Contents

Chapter 1

D6-branes on Calabi-Yau manifolds

TYPES OF STRING THEORIES

ROLE OF COMPACTIFICATION

TYPES OF COMPACTIFICATIONS (Green, Uranga)

We assume that the manifold is factorizable into a four-dimensional space and the compact space $\mathcal{M} = N \times K$.

TIIA or TIIB?

For what theories is the following reasoning exactly valid.

Reason for N=1, chirality or th other reasons. I think N=something for other reasons and N=1 for chirality.

Out of the possible ways to compactify a theory, we pick out the ones that preserve some degree of supersymmetry. There are several reasons for this choice

- Gauge hierarchy problem.
- As a way to solve the equations of motion.
- It gives a nice phenomenological description.

  A four dimensional theory with $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry allows for massless fermions that transform in a complex representation of the gauge group associated to the supersymmetry. Since $\mathcal{N} \geq 2$ in four dimensions all fermions must transform in a real representation of the gauge group, we shall only consider the case $\mathcal{N} = 1$.

Understand the reason for different possible representations.

Understand the meaning of SUSY parameter.

Every supersymmetry transformation is parametrized by an infinitesimal parameter $\eta_\alpha(X)$ which has an associated conserved supercharge Q at every space-time point.

Fill in the proof. We translate field equations into operator equations.

A conserved charge Q associated to an unbroken supersymmetry annihilates the vacuum $|\Omega\rangle$, so $Q\,|\Omega\rangle = 0$, since This in turn means that for any operator U, $\langle\Omega|\{Q,U\}|\Omega\rangle = 0$.

$$U' = U + \delta U = e^{-iQ\eta} U e^{iQ\eta} = (1 + iQ\eta)U(1 - iQ\eta) = \cdots \tag{1.1}$$

If U is a fermionic operator, we derive that the variation of the operator under the supersymmetry transformation is $\delta U = \{Q, U\}$. Taking this as the classical limit, $\delta U = \langle\Omega|\delta U|\Omega\rangle$. Thus, we conclude that at tree level $\delta U = 0$ for any fermionic field U.

What is really U?. Read about tree level.

Read some details on how to obtain this. Fill in the gaps. Check the implication direction.

The low energy spectrum of a ten-dimensional theory has as elementary fermions the gravitino ψ_M, the dilatino λ and the gluino ξ. Their variation is

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\psi_M &= \frac{1}{\kappa} D_M \eta + \frac{\kappa}{32 g^2 \phi}(\Gamma_M^{NPQ} - 9\delta_M^N \Gamma^{PQ})\eta H_{NPQ} + (\text{Fermi})^2 \\
\delta\xi^a &= -\frac{1}{4g\sqrt{\phi}}\Gamma^{MN} F^a_{MN}\eta + (\text{Fermi})^2 \\
\delta\lambda &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\phi}(\Gamma\partial\phi)\eta + \frac{\kappa}{8\sqrt{2}g^2\phi}\Gamma^{MNP}\eta H + (\text{Fermi})^2
\end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

Supersymmetry preservation means that all variations must be zero. For convenience, we set $H = 0$ and $\phi = \text{const.}$. This leads to the constraints

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\psi_M &= \frac{1}{\kappa} D_M \eta \\
\delta\xi^a &= -\frac{1}{4g\sqrt{\phi}}\Gamma^{MN} F^a_{MN}\eta
\end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

The first equation implies that there exists $[D_M, D_N]\eta = 0$ $R_{MNPQ}\Gamma^{PQ}\eta$. If we particularize to T, which is a maximally symmetric space, the second equation imposes that T is Minkowski space, which is not surprising. Cosmological constant blah, blah, blah. We can now use the first equation to conclude that η does not depend on the uncompactified coordinates, $\partial_T \eta = 0$.

`https://groups.google.com/forum/#!topic/sci.physics.research/rrBoIXk9Rw0`

We proceed to examine what the existence of a covariantly constant spinor field imposes on the compact space.

Let us consider a Riemannian manifold K of dimension n with a spin connection ω, which is in general a $SO(n)$ gauge field. If we parallel transport a field ψ around a contractible closed curve γ, the field becomes $U\psi$ where $U = \mathcal{P}e^{\int_\gamma dx\omega}$, where $\mathcal{P}$ is the path-ordered product.

The set of the transformation matrices associated to all possible loops form the holonomy group of the manifold, which must be a subgroup of $SO(n)$.

Fill in Group Theory discussion

We now consider how the $SU(3)$ holonomy translates into the manifold.

Fill in Group Theory discussion

The only $U(3)$ invariants in the **6** representation of $SO(6)$ are the identity and $\bar{I}$.

Check the different spaces we consider.

We can also form a tensor field on K of the type $J^i_j(y) = g^{ik}(y)\bar{\eta}\Lambda_{kj}\eta(y)$. For each point y, we can consider J^i_j as a matrix that acts on the tangent space, so $v^i \to J^i_j v^j$. In this sense, J^i_j is a real, traceless and $SU(3)$ invariant matrix, which means that it must be proportional to $\bar{I}$. We had already seen that $\bar{I} = -I$, this an example of an almost-complex structure, which is a tensor field J that satisfies $J^2 = -I$.

If we employ complex coordinates, we can diagonalize J so that the non-zero components are $J^a_b = i\delta^a_b$ and $J^{\bar{a}}_{\bar{b}} = -i\delta^{\bar{a}}_{\bar{b}}$. This particular choice is know as the canonical form.

Complex structure stuff

Nijenhuis tensor

$$N_{ij}^{k} = J_i^l(\partial_l J_j^k - \partial_j J_l^k) - J_j^l(\partial_l J_i^k - \partial_i J_l^k) \tag{1.4}$$

$N = 0$

Coordinate definition of complex manifold

INTRODUCE NON-ABELIAN GAUGE BOSONS