

Quantum Gates to other Universes

Constantin Bachas and Ioannis Lavdas

Laboratoire de Physique Théorique de l'École Normale Supérieure,
PSL Research University, CNRS, Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ. Paris 06,
24 rue Lhomond, 75231 Paris Cedex 05, France

ABSTRACT

We present a microscopic model of a bridge connecting two large Anti-de-Sitter Universes. The Universes admit a holographic description as three-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric gauge theories based on large linear quivers, and the bridge is a small rank- n gauge group that acts as a messenger. On the gravity side, the bridge is a piece of a highly-curved $\text{AdS}_5 \times \text{S}^5$ throat carrying n units of five-form flux. We derive a universal expression for the mixing of the two massless gravitons: $M^2 \simeq 3n^2(\kappa_4^2 + \kappa_4'^2)/16\pi^2$, where M is the mass splitting of the gravitons, $\kappa_4^2, \kappa_4'^2$ are the effective gravitational couplings of the AdS_4 Universes, and n is the quantized charge of the gate. This agrees with earlier results based on double-trace deformations, with the important difference that the effective coupling is quantized. We argue that the apparent non-localities of holographic double-trace theories are resolved by integrating-in the (scarce) degrees of freedom of the gate.

1 Introduction

One of the tantalizing aspects of General Relativity is the possibility of connecting disjoint Universes. Most of the attention has been captured by wormholes which are pointlike contacts between Universes [1, 2, 3]. But one can in principle consider a wormbrane or Wp -brane, that is a bridge whose entry and exit are of spacetime dimension $p + 1$. In this language the usual wormholes are $W(-1)$ -branes.

When the Universes are AdS_{d+1} , holographic duality offers a different perspective of such objects as bridges between two decoupled d -dimensional field theories. Consistency requires that non-traversable wormholes correspond to pure entanglement of the theories [4], while traversable bridges must also involve a Hamiltonian coupling [5]-[7]. The generic deformation is given by a double-trace coupling

$$S_{\text{int}} \sim \int d^p \zeta \mathcal{O}(x(\zeta)) \mathcal{O}'(x'(\zeta)) K(x, x') , \quad (1.1)$$

where $\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}'$ are single-trace operators in the two theories, $x(\zeta)$ and $x'(\zeta)$ parametrize the boundary submanifolds sewed together by the coupling, and $K(x, x')$ is an interaction kernel. If one insists on conformal invariance the coupling will extend at all scales, and the bridge will have codimension $(d - p)$ both in the boundary and in the bulk.¹ This excludes the case $p = -1$. In this paper we will focus on the other extreme, $p = d$, where the entry and the exit of the bridge are the entire AdS spacetime. From a higher-dimensional perspective on the other hand, the entry and exit still look like localized defects.

Double-trace deformations were introduced in [8]-[10] and used to model two or more interacting gravitons in [11]-[14]. Because of the absence of the van Dam-Veltman-Zakharov (DVZ) discontinuity in Anti-de-Sitter spacetime [15][16] a linear combination of the massless gravitons can obtain an arbitrarily-small mass M . An interesting feature of these double-trace models is that M comes from a one-loop quantum-gravity effect. However, although double-trace deformations have been understood as boundary conditions in the supergravity limit [9], their status in string theory is less clear. Their presence seems to introduce non-localities both in the target spacetime and on the worldsheet [8][10].

The gates presented in this paper share one key feature with these earlier models: M is suppressed by two powers of the effective gravitational coupling κ_{d+1} . Contrary, however, to double-trace models, our gates have a good semiclassical limit and are perfectly local when viewed both from the boundary and from the bulk. The price to pay (as usual) for locality is that the continuous double-trace coupling must be traded for an integer charge.

The basic idea is illustrated in figure 1. One starts with two large-quiver gauge theories that are dual to two large AdS_4 spacetimes. The number of degrees of freedom in these quivers is measured by the inverse-squared effective couplings, κ_4^{-2} and $\kappa_4'^{-2}$. The bridge is then an additional ‘messenger’ node representing a small gauge group with rank $n \ll \kappa_4^{-1}, \kappa_4'^{-1}$. We here consider quivers corresponding to ‘good’ 3d $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric gauge theories at the

¹In general, after taking account of the backreaction the bridge will be fat rather than delta-function localized in the transverse dimensions. Its worldvolume can be either Euclidean or Lorentzian.




Figure 1: Two large quivers corresponding to two large AdS Universes joined by a gate which is a low-rank gauge theory coupling via bifundamental matter to the quivers.

origin of their Higgs or Coulomb branches [17, 18] for which a detailed holographic dictionary is available [19]-[22]. The idea is however more general. When $n \gg 1$ (but still much smaller than $\kappa_4^{-1}, \kappa_4'^{-1}$) the bridge admits a smooth gravitational description as a $\text{AdS}_5 \times \text{S}^5$ throat of radius $L \sim n^{1/4}$. This had been noticed already in [19][20]. Excising the throat is equivalent to integrating out the messenger degrees of freedom leading to two effective descriptions of the bridge, either as the gluing of two AdS_4 spacetimes or as a multitrace deformation of the boundary theories. In our example both these effective descriptions are highly non-local because one integrates out massless fields. But it should be obvious that this apparent non-locality is a red herring.

To make the field-theory deformation quasi-local one may give mass to the hypermultiplets represented by the two links that join the $U(n)$ node to the quivers. The dual geometry should now exhibit a characteristic scale below which the bridge between the Universes disappears. Taking the formal $m \rightarrow \infty$ limit makes the double-trace deformation local, but the geometry is singular. This explains the tension between locality in field theory and in string theory. To resolve it one must simply integrate back-in the gate fields.

Quivers like those of figure 1 actually make sense for any $p \leq d$ (including $p = -1$) and can serve as definitions of Wp -branes. In most cases the dual geometries are singular, and the problem is further complicated by infrared divergences. The question of what constitutes a ‘weak link’ (as opposed to a full-fledged interface) must be in particular carefully reexamined. These issues will be discussed elsewhere.

The plan of the present paper is as follows: In section 2 we review some relevant features of the 3d $\mathcal{N} = 4$ quiver gauge theories that we need. We recall in particular how the data for good quivers can be repackaged efficiently in an ordered pair of Young diagrams $(\rho, \hat{\rho})$. In section 3 we describe the microscopic gate of figure 1 as the rearrangement of n boxes in the Young diagrams. In section 4 we present the dual type-IIB supergravity solutions before and

after the construction of the bridge. The mixing of the gravitons due to the introduction of the gate is calculated in the semiclassical limit $1 \ll n \ll \kappa_4^{-2}, \kappa_4'^{-2}$ in section 5, and shown to agree parametrically with the double-trace models of [11]-[14]. One can interpret our result as a rule of quantization of the double-trace coupling in these models. Finally, in section 6 we comment on some future directions.

2 Partitions for good quivers

The field theories of our holographic setup are three-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 4$ gauge theories that can be engineered with D3-branes suspended between D5-branes and NS5-branes [17]. Let A, N, \hat{N} be respectively the number of these three types of brane. To define the gauge theory one must give two ordered partitions of A in N or \hat{N} positive integers

$$A = l_1 + l_2 + \cdots + l_N = \hat{l}_1 + \hat{l}_2 + \cdots + \hat{l}_{\hat{N}}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $l_i \geq l_{i+1}$ and $\hat{l}_i \geq \hat{l}_{i+1}$. These describe the distribution of the D3-branes among NS5-branes on the left and D5-branes on the right. Equivalently, the partitions define two Young diagrams, ρ and $\hat{\rho}$, both with the same number A of boxes. The diagram ρ has l_i boxes in the i^{th} row, and $\hat{\rho}$ has \hat{l}_j boxes in the \hat{j}^{th} row. We label the rows of the transposed Young diagram ρ^T (i.e. the columns of ρ) by hatted Latin letters, and the rows of the transposed Young diagrams $\hat{\rho}^T$ by unhatted letters. The reason for this notation will soon be clear. The length of the \hat{j}^{th} row in ρ^T is l_j^T , and the length of the j^{th} row in $\hat{\rho}^T$ is \hat{l}_j^T .

Quivers whose gauge symmetry can be entirely Higgsed correspond to pairs obeying the ordering condition $\rho^T > \hat{\rho}$. It was conjectured by Gaiotto and Witten [18] that at the origin of their Higgs branch such ‘good theories’ flow to strongly-coupled supersymmetric CFTs that are irreducible with no free-field factors. We can put the ordering condition in compact form by introducing the integrated row lengths

$$L_j = \sum_{i=1}^j l_i, \quad L_j^T = \sum_{\hat{i}=1}^{\hat{j}} l_{\hat{i}}^T, \quad \hat{L}_{\hat{j}} = \sum_{\hat{i}=1}^{\hat{j}} \hat{l}_{\hat{i}}, \quad \hat{L}_{\hat{j}}^T = \sum_{\hat{i}=1}^{\hat{j}} \hat{l}_{\hat{i}}^T, \quad (2.2)$$

which count the total number of boxes in the first j or \hat{j} rows of the corresponding diagrams. The condition $\rho^T > \hat{\rho}$ is then equivalent to the following set of strict inequalities

$$L_{\hat{j}}^T > \hat{L}_{\hat{j}} \quad \text{for all } \hat{j} = 1, 2, \dots, \hat{N} - 1. \quad (2.3)$$

In words, the first \hat{j} rows of ρ^T contain more boxes than the first \hat{j} non-empty rows of $\hat{\rho}$, for all \hat{j} . The mirror statement $\hat{\rho}^T > \rho$ can be shown to be mathematically equivalent.

The first of the above inequalities implies that $N > \hat{l}_1$, while its mirror statement is $\hat{N} > l_1$. It follows that the Young diagrams ρ^T and $\hat{\rho}$ are contained in a $\hat{N} \times N$ grid, and the diagrams ρ and $\hat{\rho}^T$ are both contained in a $N \times \hat{N}$ grid, see figure 2. This justifies our use of the same labelling for the rows of ρ^T and $\hat{\rho}$, and also for the rows of ρ and $\hat{\rho}^T$. When




Figure 2: The Young diagram ρ and its transpose ρ^T inscribed in their respective grids.

viewed as directed walks ρ and $\hat{\rho}$ end at the lower left corner of their respective grids, while the transposed walks begin at the upper right corner of their grids.

The linear-quiver theories defined by such partitions are called $T_\rho^\hat{\rho}[SU(A)] \equiv T_\hat{\rho}^\rho[SU(A)]$ where ‘ \equiv ’ denotes mirror symmetry. Their quivers are shown in figure 3. We call electric the quiver with $\hat{N} - 1$ nodes (for which the gauge group is realized on D3-branes suspended on NS5-branes) and magnetic the quiver with $N - 1$ nodes (with the D3-branes suspended on D5-branes). To minimize the occurrence of hatted symbols we choose to show here the magnetic




Figure 3: The magnetic quiver for the ordered pair of partitions $(\rho, \hat{\rho})$. The gauge-group ranks n_j and the flavor-group ranks m_j can be expressed in terms of the row lengths of ρ and $\hat{\rho}^T$. The inequality $\hat{\rho}^T > \rho$ guarantees the positivity of all n_j .




Figure 4: The operation C that replaces ρ by its complement inside the $N \times \hat{N}$ grid, and $\hat{\rho}$ by its complement inside the $N \times \hat{N}$ grid. C changes black to white and rotates the diagram by 180° .

quiver. The ranks n_j and m_j of the gauge and the flavor groups can be read from the row-lengths of ρ and $\hat{\rho}^T$ via the relations

$$n_i = \hat{L}_j^T - L_j, \quad m_j = \hat{l}_j^T - \hat{l}_{j+1}^T \quad (j = 1, \dots, N-1). \quad (2.4)$$

The ordering condition $\hat{\rho}^T > \rho$ ensures that all gauge-group factors have positive rank, while for the flavor groups this is automatic. The dual electric quiver can be expressed likewise in terms of the row lengths of ρ^T and $\hat{\rho}$.

Besides mirror symmetry which exchanges ρ and $\hat{\rho}$, good pairs of Young diagrams admit one other involution (C) which replaces ρ by its complement ρ^c inside the $N \times \hat{N}$ grid, and $\hat{\rho}$ by its complement $\hat{\rho}^c$ inside the $\hat{N} \times N$ grid, as in figure 4. The lengths of the rows in the transformed diagrams are

$$l_j^c = \hat{N} - l_{N-j} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{l}_j^c = N - \hat{l}_{\hat{N}-j}. \quad (2.5)$$

The reader is invited to check that this operation amounts to a reflection of the electric and magnetic quivers. In the underlying string theory this flips the orientation of the suspended D3-branes. Since the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ gauge theories are not chiral, C is a symmetry of the problem.²

3 Quantum gates as box moves

Consider now two decoupled theories, described by the good pairs $(\rho_1, \hat{\rho}_1)$ and $(\rho_2, \hat{\rho}_2)$. We assume that all the brane charges are large, so that the dual AdS_4 spacetimes can be described accurately by type-IIB supergravity. We would like to couple these theories weakly, as shown in the figure below. ‘Weak’ means that the node joining the quivers has a gauge group of low rank n . The weakest bridge has $n = 1$. When the quivers in the picture are magnetic, we

² C changes A to $(N\hat{N} - A)$, in apparent violation of the D3-brane charge. It is however known that this latter is only defined modulo large gauge transformations, and can be shifted by $N\hat{N}$. This shift changes the charge to $-A$ consistently with the fact that C reverses the orientation of the D3-branes.




Figure 5: The Young diagrams $(\rho, \hat{\rho})$ corresponding to two decoupled theories $(\rho_1, \hat{\rho}_1)$ and $(\rho_2, \hat{\rho}_2)$.

call this an ‘elementary magnetic bridge’ between theory 1 and theory 2. Since we may join either of the two ends of each quiver, there exist four different magnetic bridges between two theories, and also four different electric bridges.

Before describing the bridge, let us first construct the partition pair $(\rho, \hat{\rho})$ in the decoupled case, $n = 0$. Together the two quivers have $(N_1 + N_2)$ D5-branes and $(\hat{N}_1 + \hat{N}_2)$ NS5-branes, so the grid containing ρ must have dimensions $(N_1 + N_2) \times (\hat{N}_1 + \hat{N}_2)$, and the grid containing $\hat{\rho}$ must have dimensions $(\hat{N}_1 + \hat{N}_2) \times (N_1 + N_2)$. The partitions corresponding to the product theory are shown in figure 5. Their Young diagrams contain all the boxes in the black upper-left blocks of the grids, and none of the boxes in the white lower-right blocks. The off-diagonal blocks contain the diagrams of theory 1 and 2, as shown in the figure.

To construct the magnetic quiver of the composite theory one looks at eqs. (2.4). The first $(N_1 - 1)$ nodes reproduce the quiver of theory 1, but at the next node one finds a gauge group of zero rank, $n_{N_1} = \hat{L}_{N_1}^T - L_{N_1} = 0$. The remaining nodes, $j > N_1$, reproduce the quiver of theory 2. The fact that the bridge has $n = 0$ rank means that the partitions ρ and $\hat{\rho}$ fail to obey strict ordering at the N_1^{th} node where the theories decouple.³

It should now be clear how to create a bridge. We must crank up the rank of the N_1^{th} gauge-group factor by rearranging a few boxes of these diagrams. The rearrangement should restore the strict inequalities $\rho^T > \hat{\rho}$ that characterize irreducible quivers. To visualize the construction of the bridge let us assume that the Young diagrams of the original theories are rectangular blocks.⁴ It will soon become clear that the construction is general and does not depend on this simplifying assumption. For now take ρ_p ($p = 1, 2$) to be rectangular $N_p \times l_{1,p}$ blocks, and $\hat{\rho}_p$ rectangular $\hat{N}_p \times \hat{l}_{1,p}$ blocks, where $l_{1,p}$ and $\hat{l}_{1,p}$ are the sizes of the longest rows, i.e. with our simplifying assumption of all rows. Recall that these lengths are bounded respectively by \hat{N}_p and N_p .

Figure 6 shows the Young diagrams ρ and $\hat{\rho}^T$ before and after the construction of a bridge.

³If n were negative, the corresponding node would have anti-D3 branes breaking supersymmetry.

⁴In the quiver theories, this assumption leads to single-factor flavor groups. In the dual type-IIB solutions, it corresponds to single stacks of 5-brane sources of each type.




Figure 6: The Young diagrams ρ and $\hat{\rho}^T$ obtained by merging two single-stack quivers, as discussed in the text. A magnetic bridge is created by moving n boxes from the red to the blue positions in the diagram ρ , while leaving $\hat{\rho}$ the same. [In this example $N_1 = \hat{N}_1 = 6, N_2 = 10, \hat{N}_2 = 8$ and $l_{1,1} = l_{1,2} = \hat{l}_{1,1} = 4, \hat{l}_{1,2} = 5$. The original diagrams contain $A_1 = 24$ and $A_2 = 40$ boxes, so for the merged diagrams $A = 64$].

The initial diagrams have the general form of figure 5. A magnetic bridge can be constructed by moving n boxes of the diagram ρ from the N_1^{th} to the $(N_1 + 1)^{th}$ row. This increases the rank of the N_1^{th} node from 0 to n , leaving all other quantum numbers in the magnetic quiver unchanged, see equations (2.4). The rank of the gauge group at the connecting node is bounded by

$$2n \leq \hat{N}_2 - l_{1,2} + l_{1,1} . \quad (3.1)$$

Since the right-hand-side is at least equal to 2, elementary bridges are always allowed. For $n > 1$ there exist several rearrangements of the boxes that respect the strict ordering. They all look indistinguishable at leading order in $n/N\hat{N}$ as will become clear in the following sections. The elementary $n = 1$ bridge requires the rearrangement of a single box and can be considered as the quantum of a gate.

The reader can easily convince herself that the simplifying assumption of rectangular Young diagrams plays no role, and that elementary magnetic bridges between good theories always exist. It is also straightforward to exhibit the electric quiver of the composite theory with a magnetic bridge, but its detailed form is not particularly illuminating. The new bridge has small readjustments of both gauge-group and flavor-group ranks at several nodes of the originally-decoupled electric quivers.

4 Geometry of the gates

The type IIB solutions dual to the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ quiver theories were found in [19, 20]. The geometry has the warped form $(\text{AdS}_4 \times \text{S}^2 \times \hat{\text{S}}^2) \times_w \Sigma$, with Σ the infinite strip $0 \leq \text{Im}z \leq \pi/2$ [23, 24]. The S^2 fiber degenerates at the lower boundary of the strip and the $\hat{\text{S}}^2$ fiber degenerates at the upper boundary, but these are mere coordinate singularities. Points where the AdS_4 fiber degenerates, on the other hand, are positions of 5-brane sources. The D5-branes which wrap the 2-sphere S^2 are localized at $z = \delta_j + \frac{i\pi}{2}$ on the upper boundary of Σ , while the NS5-branes which wrap the second sphere $\hat{\text{S}}^2$ are localized at $z = \hat{\delta}_j$ on the lower boundary. The relation of the five-brane positions to their linking numbers is [19]

$$l_j = \sum_{\hat{j}=1}^{\hat{N}} \vartheta(\hat{\delta}_{\hat{j}} - \delta_j), \quad \hat{l}_j = \sum_{j=1}^N \vartheta(\hat{\delta}_j - \delta_j), \quad (4.1)$$

where ϑ is the function

$$\vartheta(u) = \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan(e^{-u}) \quad (4.2)$$

which extrapolates between 1 and 0 as u goes from $-\infty$ and ∞ , and the five-brane singularities have been labeled in clockwise order in order to respect our convention that $\{l_j\}$ and $\{\hat{l}_j\}$ are non-increasing sequences.

Rectangular Young diagrams correspond to solutions with a single stack of N D5-branes all at the same position $z = \delta + i\pi/2$, and a single stack of NS5-branes all at the same position $z = \hat{\delta}$. In this case (4.1) reduce to two equations

$$l = \hat{N} \vartheta(\hat{\delta} - \delta), \quad \hat{l} = N \vartheta(\hat{\delta} - \delta), \quad (4.3)$$

which are related by the conservation law $Nl = \hat{N}\hat{l}$. Requesting that both linking numbers be integers can make this system of equations overconstrained. The general solution is of the form

$$l = \frac{\hat{N}m}{\text{gcd}}, \quad \hat{l} = \frac{Nm}{\text{gcd}}, \quad \text{where } 0 < m < \text{gcd} \quad (4.4)$$

and gcd is the greatest common divisor of N and \hat{N} . If N and \hat{N} are relatively prime there is no solution whatsoever, if $\text{gcd}(N, \hat{N}) = 2$ there is a unique isolated solution $m = 1 \iff \hat{\delta} = \delta$ etc etc. The fact that the solutions to (4.3) depend on detailed arithmetic properties of N and \hat{N} is physically unreasonable, and is actually an artifact of the assumption of single-stack five-branes. By allowing the stacks to split one finds a large number of nearby solutions when the five-brane charges N and \hat{N} are large.

Let us assume now that we have found a solution of (4.3) with $\delta - \hat{\delta} = u_0$. To describe two decoupled quiver theories we take two copies of the above five-brane stacks with infinite separation along the $\text{Re}z$ axis as in figure 7. To simplify the calculation, we take the symmetric arrangement shown in the figure: two stacks of N D5-branes are separated by $\xi - u_0$, and two




Figure 7: The initial geometry (upper part of the figure) which is dual to the two decoupled quiver theories has singularities separated by $\xi = \infty$. The quantum bridge obtained by the rearrangement of boxes in ρ shown in figure 6 corresponds to taking large but finite ξ and making the moves shown in the lower part of the above figure. The entire NS5-brane stacks, and one brane detached from each D5-brane stack, are respectively displaced by $\delta\hat{u}$ and δu_1 towards the center of the strip.

stacks of \hat{N} NS5-branes are separated by $\xi + u_0$, so that the entire configuration is invariant under reflection of the $\text{Re}z$ -axis.

Using equations (4.1) one finds in the $\xi = \infty$ limit

$$l_1 = \hat{N}(1 + \vartheta_0), \quad l_2 = \hat{N}(1 - \vartheta_0), \quad \hat{l}_1 = N(2 - \vartheta_0), \quad \hat{l}_2 = N\vartheta_0. \quad (4.5)$$

where $\vartheta_0 = \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan(\exp(-u_0))$. These linking numbers match those of the Young diagrams for two decoupled quivers, see figure 5, if one identifies $N_1 = N_2 = N$, $\hat{N}_1 = \hat{N}_2 = \hat{N}$, and

$$l_{1,1} = \hat{N}\vartheta_0, \quad \hat{l}_{1,1} = N\vartheta_0, \quad l_{1,2} = \hat{N}(1 - \vartheta_0), \quad \hat{l}_{1,2} = N(1 - \vartheta_0).$$

Notice that theory 2 is the C -transform of theory 1 defined in figure 4. This is expected since the two theories are obtained by $\text{Re}z$ reflection from each other. Of course the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ theory is self-conjugate, so our choice of relative orientation just indicates by which ends we chose to join the two decoupled quivers.

We want now to find a new solution obtained from this initial configuration by (i) taking ξ large but finite, and (ii) making some small five-brane moves. The two moves that create the elementary bridge of the previous section are shown in the lower part of figure 7. The entire NS5-brane stacks are displaced by $\delta\hat{u}$ towards the center of the figure, while only a single D5-brane is detached from each D5-brane stack and displaced by δu_1 in the same direction. To match the Young diagrams of figure 6, all linking numbers except those of the detached D5 branes should stay the same after these moves, while the detached D5-branes should transfer n units of linking number to each other. This gives three equations for the three unknown parameters ($\xi, \delta\hat{u}$ and δu_1) of the new solution

$$\begin{aligned} -\hat{N}(\delta u_1 - \delta\hat{u}) \sin \pi\vartheta_0 &\simeq -\pi n, & \hat{N}\delta\hat{u} \sin \pi\vartheta_0 - 2\hat{N}e^{-\xi} &\simeq 0, \\ N\delta\hat{u} \sin \pi\vartheta_0 - \delta u_1 \sin \pi\vartheta_0 + 2Ne^{-\xi} &\simeq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

where we have neglected terms that are subleading in the limit $N, \hat{N} \gg n$. The solution of these leading-order equations is

$$e^{-\xi} \simeq \frac{\pi n}{4N\hat{N}}, \quad \delta\hat{u} \simeq \frac{\pi n}{2N\hat{N} \sin \pi\vartheta_0}, \quad \delta u_1 \simeq \frac{\pi n}{\hat{N} \sin \pi\vartheta_0}. \quad (4.7)$$

Note that all displacements are proportional to the rank n of the additional gauge group in the magnetic quiver, and that the displacement of the detached D5-branes is parametrically larger than that of the NS5-branes in the large N, \hat{N} limit.

The metric of the ten-dimensional type-IIB solution is [23, 24]

$$\frac{4}{\alpha'} ds^2 = \rho_4^2 ds_{\text{AdS}}^2 + \rho_1^2 ds_{(1)}^2 + \rho_2^2 ds_{(2)}^2 + 4\rho^2 dzd\bar{z}, \quad (4.8)$$

where $ds_{(i)}^2 = d\vartheta_i^2 + \sin^2\vartheta_i d\varphi_i^2$ are the metrics of the unit-radius 2-spheres, ds_{AdS}^2 is the metric of the unit-radius AdS₄ spacetime, α' is the Regge slope parameter, and the four scale factors are given by

$$\rho_4^8 = 16 \frac{\mathcal{U}_1 \mathcal{U}_2}{W^2}, \quad \rho_1^8 = 16 h_1^8 \frac{\mathcal{U}_2 W^2}{\mathcal{U}_1^3}, \quad \rho_2^8 = 16 h_2^8 \frac{\mathcal{U}_1 W^2}{\mathcal{U}_2^3}, \quad \rho^8 = \frac{\mathcal{U}_1 \mathcal{U}_2 W^2}{h_1^4 h_2^4}. \quad (4.9)$$

In the above expressions

$$W = \partial_z \partial_{\bar{z}} (h_1 h_2), \quad \mathcal{U}_i = 2h_1 h_2 |\partial_z h_i|^2 - h_i^2 W, \quad (4.10)$$

and h_1, h_2 are harmonic functions on the z -strip obtained by summing, respectively, over the D5-brane and the NS5-brane singularities. For the configuration of figure 7 these harmonic functions read: [19]

$$\begin{aligned} h_1 = & -(N-1) \log \tanh \left(\frac{i\pi}{4} - \frac{z}{2} + \frac{\xi - u_0}{4} \right) - (N-1) \log \tanh \left(\frac{i\pi}{4} - \frac{z}{2} - \frac{\xi - u_0}{4} \right) \\ & - \log \tanh \left(\frac{i\pi}{4} - \frac{z}{2} + \frac{\xi - u_0}{4} - \frac{\delta u_1}{2} \right) - \log \tanh \left(\frac{i\pi}{4} - \frac{z}{2} - \frac{\xi - u_0}{4} + \frac{\delta u_1}{2} \right) + c.c., \end{aligned}$$

$$h_2 = -\hat{N} \log \tanh \left(\frac{z}{2} - \frac{\xi + u_0}{4} + \frac{\delta \hat{u}}{2} \right) - \hat{N} \log \tanh \left(\frac{z}{2} + \frac{\xi + u_0}{4} - \frac{\delta \hat{u}}{2} \right) + c.c. . \quad (4.11)$$

The solutions also have a non-trivial dilaton

$$e^\Phi = \left(\frac{\mathcal{U}_2}{\mathcal{U}_1} \right)^{1/4} , \quad (4.12)$$

as well as 3-form and 5-form backgrounds that we will not need.

Setting $z = x + iy$ and expanding these harmonic functions near the center of the strip ($|x| \ll \xi$) gives after a little calculation

$$h_1 \simeq 8N e^{-\xi/2} \cosh x \sin y , \quad h_2 \simeq 8\hat{N} e^{-\xi/2} \cosh x \cos y , \quad (4.13)$$

where we dropped terms of order $O(e^{-3|\xi-x|/2})$ which are subleading in the $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ limit. Plugging these expansions in (4.8)-(4.10) gives the $\text{AdS}_5 \times \text{S}^5$ metric expressed as an AdS_4 foliation over x . The radius L and the constant dilaton Φ_0 read

$$L^4 = 4\pi\alpha'^2 n , \quad e^{\Phi_0} = \left(\frac{\hat{N}}{N} \right)^{1/4} . \quad (4.14)$$

As expected, the radius only depends on the number n of D3-branes that created the AdS_5 throat/bridge. We are here working in units $g_s = 1$ where the NS5-branes and the D5-branes have equal tension. The AdS_5 throat does not of course extend out to infinity, it is cut off at $x \sim \pm\xi/2$ where the AdS_5 boundary is capped.

5 Mixing of the gravitons

We will compute the mixing of the gravitons in the regime $1 \ll n \ll N\hat{N}$, in which the bridge is thin compared to the AdS spacetimes on either side, but supergravity can be trusted. The general expression for the spectrum of spin-2 excitations in any warped supergravity background was given in [25]. The relevant eigenvalue problem depends only on the metric $g_{(6)}$ of the compact space \mathcal{M}_6 , and on the warp factor $e^A \equiv \rho_4$. The mass-squared operator and the norm of wavefunctions read

$$M^2 = -\frac{e^{-2A}}{\sqrt{g_{(6)}}} \partial_a \sqrt{g_{(6)}} e^{4A} g^{ab} \partial_b , \quad \|\psi\|^2 = \int_{\mathcal{M}_6} \sqrt{g_{(6)}} e^{2A} \psi^* \psi , \quad (5.1)$$

where ψ is a scalar wavefunction on \mathcal{M}_6 . Here M^2 is the dimensionless mass, which is the eigenvalue of the Lichnerowicz Laplacian (the spin-2 wave operator) on the unit-radius AdS_4 spacetime. It is related to the scaling dimension of the dual operator by the well-known formula $\Delta(\Delta - 3) = M^2$. For the case at hand $\mathcal{M}_6 = (\text{S}^2 \times \text{S}^{2'}) \times_w \Sigma$, and using our expressions for the scale factors we find⁵

$$\|\psi\|^2 = (4\pi)^2 \int_{\Sigma} dx dy (4\rho^2 \rho_1^2 \rho_2^2 \rho_4^2) |\psi|^2 = 2^9 \pi^2 \int_{\Sigma} dx dy h_1 h_2 |\bar{\partial} \partial (h_1 h_2)| |\psi|^2 , \quad (5.2)$$

⁵Note that the metric on the strip is $4\rho^2 dz d\bar{z}$, giving the volume element $\sqrt{g} d^2 z = 4\rho^2 dx dy$ and the scalar wave operator $g^{ab} \partial_a \partial_b = \rho^{-2} \bar{\partial}_{\bar{z}} \partial_z$. The factor $(4\pi)^2$ comes from the volume of the 2-spheres.

$$\langle \psi | M^2 | \psi \rangle = (4\pi)^2 \int_{\Sigma} dx dy (4\rho_1^2 \rho_2^2 \rho_4^4) (\bar{\partial} \psi^*) \partial_z \psi = 2^{10} \pi^2 \int_{\Sigma} dx dy (h_1 h_2)^2 |\partial_z \psi|^2 . \quad (5.3)$$

These expressions are valid for any of the AdS₄ solutions in [19, 20], we will now specialize to the nearly-factorized configurations (4.11).

Consider first the decoupling limit $\xi \rightarrow \infty$. Each AdS₄ spacetime has a massless graviton with constant wavefunction ψ_0 , and a tower of massive excitations with $M \sim O(1)$. The normalized wavefunction of the massless graviton is

$$\psi_0 = V_6^{-1/2} \quad \text{with} \quad V_6 = 2^9 \pi^2 \int_{\Sigma} dx dy h_1 h_2 \left| \partial \bar{\partial} (h_1 h_2) \right| := (N \hat{N})^2 v_6 . \quad (5.4)$$

Here v_6 is a number $\sim O(1)$ that depends on the details of each decoupled theory, and whose precise value is not important. It can be computed by keeping in h_1, h_2 only the five-branes near $x \sim \xi/2$ for the theory on the right of the bridge, or only those near $x \sim -\xi/2$ for the theory on the left. In the example the two theories are identical.

It is useful to express this compactification volume in terms of an effective four-dimensional gravitational coupling. Following ref. [26] one defines a consistent truncation to four-dimensional gravity with effective action $S_{\text{eff}} = -(1/2\kappa_4^2) \int d^4x \sqrt{g_{(4)}} (R_{(4)} + 6)$ which admits the unit-radius AdS₄ as solution. The relation of κ_4 to V_6 is

$$\kappa_4^2 = \kappa_{10}^2 V_6^{-1} \left(\frac{\alpha'}{4}\right)^{-4} , \quad \text{where} \quad 2\kappa_{10}^2 = (2\pi)^7 (\alpha')^4 \quad (5.5)$$

is the type-IIB gravitational coupling. This parametrization is particularly convenient when comparing the on-shell supergravity action with the free energy of the quiver gauge theory on the 3-sphere [26].⁶

Let us consider next the configuration with a bridge. The two previously massless gravitons will now mix, so that the graviton with constant wavefunction ψ_0 remains massless, while the orthogonal combination ψ_1 obtains a small mass. To find these new wavefunctions, note that the AdS₅ × S⁵ bridge makes a parametrically-small contribution to the compactification volume. Indeed, cutting off the throat at $x = \pm x_0$ we find

$$\text{Volume}_{(\text{throat})} \sim L^8 \int_{-x_0}^{x_0} \cosh^4 x dx \sim n^2 e^{4x_0} , \quad (5.6)$$

which should be compared to the volume of the five-brane regions $\sim (N \hat{N})^2$. From (4.7) one sees that the two volumes are of the same order if $x_0 \simeq \xi/2$, i.e. when the AdS₅ cutoff reaches the five-brane regions, as should be expected. Here we take $\xi/2 \gg x_0 \gg 1$ so that the throat volume stays parametrically small and can be ignored. The two wavefunctions at this leading order are then given by

$$\psi_0 \simeq (2V_6)^{-1/2} , \quad \psi_1 \simeq \begin{cases} (2V_6)^{-1/2} & \text{for } x > x_0 , \\ \psi_1(x) & \text{for } -x_0 < x < x_0 , \\ -(2V_6)^{-1/2} & \text{for } x < -x_0 . \end{cases} \quad (5.7)$$

⁶When comparing to [26] and to earlier references, note that we have here rescaled the harmonic functions by $\alpha'/4$, so that the coefficients of the log tanh contributions are integer.

Here $\psi_1(x)$ is an interpolating function in the throat region which must be chosen so as to minimize the mass. Note that under reflection $x \rightarrow -x$, ψ_0 is even and ψ_1 is odd as in the double-well potential of quantum mechanics.

From (5.3) it follows that the only contribution to the mass of the ψ_1 state comes from the throat region where the geometry is approximately $\text{AdS}_5 \times \text{S}^5$,

$$L^{-2} ds^2 \simeq dx^2 + \cosh^2 x ds^2(\text{AdS}_4) + ds^2(\text{S}^5) .$$

The function ψ_1 that minimizes the mass in this cut-off AdS_5 throat is a solution to the differential equation

$$\frac{d}{dx} (\cosh^4 x \frac{d\psi_1}{dx}) = 0 \quad \implies \quad \psi_1(x) \simeq \frac{3}{2} (\tanh x - \frac{1}{3} \tanh^3 x) (2V_6)^{-1/2} . \quad (5.8)$$

In infinite AdS_5 spacetime this would have been a non-normalizable solution, but in our capped off geometry it is normalized by imposing a smooth interpolation between the two asymptotic values $\pm(2V_6)^{-1/2}$. Inserting this wavefunction in (5.3) and using the harmonic functions (4.13) leads to the following expression for the mass

$$\langle \psi_1 | M^2 | \psi_1 \rangle \simeq 2^{16} \pi^3 (N \hat{N} e^{-\xi})^2 \int_{-x_0}^{x_0} dx \cosh^4 x \left(\frac{d\psi_1}{dx} \right)^2 \simeq 2^{16} \pi^3 (N \hat{N} e^{-\xi})^2 \times \frac{3}{2V_6} . \quad (5.9)$$

Using finally (4.7) and the relation (5.5) of V_6 to the effective gravitational coupling we arrive at the main result of this paper:

$$M^2 = \frac{3}{8\pi^2} \kappa_4^2 n^2 \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots) . \quad (5.10)$$

If one restores the AdS_4 radius R in this formula, one finds $M^2 = (3G_N/\pi R^4) n^2$, where G_N is the four-dimensional Newton's constant.

It is straightforward to extend this calculation to the case of a bridge connecting AdS_4 Universes of unequal size. The properly normalized wavefunction orthogonal to the massless graviton in this case reads

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}^{-1} \psi_1(x) &\simeq \frac{3}{4} (V'_6 + V_6) (\tanh x - \frac{1}{3} \tanh^3 x) + \frac{1}{2} (V'_6 - V_6) , \\ \text{where} \quad \mathcal{N}^{-1} &= \sqrt{V_6 V'_6 (V_6 + V'_6)} \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

and V'_6 (V_6) is the compactification volume of the Universe on the left (right) side of the bridge. Note that this wavefunction extrapolates between $\mathcal{N} V'_6$ at $x \rightarrow \infty$, and $-\mathcal{N} V_6$ at $x \rightarrow -\infty$. Inserting it in the expression for the mass gives

$$M^2 = \frac{3}{16\pi^2} (\kappa_4^2 + \kappa'_4{}^2) n^2 , \quad (5.12)$$

where κ_4 and κ'_4 are the effective gravitational couplings for the two theories. For identical Universes this reduces to (5.10). Note that for unequal Universes the mixing is dominated by the smaller Universe whose effective Newton's constant is the strongest.

6 Concluding Remarks

We may compare our result for graviton mixing with the one obtained by Aharony et al [13] in the double-trace deformation model. Their field theory calculation gives a mass that depends on a continuous double-trace coupling h (in which we reabsorbed numerical factors) and on the central charges of the two theories via the combination

$$M^2 = h^2 \left(\frac{1}{c_1} + \frac{1}{c_2} \right). \quad (6.1)$$

This is of the same form as (5.12) if one notes that the central charges c_1, c_2 , defined as the coefficients in the two-point function of the energy-momentum tensors, can be identified with κ_4^{-2} and $\kappa'_4{}^{-2}$. The important difference is that in our model h is quantized. It would be interesting to see if this quantization rule can be also found by studying RG flows in the space of double-trace coupling. Note that if one views the quantum bridge as the minimal allowed coupling between two mutually-hidden sectors of a theory, the quantization of charge ensures that the mixing cannot be weaker than $\sim \kappa_4 \kappa'_4$, in harmony with the general spirit of the weak gravity conjecture.

To an observer in Universe 1 the gate looks like a D3-brane with AdS worldvolume. By conservation of five-form flux, the exit looks like an anti-D3 brane in Universe 2. Since the two Universes are invariant under charge-conjugation, only an observer travelling through the throat can compare the charges of entry and exit.

The D3-branes are special because they have regular extremal horizons, but other defects can serve as entries and exits of a bridge. The simplest case is that of a D-instanton, which was identified as a wormhole solution of type-II supergravity in [27] and should be revisited in the light of our present discussion. Another interesting question was raised by the recent paper [28], which counted the number of conserved energy-momentum tensors in class-S theories by means of an index. It would be interesting to find a way of counting the number of nearly conserved energy-momentum tensors, i.e. of the dual spin-2 gravitons with mass much below the mass gap of $O(1)$.

Finally an obvious question is whether, like D-branes, quantum gates can also be described on the string worldsheet by a modification of the rules of string perturbation theory. Ideas include sigma models that flow to topological theories in the infrared [29], zero-size wormholes in the 2d gravity of the worldsheet [8],⁷ or worldsheets with conformal interfaces [33]. Viewing the gates as weak quiver links may give a new breadth to these earlier efforts.

Note added: In the extension to non-identical Universes we implicitly assumed that the bridge geometry remains $\text{AdS}_5 \times S^5$, i.e. that the dilaton does not vary. This will not be the case for arbitrary quivers – the generic bridge has the Janus geometry [23].

Acknowledgements: We thank Camille Aron, Eric Bergshoeff, Massimo Bianchi, Amihay Hanany, Gary Horowitz, Amir Kashani-Poor, Elias Kiritsis, Kyriakos Papadodimas, Giuseppe Policastro and Jan Troost for discussions.

⁷This has been discussed previously in the context of matrix models, see [30]-[32] and references therein.

References

- [1] A. Einstein and N. Rosen, “The particle problem in the General Theory of Relativity,” *Phys. Rev.* **48**, 73-77 (1935).
- [2] J. A. Wheeler, “Geons,” *Phys. Rev.* **97**, 511-536 (1955).
- [3] M. S. Morris and K. S. Thorne, “Wormholes in spacetime and their use for interstellar travel: A tool for teaching General Relativity,” *Am. J. Phys.* **56**, 395 (1988).
- [4] J. Maldacena and L. Susskind, “Cool horizons for entangled black holes,” *Fortsch. Phys.* **61** (2013) 781 [arXiv:1306.0533 [hep-th]].
- [5] P. Gao, D. L. Jafferis and A. Wall, “Traversable Wormholes via a Double Trace Deformation,” arXiv:1608.05687 [hep-th].
- [6] J. Maldacena, D. Stanford and Z. Yang, “Diving into traversable wormholes,” *Fortsch. Phys.* **65** (2017) no.5, 1700034 [arXiv:1704.05333 [hep-th]].
- [7] R. van Breukelen and K. Papadodimas, “Quantum teleportation through time-shifted AdS wormholes,” arXiv:1708.09370 [hep-th].
- [8] O. Aharony, M. Berkooz and E. Silverstein, “Multiple trace operators and nonlocal string theories,” *JHEP* **0108** (2001) 006 [hep-th/0105309].
- [9] E. Witten, “Multitrace operators, boundary conditions, and AdS / CFT correspondence,” hep-th/0112258.
- [10] M. Berkooz, A. Sever and A. Shomer, “‘Double trace’ deformations, boundary conditions and space-time singularities,” *JHEP* **0205** (2002) 034 [hep-th/0112264].
- [11] M. Porrati, “Higgs phenomenon for the graviton in ADS space,” *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **18** (2003) 1793 [hep-th/0306253].
- [12] E. Kiritsis, “Product CFTs, gravitational cloning, massive gravitons and the space of gravitational duals,” *JHEP* **0611** (2006) 049 [hep-th/0608088].
- [13] O. Aharony, A. B. Clark and A. Karch, “The CFT/AdS correspondence, massive gravitons and a connectivity index conjecture,” *Phys. Rev. D* **74** (2006) 086006 [hep-th/0608089].
- [14] E. Kiritsis and V. Niarchos, “Interacting String Multi-verses and Holographic Instabilities of Massive Gravity,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **812** (2009) 488 [arXiv:0808.3410 [hep-th]].
- [15] I. I. Kogan, S. Mouslopoulos and A. Papazoglou, “The $m \rightarrow 0$ limit for massive graviton in dS(4) and AdS(4): How to circumvent the van Dam-Veltman-Zakharov discontinuity,” *Phys. Lett. B* **503** (2001) 173 [hep-th/0011138].

- [16] M. Porrati, “No van Dam-Veltman-Zakharov discontinuity in AdS space,” *Phys. Lett. B* **498** (2001) 92 [hep-th/0011152].
- [17] A. Hanany and E. Witten, “Type IIB superstrings, BPS monopoles, and three-dimensional gauge dynamics,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **492** (1997) 152 [hep-th/9611230].
- [18] D. Gaiotto and E. Witten, “S-Duality of Boundary Conditions In N=4 Super Yang-Mills Theory,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **13** (2009) no.3, 721 [arXiv:0807.3720 [hep-th]].
- [19] B. Assel, C. Bachas, J. Estes and J. Gomis, “Holographic Duals of D=3 N=4 Superconformal Field Theories,” *JHEP* **1108** (2011) 087 [arXiv:1106.4253 [hep-th]].
- [20] B. Assel, C. Bachas, J. Estes and J. Gomis, “IIB Duals of D=3 N=4 Circular Quivers,” *JHEP* **1212**, 044 (2012) [arXiv:1210.2590 [hep-th]].
- [21] B. Assel, “Holographic Duality for three-dimensional Super-conformal Field Theories,” arXiv:1307.4244 [hep-th].
- [22] C. Bachas, M. Bianchi and A. Hanany, “N=2 Moduli of AdS4 vacua: A fine-print study,” arXiv:1711.06722 [hep-th].
- [23] E. D’Hoker, J. Estes and M. Gutperle, “Exact half-BPS Type IIB interface solutions. I. Local solution and supersymmetric Janus,” *JHEP* **0706** (2007) 021 [arXiv:0705.0022 [hep-th]].
- [24] E. D’Hoker, J. Estes and M. Gutperle, “Exact half-BPS Type IIB interface solutions. II. Flux solutions and multi-Janus,” *JHEP* **0706** (2007) 022 [arXiv:0705.0024 [hep-th]].
- [25] C. Bachas and J. Estes, “Spin-2 spectrum of defect theories,” *JHEP* **1106** (2011) 005 [arXiv:1103.2800 [hep-th]].
- [26] B. Assel, J. Estes and M. Yamazaki, “Large N Free Energy of 3d N=4 SCFTs and AdS_4/CFT_3 ,” *JHEP* **1209** (2012) 074 [arXiv:1206.2920 [hep-th]].
- [27] G. W. Gibbons, M. B. Green and M. J. Perry, “Instantons and seven-branes in type IIB superstring theory,” *Phys. Lett. B* **370** (1996) 37 [hep-th/9511080].
- [28] J. Distler, B. Ergun and F. Yan, “Product SCFTs in Class-S,” arXiv:1711.04727 [hep-th].
- [29] C. Bachas and P. M. S. Petropoulos, “Topological models on the lattice and a remark on string theory cloning,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **152** (1993) 191 [hep-th/9205031].
- [30] S. R. Das, A. Dhar, A. M. Sengupta and S. R. Wadia, “New Critical Behavior in $d = 0$ Large N Matrix Models,” *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **5** (1990) 1041.
- [31] G. P. Korchemsky, “Matrix model perturbed by higher order curvature terms,” *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **7** (1992) 3081 [hep-th/9205014].

- [32] I. R. Klebanov and A. Hashimoto, “Nonperturbative solution of matrix models modified by trace squared terms,” Nucl. Phys. B **434**, 264 (1995) [hep-th/9409064].
- [33] C. P. Bachas, “On the Symmetries of Classical String Theory,” arXiv:0808.2777 [hep-th].