

LARGE N DUALITIES FROM WRAPPED D-BRANES

JOSÉ D. EDELSTEIN

*Departamento de Matemática, Instituto Superior Técnico
Av. Rovisco Pais, 1049-001, Lisboa, Portugal*

*Instituto de Física de La Plata – Conicet, Universidad Nacional de La Plata
C.C. 67, (1900) La Plata, Argentina*

*Departamento de Física de Partículas, Universidad de Santiago de Compostela
E-15782 Santiago de Compostela, Spain*

We review some aspects of the gravity duals of supersymmetric gauge theories, arising in the world-volume of D-branes wrapping supersymmetric cycles of special holonomy manifolds, within the framework of lower dimensional gauged supergravity.

In a seminal paper, 't Hooft proposed that large N gauge theories, in the strongly coupled regime, should be better described by perturbative closed strings [1]. The argument goes as follows. Consider a gauge theory with the gauge field $A_\mu^{k\bar{k}} \in F \otimes \bar{F}$ in the adjoint representation of $U(N)$ and gauge coupling λ . Each line in the Feynman diagrams becomes a double line and the diagram itself is then drawn as a ribbon graph. These graphs can be topologically classified according to the closed Riemann surface Σ_g of genus g on which they can be drawn. In presence of matter (that we will not consider, for simplicity, from now on), the surface will also display holes. Any amplitude can then be written as a sum over topologies

$$\mathcal{A} = \sum_{g=0}^{\infty} c_g(t) N^{2-2g} , \quad (1)$$

where $t \equiv \lambda^2 N$ is the so-called 't Hooft parameter. When $N \rightarrow \infty$ with t fixed (the 't Hooft limit), planar Feynman diagrams dominate and we have two well distinct regimes: If $t \ll 1$, also $\lambda \ll 1$, and the gauge theory is well described perturbatively. On the other hand, when $t \gg 1$, the amplitudes (1) can be rearranged as

$$\mathcal{A} = \sum_{g=0}^{\infty} \lambda_s^{2g-2} \mathcal{A}_g(t) , \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_g(t)$ is a closed string amplitude on Σ_g , $\lambda_s \equiv \lambda^2$ being the corresponding string coupling, and t is a *modulus* of the target space.

Early examples of 't Hooft's duality, involving bosonic strings on various backgrounds that are dual to zero dimensional gauge theories, were constructed some ten years ago [2]. In the same vein, it was recently proposed that type IIB superstring on $AdS_5 \times S^5$ is dual to $\mathcal{N} = 4$ super Yang–Mills theory in four dimensions [3]. The gauge theory is realized on the world–volume of D3–branes. This conjecture was extended to theories with sixteen supercharges that correspond to the low–energy dynamics of *flat* D–branes. These are, in general, non–conformal, and the gravity/gauge theory correspondence provides a powerful tool to study the phase structure of the resulting RG flows [4].

Analogue results can be obtained in the context of topological strings. The A–model topological string on the resolved conifold is dual to Chern–Simons gauge theory on S^3 [5]. There is also a mirrored version of this: B–model topological strings on local Calabi–Yau threefolds being dual to matrix models [6]. The embedding of these dualities into superstring theory allowed Vafa to conjecture that $\mathcal{N} = 1$ super Yang–Mills theory in four dimensions must be dual to either type IIA superstrings on $\mathcal{O}(-1) + \mathcal{O}(-1) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ with RR fluxes through the exceptional \mathbb{P}^1 or, through the looking glass, to type IIB superstrings on the deformed conifold with RR fluxes piercing the blown–up S^3 [7]. In these cases, the gauge theory is realized on the world–volume of *wrapped* D–branes in a Calabi–Yau threefold; respectively, D6–branes on special Lagrangian three–cycles and D5–branes on holomorphic two–cycles. Furthermore, arbitrary tree level superpotentials can be accommodated into this framework [8].

The low–energy dynamics of a collection of D–branes wrapping supersymmetric cycles is governed, when the size of the cycle is taken to zero, by a lower dimensional supersymmetric gauge theory with less than sixteen supercharges [9]. The non–trivial geometry of the world–volume leads to a gauge theory in which supersymmetry is appropriately twisted [10]. The amount of supersymmetry preserved has to do with the way in which the cycle is embedded in a higher dimensional space. When the number of branes is taken to be large, the near horizon limit of the corresponding supergravity solution provides a gravity dual of the field theory arising in their world–volume. The gravitational description of the strong coupling regime of these gauge theories allows for a geometrical approach to the study of such important aspects of their infrared dynamics as, for example, chiral symmetry breaking, gaugino condensation, domain walls, confinement and the existence of a mass gap.

A natural framework to perform the above mentioned twisting is given by lower dimensional gauged supergravities. Their domain wall like vacuum solutions usually correspond to the near horizon limit of D–brane configura-

tions [11] thus giving directly the gravity dual description of the gauge theories living on their world–volumes. Let us consider, in this talk, the case of the D6–brane. This system is best described in the infrared by means of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ seven dimensional super Yang–Mills theory [4]. So, for example, wrapping D6–branes on S^3 would imply, after appropriate twisting, breaking one quarter of the supercharges, the theory reducing to pure $\mathcal{N} = 1$ four dimensional super Yang–Mills in the infrared. The above referred twisting corresponds to S^3 being a special Lagrangian submanifold of a Calabi–Yau three–fold. The natural set up for this problem is provided by eight dimensional gauged supergravity [12]. The Lagrangian describing the dynamics of a sector of the theory given by the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, the dilaton Φ , five scalars L_α^i in the coset $SL(3, \mathbb{R})/SO(3)$, and an $SU(2)$ gauge potential A^i , reads

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{4}R - \frac{1}{4}e^{2\Phi}(F_{\mu\nu}^i)^2 - \frac{1}{4}(P_{\mu ij})^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu\Phi)^2 - \frac{1}{16}e^{-2\Phi}(T_{ij}T^{ij} - \frac{1}{2}T^2) , \quad (3)$$

where e is the determinant of the vierbein e_μ^a , $F_{\mu\nu}^i$ is the Yang–Mills field strength and $P_{\mu ij}$ is a symmetric and traceless quantity defined by

$$P_{\mu ij} + Q_{\mu ij} \equiv L_i^\alpha(\partial_\mu\delta_\alpha^\beta - \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}A_\mu^\gamma)L_{\beta j} , \quad (4)$$

$Q_{\mu ij}$ being the antisymmetric counterpart and

$$T^{ij} \equiv L_\alpha^i L_\beta^j \delta^{\alpha\beta} , \quad T = \delta_{ij}T^{ij} . \quad (5)$$

The supersymmetry transformations for the fermions are given by

$$\delta\psi_\gamma = \mathcal{D}_\gamma\epsilon + \frac{1}{24}e^\Phi F_{\mu\nu}^i \hat{\Gamma}_i(\Gamma_\gamma^{\mu\nu} - 10\delta_\gamma^{\mu\nu})\epsilon - \frac{1}{288}e^{-\Phi}\epsilon_{ijk}\hat{\Gamma}^{ijk}\Gamma_\gamma T\epsilon , \quad (6)$$

$$\delta\chi_i = \frac{1}{2}(P_{\mu ij} + \frac{2}{3}\delta_{ij}\partial_\mu\Phi)\hat{\Gamma}^j\Gamma^\mu\epsilon - \frac{1}{4}e^\Phi F_{\mu\nu i}\Gamma^{\mu\nu}\epsilon - \frac{1}{8}e^{-\Phi}(T_{ij} - \frac{1}{2}\delta_{ij}T)\epsilon^{jkl}\hat{\Gamma}_{kl}\epsilon , \quad (7)$$

where we use, for the Clifford algebra, $\Gamma^a = \gamma^a \times \mathbb{I}$, $\hat{\Gamma}^i = \gamma_9 \times \sigma^i$, γ^a are eight dimensional gamma matrices, $\gamma_9 = i\gamma^0\gamma^1\dots\gamma^7$, $\gamma_9^2 = 1$, and σ^i are the Pauli matrices. It is convenient to introduce $\hat{\Gamma}_9 \equiv -i\hat{\Gamma}^{123} = \gamma_9 \times \mathbb{I}$.

Let us start by considering a flat D6–brane configuration in which we only excite the dilaton and one scalar φ , and the ansatz for the line element is

$$ds^2 = e^{2f(\rho)}dx_{1,6}^2 + d\rho^2 . \quad (8)$$

The corresponding BPS equations, emerging from $\delta\psi_\gamma = \delta\chi_i = 0$, are

$$\Phi'(\rho) = \frac{1}{8}e^{-\Phi}(e^{-4\varphi} + 2e^{2\varphi}) , \quad (9)$$

$$\varphi'(\rho) = \frac{1}{6}e^{-\Phi}(e^{-4\varphi} - e^{2\varphi}) , \quad (10)$$

while the equations for f and ϵ can be easily integrated with the result

$$f = \frac{1}{3}\Phi , \quad \epsilon = i\hat{\Gamma}_9\Gamma_r\epsilon = e^{\frac{1}{6}\Phi}\epsilon_0 . \quad (11)$$

After the change of variables $d\rho = e^{\Phi-2\varphi}dt$, the BPS equations decouple and we obtain the solution ¹

$$\varphi(t) = \frac{1}{6} [\log(e^t - \xi_0) - t] , \quad \Phi(t) = \frac{3}{4} \left[\varphi(t) + \frac{1}{2}(t - t_0) \right] . \quad (12)$$

A further change of variables $e^t = r^4 - a^4$, with $\xi_0 = -a^4$, drives the solution, when uplifted to eleven dimensions through the external S^3 (whose left invariant Maurer–Cartan one forms we denote as \tilde{w}^i), to the form

$$ds_{11d}^2 = dx_{1,6}^2 + \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a^4}{r^4}} dr^2 + \frac{r^2}{4} \left[(\tilde{w}^1)^2 + (\tilde{w}^2)^2 + \left(1 - \frac{a^4}{r^4}\right) (\tilde{w}^3)^2 \right] , \quad (13)$$

where, besides the seven dimensional Minkowskian contribution from the uplift of the world–volume of the flat D6–branes, we get a (hyperkähler) metric for a non–trivial ALE four manifold with $SU(2) \times U(1)$ isometry, namely the Eguchi–Hanson metric [14]. This is in coincidence with the uplifting of the near horizon solution corresponding to D6–branes in type IIA. It is natural to analyze these configurations in 11d for the fact that uplifted D6 branes become purely gravitational. Besides, the D6 branes are strongly coupled in the ultraviolet and the would be decoupling limit has to be addressed in eleven dimensions. In particular, the 11d supergravity solution is trustable for any number of branes [4].

We now proceed towards the supergravity dual of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ super Yang–Mills theory in four dimensions, arising in the low–energy dynamics of D6–branes wrapped on a special Lagrangian S^3 in a Calabi–Yau three–fold. Let us start with an ansatz that describes such a deformation of the world–volume of the D6–branes

$$ds^2 = e^{2f(r)} dx_{1,3}^2 + \frac{1}{4} e^{2h(r)} \sum_{i=1}^3 (w^i)^2 + dr^2 , \quad (14)$$

where w^i are the left invariant one forms corresponding to the special Lagrangian S^3 . The fields on the D6–branes transform under $SO(1, 6) \times SO(3)_R$

¹Notice that the solution presented in [11, 13] corresponds to $\xi_0 = 0$.

as **(8,2)** for the fermions and **(1,3)** for the scalars, while the gauge field is a singlet under R -symmetry. When we wrap the D6 branes on a three-cycle, the symmetry group splits as $SO(1,3) \times SO(3) \times SO(3)_R$. The effect of the twisting is to preserve those fields that are singlets under a diagonal $SO(3)_D$ build up from the last two factors. The gauged R -symmetry is used to cancel the effect of the spin connection in the covariant derivative [15]. The vector fields survive but the scalars are transformed into one forms on the curved surface, so we are left with a theory with no scalar fields in the infrared; besides four supercharges are preserved.

The twisting might be achieved by turning on the non-Abelian $SO(3)$ gauge field given by the left invariant form of the three sphere,

$$A^i = -\frac{1}{2} w^i , \quad (15)$$

and it is easy to see that in this case we can get rid of the scalars $L_\alpha^i = \delta_\alpha^i \Rightarrow P_{ij} = 0$, $Q_{ij} = -\epsilon_{ijk} A^k$. We impose the following projections in the supersymmetric parameter ϵ :

$$\Gamma_{ij} \epsilon = -\hat{\Gamma}_{ij} \epsilon , \quad i \neq j = 1, 2, 3 \quad \epsilon = i\hat{\Gamma}_9 \Gamma_r \epsilon . \quad (16)$$

These projections leave unbroken 1/8 of the original supersymmetries, that is, four supercharges. The first order BPS equations are,

$$f'(r) = \frac{1}{3} \Phi'(r) = -\frac{1}{2} e^{\Phi-2h} + \frac{1}{8} e^{-\Phi} , \quad (17)$$

$$h'(r) = \frac{3}{2} e^{\Phi-2h} + \frac{1}{8} e^{-\Phi} , \quad (18)$$

and the solution [13], when uplifted to eleven dimensions, read:

$$ds^2 = dx_{1,3}^2 + \frac{1}{\left(1 - \frac{a^3}{\rho^3}\right)} d\rho^2 + \frac{\rho^2}{12} (\tilde{w}^a)^2 + \frac{\rho^2}{9} \left(1 - \frac{a^3}{\rho^3}\right) \left[w^a - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{w}^a\right]^2 . \quad (19)$$

This is the metric of a G_2 holonomy manifold which is topologically $\mathbb{R}^4 \times S^3$. The radial variable $\rho \geq a$ fills S^3 while the other sphere \tilde{S}^3 remains of finite volume a^3 when the former shrinks. The G_2 holonomy manifold has isometry group $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_{\tilde{L}} \times SU(2)_D$, the first two factors corresponding to the left action on S^3 and \tilde{S}^3 respectively, and the last one is the diagonal subgroup of $SU(2)_R \times SU(2)_{\tilde{R}}$. There is a flop transition in which the two spheres are exchanged. In this case, M-theory smooths out the singularity thanks to the existence of C -field fluxes through the three-sphere.

There are two very different quotients of this manifold: a singular one by modding out by $\mathbb{Z}_N \subset U(1) \subset SU(2)_L$, and a non-singular quotient if one instead chooses $\mathbb{Z}_N \subset U(1) \subset SU(2)_{\tilde{L}}$. This is due to the fact that S^3 shrinks to a point when $\rho \rightarrow a$ while \tilde{S}^3 has radius a . Modding out by $\mathbb{Z}_N \subset U(1) \subset SU(2)_L$ results in an A_{N-1} singularity fibered over \tilde{S}^3 so that, after KK reduction along the circle corresponding to the $U(1)$, one ends with N D6-branes wrapped on a special Lagrangian \tilde{S}^3 in a Calabi–Yau three-fold. The second case, amounts to modding out by $\mathbb{Z}_N \subset U(1) \subset SU(2)_{\tilde{L}}$, which has no fixed points so the quotient a smooth manifold admitting no normalizable supergravity zero modes. Thus, M-theory on the latter has no massless fields localized in the transverse four-dimensional spacetime. By a smooth interpolation between these manifolds, M-theory realizes the mass gap of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric four-dimensional gauge theory [16, 17]. After KK reduction of the smooth manifold one ends with a non-singular type IIA configurations (without D6-branes) on a space with the topology of $\mathcal{O}(-1) + \mathcal{O}(-1) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ [17], and with N units of RR flux through the finite radius S^2 .

Let us now consider turning on some units of RR four-form flux along the unwrapped directions [18]. The bosonic truncation of eight dimensional supergravity relevant for our purposes now includes a three-form potential (whose field strength we will denote by G). This, in general, is an inconsistent truncation: G acts as a non-linear source for some of the forms we have turned off. However, we will consider solutions that are fully compatible with the equations of motion of 8d gauged supergravity by imposing $G \wedge G = *G \wedge F^i = 0$, where F^i is the $SU(2)$ field strength and $*G$ is the Hodge dual of G in eight dimensions. The presence of this flux introduces a distinction between one of the unwrapped directions of the brane and the other three. Accordingly, the ansatz for the metric will be:

$$ds_8^2 = e^{2f} dx_{1,2}^2 + e^{2\alpha} dy^2 + \frac{1}{4} e^{2h} \sum_{i=1}^3 (w^i)^2 + dr^2, \quad (20)$$

where f , α and h are functions of the radial coordinate r . The corresponding ansatz for the 4-form G in flat coordinates is $G_{012r} = \Lambda e^{-\alpha-3h-2\phi}$ with Λ being a constant and ϕ the eight-dimensional dilaton. The non-Abelian gauge field A^i is chosen as in (15) to undertake the prescribed twisting.

The supersymmetry transformations include now the contribution of the G field. The standard projections corresponding to the D6-branes wrapping the S^3 (16) are supplemented by a new one due to the presence of the G flux. In flat indices, $\Gamma_{012} \epsilon = \epsilon$. The number of supercharges unbroken by this

configuration is then one half of those corresponding to the case $\Lambda = 0$, *i.e.* two. The BPS equations are:

$$f' = -\frac{1}{2}e^{\phi-2h} + \frac{1}{8}e^{-\phi} + \frac{\Lambda}{2}e^{-\phi-3h-\alpha}, \quad (21)$$

$$\alpha' = -\frac{1}{2}e^{\phi-2h} + \frac{1}{8}e^{-\phi} - \frac{\Lambda}{2}e^{-\phi-3h-\alpha}, \quad (22)$$

$$h' = \frac{3}{2}e^{\phi-2h} + \frac{1}{8}e^{-\phi} - \frac{\Lambda}{2}e^{-\phi-3h-\alpha}, \quad (23)$$

$$\phi' = -\frac{3}{2}e^{\phi-2h} + \frac{3}{8}e^{-\phi} - \frac{\Lambda}{2}e^{-\phi-3h-\alpha}. \quad (24)$$

The general solution of this system can be found [18], and its 11d uplift results into the following metric:

$$ds_{11}^2 = [H(\rho)]^{-\frac{2}{3}} dx_{1,2}^2 + [H(\rho)]^{\frac{1}{3}} [dy^2 + ds_7^2], \quad (25)$$

where ds_7^2 is the G_2 holonomy metric (19), while the warp factor $H(\rho)$ is,

$$H(\rho) = 1 + \frac{1296}{5}\sqrt{3}\frac{\Lambda}{(12)^{\frac{1}{6}}}\left[\frac{5}{3a^3\rho^2}\frac{1}{1-\frac{a^3}{\rho^3}} + \frac{10}{3\sqrt{3}a^5}\operatorname{arccot}\left[\frac{2\rho+a}{a\sqrt{3}}\right] - \frac{5}{9a^5}\log\left(1 + \frac{3a\rho}{(\rho-a)^2}\right)\right], \quad (26)$$

the four-form being given by $F_{012\rho} = \epsilon_{012}\partial_\rho[H(\rho)]^{-1}$. This solution represents a smeared distribution of M2-branes on the manifold of G_2 holonomy obtained before. $H(\rho)$ is an harmonic function in the seven-manifold.

The somehow unusual appearance of a smeared configuration in this approach deserves some comments. We should first remind that, even in the case of flat D-branes, it is well known that D2-branes have a low energy range, $g_{YM}^2 < U < g_{YM}^2 N^{\frac{1}{5}}$, in which string theory is strongly coupled but the eleven dimensional curvature is small, and the appropriate description is given in terms of the supergravity solution of smeared (in the eleventh circle direction) M2-branes [4]. This result also holds in presence of D6-branes, that also has a low energy range described by smeared M2-branes [19]. It is natural to expect that, if the D6-branes are wrapping a supersymmetric cycle, the corresponding description will be given in terms of smeared M2-branes transverse to some special holonomy manifold. When we go further towards the IR, say $U < g_{YM}^2$, we expect the smeared solution to be replaced (resolved) by a periodic array of localized M2-branes along the eleventh circle. Closer enough to

the M2-branes, we should recover a conformal field theory. If we KK reduce along the y -direction, we get:

$$ds_{10}^2 = [H(\rho)]^{-\frac{1}{2}} dx_{1,2}^2 + [H(\rho)]^{\frac{1}{2}} ds_7^2, \quad e^{\phi_D} = [H(\rho)]^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad (27)$$

while the 4-form field strength of D=11 becomes the RR 4-form $F^{(4)}$ of type IIA theory. It is clear that this solution represents a D2-brane sitting at the tip of the G_2 holonomy manifold. Notice, however, that the solution resulting from gauged supergravity is the complete D2-brane solution. So, we should reintroduce l_p units everywhere and take ρ , a and l_p to zero such that $U \equiv a\rho/l_p^3$ and $L \equiv a^2/l_p^3$ are kept fixed. The asymptotic background gives the near horizon limit of N D2-branes transverse to the G_2 holonomy manifold:

$$ds_{10}^2 = l_s^2 \left(\frac{U^{\frac{5}{2}}}{\sqrt{g_{YM}^2 N}} dx_{1,2}^2 + \frac{\sqrt{g_{YM}^2 N}}{U^{\frac{5}{2}}} ds_7^2 \right), \quad e^{\phi_D} = \left(\frac{g_{YM}^{10} N}{U^5} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad (28)$$

where $g_{YM}^2 \approx L$ is the three dimensional coupling constant, $al_s^2 = l_p^3$, and N is the number of D2-branes; the 4-form field strength $F^{(4)}$ is unchanged.

In the UV we can trust the super Yang–Mills theory description. In the case of a single D2-brane, it is an $\mathcal{N} = 1$, $U(1) \times U(1)$ gauge theory in $2 + 1$ dimensions with four complex scalars Q_i , \tilde{Q}_i , $i = 1, 2$, and a vector multiplet whose gauge field can be dualized to a compact scalar that would parametrize the position of the D2-branes along the M-theory circle. The vacuum moduli space is given by

$$|q_1|^2 + |q_2|^2 - |\tilde{q}_1|^2 - |\tilde{q}_2|^2 = L^2, \quad (29)$$

where q_i , \tilde{q}_i are the scalar components of the superfields Q_i , \tilde{Q}_i , which precisely provides an algebraic–geometric description of the G_2 manifold.

In summary, we have briefly presented some aspects of the lower dimensional gauged supergravity approach to the study of gravity duals of D-branes wrapping cycles of special holonomy manifolds. Let me end by mentioning that the twisting procedure can be significantly generalized such that, for example, all G_2 metrics of cohomogeneity one with $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ isometry can be obtained from Salam–Sezgin’s theory [20].

I wish to thank Carlos Núñez, Kyungho Oh, Ángel Paredes, Alfonso Rammallo and Radu Tatar for delightful collaborations on these subjects. I would also like to thank the organizers of the Sakharov conference and the people of Moscow and St. Petersburg for their kind hospitality. This work has been supported in part by MCyT and FEDER under grant BFM2002-03881, by Xunta de Galicia, by Fundación Antorchas and by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia under grants POCTI/1999/MAT/33943 and SFRH/BPD/7185/2001.

- [1] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B **72** (1974) 461.
- [2] See, for example, J. Distler and C. Vafa, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A6** (1991) 259. M. Kontsevich, Commun. Math. Phys. **147** (1992) 1.
- [3] J. M. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2** (1998) 231.
- [4] N. Itzhaki, J. M. Maldacena, J. Sonnenschein and S. Yankielowicz, Phys. Rev. D **58** (1998) 046004.
- [5] R. Gopakumar and C. Vafa, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **3** (1999) 1415.
- [6] R. Dijkgraaf and C. Vafa, Nucl. Phys. B **644** (2002) 3.
- [7] C. Vafa, J. Math. Phys. **42** (2001) 2798.
- [8] F. Cachazo, K. A. Intriligator and C. Vafa, Nucl. Phys. B **603** (2001) 3. J. D. Edelstein, K. Oh and R. Tatar, JHEP **0105** (2001) 009.
- [9] J. M. Maldacena and C. Núñez, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **16** (2001) 822. Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** (2001) 588.
- [10] M. Bershadsky, C. Vafa and V. Sadov, Nucl. Phys. B **463** (1996) 420.
- [11] H. Boonstra, K. Skenderis and P. K. Townsend, JHEP **9901** (1999) 003.
- [12] A. Salam and E. Sezgin, Nucl. Phys. B **258** (1985) 284.
- [13] J. D. Edelstein and C. Núñez, JHEP **0104** (2001) 028.
- [14] T. Eguchi and A. J. Hanson, Phys. Lett. B **74** (1978) 249.
- [15] J.D. Edelstein, C.Núñez and F.Schaposnik, Phys. Lett. B **375** (1996) 163.
- [16] B. S. Acharya, hep-th/0011089.
- [17] M. Atiyah, J. Maldacena and C. Vafa, J. Math. Phys. **42** (2001) 3209.
- [18] J. D. Edelstein, A. Paredes and A. V. Ramallo, hep-th/0207127.
- [19] O. Pelc and R. Siebelink, Nucl. Phys. B **558** (1999) 127, hep-th/9902045.
- [20] J. D. Edelstein, A. Paredes and A. V. Ramallo, hep-th/0211203.