

Five-Dimensional Moving Brane Solutions with Four-Dimensional Limiting Behaviour

Edmund J. Copeland^{1*}, James Gray^{2†},
André Lukas^{1‡} and David Skinner^{3§}

¹Centre for Theoretical Physics, University of Sussex
Falmer, Brighton BN1 9QJ, United Kingdom

²Department of Physics, University of Newcastle upon Tyne
Herschel Building, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU, United Kingdom

³Department of Physics, Theoretical Physics, University of Oxford
1 Keble Road, Oxford OX1 3NP, United Kingdom

Under certain conditions some solutions to five-dimensional heterotic M-theory can be accurately described by the four-dimensional action of the theory - they have a four-dimensional limit. We consider the connection between solutions of four and five-dimensional heterotic M-theory when moving five-branes are present in the bulk. We begin by describing how to raise the known four-dimensional moving brane solutions to obtain approximate solutions to the five-dimensional theory, presenting for the first time the metric template necessary for this procedure. We then present the first solutions to the five-dimensional theory containing moving five-branes. We can then discuss the connection between our new exact five-dimensional solution and the four-dimensional ones. It is shown that our new solution corresponds to a solution with a *static* brane in four-dimensions. In other words our new solution could not have been identified as containing a moving brane from a purely four-dimensional view point.

*email: e.j.copeland@sussex.ac.uk

†email: J.A.Gray2@newcastle.ac.uk

‡email: a.lukas@sussex.ac.uk

§email: skinner@thphys.ox.ac.uk

I. INTRODUCTION

Branes moving during the course of the evolution of the universe constitute an interesting and generic feature of brane-world models. In this paper, we will analyse this phenomenon in the context of five-dimensional heterotic brane-world models derived from heterotic M-theory in eleven dimensions [1,2]. The five-dimensional effective action for these brane-world models has been derived recently [3–5] and the associated four-dimensional effective action and its relation to the five-dimensional theory has been presented in ref. [4]. These results open up the possibility of explicitly studying moving-brane cosmologies in a well-defined M-theory setting.

In the context of the four-dimensional effective theory, these results have been applied to obtain the first heterotic moving-brane cosmological solutions [6]. These solutions can be viewed as generalisations of the familiar string-theory rolling-radii solutions (see *e.g.* [7]). In addition to the dilaton and the universal T -modulus they involve the position modulus of the moving brane. In fact, from the structure of the four-dimensional effective action, the evolution of the dilaton and the T -modulus cannot be disentangled from the brane motion, or, more precisely, the dilaton and the T -modulus cannot be set to constants once the brane moves. This has important consequences for the properties of such moving-brane cosmologies. For example, it was found in ref. [6] that the effect of the brane is to interpolate between two rolling-radii solutions with static branes at early and late time, both in the positive and negative time branch. In addition, all such four-dimensional solutions become strongly coupled asymptotically; that is, at early and late time in both branches. From this result, proposals for an initial state of the universe based on weak coupling [8] appear to be problematic in the presence of a moving brane.

In this paper, we will be investigating moving brane cosmological solutions within the framework of five-dimensional heterotic M-theory [9,10] and the connection to their four-dimensional counterparts found in ref. [6]. We begin by showing how to oxidise a moving brane solution of the four-dimensional theory to an approximate solution of the five-dimensional theory. Specifically we provide a template for a five-dimensional metric and dilaton. To obtain the approximate five-dimensional configuration one simply has to take certain quantities from the four-dimensional solution and substitute them into this expression. The resulting solution is accurate to first order in the slowly moving moduli and weak coupling expansions as will be described.

We then go on to look for five-dimensional moving brane solutions. The technical challenge here is to find suitable solutions to the five-dimensional bulk theory in which to embed the branes. For five-dimensional heterotic M-theory only a very limited number of such solutions are presently known. The most elementary one is the BPS domain-wall vacuum of ref. [9]. However, as we have shown [6], this solution only allows the embedding of *static* branes, that is, branes which do not move in their transverse direction. The same is true for the simple separating cosmological solutions of ref. [11]. We, therefore, use the only other known class of bulk solutions which were found in ref. [12]. We show that, in addition to the boundaries, a moving brane can be embedded in these bulk solutions.

Finally we investigate the connection between four and five-dimensional moving brane solutions. We find that our five-dimensional solutions have a four-dimensional interpretation only in particular limits. Specifically they can be understood as being described by the effective four-dimensional theory only for certain periods of time. Remarkably, while the bulk 5-branes generically move across the orbifold, the four-dimensional limit requires that they be static. The 5-brane can remain static for an arbitrarily long period of time, however if it does start to move the four-dimensional description breaks down and a brane collision is inevitable. In this case, the breakdown of the effective description is not caused by moving to strong-coupling, but rather because the 5-brane moduli evolves more quickly than is allowed in the lowest-order four-dimensional action. In other words, studying the five-dimensional theory has revealed a new type of moving-brane solution which could not have been identified

as such from a purely four-dimensional viewpoint. Moreover, in the four-dimensional limit the solutions become more weakly-coupled with time in the positive time branch. This is in contrast to the purely four dimensional moving-brane solutions found in ref. [6] which are always strongly-coupled asymptotically.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In the next Section, we set the scene by presenting the minimal version of the five-dimensional brane-world theory and its associated four-dimensional effective action. We also provide the template mentioned above for raising four-dimensional moving brane solutions to five-dimensions. The five-dimensional moving-brane solutions will be presented in Section III. In Section IV, we analyse their four-dimensional limits so providing explicit examples illustrating the transition between four and five dimensions, first without and then with a bulk 5-brane. We end with a discussion of our results and our conclusions. Appendix A contains numerical solutions for the motion of the five-branes and orbifold fixed-points and finally Appendix B discusses the causal structure of the five-dimensional solutions.

II. THE ACTIONS IN FIVE AND FOUR DIMENSIONS

The five-dimensional theory which we will consider emerges as the low-energy limit of eleven-dimensional Hořava-Witten theory [1,2], that is eleven-dimensional supergravity on the orbifold $S^1/Z_2 \times \mathcal{M}_{10}$ coupled to two ten-dimensional E_8 SYM theories each residing on one of the two orbifold fixed planes. Upon compactification of this theory on a Calabi-Yau three-fold to five-dimensions [9,10] one obtains a five-dimensional $N = 1$ gauged supergravity theory on the orbifold $S^1/Z_2 \times \mathcal{M}_4$. This bulk theory is coupled to two $D = 4$, $N = 1$ theories which originate from the ten-dimensional E_8 gauge theories and are localised on 3-branes which coincide with the now four-dimensional orbifold fixed planes.

In compactifying from eleven to five dimensions, it is possible to include additional 5-branes in the vacuum [3,4]. These 5-branes are transverse to the orbifold and wrap (holomorphic) two-cycles within the Calabi-Yau three-fold. Hence, they also appear as 3-branes in the five-dimensional effective theory. However, unlike the “boundary” 3-branes which are stuck to the orbifold fixed-points, these 3-branes are free to move across the orbifold. Altogether, the five-dimensional theory is then still a gauged $N = 1$ supergravity theory on the orbifold $S^1/Z_2 \times \mathcal{M}_4$. It now couples to the two $N = 1$ theories on the boundary 3-branes as well as to a series of $N = 1$ theories residing on the additional 3-branes.

For the purposes of this paper, we will consider the inclusion of only one intermediate 3-brane. Further, we consistently truncate the action to the minimal possible set of fields. These are the metric $g_{\alpha\beta}$ and the dilaton Φ in the bulk, together with the embedding co-ordinates of the brane (which, after gauge-fixing, leads to one physical degree of freedom corresponding to transverse motion of the brane). We will use co-ordinates x^α , where $\alpha, \beta, \dots = 0, \dots, 3, 5$ for the five-dimensional space, and allow general embeddings of the branes within this bulk space. Four-dimensional co-ordinates x^μ will be indexed by $\mu, \nu, \dots = 0, \dots, 3$.

The five-dimensional action contains pieces from the bulk, the two orbifold fixed-planes (boundaries) and the 5-branes, that is,

$$S_5 = S_{\text{bulk}} + \sum_{i=1,2,5} S^{(i)}, \quad (1)$$

where $i = 1, 2$ refer to the two boundaries and $i = 5$ refers to the 5-brane. Specifically, these pieces are given by [5]

$$S_{\text{bulk}} = -\frac{1}{2\kappa_5^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}_5} \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2} R + \frac{1}{4} (\partial\Phi)^2 + V_{\text{bulk}}(\Phi) \right] \quad (2)$$

$$S^{(i)} = -\frac{1}{2\kappa_5^2} \int_{\Sigma_i} \sqrt{-h^{(i)}} V_i(\Phi). \quad (3)$$

Here, κ_5 is the five-dimensional Newton constant and $h^{(i)}$ are the determinants of the four-dimensional induced metrics on the branes Σ_i . The branes Σ_1 and Σ_2 coincide with the fixed-planes of the orbifold, whilst Σ_5 is free to move between these two.

The bulk potential is given by

$$V_{\text{bulk}} = \frac{\alpha^2}{3} e^{-2\Phi} \quad (4)$$

where α is a sum of θ functions ¹

$$\alpha = \sum_{i=1,2,5} \alpha_i \theta(\Sigma_i). \quad (5)$$

The boundary potentials V_i , where $i = 1, 2$ take the form

$$V_i = 2\alpha_i e^{-\Phi} \quad (6)$$

while the potential V_5 on the 5-brane reads

$$V_5 = \alpha_5 e^{-\Phi}. \quad (7)$$

The constants α_i can be interpreted as charges on the boundaries and the 5-brane and they satisfy the cohomology condition

$$\sum_{i=1,2,5} \alpha_i = 0. \quad (8)$$

Varying the above action gives the bulk Einstein equation and bulk scalar field equation in the usual way. The embeddings of the branes Σ_i within this bulk are described by the Israel conditions

$$\left[K_{\alpha\beta}^{(i)} \right] = -\frac{1}{3} V_i h_{\alpha\beta}^{(i)} \quad (9)$$

$$\left[n_{\alpha}^{(i)} \partial^{\alpha} \Phi \right] = \frac{dV_i}{d\Phi}. \quad (10)$$

where $K_{\alpha\beta}^{(i)}$ is the extrinsic curvature and we have defined $[X] \equiv X_+ - X_-$. The jump of any quantity across the Z_2 orbifold-fixed planes is, of course, simply twice the value next to the boundary, taken with a positive sign at the first boundary and a negative one at the second.

The vacuum of this five-dimensional theory is a BPS domain-wall solution first derived in ref. [9]. We may compactify the five-dimensional theory on this vacuum, promoting certain constants to moduli, so as to obtain

¹Ref. [5] uses the orbifold picture where the action (1) and the definition of α , (5), contain an additional term related to the Z_2 mirror of the 5-brane. In this paper, we will be working in the boundary picture and have, hence, dropped these terms.

the four-dimensional action of heterotic M-theory. If one considers only those fields presented in the action (2)-(3) (a consistent truncation of the full five-dimensional theory) then one arrives at the four-dimensional action [4]

$$S = -\frac{1}{2\kappa_4^2} \int \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2}R + \frac{1}{4}\partial_\mu\phi\partial^\mu\phi + \frac{3}{4}\partial_\mu\beta\partial^\mu\beta + \frac{q_5}{2}e^{\beta-\phi}\partial_\mu z\partial^\mu z \right] \quad (11)$$

where the four-dimensional Newton constant κ_4 is related to its five-dimensional counterpart by

$$\kappa_4^2 = \frac{\kappa_5^2}{2\pi\rho} \quad (12)$$

and the constant $q_5 = 2\pi\rho\alpha_5$ is proportional to the 5-brane charge.

All three four-dimensional scalar fields β, ϕ and z have a geometrical interpretation in terms of the underlying five- or eleven-dimensional theory. Concretely, $\pi\rho e^\beta$ specifies the size of the orbifold, where $\pi\rho$ is a fixed reference length, while the volume of the internal Calabi-Yau space is given by ve^ϕ with a fixed reference volume v . The field z is normalised so it takes values in the interval $z \in [0, 1]$ and, from a five-dimensional viewpoint, it specifies the position of the three-brane in the transverse space. Here $z = 0$ ($z = 1$) corresponds to the first (second) boundary. At the perturbative level, the fields ϕ, β and z correspond to flat directions which will typically be lifted by non-perturbative potentials from various sources [13–16]. In this paper, for simplicity, we will not take such non-perturbative effects into consideration. Note, that the above action can be interpreted as the consistent truncation of an $N = 1$ supergravity theory. The Kähler potential of this theory and its relation to the component fields has been given in ref. [4,5].

The four-dimensional action is correct to first-order in the strong-coupling expansion parameter, defined as

$$\epsilon \equiv 2\alpha\pi\rho e^{\beta-\phi} . \quad (13)$$

This parameter may be interpreted as measuring the strength of Kaluza-Klein excitations in the orbifold direction, or the strength of string-loop corrections to the four-dimensional effective action, or the relative size of the orbifold and the Calabi-Yau space. When $\epsilon \ll 1$ the theory is in the weakly-coupled regime and the four-dimensional effective action can provide a good description of the system. However, if $\epsilon \sim 1$ or greater, then the four-dimensional action (11) cannot be expected to provide a good description of the theory, as excitations of the five-dimensional Kaluza-Klein modes become important. The five-dimensional action (1)-(3) should also receive higher order corrections in ϵ governed by the eleven-dimensional theory. However, it can be expected to provide a more accurate description of the system at $\epsilon > 1$ than the four-dimensional theory. In this sense, we will use the action (1) to obtain a qualitative picture for brane-evolution at $\epsilon > 1$.

Notice also that from a four-dimensional perspective, a moving 5-brane necessarily implies time-evolution of the fields ϕ and β , as can be seen from the kinetic term of the z field in (11). The complete set of cosmological solutions for the action (11) (assuming Ricci flat spatial sections) has been given in [6]. It has been shown for those solutions, that a moving brane necessarily implies strong coupling, *i.e.* diverging ϵ , asymptotically at both early and late time. This property is a direct consequence of the coupling between z, ϕ and β in (11).

How does one raise a solution of this four-dimensional action to obtain an approximate solution to the five-dimensional one? As is well-known, the vacuum solution contains non-trivial dependence on the orbifold coordinate due to the presence of the branes. This dependence gets modified slightly in the presence of a moving 5-brane. To raise a four-dimensional moving brane solution to obtain a five-dimensional approximate solution, one must use the following template. Using co-ordinates in which the orbifold fixed-planes lie along lines of constant y (at $y = 0$ and $y = \pi\rho$), the template is

$$ds^2 = e^{-\beta} g_{\mu\nu} (1 + \epsilon B(y)) dx^\mu dx^\nu + e^{2\beta} (1 + \epsilon B(y))^4 dy^2 \quad (14)$$

$$e^\Phi = e^\phi (1 + \epsilon B(y))^3 \quad (15)$$

where, for a 5-brane located at $y = Y = z\pi\rho$, the function $B(y)$ is given by

$$B(y) = \begin{cases} \frac{e^{3\beta} \alpha_5 \dot{z}^2}{6\alpha_1} \frac{y^2}{2} - \frac{1}{3\pi\rho} y + c_1 & 0 \leq y \leq Y \\ -\frac{e^{3\beta} \alpha_5 \dot{z}^2}{6\alpha_2} \frac{y^2}{2} - \left(\frac{1}{3\pi\rho} - \frac{\pi\rho e^{3\beta} \alpha_5 \dot{z}^2}{6\alpha_2} \right) y + c_2 & Y \leq y \leq \pi\rho \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

where

$$c_1 = \frac{1}{6} \left(1 + \frac{\alpha_5}{\alpha_1} (1 - z)^2 + \frac{e^{3\beta} \alpha_5}{2\alpha_1} (\pi\rho\dot{z})^2 \left(\frac{2}{3} + z^2 - 2z \right) \right) \quad (17)$$

$$c_2 = -\frac{1}{6} \left(-1 + \frac{\alpha_5}{\alpha_2} z^2 + \frac{e^{3\beta} \alpha_5}{2\alpha_2} (\pi\rho\dot{z})^2 \left(\frac{2}{3} + z^2 \right) \right). \quad (18)$$

Notice that the five-brane may effectively be removed from this template by setting $\alpha_5 = 0$; for constant moduli we then recover the standard BPS vacuum solution of [9]. A BPS configuration is also obtained if the five-brane is static, so $\dot{z} = 0$.

To obtain five-dimensional solutions with dynamical five-branes one simply has to substitute the fields $g_{\mu\nu}$, β , ϕ and z from the four-dimensional moving brane solutions of [6] into this template. The resulting configuration will be a solution to the five-dimensional theory to first order in the weak coupling and slowly moving moduli approximations.

III. A FIVE-DIMENSIONAL SOLUTION WITH A MOVING 5-BRANE

To date, it has proven elusive to show explicitly the connection between solutions of the theories (1)–(3) and (11) for anything other than the BPS vacuum state and the separating cosmological solutions of [11] (the four-dimensional solutions corresponding to which are marked in figure 1). Unsurprisingly, the main reason for this is that complete five-dimensional solutions are extremely difficult to find. One approach that has been followed by Chamblin & Reall in ref. [12] is to consider bulk spacetimes that only depend on a single co-ordinate. As noticed in ref [18], the constraint that the bulk fields only depend on one co-ordinate is equivalent to adoption of the ansatz

$$e^\Phi \propto R^6. \quad (19)$$

relating the dilaton Φ and brane scale-factor R , where the sixth power is governed by the particular form of the universal potentials in heterotic M-theory (4)-(7). The first steps towards more general solutions have been taken in ref [19]. Although we will not attempt to use such more complicated solutions explicitly in this paper, in the final section we will point out how we anticipate they play a rôle.

Instead, here we wish to generalize the solution of ref. [12] so as to describe the possibility of additional 5-branes which are free to move across the orbifold. For simplicity, we will consider the inclusion of only one bulk 5-brane, the generalization being straightforward. The metric that achieves this is given by

$$ds^2 = -\frac{1}{U_\pm(t_\pm)} dt_\pm^2 + U_\pm(t_\pm) dr_\pm^2 + R_\pm(t_\pm)^2 d\mathbf{x}^2 \quad (20)$$

where co-ordinates (t_-, r_-) and (t_+, r_+) are valid on the left and right of the 5-brane, respectively. The dilaton field has a corresponding solution

$$\Phi = \Phi_{0\pm} + \frac{6}{7} \ln(t_{\pm}) \quad (21)$$

where $\Phi_{0\pm}$ are arbitrary integration constants. The functions U_{\pm} and R_{\pm} that appear in the metric are given by

$$U_{\pm}(t_{\pm}) = 49t_{\pm}^{\frac{2}{7}} \left(2M_{\pm}t_{\pm}^{\frac{2}{7}} - \frac{\alpha_{\pm}^2 e^{-2\Phi_{0\pm}}}{9} \right) \quad (22)$$

$$R_{\pm}(t_{\pm}) = t_{\pm}^{\frac{1}{7}}. \quad (23)$$

In this paper, we will mainly consider the region above the horizons where

$$t_{\pm} > t_{\pm}^h \equiv \left(\frac{\alpha_{\pm}^2 e^{-2\Phi_{0\pm}}}{18M_{\pm}} \right)^{\frac{7}{2}} \quad (24)$$

in each portion of the bulk and hence the $U(t)$'s are positive, making t and r locally timelike and spacelike, respectively. The conventions in ref. [12] were the opposite. The parameters M_{\pm} are positive, but otherwise arbitrary constants of integration which may be interpreted as the mass of the singularity at $t = 0$ in the maximally extended spacetimes. They may be chosen independently on each side of a bulk 5-brane. The 'charges' felt by each region of the bulk are given by $\alpha_- = \alpha_1$ and $\alpha_+ = \alpha_1 + \alpha_5 = -\alpha_2$ in terms of the charges on the branes. This solution is essentially two copies of the spacetime found in ref. [12], sewn together at the bulk brane Σ_5 . The sewing is continuous, but not necessarily smooth as the 5-brane supports energy-momentum through its potential. Continuity of the metric requires that $t_-(\Sigma_5) = t_+(\Sigma_5)$ (we can make this choice of scaling of \mathbf{x}_{\pm} without loss of generality). Continuity of the dilaton then forces us to choose $\Phi_{0-} = \Phi_{0+}$. In the limit $M_{\pm} \rightarrow 0$ this solution becomes the BPS vacuum of ref. [5,9].

Since R_{\pm} are monotonically increasing functions of t_{\pm} alone, the branes may be taken to be located in the bulk such that their scale factors are $R = R_1, R_5$ and R_2 respectively, with $R_1 < R_5 < R_2$. The locations of the branes are governed by the Israel conditions (9). Using the co-ordinates of the metric (20) it is possible to write these in a convenient form. Following the procedure of ref. [20] where non-BPS brane configurations in type IIA massive supergravity were considered, we twice square the ij components of eq. (9) to obtain the brane equations of motion as

$$\left(\frac{dR_i}{d\lambda} \right)^2 = \frac{9e^{2\Phi_0} [M]^2}{[\alpha]^2} \frac{1}{R_i^6} + \left(\{M\} - \frac{\{\alpha\}[M]}{[\alpha]} \right) \frac{1}{R_i^8} \quad (25)$$

where λ is proper time measured on the relevant brane. We have defined $\{X\} \equiv X_+ + X_-$, and $[\alpha] = \alpha_i$ is the (bulk 5-) brane's charge.

Notice that for a brane at an orbifold fixed-plane, Z_2 -symmetry requires that $[M] = 0$ and $\{M\} = 2M$, whereas for a bulk five-brane neither condition is necessarily true. This crucial difference between the embeddings of the orbifold fixed-planes and bulk 5-brane immediately leads to the conclusion that, if M_{\pm} are chosen to be different in the two sections of the bulk, the 5-brane will always collide with a fixed plane in at least one asymptotic regime. This may be seen from the first term in eq. (25) which dominates as $R_i \rightarrow \infty$. Since this term can only exist for a bulk brane, the 5-brane will move across the orbifold and ultimately collide with one of the fixed planes. Conversely, the only possibility for obtaining a solution where the 5-brane is asymptotically static with respect to the orbifold is to choose $M_- = M_+$. Then, as for the fixed planes, eq. (25) may be solved in compact form

and it is clear that the brane separations approach constants as $R \rightarrow \infty$. In this case the branes' trajectories in either (r, t) plane are given by

$$r = r_0^{(i)} \pm \frac{(t^h)^{\frac{3}{7}}}{28M} \left[\left(\frac{t}{t^h} \right)^{\frac{2}{7}} + \ln \left(\left(\frac{t}{t^h} \right)^{\frac{2}{7}} - 1 \right) \right] \quad (26)$$

where $r_0^{(i)}$ is an arbitrary integration constant and t^h was defined in eq. (24) using either the (r_-, t_-) or (r_+, t_+) co-ordinates.

We shall make use only of certain limits of the fixed plane and 5-brane motion in the next section, for which simple analytical forms can be found in both cases. Diagrams illustrating the orbifold fixed plane and 5-brane trajectories for more general choices of parameters may be found in Appendix A.

IV. THE FOUR-DIMENSIONAL LIMIT

In this Section we will show how the solution (20)-(21) is related to solutions of the four-dimensional action (11). First, we will consider the case without a bulk brane. This provides both the background in which we later wish to study the 5-brane motion, and also in itself demonstrates an example of a correspondence between a five- and four-dimensional solution in a concrete manner. We shall then proceed to include a five-brane in the bulk.

A. The case without bulk 5-branes

Homogeneous, isotropic solutions of the four-dimensional action (11) for $z = \text{const}$ have been extensively studied (see *e.g.* [7,6,17]). Here we will be interested in those which possess metrics with spatially flat sections, described by

$$ds^2 = -d\tau^2 + e^{2A} d\mathbf{x}^2 \quad (27)$$

with the moduli fields

$$A(\tau) = A_0 + \frac{1}{3} \ln \left| \frac{\tau - \tau_0}{T} \right| \quad (28)$$

$$\beta(\tau) = \beta_0 + p_\beta \ln \left| \frac{\tau - \tau_0}{T} \right| \quad (29)$$

$$\phi(\tau) = \phi_0 + p_\phi \ln \left| \frac{\tau - \tau_0}{T} \right| \quad (30)$$

where $A_0, \beta_0, \phi_0, \tau_0$ and T are arbitrary constants (clearly they are not all physical, but we shall find it convenient to express the four-dimensional metric in this form). On the other hand, the constants p_β and p_ϕ satisfy the constraint $3p_\beta^2 + p_\phi^2 = 4/3$, so the space of possible four-dimensional rolling-radii solutions may be described by an ellipse as in figure 1. The solutions are classified by $\delta \equiv p_\beta - p_\phi$, with the $\delta > 0$ solutions evolving towards strong coupling as $|\tau - \tau_0| \rightarrow \infty$ and the $\delta < 0$ solutions becoming strongly coupled as $|\tau - \tau_0| \rightarrow 0$. To first order in the strong-coupling parameter and the slowly evolving moduli expansions, these solutions may be oxidised to provide solutions to the full five-dimensional theory by considering them as fluctuations around the BPS vacuum. To do this one can use a simpler version of the template (14)-(15) where the bulk five-brane has been removed - by setting $\alpha_5 = 0$ for example. We now wish to demonstrate that, in a certain regime, the solution (20)-(21) (in the absence of a five-brane) is equivalent to an oxidised four-dimensional solution.

The question immediately arises as to which of the four-dimensional solutions we should oxidise. The relationship between R and Φ given in (19) scales to become the constraint

$$p_\phi = 2 - 3p_\beta \quad (31)$$

in four dimensions. Therefore, if the five-dimensional fields of Section III are to evolve into any of the four-dimensional rolling radii solutions, then it must be one of the two intersection points in figure 1. Which of these two points is the relevant one can be determined by noticing that, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, the terms in the metric (20) that involve the brane charge α become negligible, so the solution must become weakly coupled at late time. This uniquely determines that the required four-dimensional moduli fields have expansion powers $p_\phi = 1$ and $p_\beta = 1/3$.




FIG. 1. The ellipse of possible expansion powers (p_β, p_ϕ) is shown. Solutions on the dotted part of the ellipse evolve towards weak coupling as $|\tau - \tau_0| \rightarrow \infty$ whereas those on the solid curve tend towards strong coupling. The straight line indicates by its intersection with the ellipse the two four-dimensional solutions which are compatible with the relationship between R and Φ in the five-dimensional solution as given by (19). The four-dimensional solution to which the configuration given in section III corresponds is marked with a rectangle. The two points marked on the ellipse with solid black oblongs are the rolling radii solutions which correspond to the separating solutions mentioned at the start of section III.

Our procedure shall now be to insert eqs. (27)-(30) into eqs. (14)-(15), in the absence of a five-brane, to obtain the oxidised four-dimensional solution. This we will compare with the full solution of Section III (for the case where there is no bulk five-brane of course). We do not expect that the oxidised expressions will reproduce the entire five-dimensional solution, but only a certain region thereof. More specifically, since the oxidised solution is accurate to linear order in the strong-coupling expansion parameter ϵ , and we have seen that this limit of the bulk metric occurs at ‘late’ times, it is clear that the appropriate region of the metric (20) with which to compare the raised expressions is where $t \gg t_\pm^h$. Then each orbifold fixed-plane is far ‘above’ the horizon that would be present in the maximally extended bulk.

In the absence of a bulk brane, to first order in the strong coupling parameter ϵ , the oxidised dilaton has the

form

$$e^{\Phi} = e^{\phi} (1 + 2he^{\beta-\phi}) \quad (32)$$

where h has the simple form $h(y) = \alpha_1(|y| - \pi\rho/2)$ as appropriate for the BPS vacuum without 5-branes. Inserting equations (29) and (30) into this and comparing with the five-dimensional expression eq. (21) shows that we must choose the t co-ordinate of equation (20) to be given in terms of rolling radii co-ordinates employed in equations (14)-(15) by

$$t = \left| \frac{\tau - \tau_0}{T} \right|^{\frac{7}{6}} \left(1 + \frac{7}{3} h e^{\beta_0 - \phi_0} \left| \frac{\tau - \tau_0}{T} \right|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \right) \quad (33)$$

to first order in brane charges, and we have set $\Phi_0 = \phi_0$.

We recall that the reduction of the five-dimensional action (2)-(3) to the four-dimensional effective action (11) was done using co-ordinates where the orbifold fixed-planes lay at constant y , whereas in Section III the fixed-planes followed the trajectories given in eq. (26). This determines the other change of variable required as as

$$dr = \gamma dy \pm \frac{2}{7} t^{-\frac{5}{7}} \frac{t_h^{\frac{1}{7}}}{28M} dt \quad (34)$$

where γ is a possible scaling of the y -axis to be determined later, and again we have only considered terms up to first order in the strong-coupling parameter.

We can now insert these co-ordinate transformations into the limit of the five-dimensional solution described above to obtain

$$ds^2 = e^{-\beta_0} \left| \frac{\tau - \tau_0}{T} \right|^{-\frac{1}{3}} \left(1 + \frac{2h}{3} e^{\beta_0 - \phi_0} \left| \frac{\tau - \tau_0}{T} \right|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \right) \left[-d\tau^2 + e^{2A_0} \left| \frac{\tau - \tau_0}{T} \right|^{\frac{2}{3}} d\mathbf{x}^2 \right] + e^{2\beta_0} \left| \frac{\tau - \tau_0}{T} \right|^{\frac{2}{3}} \left(1 + \frac{4h}{3} e^{\beta_0 - \phi_0} \left| \frac{\tau - \tau_0}{T} \right|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \right) dy^2 \quad (35)$$

for the metric and

$$e^{\Phi} = e^{\phi_0} \left| \frac{\tau - \tau_0}{T} \right| \left(1 + 2h e^{\beta_0 - \phi_0} \left| \frac{\tau - \tau_0}{T} \right|^{-\frac{2}{3}} \right) \quad (36)$$

for the dilaton. In deriving these expressions, we have made the following identifications between five- and four-dimensional constants

$$2M = \frac{e^{\beta_0}}{(6T)^2} \quad (37)$$

$$\gamma = \frac{\pm e^{\beta_0}}{7\sqrt{2M}} \quad (38)$$

$$2A_0 = \beta_0 \quad (39)$$

The last of these conditions is simply a consequence of a choice of scaling we have made for the x_i (this choice was mentioned briefly in the paragraph underneath (24)).

We now see that the late time limit of our five-dimensional solution (as given in eqs (35)-(36)) is, to first order in the strong-coupling parameter, exactly the same as the oxidised four-dimensional solution (obtained by inserting (27)-(30) into the template of eqs (14)-(15) with $\alpha_5 = 0$ as appropriate if no 5-brane is present) except

for the co-efficient of dy^2 . In eq. (35) this co-efficient contains a factor of $\frac{4}{3}$ whereas the template has $\frac{8}{3}$. This difference is to be expected in general when comparing such solutions for the following reason. If we insert the template structure into the five-dimensional Friedmann equation and expand to first order in strong-coupling we obtain,

$$\left(\dot{A}^2 - \frac{\dot{\beta}^2}{4} - \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{12}\right) + \frac{1}{3} \left(6\dot{A} - 2\dot{\beta} - \dot{\phi}\right) \left(\dot{\beta} - \dot{\phi}\right) h e^{\beta-\phi} = \frac{1}{3} e^{-2\beta-\phi} h'' \mp \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{\alpha_i}{3} e^{-2\beta-\phi} \delta(y - y_i). \quad (40)$$

The only terms in this equation which depend on the precise factor in the co-efficient of dy^2 in the metric are,

$$\frac{1}{3} \left(6\dot{A} - 2\dot{\beta} - \dot{\phi}\right) \left(\dot{\beta} - \dot{\phi}\right) h e^{\beta-\phi} \quad (41)$$

Notice however that these terms are first order both in the strong-coupling parameter and in squared time derivatives of moduli. The four-dimensional action (11) is only accurate to first order in each of these expansions and so these terms are negligible when it is valid. Thus in connecting the two solutions the value of this factor in the metric is irrelevant.

Hence we have established the connection between the two solutions. The late time behaviour of the metric (20) and dilaton (21) is described by the four-dimensional rolling radius solution of eqs. (27)-(30) with $p_\phi = 1$ and $p_\beta = 1/3$. Conversely, one full continuation of this particular weakly coupled solution into the strong-coupling regime is given by (20)-(22). To our knowledge, this is the first time such a non-trivial correspondence between dynamical solutions of five- and four-dimensional heterotic M-theory has been explicitly demonstrated.

B. Including a 5-brane

We may now proceed to include a bulk 5-brane in this process of identification. Four-dimensional solutions of the action (11) including the modulus z describing the location of the 5-brane were studied in [6]. There, it was shown that z evolves according to

$$z(\tau) = z_0 + d \left(1 + \left|\frac{\tau - \tau_0}{T}\right|^{p_\beta^i - p_\phi^i}\right)^{-1} \quad (42)$$

with z_0 and d arbitrary constants. p_β^i and p_ϕ^i are the expansion powers of the T modulus and the dilaton at infinity. In our case we know that as we let $t \rightarrow \infty$ we also have $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. This is impossible for a four-dimensional solution which contains a moving brane and so we set $d = 0$. Therefore we will see that, although the 5-brane moves in the full five-dimensional solution, it corresponds to a solution which has a stationary 5-brane in the four-dimensional limit. In this limit the expansion powers will be the same as for the case without a five brane, *i.e.* $p_\phi = 1$, $p_\beta = \frac{1}{3}$.

From the five-dimensional perspective, there is no Z_2 symmetry across the bulk brane and so *a priori* we should consider all the terms in the Israel conditions:

$$\left(\frac{dR_i}{d\lambda}\right)^2 = \frac{9e^{2\Phi_0} [M]^2}{[\alpha]^2} \frac{1}{R_i^6} + \left(\{M\} - \frac{\{\alpha\}[M]}{[\alpha]}\right) \frac{1}{R_i^8} \quad (43)$$

where, again, λ is proper time as measured on the relevant brane. If we make the *choice* $[M] = 0$, as we are free to decide, then the 5-brane would move in the maximally extended bulk in precisely the same way as an orbifold

fixed-plane. It is then clear that as $t \rightarrow \infty$ this solution has a four-dimensional limit exactly as before, except of course that the function $h(y)$ in eqs. (35)-(36) should now be replaced by the expression given in eq. (16) as appropriate for raising a four-dimensional solution on a background containing a 5-brane (with $\dot{z} = 0$). In the four-dimensional regime, this corresponds to choosing $\pi\rho z_0 = Y$ in eq (42).

On the other hand, for any $[M] \neq 0$, it is inevitable that the 5-brane starts to move with respect to the orbifold fixed-planes, ultimately colliding with one of them as discussed above. This effect becomes important after the time

$$t^{\frac{2}{7}} \sim t_{\text{move}}^{\frac{2}{7}} \equiv \frac{[\alpha]}{9e^{2\Phi_0}[M]^2} (\{M\}[\alpha] - \{a\}[M]) \quad (44)$$

for a 5-brane of charge $[\alpha] = \alpha_5$. This time may be delayed arbitrarily by taking $[M] \rightarrow 0$. In particular, it is possible to choose $[M]$ such that $t_{\text{move}} \gg t^h$ so that the whole model can have evolved well into the weakly coupled regime long before the 5-brane motion becomes significant. Of course, for the case where $[M]$ is large enough that $t^h > t_{\text{move}}$ the bulk brane will perform its motion within the five-dimensional regime to start off with, as even the bulk fields have not evolved sufficiently to allow a four-dimensional description.

Assuming that $[M]$ is sufficiently small, when the 5-brane does begin to move appreciably we may describe it in terms of the same four-dimensional co-ordinates as were introduced earlier in eqs. (33)-(34). Our above analysis tells us that this motion should not correspond to that of a four dimensional solution and we shall now see that this is indeed the case. Writing the five brane motion in these coordinates we obtain,

$$\frac{dz}{d\tau} = \pm \frac{e^{-\frac{3\beta_0}{2}}}{\pi\rho} \left| \frac{\tau - \tau_0}{T} \right|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (45)$$

where we have considered only the lowest-order terms in the strong-coupling parameter. Comparing this expression with eq (42) as found directly from solutions of the four-dimensional action shows that the 5-brane motion considered here is not a solution of the weakly-coupled action.

Thus the brane's motion is a higher-order effect than is contained in the action (11) and so when such motion becomes significant our five-dimensional solution is no longer in a four-dimensional limit due to a break down of the slowly moving moduli approximation. To see this in more detail, let us again consider the five-dimensional Friedmann equation with the raising template metric, this time including an additional source for the 5-brane. We find

$$3e^\beta \left(\dot{A}^2 - \frac{\dot{\beta}^2}{4} - \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{12} \right) - \frac{3}{2} e^{-2\beta} \epsilon B'' = \sum_{i=1}^2 2\alpha_i e^{-\beta-\phi} \delta(y-y_i) + e^{-\beta-\phi} \delta(y-\pi\rho z) \alpha_5 (1 + e^{3\beta} \dot{z}^2 (\pi\rho)^2) \quad (46)$$

where we keep only terms up to first order in the strong-coupling expansion parameter and slowly moving moduli approximations.

The zeroth-order contributions survive to appear in the four-dimensional theory. The terms

$$\frac{3}{2} e^{-2\beta} \epsilon B'' + \sum_{i=1}^2 2\alpha_i e^{-\beta-\phi} \delta(y-y_i) + e^{-\beta-\phi} \delta(y-\pi\rho z) \alpha_5 (1 + e^{3\beta} \dot{z}^2 (\pi\rho)^2) \quad (47)$$

cancel exactly because of the complicated structure of $B(y)$ in the metric template in the presence of a bulk 5-brane (see eqs. (16)-(18)). However, when the 5-brane starts to move, we see that there is no term which can match the contribution of its kinetic energy. Furthermore, since

$$e^{3\beta} \dot{z}^2 = 1 \quad (48)$$

when $t > t^h$ and $t > t_{\text{move}}$, the contribution of terms we have ignored in working to first order in the expansion in the time derivatives of the z modulus become just as important as those which we have kept. Thus we see that higher-order corrections to the template structure would indeed be needed to describe the solution as soon as the brane motion is important. Hence, as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$, the motion of the bulk brane in this particular five-dimensional solution does not admit a description in terms of the lowest order four-dimensional theory. Notice incidentally that choosing the jump of M to be small only delays the time when the bulk brane starts to move, and does not ‘slow it down’ at this level of approximation.

In conclusion, we have established that in a certain regime (namely when $t^h \ll t \ll t_{\text{move}}$) our five-dimensional moving brane solution corresponds to an oxidised four dimensional rolling radius solution with a static 5-brane. To our knowledge this is the first non-trivial example where such a correspondence has been established explicitly, with or without a bulk brane. If $M_1 = M_2$, the bulk 5-brane remains static for all times, but any mismatch of these parameters will ultimately always cause the brane to move, forcing us to consider higher-order terms than are usually kept in the four-dimensional theory. The matching procedure presented in this section can be simply extended to a solution with any number of 5-branes present in the bulk.

V. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSIONS

We have provided three main new pieces of information in this paper. Firstly, we have described how to raise four-dimensional moving brane solutions of heterotic M-theory to obtain five-dimensional solutions accurate to first order in the ϵ and slowly moving moduli expansions. The procedure for raising such solutions is to take certain quantities such as the values of various fields in the four-dimensional description and substitute them into the template of a five-dimensional configuration which we have provided. Secondly, we have presented the first solutions to five-dimensional heterotic M-theory which containing moving five-branes. These are exact solutions to the full five-dimensional action of the theory. Finally, we have shown that at late times on the positive time branch, our solutions possesses a mild enough warping to admit a four-dimensional effective description. However, the presence of a 5-brane in the bulk can destroy this four-dimensional limit as its position modulus can vary rapidly in the full solution, breaking the slowly moving moduli approximation necessary for such a description to be valid. We end up with our five-dimensional solutions generically having a four-dimensional limit for some intermediate period of time - where ϵ has become small enough to admit a weakly coupled description but the five-brane has yet to start moving significantly. The fact that a five-dimensional moving five-brane solution corresponds to a four-dimensional solution with a constant z modulus is interesting. It means that we could not have identified our solutions as containing a moving five-brane from a four-dimensional perspective - the full five-dimensional theory is required for that.

It is of interest to consider briefly how we might expect other five-dimensional solutions to behave. As pointed out by Chamblin & Reall in ref. [12], there is of course no reason to expect that a general solution to Einstein’s equations should only depend on one bulk co-ordinate, even if it is homogeneous and isotropic in directions parallel to the orbifold planes. More recently, in ref. [19] Charmousis has attempted to construct heterotic M-theory solutions where the bulk fields cannot, in any gauge, be written as functions of only one co-ordinate, even locally. Of course, not all of these solutions will necessarily possess four-dimensional descriptions in any regime, however from the perspective of this paper we expect that at least some should display similar behaviour to the $e^\Phi = R^6$ solution considered here. Specifically, as either $|t| \rightarrow \infty$ or $t \rightarrow 0$ they should evolve to become one of

the other four-dimensional rolling radii solutions displayed in fig. 1. If these solutions were augmented to include 5-branes across the orbifold, then again we would expect there to be additional conditions on the validity of the four-dimensional description dependent upon the velocity of the 5-brane. In particular, it should in principle be possible to find the full, non-linear five-dimensional lift of the moving brane solutions in ref. [6]. Unfortunately, owing to the difficulty of the five-dimensional field equations, at present we are unaware of any explicit examples of such solutions.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

J.G. would like to thank Ian Moss for a useful conversation about the causal structure. D.S. is supported by a PPARC studentship, J.G. is supported by a Sir James Knott fellowship and A.L. is supported by a PPARC Advanced Fellowship. D.S. would like to thank E.J.C, A.L. and Jocelyn Retter for hospitality at Sussex while part of this work was being completed.

APPENDIX A: NUMERICAL SOLUTIONS FOR BRANE MOTION

Presented in figures 2-4 are numerical solutions for the brane motion as determined by equation (25). The plots are given in terms of R and τ_b . These variables are the scale factor and comoving time of the induced metric on the brane in question and, it should be noted, are not the same as the four-dimensional comoving time and scale factor.

The plots are all for the same values of parameters and integration constants (as described in the caption of figure 2) but are plotted over different ranges. Figure 2 shows the overall shape of the solutions. Figure 3 shows that for very large changes in the time co-ordinates in the four-dimensional region the branes barely move with respect to one another at all. This directly leads us to the same conclusion in four-dimensional units. Figure 4 shows the five-brane finally starting to move appreciably relative to the orbifold fixed points. This results in the brane impacting upon the upper fixed point as we saw was inevitable in Section III. The four-dimensional description is valid when all the extended objects are far above the horizon and before the five-brane has begun to move appreciably relative to the orbifold fixed points. In other words the four dimensional regime is roughly the part of the motion shown in figure 3.




FIG. 2. The position of our various extend objects is shown as a function of the proper time on each of them. The two solid curves are the orbifold fixed planes while the broken line is a 5-brane. The only physical part of the space is of course contained between the two solid curves. We have chosen $\alpha_1 = -20$, $\alpha_2 = 10$, $\alpha_3 = 10$ for the brane charges and $M_1 = 0.04$, $M_2 = 0.05$ for the bulk mass parameters. The two horizontal lines correspond to horizons in the maximally extended versions of each of the two pieces of bulk. The solution corresponds to a raised four-dimensional configuration when all the branes are far above these lines.




FIG. 3. The positions of the extended objects are shown for the same choices of constants as in figure 2 but over different time ranges. Clearly, the branes are at almost constant separation for very long periods of time in this portion of the solution. This is due to our choice of $[M]$ as small. Throughout this time, the 5-brane is roughly static with respect to the orbifold and we are well above the horizons of the extended bulk metrics. Hence an effective four-dimensional description is valid to good approximation here.




FIG. 4. The positions of the extended objects are shown for the same choices of constants as in figures 2-3 but again over a different time ranges. It can be seen that the 5-brane starts to move appreciably and eventually hits the uppermost fixed point. Once the 5-brane starts to move relative to the fixed points in this manner the four-dimensional description of the system breaks down.

APPENDIX B: CAUSAL STRUCTURE

The Penrose diagram detailing the causal structure of a maximally extended piece of the bulk spacetime we are employing is given in figure 5. The reader may be concerned that the horizon which is drawn with a double line is of the same form as the Reissner-Nordström Cauchy horizon and as such is unstable in the same sense. In fact we are not interested in a maximally extended piece of the bulk but in two segments of such solutions sandwiched between our various extended objects. This changes the causal structure in such a way as to remove the unstable horizon.

This point is best illustrated by looking at the case without a 5-brane which is illustrated in figure 6. Here the two new lines represent the world volumes of the orbifold fixed planes. In the solutions in this paper, the only physical space is that piece of the bulk which lies between these two curves - the rest is discarded. This of course has a profound effect on the causal structure of the spacetime. The horizon which passes through the two fixed points was only a horizon while we kept the whole spacetime. Specifically, when we orbifold the space between the two boundary branes, we discard portions of the singularities and hence the horizons cease to have physical meaning. In fact, from the point of view of the physical spacetime we are left with, the lines at 45° on figure 6 are no longer really horizons at all and so our fixed points do not pass through a potentially singular unstable horizon.

Another way of seeing that the ‘horizon’ is no longer unstable is that the ‘paths of infinite blue shift’ which cause the instability in the Reissner-Nordström case have been removed from the space time by the cutting procedure. Similar comments of course apply to cases where 5-branes are present. The global structure of the bulk solutions without 5-branes was first discussed in [20].




FIG. 5. *Penrose diagram of maximally extended bulk segment.*




FIG. 6. *Penrose diagram as in figure 5 with orbifold fixed point trajectories included.*

-
- [1] P. Hořava and E. Witten, “Heterotic and type I string dynamics from eleven dimensions,” Nucl. Phys. B **460**, (1996) 506 [arXiv:hep-th/9510209].
 - [2] P. Hořava and E. Witten, “Eleven-Dimensional Supergravity on a Manifold with Boundary,” Nucl. Phys. B **475**, (1996) 94 [arXiv:hep-th/9603142].
 - [3] A. Lukas, B. A. Ovrut and D. Waldram, “Non-standard embedding and five-branes in heterotic M-theory,” Phys. Rev. D **59** (1999) 106005 [arXiv:hep-th/9808101].
 - [4] J. P. Derendinger and R. Sauser, “A five-brane modulus in the effective $N = 1$ supergravity of M-theory,” Nucl. Phys. B **598** (2001) 87 [arXiv:hep-th/0009054].

- [5] M. Brändle and A. Lukas, “Five-branes in heterotic brane-world theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **65** (2002) 064024 [arXiv:hep-th/0109173].
- [6] E. J. Copeland, J. Gray and A. Lukas, “Moving five-branes in low-energy heterotic M-theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 126003 [arXiv:hep-th/0106285].
- [7] M. Mueller, “Rolling radii and a time dependent dilaton,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **337** (1990) 37.
- [8] J. Khoury, B. A. Ovrut, P. J. Steinhardt and N. Turok, “The ekpyrotic universe: Colliding branes and the origin of the hot big bang,” *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 123522 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0103239].
- [9] A. Lukas, B. A. Ovrut, K. S. Stelle and D. Waldram, “The universe as a domain wall,” *Phys. Rev. D* **59** (1999) 086001 [arXiv:hep-th/9803235].
- [10] A. Lukas, B. A. Ovrut, K. S. Stelle and D. Waldram, “Heterotic M-theory in five dimensions,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **552** (1999) 246 [arXiv:hep-th/9806051].
- [11] A. Lukas, B. A. Ovrut and D. Waldram, “Cosmological solutions of Hořava-Witten theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **60** (1999) 086001 [arXiv:hep-th/9806022].
- [12] H. A. Chamblin and H. S. Reall, “Dynamic dilatonic domain walls,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **562** (1999) 133 [arXiv:hep-th/9903225].
- [13] E. Lima, B. A. Ovrut, J. Park and R. Reinbacher, “Non-perturbative superpotential from membrane instantons in heterotic M-theory,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **614** (2001) 117 [arXiv:hep-th/0101049].
- [14] E. Lima, B. A. Ovrut and J. Park, “Five-brane superpotentials in heterotic M-theory,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **626** (2002) 113 [arXiv:hep-th/0102046].
- [15] E. I. Buchbinder, R. Donagi and B. A. Ovrut, “Superpotentials for vector bundle moduli,” [arXiv:hep-th/0205190].
- [16] E. I. Buchbinder, R. Donagi and B. A. Ovrut, “Vector bundle moduli superpotentials in heterotic superstrings and M-theory,” [arXiv:hep-th/0206203].
- [17] M. Brändle, A. Lukas and B. A. Ovrut, “Heterotic M-theory cosmology in four and five dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2001) 026003 [arXiv:hep-th/0003256].
- [18] D. Langlois and M. Rodriguez-Martinez, “Brane cosmology with a bulk scalar field,” *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 123507 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0106245].
- [19] C. Charmousis, “Dilaton spacetimes with a Liouville potential,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19** (2002) 83 [arXiv:hep-th/0107126].
- [20] A. Chamblin, M. J. Perry and H. S. Reall, “Non-BPS D8-branes and dynamic domain walls in massive IIA supergravities,” *JHEP* **9909** (1999) 014 [arXiv:hep-th/9908047].