

SD-brane gravity fields and rolling tachyons

Frédéric Leblond* and Amanda W. Peet†

* *Department of Physics, McGill University, Montréal, Québec H3A 2T8 Canada*

* *Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, Waterloo, Ontario N2J 2W9 Canada*

† *Radcliffe Institute, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138 USA*

† *Department of Physics, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A7 Canada*

† *Cosmology and Gravity Program, Canadian Institute for Advanced Research*

ABSTRACT: S(pacelike)D-branes are objects arising naturally in string theory when Dirichlet boundary conditions are imposed on the time direction. SD-brane physics is inherently time-dependent. Previous investigations of gravity fields of SD-branes have yielded undesirable naked spacelike singularities. We set up the problem of coupling the most relevant open-string tachyonic mode to massless closed-string modes in the bulk, with backreaction and Ramond-Ramond fields included. We find solutions numerically in a self-consistent approximation, by starting integration when the tachyon is on the top of its potential hill and imposing time-reversal symmetry; our solutions are naturally asymptotically flat. We find completely nonsingular evolution; in particular, the dilaton and curvature are well-behaved for all time. The essential mechanism for spacetime singularity resolution is the inclusion of full backreaction between the bulk fields and the rolling tachyon. Our analysis is not the final word on the story, because we have to make some significant approximations, most notably homogeneity of the tachyon on the unstable branes. Nonetheless, we provide significant progress in plugging a gaping hole in prior understanding of the gravity fields of SD-branes.

KEYWORDS: S-branes, rolling tachyons, singularity resolution.

*E-mail: fleblond@perimeterinstitute.ca

†E-mail: peet@physics.utoronto.ca

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Singular supergravity SD-branes: Review	3
2.1 Sourceless SD-brane supergravity solutions	4
2.2 Unstable brane probes in sourceless SD-brane backgrounds	6
3. Supergravity SD-branes with a tachyon source	8
3.1 Preliminaries: action and equations of motion	9
3.2 The homogeneous brane self-consistent ansatz	12
4. The roll of the tachyon	16
4.1 Tachyon evolution in flat space	16
4.2 R-symmetry group	17
4.3 Numerical SD-brane solutions	18
4.3.1 Deformation of the tachyon field	19
4.3.2 Time-dependent string coupling	20
4.3.3 Gravitational field	22
4.3.4 Ramond-Ramond field	23
4.3.5 Curvature bounds and asymptotic flatness	24
4.3.6 The $p = 7$ and space-filling SD-branes	26
4.4 Einstein frame	27
5. Discussion	28
A. Regular KMP SD-brane solutions	31
A.1 The region close to the origin	31
A.2 Horizon physics	31
A.3 Unstable brane probe analysis	32
B. Tachyon in flat space	34

1. Introduction

SD-branes in string theory were first studied by Gutperle and Strominger in ref. [1]. They were introduced as objects arising when Dirichlet boundary conditions on open strings are put on the time coordinate, as well as on spatial coordinates. SD-branes are not supersymmetric objects, which makes them hard to handle but potentially very interesting. The boundary conditions for SD-branes imply that they live for only an “instant” of time, and so the worldvolume is purely spatial. SD-branes should not be confused with instantons, however; it is important that their lives are lived out in a Lorentzian signature context.

SD-branes are especially interesting objects to study in the context of tachyon condensation, which will be the arena of our investigation. SD-branes are indeed inherently related to the general study of time-dependence in string theory. One of the original goals of ref. [1] was in fact to seek examples of gauge/gravity dualities where a time direction on the gravity side is reconstructed by a Euclidean field theory.¹

There have been several investigations of SD-branes since they were introduced [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. Most of them involve taking the limit $g_s \rightarrow 0$, the regime in which perturbative string computations can be done. As the tachyon rolls down its potential hill, there is a divergence in production of higher mass open string modes [6, 11, 10]. This divergence occurs before the tachyon gets to the bottom of the potential well, as it must because there are no perturbative open string excitations around the true minimum of the tachyon potential [12]. Also, the time taken to convert the energy of the rolling tachyon into these massive open string modes is of order² $\mathcal{O}(g_s^0)$. This analysis was done for a single SD-brane using CFT methods; analysis for production of massive closed string modes was also done [13, 14].

One aspect of SD-brane physics has become clear: that the decoupling limit applied to SD-branes is not a smooth limit like it is for regular D-branes. In particular, as $g_s \rightarrow 0$ the brane tachyon becomes decoupled from bulk modes, which were however the most natural modes into which the initial energy of the unstable brane should decay. Then, the endpoint of the rolling tachyon must include a somewhat mysterious substance called “tachyon matter” [15]. Consideration of the full problem with g_s finite would presumably eliminate the need for mysterious tachyon matter; this was in fact part of our motivation for this work. Regarding production of closed string massive modes, at very small g_s , it seemed that there was some debate [13, 14] about the form of a divergence. However, an infinite production of closed string modes might not actually be too surprising for an extended object, because finite tension means infinite energy. In any case, unstable brane decay should presumably be a physically smooth process for $\{g_s, \ell_s\}$ finite.

The point of view that we will be taking is to consider a system of N SD-branes, with $g_s N$ large, study the overall centre-of-mass tachyon, and couple it to bulk massless closed

¹An attempt to find a realization for such a duality is the dS/CFT correspondence [2] – see also ref. [3] for an extensive list of references.

²In later sections we will see that our calculation, which includes gravity backreaction, agrees with this in the sense that the time it takes for the tachyon to decay only slightly depends on the particular value of g_s .

string modes. Obviously, it would be nice to understand the full problem including coupling to all massive open and closed string modes, but this is a hard problem beyond our reach. We will make a beginning here with a quantitative analysis involving only the lowest modes in each of the open and closed string sectors. We believe that our approach, while “lowbrow” by comparison to SFT computations, already shows some very interesting physics.

The punchline of our paper will be this: we find nonsingular solutions for the evolution of the open string tachyon coupled to bulk supergravity modes. This plugs a gaping hole in our previous understanding [1, 4, 5] of the supergravity fields arising from a large number of SD-branes. All previous attempts at describing SD-branes in the context of supergravity had found that the corresponding solutions were plagued with naked spacelike singularities. We find that resolution of these singularities is achieved in a conceptually simple way: by including full backreaction on the rolling tachyon.

Our investigation can also be considered to shed light on the question of tachyon cosmology [16] including Ramond-Ramond fields, the effect of which was ignored in previous investigations. Tachyon cosmology itself may not yet provide realistic models for inflation, nonetheless, see recent work including e.g. [17]. One of the reasons is that, in the low-energy actions used to describe tachyon cosmology dynamics, there is only one length scale — the string length. Tachyon cosmology involving brane-antibrane annihilation may be relevant only to a pre-inflationary period, but it is interesting to analyze the dynamics from the “top-down” perspective in string theory. It would certainly be interesting if a mechanism generating a lower scale for inflation were found.

The plan of our paper is as follows. We begin by reviewing in section 2 the previous work on gravity fields of SD-branes, and commenting on the nature of singularities found in the past. In subsection 2.1 we discuss pathologies of the solutions found in refs. [4, 5], where only supergravity fields were considered. In subsection 2.2 we move to discussing ref. [7], in which an unstable brane probe was coupled to a $d = 4$ SD0-brane supergravity background; we generalized their arguments but still find generic singularities in the probe approximation (exceptions are considered in Appendix A). In section 3 we set up the full backreacted problem of interest. The equations are naturally highly nonlinear, and since backreaction is essential we have no desire to ignore it or treat it perturbatively. We need to use a particular homogeneous ansatz to facilitate solution of the equations of motion, and we discuss implications of the ansatz. In section 4 we demonstrate numerical solutions of our backreaction-inclusive equations, and interpret qualitative features found. In particular, we follow carefully the evolution of both the dilaton and curvature invariants. Lastly, in the Discussion section we summarize our conclusions, open issues, and directions of future work.

2. Singular supergravity SD-branes: Review

In the paper [1], a small number of supergravity solutions, thought to be appropriate for a large number N of SD-branes, were presented. Subsequently, the class of supergravity solutions was widened considerably, simultaneously by two groups (refs. [4] and [5]). A later

paper showed that these two sets of solutions were equivalent [8], by matching boundary conditions on asymptotic fields and finding the coordinate transformation explicitly.

2.1 Sourceless SD-brane supergravity solutions

The convention of ref. [1], which we will use, is that SD p -branes have $(p+1)$ worldvolume coordinates. We call these \vec{y} . There is also the time coordinate t , and the $(8-p)$ overall transverse coordinates \vec{x} .

The most general SD p -brane supergravity solutions of refs. [4] and [5] can then be written in string frame as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
ds_{S^p}^2 &= F(t)^{1/2} \beta(t)^G \alpha(t)^H (-dt^2 + t^2 dH_{8-p}^2(\vec{x})) \\
&\quad + F(t)^{-1/2} \left[\sum_{i=2}^{p+1} \left(\frac{\beta(t)}{\alpha(t)} \right)^{-k_i} (dy^i)^2 + \left(\frac{\beta(t)}{\alpha(t)} \right)^{k_1 + \tilde{k}} (dy^1)^2 \right], \\
e^{2\Phi} &= F(t)^{\frac{3-p}{2}} \left(\frac{\beta(t)}{\alpha(t)} \right)^{-\sum_{i=2}^{p+1} k_i}, \\
C^{(p+1)} &= \sin \theta \cos \theta \frac{C(t)}{F(t)} dy^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dy^{p+1},
\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$C(t) \equiv \left(\frac{\beta(t)}{\alpha(t)} \right)^{k_1} - \left(\frac{\beta(t)}{\alpha(t)} \right)^{\tilde{k}}, \quad F(t) \equiv \cos^2 \theta \left(\frac{\beta(t)}{\alpha(t)} \right)^{\tilde{k}} + \sin^2 \theta \left(\frac{\beta(t)}{\alpha(t)} \right)^{k_1}, \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$\alpha(t) \equiv 1 + \left(\frac{\omega}{t} \right)^{7-p}, \quad \beta(t) \equiv 1 - \left(\frac{\omega}{t} \right)^{7-p}. \tag{2.3}$$

The supergravity equations of motion will be satisfied when the exponents satisfy the constraints,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{k}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{p+1} k_i^2 + \frac{7-p}{4} (H-G)^2 - 4 \frac{8-p}{7-p} &= 0, \\
\tilde{k} + \sum_{i=1}^{p+1} k_i - \frac{7-p}{2} (H-G) &= 0, \\
H + G - \frac{4}{7-p} &= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

The general metric above is not isotropic in the worldvolume directions \vec{y} . However, from a microscopic point of view, one expects that the supergravity solution would have an isotropic worldvolume. Isotropy in the worldvolume will be restored in the above solution for the choice $-k_2 = \dots = -k_{p+1} = k_1 + \tilde{k} \equiv n$. Unfortunately, the isotropy requirement excludes

SD-brane solutions with regular horizon.³ In fact, the curvature invariants associated to all isotropic solutions diverge at $t = \pm\omega$ and $t = 0$. Consequently, although they possess the right symmetries and charge, these solutions do not appear to be well-defined.

Besides, SD-branes should be represented by solutions with, roughly, three distinct regions: the infinite past with incoming radiation only in the form of massless closed strings, an intermediate region with both open and closed strings, and finally the infinite future with dissipating outgoing radiation in the form of massless closed strings. But the supergravity solutions of refs. [1, 4, 5] cannot represent this process, because there are no rules for deciding how to go through the singular regions (see, however, Appendix A where we show that some anisotropic solutions avoid the pathology).

Nevertheless, the isotropic solutions have a positive feature worth noting: they have the correct asymptotics at large time. In the limit that the functions $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ become trivial, part of the metric is simply the Milne universe: flat Minkowski space foliated by hyperbolic sections,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} ds_{S_p}^2 = -dt^2 + t^2 dH_{8-p}^2(\vec{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^{p+2} (dy^i)^2. \quad (2.5)$$

On the other hand, there are (at least) two reasons to suspect that the above solutions are not the final word in the SD-brane supergravity story. The first is that there are one too many parameters in the solution, by comparison to expectations from microscopies of SD-branes [5]. A possible explanation for this may be as follows. In the rest of our paper, we will be showing that the full coupling/backreaction between the open-string tachyon and the closed-string bulk modes is crucial for resolution of spacetime singularities. It is possible that the freedom in the supergravity solutions may correspond to a freedom in picking boundary conditions for the rolling tachyon — the coupling to which was not included in ref. [1, 4, 5].

The most noticeable negative feature of the above solutions is that the isotropic solutions are nakedly singular. Quite generally, nakedly singular spacetimes arising in low-energy string theory come under immediate suspicion, even though they are solutions to the supergravity field equations. No-hair theorems are usually what we rely on in order to be sure that we have the unique supergravity solution, but no-hair theorems are never valid for solutions with *naked* spacetime singularities. It is worth noting that it has been shown with an explicit counterexample [18] that even no-hair theorems themselves fail for black holes in $d = 5$ with mass and angular momentum — and hence the idea of no-hair theorems in all higher dimensions is under suspicion. (Nonetheless, with particular assumptions about field couplings, no-hair theorems can be proven for static asymptotically flat dilaton black holes [19]. Also, uniqueness of the *supersymmetric* rotating BMPV [20] black hole in $d = 5$ has been proven [21].) Even if a no-hair theorem appropriate to the supergravity theory involving SD-branes could

³We should be more precise with horizons (in time) for spacetimes without a timelike Killing vector. We loosely call an horizon the place, in the particular system of coordinate system considered here, where, for null trajectories (the light-cones), the derivative of any of the spatial directions with respect to time either vanishes or diverges.

be proven, however, the above solutions we have reviewed would be ruled out as candidates because their singularities are uncontrollably nasty. So we have to look elsewhere.

Let us take a brief sidetrip here to comment on the singularity story for supergravity fields of $N \gg 1$ regular D-branes with timelike worldvolume. Certainly, the geometry of BPS D3-branes is nonsingular, and there are several other pretty situations known in the literature where branes “melt” into fluxes: the sources are no longer needed. However, the disappearance of D-brane sources for supergravity fields only occurs when the branes are BPS. If any energy density above BPS is added to these systems, singularities reappear: this certainly happens for the D3-brane system. Also, in the low-energy approximation to string theory, it is misleading to think of supergravity fields of Dp -branes as simple condensates of massless closed string modes. The reason is directly analogous to the fact that the Coulomb field of an electron cannot be a photon condensate because the photon is transverse. Similarly, Coulomb Ramond-Ramond fields of Dp -branes cannot be represented by supergravity fields alone.⁴ This river runs deeper: in the decoupling limit, resolution of dilaton and curvature singularities for $p \neq 3$ Dp -branes is in fact *provided* by the gauge theory on the D-branes [22, 23].

Let us now get back to our SD-branes. The supergravity situation looks similar to that for non-BPS (ordinary) D-branes: it seems that brane modes will be required for singularity resolution. Therefore, we are motivated to try to solve all problems with prior candidate SD-brane spacetimes by solving the coupled system of brane tachyon plus bulk supergravity fields with full backreaction.

2.2 Unstable brane probes in sourceless SD-brane backgrounds

The first progress towards the goal of singularity resolution in SD-brane systems was made by Buchel, Langfelder and Walcher [7]. We now briefly review what is, for our purposes, the most relevant point of their work.

Essentially, they take the reasonable point of view that the process of creation and subsequent decay of an SDp -brane must be driven by a single open string mode: the tachyon field denoted $T(t)$, which lives on the associated unstable $D(p+1)$ -brane. They use the $p = 0$ *non-dilatonic* version of the worldvolume action [24, 25, 26, 27, 15, 28]

$$S_{brane} = -T_{p+1} \int d^{p+2}y e^{-\Phi} V(T) \sqrt{-\det (\mathcal{P}G_{\alpha\beta} + \partial_{\alpha}T \partial_{\beta}T)} + \mu_{p+1} \int f(T) dT \wedge C^{(p+1)}, \quad (2.6)$$

to study the dynamics of the tachyon and its couplings with bulk (closed string) modes. The operation \mathcal{P} is for pullback, and $\alpha, \beta = 1 \dots (p+1)$. In section 3.1 we will comment both on the validity of this type of effective action, and on the expected form for the tachyon potential $V(T)$ and the Ramond-Ramond coupling $f(T)$. For now, we just use it.

⁴This is the case even though Dp -branes are “solitonic” in string theory while electrons are fundamental in QED. The straightforward argument we use here depends only on the couplings of the charge-carrying objects to the bulk gauge fields. We thank Abhay Ashtekar for a discussion on this issue.

The way we look at the calculation of ref. [7] is as follows. Supergravity SD-brane fields should be regarded as arising directly from a large number of unstable branes. Then, using the intuition gained from studying the enhançon mechanism [29], it is natural to use an unstable brane probe to study more substantively the candidate supergravity solutions of refs. [4, 5]. Then, we look for problems arising in the probe calculation. The idea is that whenever the probe analysis goes wrong, it signals a pathology for the gravitational background. There are at least two ways the probe analysis can signal a problem: infinite energy or pressure density for the tachyon may be induced, $(\rho_{probe}, p_{probe} \rightarrow \pm\infty)$, or there might not exist any reasonable solutions for $T(t)$ across the horizon.

So let us consider inserting an unstable brane probe in a background with fields corresponding to the sourceless SD-brane supergravity fields, eqs. (2.1), of the previous subsection. The equation of motion for the open string tachyon is, generally,

$$\begin{aligned} & (-g_{tt})^{\frac{1}{2}} (g_{y^i y^i})^{\frac{p}{2}} (g_{y^1 y^1})^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\Phi} \frac{\partial V(T)}{\partial T} \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & + f(T) F^{(p+2)} + \frac{d}{dt} \left(\dot{T} V(T) \frac{(g_{y^1 y^1})^{\frac{1}{2}} (g_{y^i y^i})^{\frac{p}{2}}}{e^{\Phi} \Delta^{\frac{1}{2}} (-g_{tt})^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

where $\dot{} \equiv d/dt$, our notation for the Ramond-Ramond field strength is $F^{(p+2)} = dC^{(p+1)}$, we have factored out T_{p+1} by including a factor of g_s in C , and we also defined the following expression,

$$\Delta = 1 + \frac{(\dot{T})^2}{g_{tt}}. \quad (2.8)$$

The question needing attention here is whether or not the tachyon field, regarded as a probe,⁵ is well-behaved when inserted in the candidate supergravity backgrounds (2.1). Ref. [7] provided a clear answer for the case of a $d = 4$ SD0-brane with dilaton field set to zero⁶. Let us now see how this goes.

The $d = 4$ SD0-brane background introduced in ref. [1] has the form,

$$g_{tt} = -g^{y^1 y^1} = -\frac{Q^2}{\omega^2} \frac{t^2}{t^2 - \omega^2}, \quad g_{y^i y^i} = 0, \quad g_{xx} = \frac{Q^2}{\omega^2} t^2, \quad (2.9)$$

and

$$F_2 = Q\epsilon_2, \quad \Phi = 0. \quad (2.10)$$

This spacetime metric has a regular horizon (a coordinate singularity) at $t = \omega$, and a genuine timelike curvature singularity at $t = 0$. The expressions for the energy density (T_t^t) and the pressure ($T_{y^1}^{y^1}$) associated with the probe are respectively,

$$\rho_{probe} \sim \frac{V(T)}{\Delta^{1/2}}, \quad p_{probe} \sim V(T)\Delta^{1/2}. \quad (2.11)$$

⁵The unstable brane will be a probe as long as its backreaction is small and can therefore be treated self-consistently as a perturbation.

⁶The authors of ref. [7] also investigated the effect of tachyon backreaction but the ansatz they used for the metric was not general enough.

The only time (apart from $t = 0$) when the probe limit becomes ill-defined is around $t = \omega$. In fact, in the near horizon limit, the dynamical quantity Δ satisfies the simple ordinary differential equation,

$$\Delta^2 - \Delta + (t - \omega)\dot{\Delta} = 0. \quad (2.12)$$

This has the general solution

$$\Delta = \frac{t - \omega}{t - \omega + g}, \quad (2.13)$$

where g is a constant of integration. There are two possible solutions at $t = \omega$: $\Delta = 0$ ($g \neq 0$) or $\Delta = 1$ ($g = 0$). Clearly, the case for which $\Delta = 0$ corresponds to the probe limit breaking down since the energy density of the unstable brane diverges. The other possibility, $\Delta = 1$, implies that the time-derivative of the tachyon diverges on the horizon. This last case is clearly pathological and cannot correspond to a physically relevant tachyon field solution.

The conclusion is that unstable brane *probes* are not well-defined in the SD0-brane background. Not only are they useless to resolve the timelike singularity at $t = 0$ but, worse, they appear to generically induce a spacelike curvature singularity on the horizon at $t = \omega$. That is, if we take the probe story to be a good indicator of the story for the full backreacted problem.

One of our first motivations for the work leading to our paper was to plumb how restricted the conclusions of ref. [7] were. Did this above story work only for bulk couplings of the kind arising for SD0-branes in $d = 4$, where no dilaton field appears? Was it true only for the case of SD0-branes, which are a special case for SD p -branes since there can be no anisotropy in a one-dimensional worldvolume? Are all timelike clothed singularities turned into naked spacelike singularities by probes? Could we even trust the probe approximation to tell us anything about the solution with full backreaction?

The first generalization we considered was to look at an unstable brane probe in the background of the isotropic SD p -brane solutions of ref. [5]. However, what we saw there was that the naked spacelike singularities remained naked spacelike singularities; the small effect of the probe could not undo that pathology. Next, we moved to analyzing anisotropic solutions of the form (2.1), those with regular horizons. Some of these are actually completely nonsingular(!); we analyzed the details of the probe computation in those backgrounds, and the specifics are recorded in Appendix A. The results there are simple to summarize: the solutions with singularities hidden behind horizons do not give rise to conclusions qualitatively different than what we have reviewed here for $d = 4$ SD0-branes. The picture therefore remains unsatisfactory.

The upshot, then, is that the probe story does not resolve singularities found for sourceless supergravity SD-brane solutions. So we now move to the full backreacted problem, which is the main content of our paper.

3. Supergravity SD-branes with a tachyon source

In this section we find, in the context of supergravity, the equations of motion associated with

the real-time (formation and) decay of a clump of unstable D-branes. We begin this section by writing the form of the action which we will use in our analysis. We will concentrate on only the most relevant⁷ modes in both the open and closed string sectors; in other words, we keep in our analysis only the (homogeneous) tachyon and massless bulk supergravity fields. Potentially, the effect of massive modes could be encoded in a modified equation of state for the tachyon fluid on the unstable D-brane.⁸ We leave for future work the issue of non-homogeneous tachyonic modes, and of massive string modes in both the open and closed string sectors, for the coupled bulk-brane system with full backreaction. In order to use the supergravity approximation here self-consistently, we will take g_s small but $g_s N$ large, and time-derivatives will be small compared to ℓ_s . We will see that it is simple to choose boundary conditions in our numerical integration such that these remain true for all time.

3.1 Preliminaries: action and equations of motion

For this section we will be able to suppress R-R Chern-Simons terms in writing the bulk action. This is a consistent truncation, to set the NS-NS two-form to zero throughout the evolution of the system of interest, as long as consistency conditions on the R-R fields are satisfied. E.g. for the SD2-brane system with R-R field $C^{(3)}$ activated, it is necessary to make certain that $dC^3 \wedge dC^3 = 0$ in order not to activate the NS-NS two-form and the accompanying Chern-Simons terms. Other cases are related to this one by T-duality. Therefore, we allow only electric-type coupling of the SDp-brane to C^{p+1} (or equivalently magnetic-type coupling to C^{7-p}). Later we will show that this ansatz is physically consistent provided we assume that there is $ISO(p+1)$ symmetry along the worldvolume of the SDp-brane, the object we are interested in. This is equivalent to considering *only the lowest-mass tachyon*, i.e. not allowing any excitations of the brane tachyon along the spatial worldvolume directions. Of course, the R-R field strengths are then very simple: $G^{p+2} = dC^{p+1}$, and the string frame bulk action takes the simple [30]

$$S_{\text{bulk}} = \frac{1}{16\pi G_{10}} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-g} \left\{ e^{-2\Phi} [\mathcal{R} + 4(\partial\Phi)^2] - \frac{1}{2} |dC^{p+1}|^2 \right\}. \quad (3.1)$$

We used mostly plus signature. In the above conventions, the R-R field solutions automatically get a factor of g_s (as we mentioned also in the previous subsection), and

$$16\pi G_{10} = (2\pi)^7 g_s^2 \ell_s^8, \quad \tau_{Dp} = \frac{1}{g_s (2\pi)^p \ell_s^{p+1}}. \quad (3.2)$$

Our analytical and numerical results in following sections will be given *in string frame*. If desired, it is easy to convert to Einstein frame – with metric $\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu}$ – with canonical normalization of the metric and positive dilaton kinetic energy, by using the standard $d = 10$ conformal transformation

$$\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} = e^{-(\Phi - \Phi_\infty)/2} g_{\mu\nu}. \quad (3.3)$$

⁷Relevant in the technical sense.

⁸We thank Andy Strominger for this suggestion.

Stress-tensors are defined in Einstein frame,

$$\tilde{T}_{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{-1}{\sqrt{-\tilde{g}}} \frac{\delta S_{\text{matter}}}{\delta \tilde{g}^{\mu\nu}}, \quad (3.4)$$

with the usual

$$\tilde{T}_{\mu\nu} [\Phi] = \frac{1}{2} \left[\partial_\mu \Phi \partial_\nu \Phi - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} (\partial \tilde{\Phi})^2 \right], \quad (3.5)$$

$$\tilde{T}_{\mu\nu} [C^{p+1}] = \frac{1}{2(p+1)!} e^{(3-p)\Phi/2} \left[\tilde{G}_\mu^{\lambda_2 \dots \lambda_{p+2}} G_{\nu \lambda_2 \dots \lambda_{p+2}} - \frac{1}{2(p+2)} \tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^2 \right]. \quad (3.6)$$

We can transform to string-frame “Einstein” equation using standard formulæ

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} \tilde{\mathcal{R}} - \frac{1}{2} \left[\partial_\mu \Phi \partial_\nu \Phi - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} (\partial \tilde{\Phi})^2 \right] \quad (3.7)$$

$$= \mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{R} + 2 \left[\nabla_\mu \partial_\nu \Phi - g_{\mu\nu} \nabla^2 \Phi + g_{\mu\nu} (\partial \Phi)^2 \right]. \quad (3.8)$$

For all matter fields except the dilaton, it is therefore obvious that string frame “stress-tensors” take the form

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \frac{-1}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\delta S_{\text{matter}}}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}}. \quad (3.9)$$

For the dilaton we find

$$T_\nu^\mu [\Phi] = 2 \left[-\nabla^\mu \partial_\nu \Phi + g^\mu_\nu \nabla^2 \Phi - g^\mu_\nu (\partial \Phi)^2 \right], \quad (3.10)$$

and, obviously, familiar energy conditions for bulk fields are only satisfied in Einstein frame, not string frame.

For the bulk field equations, we must include coupling to the brane tachyon — this is of course the main point of our paper. Hence, we now turn to the brane action. The brane theory is that appropriate to unstable D(p+1)-branes, for SDp-branes. We consider N branes. At low energy, the overall $U(1)$ center-of-mass tachyon T couples as follows:

$$S_{\text{brane}} = \frac{\Lambda}{16\pi G_{10}} \left\{ \int dt d^{p+1} y \left[-e^{-\Phi} \sqrt{-AV(T)} \right] + \int f(T) dT \wedge C^{p+1} \right\}, \quad (3.11)$$

where the matrix $A_{\alpha\beta}$ is defined as

$$A_{\alpha\beta} = \mathcal{P} (G_{\alpha\beta} + B_{\alpha\beta}) + F_{\alpha\beta} + \partial_\alpha T \partial_\beta T, \quad (3.12)$$

where \mathcal{P} stands for pullback. For the constants, our conventions are that T is normalized like $F_{\alpha\beta}$, and also

$$\Lambda \equiv \frac{N \mu_{p+1}}{g_s} (16\pi G_{10}) = (N g_s) (2\pi \ell_s)^{6-p}. \quad (3.13)$$

Notice that Λ is proportional to $g_s N$. This will be the *sole* continuous⁹ control parameter associated with the physics of our final solutions for the coupled tachyon-supergravity system.

⁹ Λ is effectively continuous in the supergravity approximation since $g_s N$ is large and all derivatives small in string (ℓ_s) units.

It is important to know when we can expect to trust the action we use. Our approach consists in assuming that the kinetic terms of the open string tachyon field are re-summed to take a Born-Infeld-like form. Strictly speaking, this has only been shown to be a valid claim late in the tachyon evolution. We refer the reader to ref. [28] for more details on the limits in which this approximation holds. The functions $V(T)$ and $f(T)$ are therefore not known exactly at all times. For definiteness in our numerical analysis, we will choose a specific form and assume that the dynamics of the tachyon is governed by eq. (3.11). For an SD-brane, we make the choice $V(T) = f(T) = 1/\cosh(T/\sqrt{2})$ which has been shown to be the correct large time behavior of the couplings. Our results turn out to be quite robust, in that their qualitative features do not depend on the precise form of $V(T)$ and $f(T)$.

For the remainder of our discussion it will be convenient to use static gauge, which is an appropriate gauge choice for our problem of interest. Therefore, in the following, we will be rather cavalier about dropping pullback signs.

When we get to solving the coupled brane-bulk equations, it will be convenient to allow for a density of branes, denoted ρ_\perp , in the transverse space:

$$\int_{\text{brane}} dt d^{p+1}y \longrightarrow \int_{\text{bulk}} dt d^{p+1}x d^{8-p}x \rho_\perp. \quad (3.14)$$

Therefore our brane action becomes

$$S_{\text{brane}} = \frac{\Lambda}{16\pi G_{10}} \int d^{10}x \rho_\perp \left\{ -V(T)\sqrt{-A}e^{-\Phi} + f(T)\epsilon^{\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_{p+2}} C_{[\lambda_2 \dots \lambda_{p+2}} \partial_{\mu_1]} T \right\} \quad (3.15)$$

where ϵ is the worldvolume permutation tensor with values $(0, \pm 1)$.

We are now ready to write down the coupled field equations. The simplest bulk equation to pick off is the dilaton. In string frame we see immediately that

$$\nabla^2 \Phi - (\partial\Phi)^2 + \frac{1}{4}\mathcal{R} = \frac{1}{8} \left(\frac{\Lambda \rho_\perp}{\sqrt{-g}} \right) e^{+\Phi} V(T) \sqrt{-A}, \quad (3.16)$$

and for the Ramond-Ramond field

$$\nabla_\mu G^{\mu\lambda_2 \dots \lambda_{p+2}} = - \left(\frac{\Lambda \rho_\perp}{\sqrt{-g}} \right) f(T) \epsilon^{\mu\lambda_2 \dots \lambda_{p+2}} \partial_\mu T. \quad (3.17)$$

For the metric equation of motion (string frame ‘‘Einstein’’ equations), it is convenient to define

$$\mathcal{R}^\mu{}_\nu = \hat{T}^\mu{}_\nu \equiv T^\mu{}_\nu - \frac{1}{8} T^\lambda{}_\lambda. \quad (3.18)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\hat{T}^\mu{}_\nu[\Phi] = -2\nabla^\mu \partial_\nu \Phi - \frac{1}{4} g^\mu{}_\nu \nabla^2 \Phi + \frac{1}{2} (\partial\Phi)^2 g^\mu{}_\nu. \quad (3.19)$$

For the brane stress-tensor, we need to figure out the dependence of $\sqrt{-A}$ on $g_{\mu\nu}$ (the Wess-Zumino term clearly does not contribute). We find

$$T^\mu{}_\nu[T] = -\frac{1}{2} e^\Phi \left(\frac{\Lambda \rho_\perp}{\sqrt{-g}} \right) V(T) \sqrt{-A} (A^{-1})^{\alpha\mu} g_{\alpha\nu}, \quad (3.20)$$

$$\hat{T}^\mu{}_\nu[T] = -\frac{1}{2}e^\Phi \left(\frac{\Lambda\rho_\perp}{\sqrt{-g}} \right) V(T)\sqrt{-A} \left[(A^{-1})^{\alpha\mu}g_{\alpha\nu} - \frac{1}{8}g_\nu^\mu(A^{-1})^{\lambda\sigma}g_{\lambda\sigma} \right]. \quad (3.21)$$

The other object we need for the metric equation of motion is

$$\hat{T}^\mu{}_\nu[C] = \frac{1}{2(p+1)!}e^{2\Phi}G^{\mu\lambda\dots\sigma}G_{\nu\lambda\dots\sigma} - \frac{(p+1)}{16}e^{2\Phi}\frac{G^2}{(p+2)!}g^\mu{}_\nu. \quad (3.22)$$

Lastly, for the tachyon we find the equation of motion

$$\frac{dV}{dT}e^{-\Phi}\sqrt{-A} - \partial_\mu \left[V(T)e^{-\Phi}\sqrt{-A}(A^{-1})^{\mu\alpha}\partial_\alpha T \right] + f(T)\epsilon^{\mu\dots\lambda}G_{\mu\dots\lambda} = 0. \quad (3.23)$$

In the Discussion section we will make some remarks about the robustness of these equations.

3.2 The homogeneous brane self-consistent ansatz

As pointed out earlier, we are interested in time-dependent processes by which massless Type IIa or Type IIb supergravity fields are sourced by an open-string tachyon mode on the worldvolume of an unstable brane. A reasonable assumption is that the gravitational background generated by backreaction of the rolling tachyon is of the form

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a(t)^2 d\Sigma_{p+1}^2(k_\parallel) + R(t)^2 d\Sigma_{8-p}^2(k_\perp), \quad (3.24)$$

where the n -dimensional Euclidean metric $d\Sigma_n^2(k)$ is

$$d\Sigma_n^2(k) = \begin{cases} d\Omega_n^2 & \text{for } k = +1 \\ dE_n^2 & \text{for } k = 0 \\ dH_n^2 & \text{for } k = -1, \end{cases} \quad (3.25)$$

where $d\Omega_n^2$ is the unit metric on S^n , dE_n^2 the flat Euclidean metric, and dH_n^2 the ‘unit metric’ on n -dimensional hyperbolic space H^n . The corresponding symmetry groups are

$$\begin{cases} SO(n+1) & \text{for } k = +1 \\ ISO(n) & \text{for } k = 0 \\ SO(1, n) & \text{for } k = -1. \end{cases} \quad (3.26)$$

For $k = \pm 1$ we obviously require that $n \geq 2$.

We note that the ansatz (3.24), for $k_\perp = -1$ and $k_\parallel = 0$, appears, after using an appropriate change of coordinates, to be equivalent to that considered for supergravity SD-branes in ref. [5]. One can show that this is actually *not* the case. In order to bring solutions of the form (3.24) with $-\infty < t < +\infty$ to the form introduced in ref. [5] we must find a change of coordinates such that

$$dt^2 = d\tau^2 F(\tau)^{1/2} (\beta(\tau)\alpha(\tau))^{\frac{2}{7-p}} \left(\frac{\beta(\tau)}{\alpha(\tau)} \right)^{(k_1 + \tilde{k})(p-1)/(7-p)}, \quad (3.27)$$

where $-\infty < \tau < +\infty$. It turns out that for all values of the parameters associated with the isotropic supergravity solutions, such a change of coordinates does not exist. However,

the main feature of our analysis is that we are allowing for modifications of SD-brane physics in the region close to the spacelike worldvolume (the region around $t = 0$ for the system of coordinates we use). It should therefore have been expected that our new solutions are not included in those presented in ref. [5]. However, we do expect the asymptotics to agree.

To be physically relevant, solutions should be asymptotically flat. In other words, SD-brane gravity solutions will be such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \dot{a}(t) = \text{const.}, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \dot{R}(t) = \text{const.} \quad (3.28)$$

We will also see in our numerical analysis that only some values of k_{\perp} and k_{\parallel} will be allowed. Also, we expect that for the dilaton and R-R field

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \dot{C}(t) = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \dot{\Phi}(t) = 0. \quad (3.29)$$

By inspection of the tachyon equation of motion (3.23), we see that the electric- (or magnetic-) only ansatz referred to at the beginning of this section will be obviously consistent if we only allow worldvolume time-derivatives. This is tantamount to imposing an $ISO(p+1)$ symmetry on the worldvolume. Ref. [31] argues that spatial inhomogeneities of the tachyon field will play an important role in the decay (a view which is also supported, although using a different line of reasoning, by the results of ref. [32]). It will be interesting to investigate the full importance of such effects in the context of our effective supergravity analysis. We will include a discussion of the nontrivial issues raised in the Discussion section.

It turns out that the equations for the combined bulk-brane evolution in the time-dependent system are complicated enough to require numerical solution. For this reason, we will not be able to accommodate the most natural ansatz¹⁰ $\rho_{\perp} = \delta(\vec{x})$. Instead, we will use the “smeared” ansatz also used by Buchel et al. in ref. [7],

$$\rho_{\perp} = \rho_0 \sqrt{g_{\perp}}. \quad (3.30)$$

Note that in this ansatz, the implicit time-dependence in the transverse metric components is not varied in producing the equation of motion, rather it is only taken into consideration at the end of the calculation. Also, a smeared brane source does not contribute stress-energy perpendicular to the worldvolume, which is in the directions t, \vec{y} . It should be noted that the effect of using this ansatz will be minimized by using a small value for the density parameter ρ_0 . Of course, the aim when using such an ansatz is to get rid of any brane action dependence on the transverse coordinates \vec{x} .

We should remark that supergravity solutions corresponding to unstable D-brane systems have been found before [33]. Their solutions are time-independent, a feature which might seem rather unreasonable since they are, after all, supposed to describe unstable objects. Typically, these solutions are nakedly singular; there is no horizon. For reasons discussed previously,

¹⁰Strictly speaking, instead of being a delta-function distribution, the more general ansatz for the source should be extended (e.g. a Gaussian) with its size of the order of the string length.

these solutions would therefore justifiably be regarded with some level of suspicion. Possibly, we should really regard these solutions as fixed-time snap-shots of the unstable brane system during its evolution. They do however reflect one desirable feature: taking into account warping of space in the directions transverse to the unstable branes.

What we really want is a sort of hybrid of that approach – where transverse dependence is the only dependence – and what we are doing here – where time dependence is all there is. This is something we postpone to a future investigation; remarks on this will be given in the Discussion section.

Let us now get back to the simplified ansatz, and just go ahead and solve it. We are therefore interested in the precise system of *ordinary* differential equations for our coupled tachyon-supergravity system. Using the form $C_{12\dots p+1} \equiv C(t)$ (which is consistent with our ansatz) the equation of motion for the R-R field (3.17) becomes

$$\ddot{C} + \dot{C} \left[(8-p) \frac{\dot{R}}{R} - (p+1) \frac{\dot{a}}{a} \right] = \lambda a^{p+1} f(T) \dot{T}. \quad (3.31)$$

Now let us find the dilaton equation of motion. A useful identity is

$$\mathcal{R} = 5(\partial\Phi)^2 - \frac{9}{2}\nabla^2\Phi + \frac{(3-p)}{8(p+2)!} e^{2\Phi} G^2 + \frac{1}{8} \left(\frac{\Lambda\rho_{\perp}}{\sqrt{-g}} \right) e^{\Phi} V(T) \sqrt{-A} (A^{-1})^{\lambda\sigma} g_{\lambda\sigma}, \quad (3.32)$$

with which the dilaton equation of motion can be written,

$$2(\partial\Phi)^2 - \nabla^2\Phi = \frac{(p-3)}{4(p+2)!} e^{2\Phi} G^2 + \left(\frac{\Lambda\rho_{\perp}}{\sqrt{-g}} \right) e^{\Phi} V(T) \sqrt{-A} \left[1 - \frac{1}{4} (A^{-1})^{\lambda\sigma} g_{\lambda\sigma} \right]. \quad (3.33)$$

This last expression is simply the Einstein frame equation of motion. So the dilaton in our ansatz satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \ddot{\Phi} + \dot{\Phi} \left[(8-p) \frac{\dot{R}}{R} + (p+1) \frac{\dot{a}}{a} \right] - 2\dot{\Phi}^2 \\ &= \frac{(3-p)}{4} \left(\frac{e^{\Phi} \dot{C}}{a^{(p+1)}} \right)^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4} e^{\Phi} V(T) \left[(3-p) \sqrt{\Delta} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

This will be used whenever double time-derivatives of the dilaton need to be substituted for.

With $T = T(t)$ we find that the dynamics of the tachyon field is governed by

$$\ddot{T} = \Delta \left\{ \dot{\Phi} \dot{T} - \dot{T} \left[(p+1) \frac{\dot{a}}{a} \right] - \frac{1}{V(T)} \frac{dV(T)}{dT} + \frac{f(T)}{V(T)} \dot{C} e^{\Phi} a^{-(p+1)} \sqrt{\Delta} \right\}, \quad (3.35)$$

where $\Delta = 1 - \dot{T}^2$. In this paper we will be assuming that $V(T) = f(T)$, a statement which has been shown to be correct only at past and future asymptopia. However, we have also done numerical experiments which show that some breaking of this relation at intermediate times (near the hilltop) does not change the important features of our solutions.

We now turn to the equations of motion for the metric components $a(t)$ and $R(t)$. For the stress-tensors, eliminating second order derivatives in matter fields, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{T}_t^t &= +4(\dot{\Phi})^2 - 2\dot{\Phi} \left[(p+1)\frac{\dot{a}}{a} + (8-p)\frac{\dot{R}}{R} \right] + \frac{(5-2p)}{4} \left(\frac{e^{\Phi}\dot{C}}{a^{p+1}} \right)^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4}\lambda e^{\Phi}V(T) \left[(7-2p)\sqrt{\Delta} - \frac{4}{\sqrt{\Delta}} \right], \\
\hat{T}_y^y &= +2\dot{\Phi}\frac{\dot{a}}{a} - \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{e^{\Phi}\dot{C}}{a^{p+1}} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{4}\lambda e^{\Phi}V(T)\sqrt{\Delta}, \\
\hat{T}_x^x &= +2\dot{\Phi}\frac{\dot{R}}{R} + \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{e^{\Phi}\dot{C}}{a^{p+1}} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{4}\lambda e^{\Phi}V(T)\sqrt{\Delta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.36}$$

The components of the Ricci tensor are easily evaluated:

$$\mathcal{R}_t^t = (p+1)\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + (8-p)\frac{\ddot{R}}{R}, \tag{3.37}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_y^y = \frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + (8-p)\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\frac{\dot{R}}{R} + p \left[\left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a} \right)^2 + \frac{k_{\parallel}}{a^2} \right], \tag{3.38}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_x^x = \frac{\ddot{R}}{R} + (p+1)\frac{\dot{R}}{R}\frac{\dot{a}}{a} + (7-p) \left[\left(\frac{\dot{R}}{R} \right)^2 + \frac{k_{\perp}}{R^2} \right]. \tag{3.39}$$

For the (string-frame) ‘‘Einstein’’ equations, the time, longitudinal and transverse components are respectively

$$\begin{aligned}
(p+1)\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + (8-p)\frac{\ddot{R}}{R} &= +4(\dot{\Phi})^2 - 2\dot{\Phi} \left[(p+1)\frac{\dot{a}}{a} + (8-p)\frac{\dot{R}}{R} \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{(5-2p)}{4} \left(\frac{e^{\Phi}\dot{C}}{a^{p+1}} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{4}\lambda e^{\Phi}V(T) \left[(7-2p)\sqrt{\Delta} - \frac{4}{\sqrt{\Delta}} \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{3.40}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} &= -(8-p)\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\frac{\dot{R}}{R} - p \left[\left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a} \right)^2 + \frac{k_{\parallel}}{a^2} \right] + 2\dot{\Phi}\frac{\dot{a}}{a} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{e^{\Phi}\dot{C}}{a^{p+1}} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{4}\lambda e^{\Phi}V(T)\sqrt{\Delta},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.41}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\ddot{R}}{R} &= -(p+1)\frac{\dot{R}}{R}\frac{\dot{a}}{a} - (7-p) \left[\left(\frac{\dot{R}}{R} \right)^2 + \frac{k_{\perp}}{R^2} \right] + 2\dot{\Phi}\frac{\dot{R}}{R} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{e^{\Phi}\dot{C}}{a^{p+1}} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{4}\lambda e^{\Phi}V(T)\sqrt{\Delta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.42}$$

One of these three equations is of course redundant.

In the end we have a system of five second order coupled ordinary differential equations for $\{T, C, \Phi, a, R\}$ as functions of t .

4. The roll of the tachyon

We refer to a supergravity SD-brane as the field configuration generated by a system composed of a large number, N , of microscopic SD-branes. As emphasized in section 3.2, there is a single continuous parameter that controls the dynamics of these fields, i.e., $\lambda = \rho_0 \Lambda$. This is the parameter that determines the relative *importance* of the unstable brane source. Clearly, for $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ the open string tachyon decouples from the bulk fields (no backreaction) and the corresponding supergravity solutions will presumably be the singular ones found in refs. [1, 4, 5].

In this section we present solutions with the symmetries of SD-branes and a non-vanishing λ . We demonstrate that they are generically non-singular.

4.1 Tachyon evolution in flat space

The solutions relevant for SD-brane physics in Type II a,b superstring theory are those which are time-reversal symmetric.¹¹ These correspond to an open string tachyon evolving from

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} T(t) = -\infty \quad (4.1)$$

to

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} T(t) = +\infty \quad (4.2)$$

in a symmetric runaway potential of the form shown on figure 1. The initial conditions (at $t = 0$) invariant under $t \rightarrow -t$ and $T \rightarrow -T$ are of the form

$$\dot{T}(0) = \text{const.}, \quad T(0) = 0. \quad (4.3)$$

In this section we characterize the supergravity solutions generated by a tachyonic source with the properties mentioned above. Strictly speaking, our approach to studying real-time evolution in supergravity can be extended to more general cases, i.e., brane decay or creation (half SD-branes).

In our analysis we use the potential

$$V(T) = \frac{1}{\cosh(T/\sqrt{2})} \quad (4.4)$$

because it agrees with open string field theory calculations for large values of the tachyon for unstable D-brane systems in Type II a,b superstring theory.¹² It is not known what the exact potential is for intermediate times but our solutions are only mildly affected by its particular form.

¹¹The more general asymmetric cases would also correspond to interesting solutions but we do not consider those here. E.g. due to the nature of the tachyon potential in bosonic string theory, the supergravity SD-branes in this theory would be asymmetric.

¹²In bosonic string theory the potential is asymmetric and unbounded from below as $T \rightarrow -\infty$.




Figure 1: Possible form of the open string tachyon potential $V(T)$ on an SD-brane in Type II a,b superstring theory.

The expression for the tachyon when $\lambda = 0$, i.e., when there are no couplings to the bulk supergravity modes, is¹³

$$T(t) = -\sqrt{2} \operatorname{arcsinh} \left(-\dot{T}(0) \sinh \frac{t}{\sqrt{2}} \right). \quad (4.5)$$

Figure 2 shows the tachyon evolution for $T(0) = 0$ and $\dot{T}(0) = 1/10$. Homogeneous solutions such as eq. (4.5), derived from a tachyonic action, correspond to a fluid that has a constant energy density and vanishing pressure asymptotically. We will shortly see how these features are affected by the inclusion of couplings to bulk modes.

4.2 R-symmetry group

Before presenting the numerical results we comment on the issue of R-symmetry. As pointed out in ref. [1], SD-brane solutions should be invariant under the transverse Lorentz transformations leaving the location of the brane fixed. This corresponds to an $SO(1, 8 - p)$ R-symmetry.¹⁴ This property is embodied in the supergravity solutions found in refs. [1, 4, 5] where the transverse space metric has a factor of the form: $R(t)^2 dH_{8-p}^2$. The embedding group of the hyperbolic space H^{8-p} is $SO(1, 8 - p)$.¹⁵ This explains why we study supergravity solutions with $k_{\perp} = -1$ in this paper.

¹³We refer the reader to Appendix B for a derivation of this expression.

¹⁴The interpretation in terms of R-symmetry is relevant for the idea that SD-brane gravity fields are holographically dual to a worldvolume Euclidean field theory.

¹⁵The intuition for the nature of the R-symmetry group is inherited from the AdS/CFT correspondence. For example, the metric of a 3-brane is of the form: $ds^2 = f(r) [-dt^2 + d\vec{y}^2] + 1/f(r) [dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_5^2]$. The




Figure 2: The tachyon field for $\dot{T}(0) = 1/10$ and $T(0) = 0$. The upper curve represents the flat space tachyon ($\lambda = 0$) and the lower curve the tachyon field that is back-reacting on the bulk fields (in this case, $\lambda = 1$, $a(0) = 1$, $R(0) = 1$, $\Phi(0) = -3/2$ and $C(0) = 0$).

It is suggested in ref. [1] that the spacelike naked singularities [1, 4, 5] associated with the supergravity SD-branes could be resolved by using a metric ansatz that allows for a breaking of the R-symmetry in the region around the core of the object ($t = 0$). The intuition from the AdS/CFT correspondence comes from ref. [34] which describes cases of spontaneously broken R-symmetry. Our ansatz as it is *cannot* accommodate such an R-symmetry breaking. Presumably, this would correspond to a time-dependent process by which the R-symmetry is broken down to $SO(8 - p)$ in a finite region. The closest our ansatz can come to realizing this scenario is if we consider the cases with $k_{\perp} = 0$. Then, the transverse symmetry group is $ISO(8 - p)$, the compactification of which is $SO(8 - p)$. We have found that solutions with $k_{\perp} = 0$ are *regular* and asymptotically flat. Moreover, a generic feature of the $k_{\perp} = 0$ solutions is that the effective string coupling ($g_s \exp(\Phi(t))$) vanishes asymptotically. We do not consider these solutions further in this paper. We have also studied the cases with $k_{\perp} = 1$ and found that they all develop curvature singularities during the roll of the tachyon.

4.3 Numerical SD-brane solutions

Our ansatz for describing supergravity SD p -brane solutions is

$$\begin{aligned} ds_{S_p}^2 &= -dt^2 + a(t)^2 d\vec{y}^2 + R(t)^2 dH_{8-p}^2, \\ C &= C(t), \quad \Phi = \Phi(t), \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

R-symmetry group in this case is $SO(6)$, a statement that can be traced to the fact that the near horizon limit of the geometry is $AdS_5 \times S^5$, i.e., the gravitational background dual to the worldvolume field theory on an ensemble of D3-branes.

where we have taken $k_{\perp} = -1$ in accord with the original paper ref. [1]. Again, these supergravity bulk modes will be excited by couplings to an homogeneous open string tachyon as described in section 3.1. We consider only homogeneous solutions (i.e., depending only on time). As discussed in the last section, it is possible that inhomogeneities might play an important role in the creation/decay process [31], but we are postponing this issue for now.

The resulting system of coupled differential equations for which we will find solutions is of course highly non-linear. Among other things, this implies that it is not possible to extract scaling behavior for the fields from their equations of motion. We could therefore expect that the behavior of these solutions depends in a physically important way on the initial conditions for the field components involved: $a(t)$, $R(t)$, $C(t)$, $\Phi(t)$ and the source $T(t)$. Quite surprisingly, we find that the qualitative behavior of the supergravity SD-brane solutions does not depend very much on these initial conditions.

Related to this last comment is the apparently large multiplicity of potential solutions. In fact, there should exist one solution for each set of initial conditions. However for SD-branes the number of solutions is restricted by the property of time-reversal symmetry: the only solutions that can qualify as SD-branes are those with boundary conditions such that

$$\dot{a}(0) = 0, \quad \dot{R}(0) = 0, \quad \dot{\phi}(0) = 0, \quad \dot{C}(0) = 0. \quad (4.7)$$

Unfortunately we have been unsuccessful at finding analytical expressions for the bulk modes and tachyon field when their mutual coupling is non-vanishing ($\lambda \neq 0$). We therefore resorted to solving the corresponding system of differential equations numerically.¹⁶ In what follows we show results for different values of p and present some interesting analysis of the effect of varying the initial conditions. We present in detail the cases corresponding to $p < 7$ and comment on the SD p -branes with $p = 7, 8$ at the end of this section. We present solutions involving a range of initial conditions on $T(t)$, $a(t)$, $R(t)$, $C(t)$, and we comment on the robustness of the solutions to changes in initial conditions. Throughout our analysis we pay special attention to the impact of varying the initial condition $\Phi(0)$ on the dilaton, because this controls the string coupling at the hilltop.

4.3.1 Deformation of the tachyon field

Figure 2 shows the evolution of the tachyon for an S2-brane with the boundary condition $\dot{T}(0) = 1/10$. For $\lambda = 0$ (no coupling between the closed and the open string modes), we find

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} T(t) = \pm t. \quad (4.8)$$

This observation is suggestive that the tachyon field might play the role of time itself in cosmological models driven by brane decay (as proposed in ref. [28]). We find that this asymptotic behavior for the tachyon survives when couplings to the bulk modes are introduced. In fact, for $\lambda \neq 0$ we find

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} T(t) = \pm(t + \kappa_T). \quad (4.9)$$

¹⁶Recall that this is the primary reason why it is so difficult to include \vec{x} -dependence in our ansatz.

The constant κ_T depends non-trivially on the initial conditions of the fields: $\dot{T}(0)$, $a(0)$, $R(0)$, $C(0)$ and $\Phi(0)$. For example, as p is increased κ_T decreases. Also, for large values of $\Phi(0)$ the tachyon deformation from the flat space case becomes larger. As mentioned in Appendix B, for $\lambda = 0$ the state of the tachyon for large time is that of a perfect fluid with constant energy density and vanishing pressure. This is the so-called tachyon matter. We find that for $\lambda \neq 0$, both the energy density and the pressure (physical quantities measured in the Einstein frame) vanish. In other words, the tachyon matter is clearly only an illusion of the $g_s \rightarrow 0$ limit.

We consider briefly the effect of varying the initial condition $\dot{T}(0)$ on the tachyon field. First, as expected we find that the time it takes the tachyon to reach the bottom of its potential increases for smaller values of $\dot{T}(0)$. Not only that, for very small initial velocities the tachyon stays perched at the top of the potential for a certain period of time. In general, we observe that it takes less time for the tachyon to reach the bottom of its potential when we increase λ . Now, we also observe that the difference between the curves associated with flat space ($\lambda = 0$) and $\lambda \neq 0$ tachyons decreases as $\dot{T}(0)$ increases. Also, for large negative values of $\Phi(0)$, κ_T becomes very small. This is simply a reflection of the fact that such cases correspond to a very small initial string coupling (see below for details).

There is another interesting feature of the tachyon when coupled to the massless closed string modes. Firstly, the time it takes the tachyon to reach the bottom of its potential is not significantly altered even when considering large values of the ‘coupling’ λ . Finally, we find that as the coupling λ is increased, κ_T , or the deformation away from the flat space tachyon, increases correspondingly.

4.3.2 Time-dependent string coupling

The string coupling is given by the expression

$$g_s = e^{\langle \Phi_0 \rangle}, \quad (4.10)$$

where Φ_0 is the background dilaton field in the absence of sources, i.e., strings and D-branes. Typically the presence of stringy excitations will modify the coupling of the theory,

$$g_s \rightarrow g_s e^{\Phi(\eta)}, \quad (4.11)$$

where η is a spacelike variable for D-branes and is timelike for SD-branes.

For supergravity Dp -brane solutions the dilaton field is (see, for example, ref. [35]),

$$g_s(r) = g_s e^{\Phi(r)} = g_s \left(1 + \frac{c_p g_s N_p l_s^{7-p}}{r^{7-p}} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}(3-p)}, \quad (4.12)$$

where $c_p = (2\sqrt{\pi})^{5-p} \Gamma[\frac{1}{2}(7-p)]$. The string coupling is seen to vary according to whether test closed strings propagate close or far from the horizon ($r = 0$) of these geometries. For all static supergravity solutions (including NS5-branes), the asymptotic string coupling is such that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} g_s(r) = g_s. \quad (4.13)$$

The effect of supergravity D-branes is therefore to modify the coupling locally. For $p < 3$, it is large close to the horizon and decreases to g_s as $r \rightarrow +\infty$. For $p > 3$, the string coupling is small close to the horizon but increases to g_s for large r . The case $p = 3$ is special because the dilaton field sourced by the 3-brane is constant throughout the spacetime. Typically, the size of the region where the dilaton is not constant depends on the parameter $g_s N$. Large values of this parameter are associated with larger regions where dilaton perturbations associated with the brane are noticeable.

The solutions associated with supergravity SD-branes induce dilaton perturbations corresponding to a time-dependent string coupling,

$$g_s(t) = g_s e^{\Phi(t)}. \quad (4.14)$$

We find that the time-dependence of the dilaton sourced by SD-branes is qualitatively different when compared to the radial-dependence of the dilaton associated with regular D-branes.¹⁷

Figure 3 shows the time-evolution of the dilaton function $g_s^{-1} e^{\Phi(t)}$ for different values of p . The corresponding set of solutions have (for definiteness) the boundary conditions: $\dot{T}(0) = 1/10$, $a(0) = 1$, $R(0) = 1$, $C(0) = 0$ and $\Phi(0) = 0$. For $p < 2$, the function $g_s^{-1} e^{\Phi(t)}$ rises up and, after a relatively short time, starts to decrease. This implies that the string coupling increases before it starts decreasing until it reaches a stable value. For $p > 2$ the function simply decreases toward a stable minimum. Clearly, smaller values of p correspond to larger asymptotic string coupling.

The dilaton field generated by SD-branes has at least two interesting properties. First, all solutions are such that the dilaton stabilizes to a constant asymptotically,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \Phi(t) = \Phi_\infty. \quad (4.15)$$

Secondly, the asymptotic value of the dilaton is always smaller than its initial value at $t = 0$,

$$\Phi_\infty < \Phi(0). \quad (4.16)$$

This implies that the late/early string coupling ($t \rightarrow \pm\infty$) is always smaller than the coupling when the tachyon is at the top of its potential ($t = 0$), i.e.,

$$g_s e^{\Phi_\infty} < g_s e^{\Phi(0)}. \quad (4.17)$$

We find that the qualitative features shown on figure 3 are preserved when the boundary conditions on the various fields are changed. Nevertheless, we consider the effect of varying $\Phi(0)$ in some detail. An interesting quantity to study is the ratio

$$h = \frac{e^{\Phi_\infty}}{e^{\Phi(0)}}, \quad (4.18)$$

¹⁷This is an other example where features of SD-branes are not simply those inherited by analytic continuation of D-branes. In fact, a double analytic continuation ($r \rightarrow ir$ and $t \rightarrow it$) of the supergravity Dp -brane solutions lead to objects with an imaginary R-R charge. This is unphysical.

which gives a quantitative measure of how much the initial string coupling is modified asymptotically. The tachyon profile is not altered significantly when the initial condition on $\Phi(t)$ is varied. Nevertheless, we observe that for large values of $\Phi(0)$ (large initial coupling) the tachyon field reaches the bottom of the potential well faster. A large initial coupling also means that the bulk fields relax faster to their stable asymptotic configuration compared to cases where $\Phi(0)$ is smaller.¹⁸ The overall effect on the bulk fields is also enhanced for larger values of $\Phi(0)$. For example, as the initial coupling is increased the scale factor $a(t)$ stabilizes to significantly smaller values (see next section). As for the dilaton field itself, we find that the ratio h is large for larger values of $\Phi(0)$. For very small values of the initial string coupling (large negative values of $\Phi(0)$), the ratio h approaches unity.

In summary, we find that the parameter $\Phi(0)$, i.e., the parameter determining the string coupling when the tachyon is at the top of its potential, strongly determines the *importance* of the unstable brane source effect on the supergravity bulk modes.




Figure 3: Time-dependence of the function $e^{\Phi(t)}/g_s$ for some SD-branes. Starting from the top, the curves are for $p = 0$, $p = 1$, $p = 2$, $p = 4$ and $p = 6$. These results correspond to solutions with the boundary conditions: $\dot{T}(0) = 1/10$, $a(0) = 1$, $R(0) = 1$, $C(0) = 0$ and $\Phi(0) = 0$.

4.3.3 Gravitational field

We now describe the effect of the unstable brane source on the time-dependent metric components $a(t)$ and $R(t)$.

Figure 4 shows the scale factor $a(t)$ on the worldvolume of an SD2-brane with the boundary conditions $\dot{T}(0) = 1/10$, $a(0) = 1$, $R(0) = 10$, $C(0) = 0$ and $\Phi(0) = -3/2$. A general feature is that as time evolves the scale factor monotonically decreases from its initial value,

¹⁸Obviously $\Phi(0)$ can be taken to have negative values.




Figure 4: The scale factor on the Euclidean worldvolume of a supergravity S2-brane with boundary conditions $\dot{T}(0) = 1/10$, $a(0) = 1$, $R(0) = 1$, $C(0) = 0$ and $\Phi(0) = -3/2$.

$a(0)$, to a stable asymptotic value,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} a(t) = a_\infty, \quad (4.19)$$

at which point $\dot{a} = 0 = \ddot{a}$. The time it takes for this scale factor to reach its asymptotic value corresponds roughly to the time it takes for the tachyon to reach the bottom of its potential. As pointed out above, for large initial values of the dilaton, $\Phi(0)$, the asymptotic value of the scale factor, a_∞ , is small. Correspondingly, when the initial coupling is weak the effect of the probe on the bulk modes is small and $a(t)$ stabilizes to a value closer to its initial value $a(0)$.

Figure 5 shows the behavior of the metric function $R(t)$. A generic feature of the supergravity SD-brane solutions is that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} R(t) = \pm(t + \kappa_R). \quad (4.20)$$

The constant κ_R is generically larger for larger values of p .

4.3.4 Ramond-Ramond field

Figure 6 shows the time-dependence of the Ramond-Ramond form field for supergravity SD-branes with $p = 0$, $p = 2$, $p = 4$ and $p = 6$. The boundary conditions associated with the solutions represented are $\dot{T}(0) = 0$, $a(0) = 1$, $R(0) = 10$, $C(0) = 0$ and $\Phi(0) = -3/2$. Again, the energy stored in this field (proportional to its time-derivative) goes to zero in approximately the time it takes for the tachyon to reach the bottom of its potential. A generic feature of the Ramond-Ramond field associated with an SD-brane is therefore,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} C(t) = C_\infty, \quad (4.21)$$




Figure 5: The SD p -brane transverse scale factor $R(t)$ for $p = 0$, $p = 2$, $p = 4$ and $p = 6$ (from top to bottom) with the boundary conditions $\dot{T}(0) = 0$, $a(0) = 1$, $R(0) = 10$, $C(0) = 0$ and $\Phi(0) = -3/2$.

where C_∞ is a constant.




Figure 6: The SD p -brane Ramond-Ramond field $C(t)$ for $p = 0$, $p = 2$, $p = 4$ and $p = 6$ (from top to bottom) with the boundary conditions $\dot{T}(0) = 0$, $a(0) = 1$, $R(0) = 10$, $C(0) = 0$ and $\Phi(0) = -3/2$.

4.3.5 Curvature bounds and asymptotic flatness

The supergravity equations of motion are derived from a worldsheet calculation by requiring

that, at a certain order in perturbation theory, the beta-functions associated with bulk fields vanish. Typically, there are higher order (in α') curvature corrections to the beta-functions. These corrections are negligible only if the curvature involved is small when measured with respect to the string length, $l_s = \sqrt{\alpha'}$. This is why our solutions can, strictly speaking, be trusted only if the curvature involved is such that $|\mathcal{R}|$, $|\mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu}|$, $|\mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}|$ are small. We verify that this condition is satisfied by studying the behavior of the time-dependent Ricci scalar of the supergravity SD-branes,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(t) = & 2(p+1)\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} + 2(8-p)\frac{\ddot{R}}{R} + 2(p+1)(8-p)\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\frac{\dot{R}}{R} \\ & + p(p+1)\frac{\dot{a}^2}{a^2} + (8-p)(7-p)\left(\frac{\dot{R}^2}{R^2} + \frac{k_{\perp}}{R^2}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

where $k_{\perp} = -1$ for the cases of interest here.

A property of the solutions, which is apparent from studying the evolution of bulk modes, is that of asymptotic flatness. In fact, we find

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} ds_{S^p}^2 = -dt^2 + a_{\infty}^2 d\bar{y}^2 + (t + \kappa_R)^2 dH_{8-p}^2, \quad (4.23)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \Phi(t) = \Phi_{\infty}, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} C(t) = C_{\infty}, \quad (4.24)$$

where a_{∞} , κ_R , Φ_{∞} and C_{∞} are constants. Both the first- and second-derivative of the bulk modes vanish asymptotically. The resulting brane configuration is then clearly flat for $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$, as it should be.

An important question to answer at this stage is: *Which quantity in the problem sets an upper bound on the curvature for SD-branes?* First, we have found that whatever the curvature is at $t = 0$, its absolute value will never exceed it significantly in the course of the evolution. This behavior is shown on figure 7.

We therefore use the Ricci scalar at $t = 0$, $\mathcal{R}(t = 0)$, as a measure for the (approximate) maximum curvature associated with a given supergravity SD-brane configuration. Using the expressions for \ddot{a}/a and \ddot{R}/R (in terms of first-derivatives only) in eq. (4.22) we find

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{R}(t) = -\frac{(8-p)(7-p)k_{\perp}}{R(0)^2} + \lambda \frac{7-2p}{2} e^{\Phi(0)} \Delta^{1/2}(0), \quad (4.25)$$

where we have used $V(T = 0) = 1$. The acceptable solutions will therefore be those with a combination of the boundary conditions $\dot{T}(0)$, $\Phi(0)$, and $R(0)$ such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} |\mathcal{R}(t)| \text{ small.} \quad (4.26)$$

There is a wide range of solutions possessing this characteristic. For example when $\dot{T}(0) = 1/10$, choosing $R(0) = 10$ and an initial string coupling such that $\Phi(0) < 1/2$ leads to reasonable supergravity solutions.

At this point it is also worth noting that there are really *two* parameters which control the spacetime curvature bound — the continuous λ and the discrete k_{\perp} . The appearance of

k_{\perp} is not particularly surprising, since it feeds directly into the Einstein equations. For the case $k_{\perp} = -1$, choosing $R(0)$ to be moderately large and $\lambda e^{\Phi(0)}$ small is sufficient to keep the curvature bounded. For the case $k_{\perp} = 0$, we would require $\lambda e^{\Phi(0)}$ small. Either way, these requirements are certainly attainable within the self-consistent supergravity approximation we are considering — along with the specific ansatz we introduced in order to be able to solve the equations numerically.




Figure 7: Evolution of the Ricci scalar for SD p -branes with $p = 0$, $p = 2$, $p = 4$ and $p = 6$.

4.3.6 The $p = 7$ and space-filling SD-branes

The case $p = 8$ should be special because there is no transverse space into which energy be dissipated. The only bulk fields involved are then the metric component, $a(t)$, the dilaton, $\Phi(t)$, and the Ramond-Ramond field, $C(t)$. We find that the time-derivative of the scale factor, $\dot{a}(t)$, decays to zero many orders of magnitude slower than for $p < 7$. The scale factor $a(t)$ also goes to zero after an infinite time (see section 4.4 for a physical interpretation) which is to be contrasted with the cases $p < 7$ where $a_{\infty} \neq 0$. One would expect that to be the source of a curvature singularity at $t = \pm\infty$ but it is not the case. The Ricci scalar for the spacetime filling SD-brane is

$$\mathcal{R}(t) = -72 \left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a} \right)^2 - \frac{9}{2} \left(\frac{e^{\Phi} \dot{C}}{a^9} \right)^2 + 36 \dot{\Phi} \frac{\dot{a}}{a} + \frac{9}{2} \lambda e^{\Phi} \Delta^{1/2} V(T). \quad (4.27)$$

Curvature singularities are avoided because all time-derivatives in the problem go to zero faster than the scale factor as $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$. In particular, the quantity $e^{\Phi} \dot{C}$ goes to zero faster than $a(t)$ for large time. Also the string coupling slowly goes to zero asymptotically ($\Phi_{\infty} \rightarrow -\infty$)! For the Ramond-Ramond field we find the same behavior as for the cases $p < 7$. The only

difference is that the relaxation time of the bulk modes is many orders of magnitude larger than in the other cases.

The functions $a(t)$, $\Phi(t)$ and $C(t)$ associated with the SD7-brane behave in the same way as the space-filling SD-brane. Of course in this case there is a transverse space and we find that the relaxation of $|R(t)|$ to its asymptotic form $t + \kappa_R$ takes an infinite amount of time. In other words, it relaxes to its asymptotic form much slower than for the cases $p < 7$.

4.4 Einstein frame

Let us end this section with a remark about the physics of our SD-branes in Einstein frame. This would be the more natural and more physical frame to use in discussions of potential uses of rolling tachyons in the context of cosmology.

The transformation from string frame to Einstein frame involves a multiplicative factor of $e^{-\Phi/2}$ for $d = 10$, which is the dimension in which we are working here. Now, we have already commented at length on the behavior of the time-dependent dilaton field in section 4.3.2. The essential physics there was that the dilaton is biggest at the top of the potential hill; in particular, it stabilizes in the infinite past and future at a constant value smaller than the initial condition at the hilltop. Dilaton derivatives also remain small at all times during the evolution. Therefore, most of the qualitative features of our solutions will be preserved upon transformation to Einstein frame; in particular, all solutions remain completely nonsingular.

A case that deserves further comments is that of the spacetime filling SD8-brane discussed earlier. In string frame the metric is written

$$ds_{S8}^2 = -dt^2 + a(t)^2 d\vec{y}^2. \quad (4.28)$$

Upon converting to Einstein frame we get the metric

$$ds_{ES8}^2 = -d\tau^2 + a_E(\tau)^2 d\vec{y}^2, \quad (4.29)$$

where we have used a change of coordinate such that $d\tau^2 = e^{-\Phi/2} dt^2$, and where

$$a_E(\tau) = e^{-\Phi(t)/4} a(t). \quad (4.30)$$

For the SD8-brane we found

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} a(t) = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} e^{\Phi(t)} = 0. \quad (4.31)$$

In string frame this implies that the metric ‘closes off’ at infinity but in the (more physical) Einstein frame the converse happens, i.e., the limit $\tau \rightarrow \pm\infty$ corresponds to a constant scale factor,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} a_E(\tau) = \text{const.} \quad (4.32)$$

This is a very sensible result. We mentioned before that, because of the absence of a transverse space, there appeared to be no channel into which the energy could go. We therefore find that asymptotically the energy has gone into inflating the worldvolume of the SD-brane. In fact, the relaxation time for the gravitational field is essentially infinite.

5. Discussion

Our primary motivation for this work was the general problem of seeking mechanisms for resolution of singularities in spacetimes of interest in string theory. SD-brane supergravity spacetimes presented in refs. [1, 4, 5] create somewhat of a supergravity *emergency* because they are not only singular but nakedly so.

An important first step in the resolution program was made in ref. [7], where some effects of unstable brane probes in these backgrounds were considered. In particular, the probe physics was also sick, and taking this analysis seriously led to an even more dire assessment of the likelihood of singularity resolution without resorting to the inclusion of massive string modes in both the open and closed sectors. In our work, then, we began by plumbing the depths of this approach [7]. We found it to be generally insufficient, not least because the probe approximation took itself out of its own regime of self-consistency.

We then launched into an investigation of the physics of the gravitational fields exerted by SD-branes by including backreaction. In order to get started on this problem, we had to make the approximation of considering only the most relevant open- and closed- string modes, with full gravitational backreaction taken into account. The equations we derived are highly nonlinear and couple brane with bulk, so did not lend themselves to solution analytically. We therefore resorted to numerical techniques to search for solutions. Because of this restriction, we had to use an ansatz which smeared the branes in the transverse space; this allowed us to turn the equations into ODE's and integrate them numerically. By comparison with previous work, especially ref. [7], the essential step was to begin the numerical integration at the *top* of the potential hill, and then reconstruct asymptopia, which we were able to do successfully. Time symmetry about the hilltop was used to make a half SD-brane into a whole one. Given this two-stage approximation (lowest modes, and smeared ansatz), we found it rather satisfying that significant progress in the resolution program is already found at this level. In particular, our solutions for rolling tachyons backreacting on spacetime are *completely nonsingular*, and our approximations satisfy the fundamental property of self-consistency. We find these conclusions very suggestive of resolution of the SD-brane spacetime singularity emergency.

It is however hard to know for sure whether our nonsingular results will survive refinement. Therefore, let us now make some specific remarks about technical roadblocks we encountered which forced us to make approximations, their physical consequences, and future outlook.

Section 3.1 was where we derived the coupled tachyon-supergravity equations for a general brane distribution, assuming Chern-Simons terms are turned off in a consistent truncation. Our resulting equations are on the one hand remarkably non-robust, and on the other quite robust. What we mean by non-robustness is this: our ability to obtain nonsingular evolution depends *totally* on the structure of these equations of motion. Signs are crucial, coefficients are crucial, and so is the inclusion of Ramond-Ramond fields. In other words, our nonsingular results are highly specific to the field couplings arising from the low-energy approximation

to string theory. Other “S-branes” arising from “string-motivated” actions will probably not possess similarly nonsingular behavior. The positive type of robustness we refer to is also a desirable property. What we see manifestly is that the precise form of the potentials $\{V(T), f(T)\}$ is not important, apart from the large- $|T|$ behavior which had been derived elsewhere. The most obvious refinement of our work here will be to attack the problem of relaxing the requirement of zero NS-NS B -field. Allowing $B^{(2)}$ to be turned on will allow us to break $ISO(p+1)$ on the worldvolume and allow inhomogeneous tachyonic modes — the importance of which is discussed in [31] — and also to turn on more components of R-R fields. We have postponed this problem to the future mainly because it is messy; our work reported here should be considered a step in a larger program.

The other important approximation we made in our work was in section 3.2, where we had to smear the SD-brane sources in the transverse space to facilitate integrating the equations numerically by turning them into ODE’s. This limits our ability to fully probe the properties of the system in which we are interested. Here we would also like to record another physical consequence of this ansatz. Namely, this restriction has notable, negative, consequences for our ability to track whether black holes form as intermediate states during the time evolution of our coupled system including full backreaction. The issue of black holes was raised in the discussion section of ref. [5]. The essential point is that a black hole intermediate state may arise as an alternative to SD-brane formation and decay, at least with the half-advanced, half-retarded propagator. The fine-tuned nature of the initial conditions producing SD-branes highlights a reason why integrating partial differential equations of motion (including dependence on transverse coordinates) may be particularly difficult numerically. Or the obstruction to finding the full solution may yet turn out to be negotiable.

Let us end with some somewhat speculative remarks. Typically in the limit $g_s N \rightarrow 0$ the open and closed strings decouple. This is true in our effective lowest-modes analysis here, but also explicit in other worldsheet-inspired approaches. There should also exist a limit (in time) to be taken where only the open strings survive. From the worldsheet definition of an SD-brane, it is suggestive that the open string degrees of freedom would combine to form a Euclidean conformal field theory in $p+1$ dimensions. The same appears true when considering the effective action of massless open string degrees of freedom on an unstable D-brane [32]. In both approaches, however, it is not clear what the role of the tachyon could be. Physically, it is the source of a process by which energy is siphoned out of the open string sector and pumped into the closed string sector. So, in a sense, the decay of a D-brane through tachyon condensation corresponds to the decrease of a c -function-like quantity on the gauge theory side. Then, we can entertain the idea that time-evolution on the gravity side should really be regarded as a renormalization group (RG) flow on the gauge theory side. From this viewpoint, formation and decay of an SD-brane would be a process corresponding to first an *inverse* RG flow (integrating in degrees of freedom) followed by regular RG flow (integrating out degrees of freedom).¹⁹ This might be related to the study of open string tachyon condensation using

¹⁹Similar ideas were explored in the context of the dS/CFT correspondence (see, for example, refs. [36, 37])

RG flow in the worldsheet theory [38].

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Alex Buchel, Martin Kruczenski, Juan Maldacena, Alex Maloney, Don Marolf, Rob Myers, Andy Strominger, and Johannes Walcher for useful discussions. Finally we thank Dave Winters for proof-reading an earlier draft of this paper.

FL was supported in part by NSERC of Canada and FCAR du Québec. AWP thanks the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, and the High-Energy Theory group of the Harvard University Physics Department, for hospitality during Fall semester 2002-3 while this work was carried out. Research of AWP is supported by the Radcliffe Institute, NSERC and CIAR of Canada, and the Sloan Foundation of the USA.

A. Regular KMP SD-brane solutions

Among the supergravity solutions found by [5], there exist some that are regular on the horizon located at $t = \omega$. This is only realized for the following values of the parameters,

$$\tilde{k} = 2, \quad H = \frac{4}{7-p}, \quad G = k_i = 0. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The corresponding metric is

$$ds^2 = F(t)^{1/2} \alpha(t)^{4/(7-p)} (-dt^2 + t^2 dH_{8-p}^2) + F(t)^{-1/2} \left[\sum_{i=2}^{p+1} (dx^i)^2 + \left(\frac{\beta(t)}{\alpha(t)} \right)^2 (dx^1)^2 \right]. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Because these solutions are anisotropic in the worldvolume directions, it is not clear that they are physically relevant. We will nevertheless study some interesting properties not considered in ref. [5]. For example, the region $t = +\omega$ does *not* correspond to an horizon as suggested by the fact that none of the metric components either vanish or diverge there. For p odd the solutions are time-reversal symmetric so the region $t = -\omega$ is also not an horizon.

A.1 The region close to the origin

For the anisotropic solutions there is no curvature singularity at $t = \omega$. It is therefore interesting to consider the behavior of the metric components and curvature invariants close to the potentially problematic region around the origin, $t = 0$. We evaluated the curvature invariants: \mathcal{R} , $\mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu}$, and $\mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}$. They identically vanish for $t = 0$. The metric tensor there appears suspicious (for example, the component g_{tt} diverges) but we find

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} ds^2 = -d\tau^2 + \tau^2 dH_{8-p}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{p+1} (dx^i)^2, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where $\tau = \omega^2/t$. The expression (A.3) is simply flat space with part of it written in Milne coordinates. Not surprisingly, we find

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \dot{\Phi} = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \dot{C} = 0, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

which implies that all stress-energy components vanish in the the region close to the origin.

A.2 Horizon physics

We demonstrate that, contrary to previous claims, many of the anisotropic solutions are actually regular in the *full* range: $-\infty < t < +\infty$. The anisotropic solutions were already shown to be non-singular at $t = \omega$ and $t = 0$. We now investigate the region $t = -\omega$ further. Let us introduce the change of coordinates

$$T = \left(1 + \left(\frac{\omega}{t} \right)^{7-p} \right)^{2/(7-p)} t \quad (\text{A.5})$$

in order to make comparison with the results of ref. [5] easier. For p even, $T = 0$ corresponds to $t = -\omega$ while for p odd we have $T = -2\omega$ when $t = -\omega$. A comment in ref. [5] is that $T = 0$ corresponds to a spacelike (non-naked) curvature singularity. Actually, this is not always the case! For example, we considered the case $p = 1$ and computed the associated curvature invariants at all times. Figure 8 shows the evolution of the Ricci scalar for the solution with $\omega = 1$ and $\theta = \pi/4$. Clearly, the $p = 1$ solution is symmetric under time-reversal and therefore has no curvature singularity. It also does not possess any horizon, a feature common to the regular solutions found in this paper. The qualitative behavior of all curvature invariants is similar to the Ricci scalar and is quite generic, i.e., it is unchanged for all *odd* values of p , θ and ω . For $p = 1$ we obtain

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\omega} \mathcal{R} = -\frac{32^{1/3}}{\omega^2} \frac{19 \cos^4 \theta - 26 \cos^2 \theta + 7}{\sin^5 \theta}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

This is finite except for $\theta = 0$ in which case the Ricci scalar diverges like $R \sim 1/(t - \omega)^3$. We also found expressions for two other curvature invariants (for $p = 1$),

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\omega} \mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu} = \frac{92^{3/4}}{2\omega^4} \frac{-272 \cos^6 \theta + 14 + 255 \cos^4 \theta + 101 \cos^8 \theta - 98 \cos^2 \theta}{\sin^{10} \theta}, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\omega} \mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = \frac{32^{2/3}}{4\omega^4} \frac{-112 \cos^8 \theta + 28 + 892 \cos^6 \theta - 1840 \cos^4 \theta + 1032 \cos^2 \theta}{\sin^{10} \theta}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

We found expressions with similar qualitative behavior for other values of p *odd*.

For p *even* the solutions are not time-reversal symmetric. As pointed out previously, curvature invariants are finite at $t = \omega$ but there is a curvature singularity at $t = -\omega$. These are the spacelike curvature singularities (protected by an horizon at $t = 0$) described in ref. [5].

A.3 Unstable brane probe analysis

As mentioned in section 2.2, the motivation behind considering an unstable brane probe in a background with singularity problems is to ask if the singular background could actually be built.

The calculations and results of ref. [7] were summarized in section 2.2. In this appendix we generalize this calculation by probing the $d = 10$ *anisotropic* backgrounds presented above, since these are the only ones which are either non-singular or have singularities (at $t = -\omega$) shielded by an horizon ($t = 0$). We felt this generalization to be necessary because ref. [7] did not, for example, address the issue as to how the inclusion of the dilaton might affect the brane probe calculation. The unstable brane action is the obvious generalization eq. (2.6) of the case studied in ref. [7].

We investigate whether or not an unstable brane probe is a well-defined object in the vicinity of the region $t = \omega$. In Einstein frame, the energy density for the probe propagating in the anisotropic backgrounds is

$$\rho_{probe} = \frac{N \mu_{p+1}}{g_s} f(\Phi) \frac{V(T)}{\Delta^{1/2}}, \quad (\text{A.9})$$




Figure 8: This figure illustrates the Ricci scalar for the $p = 1$ anisotropic SD-brane solution with $\omega = 1$ and $\theta = \pi/4$. The other curvature invariants behave similarly.

while the pressure corresponds to

$$p_{probe} = \frac{N\mu_{p+1}}{g_s} f(\Phi)V(T)\Delta^{1/2}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

The dilaton function $f(\Phi)$ was picked up during the transformation from the string frame to the Einstein frame. It plays no role in the upcoming analysis because the dilaton is well-behaved,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \omega} f(\Phi) = \text{const.} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

As we saw in section 2.2, whenever the probe analysis goes wrong, it signals a pathology for the gravitational background. As we saw, there are at least two ways the probe analysis can go wrong: it may induce an infinite energy or pressure density ($\rho_{probe}, p_{probe} \rightarrow \pm\infty$), or, there might not exist any reasonable solutions for $T(t)$.

For $t \simeq \omega$, the dominant contribution to the equation of motion for the tachyon is

$$\Delta^2 - \Delta + \frac{2}{9}(t - \omega)\dot{\Delta} = 0. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

This is solved for

$$\Delta(t) = \frac{(t - \omega)^{9/2}}{(t - \omega)^{9/2} - g}, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where g is a constant of integration. The solution $\Delta = 0$ ($g \neq 0$) clearly corresponds to the brane probe inducing a curvature singularity on the horizon. The only physical solution is the one for which $g = 0$ which corresponds to $\Delta = 1$. For the anisotropic backgrounds considered here the metric component g_{tt} neither vanishes nor blows up at $t = \omega$. The solution $\Delta = 1$

therefore corresponds to a tachyon field for which the time-derivative vanishes ($\dot{T} = 0$) at $t = \omega$. It therefore appears that there are solutions for the probe evolution that avoids the pathologies described earlier. This is no surprise since for these anisotropic backgrounds the region $t = \omega$ is not an horizon in the technical sense of the term. We repeated the calculation around the regions $t = 0$ and $t = -\omega$. We find that for both p *odd* and *even* the unstable brane probe is not well-behaved at $t = 0$, i.e., it induces a curvature singularity there.

B. Tachyon in flat space

We consider solutions to the equation of motion for an open string tachyon when the massless closed string modes are absent.²⁰ The relevant equation of motion is

$$\ddot{T} + (1 - \dot{T}^2) \frac{\partial \ln V(T)}{\partial T} = 0. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

General solutions: This is a simple second order differential with general solutions of the form,

$$T(t) = \int dt \frac{1 + a^2 V(t)^2}{1 - aV(t)^2} + b, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where a and b are constants of integration. To integrate this equation one needs the function $V(t)$ which would imply that we already know the solution $T(t)$. One thing we know is that for $t = t_c$ large we have,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow t_c} V(t) \ll 1. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

So we get

$$T(t) \simeq \int_{t_c}^t dt (1 + 2a^2 V(t)) + b. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

This means that at large time the tachyon behaves like,

$$T(t) = t + (b - t_c) + 2a^2 \int_{t_c}^t dt V(t)^2. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Now we use the stringy result

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} V(T) = e^{-T/\sqrt{2}}, \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Taking $T(t) \simeq t$ then leads to the following large time formula,

$$T(t) \simeq t - a^2 \sqrt{2} e^{-\sqrt{2}t}, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where we have fixed the integration constants by imposing

$$a^2 \sqrt{2} e^{-\sqrt{2}t_c} + b - t_c = 0. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

²⁰Note that this does not simply correspond to the $g_s = 0$ limit of the more general system of equations we later derive. The reason is simply that taking the $g_s = 0$ limit does not commute with operations involved in varying the action to produce the equations of motion with backreaction *included*.

Specific solution: We consider solutions to the equation of motion (B.1) with the potential,

$$V(T) = \frac{1}{\cosh T/\sqrt{2}}. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

The tachyon equation of motion becomes

$$\ddot{T} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1 - \dot{T}^2) \tanh T/\sqrt{2}, \quad (\text{B.10})$$

which has the solution

$$T(t) = -\sqrt{2} \operatorname{arcsinh} \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} [c_1 e^{t/\sqrt{2}} - c_2 e^{-t/\sqrt{2}}] \right), \quad (\text{B.11})$$

where c_1 and c_2 are constants of integration. We usually specify boundary conditions at $t = 0$,

$$T(0) = -\sqrt{2} \operatorname{arcsinh} \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}(c_1 - c_2)}{2} \right), \quad (\text{B.12})$$

$$\dot{T}(0) = -\sqrt{2} \frac{c_1 + c_2}{(4 + 2(c_1 - c_2)^2)^{1/2}}. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

The family of solutions characterized by $T(0) = 0$ ($c_1 = c_2$) corresponds to all possible tachyon velocities at $t = 0$: $\dot{T}(0) = -c_1$. An other class of solutions are those for which $\dot{T}(0) = 0$ ($c_1 = -c_2$). Those correspond to allowing the tachyon to begin its evolution with $T(0) = -\sqrt{2} \operatorname{arcsinh} \sqrt{2}c_1$.

The solution we presented are referred to as tachyon matter. The stress-energy components (which are independent of the number of dimensions in the theory) correspond to a constant energy density ($\rho \sim V(T)/\sqrt{\Delta}$) and a pressure ($p \sim -V(T)\sqrt{\Delta}$) that vanishes as $t \rightarrow +\infty$ [15].

References

- [1] M. Gutperle and A. Strominger, “Spacelike branes,” *JHEP* **0204**, 018 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0202210].
- [2] A. Strominger, “The dS/CFT correspondence,” *JHEP* **0110**, 034 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0106113]; E. Witten, “Quantum gravity in de Sitter space,” arXiv:hep-th/0106109.
- [3] F. Leblond, D. Marolf and R. C. Myers, “Tall tales from de Sitter space II: Field theory dualities,” *JHEP* **0301**, 003 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0211025].
- [4] C. M. Chen, D. V. Gal'tsov and M. Gutperle, “S-brane solutions in supergravity theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 024043 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0204071].
- [5] M. Kruczenski, R. C. Myers and A. W. Peet, “Supergravity S-branes,” *JHEP* **0205**, 039 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0204144].
- [6] A. Strominger, “Open string creation by S-branes,” arXiv:hep-th/0209090.
- [7] A. Buchel, P. Langfelder and J. Walcher, “Does the tachyon matter?,” *Annals Phys.* **302**, 78 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0207235]; A. Buchel and J. Walcher, “The tachyon does matter,” arXiv:hep-th/0212150.
- [8] S. Roy, “On supergravity solutions of space-like Dp-branes,” *JHEP* **0208**, 025 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0205198].
- [9] B. McInnes, “dS/CFT, censorship, instability of hyperbolic horizons, and spacelike branes,” arXiv:hep-th/0205103; N. S. Deger and A. Kaya, “Intersecting S-brane solutions of D = 11 supergravity,” *JHEP* **0207**, 038 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0206057]; J. E. Wang, “Spacelike and time dependent branes from DBI,” *JHEP* **0210**, 037 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0207089]; C. P. Burgess, F. Quevedo, S. J. Rey, G. Tasinato and I. Zavala, “Cosmological spacetimes from negative tension brane backgrounds,” *JHEP* **0210**, 028 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0207104]; V. D. Ivashchuk, “Composite S-brane solutions related to Toda-type systems,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **20**, 261 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0208101]; F. Quevedo, G. Tasinato and I. Zavala, “S-branes, negative tension branes and cosmology,” arXiv:hep-th/0211031; N. Ohta, “Intersection rules for S-branes,” arXiv:hep-th/0301095; C. P. Burgess, P. Martineau, F. Quevedo, G. Tasinato and I. Zavala C., “Instabilities and particle production in S-brane geometries,” arXiv:hep-th/0301122.
- [10] A. Maloney, A. Strominger and X. Yin, “S-brane thermodynamics,” arXiv:hep-th/0302146.
- [11] M. Gutperle and A. Strominger, “Timelike boundary Liouville theory,” arXiv:hep-th/0301038.
- [12] A. Sen, “Fundamental strings in open string theory at the tachyonic vacuum,” *J. Math. Phys.* **42**, 2844 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0010240]; L. Rastelli, A. Sen and B. Zwiebach, “String field theory around the tachyon vacuum,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **5**, 353 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0012251].
- [13] T. Okuda and S. Sugimoto, “Coupling of rolling tachyon to closed strings,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **647**, 101 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0208196].
- [14] N. Lambert, H. Liu and J. Maldacena, “Closed strings from decaying D-branes,” arXiv:hep-th/0303139.

- [15] A. Sen, “Rolling tachyon,” *JHEP* **0204**, 048 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0203211]; A. Sen, “Tachyon matter,” *JHEP* **0207**, 065 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0203265]; A. Sen, “Field theory of tachyon matter,” *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **17**, 1797 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0204143].
- [16] G. W. Gibbons, “Cosmological evolution of the rolling tachyon,” *Phys. Lett. B* **537**, 1 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0204008].
- [17] M. Fairbairn and M. H. Tytgat, “Inflation from a tachyon fluid?,” *Phys. Lett. B* **546**, 1 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0204070]; S. Mukohyama, “Brane cosmology driven by the rolling tachyon,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 024009 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0204084]; A. Feinstein, “Power-law inflation from the rolling tachyon,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 063511 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0204140]; T. Padmanabhan, “Accelerated expansion of the universe driven by tachyonic matter,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 021301 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0204150]; A. V. Frolov, L. Kofman and A. A. Starobinsky, “Prospects and problems of tachyon matter cosmology,” *Phys. Lett. B* **545**, 8 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0204187]; D. Choudhury, D. Ghoshal, D. P. Jatkar and S. Panda, “On the cosmological relevance of the tachyon,” *Phys. Lett. B* **544**, 231 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0204204]; X. z. Li, J. g. Hao and D. j. Liu, “Can quintessence be the rolling tachyon?,” *Chin. Phys. Lett.* **19**, 1584 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0204252]; G. Shiu and I. Wasserman, “Cosmological constraints on tachyon matter,” *Phys. Lett. B* **541**, 6 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0205003]; L. Kofman and A. Linde, “Problems with tachyon inflation,” *JHEP* **0207**, 004 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0205121]; H. B. Benaoum, “Accelerated universe from modified Chaplygin gas and tachyonic fluid,” arXiv:hep-th/0205140; M. Sami, “Implementing power law inflation with rolling tachyon on the brane,” arXiv:hep-th/0205146; M. Sami, P. Chingangbam and T. Qureshi, “Aspects of tachyonic inflation with exponential potential,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 043530 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0205179]; J. c. Hwang and H. Noh, “Cosmological perturbations in a generalized gravity including tachyonic condensation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 084009 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0206100]; T. Mehen and B. Wecht, “Gauge fields and scalars in rolling tachyon backgrounds,” arXiv:hep-th/0206212; K. Ohta and T. Yokono, “Gravitational approach to tachyon matter,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 125009 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0207004]; Y. S. Piao, R. G. Cai, X. m. Zhang and Y. Z. Zhang, “Assisted tachyonic inflation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 121301 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0207143]; G. Shiu, S. H. Tye and I. Wasserman, “Rolling tachyon in brane world cosmology from superstring field theory,” arXiv:hep-th/0207119; X. z. Li, D. j. Liu and J. g. Hao, “On the tachyon inflation,” arXiv:hep-th/0207146; J. M. Cline, H. Firouzjahi and P. Martineau, “Reheating from tachyon condensation,” *JHEP* **0211**, 041 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0207156]; G. N. Felder, L. Kofman and A. Starobinsky, “Caustics in tachyon matter and other Born-Infeld scalars,” *JHEP* **0209**, 026 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0208019]; B. Wang, E. Abdalla and R. K. Su, “Dynamics and holographic discreteness of tachyonic inflation,” arXiv:hep-th/0208023; S. Mukohyama, “Inhomogeneous tachyon decay, light-cone structure and D-brane network problem in tachyon cosmology,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 123512 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0208094]; M. C. Bento, O. Bertolami and A. A. Sen, “Tachyonic inflation in the braneworld scenario,” arXiv:hep-th/0208124; J. g. Hao and X. z. Li, “Reconstructing the equation of state of tachyon,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 087301 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0209041]; C. j. Kim, H. B. Kim and Y. b. Kim, “Rolling tachyons in string cosmology,” *Phys. Lett. B* **552**, 111 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0210101]; F. Quevedo, “Lectures on string / brane cosmology,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19**, 5721 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0210292]; G. Shiu, “Tachyon dynamics and brane cosmology,” arXiv:hep-th/0210313; J. S. Bagla, H. K. Jassal and T. Padmanabhan, “Cosmology with tachyon field as dark energy,” arXiv:astro-ph/0212198; Y. S. Piao,

- Q. G. Huang, X. m. Zhang and Y. Z. Zhang, “Non-minimally coupled tachyon and inflation,” arXiv:hep-ph/0212219; X. z. Li and X. h. Zhai, “The tachyon inflationary models with exact mode functions,” arXiv:hep-ph/0301063; G. W. Gibbons, “Thoughts on tachyon cosmology,” arXiv:hep-th/0301117; M. Sami, P. Chingangbam and T. Qureshi, “Cosmological aspects of rolling tachyon,” arXiv:hep-th/0301140; C. j. Kim, H. B. Kim, Y. b. Kim and O. K. Kwon, “Cosmology of rolling tachyon,” arXiv:hep-th/0301142.
- [18] R. Emparan and H. S. Reall, “A rotating black ring in five dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 101101 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0110260].
- [19] G. W. Gibbons, D. Ida and T. Shiromizu, “Uniqueness and non-uniqueness of static black holes in higher dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 041101 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0206049]; “Uniqueness of (dilaton) charged black holes and black p-branes in higher dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 044010 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0206136].
- [20] J. C. Breckenridge, R. C. Myers, A. W. Peet and C. Vafa, “D-branes and spinning black holes,” *Phys. Lett. B* **391**, 93 (1997) [arXiv:hep-th/9602065].
- [21] H. S. Reall, “Higher dimensional black holes and supersymmetry,” arXiv:hep-th/0211290.
- [22] N. Itzhaki, J. M. Maldacena, J. Sonnenschein and S. Yankielowicz, “Supergravity and the large N limit of theories with sixteen supercharges,” *Phys. Rev. D* **58**, 046004 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9802042].
- [23] A. W. Peet, “More on singularity resolution,” published in the proceedings of *Strings 2001* (World Scientific, 2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0106148].
- [24] A. Sen, “Supersymmetric world-volume action for non-BPS D-branes,” *JHEP* **9910**, 008 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9909062].
- [25] M. R. Garousi, “On-shell S-matrix and tachyonic effective actions,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **647**, 117 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0209068].
- [26] E. A. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo, T. C. de Wit, E. Eyras and S. Panda, “T-duality and actions for non-BPS D-branes,” *JHEP* **0005**, 009 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/0003221].
- [27] J. Kluson, “Proposal for non-BPS D-brane action,” *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 126003 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/0004106].
- [28] A. Sen, “Time and tachyon,” arXiv:hep-th/0209122.
- [29] C. V. Johnson, A. W. Peet and J. Polchinski, “Gauge theory and the excision of repulson singularities,” *Phys. Rev. D* **61**, 086001 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/9911161].
- [30] J. Polchinski, “String Theory. Vol. 2: Superstring Theory And Beyond,” Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [31] F. Larsen, A. Naqvi and S. Terashima, “Rolling tachyons and decaying branes,” arXiv:hep-th/0212248.
- [32] K. Hashimoto, P. M. Ho and J. E. Wang, “S-brane actions,” arXiv:hep-th/0211090.
- [33] P. Brax, G. Mandal and Y. Oz, “Supergravity description of non-BPS branes,” *Phys. Rev. D* **63**, 064008 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0005242].

- [34] J. M. Maldacena and C. Nunez, “Towards the large N limit of pure N = 1 super Yang Mills,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 588 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0008001].
- [35] A. W. Peet, “TASI lectures on black holes in string theory,” arXiv:hep-th/0008241.
- [36] A. Strominger, “Inflation and the dS/CFT correspondence,” JHEP **0111**, 049 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0110087].
- [37] F. Leblond, D. Marolf and R. C. Myers, “Tall tales from de Sitter space. I: Renormalization group flows,” JHEP **0206**, 052 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0202094].
- [38] J. A. Harvey, D. Kutasov and E. J. Martinec, “On the relevance of tachyons,” arXiv:hep-th/0003101.