

Kaluza-Klein Induced Supersymmetry Breaking for Braneworlds in Type IIB Supergravity

Jean-Luc Lehners[†], Paul Smyth[‡] and K.S. Stelle[§]

[†] *DAMTP, CMS, Wilberforce Road, CB3 0WA, Cambridge, UK*

[‡] *Institute for Theoretical Physics, K.U. Leuven,
Celestijnenlaan 200D, B-3001 Leuven, Belgium*

[§] *The Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College London,
Prince Consort Road, London SW7 2AZ, UK*

Abstract

We consider \mathbb{Z}_2 -symmetric braneworlds arising from 5-sphere compactifications with 5-form flux in type IIB supergravity. This Kaluza-Klein reduction produces a $D = 5$ theory which supports $\frac{1}{2}$ -supersymmetric \mathbb{Z}_2 -symmetric domain-wall solutions. However, upon lifting such solutions back to $D = 10$, one finds that supersymmetry is broken by 5-sphere Kaluza-Klein effects. This happens owing to the action on the Killing spinor of the $\mathbb{Z}_2 \subset SO(1,9)$ symmetry, which requires an orientation-reversing transformation in the 5-sphere directions together with the flip of the orbifold coordinate. We study the consequences of this supersymmetry breaking for the masses of fermion fluctuation modes about the brane background and find a natural two-scale hierarchy: some bulk modes have characteristic masses of order $\frac{1}{L_5}$ but other modes more closely associated to the branes have an additional factor $\exp(-\frac{\rho}{L_5})$, where L_5 is the AdS_5 length parameter and ρ is the orbifold size.

E-mail: j.lehners@damtp.cam.ac.uk, paul.smyth@fys.kuleuven.be, k.stelle@imperial.ac.uk.

[†] Research supported by PPARC.

[‡] Research supported in part by the Belgian Federal Office for Scientific, Technical and Cultural Affairs through the “Interuniversity Attraction Poles Programme – Belgian Science Policy” P5/27 and by the EU under contract MRTN-CT-2004-005104.

[§] Research supported in part by the EU under MRTN contract MRTN-CT-2004-005104 and by PPARC under rolling grant PP/D0744X/1.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Dimensional Reduction of Type IIB Supergravity on a 5-Sphere	4
3	The Supersymmetric Theory in 5 Dimensions	7
4	Oxidising back to 10 Dimensions - Breaking Supersymmetry	8
5	Fermionic Modes and the Scale of Supersymmetry Breaking	11
5.1	The Gravitino	12
5.2	Other Modes	14
6	Discussion	16
	Appendix: Linearised Domain Wall Perturbation Modes	18
	Examples of Bosonic Modes	21
	Fermionic Partners	24

1 Introduction

Perhaps the most dramatic way in which string theory has modified our picture of spacetime so far is by the inclusion of extra dimensions and branes. Branes have the remarkable property that they can localise Yang-Mills gauge theories on them - this then leads to the braneworld picture, in which our universe is a brane embedded in a higher-dimensional bulk spacetime. The Randall-Sundrum models in particular, in which the bulk is 5-dimensional anti-de Sitter space, have been studied extensively due to their simplicity and because they provide a possible solution to the hierarchy problem [1], while also being able to localise gravitons on a brane [2]. However, in order to take these models seriously, one would like to see them emerge as a solution of the supergravity approximations to string theory. Such a solution was presented in [3, 4] in the context of 5-sphere compactifications of type IIB supergravity [5] (it is clear from the fact that type IIB supergravity admits an $AdS_5 \times S^5$ vacuum that this is a natural place to start). In the present paper we will study this embedding of the Randall-Sundrum geometry, and the more general family of \mathbb{Z}_2 -symmetric braneworlds of which it is a limiting case, in more detail from a 10-dimensional point of view.

One of the main outstanding questions is how supersymmetry may be broken in braneworld models, and this is the question that we address here. We find that supersymmetry is in fact automatically broken at the location of the \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetric branes in all the present family of solutions, owing to the geometry of the internal 5-sphere. The reason is the following: due to its chirality (in particular the self-duality of the 5-form), type IIB supergravity actually admits an $SO(1, 9)$ rather than an $O(1, 9)$ symmetry. This means that when one is forming a \mathbb{Z}_2 -symmetric braneworld, one needs to mod out by a \mathbb{Z}_2 that is an element of $SO(1, 9)$. Thus, if we flip the orbifold coordinate $y \rightarrow -y$, we must accompany this transformation with a reversal of the orientation of the internal 5-sphere. However, because of the curvature of the 5-sphere, the Killing spinor equation is sensitive to the sphere's orientation, and this makes the Killing spinor discontinuous at the location of the branes. Consequently, supersymmetry is broken on the branes, while being preserved in the bulk - a phenomenologically attractive setup.

As we will show, this breaking of supersymmetry is not manifest from the 5-dimensional point of view, but can only be appreciated by including the internal manifold in the analysis. This is why we call this type of supersymmetry breaking *Kaluza-Klein induced*. It is also clear from the general argument just presented that this mechanism will apply to all \mathbb{Z}_2 -symmetric braneworlds in type IIB supergravity, as long as the internal manifold is curved.

In order to illustrate the effects of this supersymmetry breaking, we study a class of bosonic zero modes as well as their fermionic superpartners. We perform our analysis in linearised perturbation theory about the braneworld background, taking into account the corresponding brane actions. The modes that we focus on are those which are factorisable with regard to their worldvolume and orbifold dependencies, and which have a profile in the orbifold direction such that, were supersymmetry not broken, they would appear as massless fields from the 4-dimensional point of view. Here, however, the fermionic modes acquire a mass, while the bosons (which are insensitive to the orientation of the 5-sphere) remain massless. The mass of the fermions depends crucially on their y -dependence. In the most common case, the resulting mass is naturally of the order of the compactification scale L_5 , which may be taken to be near the GUT or Planck scale. However, if the fermionic modes are such that they have a y -dependence that evolves contrary to the bulk warping, then their mass is suppressed by an additional bulk warp factor. In this way one obtains two scales of supersymmetry breaking, and thus both heavy and light fermions, by the same mechanism.

2 Dimensional Reduction of Type IIB Supergravity on a 5-Sphere

Type IIB supergravity can be given a formulation in terms of a Lagrangian, supplemented by the self-duality condition on the 5-form field. Keeping only the graviton, the gravitino and the 5-form, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{IIB} = \sqrt{-\hat{g}} \left[\hat{R} - \frac{1}{4 \cdot 5!} \hat{F}_{[5]}^2 - \hat{\psi}_M \hat{\Gamma}^{MNP} \hat{\mathcal{D}}_N \hat{\psi}_P \right] \quad (2.1)$$

$$\hat{F}_{[5]} = * \hat{F}_{[5]} . \quad (2.2)$$

Here $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_M$ denotes the supercovariant derivative which also appears in the supersymmetry transformation of the gravitino:

$$\delta \hat{\psi}_M = \hat{\mathcal{D}}_M \hat{\epsilon} = \left[\hat{\nabla}_M + \frac{i}{16 \cdot 5!} \hat{F}_{NPQRS} \hat{\Gamma}^{NPQRS} \hat{\Gamma}_M \right] \hat{\epsilon} , \quad (2.3)$$

where $\hat{\epsilon}$ is the (chiral) spinorial parameter of the transformation. We will dimensionally reduce this theory on a 5-sphere S^5 . In this section we are only interested in the dimensional reduction of the bulk. We will find a domain wall solution to this theory, and in the subsequent sections we will be concerned with the modifications required by the presence of these lower-dimensional hypersurfaces. The Γ -matrices are decomposed according to

$$\hat{\Gamma}^m = \Gamma^m \otimes 1 \otimes \sigma_1 \quad (2.4)$$

$$\hat{\Gamma}^a = 1 \otimes \tilde{\Gamma}^a \otimes \sigma_2 , \quad (2.5)$$

where the σ_i are the Pauli matrices. With this decomposition, the ten-dimensional chirality operator is given by $\hat{\Gamma}^{11} = 1 \otimes 1 \otimes \sigma_3$. The 10-dimensional fields and the supersymmetry parameter $\hat{\epsilon}$ are then dimensionally reduced according to [5, 6]

$$ds_{10}^2 = e^{2\alpha\phi} ds_5^2 + e^{2\beta\phi} ds^2(S^5) \quad (2.6)$$

$$\hat{F}_{[5]} = 4m e^{8\alpha\phi} \epsilon_{[5]} + 4m \epsilon_{[5]}(S^5) \quad (2.7)$$

$$\hat{\psi}_m = e^{\frac{1}{2}\alpha\phi} (\psi_m + \alpha \Gamma_m \lambda) \otimes \eta \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.8)$$

$$\hat{\psi}_a = \frac{3\alpha i}{5} e^{-\frac{11}{10}\alpha\phi} \lambda \otimes \tilde{\Gamma}_a \eta \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.9)$$

$$\hat{\epsilon} = e^{\frac{1}{2}\alpha\phi} \epsilon \otimes \eta \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.10)$$

where ϕ is the breathing mode of the sphere, *i.e.* ϕ determines the volume of the sphere; η denotes a Killing spinor on the 5-sphere. Note that we have chosen $\hat{\psi}$ and $\hat{\epsilon}$ such that they are of positive (10-dimensional) chirality. In order to obtain canonically normalised fields in 5 dimensions, one also has to impose

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\frac{5}{3}}, \quad \beta = -\frac{3}{5}\alpha. \quad (2.11)$$

The resulting 5-dimensional bulk theory is the maximal (32-supercharge) $SO(6)$ gauged supergravity [7]. The 32-supercharge structure is generated by four complex, independent 4-component $D = 5$ spinors arising from a 5-sphere Killing spinor in the $\mathbf{4}$ of $SU(4) \sim SO(6)$. The \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry we are interested in acts in the same way on each of these spinors, and so for our purposes it shall suffice to consider just one of them. Thus, from now on we shall focus on a single gravitino and adopt a minimal $D = 5$ (8 real spinor component) notation (see [6, 8]). The graviton supermultiplet contains the gravitino ψ_m and a vector. The breathing mode scalar ϕ belongs to a massive vector multiplet [6, 7] which also contains a spinor λ . Since the two vectors play no role in what follows, we will set them to zero henceforth. For the reduced set of fields that we are considering, the 5-dimensional theory is described by the Lagrangian¹

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_5 = \sqrt{-g} \left[R - \frac{1}{2}(\partial\phi)^2 - V(\phi) - \bar{\psi}_m \Gamma^{mnp} \mathcal{D}_n \psi_p - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\lambda} \Gamma^m \nabla_m \lambda - \left(\frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial \phi^2} - \frac{W}{16} \right) \bar{\lambda} \lambda \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{4} \phi_{,m} (\bar{\psi}_m \Gamma^n \Gamma^m \lambda + \bar{\lambda} \Gamma^m \Gamma^n \psi_m) + \frac{1}{8} \frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi} (\bar{\psi}_m \Gamma^m \lambda - \bar{\lambda} \Gamma^m \psi_m) \right], \quad (2.12) \end{aligned}$$

where $V(\phi)$ has the double exponential form [5]

$$V = 8m^2 e^{8\alpha\phi} - R_5 e^{\frac{16}{5}\alpha\phi} \quad (2.13)$$

and R_5 represents the Ricci scalar of S^5 . The 5-dimensional supercovariant derivative \mathcal{D}_n is defined in terms of the superpotential W by

$$\mathcal{D}_n = \nabla_n + \frac{1}{24} W \Gamma_n, \quad (2.14)$$

where

$$W(\phi) = -8me^{4\alpha\phi} + 20\sqrt{\frac{R_5}{20}} e^{\frac{8}{5}\alpha\phi}. \quad (2.15)$$

¹We are not considering higher-order terms in the fermions here. See also [9] and [10] for a discussion of the fermionic equations of motion.

As usual, the potential V can be written in terms of the superpotential W according to

$$V = \frac{1}{8} \left[W_{,\phi}^2 - \frac{2}{3} W^2 \right]. \quad (2.16)$$

The fermionic supersymmetry transformations are

$$\delta\psi_m = \mathcal{D}_m \epsilon = \left(\nabla_m + \frac{1}{24} \Gamma_m W \right) \epsilon \quad (2.17)$$

$$\delta\lambda = \left(\frac{1}{2} \Gamma^m \nabla_m \phi - \frac{1}{4} W_{,\phi} \right) \epsilon. \quad (2.18)$$

This 5-dimensional theory admits a two-parameter domain wall solution given by [5]

$$\begin{aligned} ds_5^2 &= e^{2A} dx^\mu dx^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu} + e^{2B} dy^2, \\ e^{-\frac{7}{\sqrt{15}}\phi} &= H = -k|y| + c, \quad B = -4A, \quad k > 0, \\ e^{4A} &= b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

where $3kb_1 = -28m$ and $3kb_2 = +28\sqrt{\frac{R_5}{20}}$ and c is a constant. The linear harmonic function $H(y)$ is taken to admit a second (trough-like) kink at $y = \rho$; we thus have a positive-tension brane at $y = 0$ and a negative-tension one at $y = \rho$ in a Hořava-Witten-like setup with the two branes located at the endpoints of an S^1/\mathbb{Z}_2 orbifold. In the limit where the scalar ϕ sits at the minimum of its potential, the bulk becomes AdS_5 and the double domain wall configuration then represents the embedding of the Randall-Sundrum model [1] in type IIB supergravity [3, 4].

To display the Randall-Sundrum AdS_5 patch geometry explicitly [3], consider the positive-tension brane at $y = 0$ and take $H(0) = c > H_* = e^{-\frac{7}{\sqrt{15}}\phi_*} + \beta k$, $\beta > 0$, where ϕ_* is the constant scalar field in the $AdS_5 \times S^5$ solution (satisfying $e^{\frac{24\alpha}{5}\phi_*} = \frac{R_5}{20m^2}$). Then take the limit $k \rightarrow 0_+$ and change coordinates using $\beta - |y| = \beta e^{-\frac{4}{L_5}|z|}$ to obtain the Poincaré-coordinate form of the AdS_5 metric

$$ds^2 = e^{-\frac{2|z|}{L_5}} dx^\mu dx^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu} + dz^2, \quad (2.20)$$

where

$$L_5 = m^{-1} \left(\frac{20m^2}{R_5} \right)^{\frac{5}{6}} \quad (2.21)$$

is the length parameter of the AdS_5 space.

3 The Supersymmetric Theory in 5 Dimensions

In order to fully account for the kinks in the double domain wall solution presented above, we have to extend the 5-dimensional theory so as to allow the coupling constants m and $\sqrt{R_5}$ to change sign when crossing a domain wall. This approach was developed by Bergshoeff, Kallosh and Van Proeyen (BKvP) [11], and it allows for a complete characterisation of $D = 5$ supersymmetry, even at the singular brane hypersurfaces. The easiest way to implement this procedure is to let

$$m \rightarrow m \theta(y) \quad \sqrt{R_5} \rightarrow \sqrt{R_5} \theta(y) , \quad (3.1)$$

with

$$\theta(y) = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{for } 0 \leq y < \pi \\ -1 & \text{for } -\pi \leq y < 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

and we impose the upstairs-picture identification $y \sim y + 2\pi$. Note that, consequently, the superpotential should be redefined as

$$W(y, \phi) = -\theta(y) \left[8me^{4\alpha\phi} - 20\sqrt{\frac{R_5}{20}}e^{\frac{8}{5}\alpha\phi} \right] . \quad (3.3)$$

Then, the potential of the 5-dimensional theory can still be expressed by the relation (2.16) and the 5-dimensional supersymmetry variations of the gravitino and dilatino remain unchanged, except for the above new definition of the superpotential². The Killing spinor equations, *i.e.* the vanishing of the above supersymmetry transformations, are then solved exactly by

$$\epsilon = (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{1/8} \epsilon_+ , \quad (3.4)$$

subject to the projection condition $\Gamma_{\underline{y}}\epsilon_+ = \epsilon_+$, where ϵ_+ is a constant spinor. Thus, in the extended theory with couplings changing sign across domain wall hypersurfaces, the 5-dimensional braneworld solutions preserve half of the supersymmetries.

For completeness, and in order to contrast with the 10-dimensional calculation that will follow shortly, we write out the integrability condition for the Killing spinor equations. Since the Killing spinors have already been found, the integrability condition is necessarily satisfied; however, it can be instructive to see the details of how this goes:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \Gamma^{pmn}[\mathcal{D}_m, \mathcal{D}_n]\epsilon \\ &= \Gamma^n[G_n{}^p - \frac{1}{24}g_n{}^p W^2 + \frac{1}{4}g_n{}^p \Gamma^m W_{,m}]\epsilon - \frac{1}{4}W^{,p}\epsilon . \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

²The supersymmetric bosonic theory, including brane actions, has been presented previously in [12].

For $p = y$, using $\Gamma_{\underline{y}}\epsilon = \epsilon$, the last two terms cancel, which is in agreement with the fact that there are no singular contributions to G_{yy} . For $p = \mu$ the last term vanishes, while the singular terms arising from $W_{,y}$, where the y derivative acts on the $\theta(y)$ inside W , are cancelled by the singular contributions to the Einstein tensor

$$G_{\mu\nu} = \text{Regular} - g_{\mu\nu}\delta(y)\frac{1}{\sqrt{g_{yy}}}\left(\frac{3kb_1}{7}H^{-5/7} + \frac{15kb_2}{14}H^{-2/7}\right). \quad (3.6)$$

4 Oxidising back to 10 Dimensions - Breaking Supersymmetry

The 5-dimensional domain wall solution can be oxidised back to 10 dimensions, resulting in the metric [5]

$$ds_{10}^2 = (b_1H^{-3/7} + b_2)^{1/2}dx^\mu dx^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu} + (b_1H^{13/28} + b_2H^{25/28})^{-2}dy^2 + H^{3/14}ds^2(S^5). \quad (4.1)$$

Now we can check again the integrability condition resulting from the Killing spinor equation in 10 dimensions, remembering that we now have $\hat{F}_{[5]} \propto m\theta(y)$ rather than just $\hat{F}_{[5]} \propto m$. We get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \hat{\Gamma}_P^{MN}[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_M, \hat{\mathcal{D}}_N]\epsilon \\ &= \hat{\Gamma}^N \left[\hat{G}_{PN} - \frac{1}{96}\hat{F}_{PN}^2 \right] \epsilon - \frac{2i}{4!}\hat{\Gamma}^{QRS}\hat{\nabla}^N \hat{F}_{PQRSN}\epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

The bulk terms are easily seen to satisfy this equation. The singular terms in the Einstein tensor in 10 dimensions are [13]:

$$\hat{G}_{\mu\nu} = \text{Regular} - \hat{g}_{\mu\nu}\delta(y)\frac{1}{\sqrt{g_{yy}}}\left(\frac{3kb_1}{7}H^{-15/28} + \frac{15kb_2}{14}H^{-3/28}\right) \quad (4.3)$$

$$\hat{G}_{yy} = \text{Regular} + 0 \quad (4.4)$$

$$\hat{G}_{ab} = \text{Regular} - \hat{g}_{ab}\delta(y)\frac{1}{\sqrt{g_{yy}}}\frac{6kb_2}{7}H^{-3/28}. \quad (4.5)$$

For $P = y$, the last term in the integrability condition (4.2) vanishes, in agreement with the absence of singular terms in \hat{G}_{yy} . For $P = \mu$, the last term in the integrability condition adequately cancels the b_1 contribution to the singular terms in $\hat{G}_{\mu\nu}$; however, there is nothing there to cancel the singular terms proportional to b_2 (and likewise for the b_2 terms when $P = a$). We are thus led to conclude that the oxidised domain wall solution does not preserve any supersymmetry! It is however supersymmetric away from the branes in the

bulk spacetime. Note that this result also means that the extension of the ordinary 5-dimensional supergravity theory along the lines advocated by BKvP cannot be obtained by dimensionally reducing type IIB supergravity.

What, however, is the problem with supersymmetry more concretely? It is enlightening to study the Killing spinor equations directly; they are given by the condition

$$0 = \delta\hat{\psi}_M = \left[\hat{\nabla}_M + \frac{i}{16 \cdot 5!} \hat{F}_{NPQRS} \hat{\Gamma}^{NPQRS} \hat{\Gamma}_M \right] \hat{\epsilon}. \quad (4.6)$$

Let us write out this calculation in detail: the Γ -matrices are dimensionally reduced to 4+1+5 dimensions according to

$$\hat{\Gamma}_\mu = (b_1 H^{-3/7} + b_2)^{1/4} \gamma_\mu \otimes 1 \otimes \sigma_1 \quad (4.7)$$

$$\hat{\Gamma}_y = (b_1 H^{13/28} + b_2 H^{25/28})^{-1} \gamma_y \otimes 1 \otimes \sigma_1 \quad (4.8)$$

$$\hat{\Gamma}_a = H^{3/28} \otimes \tilde{\Gamma}_a \otimes \sigma_2 \quad (4.9)$$

where there is no y -dependence left in $\gamma_\mu, \gamma_y, \tilde{\Gamma}_a$ (thus γ_μ are the 4-dimensional Γ -matrices with indices raised and lowered with $\eta_{\mu\nu}$, γ_y is the 4-dimensional chirality matrix, and $\tilde{\Gamma}_a$ are the Γ -matrices on the internal 5-sphere).

We are now in a position to analyse the Killing spinor equations, using $\hat{F}_{[5]} \cdot \hat{\Gamma} = -4i5!m\theta(y)H^{-15/28}[1 \otimes 1 \otimes (\sigma_1 + i\sigma_2)]$:

$$0 = \delta\hat{\psi}_\mu = \hat{\nabla}_\mu + \frac{3kb_1}{112} \theta(y) H^{-15/28} (b_1 H^{-3/7} + b_2)^{1/4} [\gamma_\mu \otimes 1 \otimes (1 + \sigma_3)] \hat{\epsilon} \quad (4.10)$$

$$0 = \delta\hat{\psi}_y = \hat{\nabla}_y + \frac{3kb_1}{112} \theta(y) H^{-15/28} (b_1 H^{13/28} + b_2 H^{25/28})^{-1} [\gamma_y \otimes 1 \otimes (1 + \sigma_3)] \hat{\epsilon} \quad (4.11)$$

$$0 = \delta\hat{\psi}_a = \hat{\nabla}_a + \frac{3kb_1}{112} \theta(y) H^{-15/28} H^{3/28} [1 \otimes \tilde{\Gamma}_a \otimes i(\sigma_3 + 1)] \hat{\epsilon}, \quad (4.12)$$

where the spin covariant derivatives are given by

$$\hat{\nabla}_\mu = \partial_\mu - \frac{3kb_1}{56} \theta(y) H^{-15/28} (b_1 H^{-3/7} + b_2)^{1/4} \gamma_\mu \gamma_y \otimes 1 \otimes 1 \quad (4.13)$$

$$\hat{\nabla}_y = \partial_y \quad (4.14)$$

$$\hat{\nabla}_a = \nabla_a - \frac{3ik}{56} \theta(y) (b_1 H^{-3/7} + b_2) \gamma_y \otimes \tilde{\Gamma}_a \otimes \sigma_3. \quad (4.15)$$

From the expression for the oxidised metric (4.1), we expect the Killing spinor to be of the form

$$\hat{\epsilon} = (b_1 H^{-3/7} + b_2)^{1/8} \epsilon_+ \otimes \eta \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4.16)$$

with $\gamma_y \epsilon_+ = \epsilon_+$. This Ansatz indeed solves the first two Killing spinor equations (4.10) and (4.11), but (4.12) reduces to

$$\nabla_a \eta = \theta(y) \frac{i}{2} \sqrt{\frac{R_5}{20}} \tilde{\Gamma}_a \eta . \quad (4.17)$$

Using the explicitly known expressions for Killing spinors on spheres [14], we can write down a solution to the above equation as

$$\eta = \eta(y, \theta_a) = e^{\frac{i}{2} \theta(y) \theta_5 \frac{3kb_2}{28} \tilde{\Gamma}_5} \left(\prod_{j=1}^4 e^{-\frac{1}{2} \theta_j \left(\frac{3kb_2}{28}\right)^2 \tilde{\Gamma}_{j,j+1}} \right) \eta_0 , \quad (4.18)$$

where η_0 is a constant spinor and θ_a with $a, b, \dots = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ are the angular coordinates on the 5-sphere. Thus, we see that we are forced to introduce y -dependence into the spherical part of the candidate Killing spinor in the form of a θ -function. This makes the angular dependence in the spherical part discontinuous and in this way supersymmetry is necessarily broken, because a Killing spinor must be continuous. Note that the change in sign in the angular dependence corresponds to a reversal of orientation of the 5-sphere. Thus we obtain the geometrical picture that the orientation of the 5-sphere changes as we cross a brane. This is consistent with the fact that the type IIB theory admits an $SO(1, 9)$ symmetry rather than an $O(1, 9)$ symmetry (this is because the self-duality of the 5-form must be preserved). Indeed, the \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry by which we are modding out at the location of the branes, must be contained within $SO(1, 9)$, and therefore the flip $y \rightarrow -y$ must be accompanied by a reversal of orientation of the five-sphere.³

We should note that there also exists a supersymmetric limit, namely $b_2 \rightarrow 0$. In this limit the troublesome term proportional to $\theta(y)$ disappears in the Killing spinor equation (4.17) of the sphere, and in fact that condition reduces simply to the condition of having a covariantly constant spinor. However, this limit is really the decompactification limit in which the sphere becomes larger and larger, as well as flatter and flatter, and one ends up with an ordinary 3-brane in 10 dimensions.

Another aspect of the decompactification/supersymmetry-restoring limit $b_2 \rightarrow 0$ is the structure of the metric warp factor. In Poincaré coordinates (where the transverse term is simply dz^2), the $D = 5$ metric in the $b_2 \rightarrow 0$ limit has a power-law warp factor:

$$ds_5^2 = \left(1 - \frac{5k}{7|z|} \right)^{\frac{1}{5}} dx^\mu dx^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu} + dz^2 . \quad (4.19)$$

³Note that for odd-dimensional spheres such an orientation-reversing map admits at least two fixed points. From (4.18) one sees that our choice of \mathbb{Z}_2 has a fixed point set on the locus $\theta_5 = 0$, *i.e.* at the equator of the 5-sphere. Note also that the antipodal map is orientation-preserving for odd-dimensional spheres, so this cannot be used as the S^5 part of the \mathbb{Z}_2 action.

This should be compared with the structure of the metric in the Randall-Sundrum limit [3] $k \rightarrow 0$, where the Poincaré-coordinate metric (2.20) is composed of patches of anti-de Sitter space with an exponential warp factor:

$$ds_5^2 = e^{\frac{-2|z|}{L_5}} dx^\mu dx^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu} + dz^2 . \quad (4.20)$$

The exponential warp factor underlies many of the proposed physical applications of the Randall-Sundrum schemes, be it the effective concentration of gravity near the $D = 4$ positive tension brane in RSII, or possible applications to the hierarchy problem arising from exponential differences in coupling constants on opposing RSI braneworlds. These features disappear with the power-law warp factor (4.19) which arises as supersymmetry is restored in the $b_2 \rightarrow 0$ limit.

Let us take stock at this point of what we have learned: we have a double domain wall solution in 5 dimensions, which upon oxidation to 10 dimensions on a 5-sphere leads to another double domain wall solution. This solution has the particular property that it is supersymmetric everywhere in the bulk spacetime, but breaks supersymmetry completely at the locations of the domain walls. This immediately raises two questions:

1. Since supersymmetry is broken on the domain wall, what is the mass scale of this breaking, as seen from the viewpoint of a 4-dimensional observer on the domain wall? We will treat this question in the section 5.

2. Is this solution stable? Indeed one might speculate that since this non-supersymmetric solution is surrounded by a supersymmetric spacetime, it might be kept stable by the surrounding bulk (in the fully supersymmetric case solutions of this type are known to be stable despite the presence of a negative-tension brane [12]). A detailed calculation of the stability properties of this solution would be very interesting. We leave it for future work.

5 Fermionic Modes and the Scale of Supersymmetry Breaking

If supersymmetry were not broken, we would expect the theory on the 4-dimensional branes to be an ungauged supergravity theory with half the number of supercharges as compared with the bulk theory [8]. Then, there would be fermionic modes which, from the 4-dimensional point of view, would be massless. In this section, we will present modes of this type, which we obtain as superpartners of linearised massless bosonic perturbations (see the Appendix for a detailed derivation, following the linearised supersymmetry procedure of

[15]). However, since supersymmetry is actually broken, we know that the fermionic excitations will pick up mass terms (while the bosons remain massless at this level). The easiest way to derive these mass terms is by dimensionally reducing the 10-dimensional Rarita-Schwinger action for these modes in order to find their 4-dimensional effective actions. The mass terms then arise when a y -derivative hits the discontinuity in the spherical spinor part $\eta(y, \theta_a)$ at the location of the branes⁴.

5.1 The Gravitino

As shown in the Appendix, one of the would-be massless perturbation modes of the braneworld geometry that we are considering is a worldvolume gravitino given by

$$\psi_\mu = (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{1/8} \tilde{\psi}_\mu(x) \quad (5.1)$$

$$\psi_y = 0 \quad (5.2)$$

$$\lambda = 0. \quad (5.3)$$

This mode can be lifted to 10 dimensions, where it reads

$$\hat{\psi}_\mu = (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{1/8} \tilde{\psi}_\mu \otimes \eta(y, \theta_a) \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (5.4)$$

$$\hat{\psi}_y = 0 \quad (5.5)$$

$$\hat{\psi}_a = 0. \quad (5.6)$$

The discontinuous spherical part of the gravitino should really be seen as an approximation; one would expect the gravitino to be continuous but interpolating between two different bulk profiles on either side of a brane. For our purposes, though, this approximation is accurate enough. The action for the gravitino can then be dimensionally reduced as follows⁵

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{10d} \sqrt{-\hat{g}} i \hat{\psi}_M \hat{\Gamma}^{MNP} \hat{\mathcal{D}}_N \hat{\psi}_P &= \int_{4d} \sqrt{-g} \int_0^\rho H^{-5/14} dy \int d\mathcal{O}_4 \int_0^\pi \sin^4(\theta_5) d\theta_5 \times \\ &\left(i (b_1 H^{-3/7} + b_2)^{-1/2} \tilde{\psi}_\mu \gamma^{\mu\nu\tau} \nabla_\nu \tilde{\psi}_\tau \otimes \bar{\eta} \eta \otimes [1 \ 0] \sigma_2 \sigma_1 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right. \\ &\left. - i (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{3/4} H^{5/14} i \frac{3kb_2}{28} \theta_5 (\delta(y) - \delta(y - \rho)) \tilde{\psi}_\mu \gamma^{\mu\nu} \gamma_y \tilde{\psi}_\nu \otimes \bar{\eta} \tilde{\gamma}_5 \eta \otimes [1 \ 0] \sigma_2 \sigma_1 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \right). \end{aligned}$$

⁴The setup described here thus provides a concrete example of the general framework for brane supersymmetry breaking of Bagger and Belyaev [16, 17].

⁵We define $\bar{\psi} = \psi^\dagger A$. The 10-dimensional intertwiner $A_{1,9}$ is dimensionally reduced according to $A_{1,9} = A_{1,4} \otimes A_{0,5} \otimes \sigma_2$. Our conventions are as in Sohnius [18].

Now, if we assume that $\tilde{\gamma}_5 \eta = \pm \eta$ (thus the $SO(6)$ symmetry of the five-sphere also gets broken at the location of the branes), and further use the fact that $\gamma_y \psi_\mu = \psi_\mu$ as well as the integrals

$$\int_0^\pi \sin^4(\theta_5) d\theta_5 = \frac{3\pi}{8} \quad (5.7)$$

$$\int_0^\pi \sin^4(\theta_5) \theta_5 d\theta_5 = \frac{3\pi^2}{16} , \quad (5.8)$$

then we get the 4-dimensional effective action for $\tilde{\psi}_\mu$:

$$S_{\tilde{\psi}} = \int_{4d} \sqrt{-g} [i \tilde{\psi}_\mu \gamma^{\mu\nu\tau} \nabla_\nu \tilde{\psi}_\tau \pm m_{(3/2)} \tilde{\psi}_\mu \gamma^{\mu\nu} \tilde{\psi}_\nu] , \quad (5.9)$$

where

$$m_{(3/2)} = \frac{3\pi k b_2}{56} \frac{[(b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{3/4}]_0^\rho}{\int_0^\rho dy (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{-1/2}} . \quad (5.10)$$

Thus, as expected, we find an ungauged supergravity in 4 dimensions, broken by the above mass term.

The expression for the mass term is a bit unwieldy, which is why it is instructive to write out the Randall-Sundrum limit of the above formulae. The 10-dimensional metric is then given by

$$ds_{10,RS}^2 = e^{-\frac{2|y|}{L_5}} \eta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu + dy^2 + L_5^2 d\mathcal{O}_5^2 , \quad (5.11)$$

where L_5 is the length parameter of both AdS_5 and S^5 as given in (2.21). The gravitino reduces to

$$\psi_\mu = e^{-\frac{|y|}{2L_5}} \tilde{\psi}_\mu(x) \quad (5.12)$$

$$\psi_y = 0 \quad (5.13)$$

$$\lambda = 0 , \quad (5.14)$$

which in 10 dimensions is expressed as

$$\hat{\psi}_\mu = e^{-\frac{|y|}{2L_5}} \tilde{\psi}_\mu(x) \otimes \eta(y, \theta_a) \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (5.15)$$

$$\hat{\psi}_y = 0 \quad (5.16)$$

$$\hat{\psi}_a = 0 . \quad (5.17)$$

In the Randall-Sundrum limit the discontinuous spherical spinor η is given by

$$\eta(y, \theta_a) = e^{\frac{i}{2}\theta(y)\theta_5 \tilde{\gamma}_5} \left(\prod_{j=1}^4 e^{-\frac{1}{2}\theta_j \tilde{\gamma}_{j,j+1}} \right) \eta_0 . \quad (5.18)$$

The calculation of the effective action proceeds along the same lines as above, and this time we find

$$S_{\tilde{\psi},RS} = \int_{4d} \sqrt{-g} [i \tilde{\psi}_\mu \gamma^{\mu\nu\tau} \nabla_\nu \tilde{\psi}_\tau \pm m_{(3/2,RS)} \tilde{\psi}_\mu \gamma^{\mu\nu} \tilde{\psi}_\nu] , \quad (5.19)$$

where

$$m_{(3/2,RS)} = \frac{\pi}{L_5} \frac{(1 - e^{-\frac{3\rho}{L_5}})}{(1 - e^{-\frac{2\rho}{L_5}})} . \quad (5.20)$$

We can see that $m_{(3/2,RS)}$ varies between $\frac{3\pi}{2L_5}$ (as $\frac{\rho}{L_5} \rightarrow 0$) and $\frac{\pi}{L_5}$ (as $\frac{\rho}{L_5} \rightarrow \infty$), and is therefore always close to the L_5^{-1} scale of S^5 -compactification, which one may take to be close to the GUT or Planck scales. Thus, from the 4-dimensional point of view, the gravitino is heavy.

5.2 Other Modes

Let us now turn our attention to the other fermionic modes discussed in the Appendix. These modes have a different y -profile, but nevertheless, in a supersymmetry-preserving context, they would appear to be massless from a 4-dimensional perspective. First of all, we have the fermionic partner of the Goldstone boson associated with the y -translation symmetry that is broken by the brane. This mode is given by

$$\psi_\mu = -\frac{k}{8H} \gamma_\mu^\rho s_{,\rho} (2b_1 H^{2/7} + 5b_2 H^{5/7}) (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{-3/8} \epsilon_+ \quad (5.21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_y &= -\frac{k}{4H} (2b_1 H^{2/7} + 5b_2 H^{5/7}) (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{-13/8} \gamma^\rho s_{,\rho} \epsilon_+ \\ &\quad + \frac{k^2 \theta(y)}{112H^2} (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{-11/8} [24b_1^2 H^{4/7} + 60b_1 b_2 H + 45b_2^2 H^{10/7}] s(x) \epsilon_+ \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

$$\lambda = \frac{\sqrt{15}k}{2H} (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{3/8} \gamma^\rho s_{,\rho} \epsilon_+ , \quad (5.23)$$

which in the Randall-Sundrum limit simplifies to

$$\psi_\mu = \frac{1}{4} e^{\frac{3|y|}{2L_5}} \gamma_\mu^\rho s_{,\rho} \epsilon_+ \quad (5.24)$$

$$\psi_y = \frac{1}{2} e^{\frac{5|y|}{2L_5}} \gamma^\rho s_{,\rho} \epsilon_+ - \frac{\theta(y)}{2L_5} e^{\frac{3|y|}{2L_5}} s(x) \epsilon_+ \quad (5.25)$$

$$\lambda = 0 . \quad (5.26)$$

If we now let

$$\gamma_\mu^\rho s_{,\rho} \epsilon_+ \equiv \gamma_\mu \chi \quad (5.27)$$

and take this as the definition of the mode $\chi(x)$, then we can derive the effective 4-dimensional action for χ :

$$S_{\chi,RS} = \int_{4d} \sqrt{-g} [i \bar{\chi} \gamma^\mu \nabla_\mu \chi \pm m_{(\chi,RS)} \bar{\chi} \chi] , \quad (5.28)$$

where the mass term is given by

$$m_{(\chi,RS)} = \frac{6\pi}{5L_5} \frac{(e^{\frac{\rho}{L_5}} - 1)}{(e^{\frac{2\rho}{L_5}} - 1)} . \quad (5.29)$$

We can see that this time $m_{(\chi,RS)}$ varies between $\frac{3\pi}{5L_5}$ (as $\frac{\rho}{L_5} \rightarrow 0$) and $e^{-\frac{\rho}{L_5}} \frac{6\pi}{5L_5}$ (as $\frac{\rho}{L_5} \rightarrow \infty$). Thus we get an exponential mass suppression when $\frac{\rho}{L_5}$ is large. It seems reasonable on phenomenological grounds to assume that ρ might be an order of magnitude larger than L_5 [1], and therefore χ can be a *light* fermion from the 4-dimensional effective theory point of view. This is because χ has a profile along the orbifold direction y which evolves in the opposite way as compared to the bulk warp factor, and therefore χ is localised mainly near the negative-tension brane at $y = \rho$.

The last mode that we will consider is the fermionic partner to the third bosonic mode presented in the Appendix. This bosonic mode has the particular property that in the Randall-Sundrum limit it reduces to a pure scalar field perturbation, the metric remaining unchanged. In general, its fermionic partner is given by

$$\psi_\mu = -\frac{k}{8H^{10/7}} \gamma_\mu^\rho s_{,\rho} (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{17/8} \epsilon_+ \quad (5.30)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_y &= -\frac{k}{4H^{10/7}} (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{7/8} \gamma^\rho s_{,\rho} \epsilon_+ \\ &+ \frac{3k^2 b_1 \theta(y)}{28H^{15/7}} (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{9/8} s(x) \epsilon_+ \end{aligned} \quad (5.31)$$

$$\lambda = \frac{\sqrt{15}k}{8H} (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{-1/8} [2b_1^2 H^{1/7} + b_1 b_2 H^{4/7} - b_2^2 H] \gamma^\rho s_{,\rho} \epsilon_+ , \quad (5.32)$$

which in the Randall-Sundrum limit reduces to a pure dilatino perturbation:

$$\psi_\mu = 0 \quad (5.33)$$

$$\psi_y = 0 \quad (5.34)$$

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{7|y|}{2L_5}} \gamma^\rho s_{,\rho} \epsilon_+ . \quad (5.35)$$

It is again helpful to define $\tilde{\lambda}$ by

$$\frac{1}{2} \gamma^\rho s_{,\rho} \epsilon_+ \equiv \tilde{\lambda} , \quad (5.36)$$

in terms of which the effective action is given by

$$S_{\tilde{\lambda},RS} = \int_{4d} \sqrt{-g} [i \tilde{\lambda} \gamma^\mu \nabla_\mu \tilde{\lambda} \pm m_{(\tilde{\lambda},RS)} \tilde{\lambda} \tilde{\lambda}] , \quad (5.37)$$

with the mass term

$$m_{(\tilde{\lambda},RS)} = \frac{5\pi}{L_5} \frac{(1 - e^{-\frac{11\rho}{L_5}})}{(1 - e^{-\frac{10\rho}{L_5}})} . \quad (5.38)$$

$m_{(\tilde{\lambda},RS)}$ thus varies between $\frac{11\pi}{2L_5}$ (as $\frac{\rho}{L_5} \rightarrow 0$) and $\frac{5\pi}{L_5}$ (as $\frac{\rho}{L_5} \rightarrow \infty$), and so $\tilde{\lambda}$ is another example of a heavy fermion.

6 Discussion

We have seen that \mathbb{Z}_2 -symmetric braneworlds in type IIB supergravity necessarily break supersymmetry owing to the chiral nature of the theory and the curvature of the internal manifold. Supersymmetry is broken only at the location of the branes, and this can also be traced back to the presence of source terms that are proportional to the square root of the curvature $\sqrt{R_5} \sim b_2$ of the internal 5-sphere.

We have shown how fermionic modes, which would have been massless in a supersymmetric context, thus acquire masses. Moreover, depending on their profiles along the orbifold direction y , the effective 4-dimensional fermionic modes can appear either heavy or light. The heavy modes are those whose profiles along the orbifold direction evolve similarly to the metric warp factor, *i.e.* they are mainly associated to the bulk geometry, and they tend to have a mass comparable to the L_5^{-1} compactification scale. The light fermions, by contrast, are those modes which have profiles that evolve in the opposite way as compared to the metric warp factor and are more specifically associated to a brane. In the Randall-Sundrum limit, for example, the light fermions are those that have a y -dependence proportional to

$$e^{\frac{c|y|}{L_5}} \quad \text{with} \quad c > 1 . \quad (6.1)$$

This ensures that these modes are mostly localised near the negative-tension brane at $y = \rho$. For large values of $\frac{\rho}{L_5}$, their masses are suppressed by a factor of $e^{-\frac{\rho}{L_5}}$, which is certainly attractive for phenomenological reasons. We recall the discussion of section 4 on the exponential warp factor in the general solutions of Bremer *et al.* [5], and particularly in the Randall-Sundrum limit [8], as compared to the power-law warp factor occurring in the supersymmetry-restoring $b_2 \rightarrow 0$ limit. This exponential warp factor is also seen to be

at the root of the orbifold exponential hierarchy of masses for fermionic fluctuations that we have found.

For simplicity, we have focused in this paper on the minimal $D = 5$ supersymmetric structure with 8 supercharges. The full S^5 -reduced theory, of course, has an extended 32-supercharge supersymmetry organized into a $\mathbf{4}$ of $SU(4) \sim SO(6)$. In the bulk spacetime of the brane solutions we consider, each of these 4 $D = 5$ spinor supercharges splits up into two $D = 4$ spinors of opposite $\Gamma_{\underline{y}}$ chirality, one of which becomes spontaneously broken, with a corresponding massive gravitino in the usual fashion. The remaining $\Gamma_{\underline{y}}$ chirality gives the erstwhile unbroken supersymmetry, which however is broken by the \mathbb{Z}_2 structure of the brane system as we have shown. Choosing a specific \mathbb{Z}_2 action in the 5-sphere directions necessitates picking an equator of the 5-sphere, which becomes the fixed-point surface for the chosen \mathbb{Z}_2 . This breaks the surviving automorphism symmetry down from $SU(4) \sim SO(6)$ to $USp(4) \sim SO(5)$. However, the $\mathbf{4}$ representation remains irreducible with respect to $USp(4)$, so all 4 of the $D = 5$ theory's supersymmetries get broken by the \mathbb{Z}_2 action in the same way. Accordingly, the full story is just a four-fold replication of the minimal $D = 5$ story that we have presented.

Let us conclude with a few remarks about the nature of the supersymmetry-breaking sources. The Randall-Sundrum scenario has been associated to a combination of D3 branes and 7-branes [19]. There is a possible association of the b_2 term in our construction to 7-branes, as noted already in [13]. Note that the singular terms in G_{ab} are a factor of $\frac{4}{5}$ smaller than the ones in $G_{\mu\nu}$, suggesting that the upper 4-dimensional parts of the worldvolumes of the 7-branes might be averaged over the 5 spherical dimensions. This association is supported furthermore by the fact that the y -dependence of the singular terms in (4.3)-(4.5) would be consistent with the presence of two transverse directions instead of just one, *e.g.* the y -direction and one of the spherical directions. For the b_2 part of the solution, we explicitly have

$$G_{\mu\nu} \sim G_{ab} \sim b_2 \delta(y) (b_1 H^{5/14} + b_2 H^{11/14}) = b_2 \frac{\delta(y)}{\sqrt{g_{\text{transverse}}}} , \quad (6.2)$$

where (with no summation implied on a)

$$g_{\text{transverse}} = g_{yy} g_{aa} . \quad (6.3)$$

Note also that the \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry chosen in our construction has a fixed-point set on the locus $y = 0, \theta_5 = 0$, *i.e.* an 8-dimensional surface which could be associated to a 7-sphere worldvolume.

Going against the 7-brane interpretation of the b_2 part of the solution, however, is the fact that the IIB axionic scalar that would support a standard 7-brane is zero in the background considered here. Of course it could be that the precise smearing of 7-branes needed has to be such that the axion charge averages to zero.⁶

A final question is that of stability. Even if the background solution we consider can be associated to a smeared set of 7-branes taken together with the D3 brane, the breaking of supersymmetry that we have found raises the question of whether this construction has tachyonic instabilities. But since the bulk spacetime remains perfectly supersymmetric away from the branes, one is led to speculate that the bulk supersymmetry might be enough to stabilise the boundary branes where supersymmetry is broken, perhaps in a manner similar to the “fake supergravity” framework of Ref. [21].

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Jussi Kalkkinen for collaboration during the early stages of this work. They would also like to acknowledge useful and stimulating discussions with Ben Allanach, Kevin Costello, Mirjam Cvetič, Ruth Durrer, Joel Fine, Gary Gibbons, Ulf Gran, Neil Lambert, Jim Liu and Antoine Van Proeyen. K.S.S. would like to thank the TH Unit at CERN and the Galileo Galilei Institute for Theoretical Physics for hospitality and would like to thank the INFN for partial support during the completion of this work.

Appendix: Linearised Domain Wall Perturbation Modes

In this Appendix, we explicitly derive the form of linearised bosonic perturbations about domain wall geometries, which, from the 4-dimensional point of view, are massless. We also show how one can then determine the fermionic superpartners of these modes. It should be noted that the method employed here is not the same as determining the moduli of a domain wall solution and then promoting those moduli to spacetime-dependent fields (see for example [22] for an exposition of the latter method). Here, we allow the various modes to have different y -dependent profiles along the orbifold direction, chosen such that

⁶Another puzzle with such an interpretation arises in the analogous case of 11-dimensional supergravity compactified on a 7-sphere. In that case, the analogous source would have to be made out of 8-branes, but no 8-brane solutions are known in D=11 supergravity, although they do exist in massive type IIA supergravity [20].

the modes appear massless from the brane worldvolume perspective (when supersymmetry is not broken). The existence of this type of zero mode is really a particular feature of braneworld Kaluza-Klein reductions. Consider theories of the form

$$S = \int_{5d} \sqrt{-g} \left[R - \frac{1}{2} (\partial\phi)^2 - V(\phi) \right] - \int_{4d, y=0} \sqrt{-g} W(\phi) , \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where, in this Appendix, we are considering a single positive tension domain wall residing at $y = 0$. In static gauge, the equations of motion are

$$G_{mn} = \frac{1}{2} \phi_{,m} \phi_{,n} - \frac{1}{4} g_{mn} \phi_{,p} \phi^{,p} - \frac{1}{2} g_{mn} V(\phi) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta(y)}{\sqrt{g_{yy}}} \delta_m^\mu \delta_n^\nu g_{\mu\nu} W(\phi) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\square\phi = \frac{\partial V}{\partial\phi} + \frac{\delta(y)}{\sqrt{g_{yy}}} \frac{\partial W}{\partial\phi} . \quad (\text{A.3})$$

We write the fields as

$$g_{mn} = g_{mn}^{(0)} + h_{mn} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$\phi = \phi^{(0)} + \phi^{(1)} , \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where $^{(0)}$ quantities correspond to the unperturbed domain wall solutions. We then have

$$g^{mn} = g^{mn(0)} - h^{mn} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$\Gamma_{mn}^{(1)p} = \frac{1}{2} g^{(0)pl} (h_{lm;n} + h_{ln;m} - h_{mn;l}) . \quad (\text{A.7})$$

When we perturb the geometry, we choose coordinates such that the domain wall always remains at $y = 0$ [23]. The linearised equations of motion then are

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} (h^p{}_{m;n;p} + h^p{}_{n;m;p} - h_{mn;p}{}^p - h_{;mn}) - \frac{1}{2} g_{mn}^{(0)} (h^{pl}{}_{;lp} - h_{;p}{}^p) \\ & - \frac{1}{2} h_{mn} R^{(0)} + \frac{1}{2} g_{mn}^{(0)} h^{pl} R_{pl}^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2} \phi_{,m}^{(0)} \phi_{,n}^{(1)} + \frac{1}{2} \phi_{,n}^{(0)} \phi_{,m}^{(1)} - \frac{1}{4} h_{mn} \phi^{(0),p} \phi_{,p}^{(0)} \\ & + \frac{1}{4} g_{mn}^{(0)} h^{pl} \phi_{,p}^{(0)} \phi_{,l}^{(0)} - \frac{1}{2} g_{mn}^{(0)} \phi^{(0),p} \phi_{,p}^{(1)} - \frac{1}{2} h_{mn} V - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial V}{\partial\phi} \phi^{(1)} \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta(y)}{\sqrt{g_{yy}^{(0)}}} \delta_m^\mu \delta_n^\nu \left(h_{\mu\nu} W + g_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} \frac{\partial W}{\partial\phi} \phi^{(1)} - \frac{1}{2} h^y{}_y g_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} W \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \square^{(0)} \phi^{(1)} - h^{mn} \phi_{;mn}^{(0)} - h^{mn}{}_{;n} \phi_{;m}^{(0)} + \frac{1}{2} h^{,m} \phi_{,m}^{(0)} \\ & = \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial\phi^2} \phi^{(1)} + \frac{\delta(y)}{\sqrt{g_{yy}^{(0)}}} \left(\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial\phi^2} \phi^{(1)} - \frac{1}{2} h^y{}_y \frac{\partial W}{\partial\phi} \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

For a background metric of the form

$$ds^2 = e^{2A(y)} \eta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu + e^{2B(y)} dy^2, \quad (\text{A.10})$$

the non-zero connections are

$$\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{(0)y} = -A_{,y} \eta_{\mu\nu} e^{2A-2B} \quad \Gamma_{\mu y}^{(0)\rho} = \delta_{\mu}^{\rho} A_{,y} \quad \Gamma_{yy}^{(0)y} = B_{,y}, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

and thus we have

$$R_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} = \eta_{\mu\nu} e^{2A-2B} (-A_{,yy} - 4A_{,y}^2 + A_{,y} B_{,y}) \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$R_{yy}^{(0)} = -4A_{,yy} - 4A_{,y}^2 + 4A_{,y} B_{,y} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

$$G_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} = \eta_{\mu\nu} e^{2A-2B} (3A_{,yy} + 6A_{,y}^2 - 3A_{,y} B_{,y}) \quad (\text{A.14})$$

$$G_{yy}^{(0)} = 6A_{,y}^2 \quad (\text{A.15})$$

$$\square^{(0)} \phi^{(0)} = e^{-2B} (\phi_{,yy}^{(0)} + 4\phi_{,y}^{(0)} A_{,y} - \phi_{,y}^{(0)} B_{,y}). \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Taking into account that we are imposing a \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry at the location of the domain wall, we can see that the junction conditions (*i.e.* the matching conditions for the singular pieces in the Einstein equations) at the location of the domain wall become

$$12A_{,y} = -e^B W \Big|_{y=0} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

$$2\phi_{,y}^{(0)} = e^B \frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi} \Big|_{y=0}. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Note that the yy Einstein equation is given by

$$6A_{,y}^2 = \frac{1}{4} \phi_{,y}^{(0)2} - \frac{1}{2} e^{2B} V. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

This doesn't involve second derivatives in y , which is consistent with the fact that there are no singular source terms in that direction. If we evaluate this equation at the location of the domain wall, we can substitute in the junction conditions derived above, to find

$$V = \frac{1}{8} \left(\left(\frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 - \frac{2}{3} W^2 \right) \Big|_{y=0}. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

This is of course the relation between the superpotential W and the potential V in supersymmetric theories. In a supersymmetric context, the junction conditions above are actually the Bogomol'nyi equations, and they are then valid throughout the bulk. Furthermore, this shows that the domain wall couples to the bulk via the superpotential.

Looking at the terms containing two y derivatives in the linearised equations of motion, one can write down the linearised junction conditions in this background (making use of the 0th order junction conditions):

$$(h_{\mu\nu} - \eta_{\mu\nu}\eta^{\rho\sigma}h_{\rho\sigma})_{,y} = -\frac{1}{6}e^B W(h_{\mu\nu} - \eta_{\mu\nu}\eta^{\rho\sigma}h_{\rho\sigma}) + \frac{1}{4}e^{2A-B}\eta_{\mu\nu}W h_{yy} + \frac{1}{2}e^{2A+B}\eta_{\mu\nu}\frac{\partial W}{\partial\phi}\phi^{(1)} \Big|_{y=0} \quad (\text{A.21})$$

$$\phi_{,y}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2}e^B\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial\phi^2}\phi^{(1)} + \frac{1}{4}e^{-B}\frac{\partial W}{\partial\phi}h_{yy} \Big|_{y=0} . \quad (\text{A.22})$$

There is also a junction condition associated with the μy linearised Einstein equation, and it reads

$$h_{\mu y} = 0 \Big|_{y=0} . \quad (\text{A.23})$$

This condition was already implied by the imposition of the \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry at $y = 0$ under which $h_{\mu y}$ is odd.

Examples of Bosonic Modes

We will now give explicit expressions for these modes in the Bremer *et al.* case [5] as well as the Randall-Sundrum limit [3, 4].

In the Bremer *et al.* case [5], the background solution is given by

$$e^{-\frac{7}{\sqrt{15}}\phi} = H = -k|y| + c , \quad e^{4A} = b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7} , \quad B = -4A . \quad (\text{A.24})$$

We then have the following expressions for the superpotential and the potential:

$$W = \frac{3k}{7}(2b_1 H^{-5/7} + 5b_2 H^{-2/7})\theta(y) \quad (\text{A.25})$$

$$V = \frac{9k^2}{196}(2b_1^2 H^{-10/7} - 5b_2^2 H^{-4/7}) . \quad (\text{A.26})$$

The $\mu \neq \nu$ linearised junction conditions are solved for $h_{\mu\nu} \sim (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{1/2}$, unless $h_{\mu\nu} \propto \eta_{\mu\nu}$. In the first case, this ansatz also solves the other junction conditions and the linearised equations of motion (it should be noted that, although the linearised junction conditions would also allow for h_{yy} and $\phi^{(1)}$ contributions, say proportional to a mode $c(x)$, the $\mu \neq \nu$ linearised Einstein equations would then demand $c_{,\mu\nu} = 0$ and thus we set

$h_{yy} = 0 = \phi^{(1)}$. This mode represents a 4-dimensional worldvolume graviton excitation:

$$h_{\mu\nu} = (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{1/2} \tilde{h}_{\mu\nu}(x) \quad (\text{A.27})$$

$$h_{yy} = 0 \quad (\text{A.28})$$

$$\phi^{(1)} = 0, \quad (\text{A.29})$$

where $\tilde{h}_{\mu\nu}(x)$ obeys the 4-dimensional linearised Einstein equations.

In the second case, our ansatz for the metric perturbations is

$$h_{\mu\nu} = a \eta_{\mu\nu} s(x^\rho) f(y) \quad (\text{A.30})$$

$$h_{yy} = s(x^\rho) j(y). \quad (\text{A.31})$$

Then, looking at the linearised $\mu\nu$ equations for $\mu \neq \nu$ we find

$$a = -\frac{1}{2} \quad (\text{A.32})$$

$$j(y) = (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{-5/2} f(y). \quad (\text{A.33})$$

Note that these conditions also automatically ensure that there are no $s_{;\mu\nu}$ terms present in $G_{\mu\nu}^{(1)}$ for any μ, ν . Next we look at the μy equations, from which we can infer that

$$\phi^{(1)} = \frac{21\theta(y)}{2\sqrt{15}k} s(x^\rho) (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{-1/2} H f_{,y}. \quad (\text{A.34})$$

At this point all μm equations are identically satisfied for all $f(y)$. The linearised yy and ϕ equations demand

$$\square^{(4d)} s(x^\rho) = 0 \quad (\text{A.35})$$

and the additional constraint

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & f_{,yy} [98b_1^2 H^{4/7} + 98b_2^2 H^{10/7} + 196b_1 b_2 H] \\ & + k f_{,y} [154b_1^2 H^{-3/7} + 91b_2^2 H^{3/7} + 245b_1 b_2] \\ & + k^2 f [-10b_1^2 H^{-10/7} - 10b_2^2 H^{-3/7} - 20b_1 b_2 H^{-1}]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.36})$$

This has the following two solutions:

$$f(y) = 2b_1 H^{-5/7} + 5b_2 H^{-2/7} \quad \propto (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})_{,y} \quad (\text{A.37})$$

$$f(y) = (b_1 H^{-2/7} + b_2 H^{1/7})^{5/2}. \quad (\text{A.38})$$

Thus, explicitly, we have the ‘‘Goldstone’’ mode

$$h_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{2} \eta_{\mu\nu} s(x^\rho) (2b_1 H^{-5/7} + 5b_2 H^{-2/7}) k \quad (\text{A.39})$$

$$h_{yy} = s(x^\rho) (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{-5/2} (2b_1 H^{-5/7} + 5b_2 H^{-2/7}) k \quad (\text{A.40})$$

$$\phi^{(1)} = s(x^\rho) \sqrt{15} (b_1 H^{2/7} + b_2 H^{5/7})^{1/2} H^{-1} k \quad (\text{A.41})$$

and a third mode

$$h_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{2}\eta_{\mu\nu}s(x^\rho)(b_1H^{-2/7} + b_2H^{1/7})^{5/2}k \quad (\text{A.42})$$

$$h_{yy} = s(x^\rho)H^{-10/7}k \quad (\text{A.43})$$

$$\phi^{(1)} = \frac{\sqrt{15}}{4}s(x^\rho)(b_1H^{2/7} + b_2H^{5/7})(2b_1H^{-8/7} - b_2H^{-5/7})k. \quad (\text{A.44})$$

It is then straightforward to verify that the latter two modes also satisfy the linearised junction conditions. The Goldstone mode takes its name from the fact that, in the bulk, its general form can be obtained by a y -dependent diffeomorphism with parameter

$$\xi_\mu = 0 \quad (\text{A.45})$$

$$\xi_y = 7(b_1H^{2/7} + b_2H^{5/7})^{-3/2}s, \quad (\text{A.46})$$

where

$$h_{mn} = \xi_{m;n} + \xi_{n;m} \quad (\text{A.47})$$

$$\phi^{(1)} = \xi^m \phi_{,m}. \quad (\text{A.48})$$

If we then promote s to a function $s(x)$, this is not a diffeomorphism anymore, and we obtain the above non-trivial mode. In this sense, this mode is a Goldstone mode corresponding to the translational symmetry that is broken by the domain wall (see [24] for a general treatment of these types of modes).

For the Randall-Sundrum model [1, 3], we have the following expressions for the superpotential and the potential:

$$W = \frac{12}{L_5}\theta(y) \quad \frac{\partial W}{\partial\phi} = 0 \quad \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial\phi^2} = -\frac{8}{L_5}\theta(y) \quad (\text{A.49})$$

$$V = -\frac{12}{L_5^2} \quad \frac{\partial V}{\partial\phi} = 0 \quad \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial\phi^2} = \frac{32}{L_5^2}, \quad (\text{A.50})$$

where L_5 is the AdS_5 radius of curvature⁷. The background metric is given by

$$ds_5^2 = e^{-\frac{2|y|}{L_5}}\eta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu + dy^2. \quad (\text{A.51})$$

The perturbation modes can simply be determined by taking the appropriate limit of the Bremer *et al.* modes [3]. This gives the graviton excitation

$$h_{\mu\nu} = e^{-\frac{2|y|}{L_5}}\tilde{h}_{\mu\nu}(x) \quad (\text{A.52})$$

$$h_{yy} = 0 \quad (\text{A.53})$$

$$\phi^{(1)} = 0, \quad (\text{A.54})$$

⁷Incidentally, the second derivative of the potential indicates that the breathing mode ϕ has mass squared equal to $32/L_5^2$, in agreement with [7].

where $\tilde{h}_{\mu\nu}(x)$ obeys the 4-dimensional linearised Einstein equations. The Goldstone mode is now given by

$$h_{\mu\nu} = s(x)\eta_{\mu\nu} \quad (\text{A.55})$$

$$h_{yy} = -2e^{\frac{2|y|}{L_5}} s(x) \quad (\text{A.56})$$

$$\phi^{(1)} = 0, \quad (\text{A.57})$$

with

$$\square^{(4d)} s(x) = 0. \quad (\text{A.58})$$

This is the ‘‘radion’’ mode of Ref. [23] (see also [25] for a heterotic M-theory equivalent), and it can be obtained by starting with a diffeomorphism with parameter $\xi_y = -\frac{L_5}{2} e^{\frac{2|y|}{L_5}} s$. The third mode reduces to a pure scalar field perturbation:

$$h_{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad (\text{A.59})$$

$$h_{yy} = 0 \quad (\text{A.60})$$

$$\phi^{(1)} = e^{-\frac{4|y|}{L_5}} s(x), \quad (\text{A.61})$$

again with $\square^{(4d)} s(x) = 0$.

Fermionic Partners

The fermionic superpartners of the bosonic modes that we have just derived can be obtained by using the linearised form of the supersymmetry transformations (2.17,2.18) [15]. In this way it is guaranteed that the resulting fermions are also solutions of the linearised equations of motion. In general, the fermions are given by

$$\psi_m = (\mathcal{D})_m^{(1)} \epsilon \quad (\text{A.62})$$

$$\lambda = \left[-\frac{1}{4} h^y{}_y \gamma^y \phi_{,y} + \frac{1}{2} \gamma^\mu \phi_{,\mu}^{(1)} + \frac{1}{2} \gamma^y \phi_{,y}^{(1)} - \frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial \phi^2} \phi^{(1)} \right] \epsilon, \quad (\text{A.63})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{D})_\mu^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{4} h_{\mu\nu,\rho} \gamma^{\nu\rho} + \frac{1}{4} (h_{\mu\nu,y} - A_{,y} h_{\mu\nu} - g_{\mu\nu} A_{,y} h^y{}_y) \gamma^{\nu y} \\ &\quad + \frac{W}{48} h_\mu{}^\nu \gamma_\nu + \frac{1}{24} \frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi} \phi^{(1)} \gamma_\mu \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.64})$$

$$(\mathcal{D})_y^{(1)} = -\frac{1}{4} h_{yy,\mu} \gamma^{\mu y} + \frac{W}{48} h_y{}^y \gamma_y + \frac{1}{24} \frac{\partial W}{\partial \phi} \phi^{(1)} \gamma_y. \quad (\text{A.65})$$

In the case of a graviton perturbation

$$h_{\mu\nu} = e^{2A}\tilde{h}_{\mu\nu}(x) \quad h_{yy} = 0 = \phi^{(1)} , \quad (\text{A.66})$$

the fermionic superpartner is the gravitino given by

$$\psi_\mu = \frac{1}{4}h_{\mu\nu,\rho}\gamma^{\nu\rho}e^{\frac{A}{2}}\epsilon_+ = \frac{1}{4}\tilde{h}_{\mu\nu,\rho}\gamma^{\nu\rho}e^{\frac{A}{2}}\epsilon_+ \equiv e^{\frac{A}{2}}\tilde{\psi}_\mu(x) \quad (\text{A.67})$$

$$\psi_y = 0 \quad (\text{A.68})$$

$$\lambda = 0 . \quad (\text{A.69})$$

Consequently the chirality of the gravitino is given by

$$\gamma_y\tilde{\psi}_\mu = +\tilde{\psi}_\mu . \quad (\text{A.70})$$

Our remaining bosonic modes are of the form

$$h_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{2}\eta_{\mu\nu}s(x)f(y) \quad (\text{A.71})$$

$$h_{yy} = s(x)e^{2B-2A}f(y) . \quad (\text{A.72})$$

In this case the linearised junction conditions (A.21) and (A.22) simplify the resulting expressions for the fermionic partners, and we end up with

$$\psi_\mu = -\frac{1}{8}e^{-\frac{3}{2}A}f\gamma_\mu{}^\rho s_{,\rho}\epsilon_+ \quad (\text{A.73})$$

$$\psi_y = -\frac{1}{4}e^{-\frac{5}{2}A+B}f\gamma^\mu s_{,\mu}\epsilon_+ + \frac{W}{48}e^{-\frac{3}{2}A+B}fs(x)\epsilon_+ + \frac{1}{24}\frac{\partial W}{\partial\phi}\phi^{(1)}e^{\frac{A}{2}+B}\epsilon_+ \quad (\text{A.74})$$

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2}\gamma^\mu\phi_{,\mu}^{(1)}e^{-\frac{A}{2}}\epsilon_+ . \quad (\text{A.75})$$

Thus we can see that we have the following chiralities

$$\gamma_y\psi_\mu = +\psi_\mu \quad (\text{A.76})$$

$$\gamma_y\lambda = -\lambda , \quad (\text{A.77})$$

whereas ψ_y contains terms of both chiralities.

As a consistency check, it is straightforward to verify that all the above fermionic modes satisfy their equations of motion:

$$\gamma^{mnp}\mathcal{D}_n\psi_p - \frac{1}{8}\frac{\partial W}{\partial\phi}\gamma^m\lambda - \frac{1}{4}(g^{mn} - \gamma^{mn})\phi_{,n}\lambda = 0 \quad (\text{A.78})$$

$$\gamma^m\nabla_m\lambda + \left(\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial\phi^2} - \frac{W}{8}\right)\lambda - \frac{1}{2}\gamma^m\gamma^n\phi_{,n}\psi_m + \frac{1}{4}\frac{\partial W}{\partial\phi}\gamma^m\psi_m = 0 . \quad (\text{A.79})$$

References

- [1] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3370 (1999), [hep-ph/9905221](#).
- [2] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4690 (1999), [hep-th/9906064](#).
- [3] M. J. Duff, J. T. Liu, and K. S. Stelle, J. Math. Phys. **42**, 3027 (2001), [hep-th/0007120](#).
- [4] M. Cvetič, H. Lu, and C. N. Pope, Class. Quant. Grav. **17**, 4867 (2000), [hep-th/0001002](#).
- [5] M. S. Bremer, M. J. Duff, H. Lu, C. N. Pope, and K. S. Stelle, Nucl. Phys. **B543**, 321 (1999), [hep-th/9807051](#).
- [6] J. T. Liu and H. Sati, Nucl. Phys. **B605**, 116 (2001), [hep-th/0009184](#).
- [7] H. J. Kim, L. J. Romans, and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. **D32**, 389 (1985).
- [8] M. J. Duff, J. T. Liu, and W. A. Sabra, Nucl. Phys. **B605**, 234 (2001), [hep-th/0009212](#).
- [9] G. W. Gibbons and N. D. Lambert, Phys. Lett. **B488**, 90 (2000), [hep-th/0003197](#).
- [10] F. Brito, M. Cvetič, and S. Yoon, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 064021 (2001), [hep-ph/0105010](#).
- [11] E. Bergshoeff, R. Kallosh, and A. Van Proeyen, JHEP **10**, 033 (2000), [hep-th/0007044](#).
- [12] J. L. Lehnert, P. Smyth, and K. S. Stelle, Class. Quant. Grav. **22**, 2589 (2005), [hep-th/0501212](#).
- [13] M. Cvetič, M. J. Duff, J. T. Liu, H. Lu, C. N. Pope, and K. S. Stelle, Nucl. Phys. **B605**, 141 (2001), [hep-th/0011167](#).
- [14] H. Lu, C. N. Pope, and J. Rahmfeld, J. Math. Phys. **40**, 4518 (1999), [hep-th/9805151](#).
- [15] M. Cvetič and N. D. Lambert, Phys. Lett. **B540**, 301 (2002), [hep-th/0205247](#).
- [16] J. Bagger and D. V. Belyaev, Phys. Rev. **D67**, 025004 (2003), [hep-th/0206024](#).
- [17] J. A. Bagger and D. V. Belyaev, Phys. Rev. **D72**, 065007 (2005), [hep-th/0406126](#).
- [18] M. F. Sohnius, Phys. Rept. **128**, 39 (1985).
- [19] C. S. Chan, P. L. Paul, and H. L. Verlinde, Nucl. Phys. **B581**, 156 (2000), [hep-th/0003236](#).

- [20] L. J. Romans, Phys. Lett. **B169**, 374 (1986).
- [21] D. Z. Freedman, C. Nunez, M. Schnabl, and K. Skenderis, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 104027 (2004), [hep-th/0312055](#).
- [22] J.-L. Lehners, P. McFadden, and N. Turok (2006), [hep-th/0612026](#).
- [23] C. Charmousis, R. Gregory, and V. A. Rubakov, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 067505 (2000), [hep-th/9912160](#).
- [24] T. Adawi, M. Cederwall, U. Gran, B. E. W. Nilsson, and B. Razaznejad, JHEP **02**, 001 (1999), [hep-th/9811145](#).
- [25] J.-L. Lehners and K. S. Stelle, Nucl. Phys. **B661**, 273 (2003), [hep-th/0210228](#).