Darker and brighter branes, suppression and enhancement of photon production in a strongly coupled magnetized plasma
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We extend our holographic analysis of the emission of photons by a strongly coupled plasma subject to a very intense external magnetic field. We previously showed that in our model, any photon produced by the plasma has to be in its only polarization state parallel to the reaction plane. In this paper we present the results and details of the numerical calculation for the differential rate of emitted photons. One of our main results is that the production of photons is increased by the introduction of non-vanishing magnetic field with an intensity up to a value $B_0$, above which the effect is reversed and said production becomes lower than the $B = 0$ case. The characteristic intensity $B_0$ depends on the propagation direction and tends to zero as the photon momentum becomes aligned with the magnetic field. Additionally, we also show that the magnetic field has the effect of increasing the value of the elliptic flow, providing a possible explanation for the excess measured in collision experiments. The holographic model is constructed by means of a five-dimensional truncation of 10-dimensional type IIB supergravity and includes a scalar field in addition to the constant magnetic field.

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the most important probes to obtain information about the quark-gluon plasma (QGP) are the thermal photons emitted by it. Due to the weakness of the electromagnetic coupling and the small extension in space of the QGP, the emitted photons exit the plasma practically unscattered, hence providing an excellent source of information about the emission point. It has been suggested that the QGP has global quark spin polarization in non-central heavy-ion collisions and it was shown later that this in turn leads to the polarization of the emitted photons, either direct or virtual. Moreover, it has become increasingly accepted that an intense magnetic field pointing perpendicularly to the reaction plane is produced in high energy collisions and that understanding its effects is relevant to properly analyze experimental observations. The intensity of said magnetic field is estimated to be in the range of $3m_{\pi}^2 \leq eB \leq 15m_{\pi}^2$, with $m_{\pi}$ the mass of the neutral pion. It was suggested in that the existence of strong (electro)magnetic fields in heavy ion collisions could account for the unexpected observations regarding the total emission of photons in general and the elliptic anisotropy of those with low transverse momentum $p_T$, both underestimated by the methods of pQCD. Additionally, it was proposed in that this magnetic field could lead to the quark spin polarization, and in turn induce a polarization on the emitted photons.

Given that the QGP produced at high energy p-p or heavy-ion collisions exists in a strongly coupled state, the gauge/gravity correspondence has been extensively used to explore some of its dynamical properties. It should be noted however, that the theory that can be studied with holographic methods is not properly quantum chromodynamics (QCD), as the exact gravity dual to this theory has not been found yet. What has been done instead is to consider theories similar to QCD, such as $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Super Yang-Mills (SYM) at finite temperature with gauge group $SU(N_c)$, and either modify them to bring them as close to QCD as possible, or use them to compute quantities that are not sensitive to the details of the theory. An important example of the later is the famous shear viscosity to entropy ratio, which can be computed in the strongly coupled plasma of the SYM $\mathcal{N} = 4$ theory using holographic methods, and extrapolated to the QGP produced in high energy heavy-ion collisions. On the other hand, the modifications to SYM $\mathcal{N} = 4$ have been extended to include spatial anisotropies and, in particular, the presence of a very intense external magnetic field.

The photon production of strongly coupled plasmas has been analyzed using many of the previously mentioned holographic models. While the first holographic study only considered SYM $\mathcal{N} = 4$ at finite temperature, many developments have been considered to improve the modelling of the experimental context. In $N_f$ flavor degrees of freedom were added to the theory in the probe limit, while the Veneziano limit was latter considered. Other modifications such as non-vanishing chemical potential and spatial anisotropies have also been considered.

Of particular interest to this work is the inclusion of an external magnetic field. The photon production in this context was studied in using the holo-
graphic model developed in [28], finding that in general the magnetic field enhances it. The five-dimensional theory presented there, that considers the full backreaction of the magnetic field, is dual to the desired gauge theory because it is a solution to a consistent truncation of supergravity (SUGRA) IIB [44]. Given that the magnetic field is introduced by factorizing a $U(1)$ from the $SO(6)$ symmetry of the compact space and changing it to a gauge symmetry, from the gauge theory perspective the magnetic field in this case couples to the conserved current associated with a $U(1)$ subgroup of the $SU(4)$ $R-$symmetry.

The effect of the magnetic field on the polarization of the emitted photon was studied in [20] by means of the Sakai-Sugimoto holographic model [45], where said magnetic field was introduced on the world volume of the $D8$/$\bar{D}8$-branes. However, the reported polarization was mild, given that the backreaction on the embedding of the branes resulting from the combined effect of the magnetic field and the electromagnetic perturbations was not taken into account.

Another important observable in the study of the emitted photons is the elliptic flow $v_2$, which characterizes the momentum anisotropy of the particles produced in heavy-ion collisions. Previous measurements of the elliptic flow at the RHIC and LHC collaborations revealed a surprisingly large value of $v_2$ for $p_T < 4$ GeV/c [3, 5, 46], and the presence of an intense magnetic field presents itself as a possible explanation for such a large elliptic anisotropy at low $p_T$ momenta. An holographic model for this was given in [20] using the Sakai-Sugimoto model, showing that indeed the magnetic field has a strong influence over the elliptic flow. Another model was given in [17], using a $D3$/$D7$ system and including the magnetic field as an excitation over the probe $D7$-branes. Their results are qualitatively consistent with experimental observations, with the authors stating that this should be regarded as an upper bound for the real QGP.

An alternative holographic setup to model the magnetized QGP was introduced in [29] as a different 5-dimensional consistent truncation to SUGRA IIB. The constructed family of solutions features the full backreaction of a constant magnetic field and a scalar field dual to an operator of scaling dimension 2. Given that these solutions are part of the same general truncation ansatz studied in [44], from the gauge theory perspective the magnetic field couples to the $R-$current. A critical intensity for the magnetic field $B_c$, above which the system becomes unstable, is induced by the presence of the scalar field. For intensities below $B_c$, two branches of solutions exist, with one of them being thermodynamically preferred over the other.

The original motivation for this new model was to find a feasible way of easily adding fundamental degrees of freedom in the probe limit. This latter objective was achieved in [30, 31], where it was shown that the interplay between the magnetic and scalar fields leads to a very interesting thermodynamic behavior for the fundamental matter. However, even without considering flavor degrees of freedom the magnetized plasma features rich physics. For instance, it was recently shown in [20] that the photons emitted by the plasma in the adjoint representation are linearly polarized in its state parallel to the reaction plane, the so-called in-plane polarization state, for any non-vanishing magnetic field intensity.

The main objective of this manuscript is to provide additional details of the calculations and extend the analysis in [20]. In particular, we present a numerical analysis of the emission rate of photons in the in-plane polarization state. This includes the total energy produced as a function of the magnetic field $B$ and the temperature of the plasma $T$, and the elliptic flow $v_2$ as a function of the frequency of the emitted photons $\omega$ and the magnetic field $B$. Regarding the latter, we found that the magnetic field indeed increases $v_2$, while for the former we found a very interesting behavior: for any given direction of propagation, the production of photons is increased with respect to the $B = 0$ value if the magnetic field intensity lies in the interval $0 < B < B_\theta$, while it decreases for any $B > B_\theta$. The magnetic field intensity $B_\theta$ depends on the propagation direction, in a manner such that it tends to zero as the photon momentum is aligned with the magnetic field.

The manuscript is organized as follows. In the Sec. II we review the framework to study the emission of photons from the gauge theory perspective. Section III is devoted to the family of gravitational solutions that we use for the holographic description. In Sec. IV we present the details of the computations necessary to study the emitted photons via holography. In Sec. IV A we focus on the out-plane polarization states, while in Sec. IV B we deal with the in-plane ones. We close with a discussion of our results in Sec. V. Details about the equations of motion are included in Appendices A and B.

II. PHOTON PRODUCTION IN A STRONGLY COUPLED MAGNETIZED PLASMA

The gauge theory we consider is 4-dimensional SYM $\mathcal{N} = 4$ over Minkowski spacetime, with gauge group $SU(N_c)$ at large $N_c$ and ’tHooft coupling $\lambda = g_{YM}^2 N_c$. All the matter fields of this theory are in the adjoint representation of the gauge group. The produced photons are modeled by adding a $U(1)$ kinetic term to the SYM action that couples to the electromagnetic current associated to a $U(1)$ subgroup of the global $SU(4)$ $R$-symmetry group of the theory. Hence, the action adopts the form of a $SU(N_c) \times U(1)$ gauge theory

$$S = S_{SYM} - \frac{1}{4} \int d^4 x \left( \mathcal{F}^2 - 4 e A^\mu J^{EM}_{\mu} \right),$$

where $\mathcal{F} = dA$ is the electromagnetic field, and the electromagnetic current is given by

$$J^{EM}_{\mu} = \bar{\Psi} \gamma_\mu \Psi + \frac{i}{2} \Phi^* (D_\mu \Phi) - \frac{i}{2} (D_\mu \Phi^*)^* \Phi.$$


In the previous expression $\Psi$ and $\Phi$ represent the fermionic and scalar fields of SYM $N = 4$, respectively. In this same expression there is an implicit sum over the color indexes, and the derivative operator $D_{\mu} = D_{\mu} - ieA_{\mu}$ is the covariant derivative of the full $SU(N_c) \times U(1)$ group.

Given that the electromagnetic coupling $\alpha_{EM} = e^2/4\pi$ is small compared to t'Hooft coupling $\lambda = g_{YM}^2 N_c$ (at large $N_c$), even if the two-point correlation function necessary to compute photon production has to be calculated non-perturbatively in the $SU(N_c)$ theory that involves $\lambda$, it is enough to determine it to leading order in $\alpha_{EM}$ and ignore terms of order $O(\alpha_{EM}^2)$. It is because of this that we can work exclusively in the gravitational dual of the $SU(N_c)$ gauge theory.

If the plasma is in thermal equilibrium at temperature $T$, the rate of emitted photons with wave null 4-vector $k^\mu = (k^0, \vec{k})$ and polarization 4-vector $\epsilon^\mu_{\alpha}(\vec{k})$ is

$$\frac{d\Gamma_s}{dk} = \frac{e^2}{(2\pi)^3 2|k|} n_B(k^0) \epsilon^\mu_{\alpha}(\vec{k}) \epsilon_{\alpha\mu}(k) \bigg|_{k=0},$$

where

$$n_B(k^0) = \frac{1}{e^{k^0/T} - 1},$$

is the Bose-Einstein distribution. The spectral density $\chi_{\mu\nu}(k) = -2\text{Im}[G_{\mu\nu}^R(k)]$ is given in terms of the retarded two-point correlator of the electromagnetic current $\langle \mathcal{J}_{\mu}(x)\mathcal{J}_{\nu}(0) \rangle$, where the expectation value is taken in the state at temperature $T$.

The spatial polarization four-vectors $\epsilon^\mu_{\alpha}$ are orthogonal to the null wave four-vector with respect to the Minkowski metric, $\epsilon^\mu_{\alpha}k^\nu\delta_{ij} = 0$ and without loss of generality they can also be chosen to satisfy $\epsilon^1\epsilon^2\delta_{ij} = 0$. We will fix our coordinate system such that the background magnetic field is directed along the $z$-direction. This choice leaves us with a rotational symmetry on the reaction plane $(xy$-plane), allowing us to conveniently set the wave four-vector to lie in the $xz$-plane. Denoting the angle that $\vec{k}$ forms with the background magnetic field by $\vartheta$, the wave and polarization four-vectors take the form

$$k^\mu = k^0(1, \sin \vartheta, 0, \cos \vartheta),$$
$$\epsilon^\mu_{\alpha}(\vec{k}) = (0, \cos \vartheta, 0, -\sin \vartheta),$$
$$\epsilon^\mu_{\alpha}(\vec{k}) = (0, 0, 1, 0),$$

where the notation makes reference to the in-plane and out-plane polarization states. Hence the rate of emitted photons can be decomposed as

$$\frac{d\Gamma_{\text{out}}}{dk} = \frac{e^2}{(2\pi)^3 2|k|} n_B(k^0) \chi_{\mu\nu}(k) \bigg|_{k=0},$$

for the polarization state $\epsilon_{\text{out}}$, while for the $\epsilon_{\text{in}}$ state we have

$$\frac{d\Gamma_{\text{in}}}{dk} = \frac{e^2}{(2\pi)^3 2|k|} n_B(k^0) \chi_{\mu\nu}.$$

We present a diagram with the described kinematics in FIG. 1.

![FIG. 1. Spatial components of the photon momentum $\vec{k}$ and the polarization vectors: $\epsilon_{\text{out}}$ out-plane and $\epsilon_{\text{in}}$ in-plane. The magnetic field $\vec{B}$ points perpendicular to the reaction plane, which is depicted as a disk in the $xy$-plane. Given the rotational symmetry around the $z$-direction, without loss of generality we can choose the momentum of the photon parallel to the $xz$-plane. As previously shown in [23] any photon produced within the plasma has to be in its only polarization state parallel to the reaction plane.](image)

The elliptic flow $v_2$ gives a measure of the degree of the momentum anisotropy of the particles generated in the collision. It is given by the the second harmonic coefficient of the Fourier expansion in the azimuthal photon distribution [46, 49], which for central rapidity and fixed polarization state $\epsilon_{\alpha}$ can be computed as

$$v_2 = -\frac{\int_0^{\pi/2} d\vartheta \cos(2\vartheta) \frac{d\varphi}{dk}}{\int_0^{\pi/2} d\vartheta \frac{d\varphi}{dk}}.$$

III. THE GRAVITATIONAL BACKGROUND

The holographic model that we consider is a family of solutions to five-dimensional gauged supergravity with its bosonic part of the action given by [29]

$$S = \frac{1}{16\pi G_5} \int d^5x \sqrt{-g} \left[ R - \frac{1}{2} (\partial \varphi)^2 + \frac{4}{L^2} \left( e^{2\varphi} + e^{-3\varphi} \right) + e^{-\varphi} (F)^2 \right],$$

(10)
where the field content consists of the scalar $\varphi$, the Faraday tensor $F$, and the components of the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. $G_5$ is the five-dimensional Newton constant and $L$ is the $AdS_5$ radius, which in what follows is set equal to one, $L = 1$, and therefore $G_5 = \frac{\pi}{2 L^2}$. This theory is a consistent truncation of ten-dimensional SUGRA IIB [44] as long as the constraint

$$ F \wedge F = 0, $$

is imposed at the level of the equations of motion.

We consider the following ansatz for the family of solutions

$$ ds_5^2 = \frac{dr^2}{U(r)} - U(r) dt^2 + V(r)(dx^2 + dy^2) + W(r)dz^2, $$

$$ F = B \, dx \wedge dy, $$

$$ \varphi = \varphi(r). $$

where $r$ is the $AdS_5$ radial coordinate, in terms of which the boundary is located at $r \to \infty$. All these backgrounds feature a black hole, with a horizon located at $r = r_h$ where the metric function $U(r)$ vanishes. Hence the temperature of each solution is given by

$$ T = \frac{3r_h}{2\pi}. $$

The magnetic field intensity $B$ coincides with the one in the dual gauge theory given that the metric in (12) asymptotes 5-dimensional anti-de Sitter spacetime at the boundary. From the ten-dimensional perspective the Maxwell field is interpreted as an infinitesimal rotation in the compact part of the geometry (see [31, 44] for additional details). Given that the equations of motion coming from (10) are highly non-linear, the family of solutions given by (12) must be obtained numerically for any non-vanishing intensity of the magnetic field. The general integration procedure is described in detail in [29]. It is important to mention that the equations of motion deduced from (10) require a non-constant scalar field $\varphi(r)$ for any non-vanishing magnetic field. This means that the gravitational model found in [28] cannot be recovered from ours for $B$ other than zero. For $B = 0$, $\varphi = 0$ and any $T$ the geometries reduce to the non-compact part of the black D3-brane metric.

The near boundary behavior of the scalar field is

$$ \varphi \to \frac{1}{r^2} \left( \varphi_0 + \psi_0 \log r \right), $$

where the coefficients $\varphi_0$ and $\psi_0$ can be read from the asymptotics of any specific numerical solution. This behavior implies that $\varphi$ saturates the BF bound [50, 51]. Hence the scalar field $\varphi$ is dual to a scalar operator $\mathcal{O}_\varphi$ of scaling dimension $\Delta = 2$. According to the holographic dictionary, $\psi_0$ is dual to the source of the operator and $\varphi_0$ to its vacuum expectation value $\langle \mathcal{O}_\varphi \rangle$ [51]. From the gauge theory perspective, it makes sense to specify the source of the operator and then compute the vacuum expectation value that it generates in response to such source.

It was shown in [29] that for any given $\psi_0$ there exists a critical magnetic field intensity $B_c$ that the plasma can tolerate, as it becomes unstable for higher values. From the dual gravitational perspective, beyond this critical value $B_c$, the geometries develop a naked singularity. Below $B_c$ there are two branches of solutions for any fixed $B/T^2$ that differ in the value of $\langle \mathcal{O}_\varphi \rangle/T^2$. In [29] it was also shown that one of these branches is thermodynamically preferred over the other. The one with the higher value for $\langle \mathcal{O}_\varphi \rangle/T^2$ corresponds to a state with negative specific heat, higher free energy and lower entropy than the other, showing that the solutions with smaller $\langle \mathcal{O}_\varphi \rangle/T^2$ are thermodynamically preferred. Throughout this manuscript we will fix the scalar source to $\psi_0 = 0$ and work exclusively on the thermodynamically favored branch. For this value of the scalar source the maximum magnetic field intensity is given by $B_c/T^2 \approx 11.24$.

### IV. HOLOGRAPHIC PHOTON PRODUCTION

According to the holographic dictionary, the correlation function [5] can be determined by a perturbative calculation on the gravitational dual [52, 53]. To this end we write

$$ g_{mn} = g_{BG_{mn}} + h_{mn}, $$

$$ F = F_{BG} + dA, $$

$$ \varphi = \varphi_{BG} + \phi, $$

where the superscript $BG$ labels the background fields as given by (12) while $h_{mn}$, $A$, and $\phi$ are their first-order perturbations, for which we will solve the field equations at the corresponding order.

The perturbation to the Maxwell field $A$ evaluated at the boundary, which we will denote as $A^{bdry}$, is dual to the source term of the gauge field $A$ in the dual theory [1]. In other words, $A^{bdry}$ is dual to the electromagnetic current $\mathcal{J}^{EM}$ on the gauge theory side as long as we work in the $A_r = 0$ gauge. Moreover, given that the boundary is perpendicular to $r$, we will also impose the gauge $h_{nr} = 0$ for the metric perturbations. The previous gauge choices are consistent with the fact that these components are not dual to a source on the gauge theory.

The procedure to compute the production of photons is as follows: The equations of motion from (10) along with the constraint (11) are numerically solved at first order in the perturbations $h_{mn}$, $A$, and $\phi$ in (15). Since we are interested in the retarded correlator, we consider only the corresponding ingoing and regular solutions obtained by the Frobenius method applied near to the horizon, discarding the outgoing modes. Next, in order to obtain the correlator [5] it is necessary to evaluate the action (10) on the perturbed solutions and take the second variation with respect to $A^{bdry}$. Since all the perturbations are coupled by the equations of motion, we apply the method...
to compute correlators for mixing operators developed in [50, 57].

First, the near boundary behavior of the equations reveal that the asymptotic solutions for the scalar field and metric perturbations are

$$h_{mn}(r) = r^2 \tilde{h}_{mn}(r),$$

$$\phi(r) = \frac{1}{r^2} \log(r) \tilde{\phi}(r)$$

(16)

where $\tilde{h}_{mn}(r)$ and $\tilde{\phi}(r)$ tend to constant values as $r \to \infty$. In order to follow the procedure outlined in [42, 56, 57] we must solve for the normalized fields $\tilde{h}_{mn}(r)$ and $\tilde{\phi}(r)$. To keep a clean notation, we will refer to these normalized fields as $h_{mn}(r)$ and $\phi(r)$ hoping that no confusion will arise.

We then look for all the linearly independent non-outgoing solutions such that their behavior near the boundary is

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{A(1)}{\Phi(1)} = \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \end{array} \right), \quad \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{A(2)}{\Phi(2)} = \left( \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 1 \end{array} \right),$$

(17)

where $A$ denotes any of the components of the gauge field perturbation and $\Phi$ denotes any of the fields coupled to $A$. Given that we are solving the equations for the perturbations at linear order, the most general solution can be written as a linear combination of (17)

$$\left( \begin{array}{c} A \\ \Phi \end{array} \right) = A^{bdry} \left( \begin{array}{c} A^{(1)} \\ \Phi^{(1)} \end{array} \right) + \Phi^{bdry} \left( \begin{array}{c} A^{(2)} \\ \Phi^{(2)} \end{array} \right).$$

(18)

Note that in this way the $A^{bdry}$ dependence has been made explicit, making it simple to take variations with respect to this quantity. We can see from (18) that the values the fields take at the boundary are independent of each other

$$\frac{\delta A|_{bdry}}{\delta A^{bdry}} = 1, \quad \frac{\delta \Phi|_{bdry}}{\delta A^{bdry}} = 0,$$

(19)

while this is not the case for the derivatives

$$\frac{\delta A'(1)|_{bdry}}{\delta A^{bdry}} = A'(1)|_{bdry}, \quad \frac{\delta \Phi'(1)|_{bdry}}{\delta A^{bdry}} = \Phi'(1)|_{bdry},$$

(20)

where a prime denotes the derivative with respect to $r$. We will use this generic fact to compute the retarded green function from the action (10). In Sec. IV B we will show how to explicitly construct the solutions in (17).

After evaluating (10) in the perturbed solutions, we look for the second derivative terms and integrate them by parts to obtain a boundary term, keeping the calculations at second order in the perturbations. Schematically we have

$$S^{bdry} \propto \int d^4x \left( O(AA') + O(\phi \phi') + O(h^2) + O(hh') \right),$$

(21)

where the limit $r \to \infty$ is implicit and the zero, first and greater than second order terms have not been written, as they are not relevant to our computation. From the previous discussion we see that the $O(\phi \phi'), O(h^2)$ and $O(hh')$ terms do not contribute to the Green function, as they vanish when taking the second variation with respect to $A^{bdry}$, thus the only relevant part of the boundary action is

$$S^{bdry} = -\frac{1}{8\pi G_5} \int d^4x UVX^{-2} \sqrt{W} \left( -\frac{A_t A_t'}{U} + \frac{A_x A_z'}{V} + \frac{A_y A_y'}{V} + \frac{A_z A_z'}{W} \right).$$

(22)

The only other terms that could have contributed are of the form $O(h'h')$, $O(\phi' \phi')$, $O(\phi'h')$, $O(Ah')$, $O(A\phi')$, $O(A'h')$ and $O(A'\phi')$, but none of them appear in the action.

We need to solve the the field equations simultaneously with the constraint (11) to first order in the perturbations and find the non-outgoing solutions (17). To this end, we note that even if the dual gauge theory is anisotropic because of the presence of the magnetic field, it is still invariant under translations, hence we can take the Fourier decomposition of all the fields

$$\Phi(r, x^\mu) = \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^4} \Phi(r, k^\mu),$$

(23)

$$k^\mu = \delta^\mu(1, \sin \vartheta, 0, \cos \vartheta),$$

where $\Phi$ denotes any of the fields $h_{mn}, A_m$ or $\phi$. This results in 24 ordinary differential equations that decouple in two independent groups, corresponding to the independent polarization states.

### A. Out-plane polarization state

In order to compute the production of photons in the out-plane polarization state $\epsilon_{out}$, we need to solve eleven equations for the fields $A_t, A_x, A_z, h_{y\vartheta}, h_{\vartheta y}$ and $h_{yz}$. Given that the number of equations surpasses the number of fields, it would seem that the system is over determined. However, it can be solved consistently analytically. We previously studied this group of equations in [48], showing that the emitted photons are linearly polarized, as no photons are in the polarization state $\epsilon_{out}$. Here we will revisit that argument and present the technical details that were omitted in [48] in the Appendix A.

The first three equations come from the constraint (11) to first order in the perturbations

$$A_z = A_t \cos \vartheta = 0, \quad A'_x = 0, \quad A'_t = 0,$$

(24)

while the $r$-component of the Maxwell equations reads

$$UW A'_z \sin \vartheta + V(W A'_y + U A'_z \cos \vartheta) = 0.$$
From (24) and (25) we conclude that for \( \vartheta \neq 0 \)

\[
A_x(r) = A_x^{bdry}, \\
A_y(r) = A_y^{bdry}, \\
A_z(r) = A_z^{bdry} \cos \vartheta,
\]

hence these three components of the Maxwell field \( A \) are independent of the radial coordinate. Notice that this does not apply for \( \vartheta = 0 \), when the photons are propagating along the direction of the magnetic field, since equation (25) is automatically satisfied. We present the treatment of the seven remaining equations of the system in the Appendix [A].

Given that the derivatives of (26) vanish, the only relevant term in the action (22) is

\[
S^{bdry} = -\frac{1}{8\pi G_5} \int d^4 x U \sqrt{W} X^{-2} A_y A_y'.
\]

Since the elements \( A_i \) are the coefficients of the Fourier mode with wave vector \( k^\mu \) in the transformation of the respective Maxwell field, and the scaling explained above has already been performed, the usual Minkowski prescription reduces to computing

\[
G_{ij}^R = \frac{\delta^2 S^{bdry}}{\delta A_i^{bdry} \delta A_j^{bdry}}.
\]

We see now that when substituted in (28), the lack of other terms in (27) leads to

\[
G_{xx}^R = G_{zz}^R = 0,
\]

so the spectral densities \( \chi_{zz}, \chi_{xx} \) and \( \chi_{xx} \) also vanish. From (7) it can therefore be seen that

\[
\frac{dT_{out}}{dr} = 0,
\]

so the plasma does not emit photons in the polarization state \( \epsilon_{out} \) for a propagation direction such that \( \vartheta \neq 0 \). When the photons propagate along the direction of the magnetic field \( \vartheta = 0 \), no restriction is imposed on \( A_x \) whatsoever. In fact, as in this particular case the rotational symmetry in the \( xy \)-plane remains, then we have \( \chi_{xx} = \chi_{yy} \) and hence both polarization states are in-plane states. Our result can be phrased in terms of the kinematics of a collision experiment by saying that any photon emitted by the plasma is in its polarization state parallel to the reaction plane. This is a direct consequence of the constraint \( F \wedge F = 0 \), which must be imposed so the 5-dimensional solutions can be uplifted to the corresponding 10-dimensional SUGRA IIB solutions.

\[\text{B. In-plane polarization state}\]

In order to compute the production of photons in the polarization state \( \epsilon_{in} \), we need to solve thirteen differential equations for nine components of the fields: \( A_y, \phi, h_{tx}, h_{tz}, h_{zz}, h_{tt}, h_{xy}, h_{yy} \). Even when the number of equations surpasses the number of variables, the system can be solved consistently. Of the thirteen equations, four are constraints that once imposed at a given \( r \), they will be satisfied at any other radial position. This leaves nine second order differential equations, thus once the constraints have been taken into account, we have fourteen linearly independent solutions to the system. We present the equations explicitly in the Appendix [B].

The system does not have an analytical solution for any non-vanishing magnetic field, and as a consequence we need to resort to numerical methods to obtain a solution. The first step is to solve the equations near the horizon, using a Frobenius expansion around \( r_h \) of the form

\[
\Phi(r) = (r - r_h)^\alpha \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Phi_j (r - r_h)^j,
\]

where \( \Phi \) denotes any of the components of the fields. This procedure gives three independent solutions for \( \alpha = 0 \), five ingoing solutions with \( \alpha = -ik_0/6r_h \), five outgoing solutions with \( \alpha = ik_0/6r_h \) and one with \( \alpha = 1/2 \). As a consequence, the space of non-outgoing solutions is 9-dimensional. In what follows we will denote an arbitrary element of this space as

\[
\text{Sol} = \begin{pmatrix} A_y \\ \phi \\ h_{tx} \\ h_{tz} \\ h_{zz} \\ h_{tt} \\ h_{xy} \\ h_{yy} \\ h_{zz} \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Next we look for the nine linearly independent non-outgoing solutions (17) such that its near boundary behavior is

\[
\lim_{r \to \infty} \text{Sol}^{(1)} = 0, \cdots, \lim_{r \to \infty} \text{Sol}^{(9)} = 0,
\]

hence an arbitrary non-outgoing solution can be written as

\[
\text{Sol} = A_y^{bdry} \text{Sol}^{(1)} + \phi^{bdry} \text{Sol}^{(2)} + \cdots + h_{zz}^{bdry} \text{Sol}^{(9)}.
\]

From this expression we can compute the variation with respect to \( A_y^{bdry} \), which gives

\[
\frac{\delta \text{Sol}}{\delta A_y^{bdry}} = \text{Sol}^{(1)}|_{bdry}, \quad \frac{\delta \text{Sol}}{\delta A_y^{bdry}} = \text{Sol}^{(1)}|_{bdry}.
\]
We can substitute $C^{(4)}$ on the action (27) and take its second variation with respect to $A^{bdry}$ using (35). The final result is that the correlator function is

$$G_{yy}^R = -\frac{1}{4\pi G_5} \left( U X^{-2} \sqrt{W} A_{y}^{(1)} \right) \bigg|_{bdry}. \quad (36)$$

It is clear then that we need to compute the solution $\text{Sol}^{(1)}$ explicitly. In order to do this we look for nine non-outgoing solutions with an arbitrary behavior near the boundary, and use them as columns of the matrix

$$\mathcal{M} = (\text{Sol}^{(1)} \text{Sol}^{(2)} \ldots \text{Sol}^{(9)}). \quad (37)$$

We can use this matrix to invert (34) and obtain

$$(\text{Sol}^{(1)} \text{Sol}^{(2)} \ldots \text{Sol}^{(9)}) = \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{M}^{-1})_{bdry}, \quad (38)$$

from where $\text{Sol}^{(1)}$ can be read immediately.

The arbitrary solutions that constitute the matrix (37) can be constructed by numerically solving the equations of motion. In practice this procedure consists in solving around the horizon using the expansions (31), choosing the values for $\alpha$ that exclude the outgoing solutions. The result of this is used as the initial conditions for the numerical integration from $r = r_h + \epsilon$, with $\epsilon \ll r_h$, to the boundary at $r \to \infty$.

With this procedure it is possible to compute the spectral density $\chi_{yy} = -2\text{Im}[G_{yy}^R]$ as a function of the dimensionless frequency

$$\omega = \frac{k_0}{2\pi T}, \quad (39)$$

displays the opposite behavior. In other words, for high values of the frequency, $\chi_{yy}$ decreases as the direction of propagation is aligned with the magnetic field, while for small $\omega$ the spectral function decreases as the direction of propagation aligns with the reaction plane. Although we only show here the results for this specific magnetic field intensity, we verified that the same qualitative behavior is shared for any $B/T^2 \neq 0$.

In Figure 3 we show the results for $\vartheta = \pi/4$ and several values of the magnetic field, each one represented by a different colored curve. We see that for small frequencies, $\chi_{yy}$ decreases as the magnetic field intensity increases, while for high frequencies this behavior is reversed. Rephrasing the result, for small frequencies the spectral function displays inverse magnetic catalysis (IMC), whereas for high frequencies we observe magnetic catalysis (MC). We present here the results only for $\vartheta = \pi/4$. However, we verified that the same qualitative behavior is reproduced for any $\vartheta$.

C. Total photon production

In the previous sections we have computed all the relevant components of the spectral function, and can now proceed to calculate the total differential emission of photons. As there is no production of photons with an out-of-plane polarization, the contribution to the total differential production comes only from photons in the in-plane polarization states, and therefore

$$\frac{dT}{dk} = \frac{d\Gamma_{in}}{dk}, \quad (40)$$

where we can substitute the spectral function in (3) to obtain the total differential photon production. Given that we have rotational invariance on the reaction plane,
we can integrate over this direction to obtain

$$\frac{G_5}{2\alpha_{EM} T^3} \frac{d\Gamma}{dk_\theta d \cos \vartheta} = \frac{G_5 \omega}{2T^2} n_B(k_\theta) \chi_{yy}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (41)

We show the results for this quantity as a function of the photon frequency and different values for the magnetic field intensity and propagation directions.

In Figure 4, we show the differential photon production as a function of $\omega$ for fixed magnetic field at $B/T^2 = 11.24$. The different curves correspond to different values of the propagation angle $\vartheta$. We can see how for small frequencies $0 < \omega < 0.3$, the photon production is increased as the propagation direction is aligned with the magnetic field. However, for higher frequencies this behavior is reversed, as the production of photons is increased as the direction of propagation aligns with the reaction plane, reaching its maximum precisely when $\vartheta = \pi/2$. Even if we only show here the results for $B/T^2 = 11.24$, we verified that the same qualitative behavior is shared by any other non-zero magnetic field.

Next, in Figure 5, we show the results for $\frac{G_5}{2\alpha_{EM} T^3} \frac{d\Gamma}{dk_\theta d \cos \vartheta}$ at fixed $\vartheta = \pi/2$ and different magnetic field intensities. In can be seen how increasing the magnetic field decreases the production of photons for small frequencies, that is, we have IMC. However, for high frequencies the opposite behavior is displayed and the photon production is increased with the magnetic field, hence the phenomenon of MC.

So far we have examined the different quantities as a function of the photon frequency. Nonetheless, it is possible to integrate $\omega$ in (41) to obtain the total photon production at a given direction and fixed magnetic field. In FIG. 6, we show this as a function of the propagation angle $\vartheta$ for different magnetic field intensities. For instance, for the values $B/T^2 = \{4.22, 8.73, 11.24\}$ we have the same qualitative behavior, that is, the production of photons increases as the momentum is aligned with the reaction plane. Also, for this magnetic field intensities the production is always less when compared to the $B = 0$ case for any $\vartheta$. However, for $B/T^2 = 2.01$ this last behavior changes. While it is still true that the production increases as $\vartheta \rightarrow \pi/2$, for $\vartheta > \pi/4$ more photons are produced when compared to the $B = 0$ case.

The previously described phenomenon can be better appreciated in FIG. 7 where we show the total photon production as a function of the magnetic field for different directions of propagation. It can be seen that for any fixed $\vartheta$, there exists a magnetic field intensity $B_\theta$ such as if $B > B_\theta$ less photons are produced when compared to the $B = 0$ case. However, if $0 < B < B_\theta$ the magnetic field enhances the production of photons. Up to our numerical precision, we were able to corroborate that $B_\theta \rightarrow 0$ as $\vartheta \rightarrow 0$, that is, as the photon momentum is aligned with the magnetic field. The detail of this is
FIG. 7. Differential photon production $\frac{d\Gamma}{4\pi\alpha EM T^2} \frac{d\theta}{d\cos \vartheta}$ as a function of $B/T^2$. The blue, orange, green and red curves (from bottom to top on the right side of the graph) correspond to $\vartheta = \{\pi/32, \pi/8, \pi/4, \pi/2\}$, respectively.

FIG. 8. Differential photon production $\frac{d\Gamma}{4\pi\alpha EM T^2} \frac{d\theta}{d\cos \vartheta}$ as a function of $B/T^2$. The blue, orange, green and red curves (from bottom to top on the right side of the graph) correspond to $\vartheta = \{\pi/32, \pi/8, \pi/4, \pi/2\}$, respectively. The horizontal black line represents the total photon production for $B/T^2 = 0$. The vertical dashed lines correspond to the $B_\vartheta$ magnetic field intensities below which the production of photons is enhanced with respect to the $B = 0$ case. For the propagation angles considered we have $B_{\pi/2} = 3.21$, $B_{\pi/4} = 2.46$ and $B_{\pi/8} = 1.47$.

FIG. 9. Elliptic flow $v_2$ as a function of $\omega$. The blue, orange, green, red and purple curves (from bottom to top at the right) correspond to $B/T^2 = \{0.1, 2.01, 4.22, 8.73, 11.24\}$ respectively.

V. DISCUSSION

In this paper we employed holographic methods to study the effects of an external magnetic field over the photons produced in a strongly coupled plasma. While there have been other studies on this topic in the past [20, 41–43, 47], our holographic model features many novel results. The first one, which we previously reported in [48], is that the emitted photons are linearly polarized in its state parallel to the reaction plane, the in-plane polarization state. This is a direct consequence of the constraint (11) coming from the fact that the family of solutions used is a consistent truncation of SUGRA IIB [29]. While other works have reported that the presence of an external magnetic field (or other spatial anisotropies) can cause an increase in the production of photons in one polarization state over the other [20, 39, 42, 43], the strict polarization effect is a novelty of our model. In particular, the Chern-Simons term coming from the truncation to five dimensions was turned off [58] in [42], which partially explains why some of the results presented there differ from the ones here. We will explore more of those differences below.

In this paper we also show the numerical results for the production of photons in the in-plane polarization state. From our results, we conclude that for any fixed non-zero magnetic field, the production is increased when the photon momentum is aligned with the reaction plane. This differs from the results from [39], where the emission of photons propagating along the anisotropic direction is increased. This tells us that the source of the anisotropy is very relevant when studying the emission of photons. However, our results agree with the previous models with a magnetic field. By introducing an external magnetic field in the model from [39], the authors in [43] found an enhancement in the plane perpendicular to the magnetic field. Interestingly, they also found that this enhance-
moment is more notorious for the out-plane state, meaning that using their holographic model they found that more photons are produced in its state perpendicular to the reaction plane, which is contrary to what we found using our model.

As previously stated, a study of the production of photons in the presence of a magnetic field was performed in [42] using the holographic model from [25]. In that work only two directions of propagation were considered, namely parallel and perpendicular to the magnetic field, due to the intricacy of the equations of motion. In that sense here we present an extension to that work, as we were able to explore the emission of photons in any propagation direction. In [42] it was previously discovered that the spectral function $\chi_{yy}$ dropped to zero at $\omega = 0$ for any $B/T^2$ along parallel and perpendicular directions with respect to the magnetic field. Here we confirmed that this is indeed the case for any direction of propagation, as can be seen in Figure 3. While the qualitative results for $d\Gamma/d\vec{k}$ are also the same, we can see that quantitatively the production in our model is decreased with respect to theirs as a consequence of the polarization effect present in our setting.

Another main result of our study is that for any given direction of propagation, the production of photons is increased with respect to the $B = 0$ value if the magnetic field intensity lies in the interval $0 < B < B_0$, while it decreases for any $B > B_0$. The magnetic field intensity $B_0$ depends on the propagation direction, in a manner such that it tends to zero as the photon momentum is aligned with the magnetic field. This phenomenon can be better appreciated in Figure 7 and Figure 8.

We also computed the elliptic flow $v_2$ for the emitted photons. This quantity characterizes the momentum anisotropy of the produced particles in heavy-ion collisions. The effect that an external magnetic field has on the elliptic flow was computed holographically in [47]. In their model the magnetic field was introduced as an excitation over probe D7-branes. Considering massless quarks, the authors found that for small $\omega$ the elliptic flow is bigger for the out-plane polarization state, while for higher frequencies the opposite behavior is displayed and the flow is bigger for the in-plane polarization states. This differs from our results, as there are no photons emitted in the out-plane polarization state. Regardless of that, we show that the magnetic field has the general effect of increasing the value of $v_2$ except for very small frequencies, thus it can explain the puzzling excess observed in heavy-ion experiments in RHIC and LHC [3, 5, 46]. It was previously argued that the magnetic field was the cause of this excess by a perturbative computation in QCD in [29] [41]. Hence the results presented here can be thought as a non-perturbative confirmation of this.

A possible extension to our work is to study if adding massive quarks modifies any of the phenomenons described here. As we previously mentioned, the holographic model we use allows a simple description of the embedding of flavor D7-branes [30] [31]. Moreover, under those circumstances an independent magnetic field could also be turned on over the world volume of the D7-branes. It could be interesting to study the interplay between both fields.
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Appendix A: Equations of motion for the out-plane polarization state

As explained in the main text, in order to compute the production of photons in the polarization state $\epsilon_{\text{out}}$, we need to solve eleven equations for the field’s components $A_t, A_x, A_z, h_{ty}, h_{xy}$ and $h_{yz}$. In this appendix we will show that this system can be solved consistently analytically. Note that the metric functions $h_{mn}$ here are the rescaled versions described in [10].

Three of the equations come from the constraint (11)

\begin{align}
A_z - A_t \cos \vartheta &= 0,
A'_z &= 0,
A'_t &= 0,
\end{align}

which can be solved by taking

\begin{align}
A_t(r) &= A_{t\text{bdry}} \cos \vartheta,
A_z(r) &= A_{z\text{bdry}}.
\end{align}

On the other hand, the relevant Maxwell and Einstein equations read

\begin{align}
0 &= U W A'_z \sin \vartheta + V(W A'_t + U A'_z \cos \vartheta),
0 &= -6 U V^2 W A'_t - 6 U V W V' A'_z - 3 U V^2 A'_t W' + 2 \sqrt{6} U V^2 W A'_z \varphi' + 6 k_0^2 A_t V(V \cos^2 \vartheta + W \sin^2 \vartheta) + 6 k_0^2 A_z V W \sin \vartheta + 6 k_0^2 A'_z V^2 \cos \vartheta + 6i B k_0 r^2 h_{ty} W \sin \vartheta,
0 &= 6 k_0^2 U W A_t \sin \vartheta + 6 U^2 V W A'_t + 6 U V W A'_z U' + 3 U^2 V A'_z W' - 2 \sqrt{6} U V^2 W A'_z \varphi' - 6 k_0^2 A_z V (U \cos^2 \vartheta - W) + 6 k_0^2 A_z U V \sin \vartheta \cos \vartheta + 6i B k_0 r^2 h_{ty} W + 6i B k_0 r^2 \cos \vartheta h_{yz} U,
\end{align}
which can all be solved simultaneously by taking

\[
A_x(r) = A_{x}^{\text{bdry}},
\]

\[
h_{ty}(r) = \frac{i k_0 V(r)}{B r^2} (A_x^{\text{bdry}} - A_{x}^{\text{bdry}} \tan \vartheta),
\]

\[
h_{yz}(r) = \frac{i k_0 V(r)}{B r^2} \sin \vartheta (A_x^{\text{bdry}} - A_{x}^{\text{bdry}} \cot \vartheta),
\]

\[
h_{xy}(r) = -\frac{i k_0 V(r)}{B r^2} (A_x^{\text{bdry}} - A_{x}^{\text{bdry}} \tan \vartheta),
\]

A_x, \phi, h_{tx}, h_{xz}, h_{tt}, h_{xx}, h_{yy} y h_{zz}. Even when the number of equations surpasses the number of variables, the system can be solved consistently by the procedure described in the main text. The metric fields \( h_{mn} \) are the rescaled versions given in (111), while the \( \log(r) \) has yet to be factorized from the scalar field \( \varphi \). The reason for this is that numerically is more efficient to solve for this variable \( \phi \) and then divide by \( \log(r) \) at the end of the computation.

### Appendix B: Equations of motion for the in-plane polarization state

For the polarization state \( \epsilon_{mn} \) we need to solve thirteen differential equations for nine components of the fields: The thirteen equations are

\[
0 = V(6k_0^2 A_x \cos \vartheta U W + 6k_0^2 A_x \sin \vartheta \cos \varphi U W + 6U/VW A_y' + 6U/VW A_x' U' + 6U^2 W A_y' V' - 3U^2 V A_x' W')
- 2\sqrt{6}U^2 V W A_y' \varphi' - 6k_0^2 A_x W(\sin^2 \vartheta U - V) - 6i B k_0^2 \sin \vartheta h_{xy} U W,
\]

\[
0 = 4 B e^{-\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \varphi} V A_e + \frac{i k_0 V}{U W}(V(\varphi W_h'_{gy} + \cos \vartheta U h_{gy}' U' + h'_{ty}(2r - r V') + r \sin \vartheta U W h_{xy}) + \sin \vartheta h_{xy} U W(2r - r V')
+ \cos \vartheta h_{xy} U V (2r - r V'))
- 24i B k_0 e^{-\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \varphi} V(A_t \sin \vartheta + A_x) + 8r h_{ty} e^{-\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \varphi}(B^2 + 2 e^{\frac{3}{2} \varphi}(e^{\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \varphi} + 2 \varphi V)^2) - 3V W(r(U/V(2r W h''_{ty} + rh_{ty}' W')
+ 8W h_{ty} - 2k_0^2 \sin \vartheta h_{xy} W - 2k_0^2 \cos \vartheta h_{y z} V) + h_{ty}(2r^2 W(U' V' - k_0^2 \sin^2 \vartheta) + V(2U r W' + 2W)
- 2k_0^2 \cos^2 \vartheta))
- 2h_{xy}(r U(e^{\frac{3}{2} \varphi} V^2(3k_0^2 r^2 \cos \vartheta e^{\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \varphi} - 6 e^{\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \varphi} W U' + 8r(e^{\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \varphi} + 2W) r W) - 3k_0^2 e^{\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \varphi} V^2 V)
- 3U^2 e^{\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \varphi}(r^2 W r V' - 2r V W') + V^2 (r W' + 2W)) - 3r e^{\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \varphi} V(2k_0^2 \sin \vartheta h_{ty} W
+ U(2r W h_{xy}' U' + U(2r W h_{xy}' W + 8W h_{xy}'))) + k_0^2 \sin(2 \vartheta) h_{xy} U W + h_{yz}(2k_0^2 r^2 V W + 2U^2 (r^2 V W' - r V W' + 2V'))).
\]

once that [A2] and the condition that \( U, V, W \) and \( \varphi \) satisfy the background equations have been imposed.
\[
0 = -(8e^\frac{1}{2}\phi(-6Bk_0r^2VA_y + \sin \theta + 3B^2r^4h_{xx} + 3B^2r^4h_{yy} + \sqrt{6}B^2V \phi - 2\sqrt{6}e^\frac{1}{2}\phi V^3 \phi + 2\sqrt{6}e^\frac{1}{2}\phi V^3 \phi)) \\
(\text{r}^2U^3)^{-1} - (3\phi(\phi - 2\phi))^{-\text{r}^3} - U^{-3}(9(\text{ht}_0(2r^2UU'' + r^2U'' + 2rUU'' + 4U^2) - (U(r\text{W}V(V^2W^2h'_t(rU'') - 8U) + U(W^2h'_{xx}(rV'') - 2rUV + 8UV) + WH'_y(rUV' - 2rUV' + 8UV) + V(Vr(2W^2h''_t + U^2h''_wv + U^2h''_w) + U^2h''_w) + U^3h''_w(rWU' - 2rUV' + 8WU')) + U^3h''_w(2U(W(2W - r^2W'') + r^2V'' - 2rW') + rWU'(2W - r''W')) + U^3h''_w(2U(V(2V - r^2V'') + r^2V'' - 2rVV') + rWU'(2V - r''V'))))(V^{-3W^3} 3)) \\
0 = r^3W(2(rUW(sin \text{ht}_t + h'_t + h''_y) + V(cos \text{ht}_t + h''_x)) + WH_{tt} \sin \theta(2U - r''U)) \\
+ WH_{xx}(rVU' + rUV' - 4UV) + WH_{yy}(rVU' + rUV' - 4UV) - 2V^2(WH_{tt} \cos \theta(2U - r''U)) \\
+ V^2h_{xx}(rWU' + rWU' - 4UV)(UV^2W^2)^{-1} - 2\phi' \phi \\
0 = -8B\varepsilon\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}e}(A_y V^{-1} - 2ir_k \phi' \phi \sin \theta + (i k_0 \varepsilon(-W(V - 2rU(VW(sinh''_t + h''_x) + UV(cos \text{ht}_x - \sin h''_x) \\
- UV \sin \text{ht}_y) + WH_{tt}(rVU' + rUV' + 4UV) + 2WH_{tt}(rV' - 2U) + 2WH_{yy}(rV' - 2U)) \\
+ U^2h_{xx} \sin \theta(rWV + rVV - 4UV) + 2UVW\text{h}_x \cos \theta(2V - r''V)))(U^{-2V^2W^2})^{-1} \\
0 = 2\phi' \phi \cos \theta + r^3W^{-1}(U^{-2}(\text{ht}_t \cos \theta(rVU' + rUV' - 4UV) - 2U(rW(cos \text{ht}_t + h''_x) + h''(2W - r''W))) \\
+ V^{-2}(2W(rW(cos \text{ht}_x - \sin h''_x) + h''_x \sin \theta(rW' - 2W)) - h''_x \cos \theta(rW' + rVV' - 4W)) \\
+ (cos \theta(2r(WVW' - h''_y - rWV' - 2UVW)))) \\
0 = r^{-2}(8Ue^{-\sqrt{2}\phi}(-6Bk_0r^2VA_y \sin \theta + 3B^2r^4h_{xx} + 3B^2r^4h_{yy} + \sqrt{6}B^2V \phi - 2\sqrt{6}e^\frac{1}{2}\phi V^3 \phi + 2\sqrt{6}e^\frac{1}{2}\phi V^3 \phi)) \\
+ 24r^2e^{-\sqrt{2}\phi}Vh_{tt}(B^2 + 2e^\frac{1}{2}\phi V(e^\sqrt{2}\phi + 2)^V) + (UV)^{-1}(WV(WV'(h''_t + (WV'' - U)(2rWV' + rVV' \\
+ 8WV)) + rU(U''(Vh''_x + Wh''_x + Wh''_y + 2WV''_h + 4k_0^2 WH_{tx} \sin \theta) + WH_{xx}(2k_0^2 rV + U'V(2W - r''V))) \\
+ WH_{yy}(2k_0^2 rV + U'V(2W' - r''V)) + 4k_0^2 V^2W'h_{tx} \cos \theta + V^2h_{xx}(2k_0^2 rW + UU'(2W - r''W))) \\
+ WH_{tt}(2r(W(k_0^2 r(V \cos^2 \theta + W \sin^2 \theta) + WV''))- r^2VW^2W^{-2} - 2U^2(2rWV' + rVV' + 4W))))) \\
0 = 24iBk_0 e^{-\sqrt{2}\phi}VA_y + 8r^2 e^{-\sqrt{2}\phi}h_{tx}(B^2 + 2e^\frac{1}{2}\phi V(e^\sqrt{2}\phi + 2)V) - W^{-1}(3V(r(2rUVW' h''_t + rUVW' h''_t' + \\
+ 8UVW' h''_x + k_0^2 rVh_{tx} \sin \theta(2\theta) - 2k_0^2 rVh_{xx} \cos \theta + 2k_0^2 W h_{yy} \sin \theta)) - 2k_0^2 rW h_{tx} \sin \theta + 2k_0^2 rW h_{yy} \cos \theta)) \\
0 = -96Bk_0 e^{-\sqrt{2}\phi}VA_y \sin \theta + 3rh_{yy}(16r^2 e^{-\sqrt{2}\phi} + 6k_0^2 r \sin^2 \theta + 3rU'W' - 6U')) \\
- W^{-1}(3rV(2rUVW'h''_t + 2rUVW'h''_x - rUVW'h''_x + 8UVW'h''_t + k_0^2 rW h_{tx} \sin \theta) + 2k_0^2 rW h_{xx} \cos \theta \\
- 2k_0^2 rW h_{xx} \sin \theta + 2k_0^2 rW h_{yy} \cos \theta)) \\
0 = 96Bk_0 e^{-\sqrt{2}\phi}VA_y \sin \theta + 3rh_{yy}(16r^2 e^{-\sqrt{2}\phi} + 6k_0^2 r \sin^2 \theta + 3rU'W' - 6U')) \\
+ 3h_{xx}(3k_0^2 r(UW^{-1}V^2(U \cos \theta) + U - 2W) - 3r^2U'V^2 + 16r^2 e^{-\sqrt{2}\phi} V^2 + 32r^2 e^{-\sqrt{2}\phi} V^2 - 12rUV') \\
+ 6rUW^{-1}V'W' + 6rUV'' - 12UV^2) - r^2V(16\sqrt{6}B^2 \varepsilon^{-\sqrt{2}\phi} + 18r^2 UV h''_t - 9r^4\varepsilon^{-1}W''_h h''_x + 18r^4UV'h''_t \\
+ 9r^4uv^{-1}V'V'' h''_t - 9r^4uv'h''_x + 9r^4uv'h''_y + 9r^4uv^{-1}WV'h''_x + 72r^3UVh''_x \\
+ 36k_0^2 rU^{-1}Vh_{tx} \sin \theta + 36k_0^2 rV^-1W'h_{xx} \sin \theta \cos \theta - 18k_0^2 rW^{-1}h''_x \sin^2 \theta \\
+ 9r^3 u^{-1}h''_t(2k_0^2 r \sin^2 \theta + V'(rU' - 2U)) - 9r^4uv^{-1}W^2h_{xx} V'' + 18r^3uv^{-1}W^2h_{xx} V' - 16\sqrt{6}e^{-\sqrt{2}\phi} V^2 \phi \\
+ 16\sqrt{6} e^{-\sqrt{2}\phi} V^2 \phi)) \\
0 = 2h_{xx}(2rUV(2B^2r + e^\sqrt{2}\phi V^2(4r(e^{-\sqrt{2}\phi} + 2) - 3e^\sqrt{2}\phi U')) - 3k_0^2 r^2 e^{-\sqrt{2}\phi} V^2W - 3U^2 e^{-\sqrt{2}\phi} V(rW'(r''V - V) + 2W)) \\
+ 3V(16\sqrt{6}B^2 \varepsilon^{-\sqrt{2}\phi}k_0^2 rW h_{yy} \sin \theta) - V(2rU^2W'h''_t - rUVW'h''_x + 2rUWV'h''_t + 8UVW'h''_x + k_0^2 rW h_{tt} \sin \theta \sin \theta \\
+ 2k_0^2 rW h_{xx} \cos \theta + 2k_0^2 rW h_{tt} \sin \theta)) - 8iBk_0 uW A_y \cos \theta)
\[0 = V(-96iB_{00}r^2UW^2A_y\sin\vartheta + UW^2(16\sqrt{6}\phi(B^2 + e\tilde{\varphi}(e\sqrt{\varphi} - 1)V^2) - 9r^3e\sqrt{\varphi}V(2rU'h'_{yy} - V'(rh'_{tt} + 2h_{tt})))
\]
\[-9r^3U'e\sqrt{\varphi}(2rVW^2h'_{yy} + V'(rW(Vh'_{zz} + Wh'_{xx}) + Vh_{zz}(2W - rW')) + Wh'_{yy}(-rWV' + rWV' + 8WV'))
\]-\[9r^4e\sqrt{\varphi}VW^2h_{tt}(V') + 3rUW^2h_{xx}(16B^2r + 3Ue\sqrt{\varphi}V'(rV' - 2V)) + 3r^2e\tilde{\varphi}h_{yy}(6k_0^2r^2e\tilde{\varphi}V^2W + 2rUV(3k_0^2r\tilde{\varphi}(V\cos^2\vartheta + W\sin^2\vartheta) + 8r(e\sqrt{\varphi} + 2)VW - 6e\tilde{\varphi}VVV'))
\]-\[3U^2e\tilde{\varphi}(r^2W^2 + 2V^2(rW + 2W) - 2rWVV'))
\]

\[0 = -r^{-2}(8e^{-2\sqrt{\varphi}W(-96iB_{00}r^2V_Ay\sin\vartheta + 3B^2r^2h_{xx} + 3B^2r^4h_{yy} + \sqrt{6}B^2\phi - 2\sqrt{6}e\sqrt{\varphi}V^3\phi + 2\sqrt{6}e\tilde{\varphi}V^3\phi)) + 24r^2e^{-2\sqrt{\varphi}W}h_{zz}(B^2 + 2e\tilde{\varphi}(e\sqrt{\varphi} + 2)V^2) + 9V(-2UW)^{-1}(V(rW(U(2h'_{zz}(rWVU' + U(rWV' - rWV' + 4WV')) + rW(2UVh'_{zz} + U(H'(h'_{xx} + h'_{yy}) - Vh'_{tt})) + 2k_0^2rWh_{xx}(sin(2\vartheta)) + VWVh_{tt}(2k_0^2r^2\cos^2\vartheta + W'(rV' - 2U)) + 4k_0^2rWVh_{zz}(cos\vartheta + h_{zz}(k_0^2r^2W^2(U\cos(2\vartheta) - U + 2V) + U(4rWV^2U' + U(4rWV' + V(rW' - 2W^2)))) + rh_{xx}(2k_0^2r^2\cos^2\vartheta + 4W'(rV' - 2V)) + rh_{yy}(2k_0^2r^2\cos^2\vartheta + UV(rV' - 2V)))}
\]
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