

# Softer Hard Scattering and Noncommutative Gauge–String Duality <sup>1</sup>

Soo-Jong Rey <sup>a,b</sup> and Jung-Tay Yee <sup>c,d</sup>

*School of Natural Sciences, Institute for Advanced Study  
Einstein Drive, Princeton NJ 08540 USA <sup>a</sup>*

*School of Physics & BK-21 Physics Division  
Seoul National University, Seoul 151-747 KOREA <sup>b</sup>*

*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Amsterdam  
Valckenierstraat 65, 1018 XE Amsterdam, The NETHERLANDS <sup>c</sup>*

*School of Physics, Korea Institute for Advanced Study  
Seoul 130-012 KOREA <sup>d</sup>*

sjrey@gravity.snu.ac.kr

jungtay@science.uva.nl

## Abstract

We study exclusive scattering of ‘hadrons’ at high energy and fixed angle in (non-conformal) noncommutative gauge theories. Via gauge-string duality, we show that the noncommutativity renders the scattering soft, leading to exponential suppression. The result fits with the picture that, in noncommutative gauge theory, ‘fundamental partons’ consist of extremely soft constituents and hadrons are made out of open Wilson lines.

---

<sup>1</sup>Work supported in part by the KRF Overseas Research Grant, the KOSEF Interdisciplinary Research Grants, the KOSEF Leading Scientist Grant, and the Stichting FOM.

In this paper, we pose the question: “*what are the fundamental degrees of freedom in noncommutative gauge theory?*” and find an answer to it. Study of noncommutative gauge theory [1, 2], motivated prominently because the theory describes D-brane worldvolume dynamics under B-field background in string theory, has brought us many surprises. First, what one might counted as an ultraviolet (UV) effect is sometimes transmuted to an infrared (IR) effect. Diagrammatically, origin of this so-called UV-IR mixing [3] is quite reminiscent of the channel duality between open and closed strings. Second, the quantum dynamics is describable entirely in terms of open Wilson lines [4] (see also [5]). The open Wilson lines [6] are nonlocal, gauge-invariant operators, and behave as a dipole under a strong magnetic field, analogous to fundamental strings. Both features point to the possibility that partons in the noncommutative gauge theory are not pointlike gluons but some extended objects. We will attempt to answer the question posed by utilizing the gauge-string duality, and by examining exclusive processes such as high-energy, fixed-angle scattering [7].

For commutative gauge theory, Polchinski and Strassler [8] recasted the fixed-angle scattering of glueballs entirely in terms of gauge-string duality [9], and have shown that the known power-like behavior [7] at high-energy regime is retractible. In terms of the gauge-string duality, the glueball scattering in the gauge theory side is described by the dilaton scattering in the bulk string theory side. At high-energy, as the latter process is described by the Virasoro-Shapiro amplitude, one might naively expect that the scattering process is exponentially suppressed.

The above expectation turns out incorrect [8]. By the holography principle in anti-de Sitter space and the superposition principle in quantum mechanics, the scattering amplitude in gauge theory is given by a coherent sum of the string scattering amplitude over the bulk location where the scattering takes place. For this, because of the holographic UV-IR relation [10] in the gauge-string duality, one finds that the sum is dominated by the process taking place near the boundary. Key feature here is that, because of the warp factor, the local inertial momentum  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$  is mapped to the conserved, gauge theory momentum  $\mathbf{p}$  via  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_m = (R/\ell_{\text{st}}u) \mathbf{p}_m$ , so, for any value of  $\mathbf{p}$ , one can locate a bulk position  $u$ , where  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$  becomes  $\mathcal{O}(1/\ell_{\text{st}})$ , leading to  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  contribution of the string amplitude. This explains why the glueball scattering as deduced via the gauge-string duality actually behaves power-like at high-energy. It provokes one to inquire if the elastic scattering processes are revealing point-like, hard parton nature of the fundamental degrees of freedom in commutative gauge theory.

From the gauge theory viewpoint, one can portray the question posed from a different angle: “is it possible to find a field-theoretic deformation of commutative gauge theory so that low-energy dynamics remains unmodified but high-energy parton content is dramatically modified?” The answer is affirmatively yes, and is achieved by defining the theory on a noncommutative space-time. Our result would be considered as a *direct* evidence for the assertion.

For  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  supersymmetric gauge theory with noncommutativity on (23)-plane turned on,

the background fields in the dual string theory is given by [12]

$$\begin{aligned}
ds^2 &= \ell_{\text{st}}^2 \left[ \frac{u^2}{R^2} \left\{ -dx_0^2 + dx_1^2 + \frac{1}{1+a^4u^4} (dx_2^2 + dx_3^2) \right\} + \frac{R^2}{u^2} du^2 + R^2 d\Omega_5^2 \right] \\
e^{2\phi} &= g_{\text{st}}^2 (1+a^4u^4)^{-1} & G_{0123u} &= \frac{1}{g_{\text{st}}} \partial_u \left( \frac{\ell_{\text{st}}^4}{R^4} u^4 \right) (1+a^4u^4)^{-1} \\
B_{23}^{\text{NS}} &= \frac{\ell_{\text{st}}^2}{\Theta} \frac{\Theta^2}{R^4} u^4 (1+a^4u^4)^{-1} & C_{01}^{\text{RR}} &= \frac{1}{g_{\text{st}}} \frac{\ell_{\text{st}}^2}{\Theta} a^4 u^4.
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Here, the curvature radius is given by  $R\ell_{\text{st}}$ , where  $R$  is related to the string coupling parameter and number of colors by  $R = (4\pi g_{\text{st}} N)^{1/4}$ . The parameter  $a^4 = \Theta^2/R^4$  sets the noncommutative scale. In the coordinates adopted, the noncommutativity is denoted by  $[\widehat{x}_2, \widehat{x}_3] = i\Theta$ . As we are interested primarily in studying how the noncommutativity affects high-energy fixed-angle scattering processes, we will restrict the kinematics so that the scattering takes place in the noncommutative subspace. The momentum  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$  in local inertial coordinates and the conserved momentum  $\mathbf{p}$  at the holographic boundary are then related by the geometry Eq.(1) as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_m = e_m^{\underline{m}} \mathbf{p}_{\underline{m}} = \frac{\sqrt{\Theta}}{\ell_{\text{st}}} \left( \frac{R^2/\Theta}{u^2} + \frac{u^2}{R^2/\Theta} \right)^{1/2} \mathbf{p}_m. \tag{2}$$

In the commutative regime,  $u \ll R/\sqrt{\Theta}$ , and the relation reduces to the same as in the conformal gauge theory [10]  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_m \sim (R/\ell_{\text{st}}u) \mathbf{p}_m$ . As such, for a high gauge-momentum  $\mathbf{p}$ , it was always possible to find a region in the bulk, where the string-momentum  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$  is of order unity. On the other hand, in the noncommutative regime,  $u \gg R/\sqrt{\Theta}$ , and the relation is given by  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_m \sim (\Theta u/\ell_{\text{st}}R) \mathbf{p}_m$ . Thus, for a fixed string-momentum  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ , the gauge-momentum  $\mathbf{p}$  is inversely proportional to  $u$ , precisely the opposite to the commutative regime.

So, what makes the story so interesting for noncommutative gauge theory is that, for the very high gauge-momentum  $\mathbf{p}$ , there is no  $u$ -region in the bulk where the inertial string-momentum  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$  can be made small enough — the conversion factor in Eq.(2) is bounded below. This will become the key reason why noncommutative gauge theory behaves string-like at high energy. For the scattering at high enough energy, one cannot adjust  $u$ -location of the scattering center so that  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$  remains small. The local inertial string-momentum  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$  has to grow in proportion to the gauge-momentum  $\mathbf{p}$ . Thus, up to a finite rescaling, high-energy processes in gauge theory corresponds to high-energy processes in string theory as well. We will see momentarily that the string theory processes take place at the location  $u \sim R/\sqrt{\Theta}$ . Notice that, at this location, the proportionality factor in Eq.(2) becomes independent of the 't Hooft coupling parameter.

We now investigate the high-energy, fixed-angle limit of exclusive scalar glueball scattering, and compare the result with the one for commutative gauge theory. In exclusive processes, in- and out-states are created by gauge-invariant operators. In noncommutative gauge theory, this requires adjoining the leading-twist glueball operator  $F_{mn}^2$  with open Wilson lines [6].

The simplest exclusive process would be the elastic two-body scattering, and the scattering amplitude in gauge theory is obtainable by convoluting the corresponding string amplitude over the wave function of the bulk state, e.g. the dilaton for scalar glueballs. Thus,

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{NCYM}}(\mathbf{p}) = \int_0^\infty du \int_{S_5} d\Omega_5 \sqrt{g_{(10)}} \mathcal{A}_{\text{string}}(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, \Omega_5) \prod_{i=1}^4 \Psi_i(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_i, u), \quad (3)$$

where  $\Psi(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}, u)$  is the normalized wave-function of the dilaton field in the bulk, and  $g_{(10)}$  is the volume factor of the ten-dimensional space-time (in type IIB string frame). From Eq.(1),  $\sqrt{g_{(10)}} = \ell_{\text{st}}^{10} R^2 u^3 (1 + \Theta^2 u^4 / R^4)^{-1}$ . The string scattering process taking place in the bulk is complicated as background fields – metric, dilaton, NS-NS 2-form, and R-R 2- and 5-forms – are turned on. In particular, contribution of the R-R field background is of the same order as that of the NS-NS fields, since the former has strength of order  $1/g_{\text{st}}$ . With currently available methods, analytic computation of string scattering amplitude in such situation is impossible. Nevertheless, in the limit  $R \rightarrow \infty$ , the background is reduced to the one with flat space-time, constant dilaton, and vanishing NS-NS and R-R field strengths. Thus, at leading-order in  $1/R$ , the string scattering amplitude can be approximated by the Virasoro-Shapiro amplitude.

Consider a *large* but *fixed* gauge-momentum  $\mathbf{p}_m$ . When converted into the inertial string-momentum  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_m$ , the conversion factor depends on the  $u$ -coordinate. At the minimum of the conversion factor, *both* the mean-value and the variance of the  $u$ -coordinate is set by  $R/\sqrt{\Theta}$ . Thus, by letting the noncommutativity  $\Theta/\ell_{\text{st}}^2 \equiv \mu^2 \gg 1$  but  $R/\mu \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ , one can always find a situation that the scattering process is pinned at a fixed  $u$ -position and the wave function is spread out typically only over the string scale  $\ell_{\text{st}}$ . In such a case, combined with the argument given in the previous paragraph, we can adopt the Virasoro-Shapiro amplitude, which refers to the scattering process in a flat ten-dimensional background, as the leading-order string scattering amplitude. We recall that the Virasoro-Shapiro amplitude is given by

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{string}}(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}) = g_s^2 \ell_{\text{st}}^6 \frac{\Gamma\left(-\frac{1}{4}\ell_{\text{st}}^2 \tilde{s}\right) \Gamma\left(-\frac{1}{4}\ell_{\text{st}}^2 \tilde{t}\right) \Gamma\left(-\frac{1}{4}\ell_{\text{st}}^2 \tilde{u}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{1}{4}\ell_{\text{st}}^2 \tilde{s}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{1}{4}\ell_{\text{st}}^2 \tilde{t}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{1}{4}\ell_{\text{st}}^2 \tilde{u}\right)} K_c,$$

where  $K_c$  is a kinematical factor. For high-energy and fixed-angle scattering,  $\tilde{s} \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\tilde{t} \rightarrow \infty$  with  $\tilde{s}/\tilde{t}$  held fixed, and the string scattering amplitude exhibits a soft behavior

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{string}}(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}) \sim g_s^2 \ell_{\text{st}}^6 \left(\ell_{\text{st}}^2 \tilde{s}\right)^3 \sin^2 \theta \left[ \exp\left(\frac{f(\theta)}{2}\right) \right]^{-\ell_{\text{st}}^2 \tilde{s}}. \quad (4)$$

Here, we have used the mass-shell condition  $\tilde{s} + \tilde{t} + \tilde{u} = 0$ , and defined the scattering angle  $\theta$  as  $\tilde{t} = -\tilde{s} \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2}$  and  $\tilde{u} = -\tilde{s} \cos^2 \frac{\theta}{2}$ . The parametric function  $f(\theta) = -\sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2} \ln\left(\sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2}\right) - \cos^2 \frac{\theta}{2} \ln\left(\cos^2 \frac{\theta}{2}\right)$  is a positive-definite function of  $\theta$  in the entire range  $[0, \pi]$ .

What becomes modified dominantly by turning on the noncommutativity is the normalized wave-function of the bulk scalar field,  $\Psi(u, \Omega_5)$ . The wave-function was computed already

in [6, 11], and is given by  $\Psi(u, \mathbf{p}) \sim u^{-2} e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}(\nu+1)} H^{(2)}(\nu, -\log(\Theta u))$ , where  $H^{(2)}$  denotes the second kind of the Mathieu function, and  $\nu$  refers to so-called Floquet coefficient (which depends implicitly on the momentum  $\mathbf{p}$ ). For foregoing analysis, we have found it sufficient and more illuminating to understand asymptotic behavior of the normalized wave-function,  $\psi(u, \Omega_5)$ . The wave function obeys the dilaton equation of motion:  $\partial_M \left( \sqrt{g_{(10)}} g_{(10)}^{MN} e^{-2\phi(u)} \partial_N \Psi \right) (x, u, \Omega_5) = 0$ . Fourier transforming with respect to  $x^m$ , taking S-wave mode on  $S_5$ , and rescaling as  $\Psi(u, \mathbf{p}) = u^{-\frac{5}{2}} \psi(u, \mathbf{p})$ , we recast the equation of motion into a form of the Schrödinger equation:

$$-\partial_u^2 \psi(u, \mathbf{p}) + \mathcal{K}^2(u, \mathbf{p}) \psi(u, \mathbf{p}) = 0 \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{K}^2(u, \mathbf{p}) = \left( \frac{R^4 \mathbf{p}^2}{u^4} + \frac{15}{4} \frac{1}{u^2} + |\mathbf{p}\Theta|^2 \right). \quad (5)$$

Classical turning point  $u = u_c$  of Eq.(5) is determined by  $\mathcal{K}(u_c, \mathbf{p}) = 0$ . At high-energy limit  $|\mathbf{p}| \rightarrow \infty$  we are interested in, it turns out the turning point is located at  $u_c \sim u_* = R/\sqrt{\Theta}$ , and this is precisely the scale set by the noncommutativity, as seen in Eq.(2). Asymptotic form of the wave function is obtainable via the WKB method. The result is

$$\Psi(u, \mathbf{p}) \simeq \begin{cases} C(\mathbf{p}) |\mathbf{p}\Theta|^{-1/2} u^{-5/2} e^{-|\mathbf{p}\Theta|(u-u_*)} & u \gg u_* \\ 2C(\mathbf{p}) |\mathbf{p}R^2|^{-1/2} u^{-3/2} \cos \left( |\mathbf{p}R^2| \left( \frac{1}{u} - \frac{1}{u_*} \right) - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) & u \ll u_* \\ 2\sqrt{\pi} C(\mathbf{p}) u^{-5/2} h^{-\frac{1}{6}}(\mathbf{p}) Ai \left( h^{\frac{1}{3}}(\mathbf{p})(u - u_*) \right) & u \approx u_*. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Here,  $C(\mathbf{p})$  is a momentum-dependent normalization constant,  $h(\mathbf{p})$  is defined as  $h(\mathbf{p}) \equiv [\partial_u \mathcal{K}^2(u, \mathbf{p})]_{u=u_*}$ , and  $Ai(x)$  refers to the Airy function. In the high-energy limit, the coefficient function  $h(\mathbf{p})$  is approximated as  $h(\mathbf{p}) \approx 4\mathbf{p}^2 \Theta^{5/2}/R$ . The normalization constant  $C(\mathbf{p})$  is determined by requiring that the wave-function obeys correctly normalized commutation relations, and this results in the condition:  $\int_0^\infty du g_{(10)}^{00} \sqrt{g_{(10)}} |\Psi|^2 = 1$ . As  $|\Psi|(u, \mathbf{p})$  in Eq.(6) is exponentially damped for large  $u$  and rapidly oscillatory for small  $u$ , the normalization integral is dominated by the region near  $u \approx u_*$ . Evaluating the integral by the saddle-point method, we determined  $C(\mathbf{p})$  in terms of the coefficient function  $h(\mathbf{p})$  as  $|C(\mathbf{p}) h^{-\frac{1}{6}}(\mathbf{p})|^2 \sim (u_*^3/\ell_{\text{st}}^8 R^4)$ .

It now remains to collect all parts and put them together. Re-expressing all momentum dependence in terms of gauge-momentum Eq.(2), we obtain the string scattering amplitude Eq.(4) in the high-energy limit as

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{string}}(\mathbf{p}) \sim g_{\text{st}}^2 \ell_{\text{st}}^6 (\Theta s)^3 \sin^2 \theta \left( \frac{u_*^2}{u^2} + \frac{u^2}{u_*^2} \right)^3 \left[ \exp \left( \frac{f(\theta)}{2} \right) \right]^{-\left( \frac{u_*^2}{u^2} + \frac{u^2}{u_*^2} \right) \Theta s}. \quad (7)$$

With the above WKB results, the convolution integral Eq.(3) is not doable analytically, so we shall evaluate it via the saddle-point method. For large and small values of  $u$ , the integrand in Eq.(3) is exponentially suppressed, as we see from Eq.(7). The suppression is dominantly due to the string scattering amplitude Eq.(7), and the normalized dilaton wave function renders

further, sub-leading suppression at large  $u$ . Thus, leading contribution to the convolution integral Eq.(3) comes from the region around the saddle-point  $u = u_*$ . Near the saddle-point, the Airy function yields  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  contribution. Consequently, we find that exponentially soft behavior dominates the gauge theory amplitude at high-energy:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{NCYM}}(\mathbf{p}) \sim \frac{(g_{\text{YM}}^2 N)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{N^2} (\Theta s)^3 \sin^2 \theta [e^{f(\theta)}]^{-\Theta s} \quad \text{for } |\mathbf{p}| \rightarrow \infty, \quad (8)$$

where subdominant terms are omitted. Notice that, in Eq.(8), dependence on the string scale  $\ell_{\text{st}}$  is cancelled out while dependence on the gauge theory coupling parameters is identical to the commutative counterpart [8], as anticipated. As Eq.(8) refers to the leading-order result at large noncommutativity,  $\Theta \gg \ell_{\text{st}}^2$ , naive commutative limit of Eq.(8) is not permitted. Redoing the saddle-point analysis at finite  $\Theta$ , however, one readily finds that Eq.(8) interpolates smoothly to the commutative result of [8]: from Eq.(8), the exponential suppression disappears, and the pre-exponential part is replaced by a constant (up to sub-leading corrections).

Eq.(8) is the main result of this paper. What is most remarkable of the result Eq.(8) is that, in noncommutative gauge theory, the exclusive scattering amplitude is extremely soft at high-energy, damped exponentially. In fact, the scattering amplitude is the same as that of the string theory except the role of the string scale  $\ell_{\text{st}}$  is now played by the noncommutative scale  $\sqrt{\Theta}$ . The stringy behavior is pronounced most for the energy-momentum exceeding the value set by the noncommutativity scale:  $|\mathbf{p}| \gtrsim 1/\sqrt{\Theta}$ . According to the gauge-string duality, the dilaton scattering in the string theory is described by the glueball scattering in the gauge theory. In noncommutative gauge theory, it is known that the interpolating operator of the glueball is not just  $F_{mn}^2(x)$  but the one adjoined by the open Wilson line [6]. The size  $\mathbf{d}$  of the open Wilson line grows linearly with the center-of-mass momentum  $\mathbf{p}$ :  $\mathbf{d} = \Theta \wedge \mathbf{p}$ . It then implies that, in noncommutative gauge theory, stringy behavior of the partons are manifested by the open Wilson lines, whose size grows larger at stronger noncommutativity:  $|\mathbf{d}| \gtrsim \sqrt{\Theta}$ . As such, ‘hadrons’ adjoined with such large open Wilson lines are interpretable as a sort of ‘closed string’ modes emergent in noncommutative gauge theory.

In [6], Gross et.al. also reported soft behavior of high-energy scattering in noncommutative gauge theory. There, however, despite apparent similarity of the result with ours, the exponential suppression bears no connection to the exponential suppression in the dual string scattering amplitude. This is because their exponential suppression originates from the bulk-to-boundary propagator ( $u \gg u_*$  region of Eq.(6)) and was entirely within the supergravity approximation, under which no stringy features would remain. In contrast, in our result Eq.(8), exponential suppression originates dominantly from the full-fledged string scattering amplitude  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{string}}$  (dilaton wave function served mainly to provide the requisite kinematical parameters and coupling constant of the dual gauge theory). We emphasize importance of string theoretic computation in the bulk. Had we taken a supergravity approximation and replaced Eq.(4) by the four-point

dilaton scattering amplitude, the result would come out grossly different and incorrect at high-energy. For that reason, in our result, correspondence of exponential suppression between the string theory and the noncommutative gauge theory is exact.

Obviously, next task is to compute high-energy scattering amplitude directly from the noncommutative gauge theory and to confirm the stringy behavior for the scattering among four ‘glueball’ operators involving open Wilson lines. In [13], such processes were studied, but exclusively at leading order at weak coupling regime. An interesting issue for future study is to establish a suitable interpolation from weak to strong coupling regime, and relate to our result.

We showed explicitly, in terms of gauge-string duality, how ‘closed string’-like behavior appears in noncommutative gauge theory. Though, from purely field theoretical consideration, the appearance of ‘closed string’ behavior in noncommutative field theories is rather surprising, we have learned that exclusive high-energy processes offers an ideal set-up for answering the reason why via the gauge-string duality. A further hint may be learned from the full-figured ten-dimensional geometry of D3-brane before taking the near-horizon limit. The geometry is claimed [14] to be dual to a UV-flow of the four-dimensional  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  supersymmetric gauge theory once special irrelevant operators are turned on. If, tentatively, the holographic boundary is placed at asymptotic infinity (which is the ten-dimensional flat space-time), one obtains the local inertial momentum  $\mathbf{p}$  is related to the gauge theory momentum  $\mathbf{p}$  as  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \sqrt{1 + \ell_{\text{st}}^4 R^4 / u^4} \mathbf{p}$ , we see that the resulting relation is qualitatively similar to Eq.(2): if we take large  $u \gg 1/(R\ell_{\text{st}})$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$  is proportional to  $\mathbf{p}$ . This means that closed string modes do survive, and the holographic theory would behave precisely like IIB string theory in ten dimensions.

Summarizing our results, we have demonstrated that noncommutative gauge theory exhibits dramatically modified elastic scattering behavior from commutative counterparts. At energy-momentum transfer well below the noncommutativity scale, both theories are indistinguishable. As energy-momentum transfer is increased toward the noncommutativity scale, both theories exhibit parton-like elastic scattering behavior. Underlying to the behavior is attributable to the kinematics of conformal invariance at energy scale far above any nonperturbative scales and not to underlying dynamics of partons. At energy-momentum transfer well above the noncommutativity scale, the two theories display dramatically different elastic scattering behavior — while commutative gauge theory continue exhibiting parton-like power-law behavior, noncommutative gauge theory begins to expose nonlocal and string-like constituents. As the behavior originates from departure of the bulk asymptotic geometry from anti-de Sitter and as the departure is precisely the feature underlying emergence of dipole-like excitations at very high-energy scale, one may interpret quanta created by the open Wilson lines as the fundamental constituents of the noncommutative gauge theory.

More recently, Polchinski and Strassler [15] extended the gauge-string duality for commutative gauge theory to deep inelastic scattering processes at large ‘t Hooft coupling, and found

that evolution of the structure functions is more rapid than those at small 't Hooft coupling. This implies that there are no hard-momentum carrying partons inside hadrons but only wee partons. In light of the result of this work, it would be quite interesting to extend the study of [15] to noncommutative gauge theory and examine if high-energy evolution of the structure functions is modified further than the wee-parton behavior beyond the noncommutativity scale.

## Acknowledgement

We thank D.J. Gross, J. Polchinski, L. Susskind, and C. Thorn for interesting conversations during the "QCD and String Theory" Workshop at the Institute for Nuclear Theory at Seattle. We also thank the anonymous referee for important remark concerning interpretation of the results of [8, 15]. This work was carried out while SJR was a Member at the Institute for Advanced Study. He thanks the School of Natural Sciences for hospitality and the Funds of Natural Sciences.

## References

- [1] A. Connes, M.R. Douglas and A. Schwartz, JHEP **9802**, 003 (1998) .
- [2] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, JHEP **9909**, 032 (1999) .
- [3] S. Minwalla, M. Van Raamsdonk and N. Seiberg, JHEP **0002**, 020 (2000) ; M. Van Raamsdonk and N. Seiberg, JHEP **0003**, 035 (2000) ; H. Liu and J. Michelson, Nucl. Phys. B **614**, 279 (2001) .
- [4] Y. Kiem *et.al.*, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 026002 (2002) ; Eur. Phys. J. C **22**, 781 (2002); Eur. Phys. J. C **22**, 757 (2002) ; Y. Kiem *et.al.*, Nucl. Phys. B **641**, 256 (2002) ; Y. Kiem *et.al.*, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 046003 (2002) .
- [5] H. Liu, Nucl. Phys. B **614**, 305 (2001) ; A. Armoni and E. Lopez, Nucl. Phys. B **632**, 240 (2002); M. Van Raamsdonk, JHEP **0111**, 006 (2001) ; L. Jiang and E. Nicholson, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 105020 (2002) ; E. Nicholson, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 105018 (2002) .
- [6] S. J. Rey and R. von Unge, Phys. Lett. B **499**, 215 (2001); S. R. Das and S. J. Rey, Nucl. Phys. B **590**, 453 (2000); D. J. Gross, *et.al.*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **4**, 893 (2000), S. J. Rey, [arXiv:hep-th/0207108] ; J. Korean Phys. Soc. **39**, s527 (2001).
- [7] S. J. Brodsky and G. R. Farrar, Phys. Rev. D **11**, 1309 (1975); C. G. Callan Jr. and D. J. Gross, Phys. Rev. D **11**, 2905 (1975).



- [8] J. Polchinski and M. J. Strassler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 031601 (2002) .
- [9] J. M. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 231 (1998) .
- [10] S. J. Rey and J. T. Yee, Eur. Phys. J. C **22**, 379 (2001) ; J. M. Maldacena, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4859 (1998) ; S. J. Rey, S. Theisen and J. T. Yee, Nucl. Phys. B **527**, 171 (1998)
- [11] S. R. Das and B. Ghosh, JHEP **0006**, 043 (2000) .
- [12] A. Hashimoto and N. Izhaki, Phys. Lett. B **465**, 142 (1999) ; J. M. Maldacena and J. G. Russo, JHEP **9909**, 025 (1999) .
- [13] A. Dhar and Y. Kitazawa, JHEP **0102**, 004 (2001) .
- [14] K. Intriligator, Nucl. Phys. B **580**, 99 (2000) ; U.H. Danielsson *et.al.*, JHEP **0005**, 028 (2000) .
- [15] J. Polchinski and M. J. Strassler, JHEP **0305**, 012 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0209211].