

# The Cosmological Slingshot Scenario: A Stringy Early Times Universe

**Cristiano Germani**

D.A.M.T.P., Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge, Wilberforce  
road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, England  
Department of Physics, King's College London, London WC2R 2LS, England  
SISSA, via Beirut 4, 34014 Trieste, Italy

E-mail: [Germani@sissa.it](mailto:Germani@sissa.it)

**Nicolás Grandi**

IFLP-CONICET, cc67, CP1900 La Plata, Argentina  
ICTP, Strada Costiera 11, 34014 Trieste, Italy  
SISSA, via Beirut 4, 34014 Trieste, Italy

E-mail: [grandi@fisica.unlp.edu.ar](mailto:grandi@fisica.unlp.edu.ar)

**Alex Kehagias**

Physics Division, National Technical University of Athens,  
15780 Zografou Campus, Athens, Greece

E-mail: [kehagias@central.ntua.gr](mailto:kehagias@central.ntua.gr)

**Abstract.** A cosmological model for the early time Universe is proposed. In this model, the Universe is a wandering brane moving in a warped throat of a Calabi-Yau space. A non-zero angular momentum induces a turning point in the brane trajectory, and leads to a bouncing cosmology as experienced by an observer living on the brane. The Universe undergoes a decelerated contraction followed by an accelerating expansion and no big-bang singularity. Although the number of e-folds of accelerated motion is low (less than 2), standard cosmological problems are not present in our model thanks to the absence of an initial singularity and the violation of energy conditions of mirage matter at high energies. Density perturbations are also calculated in our model and we find a slightly red spectral index with negligible tensorial perturbations in compatibility with WMAP data.

## 1. Introduction

In April 1970 the spacecraft Apollo 13 was sent to the moon for a NASA mission. Two days after its launch an explosion made the Service Module lose power and oxygen very quickly. In this dangerous scenario the astronauts had to take the decision to move into the Lunar Module *Aquarius* and leave the Service Module. However, as the Lunar module is not designed for long trips, NASA engineering had to find a way to bring back to earth the Lunar Module, using as less energy as possible. As the Module was moving towards the Moon, NASA rocket scientists decided to use very little power of the Module in order to modify its orbit to be an open orbit around the Moon. This was lead by the knowledge that, at the inversion point of the trajectory of the (probe) spacecraft around the Moon, conservation of angular momentum would lead to an acceleration of the spacecraft and would redirect it towards the Earth. The effect they used is called the gravitational Slingshot effect.

In this paper we show that the same effect appears any time a brane moves with an open orbit around a not trivial central background. In this case an observer living on the brane will experience a bouncing cosmology without singularity with a well defined bounce, followed by a very short acceleration period. We will call this the ‘‘Cosmological Slingshot’’ scenario.

We will study the cosmological evolution of a brane observer at early times using the so called mirage cosmology approximation [1],[2]. In it, what the observer is measuring as the physical  $3 + 1$  dimensional metric is given in terms of the brane embedding and the bulk metric by the induced metric formula. Its time evolution is then dictated by the motion of the brane in the background which, if the back-reaction of the probe can be neglected, is a static solution of  $9 + 1$  dimensional IIB supergravity equations. In particular, our Slingshot brane is moving on a Calabi-Yau manifold sourced by a stack of  $D3$ -branes. In this background, mirage effects can dominate the evolution of the Universe only at early time, *i.e.* when the brane moves in the throat of the Calabi-Yau. Viceversa, at late times, when the brane reaches the hat of the Calabi-Yau, local effects *a la* Randall-Sundrum [3] might become important thus obtaining the standard cosmological evolution at late times. In this context, we will show that there is an infinitely large region of choice of parameters such that homogeneity, isotropy and flatness problems of standard cosmology can be avoided as follow:

**Homogeneity** Latest measures of the cosmic microwave background (CMB) [4] clearly show that the CMB radiation is homogeneous and isotropic. This implies that all points of the CMB sky, as we observe them nowadays, should have been in causal contact, with high degree of accuracy, at very early times. In other words, two photons from two distant points in the CMB sky should have had enough time in the past to meet each other and exchange information. Standard Big Bang cosmology predicts a finite ‘‘life time’’ of the Universe. One can show that this ‘‘life time’’ is too short to allow the high homogeneity and isotropy of the CMB sky.

The Slingshot scenario overcomes this problem by generating a non-singular

bouncing cosmology. In this case two photons had enough time to meet each other in the past so that the high degree of homogeneity and isotropy observed could be reached. More technically, the conformal horizon of the Universe in the Slingshot scenario is infinite.

**Isotropy** Standard Cosmology assumes that the cosmic evolution is driven by “standard matter” (which does not violate energy conditions) via Einstein equations. It is possible to prove that in this case an isotropic Universe is highly unstable under anisotropic perturbations. This is because, close to the singularity, the energy density associated with anisotropic perturbations is stronger than the energy density of standard matter.

In the Slingshot scenario, this problem is solved in two different ways. Firstly, our bouncing cosmology may not allow the Universe to reach scales in which the anisotropic perturbations dominates. Secondly, one can show that for small scales, the mirage energy density grows faster than the energy density associated with anisotropic perturbations, so to stabilize an homogeneous and isotropic Universe, a Friedman geometry.

**Flatness** Current measures [4], clearly show that our Universe is nowadays very close to be spatially flat. However, in standard cosmology a measure of the spatial curvature decreases backwards in time while the Hubble constant increases. In this case in order to have the required flatness today, extreme fine tuning of the curvature must be used at very early times close to the Planck scales. This is mainly due to the fact that, given the matter content, spatial curvature depends only on one parameter.

In the Slingshot scenario we solve this problem as the spatial curvature is bounded from below. Indeed, by an appropriate choice of the minimum for the spatial curvature, which only restrict to a semi-infinite region the space of parameter of our model (the “energy” and “angular momentum”), the flatness problem is easily solved without the use of fine-tunings.

Besides the resolution of standard cosmological problems, we show that the correct scale invariant perturbation necessary to reproduce the CMB spectra as measured by the WMAP team [4], can be easily produced. This is due to the fact that perturbations are dynamically generated at a stringy scale. The introduction of this scale is indeed enough to produce an almost scale invariant spectrum.

### 1.1. Framework

The bosonic part of the bulk supergravity action (in Einstein frame) for the type IIB theory is [5]

$$\begin{aligned}
 S_{IIB} = & \frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-g} \left( R - \frac{\partial_M \tau \partial^M \bar{\tau}}{2(\text{Im}\tau)^2} - \frac{G_{(3)} \cdot \bar{G}_{(3)}}{12\text{Im}\tau} - \frac{\tilde{F}_{(5)}^2}{4 \cdot 5!} \right) \\
 & + \frac{1}{8i\kappa_{10}^2} \int \frac{C_{(4)} \wedge G_{(3)} \wedge \bar{G}_{(3)}}{\text{Im}\tau}, \tag{1.1}
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $G_{(3)} = F_3 - \tau H_3$  is the complex three-form (with  $G_{(3)} = dC_{(2)}$ ,  $H_{(3)} = dB_{(2)}$ ),  $\tau = C_{(0)} + ie^{-\phi}$  is the complex IIB scalar and

$$\tilde{F}_{(5)} = F_{(5)} - \frac{1}{2}C_{(2)} \wedge H_{(3)} + \frac{1}{2}B_{(2)} \wedge F_{(3)} , \quad (1.2)$$

with the five-form  $F_{(5)} = dC_{(4)}$ . The equations of motion resulting from the above action have to be supplemented by the self-duality condition

$$\tilde{F}_{(5)} = *\tilde{F}_{(5)} . \quad (1.3)$$

In order to describe a background geometry sourced by  $D3$ -branes, we will consider the following background warped metric

$$ds^2 = h^{-1/2}ds_{\parallel}^2 + h^{1/2}ds_{\perp}^2 , \quad (1.4)$$

where  $ds_{\parallel}^2$  is the four dimensional metric along the  $D3$ -branes and  $ds_{\perp}^2$  the metric of the six dimensional transverse space. In the case of vanishing three-form  $G_{(3)} = 0$ , the corresponding RR 4-form gauge potential is given by

$$C_{(4)} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{h}\right) dx^0 \wedge \dots \wedge dx^3 , \quad (1.5)$$

while the dilaton field  $\phi$  as well as the string coupling are constant. The supergravity equations coming from the variation of the action (1.1) are satisfied for Ricci flat  $D3$ 's if and only if  $h$  satisfies

$$h^{-1}\nabla_{\perp}^2 h = 0. \quad (1.6)$$

Moreover, supersymmetry requires that the four dimensional slice parallel to the stack of  $D3$ -branes is flat Minkowski space-time, whereas depending on the number of supersymmetries, the transverse space can be flat  $\mathbb{R}^6$ ,  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{H}_4$  ( $\mathbb{H}_4$  hyperkähler), Calabi-Yau (CY) or a generic Ricci-flat space  $V_6$ . In these cases, the  $D3$ -stack breaks  $1/2, 1/4, 1/8$  or all of the supersymmetries respectively, leading to  $\mathcal{N} = 4, 2, 1$  or  $\mathcal{N} = 0$  four dimensional theories.

We will introduce our  $D3$ -brane universe in the background (1.4,1.5) (for type-0 backgrounds see [6]). In order to find analytical results, we will rely on the probe-background approximation, in which the backreaction of the probe brane onto the bulk fields is disregarded. In order to ensure the validity of this approximation, we need to keep the strength of the perturbation produced by the probe small enough compared to the strength of the source, as we shall discuss later. In particular, our  $D3$  probe universe is embedded along a four dimensional slice described by the embedding fields  $X^A(\xi^\mu)$ ,  $A = 0, \dots, 9$ , in term of its local world-volume coordinates  $\xi^\mu$ ,  $\mu = 0, \dots, 3$ . Lengths along this slice are measured with the corresponding induced metric, which is given in terms of the bulk metric and the embedding fields by the pullback formula

$$ds_i^2 = g_{AB}\partial_{\mu}X^A\partial_{\nu}X^B d\xi^{\mu}d\xi^{\nu} . \quad (1.7)$$

Such a probe will then experience forces due to the background and will consequently move through the bulk, with dynamics governed by the Dirac-Born-Infeld action with a Wess-Zumino term

$$S_{DBI} + S_{WZ} = -T_3 \int e^{-\phi} \sqrt{-g_i} d^4\xi - T_3 \int C_{(4)} . \quad (1.8)$$

The sign of the Wess-Zumino term has been chosen so as to represent a  $D3$ -brane, and  $T_3$  is the tension of the probe, given by

$$T_3 = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3 g_s l_s^4}. \quad (1.9)$$

If there is additional matter living in the brane, its contribution has to be added to action (1.8). However, we will assume that the contribution to the probe motion of any additional matter living on the brane is subdominant, i.e.  $T_3 \gg \rho_m$ , where  $\rho_m$  is the matter canonical energy density on the probe.

The induced metric (1.7) will evolve during the probe brane motion. From the point of view of an observer living in the probe, such induced metric describes the evolution of his/her Universe. We will introduce next an explicit description of a probe brane in a type IIB supergravity background, which will be later used for our Slingshot scenario.

## 2. Wandering $D3$ -branes in warped throats

**Background**  $Dp$ -branes may exist on compact manifolds [7]. In the case of CY compactifications, the CY manifolds may have singularities at special points of their moduli space. Near a singularity, CY looks like a conifold  $\mathcal{M}_6$  on which, although singular, strings may consistently propagate. The conifold geometry [8] is that of a cone with a  $\mathbb{T}^{1,1}$  base, whose topology is  $S^3 \times S^2$ . At the singularity (the tip of the cone) both  $S^2$ ,  $S^3$  shrinks to zero size. One may then introduce a stack of  $D3$ -branes at the tip of the cone [9], [10], [11], [12], and the geometry looks like  $AdS_5 \times \mathbb{T}^{1,1}$  near the  $D3$ -branes with a warp factor  $h$ . Away from the  $D3$ 's, the warped conifold is no longer a good description of the geometry. The conifold singularity may now be deformed by blowing up the tip of the cone to an  $S^3$  by means of appropriate fluxes giving rise to the Klebanov-Strassler geometry [13]. The latter provides an IR description (close to the tip) and it can be smoothly glued into a CY manifold in the UV (far from the tip) [7]. In this case, we will expect that a wandering probe  $D3$ -brane will experience mirage cosmology as it falls down towards the tip of the warped deformed conifold in the Klebanov-Strassler throat [14].

In what follows we will need a detailed description of the motion of our wandering probe  $D3$ -brane inside the above described throat, assuming that at some point the brane leaves the throat reaching the CY space. As to that end is not important the detailed geometry of the conifold, we may replace it by flat six dimensional space, (which corresponds actually to a  $\mathbb{T}^6$  compactification [15], [16]), postponing the more complicated case of the deformed conifold to section 4. In this simplified configuration, the solution is the maximally supersymmetric one with flat Minkowskian four dimensional slice and Euclidean transverse space with metrics

$$ds_{\parallel}^2 = -d\eta^2 + d\vec{x} \cdot d\vec{x}, \quad ds_{\perp}^2 = d\vec{r} \cdot d\vec{r} = dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_5^2, \quad (2.1)$$

respectively, where  $d\Omega_5^2$  is the metric on an  $S^5$ . In this case, the  $h$  factor corresponds to the solution of (1.6) sourced by a stack of  $N$   $Dp$ -branes sitting at  $\vec{r} = 0$ . If the spacetime

is chosen to be asymptotically Minkowski we have

$$h = 1 + L^4/r^4, \quad (2.2)$$

whereas if the spacetime is chosen to be  $AdS_5 \times S^5$

$$h = L^4/r^4. \quad (2.3)$$

We note that the two spacetimes are coincident in the deep throat region for which  $L/r \ll 1$ . In both cases,  $L$  is related to the RR charge  $N$  of the  $D3$ -branes by

$$L^4 = 4\pi l_s^4 N g_s. \quad (2.4)$$

Here  $l_s$  is the string length,  $g_s$  the string coupling and  $N$  the number of  $D3$ -branes in the stack. The supergravity approximation we are using here are valid as long as string perturbation theory can be applied and  $\alpha'$  corrections are negligible, meaning the curvature radius  $L$  of the solution is big compared to the string length  $l_s$ , or equivalently  $g_s \ll 1$  and  $g_s N \gg 1$ .

**Wandering  $D3$ -brane** We now introduce a  $D3$  probe with world-volume coordinates  $(\xi^0, \xi^i)$  in the vicinity of the  $N$  coincident  $D3$ -branes. In order to keep the validity of the probe-background approximation, we shall require  $N \gg 1$ .

In the following, we assume that the probe brane is extended parallel to the stack of  $D3$ -branes so that it looks like a point moving in transverse space (for inhomogeneous embedding see [17]). In this case, near the stack of  $D3$ 's, the geometry is that of an  $AdS_5 \times S^5$  space. In the static gauge  $\eta = \xi^0, x^i = \xi^i$ , with  $\vec{r} = \vec{r}(\eta)$ , the induced metric is given by

$$ds_i^2 = h^{-1/2} \left[ - (1 - h\vec{r}'^2) d\eta^2 + d\vec{x} \cdot d\vec{x} \right], \quad (2.5)$$

where a prime ( $'$ ) is a derivative with respect to  $\eta$ .

Under the above described assumptions, the brane action turns out to be

$$S = - \int \mathcal{L} d\eta, \quad (2.6)$$

where the Lagrangian is given by

$$\mathcal{L} = -T_3 V_3 \frac{1}{h} \sqrt{1 - h\vec{r}'^2} - T_3 V_3 \left( 1 - \frac{1}{h} \right), \quad (2.7)$$

and  $V_3$  is the un-warped volume of longitudinal brane directions (parallel to the probe).

To begin the analysis of the motion, we will use the rotational symmetry of transverse space to write  $\vec{r}'^2 = r'^2 + r^2 \Omega_5'^2$ . Here  $\Omega_5'$  represents the angular velocity on the transverse 5-sphere. From the action (2.6), we can define the conserved quantities

$$\ell = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \Omega_5'} = T_3 V_3 \frac{r^2}{\sqrt{1 - h\vec{r}'^2}} \Omega_5' \quad (2.8)$$

and

$$\mathcal{E} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \Omega_5'} \Omega_5' + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial r'} r' - \mathcal{L} = \frac{T_3 V_3}{h \sqrt{1 - h\vec{r}'^2}} + T_3 V_3 \left( 1 - \frac{1}{h} \right). \quad (2.9)$$

These quantities parameterize the physical angular momentum and the physical brane energy, so we will loosely call them angular momentum ( $\ell$ ) and energy ( $\mathcal{E}$ ). Inverting the above equalities we obtain [1]

$$\Omega'_5 = \frac{lL}{r^2 h(1 - C + U)}, \quad r'^2 = -V, \quad (2.10)$$

where

$$C = 1 - \frac{1}{h}, \quad V = -\frac{1}{h} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{h^2(1 - C + U)^2} \left( 1 + \frac{l^2 h L^2}{r^2} \right) \right]. \quad (2.11)$$

We have redefined the energy and the angular momentum as  $U = \mathcal{E}/T_3 V_3 - 1$  and  $l = \ell/T_3 V_3 L$ , respectively.

In the above formulae we note that the allowed regions for the motion are those where  $r'^2 \geq 0$ ; the points where  $r'^2 = 0$  being the bouncing points.

We may define the cosmic time  $t$  according to

$$\frac{d\eta}{dt} = \frac{h^{1/4}}{\sqrt{1 - hr'^2}} = h^{5/4}(q(C - 1) + U). \quad (2.12)$$

The induced metric (2.5) can now be written in the zero spatial curvature Friedman-Robertson-Walker form

$$ds_i^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t) d\vec{x} \cdot d\vec{x}, \quad (2.13)$$

where the scale factor is

$$a(t) = h^{-1/4}(r(\eta(t))). \quad (2.14)$$


An observer living on the probe brane will therefore experience a cosmological evolution parameterized by the two dimensionless parameters  $l$  and  $U$  that specify the form of the probe orbits. He/she may wonder how much fine tuning is needed on these parameters in order to have phenomenologically acceptable results. We are mainly interested here in the  $l \neq 0$  case, which corresponds to a probe starting at  $r = r_{in}$ , with some initial velocity  $r'_{in}$  (c.f. point A of Fig.1) and traveling towards the stack of  $D3$ -branes at  $r = 0$ . During this travel, the velocity of the probe decreases until the turning point B at  $r = r_b$ , where the velocity of the probe vanishes. After that point, the outgoing probe velocity increases again until it reaches its initial value at point D.

As we are now going to show, in the case where the probe brane follows an orbit around the stack with a turning point, an observer on the brane will measure a cosmological accelerated expansion during a short period in the outgoing part of the orbit (interval BC of Fig.1) and a decelerated expansion from that point on. With the above definitions, the expansion rate is

$$\dot{a} = \frac{da}{dr} r' \frac{d\eta}{dt}, \quad (2.15)$$

where we denote with a dot ( $\dot{\phantom{a}}$ ) derivatives with respect to cosmic time  $t$ .

An observer in the brane will measure cosmological contraction during the ingoing part of the orbit, an expansion during the outgoing part, and a bounce at the turning



**Figure 1.** Open orbit of a  $D3$ -brane probe in the background of  $N$   $D3$ -branes. The probe starts at point A with some initial velocity, reaches the turning point B and continues towards point D. In the interval AB we have cosmological contraction on the probe and expansion in the interval BD. Accelerated expansion exists for the part BC of the orbit.

point  $r_b = r(\eta_b)$  such that  $r'(\eta_b) = 0$ . We can readily see that the cosmic acceleration can be expanded around the turning point as

$$\ddot{a} \propto r' \frac{dr'}{dr} + \mathcal{O}(r'^2). \quad (2.16)$$

When the probe brane approaches the bouncing point  $r_b$ ,  $r$  decreases while the brane is climbing a centrifugal barrier so that  $r'$  decreases as well. Conversely, when  $r$  is growing,  $r'$  is also growing, as the brane is falling down the barrier. This implies that  $dr'/dr$  is positive and therefore  $\ddot{a}$  is negative in the vicinity of the turning point  $r_b$  in the incoming branch of the orbit, and it becomes positive in the outgoing branch. Consequently, the brane observer will measure cosmological acceleration when the brane has passed through the turning point as it moves away from the stack of  $D3$ 's. It is therefore interesting to ask how many e-folds such an observer will experience during the accelerated expanding era. The number of e-folds is defined as  $N_e = \ln(a(\eta_f)/a(\eta_b))$  where  $\eta_f$  is the time in which the acceleration ends, and  $\eta_b$  the inversion time. In order to have as many e-folds as possible it would be therefore important to have  $a(\eta_f) = h^{-1/4}(r(\eta_f))$  as big as possible, or equivalently,  $r(\eta_f)$  as big as possible together with the requirement that  $r(\eta_b)$  is as small as possible.

To take this analysis further, we need some explicit knowledge on the orbits and the resulting cosmological evolution.



### 2.1. Asymptotically Minkowski Throat

It can be easily seen that in the case that the warping factor  $h$  in the metric (1.4) is chosen by Eq.(2.2), flat Minkowskian spacetime is recovered in the large  $r \gg L$  limit. In this background, the probe brane will feel some effective potential when it is close enough to the stack of  $D3$ 's, while it will move more or less freely when it is far from it. We will study the motion of the probe and the resulting cosmology in this section.

We are interested in unbounded orbits, which exists as long as  $V < 0$  at infinity. Solving Eq.(2.10) for  $r'^2$  we get that the allowed region for the motion ( $r'^2 \geq 0$ ) is

$$r^2 \geq \frac{L^2}{2U(U+2)} \left[ l^2 + \sqrt{l^4 - 4(U+2)U^3} \right] . \quad (2.17)$$

In order to have a bounce, angular momentum and energy are therefore constrained to be

$$l^4 - 4(U+2)U^3 \geq 0 . \quad (2.18)$$

In this case an inversion point  $r_b$  such that  $r' = 0$  always exist at the value of  $r$  that saturates the inequality (2.17). Then the probe follows an unbounded orbit coming from infinity, bouncing at  $r_b$ , and then going back to infinity. The explicit form of these orbits can be obtained by quadratures integrating  $d\Omega_5/dr = \Omega'_5/r'$  [18].

In order to maximize  $N_e$ , the acceleration period should end when the probe is far away from the stack of  $D3$ -branes, or in other words in the  $r_f \gg L$  region. We can already anticipate that this cannot work as in the asymptotic region, close to the hat of the CY, the probe brane does not feel any potential. A numerical exploration of the  $(l, U)$  plane, indeed shows that the  $N_e$  is not bigger than  $\sim 0.4$ . Also analytical arguments can be given as follow.

The condition to have a positive acceleration in the  $r_f \gg L$  region can be found by expanding the acceleration in the  $\epsilon = r_f/L$  parameter, so to have

$$\frac{l^2 L^2}{r_f^2} > \frac{10}{7}(U+2)U . \quad (2.19)$$

However, from the  $r'^2 > 0$  constraint we get

$$(U+2)U > \frac{l^2 L^2}{r_f^2} , \quad (2.20)$$

which is obviously in contradiction with (2.19). So, the acceleration cannot finish in the flat region as anticipated.

We conclude that the whole acceleration process must take place in the throat region. We will now be more explicit in the next paragraph, studying the motion of the probe inside the  $AdS_5 \times S^5$  throat.

### 2.2. $AdS_5 \times S^5$ space

In this background the warping factor  $h$  is given by Eq.(2.3) and therefore  $a = r/L$ . Again we can use Eq.(2.10) to understand the orbits of the probe brane. In order to

have unbounded orbits (*i.e.* in order to let our probe to eventually leave the throat instead of being confined in it), we again impose that  $V$  is non positive at infinity. This leads us to the choice  $U > 0$ . From the condition  $r'^2 \geq 0$  we get that the allowed region for the brane motion is

$$r^2 \geq \frac{L^2}{4U} \left[ l^2 + \sqrt{l^4 - 8U^3} \right] , \quad (2.21)$$

and for a bouncing point we should have

$$l^4 - 8U^3 > 0 . \quad (2.22)$$

In this case, a turning point  $r' = 0$  always exists at  $r = r_b$  where the inequality (2.21) is saturated. Thus, when the condition (2.22) is fulfilled, the probe brane coming from infinity bounces at  $r_b$  and then goes back to infinity.

Requiring  $\ddot{a} > 0$  and  $r'^2 > 0$  we obtain an upper bound for the accelerating region

$$r^2 \leq \frac{L^2}{2U} \left[ l^2 + \sqrt{l^4 - 6U^3} \right] \quad \text{with } \ddot{a} > 0 . \quad (2.23)$$

It is then simple to see that the number of e-folds is

$$N_e = \frac{1}{2} \log \left( 2 \frac{l^2 + \sqrt{l^4 - 6U^3}}{l^2 + \sqrt{l^4 - 8U^3}} \right) \lesssim 0.7 , \quad (2.24)$$

consistently with the numerical results cited above.

Then the cosmological evolution as seen for an observer in the brane does have an inflationary period, but it is too short to be used for the resolution of the standard cosmological problems. Nevertheless, we will show in section 3 that horizon, isotropy and curvature problems can be naturally solved in our proposed Slingshot scenario.

### 2.3. Non-vanishing spatial curvature

The flatness of the Universe is one of the vexing problems of standard cosmological scenarios. In the previous discussions we considered embedding with spatially flat three-sections. However, Friedman geometries with non vanishing three-curvature can also be embedded on a maximally symmetric bulk. To this end, we will consider again an  $AdS_5 \times S^5$  background. An appropriate change of coordinates puts the metric (1.4) into the form

$$ds^2 = -\left(\kappa + \frac{r^2}{L^2}\right)d\eta^2 + \frac{dr^2}{\kappa + \frac{r^2}{L^2}} + \frac{r^2}{L^2\left(1 + \frac{\kappa}{4L^2}\rho^2\right)^2} (d\rho^2 + \rho^2 d\Omega_2^2) + L^2 d\Omega_5^2 . \quad (2.25)$$

The constant  $\kappa$  parameterizes the flat, spherical or hyperbolic three-curvature of the four dimensional slice, and can be set respectively to  $\kappa = 0, 1, -1$  by the following re-scaling of coordinates:  $\rho \rightarrow \rho/\sqrt{|\kappa|}$ ,  $r \rightarrow r\sqrt{|\kappa|}$ ,  $\eta \rightarrow \eta/\sqrt{|\kappa|}$ .

The RR 5-form field strength is

$$F_{(5)} = -\frac{4}{L}(1 + *)Vol(AdS_5) . \quad (2.26)$$

The corresponding potential is given, after a straightforward integration in the  $r$  variable, by

$$C_{(4)} = \left(1 - \frac{r^4}{L^4}\right) \frac{\rho^2}{\left(1 + \frac{\kappa}{4L^2}\rho^2\right)^3} d\eta \wedge d\rho \wedge d\Omega_2, \quad (2.27)$$

where, without loss of generality, we have set the integration constant to 1.

The probe with time-like coordinate  $\xi^0$  and spatial polar coordinates  $(\xi, \Xi_2)$  can be embedded along the new coordinates  $\xi^0 = \eta, \xi = \rho$  and  $\Xi_2 = \Omega_2$ , at a time-dependent position  $r(\eta), \Omega_5(\eta)$  in transverse space. The induced metric on the brane is

$$ds_i^2 = - \left[ \kappa + \frac{r^2}{L^2} - \frac{r'^2}{\kappa + \frac{r^2}{L^2}} - L^2 \Omega_5'^2 \right] d\eta^2 + \frac{r^2}{L^2 \left(1 + \frac{\kappa}{4L^2}\rho^2\right)^2} (d\rho^2 + \rho^2 d\Omega_2^2) \quad (2.28)$$

and therefore the DBI action turns out to be

$$S = -T_3 V_3 \int d\eta \frac{r^3}{L^3} \sqrt{\kappa + \frac{r^2}{L^2} - \frac{r'^2}{\kappa + \frac{r^2}{L^2}} - L^2 \Omega_5'^2} - T_3 V_3 \int d\eta \left(1 - \frac{r^4}{L^4}\right). \quad (2.29)$$

Following the same procedure as in the previous paragraphs we find

$$\Omega_5' = \frac{l}{L(1 - C + U)} \left( \kappa + \frac{r^2}{L^2} \right), \quad r'^2 = -V, \quad (2.30)$$

and

$$V = - \left( \kappa + \frac{r^2}{L^2} \right)^2 \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{(1 - C + U)^2} \left( \kappa + \frac{r^2}{L^2} \right) \left( l^2 + \frac{r^6}{L^6} \right) \right]. \quad (2.31)$$

With this in hand, we can now investigate the form of the orbits for non-vanishing  $\kappa$ . It is not difficult to verify that

$$r'^2 \propto U^2 - \kappa l^2 - l^2 x - 2Ux^2 - \kappa x^3, \quad (2.32)$$

where  $x = r^2/L^2$  and the proportionality function is strictly positive. The zeros of the cubic polynomial (2.32) in the positive  $x$  semi-axis correspond to the bouncing points for our probe brane motion. For negative  $\kappa$ , in the  $x \rightarrow \infty$  limit of Eq.(2.32), we have  $r'^2 \sim -\kappa x^3 > 0$ , the polynomial is positive there and infinity is part of the allowed region. Conversely, at  $x = 0$  we have  $r'^2 \sim U^2 - \kappa l^2 > 0$  and the origin is also part of the allowed region. Since the slope of the polynomial is negative at  $x = 0$ , there exist either two or zero positive roots, according to the sign of the cubic discriminant. When the discriminant is positive, we will necessarily have two positive roots, and then two bouncing points, while when it is negative, the polynomial reaches a minimum positive value and then grows to infinity with no positive roots. We conclude that for negative discriminant, the probe brane can move from infinity to the origin without finding any bouncing point (*i.e.* hitting eventually the stack). On the other hand, for positive discriminant there are “inner” orbits hitting the stack with an outer bouncing point and “outer” orbits coming from infinity, bouncing at some fixed radius  $r_b$  and then going back to infinity.

For positive  $\kappa$ , we find  $r'^2 \sim -\kappa x^3 < 0$  at infinity, which implies that infinity is not part of the allowed region. Thus, all orbits are bounded, *i.e.* there always exists an

outer bouncing point. On the other hand, for  $4U^2 - 3\kappa l^2 > 0$  there are two zero slope points in the positive  $x$  axis, meaning that the curve goes through the vertical axes with negative slope. Then, when the discriminant is positive two of the roots should be at the positive  $x$  axis so that there is also an inner bouncing point. In this last case, all orbits are bounded.

Even if the explicit expression of the cubic discriminant is not very enlighten, it can be checked that it is positive for large enough angular momentum, and we will assume this in what follows. Whenever we need an explicit lower bound for  $l$ , we will use the expression (2.22) for the case of zero curvature as an estimation of it.

The conclusion is that for large enough angular momentum, when  $\kappa < 0$  the probe moves coming from infinity up to some finite distance to the origin  $r_b$  and then goes back to infinity. On the other hand, when  $\kappa > 0$  there is an additional outer bouncing point preventing the probe to go too far from the origin. This result can be translated into the familiar statement that positive curvature universes will expand up to some finite scale parameter and then contract, while negative curvature ones expand forever.

What kind of cosmological evolution would we get with this modified scenario? To answer that we change variables in the above induced metric (2.28) to get

$$ds_i^2 = -dt^2 + \frac{a(t)^2}{\left(1 + \frac{\kappa}{4L^2}\rho^2\right)^2} (d\rho^2 + \rho^2 d\Omega_2^2), \quad (2.33)$$

where again the scale factor is given by  $a = r/L$  and the cosmic time has been defined according to

$$\frac{d\eta}{dt} = \frac{L^3(1 - C + U)}{r^3 \left(\kappa + \frac{r^2}{L^2}\right)}. \quad (2.34)$$

Note that now our cosmological model is specified giving two continuous  $l, U$  and one discrete  $\kappa$  dimensionless parameters.

Although we again have an accelerating period at the turning point of the brane orbit, the same numerical analysis as before shows that the number of e-folds is again ridiculously small.

### 3. Slingshot cosmology: a realistic scenario

In the previous sections we described the cosmic evolution as experienced by a brane observer while the  $D3$ -brane is probing the bottom of the CY throat. We consider this evolution as describing the early time cosmology of our Universe. We will consequently assume that at some point, the orbit reaches the top of the throat and moves into the CY space to which the throat is glued. As the brane moves away from the throat, mirage approximation breaks down and the dynamics is determined by local gravity on the brane. This is the analog of the exit of the inflationary era in standard inflation. Unfortunately, the explicit description for the transition from the mirage to local gravity dynamics is lacking at the moment. Intuitively what happens is that, at the bottom of the throat, very close to the heavy stack of  $N$  branes sourcing it, a slowly

moving additional brane has a negligible effect on the background as compared with the distortion produced by the stack, for  $N \gg 1$ . On the other hand, when the brane is far from the stack and it leaves the throat, there is no other heavy object around, and the backreaction of the brane and of any matter living on it, becomes the only important correction to the background metric. At this point backreaction causes expansion of the 4d slice, and in consequence the brane motion is Hubble damped. Four dimensional local gravity might then be realized as in [19],[20].

Inside the throat, the motion is completely described by the energy  $U$  and angular momentum  $l$  of the orbit, the number  $N$  of branes in the stack and the sign of  $\kappa$ . The natural question is whether we can choose these free parameters of our model so as to have a realistic cosmology in the probe brane and, in case we can, how much fine tuning is needed on these parameters.

As we have found in the previous sections, our cosmological model passes through an inflationary era, but it is very short and it only provides a small amount of inflation  $N \leq 0.7$ . Is this reason enough to rule it out? To answer that, we must reexamine the naturalness problems that originally inspire inflationary scenarios, and check if they are also present in our Slingshot model.

### 3.1. Early Time Cosmology

To gain intuition in the behavior of the scale factor, it is now convenient to calculate the Hubble constant  $H^2 = \dot{a}^2/a^2$  and write Hubble equation using (2.10) and (2.12)

$$H^2 = -\frac{1}{L^2} \left[ \frac{\kappa}{a^2} - \frac{2U}{a^4} + \frac{l^2}{a^6} + \frac{\kappa l^2 - U^2}{a^8} \right]. \quad (3.1)$$

Here we see that mirage matter behaves like a curvature term, a radiation term (this is the “dark radiation” of [21], or the mirage radiation of [1]) and some higher order terms depending on energy and angular momentum. At late times the higher order terms are subdominant, ensuring that we can smoothly match the evolution with a standard cosmology in the local gravity era.

**Homogeneity and Isotropy problem** In the previous sections we have established that for large enough angular momentum the orbits described by the probe have a bouncing point. When this condition is satisfied, the probe brane never reaches the origin  $r = 0$  where the scale factor  $a = h^{-1/4}$  vanishes. Then we realize that in the brane Slingshot scenario there is no singularity and consequently there is no horizon problem. A different way to say that is to note that since there is no big bang, the universe has had time enough to reach any desired degree of homogeneity. To be more precise, standard arguments [22] require the comoving horizon to be bigger than the Hubble horizon today  $H_0^{-1}$  in order to solve the horizon problem. In fact in this case each point on the last scattering surface was causally connected sometime in the past.

The comoving horizon is defined as

$$\Delta\eta = \int_{\eta_i}^{\eta_0} d\eta', \quad (3.2)$$

where  $\eta_0$  is the conformal time today and  $\eta_i$  is the smallest conformal time in the Universe evolution. As we have a bounce,  $\eta_i \rightarrow -\infty$  and the condition to solve the horizon problem

$$\Delta\eta \gg H_0^{-1} , \quad (3.3)$$

is trivially satisfied.

Another important problem in standard cosmology is the isotropy problem, which can be formulated as follow: A measure of anisotropy is the shear. The shear is defined as  $\sigma_{\mu\nu} = h_{\mu}^{\alpha} h_{\nu}^{\beta} \nabla_{(\beta} u_{\alpha)}$ , where  $u_{\alpha}$  is the four velocity of a timelike geodesic observer and  $h_{\alpha\beta} = g_{\alpha\beta} + u_{\alpha} u_{\beta}$  is the three metric orthogonal to the four velocity  $u_{\alpha}$ . In a FRW background  $\sigma^2 = \sigma_{\alpha\beta} \sigma^{\alpha\beta} \sim a^{-6}$ . Purely geometrical considerations imply that for an anisotropic perturbation we have [23]

$$H^2 = \sigma^2 + \frac{8\pi G_N}{3} \rho , \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\rho$  is the matter energy density, and it satisfies energy conditions,  $\rho \sim a^{-n}$  where  $n \leq 4$  and  $G_N$  is the gravitational coupling to brane matter. In this case, when the scale factor is close to the singularity, shear dominates making the universe more and more anisotropic. This kind of behavior also generate a chaotic evolution at early time making the Universe very unstable under small perturbations. In other words, in order to produce the small anisotropy we observe today, standard cosmology needs an extreme fine tuning.

In the Slingshot this problem is circumvented as in Cyclic Scenarios []. As we shall see later, the non-relativistic limit for our Universe evolution, does not allow the scale factor to reach very small values. In this way the shear cannot dominate. But even if this condition is relaxed, the angular momentum term  $l^2 a^{-6}$  will always dominate over the shear perturbation. Moreover, if angular momentum is negligible, as mirage matter violates energy conditions, the Hubble equation (3.1) contains terms scaling like  $a^{-8}$ . These terms obviously dominates with respect to the shear at high energies (small  $a$  values) avoiding the Kasner behavior typical of standard cosmology close to the singularity. Therefore the isotropic solution we used is stable under anisotropic perturbations.

**Flatness Problem** In our model, the spatial curvature is a function of our orbital parameters  $U, l, \kappa$  that specify the orbit and the embedding of the probe brane. However, it is important to see whether these parameter have to be fine tuned or not in order to obtain phenomenologically acceptable results.

To that end, we will find the minimum of the spatial curvature using (3.1). We will assume  $U \gg l$  in order to disregard the  $\kappa l^2/a^8$  term. We will check that this assumption is actually satisfied at the end of the calculation. Furthermore we will work in the  $U/a^4 \ll 1$  limit, and then discard the  $U^2/a^8$  term. As we will explain later, this corresponds to non-relativistic motion of the probe brane. With these assumptions, (3.1) becomes

$$H^2 = -\frac{1}{L^2} \left[ \frac{\kappa}{a^2} - \frac{2U}{a^4} + \frac{l^2}{a^6} \right] . \quad (3.5)$$

The curvature term can be discarded at late times if it passes through a minimum at a very small value of the quantity

$$|\Omega - 1| = \frac{1}{L^2 a^2 \bar{H}^2}, \quad (3.6)$$

where

$$\bar{H}^2 = -\frac{1}{L^2} \left[ -\frac{2U}{a^4} + \frac{l^2}{a^6} \right]. \quad (3.7)$$

It can be easily verified that the minimum of (3.6) is at  $a^2 = 3l^2/4U$ , where it takes the value

$$\frac{1}{L^2 a^2 \bar{H}^2} \simeq \left(\frac{l}{U}\right)^2 \ll 10^{-8}. \quad (3.8)$$

The last inequality has been imposed in order to get an agreement with observation. This is satisfied whenever

$$l \ll 10^{-4}U, \quad (3.9)$$

consistently with our approximations.

We now combine this limit with the limit (2.22) in order to have the bouncing, we obtain the necessary condition

$$U \gg 8 \times 10^{16}. \quad (3.10)$$

The conclusion is that observational constraints in the curvature are enforced in our model by (3.9). Note that, as can be seen in Fig.3, even satisfying all the constraints (3.9) and (3.10) we still have an enormous region of parameter space in which to make our choice, and in this sense the fine tuning problem is relaxed.

### 3.2. Density Perturbations

In order to compute density perturbations in the present setup, we will use the non-relativistic approximation. This is equivalent to adiabatic mirage cosmological expansion and implies that  $h(r'^2 + r^2\Omega'^2) \ll 1$ . From Eq.(2.10) we get that

$$h(r'^2 + r^2\Omega'^2) = 1 - \frac{1}{h^2(1 - C + U)^2}. \quad (3.11)$$

Therefore a sufficient condition to satisfy the non-relativistic approximation is

$$1 - \frac{1}{h^2(1 - C + U)^2} \ll 1, \quad (3.12)$$

or

$$2hU \ll 1. \quad (3.13)$$

This condition could have been already guessed before. In fact, the physical brane energy is  $hU$ , therefore the non-relativistic approximation consistently requires (3.13). Note that Eq. (3.12) is equivalent to the condition  $U/a^4 \ll 1$  that we used in the previous section to study the flatness problem.

With this approximation the calculations can be made explicit and we will be able to find the power spectrum for the cosmological perturbations. We will suppose as usual that the gravitational perturbations, in our case produced by quantum fluctuations of the brane embedding, will be straightforwardly passed to the matter fields.

**Power Spectrum** We are interested in the spectrum of the scalar fluctuations of the gravitational field around its classical value. A straightforward way is to allow the embedding fields  $r, \Omega_5$  to depend on all brane coordinates *i.e.*  $r = r(\eta, x^i)$ ,  $\Omega_5 = \Omega_5(\eta, x^i)$ . Then the induced metric turns out to be

$$ds_i^2 = - \left( \frac{r^2}{L^2} - \frac{L^2 r'^2}{r^2} - L^2 \Omega_5'^2 \right) d\eta^2 + \left( \frac{r^2}{L^2} \delta_{ij} + \frac{L^2 \partial_i r \partial_j r}{r^2} + L^2 \partial_i \Omega_5 \partial_j \Omega_5 \right) dx^i dx^j + 2 \left( \frac{L^2 r' \partial_i r}{r^2} + L^2 \Omega_5' \partial_i \Omega_5 \right) d\eta dx^i . \quad (3.14)$$

According to standard results [25] the Bardeen potentials in the non-relativistic approximation are

$$\Phi = -\frac{\delta r}{r}, \quad \Psi = -\Phi . \quad (3.15)$$

It is generally assumed that the present power spectrum of scalar fluctuations in the CMB as measured at WMAP has been produced by quantum fluctuations in the early universe. The usual way to calculate this spectrum is to quantize the appropriate fields and canonically normalize them. After that, the quantum amplitudes are taken as an initial conditions for a classical evolution up to present. The details of the quantum to classical transition are subtle, and its explanation would necessarily include some kind of decoherence mechanism or “collapse of the wave function” as analyzed in [26]. We will simply assume that such mechanism exists and that it is in agreement with the above described picture.

We will first describe the classical dynamics of the perturbation on the probe  $D3$ , expanding the DBI action up to quadratic order in derivatives. In the non-relativistic limit, which is equivalent to adiabatic expansion, the resulting DBI action is

$$S = -\frac{T_3}{2} \int d^4x \left( \partial_\mu r \partial^\mu r + r^2 \partial_\mu \Omega_5 \partial^\mu \Omega_5 \right) , \quad (3.16)$$

where the metric and the integral measure are the flat Minkowskian ones.

The equations of motion, which follows from the action (3.16) are

$$\partial^\mu \partial_\mu r = r \partial_\mu \Omega_5 \partial^\mu \Omega_5, \quad \partial^\mu (r^2 \partial_\mu \Omega_5) = 0 . \quad (3.17)$$

For the unperturbed motion of the probe we have  $r = r(\eta)$ ,  $\Omega_5 = \Omega_5(\eta)$  so that

$$r'' - r \Omega_5'^2 = 0, \quad (r^2 \Omega_5')' = 0 , \quad (3.18)$$

and the conserved first integrals of this system are

$$r'^2 + \frac{l^2 L^2}{r^2} = 2U, \quad r^2 \Omega_5' = lL , \quad (3.19)$$

where we have related them with the angular momentum and energy of the corresponding relativistic problem, by expanding (2.10) up to quadratic order in time



derivatives. The solution to Eq.(3.18) is then

$$r = \sqrt{2U\eta^2 + \frac{l^2 L^2}{2U}}, \quad \Omega_5 = \arctan\left(\frac{2U}{lL}\eta\right), \quad (3.20)$$

where a constant of integration has been fixed by requiring that at  $\eta = 0$  the probe is at the turning point

$$r_b = \frac{lL}{\sqrt{2U}}. \quad (3.21)$$

One can easily find that the inequality for the validity of the non-relativistic approximation (3.13) is always fulfilled (with  $h = L^4/r^4$ ) for  $2UL^4/r_b^4 \ll 1$ , or

$$l^4 \gg 8U^3. \quad (3.22)$$

This is an important constraint and it should be satisfied in order our solution to be valid. It simply stretches the fact that the brane may keep always its slow velocity as it approaches and turns around the stack of the background D-branes. Moreover, since (3.22) is stronger than the bouncing condition (2.22), it ensures that in the non-relativistic approximation we always have a bounce. This can be explicitly seen in the solution above. The induced metric on the probe in the non-relativistic limit turns out then to be

$$ds^2 = \left(\frac{2U}{L^2}\eta^2 + \frac{l^2}{2U}\right) \left(-d\eta^2 + d\vec{x}^2\right), \quad (3.23)$$

where  $\eta$  is the conformal time and clearly represents a bouncing universe.

At very early and late times ( $|\eta| \gg lL/2U$ ) we have a radiation dominated universe, while the initial singularity is avoided as the universe has minimal ‘‘radius’’  $r_b$ . This is also compatible with the fact that the geometry (3.23) violates energy conditions. Indeed, the effective energy momentum tensor for (3.23) has non-zero components

$$T_{\eta\eta} = \frac{48U^4\eta^2}{(l^2L^2 + 4U^2\eta^2)^2}, \quad T_{ij} = -\delta_{ij} \frac{8(L^2l^2 - 2U^2\eta^2)}{(l^2L^2 + 4U^2\eta^2)^2} \quad (3.24)$$

and it can easily be seen that both, weak and strong energy conditions are violated for

$$|\eta| < \frac{Ll}{2\sqrt{2U}}. \quad (3.25)$$

We note that (3.16) is the action of a free two-dimensional harmonic oscillator. In fact, by using the change of variables  $X = T_3^{1/2} r \cos \Omega_5$  and  $Y = T_3^{1/2} r \sin \Omega_5$  we have

$$S = -\frac{1}{2} \int d^4x (\partial_\mu X \partial^\mu X + \partial_\mu Y \partial^\mu Y). \quad (3.26)$$

Then, the quadratic action for the perturbations  $X + \delta X$ ,  $Y + \delta Y$  is

$$S_\delta = -\frac{1}{2} \int d^4x (\partial_\mu \delta X \partial^\mu \delta X + \partial_\mu \delta Y \partial^\mu \delta Y), \quad (3.27)$$

or, in Fourier space

$$S_\delta = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \int d\eta (\delta X_k'^2 + k^2 \delta X_k^2 + \delta Y_k'^2 + k^2 \delta Y_k^2), \quad (3.28)$$

where  $k$  is the wave number of the fluctuation. These fluctuations are related with those in the original variables by

$$\begin{aligned} T_3^{1/2} \delta r_k &= \delta X_k \cos \Omega_5 + \delta Y_k \sin \Omega_5 , \\ T_3^{1/2} r \delta \Omega_k &= \delta Y_k \cos \Omega_5 - \delta X_k \sin \Omega_5 . \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

The equation of motion for the variable  $\delta X_k$  and  $\delta Y_k$  are

$$\delta X_k'' + k^2 \delta X_k = 0 , \quad \delta Y_k'' + k^2 \delta Y_k = 0 , \quad (3.30)$$

and the solution is the standard plane waves

$$\delta X_k = A_x \sin(k\eta + \phi_x) , \quad \delta Y_k = A_y \sin(k\eta + \phi_y) . \quad (3.31)$$

Here,  $A_x, A_y$  are constant amplitudes and  $\phi_x, \phi_y$  initial phases.

It is now straightforward to verify that for  $k \ll lL/r^2$ , the Bardeen variable  $\Phi = -\delta r_k/r$  is frozen, i.e.  $(\delta r_k/r)' \simeq 0$  in the limit  $r \gg r_b$ . The same result could also be deduced in the original  $(r, \Omega_5)$  variables as it is illustrated in the Appendix.

In order to calculate the power spectrum of perturbations we need now some consideration on the quantum behavior of the brane fluctuations. A given mode will behave quantum mechanically as long as there is no ‘‘collapse of the wave function’’ occurring. The key assumption usually made is that, at some point of the cosmological evolution, the wave-function collapses and then the mode begins to behave classically. We will keep this assumption here, but we will choose the time at which this collapse happens differently: instead of the usual horizon crossing, we will suppose that it happens when the proper wavelength of the mode becomes larger than some collapsing length  $l_c$ . This is the mechanism proposed in [27] to produce a flat power spectrum without inflation. The need for such a collapse mechanism in any quantum theory of gravity was emphasized in [26]. It was also found in the discussion of transplankian effects in [28], and in the very different context of noncommutative inflation in [29]. Then we will say that classical modes are created at the time  $\eta_*$  when the proper wavelength of the corresponding quantum mode reaches the value  $a(\eta_*)/k \equiv a_*/k = l_c$ .

In the quantum mechanical regime we have

$$\delta X_k = v a_x + v^* a_x^\dagger , \quad \delta Y_k = u a_y + u^* a_y^\dagger \quad (3.32)$$

where

$$u = v = \frac{e^{-ik\eta}}{\sqrt{2k}} . \quad (3.33)$$

and therefore we have

$$\frac{\langle \delta r_k r_{k'} \rangle}{r^2} = \frac{\delta_{k,k'}}{2T_3 k r^2} . \quad (3.34)$$

The above quantum mean value for  $\delta r_k^2/r^2$  will then evolve like  $1/r(\eta)^2$  up to the time at which the referred collapse takes place. After that moment, it will behave classically and, according to the previous considerations, co-moving wave numbers smaller than the  $lL/r^2$  curve will be frozen. With that, for frozen modes, we have

$$P = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \frac{|\delta r_k|^2}{r^2} = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \frac{|\delta r_k(\eta_*)|^2}{r_*^2} . \quad (3.35)$$

Then, we get an exact scale invariant spectrum

$$P = \frac{2\pi g_s l_s^4}{L^2 l_c^2} \frac{1}{k^3}, \quad (3.36)$$

due to the fact that

$$|\delta r_k(\eta_*)|^2 = \frac{1}{2T_3 k}, \quad r_* = L a_* = L k l_c. \quad (3.37)$$

In this way we have gone around the general arguments of [30] about the blue spectrum of bouncing cosmologies‡.

#### 4. A Slingshot with $n_s \simeq .95$

In the previous section, we found an exactly flat ( $n_s = 1$ ) power spectrum for the perturbations. Nevertheless, accordingly to WMAP measurements, the observed spectral index is slightly red  $n_s \simeq .95$ . Moreover, the warped conifold geometry was replaced by the simpler  $AdS_5 \times S^5$  metric, which is not realistic from the point of view of string compactifications. In this section, we will show that both problems are closely related and in fact, using the resolved conifold Klebanov-Strassler (KS) solution for the throat metric, the resulting spectrum has a slightly red spectral index.

##### 4.1. Orbits in the Klebanov-Strassler throat

Let us consider here a  $D3$ -brane probe moving in the background of a warped throat region in a CY compactification of type IIB string theory. Instead of approximating the throat with the conifold geometry with a large number of  $D3$ -branes on its tip, we will resolve the singularity using the Klebanov-Strassler (KS) warped deformed conifold, where the tip of the conifold has been blown-up. In this case the metric (1.4) has a transverse part given by the KS [14] geometry

$$ds_{\perp}^2 = \frac{\epsilon^{4/3} K}{2} \left( \frac{1}{3K^3} [d\tau^2 + (g^5)^2] + \cosh^2\left(\frac{\tau}{2}\right) [(g^3)^2 + (g^4)^2] + \sinh^2\left(\frac{\tau}{2}\right) [(g^1)^2 + (g^2)^2] \right). \quad (4.1)$$

Here  $\epsilon$  is the resolution parameter, resolving the tip of the cone, and  $K$  is a function of the “radial” variable  $\tau$  given by

$$K(\tau) = \frac{(\sinh(2\tau) - 2\tau)^{1/3}}{2^{1/3} \sinh \tau}. \quad (4.2)$$

In the conventions of [14], we have

$$\begin{aligned} g^1 &= \frac{e^1 - e^3}{\sqrt{2}}, & g^2 &= \frac{e^2 - e^4}{\sqrt{2}}, \\ g^3 &= \frac{e^1 + e^3}{\sqrt{2}}, & g^4 &= \frac{e^2 + e^4}{\sqrt{2}}, \\ g^5 &= e^5, \end{aligned}$$

‡ See [31] for other examples of scale invariant spectrum in bouncing cosmologies.

where, in terms of the angular coordinates  $\psi$  in the range from 0 to  $4\pi$  and  $(\theta_1, \phi_1)$  and  $(\theta_2, \phi_2)$  which parameterize two  $S^2$ 's,

$$\begin{aligned} e^1 &= -\sin \theta_1 d\phi_1, & e^2 &= d\theta_1, \\ e^3 &= \cos \psi \sin \theta_2 d\phi_2 - \sin \psi d\theta_2, \\ e^4 &= \sin \psi \sin \theta_2 d\phi_2 + \cos \psi d\theta_2, \\ e^5 &= d\psi + \cos \theta_1 d\phi_1 + \cos \theta_2 d\phi_2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

The warping factor  $h$  is given by

$$h(\tau) = 2^{2/3} \mu^2 \epsilon^{-8/3} I(\tau), \quad (4.4)$$

where

$$I(\tau) = \int_{\tau}^{\infty} dx \frac{x \coth x - 1}{\sinh^2 x} (\sinh(2x) - 2x)^{1/3}, \quad (4.5)$$

and  $\mu = 2\pi^3 L^4 V_3 g_s l_s^2 \kappa_{10}^{-2}$ .

The small and large  $\tau$  regions in the KS background are easily found by recalling that

$$I(\tau) \sim .71805 + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2), \quad K(\tau) \sim \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{1/3} + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2), \quad \text{small } \tau; \quad (4.6)$$

$$I(\tau) \sim 3 \times 2^{-1/3} \left(\tau - \frac{1}{4}\right) e^{-\frac{4\tau}{3}}, \quad K(\tau) \sim 2^{1/3} e^{-\frac{\tau}{3}}, \quad \text{large } \tau. \quad (4.7)$$

The motion of the probe  $D3$ -brane in this background is described by the DBI action. In compatibility with its equations of motion, we put the probe at a fixed value for the angular coordinates  $\theta_2, \phi_2, \psi$  and we also fix  $\theta_1 = \pi/2$ . Moreover we choose the probe coordinates to be  $\eta = \xi^0, x^i = \xi^i$ . The resulting degrees of freedom are therefore  $\tau = \tau(\eta)$  and  $\phi_1 = \phi_1(\eta)$ . The induced metric is

$$ds_i^2 = -h^{-1/2} \left( 1 - \frac{\epsilon^{4/3} h}{6K(\tau)^2} \tau'^2 - \frac{\epsilon^{4/3} h}{4} \cosh \tau K(\tau) \phi_1'^2 \right) d\eta^2 + h^{-1/2} d\vec{x} \cdot d\vec{x}. \quad (4.8)$$

Then, the DBI action turns out to be

$$S_{BI} = -T_3 V_3 \int d\eta \left( \frac{1}{h} \sqrt{1 - \frac{\epsilon^{4/3} h}{6K(\tau)^2} \tau'^2 - \frac{\epsilon^{4/3} h}{4} \cosh \tau K(\tau) \phi_1'^2} - q \left( 1 - \frac{1}{h} \right) \right), \quad (4.9)$$

and, to leading order in the non-relativistic limit, we have

$$S_{BI} = -T_3 V_3 \int d\eta \left( \frac{\epsilon^{4/3}}{12K(\tau)^2} \tau'^2 + \frac{\epsilon^{4/3}}{8} \cosh \tau K(\tau) \phi_1'^2 \right). \quad (4.10)$$

In terms of the brane cosmic time  $t$  defined similarly to (2.12), which in the small velocity limit turns out to be  $dt/d\eta = h^{-1/4}$ , the DBI action is written as

$$S_{BI} = -T_3 V_3 \int dt h^{-1/4} \left( \frac{\epsilon^{4/3}}{12K(\tau)^2} \dot{\tau}^2 + \frac{\epsilon^{4/3}}{8} \cosh(\tau) K(\tau) \dot{\phi}_1^2 \right). \quad (4.11)$$

For this system, the conserved energy  $U$  and angular momentum  $l$  are

$$\begin{aligned} U &= \frac{\epsilon^{4/3}}{12h^{1/4}K(\tau)^2} \left( \dot{\tau}^2 + \frac{3}{2} \cosh \tau K(\tau) \dot{\phi}_1^2 \right) , \\ l &= \frac{\epsilon^{4/3} \sqrt{\mu} \cosh \tau K(\tau) \dot{\phi}_1}{4h^{1/4}} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

The equations of motion for  $\tau$  then read

$$\dot{\tau}^2 = \frac{12h^{1/4}K(\tau)^2U}{\epsilon^{4/3}} - \frac{24h^{1/2}K(\tau)l^2/\mu}{\epsilon^{8/3} \cosh \tau} . \quad (4.13)$$

Recalling that the induced metric on the probe  $D3$ -brane takes the FRW form with scale factor (2.14), we get that the acceleration is

$$\ddot{a} = \dot{\tau} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \left( \dot{\tau} \frac{\partial h^{-1/4}}{\partial \tau} \right) . \quad (4.14)$$

We should note that for small  $\tau$  the mirage cosmology is very simple, as

$$a(t) = a_0 + \mathcal{O}(t^2), \quad a_0 = \text{const.} \quad (4.15)$$

due to Eq.(4.6). For large  $\tau$  on the other hand we get that

$$\dot{\tau}^2 = 4 \cdot 2^{3/4} 3^{5/4} \epsilon^{-2} \mu^{1/2} U \left( \tau - \frac{1}{4} \right)^{1/4} e^{-\tau} - 48 \cdot 6^{1/2} \epsilon^{-4} l^2 \mu \left( \tau - \frac{1}{4} \right)^{1/2} e^{-2\tau} , \quad (4.16)$$

whereas for the acceleration we find

$$\ddot{a} = \frac{16 \cdot 2^{2/3} \epsilon^{-10/3}}{3(4\tau - 1)} \left[ -e^{-2\frac{\tau}{3}} \epsilon^2 (2\tau^2 - \tau - 10) U + \frac{2 \cdot 6^{1/4} l^2}{\sqrt{\mu}} (4\tau - 1)^{1/4} (8\tau^2 - 10\tau - 7) e^{-5\frac{\tau}{3}} \right] . \quad (4.17)$$


We see that there are two contributions to the acceleration. The first one is proportional to the energy  $U$  and enters with a negative contribution and so it leads to deceleration. The second contribution is due to angular momentum  $l$  and contributes positively so that it tends to accelerate the probe. These terms are competitive and may lead to an acceleration period as long as the angular momentum dominates the energy. However, at the end energy always dominates (as it is multiplied by a factor  $e^{-2\tau/3}$  whereas the angular momentum is multiplied by a factor  $e^{-5\tau/3}$ ) leading to a final deceleration epoch generating a bounce in the probe brane trajectory. We would like to point out that the nature of the bounce we describe here differs from the one found in [14]. In our case, the bounce is due to a non-zero angular momentum of the probe brane whereas in [14], the bounce is due to the resolution of the conifold singularity of the CY.

Again one can show numerically that the numbers of e-folds during the acceleration period is too small to obtain inflation.

For large  $\tau$ , the KS metric after appropriate change of coordinates, simplifies to the Klebanov-Tseytlin (KT) metric [32]

$$ds^2 = \frac{r^2}{L^2 \sqrt{\log(r/r_s)}} dx_{\parallel}^2 + \frac{L^2 \sqrt{\log(r/r_s)}}{r^2} dr^2 + L^2 \sqrt{\ln(r/r_s)} ds_{\mathbb{T}^{1,1}}^2 , \quad (4.18)$$

where  $ds_{\mathbb{T}^{1,1}}^2$  is the metric on the  $\mathbb{T}^{1,1}$  manifold and  $r_s = 3^{1/2} 2^{-5/6} \epsilon^{2/3}$ .



**Figure 2.** The two real branches of the Lambert W-function which satisfies  $z = W(z)e^{W(z)}$ .  $W_0$  is the continuous line and  $W_{-1}$  is the dashed line.

#### 4.2. A red spectral index

The non-relativistic limit of the DBI action in the KT geometry is

$$S = -\frac{T_3}{2} \int d^4x (\partial_\mu r \partial^\mu r + r^2 \partial_\mu \phi_1 \partial^\mu \phi_1) . \quad (4.19)$$

In this case, in the  $r \gg r_s$  (*i.e.* far from the singularity  $r = r_s$ ) the Bardeen potentials are again

$$\Phi = -\frac{\delta r}{r}, \quad \Psi = -\Phi . \quad (4.20)$$

From these last two equations, we deduce that the analysis of section 3.2 is valid and the power spectrum of density perturbations is given as in Eq.(3.35) by

$$P = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \frac{|\delta r_k|^2}{r^2} = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \frac{|\delta r_k(\eta_*)|^2}{r_*^2} . \quad (4.21)$$

In the present case, the scale factor is given by

$$a_* = \frac{r_*}{L(\log(r_*/r_s))^{1/4}} \quad (4.22)$$

and we should impose the condition  $a_* = kl_c$ , which is explicitly written as

$$\frac{r_*}{L(\log(r_*/r_s))^{1/4}} = kl_c . \quad (4.23)$$

Defining  $\zeta = (\sqrt{2}r_s/Lkl_c)^4$ , a real solution of the above equation turns out to be

$$r_* = r_s \exp\left[-\frac{1}{4}W_{-1}(-\zeta)\right] \quad \text{for} \quad \zeta \leq e^{-1} , \quad (4.24)$$

where  $W_{-1}(x)$  is the second real branch of Lambert W-function, a plot of which is given in Fig.2. Thus, the power spectrum is given by

$$P = 2\pi l_s^4 g_s \frac{1}{k r_s^2} \exp\left[\frac{1}{2} W_{-1}(-\zeta)\right], \quad (4.25)$$

whereas, by defining the scalar spectral index as  $n_s - 1 = d \ln(k^3 P) / d \ln k$ , we find that

$$n_s = \frac{3 + W_{-1}(-\zeta)}{1 + W_{-1}(-\zeta)}. \quad (4.26)$$

Recalling that [33]

$$W_{-1}(-x) = \ln(x) - \ln(-\ln(x)) + \dots \quad \text{for } x \rightarrow 0^- \quad (4.27)$$

we get for  $\sqrt{2} r_s \ll L k l_c$  the following power spectrum

$$P \simeq \frac{1}{k^3} \sqrt{\frac{\pi g_s}{N}} \frac{l_s^2}{l_c^2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ln\left(\frac{L k l_c}{\sqrt{2} r_s}\right)}}, \quad (4.28)$$

and scalar spectral index

$$n_s \simeq 1 - \frac{1}{2 \ln\left(\frac{L k l_c}{\sqrt{2} r_s}\right)}. \quad (4.29)$$

Considering the pivot wave number  $k_p \approx 0.002 \text{ Mpc}^{-1} a_0$ , where  $a_0$  is the scale factor today, we find that, in order to obtain the WMAP scalar spectral index at the pivot scale ( $n_s \approx .95$ ), we need

$$r_s \approx 6 \times 10^{-8} \text{ Mpc}^{-1} L l_c a_0, \quad (4.30)$$

which gives a measure for the radius of the blown up sphere at the tip of the CY. Using this value in the expression (4.28) for the power spectrum we get

$$P k^3 = 0.5 \times \sqrt{\frac{g_s}{N}} \frac{l_s^2}{l_c^2} \simeq 10^{-10} \quad (4.31)$$

which is a constraint in our parameters.

## 5. Collapsing length and compatibility of constraints

**Collapsing length** The first important point to address is the definition of our collapsing length  $l_c$ . General arguments imply the following string space-time uncertainty relation [34]

$$\Delta X \Delta t \gtrsim l_s^2. \quad (5.1)$$

One can show that the smallest scale that can be probed is the 11-dimensional M-Theory Planck scale [34], which is  $l_P^{11} \sim g_s^{1/3} l_s$ . With that  $\Delta X > g_s^{1/3} l_s$ . For a single perturbative mode the period  $\Delta t$  of oscillation is the wave length ( $\lambda$ ). From (5.1) we then have

$$\lambda > l_s g_s^{-1/3}. \quad (5.2)$$

This inequality implies a bound in the smallest wavelength that can be probed semiclassically. Following this argument, our collapsing length  $l_c$  cannot be shorter

than  $l_s g_s^{-1/3}$ . Since the only fundamental parameters appearing in our model are  $l_s$  and  $g_s$  we can therefore write

$$l_c = l_s g_s^{-\gamma}, \quad (5.3)$$

where  $\gamma > 1/3$  is a constant.

An example of a possible value for  $\gamma$  is the following. The first massive mode in the quantization of strings has a mass  $M \sim l_s g_s^{-1}$ . Therefore one might decide that  $M$  naturally sets the scale of which processes can be treated semiclassically. Moreover, as  $g_s \ll 1$  we have  $l_s g_s^{-1} > l_s g_s^{-1/3}$  so that, considering (5.2) we might identify  $l_c \sim l_s g_s^{-1}$ .

From another perspective it is known that  $D$ -brane can probe scales of order  $g_s l_s$  [35]. In other words we can say that the  $D$ -brane is only approximately thin, but instead has a thickness of order  $g_s l_s$ . Using again the string space-time uncertainty relation we get  $l_c \sim g_s^{-1} l_s$ . It is therefore reasonable for us to use  $\gamma = 1$  although we will keep this number undefined by the time being.

**Constraints** There is a number of potentially controversial issues of the present setup that we would like to discuss.

- (i) The first one regards the choice of physical frame.

To fix his units of length, a brane observer may use one of the dimensionful parameters:  $G_N$  (the four dimensional Newton constant), or  $m_0$  (the mass of a given elementary particle). According to [36], if the observer uses proper distance to measure lengths on the brane, masses are necessarily fixed. Following the lines of [14], we therefore consider as a physical frame the one where proper distances are used.

In the Slingshot Scenario, a warped throat is glued into a compact CY space. At early times, when our wandering brane is on the throat, ten dimensional graviton wave function has a non-trivial dependence on the radial direction. This results in a time dependent Newtonian constant of the effective four dimensional theory as seen for an observer in the brane. In the adiabatic approximation, in  $AdS_5 \times S_5$ ,  $G_N \sim a(t)^2/a_0^2 M_p^{-2}$  [14], with  $a_0$  the present value of the scale factor§. However, when at late times the brane reaches the hat of the CY, local gravity with a fixed Newtonian constant, might be realized [20].

Our model therefore results in a early-time variable  $G_N$  cosmology, smoothly joined into a constant  $G_N$  late-time cosmology, *i.e.* the ‘‘Brans-Dicke’’ frame of the early times can be smoothly joined to an ‘‘Einstein’’ frame at late times.

Note that the observable consequences of the mirage era, where  $G_N$  is time dependent, have been proved to agree with observations along the previous sections (flatness, isotropy, power spectrum). Constraints on the time variation of  $G_N$  become relevant only at late times, where local gravity dominates. During local gravity era however,  $G_N$  is constant and standard results follows.

§ Here there is a possible problem of terminology. What we called mirage matter in the right hand side of eq. (3.1) can be re-interpreted as  $\frac{8\pi G}{3} \rho_{\text{mirage}}$  where  $\rho_{\text{mirage}}$  is the effective mirage energy density. In this way we can directly compare the mirage energy densities with local matter energy densities.



An extra point is about the absence of singularity in our frame. One may argue that a conformal transformation to the (early times un-physical) Einstein frame can bring back the cosmological singularity. However, as the change to the Einstein frame involves a smooth non-singular transformation, an early time Einstein frame is non singular as well.

- (ii) The second point concerns the generation of the density perturbations as has been criticized in [37]. In the model of [27] the density perturbations are generated at a fundamental scale  $l_f$  with  $l_f > H^{-1}$ . The fact that the fundamental scale  $l_f$  is bigger than the horizon has been emphasized in [37] as it sounds quite unnatural. In our case the fundamental length is not  $l_c$  but the string length  $l_s$  and one can easily check that this length is the smallest length in our model.

Although for some parameters it can happen that  $l_c > H^{-1}$  this should not be seen as a problem in our model. In fact,  $H^{-1}$  has a physical meaning only as a measure of causality for a four-dimensional observer. From the ten-dimensional point of view the semiclassical approximation is under control as the brane orbit is macroscopical. Instead,  $l_c$  define the microscopical structure of the probe brane.

- (iii) Another point we would like to mention appeared also in [37] and it can be formulated in our case as follows. The scale factor  $a_{*hor}$  where the fluctuations, corresponding to the present horizon of  $10^{28}\text{cm}$ , were frozen, have the value

$$a_{*hor} = \frac{l_c}{10^{28}\text{cm}} a_0, \quad (5.4)$$

with  $a_0$  the present value of the scale factor. Note that  $a_0$  cannot be set to one as usual, as we have already chosen  $a_b$  at the bouncing point. With a radiation density today  $\rho_r \simeq 10^{-35}\text{gr/cm}^3$ , we get that the radiation density at the moment  $\eta_{*hor}$  was

$$\rho_{*hor} \simeq \rho_0 \left( \frac{a_0}{a_{*hor}} \right)^4 = 10^{-17} M_p^4 \left( \frac{\text{cm}}{l_c} \right)^4. \quad (5.5)$$

Demanding that the four dimensional curvature is small, so as to keep the validity of classical gravity, we should have  $G_N \rho_{*hor} \ll M_p^2$ , however as  $G_N \sim a(t)^2/a_0^2 M_p^{-2}$  [14], we get that

$$G_N \rho_{*hor} \simeq 10^{-73} a_0^{-2} M_p^2 \left( \frac{\text{cm}}{l_c} \right)^2, \quad (5.6)$$

and thus we have indeed  $G_N \rho_{*hor} \ll M_p^2$  for  $l_c \gg 10^{-36} a_0^{-2} \text{cm}$ . Since  $a_0 > 1$ , a sufficient condition is  $l_c \gg 10^{-36} a_0^{-2} \text{cm}$ .

- (iv) If this mechanism should be applied to the observed power spectrum, an obvious constraint is that all density perturbations that crossed the horizon from the CMB ( $\sim 10^{24} \text{cm}$ ) to the present cosmological horizon of  $10^{28} \text{cm}$  should be born after the bounce. A sufficient condition is therefore  $a_{*hor} > a_b$  or

$$\frac{l_c}{10^{28}\text{cm}} a_0 > \frac{l}{\sqrt{2U}}. \quad (5.7)$$

As we have noted above,  $a_0$  cannot be fixed to one but it is rather a parameter and (5.7) is a constraint on the value of  $a_0$ .

- (v) A further constraint is obtained by the requirement that the relevant modes for density perturbations are frozen immediately after they are created *i.e.*

$$k_* < \frac{lL}{r_*^2} . \quad (5.8)$$

Moreover, they have to remain frozen at least until the local gravity era. If we choose an arbitrary matching point  $r_{Match}$  as the end of the mirage era, we can see that a sufficient condition for that is

$$k_{CMB} < \frac{lL}{r_{Match}^2} , \quad (5.9)$$

where  $k_{CMB}$  is the wave-number of the mode crossing the horizon at the CMB.

There is also a number of additional constraints on the parameters appeared all along the previous sections whose compatibility should also be checked.

- (vi) The degrees of freedom of the probe brane were described in terms of its embedding fields, whose dynamics is controlled by the DBI action (1.8). This in turn implies that the probe brane never approach the stack, so that the open string modes related to the strings extending between them are always massive  $r_b \gg l_s$ .
- (vii) In section 3.1 we found that, in order to solve the flatness problem, we need to enforce the condition

$$l \ll 10^{-4}U . \quad (5.10)$$

- (viii) The calculations of section 3.2 are valid when the non-relativistic approximation is satisfied

$$l^4 \gg 8U^3 . \quad (5.11)$$

**Cross checking the constraints** Recalling that  $k_* = a_*/l_c$ , we can rewrite condition v as  $a_*^3 < ll_c/L$ . Now using the evident relation  $a_b < a_*$  we obtain

$$l^4 < \left(\frac{l_c}{L}\right)^2 8U^3 . \quad (5.12)$$

In order to make this compatible with constraint viii we need the following necessary condition

$$\frac{l_c}{L} \gg 1 . \quad (5.13)$$

Substituting in (5.13) the definition of  $L$  (2.4) we obtain

$$g_s^{-4\gamma} \gg Ng_s . \quad (5.14)$$

The constraint (5.14) can easily be satisfied in the weakly coupled type IIB string theory ( $g_s \ll 1$ ) and it can therefore be compatible with supergravity approximation ( $g_s N \gg 1$ ) for positive  $\gamma$ .

The conditions vii and viii constrain only the energy  $U$  and the angular momentum  $l$ . The non-relativistic approximation (5.11) is compatible with the small spatial

curvature constraint (5.10) in the dashed region of Fig.3. Moreover they implies the necessary condition

$$U \gg 8 \times 10^{16} , \quad (5.15)$$

and then (5.10) and (5.11) can simultaneously be satisfied.

Condition vi is ensured for  $r_b \gg l_s$ , which can be written, using Eqs.(2.4, 3.21) as

$$\pi l^4 g_s N \gg U^2 . \quad (5.16)$$

For  $g_s N$  large enough this is satisfied in the dashed region of Fig.3. This makes vi consistent with the rest.

The last point involves the observed amplitude of the power spectrum. Let us consider the flat spectrum of  $AdS_5 \times S^5$  (3.36). Recalling the definition (2.4) and (5.3), considering the fact that the observed amplitude of the power spectrum is of order  $10^{-10}$ , we find the constraint

$$g_s N \sim 10^{19} g_s^{4\gamma+2} \quad (5.17)$$

To make it compatible with the supergravity approximation  $g_s \ll 1$ ,  $g_s N \gg 1$  we need

$$10^{-\frac{19}{4\gamma+2}} \ll g_s \ll 1 , \quad (5.18)$$

which is obviously satisfied for any  $\gamma > 0$  in accordance with previous discussions.


Thus, after all these constraints, it is interesting that we are not left with an empty set in the  $(l, U)$  parameter space as it is illustrated in Fig.3. The allowed region of parameter space is large enough, and it requires no fine tuning to achieve phenomenologically relevant results.

## 6. Summary and Conclusions

In this paper we have proposed a cosmological model within the String Theory framework, where most of the standard cosmological problems are naturally solved in the probe brane approximation.

In our model, the observable universe is a  $D3$ -brane moving in a warped throat in a CY compactification of IIB string theory where we suppose that early cosmology is dominated by a mirage era, while local gravity becomes important only at late times when the probe brane universe leaves the throat entering into the CY.

In this scenario, considering a non-vanishing value of angular momentum for the brane trajectory in transverse space, we show the existence of a turning point on the brane orbit at a finite distance of the tip of the throat. From the point of view of an observer living in the brane, the turning point prevents an initial singularity and gives rise to a bouncing cosmology without passing through a quantum gravity regime. There is a decelerating phase followed by an accelerating one around the bounce, with a small e-folds number. The main features of the model are depicted in Fig.4 and its achievements can be summarized as follows



**Figure 3.** The angular momentum and energy  $(l, U)$  parameter space. The region in which our model predicts observed results is marked on gray. It is given by the intersection of the regions below lines A and B and above lines C and D. Line A represents the region of validity of the DBI action, Eq.(5.16) and it moves to the  $U$  axis as  $g_s N$  grows. Line B is the limit of the non-relativistic approximation Eq.(5.11), and it coincides with the frontier of the region in which we have a bounce Eq.(2.22). Line D represents the condition in order to solve the flatness problem Eq.(5.10). Finally the constraint Eq (5.12) is represented by line C. We observe that the width of the allowed region grows as  $l^{4/3}$ , meaning that as we enlarge the angular momentum we relax the amount of fine tuning needed to get phenomenologically reliable results.

- (i) **Horizon** The well defined classical bounce (see section 2) solves the horizon problem of standard cosmology. In fact, since there is no initial singularity the comoving horizon becomes infinitely bigger than the present Hubble horizon, see Eq.(3.3). In other words there have been time enough for any two points in space to enter in causal contact in the past.
- (ii) **Isotropy** As can be seen in equation (3.1), at high energies the mirage energy contribution to the Hubble equation goes like  $a^{-8}$  so to dominate against anisotropic perturbations (c.f. 3.4), as shear goes like  $\sigma^2 \sim a^{-6}$ . Shear instability is therefore not present in the Slingshot scenario, solving the isotropy problem of standard cosmology.
- (iii) **Flatness** Regarding spatial flatness, we calculated the deviation  $|\Omega_k - 1|$  from a flat three-dimensional spatial section in Eqs.(3.6)-(3.7) showing that with a non-vanishing angular momentum, it is bounded from below. The minimum of  $|\Omega_k - 1|$  is a function the orbital parameters of the brane trajectory  $l, U$ . Demanding the spatial curvature to be small imposes only one inequality (see (3.8)) on the two-dimensional parameter space, leaving half of the space at our disposal, (c.f. Eq.(3.9)). In conclusion, we get a spatially flat universe with a very generic choice

of parameters, no fine-tuning is needed. The flatness problem is then solved.

- (iv) **Spectral Index** To calculate the power spectrum of density perturbations, we assumed in section 3.2 that there is a fundamental length  $l_c$  at which a quantum fluctuation collapses and the corresponding perturbation behaves classically. The value of  $l_c$  can be inferred from the String Spacetime Uncertainty Relation (5.1), getting (5.3). After such collapse has occurred, the existence of non-zero angular momentum allows for frozen modes at large scales to appear. These modes survive up to late time, giving rise to a slightly red power spectrum, as can be seen Eq.(4.29). Also we argued that tensor perturbations are suppressed.

The main predictive achievement of our Slingshot scenario is the calculation of the spectral index for density perturbations. Although the mechanism we use to produce these perturbations is similar to the one used by [27], we showed that the reservations expressed in [37] are naturally solved in our model.

Apart from the above achievements the strength of our model resides also on its generality. Brane inflationary scenarios indeed usually ignore angular-momentum contributions [38] (see also [39]-[45]). This is due to the fact that in an expanding background any non vanishing angular momentum is rapidly damped by the expansion. On the other hand, if the background is static, zero angular-momentum is just a very special choice in the space of all possible initial conditions for the brane motion. In our case the absence of  $\bar{D}3$ -branes ensures that we can consistently choose a static background, and then the vanishing angular momentum might well be thought as a fine tuning. The generic case of a nonzero impact parameter, *i.e.* a non-vanishing value of the angular momentum, gives rise to a very rich set of solutions [1, 2, 18, 46, 47] and to the possibility of bouncing cosmologies [48]. It is indeed in this context, that our ‘‘Cosmological Slingshot Scenario’’ is based.

There are many open issues of our model that is left for future research. An open problem for example is to consider corrections to the probe brane approximation used here. This is important for the late time evolution when the brane leaves the throat of the CY. There, according to our paradigm, the slingshot cosmology evolves into standard cosmology, or in other words, the mirage evolution is overcome by local gravity. This involves a transition from a mirage dominated era with a moving brane without any matter, into a local gravity dominated era with an static brane and matter fields excited on it. This transition has to be understood as an analogous of the reheating process in standard inflationary models. It entails a dynamical mechanism under which the kinetic energy of the brane is passed to matter fields. The exact description of this dynamics as well as the robustness of our predictions for physical observables is an open point of the model which is left for future research.

### Note added

After the first draft of this paper appeared on the web, some other papers were released [49]-[53], whose relation with the present work is worth to clarify.


In [49], the orbits of a probe brane in a Klebanov-Strassler throat were explored numerically using the full BDI equations of motion. The resulting mirage cosmology corresponds to bouncing/cyclic universes. This confirms the presence of the bounce, studied here in the nonrelativistic approximation of section 4, and completes the analytic results obtained in the Klebanov-Tseytlin limit. It would be interesting to know whether this results may improve the solution to the standard cosmological problems presented in our paper.

In [49] the motion of an antibrane probe was studied as well. In this case, neglecting the backreaction of the probe may be a catastrophic assumption: due to the nonvanishing vacuum energy there is an exponential expansion of the 4d slice that gives rise to Hubble damping. Since the angular momentum scales as  $l^2 \sim a^{-6}$ , the corresponding centrifugal barrier disappears very fast, and the system flows into a standard brane inflationary scenario [38]. Nevertheless, based in numerical calculations, in [50] was claimed that the presence of a nonvanishing angular momentum may contribute with an additional few of e-folds to the inflationary era. These investigations are not related to what we presented here, where we concentrated in the brane case.

Finally, in [51] the power spectrum for perturbations was calculated in a complementary way, by making use of a different choice of vacuum and in the case of zero angular momentum. Instead of assuming that perturbations are in their quantum mechanical vacuum when their wavelength is smaller than a quantum critical length  $l_c$ , so that perturbations are continuously created in conformal time, the authors in [51] assumed that the perturbations were created at the infinite conformal past (*i.e.* well before the bounce). For this reason, and because the lack of angular momentum in their case, the spectrum of primordial scalar perturbation was found to be blue, in contrast to the slightly red spectral index found here. With the present knowledge of the quantum mechanical behavior of branes at high energies and the infinite past evolution of the Slingshot Universe, there is not yet a definitive answer to what it should be the "correct" vacuum. In [51] it is was supposed that perturbations where quantum mechanically created at macroscopic scales (as at past infinity the Universe is contracting). In the Slingshot instead the perturbations are created at some quantum mechanical scale defined by the underline quantum String Theory.

### *Acknowledgments*

CG wish to thank Kate Marvel, Mairi Sakellariadou, David Wands and Daniel Wesley for useful discussions on physical cosmology. He also thanks Cliff Burgess, Roy Maartens, Nik Mavromatos and Shinji Tsujikawa for correspondence. CG was supported by PPARC research grant PPA/P/S/2002/00208 during the early stages of this work. NEG wants to thank Samuel Leach and Paolo Creminelli for helpful discussions, as well as Fernando Quevedo for help and encouragement in the early stages of this work. NEG is grateful to SISSA and ICTP for hospitality and support during most of this work. This work is also supported by the RTN programme, "Constituents, Fundamental Forces and



**Figure 4.** The cosmological Slingshot model: the probe brane follows an open orbit in the throat background. It comes from a pre-bounce contracting past in the lower branch of the orbit, reaches the turning point in which we have a cosmological bounce, and then re-expands with a short acceleration period. The early expansion epoch is dominated by mirage terms. At some point we match it with standard cosmology and local gravity becomes relevant, while the brane leaves the throat hitting the CY.

Symmetries of the Universe”, MRTN-CT-2004-005104.

## Appendix

The existence of frozen decaying modes in the fluctuation spectrum can be shown by different means directly in the  $\delta r_k, \delta \Omega_k$  variables. By using the background solution Eq.(3.20) and after Fourier transforming, the quadratic action for the fluctuations is written as

$$S = \frac{T_3}{2} \int d\eta \left( \delta r_k'^2 + r^2 \delta \Omega_k'^2 - (k^2 - \Omega_5'^2) \delta r_k^2 - r^2 k^2 \delta \Omega_k^2 + 4r \Omega_5' \delta \Omega_k' \delta r_k \right). \quad (.1)$$


The equations of motion for the perturbations turn out then to be

$$\frac{d}{d\eta} \left( r^2 \delta \Omega_k' + \frac{2lL}{r} \delta r_k \right) + r^2 k^2 \delta \Omega_k = 0, \quad (.2)$$

$$\delta r_k'' + \left( k^2 - \frac{l^2 L^2}{r^4} \right) \delta r_k - 2r \Omega_5' \delta \Omega_k' = 0, \quad (.3)$$

where Eq.(3.18) has been used. A first integral of these equations can be found as the energy associated to the above action

$$\delta e_k = \frac{T_3}{2} \left( \delta r_k'^2 + r^2 \delta \Omega_k'^2 + \left( k^2 - \frac{l^2 L^2}{r^4} \right) \delta r_k^2 + r^2 k^2 \delta \Omega_k^2 \right), \quad (.4)$$



**Figure 1.** Numerical integration of Eqs.(5.14) for  $(k, l, E) = (0.002, 25, 4)$  and initial conditions  $\delta r(0) = 0, \delta r'(0) = 1, \delta\Omega(0) = 0, \delta\Omega'(0) = 0.1$ . The continuous line is  $\delta r(\eta)$  and  $\delta\Omega(\eta)$  is the dashed line. Indeed,  $\delta\Omega$  remains zero, while  $\delta r$  evolves linearly (as long as  $k < 2lL/r$ ).

so that the corresponding potential is

$$\mathcal{V} = \frac{T_3}{2} \left( \left( k^2 - \frac{l^2 L^2}{r^4} \right) \delta r_k^2 + r^2 k^2 \delta\Omega_k^2 \right). \quad (.5)$$

For  $k > lL/r^2 = k_0$  the system clearly oscillates. However,  $k < k_0$  (for sufficiently small  $\delta\Omega_k$ ), we will see that the  $\delta r_k$  perturbations grow immediately after they are created. The system of equations although complicated enough, it can easily be solved for  $r\delta\Omega_k \ll \delta r_k$ . This is physically reasonable as one would expect that the angular momentum is important only at the inversion point of the trajectory. Mathematically one can check that for sub- and super-critical modes (i.e.  $k \gg k_0$  and  $k \ll k_0$ ) this approximation is valid.

For sub-critical modes substituting  $\delta\Omega'_k$  from the second equation (.3) to the first, it is possible to see that  $\delta\Omega_k = 0$  is a good approximation whenever  $k \gg k_0$ . In the case of super-critical modes ( $k \ll k_0$ ) Eq.(.3) turns out to be

$$\delta r_k'' - \frac{4(E-1)^2 l^2 L^2}{(4(E-1)^2 \eta^2 + l^2 L^2)^2} \delta r_k = 0 \quad (.6)$$

and the corresponding solution is

$$\delta r_k = C_k r, \quad (.7)$$

where  $C_k$  a constant whose value is obtained by matching the solution for  $\delta r_k/r$ , at the critical value  $k = k_0$  with the corresponding canonically normalized oscillating sub-critical mode, obtaining  $C_k = 1/\sqrt{2k}$ . In this case, this solution, together with  $\delta\Omega_k = 0$ , is an exact solution of the system (.2)-(.3) at  $k = 0$  and an approximate solution at  $k \ll k_0$ . This approximate solutions are also verified numerically, see Fig.1 .

## References

- [1] A. Kehagias and E. Kiritsis, JHEP **9911**, 022 (1999)



- [2] E. Kiritsis, Fortsch. Phys. **52**, 200 (2004) [Phys. Rept. **421**, 105 (2005 ERRAT,429,121-122.2006)] [arXiv:hep-th/0310001].
- [3] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4690 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9906064].
- [4] D. N. Spergel *et al.*, “Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) three year results: Implications for cosmology,” [arXiv:astro-ph/0603449].
- [5] J. H. Schwarz and P. C. West, Phys. Lett. B **126**, 301 (1983).  
P. S. Howe and P. C. West, Nucl. Phys. B **238**, 181 (1984);  
J. H. Schwarz, Nucl. Phys. B **226**, 269 (1983).
- [6] E. Papantonopoulos and V. Zamarias, JHEP **0410**, 051 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0408227];  
E. Papantonopoulos and I. Pappa, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **15**, 2145 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/0001183];  
E. Papantonopoulos and I. Pappa, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 103506 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0010014].
- [7] S. B. Giddings, S. Kachru and J. Polchinski, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 106006 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0105097].
- [8] P. Candelas and X. C. de la Ossa, Nucl. Phys. B **342**, 246 (1990).
- [9] S. Kachru and E. Silverstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4855 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9802183].
- [10] A. Kehagias, Phys. Lett. B **435**, 337 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9805131].
- [11] I. R. Klebanov and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **536**, 199 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9807080].
- [12] B. S. Acharya, J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill, C. M. Hull and B. J. Spence, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 1249 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9808014].  
D. R. Morrison and M. R. Plesser, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **3**, 1 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9810201].
- [13] I. R. Klebanov and M. J. Strassler, JHEP **0008**, 052 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/0007191].
- [14] S. Kachru and L. McAllister, JHEP **0303**, 018 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0205209].
- [15] H. L. Verlinde, Nucl. Phys. B **580**, 264 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/9906182].
- [16] C. S. Chan, P. L. Paul and H. L. Verlinde, Nucl. Phys. B **581**, 156 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/0003236].
- [17] C. Galfard, C. Germani and A. Kehagias, Class. Quant. Grav. **23** (2006) 1999 [arXiv:hep-th/0509136].
- [18] C. P. Burgess, P. Martineau, F. Quevedo and R. Rabadan, JHEP **0306**, 037 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0303170];  
C. P. Burgess, N. E. Grandi, F. Quevedo and R. Rabadan, JHEP **0401**, 067 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0310010].
- [19] T. Shiromizu, K. i. Maeda and M. Sasaki, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 024012 (2000) [arXiv:gr-qc/9910076].
- [20] L. Cotta-Ramusino and D. Wands, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 104001 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0609092].
- [21] P. Binetruy, C. Deffayet, U. Ellwanger and D. Langlois, Phys. Lett. B **477** 285 (2000), hep-th/9910219;  
S. Mukohyama, Phys. Lett. B **473** 241 (2000), hep-th/9911165.
- [22] E.W. Kolb and M.S. Turner, 1990 *The Early Universe Frontiers in Physics no. 69* (Addison-Wesley).
- [23] J. D. Barrow and C. G. Tsagas, Class. Quant. Grav. **22**, 1563 (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0411045].
- [24] D. H. Wesley, P. J. Steinhardt and N. Turok, Phys. Rev. D **72** (2005) 063513 [arXiv:hep-th/0502108].
- [25] T. Boehm and D. A. Steer, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 063510 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0206147].  
R. Durrer, Fund. Cosmic Phys. **15** (1994) 209 [arXiv:astro-ph/9311041];
- [26] A. Perez, H. Sahlmann and D. Sudarsky, Class. Quant. Grav. **23** (2006) 2317 [arXiv:gr-qc/0508100].
- [27] S. Hollands and R. M. Wald, Gen. Rel. Grav. **34**, 2043 (2002) [arXiv:gr-qc/0205058].  
S. Hollands and R. M. Wald, arXiv:hep-th/0210001.
- [28] V. Bozza, M. Giovannini and G. Veneziano, JCAP **0305** (2003) 001 [arXiv:hep-th/0302184].
- [29] S. Alexander, R. Brandenberger and J. Magueijo, Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003) 081301 [arXiv:hep-th/0108190].
- [30] S. Tsujikawa, R. Brandenberger and F. Finelli, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 083513 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0207228];  
P. Creminelli, A. Nicolis and M. Zaldarriaga, Phys. Rev. D **71** (2005) 063505 [arXiv:hep-

- th/0411270].
- [31] A. Nayeri, R. H. Brandenberger and C. Vafa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97** (2006) 021302 [arXiv:hep-th/0511140].  
T. Biswas, A. Mazumdar and W. Siegel, JCAP **0603** (2006) 009 [arXiv:hep-th/0508194].  
T. Biswas, R. Brandenberger, A. Mazumdar and W. Siegel, JCAP **0712** (2007) 011 [arXiv:hep-th/0610274].
- [32] I. R. Klebanov and A. A. Tseytlin, Nucl. Phys. B **578**, 123 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/0002159].
- [33] R.M. Corless, G.H. Gonnet, D.E.G. Hare, D.J. Jaffrey and D. Knuth, Adv. Comp. Math. **5** (1996)329.
- [34] M. Li and T. Yoneya, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997) 1219 [arXiv:hep-th/9611072].
- [35] S. H. Shenker, arXiv:hep-th/9509132.
- [36] B. Grinstein, D. R. Nolte and W. Skiba, Phys. Rev. D **63** (2001) 105005 [arXiv:hep-th/0012074].
- [37] L. Kofman, A. Linde and V. F. Mukhanov, JHEP **0210**, 057 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0206088].
- [38] S. Kachru, R. Kallosh, A. Linde, J. M. Maldacena, L. McAllister and S. P. Trivedi, JCAP **0310**, 013 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0308055].
- [39] G. R. Dvali and S. H. H. Tye, Phys. Lett. B **450** (1999) 72 [arXiv:hep-ph/9812483].
- [40] C. P. Burgess, M. Majumdar, D. Nolte, F. Quevedo, G. Rajesh and R. J. Zhang, JHEP **0107** (2001) 047 [arXiv:hep-th/0105204].
- [41] F. Quevedo, *Prepared for ICTP Spring School on Superstrings and Related Matters, Trieste, Italy, 18-26 Mar 2002*
- [42] S. Shandera, B. Shlaer, H. Stoica and S. H. H. Tye, JCAP **0402** (2004) 013 [arXiv:hep-th/0311207].
- [43] C. P. Burgess, J. M. Cline, H. Stoica and F. Quevedo, JHEP **0409** (2004) 033 [arXiv:hep-th/0403119].
- [44] S. H. Tye, arXiv:hep-th/0610221.
- [45] T. Matsuda, [arXiv:astro-ph/0610402]; T. Matsuda, [arXiv:hep-th/0610232].
- [46] P. Brax and D. A. Steer, JHEP **0205**, 016 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0204120].
- [47] P. Brax and D. A. Steer, arXiv:hep-th/0207280.
- [48] C. P. Burgess, F. Quevedo, R. Rabadan, G. Tasinato and I. Zavala, JCAP **0402**, 008 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0310122].
- [49] D. Easson, R. Gregory, G. Tasinato and I. Zavala, JHEP **0704** (2007) 026 [arXiv:hep-th/0701252].
- [50] D. A. Easson, R. Gregory, D. F. Mota, G. Tasinato and I. Zavala, [arXiv:0709.2666 [hep-th]].
- [51] R. Brandenberger, H. Firouzjahi and O. Saremi, JCAP **0711** (2007) 028 [arXiv:0707.4181 [hep-th]].
- [52] C. Germani, N. Grandi and A. Kehagias, arXiv:0706.0023 [hep-th].
- [53] C. Germani and M. Liguori, arXiv:0706.0025 [astro-ph].
- [54] Y. Shtanov and V. Sahni, Phys. Lett. B **557** (2003) 1 [arXiv:gr-qc/0208047].
- [55] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. R. Dvali, Phys. Lett. B **429**, 263 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9803315];  
I. Antoniadis, N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. R. Dvali, Phys. Lett. B **436**, 257 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9804398].