

# Black Holes and Black Strings in M-theory on Calabi-Yau threefolds with four Kähler parameters

A. Belhaj<sup>1</sup>, H. Belmahi<sup>1\*</sup>, A. Bouhouch<sup>1</sup>, S. E. Ennadifi<sup>2</sup>, M. B. Sedra<sup>3 †</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Science, Mohammed V University in Rabat, 4 Avenue Ibn Battouta, Rabat, Morocco

<sup>2</sup> LHEP-MS, Mohammed V University in Rabat, Rabat, Morocco

<sup>3</sup> LPMS, University of Ibn Tofail, Kénitra, Morocco

January 20, 2025

## Abstract

Combining toric geometry techniques and  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supergravity formalisms, we study 5D black branes in the M-theory compactification on a four parameter Calabi-Yau threefold. First, we investigate 5D BPS and non-BPS black holes that are derived by wrapping M2-branes on non-holomorphic 2-cycles in such a toric Calabi-Yau manifold. Concretely, we provide the allowed electric charge regions of BPS and non-BPS black hole states that are obtained by surrounding M2-branes over appropriate 2-cycles. Then, we approach the black hole thermodynamic behavior by computing the entropy and the temperature. By evaluating the recombination factor, we examine the stability of such non-BPS black holes. Precisely, we find stable and unstable solutions depending on the allowed electric charge regions. After that, we study 5D black strings by wrapping M5-branes on non-holomorphic dual 4-cycles in the proposed toric Calabi-Yau manifold by focusing on the stability behaviors. In the allowed regions of the moduli space of the non-BPS stringy solutions, we find stable and unstable states depending on the magnetic charge values.

**Keywords:** 5D  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supergravity formalism, toric geometry, Calabi-Yau manifolds, M-theory, black holes, black strings, stability behaviors.

---

\*Corresponding authors: hajar-belmahi@um5.ac.ma, abderrahim.bouhouch@um5r.ac.ma

†Authors in alphabetical order.

# Contents

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction</b>   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>2</b> | <b>M-theory black branes on CY geometries</b>                           | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>3</b> | <b>M-theory black holes from a THCY with <math>h^{1,1} = 4</math></b>   | <b>5</b>  |
| 3.1      | BPS and non-BPS black hole solutions . . . . .                          | 8         |
| 3.2      | Recombination factor and stability of non-BPS black holes . . . . .     | 17        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>M-theory black strings from a THCY with <math>h^{1,1} = 4</math></b> | <b>19</b> |
| 4.1      | 5D black string solutions . . . . .                                     | 19        |
| 4.2      | Stability scenarios of 5D black strings . . . . .                       | 25        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Conclusion and discussions</b>                                       | <b>27</b> |

# 1 Introduction

Recently, a special interest has been developed to the study of charged black holes and black strings in 5 dimensions (5D). These black objects have been built from supersymmetric M-theory on Calabi-Yau (CY) threefolds using the compactification mechanism [1–6]. In this approach, the BPS and the non-BPS black states have been derived by help of the 5D  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supergravity formalism elaborated in the investigation of lower dimensional supersymmetric models [7–10]. A close examination shows that such charged black holes and black strings arise by wrapping M2 and M5 branes on non-holomorphic 2-cycles and dual 4-cycles of the CY threefolds via intersecting number computations, respectively. These cycle behaviors are controlled by a real number  $h^{1,1}$  being the Kähler moduli space dimension. The latter is needed not only to specify the corresponding 5D spectrum fields that are derived from the M-theory compactification but also to determine the effective potential of the BPS and the non-BPS solutions in 5D. Two and three dimensional Kähler moduli spaces have been investigated [1–6]. For two dimensions, for instance, concrete models have been studied by proposing two parameter complete intersection Calabi-Yau (CICY) models in the ordinary projective spaces where the stability behaviors of such black brane objects have been discussed. These studies have been conducted by calculating a scalar quantity called the recombination factor  $R$ . Stable and unstable black object solutions have been obtained corresponding to  $R < 1$  and  $R > 1$ , respectively [1]. Later, CICY models in the weighted projective spaces have been proposed by insisting on the weight value effect on the stability and the thermal behaviors of certain 5D black M-branes including black holes and black strings [4, 5].

More recently, these works have been extended to three parameter CY threefolds in M-theory scenarios. Two different CY descriptions have been elaborated. Concretely, a toric description of M-theory scenarios has been proposed by elaborating a generic discussion. Precise computations for CY threefolds regarded as hypersurfaces in toric varieties (THCY) have been provided for  $h^{1,1} = 3$ . In this way, 5D BPS and non-BPS black brane configurations involving stable and unstable behaviors have been obtained using numerical computations [3]. Alternatively, a three parameter model of CICY dealing with such black brane stability behaviors based on the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  5D formalism has been investigated [6]. Precisely, a M-theory CY threefold in the  $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$  projective space product has been studied by calculating the corresponding effective potential. In this regard, 5D BPS and non-BPS black brane solutions have been derived and examined. Stable and unstable black branes depending on the charge regions of the Kähler moduli space have been determined using analytical and numerical computations.

In this work, we study 5D black branes in the M-theory compactification on a four parameter THCY by combining toric geometry techniques and  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supergravity formalisms. First, we investigate 5D BPS and non-BPS black holes that are obtained by wrapping M2-branes on non-holomorphic 2-cycles in such a toric CY manifold. Concretely, we determine the allowed electric charge regions of the black hole moduli space and approach certain ther-

modynamic behaviors by computing the corresponding quantities including the temperature and the entropy. Then, we inspect the stability behaviors of such 5D black holes via the calculation of the recombination factor  $R$ . After that, we approach 5D black strings being derived by wrapping M5-branes on non-holomorphic 4-cycles in the proposed CY toric geometry. Calculating the recombination factor  $R$  for 5D black strings, we find various stable and unstable solutions depending on the magnetic charge regions of the involved moduli space.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In section 2, we provide a concise discussion on 5D M-theory black branes using  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supergravity formalisms. In section 3, we investigate 5D BPS and non-BPS black holes by wrapping M2-branes on 2-cycles inside a CY threefold with four Kähler parameters using toric geometry techniques. In section 4, we move to study the 5D BPS and the non-BPS black strings by wrapping M5-branes on 4-cycles in such a toric CY threefold. The last section is devoted to certain final remarks and open issues.

## 2 M-theory black branes on CY geometries

To start, we would like to provide a concise discussion on 5D black branes from the M-theory compactification using  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supergravity techniques elaborated in the study of stringy spectrums in lower dimensional space-times. Precisely, these solutions can be derived from the compactification scenario on CY threefolds needed to engineer models involving minimal supercharges in 5D [11–19]. Alternatively, these non-trivial geometries have been also exploited in the compactification of type II superstrings producing 4D  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supersymmetric classes based on mirror symmetry tools [20–22]. It is worth recalling that, at low energies, M-theory represents an eleven-dimensional supergravity model [23]. This can generate certain non-perturbative limits of superstring theories via the compactification mechanism on specific specific geometries with non-trivial holonomy groups. In the M-theory context, the black brane objects can be built by considering M2 and M5 solitonic solutions living in 11D. With help of the compactification mechanism, these black objects can be approached using the 5D  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supergravity formalisms. The associated physics depends on the CY moduli spaces coordinated by the Kähler and the complex deformation parameters associated with the Hodge numbers  $h^{1,1}$  and  $h^{2,1}$ , respectively [24–32]. Forgetting about hypermultiplet spectrums linked to the Hodge number  $h^{2,1}$ , the black object physics in such M-theory compactifications can be studied using the following 5D Maxwell-Einstein action

$$S = \frac{1}{2\kappa_5^2} \int d^5x \left( R \star \mathbb{1} - G_{IJ} dt^I \wedge \star dt^J - G_{IJ} F^I \wedge \star F^J - \frac{1}{6} C_{IJK} F^I \wedge F^J \wedge A^K \right) \quad (2.1)$$

describing the dynamics of  $h^{1,1}$  vector multiples indexed by  $I$  involving the scalar Kähler moduli  $t_I$  and gauge fields  $F^I = dt^I$ . The symmetric tensor  $G_{IJ}$  indicates the moduli space metric being a relevant piece to compute the effective scalar potential needed to examine the associated stability behaviors. The tensor elements  $C_{IJK}$  provide the intersecting numbers which could be fixed once the CY manifolds are built. 5D black holes, for instances, carry  $q^I$  electric charges under the  $U(1)^{\otimes h^{1,1}}$  abelian gauge symmetries. These electric charges have

been exploited to calculate the corresponding effective potential via the moduli space metric  $G_{IJ}$ . It has been suggested that this effective potential can take the following form

$$V_{eff}^e = G^{IJ} q_I q_J, \quad I, J = 1, \dots, h^{1,1}. \quad (2.2)$$

This scalar potential is invariant under a  $Z_2$  symmetry acting as follows

$$Z_2 : q_I \rightarrow -q_I \quad (2.3)$$

which could be exploited in certain discussions corresponding to the allowed electric charge regions. For dual black strings with magnetic charges  $p^I$ , however, the effective scalar potential can be expressed as

$$V_{eff}^m = 4G_{IJ} p^I p^J. \quad (2.4)$$

In this context,  $G_{IJ}$  can be written in terms of the volume  $\mathcal{V}$  of the involved CY threefolds via the relation

$$G_{IJ} = -\frac{1}{2} \partial_I \partial_J \log(\mathcal{V}), \quad (2.5)$$

where one has used

$$\mathcal{V} = \frac{1}{3!} C_{IJK} t^I t^J t^K. \quad (2.6)$$

In M-theory scenarios, certain models of two and three parameter CY threefolds have been studied using at least two classes of CY spaces relying on THCY and CICY descriptions [1–6]. Using analytical and numerical computations for the recombination factor  $R$ , stable and non-stable solutions for certain 5D black holes and black strings have been examined. They are associated with  $R < 1$  and  $R > 1$  conditions, respectively [3].

In what follows, we would like to extend such works to four parameter CY threefolds using a toric description in the M-theory compactification mechanism by help of M2 and M5-branes.

### 3 M-theory black holes from a THCY with $h^{1,1} = 4$

In this section, we would like to deal with 5D black hole behaviors from a four parameter CY threefold in the M-theory compactification scenarios. This manifold can be constructed using toric geometry techniques [33–39]. These mathematical tools have been largely used in the geometric engineering method being exploited to provide lower dimensional gauge models from different roads including type II superstrings, M-theory on G2 manifolds, and F-theory with elliptic compactifications [40–42]. Roughly speaking, a toric manifold is associated with a polytope encoding the geometric data of the associated CY manifolds defined as hypersurfaces. In this way, this manifold can be described in terms of quotient spaces generating the ordinary and the weighted projective spaces. To construct such quotient spaces, one needs, usually, a  $n+r$  dimensional complex space  $\mathbb{C}^{n+r}$  coordinated by  $z_1, \dots, z_{n+r}$  with  $r$   $\mathbb{C}^*$  scale symmetries acting as follows

$$\mathbb{C}^{*a} : z_i \rightarrow \lambda^{q_i^a} z_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n+r, \quad a = 1, 2, \dots, r, \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\lambda$  is a non-zero complex number and  $q_i^a$  are integers where each  $a$  generates the so-called Mori vector in toric geometry language [43, 44]. In fact, they generalize the weight vector of the complex  $n$ -dimensional weighted projective space  $\mathbf{WCP}^n(w_1, \dots, w_{n+1})$  associated with one Mori vector  $w_i = q_i$ . Roughly speaking, a general toric variety  $\mathbf{V}^n$  can be defined by the following symplectic quotient space

$$\mathbf{V}^n = \frac{\mathbb{C}^{n+r} \setminus U}{\mathbb{C}^{*r}}, \quad (3.2)$$

where  $U$  is considered as a subset of  $\mathbb{C}^k$  required by triangulation configurations. A close examination shows that one can regard  $\mathbf{V}^n$  as a  $T^n$  fibration. This can be understood by dividing  $T^{n+r}$  by the  $U(1)^r$  gauge symmetry

$$z_i \rightarrow e^{iq_i^a \theta^a} z_i, \quad a = 1, \dots, r, \quad (3.3)$$

where  $\theta^a$  are the generators of the  $U(1)$  phase symmetries. In this way,  $\mathbf{V}^n$  can be represented by a toric graph  $\Delta(\mathbf{V}^n)$  spanned by  $k = n + r$  vertices  $v_i$  in the  $\mathbf{Z}^n$  lattice satisfying the following toric relations

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n+r} q_i^a v_i = 0, \quad a = 1, \dots, r. \quad (3.4)$$

It turns out that such a toric manifold exhibits a beautiful physical realization via  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  linear sigma models in two dimensions involving the  $U(1)^r$  gauge fields coupled to  $n + r$  chiral fields  $\phi_i$  with a matrix gauge charge  $q_i^a$  [45]. Up to the  $U(1)^r$  gauge transformations,  $\mathbf{V}^n$  can be considered as a solution of the D-term flatness condition

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n+r} q_i^a |\phi_i|^2 = \rho^a, \quad (3.5)$$

where the quantities  $\rho^a$  represent the Fayet-Iliopoulos (FI) coupling parameters [45, 46]. In toric variety  $\mathbf{V}^n$ , a hypersurface with a vanishing first Chern class provides a  $(n - 1)$  dimensional CY manifold. Using toric techniques, CY threefolds have been classified by Kreuzer and Skarke [34]. The present investigation concerns a CY threefold encoded in Krenzer-Skarke database involving all geometrical data of all different CY manifolds in terms of the ambient toric polytope information [34-39]. Supported by such activities, we consider a four parameter CY threefold with the following toric data

| Poly tope | Weight matrix  | Kähler cone matrix   | Mori cone matrix   | $(h^{1,1}, h^{1,2}, \chi)$ |
|-----------|--|--|--|----------------------------|
| 1310      | $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 3 & 4 & 6 & 2 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ | $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix}$ | $\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix}$ | (4,106,-204)               |

A close inspection, in the study of the black holes and the black strings in the M-theory compactification on CY threefolds, reveals that the relevant data are the intersection numbers. These geometric quantities are needed to calculate the effective potential of the black brane objects including the black holes and the black strings [1]. For the present toric CY threefold, we should compute the tensor elements  $C_{IJK}$  with  $I, J, K = 1, \dots, 4$  taking the following matrix form

$$C_{1JK} = \begin{pmatrix} C_{111} & C_{112} & C_{113} & C_{114} \\ C_{121} & C_{122} & C_{23} & C_{124} \\ C_{131} & C_{132} & C_{133} & C_{134} \\ C_{141} & C_{142} & C_{143} & C_{144} \end{pmatrix}, \quad C_{2JK} = \begin{pmatrix} C_{211} & C_{212} & C_{213} & C_{214} \\ C_{221} & C_{222} & C_{223} & C_{224} \\ C_{231} & C_{232} & C_{233} & C_{234} \\ C_{241} & C_{242} & C_{243} & C_{244} \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.6)$$

$$C_{3JK} = \begin{pmatrix} C_{311} & C_{312} & C_{313} & C_{314} \\ C_{321} & C_{322} & C_{323} & C_{324} \\ C_{331} & C_{332} & C_{333} & C_{334} \\ C_{341} & C_{342} & C_{343} & C_{344} \end{pmatrix}, \quad C_{4JK} = \begin{pmatrix} C_{411} & C_{412} & C_{413} & C_{414} \\ C_{421} & C_{422} & C_{423} & C_{424} \\ C_{431} & C_{432} & C_{433} & C_{434} \\ C_{441} & C_{442} & C_{443} & C_{444} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.7)$$

Using the equation given in (2.6), appropriate calculations provide the following volume expression of the proposed toric CY threefold

$$\mathcal{V} = \frac{1}{3} (3t_1 t_3 (t_3 + 2t_4) + t_2^3 - 3t_2^2 t_3 + 3t_2 t_3^2 + t_3^3 - 6t_3 t_4^2). \quad (3.8)$$

Exploiting now the relation (2.2), we can establish the effective potential of 5D black holes in such M-theory scenarios. Precisely, it takes the form

$$V_{eff}^{BH}(q_I, t_I) = \frac{G(q_I, t_I)}{T(t_I)} \quad (3.9)$$

where  $T$  is a geometric function which reads as

$$T(t_I) = 3 (t_1 (t_3 + 2t_4) - t_2^2 + t_2 t_3 - 2t_4^2). \quad (3.10)$$

The scalar quantity  $G(q_I, t_I)$  is found to be

$$G(q_I, t_I) = g^{IJ}(t_I) q_I q_J \quad (3.11)$$

where one has used the following matrix elements

$$\begin{aligned}
g^{11} &= 6(t_3 + 2t_4)t_1^3 + (-6t_2^2 + 6t_3t_2 + 7t_3^2 - 36t_4^2)t_1^2 + 2(7t_3^3 + 10t_4t_3^2 - 12t_2t_4t_3 + 12t_4(t_2^2 + 2t_4^2))t_1 \\
&\quad - 2(3t_2^4 - 6t_3t_2^3 + 8t_3^2t_2^2 + 12t_4^2t_2^2 - 5t_3^3t_2 - 12t_3t_4^2t_2 - 2t_3^4 + 12t_4^4 + 10t_3^2t_4^2) \\
g^{12} &= -3(2t_2 - t_3)(t_3 + 2t_4)t_1^2 + (6t_2^3 - 9t_3t_2^2 - 4(t_3^2 + 3t_4t_3 - 3t_4^2)t_2 + t_3(7t_3^2 + 12t_4t_3 - 6t_4^2))t_1 \\
&\quad + 2(t_2 - t_3)t_3(3t_2^2 - 3t_3t_2 - t_3^2 + 6t_4^2) \\
g^{13} &= t_3^2(-6t_2^2 + 6t_3t_2 + 2t_3^2 - 12t_4^2 + 7t_1t_3 + 12t_1t_4) \\
g^{14} &= -3t_2^4 + 6t_3t_2^3 + (3t_1(t_3 + 2t_4) - 2(4t_3^2 + 3t_4t_3 + 6t_4^2))t_2^2 + t_3(5t_3^2 + 6t_4t_3 + 12t_4^2) \\
&\quad - 3t_1(t_3 + 2t_4)t_2 + t_1(6t_3^3 + 17t_4t_3^2 + 18t_4^2t_3 + 12t_4^3) + 2(t_3^4 + t_4t_3^3 - 5t_4^2t_3^2 - 6t_4^3t_3 - 6t_4^4) \\
g^{22} &= -3t_2^4 + 6t_3t_2^3 - 6t_3^2t_2^2 + 2t_3^3t_2 + t_3^4 + 12t_4^4 - 8t_3^2t_4^2 + 3t_1^2(t_3 + 2t_4)^2 + 4t_1(t_3^3 + 2t_4t_3^2 - 3t_4^2t_3 - 6t_4^3) \\
g^{23} &= t_3^2(-3t_2^2 + 2t_3t_2 + t_3^2 - 6t_4^2 + 3t_1(t_3 + 2t_4)) \\
g^{24} &= 3(t_3 + 2t_4)t_2^3 - 3t_3(2t_3 + 3t_4)t_2^2 + (2(t_3^3 + t_4t_3^2 + 3t_4^2t_3 + 6t_4^3) - 3t_1(t_3 + 2t_4)^2)t_2 \\
&\quad + t_3(t_3 + t_4)(t_3^2 - 6t_4^2 + 3t_1(t_3 + 2t_4)) \\
g^{33} &= t_3^2(-6t_2^2 + 6t_3t_2 + t_3^2 - 12t_4^2 + 6t_1(t_3 + 2t_4)) \\
g^{34} &= t_3^2(-3t_2^2 + 3t_3t_2 + t_3^2 - 6t_4^2 + t_3t_4 + 3t_1(t_3 + 2t_4)) \\
g^{44} &= t_3^4 + 2t_4t_3^3 - 5t_4^2t_3^2 - 12t_4^3t_3 + 3t_2(t_3^2 + 2t_4t_3 + 2t_4^2)t_3 - 12t_4^4 - 3t_2^2(t_3^2 + 2t_4t_3 + 2t_4^2) \\
&\quad + 3t_1(t_3^3 + 4t_4t_3^2 + 6t_4^2t_3 + 4t_4^3).
\end{aligned}$$

Having computed the black hole effective scalar potential, we move now to examine the BPS and non-BPS black hole solutions in the proposed M-theory compactification followed by a stability analysis.

### 3.1 BPS and non-BPS black hole solutions

Here, we investigate the BPS and the non-BPS black hole behaviors with four charges  $q_I$  associated with  $U(1) \times U(1) \times U(1) \times U(1)$  gauge fields derived by wrapping M2-branes on 2-cycles in the above four parameter CY toric geometry. To do so, we first elaborate the BPS black hole solutions. To get such solutions, we need to solve the constraints

$$q_I - 2\tau_I Z_e = 0, \quad I = 1, 2, 3, 4 \quad (3.12)$$

where one has used

$$\tau_I = \frac{1}{2}C_{IJK}t^J t^K, \quad Z_e = q_1 t_1 + q_2 t_2 + q_3 t_3 + q_4 t_4. \quad (3.13)$$

To handle such equations, the local coordinates of the black hole moduli spaces should be used. More precisely, we consider the following inhomogeneous variables

$$x = \frac{t_1}{t_4}, \quad y = \frac{t_2}{t_4}, \quad z = \frac{t_3}{t_4}, \quad \alpha = \frac{q_1}{q_4}, \quad \beta = \frac{q_2}{q_4}, \quad \gamma = \frac{q_3}{q_4} \quad (3.14)$$

where  $q_I$  and  $t_I$  represent the homogeneous charges and the geometric variables of the 5D black hole moduli space, respectively. In terms of the local coordinates, the above constraints



provide the following three equations

$$\begin{aligned}
-\frac{q_4(-2\alpha(x-2)+z+2)}{2(x-2)} &= 0 \\
\frac{q_4(2\beta(x-2)+2y-z)}{2(x-2)} &= 0 \\
\frac{q_4(2x((\gamma-1)z-1)+y^2-2yz-z^2-4\gamma z+2)}{2(x-2)z} &= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Solving this system of equations, we can get the local charge variables in terms of the local coordinates of the Kähler moduli in the following form

$$\alpha = \frac{z+2}{2(x-2)}, \quad \beta = \frac{z-2y}{2(x-2)}, \quad \gamma = \frac{2x(z+1)-y^2+2yz+z^2-2}{2(x-2)z}. \tag{3.16}$$

Indeed, it is possible to express to the local geometric coordinates as functions of the local charge variables. Two triplet solutions are obtained  $(x_+, y_+, z_+)$ , and  $(x_-, y_-, z_-)$  which are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
x_{\mp} &= \frac{14\alpha^3 \mp \xi(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) + \alpha^2(-4\beta - 8\gamma + 11) - \alpha(2\beta^2 + \beta + 2\gamma - 1)}{\alpha(7\alpha^2 - 2\alpha(\beta + 2\gamma - 2) - \beta^2)} \\
y_{\mp} &= \frac{-4\alpha^3 \mp \alpha(\xi(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) - 2\beta^2 - 2\beta\gamma + \beta) \pm \beta\xi(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) + \alpha^2(-2\beta + 2\gamma - 3)}{\alpha(7\alpha^2 - 2\alpha(\beta + 2\gamma - 2) - \beta^2)} \\
z_{\mp} &= \frac{\mp 2\xi(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) - 8\alpha^2 + 2\alpha(\beta + 2\gamma - 3) + 2\beta^2}{7\alpha^2 - 2\alpha(\beta + 2\gamma - 2) - \beta^2}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

where one has used

$$\xi(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = \sqrt{\alpha^2(2\alpha^2 + \alpha(-4\beta - 8\gamma + 2) + 2\beta^2 + \beta(4\gamma - 2) + (1 - 2\gamma)^2)}. \tag{3.18}$$

To determine the possible regions of the allowed electric charges, strong constraints should be imposed on the geometric local variables of the black hole moduli space to ensure that they lie within the Kähler cone. A close examination shows that each triplet solution should be analyzed separately. Notably, the first triplet  $(x_-, y_-, z_-)$  reveals larger regions of the allowed electric charges. Similar behaviors can be elaborated for the second triplet  $(x_+, y_+, z_+)$ . As illustrated in Fig.(1), the allowed electric charge regions for BPS black holes in the  $(\alpha, \beta)$  plane are shown for the  $(x_-, y_-, z_-)$  triplet by taking certain values of the local electric charge  $\gamma$ .

In this figure, the white regions indicate the absence of large black hole solutions. It has been observed that for each fixed value of  $\gamma$ , the configurations provide only half-cone black hole solutions. Interestingly, the negative and the positive values of  $\gamma$  can be combined to recover the symmetric cone of the BPS black holes appearing in two parameter CY models [1, 4, 5]. Moreover, in the special case of  $\gamma = 0$ , the cone symmetry is fully restored.

According to [4–6], we approach certain thermodynamic behaviors of such black hole solutions. In particular, we can calculate the entropy of the BPS black holes via the relation

$$S_{BPS} = \frac{2\pi}{3\sqrt{3}} |Z_e|^{3/2}. \tag{3.19}$$




Figure 1: *Electric charge regions for BPS black hole states associated with the second triplet  $(x_-, y_-, z_-)$ .*

Indeed, this entropy is found to be

$$S_{BPS} = \frac{2\pi}{3\sqrt{3}} |t_4 q_4|^{3/2} |x\alpha + y\beta + z\gamma + 1|^{3/2}. \quad (3.20)$$

Using the CY threefold volume,  $t_4$  can be expressed in terms of the local variables of the black hole moduli space as follows

$$t_4 = \frac{1}{2^{2/3} \sqrt[3]{(x-2)z(\alpha x + \beta y + \gamma z + 1)}}. \quad (3.21)$$

Computations show that the BPS black hole entropy can take the form

$$S_{BPS} = \frac{1}{9} \sqrt{2\pi} \left| \frac{q_4(\alpha x + \beta y + \gamma z + 1)}{\sqrt[3]{(x-2)z(\alpha x + \beta y + \gamma z + 1)}} \right|^{3/2}. \quad (3.22)$$

Examining the cubic root charge behaviors of this expression provides a pathway to explore other thermodynamic quantities. Notably, numerous extended forms of the entropy have been introduced in various black hole studies [47, 48]. Inspired by such generalized entropies, we can investigate the thermodynamic behaviors of these 5D black hole solutions, with particular attention to the temperature as a key parameter. Specifically, we could identify the obtained entropy  $S_{BPS}$  with the Brown one, denoted as  $S_B$

$$S_B = \left( \frac{A}{A_{p1}} \right)^{3/2}, \quad (3.23)$$

where one has used  $A_{p_1} = 4G$  being the Planck area and  $A = 4\pi r_h^2$ . In this way,  $\Delta$  indicates a deformed quantum gravity dimensionless parameter. Considering a maximal quantum deformation required by  $\Delta = 1$ , we find the event horizon radius

$$r_h = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{9} \sqrt{2\pi} \right)^{1/3} \left| \frac{q_4(\alpha x + \beta y + \gamma z + 1)}{\sqrt[3]{(x-2)z(\alpha x + \beta y + \gamma z + 1)}} \right|^{1/2}. \quad (3.24)$$

Exploiting the thermodynamic techniques, we obtain the Hawking temperature

$$T_H = \left( \frac{9}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right)^{1/3} \left| \frac{\sqrt[3]{(x-2)z(\alpha x + \beta y + \gamma z + 1)}}{q_4(\alpha x + \beta y + \gamma z + 1)} \right|^{1/2}. \quad (3.25)$$

For generic regions of the moduli space, such a temperature exhibits inverse square root charge behaviors matching with the results obtained in the literature.

To obtain 5D non-BPS black hole solutions, we can exploit the Lagrange multipliers used in the elaboration of the equations of motion in dynamical systems. Concretely, this could be approached via the relation

$$g_\nu = 3t_1 t_3 (t_3 + 2t_4) + t_2^3 - 3t_2^2 t_3 + 3t_2 t_3^2 + t_3^3 - 6t_3 t_4^2. \quad (3.26)$$

Solving the equations

$$\frac{D_I V_{eff}^e}{D_J V_{eff}^e} = \frac{D_I g_\nu}{D_J g_\nu}, \quad I, J = 1, 2, 3, 4 \quad (3.27)$$

one can find the possible solutions, where one has used  $D_I = \partial_I - \frac{2}{3\nu} \tau_I$ . Instead of giving large equations, we give, however, only the possible accessible solutions. Indeed, computations for building such models reveal that we have five solutions which are listed as follows:

Solution 1

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \frac{z+2}{2(x-2)} \\ \beta &= \frac{z-2y}{2(x-2)} \\ \gamma &= \frac{2x(z+1) - y^2 + 2yz + z^2 - 2}{2(x-2)z}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

Solution 2

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= -\frac{3(z+2)^2}{2(3x(z+2) - 6y^2 + 6yz + 2z(z+3))} \\ \beta &= \frac{3(z+2)(2y-z)}{2(3x(z+2) - 6y^2 + 6yz + 2z(z+3))} \\ \gamma &= \frac{6x(z^2 + 3z + 2) - 3y^2(3z+2) + 6yz^2 + z^3 - 2z^2 - 18z - 12}{2z(3x(z+2) - 6y^2 + 6yz + 2z(z+3))}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

Solution 3

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha &= -\frac{(z+2)^2(12x(z+2) - 12y^2 + 12yz + 5z^2 - 24)}{\Lambda(x, y, z)} \\
\beta &= -\frac{(z+2)(z-2y)(12x(z+2) - 12y^2 + 12yz + 5z^2 - 24)}{\Lambda(x, y, z)} \\
\gamma &= -\frac{\varsigma(x, y, z)}{\Lambda(x, y, z)}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

where one has used

$$\begin{aligned}
\varsigma(x, y, z) &= 24x^2(z+2)^2 + 2x(z+2)(6y^2(z-4) + 36yz + z^3 + 11z^2 + 12z - 48) - 12y^4(z-2) \\
&\quad + 12y^3(z-6)z + y^2(3z^3 + 26z^2 - 48z + 96) + 2y(z^3 + 16z^2 + 12z - 72)z + z^5 + 6z^4 \\
&\quad + 6z^3 - 44z^2 - 48z + 96
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda(x, y, z) &= 24x^2(z+2)^2 + 6x(z+2)(-12y^2 + 12yz + 3z^2 + 8z - 8) + 4(12y^4 - 24y^3z \\
&\quad + y^2(5z^2 - 12z + 24) + yz(7z^2 + 12z - 24) + z(z^3 + 5z^2 - 4z - 24)).
\end{aligned}$$

Solution 4

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha &= \frac{z+2}{2(x-2)} \\
\beta &= \frac{z-2y}{2(x-2)} \\
\gamma &= \frac{\Gamma(x, y, z)}{2(x-2)\Delta(x, y, z)}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

where the function  $\Delta(x, y, z)$  is expressed as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma(x, y, z) &= -24x^3(z+2)^2 + 2x^2(z+2)(6y^2(z+6) - 24yz + 7z^3 + 9z^2 + 12z + 72) \\
&\quad - x(24y^4(z+3) - 24y^3(z+4)z + y^2(23z^3 + 60z^2 + 96z + 288) - 2y(14z^3 + 23z^2 \\
&\quad + 24z + 96)z - 7z^5 - 12z^4 + 46z^3 + 72z^2 + 96z + 288) + 12y^6 - 24y^5z + 3y^4(7z^2 + 24) \\
&\quad - y^3z(23z^2 + 96) + 4y^2(2z^4 + 15z^2 + 36) + yz(7z^4 - 46z^2 - 96) + z^6 - 12z^4 + 36z^2 + 96
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(x, y, z) &= z(12x^2(z+2)^2 + x(z+2)(-24y^2 + 24yz + 5z^2 - 48) + 12y^4 - 24y^3z \\
&\quad + y^2(7z^2 + 48) + yz(5z^2 - 48) + z^4 - 10z^2 + 48).
\end{aligned}$$

Solution 5

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha &= \frac{z+2}{2(x-2)} \\
\beta &= \frac{\phi_{\mp}(x, y, z)}{2(x-2)^2\chi(x, y, z)} \\
\gamma &= \frac{\pm\varphi(x, y, z)}{2(x-2)^2\chi(x, y, z)}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

where one has used

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{\mp}(x, y, z) &= 288x(x^2 - 3x + 2)z^2 + 12(6x^3 - x^2 - 33x + 22)z^3 + 72(x - 2)y^3(z + 2)(2x + z - 2) \\ &\quad - 108(x - 2)y^2(z + 2)z(2x + z - 2) + 15(x - 2)z^5 + 66(x - 2)xz^4 + 288(x - 2)(x - 1)^2z \\ &\quad \mp 2\sqrt{2}\delta(x, y, z) - 6(x - 2)y(z + 2)(24x^2(z + 2) + 2x(5z^2 - 48) - z^3 + 2z^2 - 24z + 48)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\chi(x, y, z) &= 12y^2(6x(z + 2) - 5z^2 - 12) - 12yz(6x(z + 2) + z^2 - 12) + z^2(18x(z + 2) + 7z^2 - 36) \\ &\quad - 72y^4 + 144y^3z\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(x, y, z) &= -72(x - 2)y^4z^3(x + z) + 12y^3(-12(x^2 - 3x + 2)z^3 \pm \sqrt{2}\delta(x, y, z) + 9(x - 2)z^5 + 6(x - 2)xz^4) \\ &\quad + 2y(-288z^3 + 720xz^3 - 576x^2z^3 + 144x^3z^3 + 144xz^4 - 216x^2z^4 + 72x^3z^4 - 96z^5) \\ &\quad + 144xz^5 - 48x^2z^5 + 60xz^6 - 30x^2z^6 - 9xz^7 + 18z^7 \\ &\quad \pm \sqrt{2}\delta(x, y, z)(12 - 12x - 6xz + 2z^2) \\ &\quad + z(336z^3 - 840xz^3 + 672x^2z^3 - 168x^3z^3 - 264xz^4 + 396x^2z^4 - 132x^3z^4 - 76z^5 + 114xz^5) \\ &\quad + 10x^2z^5 - 24x^3z^5 + 24xz^6 - 12x^2z^6 + 2z^7 - xz^7 \\ &\quad \pm \sqrt{2}\delta(x, y, z)(-12 + 12x + 6xz + 2z^2) \\ &\quad - 3y^2(-24x^3z^3(z + 2) - 2x^2z^3(21z^2 + 38z - 72) + xz^3(z^3 + 84z^2 + 372z - 96) + \\ &\quad + 2(-z^6 - 124z^4 + 3\sqrt{2}z\delta(x, y, z)))\end{aligned}$$

with  $\delta = \sqrt{(x - 2)^2z^4(z + 2)(2x + z - 2)(3x(z + 2) - 3y^2 + 3yz + z^2 - 6)^2}$ . It has been observed that the first solution (3.28) has been already considered in the elaboration the BPS charge solutions given in (3.16). However, the remaining ones do not verify the BPS equations giving the non-BPS solutions which will be dealt with in the forthcoming discussions. Considering such non-BPS solutions, we can express the local geometric variables in terms of the local charge quantities. For each solution, computations provide two triplets. Due to higher orders of the local geometric coordinates for certain solutions, we approach the allowed charge regions using two different methods. First, we consider lower orders appearing in the second and the third solutions. Then, we reconsider the remaining ones via attractor techniques. Indeed, for the second non-BPS black hole solution (3.29), we find

$$\begin{cases} x_{\mp}^2 = \frac{14\alpha^4 + \alpha^3(4\beta + 8\gamma - 3) + \alpha^2(2\beta^2 + \beta(9 - 8\gamma) - 8\gamma^2 + 18\gamma - 7) \mp 2\beta^2 v(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) + \alpha(-4\beta^3 + \beta^2(4 - 8\gamma) + 2\beta v(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) + (4\gamma - 1)v(\alpha, \beta, \gamma))}{3\alpha^2(7\alpha^2 - 2\alpha(\beta + 2\gamma - 2) - \beta^2)} \\ y_{\pm}^2 = \frac{(-4\alpha^3 + \alpha^2(-2\beta + 2\gamma - 3) \pm \beta v(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)\alpha(\beta - 2\beta^2 - 2\beta\gamma + v(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)))}{\alpha(7\alpha^2 - 2\alpha(\beta + 2\gamma - 2) - \beta^2)} \\ z_{\mp}^2 = \frac{\mp 2v(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) - 8\alpha^2 + 2\alpha(\beta + 2\gamma - 3) + 2\beta^2}{7\alpha^2 - 2\alpha(\beta + 2\gamma - 2) - \beta^2} \end{cases} \quad (3.33)$$

where one has used

$$v(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = \sqrt{\alpha^2(2\alpha^2 + \alpha(-4\beta - 8\gamma + 2) + 2\beta^2 + \beta(4\gamma - 2) + (1 - 2\gamma)^2)}. \quad (3.34)$$

Concerning the third non-BPS black hole solution (4.13), we get

$$\begin{cases} x_{\mp}^3 = \frac{\mp F(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)}{\alpha^2(14\alpha^4 - 2\alpha^3(18\beta + 36\gamma + 5) + \alpha^2(47\beta^2 + 12\beta(8\gamma + 1) + 24\gamma(4\gamma + 1)) - 6\alpha\beta^2(5\beta + 10\gamma + 1) + 9\beta^4)} \\ y_{\pm}^3 = \frac{\pm G(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)}{\alpha(14\alpha^4 - 2\alpha^3(18\beta + 36\gamma + 5) + \alpha^2(47\beta^2 + 12\beta(8\gamma + 1) + 24\gamma(4\gamma + 1)) - 6\alpha\beta^2(5\beta + 10\gamma + 1) + 9\beta^4)} \\ z_{\pm}^3 = -\frac{6(-8\alpha^4 + 2\alpha^3(5\beta + 10\gamma - 3) + \alpha^2(-2\beta^2 + 10\beta + 20\gamma + 2) \pm \sqrt{\alpha^2(-2\alpha^2 - 2\alpha + \beta^2)^2 v(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)}) - \alpha\beta^2(5\beta + 10\gamma + 7) + 3\beta^4}{14\alpha^4 - 2\alpha^3(18\beta + 36\gamma + 5) + \alpha^2(47\beta^2 + 12\beta(8\gamma + 1) + 24\gamma(4\gamma + 1)) - 6\alpha\beta^2(5\beta + 10\gamma + 1) + 9\beta^4} \end{cases} \quad (3.35)$$

where one has used

$$\begin{aligned} F(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) &= -28\alpha^6 + \alpha^5(24\beta + 48\gamma - 46) + 6\alpha^4(7\beta^2 + \beta(8\gamma + 13) + 8\gamma^2 + 26\gamma + 2) \\ &\quad - \alpha^3(84\beta^3 + \beta^2(168\gamma + 59) + 6\beta(8\gamma - 1) + 6(8\gamma^2 - 2\gamma - 1)) + \alpha^2\beta^2(58\beta^2 \\ &\quad + \beta(72\gamma - 3) + 72\gamma^2 - 6\gamma - 15) \mp 6\beta^2\sqrt{\alpha^2(-2\alpha^2 - 2\alpha + \beta^2)^2 v(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)} \\ &\quad + 3\alpha(\sqrt{\alpha^2(-2\alpha^2 - 2\alpha + \beta^2)^2 v(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)})(2\beta + (4\gamma + 1)) - 4\beta^5 + \beta^4(4 - 8\gamma)) \\ G(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) &= 24\alpha^5 - 2\alpha^4(34\beta + 30\gamma - 9) + 2\alpha^3(36\beta^2 + \beta(66\gamma - 19) - 30\gamma - 3) \\ &\quad + \alpha^2\beta(-38\beta^2 + \beta(39 - 66\gamma) - 96\gamma^2 + 36\gamma + 6) + 3\beta\sqrt{\alpha^2(-2\alpha^2 - 2\alpha + \beta^2)^2 v} \\ &\quad \pm 3\alpha(\sqrt{\alpha^2(-2\alpha^2 - 2\alpha + \beta^2)^2 v} - 2\beta^4 + \beta^3(5 - 10\gamma)). \end{aligned}$$

In Fig.(2) and Fig.(3), we illustrate the allowed electric charge regions in the half cone configurations for the second and third solutions of the non-BPS black holes that are constrained by the Kähler cone conditions, respectively.




Figure 2: Allowed electric charge regions for the second non-BPS black hole solution for the triplet  $(x_-^2, y_-^2, z_-^2)$ .




Figure 3: Allowed electric charge regions for the third non-BPS black hole solution for the triplet  $(x^3, y^3, z^3)$ .

The two figures illustrate that the cone symmetry configuration is recovered when we set  $\gamma = 0$ , as observed for 5D black holes obtained from M-theory on CY threefold with two Kähler parameters [1, 4, 6]. Non zero values of the  $\gamma$  breaks such a symmetry in the graphical representation of the allowed regions of black hole electric charges. In fact, the positive and the negative charge values should be gathered to recover the symmetric configurations appearing in M-theory on two parameter CY manifolds. Moreover, it has been remarked that for these two solutions, however, certain regions that are allowed for the BPS black holes become disallowed.

Having discussed solutions with lower orders, we move now to approach the higher ones associated with the fourth and the fifth solutions. Due to the higher order of the local geometric coordinates in the charge expressions, a direct study of the allowed charge regions is not an easy task. It may need more advanced numerical computations. Nevertheless, it could be possible to determine the range of the charge ratios that admit attractor solutions lying within the Kähler cone. A close examination shows that there are certain singular curves in the moduli space, which do not correspond to any possible extremal black hole configurations for charge finite values. These curves are obtained by setting the denominators in the expressions of  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\gamma$  to zero. To unveil such behaviors, we consider the fourth solution given in (3.31). Indeed, it is evident that there is a common singularity among the three charges at  $x = 2$ . This contrasts with the previous study, where the singularity has been located within a region of the  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$  space. However, it is reduced here to a single

point in such a space.

Moreover, the denominator of  $\gamma$  in this form reveals the presence of the complex singularities. A closer inspection indicates that additional singularities can be uncovered by performing certain changes of variables, resembling coordinate singularities. From the solution (3.31), we can obtain the expressions of  $x$  and  $z$  as follows

$$x = \frac{2\alpha - 2\beta + y + 1}{\alpha - \beta}, \quad z = \frac{2(\beta + \alpha y)}{\alpha - \beta}. \quad (3.36)$$

Replacing  $x$  and  $z$  in the  $\gamma$  expression, we get

$$\gamma = \frac{s(y)}{\ell(y)} \quad (3.37)$$

where  $s(y)$  and  $\ell(y)$  are found to be

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(y) = & 4(\beta + \alpha y)(2\alpha^4(6y^4 + 22y^3 + 35y^2 + 24y + 6) + 2\alpha^3(11y^4 + 2(\beta + 23)y^3 + (71 - 4\beta)y^2 \\ & - 2(\beta - 24)y + 12) - \alpha^2(2(7\beta^2 - 6) + (11\beta^2 - 12)y^4 + (46\beta^2 + 4\beta - 48)y^3 + (61\beta^2 + 8\beta - 72)y^2 \\ & + 4(13\beta^2 + \beta - 12)y) + 2\alpha\beta^2(-6y^4 + (\beta - 24)y^3 + (2\beta - 37)y^2 + (5\beta - 26)y - 7) \\ & + \beta^4(3y^4 + 12y^3 + 19y^2 + 14y + 6)) \\ s(y) = & 2\alpha^6(35y^5 + 99y^4 + 92y^3 - 36y - 12) + \alpha^5(48\beta + (134 - 24\beta)y^5 + (64\beta + 382)y^4 + 4(71\beta \\ & + 69)y^3 + 24(19\beta - 6)y^2 + 24(11\beta - 10)y - 72) + \alpha^4(12(5\beta^2 + 10\beta - 6) + (-55\beta^2 - 44\beta + 68)y^5 \\ & + (-179\beta^2 + 104\beta + 160)y^4 + (-48\beta^2 + 692\beta - 4)y^3 + 12(6\beta^2 + 89\beta - 24)y^2 + 12(13\beta^2 + 52 \\ & \beta - 22)y) + 2\alpha^3(-28\beta^3 + 60\beta^2 + 48\beta + \beta(11\beta^2 - 23\beta - 12)y^5 - 2(9\beta^3 + 26\beta^2 - 21\beta + 6)y^4 \\ & + (-169\beta^3 + 33\beta^2 + 252\beta - 48)y^3 - 2(95\beta^3 - 78\beta^2 - 189\beta + 36)y^2 - 6(23\beta^3 - 29\beta^2 - 38\beta + 8)y \\ & - 12) + 2\alpha^2\beta(-20\beta^3 - 42\beta^2 + 30\beta + 3\beta(\beta^2 + 4\beta + 2)y^5 + 3(2\beta^3 - 11\beta^2 + 10\beta + 4)y^4 + (-9\beta^3 \\ & - 204\beta^2 + 78\beta + 48)y^3 + (-66\beta^3 - 287\beta^2 + 120\beta + 72)y^2 + (-34\beta^3 - 190\beta^2 + 96\beta + 48)y \\ & + 12) - 2\alpha\beta^3(-12\beta^2 + 20\beta + 3\beta(\beta + 2)y^5 + (-6\beta^2 + 21\beta + 12)y^4 + (-39\beta^2 + 45\beta + 48)y^3 \\ & + (-58\beta^2 + 70\beta + 74)y^2 + (-26\beta^2 + 50\beta + 52)y + 14) + \beta^5(4(\beta + 3) + 3\beta y^5 + (9\beta + 6)y^4 \\ & + 6(3\beta + 4)y^3 + (28\beta + 38)y^2 + 4(6\beta + 7)y). \end{aligned}$$

Solving the constraint  $\ell(y) = 0$ , we obtain the following new real pole

$$y = -\frac{\beta}{\alpha}. \quad (3.38)$$

In this case, the singularity is located in the region with opposite charges being either ( $\beta > 0$  and  $\alpha < 0$ ) or ( $\beta < 0$  and  $\alpha > 0$ ). These regions can be reduced by replacing  $y$  in the  $x$  and the  $z$  expressions. This yields to

$$x = \frac{1 + 2\alpha}{\alpha}, \quad z = 0. \quad (3.39)$$

Now, we would like to discuss the poles of the fifth solution (3.32). Interestingly, the singularity at  $x = 2$  is still present here, appearing as a trivial pole. However, non-trivial poles



can be obtained by considering the surface constraint  $\chi = 0$ . Resolving this equation, we can express the poles of  $y$  as functions of  $x$  and  $z$  as follows

$$\begin{cases} y_{(\pm, \mp)} = \frac{1}{6} \left( 3z(\pm, \mp) \sqrt{3} \sqrt{(\pm, \mp) \iota(x, y, z) + 6x(z+2) + 4z^2 - 12} \right) \\ y_{(\mp, \mp)} = \frac{1}{6} \left( 3z(\mp, \mp) \sqrt{3} \sqrt{(\mp, \mp) \iota(x, y, z) + 6x(z+2) + 4z^2 - 12} \right), \end{cases} \quad (3.40)$$

where  $\iota(x, y, z) = \sqrt{3} \sqrt{(z+2)(12x^2(z+2) + 16x(z^2-3) + 5z^3 - 10z^2 - 12z + 24)}$ . It has been observed that there are four solutions  $(y_{(+,-)}, y_{(-,+)}), (y_{(-,-)}, y_{(+,+)})$ . These poles satisfy the Kahler cone condition subject to the following constrain regions

$$(x < 1 \text{ or } z \geq 2 - 2x) \text{ and } (x \geq 1 \text{ or } z > 0). \quad (3.41)$$

### 3.2 Recombination factor and stability of non-BPS black holes

Having determined the non-BPS black hole solutions, we move now to inspect their stability behaviors. This analysis can be done by calculating the recombination factor  $R$  via a generic computation. Following to [1], this factor of such non-BPS solutions can be determined by means of the following relation

$$R = \frac{\sqrt{V_{eff}^{cr}}}{M_{C^\cup}} \quad (3.42)$$

where  $V_{eff}^{cr}$  denotes the critical value of the effective potential  $V_{eff}$  and  $M_{C^\cup} = \sum |\varrho_I| t_I$ . To compute  $\varrho_I$ , we consider the non-BPS black holes obtained by wrapping M2-branes on a non-holomorphic curve class embedded in the proposed toric CY threefold given by

$$C = \varrho_1 C^1 + \varrho_2 C^2 + \varrho_3 C^3 + \varrho_4 C^4. \quad (3.43)$$

The associated black hole charges are given by

$$q_I = \int_C J_I = \varrho_1 C^1 J_I + \varrho_2 C^2 J_I + \varrho_3 C^3 J_I + \varrho_4 C^4 J_I, \quad I = 1, \dots, 4. \quad (3.44)$$

Using the Kähler cone matrix, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_1 &= q_4 - 2(q_1 + q_2) \\ \varrho_2 &= -q_1 \\ \varrho_3 &= q_3 \\ \varrho_4 &= q_1 + q_4. \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

After appropriate computations, the recombination factor is found to be

$$R = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}(|\alpha + \beta| + x|1 - 2(\alpha + \beta)| + y|\alpha| + z|\gamma|)} \sqrt{\frac{3\zeta}{x(z+2) - y^2 + yz - 2}} \quad (3.46)$$

where one has used

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta = & -24\alpha^2 - 24\alpha + 12\beta^2 + 6\alpha^2x^3(z+2) + x^2(\alpha^2(-6y^2 + 6yz + 7z^2 - 36) + 6\alpha\beta \\
& (z+2)(2y-z) + 3\beta^2(z+2)^2) + x(12(-2\beta^2 + 2\alpha^2(y^2+2) - \alpha(y^2+2)(\beta y-1) + 2\beta y+1) \\
& - 6z(2\beta^2 - \alpha(2\beta + 3\beta y^2 + y^2 + 4\beta y - 2y + 6) + 4\alpha^2y + \beta(2-4y) - 3) + 2z^2(10\alpha^2 + 4 \\
& \beta^2 + 6(\gamma^2 - \gamma + 1) + \alpha(-12\beta - 12\gamma + (4\beta - 3)y + 17) + 3\beta(2\gamma + y - 3)) + z^3(14\alpha^2 \\
& - 2\alpha(7\beta + 7\gamma - 6) + 4\beta^2 + 6\beta(\gamma - 1) + 6\gamma^2 - 6\gamma + 3)) - 3y^4(2\alpha^2 + 2\alpha + \beta^2) \\
& + 6y^3(z(2\alpha^2 - 2\alpha(\beta - 1) + (\beta - 1)\beta) - 2\beta) - y^2(6(2\alpha + 1)^2 + z^2(16\alpha^2 - 4\alpha(6\beta \\
& + 3\gamma - 4) + 6\beta^2 + 6\beta(\gamma - 2) + 6\gamma^2 - 6\gamma + 3) + 6z(2\alpha - 3\beta + 1)) + y(-24\beta + z^3(10\alpha^2 \\
& - 2\alpha(4\beta + 6\gamma - 5) + 2\beta^2 + 4\beta(\gamma - 1) + 6\gamma^2 - 6\gamma + 3) + 2z^2(6\alpha - 2\beta + 3) + 6(2\alpha + 1) \\
& z(2\alpha - 2\beta + 1)) + 4\alpha^2z^4 - 4\alpha\beta z^4 - 4\alpha\gamma z^4 + 4\alpha z^4 + \beta^2z^4 + 2\beta\gamma z^4 - 2\beta z^4 + \gamma^2z^4 \\
& - 2\gamma z^4 + z^4 + 4\alpha z^3 - 2\beta z^3 - 2\gamma z^3 + 2z^3 - 20\alpha^2z^2 + 24\alpha\beta z^2 + 24\alpha\gamma z^2 \\
& - 20\alpha z^2 - 8\beta^2z^2 - 12\beta\gamma z^2 + 12\beta z^2 - 12\gamma^2z^2 + 12\gamma z^2 - 5z^2 - 24\alpha z + 12\beta z - 12z - 12.
\end{aligned}$$

For simplicity reasons, we analyse the stability behavior within the allowed electric charge regions of the second and the third non-BPS solutions presented previously. Considering the second solution (3.29), we illustrate in Fig.(4) the behavior of the recombination factor by taking  $\gamma = 0$  and varying  $\beta$  between  $-100$  and  $100$  for positive and negative  $\alpha$  charges given in the left and right panels, respectively.




Figure 4: *Recombination factor for the second solution in the allowed charge regions.*

To perform this study in the allowed regions, we select appropriate values of  $\alpha$  providing two graphs. The latter exhibit a remarkable symmetry with one appearing as the mirror image of the other. This can be supported by the cone symmetry observed in the allowed charge region illustrations. It follows that the recombination factor  $R$  rises to its maximum values in the left and right plots in the respective regions  $-100 < \beta < -50$  and  $50 < \beta < 100$  where the stable and unstable black holes live. Taking  $-50 < \beta < 0$  and  $0 < \beta < 50$ , we observe that the black holes are unstable, for positive and negative  $\alpha$  values, respectively. The cited symmetry can be understood from the fact that the regions with stable black holes are associated the positivity and the negativity behaviors of  $\beta$  in the left and the right plots,

respectively. In addition, for  $\gamma = \beta = 0$ , a critical point appears in both graphs where all the curves meet. Interestingly, at this point, the behavior of the black hole changes from stable to unstable, and vice versa.

For the third solution (4.13), we approach this symmetrical behavior by taking  $\gamma \neq 0$ . This means that for each negative value of  $\gamma$ , we can associate a symmetrical positive value with the same magnitude and then we study the recombination factor behaviors. Effectively, we consider  $\gamma = 50$  and  $\gamma = -50$ . In Fig(5), we illustrate the variation of the recombination factor for opposite charge regions.




Figure 5: *Recombination factor for the third solution in the allowed charge regions.*

As the figure shows, the same symmetrical behavior is present, but not for the same  $\gamma$  value. This symmetry is observed for each pair of opposite values, which could be linked to the symmetry observed in the allowed region where, each half-cone configuration is associated with the second half-cone configuration that has the opposite charges, recovering the full cone configuration. Since it has been shown that a solution could be stable if this factor is more than one, this figure provides stable and unstable black hole configurations depending on the allowed charge regions. Indeed, for  $R < 1$ , the constituent BPS-anti-BPS pairs can recombine to generate stable non-BPS black hole states.

## 4 M-theory black strings from a THCY with $h^{1,1} = 4$

In this section, we study 5D black strings using the M-theory compactification on the proposed THCY with  $h^{1,1} = 4$ . These solutions can be provided by wrapping M5-branes on dual divisors of such a toric CY manifold. The associated stability behaviors can be discussed by means of the effective potential given in terms of the M5-brane magnetic charges.

### 4.1 5D black string solutions

Before approaching the stability behaviors, one needs first to find the black string solutions carrying four magnetic charges  $p^I$ ,  $I = 1, 2, 3, 4$  under  $U(1)^4$  gauge symmetries. To do so, we

should calculate the effective potential  $V_{eff}^m$  of the 5D black strings. Indeed, it is given by

$$V_{eff}^m = \frac{J}{t_3^2(-3t_2^2 + 3t_3t_2 + t_3^2 - 6t_4^2 + 3t_1(t_3 + 2t_4))^2} \quad (4.1)$$

where the scalar function  $J$  is expressed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} J = & 6(p_3^2(3t_2^4 - 6t_3t_2^3 + 6(t_3^2 + 2t_4^2 - t_1(t_3 + 2t_4))t_2^2 + 4t_3((t_3^2 - 3t_4^2 + 3t_1((t_3 + t_4))t_2 + t_3^4 + 12t_4^4 \\ & + 6t_1^2(t_3^2 + 2t_4t_3 + 2t_4^2) + 4t_1(t_3^3 - 3t_4^2t_3 - 6t_4^3)) + 2p_3t_3^2(2p_4(3t_1 + 3t_2 + 2t_3)(t_1 - 2t_4) \\ & + p_1(3t_2^2 + 6t_4t_2 + t_3^2 + 6t_4^2 + 4t_3t_4) + p_2(-3t_2^2 - 4t_3t_2 + t_3^2 + 6t_4^2 - 6t_1(t_2 + t_4))) \\ & + t_3^2(p_2^2(6t_2^2 - 6t_3t_2 + 5t_3^2 - 12t_4^2 + 6t_1(t_3 + 2t_4)) - 6p_1p_2(2t_2 - t_3)(t_3 + 2t_4) + 3p_1^2(t_3 + 2t_4)^2 \\ & + 4p_4^2(3t_1^2 + 3(t_3 - 2t_4)t_1 - 3t_2^2 + t_3^2 + 6t_4^2 + 3t_2t_3) - 4p_4(3p_2(2t_2 - t_3)(t_1 - 2t_4) \\ & + p_1(-3t_2^2 + 3t_3t_2 + t_3^2 + 6t_4^2 + 6t_3t_4))))). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we need to determine the critical points in terms of the local coordinate of the moduli space. Roughly, one has the following new dynamical variables

$$\rho = \frac{p_1}{p_4}, \quad \sigma = \frac{p_2}{p_4}, \quad \tau = \frac{p_3}{p_4} \quad x = \frac{t_1}{t_4}, \quad y = \frac{t_2}{t_4}, \quad z = \frac{t_3}{t_4}. \quad (4.2)$$

The black string solutions can be approached by considering  $t^I = \frac{3p^I}{Z_m}$ , where  $Z_m$  represents the central charge of the black strings. In this way, the BPS solutions are given in terms of the magnetic charges

$$x = \rho, \quad y = \sigma, \quad z = \tau. \quad (4.3)$$

The above solutions show that all the BPS region charges inside the Kähler cone corresponding to the positivity of the geometric local variables  $x$ ,  $y$  and  $z$ .

To establish the equations of motion of the scalar fields associated with the black string moduli space, one needs to employ an extremization mechanism with respect to the geometric local variables via (3.27). Indeed, we find three equations which can be formulated as follows

$$24z(2\sigma - \tau - (\tau + 2)y + \sigma z + z)(3(\tau + 2)x - 6\sigma y + 3\tau y + 3\rho(z + 2) + 3\sigma z + 2\tau z - 12) = 0 \quad (4.4)$$

$$-24z(2(\rho + \tau) - (\tau + 2)x + (\rho - 2)z)(3(\tau + 2)x - 6\sigma y + 3\tau y + 3\rho(z + 2) + 3\sigma z + 2\tau z - 12) = 0 \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& -24(z^3(10(\rho-2)(3\rho+3\sigma+2\tau) - 3x^2(\sigma^2+2\sigma(\tau+3)+\tau^2+8\tau+10) + x(-12\sigma(\rho-\tau-5) \\
& + 4\rho\tau+6\sigma^2+6\tau^2+40\tau+3y(2\rho(\sigma+\tau+3)+5\sigma^2+2\sigma(\tau+4)-\tau^2-8\tau-10)+60) \\
& - (\rho-2)y^2(3\rho+15\sigma-4\tau)+6y(2\rho^2-2\rho(3\sigma-\tau+5)-5\sigma^2-2\sigma\tau+\tau^2+10))+6\tau^2(x-2)z \\
& (2x^2-x(y^2-2y+2)-y(y^2+2))-3z^2(-4(\rho^2+\rho(\tau-2)-\sigma^2+\sigma\tau+\tau^2+2)+4(\tau+1)x^3 \\
& -2x^2(-\sigma^2+\sigma\tau+\tau^2+6\tau+2\sigma(\tau+2)y-2\tau y+6)+x(6(-\sigma^2+\sigma\tau+\tau^2+2\tau+2) \\
& +y^2(2\rho(\tau+2)+3\sigma^2-3\sigma\tau+\tau^2-2\tau-6)+y(-4\rho\sigma+2(\rho-6)\tau+8\sigma(\tau+3)))-(\rho-2)y^3 \\
& (2\sigma-\tau)+2y^2(\rho^2-\rho(\tau+6)-3\sigma^2+3\sigma\tau-\tau^2+6)+6(\rho-2)y(2\sigma-\tau))+3\tau^2(x-2) \\
& (-2x+y^2+2)^2-z^4(x(\rho(6\sigma+4)+7\sigma^2+\sigma(7\tau+12)+2(\tau^2+7\tau+7))-6\rho^2(y+3)+\rho(-24\sigma \\
& -14\tau+(12-7\tau)y+28)-2(7\sigma^2+7\sigma\tau+2(\tau^2+7)-7\tau y))+(\rho-2)z^5(3\rho+3\sigma+2\tau))=0.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Solving these scalar equations of motion, we can obtain the magnetic black string configurations in terms the geometric ones. They are organized as follows:

Solution 1

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho &= \frac{\omega(x, y, z)}{(z+2)(12x(z^2+3z+2)-12y^2(z+1)+12y(z+1)z+4z^3+5z^2-24z-24)} \\
\sigma &= \frac{y(12x(z+2)-7z^2-24)-4z(3x(z+2)+z^2-6)-12y^3+24y^2z}{12x(z^2+3z+2)-12y^2(z+1)+12y(z+1)z+4z^3+5z^2-24z-24} \\
\tau &= -\frac{3z(4x(z+2)-4y^2+4yz+z^2-8)}{12x(z^2+3z+2)-12y^2(z+1)+12y(z+1)z+4z^3+5z^2-24z-24}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

where one has used

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega(x, y, z) &= -12x^2(z+2)^2+3x(z+2)(12y^2-12yz+5z^2+16z+24)-24y^4+48y^3z \\
& -2y^2(17z^2+24z+48)+2yz(5z^2+24z+48)+6z^4+16z^3-20z^2-96z-96.
\end{aligned}$$

Solution 2

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho &= \frac{-3x(z+2)+6y^2-6yz-2z^2+12}{3(z+2)} \\
\sigma &= y \\
\tau &= z.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Solution 3

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho &= \frac{\Phi}{\Omega} \\
\sigma &= \frac{\Psi}{\Omega} \\
\tau &= \frac{z(-3x(z+2)+3y^2-3yz+z^2+6)(4x(z+2)-4y^2+4yz+z^2-8)}{\Omega}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

where one has used

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \Phi &= 12x^3(z+2)^2 + 3x^2(z+2)(-8y^2 + 8yz + 11z^2 + 16z - 16) + x(12y^4 - 24y^3z \\ &+ y^2(-45z^2 - 96z + 48) + 3yz(19z^2 + 32z - 16) + 9z^4 + 16z^3 - 114z^2 - 192z + 48) \\ &+ 8z(3y^4 - 6y^3z + 2y^2(z^2 + 6) + yz(z^2 - 12) - 2(z^2 - 6)) \\ \Psi &= 3y(4x^2(z+2)^2 - x(5z^3 + 10z^2 + 16z + 32) - z^4 + 10z^2 + 16) - 4z(3x^2(z+2)^2 \\ &+ x(z^3 + 2z^2 - 12z - 24) - 2(z^2 - 6)) - 3y^3(8x(z+2) - 9z^2 - 16) + y^2z(48x(z+2) + z^2 - 96) \\ &+ 12y^5 - 36y^4z \\ \Omega &= 12x^2(z+1)(z+2)^2 + x(z+2)(-24y^2(z+1) + 24y(z+1)z + 4z^3 + 9z^2 - 48z - 48) \\ &+ 12y^4(z+1) - 24y^3z(z+1) + y^2(8z^3 + 3z^2 + 48z + 48) + yz(4z^3 + 9z^2 - 48z - 48) \\ &+ z^4 - 8z^3 - 18z^2 + 48z + 48. \end{aligned} \right.$$

Solution 4

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \frac{\Gamma_{\pm}}{(2+z)\Lambda} \\ \sigma &= -\frac{\Pi_{\pm}}{(2y-z)\Lambda} \\ \tau &= 3 \frac{\mp\sqrt{2}\eta - 2z^3(6x^2 + 6xy + x - 3y^2 - 6y - 7) - 12(x-1)z^2(2x - y^2 - 2) + z^4(-10x - 6y + 3) - 2z^5}{\Lambda} \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

where one has used

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\pm} &= 6x^2(z+2)(-6y^2(z+2) + 6yz(z+2) + z^2(5z+9)) - x(\pm 3\sqrt{2}\eta - 36y^4(z+2) + 72y^3(z+2)z \\ &+ 6y^2(7z^3 + 26z^2 + 12z - 24) - 6y(13z^3 + 38z^2 + 12z - 24)z - 22z^5 - 29z^4 + 156z^3 + 252z^2) \\ &+ 2(\pm 3\sqrt{2}\eta + 18y^4(z+2)z - 36y^3(z+2)z^2 + 6y^2(z^3 + 5z^2 + 12z + 12)z \\ &+ 6y(2z^3 + z^2 - 12z - 12)z^2 + 2z^6 - 2z^5 - 24z^4 + 12z^3 + 72z^2) \\ \Pi_{\pm} &= -6y^2(12x^2(z+2)^2 + 4x(z^3 - 2z^2 - 12z - 24) - z^4 - 8z^3 + 8z^2 + 48) - 3y \\ &(\pm\sqrt{2}\eta - 6(2x^2 + 5x - 3)z^3 + (-72x^2 + 48x + 24)z^2 + (1 - 10x)z^4 - 96(x-1)^2z - 2z^5) \\ &- 2(18x^2z^3 + 36x^2z^2 + 15xz^4 - 72xz^2 \pm \sqrt{2}\eta(3x+z-3) + 3z^5 - 6z^4 - 18z^3 + 36z^2) \\ &+ 36y^4(z+2)(2x+z-2) - 18y^3z(3z+8)(2x+z-2) \\ \Lambda &= z^2(18x^2(z+2) + 6x(2z^2 - 2z - 15) + 2z^3 - 8z^2 - 15z + 54) + 6y^2(-6x(z^2 + 2z + 2) \\ &+ z^3 + 8z^2 + 6z + 12) + 12yz(3x(z^2 + 2z + 2) + z^3 - z^2 - 3z - 6) + 18y^4(z+2) - 36y^3z(z+2) \\ \eta &= \sqrt{z^2(z+2)(2x+z-2)(z-2y)^2(3x(z+2) - 3y^2 + 3yz + z^2 - 6)^2}. \end{aligned} \right.$$

As in the previous cases, we should express the local geometric variable  $x$ ,  $y$  and  $z$  in terms of the obtained magnetic ratio charges of the 5D black strings. This is needed to determine the allowed magnetic charge regions. As shown in the above equations above, it has been

inspected that only the first and the second solutions can provide explicit expressions for the triplet  $(x, y, z)$  in terms of the magnetic charge regions. They are given respectively by

$$x = \frac{-3\rho(\tau + 2) + 6\sigma^2 - 6\sigma\tau - 2\tau^2 + 12}{3(\tau + 2)}, \quad y = \sigma, \quad z = \tau \quad (4.11)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \frac{B}{(\tau + 2)(12\rho(\tau^2 + 3\tau + 2) - 12\sigma^2(\tau + 1) + 12\sigma(\tau + 1)\tau + 4\tau^3 + 5\tau^2 - 24\tau - 24)} \\ y &= \frac{\sigma(12\rho(\tau + 2) - 7\tau^2 - 24) - 4\tau(3\rho(\tau + 2) + \tau^2 - 6) - 12\sigma^3 + 24\sigma^2\tau}{12\rho(\tau^2 + 3\tau + 2) - 12\sigma^2(\tau + 1) + 12\sigma(\tau + 1)\tau + 4\tau^3 + 5\tau^2 - 24\tau - 24} \\ z &= -\frac{3\tau(4\rho(\tau + 2) - 4\sigma^2 + 4\sigma\tau + \tau^2 - 8)}{12\rho(\tau^2 + 3\tau + 2) - 12\sigma^2(\tau + 1) + 12\sigma(\tau + 1)\tau + 4\tau^3 + 5\tau^2 - 24\tau - 24} \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where one has used

$$\begin{aligned} B &= -12\rho^2(\tau + 2)^2 + 3\rho(\tau + 2)(12\sigma^2 - 12\sigma\tau + 5\tau^2 + 16\tau + 24) - 24\sigma^4 + 48\sigma^3\tau - 2\sigma^2(17\tau^2 \\ &+ 24\tau + 48) + 2\sigma\tau(5\tau^2 + 24\tau + 48) + 6\tau^4 + 16\tau^3 - 20\tau^2 - 96\tau - 96(5z^2 + 24z + 48) + 6z^4 \\ &+ 16z^3 - 20z^2 - 96z - 96. \end{aligned}$$

Using the black hole similar techniques, in Fig. (6), we illustrate the allowed magnetic charge regions for the first solution given in (4.11).




Figure 6: Allowed magnetic charge regions for the first non-BPS black string solution by considering  $x, y$  and  $z$  functions.

As for black holes, we observe overlapping regions with symmetric Kähler cones. They are given by three colors associated with the three local geometric variables  $x, y$  and  $z$ .

In Fig. (7), we present the allowed magnetic charge regions for the second solution of non-BPS black strings given in (4.12). At first sight, it looks that the cone symmetrical behavior is broken. A close observation, however, shows that such a behavior still exists by focusing on the  $x$  regions and the non-allowed charge regions. To make this more obvious, we illustrate in Fig.(8) the allowed charge regions for the second solution by considering only the local variable  $x$ . It is clear from the figure that the cone symmetry behavior is recovered.




Figure 7: Allowed magnetic charge regions for the second non-BPS black string solution by considering  $x$ ,  $y$  and  $z$  functions.

Before approaching the stability behaviors, we provide a comment on the non-BPS charges associated with the equations (4.9) and (4.10). As we have done for the black hole solutions, we consider the pole behaviors obtained by resolving the vanishing denominators  $\Omega = 0$  and  $\Lambda = 0$ . They are found to be

$$\begin{cases} x_{\pm}^{p1} = \frac{24y^2(z+1) - 24y(z+1)z - 4z^3 - (\pm\sqrt{16z^2 + 24z + 33} + 9)z^2 + 48z + 48}{24(z+1)(z+2)} \\ x_{\mp}^{p2} = \frac{6y^2(z^2 + 2z + 2) \mp \sqrt{3} \sqrt{(z-2y)^2(12y^2(z+1)^2 - 12y(z+1)^2z + (2z^2 + 4z + 3)z^2) - 6y(z^2 + 2z + 2)z - 2z^4 + 2z^3 + 15z^2}}{6z^2(z+2)}. \end{cases} \quad (4.13)$$






Figure 8: Allowed magnetic charge regions for the second non-BPS black string solution by considering only the  $x$  variable.

## 4.2 Stability scenarios of 5D black strings

To examine the stability of these solutions, we need to count the recombination factor, which is the ratio between the black string tension  $T$  and the minimum size of the corresponding piecewise calibrated divisors. By employing the local magnetic variables, we can determine such a factor from the size  $V_{D^\cup}$  which is the minimum piecewise calibrated volume representative of the class  $[D]$  given by

$$D = p_1 \mathcal{D}_1 + p_2 \mathcal{D}_2 + p_3 \mathcal{D}_3 + p_4 \mathcal{D}_4 \quad (4.14)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \mathcal{D}_3, \mathcal{D}_4$  are dual divisors to  $\mathcal{J}_1, \mathcal{J}_2, \mathcal{J}_3$  and  $\mathcal{J}_4$  denoting the Kähler  $(1,1)$ -forms of the proposed toric CY manifold, respectively. Roughly, the recombination factor is expressed as follows

$$R = \frac{T}{V_{D^\cup}} \quad (4.15)$$

where one has used  $V_{D^\cup} = \sum_{I=1}^4 A_I |p_I|$  with  $A_I = C_{IJK} t^J t^K = 2\tau_I$  describing the size of the involved divisors. Computations lead to

$$V_{C^\cup} = t_3(t_3+2t_4)|p_1| + t_3(-2t_2+t_3)|p_2| + (2t_1(t_3+t_4) + t_3(2t_2+t_4) - t_2^2 - 2t_4^2)|p_3| + 2t_3(t_1-2t_4)|p_4|. \quad (4.16)$$

Combining these relations, the black string recombination factor is found to be

$$R = \frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{F}}}{|\tau|(2xz + 2x - y^2 + 2yz + z^2 - 2) + |\sigma|(z^2 - 2yz) + (z^2 + 2z)|\rho| + 2xz - 4z} \quad (4.17)$$

where one has used

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(x, y, z) = & 6z^2(2(\rho^2 + \rho(\tau - 2) - \sigma^2 + \sigma\tau + 2) + (\tau^2 + 2\tau + 2)x^2 - 2x(-\sigma^2 + \sigma\tau + 2\tau + \sigma(\tau + 2)y \\ & - \tau(\tau + 1)y + 2) + y^2(\rho(\tau + 2) + \sigma^2 - \sigma\tau + \tau^2 - 2) - 2(\rho - 2)y(2\sigma - \tau)) + 6\tau^2z(2x^2 \\ & - x(y^2 - 2y + 2) - y(y^2 + 2)) + 3\tau^2(-2x + y^2 + 2)^2 + 2z^3(2(\rho - 2)(3\rho + 3\sigma + 2\tau) \\ & + x(3\sigma^2 + 6\sigma + 2\tau^2 + 4\tau + 6) - y(6\rho(\sigma + 1) + 3\sigma^2 + 4\sigma\tau - 2\tau^2 - 6)) + z^4(3\rho^2 + 2\rho(3\sigma + \tau - 2) \\ & + 5\sigma^2 + 2\sigma\tau + \tau^2 + 4). \end{aligned}$$




Figure 9: *Recombination factor for the first solution in the allowed magnetic charge regions.*

In Fig.(9), we illustrate the behavior of the recombination factor in the allowed magnetic charge regions of the first black string solution by fixing the value of  $\tau$  and varying  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$ . From the figure, it is evident that for different allowed regions of the magnetic charge, the black strings exhibit instability behaviors as the recombination factor exceeds 1. Moreover, a certain symmetry is observed in these two graphs, particularly for opposite values of  $\tau$  and  $\rho$  local magnetic charges.

Considering the second black string solution, the variation of the recombination factor is depicted in Fig.(10). As shown in the figure, the stability of the black string solutions depends on the values of the magnetic charge ratios. For instance, in the case of  $\tau = 100$ , the recombination factor is consistently less than 1, indicating that only stable behaviors are observed. Conversely, for  $\tau = 50$ , both stable and unstable behaviors can occur depending on the specific value of magnetic charges. It is worth noting that the variation in the recombination factor exhibits some apparent similarities in form across different cases.




Figure 10: *Recombination factor for the second solution in the allowed magnetic charge regions.*

## 5 Conclusion and discussions

In this paper, we have studied certain physical behaviors of black branes from the compactification of M-theory on a four parameter CY threefold with  $h^{1,1} = 4$ . Combining toric geometry techniques and 5D  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supergravity formalisms, we have approached the BPS and the non-BPS states of the black holes and the black strings which are obtained by wrapping M2 and M5-branes on appropriate non-homomorphic 2-cycles and 4-cycles, respectively. Concerning the black holes, we have found the allowed electric charge regions of the BPS and the non-BPS states using the effective scalar potential computations. Inspired by extended black hole entropies, we have discussed certain thermodynamic behaviors by computing the associated quantities including the entropy and the temperature. Then, we have approached the stability of the non-BPS black holes by computing the recombination factor associated with four CY Kähler parameters. For simplicity reasons, we have treated only two solutions. Analyzing such branch solutions, we have examined the stability behaviors in the allowed electric charge regions of 5D M-theory black holes. As expected, we have found stable and unstable non-BPS black hole states depending on the electric charge ratios. After that, we have investigated the non-BPS black strings that are obtained by wrapping M5-branes on dual non-homomorphic 4-cycles in the proposed toric CY threefold. Precisely, we have found multiple non-BPS solutions. Using the extremization mechanism with respect to the geometric local variables subject to the volume constraint, we have elaborated black string solutions from the expression of the stringy effective scalar potential. In particular, we have computed the recombination factor  $R$ . After a close examination, we have shown that the associated non-BPS black string states are stable in certain allowed magnetic charge regions. In such regions, the 5D black strings do enjoy the recombination process.

In the end of this work, we could quote certain open questions which may come up. A classic one concerns 4D black holes using the M-theory compactifications. It would be interesting to think about alternative compactifications by implementing manifolds with non-trivial features such as holonomy groups.  $G_2$  manifolds could be a possible road to investigate such classes of black holes [49, 50]. Moreover, a remarkable feature of CY threefolds is mirror

symmetry playing a fundamental role in the compactification scenarios of string theory and related topics including F-theory. It would therefore be interesting to try to deploy such a geometric tool in CY black holes. We believe that these issues deserve more reflections. We hope to address such questions in future works.

## References

- [1] C. Long, A. Sheshmani, C. Vafa and S. T. Yau, *Non-Holomorphic Cycles and Non-BPS Black Branes*, Commun. Math. Phys. 399 (2023)1991, [arXiv:2104.06420](#).
- [2] A. Marrani, A. Mishra and P. K. Tripathy, *Non-BPS Black Branes in M-theory over Calabi-Yau Threefolds*, JHEP 06 (2022)163, [arXiv:2202.06872](#).
- [3] A. Mishra, P. K. Tripathy, *Stable non-BPS black holes and black strings in five dimensions*, Phys. Rev. D109 (2024) 026001, [arXiv:2310.14187](#).
- [4] A. Belhaj, A. Bouhouch, *On stability behaviors of 5D M-theory black objects*, Communications in Theoretical Physics 76(5) (2024)055401.
- [5] A. Belhaj, A. Bouhouch, *Behaviors of black holes and black strings in M-theory on Calabi-Yau manifolds*, Int.J.Geom.Meth.Mod.Phys. 21 (2024) 09, 2450169.
- [6] A. Belhaj, H. Belmahi, A. Bouhouch and S. E. Ennadifi, *On 5D black brane stabilities from M-theory on three-parameter Calabi-Yau threefolds*, International Journal of Modern Physics A (2024) 2450081, [arXiv:2405.15937](#).
- [7] R. Gopakumar and C. Vafa, M theory and topological strings. 1, [hep-th/9809187](#).
- [8] R. Gopakumar and C. Vafa, M theory and topological strings. 2, [hep-th/9812127](#).
- [9] S. H. Katz, A. Klemm and C. Vafa, M theory, topological strings and spinning, Adv.Theor.Math.Phys.3 (1999)1445, [arXiv:hep-th/9910181](#).
- [10] P. Meessen, T. Ortin, J. Perz and C. S. Shahbazi, *Black holes and black strings of N=2, d=5 supergravity in the H-FGK formalism*, JHEP 09 (2012) 001, [arXiv:1204.0507](#).
- [11] A. Strominger and C. Vafa, *Microscopic origin of the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy*, Phys. Lett. B379 (1996) 99104, [hep-th/9601029](#).
- [12] I. Halder, C. Vafa, K. Xu, *Black Hole Entropy for M-theory on the Quintic Threefold via F-theoretic Strings*, [arXiv:2404.01380](#).
- [13] A. C. Cadavid, A. Ceresole, R. D’Auria and S. Ferrara, *Eleven-dimensional supergravity compactified on Calabi-Yau threefolds*, Phys. Lett. B357 (1995) 76, [hep-th/9506144](#).

- [14] K. Becker, M. Becker and A. Strominger, *Five-branes, membranes and nonperturbative string theory*, Nucl. Phys. B456 (1995)130, [hep-th/9507158](#).
- [15] A. Strominger and C. Vafa, *Microscopic Origin of the Bekenstein-Hawking Entropy*, Phys. Lett. B379 (1996) 99, [hep-th/9601029](#).
- [16] S. Ferrara, R. R. Khuri, and R. Minasian, *M-theory on a Calabi-Yau manifold*, Phys. Lett. B375 (1996) 81, [hep-th/9602102](#).
- [17] W. A. Sabra, *General BPS black holes in five dimensions*, Mod. Phys. Lett. A13 (1998) 239, [hep-th/9708103](#).
- [18] M. Gunaydin, G. Sierra and P. K. Townsend, *The Geometry of N=2 Maxwell-Einstein Supergravity and Jordan Algebras*, Nucl. Phys. B242 (1984) 244.
- [19] J. M. Maldacena, A. Strominger and E. Witten, *Black hole entropy in M-theory*, JHEP 12 (1997) 002, [hep-th/9711053](#).
- [20] S. Katz, P. Mayr and C. Vafa, *Mirror symmetry and exact solution of 4d N=2 gauge theories I*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys 1(1998)53.
- [21] A. Belhaj, A. EL Fallah and E.H. Saidi, *On the affine  $D_4$  mirror geometry*, Class. Quantum. Grav. 16 (1999)3297.
- [22] A. Belhaj, A. EL Fallah and E.H. Saidi, *On non simply laced mirror geometries in type II strings*, Class. Quantum. Grav. 17 (1999)515.
- [23] E. Witten, *Solutions of four-dimensional field theories via M theory*, Nucl. Phys. B500 (1997) 3, [hep-th/9703166](#).
- [24] P. Candelas, G. Horowitz, A. Strominger, E. Witten, *Vacuum configurations for superstrings*, Nucl. Phys. B258 (1985) 46.
- [25] B.R. Greene, *String Theory on Calabi Yau Manifolds*, [hep-th/9702155](#).
- [26] S. Ferrara, R. Kallosh and A. Strominger, *N = 2 Extremal Black Holes*, Phys. Rev. D52 (1995) 5412, [hep-th/9508072](#).
- [27] A. Dabholkar, *Black hole entropy and attractors*, Class. Quant. Grav. 23 (2006) 957.
- [28] S. Bellucci, S. Ferrara, A. Marrani, *Attractors in Black*, Fortsch.Phys. 56 (2008) 761, [arXiv:0805.1310](#).
- [29] A. S. Chou, R. Kallosh, J. Rahmfeld, S. J. Rey, M. Shmakova and W. K. Wong, Nucl. Phys. B508 (1997) 147, [arXiv:hep-th/9704142](#).
- [30] S. Ferrara and M. Gunaydin, Nucl. Phys. B59 (2006)1, [arXiv:hep-th/0606108](#).

- [31] B. L. Cerchiai, S. Ferrara, A. Marrani and B. Zumino, Phys. Rev. D82 (2010)085010, [arXiv:1006.310](#).
- [32] L. Andrianopoli, S. Ferrara, A. Marrani and M. Trigiante, *Non-BPS Attractors in 5d and 6d Extended Supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. B795 (2008) 428.
- [33] B. Skauli, *Curve Classes on Calabi-Yau Complete Intersections in Toric Varieties*, [arXiv:1911.03146](#).
- [34] M. Kreuzer and H. Skarke, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 4 (2000) 1209, [arXiv:hep-th/0002240](#).
- [35] R. Altman, J. Gray, Y. H. He, V. Jejjala and B. D. Nelson, JHEP 02 (2015) 158, [arXiv:1411.1418](#).
- [36] R. Altman, Y. H. He, V. Jejjala and B. D. Nelson, Phys. Rev. D7, no.4 (2018)046003, [arXiv:1706.09070](#).
- [37] R. Altman, J. Carifio, X. Gao and B. D. Nelson, JHEP 03, (2022)087, [arXiv:2111.03078](#).
- [38] <http://www.rossealtman.com/toriccy/index.html>.
- [39] A. Belhaj, J. Rasmussen, *On toric geometry, spin(7) manifolds, and type two superstring compactifications*, J.Math.Phys. 46 (2005) 043511, [arXiv:hep-th/0402119](#).
- [40] A. Belhaj, L. B. Drissi, J. Rasmussen, *On N=1 gauge models from geometric engineering in M-theory*, Class. Quant. Grav. 20 (2003)4973.
- [41] A. Belhaj, J. Rasmussen, A. Sebbar, M.B. Sedra, *On ADE quiver models and F-theory compactification*, J.Phys.A 39 (2006) 9339.
- [42] P. Candelas, E. Peralov and G. Rajesh, *Toric Geometry and Enhanced Gauge Symmetry of F-Theory/ Heterotic Vacua*, Nucl.Phys. B507 (1997) 445, [hep-th/9704097](#).
- [43] W. Fulton, *Introduction to Toric varieties*, Annals of Math. Studies, No.131, Princeton University Press, 1993.
- [44] N. C. Leung and C. Vafa, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 2 (1998) 91, [hep-th/9711013](#).
- [45] E. Witten, *Phases of N = 2 theories in two dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. B403 (1993) 159, [hep-th/9301042](#).
- [46] P. Aspinwall, B.R. Greene and R. Morrison, *Calabi-Yau Moduli Space, Mirror Manifolds and Spacetime Topology Change in String Theory*, Nucl. Phys B416 (1994) 414, [arXiv:hep-th/9309097](#).

- [47] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, V. Faraoni, *Generalized Black Hole Entropy in Two Dimensions*, Int.J.Geom.Meth.Mod.Phys. 20, 09 (2023) 2350148, [arXiv: 2303.02663](#).
- [48] S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov, V. Faraoni, *Alternative entropies and consistent black hole thermodynamics*, Int.J.Geom.Meth.Mod.Phys. 19, 13 (2022) 2250210, [arXiv: 2207.07905](#).
- [49] B.S. Acharya, *M theory, Joyce orbifolds and super Yang-Mills*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 3 (1999) 227, [hep-th/9812205](#).
- [50] A. Belhaj, *M-theory on  $G(2)$  manifolds and the method of  $(p,q)$  brane webs*, J.Phys.A 37 (2004) 5067, [hep-th/0303198](#).