

Mink₄ × S² Solutions of 10 and 11 Dimensional Supergravity

Andrea Legramandi^a and Niall T. Macpherson^b

a: Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Milano–Bicocca,
Piazza della Scienza 3, I-20126 Milano, Italy

and

INFN, sezione di Milano–Bicocca

b: SISSA International School for Advanced Studies
Via Bonomea 265, 34136 Trieste

and

INFN, sezione di Trieste

`nmacpher@sissa.it`, `a.legramandi@campus.unimib.it`

Abstract

We complete the classification of Mink₄ solutions preserving $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry and SU(2) R-symmetry parameterized by a round S^2 factor. We consider eleven-dimensional supergravity and relax the assumptions of earlier works in type II theories. We show that, using chains of dualities, all solutions of this type can be generated from one of 3 master classes: the M5 brane, an SU(2)-structure in M-theory and a conformal Calabi–Yau in type IIB. Along the way we uncover evidence for a new solution generating technique generalising T-s-T, to scenarios with only a single U(1) isometry. Finally, using our results, we recover AdS₅ × S² solutions in M-theory and construct a compact solution with Atiyah–Hitchin singularity.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Mink₄ × S² in M-theory	4
2.1	The Spinor Ansatz	4
2.2	Supersymmetry Conditions from 7 to 5 dimensions	5
2.3	Case A: α = 0, SU(2)-structure	8
2.3.1	Simple Ansatz: Warped SU(2)-holonomy	9
2.3.2	Squashed S ³ Ansatz	10
2.4	Case B: α ≠ 0, The M5-brane	11
3	Classes of Solution in type II with non equal Spinor Norm	12
3.1	Non-equal norm in IIA	13
3.2	Non equal norm in IIB	14
3.3	Relation to the M5-brane	19
4	Master Classes for Mink₄ × S² and Hint of a New Solution Generating Technique	21
4.1	Master Class in Type IIB: Case I in IIB	22
4.2	IIA Reduction of Master Class in M-theory: Case I in IIA	22
4.3	Generating Case II	23
4.3.1	Case II in IIA	24
4.3.2	Case II in IIB	25
4.4	Generating Case III	26
4.4.1	Case III in IIB	26
4.4.2	Case III in IIA	26
5	Examples	28
5.1	N = 2 AdS ₅ × S ² in M-theory	28
5.2	Towards Compact Mink ₄ in M-theory with Fluxes	29
A	Killing Spinors in M-theory	30
B	Mink₄ × S² Killing Spinor Conditions in Type IIB	32
C	Towards Solutions for the General IIA case	34
C.1	Case I	35
C.1.1	∂ _{x₁} \tilde{S} = 0: Localized D4 and smeared D6-NS5 system	36
C.1.2	∂ _{x₂} \tilde{T} = 0: Smeared D4-D6-NS5 system	36
C.2	Case II	36
C.2.1	∂ _{x₁} e ^{-4A} = 0: Localised D4-NS5 smeared D6 system	37

1 Introduction

Some of the most physically relevant supersymmetric solutions of supergravity in diverse dimensions are those exhibiting a warped Minkowski factor. From early on, the main reason for this is that Minkowski vacua of string and M-theory are required to make contact with known particle physics phenomena in four dimensions, where one should arrange for the co-dimensions to be compact. Another reason, which clearly gained considerable traction with the advent of the AdS/CFT correspondence, is that all AdS solutions admit a description in terms of a foliation of Minkowski over a non compact interval - namely the Poincaré patch.

The most simple way to realize a Minkowski vacua from ten or eleven dimensions is to assume that the compact internal space accommodates some holonomy group, specifically $SU(3)$ or G_2 for compactifications of string theory or M-theory down to four dimensions respectively. Such solutions preserve (at least) $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry and have been well studied in the literature [1–5], with a resurgence of the study of G_2 holonomy manifolds happening in recent years [6–9] (see also [10–12] for G_2 arising in a heterotic context). However, this kind of manifolds support neither fluxes nor a warping of the Minkowski directions, so it is reasonable to expect that they represent a rather small region of the space of possible solutions. The inclusion of fluxes usually requires to generalize the notion of holonomy group to structure group (G-structure) [13–16]. It is well known that no compact regular solutions of this type exist [17–19] - indeed a necessary element of such constructions are localized singularities, namely O-planes and their generalizations through string dualities, or lifts to M-theory (e.g. Atiyah–Hitchin singularities). Most progress constructing compact solutions with fluxes has happened by taking another restrictive ansatz, namely assuming the internal space is conformally a holonomy manifold [20–22], allowing one to broadly use the same mathematical tools as before. At this point all $Mink_d$ solutions for $d > 1$ (with the exception of $Mink_2$ in eleven dimensions) have been classified (see [23–27] for eleven dimensions, [28–35] for ten dimensions), however finding solutions beyond the ansatz of warped holonomy has proved challenging - see [37, 38] for success in this direction. The issue appears to be one of tractability, so it would be helpful to have some additional guiding principle.

AdS solutions necessitate the inclusion of fluxes, early examples were also constructed by studying warped holonomy manifolds (albeit now non compact) using the Freund-Rubin ansatz [39]. By now the state of affairs for AdS solutions beyond this class is rather more developed than the Minkowski vacua cases. Many AdS solutions preserving 16 supercharges or more, when they exist, are either completely known (see the cases of AdS_7 [40], AdS_6 [41] in IIA/M-theory $AdS_5 \times S^2$ [42] in IIB), or known locally up to solving comparatively simple partial differential equations (see the cases of AdS_6 [43, 46] and AdS_4 [46] in IIB and $AdS_5 \times S^2$ [45, 47]). The exceptions are $AdS_{2/3}$ (see [49–51]

for certain ansatz¹), AdS₄ in IIA and AdS₅ with the requisite R-symmetry not realized by a round S^2 - but these will not be our focus here. Many cases with less supersymmetry are also well studied, in particular, with the recent addition of [51], all AdS_{*d*} solutions with $d > 2$ and at least minimal supersymmetry have been classified (see [23, 27, 29, 51, 53, 54, 57] and the AdS_{6,7} classifications above) - broadly speaking these classes have been more successfully used to find solutions beyond restrictive ansatz than their Minkowski counter-parts. The AdS/CFT obviously motivated these classifications, but in addition to the extra impetus this provided, these classifications benefit from additional symmetry with respect to the Minkowski cases. One issue however, is most classifications for AdS, while quite detailed, assume global AdS factors from the start, so are not particularly useful for studying certain non conformal behaviors such as RG flows. For this reason it would be useful to embed the AdS classes into a more general set up².

Here and in the earlier works of [47], [48], the philosophy is to learn from the successes of the AdS classifications and perform a Mink₄ classification that assumes some additional symmetry so as to enable a more detailed description than previous efforts. A good starting point for this is to classify $\mathcal{N} = 2$ that preserve an SU(2) R-symmetry in the form of a round S^2 factor (see also [35] where Mink₃ × S^3 are classified) - one can then try to break some of this (super)symmetry and generate many more solutions in the spirit of [58]. An SU(2) R-symmetry is a necessary part of the super-conformal algebra in $d = 5, 6$ and $d = 4$ with $\mathcal{N} = 2$. As such a corollary to this classification endeavor is that it provides an embedding of the known half-BPS AdS_{*d*} solutions (with $d > 4$) into a broader context still preserving $SU(2)_R$. In [47], [48] such classifications were performed in types IIA and IIB respectively, under a certain simplifying assumptions. The purpose of this work is to complete this program by classifying solutions in eleven-dimensional supergravity and relaxing the assumptions made in the earlier works.

The lay out of the paper is as follows. In section 2 we classify $\mathcal{N} = 2$ Mink₄ solutions in M-theory that realize an SU(2) R-symmetry in terms of a round S^2 factor in there internal space, which leaves a 5-manifold to be determined by geometric supersymmetry constraints. We find that there are two distinct classes of solution, we refer to as A and B. Class A is governed by an SU(2)-structure in five dimensions, while Class B is the M5-branes with SO(3) rotational invariance in it's co-dimensions. Additionally we make some simple ansatz for Case A, specifically a conformal CY2 ansatz and one where the internal space contains an additional squashed S^3 .

In section 3 we turn our attention to Mink₄ × S^2 in ten dimensions. We drop the assumption of equal Majorana–Weyl spinor norm made in the [47], [48] making the classification of type II completely general. We find that all solutions that lie outside the existing classifications always have a $U(1) \times U(1)$ flavour symmetry and can be generated from a “master” system in M-theory

¹Recently there was also [36] which makes no assumption beyond the existence of a time-like Killing vector

²See [55] and [56] for some recent progress in this direction using exceptional field theory and consistent truncation respectively

(the M5-brane) via a chain of dualities.

Section 4 elucidates the connection between the different classes of solution contained in [47], [48]. We are able to show that all such $\text{Mink}_4 \times S^2$ solutions in type II can be generated from two master systems using chains of dualities - a conformal Calabi–Yau system in IIB and the $SU(2)$ -structure in M-theory (Case A). In the process of deriving some of the descendant cases we uncover evidence of a solution generating technique generalizing T-s-T to certain scenario containing a single $U(1)$ isometry.

Finally in section 5 we close with some simple examples contained within M-theory case A. Specifically we establish how the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ AdS_5 class in M-theory is embedded in the $SU(2)$ -structure of case A and we point the way towards some compact Mink_4 solutions with fluxes and Atiyah–Hitchin singularities.

2 $\text{Mink}_4 \times S^2$ in M-theory

In this section we will classify $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric warped Mink_4 solutions in eleven dimensions realizing an $SU(2)$ R-symmetry with a round S^2 .

2.1 The Spinor Ansatz

We are interested in supersymmetric solutions to eleven-dimensional supergravity with a warped four-dimensional Minkowski factor. As such we decompose the metric as

$$ds^2 = e^{2\Delta} ds^2(\mathbb{R}_{1,3}) + ds^2(M_7), \quad (2.1)$$

where $e^{2\Delta}$ is a functions with support on M_7 and the 4-form flux G is necessarily purely magnetic. As we seek $\mathcal{N} = 2$ solutions respecting the warped product of $\mathbb{R}_{1,3} \times M_7$, our eleven-dimensional spinor will decompose as

$$\epsilon = \sum_{a=1}^2 \left(\zeta_+^a \otimes \chi^a + (\zeta_+^a)^c \otimes (\chi^a)^c \right) \quad (2.2)$$

where ζ_+^a is a doublet of positive chirality Mink_4 spinors, χ^a a doublet of seven-dimensional spinors such that

$$\|\chi^a\|^2 = e^\Delta, \quad \bar{\chi}^a \chi^a = 0 \quad (2.3)$$

and c denotes Majorana conjugation. It is argued in [26], that it is possible to be slightly more general than this, however we show in Appendix A that (2.2) is sufficient for our considerations. We will assume also that our spinors χ^a are charged under an $SU(2)$ R-symmetry, realized by a round S^2 factor in the internal geometry so that the metric and flux on M_7 further decompose as

$$ds^2(M_7) = e^{2C} ds^2(S^2) + ds^2(M_5), \quad G = F_4 + e^{2C} \text{Vol}(S^2) \wedge F_2, \quad (2.4)$$

i.e. as a foliation of S^2 over M_5 , where e^{2C} is a function depending on the coordinates on the five-dimensional manifold. At the level of the spinors the $SU(2)$ R-symmetry will be realized by decomposing our doublet of spinors as

$$\chi^a = \xi^a \otimes \eta^1 + \hat{\xi}^a \otimes \eta^2 \quad (2.5)$$

where ξ^a and $\hat{\xi}^a$ are two $SU(2)$ doublets formed from the Killing spinors on S^2 , ξ , which obeys

$$\nabla_\mu \xi = \frac{i}{2} \sigma_\mu \xi, \quad (2.6)$$

where we used the Pauli matrices to represent the Clifford algebra on S^2 . As established in [47], the doublets take the form

$$\xi^a = \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \xi^c \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\xi}^a = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_3 \xi \\ \sigma_3 \xi^c \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.7)$$

where σ_3 is the 2d chirality matrix and $\xi^c = \sigma_2 \xi^*$. Plugging ϵ into the the eleven-dimensional Killing spinor equation we get two independent reduced equations for the seven dimensional spinors χ^1 and χ^2 . However, given the doublet transformation property under the spinorial Lie derivative

$$\mathcal{L}_{K_i} \xi^a = \frac{i}{2} (\sigma^i)^a_b \xi^b, \quad \mathcal{L}_{K_i} \hat{\xi}^a = \frac{i}{2} (\sigma^i)^a_b \hat{\xi}^b \quad (2.8)$$

where K_i are the Killing vectors of $SU(2)$, we have that we can generate the solution for χ^2 from the solution of χ^1 , as such it will be sufficient to solve the supersymmetry conditions for the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ subsector governed by the seven-dimensional spinors

$$\chi = \xi \otimes \eta^1 + \sigma_3 \xi \otimes \eta^2. \quad (2.9)$$

In the following section we shall establish a set of geometric conditions for the five dimensional submanifold, the solutions to which are in one-to-one correspondence with all the supersymmetric solutions that follow from (2.9).

2.2 Supersymmetry Conditions from 7 to 5 dimensions

The supersymmetry conditions for a warped product of $\mathbb{R}_{1,3} \times M_7$ with spinors of the form

$$\epsilon = \zeta_+ \otimes \chi + \text{m.c} \quad (2.10)$$

were studied in [24, 25], where necessary and sufficient geometric conditions were derived for the preservation of supersymmetry in the particular case $\bar{\chi}\chi = 0$. In the convention of [27] these are

$$d(e^{2\Delta} K) = 0, \quad (2.11a)$$

$$d(e^{4\Delta} J) = -e^{4\Delta} \star_7 G, \quad (2.11b)$$

$$d(e^{3\Delta} \Omega) = 0, \quad (2.11c)$$

$$d(e^{2\Delta} J \wedge J) = -2e^{2\Delta} G \wedge K \quad (2.11d)$$

where

$$e^\Delta = \chi^\dagger \chi, \quad e^\Delta K_a = \chi^\dagger \gamma_a \chi, \quad e^\Delta J_{ab} = -i \chi^\dagger \gamma_{ab} \chi, \quad e^\Delta \Omega_{abc} = -i \chi^{c\dagger} \gamma_{abc} \chi, \quad (2.12)$$

define an $SU(3)$ -structure. In fact these geometric conditions combined with Bianchi identity of G_4 are necessary and sufficient conditions for a solution with $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry to exist [59].

Since we want the solution to be independent of the S^2 directions so as not to break the $SU(2)$ isometry, we can extract conditions on M_5 from (2.11a)-(2.11d) by imposing (2.4) and that our seven-dimensional spinor will take the form

$$\chi = e^{\frac{\Delta}{2}} (\xi \otimes \eta^1 + \sigma_3 \xi \otimes \eta^2), \quad (2.13)$$

where we η^i and Δ are independent of the S^2 directions.

The first conditions we encounter comes from (2.3), given (2.13) from the first identity one finds

$$\chi^\dagger \chi = e^\Delta (\eta_1^\dagger \eta_1 + \eta_2^\dagger \eta_2) + y_3 e^\Delta (\eta_1^\dagger \eta_2 + \eta_2^\dagger \eta_1), \quad (2.14)$$

which can only be consistent with $e^\Delta = \chi^\dagger \chi$ if

$$\|\eta_1\|^2 + \|\eta_2\|^2 = 1, \quad \text{Re}(\eta_1^\dagger \eta_2) = 0. \quad (2.15)$$

The second condition of (2.3) imposes

$$\bar{\eta}_1 \eta_2 = 0. \quad (2.16)$$

Let's see how the seven dimensional bi-linears decompose into products of two- and five-dimensional ones. To do this we use the following gamma-matrix representation

$$\gamma_i^{(7)} = e^C \sigma_a \otimes \mathbb{I}_4, \quad \gamma_a^{(7)} = \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_a, \quad B_7 = \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2. \quad (2.17)$$

We also decompose the 5d spinors in a common basis in terms of a unit norm spinor η as

$$\eta_1 = q_1 \eta, \quad \eta_2 = q_2 (i \cos \alpha \eta + \frac{1}{2} \sin \alpha \bar{w} \eta), \quad q_1^2 + q_2^2 = 1, \quad (2.18)$$

which is the most general parametrization consistent with (2.15), (2.16). To calculate the forms in (2.12) we will make repeated use of the bilinear product identity

$$[\xi^1 \otimes \eta^1] \otimes [\xi^2 \otimes \eta^2]^\dagger = (\eta^1 \otimes \eta^{2\dagger})_+ \wedge (\xi^1 \otimes \xi^{2\dagger}) + (\eta^1 \otimes \eta^{2\dagger})_- \wedge (\sigma_3 \xi^1 \otimes \xi^{2\dagger}) \quad (2.19)$$

where the plus and the minus indicate that we have to consider just form with even and odd degree respectively, while the presence of σ_3 depends on our parametrization of the gamma matrices. The bi-linears that follow from η are given in [57] and read:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta \otimes \eta^\dagger &= \frac{1}{4} (1 + v) \wedge e^{-ij_2}, \quad \eta \otimes \eta^{c\dagger} = \frac{1}{4} (1 + v) \wedge \omega_2, \\ \omega_2 &= w \wedge u, \quad j_2 = \frac{i}{2} (w \wedge \bar{w} + u \wedge \bar{u}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

where

$$v, w_1 = \text{Re}w, w_2 = \text{Im}w \quad u_1 = \text{Re}u, u_2 = \text{Im}u \quad (2.21)$$

defines a vielbein in five dimensions. And finally the bi-linears that following from ξ [47],

$$\begin{aligned} \xi \otimes \xi^\dagger &= \frac{1}{2}(1 + k_3 - iy_3 \text{Vol}(S^3)), & \xi \otimes \xi^{c\dagger} &= -\frac{1}{2}(k_1 + ik_2 - i(y_1 + iy_2) \text{Vol}(S^2)), \\ \sigma_3 \xi \otimes \xi^\dagger &= \frac{1}{2}(y_3 + idy_3 - i \text{Vol}(S^3)), & \sigma_3 \xi \otimes \xi^{c\dagger} &= -\frac{1}{2}(y_1 + iy_2 - id(y_1 + iy_2)), \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

where y_i are coordinates embedding S^2 into \mathbb{R}^3 and k_i are 1-forms dual to the Killing vectors of $SU(2)$ which may be parameterised as

$$k_i = \epsilon_{ijk} y_j dy_k. \quad (2.23)$$

The first thing we calculate is the 1-form

$$\begin{aligned} K &= -q_1 q_2 e^C \cos \alpha dy_3 + q_1 q_2 \sin \alpha w_1 + q_2^2 y_3 \cos \alpha (\cos \alpha v - \sin \alpha w_2) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}(q_1^2 - q_2^2)(k_3 + y_3 u_2), \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

The appearance of k_3 here is opportune because $dk_i = 2y_i \text{Vol}(S^2)$ which means that the only way to make K consistent with (2.11a) is to set the coefficient of k_3 to zero - thus we can without loss of generality take

$$q_1 = q_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad (2.25)$$

and then rotate the 5 dimensional frame such that (2.24) simply becomes

$$K = -e^C \cos \alpha dy_3 + \sin \alpha w_1 + y_3 \cos \alpha v, \quad (2.26)$$

In this frame the other forms become

$$\begin{aligned} J &= e^C (\sin \alpha dy_3 \wedge w_2 - v \wedge k_3) + y_3 (\sin \alpha w_2 \wedge V + e^{2C} \text{Vol}(S^2)) \\ &+ \cos \alpha w_1 \wedge w_2 + u_1 \wedge u_2, \\ \Omega &= e^C u \wedge (i \sin \alpha v \wedge (k_1 + ik_2) - (\cos \alpha w_1 + iw_2) \wedge (y_1 + idy_2)), \\ \frac{1}{2} J \wedge J &= e^{2C} (\sin \alpha w_2 \wedge v + y_3 (\cos \alpha w_1 \wedge w_2 + u_1 \wedge u_2) \wedge \text{Vol}(S^2)) \\ &- e^C (w_2 \wedge u_1 \wedge u_2 \wedge dy_3 + (\cos \alpha w_1 \wedge w_2 + u_1 \wedge u_2) \wedge v \wedge k_3) \\ &+ \cos \alpha w_1 \wedge w_2 \wedge u_1 \wedge u_2 + y_3 \sin \alpha w_2 \wedge u_1 \wedge u_2 \wedge v \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

where in simplifying the last of these we make use of the identity

$$k_{(i)} \wedge dy_{(i)} + y_{(i)}^2 \text{Vol}(S^2) = \text{Vol}(S^2). \quad (2.28)$$

We now plug (2.27) into (2.11a)-(2.11d) and factor out all dependence on S^2 . The result of this operation is the following set of five-dimensional form constraints

$$\sin \alpha d(e^{2\Delta} w) = \sin \alpha d(e^{-\Delta} u) = d(e^{2\Delta+C}) + e^{2\Delta} v = d\alpha = 0, \quad (2.29a)$$

$$d(e^\Delta (\cos \alpha w_1 + i w_2) \wedge u) = F_4 = 0, \quad (2.29b)$$

$$\sin \alpha (d(e^{2\Delta+2C} w_2 \wedge v) + e^{2\Delta+2C} w_1 \wedge F_2) = 0, \quad (2.29c)$$

$$d(e^{-2\Delta} (\cos \alpha w_1 \wedge w_2 + u_1 \wedge u_2) + e^{-2\Delta} \cos \alpha F_2 \wedge v) = 0, \quad (2.29d)$$

$$d(e^{4\Delta} (\cos \alpha w_1 \wedge w_2 + u_1 \wedge u_2)) = e^{4\Delta} \star_5 F_2. \quad (2.29e)$$

Clearly the behaviour is quite different depending on whether or not $\alpha = 0$, so one should look at these cases separately, which we now proceed to do in the next section.

Before we move on let briefly examine the form of the $SU(3)$ -structure in the internal six dimensions orthogonal to K . Any $SU(3)$ -structure can be expressed in canonical form in terms of a complex vielbein E^i as

$$\begin{aligned} J &= \frac{i}{2} (E^1 \wedge \bar{E}^1 + E^2 \wedge \bar{E}^2 + E^3 \wedge \bar{E}^3), \\ \Omega &= E^1 \wedge E^2 \wedge E^3. \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

With a little effort, one can reverse engineer a complex vielbein by manipulating (2.27), we find

$$E^1 = \cos \alpha w_1 + i w_2 + \sin \alpha (e^C dy_3 - y_3 v), \quad E^2 = u, \quad E^3 = (y_1 + i y_2) v - e^C d(y_1 + i y_2),$$

where it is easy to confirm that this does indeed lead to a factored metric $M_7 = S^2 \times M_5$

$$K^2 + E^i \bar{E}^i = e^{2C} \text{Vol}(S^2) + v^2 + w_1^2 + w_2^2 + u_1^2 + u_2^2. \quad (2.31)$$

We shall now proceed to classify the solutions that follow from the 5 dimensional supersymmetry conditions, (2.29a)-(2.29e) - there are two cases contained in sections 2.3 and 2.4

2.3 Case A: $\alpha = 0$, $SU(2)$ -structure

In this case η_1 and η_2 are proportional to one another, specifically $\eta_1 = i\eta_2$, and so they define a $SU(2)$ -structure on M_5 ,

$$\omega_2 = u \wedge w, \quad j = \frac{i}{2} (u \wedge \bar{u} + w \wedge \bar{w}). \quad (2.32)$$

This means that we cannot find local expression for the vielbein u, w without any further assumptions. The purely geometric supersymmetry conditions are simply

$$d(e^{2\Delta+C}) + e^{2\Delta} v = 0, \quad (2.33)$$

$$d(e^\Delta \omega_2) = 0, \quad (2.34)$$

while those involving the flux read

$$d(e^{4\Delta} j_2) - e^{4\Delta} \star_5 F_2 = d(e^{-2\Delta} j_2) + e^{-2\Delta} F_2 \wedge v = 0. \quad (2.35)$$

We have a solution whenever we solve (2.33), (2.33), (2.35) and the Bianchi identity of G is satisfied, which requires

$$d(e^{2C} F_2) = 0, \quad (2.36)$$

away from localized sources³. We can solve (2.34) without loss of generality by introducing a local coordinate ρ such that

$$\rho = e^{2\Delta+C}, \quad v = -e^{-2\Delta} d\rho. \quad (2.37)$$

Solutions in this class then take the form

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= e^{2\Delta} ds^2(\text{Mink}_4) + e^{-4\Delta} (d\rho^2 + \rho^2 ds^2(S^2)) + ds^2(M_4), \\ G &= e^{-8\Delta} \rho^2 \text{Vol}(S^2) \wedge \star_5 d(e^{4\Delta} j_2) \end{aligned} \quad (2.38)$$

where M_4 supports the $SU(2)$ -structure.

In the next subsections we shall make some assumptions about the form of the $SU(2)$ -structure to obtain more detailed classes.

2.3.1 Simple Ansatz: Warped $SU(2)$ -holonomy

The easiest way to solve this system is define the local coordinate

$$\rho = e^{2\Delta+C}, \quad v = -e^{-2\Delta} d\rho \quad (2.39)$$

And to impose that the part of the metric orthogonal to v has warped $SU(2)$ -holonomy, ie

$$e^\Delta \omega_2 = \tilde{\omega}_2 = e^\Delta j_2 = \tilde{j}_2, \quad (2.40)$$

with $\tilde{\omega}_2, \tilde{j}_2$ closed. The local form of the solution is then

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= H^{-2/3} ds^2(\mathbb{R}_{1,3}) + H^{1/3} \left(ds^2(M_4) + H (d\rho^2 + \rho^2 ds^2(S^2)) \right), \\ e^{2C} F_2 &= c \tilde{j}_2, \quad H = 1 + \frac{c}{\rho}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.41)$$

with M_4 any $SU(2)$ -manifold. These solutions are all non compact and the warp factor is not indicative of a simple brane set up. As suggested from [68], this can be a KK6-M2 system or something more exotic like the lift of a O6-D2 system.

³The inclusion of such sources would put delta-function sources on the left hand side of the equality.

2.3.2 Squashed S^3 Ansatz

Let's consider the simple case where the $SU(2)$ -structure is defined on a squashed S^3 trivially fibered over an interval y . Here we take the vielbein to be

$$v = -e^{-2\Delta}d\rho, \quad w = \frac{e^{C_1}}{2}(\omega_1 + i\omega_2), \quad u = \frac{e^{C_2}}{2}\omega_3 + ie^{K-2\Delta+h(y)}dy, \quad (2.42)$$

where C_1, C_2, K, Δ are warping function which depend on $\rho = e^{2\Delta+C}$ and y only, h is an arbitrary function of y and ω_i are the right-invariant one-form defined on S^3 , which satisfies

$$d\omega_i = -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ijk}\omega^j \wedge \omega^k. \quad (2.43)$$

Notice that this means we are enhancing the R-symmetry to $SU(2) \times U(1)$ as $(\omega_1 + i\omega_2)$ will generically come with a phase $e^{i\psi}$, where ∂_ψ is the $U(1)$ of the Hopf fibration. From (2.34) we get the following three equations:

$$\partial_\rho e^{C_1+C_2+\Delta} = \partial_\rho e^{C_1+K-\Delta} = 0, \quad \partial_y e^{C_1+C_2+\Delta} = 2e^{C_1+K-\Delta+h}. \quad (2.44)$$

These are solved by defining C_1 and C_2 in terms of two functions $f(y)$ and $g(y)$ such that

$$e^{C_1} = e^{\Delta-K-h} \frac{f(y)}{g}, \quad e^{C_2} = e^{K-2\Delta+h} g, \quad g = \frac{2f}{f'}. \quad (2.45)$$

At this point, because it simplifies later expressions, we choose the arbitrary function h and use diffeomorphism invariance in y to fix f as

$$e^h = f', \quad f = 2\sqrt{c+y}, \quad (2.46)$$

where c is a constant, without loss of generality. This fixes the metric as

$$ds^2 = e^{2\Delta}ds^2(\text{Mink}_4) + e^{-4\Delta} \left(d\rho^2 + \rho^2 ds^2(S^2) + \frac{e^{2K}}{c+y} dy^2 + 4(c+y)e^{2K}(d\psi + \eta) \right) + \frac{e^{2\Delta-2K}}{16} ds^2(\tilde{S}^2) \quad (2.47)$$

The two condition involving the flux in (2.35) impose that

$$(2e^{-\Delta})^6 = \partial_y(e^{-4K}), \quad (2.48)$$

which allows one to define Δ in terms of K . What remains in (2.35) just defines the flux F_2 , which can be used to express the M-theory 4-form as

$$G = \left(\frac{\rho^2}{16} \partial_\rho(e^{-2K})\omega_1 \wedge \omega_2 - 2\partial_\rho(e^{-6\Delta+2K}) + 2(c+y)\rho^2(32e^{-12\Delta+4K} + e^{-2K}\partial_y(e^{-6\Delta+2K})) \right) \wedge \text{Vol}(S^2).$$

All we need to do now is solve the Bianchi identity of the flux, which away from localized sources leads to just one partial differential equation (PDE) in e^K , namely

$$\frac{1}{\rho^2} \partial_\rho(\rho^2(e^{-2K})) + (y+c)\partial_y^2(e^{-4K}) = 0. \quad (2.49)$$

This bares a striking similarity to the PDE governing the D8-D6-NS5 intersecting brane system of [67] - the only difference is the $(y + c)$ factor. Of course this is only a formal similarity and the class of solutions currently under investigation is unlikely to have any relation to a Mink_6 class in massive IIA. At any rate, the form of the metric in (2.47) and that a relatively simple PDE governs the system, makes this class appear promising for finding compact solutions in M-theory⁴

2.4 Case B: $\alpha \neq 0$, The M5-brane

In this case α is non zero, however one can see that it actually factors out from all of the supersymmetry conditions and in the end nothing physical depends on its specific value, as long as $\sin \alpha \neq 0$ (in which case we fall into the class of the previous section). The 1-form supersymmetry constraints are

$$d(e^{2\Delta+C}) + e^{2\Delta}v = d(e^{2\Delta}w) = d(e^{-\Delta}u) = 0 \quad (2.50)$$

which we can be solved without loss of generality by introducing local coordinates x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 and

$$\rho = e^{2\Delta+C}, \quad (2.51)$$

such that the 5d vielbein becomes

$$v = -e^{-2\Delta}d\rho, \quad w = e^{-2\Delta}(dx_1 + idx_2), \quad u = e^\Delta(dx_3 + idx_4), \quad \rho = e^{2\Delta+C}, \quad (2.52)$$

which span an identity-structure in 5 dimensions - so we have completely local expressions for solutions in this class. The rest of the supersymmetry conditions, that are not implied by the 1-forms, involve the flux, namely

$$d(e^{4\Delta}u_1 \wedge u_2) + e^{4\Delta} \star_5 F_2 = 0, \quad (2.53)$$

$$d(e^{2C+2\Delta}w_2 \wedge v) + e^{2C+2\Delta}w_1 \wedge F_2 = 0, \quad (2.54)$$

$$\cos \alpha (d(e^{-2\Delta}(w_1 \wedge w_2)) + e^{-2\Delta}F_2 \wedge v) = 0. \quad (2.55)$$

The definition of F_2 can be read from (2.53) where we need to use (2.52) to define the Hodge dual:

$$F_2 = -\rho^2 e^{-2C} (\partial_\rho e^{-6\Delta} dx_1 \wedge dx_2 + \partial_{x_2} e^{-6\Delta} d\rho \wedge dx_1 + \partial_{x_1} e^{-6\Delta} dx_2 \wedge d\rho). \quad (2.56)$$

We then plug this back into (2.54) which imposes

$$\partial_{x_3} e^{2\Delta} = \partial_{x_4} e^{2\Delta} = 0, \quad (2.57)$$

⁴One might also wonder if AdS solutions exist here. We checked that all of the SUSY constraint for the most general AdS_5 solution one can embed in this class can be solved - but the flux always has a leg in the AdS direction breaking the $\text{SO}(2,4)$ symmetry; moreover, the Bianchi identity is not satisfied.

so that $\partial_{x_3}, \partial_{x_4}$ are necessarily isometries of the solution - this automatically solves (2.55) without imposing any further restriction on α , then nothing physical depends on it. Thus the local form of all solutions in this class is

$$ds^2 = e^{2\Delta} ds^2(\text{Mink}_6) + e^{-4\Delta} (dx_1^2 + dx_2^2 + d\rho^2 + \rho^2 ds^2(S^2)), \quad (2.58)$$

$$G = -\rho^2 (\partial_\rho e^{-6\Delta} dx_1 \wedge dx_2 + \partial_{x_2} e^{-6\Delta} d\rho \wedge dx_1 + \partial_{x_1} e^{-6\Delta} dx_2 \wedge d\rho) \wedge \text{Vol}(S^2), \quad (2.59)$$

where the Bianchi identity of G imposes that the warp factor obeys

$$\frac{1}{\rho^2} \partial_\rho (\rho^2 \partial_\rho e^{-6\Delta}) + \partial_{x_1}^2 e^{-6\Delta} + \partial_{x_2}^2 e^{-6\Delta} = 0 \quad (2.60)$$

away from localized sources. This is a 5d Laplace equation expressed in coordinates that make the the $SO(3)$ symmetry of it's solutions manifest - Thus the entire class of solutions away from $\alpha = 0$ are then nothing more than M5-branes with some rotational symmetry in their co-dimensions.

We shall see in the next section that this connected to solutions in type II theories which have internal Killing spinors with non equal norm.

3 Classes of Solution in type II with non equal Spinor Norm

Supersymmetric type II solutions with $\text{Mink}_4 \times S^2$ factors were partially classified in [47, 48]. Similarly to the M-theory classification of section 2, the starting point is the decomposition of the ten-dimensional Majorana-Weyl Killing spinors of the form

$$\epsilon_1 = \zeta_+ \otimes (\xi \otimes \tilde{\eta}^1 + \sigma_3 \xi \otimes \hat{\gamma} \tilde{\eta}^1) + \text{m.c.}, \quad \epsilon_2 = \zeta_+ \otimes (\xi \otimes \tilde{\eta}^2 \pm \sigma_3 \xi \otimes \hat{\gamma} \tilde{\eta}^2) + \text{m.c.}, \quad (3.1)$$

where we have the sign $+$ in IIB and $-$ in IIA. Once more ξ is a Killing spinor on S^2 obeying (2.6) and now η^i defines a non chiral spinor in four dimensions. The metric decomposes as

$$ds^2 = e^{2A} ds^2(\text{Mink}_4) + e^{2C} ds^2(S^2) + ds^2(M_4), \quad (3.2)$$

where e^{2A} and e^{2C} depend on the coordinates on M_4 only. However, unlike the M-theory case, the classifications in ten dimensions [47, 48] are not completely general, as we will now explain. A consequence of supersymmetry is that

$$d(e^{\mp A} (|\eta_1|^2 \pm |\eta_2|^2)) = 0, \quad (3.3)$$

which means we can define constants c_\pm such that

$$|\eta_1|^2 \pm |\eta_2|^2 = c_\pm e^{\pm A}, \quad (3.4)$$

c_+ can be tuned to any positive constant without loss of generality, but tuning c_- can have marked physical effects - namely the physics of solutions with generic c_- is quite different to the physics when

$c_- = 0$, i.e. the case of equal spinor norm. In [47, 48] it is only the equal norm case that is classified, so in this section we shall classify the solutions in type II for generic c_- , or non equal spinor norm. As we shall see, it will turn out that such solutions always exhibit 2 uncharged isometries, so all type IIB solutions are contained in the classification of type IIA up to a T-duality, and further, all type IIA solutions have the Romans mass set to zero - so descend from our M-theory classification.

In the next section we shall study the unequal norm cases in type IIA.

3.1 Non-equal norm in IIA

We begin our analysis in IIA, our goal here is not to give a detailed classification, rather we seek to show that all solutions in this class descend from M-theory. This statement turns out to actually be true for any warped Mink_4 solution - so we will not actually assume an S^2 factor here, merely a decomposition of the metric of the form

$$ds^2 = e^{2A} ds^2(\text{Mink}_4) + ds^2(M_6), \quad (3.5)$$

and likewise for the fluxes, with all physical fields supported by M_6 only.

In the conventions of [60], supersymmetry depends on the existence of a non-chiral IIA spinor on warped $\text{Mink}_4 \times M_6$ that takes the form

$$\epsilon = \zeta_+ \otimes \chi + \zeta_+^c \otimes \chi^c \quad (3.6)$$

where ζ_+ is a positive chirality spinor in four dimensions, χ a non-chiral six-dimensional spinor in and where the c superscript labels Majorana conjugation⁵ such that $\epsilon^c = \epsilon$. Supersymmetry is then implied by the following spinorial conditions on M_6

$$\left[\partial A + \frac{e^\Phi}{4} (F_0 + F_2 \hat{\gamma}^{(6)} + F_4 + i \star_6 F_6) \right] \chi = 0, \quad (3.7a)$$

$$\left[\partial \Phi + \frac{1}{2} H \hat{\gamma}^{(6)} + \frac{e^\Phi}{4} (5F_0 + 3F_2 \hat{\gamma}^{(6)} + F_4 - i \star_6 F_6) \right] \chi = 0, \quad (3.7b)$$

$$\left[\nabla_a + \frac{1}{4} H_a \hat{\gamma}^{(6)} + \frac{e^\Phi}{8} (F_0 - F_2 \hat{\gamma}^{(6)} + F_4 - i \star_6 F_6) \gamma_a^{(6)} \right] \chi = 0, \quad (3.7c)$$

where Φ is the dilaton, $\hat{\gamma}^{(6)}$ the chiral operator and where in (3.7c) we correct a typo appearing in [60]. Here F_n labels the RR flux magnetically coupled to a space-filling brane

$$F_{\text{RR}} = F + e^{4A} \text{Vol}_4 \wedge \star_6 \lambda(F) \quad (3.8)$$

however, as we shall see shortly, the 0, 2, 4 forms will turn out to be purely magnetic so we need not worry about this distinction for long. Using (3.7a) and (3.7c) it is possible to establish that

⁵One can without loss of generality take $B^{(10)} = \mathbb{I} \otimes B^{(6)}$ where $B^{(6)} B^{(6)*} = \mathbb{I}$ as the relevant intertwiner so that $\zeta_+^c = \zeta_+^*$ and $\chi^c = B^{(6)} \chi^*$.

$d(e^{-A}|\chi|^2) = d(e^A\chi^\dagger\hat{\gamma}\chi) = 0$, while including also (3.7b) one can establish that $d(e^{2A-\Phi}\bar{\chi}\chi) = 0$, which one can use to fix

$$|\chi|^2 = c_+e^A, \quad \chi^\dagger\hat{\gamma}^{(6)}\chi = c_-e^{-A}, \quad \bar{\chi}\chi = ce^{-2A+\Phi}, \quad \bar{\chi}\hat{\gamma}^{(6)}\chi = 0 \quad (3.9)$$

where the final condition follows in general whenever $(\hat{\gamma}^{(6)})^T = -\hat{\gamma}^{(6)}$. c_\pm, c are constants, we can set $c_+ = 2$ without loss of generality, $c_- = 0$ is the cases of equal chiral spinor norms and c parametrises the G-structure of the internal 6 manifold; in particular, $c = 0$ corresponds to an orthogonal $SU(2)$ -structure. Using the relations

$$(\chi^\dagger\gamma_{a_1,\dots,a_n}^{(6)}\chi)^* = (-1)^{\frac{n}{2}(n-1)}\chi^\dagger\gamma_{a_1,\dots,a_n}^{(6)}\chi, \quad (\chi^\dagger\gamma_{a_1,\dots,a_n}^{(6)}\hat{\gamma}^{(6)}\chi)^* = (-1)^{\frac{n}{2}(n+1)}\chi^\dagger\gamma_{a_1,\dots,a_n}^{(6)}\hat{\gamma}^{(6)}\chi, \quad (3.10)$$

which actually hold for Hermitian gamma matrices in any dimension, we get that the rank 2,3,6 forms which come from the bilinear $\chi \otimes \chi^\dagger$ and the rank 1,2,5,6 forms constructed from $\hat{\gamma}^{(6)}\chi \otimes \chi^\dagger$ are purely imaginary, while the rest are real. Using this fact, it is possible to show from the inner-products of (3.7a)-(3.7b) with χ and $\hat{\gamma}^{(6)}\chi$ that

$$\star_6 F_6 = F_0\chi^\dagger\hat{\gamma}^{(6)}\chi = 0, \quad (3.11)$$

which come from the imaginary and real parts of the above inner products respectively. Equal spinor norm is equivalent to $\chi^\dagger\hat{\gamma}^{(6)}\chi = 0$ in this language, so it is clear that Romans mass do not vanish only for equal spinor norm. As such all type IIA solutions with non equal spinor norm can be lifted to M-theory

As we shall show later in section 3.3, the $\text{Mink}_4 \times S^2$ non equal norm solutions in IIA necessarily descend from section 2.4 by dimensional reduction. In the next section we turn our attention to type IIB solutions with non equal norm, as we shall see, this requires a more detailed analysis.

3.2 Non equal norm in IIB

In this section we study the Killing spinor conditions in IIB. Our goal is to establish that when the spinor norms are not equal, there are always two flavour $U(1)$ isometries on the solutions - however, most of the results in this section apply irrespective of the particular values of the norms.

In IIB we shall define our ten-dimensional Killing spinors as in 3.1, but redefine the 4d spinors as

$$\tilde{\eta}^1 = \frac{1}{2}(\eta^1 + \eta^2), \quad \tilde{\eta}^2 = \frac{1}{2}(\eta^1 - \eta^2). \quad (3.12)$$

As we establish in Appendix B, supersymmetry imposes the following set of four-dimensional spinoral

constraints

$$\partial A \eta^1 + \frac{e^\Phi}{4} \left[- (f_1 \hat{\gamma} + i g_3) \eta^2 + (f_3 \hat{\gamma} + i g_1) \eta^1 \right] = 0, \quad (3.13a)$$

$$\partial A \eta^2 - \frac{e^\Phi}{4} \left[- (f_1 \hat{\gamma} + i g_3) \eta^1 + (f_3 \hat{\gamma} + i g_1) \eta^2 \right] = 0, \quad (3.13b)$$

$$\partial \Phi \eta_1 - \frac{1}{2} (H_3 + i H_1 \hat{\gamma}) \eta^2 + e^\Phi \left[- f_1 \hat{\gamma} \eta^2 + \frac{1}{2} (f_3 \hat{\gamma} + i g_1) \eta^1 \right] = 0, \quad (3.13c)$$

$$\partial \Phi \eta_2 - \frac{1}{2} (H_3 + i H_1 \hat{\gamma}) \eta^1 - e^\Phi \left[- f_1 \hat{\gamma} \eta^1 + \frac{1}{2} (f_3 \hat{\gamma} + i g_1) \eta^2 \right] = 0, \quad (3.13d)$$

$$\partial C \eta^1 - i e^{-C} \hat{\gamma} \eta^2 - \frac{i}{2} H_1 \hat{\gamma} \eta^2 + \frac{e^\Phi}{4} \left[- (f_1 \hat{\gamma} - i g_3) \eta^2 + (f_3 \hat{\gamma} - i g_1) \eta^1 \right] = 0, \quad (3.13e)$$

$$\partial C \eta^2 - i e^{-C} \hat{\gamma} \eta^1 - \frac{i}{2} H_1 \hat{\gamma} \eta^1 - \frac{e^\Phi}{4} \left[- (f_1 \hat{\gamma} - i g_3) \eta^1 + (f_3 \hat{\gamma} - i g_1) \eta^2 \right] = 0, \quad (3.13f)$$

$$\nabla_a \eta_1 - \frac{1}{4} \left((H_3)_a + i (H_1)_a \hat{\gamma} \right) \eta^2 + \frac{e^\Phi}{8} \left[- (f_1 \hat{\gamma} - i g_3) \gamma_a \eta_2 + (f_3 \hat{\gamma} - i g_1) \gamma_a \eta_1 \right] = 0, \quad (3.13g)$$

$$\nabla_a \eta_2 - \frac{1}{4} \left((H_3)_a + i (H_1)_a \hat{\gamma} \right) \eta^1 - \frac{e^\Phi}{8} \left[- (f_1 \hat{\gamma} - i g_3) \gamma_a \eta_1 + (f_3 \hat{\gamma} - i g_1) \gamma_a \eta_2 \right] = 0, \quad (3.13h)$$

Where f, g, H_1, H_3 are the form fields defined as in Appendix B while Φ, C, A are function on M_4 .

From the six-dimensional zero-form conditions (B.5), imposing that the physical quantities are SU(2) singlets leads to the following equations for the four-dimensional spinors:

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta^1|^2 &= |\eta^2|^2 = e^A, & \eta^{1\dagger} \hat{\gamma} \eta^2 + \eta^{2\dagger} \hat{\gamma} \eta^1 &= 0, \\ \eta^{1\dagger} \eta^2 &= \eta^{2\dagger} \eta^1 = c_- e^{-A}, & \eta^{1\dagger} \hat{\gamma} \eta^1 + \eta^{2\dagger} \hat{\gamma} \eta^2 &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Working a bit harder we can establish another scalar condition from the difference between $\overline{\eta^2}(2(3.13a)+2(3.13e)-(3.13c))$ and $\overline{\eta^1}(2(3.13b)+2(3.13f)-(3.13d))$ ⁶, namely

$$\overline{\eta^2} \hat{\gamma} \eta^1 = 0. \quad (3.15)$$

One can solve all of these scalar conditions with the following decomposition of η^i in terms of a single spinor η , and complex functions a, b

$$e^{-\frac{1}{2}A} \eta^1 = \sin\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \eta + \cos\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) (a \hat{\gamma} \eta + b \eta^c), \quad e^{-\frac{1}{2}A} \eta^2 = \sin\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \eta - \cos\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}\right) (a \hat{\gamma} \eta + b \eta^c) \quad (3.16)$$

where

$$|\eta|^2 = 1, \quad \eta^\dagger \hat{\gamma} \eta = 0, \quad |a|^2 + |b|^2 = 1, \quad e^{2A} \cos \alpha = -c_-, \quad (3.17)$$

so that α parametrise the difference in norms of the spinor, which are equal only when $\cos \alpha = 0$.

⁶We define $\bar{\eta} = (\eta^c)^\dagger$ where $\eta^c = B \eta^*$ and the conventions for B are given in Appendix B.

As shown in [35, 43], the spinor η is sufficient to define an identity-structure on M_4 , which is expressed in terms of the vielbein $\{v_1, v_2, w_1, w_2\}$

$$\eta^\dagger \gamma_a \eta = v_1, \quad \eta^\dagger \gamma_a \hat{\gamma} \eta = i v_2, \quad \bar{\eta} \gamma_a \hat{\gamma} \eta = w = w_1 + i w_2. \quad (3.18)$$

The definition of w is such that $\eta^c = \frac{1}{2} \bar{w} \hat{\gamma} \eta$, which we can use to fix the phase of b in (3.16) by rotating the vector w , so we choose b to be real and expand a as

$$b = |b|, \quad a = a_1 + i a_2 \quad (3.19)$$

Let us now consider the vector

$$k = \bar{\eta}^2 \gamma^a \hat{\gamma} \eta^1 \partial_a, \quad (3.20)$$

which can be rewritten as a one form in terms of the vielbein (3.18)

$$e^{-A} k = a(1 + \cos \alpha) (b v_1 + (a_1 w_1 - a_2 w_2)) - (\cos \alpha w_1 - i w_2). \quad (3.21)$$

We will spend the rest of this section to proving that k is a Killing vector parametrizing a $U(1) \times U(1)$ flavour symmetry in the solutions. However we shall first perform some consistency checks: We notice that for generic values of α both real and imaginary components of k cannot vanish, so k is necessarily non zero. The exception is when $\cos \alpha = 0$, which is the case of equal chiral spinor norm studied in [48] - here the number of isometries we find depends on the values of a_1, a_2, b . In particular there is the following reduced isometry structure when the functions of the spinor ansatz are tuned as follows

$$0 \text{ isometries: } \quad \cos \alpha = a_1 = b = 0,$$

$$1 \text{ isometries: } \quad \cos \alpha = a_1 = 0, \quad b \neq 0,$$

which can happen because k is respectively zero or purely imaginary in these two cases only - so k is non zero $\cos \alpha \neq 0$ and is also consistent with the isometry structure of known solutions with equal norm, a promising sign we are on the correct track.

The first thing to establish is that k is an isometry with respect to scalar physical fields. To do so one can take the sum of the inner products of (3.13a), (3.13b) with $\hat{\gamma} \eta^2, \hat{\gamma} \eta^1$ respectively and repeat this operation for (3.13c), (3.13d) and (3.13e), (3.13f). This leads to the conditions

$$k^a \partial_a A = k^a \partial_a \Phi = k^a \partial_a C = 0 \quad (3.22)$$

which means that A, C, Φ do not depend on k directions.

Now let's prove that k is Killing with respect to the metric, i.e., that $\nabla_{(a} k_{b)} = 0$. A straightforward calculation leads to:

$$\nabla_a k_b = \frac{1}{4} H_{3abd} (\bar{\eta}^1 \gamma^d \hat{\gamma} \eta^1 + \bar{\eta}^2 \gamma^d \hat{\gamma} \eta^2) + \frac{e^\Phi}{8} (\star f_1 + i g_3)_{abd} (\bar{\eta}^1 \gamma^d \hat{\gamma} \eta^1 - \bar{\eta}^2 \gamma^d \hat{\gamma} \eta^2) + \frac{e^\Phi}{4} (f_3 + i \star g_1)_{abd} \bar{\eta}^2 \gamma^d \eta^1,$$

and by the manifest anti-symmetry of the right hand side, it is immediate to notice that therefore k is a Killing vector. This expression can be further simplified, indeed, using the combinations of equations (2(3.13a)+(3.13e)-(3.13c)) and (2(3.13b)+(3.13f)-(3.13d)), which read

$$\partial(2A + C - \Phi)\eta^1 + \frac{1}{2}H_3\eta^2 - ie^{-C}\hat{\gamma}\eta^2 + \frac{e^\Phi}{4}\left[-(-f_1\hat{\gamma} + ig_3)\eta^2 + (f_3\hat{\gamma} - ig_1)\eta^1\right] = 0, \quad (3.23)$$

$$\partial(2A + C - \Phi)\eta^2 + \frac{1}{2}H_3\eta^1 - ie^{-C}\hat{\gamma}\eta^1 - \frac{e^\Phi}{4}\left[-(-f_1\hat{\gamma} + ig_3)\eta^1 + (f_3\hat{\gamma} - ig_1)\eta^2\right] = 0, \quad (3.24)$$

one may establish from the sum of $\bar{\eta}^2\gamma_{ab}\hat{\gamma}$ (3.23) and $\bar{\eta}^1\gamma_{ab}\hat{\gamma}$ (3.24), that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4}H_3{}_{abd}(\bar{\eta}^1\gamma^d\hat{\gamma}\eta^1 + \bar{\eta}^2\gamma^d\hat{\gamma}\eta^2) + \frac{e^\Phi}{8}(\star f_1 + ig_3)_{abd}(\bar{\eta}^1\gamma^d\hat{\gamma}\eta^1 - \bar{\eta}^2\gamma^d\hat{\gamma}\eta^2) + \frac{e^\Phi}{4}(f_3 + i\star g_1)_{abd}\bar{\eta}^2\gamma^d\eta^1 \\ & = -2\partial_{[a}(2A + C - \Phi)k_{b]} + \frac{i}{2}e^{-C}(\bar{\eta}^1\gamma_{ab}\eta^1 + \bar{\eta}^2\gamma_{ab}\eta^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

Therefore we get

$$\nabla_a k_b = -2\partial_{[a}(2A + C - \Phi)k_{b]} + \frac{i}{2}e^{-C}(\bar{\eta}^1\gamma_{ab}\eta^1 + \bar{\eta}^2\gamma_{ab}\eta^2). \quad (3.26)$$

This expression is particularly useful because allows us to establish that the isometry group is $U(1) \times U(1)$. To prove this we need to show that the Lie bracket $[k, \bar{k}] = 0$ which, in the case at hand, is equivalent to

$$\bar{k}^a \nabla_a k_b \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (3.27)$$

Given our decomposition of the spinor and definition of the 4d vielbein in terms of a single spinor η , one can show that

$$(\bar{\eta}^1\gamma_{ab}\eta^1 + \bar{\eta}^2\gamma_{ab}\eta^2) = -4ie^A k_{[a}(v_2)_{b]}. \quad (3.28)$$

It is then a simple matter to calculate that

$$\bar{k}^a \nabla_a k_b = -|k|^2(\partial_b(2A - \Phi + C) - e^{A-C}(v_2)_b), \quad (3.29)$$

which is clearly real - so the isometry group of k is indeed $U(1) \times U(1)$.

The next task is to prove that $U(1) \times U(1)$ is a flavour symmetry - which means that the spinors $\eta^{1,2}$ are not charged under these isometries. This statement can be cast as the vanishing of the spinorial Lie derivative along k , ie

$$\mathcal{L}_k \eta^i = k^a \nabla_a \eta^i + \frac{1}{4} \nabla_a k_b \gamma^{ab} \eta^i = 0. \quad (3.30)$$

To prove this we will need the following algebraic relation, which can be demonstrated using standard Fierz identity techniques:

$$k\eta^1 = (\bar{\eta}^2\eta^1)\hat{\gamma}\eta^1, \quad k\eta^2 = -(\bar{\eta}^2\eta^1)\hat{\gamma}\eta^2, \quad ie^A v_2\eta^2 = \hat{\gamma}\eta^1, \quad ie^A v_2\eta^1 = \hat{\gamma}\eta^2, \quad (3.31)$$

where k and v_2 must now be understood as gamma matrices (via Clifford map). Let us fix $i = 1$ (the discussion for $i = 2$ is specular) and start by evaluating the first term in (3.30). Contracting (3.13g) with k^a and using the first two relation of (3.31) one finds:

$$k^a \left(\nabla_a \eta^1 - \frac{1}{4} ((H_3)_a + i(H_1)_a \hat{\gamma}) \eta^2 \right) + \frac{e^\phi}{8} (\overline{\eta^2} \eta^1) (-(-f_1 \hat{\gamma} + ig_3) \hat{\gamma} \eta^2 + (f_3 \hat{\gamma} - ig_1) \hat{\gamma} \eta^1) = 0. \quad (3.32)$$

Now we can substitute for the RR fluxes using (3.23) multiplied by $\hat{\gamma}$. With some manipulations one realizes

$$k^a \left(\nabla_a \eta_1 - \frac{1}{4} (\star H_3 + iH_1)_a \hat{\gamma} \eta^2 \right) - \frac{1}{2} (\overline{\eta^2} \eta^1) (\partial(2A + C - \Phi) \hat{\gamma} \eta^1 + ie^{-C} \eta^2) = 0. \quad (3.33)$$

The term $k^a (\star H_3 + iH_1)_a$ can be evaluated from the inner product of (3.13c) with η^1 and (3.13d) with η^2 , indeed this leads to

$$k^a (\star H_3 + iH_1)_a = k^a (f_1)_a = 0, \quad (3.34)$$

not that is implies that H_1 has no legs in the isometry directions, while H_3 has a leg in each. We are left with the expression

$$k^a \nabla_a \eta_1 = \frac{1}{2} (\overline{\eta^2} \eta^1) (\partial(2A + C - \Phi) \hat{\gamma} \eta^1 + ie^{-C} \eta^2) = \frac{1}{2} (\partial(2A + C - \Phi) k \eta^1 - ie^{-C} \hat{\gamma} k \eta^2). \quad (3.35)$$

Now we consider the second term in (3.30): Using (3.26) one may write

$$(\nabla_a k_b) \gamma^{ab} \eta^1 = -2(\partial_a(2A + C - \phi) k_b - e^{A-C} k_a (v_2)_b) \gamma^{ab} \eta^1. \quad (3.36)$$

Since k_a is orthogonal to $\partial_a(2A + C - \phi)$ and $(v_2)_a$, we can take $\gamma^{ab} = \gamma^a \gamma^b$ in the previous expression and, using (3.31) we find

$$(\nabla_a k_b) \gamma^{ab} \eta^1 = -2\partial(2A + C - \phi) k \eta^1 + 2ie^{-C} \hat{\gamma} k \eta^2. \quad (3.37)$$

Now one simply combines the contributions from (3.35) and (3.37) to establish that

$$\mathcal{L}_k \eta^1 = 0. \quad (3.38)$$

It is easy to perform the same steps for $\mathcal{L}_k \eta^2$ and therefore we get that $U(1) \times U(1)$ is a flavour symmetry.

The last step is to prove that also the fluxes are not charged under the isometry. Extrapolating from the classification of [29], we know that the RR fluxes are defined in terms of bilinears of η^i and the NSNS 3-form. Since the spinors are uncharged, the same follows for the bilinears and so we need only establish that the NSNS 3-form is a $U(1) \times U(1)$ singlet. We begin by considering $\overline{\eta^1}$ (3.13a), $\overline{\eta^1}$ (3.13c) + $\overline{\eta^2}$ (3.13d), $\overline{\eta^2} \hat{\gamma}$ (3.13a), $\overline{\eta^2} \hat{\gamma}$ (3.13e); these, together with (3.34), allow us to find the following relations:

$$k^a (H_1)_a = k^a (\star H_3)_a = k^a (f_1)_a = k^a (\star f_3)_a = k^a (g_1)_a = k^a (\star g_3)_a = 0. \quad (3.39)$$

The first, with the Bianchi identity $d(e^{2C}H_1) = 0$ implies $\mathcal{L}_k(e^{2C}H_1) = 0$. Now let's consider the equation of motions for the B-field, this implies the following equation

$$d(e^{4A+2C-2\Phi} \star H_3) = e^{4A+2C}(f_1 \wedge \star f_3 + \star g_3 \wedge g_1). \quad (3.40)$$

Contracting this with k and using (3.39) we get that

$$\iota_k d(\star H_3) + d(\iota_k \star H_3) = \mathcal{L}_k(\star H_3) = 0, \quad (3.41)$$

which proves that H_1 and H_3 are singlets under $U(1) \times U(1)$.

We have now established that all non Mink₄ \times S^2 solutions in type IIB with non equal spinor norm necessarily have a $U(1) \times U(1)$ flavour symmetry. In the next section we shall show that they all actually follow from IIA via T-duality and can then be lifted to the class B in M-theory.

3.3 Relation to the M5-brane

We have proved that all supersymmetric Mink₄ \times S^2 solutions with non equal spinor norm have an uncharged $U(1) \times U(1)$ isometry when they are in type IIB and can be lifted to M-theory when they are in IIA. We shall now prove that they all descend from Case B in M-theory - which is the M5-brane. First let us establish that Case B implies the IIA solutions.

Whenever one has a $U(1)$ isometry in M-theory one can reduce down to type IIA along it. When one reduces from 11 dimensions to 10, it is convenient to choose a frame such that

$$e_{11}^a = e^{-\frac{1}{3}\Phi} e_{10}^a, \quad a = 0, 1, \dots, 9, \quad e_{11}^{10} = e^{\frac{2}{3}\Phi}(d\psi + C_1) \quad (3.42)$$

where e_d^a is the vielbein in d space-time dimensions, ∂_ψ is the isometry direction, Φ the dilaton and C_1 the potential of the RR 2-form in IIA. When one reduces, the gamma matrix corresponding to e_{11}^{10} then becomes the chirality matrix in IIA. The non equal norm condition in IIA, in the conventions of section 3.1, is equivalent to $\chi^\dagger \hat{\gamma}^{(6)} \chi \neq 0$ and, up to an overall warping not relevant for our discussion, the six-dimensional non-chiral spinor in IIA and seven-dimensional spinor in M-theory are the same. The non equal norm condition in M-theory therefore reads $\chi^\dagger \gamma_m^{(7)} \chi (e_{11}^{10})^m = K_m (e_{11}^{10})^m \neq 0$. Therefore we can establish whether or not we reduce to a non equal norm class in IIA by studying the M-theory 1-form K defined in (2.26). Specifically, we generate non equal norm in IIA whenever K has a leg in the isometry direction we reduce on.

There are two ways to get a round S^2 factor in IIA via dimensional reduction of a parent solution in M-theory. 1) The parent solution has a round S^2 and a $U(1)$ isometry orthogonal to this to reduce on. 2) The parent has a $U(1)$ fibred over S^2 , ie an S^3 that may be squashed along the Hopf fibre direction only. We can immediately rule out option 2) as in this case $K \sim d\psi + \eta + \dots$, with $d\eta = \text{Vol}(S^2)$, which can never solve the 1-form condition $d(e^{2\Delta}K) = 0$ - as such IIA non equal norm must descend from Case A or B in M-theory. Here the only⁷ place the $U(1)$ can lie that will

⁷The 1-form K generically has legs along, w_1 , dy_3 and v . But dy_3 contains no $U(1)$ and the supersymmetry equation for v in both M-theory classes is incompatible with it having a leg along a(n uncharged) $U(1)$ isometry direction.




Figure 1: Depiction of the chains of dualities leading to $\text{Mink}_4 \times S^2$ classes in type II with non equal spinor norm. The relative complexity of solutions at each step as one moves from M-theory to IIA to IIB can increase considerably, with specific choices of $U(1)$ the duality is performed on. However all solutions are governed by the M5 Laplacian.

give rise to non equal norm in IIA is w_1 . As w_1 is only tuned on when $\sin \alpha \neq 0$, that means that all non equal norm solutions in type II descend through reduction and T-duality from Case B in section 2.4, which is simply the M5-brane class with $SO(3)$ rotational symmetry in it's co-dimensions, which is rather remarkable. The local form of this solution is given in (2.58), where giving w_1 a leg along the reduction isometry is equivalent to making the local coordinate ∂_{x_1} and isometry without loss of generality⁸. Together with the two aprior $U(1)$'s in section 2.4 (packaged as part of a Mink_6 factor there) this gives three flavour $U(1)$ isometries, which implies that two will always remain when we reduce to IIA, just as we found in IIB class.

Thus all non equal norm solutions in IIA descend from Case B in M-theory and all such type II solutions come with a flavour $U(1) \times U(1)$ solution. Naively one might then conclude that all the IIB solutions follow from IIA via T-duality - but there is another possibility to rule out. Much like option 2) for the M-theory reduction, round S^2 in IIB could follow by T-dualizing on the Hopf fibre of a squashed S^3 . Such a solution in IIB would necessarily have

$$H_1 \sim d\psi \wedge \text{Vol}(S^2), \quad (3.44)$$

but fortunately for us, this was already ruled out in the previous section by the necessary condition $k^a(H_1)_a = 0$.

We have shown that the parent or master class of all non equal norm $\text{Mink}_4 \times S^2$ solutions in type II is an M5-brane with $SO(2) \times SO(3)$ rotational symmetry in it's co-dimensions. All solutions

⁸This is not the only way to form a $U(1)$ to reduce on, in general one could take

$$x_1 = \psi + c_1 x, \quad x_2 = c_2 \psi + x, \quad dc_i = 0, \quad (3.43)$$

and impose that ∂_ψ is an isometry - however in IIA c_i can be turned off with a coordinate transformation and rescaling of g_s . One can also form a $U(1)$ of the metric and flux by expressing x_1, x_2 , in polar coordinates, however this is not an isometry of the G-structure, as (2.26) makes clear. Indeed such an isometry is charged, so reducing on it would brake supersymmetry.

in IIA and IIB are then generated from this by a chain of dualities depicted in Fig 1. However, we should stress this does not mean that the type II classes are completely trivial - there are several distinct ways to reduce to type IIA on a $U(1)$ subgroup of the available $U(1) \times U(1) \times U(1)$ uncharged isometry, and yet further ways to T-dualize inside the residual $U(1) \times U(1)$ to get to IIB - the result of this chain of dualities can potentially end up being rather complicated. Rather we would just like to stress that if one is interested in constructing a non equal norm $\text{Mink}_4 \times S^2$ solution in type II, this is best done from the M5-brane perspective.

In the next section we shall provide master classes for the remaining $\text{Mink}_4 \times S^2$ solutions in type II, namely those with equal spinor norm.

4 Master Classes for $\text{Mink}_4 \times S^2$ and Hint of a New Solution Generating Technique

In [47, 48], $\text{Mink}_4 \times S^2$ solutions with equal spinor norm were classified. They fall into three distinct classes characterised by the minimum number of uncharged $U(1)$ isometries the internal four-manifold M_4 contain a priori⁹. Specifically one has

$$\begin{array}{lll} \text{Case I: } M_4 = M_2 \times \Sigma_2, & \text{Case II: } S^1 \hookrightarrow M_4, & \text{Case III: } T^2 \hookrightarrow M_4, \\ & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ & M_3 & M_2 \end{array}$$

Class I has no a priori isometries on M_4 , for Class II one generically has a $U(1)$ bundle over a 3-manifold, while generic solutions in Class III have a T^2 bundle over a 2-manifold - They can be found in sections 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 of [47, 48] for IIA and IIB respectively. Cases II and III contain 1 and 2 constant parameters respectively - when they are set to zero one reduces to classes that have local $\text{Mink}_5 \times S^2$ and $\text{Mink}_6 \times S^2$ factors. More surprising is that all solutions in class III, all in IIB class II, and many in class II IIB, are governed by the same PDE's irrespective of whether or not these parameters are turned on - such generic solutions in these classes can be viewed as parametric deformations of un-fibred $\text{Mink}_4 \times S^1 \times S^2$ and $\text{Mink}_4 \times T^2 \times S^2$ solutions respectively, where the first two factors share a common warping in each instance¹⁰.

The existence of parametric deformations raise an obvious question - is some sort of duality at play? Two obvious candidates are formal U-dualities of the type in [63] and T-s-T transformations [64] - which are both solution generating techniques involving chains of string dualities and coordinate transformations (specifically shifts between $U(1)$ isometries) that do not commute with

⁹This in turn is related to which inner products of the two independent non-chiral four-dimensional spinors are assumed to be non vanishing, see [47, 48] for details.

¹⁰When this is true, locally, there is no difference between $\text{Mink}_4 \times T^n$ and Mink_{4+n} . However, for the parametric deformations the warp factors are no longer the same and T^n becomes fibered over a base. As such it makes more sense physically for only the Mink_4 directions to be non compact in these cases.

these dualities. As we shall see this is enough to explain case III, but case II is more subtle and seems to point the way to a new solution generating technique.

In the previous section we established that all solutions in type II supergravity with non equal norm can be obtained from the M5-brane, by reduction and T-duality - so one can view the M5-brane as a master class for all such solutions. In this section, in addition to explaining the origin of the parametric deformations, we establish master classes for the non equal norm in type II. The first of these is M-theory Case A in section 2.3, the second is class I in IIB - note that after imposing a U(1) isometry in the M-theory class and reducing on it one end up in class I in IIA. We shall quote these solutions in the next sub-sections for convenience. All other cases can be generated from these via certain chains of dualities, as we shall show - the maps between solutions are also summarized in Fig 2.

4.1 Master Class in Type IIB: Case I in IIB

The master class in Type IIB has a NS sector that takes the local form

$$ds^2 = e^{2A} ds^2(\text{Mink}_4) + e^{-2A} \left(\frac{1}{f} (dx_1^2 + dx_2^2 + x_2^2 ds^2(S^2)) \right) + ds^2(\Sigma_2),$$

$$ds^2 = e^{-2A} (dx_3^2 + dx_4^2), \quad B = g \left(\text{Vol}(S^2) + \frac{dx_1 \wedge dx_2}{x_2^2} \right), \quad e^{-\Phi} = f, \quad (4.1)$$

where e^{2A} depends on all four-dimensional local coordinates x_i , and f, g have support on Σ_2 only. The RR sector is generically non trivial, with F_1, F_3, F_5 all turned on, and can be found in [48]. Solving the Bianchi identities of these fluxes (away from localized sources) requires the following PDE's to be solved

$$\square_2 f = 0, \quad \square_2 (fg) = 0, \quad \square_2 = \partial_{x_3}^2 + \partial_{x_4}^2, \quad (4.2a)$$

$$\partial_{x_1}^2 (e^{-4A}) + \frac{1}{x_2^2} \partial_{x_2} (x_2^2 \partial_{x_2} (e^{-4A})) + \square_2 (e^{-4A} f^{-1}) + \frac{1}{x_2^4} \square_2 (fg^2) = 0. \quad (4.2b)$$

The six dimensions orthogonal to Mink_4 in-fact support a conformal Calabi–Yau. Clearly if impose that one of $\partial_{x_3}, \partial_{x_4}$ is an isometry (which g does not depend on) and T-dualize on it we end up with a local Mink_5 class in IIA which exhausts this class. If we make both isometries (and g constant) then T-dualize on both we exhaust the $\text{Mink}_6 \times S^2$ solutions in IIB. Of course one still has a U(1) isometries when g is an polynomial of order 1 - When this is the case we can gauge transform such that B respects the isometry, but as a leg in it - this generically leads to the U(1) becoming fibred over the S^2 in the T-dual.

4.2 IIA Reduction of Master Class in M-theory: Case I in IIA

Case I in IIA can be generated from M-theory by imposing a U(1) isometry within the SU(2)-structure of the M-theory class in section 2.3 and reducing on it. This class is rather more complicated than it's IIB counter-part, with the six-dimensional space orthogonal to Mink_4 supporting an

orthogonal SU(2)-structure. The local form of the NS sector in this class is

$$ds^2 = e^{2A} ds^2(\text{Mink}_4) + e^{-4A+2\Phi} \left(dx_2^2 + x_2^2 ds^2(S^2) \right) + e^{4A-2\Phi} \left(dx_1 + B_0 e^{-4A+2\Phi} dx_2 \right)^2 + ds^2(\Sigma_2),$$

$$ds^2(\Sigma_2) = e^{-2A} (dx_3^2 + dx_4^2), \quad B = x_2^2 e^{-4A+2\Phi} B_0 \text{Vol}(S^2), \quad (4.3)$$

where e^{2A} , e^Φ , B_0 each generically depend on all the four-dimensional local coordinates x_i . Supersymmetry additionally requires the following PDE's to be solved

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_2} (e^{2A-2\Phi}) &= \partial_{x_1} (e^{-2A} B_0), \\ \partial_{x_2} (x_2^2 e^{-2A} B_0) &= \partial_{x_1} (x_2^2 e^{-6A+2\Phi} (1 + B_0^2)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

The RR sector is rather involved, but can be found in [47], however there is no Romans mass. Ensuring that the fluxes obey the correct Bianchi identities imposed another set of PDE's

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_3}^2 (e^{2A-2\Phi}) + \partial_{x_4}^2 (e^{2A-2\Phi}) + \partial_{x_1}^2 (e^{-4A}) &= 0, \\ \partial_{x_3}^2 (e^{-2A} B_0) + \partial_{x_4}^2 (e^{-2A} B_0) + \partial_{x_1} \partial_{x_2} (e^{-4A}) &= 0, \\ \partial_{x_3}^2 (x_2^2 e^{-6A+2\Phi} (1 + B_0^2)) + \partial_{x_4}^2 (x_2^2 e^{-6A+2\Phi} (1 + B_0^2)) + \partial_{x_2} (x_2^2 \partial_{x_2} (e^{-4A})) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

We can generate the Mink₅ and Mink₆ cases in IIB and IIA respectively by imposing that the canonical coordinates on Σ_2 are isometry direction, and that dB has no leg in this isometry. Clearly if impose that one of ∂_{x_3} , ∂_{x_4} is an isometry (which g does not depend on) and T-dualize on it we end up with a local Mink₅ class in IIA which exhausts this class. If we make both isometries (and g constant) then T-dualize on both we exhaust the Mink₆ \times S^2 solutions in IIB.

4.3 Generating Case II

In this section we shall establish how case II in IIA and IIB are generated from the master systems - as we shall see this is achieved through a generalisation of a T-s-T transformation. Generic solutions in this class are parametric deformations of solutions with metric factor

$$ds^2 = e^{2A} \left(ds^2(\text{Mink}_4) + ds^2(S^1) \right) + e^{2C} ds^2(S^2) + \dots \quad (4.6)$$

and similarly for the fluxes and for many cases, the deformed solutions are governed by the same PDE's as the undeformed ones. The deformations are reminiscent of T-s-T transformations, but since we only have the flavour U(1) of S^1 to work with this cannot be what is happening here. The deformations turn out to be possible precisely because these solutions, after T-dualizing, can be embedded in more general master systems for Mink₄ \times S^2 with no a prior isometry. One generates solutions of the form (4.6) from the master systems by imposing that one direction in Σ_2 , ∂_{x_4} say, is an isometry and T-dualizing on it. One can generate deformations by performing a diffeomorphism

mixing ∂_{x_4} and a direction in M_2 , ∂_{x_1} say, in terms of an arbitrary constant c_0 ie $x_1 \rightarrow x_1 - c_0 x_4$. Only then does one impose that ∂_{x_4} is an isometry. Such a diffeomorphism will require a frame rotation (with respect to the un-transformed case) to put the solution in the canonical T-duality frame, where the solution can be expressed in terms of a U(1) fibration over a 9 dimensional base, ie

$$ds^2 = ds^2(M_9) + e^{2\tilde{A}}(dx_4 + \mathcal{A})^2, \quad B = \tilde{B}_2 + \tilde{B}_1(dx_4 + \mathcal{A}), \quad (4.7)$$

If the RR fluxes have components orthogonal to x_1 but with a leg in x_4 , such a diffeomorphism and frame rotation will turn on additional RR flux components in vielbein frame that lie orthogonal to the isometry vielbein $e^{x_4} = e^{\tilde{A}}(dx_4 + \mathcal{A})$. Under T-duality a RR flux component parallel to e^{x_4} is mapped as $\tilde{F}_n \rightarrow \tilde{F}_{n-1}$ while one that lies orthogonal is mapped to \tilde{F}_{n+1} , as such these new flux components cannot be turned off with a coordinate transformation in the T-dual, so this diffeomorphism does not commute with T-duality in this instance. One also has a non T-duality commuting diffeomorphism whenever the warp factors of the x_1 and x_4 directions in the metric are not constant or equal¹¹. A non T-duality commuting diffeomorphism then generates a parametric deformation in the T-dual of the master system -The result is much like a T-s-T transformation of the (4.6) class of solutions, but only a single U(1) is required.

Before explicitly spelling out exactly how case II in IIA and IIB are realized from the master systems, let us pause to stress a few points. First, if x_1 and x_4 are both set to isometry directions, after the diffeomorphism, the result of T-dualizing on x_4 coincides with performing a T-s-T transformation on these directions in the (4.6) subclass of class II, so what we have here is a generalization of T-s-T. Second, clearly we were able to spot this generalization because we have completely local expressions for case I in IIA and IIB - we do not however expect this solution generating technique to require this in general.

4.3.1 Case II in IIA

It was already observed in [47] that when one T-dualized on the U(1) isometry of Case II in IIA, one is mapped to a conformal Calabi–Yau type system - this system is clearly case I in IIB. To see this we perform the coordinate transformation

$$x_1 \rightarrow x_1 - c_0 x_4 \quad (4.8)$$

in (4.1), the NS sector then takes the form

$$ds_6^2 = e^{-2A} \left(\frac{1}{f} (b^2 dx_1^2 + dx_2^2 + x_2^2 ds^2(S^2)) + dx_3^2 + \frac{1}{b^2} \left(dx_4 + \frac{ba_2}{\sqrt{f}} dx_1 \right)^2 \right),$$

$$B = g\mathcal{C}_2 + \frac{a_2\sqrt{f}}{b} g \frac{dx_2 \wedge dx_4}{x_2^2}, \quad \mathcal{C}_2 = \text{Vol}(S^2) + \frac{dx_1 \wedge dx_2}{x_2^2} \quad (4.9)$$

¹¹which is why we choose to use x_1 rather than x_3 as the additional coordinate, why we don't use x_2 should be obvious.

where

$$b^2 + a_2^2 = 1, \quad \frac{a_2 \sqrt{f}}{b} = c_0. \quad (4.10)$$

if we now impose that ∂_{x_4} is an isometry, we have

$$f(x_3, x_4) \rightarrow g(x_3), \quad g(x_3, x_4) \rightarrow g(x_3), \quad A(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \rightarrow A(x_1, x_2, x_3) \quad (4.11)$$

and the PDE's governing the system become

$$\partial_{x_3}^2 f = 0, \quad \partial_{x_3}^2 (fg) = 0, \quad (4.12a)$$

$$\frac{1}{b^2} \partial_{x_1}^2 (e^{-4A}) + \frac{1}{x_2^2} \partial_{x_2} (x_2^2 \partial_{x_2} (e^{-4A})) + \partial_{x_3}^2 (f^{-1} e^{-4A}) + \frac{1}{x_2^4} \partial_{x_3}^2 (fg^2) = 0, \quad (4.12b)$$

ie exactly what one has for case II in IIA. If we now T-dualize on ∂_{x_4} the effect of (4.8) can no longer be turned off with a coordinate transformation, (4.9) is mapped to the NS sector of case II in IIA (see sec 4.4 of [47] for a comparison) and the the RR fluxes and PDEs also follow. When x_3 is also assumed to be an isometry (4.12b) the same for all values of c_0 , this is of course because the procedure reduces to T-s-T acting on the $c_0 = 0$ case. This is not the only way to make this happen though, indeed if $b = \text{constant}$, we can remove it from the PDE by rescaling x_1 , the result is another parametric deformation, with the same PDE's for all c_0 , but with x_3 no longer an isometry.

4.3.2 Case II in IIB

We can generate case II in IIB from case I in IIA, which itself descends from case A in M-theory by dimensional reduction. Starting from the NS sector in (4.3) one performs the coordinate transformation

$$x_1 \rightarrow x_1 - c_0 x_4 \quad (4.13)$$

and imposes that ∂_{x_4} is an isometry - so that the that the physical fields depend on the local coordinates (x_1, x_2, x_3) only. Notice that the warp factors of the dx_1^2 and dx_4^2 directions are not equal, so this transformation will not commute with T-duality on ∂_{x_4} generically. This time after T-dualizing , one generates case II in IIB and one can map the PDE's for generic c_0 to those for $c_0 = 0$ by rescaling x_1 as in before, but without making further assumptions about the physical fields. Thus, the entire of case II in IIB is a on parameter family of solutions governed by common PDE's. To make contact with the conventions of section 4.4 of [48] one should identify the deformation parameter c_0 with the following combination of functions there

$$c_0 = e^{-4A + \Phi} \frac{\kappa_{\parallel}}{\kappa_{\perp}}, \quad (4.14)$$

where $\kappa_{\parallel}^2 + \kappa_{\perp}^2 = 1$ are angles parametrizing a point depended SU(2)-structure there - it is not hard to check that the right hand side of this expression is indeed a constant.

For now we are at a loss as to why the generalized T-s-T procedure does not modify the PDE's for case II in IIB, but generically does in IIA. It is of course possible that a change of coordinates

exists in IIA after which the PDE's actually do match, but we were so far unable to find it. We hope to study the possible utility of the generalized T-s-T procedure as a solution generating technique in the future.

4.4 Generating Case III

In this section we will sketch how Case III in type IIA and IIB can be generated from one of the master systems. As this only involves standard solution generating techniques we will be less detailed than Case II.

4.4.1 Case III in IIB

Case III in IIB can be generated from case I in IIB by first imposing that $\Sigma_2 = T^2$ so that one has two isometries to work with and setting

$$g = 0. \tag{4.15}$$

Notice that this makes the dilaton constant and reduces (4.2b) to a Laplacian in four dimensions; indeed, if we now T-dualize on both direction in $\sigma_2 = T^2$ we are mapped to D5-brane in flat space. We can generate a double parametric deformation of the D5-brane system as follows

1. Formal U-duality on spatial Mink₄ directions¹²
2. T-dualize on ∂_{x_4} and add an exact to the NS 2-form
3. Shift $x_3 \rightarrow x_3 + \gamma x_4$
4. T-dualize on ∂_{x_4}

One needs to supplement this by rescaling the dilaton, Minkowski and local coordinates, but after doing this carefully one is mapped to Case III in IIB.

4.4.2 Case III in IIA

Case III in IIA can be generated in a similar fashion. We again fix $\Sigma_2 = T^2$ and T-dualize on both U(1)'s therein. We are mapped to a Mink₆ system studied in [67] (see also section 4.1 of [47]), with non trivial NS and RR 0 and 2 form fluxes. We have checked that the following chain of dualities, boosts and shifts maps this to section Case III in IIA

1. Four T-dualities performed on the spatial Mink₄ directions and one direction in T^2 , say x_4 .
2. Lift to M-theory, boost along the M-theory isometry, reduce back to IIA.
3. Shift $x_3 \rightarrow x_3 + \gamma x_4$

¹²A T-duality on each of the 3 spacial directions, lift to M-theory, boost along the M-theory circle, reduce back to IIA, redo the spatial T-dualities to return to IIB.




Figure 2: Depiction of the chains of dualities leading to the various $\text{Mink}_4 \times S^2$ class in type II with equal spinor norm. Cases A in M-theory and I in IIB (shaded grey) are the truly fundamental master cases from which all else can be generated. Specifically γ_1, γ'_1 represent a generalized T-s-T transformations, where one performs a diffeomorphism mixing the M_2 and Σ_2 factors in case I, and introducing a parameter c_0 . One then imposes an isometry and T-dualizing on it, in many cases generic c_0 gives parametric deformation of $c_0 = 0$ governed by the same PDE's. γ_2, γ'_2 represent the following: Impose $\Sigma_2 = T^2$ in case I and T-dualize on both directions, lets call this case III_0 , - one then performs a formal U-duality followed by a T-s-T transformation with T^2 - which generates a two parameter deformation of of case III_0 governed by the same PDE's, ie case III.

4. Four more T-dualities once more on the spatial Mink₄ directions and x_4 .

Along the way some additional rescaling of coordinates is required, but this gives the general idea - ie Case III in IIA is generated by a combination of U-duality and T-s-T transformation.

5 Examples

In this section we give some simple examples in M-theory that follow from case A in M-theory, we exclude case B because it is very simple - of course $\text{AdS}_7 \times S^4/\mathbb{Z}_k$ can be embedded here, but as this just requires solving a simple Laplace equation, we omit the details. In section 5.1 we show how $\mathcal{N} = 2$ AdS_5 solutions are embedded in M-theory case while in section 5.2 we provide some evidence that the squashed S^3 ansatz of section 2.3.2 likely contains compact Mink₄ solutions in M-theory with non trivial fluxes

5.1 $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $\text{AdS}_5 \times S^2$ in M-theory

AdS_5 solutions preserving $\mathcal{N} = 2$ in M-theory were classified in [45] (which was shown to be exhaustive in [65]), in this section we will show how they are embedded within M-theory class A.

The metric of these solutions is of the form

$$ds^2 = e^{2\lambda} \left(4ds^2(\text{AdS}_5) + y^2 e^{-6\lambda} ds^2(S^2) \right) + \frac{4}{(1 - y\partial_y D)} e^{2\lambda} (d\psi + V)^2, \\ + \frac{-\partial_y D}{y} e^{2\lambda} \left(dy^2 + e^D (d\hat{x}_1^2 + d\hat{x}_2^2) \right), \quad (5.1)$$

$$e^{-6\lambda} = \frac{-\partial_y D}{y(1 - y\partial_y D)}, \quad V = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_{x_2} d\hat{x}_1 - \partial_{\hat{x}_1} d\hat{x}_2), \quad (5.2)$$

where D is a function of y, x_1, x_2 and ∂_ψ is an isometry; this one together with the S^2 factor realize the $SU(2) \times U(1)$ R-symmetry of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ super-conformal algebra in four dimensions. Comparing this with (2.38) we see that if one realize AdS as

$$ds^2(\text{AdS}_5) = e^{2r} ds^2(\text{Mink}_4) + dr^2, \quad (5.3)$$

then one needs to fix

$$\rho = e^{2r} y, \quad e^{2\Delta} = e^{2\lambda+2r}, \quad v = -e^{-2\lambda} (2dr + dy). \quad (5.4)$$

In order get a metric that actually respects the isometries of AdS, we need the radial component to point along one of the vielbein that make up the $SU(2)$ in such a way that the metric has no dr cross terms, and has a common warp factor for all the putative AdS directions - the $SU(2)$ structure should also be charged under ∂_ψ . After some work, one is able to establish that the following 4 dimensional vielbein satisfies all the $SU(2)$ -structure conditions

$$u = \sqrt{\frac{-\partial_y D}{y}} e^{\lambda+\frac{1}{2}D} (dx_1 + idx_2), \quad w = 2e^{i\psi} e^{-2\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{y}{-\partial_y D}} \left(dr + \frac{1}{2} \partial_y D dy + i(d\psi + V) \right), \quad (5.5)$$

provided that D satisfies the Toda equation

$$(\partial_{x_1}^2 + \partial_{x_2}^2)D + \partial_y^2 e^D = 0, \quad (5.6)$$

away from localized sources. The flux F_2 that follows from this is then

$$F_2 = e^{4\lambda} y^{-2} \left(2(d\psi + V) \wedge d(y^3 e^{-6\lambda}) + 2y(1 - y^2 e^{-6\lambda})dV - \partial_y e^D dx_1 \wedge dx_2 \right), \quad (5.7)$$

which reproduces the correct M-theory 4-form through $G = e^{2C} \text{Vol}(S^2) \wedge F_2$ and obeys the Bianchi identity.

5.2 Towards Compact Mink₄ in M-theory with Fluxes

The ansatz of section 2.3.2, contains a squashed S^3 in addition to the Mink₄ \times S^2 factor generic to all solutions we considered. As such it is a prime candidate for solutions which support a Taub-NUT or Atiyah–Hitchin manifolds. Metrics with Atiyah–Hitchin singularities (which are the lift of O6 planes) are a possible option to make flat-space solutions in M-theory with non trivial fluxes compact. Here we show that it is indeed possible to find metrics with such singularities inside section 2.3.2 with a simple example.

The solutions in section 2.3.2 are defined in terms of a single undetermined function e^{-2K} that is governed by a relatively simple PDE in two variable (ρ, y) , namely (2.49). The simplest way to make progress with this PDE is with a separation of variables ansatz

$$e^{-2K} = p(\rho)q(y). \quad (5.8)$$

The PDE then reduces to two ODE's of the form

$$\frac{1}{\rho^2} \partial_\rho(\rho^2 \partial_\rho p) + c_1 p^2 = 0, \quad \partial_y^2(q^2) = \frac{c_1 q}{c + y}, \quad (5.9)$$

where c, c_1 are constants. These ODE's are still somewhat non trivial to solve, so in principle one can could proceed numerically, however our aim is just to show the plausibility of finding compact solutions with non trivial fluxes in the squashed S^3 ansatz, so let us just make most simple, non trivial assumption

$$c_1 = 0, \quad p = 1. \quad (5.10)$$

As a consequence of this

$$q = L\sqrt{y - b} \quad (5.11)$$

for L, b constants and we have $G = 0$ while the part of the metric spanned by (ρ, S^2) becomes simply \mathbb{R}^3 or equivalently T^3 . So the metric for this solution is given (for $L = 1$)

$$ds^2 = ds^2(\text{Mink}_4) + ds^2(T^3) + \frac{dy^2}{(y+c)\sqrt{y+b}} + \frac{\sqrt{y+b}}{4} ds^2(\tilde{S}^2) + \frac{y+c}{4\sqrt{y+b}} (d\psi + \eta)^2, \quad (5.12)$$

ie a squashed S^3 foliated over an interval - which is in fact bounded. One can check that close to $y = -c$ the metric exhibits an Atiyah–Hitchin singularity while as y approaches $-b$ the warp factor of \tilde{S}^2 becomes constant and the remaining directions vanish regularly as \mathbb{R}^2 in polar coordinates - thus if we assume $-c < -b$ the interval is bounded between $-c < y < -b$ and the manifold is compact.

This example of course has no fluxes turned on, but it seems likely that, even within the separation of variables ansatz, it will be possible to find similar solutions, with $G \neq 0$ and with $T^3 \rightarrow (\rho, \text{Vol}(S^2))$ with the metric warped in terms of ρ . It would be interesting to pursue this - but such a detailed study is outside of the scope of this work.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Eirik Eik Svanes and Alessandro Tomasiello for useful discussions. Additionally N Macpherson would like to thank the IFT in Madrid, where this work was completed, for their warm hospitality. A. Legramandi is funded in part by INFN, N Macpherson is funded by the Italian Ministry of Education, Universities and Research under the Prin project “Non Perturbative Aspects of Gauge Theories and Strings” (2015MP2CX4) and INFN.

A Killing Spinors in M-theory

In this appendix we derive some of the conditions that will be useful in section 2 and we prove that the M-theory case with a G_2 structure is actually a subcase of M-theory classification.

The eleven-dimensional supersymmetry condition can be written as

$$D_M \epsilon + \frac{1}{24}(3G\gamma_M - \gamma_M G)\epsilon = 0. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where G is defined in (2.1). The first step is to perform a decomposition from 11 to 4+7 dimensions

$$\epsilon = \zeta_+ \otimes \chi + \zeta_- \otimes \chi^c \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where ζ_+ is a four-dimensional spinor with positive chirality, $\zeta_+^c = \zeta_-$ and χ is a seven-dimensional one.

Evaluating (A.1) on Mink_4 directions we get the following algebraic condition:

$$\left(e^{-\Delta} \partial_a e^{\Delta} \gamma^a - \frac{1}{3} i f + \frac{1}{6} F \right) \chi = 0 \quad (\text{A.3})$$

while taking the internal index

$$\left(D_a + \frac{1}{24}(3F\gamma_a - \gamma_a F) - \frac{i}{12} f \gamma_a \right) \chi = 0. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where we have chosen $\gamma_5 = i\text{Vol}_4$. Multiplying (A.3) by $\gamma_a/4$ we can further simplify (A.4):

$$\left(D_a + \frac{1}{8} F \gamma_a - \frac{i}{6} f \gamma_a + \frac{1}{4} e^{-\Delta} \partial^b e^{\Delta} \gamma_a \gamma_b \right) \chi = 0. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

From these conditions we can easily prove that $f = 0$, indeed contracting (A.3) by χ^\dagger and make the difference with the conjugate of the same expression of we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \chi^\dagger \left(e^{-\Delta} \partial_a e^\Delta \gamma^a - \frac{1}{3} i f + \frac{1}{6} F \right) \chi - \bar{\chi} \left(-e^{-\Delta} \partial_a e^\Delta \gamma^a + \frac{1}{3} i f + \frac{1}{6} F \right) \chi^c \\
&= 2i \left(e^{-\Delta} \partial_a e^\Delta \text{Im}(\chi^\dagger \gamma^a \chi) - \frac{1}{6} \text{Im}(\chi^\dagger F \chi) - \frac{1}{3} f \right) \\
&= -\frac{2i}{3} f \chi^\dagger \chi = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

since the bilinears of $\chi \chi^\dagger$ are real if they have degree 0, 1, 4, 5 and purely imaginary otherwise.

When $\chi^c = \chi$, we can only define a G_2 structure on M_7 . From the sum and the difference of (A.3) with its conjugate we have that $F\chi = 0$ and $\partial_a \Delta \gamma^a \chi = 0$. From the second condition we have:

$$(\partial_a \Delta \gamma^a)^2 \chi = (\partial_a \Delta \partial^a \Delta) \chi = 0 \tag{A.7}$$

which implies $\partial^a \Delta = 0$ since a sum of squares vanishes if and only if each individual term in the sum does. Moreover from (A.4)

$$D_a \chi + D_a \chi^c = 2D_a \chi = 0 \tag{A.8}$$

and then we can set $F = 0$. So the internal 7-manifold actually has G_2 holonomy and no warping factor on Mink_4 . Although such solutions may exist with $M_7 = S^2 \times M_5$ we need not consider them explicitly; indeed there are no Killing spinors on S^2 such that $\xi = \xi^c$, and there is no invariant form on S^2 that maps the Killing spinor to its Majorana conjugate - as such imposing $\chi^c = \chi$ makes χ contain two separable five-dimensional systems, one coupling to ξ one to ξ^c - this just imposes additional constraints on the 5d system that follows from $\chi^c \neq \chi$, so cases with G_2 holonomy are special cases of the systems we consider in the main text. We thus restrict ourselves to $SU(3)$ structure case $\chi \neq \chi^c$.

Now let's analyze the zero-form constraints on M_7 :

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_a (\chi^\dagger \chi) &= D_a \chi^\dagger \chi + \chi^\dagger D_a \chi = \frac{1}{12} \left(\chi^\dagger \gamma_a F \chi + \chi^\dagger F \gamma_a \chi \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \partial_b \Delta \left(\chi^\dagger \gamma_a \gamma_b \chi + \chi^\dagger \gamma_b \gamma_a \chi \right) = \partial_a \Delta \chi^\dagger \chi,
\end{aligned} \tag{A.9}$$

from which we have

$$d(e^{-\Delta} \chi^\dagger \chi) = 0 \tag{A.10}$$

and so we can set, without loss of generality, $\|\chi\|^2 = e^\Delta$. Moreover, we can also calculate

$$\partial_a (\bar{\chi} \chi) = -\frac{1}{6} (\bar{\chi} \gamma_a F \chi - \bar{\chi} F \gamma_a \chi) = -2\partial_a \Delta \chi^\dagger \chi \tag{A.11}$$

which implies

$$d(e^{2\Delta} \bar{\chi} \chi) = 0. \tag{A.12}$$

This equation tells us that the phase of $\bar{\chi}\chi$ is constant and then we can set it to zero choosing the following parametrization:

$$\bar{\chi}\chi = ce^{-2\Delta} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where c is a real constant.

Let's analyze the two zero-form equations using our ansatz (2.9). The first condition in terms of the five and two dimensional spinors reads:

$$\frac{1}{2}(\eta_1^\dagger\eta_1 + \eta_2^\dagger\eta_2) + \frac{y_3}{2}(\eta_1^\dagger\eta_2 + \eta_2^\dagger\eta_1) = e^\Delta, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

to preserve the $SU(2)$ R-symmetry the warp factor cannot depend on the coordinate on the sphere, so we have

$$\|\eta_1\|^2 + \|\eta_2\|^2 = 2e^\Delta, \quad \text{Re}(\eta_1^\dagger\eta_2) = 0. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

On the other hand (A.12) reads

$$-(y_1 - iy_2)\bar{\eta}_1\eta_2 = ce^{-2\Delta} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

and then we must have

$$\bar{\eta}_1\eta_2 = 0, \quad c = 0. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

These considerably simplify the supersymmetry conditions, and in particular we can restrict to (2.11), as we have done in the main text.

B $\text{Mink}_4 \times S^2$ Killing Spinor Conditions in Type IIB

In this appendix we derive the four-dimensional Killing spinor conditions a supersymmetric solutions of type IIB on $\text{Mink}_4 \times S^2 \times \text{M}_4$ must obey. In the conventions of [62] the type IIB supersymmetry conditions are

$$\partial\Phi\epsilon_1 - \frac{1}{2}H\epsilon_1 + e^\Phi\left(F_1 + \frac{1}{2}F_3\right)\epsilon_2 = 0, \quad (\text{B.1a})$$

$$\partial\Phi\epsilon_2 + \frac{1}{2}H\epsilon_2 + e^\Phi\left(-F_1 + \frac{1}{2}F_3\right)\epsilon_1 = 0, \quad (\text{B.1b})$$

$$\left(\nabla_M - \frac{1}{4}H_M\right)\epsilon_1 - \frac{e^\Phi}{8}\left(F_1 + F_3 + \frac{1}{2}F_5\right)\Gamma_M\epsilon_2 = 0, \quad (\text{B.1c})$$

$$\left(\nabla_M + \frac{1}{4}H_M\right)\epsilon_1 - \frac{e^\Phi}{8}\left(-F_1 + F_3 - \frac{1}{2}F_5\right)\Gamma_M\epsilon_1 = 0, \quad (\text{B.1d})$$

where ϵ_i are two positive chirality Majorana spinors. If we seek a solution that contains a Mink_4 factor foliated over the internal space by a warp factor e^{2A} , we can decompose the ten-dimensional Clifford algebra as

$$\Gamma_\mu = e^A\gamma_\mu^{(4)} \otimes \mathbb{I}, \quad \Gamma_a = \gamma_5^{(4)} \otimes \gamma_a^{(6)}, \quad \mu = 0, \dots, 3, \quad a = 4, \dots, 9 \quad (\text{B.2})$$

and the ten-dimensional spinors as

$$\epsilon_i = \zeta_+ \otimes \chi_+^i + \text{m.c} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where ζ_+, χ_+^i are positive chirality spinors in four and six dimensions respectively, and (B.1a)-(B.1d) become

$$\partial A \chi_+^1 + \frac{e^\Phi}{4} \left(F_1 + F_3 + \tilde{F}_5 \right) \chi_+^2 = 0, \quad (\text{B.4a})$$

$$\partial A \chi_+^2 + \frac{e^\Phi}{4} \left(-F_1 + F_3 - \tilde{F}_5 \right) \chi_+^1 = 0, \quad (\text{B.4b})$$

$$\partial \Phi \chi_+^1 - \frac{1}{2} H \chi_+^1 + e^\Phi \left(F_1 + \frac{1}{2} F_3 \right) \chi_+^2 = 0, \quad (\text{B.4c})$$

$$\partial \Phi \chi_+^2 + \frac{1}{2} H \chi_+^2 + e^\Phi \left(-F_1 + \frac{1}{2} F_3 \right) \chi_+^1 = 0, \quad (\text{B.4d})$$

$$\left(\nabla_a - \frac{1}{4} H_a \right) \chi_+^1 - \frac{e^\Phi}{8} \left(F_1 + F_3 + \tilde{F}_5 \right) \gamma_a^{(6)} \chi_+^2 = 0, \quad (\text{B.4e})$$

$$\left(\nabla_a + \frac{1}{4} H_a \right) \chi_+^2 - \frac{e^\Phi}{8} \left(-F_1 + F_3 - \tilde{F}_5 \right) \gamma_a^{(6)} \chi_+^1 = 0, \quad (\text{B.4f})$$

where F_1, F_3, H_3 are purely magnetic and \tilde{F}_5 is the magnetic component of F_5 .

Using (B.4e) and (B.4f) together with (B.4a)-(B.4d) multiplied by γ_a , we get the following conditions on the zero degree bilinears:

$$\begin{aligned} |\chi_+^1|^2 + |\chi_+^2|^2 &= 2e^A, & |\chi_+^1|^2 - |\chi_+^2|^2 &= 2c_- e^{-A}, \\ \partial_a (e^{2A-\Phi} \chi_+^{2\dagger} \chi_+^1) - e^{2A-\Phi} \partial_a (\chi_+^{1\dagger} \chi_+^2) &= i e^{3A} (\star F_5)_a - c_- e^A (F_1)_a. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

If we now assume we have an $SU(2)$ R-symmetry parameterized by a round S^2 factor in our solution we have again to factorize the Clifford algebra, and we choose the following conventions:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_i^{(6)} &= \sigma_i \otimes \mathbb{I}, \quad i = 1, 2 & \gamma_{a+2}^{(6)} &= \sigma_3 \otimes \gamma_a, \quad a = 1, \dots, 4 \\ B^{(6)} &= \sigma_2 \otimes B, \quad B = B^{-1} = -B^* = -B^T, & \gamma_a^* &= B^{-1} \gamma_a B, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where e^C is the warping function for S^2 . Moreover, we have to decompose the spinors

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_+^1 &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\xi \otimes (\eta^1 + \eta^2) + \sigma_3 \xi \otimes \hat{\gamma}^{(6)} (\eta^1 + \eta^2) \right], \\ \chi_+^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\xi \otimes \hat{\gamma}^{(6)} (\eta^1 - \eta^2) + \sigma_3 \xi \otimes (\eta^1 - \eta^2) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

and the fluxes

$$F = f + e^{2C} \text{Vol}(S^2) \wedge g, \quad H = H_3 + e^{2C} \text{Vol}(S^2) \wedge H_1, \quad (\text{B.8})$$

one can show that (B.4a)-(B.4f) is equivalent to (3.13a)-3.13h in the main text.

C Towards Solutions for the General IIA case

In this way we will find a large ansatz that allows us to simplify Case I in IIA in such a way to have a diagonal metric. In this case supersymmetry is implied by the following equations:

$$d(e^A w) = 0, \quad d(e^{2A+C-\Phi}) + e^{2A-\Phi} v_2 = 0, \quad d(e^{-2A+\Phi}(v_1 + B_0 v_2)) = 0 \quad (\text{C.1a})$$

$$d(e^{-\Phi} v_1) \wedge w \wedge \bar{w} = 0, \quad d(e^{2C-\Phi}(B_0 v_1 - v_2)) \wedge w \wedge \bar{w} = 0, \quad B_2 = 0. \quad (\text{C.1b})$$

In the present case equations (C.1) automatically give us a definition of a diagonal vielbein except for the component v_1 , which we diagonalize by hand with the introduction of an arbitrary function μ :

$$v_1 = e^{\Phi+\mu} dx_1, \quad v_2 = -e^{-2A+\Phi} dx_2, \quad w_1 = e^{-A} dx_3, \quad w_2 = e^{-A} dx_4. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

where $x_2 = e^{2A+C-\Phi}$. The internal metric thus reads

$$ds_6^2 = e^{-4A+2\Phi} (dx_2^2 + x_2^2 ds^2(S^2)) + e^{2\Phi+2\mu} dx_1^2 + e^{-2A} (dx_3^2 + dx_4^2). \quad (\text{C.3})$$

It turns out to be useful define the following functions:

$$f = e^{-2A+2\Phi+\mu}, \quad g = e^{2C} B_0. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

The other equations of (C.1) imply that $f = f(x_1, x_2)$, $g = g(x_1, x_2)$ and $\mu = \mu(x_1, x_3, x_4)$. Moreover we have the following PDEs:

$$\partial_{x_1} g = -x_2^2 \partial_{x_2} f, \quad (\text{C.5a})$$

$$\partial_{x_2} g = x_2^2 e^{-\mu} \partial_{x_1} (f e^{-4A-\mu}). \quad (\text{C.5b})$$

The fluxes are

$$B_2 = g \text{Vol}(S^2), \quad (\text{C.6a})$$

$$F_2 = (\partial_{x_4} e^\mu dx_3 - \partial_{x_3} e^\mu dx_4) \wedge dx_1 - f^{-1} \partial_{x_1} e^{-4A} dx_3 \wedge dx_4, \quad (\text{C.6b})$$

$$F_4 = B_2 \wedge F_2 + \text{Vol}(S^2) \wedge (x_2^2 f (\partial_{x_3} e^{-4A-\mu} dx_4 - \partial_{x_4} e^{-4A-\mu} dx_3) \wedge dx_2 - g (\partial_{x_4} e^\mu dx_3 - \partial_{x_3} e^\mu dx_4) \wedge dx_1 + (x_2^2 \partial_{x_2} e^{-4A} + g f^{-1} \partial_{x_1} e^{-4A}) dx_3 \wedge dx_4), \quad (\text{C.6c})$$

and the Bianchi identities for these fluxes impose the following PDEs:

$$\partial_{x_2} (f^{-1} \partial_{x_1} e^{-4A}) = 0 \quad (\text{C.7a})$$

$$(\partial_{x_3}^2 + \partial_{x_4}^2) e^\mu + \partial_{x_1} (f^{-1} \partial_{x_1} e^{-4A}) = 0 \quad (\text{C.7b})$$

$$f (\partial_{x_3}^2 + \partial_{x_4}^2) e^{-4A-\mu} + \frac{1}{x_2^2} \partial_{x_2} (x_2^2 \partial_{x_2} e^{-4A}) + \frac{1}{x_2^2} \partial_{x_2} g f^{-1} \partial_{x_1} e^{-4A} = 0. \quad (\text{C.7c})$$

We can notice that (C.7a) is just a restriction on the coordinate dependence of the physical fields, while (C.5) can be used to define H . If this is the case, then we can define f from this equation

$$\frac{1}{x_2^2} \partial_{x_2} (x_2^2 \partial_{x_2} f) + \partial_{x_1} (e^{-\mu} \partial_{x_1} (f e^{-4A-\mu})) = 0 \quad (\text{C.8})$$

which is redundant whenever g gets defined rather than it's derivatives.

At this point, solving these PDEs in full generality is hard; however, this class of solutions is large enough to allow us to impose some further ansatz and still obtaining interesting intersecting-brane systems.

The first thing that needs to be addressed is that the LHS of (C.5b) is independent of (x_3, x_4) which means the RHS should also be, which is not true a priori. We can deal with this by making an ansatz for e^{-4A} , we find that

$$\text{Case I : } e^{-4A} = f^{-1}e^\mu T(x_2, x_3, x_4), \quad (\text{C.9a})$$

$$\text{Case II : } e^{-4A} = f^{-1}H(x_1, x_2)S(x_3, x_4)^2, \quad (\text{C.9b})$$

$$e^\mu = S(x_3, x_4) \quad (\text{C.9c})$$

achieve the stated aims¹³. We will look at these cases separately in the following subsections.

C.1 Case I

Here (C.5a)-(C.5b) implies

$$g'(x_1) = f_1(x_1), \quad f = f_0(x_1) + \frac{f_1(x_1)}{x_2} \quad (\text{C.10})$$

The first thing we need to do is solve (C.7a) which becomes

$$\partial_{x_2} \left[\frac{1}{(x_2 f_0 + f_1)} \partial_{x_1} \left(\frac{e^\mu x_2^2 T}{x_2 f_0 + f_1} \right) \right] = 0. \quad (\text{C.11})$$

The obvious way to make progress with this is to do one of the following

$$f_0 = 0, \quad f_1 = 0, \quad \text{or} \quad f = c_0 + \frac{c_1}{x_2} \text{ for } c_i \text{ constant.} \quad (\text{C.12})$$

The first two of these turn out to be sub cases of the last up to a redefinitions of x_1 so we without loss of generality set

$$T = \frac{\tilde{T}(x_2, x_3, x_4)}{x_2^2(c_1 + c_2 x_2)}, \quad e^\mu = \tilde{S}(x_1, x_3, x_4), \quad f(x_2) = c_0 + \frac{c_1}{x_2} \quad (\text{C.13})$$

and then (C.7a) PDE's becomes a Youm like condition

$$\partial_{x_1} \tilde{S} \partial_{x_2} \tilde{U} = 0. \quad (\text{C.14})$$

¹³In principle one can add a generic function $e^{\mu_0(x_1)}$ in front of the expressions for e^{-4A} and e^μ in the second case, but it is easy to check that this can be reabsorbed into f and performing a change of coordinates. Another non-trivial generalization of the second case is to define $e^{-4A} = f^{-1}[H(x_1, x_2)S(x_3, x_4)^2 + T(x_2, x_3, x_4)]$. This case however seems to require further assumptions which so far didn't lead to something interesting.

C.1.1 $\partial_{x_1}\tilde{S} = 0$: Localized D4 and smeared D6-NS5 system

For this case \tilde{T} is not particularly useful, instead we define

$$T = fU(x_2, x_3, x_4), \quad \tilde{S} = S(x_3, x_4) \quad (\text{C.15})$$

We are then left with the PDE's

$$\square_2 S = 0, \quad f\square_2 U + \frac{S}{x_2^2}\partial_{x_2}(x_2^2\partial_{x_2}U) = 0 \quad (\text{C.16})$$

which define the system. The physical fields are defined by the solutions to these PDEs as

$$e^{2A} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{US}}, \quad e^{2\Phi+2\mu} = f\sqrt{\frac{U}{S}}, \quad e^{-4A+2\Phi} = f\sqrt{\frac{S}{U}}, \quad e^{2C}B_0 = c_1x_1. \quad (\text{C.17})$$

Finally we note that the only dependence on x_1 appears in the NS 2-form as $B = f_1x_1\text{Vol}(S^2)$, which gives rise to

$$H = c_1dx_1 \wedge \text{Vol}(S^2), \quad (\text{C.18})$$

so ∂_{x_1} is an isometry of any solution within this class. Comparing (C.17) and (C.3) with ([66], sections 4.2 and 4.5) we see that we have an ansatz for localized D4 stretched between D6-branes and ending on NS5 branes that are both smeared along x_1 .

C.1.2 $\partial_{x_2}\tilde{T} = 0$: Smeared D4-D6-NS5 system

Here we define

$$\tilde{T} = U(x_3, x_4), \quad \tilde{S} = S(x_1, x_3, x_4) \quad (\text{C.19})$$

and then the remaining PDE's become

$$\square_2 U = 0, \quad \square_2 S + U\partial_{x_1}^2 S = 0, \quad (\text{C.20})$$

The physical fields are defined as:

$$e^{2A} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{fSU}}, \quad e^{2\Phi+2\mu} = \sqrt{\frac{fS}{U}}, \quad e^{-4A+2\Phi} = f^{-3/2}\sqrt{\frac{S}{U}}, \quad e^{2C}B_0 = c_1x_1 \quad (\text{C.21})$$

We thus have a system of D4-D6-NS5 branes where the NS5 is smeared along x_1 while the D4 along x_2 .

C.2 Case II

Here (C.5b) becomes

$$\partial_{x_2}g = x_2^2e^{-\mu_0}\partial_{x_1}H \quad (\text{C.22})$$

The discussion turns out to be different if we consider the warping A to depend or not from x_1 .

C.2.1 $\partial_{x_1} e^{-4A} = 0$: Localised D4-NS5 smeared D6 system

To make e^{-4A} independent of x_1 we need to set

$$H = f\lambda(x_2). \quad (\text{C.23})$$

We can solve the (C.5a) by introducing the an auxiliary function $h(x_1, x_2)$ such that

$$f = \partial_{x_1} h, \quad g = -x_2^2 \partial_{x_2} h, \quad (\text{C.24})$$

We are then left with the PDE's

$$\partial_{x_2}(x_2^2 \partial_{x_2} \lambda) = 0, \quad \square_2 S = 0, \quad \frac{1}{x_2^2} \partial_{x_2}(x_2^2 \partial_{x_2} h) + \lambda \partial_{x_1}^2 h = 0, \quad (\text{C.25})$$

to solve, with physical fields given by

$$e^{2A} = \frac{1}{S\sqrt{\lambda}}, \quad e^{2\Phi+2\mu} = \frac{\partial_{x_1} h}{\sqrt{\lambda}}, \quad e^{-4A+2\Phi} = \sqrt{\lambda} \partial_{x_1} h, \quad e^{2C} B_0 = -x_2^2 \partial_{x_2} h \quad (\text{C.26})$$

When $S = 1$ this is simply the massless system of [67] describing localized D6-NS5 brane intersection up to two T-duality along dx_3 and dx_4 . On the other hand when $S \neq 0$ but $\partial_{x_1} h = 1$ we have a D4-D6 system where the D6 brane is smeared along x_1 , indeed its harmonic function is $S = S(x_3, x_4)$, while the harmonic function of the D4 factorize in λS . therefore we can interpret our solution as a localized D4-NS5 smeared D6 system.

C.2.2 $\partial_{x_1} e^{-4A} \neq 0$: “Massive” D4-D6-NS5 system

We now allow e^{-4A} to depend on x_1 . Let's absorb f^{-1} into H . From (C.7a) we can define f from H up to an arbitrary function $G(x_1) \neq 0$ (otherwise we will come back to the previous case)

$$f = \frac{\partial_{x_1} H}{G}. \quad (\text{C.27})$$

Moreover condition (C.7b) impose that this function has to be at least linear in x_1 , $G = c_1 x_1 + c_2$.

We then have that supersymmetry follows from the following two PDEs:

$$\square_2 S = -c_1 S^2, \quad \frac{1}{x_2^2} \partial_{x_2}(x_2^2 \partial_{x_2} H) + \frac{1}{2} \partial_{x_1}^2 H^2 = c_1 \frac{\partial_{x_1} H^2}{c_1 x_1 + c_2}. \quad (\text{C.28})$$

The field are defined as:

$$e^{2A} = \frac{1}{S\sqrt{H}}, \quad e^{2\Phi+2\mu} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{HG}} \partial_{x_1} H, \quad e^{-4A+2\Phi} = \frac{\sqrt{H}}{G} \partial_{x_1} H \quad (\text{C.29})$$

$$\partial_{x_1}(e^{2C} B_0) = \frac{x_2^2}{G} \partial_{x_1} \partial_{x_2} H, \quad \partial_{x_2}(e^{2C} B_0) = \frac{x_2^2}{2} \partial_{x_1} \left(\frac{\partial_{x_1} H^2}{G} \right).$$

We can see that for $c_1 = 0$ this is the equivalent of the previous case but describing the T-dual of the massive system of localized D6-NS5 of [67]; therefore for $c_1 = 0$ we have a localized “massive” D4-NS5 smeared D6 system. When $c_1 \neq 0$ we have something more exotic which physical interpretation is less clear, but the fluxes suggest a system of (possibly localized) D4-D6-NS5 branes.

References

- [1] P. Candelas, G. T. Horowitz, A. Strominger and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **258** (1985) 46. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(85)90602-9
- [2] E. Witten, “Solutions of four-dimensional field theories via M theory,” Nucl. Phys. B **500** (1997) 3 doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(97)00416-1 [hep-th/9703166].
- [3] B. S. Acharya and E. Witten, “Chiral fermions from manifolds of $G(2)$ holonomy,” hep-th/0109152.
- [4] B. S. Acharya and S. Gukov, “M theory and singularities of exceptional holonomy manifolds,” Phys. Rept. **392** (2004) 121 doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2003.10.017 [hep-th/0409191].
- [5] M. R. Douglas, “CalabiYau metrics and string compactification,” Nucl. Phys. B **898** (2015) 667 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2015.04.009 [arXiv:1503.02899 [hep-th]].
- [6] B. S. Acharya, K. Boek, M. Crispim Romo, S. F. King and C. Pongkitivanichkul, Phys. Rev. D **92** (2015) no.5, 055011 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.055011 [arXiv:1502.01727 [hep-ph]].
- [7] M. A. Fiset, “Superconformal algebras for twisted connected sums and G_2 mirror symmetry,” arXiv:1809.06376 [hep-th].
- [8] A. Kennon, “ G_2 -Manifolds and M-Theory Compactifications,” arXiv:1810.12659 [hep-th].
- [9] S. Andriolo, G. Shiu, H. Triendl, T. Van Riet, G. Venken and G. Zoccarato, “Compact G_2 holonomy spaces from $SU(3)$ structures,” arXiv:1811.00063 [hep-th].
- [10] X. de la Ossa, M. Larfors and E. E. Svanes, “Exploring $SU(3)$ structure moduli spaces with integrable G_2 structures,” Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **19** (2015) 837 doi:10.4310/ATMP.2015.v19.n4.a5 [arXiv:1409.7539 [hep-th]].
- [11] M. A. Fiset, C. Quigley and E. E. Svanes, “Marginal deformations of heterotic G_2 sigma models,” JHEP **1802** (2018) 052 doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2018)052 [arXiv:1710.06865 [hep-th]].
- [12] X. de la Ossa, M. Larfors and E. E. Svanes, “Restrictions of Heterotic G_2 Structures and Instanton Connections,” arXiv:1709.06974 [math.DG].
- [13] J. P. Gauntlett, N. Kim, D. Martelli and D. Waldram, “Five-branes wrapped on SLAG three cycles and related geometry,” JHEP **0111** (2001) 018 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2001/11/018 [hep-th/0110034].
- [14] T. Friedrich and S. Ivanov, “Killing spinor equations in dimension 7 and geometry of integrable $G(2)$ manifolds,” J. Geom. Phys. **48** (2003) 1 doi:10.1016/S0393-0440(03)00005-6 [math/0112201 [math.DG]].

- [15] J. P. Gauntlett, D. Martelli, S. Pakis and D. Waldram, “G structures and wrapped NS5-branes,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **247** (2004) 421 doi:10.1007/s00220-004-1066-y [hep-th/0205050].
- [16] J. P. Gauntlett, D. Martelli and D. Waldram, “Superstrings with intrinsic torsion,” *Phys. Rev. D* **69** (2004) 086002 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.69.086002 [hep-th/0302158].
- [17] G. W. Gibbons, “Aspects Of Supergravity Theories,” Print-85-0061 (CAMBRIDGE).
- [18] B. de Wit, D. J. Smit and N. D. Hari Dass, “Residual Supersymmetry of Compactified D=10 Supergravity,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **283** (1987) 165. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(87)90267-7
- [19] J. M. Maldacena and C. Nunez, “Supergravity description of field theories on curved manifolds and a no go theorem,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **16** (2001) 822 doi:10.1142/S0217751X01003935, 10.1142/S0217751X01003937 [hep-th/0007018].
- [20] K. Becker and M. Becker, “M theory on eight manifolds,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **477** (1996) 155 doi:10.1016/0550-3213(96)00367-7 [hep-th/9605053].
- [21] K. Dasgupta, G. Rajesh and S. Sethi, “M theory, orientifolds and G - flux,” *JHEP* **9908** (1999) 023 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/1999/08/023 [hep-th/9908088].
- [22] S. B. Giddings, S. Kachru and J. Polchinski, “Hierarchies from fluxes in string compactifications,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66** (2002) 106006 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.66.106006 [hep-th/0105097].
- [23] D. Martelli and J. Sparks, “G structures, fluxes and calibrations in M theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **68** (2003) 085014 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.68.085014 [hep-th/0306225].
- [24] P. Kaste, R. Minasian and A. Tomasiello, “Supersymmetric M theory compactifications with fluxes on seven-manifolds and G structures,” *JHEP* **0307** (2003) 004 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2003/07/004 [hep-th/0303127].
- [25] G. Dall’Agata and N. Prezas, “N = 1 geometries for M theory and type IIA strings with fluxes,” *Phys. Rev. D* **69** (2004) 066004 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.69.066004 [hep-th/0311146].
- [26] A. Lukas and P. M. Saffin, “M theory compactification, fluxes and AdS(4),” *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005) 046005 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.71.046005 [hep-th/0403235].
- [27] J. P. Gauntlett, D. Martelli, J. Sparks and D. Waldram, “Supersymmetric AdS(5) solutions of M theory,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21** (2004) 4335 doi:10.1088/0264-9381/21/18/005 [hep-th/0402153].
- [28] M. Grana, R. Minasian, M. Petrini and A. Tomasiello, “Supersymmetric backgrounds from generalized Calabi-Yau manifolds,” *JHEP* **0408** (2004) 046 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2004/08/046 [hep-th/0406137].

- [29] M. Grana, R. Minasian, M. Petrini and A. Tomasiello, “Generalized structures of N=1 vacua,” JHEP **0511** (2005) 020 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2005/11/020 [hep-th/0505212].
- [30] M. Haack, D. Lust, L. Martucci and A. Tomasiello, “Domain walls from ten dimensions,” JHEP **0910** (2009) 089 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/10/089 [arXiv:0905.1582 [hep-th]].
- [31] D. Lust, P. Patalong and D. Tsimpis, “Generalized geometry, calibrations and supersymmetry in diverse dimensions,” JHEP **1101** (2011) 063 doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2011)063 [arXiv:1010.5789 [hep-th]].
- [32] D. Prins and D. Tsimpis, “IIB supergravity on manifolds with SU(4) structure and generalized geometry,” JHEP **1307** (2013) 180 doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2013)180 [arXiv:1306.2543 [hep-th]].
- [33] D. Prins and D. Tsimpis, “Type IIA supergravity and M -theory on manifolds with SU(4) structure,” Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 064030 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.064030 [arXiv:1312.1692 [hep-th]].
- [34] D. Rosa, “Generalized geometry of two-dimensional vacua,” JHEP **1407** (2014) 111 doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2014)111 [arXiv:1310.6357 [hep-th]].
- [35] N. T. Macpherson, J. Montero and D. Prins, “Mink $_3 \times S^3$ solutions of type II supergravity,” Nucl. Phys. B **933** (2018) 185 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2018.05.021 [arXiv:1712.00851 [hep-th]].
- [36] A. Legramandi, L. Martucci and A. Tomasiello, “Timelike structures of ten-dimensional supersymmetry,” arXiv:1810.08625 [hep-th].
- [37] P. Candelas, A. Constantin, C. Damian, M. Larfors and J. F. Morales, “Type IIB flux vacua from G-theory I,” JHEP **1502** (2015) 187 doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2015)187 [arXiv:1411.4785 [hep-th]].
- [38] P. Candelas, A. Constantin, C. Damian, M. Larfors and J. F. Morales, “Type IIB flux vacua from G-theory II,” JHEP **1502** (2015) 188 doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2015)188 [arXiv:1411.4786 [hep-th]].
- [39] P. G. O. Freund and M. A. Rubin, “Dynamics of Dimensional Reduction,” Phys. Lett. B **97** (1980) 233 [Phys. Lett. **97B** (1980) 233]. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(80)90590-0
- [40] F. Apruzzi, M. Fazzi, D. Rosa and A. Tomasiello, “All AdS₇ solutions of type II supergravity,” JHEP **1404** (2014) 064 doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2014)064 [arXiv:1309.2949 [hep-th]].
- [41] A. Passias, “A note on supersymmetric AdS₆ solutions of massive type IIA supergravity,” JHEP **1301** (2013) 113 doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2013)113 [arXiv:1209.3267 [hep-th]].
- [42] E. O Colgain and B. Stefanski, Jr., “A search for AdS₅ X S² IIB supergravity solutions dual to N = 2 SCFTs,” JHEP **1110** (2011) 061 doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2011)061 [arXiv:1107.5763 [hep-th]].

- [43] F. Apruzzi, M. Fazzi, A. Passias, D. Rosa and A. Tomasiello, “AdS₆ solutions of type II supergravity,” JHEP **1411** (2014) 099 Erratum: [JHEP **1505** (2015) 012] doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2014)099, 10.1007/JHEP05(2015)012 [arXiv:1406.0852 [hep-th]].
- [44] E. D’Hoker, M. Gutperle, A. Karch and C. F. Uhlemann, “Warped AdS₆ × S² in Type IIB supergravity I: Local solutions,” JHEP **1608**, 046 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2016)046 [arXiv:1606.01254 [hep-th]].
- [45] H. Lin, O. Lunin and J. M. Maldacena, “Bubbling AdS space and 1/2 BPS geometries,” JHEP **0410** (2004) 025 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2004/10/025 [hep-th/0409174].
- [46] E. D’Hoker, M. Gutperle, A. Karch and C. F. Uhlemann, “Warped AdS₆ × S² in Type IIB supergravity I: Local solutions,” JHEP **1608** (2016) 046 doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2016)046 [arXiv:1606.01254 [hep-th]].
- [47] N. T. Macpherson and A. Tomasiello, “Minimal flux Minkowski classification,” arXiv:1612.06885 [hep-th].
- [48] F. Apruzzi, J. C. Geipel, A. Legramandi, N. T. Macpherson and M. Zagermann, “Minkowski₄ × S² solutions of IIB supergravity,” Fortsch. Phys. **66** (2018) no.3, 1800006 doi:10.1002/prop.201800006 [arXiv:1801.00800 [hep-th]].
- [49] D. Corbino, E. D’Hoker and C. F. Uhlemann, “AdS₂ S⁶ versus AdS₆ S² in Type IIB supergravity,” JHEP **1803** (2018) 120 doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2018)120 [arXiv:1712.04463 [hep-th]].
- [50] G. Dibitetto and A. Passias, “AdS₂ × S⁷ solutions from D0 – F1 – D8 intersections,” JHEP **1810** (2018) 190 doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2018)190 [arXiv:1807.00555 [hep-th]].
- [51] G. Dibitetto, G. Lo Monaco, A. Passias, N. Petri and A. Tomasiello, “AdS₃ solutions with exceptional supersymmetry,” Fortsch. Phys. **66** (2018) no.10, 1800060 doi:10.1002/prop.201800060 [arXiv:1807.06602 [hep-th]].
- [52] F. Apruzzi, M. Fazzi, A. Passias and A. Tomasiello, “Supersymmetric AdS₅ solutions of massive IIA supergravity,” JHEP **1506** (2015) 195 doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2015)195 [arXiv:1502.06620 [hep-th]].
- [53] J. P. Gauntlett, D. Martelli, J. Sparks and D. Waldram, “Supersymmetric AdS(5) solutions of type IIB supergravity,” Class. Quant. Grav. **23** (2006) 4693 doi:10.1088/0264-9381/23/14/009 [hep-th/0510125].
- [54] C. Couzens, “Supersymmetric AdS₅ solutions of type IIB supergravity without D3 branes,” JHEP **1701** (2017) 041 doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2017)041 [arXiv:1609.05039 [hep-th]].

- [55] E. Malek, H. Samtleben and V. Vall Camell, “Supersymmetric AdS₇ and AdS₆ vacua and their minimal consistent truncations from exceptional field theory,” *Phys. Lett. B* **786** (2018) 171 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2018.09.037 [arXiv:1808.05597 [hep-th]].
- [56] G. B. De Luca, A. Gnechchi, G. L. Monaco and A. Tomasiello, “Holographic duals of 6d RG flows,” arXiv:1810.10013 [hep-th].
- [57] F. Apruzzi, M. Fazzi, A. Passias and A. Tomasiello, “Supersymmetric AdS₅ solutions of massive IIA supergravity,” *JHEP* **1506** (2015) 195 doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2015)195 [arXiv:1502.06620 [hep-th]].
- [58] A. Rota and A. Tomasiello, “AdS₄ compactifications of AdS₇ solutions in type II supergravity,” *JHEP* **1507** (2015) 076 doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2015)076 [arXiv:1502.06622 [hep-th]].
- [59] J. P. Gauntlett and S. Pakis, “The Geometry of D = 11 killing spinors,” *JHEP* **0304** (2003) 039 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2003/04/039 [hep-th/0212008].
- [60] G. B. De Luca, G. L. Monaco, N. T. Macpherson, A. Tomasiello and O. Varela, “The geometry of $\mathcal{N} = 3$ AdS₄ in massive IIA,” *JHEP* **1808** (2018) 133 doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2018)133 [arXiv:1805.04823 [hep-th]].
- [61] P. Candelas and D. J. Raine, “Spontaneous Compactification and Supersymmetry in $d = 11$ Supergravity,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **248** (1984) 415. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(84)90604-7
- [62] . Kelekci, Y. Lozano, N. T. Macpherson and E. . Colgin, “Supersymmetry and non-Abelian T-duality in type II supergravity,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **32** (2015) no.3, 035014 doi:10.1088/0264-9381/32/3/035014 [arXiv:1409.7406 [hep-th]].
- [63] J. Maldacena and D. Martelli, “The Unwarped, resolved, deformed conifold: Fivebranes and the baryonic branch of the Klebanov-Strassler theory,” *JHEP* **1001** (2010) 104 doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2010)104 [arXiv:0906.0591 [hep-th]].
- [64] O. Lunin and J. M. Maldacena, “Deforming field theories with U(1) x U(1) global symmetry and their gravity duals,” *JHEP* **0505** (2005) 033 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2005/05/033 [hep-th/0502086].
- [65] E. O Colgain, J. B. Wu and H. Yavartanoo, “On the generality of the LLM geometries in M-theory,” *JHEP* **1104** (2011) 002 doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2011)002 [arXiv:1010.5982 [hep-th]].
- [66] D. Youm, “Partially localized intersecting BPS branes,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **556** (1999) 222 doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(99)00384-3 [hep-th/9902208].
- [67] Y. Imamura, “1/4 BPS solutions in massive IIA supergravity,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **106** (2001) 653 doi:10.1143/PTP.106.653 [hep-th/0105263].

- [68] L. Jarv and C. V. Johnson, “Orientifolds, M theory, and the ABCD’s of the enhancon,” *Phys. Rev. D* **62** (2000) 126010 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.62.126010 [hep-th/0002244].