

Twisted supergravity and untwisted super–bigravity

Zygmunt Lalak and Radosław Matyszkiewicz

*Institute of Theoretical Physics
University of Warsaw, Poland*

Abstract

We have extended previous analysis of the bulk/brane supersymmetrizations involving non-zero brane mass terms of bulk fermions (gravitini) and twisting of boundary conditions. We have constructed new brane/bulk models that may be relevant for realistic model building. In particular, we have built a model with the Randall–Sundrum bosonic sector, orthogonal projection operators on the branes in the fermionic sector, and an unbroken $N = 1$ supersymmetry. We have also constructed 5d super–bigravity with static vacuum and unbroken $N = 1$ supersymmetry, which may be viewed as a deconstruction of 5d supergravity.

March 2003

1 Introduction

Higher-dimensional theories with branes offer an intriguing possibility of breaking symmetries through imposing, at the branes, nontrivial boundary conditions on fields transforming in various representations of the subgroups of the original symmetry group. Subsequently, when the breaking is explicit at the distant brane, locality in extra-dimension implies that the result of that breaking seen at the observable brane becomes conveniently suppressed. At the same time one believes that the ultimate solution to the hierarchy problem is related to space-time supersymmetry, and one wants to retain the gravitational sector in the model, in the hope to partially unify gravity with other forces and to explain the Planck scale/weak scale hierarchy. Hence, since supersymmetry is actually a space-time symmetry, the natural arena to study symmetry breaking in brane worlds is the higher-dimensional supergravity with branes. Such theories have been constructed in five dimensions in [1]–[7], and we shall use them as the framework of our discussion. In fact, we shall concentrate on the pure supergravity case, and the symmetry broken by boundary conditions will be the supersymmetry itself. The extensive analysis of such a breakdown in the particular case of the FLP supergravity [2], coupled to a bulk hypermultiplet, has been presented in [8]. Here we extend that analysis to the bulk/brane supersymmetrizations involving non-zero brane mass terms of bulk fermions (gravitini). Preliminary analysis and the results of [8] imply that the bulk fields from the hypermultiplet will behave analogously to gravitini. Bulk moduli shall play an important role in transmission of supersymmetry breakdown to the matter sectors, however we postpone the analysis of such a matter/moduli/gravity system to a future publication. Our results confirm these of the ref. [6] at points where the papers overlap.

2 General construction

To begin with, let us summarize the construction of the general brane–bulk supergravity Lagrangian using the notation, and in the spirit of [2],[5]. The simple N=2 d=5 supergravity multiplet contains metric tensor (represented by the vielbein e_α^m), two gravitini Ψ_α^A and one vector field A_α – the graviphoton. We shall consider gauging of a $U(1)$ subgroup of the global $SU(2)_R$ symmetry of the 5d Lagrangian. In general, coupling of bulk fields to branes turns out to be related to the gauging, and the bulk-brane couplings will preserve only a subgroup of the $SU(2)_R$. Purely gravitational 5d action describing such a setup reads $S = \int_{M_5} e_5 \mathcal{L}_{grav}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{grav} = & \frac{1}{2}R - \frac{3}{4}\mathcal{F}_{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{F}^{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}A_\alpha\mathcal{F}_{\beta\gamma}\mathcal{F}_{\delta\epsilon}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon} \\ & - \frac{1}{2}\bar{\Psi}_\alpha^A\gamma^{\alpha\beta\gamma}D_\beta\Psi_{\gamma A} + \frac{3i}{8\sqrt{2}}\left(\bar{\Psi}_\gamma^A\gamma^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\Psi_{\delta A} + 2\bar{\Psi}^{\alpha A}\Psi_A^\beta\right)\mathcal{F}_{\alpha\beta} \\ & - \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}\mathcal{P}_{AB}\bar{\Psi}_\alpha^A\gamma^{\alpha\beta}\Psi_\beta^B - \frac{8}{3}\text{Tr}(\mathcal{P}^2) . \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Covariant derivative contains both gravitational and gauge connections:

$$D_\alpha\Psi_\beta^A = \nabla_\alpha\Psi_\beta^A + A_\alpha\mathcal{P}_B^A\Psi_\beta^B , \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_a i\sigma^a$ is the gauge prepotential. The pair of gravitini satisfies symplectic Majorana condition $\bar{\Psi}^A \equiv \Psi_A^\dagger \gamma_0 = (\epsilon^{AB} \Psi_B)^T C$ where C is the charge conjugation matrix and ϵ^{AB} is antisymmetric $SU(2)_R$ metric (we use the convention $\epsilon_{12} = \epsilon^{12} = 1$). Supersymmetry transformations are also modified by the gauging

$$\delta e_\alpha^m = \frac{1}{2} \bar{\eta}^A \gamma^m \Psi_{\alpha A}, \quad \delta A_\alpha = \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} \Psi_\alpha^A \eta_A, \quad (3)$$

$$\delta \Psi_\alpha^A = D_\alpha \eta^A - \frac{i}{4\sqrt{2}} (\gamma_\alpha^{\beta\gamma} - 4\delta_\alpha^\beta \gamma^\gamma) \mathcal{F}_{\beta\gamma} \eta^A + \frac{\sqrt{2}i}{3} \mathcal{P}^{AB} \gamma_\alpha \eta_B. \quad (4)$$

In the most general case we can define \mathbf{Z}_2 action on the gravitino sector as:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_\mu^A(-y) &= \gamma_5 (Q_0)_B^A \Psi_\mu^B(y), & \Psi_5^A(-y) &= -\gamma_5 (Q_0)_B^A \Psi_5^B(y), \\ \Psi_\mu^A(\pi r_c - y) &= \gamma_5 (Q_\pi)_B^A \Psi_\mu^B(\pi r_c + y), & \Psi_5^A(\pi r_c - y) &= -\gamma_5 (Q_\pi)_B^A \Psi_5^B(\pi r_c + y), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

and the parameters η^A of the supersymmetry transformations obey the same boundary conditions as the 4d components of gravitini¹. The symplectic Majorana condition and the normalization $(Q_{0,\pi})^2 = 1$ imply $Q_{0,\pi} = (q_{0,\pi})_a \sigma^a$, where $(q_{0,\pi})_a$ are real parameters [3].

We would like to gauge a $U(1)$ subgroup of the global $SU(2)$, to allow for a potential energy in the bulk, and, hence, to obtain a nontrivial warp factor. In the general case [5] we can choose the prepotential of the form

$$P = g_R \epsilon(y) R + g_S S, \quad (6)$$

where $R = r_a i\sigma^a$ and $S = s_a i\sigma^a$ commutes and anticommutes with $Q_{0,\pi}$, respectively.

Let us explore supersymmetry algebra locally near the point $y = 0$. Non-vanishing part of the Lagrangian variation includes terms proportional to $\delta(y)$:

$$\delta(e_5 \mathcal{L}_{grav}) \supset -e_4 \delta(y) i \sqrt{8} g_R \bar{\Psi}_\mu^A \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 R_A^B \eta_B. \quad (7)$$

Using boundary condition $\eta_A(0) = -\gamma_5 (Q_0)_A^B \eta_B(0)$, we can write:

$$\delta(e_5 \mathcal{L}_{grav}) \supset e_4 \delta(y) i \sqrt{8} g_R \bar{\Psi}_\mu^A \gamma^\mu R_A^B (Q_0)_B^C \eta_C. \quad (8)$$

Commutation relation $[Q_0, R] = 0$ let us write $R_A^B (Q_0)_B^C = -N \delta_A^C$, which implies:

$$\delta(e_5 \mathcal{L}_{grav}) \supset -e_4 \delta(y) i \sqrt{8} g_R N \bar{\Psi}_\mu^A \gamma^\mu \eta_A. \quad (9)$$

To cancel above variation, we need to add to the initial Lagrangian brane tension and/or gravitini mass term on the brane:

$$e_5 \mathcal{L}_{grav} \longrightarrow e_5 \mathcal{L}_{grav} - e_4 \delta(y) \lambda_0 - e_4 \delta(y) \bar{\Psi}_\mu^A \gamma^{\mu\nu} (M + \gamma_5 \bar{M})_A^B \Psi_{\nu B}, \quad (10)$$

¹We assume that all *even* fields are *smooth*, except Ψ_5 which we take to be *smooth* function multiplied by $\epsilon^2(y)$. The *odd* bosonic fields are also assumed to be *smooth*, however *odd* gravitini are allowed to have discontinuities proportional to the epsilon functions centered at the branes, e.g.: $\Psi_- = \epsilon(y) \bar{\Psi}_-$, where $\bar{\Psi}_-$ is smooth. In our calculations we use the formula $\epsilon^2(y) \delta(y) = \frac{1}{3} \delta(y)$, when integrated over a fixed point. In the bulk we use $\epsilon^2(y) = 1$. In addition we introduce the distribution $\epsilon^{-1}(y)$ in the following way: $h(y) = \epsilon^{-1}(y) f(y) \iff f(y) = \epsilon(y) h(y)$. One can easily check that derivatives of the step-function-type distributions obey $(\epsilon^{-1}(y))' = -\epsilon^{-2}(y) \delta(y)$, and everywhere $\epsilon^{-1} \epsilon = 1$ (even at fixed points). The parameters of the supersymmetry transformations follow the same rules as gravitini.

where M_{AB} and \bar{M}_{AB} are symmetric. Associated contributions to the Lagrangian variation read:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta(e_5 \mathcal{L}_{grav}) \supset & e_4 \delta(y) \frac{1}{2} \lambda_0 \bar{\Psi}_\mu^A \gamma^\mu \eta_A \\
& + e_4 \delta(y) \epsilon(y) \frac{\lambda_0}{2} \bar{\Psi}_\mu^A \gamma^\mu (\gamma_5 M - \bar{M})_A^B \eta_B \\
& - e_4 \delta(y) i \sqrt{8} \bar{\Psi}_\mu^A \gamma^\mu (M - \gamma_5 \bar{M})_A^B P_B^C \eta_C \\
& + e_4 \delta(y) 2 \bar{\Psi}_\mu^A (M + \gamma_5 \bar{M})_A^B \left(\frac{3i}{2\sqrt{2}} \gamma^5 F_5^\mu \eta_B - \gamma^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu \eta_B \right). \tag{11}
\end{aligned}$$

Now one is able to cancel the variation (9). However, we have produced an additional uncanceled term – the last one in (11). To solve this problem, let us redefine the Ψ_5^A variation:

$$\delta \Psi_5^A \longrightarrow \delta \Psi_5^A - \delta(y) (\omega + \gamma_5 \bar{\omega})_B^A \gamma_5 \eta^B. \tag{12}$$

As the result, the new brane contributions to the Lagrangian variation read:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta(e_5 \mathcal{L}_{grav}) \supset & -e_4 \delta(y) \epsilon(y) \frac{\lambda_0}{4} \bar{\Psi}_\mu^A \gamma^\mu (\gamma_5 \omega + \bar{\omega})_A^B \eta_B \\
& + e_4 \delta(y) i \sqrt{2} \bar{\Psi}_\mu^A \gamma^\mu P_A^B (\omega + \gamma_5 \bar{\omega})_B^C \eta_C \\
& + e_4 \delta(y) \bar{\Psi}_\mu^A (\omega + \gamma_5 \bar{\omega})_A^B \left(\frac{3i}{2\sqrt{2}} \gamma^5 F_5^\mu \eta_B - \gamma^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu \eta_B \right). \tag{13}
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that P_{AB} is symmetric. The vanishing of the sum of the variations (9),(11),(13) leads to the following constraints:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = \delta(y) \bar{\Psi}_\mu^A \gamma^\mu \left[& (M - \gamma_5 \bar{M})_A^B P_B^C - \frac{1}{2} P_A^B (\omega + \gamma_5 \bar{\omega})_B^C + g_R N \delta_A^C + \frac{i}{4\sqrt{2}} \lambda_0 \delta_A^C \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{i}{4\sqrt{2}} \lambda_0 \epsilon(y) \left(\gamma_5 M_A^C - \bar{M}_A^C - \frac{1}{2} \gamma_5 \omega_A^C - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\omega}_A^C \right) \right] \eta_C \tag{14}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$0 = \delta(y) \bar{\Psi}_\mu^A \left[2(M + \gamma_5 \bar{M})_A^B + (\omega + \gamma_5 \bar{\omega})_A^B \right] \left(\frac{3i}{2\sqrt{2}} \gamma^5 F_5^\mu \eta_B - \gamma^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu \eta_B \right). \tag{15}$$

On the other hand the gravitini equation of motion and supersymmetry transformations imply boundary condition²:

$$\epsilon^{-1}(y) \delta(y) (\gamma_5 \delta + Q_0)_A^B \eta_B = \delta(y) 2(M + \gamma_5 \bar{M})_A^B \eta_B \tag{16}$$

and the equation (15) takes the form:

$$0 = \delta(y) \bar{\Psi}_\mu^A \left[\epsilon^{-1}(y) (\gamma_5 \delta + Q_0)_A^B + (\omega + \gamma_5 \bar{\omega})_A^B \right] \left(\frac{3i}{2\sqrt{2}} \gamma^5 F_5^\mu \eta_B - \gamma^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu \eta_B \right). \tag{17}$$

²The cancellation of terms proportional to the delta functions in the gravitini equations of motion imply the following boundary conditions: $\epsilon^{-1}(y) \delta(y) (\gamma_5 \delta + Q_0)_A^B (\Psi_\mu)_B = \delta(y) 2(M + \gamma_5 \bar{M})_A^B (\Psi_\mu)_B$. On the other hand, odd bosonic fields vanish on the branes, and constraints $\delta_\eta e_\mu^{\hat{5}} = \delta_\eta e_5^a = \delta_\eta A_\mu = 0$ imply boundary conditions for the parameters of the supersymmetry transformations η_A .

To complete our discussion, let us check the supersymmetry algebra. One can show that the commutators vanish except the following term proportional to the delta function [6]:

$$[\delta_\xi, \delta_\eta]e_5^\mu \supset \epsilon^{-1}(y)\delta(y)\bar{\eta}^A\gamma^\mu (\delta + \gamma_5 Q_0)_A^B \xi_B + \delta(y)\bar{\eta}^A\gamma^\mu (\gamma_5\omega + \bar{\omega})_A^B \xi_B . \quad (18)$$

We can cancel this term by choosing

$$\omega_A^B = -\epsilon^{-1}(y)(Q_0)_A^B , \quad \bar{\omega}_A^B = -\epsilon^{-1}(y)\delta_A^B , \quad (19)$$

then (17) is simply satisfied and (14) takes the form:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \delta(y)\bar{\Psi}_\mu^A\gamma^\mu \left[(M - \gamma_5\bar{M})_A^B P_B^C + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{-1}(y)P_A^B(Q_0 + \gamma_5\delta)_B^C + g_R N\delta_A^C \right. \\ \left. + \frac{i}{4\sqrt{2}}\lambda_0\delta_A^C + \frac{i}{4\sqrt{2}}\lambda_0\epsilon(y) (\gamma_5 M_A^C - \bar{M}_A^C) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{i}{4\sqrt{2}}\lambda_0 \left(\frac{1}{2}\gamma_5(Q_0)_A^C + \frac{1}{2}\delta_A^C \right) \right] \eta_C . \quad (20) \end{aligned}$$

We can repeat the same construction for the second brane at the $y = \pi r_c$. The analogue of the equation (20) is:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \delta(y - \pi r_c)\bar{\Psi}_\mu^A\gamma^\mu \left[(M_\pi - \gamma_5\bar{M}_\pi)_A^B P_B^C - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{-1}(y)P_A^B(Q_\pi + \gamma_5\delta)_B^C - g_R N_\pi\delta_A^C \right. \\ \left. + \frac{i}{4\sqrt{2}}\lambda_\pi\delta_A^C - \frac{i}{4\sqrt{2}}\lambda_\pi\epsilon(y) (\gamma_5(M_\pi)_A^C - (\bar{M}_\pi)_A^C) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{i}{4\sqrt{2}}\lambda_\pi \left(\frac{1}{2}\gamma_5(Q_\pi)_A^C + \frac{1}{2}\delta_A^C \right) \right] \eta_C , \quad (21) \end{aligned}$$

where we choose

$$(\omega_\pi)_A^B = \epsilon^{-1}(y)(Q_\pi)_A^B , \quad (\bar{\omega}_\pi)_A^B = \epsilon^{-1}(y)\delta_A^B , \quad (22)$$

and boundary condition reads:

$$\epsilon^{-1}(y)\delta(y - \pi r_c)(\gamma_5\delta + Q_\pi)_A^B \eta_B = -\delta(y - \pi r_c)2(M_\pi + \gamma_5\bar{M}_\pi)_A^B \eta_B . \quad (23)$$

The equations (20) and (21) provide the relations, one for each brane, between parameters of the boundary Lagrangian and the prepotential (whose square determines the vacuum energy in the bulk). These are the conditions analogous, although somewhat weaker, to the strict relation between the brane tensions and the bulk cosmological constant found in the original FLP scenario [2]. We should note at this point that there exists an additional condition that allows to close the susy algebra: one needs to assume that the elementary bosonic fields that are odd with respect to a given brane are also continuous - hence vanishing - on that brane. This is needed in all consistent approaches to bulk/brane supergravity known so far. However, this requirement cannot be imposed on non-elementary bosonic fields, like gauge field strengths or spin connections. On one hand extending the conditions that all odd bosonic fields are continuous on the branes would help to cancel a number of supersymmetry variations and to simplify the constraints (20), (21). On the other hand such a strong assumption wouldn't allow for a supersymmetrization of a wide class of nontrivial models - for instance in the Randall-Sundrum model, [9], the spin connection is discontinuous on the branes (proportional to the step function).

3 Twisting the Randall–Sundrum model

In the forthcoming sections we shall apply the formalism developed above to the construction of supergravity models with nontrivial boundary conditions imposed on the bulk fields.

3.1 Randall-Sundrum model without mass terms on branes [2]

To start with let us choose the prepotential in the form: $P_A^B = g\epsilon(y)i(\sigma_3)_A^B$. We define \mathbf{Z}_2 action on the gravitini by $(Q_0)_A^B = (Q_\pi)_A^B = (\sigma_3)_A^B$, which implies $N_0 = N_\pi = -i$. We do not put any gravitini mass terms on the branes. Then the equations (20) and (21) reduce to:

$$\lambda_0 = g4\sqrt{2}, \quad \lambda_\pi = -g4\sqrt{2}. \quad (24)$$

With $g = \frac{3}{4}\sqrt{2}k$ the bosonic part of the Lagrangian reads:

$$S = \int d^5x \sqrt{-g_5} \left(\frac{1}{2}R + 6k^2 \right) - 6 \int d^5x \sqrt{-g_4} k (\delta(y) - \delta(y - \pi r_c)). \quad (25)$$

3.2 Randall-Sundrum model with gravitini masses on the branes [6]

For the second example let us assume the prepotential of the form: $P_A^B = gi(\sigma_1)_A^B$ and $(Q_0)_A^B = (Q_\pi)_A^B = (\sigma_3)_A^B$. Then $N_0 = N_\pi = 0$. Let us allow only the even components of gravitini to own mass terms on the branes

$$(M_{0,\pi})_A^B = \frac{1}{2}\alpha_{0,\pi}(\sigma_1)_A^B, \quad (\bar{M}_{0,\pi})_A^B = \frac{1}{2}\alpha_{0,\pi}i(\sigma_2)_A^B, \quad (26)$$

where $\alpha_0, \alpha_\pi \in \mathbf{R}$. In this case the equation (20) takes the form:

$$0 = \delta(y)i\bar{\Psi}_\mu^A \gamma^\mu \left[g\alpha_0(\delta - \gamma_5\sigma_3)_A^B + \epsilon^{-1}(y)g\gamma_5\sigma_1(\delta + \gamma_5\sigma_3)_A^B + \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}}\lambda_0(2\delta + \epsilon(y)\alpha_0\gamma_5\sigma_1(\delta + \gamma_5\sigma_3) + (\delta + \gamma_5\sigma_3))_A^B \right] \eta_B, \quad (27)$$

and the boundary condition (16) become:

$$\epsilon^{-1}(y)\delta(y)\gamma_5(\delta + \gamma_5\sigma_3)_A^B \eta_B = \delta(y)\alpha_0\sigma_1(\delta - \gamma_5\sigma_3)_A^B \eta_B. \quad (28)$$

One can also calculate boundary condition for the gravitino $\bar{\Psi}_\mu^A$:

$$\epsilon^{-1}(y)\delta(y)\bar{\Psi}_\mu^A(\delta - \gamma_5\sigma_3)_A^B \gamma_5 = -\delta(y)\alpha_0\bar{\Psi}_\mu^A(\delta + \gamma_5\sigma_3)(\sigma_1)_A^B. \quad (29)$$

Finally, we can rewrite the equation (27) as follows

$$0 = \delta(y)i(\bar{\Psi}_+)_\mu^A \gamma^\mu \left[2g\alpha_0 + \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}}\lambda_0(1 + 3\alpha_0^2\epsilon(y)^2) \right] (\delta - \gamma_5\sigma_3)_A^B (\eta_+)_B, \quad (30)$$

where we have decomposed fermions into the even (+) and odd (-) components:

$$(\Psi_{\pm})_{\mu}^A = \frac{1}{2}(\delta \pm \gamma_5 \sigma_3)^A_B \Psi_{\mu}^B, \quad (\eta_{\pm})^A = \frac{1}{2}(\delta \pm \gamma_5 \sigma_3)^A_B \eta^B. \quad (31)$$

The vanishing of this term implies the constraint

$$\lambda_0 = -4\sqrt{2}g \frac{2\alpha_0}{1 + \alpha_0^2}, \quad (32)$$

where we have used $\epsilon^2(y)\delta(y) = \frac{1}{3}\delta(y)$. One can repeat the same procedure for the second brane to obtain

$$\lambda_{\pi} = -4\sqrt{2}g \frac{2\alpha_{\pi}}{1 + \alpha_{\pi}^2}. \quad (33)$$

Taking $\alpha_0 = -\alpha_{\pi} = -1$ we find RS brane tensions $\lambda_0 = -\lambda_{\pi} = g4\sqrt{2}$.

Let us solve Killing equation to be certain that there remains an unbroken supersymmetry:

$$\nabla_{\alpha}\eta^A - \frac{\sqrt{2}i}{3}\mathcal{P}_B^A \gamma_{\alpha}\eta^B - \delta(y)\delta_{\alpha}^5(\omega_0)^A_B \gamma_5\eta^B - \delta(y - \pi r_c)\delta_{\alpha}^5(\omega_{\pi})^A_B \gamma_5\eta^B = 0. \quad (34)$$

For the RS background we can write

$$0 = \partial_{\mu}\eta_{\pm}^A - \frac{1}{2}k\epsilon(y)\gamma_{\mu}\gamma_5\eta_{\mp}^A + \frac{1}{2}k(\sigma_1)^A_B \gamma_{\mu}\eta_{\pm}^B, \quad (35)$$

$$0 = \partial_5\eta_+^A + \frac{1}{2}k(\sigma_1)^A_B \gamma_5\eta_-^B, \quad (36)$$

$$0 = \partial_5\eta_-^A + \frac{1}{2}k(\sigma_1)^A_B \gamma_5\eta_+^B - 2(\delta(y) - \delta(y - \pi r_c))\epsilon^{-1}(y)\eta_-^A. \quad (37)$$

The equation (35) is solved by $\eta_{\pm}^A = \epsilon(y)\gamma_5(\sigma_1)^A_B \eta_{\mp}^B$, where we have assumed that the Killing spinor doesn't depend of x_{μ} . One can easily find the solution

$$\eta_+^A = e^{-\frac{1}{2}k|y|} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\eta}_R \\ -\hat{\eta}_L \end{pmatrix}^A, \quad \eta_-^A = \epsilon(y)e^{-\frac{1}{2}k|y|} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\eta}_L \\ \hat{\eta}_R \end{pmatrix}^A, \quad (38)$$

where $\hat{\eta}$ is a four-dimensional Majorana spinor in flat space.

3.3 Flipped RS model with gravitini mass terms on the branes

The flipped version of a warped 5d supergravity without brane masses for gravitini has been described in detail in [5] and [8]. Here let us perform the flipping (twisting) in the general case with brane gravitini masses.

To flip boundary condition in the fermionic sector, let us change a sign of the \mathbf{Z}_2 operator at the brane $y = \pi r_c$ to $(Q_{\pi}) = -(\sigma_3)$ while leaving (Q_0) unchanged. Let us examine the brane action at $y = \pi r_c$. We assume gravitini mass terms that include only (locally on each brane) even components of the fields

$$(M_{\pi})_A^B = \frac{1}{2}\alpha_{\pi}(\sigma_1)_A^B, \quad (\bar{M}_{\pi})_A^B = -\frac{1}{2}\alpha_{\pi}i(\sigma_2)_A^B. \quad (39)$$

Then boundary conditions change to

$$\epsilon^{-1}(y)\delta(y - \pi r_c)\gamma_5(\delta - \gamma_5\sigma_3)_A^B\eta_B = -\delta(y - \pi r_c)\alpha_\pi\sigma_1(\delta + \gamma_5\sigma_3)_A^B\eta_B , \quad (40)$$

and the relevant version of the equation (30) reads:

$$0 = \delta(y - \pi r_c)i(\bar{\Psi}_-)^A\gamma^\mu \left[2g\alpha_\pi + \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}}\lambda_\pi(1 + 3\alpha_\pi^2\epsilon(y)^2) \right] (\delta + \gamma_5\sigma_3)_A^B(\eta_-)_B , \quad (41)$$

where (+) and (-) components are defined as in (31). Notice that now (-) are even and the (+) odd. Vanishing of this term implies constraint

$$\lambda_\pi = -4\sqrt{2}g\frac{2\alpha_\pi}{1 + \alpha_\pi^2} , \quad (42)$$

As in the previous case, for $\alpha_0 = -\alpha_\pi = -1$ we obtain RS brane tensions $\lambda_0 = -\lambda_\pi = g4\sqrt{2}$.

Let us check whether supersymmetry is broken in the effective theory, due to the flipped boundary condition. Killing equation reads:

$$0 = \partial_\mu\eta_\pm^A - \frac{1}{2}k\epsilon(y)\gamma_\mu\gamma_5\eta_\mp^A + \frac{1}{2}k(\sigma_1)_B^A\gamma_\mu\eta_\pm^B , \quad (43)$$

$$0 = \partial_5\eta_+^A + \frac{1}{2}k(\sigma_1)_B^A\gamma_5\eta_-^B + 2\delta(y - \pi r_c)\epsilon^{-1}(y)\eta_+^A , \quad (44)$$

$$0 = \partial_5\eta_-^A + \frac{1}{2}k(\sigma_1)_B^A\gamma_5\eta_+^B - 2\delta(y)\epsilon^{-1}(y)\eta_-^A . \quad (45)$$

Equation (43) can be solved by $\eta_-^A = \epsilon(y)\gamma_5(\sigma_1)_B^A\eta_+^B$, where we assume that Killing spinors don't depend of x_μ . One can easily find solutions

$$\eta_+^A = \epsilon_\pi(y)e^{-\frac{1}{2}k|y|} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\eta}_R \\ -\hat{\eta}_L \end{pmatrix}^A , \quad \eta_-^A = \epsilon_0(y)e^{-\frac{1}{2}k|y|} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\eta}_L \\ \hat{\eta}_R \end{pmatrix}^A , \quad (46)$$

where $\epsilon_0(y) = \epsilon(\frac{y}{2})$ and $\epsilon_\pi(y) = \epsilon(\frac{y+\pi r_c}{2})$ are flipped step functions.

This is an interesting example, especially if one compares of to the situation in the flipped sugra without brane mass terms, see [8] and the forthcoming chapter. The projection operators on both branes are orthogonal, hence one would naturally expect that from the four-dimensional point of view all the supersymmetries are broken down. And this is the case indeed in the absence of brane mass terms. However, when the brane masses for gravitini are present, they constitute delta-type sources in the equations of motion of the gravitini. These become the actual source of the boundary conditions which have to be imposed on the bulk fields. The compatibility with the projection operators comes from the assumption, that all the odd fields can be written down as the step-function distribution centered on a given brane times the field that is even and continuous across the brane. Then one can formally assign the value zero to such an odd field, but this zero should be assigned to the step-function distribution and not to the even field that multiplies the distribution. This is a consistent approach to the ϵ -algebra, see the comments in the footnote 1.

Hence, in a setup with brane masses the supersymmetry is controlled by boundary conditions and not by the projectors only. The boundary conditions do not need to be orthogonal even if the brane projectors are. In particular, within the relations imposed on brane parameters and the prepotential, the change induced by the change of the brane projectors can be absorbed into the modification of fermionic mass terms on the branes without the necessity to modify the bosonic sources (like brane tensions in the example above). This is why one can have orthogonal brane projections, unbroken $N = 1$ supersymmetry and Randall–Sundrum background. One should note however that the existence of the Killing spinor is by no means guaranteed even in the extended setup discussed here.

The bottom line of the above discussion is that flipped and unflipped RS models with gravitini mass terms on the branes, describe actually the same four–dimensional physics. One can easily check that the following redefinitions

$$\begin{aligned}\eta^+ &\longrightarrow \xi^+ = \epsilon_\pi(y)\eta^+ , & \eta^- &\longrightarrow \xi^- = \epsilon_\pi^{-1}(y)\eta^- , \\ \Psi_\alpha^+ &\longrightarrow \chi_\alpha^+ = \epsilon_\pi(y)\Psi_\alpha^+ , & \Psi_\alpha^- &\longrightarrow \chi_\alpha^- = \epsilon_\pi^{-1}(y)\Psi_\alpha^- ,\end{aligned}\tag{47}$$

transform unflipped model into the flipped one (η and Ψ are fields of the unflipped model and ξ , χ - of the flipped model). The modifications of the supersymmetry transformations, (22), in both models are strictly connected by the redefinition (47). To see the precise relation between respective mass terms let us concentrate on the terms in the unflipped action that are proportional to $\delta(y - \pi r_c)$:

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\bar{\Psi}_\mu^A\gamma^{\mu\nu}\gamma^5\partial_5\Psi_{\nu A} - \frac{1}{2}\delta(y - \pi r_c)\bar{\Psi}_\mu^A\gamma^{\mu\nu}\sigma_1(\delta - \gamma_5\sigma_3)_A^B\Psi_{\nu B} \longrightarrow \\ &\longrightarrow \frac{1}{2}\bar{\chi}_\mu^A\gamma^{\mu\nu}\gamma^5\partial_5\chi_{\nu A} - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_\pi^{-2}(y)\delta(y - \pi r_c)\bar{\chi}_\mu^A\gamma^{\mu\nu}\sigma_1(\delta - \gamma_5\sigma_3)_A^B\chi_{\nu B} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_\pi^{-1}(y)\delta(y - \pi r_c)\bar{\chi}_\mu^A\gamma^{\mu\nu}\gamma^5(\delta - \gamma_5\sigma_3)_A^B\chi_{\nu B} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_\pi^{-1}(y)\delta(y - \pi r_c)\bar{\chi}_\mu^A\gamma^{\mu\nu}\gamma^5(\delta + \gamma_5\sigma_3)_A^B\chi_{\nu B} .\end{aligned}\tag{48}$$

Boundary conditions derived from the new action are the same as (40). On the other hand we can use these conditions in the last two terms of (48) to restore canonical action of the flipped model with mass terms (39).

4 Super–bigravity

To introduce flipped boundary condition in the FLP model [5], [8], let us assume $(Q_0)_A^B = -(Q_\pi)_A^B = (\sigma_3)_A^B$ and the prepotential $P_A^B = g_R\epsilon(y)i(\sigma_3)_A^B + g_S i(\sigma_1)_A^B$, which implies $N_0 = -N_\pi = -i$. For $(M_0)_{AB} = (M_\pi)_{AB} = 0$ one finds:

$$\lambda_0 = g_R 4\sqrt{2} , \quad \lambda_\pi = g_R 4\sqrt{2} .\tag{49}$$

For $k = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3}\sqrt{g_R^2 + g_S^2}$ and $T = g_R/\sqrt{g_R^2 + g_S^2}$ we obtain the bosonic part of the action:

$$S = \int d^5x \sqrt{-g_5} \left(\frac{1}{2}R + 6k^2 \right) - 6 \int d^5x \sqrt{-g_4} k T (\delta(y) + \delta(y - \pi r_c)) .\tag{50}$$

One should notice that the brane tensions have the same sign. As a consequence gravitational background has no flat 4d Minkowski foliation, and the consistent solution is that of AdS_4 branes:

$$ds^2 = a^2(y)\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu + dy^2, \quad (51)$$

where

$$a(y) = \frac{\sqrt{-\bar{\Lambda}}}{k} \cosh\left(k|y| - \frac{k\pi r_c}{2}\right), \quad (52)$$

and $\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu = \exp(-2\sqrt{-\bar{\Lambda}}x_3)(-dt^2 + dx_1^2 + dx_2^2) + dx_3^2$ is the four dimensional AdS metric.

The radius of the fifth dimension is determined by brane tensions:

$$k\pi r_c = \ln\left(\frac{1+T}{1-T}\right). \quad (53)$$

Normalization $a(0) = 1$ leads to the fine tuning relation $\bar{\Lambda} = (T^2 - 1)k^2 < 0$. Compactification of this model has been performed in [8]. Five-dimensional vacuum spontaneously breaks all supersymmetries due to the flipped boundary condition in the fermionic sector.

Let us try to restore $N = 1$ supersymmetry in super-bigravity. To this end let us assume the prepotential of the form: $P_A^B = gi(\sigma_1)_A^B$ and $(Q_0)_A^B = (Q_\pi)_A^B = (\sigma_3)_A^B$. Gravitini masses on the branes read

$$(M_{0,\pi})_A^B = \frac{1}{2}\alpha_{0,\pi}(\sigma_1)_A^B, \quad (\bar{M}_{0,\pi})_A^B = \frac{1}{2}\alpha_{0,\pi}i(\sigma_2)_A^B. \quad (54)$$

Taking

$$\alpha_0 = -\frac{\cosh(k\pi r_c/2) \pm 1}{\sinh(k\pi r_c/2)}, \quad \alpha_\pi = -\frac{\cosh(k\pi r_c/2) \pm 1}{\sinh(k\pi r_c/2)}, \quad (55)$$

we obtain bosonic action of the bigravity model (50). Notice, that we have two possibilities for the gravitini masses: $\alpha_0 = 1/\alpha_\pi$ and $\alpha_0 = \alpha_\pi$. One can check that the first one is related to the BFL case [5] (both give the same physics), hence we shall explore in detail the other one. For simplicity, let us assume $\alpha_0 = \alpha_\pi = -\alpha$, where

$$\alpha = \frac{\cosh(k\pi r_c/2) - 1}{\sinh(k\pi r_c/2)}. \quad (56)$$

Then the boundary conditions take the form

$$\epsilon^{-1}(y)\delta(y)\gamma_5\eta_-^A = \delta(y)\alpha(\sigma_1)_B^A\eta_+^B, \quad (57)$$

$$\epsilon^{-1}(y)\delta(y - \pi r_c)\gamma_5\eta_-^A = -\delta(y - \pi r_c)\alpha(\sigma_1)_B^A\eta_+^B. \quad (58)$$

Let us now check whether supersymmetry is broken in the effective theory. The Killing equations read:

$$0 = \bar{\nabla}_\mu\eta_\pm^A + \frac{1}{2}k\epsilon(y)\tanh\left(k|y| - \frac{k\pi r_c}{2}\right)\gamma_\mu\gamma_5\eta_\mp^A + \frac{1}{2}k(\sigma_1)_B^A\gamma_\mu\eta_\pm^B, \quad (59)$$

$$0 = \partial_5\eta_+^A + \frac{1}{2}k(\sigma_1)_B^A\gamma_5\eta_-^B, \quad (60)$$

$$0 = \partial_5\eta_-^A + \frac{1}{2}k(\sigma_1)_B^A\gamma_5\eta_+^B - 2(\delta(y) - \delta(y - \pi r_c))\epsilon^{-1}(y)\eta_-^A, \quad (61)$$

where $\bar{\nabla}_\mu$ denotes covariant derivative with respect to the four-dimensional AdS geometry. One can decompose Killing spinors as follows:

$$\eta_+^A = \phi_+(y) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\eta}_R \\ -\hat{\eta}_L \end{pmatrix}^A, \quad \eta_-^A = \phi_-(y) \epsilon(y) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\eta}_L \\ \hat{\eta}_R \end{pmatrix}^A, \quad (62)$$

where $\hat{\eta}$ denotes killing spinor in the AdS_4 , which satisfies: $(\bar{\nabla}_\mu - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-\Lambda}\hat{\gamma}_\mu)\hat{\eta} = 0$.

The equation (59) can be solved by

$$\phi_-(y) = -\tanh(k|y|/2 - k\pi r_c/4) \phi_+(y). \quad (63)$$

One can easily check that boundary conditions (57), (58) are indeed satisfied.

The equations (60) and (61) take the form:

$$0 = \partial_5 \phi_+ - \frac{1}{2} k \epsilon(y) \tanh\left(\frac{k|y|}{2} - \frac{k\pi r_c}{4}\right) \phi_+, \quad (64)$$

$$0 = \partial_5 \phi_- - \frac{1}{2} k \epsilon(y) \coth\left(\frac{k|y|}{2} - \frac{k\pi r_c}{4}\right) \phi_-. \quad (65)$$

One finds the following solutions:

$$\phi_+ = N \cosh(k|y|/2 - k\pi r_c/4), \quad \phi_- = -N \sinh(k|y|/2 - k\pi r_c/4), \quad (66)$$

where N is a normalization constant.

One can find the explicit form of the zero-mode of gravitini. The bulk equations of motion for the even and odd components read:

$$\gamma^{\mu\rho\nu} \nabla_\rho (\Psi_\nu^\mp)^A - \gamma^{\mu\nu} \gamma^5 \partial_5 (\Psi_\nu^\pm)^A - k \epsilon \tanh\left(k|y| - \frac{k\pi r_c}{2}\right) \gamma^{\mu\nu} \gamma^5 (\Psi_\nu^\pm)^A - \frac{3}{2} k (\sigma_1)^A_B \gamma^{\mu\nu} (\Psi_\nu^\mp)^B = 0. \quad (67)$$

Boundary conditions take the same form as for the Killing spinor:

$$\epsilon^{-1}(y) \delta(y) \gamma_5 (\Psi_\mu^-)^A = \delta(y) \alpha (\sigma_1)^A_B (\Psi_\mu^+)^B, \quad (68)$$

$$\epsilon^{-1}(y) \delta(y - \pi r_c) \gamma_5 (\Psi_\mu^-)^A = -\delta(y - \pi r_c) \alpha (\sigma_1)^A_B (\Psi_\mu^+)^B. \quad (69)$$

The solution follows:

$$(\Psi_\mu^+)^A = N \cosh(k|y|/2 - k\pi r_c/4) \begin{pmatrix} (\hat{\psi}_\mu)_R \\ -(\hat{\psi}_\mu)_L \end{pmatrix}^A, \quad (70)$$

$$(\Psi_\mu^-)^A = -N \sinh(k|y|/2 - k\pi r_c/4) \begin{pmatrix} (\hat{\psi}_\mu)_L \\ (\hat{\psi}_\mu)_R \end{pmatrix}^A, \quad (71)$$

where $\hat{\psi}_\mu$ denotes massless 4d gravitino in AdS_4 : $\gamma^{\mu\rho\nu} \nabla_\rho \hat{\psi}_\nu = -\sqrt{-\Lambda} \gamma^{\mu\nu} \hat{\psi}_\nu$.

Hence, we have managed to construct the model, which has the supersymmetric vacuum state where distance between branes is fixed, and the bosonic gravitational sector looks from

the four-dimensional perspective as the $(++)$ bigravity [10],[11]. Dimensional reduction of the fermionic sector shall lead to truly $N = 1$ supersymmetric four-dimensional version of bigravity (super-bigravity). Despite the fact that the background value of the 4d cosmological constant is non-zero, this is not a bad starting point for realistic model building. First of all, one can tune the value of the cosmological constant to be arbitrarily close to zero (this corresponds to the interbrane distance going towards infinity), second - the vacuum is static, with fixed expectation value of the radion, third - the vacuum energy shall be modified by radiative corrections after including matter into the game. The situation is not that dramatically different from that of the flat RS model: there the flat foliation implies that the interbrane distance is undetermined and one needs to complicate the model to fix the radion and break supersymmetry, which induces further corrections to the vacuum energy. Although it is possible to build a (somewhat baroque) model where all the contributions conspire to give a vanishing vacuum energy in 4d, the procedure leading to that goal may be equally well applied to the present bigravity background.

Finally, let us notice, that the model constructed in this section may be interpreted as the deconstruction³ of 5d supergravity. First of all, it is immediate to extend the model to the multi-brane setup of $S^1/\Pi \mathbf{Z}_2$ as in [8]. Then one can check, that in the limit of infinite interbrane distance all wave functions of gravitons and gravitini become localized on the branes, hence one has a simple product of K $SO(1,3)$ gravities localized on the branes. When the expectation value of the radion becomes finite (the radion ‘condenses’), the bosonic and fermionic modes combine to form a single set of zero modes, corresponding to the diagonal subgroup of the product of K $SO(2,3)$ gravities, since for finite vev of the radion 4d geometry is the AdS_4 .

5 Summary

In this work we have extended previous analysis of the bulk/brane supersymmetrizations involving non-zero brane mass terms of bulk fermions (gravitini), and twisting of boundary conditions. Our results confirm these of the ref. [6] at points where the papers overlap. We have applied the results to the construction of new brane/bulk models that may be relevant for realistic model building. In particular, we have built a model with the Randall–Sundrum bosonic sector, orthogonal projection operators on the branes in the fermionic sector, and an unbroken $N = 1$ supersymmetry. We have also constructed 5d super-bigravity which allows for a static vacuum with unbroken $N = 1$ supersymmetry. This model, in its multi-brane version, may be viewed as the deconstruction of 5d supergravity.

We thank Max Zucker for very helpful and enjoyable discussions. Z.L. thanks Theory Division at CERN for hospitality. This work was partially supported by the EC Contract HPRN-CT-2000-00152 for years 2000-2004, by the Polish State Committee for Scientific Research grant KBN 2P03B 129 24, and by POLONIUM 2003.

³For the general idea of deconstruction see [12],[13].

References

- [1] R. Altendorfer, J. Bagger and D. Nemeschansky, “Supersymmetric Randall-Sundrum scenario,” *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2001) 125025 [arXiv:hep-th/0003117].
- [2] A. Falkowski, Z. Lalak and S. Pokorski, “Supersymmetrizing branes with bulk in five-dimensional supergravity,” *Phys. Lett. B* **491** (2000) 172 [arXiv:hep-th/0004093].
- [3] E. Bergshoeff, R. Kallosh and A. Van Proeyen, “Supersymmetry in singular spaces,” *JHEP* **0010** (2000) 033 [arXiv:hep-th/0007044].
- [4] M. Zucker, “Supersymmetric brane world scenarios from off-shell supergravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 024024 [arXiv:hep-th/0009083].
- [5] P. Brax, A. Falkowski and Z. Lalak, “Non-BPS branes of supersymmetric brane worlds,” *Phys. Lett. B* **521** (2001) 105 [arXiv:hep-th/0107257].
- [6] J. Bagger and D. V. Belyaev, “Supersymmetric branes with (almost) arbitrary tensions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **67** (2003) 025004 [arXiv:hep-th/0206024].
- [7] P. Brax and Z. Lalak, “Brane world supersymmetry, detuning, flipping and orbifolding,” *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **33** (2002) 2399 [arXiv:hep-th/0207102].
- [8] Z. Lalak and R. Matyszkiewicz, “On Scherk-Schwarz mechanism in gauged five-dimensional supergravity and on its relation to bigravity,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **649** (2003) 389 [arXiv:hep-th/0210053].
- [9] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, “A large mass hierarchy from a small extra dimension,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** (1999) 3370 [arXiv:hep-ph/9905221].
- [10] I. I. Kogan, S. Mouslopoulos, A. Papazoglou, G. G. Ross and J. Santiago, “A three three-brane universe: New phenomenology for the new millennium?,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **584** (2000) 313 [arXiv:hep-ph/9912552].
- [11] I. I. Kogan, S. Mouslopoulos and A. Papazoglou, “A new bigravity model with exclusively positive branes,” *Phys. Lett. B* **501** (2001) 140 [arXiv:hep-th/0011141].
- [12] N. Arkani-Hamed, A. G. Cohen and H. Georgi, “(De)constructing dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** (2001) 4757 [arXiv:hep-th/0104005].
- [13] C. T. Hill, S. Pokorski and J. Wang, “Gauge invariant effective Lagrangian for Kaluza-Klein modes,” *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 105005 [arXiv:hep-th/0104035].