Flux-induced D-terms in KKLT-like model

Andreas Braun

March 12, 2007

Institut für theoretische Physik
Universität Heidelberg

Type IIB

- After the complex structure is fixed at a high scale by three-form fluxes G_3, the remaining Kähler modulus is stablized by non-perturbative effects (gaugino condensate,...).

Type IIB

- After the complex structure is fixed at a high scale by three-form fluxes G_3, the remaining Kähler modulus is stablized by non-perturbative effects (gaugino condensate,...).
- Its dynamics are described by

$$K = -3\log(T + \overline{T}) \qquad W = W_0 + Ae^{-aT}$$

Type IIB

- After the complex structure is fixed at a high scale by three-form fluxes G_3, the remaining Kähler modulus is stablized by non-perturbative effects (gaugino condensate,...).
- Its dynamics are described by

$$K = -3\log(T + \overline{T}) \qquad W = W_0 + Ae^{-aT}$$

- This fixes T at parametrically large volume in a SUSY AdS vacuum.

Type IIB

- After the complex structure is fixed at a high scale by three-form fluxes G_3, the remaining Kähler modulus is stablized by non-perturbative effects (gaugino condensate,...).
- Its dynamics are described by

$$K = -3\log(T + \overline{T}) \qquad W = W_0 + Ae^{-aT}$$

- This fixes T at parametrically large volume in a SUSY AdS vacuum.
- By the introduction of $\overline{D3}$-branes SUSY is broken and the minimum of the potential is lifted to a positive value.

Type IIB

- After the complex structure is fixed at a high scale by three-form fluxes G_3, the remaining Kähler modulus is stablized by non-perturbative effects (gaugino condensate,...).
- Its dynamics are described by

$$K = -3\log(T + \overline{T}) \qquad W = W_0 + Ae^{-aT}$$

- This fixes T at parametrically large volume in a SUSY AdS vacuum.
- By the introduction of $\overline{D3}$-branes SUSY is broken and the minimum of the potential is lifted to a positive value.

Uplifting Proposals

It is desirable to decribe SUSY breaking and the uplift as dynamical, i.e. have a correction to the potential understandable in terms of $N = 1$ SUSY.

- There has been interest in using corrections to the Kähler potential to produce dS vacua [Parameswaran,Westphal]

Uplifting Proposals

It is desirable to decribe SUSY breaking and the uplift as dynamical, i.e. have a correction to the potential understandable in terms of $N = 1$ SUSY.

- There has been interest in using corrections to the Kähler potential to produce dS vacua [Parameswaran,Westphal]
- It was proposed [Burgess, Kallosh, Quevedo], to use 2-form flux on the world volume of $D7$-branes.
  "D-term uplift"
  - D-term potential is of the right form: $\frac{f^2}{(T+\overline{T})^3}$.
  - $D7$-branes are already part of the underlying flux compactification.

Uplifting Proposals

It is desirable to decribe SUSY breaking and the uplift as dynamical, i.e. have a correction to the potential understandable in terms of $N = 1$ SUSY.

- There has been interest in using corrections to the Kähler potential to produce dS vacua [Parameswaran,Westphal]
- It was proposed [Burgess, Kallosh, Quevedo], to use 2-form flux on the world volume of $D7$-branes.
  "D-term uplift"
  - D-term potential is of the right form: $\frac{f^2}{(T+\overline{T})^3}$.
  - $D7$-branes are already part of the underlying flux compactification.

The D-term uplift proposal faces two serious flaws. [Villadoro and Zwirner,...]
Both are connected to the fact that D-terms arise in the presence of gauge symmetries in supersymmetric models.

F-flatness implies D-flatness:

- With the use of $G = K + \ln(W^2)$, $G_T = 0$ holds in the SUSY vacuum.

The D-term uplift proposal faces two serious flaws. [Villadoro and Zwirner,...] Both are connected to the fact that D-terms arise in the presence of gauge symmetries in supersymmetric models.

F-flatness implies D-flatness:

- With the use of $G = K + \ln(W^2)$, $G_T = 0$ holds in the SUSY vacuum.
- As $D = iG_T X^T$ is the general solution to the Killing equation, this implies the vanishing of the D-term for the same field configuration.

The D-term uplift proposal faces two serious flaws. [Villadoro and Zwirner,...]
Both are connected to the fact that D-terms arise in the presence of gauge symmetries in supersymmetric models.

F-flatness implies D-flatness:

- With the use of $G = K + \ln(W^2)$, $G_T = 0$ holds in the SUSY vacuum.
- As $D = iG_T X^T$ is the general solution to the Killing equation, this implies the vanishing of the D-term for the same field configuration.
- Thus it does not alter the value of the potential at the minimum and does not lead to SUSY breaking.

The D-term uplift proposal faces two serious flaws. [Villadoro and Zwirner,...] Both are connected to the fact that D-terms arise in the presence of gauge symmetries in supersymmetric models.

F-flatness implies D-flatness:

- With the use of $G = K + \ln(W^2)$, $G_T = 0$ holds in the SUSY vacuum.
- As $D = iG_T X^T$ is the general solution to the Killing equation, this implies the vanishing of the D-term for the same field configuration.
- Thus it does not alter the value of the potential at the minimum and does not lead to SUSY breaking.

Gauge invariance:

- The D-term arises from the gauging of T with $X^T = if$. This is clearly not compatible with with the Superpotential $W = W_0 + Ae^{-aT}$!
- The clash here occurs acually between all three contributions: without W_0 the superpotential changes by a Kähler transformation $W \to e^H W$.

Gauge invariance:

- The D-term arises from the gauging of T with $X^T = if$. This is clearly not compatible with with the Superpotential $W = W_0 + Ae^{-aT}$!
- The clash here occurs acually between all three contributions: without W_0 the superpotential changes by a Kähler transformation $W \to e^H W$.
- One possible solution: The superpotential is actually gauge-invariant because scalar fields appear in its prefactor and have the right transformation law. [Achucarro et al.; Dudas, Mambrini]

Gauge invariance:

- The D-term arises from the gauging of T with $X^T = if$. This is clearly not compatible with with the Superpotential $W = W_0 + Ae^{-aT}$!
- The clash here occurs acually between all three contributions: without W_0 the superpotential changes by a Kähler transformation $W \to e^H W$.
- One possible solution: The superpotential is actually gauge-invariant because scalar fields appear in its prefactor and have the right transformation law. [Achucarro et al.; Dudas, Mambrini]

6D toy model

It is puzzling why there is an apparent inconsistency between flux and gaugino condensate. [Related work by Kashani-Poor and Tomasiello ; Haack et al.]

- A particular simple model: 6D Supergravity with 2-form flux $F_{56} = f$ compactified on T^2/Z_2.

6D toy model

It is puzzling why there is an apparent inconsistency between flux and gaugino condensate. [Related work by Kashani-Poor and Tomasiello ; Haack et al.]

- A particular simple model: 6D Supergravity with 2-form flux $F_{56} = f$ compactified on T^2/Z_2.
- The bosonic part of the 6D Action reads:

$$-\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_6 - \frac{1}{2}\partial_M\phi\partial^M\phi - \frac{1}{24}e^{2\phi}H_{MNP}H^{MNP} - \frac{1}{4}e^{\phi}F_{MN}F^{MN}.$$

$$H_{MNP} = \partial_M B_{NP} + F_{MN}A_P + \text{cyclic permutations}$$

6D toy model

It is puzzling why there is an apparent inconsistency between flux and gaugino condensate. [Related work by Kashani-Poor and Tomasiello ; Haack et al.]

- A particular simple model: 6D Supergravity with 2-form flux $F_{56} = f$ compactified on T^2/Z_2.
- The bosonic part of the 6D Action reads:

$$-\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_6 - \frac{1}{2}\partial_M\phi\partial^M\phi - \frac{1}{24}e^{2\phi}H_{MNP}H^{MNP} - \frac{1}{4}e^{\phi}F_{MN}F^{MN}.$$

$$H_{MNP} = \partial_M B_{NP} + F_{MN}A_P + \text{cyclic permutations}$$

- For simplicity we neglect matter.

6D toy model

It is puzzling why there is an apparent inconsistency between flux and gaugino condensate. [Related work by Kashani-Poor and Tomasiello ; Haack et al.]

- A particular simple model: 6D Supergravity with 2-form flux $F_{56} = f$ compactified on T^2/Z_2.
- The bosonic part of the 6D Action reads:

$$-\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_6 - \frac{1}{2}\partial_M\phi\partial^M\phi - \frac{1}{24}e^{2\phi}H_{MNP}H^{MNP} - \frac{1}{4}e^{\phi}F_{MN}F^{MN}.$$

$$H_{MNP} = \partial_M B_{NP} + F_{MN}A_P + \text{cyclic permutations}$$

- For simplicity we neglect matter.

4D action

- The 4D model emerging can be described by the Kähler potential

$$K = -\ln(T+\overline{T}) - \ln(S+\overline{S}) - \ln(\tau+\overline{\tau})$$
$$S = \frac{1}{2}(e^{\phi}r^2 + ic), \qquad T = \frac{1}{2}(e^{-\phi}r^2 + ib)$$

and the gauge-kinetic function S

4D action

- The 4D model emerging can be described by the Kähler potential

$$K = -\ln(T+\overline{T}) - \ln(S+\overline{S}) - \ln(\tau+\overline{\tau})$$
$$S = \tfrac{1}{2}(e^{\phi}r^2 + ic), \qquad T = \tfrac{1}{2}(e^{-\phi}r^2 + ib)$$

  and the gauge-kinetic function S
- We verified that the 2-form flux indeed produces a D-term by comparing
  - the scalar potential induced in 4D by the flux

4D action

- The 4D model emerging can be described by the Kähler potential

$$K = -\ln(T+\overline{T}) - \ln(S+\overline{S}) - \ln(\tau+\overline{\tau})$$
$$S = \tfrac{1}{2}(e^{\phi} r^2 + ic), \qquad T = \tfrac{1}{2}(e^{-\phi} r^2 + ib)$$

  and the gauge-kinetic function S
- We verified that the 2-form flux indeed produces a D-term by comparing
  - the scalar potential induced in 4D by the flux
    with
  - the gauging of the field T: $X^T = -if$, that determines the D-term potential via

$$\frac{1}{2(S+\overline{S})}\left(iK_T X^T\right)^2 .$$

4D action

- The 4D model emerging can be described by the Kähler potential

$$K = -\ln(T+\overline{T}) - \ln(S+\overline{S}) - \ln(\tau+\overline{\tau})$$
$$S = \tfrac{1}{2}(e^{\phi}r^2+ic), \qquad T = \tfrac{1}{2}(e^{-\phi}r^2+ib)$$

  and the gauge-kinetic function S
- We verified that the 2-form flux indeed produces a D-term by comparing
  - the scalar potential induced in 4D by the flux
    with
  - the gauging of the field T: $X^T = -if$, that determines the D-term potential via

$$\frac{1}{2(S+\overline{S})}\left(iK_T X^T\right)^2 .$$

- Consider adding a non-abelian gauge-sector:
- in 4D it will also have S as its gauge-kinetic function.

- Consider adding a non-abelian gauge-sector:
- in 4D it will also have S as its gauge-kinetic function.
- The Superpotential describing a gaugino condensate will thus be of the form

$$Ae^{-aS}$$

- Consider adding a non-abelian gauge-sector:
- in 4D it will also have S as its gauge-kinetic function.
- The Superpotential describing a gaugino condensate will thus be of the form

$$Ae^{-aS}$$

$\Rightarrow$ the two effects do not interfere at all in our toy-model, they naturally couple to different degrees of freedom.

- Consider adding a non-abelian gauge-sector:
- in 4D it will also have S as its gauge-kinetic function.
- The Superpotential describing a gaugino condensate will thus be of the form

$$Ae^{-aS}$$

$\Rightarrow$ the two effects do not interfere at all in our toy-model, they naturally couple to different degrees of freedom.

- This is in agreement with Haack et al.
- The general picture is: either the variation of the naive superpotential is canceled by charged matter or the fields entering the superpotential do not transform at all.

- Consider adding a non-abelian gauge-sector:
- in 4D it will also have S as its gauge-kinetic function.
- The Superpotential describing a gaugino condensate will thus be of the form

$$Ae^{-aS}$$

$\Rightarrow$ the two effects do not interfere at all in our toy-model, they naturally couple to different degrees of freedom.
- This is in agreement with Haack et al.
- The general picture is: either the variation of the naive superpotential is canceled by charged matter or the fields entering the superpotential do not transform at all.

Stabilizing the model

- A constant piece of superpotential can be introduced through an R-symmetry twist (well known from 5D).
  - By itself, it does not introduce an F-term potential, because $K_{i\bar{j}}K^i K^{\bar{j}} = 3$.
- S is stabilized by the superpotential and T by the D-term, but the model only has a non-SUSY AdS vacuum.

Stabilizing the model

- A constant piece of superpotential can be introduced through an R-symmetry twist (well known from 5D).
  - By itself, it does not introduce an F-term potential, because $K_{i\bar{j}}K^i K^{\bar{j}} = 3$.
- S is stabilized by the superpotential and T by the D-term, but the model only has a non-SUSY AdS vacuum.
- We also considered adding 6D matter and computed the Casimir energy in the presence of flux.

Stabilizing the model

- A constant piece of superpotential can be introduced through an R-symmetry twist (well known from 5D).
  - By itself, it does not introduce an F-term potential, because $K_{i\bar{j}}K^iK^{\bar{j}} = 3$.
- S is stabilized by the superpotential and T by the D-term, but the model only has a non-SUSY AdS vacuum.
- We also considered adding 6D matter and computed the Casimir energy in the presence of flux.

Conclusions

- The D-term uplift proposal does not work in a straight forward way.
- Our example, starting from a 6D toy model, naturally evades inconsistencies simply because there are two moduli:
  - the shift symmetry of T is gauged by the flux,
  - S appears in the superpotential generated by the gaugino condensate.

Conclusions

- The D-term uplift proposal does not work in a straight forward way.
- Our example, starting from a 6D toy model, naturally evades inconsistencies simply because there are two moduli:
  - the shift symmetry of T is gauged by the flux,
  - S appears in the superpotential generated by the gaugino condensate.