

# One loop scattering on D-branes

I.Y. Park

*Department of Chemistry and Physics, University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff  
Pine Bluff, AR 71601, USA  
inyongpark05@gmail.com*

## Abstract

We analyze one loop scattering amplitudes of the massless states on a stack of D3-branes. We use the vertex operators that have been obtained in the direct open string analysis developed in arXiv:0708.3452. The method does not have the obstacle of the D9 computation which is associated with the appearance of an  $\epsilon$ -tensor. The divergence structure is not the same as the D9 brane case. What makes the analysis deviate from the D9 brane case is that the momenta of the states have non-zero components only along the brane directions. We ponder on the possibility that the one-loop divergence may be canceled by adding additional vertex operators at the tree level. We anticipate that they will be “exponentiated” to the free string action, with the resulting action to constitute a non-linear sigma model of the D-brane/AdS geometry.

# 1 Introduction

An open string is an interesting object for its end points among other things. They are the places where the gauge symmetry is carried through Chan-Paton factors. They have a potential of sticking together thereby converting the original open string into a closed string. More recently it has been understood that they may be attached on a hyper-plane, a D-brane [1]. With its end points attached the open string itself will move on the D brane and may scatter when it comes across with another open string. Because of this it has to be a due course of study to analyze various scattering amplitudes on a stack of Dp branes, especially with  $p < 9$ . A certain pieces of information on the amplitudes may be obtained by applying T-duality to the results for the D9 brane. However the range of the information obtained in that manner is limited: many additional pieces could be obtained by directly considering an open string on lower dimensional D-branes. Furthermore a whole new picture seems to be emerging, as we propose below, on how a geometry arises as a way to cope with the open string loop divergences, which does *not* have an analogue in the D9 brane physics. The picture has implications to the open-closed string type dualities, the matrix theory conjectures and AdS/CFT conjecture. Also it will eventually suggest a new scheme for the unification of gauge theory and gravity.

The scattering physics on D-branes will obviously be relevant for AdS/CFT correspondence and its generalization, which is in fact the main motivation of the work. Although the methodology of the present paper is general we will consider the D3 brane case to be specific. In the stronger version of the AdS/CFT conjecture it is stated that the  $D = 4$   $\mathcal{N} = 4$  SYM theory is fully equivalent, without<sup>1</sup> taking any limit such as the large N limit, to the closed string theory on  $AdS_5 \times S^5$ . A low energy limit of an open string is  $D = 4$   $\mathcal{N} = 4$  SYM: a SYM theory result should be acquired by taking a small  $\alpha'$  limit of the corresponding open string computation. In light of the conjecture what it means is that the massive open string modes do not play a role in producing the same results of the dual closed string theory. This should be so in spite of the fact that they are a natural (i.e., stringy) extension of the SYM. During past few years evidence along this line has been collected. However the conjecture still remains as a conjecture. Furthermore there have been attempts to deduce or derive the conjecture which only pointed or led toward the weaker form of the conjecture, but not necessary toward the stronger form [2, 3]. (See [4] also.) Therefore we believe it is of prime importance to understand whether (and if so how) the full open stringy analysis figures into the picture.

For that purpose it may be useful to consider scattering of open strings on a stack of D3-branes. The first task will be construction of vertex operators on D3-branes.

---

<sup>1</sup>This would really be the strongest version.

In [5] massless vertex operators have been constructed and their tree level scattering has been analyzed. One of the reasons why such an independent analysis is necessary rather than relying on T-duality of the D9 physics is the non-commutativity of the quantum corrections and T duality (or dimensional reduction). In other words the 1PI effective action that is obtained by T-dualizing the D9 quantum action will be different from the one that is obtained by starting with the four dimensional classical action and adding the quantum corrections. We believe that the correct approach to obtain the D3 brane effective action is the latter. One could see the same issue from the world-sheet perspective. When computing the one loop correction one takes the trace over the momentum,  $\int d^D p \langle p | (\dots) | p \rangle$ . In the D9 case one takes  $D = 10$ . However for the D3 case one should take  $D = 4$ . This makes a difference in the divergence behavior of the one loop. In the D9 case renormalization of the string tension is sufficient to absorb the divergence. As we will see below additional counter terms (presumably infinitely many of them) may be required in the case of D3-branes.

The origin of the difference between the D9- and D3- analyses is that the transverse momentum components are zero for the D3-brane case [5]. We extend the study to one loop and in particular consider four point scattering amplitudes as shown in the figure below. The outer boundary of the annulus is attached to the D3 branes as a result of the Dirichlet boundary condition of an open string. The inner boundary “bulges out” to the transverse space. Since the momentum of the all four open string states are along the longitudinal direction [5] it is natural to believe that inner boundary should represent the closed string “propagating” into the transverse space *but with zero momentum*. Put another way the closed string should be *non-propagating*. In this setting, therefore, the status of a closed string is very different from that of an open string. In terms of the low energy field theory it would mean that the closed string will appear as an insertion of some composite operators whereas an open string will be propagating, fundamental degrees of freedom. Since an insertion of a closed string vertex operator is associated, according to the common lore, with change in the metric it is likely that the effect of the loop is to deform the metric. To what metric will it deform? The only natural candidate for the deformed metric is the supergravity metric solution for a stack of D3 branes or  $\text{AdS}^5 \times \text{S}^5$  when the number of the branes is large.

The amplitude computations will be performed in an operator formulation. However, it is not the same as the one in [6]: instead treating the first state and the last state as a bra-state and a ket-state we put all vertex operators on an equal footing. We insert the vertex operators constructed in [5]. What we found as a pleasant surprise is that the present formulation seems to be free of the well-known limitation of the light-cone gauge for D9 brane that is associated with setting  $k^\pm = 0$  for simplicity. With  $k^\pm = 0$  one can not compute M-point amplitudes with  $M > 6$ . The reason is the appearance of the  $\epsilon$ -tensor with eight indices, which is not clear how to covariantize. As a matter of fact one should prove that such terms are absent as a separate task.




Figure 1: One loop four point open string scattering on a stack of D3 branes

What saves the case of D3 brane (or for that matter other cases of  $D_p$ -branes with low enough  $p$ ) from similar difficulty is that now the momenta have only two non-zero components therefore making the  $\epsilon$ -tensor term vanish. Treating all the operators on equal footing the method has more direct link to the path integral approach.<sup>2</sup>

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We start in sec2 with a brief review of necessary ingredients. For review of string theory in general see [6, 7, 1]. To check the validity of the operator formulation with all operators on equal footing we compute various three- and four- point amplitudes at the tree level. Throughout the computations we use dimensional regularization. In sec3 we consider one loop four point amplitudes and work out the divergence structure. The analysis goes differently from

---

<sup>2</sup>The path integral that we are referring to is not that of [6] but will be a hybrid approach of [6] and [1]. The path integral approach of [6] is rather unwieldy in the sense that they rely on the oscillator wave functions. The wave functions, especially the fermionic ones, seems to be complicated. Here we use the “conventional” vertex operators, i.e., the ones constructed [5]. They are the vertex operators in the Green-Schwarz formulation for the states on D3 branes.

that of the D9 brane: it is not connected to the D9 result via T-duality. This is due to the fact that the momenta of the states are only along the D-branes but not along the transverse directions. Motivated by a physical picture we propose a mechanism of divergence cancelation by inserting additional vertex operators. We make a schematic analysis for a quartic vertex operator for an illustration that it produces terms with the correct pole structure. More complete study with inclusion of a complete set of the vertex operators will be given elsewhere. We also discuss how the geometry might arise in this setting. We put forward a coherent way to view AdS/CFT and similar type dualities assuming the validity of the proposed picture. We conclude with discussions of a few other issues and future directions.

## 2 Computations with operators on equal footing

We start by making a short review of necessary ingredients. The Green-Schwarz action in the light-cone gauge is,

$$\begin{aligned} S &= -\frac{1}{2} \int (T \partial_\alpha X^i \partial^\alpha X^i - \frac{i}{\pi} \bar{S}^a \rho^\alpha \partial_\alpha S^a) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int (\partial_\alpha X^i \partial^\alpha X^i - i \bar{S}^a \rho^\alpha \partial_\alpha S^a) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $T = \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}$  and  $S = (S^1, S^2)$ . In the construction of the D3 vertex operators [5] only  $S^1$  was used at the end. An M-point amplitude in general is given by

$$A_M = \int d\mu \langle \prod_{i=1}^M V(k_i) \rangle \quad (2)$$

The measure  $d\mu$  is given by

$$d\mu = |(x_1 - x_2)(x_1 - x_M)(x_2 - x_M)| \int dx_3 \dots dx_{M-1} \prod_1^{M-1} \theta(x_r - x_{r+1}) \quad (3)$$

The vertex operators for the massless states have been obtained : we quote them here for convenience. There are two multiplets, the vector multiplet and the scalar multiplet. We refer to [5] for the notations and conventions. Defining  $k^i = (k^u, 0)$ ,  $\zeta^i = (\zeta^u, 0)$  the vector multiplet is

$$\begin{aligned} V_{B_g}(\zeta, k) &= (\zeta^u B_g^u - \zeta^- B_g^+) e^{ik \cdot X} \\ V_{F_g}(u, k) &= (u^a E_- F_g^a + u^{\dot{a}} E_+ F_g^{\dot{a}}) e^{ik \cdot X} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where

$$B_g^+ = p^+$$

$$\begin{aligned}
B_g^u &= (\dot{X}^u - R_g^{uj} k^j) \\
F_g^{\dot{a}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2p^+}} [((\gamma^u)^T \dot{X}^u S_1)^{\dot{a}} - ((\gamma^m)^T X^{m'} S_1)^{\dot{a}} + \frac{1}{3} : ((\gamma^i)^T S_1)^{\dot{a}} R_g^{ij} : k^j] \\
F_g^a &= \sqrt{\frac{p^+}{2}} S_1^a
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

For the scalar multiplet, we define  $k^i = (k^u, 0)$ ,  $\xi^i = (0, \xi^m)$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{B_s}(\xi, k) &= \xi \cdot B_s e^{ik \cdot X} = (\xi^m B_s^m) e^{ik \cdot X} \\
V_{F_s}(w, k) &= w F_s e^{ik \cdot X} = (w^a E_- F_s^a + w^{\dot{a}} E_+ F_s^{\dot{a}}) e^{ik \cdot X}
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
B_s^m &= (X'^m + R_s^{mj} k^j) \\
F_s^{\dot{a}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2p^+}} [((\gamma^u)^T \dot{X}^u S_1)^{\dot{a}} - ((\gamma^m)^T X^{m'} S_1)^{\dot{a}} - \frac{1}{3} : ((\gamma^i)^T S_1)^{\dot{a}} R_s^{ij} : k^j] \\
F_s^a &= -\sqrt{\frac{p^+}{2}} S_1^a
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where  $R_s^{ij} = \frac{1}{4} S_1 \gamma^{ij} S_1 = R_g^{ij}$ . The bosonic and the fermionic propagators are respectively

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle X^\mu X^\nu \rangle &= -2\alpha' \eta^{\mu\nu} \ln|x - x'| \\
\langle S_1^{a_1} S_1^{a_2} \rangle &= \frac{\delta^{a_1 a_2}}{x_1 - x_2}
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

## 2.1 three-point amplitudes

As warm-up exercises let's compute three point amplitudes. Let's define

$$I \equiv \langle \prod_{i=1}^M V(k_i) \rangle \tag{9}$$

The vector three point function is expressed as.

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{AAA} &= \langle \prod_{i=1}^3 (\zeta^{u_i} \dot{X}^{u_i} - \zeta^{u_i} R^{u_i v_i} k^{v_i}) e^{ik_i \cdot X} \rangle \\
&= \zeta^1 \zeta^2 \zeta^3 \langle (\dot{X}^{u_1} - R^{u_1 v_1} k^{v_1})(\dot{X}^{u_2} - R^{u_2 v_2} k^{v_2})(\dot{X}^{u_3} - R^{u_3 v_3} k^{v_3}) \rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

One can compute it using the standard Wick contractin method. We present some details for an illustration. There are four types of terms:  $\dot{X}\dot{X}\dot{X}$ ,  $\dot{X}\dot{X}R$ ,  $\dot{X}RR$  and  $RRR$ . The second type of terms do not contribute in the dimensional regularization. After

taking the measure  $d\mu$  into account and setting  $x_1 = \infty, x_2 = 1, x_3 = 0$  the  $\dot{X}\dot{X}\dot{X}$ -term is

$$\begin{aligned} & \zeta_1^{u_1} \zeta_2^{u_2} \zeta_3^{u_3} |x_1 - x_2| |x_1 - x_3| |x_2 - x_3| < \dot{X}(x_1) \dot{X}(x_2) \dot{X}(x_3) > \\ = & (\zeta^1 \cdot k^2 \zeta^2 \cdot \zeta^3 + \zeta^3 \cdot k^1 \zeta^1 \cdot \zeta^2 + \zeta^2 \cdot k^3 \zeta^1 \cdot \zeta^3) - \zeta^1 \cdot k^3 \zeta^2 \cdot k^1 \zeta^3 \cdot k^2 \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the Wick rot,

$$x^0 = t \rightarrow -it, \quad \dot{X} \rightarrow i\dot{X} \quad (11)$$

The XRR terms yield

$$\begin{aligned} & \zeta_1^{u_1} \zeta_2^{u_2} \zeta_3^{u_3} |x_1 - x_2| |x_1 - x_3| |x_2 - x_3| \\ & < \dot{X}^{u_1} R^{u_2 v_2} k_2^{v_2} R^{u_3 v_3} k_3^{v_3} + \dot{X}^{u_2} R^{u_1 v_1} k_1^{v_1} R^{u_3 v_3} k_3^{v_3} + \dot{X}^{u_3} R^{u_1 v_1} k_1^{v_1} R^{u_2 v_2} k_2^{v_2} > \\ = & 3 \zeta^1 \cdot k^3 \zeta^2 \cdot k^1 \zeta^3 \cdot k^2 \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where  $\alpha' = 1/2$  has been used in the final line. For this computation and the ones that follow it is useful to note that

$$< R^{u_1 v_1} R^{u_2 v_2} > = -\frac{(\delta_{u_1 u_2} \delta_{v_1 v_2} - \delta_{u_1 v_2} \delta_{u_2 v_1})}{(x_1 - x_2)^2} \quad (13)$$

For the RRR-term one gets

$$\begin{aligned} & -\zeta_1^{u_1} \zeta_2^{u_2} \zeta_3^{u_3} |x_1 - x_2| |x_1 - x_3| |x_2 - x_3| < R^{u_1 v_1} k_1^{v_1} R^{u_2 v_2} k_2^{v_2} R^{u_3 v_3} k_3^{v_3} > \\ = & -2 \zeta^1 \cdot k^3 \zeta^2 \cdot k^1 \zeta^3 \cdot k^2 \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Summing all the pieces up one gets

$$A_{AAA} = (\zeta^1 \cdot k^2 \zeta^2 \cdot \zeta^3 + \zeta^3 \cdot k^1 \zeta^1 \cdot \zeta^2 + \zeta^2 \cdot k^3 \zeta^1 \cdot \zeta^3) \quad (15)$$

Similarly one gets for the vector-scalar-scalar amplitude

$$\begin{aligned} A_{A\phi A} &= \xi^1 \zeta^2 \xi^3 < (X^{m_1} + R^{m_1 v_1} k_1^{v_1})(\dot{X}^{u_2} - R^{u_2 v_2} k_2^{v_2})(X^{m_3} + R^{m_3 v_3} k_3^{v_3}) > \\ &= \xi^1 \cdot \xi^3 \zeta^2 \cdot k^3 \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Both of the results match the ones that are obtained by applying T-duality to the D9 case. The amplitudes that involve fermionic vertex operators are more subtle. We illustrate the point with the vector-fermion-fermion amplitude. It turns out that the following amplitude vanishes,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{A\psi\psi} &= < (\zeta^{u_1} \dot{X}^{u_2} - \zeta^{u_1} R^{u_1 v_1} k_1^{v_1})(u_2^a E_- F^a + u_2^{\dot{a}} E_+ F^{\dot{a}})(u_3^a E_- F^a + u_3^{\dot{a}} E_+ F^{\dot{a}}) > \\ &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Which is true for the conventional operator method [6] as well. Many of the terms vanish due to the identity  $E_+E_- = 0$ . Let's consider the amplitude with the projection operators in the last fermion flipped. After some algebra one gets

$$\begin{aligned} A_{A\psi\psi} &= \langle (\zeta^{u_1} \dot{X}^{u_2} - \zeta^{u_1} R^{u_1 v_1} k_1^{v_1})(u_2^a E_- F^a + u_2^{\dot{a}} E_+ F^{\dot{a}})(u_3^a E_+ F^a + u_3^{\dot{a}} E_- F^{\dot{a}}) \rangle \\ &= - \left[ \frac{1}{2} u_2^a \gamma \cdot \zeta_1 E_+ u_3^{\dot{a}} + \frac{1}{2} u_2^{\dot{a}} \gamma^T \cdot \zeta_1 E_- u_3^a \right] \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

In the conventional operator method also, the projection operator of the last state should be flipped to get a non-vanishing result: one gets

$$\begin{aligned} A_{A\psi\psi} &= \langle \zeta_1, k_1 | (u_2^a E_- F^a + u_2^{\dot{a}} E_+ F^{\dot{a}}) | E_+ u_3, k_3 \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} u_2^a \gamma \cdot \zeta_1 E_+ u_3^{\dot{a}} + \frac{1}{2} u_2^{\dot{a}} \gamma^T \cdot \zeta_1 E_- u_3^a \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The extra minus sign should be due to the fact that the Wick rotation convention for the present formulation is opposite to that of [6].

## 2.2 four point amplitudes

We turn to the various four point amplitudes. Recall the limitation of setting  $k^\pm = 0$  in the operator formulation of a D9 brane [6, 7]. It does not allow one to compute M-point amplitude with  $M > 6$ : with  $M > 6$  one encounters an  $\epsilon$ -tensor with 8 indices and it is not clear how to covariantize the result. A pleasant surprise is that the limitation is absent in the the current formulation of a D3 brane where the  $\epsilon$ -tensor appears in the four point amplitude already. Basically the reason is that the present approach treats the first state and the final state on equal footing with all the other states, whereas in the operator method they appear as a bra and ket respectively. Therefore one expects to face the  $\epsilon^{(8)}$  issue already at a four point level. What saves the formulation is that with the D3 brane the  $\epsilon$ -term vanishes due to the fact that the momenta only have two non-zero components which are in the brane directions. Through several examples below we again will demonstrate that the present formulation yields the same results as the conventional operator method.

Let's consider four point amplitudes in the order of increasing complexity. The simplest is the four scalar amplitude.

$$I_{\phi\phi\phi\phi} = \langle \prod_{i=1}^4 (\xi^{m_i} X^{m_i} + \xi^{m_i} R^{m_i v_i} k^{v_i}) e^{ik_i \cdot X} \rangle \quad (20)$$

There are six different types of terms:  $\dot{X}\dot{X}\dot{X}\dot{X}$ ,  $\dot{X}\dot{X}\dot{X}R$ ,  $\dot{X}\dot{X}RR$ ,  $\dot{X}RRR$  and  $RRRR$ . In the dimensional regularization the second type of terms vanish. The result is precisely the same as the result of the operator formulation [5]. Omitting the factor



$\frac{g^2}{2}\alpha'^2 \text{Tr}(\lambda^a \lambda^b \lambda^c \lambda^d) \frac{\Gamma(-s/2)\Gamma(-t/2)}{\Gamma(1-s/2-t/2)}$  one gets

$$A_{\phi\phi\phi\phi} = \frac{1}{4} (su \xi_1 \cdot \xi_4 \xi_2 \cdot \xi_3 + tu \xi_1 \cdot \xi_2 \xi_3 \cdot \xi_4 + st \xi_2 \cdot \xi_4 \xi_1 \cdot \xi_3) \quad (21)$$

Many terms that would be otherwise present vanish due to the fact that  $\xi \cdot k = 0$ . It is more involved to compute the two vector and two scalar scattering amplitude. We illustrate this with

$$I_{\phi AA\phi} = \langle \prod_{i=1,4} (\xi^{m_i} X^{m_i} + \xi^{m_i} R^{m_i v_i} k^{v_i}) e^{ik_i \cdot X} \prod_{i=2}^3 (\zeta^{u_i} \dot{X}^{u_i} - \zeta^{u_i} R^{u_i v_i} k^{v_i}) e^{ik_i \cdot X} \rangle \quad (22)$$

The corresponding operator result in the conventional formulation, apart from  $\frac{g^2}{2}\text{tr}(\lambda^a \lambda^b \lambda^c \lambda^d)$ , is [5]

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle k^1, \xi^1 | V_g(k^2, \zeta^2) V_g(k^3, \zeta^3) | k^4, \xi^4 \rangle \\ &= \xi^1 \xi^4 \left[ \frac{1}{4} su \zeta^2 \cdot \zeta^3 - \frac{1}{2} (u \zeta^2 \cdot k^1 \zeta^3 \cdot k^4 + s \zeta^2 \cdot k^4 \zeta^3 \cdot k^1) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where we have omitted the factor  $\frac{\Gamma(-\alpha's)\Gamma(-\alpha't)}{\Gamma(1-\alpha's-\alpha't)}$ . We break the computation of (22) into pieces. First we check the coefficient of  $\xi^1 \cdot \xi^4 \zeta^2 \cdot \zeta^3$  term, and subsequently the remaining terms. In all the following computations we omit the common factor  $\frac{\Gamma(-\alpha's)\Gamma(-\alpha't)}{\Gamma(1-\alpha's-\alpha't)}$ . There are three contributions:

$$\begin{aligned} XXXX &\Rightarrow \frac{su/4}{1+t/2} \\ XXRR &\Rightarrow t \frac{su/4}{1+t/2} \\ RRRR &\Rightarrow \frac{t^2}{4} \frac{su/4}{1+t/2} - \frac{1}{8} stu \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

They add up to yield

$$\frac{1}{4} su$$

which is indeed the correct coefficient. The results for the remaining terms can be similarly summarized. Unlike above the  $XXXX$ -terms contribute. One can work them out explicitly using the identities given in the appendix. The result is

$$\begin{aligned} XXXX &\Rightarrow -\frac{1}{2} \left( u \zeta^2 \cdot k^1 \zeta^3 \cdot k^4 + s \zeta^2 \cdot k^4 \zeta^3 \cdot k^1 + \frac{su/2}{1+t/2} \zeta^2 \cdot k^3 \zeta^3 \cdot k^2 \right) \\ XXRR &\Rightarrow \frac{su/4}{1+t/2} \zeta^2 \cdot k^3 \zeta^3 \cdot k^2 - \frac{t}{2} \frac{su/4}{1+t/2} \zeta^2 \cdot k^3 \zeta^3 \cdot k^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4} \left( t^2 \zeta^2 \cdot k^4 \zeta^3 \cdot k^4 - tu \zeta^2 \cdot k^3 \zeta^3 \cdot k^4 - ts \zeta^2 \cdot k^4 \zeta^3 \cdot k^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
XRRR &\Rightarrow \left( \frac{1}{4}u^2 \zeta_2 \cdot k_3 \zeta_3 \cdot k_4 - \frac{1}{4}su \zeta^2 \cdot k^3 \zeta^3 \cdot k^1 - \frac{1}{4}tu \zeta^2 \cdot k^4 \zeta^3 \cdot k^4 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{4}ts \zeta^2 \cdot k^4 \zeta^3 \cdot k^1 + \frac{1}{4}s^2 \zeta^2 \cdot k^4 \zeta^3 \cdot k^2 - \frac{1}{4}su \zeta^2 \cdot k^1 \zeta^3 \cdot k^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{4}ts \zeta^2 \cdot k^4 \zeta^3 \cdot k^4 + \frac{1}{4}tu \zeta^2 \cdot k^1 \zeta^3 \cdot k^4 \right) \\
RRRR &\Rightarrow \frac{t}{2} \frac{su/4}{1+t/2} \zeta^2 \cdot k^3 ; \zeta^3 \cdot k^2 - \frac{1}{2} su \zeta^2 \cdot k^3 \zeta^3 \cdot k^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{4}(st \zeta^2 \cdot k^4 \zeta^3 \cdot k^1 + tu \zeta^2 \cdot k^1 \zeta^3 \cdot k^4)
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where we have omitted the common factor  $\xi^1 \cdot \xi^4$ . Adding all four contributions one reproduces the last two terms of (23),

$$-\frac{1}{2} \left( u \zeta^2 \cdot k^1 \zeta^3 \cdot k^4 + s \zeta^2 \cdot k^4 \zeta^3 \cdot k^1 \right) \tag{26}$$

Note that  $XXXX, XXRR, XRRR, RRRR$  terms individually produce terms of the type  $\xi \cdot k \xi \cdot k \zeta \cdot k \zeta \cdot k$  which is zero since  $\xi \cdot k = 0$ . This completes the discussion of the two scalar and two vector amplitude.

$$I_{4v} = \langle \prod_{i=1}^4 (\zeta^{u_i} \dot{X}^{u_i} - \zeta^{u_i} R^{u_i v_i} k^{v_i}) e^{ik_i \cdot X} \rangle \tag{27}$$

goes parallel although more involved. There are four different kinds of terms as before. The computation of  $\zeta \cdot \zeta \zeta \cdot \zeta$ -type of terms is similar to those of above. Let's consider the terms of the form  $\zeta \cdot k \zeta \cdot k \zeta \cdot \zeta$ . To be specific we take the example of  $\zeta_1 \cdot \zeta_2$ . The results can be summarized as

$$\begin{aligned}
XXXX &\Rightarrow -\alpha' (u \zeta_3 \cdot k_2 \zeta_4 \cdot k_1 + t \zeta_3 \cdot k_1 \zeta_4 \cdot k_2) - \frac{\alpha' t \alpha' u}{1 + \alpha' s} \zeta_3 \cdot k_4 \zeta_4 \cdot k_3 \\
XXRR &\Rightarrow \frac{\alpha' t \alpha' u}{1 + \alpha' s} \zeta_3 \cdot k_4 \zeta_4 \cdot k_3 \\
&\quad - \left( \frac{1}{4} s^2 \zeta_3 \cdot k_2 \zeta_4 \cdot k_2 - \frac{1}{4} su \zeta_3 \cdot k_2 \zeta_4 \cdot k_3 - \frac{1}{4} st \zeta_3 \cdot k_4 \zeta_4 \cdot k_2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{s}{2} \frac{\alpha' t \alpha' u}{1 + \alpha' s} \zeta_3 \cdot k_4 \zeta_4 \cdot k_3 \right) \\
XRRR &\Rightarrow \left( -\frac{1}{4} st \zeta_3 \cdot k_2 \zeta_4 \cdot k_2 + \frac{1}{4} su \zeta_3 \cdot k_2 \zeta_4 \cdot k_1 + \frac{1}{4} t^2 \zeta_3 \cdot k_4 \zeta_4 \cdot k_2 - \frac{1}{4} tu \zeta_3 \cdot k_4 \zeta_4 \cdot k_1 \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{4} us \zeta_3 \cdot k_2 \zeta_4 \cdot k_2 + \frac{1}{4} ts \zeta_3 \cdot k_1 \zeta_4 \cdot k_2 + \frac{1}{4} u^2 \zeta_3 \cdot k_2 \zeta_4 \cdot k_3 - \frac{1}{4} tu \zeta_3 \cdot k_1 \zeta_4 \cdot k_3 \right) \\
RRRR &\Rightarrow \frac{s}{2} \frac{\alpha' t \alpha' u}{1 + \alpha' s} \zeta_3 \cdot k_4 \zeta_4 \cdot k_3 - \frac{1}{2} tu \zeta^3 \cdot k^4 \zeta^4 \cdot k^3 \\
&\quad - \left( \frac{1}{4} su \zeta_3 \cdot k_2 \zeta_4 \cdot k_1 + \frac{1}{4} st \zeta_3 \cdot k_1 \zeta_4 \cdot k_2 \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\quad - \left( \frac{1}{4} su \zeta_3 \cdot k_2 \zeta_4 \cdot k_1 + \frac{1}{4} st \zeta_3 \cdot k_1 \zeta_4 \cdot k_2 \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Adding all four contributions one gets as the coefficient of  $\zeta^1 \cdot \zeta^2$

$$-\frac{1}{2}(u \zeta_3 \cdot k_2 \zeta_4 \cdot k_1 + t \zeta_3 \cdot k_1 \zeta_4 \cdot k_2) + \frac{1}{8}tu \zeta_3 \cdot k_4 \zeta_4 \cdot k_3 \quad (30)$$

It is precisely the same result as the one obtained in the conventional operator method. Finally one can show that the terms of the type  $\zeta \cdot k \zeta \cdot k \zeta \cdot k \zeta \cdot k$  completely cancel among themselves, confirming the conventional operator result that those type of terms are absent.

### 3 Analysis of one loop divergence

The above method should be applicable to one loop computations. However we will not pursue it here. Rather we use the conventional operator method [6, 7], which is simpler, to find various one loop amplitudes. The divergence structure is different from that of the D9. As has been emphasized previously it is due to the fact that the Fock space momentum takes the non-zero values only in the brane directions. After obtaining the one loop amplitudes we ponder on how to remove the divergence. We will carry out some preliminary check to see whether it is possible to remove it by adding counter terms in the action, such as quartic  $X$ -terms, and evaluating their contributions at the tree level. For that we again will turn to the present operator method. We make a conjecture on how the counter-terms may be connected to the geometry.

#### 3.1 one loop divergence

In the operator method of [6, 7], the one loop divergence can easily be computed in analogy with the D9 brane case. The only difference occurs in the bosonic zero modes, i.e., the momentum, when one takes the trace. However the difference, although looking minor, is crucial since it is what makes the factor of  $(\ln w)$  below different from the D9 case, which in turn changes the pole structure. The divergence cancellation mechanism through an introduction of geometry which we propose below hinges on this difference.

In close analogy with the D9 brane computation one can show that a one-loop four point amplitude of the massless states in general is given by

$$A(1, 2, 3, 4) = g^4 G K \int \frac{dw}{w} \int \left( \prod_{r=1}^3 \frac{d\rho_r}{\rho_r} \right) \left( \frac{-2\pi}{\ln w} \right)^2 \prod_{r < s} (\psi_{rs})^{k_r \cdot k_s} \quad (31)$$

where  $G$  is the group theory factor

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Tr}(\lambda^a \lambda^b \lambda^c \lambda^d) + \text{Tr}(\lambda^a \lambda^d \lambda^c \lambda^b) + \text{Tr}(\lambda^a \lambda^c \lambda^b \lambda^d) \\ + & \text{Tr}(\lambda^a \lambda^d \lambda^b \lambda^c) + \text{Tr}(\lambda^a \lambda^b \lambda^d \lambda^c) + \text{Tr}(\lambda^a \lambda^c \lambda^d \lambda^b) \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

The factor  $K$  is a kinematic factor and depends on the states under consideration. For the four vector amplitude for example it is given by

$$K = t_{i_1 j_1 i_2 j_2 i_3 j_3 i_4 j_4} \zeta_1^{i_1} \zeta_2^{i_2} \zeta_3^{i_3} \zeta_4^{i_4} k_1^{j_1} k_2^{j_2} k_3^{j_3} k_4^{j_4} \quad (33)$$

with

$$t_{i_1 j_1 i_2 j_2 i_3 j_3 i_4 j_4} = \text{Tr}(R_0^{i_1 j_1} R_0^{i_2 j_2} R_0^{i_3 j_3} R_0^{i_4 j_4}) \quad (34)$$

For the four scalar scattering it is

$$-\frac{1}{4} (su \xi_1 \cdot \xi_4 \xi_2 \cdot \xi_3 + tu \xi_1 \cdot \xi_2 \xi_3 \cdot \xi_4 + st \xi_2 \cdot \xi_4 \xi_1 \cdot \xi_3) \quad (35)$$

For other amplitudes the  $K$  should be replaced appropriately. Note that the power of  $\left(\frac{-2\pi}{\ln w}\right)$  is different from the D9: instead of five it is two for the D3 case.<sup>3</sup> Note that the divergence of (31) comes from  $w \sim 1$  and has the pole structure of

$$\int_0^1 dw \frac{1}{w(\ln w)^2} \quad (40)$$

In the next section we discuss a possible mechanism to cancel the divergence after discussion of physical motivation. Before we get to that we express, for comparison later, the pole structure of (40) in a new coordinate,  $\ln w \equiv -y$ : the pole structure takes the form of

$$\int_0^\infty dy \frac{1}{y^2} \quad (41)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>To compare with the D9, the divergence structure of (31) can be put in the following variables

$$q = e^{\frac{2\pi^2}{\ln w}}, \quad \nu_r = \frac{\ln \rho_r}{\ln w} \quad (36)$$

Eq (31) now takes the form of

$$A(1, 2, 3, 4) = g^4 GK(-8\pi^4) \int \frac{dq}{q(\ln q)^3} F(q^2) \quad (37)$$

where

$$F(q^2) = \int \prod_{r=1}^3 d\nu_r \prod_{1 \leq r < s \leq 4} \left[ \sin \pi(\nu_s - \nu_r) \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - 2q^{2n} \cos 2\pi(\nu_s - \nu_r) + q^{4n}) \right]^{k_r \cdot k_s} \quad (38)$$

Compared with the D9 where the logarithmic factor disappears, the degree of divergence is more serious as

$$\int \frac{dq}{q(\ln q)^3} \quad (39)$$

## 3.2 anticipated mechanism for divergence cancelation

The presence of the  $(\ln q)^3$ -factor in (37), which does not have an analogue in the D9 case, seems to suggest a more radical measure for the divergence cancelation. We discuss the possibility that the one-loop divergence may be canceled by adding additional vertex operators at the tree level. We expect that they originate from the curved geometry.

Let's go back to the figure in the introduction where we have pointed that the status of a closed string is different from that of an open string. Whereas the open strings are the fundamental degrees of freedom, the closed strings are not in a few regards: first of all they have been *generated* by open string quantum effects. Secondly they seem to be non-propagating due to the momentum restriction on the open string states. Since it is not fundamental degrees of freedom a natural way to realize them should be via composite<sup>4</sup> operators. The crucial question is then, how should they be introduced? Here we propose that they be introduced in such a way to cancel (at least potentially) the open string divergences, in other words, as counter terms.

The connection to the geometry may occur when they get “exponentiated” to the action where they would appear as vertex terms.<sup>5</sup> Together with the quadratic part of the action they will constitute a non-linear sigma model action. If the anticipation turns out true to this point then we believe that the resulting action should be an action for an open string in a curved geometry. To what geometry would it deform? The only natural candidate is the supergravity metric solution for a stack of D3 branes or  $\text{AdS}^5 \times \text{S}^5$  in an appropriate limit. Put the other way around the precise set of the vertex operators will be dictated by the non-linear sigma model action and the divergence cancelation.

Although the counter terms may reveal aspects of the geometry which part of the geometry is revealed may depend on the dynamics considered. Another possible question is on the realization of the closed string. In the current stage they reveal their presence through the deformed metric. Could they appear on a more fundamental level? We postpone these issues until the conclusion. In the remainder of this section we carry out a preliminary check to set the ideas above on a computational ground. For an illustration we take the example of the four point scalar scattering.<sup>6</sup>

The one loop divergence structure has been presented in the previous section. One needs to find the complete list of the vertex operators that would cancel the divergence.

---

<sup>4</sup>The open string vertex operators themselves take the forms of the composite operators. Therefore what is meant by composite here is that they are even more composite and/or of different compositeness than the open string ones.

<sup>5</sup>It will be more clear to see in the path-integral approach where those composite operators will be brought down by the standard procedure.

<sup>6</sup>The corresponding calculation with the vector vertex operators would be more involved. For this reason and others the advantage of having the explicit forms of the vertex operators is obvious.

The task [8] will involve lengthy computations that involve many vertex operators. Here we only focus on one of them to illustrate the strategy. Recall that a curved metric has the following curvature expansion in a Riemann normal coordinate,

$$g_{MN} = \eta_{MN} - \frac{1}{3}R_{MNPQ}(X_0)X^N X^Q + \dots \quad (42)$$

The supergravity metric solution for a stack of D3 branes is given by

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= H^{-1/2}(-dt^2 + (dx^\mu)^2) + H^{1/2}(dx^m)^2 \\ H &= 1 + \frac{4\pi g N l^4}{r^4} \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Consider a  $r$ -expansion of the curvature tensor,  $R_{mnpq}$ , that results from the D3-brane metric where we treat  $r$  to be a large but fixed constant. In the leading order the term that has the least number of fields is

$$R_{mnpq} \sim (\delta_{mq}\delta_{np} - \delta_{mp}\delta_{nq}) \quad (44)$$

Therefore one of the vertex operators that are necessary to cancel the one loop divergence from  $\langle V_s^{m_1} V_s^{m_2} V_s^{m_3} V_s^{m_4} \rangle$  is expected to have the following form

$$\int dx C_{mpnq} \dot{X}^m \dot{X}^n X^p X^q \quad (45)$$

When inserted together with the other vertex operators that represent the scattering states the tree level amplitude

$$\int d\mu \langle V_s^{m_1}(x_1) V_s^{m_2}(x_2) V_s^{m_3}(x_3) V_s^{m_4}(x_4) \int dx C_{mpnq} \dot{X}^m(x) \dot{X}^n(x) X^p(x) X^q(x) \rangle \quad (46)$$

produce terms that have the same pole structure as that of the one loop. The measure in front  $d\mu$  is given in (3) and

$$C_{mpnq} = \text{const} \cdot (\delta_{mq}\delta_{np} - \delta_{mn}\delta_{pq}) \quad (47)$$

The constant will be a function of the t' Hooft coupling and will be determined by the requirement of the divergence cancelation. The amplitude (46) have poles at

$$x = x_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, 4$$

The pole terms at  $x = x_1$  vanishes as  $x_1 \rightarrow \infty$ . The highest order pole terms at  $x = x_i, i \neq 1$  have the structure of

$$\int_0^\infty dy \frac{1}{y^2} \quad (48)$$

where we have not recorded the precise form of the coefficient. Note that it is the same order pole as the one loop divergence given in (41). Eq (46) also produces terms of different pole structure,  $\int_0^\infty dy \frac{1}{y}$ , and/or terms that become divergent as  $x_1 \rightarrow \infty$ . It is a crucial check to be conducted that all these unwanted terms must cancel among themselves when the complete list of the vertex operators are once considered together. At the same time the momenta structure must turn out to match that of the one loop for the correct pole terms. We will report on this in [8].

## 4 Conclusion

In this letter we have analyzed the one loop divergence structure of the four point scattering amplitudes. We have conjectured existence of a complete set of additional vertex operators whose origin should be linked to the D-brane/AdS geometry. In the weak coupling the relevance of the closed strings seems to be recognized rather indirectly, i.e., through the non-linear sigma model. But is there a circumstance where they become propagating degrees of freedom? We believe that it is when one goes to large coupling limit where a closed string degrees of freedom become fundamental. It should occur through an open string conversion into a closed string [9]. Then it suggests that AdS/CFT type dualities will be a two-step process. First the open string quantum corrections will “engineer” the curved geometry, which can be viewed as a open string generalization of the gauge theory result of [10, 11, 12]. The curved geometry will be introduced as a way to absorb the divergence. At the same time it will serve as a route for the closed strings to exhibit their relevance. At this stage the closed strings are not fundamental degrees of freedom but they become so when one reaches a strong coupling region through a S-duality, as an open string converts to a closed string.<sup>7</sup>

A few comments on the future directions are in order : One obvious direction is to find those set of the vertex operators, at least order by order. For that purpose the works of [13, 14] will provide a useful guide. Another direction is to fully develop the path integral formulation. The setting of the present work is such that one can readily switch to the path integral method. There the vertex “operators” will appear in the standard procedure from the exponentiated action. If our picture is indeed correct one can say that the open string dynamics reveals aspects of the geometry. Which particular part of the geometry gets revealed depends on the dynamics considered. For example considering scalar multiple scattering will reveals different pieces of information about the geometry that the vector scattering. So the counter-terms necessary to cancel the divergences will be the geometry information relevant for the dynamics. Also there is a question concerning the radius of the sphere that originates in the large N-limit of the open string engineered geometry. Since there is a S-duality involved to go to the strong coupling it may be the inverse (in terms of the t’Hooft coupling) of the radius of the regular sphere that results from the D3 brane supergravity solution. We will tackle this issue in the near future [8].

Connection between the string divergence cancelation and the field theory cancelation may be an interesting issue as well. The field theory task has been initiated in [15] where the starting point is the four dimensional action with  $\alpha'$ -corrections. The action is obtained by dimensional reduction of the ten dimensional action [16]. Since the massive modes have been integrated out the “renormalization” process will go dif-

---

<sup>7</sup>One may wonder about the reverse mechanism where a closed string converts into an open string. We suspect that it should be a process that involves a spontaneous symmetry breaking. This issue will be pursued elsewhere.

ferently from the full fledged string analysis. However we expect that they might be properly taken into account by an energy scale. We hope to report on this with better understanding in the future.

Finally a possible connection to Fischler-Susskind mechanism. A few ingredients (such as the role of the zero momentum states) of the conjectured divergence cancelation are reminiscent of Fischler-Susskind mechanism [17, 18]. One of the differences is the setting: here we start out only with the open string degrees of freedom and try to realize the closed string within that frame-work.



## Appendix A: useful formulae

In some of the computations in section 2 we have used a few identities. For example one can show using the standard Wick contraction technique that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle R^{u_1 v_1}(x_1) R^{u_2 v_2}(x_2) R^{u_3 v_3}(x_3) \rangle \\
= & -\frac{1}{x_{12} x_{23} x_{13}} (\delta_{u_2 u_3} \delta_{u_1 v_2} \delta_{v_1 v_3} - \delta_{u_2 u_3} \delta_{u_1 v_3} \delta_{v_1 v_2} - \delta_{u_2 v_3} \delta_{u_1 v_2} \delta_{v_1 u_3} \\
& + \delta_{u_2 v_3} \delta_{u_1 u_3} \delta_{v_1 v_2} - \delta_{u_3 v_2} \delta_{u_1 u_2} \delta_{v_1 v_3} + \delta_{u_3 v_2} \delta_{u_1 v_3} \delta_{u_2 v_1} \\
& + \delta_{v_2 v_3} \delta_{u_1 u_2} \delta_{v_1 u_3} - \delta_{v_2 v_3} \delta_{u_1 u_3} \delta_{u_2 v_1}) \tag{A.1}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly one can compute  $\langle R^{u_1 v_1}(x_1) R^{u_2 v_2}(x_2) R^{u_3 v_3}(x_3) R^{u_4 v_4}(x_4) \rangle$ . For simplicity we present  $|x_1 - x_2| |x_1 - x_4| |x_2 - x_4| \langle R^{u_1 v_1}(x_1) R^{u_2 v_2}(x_2) R^{u_3 v_3}(x_3) R^{u_4 v_4}(x_4) \rangle$  with  $x_1 = \infty, x_2 = 1, x_3 = x, x_4 = 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& |x_1 - x_2| |x_1 - x_4| |x_2 - x_4| \langle R^{u_1 v_1}(x_1) R^{u_2 v_2}(x_2) R^{u_3 v_3}(x_3) R^{u_4 v_4}(x_4) \rangle \\
= & \frac{1}{2^6} \left( \frac{1}{x^2} \text{Tr} \gamma^{u_1 v_1} \gamma^{u_2 v_2} \text{Tr} \gamma^{u_3 v_3} \gamma^{u_4 v_4} + \text{Tr} \gamma^{u_1 v_1} \gamma^{u_3 v_3} \text{Tr} \gamma^{u_2 v_2} \gamma^{u_4 v_4} \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{1}{(1-x)^2} \text{Tr} \gamma^{u_1 v_1} \gamma^{u_4 v_4} \text{Tr} \gamma^{u_2 v_2} \gamma^{u_3 v_3} \right) \\
& - \frac{1}{2^5} \frac{1}{x} (\text{Tr} \gamma^{u_1 v_1} \gamma^{u_3 v_3} \gamma^{u_4 v_4} \gamma^{u_2 v_2} + \text{Tr} \gamma^{u_1 v_1} \gamma^{u_2 v_2} \gamma^{u_4 v_4} \gamma^{u_3 v_3}) \\
& - \frac{1}{2^5} \frac{1}{x(1-x)} (\text{Tr} \gamma^{u_1 v_1} \gamma^{u_4 v_4} \gamma^{u_3 v_3} \gamma^{u_2 v_2} + \text{Tr} \gamma^{u_1 v_1} \gamma^{u_2 v_2} \gamma^{u_3 v_3} \gamma^{u_4 v_4}) \\
& - \frac{1}{2^5} \frac{1}{1-x} (\text{Tr} \gamma^{u_1 v_1} \gamma^{u_4 v_4} \gamma^{u_2 v_2} \gamma^{u_3 v_3} + \text{Tr} \gamma^{u_1 v_1} \gamma^{u_3 v_3} \gamma^{u_2 v_2} \gamma^{u_4 v_4}) \tag{A.2}
\end{aligned}$$

Various traces of gamma matrices above can be expressed as products of Kronecker deltas. For example

$$\text{Tr} \gamma^{u_1 v_1} \gamma^{u_2 v_2} = -8(\delta_{u_1 u_2} \delta_{v_1 v_2} - \delta_{u_1 v_2} \delta_{u_2 v_1}) \tag{A.3}$$

The other type of the trace is more lengthy: it yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2^4} \text{Tr} \gamma^{u_1 v_1} \gamma^{u_2 v_2} \gamma^{u_3 v_3} \gamma^{u_4 v_4} \\
= & \delta_{u_1 u_2} \delta_{u_3 u_4} (\delta_{v_1 v_2} \delta_{v_3 v_4} - \delta_{v_1 v_3} \delta_{v_2 v_4} + \delta_{v_1 v_4} \delta_{v_2 v_3}) \\
& + \delta_{u_1 u_3} \delta_{u_2 u_4} (-\delta_{v_1 v_2} \delta_{v_3 v_4} + \delta_{v_1 v_3} \delta_{v_2 v_4} - \delta_{v_1 v_4} \delta_{v_2 v_3}) \\
& + \delta_{u_1 u_4} \delta_{u_2 u_3} (\delta_{v_1 v_2} \delta_{v_3 v_4} - \delta_{v_1 v_3} \delta_{v_2 v_4} + \delta_{v_1 v_4} \delta_{v_2 v_3}) \\
& + \delta_{u_1 u_2} ( -\delta_{v_1 v_2} \delta_{u_3 v_3} \delta_{u_4 v_4} - \delta_{v_1 v_2} \delta_{u_3 v_4} \delta_{v_3 u_4} + \delta_{v_1 u_3} \delta_{v_2 v_3} \delta_{u_4 v_4} - \delta_{v_1 u_3} \delta_{v_2 u_4} \delta_{v_3 v_4} \\
& + \delta_{v_1 u_3} \delta_{v_2 v_4} \delta_{v_3 u_4} - \delta_{v_1 v_3} \delta_{v_2 u_3} \delta_{u_4 v_4} + \delta_{v_1 v_3} \delta_{v_2 u_4} \delta_{u_3 v_4} + \delta_{v_1 u_4} \delta_{v_2 u_3} \delta_{v_3 v_4} \\
& - \delta_{v_1 u_4} \delta_{v_2 v_3} \delta_{u_3 v_4} + \delta_{v_1 u_4} \delta_{v_2 v_4} \delta_{u_3 v_3} - \delta_{v_1 v_4} \delta_{v_2 u_3} \delta_{v_3 u_4} - \delta_{v_1 v_4} \delta_{v_2 u_4} \delta_{u_3 u_3} ) \\
& + \delta_{u_1 u_3} ( -\delta_{v_1 u_2} \delta_{v_2 v_3} \delta_{u_4 v_4} + \delta_{v_1 u_2} \delta_{v_2 u_4} \delta_{v_3 v_4} - \delta_{v_1 u_2} \delta_{v_2 v_4} \delta_{v_3 u_4} + \delta_{v_1 v_2} \delta_{u_2 v_3} \delta_{u_4 v_4}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +\delta_{v_1v_2}\delta_{u_2v_4}\delta_{v_3u_4} - \delta_{v_1v_3}\delta_{u_2v_2}\delta_{u_4v_4} - \delta_{v_1v_3}\delta_{u_2v_4}\delta_{v_2u_4} + \delta_{v_1u_4}\delta_{u_2v_2}\delta_{v_3v_4} \\
& -\delta_{v_1u_4}\delta_{u_2v_3}\delta_{v_2v_4} + \delta_{v_1u_4}\delta_{u_2v_4}\delta_{v_2v_3} - \delta_{v_1v_4}\delta_{u_2v_2}\delta_{v_3u_4} + \delta_{v_1v_4}\delta_{u_2v_3}\delta_{v_2u_4} \\
+ & \delta_{u_1u_4} \left( -\delta_{v_1u_2}\delta_{v_2u_3}\delta_{v_3v_4} + \delta_{v_1u_2}\delta_{v_2v_3}\delta_{u_3v_4} - \delta_{v_1u_2}\delta_{v_2v_4}\delta_{u_3v_3} - \delta_{v_1v_2}\delta_{u_2v_3}\delta_{u_3v_4} \right. \\
& +\delta_{v_1v_2}\delta_{u_2v_4}\delta_{u_3v_3} - \delta_{v_1u_3}\delta_{u_2v_2}\delta_{v_3v_4} + \delta_{v_1u_3}\delta_{u_2v_3}\delta_{v_2v_4} - \delta_{v_1u_3}\delta_{u_2v_4}\delta_{v_2v_3} \\
& \left. +\delta_{v_1v_3}\delta_{u_2v_2}\delta_{u_3v_4} + \delta_{v_1v_3}\delta_{u_2v_4}\delta_{v_2u_3} - \delta_{v_1v_4}\delta_{u_2v_2}\delta_{u_3v_3} - \delta_{v_1v_4}\delta_{u_2v_3}\delta_{v_2u_3} \right) \\
+ & \delta_{u_2u_3} \left( -\delta_{u_1v_1}\delta_{v_2v_3}\delta_{u_4v_4} + \delta_{u_1v_1}\delta_{v_2u_4}\delta_{v_3v_4} - \delta_{u_1v_1}\delta_{v_2v_4}\delta_{v_3u_4} + \delta_{u_1v_2}\delta_{v_1v_3}\delta_{u_4v_4} \right. \\
& -\delta_{u_1v_2}\delta_{v_1u_4}\delta_{v_3v_4} + \delta_{u_1v_2}\delta_{v_1v_4}\delta_{v_3u_4} - \delta_{u_1v_3}\delta_{v_1v_2}\delta_{u_4v_4} + \delta_{u_1v_3}\delta_{v_1u_4}\delta_{v_2v_4} \\
& -\delta_{u_1v_3}\delta_{v_1v_4}\delta_{v_2u_4} - \delta_{u_1v_4}\delta_{v_1v_2}\delta_{v_3u_4} + \delta_{u_1v_4}\delta_{v_1v_3}\delta_{v_2u_4} - \delta_{u_1v_4}\delta_{v_1u_4}\delta_{v_2v_3} \left. \right) \\
+ & \delta_{u_2u_4} \left( -\delta_{u_1v_1}\delta_{v_2u_3}\delta_{v_3v_4} + \delta_{u_1v_1}\delta_{v_2v_3}\delta_{u_3v_4} - \delta_{u_1v_1}\delta_{v_2v_4}\delta_{u_3v_3} + \delta_{u_1v_2}\delta_{v_1u_3}\delta_{v_3v_4} \right. \\
& -\delta_{u_1v_2}\delta_{v_1v_3}\delta_{u_3v_4} + \delta_{u_1v_2}\delta_{v_1v_4}\delta_{u_3v_3} + \delta_{u_1v_3}\delta_{v_1v_2}\delta_{u_3v_4} - \delta_{u_1v_3}\delta_{v_1u_3}\delta_{v_2v_4} \\
& +\delta_{u_1v_3}\delta_{v_1v_4}\delta_{v_2u_3} - \delta_{u_1v_4}\delta_{v_1v_2}\delta_{u_3v_3} + \delta_{u_1v_4}\delta_{v_1u_3}\delta_{v_2v_3} - \delta_{u_1v_4}\delta_{v_1v_3}\delta_{v_2u_3} \left. \right) \\
+ & \delta_{u_3u_4} \left( -\delta_{u_1v_1}\delta_{u_2v_2}\delta_{v_3v_4} + \delta_{u_1v_1}\delta_{u_2v_3}\delta_{v_2v_4} - \delta_{u_1v_1}\delta_{u_2v_4}\delta_{v_2v_3} - \delta_{u_1v_2}\delta_{v_1u_2}\delta_{v_3v_4} \right. \\
& +\delta_{u_1v_2}\delta_{v_1v_3}\delta_{u_2v_4} - \delta_{u_1v_2}\delta_{v_1v_4}\delta_{u_2v_3} + \delta_{u_1v_3}\delta_{v_1u_2}\delta_{v_2v_4} - \delta_{u_1v_3}\delta_{v_1v_2}\delta_{u_2v_4} \\
& \left. +\delta_{u_1v_3}\delta_{v_1v_4}\delta_{u_2v_2} - \delta_{u_1v_4}\delta_{v_1u_2}\delta_{v_2v_3} + \delta_{u_1v_4}\delta_{v_1v_2}\delta_{u_2v_3} - \delta_{u_1v_4}\delta_{v_1v_3}\delta_{u_2v_2} \right) \\
& +\delta_{u_1v_1}\delta_{u_2v_2}\delta_{u_3v_3}\delta_{u_4v_4} + \delta_{u_1v_1}\delta_{u_2v_2}\delta_{u_3v_4}\delta_{u_4v_3} + \delta_{u_1v_1}\delta_{u_2v_3}\delta_{u_3v_2}\delta_{u_4v_4} \\
& -\delta_{u_1v_1}\delta_{u_2v_3}\delta_{u_4v_2}\delta_{u_3v_4} + \delta_{u_1v_1}\delta_{u_2v_4}\delta_{u_3v_2}\delta_{u_4v_3} + \delta_{u_1v_1}\delta_{u_2v_4}\delta_{u_4v_2}\delta_{u_3v_3} \\
& +\delta_{u_1v_2}\delta_{u_2v_1}\delta_{u_3v_3}\delta_{u_4v_4} + \delta_{u_1v_2}\delta_{u_2v_1}\delta_{u_3v_4}\delta_{u_4v_3} - \delta_{u_1v_2}\delta_{u_3v_1}\delta_{u_2v_3}\delta_{u_4v_4} \\
& -\delta_{u_1v_2}\delta_{u_3v_1}\delta_{u_2v_4}\delta_{u_4v_3} + \delta_{u_1v_2}\delta_{u_4v_1}\delta_{u_2v_3}\delta_{u_3v_4} - \delta_{u_1v_2}\delta_{u_4v_1}\delta_{u_2v_4}\delta_{u_3v_3} \\
& +\delta_{u_1v_3}\delta_{u_2v_1}\delta_{u_3v_2}\delta_{u_4v_4} - \delta_{u_1v_3}\delta_{u_2v_1}\delta_{u_4v_2}\delta_{u_3v_4} + \delta_{u_1v_3}\delta_{u_3v_1}\delta_{u_2v_2}\delta_{u_4v_4} \\
& +\delta_{u_1v_3}\delta_{u_3v_1}\delta_{u_2v_4}\delta_{u_4v_2} - \delta_{u_1v_3}\delta_{u_4v_1}\delta_{u_2v_2}\delta_{u_3v_4} - \delta_{u_1v_3}\delta_{u_4v_1}\delta_{u_2v_4}\delta_{u_3v_2} \\
& +\delta_{u_1v_4}\delta_{u_2v_1}\delta_{u_3v_2}\delta_{u_4v_3} + \delta_{u_1v_4}\delta_{u_2v_1}\delta_{u_4v_2}\delta_{u_3v_3} + \delta_{u_1v_4}\delta_{u_3v_1}\delta_{u_2v_2}\delta_{u_4v_3} \\
& -\delta_{u_1v_4}\delta_{u_3v_1}\delta_{u_2v_3}\delta_{u_4v_2} + \delta_{u_1v_4}\delta_{u_4v_1}\delta_{u_2v_2}\delta_{u_3v_3} + \delta_{u_1v_4}\delta_{u_4v_1}\delta_{u_2v_3}\delta_{u_3v_2} \tag{A.4}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the equality is valid up to the terms that vanish when contracted with the following factor (or the factor with any  $\zeta$  replaced by  $\xi$ )

$$\zeta_1^{u^1} \zeta_2^{u^2} \zeta_3^{u^3} \zeta_4^{u^4} k_1^{v_1} k_2^{v_2} k_3^{v_3} k_4^{v_4}$$

Various integrals can be evaluated in terms of products of gamma functions. Omitting the common factor

$$\frac{\Gamma(-\alpha's)\Gamma(-\alpha't)}{\Gamma(1-\alpha's-\alpha't)} \tag{A.5}$$

one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^1 dx \frac{1}{x} x^{-\alpha's} (1-x)^{-\alpha't} & \Rightarrow -\alpha't \\
\int_0^1 dx \frac{1}{(1-x)} x^{-\alpha's} (1-x)^{-\alpha't} & \Rightarrow -\alpha's \\
\int_0^1 dx \frac{1}{x(1-x)} x^{-\alpha's} (1-x)^{-\alpha't} & \Rightarrow \alpha'u
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^1 dx \frac{1}{x^2} x^{-\alpha's}(1-x)^{-\alpha't} &= \frac{\alpha't \alpha'u}{1 + \alpha's} \\
\int_0^1 dx \frac{1}{(1-x)^2} x^{-\alpha's}(1-x)^{-\alpha't} &\Rightarrow \frac{\alpha's \alpha'u}{1 + \alpha't} \\
\int_0^1 dx x^{-\alpha's}(1-x)^{-\alpha't} &\Rightarrow \frac{\alpha's \alpha't}{1 + \alpha'u} \\
\int_0^1 dx \frac{x}{(1-x)^2} x^{-\alpha's}(1-x)^{-\alpha't} &\Rightarrow \left( \alpha's + \frac{\alpha's \alpha'u}{1 + \alpha't} \right) \\
\int_0^1 dx \frac{1}{(1-x)^2 x} x^{-\alpha's}(1-x)^{-\alpha't} &\Rightarrow \left( \alpha'u + \frac{\alpha's \alpha'u}{1 + \alpha't} \right) \\
\int_0^1 dx \frac{1}{(1-x)x^2} x^{-\alpha's}(1-x)^{-\alpha't} &\Rightarrow \left( \alpha'u + \frac{\alpha't \alpha'u}{1 + \alpha's} \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

## References

- [1] J. Plochinski, String theory, Cambridge
- [2] I. Y. Park, “Fundamental vs. solitonic description of D3 branes,” Phys. Lett. B **468**, 213 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9907142].
- [3] H. Kawai and T. Suyama, “AdS/CFT Correspondence as a Consequence of Scale Invariance,” arXiv:0706.1163 [hep-th].
- [4] P. Di Vecchia, A. Liccardo, R. Marotta and F. Pezzella, “On the gauge / gravity correspondence and the open/closed string duality,” Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **20**, 4699 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0503156].
- [5] I. Y. Park, “Scattering on D3-branes,” arXiv:0708.3452 [hep-th], to appear in Phys. Lett. B.
- [6] M. B. Green, J. H. Schwarz and E. witten, Superstring theory , Springer
- [7] M. Kaku, Introduction to superstrings , Cambridge
- [8] Work in progress
- [9] I. Y. Park, “Strong coupling limit of open strings: Born-Infeld analysis,” Phys. Rev. D **64**, 081901 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0106078].
- [10] I. Chepelev and A. A. Tseytlin, “Long-distance interactions of branes: Correspondence between supergravity and super Yang-Mills descriptions,” Nucl. Phys. B **515**, 73 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9709087].
- [11] V. Periwal and R. von Unge, “Accelerating D-branes,” Phys. Lett. B **430**, 71 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9801121].
- [12] F. Gonzalez-Rey, B. Kulik, I. Y. Park and M. Rocek, “Self-dual effective action of  $N = 4$  super-Yang-Mills,” Nucl. Phys. B **544**, 218 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9810152].
- [13] R. R. Metsaev and A. A. Tseytlin, “Type IIB superstring action in  $AdS(5) \times S(5)$  background,” Nucl. Phys. B **533**, 109 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9805028].
- [14] M. Cvetič, H. Lu, C. N. Pope and K. S. Stelle, “T-duality in the Green-Schwarz formalism, and the massless/massive IIA duality map,” Nucl. Phys. B **573**, 149 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/9907202].
- [15] I. Y. Park, “Toward getting finite results from  $N=4$  SYM with  $\alpha'$ -corrections,” arXiv:0704.2853 [hep-th].

- [16] S. J. Gates, Jr. and S. Vashakidze, Nucl. Phys. B **291**, 172 (1987) ; E. Bergshoeff, M. Rakowski and E. Sezgin, Phys. Lett. B **185**, 371 (1987) ; M. Cederwall, B. E. W. Nilsson and D. Tsimpis, JHEP **0106**, 034 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0102009] ; E. A. Bergshoeff, A. Bilal, M. de Roo and A. Sevrin, JHEP **0107**, 029 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0105274] ; P. Koerber and A. Sevrin, JHEP **0110**, 003 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0108169]
- [17] W. Fischler and L. Susskind, “Dilaton Tadpoles, String Condensates And Scale Invariance,” Phys. Lett. B **171**, 383 (1986).
- [18] S. R. Das and S. J. Rey, “Dilaton condensates and loop effects in open and closed bosonic strings,” Phys. Lett. B **186**, 328 (1987).