

# A Heterotic Kähler Gravity and the Distance Conjecture

Javier José Murgas Ibarra<sup>a</sup>, Paul-Konstantin Oehlmann<sup>b</sup>, Fabian Ruehle<sup>b,c,d</sup>,  
Eirik Eik Svanes<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Mathematics and Physics  
Faculty of Science and Technology, University of Stavanger  
N-4036, Stavanger, Norway*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Physics, Northeastern University,  
Boston, MA 02115, USA*

<sup>c</sup>*Department of Mathematics, Northeastern University,  
Boston, MA 02115, USA*

<sup>d</sup>*NSF Institute for Artificial Intelligence and Fundamental Interactions,  
Boston, USA*

## Abstract

Deformations of the heterotic superpotential give rise to a topological holomorphic theory with similarities to both Kodaira-Spencer gravity and holomorphic Chern-Simons theory. Although the action is cubic, it is only quadratic in the complex structure deformations (the Beltrami differential). Treated separately, for large fluxes, or alternatively at large distances in the background complex structure moduli space, these fields can be integrated out to obtain a new field theory in the remaining fields, which describe the complexified hermitian and gauge degrees of freedom. We investigate properties of this new holomorphic theory, and in particular connections to the swampland distance conjecture in the context of heterotic string theory. In the process, we define a new type of symplectic cohomology theory, where the background complex structure Beltrami differential plays the role of the symplectic form.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>The Distance Conjecture</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>The Heterotic Effective Action</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	The Effective Action . . . . .	7
3.2	Heterotic action including the dilaton . . . . .	11
3.3	Integrating out the dilaton from the exact action . . . . .	15
3.4	Infinite Distance Limits . . . . .	17
<b>4</b>	<b>Elliptic complexes, BV actions, and symplectic cohomology</b>	<b>19</b>
4.1	The first term of the dilaton effective action . . . . .	20
4.2	The second term of the dilaton effective action . . . . .	23
4.3	The full dilaton effective action . . . . .	26
4.4	The BV Action . . . . .	28
<b>5</b>	<b>The SYZ fibration and a three-dimensional toy model</b>	<b>30</b>
5.1	The model . . . . .	30
5.2	An alternative model . . . . .	32
<b>6</b>	<b>Including gauge fields</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusions and outlook</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Connections and Curvature</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Proving ellipticity of complexes</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Connections on the three-sphere</b>	<b>40</b>

# 1 Introduction

Understanding under which circumstances quantum field theories can be UV completed with gravity is one of the main efforts of the last decades of theoretical physics. Major inspirations for consistent UV completions have been drawn from string theory, which is a UV complete theory of quantum gravity.

The swampland program [1] (see [2–4] for recent reviews) aims to extract and connect necessary conditions for UV completion. The swampland distance conjecture [5] is a well-studied conjecture with a lot of evidence supporting it, stating that EFTs with a moduli space  $\mathcal{M}$  get heavily modified when moving to the boundary of  $\mathcal{M}$ , which eventually leads to a breakdown of its description [5]. More concretely, it is conjectured that there is a tower of light states whose mass gap closes exponentially fast towards infinite geodesic distance in  $\mathcal{M}$ . These limits have been studied extensively in the recent literature and further sharpened over time (see [6] and reference therein), mostly in theories with more than four supercharges, where BPS states give a lot of extra control. In such setups, the respective towers could be characterized, and it was further proposed that their origin should be attributed to either light Kaluza-Klein states or light string degrees of freedom. This is known as the emergent string conjecture [7].

Four-dimensional theories with  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  supersymmetry are more challenging, since there are fewer BPS-protected states, and the moduli spaces may receive non-perturbative corrections. Such cases were studied in F-theory and Type II orientifolds for asymptotic limits in the Kähler and complex structure moduli spaces of the underlying CY three- and four-folds. In contrast, infinite distance limits in heterotic string theory setups are less well understood and explored. Efforts are mostly focusing on the Kähler moduli space [8–11] and invoke mirror symmetry for analogous statements for complex structure moduli, similar to the Type II scenarios.

The additional complication in the heterotic string stems from the fact that it requires choosing an  $SU(3)$  structure manifold  $X_3$  *together with* a compatible vector bundle  $V$ . As a consequence, the moduli space of a heterotic string theory with a choice of  $(X_3, V)$  contains bundle deformations of  $V$  in addition to Kähler and complex structure deformations. Moreover, the defining data  $X_3$  and  $V$  and their moduli spaces are not independent quantities but constrained by the Bianchi identity and the hermitian Yang-Mills equations, or more generally the Hull-Strominger (HS) system [12, 13]. This makes studying the full heterotic string moduli space and its various limits difficult, even at finite distances. Setting the gauge bundle  $V$  equal to the tangent bundle  $TX_3$  (the so called *standard embedding*) solves the HS

system trivially and leads to a local split of complex structure and Kähler moduli spaces, but is far from being the most generic situation. Moreover, due to the enhanced  $\mathcal{N} = (2, 2)$  supersymmetry on the world sheet (WS), this is also the only instance in which mirror symmetry for the heterotic string is well-understood and can be used to probe infinite distance limits. In the generic situation, WS supersymmetry is broken to  $\mathcal{N} = (0, 2)$  and the mirror map in this case is not known in general.<sup>1</sup> Hence we need to study the heterotic moduli space on  $(X_3, V)$  without invoking mirror symmetry.

These complications make the heterotic moduli space intimidating at first glance. However, fairly recently a better understanding of the generic heterotic moduli problem has emerged [17–23]. In particular, in [21] it was shown that finite deformations of the system can be parameterized in terms of solutions to a Maurer-Cartan equation associated to a holomorphic Courant algebroid. This equation can be seen as the equation of motion of a quasi-topological theory derived from the heterotic superpotential. This theory has features resembling both Kodaira-Spencer gravity [24] and Donaldson-Thomas theory, or holomorphic Chern-Simons theory [25, 26]. In particular, it is a cubic theory in the fields, coupling the gauge degrees of freedom of holomorphic Chern-Simons theory to the gravitational modes of hermitian and complex structure degrees of freedom.

Although the theory is cubic, it is only quadratic in the complex structure degrees of freedom, and a background flux gives rise to a mass term for these modes. At large fluxes these modes can be integrated out, leading to an effective theory in the remaining fields. For technical reasons, for this procedure to make sense the flux viewed as a closed  $(2, 1)$ -form, it is required to have a non-vanishing Yukawa coupling. An alternative, but slightly more speculative point of view, relates the mass term to a background complex structure. When this complex structure modulus is taken to infinity, we find a tower of light modes in the effective theory coming down at an exponential rate in geodesic distance, in accordance with the distance conjecture.

The new effective topological heterotic Kähler gravity theories proposed here are also interesting in their own right, both from the point of view of the distance conjecture, and from a mathematical point of view. In particular, exploring the gauge structure of these actions, and specifically their quadratic approximations, leads us to define a new type of “symplectic cohomology” theory, where the background flux/background complex structure plays the role of the symplectic form. We find that the gauge structure forms a natural part of new elliptic differential complexes, which can also be used to quantize the theories and study properties like anomalies and topological invariants at a later point.

---

<sup>1</sup>Progress on establishing a  $(0, 2)$  mirror map include earlier cases, when  $V$  is a perturbation of the tangent bundle of  $X_3$  [14, 15], and more recent generalizations [16].

This paper is structured as follows: In Section 2, we give a short introduction to the distance conjecture. We introduce the heterotic effective action that we focus on in this paper in Section 3. Section 4 is devoted to discussing important aspects of the action, such as ellipticity of the mass operator in Sections 4.1 - 4.3 and fixing BV quantization in Section 4.4. Inspired by the SYZ conjecture, we discuss in Section 5 a toy model on a 3-sphere. In Section 6, we briefly look at a case that includes  $\alpha'$  effects and thus gauge fields via the Chern-Simons term in the heterotic three-form field. We present our conclusions in Section 7, and give more details about some of our calculations in three appendices.

## 2 The Distance Conjecture

Within the swampland program, the distance conjecture [5] is rather well-established and studied, in particular since it makes strong general predictions and connects to other conjectures, such as the absence of global symmetries or the weak gravity conjecture. The distance conjecture states that when we start with an EFT in quantum gravity at a certain point  $P \in \mathcal{M}$  in its moduli space and move to another point  $O \in \mathcal{M}$  that is at infinite distance along a shortest geodesic,  $d(P, O) \rightarrow \infty$ , there is an infinite tower of states that becomes exponentially light. The masses of this tower scale asymptotically as

$$m(O) \sim m(P)e^{-\alpha d(P,O)}, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\alpha$  is a positive, order  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  factor. The above behavior represents a critical breakdown of the EFT, which loses validity in this limit. The tower could for example arise from KK modes that becomes light when approaching a decompactification limit. However, this need not always be the case. According to the *emergent string conjecture*, the towers are either a KK tower or a string that becomes light, which may have a perturbative description in a dual frame [7, 27]. The prototypical example is the compactification of a  $D$ -dimensional theory on a circle. This theory has a one-dimensional moduli space  $\mathcal{M}$  corresponding to the radius of the circle. The dimensional reduction of the radion field  $R$  then has the kinetic term (in Einstein frame)

$$S = \int \left( \frac{dR}{R} \right)^2 + \dots \quad (2.2)$$

The field space metric is thus given by  $1/R$  and distances between the points  $P$  and  $O$  with radii  $R_P$  and  $R_O$  are

$$d(R_P, R_O) = \int_{R_P}^{R_O} \frac{1}{R} = \log(R_O/R_P), \quad (2.3)$$

and hence  $R_O \sim e^{d(R_P, R_O)}$ . There is indeed already one tower we know of, which is the KK tower whose masses scale as

$$m_n = \frac{n}{R} \sim n e^{-d(R_P, R_O)}, \quad (2.4)$$

as expected. There does also exist a second limit, for  $R_O \rightarrow 0$  which is at infinite distance. Field-theoretically, it is not clear what type of characteristic objects become light in this limit, but from string theory we know that the light states are the string winding modes, whose masses scale as

$$m_{\hat{n}} = \frac{\hat{n} R_O}{\alpha'}, \quad (2.5)$$

which become light at  $R_O \rightarrow 0$ , which is just the T-dual description of the  $R_O \rightarrow \infty$  limit.

This is perhaps the simplest example possible: the moduli space is only one-dimensional and both types of towers can be identified straight-forwardly. Theories in lower dimensions and with less supersymmetry substantially enriches the discussion. For example, Calabi-Yau compactifications have  $\mathcal{O}(100)$ -dimensional complex structure and Kähler moduli spaces. The lower amount of supersymmetry makes it also more difficult to identify the infinite towers and their behaviors.

### 3 The Heterotic Effective Action

Throughout most of this paper we will set  $\alpha' = 0$ , i.e., we will be working in the supergravity approximation where the gauge vector degrees of freedom decouple from the gravitational sector and the background geometry is Calabi-Yau. We will comment on the case  $\alpha' \neq 0$  in Section 6, but leave a full treatment to future work.

To set the stage, consider a Calabi-Yau manifold  $(X, \Psi, g)$  with a fixed background metric  $g$  and holomorphic top-form  $\Omega = e^{-2\phi}\Psi$ , where  $\phi$  denotes the dilaton. The heterotic superpotential reads [28–30]

$$W = \int_X (H + i d\omega) \wedge \Omega, \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\omega$  is the Hermitian  $(1, 1)$ -form which need not be closed off-shell. The closed three-form  $H = dB$  is the heterotic NS-flux. Performing a finite but small fluctuation of this superpotential around a Calabi-Yau background, we get the following quasi-topological<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>The action is quasi-topological in that it does not depend on the background metric, but does depend on the background complex structure.

superpotential contribution [21, 31]

$$\Delta W = \int_X (x_a \bar{\partial} \mu^a + (H_{ab} + \partial x_{ab}) \mu^a \mu^b + \mu^a \partial_a b) \wedge \Omega, \quad (3.2)$$

where we have ignored off-shell deformations of the dilaton, which will be analyzed in section 3.2. Here  $x \in \Omega^{(0,1)}(T^{*(1,0)}X)$  is the complexified hermitian deformation, and  $\mu \in \Omega^{(0,1)}(T^{(1,0)}X)$  is the complex structure deformation, or Beltrami differential. The field  $b \in \Omega^{(0,2)}$  derives from the holomorphic deformation of the  $B$ -field. Finally, by slight abuse of notation,  $H \in \Omega^{(0,1)}(\wedge^2 T^{*(1,0)}X) = \Omega^{(2,1)}$  corresponds to the background flux. This is required to be both  $\partial$ -closed and  $\bar{\partial}$ -closed. Shifting  $H$  by  $\partial\bar{\partial}$ -exact forms, we can, modulo a field redefinition of  $x$ , take  $H$  to be Bott-Chern harmonic, which on a Calabi-Yau is the same as being harmonic ( $H \in \mathcal{H}^{(2,1)}$ ) in the usual sense [32].

In (3.2),  $H$  is treated as a background flux, which is quantized and hence cannot be deformed continuously. We would also like to consider an alternative perspective, where  $H \in \mathcal{H}^{(2,1)}$  is taken to correspond to a direction in the background complex structure moduli space. To get such a term, one can add a  $(3,0)$ -part to the three-form flux  $H$ , resulting in a shift of (3.2) to

$$\Delta W \rightarrow \Delta W + \int_X \frac{c}{3!} \mu^a \mu^b \mu^c \Omega_{abc} \wedge \Omega. \quad (3.3)$$

This is a very natural inclusion from a mathematical point of view, as it forms part of the more general holomorphic Courant algebroids, which give a natural mathematical description of six-dimensional heterotic geometries [20–22, 33–36].

Physically, a term like (3.3) could arise for instance from gaugino condensation [37, 38].<sup>3</sup> It is argued in [39] that this effectively shifts the superpotential to

$$\Delta W \rightarrow \Delta W + \int_X \Sigma \wedge \Omega, \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\Sigma_{mnp} = \langle \text{Tr}(\bar{\chi} \Gamma_{mnp} \chi) \rangle$  is the gaugino condensate, which on-shell takes the form

$$\Sigma = \Lambda^3 \Omega + \bar{\Lambda}^3 \bar{\Omega}. \quad (3.5)$$

Here  $\Lambda^3$  denotes the expectation value of the gaugino condensate in the four-dimensional spacetime. Similar terms also appear from dilatino condensates [40, 41], and potentially also gravitino condensates.

---

<sup>3</sup>Consistent inclusion of effects from the gauge sector, such as a gaugino condensation, requires a full treatment of the theory including  $\alpha'$ -corrections. We leave such a treatment for future work.

Plugging (3.5) into (3.4) produces a term of the form

$$\int_X \bar{\Lambda}^3 \bar{\Omega} \wedge \Omega. \quad (3.6)$$

As it stands, this term is not holomorphic, which a superpotential term needs to be. To remedy this with the field content at hand, one might anticipate a dependence of the condensate term on the (not necessarily on-shell) parameters of the form

$$\bar{\Lambda}^3 \bar{\Omega} = c \Omega(\mu, \mu, \mu) = \frac{c}{3!} \mu^a \mu^b \mu^c \Omega_{abc}, \quad (3.7)$$

for some complex number  $c$ , potentially depending on the axio-dilaton [28]. Since the condensate analysis is already quite speculative, we afford ourselves this replacement and keep in mind that this is not a rigorous derivation of a physical effect that leads to the deformation (3.3), but rather a mathematically motivated deformation that could arise in a physical theory.

Turning off the background flux, the deformed superpotential now reads

$$\Delta W = \int_X (x_a \bar{\partial} \mu^a + \partial x_{ab} \mu^a \mu^b + \mu^a \partial_a b + c \Omega(\mu, \mu, \mu)) \wedge \Omega, \quad (3.8)$$

where we have included the term cubic in complex structure deformations. Below, we will treat this as a quantum theory in the complex structure deformations. Let us therefore expand  $\mu$  around a background on-shell complex structure, and set

$$\mu \rightarrow \mu_0 + \mu, \quad (3.9)$$

where  $\mu_0$  satisfies the Maurer-Cartan equation

$$\bar{\partial} \mu_0^a + \frac{1}{2} [\mu_0, \mu_0]^a = 0. \quad (3.10)$$

It is well-known that solutions to (3.10) and hence the local complex structure moduli space are parametrized by  $H^{(2,1)} \cong \mathcal{H}^{(0,1)}(T^{(1,0)}(X))$ . In particular, if we pick a parametrization in which  $\mu_0$  is *harmonic*, then both terms in (3.10) vanish separately. To see this, note that by contracting (3.10) with  $\Omega$ , the second term becomes

$$\frac{1}{2} [\mu_0, \mu_0]^a \Omega_{abc} dz^{bc} \propto \partial (\mu_0^a \mu_0^b \Omega_{abc} dz^c) = 0. \quad (3.11)$$

The last equality follows from special geometry, and the fact that  $\mu_0^a \mu_0^b \Omega_{abc} dz^c$  is harmonic



[42, 43]. Expanding (3.8) in quantum fluctuation  $\mu$  around the background  $\mu_0$ , we get

$$\Delta W = \int_X (x_a \bar{\partial} \mu^a + \partial x_{ab} \mu^a \mu^b + \mu^a \partial_a b + 3c \Omega(\mu_0, \mu, \mu)) \wedge \Omega + \mathcal{O}(\mu^3), \quad (3.12)$$

where we ignored cubic terms in  $\mu$ , which we take to parameterize small fluctuations around a (large) background vev  $\mu_0$ . We also ignore terms linear in the fields, as these only serve to correct the equations of motion of the background fields. We have also ignored a constant contribution from  $\Omega(\mu_0, \mu_0, \mu_0)$ . This term will be relevant when we come to consider the dilaton coupling in the next sections.

Note that the last term in (3.12) is exactly of the same form as the  $H$ -term of (3.2), so we will identify them from hereon. This is what we mean when we say we treat  $H$  as a background complex structure modulus.

### 3.1 The Effective Action

We will now treat the superpotential contribution  $\Delta W$  of (3.2) as a quantum theory, and study its implications. For example, note that the expression is linear in  $x$ , so integrating out  $x$  simply imposes its equation of motion which puts the complex structure deformations on-shell. That is, they satisfy the Kodaira–Spencer Maurer–Cartan equation. More interestingly, one can ask what happens when we integrate out  $\mu$ ? As the action is quadratic in  $\mu$ , there is hope of performing such an integral explicitly, to get an effective theory for the hermitian degrees of freedom  $x$  and  $b$ . In a usual field theory, the quadratic term is given in terms of an elliptic differential operator with a finite-dimensional kernel. Hence, the operator is invertible, modulo this kernel. Our action (3.2) does not have a kinetic term for  $\mu$ , but we nevertheless can employ the fundamental theorem of quantum field theory assuming the invertibility of  $H$  as an operator acting on forms valued in  $\Omega^{(0,1)}(T^{(1,0)})$ . Indeed, this quadratic term is a mass term for  $\mu$ , and for large values of  $H$  the fluctuations  $\mu$  can be integrated out.

When integrating out  $\mu$ , we treat it as a dynamical field in the path integral, and  $\Delta W$  as part of the effective action as

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}\mu e^{-(S+\Delta W)}. \quad (3.13)$$

Integrating out  $\mu$  is then a standard exercise in field theory.

Treating the three-form  $M = H + \partial x$  as a matrix acting on  $\mu$  in (3.2), and using a partial

integration to shift the partial derivative from  $\mu$  to  $x$  in the  $\mu^a \bar{\partial} x_a$  term, we can obtain an action quadratic in  $\mu$ . Schematically, the shift is

$$\mu \rightarrow \mu - \frac{1}{2} (M^{-1}) (\bar{\partial} x + \partial b), \quad (3.14)$$

where we have to make the assumption that  $M$  is invertible. We then obtain the new schematic action

$$\Delta W = \int_X (\mu(H + \partial x)\mu - \frac{1}{4}(\bar{\partial} x + \partial b)(H + \partial x)^{-1}(\bar{\partial} x + \partial b)). \quad (3.15)$$

After this shift, the action is purely quadratic in  $\mu$  and we can therefore integrate out the fluctuations  $\mu$ . This results in an effective field theory for the remaining degrees of freedom of the form

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{eff}} &= \frac{1}{2} \log(\det(H + \partial x)) - \frac{1}{4} \int_X (\bar{\partial} x + \partial b)(H + \partial x)^{-1}(\bar{\partial} x + \partial b) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\log(H + \partial x)) - \frac{1}{4} \int_X (\bar{\partial} x + \partial b)(H + \partial x)^{-1}(\bar{\partial} x + \partial b), \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

where the trace in the first term includes an integral over  $X$  as well a trace over matrix indices where  $H + \partial x$  is viewed as a matrix.

Note that this is an exact theory for the hermitian mode  $x$  and the  $b$ -field. As invertibility is an open property, the matrix  $(H + \partial x)^{-1}$  is well-defined for small enough  $x$  provided  $H$  is invertible. By naive inspection, the action has the following gauge symmetries

$$\delta x = \partial \alpha \quad (3.17)$$

$$\delta b = \bar{\partial} \alpha, \quad (3.18)$$

where  $\alpha \in \Omega^{(0,1)}(X)$ . However, as we will discuss in Section 4 this is not quite accurate. Note also that since our starting theory is topological (it does not depend explicitly on the background metric), this new effective theory will be topological as well.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>In the following we make repeated use of the fact that we assume  $H$  is harmonic, which does imply an implicit dependence on the background metric. It should however be noted that, upon an appropriate field redefinition of  $x$ ,  $H$  in (3.16) may be shifted by  $\partial \bar{\partial}$ -exact forms to any other representative of the Bott-Chern class of  $H$ . The Bott-Chern class is quasi-topological, i.e., it only needs a complex structure to be well-defined [32].

Expanding the theory (3.16) to quadratic order in the fields  $x$  and  $b$ , we get

$$S_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \log (H) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} (H^{-1} \partial x) - \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} ((H^{-1} \partial x)^2) - \frac{1}{4} \int_X (\bar{\partial} x + \partial b)(H)^{-1}(\bar{\partial} x + \partial b) + \text{higher orders}, \quad (3.19)$$

where we have dropped terms of cubic and higher orders.

We now argue for the invertibility of  $H$ . The  $H\mu\mu$  term in (3.2) can be rewritten as<sup>5</sup>

$$H\mu\mu \propto h_a^d \epsilon^{\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}} \epsilon_{def} \mu_b^e \mu_{\bar{c}}^f = H_e^{\bar{b}} f^{\bar{c}} \mu_b^e \mu_{\bar{c}}^f, \quad (3.20)$$

where we work in coordinates where  $\Omega$  is normalized to  $\Omega_{abc} = \epsilon_{abc}$ , convenient for the below computations. Note that the determinant of the Calabi-Yau metric is also constant in this coordinate choice.

Writing  $H$  in terms of  $h$  and epsilon tensors allows us to view it as an element of *harmonic*  $\Omega^{(0,1)}(T^{(1,0)}X)$  forms. Note that since  $h_a^d$  is harmonic,  $g^{\bar{a}\bar{a}} h_a^d = h^{ad}$  is symmetric [42]. This quantity can then serve as a “metric”, i.e., an object with which can be used to raise and lower indices, though we will not use this feature much in the current paper.

Let us define the “determinant” of  $h_a^b$  as  $|h|$  given by

$$|h|\bar{\Omega} = \frac{1}{3!} h^b \wedge h^d \wedge h^f \Omega_{bdf} = \Omega(h, h, h). \quad (3.21)$$

Note that  $|h|$  is also proportional to the determinant of the symmetric matrix  $h^{ab}$ , where the proportionality factor depends on the determinant of the Calabi-Yau metric. Equation (3.21) is then the Yukawa coupling of the harmonic form  $h$ , which is known to be a constant times  $\bar{\Omega}$  [42, 43]. Assuming  $h$  has a non-zero Yukawa coupling, the determinant  $|h|$  becomes a point-wise non-zero constant. That is,  $h_a^b$  is invertible whenever this constant (proportional to the Yukawa coupling of  $h$ ) is non-zero.

We therefore assume from now on that  $h_b^a$  is invertible, and let  $h_a^{\bar{b}}$  denote its inverse,

$$h_a^{\bar{c}} h_c^{\bar{b}} = \delta_{\bar{b}}^{\bar{a}}. \quad (3.22)$$

In Appendix A we argue that when  $h$  is harmonic, then so is its inverse  $h^{-1}$ . We also

---

<sup>5</sup>Raising all indices of  $\epsilon_{abc}$  or  $\Omega_{abc}$  introduces a mild dependence on the background metric, specifically on its determinant, which in suitable coordinates can be chosen constant on a Calabi-Yau. Alternatively, it introduces a dependence on the overall volume, though this dependence must drop out in the end as the original theory is topological.

introduce a rescaled  $\epsilon$ -symbol

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_{abc} = |h|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon_{abc} .$$

This rescaled symbol satisfies the identity

$$h_{\bar{a}}^d \tilde{\epsilon}^{\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}} \tilde{\epsilon}_{def} = |\Omega|^2 \left( h_e^{\bar{b}} h_f^{\bar{c}} - h_f^{\bar{b}} h_e^{\bar{c}} \right) , \quad (3.23)$$

where

$$|\Omega|^2 = \frac{1}{3!} \Omega^{\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}} \bar{\Omega}_{\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}} = \frac{1}{3!} \epsilon^{\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}} \epsilon_{\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}} , \quad (3.24)$$

in the chosen coordinates. Note that this is a constant on a Calabi-Yau. Using this, it is straightforward to find the inverse of  $H$  as

$$(H^{-1})_{\bar{a}}^b \bar{c}^d = |\Omega|^{-2} |h|^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{2} h_a^b h_c^d - h_c^b h_a^d \right) . \quad (3.25)$$

The quadratic part of the new effective action then becomes

$$S_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} (H^{-1} \partial x) - \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} ((H^{-1} \partial x)^2) - \frac{1}{4} \int_X (\bar{\partial} x + \partial b)_{\bar{b}}^{\bar{a}} (H^{-1})_{\bar{a}}^b \bar{c}^d (\bar{\partial} x + \partial b)_d^{\bar{c}} , \quad (3.26)$$

where we have dropped the constant term independent of  $x$ . Note that

$$(\bar{\partial} x + \partial b)_a^{\bar{d}} = (\partial_{\bar{b}} x_{\bar{c}a} + \partial_a b_{\bar{b}\bar{c}}) \Omega^{\bar{b}\bar{c}\bar{d}} . \quad (3.27)$$

The first term in the action (3.26) actually drops out: As one can show using (3.25), it is proportional to the inner product of  $\partial x$  with  $\overline{\Omega(h, h)}$ , where

$$\Omega(h, h) = \frac{1}{2} \Omega_{abc} h^a \wedge h^b \wedge dz^c . \quad (3.28)$$

Special geometry dictates that  $\Omega(h, h)$  is harmonic [42, 43], so this inner product vanishes. The quadratic effective action of interest is therefore

$$S_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} ((H^{-1} \partial x)^2) - \frac{1}{4} \int_X (\bar{\partial} x + \partial b)_{\bar{b}}^{\bar{a}} (H^{-1})_{\bar{a}}^b \bar{c}^d (\bar{\partial} x + \partial b)_d^{\bar{c}} , \quad (3.29)$$

We note that the first and second terms in the effective action are of order  $\mathcal{O}(H^{-2})$  and  $\mathcal{O}(H^{-1})$ , respectively. Treating  $S_{\text{eff}}$  as an effective superpotential, we therefore expect two towers of light states to come down at different rates as we send  $H \rightarrow \infty$ . We will analyze this in further detail below.

The observant reader may wonder what measure we are using when integrating over  $X$ , in (3.29) and in other places. As noted above, since the original action was topological, i.e.

independent of the Calabi-Yau metric  $g$ , the resulting effective theory has to be independent of the metric choice as well. Since we are using  $\Omega^{\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}}$  to raise indices, which introduces factors of the determinant of  $g$ , the integration measure must be accompanied by an appropriate factor of  $|\Omega|^2$  to compensate for this. In particular, the second term in (3.29) is just

$$\int_X (\bar{\partial}x + \partial b)_b^{\bar{a}} (H^{-1})_a^b \bar{c}^d (\bar{\partial}x + \partial b)_d^{\bar{c}} := \int_X \sqrt{|g|} (\bar{\partial}x + \partial b)_b^{\bar{a}} (H^{-1})_a^b \bar{c}^d (\bar{\partial}x + \partial b)_d^{\bar{c}}, \quad (3.30)$$

with the integration measure explicitly written out. The first term is

$$\text{Tr}((H^{-1}\partial x)^2) := \int_X \sqrt{|g|} |\Omega|^2 \text{Tr}((H^{-1}\partial x)^2), \quad (3.31)$$

where the trace inside the integral is over matrix indices, where we view  $H^{-1}\partial x$  as a product of matrices as defined above. We will suppress such factors of the integration measure and  $|\Omega|^2$  for the majority of the text. Alternatively, we pick a normalisation of  $\Omega$  where  $|\Omega|^2 = 1$ .

## 3.2 Heterotic action including the dilaton

In the above we have neglected complications due to fluctuations of the dilaton. In string theory, the dilaton is a field and we need to take its fluctuations into account. Let us analyze what happens when this is the case.

Deforming the superpotential including the dilaton leaves the following action

$$S = \int_X (dx + H + db) \wedge e^\chi (\Omega + \Omega(\mu) + \Omega(\mu, \mu)) + c \int_X e^\chi \Omega(h, h, h) \wedge \Omega, \quad (3.32)$$

where  $\chi$  denotes the complexified deformation of the dilaton, or the axio-dilaton. Note that we have re-introduced the ‘‘constant’’ background term proportional to  $\Omega(h, h, h)$ , as this term also couples to the axio-dilaton. Using the Hodge decomposition of  $\chi$ , we can take  $\chi$  to be a total divergence, as any constant part can be absorbed by rescaling the action, so we obtain

$$S = \int_X (e^\chi (\bar{\partial}x_a + \partial_a b) \mu^a + e^\chi (H_{ab} + \partial_{[a} x_{b]}) \mu^a \mu^b + e^\chi \bar{\partial}b + e^\chi c |h| \bar{\Omega}) \wedge \Omega, \quad (3.33)$$

where we have used equation (3.21). Proceeding in integrating out  $\mu$  in the quadratic action, we want to solve the path integral by first completing the square

$$\mu \rightarrow \mu - \frac{1}{2} M^{-1} v \quad \text{with } M_{ab} = (H_{ab} + \partial x_{ab}), \quad v_a = \bar{\partial}x_a + \partial_a b. \quad (3.34)$$

This shift eliminates the linear term in  $\mu$  such that we can solve the Gauss integral, leaving us with

$$S_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \log [e^\chi (H + \partial x)] - \frac{1}{4} \int_X e^\chi (\bar{\partial} x + \partial b) (H + \partial x)^{-1} (\bar{\partial} x + \partial b) + \int_X e^\chi (\bar{\partial} b + c |h| \bar{\Omega}) \wedge \Omega. \quad (3.35)$$

Note that the axio-dilaton dependence of the first term actually vanishes,

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\chi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_X \chi = 0, \quad (3.36)$$

since by assumption  $\chi$  is a total derivative. The effective quadratic action can then schematically be written as

$$S_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} ((H^{-1} \partial x)^2) - \frac{1}{4} \int_X (\bar{\partial} x + \partial b) (H)^{-1} (\bar{\partial} x + \partial b) + \int_X (\chi \bar{\partial} b + \frac{c}{2} \chi^2 |h| \bar{\Omega}) \wedge \Omega, \quad (3.37)$$

where again the linear term in the axio-dilaton multiplying  $c|h|\bar{\Omega}$  drops out as the axio-dilaton is a total derivative. Note also that the last term in the action, proportional to the Yukawa coupling, gives rise to a large mass-term for the axio-dilaton as  $|h| \rightarrow \infty$ . It is reasonable to expect that this freezes out higher order momentum modes, so we can effectively also integrate out the axio-dilaton.

Integrating out the dilaton from the quadratic action imposes the equation of motion

$$\bar{\partial} b + c \chi |h| \bar{\Omega} = 0. \quad (3.38)$$

Solving this equation for the dilaton, and plugging it back into the action gives

$$S_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} ((H^{-1} \partial x)^2) - \frac{1}{4} \int_X (\bar{\partial} x + \partial b) (H)^{-1} (\bar{\partial} x + \partial b) - \frac{1}{2c|h|} \int_X (\bar{\partial} b)^2, \quad (3.39)$$

where  $(\bar{\partial} b)^2 \propto \left( \Omega^{\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}} \bar{\partial}_{[\bar{a}} b_{\bar{b}\bar{c}]} \right)^2$ .

Note that the first term in the action (3.39) goes as  $\mathcal{O}(H^{-2})$ , the second term goes as  $\mathcal{O}(H^{-1})$ , and the third term goes as  $\mathcal{O}(H^{-3})$ . We expect a tower of light modes coming down at each of these respective rates. The effect of including the axio-dilaton hence appears to be the inclusion of an additional light tower of states coming down at rate  $\mathcal{O}(H^{-3})$ .

The action (3.39) is somewhat complicated, especially with the middle term coupling the hermitian modes given by  $x$  with the  $b$ -field. To simplify the analysis, we will in the remainder

of this sub-section ignore the  $b$ -field, by setting  $b = 0$ . Alternatively, given the large mass of the dilaton, one could argue that the natural mass-scale of the dilaton is far above the other fields, and so it is perhaps more accurate to expand the dilaton to linear order, rather than quadratic. Doing so, the dilaton equation of motion becomes

$$\bar{\partial}b = 0, \quad (3.40)$$

which on a Calabi-Yau background means that the  $(0, 2)$ -form  $b$  is  $\bar{\partial}$ -exact. Upon an appropriate field redefinition that shifts  $x$  by a  $\partial$ -exact form, the quadratic action then becomes

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{eff}} &= -\frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} \left( (H^{-1} \partial x)^2 \right) - \frac{1}{4} \int_X (\bar{\partial}x)_{\bar{b}}^{\bar{a}} (H^{-1})_{\bar{a}}^{\bar{b}} \bar{c}^d (\bar{\partial}x)_d^{\bar{c}} \\ &= \int_X \partial x \star_H \partial x + \bar{\partial}x \star'_H \bar{\partial}x, \end{aligned} \quad (3.41)$$

where the last equality serves to define ‘‘Hodge duals’’  $\star_H$  and  $\star'_H$  that are constructed using  $H$  instead of  $g$ . Note that these Hodge duals give rise to symmetric pairings. Explicitly, the Hodge duals take the form

$$\star_H \partial x \quad \propto \quad (H^{-1})_{\bar{a}}^{\bar{b}} \bar{c}^d (H^{-1})_{\bar{f}}^e \bar{h}^j \Omega^{\bar{l}\bar{c}\bar{f}} \Omega_{bjk} \partial x_{de\bar{l}} dz^{k\bar{a}\bar{h}}, \quad (3.42)$$

$$\star'_H \bar{\partial}x \quad \propto \quad (H^{-1})_{\bar{a}}^{\bar{b}} \bar{c}^d \Omega_{bef} (\bar{\partial}x)_d^{\bar{c}} dz^{ef\bar{a}}, \quad (3.43)$$

where we suppressed unimportant numerical prefactors.

The action (3.41) is slightly different from (3.29). In particular, the new action appears to have a naive gauge symmetry  $\delta x = \partial \bar{\partial} f$  for some function  $f$ , though this again turns out to be not quite accurate, which we will explore further in Section 4.

We observe that the quadratic action (3.41) has again two different terms of order  $\mathcal{O}(H^{-2})$  and  $\mathcal{O}(H^{-1})$ , respectively. As we send the background field  $H$  to infinity and approach the boundary of complex structure moduli space, we thus expect two towers of massive states coming down at different rates. In particular, the kinetic operator of the theory takes the form

$$\Delta_H = \partial \star_H \partial + \bar{\partial} \star'_H \bar{\partial}. \quad (3.44)$$

Note that this operator has no explicit dependence on the background geometry, reflecting the topological nature of the theory. However, this operator maps  $(1, 1)$ -forms to  $(2, 2)$ -forms. In order to discuss its eigenvalues, we need to map back to  $(1, 1)$ -forms. This is perhaps most conveniently done by choosing a fixed background metric, taking the Hodge-dual, and

considering the operator

$$*\Delta_H : \Omega^{(1,1)} \rightarrow \Omega^{(1,1)}. \quad (3.45)$$

Note that the explicit value of the individual eigenvalues will depend on the choice of fixed metric, but their overall behaviour as we approach a point at large distance in complex structure moduli space is universal.

However, there is another slight complication in that some modes arise from a combination of both terms in the operator, and the two operators in  $\Delta_H$  do not commute and hence cannot be diagonalized simultaneously. However, the corresponding corrections to the eigenvalues will be of higher order in the  $H^{-1}$  expansion, so this does not affect the observation that we get two separate towers of modes.

To be more explicit, by picking a Kähler metric on  $X$ , we can Hodge-decompose  $x$  as

$$x = x_h + \partial\bar{\partial}f + \partial^\dagger\bar{\partial}\alpha + \bar{\partial}^\dagger(\partial\beta + \partial^\dagger\gamma), \quad (3.46)$$

where  $x_h$  is harmonic. The last term appears in both parts of the action (3.41), while the second term only appears in the first part of the action, and it is this term that gives the leading contribution to eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{O}(H^{-2})$ . To illustrate why, consider a family of  $2 \times 2$  matrices

$$A_t = \begin{pmatrix} ta & tb \\ tc & d \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.47)$$

where  $ta$  models the part of  $\Delta_H$  acting on the space of forms of the type  $\partial^\dagger\bar{\partial}\alpha$ , while  $d$  models the part of  $\Delta_H$  acting on the space of forms of the type  $\bar{\partial}^\dagger(\partial\beta + \partial^\dagger\gamma)$ . Here  $t$  is a small parameter modelling the separation of scales. It is straight-forward to compute the eigenvalues of  $A_t$ ,

$$\lambda_1 = d + \mathcal{O}(t) \quad (3.48)$$

$$\lambda_2 = ta + \mathcal{O}(t^2), \quad (3.49)$$

which illustrates the separation of scales of eigenvalues.

If we restrict ourselves for example to the tower of the heaviest modes, we can focus on the second part of (3.41),

$$\int_X \bar{\partial}x \star'_H \bar{\partial}x. \quad (3.50)$$

where  $\star'_H$  is a Hodge-star like operator giving rise to a symmetric pairing. Classically, we may assume without loss of generality that  $x = \bar{\partial}^\dagger\gamma$  where  $\gamma \in \bar{\partial}\Omega^{(1,1)}$ . Using this, the action



becomes

$$S_{\text{eff}} = \int_X \bar{\partial}x \star'_H \bar{\partial}x \propto \int_X \gamma \Delta \star'_H \Delta \gamma, \quad (3.51)$$

where  $\Delta$  is the Laplacian. Since  $\Delta$  is elliptic and  $\star'_H$  is invertible, the operator  $\Delta \star'_H \Delta$  is elliptic. It will hence have a finite-dimensional kernel, and a discrete tower of eigenmodes with a non-zero eigenvalue that tends to zero as  $H \rightarrow \infty$  at a rate of  $\mathcal{O}(H^{-1})$ . This should further translate to an exponential decay in geodesic distance using the moduli space metric as we will discuss in Section 3.4.

### 3.3 Integrating out the dilaton from the exact action

We now discuss a slightly different scenario, whereby we integrate out the axio-dilaton from the exact action (3.35). In Section 3.2 we have effectively assumed that all our fields live at roughly the same energy scale, where we expand all the fields to at most quadratic order. If, on the other hand, the natural energy scale of the dilaton was far below the other fields, we also need to consider higher momentum modes of the dilaton, which effectively also means considering higher order terms in  $\chi$ , as  $\chi$  is a total derivative by assumption. Note that the second and third terms in the effective action (3.35) are linear in  $e^\chi$ , so there is hope to integrate out the exponentiated dilaton from the action.

In integrating out the dilaton, we need to be careful with the Jacobian factor introduced in the path integral measure when changing variables from  $\chi$  to  $e^\chi$ . In position space, where  $p \in X$  is a point in  $X$ , the path integral over the dilaton is

$$\int \mathcal{D}\chi = \prod_p \int d\chi_p = \prod_p \int d(e^{\chi_p}) e^{-\chi_p} = \int \mathcal{D}(e^\chi) e^{-\int_X \chi} = \int \mathcal{D}(e^\chi). \quad (3.52)$$

The last equality follows as the dilaton is assumed to be a total derivative, as noted above.

The factor  $e^\chi$  then acts as a Lagrange multiplier in the action, which can be integrated out. To define some terms, let us write the effective action as

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{eff}} &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \log [(H + \partial x)] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4} \int_X e^\chi (\bar{\partial}x + \partial b)(H + \partial x)^{-1} (\bar{\partial}x + \partial b) + \int_X e^\chi (\bar{\partial}b + c|h|\bar{\Omega}) \wedge \Omega \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \log [(H + \partial x)] + \int_X e^\chi \mathcal{L}(x, b) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \log [(H + \partial x)] + \int_X e^\chi (\mathcal{L}_0(x, b) + c|h|). \end{aligned} \quad (3.53)$$

Imposing the dilaton equation of motion, we get

$$[e^\chi \mathcal{L}(x, b)]_{\text{total derivative}} = 0. \quad (3.54)$$

Note that we only get the total derivative part, as  $\chi$  is assumed to be a total derivative. On a compact space, this is equivalent to  $e^\chi \mathcal{L}(x, b)$  being constant

$$d(e^\chi \mathcal{L}(x, b)) = 0, \quad (3.55)$$

which gives

$$(d\chi)\mathcal{L}(x, b) + d\mathcal{L}(x, b) = 0. \quad (3.56)$$

We can solve this equation for  $\chi$  to get

$$\chi = -[\log(\mathcal{L}(x, b))]_{\text{total derivative}} = -\log(\mathcal{L}(x, b)) + [\log(\mathcal{L}(x, b))]_{\text{constant}}, \quad (3.57)$$

where the constant part of  $\log(\mathcal{L}(x, b))$  is given by

$$[\log(\mathcal{L}(x, b))]_{\text{constant}} = \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(X)} \int_X \log(\mathcal{L}(x, b)). \quad (3.58)$$

Plugging this back into the action gives

$$\int_X e^\chi \mathcal{L}(x, b) = \text{Vol}(X) \exp\left(\frac{1}{\text{Vol}(X)} \int_X \log(\mathcal{L}(x, b))\right). \quad (3.59)$$

Let us then expand the logarithm as

$$\log(\mathcal{L}(x, b)) = \log(\mathcal{L}_0(x, b) + c|h|) = \log(c|h|) + \frac{1}{c|h|}\mathcal{L}_0(x, b) - \frac{1}{2c^2|h|^2}\mathcal{L}_0(x, b)^2 + \dots \quad (3.60)$$

The action then becomes

$$\int_X e^\chi \mathcal{L}(x, b) = c|h|\text{Vol}(X) \exp\left(\frac{1}{\text{Vol}(X)} \int_X \left[\frac{1}{c|h|}\mathcal{L}_0(x, b) - \frac{1}{2c^2|h|^2}\mathcal{L}_0(x, b)^2 + \dots\right]\right). \quad (3.61)$$

Further expanding the exponential, and keeping only terms which produce a quadratic action in the remaining fields, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X e^\chi \mathcal{L}(x, b) &= c|h|\text{Vol}(X) + \int_X \left[\mathcal{L}_0(x, b) - \frac{1}{2c|h|}\mathcal{L}_0(x, b)^2\right] + \dots \\ &= c|h|\text{Vol}(X) - \frac{1}{4} \int_X (\bar{\partial}x + \partial b)(H)^{-1}(\bar{\partial}x + \partial b) - \frac{1}{2c|h|} \int_X (\bar{\partial}b)^2 + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3.62)$$

We hence see that the effect of integrating the dilaton out exactly, or in the quadratic approximation, result in the same quadratic action. Though it should be noted that the higher order terms differ. In particular, exactly integrating out the dilaton will produce higher order non-local interaction terms.

### 3.4 Infinite Distance Limits

Having setup our effective actions, we can discuss infinite distance limits in the moduli space and check whether a tower of states becomes exponentially light, as we would expect from the swampland distance conjecture. Recall that in our quadratic action (3.12) the presence of a non-trivial cubic Yukawa term along which we take the infinite complex structure limit was crucial. CY threefolds can have  $\mathcal{O}(100)$  complex structure moduli and some generic direction in this space will have a non-vanishing cubic Yukawa term. There may, however, be directions in which the Yukawa term vanishes, and our effective action does not apply. We will see an example of this below.

To discuss such limits, recall that the Kähler potential for the complex structure moduli space is given in terms of the pre-potential  $\mathcal{G}(\mu_i)$  via [44]

$$\mathcal{K} = -\log \left( 2(\bar{\mathcal{G}} - \mathcal{G}) + (\mu_i - \bar{\mu}_i)(\partial_i \mathcal{G} + \bar{\partial}_i \bar{\mathcal{G}}) \right) . \quad (3.63)$$

To be concrete, consider the mirror quintic threefold which is a simple example with one complex structure modulus. We take  $H = cH_0$ , where  $H_0$  is a fixed complex structure and  $c$  denotes the direction in complex structure moduli space for which we are taking the limit. At large complex structure, the pre-potential for the mirror quintic becomes

$$\mathcal{G}(c) = \frac{5}{3!} c^3 . \quad (3.64)$$

such that the Kähler potential is given as

$$\mathcal{K} = -\log \left( \frac{5}{6} (c - \bar{c})^3 \right) . \quad (3.65)$$

In radial coordinates  $c = e^{i\phi} \lambda$  and neglecting the irrelevant  $\phi$ -dependent terms, we have

$$\mathcal{K} \propto -\log(\lambda^3) , \quad (3.66)$$

from which we can compute the Kähler metric

$$K_{\lambda\lambda} = \frac{3}{\lambda^2}. \quad (3.67)$$

We then want to obtain flat coordinates  $T$  for the kinetic terms, i.e.

$$K_{\lambda\lambda} d\lambda d\lambda = dT dT, \quad (3.68)$$

which is provided by

$$\sqrt{3}\lambda^{-1} d\lambda = dT, \quad (3.69)$$

from which we obtain the relation

$$\lambda^{-1} = e^{-\frac{T}{\sqrt{3}}}. \quad (3.70)$$

Recall next that the elliptic operator in the action (see for example (3.51)) behaves like  $H^{-1} \propto \lambda^{-1}$ , which we interpret as the mass term for the infinite tower of internal hermitian degrees of freedom associated to the elliptic operator. For  $T \rightarrow \infty$  this tower becomes exponentially light as expected from the swampland distance conjecture.

The discussion was simple enough for the one-parameter case and will also apply for generic directions in  $\mathcal{O}(100)$  dimensional complex structure moduli spaces. However, there may be special directions in which the Yukawa couplings vanish. Note that we can infer the structure of the Yukawa couplings by the virtue of mirror symmetry [42, 44]: At large complex structure, the Yukawa coupling in  $X_3$  is identified with the triple intersection numbers  $D_{ijk}$  in the mirror  $X_3^*$ , which can be evaluated as

$$D_{ijk} = \int_{X_3^*} D_i \cdot D_j \cdot D_k, \quad (3.71)$$

with  $D_i$  being a basis of integral two-forms. Indeed, the infinite distance limits in complex structure moduli space of  $X_3$  correspond to infinite distance limits in Kähler moduli spaces of the mirror  $X_3^*$ .

Notably, for large numbers of Kähler moduli it has been observed that the intersection matrix indeed becomes sparse. Moreover, this structure is closely related to possible fibration structures of the threefold as discussed in the works by Kollár, Oguiso, and Wilson [45–47]: Roughly speaking, divisors  $D$  with  $D^3 = 0$  or  $D^2 \cdot D_m = 0$ , for any  $m$  are associated with a  $T^2$  or K3 fibration structures of the respective threefold. Infinite distance limits that send the volume of  $D$  to infinity, can therefore be thought of as decompactification limits of the base of the respective fibrations [48].

As an example, consider the bi-cubic CICY given by the configuration matrix

$$X_3^* : \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} \mathbb{P}^2 & 3 \\ \hline \mathbb{P}^2 & 3 \end{array} \right] \quad (3.72)$$

with intersection numbers

$$D_{111} = D_{222} = 0, \quad D_{112} = D_{122} = 3. \quad (3.73)$$

The two vanishing self-intersections show the presence of two torus fibrations in  $X_3^*$  over a  $\mathbb{P}^2$  base in each case. The pre-potential for the two complex structures in the mirror bi-cubic  $X_3$  in the large complex structure limit is therefore given by

$$\mathcal{G} = \frac{1}{2} (\mu_1 \mu_2^2 + \mu_2 \mu_1^2). \quad (3.74)$$

The problematic limits with vanishing Yukawa couplings are those that send one of the  $\mu_i \rightarrow \infty$  and correspond to decompactifications of either  $\mathbb{P}^2$  bases in the two  $T^2$  fibrations in the dual  $X_3^*$ . A general linear combination  $\lambda_1 \mu_1 + \lambda_2 \mu_2$  has a non-vanishing Yukawa interaction. For example along the diagonal direction  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda$ , the pre-potential is  $\mathcal{G} \propto \lambda^3$ , which behaves in the same way as in the mirror quintic example.

The connection between infinite distance limits and fibration structures in the Kähler moduli has been explored in [48]. The three principal types of infinite distance limits are denoted by type II, III and IV [49] and precisely correspond to sending the base of a K3 (or  $T^4$ ),  $T^2$  and the full threefold volume to infinite. Using our effective action, we have therefore identified the respective tower of states for the mirror dual of a type IV degeneration in the heterotic string complex structure moduli space. It would be interesting to extend the discussion of our effective action to include degeneration limits in directions that correspond to type II and III limits in the Kähler sector of the mirror dual geometry.

## 4 Elliptic complexes, BV actions, and symplectic cohomology

In the above quadratic actions, we have postulated by naive inspection what the corresponding gauge symmetries ought to be. In order to make this more rigorous, we will now check that these structures indeed form part of elliptic complexes, implying that the corresponding cohomologies become finite-dimensional on compact geometries. This is also important

when we quantize the respective actions later, since the cohomologies count the “on-shell” degrees of freedom, which ought to be finite and can (modulo potential complications from anomalies) be decoupled from the quantization procedure. As an example, we also construct the BV action for one of the quadratic actions but leave the full quantization for future work.

As a prelude, it will turn out that the proposed naive gauge transformations are not quite correct, and in understanding the correct gauge complex we also define a new symplectic cohomology associated to the background complex structure deformation. We will not do the full analysis for every effective action presented until this point, but focus on the quadratic effective action (3.41), derived in section 3.2 where we included the dilaton. As such, we refer to this as the “dilaton effective action”, though the dilaton does not appear explicitly in this quadratic action.

## 4.1 The first term of the dilaton effective action

Let us begin by considering the first term of the dilaton effective action (3.41),

$$S_{\text{eff}} = \int_X \partial x \star_H \partial x . \quad (4.1)$$

Here the kinetic operator in question takes the form

$$D = \partial \star_H \partial . \quad (4.2)$$

This operator forms part of a natural differential complex

$$0 \rightarrow \Omega^{(0,1)} \xrightarrow{\partial} \Omega^{(1,1)} \xrightarrow{D} \Omega^{(2,2)} \xrightarrow{\partial} \Omega^{(3,2)} \rightarrow 0 . \quad (4.3)$$

For reasons mentioned above, we would like to check that this complex is elliptic. To do so, we replace  $\partial$  with  $\xi \in \Omega^{(1,0)}$ , the holomorphic part of a real one-form,

$$0 \rightarrow \Omega^{(0,1)} \xrightarrow{\xi} \Omega^{(1,1)} \xrightarrow{D\xi} \Omega^{(2,2)} \xrightarrow{\xi} \Omega^{(3,2)} \rightarrow 0 . \quad (4.4)$$

If the new complex is exact for all non-vanishing  $\xi$ , i.e., the kernel at one stage equals the image at the previous stage, the complex is elliptic. As is, the complex (4.3) appears not to be elliptic, as we explain next.

It is easy to see that the complex is exact at the first stage and last stage, as these stages form part of elliptic Dolbeault complexes. Consider therefore the stage  $\Omega^{(1,1)}$ . Clearly  $\ker(\xi) \subseteq$

$\text{Im}(D_\xi)$ . To show the converse, assume that  $\alpha \in \Omega^{(1,1)}$  sits in  $\ker(D_\xi)$ . That is

$$D_\xi \alpha = \xi \star_H (\xi \wedge \alpha) = 0. \quad (4.5)$$

From ellipticity of the  $\partial$ -complex, it follows that

$$\star_H(\xi \wedge \alpha) = \xi \wedge \beta \quad (4.6)$$

for some  $\beta \in \Omega^{(0,2)}$ . However, the space of two-forms that are not in the kernel of  $\xi$  is (point-wise) six-dimensional, and the operator  $\star_H \circ \xi$  is an isomorphism on this space. However, since  $\beta$  is a  $(0,2)$ -form, it lives in a (point-wise) three-dimensional subspace. Hence, only those  $\alpha$  that map into this three-dimensional subspace can satisfy equation (4.6). As we shall see, this subspace is related to  $\alpha$  being (non-)primitive in an appropriate sense. This however leaves a potential three-dimensional sub-space of  $\alpha$ 's which can satisfy (4.6), i.e. not in  $\ker(\star_H \circ \xi) = \ker(\xi) = \text{Im}(\xi)$ , implying that the complex (4.3) is not elliptic.

To define the primitivity notion we are interested in, we first define a new double complex<sup>6</sup>

$$\hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)} := \Omega^{(p,0)} \otimes \wedge^q T^{(0,1)}. \quad (4.7)$$

A normal form in  $\Omega^{(p,q)}$  can be mapped to a form in  $\hat{\Omega}^{(p,3-q)}$  using  $\Omega^{\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}}$ . In particular, for our field we have  $x \in \hat{\Omega}^{(1,2)}$ . Note also that  $h^{-1} \in \hat{\Omega}^{(1,1)}$ , and in this sense it takes the role of a (complex) Kähler form. We use this form to define a notion of primitivity. We can then decompose

$$x = x_p + h^{-1} \wedge v, \quad (4.8)$$

where  $x_p \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(1,2)} \subset \hat{\Omega}^{(1,2)}$  is primitive and  $v \in \hat{\Omega}^{(0,1)}$ . Similar decompositions hold for forms of other degrees, just like ordinary primitivity in symplectic geometry.

The operators  $\partial$  and  $\bar{\partial}$  can also be interpreted as acting on  $\hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)}$ . Note that  $\partial$  has degree  $(1,0)$  whereas  $\bar{\partial}$  has degree  $(0,-1)$ . Moreover, they act in the following way. Let  $\alpha \in \hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)}$ ,  $\alpha = \frac{1}{p!} \frac{1}{q!} \alpha_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_p \bar{\nu}_1, \dots, \bar{\nu}_q} dz^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_p} d\bar{z}^{\bar{\nu}_1, \dots, \bar{\nu}_q}$ . Then

$$\partial \alpha = \frac{1}{p!} \frac{1}{q!} \partial_\mu \alpha_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_p \bar{\nu}_1, \dots, \bar{\nu}_q} dz^{\mu \mu_1 \dots \mu_p} d\bar{z}^{\bar{\nu}_1, \dots, \bar{\nu}_q} \quad (4.9)$$

$$\bar{\partial} \alpha = \frac{1}{p!} \frac{1}{q!} (-1)^{p+q+1} \nabla_{\bar{\nu}_1} \alpha_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_p \bar{\nu}_1, \dots, \bar{\nu}_q} dz^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_p} d\bar{z}^{\bar{\nu}_2, \dots, \bar{\nu}_q} \quad (4.10)$$

where  $\nabla$  is the connection defined in Appendix A.

---

<sup>6</sup>A similar complex appeared recently in [50], in the context of the double copy of Chern-Simons theory and Kodaira-Spencer theory.

Inspired by previous works in symplectic cohomology [51–53] and their applications in physics [54–58], we can then decompose  $\partial$  as

$$\partial = \partial_+ + h^{-1}\partial_-, \quad (4.11)$$

where  $\partial_+ : \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(p,q)} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(p+1,q)}$  and  $\partial_- : \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(p,q)} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(p,q-1)}$ . Consider then

$$0 = \partial^2 = \partial_+^2 + h^{-1}(\partial_- \partial_+ + \partial_+ \partial_-) + h^{-1}h^{-1}\partial_-^2. \quad (4.12)$$

From the primitive decomposition, we get that each term vanishes separately,

$$\partial_+^2 = 0, \quad h^{-1}(\partial_- \partial_+ + \partial_+ \partial_-) = 0, \quad \partial_-^2 = 0, \quad (4.13)$$

similar to ordinary symplectic geometry. Note that for forms in  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(p,q)}$  of degree  $p + q = 3$ , the middle equality is trivial, while for forms where  $p + q < 3$  it implies that  $\partial_+$  and  $\partial_-$  anti-commute. There are no primitive forms of total degree larger than 3.

In terms of the primitive decomposition, the action becomes

$$S = \int_X (h^{-1}\partial_- x_p + h^{-1}\partial_+ v + h^{-1}h^{-1}\partial_- v) \star_H (h^{-1}\partial_- x_p + h^{-1}\partial_+ v + h^{-1}h^{-1}\partial_- v). \quad (4.14)$$

Note that the Hodge-dual like isomorphism  $\star_H$  is constructed with  $h$  and its inverse, which are singlets under the primitive decomposition. It follows that  $\star_H$  can only change the form representation, but not the primitivity type of a form. Note also that forms of the same primitivity type can only pair to give a singlet in one way, which we will view as a top-form. The above action hence splits into two terms  $S_1(x_p, v)$  and  $S_2(v)$  where

$$\begin{aligned} S_1(x, v) &= \int_X (h^{-1}\partial_- x_p + h^{-1}\partial_+ v) \star_H (h^{-1}\partial_- x_p + h^{-1}\partial_+ v) \\ &\propto \int_X h^{-1}(\partial_- x_p + \partial_+ v)(\partial_- x_p + \partial_+ v), \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

and

$$S_2(v) = \int_X (h^{-1}h^{-1}\partial_- v) \star_H (h^{-1}h^{-1}\partial_- v) \propto \int_X h^{-1}h^{-1}h^{-1}\partial_- v \partial_- v. \quad (4.16)$$

Consider the cross-terms of  $S_1(x, v)$  proportional to

$$\int_X h^{-1}\partial_- x_p \partial_+ v = \int_X h^{-1}\partial_- x_p \partial v = \int_X \partial x_p \partial v = 0, \quad (4.17)$$

where the first equality uses the primitive decomposition, the second equality follows from



$\partial$ -closure of  $h^{-1}$  and primitivity of  $x_p$ , and the final expression vanishes since the integrand is a total derivative.

The term in  $S_1$  involving  $v$  becomes

$$\int_X h^{-1} \partial_+ v \partial_+ v = \int_X h^{-1} \partial v \partial_+ v = \int_X h^{-1} v \partial \partial_+ v = - \int_X h^{-1} h^{-1} v \partial_+ \partial_- v. \quad (4.18)$$

A similar computation shows that this is proportional to  $S_2(v)$ . Upon an appropriate re-scaling of the fields, we can thus write our action as

$$S = \int_X x_p \partial_+ \partial_- x_p + \int_X h^{-1} h^{-1} v \partial_+ \partial_- v. \quad (4.19)$$

Note that we do not expect the last term to vanish in general, since this term is derived from the original action (4.1) as the term involving the part of  $\partial x$  that is point-wise proportional to  $\Omega(h)$ .

Taking inspiration from [52], we expect the kinetic operator of the first term of (4.19) to form part of an elliptic complex

$$0 \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,2)} \xrightarrow{\partial_+} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(1,2)} \xrightarrow{\partial_+ \partial_-} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,1)} \xrightarrow{\partial_-} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,0)} \rightarrow 0, \quad (4.20)$$

while the kinetic operator of the second term of (4.19) is part of an elliptic complex

$$0 \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,3)} \xrightarrow{\partial_-} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,2)} \xrightarrow{\partial_-} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,1)} \xrightarrow{\partial_+ \partial_-} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(1,0)} \xrightarrow{\partial_+} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,0)} \xrightarrow{\partial_+} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(3,0)} \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.21)$$

These are the complexes we ought to use when we BV-quantize the action (4.1). We prove that they are elliptic in Appendix B.

## 4.2 The second term of the dilaton effective action

Regarding the second term of the dilaton effective action (3.41), i.e. the action

$$S = \int_X \bar{\partial} x \star'_H \bar{\partial} x, \quad (4.22)$$

a similar analysis can be done for its kinetic operator  $D' = \bar{\partial} \star'_H \bar{\partial}$ . This is the leading term of dilaton effective action as we approach the boundary of complex structure moduli space, when  $H \rightarrow \infty$ , and so should give the leading contribution to the partition function in this limit.

In this case, the suitable double complex is

$$\check{\Omega}^{(p,q)} := \wedge^p T^{(1,0)} \otimes \Omega^{(0,q)}. \quad (4.23)$$

The field  $x \in \Omega^{(1,1)}$  is mapped to  $\check{\Omega}^{(2,1)}$  by contracting with  $\bar{\Omega}$ , that is,  $x_{a\bar{b}} \rightarrow x_{\bar{b}}^{bc} = x_{a\bar{b}} \bar{\Omega}^{abc}$ . Clearly  $h \in \check{\Omega}^{(1,1)}$ , so we can use  $h$  as a complexified Kähler form and define primitivity with respect to it. We have the following decompositions:

$$x = x_p + h \wedge v \quad (4.24)$$

$$\bar{\partial} = \bar{\partial}_+ + h \wedge \bar{\partial}_- \quad (4.25)$$

where  $\bar{\partial}_+ : \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(p,q)} \rightarrow \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(p,q+1)}$  and  $\bar{\partial}_- : \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(p,q)} \rightarrow \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(p-1,q)}$ .

From here, everything follows analogously. The action (4.22) can then be written as:

$$S = \int_X x_p \bar{\partial}_+ \bar{\partial}_- x_p + \int_X h h v \bar{\partial}_+ \bar{\partial}_- v, \quad (4.26)$$

and the complexes governing the first and second terms are respectively:

$$0 \rightarrow \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,0)} \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}_+} \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,1)} \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}_+ \bar{\partial}_-} \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(1,2)} \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}_-} \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,2)} \rightarrow 0, \quad (4.27)$$

$$0 \rightarrow \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(3,0)} \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}_-} \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,0)} \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}_-} \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(1,0)} \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}_+ \bar{\partial}_-} \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,1)} \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}_+} \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,2)} \xrightarrow{\bar{\partial}_+} \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,3)} \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.28)$$

Again, these complexes can be shown to be elliptic, and they are the complexes we should use when quantizing the action.

We further note that the above action (4.26) can be written in a form where we view the field  $x$  as part of the  $\hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)}$  complex instead. To do so, first note that the map from  $\hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)}$  to  $\check{\Omega}^{(p,q)}$  takes primitive forms to primitive forms. This has to be the case, since  $h$ ,  $h^{-1}$ ,  $\Omega$  and  $\bar{\Omega}$  are all singlets under the primitive decomposition.

For example, primitivity for  $x_p \in \hat{\Omega}^{(1,2)}$  implies

$$h_{\bar{b}}^a x_{pa} \bar{b}^{\bar{c}} = 0. \quad (4.29)$$

Viewing  $x_p$  as an ordinary  $(1, 1)$ -form, this is equivalent to

$$\Omega(h) \wedge x_p = 0, \quad (4.30)$$

where

$$\Omega(h) = \frac{1}{2} h^a \wedge \Omega_{abc} dz^{bc} \quad (4.31)$$

is the  $(2, 1)$ -form corresponding to  $h$ . Contracting (4.30) with another factor of  $h$  is an isomorphism from  $(3, 2)$ -forms to  $(2, 3)$ -forms, giving

$$\Omega(h, h) \wedge x_p = 0, \quad (4.32)$$

where

$$\Omega(h, h) = \frac{1}{2} h^a h^b \wedge \Omega_{abc} dz^c. \quad (4.33)$$

This equation is equivalent to  $x_p$  being primitive when viewed as an element of the  $\check{\Omega}^{(p,q)}$  complex.

We then define a new operator on the  $\hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)}$  complex, denoted as

$$\delta = h^{\bar{a}} \nabla_{\bar{a}}, \quad (4.34)$$

where  $\nabla_{\bar{a}}$  is the Chern-type connection defined in Appendix A. We use this connection, as it is “metric” with respect to  $h$ . Moreover, it is torsion-free, so ordinary anti-commuting derivatives can be replaced with  $\nabla$ , just like in Kähler geometry. Note also that

$$\delta : \hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)} \rightarrow \hat{\Omega}^{(p+1,q)}, \quad (4.35)$$

and

$$\delta^2 = dz^{ab} h_{\bar{a}}^{\bar{a}} h_{\bar{b}}^{\bar{b}} \nabla_{\bar{a}} \nabla_{\bar{b}} = 0. \quad (4.36)$$

Just like for  $\partial$ , we can define operators  $\delta_+$  and  $\delta_-$  via

$$\delta = \delta_+ + h^{-1} \wedge \delta_-. \quad (4.37)$$

The operators  $\delta_{\pm}$  satisfy analogous identities to  $\partial_{\pm}$ , and we can further decompose  $\bar{\partial}x$  and the action (4.22) in terms of these operators, leading to an effective action

$$S = \int_X x_p \delta_+ \delta_- x_p + \int_X h^{-1} h^{-1} v \delta_+ \delta_- v, \quad (4.38)$$

where now  $x_p$  and  $v$  are fields taking values in  $\hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)}$ . This is the action we get from (4.26)

when we view  $x$  as a field in the  $\hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)}$  complex instead. We will use this form of the action below, when we come to combine the theories, as in the full dilaton effective action (3.41).

### 4.3 The full dilaton effective action

Let us consider the dilaton effective action (3.41) written out in the primitive decomposition. Note that  $\partial_+ = \mathcal{O}(1)$ ,  $\partial_- = \mathcal{O}(H)$ ,  $\delta_+ = \mathcal{O}(H^{-1})$ , and  $\delta_- = \mathcal{O}(1)$ . If we re-scale our fields  $(x_p, v)$  so that they do not scale with  $H$ , then the action can be written as

$$S = |h|^{-1} \int_X x_p (\partial_+ \partial_- + |h| \delta_+ \delta_-) x_p + |h|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \int_X h^{-1} h^{-1} v (\partial_+ \partial_- + |h| \delta_+ \delta_-) v. \quad (4.39)$$

We are interested in (elliptic) complexes in which the kinetic operator  $(\partial_+ \partial_- + |h| \delta_+ \delta_-)$  appears. Consider the first part of the above action

$$S(x_p) = |h|^{-1} \int_X x_p (\partial_+ \partial_- + |h| \delta_+ \delta_-) x_p. \quad (4.40)$$

Taking inspiration from above, for generic large values of  $|h|$  it is reasonable to expect that the gauge-transformation of  $x_p$  should be both  $\partial_+$ - and  $\delta_+$ -exact. That is

$$\delta x_p = \partial_+ \alpha = \delta_+ \beta, \quad (4.41)$$

for  $\alpha, \beta \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,2)}$ . As we will see, if  $\gamma$  is a primitive form of total degree 3, then

$$\delta_+ \partial_- \gamma = \partial_+ \delta_- \gamma. \quad (4.42)$$

We therefore propose the following complex governing the differential operator of (4.40):

$$0 \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,3)} \xrightarrow{\partial_+ \delta_-} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(1,2)} \xrightarrow{\partial_+ \partial_- + |h| \delta_+ \delta_-} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,1)} \xrightarrow{\partial_+ \delta_-} \mathcal{P}^{(3,0)} \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.43)$$

Checking that this complex is elliptic is quite cumbersome, and beyond the scope of this paper. However, we remark without proof that the corresponding symbol complex appears to be exact for generic  $\xi_p \in T_p^* X \setminus \{0\}$ , though not in general.

Let us now show that  $\partial_+ \delta_- = \delta_+ \partial_-$  on the primitive forms of interest. In particular, consider  $x_p \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(1,2)}$  of total degree 3. Note first that

$$(\delta x_p)^{\bar{b}\bar{c}} = h^{\bar{a}} \nabla_{\bar{a}} x_p^{\bar{b}\bar{c}} = 2 h^{[\bar{b}} \nabla_{\bar{a}} x_p^{|\bar{a}|\bar{c}]}, \quad (4.44)$$

where we have used primitivity of  $x_p$ , i.e.  $h^{-1} \wedge x_p = 0$ . Note that, because of equation (4.10), contraction of  $\nabla_{\bar{a}}$  with  $x_p$  is just the action of  $\bar{\partial}$ . It follows that

$$\delta x_p = -h^{-1} \wedge (\bar{\partial} x_p). \quad (4.45)$$

Let  $\pi$  denote the projection onto primitive forms, and consider

$$\partial_+ \delta_- x_p = -\pi(\partial \bar{\partial} x_p) = \pi(\bar{\partial} \partial x_p) = \pi(\bar{\partial}(h^{-1} \partial_- x_p)). \quad (4.46)$$

Next, note that

$$\bar{\partial}(h^{-1} \partial_- x_p)^{\bar{b}} = -2 \nabla_{\bar{a}} \left( -h^{[\bar{a}} \partial_- x_p^{\bar{b}]} \right) = \delta(\partial_- x_p)^{\bar{b}} - h^{\bar{b}} \nabla_{\bar{a}} (\partial_- x_p)^{\bar{a}}. \quad (4.47)$$

The last term drops out when we do the primitive projection. We therefore get

$$\partial_+ \delta_- x_p = \pi(\delta \partial_- x_p) = \delta_+ \partial_- x_p, \quad (4.48)$$

as desired. A similar computation shows  $\partial_+ \delta_- = \delta_+ \partial_-$  on the other primitive forms of interest.

Next, let us consider the second term of (4.39). To study the corresponding complex, it is convenient to define a new set of operators

$$\hat{d} = \partial + i\sqrt{|h|} \delta \quad (4.49)$$

$$\hat{d}^c = \partial - i\sqrt{|h|} \delta. \quad (4.50)$$

Note that these operators are also nilpotent. For example,

$$\hat{d}^2 = i\sqrt{|h|} (\partial \delta + \delta \partial) = i\sqrt{|h|} dz^{ab} h_a^{\bar{a}} R_{\bar{a}b} = 0, \quad (4.51)$$

where  $R$  is the curvature of  $\nabla$ . This vanishes, as the curvature is primitive as shown in Appendix A. As above, we decompose  $\hat{d}$  and  $\hat{d}^c$  as

$$\hat{d} = \hat{d}_+ + h^{-1} \hat{d}_- \quad (4.52)$$

$$\hat{d}^c = \hat{d}_+^c + h^{-1} \hat{d}_-^c \quad (4.53)$$

where again  $\hat{d}_\pm$  and  $\hat{d}_\pm^c$  satisfies similar identities to  $\partial_\pm$  and  $\delta_\pm$ . Let us compute<sup>7</sup>

$$S(v) = \int_X h^{-1}h^{-1}v \hat{d}_+ \hat{d}_-^c v = \int_X h^{-1}h^{-1}v (\partial_+ \partial_- + |h| \delta_+ \delta_-) v + i\sqrt{|h|} \int_X h^{-1}h^{-1}v (\delta_+ \partial_- - \partial_+ \delta_-) v. \quad (4.55)$$

The last term vanishes upon appropriate integrations by parts.  $S(v)$  is then governed by the following differential complex

$$0 \rightarrow \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(3,0)} \xrightarrow{\hat{d}_-^c} \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,0)} \xrightarrow{\hat{d}_-^c} \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(1,0)} \xrightarrow{\hat{d}_+ \hat{d}_-^c} \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,1)} \xrightarrow{\hat{d}_+} \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,2)} \xrightarrow{\hat{d}_+} \check{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,3)} \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.56)$$

Again, we leave questions regarding the elliptic properties of this complex and the complex (4.43) for now, though we comment that a possible approach to understanding such issues might be to perform an expansion of the fields in an order parameter suitably related to  $H^{-1}$ , and study the resulting actions order by order.

## 4.4 The BV Action

As an example, we also construct the BV action of (4.1). The gauge symmetries of the action can be read off from the complexes (4.20) and (4.21), and are given by

$$\delta_{\epsilon_1} x_p = \partial_+ \epsilon_1, \quad \delta_{\epsilon_2} v = \partial_- \epsilon_2. \quad (4.57)$$

And the gauge of the gauge is

$$\delta_{\epsilon_3} \epsilon_2 = \partial_- \epsilon_3 \quad (4.58)$$

These gauge transformations form an off-shell abelian gauge algebra, so the corresponding BV actions are given by:

$$S_{BV}(x) = \int_X x_p \partial_+ \partial_- x_p + x^* \wedge \partial_+ c_1, \quad (4.59)$$

$$S_{BV}(v) = \int_X h^{-1}h^{-1}v \partial_+ \partial_- v + h^{-1}h^{-1}v^* \partial_- c_2 + h^{-1}c^{*2} \partial_- c_3, \quad (4.60)$$

---

<sup>7</sup>The first term of (4.39) can similarly be written as

$$S(x_p) = |h|^{-1} \int_X x_p \hat{d}_+ \hat{d}_-^c x_p. \quad (4.54)$$

where  $c_1, c_2 \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,2)}$  are fermionic ghosts, and  $c_3 \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,3)}$ , which has bosonic statistics, is the ghost for the ghost  $c_2$ . We denote the anti-fields by  $x^* \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,1)}$  and  $v^* \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(1,0)}$ , and  $c^{*i}$  are the corresponding anti-ghosts. Note that the only anti-ghost appearing in the BV action is  $c^{*2} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,0)}$ .

The classical master equation

$$\frac{1}{2}\{S_{BV}, S_{BV}\} = 0 \quad (4.61)$$

can be checked easily for  $S_{BV}(x)$ :

$$\frac{1}{2}\{S_{BV}(x), S_{BV}(x)\} = \frac{\partial_r S_{BV}(x)}{\partial x} \frac{\partial_l S_{BV}(x)}{\partial x^*} = \int_X 2 \partial_+ \partial_- x \wedge \partial_+ c_1, \quad (4.62)$$

which vanishes after integrating by parts and using (4.13), together with the comment below the equation.

The master equation for  $S_{BV}(v)$  is slightly more subtle. We need to use an appropriate number of factors of  $h^{-1}$  in defining the natural symplectic pairing on the complex (4.21) to get an appropriate top-form. With this in mind, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\{S_{BV}(v), S_{BV}(v)\} &= \frac{\partial_r S_{BV}(v)}{\partial v} \frac{\partial_l S_{BV}(v)}{\partial v^*} + \frac{\partial_r S_{BV}(v)}{\partial c_i} \frac{\partial_l S_{BV}(v)}{\partial c^{*i}} \\ &= \int_X 2 h^{-1} h^{-1} \partial_+ \partial_- v \partial_- c_2 + h^{-1} \partial_+ v^* \partial_- c_3. \end{aligned} \quad (4.63)$$

Again, the terms vanish after integrating by parts and using (4.13), together with the comment below the equation.

In order to quantize the theory, we should also gauge fix the action. This requires a choice of Lagrangian sub-manifold in the space of fields. Usually, one does this by introducing a metric, with respect to which one can define a positive definite inner-product, and adjoints of the respective operators. The gauge fixing procedure then imposes that the fields are in the kernel of the corresponding adjoint operators. One then needs to check that the final answer is independent of the choice of gauge fixing. In particular, it should be independent of the choice of metric, see e.g. [59] for an explicit example of such a computation. As we are not concerned with quantizing the theories in the current paper, we will leave questions regarding gauge fixing and a choice of metric for future work.

## 5 The SYZ fibration and a three-dimensional toy model

According to the SYZ conjecture [60], as one approaches the large complex structure limit, the three-torus of the SYZ-fibration shrinks while the topological three-sphere base of the fibration grows. A light tower of states could then arise either from winding string modes of the SYZ fiber or from KK modes of the SYZ base.

Ignoring complications concerning details of the degeneration loci of the fibration, it is reasonable to anticipate a six-dimensional theory to undergo an effective dimensional reduction to the three-sphere. This philosophy of modelling the system in terms of a (local) three-dimensional description has been utilized to gain valuable insights into the nature of both heterotic and M-theory compactifications, see e.g. [61–71], and [72] for a discussion in the context of the emergent string conjecture. In this section we make an educated guess for a similar reduction of our theory (3.2).

### 5.1 The model

Before we present the model, we need to define some terms. Let  $\hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)} := \Omega^p(S^3, \Omega^q(S^3))$  be the space of  $p$ -forms on  $S^3$  with values on  $\Omega^q(S^3)$ , not to be confused with the hatted double complex on  $X$  above. This will model an effective Dolbeault complex which our fields take values in. An element  $\alpha \in \hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)}$  is expressed in coordinates by

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{p!} \frac{1}{q!} \alpha_{a_1 \dots a_p, m_1 \dots m_q} dx^{a_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx^{a_p} \otimes dx^{m_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx^{m_q}, \quad (5.1)$$

In order to shorten the expressions, from now on we write  $dx^{a_1 \dots a_p}$  instead of  $dx^{a_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx^{a_p}$ . We also need differentials to play the role of Dolbeault operators. As the tangent bundle of  $S^3$  is topologically trivial, we could just set the connections on the tangent bundle to zero, and simply use the ordinary derivative to raise the  $p$  and  $q$  index. This does, however, not play well with the reduced geometric structure, which for  $S^3$  we will model by the (round) metric. Indeed, recall that  $h^{ab}$  is a symmetric invertible matrix, whose reduction is most conveniently modelled by the round metric.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>Note that in the SYZ case, the metric on  $S^3$  would not be the round metric but the pullback of the Calabi-Yau metric to  $S^3$ .



In Appendix C we define two nilpotent operators

$$d_+ : \hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)} \rightarrow \hat{\Omega}^{(p+1,q)} \quad (5.2)$$

$$d_- : \hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)} \rightarrow \hat{\Omega}^{(p,q+1)}, \quad (5.3)$$

which also anti-commute

$$\{d_+, d_-\} = d_+d_- + d_-d_+ = 0, \quad (5.4)$$

so we have a double complex. These operators also have the advantage that they are metric in an appropriate sense. Inspired by the action (3.2), we consider the action

$$S = \int_{S^3} (x_a d_- \mu^a + (H_{ab} + \nabla_+ x_{ab}) \mu^a \mu^b + \mu^a \nabla_+ x_a b). \quad (5.5)$$

where the fields are  $x \in \hat{\Omega}^{(1,1)}$ ,  $\mu \in \hat{\Omega}^{(0,1)}(TS^3)$ ,  $b \in \hat{\Omega}^{(0,2)}$ , and  $H \in \hat{\Omega}^{(2,1)}$ . In this particular case, if  $x = x_{am} dx^a \otimes dx^m$ , then  $d_-$  acts as

$$d_- x = -(\nabla_n^{LC} x_{am} + \epsilon_n^l x_{lm}) dx^a \otimes dx^{nm}, \quad (5.6)$$

and for  $b = \frac{1}{2} b_{mn} dx^{mn} \in \hat{\Omega}^{(0,2)}$ ,

$$d_+ b = \frac{1}{2} (\nabla_a^{LC} b_{mn} - \epsilon_a^l b_{ln} - \epsilon_a^l b_{ml}) dx^a \otimes dx^{mn}. \quad (5.7)$$

where  $\nabla^{LC}$  is just the Levi-Civita connection associated to the round metric on  $S^3$ . It is natural to take  $H_{abm} = h \epsilon_{abm}$ , i.e., associated to the volume form of the growing  $S^3$ , where the complex structure  $h$  defines the size. We then have

$$H_{ab} \mu^a \mu^b = H_{abm} \mu_n^a \mu_s^b dx^{mns} = h \epsilon_{abm} \epsilon^{mns} \mu_n^a \mu_s^b dx^{123}. \quad (5.8)$$

With this, it is straight-forward to compute the inverse of the matrix  $H_a^n b^s := h \epsilon_{abm} \epsilon^{mns}$ , which is given by

$$(H^{-1})_n^a b^s = \frac{1}{h} (\frac{1}{2} \delta_n^a \delta_s^b - \delta_s^a \delta_n^b). \quad (5.9)$$

Using this, we can consider toy models on  $S^3$  of all the above effective actions. For example, integrating out  $\mu$  as in Section 3, and considering the quadratic part of the action, one gets

$$S_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} ((H^{-1} d_+ x)^2) - \frac{1}{4} \int_{S^3} (d_- x + d_+ b)_a^m (H^{-1})_m^a n^b (d_- x + d_+ b)_b^n, \quad (5.10)$$

where

$$(d_- x + d_+ b)_a^m = (\nabla_+ x_{ns} + \nabla_- x_{as}) \epsilon^{mns}. \quad (5.11)$$

The simple nature of  $H^{-1}$  means that we can write this more explicitly. Inserting (5.9) into (5.10) gives

$$S_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{9}{16} \int_{S^3} \frac{1}{h^2} \text{Tr}((d_+x)^2) - \frac{1}{4} \int_{S^3} \left( \frac{1}{2h} (\text{Tr}(d_-x + d_+b))^2 - \frac{1}{h} \text{Tr}((d_-x + d_+b)^2) \right), \quad (5.12)$$

where  $d_+x$  is the matrix

$$(d_+x)^{pq}_{ab} = (\nabla_{+[axb]_s} \epsilon^{spq}), \quad (5.13)$$

and the trace is over the double indices.

Similarly, the action analogous to (3.41), which includes linear fluctuations in the dilaton, is given by:

$$S_{\text{eff}} = \int_{S^3} \left( -\frac{9}{16h^2} \text{Tr}((d_+x)^2) - \frac{1}{8h} (\text{Tr}(d_-x))^2 + \frac{1}{4h} \text{Tr}((d_-x)^2) \right). \quad (5.14)$$

It is also possible to define a primitive decomposition of the fields as in Section 4, and similarly decompose the above actions. In the given model, this decomposition can be straight-forwardly related to irreducible representations of  $SO(3)$ .

## 5.2 An alternative model

As mentioned above, given that the tangent bundles of  $S^3$  are topologically trivial, we could also pick our connections  $\nabla_{\pm}$  such that the differentials  $d_{\pm}$  (in an appropriate gauge) simply act as ordinary derivatives, for example

$$d_-x = -\partial_n x_{am} dx^a \otimes dx^{nm}, \quad (5.15)$$

where we do not rename the operators by slight abuse of notation. These connections are perhaps simpler to work with in explicit computations. However, the connections are no longer “metric”, which can lead to complications when we come to define Laplacians, which will be required for example to quantize these models.

## 6 Including gauge fields

We also want to discuss what happens when we include the gauge sector in the action. In this case, the flux is corrected as<sup>9</sup>

$$H = dB + \frac{\alpha'}{4}\omega_{CS}(A), \quad (6.1)$$

where  $\omega_{CS}(A)$  is the Chern-Simons three-form of  $A$ . With this, the superpotential also changes, see [21]. For the case without dilaton, the action (3.2) is corrected by

$$\Delta W_\alpha = \frac{\alpha'}{4} \int_X \text{Tr} \left( \alpha \wedge \bar{\partial}_A \alpha + \frac{2}{3} \alpha \wedge \alpha \wedge \alpha - 2 \mu^d \wedge F_d \wedge \alpha - \alpha \wedge \mu^d \wedge (\partial_A \alpha)_d \right) \wedge \Omega, \quad (6.2)$$

where  $\alpha := \delta A \in \Omega^{(0,1)}(\text{End}(V))$  is a deformation of the gauge connection  $A$ .

Notice that  $\mu$  remains quadratic in the full action, so we can integrate it out. The new effective theory schematically takes the form:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{eff}} &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \log (H + \partial x) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4} \int_X (\bar{\partial} x + \partial b + \frac{\alpha'}{4} \text{Tr}(-2\alpha \wedge F + \alpha \partial_A \alpha))(H + \partial x)^{-1} (\bar{\partial} x + \partial b + \frac{\alpha'}{4} \text{Tr}(-2\alpha \wedge F + \alpha \partial_A \alpha)) \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha'}{4} \int_X \text{Tr} \left( \alpha \wedge \bar{\partial}_A \alpha + \frac{2}{3} \alpha \wedge \alpha \wedge \alpha \right) \wedge \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

When the dilaton is included, the action (3.33) is corrected by

$$\Delta W_\alpha = \frac{\alpha'}{4} \int_X e^x \text{Tr} \left( \alpha \wedge \bar{\partial}_A \alpha + \frac{2}{3} \alpha \wedge \alpha \wedge \alpha - 2 \mu^d \wedge F_d \wedge \alpha - \alpha \wedge \mu^d \wedge (\partial_A \alpha)_d \right) \wedge \Omega \quad (6.4)$$

After integrating out  $\mu$ , we get the effective action

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{eff}} &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \log [e^x (H + \partial x)] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4} \int_X e^x (\bar{\partial} x + \partial b + \frac{\alpha'}{4} \text{Tr}(-2\alpha \wedge F + \alpha \partial_A \alpha))(H + \partial x)^{-1} (\bar{\partial} x + \partial b + \frac{\alpha'}{4} \text{Tr}(-2\alpha \wedge F + \alpha \partial_A \alpha)) \\ &\quad + \frac{\alpha'}{4} \int_X e^x \text{Tr} \left( \alpha \wedge \bar{\partial}_A \alpha + \frac{2}{3} \alpha \wedge \alpha \wedge \alpha \right) \wedge \Omega + \int_X e^x \bar{\partial} b \wedge \Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

As in Section 3.2, we can expand the action up to quadratic order in the fields. If we again assume a large mass for the axio-dilaton, expand  $\chi$  to linear order and integrate it out, we

---

<sup>9</sup>We have neglected the higher derivative correction from the gravitational Chern-Simons term.

again obtain  $\bar{\partial}b = 0$ . This implies on a Calabi-Yau manifold that  $b$  is  $\bar{\partial}$ -exact and can hence again be absorbed in  $x$  by an appropriate field redefinition.

The new quadratic effective action then takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\text{eff}} = & -\frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} ((H^{-1}\partial x)^2) - \frac{1}{4} \int_X (\bar{\partial}x - \frac{\alpha'}{2} \text{Tr}(\alpha \wedge F))(H)^{-1}(\bar{\partial}x - \frac{\alpha'}{2} \text{Tr}(\alpha \wedge F)) \\
& + \frac{\alpha'}{4} \int_X \text{Tr} (\alpha \wedge \bar{\partial}_A \alpha) \wedge \Omega .
\end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

We will not examine this action in much further detail here, except to note the induced couplings between the hermitian degrees of freedom  $x$ , and the gauge degrees of freedom  $\alpha$ . Note also that if we ignore the hermitian degrees of freedom, by setting  $x$  to zero, we get an induced mass term for the internal gauge degrees of freedom. This mass term also comes down at a rate  $\mathcal{O}(H^{-1})$  as we approach the boundary of complex structure moduli space.

## 7 Conclusions and outlook

In this work we explore the recently proposed version of a heterotic Kodaira-Spencer like gravity [21], derived from fluctuations of the heterotic superpotential. Treating the heterotic superpotential as an effective quantum field theory, possibly including some mathematically motivated (non-perturbative) corrections leads to a way to study the heterotic moduli space directly. This is non-trivial since the heterotic Bianchi identity mixes Kähler, complex structure, and bundle moduli into a combined moduli space with coupled off-shell fluctuations in the effective action.

Using this framework we explore infinite distance limits and compare them with the expectations of the swampland distance conjecture [5]: At large complex structure, we can integrate out their off-shell fluctuations resulting in an effective theory for the residual degrees of freedom. We then confirmed that at large distances in the complex structure moduli space, or at large background flux, we get the expected qualitative behavior of an effective tower of states becoming light at an exponential rate in geodesic distance.

The new effective actions are also interesting in their own right. In particular, the differentials governing the quadratic parts form part of new elliptic symplectic type differential complexes, where the background complex structure Beltrami differential plays the role of the symplectic form. It would be very interesting to study the mathematical properties of these complexes further, and to investigate the quantum properties of these new effective actions, such as

the one-loop partition function, anomalies, etc. In particular, the full one-loop function has been computed in [31], where it was studied in great detail without background fluxes turned on. Turning on background fluxes and torsion complicates this analysis, and our method of partially integrating out fields in the presence of fluxes could be useful in this regard.

It should also be noted that in order to integrate out the complex structure moduli, we relied on the background complex structure having a non-vanishing Yukawa coupling. The Yukawa couplings are related to the triple intersection numbers in the mirror dual geometry, which becomes sparse in a basis of Kähler cone generators when the numbers of Kähler moduli becomes large. The vanishing entries in the intersection matrix of the mirror are related to certain fibration structures, which appear to become richer with increasing number of Kähler moduli. In fact, there is a direct connection to infinite distance limits in the Kähler moduli space in which only sub-varieties of a fibration degenerate and the rate at which towers become light [48, 49]. The specific directions in the complex structure moduli space that we can probe in this work correspond to the most drastic decompactification limits in the mirror dual Kähler moduli spaces, denoted as type IV in the nomenclature of [49]. It would be interesting to extend our scenario to such limits and identify the respective towers that become light.

Motivated by the SYZ conjecture, we also proposed toy-models on  $S^3$  for the given effective actions. As the  $T^3$  shrinks and the  $S^3$  grows at large complex structure distance, one might expect an effective dimensional reduction of the theory. Exploiting this, we make educated guesses for what such a reduced theory might look like. These theories have the advantage that the geometry is explicit, leading to the potential to perform explicit computations, such as one-loop partition functions, etc. Furthermore, such computations often lead to topological invariants which then should inform about the parent heterotic and Calabi-Yau geometries. Of course, the interesting topological properties of the SYZ fibration come from its degeneration loci. Such loci can potentially be modelled as topological defects in the reduced theory, such as analogs of Wilson lines. Understanding how to model such effects and their potential computational power is an interesting future direction.

Throughout most of the paper we have set  $\alpha' = 0$ , effectively decoupling the gauge degrees of freedom. In Section 6 we briefly considered turning on  $\alpha'$  to include these modes. It would be interesting to study such couplings further. In doing so, one also needs to worry about other non-perturbative effects, such as world-sheet instantons. Such corrections introduce a complex structure dependence of the superpotential via Pfaffian prefactors of the instanton corrections. These might play an important role especially in cases where the tree-level Yukawa coupling vanishes. However, whether these corrections occur or are absent due to Beasley-Witten cancellation [73] also depends on the gauge sector of the theory [74, 75] and

the compactness of the instanton moduli space, which we mostly ignored in this paper. On the other hand, string theory lore suggests that couplings of such effects and the off-shell modes are suppressed, given the vanishing of world-sheet instantons at higher genus [76, 77]. It would be interesting to extend our analysis to such cases in the future.

From a mathematical point of view, turning on the gauge degrees of freedom in the superpotential leads to a theory which effectively couples Donaldson-Thomas theory [25, 26] to geometric degrees of freedom (the metric and complex structure). The procedure of integrating out geometric modes as outlined in this paper effectively couples Donaldson-Thomas theory to background moduli, and the remaining geometric modes. As a mathematical curiosity, it is interesting to ask how this affects the properties of Donaldson-Thomas invariants, wall-crossing phenomena, etc. On a more speculative level, the modes coming down at infinite distance in complex structure moduli space should also play a role in understanding the physics behind moduli space compactification.

Finally, the procedure of integrating out modes at large distance as outlined here can also be employed in other theories, such as heterotic  $G_2$  compactifications and M-Theory/F-theory models. In particular, the F-theory superpotential is very similar to the heterotic superpotential, and it would be very interesting to investigate similar avenues in these settings.

## Acknowledgments

We thank Anthony Ashmore, Jim Halverson, Aleksi Kurkela, David McNutt, Jock McOrist, Ruben Minasian, Savdeep Sethi, Charles Stickland-Constable, and David Tennyson for many interesting discussions. We particularly thank David McNutt and David Tennyson for their involvement at an early stage of this project. ES would like to thank the mathematical research institute MATRIX in Australia, where part of this research was performed, for a lively and rewarding research environment. The work of FR is supported by the NSF grants PHY-2210333 and PHY-2019786 (The NSF AI Institute for Artificial Intelligence and Fundamental Interactions). The work of FR and PKO is also supported by startup funding from Northeastern University. PKO would like to thank the KITP and the program "What is String Theory? Weaving Perspectives Together" during the completion of this work. This research was supported in part by grant NSF PHY-2309135 to the Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics (KITP).

## A Connections and Curvature

Using the complex structure deformation  $h \in \Omega^{(0,1)}(T^{(1,0)}X)$ , which is a non-degenerate matrix if it has a non-vanishing Yukawa coupling, we can define a Chern-type connection on holomorphic indices

$$\nabla_a \alpha_b = h_b^{\bar{c}} \partial_a (h_{\bar{c}}^d \alpha_d) , \quad (\text{A.1})$$

with curvature

$$R_{\bar{b}a}{}^c{}_d = \partial_{\bar{b}} (h_d^{\bar{c}} \partial_a h_{\bar{c}}^c) , \quad (\text{A.2})$$

in close analogy with the curvature of the ordinary Chern connection. A similar connection can be defined on anti-holomorphic indices. Clearly the connection is “metric” with respect to  $h$ . Furthermore, the connection also preserves the holomorphic top-form, since

$$\nabla_a (\Omega_{bcd}) = h_b^{\bar{b}} h_c^{\bar{c}} h_d^{\bar{d}} \partial_a (h_{\bar{b}}^b h_{\bar{c}}^c h_{\bar{d}}^d \Omega_{bcd}) \propto |h| h_b^{\bar{b}} h_c^{\bar{c}} h_d^{\bar{d}} \partial_a (\bar{\Omega}_{\bar{b}\bar{c}\bar{d}}) = 0 , \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where we have used that  $h_b^{\bar{b}} h_c^{\bar{c}} h_d^{\bar{d}} \Omega_{bcd} \propto |h| \Omega_{\bar{b}\bar{c}\bar{d}}$ , and  $|h|$  is point-wise constant as noted in the main text.

Let us discuss further properties of this connection and its curvature. We first note that the curvature is Ricci-flat,

$$R_{\bar{b}a}{}^a{}_d = \partial_{\bar{b}} (h_d^{\bar{c}} \partial_a h_{\bar{c}}^a) = 0 , \quad (\text{A.4})$$

since  $h$  is divergence-free  $\partial_a h_{\bar{c}}^a = 0$ . Note also that the connection symbols

$$\Omega_a{}^c{}_d = h_d^{\bar{c}} \partial_a h_{\bar{c}}^a \quad (\text{A.5})$$

are torsion-free. That is

$$\Omega_{[a}{}^c{}_{d]} = 0 . \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Indeed, if  $h_{\bar{c}}^a$  is harmonic, then so is its inverse. To see this, note that the inverse is proportional to

$$h_c^{\bar{c}} \propto \Omega_{abc} h_{\bar{a}}^a h_{\bar{b}}^b \Omega^{\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}} , \quad (\text{A.7})$$

which is harmonic [42, 43]. Indeed, note that

$$h_c^{\bar{c}} h_d^{\bar{c}} \propto \Omega_{abc} h_{\bar{d}}^c h_{\bar{a}}^a h_{\bar{b}}^b \Omega^{\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}} \propto |h| \bar{\Omega}_{\bar{d}\bar{a}\bar{b}} \Omega^{\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}} \propto \delta_{\bar{d}}^{\bar{c}} , \quad (\text{A.8})$$

as  $|h|$  is point-wise constant proportional to the Yukawa coupling of  $h$ . Here  $\propto$  denotes equal up to irrelevant constant numerical factors.

The curvature is also primitive in the sense of Section 4. We use  $\Omega^{\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}}$  to raise indices, and

view

$$R \in \hat{\Omega}^{(1,2)} (\text{End}(T^{(1,0)})) . \quad (\text{A.9})$$

We then see that

$$h_{\bar{a}}^a R^{\bar{a}\bar{b}}{}^c{}_d = \Omega^{\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}} \bar{\partial}_{\bar{c}} \left( h_{\bar{a}}^a h_a^{\bar{d}} \partial_d h_{\bar{d}}^c \right) = \Omega^{\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}} \bar{\partial}_{\bar{c}} (\partial_d h_{\bar{a}}^c) = 0 , \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where in the first equality we have used the symmetry of the connection symbol (torsion-free), and  $\bar{\partial}$ -closure of  $h$  in both equalities.

## B Proving ellipticity of complexes

In this appendix we prove that (4.20) and (4.21) are elliptic. Let us repeat these complexes here for convenience

$$0 \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,2)} \xrightarrow{\partial_+} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(1,2)} \xrightarrow{\partial_+ \partial_-} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,1)} \xrightarrow{\partial_-} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,0)} \rightarrow 0 , \quad (\text{B.1})$$

$$0 \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,3)} \xrightarrow{\partial_-} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,2)} \xrightarrow{\partial_-} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,1)} \xrightarrow{\partial_+ \partial_-} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(1,0)} \xrightarrow{\partial_+} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,0)} \xrightarrow{\partial_+} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(3,0)} \rightarrow 0 . \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Let us begin with the complex (B.1). Using the middle relation of (4.13) and the comment below the equation, it is easy to check that this is indeed a differential complex. To prove ellipticity, we again replace  $\partial$  with  $\xi$  to get the complex

$$0 \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,2)} \xrightarrow{\xi_+} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(1,2)} \xrightarrow{\xi_+ \xi_-} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,1)} \xrightarrow{\xi_-} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,0)} \rightarrow 0 . \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Again, it is easy to check that this is a complex.

To show exactness at the first level, we pick  $\alpha \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,2)}$  and insist that the primitive part of  $\xi \wedge \alpha$  vanishes. Defining  $\xi_{\bar{a}} = h_{\bar{a}}^a \xi_a$ , this becomes equivalent to

$$\xi_{(\bar{a}} \alpha_{\bar{b})} = 0 , \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where we view  $\alpha$  as an ordinary  $(0,1)$ -form. To see that this implies  $\alpha = 0$ , we work point-wise and pick a frame where  $(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) = (1, 0, 0)$  (which is possible wlog since  $\xi \neq 0$ ).

Showing exactness at the second level is a bit more cumbersome. We pick  $\beta \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(1,2)}$ . Being in the kernel of  $\xi_+ \xi_-$  means that  $\xi \wedge \xi_- \beta$  is non-primitive, which is equivalent to

$$\xi_c h_{\bar{b}}^a \xi_{[a} \beta_{b]}^{\bar{b}\bar{c}} dz^{cb} = \frac{1}{2} h_{\bar{b}}^a \xi_a \xi_{[c} \beta_{b]}^{\bar{b}\bar{c}} dz^{cb} = h_{[c}^{\bar{c}} v_{b]} dz^{cb} \quad (\text{B.5})$$



for some  $v_b$ . This implies that

$$\frac{1}{2}h_c^c h_b^a \xi_a \xi_{[c} \beta_{b]}^{\bar{b}\bar{c}} = \frac{1}{4}h_c^c h_b^a \xi_a \xi_c \beta_b^{\bar{b}\bar{c}} = h_c^c h_{[c}^{\bar{c}} v_{b]} = \delta_{[c}^c v_{b]} = v_b. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

But the left-hand side vanishes as  $\beta_b^{\bar{b}\bar{c}}$  is anti-symmetric in  $\bar{b}\bar{c}$ , which induces  $\xi_{[a} \xi_{c]} = 0$ . It follows that

$$\xi \wedge h_b^a \xi_{[a} \beta_{b]}^{\bar{b}\bar{c}} dz^b = 0, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

which implies

$$h_b^a \xi_{[a} \beta_{b]}^{\bar{b}\bar{c}} = \frac{1}{2}h_b^a \xi_a \beta_b^{\bar{b}\bar{c}} = \xi_b w^{\bar{c}} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

for some  $w^{\bar{c}}$ . Primitivity of  $\beta$  implies that  $h_c^b \xi_b w^{\bar{c}} = 0$ . The above equation is then (modulo potentially re-scaling  $w$ ) equivalent to

$$\xi \wedge \beta = h^{-1} \wedge \xi \wedge w. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

That is

$$\beta = h^{-1} \wedge w + \tilde{\beta}, \quad (\text{B.10})$$

where  $\tilde{\beta} \in \ker(\xi) = \text{Im}(\xi)$ . As  $\beta$  is primitive, it follows that  $\beta \in \text{Im}(\xi_+)$ , showing exactness at the second level.

Next note the point-wise dimensions  $|\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(1,2)}| = |\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,1)}| = 6$ . Injectivity of the first map, together with exactness at the second level implies  $|\text{Im}(\xi_+ \xi_-)| = 3$ . Recall also that  $\text{Im}(\xi_+ \xi_-)$  is a sub-space of  $\ker(\xi_-)$ . If we can show that the last map is onto (exactness at the last level), it follows that  $|\ker(\xi_-)| = 3$  and hence  $|\text{Im}(\xi_+ \xi_-)| = |\ker(\xi_-)|$ , so they are the same space, i.e., we have exactness at the third level as well.

To show exactness at the last level, note that for  $\gamma \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,1)}$  we have

$$(\xi_- \gamma)_{ab} = \xi_{\bar{a}} \gamma_{ab}^{\bar{a}}. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Picking  $\gamma$  of the form  $\gamma_{ab}^{\bar{a}} = \kappa_{ab} u^{\bar{a}}$ , it is clear that we can generate any form in  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,0)}$  as long as we pick  $u$  so that  $\xi_{\bar{a}} u^{\bar{a}} \neq 0$ . This shows exactness at the last level, and hence the sequence (B.3) is exact. The complex (4.27) is therefore elliptic.

Showing that the complex (4.28) is elliptic is more straightforward. The complex with  $\partial$  replaced by  $\xi$  is

$$0 \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,3)} \xrightarrow{\xi_-} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,2)} \xrightarrow{\xi_-} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,1)} \xrightarrow{\xi_+ \xi_-} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(1,0)} \xrightarrow{\xi_+} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(2,0)} \xrightarrow{\xi_+} \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(3,0)} \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

As  $\xi_+ = \xi$  on  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(p,0)}$ , the complex is exact at the last two levels. A similar observation implies the complex is exact at the first two levels. At the third level, if  $\alpha \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,1)}$  and

$$\xi_+ \xi_- \alpha = 0, \quad (\text{B.13})$$

this can only happen if  $\xi_- \alpha = 0$ , which implies  $\alpha \in \text{Im}(\xi_-)$  by exactness of the  $\xi_-$ -complex on  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(0,q)}$  forms. This is similar to how one argues ellipticity of the ordinary  $d^\dagger$ -complex and shows that the complex is exact at the third level. Finally, at the fourth level, if  $\beta \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{(1,0)}$  is in the kernel of  $\xi_+$ , then clearly it can be written as

$$\beta = \xi_+(\xi_- v) \quad (\text{B.14})$$

for some appropriately chosen  $v$  not in the kernel of  $\xi_-$ . This shows exactness at level four, and the complex (4.28) is elliptic.

## C Connections on the three-sphere

In this appendix we define and analyze properties of the connections  $d_\pm$  that we use on the double complex  $\hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)}$  on  $S^3$  in Section 5.

### Flat connections on the three-sphere

Let  $X = S^3$ , and consider the following two connections on  $X$ :

$$d_\pm = d + \Gamma^{LC} \pm \epsilon_\pm,$$

where the action of  $\epsilon_\pm$  is defined below in terms of the three-dimensional volume form. These differentials act on the double complex  $\hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)}$  on  $S^3$  as

$$\begin{aligned} d_+ &: \hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)} \rightarrow \hat{\Omega}^{(p+1,q)} \\ d_- &: \hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)} \rightarrow \hat{\Omega}^{(p,q+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $\alpha \in \hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)}$  as in (5.1), these differentials act as

$$d_+ \alpha = dx^a \nabla_a \alpha + \epsilon_+ \cdot \alpha, \quad d_- \alpha = (-1)^{|\alpha|} (\nabla_m \alpha dx^m - \epsilon_- \cdot \alpha).$$

where  $|\alpha| := p + q$  and  $\nabla$  is the Levi-Civita connection for the round metric on  $S^3$ . Let us further define  $\epsilon_+ \cdot \alpha = dx^b(\epsilon_b \cdot \alpha)$ , where

$$\epsilon_b \cdot \alpha = -\frac{1}{p!q!} \sum_{i=1}^q \epsilon_b^l{}_{m_i} \alpha_{a_1 \dots a_p, m_1 \dots \widehat{m}_i l \dots m_q} dx^{a_1 \dots a_p} \otimes dx^{m_1 \dots m_q}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

The hat on an index  $\widehat{m}_i$  denotes omission of this index. Similarly, we define  $\epsilon_- \cdot \alpha = (\epsilon_n \cdot \alpha) dx^n$ , where

$$\epsilon_n \cdot \alpha = -\frac{1}{p!q!} \sum_{i=1}^p \epsilon_n^l{}_{a_i} \alpha_{a_1 \dots \widehat{a}_i l \dots a_p, m_1 \dots m_q} dx^{a_1 \dots a_p} \otimes dx^{m_1 \dots m_q}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

**Lemma:** These connections are flat on  $S^3$ . That is  $d_+^2 = d_-^2 = 0$ .

*Proof.* We have that

$$d_+^2 \alpha = dx^{ba} (\nabla_b + \epsilon_b)(\nabla_a + \epsilon_a) \alpha = dx^{ba} (\nabla_b \nabla_a + \nabla_b \epsilon_a + \epsilon_b \nabla_a + \epsilon_b \epsilon_a) \alpha \quad (\text{C.3})$$

It is easy to see that  $\nabla_b$  and  $\epsilon_a$  commute. Moreover, from swapping  $a$  and  $b$  it is clear that  $dx^{ba}(\nabla_b \epsilon_a + \nabla_a \epsilon_b) \alpha = 0$ . Therefore

$$d_+^2 \alpha = dx^{ba} \left( \frac{1}{2} [\nabla_b, \nabla_a] + \epsilon_b \epsilon_a \right) \alpha. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

We have also that

$$\begin{aligned} dx^{ba} \epsilon_b \epsilon_a \alpha &= -\epsilon_b \cdot \left( \frac{1}{p!q!} \sum_{i=1}^q \epsilon_a^k{}_{m_i} \alpha_{a_1 \dots a_p, m_1 \dots \widehat{m}_i k \dots m_q} dx^{baa_1 \dots a_p} \otimes dx^{m_1 \dots m_q} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{p!q!} \sum_{i=1}^q \epsilon_b^l{}_{m_i} \epsilon_a^k{}_{l} \alpha_{a_1 \dots a_p, m_1 \dots \widehat{m}_i k \dots m_q} dx^{baa_1 \dots a_p} \otimes dx^{m_1 \dots m_q} + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{p!q!} \sum_{i \neq j}^q \epsilon_b^l{}_{m_j} \epsilon_a^k{}_{m_i} \alpha_{a_1 \dots a_p, m_1 \dots \widehat{m}_i k \dots \widehat{m}_j l \dots m_q} dx^{baa_1 \dots a_p} \otimes dx^{m_1 \dots m_q}. \end{aligned}$$

After swapping  $a$  and  $b$  and interchanging the roles of  $i$  and  $j$ , it can be seen that the second term in the above expression vanishes. Therefore,

$$dx^{ba} \epsilon_b \epsilon_a \alpha = \frac{1}{p!q!} \sum_{i=1}^q \delta_b^k g_{m_i a} \alpha_{a_1 \dots a_p, m_1 \dots \widehat{m}_i k \dots m_q} dx^{baa_1 \dots a_p} \otimes dx^{m_1 \dots m_q}.$$

Recall that the Riemann tensor of the round metric for a sphere of the appropriate radius is

given by

$$R_{ijkl} = g_{ik}g_{jl} - g_{jk}g_{il} . \quad (\text{C.5})$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} dx^{ba}[\nabla_b, \nabla_a]\alpha = & - \left( \frac{1}{p!q!} \sum_{i=1}^p R_{ba \ a_i}^{\ l} \alpha_{a_1 \dots \widehat{a}_i l \dots a_p, m_1 \dots m_q} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{p!q!} \sum_{i=1}^q R_{ba \ m_i}^{\ l} \alpha_{a_1 \dots a_p, m_1 \dots \widehat{m}_i l \dots m_q} \right) dx^{baa_1 \dots a_p} \otimes dx^{m_1 \dots m_q} . \end{aligned}$$

From (C.5), we know that  $R_{ba \ a_i}^{\ l} = \delta_b^l g_{aa_i} - \delta_a^l g_{ba_i}$ . Hence, after contracting with  $dx^{baa_i}$  the first term in the equation above vanishes. Similarly, we get that  $R_{ba \ m_i}^{\ l} = \delta_b^l g_{am_i} - \delta_a^l g_{bm_i}$ , and after contracting with  $dx^{ba}$  this gives rise to  $2\delta_b^l g_{am_i} dx^{ba}$ . We therefore have:

$$\begin{aligned} dx^{ba}[\nabla_b, \nabla_a]\alpha &= -2 \sum_{i=1}^q \delta_b^l g_{am_i} \alpha_{a_1 \dots a_p, m_1 \dots \widehat{m}_i l \dots m_q} dx^{baa_1 \dots a_p} \otimes dx^{m_1 \dots m_q} \\ &= -2 dx^{ba} \epsilon_b \epsilon_a \alpha . \end{aligned}$$

This shows that  $d_+^2 = 0$ . An analogous computation shows that  $d_-^2 = 0$ .  $\square$

We can hence associate two nilpotent operators to the complex  $\hat{\Omega}^{(p,q)}$ . In order for it to be a double complex we must also have that  $d_+$  and  $d_-$  anti-commute.

**Lemma:**

$$\{d_+, d_-\} = 0$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} d_+ d_- \alpha &= (-1)^{|\alpha|} dx^b (\nabla_b + \epsilon_b) (\nabla_n - \epsilon_n) \alpha dx^n \\ &= (-1)^{|\alpha|} dx^b (\nabla_b \nabla_n - \nabla_b \epsilon_n + \epsilon_b \nabla_n - \epsilon_b \epsilon_n) \alpha dx^n . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

It is easy to see that  $dx^b \epsilon_b \nabla_n \alpha dx^n = dx^b (-\epsilon_b^{\ k} \nabla_k + \nabla_n \epsilon_b) \alpha dx^n$ . So,

$$d_+ d_- \alpha = (-1)^{|\alpha|} dx^b (\nabla_b \nabla_n - \nabla_b \epsilon_n - \epsilon_b^{\ k} \nabla_k + \nabla_n \epsilon_b - \epsilon_n \epsilon_b) \alpha dx^n . \quad (\text{C.7})$$

Similarly, we can see that

$$d_- d_+ \alpha = (-1)^{|\alpha|+1} dx^b (\nabla_n \nabla_b + \nabla_n \epsilon_b + \epsilon_n^{\ k} \nabla_k - \nabla_b \epsilon_n - \epsilon_b \epsilon_n) \alpha dx^n . \quad (\text{C.8})$$

A straight-forward calculation shows that  $\epsilon_n \cdot \epsilon_b - \epsilon_b \cdot \epsilon_n = \epsilon_n^c \epsilon_b \epsilon_c - \epsilon_b^m \epsilon_n \epsilon_m$ , and hence

$$\{d_+, d_-\} = (-1)^{|\alpha|} dx^b (2\nabla_{[b} \nabla_{n]} + \epsilon_n^c \epsilon_b \epsilon_c - \epsilon_b^m \epsilon_n \epsilon_m) \alpha dx^n. \quad (\text{C.9})$$

Now, the components of  $\epsilon_n^c \epsilon_b \epsilon_c \cdot \alpha$  are

$$-\sum_{i=1}^q \epsilon_n^c \epsilon_b \epsilon_c \epsilon_{m_i}^l \alpha_{a_1 \dots a_p, m_1 \dots \widehat{m}_i l \dots m_q} = -\sum_{i=1}^q (\delta_b^l g_{nm_i} - g_{bm_i} \delta_n^l) \alpha_{a_1 \dots a_p, m_1 \dots \widehat{m}_i l \dots m_q}, \quad (\text{C.10})$$

and hence

$$dx^b \epsilon_n^c \epsilon_b \epsilon_c \alpha dx^n = \sum_{i=1}^q g_{bm_i} \delta_n^l \alpha_{a_1 \dots a_p, m_1 \dots \widehat{m}_i l \dots m_q} dx^{ba_1 \dots a_p} \otimes dx^{m_1 \dots m_q n}, \quad (\text{C.11})$$

since  $g_{nm_i} dx^{m_i n} = 0$ . Similarly

$$dx^b \epsilon_b^m \epsilon_n \epsilon_m \alpha dx^n = \sum_{i=1}^p g_{na_i} \delta_b^l \alpha_{a_1 \dots \widehat{a}_i l \dots a_p, m_1 \dots m_q} dx^{ba_1 \dots a_p} \otimes dx^{m_1 \dots m_q n}. \quad (\text{C.12})$$

On the other hand

$$2dx^b \nabla_{[b} \nabla_{n]} \alpha dx^n = -\left( \sum_{i=1}^p R_{nb a_i}^l \alpha_{a_1 \dots \widehat{a}_i l \dots a_p, m_1 \dots m_q} + \sum_{i=1}^q R_{nb m_i}^l \alpha_{a_1 \dots a_p, m_1 \dots \widehat{m}_i l \dots m_q} \right) dx^{ba_1 \dots a_p} \otimes dx^{m_1 \dots m_q n}.$$

It is easy to check that this term precisely cancels the terms (C.11) and (C.12), so (C.9) vanishes, obtaining the desired result.  $\square$

## References

- [1] C. Vafa, *The String landscape and the swampland*, [hep-th/0509212](#).
- [2] M. van Beest, J. Calderón-Infante, D. Mirfendereski and I. Valenzuela, *Lectures on the Swampland Program in String Compactifications*, *Phys. Rept.* **989** (2022) 1–50, [[2102.01111](#)].
- [3] M. Graña and A. Herráez, *The Swampland Conjectures: A Bridge from Quantum Gravity to Particle Physics*, *Universe* **7** (2021) 273, [[2107.00087](#)].
- [4] N. B. Agmon, A. Bedroya, M. J. Kang and C. Vafa, *Lectures on the string landscape and the Swampland*, [2212.06187](#).
- [5] H. Ooguri and C. Vafa, *On the Geometry of the String Landscape and the Swampland*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **766** (2007) 21–33, [[hep-th/0605264](#)].
- [6] M. Etheredge, B. Heidenreich, S. Kaya, Y. Qiu and T. Rudelius, *Sharpening the Distance Conjecture in diverse dimensions*, *JHEP* **12** (2022) 114, [[2206.04063](#)].
- [7] S.-J. Lee, W. Lerche and T. Weigand, *Emergent strings from infinite distance limits*, *JHEP* **02** (2022) 190, [[1910.01135](#)].
- [8] C. R. Brodie, A. Constantin, A. Lukas and F. Ruehle, *Swampland conjectures and infinite flop chains*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 046008, [[2104.03325](#)].
- [9] C. R. Brodie, A. Constantin, A. Lukas and F. Ruehle, *Geodesics in the extended Kähler cone of Calabi-Yau threefolds*, *JHEP* **03** (2022) 024, [[2108.10323](#)].
- [10] S. Lanza, F. Marchesano, L. Martucci and I. Valenzuela, *The EFT stringy viewpoint on large distances*, *JHEP* **09** (2021) 197, [[2104.05726](#)].
- [11] A. Castellano, I. Ruiz and I. Valenzuela, *Stringy Evidence for a Universal Pattern at Infinite Distance*, [2311.01536](#).
- [12] C. Hull, *Compactifications of the Heterotic Superstring*, *Phys.Lett.* **B178** (1986) 357.
- [13] A. Strominger, *Superstrings with Torsion*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B274** (1986) 253.
- [14] I. V. Melnikov and M. Plesser, *A  $(0,2)$  Mirror Map*, *JHEP* **1102** (2011) 001, [[1003.1303](#)].
- [15] I. Melnikov, S. Sethi and E. Sharpe, *Recent Developments in  $(0,2)$  Mirror Symmetry*, *SIGMA* **8** (2012) 068, [[1209.1134](#)].

- [16] W. Gu, J. Guo and E. Sharpe, *A proposal for nonabelian  $(0, 2)$  mirrors*, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **25** (2021) 1549–1596, [[1908.06036](#)].
- [17] L. B. Anderson, J. Gray, A. Lukas and B. Ovrut, *Stabilizing the Complex Structure in Heterotic Calabi-Yau Vacua*, *JHEP* **02** (2011) 088, [[1010.0255](#)].
- [18] L. B. Anderson, J. Gray, A. Lukas and B. Ovrut, *The Atiyah Class and Complex Structure Stabilization in Heterotic Calabi-Yau Compactifications*, *JHEP* **10** (2011) 032, [[1107.5076](#)].
- [19] L. B. Anderson, J. Gray and E. Sharpe, *Algebroids, Heterotic Moduli Spaces and the Strominger System*, *JHEP* **07** (2014) 037, [[1402.1532](#)].
- [20] M. Garcia-Fernandez, R. Rubio and C. Tipler, *Infinitesimal moduli for the Strominger system and Killing spinors in generalized geometry*, *Math. Ann.* **369** (2017) 539–595, [[1503.07562](#)].
- [21] A. Ashmore, X. De La Ossa, R. Minasian, C. Strickland-Constable and E. E. Svanes, *Finite deformations from a heterotic superpotential: holomorphic Chern-Simons and an  $L_\infty$  algebra*, *JHEP* **10** (2018) 179, [[1806.08367](#)].
- [22] A. Ashmore, C. Strickland-Constable, D. Tennyson and D. Waldram, *Heterotic backgrounds via generalised geometry: moment maps and moduli*, *JHEP* **11** (2020) 071, [[1912.09981](#)].
- [23] J. McOrist and E. E. Svanes, *Heterotic Quantum Cohomology*, [2110.06549](#).
- [24] M. Bershadsky, S. Cecotti, H. Ooguri and C. Vafa, *Kodaira-Spencer theory of gravity and exact results for quantum string amplitudes*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **165** (1994) 311–428, [[hep-th/9309140](#)].
- [25] S. K. Donaldson and R. P. Thomas, *Gauge Theory in Higher Dimensions*, in *The Geometric Universe: Science, Geometry, and the Work of Roger Penrose*. Oxford University Press, 04, 1998. [DOI](#).
- [26] R. P. Thomas, *Gauge theory on Calabi-Yau manifolds*. PhD thesis, University of Oxford, 1997.
- [27] S.-J. Lee, W. Lerche and T. Weigand, *Emergent strings, duality and weak coupling limits for two-form fields*, *JHEP* **02** (2022) 096, [[1904.06344](#)].

- [28] G. Lopes Cardoso, G. Curio, G. Dall’Agata and D. Lust, *BPS action and superpotential for heterotic string compactifications with fluxes*, *JHEP* **10** (2003) 004, [[hep-th/0306088](#)].
- [29] K. Becker, M. Becker, K. Dasgupta and S. Prokushkin, *Properties of heterotic vacua from superpotentials*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **666** (2003) 144–174, [[hep-th/0304001](#)].
- [30] S. Gurrieri, A. Lukas and A. Micu, *Heterotic on half-flat*, *Phys.Rev.* **D70** (2004) 126009, [[hep-th/0408121](#)].
- [31] A. Ashmore, J. J. Murgas, D. D. McNutt, C. Strickland-Constable, E. E. Svanes, D. Tennyson et al., *A heterotic Kodaira-Spencer theory at one-loop*, *JHEP* **10** (2023) 130, [[2306.10106](#)].
- [32] M. Schweitzer, *Autour de la cohomologie de bott-chern*, *arXiv preprint arXiv:0709.3528* (2007) .
- [33] M. Garcia-Fernandez, R. Rubio, C. Shahbazi and C. Tipler, *Canonical metrics on holomorphic Courant algebroids*, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* **125** (2022) 700–758, [[1803.01873](#)].
- [34] M. Garcia-Fernandez, R. Rubio and C. Tipler, *Gauge theory for string algebroids*, [2004.11399](#).
- [35] J. Streets, C. Strickland-Constable and F. Valach, *Ricci flow on Courant algebroids*, [2402.11069](#).
- [36] A. A. d. Silva, M. Garcia-Fernandez, J. D. Lotay and H. N. S. Earp, *Coupled  $G_2$ -instantons*, [2404.12937](#).
- [37] M. Dine, R. Rohm, N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *Gluino Condensation in Superstring Models*, *Phys. Lett. B* **156** (1985) 55–60.
- [38] J.-P. Derendinger, L. E. Ibanez and H. P. Nilles, *On the low energy  $d= 4$ ,  $n= 1$  supergravity theory extracted from the  $d= 10$ ,  $n= 1$  superstring*, *Physics Letters B* **155** (1985) 65–70.
- [39] G. Lopes Cardoso, G. Curio, G. Dall’Agata and D. Lust, *Heterotic string theory on non-Kahler manifolds with  $H$  flux and gaugino condensate*, *Fortsch. Phys.* **52** (2004) 483–488, [[hep-th/0310021](#)].



- [40] P. Manousselis, N. Prezas and G. Zoupanos, *Supersymmetric compactifications of heterotic strings with fluxes and condensates*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **739** (2006) 85–105, [[hep-th/0511122](#)].
- [41] A. Chatzistavrakidis, O. Lechtenfeld and A. D. Popov, *Nearly Kähler heterotic compactifications with fermion condensates*, *JHEP* **04** (2012) 114, [[1202.1278](#)].
- [42] P. Candelas and X. de la Ossa, *Moduli Space of Calabi-Yau Manifolds*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B355** (1991) 455–481.
- [43] A. Strominger, *Special Geometry*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **133** (1990) 163–180.
- [44] P. Candelas, X. C. De La Ossa, P. S. Green and L. Parkes, *A pair of Calabi-Yau manifolds as an exactly soluble superconformal theory*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B359** (1991) 21–74.
- [45] J. Kollar, *Deformations of elliptic Calabi-Yau manifolds*, [1206.5721](#).
- [46] K. Oguiso, *On algebraic fiber space structures on a calabi-yau 3-fold*, *International Journal of Mathematics* **04** (1993) 439–465.
- [47] P. Wilson, *The existence of elliptic fibre space structures on calabi-yau threefolds.*, *Mathematische Annalen* **300** (1994) 693–704.
- [48] T. W. Grimm, F. Ruehle and D. van de Heisteeg, *Classifying Calabi–Yau Threefolds Using Infinite Distance Limits*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **382** (2021) 239–275, [[1910.02963](#)].
- [49] T. W. Grimm, C. Li and E. Palti, *Infinite Distance Networks in Field Space and Charge Orbits*, *JHEP* **03** (2019) 016, [[1811.02571](#)].
- [50] R. Bonezzi, F. Diaz-Jaramillo and O. Hohm, *Double Copy of 3D Chern-Simons Theory and 6D Kodaira-Spencer Gravity*, [2404.16830](#).
- [51] L.-S. Tseng and S.-T. Yau, *Cohomology and Hodge Theory on Symplectic Manifolds. I.*, *J. Diff. Geom.* **91** (2012) 383–416, [[0909.5418](#)].
- [52] L.-S. Tseng and S.-T. Yau, *Cohomology and Hodge Theory on Symplectic Manifolds. II.*, *J. Diff. Geom.* **91** (2012) 417–443, [[1011.1250](#)].
- [53] C.-J. Tsai, L.-S. Tseng and S.-T. Yau, *Cohomology and Hodge Theory on Symplectic Manifolds: III.*, *J. Diff. Geom.* **103** (2016) 83–143, [[1402.0427](#)].
- [54] L.-S. Tseng and S.-T. Yau, *Generalized Cohomologies and Supersymmetry*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **326** (2014) 875–885, [[1111.6968](#)].

- [55] S.-C. Lau, L.-S. Tseng and S.-T. Yau, *Non-Kähler SYZ Mirror Symmetry*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **340** (2015) 145–170, [[1409.2765](#)].
- [56] F. Marchesano, D. Regalado and G. Zoccarato, *On D-brane moduli stabilisation*, *JHEP* **11** (2014) 097, [[1410.0209](#)].
- [57] J. Gray and H. Parsian, *Moduli identification methods in Type II compactifications*, *JHEP* **07** (2018) 158, [[1803.08176](#)].
- [58] L. Bedulli and A. Vannini, *Syz mirror symmetry of solvmanifolds*, *arXiv e-prints* (2023) arXiv–2311.
- [59] V. Pestun and E. Witten, *The Hitchin functionals and the topological B-model at one loop*, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **74** (2005) 21–51, [[hep-th/0503083](#)].
- [60] A. Strominger, S.-T. Yau and E. Zaslow, *Mirror symmetry is T duality*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **479** (1996) 243–259, [[hep-th/9606040](#)].
- [61] B. S. Acharya and E. Witten, *Chiral fermions from manifolds of  $G(2)$  holonomy*, [hep-th/0109152](#).
- [62] T. Pantev and M. Wijnholt, *Hitchin’s Equations and M-Theory Phenomenology*, *J. Geom. Phys.* **61** (2011) 1223–1247, [[0905.1968](#)].
- [63] A. P. Braun, S. Cizel, M. Hübner and S. Schäfer-Nameki, *Higgs bundles for M-theory on  $G_2$ -manifolds*, *JHEP* **03** (2019) 199, [[1812.06072](#)].
- [64] R. Barbosa, M. Cvetič, J. J. Heckman, C. Lawrie, E. Torres and G. Zoccarato, *T-branes and  $G_2$  backgrounds*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 026015, [[1906.02212](#)].
- [65] R. Barbosa, *Harmonic Higgs Bundles and Coassociative ALE Fibrations*, [1910.10742](#).
- [66] M. Cvetič, J. J. Heckman, T. B. Rochais, E. Torres and G. Zoccarato, *Geometric unification of Higgs bundle vacua*, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) 106012, [[2003.13682](#)].
- [67] B. S. Acharya, A. Kinsella and E. E. Svanes,  *$T^3$ -invariant heterotic Hull-Strominger solutions*, *JHEP* **01** (2021) 197, [[2010.07438](#)].
- [68] M. Hubner, *Local  $G_2$ -manifolds, Higgs bundles and a colored quantum mechanics*, *JHEP* **05** (2021) 002, [[2009.07136](#)].
- [69] B. S. Acharya, A. Kinsella and D. R. Morrison, *Non-perturbative heterotic duals of M-theory on  $G_2$  orbifolds*, *JHEP* **11** (2021) 065, [[2106.03886](#)].

- [70] B. S. Acharya and D. A. Baldwin, *Coulomb and Higgs phases of  $G_2$ -manifolds*, *JHEP* **01** (2024) 147, [[2309.12869](#)].
- [71] B. S. Acharya and D. A. Baldwin, *Ricci Flat Metrics, Flat Connections and  $G_2$ -Manifolds*, [2312.12311](#).
- [72] R. Álvarez-García, D. Kläwer and T. Weigand, *Membrane limits in quantum gravity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) 066024, [[2112.09136](#)].
- [73] C. Beasley and E. Witten, *Residues and world sheet instantons*, *JHEP* **10** (2003) 065, [[hep-th/0304115](#)].
- [74] E. I. Buchbinder, A. Lukas, B. A. Ovrut and F. Ruehle, *Heterotic Instantons for Monad and Extension Bundles*, *JHEP* **02** (2020) 081, [[1912.07222](#)].
- [75] E. I. Buchbinder, A. Lukas, B. A. Ovrut and F. Ruehle, *Instantons and Hilbert Functions*, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) 026019, [[1912.08358](#)].
- [76] M. Dine, N. Seiberg, X. G. Wen and E. Witten, *Nonperturbative Effects on the String World Sheet*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **278** (1986) 769–789.
- [77] M. Dine, N. Seiberg, X. G. Wen and E. Witten, *Nonperturbative Effects on the String World Sheet. 2*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B289** (1987) 319.