

# BPS defects in AdS<sub>3</sub> supergravity

Gaston Giribet<sup>1,\*</sup>, Olivera Mišković<sup>2,†</sup>, Nahuel Yazbek<sup>3,‡</sup>, Jorge Zanelli<sup>4,5§</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Physics, New York University,  
726 Broadway, New York City, 10003, USA.

<sup>2</sup> Instituto de Física, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso,  
Avda. Universidad 330, Curauma, Valparaíso, Chile.

<sup>3</sup> Instituto de Matemática Luis A. Santaló, CONICET-UBA,  
Ciudad Universitaria, Pabellón I, CABA, C1428ZAA, Argentina.

<sup>4</sup> Universidad San Sebastián, General Lagos 1163, Valdivia, Chile.

<sup>5</sup> Centro de Estudios Científicos (CECs), Arturo Prat 514, Valdivia, Chile.

## Abstract

AdS supergravity admits supersymmetric solutions that describe BPS defects. Here, we investigate such solutions in AdS<sub>3</sub> supergravity, which is formulated as a Chern-Simons theory on  $\text{OSp}(2|1) \times \text{OSp}(2|1)$ . We compute the Killing spinor equation on the BTZ geometry in different ways, looking for BPS solutions on the entire space of parameters. We focus our attention on defects that represent geometries with integer angular excesses; these correspond to specific negative values of the BTZ mass. We compare our solutions with other results in the literature, finding exact agreement. We argue that, in the semiclassical limit, the BPS defects can be associated to degenerate representations of the Virasoro symmetry at the boundary. The case of non-diagonal representations, describing stationary, non-static defects, is also discussed.

---

\*gaston.giribet@nyu.edu

†olivera.miskovic@pucv.cl

‡nyazbek@dm.uba.ar

§jorge.zanelli@uss.cl

# 1 Introduction

The BTZ geometry [1] is a solution to Einstein equations with the negative cosmological constant in  $2 + 1$  dimension which, for a certain range of its two parameters, describes an asymptotically anti-de Sitter (AdS) [2] black hole. Being a three-dimensional Einstein space, the BTZ solution is locally equivalent to  $\text{AdS}_3$  spacetime itself, which means that the former can be constructed by identifications from the latter [3]. In particular, this implies that, locally, the solution is of constant negative curvature, albeit with a curvature  $\delta$ -like singularity at center [4, 5].

Similarly to the four-dimensional Kerr solution, the BTZ metric has two integration constants,  $M$  and  $J$ , which are the Noether charges associated to the two Killing vectors that generate the  $\mathbb{R} \times SO(2)$  isometry and, consequently, they are interpreted as the mass and the angular momentum, respectively. For the solution to represent a black hole, the constraints  $M \geq |J|/\ell \geq 0$  must hold, with  $\ell$  being the curvature radius of  $\text{AdS}_3$  space; extremal black holes correspond to  $M = \pm J/\ell > 0$ . Stationary BTZ black holes share many geometrical properties with their higher-dimensional analogs: they exhibit an event horizon and an inner Killing horizon, along with an ergosphere and a shielded singularity. It also shares with higher-dimensional black holes their main thermodynamics properties, such as finite Hawking temperature and a Bekenstein-Hawking entropy that obeys the area law.

As noted in [6], the existence of these black holes with non-trivial thermodynamic properties makes three-dimensional Einstein gravity a much more exciting system, especially when studied in connection to AdS/CFT correspondence [7]. Besides, the BTZ black hole appears in many other scenarios: being locally equivalent to  $\text{AdS}_3$ , it is also a solution to supergravity [8], conformal gravity [9], other Chern-Simons actions [10], string theory [11], topologically massive gravity [12], higher-curvature gravity [12, 13], bi-gravity theory [14], and higher-spin theories [15]; see also [16–25].

The BTZ geometry describes a stationary black hole only for  $M \geq |J|/\ell \geq 0$ , but it also presents interesting features in other ranges of parameters. For example, in the case  $M + 1/(8G) = J/\ell = 0$ , with  $G$  the Newton constant, BTZ reduces to global  $\text{AdS}_3$  spacetime. In the segment  $0 > M > -1/(8G)$  (and  $M < -|J|/\ell$ ), the solution can be regarded as point-like massive particles, i.e., a naked conical singularity similar to the point-like particles of three-dimensional gravity in flat space [26]. Less studied cases correspond to the range  $M\ell \leq -|J|$ ,  $(M\ell)^2 - J^2 > 1/(8G)^2$ , where the solution describes geometries with angular excesses around the origin. Here, we will be concerned with the

latter; we will consider solutions for the specific negative values of  $M + J/\ell$ , such that they exhibit integer angular excesses and special supersymmetric properties. From the AdS/CFT point of view, in the semiclassical limit such geometries are associated to special non-normalizable states in the dual  $\text{CFT}_2$ . Static supersymmetric configurations with negative  $M$  correspond to degenerate representations in the dual  $\text{CFT}_2$ , while stationary non-static configurations with  $M \pm J/\ell < 0$  can be identified with non-diagonal (spinfull) non-integrable representations of the type studied by Migliaccio and Ribault in [27].

Solutions that represent naked singularities of integer angular excesses have been recently considered in the literature, especially in connection to higher-spin theories. In the higher-spin context they were introduced in [25], where the way to characterize such defects as states with trivial Chern-Simons holonomy was explained in detail. A clear discussion on the holographic interpretation of those states appeared in [28], and the identification between conical solutions and primaries in the  $W_s$  minimal models that appear in spin- $s$  theories was revisited in [29]. The role of integer angular excess solutions for the  $s = 2$  case was studied in [30] and more recently in [31]; see also references thereof. Other interesting papers where the defects and degenerate representations are discussed in the context of three-dimensional gravity are [32,33]. There are also interesting works in two dimensions that, to some extent, are related to this, e.g. [34–36]; however, the relation to the uplift to dimension three is not totally obvious to us. Here, we will be concerned with naked singularities of arbitrary values of the parameters in three-dimensional supergravity. We will show that those geometries which exhibit integer angular excesses are the only BPS states appearing in the negative mass sector of the BTZ geometry [4]. It is well-known that the positive mass sector admits supersymmetric solutions: the massless BTZ solution  $M = J = 0$  has two exact supersymmetries, while the extremal solutions with  $M = \pm J/\ell \neq 0$  have only one [8]. These, together with the  $\text{AdS}_3$  vacuum, are the only solutions of positive mass with supersymmetry.

Here we want to investigate the BPS solutions in the negative mass sector: we will solve the spinor Killing equation in the stationary geometry and look for globally well-defined solutions that preserve at least one supersymmetry. The latter would represent BPS solutions with naked singularities. BPS solutions with naked singularities in AdS supergravity are known to exist in other models, e.g., the Romans solution of  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supergravity in  $\text{AdS}_4$  is  $\frac{1}{2}$  BPS [37]. Here, we will identify similar solutions in  $\text{AdS}_3$ . We will study the case of Chern-Simons theory for the  $\text{OSp}(2|1) \times \text{OSp}(2|1)$  supergroup, which realizes a supersymmetric extension of  $\text{AdS}_3$  algebra with  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supercharges

[43].<sup>1</sup> Negative mass BPS states were also studied in [38] in the context of (2,0) AdS<sub>3</sub> supergravity, where the results in the full agreement were found. Such BPS defects, on the other hand, can be seen to persist in the flat space limit [39]. As we will argue, in the AdS<sub>3</sub> case these defects are associated to degenerate representations in the dual CFT<sub>2</sub>, which in the semiclassical limit of three-dimensional gravity can be associated to an effective Liouville field theory [40]; see also [41, 42].

The paper is organized as follows: In section 2, we review the Chern-Simons theory that describes AdS<sub>3</sub> supergravity, and we introduce our notation and conventions. In section 3, we solve the Killing spinor equation in the negative mass sector of the BTZ geometry, both for the static case and the stationary case. We show that BPS solutions describing defects with integer angular excesses do exist and are distributed all over the  $(M, J)$  plane of the BTZ spectrum. In section 4, we provide an alternative derivation of the Killing spinor equation and compare our solutions with other results in the literature. As a final discussion, in section 5 we make some comments about the holographic description of the BPS defects, whose distribution in the  $(M, J)$  plane can be associated with the semiclassical limit of degenerate representations of the effective Liouville description at the boundary. We will also discuss the case of non-diagonal representations, describing stationary BPS solutions in the bulk.

## 2 Chern-Simons supergravity

The action of three-dimensional supergravity in (A)dS can be written as a Chern-Simons (CS) theory. The level is  $k = \ell/(4G)$ , with  $\ell$  being the curvature radius of the space and  $G$  is the Newton constant (hereafter we will take  $G = 1/8$  unless otherwise stated).

Consider a supersymmetric extension of AdS<sub>3</sub> algebra with  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supercharges, given by  $\text{OSp}(2|1) \times \text{OSp}(2|1)$  superalgebra<sup>2</sup> [43]:

$$[J_a^\pm, J_b^\pm] = \varepsilon_{ab}{}^c J_c^\pm, \quad [J_a^\pm, Q_\alpha^\pm] = -\frac{1}{2} (\Gamma_a)_\alpha{}^\beta Q_\beta^\pm, \quad \{Q_\alpha^\pm, Q_\beta^\pm\} = (C\Gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} J_a^\pm. \quad (2.1)$$

Here,  $a, b, c = 0, 1, 2$  are Lorentz indices;  $\alpha, \beta = 1, 2$ ; and  $\pm$  refer to two commuting copies of the superalgebra. The corresponding gauge field ( $A = A_\mu dx^\mu$ ) is expressed in terms of the dreibein ( $e^a = e_\mu^a dx^\mu$ ), the spin connection ( $\omega^{ab} = \omega_\mu^{ab} dx^\mu$ ) and the algebra generators

---

<sup>1</sup>As well-known, three-dimensional Einstein gravity in AdS space is equivalent, at the level of actions, to Chern-Simons gravity for AdS<sub>3</sub>  $\simeq$  SO(2, 2). This equivalence includes boundary terms, where Chern-Simons action provides correct surface terms which make AdS gravity finite [44].

<sup>2</sup>The notation used in this text is consistent with [8] and [45].

as follows

$$A = \left( \omega^a + \frac{1}{\ell} e^a \right) J_a^+ + \left( \omega^a - \frac{1}{\ell} e^a \right) J_a^- + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ell}} \left( \xi_+^\alpha Q_\alpha^+ + \xi_-^\alpha Q_\alpha^- \right), \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\omega^{ab} = -\varepsilon^{abc} \omega_c$ ,  $\omega_a = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{abc} \omega^{bc}$  and  $J^{ab} = \varepsilon^{abc} J_c$ ,  $J_a = -\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{abc} J^{bc}$ . The torsion and curvature 2-forms are

$$T^a = De^a, \quad R_a = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{abc} R^{bc} = d\omega^a + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{abc} \omega^b \omega^c, \quad (2.3)$$

respectively. Covariant derivatives act on vectors and spinors as

$$De^a = de^a + \varepsilon^{abc} \omega_b e_c, \quad D\psi = d\psi - \frac{1}{2} \theta \omega^a \Gamma_a \psi. \quad (2.4)$$

We use the representation of Gamma matrices

$$\Gamma_0 = i\theta\sigma_1, \quad \Gamma_1 = \theta\sigma_2, \quad \Gamma_2 = \theta\sigma_3, \quad (2.5)$$

where  $\theta = \pm 1$  corresponds to the two inequivalent representations of the three-dimensional Clifford algebra  $\{\Gamma_a, \Gamma_b\} = 2\eta_{ab}$ . The signature of Minkowski metric is  $\eta_{ab} = \text{diag}(-, +, +)$ , and the convention for the Levi-Civita symbol is

$$\varepsilon_{012} = -\varepsilon^{012} = 1. \quad (2.6)$$

With this notation, the spinorial representation of AdS<sub>3</sub> generators becomes

$$P_a = \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_a, \quad J_a = \frac{1}{2} \theta \Gamma_a, \quad (2.7)$$

because

$$J_{ab} = \frac{1}{4} [\Gamma_a, \Gamma_b] = -\frac{1}{2} \theta \varepsilon_{abc} \Gamma^c. \quad (2.8)$$

It also implies that a covariant derivative acts on a spinor as

$$\nabla\psi = \left( d + \frac{1}{2} \omega^{ab} J_{ab} + \frac{1}{\ell} e^a P_a \right) \psi = D\psi + \frac{1}{2\ell} e^a \Gamma_a \psi, \quad (2.9)$$

where the Lorentz-covariant derivative is given in (2.4). The extra  $\theta$  does not affect the vectorial representation of the generators, i.e., the definition of  $De^a$ .

As regards the spacetime, the BTZ geometry is described by the metric

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= -f^2 dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{f^2} + r^2 (N dt + d\varphi)^2, \\ f^2 &= -M + \frac{r^2}{\ell^2} + \frac{J^2}{4r^2}, \quad N = -\frac{J}{2r^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

with  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  and  $\varphi \in [0, 2\pi]$ . As it is well-known, depending on the parameters  $(M, J)$  this geometry corresponds to:

- $M \geq |J|/\ell \geq 0$  : black hole with the mass  $M \geq 0$  and the angular momentum  $J$ ;
- $M = -1/(8G)$ ,  $J = 0$  : globally  $\text{AdS}_3$  space;
- $M\ell \leq -|J|$ ,  $(M\ell)^2 - J^2 < (8G)^{-2}$  : naked singularity with angular deficit (point-like particle);
- $M\ell \leq -|J|$ ,  $(M\ell)^2 - J^2 > (8G)^{-2}$  : naked singularity with angular excess;
- $|M|\ell < |J|$ : over-spinning geometries.

Geometries with zero or negative mass parameter  $M \neq -1$  describe topological defects whose total angle in the plane is  $2\pi(1 - \alpha)$ . Thus, the parameter  $\alpha$  measures a difference with respect to the space without a defect,  $\alpha = 0$  corresponding to the  $\text{AdS}_3$  space. Furthermore, since the angular deficit is introduced in a plane by Killing vector identifications, for it to be a true manifold, a successive repetition of identifications has always to finish at the same point. A consequence is that the deficit angle,  $\alpha$ , has to be a fractional factor of  $2\pi$ , i.e.  $\alpha/(2\pi) \in \mathbb{Q}$ . In the stationary case, two angular deficits turn out to be associated to two rational numbers.

The coordinate frame where the static defect becomes explicit is

$$ds^2 = - \left( \frac{\rho^2}{\ell^2} + 1 \right) d\tau^2 + \frac{d\rho^2}{\frac{\rho^2}{\ell^2} + 1} + (1 - \alpha)^2 \rho^2 d\varphi^2,$$

where  $0 \leq \varphi \leq 2\pi$  is periodic.

Introducing the coordinates  $(t, r) = \left( \frac{\tau}{1-\alpha}, (1-\alpha)\rho \right)$ , the metric acquires the form (2.10),

$$ds^2 = - \left( \frac{r^2}{\ell^2} + (1 - \alpha)^2 \right) dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{\frac{r^2}{\ell^2} + (1 - \alpha)^2} + r^2 d\varphi^2, \quad (2.11)$$

such that we recognize the mass parameter

$$M = -(1 - \alpha)^2, \quad J = 0. \quad (2.12)$$

Note that the conical defects have a conical singularity at  $r = 0$  in the  $(x^1, x^2) = (r \cos \varphi_{12}, r \sin \varphi_{12})$  plane  $\Sigma_{12}$ , where  $\varphi_{12} = 2\pi(1 - \alpha)\varphi$ , such that [4]

$$R^{ab} + \frac{1}{\ell^2} e^a e^b = 2\pi\alpha \delta(\Sigma_{12}) d\Omega_{12} J_{12} \eta^{[12][ab]}, \quad T^a = 0, \quad (2.13)$$

where  $\eta^{[ab][cd]} = \eta^{ac}\eta^{bd} - \eta^{ad}\eta^{bc}$  is the invariant tensor.

### 3 Killing spinors

#### 3.1 The static case

It is well-known that BTZ black hole exhibits supersymmetry for specific values of the parameters. More precisely,

- the zero mass black hole ( $M = J = 0$ ) has two exact supersymmetries;
- the vacuum of the Neveu-Schwarz sector is given by global AdS<sub>3</sub> ( $M = -1, J = 0$ );
- the extremal black holes ( $0 < M = |J|/\ell$ ) have only one supersymmetry;
- the generic black holes ( $0 < M \neq |J|/\ell$ ) do not have any supersymmetry.

The solution with  $M = J = 0$  is the ground state of (1,1)-supergravity in AdS<sub>3</sub> with Ramond boundary conditions on the spinor fields. Here, we will explore the extension of this result to the range  $M < 0$  of the BTZ geometry, cf. [38].

Consider a static naked singularity with a conical excess or defect. Then, the vielbein and a torsionless spin connection, with the notation for the Levi-Civita symbol (2.6), can be chosen as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} e^0 &= f dt, & e^1 &= \frac{dr}{f}, & e^2 &= r d\varphi, \\ \omega^0 &= f d\varphi, & \omega^1 &= 0, & \omega^2 &= \frac{r}{\ell^2} dt, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where we used  $f' = \frac{r}{f\ell^2}$ . Then,  $\psi$  is a Killing spinor if it is a globally well-defined solution of the Killing spinor equation obtained from (2.4); namely, a solution where all fermions vanish,  $\xi = 0$ , has to be preserved under supersymmetry transformations,

$$\delta_\psi \xi = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad D\psi + \frac{1}{2\ell} \Gamma_a e^a \psi \equiv d\psi - \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_a \left( \theta \omega^a - \frac{1}{\ell} e^a \right) \psi = 0. \tag{3.2}$$

It corresponds to a set of linear differential equations for two components of the spinor  $\psi$ . These equations read

$$0 = d\psi + \frac{1}{2\ell} (dt - \theta \ell d\varphi) \left( f \Gamma_0 - \theta \frac{r}{\ell} \Gamma_2 \right) \psi + \frac{1}{2\ell f} \Gamma_1 \psi dr, \tag{3.3}$$

or, expressed in components,

$$dt : \quad 0 = \partial_t \psi + \frac{1}{2\ell} \left( f \Gamma_0 - \theta \frac{r}{\ell} \Gamma_2 \right) \psi, \quad (3.4)$$

$$dr : \quad 0 = \partial_r \psi + \frac{1}{2\ell f} \Gamma_1 \psi, \quad (3.5)$$

$$d\varphi : \quad 0 = \partial_\varphi \psi - \frac{\theta}{2} \left( f \Gamma_0 - \theta \frac{r}{\ell} \Gamma_2 \right) \psi. \quad (3.6)$$

The equations along  $dt$  and  $d\varphi$  can be rewritten in terms of the coordinates

$$\begin{aligned} x^\pm &= t \pm \theta \ell \varphi \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad t = \frac{x_+ + x_-}{2}, \quad \varphi = \frac{x_+ - x_-}{2\ell\theta}, \\ \partial_\pm &= \frac{1}{2\ell} (\ell \partial_t \pm \theta \partial_\varphi), \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where  $x^\pm$  has dimensions of length in the natural units, such that

$$\begin{aligned} dt + \theta \ell d\varphi : \quad 0 = \partial_+ \psi &\Rightarrow \psi = \psi(x^-, r), \\ dt - \theta \ell d\varphi : \quad 0 = \partial_- \psi + \frac{1}{2\ell} \left( f \Gamma_0 - \theta \frac{r}{\ell} \Gamma_2 \right) \psi. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Taking second derivative of the last equation and using the identity  $(f \Gamma_0 - \theta \frac{r}{\ell} \Gamma_2)^2 = -f^2 + \frac{r^2}{\ell^2} = M$ , we arrive at

$$\partial_-^2 \psi - \frac{M}{4\ell^2} \psi = 0. \quad (3.9)$$

The general solution reads

$$\psi = e^{-\frac{i}{2\ell} \sqrt{-M} x^-} \chi_1(r) + e^{\frac{i}{2\ell} \sqrt{-M} x^-} \chi_2(r). \quad (3.10)$$

We have to plug (3.10) back into the second equation (3.8). Because of the independence of  $e^{\frac{i}{2\ell} \sqrt{-M} x^-}$  and  $e^{-\frac{i}{2\ell} \sqrt{-M} x^-}$ , we obtain two linearly independent algebraic equations for  $\chi_1$  and  $\chi_2$ , where the only difference is the sign of  $\sqrt{-M}$ , so it is enough to solve only one of them,

$$\left( i\sqrt{-M} + \theta \frac{r}{\ell} \Gamma_2 - f \Gamma_0 \right) \chi_1 = 0. \quad (3.11)$$

Using the representation of Gamma matrices (2.5), we solve  $\chi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 \\ \rho_1 \end{pmatrix}$  from

$$\begin{pmatrix} i\sqrt{-M} + \frac{r}{\ell} & -i\theta f \\ -i\theta f & i\sqrt{-M} - \frac{r}{\ell} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 \\ \rho_1 \end{pmatrix} = 0. \quad (3.12)$$

Note that the determinant of the above matrix vanishes, so there is only one independent equation; namely

$$\chi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 \\ -\frac{i\theta}{f} \left( i\sqrt{-M} + \frac{r}{\ell} \right) \lambda_1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.13)$$

Finally, the radial equation (3.5) becomes

$$0 = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_r & -\frac{i\theta}{2\ell f} \\ \frac{i\theta}{2\ell f} & \partial_r \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 \\ -\frac{i\theta}{f} \left( i\sqrt{-M} + \frac{r}{\ell} \right) \lambda_1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.14)$$

The first component yields

$$\lambda_1(r) = e^{h(r)} \eta_1, \quad \eta_1 = \text{const}, \quad (3.15)$$

where  $\eta_1$  is a constant Grassmann number, and

$$h(r) = \frac{1}{2\ell} \int \frac{dr}{f^2} \left( i\sqrt{-M} + \frac{r}{\ell} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left( -i\sqrt{-M} + \frac{r}{\ell} \right). \quad (3.16)$$

Thus, the radial part of the spinor becomes

$$e^{h(r)} = \left( -i\sqrt{-M} + \frac{r}{\ell} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.17)$$

Therefore, the spinor components are

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1(r) &= \left( -i\sqrt{-M} + \frac{r}{\ell} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta_1, \\ \rho_1(r) &= -i\theta \left( i\sqrt{-M} + \frac{r}{\ell} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \eta_1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

The second component of the matrix equation (3.14) is identically satisfied and the final solution reads

$$\psi = e^{-\frac{i}{2\ell}\sqrt{-M}x^-} \begin{pmatrix} \left( -i\sqrt{-M} + \frac{r}{\ell} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ -i\theta \left( i\sqrt{-M} + \frac{r}{\ell} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix} \eta_1 + e^{\frac{i}{2\ell}\sqrt{-M}x^-} \begin{pmatrix} \left( i\sqrt{-M} + \frac{r}{\ell} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ -i\theta \left( -i\sqrt{-M} + \frac{r}{\ell} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix} \eta_2. \quad (3.19)$$

For large  $r$ , the spinor behaves as  $\sqrt{\frac{r}{\ell}}$  for any  $\theta$ .  $M = 0$  is special in the sense that there are no two independent spinors, as

$$\psi = \sqrt{\frac{r}{\ell}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i\theta \end{pmatrix} (\eta_1 + \eta_2). \quad (3.20)$$

Solution (3.19) is globally well-defined when the angular part  $e^{\pm\frac{i}{2}\sqrt{-M}\varphi}$  has a period  $\pi$  (antiperiodic spinor) or  $2\pi$  (periodic spinor). Since the period of the angular coordinate is

$2\pi$ , it means that  $\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-M}$  has to be an integer or half-integer for a global well-definiteness. In sum,

$$\sqrt{-M} = n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \quad \Rightarrow \quad M = -n^2, \quad (3.21)$$

when the spinor becomes periodic (even  $n$ ) or antiperiodic (odd  $n$ ) in the angle  $\varphi$ . Obtained BPS geometries are summarized as follows:

- $n = 0, M = 0$  : massless black hole;
- $n = 1, M = -1$  : global AdS<sub>3</sub> space;
- $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}, M = -n^2$  : naked singularity with integer angular excess.

Recall that the massless black hole,  $M = 0$ , is the Ramond vacuum, i.e., with periodic boundary conditions; the solution  $M = -1$  is the Neveu-Schwarz vacuum, i.e., with anti-periodic boundary conditions, as the space is simply connected. Remarkably, we found that we also have supersymmetric solutions with negative values of the mass,  $M = -n^2$ , with  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}$ . The latter are solutions with integer angular excesses around the origin. In addition to these configurations, we will also find that there exist stationary, non-static solutions that are  $\frac{1}{2}$  BPS. Namely, in the same way we have the well-known extremal black hole solutions with  $M = \pm J/\ell > 0$ , there are also supersymmetric solutions with negative values of  $M + J/\ell$ . We will study the latter configurations in the following subsection.

### 3.2 The stationary case

In the stationary case, the vielbein and a torsionless spin connection can be chosen as

$$\begin{aligned} e^0 &= f dt, & e^1 &= \frac{dr}{f}, & e^2 &= r(d\varphi + N dt), \\ \omega^0 &= f d\varphi, & \omega^1 &= \frac{J}{2fr^2} dr, & \omega^2 &= \frac{r}{\ell^2} dt - \frac{J}{2r} d\varphi, \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

where  $f(r)$  and  $N(r)$  are given in Eq. (2.10), and  $(M, J)$  are the mass and angular momentum of the naked singularity. To compute the spin connection components, we have used  $f' = \frac{r}{f\ell^2} - \frac{J^2}{4fr^3}$ .

With the Gamma matrices representation (2.5), the Killing spinor equation (3.2) now reads

$$d\psi + \left[ \frac{1}{2\ell} \left( f\Gamma_0 - \left( \frac{J}{2r} + \theta \frac{r}{\ell} \right) \Gamma_2 \right) (dt - \theta \ell d\varphi) - \frac{1}{2rf} \Gamma_1 \left( \frac{\theta J}{2r} - \frac{r}{\ell} \right) dr \right] \psi = 0, \quad (3.23)$$

or, expressed in components,

$$\begin{aligned}
dt & : \quad 0 = \partial_t \psi + \frac{1}{2\ell} \left[ f\Gamma_0 - \Gamma_2 \left( \frac{J}{2r} + \theta \frac{r}{\ell} \right) \right] \psi, \\
dr & : \quad 0 = \partial_r \psi - \frac{1}{2rf} \Gamma_1 \left( \frac{\theta J}{2r} - \frac{r}{\ell} \right) \psi, \\
d\varphi & : \quad 0 = \partial_\varphi \psi - \frac{\theta}{2} \left[ f\Gamma_0 - \Gamma_2 \left( \frac{J}{2r} + \theta \frac{r}{\ell} \right) \right] \psi.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

In the coordinates (3.7), these equations take the form

$$\begin{aligned}
0 & = \partial_+ \psi \quad \Rightarrow \quad \psi = \psi(x^-, r), \\
0 & = \partial_- \psi + \frac{1}{2\ell} \left[ f\Gamma_0 - \Gamma_2 \left( \frac{J}{2r} + \theta \frac{r}{\ell} \right) \right] \psi, \\
0 & = \partial_r \psi - \frac{1}{2rf} \Gamma_1 \left( \frac{\theta J}{2r} - \frac{r}{\ell} \right) \psi.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

Taking the second derivative in  $\partial_-$  of the second equation leads to

$$\partial_-^2 \psi = \frac{1}{4\ell^2} \left[ f\Gamma_0 - \Gamma_2 \left( \theta \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{J}{2r} \right) \right]^2 \psi = \frac{1}{4\ell^2} \left( M + \frac{\theta J}{\ell} \right) \psi. \tag{3.26}$$

For convenience, let us denote

$$\omega = \sqrt{-M - \frac{\theta J}{\ell}}, \quad \omega^2 \geq 0 \quad \text{or} \quad -M\ell \geq \theta J, \tag{3.27}$$

where the positivity of  $\omega^2$  is because we are interested in naked singularities; black hole solutions were discussed in [8]. Therefore, we get

$$\partial_-^2 \psi + \frac{\omega^2}{4} \psi = 0, \tag{3.28}$$

leading to the general solution

$$\psi(x^-, r) = e^{-\frac{i}{2\ell} \omega x^-} \chi_1(r) + e^{\frac{i}{2\ell} \omega x^-} \chi_2(r). \tag{3.29}$$

We still have to impose that the second equation in (3.25) is satisfied. Focusing on the positive-frequency component (the other one is obtained by  $\omega \rightarrow -\omega$ ), we write it as

$$\left[ i\omega - f\Gamma_0 + \Gamma_2 \left( \theta \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{J}{2r} \right) \right] \chi_1 = 0, \tag{3.30}$$

or, equivalently, as

$$\begin{pmatrix} i\omega + \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} & -i\theta f \\ -i\theta f & i\omega - \frac{r}{\ell} - \frac{\theta J}{2r} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 \\ \rho_1 \end{pmatrix} = 0. \quad (3.31)$$

The determinant of the system is zero, so there is a non trivial solution; namely

$$\chi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -\frac{i}{f} (i\theta\omega + \theta \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{J}{2r}) \end{pmatrix} \lambda_1. \quad (3.32)$$

It only remains to solve the radial equation in (3.25). We write it as

$$0 = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_r & \frac{i}{2rf} \left( \frac{J}{2r} - \theta \frac{r}{\ell} \right) \\ -\frac{i}{2rf} \left( \frac{J}{2r} - \theta \frac{r}{\ell} \right) & \partial_r \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 \\ -\frac{i}{f} (i\theta\omega + \theta \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{J}{2r}) \lambda_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.33)$$

or, equivalently, as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \partial_r \lambda_1 + \frac{1}{2rf^2} \left( \frac{J}{2r} - \theta \frac{r}{\ell} \right) \left( i\theta\omega + \theta \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{J}{2r} \right) \lambda_1, \\ 0 &= \frac{1}{2rf} \left( \frac{J}{2r} - \theta \frac{r}{\ell} \right) \lambda_1 + \partial_r \left[ \frac{1}{f} \left( i\theta\omega + \theta \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{J}{2r} \right) \lambda_1 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

The first line can be solved exactly as

$$\lambda_1(r) = e^{h(r)} \eta_1, \quad \eta_1 = const, \quad (3.35)$$

with  $\eta_1$  being a constant Grassmann number. The radial part is given by the function

$$h(r) = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{dr}{rf^2} \left( \frac{r}{\ell} - \frac{\theta J}{2r} \right) \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} + i\omega \right) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} + i\omega \right), \quad (3.36)$$

where we applied the identity  $f^2 = \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} + i\omega \right) \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} - i\omega \right)$  in order to solve the integral. Therefore, the radial part has the form

$$e^{h(r)} = \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} - i\omega \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.37)$$

Again, it results proportional to  $\sqrt{\frac{r}{\ell}}$  for large  $r$ .

The last equation to be checked is the second line of (3.34), which is algebraic, and can be factorized as follows

$$0 = -\frac{1}{2rf^3} \left( \frac{J}{2r} - \frac{r}{\ell} \right) \left[ f^2 - 2 \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{J}{2r} \right) \left( i\omega + \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{J}{2r} \right) + \left( i\omega + \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{J}{2r} \right)^2 \right]. \quad (3.38)$$

Replacing  $f^2 = \omega^2 + \frac{J}{\ell} + \frac{r^2}{\ell^2} + \frac{J^2}{4r^2}$  in the second factor, we easily observe that it vanishes identically.

The final solution is a  $J \neq 0$  generalization of the static one (3.19), and it reads

$$\psi = e^{-\frac{i}{2\ell}\omega x^-} \begin{pmatrix} \left(\frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} - i\omega\right)^{1/2} \\ -i\theta \left(\frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} + i\omega\right)^{1/2} \end{pmatrix} \eta_1 + e^{\frac{i}{2\ell}\omega x^-} \begin{pmatrix} \left(\frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} + i\omega\right)^{1/2} \\ -i\theta \left(\frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} - i\omega\right)^{1/2} \end{pmatrix} \eta_2. \quad (3.39)$$

Similarly to the static case (3.21), this solution is globally well-defined when the spinor is periodic or antiperiodic in the angle  $x^-$ , leading to the condition

$$\omega = n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \quad \Rightarrow \quad M + \frac{\theta J}{\ell} = -n^2. \quad (3.40)$$

## 4 Alternative derivations

### 4.1 Computing Killing spinors and separability

Now, let us solve the Killing spinor equation (3.25) in an alternative way that, in particular, will allow us to make contact with the results of Ref. [4]; see appendix therein. First, we solve the radial components in (3.25), considering

$$\psi = U(r) \Phi(x^+, x^-), \quad (4.1)$$

where  $\Phi(x^+, x^-)$  is an arbitrary spinor and  $U(r)$  is the following invertible matrix,

$$U(r) = e^{-\beta(r)\Gamma_1} = \cosh \beta - \Gamma_1 \sinh \beta, \quad (4.2)$$

with the radial part given by<sup>3</sup>

$$\beta(r) = \int \frac{dr}{2rf} \left( \frac{r}{\ell} - \frac{\theta J}{2r} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} + f \right). \quad (4.3)$$

It means that the radial matrix acquires the form

$$U(r) = \frac{1 + \Gamma_1}{2} \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} + f \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1 - \Gamma_1}{2} \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} + f \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (4.4)$$

With this result at hand, we can write the other two Killing spinor equation components in (3.25) as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= U \partial_+ \Phi(x^+, x^-) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Phi = \Phi(x^-), \\ 0 &= \partial_- \Phi(x^-) + \frac{1}{2\ell} U^{-1} \Omega U \Phi(x^-), \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>Introducing the variable  $z = \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} + i\omega$  in  $f^2 = z^2 + \omega^2$ , the radial integral can be solved as  $\beta = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{dz}{\sqrt{z^2 + \omega^2}} = \frac{1}{2} \ln(z + f)$ .

where we defined the radial matrix

$$\Omega(r) = f\Gamma_0 - \Gamma_2 \left( \frac{J}{2r} + \theta \frac{r}{\ell} \right), \quad (4.6)$$

with the property

$$\det \Omega = -M - \frac{\theta J}{\ell} = \omega^2. \quad (4.7)$$

Using the identity

$$\Gamma_a \Gamma_b = -\theta \varepsilon_{abc} \Gamma^c, \quad (4.8)$$

it is a straightforward computation to show that the matrix  $U^{-1}\Omega U$  is  $r$ -independent; namely

$$U^{-1}\Omega U = \frac{1+\omega^2}{2} \Gamma_0 - \frac{1-\omega^2}{2} \theta \Gamma_2. \quad (4.9)$$

Moreover, it satisfies

$$(U^{-1}\Omega U)^2 = -\omega^2, \quad (4.10)$$

implying that it has eigenvalues  $\pm i\omega$ . Its representation is

$$U^{-1}\Omega U = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1-\omega^2}{2} & i\theta \frac{1+\omega^2}{2} \\ i\theta \frac{1+\omega^2}{2} & \frac{1-\omega^2}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.11)$$

We could solve the second Eq. (4.5) in a diagonal basis and, then, we would have two solutions with coefficients  $e^{\pm \frac{i}{2\ell} \omega x^-}$ , such that their single-valuedness would again impose the condition (3.40) on the frequency. However, instead of proceeding in that way, for a simpler comparison with the previous section, let us solve the second Eq. (4.5) in the present basis. Because of  $U^{-1}\Omega U$  being a constant matrix, we can take its second derivative in  $\partial_-$ , finding

$$0 = \partial_-^2 \Phi + \frac{\omega^2}{4\ell^2} \Phi \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Phi(x^-) = e^{-\frac{i}{2\ell} \omega x^-} \chi_1 + e^{\frac{i}{2\ell} \omega x^-} \chi_2, \quad (4.12)$$

where  $\chi_i$  are constant spinors ( $i = 1, 2$ ). Denoting  $\chi_i = \begin{pmatrix} \eta_i \\ \rho_i \end{pmatrix}$ , Eq. (4.5) becomes

$$0 = \begin{pmatrix} -i\omega - \frac{1-\omega^2}{2} & i\theta \frac{1+\omega^2}{2} \\ i\theta \frac{1+\omega^2}{2} & -i\omega + \frac{1-\omega^2}{2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \rho_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.13)$$

and the negative-frequency solution is obtained by the replacement  $\omega \rightarrow -\omega$ . The two components are not independent and it is enough to solve only the first one. We find

$$\rho_1 = -i\theta \frac{1-\omega^2 + 2i\omega}{1+\omega^2} \eta_1 = -i\theta \frac{1+i\omega}{1-i\omega} \eta_1. \quad (4.14)$$

The final solution is  $\psi = U\Phi$ , with

$$\Phi = e^{-\frac{i}{2\ell}\omega x^-} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i\theta \frac{1+i\omega}{1-i\omega} \end{pmatrix} \eta_1 + e^{\frac{i}{2\ell}\omega x^-} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i\theta \frac{1-i\omega}{1+i\omega} \end{pmatrix} \eta_2, \quad (4.15)$$

and the radial part (4.4) given by

$$U(r) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{2}\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \frac{i\theta}{2}\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{i\theta}{2}\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ -\frac{i\theta}{2}\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{i\theta}{2}\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \frac{1}{2}\mu^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{2}\mu^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.16)$$

where  $\mu = \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} + f$ . For large  $r$ , the solution  $\psi$  behaves as  $\sqrt{\frac{r}{\ell}}$  and, similarly as before, it has a common vector  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ i\theta \end{pmatrix}$  with a  $\omega$ -dependent factor multiplying each  $\eta_i$ . This solution is totally equivalent to the solution found previously: see the following two subsections for more details.

## 4.2 The Coussaert-Henneaux solution

Now, let us compare the solution (4.15) with the one found by Coussaert and Henneaux (CH) in Ref. [8]. While, in [8], the authors were mainly interested in the black hole solutions, the derivation above is general enough, so that it has to match the CH solution after restricting in the correct range of the space of parameters. Let us plug in the expressions for  $U(r)$  and  $\Phi(x^-)$  in the (positive frequency part of the) Killing spinor using the notation  $A = B^{-1} = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . We get

$$\psi_+ = U(r)\Phi_+(x^-) = e^{-\frac{i}{2\ell}\omega x^-} \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} A + B + (A - B) \frac{1+i\omega}{1-i\omega} \\ -i\theta [(A - B) + (A + B) \frac{1+i\omega}{1-i\omega}] \end{pmatrix} \eta_1, \quad (4.17)$$

or simply

$$\psi_+ = e^{-\frac{i}{2\ell}\omega x^-} \begin{pmatrix} A - i\omega B \\ -i\theta (A + i\omega B) \end{pmatrix} \tilde{\eta}_1, \quad (4.18)$$

and for the negative frequency part

$$\psi_- = e^{\frac{i}{2\ell}\omega x^-} \begin{pmatrix} A + i\omega B \\ -i\theta (A - i\omega B) \end{pmatrix} \tilde{\eta}_2, \quad (4.19)$$

with redefinitions  $\tilde{\eta}_1 = \frac{\eta_1}{1-i\omega}$  and  $\tilde{\eta}_2 = \frac{\eta_2}{1+i\omega}$ .

The CH solution corresponds to the extremal black hole, i.e.,

$$M = \frac{\theta J}{\ell} \geq 0, \quad (4.20)$$

where  $\theta = \pm 1$  is chosen so that the positivity of  $M$  is satisfied. In that case,  $f = \frac{r}{\ell} - \frac{\theta J}{2r}$  and  $A = B^{-1} = \sqrt{2} \left(\frac{r}{\ell}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ .

We can use this result to make the Killing spinor looks like CH solution. Indeed, in

$$\psi = \psi_+ + \psi_- = e^{-\frac{i}{2\ell}\omega x^-} \begin{pmatrix} A - i\omega B \\ -i\theta(A + i\omega B) \end{pmatrix} \tilde{\eta}_1 + e^{\frac{i}{2\ell}\omega x^-} \begin{pmatrix} A + i\omega B \\ -i\theta(A - i\omega B) \end{pmatrix} \tilde{\eta}_2, \quad (4.21)$$

we first separate the terms growing and decreasing with  $r$  (by  $A$  and  $B$ , respectively),

$$\psi = A \left( e^{-\frac{i}{2\ell}\omega x^-} \tilde{\eta}_1 + e^{\frac{i}{2\ell}\omega x^-} \tilde{\eta}_2 \right) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i\theta \end{pmatrix} - i\omega B \left( e^{-\frac{i}{2\ell}\omega x^-} \tilde{\eta}_1 - e^{\frac{i}{2\ell}\omega x^-} \tilde{\eta}_2 \right) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ i\theta \end{pmatrix}.$$

Plugging in  $A = B^{-1} = \sqrt{2} \left(\frac{r}{\ell}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  and introducing the trigonometric functions along  $\Lambda_1 = \tilde{\eta}_1 + \tilde{\eta}_2$  and  $\Lambda_2 = \tilde{\eta}_1 - \tilde{\eta}_2$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &= \sqrt{2} \left(\frac{r}{\ell}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[ \Lambda_1 \cos\left(\frac{\omega x^-}{2\ell}\right) - i\Lambda_2 \sin\left(\frac{\omega x^-}{2\ell}\right) \right] \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i\theta \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad + \frac{i\omega}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{r}{\ell}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left[ -\Lambda_2 \cos\left(\frac{\omega x^-}{2\ell}\right) + i\Lambda_1 \sin\left(\frac{\omega x^-}{2\ell}\right) \right] \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ i\theta \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

Furthermore, the extremal black hole have complex  $\omega = i\sqrt{2M}$ , such that we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &= \sqrt{2} \left(\frac{r}{\ell}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[ \Lambda_1 \cosh\left(\sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell}\right) + \Lambda_2 \sinh\left(\sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell}\right) \right] \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i\theta \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{M} \left(\frac{r}{\ell}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left[ \Lambda_2 \cosh\left(\sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell}\right) + \Lambda_1 \sinh\left(\sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell}\right) \right] \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ i\theta \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

Now, we are in conditions to compare this solution we obtained with the CH Killing spinor found in [8] for the extremal black hole. The latter is

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\text{CH}} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{r}{\ell}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[ a_1 \cosh\left(\sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell}\right) + a_2 \sinh\left(\sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell}\right) \right] \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{r}{\ell}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \left[ a_2 \cosh\left(\sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell}\right) + a_1 \sinh\left(\sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell}\right) \right] \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

And we, actually, verify that they completely match, provided one chooses the normalization as  $\Lambda_i = \frac{a_i}{2\sqrt{2}}$ . A difference in the columns is related to the representation choice: in [8] it is used  $\{\Gamma_0 = i\sigma^2, \Gamma_1 = \sigma^1, \Gamma_2 = \sigma^3\}$ .

As a consistency check, let us notice that the Killing spinor (3.39), obtained in a different way, is also equivalent to the CH solution in the extremal black hole case. Indeed, when  $\omega = i\sqrt{2M}$ , it becomes

$$\psi = e^{\sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell}} \begin{pmatrix} \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} + \sqrt{2M} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ -i\theta \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} - \sqrt{2M} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix} \eta_1 + e^{-\sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell}} \begin{pmatrix} \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} - \sqrt{2M} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ -i\theta \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} + \sqrt{2M} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix} \eta_2. \quad (4.25)$$

Then, noting that  $\frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} \pm \sqrt{2M} = \left[ \left( \frac{r}{\ell} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \pm \left( \frac{M\ell}{2r} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right]^2$  when  $M\ell = \theta J$ , it can be rewritten as

$$\psi = e^{\sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell}} \begin{pmatrix} \left( \frac{r}{\ell} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left( \frac{M\ell}{2r} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ -i\theta \left[ \left( \frac{r}{\ell} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \left( \frac{M\ell}{2r} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \end{pmatrix} \eta_1 + e^{-\sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell}} \begin{pmatrix} \left( \frac{r}{\ell} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \left( \frac{M\ell}{2r} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ -i\theta \left[ \left( \frac{r}{\ell} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left( \frac{M\ell}{2r} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \end{pmatrix} \eta_2, \quad (4.26)$$

or separating the  $\left( \frac{r}{\ell} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $\left( \frac{r}{\ell} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  contributions,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &= \left( \frac{r}{\ell} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( e^{\sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell}} \eta_1 + e^{-\sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell}} \eta_2 \right) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i\theta \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad + \left( \frac{r}{\ell} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \left( e^{\sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell}} \eta_1 - e^{-\sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell}} \eta_2 \right) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ i\theta \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

or equivalently, in terms of hyperbolic functions,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &= \left( \frac{r}{\ell} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[ \cosh \left( \sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell} \right) (\eta_1 + \eta_2) + \sinh \left( \sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell} \right) (\eta_1 - \eta_2) \right] \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -i\theta \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad + \left( \frac{r}{\ell} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \left[ \cosh \left( \sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell} \right) (\eta_1 - \eta_2) + \sinh \left( \sqrt{\frac{M}{2}} \frac{x^-}{\ell} \right) (\eta_1 + \eta_2) \right] \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ i\theta \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Redefining the constant spinors as  $\eta_1 + \eta_2 = \frac{a_1}{2}$  and  $\eta_1 - \eta_2 = \frac{a_2}{2}$ , the result exactly matches Eq. (4.24).

### 4.3 Equivalence of solutions

To complete the discussion and as a further consistency check of the calculation, let us show now that the Killing spinors (3.39) and (4.21), obtained by different procedures, are equivalent for any  $M$ . To make it simpler, we first note that both solutions have the form

$$\psi = e^{-\frac{i}{2\ell}\omega x^-} \begin{pmatrix} z \\ -i\theta z^* \end{pmatrix} \eta_1 + e^{\frac{i}{2\ell}\omega x^-} \begin{pmatrix} z^* \\ -i\theta z \end{pmatrix} \eta_2, \quad (4.28)$$

where  $z$  is a complex number and  $z^*$  is its conjugate. Specifically,  $z_1$  in Eq. (3.39) and  $z_2$  in Eq. (4.21) are

$$\begin{aligned} z_1 &= \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} - i\omega \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ z_2 &= \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} + f \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - i\omega \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} + f \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} = A - i\omega B. \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

Thus, it is enough to prove that  $z_1^2$  and  $z_2^2$  are proportional to each other. Then, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} z_1^2 &= \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} - i\omega, \\ z_2^2 &= A^2 - \omega^2 B^2 - 2i\omega, \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

where we used  $AB = 1$ . Using also  $f^2 = \omega^2 + \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} \right)^2$ , we can manipulate the real part of  $z_2^2$  as

$$A^2 - \omega^2 B^2 = 2 \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} \right), \quad (4.31)$$

such that the complex numbers are manifestly proportional, namely

$$z_2^2 = 2 \left( \frac{r}{\ell} + \frac{\theta J}{2r} \right) - 2i\omega = 2z_1^2. \quad (4.32)$$

Then, we conclude that the Killing spinors (3.39) and (4.21) are equal, provided the relation between the constant spinors is  $\eta_i = \sqrt{2}\tilde{\eta}_i$ .

## 5 A CFT<sub>2</sub> boundary perspective

Before concluding, let us make some comments about how to look at these special states from the holographic point of view; that is to say, from the dual CFT<sub>2</sub> perspective. We are interested in identifying which representations of the Virasoro symmetry are those associated to the negative mass BPS configurations discussed above. As anticipated, in the semiclassical limit, the static BPS states can be associated to the so-called degenerate representation of Liouville field theory, which are non-normalizable states of the CFT<sub>2</sub> that contain null descendants in the Verma modulo. But, first, let us review where the Liouville CFT<sub>2</sub> description comes from. Since here we are dealing with AdS<sub>3</sub> supergravity, the right theory to look at would be super-Liouville; nevertheless, it will be sufficient for

us to focus on the bosonic theory first; we will see below how the super-Liouville leads to the same results.

In the renowned paper [2], Brown and Henneaux found that the asymptotic isometries in asymptotically AdS<sub>3</sub> spacetimes is generated by two commuting copies of the Witt algebra, with the associated Noether charges satisfying two copies of Virasoro algebra with the central charge<sup>4</sup>

$$c = \frac{3\ell}{2G}. \quad (5.1)$$

The extension of the study of the asymptotic dynamics in AdS<sub>3</sub> supergravity was done in [46] and yields an equivalent result. The observation in [2] is often considered a precursor of AdS/CFT [47], the reason being that, from a modern perspective, the central charge (5.1) is understood as that of the dual CFT<sub>2</sub>. Also, one can identify the conformal dimension of the CFT<sub>2</sub> states as coming from the  $L_0$  and  $\bar{L}_0$  generators of the isometry algebra, which correspond to the spin and the energy of the configuration; namely

$$h - \frac{c}{24} = \frac{1}{2}(\ell M + J), \quad \bar{h} - \frac{c}{24} = \frac{1}{2}(\ell M - J), \quad (5.2)$$

which is equivalent to

$$\frac{h + \bar{h}}{\ell} = M + \frac{1}{8G}, \quad h - \bar{h} = J. \quad (5.3)$$

This result enables us to identify the gap in the spectrum of the BTZ black hole with respect to the AdS<sub>3</sub> vacuum  $h = \bar{h} = 0$ , which corresponds to

$$M_0 = -\frac{1}{8G}, \quad J_0 = 0. \quad (5.4)$$

Reciprocally, the configuration  $M = J = 0$  corresponds to

$$h_0 = \bar{h}_0 = \frac{c}{24}. \quad (5.5)$$

In [40], van Driel, Coussaert and Henneaux went further in the CFT<sub>2</sub> description of the AdS<sub>3</sub> asymptotic dynamics and, following a sequence of steps that includes a gauge fixing and a prescription of boundary conditions that implement a Hamiltonian reduction [42], they found that the asymptotic dynamics of Einstein (super-)gravity in AdS<sub>3</sub> is governed by a (super-)Liouville field theory action. Because this equivalence is valid only at the level of the actions, one should not understand the relation between three-dimensional gravity and Liouville as holding beyond the semiclassical limit. In fact, there are many reasons why Liouville field theory should not be regarded as dual to a sensible quantum gravity

---

<sup>4</sup>In this subsection, we restore the dependence of the Newton constant  $G$ .

theory: the continuous spectrum and the absence of an  $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ -invariant vacuum are probably the most salient reasons. Nevertheless, nothing prevents us from investigating to what extent this relation between  $\text{AdS}_3$  gravity and Liouville  $\text{CFT}_2$  can be taken for valid.

Therefore, let us be reminded of some basic aspects of Liouville field theory. The theory has a central charge given by

$$c = 1 + 6Q^2, \quad \text{with } Q = q + q^{-1}, \quad (5.6)$$

where  $q \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $c \geq 25$ , and  $Q$  is the background charge. The semiclassical (large  $c$ ) limit of the theory corresponds to  $q \rightarrow 0$ .

Liouville field theory has a continuous spectrum, with normalizable states having conformal dimension

$$h = \bar{h} = \frac{c-1}{24} + \lambda^2, \quad \text{with } \lambda^2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \quad (5.7)$$

We notice from (5.7) that the spectrum has a gap, which in the semiclassical limit reads

$$\min(h) = \min(\bar{h}) = \frac{c-1}{24} \simeq \frac{1}{4q^2}; \quad (5.8)$$

cf. (5.5). From (5.4) and (5.8) we read a relation between the gravity parameter  $\ell/G$  and the Liouville variable  $q$ ; namely

$$q^2 = \frac{4G}{\ell}. \quad (5.9)$$

In addition to the normalizable states (5.7), the theory has other interesting lower weight representations. These are the degenerate representations; namely, non-normalizable, spinless states that contain null descendants in the Verma modulo and are useful to carry on the bootstrap method in the theory, for example, to solve correlation functions. The states of the degenerate representations are of the form

$$h_{m,n} = \bar{h}_{m,n} = \frac{c-1}{24} - \frac{1}{4}(mq + nq^{-1})^2, \quad \text{with } m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}. \quad (5.10)$$

If we again consider the semiclassical limit, we can write the following state identification

$$h_{m,n} = \bar{h}_{m,n} \simeq \frac{c}{24}(1 - n^2) \simeq \frac{\ell}{16G}(1 - n^2), \quad (5.11)$$

which yields the mass and angular momentum of the BPS states,

$$M \simeq -\frac{n^2}{8G}, \quad J = 0. \quad (5.12)$$

This means that we can identify the BPS static configurations of negative mass with the semiclassical limit of Liouville degenerate representations.

Now, let us consider the super-Liouville theory: Virasoro central charge in the superconformal algebra of super-Liouville theory is

$$\hat{c} = 1 + 2Q^2. \quad (5.13)$$

On the other hand, the central charge  $\hat{c}$  is also related to the Chern-Simons level  $k$  as  $\hat{c} = 4k$ . It is useful to compare the notation in [48] with that in [46]. In order to do so, we can define

$$\hat{c} = \frac{2}{3}c, \quad (5.14)$$

with  $c = 6k = \frac{3\ell}{2G}$  being the Brown-Henneaux central charge.

Studying the degenerate representations in super-Liouville, we also find

$$h_{m,n} + \bar{h}_{m,n} - \frac{c}{12} = \ell M = -\frac{n^2\ell}{8G}. \quad (5.15)$$

So far, we have discussed spin-zero representations, which correspond to static geometries. For those states we have identified the BPS configurations of negative mass with the semiclassical limit of spinless Liouville degenerate representations. The question arises as to whether such an identification is also possible for the spinning ( $J \neq 0$ ) configurations. Answering this question leads us to investigate the non-diagonal representations of  $\text{CFT}_2$ , which were recently studied in [27]. These representations take the form

$$h_{m,n} = \frac{c-1}{24} - \frac{1}{4}(mq + nq^{-1})^2, \quad \bar{h}_{m,n} = \frac{c-1}{24} - \frac{1}{4}(mq - nq^{-1})^2, \quad (5.16)$$

with  $m, n$  taking (semi-)integer values, cf. [49]. Figure 1 depicts the non-diagonal representations of [27] for some (finite) values of the central charge  $c$ . This yields the spin  $h_{m,n} - \bar{h}_{m,n} = mn$  and, in the semiclassical limit, the condition

$$h_{m,n} - \frac{c}{24} = \frac{1}{2}(\ell M + J) \simeq -\frac{n^2\ell}{16G}, \quad (5.17)$$

which is exactly the BPS condition (3.40) after restoring the factor of  $G$ . However, the last approximation in (5.17) requires  $h_{m,n} - \bar{h}_{m,n}$  to be parametrically small relative to  $\frac{n^2}{q^2}$  in the  $q \rightarrow 0$  limit, and so this fails to represent states with non-zero spin in the semiclassical limit.

It would be interesting to explore the  $\text{CFT}_2$  realization of spinning BPS states discussed here in the semiclassical limit from a boundary perspective. This would require to




Figure 1: Non-diagonal representations for some specific, finite values of  $c$  as a function of  $M$  and  $J$ . Sparse spectrum is observed for large  $c$ .

take in (5.16)  $m \sim \hat{m}q^{-2}$ , which yields  $\ell M + J \simeq -\frac{(\hat{m}+n)^2\ell}{8G}$ . This result can be thought of as a motivation to further study non-diagonal representations of supersymmetric non-rational  $\text{CFT}_2$  and generalize the results of [27, 49]. It would also be interesting to explore the relation between the solutions studied here and some of the states discussed in Ref. [50]. Understanding the connection with theories in two dimensions would also be important to seek. We leave these problems for the future.

## Acknowledgments

The authors thank Glenn Barnich, Laura Donnay, Andrea Campoleoni, Marc Henneaux, Julio Oliva, Joris Raeymaekers, Sylvain Ribault, and Gustavo Turiaci for discussions, correspondence and references. This work has been funded in part by Anillo Grant ANID/ACT210100 and FONDECYT Grants 1231779, 1230492, 1220862 and 1201208.

## References

- [1] M. Bañados, C. Teitelboim and J. Zanelli, “The Black hole in three-dimensional space-time,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 1849-1851 (1992) [arXiv:hep-th/9204099 [hep-th]].
- [2] J. D. Brown and M. Henneaux, “Central Charges in the Canonical Realization of Asymptotic Symmetries: An Example from Three-Dimensional Gravity,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **104**, 207-226 (1986).

- [3] M. Bañados, M. Henneaux, C. Teitelboim and J. Zanelli, “Geometry of the (2+1) black hole,” *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 1506-1525 (1993) [erratum: *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 069902 (2013)] [arXiv:gr-qc/9302012 [gr-qc]].
- [4] O. Mišković and J. Zanelli, “On the negative spectrum of the 2+1 black hole,” *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 105011 (2009) [arXiv:0904.0475 [hep-th]].
- [5] M. Briceño, C. Martínez and J. Zanelli, “On the Central Singularity of the BTZ Geometries,” to appear.
- [6] E. Witten, “Three-Dimensional Gravity Revisited,” [arXiv:0706.3359 [hep-th]].
- [7] A. Strominger, “Black hole entropy from near horizon microstates,” *JHEP* **02**, 009 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9712251 [hep-th]].
- [8] O. Coussaert and M. Henneaux, “Supersymmetry of the (2+1) black holes,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 183-186 (1994) [arXiv:hep-th/9310194 [hep-th]].
- [9] J. Oliva, D. Tempo and R. Troncoso, “Static spherically symmetric solutions for conformal gravity in three dimensions,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **24**, 1588-1592 (2009) [arXiv:0905.1510 [hep-th]].
- [10] A. A. García, F. W. Hehl, C. Heinicke and A. Macias, “Exact vacuum solution of a (1+2)-dimensional Poincare gauge theory: BTZ solution with torsion,” *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 124016 (2003) [arXiv:gr-qc/0302097 [gr-qc]].
- [11] G. T. Horowitz and D. L. Welch, “Exact three-dimensional black holes in string theory,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 328-331 (1993) [arXiv:hep-th/9302126 [hep-th]].
- [12] K. A. Moussa, G. Clement and C. Leygnac, “The Black holes of topologically massive gravity,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **20**, L277-L283 (2003) [arXiv:gr-qc/0303042 [gr-qc]].
- [13] E. A. Bergshoeff, O. Hohm and P. K. Townsend, “More on Massive 3D Gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 124042 (2009) [arXiv:0905.1259 [hep-th]].
- [14] M. Bañados and S. Theisen, “Three-dimensional massive gravity and the bigravity black hole,” *JHEP* **11**, 033 (2009) [arXiv:0909.1163 [hep-th]].
- [15] M. Gutperle and P. Kraus, “Higher Spin Black Holes,” *JHEP* **05**, 022 (2011) [arXiv:1103.4304 [hep-th]].

- [16] M. Ammon, M. Gutperle, P. Kraus and E. Perlmutter, “Spacetime Geometry in Higher Spin Gravity,” JHEP **10**, 053 (2011) [arXiv:1106.4788 [hep-th]].
- [17] P. Kraus and E. Perlmutter, “Partition functions of higher spin black holes and their CFT duals,” JHEP **11**, 061 (2011) [arXiv:1108.2567 [hep-th]].
- [18] M. R. Gaberdiel, T. Hartman and K. Jin, “Higher Spin Black Holes from CFT,” JHEP **04**, 103 (2012) [arXiv:1203.0015 [hep-th]].
- [19] J. de Boer and J. I. Jottar, “Thermodynamics of higher spin black holes in  $AdS_3$ ,” JHEP **01**, 023 (2014) [arXiv:1302.0816 [hep-th]].
- [20] M. Henneaux, A. Pérez, D. Tempo and R. Troncoso, “Chemical potentials in three-dimensional higher spin anti-de Sitter gravity,” JHEP **12**, 048 (2013) [arXiv:1309.4362 [hep-th]].
- [21] A. Pérez, D. Tempo and R. Troncoso, “Higher Spin Black Holes,” Lect. Notes Phys. **892**, 265-288 (2015) [arXiv:1402.1465 [hep-th]].
- [22] A. Pérez, D. Tempo and R. Troncoso, “Higher spin black hole entropy in three dimensions,” JHEP **04**, 143 (2013) [arXiv:1301.0847 [hep-th]].
- [23] A. Perez, D. Tempo and R. Troncoso, “Higher spin gravity in 3D: Black holes, global charges and thermodynamics,” Phys. Lett. B **726**, 444-449 (2013) [arXiv:1207.2844 [hep-th]].
- [24] M. Bañados, A. Castro, A. Faraggi and J. I. Jottar, “Extremal Higher Spin Black Holes,” JHEP **04**, 077 (2016) [arXiv:1512.00073 [hep-th]].
- [25] A. Castro, R. Gopakumar, M. Gutperle and J. Raeymaekers, “Conical Defects in Higher Spin Theories,” JHEP **02**, 096 (2012) [arXiv:1111.3381 [hep-th]].
- [26] S. Deser, R. Jackiw and G. 't Hooft, “Three-Dimensional Einstein Gravity: Dynamics of Flat Space,” Annals Phys. **152**, 220 (1984)
- [27] S. Migliaccio and S. Ribault, “The analytic bootstrap equations of non-diagonal two-dimensional CFT,” JHEP **05**, 169 (2018) [arXiv:1711.08916 [hep-th]].
- [28] E. Perlmutter, T. Prochazka and J. Raeymaekers, “The semiclassical limit of  $W_N$  CFTs and Vasiliev theory,” JHEP **05**, 007 (2013) [arXiv:1210.8452 [hep-th]].

- [29] A. Campoleoni, S. Fredenhagen and J. Raeymaekers, “Quantizing higher-spin gravity in free-field variables,” JHEP **02**, 126 (2018) [arXiv:1712.08078 [hep-th]].
- [30] J. Raeymaekers, “Quantization of conical spaces in 3D gravity,” JHEP **03**, 060 (2015) [arXiv:1412.0278 [hep-th]].
- [31] J. Raeymaekers, “Conical spaces, modular invariance and  $c_{p,1}$  holography,” JHEP **03**, 189 (2021) [arXiv:2012.07934 [hep-th]].
- [32] S. Collier, Y. Gobeil, H. Maxfield and E. Perlmutter, “Quantum Regge Trajectories and the Virasoro Analytic Bootstrap,” JHEP **05**, 212 (2019) [arXiv:1811.05710 [hep-th]].
- [33] N. Benjamin, S. Collier and A. Maloney, “Pure Gravity and Conical Defects,” JHEP **09**, 034 (2020) [arXiv:2004.14428 [hep-th]].
- [34] T. G. Mertens and G. J. Turiaci, “Defects in Jackiw-Teitelboim Quantum Gravity,” JHEP **08**, 127 (2019) [arXiv:1904.05228 [hep-th]].
- [35] M. Heydeman, L. V. Iliesiu, G. J. Turiaci and W. Zhao, “The statistical mechanics of near-BPS black holes,” J. Phys. A **55**, no.1, 014004 (2022) [arXiv:2011.01953 [hep-th]].
- [36] G. J. Turiaci and E. Witten, “ $\mathcal{N} = 2$  JT Supergravity and Matrix Models,” [arXiv:2305.19438 [hep-th]].
- [37] L. J. Romans, “Black holes in cosmological Einstein-Maxwell theory,” Workshop on Superstrings and Related Topics, 416-427 (1992).
- [38] J. M. Izquierdo and P. K. Townsend, “Supersymmetric space-times in (2+1) adS supergravity models,” Class. Quant. Grav. **12** (1995), 895-924 [arXiv:gr-qc/9501018 [gr-qc]].
- [39] G. Barnich, L. Donnay, J. Matulich and R. Troncoso, “Asymptotic symmetries and dynamics of three-dimensional flat supergravity,” JHEP **08**, 071 (2014)[arXiv:1407.4275 [hep-th]].
- [40] O. Coussaert, M. Henneaux and P. van Driel, “The Asymptotic dynamics of three-dimensional Einstein gravity with a negative cosmological constant,” Class. Quant. Grav. **12**, 2961-2966 (1995) [arXiv:gr-qc/9506019 [gr-qc]].

- [41] K. Krasnov, “3-D gravity, point particles and Liouville theory,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **18**, 1291-1304 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0008253 [hep-th]].
- [42] L. Donnay, “Asymptotic dynamics of three-dimensional gravity,” *PoS Modave2015*, 001 (2016) [arXiv:1602.09021 [hep-th]].
- [43] A. Achúcarro and P. K. Townsend, “A Chern-Simons Action for Three-Dimensional anti-De Sitter Supergravity Theories,” *Phys. Lett. B* **180**, 89 (1986).
- [44] O. Mišković and R. Olea, “On boundary conditions in three-dimensional AdS gravity,” *Phys. Lett. B* **640** (2006), 101-107 [arXiv:hep-th/0603092 [hep-th]].
- [45] A. Giacomini, R. Troncoso and S. Willison, “Three-dimensional supergravity reloaded,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **24**, 2845-2860 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0610077 [hep-th]].
- [46] M. Bañados, K. Bautier, O. Coussaert, M. Henneaux and M. Ortiz, “Anti-de Sitter / CFT correspondence in three-dimensional supergravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **58**, 085020 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9805165 [hep-th]].
- [47] J. M. Maldacena, “The Large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2**, 231-252 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9711200 [hep-th]].
- [48] A. Belavin and A. Zamolodchikov, “Higher equations of motion in  $N = 1$  SUSY Liouville field theory,” *JETP Lett.* **84**, 418-424 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0610316 [hep-th]].
- [49] S. Migliaccio, “Conformal bootstrap in two-dimensional conformal field theories with non-diagonal spectrums,” [arXiv:1901.10922 [hep-th]].
- [50] J. Balog, L. Feher and L. Palla, “Coadjoint orbits of the Virasoro algebra and the global Liouville equation,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **13**, 315-362 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9703045 [hep-th]].