where  $G = 0$ . Interestingly, in the gauge  $G = 0$ , a supergravity theory subject to the constraints (28), (32) and (43), will always reduce to the Einstein gravity with a cosmological constant. Indeed, following [34], for

$$K = X\bar{X}, \quad W = fX + m_{3/2}, \quad (48)$$

the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{E-H}} = \int d^2\Theta 2\mathcal{E} \left\{ \mathcal{R} + X \left[ -\frac{1}{8} (\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2 - 8\mathcal{R}) \bar{X} \right] + W + c.c. \right\} \quad (49)$$

reduces to

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{H-E}} = -\frac{1}{2} e R - e \Lambda, \quad (50)$$

where

$$\Lambda = \frac{1}{3} |c|^2 + |f|^2 + m_{3/2} \bar{c} + \bar{m}_{3/2} c. \quad (51)$$

Let us also discuss the supersymmetry breaking scale in a model with Kähler potential and superpotential as in (41), and Lagrangian which contains also an explicit gravitino mass of the form (37). The Lagrangian (37) is a higher derivative term, and therefore it will generically violate the standard supergravity formulas. Indeed, even though the Kähler potential in (41) is flat, the relation between the gravitino mass, the vacuum energy and the vacuum expectation value of the auxiliary field  $F^X$  do *not* have the traditional form since one can see that

$$V \neq |F^X|^2 - 3m_{3/2}^2. \quad (52)$$

This happens because the term (37) generates an unusual goldstino-gravitino mixing. We have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{m_{3/2}}|_{\text{kin.mix.}} &= 4\zeta \left[ \hat{D}_a \left( \frac{G^\alpha}{\sqrt{2}F^X} \right) \sigma^{ab}{}_\alpha{}^\beta \hat{D}_b \left( \frac{G_\beta}{\sqrt{2}F^X} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{i}{3} M \frac{\bar{G}_\epsilon}{\sqrt{2}F^X} \bar{\sigma}_a^{\epsilon\alpha} \sigma^{ab}{}_\alpha{}^\beta \hat{D}_b \left( \frac{G_\beta}{\sqrt{2}F^X} \right) \right] + c.c., \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

where

$$\hat{D}_a \left( \frac{G^\alpha}{\sqrt{2}F^X} \right) = e_a^m \left[ \mathcal{D}_m \left( \frac{G^\alpha}{\sqrt{2}F^X} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \psi_m^\alpha \right]. \quad (54)$$

These new terms are responsible for an unconventional goldstino-gravitino mixing which alters the standard supergravity results and therefore the vacuum expectation value of  $F^X$  seizes to be the supersymmetry breaking scale.

To correctly identify the supersymmetry breaking scale, we define a new scale  $f^S$  as

$$f^S = \sqrt{V + 3m_{3/2}^2}, \quad (55)$$

which is consistent with the results of standard supergravity. Notice that  $f^S$  is in fact proportional to the *effective gravitino mass* as defined in [39]

$$m_{3/2}^{\text{eff}} = \sqrt{|m_{3/2}|^2 + \frac{1}{3}V}. \quad (56)$$

The simplest way to understand why  $f^S$  is given by (55) is by constructing a standard supergravity theory coupled to the nilpotent  $X$ , with *no* higher derivative terms, which on the other hand will reproduce exactly (42) in the  $G = 0$  gauge. Indeed to find (42) we would require

$$\begin{aligned} K &= X\bar{X}, \\ W &= \sqrt{|f|^2 - 3|W_0|^2 + 3|W_0 - \bar{\zeta}|^2} X + W_0 - \bar{\zeta}. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

The supersymmetry breaking scale now would be  $\langle F^X \rangle = \sqrt{|f|^2 - 3|W_0|^2 + 3|W_0 - \bar{\zeta}|^2}$  and the gravitino mass is  $m_{3/2} = W_0 - \bar{\zeta}$ . Now  $\langle F^X \rangle$  will match with  $f^S$  given in (55), and therefore will be consistent with the standard supergravity results.

We close this section with a general discussion on the supersymmetry breaking scale. As we have seen there are various operators which can contribute independently to the vacuum energy, as for example (36) and also independently to the gravitino mass as for example (38). Therefore, a theory with a non-linearly realized supersymmetry will have a vacuum energy  $V$  and a gravitino mass  $m_{3/2}$ . Then the supersymmetry breaking scale can be identified with  $f^S$  given by (55). The reason as we explained is simple. We can construct such an effective theory from a supergravity coupled to  $X$  with no higher derivatives, but with Kähler potential  $K = X\bar{X}$  and superpotential  $W = f^S X + m_{3/2}$ . Notice finally that the models with arbitrary gravitino mass and arbitrary vacuum energy will not necessarily satisfy the unitarity bound on the gravitino mass ( $V \geq -3m_{3/2}^2$ ), and one has to impose this by hand by adjusting the parameters. For a discussion see for example [34].

Let us also note that we have not considered here supergravity matter couplings. In the latter case, integrating over the gravitino, which now couples to matter, supercurrent-supercurrent interaction are expected to appear since the gravitino becomes an auxiliary field in the zero-momentum limit.

### 3 Effective theories

Now we are in position to couple chiral superfields to the supergravity multiplet in such a way that we generate in the bosonic sector couplings of the form (1). Even though one can construct

these couplings also within a linearly realized supersymmetric theory, the Lagrangian which arises will contain various other terms which give rise to ghosts. For example in [5], where the ‘‘supersymmetrization’’ of the Gauss-Bonnet coupled to a scalar was investigated, it was shown that physical scalars and auxiliary fields have kinetic mixings which lead to ghost states. However, in our construction, the use of constrained superfields helps to avoid the appearance of these states because the fields which leads to these mixings are eliminated from the spectrum. Therefore, the low energy effective theory turns out to be meaningful.

### 3.1 Chiral superfield coupled to super Gauss–Bonnet

As we will now see, the supersymmetric version of  $a_1(\phi) R_{GB}^2$  follows naturally from the coupling of chiral superfields to the supersymmetric Gauss–Bonnet combination [3–5]. Before coupling to matter let us remind the reader that, as it happens for gravity, the Lagrangian that contains the pure Gauss–Bonnet combination is a total derivative, therefore contributes only to topological properties. The pure super Gauss-Bonnet combination is constructed from the chiral superfield

$$Y_{GB} = \mathcal{W}^{\alpha\beta\gamma}\mathcal{W}_{\alpha\beta\gamma} - \frac{1}{4}(\overline{\mathcal{D}}^2 - 8\mathcal{R})(2\mathcal{R}\overline{\mathcal{R}} + B^a B_a). \quad (58)$$

The form of this combination can be traced back to the linearized supergravity approach [29]. An interesting discussion on the properties of  $Y_{GB}$  can be also found in [30]. The full component field expansion of (58) can be found in [4,5], and since it is a chiral superfield it has an expansion of the form

$$Y_{GB} = A^Y + \sqrt{2}\Theta^\alpha\chi_\alpha^Y + \Theta^2 F^Y. \quad (59)$$

For our discussion it is important to recall the bosonic parts of the superfield (58). For the lowest component of (58) we have

$$A^Y = -\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{1}{9}MR - \frac{2i}{9}M\mathcal{D}^a b_a - \frac{10}{27}Mb^a b_a - \frac{2}{27}M^2\overline{M} - \frac{4i}{9}b^a\mathcal{D}_a M\right), \quad (60)$$

whereas for the highest component we have

$$F^Y = \frac{1}{16}\left(R_{GB}^2 - \frac{i}{2}R_{HP}^2 + \frac{8}{9}\mathcal{D}^a P_a\right). \quad (61)$$

The terms with auxiliary fields in (61) are included in

$$P_a = M\mathcal{D}_a\overline{M} + \frac{i}{3}M\overline{M}b_a + \mathcal{D}^b(b_a b_b) - 2i b^b B_{ba} + \frac{2i}{3}b_a b^b b_b + \frac{3i}{2}n_{ab}\epsilon^{bcde}b_c\mathcal{D}_d b_e, \quad (62)$$

where

$$B_{ba} = -\frac{3}{2}\overline{\sigma}_b^{\dot{\alpha}\alpha}\mathcal{D}_\alpha\overline{\mathcal{D}}_{\dot{\alpha}}B_a. \quad (63)$$

The Lagrangian which gives the pure topological contribution is [4, 5]

$$\mathcal{L}_{GB} = 16 \int d^2\Theta 2\mathcal{E} Y_{GB} + c.c. \quad (64)$$

The component form of (64) can easily be found by using the generic Lagrangian (17). We find that the bosonic sector of (64) is up to total derivatives

$$e^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{GB} = R_{GB}^2 - \frac{i}{2} R_{HP}^2 + c.c. \quad (65)$$

Notice that by ‘‘supersymmetrizing’’ the Gauss-Bonnet combination one gets also the Hirzebruch–Pontryagin combination  $R_{HP}^2$ .

Now we will couple supergravity to the chiral superfields  $\Phi^I$  via the term [4, 5]

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Phi, GB} = 16 \int d^2\Theta \, 2\mathcal{E} f(\Phi^I) Y_{GB} + c.c. \quad (66)$$

where  $f(\Phi^I)$  is a holomorphic function. Of course the Lagrangian (66) is a total derivative if we set  $f(\Phi^I) = \text{constant}$ . We use the notation

$$f_I = \frac{\partial f}{\partial A^I}. \quad (67)$$

One can use (17) to verify that the pure bosonic sector of (66) turns out to be

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{\Phi, GB} = & \frac{8}{9} f_I F_I \left( -\frac{1}{2} MR + iM\mathcal{D}^a b_a + \frac{1}{3} Mb^a b_a + \frac{1}{3} M^2 \overline{M} \right) + c.c. \\ & + \frac{8}{9} f_I F_I \left( \frac{4}{3} Mb^a b_a + 4ib^a \mathcal{D}_a M \right) + c.c. \\ & + f(A^I) \left( R_{GB}^2 - \frac{i}{2} R_{HP}^2 + \frac{8}{9} \mathcal{D}^a P_a \right) + c.c. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

We will employ now the constrained superfields  $X$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  introduced in (22) and (25), which satisfy

$$X^2 = 0, \quad X(\mathcal{A} - \overline{\mathcal{A}}) = 0. \quad (69)$$

In addition, we will also use the constrained supergravity multiplet which satisfies both (28) and (32)

$$X\overline{X} B_a = 0, \quad X \left( \mathcal{R} + \frac{c}{6} \right) = 0. \quad (70)$$

In the unitary gauge ( $G_\alpha = 0$ ) we have for the matter superfields

$$\mathcal{A} = \phi, \quad X = \Theta^2 F^X, \quad (71)$$

while for the supergravity auxiliary component fields we have

$$M = c, \quad b_a = 0, \quad (72)$$

where we set  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  to simplify the effective theory. Let us recall that in general the scalar kinetic terms have three possible sources: the scalar kinetic term in the original supergravity Lagrangian, the Weyl rescaling, and the elimination of the vector  $b_a$  of the supergravity multiplet. It is the latter integration, which leads to ghost multiplets in the super Gauss–Bonnet supergravity.

Indeed, as it has been shown in [4], it is this integration that mixes the scalar kinetic terms, which after diagonalization leads to ghosts. Here, by employing the constraint (70), which sets  $b_a = 0$  we remove this mixing and therefore there are no ghosts in this constrained super Gauss-Bonnet supergravity. Let us also note that the constraint (70) also sets  $M = c$  and this simply modifies the scalar potential. Indeed, the constraints which fix the auxiliary fields of the supergravity multiplet to be  $M = c$ ,  $b_a = 0$ , modify the standard form of the supergravity. For example, in standard supergravity, before the Weyl rescaling, the Lagrangian with  $X\bar{X}B_a = 0$  and  $X(\mathcal{R} + c/6) = 0$ , following [11] is given by

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{\text{bos}} = \frac{1}{6}\Omega R - \Omega_{I\bar{J}}\partial_m A^I \partial^m \bar{A}^{\bar{J}} - V, \quad (73)$$

where

$$V = \Omega^{I\bar{J}} \left( \frac{1}{2}W_{\bar{J}} + \frac{1}{3}c\Omega_{\bar{J}} \right) \left( \frac{1}{2}W_I + \frac{1}{3}c^*\Omega_I \right) - \frac{1}{9}|c|^2\Omega - \frac{1}{2}cW - \frac{1}{2}c^*W. \quad (74)$$

After the Weyl rescaling we have

$$\frac{1}{6}\Omega R \rightarrow -\frac{1}{2}R - \frac{3}{4}(\partial_m \log \Omega)^2, \quad V \rightarrow \left( \frac{9}{\Omega^2} \right) V, \quad (75)$$

and the relevant bosonic part of the Lagrangian turns out to be

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{\text{bos}(b_a=0, M=c)} &= -\frac{1}{2}R - \frac{3}{4\Omega^2} \left( \Omega_I \partial_m A^I + \Omega_{\bar{J}} \partial_m \bar{A}^{\bar{J}} \right)^2 + \frac{3}{\Omega} \Omega_{I\bar{J}} \partial_m A^I \partial^m \bar{A}^{\bar{J}} \\ &\quad - \left( \frac{9}{\Omega^2} \right) \left\{ \Omega^{I\bar{J}} \left( \frac{1}{2}W_{\bar{J}} + \frac{1}{3}c\Omega_{\bar{J}} \right) \left( \frac{1}{2}W_I + \frac{1}{3}c^*\Omega_I \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{9}|c|^2\Omega - \frac{1}{2}cW - \frac{1}{2}c^*W \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

As a consequence, we see that the metric is not anymore Kähler (due to the  $b_a = 0$ ) and the scalar potential has not the standard form of  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  supergravity (due to  $M = c$ ).

For a minimal setup, we may assume

$$K = X\bar{X} - \frac{1}{4}(\mathcal{A} - \bar{\mathcal{A}})^2, \quad (77)$$

and

$$W = X y(\mathcal{A}) + g(\mathcal{A}), \quad f = f(\mathcal{A}). \quad (78)$$

The functions  $y$  and  $g$  are both real in the sense that:  $y(z)^* = y(\bar{z})$ . The full bosonic sector of the model

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{A},GB}, \quad (79)$$

turns out to be (after we integrate out  $F^X$ )

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2}R - \frac{1}{2}\partial^m \phi \partial_m \phi + 2\text{Re}f(\phi) R_{GB}^2 + \text{Im}f(\phi) R_{HP}^2 - V(\phi). \quad (80)$$

The scalar potential has now a new form

$$V(\phi) = \frac{1}{3}c^2 + 2c g(\phi) + y(\phi)^2, \quad (82)$$

due to the constraints we imposed on the gravitational multiplet [34]. This form of the potential coincides with Eq.(51) for real  $c$ ,  $g(\phi) = m_{3/2}$ ,  $y(\phi) = f$  of course. Notice that by integrating out  $F^X$  we have

$$F^X = -y(\phi) \quad (83)$$

therefore, one may use various forms for  $y(\phi)$ , but condition (23) must hold. We stress also that if we had not used the constrained superfield  $\mathcal{A}$ , which does not have an auxiliary field due to the constraint  $|X|^2\mathcal{A} = 0$ , the scalar potential would have the form (77). This difference in the structure of the scalar potential has been discussed for example in [35].

Before concluding this subsection let us discuss the properties of the resultant effective theory (81). Let us recall that the independent quadratic curvature combinations are  $C_{mnpq}C^{mnpq}$ ,  $R_{mn}R^{mn}$  and  $R^2$ , where  $C_{mnpq}$  is the Weyl tensor. From these one can construct the topological

$$R_{GB}^2 = R^{klmn}R_{klmn} - 4R^{mn}R_{mn} + R^2, \quad (84)$$

$$R_{HP}^2 = \epsilon^{klmn}R_{mnpq}R_{kl}{}^{pq}, \quad (85)$$

namely the Gauss–Bonnet and the Hirzebruch–Pontryagin tensors, which can also be written alternatively in terms of the Weyl tensor  $C_{mnpq}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} R_{GB}^2 &= C_{klmn}C^{klmn} - 2R_{kl}R^{kl} + \frac{2}{3}R^2, \\ R_{HP}^2 &= \epsilon^{klmn}C_{mnpq}C_{kl}{}^{pq}. \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

Both the Gauss–Bonnet and the Hirzebruch–Pontryagin tensors when added in the gravitational action do not contribute to the field equations, which is consistent with the fact that both these tensors are total derivatives in four-dimensions. The contribution of the Gauss–Bonnet and Hirzebruch–Pontryagin tensors is not trivial once a scalar is coupled to them.

One may consider now the Lagrangian (81), where  $\text{Re}f(\phi)$  and  $\text{Im}f(\phi)$  are arbitrary general functions of (at least) a scalar field  $\phi$ . In this case, there is a contribution to the Einstein equations, which turns out to be

$$R_{mn} - \frac{1}{2}g_{mn}R = T_{mn}^\phi + K_{mn} + C_{mn}, \quad (87)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} K_{mn} &= 2R\nabla_m\nabla_n(2\text{Re}f) - 2g_{mn}R\nabla^2(2\text{Re}f) \\ &\quad - 4R_{mk}\nabla^k\nabla_n(2\text{Re}f) - 4R_{nk}\nabla^k\nabla_m(2\text{Re}f) \\ &\quad + 4R_{mn}\nabla^2(2\text{Re}f) + 4g_{mn}R_{k\ell}\nabla^k\nabla^\ell(2\text{Re}f) - 4R_{mkn\ell}\nabla^k\nabla^\ell(2\text{Re}f), \\ C_{mn} &= -8\nabla_k(\text{Im}f)(e^{pmij}\nabla_i R_j^n + e^{pmij}\nabla_i R_j^m) \\ &\quad - 4\nabla_p\nabla_q(\text{Im}f)(\epsilon^{pmij}R^{qm}{}_{ij} + \epsilon^{pmij}R^{qn}{}_{ij}), \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$



are the contribution of the variation of the Gauss–Bonnet and Hirzebruch–Pontryagin tensors, respectively and  $T_{mn}^\phi$  is the energy-momentum tensor of the scalar. It is clear from the structure of  $K_{mn}$  that it doesn't contribute with more than two time derivatives to the Einstein equations. Indeed, there are no terms in (88) that have more than two derivatives. However, the tensor  $C_{mn}$  has a potentially dangerous term which emerges from the derivatives of the Ricci tensor. In particular, for a spacelike  $\nabla_k(\text{Im}f)$ , one may easily verify that  $C_{mn}$  has third time derivatives and therefore, it is potentially problematic. However, for timelike  $\nabla_k(\text{Im}f)$ , there is no such problem as  $C_{mn}$  contains only two-time derivatives in this case. For example, on cosmological backgrounds  $C_{mn}$  contributes only with second time derivatives. In particular, if we have the coupling with a scalar profile of the form  $\phi = \phi(t)$ , then the theory will not develop instabilities around a Minkowski background<sup>3</sup> [40].

Notice that this coupling  $\text{Im}f(\phi) R_{HP}^2$  will lead to violation of CP conservation [40]. In a cosmological framework, parity violating terms appear in the effective theory of inflation [41]. Moreover, chiral gravity may produce parity-violating TB and EB correlations in the CMB [42].

Finally, for a real form-factor function  $f(\mathcal{A})$ , we have

$$f(\mathcal{A})^* = f(\mathcal{A}^*) \quad (89)$$

so that  $\text{Im}f(\phi) = 0$ . Hence, the Lagrangian (81) is written as

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2}R - \frac{1}{2}\partial^m\phi\partial_m\phi + 2\text{Re}f(\phi)R_{GB}^2 - V(\phi), \quad (90)$$

which describes standard gravity with a scalar coupled to the Gauss–Bonnet tensor. This theory propagates normal states and it has been considered as consistent UV modification of Einstein gravity.

### 3.2 Gauss–Bonnet–Volkov–Akulov supergravity

We now turn to a minimal setup where only the nilpotent superfield  $X$  is coupled to supergravity. In such a setup the most general coupling is when  $X$  has  $\Omega$  function and superpotential

$$\Omega = X\bar{X} - 3, \quad W = fX + W_0, \quad (91)$$

and for simplicity we assume  $f$  and  $W_0$  to be real constants. For the higher derivative sector the most general form of the coupling to the Gauss–Bonnet is

$$\mathcal{L}_{X,GB} = -18\alpha \int d^2\Theta 2\mathcal{E} X Y_{GB} + c.c., \quad (92)$$

where the constant  $\alpha$  can be chosen to be real

$$\alpha = \alpha^*. \quad (93)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>For theories with stable vacua, as it is the case we are discussing here ( $\phi = \text{const.}$  in the vacuum),  $R_{HP}^2$  does not lead to any linear instabilities and the theory propagates still two polarizations for the graviton. For example, on a Minkowski vacuum with background metric  $\bar{g}_{mn} = \eta_{mn}$ ,  $\bar{\phi} = \phi_0 = \text{const.}$ , the  $R_{HP}^2$  does not contribute to the propagator but it just introduces extra graviton-scalar interactions. The situation is not the same with Lorentz violating backgrounds. The latter have non-vanishing  $a_m = \partial_m\phi$  and for spacelike  $a_m$  instabilities may occur.

Moreover we want to study an effective theory where for the  $X$  superfield we have

$$X\bar{X}\left(-\frac{1}{4}\bar{\mathcal{D}}^2\bar{X}\right) = -fX\bar{X}, \quad (94)$$

which fixes the value of  $F^X$  to be (for  $G = 0$ )

$$F^X = -f. \quad (95)$$

On the supergravity multiplet we impose only (28) which gives (for  $G = 0$ )

$$b_a = 0, \quad (96)$$

and we leave the auxiliary field of supergravity  $M$  unconstrained. Then from Eq.(68) we see that the bosonic sector now reads

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-1}\mathcal{L} = & -\frac{1}{2}R - \frac{1}{3}|M|^2 - W_0\bar{M} - W_0M - f^2 \\ & + \alpha f \left[ -\frac{1}{2}MR - \frac{1}{2}\bar{M}R + \frac{1}{3}M^2\bar{M} + \frac{1}{3}\bar{M}^2M \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

The first line in (97) is the bosonic part of the standard supergravity, whereas the second line of (97) is the modification due to the Gauss-Bonnet term. Notice that this term effects the dynamics only when supersymmetry is broken (i.e.,  $f \neq 0$ ) as was anticipated in [5].

For the other auxiliary field  $M$  we will not impose (32), instead we will keep it as a dynamical field. In fact, we can integrate it out as it appears algebraically. Before doing that, let us first split  $M$  into real and imaginary part at

$$M = t + is, \quad (98)$$

which gives

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2}(1 + 2\alpha ft)R - \frac{1}{3}t^2 - \frac{1}{3}s^2 - 2W_0t - f^2 + \frac{2}{3}\alpha ft(t^2 + s^2). \quad (99)$$

Clearly when we integrate out  $s$  we find

$$s = 0. \quad (100)$$

After defining the field

$$t = \frac{1}{2\alpha f}(e^{\gamma\varphi} - 1), \quad \gamma = \sqrt{2/3} \quad (101)$$

and performing a Weyl rescaling of the form

$$g_{mn} \rightarrow e^{-\gamma\varphi} g_{mn}, \quad (102)$$

we get

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2}R - \frac{1}{2}\partial_m\varphi\partial^m\varphi - V, \quad (103)$$

where the scalar potential is given by

$$V = \frac{1}{12\alpha^2 f^2} e^{-2\gamma\varphi} \left\{ 4(1 + 3\alpha^2 f^4 - 3\alpha f W_0) + e^{\gamma\varphi}(12\alpha f W_0 - 11) + 10e^{2\gamma\varphi} - 3e^{3\gamma\varphi} \right\}. \quad (104)$$

A plot of the potential is given below in Fig.1. We see that for large values of  $\varphi \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $V \sim -e^{\gamma\varphi}$ , and for  $\varphi \rightarrow -\infty$ ,  $V \sim e^{-2\gamma\varphi}$ . Moreover, the potential  $V$  has an inflection point.




Figure 1: The potential  $V$  in (104) for typical values of the parameters. Here for  $f = 3$ ,  $\alpha = 1, W_0 = 4$ .

### 3.3 Chiral superfield coupled to super Weyl square

In this section we study the supersymmetrization of the square of the Weyl tensor coupled to a scalar, by combining the square of the Weyl superfield  $\mathcal{W}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$  with a function of the chiral superfields  $\Phi^I$  of the chiral model. The Weyl multiplet is chiral therefore we can construct the chiral superfield

$$\mathcal{W}^{\alpha\beta\gamma}\mathcal{W}_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = A^{\mathcal{W}} + \sqrt{2}\Theta\chi^{\mathcal{W}} + \Theta^2 F^{\mathcal{W}}. \quad (105)$$

The only contribution to the pure bosonic sector comes from

$$F^{\mathcal{W}} = \frac{1}{16} \left( C^{abcd}C_{abcd} - \frac{i}{2} C_{abcd}\epsilon^{cdgh}C_{gh}{}^{ab} - \frac{4}{3}F^{ab}F_{ab} + \frac{2i}{3}F_{ab}F_{cd}\epsilon^{abcd} \right), \quad (106)$$

where

$$F_{ab} = \mathcal{D}_a b_b - \mathcal{D}_b b_a, \quad (107)$$

and  $C_{abcd}$  is the Weyl tensor. Note that  $R_{HP}^2 = C_{abcd}\epsilon^{cdgh}C_{gh}{}^{ab}$ . The coupling of the chiral superfield to the super-curvature is described by the term

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Phi,\mathcal{W}} = 8 \int d^2\Theta \, 2\mathcal{E} h(\Phi^I) \mathcal{W}^2 + c.c. \quad (108)$$

From (17) we find that the bosonic sector of (108) is

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{\Phi,\mathcal{W}} = \text{Im} h(A^I) \left( \frac{1}{2}R_{HP}^2 - \frac{2}{3}F_{ab}F_{cd}\epsilon^{abcd} \right) + \text{Re}h(A^I) \left( C^{abcd}C_{abcd} - \frac{4}{3}F^{ab}F_{ab} \right). \quad (109)$$

In (109) we see that the square of the Weyl tensor is coupled to the real part of the holomorphic function  $h$ , whereas the imaginary part of  $h$  is coupled to the Hirzebruch–Pontryagin combination. In addition the vector  $b_a$  has now become dynamical due to the presence of the kinetic term  $-\frac{4}{3}F^{ab}F_{ab}$ . To find the pure quadratic curvature couplings resulting from this coupling we will follow the same procedure as before.

Let us now consider the chiral model (18) with Kähler potential (78) and superpotential (79), where  $X$  satisfies (21) and  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfies (26). Within this setup, the field strength of the auxiliary  $b_a$  still appears in (109) which we can eliminate by removing the field  $b_a$  with the constraint (28). In addition, we also impose the constraint (32) on  $\mathcal{R}$  which will lead us to the same effective Lagrangian for the  $\mathcal{L}_0$  sector as in the previous section with Kähler potential and superpotential given by (78) and (79). Finally we set

$$h(\Phi^I) = h(\mathcal{A}), \quad (110)$$

namely that the  $h$  holomorphic function depends only on  $\mathcal{A}$ . Once we add (109) to  $\mathcal{L}_0$  and take into account the constraints, the effective theory takes the form

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2}R - \frac{1}{2}\partial^m\phi\partial_m\phi + \frac{1}{2}\text{Im}h(\phi)R_{HP}^2 + \text{Re}h(\phi)C^{abcd}C_{abcd} - V(\phi), \quad (111)$$

where  $V(\phi)$  is given by (82). Further properties of the theories with the bosonic sector (111) can be found in [40]. Notice that we did not have to impose the constraints (28) and (32) to eliminate any ghosts, we only impose them such that the theory becomes simpler and the  $\mathcal{L}_0$  sector takes the form it has in the previous subsection 3.1.

Before concluding this subsection, let us comment on the cosmological properties of the resulting effective theory (111) during inflation. Assuming that  $h(\mathcal{A})$  is an imaginary function

$$h(\mathcal{A})^* = -h(\mathcal{A}^*), \quad (112)$$

we have that  $\text{Re}h(\phi) = 0$  and the action (111) is written as

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2}R - \frac{1}{2}\partial^m\phi\partial_m\phi + \frac{1}{2}\text{Im}h(\phi)R_{HP}^2 - V(\phi). \quad (113)$$

This is the action for chiral gravity which has been discussed in [40] and in a cosmological setup in [41, 42]. In the opposite case in which  $\text{Re}h(\phi) = 0$ , we are left with

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2}R - \frac{1}{2}\partial^m\phi\partial_m\phi - \text{Re}h(\phi)C^{abcd}C_{abcd} - V(\phi). \quad (114)$$

This theory suffers from a massive ghost. However, it can be a meaningful theory, if the Weyl term is treated as a perturbation to the Einstein–Hilbert term [41]. In this case, as has been shown in [43], the coupling proportional to  $\text{Re}h(\phi)$  will induce a contribution to the tensor tilt during slow roll of the form:  $n_t \simeq -2\epsilon \pm 4\sqrt{2\epsilon}H^2\beta$ , where  $\beta = \partial\text{Im}h(\phi)/\partial\phi$ . This relation will violate the consistency condition  $n_t = -r/8$ , allowing a blue tilt to the tensor spectrum.

## 4 Concluding remarks

In this work we have considered non-linear realizations of local supersymmetry applied to different sectors of a spontaneously broken supergravity theory. A new constraint removes the gravitino from the spectrum which corresponds to a very massive gravitino in the effective

Lagrangian. This is the analog of decoupling massive vector states from the low energy spontaneously broken effective gauge theory. Then we consider some aspects of non-linear realization in the context of higher curvature supergravity, and in particular of the Gauss–Bonnet and Weyl square invariants. When coupled to a chiral field these invariants give rise to ghosts and/or instabilities for two different reasons. The super Gauss–Bonnet introduces ghost degrees of freedom in the sector in which supersymmetry is broken, while the Weyl square unavoidably introduces a supermultiplet of a massive spin-2 ghost [6, 7]. For chiral multiplets with the suitable non-holomorphic constraint such instabilities can be avoided and only the coupling to the Hirzebruch–Pontryagin invariant remains. The other super invariant, the chiral scalar curvature  $\mathcal{R}^2$  does not suffer from any instabilities and in fact it will propagate two extra physical chiral multiplets. An interesting exception is the Volkov–Akulov superfield directly coupled to Gauss–Bonnet. In this case, there is an effect due to the appearance of a physical new scalar state coming from the supersymmetric completion of Gauss–Bonnet. This mode corresponds to the usual scalar degree of freedom of a particular  $f(R)$  type theory whose dual scalar potential has no extrema. This investigation may have some potential implications for cosmological models based on non-linear representations of local supersymmetry.

## Acknowledgments

We thank M. Porrati for enlightening discussions. FF was partially supported by the Padua University Project CPDA144437. SF was supported in part by the CERN TH-Department and by INFN (IS CSN4-GSS-PI). AK was supported in part by the CERN TH-Department. The work of DL is supported by the ERC Advanced Grant No. 320045 “Strings and Gravity” and by the DFG cluster of excellence “Origin and Structure of the Universe”.

## References

- [1] S. Cecotti, Phys. Lett. B **190**, 86 (1987); S. Cecotti, S. Ferrara, M. Porrati and S. Sabharwal, Nucl. Phys. B **306**, 160 (1988).
- [2] R. Kallosh and A. Linde, JCAP **1306**, 028 (2013) [arXiv:1306.3214 [hep-th]]; J. Ellis, D. V. Nanopoulos and K. A. Olive, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 111301 (2013) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, no. 12, 129902 (2013)] arXiv:1305.1247 [hep-th]; JCAP **1310**, 009 (2013) [arXiv:1307.3537 [hep-th]]; F. Farakos, A. Kehagias and A. Riotto, Nucl. Phys. B **876**, 187 (2013) [arXiv:1307.1137 [hep-th]]; S. Ferrara, R. Kallosh, A. Linde and M. Porrati, Phys. Rev. D **88**, no. 8, 085038 (2013) [arXiv:1307.7696 [hep-th]]; R. Kallosh, A. Linde and D. Roest, JHEP **1311**, 198 (2013) [arXiv:1311.0472 [hep-th]]; C. Pallis, JCAP **1404**, 024 (2014) Erratum: [JCAP **1707**, no. 07, E01 (2017)] [arXiv:1312.3623 [hep-ph]]; J. Alexandre, N. Houston and N. E. Mavromatos, Phys. Rev. D **89**, no. 2, 027703 (2014) [arXiv:1312.5197 [gr-qc]]; S. Ferrara and M. Porrati, Phys. Lett. B **737**, 135 (2014) [arXiv:1407.6164 [hep-th]]; A. Ceresole, G. Dall’Agata, S. Ferrara, M. Tri-

- giante and A. Van Proeyen, *Fortsch. Phys.* **62**, 584 (2014) [arXiv:1404.1745 [hep-th]]; C. Kounnas, D. Lüst and N. Toumbas, *Fortsch. Phys.* **63**, 12 (2015) [arXiv:1409.7076 [hep-th]]; I. Dalianis, F. Farakos, A. Kehagias, A. Riotto and R. von Unge, *JHEP* **1501**, 043 (2015) [arXiv:1409.8299 [hep-th]]; G. A. Diamandis, B. C. Georgalas, K. Kaskavelis, P. Kouroumalou, A. B. Lahanas and G. Pavlopoulos, *Phys. Lett. B* **744**, 74 (2015) [arXiv:1411.5785 [hep-th]]; T. Terada, Y. Watanabe, Y. Yamada and J. Yokoyama, *JHEP* **1502**, 105 (2015) [arXiv:1411.6746 [hep-ph]]; S. Ferrara and A. Kehagias, *Subnucl. Ser.* **52**, 119 (2017) [arXiv:1407.5187 [hep-th]]; G. D. Diamandis, A. B. Lahanas and K. Tamvakis, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, no. 10, 105023 (2015) [arXiv:1509.01065 [hep-th]]; S. Ferrara, A. Kehagias and A. Sagnotti, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **31**, no. 25, 1630044 (2016) [arXiv:1605.04791 [hep-th]]; G. A. Diamandis, B. C. Georgalas, K. Kaskavelis, A. B. Lahanas and G. Pavlopoulos, arXiv:1704.07617 [hep-th].
- [3] P. K. Townsend and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Phys. Rev. D* **19**, 3592 (1979).
- [4] S. Cecotti, S. Ferrara, L. Girardello, M. Porrati and A. Pasquinucci, *Phys. Rev. D* **33**, 2504 (1986); S. Cecotti, S. Ferrara and M. Villasante, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **2**, 1839 (1987).
- [5] S. Cecotti, S. Ferrara, L. Girardello, A. Pasquinucci and M. Porrati, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **3**, 1675 (1988).
- [6] K. S. Stelle, *Phys. Rev. D* **16**, 953 (1977).
- [7] S. Ferrara, M. T. Grisaru and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Nucl. Phys. B* **138** (1978) 430.
- [8] A. A. Starobinsky, *Phys. Lett.* **91B**, 99 (1980).
- [9] D. H. Lyth and A. Riotto, *Phys. Rept.* **314**, 1 (1999) [hep-ph/9807278].
- [10] R. Blumenhagen, D. Lüst and S. Theisen, “Basic concepts of string theory,” Springer, Heidelberg, Germany (2013) 782 p.
- [11] E. Cremmer, S. Ferrara, L. Girardello and A. Van Proeyen, *Nucl. Phys. B* **212**, 413 (1983).
- [12] D. Z. Freedman and A. Van Proeyen, “Supergravity,” Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, (2012) 607 p.
- [13] J. Wess and J. Bagger, “Supersymmetry and supergravity,” Princeton, USA: Univ. Pr. (1992) 259 p.
- [14] S. Cecotti, S. Ferrara and L. Girardello, *Phys. Lett. B* **187** (1987) 321.
- [15] M. Koehn, J. L. Lehnert and B. A. Ovrut, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 085019 (2012) [arXiv:1207.3798 [hep-th]]; F. Farakos and A. Kehagias, *JHEP* **1211**, 077 (2012) [arXiv:1207.4767 [hep-th]].
- [16] D. Ciupke, J. Louis and A. Westphal, *JHEP* **1510** (2015) 094 [arXiv:1505.03092 [hep-th]].

- [17] R. Kallosh, A. Linde, D. Roest, A. Westphal and Y. Yamada, arXiv:1707.05830 [hep-th].
- [18] D. Baumann and D. Green, JHEP **1203**, 001 (2012) [arXiv:1109.0293 [hep-th]].
- [19] A. Hindawi, B. A. Ovrut and D. Waldram, Nucl. Phys. B **476**, 175 (1996) [hep-th/9511223]; A. Kehagias, C. Kounnas, D. Lüst and A. Riotto, JHEP **1505** (2015) 143; L. Alvarez-Gaume, A. Kehagias, C. Kounnas, D. Lüst and A. Riotto, Fortsch. Phys. **64**, no. 2-3, 176 (2016) [arXiv:1505.07657 [hep-th]]; S. Ferrara, A. Kehagias and M. Porrati, JHEP **1508**, 001 (2015) [arXiv:1506.01566 [hep-th]]; S. Ferrara, M. Porrati and A. Sagnotti, Phys. Lett. B **749**, 589 (2015) [arXiv:1508.02939 [hep-th]].
- [20] E. A. Ivanov, A. A. Kapustnikov, J.Phys. A11 (1978) 2375-2384, JINR-P2-11514; S. Samuel and J. Wess, Nucl. Phys. B **221**, 153 (1983).
- [21] U. Lindstrom and M. Rocek, Phys. Rev. D **19**, 2300 (1979); E. A. Ivanov, A. A. Kapustnikov, Phys.Lett. B143 (1984) 379, JINR-P2-84-111; E. A. Ivanov, A. A. Kapustnikov, Nucl. Phys. B333 (1990) 439, JINR-E2-89-266; S. M. Kuzenko and S. J. Tyler, JHEP **1104**, 057 (2011) [arXiv:1102.3042 [hep-th]]; F. Farakos and A. Kehagias, Phys. Lett. B **724**, 322 (2013) [arXiv:1302.0866 [hep-th]]; E. A. Bergshoeff, K. Dasgupta, R. Kallosh, A. Van Proeyen and T. Wrase, JHEP **1505**, 058 (2015) [arXiv:1502.07627 [hep-th]]; E. Dudas, S. Ferrara, A. Kehagias and A. Sagnotti, JHEP **1509**, 217 (2015) [arXiv:1507.07842 [hep-th]]; E. A. Bergshoeff, D. Z. Freedman, R. Kallosh and A. Van Proeyen, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 8, 085040 (2015) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 6, 069901 (2016)] [arXiv:1507.08264 [hep-th]]; F. Hasegawa and Y. Yamada, JHEP **1510**, 106 (2015) [arXiv:1507.08619 [hep-th]]; S. M. Kuzenko, JHEP **1510**, 006 (2015) [arXiv:1508.03190 [hep-th]]; I. Antoniadis and C. Markou, Eur. Phys. J. C **75**, no. 12, 582 (2015) [arXiv:1508.06767 [hep-th]]; F. Hasegawa and Y. Yamada, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 10, 105027 (2015) [arXiv:1509.04987 [hep-th]]; I. Bandos, L. Martucci, D. Sorokin and M. Tonin, JHEP **1602**, 080 (2016) [arXiv:1511.03024 [hep-th]]; F. Farakos, A. Kehagias, D. Racco and A. Riotto, JHEP **1606**, 120 (2016) [arXiv:1605.07631 [hep-th]].
- [22] S. Ferrara, R. Kallosh, A. Van Proeyen and T. Wrase, JHEP **1604**, 065 (2016) [arXiv:1603.02653 [hep-th]].
- [23] G. Dall'Agata, E. Dudas and F. Farakos, JHEP **1605**, 041 (2016) [arXiv:1603.03416 [hep-th]].
- [24] L. Alvarez-Gaume, C. Gomez and R. Jimenez, Phys. Lett. B **690**, 68 (2010) [arXiv:1001.0010 [hep-th]]; I. Antoniadis, E. Dudas, S. Ferrara and A. Sagnotti, Phys. Lett. B **733**, 32 (2014) [arXiv:1403.3269 [hep-th]]; S. Ferrara, R. Kallosh and A. Linde, JHEP **1410**, 143 (2014) [arXiv:1408.4096 [hep-th]]; R. Kallosh and A. Linde, JCAP **1501** (2015) 025 [arXiv:1408.5950 [hep-th]]; G. Dall'Agata and F. Zwirner, JHEP **1412**, 172 (2014) [arXiv:1411.2605 [hep-th]]; E. Dudas, L. Heurtier, C. Wieck and M. W. Winkler,

- Phys. Lett. B **759**, 121 (2016) [arXiv:1601.03397 [hep-th]]; E. McDonough and M. Scalisi, JCAP **1611**, no. 11, 028 (2016) [arXiv:1609.00364 [hep-th]]; F. Hasegawa, K. Mukaida, K. Nakayama, T. Terada and Y. Yamada, Phys. Lett. B **767**, 392 (2017) [arXiv:1701.03106 [hep-ph]]; I. Dalianis and F. Farakos, arXiv:1705.06717 [hep-th]; R. Kallosh, A. Linde, D. Roest and Y. Yamada, JHEP **1707**, 057 (2017) [arXiv:1705.09247 [hep-th]].
- [25] S. Ferrara and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Lett. **74B**, 333 (1978); K. S. Stelle and P. C. West, Phys. Lett. **74B** (1978) 330.
- [26] S. Ferrara and M. Villasante, J. Math. Phys. **30**, 104 (1989).
- [27] R. Grimm, J. Wess and B. Zumino, Nucl. Phys. B **152** (1979) 255.
- [28] J. Wess and B. Zumino, Phys. Lett. **79B** (1978) 394.
- [29] S. Ferrara and B. Zumino, Nucl. Phys. B **134**, 301 (1978).
- [30] I. L. Buchbinder and S. M. Kuzenko, Nucl. Phys. B **308**, 162 (1988).
- [31] S. Ferrara, M. Samsonyan, M. Tournoy and A. Van Proeyen, arXiv:1705.02272 [hep-th].
- [32] M. Rocek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **41**, 451 (1978); R. Casalbuoni, S. De Curtis, D. Dominici, F. Feruglio and R. Gatto, Phys. Lett. B **220**, 569 (1989).
- [33] N. Cribiori, G. Dall'Agata and F. Farakos, arXiv:1704.07387 [hep-th].
- [34] N. Cribiori, G. Dall'Agata, F. Farakos and M. Porrati, arXiv:1611.01490 [hep-th].
- [35] Y. Kahn, D. A. Roberts and J. Thaler, JHEP **1510**, 001 (2015) [arXiv:1504.05958 [hep-th]]; S. Ferrara, R. Kallosh and J. Thaler, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 4, 043516 (2016) [arXiv:1512.00545 [hep-th]]; G. Dall'Agata and F. Farakos, JHEP **1602**, 101 (2016) [arXiv:1512.02158 [hep-th]].
- [36] N. Cribiori, G. Dall'Agata and F. Farakos, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 6, 065019 (2016) [arXiv:1607.01277 [hep-th]]; F. Farakos, arXiv:1704.08569 [hep-th].
- [37] I. Bandos, M. Heller, S. M. Kuzenko, L. Martucci and D. Sorokin, JHEP **1611**, 109 (2016) [arXiv:1608.05908 [hep-th]].
- [38] Z. Komargodski and N. Seiberg, JHEP **0909**, 066 (2009) [arXiv:0907.2441 [hep-th]].
- [39] S. Ferrara and A. Van Proeyen, Fortsch. Phys. **64**, no. 11-12, 896 (2016) [arXiv:1609.08480 [hep-th]].
- [40] R. Jackiw and S. Y. Pi, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 104012 (2003) [gr-qc/0308071].
- [41] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 123541 (2008) [arXiv:0804.4291 [hep-th]].



- [42] V. Gluscevic and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 123529 (2010) [arXiv:1002.1308 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [43] D. Baumann, H. Lee and G. L. Pimentel, *JHEP* **1601**, 101 (2016) [arXiv:1507.07250 [hep-th]].