

Counter-term charges generate bulk symmetries

Stefan Hollands

*Institut für Theoretische Physik, U. Göttingen,
D-37077 Göttingen, Germany and
Physics Department, UCSB,
Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA
hollands@vulcan2.physics.ucsb.edu*

Akihiro Ishibashi

*Enrico Fermi Inst., U Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637, USA
akihiro@midway.uchicago.edu*

Donald Marolf

*Physics Department, UCSB,
Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA
marolf@physics.syr.edu
(Dated: February, 2005)*

We further explore the counter-term subtraction definition of charges (e.g., energy) for classical gravitating theories in spacetimes of relevance to gauge/gravity dualities; i.e., in asymptotically anti-de Sitter spaces and their kin. In particular, we show in general that charges defined via the counter-term subtraction method generate the desired asymptotic symmetries. As a result, they can differ from any other such charges, such as those defined by bulk spacetime-covariant techniques, only by a function of auxiliary non-dynamical structures such as a choice of conformal frame at infinity (i.e., a function of the boundary fields alone). Our argument is based on the Peierls bracket, and in the AdS context allows us to demonstrate the above result even for asymptotic symmetries which generate only conformal symmetries of the boundary (in the chosen conformal frame). We also generalize the counter-term subtraction construction of charges to the case in which additional non-vanishing boundary fields are present.

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the study of gravitational theories in asymptotically anti-de Sitter (AdS) spaces has been of great interest due to the AdS/CFT correspondence [1, 2, 3, 4], a conjectured equivalence between at least certain such “bulk” string theories (which therefore contain gravity) and non-gravitational dual theories. In the case of AdS, the non-gravitating dual theories are associated with spacetimes that may be considered to form the boundary of the asymptotically anti-de Sitter space. Similar so-called gauge/gravity correspondences also arise for other systems (see e.g. [5, 6, 7]) and involve bulk spacetimes with some of the same features as anti-de Sitter space.

As one may expect, the notion of energy (and of other conserved charges) is of significant use in understanding this correspondence. For some time, it has been clear that the dual field theories are closely associated with what is called the “counter-term subtraction” definition of energy [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16] in the bulk. Such ideas are well developed for the case of anti-de Sitter space, and one might expect a suitable generalization to apply to other contexts as well. However, a number of other definitions of energy [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24] have also been given for bulk theories in AdS, and these are known to differ from the counter-term subtraction definition.

In particular, these other definitions all assign zero energy to pure AdS space, as is required if the charges are to form a representation of the AdS group. In contrast, in odd dimensions the counter-term subtraction approach assigns a *non-zero* value to AdS space which, moreover, depends on the choice of an auxiliary structure: a conformal frame Ω at infinity. This feature is natural from the point of view of the dual gauge theory (where it is associated with the conformal anomaly [8, 9]), but raises the question of the general relationship between the counter-term subtraction energy and other constructions.

A reasonable conjecture is that the difference between these various notions of energy amounts to a “constant offset” which might in general depend on the choice of auxiliary conformal frame Ω , but which in no way depends on the dynamical bulk degrees of freedom. If this were so, the difference would be a constant over the phase space of the theory and all notions of energy would generate the same action on observables via the Poisson Bracket. This conjecture is consistent with the interpretation of the “vacuum energy” assigned to pure AdS as arising from the Casimir energy in the dual field theory. It is also suggested by numerous calculations (see e.g., [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16], and also [25, 26, 27] for cases with slightly weaker asymptotic conditions) of the value of the counter-term energy assigned to particular families of spacetimes (e.g., the Schwarzschild-AdS spacetimes) in a particular conformal frame and also

by [28]. Finally, under appropriate asymptotically anti-de Sitter asymptotic conditions, this conjecture was recently proven [29] for all solutions and in all conformal frames in $d = 5$ bulk spacetime dimensions. Ref. [29] also derives an explicit formula for this difference as a function of the metric on the conformal boundary defined by Ω , and shows under their boundary conditions that the definitions [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23] also agree with a covariant phase space definition based on techniques of [30, 31, 32].

Our purpose here is to demonstrate similar results in all dimensions, and also for a much broader class of asymptotic behaviors. In fact, though we derive additional results in the AdS context, our main arguments below make no reference to anti-de Sitter space whatsoever. As a result, they should apply equally well to contexts closely related to AdS space (such as [35]) as to more general gauge/gravity dualities such as those described in [5], assuming that an appropriate set of counter-terms for the bulk action can be found in the latter case. Our arguments will be based on general properties of the so-called Peierls bracket [33], a manifestly covariant construction which is equivalent to the Poisson bracket on the space of observables (see [34] for extensions of the Peierls bracket to algebras of gauge-dependent quantities and [36, 37] for recent related work in quantum field theory).

We begin by reviewing both the counter-term subtraction definition of charge and the Peierls bracket in section II. This serves to set a number of conventions, and the counter-term charge discussion provides an opportunity to comment on subtle features associated with the choice of conformal frame Ω used to define the charge associated with a particular asymptotic symmetry ξ . In particular, depending on the choice of conformal frame, a given asymptotic symmetry need not act as a strict symmetry on the collection of boundary fields used to construct the counter-term charges. Instead, it might act only as a conformal symmetry. However, in the special case of appropriate asymptotically anti-de Sitter behavior, one may nevertheless show [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16] that the difference between the charge evaluated on any two hypersurfaces is determined entirely by the conformal frame Ω and is independent of the bulk dynamics. Thus, even in this context the counter-term definition remains useful. We also take this opportunity to generalize the construction to allow arbitrary tensor and spinor boundary fields¹. Following this review, we give our main argument in section III and close with a brief discussion of the results.

Since our arguments below will rely only on general properties of the Peierls bracket, they are independent of the details of the bulk dynamics. This is in sharp contrast to the results of [29] which also compared various definitions of energy, but which were based on a common technique involving explicit expansion of the Einstein equations in a power series around the boundary of an asymptotically anti-de Sitter space. Our results here are correspondingly more general, but also much less explicit. We remind the reader that [29] was able not only to relate the counter-term energy to the covariant phase space Hamiltonian, but also to show that the covariant phase space Hamiltonian agrees with the constructions of Ashtekar et al based on the electric part of the Weyl tensor [17, 18], with the Hamiltonian charge due to Henneaux and Teitelboim [19], and finally with the spinor charge of [21, 22, 23] (which guarantees positivity). The Abbott and Deser construction [20] and its extensions [39, 40, 41] and the KBL construction [24] (applied to AdS in [42]) were not considered in [29].

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we review the two constructions central to our analysis: the counter-term subtraction definition of conserved charges (section II A) and the Peierls bracket (section II C) between observables.

A. Counter-term Subtraction Charges

The setting for the counter-term subtraction construction of conserved charges [8, 9] is to consider systems associated with a certain sort of variational principle. Now, in general, such a principle specifies a class of variations with respect to which one requires the associated action S to be stationary. Let us suppose that this is done by positing a space of kinematically allowed histories \mathcal{H} (“bulk variables”) within which one is allowed to perform an arbitrary variation. There will also be certain features (“boundary values”) which are identical for all histories in \mathcal{H} and which are not to be varied. Thus, we in fact consider a family of actions S and spaces of histories \mathcal{H} parameterized by some set of allowed boundary values. Although typically discussed in the context of the conformal completion of some spacetime, the counter-term subtraction construction of conserved charges generalizes naturally to a somewhat more abstract

¹ The case of certain scalar fields was considered in [11, 12, 14, 16]. The contribution of gauge fields to the divergence of the stress tensor was considered in [38]. In addition, we understand that the corresponding conserved quantities are also constructed in unpublished work by Kostas Skenderis, with results similar to those presented below.

setting. We will therefore find it useful to state the minimal axioms for this construction. The reader may readily verify that each axiom holds when the boundary manifold ∂M described below is the conformal boundary of the spacetime M . Though our setting is in principle more abstract, it is convenient to use the term “boundary manifold” and other such terms in our discussion.

The counter-term subtraction construction of conserved charges is relevant when the following conditions hold:

- 1) The boundary values can be described by a set of tensor (and perhaps spinor) “boundary fields” on an auxiliary manifold ∂M which is called the ‘boundary of the spacetime M .’ This will typically require the introduction of some auxiliary structure, which we call Ω , and which may include for example a choice of conformal frame at infinity. The choice of Ω is typically not unique, but is by definition a fixed kinematical structure independent of the bulk state.
- 2) One of these boundary fields is a metric h_{ab} on ∂M such that $(\partial M, h_{ab})$ is a globally hyperbolic spacetime.
- 3) The action S is diffeomorphism invariant in the following sense: Every diffeomorphism ψ_∂ of the boundary manifold ∂M is (not uniquely) associated with a diffeomorphism ψ of the bulk spacetime which i) preserves the auxiliary structure Ω and ii) is such that S is invariant under the simultaneous action of ψ on the bulk fields and ψ_∂ on the boundary values. We refer to the vector fields generating ψ and ψ_∂ as ξ^a and ξ_∂^a .
- 4) First functional derivatives of the action S with respect to the boundary fields are well-defined and finite when evaluated on the space \mathcal{S} of solutions to the equations of motion. This is typically arranged by an appropriate choice of “counter-terms,” leading to the name counter-term subtraction method.

As a particular example of this construction, one may consider asymptotically anti-de Sitter spacetimes. In this case, one takes ∂M to be the conformal boundary of M defined by the conformal frame Ω . The condition that ψ in requirement (3) above should preserve the conformal frame Ω determines how ψ_∂ is extended from ∂M to M , at least near ∂M .

The essential point of the above setting is that it is directly analogous to consideration of a field theory in the presence of non-dynamical background fields. Here, however, the role of the background fields is played only by the boundary fields. Note that, for a given choice of initial data in the bulk, the action on the space of solutions (the “on-shell action”) becomes a functional of the boundary values in the same way that the action for a field theory becomes a functional of any background fields. As a result, [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 38] defines the “boundary stress tensor” τ_{ab} as a function on the space of solutions satisfying

$$\tau_{ab}\epsilon = -2\frac{\delta S}{\delta h_{ab}}, \quad (2.1)$$

where the functional derivative is computed holding all other boundary fields constant, and where $\epsilon = \epsilon_{[a_1 a_2 \dots a_n]}$ is the natural n -form associated with h_{ab} , identified with a density.

The definition (2.1) is sufficient when the metric is the only non-trivial boundary field; i.e., in the context considered by [8, 9]. In that context one may show that τ_{ab} is covariantly conserved with respect to the metric h_{ab} on ∂M by following the essential steps through which one would derive covariant conservation of the stress-energy tensor T_{ab} in a curved spacetime. We will describe this argument below, but we also wish to consider the more general case in which other boundary fields may be non-vanishing. When the extra fields are not scalars, this generalization will require us to introduce a “modified boundary stress tensor” with extra terms representing contributions from these extra boundary fields.

To do so, let us introduce some complete set of bulk fields ϕ^i on M , where the i ranges over an appropriate label set to include components of vector and tensor (and perhaps spinor) fields as well as scalars. We also wish to pick out a complete set of boundary fields. However it turns out that the tensor (or spinor) rank of these fields will affect the detailed form of certain expressions below (including the definition of the charges). As a result, it is convenient at this stage to replace the boundary metric h_{ab} with a set of frame fields e_a^A satisfying

$$h_{ab} = \eta_{AB} e_a^A e_b^B \quad (2.2)$$

for a fixed metric η_{AB} (perhaps the Minkowski metric). The introduction of the frame fields allows us to write all remaining boundary fields without loss of generality in terms of a set of *scalar* fields, e.g., a tensor field $X_{ab\dots c}$ is encoded in the set $X_{AB\dots C} = X_{ab\dots c} e_a^A e_b^B \dots e_c^C$ of scalar fields. We denote the collection of scalar fields on ∂M by ϕ_∂^i . Thus, these scalars are just the ‘tangent space components’ of any remaining vector, tensor, or spinor boundary fields.

Having replaced the metric by a set of frame fields, it is natural to introduce the “modified boundary stress tensor”

$$\mathbf{T}^{ab}\epsilon = \frac{\delta S}{\delta e_b^A} e^{aA}, \quad (2.3)$$

where the functional derivative is computed holding fixed the scalars ϕ_∂^i (i.e., the tangent space components of boundary fields). In the case where the nontrivial boundary fields are just the metric and some scalars on ∂M , the modified and original boundary stress tensors agree $\mathbf{T}_{ab} = \tau_{ab}$. However, in the presence of other non-trivial boundary fields, \mathbf{T}^{ab} contains extra contributions from these fields. As usual, we will use the frame fields e_a^A and the inverse frames to convert spacetime indices into tangent space indices (and vice versa). In particular, we will make use of \mathbf{T}^a_A , which is in fact the more fundamental quantity.

Now, in general, the modified boundary stress tensor \mathbf{T}^a_A will fail to be covariantly conserved due to the presence of the other background fields. However, its covariant divergence takes a simple and useful form. This may be demonstrated by considering the simultaneous action of an arbitrary infinitesimal boundary diffeomorphism ψ_∂ , which we take to be generated by the vector field ξ_∂^a , and the associated bulk diffeomorphism ψ generated by ξ^a . By property (3) above we have

$$0 = \int_M \frac{\delta S}{\delta \phi^i} \mathcal{L}_\xi \phi^i + \int_{\partial M} \frac{\delta S}{\delta \phi_\partial^i} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_\partial} \phi_\partial^i + \int_{\partial M} \epsilon \mathbf{T}^a_A \mathcal{L}_{\xi_\partial} e_a^A. \quad (2.4)$$

If we evaluate (2.4) on the space of solutions (so that the bulk equations of motion hold), then the first term vanishes. Considering the second term, the ϕ_∂^i are scalars so that $\mathcal{L}_{\xi_\partial} \phi_\partial^i = \xi_\partial^a \nabla_a \phi_\partial^i$, where ∇ is the (torsion-free) covariant derivative on ∂M compatible with the metric h_{ab} . Thus, this term is algebraic in ξ_∂ . Finally, turning to the last term we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\xi_\partial} e_a^A = \xi_\partial^b \nabla_b e_a^A + e_b^A \nabla_a \xi_\partial^b. \quad (2.5)$$

Thus, we may perform an integration by parts in the third term and use the arbitrariness of ξ_∂^a to conclude that the covariant divergence of \mathbf{T}_{ab} satisfies².

$$\nabla_a \mathbf{T}^{ab} = \sum_i \frac{\delta S}{\delta \phi_\partial^i} \nabla^b \phi_\partial^i + \mathbf{T}^a_A \nabla^b e_a^A. \quad (2.6)$$

We are now in a position to construct the counter-term charges and demonstrate their conservation. To do so, consider a particular choice of boundary values and an infinitesimal diffeomorphism ψ_∂ corresponding to a symmetry of the boundary values. We take ψ_∂ to be generated by the vector field ξ_∂^a and the associated bulk diffeomorphism ψ to be generated by ξ^a . Hence ξ_∂^a Lie-derives the boundary fields up to a local gauge transformation

$$\mathcal{L}_{\xi_\partial} e_a^A = R^A_B e_a^B, \quad \mathcal{L}_{\xi_\partial} \phi_\partial^i = \sum_j R^i_j \phi_\partial^j, \quad (2.7)$$

where $R_{AB} = -R_{BA}$ and R^i_j gives the action of the associated frame rotation on the boundary scalars ϕ_∂^i . In fact, as we will see shortly, it is just as easy to allow (R^A_B, R^i_j) to define an arbitrary infinitesimal transformation $\delta e_a^A = R^A_B e_a^B$, $\delta \phi_\partial^i = \sum_j R^i_j \phi_\partial^j$ under which the action S is locally invariant³.

We call such a ξ^a an “asymptotic symmetry compatible with Ω .” One then defines the associated “counter-term subtraction charge:”

$$Q[\xi] = \int_C \mathbf{T}_{ab} \xi^a ds^b, \quad (2.9)$$

² Some readers may consider it more elegant to introduce another derivative operator D_a on ∂M satisfying $D_a e_b^B = 0$. In this case, $D_a \mathbf{T}^{ab}$ is given just by the scalar field term on the right-hand side of (2.6). However, it is the covariant divergence with respect to ∇_a which will be of direct use below.

³ By locally invariant, we mean that

$$\int_V \left(R^A_B e_a^B \frac{\delta}{\delta e_a^A} + R^i_j \phi_\partial^j \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi_\partial^i} \right) S = 0 \quad (2.8)$$

for any $V \subset \partial M$.

where C is a Cauchy surface of ∂M , and

$$ds^a = \epsilon^a{}_{b_1 \dots b_{n-1}} dx^{b_1} \dots dx^{b_{n-1}}$$

is the induced integration element on C . We will refer to C as a ‘cut’ of ∂M in order to avoid confusion with Cauchy surfaces in M . As an example of $Q[\xi]$ in the familiar anti-de Sitter context, one might take the boundary metric to be the Einstein static universe with all other boundary fields vanishing. In this case, one could take ξ to be an asymptotic time translation and the associated $Q[\xi]$ would give the counter-term subtraction definition of energy. Note also that we have defined $Q[\xi_0]$ only when ξ_0^a preserves any auxiliary structure (Ω) needed to define the boundary fields. However, in typical examples (e.g., AdS) the result may be applied much more generally: one need only find the boundary symmetry $(\xi_0^a)_\partial$ associated with ξ_0^a and then choose another extension ξ_0^a to the bulk which preserves Ω and induces the same action ξ_0^a on the boundary. One then defines $Q[\xi_0] := Q[\xi'_0]$.

We wish to prove that $Q[\xi]$ is independent of the choice of cut C . Let us therefore consider some region $V \subset \partial M$ such that the boundary ∂V within ∂M consists of two cuts C_1 and C_2 . Let $Q_{C_1}[\xi]$ and $Q_{C_2}[\xi]$ denote the values of $Q[\xi]$ associated with the two cuts respectively. Then we have

$$Q_{C_1}[\xi] - Q_{C_2}[\xi] = \int_V \epsilon \nabla_a (\mathbf{T}^{ab} \xi_{\partial b}). \quad (2.10)$$

But we may use (2.6) to express (2.10) as

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{C_1}[\xi] - Q_{C_2}[\xi] &= \int_V \sum_i \frac{\delta S}{\delta \phi_\partial^i} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_\partial} \phi_\partial^i + \int_{\partial M} \epsilon \mathbf{T}^a{}_A \mathcal{L}_{\xi_\partial} e_a{}^A \\ &= \int_V \left(R^A{}_B e^B{}_a \frac{\delta}{\delta e_a{}^A} + \sum_{i,j} R^i{}_j \phi_\partial^j \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi_\partial^i} \right) S = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

where in the second step we have used the fact that ξ_∂ generates a symmetry of the boundary fields up to a gauge rotation, and where in the final step we have used the fact that S is invariant under such rotations.

Thus, for asymptotic symmetries ξ compatible with Ω , $Q[\xi]$ is indeed independent of the cut C . Note that, as a result, we can weaken the framework to require only that C is homotopic to a Cauchy surface. The result (2.11) generalizes the construction of [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 38] to include arbitrary non-trivial (tensor and spinor) boundary fields.

B. Conformal Boundary Killing Fields and Asymptotically anti-de Sitter Boundary Conditions

In [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16] it was shown that many gravitational theories with asymptotically anti-de Sitter asymptotic behavior satisfy the above requirements (1-4) of section II A. In addition, [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16] also demonstrate another property associated with the conformal invariance of the dual field theory (under the AdS/CFT correspondence). Recall that conformal invariance requires the trace of the stress-energy tensor to be zero. Now, if such a quantum field theory is placed on a generic curved background the trace of the stress tensor might be non-vanishing. This trace—the ‘anomaly’—is normally given by local curvature terms of the background metric. As a result, the AdS/CFT correspondence suggests that the trace $\tau = h^{ab} \tau_{ab}$ of the boundary stress tensor defined above should depend only on h_{ab} and, in particular, should be a constant on the space of solutions \mathcal{S} . That this is the case was shown in [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16] for their boundary conditions, under which τ^{ab} agrees with our \mathbf{T}_{ab} . Indeed, when the metric on ∂M is taken to be the Einstein static universe, references [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16] show that τ vanishes.

We may now follow [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16] and use this observation to generalize the discussion of $Q[\xi]$ to the case where ξ^a is associated with a vector field on ξ_∂^a which is only a conformal killing field of h_{ab} . Note that in cases where the boundary spacetime $(\partial M, h_{ab})$ is just the conformal boundary of the bulk, any asymptotic symmetry ξ^a of the bulk should induce such a conformal isometry ξ_∂^a of the boundary metric of ∂M so that this procedure will lead to a counter-term charge associated with every conserved quantity that one expects from the symmetries of the bulk system.

In particular, let us suppose that we have

$$\nabla_a \xi_{\partial b} + \nabla_b \xi_{\partial a} = \mathcal{L}_{\xi_\partial} h_{ab} = 2k h_{ab}, \quad (2.12)$$

for some smooth function k on ∂M , and that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\xi_\partial} \phi_\partial^i = \sum_j K^i_j \phi_\partial^j + \sum_j R^i_j \phi_\partial^j. \quad (2.13)$$

Here the coefficients K^i_j encode the behavior of the ϕ_∂^i under conformal transformations and the R^i_j are as before in section II A. Equation (2.12) implies that $\mathcal{L}_{\xi_\partial} e_a^A = k e_a^A + R^A_B e_a^B$. We now simply repeat the above calculation to see how $Q_C[\xi]$ depends on the cut C . Consider again equations (2.6) and (2.10), but now use equation (2.12) to write the right-hand side in the form

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{C_1}[\xi] - Q_{C_2}[\xi] &= \int_V \left(\epsilon \mathbf{T}^a_A \mathcal{L}_{\xi_\partial} e^A_a + \sum_i \frac{\delta S}{\delta \phi_\partial^i} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_\partial} \phi_\partial^i \right) \\ &= \int_V \left(k \epsilon \mathbf{T} + \sum_{i,j} K^i_j \phi_\partial^j \frac{\delta S}{\delta \phi_\partial^i} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

$$= \int_V \left(k e^A_a \frac{\delta}{\delta e^A_a} + \sum_{i,j} K^i_j \phi_\partial^j \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi_\partial^i} \right) S, \quad (2.15)$$

where we have defined $\mathbf{T} := \mathbf{T}^a_A e_a^A = \mathbf{T}^{ab} h_{ab}$, and in the second line we have used the invariance of S under frame rotations. Thus, assuming that the integrand on the right side is a function of the boundary fields alone and not of the particular solution under consideration (as is the case under the asymptotic conditions of [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]), the change in $Q[\xi]$ is a function only of the boundary fields and is otherwise constant over the space of solutions \mathcal{S} .

C. The Peierls bracket

Having introduced (and generalized) the counter-term subtraction definition of charges, we now briefly review the other piece of machinery we will need to derive our main result: the Peierls bracket.

The Peierls bracket is an algebraic structure defined directly on gauge-invariant functions on the space of solutions \mathcal{S} associated with an action principle. As shown in the original work [33], this bracket is equivalent to the Poisson bracket under the natural identification of the phase space with the space of solutions. One of the powerful features of the Peierls bracket is that it is manifestly spacetime covariant. Another is that it is defined directly for general gauge invariants A and B whether or not A and B are associated with some common time t . Furthermore, A and B need not be local but can instead be extended over regions of space and time so long as there exist initial data surfaces both to the future and to the past of their support. More general cases may then be defined through limits when those limits converge.

These features make the Peierls bracket ideal for studying the boundary stress-tensor, which is well-defined only on the space of solutions and is not a local function in the bulk spacetime⁴. As a result, it will be straight-forward to give a Peierls version of a Noether argument to show that the charges $Q[\xi]$ generate the appropriate symmetries when ξ_∂ is a boundary Killing field – or, more generally, a boundary conformal Killing field under the conditions of section II B. Since this property is required of any charge defined by Hamiltonian methods, it follows that such charges can differ from $Q[\xi]$ only by a quantity with vanishing Peierls bracket. But all such quantities can depend only on the boundary fields and must otherwise be constants on the space of solutions \mathcal{S} .

The Peierls construction considers the effect on one gauge invariant function (say, B) on the space of solutions when the action is deformed by a term proportional to the another such function (A). In particular, suppose that the dynamics is determined by an action S . One defines the advanced ($D_A^+ B$) and retarded ($D_A^- B$) effects of A on B by comparing the original system with a new system defined by the action $S_\epsilon = S + \epsilon A$, but associated with the same space of histories. Here ϵ is a real parameter which will soon be taken to be infinitesimal, and the new action is associated with a new space \mathcal{S}_ϵ of deformed solutions.

⁴ For the same reasons, we expect the Peierls bracket to be of use in studying other objects which naturally arise in the AdS/CFT correspondence.

Under retarded (advanced) boundary conditions for which the solutions $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $s_\epsilon \in \mathcal{S}_\epsilon$ coincide to the past (future) of the support of A , the quantity $B_0 = B(s)$ computed using the undeformed solution s will in general differ from $B_\epsilon^\pm = B(s_\epsilon)$ computed using s_ϵ and retarded (+) or advanced (-) boundary conditions. For small epsilon, the difference between these quantities defines the retarded (advanced) effect $D_A^- B$ ($D_A^+ B$) of A on B through:

$$D_A^\pm B = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} (B_\epsilon^\pm - B_0), \quad (2.16)$$

which is a function of the unperturbed solution s . Similarly, one defines $D_B^\pm A$ by reversing the roles of A and B above. Since A, B are gauge invariant, $D_B^\pm A$ is well-defined (and again gauge-invariant).

The Peierls bracket [33] is then defined to be the difference of the advanced and retarded effects:

$$\{A, B\} = D_A^+ B - D_A^- B. \quad (2.17)$$

The fact that this agrees with the Poisson bracket (supplemented by the equations of motion) was shown in [33], and generalizes the familiar result that the commutator function for a free scalar field is given by the difference between the advanced and retarded Green's functions. In fact, it is enlightening to write the Peierls bracket more generally in terms of such Green's functions. To do so, we again make use of our complete set of (bulk) fields ϕ^i (which include the metric and components of bulk tensor and spinor fields) and the associated advanced and retarded Green's functions $G_{ij}^\pm(x, x')$. Note that we have

$$D_A^+ B = \int dx dx' \frac{\delta B}{\delta \phi^i(x)} G_{ij}^+(x, x') \frac{\delta A}{\delta \phi^j(x')} = \int dx dx' \frac{\delta B}{\delta \phi^j(x')} G_{ji}^-(x', x) \frac{\delta A}{\delta \phi^i(x)} = D_B^- A. \quad (2.18)$$

Thus, the Peierls bracket may also be written in the manifestly anti-symmetric form

$$\{A, B\} = D_B^- A - D_A^- B. \quad (2.19)$$

The expressions (2.18) in terms of $G_{ij}^\pm(x, x')$ are also useful in order to verify that the Peierls bracket defines a Lie-Poisson algebra. In particular, the derivation property $\{A, BC\} = \{A, B\}C + \{A, C\}B$ follows immediately from the Leibnitz rule for functional derivatives. The Jacobi identity also follows by a straightforward calculation, making use of the fact that functional derivatives of the action commute (see e.g., [43, 44]).

If one desires, one may use related Green's function techniques to extend the Peierls bracket to a Lie algebra of gauge dependent quantities [34]. The result is not unique, and the associated freedom can be used to define an algebra equivalent either to the canonical Dirac procedure or to algebras associated with various gauge-fixing schemes as one chooses. Such extensions are useful in the presence of diffeomorphism invariance due to the following subtlety: Because (active) diffeomorphisms can 'move' the hypersurface, the spacetime support of a diffeomorphism invariant function A is always the entire spacetime. However, one may follow [34] in defining the Peierls algebra on gauge-dependent quantities with appropriately localized support. One can then use the results to define the Peierls algebra of gauge-independent quantities by taking appropriate limits.

Alternatively, in the presence of diffeomorphism invariance one may choose to simply define the Peierls algebra locally on the space of solutions \mathcal{S} . In this case one uses that fact that one can find (gauge-dependent) functions on \mathcal{H} which are supported to the future of some Cauchy surface and which also coincide with certain gauge-invariant functions on judiciously chosen open sets of \mathcal{S} (containing only small open sets of the gauge orbits). Such open sets may then be pieced together to (consistently) define the Peierls algebra on appropriate gauge-invariant functions. In fact, however, we will be able to avoid this issue below by making use of an additional property of the spacetimes of interest.

III. MAIN ARGUMENT

We now use the Peierls bracket to show that the counter-term subtraction charges $Q[\xi]$ generate the appropriate symmetries when ξ_∂ is a boundary Killing field, or, more generally, a boundary conformal Killing field under the conditions of section II B. Since this property is required of any charge defined by Hamiltonian methods, it follows that such charges can differ from $Q[\xi]$ only by a quantity with vanishing Peierls bracket. But any such quantity can be built only from auxiliary structures and must otherwise be constant on the space of solutions \mathcal{S} .

The essential point of the argument is that the Peierls bracket allows an extremely simple derivation of Noether's theorem. However, in order to avoid the issue mentioned at the end of section II C in connection with diffeomorphism invariance, we require that our system have a special property relating the causal structure of ∂M to causal structures on M . In particular, we require:




FIG. 1: This diagram shows the structure of the vector field ξ and the various causal relationships. The boundary spacetime ∂M is represented by the solid vertical lines, while the cuts C_1 and C_0 are each indicated by a pair of labeled points. We have $\xi = 0$ in the (shaded) region outside the future of C_0 and $\xi = \xi_0$ in the (differently shaded) region to the future of C_1 . The regions marked A and $\delta_\xi S$ indicate the relative locations of the spacetime support of these functions.

Given a Cauchy surface C of the *boundary* manifold ∂M and a bulk solution $s \in \mathcal{S}$, there is a notion $J_M^+(C)$ of the causal future of C in the *bulk* spacetime⁵ M . Similarly, there is a notion $J_M^-(C) \subset M$ of the causal past of C in the *bulk* spacetime. Considering the linearized equations of motion about s , we require that for bulk sources in $J_M^+(C)$ there be a unique retarded Green's function which vanishes outside of $J_M^+(C)$. Similarly, for bulk sources in $J_M^-(C)$ we require that there be a unique advanced Green's function which vanishes outside of $J_M^-(C)$. Furthermore, we require that $J_M^+(C)$ and $J_M^-(C)$ do not intersect inside M .

Such a requirement is generally satisfied when ∂M is defined by conformal completion of M , regardless of whether the boundary has multiple components and also regardless of the existence of past or future boundaries of M (both of which arise for eternal black holes). Of course, we may also discuss points in the boundary manifold ∂M as lying to the past or future of C using the causal structure of ∂M .

Now, consider any gauge invariant function A on the space \mathcal{S} of solutions such that, for each $s \in \mathcal{S}$, the spacetime support of A lies to the future of some Cauchy surface C_1 of ∂M . Similarly, consider any vector field ξ_∂ on ∂M which satisfies the following requirements, which are illustrated in Fig. 1 above:

- Both ξ_∂ and the associated bulk ξ vanish except to the future of some Cauchy surface C_0 of ∂M .
- Everywhere to the future of C_1 in the boundary spacetime ∂M , ξ_∂ coincides with a vector field $(\xi_0)_\partial$ which generates a symmetry of the boundary fields. Similarly, everywhere to the future of C_1 in the bulk, we require that the two associated bulk vector fields ξ and ξ_0 coincide. Note that our diffeomorphism-invariance assumption implies that ξ_0 generates a symmetry. Thus, the change $\delta_\xi S$ in the action under the infinitesimal (bulk) diffeomorphism generated by ξ is supported in the (bulk) region $J_M^+(C_0) \setminus J_M^+(C_1)$; i.e., in that region in the future of C_0 but not in the future of C_1 . Furthermore, the diffeomorphism ξ will act as the corresponding symmetry ξ_0 on A .

Let us now consider the retarded effects of A on $\delta_\xi S$ and of $\delta_\xi S$ on A . Since A is supported to the future of C_1 , we may compute the retarded effect of A on *any* observable by imposing that the change vanishes outside the future of C_1 . But $\delta_\xi S$ is supported outside the future of C_1 . Thus the retarded effect $D_A^- \delta_\xi S$ vanishes.

On the other hand, since $\delta_\xi S$ is supported to the future of C_0 , we may compute the retarded effect of $\delta_\xi S$ on any observable by imposing that the change vanishes outside the future of C_0 . In fact, to compute this retarded effect we need only note that⁶, by definition, adding $\delta_\xi S$ to the original action S gives the deformation of S that results from performing an infinitesimal diffeomorphism along ξ . Furthermore, since ξ vanishes outside the future of C_0 , the change $\delta_\xi \phi(x)$ in any field $\phi(x)$ induced by the infinitesimal diffeomorphism ξ satisfies our retarded boundary conditions. Thus, the retarded effect of adding $\delta_\xi S$ is given on any solution by the infinitesimal diffeomorphism generated by ξ . In particular, since $D_A^- \delta_\xi S = 0$, we have

$$\{\delta_\xi S, A\} = -D_{\delta_\xi S}^- A = -\delta_\xi A = -\delta_{\xi_0} A, \quad (3.1)$$

⁵ When the boundary ∂M is defined by conformal completion of M , $J_M^+(C)$ is just the intersection of the bulk spacetime M with the causal future $J^+(C, M \cup \partial M)$ of C in the conformally completed spacetime $M \cup \partial M$.

⁶ Technically, we also assume that $\delta_\xi S$ is differentiable on the original space \mathcal{H} of histories; i.e., with the same boundary fields as S . This is typically straightforward to verify.

and we see that $-\delta_\xi S$ generates the action of our symmetry ξ_0 on A .

Our task is now to relate $\delta_\xi S$ to $Q[\xi_0]$. To do so, let us consider the particular case $\xi = f\xi_0$ where f is a function on ∂M which vanishes except to the future of C_0 and is such that $f = 1$ everywhere outside the past of C_1 . We now once again make use of the fact that S is *invariant* under the simultaneous actions of the diffeomorphism generated by ξ^a on the bulk fields and of the diffeomorphism generated by $\xi_\partial^a = f(\xi_0)_\partial^a$ on the boundary fields. Thus, we may write

$$\delta_\xi S = - \int_{\partial M} \frac{\delta S}{\delta \phi^i} \mathcal{L}_{\xi_\partial} \phi^i - \int_{\partial M} \epsilon \mathbf{T}^a{}_A \mathcal{L}_{\xi_\partial} e_a{}^A. \quad (3.2)$$

However, since $(\xi_0)_\partial$ is a symmetry of the boundary fields, the Lie derivatives of both ϕ^i and $e_a{}^A$ along the vector field $(\xi_0)_\partial$ are given by a gauge rotation (2.7). Thus we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\xi_\partial} \phi^i = \xi_\partial^a \nabla_a \phi^i = f(\xi_0)_\partial^a \nabla_a \phi^i = f \mathcal{L}_{\xi_0} \phi^i = f \sum_j R^i{}_j \phi^j, \quad (3.3)$$

and, similarly,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\xi_\partial} e_a{}^A = e^A{}_b (\xi_0)_\partial^b \nabla_a f + f \sum_B R^A{}_B e^B{}_a. \quad (3.4)$$

Furthermore, since f is constant both to the past of C_0 and to the future of C_1 , we may use (3.3) and (3.4) to replace the integral over ∂M with an integral over the region V between C_0 and C_1 . Thus, (3.2) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\xi S &= - \int_V \epsilon \mathbf{T}^{ab} (\xi_0)_b \nabla_a f + \int_V f \underbrace{\left(R^A{}_B e^B{}_a \frac{\delta}{\delta e_a{}^A} + R^i{}_j \phi^j \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi^i} \right)}_{=0} S \\ &= - \int_{C_1} \mathbf{T}_{ab} \xi^b ds^a + \int_V \epsilon f \underbrace{\nabla_a (\mathbf{T}^{ab} (\xi_0)_b)}_{=0} \\ &= - \int_{C_1} \mathbf{T}_{ab} \xi^b ds^a \\ &= -Q_{C_1}[\xi_0]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

In the first line, we have used the fact that S is invariant under frame rotations. In the second line, we have used that $\nabla^b (\mathbf{T}_{ab} (\xi_0)_\partial^a) = 0$, which follows from the fact that ξ_0^a is an asymptotic symmetry (see eqs.(2.10, 2.11)). Finally, in passing from the first to the second line we have used the fact that $f = 0$ on C_0 .

Thus, $-\delta_\xi S$ agrees with the charge $Q[\xi]$ evaluated on the cut C_1 . By the arguments of section II A, this equality also holds on any other cut of ∂M . Consequently, since by eq. (3.1) the variation $\delta_\xi S$ generates the action of the infinitesimal symmetry ξ_0 on observables, it follows that the same must be true for the counter-term charges. Thus,

$$\{Q[\xi_0], A\} = \delta_{\xi_0} A \quad (3.6)$$

So far, we have established (3.6) only when A lies to the future of some Cauchy surface of ∂M . Of course, a similar argument holds if A lies to the past of some Cauchy surface of ∂M . Typically⁷, one finds that any gauge invariant may be written as a function of observables supported either to the past or to the future of various Cauchy surfaces of ∂M . Thus, we may extend the result (3.6) to the entire space of observables. It therefore follows that $Q[\xi_0]$ can differ from any Hamiltonian generator of the symmetry ξ_0 (which also satisfies (3.6)) only through a (cut-independent) term which is a function *only* of the boundary fields and is otherwise constant over the space \mathcal{S} of solutions.

In fact, under the conditions of section II B we may also apply this argument to the case where $(\xi_0)_\partial$ is only a conformal Killing field of the chosen boundary fields, see (2.12, 2.13). While $\delta_\xi S$ is no longer supported to the past of C_1 , the part of $\delta_\xi S$ not to the past of C_1 is given by an integral which depends only on the boundary fields and is otherwise constant on the space of solutions. Thus, the advanced effect $D_{\delta_\xi S}^+ A$ of $\delta_\xi S$ on A again vanishes.

⁷ At least in the case where the bulk manifold M is the union of the causal past and the causal future of the boundary spacetime ∂M . More generally, there may be additional observables supported in the causal complement of ∂M , but these necessarily have vanishing Peierls bracket with any observable (such as $\delta_\xi S$) supported near the boundary.

Said differently, we have shown that the regulated expression

$$\delta'_\xi S = \delta_\xi S - \int_{I+(C_1, \partial M) \subset \partial M} f \left(k_0 e^A{}_a \frac{\delta}{\delta e^A{}_a} + \sum_{i,j} K_0{}^i{}_j \phi_\partial^j \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi_\partial^i} \right) S, \quad (3.7)$$

also satisfies $\{\delta'_\xi S, A\} = -\delta_{\xi_0} A$. We now use the conformal symmetry conditions (2.12, 2.13) along with the arguments above to calculate $\delta'_\xi S$:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta'_\xi S &= - \int_V \epsilon \mathbf{T}_{ab}(\xi_0)_\partial^b \nabla^a f - \int_V f \left(k_0 e^A{}_a \frac{\delta}{\delta e^A{}_a} + \sum_{i,j} K_0{}^i{}_j \phi_\partial^j \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi_\partial^i} \right) S \\ &= - \int_{C_1} \mathbf{T}_{ab}(\xi_0)_\partial^b ds^a + \int_V f \nabla_a (\mathbf{T}^{ab}(\xi_0)_b) - \int_V f \left(k_0 e^A{}_a \frac{\delta}{\delta e^A{}_a} + \sum_{i,j} K_0{}^i{}_j \phi_\partial^j \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi_\partial^i} \right) S \\ &= - \int_{C_1} \mathbf{T}_{ab}(\xi_0)_\partial^b ds^a + \int_V f \frac{\delta S}{\delta \phi_\partial^i} \mathcal{L}_{(\xi_0)_\partial} \phi_\partial^i + \int_V \epsilon f \mathbf{T}_A^a \mathcal{L}_{(\xi_0)_\partial} e_a^A \\ &\quad - \int_V f \left(k_0 e^A{}_a \frac{\delta}{\delta e^A{}_a} + \sum_{i,j} K_0{}^i{}_j \phi_\partial^j \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi_\partial^i} \right) S \\ &= -Q_{C_1}[\xi_0]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Finally, since we saw in section II B that $Q_C[\xi_0]$ depends on the cut C only through a term that is constant on \mathcal{S} , it follows that we have (3.6) for any cut C and any sufficiently localized observable A , also for the case of conformal isometries $(\xi_0)_\partial^a$. Thus, under the conditions of section II B, even when $(\xi_0)_\partial^a$ is only a conformal symmetry of the boundary, $Q_C[\xi_0]$ can differ from any Hamiltonian generator of the symmetry ξ_0^a only through a (possibly cut-dependent) term which is a function *only* of the boundary fields and is otherwise constant over the space \mathcal{S} of solutions.

IV. DISCUSSION

We have used general arguments based on the Peierls brackets to compare the counter-term subtraction charges $Q[\xi]$ of [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16] with any Hamiltonian charges $H[\xi]$ when ξ is a diffeomorphism which generates a symmetry of an appropriate system. Specifically, when ξ induces a symmetry ξ_∂ of the boundary fields, we have shown that $Q[\xi]$ generates the bulk symmetry associated with ξ via the Peierls bracket. As a result, it can differ from $H[\xi]$ only by a term determined entirely by the boundary fields and which is otherwise constant on the space of solutions. Furthermore, since both $Q[\xi]$ and $H[\xi]$ are conserved, this difference is also independent of the cut of infinity on which it is evaluated.

Our results generalize a conclusion of [29], which was in turn suggested by a number of more specific calculations (e.g. [8, 9, 25, 26, 27, 28]). Ref. [29] showed via direct calculation that $Q[\xi] - H[\xi]$ was a function of boundary fields alone in $d = 5$ spacetime dimensions and under a particular set of asymptotic conditions; indeed, [29] gives an explicit formula for this difference. Ref. [29] was also able to show that $H[\xi]$ agrees with a definition of energy in that context due to Asthekar et al. [17, 18]. However, from the results of the present paper and the convention that the Hamiltonian charges $H[\xi]$ vanish in AdS space, we may conclude generally that $H[\xi] = Q[\xi] - Q[\xi](AdS)$, where $Q[\xi](AdS)$ is the result obtained by evaluating the counter-term charge in pure AdS space. The present results could also be applied in non-conformal versions of gauge-gravity duality (such as those described in, e.g., [5]) if an appropriate set of counterterms can be identified to implement requirement (4) of section II.

Two further generalizations of [29] were also described in the work above. The first involves the generalization of the construction of [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16] to the case in which arbitrary (tensor and spinor) non-trivial boundary fields may be present in addition to the boundary metric. The result is simply the replacement of the boundary stress tensor with the “modified boundary stress tensor” \mathbf{T}^{ab} of equation (2.3), which contains extra terms arising from any non-trivial boundary fields which are not scalars. This modified boundary stress tensor is not covariantly conserved, and even boundary scalar fields contribute to its divergence. Nevertheless, the form of $\nabla_a \mathbf{T}^{ab}$ allows one to show that $Q[\xi]$ is in fact conserved. Furthermore, the Peierls bracket argument again shows that $H[\xi] = Q[\xi] - Q[\xi](AdS)$.

The final generalization considers a special case which arises when the bulk theory is dual to a conformal theory, as in the original anti-de Sitter context. In such cases, the counter-term action changes under a conformal transformation, but only by a function of the boundary fields which is otherwise constant on the space \mathcal{S} of solutions. As a result, one

may consider the case of a vector field ξ_∂ which acts only as a conformal symmetry on the boundary. The result is again that $Q[\xi]$ generates the action of the bulk symmetry along ξ via the Peierls bracket and thus that $Q[\xi]$ can differ from any Hamiltonian charge $H[\xi]$ only by a term built from the boundary fields (and which is otherwise constant on \mathcal{S}). However, in this case the term can depend on the cut C of the boundary spacetime on which it is evaluated⁸.

Recall that when ∂M is determined through conformal compactification (as in the asymptotically anti-de Sitter context), any asymptotic symmetry induces a conformal Killing field on the boundary. Thus, in this case one may work with a fixed conformal structure Ω and still construct all conserved quantities via the counter-term subtraction method. Furthermore, Hamiltonian generators which vanish on AdS space itself are given for all asymptotic symmetries ξ by

$$H[\xi] = Q_C[\xi] - Q_C[\xi](AdS), \quad (4.1)$$

where we have once again subtracted off the value $Q_C[\xi](AdS)$ of the counter-term charge evaluated on a corresponding cut C of ∂M in pure anti de-Sitter space. As a result, both $H[\xi]$ and $Q_C[\xi]$ are consistent with the covariant phase space methods of [31], which controls only variations of the Hamiltonian on the space of solutions.

Acknowledgments

D.M. would like to thank Vijay Balasubramanian and Per Kraus for useful discussions about counter-term charges. S.H. and D.M. were supported in part by NSF grant PHY0354978 and by funds from the University of California. S.H. was also supported in part by DOE grant DE-FG02-91ER40618. A.I. was supported in part by NSF grant PHY 00-90138 to the University of Chicago.

-
- [1] J. M. Maldacena, “The large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2**, 231 (1998) [*Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **38**, 1113 (1999)] [arXiv:hep-th/9711200].
 - [2] S. S. Gubser, I. R. Klebanov and A. M. Polyakov, “Gauge theory correlators from non-critical string theory,” *Phys. Lett. B* **428**, 105 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9802109].
 - [3] E. Witten, “Anti-de Sitter space and holography,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2**, 253 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9802150].
 - [4] O. Aharony, S. S. Gubser, J. M. Maldacena, H. Ooguri and Y. Oz, “Large N field theories, string theory and gravity,” *Phys. Rept.* **323**, 183 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/9905111].
 - [5] N. Itzhaki, J. M. Maldacena, J. Sonnenschein and S. Yankielowicz, “Supergravity and the large N limit of theories with sixteen supercharges,” *Phys. Rev. D* **58**, 046004 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9802042].
 - [6] A. Hashimoto and N. Itzhaki, “Non-commutative Yang-Mills and the AdS/CFT correspondence,” *Phys. Lett. B* **465**, 142 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9907166].
 - [7] J. M. Maldacena and J. G. Russo, “Large N limit of non-commutative gauge theories,” *JHEP* **9909**, 025 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9908134].
 - [8] M. Henningson and K. Skenderis, “The holographic Weyl anomaly,” *JHEP* **9807**, 023 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9806087].
 - [9] V. Balasubramanian and P. Kraus, “A stress tensor for anti-de Sitter gravity,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **208**, 413 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9902121].
 - [10] K. Skenderis and S. N. Solodukhin, “Quantum effective action from the AdS/CFT correspondence,” *Phys. Lett. B* **472**, 316 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/9910023].
 - [11] M. Bianchi, D. Z. Freedman and K. Skenderis, “How to go with an RG flow,” *JHEP* **0108**, 041 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0105276].
 - [12] S. de Haro, K. Skenderis and S. N. Solodukhin, “Gravity in warped compactifications and the holographic stress tensor,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **18**, 3171 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0011230].
 - [13] K. Skenderis, “Lecture notes on holographic renormalization,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19**, 5849 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0209067].
 - [14] S. de Haro, S. N. Solodukhin and K. Skenderis, “Holographic reconstruction of spacetime and renormalization in the AdS/CFT correspondence,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **217**, 595 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0002230].
 - [15] K. Skenderis, “Asymptotically anti-de Sitter spacetimes and their stress energy tensor,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **16**, 740 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0010138].
 - [16] I. Papadimitriou and K. Skenderis, “AdS/CFT correspondence and geometry,” arXiv:hep-th/0404176.
 - [17] A. Ashtekar, A. Magnon, “Asymptotically anti-de Sitter space-times,” *Classical and Quantum Gravity Lett.* **1**, L39 (1984).

⁸ Note that this dependence vanishes for the special case of asymptotically AdS spaces when the boundary metric is chosen to be the Einstein static universe and all other boundary fields vanish, since in that case $\tau = \tau^{ab}h_{ab} = 0$ [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16].

- [18] A. Ashtekar and S. Das, “Asymptotically anti-de Sitter space-times: Conserved quantities,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **17**, L17 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/9911230].
- [19] M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, “Asymptotically Anti-De Sitter Spaces,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **98**, 391 (1985).
- [20] L. F. Abbott and S. Deser, “Stability Of Gravity With A Cosmological Constant,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **195**, 76 (1982).
- [21] G. W. Gibbons, S. W. Hawking, G. T. Horowitz and M. J. Perry, “Positive Mass Theorems For Black Holes,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **88**, 295 (1983).
- [22] G. W. Gibbons, C. M. Hull and N. P. Warner, “The Stability Of Gauged Supergravity,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **218**, 173 (1983).
- [23] P. K. Townsend, “Positive Energy And The Scalar Potential In Higher Dimensional (Super)Gravity Theories,” *Phys. Lett. B* **148**, 55 (1984).
- [24] J. Katz, J. Bicak and D. Lynden-Bell, “Relativistic conservation laws and integral constraints for large cosmological perturbations,” *Phys. Rev. D* **55**, 5957 (1997).
- [25] J. T. Liu and W. A. Sabra, “Mass in anti-de Sitter spaces,” arXiv:hep-th/0405171.
- [26] G. W. Gibbons, M. J. Perry and C. N. Pope, “The first law of thermodynamics for Kerr - anti-de Sitter black holes,” arXiv:hep-th/0408217.
- [27] P. Mora, R. Olea, R. Troncoso and J. Zanelli, “Vacuum energy in odd-dimensional AdS gravity,” arXiv:hep-th/0412046.
- [28] E. Radu and D. H. Tchrakian, “New hairy black hole solutions with a dilaton potential,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22**, 879 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0410154].
- [29] S. Hollands, A. Ishibashi, and D. Marolf, “Comparison between various notions of conserved charges in asymptotically AdS-spacetimes,” arXiv:hep-th/0503045.
- [30] A. Ashtekar, L. Bombelli and O. Reula, “The Covariant Phase Space Of Asymptotically Flat Gravitational Fields,” in *Analysis, Geometry and Mechanics: 200 Years After Lagrange*, edited by M. Francaviglia and D. Holm (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1991).
- [31] R. M. Wald and A. Zoupas, “A General Definition of ”Conserved Quantities” in General Relativity and Other Theories of Gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **61**, 084027 (2000) [arXiv:gr-qc/9911095].
- [32] V. Iyer and R. M. Wald, “Some properties of Noether charge and a proposal for dynamical black hole entropy,” *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 846 (1994) [arXiv:gr-qc/9403028].
- [33] R. E. Peierls, “The commutation laws of relativistic field theory,” *Proc. Roy. Soc. (London)* **214** (1952), 143-157.
- [34] D. M. Marolf, “The Generalized Peierls bracket,” *Annals Phys.* **236**, 392 (1994) [arXiv:hep-th/9308150].
- [35] R. G. Cai and N. Ohta, “Surface counterterms and boundary stress-energy tensors for asymptotically non-anti-de Sitter spaces,” *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 024006 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/9912013].
- [36] M. Duetsch and K. Fredenhagen, “Algebraic quantum field theory, perturbation theory, and the loop expansion,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **219**, 5 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0001129].
- [37] M. Duetsch and K. Fredenhagen, “Causal perturbation theory in terms of retarded products, and a proof of the action Ward identity,” arXiv:hep-th/0403213.
- [38] M. Bianchi, D. Z. Freedman and K. Skenderis, “Holographic renormalization,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **631**, 159 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0112119].
- [39] S. Deser and B. Tekin, “Energy in generic higher curvature gravity theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 084009 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0212292].
- [40] S. Deser and B. Tekin, “Gravitational energy in quadratic curvature gravities,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 101101 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0205318].
- [41] N. Okuyama and J. Koga, “Asymptotically anti-de Sitter spacetimes and conserved quantities in higher curvature gravitational theories,” [arXiv:hep-th/0501044].
- [42] N. Deruelle and J. Katz, “On the mass of a Kerr-anti-de Sitter spacetime in D dimensions,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22**, 421 (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0410135].
- [43] B. DeWitt, “Dynamical Theory of Groups and Fields,” (Gordon and Breach, NY, 1965).
- [44] B. DeWitt in *Relativity, Groups, and Topology II: Les Houches 1983* (B. DeWitt and R. Stora, Ed.), part 2, p. 381, North-Holland, New York, 1984.