

IC/99/7
RU-99-06

TWO LECTURES ON AdS/CFT CORRESPONDENCE

MICHAEL R. DOUGLAS^a

*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Rutgers University,
Piscataway, NJ 08855, USA*

and

I.H.E.S., Le Bois-Marie, Bures-sur-Yvette France 91440

S. RANDJBAR-DAEMI

*The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics,
Trieste, Italy*

This is a write-up of two lectures on AdS/CFT correspondence given by the authors at the 1998 Spring School at the Abdus Salam ICTP.

1 Introduction

The best candidate theories of quantum gravity, maximal supergravity and superstring theory, are formulated in more than four dimensions. Traditionally four-dimensional physics is derived using the Kaluza-Klein approach, which assumes space-time is a product of a non-compact manifold M and a compact manifold K . Einstein's equations in the full space-time then relate the curvature of these manifolds: if M is to be flat Minkowski space, K must be Ricci-flat (or related to a Ricci-flat manifold in a simple way). Massless fields on M arise as zero modes of differential operators on K .

These models are easily studied for K an n -torus, and candidate K 's exist with reduced supersymmetry. However their Ricci-flat metrics are not known explicitly and studying them requires tricky, indirect methods. Rather, the next simplest possibility is to take K to be a homogeneous space such as the n -sphere S^n . The isometries of K lead to vector fields on M , so these compactifications produce gauged supergravity.

These models were much studied in the 1980's¹⁰; solutions exist but the positive curvature of K forces M to have equal and opposite negative curvature, making them at first sight phenomenologically irrelevant. The simplest possibility is M of constant negative curvature, i.e. anti-de Sitter space AdS_d .

These models also have maximal supersymmetry and thus are "too good" not to find a place in the web of theories known as M theory. A clear ap-

^aSupported in part by DOE grant DE-FG05-90ER40559.

plication emerged with the study of extremal black hole solutions¹². Such solutions of supergravity in Minkowski space can preserve up to half of the global supersymmetry, but it was observed that in the near horizon limit they often preserve maximal supersymmetry. This comes about because the near horizon geometry is equivalent to an AdS compactification.

Black hole physics underwent a revolution with the advent of the D -brane as one could now find configurations with the same long range fields as an extremal black hole, but whose microscopic degrees of freedom are known explicitly. This led to the first generally accepted computation of the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy of a black hole, by Strominger and Vafa²⁶. Certain extremal black holes in type IIB superstring theory compactified on T^5 can be represented as bound states of D1 and D5-branes wrapped on the torus – both objects have exactly the same long-range fields, and are identified in string theory. On the other hand the D-brane system can also be described in world-volume terms – from open string theory one derives a two-dimensional conformal field theory, for which the entropy can be computed exactly. This entropy, certain Hawking emission rates, and many other observables agree exactly between the two descriptions.

The essential reason that conformal field theory appears in the discussion is to reflect the additional near-horizon symmetry visible in the space-time description. By D-brane considerations to be reviewed below, the near horizon limit in space-time is reflected in the low energy limit of the world-volume theory, which takes it to a fixed point with conformal symmetry. Such a d -dimensional conformal theory will then have $SO(d, 2)$ space-time symmetry. This symmetry enhancement is exactly parallel to the enhancement of the black hole symmetry to the isometry group of AdS_{d+1} , $SO(d, 2)$. The same relation holds in the superconformal case.

Another example of this type in type IIB superstring theory is the D3-brane. A configuration of N coincident D3-branes in Minkowski space is identified with another extremal black hole, as we discuss below. On the other hand, its low energy world-volume theory is $N = 4$ four-dimensional supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory. Thus we might conjecture that the entropy of this extremal black hole is equal to the entropy of $N = 4$ Yang-Mills theory.

Thus it was something of a surprise when it was found that – in distinction to the D1–D5 black hole – these entropies, computed in conventional perturbation theory, did not agree¹⁴. Further work found many quantities that do not agree, even in the D1–D5 system – for example, the metric as seen by a probe brane^{7,19}.

Of course the simplest resolution of all such issues is to argue that conventional perturbation theory is not accurate for these questions. In fact the gauge

theory limit which must reproduce supergravity is large N and large 't Hooft coupling g^2N , where perturbation theory fails, and not much was known. So how does one proceed ?

Recently Maldacena has reversed this identification in a fruitful way²⁰. Instead of trying to derive the properties of a black hole from the D-brane theory, one makes a precise conjecture stating that the D-brane theory is *equivalent to* the black hole and indeed all of the gravitational dynamics needed to describe it. Assuming this conjecture, one can derive results for the large 't Hooft coupling limit of gauge theory, by doing computations in AdS supergravity. Even better, by simple modifications of the background geometry, one can get results in gauge theories with reduced or no supersymmetry.

This relation has the same spirit as previously conjectured dualities: here there exists a single theory which reduces to perturbative gauge theory for weak coupling and to supergravity for strong coupling. There are a few observables constrained by supersymmetry to be independent of the coupling, and the basic test of the hypothesis is that these agree. Explicit computation has revealed that additional quantities agree in the two limits; no compelling statement has yet been made as to what should be expected to agree and why.

On the other hand the entropy and indeed almost all observables are expected to disagree^b and thus one interprets these as non-trivial functions of the coupling for which one now has results in both limits. In general, one has as yet no direct way to test these predictions from either gauge theory or string theory; however even qualitative agreement can be regarded as evidence. In the case of the D3-brane, large N four-dimensional gauge theory was much studied over the years and numerous guesses made for its behavior. As it turns out the predictions from AdS/CFT contradict some of these guesses, but in ways which appear to form a new consistent picture of large N $\mathcal{N} = 4$ gauge theory; the better motivated guesses (e.g. for a deconfinement transition in pure Yang-Mills at finite temperature) are confirmed.

The aim of these lectures was to introduce this subject at an elementary level. We shall mostly be concerned with the case of the D3 brane in type IIB theory.

2 The 3-brane of type IIB

The massless sector of IIB string theory is IIB supergravity, which is described in many references including^{28,29}. On general grounds a p -brane will be a

^b The agreement for the D1-D5 system turns out to depend on a result special to two-dimensional conformal field theory; the invariance of central charge under marginal deformations.

source of a $p + 1$ -form gauge potential and thus the minimal subsector of the theory required to describe a 3-brane will be the metric g_{MN} and the four-form potential C . This potential has a self-dual five-form field strength F for which the action is somewhat complicated but for our purposes we will only need the equations of motion

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\kappa^2} R_{MN} &= \frac{1}{6} F_{MIJKL} F_N^{IJKL} \\ F &= *F; \quad dF = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

and supersymmetry transformations of the gravitino

$$\delta\psi_M = (D_M + \frac{i\kappa}{5!} F_{ABCDE} \Gamma^{ABCDE} \Gamma_M) \xi \quad (2)$$

where ξ and ψ_M are complex ten-dimensional Weyl spinors (representing the sum of two Majorana-Weyl spinors), and κ is the ten-dimensional Newton's constant.

We write the 3-brane ansatz

$$ds^2 = e^{2A(y)} dx^\mu dx^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu} + e^{-2B(y)} dy^2 \quad (3)$$

and

$$F = (1 + *) de^{4C(y)} dx^0 dx^1 dx^2 dx^3 \quad (4)$$

where $\eta_{\mu\nu}$, $0 \leq \mu, \nu \leq 3$ is the usual $3 + 1$ Minkowski metric, while y^i parameterize the six dimensions transverse to the brane. Ultimately the functions A , B and C will be taken to depend only on $r = |y|$ to describe a single 3-brane.

The brane solution will preserve supersymmetries corresponding to parameters ξ for which the gravitino variation is zero. We can decompose ξ into the product of four and six dimensional spinors of each chirality

$$\xi = f_+(y) \xi^{(4+)} \epsilon^{(6+)} + f_-(y) \xi^{(4-)} \epsilon^{(6-)} \quad (5)$$

and substituting the ansatz into (2) only Γ^{0123} appears, so up to $1/2$ the bulk supersymmetry can be preserved, say the components $\xi^{(4+)} \epsilon^{(6+)}$ giving the equivalent of $N = 4$ supersymmetry in $d = 4$. Requiring (2) to have solutions we can derive the relation $A = B = C$ and substituting this into $dF = 0$ we find that $e^{-4C} \equiv f(y)$ must satisfy Laplace's equation in six flat transverse dimensions.

The final three-brane solutions are

$$ds^2 = f^{-1/2} dx^\mu dx^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu} + f^{1/2} dy^2 \quad (6)$$

and

$$F = (1 + *)d(f^{-1})dx^0 dx^1 dx^2 dx^3 \quad (7)$$

with

$$f(y) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{Q_i}{|y - y_i|^4}. \quad (8)$$

The charges Q_i are quantized as one can see by an extension of the Dirac argument: consider a second three-brane which extends in x^0 and (say) y^4 , y^5 and y^6 ; from its point of view (7) is a magnetic gauge potential, and by moving it in the three remaining transverse dimensions we can rerun Dirac's argument. There is actually a subtle factor of two coming from the self-duality of F but the final quantization condition is

$$Q_i = 4\pi g_s N_i l_s^4 \quad (9)$$

with N_i integer.

Let us take $n = 1$ and $y_1 = 0$ to get a solution symmetric under $SO(6)$ rotations of y . Define $r = |y|$. The parameter $g_s N$ appearing in (9) will play a central role, so we define $\lambda = 4\pi g_s N$ and write

$$f(y) = 1 + \frac{\lambda l_s^4}{r^4}. \quad (10)$$

On general grounds in IIB string theory we believe the supergravity description of this solution only for $r \gg l_s$, because at shorter distances we cannot justify ignoring the massive closed string modes. This is good as brane solutions in supergravity are typically singular (the extreme three-brane is an exception) but leads us to ask: How do we describe the regime $r \ll l_s$?

3 The 3-brane as a D3-brane

As is well-known by now, we can define the *same* solution of IIB string theory by introducing boundaries in our world-sheet theory, constrained to live on the plane $y = 0$. The charge N is represented by allowing an N -valued Chan-Paton factor; the multi-center solutions correspond to allowing several types of boundaries ending on the planes $y = y_i$. We can compute the long-range supergravity fields around this plane at leading order in g_s by doing world-sheet path integrals on a disk with a graviton or RR vertex operator inserted; we can also verify that the Dirichlet boundary conditions linearly relate the left and right-moving world-sheet operators generating space-time supersymmetry as

$$Q_L = \Gamma^{0123} Q_R \quad (11)$$

and thus preserve the same supersymmetries as the supergravity solution (6). These considerations lead us to *identify* the D-brane as the unique object in string theory corresponding to the field configuration (6).

This description is non-singular and in contrast to the supergravity description becomes simpler as we consider short transverse distance scales $r \ll l_s$. Fluctuations of the D-brane are described by exciting open strings ending on the D-brane, and effects described by open strings stretched to the radius r will be associated with the mass scale $m = T_s r = r/2\pi l_s^2$ (the usual string tension energy). In general excited open strings will also contribute but if $r \ll l_s$ these will be much heavier than the lightest open strings.

Thus we can simplify our brane theory by taking a scaling limit of short distances and large string tension: $r \rightarrow 0$ and $l_s \rightarrow 0$, and work in the energy units set by the stretched strings: $u = r/l_s^2$ fixed. This is the low energy limit of the world-volume theory, which is $N = 4$ $U(N)$ super Yang-Mills theory (SYM) with gauge coupling $g_{YM}^2 = 4\pi g_s$.^c

We review some well-known facts about this theory. The $N = 4$ gauge multiplet contains besides the gauge field six real adjoint scalars Y^i and four Majorana gauginos $\chi^{I\alpha}$. The action can be obtained by dimensional reduction from $N = 1$, $d = 10$ SYM and contains the potential $V = \sum_{i < j} [Y^i, Y^j]^2$. It respects an $SO(6)$ R symmetry which is simply inherited from the original rotational symmetry in $d = 10$ SYM and acts on Y^i as a vector.

As a field theory on $\mathbf{R}^{3,1}$, the moduli space of supersymmetric vacua is parameterized by commuting matrices $[Y^i, Y^j] = 0$ up to gauge transformation; i.e. is $\mathbf{R}^{6N}/\mathbf{S}_N$. This is identical to the parameter space for the most general harmonic function (10) with all $Q_i = 1$ so the moduli space is identical in the two descriptions.

If we take all $Y^i = 0$ we have an unbroken conformal invariance $SO(4, 2)$ in the classical theory and (unusually) even after quantization, because the beta function vanishes. This directly implies scale invariance and indirectly implies conformal invariance in the quantum theory.^d In fact we have a superconformal quantum theory in four dimensions. Now the superconformal algebra is generated by the product of the conformal and supersymmetry algebras, but is larger – we can apply conformal inversion to the supercharges $Q^{I\alpha}$, to obtain partners $S^{I\alpha}$, leading to a total of 32 fermionic generators. The full algebra is $SU(2, 2|4)$ and given in²⁷. We shall come back to this algebra in section 5 and give a brief description of some of its unitary irreducible representations.

^c Our conventions are such that S-duality is $g_s \rightarrow 1/g_s$.

^d Actually, when we are taking the low energy limit, any starting theory will flow to a conformal theory. Examples in which the theory only becomes conformal in this limit include the D1-D5 black hole, the 2-brane in M theory, and many others.

Clearly this is a very interesting point in the moduli space, however it was never too clear what its physics might be. In particular, the usual particle and S-matrix interpretation for quantum field theory is problematic as Green's functions are not expected to have the required analytic structure.

On the other hand there are numerous qualitative consequences of conformal invariance which are well known in two dimensions and which we can expect to hold here. One of these is the operator-state correspondence. This is most clearly formulated by using radial quantization: we choose a point, say $x^\mu = 0$ in Euclidean $\mathbf{R}^4$, and define the state on surfaces of constant $|x|$. We then develop the canonical formalism with $|x|$ as time and quantize; the role of Hamiltonian is then played by the dilatation operator D . The conformal invariance prediction for the two-point function

$$\langle \phi^i(x) \phi^j(0) \rangle = \frac{C_i \delta^{ij}}{|x|^{2\Delta_i}} \quad (12)$$

then (by spectral decomposition) implies that each primary field $\phi^i(x)$ is associated with a distinct state $|i\rangle = \phi^i(0)|0\rangle$ of ‘energy’ $D|i\rangle = \Delta_i|i\rangle$.

Superconformal invariance also leads to constraints on short multiplets of supersymmetry. The generic $\mathcal{N} = 4$, $d = 4$ supersymmetry multiplet with 256 components must be annihilated by all of the $S^{I\alpha}$. This requires the multiplet to belong to the appropriate representation of $SO(6)$ to allow both sides of $\{Q, S\} = D + J$ (where J are the $SO(6)$ charges) to vanish. Since $SO(6)$ charges are quantized, the dimensions and spectrum of short multiplets are independent of continuous parameters such as the coupling constant. Thus “chiral operators of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ ” which create states in these multiplets can be completely enumerated in perturbation theory.

One way to do this is to pick an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ subalgebra of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ as chiral operators in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ are those which can be written as $\int d^2\theta$ in superspace; each $\mathcal{N} = 4$ multiplet will contain a unique sub- $\mathcal{N} = 1$ chiral multiplet of largest $U(1)_R$ charge.

The $\mathcal{N} = 4$ theory in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ superspace has three chiral adjoints Z^i and a field strength W^α , and superpotential $W = \text{Tr} Z^1[Z^2, Z^3]$. A representative set of chiral operators (not all) is

$$O_{1n}^{i_1 i_2 \dots i_n} = \text{Tr} Z^{i_1} Z^{i_2} \dots Z^{i_n} \quad (13)$$

Note that this set of operators is huge as we need to distinguish all possible orderings of the indices i_k in the large N limit. On the other hand we need to remove descendant operators such as those predicted by the equations of motion,

$$\frac{\partial W}{\partial Z^i} = \epsilon_{ijk}[Z^j, Z^k] = D\bar{D}Z^i \sim 0 \quad (14)$$

in terms of the chiral ring. In other words, any operator in (13) which includes a commutator is a descendant.

The result is that $\mathcal{N} = 4$ superconformal theory, for any value of the Yang-Mills coupling constant, contains a sequence of chiral operators O_{1n} of dimension $\Delta = n$ which transform in the n -fold symmetric tensor of $SO(6)_R$. The complete spectrum of chiral operators can be worked out¹.

Note by contrast that we cannot make any statement about the spectrum of non-chiral operators at strong coupling. An operator such as $\sum_i \text{Tr} Y^i Y^i$ will have dimension 2 in the free theory but can gain an arbitrary anomalous dimension, presumably computable as a power series in g_{YM}^2 and N . When these corrections are large, we have little direct control on these dimensions or indeed any generic observable from the gauge theory point of view.

4 Large N

Another limit which is believed to simplify the gauge theory is that of large N . Although we can imagine different such limits, the best studied (and probably best) is that of 't Hooft where we hold the 't Hooft coupling $g_{YM}^2 N = \lambda$ fixed in the limit. As is by now classic (and reviewed in⁴) the perturbative expansion in this limit reduces to the sum of planar diagrams where a diagram with V vertices is weighed by the factor $(g_{YM}^2 N)^V$. Furthermore, corrections in $1/N$ are organized in a topological expansion, with diagrams which can be drawn on a genus g surface weighed by N^{2-2g} .

This gives us a formal relation to string theory, in which each operator written as a single trace of a product of adjoints corresponds to an operator creating or destroying a single closed string, and $1/N$ plays the role of the closed string coupling constant g_s . Specifically,

$$\langle \text{Tr} O_1 \rangle = N [O_1]_{\text{disk}} + N^{-1} [O_1]_{\text{punctured torus}} + \dots \quad (15)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{Tr} O_1 \text{Tr} O_2 \rangle = & N^2 [O_1]_{\text{disk}} [O_2]_{\text{disk}} + N^0 [O_1 O_2]_{\text{annulus}} \\ & + N^0 [O_1]_{\text{disk}} [O_2]_{\text{punctured torus}} + N^0 [O_2]_{\text{disk}} [O_1]_{\text{punctured torus}} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where each term $[O_1 \dots]_{\text{surface}}$ corresponds to the contribution of a string world-sheet with that topology and the specified operators inserted at each boundary (or puncture).

This relation is very direct in weak coupling perturbation theory, so when this series converges, as was true for the “old matrix models”¹³, we can confidently say that large N field theory is equivalent to a string. We might hope to prove (16) for general $g^2 N$ by analytic continuation.

However, we should recognize that the story for most field theories is not so simple – the weak coupling perturbation theory is more typically asymptotic. This leads to many potential difficulties with the string interpretation. The simplest appears in asymptotically free theories, where g^2N is dimensionful, and the dynamically generated mass gap is known to be non-analytic at $g^2N = 0$. In the solvable example of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SYM, (16) can be seen explicitly to fail⁸.

A different approach to string theory starts with a strong coupling expansion around $g^2N \sim \infty$. (This is a subject with a long history; see⁹ and references there.) This can at present be made precise only in two dimensions or on the lattice but in these cases leads directly to a string with finite string tension, computable in an expansion with finite radius of convergence. However these expansions generically predict large N transitions and a critical g_c^2N below which the string expansion breaks down.

The situation may well be better in a superconformal theory and there is no strong argument against analyticity on the positive g^2N axis in this case (but see¹⁸). One could then assume (16) to obtain a non-perturbative description of the theory, as we explain in the last section.

5 Near-horizon geometry and AdS₅ supergravity

The p -brane solutions were originally found as generalizations of the extreme Reissner-Nordstrom solution of Einstein-Maxwell theory and this leads us to ask whether the solutions have event horizons and should be considered as black holes. The story is different for different solutions but what we need to do is consider the limit $r = 0$ and understand the behavior of the metric there.

This limit of the (single center) metric (6) is

$$ds^2 = \left(\frac{r^2}{\lambda^{1/2} l_s^2} \right) dx^2 + \left(\frac{\lambda^{1/2} l_s^2}{r^2} \right) (dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_5^2) \quad (17)$$

where we have written $y^i = r \hat{y}^i$; $\hat{y}^i$ is a unit vector in R^6 parameterizing the sphere S^5 , and $d\Omega_5^2$ is the round metric on S^5 . This limit will be justified (we can drop the "1" term in (6)) when

$$r \ll R \equiv \lambda^{1/4} l_s. \quad (18)$$

The first thing to notice is that the r dependence cancels out in the S^5 metric, leaving us with a solution $M \times S^5$. Flux quantization for the five-form field strength tells us that its restriction to S^5 must also be independent of r , while the equation of motion tells us it will be a harmonic form on S^5 . The stress tensor for this special case is easily computed and is invariant under

$SO(4,1) \times SO(6)$, leading to a constant curvature solution in both S^5 and in M . The $SO(d-1,1)$ Lorentzian metric of constant negative curvature is anti-de Sitter space AdS_d and in fact admits an action of $SO(d-1,2)$, as we will see below.

Now that we have obtained $AdS_5 \times S^5$ as a near-horizon limit we can also think in five-dimensional terms, by making the Kaluza-Klein reduction of IIB supergravity on S^5 . This was worked out in detail in ^{15,16}; we summarize here.

According to the Kaluza-Klein program we must expand all the ten dimensional fields in harmonics of the isometry group $SO(6)$ of S^5 . In this way we generate an infinite number of AdS_5 fields with spins ranging from 0 to 2. Each field has a definite $SO(6)$ content. One should then solve the linearized type IIB supergravity equations for these modes to determine the mass spectrum of the physical states and their behaviour under the isometry group $SO(4,2)$ of AdS_5 . For the $AdS_5 \times S^5$ solution the analysis has been carried out in detail in ¹⁵.

An alternative route to obtain information about the spectrum is to use the supersymmetry algebra $SU(2,2|4)$ of the $AdS_5 \times S^5$ background. Let M_{AB} , $A, B = 1, 2, 3, 4$ or $0, -1$ denote the generators of its $SO(4,2)$ bosonic subgroup of isometries of AdS_5 , and let B_N^M with $1 \leq M, N = 4$ denote generators of $SU(4) \cong SO(6)$, the isometry group of S^5 . Supersymmetry generators correspond to solutions of the Killing spinor equations (which set (2) to zero). Half of these were discussed in section 2: the D3-brane solution preserves an $SO(3,1)$ subgroup of $SO(4,2)$, generated by the subset M_{ab} , $0 \leq a, b \leq 3$, and 16 real supersymmetries, a 4-plet of Weyl spinors of $SO(3,1)$ which we denote by Q^M with $M = 1, \dots, 4$ a vector of $SU(4)$.

The commutators of Q^M with $K_a = M_{a4} - M_{a,-1}$ now produce another 4-plet of Weyl spinorial charges S^M , enlarging the total number of unbroken supersymmetries to 16 complex. The set M_{AB}, B_N^M, Q^M, S^M generates $SU(2,2|4)$.^e As we commented in section 3 this symmetry group follows from combining $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetry with the enlargement $SO(4,2) \supset SO(3,1)$ and is also the superconformal symmetry of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM.

Being the symmetry group of the background manifold, the KK spectrum will be a discrete unitary (reducible) representation of $SU(2,2|4)$. We will discuss this representation theory in some detail shortly. The masses of 5-dimensional modes will be given in terms of the eigenvalues of the generator $E = M_{0,-1}$. This operator generates translations along a global timelike Killing vector field of AdS and therefore is a useful choice for the AdS energy operator.

The simplest way ^{16,17} to construct the lowest weight unitary irreducible representation (UIR) of $SU(2,2|4)$ is to introduce a set of superoscillators

^e This group has an extra $U(1)$ factor which should be factored out.¹⁷

$\xi^A = \{a^i, \alpha^\mu\}$ and $\eta^M = \{b^r, \beta^x\}$, where i, μ, r and $x = 1, 2$. They satisfy the usual algebra of the creation and annihilation operators, viz, $[a^i, a_j] = \delta_j^i$, $[b^r, b_s] = \delta_s^r$, $\{\alpha^\mu, \alpha^\nu\} = \delta_\nu^\mu$ and $\{\beta^x, \beta^y\} = \delta_y^x$. All other commutators or anticommutators are zero. Here we have denoted the hermitian conjugate of a^i by a_i , etc. The $SU(2, 2|4)$ generators are constructed as bilinears in these oscillators. For example the 16 generators B_N^M of $U(4)$ are given by $\alpha^\mu \alpha_\nu$, $\beta^x \beta_y$, $\alpha^\mu \beta^x$ and $\alpha_\mu \beta_y$.

The Fock space of the oscillators provides the vector space on which one particular class of lowest weight UIR of $SU(2, 2|4)$ are realized. These representations are called the doubleton representations, because only one pair of superoscillators are used in their construction. Furthermore, although the doubleton representations are not part of the KK spectrum of the IIB supergravity on the $AdS_5 \times S^5$ background, some of them can be given an interpretation of massless states in a conformal field theory in 4 dimensions. They are massless because the entire set of doubleton representations are in the kernel of the 4-dimensional mass operator $m^2 = P^a P_a$,¹⁷ where the momentum is defined by $P_a = M_{a,0} + M_{a,-1}$, $a = 0, 1, 2, 3$.

The simplest doubleton representation is built using the Fock vacuum $|0\rangle$ as the lowest weight vector of $SU(2, 2|4)$. It can be shown that the multiplet contains 2^4 physical states: 6 real scalars, 4 Weyl spinors and a vector potential, transforming respectively in the vector, spinor and the singlet representations of $SO(6)$. This is the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ super Yang Mills multiplet in $d = 4$.

As another example we consider the direct sum of the two doubleton representations built on the lowest weight vectors $\xi\xi|0\rangle$ and $\eta\eta|0\rangle$. The resulting states correspond to the spectrum of the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ superconformal gravity in $d = 4$. The full list of the doubleton representations have been given in¹⁷.

By taking tensor products of doubletons one builds other representations of $SU(2, 2|4)$. An equivalent way to do this is to affix an index $K = 1, \dots, p$ to the oscillators and write them as $a^i(K)$, $b^r(K)$, The commutators then become $[a^i(K), a_j(K')] = \delta_j^i \delta_{KK'}$, etc. The generators of $SU(2, 2|4)$ are again bilinear invariants of the $O(p)$ group acting on the index K . For example, the $U(4)$ generators are given by $\alpha^\mu(K) \alpha_\nu(K)$, $\beta^x(K) \beta_y(K)$, $\alpha^\mu(K) \beta^x(K)$ and $\alpha_\mu(K) \beta_y(K)$, where we sum over the repeated K label from 1 to p .

By choosing different values of p and different lowest weight spaces, one can obtain many UIRs of $SU(2, 2|4)$. Each of these will contain a finite number of UIRs of $SO(4, 2) \times SO(6)$, and each mass shell physical mode in AdS_5 will come in such a UIR. However, states in the KK spectrum of IIB supergravity on $AdS_5 \times S^5$ will correspond to using the Fock vacuum $|0\rangle$ as the lowest weight vector, and live in short multiplets of $SU(2, 2|4)$. This follows simply because KK reduction will only produce states with spins not exceeding 2.

Other choices of the lowest weight vectors such as $\xi\xi\dots\xi|0\rangle$ will produce a longer spin range and thereby also longer multiplets.^f

Restricting attention to this choice, the multiplets are conveniently characterized by their lowest weights (J_L, J_R, E) under the subgroup $SO(4) \times SO(2) \subset SO(4, 2)$. For example, for each $p > 1$, the $SO(4, 2)$ representations defined by the lowest weight vector $(1, 1, 2p + 4)$ contain all spin 2 modes in AdS_5 transforming in the representations characterized by the Dynkin label $(0, p - 2, 0)$ of $SO(6)$. The complete multiplet contains $128 \frac{p^2(p^2-1)}{12}$ fermionic and the same number of bosonic states (see Table I of¹⁶).

For $p = 2$ the spin 2 mode is the 5-dimensional graviton which is a singlet of $SO(6)$. In addition this multiplet (the massless supergraviton multiplet) contains four complex gravitini, 15 vector fields in the adjoint of $SO(6)$, plus spin zero and spin 1/2 objects for a total of $128 + 128$ physical states.

The $p > 2$ representations will correspond to the massive KK towers. In fact, the complete KK spectrum on $AdS_5 \times S^5$ is obtained by taking a single copy of each $p \geq 2$ representation. Again with each $SO(4, 2)$ lowest weight we can associate a particular mass shell mode in AdS_5 in a definite $SO(6)$ representation.

To close this section we remark that since the supersymmetries transform under $SO(6)$, so will the gravitinos. The presence of vector fields in the adjoint of $SO(6)$ thus means that the 5-dimensional theory is one of the known gauged supergravities²⁸.

6 More on AdS

The $SO(d - 1, 2)$ symmetry of AdS_d is directly analogous to the $SO(d + 1)$ action on S^d and can be realized linearly in the same way, by embedding as a surface in one higher dimension. Thus we introduce a $d + 1$ dimensional flat space with a Lorentzian metric of signature $(2, d - 1)$ and coordinates X^A , and represent AdS_d as the surface satisfying

$$X_{-1}^2 + X_0^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} X_i^2 = R^2. \quad (19)$$

with the curvature radius R given in (18). This construction also provides global coordinates on AdS_d : the relation between the D-brane coordinates (x^μ, r) and the X^A is

$$r = X_{-1} + X_4$$

^fFor $p = 2$ a complete classification of these has been given in¹⁷.

$$x^\mu = \frac{X^\mu R}{r}. \quad (20)$$

We see that the full metric is non-singular for $r > 0$. This region is behind an event horizon from the point of view of an asymptotic observer in the original D-brane metric (6).

The global structure of the AdS metric is better visualized by solving the constraint (19) in a different way (take $R = 1$):

$$\begin{aligned} X_{-1} &= \frac{\cos t}{\cos \rho} \\ X_0 &= \frac{\sin t}{\cos \rho} \\ X_i &= z_i \tan \rho \\ \sum_i z_i^2 &= 1 \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

which leads to the metric in the form

$$ds^2 = \frac{1}{\cos^2 \rho} (-dt^2 + d\rho^2) + \tan^2 \rho \, d\Omega_{d-2}^2. \quad (22)$$

These are usually called ‘global’ coordinates as they cover all of AdS as a single copy of the region $0 \leq t \leq 2\pi$, $0 \leq \rho \leq \pi/2$ and $z_i \in S^{d-2}$. (For $d = 2$ we take S^0 as the two points $z^1 = \pm 1$). Furthermore, the metric is conformally flat in the pt plane, so the causal structure is easy to understand, and is depicted in Figure 1. The shaded region is the region described in the original (‘Minkowski’) coordinates.

Note that the coordinate t is periodic and thus AdS space contains closed time-like curves. Often these are problematic and to avoid this we can work instead on the universal cover by simply ignoring the periodicity of t . If we do so, the future boundary of the shaded region is a horizon, but only because the infalling observer is forced to leave through a copy of the original asymptotic region. The physics is quite different from that of a black hole horizon.

Rather, the striking feature of AdS geometry is that the limit $r \rightarrow \infty$ (equivalently $\rho \rightarrow \pi/2$) takes us to a *time-like* boundary, with geometry (on the cover) $S^{d-2} \times \mathbf{R}$.

The presence of the timelike boundary leads to major differences with physics in Minkowski space. For one thing, we do not have a well-posed initial value problem unless we put boundary conditions there. Of course we always need boundary conditions at infinity, but for Minkowski space the boundary conditions can be decomposed into incoming and outgoing waves, leading to the usual idea of particle and S-matrix.

By contrast in AdS a small fluctuation can typically be decomposed into normalizable and nonnormalizable components; the correct way to proceed in such situations^{25,2} is to quantize the normalizable fluctuations (each such




Figure 1: Penrose diagram for AdS space-time

mode is associated with a creation and annihilation operator) while the non-normalizable modes are instead considered to be a static background. The two types of modes are distinguished by their asymptotics as $\rho \rightarrow \pi/2$ and so the background can be determined from boundary conditions at $\rho = \pi/2$ uniquely up to a choice of normalizable component.

Thus we can regard all observables in AdS_d quantum gravity as functions of a set of $d - 1$ dimensional fields, in one-to-one correspondence with non-normalizable modes and thus with fields on AdS_d .

7 The AdS/CFT correspondence

As we saw in the previous sections, superstring theory admits a class of BPS solitons – N parallel coincident D3-branes – with two very different descriptions in the near-horizon limit $r \ll R$.

On the one hand, we have the dynamics of small fluctuations of IIB supergravity around the $\text{AdS}_5 \times S^5$ background. In general this is only an approximation to IIB string theory. First of all, we need $g_s \ll 1$ to justify ignoring quantum corrections⁹ (which are ill-defined in pure supergravity). Furthermore we have stringy corrections – in an effective Lagrangian language, we know that higher order corrections exist at leading order $l_s^6 R^4$ in the pure gravity sector, and presumably at all higher orders in l_s . However when the background curvature radius $R \gg l_s$ and all energy scales of interest satisfy $El_s \ll 1$, IIB supergravity is a good approximation. Using (18) this corresponds to

$$g_s N \gg 1 \quad \text{and} \quad g_s \ll 1 \quad (23)$$

so evidently we require $N \gg 1$.

On the other hand, for $g_s N \ll 1$ we are more tempted to regard the D3-branes as a small perturbation of flat space. From this point of view the full dynamics is the open strings attached to the D3-branes, coupled to the closed strings in the bulk. If we then restrict attention to the near-horizon limit $r \ll R$, since we have $R \ll l_s$ in this regime we are in the sub-stringy regime $r \ll l_s$ and can restrict attention to the lightest open strings, in other words $N = 4$ SYM coupled to supergravity.

Actually, if $g_s N \ll 1$, this is a redundant description. As was argued in ⁶, by considering world-sheet duality as it works in the perturbative string expansion, all closed string effects, including supergravity, in this limit are actually contained in the dynamics of the open string theory. On the other

⁹ We can treat the S-dual limits $g_s \rightarrow \infty$ and so on by first applying IIB S-duality before making our analysis. We would reach the same conclusions in terms of the S-dual coupling which is going to zero.

hand, supergravity predictions will obtain large corrections due to the massive closed string modes.

The upshot of all this is that we have two descriptions of the 3-brane which appear to have non-overlapping regimes of validity.

We can now consider the question: What happens when we extrapolate this second, gauge theory description to the regime $g_s N \gg 1$? As long as we consider low energies and $r \ll l_s$, all of the conditions for the gauge theory description appear to be met. But we can also fulfill the condition for the applicability of supergravity, $R \gg l_s$. Could it be that both descriptions are simultaneously valid? If so, could it be that we can interpret the gauge theory at finite $g_s N$ as IIB string theory on AdS with the l_s corrections included?

As we saw in detail, the two descriptions have a lot in common – for example, the symmetry groups are the same. However the crucial remaining ingredient in making such a claim is that we need to argue that the description involving gauge theory coupled to supergravity is also redundant for $g_s N \gg 1$ – that the gauge theory includes all of the states of supergravity in this regime as well.

Using the operator-state correspondence of the gauge theory, we can rephrase this as follows: if there is a one-to-one correspondence between the operators of $d = 4$, $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM and the states of the $AdS_5 \times S^5$ compactification of type IIB theory (including their transformation properties under $SU(2, 2|4)$), then gauge theory must contain the states of supergravity already – we do not need to add them as separate degrees of freedom. Since the large N limit at fixed λ corresponds to weak string coupling, we expect this to work for single string states: that these are in correspondence with single trace operators in the gauge theory.

Without results for the gauge theory at large λ , we can only check this for the short multiplets, whose dimensions are unrenormalized. Happily all the states of this KK supergravity lie in short multiplets and the check for these states works^{30,1}. From the arguments above we might regard this as proof; a skeptic might reply that the one-to-one correspondence for these operators was also required by the gauge theory coupled to supergravity picture, which already required a gauge theory current to couple to each supergravity field.

We can extend the conjecture to any N and λ and in the large N limit we should make contact with the classical (genus zero) limit of the IIB theory. The (Polyakov) bosonic string action in the metric (17) is

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{1}{2\pi l_s^2} \int d^2\sigma \, g_{\mu\nu}(X) \partial X^\mu \partial X^\nu \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d^2\sigma \, \lambda^{1/2} \frac{(\partial u)^2}{u^2} + \lambda^{-1/2} u^2 (\partial x)^2 \\ &\quad + \lambda^{1/2} g_{S^5}(\hat{y}) (\partial \hat{y})^2. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

After substituting $u = r/l_s^2$, we can take the limit $l_s \rightarrow 0$, and still get a non-trivial closed string theory, whose action depends on $\lambda^{1/2}$, the curvature radius squared (of both AdS and S^5) in string units. Stringy corrections to supergravity results will be naturally computed as a series in $1/\lambda^{1/2}$. The superstring action also includes the fermions and their coupling to the background RR field. Various forms of this action have been proposed²² though as yet none have been quantized.

In a way the case for this stronger conjecture is better – we know there is more than one candidate classical theory with $SU(2,2|4)$ symmetry and this spectrum of short multiplets (indeed taking different λ produces different theories) but if we could assert that *all* such theories fall into this one parameter family the equivalence would be proven. This type of assumption underlies all duality arguments but we should recognize that except in the most intensively studied cases (e.g. supersymmetric gauge theory) it is at some level an argument from ignorance, especially because we cannot assume the theory is local in ten-dimensional space-time. Thus it is worthwhile to look for further, concrete tests of the conjecture.

For finite λ , we now have massive string states as well with masses determined by the string tension and these would correspond to gauge theory operators with dimension $\lambda^{1/2}$ ¹⁴. The simplest picture is thus that all nonchiral gauge theory operators acquire such an anomalous dimension at large λ , a prediction which remains to be tested.

A more general statement of the conjecture can be made by considering the possibility of non-trivial boundary values of the fields in AdS, as we explained in section 6. It is quite natural to associate these with non-trivial *couplings* to the corresponding operators in the gauge theory. We then can conjecture the equivalence of the complete generating functionals

$$\begin{aligned} & \int [DA, Y, \chi] e^{-\frac{N}{\lambda} S_{N=4} + \sum_i \int d^4x \hat{\phi}_i(x) O_i(x)} \\ &= \int_{\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \phi_i(x, r) \sim \hat{\phi}_i(x)} [Dg, \phi, \dots] e^{-S_{IIB}} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

in the two quantum theories. In the large N limit, the IIB side reduces to genus zero string theory which is dominated by a single “master field;” in the large λ limit this reduces to IIB supergravity. Thus any gauge theory correlation function can be computed in this limit by a corresponding computation in classical field theory. For more details on this we refer to³⁰.

Perhaps the most striking result which has been obtained in this direction is^{24,5} in which three-point functions of chiral operators are compared and found to agree at large N in the two limits of large and small λ .

8 Wilson loops

Quite a lot of work has been done on the correspondence following²⁰ and we will not even try to summarize it all here. However as of this writing it seems fair to say that while some striking agreements and no definite contradictions have been found, no convincing microscopic argument has been made for why it should work.

By a microscopic argument we mean some identification in one limit (say, perturbative gauge theory) of the degrees of freedom which control the other limit, as we have in the earlier examples of superstring duality. For example, the D0-branes of IIA superstring theory clearly become the lightest BPS states in the strong coupling limit, leading to the conjecture that this is eleven dimensional supergravity; furthermore we have a very explicit definition of the D0-branes in the weak coupling limit, which we could in principle extrapolate to define the supergravity, as in³. Making this extrapolation in practice is difficult as it seems to require understanding bound states of large numbers of D0-branes, but at least we know the bound states exist.

In the present case, the analogous object would seem to be the IIB string in the $N = 4$ gauge theory, and a convincing argument that the string is present in the gauge theory would remove any doubt. Although it has been repeatedly conjectured over the years that gauge theories contain strings in the large N limit, based on the formal correspondence we described in section 4, all attempts to make this concrete so far have run into problems.

All attempts we know about have identified the Wilson loop operators in the gauge theory as string creation operators and so we should start by making sense of this identification for $\text{AdS}_5 \times S^5$. Now a Wilson loop in gauge theory is a four-dimensional object and to formulate an operator which creates a superstring in the nine-dimensional boundary of $\text{AdS}_5 \times S^5$ we clearly need to include the operators Y^i as well. In general we also need to specify the spin state of the string and thus insert operators χ ; however this should not affect the leading results in an expansion in the inverse string tension $1/\lambda^{1/2}$, which are plausibly given just by minimizing the Nambu-Goto action in $\text{AdS}_5 \times S^5$ for a world-sheet with the specified boundary. We thus arrive (for large λ) at the conjecture²¹

$$\frac{1}{N} \langle \text{Tr} P e^{\int_L iA + \theta \cdot Y} \rangle_{g.t.} = e^{-S_{N.G.}|_{\partial\Sigma=L}}. \quad (26)$$

Let us consider a boundary at a single point in S^5 and a rectangular Wilson loop L in $\mathbf{R}^4$ with two sides at distance $\Delta X^1 = L$ extending for a time $\Delta X^0 = T$. This loop will be spanned by a world-sheet which in the large T limit will be

independent of X^0 , so the amplitude will be determined by a static potential, $\exp -TV(L, \lambda)$. The string can then be described by world-sheet coordinates $\tau = X^0$ and $\sigma = X^1$; its embedding in AdS is determined by $u(\sigma)$. The Nambu-Goto action then reduces to

$$S_{N.G.} = \lambda^{1/2} T \int d\sigma \sqrt{u^2 + \frac{1}{u^2} \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \sigma} \right)^2}. \quad (27)$$

Minimizing this action is a solvable problem²¹ and the result is

$$V \equiv \frac{\kappa(\lambda)}{L} = \frac{4\pi^2 \lambda^{1/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{4})^4 L} \quad (28)$$

Conformal invariance guaranteed that the amplitude would be a function of T/L and thus the non-trivial information is in the effective coupling $\kappa(\lambda)$.

We can compare this to the gauge theory at weak coupling, at least on a qualitative level. There the leading contribution comes from exchange of a single gluon or scalar, giving

$$\kappa = \frac{\lambda}{2\pi} + \dots \quad (29)$$

We can easily imagine a continuous, monotonic function $\kappa(\lambda)$ with these two asymptotic behaviors, giving us a consistent picture.

From the IIB string point of view, the dependence $\kappa \sim \lambda^{1/2}$ at large λ comes just because the string tension $T_s \sim 1/l_s^2$. On the other hand it is quite surprising from the gauge theory point of view, so confirming this would provide strong new evidence for the conjectured string. However, no effective techniques for this gauge theory computation exist at present.

A natural starting point which takes the large N limit but keeps λ finite is the “loop equation” approach, first formulated for pure YM theory by Migdal and Makeenko²³. Let

$$W(L) \equiv P e^{i \int_L A} \quad (30)$$

so that the complete set of Wilson loop operators is $\text{Tr} W(L)$ for all loops L starting and ending at a point x . (This is in pure gauge theory; adding the additional fields of SYM and including loops such as (26) is easy at this formal level.)

The starting point is the Schwinger-Dyson equations,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int [DA] \text{Tr} \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta A_\mu(x)} W(L) \right) e^{-\frac{N}{\lambda} \text{Tr} F^2} \\ &= \langle \sum_{L_1 L_2 = L} \text{Tr} W(L_1) \text{Tr} W(L_2) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$- \frac{N}{\lambda} \langle \text{Tr} W (\nabla^\nu F_{\mu\nu} W(L)) \rangle. \quad (31)$$

Using techniques described in ²³, the second term can be rewritten as a “differential operator on loop space”, a difference of $W(L')$ and $W(L)$ where L' is obtained from L by adding infinitesimal pieces of loop at x . The large N limit is then taken by using (16) on the first term and keeping only the $O(N^2)$ part. The final result is a closed equation for the $O(N)$ expectation values of all Wilson loops (or “master field”),

$$\langle \text{Tr} W(L') \rangle - \langle \text{Tr} W(L) \rangle = \lambda \sum \langle \text{Tr} W(L_1) \rangle \langle \text{Tr} W(L_2) \rangle. \quad (32)$$

Setting the left hand side to zero would just be the classical equation of motion; if L intersects itself at the point x we also obtain a quantum source term which is a sum over all ways of intercommuting the loop L at x .

All this is precise for a regulated gauge theory and one can argue that area law is a natural ansatz which solves it (this sounds good for pure YM); furthermore one can reproduce conventional weak coupling perturbation theory by expanding the $W(L)$ ’s in powers of the fields. However its non-linearity makes direct contact with string theory – e.g. checking whether a concrete first quantized string wave functional $\psi[X(\sigma)]$ is a solution – quite difficult.

Furthermore we know no regulated form of pure $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM which preserves the supersymmetry, so using this probably requires postulating a renormalized form of the equation. In addition we run into all of the old problems of QCD string ¹¹ such as the great difference between a loop functional $W[L]$ of continuous loops L , and all known superstring loop functionals $\psi[X(\sigma)]$ which have support on *discontinuous* loops.

Nevertheless, now that we have a precise and better motivated conjecture for the appropriate string in this case, we can hope that progress along these lines will be made in the near future.

References

1. L. Andrianopoli and S. Ferrara, Phys. Lett. B430 (1998) 248; hep-th/9803171.
2. V. Balasubramanian, P. Kraus and A. Lawrence, hep-th/9805171.
3. T. Banks, W. Fischler, S. H. Shenker, L. Susskind, hep-th/9610043.
4. S. Coleman, “ $1/N$,” 1979 Erice lecture, reprinted in *Aspects of Symmetry*.
5. E. D’Hoker, D. Z. Freedman and W. Skiba, hep-th/9807098.
6. M. R. Douglas, D. Kabat, P. Pouliot and S. H. Shenker, Nucl.Phys. B485 (1997) 85; hep-th/9608024.

7. M. R. Douglas, J. Polchinski and A. Strominger, JHEP 9712 (1997) 003; hep-th/9703031.
8. M. R. Douglas and S. H. Shenker, Nucl.Phys. B447 (1995) 271; hep-th/9503163.
9. M. R. Douglas, “Large N Gauge Theory – Expansions and Transitions,” in Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 41 (1995) 66; hep-th/9409098.
10. M. J. Duff, B. E. W. Nilsson and C. N. Pope, Phys. Rept. 130 (1986) 1-142.
11. *Gauge Fields and Strings*, A. M. Polyakov, Harwood 1987. Let us also mention “Some comments on QCD string” by M. R. Douglas, pp. 205–213 in the Proceedings of Strings ’93, World Scientific, hep-th/9401073; and P. Horava, hep-th/9811028.
12. G. W. Gibbons, Nucl. Phys. B207 (1982) 337; R. Kallosh and A. Peet, Phys. Rev. D46 (1992) 5223; hep-th/9209116.
13. P. Ginsparg and G. Moore, 1992 TASI Lectures, hep-th/9304011.
14. S. Gubser, I. Klebanov and A. Peet, Phys. Rev. D54 (1996) 3915; hep-th/9602135.
15. H. J. Kim, L. J. Romans and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. D32 (1985) 389.
16. M. Gunaydin and N. Marcus, Class. and Quantum Gravity, 2 (1985) L11
17. M. Gunaydin, D. Minic and M. Zagermann, hep-th/9806042 and hep-th/9810226.
18. M. Li, hep-th/9807196.
19. J. Maldacena, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 68 (1998) 17; hep-th/9709099.
20. J. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 2 (1998) 231; hep-th/9711200.
21. J. Maldacena, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1998) 4859; hep-th/9803002.
22. R. R. Metsaev and A. A. Tseytlin, hep-th/9806095; R. Kallosh and A. A. Tseytlin, hep-th/9808088.
23. A. A. Migdal, Phys. Rept. 102 (1983) 199-290.
24. S. Lee, S. Minwalla, M. Rangamani and N. Seiberg, hep-th/9806074.
25. N. Seiberg and S. Shenker, Phys. Rev. D45 (1992) 4581.
26. A. Strominger and C. Vafa, Phys. Lett. B379 (1996) 99, hep-th/9601029.
27. *Superspace*, S. J. Gates et. al., Benjamin/Cummings 1983.
28. *Supergravities in Diverse Dimensions*, eds. A. Salam and E. Sezgin, World Scientific 1989.
29. *Superstring Theory*, M. B. Green et. al., Cambridge Univ. Press 1987.
30. E. Witten, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 2 (1998) 253; hep-th/9802150.