

Status of D6-brane Flux Models and their Effective Field Theories

Giovanni Villadoro

Harvard U.

Outline

- Short introduction
- Mini-review on known type-IIA vacua
- Consistency constraints in compactifications
- Constructing the EFT
 - bulk sector
 - vector fields
 - chiral sector
- Leftover and conclusions

Renewed interests in type-IIA compactifications:

- New 4d classical vacua (*more generic than in type-IIB and Heterotic cases*)
- Improvement in understanding of generalized geometries
(*i.e. non CY compactifications with fluxes and torsion...*)
- $\text{AdS}_4/\text{CFT}_3$ in IIA/M-theory
(*may provide non-perturbative description of IIA string in AdS backgrounds*)
- Intersecting brane model building – phenomenology
(*easy geometrical construction of chiral gauge theories*)
- ...

Renewed interests in type-IIA compactifications:

- New 4d classical vacua (*more generic than in type-IIB and Heterotic cases*)
- Improvement in understanding of generalized geometries
(*i.e. non CY compactifications with fluxes and torsion...*)
- $\text{AdS}_4/\text{CFT}_3$ in IIA/M-theory
(*may provide non-perturbative description of IIA string in AdS backgrounds*)
- Intersecting brane model building – phenomenology
(*easy geometrical construction of chiral gauge theories*)
- ...

Final goal:

– *Find a "reliable" string construction (aka vacuum) compatible with experiments –*

Many ways to attack the problem:

- top-down

(start from the strings, find vacuum, stab. moduli...)

Many ways to attack the problem:

- top-down

(start from the strings, find vacuum, stab. moduli...)

- bottom-up

(start from the model, embed into branes, stab. moduli...)

Many ways to attack the problem:

- top-down

(start from the strings, find vacuum, stab. moduli...)

- bottom-up

(start from the model, embed into branes, stab. moduli...)

more control on the string side

less powerful from the phenomenology side and viceversa...

Many ways to attack the problem:

- top-down

(start from the strings, find vacuum, stab. moduli...)

- bottom-up

(start from the model, embed into branes, stab. moduli...)

more control on the string side

less powerful from the phenomenology side and viceversa...

key – "try to find a good compromise":

derive an EFT from string theory *such that* it allows
to implement both the constraints and the corrections from string theory
and
to model a successful low energy description

Mini-review on type-IIA '*classical*' known vacua I

- Susy AdS₄:

- Many types:

- Toroidal Orbifolds ($T^6/Z_2 \times Z_2$, $T^6/Z_3 \times Z_3$, ...);

*GV, Zwirner, DeWolfe et al,
Camara, Font, Ibanez...*

- Group manifolds ($S^3 \times S^3$, twisted tori...);

- Coset manifolds (CP_3 , $SU(3)/U(1) \times U(1)$, ...);

*Behrndt, Cvetič,
Lust, Tsimpis...*

- ...

- All moduli stabilized;

- infinite number, with small g_s large V_6 ;

- good for AdS/CFT;

- not good for phenomenology;

Mini-review on type-IIA '*classical*' known vacua I

- **Susy AdS₄:**

- Many types:
 - Toroidal Orbifolds ($T^6/Z_2 \times Z_2$, $T^6/Z_3 \times Z_3$, ...);
 - Group manifolds ($S^3 \times S^3$, twisted tori...);
 - Coset manifolds (CP_3 , $SU(3)/U(1) \times U(1)$, ...);
 - ...
- All moduli stabilized;
- infinite number, with small g_s large V_6 ;
- good for AdS/CFT;
- not good for phenomenology;

*GV, Zwirner, DeWolfe et al,
Camara, Font, Ibanez...*

*Behrndt, Cvetič,
Lust, Tsimpis...*

- **Non susy AdS₄:**

- (twisted)-Toroidal Orbifolds (+fluxes+sources);
- All moduli stabilized;
- good for phenomenology (uplifting with D-terms?, other F-terms?...);

Camara, Font, Ibanez...

continue...

Mini-review on type-IIA '*classical*' known vacua II

...continue

- **Susy Mink₄:**

- flat directions with geometrical fluxes;
- All moduli fixed with non-geometrical fluxes?
- large V_6 and small g_s ? (*Micu, Palti, Tasinato '07*);
- not good for phenomenology;

Aldazabal et al.

Mini-review on type-IIA '*classical*' known vacua II

...continue

- **Susy Mink₄:**

- flat directions with geometrical fluxes;
- All moduli fixed with non-geometrical fluxes?
- large V_6 and small g_s ? (Micu, Palti, Tasinato '07);
- not good for phenomenology;

Aldazabal et al.

- **No-scale models:**

- (twisted)-Toroidal Orbifolds (+fluxes+sources)
- good for phenomenology (after no-scale moduli stabilized radiatively...)
- Ω -dominated? (J -dominated? - non geom.)

see e.g.
Derendinger et al.,...
Camara, Grana...

Mini-review on type-IIA '*classical*' known vacua II

...continue

- **Susy Mink₄:**

- flat directions with geometrical fluxes;
- All moduli fixed with non-geometrical fluxes?
- large V_6 and small g_s ? (*Micu, Palti, Tasinato '07*);
- not good for phenomenology;

Aldazabal et al.

- **No-scale models:**

- (twisted)-Toroidal Orbifolds (+fluxes+sources)
- good for phenomenology (after no-scale moduli stabilized radiatively...)
- Ω -dominated? (J -dominated? - non geom.)

see e.g.
Derendinger et al.,...
Camara, Grana...

- **dS4 vacua?**

- *Silverstein '07* (EFT?)

From the compactification to the EFT

closed strings \rightarrow metric [$g(J, \Omega)$], dilaton [Φ],
[B_{NS}]-field, RR-fields [$C^{(p)}$], ...

open strings \rightarrow D6-D6 gauge sector [A_μ, Z^k],
D6-D6' chiral sector [ϕ^i]

From the compactification to the EFT

closed strings \rightarrow metric $[g(J, \Omega)]$, dilaton $[\Phi]$,
[B_{NS}]-field, RR-fields $[C^{(p)}]$, ...
open strings \rightarrow D6-D6 gauge sector $[A_\mu, Z^k]$,
D6-D6' chiral sector $[\phi^i]$

$N=1$ 4d Effective SUGRA determined by:

- Kahler function $G(q, q^*) = K(q, q^*) + \log|W(q)|^2$
- Gauge kinetic function $f_{\text{AB}}(q)$
- Killing vectors $X(q)$

Most of the 4d EFT can be derived from dim.red. from 10d SUGRA
EFT only partially known for generic background
Explicit formulae known for particular orbifolds

Consistency Constraints

RR-tadpole \Leftrightarrow RR Bianchi Id.

$$d_H G = Q_{\text{RR}} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \omega G^{(2)} + H \wedge G^{(0)} = \Sigma [\pi_6]$$

Consistency Constraints

RR-tadpole \Leftrightarrow RR Bianchi Id.

$$d_H G = Q_{\text{RR}} \Rightarrow \omega G^{(2)} + H \wedge G^{(0)} = \Sigma [\pi_6]$$

NSNS-tadpole \Leftrightarrow NSNS Bianchi Id.

$$d_H d_H = 0, \Rightarrow \omega \omega = 0, \omega H = 0$$

$$\text{with sources } d_H d_H = Q_{\text{NSNS}} \Rightarrow \omega \omega = \Sigma [\kappa_5], \omega H = \Sigma [\nu_5]$$

Consistency Constraints

RR-tadpole \Leftrightarrow RR Bianchi Id.

$$d_H G = Q_{\text{RR}} \Rightarrow \omega G^{(2)} + H \wedge G^{(0)} = \Sigma [\pi_6]$$

NSNS-tadpole \Leftrightarrow NSNS Bianchi Id.

$$d_H d_H = 0, \Rightarrow \omega \omega = 0, \omega H = 0$$

$$\text{with sources } d_H d_H = Q_{\text{NSNS}} \Rightarrow \omega \omega = \Sigma [\kappa_5], \omega H = \Sigma [\nu_5]$$

Localized tadpoles \Leftrightarrow loc. Bianchi Id.

$$d_H Q_{\text{RR}} = 0 \Rightarrow \omega [\pi_6] = 0, H \wedge [\pi_6] = 0$$

$$Q_{\text{NSNS}} G = 0 \Rightarrow [\nu_5] \wedge G = 0, [\kappa_5] G = 0$$

(+ branes on branes)

*Freed, Witten,
Maldacena, Moore, Seiberg,
...
GV, Zwirner*

Consistency Constraints

RR-tadpole \Leftrightarrow RR Bianchi Id.

$$d_H G = Q_{RR} \Rightarrow \omega G^{(2)} + H \wedge G^{(0)} = \Sigma [\pi_6]$$

NSNS-tadpole \Leftrightarrow NSNS Bianchi Id.

$$d_H d_H = 0, \Rightarrow \omega \omega = 0, \omega H = 0$$

$$\text{with sources } d_H d_H = Q_{NSNS} \Rightarrow \omega \omega = \Sigma [\kappa_5], \omega H = \Sigma [v_5]$$

Localized tadpoles \Leftrightarrow loc. Bianchi Id.

$$d_H Q_{RR} = 0 \Rightarrow \omega [\pi_6] = 0, H \wedge [\pi_6] = 0$$

$$Q_{NSNS} G = 0 \Rightarrow [v_5] \wedge G = 0, [\kappa_5] G = 0$$

(+ branes on branes)

*Freed, Witten,
Maldacena, Moore, Seiberg,
...
GV, Zwirner*

Crucial for gauge (+susy) inv. of the EFT:

- classical: gauge inv. of W
- perturbative: cancellation of 1-loop anomalies
- non-perturbative: gauge inv. of instanton corrections

1. EFT for bulk fields

Kahler potential:

$$K = -\log \left(\frac{1}{3!} \int J \wedge J \wedge J \right) - 2 \log \left(\frac{1}{3!} \int \Omega' \wedge \overline{\Omega'} \right)$$

From dim. red. on $T^6/Z_2 \times Z_2 \Rightarrow$

$$K = -\log(su_1u_2u_3) - \log(t_1t_2t_3) + \dots \quad (\text{twisted sector})$$

see Lust, Reffert, Stieberger...

1. EFT for bulk fields

Kahler potential:

$$K = -\log \left(\frac{1}{3!} \int J \wedge J \wedge J \right) - 2 \log \left(\frac{1}{3!} \int \Omega' \wedge \overline{\Omega}' \right)$$

From dim. red. on $T^6/Z_2 \times Z_2 \Rightarrow$

$$K = -\log(su_1 u_2 u_3) - \log(t_1 t_2 t_3) + \dots \quad (\text{twisted sector})$$

see Lust, Reffert, Stieberger...

Superpotential:

$$W = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathcal{M}_6} e^{iJ^c} (\overline{\mathbf{G}} - i d_H \Omega'^c)$$

$$J^c \equiv J + i B, \quad \Omega'^c \equiv \text{Re } \Omega' + i C^{(3)},$$

$$d_H \equiv d + \omega + \overline{H}$$

$$\overline{\mathbf{G}} = \sum_{p=\text{even}} \overline{G}^{(p)}$$

D2 domain wall argument: $\Delta W \sim \int \Delta G^{(6)}$

a la' Gukov Vafa Witten

$$W = \int G^{(6)}$$

with $G^{(6)}$ complexification of the solution of $d_H G = 0$

Gauge kinetic function: (from DBI+WZ)

$$f_{ab} = \delta_{ab} N_a \left(\text{Re } \Omega'_{\pi_a} + i \int_{\pi_a} C^{(3)} \right) = \delta_{ab} N_a \Omega'^c_{\pi_a}$$

From dim. red. on $T^6/Z_2 \times Z_2 \Rightarrow$

$$f = N T_6 (m_1 m_2 m_3 S - m_1 n_2 n_3 U_1 - n_1 m_2 n_3 U_2 - n_1 n_2 m_3 U_3)$$

Cremades, Ibanez, Marchesano '02

Gauge kinetic function: (from DBI+WZ)

$$f_{ab} = \delta_{ab} N_a \left(\text{Re } \Omega'_{\pi_a} + i \int_{\pi_a} C^{(3)} \right) = \delta_{ab} N_a \Omega'^c_{\pi_a}$$

From dim. red. on $T^6/Z_2 \times Z_2 \Rightarrow$

$$f = N T_6 (m_1 m_2 m_3 S - m_1 n_2 n_3 U_1 - n_1 m_2 n_3 U_2 - n_1 n_2 m_3 U_3)$$

Cremades, Ibanez, Marchesano '02

Killing vectors: (of the gauging)

$$\begin{aligned} i X^S &= -2 N \mu_6 n_1 n_2 n_3 = -2 N \mu_6 q^0, \\ i X^{U_A} &= 2 N \mu_6 n_A m_B m_C = 2 N \mu_6 q^A, \end{aligned}$$

D-terms: ($= i K_a X^a$)

$$\text{Im } \tilde{\Omega}_\pi = \frac{\sqrt{s u_1 u_2 u_3} D}{N T_6}$$

$$D = N \mu_6 \left(\frac{n_1 n_2 n_3}{s} - \sum_{A=1}^3 \frac{n_A m_B m_C}{u_A} \right) = N \mu_6 \left(\frac{q^0}{s} - \sum_{A=1}^3 \frac{q^A}{u_A} \right)$$

D-terms: $(= i K_a X^a)$

$$\text{Im } \tilde{\Omega}_\pi = \frac{\sqrt{s u_1 u_2 u_3} D}{N T_6}$$

$$D = N \mu_6 \left(\frac{n_1 n_2 n_3}{s} - \sum_{A=1}^3 \frac{n_A m_B m_C}{u_A} \right) = N \mu_6 \left(\frac{q^0}{s} - \sum_{A=1}^3 \frac{q^A}{u_A} \right)$$

...but from DBI reduction on generic configurations

$$\text{Re } f = N T_6 \sqrt{(\text{Re } \tilde{\Omega}_\pi)^2 + (\text{Im } \tilde{\Omega}_\pi)^2}$$

$$V_D = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{N T_6 \text{Re } \tilde{\Omega}_\pi} D^2 \frac{2}{\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{\text{Im } \tilde{\Omega}_\pi}{\text{Re } \tilde{\Omega}_\pi} \right)^2} + 1}$$

D-terms: ($= i K_a X^a$)

$$\text{Im } \tilde{\Omega}_\pi = \frac{\sqrt{s u_1 u_2 u_3} D}{N T_6}$$

$$D = N \mu_6 \left(\frac{n_1 n_2 n_3}{s} - \sum_{A=1}^3 \frac{n_A m_B m_C}{u_A} \right) = N \mu_6 \left(\frac{q^0}{s} - \sum_{A=1}^3 \frac{q^A}{u_A} \right)$$

...but from DBI reduction on generic configurations

$$\text{Re } f = N T_6 \sqrt{(\text{Re } \tilde{\Omega}_\pi)^2 + (\text{Im } \tilde{\Omega}_\pi)^2}$$

Right SUGRA results
only in the 2-der. limit

i.e. $\left| \frac{\text{Im } \tilde{\Omega}_\pi}{\text{Re } \tilde{\Omega}_\pi} \right| \ll 1$

GV, Zwirner '06

$$V_D = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{N T_6 \text{Re } \tilde{\Omega}_\pi} D^2 \frac{2}{\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{\text{Im } \tilde{\Omega}_\pi}{\text{Re } \tilde{\Omega}_\pi} \right)^2} + 1}$$

lesson for anti-D-branes....

2. EFT for the D6-D6 sector

Kahler potential: *for arbitrary configuration of D6-branes*

From dim.red. of DBI action (*involving highly non-trivial field-redefinition*)

(assuming $S_{\text{DBI}} = \sum_k S_{\text{DBI}}(\text{D6}_k)$ from dim. red. on $T^6/Z_2 \times Z_2$)

$$K = -\log \left[t_1 t_2 t_3 \left(s + \sum_{A=1}^3 p_A^a \frac{z_A^{i_a 2}}{t_A} \right) \prod_{A=1}^3 \left(u_A - p_0^a \frac{z_A^{i_a 2}}{t_A} + \sum_{B,C=1}^3 d_{ABC} p_B^a \frac{z_C^{i_a 2}}{t_C} \right) \right]$$

unpublished with F. Zwirner '06

2. EFT for the D6-D6 sector

Kahler potential: *for arbitrary configuration of D6-branes*

From dim.red. of DBI action (*involving highly non-trivial field-redefinition*)
(assuming $S_{\text{DBI}} = \sum_k S_{\text{DBI}}(\text{D6}_k)$ from dim. red. on $T^6/Z_2 \times Z_2$)

$$K = -\log \left[t_1 t_2 t_3 \left(s + \sum_{A=1}^3 p_A^a \frac{z_A^{i_a 2}}{t_A} \right) \prod_{A=1}^3 \left(u_A - p_0^a \frac{z_A^{i_a 2}}{t_A} + \sum_{B,C=1}^3 d_{ABC} p_B^a \frac{z_C^{i_a 2}}{t_C} \right) \right]$$

unpublished with F. Zwirner '06

up to quadratic fluctuations it gives:

$$K = -\log(t_1 t_2 t_3 s u_1 u_2 u_3) + p_0^a \sum_{A=1}^3 \frac{z_A^{i_a 2}}{t_A u_A} - \sum_{A=1}^3 \left(p_A^a \frac{z_A^{i_a 2}}{s t_A} + \sum_{B,C=1}^3 d_{ABC} p_B^a \frac{z_A^{i_a 2}}{t_A u_C} \right) + \mathcal{O}(z^4)$$

2. EFT for the D6-D6 sector

Kahler potential: *for arbitrary configuration of D6-branes*

From dim.red. of DBI action (*involving highly non-trivial field-redefinition*)
(assuming $S_{\text{DBI}} = \sum_k S_{\text{DBI}}(\text{D6}_k)$ from dim. red. on $T^6/Z_2 \times Z_2$)

$$K = -\log \left[t_1 t_2 t_3 \left(s + \sum_{A=1}^3 p_A^a \frac{z_A^{i_a 2}}{t_A} \right) \prod_{A=1}^3 \left(u_A - p_0^a \frac{z_A^{i_a 2}}{t_A} + \sum_{B,C=1}^3 d_{ABC} p_B^a \frac{z_C^{i_a 2}}{t_C} \right) \right]$$

unpublished with F. Zwirner '06

up to quadratic fluctuations it gives:

$$K = -\log(t_1 t_2 t_3 s u_1 u_2 u_3) + p_0^a \sum_{A=1}^3 \frac{z_A^{i_a 2}}{t_A u_A} - \sum_{A=1}^3 \left(p_A^a \frac{z_A^{i_a 2}}{s t_A} + \sum_{B,C=1}^3 d_{ABC} p_B^a \frac{z_A^{i_a 2}}{t_A u_C} \right) + \mathcal{O}(z^4)$$

Notice that $z_A = \text{Re } Z_A$

i.e. there are Giudice-Masiero-like terms (like in Heterotic) good for μ -terms

For special configuration of D6-branes (or equiv. magnetized branes) results are already present in the literature – (*Lust, Stieberger...*, *Kors, Nath...Font, Ibanez...*)

For special configuration of D6-branes (or equiv. magnetized branes) results are already present in the literature – (*Lust, Stieberger...*, *Kors, Nath...Font, Ibanez...*)

In several cases these results seem not to agree with ours,
in particular $O(z^2)$ coefficients are not constant but proportional to

$$(m_A^2 + n_A^2) \sqrt{\frac{\Upsilon_B \Upsilon_C}{\Upsilon_A}} : \quad \Upsilon_A = \frac{m_A^{a2}}{u'_B u'_C} + \frac{n_A^{a2}}{s' u'_A}$$

For special configuration of D6-branes (or equiv. magnetized branes) results are already present in the literature – (*Lust, Stieberger...*, *Kors, Nath...Font, Ibanez...*)

In several cases these results seem not to agree with ours,
in particular $O(z^2)$ coefficients are not constant but proportional to

$$(m_A^2 + n_A^2) \sqrt{\frac{\Upsilon_B \Upsilon_C}{\Upsilon_A}} \quad \Upsilon_A = \frac{m_A^{a2}}{u'_B u'_C} + \frac{n_A^{a2}}{s' u'_A}$$

however they simplify (and agree with our results) when we notice that

$$(m_A^2 + n_A^2) \sqrt{\frac{\Upsilon_B \Upsilon_C}{\Upsilon_A}} = \left(\frac{p_0}{s'} - \frac{p_A}{u'_A} - \frac{p_B}{u'_B} - \frac{p_C}{u'_C} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\text{Im } \Omega'_{\pi_a}}{\text{Re } \Omega'_{\pi_a}} \right) \quad \text{these terms must be discarded for consistency}$$

For special configuration of D6-branes (or equiv. magnetized branes) results are already present in the literature – (*Lust, Stieberger...*, *Kors, Nath...Font, Ibanez...*)

In several cases these results seem not to agree with ours,
in particular $O(z^2)$ coefficients are not constant but proportional to

$$(m_A^2 + n_A^2) \sqrt{\frac{\Upsilon_B \Upsilon_C}{\Upsilon_A}} \quad \Upsilon_A = \frac{m_A^{a2}}{u'_B u'_C} + \frac{n_A^{a2}}{s' u'_A}$$

however they simplify (and agree with our results) when we notice that

$$(m_A^2 + n_A^2) \sqrt{\frac{\Upsilon_B \Upsilon_C}{\Upsilon_A}} = \left(\frac{p_0}{s'} - \frac{p_A}{u'_A} - \frac{p_B}{u'_B} - \frac{p_C}{u'_C} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\text{Im } \Omega'_{\pi_a}}{\text{Re } \Omega'_{\pi_a}} \right) \quad \text{these terms must be discarded for consistency}$$

*Notice also that mixed $O(z^2 z^2)$ terms do not agree in the $N=2$ limit
with the prepotential proposed by
Ferrara, Minasian, Sagnotti... *Antoniadis et al...*
connected with ρ -problem, see below...*

Superpotential:

from dim.red. + DBI fluctuations

agrees with the domain-wall argument: $W = \int G^{(6)}$
(with $G^{(6)}$ complexification of the solution of $d_H G = Q_{RR}$)

Superpotential:

from dim.red. + DBI fluctuations

agrees with the domain-wall argument: $W = \int G^{(6)}$

(with $G^{(6)}$ complexification of the solution of $d_H G = Q_{RR}$)

$$W = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathcal{M}_6} e^{iJ^c} (\overline{\mathbf{G}} - i d_H \Omega^c) + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\pi_a} \omega_{YM}^c$$

unpublished with F.Zwirner '06

$$\omega_{YM}^c = Z^{i_a} \wedge \omega Z^{i_a} + \frac{2}{3} i f_{i_a i_b i_c} Z^{i_a} \wedge Z^{i_b} \wedge Z^{i_c}$$

$$Z^{i_a} = \left[Z_1^{i_a} \frac{n_1^a dx^5 + m_1^a dx^6}{\sqrt{(m_1^a)^2 + (n_1^a)^2}} + Z_2^{i_a} \frac{n_2^a dx^7 + m_2^a dx^8}{\sqrt{(m_2^a)^2 + (n_2^a)^2}} + Z_3^{i_a} \frac{n_3^a dx^9 + m_3^a dx^{10}}{\sqrt{(m_3^a)^2 + (n_3^a)^2}} \right]$$

Superpotential:

from dim.red. + DBI fluctuations

agrees with the domain-wall argument: $W = \int G^{(6)}$

(with $G^{(6)}$ complexification of the solution of $d_H G = Q_{RR}$)

$$W = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathcal{M}_6} e^{iJ^c} (\overline{G} - i d_H \Omega^c) + \frac{1}{4} \int_{\pi_a} \omega_{YM}^c$$

unpublished with F.Zwirner '06

$$\omega_{YM}^c = Z^{i_a} \wedge \omega Z^{i_a} + \frac{2}{3} i f_{i_a i_b i_c} Z^{i_a} \wedge Z^{i_b} \wedge Z^{i_c}$$

$$Z^{i_a} = \left[Z_1^{i_a} \frac{n_1^a dx^5 + m_1^a dx^6}{\sqrt{(m_1^a)^2 + (n_1^a)^2}} + Z_2^{i_a} \frac{n_2^a dx^7 + m_2^a dx^8}{\sqrt{(m_2^a)^2 + (n_2^a)^2}} + Z_3^{i_a} \frac{n_3^a dx^9 + m_3^a dx^{10}}{\sqrt{(m_3^a)^2 + (n_3^a)^2}} \right]$$

in agreement with *Martucci, Marchesano, Camara, Grana*
but valid also for susy-breaking and/or non-Mink vacua,
automatically holomorphic

D-terms:

- D6-D6 sector uncharged under U(1) part

$$D_a = \frac{q_a^0}{s'} - \sum_{A=1}^3 \frac{q_a^A}{u'_A} = \frac{q_a^0}{s + \sum_{A=1}^3 p_A^a \frac{z_A^{i_a^2}}{t_A}} - \sum_{A=1}^3 \frac{q_a^A}{u_A - p_0^a \frac{z_A^{i_a^2}}{t_A} + \sum_{B,C=1}^3 d_{ABC} p_B^a \frac{z_C^{i_a^2}}{t_C}}$$

- Only non-abelian D-term

$$D_{i_a} = i K_{Z_A^{i_b}} (X_{i_a})_A^{i_b} = Q_A^a f_{i_a j_a k_a} \frac{z_A^{j_a} \zeta_A^{k_c}}{t_A}$$

$$Q_A^a = \frac{p_0^a}{u'_A} - \frac{p_A^a}{s'} - \frac{p_B^a}{u'_C} - \frac{p_C^a}{u'_B}$$

D-terms:

- D6-D6 sector uncharged under U(1) part

$$D_a = \frac{q_a^0}{s'} - \sum_{A=1}^3 \frac{q_a^A}{u'_A} = \frac{q_a^0}{s + \sum_{A=1}^3 p_A^a \frac{z_A^{i_a^2}}{t_A}} - \sum_{A=1}^3 \frac{q_a^A}{u_A - p_0^a \frac{z_A^{i_a^2}}{t_A} + \sum_{B,C=1}^3 d_{ABC} p_B^a \frac{z_C^{i_a^2}}{t_C}}$$

- Only non-abelian D-term

$$D_{i_a} = i K_{Z_A^{i_b}} (X_{i_a})_A^{i_b} = Q_A^a f_{i_a j_a k_a} \frac{z_A^{j_a} \zeta_A^{k_c}}{t_A}$$

$$Q_A^a = \frac{p_0^a}{u'_A} - \frac{p_A^a}{s'} - \frac{p_B^a}{u'_C} - \frac{p_C^a}{u'_B}$$

Gauge kinetic function:

$$f_a \propto \Omega'^c_{\pi_a} = \Omega^c_{\pi_a} + \sum_b \int_{\pi_a} Z^{i_b} \phi^{i_b}[\pi_b] = \Omega^c_{\pi_a} + \sum_b (non \ hol.) \times I_{ab}$$

dual to the type-IIB " ρ -problem":

- *solution 1*: (Berg, Haack, Kors '04) – 1-loop from open strings (see Akerblom et al. '07 for IIA)
- *solution 2*: (Baumann et al. '06) – tree level from closed-strings inter-brane backreaction

D-terms:

- D6-D6 sector uncharged under U(1) part

$$D_a = \frac{q_a^0}{s'} - \sum_{A=1}^3 \frac{q_a^A}{u'_A} = \frac{q_a^0}{s + \sum_{A=1}^3 p_A^a \frac{z_A^{i_a^2}}{t_A}} - \sum_{A=1}^3 \frac{q_a^A}{u_A - p_0^a \frac{z_A^{i_a^2}}{t_A} + \sum_{B,C=1}^3 d_{ABC} p_B^a \frac{z_C^{i_a^2}}{t_C}}$$

- Only non-abelian D-term

$$D_{i_a} = i K_{Z_A^{i_b}} (X_{i_a})_A^{i_b} = Q_A^a f_{i_a j_a k_a} \frac{z_A^{j_a} \zeta_A^{k_c}}{t_A}$$

$$Q_A^a = \frac{p_0^a}{u'_A} - \frac{p_A^a}{s'} - \frac{p_B^a}{u'_C} - \frac{p_C^a}{u'_B}$$

Gauge kinetic function:

$$f_a \propto \Omega'^c_{\pi_a} = \Omega^c_{\pi_a} + \sum_b \int_{\pi_a} Z^{i_b} \phi^{i_b}[\pi_b] = \Omega^c_{\pi_a} + \sum_b (non \ hol.) \times I_{ab}$$

dual to the type-IIB " ρ -problem":

- *solution 1*: (Berg, Haack, Kors '04) – 1-loop from open strings (see Akerblom et al. '07 for IIA)
- *solution 2*: (Baumann et al. '06) – tree level from closed-strings inter-brane backreaction

Conclusions:

EFT is known up to quadratic fluctuations,

higher-power terms only partially known, not under control...

3. EFT for the D6-D6' sector

(not from supergravity)

Kahler potential: from string amplitudes (*Lust et al... Bertolini et al...*)

$$K_{ij}^{ab} = \delta_{ij} S^{-\alpha} \prod_{I=1}^3 U_I^{-(\beta+\xi\theta_{ab}^I)} T_I^{-(\gamma+\zeta\theta_{ab}^I)} \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma(\theta_{ab}^1)\Gamma(\theta_{ab}^2)\Gamma(1+\theta_{ab}^3)}{\Gamma(1-\theta_{ab}^1)\Gamma(1-\theta_{ab}^2)\Gamma(-\theta_{ab}^3)}},$$

3. EFT for the D6-D6' sector

(not from supergravity)

Kahler potential: from string amplitudes (*Lust et al... Bertolini et al...*)

$$K_{ij}^{ab} = \delta_{ij} S^{-\alpha} \prod_{I=1}^3 U_I^{-(\beta+\xi \theta_{ab}^I)} T_I^{-(\gamma+\zeta \theta_{ab}^I)} \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma(\theta_{ab}^1)\Gamma(\theta_{ab}^2)\Gamma(1+\theta_{ab}^3)}{\Gamma(1-\theta_{ab}^1)\Gamma(1-\theta_{ab}^2)\Gamma(-\theta_{ab}^3)}},$$

recently proposed (by *Akerblom et al. '07*)

$$K_{ij}^{ab} = \delta_{ij} S^{-\frac{1}{4}} \prod_{J=1}^3 U_J^{-\frac{1}{4}} T_J^{-(\frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} \text{sign}(I_{ab}) \theta_{ab}^J)} \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma(\theta_{ab}^1)\Gamma(\theta_{ab}^2)\Gamma(1+\theta_{ab}^3)}{\Gamma(1-\theta_{ab}^1)\Gamma(1-\theta_{ab}^2)\Gamma(-\theta_{ab}^3)}},$$

still to be confirmed...

3. EFT for the D6-D6' sector

(not from supergravity)

Kahler potential: from string amplitudes (*Lust et al... Bertolini et al...*)

$$K_{ij}^{ab} = \delta_{ij} S^{-\alpha} \prod_{I=1}^3 U_I^{-(\beta+\xi\theta_{ab}^I)} T_I^{-(\gamma+\zeta\theta_{ab}^I)} \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma(\theta_{ab}^1)\Gamma(\theta_{ab}^2)\Gamma(1+\theta_{ab}^3)}{\Gamma(1-\theta_{ab}^1)\Gamma(1-\theta_{ab}^2)\Gamma(-\theta_{ab}^3)}},$$

recently proposed (by *Akerblom et al. '07*)

$$K_{ij}^{ab} = \delta_{ij} S^{-\frac{1}{4}} \prod_{J=1}^3 U_J^{-\frac{1}{4}} T_J^{-(\frac{1}{2}\pm\frac{1}{2}\text{sign}(I_{ab})\theta_{ab}^J)} \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma(\theta_{ab}^1)\Gamma(\theta_{ab}^2)\Gamma(1+\theta_{ab}^3)}{\Gamma(1-\theta_{ab}^1)\Gamma(1-\theta_{ab}^2)\Gamma(-\theta_{ab}^3)}},$$

still to be confirmed...

Superpotential:

$$W = Y_{ijk} \phi^i \phi^j \phi^k + \mu_{1ijk} \phi^i \phi^j Z^k + \mu_{2ij} \phi^i \phi^j + \dots$$

Y_{ijk} from w.s. instantons,
(~IIB perturbative calculus)

$$Y_{ijk} = h_{qu} \sigma_{abc} \prod_{r=1}^n \vartheta \begin{bmatrix} \delta^{(r)} \\ \phi^{(r)} \end{bmatrix} (\kappa^{(r)})$$

*Cremades, Ibanez, Marchesano,
Cvetic, Papadimitriou*

3. EFT for the D6-D6' sector

(not from supergravity)

Kahler potential: from string amplitudes (*Lust et al... Bertolini et al...*)

$$K_{ij}^{ab} = \delta_{ij} S^{-\alpha} \prod_{I=1}^3 U_I^{-(\beta+\xi\theta_{ab}^I)} T_I^{-(\gamma+\zeta\theta_{ab}^I)} \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma(\theta_{ab}^1)\Gamma(\theta_{ab}^2)\Gamma(1+\theta_{ab}^3)}{\Gamma(1-\theta_{ab}^1)\Gamma(1-\theta_{ab}^2)\Gamma(-\theta_{ab}^3)}},$$

recently proposed (by *Akerblom et al. '07*)

$$K_{ij}^{ab} = \delta_{ij} S^{-\frac{1}{4}} \prod_{J=1}^3 U_J^{-\frac{1}{4}} T_J^{-(\frac{1}{2}\pm\frac{1}{2}\text{sign}(I_{ab})\theta_{ab}^J)} \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma(\theta_{ab}^1)\Gamma(\theta_{ab}^2)\Gamma(1+\theta_{ab}^3)}{\Gamma(1-\theta_{ab}^1)\Gamma(1-\theta_{ab}^2)\Gamma(-\theta_{ab}^3)}},$$

still to be confirmed...

Superpotential:

$$W = Y_{ijk} \phi^i \phi^j \phi^k + \mu_{1ijk} \phi^i \phi^j Z^k + \mu_{2ij} \phi^i \phi^j + \dots$$

Y_{ijk} from w.s. instantons,
(~IIB perturbative calculus)

$$Y_{ijk} = h_{qu}\sigma_{abc} \prod_{r=1}^n \vartheta \begin{bmatrix} \delta^{(r)} \\ \phi^{(r)} \end{bmatrix} (\kappa^{(r)})$$

*Cremades, Ibanez, Marchesano,
Cvetic, Papadimitriou*

Killing vectors: known (gauge transformation properties of chiral fields)

Gauge kinetic functions: (corrections are higher order, from threshold....)

Extra interesting ingredients:

- KK5-monopoles:
 - $\omega \neq 0$ (*alternative description of twisted sector, stabilization, ...*)
 - Phenomenology ($N=1$ configurations)
 - dual to D6-branes
 - D6-KK5 intersecting models \rightarrow KK6 M-theory configuration
 - May help with dS vacua? (*Silverstein '07*)

Extra interesting ingredients:

- KK5-monopoles:
 - $\omega \neq 0$ (alternative description of twisted sector, stabilization, ...)
 - Phenomenology ($N=1$ configurations)
 - dual to D6-branes
 - D6-KK5 intersecting models \rightarrow KK6 M-theory configuration
 - May help with dS vacua? (Silverstein '07)
- Non-geometrical fluxes:
 - how far one can go with EFT?

Extra interesting ingredients:

- KK5-monopoles:
 - $\omega \neq 0$ (alternative description of twisted sector, stabilization, ...)
 - Phenomenology ($N=1$ configurations)
 - dual to D6-branes
 - D6-KK5 intersecting models \rightarrow KK6 M-theory configuration
 - May help with dS vacua? (Silverstein '07)
- Non-geometrical fluxes:
 - how far one can go with EFT?
- Add Coisotropic branes (non-commuting fluxes) in EFT;

Extra interesting ingredients:

- KK5-monopoles:
 - $\omega \neq 0$ (alternative description of twisted sector, stabilization, ...)
 - Phenomenology ($N=1$ configurations)
 - dual to D6-branes
 - D6-KK5 intersecting models \rightarrow KK6 M-theory configuration
 - May help with dS vacua? (Silverstein '07)
- Non-geometrical fluxes:
 - how far one can go with EFT?
- Add Coisotropic branes (non-commuting fluxes) in EFT;
- Other important subjects not discussed here:
 - α' , g_s corrections to EFT (threshold corrections...);
 - Non-perturbative corrections (E2-instantons...);
 - Inflation...

Conclusions:

- The EFT of the bulk sector is sufficiently known for several compactifications (Orbifolds, twisted tori, coset spaces....)

Conclusions:

- The EFT of the bulk sector is sufficiently known for several compactifications (Orbifolds, twisted tori, coset spaces....)
- EFT for untwisted sector (vector sector)
 - mainly known up to quadratic fluctuations on orbifolds,
 - calculable in many other compactifications from DBI
 - still unknown above quadratic fluctuations (up to special cases)

Conclusions:

- The EFT of the bulk sector is sufficiently known for several compactifications (Orbifolds, twisted tori, coset spaces....)
- EFT for untwisted sector (vector sector)
 - mainly known up to quadratic fluctuations on orbifolds,
 - calculable in many other compactifications from DBI
 - still unknown above quadratic fluctuations (up to special cases)
- EFT for twisted fields (chiral sector)
 - it is partially known for orbifolds (still some open questions)
 - it is not known for other compactifications

Conclusions:

- The EFT of the bulk sector is sufficiently known for several compactifications (Orbifolds, twisted tori, coset spaces....)
- EFT for untwisted sector (vector sector)
 - mainly known up to quadratic fluctuations on orbifolds,
 - calculable in many other compactifications from DBI
 - still unknown above quadratic fluctuations (up to special cases)
- EFT for twisted fields (chiral sector)
 - it is partially known for orbifolds (still some open questions)
 - it is not known for other compactifications
- Soft terms are partially known (rely on the info above) for special cases
 - deserve a more careful study

Conclusions:

- The EFT of the bulk sector is sufficiently known for several compactifications (Orbifolds, twisted tori, coset spaces....)
- EFT for untwisted sector (vector sector)
 - mainly known up to quadratic fluctuations on orbifolds,
 - calculable in many other compactifications from DBI
 - still unknown above quadratic fluctuations (up to special cases)
- EFT for twisted fields (chiral sector)
 - it is partially known for orbifolds (still some open questions)
 - it is not known for other compactifications
- Soft terms are partially known (rely on the info above) for special cases
 - deserve a more careful study

Next step – Start putting everything together....