

A guide to frames, 2π 's, scales and corrections in string compactifications

B. V. Bento^a, D. Chakraborty^b, S. Parameswaran^a, I. Zavala^c

^a *Department of Mathematical Sciences,
University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZL*

^b *Department of Physics, Ashoka University,
Plot 2, Rajiv Gandhi Education City, P.O. Rai, Sonapat 131029, Haryana, India*

^c *Department of Physics, Swansea University,
Singleton Park, Swansea, SA2 8PP, UK*

Abstract

This note is intended to serve as a reference for conventions used in the literature on string compactifications, and how to move between them, collected in a single and easy-to-find place, using type IIB as an illustrative example. We hope it may be useful to beginners in the field and busy experts. E.g. string constructions proposed to address the moduli stabilisation problem are generically in regions of parameter space at the boundaries of control, so that consistent use of 2π 's and frame conventions can be pivotal when computing their potentially dangerous corrections.

1 Introduction

The idea that this pedagogical note could be a useful contribution to the community came about after several discussions with colleagues on the robustness of various candidate string constructions for moduli stabilisation, towards particle physics and cosmology, against potentially dangerous corrections. To scrutinise these constructions, it becomes necessary to use other people's conventions (or indeed one's own in one's past worldline), and although there is nothing deep in changing conventions, and a change of frames is simply a field redefinition¹, it is tedious, and possibly tricky unless starting from scratch. We thus present the various choices most commonly used for 10d and 4d string and Einstein frames in type IIB compactifications, and 2π 's, together with the map between them. We emphasise how physical quantities such as mass ratios, which determine the size of leading corrections to explicit string compactifications, are of course convention-independent. We hope that this may help both beginners in the field and busy experts to save some time.

In Section 2, we present the 10d type IIB supergravity action in the string frame and the Einstein frame, using the two main choices of conventions for change of frames, and including the $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ manifest action. In Section 3, we dimensionally reduce to 4d using a general warped compactification, and present the 4d Einstein frame in different conventions which, however, always allow to recover the unwarped limit from the warped case in an intuitive way. We identify the (warped) KK scale, presenting a single expression that covers the various conventions considered. In Section 4 we similarly work out the flux superpotential and gravitino mass, and show how the mass ratio $\frac{m_{3/2}}{m_{KK}}$ – which not only determines whether we have a consistent supergravity description in 4d, but also controls the higher F-term corrections to KKLT/LVS type compactifications – is of course convention-independent. In Section 5 we give the leading perturbative corrections to the Kähler potential and non-perturbative corrections to the superpotential in the most common conventions, again showing how the convention-independence can be made manifest.

¹See e.g. [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] and references therein for some interesting discussions on the equivalence of the Einstein and Jordan frames in cosmology.

2 Type IIB supergravity

Our starting point is the type IIB low-energy supergravity action in **string frame**, which is given by²

$$S_{IIB}^S = \frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-G^S} \left\{ e^{-2\Phi} \left(R + 4\partial_\mu \Phi \partial^\mu \Phi - \frac{1}{2} |H_3|^2 \right) - \left(\frac{1}{2} |F_1|^2 + \frac{1}{2} |\tilde{F}_3|^2 + \frac{1}{4} |\tilde{F}_5|^2 \right) \right\} - \frac{1}{4\kappa_{10}^2} \int C_4 \wedge H_3 \wedge F_3, \quad (1)$$

where R is the Ricci scalar, Φ is the dilaton, H_3 is the field-strength of the NS 2-form B_2 and F_p is the field-strength of the RR $(p-1)$ -forms C_{p-1} , and \tilde{F}_3, \tilde{F}_5 are defined as below:

$$\begin{aligned} H_3 &= dB_2, & \tilde{F}_3 &= F_3 - C_0 H_3, \\ F_p &= dC_{p-1}, & \tilde{F}_5 &= F_5 - \frac{1}{2} C_2 \wedge H_3 + \frac{1}{2} B_2 \wedge F_3, \\ |F_p|^2 &= \frac{1}{p!} F_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_p} F^{\mu_1 \dots \mu_p}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the type IIB action must be supplemented with the self-duality condition³

$$\tilde{F}_5 = \star \tilde{F}_5.$$

The relation between the string scale α' and the 10d gravitational coupling in **string frame** κ_{10} is

$$\boxed{2\kappa_{10}^2 = (2\pi)^7 \alpha'^4}. \quad (2)$$

A common convention for the string length⁴ l_s , which we use below, is

$$\boxed{(2\pi)^2 \alpha' = l_s^2}, \quad (3)$$

although sometimes $\alpha' = l_s^2$ is used instead.

²The action can be found on p.90 of [6], p.314 of [7], p.114 of [8], p.79 of [9] and p.625 of [10], along with the necessary definitions. There is a different definition of F_5 , for example in [11], which also contains the equations of motion. See also [12] for the dilaton dependence of the RR sector.

³Notice the factor of $\frac{1}{4}$ rather than $\frac{1}{2}$ in the kinetic term, which accounts for the fact that only half the degrees of freedom should be present.

⁴The string scale (corresponding to the mass of the tower of string states) is $M_s = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha'}} = \frac{2\pi}{l_s}$ for this choice of conventions. Sometimes the notation $m_s = \frac{1}{l_s}$ is used with this convention, with the relation $M_s = 2\pi m_s$.

2.1 Einstein frame

In the **string frame**, the gravitational part of the action is not in the canonical Einstein-Hilbert form. In order to obtain the latter, we perform a conformal transformation of the metric in 10d, $G^S \rightarrow G^E = e^{2\Omega} G^S$.

The frame in which the gravitational part of the action takes the canonical Einstein-Hilbert form – i.e. the Ricci scalar does not couple to anything other than $\sqrt{-G^E}$ – is the **Einstein frame**. This choice fixes the required conformal transformation up to a constant⁵

$$\Omega = -\frac{\Phi - \Phi_0}{4}, \quad (4)$$

where the constant Φ_0 is a choice of convention, and the two metrics are related by

$$G_{MN}^E = e^{-\frac{\Phi - \Phi_0}{2}} G_{MN}^S. \quad (5)$$

The first term in the action (1), namely the Ricci scalar, in the **Einstein frame** becomes

$$S_{grav}^E = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-G^E} \left\{ R^E - \frac{9}{2} (G^E)^{\mu\nu} (\partial_\mu \Phi) (\partial_\nu \Phi) \right\}, \quad (6)$$

where $\kappa \equiv e^{\Phi_0} \kappa_{10}$ is the rescaled coupling. Including the contribution from the kinetic term of Φ , which also transforms under this conformal transformation, the **Einstein frame** gravitational plus dilaton action becomes

$$S_{grav+\Phi}^E = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-G^E} \left\{ R^E - \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \Phi) (\partial^\mu \Phi) \right\}. \quad (7)$$

Note that the dilaton is canonically normalised in **Einstein frame**.

The kinetic terms of the NS and RR form fields include an implicit metric associated to the index contraction of the forms. For a generic p -form η we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta|_S^2 &= \frac{1}{p!} (G^S)^{\mu_1 \nu_1} \dots (G^S)^{\mu_p \nu_p} \eta_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_p} \eta_{\nu_1 \dots \nu_p} \\ &= \frac{1}{p!} (e^{2\Omega})^p (G^E)^{\mu_1 \nu_1} \dots (G^E)^{\mu_p \nu_p} \eta_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_p} \eta_{\nu_1 \dots \nu_p} = e^{2\Omega \cdot p} |\eta|_E^2. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Putting everything together, with the appropriate choice (4), the action (1) in **Einstein frame**

⁵Note that a constant multiplying R^E is a simple rescaling of the coupling constant κ , so that one still obtains the Einstein frame. The constant is a matter of convention.

becomes

$$S_{IIB}^E = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \left\{ \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-G^E} \left(R^E - \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \Phi)(\partial^\mu \Phi) - \frac{e^{\Phi_0}}{2} e^{-\Phi} |H_3|_E^2 \right) \right. \\ \left. - \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-G^E} \left(\frac{e^{2\Phi}}{2} |F_1|_E^2 + \frac{e^{\Phi_0}}{2} e^\Phi |\tilde{F}_3|_E^2 + \frac{e^{2\Phi_0}}{4} |\tilde{F}_5|_E^2 \right) - \frac{e^{2\Phi_0}}{2} \int C_4 \wedge H_3 \wedge F_3 \right\}. \quad (9)$$

Note that the Chern-Simons term in the action does not transform, apart from via the constant relating κ and κ_{10} , as it is a topological term, independent of the metric.

A common choice of Φ_0 is such that the metric in the **string frame** and the metric in the **Einstein frame** are the same at the vacuum, i.e. $\Phi_0 = \langle \Phi \rangle$ – this allows us to discuss quantities in a frame-independent way *at the vacuum*. For that choice the action in **Einstein frame** reads

$$S_{IIB}^E = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \left\{ \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-G} \left(R - \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \Phi)(\partial^\mu \Phi) - \frac{g_s}{2} e^{-\Phi} |H_3|^2 \right) \right. \\ \left. - \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-G} \left(\frac{e^{2\Phi}}{2} |F_1|^2 + \frac{g_s}{2} e^\Phi |\tilde{F}_3|^2 + \frac{g_s^2}{4} |\tilde{F}_5|^2 \right) - \frac{g_s^2}{2} \int C_4 \wedge H_3 \wedge F_3 \right\}, \quad (10)$$

where we dropped the **E**, as all metrics are in **Einstein frame**. With this choice, the gravitational coupling is related to the string scale as

$$\boxed{2\kappa^2 = 2\kappa_{10}^2 g_s^2 = (2\pi)^7 g_s^2 \alpha'^4} \quad \text{or} \quad \boxed{2\kappa^2 = \frac{g_s^2 l_s^8}{2\pi}}. \quad (11)$$

Another common choice of convention is $\Phi_0 = 0$. In this case, volumes are frame-dependent in the vacuum (see eq. (46) below) and one needs to be careful in using the right frame, e.g. when checking whether the α' -expansion is under control for a certain vacuum, which should be done using the **string frame** volume. For this choice the gravitational coupling is related to the string scale as

$$\boxed{2\kappa^2 = 2\kappa_{10}^2 = (2\pi)^7 \alpha'^4} \quad \text{or} \quad \boxed{2\kappa^2 = \frac{l_s^8}{2\pi}}. \quad (12)$$

2.2 $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ manifest action

We now express the **Einstein frame** action (10) in terms of the fields G_3 and τ , such that the underlying $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ symmetry becomes manifest, which is sometimes useful when doing

calculations and it is commonly used in the literature. We define the fields

$$\tau = C_0 + ie^{-\Phi}, \quad (13)$$

$$G_3 = \tilde{F}_3 - ie^{-\Phi}H_3 = F_3 - \tau H_3, \quad (14)$$

where τ is known as the *axio-dilaton*.

In terms of these fields, the action takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} S_{IIB}^E &= \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-G} \left(R - \frac{(\partial_\mu \tau)(\partial^\mu \bar{\tau})}{2(\text{Im } \tau)^2} - \frac{e^{\Phi_0}}{2(\text{Im } \tau)} |G_3|^2 - \frac{e^{2\Phi_0}}{4} |\tilde{F}_5|^2 \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \frac{ie^{2\Phi_0}}{4} \int \frac{1}{(\text{Im } \tau)} C_4 \wedge G_3 \wedge \bar{G}_3, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where we recall $\kappa = e^{\Phi_0} \kappa_{10}$. We can also write the action in differential form language,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{IIB}^E &= \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \int \left(R \star 1 - \frac{d\tau \wedge \star d\tau}{2(\text{Im } \tau)^2} - \frac{e^{\Phi_0}}{2(\text{Im } \tau)} G_3 \wedge \star \bar{G}_3 - \frac{e^{2\Phi_0}}{4} \tilde{F}_5 \wedge \star \tilde{F}_5 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{ie^{2\Phi_0}}{4(\text{Im } \tau)} C_4 \wedge G_3 \wedge \bar{G}_3 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Written in this form, the $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ symmetry of the type IIB action becomes manifest — it leaves the metric and 4-form invariant, and acts on the remaining fields as

$$\tau \rightarrow \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} C_2 \\ B_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} C_2 \\ B_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in SL(2, \mathbb{R}), \quad (17)$$

that is, $ad - bc = 1$.

Another occasionally used convention (see e.g. [13, 14, 15, 16]) is to redefine the RR forms in **Einstein frame** as $C_p^E = e^{\Phi_0} C_p^S$; the action then becomes

$$S_{IIB}^E = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \int \left(R \star 1 - \frac{d\tau \wedge \star d\tau}{2(\text{Im } \tau)^2} - \frac{G_3 \wedge \star \bar{G}_3}{2(\text{Im } \tau)} - \frac{1}{4} \tilde{F}_5 \wedge \star \tilde{F}_5 - \frac{i}{4(\text{Im } \tau)} C_4 \wedge G_3 \wedge \bar{G}_3 \right), \quad (18)$$

where the axio-dilaton was also redefined as $\tau^E = e^{\Phi_0} \tau^S = e^{\Phi_0} C_0^S + ie^{-\varphi}$, with $e^{-\varphi} = e^{-(\Phi - \Phi_0)}$, and $G_3^E = e^{\Phi_0} G_3^S = F_3^E - \tau^E H_3$. Note that in terms of τ^E we have $\langle \text{Im } \tau^E \rangle = 1$. With this field redefinition the action looks the same regardless of the choice of convention, apart from having a different gravitational coupling κ .

3 Dimensional Reduction

In order to obtain a 4d EFT at low energies, we consider a compactification (or dimensional reduction) of the 10d theory down to 4 dimensions. The 4d theory describes perturbations around a 10d vacuum solution and is valid for energies much lower than the compactification scale⁶. We consider a vacuum solution which corresponds to a warped product spacetime $\mathcal{M}_{10} = \mathbb{R}^{1,3} \times_w X_6$, where $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ is a 4d Lorentzian spacetime and X_6 is a 6d compact space. The [Einstein frame](#) metric takes the form⁷

$$ds_{10}^2 = H^{-1/2}(y) e^{2\omega(x)} g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu + H^{1/2}(y) \mathcal{V}^{1/3} g_{mn} dy^m dy^n, \quad (19)$$

where x^μ ($\mu = 0, \dots, 3$) are 4d coordinates and y^m ($m = 4, \dots, 9$) are 6d coordinates on the compact space X_6 . The metric $g_{mn} = (g_6)_{mn}$ is the 6d metric of a Calabi-Yau (Ricci flat) manifold normalised such that

$$\int d^6 y \sqrt{g_6} \equiv l_s^6,$$

with $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_E(x)$ keeping track of the physical size of the compact space. We define the warp factor H as

$$H(y) \equiv 1 + \frac{e^{-4A_0(y)}}{\mathcal{V}^{2/3}}, \quad (20)$$

which is motivated as follows. First, the background warp factor – commonly written as $e^{-4A(y)}$ – that solves the 10d Einstein equations in the presence of fluxes is only fixed up to a constant shift, $e^{-4A(y)} = e^{-4A_0(y)} + c$, which becomes a modulus in the 4d EFT [17]. The fact that $g_{mn} \rightarrow \lambda g_{mn}$ together with $e^{2A} \rightarrow \lambda e^{2A}$ is a gauge redundancy of the metric [18, 19] allows us to choose $\lambda = c^{1/2}$ and rewrite $e^{-4A(y)} = 1 + \frac{e^{-4A_0(y)}}{c}$, which naturally recovers the unwarped case in the $c \rightarrow \infty$ limit – this relates $c = \mathcal{V}^{2/3}$ with the unwarped volume of the compact space. The factor $e^{2\omega(x)}$ is introduced to Weyl rescale to the [4d Einstein frame](#), with metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, as we now describe.

Dimensionally reducing the 10d Einstein-Hilbert term (in [Einstein frame](#))

$$S_{IIB}^E = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \int d^{10} x \sqrt{-G} R_{10} \quad (21)$$

down to 4d using the ansatz (19) gives, among other contributions, the term

$$S_{4d} \supset \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \int d^4 x \sqrt{-g_4} \cdot e^{2\omega(x)} \left(\mathcal{V} \int d^6 y \sqrt{g_6} \cdot H(y) \right) R_4. \quad (22)$$

⁶Depending on the details of the compactification, this scale could correspond to e.g. m_{KK} or $m_{KK}^{\mathcal{V}}$.

⁷Since we start with [Einstein frame](#) metric (19) and action (21), the volumes \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{V}_w are [Einstein frame](#) volumes.

Any choice of $e^{2\omega(x)}$ that leaves a non-canonical coupling of the volume modulus \mathcal{V} to R_4 is said to be in the **Jordan frame**. Requiring a canonical form for the Einstein-Hilbert term instead – which defines the **4d Einstein frame** – fixes the Weyl rescaling $e^{2\omega(x)}$, up to a constant factor $e^{2\omega_0}$, as

$$e^{2\omega(x)} = \frac{e^{2\omega_0} \cdot l_s^6}{\mathcal{V} \int d^6 y \sqrt{g_6} \cdot H(y)} \equiv \frac{e^{2\omega_0} \cdot l_s^6}{V_w} = \frac{e^{2\omega_0}}{\mathcal{V}_w}, \quad (23)$$

where we defined the *warped volume* $V_w = \mathcal{V}_w \cdot l_s^6$ as⁸

$$V_w \equiv \underbrace{\mathcal{V} \int d^6 y \sqrt{g_6} \cdot H(y)}_{\langle H \rangle_{\text{av}} \cdot l_s^6}. \quad (24)$$

This definition of V_w only differs from $\mathcal{V} \cdot l_s^6$ by the factor $\langle H \rangle_{\text{av}}$, the average of the warp factor over the compact space. If the integral is dominated by the unwarped bulk, then $\langle H \rangle_{\text{av}} \approx 1$ and $V_w \approx \mathcal{V} \cdot l_s^6$.

Note the similarities with the conformal transformation in 10d to go from **string frame** to **Einstein frame**, where we also had some freedom in the form of a constant. There a convenient choice was the one for which the two metrics matched *at the vacuum*. Here we are going from the **Jordan frame**, in which some scalars couple to the Ricci scalar in the action, to the **4d Einstein frame**, in which we recover the canonical Einstein-Hilbert term. The two metrics will match *at the vacuum* if we choose $e^{2\omega_0} = \langle \mathcal{V}_w \rangle$. The action in Einstein frame for general ω_0 becomes

$$S_{4d}^E \supset \frac{e^{2\omega_0} \cdot l_s^6}{2\kappa^2} \int d^4 x \sqrt{-g_4} \cdot R_4 \equiv \frac{M_{\text{Pl}}^2}{2} \int d^4 x \sqrt{-g_4} \cdot R_4, \quad (25)$$

which defines the relation between the string scale⁹ ($m_s = 1/l_s$) and the Planck scale as

$$\boxed{m_s = \frac{e^{\Phi_0}}{\sqrt{4\pi} e^{2\omega_0}} M_{\text{Pl}}}. \quad (26)$$

⁸Note that this differs from the volume of the 6d compact space in the ansatz (19), which is

$$\mathcal{V} \int d^6 y \sqrt{g_6} H^{3/2}(y).$$

⁹See footnote 4.

For the convenient choice $e^{\Phi_0} = g_s$ and $e^{2\omega_0} = \langle \mathcal{V}_w \rangle$, this relation becomes

$$m_s = \frac{g_s}{\sqrt{4\pi\mathcal{V}_w}} M_{\text{Pl}}. \quad (27)$$

Note also that in the unwarped limit the warped volume tends to the volume modulus of the compactification, $\mathcal{V}_w \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$, and – with these choices of convention for the Weyl rescalings – we recover the common expression for the ratio m_s/M_{Pl} . If instead we choose conventions $\Phi_0 = 0 = \omega_0$, then $m_s = M_{\text{Pl}}/\sqrt{4\pi}$. Note that the convention dependence of M_{Pl} with respect to m_s makes sense, as M_{Pl} measures the coupling strength of the [Einstein frame](#) gravitational field, whose definition depends on the convention chosen.

At the same time, the *warped* string scale is given by

$$m_s^w \equiv H^{-1/4}(y_0) m_s, \quad (28)$$

and corresponds to the scale perceived by a 4d observer living at some fixed position y_0 along the warping direction of the compact space.

We now determine the Kaluza-Klein (KK) scale at which the towers of massive states associated with the compact dimensions appear. Considering the simple case of a 10d scalar field ρ ,

$$S = \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-G} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} G^{MN} (\partial_M \rho) (\partial_N \rho) \right\} \quad (29)$$

$$= \int d^4x \int d^6y \cdot H^{-1}(y) e^{2\omega(x)} \sqrt{-g_4} \cdot H^{3/2}(y) \mathcal{V} \sqrt{g_6} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} H^{1/2}(y) e^{-2\omega(x)} g^{\mu\nu} (\partial_\mu \rho) (\partial_\nu \rho) - \frac{1}{2} H^{-1/2}(y) \mathcal{V}^{-1/3} g^{mn} (\partial_m \rho) (\partial_n \rho) \right\} \quad (30)$$

$$= \int d^4x \sqrt{-g_4} \mathcal{V} \int d^6y \sqrt{g_6} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} H(y) g^{\mu\nu} (\partial_\mu \rho) (\partial_\nu \rho) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{e^{2\omega(x)}}{\mathcal{V}^{1/3}} g^{mn} (\partial_m \rho) (\partial_n \rho) \right\} \quad (31)$$

$$= \int d^4x \sqrt{-g_4} \mathcal{V} \int d^6y \sqrt{g_6} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} H(y) g^{\mu\nu} (\partial_\mu \rho) (\partial_\nu \rho) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{e^{2\omega(x)}}{\mathcal{V}^{1/3}} H(y) (\Delta_6 \rho) \cdot \rho \right\}, \quad (32)$$

where in the last step we integrated the second term by parts and defined the internal space Laplacian operator

$$\Delta_6 \rho \equiv \frac{H^{-1}(y)}{\sqrt{g_6}} \partial_m (\sqrt{g_6} g^{mn} \partial_n \rho). \quad (33)$$

Decomposing the field $\rho(x, y)$ in a basis of eigenfunctions of Δ_6 (i.e. $\Delta_6 \xi^k = -\lambda_k^2 \xi^k$, with no

sum over k),

$$\rho(x, y) = \sum_k \varrho_k(x) \xi^k(y), \quad (34)$$

the action for the 10d scalar ρ becomes an action for infinitely many 4d scalars $\varrho_k(x)$,

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g_4} \mathcal{V} \int d^6y \sqrt{g_6} \sum_{k,l} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} H(y) g^{\mu\nu} (\partial_\mu \varrho_k) (\partial_\nu \varrho_l) (\xi^k \xi^l) \right. \\ \left. - \frac{1}{2} \frac{e^{2\omega(x)}}{\mathcal{V}^{1/3}} H(y) \lambda_k^2 \varrho_k \varrho_l (\xi^k \xi^l) \right\} \quad (35)$$

$$= \int d^4x \sqrt{-g_4} \mathcal{V} \sum_{k,l} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} (\partial_\mu \varrho_k) (\partial_\nu \varrho_l) \cdot \int d^6y \sqrt{g_6} \cdot H(y) \xi^k \xi^l \right. \\ \left. - \frac{1}{2} \frac{e^{2\omega(x)}}{\mathcal{V}^{1/3}} \lambda_k^2 \varrho_k \varrho_l \cdot \int d^6y \sqrt{g_6} \cdot H(y) \xi^k \xi^l \right\}. \quad (36)$$

Since the eigenmodes ξ^k satisfy the orthogonality condition

$$\int d^6y \sqrt{g_6} \cdot H(y) \xi^k \xi^l = c_1 \delta^{kl}, \quad (37)$$

the KK modes decouple and the action reduces to

$$S = \sum_k \int d^4x \sqrt{-g_4} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} (\partial_\mu \varrho_k) (\partial_\nu \varrho_k) (c_1 \mathcal{V}) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{e^{2\omega(x)}}{\mathcal{V}^{1/3}} \lambda_k^2 \varrho_k^2 (c_1 \mathcal{V}) \right\} \quad (38)$$

$$= \sum_k \int d^4x \sqrt{-g_4} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} (\partial_\mu \varrho_k^c) (\partial_\nu \varrho_k^c) + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\lambda_k^2}{\mathcal{V}^{1/3}} \frac{e^{2\omega_0}}{\mathcal{V}_w} \cdot (\varrho_k^c)^2 \right\}, \quad (39)$$

where in the second line we canonically normalise the fields ϱ_k . Therefore, the mass of ϱ_k^c is

$$m_k = \frac{\lambda_k}{\mathcal{V}^{1/6}} \left(\frac{e^{2\omega_0}}{\mathcal{V}_w} \right)^{1/2} \implies m_{KK} = \frac{\lambda_1}{\mathcal{V}^{1/6}} \left(\frac{e^{2\omega_0}}{\mathcal{V}_w} \right)^{1/2}, \quad (40)$$

where we identify the KK scale, m_{KK} , with the mass of the lightest mode m_1 .

To determine λ_k (and the eigenfunctions¹⁰) one must solve the eigenvalue equation

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{g_6}} \partial_m (\sqrt{g_6} g^{mn} \partial_n \xi^k) + H(y) \cdot \lambda_k^2 \cdot \xi^k = 0, \quad (41)$$

¹⁰These are commonly referred to as the wavefunctions of the modes ϱ_k .

together with appropriate boundary conditions. It is therefore not possible to give a fully generic expression for λ_k , and thus m_{KK} , as it depends on the details of the compactification. If we consider the case of a torus with a single common radius as the prototypical example of an isotropic compact space¹¹ with characteristic scale l_s and constant warp factor¹², the eigenvalue is $\lambda_1 = H_0^{-1/2} \cdot (2\pi) \cdot m_s$. Then the KK scale becomes

$$m_{KK} = \left(\frac{e^{2\omega_0}}{\mathcal{V}_w} \right)^{1/2} H_0^{-1/2} \cdot \frac{2\pi}{\mathcal{V}^{1/6}} m_s = H_0^{-1/2} \cdot \frac{2\pi}{\mathcal{V}^{1/6}} \cdot \frac{e^{\Phi_0}}{\sqrt{4\pi} \mathcal{V}_w^{1/2}} M_{\text{Pl}}. \quad (42)$$

We should note that generally there are two distinct volumes appearing in m_{KK} . One usually takes $\mathcal{V}_w \approx \mathcal{V}$, i.e. one assumes that the unwarped region of the compact space dominates the volume integral, in which case we recover the well-known volume suppression $m_{KK} \sim M_{\text{Pl}}/\mathcal{V}^{2/3}$. For the convenient choice $e^{\Phi_0} = g_s$ and $e^{2\omega_0} = \langle \mathcal{V}_w \rangle$, and approximating $\mathcal{V}_w \approx \mathcal{V}$, we have

$$m_{KK} = H_0^{-1/2} \cdot \frac{2\pi}{\mathcal{V}^{1/6}} m_s = H_0^{-1/2} \cdot \frac{2\pi g_s}{\sqrt{4\pi} \mathcal{V}^{2/3}} M_{\text{Pl}}, \quad (43)$$

while for the common alternative choice $\Phi_0 = 0$, the factor of g_s will be absent.

One also often finds in the literature another scale

$$m_{KK}^w \equiv H^{-1/4}(y_0) m_{KK}^{\text{loc}}, \quad (44)$$

where m_{KK}^{loc} corresponds to a KK scale associated with modes localised on a subspace at some fixed $y = y_0$ (e.g. the tower of states associated with fields living on the world-volume of a brane wrapping an internal cycle at the tip of some warped throat).

It is worth emphasising that volumes measured using a **string frame** metric may differ from the ones measured using an **Einstein frame** metric, depending on the convention used, i.e. on the choice of Φ_0 . To see this, recall that the two metrics are related by $G_{MN}^E = e^{-\frac{\Phi - \Phi_0}{2}} G_{MN}^S$.

¹¹More generically one could consider different scales in different directions, which would result in different KK scales.

¹²This is consistent with our normalisation for the coordinates y^m , such that $\int d^6 y \sqrt{g_6} = l_s^6$ – it corresponds to an identification of the normalised coordinates $y^m \sim y^m + 1$ (with $ds_6^2 = l_s^2 dy^m dy_m$), rather than $y^m \sim y^m + 2\pi$. Moreover, with a constant warp factor, $H(y) \equiv H_0$, the eigenfunctions respecting the (periodic) boundary conditions on the torus would be $\xi^{\vec{k}} \propto e^{2\pi i \vec{k} \cdot \vec{y}}$, with a vector of integers \vec{k} labeling the modes, and hence $\Delta_6 \xi^{\vec{k}} = -H_0^{-1} \cdot (2\pi)^2 k^2 \cdot m_s \cdot \xi^{\vec{k}}$, giving $\lambda_{\vec{k}} = H_0^{-1/2} \cdot (2\pi |\vec{k}|) \cdot m_s$. When the warp factor is not trivial, its functional form will qualitatively change the eigenvalue equation (41) and the solutions λ_k will depend, in particular, on the balance between warped and unwarped regions of the compact space.

Therefore, a generic d -dimensional volume can be written as

$$V_d^E = \int d^d y \sqrt{g_d^E} f(y) = \int d^d y \sqrt{g_d^S} e^{-\frac{d}{4}(\Phi - \Phi_0)} f(y), \quad (45)$$

where we allow for some function $f(y)$, such as $H(y)$ in the definition of V_w (24). Therefore, the volumes in the two frames (assuming Φ is stabilised) are related as $V_d^S = (e^{\langle \Phi \rangle - \Phi_0})^{\frac{d}{4}} V_d^E \Leftrightarrow$

$$\boxed{\mathcal{V}_S = e^{\frac{3}{2}(\langle \Phi \rangle - \Phi_0)} \mathcal{V}_E.} \quad (46)$$

Hence, it is important to note the convention being used for the [Einstein frame](#) metric and how it relates to quantities that are obtained in either [string frame](#) or [Einstein frame](#) (e.g. perturbative and non-perturbative corrections).

Finally, it is interesting to note that the ratio m_{KK}/m_s is manifestly independent of the choice for e^{Φ_0} , i.e. on the convention used in changing from [string frame](#) to [Einstein frame](#), whereas the ratio m_{KK}/M_{Pl} is manifestly independent of the choice for e^{ω_0} , i.e. on the convention used in going to [4d Einstein frame](#). After taking into account the dependence of the [Einstein frame](#) volume on the frame convention, the ratio m_{KK}/M_{Pl} is also actually independent of the choice for e^{Φ_0} , as it must be. Approximating $\mathcal{V}_w \approx \mathcal{V}$ and expressing the ratio in terms of the [string-frame](#) volume, the convention-dependent factors fall out:

$$\frac{m_{KK}}{M_{\text{Pl}}} = H_0^{-1/2} \cdot \frac{2\pi g_s}{\sqrt{4\pi} \mathcal{V}_S^{2/3}}. \quad (47)$$

4 Flux scalar potential

The scalar potential for the moduli fields and the dilaton comes from the terms R , $|G_3|^2$ and $|\tilde{F}_5|^2$ in the action (9), after dimensional reduction to 4d. The contributions from the R and \tilde{F}_5 terms can be shown to give (see section 5.3 of [20])

$$\frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \int \left(R \star 1 - \frac{e^{2\Phi_0}}{4} \tilde{F}_5 \wedge \star \tilde{F}_5 \right) = \frac{e^{\Phi_0}}{2\kappa^2} \int d^4 x \sqrt{-g_4} \cdot e^{4\omega(x)} \int H^{-1} \frac{G_3 \wedge i\bar{G}_3}{2(\text{Im}\tau)}, \quad (48)$$

which we can put together with the $G_3 \wedge \star \bar{G}_3$ term to give in total

$$S_{IIB}^E \supset \frac{e^{\Phi_0}}{2\kappa^2} \int d^4 x \sqrt{-g_4} \cdot e^{4\omega(x)} \int \frac{H^{-1}}{2(\text{Im}\tau)} G_3 \wedge (i\bar{G}_3 + \star_6 \bar{G}_3) \quad (49)$$

$$= \frac{e^{\Phi_0}}{2\kappa^2} \int d^4 x \sqrt{-g_4} \cdot e^{4\omega(x)} \int \frac{H^{-1}}{(\text{Im}\tau)} G_3^+ \wedge \star_6 \bar{G}_3^+, \quad (50)$$

with $G_3^+ = \frac{1}{2}(G_3 + i \star_6 G_3)$ such that $\star_6 G_3^+ = -iG_3^+$ [20]. Using the metric (19) we can rewrite this action in terms of g_{mn} ,

$$S_{IIB}^E \supset \int d^4x \sqrt{-g_4} \left\{ \frac{e^{\Phi_0}}{2\kappa^2} e^{4\omega(x)} \int H^{-1} \frac{G_3^+ \wedge \star_{g_6} \overline{G_3^+}}{(\text{Im}\tau)} \right\} \equiv - \int d^4x \sqrt{-g_4} V, \quad (51)$$

which defines the 4d scalar potential V as

$$\boxed{V = -i \frac{e^{\Phi_0}}{2\kappa^2} e^{4\omega(x)} \int H \frac{(H^{-1}G_3^+) \wedge (H^{-1}\overline{G_3^+})}{(\text{Im}\tau)}}. \quad (52)$$

It is now possible to rewrite this potential in an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity form, by defining

$$W = \frac{1}{a} \int G_3 \wedge \Omega, \quad (53)$$

where a is a normalisation constant to be determined below, and using that

$$\int H (H^{-1}G_3^+) \wedge (H^{-1}\overline{G_3^+}) = \frac{a^2}{\int H \Omega \wedge \overline{\Omega}} G^{\alpha\bar{\beta}} (D_\alpha W)(D_{\bar{\beta}} \overline{W}) \quad (54)$$

where α, β run over the complex structure moduli and the axio-dilaton. Using this, the scalar potential becomes

$$\begin{aligned} V &= -i \frac{e^{\Phi_0}}{2\kappa^2} \frac{e^{4\omega(x)}}{(\text{Im}\tau)} \frac{a^2}{\int H \Omega \wedge \overline{\Omega}} (G^{i\bar{j}}(D_i W)(D_{\bar{j}} \overline{W}) - 3|W|^2) \\ &= \frac{e^{\Phi_0}}{2\kappa^2} \left(\frac{e^{2\omega_0} \cdot l_s^6}{V_w} \right)^2 \frac{1}{(\text{Im}\tau)} \frac{a^2}{l_s^6} \frac{l_s^6}{i \int H \Omega \wedge \overline{\Omega}} (G^{i\bar{j}}(D_i W)(D_{\bar{j}} \overline{W}) - 3|W|^2) \\ &= \frac{2\pi}{e^{\Phi_0} \cdot l_s^8} \left(\frac{e^{2\Phi_0} M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \cdot l_s^2 \cdot l_s^6}{4\pi V_w} \right)^2 \frac{1}{(\text{Im}\tau)} \frac{a^2}{l_s^6} \frac{l_s^6}{i \int H \Omega \wedge \overline{\Omega}} (G^{i\bar{j}}(D_i W)(D_{\bar{j}} \overline{W}) - 3|W|^2) \\ &= \frac{e^{3\Phi_0}}{4\pi \cdot l_s^4} M_{\text{Pl}}^4 \frac{a^2}{l_s^6} \cdot \left(\frac{l_s^6}{V_w} \right)^2 \frac{1}{2(\text{Im}\tau)} \frac{l_s^6}{i \int H \Omega \wedge \overline{\Omega}} \cdot M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \left(\frac{G^{i\bar{j}}}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2} (D_i W)(D_{\bar{j}} \overline{W}) - \frac{3}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2} |W|^2 \right) \\ &= \left\{ \frac{e^{3\Phi_0}}{4\pi \cdot l_s^{10}} M_{\text{Pl}}^6 \right\} e^{K/M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left(K^{i\bar{j}}(D_i W)(D_{\bar{j}} \overline{W}) - \frac{3}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2} |W|^2 \right), \quad (55) \end{aligned}$$

where now i, j run over complex structure moduli, Kähler moduli and the axio-dilaton, the Kähler potential K is given by

$$K/M_{\text{Pl}}^2 = -2 \log \mathcal{V}_w - \log(-i(\tau - \bar{\tau})) - \log\left(\frac{i}{l_s^6} \int H \Omega \wedge \bar{\Omega}\right) \quad (56)$$

and $K^{i\bar{j}}$ is the inverse field space metric that follows from $K_{i\bar{j}} = \partial_i \partial_{\bar{j}} K$.

Note that the volume term in K includes not only the overall volume modulus \mathcal{V} , but also the other Kähler moduli. This scalar potential leads to the normalisation

$$W/M_{\text{Pl}}^3 = \frac{e^{\frac{3}{2}\Phi_0}}{\sqrt{4\pi} \cdot l_s^5} \int G_3 \wedge \Omega. \quad (57)$$

We can see that the normalisation constant, a , is convention-dependent through the choice of e^{Φ_0} .

This gives for the gravitino mass

$$m_{3/2} = e^{\frac{K}{2M_{\text{Pl}}^2}} \frac{|W|}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2} = \frac{e^{\frac{1}{2}\langle\Phi\rangle}}{\mathcal{V}_w} \frac{e^{\frac{3}{2}\Phi_0} W_0}{\sqrt{8\pi}} M_{\text{Pl}}, \quad (58)$$

where $e^{\frac{1}{2}\langle\Phi\rangle}$ comes from $\langle\text{Im } \tau\rangle$, $\|\Omega\|_w^2 \cdot l_s^6 = i \int H \Omega \wedge \bar{\Omega}$ and we define

$$W_0/M_{\text{Pl}}^3 \equiv \left\langle \frac{1}{l_s^5} \int G_3 \wedge \Omega \right\rangle. \quad (59)$$

It follows from (58) and (42) that the important¹³ ratio (assuming the bulk dominates all the integrals, so that $\mathcal{V}_w \approx \mathcal{V}$ and $\|\Omega\|_w \approx \|\Omega\|$)

$$\frac{m_{3/2}}{m_{KK}} = H_0^{1/2} \frac{e^{\frac{1}{2}(\langle\Phi\rangle + \Phi_0)}}{\mathcal{V}_E^{1/3}} \frac{W_0}{\sqrt{2}(2\pi)\|\Omega\|}, \quad (60)$$

where we highlight the fact that the volume being used is the **Einstein frame** volume, \mathcal{V}_E . Note that this mass ratio, as written in terms of the **Einstein frame** volume, seems to depend on the convention used for the 10d change of frames, i.e. the choice of Φ_0 . It is however convention-independent, as it must be, since the **Einstein frame** volume also depends on the choice of Φ_0 . If we express the mass ratio in terms of the **string frame** volume instead, which

¹³Not only is this ratio important because a consistent 4d supergravity description requires that the gravitino remains in the theory, i.e. its mass is not above the EFT cutoff – typically m_{KK} – and therefore integrated out, but it was shown that it also serves as a control parameter for certain corrections to the scalar potential, e.g. from higher F-terms [21].

corresponds to the volume perceived by the string itself, using (46) we find

$$\frac{m_{3/2}}{m_{KK}} = H_0^{1/2} \frac{e^{\langle\Phi\rangle}}{\mathcal{V}_S^{1/3}} \frac{W_0}{\sqrt{2}(2\pi)\|\Omega\|}, \quad (61)$$

which is manifestly independent of conventions¹⁴.

5 Corrections to the scalar potential

Since the flux superpotential leaves all Kähler moduli unstabilised, either leaving them as flat directions or generating runaways, one must resort to higher-order corrections to the EFT in order to stabilise them. Both perturbative and non-perturbative corrections have been considered in the literature — while the former are computed at the level of the 10d EFT and in **string frame**, the latter are obtained directly at the level of the 4d EFT and are computed in **Einstein frame**. One must therefore be careful with the conventions being used to change frames, i.e. the choice of Φ_0 , in order to remain consistent.

5.1 Perturbative corrections

In [22], it was shown that α' -corrections to the Type IIB effective action (9) manifest as corrections to the 4d volume modulus Kähler potential and spoil the no-scale structure of its scalar potential. These corrections arise from higher-derivative terms at order $(\alpha')^3$ appearing in the type IIB effective action,

$$S_{IIB}^S = \frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}^2} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-G^S} e^{-2\Phi} \left(R^S + 4(\partial\Phi)_S^2 + (\alpha')^3 \cdot \frac{\zeta(3)}{3 \cdot 2^{11}} \cdot J_0 \right), \quad (62)$$

where the higher-order term is schematically given by

$$J_0 \sim (R_{MNPQ})^4. \quad (63)$$

One must also add a term

$$\delta S_\Phi^S \sim \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-G^S} e^{-2\Phi} (\alpha')^3 (\nabla^2\Phi) Q, \quad (64)$$

¹⁴Note that we give mass ratios for canonically normalised fields defined in the Einstein frame. Whilst these mass ratios must be invariant under change of conventions, a change in frame would come with field redefinitions, and new masses and couplings. In a setup in which all couplings, including the gravitational coupling, are constant (e.g. assuming that the dilaton and volume modulus are stabilised and integrated out), the change of frames becomes a change of convention from one Einstein frame to another Einstein frame, and the mass ratios would be invariant.

where $Q \sim (R_{MNPQ})^3$ is a generalisation of the 6d Euler integrand $\int_{X_6} d^6y \sqrt{g_6} Q = \chi$, with χ the Euler characteristic of X_6 [22]. This term corrects the 10d solution to the equation of motion for Φ , such that $\Phi = \Phi_{10} + \frac{\zeta(3)}{16}Q$. It is then shown in [22] that this leads to a correction to the Kähler potential of the form

$$K = -2 \log \left(\mathcal{V}_S + \frac{\xi}{2} \right) = -2 \log \left(\mathcal{V}_E e^{\frac{3}{2}(\Phi - \Phi_0)} + \frac{\xi}{2} \right) \quad (65)$$

$$= -2 \log \left(\mathcal{V}_E + \frac{\xi}{2} e^{-\frac{3}{2}(\Phi - \Phi_0)} \right) + \dots, \quad (66)$$

where we have used (46) with $d = 6$, keeping Φ_0 unspecified, and ξ is defined as¹⁵

$$\xi = -\frac{\zeta(3)\chi}{2(2\pi)^3}. \quad (67)$$

Note in particular that the correction expressed in [Einstein frame](#) depends on the convention one chooses for Φ_0 ,

$$\Phi_0 = 0 \implies K = -2 \log \left(\mathcal{V} + \frac{\xi}{2g_s^{3/2}} \right), \quad (68)$$

$$\Phi_0 = \langle \Phi \rangle \implies K = -2 \log \left(\mathcal{V} + \frac{\xi}{2} \right), \quad (69)$$

where we have assumed as usual that the dilaton has been stabilised by fluxes.

5.2 Non-perturbative corrections

Although the superpotential W does not receive perturbative corrections, it may receive non-perturbative corrections from either instantons arising from Euclidean D3-branes wrapping 4-cycles or gaugino condensation on the world-volume theory of D7-branes wrapped around internal 4-cycles. Let us consider the latter case in some detail. In what follows, $T_p = \frac{2\pi}{l_s^{p+1}}$ is the brane tension. The DBI action for a Dp-brane, in the [string frame](#), is given by [6, 7]

$$S_{\text{Dp}}^{\text{DBI}} = -T_p \int d^{p+1}\sigma e^{-\Phi} \sqrt{-\det \left(g^S + B + \frac{l_s^2}{2\pi} F \right)}, \quad (70)$$

¹⁵In [22], we find the definition $\xi = -\frac{\zeta(3)\chi(X_6)}{2}$. The missing factor of $(2\pi)^3$ comes from their conventions for the volume, $\mathcal{V}_{[22]} = V_6/(2\pi\alpha')^3$, whereas we are using $\mathcal{V} = V_6/l_s^6 = (2\pi)^{-3} V_6/(2\pi\alpha')^3$, with the convention $(2\pi)^2\alpha' = l_s^2$. There are also instances in the literature where the factor of $1/2$ is absorbed into the definition of ξ .

where g^S and B refer to the pull-back of the **string frame** metric $(G^S)_{MN}$ and 2-form B_{MN} onto the world-volume of the brane and F to the field-strength F_{ab} of the brane gauge fields. Rewriting the action in terms of the **Einstein frame** metric,

$$S_{\text{Dp}}^{\text{DBI}} = -T_p \int d^{p+1}\sigma e^{-\Phi} \sqrt{-\det g^S} \sqrt{\det \left(\mathbf{1} + (g^S)^{-1} \left(B + \frac{l_s^2}{2\pi} F \right) \right)} \quad (71)$$

$$\supset -T_p \int d^{p+1}\sigma e^{-\Phi} \sqrt{-\det g^S} \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{l_s^2}{2\pi} \right)^2 (g^S)^{ac} (g^S)^{bd} F_{ab} F_{cd} \quad (72)$$

$$= -\frac{T_p}{4} \frac{l_s^4}{(2\pi)^2} \int d^{p+1}\sigma \sqrt{-\det g^E} e^{\frac{p-3}{4}(\Phi-\Phi_0)} e^{-\Phi} F_{ab} F^{ab}, \quad (73)$$

where the indices in $F_{ab} F^{ab}$ are contracted with **Einstein frame** metrics. This is the kinetic term for the brane gauge bosons (see Appendix A.2. of [23]) and tells us the gauge coupling of the corresponding theory, which is a key parameter for gaugino condensation. If the brane is wrapping a $(p-3)$ -cycle Σ_{p-3} , we find the corresponding 4d term (assuming that Φ is constant over the cycle)

$$S_{\text{Dp}}^{4\text{d}} \supset -\frac{1}{8\pi l_s^{p-3}} \int d^4x \sqrt{-\det g_4^E} e^{\frac{p-3}{4}(\Phi-\Phi_0)} e^{-\Phi} \underbrace{\left(\int d^{p-3}\sigma \sqrt{g_{p-3}^E} \right)}_{\tau_{\Sigma_{p-3}}^E l_s^{p-3}} F_{ab} F^{ab} \quad (74)$$

$$= -\int d^4x \sqrt{-\det g_4^E} \left\{ \frac{\tau_{\Sigma_{p-3}}^E}{8\pi e^{\langle\Phi\rangle}} e^{\frac{p-3}{4}(\Phi-\Phi_0)} \right\} F_{ab} F^{ab}, \quad (75)$$

and we can read off the gauge coupling g_c ,

$$\boxed{\frac{1}{g_c^2} = \frac{\tau_{\Sigma_{p-3}}^E}{4\pi e^{\langle\Phi\rangle}} e^{\frac{p-3}{4}(\langle\Phi\rangle-\Phi_0)}}, \quad (76)$$

where we have assumed as usual that the dilaton has been stabilised by fluxes at some higher scale. Gaugino condensation on the world-volume theory of D7-branes will then give a non-perturbative contribution to the superpotential [24],¹⁶

$$W_{np} \sim e^{-\frac{8\pi^2}{g_c^2} \frac{1}{N}} = e^{-\frac{2\pi}{N} \frac{\tau^E}{g_s} e^{\langle\Phi\rangle-\Phi_0}}, \quad (77)$$

¹⁶Here N is the number of branes stacked on top of each other, responsible for the gauge group. It appears through the beta-function coefficient [24].

where we used $e^{\langle\Phi\rangle} = g_s$. Holomorphicity of W then leads to the general contribution

$$\boxed{W_{np} = \sum_i A_i e^{i \frac{a_i}{g_s} e^{\langle\Phi\rangle - \Phi_0} T_i^E}}, \quad (78)$$

where the sum is over the contributing cycles, $a_i = \frac{2\pi}{N_i}$ and the fields $T_i = b_i + i\tau_i$ are the complexified Kähler moduli. Hence, we can compare the two most common conventions for Φ_0 ,

$$\Phi_0 = 0 \implies W_{np} = \sum_i A_i e^{ia_i T_i^E}, \quad (79)$$

$$\Phi_0 = \langle\Phi\rangle \implies W_{np} = \sum_i A_i e^{i \frac{a_i}{g_s} T_i^E}. \quad (80)$$

As for the mass ratio $m_{3/2}/m_{KK}$, the superpotential as written, in terms of Einstein frame 4-cycle volumes, appears to depend on the choice of convention for Φ_0 , but one should recall that the 4-cycle volumes also depend on this choice of convention. If we express the 4-cycle volumes in terms of the **string frame** metric (46),

$$\tau_i^S = e^{\langle\Phi\rangle - \Phi_0} \tau_i^E, \quad (81)$$

the convention-independence becomes manifest.

Acknowledgements

IZ is partially supported by STFC, grant ST/P00055X/1.

References

- [1] V. Faraoni and E. Gunzig, *Einstein frame or Jordan frame?*, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **38** (1999) 217–225, [[astro-ph/9910176](#)].
- [2] C. Corda, *Gravitational wave astronomy: the definitive test for the ‘Einstein frame versus Jordan frame’ controversy*, *Astropart. Phys.* **34** (2011) 412–419, [[arXiv:1010.2086](#)].
- [3] A. Y. Kamenshchik and C. F. Steinwachs, *Question of quantum equivalence between*

- Jordan frame and Einstein frame*, *Phys. Rev. D* **91** (2015), no. 8 084033, [[arXiv:1408.5769](#)].
- [4] S. Karamitsos and A. Pilaftsis, *On the Cosmological Frame Problem*, *PoS CORFU2017* (2018) 036, [[arXiv:1801.07151](#)].
- [5] J. Bamber, *Fifth forces and frame invariance*, [[arXiv:2210.06396](#)].
- [6] J. Polchinski, *String theory. Vol. 2: Superstring theory and beyond*. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press, 12, 2007.
- [7] K. Becker, M. Becker, and J. H. Schwarz, *String theory and M-theory: A modern introduction*. Cambridge University Press, 12, 2006.
- [8] L. E. Ibanez and A. M. Uranga, *String theory and particle physics: An introduction to string phenomenology*. Cambridge University Press, 2, 2012.
- [9] D. Baumann and L. McAllister, *Inflation and String Theory*. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press, 5, 2015.
- [10] R. Blumenhagen, D. Lüst, and S. Theisen, *Basic concepts of string theory*. Theoretical and Mathematical Physics. Springer, Heidelberg, Germany, 2013.
- [11] J. Polchinski and M. J. Strassler, *The string dual of a confining four-dimensional gauge theory*, *Physical Review D* (3, 2000) [[hep-th/0003136](#)].
- [12] A. A. Tseytlin, *On dilaton dependence of type II superstring action*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **13** (1996) L81–L85, [[hep-th/9601109](#)].
- [13] F. Tonioni, *Fundamental and Phenomenological Aspects of Anti-D-Brane Supersymmetry Breaking*. PhD thesis, [U. Liverpool](#), 2022.
- [14] P. McGuirk, G. Shiu, and F. Ye, *Soft branes in supersymmetry-breaking backgrounds*, *JHEP* **07** (2012) 188, [[arXiv:1206.0754](#)].
- [15] L. Martucci, J. Rosseel, D. Van den Bleeken, and A. Van Proeyen, *Dirac actions for D-branes on backgrounds with fluxes*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22** (2005) 2745–2764, [[hep-th/0504041](#)].
- [16] R. C. Myers, *Dielectric branes*, *JHEP* **12** (1999) 022, [[hep-th/9910053](#)].
- [17] A. R. Frey, G. Torroba, B. Underwood, and M. R. Douglas, *The Universal Kahler Modulus in Warped Compactifications*, *JHEP* **01** (2009) 036, [[arXiv:0810.5768](#)].

- [18] S. B. Giddings and A. Maharana, *Dynamics of warped compactifications and the shape of the warped landscape*, *Phys. Rev. D* **73** (2006) 126003, [[hep-th/0507158](#)].
- [19] L. Aparicio, F. Quevedo, and R. Valandro, *Moduli Stabilisation with Nilpotent Goldstino: Vacuum Structure and SUSY Breaking*, *JHEP* **03** (2016) 036, [[arXiv:1511.08105](#)].
- [20] O. DeWolfe and S. B. Giddings, *Scales and hierarchies in warped compactifications and brane worlds*, *Physical Review D* **67** (2003), no. 6 [[hep-th/0208123](#)].
- [21] M. Cicoli, J. P. Conlon, A. Maharana, and F. Quevedo, *A Note on the Magnitude of the Flux Superpotential*, *JHEP* **01** (2014) 027, [[arXiv:1310.6694](#)].
- [22] K. Becker, M. Becker, M. Haack, and J. Louis, *Supersymmetry breaking and alpha-prime corrections to flux induced potentials*, *JHEP* **06** (2002) 060, [[hep-th/0204254](#)].
- [23] S. Parameswaran and F. Tonioni, *Non-supersymmetric String Models from Anti-D3-/D7-branes in Strongly Warped Throats*, *JHEP* **12** (2020) 174, [[arXiv:2007.11333](#)].
- [24] A. Hebecker, *Lectures on Naturalness, String Landscape and Multiverse*, [[arXiv:2008.10625](#)].