


UT-03-11
hep-th/0303256
March, 2003

Noncommutative Solitons and D-branes

Masashi Hamanaka¹

*Department of Physics, University of Tokyo,
Tokyo 113-0033, Japan²*

A Dissertation in candidacy for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy



¹From 16 August, 2005 to 15 August, 2006, the author visits the Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford. (E-mail: hamanaka@maths.ox.ac.uk)

²The present affiliation is Graduate School of Mathematics, Nagoya University, Nagoya, 464-8602, Japan. (E-mail: hamanaka@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp)

Abstract

D-branes are mysterious solitons in string theories and play crucial roles in the study of the non-perturbative aspects. Among many ways to analyze the properties of D-branes, gauge theoretical analysis often become very strong to study the dynamics especially at the low-energy scale. It is very interesting that gauge theories live on the D-branes are useful to study the D-branes themselves (even on non-perturbative dynamics).

Noncommutative solitons are solitons on noncommutative spaces and have many interesting aspects. The distinguished features on noncommutative spaces are resolutions of singularities, which leads to the existence of new physical objects, such as $U(1)$ instantons and makes it possible to deal with singular configurations in usual manner.

Noncommutative gauge theories have been studied intensively for the last several years in the context of the D-brane effective theories. This is motivated by the fact that they are equivalent to the gauge theories on D-branes in the presence of background NS-NS B -fields, or equivalently, magnetic fields. We can examine various aspects of D-branes from the analysis of noncommutative gauge theories which is comparatively easier to treat. In particular noncommutative solitons are just the (lower-dimensional) D-branes and successfully applied to the study of non-perturbative dynamics of D-branes.

In this thesis, we discuss the noncommutative solitons in detail with applications to D-brane dynamics. We mainly treat noncommutative instantons and monopoles by using Atiyah-Drinfeld-Hitchin-Manin (ADHM) and Nahm constructions which have the clear D-brane interpretations. We construct various exact solutions which contain new solitons and discuss the corresponding D-brane dynamics. We find that the ADHM construction potentially possesses the “solution generating technique,” the strong way to confirm the Sen’s conjecture related to decays of unstable D-branes by the tachyon condensations. We also discuss the corresponding D-brane aspects, such as T-duality and matrix interpretations, from gauge theoretical viewpoints. The results are proved to be all consistent. Finally we propose noncommutative extension of soliton theories and integrable systems, which, we hope, would pioneers a new study area of integrable systems and (hopefully) string theories.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Non-Commutative (NC) Gauge Theories	7
2.1	Foundation of NC Gauge Theories	7
2.2	Seiberg-Witten Map	14
3	Instantons and D-branes	17
3.1	ADHM Construction of Instantons	17
3.2	ADHM Construction of NC Instantons	20
3.3	D0-D4 Brane Systems and ADHM Construction	28
4	Monopoles and D-branes	31
4.1	Nahm Construction of Monopoles	31
4.2	Nahm Construction of NC Monopoles	34
4.3	D1-D3 Brane Systems and Nahm Construction	37
4.4	Nahm Construction of the Fluxon	42
5	Calorons and D-branes	45
5.1	Instantons on $\mathbf{R}^3 \times S^1$ (=Calorons) and T-duality	45
5.2	NC Calorons and T-duality	46
5.3	Fourier Transformation of Localized Calorons	48
6	NC Solitons and D-branes	50
6.1	Gopakumar-Minwalla-Strominger (GMS) Solitons	50
6.2	The Solution Generating Technique	51
7	Towards NC Soliton Theories and NC Integrable Systems	57
7.1	The Lax-Pair Generating Technique	57
7.2	NC Lax Equations	60
7.3	Comments on the Noncommutative Ward Conjecture	63
8	Conclusion and Discussion	64
A	ADHM/Nahm Construction	69
A.1	A Derivation of ADHM/Nahm construction from Nahm Transformation	70
A.2	ADHM Construction of Instantons on \mathbf{R}^4	76
A.3	Nahm Construction of Monopoles on \mathbf{R}^3	93

1 Introduction

D-branes are solitons in string theories and play crucial roles in the study of the non-perturbative aspects. Since the discovery of them by J. Polchinski [203], there has been remarkable progress in the understanding of string dualities, the M-theory, the holographic principle, microscopic origins of the blackhole entropy, and so on [204]. In the developments, D-branes have occupied central positions.

The properties of D-branes can be investigated in various ways, for example, supergravities (SUGRA), conformal field theories (CFT), string field theories (SFT) and so on. In particular, the effective theories of D-branes are very powerful to analyze the low-energy dynamics of it. The effective theories are described by the Born-Infeld (BI) actions which are gauge theories on the D-branes coupled to the bulk supergravity. In the $\alpha' \rightarrow 0$ limit (called the *decoupling limit* or *zero-slope limit*), gravities are decoupled to the theory and the Born-Infeld action reduces to the Yang-Mills (YM) action which is very easy to treat. In this thesis, we will discuss the D-brane dynamics from the Yang-Mills theories.

Non-Commutative (NC) gauge theories are gauge theories on noncommutative spaces and have been studied intensively for the last several years in the context of the D-brane effective theories. NC gauge theories on D-branes are shown to be equivalent to ordinary gauge theories on D-branes in the presence of background magnetic fields [43, 73, 215], which triggers the recent explosive developments in noncommutative theories, which is partly because NC gauge theories are sometimes easier than commutative ones.

In this study, noncommutative solitons are very important because they can be identified with the lower-dimensional D-branes. This makes it possible to reveal some aspects of D-brane dynamics, such as tachyon condensations [111], by constructing exact noncommutative solitons and studying their properties.

Noncommutative spaces are characterized by the noncommutativity of the spatial coordinates:

$$[x^i, x^j] = i\theta^{ij}. \tag{1.1}$$

This relation looks like the canonical commutation relation $[q, p] = i\hbar$ in quantum mechanics and leads to “space-space uncertainty relation.” Hence the singularity which exists on commutative spaces could resolve on noncommutative spaces (cf. Fig. 1). This is one of the distinguished features of noncommutative theories and gives rise to various new physical objects, for example, U(1) instantons [192], “visible Dirac-like strings” [94]

and the fluxons [206, 95]. U(1) instantons exist basically due to the resolution of small instanton singularities of the complete instanton moduli space [186].




Figure 1: Resolution of singularities on noncommutative spaces

The solitons special to noncommutative spaces are sometimes so simple that we can calculate various physical quantities, such as the energy, the fluctuation around the soliton configuration and so on. This is also due to the properties on noncommutative space that the singular configuration becomes smooth and get suitable for the usual calculation.

In the present thesis, we discuss noncommutative solitons with applications to the D-brane dynamics. We mainly treat noncommutative instantons and noncommutative monopoles³ from section 3 to section 5. Instantons and monopoles are stable (anti-)self-dual configurations in the Euclidean 4-dimensional Yang-Mills theory and the (3 + 1)-dimensional Yang-Mills-Higgs (YMH) theory, respectively and actually contribute to the non-perturbative effects. They also have the clear D-brane interpretations such as D0-D4 brane systems [246, 247, 72]⁴ and D1-D3 brane systems [66] in type II string theories, respectively.

There are known to be strong ways to generate exact noncommutative instantons and monopoles, the *Atiyah-Drinfeld-Hitchin-Manin* (ADHM) *construction* and the *Atiyah-Drinfeld-Hitchin-Manin-Nahm* (ADHMN) or the *Nahm construction*, respectively.⁵ ADHM/Nahm construction is a wonderful application of the one-to-one correspondence between the instanton/monopole moduli space and the moduli space of ADHM/Nahm data and gives rise to arbitrary instantons [8] / monopoles [181]-[185].⁶

D-branes give intuitive explanations for various known results of field theories and explain the reason why the instanton/monopole moduli spaces and the moduli space of

³In this thesis, “monopoles” basically represents “BPS monopoles.”

⁴In the D-brane picture, instantons correspond to the static solitons on (4 + 1)-dimensional space which the D4-branes lie on. In this sense, we consider instantons as one of solitons in this thesis.

⁵In this thesis, “ADHM construction” and “Nahm construction” are sometimes written together as “ADHM/Nahm construction.”

⁶In this thesis, the slash “/” means “or” and the repetition of them implies “respectively.”

ADHM/Nahm data correspond one-to-one. However there still exist unknown parts of the D-brane descriptions and it is expected that further study of the D-brane description of ADHM/Nahm construction would reveal new aspects of D-brane dynamics, such as Myers effect [180] which in fact corresponds to some boundary conditions in Nahm construction.

In section 3, we discuss the ADHM construction of instantons focusing on new type of instantons, noncommutative U(1) instantons. In the study of noncommutative U(1) instantons, the self-duality of the noncommutative parameter is very important and reflects on the properties of the instantons. Usually we discuss noncommutative U(1) instantons which have the *opposite* self-duality between the gauge field and the noncommutative parameter. Here, in section 3.2, we discuss noncommutative U(1) instantons which have the *same* self-duality between them. As the results, we see that ADHM construction of noncommutative instantons naturally yields the essential part of the “*solution generating technique*” (SGT) [100].

The “solution generating technique” is a transformation which leaves the equation of motion of noncommutative gauge theories as it is and gives rise to various new solutions from known solutions of it. The new solutions have a clear interpretation of matrix models [16, 135, 4], which concerns with the important fact that a D-brane can be constructed by lower-dimensional D-branes. The “solution generating technique” can be also applied to the problem on the non-perturbative dynamics of D-branes. One remarkable example is an exact confirmation of Sen’s conjecture within the context of the effective theory of SFT that unstable D-branes decays into the lower-dimensional D-branes by the tachyon condensation. We discuss this technique and the applications in section 6 with a brief introduction to the key objects of the first breakthrough on the problem, *Gopakumar-Minwalla-Strominger* (GMS) *solitons*. The application of the solution generating technique to the noncommutative Bogomol’nyi equation is briefly discussed in section 6.2. This time we have to modify the technique [103] or use some trick [116].

In section 4, we discuss Nahm constructions of monopoles. After reviewing some typical monopoles, we construct a special BPS configuration of noncommutative Yang-Mills-Higgs theory, the *fluxon* [206, 95] by Nahm procedure [100]. The configuration is close to the flux rather than the monopole. The D-brane interpretation is also presented.

Monopoles can be considered as T-dualized (or Fourier-transformed) configurations of instantons in some limit as we see in section 5. The fluxon is also obtained by the Fourier transformation of the noncommutative periodic instanton (caloron) in the zero-period limit. The periodic solitons and the attempts of the Fourier-transformations are new [100]. All the results are consistent with T-duality transformation of the corresponding

D0-D4 brane systems, which is discussed in detail in section 5.

Furthermore in section 7, we discuss noncommutative extension of soliton theories and integrable systems as a further direction. We present a powerful method to generate various equations which possess the Lax representations on noncommutative $(1 + 1)$ and $(2 + 1)$ -dimensional spaces. The generated equations contain noncommutative integrable equations obtained by using the bicomplex method and by reductions of the noncommutative (anti-)self-dual Yang-Mills equation. This suggests that the noncommutative Lax equations would be integrable and be derived from reductions of the noncommutative (anti-)self-dual Yang-Mills equations, which implies noncommutative version of Richard Ward conjecture.

This thesis is designed for a comprehensive review of those studies including my works and organized as follows: In section 2, we introduce foundation of noncommutative gauge theories and the commutative description briefly. In section 3, 4 and 5, we discuss ADHM/Nahm construction of instantons and monopoles on both commutative spaces and noncommutative spaces. In section 6, we extend the discussion to non-BPS solitons and give a confirmation of Sen's conjecture on tachyon condensations. In section 7, we discuss the noncommutative extension of soliton equations or integrable equations as further directions. Finally we conclude in section 8. Appendix is devoted to an introduction to ADHM/Nahm construction on commutative spaces.

The main papers contributed to the present thesis are the following:

- M. Hamanaka, "Atiyah-Drinfeld-Hitchin-Manin and Nahm constructions of localized solitons in noncommutative gauge theories," *Physical Review D* **65** (2002) 085022 [[hep-th/0109070](#)] [100] (Section 3.2, 3.3, 4.4, 5.2, 5.3),
- M. Hamanaka and K. Toda, "Towards noncommutative integrable systems," *Physics Letters A* **316** (2003) 77-83 [[hep-th/0211148](#)] [104] (Section 7),

where the corresponding parts in this thesis are shown in the parenthesis.

There is another paper which is a part of this thesis:

- M. Hamanaka and S. Terashima, "On exact noncommutative BPS solitons," *Journal of High Energy Physics* **0103** (2001) 034 [[hep-th/0010221](#)] [103] (The latter half of section 6.2),


though I do not consider it as a main paper for this thesis.

2 Non-Commutative (NC) Gauge Theories

In this section, we introduce foundation of noncommutative gauge theories. Noncommutative gauge theories are equivalent to ordinary commutative gauge theories in the presence of the background magnetic fields. This equivalence between noncommutative gauge theories and gauge theories in magnetic fields is famous in the area of quantum Hall effects and recently it has been shown that it is also true of string theories [43, 73, 215]. We finally comment on the results of the equivalence in string theories.

2.1 Foundation of NC Gauge Theories

Noncommutative gauge theories have the following three equivalent descriptions and are connected one-to-one by the Weyl transformation and the Seiberg-Witten (SW) map⁷:



In the star-product formalism (i), we realize the noncommutativity of the coordinates (1.1) by replacing the products of the fields with the star-products. The fields are ordinary functions. In the commutative limit $\theta^{ij} \rightarrow 0$, this noncommutative theories reduce to the ordinary commutative ones. In the operator formalism (ii), we start with the noncommutativity of the coordinates (1.1) and treat the coordinates and fields as operators (infinite-size matrices). This formalism is the most suitable to be called “noncommutative theories,” and has a good fit for matrix theories. The formalism (iii) is a commutative description and represented as an effective theory of D-branes in the background of B -fields. The equivalence between (ii) and (iii) is clearly shown in [215].

In this section, we define noncommutative gauge theories in the star-product formalism (i) and then move to the operator formalism (ii) by the Weyl transformation.

⁷In this thesis, we treat “noncommutative Euclidean spaces” only. On noncommutative “curved spaces,” there are not in general one-to-one correspondences between (i) and (ii).

(i) The star-product formalism

The star-product is defined for ordinary fields on commutative spaces and for Euclidean spaces, explicitly given by

$$\begin{aligned} f \star g(x) &:= \exp\left(\frac{i}{2}\theta^{ij}\partial_i^{(x')}\partial_j^{(x'')}\right)f(x')g(x'')\Big|_{x'=x''=x} \\ &= f(x)g(x) + \frac{i}{2}\theta^{ij}\partial_i f(x)\partial_j g(x) + \mathcal{O}(\theta^2). \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

This explicit representation is known as the *Groenewold-Moyal product* [92, 176].

The star-product has associativity: $f \star (g \star h) = (f \star g) \star h$, and returns back to the ordinary product with $\theta^{ij} \rightarrow 0$. The modification of the product makes the ordinary spatial coordinate “noncommutative,” which means : $[x^i, x^j]_\star := x^i \star x^j - x^j \star x^i = i\theta^{ij}$.

Noncommutative gauge theories are given by the exchange of ordinary products in the commutative gauge theories for the star-products and realized as deformed theories from commutative ones. In this context, we often call them the *NC-deformed theories*. The equation of motion and BPS equation are also given by the same procedure because the fields are ordinary functions and we can take the same steps as commutative case.

We show some examples where all the products of the fields are the star products.

4-dimensional NC-deformed Yang-Mills theory

Let us consider the 4-dimensional noncommutative space with the coordinates x^μ , $\mu = 1, 2, 3, 4$ where the noncommutativity is introduced as the canonical form:

$$\theta^{\mu\nu} = \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} 0 & \theta_1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\theta_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & \theta_2 \\ 0 & 0 & -\theta_2 & 0 \end{array} \right). \quad (2.2)$$

The action of 4-dimensional gauge theory is given by

$$I_{\text{YM}} = -\frac{1}{2g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int d^4x \text{Tr} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}. \quad (2.3)$$

The BPS equations are the ASD equations:⁸

$$F_{\mu\nu} + *F_{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad (2.4)$$

or equivalently,

$$F_{z_1\bar{z}_1} + F_{z_2\bar{z}_2} = 0, \quad F_{z_1z_2} = 0, \quad (2.5)$$

⁸When we make the distinct between “self-dual” or “anti-self-dual,” then we write “SD” or “ASD” explicitly. For example, while “instantons” or “(A)SD equations” shows no distinction, “ASD instantons” or “ASD equations” specifies the ASD one.

which are derived from the condition that the action density should take the minimum:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\text{YM}} &= -\frac{1}{4g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int d^4x \operatorname{Tr} (F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + *F_{\mu\nu} * F^{\mu\nu}) \\ &= -\frac{1}{4g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int d^4x \operatorname{Tr} \left((F_{\mu\nu} \mp *F_{\mu\nu})^2 \pm 2F_{\mu\nu} * F^{\mu\nu} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

where the symbol $*$ is the Hodge operator defined by $*F_{\mu\nu} := (1/2)\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}F^{\rho\sigma}$.

(3 + 1)-dimensional NC-deformed Yang-Mills-Higgs theory

Next let us consider the (3 + 1)-dimensional noncommutative space with the coordinates x^0, x^i , $i = 1, 2, 3$ where the noncommutativity is introduced as $\theta^{12} = \theta > 0$.

The action of (3 + 1)-dimensional gauge theory is given by

$$I_{\text{YMH}} = -\frac{1}{4g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int d^4x \operatorname{Tr} (F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + 2D_\mu \Phi D_\mu \Phi), \quad (2.7)$$

where Φ is an adjoint Higgs field. The anti-self-dual BPS equations are

$$B_3 = -D_3 \Phi, \quad B_z = -D_z \Phi, \quad (2.8)$$

where B_i is magnetic field and $B_i := -(i/2)\epsilon_{ijk}F^{jk}$, $B_z := B_1 - iB_2$, $D_z := D_1 - iD_2$. These equations are usually called *Bogomol'nyi equations* [25] and derived from the conditions that the energy density E should take the minimum:

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \frac{1}{2g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int d^3x \operatorname{Tr} \left[\frac{1}{2} F_{ij} F^{ij} + D_i \Phi D^i \Phi \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int d^3x \operatorname{Tr} [(B_i \mp D_i \Phi)^2 \pm \partial_i (\epsilon_{ijk} F^{jk} \Phi)]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

(ii) The operator formalism

This time, we start with the noncommutativity of the spatial coordinates (1.1) and define noncommutative gauge theories considering the coordinates as operators. From now on, we write the hats on the fields in order to emphasize that they are operators. For simplicity, we deal with a noncommutative plane with the coordinates \hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2 which satisfy $[\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2] = i\theta$, $\theta > 0$.

Defining new variables \hat{a}, \hat{a}^\dagger as

$$\hat{a} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\theta}} \hat{z}, \quad \hat{a}^\dagger := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\theta}} \hat{\bar{z}}, \quad (2.10)$$

where $\hat{z} = \hat{x}^1 + i\hat{x}^2$, $\hat{\bar{z}} = \hat{x}^1 - i\hat{x}^2$, we get the Heisenberg's commutation relation:

$$[\hat{a}, \hat{a}^\dagger] = 1. \quad (2.11)$$

Hence the spatial coordinates can be considered as the operators acting on a Fock space \mathcal{H} which is spanned by the occupation number basis $|n\rangle := \{(\hat{a}^\dagger)^n/\sqrt{n!}\}|0\rangle$, $\hat{a}|0\rangle = 0$:

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{C}|n\rangle. \quad (2.12)$$

Fields on the space depend on the spatial coordinates and are also the operators acting on the Fock space \mathcal{H} . They are represented by the occupation number basis as

$$\hat{f} = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} f_{mn}|m\rangle\langle n|. \quad (2.13)$$

If the fields have rotational symmetry on the plane, namely, commute with the number operator $\hat{\nu} := \hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a} \sim (\hat{x}^1)^2 + (\hat{x}^2)^2$, they become diagonal:

$$\hat{f} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f_n|n\rangle\langle n|. \quad (2.14)$$

The derivation is defined as follows:

$$\partial_i \hat{f} := [\hat{\partial}_i, \hat{f}] := [-i(\theta^{-1})_{ij}\hat{x}^j, \hat{f}], \quad (2.15)$$

which satisfies the Leibniz rule and the desired relation:

$$\partial_i \hat{x}^j = [-i(\theta^{-1})_{ik}\hat{x}^k, \hat{x}^j] = \delta_i^j. \quad (2.16)$$

The operator $\hat{\partial}_i$ is called the *derivative operator*. The integration can also be defined as the trace of the Fock space \mathcal{H} :

$$\int dx^1 dx^2 \hat{f}(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2) := 2\pi\theta \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \hat{f}, \quad (2.17)$$

The covariant derivatives act on the fields which belong to the adjoint and the fundamental representations of the gauge group as

$$\begin{aligned} D_i \hat{\Phi}^{\text{adj.}} &:= [\hat{D}_i, \hat{\Phi}] := [\hat{\partial}_i + \hat{A}_i, \hat{\Phi}], \\ D_i \hat{\phi}^{\text{fund.}} &:= [\hat{\partial}_i, \hat{\phi}] + \hat{A}_i \hat{\phi}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

respectively. The operator \hat{D}_i is called the *covariant derivative operator*.

In noncommutative gauge theories, there are almost unitary operators \hat{U}_k which satisfy

$$\hat{U}_k \hat{U}_k^\dagger = 1, \quad \hat{U}_k^\dagger \hat{U}_k = 1 - \hat{P}_k, \quad (2.19)$$

where the operator \hat{P}_k is a projection operator whose rank is k . The operator \hat{U}_k is called the *partial isometry* and plays important roles in noncommutative gauge theories concerning the soliton charges.

The typical examples of them are

$$\hat{P}_k = \sum_{p=0}^{k-1} |p\rangle\langle p|, \quad (2.20)$$

$$\hat{U}_k = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |n\rangle\langle n+k| = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |n\rangle\langle n| \hat{a}^k \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n+k)\cdots(n+1)}}, \quad (2.21)$$

$$\hat{U}_k^\dagger = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |n+k\rangle\langle n| = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n+k)\cdots(n+1)}} (\hat{a}^\dagger)^k |n\rangle\langle n|. \quad (2.22)$$

This \hat{U}_k is sometimes called the *shift operator*.⁹

[Equivalence between (i) star-product formalism and (ii) operator formalism]

The descriptions (i) and (ii) are equivalent and connected by the Weyl transformation. The Weyl transformation transforms the field $f(x^1, x^2)$ in (i) into the infinite-size matrix $\hat{f}(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2)$ in (ii) as

$$\hat{f}(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int dk_1 dk_2 \tilde{f}(k_1, k_2) e^{-i(k_1 \hat{x}^1 + k_2 \hat{x}^2)}, \quad (2.23)$$

where

$$\tilde{f}(k_1, k_2) := \int dx^1 dx^2 f(x^1, x^2) e^{i(k_1 x^1 + k_2 x^2)}. \quad (2.24)$$

This map is the composite of twice Fourier transformations replacing the commutative coordinates x^1, x^2 in the exponential with the noncommutative coordinates \hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2 in the inverse transformation:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & f(x^1, x^2) & \\ & \downarrow & \\ \tilde{f}(k_1, k_2) & \swarrow \text{Weyl transformation} & \downarrow \\ & \hat{f}(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2) & \end{array}$$

The Weyl transformation preserves the product:

$$\widehat{f \star g} = \hat{f} \cdot \hat{g}. \quad (2.25)$$

The inverse transformation of the Weyl transformation is given directly by

$$f(x^1, x^2) = \int dk_2 e^{-ik_2 x^2} \left\langle x^1 + \frac{k_2}{2} \left| \hat{f}(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2) \right| x^1 - \frac{k_2}{2} \right\rangle. \quad (2.26)$$

⁹The shift operators can be constructed concretely by applying Atiyah-Bott-Shapiro (ABS) construction [11] to noncommutative cases [115].

The transformation also maps the derivation and the integration one-to-one. Hence the BPS equation and the solution are also transformed one-to-one. The correspondences are the following:

(i) the star-product formalism	← Weyl transformation →	(ii) the operator formalism
ordinary functions $f(x^1, x^2)$	[field]	infinite-size matrices $\hat{f}(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2) = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} f_{mn} m\rangle \langle n $
star-products $(f \star (g \star h) = (f \star g) \star h)$	[product] (associativity)	multiplications of matrices $(\hat{f}(\hat{g}\hat{h}) = (\hat{f}\hat{g})\hat{h})$ (trivial)
$[x^i, x^j]_{\star} = i\theta^{ij}$	[noncommutativity]	$[\hat{x}^i, \hat{x}^j] = i\theta^{ij}$
$\partial_i f$ (especially, $\partial_i x^j = \delta_i^j$)	[derivation]	$\partial_i \hat{f} := \underbrace{[-i(\theta^{-1})_{ij} \hat{x}^j, \hat{f}]}_{=: \hat{\partial}_i}$ (especially, $\partial_i \hat{x}^j = \delta_i^j$)
$\int dx^1 dx^2 f(x^1, x^2)$	[integration]	$2\pi\theta \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \hat{f}(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2)$
$F_{ij} = \partial_i A_j - \partial_j A_i + [A_i, A_j]_{\star}$	[curvature]	$\hat{F}_{ij} = \partial_i \hat{A}_j - \partial_j \hat{A}_i + [\hat{A}_i, \hat{A}_j]$ $= [\hat{D}_i, \hat{D}_j] - i(\theta^{-1})_{ij}$
$\sqrt{\frac{n!}{m!}} (2r^2/\theta)^{\frac{m-n}{2}} e^{i(m-n)\varphi} \times$ $2(-1)^n L_n^{m-n}(2r^2/\theta) e^{-\frac{r^2}{\theta}}$	[matrix element]	$ n\rangle \langle m $
$\left(\begin{array}{c} \\ \text{Independent of } \varphi \\ \Leftrightarrow m = n \\ \downarrow \end{array} \right)$	$\left(\begin{array}{c} \\ \text{Rotational symmetry} \\ \text{on } x^1\text{-}x^2 \text{ plane} \\ \downarrow \end{array} \right)$	$\left(\begin{array}{c} \\ \text{Commutates with} \\ (\hat{x}^1)^2 + (\hat{x}^2)^2 \Leftrightarrow m = n \\ \downarrow \end{array} \right)$
$2(-1)^n L_n(2r^2/\theta) e^{-\frac{r^2}{\theta}}$	[some projection]	$ n\rangle \langle n $

where (r, φ) is the usual polar coordinate ($r = \{(x^1)^2 + (x^2)^2\}^{\frac{1}{2}}$) and $L_n^\alpha(x)$ is the Laguerre polynomial:

$$L_n^\alpha(x) := \frac{x^{-\alpha} e^x}{n!} \left(\frac{d}{dx} \right)^n (e^{-x} x^{n+\alpha}). \quad (2.27)$$

(Especially $L_n(x) := L_n^0(x)$.)

We note that in the curvature in operator formalism, a constant term $-i(\theta^{-1})_{ij}$ appears so that it should cancel out the term $[\hat{\partial}_i, \hat{\partial}_j](= i(\theta^{-1})_{ij})$ in $[\hat{D}_i, \hat{D}_j]$. For a review of the correspondence, see [110].

We show some examples of BPS equations in operator formalism which are simply mapped by the Weyl transformation from the BPS equations (2.5) and (2.8).

4-dimensional noncommutative Yang-Mills theory

First we show the operator formalism on noncommutative 4-dimensional space setting the noncommutative parameter $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ anti-self-dual. The fields on the 4-dimensional noncommutative space whose noncommutativity is (2.2) are operators acting on Fock space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ where \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 are defined by the same steps as the previous paragraph on noncommutative x^1 - x^2 plane and on noncommutative x^3 - x^4 plane respectively. The element in the Fock space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ is denoted by $|n_1\rangle \otimes |n_2\rangle$ or $|n_1, n_2\rangle$.

In order to make the noncommutative parameter anti-self-dual, we put $\theta_1 = -\theta_2 = \theta > 0$. In this case, \hat{z}_1 and \hat{z}_2 correspond to annihilation operators and $\hat{\bar{z}}_1$ and $\hat{\bar{z}}_2$ creation operators:

$$[\hat{z}_1, \hat{\bar{z}}_1] = 2\theta_1 = 2\theta, [\hat{\bar{z}}_2, \hat{z}_2] = -2\theta_2 = 2\theta, \text{ otherwise } = 0. \quad (2.28)$$

We can define annihilation operators as $\hat{a}_1 := (1/\sqrt{2\theta})\hat{z}_1$, $\hat{a}_2 := (1/\sqrt{2\theta})\hat{z}_2$ and creation operator $\hat{a}_1^\dagger := (1/\sqrt{2\theta})\hat{\bar{z}}_1$, $\hat{a}_2^\dagger := (1/\sqrt{2\theta})\hat{\bar{z}}_2$ in Fock space $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{n_1, n_2=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{C}|n_1\rangle \otimes |n_2\rangle$ such as

$$[\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_1^\dagger] = 1, [\hat{a}_2, \hat{a}_2^\dagger] = 1, \text{ otherwise } = 0, \quad (2.29)$$

where $|n_1\rangle$ and $|n_2\rangle$ are the occupation number basis generated from the vacuum $|0_1\rangle$ and $|0_2\rangle$ by the action of \hat{a}_1^\dagger and \hat{a}_2^\dagger , respectively.

The anti-self-dual BPS equations in operator formalism are transformed by Weyl transformation from equation (2.5):

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{F}_{z_1\bar{z}_1} + \hat{F}_{z_2\bar{z}_2} =) & \quad -[\hat{D}_{z_1}, \hat{D}_{z_1}^\dagger] - [\hat{D}_{z_2}, \hat{D}_{z_2}^\dagger] - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\theta_1} + \frac{1}{\theta_2} \right) = 0, \\ (\hat{F}_{z_1z_2} =) & \quad [\hat{D}_{z_1}, \hat{D}_{z_2}] = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

The fields are represented by using the occupation number basis as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}(\hat{x}^\mu) &= \sum_{m_1, m_2, n_1, n_2=0}^{\infty} f_{m_1, m_2, n_1, n_2} |m_1\rangle \langle n_1| \otimes |m_2\rangle \langle n_2| \\ &=: \sum_{m_1, m_2, n_1, n_2=0}^{\infty} f_{m_1, m_2, n_1, n_2} |m_1, m_2\rangle \langle n_1, n_2|. \end{aligned} \quad (2.31)$$

We note that in the case that noncommutative parameter θ^{ij} is also anti-self-dual, the constant term $(1/\theta_1 + 1/\theta_2)$ disappears.

(3 + 1)-dimensional noncommutative Yang-Mills-Higgs theories

The anti-self-dual BPS equations in the operator formalism are transformed by Weyl transformation of equations (2.8):

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{B}_3 =) \quad & [\hat{D}_z, \hat{D}_z^\dagger] + \frac{1}{\theta} = -[\hat{D}_3, \hat{\Phi}], \\ (\hat{B}_z =) \quad & [\hat{D}_3, \hat{D}_z] = -[\hat{D}_z, \hat{\Phi}]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

The fields are represented by using the occupation number basis as

$$\hat{f}(\hat{x}^1, \hat{x}^2, x^3) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f_{mn}(x^3) |m\rangle \langle n|. \tag{2.33}$$

2.2 Seiberg-Witten Map

Here we present the results discussed by Seiberg and Witten, which motivates the recent explosive developments in noncommutative gauge theories and string theories.

Let us consider the low-energy effective theory of open strings in the presence of background of constant NS-NS B -fields. In order to do this, there are two ways to regularize the open-string world-sheet action corresponding to the situation with Dp -branes. If we take Pauli-Villars (PV) regularization neglecting the derivative corrections of the field strength, we get the ordinary (commutative) Born-Infeld action [27] with B -field for $G = U(1)$:

$$I_{\text{BI}} = \frac{1}{g_s (2\pi)^p (\alpha')^{\frac{p+1}{2}}} \int d^{p+1}x \sqrt{\det(g_{\mu\nu} + 2\pi\alpha'(F_{\mu\nu} + B_{\mu\nu}))} \tag{2.34}$$

where g_s and $g_{\mu\nu}$ are the string coupling and the closed string metric, respectively. On the other hand, if we take the Point-Splitting (PS) regularization neglecting the derivative corrections of the field strength, we get the noncommutative Born-Infeld action without B -field (in the star-product formalism):

$$I_{\text{NC BI}} = \frac{1}{G_s (2\pi)^p (\alpha')^{\frac{p+1}{2}}} \int d^{p+1}x \sqrt{\det(G_{\mu\nu} + 2\pi\alpha' F_{\mu\nu})_\star} \tag{2.35}$$

where G_s and $G_{\mu\nu}$ are the open string coupling and the open string metric, respectively.

The effective theories should be independent of the ways to regularize it and hence be equivalent to each other and connected by field redefinitions. The equivalent relation between the commutative fields $A_\mu(x), F_{\mu\nu}(x)$ and the noncommutative fields $\hat{A}_\mu(\hat{x}), \hat{F}_{\mu\nu}(\hat{x})$ was found by Seiberg and Witten as a differential equation.¹⁰




Figure 2: The equivalence between NC BI action without B -field and BI action with B -field, and the Seiberg-Witten map

A solution of it for $G = U(1)$ is obtained by [194, 178, 166] and the Fourier component of the field strength of the mapped gauge fields on commutative side is given in terms of the noncommutative gauge fields by

$$\begin{aligned}
 & F_{ij}(k) + (\theta^{-1})_{ij} \delta(k) \\
 &= \frac{1}{\text{Pf}(\theta)} \int dx \left[e^{ikx} (\theta - \theta \hat{f} \theta)_{ij}^{n-1} P \exp \left(i \int_0^1 \hat{A}(x + l\tau) l^i d\tau \right) \right], \quad (2.36)
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 l^i &:= k_j \theta^{ji}, \\
 \hat{f}_{ij} &:= \int_0^1 \hat{F}_{ij}(x + l\tau) d\tau, \\
 \text{Pf}(\theta) &:= \frac{1}{2^n n!} \epsilon_{i_1 \dots i_{2n}} \theta_{i_1 i_2} \cdots \theta_{i_{2n-1} i_{2n}}, \quad (2.37)
 \end{aligned}$$

¹⁰This equation is in fact not completely integrable and has some ambiguities [5].

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(\theta - \theta \hat{f}\theta)_{ij}^{n-1} &= -\frac{1}{2^{n-1}(n-1)!} \epsilon^{ij i_1 i_2 \dots i_{2n-2}} \\
&\times \int_0^1 d\tau_1 (\theta - \theta \hat{F}(x + l\tau_1)\theta)^{i_1 i_2} \dots \int_0^1 d\tau_{n-1} (\theta - \theta \hat{F}(x + l\tau_{n-1}))^{i_{2n-3} i_{2n-2}} \quad (2.38)
\end{aligned}$$

The exact transformation (2.36) contains the open Wilson line [134] which is gauge invariant in noncommutative gauge theories. The more explicit examples of the SW map will be presented later.

From section 3 to section 6 except for section 6.2, we discuss the exact solution of Yang-Mills theories as D-brane effective theories in the zero-slope limit: $\alpha' \rightarrow 0$. In this limit, the (NC) Born-Infeld action is reduced to the (NC) Super-Yang-Mills action and yields soliton solutions which are just the (lower-dimensional) D-branes. For example, the effective theory of N D3-branes coincides with the $G = U(N)$ Yang-Mills-Higgs action (2.7) by setting the transverse Higgs fields $\Phi^4 \equiv \Phi$ and $\Phi^{\hat{\mu}} = 0$, ($\hat{\mu} = 5, \dots, 9$). We construct explicit noncommutative soliton solutions via ADHM/Nahm construction and discuss the corresponding D-brane dynamics.

3 Instantons and D-branes

In this section, we study noncommutative instantons in detail by using ADHM construction. ADHM construction is a strong method to generate all instantons and based on a duality, that is, one-to-one correspondence between the instanton moduli space and the moduli space of ADHM-data, which are specified by the ASD equation and ADHM equation, respectively. In the context of string theories, instantons are realized as the D0-D4 brane systems in type IIA string theory. The numbers of D0-branes and D4-branes correspond to the instanton number and the rank of the gauge group and are denoted by k and N in this thesis, respectively. We will see how well ADHM construction extracts the essence of instantons and how much it fits to the D-brane systems in the construction of exact instanton solutions on both commutative and noncommutative \mathbf{R}^4 .

3.1 ADHM Construction of Instantons

In this subsection, we construct exact instanton solutions on commutative \mathbf{R}^4 . By using ADHM procedure, we can easily construct Belavin-Polyakov-Schwartz-Tyupkin (BPST) instanton solution [20] ($G = SU(2)$ 1-instanton solution), 't Hooft instanton solution and Jackiw-Nohl-Rebbi solution [140] ($G = SU(2)$ k -instanton solution). The concrete steps are as follows:

- Step (i): Solving ADHM equation:

$$\begin{aligned} [B_1, B_1^\dagger] + [B_2, B_2^\dagger] + II^\dagger - J^\dagger J &= -[z_1, \bar{z}_1] - [z_2, \bar{z}_2] = 0, \\ [B_1, B_2] + IJ &= -[z_1, z_2] = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

We note that the coordinates $z_{1,2}$ always appear in pair with the matrices $B_{1,2}$ and that is why we see the commutator of the coordinates in the RHS. These terms, of course, vanish on commutative spaces, however, they cause nontrivial contributions on noncommutative spaces, which is seen later soon.

- Step (ii): Solving “0-dimensional Dirac equation” in the background of the ADHM data which satisfies ADHM eq. (3.1):

$$\nabla^\dagger V = 0, \tag{3.2}$$

with the normalization condition:

$$V^\dagger V = 1, \tag{3.3}$$

where the “0-dimensional Dirac operator” ∇ is defined as in Eq. (A.43).

- Step (iii): Using the solution V , we can construct the corresponding instanton solution as

$$A_\mu = V^\dagger \partial_\mu V, \quad (3.4)$$

which actually satisfies the ASD equation:

$$\begin{aligned} F_{z_1 \bar{z}_1} + F_{z_2 \bar{z}_2} &= [D_{z_1}, D_{\bar{z}_1}] + [D_{z_2}, D_{\bar{z}_2}] = 0, \\ F_{z_1 z_2} &= [D_{z_1}, D_{z_2}] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

The detailed aspects are discussed in Appendix A. In this subsection, we give some examples of the explicit instanton solutions focusing on BPST instanton solution.

BPST instanton solution (1-instanton, $\dim \mathcal{M}_{2,1}^{\text{BPST}} = 5$)

This solution is the most basic and important and is constructed almost trivially by ADHM procedure.

- Step (i): ADHM equation is a $k \times k$ matrix-equation and in the present $k = 1$ case, is trivially solved. The commutator part of $B_{1,2}$ is automatically dropped out and the matrices $B_{1,2}$ can be taken as arbitrary complex numbers. The remaining parts I, J are also easily solved:

$$B_1 = \alpha_1, \quad B_2 = \alpha_2, \quad I = (\rho, 0), \quad J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \rho \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha_{1,2} \in \mathbf{C}, \quad \rho \in \mathbf{R}. \quad (3.6)$$

Here the real and imaginary parts of α are denoted as $\alpha_1 = b_2 + ib_1$, $\alpha_2 = b_4 + ib_3$, respectively.

- Step (ii): The “0-dimensional Dirac operator” becomes

$$\nabla = \begin{pmatrix} \rho & 0 \\ 0 & \rho \\ e_\mu(x_\mu - b_\mu) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \nabla^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} \rho & 0 & \bar{e}_\mu(x_\mu - b_\mu) \\ 0 & \rho & \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.7)$$

and the solution of “0-dimensional Dirac equation” is trivially found:

$$V = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\phi}} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{e}_\mu(x_\mu - b_\mu) \\ -\rho & 0 \\ 0 & -\rho \end{pmatrix}, \quad \phi = |x - b|^2 + \rho^2, \quad (3.8)$$

where the normalization factor ϕ is determined by the normalization condition (3.3).

- Step (iii): The instanton solution is constructed as

$$A_\mu = V^\dagger \partial_\mu V = \frac{i(x-b)^\nu \eta_{\mu\nu}^{(-)}}{(x-b)^2 + \rho^2}. \quad (3.9)$$

The field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$ is calculated from this gauge field as

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \frac{2i\rho^2}{(|x-b|^2 + \rho^2)^2} \eta_{\mu\nu}^{(-)}. \quad (3.10)$$

The distribution is just like in Fig. 3. The dimension 5 of the instanton moduli space corresponds to the positions b^μ and the size ρ of the instanton¹¹.

Now let us take the zero-size limit. Then the distribution of the field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$ converses into the singular, delta-functional configuration. Instantons have smooth configurations by definition and hence the zero-size instanton does not exist, which corresponds to the singularity of the (complete) instanton moduli space which is called the *small instanton singularity*. (See Fig. 3.)¹² On noncommutative space, the singularity is resolved and new class of instantons appear.




Figure 3: Instanton moduli space \mathcal{M} and the instanton configurations

't Hooft instanton solution (k -instanton, $\dim \mathcal{M}_{2,k}^{t\text{Hooft}} = 5k$)

This solution is the most simple multi-instanton solution without the orientation moduli parameters and is also easily constructed by ADHM procedure. Here we take the real representation instead of the complex representation.

¹¹Here the size of instantons is the full width of half maximal (FWHM) of $F_{\mu\nu}$.

¹²Here the horizontal directions correspond to the degree of global gauge transformations which act on the gauge fields as the adjoint action.

- Step (i): In this case, we solve the ADHM equation by putting the matrices B_i diagonal. Then S is easily solved:

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_1 & 0 & \dots & \rho_k & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_1 & & 0 & \rho_k \end{pmatrix},$$

$$B_i = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_i^{(1)} & & & O \\ & \ddots & & \\ O & & & \alpha_i^{(k)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho_p \in \mathbf{R}, \quad \alpha_i^{(p)} \in \mathbf{C}. \quad (3.11)$$

- Step (ii): The solution of “0-dimensional Dirac equation” $\nabla^\dagger V = 0$ is

$$V = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\phi}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ ((x^\mu - T^\mu) \otimes \bar{e}_\mu)^{-1} S^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.12)$$

where

$$\phi = 1 + \sum_{p=1}^k \frac{\rho_p^2}{|x - b_p|^2},$$

$$((x^\mu - T^\mu) \otimes \bar{e}_\mu)^{-1} = \text{diag}_{p=1}^k \left(\frac{(x^\mu - b_p^\mu)}{|x - b_p|^2} \otimes e^\mu \right),$$

where $\alpha_1^{(p)} = b_p^2 + ib_p^1$, $\alpha_2^{(p)} = b_p^4 + ib_p^3$.

- Step (iii): The ASD gauge field is

$$A_\mu^{(-)} = V^\dagger \partial_\mu V = -\frac{i}{\phi} \sum_{p=1}^k \frac{\rho_p^2 \eta_{\mu\nu}^{(+)} (x_\nu - b_\nu^{(p)})}{|x - b^{(p)}|^4} = \frac{i}{2} \eta_{\mu\nu}^{(+)} \partial^\nu \log \phi. \quad (3.13)$$

The final form relates to *'t Hooft ansatz* or *CFtHW ansatz* [229, 48, 243], and originally this solution is obtained by putting this ansatz on the ASD equation directly, which leads to the Laplace equation of ϕ . This solution is singular at the centers of k instantons because a singular gauge is taken here. In fact, in $k = 1$ case, this solution is known to be equivalent to the smooth BPST instanton solution up to a singular gauge transformation. (See, for example, [76] p. 381-383.) The field strength is proved to be ASD though the SD symbol $\eta_{\mu\nu}^{(+)}$ is found in the gauge field (3.13). The dimension of the moduli space $5k$ consists of that of the positions b_p^μ of the k instantons and the size ρ_p of them. The diagonal components b_p^μ of ADHM data T_μ shows the positions of the instantons, which is also seen in Eq. (A.90) because the constant shift of x^μ gives rise to the shift of the date of T^μ .

3.2 ADHM Construction of NC Instantons

In this subsection, we construct some typical noncommutative instanton solutions by using ADHM method in the operator formalism. In noncommutative ADHM construction, the

self-duality of the noncommutative parameter is important, which reflects the properties of the instanton solutions.

The steps are all the same as commutative one:

- Step (i): ADHM equation is deformed by the noncommutativity of the coordinates as we mentioned in the previous subsection:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu_{\mathbf{R}} :=) \quad & [B_1, B_1^\dagger] + [B_2, B_2^\dagger] + II^\dagger - J^\dagger J = -2(\theta_1 + \theta_2) =: \zeta, \\ (\mu_{\mathbf{C}} :=) \quad & [B_1, B_2] + IJ = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

We note that if the noncommutative parameter is ASD, that is, $\theta_1 + \theta_2 = 0$, then the RHS of the first equation of ADHM equation becomes zero.¹³

- Step (ii): Solving the noncommutative “0-dimensional Dirac equation”

$$\hat{\nabla}^\dagger \hat{V} = \begin{pmatrix} I & \hat{z}_2 - B_2 & \hat{z}_1 - B_1 \\ J^\dagger & -(\hat{z}_1 - B_1^\dagger) & \hat{z}_2 - B_2^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \hat{V} = 0 \quad (3.15)$$

with the normalization condition.

- Step (iii): the ASD gauge fields are constructed from the zero-mode V ,

$$\hat{A}_\mu = \hat{V}^\dagger \partial_\mu \hat{V}, \quad (3.16)$$

which actually satisfies the noncommutative ASD equation:

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{F}_{z_1 \bar{z}_1} + \hat{F}_{z_2 \bar{z}_2} =) \quad & [\hat{D}_{z_1}, \hat{D}_{\bar{z}_1}] + [\hat{D}_{z_2}, \hat{D}_{\bar{z}_2}] - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\theta_1} + \frac{1}{\theta_2} \right) = 0, \\ (\hat{F}_{z_1 z_2} =) \quad & [\hat{D}_{z_1}, \hat{D}_{z_2}] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

There is seen to be a beautiful duality between Eqs. (3.14) and (3.17). We note that when the noncommutative parameter is ASD, then the constant terms in both Eqs. (3.14) and (3.17) disappear.

In this way, noncommutative instantons are actually constructed. Here we have to take care about the inverse of the operators.

Comments on instanton moduli spaces

Instanton moduli spaces are determined by the value of $\mu_{\mathbf{R}}$ [187, 188] (cf. Fig. 4). Namely,

¹³When we treat SD gauge fields, then the RHS is proportional to $(\theta_1 - \theta_2)$. Hence the relative self-duality between gauge fields and NC parameters is important.

- In $\mu_{\mathbf{R}} = 0$ case, instanton moduli spaces contain small instanton singularities, (which is the case for commutative \mathbf{R}^4 and special noncommutative \mathbf{R}^4 where $\theta : \text{ASD}$).
- In $\mu_{\mathbf{R}} \neq 0 =: \zeta$ case, small instanton singularities are resolved and new class of smooth instantons, $U(1)$ instantons exist, (which is the case for general noncommutative \mathbf{R}^4)




Figure 4: Instanton Moduli Spaces

Since $\mu_{\mathbf{R}} = \zeta = -2(\theta_1 + \theta_2)$ as Eq. (3.14), the self-duality of the noncommutative parameter is important. NC ASD instantons have the following “phase diagram” (Fig. 5):




Figure 5: “phase diagram” of NC ASD instantons

When the noncommutative parameter is ASD, that is, $\theta_1 + \theta_2 = 0$, instanton moduli space implies the singularities. The origin of the “phase diagram” corresponds to commutative instantons. The θ -axis represents instantons on $\mathbf{R}_{\text{NC}}^2 \times \mathbf{R}_{\text{Com}}^2$. The other instantons

basically have the same properties, and hence let us fix the noncommutative parameter θ self-dual. This type of instantons are first discussed by Nekrasov and Schwarz [192].¹⁴

Now let us construct explicit noncommutative instanton solution focusing on $U(1)$ instantons.

$U(1)$, $k = 1$ solution (U(1) ASD instanton, $\theta : \text{SD}$)

Let us consider the ASD-SD instantons. For simplicity, let us take $k = 1$ and fix the instanton at the origin. The generalization to multi-instanton is straightforward. If we want to add the moduli parameters of the positions, we have only to do translations. We note that on noncommutative space, translations are gauge transformations [95].

- Step (i): Solving noncommutative ADHM equation

When the gauge group is $U(1)$, the matrix I or J becomes zero [188]. Hence ADHM equation is trivially solved as

$$B_{1,2} = 0, \quad I = \sqrt{\zeta}, \quad J = 0 \quad (3.18)$$

- Step (ii): Solving the “0-dimensional Dirac equation”

In the background of the ADHM data (3.18), the Dirac operator becomes

$$\hat{\nabla} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\zeta} & 0 \\ \hat{z}_2 & -\hat{z}_1 \\ \hat{z}_1 & \hat{z}_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\nabla}^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\zeta} & \hat{z}_2 & \hat{z}_1 \\ 0 & -\hat{z}_1 & \hat{z}_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.19)$$

Then the inverse of $\nabla^\dagger \nabla$ exists:

$$\hat{f} = \sum_{n_1, n_2=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n_1 + n_2 + \zeta} |n_1, n_2\rangle \langle n_1, n_2|. \quad (3.20)$$

In $\zeta \neq 0$ case, \hat{f} always exists [80]. One of the important points is on the Dirac zero-mode. The solution of the “0-dimensional Dirac equation” is naively obtained as follows up to the normalization factor:

$$\hat{V}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{z}_1 \hat{z}_1 + \hat{z}_2 \hat{z}_2 \\ -\sqrt{\zeta} \hat{z}_2 \\ -\sqrt{\zeta} \hat{z}_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\nabla}^\dagger \hat{V}_1 = 0. \quad (3.21)$$

¹⁴This Nekrasov-Schwarz type instantons (the self-duality of gauge field-noncommutative parameter is ASD-SD) are discussed in [80, 81, 82, 137, 146, 45, 46, 189, 192, 157, 199, 222, 77], and the ASD-ASD instantons [3] are constructed by ADHM construction in [83, 99], and ADHM construction of instantons on $\mathbf{R}_{\text{NC}}^2 \times \mathbf{R}_{\text{Com}}^2$ are discussed in [147]. For recommended articles, see [41, 239]. Instantons on commutative side in B -fields are discussed in [175, 215, 221].

However this does not satisfy the normalization condition in the operator sense because \hat{V}_1 has the zero mode $|0, 0\rangle$ in the Fock space \mathcal{H} and the inverse of $\hat{V}_1^\dagger \hat{V}_1$ does not exist in \mathcal{H} calculating the normalization factor. We have to take care about this point.

K. Furuuchi [80] shows that if we restrict all discussions to $\mathcal{H}_1 := \mathcal{H} - |0, 0\rangle\langle 0, 0|$, then \hat{V}_1 give the smooth ASD instanton solution in \mathcal{H}_1 . Furthermore he transforms the situation in \mathcal{H}_1 into that in \mathcal{H} by using shift operators and find the correctly normalized \hat{V} and ASD instanton in \mathcal{H} [81]:

$$\hat{V} = \hat{V}_1 \hat{\beta}_1 \hat{U}_1^\dagger, \quad \hat{V}^\dagger \hat{V} = 1, \quad (3.22)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta}_1 &= (1 - \hat{P}_1)(\hat{V}_1^\dagger \hat{V}_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(1 - \hat{P}_1) \\ &= \sum_{(n_1, n_2) \neq (0, 0)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n_1 + n_2)(n_1 + n_2 + \zeta)}} |n_1, n_2\rangle \langle n_1, n_2|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

The projection $(1 - \hat{P}_1)$ in the zero-mode corresponds to the restriction to \mathcal{H}_1 and the shift operator \hat{U}_1 transforms all the fields in \mathcal{H}_1 to those in \mathcal{H} . The two prescriptions give the correct zero-mode in \mathcal{H} .

Finally we can construct the ASD gauge field as step (iii) and the field strength. The instanton number is actually calculated as -1 .

$U(2)$, $k = 1$ solution (NC BPST, θ : SD)

This solution is also obtained by ADHM procedure with the ‘‘Furuuchi’s Method.’’ The solution of noncommutative ADHM equation is

$$B_{1,2} = 0, \quad I = (\sqrt{\rho^2 + \zeta}, 0), \quad J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \rho \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.24)$$

The date I is deformed by the noncommutativity of the coordinates, which shows that the size of instantons becomes larger than that of commutative one because of the existence of ζ . In fact, in the $\rho \rightarrow 0$ limit, the configuration is still smooth and the $U(1)$ part is alive. This is essentially just the same as the previous $U(1)$, $k = 1$ instanton solution.

$U(1)$, k -instanton solution (Localized $U(1)$ ASD instanton, θ : ASD)

This time, let us consider the ASD-ASD (not ASD-SD) instanton. In this case, there are small instanton singularities in the instanton moduli space. The $U(1)$ part corresponds to this singular points. Let us construct this solution directly.

- Step (i): The solution of ADHM equation becomes perfectly trivial:

$$B_i = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_i^{(0)} & & O \\ & \ddots & \\ O & & \alpha_i^{(k-1)} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$I = J = 0, \quad (3.25)$$

where $\alpha_i^{(m)}$ should show the position of the m -th instanton. The matrices I and J contain information of the size of instantons and hence $I = J = 0$ suggests that the configuration would be size-zero and singular.

- Step (ii):¹⁵ Next we solve “0-dimensional Dirac equation” in the background of the solutions (3.25) of the ADHM equation. This is also simple. Observing the right hand side of the completeness condition (A.87), we get $\hat{v}_1^{(m)} = |\alpha_1^{(m)}, \alpha_2^{(m)}\rangle \langle p_1^{(m)}, p_2^{(m)}|$ and $\hat{v}_2 = 0$, where $|p_1^{(m)}, p_2^{(m)}\rangle$ is the normalized orthogonal state in $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$:

$$\langle p_1^{(m)}, p_2^{(m)} | p_1^{(n)}, p_2^{(n)} \rangle = \delta_{mn}, \quad (3.26)$$

and $|\alpha_1^{(m)}, \alpha_2^{(m)}\rangle$ is the normalized coherent state and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{z}_1 |\alpha_1^{(m)}, \alpha_2^{(m)}\rangle &= \alpha_1^{(m)} |\alpha_1^{(m)}, \alpha_2^{(m)}\rangle, \\ \hat{z}_2 |\alpha_1^{(m)}, \alpha_2^{(m)}\rangle &= \bar{\alpha}_2^{(m)} |\alpha_1^{(m)}, \alpha_2^{(m)}\rangle, \\ \langle \alpha_1^{(m)}, \alpha_2^{(m)} | \alpha_1^{(m)}, \alpha_2^{(m)} \rangle &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

The eigen values $\alpha_1^{(m)}$ and $\alpha_2^{(m)}$ of \hat{z}_1 and \hat{z}_2 are decided to be just the same as the m -th diagonal components of the solutions B_1 and B_2 in Eq. (3.25), respectively. Though \hat{u} is undetermined, \hat{V} already satisfies $\nabla^\dagger \hat{V} = 0$, which comes from that in the case that the self-dualities of gauge fields and noncommutative parameters are the same, the coordinates in each column of ∇^\dagger play the same role in the sense that they are annihilation operators or creation operators. Finally, the normalization condition $\hat{V}^\dagger \hat{V} = 1$ determines $\hat{u} = \hat{U}_k$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{U}_k \hat{U}_k^\dagger &= 1, \\ \hat{U}_k^\dagger \hat{U}_k &= 1 - \hat{P}_k = 1 - \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} |p_1^{(m)}, p_2^{(m)}\rangle \langle p_1^{(m)}, p_2^{(m)}|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

¹⁵The general discussion is rather complicated. We recommend the readers interested in the details to follow without the moduli parameters $\alpha_i^{(m)}$ first. Then taking the direct sum of the translation $\hat{T} \sim e^{\alpha_1 \hat{\partial}_{z_1}} \otimes e^{\alpha_2 \hat{\partial}_{z_2}} \sim e^{\alpha_1 \hat{z}_1 / \theta} \otimes e^{\alpha_2 \hat{z}_2 / \theta}$ on $\hat{\nabla}$ and \hat{V} , we reach to the present results with the moduli parameters. (We note $|\alpha_i\rangle \sim e^{\alpha_i \hat{a}_i^\dagger} |0\rangle$.)

This is just the shift operator and naturally appears in this way. The shift operator and \hat{u} have the same behavior at $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, which is consistent.

Gathering the results, we get the Dirac zero-mode as

$$\hat{V} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{u} \\ \hat{v}_1^{(m)} \\ \hat{v}_2^{(m)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{U}_k \\ |\alpha_1^{(m)}, \alpha_2^{(m)}\rangle \langle p_1^{(m)}, p_2^{(m)}| \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.29)$$

here $\hat{v}_i^{(m)}$ is the m -th low of \hat{v}_i . One example of the shift operators which satisfies (3.28) are given by

$$\hat{U}_k = \sum_{n_1=1, n_2=0}^{\infty} |n_1, n_2\rangle \langle n_1, n_2| + \sum_{n_2=0}^{\infty} |0, n_2\rangle \langle 0, n_2 + k|, \quad (3.30)$$

where

$$\hat{P}_k = \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} |0, m\rangle \langle 0, m|. \quad (3.31)$$

We note that ASD-ASD instantons do not need the ‘‘Furuuchi’s method’’ unlike ASD-SD instantons.

- Step (iii): The k -instanton solution with the moduli parameters of the positions of the instantons are:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{D}_{z_i} &= \hat{V}^\dagger \hat{\partial}_{z_i} \hat{V} = \hat{u}^\dagger \hat{\partial}_{z_i} \hat{u} + \hat{v}^\dagger \hat{\partial}_{z_i} \hat{v} \\ &= \hat{U}_k^\dagger \hat{\partial}_{z_i} \hat{U}_k - \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} |p_1^{(m)}, p_2^{(m)}\rangle \langle \alpha_1^{(m)}, \alpha_2^{(m)}| \frac{\hat{z}_i}{2\theta^i} |\alpha_1^{(m)}, \alpha_2^{(m)}\rangle \langle p_1^{(m)}, p_2^{(m)}| \\ &= \hat{U}_k^\dagger \hat{\partial}_{z_i} \hat{U}_k - \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_{z_i}^{(m)}}{2\theta^i} |p_1^{(m)}, p_2^{(m)}\rangle \langle p_1^{(m)}, p_2^{(m)}|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

This is just the essential part of the solution generating technique. The solution generating technique is one of the strong auto-Bäcklund transformation and is based on the following transformation:

$$\hat{D}_{z_i} \rightarrow \hat{U}_k^\dagger \hat{D}_{z_i} \hat{U}_k - \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_{z_i}^{(m)}}{2\theta^i} |p_1^{(m)}, p_2^{(m)}\rangle \langle p_1^{(m)}, p_2^{(m)}|. \quad (3.33)$$

Though this transformation looks like the gauge transformation, it is a non-trivial transformation because \hat{U}_k is not a unitary operator but a shift operator. This transformation

leaves equation of motion as it is in gauge theories and can be applied to the problems on tachyon condensations and Sen's conjecture, which is discussed in section 6 in this thesis.

The field strength is calculated very easily:

$$F_{12} = -F_{34} = i \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} |p_1^{(m)}, p_2^{(m)}\rangle \langle p_1^{(m)}, p_2^{(m)}|. \quad (3.34)$$

The instanton number k is represented by the dimension of the projected states $|p_1^{(m)}, p_2^{(m)}\rangle$ which appears in the relations of the shift operator $\hat{u} = \hat{U}_k$ or the bra part of $\hat{v}_1^{(m)}$. Information of the position of k localized solitons is shown in the coherent state $|\alpha_i^{(m)}\rangle$ in the ket part of $\hat{v}_1^{(m)}$.

It seems to be strange that the field strength contains no information of the positions $\alpha_i^{(m)}$ of the instantons. This is due to the fact that it is hard to discuss what is gauge invariant quantities in noncommutative gauge theories. The apparent paradox is solved by mapping this solution to commutative side by exact Seiberg-Witten map [194, 178, 166]. The commutative description of D0-brane density $J_{D0} \sim F_{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}$ is as follows [121]:

$$J_{D0}(k) = 2\delta^{(4)}(k) + \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} e^{ikz_i \alpha_i^{(m)}}, \quad (3.35)$$

that is,

$$J_{D0}(x) = \frac{2}{\theta^2} + \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \delta^{(2)}(z_1 - \alpha_1^{(m)}) \delta^{(2)}(z_2 - \alpha_2^{(m)}). \quad (3.36)$$

The second term shows the k instantons localized at $z_i = \alpha_i$. The configuration is actually singular, which is consistent with the existence of small instanton singularities. The first term represents the situation that infinite number of D0-branes form D4-brane in the presence of background B -field, which is consistent with interpretations in matrix models [16, 135] (cf. section 6.2). This D0-D4 brane system with B -field preserves the original SUSY without B -field and tachyon fields do not appear, which is reflected by $\zeta = 0$ (cf. section 3.3).

localized $U(N)$ k instantons

There is an obvious generalization of the construction of $U(N)$ localized instanton, which is essentially the diagonal product of the previous discussions. In the solution of ADHM equations, I, J can be still zero and $B_{1,2}$ are the same as that of $N = 1$ case. The solution of "0-dimensional Dirac equation" is given by

$$\hat{V} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{u} \\ \hat{v}_1^{(m,a)} \\ \hat{v}_2^{(m,a)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{U}_k \\ |\alpha_1^{(m_a)}, \alpha_2^{(m_a)}\rangle \langle p_1^{(m_a)}, p_2^{(m_a)}| \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.37)$$

where m_a runs over some elements in $\{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$ whose number is k_a and all m_a are different. (Hence $\sum_{a=1}^N k_a = k$.) The $N \times N$ matrix \hat{U}_k is a partial isometry and satisfies

$$\hat{U}_k \hat{U}_k^\dagger = 1, \quad \hat{U}_k^\dagger \hat{U}_k = 1 - \hat{P}_k, \quad (3.38)$$

where the projection \hat{P}_k is the following diagonal sum:

$$\hat{P}_k := \text{diag}_{a=1}^N \left(\text{diag}_{m_a} |p_1^{(m_a)}, p_2^{(m_a)}\rangle \langle p_1^{(m_a)}, p_2^{(m_a)}| \right). \quad (3.39)$$

$|\alpha_i^{(m_a)}\rangle$ is the normalized coherent state (3.27). Next in the case of $|p_1^{(m_a)}, p_2^{(m_a)}\rangle = |0, m_a\rangle$, then the shift operator is, for example, chosen as the following diagonal sum:

$$\hat{U}_k = \text{diag}_{a=1}^N \left(\sum_{n_1=1, n_2=0}^{\infty} |n_1, n_2\rangle \langle n_1, n_2| + \sum_{n_2=0}^{\infty} |0, n_2\rangle \langle 0, n_2 + k_a| \right). \quad (3.40)$$

$|\alpha_1^{(m_a)}, \alpha_2^{(m_a)}\rangle$ is the normalized coherent state and defined similarly as (3.27). We can construct another non-trivial example of a shift operator in $U(N)$ gauge theories by using noncommutative ABS construction [11]. The localized instanton solution in [83] is one of these generalized solutions for $N = 2$.

$U(2)$, $k = 1$ instanton solution (NC BPST instanton, θ : ASD)

In the same process, we can construct exact NC ASD-ASD BPST instanton solutions with the moduli parameter ρ of the size and in the $\rho \rightarrow 0$ limit, these solutions essentially are reduced to the localized $U(1)$ instantons [83].

3.3 D0-D4 Brane Systems and ADHM Construction

In this subsection, we discuss the D-brane interpretation of ADHM construction of instantons. The low-energy effective theory is described by the Super-Yang-Mills (SYM) theory. In particular the solitons in the SYM theory corresponds to the lower-dimensional D-branes on the D-brane. ADHM construction is elegantly embedded in D0-D4 systems, which gives the physical meaning of ADHM construction [245, 71, 72], where the number of D0 and D4 corresponds to the instanton number k and the rank of the gauge group N , respectively. (See Fig. 6.)

This system preserves eight supersymmetry. Now let us represent this SUSY condition from two different viewpoints.




Figure 6: D-brane interpretation of ADHM construction

On the D4-brane, the SUSY condition is described as the BPS condition for the SUSY transformation of the gaugino, which is just the ASD Yang-Mills equation. On the other hand, on D0-branes, the SUSY condition is described as the D-flatness condition in the Higgs branch. The D-term is an auxiliary field and related to the massless scalar fields which come from massless excitation modes of 0-0 strings and 0-4 strings. If the massless excitation modes of 0-0 strings and 0-4 strings are denoted by $k \times k$ matrices $B_{1,2}$ (adjoint Higgs fields) and $k \times N$ matrices I, J (fundamental Higgs fields), respectively, then we get the D-flatness condition as

$$\begin{aligned}
 [B_1, B_1^\dagger] + [B_2, B_2^\dagger] + II^\dagger - J^\dagger J &= 0, \\
 [B_1, B_2] + IJ &= 0.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3.41}$$

This is just the ADHM equation! Of course, the described physical situation is unique and hence both moduli space should be equivalent. Furthermore the degree of freedom of the k D0-branes is apparently $4Nk$, which reproduces the results from Atiyah-Singer index theorem.

We comment on the interpretation of $\mu_{\mathbf{R}} = \zeta$ on noncommutative space from the viewpoint of effective theory of D-branes. If B -field is turned on in the background of this D-brane systems, Fayet-Illiopolous (FI) parameter appears in the D-flatness condition, because constant expectation value of B -field appears in the SUSY transformation of gaugino on D4-branes and the constant term in the transformation equation is just the FI parameter. The physical meaning of the FI parameter is the expectation value of tachyon field which appears first due to the unstablity of the D-brane systems because of the presence of B -field. After the tachyon condensation, different SUSY from the original one is preserved again and the systems becomes stable. NC instanton represents such

situation in general.

The interpretation of the “0-dimensional Dirac equation” is also discussed in [244, 72] by D1-probe analysis of the background k D5- N D9 brane systems.

4 Monopoles and D-branes

Monopoles are also constructed by ADHM-like procedure, which is called *Nahm construction*. This time the duality is the one-to-one correspondence between the monopole moduli space and the moduli space of Nahm data. The D-brane interpretations are also given as D1-D3 brane systems which can be considered as the T-dualized situation of D0-D4 brane systems. D-brane picture clearly explains the equivalence between noncommutative situation and that in the presence of the background B -field.

4.1 Nahm Construction of Monopoles

In this subsection, we construct exact BPS monopole solutions on commutative \mathbf{R}^3 . By applying ADHM procedure to monopoles, we can easily construct Dirac monopole [65] ($G = U(1)$ monopole solution) and Prasad-Sommerfield (PS) solution [207]. ($G = SU(2)$ 1-BPS monopole solution which is the typical example of 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole solution [227, 205].) The concrete steps are as follows:

- Step (i): Solving Nahm equation:

$$\frac{dT_i}{d\xi} = i\epsilon_{ijl}T_jT_l, \quad (4.1)$$

where $T_i(\xi)$ should satisfies the following boundary condition:

$$T_i(\xi) \xrightarrow{\xi \rightarrow \pm a/2} \frac{\tau_i}{\xi \mp \frac{a}{2}} + (\text{regular terms on } \xi) \quad (4.2)$$

where τ_i : irreducible representation of $SU(2)$ $[\tau_i, \tau_j] = i\epsilon_{ijl}\tau_l$.

We note that the coordinates $x^{1,2}$ always appear in pair with the matrices $T^{1,2}$ and that is why we see the commutator of the coordinates in the RHS. These terms of course vanish on commutative spaces, however, they cause nontrivial contributions on noncommutative spaces, which is seen later soon.

- Step (ii): Solving “0-dimensional Dirac equation” in the background of the Nahm data which satisfies Nahm eq. (4.1):

$$\nabla^\dagger v = 0, \quad (4.3)$$

with the normalization condition:

$$\int d\xi v^\dagger v = 1, \quad (4.4)$$

where the “1-dimensional Dirac operator” is defined by

$$\nabla_\xi(\mathbf{x}) = i\frac{d}{d\xi} + e_i(x^i - T^i), \quad \nabla_\xi(\mathbf{x})^\dagger = i\frac{d}{d\xi} + \bar{e}_i(x^i - T^i), \quad (4.5)$$

in which x^i is the coordinate of \mathbf{R}^3 , and ξ is an element of the interval $(-(a/2), a/2)$ for $G = SU(2)$.¹⁶

- Step (iii): Using the solution v , we can construct the corresponding BPS monopole solution as

$$\Phi = \int d\xi v^\dagger \xi v, \quad A_i = \int d\xi v^\dagger \partial_\mu v, \quad (4.6)$$

which actually satisfies the Bogomol’nyi equation:

$$B_i = -[D_i, \Phi], \quad (4.7)$$

where $B_i := (i/2)\epsilon_{ijk}F^{jk}$ is the magnetic fields.

The detailed aspects are discussed in Appendix A. In this subsection, we give some typical examples of the explicit monopole solutions.

$G = U(2)$ BPS ’t Hooft-Polyakov monopole ($k = 1$)

- Step (i):

In $k = 1$ case, the boundary condition (A.121) is simplified and Nahm equation is trivially solved :

$$T_i = b_i, \quad (4.8)$$

which shows that the monopole is located at $x_i = b_i$. For simplicity, we set $b_i = 0$.

- Step (ii):

In order to solve the “1-dimensional Dirac equation,” let us take the following ansatz on v which corresponds to the gauge where the Higgs field Φ is proportional to σ_3 :

$$v = \begin{pmatrix} -(x_1 - ix_2) \\ \partial_\xi + x^3 \end{pmatrix} \beta. \quad (4.9)$$

¹⁶The region spanned by ξ depends on the gauge group, for example, in $G = U(2)$ case, finite interval (a_-, a_+) , and in $G = U(1)$ case, semi-infinite line.

Then the equation is reduced to the simple differential equation $\partial_\xi^2 \beta = r^2 \beta$ and we get

$$\beta = e^{\pm r\xi}, \quad (4.10)$$

which says that there are two independent solutions and the gauge group becomes $U(2)$. From the normalization condition, the zero-mode is

$$v = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{x_1 - ix_2}{\sqrt{(r+x_3)(e^{2ra_+} - e^{2ra_-})}} e^{r\xi} & \frac{x_1 - ix_2}{\sqrt{(r-x_3)(e^{-2ra_-} - e^{-2ra_+})}} e^{-r\xi} \\ \sqrt{\frac{r+x_3}{e^{2ra_+} - e^{2ra_-}}} e^{r\xi} & \sqrt{\frac{r-x_3}{e^{2ra_+} - e^{2ra_-}}} e^{-r\xi} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.11)$$

where the integral region is (a_-, a_+) .

- Step (iii): The Higgs field is calculated as follows:

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{a_+ e^{2ra_+} - a_- e^{2ra_-}}{e^{2ra_+} - e^{2ra_-}} - \frac{1}{2r} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{a_- e^{-2ra_-} - a_+ e^{-2ra_+}}{e^{-2ra_-} - e^{-2ra_+}} + \frac{1}{2r} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.12)$$

The gauge field is also solved, however, is rather complicated. Here if we take the integral region as $(-(a/2), a/2)$, then the gauge group becomes $G = SU(2)$ and the monopole solution (4.12) coincides with Prasad-Sommerfield (PS) monopole [207] up to gauge transformation¹⁷:

$$\Phi = \frac{x^i \sigma_i}{2|\vec{x}|^2} \left(\frac{a|\vec{x}|}{\tanh a|\vec{x}|} - 1 \right), \quad A_i = \frac{\epsilon_{ijk} \sigma^j x^k}{2|\vec{x}|^2} \left(\frac{a|\vec{x}|}{\sinh a|\vec{x}|} - 1 \right). \quad (4.13)$$

If we take the integral region $(-\infty, 0)$, then one part $e^{-r\xi}$ of the solution (4.10) becomes unnormalized and the gauge group becomes $G = U(1)$, and the solution (4.12) is reduced to the Dirac monopole [65] up to gauge transformation:

$$\Phi = -\frac{1}{2r}, \quad A_r = A_\theta = 0, \quad A_\varphi = -\frac{i}{2r} \frac{1 + \cos \vartheta}{\sin \vartheta}, \quad (4.14)$$

where (r, ϑ, φ) is the ordinary polar coordinate. The gauge fields diverge at $\vartheta = 0$ and the magnetic fields also have the singularities at $\vartheta = 0$, that is, on the positive part of x^3 -axis. The string-like singularity is called Dirac string and can be interpreted as the infinitely-thin solenoid. This is an unphysical object and the direction can be

¹⁷If we take the most simple form $v \propto \exp(-x^i \sigma_i \xi)$ as the ansatz for v , this PS solution is directly obtained without any gauge transformation.

changed under a gauge transformation.¹⁸ On the region apart from the positive part of x^3 -axis, the magnetic fields have the following configuration in a radial pattern (See the left side of Fig. 7):

$$B_i = -\partial_i \Phi = -\frac{x^i}{2r^3}. \quad (4.15)$$

4.2 Nahm Construction of NC Monopoles

In this subsection, we construct some typical $G = U(2)$ or $U(1)$ noncommutative monopole solutions by Nahm procedure. The steps are the same as commutative one:

- Step (i): Solving Nahm equation

$$\frac{dT_i}{d\xi} - \frac{i}{2}\epsilon_{ijk}[T_j, T_k] = -\theta\delta_{i3} \quad (4.16)$$

with the boundary condition (A.121). There is seen to be a constant term due to the noncommutativity of the coordinates, which can be absorbed by a constant shift of T_3 [13, 86]. In $k = 1$ case, the boundary condition becomes trivial and the solution T_i is easily found.

- Step (ii): Solving the 1-dimensional Dirac equation

$$\hat{\nabla}^\dagger \hat{v} = 0 \quad (4.17)$$

with the normalization condition.

- Step (iii): By using the solution \hat{v} of the “1-dimensional Dirac equation,” we can construct the Higgs field and gauge fields as

$$\hat{\Phi} = \int d\xi \hat{v}^\dagger \xi \hat{v}, \quad \hat{A}_i = \int d\xi \hat{v}^\dagger \partial_i \hat{v}. \quad (4.18)$$

Let us construct explicit solutions.

$U(1)$, $k = 1$ monopole solution (NC Dirac monopole)

For simplicity, we can set the monopole at the origin.

- Step (i): The solution for noncommutative Nahm equation is

$$T_{1,2} = 0, \quad T_3 = -\theta\xi, \quad (4.19)$$

¹⁸For a review see, [89, 110].

where ξ is an element of $(-\infty, 0)$. Here we introduce new symbols W, b, b^\dagger as

$$\begin{aligned} W(x_3, \xi) &= x_3 \xi + \frac{1}{2} \theta \xi^2 \\ b &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\theta}} (\partial_\xi + x_3 + \theta \xi) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\theta}} e^{-W} \partial_\xi e^W \\ b^\dagger &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\theta}} (-\partial_\xi + x_3 + \theta \xi) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\theta}} e^W \partial_\xi e^{-W}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

The operator b satisfies Heisenberg's commutation relation:

$$[b, b^\dagger] = 1. \quad (4.21)$$

- Step (ii): Now the “1-dimensional Dirac equation” is

$$\begin{pmatrix} b & \hat{a}^\dagger \\ \hat{a} & -b^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{v}_1 \\ \hat{v}_2 \end{pmatrix} = 0. \quad (4.22)$$

(\hat{a} is the same as that in (2.11) and satisfies $[\hat{a}, \hat{a}^\dagger] = 1$.) In order to solve it, let us put the following ansatz on \hat{v} :

$$\hat{v} = \begin{pmatrix} -\hat{a}^\dagger \\ b \end{pmatrix} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \beta_n |n-1\rangle \langle n-1| \hat{U}_1^\dagger + \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\zeta_0}} e^{-W} |0\rangle \langle 0| \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.23)$$

where $\zeta_0 = \int_{-\infty}^0 d\xi e^{-2W}$ and β_n satisfies

$$(b^\dagger b + n) \beta_n = 0. \quad (4.24)$$

Hence β_n is determined by acting b on β_1 one after another. The final unknown is the coefficient which is determined by the normalization condition. There needs to be the boundary condition

$$\beta_n b \beta_n(0) = 1, \quad \beta_n(\xi) \xrightarrow{\xi \rightarrow -\infty} 0 \quad (4.25)$$

and finally β_n is obtained as

$$\beta_n(\xi) = \frac{\zeta_{n-1}(x_3 + \theta \xi)}{\sqrt{\zeta_n(x_3) \zeta_{n-1}(x_3)}}, \quad \zeta_n(x_3) := \int_0^\infty dp p^n e^{-\theta p^2 + 2px^3}. \quad (4.26)$$

- Step (iii): The Higgs field and the gauge fields are

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Phi} &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Phi_n |n\rangle \langle n| = -\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\xi_n^2 - \xi_{n-1}^2) |n\rangle \langle n| - \left(\xi_0^2 + \frac{x^3}{\theta} \right) |0\rangle \langle 0|, \\ \hat{D}_z &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\theta}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\xi_n}{\xi_{n+1}} a^\dagger |n\rangle \langle n|, \quad \hat{A}_3 = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

$$\xi_n(x_3) := \sqrt{\frac{n \zeta_{n-1}}{2\theta \zeta_n}}. \quad (4.28)$$

This is smooth everywhere. The behavior at the infinity ($r_n + x_3 \rightarrow \infty$, $r_n := \sqrt{(x_3)^2 + 2\theta n}$) is¹⁹:

$$\Phi_n \sim \begin{cases} -\frac{x_3}{\theta} & : n = 0, x_3 \rightarrow +\infty \\ -\frac{1}{2r_n} = -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{(x_3)^2 + 2\theta n}} & : \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4.29)$$

$$(B_3)_n \sim \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\theta} & : n = 0, x_3 \rightarrow +\infty \\ -\frac{x_3}{2(r_n)^3} & : \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4.30)$$

This says that the Higgs field and the magnetic field have the special behavior at the positive part of x_3 -axis, that is, $n = 0$, $x_3 \rightarrow \infty$ ²⁰, The distribution of the magnetic fields is roughly estimated like the right side of Fig. 7.




Figure 7: The distribution of the magnetic fields of Dirac monopole (On commutative space (left) V.S. On NC space (right))

The universal magnetic field $(B_3(x_3 \rightarrow +\infty))_0|0\rangle\langle 0|$ on the positive part of x_3 -axis, can be mapped into the star-product formalism and it has a Gaussian distribution $(2/\theta) \exp\{-((x_1)^2 + (x_2)^2)/\theta\}$ whose width is $\sqrt{\theta}$. Hence in the commutative limit $\theta \rightarrow 0$, it is reduced to delta-functional distribution and coincides with the Dirac string.

Relation to Integrable Systems

¹⁹The integral of ζ_n is done by the saddle point method.

²⁰Here we consider n as the square of the distance from the origin on the 1-2 plane. $((x_1)^2 + (x_2)^2 \sim 2\theta n)$.

The solution of noncommutative 1-Dirac monopole (4.27) has an interesting form from the integrable viewpoint. The solution can be written as Yang's form [94] (See [171].):

$$\Phi = \hat{\xi}^{-1} \partial_3 \hat{\xi}, \quad A_z = \hat{\xi}^{-1} [\hat{\partial}_z, \hat{\xi}], \quad (4.31)$$

where

$$\hat{\xi} := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \xi_n(x_3) |n\rangle \langle n|. \quad (4.32)$$

This suggests that even on noncommutative spaces, the discussion on the integrability is possible. In fact, noncommutative Bogomol'nyi equation for $G = U(1)$ (2.32) can be written as the 1-dimensional semi-infinite Toda lattice equation [94]:

$$\frac{d^2 q_n}{dt^2} + e^{q_{n-1} - q_n} - e^{q_n - q_{n+1}} = 0, \quad (n = 0, 1, 2, \dots) \quad (4.33)$$

where

$$q_n(t) := \begin{cases} \log \left[\frac{e^{\frac{t^2}{2}}}{n!} \xi_n^2 \left(\frac{t}{2} \right) \right], & t := 2x_3 \quad n \geq 0 \\ -\infty & n = -1. \end{cases} \quad (4.34)$$

The operator $\hat{\xi}$ in Yang's form (4.31) is just the ξ_n in (4.28). It is interesting that discrete structure appears.

U(2), k = 1 monopole solution (NC Prasad-Sommerfield solution)

This solution is also constructed by Gross and Nekrasov [96]. The concrete steps are all the same as those in the noncommutative Dirac monopole. The exact solution is, however, very complicated and the properties are not yet revealed clearly.

4.3 D1-D3 Brane Systems and Nahm Construction

The monopoles are described by D1-D3 brane systems. The $G = U(N)$ Yang-Mills-Higgs theory is described by the low-energy effective theory of N D3-branes. Then the diagonal values of Higgs field Φ stand for the positions of the D3-branes in the transverse direction of it. For example, the Dirac monopole corresponds to the semi-infinite D1-brane whose end attaches to D3-brane. (See Fig. 10.) This D-brane systems finally becomes stable and then D1-branes are unified with D3-brane and are considered as a part of the D3-brane. (See the upper-left of Fig.10.) The end of D1-brane has magnetic charge on D3-brane and is considered as magnetic monopoles.

Nahm construction is clearly interpreted as the D1-D3 brane systems [66]. (See Fig. 8.) The situation with k D1-brane and N D3-brane represents the $G = U(N)$, k monopoles. As in instanton case, Bogomol'nyi equation and Nahm equation are described as the BPS condition on D3-branes and D1-branes, respectively. The physical situation is unique and the equivalence between two kind of moduli spaces is trivial.




Figure 8: D-brane interpretation of Nahm construction

Let us consider the D-brane interpretation of the correspondence of the boundary condition of the Higgs field and the Nahm data. On the D3-brane, the boundary condition of the Higgs field shows that D3-brane has a trumpet-like configuration because of the pull-back by D1-brane. On the other hand, on D1-brane, the diagonal components of T_i shows the positions of the D1-branes. However in $k > 1$ case, we cannot diagonalize all T_i at the same time and cannot know all of the coordinates of D1-branes. Instead, there is a condition for the second Casimir of k -dimensional irreducible representation of $SU(2)$, that is, $\tau_1^2 + \tau_2^2 + \tau_3^2 = (k^2 - 1)/4$ and hence

$$T_1^2 + T_2^2 + T_3^2 \xrightarrow{\xi \rightarrow \pm a/2} \frac{1}{4\xi^2}(k^2 - 1). \quad (4.35)$$

This equation says that the D1-branes have a funnel-like configuration near the D3-brane whose radius is $\sqrt{k^2 - 1}/2\xi$ (Fig. 9). This is in fact consistent with the result from the analysis of coincide multiple D-branes by using a non-abelian BI action [44], which strongly suggests the Myers' effect [180].

Next let us discuss noncommutative case. Introducing the noncommutativity in x^1 - x^2 plane is equivalent to the presence of background B -field (magnetic field) in the x^3




Figure 9: Myers effect

direction on the D3-brane. Then the end of D1-brane is pulled back by the magnetic field and finally the pulling force balances the tension of the D1-brane and the D-brane system becomes stable where the the slope of D1-brane is constant [117, 118, 119]. (See the lower right side of Fig. 10.)

The configuration of the Higgs fields (4.14) and (4.29) are shown like at the upper left and the upper right sides of Fig. 10, respectively. Comparing the previous argument with the above D-brane interpretation (The lower side of Fig. 10), the singular behavior at the positive part of the x_3 -axis corresponds to the D1-brane which is considered as the part of D3-brane. The magnetic flux on x_3 -axis is the “shadow” of the D1-brane [94]. The slope of D1-brane is $-1/\theta$ against “ x^i -plane” on the D3-brane and $-\theta$ against ξ -axis, which is very consistent (The lower right side of Fig. 10) and just coincides with that in commutative side from the analysis of Born-Infeld action [174, 120].

Nahm construction of $SU(N)$, $N \geq 3$ monopole and the D-brane interpretation

We give a brief introduction of Nahm construction of $SU(N)$, $N \geq 3$, k -monopole solution which corresponds to the situation of k D1- N D3 brane system with $N \geq 3$ [132]. (See Fig. 11.) The present discussion is basically commutative one, however, also holds in noncommutative case.

Unlike $G = SU(2)$ -monopole, there appear the matrices I, J in the “0-dimensional




Figure 10: The configuration of the Higgs field (Upper) and the D-brane interpretation and the magnetic field (Lower) of the Dirac monopole (Left: Commutative case, Right: NC case)

Dirac operator” as in ADHM construction:

$$\hat{\nabla} := \begin{pmatrix} J & I^\dagger \\ i\frac{d}{d\xi} - i(x_3 - T_3) & -i(\bar{z}_1 - T_z^\dagger) \\ -i(z_1 - T_z) & i\frac{d}{d\xi} + i(x_3 - T_3) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.36)$$

Here it is convenient to introduce the following symbols:

$$\vec{V} \cdot \vec{V}' := \sum_{b=1}^{N_b} u_b^\dagger u'_b \delta(\xi - \xi_b) + \vec{v}^\dagger \vec{v}', \quad (4.37)$$

$$\langle \vec{V}, \vec{V}' \rangle := \int d\xi \vec{V} \cdot \vec{V}' = \sum_{b=1}^{N_b} u_b^\dagger u'_b + \int d\xi \vec{v}^\dagger \vec{v}'. \quad (4.38)$$

Now Nahm data $T_i(\xi)$ are discontinuous with respect to ξ . Though the size of T_i is also variable at each interval of ξ , here for simplicity, suppose that the size is the same. The

points $\xi = \xi_b$ where the D1-branes are attached from both side of the D3-brane is called “jumping point,” which depends on how the gauge group is broken. (See Fig. 11.) The number N_b denotes that of “jumping points.”




Figure 11: The D-brane interpretation of $U(3)$ -monopole (When $k_1 = k_2$, the point $\xi = \xi_2$ shows the “jumping point.”)

Nahm equation is derived as the condition that $\nabla \cdot \nabla$ commutes with Pauli matrices:

$$\begin{aligned}
 [T_z, T_z^\dagger] + \left[\frac{d}{d\xi} + T_3, -\frac{d}{d\xi} + T_3 \right] + \sum_{b=1}^{N_b} (I_b J_b^\dagger - J_b^\dagger I_b) \delta(\xi - \xi_b) &= 0, \\
 [T_z, \frac{d}{d\xi} + T_3] + \sum_{b=1}^{N_b} I_b J_b \delta(\xi - \xi_b) &= 0.
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.39}$$

The steps are all the same as the usual Nahm construction. Next we solve the “1-dimensional Dirac equation”

$$\begin{aligned}
 \nabla \cdot V &= \sum_{b=1}^{N_b} \begin{pmatrix} J_b^\dagger \\ I_b \end{pmatrix} \hat{u}_b \delta(\xi - \xi_b) \\
 &+ \begin{pmatrix} i \frac{d}{d\xi} + i(x_3 - T_3) & i(\bar{z}_1 - T_z^\dagger) \\ i(z_1 - T_z) & i \frac{d}{d\xi} - i(x_3 - T_3) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix} = 0,
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.40}$$

$$\langle V, V \rangle = 1. \tag{4.41}$$

and construct the Higgs field and gauge fields which satisfies the Bogomol’nyi equation

$$\Phi = \langle V, \xi V \rangle, \quad A_i = \langle V, \partial_i V \rangle. \tag{4.42}$$

Note

- The boundary conditions in Nahm construction are discussed from D-brane pictures in [39, 145, 226]

4.4 Nahm Construction of the Fluxon

$U(1)$ BPS fluxon solution ($k = 1$)

In the noncommutative Yang-Mills-Higgs theory, there exists the special soliton corresponding to the localized instantons. Let construct it for $k = 1$ for simplicity.

From the suggestion of caloron solutions, this solution is considered as the noncommutative version of the monopole with $\rho = \zeta = 0$, that is, $D = 0$. Hence ξ runs all real number and there are “jumping points.” (Suppose $\xi_b = 0$.)

- Step (i): The solution of Nahm equation is

$$I = J = 0, \quad T_i(\xi) = -\theta\delta_{i3}\xi. \quad (4.43)$$

- Step (ii): The solution of “1-dimensional Dirac equation” is

$$\hat{V} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{u} \\ \hat{v}_1 \\ \hat{v}_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{U}_k \\ f(\xi, x_3)|0\rangle\langle 0| \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.44)$$

where

$$f(\xi, x_3) = \left(\frac{\pi}{\theta}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \exp\left[-\frac{\theta}{2}\left(\xi + \frac{x_3}{\theta}\right)^2\right]. \quad (4.45)$$

- Step (iii): Substituting this to (4.42), we get the Higgs field and the gauge fields which satisfies noncommutative Bogomol’nyi equation [100]:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Phi} &= \xi_1 \hat{U}_1^\dagger \hat{U}_1 + \left(\frac{\theta}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \left(\xi - \frac{x_3}{\theta}\right) e^{-\theta\xi^2} |0\rangle\langle 0| = -\frac{x_3}{\theta} |0\rangle\langle 0|, \\ \hat{A}_3 &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \hat{v}^\dagger \left(-\frac{x_3}{\theta} - \xi\right) \hat{v} = \left(-\frac{x_3}{\theta} - \hat{\Phi}\right) |0\rangle\langle 0| = 0, \\ \hat{D}_z &= \hat{U}_1^\dagger \hat{\partial}_z \hat{U}_1. \end{aligned} \quad (4.46)$$

This is a special soliton on noncommutative space which is called the *BPS fluxon* [206, 95]. The magnetic field is easily calculated as

$$\hat{B}_3 = \frac{1}{\theta} \hat{P}_1, \quad \hat{B}_1 = \hat{B}_2 = 0. \quad (4.47)$$

We can also take the Seiberg-Witten map to the configuration. The D1-brane current density is calculated [121] as

$$J_{D1}(x) = \frac{1}{\theta} + \delta^{(2)}(z) \delta\left(\Phi + \frac{x_3}{\theta}\right). \quad (4.48)$$

The configuration of the Higgs field and the distribution of the magnetic field are as like in Fig. 12.




Figure 12: The Higgs field of 1 fluxon (Left) and the D-brane interpretation and the magnetic field (Right)

The fluxon can be interpreted as the infinite magnetic flux which appears on the positive part of x_3 -axis in noncommutative Dirac monopole and is close to a flux rather than a monopole. The tension of the flux is calculated as $2\pi/g_{YM}^2\theta$ [95].

The generalization to k -fluxon solution with the moduli parameters which show the positions of the fluxons are straightforwardly made [100] as follows.

The Dirac zero-mode is

$$\hat{V} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{u} \\ \hat{v}_1^{(m)} \\ \hat{v}_2^{(m)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{U}_k \\ f^{(m)}(\xi, x_3) |\alpha_z^{(m)}\rangle \langle m| \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.49)$$

where

$$f^{(m)}(\xi, x_3) = \left(\frac{\pi}{\theta}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \exp\left[-\frac{\theta}{2} \left(\xi + \frac{x_3 - b_3^{(m)}}{\theta}\right)^2\right]. \quad (4.50)$$

The k -fluxon solution with the moduli parameters is

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\Phi} &= \xi_1 \hat{U}_k^\dagger \hat{U}_k + \left(\frac{\theta}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \left(\xi - \frac{x_3 - b_3^{(m)}}{\theta}\right) e^{-\theta\xi^2} |m\rangle\langle m| \\
&= - \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \left(\frac{x_3 - b_3^{(m)}}{\theta}\right) |m\rangle\langle m| \\
\hat{A}_3 &= \langle \hat{V}, \partial_3 \hat{V} \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi \hat{v}^\dagger \left(-\frac{x_3 - b_3^{(m)}}{\theta} - \xi\right) \hat{v} = \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \left(-\frac{x_3 - b_3^{(m)}}{\theta} - \Phi^{(m)}\right) |m\rangle\langle m| \\
&= 0, \\
\hat{A}_z &= \langle \hat{V}, \partial_z \hat{V} \rangle = \hat{U}_k^\dagger \hat{\partial}_z \hat{U}_k - \hat{\partial}_z - \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_z^{(m)}}{2\theta} |m\rangle\langle m|. \tag{4.51}
\end{aligned}$$

The D1-brane current density is calculated [121] as

$$J_{\text{D1}}(x) = \frac{1}{\theta} + \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \delta^{(2)}(z - \alpha_z^{(m)}) \delta\left(\Phi + \frac{x_3 - b_3^{(m)}}{\theta}\right). \tag{4.52}$$

When we apply the “solution generating technique” to Bogomol’nyi equation, we have to find a modification or a trick on the transformation of the Higgs field [103, 116] (cf. section 6.2). On the other hand, Nahm construction naturally shows the modification part as in (4.51).

5 Calorons and D-branes

In section 3 and 4, we treat instantons and monopoles separately. In fact, monopoles are considered as the Fourier-transformed instantons in some sense, which is clearly understood from the T-duality transformation of D0-D4 brane systems. In this section, we discuss the reasons introducing periodic instantons which corresponds to D0-D4 brane systems on $\mathbf{R}^3 \times S^1$ which is called *calorons*. We do not examine the detailed properties but just give the D-brane interpretation of it and take the T-duality transformation.

5.1 Instantons on $\mathbf{R}^3 \times S^1$ (=Calorons) and T-duality

Calorons are periodic instantons in one direction, that is, instantons on $\mathbf{R}^3 \times S^1$. They were first constructed explicitly in [108] as infinite number of 't Hooft instantons periodic in one direction and used for the discussion on non-perturbative aspects of finite-temperature field theories [108, 97]. Calorons can intermediate between instantons and monopoles and coincide with them in the limits of $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ and $\beta \rightarrow 0$ respectively where β is the perimeter of S^1 [209]. Hence calorons also can be reinterpreted clearly from D-brane picture [163] and constructed by Nahm construction [185, 153, 161, 32].

The D-brane pictures of them are the following. (See Fig. 21.) Instantons and monopoles are represented as D0-branes on D4-branes and D-strings ending to D3-branes respectively. Hence calorons are represented as D0-branes on D4-branes lying on $\mathbf{R}^3 \times S^1$.

In the T-dualized picture, $U(N)$ 1 caloron can be interpreted as $N - 1$ fundamental monopoles and the N -th monopole which appears from the Kaluza-Klein sector [163]. The value of the fourth component of the gauge field at spatial infinity on D4-brane determines the positions of the D3-branes which denote the Higgs expectation values of the monopole. The positions of the D3-branes are called the jumping points because at these points, the D1-brane is generally separated. In $N = 2$ case, the separation interval (see Fig. 21) D satisfies $D \sim \rho^2/\beta$ [163, 161], and if the size ρ of periodic instanton is fixed and the period β goes to zero, then one monopole decouples and the situation exactly coincides with that of PS-monopole [207]. BPS fluxons are represented as infinite D-strings piercing D3-branes in the background constant B -field and considered to be the T-dualized noncommutative calorons in the limit with the period $\beta \rightarrow 0$ and the interval $D \rightarrow 0$, which suggests $\rho = 0$.




Figure 13: The D-brane description of $U(2)$ 1 caloron.

5.2 NC Calorons and T-duality

In this subsection, we construct the noncommutative caloron solution by putting infinite number of localized instantons in the one direction at regular intervals.

localized $U(1)$ 1 caloron

Now let us construct a localized caloron solution as commutative caloron solution in section 3.1, that is, we take the instanton number $k \rightarrow \infty$ and put infinite number of localized instantons in the x_4 direction at regular intervals. We have to find an appropriate shift operator so that it gives rise to an infinite-dimensional projection operator and put the moduli parameter b_4 periodic.

The solution is found as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{A}_{z_1} &= \hat{U}_{k \times \infty}^\dagger \hat{\partial}_{z_1} \hat{U}_{k \times \infty} - \hat{\partial}_{z_1} - \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_1^{(m)}}{2\theta} |m\rangle \langle m| \otimes 1_{\mathcal{H}_2}, \\
\hat{A}_{z_2} &= \hat{U}_{k \times \infty}^\dagger \hat{\partial}_{z_2} \hat{U}_{k \times \infty} - \hat{\partial}_{z_2} + \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_2^{(m)} - in\beta}{2\theta} |m\rangle \langle m| \otimes |n\rangle \langle n|, \quad (5.1)
\end{aligned}$$

where the shift operator is defined as

$$\hat{U}_{k \times \infty} = \sum_{n_1=0}^{\infty} |n_1\rangle \langle n_1 + k| \otimes 1_{\mathcal{H}_2}. \quad (5.2)$$

The field strength is calculated as

$$\hat{F}_{12} = -\hat{F}_{34} = i\frac{1}{\theta}\hat{P}_k \otimes 1_{\mathcal{H}_2}, \quad (5.3)$$

which is trivially periodic in the x_4 direction. It seems to be strange that this contains no information of the period β . Hence one may wonder if this solution is the charge-one caloron solution on $\mathbf{R}^3 \times S^1$ whose perimeter is β . Furthermore one may doubt if this suggests that this soliton represents D2-brane not infinite number of D0-branes.

The apparent paradox is solved by mapping this solution to commutative side by exact Seiberg-Witten map. The commutative description of D0-brane density is as follows

$$J_{D0}(x) = \frac{2}{\theta^2} + \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{(2)}(z_1 - \alpha_1^{(m)})\delta^{(2)}(z_2 - \alpha_2^{(m)} - in\beta). \quad (5.4)$$

The information of the period has appeared and the solution (5.1) is shown to be an appropriate charge-one caloron solution with the period β . The above paradox is due to the fact that in noncommutative gauge theories, there is no local observable and the period becomes obscure. And as is pointed out in [121], the D2-brane density is exactly zero. Hence the paradox has been solved clearly.

This soliton can be interpreted as a localized instanton on noncommutative $\mathbf{R}^3 \times S^1$. It is interesting to study the relationship between our solution and that in [59].

localized $U(1)$ 1 doubly-periodic instantons

In similar way, we can construct doubly-periodic (in the x_3 and x_4 directions) instanton solution:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A}_{z_1} &= \hat{U}_{k \times \infty}^\dagger \hat{\partial}_{z_1} \hat{U}_{k \times \infty} - \hat{\partial}_{z_1} - \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_1^{(m)}}{2\theta} |m\rangle \langle m| \otimes 1_{\mathcal{H}_2}, \\ \hat{A}_{z_2} &= \hat{U}_{k \times \infty}^\dagger \hat{\partial}_{z_2} \hat{U}_{k \times \infty} - \hat{\partial}_{z_2} \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \sum_{n_1, n_2 = -\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_2^{(m)} + \beta_1 n_1 - i\beta_2 n_2}{2\theta} |m\rangle \langle m| \otimes |\tilde{\alpha}_{n_1 n_2}^{(l_1, l_2)}\rangle \langle \tilde{\alpha}_{n_1 n_2}^{(l_1, l_2)}|, \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

where the system $\{|\tilde{\alpha}_{n_1, n_2}^{(l_1, l_2)}\rangle\}_{n_1, n_2 \in \mathbf{Z}}$ is von Neumann lattice [233] and an orthonormal and complete set [200, 17]²¹. Von Neumann lattice is the complete subsystem of the set of the coherent states which is over-complete, and generated by $e^{l_1 \hat{\partial}_3}$ and $e^{l_2 \hat{\partial}_4}$, where the periods of the lattice $l_1, l_2 \in \mathbf{R}$ satisfies $l_1 l_2 = 2\pi\theta$. (See also [12, 87].) This complete system has

²¹To make this system complete, the sum over the labels (n_1, n_2) of von Neumann lattice is taken removing some one pair. We apply this summation rule to the doubly-periodic instanton solution (5.5).

two kind of labels and suitable to doubly-periodic instanton. Of course, another complete system can be available if one label the system appropriately.

The field strength in the noncommutative side is the same as (5.3) and the commutative description of D0-brane density becomes

$$J_{D0}(x) = \frac{2}{\theta^2} + \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \sum_{n_1, n_2=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{(1)}(z_1 - \alpha_1^{(m)}) \delta^{(2)}(z_2 - \alpha_2^{(m)} - n_1 \beta_1 - i n_2 \beta_2), \quad (5.6)$$

which guarantees that this is an appropriate charge-one doubly-periodic instanton solution with the period β_1, β_2 .

This soliton can be interpreted as a localized instanton on noncommutative $\mathbf{R}^2 \times T^2$. The exact known solitons on noncommutative torus are very refined or abstract as is found in [87, 24, 154, 143]. It is therefore notable that our simple solution (5.5) is indeed doubly-periodic. The point is that we treat noncommutative \mathbf{R}^4 not noncommutative torus and apply “solution generating technique” to \mathcal{H}_1 side only.

5.3 Fourier Transformation of Localized Calorons

Now we discuss the Fourier transformation of the gauge fields of localized caloron and show that the transformed configuration exactly coincides with the BPS fluxon in the $\beta \rightarrow 0$ limit. This discussion is similar to that the commutative caloron exactly coincides with PS monopole in the $\beta \rightarrow 0$ limit up to gauge transformation as in the end of section 3.1.

The Fourier transformation can be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{1}_{\mathcal{H}_2} &\rightarrow 1, & \hat{x}_{3,4} \hat{1}_{\mathcal{H}_2} &\rightarrow x_{3,4}, \\ \hat{A}_\mu &\rightarrow \widehat{A}_\mu^{[l]} = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\beta} \int_{-\frac{\beta}{2}}^{\frac{\beta}{2}} dx_4 e^{2\pi i l \frac{x_4}{\beta}} \hat{A}_\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

In the $\beta \rightarrow 0$ limit, only $l = 0$ mode survives and the Fourier transformation (5.7) becomes trivial. Then we rewrite these zero modes $\widehat{A}_i^{[0]}$ and $i\widehat{A}_4^{[0]}$ as \hat{A}_i and $\hat{\Phi}$ in (3+1)-dimensional noncommutative gauge theory respectively. Noting that in the localized caloron solution (5.1), $\hat{U}_{k \times \infty}^\dagger \hat{\partial}_{z_2} \hat{U}_{k \times \infty} - \hat{\partial}_{z_2} = \hat{P}_k \otimes \hat{1}_{\mathcal{H}_2}(\hat{z}_2/2\theta_2)$, where the \hat{P}_k is the same as the projection in (??), the transformed fields are easily calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A}_{z_1} &= \hat{U}_k^\dagger \hat{\partial}_{z_1} \hat{U}_k - \hat{\partial}_{z_1} - \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_{z_1}^{(m)}}{2\theta_1} |m\rangle \langle m|, \\ \hat{A}_3 &= i \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{b_4^{(m)}}{\theta_2} |m\rangle \langle m|, \end{aligned}$$

$$\hat{\Phi} = \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{x_3 - b_3^{(m)}}{\theta_2} |m\rangle \langle m|. \quad (5.8)$$

The Fourier transformation (5.7) also reproduces the anti-self-dual BPS fluxon rewriting θ_1 , θ_2 and z_1 as θ , $-\theta$ and z respectively. We note that the anti-self-dual condition of the noncommutative parameter $\theta_1 + \theta_2 = 0$ in the localized caloron would correspond to the anti-self-dual condition of the BPS fluxon. In the D-brane picture, the Fourier transformation (5.7) can be considered as the composite of T-duality in the x_4 direction and the space rotation in x_3 - Φ plane [119, 175, 120]. (cf. Fig. 14)




Figure 14: Localized U(1) 1 caloron and the relation to BPS fluxon

6 NC Solitons and D-branes

So far, we have discussed mainly the Yang-Mills(-Higgs) theories which correspond to the gauge theories on D-branes in the decoupling limit. From now on, we treat other noncommutative theories. In this section, we discuss the applications of noncommutative solitons to the problems on tachyon condensations, which was a breakthrough in the understanding of non-perturbative aspects of D-branes.

6.1 Gopakumar-Minwalla-Strominger (GMS) Solitons

In this subsection, we briefly review the Gopakumar-Minwalla-Strominger (GMS) solitons which are the special scalar solitons in the $\theta \rightarrow \infty$ limit. The structure is very simple and easy to be applied to tachyon condensations.

Let us consider the Yang-Mills-Higgs theory on the noncommutative (2+1)-dimensional space-time:

$$I = \int dt d^2x \left(-\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} D_\mu \Phi D^\mu \Phi + V(\Phi) \right), \quad (6.1)$$

where the Higgs field Φ belongs to the adjoint representation of the gauge group and the potential term $V(\Phi)$ is a polynomial in Φ :

$$V(\Phi) = \frac{m^2}{2} \Phi^2 + c_1 \Phi^3 + \dots \quad (6.2)$$

Now let us take the scale transformation $x^i \rightarrow \sqrt{\theta} x^i$, $A_\mu \rightarrow \sqrt{\theta^{-1}} A_\mu$ and the $\theta \rightarrow \infty$ limit, then the kinetic terms in the action drop out and the action (6.1) is reduced to the simple one:

$$I = \int dt d^2x V(\Phi). \quad (6.3)$$

The equation of motion is easily obtained:

$$\frac{dV}{d\Phi} = c\Phi(\Phi - \lambda_1) \dots (\Phi - \lambda_n) = 0. \quad (6.4)$$

On commutative spaces, the solution is trivial: $\Phi = \lambda_i$. However, on noncommutative space, there is a simple, but non-trivial solution:

$$\Phi = \lambda_i P \quad (6.5)$$

where P is a projection. The typical example is found in operator formalism:

$$\Phi = \lambda_i |0\rangle\langle 0|. \quad (6.6)$$

This solution has the Gaussian distribution in star-product formalism and hence has a localized energy. This configuration is stable as far as $\theta \rightarrow \infty$, which guarantees this is a soliton solution called the *GMS solitons*.

The action (6.1) is equivalent to the effective action of D2-brane in the decoupling limit. Hence the solitons are considered as the D0-branes on the D2-branes. This is confirmed by the coincidence of the energy and the spectrum of the fluctuation around the soliton configuration, which makes the studies of noncommutative solitons and tachyon condensations joined. (For other discussion on noncommutative solitons and D-branes, see e.g. [2, 38, 78, 139].)

6.2 The Solution Generating Technique

The “solution generating technique” is a transformation which leaves an equation as it is, that is, one of the auto-Bäcklund transformations. The transformation is almost a gauge transformation and defined as follows:

$$\hat{D}_z \rightarrow \hat{U}^\dagger \hat{D}_z \hat{U}, \quad (6.7)$$

where \hat{U} is an almost unitary operator and satisfies

$$\hat{U} \hat{U}^\dagger = 1. \quad (6.8)$$

We note that we don't put $\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{U} = 1$. If \hat{U} is finite-size, $\hat{U} \hat{U}^\dagger = 1$ implies $\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{U} = 1$ and then \hat{U} and the transformation (6.7) become a unitary operator and just a gauge transformation respectively. Now, however, \hat{U} is infinite-size and we only claim that $\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{U}$ is a projection because $(\hat{U}^\dagger \hat{U})^2 = \hat{U}^\dagger (\hat{U} \hat{U}^\dagger) \hat{U} = \hat{U}^\dagger \hat{U}$. Hence the operator \hat{U} is the partial isometry (2.19).

The transformation (6.7) generally leaves an equation of motion as it is [113]:

$$\frac{\delta I}{\delta \mathcal{O}} \rightarrow \hat{U}^\dagger \frac{\delta I}{\delta \mathcal{O}} \hat{U}, \quad (6.9)$$

where I and \mathcal{O} are the Lagrangian and the field in the Lagrangian. Hence if one prepares a known solution of the equation of motion $\delta I / \delta \mathcal{O} = 0$, then we can get various new solution of it by applying the transformation (6.7) to the known solution. The new soliton solutions from vacuum solutions are called *localized solitons*. The dimension of the projection \hat{P}_k in fact represents the charge of the localized solitons. In general, the new solitons generated from known solitons by the “solution generating technique” are the composite of known solitons and localized solitons.

The “solution generating technique” (6.7) can be generalized so as to include moduli parameters. In U(1) gauge theory, the generalized transformation becomes as follows:

$$\hat{D}_z \rightarrow \hat{U}_k^\dagger \hat{D}_z \hat{U}_k - \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_z^{(m)}}{2\theta} |m\rangle \langle m|, \quad (6.10)$$

where $\alpha_z^{(m)}$ is a complex number and represents the position of the m -th localized soliton.

This technique is all found by hand. However as we saw in section 3.2, ADHM construction naturally gives rise to all elements in the solution generating technique including moduli parameters. Next we will see how strong the solution generating technique is to generate new soliton solution, how simple the solution is to be calculated, and how well it fits to D-brane interpretation including matrix models.

Application to Sen’s Conjecture on Tachyon Condensations

For simplicity, let us consider the bosonic effective theory of a D25-brane in the background constant B -field whose non-zero component is $B_{24,25}$ ($=: -b < 0$)²²:

$$I = \frac{T_{D25} g_s}{G_s} \int d^{24}x (2\pi\theta \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}) \mathcal{L}, \quad (6.11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & -V(T-1) \sqrt{-\det(G_{\mu\nu} + 2\pi\alpha'(F + \Phi)_{\mu\nu})} \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{G} f(T-1) [D^\mu, T] [D_\mu, T] + (\text{higher derivative terms of } F), \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\mu\nu} = & \text{diag}(1, -1, \dots, -1, -(2\pi\alpha'b)^2, -(2\pi\alpha'b)^2), \quad G_s = g_s(2\pi\alpha'), \\ \theta^{24,25} =: & \theta = \frac{1}{b}, \quad F_{24,25} + \Phi_{24,25} = \frac{1}{\theta} [D_z, D_z^\dagger], \end{aligned}$$

where T_{Dp} denotes the tension of the Dp -brane and $\mu, \nu = 0, \dots, 25$. This effective action is obtained by remaining massless tachyon fields T and gauge fields A_μ , integrating out the other massive fields, and imposing the ordinary gauge symmetry²³. Let us suppose that the tachyon potential $V(T)$ has the following shape like Fig. 15

Following Sen’s conjecture²⁴, the part at the valley ($T = 1$) corresponds to the closed string vacuum where there is no D-branes because there is no open strings. The important

²²Here 24-25 plane is supposed to be noncommutative. The variable z is the complex coordinate of this plane.

²³We have to make further discussion on the Born-Infeld part. However we do not need the details here.

²⁴For a review see [216].




Figure 15: The tachyon potential

point here is that the “solution generating technique” leaves the equation of motion as it is independent of the details of the action (6.11) because of the gauge invariance of it.

That is why we can get non-trivial exact solution of the effective theory of SFT very easily by applying the solution generating technique (6.7) to the vacuum solution $\hat{T} = 1$, $\hat{D}_z = \hat{\partial}_z$, $\hat{A}_i = 0$, ($i = 0, \dots, 23$) even if we know *no* parts of the action:

$$\hat{T} = \hat{U}_k^\dagger 1 \hat{U}_k = 1 - \hat{P}_k, \quad \hat{D}_z = \hat{U}_k^\dagger \hat{\partial}_z \hat{U}_k, \quad \hat{A}_i = 0. \quad (6.13)$$

The tension of this solution is easily calculated

$$(\text{Tension}) = (2\pi)^2 \alpha' k T_{D25} = k T_{D23}, \quad (6.14)$$

which shows that this localized configuration have the same tension as that of k D23-branes! The fluctuation spectrum is also coincident with that of D23-brane, which are both evidences that this noncommutative soliton solution is just D23-branes! This implies an *exact* confirmation of Sen’s conjecture that an unstable D25-brane decays into D23-brane by the tachyon condensation in the context of the effective theory of SFT.

Application to NC Bogomol’nyi Equation

Now let us apply the solution generating technique to BPS equations. Unlike EOM, BPS equations contain constants in general and therefore do not be transformed covariantly under the transformation (6.7).

Here we introduce some results on this problems. focusing on the noncommutative Bogomol’nyi equation for $G = U(1)$ here. The following modified transformation leaves

the noncommutative Bogomol'nyi equation as it is [103, 116]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi &\rightarrow \hat{U}_k^\dagger \Phi \hat{U}_k - \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{x_3 - b_3^{(m)}}{\theta} |m\rangle \langle m|, \\
D_3 &\rightarrow \partial_3 + \hat{U}_k^\dagger A_3 \hat{U}_k + i \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{b_4^{(m)}}{\theta} |m\rangle \langle m|, \\
D_z &\rightarrow \hat{U}_k^\dagger D_z \hat{U}_k - \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_z^{(m)}}{2\theta} |m\rangle \langle m|.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

The crucial modification part appears in the transformation law of the Higgs field, which is, interestingly, seen naturally in the fluxon solutions (4.47) by Nahm construction.

We can generate various new BPS soliton solutions from known solutions. For example, from the noncommutative 1-Dirac monopole solution (4.18), we get the following new solution by the BPS solution generating technique (6.15) [103]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi^{\text{new}} &= - \left\{ \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} (\xi_{n-k}^2 - \xi_{n-k-1}^2) |n\rangle \langle n| + \left(\xi_0^2 + \frac{x_3}{\theta} \right) |k\rangle \langle k| + \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \left(\frac{x_3 - b_3^{(m)}}{\theta} \right) |m\rangle \langle m| \right\}, \\
D_z^{\text{new}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\theta}} \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{n+1-k}{n+1}} \frac{\xi_{n-k}}{\xi_{n+1-k}} a^\dagger |n\rangle \langle n| - \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_z^{(m)}}{2\theta} |m\rangle \langle m|, \\
A_3^{\text{new}} &= i \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{b_4^{(m)}}{\theta} |m\rangle \langle m|.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

This is the composite of a noncommutative Dirac monopole and k fluxons (See Fig. 16).




Figure 16: Bound state at threshold of an Abelian monopole and k fluxons ($k=1$).

Here let us interpret this transformation from the viewpoints of matrix models [16,

135, 3, 4]. The new solution has the following matrix representation setting $b_3 = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
D_z^{\text{new}} &= \hat{U}_k^\dagger \left(\sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} (\hat{D}_z^{\text{original}})_{m,n} |m\rangle \langle n| \right) \hat{U}_k - \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_z^{(m)}}{2\theta} |m\rangle \langle m|, \\
&= \sum_{m,n=k}^{\infty} (\hat{D}_z^{\text{original}})_{m-k,n-k} |m\rangle \langle n| - \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{\bar{\alpha}_z^{(m)}}{2\theta} |m\rangle \langle m|, \\
&= \left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} -\frac{\bar{\alpha}_z^{(0)}}{2\theta} & & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ O & & -\frac{\bar{\alpha}_z^{(k-1)}}{2\theta} & & & \\ \hline & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ O & & & & & \hat{D}_z^{\text{original}} \end{array} \right) \\
\hat{\Phi}^{\text{new}} &= \left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} -\frac{x_3}{\theta} & & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ O & & -\frac{x_3}{\theta} & & & \\ \hline & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ O & & & & & \hat{\Phi}^{\text{original}} \end{array} \right). \tag{6.17}
\end{aligned}$$

The transformed configuration can be interpreted as the composite of the original configuration (basically a D3-brane) and the additional k fluxons (unbounded k D1-branes). The upper-left $k \times k$ part and the lower-right part correspond to the additional independent k D1-branes and the original D3-brane as the bound state of infinite D1-branes, respectively. The zero components in the off-diagonal parts show the no-bound between the original configuration and the k fluxons. (See the right side of Fig. 12.) The diagonal elements of the upper-left $k \times k$ part are the Higgs vacuum expectation value (VEV) on the D1-branes and represents the positions of k D1-branes. That is why the parameters $\bar{\alpha}_z^{(m)}$ are the moduli parameters which shows the positions of the fluxons, which is consistent with the previous results. The linear terms $-x_3/\theta$ in the Higgs field Φ gives rise to the slope $-1/\theta$ of D1-brane in the x_3 direction and play the crucial role so that the transformed configuration should be BPS.

We have set the transverse coordinates $\Phi^{\hat{\mu}} = 0$ in the last paragraph in section 2. After the transformation, however, we can take $\Phi^{\hat{\mu}} \neq 0$ keeping the BPS condition. For

example, to the general solutions (6.16), we can set

$$\Phi_{\hat{\mu}} = \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{b_{\hat{\mu}}^{(m)}}{\theta} |m\rangle \langle m| = \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} \frac{b_{\hat{\mu}}^{(0)}}{\theta} & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & \frac{b_{\hat{\mu}}^{(k-1)}}{\theta} & \\ \hline & & & \end{array} \right), \quad (6.18)$$

where $b_{\hat{\mu}}^{(m)}$, $\hat{\mu} = 5, \dots, 9$ are real constants and denote the $\hat{\mu}$ -th transverse coordinates of the m -th fluxon. This shows that the k fluxons can escape from the D3-brane. (See Fig. 17.)




Figure 17: Fluxons can escape from the D3-brane.

7 Towards NC Soliton Theories and NC Integrable Systems

In this section, we discuss noncommutative extension of integrable systems. We believe that this study would pioneer new area of integrable systems.

In star-product formalism, noncommutative theories are considered as deformed theories from commutative ones. Under the NC-deformation, the (anti-)self-dual (ASD) Yang-Mills equations could be considered to preserve the integrability in the same sense as in commutative cases [144, 189]. On the other hand, with regard to typical integrable equations such as the Korteweg-de Vries (KdV) equation [152] and the Kadomtsev-Petviashvili (KP) equation [142], naive noncommutative extension generally destroys the integrability. There is known to be a method, the *bicomplex method*, to yield noncommutative integrable equations which have many conserved quantities [61, 62, 63, 64, 91]. There are many other works on noncommutative integrable systems, for example, [23, 34, 45, 57, 77, 79, 107, 130, 157, 158, 159, 165, 197, 219, 248].

In this section, we discuss noncommutative extension of wider class of integrable equations which are expected to preserve the integrability. First, we present a strong method to give rise to noncommutative Lax pairs and construct various noncommutative Lax equations. Then we discuss the relationship between the generated equations and the noncommutative integrable equations obtained from the bicomplex method and from reductions of the noncommutative ASD Yang-Mills equations. All the results are consistent and we can expect that the noncommutative Lax equations would be integrable. Hence it is natural to propose the following conjecture which contains the noncommutative version of Ward conjecture: *many of noncommutative Lax equations would be integrable and be obtained from reductions of the noncommutative ASD Yang-Mills equations.* (See Fig. 18.)

7.1 The Lax-Pair Generating Technique

In commutative cases, Lax representations [156] are common in many known integrable equations and fit well to the discussion of reductions of the ASD Yang-Mills equations. Here we look for the Lax representations on noncommutative spaces. First we introduce how to find Lax representations on commutative spaces.

An integrable equation which possesses the Lax representation can be rewritten as the following equation:

$$[L, T + \partial_t] = 0, \tag{7.1}$$




Figure 18: NC Ward Conjecture

where $\partial_t := \partial/\partial t$. This equation and the pair of operators (L, T) are called the *Lax equation* and the *Lax pair*, respectively.

The noncommutative version of the Lax equation (7.1), the *noncommutative Lax equation*, is easily defined just by replacing the product of L and T with the star product.

In this subsection, we look for the noncommutative Lax equation whose operator L is a differential operator. In order to make this study systematic, we set up the following problem :

Problem : For a given operator L , find the corresponding operator T which satisfies the Lax equation (7.1).

This is in general very difficult to solve. However if we put an ansatz on the operator T , then we can get the answer for wide class of Lax pairs including noncommutative case. The ansatz for the operator T is of the following type:

Ansatz for the operator T :

$$T = \partial_i^n L + T'. \tag{7.2}$$

Then the problem for T is reduced to that for T' . This ansatz is very simple, however, very strong to determine the unknown operator T' . In this way, we can get the Lax pair (L, T) , which is called, in this paper, the *Lax-pair generating technique*.

In order to explain it more concretely, let us consider the Korteweg-de-Vries (KdV) equation on commutative $(1 + 1)$ -dimensional space where the operator L is given by

$$L_{\text{KdV}} := \partial_x^2 + u(t, x).$$

The ansatz for the operator T is given by

$$T = \partial_x L_{\text{KdV}} + T', \quad (7.3)$$

which corresponds to $n = 1$ and $\partial_i = \partial_x$ in the general ansatz (7.2). This factorization was first used to find wider class of Lax pairs in higher dimensional case [225].

The Lax equation (7.1) leads to the equation for the unknown operator T' :

$$[\partial_x^2 + u, T'] = u_x \partial_x^2 + u_t + uu_x, \quad (7.4)$$

where $u_x := \partial u / \partial x$ and so on. Here we would like to delete the term $u_x \partial_x^2$ in the RHS of (7.4) so that this equation finally is reduced to a differential equation. Therefore the operator T' could be taken as

$$T' = A \partial_x + B, \quad (7.5)$$

where A, B are polynomials of u, u_x, u_t, u_{xx} , etc. Then the Lax equation becomes $f \partial_x^2 + g \partial_x + h = 0$. From $f = 0, g = 0$, we get²⁵

$$A = \frac{u}{2}, \quad B = -\frac{1}{4}u_x + \beta, \quad (7.6)$$

that is,

$$T = \partial_x L_{\text{KdV}} + A \partial_x + B = \partial_x^3 + \frac{3}{2}u \partial_x + \frac{3}{4}u_x. \quad (7.7)$$

Finally $h = 0$ yields the Lax equation, the KdV equation:

$$u_t + \frac{3}{2}uu_x + \frac{1}{4}u_{xxx} = 0. \quad (7.8)$$

In this way, we can generate a wide class of Lax equations including higher dimensional integrable equations [225]. For example, $L_{\text{mKdV}} := \partial_x^2 + v(t, x) \partial_x$ and $L_{\text{KP}} := \partial_x^2 + u(t, x, y) + \partial_y$ give rise to the modified KdV equation and the KP equation, respectively by the same ansatz (7.3) for T . If we take $L_{\text{BCS}} := \partial_x^2 + u(t, x, y)$ and the modified ansatz $T = \partial_y L_{\text{BCS}} + T'$, then we get the Bogoyavlenskii-Calogero-Schiff (BCS) equation [26, 36, 213].²⁶

Good news here is that this technique is also applicable to noncommutative cases.

²⁵Exactly speaking, an integral constant should appear in A as $A = u/2 + \alpha$. This constant α is unphysical and can be absorbed by the scale transformation $u \rightarrow u + 2\alpha/3$. Hence we can take $\alpha = 0$ without loss of generality. From now on, we always omit such kind of integral constants.

²⁶The multi-soliton solution is found in [253, 252].

7.2 NC Lax Equations

We present some results by using the Lax-pair generating technique. First we focus on noncommutative $(2+1)$ -dimensional Lax equations. Let us suppose that the noncommutativity is basically introduced in the space directions.

- The NC KP equation [197]:

The Lax operator is given by

$$L_{\text{KP}} = \partial_x^2 + u(t, x, y) + \partial_y =: L'_{\text{KP}} + \partial_y. \quad (7.9)$$

The ansatz for the operator T is the same as commutative case:

$$T = \partial_x L'_{\text{KP}} + T'. \quad (7.10)$$

Then we find

$$T' = A\partial_x + B = \frac{1}{2}u\partial_x - \frac{1}{4}u_x - \frac{3}{4}\partial_x^{-1}u_y, \quad (7.11)$$

and the noncommutative KP equation:

$$u_t + \frac{1}{4}u_{xxx} + \frac{3}{4}(u_x \star u + u \star u_x) + \frac{3}{4}\partial_x^{-1}u_{yy} + \frac{3}{4}[u, \partial_x^{-1}u_y]_\star = 0, \quad (7.12)$$

where $\partial_x^{-1}f(x) := \int^x dx' f(x')$, $u_{xxx} = \partial^3 u / \partial x^3$ and so on. This coincides with that in [197]. There is seen to be a nontrivial deformed term $[u, \partial_x^{-1}u_y]_\star$ in the equation (7.12) which vanishes in the commutative limit. In [197], the multi-soliton solution is found by the first order to small θ expansion, which suggests that this equation would be considered as an integrable equation.

If we take the ansatz $T = \partial_x^n L_{\text{KP}} + T'$, we can get infinite number of the hierarchy equations.

- The NC BCS equation:

This is obtained by following the same steps as in the commutative case. The new equation is

$$\begin{aligned} u_t + \frac{1}{4}u_{xxy} + \frac{1}{2}(u_y \star u + u \star u_y) + \frac{1}{4}u_x \star (\partial_x^{-1}u_y) \\ + \frac{1}{4}(\partial_x^{-1}u_y) \star u_x + \frac{1}{4}[u, \partial_x^{-1}[u, \partial_x^{-1}u_y]_\star]_\star = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (7.13)$$

whose Lax pair and the ansatz are

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{\text{BCS}} &= \partial_x^2 + u(t, x, y), \\
T &= \partial_y L_{\text{BCS}} + T', \\
T' &= A\partial_x + B = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_x^{-1}u_y)\partial_x - \frac{1}{4}u_y - \frac{1}{4}\partial_x^{-1}[u, \partial_x^{-1}u_y]_\star.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.14}$$

This time, a non-trivial term is found even in the operator T .

We can generate many other noncommutative Lax equations in the same way. Furthermore if we introduce the noncommutativity into time coordinate as $[t, x] = i\theta$, we can construct noncommutative $(1 + 1)$ -dimensional integrable equations. Let us show some typical examples.

- The NC KdV equation:

The noncommutative KdV equation is simply obtained as

$$u_t + \frac{3}{4}(u_x \star u + u \star u_x) + \frac{1}{4}u_{xxx} = 0, \tag{7.15}$$

whose Lax pair and the ansatz are

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{\text{KdV}} &= \partial_x^2 + u(t, x), \\
T &= \partial_x L_{\text{KdV}} + T', \\
T' &= A\partial_x + B = \frac{1}{2}u\partial_x + \frac{3}{4}u_x.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.16}$$

This coincides with that derived by using the bicomplex method [63] and by the reduction from noncommutative KP equation (7.12) setting the fields y -independent: “ $\partial_y = 0$.” The bicomplex method guarantees the existence of many conserved topological quantities, which suggests that noncommutative Lax equations would possess the integrability. Here we reintroduce the noncommutativity as $[t, x] = i\theta$.²⁷ We also find the noncommutative KdV hierarchy [224], by taking the ansatz $T = \partial_x^n L_{\text{KdV}} + T'$. It is interesting that for $n = 2$, the hierarchy equation becomes trivial: $u_t = 0$.

²⁷We note that this reduction is formal and the noncommutativity here contains subtle points in the derivation from the $(2 + 2)$ -dimensional noncommutative ASD Yang-Mills equation by reduction because the coordinates (t, x, y) originate partially from the parameters in the gauge group of the noncommutative Yang-Mills theory [1, 171]. We are grateful to T. Ivanova for pointing out this point to us.

- The NC Burgers equation [105]:

As one of the important and new Lax equations, the noncommutative Burgers equation is obtained:

$$u_t - \alpha u_{xx} + (1 + \alpha - \beta)u_x \star u + (1 - \alpha - \beta)u \star u_x = 0, \quad (7.17)$$

whose Lax pair and the ansatz are

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\text{Burgers}} &= \partial_x + u(t, x), \\ T &= \partial_x L_{\text{Burgers}} + T', \\ T' &= A\partial_x + B = u\partial_x + \alpha u_x + \beta u^2. \end{aligned} \quad (7.18)$$

We can linearize it by the following two kind of noncommutative Cole-Hopf transformations [105]:

$$u = \psi^{-1} \star \psi_x, \quad (7.19)$$

only when $1 + \alpha - \beta = 0$, and

$$u = -\psi_x \star \psi^{-1}, \quad (7.20)$$

only when $1 - \alpha - \beta = 0$. The linearized equation is the noncommutative diffusion equation

$$\psi_t = \alpha \psi_{xx}, \quad (7.21)$$

which is solvable via the Fourier transformation. Hence the noncommutative Burgers equation is really integrable. The noncommutative Burgers hierarchy is also obtained by taking the ansatz $T = \partial_x^n L + T'$ [105].

The transformations (7.19) and (7.20) are analogy of the commutative Cole-Hopf transformation $u = \partial_x \log \psi$ [42, 128]. This success makes us expect the possibility of noncommutative extension of Hirota's bilinear forms [123], tau-functions and Sato theory [211, 173].

Let us here comment on the multi-soliton solutions. First we note that if the field is holomorphic, that is, $f = f(x - vt) = f(z)$, then the star product is reduced to the ordinary product:

$$f(x - vt) \star g(x - vt) = f(x - vt)g(x - vt). \quad (7.22)$$

Hence the commutative multi-soliton solutions where all the solitons move at the same velocity always satisfy the noncommutative version of the equations. Of course, this does not mean that the equations possess the integrability.

7.3 Comments on the Noncommutative Ward Conjecture

In commutative case, it is well known that many of integrable equations could be derived from symmetry reductions of the four-dimensional ASD Yang-Mills equation [1, 171], which is first conjectured by R.Ward [237].

Even in noncommutative case, the corresponding discussions would be possible and be interesting. The noncommutative ASD Yang-Mills equations also have the Yang's forms [190, 189] and many other similar properties to commutative ones [144]. The simple reduction to three dimension yields the noncommutative Bogomol'nyi equation which has the exact monopole solutions and can be rewritten as the non-Abelian Toda lattice equation as in Eq. (4.33) [189, 94]. It is interesting that a discrete structure appears. Furthermore M.Legaré [165] succeeded in some reductions of the $(2 + 2)$ -dimensional noncommutative ASD Yang-Mills equations which coincide with our results and those by using the bicomplex method [62, 63], which strongly suggests that the noncommutative deformation would be unique and integrable and the Ward conjecture would still hold on noncommutative spaces.

8 Conclusion and Discussion

In the present thesis, we constructed various exact noncommutative solitons and discussed the corresponding D-brane dynamics. We saw that ADHM/Nahm construction is very strong to generate both commutative and noncommutative instantons/monopoles and makes it possible to see the essential properties of them clearly. On noncommutative spaces, it was proved that resolutions of the singularities actually occur and give various new physical objects. We could also see the equivalence between the noncommutative deformation and the turning-on of the background magnetic (B -) fields in gauge theories on D-branes. Furthermore we found that ADHM construction naturally yields the “solution generating technique” which has been remarkably applied to Sen’s conjecture on tachyon condensations in the context of string field theories. The reason why the noncommutative descriptions could be successful is considered to be partially that the singular configuration becomes smooth enough to be calculated due to the simple structure. We constructed periodic instanton solutions and discussed the Fourier-transformations. We saw that the transformed configuration satisfies the Bogomol’nyi equation and actually coincides with the fluxon, which has perfectly consistent D-brane pictures. Finally, we discussed noncommutative extension of integrable systems as a new study-area of them. We proposed the strong way to generate noncommutative Lax equations which are expected to be both integrable and obtained from the noncommutative Yang-Mills equation by reductions.

There are many further directions following to these studies.

One of the expected directions is the noncommutative extension of soliton theories and integrable systems in the lower-dimensions which preserve the integrabilities as is introduced in section 7.

In four-dimensional Yang-Mills theory, the noncommutative deformation resolves the small instanton singularity of the (complete) instanton moduli space and gives rise to a new physical object, the $U(1)$ instanton. Hence the noncommutative Ward conjecture would imply that the noncommutative deformations of lower-dimensional integrable equations might contain new physical objects because of the deformations of the solution spaces in some case.

Now there are mainly three methods to yield noncommutative integrable equations:

- Lax-pair generating technique
- Bicomplex method
- Reduction of the ASD Yang-Mills equation

The interesting point is that all the results are consistent at least with the known non-commutative Lax equations, which suggests the existence and the uniqueness of the non-commutative deformations of integrable equations which preserve the integrability.

Though we can get many new noncommutative Lax equations, there need to be more discussions so that such study should be fruitful as integrable systems. First, we have to clarify whether the noncommutative Lax equations are really good equations in the sense of integrability, that is, the existence of many conserved quantities or of multi-soliton solutions, and so on. All of the previous studies including our works strongly suggest that this would be true. Second, we have to reveal the physical meaning of such equations. If such integrable theories can be embedded in string theories, there would be fruitful interactions between the both theories, just as between the (NC) ASD Yang-Mills equation and D0-D4 brane system (in the background of NS-NS B -field). There is a good string theory for this purpose: $N = 2$ string theory [195]. The $(2 + 2)$ -dimensional noncommutative ASD Yang-Mills equation and some reductions of it can be embedded [159, 157] in $N = 2$ string theory, which guarantees that such directions would have a physical meaning and might be helpful to understand new aspects of the corresponding string theory. This string theory has massless excitation modes only and seems to make no problems in introducing the noncommutativity in time direction as $(1 + 1)$ -dimensional noncommutative integrable equations.

The above direction is expected because of the success stories in 4-dimensional non-commutative Yang-Mills theories. However even in this theories, there are many problems to be solved.

The first one is the geometrical meaning of the instanton charges for $G = U(1)$. For $SU(2)$ part, there is an origin of the integer charge, the winding number: $\pi_3(SU(2)) \simeq \pi_3(S^3) \in \mathbf{Z}$. For $U(1)$ part, however, $\pi_3(U(1)) \simeq 0$ and at least the origin does not comes from the boundary of \mathbf{R}^4 . Crucial observations should be started with the geometrical meaning of the shift operators. There are several works in this direction, for example, [82, 172, 115, 137, 210, 223].

Noncommutative monopoles also have many unclear points. We have to clarify whether the “visible” Dirac string which appears in the exact solution of noncommutative 1-Dirac monopole are really physical or not. We should solve the inconsistency [94] on the valuedness of the Higgs field between exact noncommutative monopole (: single-valued) and exact nonlinear monopole (: multi-valued) which should be equivalent to each other unless the Seiberg-Witten’s discussion [215] holds. There are some discussions on these problems

in [98].

In section 3-6, we saw that NC gauge theories could reveal the corresponding D-brane dynamics in some aspects. It is natural to expect that another D-brane system would be analyzed by noncommutative gauge theories.

There is an origin of the duality of ADHM/Nahm construction, that is, *Nahm transformation* which will be briefly introduced in Appendix A.1. This duality transformation is just related to the T-duality transformation of the D0-D4 brane system where the coincident D4-branes wrap on a four-torus. The extension of Nahm transformation to even-dimensional tori has been done by the author and H. Kajiura [102]. In commutative case, we have to suppose that the number k of the D0-branes is not zero. On the other hand, the noncommutative extension of it is expected to admit the $k = 0$ case because of the resolution of singularities, which is just the T-duality transformation for one kind of D-branes themselves. Furthermore, there is some relationship between two noncommutativities on torus and the dual torus [149]. An attempt of the noncommutative extension of Nahm transformation is found in [6], however, it tells nothing about the above point. It is interesting to make it clear whether the noncommutative Nahm transformation give the relationship of the noncommutativities or not. In order to study it concretely, we have to define the tensor product of the modules on the product of torus and the dual torus as is commented on in the conclusion of [102].

The higher dimensional extension of ADHM construction is possible. In fact, on the 8-dimensional Euclidean space, there exist “ASD” configurations which satisfy the 8-dimensional “ASD” equation [47, 237] and the ADHM construction of them in some special case [53]. Some works on the noncommutative extension of it have been done and the D-brane interpretations such as D0-D8 brane systems are presented for example in [198, 193, 122, 15]. In D0-D8 systems, there is seen to be a special behavior of D-branes known as the *brane creation* [106]. It is expected that (NC) higher-dimensional ADHM construction might give gauge theoretical explanations of it and some hints of new D-brane dynamics.

There are mainly three aspects of noncommutative theories which show physical situations:

- the equivalence to physics in the presence of magnetic fields
- a formulation of open string field theory [245]
- a candidate for the geometry underlying quantum gravity

In this thesis, we focused on the first aspect and applied it to the study of D-brane dynamics in the background B -field. This approach is successful to some degree because of the simplicity. However the situation is rather restricted.

The second one is recently rewritten as NC-deformed theories by I. Bars et al. [19]. This direction is new and interesting.

The third one is more profound and very different from the present discussions. Very naively, quantum gravity might be formulated in terms of noncommutative geometries because the quantization processes usually introduce the noncommutativity of the dynamical variables. The quantization of gravities introduce the noncommutativity of the metric (the gravitational field), which would lead to noncommutative geometries. There are several suggestions to justify the latter aspect, for example, the *space-time uncertainty principle* proposed by T. Yoneya [251]. We hope that such studies might shed light on this challenging area.

Acknowledgments

It is a great pleasure to thank Y. Matsuo for advice and encouragement, and Y. Imaizumi, H. Kajiura, N. Ohta, S. Terashima and K. Toda for collaboration. In particular, K. Toda has introduced me to the wonderful world of integrable systems. The author has visited in Korea, Kyoto (as an atom-type visitor), Netherlands, UK and Germany in order to make his knowledge related to the present thesis better and is grateful to all of the members at the Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, the Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Sogang university, York university, Leiden university, Amsterdam university, Durham university, Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics at Cambridge university, Queen Mary and Westfield college, university of London, and Hannover university, especially, C. Chu, E. Corrigan, J. de Boer, J. Gauntlett, O. Lechtenfeld, B. Lee, K. Lee, N. Manton, P. van Baal and R. Ward for hospitality, hearty support and fruitful discussions during his stay. He has had many chances to have talks related to this thesis at the conferences, workshops and seminars at the universities or institutes. He would also like to express his gratitude to the organizers and the audiences for hospitality and discussions. Thanks are also due to T. Eguchi, H. Fuji, K. Fujikawa, K. Furuuchi, G. Gibbons, R. Goto, K. Hashimoto, Y. Hashimoto, T. Hirayama, K. Ichikawa, Y. Imamura, N. Inoue, M. Ishibashi, K. Izawa, M. Jinzenji, A. Kato, M. Kato, H. Kanno, T. Kawano, Y. Kazama, I. Kishimoto, Y. Konishi, H. Konno, Y. Matsumoto, S. Moriyama, A. Mukherjee, H. Nakajima, K. Ohta, H. Ooguri, R. Sasaki, A. Schwarz, J. Shiraishi, Y. Sugawara, T. Takayanagi, G. 't Hooft, I. Tsutsui, T. Uesugi, M. Wadati, S. Watamura, T. Watari, T. Yanagida, and all other members of his group for enjoyable discussions and encouragements. In particular, M. Asano, K. Hosomichi, and S. Terashima have spent a lot of their time on education and the author would like to express his special thanks to them.

Thanks to all colleagues around the author, he could spend a stimulating and happy life, which leaves him plenty of golden memories. Finally he would like to thank his parents and his brother for continuous encouragement.

This work was supported in part by the Japan Scholarship Foundation and the Japan Securities Scholarship Foundation (#12-3-0403)

A ADHM/Nahm Construction

In this appendix, we review foundation of ADHM/Nahm construction of instantons/monopoles on commutative spaces and presents our conventions.

ADHM/Nahm construction is one of the strongest methods to generate all instantons/monopoles. Instantons and monopoles have (anti-)self-dual and stable configurations and play important roles in revealing non-perturbative aspects of Yang-Mills theories. ADHM/Nahm construction is based on the one-to-one correspondence between instanton/monopole moduli space and the moduli space of ADHM/Nahm data and can be applied to the instanton calculus and so on. (For a review, see [70].)

ADHM construction is a descendent of the twistor theory [201]. (For reviews, see [167, 171, 202, 238].) In 1977, R. Ward applied the twistor theory to instantons and replaced the self-duality of the gauge fields on S^4 with the holomorphy of the vector bundles on $\mathbf{C}P_3$ [237]. The problem on the holomorphy of the vector bundle is reduced to algebraic problems from algebro-geometric idea. There are two treatments of it: the method of algebraic curves and the method of monads.

M. Atiyah and R. Ward developed the former treatment and showed that an ansatz (*Atiyah-Ward ansatz*) gives rise to instantons [10]. This idea has a close relationship to the inverse scattering methods (or Bäcklund transformations) in soliton theories [21, 50, 250] and has made much progress with integrable systems [238, 171].

On the other hand, Atiyah, Drinfeld, Hitchin and Manin developed the latter treatment and found the strong algebraic method to generate *all* instanton solutions on S^4 , which is just the ADHM construction [8]. (In this thesis, we treat instantons on \mathbf{R}^4 which is proved to be equivalent to instantons on S^4 from the conformal invariance and Uhlenbeck's theorem [231].) The idea of ADHM construction was applied to the construction of monopoles by W. Nahm [181]-[185], which is called *ADHMN construction* or *Nahm construction*. Furthermore the duality in Nahm construction which is like Fourier-transformation was extracted into as a profound duality of instantons on four-torus by Schenk [212], Braam and van Baal [32]. This is called *Nahm transformation* and has close relationship to Fourier-Mukai transformation [177] in algebraic geometry and T-duality in string theory. (For a review on T-duality, see [85].) Hence the duality on Nahm transformation is often called *Fourier-Mukai-Nahm duality*.

In this appendix, we begin with the Fourier-Mukai-Nahm duality and derive ADHM/Nahm duality from it intuitively. Then we introduce the detailed discussion on ADHM/Nahm construction on commutative spaces and present our conventions which is used in main

parts of the present thesis.

Notations and Comments in the Appendix

- The size of a $m \times n$ matrix M is denoted by $M_{[m] \times [n]}$. In particular $m \times m$ diagonal matrices are sometimes denoted by $M_{[m]}$.
- The Lie algebra of a Lie group G is represented as the corresponding calligraph symbols “ \mathcal{G} ,” where the element g of the Lie group and that X of the Lie algebra have the relation: $g = e^X$.
- “ \approx ” means “asymptotically equal to at spatial infinity” $r := |x| \rightarrow \infty$.
- Usually the trace symbols Tr and tr are taken with respect to the color indices of the gauge group and the spinor indices, respectively.
- The convention of the indices can be summarized up as follows:

$$\text{4-dimensional space indices [4]} : 1 \leq \mu, \nu, \rho, \dots \leq 4$$

$$\text{3-dimensional space indices [3]} : 1 \leq i, j, k, \dots \leq 3$$

$$\text{Color indices [N]} : 1 \leq u, v, w, \dots \leq N$$

$$\text{Instanton number indices [k]} : 1 \leq p, q, r, \dots \leq k$$

$$\text{Spinor indices [2]} : 1 \leq \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \dots, \leq 2$$

A.1 A Derivation of ADHM/Nahm construction from Nahm Transformation

ADHM/Nahm construction looks very complicated, however, is simple and beautiful in fact. In order to explain this points clearly, we introduce the beautiful duality transformation, Nahm transformation [212, 32] as the background of ADHM/Nahm construction.

Nahm transformation is a duality transformation (one-to-one mapping) between the instanton moduli space on a four-torus T^4 with $G = U(N)$, $C_2 = k$ and that on the dual torus \hat{T}^4 with $\hat{G} = U(k)$, $C_2 = N$. This situation is realized as D0-D4 brane systems where the D4-branes wrap on T^4 . We can take T-duality transformation in the four directions where the D4-brane lie, which is just the Nahm transformation. In this subsection, we review the Nahm transformation briefly and discuss a derivation of ADHM/Nahm construction by taking some limits.

Poincaré Line Bundle

Let us set up the stage first. We introduce the Poincaré Line Bundle.

Let us suppose that Λ denotes the rank-four lattice of \mathbf{R}^4 . Then a four-torus T^4 and the dual torus \widehat{T}^4 are given as follows;

$$T^4 := \mathbf{R}^4/\Lambda, \quad \widehat{T}^4 := \mathbf{R}^{4*}/2\pi\Lambda^*, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where \mathbf{R}^{4*} is the dual vector space of \mathbf{R}^4 and Λ^* is the dual lattice of Λ :

$$\Lambda^* := \left\{ \mu \in \mathbf{R}^{4*} \mid \mu \cdot \lambda \in \mathbf{Z}, \forall \lambda \in \Lambda \right\}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

In this subsection, the dot “ \cdot ” denotes the inner product of the elements of \mathbf{R}^4 and \mathbf{R}^{4*} . Hence roughly speaking, the torus and the dual torus have the opposite size to each other : $(\text{vol } T^4) \cdot (\text{vol } \widehat{T}^4) = (2\pi)^4$. The coordinates of \mathbf{R}^4 and \mathbf{R}^{4*} are represented as x^μ and ξ_μ , respectively.

Next let us introduce the trivial bundle $\mathcal{L} = T^4 \times \mathbf{C} \rightarrow T^4$ on T^4 and pull it back onto $T^4 \times \mathbf{R}^{4*}$ by the projection $\pi : T^4 \times \mathbf{R}^{4*} \rightarrow T^4$. The gauge group of the bundle is $U(1)$. On the trivial line bundle $\pi^*\mathcal{L} \rightarrow T^4 \times \mathbf{R}^{4*}$ which is the pull-back bundle of \mathcal{L} by the projection π , the natural gauge field can be defined as

$$\omega(x, \xi) = i\xi_\mu dx^\mu, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

which is considered as that on $\pi^*\mathcal{L} \rightarrow T^4 \times \widehat{T}^4$. In fact, the gauge field $\omega(x, \xi)$ is equivalent to $\omega(x, \xi + 2\pi\mu)$ and connected by the following gauge transformation:

$$\omega(x, \xi + 2\pi\mu) = g^{-1}\omega(x, \xi)g + g^{-1}dg, \quad \exists g(x) = e^{2\pi i\mu \cdot x} \in U(1), \quad \mu \in \Lambda^*. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

This gauge-equivalent relation define the line bundle on $T^4 \times \widehat{T}^4$ which is called *Poincaré line bundle* and is denoted by $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow T^4 \times \widehat{T}^4$. The curvature $\Omega(x, \xi)$ of the Poincaré line bundle is

$$\Omega(x, \xi) = i d\xi_\mu \wedge dx^\mu. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

The dual Poincaré line bundle $\widehat{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow T^4 \times \widehat{T}^4$ is also constructed from the trivial line bundle $\widehat{\mathcal{L}} = \widehat{T}^4 \times \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \widehat{T}^4$ on the dual torus \widehat{T}^4 and the gauge field is given by $\omega'(x, \xi) = ix^\mu d\xi_\mu$. The gauge field $\omega(x, \xi) = i\xi_\mu dx^\mu$ is mapped to $\omega'(x, \xi) = -ix^\mu d\xi_\mu$ by the gauge transformation $\exp(-i\xi \cdot x)$ on $\mathbf{R}^4 \times \mathbf{R}^{4*}$:

$$\omega(x, \xi) = i\xi_\mu dx^\mu \longrightarrow \omega'(x, \xi) = \omega(x, \xi) + e^{i\xi \cdot x} de^{-i\xi \cdot x} = -ix^\mu d\xi_\mu, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

which shows that $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}$ is the complex conjugate of \mathcal{P} .

The Poincaré line bundle yields the Fourier-transformation like duality in Nahm transformation.

Let us summarize on Poincaré line bundle:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & \mathcal{P} & & \\
& & \downarrow & & \\
\mathcal{L} & & T^4 \times \widehat{T}^4 & & \widehat{\mathcal{L}} \\
\downarrow & \swarrow \pi & & \searrow \hat{\pi} & \downarrow \\
T^4 & & & & \widehat{T}^4
\end{array}$$

Nahm Transformation

Now let us define Nahm transformation $\mathcal{N} : (E, A) \mapsto (\widehat{E}, \widehat{A})$, where E is the N -dimensional complex vector bundle on T^4 with Hermitian metric and $G = U(N)$, $C_2 = k$. First we pull the bundle E back by the projection π . The gauge field on $\mathcal{P} \otimes \pi^*E|_{T^4 \times \{\xi\}}$ is defined by $A_\xi := A \otimes 1_{\mathcal{L}} + 1_{[N]} \otimes i\xi_\mu dx^\mu$. The field strength F_ξ from A_ξ equals to F from A . The covariant derivative from A_ξ is denoted by $D[A_\xi] := d + A_\xi$.

Next let us define Dirac operator. Suppose that $S^\pm \rightarrow T^4$ is the spinor bundle on T^4 . The Dirac operator acting on the section $\Gamma(T^4, S^\pm \otimes E \otimes \mathcal{P})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}[A_\xi] &:= e^\mu \otimes D[A_\xi] = e_\mu \otimes (\partial_\mu + A_\mu + i\xi_\mu), \\
\bar{\mathcal{D}}[A_\xi] &:= \bar{e}^\mu \otimes D[A_\xi] = \bar{e}_\mu \otimes (\partial_\mu + A_\mu + i\xi_\mu).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.7}$$

Exactly speaking, we should call them *Weyl operators* rather than Dirac operators. Here, however, we use the word ‘‘Dirac operator’’ for simplicity, which makes no confusion, we hope.

Here let us construct the dual vector bundle \widehat{E} on \widehat{T}^4 by using the Dirac zero-mode $\psi_\xi^p(x)$, $p = 1, \dots, k$. Concretely we take $\text{Ker } \bar{\mathcal{D}}[A_\xi]$ as the fiber \widehat{E}_ξ . Atiyah-Singer family index theorem says $\dim \text{Ker } \bar{\mathcal{D}}[A_\xi] = k$. Suppose $\widehat{H} \rightarrow \widehat{T}^4$ as infinite-dim trivial vector bundle whose fiber is $\widehat{H}_\xi := L^2(T^4, S^+ \otimes E \otimes \mathcal{P}|_{T^4 \times \{\xi\}})$, the bundle $\widehat{E}_\xi = \text{Ker } \bar{\mathcal{D}}[A_\xi]$ is sub-bundle of \widehat{H}_ξ and \widehat{E} is sub-bundle of \widehat{H} . (See Fig. 19.)

$$(\mathcal{F}, A) \rightarrow (\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{A}) : \quad \begin{array}{ccccc}
& & \pi^* \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{P} & & \\
& & \downarrow & & \\
\mathcal{F} & & T^4 \times \widehat{T}^4 & & \hat{\pi}_*(\pi^* \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{P}) \\
\downarrow & \swarrow \pi & & \searrow \hat{\pi} & \downarrow \\
T^4 & & & & \widehat{T}^4
\end{array} \tag{A.8}$$




Figure 19: The stage of Nahm transformation

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & \mathcal{P} \otimes \hat{\pi}^* \hat{\mathcal{F}} & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \\
 (\mathcal{F}, A) \leftarrow (\hat{\mathcal{F}}, \hat{A}) : & \pi_*(\mathcal{P} \otimes \hat{\pi}^* \hat{\mathcal{F}}) & T^4 \times \hat{T}^4 & \hat{\mathcal{F}} & \\
 & \downarrow & \swarrow \pi & \searrow \hat{\pi} & \downarrow \\
 & T^4 & & & \hat{T}^4
 \end{array} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Here we introduce the projection

$$P : \hat{H} \rightarrow \hat{E} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

and define the covariant derivative as follows

$$\hat{D} = P\hat{d} : \Gamma(\hat{T}^4, \hat{E}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\hat{T}^4, \Lambda^1 \otimes \hat{E}), \quad (\text{A.11})$$

which specifies the gauge field \hat{A} on \hat{E} . This is the Nahm transformation (mapping): $\mathcal{N} : (E, A) \mapsto (\hat{E}, \hat{A})$. The concrete representation of the dual gauge fields are given by

$$\hat{A}_\mu^{pq} = \int_{T^4} d^4x \psi^{\dagger p} \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^\mu} \psi^q, \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where ψ^p ($p = 1, 2, \dots, k$) is the k normalizable Dirac zero-modes.

The similar argument is possible from \widehat{T}^4 which specifies the inverse transformation: $\widehat{\mathcal{N}} : (\widehat{E}, \widehat{A}) \mapsto (E, A)$. Then the dual Dirac operator is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\mathcal{D}}[\widehat{A}_x] &:= e_\mu \otimes (\widehat{\partial}^\mu + \widehat{A}^\mu - ix^\mu), \\ \widehat{\mathcal{D}}[\widehat{A}_x] &:= \bar{e}_\mu \otimes (\widehat{\partial}^\mu + \widehat{A}^\mu - ix^\mu).\end{aligned}\tag{A.13}$$

Furthermore we can prove that Nahm transformation is one-to-one, that is, $\mathcal{N}\widehat{\mathcal{N}} = \text{id}$. and $\widehat{\mathcal{N}}\mathcal{N} = \text{id}$.

Summary is the following:

Nahm transformation

E		\widehat{E}
\downarrow		\downarrow
T^4		\widehat{T}^4
$G = U(N)$		$\widehat{G} = U(k)$
k -instanton	$\xleftrightarrow{\quad} \xleftarrow{\quad}$	N -instanton
	massless Dirac eq.	
	$\widehat{\mathcal{D}}\psi = 0$	
instanton : $A_{\mu[N]}$	k solutions: $\psi(\xi, x)$	$\widehat{A}_{\mu[k]} = \int_{T^4} d^4x \psi^\dagger \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^\mu} \psi$
	$\xrightarrow{\quad}$	
	massless Dirac eq.	
	$\widehat{\mathcal{D}}v = 0$	
$A_{\mu[N]} = \int_{\widehat{T}^4} d^4\xi v^\dagger \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} v$	N solutions: $v(x, \xi)$	instanton : $\widehat{A}_{\mu[k]}$
	$\xleftarrow{\quad}$	

Examples

Let us transform concrete solutions [102]. There is known to be $G = U(N^2) (\simeq U(N) \otimes U(N))$, k^2 -instanton solutions:

$$A_1 = 0, \quad A_2 = -\frac{i}{2\pi} \frac{k}{N} x_1 \otimes 1_{[N]}, \quad A_3 = 0, \quad A_4 = 1_{[N]} \otimes \frac{i}{2\pi} \frac{k}{N} x_3,\tag{A.14}$$

which actually satisfies ASD eq. and the instanton number is calculated as $-k^2$:

$$F_{12} = -F_{34} = -\frac{i}{2\pi} \frac{k}{N} 1_{[N]} \otimes 1_{[N]}.\tag{A.15}$$




Figure 20: Nahm Transformation

By solving the Dirac equation in the background of the instantons, we find the Dirac zero-mode:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{uu'}^{pp'}(\xi, x) &= \left(\frac{N}{2\pi k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{s,t \in \mathbf{Z}} e^{ix_1(\frac{k}{N}(\frac{x_2}{2\pi} + u + Ns) + p)} e^{2\pi i \xi_2(\frac{x_2}{2\pi} + u + Ns + \frac{N}{k}(\xi_1 + p))} e^{-\frac{\pi k}{N}(\frac{x_2}{2\pi} + u + Ns + \frac{N}{k}(\xi_1 + p))^2} \\ &\times e^{-ix_3(\frac{k}{N}(\frac{x_4}{2\pi} + u' + Nt) + p')} e^{-2\pi i \xi_4(\frac{x_4}{2\pi} + u' + Nt + \frac{N}{k}(\xi_3 + p'))} e^{-\frac{\pi k}{N}(\frac{x_4}{2\pi} + u' + Nt + \frac{N}{k}(\xi_3 + p'))^2} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Then we can calculate the dual gauge field in usual manner:

$$\widehat{A}_1 = -2\pi i \frac{N}{k} \xi_2 \otimes 1_{[k]}, \quad \widehat{A}_2 = 0, \quad \widehat{A}_3 = 1_{[k]} \otimes 2\pi i \frac{N}{k} \xi_4, \quad \widehat{A}_4 = 0. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

This trivially solves the ASD equation and is proved to be $\widehat{G} = U(k^2)$, N^2 -instanton. We can calculate the Green function substituting this into (A.16).

Note

- The extension of Nahm transformation to even-dimensional tori are discussed in [102].
- The D-brane interpretations of Nahm transformation and extension to other gauge groups are discussed in [129].

A Derivation of ADHM/Nahm Construction

Though we saw a beautiful duality in Nahm transformation. this is no use for constructing explicit instanton solutions because we have to make two steps to get explicit instanton solutions on torus, that is, solving dual ASD equation and Dirac equation on the dual torus, which spend more effort than solving ASD equation directly.

If we want to make the duality useful, we often take some limit with respect to the parameters in the theory. This time there are good parameters, radius of torus r_μ . Now we take some limit of the parameters and derive non-trivial duality in the extreme situations, which is found to be just ADHM/Nahm construction.

- Taking all four radii infinity \Rightarrow ADHM construction

Then the radii of the dual torus become zero. Hence the dual torus shrink into one point and the derivative becomes meaning less because the derivative measures the difference between two points. As the result, all the derivatives in the dual ASD equation and the dual massless Dirac equation drop out naively and the differential equations becomes matrix equations. This degeneration of the Nahm transformation leads to the non-trivial results: we can construct instanton solutions on \mathbf{R}^4 (=infinite-size torus) by solving matrix equations, which is just ADHM construction ($T_\mu = \hat{A}_\mu$). For more detailed discussion, see [232].

- Taking three radii infinity and the other radius zero \Rightarrow Nahm construction

Then the torus and the dual torus become \mathbf{R}^3 and \mathbf{R} , respectively. In similar way, the differential equations on dual side become ordinary differential equations because the derivative only in one direction survives, which concludes that we can construct BPS monopole solutions (=ASD configuration on “ \mathbf{R}^3 ”) by solving the ordinary differential equations, which is just Nahm construction.

A.2 ADHM Construction of Instantons on \mathbf{R}^4

In this subsection, we review the ordinary ADHM construction of instantons on commutative space based on Corrigan-Goddard’s paper [52] and my review [99].

The most fundamental object in ADHM construction is the Dirac operator. The important equations such as ASD equation and so on can be understood from the viewpoint of Dirac operators.

Here we impose on this point and discuss the duality in ADHM construction. At the same time, we set up the notations. The outline of the review is the following as Nahm transformation:




Figure 21: ADHM/Nahm Construction

As we comment in the previous subsection, (A)SD / Bogomol'nyi / Nahm / ADHM equation is basically considered as 4 / 3 / 1 / 0-dimensional ASD equation.

In order to discuss the duality, we first present instantons and ADHM data, and then define the duality mapping and finally comment on the one-to-one correspondence without proofs.

(Instanton)

Let us explain what instantons are. For simplicity, suppose that the gauge G is $SU(N)$, $N \geq 2$. (There is no difference whether $G = U(N)$ or $G = SU(N)$.) We can fix the self-duality of instantons ASD without loss of generality. Those who know the basic notion of instantons may skip this part except for the representation of ASD equation from the viewpoint of Dirac operators.

Instantons on four-dimensional commutative Euclidean space are the configuration of the gauge fields which satisfies ASD equation and make the Yang-Mills action minimize and be finite.

Let us define the Dirac equation which is the most fundamental:

- Dirac operator

$$\mathcal{D}_x := e^\mu \otimes D_\mu = e^\mu \otimes (\partial_\mu + A_\mu), \quad \bar{\mathcal{D}}_x := \bar{e}_\mu \otimes D_\mu = -\mathcal{D}^\dagger. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Here D_μ is an ordinary covariant operator and e_μ is the two-dimensional representation matrix of quaternions $(i, j, k, 1)$ (Euclidean 4-dimensional Pauli matrix):

$$e_\mu := (-i\sigma_i, 1), \quad \bar{e}_\mu := \bar{e}_\mu = (i\sigma_i, 1), \quad (\text{A.19})$$

which satisfies

$$\bar{e}_\mu e_\nu = \delta_{\mu\nu} + i\eta_{\mu\nu}^{(+)} = \delta_{\mu\nu} + i\eta_{\mu\nu}^{(+)}\sigma_i, \quad e_\mu \bar{e}_\nu = \delta_{\mu\nu} + i\eta_{\mu\nu}^{(-)} = \delta_{\mu\nu} + i\eta_{\mu\nu}^{(-)}\sigma_i. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

The symbol $\eta_{\mu\nu}^{i(\pm)}$ is called 't Hooft's eta symbol [228, 230] and is concretely represented

$$\eta_{\mu\nu}^{i(\pm)} = \epsilon_{i\mu\nu 4} \pm \delta_{i\mu}\delta_{\nu 4} \mp \delta_{i\nu}\delta_{\mu 4}, \quad (\text{A.21})$$

which is anti-symmetric and (A)SD with respect to μ, ν :

$$\eta_{\mu\nu}^{i(\pm)} = \pm * \eta_{\mu\nu}^{i(\pm)}, \quad (\text{A.22})$$

where $*$ is Hodge operator, and defined by $*X_{\mu\nu} := (1/2)\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}X^{\rho\sigma}$. (For example, $*X_{12} = X_{34}$, $*X_{13} = X_{42}$, ...))

Some formula on $e_\mu, \eta_{\mu\nu}^{i(\pm)}$ are as follows:

$$e_\mu \bar{e}_\nu + e_\nu \bar{e}_\mu = \bar{e}_\mu e_\nu + \bar{e}_\nu e_\mu = 2\delta_{\mu\nu} \quad (\text{A.23})$$

$$e_\mu \bar{e}_\nu e_\mu = -2e_\nu, \quad e_\mu e_\nu e_\mu = -2\bar{e}_\nu \quad (\text{A.24})$$

$$e_2 e_\mu e_2 = -\bar{e}_\mu^t \quad (\text{A.25})$$

$$\text{tr}(e_\mu \bar{e}_\nu) = \text{tr}(\bar{e}_\mu e_\nu) = 2\delta_{\mu\nu}, \quad (\text{A.26})$$

$$\eta_{\mu\nu}^{i(+)} = -\frac{i}{2}\text{tr}(\sigma^i \bar{e}_\mu e_\nu), \quad \eta_{\mu\nu}^{i(-)} = -\frac{i}{2}\text{tr}(\sigma^i e_\mu \bar{e}_\nu) \quad (\text{A.27})$$

$$\eta_{\mu\nu}^{i(+)} \eta_{\mu\nu}^{j(+)} = \eta_{\mu\nu}^{i(-)} \eta_{\mu\nu}^{j(-)} = 4\delta^{ij}. \quad (\text{A.28})$$

From now on, we often omit the symbol of the tensor product \otimes .

Let us define the ASD equation by using the Dirac operator, which is based on the following observation:

$$\text{Gauge fields are ASD.} \Leftrightarrow \text{The "square" of the Dirac operator } \bar{\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{D} \text{ commutes with Pauli matrices.}$$

In fact the ‘‘square’’ of the Dirac operator $\bar{\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{D}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{D} &= \bar{e}^\mu \otimes D_\mu e^\nu \otimes D_\nu = 1_{[2]} \otimes D^2 + \frac{i}{2} \eta^{(+i\mu\nu)} \sigma_i \otimes [D_\mu, D_\nu] \\ &= 1_{[2]} \otimes D^2 + \frac{i}{2} \eta^{(+i\mu\nu)} \sigma_i \otimes F_{\mu\nu},\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A.29})$$

which gives the proof of the observation²⁸. The condition $F_{\mu\nu} = F_{\mu\nu}^{(-)}$ is the ASD equation and concretely represented as:

- The ASD equation ($\Leftrightarrow [\bar{\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{D}, \sigma_i] = 0$)

$$F_{12} + F_{34} = 0, \quad F_{13} - F_{24} = 0, \quad F_{14} + F_{23} = 0. \quad (\text{real rep.}) \quad (\text{A.30})$$

$$\Leftrightarrow F_{z_1 \bar{z}_1} + F_{z_2 \bar{z}_2} = 0, \quad F_{z_1 z_2} = 0. \quad (\text{complex rep.}) \quad (\text{A.31})$$

$$\Leftrightarrow F_{\mu\nu} + *F_{\mu\nu} = 0. \quad (\text{A.32})$$

The ASD equation gives the minimum of the Yang-Mills action:

$$\begin{aligned}I_{\text{YM}} &= -\frac{1}{2g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int d^4x \text{Tr} (F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}) = -\frac{1}{4g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int d^4x \text{Tr} (F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + *F_{\mu\nu} *F^{\mu\nu}) \\ &= -\frac{1}{4g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int d^4x \text{Tr} \left((F_{\mu\nu} \pm *F^{\mu\nu})^2 \mp 2F_{\mu\nu} *F^{\mu\nu} \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{4g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int d^4x \text{Tr} (F_{\mu\nu} \mp *F^{\mu\nu})^2 \pm \underbrace{\frac{8\pi^2}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \left[\frac{-1}{16\pi^2} \int d^4x \text{Tr} (F_{\mu\nu} *F^{\mu\nu}) \right]}_{=:\nu[A_\mu]} \quad (\text{A.33})\end{aligned}$$

The condition that the square part in the final line should be zero is just the same as the ASD equation. The second term $\nu[A_\mu]$ in the RHS takes an integer. The gauge field should be pure-gauge at infinity, that is, $A_\mu \approx g^{-1} \partial_\mu g$, $\exists g \in SU(N)$. (then $F_{\mu\nu} \approx 0$.) Then the integer $\nu[A_\mu]$ is called the *instanton number*. Here we consider the instantons whose instanton number is $-k$. (k ASD instantons):

- instanton number (the gauge field behaves at infinity as pure gauge: $A_\mu \approx g^{-1} \partial_\mu g$, $\exists g \in SU(N)$)

$$\begin{aligned}\nu[A_\mu] &:= -\frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int d^4x \text{Tr} (F_{\mu\nu} *F^{\mu\nu}) = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int \text{Tr} (F \wedge F) \\ &= -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int d\text{Tr} \left(A \wedge dA + \frac{2}{3} A \wedge A \wedge A \right) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Stokes}}{=} -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_{S^3} \text{Tr} \underbrace{\left(A \wedge dA + \frac{2}{3} A \wedge A \wedge A \right)}_{=A \wedge F - \frac{1}{3} A \wedge A \wedge A}\end{aligned}$$

²⁸If we treat SD instantons, then we have only to replace e_μ with \bar{e}_μ .

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{24\pi^2} \int_{S^3} \text{Tr} ((g^{-1}dg) \wedge (g^{-1}dg) \wedge (g^{-1}dg)) \in \mathbf{Z} \\
&= -k.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.34}$$

Furthermore we need the condition that D^2 has the inverse:

- D^2 is invertible (there exists the Green function $G(x, y)$ of D^2):

$$D_x^2 \exists G(x, y) = -\delta(x - y), \quad G(x, y) \simeq \mathcal{O}(r^{-2}). \tag{A.35}$$

Exactly speaking, more detailed conditions are needed, which is written in [69].

The gauge transformation is defined as usual:

- gauge transformation

$$A_\mu \rightarrow g^{-1}A_\mu g + g^{-1}\partial_\mu g, \quad g(x) \in SU(N). \tag{A.36}$$

Instantons whose instanton number is $-k$ is specified by finite parameters up to the freedom of the gauge transformation The space of the parameters is represented by $\mathcal{M}_{N,k}^{\text{inst}}$

Let us summarize instantons:

Instantons

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_{N,k}^{\text{inst}} &= \frac{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{ASD equation} \\ A_\mu : N \times N \text{ anti-Hermite matrices} \\ \nu[A_\mu] = -k \\ \bar{\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{D} : \text{invertible} \end{array} \right\}}{(A_\mu \sim g^{-1}A_\mu g + g^{-1}\partial_\mu g, \quad g(x) \in SU(N))} \\
\dim \mathcal{M}_{N,k}^{\text{inst}} &= \begin{cases} 4Nk - N^2 + 1 & N \leq 2k \\ 4k^2 + 1 & N > 2k \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{A.37}$$

The dimension of instanton moduli space $\dim \mathcal{M}_{N,k}^{\text{inst}}$ is calculated by using the results of Atiyah-Singer index theorem

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_k^{\text{inst}} = 4hk - \frac{\chi + \sigma}{2} \dim G, \tag{A.38}$$

where h , χ and σ are the dual Coxeter number of the gauge group G , Euler number of the base manifold and signature of the base manifold. (See Diagram 1, 2.)

Diagram 1: simply-connected compact simple Lie group

Lie group G	rank	dimension	the dual Coxeter number h
$SU(N)$ ($N \geq 2$)	$N - 1$	$N^2 - 1$	N
$SO(N)$ ($N \geq 2$)	$\left\lfloor \frac{N}{2} \right\rfloor$	$\frac{1}{2}N(N - 1)$	$N - 2$ ($N \geq 4$)
$Sp(N)_{[2N] \times [2N]}$	N	$N(2N + 1)$	$N + 1$
G_2	2	14	4
F_4	4	52	9
E_6	6	78	12
E_7	7	133	18
E_8	8	248	30

Diagram 2: Euler numbers χ and signatures σ of four-manifolds

four-manifold	Euler number χ	signature σ
T^4	0	0
S^4	2	0
$\mathbf{C}P_2$	3	-1
$S^2 \times S^2$	4	0
$K3$	24	-16

(ADHM)

Next let us define ADHM data which is the dual of instantons on “0-dimensional space” as we mention in the end of the previous subsection. That is why ADHM side contains no derivative.

Let us define the (dual) “0-dimensional Dirac operator” ∇ as follows:

$$\nabla(x) := Cx - D, \quad (\text{A.39})$$

where

$$x := x^\mu \otimes e_\mu = \begin{pmatrix} x^4 - ix^3 & -(x^2 + ix^1) \\ x^2 - ix^1 & x^4 + ix^3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{z}_2 & -z_1 \\ \bar{z}_1 & z_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A.40})$$

and x^μ or $z_{1,2}$ represents the coordinates of \mathbf{R}^4 or \mathbf{C}^2 , respectively. Here the symbol x in Eq. (A.39) means precisely $x \otimes 1_{[k]}$. This kind of omission is sometimes used in this appendix. The matrix C is $(N + 2k) \times 2k$ constant matrix:

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{[N] \times [2k]} \\ 1_{[2k] \times [2k]} \end{pmatrix}_{[N+2k] \times [2k]}. \quad (\text{A.41})$$

Hence the matrix D has all the information and is called *ADHM data* and is represented in various ways:

$$\begin{aligned}
D &= \begin{pmatrix} -S_{[N] \times [2k]} \\ T_{[2k] \times [2k]} \end{pmatrix}_{[N+2k] \times [2k]} = \begin{pmatrix} -S_{[N] \times [2k]} \\ e_{\mu[2] \times [2]} \otimes T_{[k] \times [k]}^{\mu} \end{pmatrix}_{[N+2k] \times [2k]} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} -I^{\dagger} & -J \\ T^4 - iT^3 & -(T^2 + iT^1) \\ T^2 - iT^1 & T^4 + iT^3 \end{pmatrix}_{[N+2k] \times [2k]} = \begin{pmatrix} -I^{\dagger} & -J \\ B_2^{\dagger} & -B_1 \\ B_1^{\dagger} & B_2 \end{pmatrix}_{[N+2k] \times [2k]}, \tag{A.42}
\end{aligned}$$

where the matrices $I, J, B_{1,2}$ are $k \times N, N \times k, k \times k$ complex matrices and $B_{1,2}$ is the complex representation of T_{μ} ($k \times k$ Hermitian matrix). (Please do not confuse the matrix D in eq. (A.39) with the covariant derivative D_{μ} in (instanton).)

Then the “0-dimensional Dirac operator” can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla(x) &= \begin{pmatrix} S \\ e_{\mu} \otimes (x^{\mu} - T^{\mu}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I^{\dagger} & J \\ \bar{z}_2 - B_2^{\dagger} & -(z_1 - B_1) \\ \bar{z}_1 - B_1^{\dagger} & z_2 - B_2 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\nabla(x)^{\dagger} &= \begin{pmatrix} S^{\dagger} & \bar{e}_{\mu} \otimes (x^{\mu} - T^{\mu}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I & z_2 - B_2 & z_1 - B_1 \\ J^{\dagger} & -(\bar{z}_1 - B_1^{\dagger}) & \bar{z}_2 - B_2^{\dagger} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{A.43}
\end{aligned}$$

Now let us introduce the (dual) “0-dimensional ASD equation,” in the similar way as instantons. We take the condition “ $\nabla^{\dagger} \nabla$ should commutes with Pauli matrices” as the dual ASD equation. This is concretely written down as:

- ADHM equation (“0-dimensional ASD equation”):

$$\begin{cases} [T_1, T_2] + [T_3, T_4] - \frac{i}{2}(I^{\dagger}I - JJ^{\dagger}) = 0, \\ [T_1, T_3] - [T_2, T_4] - \frac{1}{2}(IJ + J^{\dagger}J^{\dagger}) = 0, \\ [T_1, T_4] + [T_2, T_3] - \frac{i}{2}(IJ - J^{\dagger}J^{\dagger}) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{real rep.}) \tag{A.44}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} (\mu_{\mathbf{R}} :=) [B_1, B_1^{\dagger}] + [B_2, B_2^{\dagger}] + II^{\dagger} - J^{\dagger}J = 0, \\ (\mu_{\mathbf{C}} :=) [B_1, B_2] + IJ = 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{complex rep.}) \tag{A.45}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \text{tr}(\sigma^i(S^{\dagger}S + T^{\dagger}T)) = 0. \quad (\forall i = 1, 2, 3) \tag{A.46}$$

The LHS in the complex representation is often represented as $\mu_{\mathbf{R}}, \mu_{\mathbf{C}}$ in the context of hyperKähler quotient [126]. Here we note that ADHM data $T^{\mu}, B_{1,2}$ always appear in pair with the coordinates $x^{\mu}, z_{1,2}$ and therefore the existence of the commutators of ADHM data implies that of the coordinates, such as $\mu_{\mathbf{R}} = -[z_1, \bar{z}_1] - [z_2, \bar{z}_2]$. The commutator of the coordinate is zero on commutative space, of course, however, on noncommutative spaces this causes various important results.

Now we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(\nabla(x)^\dagger \nabla(x)) &= \begin{pmatrix} \square & 0_{[k]} \\ 0_{[k]} & \square \end{pmatrix}_{[2k] \times [2k]}, \\
\square(x)_{[k]} &= \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(D^\dagger D) + 2T_\mu x^\mu + |x|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.47}$$

As in instanton case, there needs to be the following condition:

- \square is invertible (The existence of the inverse matrix f)

$$\square^\exists f = 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad f(x)_{[k]} = \square^{-1} \simeq \mathcal{O}(r^2). \tag{A.48}$$

There exists the transformation which leaves ADHM equation and the constant matrix C and is called the ‘‘gauge transformation’’ of ADHM data:

- ‘‘gauge transformation’’ of ADHM data

$$I \rightarrow R^\dagger I Q^\dagger, \quad J \rightarrow Q J R, \quad T_\mu \rightarrow R^\dagger T_\mu R, \quad Q \in SU(N), \quad R \in U(k) \tag{A.49}$$

Let us consider the quotient space of the ADHM data by the equivalent relation (A.49) and represent it as $\mathcal{M}_{k,N}^{\text{ADHM}}$, which is called the moduli space of ADHM data. The dimension of the moduli space $\dim \mathcal{M}_{k,N}^{\text{ADHM}}$ can be easily calculated from the constraints:

- For $N \leq 2k$

$$\begin{aligned}
\dim \mathcal{M}_{k,N}^{\text{ADHM}} &= \underbrace{2 \cdot 2k(N + 2k)}_D - \underbrace{3k^2}_{(A.44)} - \underbrace{4k^2}_{T_\mu^\dagger = T_\mu} - \underbrace{(N^2 - 1)}_Q - \underbrace{k^2}_R \\
&= 4Nk - N^2 + 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.50}$$

- For $N > 2k$

The same calculation as $N \leq 2k$ case over-subtracts the degree of freedom of $U(N - 2k)$ $N \leq 2k$,

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_{k,N}^{\text{ADHM}} = 4Nk - N^2 + 1 + (N - 2k)^2 = 4k^2 + 1. \tag{A.51}$$

This shows the beautiful coincident: $\dim \mathcal{M}_{k,N}^{\text{ADHM}} = \dim \mathcal{M}_{N,k}^{\text{inst}}$.

Let us summarize on the ADHM data:

ADHM data

$$\mathcal{M}_{k,N}^{\text{ADHM}} = \frac{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} D^{(k,N)} = \left(\begin{array}{c} -S^{(k,N)} \\ e_\mu \otimes T^{\mu(k)} \end{array} \right) \quad \left. \begin{array}{l} \text{ADHM equation} \\ T^\mu : k \times k \text{ Hermite matrix} \\ S : N \times 2k \text{ complex matrices} \\ \nabla^\dagger \nabla \text{ is invertible.} \end{array} \right\}}{(I \sim R^\dagger I Q^\dagger, J \sim Q J R, T_\mu \sim R^\dagger T_\mu R, Q \in SU(N), R \in U(k))}$$

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_{k,N}^{\text{ADHM}} = \begin{cases} 4Nk - N^2 + 1 & N \leq 2k \\ 4k^2 + 1 & N > 2k \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.52})$$

The goal of this subsection is to outline the proof of

$$\mathcal{M}_{N,k}^{\text{inst } 1:1} \stackrel{1:1}{=} \mathcal{M}_{k,N}^{\text{ADHM}}. \quad (\text{A.53})$$

For simplicity, let us take $N \leq 2k$ case.

(ADHM) \rightarrow (Instanton)

Now we show the detailed discussion of the main part of ADHM construction: From given ADHM data $S^{(k,N)}, T_\mu^{(k)}$ to instantons $A_\mu = A_\mu(S, T)$. We present how to construct the gauge field from the ADHM data and then check that the gauge field satisfies all of the properties on instantons.

First let us consider the following “0-dimensional Dirac equation”:

$$\nabla^\dagger V = 0, \quad (\text{A.54})$$

where V is called the “0-dimensional Dirac zero-mode.” The number of the normalized zero-mode V is $(N + 2k - 2k =) N$ and we can arrange the independent N solution at each row and consider $V = V_{[N+2k] \times [N]}$. The normalization condition is

$$V^\dagger V = 1_{[N]}. \quad (\text{A.55})$$

Taking “0-dimensional Dirac equation,” normalization condition and the invertibility of $\nabla^\dagger \nabla$ into account, we get the following relation:

$$V V^\dagger = 1_{[N+2k]} - \nabla f \nabla^\dagger. \quad (\text{A.56})$$

In order to prove it, let us introduce the convenient matrix W as

$$W := \left(\begin{array}{c} \nabla \quad V \end{array} \right)_{[N+2k] \times [N+2k]}. \quad (\text{A.57})$$

From Eqs. (A.48), (A.54), (A.55), the $(N + 2k)$ rows of the matrix W is independent to each other and there exists the inverse of W . Hence

$$W(W^\dagger W)^{-1}W^\dagger \equiv 1 \Leftrightarrow V(\underbrace{V^\dagger V}_{=1})^{-1}V^\dagger + \nabla(\nabla^\dagger \nabla)^{-1}\nabla^\dagger = 1, \quad (\text{A.58})$$

which implies (A.56).

The condition (A.56) shows the completeness of the each rows of W in $(N + 2k)$ -dimensional vector space and is called the *completeness condition*.

The matrix W simplifies the relations:

$$W^\dagger W \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \nabla^\dagger \nabla & \nabla^\dagger V \\ V^\dagger \nabla & V^\dagger V \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1_{[2]} \otimes \square_{[k]} & O \\ O & 1_{[N]} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.59})$$

Here let us introduce

$$P := VV^\dagger, \quad (\text{A.60})$$

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} u_{[N] \times [N]} \\ v_{[2k] \times [N]} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_{[N] \times [N]} \\ v_1_{[k] \times [N]} \\ v_2_{[k] \times [N]} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.61})$$

$$v = C^\dagger V, \quad (\text{A.62})$$

where P is the projection in $(N + 2k)$ -dimensional space onto the N -dimensional subspace.

From the zero-mode V , we can construct the gauge field A_μ as

$$A_\mu = V^\dagger \partial_\mu V \approx \mathcal{O}(r^{-1}). \quad (\text{A.63})$$

The normalization condition (A.55) shows $A_\mu^\dagger = -A_\mu$ (anti-Hermitian) and $G = U(N)$.

The geometrical meaning of (A.63) is as follows. The covariant derivative on the N -dimensional subspace spanned by V_u ($u = 1, \dots, N$) could be defined from the natural, trivial covariant derivative ∂_μ on $(N + 2k)$ -dimensional space as the projection onto the N -dimensional space: $D_\mu := P\partial_\mu$. By acting the covariant derivative to the function $s(x)$ restricted on the subspace, which is spanned by $V^u s_u(x)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} D_\mu(V^u s_u) = P\partial_\mu(V^v s_v) &= V^u V_u^\dagger (V^v (\partial_\mu s_v) + (\partial_\mu V^v) s_v) \\ &= V^u (\delta_{uv} \partial_\mu + (V_u^\dagger \partial_\mu V^v)) s_v. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.64})$$

Here the second term of the RHS $V_u^\dagger \partial_\mu V^v$ should be just the gauge field $A_{\mu u}{}^v$ which is consistent with (A.63). The important point here is that we take the Dirac zero-mode as the basis of the subspace.

Here we present some important relations:

$$\partial_\mu f = -f(\partial_\mu f^{-1})f, \quad (\text{A.65})$$

$$e_\mu \nabla^\dagger C e_\mu = -2C^\dagger \nabla, \quad (\text{A.66})$$

$$D_\mu V^\dagger = V^\dagger \partial_\mu (V V^\dagger) = -V^\dagger C f e_\mu \nabla^\dagger, \quad (\text{A.67})$$

$$D^2 V^\dagger = -4V^\dagger C f C^\dagger, \quad (\text{A.68})$$

$$D^2 u^\dagger = 0, \quad (\text{A.69})$$

$$\text{Tr} (F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}) = -\partial^2 \partial^2 \log \det f. \quad (\text{A.70})$$

Eqs. (A.65)-(A.68) holds even when C is not the canonical form (A.41). The proof of (A.70) is found in [70]. (See also [54, 196].)

So far we define how to construct the gauge field from the ADHM data via “0-dimensional Dirac equation.” Next let us check this gauge field is the $G = SU(N)$, k -instanton.

First we check the anti-self-duality by calculating the field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$ from $A_\mu = V^\dagger \partial_\mu V$:

$$\begin{aligned} F &= dA + A \wedge A \\ &= dV^\dagger \wedge dV + V^\dagger dV \wedge V^\dagger dV = dV^\dagger \wedge dV - dV^\dagger V \wedge V^\dagger dV \\ &= dV^\dagger (1 - V V^\dagger) \wedge dV \stackrel{(\text{A.56})}{=} dV^\dagger \nabla f \nabla^\dagger \wedge dV \\ &\stackrel{(\text{A.54})}{=} V^\dagger (d\nabla) f \wedge (d\nabla^\dagger) V = V^\dagger C e_\mu dx^\mu f \wedge dx^\nu \bar{e}_\nu C^\dagger V \\ &\stackrel{(\text{A.48})^{-1}}{=} V^\dagger C dx^\mu f \wedge dx^\nu e_\mu \bar{e}_\nu C^\dagger V \stackrel{(\text{A.20})}{=} iV^\dagger C f \underbrace{\eta_{\mu\nu}^{(-)}}_{\text{ASD}} C^\dagger V dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.71})$$

$$F_{\mu\nu} = 2iV^\dagger C f \eta_{\mu\nu}^{(-)} C^\dagger V = 2iv^\dagger f \eta_{\mu\nu}^{(-)} v. \quad (\text{A.72})$$

Next in order to show the gauge field A_μ behaves at infinity as pure gauge, let us examine the behavior at infinity. At the region $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, “0-dimensional Dirac equation” (A.54) becomes $x^\dagger C^\dagger V \approx 0$, and hence $v \approx 0$. Then the normalization condition (A.55) shows $u \approx \exists g(x) \in U(N)$ and

$$A_\mu \approx g^{-1} \partial_\mu g. \quad (\text{A.73})$$

Multiplying the both hands of (A.54) by x , we get

$$V^\dagger C = \frac{V^\dagger D x^\dagger}{|x|^2} \quad (\text{A.74})$$

Hence the behavior of V at infinity is summarized as

$$V_x = \begin{pmatrix} u_x \\ v_x \end{pmatrix} \approx \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{O}(1) \\ \mathcal{O}(r^{-1}) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.75})$$

Instanton number is calculated by using Eq. (A.70):

$$\begin{aligned} \nu[A_\mu] &= -\frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int d^4x \operatorname{Tr} (F_{\mu\nu} * F^{\mu\nu}) = -\frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int d^4x \partial^2 \partial^2 \log \det f \\ &= -\frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int dS_x^\mu \partial_\mu \partial^2 \operatorname{Tr}_k \log \underbrace{f}_{\approx |x|^{-2}} = -\frac{8}{16\pi^2} \int d\Omega_x \operatorname{Tr}_k 1_{[k]} = -k, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.76})$$

where $d\Omega_x$ denotes surface element of x -space whose radius is 1 and $\int d\Omega_x = 2\pi^2$. (The surface area S^{n-1} of the $n-1$ -dimensional sphere with the radius r is $\operatorname{Vol}(S_r^{n-1}) = \frac{2\pi^{\frac{n}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})} r^{n-1}$, where $\Gamma(1) = 1$, $\Gamma(\frac{1}{2}) = \sqrt{\pi}$.)

The invertibilities of D^2 is proved from the existence of the Green function of D^2 which is concretely represented as [49]:

$$G(x, y) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \frac{V_x^\dagger V_y}{|x - y|^2}, \quad (\text{A.77})$$

which satisfies $D^2 G(x, y) = -\delta(x - y)$.

In order to prove it, let us calculate the LHS first:

$$\begin{aligned} &D^2 G(x, y) \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \left\{ \underbrace{\partial_x^2 \left(\frac{1}{|x - y|^2} \right)}_{-4\pi^2 \delta(x-y)} V_x^\dagger V_y + 2\partial_{x\mu} \left(\frac{1}{|x - y|^2} \right) D_x^\mu V_x^\dagger V_y + \frac{1}{|x - y|^2} D_x^2 V_x^\dagger V_y \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.78})$$

Here let us discuss both in $x = y$ case and in $x \neq y$ case.

- When $x = y$, using Eq. (A.67),

$$D_x^\mu V_x^\dagger V_y = -V_x^\dagger C f e^\mu \underbrace{\nabla_{x=y}^\dagger V_y}_{=0}. \quad (\text{A.79})$$

Hence the second and third terms in Eq. (A.78) vanish. Therefore,

$$D^2 G(x, y) = -\delta(x - y) \underbrace{V_{x=y}^\dagger V_y}_{=1} = -\delta(x - y). \quad (\text{A.80})$$

- When $x \neq y$, by using Eq. (A.68),

$$\begin{aligned}
D^2G(x, y) &= -\underbrace{\delta(x-y)}_{=0} V_x^\dagger V_y + \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \left\{ 2\partial_{x\mu} \left(\frac{1}{|x-y|^2} \right) D_x^\mu V_x^\dagger V_y + \frac{1}{|x-y|^2} D_x^2 V_x^\dagger V_y \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \left\{ \frac{(x-y)^\mu}{|x-y|^4} (V_x^\dagger C f e_\mu \nabla_x^\dagger) V_y + \frac{1}{|x-y|^2} (-4V_x^\dagger C f C^\dagger) V_y \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{\pi^2 |x-y|^2} V_x^\dagger C f \left\{ \frac{(x-y)^\mu}{|x-y|^2} e_\mu (\nabla_y^\dagger + (x-y)^\dagger C^\dagger) - C^\dagger \right\} V_y \\
&= \frac{1}{\pi^2 |x-y|^2} V_x^\dagger C f \left\{ \underbrace{\frac{(x-y)^\mu}{|x-y|^2} (x-y)^\nu (\delta_{\mu\nu} + i\eta_{\mu\nu}^{(-)}) - 1}_{=1+0} \right\} C^\dagger V_y = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.81}$$

Now Eq. (A.77) is proved.

The transformation of V

$$V \rightarrow Vg, \quad g(x) \in SU(N) \tag{A.82}$$

preserves Eqs. (A.54)-(A.56) and is equal to the gauge transformation of A_μ :

$$A_\mu \longrightarrow A'_\mu = (Vg)^\dagger \partial_\mu (Vg) = g^{-1} \underbrace{(V^\dagger \partial_\mu V)}_{A_\mu} g + g^{-1} \partial_\mu g. \tag{A.83}$$

We note that this discussion (ADHM) \longrightarrow (Instanton) holds even when the matrix C is not the canonical form (A.41) but a general complex matrix. This restriction does not lose generality because it is always taken by the following degree of freedom. Now let us suppose that C is a general complex matrix and consider the following transformation:

$$\begin{aligned}
D \rightarrow D' &= UDR, \quad C \rightarrow C' = UCR, \quad V \rightarrow V' = UV \\
U &\in U(N+2k), \quad R \in GL(k; \mathbf{C}) \otimes 1_{[2]}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.84}$$

This preserve the Eqs. (A.44), (A.54)-(A.56). By using this degree of freedom, we can set C the canonical form (A.41).

(Instanton) \longrightarrow (ADHM)

Here we discuss the inverse construction (Instanton) \longrightarrow (ADHM), that is, we construct the ADHM data $S = S(A)$, $T_\mu = T_\mu(A)$ from given $SU(N)$, k -instantons $A_\mu^{(N,k)}$. We have to show that the S, T_μ have all the properties of ADHM data.

First let us consider the massless Dirac equation in the background of instanton A_μ :

$$\bar{\mathcal{D}}\psi = 0. \quad (\text{A.85})$$

The solution ψ is called Dirac zero-mode and it is shown that there are independent k solutions by Atiyah-Singer index theorem. Hence we can consider ψ as $2N \times k$ matrix whose k rows are consist of the normalized k zero-mode and the normalization condition is

$$\int d^4x \psi^\dagger \psi = 1_{[k]}. \quad (\text{A.86})$$

The completeness condition is

$$\psi(x)\psi^\dagger(y) = \delta(x-y) + \mathcal{D}G(x,y) \overleftarrow{\mathcal{D}}, \quad (\text{A.87})$$

where $G(x,y)$ is Green function of D^2 . This condition is guaranteed by the normalizability of ψ and the invertibility of D^2 as in (ADHM) \rightarrow (instanton).

Here we introduce the following symbol on the spinor index of ψ :

$$\tilde{\psi} := \psi^t \cdot e_2, \quad (\text{A.88})$$

where ψ^t is the transposed matrix of ψ w.r.t. spinor indices and is considered as $N \times 2k$ matrix.

From the zero-mode ψ , we can construct ADHM data S, T as

$$\tilde{\psi} \approx -\frac{g^\dagger S x^\dagger}{\pi|x|^4} + \mathcal{O}(r^{-4}), \quad (\text{A.89})$$

$$T_\mu = \int d^4x \psi^\dagger x_\mu \psi, \quad (\text{A.90})$$

where g is just the $N \times N$ matrix which appears in the asymptotic behavior of A_μ : $A_\mu \approx g^{-1} \partial_\mu g$. The matrices S, T_μ are actually $N \times 2k, k \times k$. We can easily show that T_μ is Hermitian.

Let us check that the data (A.89) and (A.90) satisfies ADHM equation (A.46). In order to do so, we calculate first

$$T^\mu T^\nu = \int d^4x x^\mu \psi^\dagger(x) \psi(x) \int d^4y y^\nu \psi^\dagger(y) \psi(y). \quad (\text{A.91})$$

Substituting the completeness condition (A.87) into Eq. (A.91), we get

$$T^\mu T^\nu = \int d^4x x^\mu x^\nu \psi^\dagger(x) \psi(x) + \int d^4x d^4y x^\mu y^\nu \psi^\dagger(x) e^\rho \bar{e}^\sigma D_\rho G(x,y) \overleftarrow{D}_\sigma \psi(y). \quad (\text{A.92})$$

The explanation of the integrals are done by restricting the integral region within $|x| \leq R_x$, $|y| \leq R_y$ and taking the limit $R_x \rightarrow \infty$, $R_y \rightarrow \infty$. This integral contains diverse parts which are dropped out in the contraction by 't Hooft's eta symbol and cause no problem. The twice integration of the second term of (A.92) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{The second term of (A.92)} &= \int x^\mu d^4x y^\nu d^4y \text{tr} \left(\bar{e}^\rho \tilde{\psi}^\dagger(x) D_\rho G(x, y) \overleftarrow{D}_\sigma \tilde{\psi}(y) e^\sigma \right) \\
&= - \int x^\mu dS_x^\rho y^\nu dS_y^\sigma \text{tr} \left(\bar{e}^\rho \tilde{\psi}^\dagger(x) G(x, y) \tilde{\psi}(y) e^\sigma \right) \\
&\quad + \int d^4x y^\nu dS_y^\sigma \text{tr} \left(\bar{e}^\mu \tilde{\psi}^\dagger(x) G(x, y) \tilde{\psi}(y) e^\sigma \right) \\
&\quad + \int x^\mu dS_x^\rho d^4y \text{tr} \left(\bar{e}^\rho \tilde{\psi}^\dagger(x) G(x, y) \tilde{\psi}(y) e^\nu \right) \\
&\quad - \int d^4x d^4y \text{tr} \left(\bar{e}^\mu \tilde{\psi}^\dagger(x) G(x, y) \tilde{\psi}(y) e^\nu \right), \tag{A.93}
\end{aligned}$$

where the volume integral and the surface integral are taken within the region $|x| \leq R_x$, $|y| \leq R_y$ and within $|x| = R_x$, $|y| = R_y$, respectively.

Here let us take $R_y \rightarrow \infty$ first. Then the first and second terms of (A.93) become

$$\int \underbrace{y^\nu dS_y^\sigma}_{\mathcal{O}(R_y^4)} \underbrace{G(x, y)}_{\mathcal{O}(R_y^{-2})} \underbrace{\tilde{\psi}(y)}_{\mathcal{O}(R_y^{-3})} \approx \mathcal{O}(R_y^{-1}) \xrightarrow{R_y \rightarrow \infty} 0. \tag{A.94}$$

The third term of (A.93) behaves

$$\int \underbrace{d^4y}_{\mathcal{O}(R_y^4)} \underbrace{G(x, y)}_{\mathcal{O}(R_y^{-2})} \underbrace{\tilde{\psi}(y)}_{\mathcal{O}(R_y^{-3})} \approx \mathcal{O}(R_y^{-1}), \tag{A.95}$$

which shows that the integration converges. In order to evaluate the integral, let consider the following differential equation:

$$D^2 \tilde{\chi}(x) = -4\pi \tilde{\psi}(x), \quad \tilde{\chi}(x) \approx 0. \tag{A.96}$$

From Eq. (A.89), we can see

$$\tilde{\chi}(x) \approx -\frac{g^\dagger S x^\dagger}{|x|^2}. \tag{A.97}$$

Eq. (A.96) is equivalent to

$$\int d^4y G(x, y) \tilde{\psi}(y) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \tilde{\chi}(x), \tag{A.98}$$

and the third term of (A.93) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int x^\mu dS_x^\rho d^4y \operatorname{tr} \left(\bar{e}^\rho \tilde{\psi}^\dagger(x) G(x, y) \tilde{\psi}(y) e^\nu \right) \\
& \xrightarrow{R_y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{4\pi} \int x^\mu dS_x^\rho \operatorname{tr} \left(\bar{e}_\rho \tilde{\psi}^\dagger(x) \tilde{\chi}(x) e^\nu \right) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int x^\mu \frac{x^\rho}{|x|} |x|^3 d\Omega_x \operatorname{tr} \left(\frac{\bar{e}_\rho x S^\dagger S x^\dagger e^\nu}{|x|^6} \right) \\
& \xrightarrow{R_x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int \frac{x^\mu}{|x|^2} d\Omega_x \operatorname{tr} \left(S^\dagger S x^\dagger e^\nu \right) = \frac{1}{8} \operatorname{tr} \left(S^\dagger S \bar{e}^\mu e^\nu \right). \tag{A.99}
\end{aligned}$$

Now let us contract the both side of Eq. (A.92) by $\eta_{\mu\nu}^{(+)}$. Though the first term of Eq. (A.92) and the fourth term (A.93) diverse, they drop out by the contraction by $\eta_{\mu\nu}^{(+)}$ which is SD and anti-symmetric w.r.t. $\mu \leftrightarrow \nu$. The fourth term of (A.93) is ASD because \bar{e} moves to the right side of e through the spinor trace. Then we get

$$\eta_{\mu\nu}^{(+)} \left(T^\mu T^\nu - \frac{1}{8} \operatorname{tr} \left(S^\dagger S \bar{e}^\mu e^\nu \right) \right) = 0. \tag{A.100}$$

By using the relations on 't Hooft's eta symbol (A.27), (A.28), we obtain ADHM equation:

$$\operatorname{tr} \left(\sigma^i (S^\dagger S + T^\dagger T) \right) = 0. \tag{A.101}$$

We can also check the invertibility of $\nabla^\dagger \nabla$ basically showing $f \sim (\partial^2)^{-1} \psi^\dagger \psi$ as Eq. (A.105), which shows the existence of the inverse f of $\nabla^\dagger \nabla$.

The transformation for g, ψ

$$g \rightarrow Q^\dagger g, \quad \psi \rightarrow \psi R, \quad Q \in SU(N), \quad R \in U(k) \tag{A.102}$$

preserves Eqs. (A.85)-(A.87) and $A_\mu \approx g^{-1} \partial_\mu g$ and hence is “the gauge transformation” for S, T_μ .

Completeness: (ADHM) \longrightarrow (Instanton) \longrightarrow (ADHM)

In this section, we prove the completeness, that is, the composite transformation: ADHM construction and the inverse construction should be identity. We start with a given ADHM data $S^{(k,N)}, T_\mu^{(k)}$ and construct the instantons $A_\mu = A_\mu(S, T)$ in ADHM construction and reconstruct from the instantons ADHM data $S'^{(k',N')} = S'^{(k',N')}(A(S, T)), T'^{(k')} = T'^{(k')}(A(S, T))$. We show that the reconstructed ADHM data coincides with the original ones $S^{(k,N)}, T_\mu^{(k)}$ ($k' = k, N' = N, S' = S, T'_\mu = T_\mu$).

The solution ψ of the Dirac equation (A.85) can be represented by the ADHM data D and the descendents V, f as

$$\tilde{\psi} = \frac{1}{\pi} V^\dagger C f = \frac{1}{\pi} v^\dagger f, \tag{A.103}$$

which is proved by $\bar{D}\psi = 0 \Leftrightarrow D_\mu \tilde{\psi} e^\mu = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi D_\mu \tilde{\psi} e^\mu &= D_\mu (V^\dagger C e^\mu f) = \left\{ \partial_\mu V^\dagger + (V^\dagger \partial_\mu V) V^\dagger \right\} C e^\mu f + V^\dagger C e^\mu \partial_\mu f \\
&= \partial_\mu V^\dagger (1 - V V^\dagger) C e^\mu f - V^\dagger C e^\mu f \partial_\mu (\nabla^\dagger \nabla) f \\
&= (\partial_\mu V^\dagger) \nabla f \nabla^\dagger C e^\mu f - V^\dagger C e^\mu f (\bar{e}_\mu C^\dagger \nabla + \nabla^\dagger C e_\mu) f \\
&\stackrel{(A.66)}{=} -V^\dagger \underbrace{(C e_\mu f \nabla^\dagger C e^\mu + 4C f C^\dagger \nabla - 2C f C^\dagger \nabla)}_{-2f C^\dagger \nabla} f = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.104}$$

There is an important relation between ψ and f :

$$\psi^\dagger \psi = -\frac{1}{4\pi^2} \partial^2 f. \tag{A.105}$$

The proof is straightforward in similar way. Eq. (A.48) implies

$$f = \square^{-1} = \frac{1}{|x|^2} \left(1_{[k]} - \frac{2T_\mu x^\mu}{|x|^2} + \frac{\text{tr}(D^\dagger D)}{2|x|^2} \right)^{-1} \tag{A.106}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1_{[k]}}{|x|^2} + \frac{2T_\mu x^\mu}{|x|^4} - \frac{\text{tr}(D^\dagger D)}{2|x|^4} + \frac{4(T_\mu x^\mu)^2}{|x|^6} + \frac{2T_\mu x^\mu \text{tr}(D^\dagger D)}{|x|^6} + \frac{(\text{tr}(D^\dagger D))^2}{4|x|^6} + \dots \\
\psi^\dagger \psi &= \delta^4(x) \cdot 1_{[k]} + \frac{\text{tr}(S^\dagger S)}{\pi^2 |x|^6} - \frac{9\text{tr}(D^\dagger D) T_\mu x^\mu}{4\pi^2 |x|^8} - \frac{3(\text{tr}(D^\dagger D))^2}{2\pi^2 |x|^8} + \dots,
\end{aligned} \tag{A.107}$$

which gives the proof of the normalization condition of ψ :

$$\int d^4x \psi^\dagger \psi = 1_{[k]}. \tag{A.108}$$

Eq. (A.90) gives rise to new ADHM data as

$$\begin{aligned}
(T'^\mu) &= \int d^4x \psi^\dagger x^\mu \psi \stackrel{(A.105)}{=} -\frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int dS^\nu \underbrace{(x^\mu \partial_\nu - \delta_\nu^\mu) f}_{\mathcal{O}(r^{-4}) \text{ part vanishes}} \\
&\stackrel{(A.106)}{=} -\frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int dS^\nu \left\{ x^\mu \partial_\nu \left(\frac{-2T_\rho x^\rho}{|x|^4} \right) + \frac{2T_\rho x^\rho}{|x|^4} \delta_\nu^\mu \right\} \\
&= -\frac{T_\rho}{2\pi^2} \int \left\{ \underbrace{\left(\frac{x^\rho}{|x|} dS^\mu - \frac{x^\mu}{|x|} dS^\rho \right)}_{=0} \frac{1}{|x|^3} - \frac{x_\nu}{|x|^6} \underbrace{4x^\mu x^\rho dS^\nu}_{=\delta^{\mu\rho}|x|^2} \right\} \\
&= T^\mu,
\end{aligned} \tag{A.109}$$

which just coincides with the original one! In order to get new ADHM data S , let us examine the behavior of $\tilde{\psi}$ at infinity as Eq. (A.89). Substituting Eq. (A.74) into it and using the asymptotic form of V_x : “ $V_x \approx g$ ” and of f : (A.106), we get

$$\tilde{\psi} = \frac{V^\dagger D x^\dagger f}{\pi |x|^2} \approx -\frac{g^\dagger S x^\dagger}{\pi |x|^4}, \tag{A.110}$$

which shows that the reconstructed ADHM data S also coincides with the original one. This result is consistent with the asymptotic behavior of $\psi^\dagger\psi$ (A.107).

Uniqueness: (Instanton) \rightarrow (ADHM) \rightarrow (Instanton)

The opposite discussion of (ADHM) \rightarrow (instanton) \rightarrow (ADHM) is possible and we can show that the new instanton just coincides with the original ones. A key formula is

$$D_\mu V^\dagger = -\pi\tilde{\psi}e_\mu\nabla^\dagger, \tag{A.111}$$

which shows very beautiful duality. This is actually the composit of Eqs. (A.67) and (A.103).

In this way, we can show the one-to-one correspondence between the instanton moduli space and the moduli space of ADHM data, which makes the practical calculation on instantons very easy to treat.

Note

- ADHM constructions for other gauge groups are discussed in [90].
- ADHM constructions on the ALE spaces are discussed in [22, 155] and their D-brane interpretations are presented in [74].

A.3 Nahm Construction of Monopoles on \mathbf{R}^3

In this subsection, we review the application of ADHM construction to monopoles (Nahm construction) [181]-[185]. The proof of one-to-one correspondence between monopole moduli space and the moduli space of Nahm data is similar to ADHM construction. Hence here we just set up the notation and give a brief discussion pointing out the similarities and the differences.

(Monopole)

(BPS) monopoles are defined the translational invariant instantons which live on \mathbf{R}^3 whose coordinates are x^1, x^2, x^3 . For simplicity, suppose that $G = SU(2)$ and the self-duality is ASD.

As in instanton case, we have to define the “3-dimensional Dirac operator” first:

- “3-dimensional Dirac operator”

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_\mathbf{x}(\xi) &:= 1_{[2]} \otimes i(\xi - \Phi) + e^i \otimes D_i, \\ \bar{\mathcal{D}}_\mathbf{x}(\xi) &:= 1_{[2]} \otimes -i(\xi - \Phi) + e^i \otimes D_i = -\mathcal{D}, \end{aligned} \tag{A.112}$$

which can be interpreted to be obtained by replacing ∂_4, A_4 with $i\xi, -i\Phi$ in the 4-dimensional Dirac operator in instanton case.

Let us present the conditions similar to instantons:

- Bogomol'nyi equation (“3-dim ASD equation”)

$$B_i = -[D_i, \Phi], \quad (\text{A.113})$$

where $B_i := (i/2)\epsilon_{ijk}F^{jk}$ are magnetic fields. This equation comes from the condition that $\bar{\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{D}$ commutes with matrices.

Bogomol'nyi equation represents the condition that the energy functional of (3 + 1)-dimensional Yang-Mills-Higgs theory should take the minimum:

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \frac{1}{4} \int d^3x \text{Tr} [F_{ij}F^{ij} + 2D_i\Phi D^i\Phi] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x \text{Tr} (B_i \mp D_i\Phi)^2 \pm 2\pi a \underbrace{\left[\frac{1}{2\pi a} \int d^3x \text{Tr} \partial_i(B_i\Phi) \right]}_{=:\nu[\Phi, A_i]}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.114})$$

The second term in the RHS $\nu[\Phi, A_i]$ is just the definition of the monopole charge. If the behavior of the Higgs field at infinity is as follows up to degree of gauge freedom, the magnetic charge $\nu[\Phi, A_i]$ becomes $-k$:

$$\Phi \approx \left(\frac{a}{2} - \frac{k}{2r} \right) \sigma_3 + \mathcal{O}(r^{-2}). \quad (\text{A.115})$$

The vacuum expectation value of the Higgs is $a/2$. Then

- magnetic charge

$$\nu[\Phi, A_i] = \frac{1}{2\pi a} \int_{S^2} dS_i \text{Tr} (B_i\Phi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{S^2} dS_i B_i^{a=3} = -k. \quad (\text{A.116})$$

We need the following condition:

- $\bar{\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{D}$ is invertible:

$$\bar{\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{D}^3 G(\xi; \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = -\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}). \quad (\text{A.117})$$

The monopole moduli space is denoted by $\mathcal{M}_{2,k}^{\text{mono}}$ and parameterized by finite number of parameters. We summarize the $SU(2)$, k -monopole:

Monopoles

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{2,k}^{\text{mono}} &= \frac{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\Phi^{(2,k)}, A_i^{(2,k)}) \left| \begin{array}{l} \text{Bogomol'nyi equation} \\ A_\mu := (-i\Phi, A_i) : N \times N \text{ anti-Hermitian matrices} \\ \text{The b.c. of the Higgs field (A.115)} \\ \bar{D}D : \text{invertible} \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right\}}{(A_\mu \sim g^{-1}A_\mu g + g^{-1}\partial_\mu g, \quad g(\mathbf{x}) \in SU(2))} \\ \dim \mathcal{M}_{2,k}^{\text{mono}} &= 4k - 1 \end{aligned} \tag{A.118}$$

The dimension of the moduli space $\dim \mathcal{M}_{2,k}^{\text{mono}}$ is calculated by the index theorem [240, 51, 220]. The degree contains that of center of mass of the monopoles.

(Nahm)

Next we define Nahm data.

First we define the “1-dimensional Dirac operator” by using $k \times k$ Hermitian matrices $T_i(\xi)$:

- “1-dimensional Dirac operator”

$$\nabla_\xi(\mathbf{x}) = i\frac{d}{d\xi} + e_i(x^i - T^i), \quad \nabla_\xi(\mathbf{x})^\dagger = i\frac{d}{d\xi} + \bar{e}_i(x^i - T^i), \tag{A.119}$$

where x^i denotes the coordinates of \mathbf{R}^3 and ξ is an element of the interval $(-a/2, a/2)$ for $G = SU(2)$. The region of ξ depends on the gauge group and the way of the breaking. For example, in $G = U(2)$ case, the region is a finite interval (a_-, a_+) and in $G = U(1)$ case, it becomes semi-infinite.

- Nahm equation (“1-dim ASD equation” $\Leftrightarrow \nabla^\dagger \nabla$ commutes with Pauli matrices):

$$\frac{dT_i}{d\xi} = i\epsilon_{ijl}T_jT_l \tag{A.120}$$

- The boundary condition of $T_i(\xi)$

$$T_i(\xi) \xrightarrow{\xi \rightarrow \pm a/2} \frac{\tau_i}{\xi \mp \frac{a}{2}} + (\text{regular terms w.r.t. } \xi) \tag{A.121}$$

where τ_i : k -dimensional irreducible rep. of $SU(2)$ $[\tau_i, \tau_j] = i\epsilon_{ijl}\tau_l$.

The space of Nahm data up to gauge degree of freedom is denoted by $\mathcal{M}_{k,2}^{\text{Nahm}}$ and called the moduli space of Nahm data, which is summarized as follows:

Nahm data

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{k,2}^{\text{Nahm}} &= \frac{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} T_i^{(k,2)} \left| \begin{array}{l} \text{Nahm equation} \\ T_i : k \times k \text{ Hermitian matrices} \\ \text{The b.c. of Nahm data (A.121)} \\ \nabla^\dagger \nabla : \text{invertible} \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right\}}{(T_i \sim R^{-1} T_i R, \quad R(\xi) \in U(k))} \\ \dim \mathcal{M}_{k,2}^{\text{Nahm}} &= 4k - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.122})$$

The dimension is calculated directly from Nahm data [29].

There is a duality:

$$\mathcal{M}_{2,k}^{\text{mono}} \stackrel{1:1}{=} \mathcal{M}_{k,2}^{\text{Nahm}}, \quad (\text{A.123})$$

which is proved as in ADHM construction [52, 125, 184, 186].

(Nahm) \longrightarrow (Monopole)

We give the way to construct monopole solution $\Phi = \Phi(T)$, $A_i = A_i(T)$ from given Nahm data $T_i^{(k)}$.

First we solve the ‘‘1-dimensional Dirac equation’’:

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}(\xi)^\dagger v = i \begin{pmatrix} \partial_\xi + x^3 - T^3 & x^1 - ix^2 - T^1 + iT^2 \\ x^1 + ix^2 - T^1 - iT^2 & \partial_\xi - x^3 + T^3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix} = 0, \quad (\text{A.124})$$

where v is the $2k \times 2$ matrix whose rows are the independent normalized two solutions of (A.124):

$$\int d\xi v^\dagger v = 1_{[2]}. \quad (\text{A.125})$$

The completeness condition is also held:

$$v(\xi)v(\xi')^\dagger = \delta(\xi - \xi') - \nabla(\xi)f(\xi, \xi') \overleftarrow{\nabla}(\xi')^\dagger. \quad (\text{A.126})$$

We can construct the Higgs field Φ and gauge fields A_i from the zero-mode v as like instantons:

$$\Phi = \int d\xi v^\dagger \xi v, \quad A_i = \int d\xi v^\dagger \partial_i v. \quad (\text{A.127})$$

Here A_i is a 2×2 matrix and $A_i^\dagger = -A_i$ which implies $G = U(2)$.

We can show that the Higgs field and the gauge fields is the k -monopole solution in similar way to ADHM and the transformation for v : $v \rightarrow vg$, $g(\mathbf{x}) \in SU(2)$ preserves Eqs. (A.124) and (A.125) and becomes the gauge transformation of A_μ .

(Monopole) \longrightarrow (Nahm)

We can construct Nahm data from given monopoles as in ADHM case. The steps are all similar to ADHM. First we solve the massless 3-dimensional Dirac equation in the background of the given monopoles Φ, A_i :

$$\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{\mathbf{x}}(\xi)\psi(\xi, \mathbf{x}) = 0, \tag{A.128}$$

$$\int d^3x \psi_\xi^\dagger \psi_\xi = 1_{[k]}. \tag{A.129}$$

Then we can construct Nahm data T_i from the Dirac zero-mode ψ_ξ ($2N \times k$ matrix [35])

$$T_i = \int d^3x \psi_\xi^\dagger x_i \psi_\xi. \tag{A.130}$$

The data T_i are actually $k \times k$ Hermitian matrices. We can show that these data satisfy Nahm equation. The diagonal components of T_i represent the positions of k monopoles.

Furthermore we can show the completeness and the uniqueness on Nahm construction, which prove the one-to-one correspondence between the monopole moduli space and the moduli space of Nahm data.

Note

- General proofs of Nahm construction for other gauge groups are summarized in [132].
- Explicit construction of spherically symmetric monopole solutions for $G = SU(N)$ are presented in [30].

References

- [1] M. J. Ablowitz and P. A. Clarkson, *Solitons, Nonlinear Evolution Equations and Inverse Scattering* (Cambridge UP, 1991) [ISBN/0-521-38730-2].
- [2] C. Acatrinei and C. Sochichiu, “A note on the decay of noncommutative solitons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **67** (2003) 125017 [hep-th/0104263].
- [3] M. Aganagic, R. Gopakumar, S. Minwalla and A. Strominger, “Unstable solitons in noncommutative gauge theory,” *JHEP* **0104** (2001) 001 [hep-th/0009142].
- [4] H. Aoki, N. Ishibashi, S. Iso, H. Kawai, Y. Kitazawa and T. Tada, “Noncommutative Yang-Mills in IIB matrix model,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **565** (2000) 176, [hep-th/9908141].
- [5] T. Asakawa and I. Kishimoto, “Comments on gauge equivalence in noncommutative geometry,” *JHEP* **9911** (1999) 024 [hep-th/9909139].
- [6] A. Astashkevich, N. Nekrasov and A. Schwarz, “On noncommutative Nahm transform,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **211** (2000) 167 [hep-th/9810147].
- [7] M. F. Atiyah, *Geometry of Yang-Mills Fields* (Pisa, 1979) [ISBN/1-000-00071-1].
- [8] M. F. Atiyah, N. J. Hitchin, V. G. Drinfeld and Y. I. Manin, “Construction of instantons,” *Phys. Lett. A* **65** (1978) 185.
- [9] M. F. Atiyah, N. J. Hitchin and I. M. Singer, “Self-duality in four-dimensional Riemannian geometry,” *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **362** (1978) 425.
- [10] M. F. Atiyah and R. S. Ward, “Instantons and algebraic geometry,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **55** (1977) 117.
- [11] M. F. Atiyah, R. Bott and A. Shapiro, “Clifford modules,” *Topology* **3** suppl. 1 (1964) 3.
- [12] H. Bacry, A. Grossman and J. Zak, “Proof of completeness of lattice states in the kq representation,” *Phys. Rev. B* **12** (1975) 1118.
- [13] D. Bak, “Deformed Nahm equation and a noncommutative BPS monopole,” *Phys. Lett. B* **471** (1999) 149 [hep-th/9910135].
- [14] D. Bak, “Exact multi-vortex solutions in noncommutative Abelian-Higgs theory,” *Phys. Lett. B* **495** (2000) 251 [hep-th/0008204].

- [15] D. s. Bak, K. y. Lee and J. H. Park, “BPS equations in six and eight dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66** (2002) 025021 [[hep-th/0204221](#)].
- [16] T. Banks, W. Fischler, S. H. Shenker and L. Susskind, “M theory as a matrix model: A conjecture,” *Phys. Rev. D* **55** (1997) 5112, [[hep-th/9610043](#)].
- [17] V. Bargmann, P. Butera, L. Girardello and J. R. Klauder, “On the completeness of the coherent states,” *Rept. Math. Phys.* **2** (1971) 221.
- [18] C. W. Bernard, N. H. Christ, A. H. Guth and E. J. Weinberg, “Pseudoparticle parameters for arbitrary gauge groups,” *Phys. Rev. D* **16** (1977) 2967.
- [19] I. Bars, “MSFT: Moyal star formulation of string field theory,” [hep-th/0211238](#) and references therein.
- [20] A. A. Belavin, A. M. Polyakov, A. S. Schwartz and Y. S. Tyupkin, “Pseudoparticle solutions of the Yang-Mills equations,” *Phys. Lett. B* **59** (1975) 85.
- [21] A. A. Belavin and V. E. Zakharov, “Yang-Mills equations as inverse scattering problem,” *Phys. Lett. B* **73** (1978) 53.
- [22] M. Bianchi, F. Fucito, G. Rossi and M. Martellini, “Explicit construction of Yang-Mills instantons on ALE spaces,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **473** (1996) 367 [[hep-th/9601162](#)].
- [23] S. Bieling, “Interaction of noncommutative plane waves in 2+1 dimensions,” *J. Phys. A* **35** (2002) 6281 [[hep-th/0203269](#)].
- [24] F. P. Boca, “Projections in rotation algebras and theta functions,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **202** (1999) 325.
- [25] E. B. Bogomol’nyi, “The stability of classical solutions,” *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **24** (1976) 449 [*Yad. Fiz.* **24** (1976) 861].
- [26] O. I. Bogoyavlenskii, “Overturning solitons in new two-dimensional integrable equations,” *Math. USSR-Izv.* **34** (1990) 245.
- [27] M. Born and L. Infeld, “Foundations of the new field theory,” *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **144** (1934) 425.
- [28] M. C. Bowman, “A description of E. Weinberg’s continuous family of monopoles using the Atiyah-Drinfeld-Hitchin-Manin-Nahm formalism,” *Phys. Lett. B* **133** (1983) 344.

- [29] M. C. Bowman, “Parameter counting for self-dual monopoles,” *Phys. Rev. D* **32** (1985) 1569.
- [30] M. C. Bowman, E. Corrigan, P. Goddard, A. Puaca and A. Soper, “The construction of spherically symmetric monopoles using the ADHMN formalism,” *Phys. Rev. D* **28** (1983) 3100.
- [31] P. J. Braam and P. van Baal, “Nahm’s transformation for instantons,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **122** (1989) 267.
- [32] F. Bruckmann and P. van Baal, “Multi-caloron solutions,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **645** (2002) 105 [[hep-th/0209010](#)].
- [33] J. M. Burgers, “A mathematical model illustrating the theory of turbulence,” *Adv. Appl. Mech.* **1** (1948) 171.
- [34] I. Cabrera-Carnero and M. Moriconi, “Noncommutative integrable field theories in 2d,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **673** (2003) 437 [[hep-th/0211193](#)].
- [35] C. Callias, “Index theorems on open spaces,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **62** (1978) 213.
- [36] F. Calogero, “A method to generate solvable nonlinear evolution equations,” *Lett. Nuovo Cim.* **14** (1975) 443.
- [37] A. S. Cattaneo and G. Felder, “A path integral approach to the Kontsevich quantization formula,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **212** (2000) 591 [[math.qa/9902090](#)].
- [38] B. Chen, H. Itoyama, T. Matsuo and K. Murakami, “p p’ system with B field, branes at angles and noncommutative geometry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **576** (2000) 177 [[hep-th/9910263](#)]; “Worldsheet and spacetime properties of p - p’ system with B field and noncommutative geometry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **593** (2001) 505 [[hep-th/0005283](#)]; “Correspondence between noncommutative soliton and open string / D-brane system via Gaussian damping factor,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **105** (2001) 853 [[hep-th/0010066](#)].
- [39] X. g. Chen and E. J. Weinberg, “ADHMN boundary conditions from removing monopoles,” *Phys. Rev. D* **67** (2003) 065020 [[hep-th/0212328](#)].
- [40] N. H. Christ, E. J. Weinberg and N. K. Stanton, “General self-dual Yang-Mills solutions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **18** (1978) 2013.

- [41] C. S. Chu, V. V. Khoze and G. Travaglini, “Notes on noncommutative instantons,” Nucl. Phys. B **621** (2002) 101 [hep-th/0108007].
- [42] J. D. Cole, “On a quasi-linear parabolic equation occurring in aerodynamics,” Quart. Appl. Math. **9** (1951) 225.
- [43] A. Connes, M. R. Douglas and A. Schwarz, “Noncommutative geometry and matrix theory: Compactification on tori,” JHEP **9802** (1998) 003 [hep-th/9711162].
- [44] N. R. Constable, R. C. Myers and O. Tafjord, “The noncommutative bion core,” Phys. Rev. D **61** (2000) 106009 [hep-th/9911136].
- [45] D. H. Correa, G. S. Lozano, E. F. Moreno and F. A. Schaposnik, “Comments on the $U(2)$ noncommutative instanton,” Phys. Lett. B **515** (2001) 206 [hep-th/0105085].
- [46] D. H. Correa, E. F. Moreno and F. A. Schaposnik, “Some noncommutative multi-instantons from vortices in curved space,” Phys. Lett. B **543** (2002) 235 [hep-th/0207180].
- [47] E. Corrigan, C. Devchand, D. B. Fairlie and J. Nuyts, “First order equations for gauge fields in spaces of dimension greater than four,” Nucl. Phys. B **214** (1983) 452.
- [48] E. Corrigan and D. B. Fairlie, “Scalar field theory and exact solutions to a classical $SU(2)$ gauge theory,” Phys. Lett. B **67** (1977) 69.
- [49] E. Corrigan, D. B. Fairlie, S. Templeton and P. Goddard, “A Green’s function for the general self-dual gauge field,” Nucl. Phys. B **140** (1978) 31.
- [50] E. Corrigan, D. B. Fairlie, R. G. Yates and P. Goddard, “The construction of self-dual solutions to $SU(2)$ gauge theory,” Commun. Math. Phys. **58** (1978) 223.
- [51] E. Corrigan and P. Goddard, “An n monopole solution with $4n - 1$ degrees of freedom,” Commun. Math. Phys. **80** (1981) 575.
- [52] E. Corrigan and P. Goddard, “Construction of instanton and monopole solutions and reciprocity,” Annals Phys. **154** (1984) 253.
- [53] E. Corrigan, P. Goddard and A. Kent, “Some comments on the ADHM construction in $4k$ -dimensions,” Commun. Math. Phys. **100** (1985) 1.
- [54] E. Corrigan, P. Goddard, H. Osborn and S. Templeton, “Zeta function regularization and multi-instanton determinants,” Nucl. Phys. B **159** (1979) 469.

- [55] E. Corrigan, P. Goddard and S. Templeton, “Instanton Green functions and tensor products,” Nucl. Phys. B **151** (1979) 93.
- [56] N. S. Craigie, P. Goddard and W. Nahm, *Monopoles in Quantum Field Theory*. (World Sci., 1982) [ISBN/9971950294].
- [57] T. Curtright, D. Fairlie and C. K. Zachos, “Integrable symplectic trilinear interaction terms for matrix membranes,” Phys. Lett. B **405** (1997) 37 [hep-th/9704037]; C. K. Zachos, D. Fairlie and T. Curtright, “Matrix membranes and integrability,” hep-th/9709042.
- [58] K. Dasgupta, S. Mukhi and G. Rajesh, “Noncommutative tachyons,” JHEP **0006** (2000) 022 [hep-th/0005006].
- [59] S. V. Demidov, S. L. Dubovsky, V. A. Rubakov and S. M. Sibiryakov, “Gauge theory solitons on noncommutative cylinder,” Theor. Math. Phys. **138** (2004) 269 [Teor. Mat. Fiz. **138** (2004) 319] [hep-th/0301047].
- [60] G. H. Derrick, “Comments on nonlinear wave equations as models for elementary particles,” J. Math. Phys. **5** (1964) 1252.
- [61] A. Dimakis and F. Müller-Hoissen, “Bi-differential calculi and integrable models,” J. Phys. A **33** (2000) 957 [math-ph/9908015]; “Bicomplexes, integrable models, and noncommutative geometry,” Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **14** (2000) 2455 [hep-th/0006005]; “Bicomplexes and integrable models,” J. Phys. A **33** (2000) 6579 [nlin.si/0006029]; “Bicomplexes and Backlund transformations,” J. Phys. A **34** (2001) 9163 [nlin.si/0104071].
- [62] A. Dimakis and F. Müller-Hoissen, “A noncommutative version of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation,” hep-th/0007015.
- [63] A. Dimakis and F. Müller-Hoissen, “Noncommutative Korteweg-de-Vries equation,” hep-th/0007074.
- [64] A. Dimakis and F. Müller-Hoissen, J. Phys. A **34** (2001) 2571 [nlin.si/0008016].
- [65] P. A. Dirac, “Quantised singularities in the electromagnetic field,” Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **133** (1931) 60.
- [66] D. Diaconescu, “D-branes, monopoles and Nahm equations,” Nucl. Phys. B **503** (1997) 220 [hep-th/9608163].

- [67] S. K. Donaldson, “Instantons and geometric invariant theory,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **93** (1984) 453.
- [68] S. K. Donaldson, “Nahm’s equations and the classification of monopoles,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **96** (1984) 387.
- [69] S. K. Donaldson and P. B. Kronheimer, *The Geometry of Four-Manifolds* (Oxford UP, 1990) [ISBN/0-19-850269-9].
- [70] N. Dorey, T. J. Hollowood, V. V. Khoze and M. P. Mattis, “The calculus of many instantons,” *Phys. Rept.* **371** (2002) 231 [[hep-th/0206063](#)].
- [71] M. R. Douglas, “Branes within branes,” [hep-th/9512077](#).
- [72] M. R. Douglas, “Gauge fields and D-branes,” *J. Geom. Phys.* **28** (1998) 255 [[hep-th/9604198](#)].
- [73] M. R. Douglas and C. Hull, “D-branes and the noncommutative torus,” *JHEP* **9802** (1998) 008 [[hep-th/9711165](#)].
- [74] M. R. Douglas and G. W. Moore, “D-branes, quivers, and ALE instantons,” [hep-th/9603167](#).
- [75] M. R. Douglas and N. A. Nekrasov, “Noncommutative field theory,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **73** (2002) 977 [[hep-th/0106048](#)].
- [76] T. Eguchi, P. B. Gilkey and A. J. Hanson, “Gravitation, gauge theories and differential geometry,” *Phys. Rept.* **66** (1980) 213.
- [77] F. Franco-Sollova and T. Ivanova, “On noncommutative merons and instantons,” *J. Phys. A* **36** (2003) 4207 [[hep-th/0209153](#)].
- [78] A. Fujii, Y. Imaizumi and N. Ohta, “Supersymmetry, spectrum and fate of D0-Dp systems with B-field,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **615** (2001) 61 [[hep-th/0105079](#)].
- [79] K. Furuta, T. Inami and M. Yamamoto, “Topics in nonlinear sigma models in $D = 3$,” [hep-th/0211129](#).
- [80] K. Furuuchi, “Instantons on noncommutative \mathbf{R}^4 and projection operators,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **103** (2000) 1043 [[hep-th/9912047](#)].

- [81] K. Furuuchi, “Equivalence of projections as gauge equivalence on noncommutative space,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **217** (2001) 579 [[hep-th/0005199](#)].
- [82] K. Furuuchi, “Topological charge of U(1) instantons on noncommutative \mathbf{R}^4 ,” [hep-th/0010006](#).
- [83] K. Furuuchi, “Dp-D(p+4) in noncommutative Yang-Mills,” *JHEP* **0103** (2001) 033 [[hep-th/0010119](#)].
- [84] A. Giveon and D. Kutasov, “Brane dynamics and gauge theory,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **71** (1999) 983 [[hep-th/9802067](#)].
- [85] A. Giveon, M. Porrati and E. Rabinovici, “Target space duality in string theory,” *Phys. Rept.* **244** (1994) 77 [[hep-th/9401139](#)].
- [86] C. Gomez and J. J. Manjarin, “Dyons, K-theory and M-theory,” [hep-th/0111169](#).
- [87] R. Gopakumar, M. Headrick and M. Spradlin, “On noncommutative multi-solitons,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **233** (2003) 355 [[hep-th/0103256](#)].
- [88] R. Gopakumar, S. Minwalla and A. Strominger, “Noncommutative solitons,” *JHEP* **0005** (2000) 020 [[hep-th/0003160](#)].
- [89] P. Goddard and D. I. Olive, “Magnetic monopoles in gauge field theories,” *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **41** (1978) 1357.
- [90] M. B. Green, J. H. Schwarz and E. Witten, *Superstring Theory: Vol. 1, 2* (Cambridge UP, 1987) [[ISBN/0-521-35752-7, 0-521-35753-5](#)].
- [91] M. T. Grisaru and S. Penati, “The noncommutative sine-Gordon system,” [hep-th/0112246](#).
- [92] H. J. Groenewold, “On the principles of elementary quantum mechanics,” *Physica* **12** (1946) 405.
- [93] D. J. Gross, A. Hashimoto and N. Izhaki, “Observables of non-commutative gauge theories,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **4** (2000) 893 [[hep-th/0008075](#)].
- [94] D. J. Gross and N. A. Nekrasov, “Monopoles and strings in noncommutative gauge theory,” *JHEP* **0007** (2000) 034 [[hep-th/0005204](#)].

- [95] D. J. Gross and N. A. Nekrasov, “Dynamics of strings in noncommutative gauge theory,” JHEP **0010** (2000) 021 [[hep-th/0007204](#)].
- [96] D. J. Gross and N. A. Nekrasov, “Solitons in noncommutative gauge theory,” JHEP **0103** (2001) 044 [[hep-th/0010090](#)].
- [97] D. J. Gross, R. D. Pisarski and L. G. Yaffe, “QCD and instantons at finite temperature,” Rev. Mod. Phys. **53** (1981) 43.
- [98] M. Hamanaka, “Exact BPS solitons in noncommutative gauge theories,” ²⁹ Soryushiron Kenkyu (Kyoto) **104** (2001) C87 in [136] p. 85 (Japanese).
- [99] M. Hamanaka, “ADHM/Nahm construction and its duality,” Soryushiron Kenkyu (Kyoto) **106** (2002) 1 (Japanese).
- [100] M. Hamanaka, “Atiyah-Drinfeld-Hitchin-Manin and Nahm constructions of localized solitons in noncommutative gauge theories,” Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002) 085022 [[hep-th/0109070](#)].
- [101] M. Hamanaka, Y. Imaizumi and N. Ohta, “Moduli space and scattering of D0-branes in noncommutative super Yang-Mills theory,” Phys. Lett. B **529** (2002) 163 [[hep-th/0112050](#)].
- [102] M. Hamanaka and H. Kajiura, “Gauge fields on tori and T-duality,” Phys. Lett. B **551** (2003) 360 [[hep-th/0208059](#)].
- [103] M. Hamanaka and S. Terashima, “On exact noncommutative BPS solitons,” JHEP **0103** (2001) 034 [[hep-th/0010221](#)].
- [104] M. Hamanaka and K. Toda, “Towards noncommutative integrable systems,” Phys. Lett. A **316** (2003) 77 [[hep-th/0211148](#)].
- [105] M. Hamanaka and K. Toda, “Noncommutative Burgers equation,” J. Phys. A **36** (2003) 11981 [[hep-th/0301213](#)].
- [106] A. Hanany and E. Witten, “Type IIB superstrings, BPS monopoles, and three-dimensional gauge dynamics,” Nucl. Phys. B **492** (1997) 152 [[hep-th/9611230](#)].
- [107] K. C. Hannabuss, “Non-commutative twistor space,” Lett. Math. Phys. **58** (2001) 153 [[hep-th/0108228](#)].

²⁹My articles are available at the URL: [<http://www2.yukawa.kyoto-u.ac.jp/~hamanaka>].

- [108] B. J. Harrington and H. K. Shepard, “Periodic Euclidean solutions and the finite temperature Yang-Mills gas,” *Phys. Rev. D* **17** (1978) 2122.
- [109] B. J. Harrington and H. K. Shepard, “Thermodynamics of the Yang-Mills gas,” *Phys. Rev. D* **18** (1978) 2990.
- [110] J. A. Harvey, “Magnetic monopoles, duality, and supersymmetry,” [[hep-th/9603086](#)].
- [111] J. A. Harvey, “Komaba lectures on noncommutative solitons and D-branes,” [[hep-th/0102076](#)].
- [112] J. A. Harvey, “Topology of the gauge group in noncommutative gauge theory,” [[hep-th/0105242](#)].
- [113] J. A. Harvey, P. Kraus and F. Larsen, “Exact noncommutative solitons,” *JHEP* **0012** (2000) 024 [[hep-th/0010060](#)].
- [114] J. A. Harvey, P. Kraus, F. Larsen and E. J. Martinec, “D-branes and strings as non-commutative solitons,” *JHEP* **0007** (2000) 042 [[hep-th/0005031](#)].
- [115] J. A. Harvey and G. W. Moore, “Noncommutative tachyons and K-theory,” *J. Math. Phys.* **42** (2001) 2765 [[hep-th/0009030](#)].
- [116] K. Hashimoto, “Fluxons and exact BPS solitons in non-commutative gauge theory,” *JHEP* **0012** (2000) 023 [[hep-th/0010251](#)].
- [117] A. Hashimoto and K. Hashimoto, “Monopoles and dyons in non-commutative geometry,” *JHEP* **9911** (1999) 005 [[hep-th/9909202](#)].
- [118] K. Hashimoto, H. Hata and S. Moriyama, “Brane configuration from monopole solution in non-commutative super Yang-Mills theory,” *JHEP* **9912** (1999) 021 [[hep-th/9910196](#)].
- [119] K. Hashimoto and T. Hirayama, “Branes and BPS configurations of noncommutative / commutative gauge theories,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **587** (2000) 207 [[hep-th/0002090](#)].
- [120] K. Hashimoto, T. Hirayama and S. Moriyama, “Symmetry origin of nonlinear monopole,” *JHEP* **0011** (2000) 014 [[hep-th/0010026](#)].
- [121] K. Hashimoto and H. Ooguri, “Seiberg-Witten transforms of noncommutative solitons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 106005 [[hep-th/0105311](#)].

- [122] Y. Hiraoka, “Eight dimensional noncommutative instantons and D0-D8 bound states with B-field,” *Phys. Lett. B* **536** (2002) 147 [[hep-th/0203047](#)]; “BPS solutions of noncommutative gauge theories in four and eight dimensions,” [hep-th/0205283](#). “Noncommutative U(1) instantons in eight dimensional Yang-Mills theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **67** (2003) 105025 [[hep-th/0301176](#)].
- [123] R. Hirota, “Exact solution of the Korteweg de Vries equation for multiple collisions of solitons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **27** (1971) 1192.
- [124] N. J. Hitchin, “Monopoles and geodesics,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **83** (1982) 579.
- [125] N. J. Hitchin, “On the construction of monopoles,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **89** (1983) 145.
- [126] N. J. Hitchin, A. Karlhede, U. Lindstrom and M. Rocek, “Hyperkahler metrics and supersymmetry,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **108** (1987) 535.
- [127] P. M. Ho, “Twisted bundle on noncommutative space and $U(1)$ instanton,” [hep-th/0003012](#).
- [128] E. Hopf, “The partial differential equation $u_t + uu_x = \mu u_{xx}$,” *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **3** (1950) 201.
- [129] K. Hori, “D-branes, T-duality, and index theory,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **3** (1999) 281 [[hep-th/9902102](#)].
- [130] Z. Horváth, O. Lechtenfeld and M. Wolf “Noncommutative instantons via dressing and splitting approaches,” *JHEP* **0212** (2002) 060 [[hep-th/0211041](#)].
- [131] C. J. Houghton and E. J. Weinberg, “Multicloud solutions with massless and massive monopoles,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66** (2002) 125002 [[hep-th/0207141](#)].
- [132] J. Hurtubise and M. K. Murray, “On the construction of monopoles for the classical groups,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **122** (1989) 35.
- [133] M. Ihl and S. Uhlmann, “Noncommutative extended waves and soliton-like configurations in $N = 2$ string theory,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **18** (2003) 4889 [[hep-th/0211263](#)].
- [134] N. Ishibashi, S. Iso, H. Kawai and Y. Kitazawa, “Wilson loops in noncommutative Yang-Mills,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **573** (2000) 573 [[hep-th/9910004](#)].

- [135] N. Ishibashi, H. Kawai, Y. Kitazawa and A. Tsuchiya, “A large-N reduced model as superstring,” Nucl. Phys. B **498** (1997) 467 [hep-th/9612115].
- [136] H. Ishikawa, M. Kato, T. Kawano, R. Sasaki, S. Terashima and S. Watamura, *Proceeding of Workshop on Noncommutative Geometry in String Theory and Field Theories*, Soryushiron Kenkyuu (Kyoto) **104** (2001) C1 (Japanese).³⁰
- [137] T. Ishikawa, S. I. Kuroki and A. Sako, “Elongated U(1) instantons on noncommutative \mathbf{R}^4 ,” JHEP **0112** (2001) 000 [hep-th/0109111].
- [138] T. Ishikawa, S. I. Kuroki and A. Sako, “Instanton number calculus on noncommutative \mathbf{R}^4 ,” JHEP **0208** (2002) 028 [hep-th/0201196].
- [139] H. Itoyama, “Note on open string / D-brane system and noncommutative soliton,” hep-th/0011028.
- [140] R. Jackiw, C. Nohl and C. Rebbi, “Conformal properties of pseudoparticle configurations,” Phys. Rev. D **15** (1977) 1642.
- [141] R. Jackiw and C. Rebbi, “Solitons with fermion number 1/2,” Phys. Rev. D **13** (1976) 3398.
- [142] B. B. Kadomtsev and V. I. Petviashvili, “On the stability of solitary waves in weakly dispersive media,” Sov. Phys. Doklady **15** (1970) 539.
- [143] H. Kajiura, Y. Matsuo and T. Takayanagi, “Exact tachyon condensation on noncommutative torus,” JHEP **0106** (2001) 041 [hep-th/0104143].
- [144] A. Kapustin, A. Kuznetsov and D. Orlov, “Noncommutative instantons and twistor transform,” Commun. Math. Phys. **221** (2001) 385 [hep-th/0002193].
- [145] A. Kapustin and S. Sethi, “The Higgs branch of impurity theories,” Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2** (1998) 571 [hep-th/9804027].
- [146] K. Y. Kim, B. H. Lee and H. S. Yang, “Comments on instantons on noncommutative \mathbf{R}^4 ,” J. Korean Phys. Soc. **41** (2002) 290 [hep-th/0003093].
- [147] K. Y. Kim, B. H. Lee and H. S. Yang, “Noncommutative instantons on $\mathbf{R}_{\text{NC}}^2 \times \mathbf{R}_{\text{C}}^2$,” Phys. Lett. B **523** (2001) 357 [hep-th/0109121].

³⁰Available at the URL: [<http://www-hep.phys.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp/japanese/tokutei99.html>].

- [148] K. Y. Kim, B. H. Lee and H. S. Yang, “Zero-modes and Atiyah-Singer index in noncommutative instantons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66** (2002) 025034 [[hep-th/0205010](#)].
- [149] A. Konechny and A. Schwarz, “Introduction to M(atric) theory and noncommutative geometry,” *Phys. Rept.* **360** (2002) 353 [[hep-th/0012145](#)].
- [150] A. Konechny and A. Schwarz, “Introduction to M(atric) theory and noncommutative geometry, II,” *Phys. Rept.* **360** (2002) 353 [[hep-th/0107251](#)].
- [151] M. Kontsevich, “Deformation quantization of Poisson manifolds, I,” *Lett. Math. Phys.* **66**, 157 (2003) [q-alg/9709040](#).
- [152] D. J. Korteweg and G. de Vries, “On the change of form of long waves advancing in a rectangular canal, and on a new type of long stationary waves,” *Phil. Mag.* **39** (1895) 422.
- [153] T. C. Kraan and P. van Baal, “Exact T-duality between calorons and Taub-NUT spaces,” *Phys. Lett. B* **428** (1998) 268 [[hep-th/9802049](#)]; “Periodic instantons with non-trivial holonomy,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **533** (1998) 627 [[hep-th/9805168](#)].
- [154] T. Krajewski and M. Schnabl, “Exact solitons on noncommutative tori,” *JHEP* **0108** (2001) 002 [[hep-th/0104090](#)].
- [155] P. B. Kronheimer and H. Nakajima, “Yang-Mills instantons on ALE gravitational instantons,” *Math. Ann.* **288** (1990) 263.
- [156] P. D. Lax, “Integrals of nonlinear equations of evolution and solitary waves,” *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* **21** (1968) 467.
- [157] O. Lechtenfeld and A. D. Popov, “Noncommutative multi-solitons in 2+1 dimensions,” *JHEP* **0111** (2001) 040 [[hep-th/0106213](#)]; “Scattering of noncommutative solitons in 2+1 dimensions,” *Phys. Lett. B* **523** (2001) 178 [[hep-th/0108118](#)].
- [158] O. Lechtenfeld and A. D. Popov, “Noncommutative ’t Hooft instantons,” *JHEP* **0203** (2002) 040 [[hep-th/0109209](#)].
- [159] O. Lechtenfeld, A. D. Popov and B. Spindig, “Open $N = 2$ strings in a B-field background and noncommutative self-dual Yang-Mills,” *Phys. Lett. B* **507** (2001) 317 [[hep-th/0012200](#)]; “Noncommutative solitons in open $N = 2$ string theory,” *JHEP* **0106** (2001) 011 [[hep-th/0103196](#)].

- [160] B. H. Lee and H. S. Yang, “Propagators in noncommutative instantons,” Phys. Rev. D **66** (2002) 045027 [hep-th/0206001].
- [161] K. Lee and C. Lu, “SU(2) calorons and magnetic monopoles,” Phys. Rev. D **58** (1998) 025011 [hep-th/9802108].
- [162] K. M. Lee, D. Tong and S. Yi, “The moduli space of two $U(1)$ instantons on noncommutative \mathbf{R}^4 and $R^3 \times S^1$,” Phys. Rev. D **63** (2001) 065017 [hep-th/0008092].
- [163] K. Lee and P. Yi, “Monopoles and instantons on partially compactified D-branes,” Phys. Rev. D **56** (1997) 3711 [hep-th/9702107].
- [164] K. M. Lee and P. Yi, “Quantum spectrum of instanton solitons in five dimensional noncommutative U(N) theories,” Phys. Rev. D **61** (2000) 125015 [hep-th/9911186].
- [165] M. Legare, “Noncommutative generalized NS and super matrix KdV systems from a noncommutative version of (anti-)self-dual Yang-Mills equations,” hep-th/0012077; “Reduced systems of (2,2) pseudo-Euclidean noncommutative self-dual Yang-Mills theories,” J. Phys. A **35** (2002) 5489.
- [166] H. Liu and J. Michelson, “Ramond-Ramond couplings of noncommutative D-branes,” Phys. Lett. B **518** (2001) 143 [hep-th/0104139]
- [167] J. Madore, J. L. Richard and R. Stora, “An introduction to the twistor program,” Phys. Rept. **49** (1979) 113.
- [168] N. S. Manton, “Complex structure of monopoles,” Nucl. Phys. B **135** (1978) 319.
- [169] N. S. Manton, “A remark on the scattering of BPS monopoles,” Phys. Lett. B **110** (1982) 54; “Multimonopole dynamics,” in [56] p. 95.
- [170] M. Marino, R. Minasian, G. Moore and A. Strominger, “Nonlinear instantons from supersymmetric p-branes,” JHEP **0001** (2000) 005 [hep-th/9911206].
- [171] L. J. Mason and N. M. Woodhouse, *Integrability, Self-Duality, and Twistor Theory* (Oxford UP, 1996) [ISBN/0-19-853498-1].
- [172] Y. Matsuo, “Topological charges of noncommutative soliton,” Phys. Lett. B **499** (2001) 223 [hep-th/0009002].

- [173] T. Miwa, M. Jimbo and E. Date, (translated by M. Reid), “Solitons : differential equations, symmetries and infinite dimensional algebras,” (Cambridge UP, 2000) [ISBN/0-521-56161-2].
- [174] S. Moriyama, “Noncommutative monopole from nonlinear monopole,” Phys. Lett. B **485** (2000) 278 [hep-th/0003231].
- [175] S. Moriyama, “Noncommutative / nonlinear BPS equations without zero slope limit,” JHEP **0008** (2000) 014 [hep-th/0006056].
- [176] J. E. Moyal, “Quantum mechanics as a statistical theory,” Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **45** (1949) 99.
- [177] S. Mukai, “Duality between $D(X)$ and $D(\widehat{X})$ with its application to Picard sheaves,” Nagoya Math. J. **81** (1981) 153.
- [178] S. Mukhi and N. V. Suryanarayana, “Gauge-invariant couplings of noncommutative branes to Ramond-Ramond backgrounds,” JHEP **0105** (2001) 023 [hep-th/0104045]
- [179] M. K. Murray, “Monopoles,” math-ph/0101035.
- [180] R. C. Myers, “Dielectric-branes,” JHEP **9912** (1999) 022 [hep-th/9910053].
- [181] W. Nahm, “A simple formalism for the BPS monopole,” Phys. Lett. B **90** (1980) 413.
- [182] W. Nahm, “On abelian self-dual multimonopoles,” Phys. Lett. B **93** (1980) 42.
- [183] W. Nahm, “All self-dual multimonopoles for arbitrary gauge groups,” NATO ASI Series B **82** (1982) 301, [ISBN/0-306-41038-9].
- [184] W. Nahm, “The construction of all self-dual multimonopoles by the ADHM method,” in [56] p. 87.
- [185] W. Nahm, “Self-dual monopoles and calorons,” Lecture Notes in Physics **201** (1984) 189, [ISBN/0-387-13335-6].
- [186] H. Nakajima, “Monopoles and Nahm’s equations,” Lect. Notes in Pure and Appl. Math. **145** (Dekker, 1993) 193 [ISBN/0-8247-9069-3].
- [187] H. Nakajima, “Resolutions of moduli spaces of ideal instantons on \mathbf{R}^4 ,” *Topology, Geometry and Field Theory* (World Sci., 1994) 129 [ISBN/981-02-1817-6].

- [188] H. Nakajima, *Lectures on Hilbert Schemes of Points on Surfaces* (AMS, 1999) [ISBN/0-8218-1956-9].
- [189] N. A. Nekrasov, “Noncommutative instantons revisited,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **241** (2003) 143 [hep-th/0010017].
- [190] N. A. Nekrasov, “Trieste lectures on solitons in noncommutative gauge theories,” hep-th/0011095.
- [191] N. A. Nekrasov, “Lectures on open strings, and noncommutative gauge fields,” hep-th/0203109.
- [192] N. Nekrasov and A. Schwarz, “Instantons on noncommutative \mathbf{R}^4 , and (2,0) superconformal six dimensional theory,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **198** (1998) 689 [hep-th/9802068].
- [193] K. Ohta, “Supersymmetric D-brane bound states with B-field and higher dimensional instantons on noncommutative geometry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 046003 [hep-th/0101082].
- [194] Y. Okawa and H. Ooguri, “An exact solution to Seiberg-Witten equation of noncommutative gauge theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 046009 [hep-th/0104036].
- [195] H. Ooguri and C. Vafa, “Selfduality and N=2 string magic,” *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **5** (1990) 1389; “Geometry of N=2 strings,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **361** (1991) 469; “N=2 heterotic strings,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **367** (1991) 83.
- [196] H. Osborn, “Calculation of multi-instanton determinants,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **159** (1979) 497.
- [197] L. D. Paniak, “Exact noncommutative KP and KdV multi-solitons,” hep-th/0105185.
- [198] G. Papadopoulos and A. Tschendorff, “Instantons at angles,” *Phys. Lett. B* **419** (1998) 115 [hep-th/9708116].
- [199] S. Parvizi, “Non-commutative instantons and the information metric,” *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **17** (2002) 341 [hep-th/0202025].
- [200] A. M. Perelomov, “On the completeness of a system of coherent states,” *Teor. Mat. Fiz.* **6** (1971) 213.

- [201] R. Penrose, “Nonlinear gravitons and curved twistor theory,” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **7** (1976) 31.
- [202] R. Penrose and W. Rindler, *Spinors and Space-Time: Vol. 1, 2* (Cambridge UP, 1984, 1986) [ISBN/0-521-24527-3, 0-521-25267-9].
- [203] J. Polchinski, “Dirichlet-branes and Ramond-Ramond charges,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75** (1995) 4724 [hep-th/9510017].
- [204] J. Polchinski, *String Theory, Vol. 1, 2* (Cambridge UP, 1998) [ISBN/0-521-63312-5] and references therein.
- [205] A. M. Polyakov, “Particle spectrum in quantum field theory,” *JETP Lett.* **20** (1974) 194 [*Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **20** (1974) 430].
- [206] A. P. Polychronakos, “Flux tube solutions in noncommutative gauge theories,” *Phys. Lett. B* **495** (2000) 407 [hep-th/0007043].
- [207] M. K. Prasad and C. M. Sommerfield, “Exact classical solution for the ’t Hooft monopole and Julia-Zee dyon,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **35** (1975) 760.
- [208] R. Rajaraman, *Solitons and Instantons* (Elsevier, 1982) [ISBN/0-444-87047-4].
- [209] P. Rossi, “Propagation functions in the field of a monopole,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **149** (1979) 170.
- [210] A. Sako, “Instanton number of noncommutative $U(n)$ gauge theory,” *JHEP* **0304** (2003) 023 [hep-th/0209139].
- [211] M. Sato and Y. Sato, “Soliton equations as dynamical systems on infinite dimensional Grassmann manifold,” in *Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations in Applied Sciences* (North-Holland, 1982) 259.
- [212] H. Schenk, “On a generalized Fourier transform of instantons over flat tori,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **116** (1988) 177.
- [213] J. Schiff, “Integrability of Chern-Simons-Higgs vortex equations and a reduction of the selfdual Yang-Mills equations to three-dimensions,” *NATO ASI Series B* **278** (Plenum, 1992) 393.
- [214] A. Schwarz, “Gauge theories on noncommutative Euclidean spaces,” hep-th/0111174.

- [215] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, “String theory and noncommutative geometry,” JHEP **9909** (1999) 032 [hep-th/9908142].
- [216] A. Sen, “Non-BPS states and branes in string theory,” hep-th/9904207 and references therein.
- [217] P. M. Sutcliffe, “BPS monopoles,” Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **12** (1997) 4663 [hep-th/9707009].
- [218] R. J. Szabo, “Quantum field theory on noncommutative spaces,” Phys. Rept. **378** (2003) 207 [hep-th/0109162].
- [219] K. Takasaki, “Anti-self-dual Yang-Mills equations on noncommutative spacetime,” J. Geom. Phys. **37** (2001) 291 [hep-th/0005194].
- [220] C. H. Taubes, “Stability in Yang-Mills theories,” Commun. Math. Phys. **91** (1983) 235.
- [221] S. Terashima, “U(1) instanton in Born-Infeld action and noncommutative gauge theory,” Phys. Lett. B **477** (2000) 292 [hep-th/9911245].
- [222] Y. Tian and C. J. Zhu, “Instantons on general noncommutative \mathbf{R}^4 ,” Commun. Theor. Phys. **38** (2002) 691 [hep-th/0205110]; “Comments on noncommutative ADHM construction,” Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003) 045016 [hep-th/0210163].
- [223] Y. Tian, C. J. Zhu and X. C. Song, “Topological charge of noncommutative ADHM instanton,” Mod. Phys. Lett. A **18** (2003) 1691 [hep-th/0211225].
- [224] K. Toda, “Extensions of soliton equations to non-commutative $(2 + 1)$ dimensions,” JHEP proceedings of workshop on Integrable Theories, Solitons and Duality, Sao Paulo, Brazil, 1-6 July 2002.
- [225] K. Toda and S-J. Yu, “The investigation into the Schwarz Korteweg-de Vries equation and the Schwarz derivative in $(2 + 1)$ dimensions,” J. Math. Phys. **41** (2000) 4747; “The investigation into new equations in $(2+1)$ dimensions. Nonlinear evolution equations and dynamical systems,” J. Nonlinear Math. Phys. Suppl. **8** (2001) 272; “A study of the construction of equations in $(2 + 1)$ dimensions,” Inverse Problems **17** (2001) 1053 and references therein.
- [226] D. Tsimpis, “Nahm equations and boundary conditions,” Phys. Lett. B **433** (1998) 287 [hep-th/9804081].

- [227] G. 't Hooft, "Magnetic monopoles in unified gauge theories," Nucl. Phys. B **79** (1974) 276.
- [228] G. 't Hooft, "Symmetry breaking through Bell-Jackiw anomalies," Phys. Rev. Lett. **37** (1976) 8.
- [229] G. 't Hooft, *unpublished*.
- [230] G. 't Hooft, "Computation of the quantum effects due to a four-dimensional pseudoparticle," Phys. Rev. D **14** (1976) 3432, [Erratum-ibid. D **18** (1978) 2199].
- [231] K. K. Uhlenbeck, "Removable singularities in Yang-Mills fields," Commun. Math. Phys. **83** (1982) 11.
- [232] P. van Baal, "Instanton moduli for $T^3 \times \mathbf{R}$," Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **49** (1996) 238 [hep-th/9512223].
- [233] J. von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Princeton UP, 1996) [ISBN/0-691-02893-1].
- [234] N. Wang and M. Wadati, "Noncommutative extension of $\bar{\partial}$ -dressing method," J. Phys. Soc. Jap. **72** (2003) 1366.
- [235] R. S. Ward, "On self-dual gauge fields," Phys. Lett. A **61** (1977) 81.
- [236] R. S. Ward, "Completely solvable gauge field equations in dimension greater than four," Nucl. Phys. B **236** (1984) 381.
- [237] R. S. Ward, "Integrable and solvable systems, and relations among them," Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **315** (1985) 451; "Multidimensional integrable systems," Lect. Notes Phys. **280** (Springer, 1986) 106; "Integrable systems in twistor theory," in *Twistors in Mathematics and Physics* (Cambridge UP, 1990) 246.
- [238] R. S. Ward and R. O. Wells, *Twistor Geometry and Field Theory* (Cambridge UP, 1990) [ISBN/0-521-42268-X].
- [239] S. Watamura, "Gauge theories on noncommutative spaces," Proceedings of workshop on Mathematical Physics 2002, Tokyo, Japan, 21-23 September 2002 (Japanese).
- [240] E. J. Weinberg, "Parameter counting for multimonopole solution," Phys. Rev. **20** (1979) 936.

- [241] E. J. Weinberg, “A continuous family of magnetic monopole solutions,” *Phys. Lett. B* **119** (1982) 151.
- [242] E. J. Weinberg, “Massive and massless monopoles and duality,” [hep-th/9908095](#).
- [243] F. Wilczek, “Geometry and interactions of instantons,” in *Quark Confinement and Field Theory* (Wiley, 1977) 211 [ISBN/0-471-02721-9]
- [244] E. Witten, “Some exact multipseudoparticle solutions of classical Yang-Mills theory,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38** (1977) 121.
- [245] E. Witten, “Noncommutative geometry and string field theory,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **268** (1986) 253.
- [246] E. Witten, “Sigma models and the ADHM construction of instantons,” *J. Geom. Phys.* **15** (1995) 215 [[hep-th/9410052](#)].
- [247] E. Witten, “Small instantons in string theory,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **460** (1996) 541 [[hep-th/9511030](#)].
- [248] M. Wolf, “Soliton antisoliton scattering configurations in a noncommutative sigma model in 2+1 dimensions,” *JHEP* **0206** (2002) 055 [[hep-th/0204185](#)].
- [249] T. T. Wu and C. N. Yang, “Concept of nonintegrable phase factors and global formulation of gauge fields,” *Phys. Rev. D* **12** (1975) 3845.
- [250] C. N. Yang, “Condition of self-duality for SU(2) gauge fields on Euclidean four-dimensional Space,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38** (1977) 1377.
- [251] T. Yoneya, “String theory and space-time uncertainty principle,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **103** (2000) 1081 [[hep-th/0004074](#)].
- [252] S-J. Yu, K. Toda and T. Fukuyama, “N-soliton solutions to a (2+1)-dimensional integrable equations,” *J. Phys. A* **31** (1998) 10181.
- [253] S-J. Yu, K. Toda, N. Sasa and T. Fukuyama, “N soliton solutions to the Bogoyavlenskii-Schiff equation and a quest for the soliton solution in (3+1) dimensions,” *J. Phys. A* **31** (1998) 3337.