

Single field slow-roll effective potential from Kähler moduli stabilizations in type IIB/F-theory

ABHIJIT LET, ARUNODAY SARKAR, CHITRAK SARKAR and BUDDHADEB GHOSH

*Centre of Advanced Studies, Department of Physics, The University of Burdwan,
Burdwan 713 104, India*

PACS 11.25.Wx – String and brane phenomenology

PACS 98.80.Qc – Quantum cosmology

PACS 98.80.Cq – Particle-theory and field-theory models of the early Universe (including cosmic pancakes, cosmic strings, chaotic phenomena, inflationary universe, etc.)

Abstract – We derive a single field slow-roll inflaton potential in three intersecting $D7$ branes configuration under type IIB/F-theory compactification. Among three resulting Kähler moduli corresponding to three orthogonal directions, two are stabilized via perturbative corrections in Kähler potential arising from large volume scenario (α'^3) and four graviton scattering amplitude upto one loop level and the remaining Kähler modulus is stabilized by KKLT-type non-perturbative correction in superpotential. The symmetric combination of two canonically normalized and perturbatively stabilized Kähler moduli gives the inflaton field and the anti-symmetric combination manifests as an auxiliary field.

In recent years, major efforts have been made [1–6] to obtain cosmological inflation and inflaton potential(s) via Kähler moduli stabilization in type-IIB/F-theory since the inflationary picture in large scale limit is experimentally connected to the CMBR anisotropy and polarisation data [7–9]. In fact, Planck-2018 [7] has confirmed the efficacy of the single field slow-roll type potentials e.g. the α -attractors in explaining the observational bounds with significant precision. Quite obviously, moduli stabilization is essential in order to connect the string compactification to low energy effective theories, such as inflation. Therefore, obtaining a plateau-type inflaton potential via moduli stabilization is an important task in the interface of string theory and cosmology. We have already shown in an earlier publication [10] that the mode-dependent behaviours of cosmological parameters of α -attractor potentials conform to the Planck-2018 data to a great extent. This class of potentials originates from the geometry of Kähler manifold in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ minimal supergravity. Motivated by this success, we felt it is pertinent to extract such type of experimentally favoured potential from more fundamental theory viz., the superstring theory through stabilizing the Kähler moduli fields by quantum corrections in the topology of the internal compact manifold which is a Calabi-Yau threefold. In the string frame, one is concerned with two potentials: i) the Kähler potential

[11] \mathcal{K} which generates the metric of the moduli space of the internal manifold, ii) the superpotential [12] \mathcal{W} which is generated by world volume fluxes of branes. Usually, \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{W} get contributions from perturbative [1, 5, 11, 13–16] and non-perturbative [5, 17–20] effects, respectively. In the process of compactification in string theory, many moduli fields (massless scalars in four dimension) appear which are related to \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{W} . The number of moduli fields may be reduced by fluxes [21, 22], D brane compactification [23] and orientifold projection [24]. A single-field inflation is driven by a potential $V(\phi)$, where ϕ is the inflaton field. In order to connect string theory to inflation one has to i) derive $V(\phi)$ from a potential $V(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{W})$, which is called the F -term potential, and ii) make a transition from AdS space to dS space, the latter having a positive cosmological constant, which is required for inflationary expansion of the universe. Moreover, the potential $V(\phi)$ has to be a slow-roll one. The main motivation of the present work is to obtain a slow-roll potential, $V(\phi)$, incorporating the perturbative (α'^3 , four-graviton scattering upto genus one and 3 intersecting $D7$ branes wrapping over 4-cycles), non-perturbative (one instanton/gaugino condensation) corrections in $V(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{W})$. Obtaining a stable dS vacuum from superstring theory is a challenging task because of the recently proposed swampland conjecture [25, 26] in the context of quantum gravity. But still,

efforts have been made to find an effective potential from the stringy perspective, which includes both perturbative [11, 14, 15] and non-perturbative [18–20] elements in the topology of compactified extra dimensions of space-time. Another aspect of this scenario is to uplift the single field effective potential from the AdS to the dS space maintaining a slow-roll plateau. In this paper we have proposed a scheme for deriving a slow-roll dS -potential for the inflaton field by stabilizing all the Kähler moduli and suitably uplifting the AdS minimum to the dS one. Our calculational framework is based on the type IIB superstring theory compactified on a 6d T^6/\mathbb{Z}_N orbifold limit of Calabi-Yau 3-fold $(CY_3)^1$, which will be designated as \mathcal{X}_6 such that the target space is $\mathcal{M}_4 \times \mathcal{X}_6$, where \mathcal{M}_4 is the 4d Minkowski space. The internal space \mathcal{X}_6 is equipped with some non-perturbative objects like $D7$ branes and $O7$ planes. These O -planes are necessary to project out the 12d F -theory in 10d type IIB theory [28, 29]. Furthermore, the simplest configuration of three magnetised non-intersecting and intersecting $D7$ branes is considered which wrap around the 4-cycles and warp the metric topology of \mathcal{X}_6 such that $h^{1,1} = 3$. In this set-up, the complexified Kähler moduli which control the volume of \mathcal{X}_6 are expressed as,

$$\rho_k = b_k + i\tau_k, \quad k = 1, 2, 3. \quad (1)$$

b_k is connected with RR C_4 potential and τ_k is identified as 4-cycle volume transverse to the 7-branes. The internal volume of \mathcal{X}_6 can be expressed in terms of $\tau_{1,2,3}$ as,

$$\mathcal{V} = \sqrt{\tau_1 \tau_2 \tau_3} = \sqrt{\frac{(\rho_1 - \bar{\rho}_1)(\rho_2 - \bar{\rho}_2)(\rho_3 - \bar{\rho}_3)}{(2i)^3}}, \quad (2)$$

where we have assumed that the intersection number of the branes is one. Branes, wrapping the \mathcal{X}_6 , produce generalised fluxes [21, 23] threading the 4-cycles of the internal manifold arising due to some potentials C_p and the associated form fields $F_p = dC_{p-1}$, $p = 0, 2, 4$, complexified axion-dilaton $S = C_0 + ie^{-\varphi}$, where φ is the dilaton field which is related to the string coupling constant as $\langle \varphi \rangle = \ln g_s$; $F_3 = dC_2$, the Kalb-Ramond field B_2 , $H_3 = dB_2$ and $G_3 = F_3 - SH_3$. These fields depend on $h^{2,1}$ complex structure moduli z_a which dictate the shape of \mathcal{X}_6 . The CY_3 being a compact Kähler manifold (which means it is an orientable Riemann surface having finite volume) with vanishing first Chern class and Ricci flatness [30] admits a non-zero closed holomorphic $(3,0)$ form $\Omega(z_a)$ [31] (i.e. $d\Omega(z_a) = 0$) everywhere, which is a non-trivial element of Hodge-de Rham cohomology group $H^{3,0}$. The 3-form field G_3 and $\Omega(z_a)$ together define the compatibility of CY_3 with supersymmetry [21, 30] through a flux-generated tree level superpotential [12],

$$\mathcal{W}_0(S, z_a) = \int_{\mathcal{X}_6} G_3(S, z_a) \wedge \Omega(z_a), \quad (3)$$

which is a holomorphic function of z_a and S . Such type of potential is also described in the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity

¹or an elliptically fibered Calabi-Yau 4-fold in F -theory [27]

[32] except that, in that case it will be a function of superfields. The supersymmetric constraints require that z_a and S should be supersymmetrically stabilized acquiring large masses at supersymmetric minimum. Therefore, the covariant derivative of \mathcal{W}_0 w.r.t. z_a and S must vanish, i.e.

$$\mathcal{D}_S \mathcal{W}_0 = \mathcal{D}_{z_a} \mathcal{W}_0 = 0 \quad (4)$$

where, $\mathcal{D}\mathcal{W}_0 = \partial\mathcal{W}_0 + \mathcal{W}_0\partial\mathcal{K}$. $\partial\mathcal{K}$ is the connection on the moduli space of CY_3 . This stabilization ensures that those moduli fields can never appear in large four dimensions. Now, so far as the Kähler structure (which is the complex structure with a Riemannian metric) of \mathcal{X}_6 is concerned, the metric of the moduli space $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}_6) = \mathcal{M}^{2,1}(\mathcal{X}_6) \times \mathcal{M}^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}_6)$, $\mathcal{K}_{I\bar{J}}$ being an exact 2-form i.e. it is derivable (at least locally) from a scalar potential called Kähler potential \mathcal{K}_0 ,

$$K_{I\bar{J}} = \partial_I \partial_{\bar{J}} \mathcal{K}_0. \quad (5)$$

Here \mathcal{K}_0 is the classical version of the Kähler potential and it depends on three moduli viz., S , z_a and ρ_k as [21, 31],

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_0(S, z_a, \rho_k) = & - \sum_{k=1}^3 \ln(-i(\rho_k - \bar{\rho}_k)) - \ln(-i(S - \bar{S})) \\ & - \ln(-i \int \Omega \wedge \bar{\Omega}). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Using Eq. (2) we get,

$$\mathcal{K}_0(S, z_a, \rho_k) = -2 \ln \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{K}_0(z_a, S), \quad (7)$$

where a constant factor $\ln 8$ has been absorbed in $\mathcal{K}_0(z_a, S)$. $\mathcal{K}_0(S, z_a, \rho_k)$ satisfies an interesting condition,

$$\sum_{k, k' \in \mathcal{M}^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}_6)}^{h^{1,1}=3} \mathcal{K}_0^{\rho_k \bar{\rho}_{k'}} \partial_{\rho_k} \mathcal{K}_0 \partial_{\bar{\rho}_{k'}} \mathcal{K}_0 = 3 \quad (8)$$

called the ‘no-scale’ structure, which is necessary to maintain the supersymmetry [32]. The superpotential \mathcal{W}_0 and the Kähler potential $\mathcal{K}_0(S, z_a, \rho_k)$ together provide a 4d effective potential called the F -term potential,

$$\begin{aligned} V_F = e^{\mathcal{K}_0} & \sum_{I, J \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}_6)} \left(\mathcal{K}_0^{I\bar{J}} \mathcal{D}_I \mathcal{W}_0 \mathcal{D}_{\bar{J}} \bar{\mathcal{W}}_0 - 3 \mathcal{W}_0 \bar{\mathcal{W}}_0 \right) \\ = e^{\mathcal{K}_0} & \mathcal{K}_0^{S\bar{S}} \mathcal{D}_S \mathcal{W}_0 \mathcal{D}_{\bar{S}} \bar{\mathcal{W}}_0 \\ + e^{\mathcal{K}_0} & \sum_{a, b \in \mathcal{M}^{2,1}(\mathcal{X}_6)}^{h^{2,1}} \mathcal{K}_0^{z_a \bar{z}_b} \mathcal{D}_{z_a} \mathcal{W}_0 \mathcal{D}_{\bar{z}_b} \bar{\mathcal{W}}_0 \\ + e^{\mathcal{K}_0} & \left(\sum_{k, k' \in \mathcal{M}^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}_6)}^{h^{1,1}=3} \mathcal{K}_0^{\rho_k \bar{\rho}_{k'}} \mathcal{D}_{\rho_k} \mathcal{W}_0 \mathcal{D}_{\bar{\rho}_{k'}} \bar{\mathcal{W}}_0 \right. \\ & \left. - 3 \mathcal{W}_0 \bar{\mathcal{W}}_0 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

which vanishes at classical level due to Eqs. (4) and (8). Therefore, the Kähler moduli are not fixed at tree level leading to the ‘moduli stabilization problem’. In order to avoid this problem we have to come out of the classical description and turn on quantum corrections to break the

supersymmetric no-scale structure of the Kähler potential which will give a non-zero F -term potential. Let us first focus on the non-perturbative contributions of the Kähler moduli to \mathcal{W}_0 as [17]

$$\mathcal{W}(S, z_a, \rho_k) = \mathcal{W}_0(S, z_a) + \sum_{k=1}^3 A_k(z_a) e^{i\alpha_k \rho_k} \quad (10)$$

arising from various non-perturbative effects like gaugino condensation [19] and instanton correction [20] where α_k 's are small constants. According to the large volume scenario (LVS) [14], in non-compact limit, all 4-cycles do not expand to infinity, rather, at least one of the 4-cycles must be smaller than others. Also Ref. [33] says that due to certain choices of world volume fluxes in the presence of $E3$ magnetised branes, some of the Kähler moduli will have non-vanishing contributions to superpotential, which help in applying perturbative string loop effects in Kähler potential as explained in [15]. In our framework we consider τ_1 to be smallest among $\tau_{1,2,3}$ and thus suppressing the effects of larger ρ 's we get from Eq. (10)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}(S, z_a, \rho_k) &= \mathcal{W}_0(S, z_a) + A(z_a) e^{i\alpha \rho_1} \\ &= \mathcal{W}_0(S, z_a) + A'(z_a) e^{-\alpha \tau_1}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $A'(z_a) = A(z_a) e^{i\alpha b_1}$. The non-renormalization theorem [34] forbids us to modify the superpotential by perturbative corrections. The tree level Kähler potential is perturbatively corrected through the stabilization of the volume term in Eq. (7) by the classical α'^3 correction [11] and quantum string loop effects due to multi-graviton scattering [15]. The second type of correction is related to the 4d localized Einstein-Hilbert term (second part of Eq. (12)), originating through the process of compactification from the 10d effective action in gravitational sector given in Ref. [15], containing higher derivative objects² like R^4 which is also proportional to the non-zero Euler number (χ) of the internal manifold. In this way the 10d effective action reduces to (see [5, 15] for details),

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{grav}} &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^7 \alpha'^4} \int_{\mathcal{M}_4 \times \mathcal{X}_6} e^{-2\varphi} R_{(10)} \\ &+ (\alpha')^3 \frac{\chi}{(2\pi \alpha')^4} \int_{\mathcal{M}_4} (2\zeta(3) e^{-2\varphi} + 4\zeta(2)) R_{(4)}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $R_{(10)} = R \wedge e^8$ and $R_{(4)} = R \wedge e^2$. Here R is the Ricci curvature 2-form with e being some generalized basis vector over \mathcal{X}_6 (also called *vielbein*), and

$$\chi = \frac{3!}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{\mathcal{X}_6} R \wedge R \wedge R. \quad (13)$$

The terms associated with $\zeta(3)$ and $\zeta(2)$ come from genus zero scattering amplitude which is actually analogous to α'^3 correction in large volume limit and genus one amplitude which arises from one loop correction, respectively. This computation is done in T^6/\mathbb{Z}_N orbifold limit of CY_3

²Higher derivative terms like $\nabla^4 R^4$ are neglected as their effects are very small in four-graviton scattering amplitude [35, 36].

(see [37, 38] for similar calculations), where there are some points which remain invariant under discrete \mathbb{Z}_N group of transformations, called orbifold fixed points or EH vertices, where $\chi \neq 0$ ³. They act as the sources of emission of massless gravitons and massive Kaluza-Klein (KK) modes in the internal space. The one loop term in the action of Eq. (12) is modified by a correction arising from the effect of exchange of massless as well as massive closed string excitations between EH vertices and $D7$ branes and $O7$ planes, viz., logarithmic correction [15], which takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{grav}} &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^7 \alpha'^4} \int_{\mathcal{M}_4 \times \mathcal{X}_6} e^{-2\varphi} R_{(10)} \\ &+ (\alpha')^3 \frac{\chi}{(2\pi \alpha')^4} \int_{\mathcal{M}_4} (2\zeta(3) e^{-2\varphi} \\ &+ 4\zeta(2) (1 - \sum_k e^{2\varphi} T_k \ln(R_{\perp}^k/w))) R_{(4)}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where T_k is the tension of k th $D7$ brane, R_{\perp} stands for size of the transverse 2-cycle volume and w is the width of effective UV cut-off for graviton/KK modes [38]. Considering all these corrections, the volume term can be re-written as [5, 39]

$$\mathcal{V}' = \mathcal{V} + \xi + \sum_{k=1}^3 \eta_k \ln(\tau_k). \quad (15)$$

For the sake of simplicity, it is assumed that all branes are identical so that they all have same tension of constant magnitude viz., $e^{-\varphi} T_0$. Therefore,

$$\eta_k = \eta = -\frac{1}{2} e^{\varphi} T_0 \xi, \quad (16)$$

where $\eta < 0$, $\xi, T_0, e^{\varphi} > 0$ and $|\eta| \ll \xi$ [15]. Then,

$$\mathcal{V}' = \mathcal{V} + \xi + \eta \sum_{k=1}^3 \ln(\tau_k) = \mathcal{V} + \xi + \eta \ln(\mathcal{V}), \quad (17)$$

where a factor 2 is temporarily absorbed in η . $\xi = -\frac{\chi}{2} \zeta(2) e^{2\varphi}$ for orbifold and $-\frac{\chi}{4} \zeta(3)$ for smooth CY_3 [15], that means $\chi < 0$ so that $\xi > 0$ which will be used later. Now, we can finally write the modified version of Eq. (7),

$$\mathcal{K}(S, z_a, \rho_k) = -2 \ln(\mathcal{V} + \xi + \eta \ln \mathcal{V}) - \mathcal{K}_0(S, z_a) \quad (18)$$

where the 6-cycle CY-volume satisfies Eq. (2). As we are interested only in Kähler moduli stabilization, afterwards we will safely ignore the $\mathcal{K}_0(S, z_a)$ term (which is also clear from the third term of Eq. (9)) and will proceed with only the Kähler moduli dependent term

$$\mathcal{K}(\rho_k) = -2 \ln(\mathcal{V} + \xi + \eta \ln \mathcal{V}). \quad (19)$$

This Kähler potential breaks the supersymmetric no-scale structure i.e., now,

$$\sum_{k, k' \in \mathcal{M}^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}_6)}^3 \mathcal{K}^{\rho_k \bar{\rho}_{k'}} \partial_{\rho_k} \mathcal{K} \partial_{\bar{\rho}_{k'}} \mathcal{K} \neq 3 \quad (20)$$

³Although Ref. [15] shows that for orbifolds tree level contribution vanishes, which creates a little paradoxical situation.

leading to a non-vanishing F -term potential

$$V_F = e^{\mathcal{K}} \left(\sum_{k,k' \in \mathcal{M}^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}_6)}^3 \mathcal{K}^{\rho_k \bar{\rho}_{k'}} \mathcal{D}_{\rho_k} \mathcal{W} \mathcal{D}_{\bar{\rho}_{k'}} \bar{\mathcal{W}} - 3\mathcal{W}\bar{\mathcal{W}} \right), \quad (21)$$

where \mathcal{W} is the corrected fluxed superpotential of Eq. (11). Thus, the Kähler moduli sector of \mathcal{X}_6 is stabilized by perturbative and non-perturbative quantum corrections in classical F -term potential. We assume that the non-supersymmetrically stabilized $\tau_{2,3}$ will be just massive enough to be able to sneak out to \mathcal{M}_4 , for which cosmological inflation will be possible. Now we split the Eq. (21) into V_1 , V_2 and V_3 such that $V_F = V_1 + V_2 + V_3$:

$$V_1 = e^{\mathcal{K}} \left(\sum_{k,k' \in \mathcal{M}^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}_6)}^3 \mathcal{K}^{\rho_k \bar{\rho}_{k'}} \partial_{\rho_k} \mathcal{K} \partial_{\bar{\rho}_{k'}} \mathcal{K} - 3 \right) \mathcal{W}\bar{\mathcal{W}}, \quad (22)$$

$$V_2 = e^{\mathcal{K}} \sum_{k,k' \in \mathcal{M}^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}_6)}^3 \mathcal{K}^{\rho_k \bar{\rho}_{k'}} \partial_{\rho_k} \mathcal{W} \partial_{\bar{\rho}_{k'}} \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \quad (23)$$

$$V_3 = e^{\mathcal{K}} \sum_{k,k' \in \mathcal{M}^{1,1}(\mathcal{X}_6)}^3 \mathcal{K}^{\rho_k \bar{\rho}_{k'}} (\bar{\mathcal{W}} \partial_{\rho_k} \mathcal{W} \partial_{\bar{\rho}_{k'}} \mathcal{K} + \mathcal{W} \partial_{\rho_k} \mathcal{K} \partial_{\bar{\rho}_{k'}} \bar{\mathcal{W}}). \quad (24)$$

The term $e^{\mathcal{K}}$ can be approximated using Eq. (19) as

$$e^{\mathcal{K}} \approx \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}^2} - \frac{2(\xi + \eta \ln \mathcal{V})}{\mathcal{V}^3} + \frac{6\xi\eta}{\mathcal{V}^4}, \quad (25)$$

where the terms $\mathcal{O}(\xi^2)$, $\mathcal{O}(\eta^2)$ and $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\mathcal{V}^5})$ are neglected in large volume limit. Similarly, we compute the three terms V_1 , V_2 and V_3 using Eqs. (1), (2), (11) and (19) in WOLFRAM MATHEMATICA 12 and write the results,

$$V_1 = 3e^{\mathcal{K}} (\tilde{A} + \mathcal{W}_0)^2 \frac{(-8\eta + 2\xi + 2\eta \ln \mathcal{V})\mathcal{V}^2 - 2\eta\mathcal{V}(\eta + 2\xi + 2\eta \ln \mathcal{V})}{(16\eta - 2\xi - 2\eta \ln \mathcal{V} + 4\mathcal{V})\mathcal{V}^2 + 2\eta\mathcal{V}(3\eta + 2\xi + 2\eta \ln \mathcal{V})}, \quad (26)$$

$$V_2 = 4e^{\mathcal{K}} \tilde{A}^2 \alpha^2 \tau_1^2 \mathcal{V} \frac{(2\eta\mathcal{V}(\eta + \xi + \eta \ln \mathcal{V}) + 2\mathcal{V}^2(3\eta + \mathcal{V}))(2\eta \ln \mathcal{V} + 2(\xi + \mathcal{V}))}{(\mathcal{V}^2 + \eta\mathcal{V})(2\eta\mathcal{V}(3\eta + 2\xi + 2\eta \ln \mathcal{V}) + \mathcal{V}^2(16\eta - 2\xi - 2\eta \ln \mathcal{V} + 4\mathcal{V}))}, \quad (27)$$

$$V_3 = 8e^{\mathcal{K}} \alpha \tau_1 \tilde{A} (\tilde{A} + \mathcal{W}_0) \frac{(\mathcal{V}^2 + \eta\mathcal{V})(2\eta \ln \mathcal{V} + 2\xi + 2\mathcal{V})}{2\eta\mathcal{V}(3\eta + 2\xi + 2\eta \ln \mathcal{V}) + \mathcal{V}^2(16\eta - 2\xi - 2\eta \ln \mathcal{V} + 4\mathcal{V})}, \quad (28)$$

where $\tilde{A} = Ae^{-\alpha\tau_1}$. Using Eq. (25) we binomially expand $V_{1,2,3}$ in large volume limit and release the 2 factor in η (which was absorbed in Eq. (17)) to obtain,

$$V_1 \approx \frac{3}{2} \mathcal{W}_0^2 \frac{\xi - 2\eta(4 - \ln \mathcal{V})}{\mathcal{V}^3} - 9\mathcal{W}_0^2 \frac{\xi\eta \ln \mathcal{V}}{\mathcal{V}^4} + (2\mathcal{W}_0 \tilde{A} + \tilde{A}^2) \left(\frac{3(\xi - 2\eta(4 - \ln \mathcal{V}))}{2\mathcal{V}^3} - \frac{9\xi\eta \ln \mathcal{V}}{\mathcal{V}^4} \right) = V_{1p} + V_{1m}, \quad (29)$$

$$V_2 \approx \frac{4\alpha\tau_1 \tilde{A}(\alpha\tau_1 \tilde{A})}{\mathcal{V}^2} - 2\alpha\tau_1 \tilde{A}(\alpha\tau_1 \tilde{A}) \left(\frac{\xi + 2\eta(4 + \ln \mathcal{V})}{\mathcal{V}^3} + \frac{2\xi\eta(2 - 3 \ln \mathcal{V})}{\mathcal{V}^4} \right) = V_{2np} + V_{2m}, \quad (30)$$

$$V_3 \approx \frac{4\alpha\tau_1 \tilde{A}(\tilde{A} + \mathcal{W}_0)}{\mathcal{V}^2} - 2\alpha\tau_1 \tilde{A}(\tilde{A} + \mathcal{W}_0) \left(\frac{\xi + 2\eta(6 + \ln \mathcal{V})}{\mathcal{V}^3} + \frac{6\xi\eta(1 - \ln \mathcal{V})}{\mathcal{V}^4} \right) = V_{3np} + V_{3m}, \quad (31)$$

where the indices ‘p’, ‘np’ and ‘m’ respectively refer to perturbative, non-perturbative and mixed terms in $V_{1,2,3}$. Assembling all terms we finally obtain the perturbative, non-perturbative and mixed parts of V_F as,

$$V_{F1} = V_{1p} = \frac{3}{2} \mathcal{W}_0^2 \frac{\xi - 2\eta(4 - \ln \mathcal{V})}{\mathcal{V}^3} - 9\mathcal{W}_0^2 \frac{\xi\eta \ln \mathcal{V}}{\mathcal{V}^4}, \quad (32)$$

$$V_{F2} = V_{2np} + V_{3np} = \frac{4\alpha\tau_1}{\mathcal{V}^2} \tilde{A}(\tilde{A} + \alpha\tau_1 \tilde{A} + \mathcal{W}_0) \quad (33)$$

and

$$V_{F3} = V_{1m} + V_{2m} + V_{3m} = \tilde{A}(\tilde{A}f + \mathcal{W}_0g) \quad (34)$$

where,

$$f = (3\xi - 8\eta(2\alpha\tau_1(2\alpha\tau_1 + 3) + 3) - 4\xi\alpha\tau_1(\alpha\tau_1 + 1) - 2\eta(2\alpha\tau_1 - 1)(2\alpha\tau_1 + 3) \ln \mathcal{V}) / (2\mathcal{V}^3) + \frac{\eta\xi(2\alpha\tau_1 + 3)((6\alpha\tau_1 - 3) \ln \mathcal{V} - 4\alpha\tau_1)}{\mathcal{V}^4}, \quad (35)$$

$$g = \frac{(3 - 2\alpha\tau_1)(\xi + 2\eta \ln \mathcal{V}) - 24\eta(1 + \alpha\tau_1)}{\mathcal{V}^3} - 6\eta\xi \frac{(3 - 2\alpha\tau_1) \ln \mathcal{V} + 2\alpha\tau_1}{\mathcal{V}^4}. \quad (36)$$

To stabilize the smallest Kähler modulus τ_1 supersymmetrically we first approximate the Kähler potential as,

$$\mathcal{K} \approx -2 \ln \mathcal{V} \quad (37)$$

by considering the perturbative corrections ξ and η to have negligible contributions, which will make calculations simpler. Then equating the covariant derivative of \mathcal{W} of Eq. (11) w.r.t ρ_1 to zero at $\rho_1 = i\tau_1$ we get,

$$D_{\rho_1} \mathcal{W}|_{\rho_1=i\tau_1} = ie^{-\alpha\tau_1} \left(\alpha A + \frac{A + \mathcal{W}_0 e^{\alpha\tau_1}}{2\tau_1} \right) = 0 \quad (38)$$

$$\text{or, } (-\alpha\tau_1 - \frac{1}{2})e^{(-\alpha\tau_1 - \frac{1}{2})} = \frac{\mathcal{W}_0}{2A\sqrt{e}} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The physical solution of this equation is called the ‘Lambert W-function’, $w = W_0(\frac{\mathcal{W}_0}{2A\sqrt{e}})$ corresponding to the 0-branch [5]. Therefore,

$$-\alpha\tau_1 - \frac{1}{2} = w \longrightarrow \tau_1 = -\frac{1 + 2w}{2\alpha}. \quad (39)$$

Here τ_1 will be chosen as 40 as in [5]. Also from Eq. (38) we get,

$$\tilde{A} = Ae^{-\alpha\tau_1} = -\frac{\mathcal{W}_0}{1 + 2\alpha\tau_1} = \frac{\mathcal{W}_0}{2w}. \quad (40)$$

Let, $\epsilon = \frac{1+2w}{w} \approx 1$ [5], then from Eqs. (39) and (40) we obtain,

$$2\alpha\tau_1 = -\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon-2} \quad (41)$$

and

$$\tilde{A} = \frac{\epsilon-2}{2}\mathcal{W}_0. \quad (42)$$

Using Eqs. (41) and (42) we can rewrite Eqs. (32), (33) and (34) as,

$$V_{F_1} = \frac{3}{2}\mathcal{W}_0^2 \frac{\xi - 2\eta(4 - \ln \mathcal{V})}{\mathcal{V}^3} - 9\mathcal{W}_0^2 \frac{\xi\eta \ln \mathcal{V}}{\mathcal{V}^4}, \quad (43)$$

$$V_{F_2} = -(\epsilon\mathcal{W}_0)^2 \frac{\mathcal{V}}{4\mathcal{V}^3} \quad (44)$$

and

$$V_{F_3} = (\epsilon\mathcal{W}_0)^2 \left(\frac{2\xi + 4\eta(\ln \mathcal{V} - 1)}{4\mathcal{V}^3} - \eta\xi \frac{3 \ln \mathcal{V} - 1}{\mathcal{V}^4} \right) - \left(\frac{3}{2}\mathcal{W}_0^2 \frac{\xi - 2\eta(4 - \ln \mathcal{V})}{\mathcal{V}^3} - 9\mathcal{W}_0^2 \frac{\xi\eta \ln \mathcal{V}}{\mathcal{V}^4} \right). \quad (45)$$

Now we can finally write the F -term potential as,

$$V_F = V_{F_1} + V_{F_2} + V_{F_3} = -(\epsilon\mathcal{W}_0)^2 \left(\frac{\mathcal{V} - 2\xi + 4\eta(1 - \ln \mathcal{V})}{4\mathcal{V}^3} - \eta\xi \frac{1 - 3 \ln \mathcal{V}}{\mathcal{V}^4} \right) \quad (46)$$

which matches with the corresponding expression in [5]. This F -term potential arises because of deviation from the no-scale structure of the tree level Kähler potential vis-à-vis the supersymmetry breaking through non-perturbative quantum correction of fluxed superpotential by the smallest Kähler modulus τ_1 , which ensures that τ_1 is stabilized supersymmetrically and lies in compactified dimensions. The other two moduli $\tau_{2,3}$ are perturbatively stabilized through overall volume correction of the internal space \mathcal{X}_6 . Being just massive enough, they can come out of the compactified dimensions and appear in non-compact 4-manifold \mathcal{M}_4 . These relatively larger moduli $\tau_{2,3}$ play very significant role in cosmology. Certain symmetric combination of them will give rise to the inflaton field ϕ which drives the inflation by providing required large vacuum energy, whereas their anti-symmetric combination is another field which will remain in the background. Now, it is quite clear from Eq. (46) that this V_F can not alone be responsible for cosmological inflation because its minima is at AdS space. It requires some uplifting agent to obtain a slow-roll like dS vacuum. There are actually so many uplifting mechanisms which include applying $\bar{D}3$ brane [40], Fayet-Iliopoulos (FI) D -term [41] and nilpotent superfield [42]. Here we use D -term contributions associated with $U(1)$ factors in the models of intersecting $D7$ branes [1, 3, 19, 43, 44] and the corresponding D -term potential takes the form [1, 5]

$$V_D = \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{g_i^2}{2} \left(\sqrt{-1}Q_i \partial_{\rho_i} \mathcal{K} + \sum_j q_j |\langle \Phi_j \rangle|^2 \right)^2 \approx \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{d_i}{\tau_i^3}, \quad (47)$$

where g_i 's ($g_i^{-2} = \tau_i + \text{flux dependent and curvature corrections involving dilaton [19]}$) are the $U(1)$ gauge couplings and $d_i = Q_i^2/8 > 0$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) correspond to the

charges carried out by the 7-branes. q_j 's are the charges of the matter fields Φ_j 's whose VEVs are considered to be zero. This is a valid approximation because we are considering only the gravitational sector (see Eq. (12)) and also this is a safe and simple assumption for obtaining a non-vanishing V_D (see [19] and [44] for more details). $\frac{d_1}{\tau_1^3}$ acts as constant uplifting factor similar to FI D -term. Remaining two terms will manifest through inflaton and an auxiliary field. The effective potential can now be expressed using Eqs. (46) and (47) as

$$V_{\text{eff}} = V_F + V_D = -(\epsilon\mathcal{W}_0)^2 \left(\frac{\mathcal{V} - 2\xi + 4\eta(1 - \ln \mathcal{V})}{4\mathcal{V}^3} - \eta\xi \frac{1 - 3 \ln \mathcal{V}}{\mathcal{V}^4} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{d_i}{\tau_i^3}. \quad (48)$$

Let us transform $\tau_{2,3}$ into two canonically normalized fields $t_{2,3}$ as

$$t_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \ln(\sqrt{\tau_1} \tau_2), \quad t_3 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \ln(\sqrt{\tau_1} \tau_3) \quad (49)$$

where τ_1 is considered to be constant according to Eq. (39) as it is supersymmetrically stabilized. A symmetric combination of $t_{2,3}$ yields

$$\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(t_2 + t_3) = \frac{1}{2} \ln(\tau_1 \tau_2 \tau_3) = \ln \mathcal{V}. \quad (50)$$

Thus, the inflaton field manifests as logarithm of the CY₃ volume. Also from Eq. (50) we can write

$$\tau_2 \tau_3 = \frac{e^{2\phi}}{\tau_1}. \quad (51)$$

By antisymmetrizing $t_{2,3}$ we obtain

$$u = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(t_2 - t_3) = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{\tau_2}{\tau_3} \right) \longrightarrow \frac{\tau_2}{\tau_3} = e^{2u}. \quad (52)$$

These ϕ and u fields are just two new avatars of $\tau_{2,3}$ and therefore we can express ϕ and u in terms of $\tau_{2,3}$ by inverting Eqs. (51) and (52) as

$$\tau_2 = \frac{e^{(\phi+u)}}{\sqrt{\tau_1}}, \quad \tau_3 = \frac{e^{(\phi-u)}}{\sqrt{\tau_1}}. \quad (53)$$

Now, we can transform the effective potential of Eq. (48) as a 2-field potential (see Figure 3)

$$V_{\text{eff}}(\phi, u) = -(\epsilon\mathcal{W}_0)^2 \left(\frac{e^\phi - 2\xi + 4\eta(1 - \phi)}{4e^{3\phi}} - \eta\xi \frac{1 - 3\phi}{e^{4\phi}} \right) + \frac{d_1}{\tau_1^3} + \tau_1^{3/2} (d_2 e^{-3(\phi+u)} + d_3 e^{-3(\phi-u)}). \quad (54)$$

Now, in order to stabilize the u field we set,

$$\left(\frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}(\phi, u)}{\partial u} \right)_{u=u_0} = 0 \longrightarrow u_0 = \frac{1}{6} \ln \left(\frac{d_2}{d_3} \right) \quad (55)$$

and

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2 V_{\text{eff}}(\phi, u)}{\partial u^2} \right)_{u=u_0} = 9d\tau_1^{3/2} e^{-3\phi} > 0 \quad (56)$$

where $d = 2\sqrt{d_2 d_3}$. Now, we finally obtain the single field slow-roll inflaton potential with a stable dS vacuum,

$$V(\phi, u_0) \equiv V(\phi) = \eta(\epsilon\mathcal{W}_0)^2 e^{-3\phi} \left[\phi + \left(\frac{\xi}{2\eta} - 1 + \frac{d\tau_1^{3/2}}{\eta\epsilon^2\mathcal{W}_0^2} \right) - \frac{e^\phi}{4\eta} + \xi e^{-\phi}(1-3\phi) \right] + \frac{d_1}{\tau_1^3}. \quad (57)$$

We can compress this equation by considering

$$\alpha = \eta(\epsilon\mathcal{W}_0)^2, \beta = \left(\frac{\xi}{2\eta} - 1 + \frac{d\tau_1^{3/2}}{\eta\epsilon^2\mathcal{W}_0^2} \right), \gamma = \frac{1}{4\eta}, \lambda = \frac{d_1}{\tau_1^3} \quad (58)$$

as

$$V(\phi) = \alpha e^{-3\phi} \left[\phi + \beta - \gamma e^\phi + \xi e^{-\phi}(1-3\phi) \right] + \lambda. \quad (59)$$

Our derived inflaton potential $V(\phi)$ (Eq. (59)) crucially depends on four parameters α , β , γ and λ which in turn depend on perturbative and non-perturbative string theoretic parameters: ϵ , \mathcal{W}_0 , ξ , η , g_s , T_0 , χ , τ_1 , d_1 and d according to the Eq. (58). In our framework we choose these parameters as follows:

ϵ	\mathcal{W}_0	ξ	η	g_s	T_0	χ	τ_1
1	1.59	23	-0.71	0.6	0.103	-77	40
1	1.59	52	-0.71	0.6	0.045	-173	40
1	1.59	65	-0.71	0.6	0.037	-217	40
1	1.59	65	-0.71	0.6	0.037	-217	40
1	1.59	65	-0.71	0.6	0.037	-217	40
1	1.59	80	-0.71	0.6	0.029	-267	40

Table 1: In our first parameter space we have chosen ϵ , \mathcal{W}_0 , η , g_s and τ_1 to be fixed parameters while ξ , T_0 and χ are varied. The parameters are consistent with the constraints given in [5, 15]. T_0 and χ are parameterized in such a way so that η remains almost fixed.

α	β	γ	λ	d_1	d
-1.805	-70	-0.35	5.47×10^{-6}	0.35	0.45
-1.805	-80	-0.35	5.47×10^{-6}	0.35	0.45
-1.805	-90	-0.35	5.47×10^{-6}	0.35	0.17
-1.805	-100	-0.35	5.47×10^{-6}	0.35	0.31
-1.805	-110	-0.35	5.47×10^{-6}	0.35	0.45
-1.805	-120	-0.35	5.47×10^{-6}	0.35	0.45

Table 2: In our second parameter space we have treated α , γ , λ and d_1 as constants and β , d to be variables. The α , β , γ and λ are obtained from the Eq. (58) using the parameters in Table 1 and d_1 , d are suitably fixed to yield the slow-roll structure of the potential. Although d_1 satisfies the condition given in [5].

In Figure 1 we have shown the inflaton potential $V(\phi)$ against the inflaton field ϕ from Eq. (59) without the

uplifting term λ . This potential has a plateau-type slow-roll feature with an AdS minimum at $\phi \approx 6.02$, which can not drive the inflationary expansion. In Figures 2 we have described the actual inflaton potentials in dS space for two sets of the parameter β (see Eq. (58)): one is $\beta = -70, -90, -110$ for three values of the non-perturbative parameter $d = 0.17, 0.31, 0.45$ respectively keeping the perturbative parameter fixed at $\xi = 65$ (see upper figure) and the other is $\beta = -80, -100, -120$ by varying $\xi = 23, 52, 80$ respectively for a particular value of $d = 0.45$ (see lower figure). Both the figures highlight an uplifting and a slight shift in ϕ direction of the dS vacuum by the increase of β maintaining the same slow-roll plateau as found in AdS space. We find that, in these two figures, uplifting the dS vacuum does not disturb the flat direction, necessary for inflation. It is observed that the two perturbative parameters ξ and η play a major role for shaping the inflaton potential as slow-roll one, the non-perturbative parameters d and d_1 are responsible for the uplifting and the α fixes the overall energy scale of inflation which is $\sim 10^{-6}$ in our case. The smallness of this energy scale firmly indicates the microscopic origin of our inflaton potential viz., the moduli stabilization in type IIB/F-theory compactification with string, brane, orientifold and fluxes- which is certainly a prime motivation of our approach.




Figure 1: Inflaton potential with AdS minima at $\phi \approx 6.02$ for $\xi = 52$, $d = 0.45$ and $\beta = -100$.




Figure 2: Uplifted inflaton potentials with dS minima for different values of β , d with fixed value of ξ (upper figure) and different values of β , ξ with fixed value of d (lower figure). The dS vacua are uplifted as well as shifted in right direction keeping the slow-roll plateau same.




Figure 3: Three dimensional plot of the 2-field inflaton potential of Eq. (54) against the ϕ and u . The auxiliary field u remains at its minimum and its component corresponding to the potential has almost no effect, during inflation.

At the end, we would like to mention that with the slow-roll potential of Eq. (59) and following the formalism in Ref. [10] we have obtained the values of some cosmological parameters such as, scalar power spectrum (Δ_s): 3.38×10^{-4} - 3.60×10^{-4} , tensor power spectrum (Δ_t): 2.1015×10^{-7} - 2.1018×10^{-7} , number of e-folds (N): 55.0 - 56.7, scalar spectral index (n_s): 0.9652 - 0.9662, tensor spectral index (n_t): (-7.28×10^{-5}) - (-7.76×10^{-5}) and tensor-to-scalar ratio (r): 5.8×10^{-4} - 6.2×10^{-4} at $k = 0.001$ - 0.009 Mpc^{-1} for $\xi = 52$, $d = 0.45$ and $\beta = -100$. We plan to report the details of these calculations in a future publication.

In conclusion, we have derived, effectively, a single-field slow-roll inflaton potential from Kähler moduli stabilizations in type IIB/F-theory.

* * *

The authors acknowledge the University Grants Commission for the CAS-II program. AL acknowledges CSIR, the Government of India for NET fellowship. AS and CS acknowledge Government of West Bengal for granting them Swami Vivekananda fellowship.

References

- [1] ANTONIADIS I., CHEN Y. and LEONTARIS G. K., *Eur. Phys. J. C*, **78** (2018) 766.
- [2] ANTONIADIS I., CHEN Y. and LEONTARIS G. K., *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A*, **34** (2019) 1950042.
- [3] ANTONIADIS I., CHEN Y. and LEONTARIS G. K., *PoS, ORFU2018* (2019) 068.
- [4] ANTONIADIS I., LACOMBE O. and LEONTARIS G. K., *Eur. Phys. J. C*, **80** (2020) 1014.
- [5] BASIOURIS V. and LEONTARIS G. K., *Phys. Lett. B*, **810** (2020) 135809.
- [6] BASIOURIS V. and LEONTARIS G. K., *Fortsch. Phys.*, **70** (2022) 2100181.
- [7] AKRAMI Y. *et al.*, *Astron. Astrophys.*, **641** (2020) A10.
- [8] AGHANIM N. *et al.*, *Astron. Astrophys.*, **641** (2020) A6 [Erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)].
- [9] ADE P. A. R. *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **127** (2021) 151301.
- [10] SARKAR A., SARKAR C. and GHOSH B., *JCAP*, **11** (2021) 029.
- [11] BECKER K., BECKER M., HAACK M. and LOUIS J., *JHEP*, **06** (2002) 060.
- [12] GUKOV S., VAFA C. and WITTEN E., *Nucl. Phys. B*, **584** (2000) 69 [Erratum: *Nucl. Phys. B* 608, 477–478 (2001)].
- [13] CONLON J. P., QUEVEDO F. and SURULIZ K., *JHEP*, **08** (2005) 007.
- [14] BALASUBRAMANIAN V., BERGLUND P., CONLON J. P. and QUEVEDO F., *JHEP*, **03** (2005) 007.
- [15] ANTONIADIS I., CHEN Y. and LEONTARIS G. K., *JHEP*, **01** (2020) 149.
- [16] BOBKOV K., *JHEP*, **05** (2005) 010.
- [17] WITTEN E., *Nucl. Phys. B*, **474** (1996) 343.
- [18] KACHRU S., KALLOSH R., LINDE A. D. and TRIVEDI S. P., *Phys. Rev. D*, **68** (2003) 046005.
- [19] HAACK M., KREFL D., LUST D., VAN PROEYEN A. and ZAGERMANN M., *JHEP*, **01** (2007) 078.
- [20] BAUME F., MARCHESANO F. and WIESNER M., *JHEP*, **04** (2020) 174.
- [21] GIDDINGS S. B., KACHRU S. and POLCHINSKI J., *Phys. Rev. D*, **66** (2002) 106006.
- [22] GRANA M., *Phys. Rept.*, **423** (2006) 91.
- [23] BLUMENHAGEN R., KORS B., LUST D. and STIEBERGER S., *Phys. Rept.*, **445** (2007) 1.
- [24] KACHRU S., SCHULZ M. B. and TRIVEDI S., *JHEP*, **10** (2003) 007.
- [25] OOGURI H. and VAFA C., *Nucl. Phys. B*, **766** (2007) 21.
- [26] AGRAWAL P., OBIED G., STEINHARDT P. J. and VAFA C., *Phys. Lett. B*, **784** (2018) 271.
- [27] IZUKA N. and TRIVEDI S. P., *Phys. Rev. D*, **70** (2004) 043519.
- [28] SEN A., *Phys. Rev. D*, **55** (1997) R7345.
- [29] BLUMENHAGEN R., *Fortsch. Phys.*, **58** (2010) 820.
- [30] CANDELAS P., HOROWITZ G. T., STROMINGER A. and WITTEN E., *Nucl. Phys. B*, **258** (1985) 46.
- [31] CANDELAS P. and DE LA Ossa X., *Nucl. Phys. B*, **355** (1991) 455.
- [32] FREEDMAN D. Z. and VAN PROEYEN A., *Supergravity* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK) 2012.
- [33] BIANCHI M., COLLINUCCI A. and MARTUCCI L., *JHEP*, **12** (2011) 045.
- [34] BURGESS C. P., ESCODA C. and QUEVEDO F., *JHEP*, **06** (2006) 044.
- [35] GREEN M. B., RUSSO J. G. and VANHOVE P., *JHEP*, **02** (2008) 020.
- [36] BASU A., *Phys. Rev. D*, **77** (2008) 106003.
- [37] ANTONIADIS I., FERRARA S., MINASIAN R. and NARAIN K. S., *Nucl. Phys. B*, **507** (1997) 571.
- [38] ANTONIADIS I., MINASIAN R. and VANHOVE P., *Nucl. Phys. B*, **648** (2003) 69.
- [39] HAACK M. and KANG J. U., *JHEP*, **08** (2018) 019.
- [40] BAUMANN D., DYMARSKY A., KACHRU S., KLEBANOV I. R. and MCALLISTER L., *JHEP*, **06** (2010) 072.
- [41] CRIBIORI N., FARAKOS F., TOURNOY M. and VAN PROEYEN A., *JHEP*, **04** (2018) 032.
- [42] FERRARA S., KALLOSH R. and LINDE A., *JHEP*, **10** (2014) 143.
- [43] CREMADES D., GARCIA DEL MORAL M. P., QUEVEDO F. and SURULIZ K., *JHEP*, **05** (2007) 100.
- [44] BURGESS C. P., KALLOSH R. and QUEVEDO F., *JHEP*, **10** (2003) 056.