

# Distributed Systems of Intersecting Branes at Arbitrary Angles

R. Abbaspur<sup>\*,†1</sup> and H. Arfaei<sup>\*,†2</sup>

*\*Institute for Studies in Theoretical Physics and Mathematics,  
P.O. Box 19395-5531, Tehran, Iran.*

*†Department of Physics, Sharif University of Technology,  
P. O. Box 19365-9161, Tehran, Iran.*

## Abstract

A ‘reduced’ action formulation for a general class of the supergravity solutions, corresponding to the ‘marginally’ bound ‘distributed’ systems of various types of branes at arbitrary angles, is developed. It turns out that all the information regarding the classical features of such solutions is encoded in a first order Lagrangian (the ‘reduced’ Lagrangian) corresponding to the desired geometry of branes. The marginal solution for a system of  $N$  such distributions (for various distribution functions) span an  $N$  dimensional submanifold of the fields’ configuration (target) space, parametrised by a set of  $N$  independent harmonic functions on the transverse space. This submanifold, which we call it as the ‘ $H$ -surface’, is a null surface with respect to a metric on the configuration space, which is defined by the reduced Lagrangian. The equations of motion then transform to a set of equations describing the embedding of a null geodesic surface in this space, which is identified as the  $H$ -surface. Using these facts, we present a very simple derivation of the conventional orthogonal solutions together with their intersection rules. Then a new solution for a (distributed) pair of  $p$ -branes at  $SU(2)$  angles in  $D$  dimensions is derived.

---

<sup>1</sup>e-mail:abbaspur@netware2.ipm.ac.ir

<sup>2</sup>e-mail:arfaei@theory.ipm.ac.ir

## Introduction

BPS configurations of intersecting branes have been the basis of many recent developments in string and M-theory. This is mainly because of their essential role in establishing string dualities, counting the entropy of extremal black holes and constructing supersymmetric gauge theories (for reviews see [1]-[3] and references therein). The construction of supergravity solutions corresponding to such configurations of branes have been implemented using four main approaches. These include: supersymmetry techniques [4, 5, 6, 7, 15, 16], duality transformations [8, 9, 10, 15, 16], dimensional reduction and oxidation [11, 13, 15, 16] and lastly direct solving of the bosonic field equations of supergravity [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23]. If we are going to study, in a unified manner, a wide class of these solutions in various types of  $D$ -dimensional supergravities, containing all types of  $p$ -branes, the only systematic approach is to use the direct method. In this approach one considers a purely bosonic theory consisting of two sectors, the ‘gravitational sector’ including a metric tensor and several dilatons, and the ‘form-fields sector’ consisting of antisymmetric tensors (‘form-fields’) of various degrees. Such a model can be imagined to be the bosonic sector of a supergravity theory in  $D$  dimensions, obtained from the 11D-theory via the processes of dimensional reduction and truncation [11]. In the usual approach, one writes the *complete set* of the field equations for the corresponding  $D$ -dimensional action, and tries to solve them by inserting a set of ansatz appropriate to the given configuration of  $p$ -branes. In spite of its logical completeness and reliability, such an approach involves extra complications due to the appearance of coupled Einstein-‘form-fields’ equations. Typically, introducing an ansatz with a set of field equations, means ‘reducing’ the ‘actual’ degrees of freedom (including spacetime dependences) to the ‘relevant’ (i.e. excited) ones describing the physical situation of interest. So an alternative approach is to form a ‘reduced action’ describing only dynamics of the excited degrees of freedom, and try to solve their equations of motion. However, in this manner we will lose the equations of motion corresponding to ‘irrelevant’ degrees of freedom, which appear as the constraints between relevant ones. For this reason, not every solution of the ‘reduced theory’ is also a solution of the original one, but it is easy to see that the converse is true. The situation is different when certain ‘subspaces’ of the ‘configuration space’ are concerned<sup>3</sup>. It turns out that supergravity BPS saturated solutions describe two types of brane systems [9, 2]: *i*) marginal configurations and *ii*) non-marginal configurations. In the first class the binding energy of the bound system of branes for their *arbitrary separations* vanishes so that they don’t feel any total force. In the second class the binding energy

---

<sup>3</sup>This is comparable to a similar fact in the differential geometry that: Every geodesic line of a Riemannian space, lying on an arbitrary surface, is also a geodesic line of the surface itself, while the converse is not necessarily true. However for certain subspaces called ‘geodesic surfaces’ the inverse theorem is also true.

is a negative quantity and the total force between each pairs of branes is attractive. As a result the bound state can be stable only at zero separations and the corresponding solutions are spherically symmetric around the common centre of branes in their transverse space. The marginality condition in the first class, imposes heavy constraints on the form of the corresponding solutions. They must satisfy certain ‘extremality’ and ‘no-force’ conditions. Further, all the field variables must be written totally as functions of a set of ‘independent’ harmonic functions [24]. It will be seen in this paper that, the (first order) ‘reduced Lagrangian’ of the theory  $\mathcal{L}$ , on the ‘subspace’  $H$  of such solutions, identically vanishes. This property, with some insights from the differential geometry, enforces the idea that every solution of the reduced theory on the ‘ $H$ -surface’ must describe a solution of the original theory as well. It seems that all the physical information regarding these solutions comes essentially through the corresponding reduced actions. In this paper we try to elaborate this idea, to the extent that it can be used for determining the solutions corresponding to the orthogonal, as well as the *non-orthogonal configurations* of  $p$ -branes . We will study solutions with uniform distributions of branes along their relative transverse directions, but with arbitrary distributions along their overall transverse directions. We shall refer to such systems as the ‘distributed’ systems, which are described in terms of a set of density functions in this paper. Continuous distributions in a low-energy model, can be interpreted as the long-distance limits of periodic (or un-periodic) arrays of branes with relative separations of order  $\sqrt{\alpha'}$  in the high-energy string theory. In the low-energy limit the Kaluza-Klein modes corresponding to the compactified relative transfers coordinates, are averaged and the solutions will depend only on the overall transverse coordinates [14]. We begin our study of these solutions in section 1, by a reformulation of the problem of two different orthogonal branes, in the framework of a reduced theory. We will introduce a set of constraints and insist on their determining role in solving the field equations of the reduced theory. We will find in this approach, in agreement with those of [20, 21], that the field equations are completely replaced with a set of *algebraic constraints* determining parameters of the solution. The relations between couplings and dimensions emerge as the consistency conditions of these algebraic constraints. As a byproduct, a Diophantine equation governing the allowed marginal intersections of super  $p$ -branes is obtained. It is argued that the usual relation between the dilaton couplings and the corresponding form-fields degrees in supergravity [17], is a direct result of supersymmetry. In section 2 we generalize the ideas of section 1 to a system of multiply intersecting orthogonal branes. It will be seen that the algebraic constraints in matrix representation have a universal form. Then the solution for these constraints together with their consistency conditions in compact forms will be given. In section 3 we lay the foundations of a more general theory of the marginal brane solutions including systems of branes at angles. General ansatze for

the form-fields describing purely electric-type branes, in terms of the ansatz for the metric are derived. It is shown that these ansätze are dependent on a set of ‘structure constants’, which encode the geometry (i.e. angles) of the brane system. A general formula for these constants, in terms of the asymptotic form of the metric is derived. The concepts of the ‘ $H$ -surface’ and an ‘ $H$ -basis’ are defined. A general formula for the reduced Lagrangian (RL), describing such generalized systems is derived. Using this RL the equations for the embedding of the ‘ $H$ -surface’ in the configuration space of the field variables will be written. Heuristic derivations for the generalized versions of the constraints in sections 1 & 2 are given and the role of the  $\mathcal{L} = 0$  equation is emphasized. In section 4 we apply the general framework of section 3, to the problem of arbitrary branes at angles. Then explicit solutions for the marginal configuration:  $p \cap p = (p - 2)$  using this formulation is derived. During the way of this derivation we encounter an integrability condition, from which the relation between angles (besides other information) is obtained. In section 5 a formulation of the no-force conditions appropriate to the framework of section 3 will be given. It is shown that these conditions in combination with the extremality conditions gives rise to a class of constraints, derived earlier on an ad hoc basis. The various (massless) fields contributions to the static long-range potential (between a brane system and a brane probe) are separated. The consistency conditions of section 1 emerge as the balance conditions among the long-range forces. In section 6 the formulas for masses and charges are presented and shown, as is expected that, these become proportional to the integrals of the density functions. In Appendix A a general first order Lagrangian for gravity is formulated and its application for the derivation of the RL’s is indicated. In Appendix B we present two methods for classifying the solutions of the Diophantine equation for intersections for arbitrary spacetime dimension  $D$ , and then give the classifications for  $D = 4, 6, 10, 11$ . In Appendix C the angles between a pair of branes in terms of the asymptotic form of the spacetime metric are defined. Finally in Appendix D we give the proofs of some  $H$ -surface identities. In the following sections, we will use a model theory with an action of the form:

$$I_D = \int d^D x \left( \sqrt{-g} R - \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \varphi)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{r=1}^n e^{2\alpha_r \varphi} \mathcal{F}_r^2 \right) \quad (0.1)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_r$ ’s denote  $(p_r + 2)$ -form field-strengths defined as:  $\mathcal{F}_r = d\mathcal{A}_r$ , and  $\mathcal{F}_r^2 \equiv \frac{1}{(p_r+2)!} F_{rM_1 \dots M_{p_r+2}} F_r^{M_1 \dots M_{p_r+2}}$ . Upon fixing the non-vanishing form-fields and the respective couplings  $\alpha_r$ , we are able to handle various supergravity models with suitable truncations.

# 1 Two Orthogonal Branes

To show the essence of the reduced theory formulation, we begin our discussion by concentrating on a simple example. We consider a simple distributed system constructed on the basis of a pair of orthogonal <sup>4</sup>  $(d_1 - 1, d_2 - 1)$ -branes intersecting (overlapping) <sup>5</sup> over  $(\delta - 1)$  dimensions in the spacetime of arbitrary dimension  $D$ . The (minimum) dimension of a *homogeneous* hyperplane filled with the *uniform* (parallel) distributions of the two branes obviously is

$$d = d_1 + d_2 - \delta \tag{1.1}$$

The overall transverse space has  $D - d \equiv \tilde{d} + 2$  dimensions. We will use a set of Cartesian coordinates  $(x^\mu, y_1^m, y_2^{m'}, z^a)$  as defined in table (1).

<i>coordinate</i>	<i>dimension</i>	<i>tangent</i> ( $v$ )	
$x^\mu$	$\delta$	$v \parallel d_1, v \parallel d_2$	<i>table(1)</i>
$y_1^m$	$\delta_1 \equiv d_1 - \delta$	$v \parallel d_1, v \perp \delta$	
$y_2^{m'}$	$\delta_2 \equiv d_2 - \delta$	$v \parallel d_2, v \perp \delta$	
$z^a$	$\tilde{d} + 2$	$v \perp d_1, v \perp d_2$	

By construction all the components of any physical field for such a configuration will depend only on the coordinates  $(z^a)$  of the transverse space. We can also allow a ‘transverse’ distribution of branes, which unlike the ‘longitudinal’ distributions may be inhomogeneous. Throughout this paper we will describe such ‘transverse’ distributions using the density functions  $\rho_\lambda(z)$ , where  $\lambda$  labels<sup>6</sup> various distributions in the problem (e.g.  $\lambda = 1, 2$  for now). It must be remarked here that such distributions are possible only when each pair of the parallel constituent branes can form stable bound states with zero binding energy. It is widely believed that this ‘marginal’ binding property, is a characteristic of supersymmetric bound states [4, 6, 1, 27]. However it will become clear during this section that the distributions of non-supersymmetric  $p$ -branes in the non-supersymmetric theories are also possible. Also, we will see that bound states of various such distributions become possible whenever they have a suitable number of common directions.

To construct field theoretic classical solutions, as usual a set of ansatze for the metric and the form fields are required. The ansatz for the metric is fixed by means of its isometries defined by the set of commuting Killing vectors:  $(\partial_\mu, \partial_m, \partial_{m'})$ , and its isotropies:  $SO(\delta - 1, 1) \times SO(\delta_1) \times SO(\delta_2) \times SO(\tilde{d} + 2)$ . Here we have demanded Lorentz invariance

<sup>4</sup>Clearly the parallel situation  $d_1 \subseteq d_2$  is a special case where  $\delta = d_1$ .

<sup>5</sup>In this paper we use the term ‘intersecting branes’ in equal footing with ‘overlapping branes’, i.e. different branes may have separated centres in their transverse space. We use the *world-volume* notation:  $d_1 \cap d_2 = \delta$  for indicating such intersections.

<sup>6</sup>In this paper we will use the indices  $\lambda, \lambda'$ , etc. and  $\kappa, \kappa'$ , etc. exclusively for the distribution quantities.

along the common ( $x^\mu$ ) directions. This requirement is believed to be a characteristic of super symmetric solutions [17, 1]. However the solutions discussed here are not limited to supersymmetric theories. Hence we write the ansatz for the metric as

$$ds^2 = e^{2B_0(z)} dx^\mu dx_\mu + e^{2B_1(z)} dy_1^m dy_{1m} + e^{2B_2(z)} dy_2^{m'} dy_{2m'} + e^{2C(z)} dz^a dz_a \quad (1.2)$$

where  $dx^\mu dx_\mu = \eta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu$  and  $\eta_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(-1, +1, \dots, +1)$ . We should fix the ansatz for the form fields as well. For this purpose we must specify that whether the  $(d_1 - 1, d_2 - 1)$ -branes carry electric or magnetic charges, i.e. whether they couple to  $(d_1 + 1, d_2 + 1)$ -form field strengths or to their dual  $(\tilde{d}_1 + 1, \tilde{d}_2 + 1)$ -forms. To be specific, we assume here both of them to be of the ‘electric’ type (generalizations to the cases of magnetic- or mixed-type branes are then straightforward [17]). Then, as long as  $d_1 \neq d_2$ , the Lorentz & rotational invariance along the subspaces fix the  $(d_1, d_2)$ -form potentials to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_1 &= \pm e^{X_1(z)} (dx^\mu) \wedge (dy_1^m) \\ \mathcal{A}_2 &= \pm e^{X_2(z)} (dx^\mu) \wedge (dy_2^{m'}) \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

where the  $\pm$  signs discriminate between branes and anti-branes, and the differentials in the parentheses are abbreviations for the wedge products over the indicated indices. Whenever  $d_1 = d_2$  and simultaneously  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ , the above invariances fix the ansatz for  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  up to any linear combinations of the above two expressions. Because in this case we have no mean for distinguishing the forms in our model. Therefore, we can replace these two potentials by a single one written as:  $\mathcal{A} = \pm \mathcal{A}_1 \pm \mathcal{A}_2$ . (Note that this property is restricted to the orthogonal branes, where we have:  $\mathcal{F}^2 = \mathcal{F}_1^2 + \mathcal{F}_2^2$ , so that sum of the kinetic terms of  $(\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2)$  are replaceable by that of  $\mathcal{A}$  only.)

However when  $d_1 = d_2$  but  $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$ , such a replacement is not possible. For example in Type IIB theory, the bound state of orthogonal D- and NS-strings excites the 2-form fields of the RR and NSNS sectors:  $\mathcal{A}_2$  and  $\mathcal{B}_2$  respectively. Despite being orthogonal, these 2-forms can not be traded for a single 2-form, as we have:  $\alpha_A = -\alpha_B = 1/2$  [21, 10].

### The reduced Lagrangian (RL) formulation

To form a reduced action describing the physical situation of interest, first of all we have to specify the relevant degrees of freedom. In the case of interest these are  $X_\lambda$  with  $\lambda = 1, 2$ , and  $\phi^\alpha = (B_0, B_1, B_2, C, \varphi)$  with  $\alpha = 1, \dots, 5$ . Here we have unified the dilaton with the independent metric variables into a column vector  $\phi^\alpha$  for simplifying our later formulations. The RL for  $(\phi^\alpha(z), X_\lambda(z))$  is then found by inserting the ansatze (1.2) and (1.3) in the action (0.1), and integrating over the relative transverse coordinates:  $(x^\mu, y_1^m, y_2^{m'})$ . This, using the formula (A.11), gives the RL

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_G + \mathcal{L}_F \quad (1.4)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_G$  and  $\mathcal{L}_F$ , respectively the gravitational (including the dilaton) and form field parts of the RL, have the expressions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_G &= 1/2 e^{2G} \Omega_{\alpha\beta} \partial\phi^\alpha \cdot \partial\phi^\beta \\ \mathcal{L}_F &= 1/2 \sum_{\lambda=1,2} e^{2(X_\lambda - F_\lambda)} (\partial X_\lambda)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (1.5)$$

Here  $\partial \equiv \partial_a$  and  $(G, F_\lambda)$  are linear functions of  $\phi^\alpha$ 's defined by

$$\begin{aligned} G(\phi) &\equiv g_\alpha \phi^\alpha \\ F_\lambda(\phi) &\equiv f_{\lambda\alpha} \phi^\alpha \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

and  $(\Omega_{\alpha\beta}, g_\alpha, f_{\lambda\alpha})$  are matrices with constant entries depending on the dimensions,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\alpha\beta} &= 2 \begin{pmatrix} \delta(\delta-1) & \delta\delta_1 & \delta\delta_2 & \tilde{d}(\tilde{d}+1) & 0 \\ \delta\delta_1 & \delta_1(\delta_1-1) & \delta_1\delta_2 & \delta_1(\tilde{d}+1) & 0 \\ \delta\delta_2 & \delta_1\delta_2 & \delta_2(\delta_2-1) & \delta_2(\tilde{d}+1) & 0 \\ \tilde{d}(\tilde{d}+1) & \delta_1(\tilde{d}+1) & \delta_2(\tilde{d}+1) & \tilde{d}(\tilde{d}+1) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1/2 \end{pmatrix} \\ g_\alpha &= (\delta/2 \quad \delta_1/2 \quad \delta_2/2 \quad \tilde{d}/2 \quad 0) \\ f_{1\alpha} &= (\delta/2 \quad \delta_1/2 \quad -\delta_2/2 \quad -\tilde{d}/2 \quad 0) \\ f_{2\alpha} &= (\delta/2 \quad -\delta_1/2 \quad \delta_2/2 \quad -\tilde{d}/2 \quad 0) \end{aligned} \quad (1.7)$$

The equations of motion resulting from this RL are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta X_\lambda} &= \partial(e^{2(X_\lambda - F_\lambda)} \partial X_\lambda) - e^{2(X_\lambda - F_\lambda)} (\partial X_\lambda)^2 = 0 \\ \frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta\phi^\alpha} &= \partial(e^{2G} \Omega_{\alpha\beta} \partial\phi^\beta) - g_\alpha e^{2G} \Omega_{\beta\gamma} \partial\phi^\beta \cdot \partial\phi^\gamma + \sum_{\lambda=1,2} f_{\lambda\alpha} e^{2(X_\lambda - F_\lambda)} (\partial X_\lambda)^2 = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (1.8)$$

Obviously a general solution for such a set of nonlinear  $2^{nd}$  order equations is not easy to find. However we will see that a class of solutions, corresponding to a pair of *localized*

distributions  $\rho_\lambda(z)$ , can be found using simple tricks. The suitable boundary conditions for these configurations are those of the asymptotic flat metric, constant dilaton and vanishing field strengths at infinity, i.e.

$$\phi^\alpha|_{z \rightarrow \infty} = \phi^\alpha_0 \quad , \quad X_\lambda|_{z \rightarrow \infty} = X_{\lambda 0} \quad (1.9)$$

In what follows we always take  $\phi^\alpha_0 = 0$ , which is always possible by choosing suitable scales of coordinates (for  $\alpha = 1, \dots, 4$ ), and of the form fields (for  $\alpha = 5$ ) (Note that a constant shift in the dilaton field can be absorbed by scaling of the form-fields, as far as the Chern-Simons terms are not introduced in the action (0.1)). Then of course we will not be at liberty on the definitions of  $X_{\lambda 0}$ 's, since as will be seen below, they have absolute physical meanings in terms of the mass to charge ratios. In particular when  $X_{\lambda 0} = 0$  we will find that our solution describes bound state of super p-branes.

### Solving the equations using the constraints

Although the equations (1.8) seem formidable to solve, if the exponentials can be taken (consistently) to be constants, then they will be greatly simplified. So we look for the solutions satisfying the constraints

$$\begin{aligned} G(\phi) &= 0 \\ X_\lambda - F_\lambda(\phi) &= X_{\lambda 0} \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

The constants on the right sides have been fixed using the boundary conditions (1.9) with  $\phi^\alpha_0 = 0$ . Later we will find that these constraints have the physical interpretations as the 'extremality' and the 'no-force' conditions respectively. Using only the latter constraints in the  $X_\lambda$ 's equation of motion we find that

$$\partial^2 e^{-X_\lambda} = 0 \quad (1.11)$$

(More precisely equation (1.11) must be written as a Poisson equation:  $\partial^2 e^{-X_\lambda(z)} = -\kappa_\lambda \rho_\lambda(z)$ . However, assuming that distributions fill only a local region of the  $z$  space, eq. (1.11) can still be used in the outer 'empty' region.)

The general solution to this equation with the boundary condition as in (1.9) is written as

$$e^{-X_\lambda(z)} = \kappa_\lambda^{-1} H_\lambda(z) \quad (1.12)$$

where the constants  $\kappa_\lambda$  and the harmonic functions  $H_\lambda$  are defined as

$$\kappa_\lambda = e^{X_{\lambda 0}} \quad (1.13)$$

$$H_\lambda(z) = 1 + \int d^{\tilde{d}+2} z' \rho_\lambda(z') G_{\tilde{d}+2}(z, z') \quad (1.14)$$



$G_{\tilde{d}+2}(z, z')$  is the Green's function of the  $(\tilde{d} + 2)$ -dimensional (flat space) Laplacian,

$$G_{\tilde{d}+2}(z, z') = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|z-z'|^{\tilde{d}}} & , \quad \tilde{d} \neq 0 \\ -\ln |z - z'| & , \quad \tilde{d} = 0 \end{cases} \quad (1.15)$$

The masses and charges of these distributions are found in section 6 to be proportional to the integrals of corresponding  $\rho_\lambda(z)$ 's, showing that these describe 'densities' of the distributions. Applying our constraints to the second equation in (1.8), we find

$$\Omega_{\alpha\beta} \partial^2 \phi^\beta - g_\alpha \Omega_{\beta\gamma} \partial \phi^\beta \cdot \partial \phi^\gamma + \sum_{\lambda=1,2} \kappa_\lambda^2 f_{\lambda\alpha} (\partial X_\lambda)^2 = 0 \quad (1.16)$$

We can solve these equations for  $\phi^\alpha$ 's using a further ansatz which is proposed naturally by our constraints (1.10). Linearity of these constraints in both  $(\phi^\alpha, X_\lambda)$  suggests that we take the *linear* ansatz:

$$\phi^\alpha(X) = - \sum_{\lambda=1,2} \xi_\lambda^\alpha (X_\lambda - X_{\lambda 0}), \quad (1.17)$$

with suitable choices of the coefficients  $\xi_\lambda^\alpha$ , we will find a simultaneous solution of the constraints (1.10) and the equations of motion (1.16) for  $\phi^\alpha(z)$ . Assuming  $X_\lambda$ 's to be independent (which is always possible by independent choices of the distributions  $\rho_\lambda(z)$ ), our constraints (1.10) and equations of motion (1.16) are respectively replaced by the two sets of algebraic equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda &= 0 \\ \mathbf{f}_\lambda \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\lambda'} &= -\delta_{\lambda\lambda'} \end{aligned} \quad (1.18)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda + \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda) - \kappa_\lambda^2 \mathbf{f}_\lambda &= 0 \\ \boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\lambda'} &= 0 \quad , \quad \lambda \neq \lambda' \end{aligned} \quad (1.19)$$

where we have used the matrix notation for simplicity. These equations have a solution for  $(\xi_1^\alpha, \xi_2^\alpha)$  as,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_1^\alpha &= \kappa_1^2 \left( -\frac{\tilde{d}_1}{2\bar{D}}, -\frac{\tilde{d}_1}{2\bar{D}}, \frac{d_1}{2\bar{D}}, \frac{d_1}{2\bar{D}}, \alpha_1 \right) \\ \xi_2^\alpha &= \kappa_2^2 \left( -\frac{\tilde{d}_2}{2\bar{D}}, \frac{d_2}{2\bar{D}}, -\frac{\tilde{d}_2}{2\bar{D}}, \frac{d_2}{2\bar{D}}, \alpha_2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (1.20)$$

where  $\bar{D} \equiv D - 2$  and  $\tilde{d}_\lambda \equiv \bar{D} - d_\lambda$ . In addition they give a set of 'consistency conditions' ,

$$\alpha_1^2 = \frac{1}{\kappa_1^2} - \frac{d_1 \tilde{d}_1}{2\bar{D}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_2^2 &= \frac{1}{\kappa_2^2} - \frac{d_2 \tilde{d}_2}{2D} \\
\alpha_1 \alpha_2 &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{d_1 d_2}{D} - \delta \right)
\end{aligned}
\tag{1.21}$$

which express in a different notation <sup>7</sup> the result of [21] for the equations governing the intersections (usually called the ‘intersection rules’) of the two electric type branes. They are derived here simply using a set of constraints. Generalisations of the relations (1.21) can be obtained in a variety of models with various scalars and form-fields corresponding to the various types of intersecting branes [20, 27]. We will see in section 5 that equations (1.21) have simple interpretations in terms of no-force conditions among the same/different types of branes. For now let us concentrate on the first two of them, i.e. the equation

$$\alpha_\lambda^2 = \frac{1}{\kappa_\lambda^2} - \frac{d_\lambda \tilde{d}_\lambda}{2D}
\tag{1.22}$$

This relation is not specific to the bound states of orthogonal distributions; even the solution to a single distribution requires such a condition. The simple interpretation of (1.22) is obtained by calculating the mass  $M_\lambda$  and charge  $Q_\lambda$  of a  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -branes distribution (formulas (6.11) and (6.13)),

$$\begin{aligned}
M_\lambda &= \kappa_\lambda^2 \int d^{\tilde{d}+2} z \rho_\lambda(z) \\
Q_\lambda &= \kappa_\lambda \int d^{\tilde{d}+2} z \rho_\lambda(z)
\end{aligned}
\tag{1.23}$$

We observe that the physical meaning of  $\kappa_\lambda$ ,

$$\kappa_\lambda = \frac{M_\lambda}{Q_\lambda}
\tag{1.24}$$

is the mass to charge ratio. This justifies our previous statement that  $X_{\lambda 0} = \ln \kappa_\lambda$  can not be set by hand to arbitrary values. Using this ratio in (1.22), we find a relation between the three ‘charges’ <sup>8</sup> of a  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -brane:

$$Q_\lambda^2 = \alpha_\lambda^2 M_\lambda^2 + \frac{d_\lambda \tilde{d}_\lambda}{2D} M_\lambda^2
\tag{1.25}$$

This relation will become physically meaningful if we recall that the long range forces between two parallel identical  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -branes have the forms

$$F_G \sim -\frac{M_\lambda^2}{r^{\tilde{d}_\lambda+1}}, \quad F_D \sim -\frac{\alpha_\lambda^2 M_\lambda^2}{r^{\tilde{d}_\lambda+1}}, \quad F_F \sim +\frac{Q_\lambda^2}{r^{\tilde{d}_\lambda+1}}
\tag{1.26}$$

---

<sup>7</sup>In [21] and most of the other references, the  $\alpha_\lambda$ ’s are twice the  $\alpha_\lambda$ ’s in this paper. Also  $\kappa_\lambda$ ’s are often traded for another set of parameters defined by:  $\Delta_\lambda \equiv 4/\kappa_\lambda^2$ .

<sup>8</sup>These ‘charges’ include the gravitational, dilatonic and form-field charges, which are proportional to  $M_\lambda$ ,  $\alpha_\lambda M_\lambda$  and  $Q_\lambda$  respectively. Compare to [19] for a similar discussion in the context of black hole solutions.

where  $F_G$ ,  $F_D$  and  $F_F$  represent the gravitational, dilatonic and  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -form forces and  $r$  is the transverse distance between two branes. In this way the equation (1.25) is nothing but the simple statement that the gravitational and dilatonic attractions of two  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -branes must be cancelled against their  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -form repulsion, to allow stable bound state. Alternatively we might consider a single  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -brane instead of a pair of them (i.e.  $\rho_\lambda(z) \sim \delta^{\tilde{d}_\lambda+1}(z)$ ). In that case again we would recover equation (1.25), but of course with a different interpretation as the balance between the various long-range forces between different parts of a single brane. In other words, if a brane has enough ‘charge’, its form-field repulsion will prevent its collapsing due to the gravitational/dilatonic ‘self attractions’ (when it has been slightly ‘bended’).

For the third relation in (1.21), a similar argument must yield an interpretation in terms of the pair-wise no-force conditions of the intersecting branes (see section 5 and the discussion of [10]).

An interesting special case of the above solution concerns the bound states of super p-branes. In such a case the unbroken 1/2 supersymmetry of each individual  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -brane causes it to have the minimum mass:  $M_\lambda = |Q_\lambda|$  (i.e.  $\kappa_\lambda = \pm 1$ ). Such branes are of special interest, because in addition to being classically stable against the long-range forces (which is guaranteed by (1.25)), they are also stable against loop corrections and Hawking radiations [39, 40]. Strictly speaking such (supersymmetric) objects occur (only) in supersymmetric theories like the supergravity and superstring theories. So not surprisingly supersymmetry of the theory requires special relations among its parameters so as to render it compatible with the existence of such extended objects. For the model at hand a relation of this kind, restricting the couplings and dimensions, is obtained by putting  $\kappa_\lambda^2 = 1$  in equation (1.22). Thus in agreement with [17], we find that

$$\alpha_\lambda^2 = 1 - \frac{d_\lambda \tilde{d}_\lambda}{2\bar{D}} \quad (1.27)$$

This equation reproduces (up to a sign) the dilaton couplings to the form-fields in all  $D = 10$  supergravity theories with one dilaton field. In  $D = 11$  supergravity which has no dilaton field ( $\alpha_\lambda = 0$ ), hence we find that only the dual 2 and 5-branes (corresponding to 3 and 6-form potentials) are possible as supersymmetric extended objects.

Returning to our double brane system, from (1.21) we obtain,

$$(2\bar{D} - d_1 \tilde{d}_1)(2\bar{D} - d_2 \tilde{d}_2) = (\delta\bar{D} - d_1 d_2)^2 \quad (1.28)$$

We shall refer to this Diophantine equation as the ‘intersection rule’ in this paper, since it specifies the suitable dimension of the intersection subspace for marginal configurations. In Appendix B methods for classifying the solutions of (1.28) for arbitrary  $D$  are proposed and the possible solutions for  $D = 4, 6, 10, 11$  are indicated. It must be noted however that

there exist also BPS non-marginal configurations [9, 2], which do not obey the intersection rule (1.28). As has been indicated in [9], the non-marginal solutions in  $D = 10$  can be constructed from the marginal ones using T- and S-duality transformations. For theories in  $D < 10$  and  $D = 11$  this can be done using the methods of dimensional reduction and oxidation [11]. However a general theory of such solutions for arbitrary spacetime dimensions is presently absent.

### Summary of the solutions for orthogonal $d_1 \cap d_2 = \delta$ system

The solutions for the metric and dilaton are found from (1.17), referring to the definitions of the variables and values of the parameters in (1.20). Also the form-potentials are already known using their expressions by (1.3) and (1.12). The results for the general case (arbitrary  $\kappa_\lambda$ ) are

$$\begin{aligned}
ds^2 &= H_1^{\kappa_1^2 d_1 / \bar{D}} H_2^{\kappa_2^2 d_2 / \bar{D}} \{ H_1^{-\kappa_1^2} H_2^{-\kappa_2^2} dx^\mu dx_\mu + H_1^{-\kappa_1^2} dy_1^m dy_1^m + H_2^{-\kappa_2^2} dy_2^{m'} dy_2^{m'} + dz^a dz^a \} \\
e^\varphi &= H_1^{\kappa_1^2 \alpha_1} H_2^{\kappa_2^2 \alpha_2} \\
\mathcal{A}_1 &= \kappa_1 H_1^{-1} (dx^\mu) \wedge (dy_1^m) \\
\mathcal{A}_2 &= \kappa_2 H_2^{-1} (dx^\mu) \wedge (dy_2^{m'})
\end{aligned} \tag{1.29}$$

Therefore we see that the solutions of the reduced theory, satisfying suitable constraints, are in complete agreement with those of [21, 23] obtained by solving ‘directly’ the field equations of the original action (0.1). As pointed in the introduction, this feature is a general property of the marginal solutions satisfying the  $\mathcal{L} = 0$  condition, which is seen to be manifest for the above solution.

## 2 Generalization to the multiply intersecting branes

To illustrate the generality and simplicity provided by applying the methods introduced in section 1, we will apply them to obtain the solution for  $N$  (orthogonal) intersecting branes. The steps will be exactly parallel to those of section 1. We will use, for simplicity, of a model with one dilaton field  $\varphi$  and  $N$  form-potentials  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$  of degrees  $d_\lambda$  with  $\lambda = 1, \dots, N$ , which are coupled to  $N$  orthogonal branes of electric type with the respective world-volumes dimensions. Again the whole of the branes are assumed to have uniform distributions within a  $d$ -dimensional world-volume and arbitrary distributions transverse to it. Clearly the (minimum possible) dimension of this world-volume ( $d$ ) is

$$d = \sum_{\lambda} d_{\lambda} - \sum_{\lambda < \lambda'} d_{\lambda \lambda'} + \sum_{\lambda < \lambda' < \lambda''} d_{\lambda \lambda' \lambda''} - \dots \tag{2.1}$$

where  $\lambda, \lambda', \dots = 1, \dots, N$ , and  $d_{\lambda\lambda'}, d_{\lambda\lambda'\lambda''}$ 's, etc. are the dimensions of double, triple, etc. intersections respectively. We may assume that the time direction is included in all the  $d_\lambda$ 's so that the configuration is static, though it is not an essential restriction. We will use the Cartesian coordinates  $(x^i)$  and  $(z^a)$  for the homogeneous subspace and the subspace transverse to it respectively.

### The ansatz for $ds^2$ and $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$ 's

We choose a set of world-volume coordinates  $(x^i)$ , whose directions span the various constituent branes' world-volumes. In these coordinates we can write

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= e^{2B_i(z)} \eta_{ij} dx^i dx^j + e^{2C(z)} dz^a dz^a \\ \mathcal{A}_\lambda &= \pm e^{X_\lambda(z)} \bigwedge_{i \in d_\lambda} dx^i \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\eta_{ij} = \text{diag}(-1, +1, \dots, +1)$ ;  $i, j = 0, \dots, d-1$ .

### The RL and all that...

The relevant degrees of freedom are  $\phi^\alpha \equiv (B_i, C, \varphi)$  and  $X_\lambda$ . The corresponding RL is written as

$$\mathcal{L} = 1/2 e^{2G(\phi)} \Omega_{\alpha\beta} \partial\phi^\alpha \cdot \partial\phi^\beta + 1/2 \sum_{\lambda=1}^N e^{2(X_\lambda - F_\lambda(\phi))} (\partial X_\lambda)^2 \quad (2.3)$$

where as in section 1 we have defined  $(N+1)$  linear functions of  $(\phi^\alpha)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} G(\phi) &= g_\alpha \phi^\alpha \\ F_\lambda(\phi) &= f_{\lambda\alpha} \phi^\alpha, \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

and the  $(d+2)$ -dimensional constant matrices as

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\alpha\beta} &= 2 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & \dots & 1 & \tilde{d}+1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & \dots & 1 & \tilde{d}+1 & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 1 & 1 & \dots & 0 & \tilde{d}+1 & 0 \\ \tilde{d}+1 & \tilde{d}+1 & \dots & \tilde{d}+1 & \tilde{d}(\tilde{d}+1) & \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & -1/2 \end{pmatrix} \\ g_\alpha &= 1/2(1, \dots, 1, \tilde{d}, 0) \\ f_{\lambda\alpha} &= 1/2(\pm 1, \dots, \pm 1, -\tilde{d}, -2\alpha_\lambda) = 1/2(\varepsilon_{\lambda i}, -\tilde{d}, -2\alpha_\lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

The symbol  $\varepsilon_{\lambda i}$  is

$$\varepsilon_{\lambda i} = \begin{cases} +1 & , \quad i \in d_\lambda \\ -1 & , \quad i \notin d_\lambda \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

It is important to note that as far as we have not included any extra term (e.g. Chern-Simons terms) in our action (0.1), the general form of the corresponding RL for orthogonally intersecting branes always resembles that of (2.3). The only difference of such models appears in the definitions of the variables  $\phi^\alpha$  and of the constants  $(f_{\lambda\alpha}, g_\alpha, \Omega_{\alpha\beta})$ . Hence a marginal orthogonal solution in every case is obtained, by following the procedure introduced in the previous section. In particular one obtains the same equations of motion, constraints, harmonicity condition for  $e^{-X_\lambda}$ 's, ansatz for  $\phi^\alpha(X)$ , and consistency equations as the equations (1.8), (1.10), (1.12), (1.17) and (1.18) & (1.19) respectively (but now with  $\lambda = 1, \dots, N$ ). The final link in this chain always is to solve the set of algebraic equations (1.18) & (1.19) simultaneously for finding (if exists) the consistent values of our  $\xi_\lambda^\alpha$ 's. Of course the existence of such a consistent solution, often will be accompanied by a set of relations between the parameters of the model itself, which as we have seen, lead to physical information about the underlying theory. The solution to the equations (1.18) & (1.19) together with the necessary consistency conditions are found by simple algebraic manipulations to be,

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda = \kappa_\lambda^2 \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{-1}(\mathbf{g} + \mathbf{f}_\lambda) \quad (2.7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{-1}(\mathbf{g} + \mathbf{f}_\lambda) &= 0 \\ \mathbf{f}_\lambda \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{\lambda'} &= \mathbf{g} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{-1} \mathbf{g} - \frac{\delta_{\lambda\lambda'}}{\kappa_\lambda \kappa_{\lambda'}} \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

In particular for the model at hand, replacing  $(\boldsymbol{\Omega}, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{f}_\lambda)$  with those of (2.5) one obtains from (2.7),

$$\xi_\lambda^\alpha = \kappa_\lambda^2 \left( -\frac{1}{2} \delta_{\lambda i} + \frac{d_\lambda}{2D}, \frac{d_\lambda}{2D}, \alpha_\lambda \right) \quad (2.9)$$

where we have defined

$$\delta_{\lambda i} = \begin{cases} 1 & , \quad i \in d_\lambda \\ 0 & , \quad i \notin d_\lambda \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

The first consistency condition in (2.8) becomes identity (!) while the second gives

$$\alpha_\lambda \alpha_{\lambda'} - \frac{\delta_{\lambda\lambda'}}{\kappa_\lambda \kappa_{\lambda'}} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{d_\lambda d_{\lambda'}}{D} - d_{\lambda\lambda'} \right) \quad (2.11)$$

This is a closed form of the three equations in (1.21) for each pair of  $(d_\lambda - 1, d_{\lambda'} - 1)$  branes intersecting over  $(d_{\lambda\lambda'} - 1)$  dimensions. This equation has the simple interpretation that: for  $N$  branes to be marginally bounded, the various 'two-body' forces among them must vanish separately. If for example  $d_{\lambda\lambda'\lambda''}$  had been appeared in (2.11), we should have

interpreted it as the vanishing of the ‘three-body’ forces which obviously was weaker than the above condition. The final expressions for the solutions are written as

$$\begin{aligned}
ds^2 &= \prod_{\lambda=1}^N H_\lambda^{\kappa_\lambda^2 d_\lambda / \bar{D}} \left\{ \left( \prod_{\lambda=1}^N H_\lambda^{-\kappa_\lambda^2 \delta_{\lambda i}} \right) \eta_{ij} dx^i dx^j + dz^a dz^a \right\} \\
e^\varphi &= \prod_{\lambda=1}^N H_\lambda^{\kappa_\lambda^2 \alpha_\lambda} \\
\mathcal{A}_\lambda &= \kappa_\lambda H_\lambda^{-1} \bigwedge_{i \in d_\lambda} dx^i
\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

where  $H_\lambda$ 's are  $N$  independent harmonic functions. This reproduces the result of [21] in a simple way, thereby gives another proof of the ‘harmonic functions rule’ [24]. Again  $\kappa_\lambda$ 's measure the mass to charge ratios. So when  $\kappa_\lambda = \pm 1$  we obtain the solution for bound state of super  $p$ -branes. In this case equation (1.28) generalizes to a pair-wise intersection rule of the form

$$(2\bar{D} - d_\lambda \tilde{d}_\lambda)(2\bar{D} - d_{\lambda'} \tilde{d}_{\lambda'}) = (d_{\lambda\lambda'} \bar{D} - d_\lambda d_{\lambda'})^2 \quad , \quad (\lambda \neq \lambda') \tag{2.13}$$

a relation restricting different dimensions involved.

### 3 General framework for (marginal) multiply intersecting branes

Before proceeding to discuss the case of branes at angles we need to somehow develop the tools of the previous sections to include the more general cases of marginal bound states of  $p$ -branes. The key point about the corresponding solutions is that they can be described in terms of a set of *independent* harmonic functions, in one-to-one correspondence to the transverse distributions of branes. (by definition each distribution consists of only the same type parallel branes). In order to give a general formulation, we consider a spacetime of arbitrary dimension  $D$  containing a homogeneous (but in general anisotropic) time-like surface of dimension  $d \leq D - 3$ . This subspace can be the world-volume of various types of  $p$ -branes with arbitrary relative orientations (and/or velocities) and separations, which are filled (and/or moving) uniformly within a  $(d - 1)$ -dimensional space-like volume. Such a spacetime admits a set of Killing vectors which generate the symmetry group:  $R^d \times SO(\tilde{d} + 2)$ , where the two factors represent the translational and rotational invariances along the distribution space and the transverse space respectively. We can decentralize arbitrarily the positions of different uniform distributions along the transverse space to obtain non-uniform distributions. This will break the  $SO(\tilde{d} + 2)$

rotational symmetry, but not the  $R^d$  translational invariance. So as in section 2, we can introduce two sets of Cartesian coordinates  $(x^i)$  and  $(z^a)$ , along the distribution and the transverse space respectively. In these coordinates the ansatz for the metric and various form-potentials generally are written as

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= h_{ij}(z)dx^i dx^j + e^{2C(z)}dz^a dz^a \\ \mathcal{A}^r &= A_{(i)}^r(z)(dx^i) \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where in the last formula <sup>9</sup>  $\mathcal{A}^r$  is a  $(p_r + 1)$ -form potential, generated by the set of all  $p_r$ -branes of the same type, which are assumed to carry ‘electric’ charges of the corresponding form-fields. This choice makes all the  $\mathcal{A}^r$ ’s to have non-vanishing components only within the  $d$  dimensional world-volume ( Compare to a static charge distribution in electrodynamics). Generalization to systems involving branes with ‘magnetic’ charges is straightforward.

To construct the solution for a system of  $N$  marginally bound distributions, we have to take all the field variables, say  $\phi^A$ ’s, as functions of  $N$  independent harmonic functions:  $H_\lambda$ ;  $\lambda = 1, \dots, N$ ,

$$\phi^A(z) = \phi^A(H_1(z), \dots, H_N(z)) \equiv \phi^A(H(z)) \quad (3.2)$$

Using this in the equations of motion for  $\phi^A(z)$ ’s, we will obtain a new set of equations describing  $\phi^A(H)$ ’s as functions on the space of harmonic functions. We will use this technique partially throughout this paper to solve the equations of motion . A systematic approach to this viewpoint, and its further consequences will be presented in a forthcoming paper [34].

### Generation of the suitable ansatz for $\mathcal{A}^r$ ’s

First of all, we can use the above principle to obtain general ansatz for the form-potentials, which in all the non-orthogonal cases has a non-trivial expression. For this purpose we need the kinetic term of  $\mathcal{A}^r$  in the RL, which is calculated, using the ansatz (3.1) <sup>10</sup>,

$$\mathcal{L}_F^r = -\frac{1}{2}e^{2G+2\alpha_r\varphi}(h^{ij})\partial A_{(i)}^r.\partial A_{(j)}^r \quad (3.3)$$

where  $G$  is defined through

$$e^{2G} = \sqrt{-g}e^{-2C} = \sqrt{\bar{h}}e^{\bar{d}C} \quad (3.4)$$

---

<sup>9</sup>In this formula we have introduced a convention, according to which the set of indices of a  $p$ -form field, as well as the wedge products over them, are indicated by a representative within a parenthesis. In this notation, a summation over all the repeated indices within a parenthesis, including a division by  $p!$  is implied.

<sup>10</sup>In this formula and later on, we use the convention introduced in (3.1). So in (3.3) a multiplication over  $h^{ij}$ ’s followed by summations over  $(i)$  and  $(j)$ , and a normalization factor:  $1/(p_r + 1)!$  are implied.



and  $h \equiv -\det(h_{ij})$ . So we find the equation of motion for  $\mathcal{A}^r$  as

$$\partial(e^{2G+2\alpha_r\varphi}(h^{ij})\partial A_{(j)}^r) = 0 \quad (3.5)$$

which using  $\partial A_{(j)}^r = \partial H_\lambda \partial_\lambda A_{(j)}^r$  and

$$\partial^2 H_\lambda = 0 \quad (3.6)$$

becomes

$$\partial_{\lambda'}(e^{2G+2\alpha_r\varphi}(h^{ij})\partial_\lambda A_{(j)}^r)\partial H_\lambda \cdot \partial H_{\lambda'} = 0 \quad (3.7)$$

The left hand side of (3.7) is written as a quadratic polynomial function of the variables  $\partial H_\lambda$ . Assuming independence of  $H_\lambda$ 's, this equation implies

$$\partial_\lambda(e^{2G+2\alpha_r\varphi}\partial_{\lambda'} A_{(j)}^r) + \partial_{\lambda'}(e^{2G+2\alpha_r\varphi}\partial_\lambda A_{(j)}^r) = 0 \quad (3.8)$$

which upon integration yields,

$$F_\lambda^{r(i)} \equiv e^{2G+2\alpha_r\varphi}(h^{ij})\partial_\lambda A_{(j)}^r = c_\lambda^{r(i)} + c_{\lambda\lambda'}^{r(i)} H_{\lambda'} \quad (3.9)$$

where  $c_\lambda^{r(i)}$  and  $c_{\lambda\lambda'}^{r(i)}$  are two sets of constants with the latter having the antisymmetry property

$$c_{\lambda\lambda'}^{r(i)} + c_{\lambda'\lambda}^{r(i)} = 0 \quad (3.10)$$

Now we argue that each of the  $\mathcal{A}^r$ 's components must be dependent only on those subset of  $H_\lambda$ 's describing the charge distributions of the corresponding branes, i.e. those with  $d_\lambda = p_r + 1$ . In other words, the form-field associated to the charges of a given type must be independent of the charges of the other types. This is a consequence of the fact that the equation of motion for  $\mathcal{A}^r$ , i.e.  $d * (e^{2\alpha_r\varphi} \mathcal{F}^r) = * \mathcal{J}^r$  contains *only* the currents of the (corresponding)  $p_r$ -branes as the source term. This feature, according to (3.9), corresponds to the existence of a consistent solution with the properties

$$\text{for } d_\lambda \neq p_r + 1 \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \partial_\lambda A_{(i)}^r = 0 \\ c_\lambda^{r(i)} = c_{\lambda\lambda'}^{r(i)} = 0 \end{array} \right. \quad (3.11)$$

For  $d_\lambda = p_r + 1$  we see from (3.10) and (3.11) that  $c_{\lambda\lambda'}^{r(i)}$  in (3.9) only mixes  $H_\lambda$ 's of the corresponding  $\mathcal{A}^r$  sector. In fact consistency requires that all  $c_{\lambda\lambda'}^{r(i)}$ 's in each sector to be vanishing. So we can write (3.9), after inverting it for  $\partial_\lambda A_{(i)}^r$ , as

$$\partial_\lambda A_{(i)}^r = e^{-2(G+\alpha_r\phi)} c_\lambda^{r(j)}(h_{ij}) \quad (3.12)$$

This gives a general electric ansatz for  $\mathcal{F}^r$  in terms of the dilaton and the metric components. This is simply achieved by taking the curl of  $\mathcal{A}^r$  in (3.1) using (3.6) and (3.12), the result is

$$\mathcal{F}^r = \omega_{(i)}^r \wedge (dx^i) \quad (3.13)$$

where  $\omega_{(i)}^r$ 's are a set of 1-forms defined by

$$\omega_{(i)}^r \equiv dA_{(i)}^r = e^{-2(G+\alpha_r\phi)} c_\lambda^{r(i)}(h_{ij}) dH_\lambda \quad (3.14)$$

If we know the  $H_\lambda$ -dependences of  $(\varphi, h_{ij}, C)$ , then we can integrate (3.12) to express  $A_{(i)}^r$ 's (and so  $\mathcal{A}^r$ 's) as explicit functions of  $(H_\lambda)$ . Of course this is possible only whenever certain integrability conditions are satisfied. These conditions are written simply as the Bianchi identities:  $d\mathcal{F}^r = 0$  which are equivalent to

$$d\omega_{(i)}^r = 0 \quad (3.15)$$

Equation (3.15) leads to a set of first order partial differential equations for the unknown functions  $(\varphi(H), C(H), h_{ij}(H))$ . Since these functions must also satisfy the corresponding equations of motion, the above construction (in principle) determines the possible relations among  $c_\lambda^{r(i)}$ 's. This in turn specifies the allowed set of angles between the various  $p$ -branes, since as we will see shortly, all these constants have expressions in terms of angles.

### Some special cases

Before proceeding further, it worths to examine here the above result for some well known marginal BPS solutions. For simplicity we will consider solutions with only super  $p$ -branes, i.e.  $\kappa_\lambda = 1$ .

1) *Single  $(d-1)$ -brane* ( $N=1, n=1$ )

In the notations of sections 1 and 2 we have the solutions

$$h_{ij} = H^{\beta-1} \eta_{ij} \quad , \quad e^{2C} = H^\beta \quad , \quad e^\varphi = H^\alpha \quad , \quad A_{(i)} = \epsilon_{(i)} H^{-1} \quad (3.16)$$

where  $\beta \equiv d/\bar{D}$ . From these we find,  $G=0$ , and for  $F_\lambda^{r(i)}$  (dropping the  $r$  and  $\lambda$  indices) becomes

$$F^{(i)} = -\epsilon^{(i)} H^{2\alpha^2-2+d\tilde{d}/2\bar{D}} \quad (3.17)$$

So equation (3.9) is satisfied, provided we have

$$\alpha^2 = 1 - d\tilde{d}/2\bar{D} \quad (3.18)$$

which proves (1.23) again. Under this condition we have

$$c_\lambda^{(i)} = -\epsilon^{(i)} \quad , \quad c_{\lambda\lambda'}^{r(i)} = 0 \quad (3.19)$$

2) *Two orthogonal branes*:  $d_1 \cap d_2 = \delta$  ( $N=2, n=2$ )

Using the solutions (1.29) we have

$$h_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} H_1^{\beta_1-1} H_2^{\beta_2-1} \eta_{\mu\nu} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & H_1^{\beta_1-1} H_2^{\beta_2} \delta_{mn} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & H_1^{\beta_1} H_2^{\beta_2-1} \delta_{m'n'} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{2C} &= H_1^{\beta_1} H_2^{\beta_2} \quad , \quad e^\varphi = H_1^{\alpha_1} H_2^{\alpha_2} \\
A_{(\mu)(m)}^1 &= H_1^{-1} \epsilon_{(\mu)} \epsilon_{(m)} \quad , \quad A_{(\mu)(m')}^2 = H_2^{-1} \epsilon_{(\mu)} \epsilon_{(m')}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

where  $\beta_\lambda = d_\lambda / \bar{D}$  and  $\epsilon_{(\mu)}$ ,  $\epsilon_{(m)}$  and  $\epsilon_{(m')}$  are the alternating symbols corresponding to the volume forms of the subspaces:  $x^\mu$ ,  $y_1^m$  and  $y_2^{m'}$  respectively. All other components of the form-potentials are vanishing. Again we find  $G = 0$ , and the non-vanishing  $F_\lambda^{r(i)}$ 's become,

$$\begin{aligned}
F_\lambda^{1(\mu)(m)} &= -\delta_{\lambda 1} \epsilon^{(\mu)} \epsilon^{(m)} H_1^{2\alpha_1^2 - 2 + d_1 \bar{d}_1 / \bar{D}} H_2^{2\alpha_1 \alpha_2 + \delta - d_1 d_2 / \bar{D}} \\
F_\lambda^{2(\mu)(m')} &= -\delta_{\lambda 2} \epsilon^{(\mu)} \epsilon^{(m')} H_2^{2\alpha_2^2 - 2 + d_2 \bar{d}_2 / \bar{D}} H_1^{2\alpha_1 \alpha_2 + \delta - d_1 d_2 / \bar{D}}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

The only way for these to satisfy (3.9), is that all the exponents in (3.21) vanish. This gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_1^2 &= 1 - \frac{d_1 \bar{d}_1}{2\bar{D}} \\
\alpha_2^2 &= 1 - \frac{d_2 \bar{d}_2}{2\bar{D}} \\
\alpha_1 \alpha_2 &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{d_1 d_2}{\bar{D}} - \delta \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

which are the same as the consistency conditions (1.21) (with  $\kappa_\lambda = \pm 1$ ). Under these conditions we see, in agreement with (3.9), that:  $F_\lambda^{r(i)} = c_\lambda^{r(i)} = \text{const}$ . The non-vanishing  $c_\lambda^{r(i)}$ 's are

$$\begin{aligned}
c_1^{1(\mu)(m)} &= -\epsilon^{(\mu)} \epsilon^{(m)} \\
c_2^{1(\mu)(m')} &= -\epsilon^{(\mu)} \epsilon^{(m')}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

### 3) Type IIA (2, 2) – branes at angles ( $N = 2, n = 1$ )

The solution to the system  $3 \cap 3 = 1$  at two  $SU(2)$  angles in Type IIA theory, and its generalization for  $n$  number of such 2-branes, was originally conjectured by Myers *et.al.* in [29] and later derived in [31]. This is specially an interesting example for comparison with the results of this paper. Both of the above references have made use of an *asymptotically orthogonal* Cartesian coordinate system  $(t, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$  for the world-volume directions. In these coordinates one of the 2-branes lies on the  $(x_1, x_2)$  plane while the other is located on the plane  $(x'_1, x'_2)$ , obtained from the first one by two  $SU(2)$  rotations with the same angle  $\theta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
x'_1 + ix'_3 &= e^{i\theta} (x_1 + ix_3) \\
x'_2 + ix'_4 &= e^{-i\theta} (x_2 + ix_4)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

In these coordinates their solutions (in the Einstein frame) can be put into the forms

$$\begin{aligned}
ds^2 &= E^{-5/8}[-dt^2 + (1 + h_1 + \cos^2\theta h_2)(dx_1^2 + dx_2^2) + (1 + \sin^2\theta h_2)(dx_3^2 + dx_4^2) \\
&\quad + 2\cos\theta\sin\theta h_2(-dx_1dx_3 + dx_2dx_4)] + E^{3/8}dz^a dz^a \\
\mathcal{A} &= E^{-1}dt\wedge[(\cos^2\theta h_1 + h_2 + \sin^2\theta h_1 h_2)dx_1\wedge dx_2 - \sin^2\theta h_1(1 + h_2)dx_3\wedge dx_4 \\
&\quad + \cos\theta\sin\theta h_1(dx_1\wedge dx_3 + dx_2\wedge dx_4)] \\
e^\varphi &= E^{1/4}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

where  $a = 1, \dots, 5$ ,  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  are independent harmonic functions vanishing at infinity, and  $E$  is defined by

$$E \equiv 1 + h_1 + h_2 + \sin^2\theta h_1 h_2 \tag{3.26}$$

These solutions can be put into a symmetric form, relative to the exchange of the two branes, by transforming the coordinates  $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$  to the ‘branes coordinates’  $: (x_1, x_2, x'_1, x'_2) \equiv (y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4)$ , which even at  $z \rightarrow \infty$  do not constitute an orthogonal frame. This simple exercise gives

$$\begin{aligned}
ds^2 &= \sin^{-2}\theta E^{-5/8}[-\sin^2\theta dt^2 + (1 + h_1 + \cos^2\theta h_2)(dy_1^2 + dy_2^2) + \\
&\quad (1 + h_2 + \cos^2\theta h_1)(dy_3^2 + dy_4^2) - 2\cos\theta(1 + h_1 + h_2)(dy_1dy_3 + dy_2dy_4)] + E^{3/8}dz^a dz^a \\
\mathcal{A} &= E^{-1}dt\wedge[h_1(1 + h_2)dy_1\wedge dy_2 + [h_2(1 + h_1)dy_3\wedge dy_4 - \cos\theta h_1 h_2(dy_1\wedge dy_4 + dy_3\wedge dy_2)] \\
e^{2\alpha\varphi} &= E^{1/8}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

where we have used the value of  $\alpha = 1/4$  for this case. From the above solutions we find  $G = -\ln \sin\theta$ . We obtain the non-vanishing components of  $F_\lambda^{(i)}$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
F_1^{012} &= \frac{1}{\sin^2\theta} & , & & F_2^{012} &= \frac{\cos^2\theta}{\sin^2\theta} \\
F_1^{034} &= \frac{\cos^2\theta}{\sin^2\theta} & , & & F_2^{034} &= \frac{1}{\sin^2\theta} \\
F_1^{014} &= \frac{\cos\theta}{\sin^2\theta} & , & & F_2^{014} &= \frac{\cos\theta}{\sin^2\theta} \\
F_1^{032} &= \frac{\cos\theta}{\sin^2\theta} & , & & F_2^{032} &= \frac{\cos\theta}{\sin^2\theta}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

which are seen to be constants, confirming our equation (3.9) with  $c_{\lambda\lambda'}^{r(i)} = 0$ .

### General formula for $c_\lambda^{r(i)}$

The main lesson we learn from the previous examples, is that the integration constants  $c_\lambda^{r(i)}$  in the general ansatz (3.11) are determined by relative orientations of the constituent branes. For this reason, we call them as the ‘structure constants’ of the brane system. A general formula for these constants, can be obtained using the boundary conditions.

For localized distributions (with  $\tilde{d} > 0$ ), the metric and dilaton boundary conditions are written as

$$h_{ij}(z)|_{z \rightarrow \infty} = \gamma_{ij} \quad , \quad C(z)|_{z \rightarrow \infty} = 0 \quad , \quad \varphi(z)|_{z \rightarrow \infty} = \varphi_0 = 0 \quad (3.29)$$

where  $\gamma_{ij}$  is a flat Minkowski metric with the signature  $(-, +, \dots, +)$  expressed in the (generally) non-orthogonal Cartesian coordinate system  $(x^i)$ , and for convenience we have chosen  $\varphi_0 = 0$  (c.f. section 1). The other set of boundary conditions are related to the form-potentials. These boundary conditions arise since as  $z \rightarrow \infty$ , the gravity and dilaton fields become so weak as to decouple (to first order) from all the the form-fields. So at infinity, the set of form-fields propagate like an assembly of *uncoupled* fields (of generally different degrees) within a flat background. These are described by the ‘Maxwell’s equations’ :

$$d * d\mathcal{A}^r = *\mathcal{J}^r \quad (3.30)$$

in the flat spacetime, with  $p_r$ -form sources as

$$\mathcal{J}^r = \sum_{d_\lambda = p_r + 1} \rho_\lambda(z) \epsilon_\lambda \quad (3.31)$$

Here  $\epsilon_\lambda$  and  $\rho_\lambda(z)$  denote respectively the *asymptotic* volume-form and the density function associated with the  $\lambda^{th}$  distribution<sup>11</sup>. Solution to (3.30) is then:

$$A_{(i)}^r(z) = \sum_{d_\lambda = p_r + 1} \epsilon_{\lambda(i)} h_\lambda(z) \quad (3.32)$$

where  $h_\lambda(z)$ ’s are harmonic functions defined by

$$h_\lambda(z) = \int d^{\tilde{d}+2} z' \rho_\lambda(z') G_{\tilde{d}+2}(z, z') \quad (3.33)$$

Note that  $h_\lambda(z) \rightarrow 0$  as  $z \rightarrow \infty$ , provided that  $\rho_\lambda(z)$  is a localized distribution.

Viewing equation (3.32) as the boundary conditions for the original problem, we find that

$$\partial_\lambda A_{(i)}^r|_{z \rightarrow \infty} = \delta_{d_\lambda, p_r + 1} \epsilon_{\lambda(i)} \quad (3.34)$$

Then using the boundary values (3.29) and (3.34) into the equation (3.12), we obtain the desired formula for  $c_\lambda^{r(i)}$ :

$$c_\lambda^{r(i)} = \delta_{d_\lambda, p_r + 1} \sqrt{\gamma} (\gamma^{ij}) \epsilon_{\lambda(j)} \quad (3.35)$$

where  $\gamma \equiv |\det(\gamma_{ij})|$ . An important caution for later applications of this formula is that it can be used *only* in a ‘basis’ of harmonic functions as is defined by (3.33).

---

<sup>11</sup>This form of currents is read from the  $p_r$ -branes  $\sigma$ -model sources, coupled to the supergravity action. In the  $x^i$ ’s basis:  $\epsilon_\lambda \equiv \epsilon_{\lambda(i)}(dx^i)$  where the constants  $\epsilon_{\lambda(i)}$  for non-orthogonal  $x^i$ ’s may be other than 0,  $\pm 1$ .

### Change of the harmonic functions basis

For the equations describing  $\phi^A(H)$ 's (called as the 'embedding equations'), we have an obvious symmetry under the permutations of  $H_\lambda$ 's, as these equations do not involve any explicit dependence on  $H_\lambda$ 's. This symmetry is a special case of a largest symmetry, i.e.

$$\hat{H}_\lambda = a_{\lambda\kappa}H_\kappa + b_\lambda \quad , \quad \det(a_{\lambda\kappa}) \neq 0 \quad (3.36)$$

which transforms the embedding equations covariantly (see (3.56)). This originates from the fact that any nonsingular linear transformation on a set of independent harmonic functions, transforms them to another such set. It turns out that  $H_\lambda$ 's are similar to a set of Cartesian coordinates (called as the ' $H$ -basis') on a kind of 'geodesic' surface (called as the ' $H$ -surface') in the space of field variables [34]. Symmetry of the embedding equations under (3.36) is a reflection of the fact that, we have not any preferred origin and direction for choosing the  $H$ -basis on the  $H$ -surface. The transformation property of  $c_\lambda^{r(i)}$ 's under (3.36), can be read from their definition by (3.9) to be

$$\hat{c}_\lambda^{r(i)} = (a^{-1})_{\kappa\lambda}c_\kappa^{r(i)} \quad (3.37)$$

In section 4 we will find that the solution for a system of two  $p$ -branes at angles more easily described, in a certain basis which is related to the 'natural' one (3.33) by a suitable transformation (see (4.49)).

### The reduced Lagrangian

The gravitational and form-field parts of the total RL for  $(h_{ij}, C)$  and  $A_{(i)}^r$ , are given by the equations (3.3) and (A.12) respectively. Adding the dilaton term to them, the total RL will read

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \frac{1}{2}e^{2G}\left[\frac{1}{2}Tr^2(\mathbf{h}^{-1}\partial\mathbf{h}) - \frac{1}{2}Tr(\mathbf{h}^{-1}\partial\mathbf{h})^2 + 2(\tilde{d} + 1)\partial C.Tr(\mathbf{h}^{-1}\partial\mathbf{h}) \right. \\ & \left. + 2\tilde{d}(\tilde{d} + 1)(\partial C)^2 - (\partial\varphi)^2 - \sum_{r=1}^n e^{2\alpha_r\varphi}(h^{ij})\partial A_{(i)}^r.\partial A_{(j)}^r\right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.38)$$

where  $\partial \equiv \partial_a$ , and  $G$  is defined as in (3.4). Before discussing the equations of motion, some simplifications is in order:

a) As in sections 1 and 2 we take the benefit of the constraint:  $G = G_0$ , which means that  $C$  must be replaced by

$$C = -\frac{1}{4\tilde{d}}(\ln|\mathbf{h}| - \ln|\boldsymbol{\gamma}|) \quad (3.39)$$

where we have set  $G_0 = 1/2 \ln \sqrt{|\boldsymbol{\gamma}|}$  using the boundary conditions (3.29). Then by eliminating  $C$  between (3.38) and (3.39), the simplified RL describing  $(h_{ij}, \varphi, A_{(i)}^r)$  becomes

$$\mathcal{L} = -1/4[\tilde{d}^{-1}Tr^2(\mathbf{h}^{-1}\partial\mathbf{h}) + Tr(\mathbf{h}^{-1}\partial\mathbf{h})^2] - 1/2(\partial\varphi)^2 - 1/2\sum_{r=1}^n e^{2\alpha_r\varphi}(h^{ij})\partial A_{(i)}^r.\partial A_{(j)}^r \quad (3.40)$$

Demanding solutions to be on the ‘surface’ :  $G = G_0$  requires a consistency condition. This is obtained by a simple elimination of  $C$  from its equation of motion using (3.38) and (3.39). For  $\tilde{d} \neq 0$  this yields

$$\mathcal{L} = 0 \tag{3.41}$$

which will be interpreted as the ‘marginality’ condition.

b) As we have seen in sections 1 and 2, the number of actual metric variables for a given system, is often less than that of the  $h_{ij}$ ’s. Denoting these variables together with the dilaton collectively by  $\phi^\alpha$  ( $\alpha = 1, \dots, M+1$  where  $\phi^{M+1} \equiv \varphi$ ), the gravitational (including the dilaton) part of (3.40) will take a simple form as

$$\mathcal{L}_G = 1/2\Omega_{\alpha\beta}(\phi)\partial\phi^\alpha.\partial\phi^\beta \tag{3.42}$$

Here  $\Omega_{\alpha\beta}$ ’s are known functions of  $\phi^\alpha$ ’s. This Lagrangian looks like a kind of (pseudo-) Riemannian metric on the space of  $\phi^\alpha$ ’s, with  $\Omega_{\alpha\beta}$  as its metric tensor [34].

c) Let us consider, for a moment,  $H_\lambda$ ’s as the set of independent variables required to describe all the non-vanishing form-fields for the configuration of interest, i.e.  $A_{(i)}^r = A_{(i)}^r(H_\lambda)$ . So the set of all independent variables is here  $(\phi^\alpha, H_\lambda)$ , in terms of which the form-field part of (3.40) is written as

$$\mathcal{L}_F = -\frac{1}{2}U_{\lambda\lambda'}(\phi, H)\partial H_\lambda.\partial H_{\lambda'} \tag{3.43}$$

with

$$U_{\lambda\lambda'}(\phi, H) \equiv \sum_{r=1}^n e^{2\alpha_r\varphi}(h^{ij})\partial_\lambda A_{(i)}^r\partial_{\lambda'} A_{(j)}^r \tag{3.44}$$

In the last expression the (known)  $(\phi^\alpha)$ -dependence of  $U_{\lambda\lambda'}$  comes through  $(\varphi, h_{ij})$ , while its (unknown)  $(H_\lambda)$ -dependence comes through  $A_{(i)}^r$ .

Using these points, the complete Lagrangian describing  $(\phi^\alpha, H_\lambda)$  becomes

$$\mathcal{L} = 1/2\Omega_{\alpha\beta}(\phi)\partial\phi^\alpha.\partial\phi^\beta - 1/2U_{\lambda\lambda'}(\phi, H)\partial H_\lambda.\partial H_{\lambda'} \tag{3.45}$$

The equation of motion for  $H_\lambda$  from this RL is written as

$$U_{\lambda\lambda'}\partial^2 H_{\lambda'} + \partial U_{\lambda\lambda'}.\partial H_{\lambda'} - 1/2U_{\lambda'\lambda'',\lambda}\partial H_{\lambda'}.\partial H_{\lambda''} = 0 \tag{3.46}$$

where the symbol ‘ $\lambda$ ’ in the subscript represents the partial derivatives with respect to the explicit  $H_\lambda$ -dependences, whereas  $\partial_\lambda$  will represent the total  $H_\lambda$ -derivatives. Now we enter the main three assumptions characterizing the set of marginal solutions as:

- 1)  $\partial^2 H_\lambda = 0$  outside the region of branes distributions.
- 2)  $\phi^\alpha$ ’s can also be expressed as functions of  $H_\lambda$ ’s.

3)  $H_\lambda$ 's constitute a set of *independent* harmonic functions.  
Using the above ingredients in the last equation, we obtain

$$\partial_{\lambda''} U_{\lambda\lambda'} + \partial_{\lambda'} U_{\lambda\lambda''} - U_{\lambda'\lambda'',\lambda} = 0 \quad (3.47)$$

It is clear from (3.44) that, the functional dependences of  $U_{\lambda\lambda'}$ 's on  $(H_\lambda)$  will not be known, unless we specify those of  $A_{(i)}^r$ 's. We do not know these functions presently, but rather we have (from (3.12)) the expressions for their derivatives  $\partial_\lambda A_{(i)}^r$  as functions of  $(\phi^\alpha)$ , which using  $G = G_0$ , are written as,

$$\partial_\lambda A_{(i)}^r = e^{-2\alpha_r \varphi} c_\lambda^{r(i)} c_\lambda^{r(j)}(h_{ij}) \quad (3.48)$$

Using this result in (3.43), an explicit solution for  $U_{\lambda\lambda'}$  on the  $H$ -surface is found to be

$$U_{\lambda\lambda'}(\phi(H), H) = u_{\lambda\lambda'}(\phi(H)) \quad (3.49)$$

where  $u_{\lambda\lambda'}$ 's are given by

$$u_{\lambda\lambda'}(\phi) \equiv \sum_{r=1}^n e^{-2\alpha_r \varphi} c_\lambda^{r(i)} c_\lambda^{r(j)}(h_{ij}) \quad (3.50)$$

These functions are written as the sum of  $n$  homogeneous polynomials in the variables  $(h_{ij})$ , of degrees  $(p_1 + 1), \dots, (p_n + 1)$ , with the coefficients which are combinations of the structure constants. We will use, in section 4, these polynomial functions, to analyze the field equations of two  $p$ -branes at angles.

In Appendix D it is shown that the above expression is in fact the solution of the equation (3.47) for  $U_{\lambda\lambda'}$  on the  $H$ -surface. An important result of this analysis is that all the functions  $U_{\lambda\lambda'}$  (and so  $u_{\lambda\lambda'}$ ) on the  $H$ -surface can be derived from a kind of 'potential' function  $U(H)$ ,

$$U_{\lambda\lambda'}|_H = u_{\lambda\lambda'}|_H = \partial_\lambda \partial_{\lambda'} U \quad (3.51)$$

which is unique up to any linear function of  $(H_\lambda)$ . (By this result, for solutions on the  $H$ -surface, we obtain:  $\mathcal{L}_F = -\frac{1}{2}\partial^2 U$ . Then the  $\mathcal{L} = 0$  condition gives:  $\mathcal{L}_G = \frac{1}{2}\partial^2 U$ ).

This property has an important role in the proof of integrability for a system of multiply intersecting branes [34].

### Embedding equations of the $H$ -surface

Having expressed every thing in terms of  $(\phi^\alpha)$ , it now suffices to set the equations determining the 'embedding functions'  $\phi^\alpha = \phi^\alpha(H)$ , to complete the solutions to the equations of motion. These may be found simply by starting from the  $\phi^\alpha$ 's equation of motion derived from (3.45):

$$\Omega_{\alpha\beta}(\phi)\partial^2\phi^\beta + \Gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma}(\phi)\partial\phi^\beta \cdot \partial\phi^\gamma + 1/2U_{\lambda\lambda',\alpha}(\phi, H)\partial H_\lambda \cdot \partial H_{\lambda'} = 0 \quad (3.52)$$



where  $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$  is defined in terms of  $\Omega_{\alpha\beta}$  as

$$\Gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(\Omega_{\alpha\beta,\gamma} - \Omega_{\beta\gamma,\alpha} + \Omega_{\gamma\alpha,\beta}) \quad (3.53)$$

Of course the set of equations (3.52) can not be solved unless we have specified the explicit forms of  $U_{\lambda\lambda'}$ 's as functions of  $(\phi^\alpha, H_\lambda)$ , which is not the case at this point. But we can use a surprising property of these functions,

$$U_{\lambda\lambda',\alpha}(\phi, H) = -u_{\lambda\lambda',\alpha}(\phi) \quad (3.54)$$

(which gives the derivatives  $U_{\lambda\lambda',\alpha}$  as *given* functions of  $(\phi^\alpha)$  on the  $H$ -surface, see Appendix D), to rewrite (3.52) as

$$\Omega_{\alpha\beta}(\phi)\partial^2\phi^\beta + \Gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma}(\phi)\partial\phi^\beta.\partial\phi^\gamma - 1/2u_{\lambda\lambda',\alpha}(\phi)\partial H_\lambda.\partial H_{\lambda'} = 0 \quad (3.55)$$

which is now a well-defined equation. Looking for solutions on the  $H$ -surface, is equivalent to using the above three assumptions in this equation. This leads to

$$\Omega_{\alpha\beta}(\phi)\partial_\lambda\partial_{\lambda'}\phi^\beta + \Gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma}(\phi)\partial_\lambda\phi^\beta\partial_{\lambda'}\phi^\gamma - 1/2u_{\lambda\lambda',\alpha}(\phi) = 0 \quad (3.56)$$

This equation for the ‘embedding’ of the  $H$ -surface, is similar to a forced geodesic equation corresponding to the metric defined by  $\Omega_{\alpha\beta}(\phi)$ . As stated earlier, this equation does not involve any explicit  $H_\lambda$ -dependences, and is symmetric under the transformation (3.36) provided  $u_{\lambda\lambda'}$ 's transform as

$$\hat{u}_{\lambda\lambda'} = (a^{-1})_{\kappa\lambda}(a^{-1})_{\kappa'\lambda'}u_{\kappa\kappa'} \quad (3.57)$$

One can check, using the definition of  $u_{\lambda\lambda'}$ , that this is in fact the case.

It is instructive to note that equations (3.56) can be put into the form of a true geodesic equation (i.e. without force), if one extends the configuration space to  $\phi^A = (\phi^\alpha, H_\lambda)$  and defines its metric by

$$dS^2 = \Omega_{AB}d\phi^A d\phi^B \equiv \Omega_{\alpha\beta}d\phi^\alpha d\phi^\beta - U_{\lambda\lambda'}dH_\lambda dH_{\lambda'} \quad (3.58)$$

Then, of course, the  $H$ -surface will be a null-geodesic surface in the space of  $\phi^A$ 's.

### Constraints

The formulation described above provides a general framework for studying the structure and properties of the marginal solutions. In particular it has the potential to give the constraints of sections 1 & 2, and their generalizations to the systems of branes at angles, in a systematic and exclusive way. We postpone such issues to a forthcoming article [34]. Here we give heuristic derivations for the generalized versions of the constraints (1.10),

for arbitrary systems of (multiply-intersecting) branes at angles. The justification for use of these constraints is that they have simultaneous solutions with the equations of motion. This can be verified partially, using the solutions in sections 1, 2 and 4 of this paper. Generally the constraints for a marginal configuration, consist of the two following categories:

a) *Extremality condition:*

This constraint is somewhat related to the ‘marginality’ condition, which states that the binding potential energy of such a system, for arbitrary positions of its constituents, vanishes. In the language of fields, this means that the Hamiltonian density of interactions  $\mathcal{H}$  must vanish everywhere. So on a time-independent marginal solution with  $\mathcal{H} = -\mathcal{L}$ , we must have  $\mathcal{L} = 0$ . Noting the  $C$ ’s equation of motion as

$$2(\tilde{d} + 1)\partial^2 e^{2G} - 1/2\tilde{d}\mathcal{L} = 0 \quad (3.59)$$

we see that a marginal solution satisfies

$$\partial^2 e^{2G} = 0 \quad (3.60)$$

i.e. the combination  $e^{2G}$  of the metric components must be a harmonic function. The most natural choice is to take  $G = G_0$ , or equivalently

$$\ln \sqrt{|\mathbf{h}|} + \tilde{d}C = \ln \sqrt{|\boldsymbol{\gamma}|} \quad (3.61)$$

It must be remembered that the  $\mathcal{L} = 0$  is not a single equation in this formulation; it contains a set of component equations. This is because, by evaluating the RL on the  $H$ -surface we obtain

$$\mathcal{L} = 1/2[\Omega_{\alpha\beta}(\phi)\partial_\lambda\phi^\alpha\partial_{\lambda'}\phi^\beta - u_{\lambda\lambda'}(\phi)]\partial H_\lambda.\partial H_{\lambda'} \quad (3.62)$$

By independence of  $H_\lambda$ ’s, the  $\mathcal{L} = 0$  equation implies that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\lambda\lambda'} \equiv \Omega_{\alpha\beta}(\phi)\partial_\lambda\phi^\alpha\partial_{\lambda'}\phi^\beta - u_{\lambda\lambda'}(\phi) = 0 \quad (3.63)$$

which introduces a set of  $\frac{1}{2}N(N + 1)$  equations (of 1<sup>st</sup> order), satisfied by the  $(M + 1)$  functions  $\phi^\alpha(H)$ . If we have enough number of constraints, we can combine them with these equations to solve for  $\phi^\alpha(H)$ ’s; a method which will be used in the next section.

b) *No – force conditions:*

There are another set of constraints, though not seemingly expressed as the no-force conditions, but are equivalent to the latter. The no-force conditions corresponding to a configuration of  $N$  distributions, are written as a set of  $N$  constraints relating the dilaton, metric and form-fields components together (see section 5). By expressing (formally) the

form-fields in terms of the harmonic functions, we can re-express these conditions as relations between  $(\phi^\alpha, H_\lambda)$ 's. We obtain such relations in the following using a heuristic way of derivation: We consider a special case where all the charge distributions except the  $\lambda^{th}$  one are vanishingly small, i.e.  $\rho_\kappa(z) \rightarrow 0$  for every  $\kappa \neq \lambda$ . The  $\mathcal{A}^r$ 's solution for such a single distribution is known to be

$$\mathcal{A}^r = -\delta_{d_\lambda, p_{r+1}} H_\lambda^{-1} \epsilon_\lambda \quad (3.64)$$

where  $H_\lambda = 1 + h_\lambda$  with  $h_\lambda$  as in (3.33). The corresponding part of the RL is calculated to be

$$\mathcal{L}_{F\lambda} = 1/2 e^{-2F_\lambda(\phi)} (\partial H_\lambda^{-1})^2 \quad (3.65)$$

where the function  $F_\lambda(\phi)$  is implicitly defined by

$$e^{-2F_\lambda(\phi)} \equiv -e^{2(G+\alpha_\lambda\varphi)} (h^{ij}) \epsilon_{\lambda(i)} \epsilon_{\lambda(j)} \quad (3.66)$$

It is easy to check that the  $H_\lambda$ 's equation of motion from (3.65) becomes a Laplace equation, only if we have

$$F_\lambda(\phi) = -\ln H_\lambda + \text{const.} \quad (3.67)$$

This gives the desired constraints, which are claimed to be valid for a general situation. Note that in the special cases where  $x^i$ 's are chosen to be the branes' world-volume coordinates,  $\epsilon_{\lambda(i)}$  becomes the alternating symbol corresponding to the coordinates on  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -branes' world-volume, and the definition (3.66) simplifies to  $e^{2F_\lambda(\phi)} = e^{2(G+\alpha_\lambda\varphi)} |\det(h^{ij})|_{i,j \in d_\lambda}$ .

## 4 Application to a system of branes at angles

An illustrative example of the formulation of section 3, is provided by considering the distributed system:  $d_1 \cap d_2 = \delta$  at non-trivial angles. In the branes' world-volumes coordinates (as defined in section 1) the ansatz for the metric is written as

$$ds^2 = e^{2B_0(z)} dx^\mu dx_\mu + e^{2B_1(z)} dy_1^m dy_1^m + e^{2B_2(z)} dy_2^{m'} dy_2^{m'} + 2e^{B_1(z)+B_2(z)} q(z) \gamma_{mm'} dy_1^m dy_2^{m'} + e^{2C(z)} dz^a dz^a \quad (4.1)$$

This differs from its orthogonal analogue, equation (1.2), by an off-diagonal term, which appears due to the non-trivial angles between the branes. In this expression  $q$  is some new degree of freedom and  $\gamma_{mm'}$ 's are  $\delta_1 \delta_2$  parameters defining the angles. The internal (world-volume) part of the metric tensor here is written as

$$h_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{2B_0} \eta_{\mu\nu} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2B_1} \delta_{mn} & q e^{B_1+B_2} \gamma_{mn'} \\ 0 & q e^{B_1+B_2} \gamma_{nm'} & e^{2B_2} \delta_{m'n'} \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.2)$$

Rotating the internal coordinates on the individual branes changes the matrix  $\gamma \equiv (\gamma_{mm'})$  by a transformation of the form:  $\gamma \rightarrow A\gamma B^T$ , where  $A \in SO(\delta_1)$  and  $B \in SO(\delta_2)$ . However, such different  $\gamma$ 's describe geometrically equivalent angular situations. The  $SO(\delta_1) \times SO(\delta_2)$ -rotationally invariant parameters are the angles:  $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m\}$ , defined through the diagonalization of the matrix  $\gamma\gamma^T$  (see Appendix C), whose number is

$$m = \text{Min}(\delta_1, \delta_2) = \text{Min}(d_1, d_2) - \delta \quad (4.3)$$

This is smaller than the total number of  $\gamma_{mm'}$ 's.

### The expression for $\mathcal{L}_G$

With the aid of the formulas A.12 to A.20 of the Appendix, one obtains the RL,

$$\mathcal{L}_G = f(q)^{1/2} e^{2G(\phi)} \{1/2 \hat{\Omega}_{\alpha\beta}(q) \partial\phi^\alpha \cdot \partial\phi^\beta + a(q) \sigma_\alpha \partial\phi^\alpha \cdot \partial q + 1/2 b(q) (\partial q)^2\} \quad (4.4)$$

where  $\phi^\alpha \equiv (B_0, B_1, B_2, C, \varphi)$  and  $G(\phi)$  is defined by (1.6) and (1.7). Further we have defined the functions of  $q$  as

$$\begin{aligned} f(q) &\equiv \det(1 - q^2 \gamma \gamma^T) \\ a(q) &\equiv f'(q)/2f(q) \\ b(q) &\equiv f''(q)/2f(q) \\ \hat{\Omega}_{\alpha\beta}(q) &\equiv \Omega_{\alpha\beta} + \omega_\alpha \omega_\beta q a(q) \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

with a prime denoting  $\partial/\partial q$ . The constants  $(\omega_\alpha, \sigma_\alpha)$  in these formulas are defined

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_\alpha &\equiv (0 \quad 1 \quad -1 \quad 0 \quad 0) \\ \sigma_\alpha &\equiv (2\delta \quad 2\delta_1 - 1 \quad 2\delta_2 - 1 \quad 2(\tilde{d} + 1) \quad 0) \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

The matrix  $\Omega_{\alpha\beta}$  in 4.5 is defined by (1.7). According to the above expression, the explicit angular dependence of  $\mathcal{L}_G$  comes totally through an even polynomial  $f(q)$  of degree  $2m$ , whose roots  $\{q_r\}$  characterize the angles between the two branes via  $q_r^2 = 1/\cos^2\theta_r$ . In the orthogonal case with  $\gamma_{mm'} = 0$ , we have  $f(q) = 1$  and consequently the expression for  $\mathcal{L}_G$  returns to that of eq. (1.4)

### Intersection rules revisited

A natural question is that whether the intersection rules of the orthogonal branes remain to be valid even for branes at non-trivial angles? We argue that the main equation determining these rules can not be angle-dependent and so the answer to this question is positive. First of all, since the mechanism by which we obtain a marginal solution in this paper, is essentially the same for the two cases, we expect that any non-orthogonal solution of this type to be connected to the orthogonal solutions (1.29) continuously through

the parameters  $(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m)$ . So in particular, we should expect to require three consistency conditions analogous to the equations (1.21), relating the couplings, dimensions, and possibly angles. But the last possibility can not be true, as if the counterparts of equations (1.21) include angles, then either the expressions for  $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$  or the relation arising between dimensions (counterpart of (1.28)) must contain angles. Neither of these possibilities are physical. Firstly  $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$  can not be angle-dependent, as they are parameters of the model itself which can not depend on the geometry. On the other hand a relation between dimensions and angles implies a quantization of angles which has not any physical origin. Therefore in what follows we will assume that the equation (1.28) for super- $p$ -branes is always applicable.

### Derivation of the solutions for $(p, p)$ -branes at angles

To present an application of all the previous general formulas, we show here the stages of derivation for the solutions of two ‘identical’ branes at angles. So in all the previous formulas, we put  $d_1 = d_2 \equiv d_0$  and  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 \equiv \alpha_0$ . In this case we have only a single form-field  $\mathcal{A}$  of degree  $d_0$ . Applying (1.28) to this system, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_1 &= \delta_2 = 2 \\ \delta &= d_0 - 2 \\ d &= d_0 + 2\end{aligned}\tag{4.7}$$

The relative orientation in this system, (generally) is described in terms of two independent angles, say  $(\theta, \theta')$ . A simplification occurring here is that, both the subspaces of:  $(y_1^m)$  and  $(y_2^{m'})$  become 2-dimensional. So  $\gamma_{mm'}$  becomes a  $2 \times 2$  matrix, which after diagonalization takes the form

$$\gamma_{mm'} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & 0 \\ 0 & \cos\theta' \end{pmatrix}\tag{4.8}$$

Hence, putting:  $y_1^m = (y_1, y_2)$  and  $y_2^{m'} = (y_3, y_4)$ , the metric (4.1) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}ds^2 &= e^{2B_0(z)} dx^\mu dx_\mu + e^{2B_1(z)} (dy_1^2 + dy_2^2) + e^{2B_2(z)} (dy_3^2 + dy_4^2) \\ &\quad + 2e^{B_1(z)+B_2(z)} q(z) (\cos\theta dy_1 dy_3 + \cos\theta' dy_2 dy_4) + e^{2C(z)} dz^a dz^a\end{aligned}\tag{4.9}$$

We assume in the following the asymptotic flat boundary conditions (provided  $d_0 < D-4$ ),

$$\phi^\alpha|_{z \rightarrow \infty} = 0 \quad , \quad q|_{z \rightarrow \infty} = 1\tag{4.10}$$

### The $H$ -basis and the structure constants

We begin our analysis by computing the structure constants  $c_\lambda^{(i)}$  in the basis  $h_\lambda$ , defined

by the equations (3.35) and (3.33) respectively. This requires the asymptotic form of  $h_{ij}$ , which by (4.9) and (4.10) is written as

$$\gamma_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} \eta_{\mu\nu} & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_{rs} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \eta_{\mu\nu} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \cos\theta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cos\theta' \\ 0 & \cos\theta & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cos\theta' & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.11)$$

where the indices:  $r, s = 1, \dots, 4$  refer to the coordinates  $(y_1, \dots, y_4)$ . Then the non-vanishing structure constants  $c_\lambda^{(\mu)rs}$  according to (3.35) and (4.11) are written as

$$\begin{aligned} c_\lambda^{(\mu)rs} &= \epsilon^{(\mu)} c_\lambda^{rs} ; \\ c_\lambda^{rs} &\equiv \sqrt{\gamma} \gamma^{rr'} \gamma^{ss'} \epsilon_{\lambda(r's')} \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where  $\gamma \equiv \det(\gamma_{rs})$ , and  $\epsilon^{(m)}$  and  $\epsilon_{\lambda(rs)}$  (with  $\lambda = 1, 2$  and  $r, s = 1, \dots, 4$ ) are respectively the  $(p-1)$ - and 2-dimensional alternating symbols such that:  $\epsilon^{0\dots(p-2)} = -1$  and  $\epsilon_{1(12)} = \epsilon_{2(34)} = +1$ . A straightforward calculation using (4.11) and (4.12) then gives

$$\begin{aligned} c_1^{12} &= c_2^{34} = \lambda \\ c_1^{34} &= c_2^{12} = \lambda \cos\theta \cos\theta' \\ c_1^{32} &= c_2^{14} = \lambda \cos\theta \\ c_1^{14} &= c_2^{32} = \lambda \cos\theta' \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

where  $\lambda \equiv 1/\sqrt{\gamma} = 1/\sin\theta \sin\theta'$  and all other  $c_\lambda^{rs}$ 's are vanishing. Note that for  $\theta = \theta'$ , as is so for the (2,2)-brane solution (3.27), the resultant values of  $c_\lambda^{rs}$  exactly reproduce the constant values of  $F_\lambda^{(i)}$ , which were given by (3.28). We now introduce a new  $H$ -basis by

$$H_\lambda = 1 + a_{\lambda\kappa} h_\kappa \quad (4.14)$$

with a transformation matrix  $(a_{\lambda\kappa})$  as is determined below. The constants  $c_\lambda^{rs}$  in the new basis  $(H_\lambda)$  then is related to the old one  $(h_\lambda)$  according to (3.37) by

$$\hat{c}_\lambda^{rs} = (a^{-1})_{\kappa\lambda} c_\kappa^{rs} \quad (4.15)$$

To determine the coefficients  $(a_{\kappa\lambda})$  we demand that:

- i)  $a_{\kappa\lambda} = a_{\lambda\kappa}$  so that our solution to be symmetric in  $(H_1, H_2)$ , as is so for  $(h_1, h_2)$ .
- ii)  $\hat{c}_2^{12} = \hat{c}_1^{34} = 0$ , which is necessary for the integrability of our equations.
- iii) For  $\theta = \theta' = \pi/2$  we must have  $H_\lambda = 1 + h_\lambda$ .

These together fix  $(a_{\kappa\lambda})$  as

$$a_{\kappa\lambda} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cos\theta \cos\theta' \\ \cos\theta \cos\theta' & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.16)$$

Using this matrix in (4.15), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{c}_1^{12} &= \hat{c}_2^{34} = \lambda \\
\hat{c}_1^{32} &= \hat{c}_2^{14} = \lambda\nu \\
\hat{c}_1^{14} &= \hat{c}_2^{32} = \lambda\nu'
\end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

where  $\nu \equiv \cos\theta\sin^2\theta'/(1-\cos^2\theta\cos^2\theta')$ ,  $\nu' \equiv \cos\theta'\sin^2\theta/(1-\cos^2\theta\cos^2\theta')$  and as in the past  $\lambda \equiv 1/\sin\theta\sin\theta'$ .

### Explicit expressions for $u_{\lambda\lambda'}$ 's

Knowing the values of the structure constants in the  $H_\lambda$  basis, we are able to obtain the functions  $u_{\lambda\lambda'}(\phi, q)$ , also in this basis, using the formula (3.42) which reduces to

$$u_{\lambda\lambda'} = -e^{-2(\hat{G}-\delta B_0+\alpha_0\varphi)}w_{\lambda\lambda'} \tag{4.18}$$

Here a hat is used to distinguish between the analogous quantities in the orthogonal and at angles cases (see (4.26) below), and  $w_{\lambda\lambda'}$ 's are homogeneous polynomials of degree 2 in  $(h_{rs})$  defined as

$$w_{\lambda\lambda'} \equiv \hat{c}_\lambda^{rs}\hat{c}_{\lambda'}^{r's'}h_{rr'}h_{ss'} \tag{4.19}$$

Using the ansatz (4.9) for the metric and the values of the structure constants as in (4.17) we can expand the above formula to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{11} &= \lambda^2(h_{11}^2 + \sigma h_{11}h_{33} + 2\rho h_{11}h_{13} + \tau h_{13}^2) \\
w_{22} &= \lambda^2(h_{33}^2 + \sigma h_{11}h_{33} + 2\rho h_{33}h_{13} + \tau h_{13}^2) \\
w_{12} &= \lambda^2\left[\frac{\tau}{\nu}h_{11}h_{33} + \rho'h_{11}h_{13} + 2\rho'h_{33}h_{13} + \nu(1 + \sigma)h_{13}^2\right]
\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

The constants appearing in these formulas are defined in terms of the angles  $(\theta, \theta')$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
v &\equiv \frac{\cos\theta'}{\cos\theta} \quad , \\
\rho &\equiv \nu\nu + \nu' \quad , \quad \rho' \equiv \nu\nu' + \nu \\
\sigma &\equiv \nu^2 + \nu'^2 \quad , \quad \tau \equiv 2\nu\nu'
\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

where  $\nu$  and  $\nu'$  have been defined in terms of  $(\theta, \theta')$  below (4.17). We now introduce the 'homogeneous' variables  $(q, s)$ ,

$$q \equiv \frac{h_{13}}{\sqrt{h_{11}h_{33}}} \quad , \quad s \equiv \sqrt{\frac{h_{33}}{h_{11}}} \tag{4.22}$$

which are invariant under the re-scalings of  $(h_{rs})$ . Then using (4.18) and (4.20) we obtain an expression for  $u_{\lambda\lambda'}$  as

$$u_{\lambda\lambda'} = -\lambda^2 e^{2(-\hat{G}+\delta B_0+B_\lambda+B_{\lambda'}-\alpha_0\varphi)} f_{\lambda\lambda'}(q, s) \equiv -\lambda^2 e^{\hat{F}_\lambda+\hat{F}_{\lambda'}} f_{\lambda\lambda'}(q, s)/f(q) \tag{4.23}$$

where  $f_{\lambda\lambda'}(q, s)$ 's are three polynomials in  $(q, s)$  defined as

$$\begin{aligned} f_{11}(q, s) &\equiv (1 + \sigma s^2) + 2\rho s q + \tau s^2 q^2 \\ f_{22}(q, s) &\equiv (1 + \frac{\sigma}{s^2}) + 2\frac{\rho}{s} q + \frac{\tau}{s^2} q^2 \\ f_{12}(q, s) &\equiv \frac{\tau}{v} + \rho'(s + \frac{1}{s})q + v(1 + \sigma)q^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

In (4.23),  $\hat{G}$  and  $\hat{F}_\lambda$  are generalized versions of  $G$  and  $F_\lambda$  for the case at angles, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{G}(\phi, q) &\equiv G(\phi) + 1/2 \ln \sqrt{f(q)} \\ \hat{F}_\lambda(\phi, q) &\equiv F_\lambda(\phi) + 1/2 \ln \sqrt{f(q)} \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

The explicit expressions of the functions appearing here are

$$\begin{aligned} G(\phi) &= 1/2(\delta B_0 + 2B_1 + 2B_2 + \tilde{d}C) \\ F_1(\phi) &= 1/2(\delta B_0 + 2B_1 - 2B_2 - \tilde{d}C - 2\alpha_0\varphi) \\ F_2(\phi) &= 1/2(\delta B_0 - 2B_1 + 2B_2 - \tilde{d}C - 2\alpha_0\varphi) \\ f(q) &= (1 - q^2)(1 - v^2 q^2) \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

The orthogonal situation is recovered by putting:  $f(q) = 1$  ,  $f_{\lambda\lambda'}(q, s) = \delta_{\lambda\lambda'}$ , and  $\lambda = 1$ .

### Constraints

The two classes of the constraints (3.61) and (3.67) for this case take the forms

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{G}(\phi, q) &= 1/2 \ln \sqrt{\gamma} \\ \hat{F}_\lambda(\phi, q) &= -\ln H_\lambda + 1/2 \ln \sqrt{\gamma} \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$

where the constants on the right of these equations are obtained from the boundary conditions (4.10) and that  $H_\lambda \rightarrow 1$  as  $z \rightarrow \infty$ . These constraints relate the six variables  $(\phi^\alpha, q)$  and the two  $H_\lambda$ 's. Equations (4.27), compared to their orthogonal analogues in (1.10), have the additional term  $1/2 \ln \sqrt{f(q)}/\gamma$ . This suggests that one may find a consistent simultaneous solution of these and the equations of motion , by taking

$$\phi^\alpha = -\xi_\lambda^\alpha X_\lambda + \eta^\alpha \ln \sqrt{f(q)}/\gamma \quad (4.28)$$

where  $X_\lambda \equiv -\ln H_\lambda$  and  $(\xi_\lambda^\alpha, \eta^\alpha)$ 's are a set of undetermined parameters (compare to (1.17)). Replacing this in (4.27), and taking  $(X_1, X_2, \ln \sqrt{f})$  as linearly independent functions, one obtains nine algebraic equations for the parameters. This consists of the equations (1.18) and the following equations

$$\mathbf{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta} = \mathbf{f}_\lambda \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta} = -1/2 \quad (4.29)$$



where  $\mathbf{g}$  and  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  are defined as in (1.7). To completely determine these parameters, the consistency with the equations of motion must also be required. However, by considering the ‘single distribution’ limits one can verify that the values of  $\xi_\lambda^\alpha$ ’s must be independent of the angles and in fact they do depend only on the dimensions of the respective  $p$ -branes. This means that  $\xi_\lambda^\alpha$ ’s are already determined as in (1.20) (with  $\kappa_1^2 = \kappa_2^2 = 1$ ). The values of  $\eta^\alpha$ ’s are then determined using the  $\mathcal{L} = 0$  condition (see below).

### The $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda\lambda'} = 0$ equations

As was stated earlier, all the field variables:  $(q, \phi^\alpha, A_{(\mu)rs})$  must be expressible as functions of  $H_\lambda$ ’s. These are not independent functions; since by (3.12) and (4.28), a knowledge of  $q(H)$  determines all other functions of  $H_\lambda$ ’s. To determine the former we use the  $\mathcal{L} = 0$  condition, which by (3.63) gives

$$e^{2\hat{G}}[\hat{\Omega}_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\lambda\phi^\alpha\partial_{\lambda'}\phi^\beta + \sigma_\alpha a(\partial_\lambda\phi^\alpha\partial_{\lambda'}q + \partial_{\lambda'}\phi^\alpha\partial_\lambda q) + b\partial_\lambda q\partial_{\lambda'}q] + e^{\hat{F}_\lambda + \hat{F}_{\lambda'}} f_{\lambda\lambda'}/f = 0 \quad (4.30)$$

where  $\partial_\lambda \equiv \partial/\partial H_\lambda$  and

$$s = e^{-(B_1 - B_2)} = e^{-\omega_\alpha \phi^\alpha} \quad (4.31)$$

Using (4.27) and replacing  $H_\lambda$  with  $X_\lambda$ , eq.(4.30) becomes,

$$[a^2(\boldsymbol{\eta}\hat{\Omega}\boldsymbol{\eta} + 2\boldsymbol{\sigma}\cdot\boldsymbol{\eta}) + b]\dot{\partial}_\lambda q\dot{\partial}_{\lambda'}q + a[(\boldsymbol{\eta}\hat{\Omega}\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda + \boldsymbol{\sigma}\cdot\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda)\dot{\partial}_{\lambda'}q + (\boldsymbol{\eta}\hat{\Omega}\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\lambda'} + \boldsymbol{\sigma}\cdot\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\lambda'})\dot{\partial}_\lambda q] + \boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda\hat{\Omega}\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\lambda'} + f_{\lambda\lambda'}/f = 0 \quad (4.32)$$

where  $\dot{\partial}_\lambda \equiv \partial/\partial X_\lambda$ . This can be put into a more convenient form,

$$(\dot{\partial}_\lambda q - a_\lambda(q))(\dot{\partial}_{\lambda'} q - a_{\lambda'}(q)) = b_{\lambda\lambda'}(q, s) \quad (4.33)$$

where we have defined;

$$\begin{aligned} a_\lambda &\equiv -\frac{a}{c}(\boldsymbol{\eta}\hat{\Omega}\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda + \boldsymbol{\sigma}\cdot\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda) \\ b_{\lambda\lambda'} &\equiv -\frac{1}{c}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_\lambda\hat{\Omega}\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\lambda'} + f_{\lambda\lambda'}/f) \\ c &\equiv b + a^2(\boldsymbol{\eta}\hat{\Omega}\boldsymbol{\eta} + 2\boldsymbol{\sigma}\cdot\boldsymbol{\eta}) \end{aligned} \quad (4.34)$$

Note that in (4.34)  $f, a, b, c, a_\lambda, \hat{\Omega}$  are only rational functions of  $q$ , while  $f_{\lambda\lambda'}$  and  $b_{\lambda\lambda'}$  are rational functions of  $q$  and polynomial functions (at most of degree 2) of  $s$  and  $1/s$ . By subtracting the  $\lambda = 1, 2$  equations in 4.27, we obtain

$$s = \sqrt{H_1/H_2} = e^{-1/2(X_1 - X_2)} \quad (4.35)$$

### The integrability conditions

The three partial differential equations (4.33) (for  $\lambda, \lambda' = 1, 2$ ) have a solution if,

*i*) a consistency condition and *ii*) an integrability condition are satisfied.

To see this, consider first the two equations with  $\lambda = \lambda'$ . These determine  $\dot{\partial}_\lambda q$ 's as functions of  $(q, X_\lambda)$ ,

$$\dot{\partial}_\lambda q = a_\lambda + \varepsilon_\lambda \sqrt{b_{\lambda\lambda}} \quad (4.36)$$

where  $\varepsilon_\lambda = \pm 1$ , upon which eq. (4.33) requires the *consistency* condition:

$$b_{11}b_{22} = (b_{12})^2 \quad (4.37)$$

The *integrability* condition follows from:  $\dot{\partial}_1(\dot{\partial}_2 q) = \dot{\partial}_2(\dot{\partial}_1 q)$ , which using (4.36) gives

$$\varepsilon_1 \sqrt{b_{11}}(4\bar{a}'b_{22} - 2\bar{a}b_{22}' + s\dot{b}_{22}) - \varepsilon_2 \sqrt{b_{22}}(4\bar{a}'b_{11} - 2\bar{a}b_{11}' + s\dot{b}_{11}) = 2(b_{11}b_{22}' - b_{22}b_{11}') \quad (4.38)$$

where prime means  $\partial/\partial q$  and dot means  $\partial/\partial s$ . By symmetry we have set  $a_1 = a_2 \equiv \bar{a}$ . Comparing (4.38) to an equation in the domain of  $\mathbf{Z}$  of the form<sup>12</sup>

$$a\sqrt{x} + b\sqrt{y} = c \quad (4.39)$$

one concludes that  $b_{\lambda\lambda}(q, s)$  must be written as the square of a polynomial  $p_\lambda(q, s)$  in  $s$  or  $1/s$ ,

$$b_{\lambda\lambda}(q, s) = [p_\lambda(q, s)]^2 \quad (4.40)$$

This statement, as will be seen, leads to important implications about the angles and other parameters of the solution. Although logically (4.40) is only a necessary integrability condition for (4.36), in the case at hand it provides the sufficient conditions as well. Explicit expressions of  $b_{\lambda\lambda}$ 's follow from their definitions by (4.34) restricted to the case:  $d_0 \cap d_0 = d_0 - 2$  via the equations (4.24) and (4.26). In this calculation we encounter various combinations of the parameters  $(\xi_\lambda^\alpha, \eta^\alpha)$ , all of which except one are found to be calculable from the equations (1.18), (1.19) and (4.29). For later reference we list them below

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_\lambda \Omega \xi_{\lambda'} &= -\delta_{\lambda\lambda'} & , & & \xi_\lambda \omega \xi_{\lambda'} &= 1/4(2\delta_{\lambda\lambda'} - 1) \\ \eta \Omega \xi_\lambda &= -1 & , & & \eta \omega \xi_\lambda &= \eta \omega \eta = 0 \\ \sigma \cdot \xi_\lambda &= 1/2 & , & & \eta \Omega \eta + 2\sigma \cdot \eta &\equiv \kappa \end{aligned} \quad (4.41)$$

Only the last combination ( $\kappa$ ) remains unknown which must be determined using the condition (4.40).

The resultant expressions for  $b_{11}$  and  $b_{22}$  become

$$\begin{aligned} b_{11}(q, s) &= b_0(q) + b_1(q)s + b_2(q)s^2 \\ b_{22}(q, s) &= b_0(q) + b_1(q)\frac{1}{s} + b_2(q)\frac{1}{s^2} \end{aligned} \quad (4.42)$$

---

<sup>12</sup>Mathematically this comparison is possible, since the set of polynomials (in  $(s, 1/s)$ ), as that of the integers, with ordinary addition and multiplication, constitute a 'ring'.

with  $q$ -dependent coefficients as

$$\begin{aligned}
b_0 &= \frac{a^2}{4c^2} - q\frac{a}{4c} + \frac{1}{c}\left(1 - \frac{1}{f}\right) \\
b_1 &= -\frac{2\rho q}{fc} \\
b_2 &= -\frac{\sigma + \tau q^2}{fc}
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.43}$$

Now for  $b_{\lambda\lambda}(q, s)$  to be the square of a polynomial (in  $s$  or  $1/s$ ), we must have

$$b_1^2(q) = 4b_0(q)b_2(q) \tag{4.44}$$

For this to be held identically the relations among coefficients must be

$$\begin{aligned}
v^2 &= 1 \\
\sigma &= \tau = \rho^2/2 \\
\kappa &= -2
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.45}$$

which leads to<sup>13</sup>

$$\cos\theta' = \cos\theta \tag{4.46}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}\boldsymbol{\Omega}\boldsymbol{\eta} + 2\boldsymbol{\sigma}\cdot\boldsymbol{\eta} = -2 \tag{4.47}$$

The intersection rule (4.7), combined with relation (4.46), leads to the interesting conclusion:

A pair of identical supersymmetric branes in any dimension make a marginal configuration, if the two branes intersect *at two equal* or equivalently *at  $SU(2)$  angles*.

The existence of a configuration of two intersecting branes at  $SU(2)$  angles is a result of its unbroken  $1/4$  supersymmetry first established in [28]. A similar conclusion was reached in the context of string theory calculations in [33], where it was shown that the interaction potential between two  $D$ -branes at  $SU(2)$  angles identically vanishes. Our result establishes their conclusions in a purely field theoretic context. The advantage of such a derivation is its independence of the high-energy model of the theory and in particular of the spacetime dimension.

We will return to the other result, equation (4.47) shortly. It is suitable here to emphasize on another feature of the integrability conditions which is only implicit in our calculations, i.e. their role in fixing the suitable  $H$ -basis for using with the constraints (4.27). This relation becomes clear, recalling the role of  $w_{\lambda\lambda}$ 's (see (4.18)) in our equations. These are

---

<sup>13</sup> We must discard the possibility of  $\cos\theta' = -\cos\theta$  as will be seen below.

2<sup>nd</sup> degree homogeneous polynomials in  $h_{rs}$  variables, and have six terms generally. However, by choosing a suitable  $H$ -basis, we can remove two of these terms simultaneously. For example the expression for  $w_{11}$  has the form

$$w_{11} = (\hat{c}_1^{34})^2 (h_{33})^2 + 2\hat{c}_1^{34}(\hat{c}_1^{14} + \hat{c}_1^{32})h_{33}h_{13} + \dots \quad (4.48)$$

where the dotted terms do not contain any powers of  $\hat{c}_1^{34}$ . We can suppress the first two terms by choosing an  $H$ -basis for which  $\hat{c}_1^{34} = 0$ . As a result the terms of higher degree than  $s^2$  (i.e.  $qs^3$  and  $s^4$ ) will be removed from  $f_{11}(q, s)$ , so that finally a quadratic expression (in  $s$ ) for  $b_{11}(q, s)$  is obtained. If we choose a basis for which  $\hat{c}_2^{12} = 0$ , a similar result for  $b_{22}(q, s)$  emerges. These two conditions (among the others stated below (4.15)) then determine, as we have seen, the matrix  $(a_{\kappa\lambda})$  defining the suitable basis. The important point here is that without taking:  $\hat{c}_1^{34} = \hat{c}_2^{12} = 0$ , our equations (4.36) for  $q(X)$  would not be integrable. The suitable basis, using (4.16) and  $\theta' = \theta$ , is therefore

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &= 1 + h_1 + \cos^2\theta h_2 \\ H_2 &= 1 + \cos^2\theta h_1 + h_2 \end{aligned} \quad (4.49)$$

### The solutions for $q(X)$ and $\phi^\alpha(X)$

Using  $\theta = \theta'$  in our equations causes considerable simplifications. A straightforward calculation in this case, using (4.24) and (4.34), shows that

$$\begin{aligned} f(q) &= (1 - q^2)^2 \\ a(q) &= -\frac{2q}{1 - q^2} \\ a_1(q) &= a_2(q) = -\frac{q(1 + q^2)}{2(1 - q^2)} \\ b_{11}(q, s) &= \frac{(\alpha s + q + \alpha s q^2)^2}{(1 - q^2)^2} \\ b_{22}(q, s) &= \frac{(\frac{\alpha}{s} + q + \frac{\alpha}{s} q^2)^2}{(1 - q^2)^2} \\ b_{12}(q, s) &= \frac{(\alpha s + q + \alpha s q^2)(\frac{\alpha}{s} + q + \frac{\alpha}{s} q^2)}{(1 - q^2)^2} \end{aligned} \quad (4.50)$$

where  $\alpha \equiv \cos\theta/(1 + \cos^2\theta)$ , and we have used the numerical relations (4.41) with  $\kappa = -2$ . It is clear from these expressions that the consistency condition (4.37) is automatically satisfied. Note, however, that if we chose the other possibility from (4.45):  $\cos\theta' = -\cos\theta$ , then the consistency condition would not be satisfied. Using these in the equation(s) (4.36) leads to four possibilities for solutions of  $(\dot{\partial}_1 q, \dot{\partial}_2 q)$ , from which only the  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = -1$  case is integrable. This corresponds to

$$\dot{\partial}_1 q = \frac{1}{2}q - \alpha s$$

$$\dot{\partial}_2 q = \frac{1}{2}q - \frac{\alpha}{s} \quad (4.51)$$

where  $s = e^{-1/2(X_1 - X_2)}$  as in (4.35). This system with the boundary condition:  $q(0, 0) = \cos\theta$  has a unique solution,

$$\begin{aligned} q &= \alpha[2\cosh(X_1 - X_2)/2 - \beta e^{(X_1 + X_2)/2}] \\ &= \alpha(H_1 + H_2 - \beta)/\sqrt{H_1 H_2} \end{aligned} \quad (4.52)$$

where  $\beta \equiv \sin^2\theta$ .

The solutions for  $\phi^\alpha(X)$ 's, using this solution for  $q(X)$ , are already expressed as in (4.28) up to the unknown parameters  $\eta^\alpha$ . To determine  $\eta^\alpha$ 's (as well as  $\xi_\lambda^\alpha$ 's in principle), we have to set the relations between parameters, required by the consistency of the equations governing  $(\phi^\alpha(X), q(X))$  and the ansatz (4.28) for  $\phi^\alpha(X, q)$ . Four of these relations have been given previously by (4.29) and (4.47). For obtaining a fifth one, we use the embedding equation of the dilaton,

$$(\dot{\partial}_\lambda \dot{\partial}_{\lambda'} + \delta_{\lambda\lambda'} \dot{\partial}_\lambda) \varphi + \alpha_0 f_{\lambda\lambda'} / f = 0 \quad (4.53)$$

where we have used the constraints (4.27) to eliminate the exponentials. On the other hand, the dilaton (i.e.  $\alpha = 5$ ) component of (4.28) is written as

$$\varphi = -\alpha_0(X_1 + X_2) + \eta^5 \ln \sqrt{f(q)/\gamma} \quad (4.54)$$

where we have put  $\xi_1^5 = \xi_2^5 = \alpha_0$  using (1.20). Inserting this ansatz in (4.53), a new set of equations involving only  $q(X)$  results. For these to become identities, equations (4.51) require that:  $\eta^5 = \alpha_0$ . Putting this value in the equations (4.29) and (4.47) and solving for  $\eta^\alpha$ 's, then gives

$$\eta^\alpha = \left( -\frac{\tilde{d}_0}{2\tilde{D}}, -\frac{\tilde{d}_0}{2\tilde{D}}, -\frac{\tilde{d}_0}{2\tilde{D}}, \frac{d_0}{2\tilde{D}}, \alpha_0 \right) \quad (4.55)$$

This completes our solution (4.28) for  $\phi^\alpha(X)$ .

### The solutions for $\mathcal{A}(X)$

For purely electric-type branes only the 'world-volume' components of the form-potentials survive (see (3.1)),

$$\mathcal{A} = A_{(\mu)rs}(dx^\mu) \wedge dy^r \wedge dy^s \quad (4.56)$$

Applying the formula (3.12) to this case, we obtain

$$\partial_\lambda A_{(\mu)rs} = \epsilon_{(\mu)\lambda} \hat{C}_\lambda^{r's'} h_{rr'} h_{ss'} e^{2(\delta B_0 - \hat{G} - \alpha_0 \varphi)} \quad (4.57)$$

With the help of (4.27), and in the form-notation, eq. (4.57) is written as

$$dA_{(\mu)rs} = \epsilon_{(\mu)}\omega_{rs} \quad (4.58)$$

where  $\omega$ 's are a set of 1-forms (on the  $H$ -surface) defined by

$$\omega_{rs} \equiv \frac{f_{\lambda(rs)}}{f} H_\lambda^{-2} dH_\lambda \quad (4.59)$$

where  $f_{\lambda(rs)}$ 's are functions of  $(q, s)$  with the non-vanishing members:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{1(12)} &= 1 + 2\alpha sq & f_{2(12)} &= 2\alpha \frac{q}{s^3} + \frac{q^2}{s^2} \\ f_{1(34)} &= 2\alpha s^3 q + s^2 q^2 & f_{2(34)} &= 1 + 2\alpha \frac{q}{s} \\ f_{1(32)} &= f_{1(14)} = \alpha s^2 + sq + \alpha s^2 q^2 & f_{2(32)} &= f_{2(14)} = \frac{\alpha}{s^2} + \frac{q}{s} + \alpha \frac{q^2}{s^2} \end{aligned} \quad (4.60)$$

For the equations (4.58) (for  $A_{(\mu)rs}$ 's) to be integrable, the forms  $\omega_{rs}$  must be exact, which can be checked by expressing them totally in  $(q, s)$  variables. Therefore  $\omega$ 's can be integrated to yield,

$$e_{rs} = - \int \omega_{rs} \quad (4.61)$$

The non-vanishing  $e_{rs}$ 's are;

$$\begin{aligned} e_{12} &\equiv \frac{1 + \frac{1}{s^2} + \frac{q}{\alpha s}}{\beta(1 - q^2)} \\ e_{34} &\equiv \frac{1 + s^2 + \frac{sq}{\alpha}}{\beta(1 - q^2)} \\ e_{32} &\equiv e_{14} \equiv \frac{(s + \frac{1}{s})q + \frac{q^2}{\alpha}}{\beta(1 - q^2)} \end{aligned} \quad (4.62)$$

Finally the solutions for the components of  $\mathcal{A}$  are written as

$$A_{\mu(rs)} = -\epsilon_{(\mu)}e_{rs} \quad (4.63)$$

### Summary of the solutions

In the following we present the final forms of the solutions in terms of the variables  $(H_\lambda, q)$ , without inserting the  $H$ -dependences of  $q$  in them. This choice makes them more transparent. First, the expressions for  $ds^2$  and  $e^\varphi$  are found from (4.28), using (1.20) and (4.55), as

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= \left( \sqrt{f(q)/\gamma H_1 H_2} \right)^{-\bar{d}_0/\bar{D}} [dx^\mu dx_\mu + H_2(dy_1^2 + dy_2^2) + H_1(dy_3^2 + dy_4^2) \\ &\quad + 2q\sqrt{H_1 H_2}(dy_1 dy_3 + dy_2 dy_4)] + \left( \sqrt{f(q)/\gamma H_1 H_2} \right)^{d_0/\bar{D}} dz^a dz^a \end{aligned} \quad (4.64)$$

$$e^\varphi = \left( \sqrt{f(q)/\gamma} H_1 H_2 \right)^{\alpha_0} \quad (4.65)$$

Second, the expression for  $\mathcal{A}$  is found, from (4.62) and (4.63), as

$$\mathcal{A} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{f(q)/\gamma}} (dx^\mu) \wedge \left[ \frac{1}{H_1} dy^1 \wedge dy^2 + \frac{1}{H_2} dy^3 \wedge dy^4 + \frac{q}{\sqrt{H_1 H_2}} (dy^1 \wedge dy^4 + dy^3 \wedge dy^2) \right] \quad (4.66)$$

In these formulas,  $H$ -dependence of  $q$  is given by (4.52) and  $f(q)$  is defined in (4.50). The harmonic functions  $(H_1(z), H_2(z))$  are related to the charge densities  $(\rho_1(z), \rho_2(z))$  via (3.33) and (4.49) which altogether may be written as

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(z) &= 1 + \int d^{\tilde{d}+2} z' G_{\tilde{d}+2}(z, z') [\rho_1(z') + \cos^2 \theta \rho_2(z')] \\ H_2(z) &= 1 + \int d^{\tilde{d}+2} z' G_{\tilde{d}+2}(z, z') [\cos^2 \theta \rho_1(z') + \rho_2(z')] \end{aligned} \quad (4.67)$$

By expressing  $(H_1, H_2)$  in terms of  $(h_1, h_2)$ , it is easy to check that for Type IIA (2, 2)-branes with  $D = 10$  and  $d_0 = 3$ , this solution exactly matches that of [29] expressed as (3.27) previously. In particular the function  $E$  in that solution is nothing but:  $E = \sqrt{f(q)/\gamma} H_1 H_2$ . The general case with arbitrary  $D$  and  $p$  had not been reported earlier.

## 5 No-force conditions

No-force conditions are a set of constraints arising naturally when we consider the marginally stable (static or stationary) configurations of  $p$ -branes. We have seen how a class of field theory solutions for these systems are constructed based on a very special set of constraints corresponding to the extremality and no-force conditions. The interpretation of the former was given in section 3. In this section we give a precise interpretation of the latter, which justifies its name. We start from a formulation of the no-force conditions similar to that of [25]. In principle to find such conditions, one has to single out every constituent  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -brane from rest of the branes, and demand its ‘equilibrium’ conditions under interactions with the others. Equivalently we may look for the equilibrium conditions of a  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -brane ‘probe’, with nearly zero mass and charge, situated parallel to the similar distribution within the system. Since the spacetime geometry along the world-volume of the brane in equilibrium is homogeneous, we can decompose the metric as

$$ds^2 = h_{\mu\nu}(y) dx^\mu dx^\nu + k_{mn}(y) dy^m dy^n \quad (5.1)$$

where  $(x^\mu)$  and  $(y^m)$  stand for the coordinates parallel and transverse to the world-volume of the  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -brane respectively. The action governing the dynamics of the brane is the DBI action. Since our branes have no boundaries, we can truncate DBI actions such that

all the internal gauge fields of the branes vanish [42]. Therefore the static gauge action of a  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -brane with  $X^\mu = \xi^\mu$ ,  $Y^m = Y^m(\xi)$  is written as

$$S_\lambda[Y] = -T_\lambda \int d^{d_\lambda} \xi \{ e^{-\alpha_\lambda \varphi(Y)} [-\det(h_{\mu\nu}(Y) + k_{mn}(Y) \partial_\mu Y^m \partial_\nu Y^n)]^{1/2} + \kappa_\lambda^{-1} \epsilon_\lambda^{(\mu)} A_{\lambda(\mu)}(Y) \} \quad (5.2)$$

Here  $T_\lambda$  is the brane tension,  $\epsilon_\lambda^{(\mu)}$  the  $d_\lambda$ -dimensional alternating symbol, and  $A_{\lambda(\mu)}$  represents the pull-back of the  $d_\lambda$ -form potential on the world-volume of the  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -brane. In (5.2) we have introduced an unusual factor  $\kappa_\lambda$ , which must be the same as the mass to charge ratio (1.24) of the brane (see below). For  $\kappa_\lambda = \pm 1$  we recover the usual action of super  $p$ -branes. Expanding this action in powers of the velocities:  $(\partial_\mu Y^m)$  and keeping only the leading order terms, we obtain the static potential between a  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -brane probe and the complete brane system as

$$V_\lambda(Y) = T_\lambda \left( e^{-\alpha_\lambda \varphi(Y)} \sqrt{h_\lambda(Y)} + \kappa_\lambda^{-1} \epsilon_\lambda^{(\mu)} A_{\lambda(\mu)}(Y) \right) \quad (5.3)$$

where  $h_\lambda \equiv |\det(h_{\mu\nu})|$ . In the equilibrium state, we must have  $V_\lambda(Y) = \text{constant}$ . Eliminating this constant by a suitable gauge transformation on  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$ , the no-force condition for a  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -brane is written as  $V_\lambda = 0$ , alternatively

$$e^{-\alpha_\lambda \varphi} h_\lambda^{1/2} = -\kappa_\lambda^{-1} \epsilon_\lambda^{(\mu)} A_{\lambda(\mu)} \quad (5.4)$$

Note that the above equation gives explicitly the component of a  $d_\lambda$ -form potential parallel to  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -brane, as a function of the dilaton and the (determinant of the) corresponding metric components. This can be compared to an analogous but different result, which was given in the form of equation (3.12) previously. As the the number of the equations in (5.4) is equal to the number of constraints (3.67),  $N$ , we may tend to guess that these two sets of equations are equivalent. This is in fact true for all the configurations considered earlier, as will be seen below.

### The case of $N$ orthogonal branes

In this case by (2.2), for all the branes within the  $\lambda^{\text{th}}$  distribution, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\lambda(\mu)} &= \epsilon_{\lambda(\mu)} e^{X_\lambda} \\ e^{-\alpha_\lambda \varphi} h_\lambda^{1/2} &= \exp\left(\sum_i \delta_{\lambda i} B_i - \alpha_\lambda \varphi\right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

So noting  $e^{X_\lambda} = \kappa_\lambda H_\lambda^{-1}$ , equation (5.4) gives

$$\sum_i \delta_{\lambda i} B_i - \alpha_\lambda \varphi = -\ln H_\lambda \quad (5.6)$$

Note that cancellation of the factor  $\kappa_\lambda$  in this equation, occurs only if one introduces the factor  $\kappa_\lambda^{-1}$  in the action (5.2). This confirms the result of section 1 that  $\kappa_\lambda$  is the mass



to charge ratio of a  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -brane. We can put (5.6) into a more familiar form, using the extremality constraint (equation (3.61))

$$G(\phi) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_i B_i + \tilde{d}C \right) = 0 \quad (5.7)$$

Combining the last two equations gives

$$F_\lambda(\phi) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \varepsilon_{\lambda i} B_i - 1/2 \tilde{d}C - \alpha_\lambda \varphi = -\ln H_\lambda \quad (5.8)$$

This is exactly the second constraint in (1.10) or its generalization to (3.67). Clearly this derivation does not rely on supersymmetry properties of the theory, as it does not rely on choosing  $\kappa_\lambda = \pm 1$ . In this sense, the marginality of a solution is not necessarily a result of its supersymmetries.

### The case of $(p, p)$ -branes at angles

For comparing with section 4, we consider only the case of super p-branes. In this case, using the ansatz (4.2) for  $h_{ij}$  and the solution (4.66) for  $\mathcal{A}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A_\lambda &= H_\lambda^{-1} [f(q)/\gamma]^{-1/2} \\ e^{-\alpha_0 \varphi} h_\lambda^{1/2} &= e^{2B_\lambda + \delta B_0 - \alpha_0 \varphi} \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

where we have introduced  $A_\lambda \equiv \varepsilon_\lambda^{(\mu)} A_{(\mu)}$ . So (5.4) takes the form

$$2B_\lambda + \delta B_0 - \alpha_0 \varphi = -\ln H_\lambda - \ln \sqrt{f(q)/\gamma} \quad (5.10)$$

Again the extremality constraint (first equation in (4.27)), combined with this equation, gives

$$F_\lambda(\phi) + 1/2 \ln \sqrt{f(q)} = -\ln H_\lambda + 1/2 \ln \gamma \quad (5.11)$$

This represents the second constraint in (4.27), as was expected.

### Long range potentials

The (short and long range) potentials between D-branes in the spacetime of dimensionality  $D = 10$ , due to exchange of (massive and massless) closed superstring states, have been calculated in many places [35, 36, 37]. However there has not been a general prescription for such calculations in spacetimes of arbitrary dimension, as a quantum theory of strings in other dimensions does not make sense. Nevertheless by studying the long distance behaviour of the ‘effective’ potential (5.3), we can specify the contributions from the various (massless) bosonic fields in our (low energy) model to the total long-range potential between a brane probe and a system of distributed branes. This will give physical

interpretations to the various consistency conditions, arising in the discussion of marginal solutions (e.g. eqns.(1.21)). To this end, we first note that the various dynamical variables in these solutions have power series expansions in terms of the harmonic functions  $\Delta H_\lambda \equiv H_\lambda - 1$ , which all tend to zero as  $z \rightarrow \infty$ <sup>14</sup>. So in particular (noting the boundary conditions) we have the expansions

$$\begin{aligned} e^\varphi &= 1 + \Delta\varphi + \dots \\ A_\lambda &= \kappa_\lambda(1 - \Delta H_\lambda + \dots) \\ h_\lambda &= 1 + \Delta h_\lambda + \dots \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

where the dots stand for higher than first order terms in  $\Delta H_\lambda$ 's. Using these in (5.3) we find the expansion for  $V_\lambda(z)$  (to first order) as

$$V_\lambda = T_\lambda \left( \frac{1}{2} \Delta h_\lambda - \alpha_\lambda \Delta\varphi + \Delta H_\lambda \right) + \dots \tag{5.13}$$

We identify the three leading order terms of this expansion as the gravitational, dilatonic, and  $(d_\lambda + 1)$ -form contributions to the potential energy of a distant  $(d_\lambda - 1)$ -brane, which is parallel to the corresponding distribution within the system, that is

$$V_{G\lambda} = \frac{1}{2} T_\lambda \Delta h_\lambda, \quad V_{D\lambda} = -T_\lambda \alpha_\lambda \Delta\varphi, \quad V_{F\lambda} = T_\lambda \Delta H_\lambda \tag{5.14}$$

Such an identification is possible, as each of these terms involves *only* the variations of the corresponding field variables and not mixings among themselves. As an example we consider the case of the orthogonal system  $d_1 \cap d_2 = \delta$  and a  $(d_1 - 1)$ -brane probe. Then from the solutions (1.29) we find

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta h_1 &= -\kappa_1^2 \frac{d_1 \tilde{d}_1}{D} \Delta H_1 + \kappa_2^2 \left( \frac{d_1 d_2}{D} - \delta \right) \Delta H_2 \\ \Delta\varphi &= \kappa_1^2 \alpha_1 \Delta H_1 + \kappa_2^2 \alpha_2 \Delta H_2 \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

Specializing to the case of localized distributions along the transverse space at the points  $z_\lambda^a$  ( $\lambda = 1, 2$ ), we have

$$\Delta H_\lambda(z) = \frac{c_\lambda T_\lambda}{|z - z_\lambda|^{\tilde{d}}} \tag{5.16}$$

where  $c_\lambda$ 's are constants proportional to the densities of the corresponding longitudinal distributions. The potentials (5.14) for e.g. a  $(d_1 - 1)$ -brane probe at point  $z^a$  thus become

$$V_{G1}(z) = -c_1 \kappa_1^2 \frac{d_1 \tilde{d}_1}{D} \frac{T_1^2}{|z - z_1|^{\tilde{d}}} + c_2 \kappa_2^2 \left( \frac{d_1 d_2}{2D} - \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \frac{T_1 T_2}{|z - z_2|^{\tilde{d}}}$$

---

<sup>14</sup>In general  $\Delta H_\lambda$ 's are written as linear combinations of  $h_\lambda$ 's defined in (3.33). But for the orthogonal case considered here, they actually coincide.

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{D1}(z) &= -c_1 \kappa_1^2 \frac{\alpha_1^2 T_1^2}{|z - z_1|^{\bar{d}}} - c_2 \kappa_2^2 \frac{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 T_1 T_2}{|z - z_2|^{\bar{d}}} \\
V_{F1}(z) &= c_1 \frac{T_1^2}{|z - z_1|^{\bar{d}}}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

where the first (second) term in each expression represents the interaction potential with the  $(d_1 - 1)$ -branes ( $(d_2 - 1)$ -branes) distribution. As these formulas indicate, the gravitational and dilatonic forces between two same-type (parallel) branes are always attractive, while their form-field force is restrictly repulsive. In contrast, both the gravitational and dilatonic forces between two (orthogonal) different-type branes may be either attractive or repulsive depending on the values of the various dimensions and couplings, but there are no form-field forces between themselves, as is expected. When the  $(d_1 - 1, d_2 - 1)$ -branes system is in a marginal (BPS) state, the internal branes as well as the brane probe do not feel any total force. So at an arbitrary point  $(z^a)$  we must have  $V_1(z) = V_{G1}(z) + V_{D1}(z) + V_{F1}(z) \equiv 0$ , which according to (5.17) requires

$$\begin{aligned}
-\kappa_1^2 \frac{d_1 \tilde{d}_1}{2\bar{D}} - \kappa_1^2 \alpha_1^2 + 1 &= 0 \\
\left(\frac{d_1 d_2}{2\bar{D}} - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) - \alpha_1 \alpha_2 &= 0
\end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

Interchanging the roles of  $(d_1 - 1)$  and  $(d_2 - 1)$ -branes in (5.18), we obtain the three consistency conditions (1.21). This verifies explicitly our assertion in section 1 that the consistency conditions are nothings but the requirements of the no-force conditions between different pairs of branes.

## 6 Masses and charges

The important physical parameters of a brane configuration (appearing e.g. in the black hole applications) are its mass and various charges. The total mass is the sum of the (positive) rest masses of the constituent branes, and the (negative) energy of the binding forces, both contained in the ADM mass of the brane system. For a marginal configuration, the *total* interaction energy vanishes and one expects that the ADM mass to be the sum of the constituents masses. The general ADM mass formula is derived by linearizing the Einstein equation in the (flat) background of the asymptotic metric [41]. For a system of distributed branes with a metric of the form (3.1), the general formula (in the units with  $16\pi G_D = 1$ ) reduces to

$$\mathcal{M} \equiv \frac{M}{V_{d-1}} = - \int d^{\bar{d}+2} z \partial^2 \Psi(z) \tag{6.1}$$

where  $V_{d-1}$  is the volume of the distribution subspace, and  $\Psi(z)$  is

$$\Psi(z) \equiv \gamma^{ij} h_{ij}(z) + h_{00}(z) + (\tilde{d} + 1)e^{2C(z)} + \text{const.} \quad (6.2)$$

In this formula,  $\gamma^{ij} \equiv h^{ij}(z)|_{z \rightarrow \infty}$ . Using the Stokes theorem, the expression for ADM mass becomes

$$\mathcal{M} = - \int_{S^{\tilde{d}+1}} d^{\tilde{d}+1} \Omega r^{\tilde{d}+1} \partial_r \Psi(r, \theta^{\tilde{a}}) = - \Omega_{\tilde{d}+1} (r^{\tilde{d}+1} \partial_r \Psi)_{r \rightarrow \infty} \quad (6.3)$$

where  $(r, \theta^{\tilde{a}})$  denotes a set of polar coordinates on the transverse space, and  $\Omega_{\tilde{d}+1}$  stands for the unit  $(\tilde{d} + 1)$ -sphere's area. From this formula a finite value for  $\mathcal{M}$  is obtained, only if  $\Psi$  at infinity behaves as  $\frac{1}{r^{\tilde{d}}}$  (i.e. as an harmonic function). In fact by expressing the metric in terms of the harmonic functions  $h_\lambda$  as in (3.33), and expanding in powers of  $h_\lambda$ 's we obtain

$$\Psi(h_\lambda) = \sum_\lambda \mu_\lambda h_\lambda + \mathcal{O}(h_\lambda^2) \quad (6.4)$$

where  $\mu_\lambda$ 's are constants depending on the specifications of the system under consideration. Using this in (6.3), and reversing the route of Stokes theorem from (6.3) to (6.1), yields

$$\mathcal{M} = - \sum_\lambda \mu_\lambda \int d^{\tilde{d}+2} z \partial^2 h_\lambda = \sum_\lambda \mu_\lambda \int d^{\tilde{d}+2} z \rho_\lambda(z) \quad (6.5)$$

where we have used the Poisson equations  $\partial^2 h_\lambda = -\rho_\lambda$  within the distribution region of the transverse space. Note that, despite using only the  $\mathcal{O}(h_\lambda)$  terms of (6.4), this is an exact expression for  $\mathcal{M}$ , since higher order terms of  $\Psi$  do not contribute to the surface integral in (6.3).

The charges are determined by types of the existing branes. In this paper we deal with cases where only *electric* charges present. The *total* electric charge, corresponding to a  $(d_r + 1)$ -form field strength  $\mathcal{F}^r$ , is defined via a  $d_r$ -form conserved current  $\mathcal{J}^r$  as

$$Q^r = \int_{V^{\tilde{d}_r+2}} * \mathcal{J}^r = \int_{S^{\tilde{d}_r+1}} e^{2\alpha_r \varphi} * \mathcal{F}^r \quad (6.6)$$

where  $V^{\tilde{d}_r+2}$  is any  $(\tilde{d}_r + 2)$ -dimensional hyperplane intersecting all the existing  $(d_r - 1)$ -branes at points and  $S^{\tilde{d}_r+1}$  is a  $(\tilde{d}_r + 1)$ -sphere surrounding these points. The  $*$  in (6.6) denotes the Hodge dual in the curved background. By taking the radius of  $S^{\tilde{d}_r+1}$  to infinity, the fields in (6.6) are replaced by their asymptotic values and it reduces to

$$Q^r = \int_{S^{\tilde{d}_r+1}} * \mathcal{F}_\infty^r = \int_{V^{\tilde{d}_r+2}} d * \mathcal{F}_\infty^r \quad (6.7)$$

where now  $*$  denotes the Hodge dual with respect to the flat background, and we have set as in the previous sections  $\varphi_\infty = 0$ . Using the  $\mathcal{A}^r$ 's equation of motion at infinity (see

section 3)

$$d * \mathcal{F}_\infty^r = * \mathcal{J}_\infty^r = \sum_{d_\lambda=d_r} \kappa_\lambda \rho_\lambda(z) * \epsilon_\lambda \quad (6.8)$$

eq. (6.7) becomes

$$\mathcal{Q}^r \equiv \frac{Q^r}{V_{d-d_r}} = \sum_{d_\lambda=d_r} \kappa_\lambda \int d^{\tilde{d}+2} z \rho_\lambda(z) \quad (6.9)$$

where  $V_{d-d_r}$  denotes the volume of the subspace transverse to  $(d_r - 1)$ -brane's world-volume and parallel to the distribution subspace. This shows that the charges of the same-type branes are additive even if they are not parallel, and  $\kappa_\lambda \rho_\lambda(z)$  measures the charge density of the  $\lambda^{\text{th}}$  distribution per its unit transverse volume. We examine in the following the general formulas (6.9) and (6.5) for the orthogonal solution of section 2. Similar results hold for the non-orthogonal solution of section 4.

### The case of $N$ orthogonal branes

In this case from the ansatz (2.2), and using (1.10) and (1.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{2\alpha_\lambda \varphi} * \mathcal{F}_\lambda &= e^{-2F_\lambda(\phi)} \tilde{*} d e^{X_\lambda} \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{i \notin d_\lambda} dx^i \right) \\ &= \kappa_\lambda \tilde{*} d H_\lambda \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{i \notin d_\lambda} dx^i \right) \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

where the  $\tilde{*}$  denotes the Hodge dual in a  $(\tilde{d}+2)$ -dimensional Euclidean space (an irrelevant overall sign concerning dualization have been omitted). Using this in (6.6), we obtain in agreement with (6.9) that

$$\mathcal{Q}_\lambda = \kappa_\lambda \int_{S^{\tilde{d}+1}} \tilde{*} d H_\lambda = \kappa_\lambda \int_{V^{\tilde{d}+2}} d^{\tilde{d}+2} z \rho_\lambda(z) \quad (6.11)$$

where the Stokes theorem with and Poisson equation have been used. For the mass formula, using (6.2) with the solution (2.12), we obtain

$$\Psi = \sum_\lambda \kappa_\lambda^2 \Delta H_\lambda + \mathcal{O}(\Delta H^2) \quad (6.12)$$

which shows that  $\mu_\lambda = \kappa_\lambda^2$  in this case. So by (6.5) we have

$$\mathcal{M} = \sum_\lambda \kappa_\lambda^2 \int d^{\tilde{d}+2} z \rho_\lambda(z) = \sum_\lambda |\kappa_\lambda \mathcal{Q}_\lambda| \quad (6.13)$$

That is the total mass  $\mathcal{M}$  equals the sum of the constituent masses  $\mathcal{M}_\lambda = |\kappa_\lambda \mathcal{Q}_\lambda|$ , which is an indication of marginality.

## Conclusion

Starting from a reduced Lagrangian reformulation of the problem of orthogonal brane solutions, we arrived at a set of (linear) constraints, which was shown to consistently solve

the corresponding (non-linear) field equations. The requirement of consistency between these two sets of equations, led to a set of algebraic constraints containing all the physical information characterizing the marginal orthogonal solutions. These include the mass to charge ratios of the constituent branes and their suitable intersection rules. Although in the realistic supergravities this lead to the BPS saturated solutions with extremal (super)  $p$ -branes as the building blocks, extensions to the black solutions with non-extremal (black)  $p$ -branes are also possible using suitable deformation functions [22]. By introducing a general formulation for handling arbitrary geometries of the intersecting branes with uniform ‘longitudinal’ distributions, a very general expression for the associated form-potentials in terms of the metric and dilaton field was derived. It was shown that the equations of motion of the reduced theory, can be translated to the ‘forced-geodesic’ equations describing a surface in the fields ‘configuration space’. The conditions for the integrability of these equations are found to coincide with the constraints obtained earlier [34]. Essentially this type of formulation is not restricted to the case of the marginal solutions, as far as the number of the independent harmonic functions is not restricted to that of the density functions. The distributions densities may be so correlated to result in the dependent harmonic functions. Consequently the constraints of the marginal solutions are not valid for the non-marginal solutions. As a result the suitable intersection rules will be different from those of the marginal solutions. We hope that the formulation of this paper (with suitable changes) to be applicable for classifying these non-marginal solutions as well (see however [38]). Finally we showed that how applying the ideas of the  $H$ -surface and null geodesic surface lead to the solutions for a system with two similar branes at  $SU(2)$  angles.

## Appendix:

### A. First order RL’s for gravity

The standard Einstein-Hilbert action is written in terms of the  $2^{nd}$  order Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}_{EH} = \sqrt{-g}R(g, \partial g, \partial^2 g) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

However, that the Einstein equation itself is of second order, shows that  $\mathcal{L}_{EH}$  must be ‘equivalent’ to a  $1^{st}$  order Lagrangian. To see this explicitly, we apply the formula for Ricci tensor:

$$R_{MN} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\partial_P(\sqrt{-g}\Gamma_{MN}^P) - \Gamma_{QM}^P\Gamma_{PM}^Q - \partial_M\partial_N(\ln\sqrt{-g}) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where the Christoffel symbols,  $\Gamma_{MN}^P$ ’s are  $1^{st}$  order quantities. Using this formula, the expression for  $\sqrt{-g}R$  becomes

$$\sqrt{-g}R = g^{MN}\partial_P(\sqrt{-g}\Gamma_{MN}^P) - \sqrt{-g}\Gamma_{QM}^P\Gamma_{PM}^Q - \sqrt{-g}\partial^M\partial_M(\ln\sqrt{-g})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
= & -\sqrt{-g}\partial_P g^{MN}\Gamma_{MN}^P - \sqrt{-g}\Gamma^{PQM}\Gamma_{QPM} + \partial_M(\ln\sqrt{-g})\partial_N(\sqrt{-g}g^{MN}) \\
& + \partial_P(\sqrt{-g}g^{MN}\Gamma_{MN}^P - \partial_N(\sqrt{-g}g^{MN}\partial_M\ln\sqrt{-g}))
\end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

where the  $2^{nd}$  order terms in the first line, have been appeared as total derivatives in the third line. After further simplification using the formulas

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_P g^{MN}\Gamma_{MN}^P &= -2\Gamma^{PQR}\Gamma_{QPR} \\
g^{MN}\Gamma_{MN}^P &= -\partial_Q g^{PQ} - \partial^P(\ln\sqrt{-g})
\end{aligned} \tag{A.4}$$

equation (A.3) reduces to

$$\sqrt{-g}R = \mathcal{L}_G(g, \partial g) - \partial_M \Lambda^M(g, \partial g) \tag{A.5}$$

where we have defied

$$\mathcal{L}_G \equiv \sqrt{-g}\Gamma^{PMN}\Gamma_{(MN)P} + \partial_M(\ln\sqrt{-g})\partial_N(\sqrt{-g}g^{MN}) \tag{A.6}$$

$$\Lambda^M \equiv \sqrt{-g}(\partial_N g^{MN} + 2g^{MN}\partial_N \ln\sqrt{-g}) \tag{A.7}$$

Formulas (A.5) to (A.7) can serve as simplifying explicit formulas for practical calculations of the Ricci scalar. However, since the surface term in (A.5) does not contribute to the equations of motion, we can identify the  $1^{st}$  order part,  $\mathcal{L}_G$ , as the gravitational field's Lagrangian.<sup>15</sup>

### Application to semi-homogeneous spacetimes

We have constructed examples of such spacetimes using the brane distributions throughout sections 1 to 4 of this paper. The generic form of the metric tensor for such spacetimes can be written as (see (3.1) and the related descriptions)

$$g_{MN} = \begin{pmatrix} h_{ij}(z) & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_{ab}e^{2C(z)} \end{pmatrix} \tag{A.8}$$

From this metric we have

$$\ln\sqrt{-g} = 1/2\ln h + (\tilde{d} + 2)C \tag{A.9}$$

where  $h \equiv |\det(h_{ij})|$ . The non-vanishing Christoffel symbols are

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{ija} &= -\Gamma_{aij} = 1/2\partial_a h_{ij} \\
\Gamma_{abc} &= e^{2C}(\delta_{ab}\partial_c C - \delta_{bc}\partial_a C + \delta_{ca}\partial_b C)
\end{aligned} \tag{A.10}$$

---

<sup>15</sup>It must be noted however that  $\mathcal{L}_G$  despite  $\mathcal{L}_{EH}$  is not transforming as a scalar density under coordinate transformations.

The expression for  $\mathcal{L}_G$  in (A.7) thus becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_G = h^{1/2} e^{\tilde{d}C} [1/4 \partial_a h_{ij} \partial_a h^{ij} + 1/4 (\partial_a \ln h)^2 + (\tilde{d} + 1) (\partial_a \ln h) \partial_a C + \tilde{d}(\tilde{d} + 1) (\partial C)^2] \quad (\text{A.11})$$

After simple manipulations, using the matrix notation, this formula is rewritten as

$$\mathcal{L}_G = e^{2G} [-1/4 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{h}^{-1} \partial \mathbf{h})^2 + 1/4 \text{Tr}^2(\mathbf{h}^{-1} \partial \mathbf{h}) + (\tilde{d} + 1) \partial C \cdot \text{Tr}(\mathbf{h}^{-1} \partial \mathbf{h}) + \tilde{d}(\tilde{d} + 1) (\partial C)^2] \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Here we have dropped the (contracted) transverse space indices, taken traces over  $(i, j)$  and defined  $G$  as

$$2G \equiv 1/2 \ln h + \tilde{d}C \quad (\text{A.13})$$

### A simplifying trick for calculating $\mathcal{L}_G$

Finding a closed form for  $\mathcal{L}_G$  in the specific problems (given the ansatz for  $h_{ij}$ ) by (A.12) needs to a closed form of  $h^{ij}$ , which in many situations can not be found easily. Fortunately a shortcut exists by means of which  $\mathcal{L}_G$  can be computed without really inverting  $h_{ij}$ . All that is needed, is to calculate the determinant:  $h = \det(h_{ij})$ , and take its 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> variations. This originates from the formula

$$h^{ij} = \frac{\partial(\ln h)}{\partial h_{ij}} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

using which the two traces in (A.12), take simple expressions as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{h}^{-1} \partial \mathbf{h}) &= \frac{\partial(\ln h)}{\partial h_{ij}} \partial h_{ij} = \partial(\ln h) \\ - \text{Tr}(\mathbf{h}^{-1} \partial \mathbf{h})^2 &= \frac{\partial^2(\ln h)}{\partial h_{ij} \partial h_{kl}} \partial h_{ij} \cdot \partial h_{kl} = (\partial^2 \ln h)_{\partial^2 h_{ij}=0} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.15})$$

That is the two traces are calculated by expressing  $\ln h$  as a function of  $(h_{ij})$ , taking its 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> order variations, and neglecting the 2<sup>nd</sup> order variation of  $h_{ij}$ <sup>16</sup>. Finally these two expressions are combined into the equation

$$\text{Tr}^2(\mathbf{h}^{-1} \partial \mathbf{h}) - \text{Tr}(\mathbf{h}^{-1} \partial \mathbf{h})^2 = \left( \frac{\partial^2 h}{h} \right)_{\partial^2 h_{ij}=0} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

This is proved to be a very useful formula for the sake of practical calculations.

### Application to the system $d_1 \cap d_2 = \delta$ at angles

For this system  $h_{ij}$  is defined by (4.1). Computing the determinant of this matrix we obtain

$$h = f(q) e^{2(\delta B_0 + \delta_1 B_1 + \delta_2 B_2)} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

---

<sup>16</sup>When calculating the second variation, we are allowed to replace  $h_{ij}$ 's with another set of variables in terms of which  $h_{ij}$ 's are linear.



where

$$f(q) \equiv |\det(1 - q^2 \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T)| \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Defining the four independent variables  $q^A$  linear in  $h_{ij}$ 's as

$$q^A \equiv (e^{2B_0}, e^{B_1}, e^{2B_2}, qe^{B_1+B_2}) \quad (\text{A.19})$$

and using the above tricks, with  $\partial^2 q^A = 0$  in (A.16), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 1/2 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{h}^{-1} \partial \mathbf{h}) &= \delta \partial B_0 + \delta_1 \partial B_1 + \delta_2 \partial B_2 + \frac{f'}{2f} \partial q \\ 1/4 [\text{Tr}^2(\mathbf{h}^{-1} \partial \mathbf{h}) - \text{Tr}(\mathbf{h}^{-1} \partial \mathbf{h})^2] &= \\ \delta(\delta - 1)(\partial B_0)^2 + [\delta_1(\delta_1 - 1) + \frac{qf'}{4f}] (\partial B_1)^2 + [\delta_2(\delta_2 - 1) + \frac{qf'}{4f}] (\partial B_2)^2 + \\ 2\delta\delta_1 \partial B_0 \cdot \partial B_1 + 2\delta\delta_2 \partial B_0 \cdot \partial B_2 + 2(\delta_1\delta_2 - \frac{qf'}{4f}) \partial B_1 \cdot \partial B_2 + \\ \frac{f'}{f} \partial q \cdot [\delta \partial B_0 + (\delta_1 - 1/2) \partial B_1 + (\delta_2 - 1/2) \partial B_2] + \frac{f''}{4f} (\partial q)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Using these in (A.12) and including the dilaton term, a final expression for  $\mathcal{L}_G$  as in (4.4) results.

## B. Analysis of the Diophantine equation for intersections

As we have seen in section 1, possible marginal intersections of super p-branes are governed by a Diophantine equation written as (1.28) or

$$(2\bar{D} - d_1 \tilde{d}_1)(2\bar{D} - d_2 \tilde{d}_2) = (d_1 d_2 - \delta \bar{D})^2 \quad (\text{B.1})$$

There are at least two means for classifying the solutions of this equation. Given the spacetime dimension  $D$ , we can specify:

1) the number of common directions  $(\delta - 1)$  or 2) the number of angles  $m$  and look for the possible dimensions of the branes  $(d_1 - 1, d_2 - 1)$ . We first present the method of analysis for arbitrary  $D$ 's below, and at the end summarize the results for interesting dimensions  $D = 4, 6, 10, 11$ . But before, two simple cases may be distinguished:

### a) The same-type branes

This corresponds to:  $d_1 = d_2$  &  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$  so that  $\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \geq 0$  and (1.21) implies:  $2\bar{D} - d_1 \tilde{d}_1 = +(d_1^2 - \delta \bar{D})$ , i.e.

$$\delta = d_1 - 2 \quad (\text{B.2})$$

This means that for two branes of the 'same type' to marginally bind, all their angles except two of them must be vanishing (i.e.  $m = 2$ ). A result which is in section 4 of this paper.

**b) The self-dual pair of branes**

This case corresponds to:  $d_1 = \tilde{d}_2$  &  $\alpha_1 = -\alpha_2$  so that  $\alpha_1\alpha_2 \leq 0$  and (1.21) implies:  $2\bar{D} - d_1\tilde{d}_1 = -(d_1\tilde{d}_1 - \delta\bar{D})$ , i.e.

$$\delta = 2 \tag{B.3}$$

This means that for a ‘self-dual’ pair of branes to marginally bind, they must be intersecting over a string.

**General restrictions**

Not all the solutions of (B.1) are physically acceptable, as we have two sets of restrictions: First, the definitions of dimensions and the condition of asymptotic flatness require

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \delta \leq d_\lambda < \bar{D} \ ; \ \lambda = 1, 2 \\ 0 < d_1 + d_2 - \delta < \bar{D} \end{aligned} \tag{B.4}$$

Second, the reality of  $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$  and the restriction on their relative sign require

$$\begin{aligned} d_\lambda\tilde{d}_\lambda \leq 2\bar{D} \ ; \ \lambda = 1, 2 \\ \text{sgn}(d_1d_2 - \delta\bar{D}) = \text{sgn}(\alpha_1\alpha_2) \end{aligned} \tag{B.5}$$

**The method of classification by  $\delta$**

Noting the symmetry of (B.1) relative to  $(d_1, d_2)$ , we introduce the new variables

$$r = d_1d_2 \quad , \quad s = d_1 + d_2 \tag{B.6}$$

in terms of which (B.1) is written as

$$r = 2s + P + \frac{R}{s - Q} \tag{B.7}$$

where  $(P, Q, R)$  are integers defined as

$$P = 4(\delta - 2) \quad , \quad Q = \bar{D} + 2(\delta - 2) \quad , \quad R = (8 - \bar{D})(\delta - 2)^2 \tag{B.8}$$

Therefore solving (B.1) for  $(d_1, d_2)$  (assuming  $(\delta, \bar{D})$  are given) is equivalent to solving (B.7) for  $(r, s)$  generally, and selecting then those solutions for which  $(d_1, d_2)$  are integers, i.e.

$$s^2 - 4r = \begin{cases} (2q)^2 & , \quad s \in 2\mathbf{Z} \\ (2q + 1)^2 & , \quad s \in 2\mathbf{Z} + 1 \end{cases} \quad (q \in \mathbf{Z}) \tag{B.9}$$

On the other hand (B.7) by itself has a finite set of solutions for  $(r, s)$ , for given values of  $(P, Q, R)$ , which may be obtained by demanding that the integer  $(s - Q)$  enumerates the

integer  $R \neq 0$ .

*The  $R = 0$  cases:*

These include:  $D = 10$  and/or  $\delta = 2$ . In both cases each of the relations:  $s = Q$ ,  $r = 2s + P$  solves the equation (B.7). The corresponding solutions for  $(d_1, d_2)$  then are given by

$$D = 10 : \begin{cases} or & d_1 + d_2 = 2(\delta + 2) \\ & (d_1 - 2)(d_2 - 2) = 4(\delta - 1) \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.10})$$

$$\delta = 2 : \begin{cases} or & d_1 + d_2 = \bar{D} \\ & (d_1, d_2) = (4, 4), (3, 6) \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

### The method of classification by $m$

For simplicity we may assume:  $d_1 \leq d_2$  and thus  $\delta = d_1 - m$ . So noting (B.6) and (B.8), we can write (B.7) as

$$d_1 d_2 = 2(d_1 + d_2) + 4(d_1 - m - 2) + \frac{(8 - \bar{D})(d_1 - m - 2)^2}{(d_2 - d_1) - \bar{D} + 2(m + 2)} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Defining the 1 to 1 map:  $(d_1, d_2) \mapsto (x, y)$  in the domain of  $\mathbf{Z}$  by

$$x = d_1 - (m + 2) \quad , \quad y = (d_2 - d_1) - \bar{D} + 2(m + 2) \quad (\text{B.13})$$

equation (B.12) in  $(x, y)$  variables transforms to

$$x^2 + yx + \left( my - k - \frac{l}{y - n} \right) = 0 \quad (\text{B.14})$$

where  $(n, k, l)$  are integers defined by

$$n \equiv 8 - \bar{D} \quad , \quad k \equiv (m - 2)^2 \quad , \quad l \equiv nk \quad (\text{B.15})$$

Solving (B.1) for  $(d_1, d_2)$  (assuming  $(D, d_1 - \delta)$  as given) is equivalent to solving (B.14) for  $(x, y)$  which is much easier. In fact equation (B.14) (as (B.7)) has a finite set of solutions for given values of  $(m, n, k, l)$ , which can be found easily by demanding that the integer  $(y - n)$  must enumerate the integer  $l \neq 0$  (for  $l = 0$  see below), and further that

$$y^2 - 4\left( my - k - \frac{l}{y - n} \right) = \begin{cases} (2q)^2 & , \quad s \in 2\mathbf{Z} \\ (2q + 1)^2 & , \quad s \in 2\mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{1} \end{cases} \quad (q \in \mathbf{Z}) \quad (\text{B.16})$$

so that (B.14) has integer solutions for  $x$ .

*The  $l = 0$  cases:*

By (B.15) these include:  $D = 10$  and/or  $m = 2$ . Again (like the  $R = 0$  case) the solution in both cases lie on two branches, i.e.:  $y = n$  ,  $y = -x + m - \frac{4(m-1)}{x+m}$ . The corresponding solutions for  $(d_1, d_2)$  then are given by

$$D = 10 : \begin{cases} d_2 - d_1 = 4 - 2m \\ or \\ (d_1 - 2)(d_2 - 6) = 4 - 4m \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.17})$$

$$m = 2 : \begin{cases} d_1 = d_2 \\ or \\ (d_1, d_2) = (3, D - 8), (4, D - 6), (6, D - 5) \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.18})$$

where the condition  $d_1 \leq d_2$  in the second class of (B.18) requires that  $D \geq 11, 10, 11$  respectively. Note that the two classes: (B.17) & (B.10) are the same. The condition  $d_1 \leq d_2$  restricts the first class of the (B.17) solutions to those with  $m = 0, 1, 2$ . In particular for two parallel branes ( $m = 0$ ) or two non-parallel branes with only one angle ( $m = 1$ ) in this class, we obtain:  $d_2 - d_1 = 4$  or  $2$  respectively, in agreement with the results of [37] for  $D$ -branes. In fact noting that the dilaton coupling for a  $D$ - ( $d - 1$ )-brane is  $\alpha(d) = \pm(4 - d)/4$ , with  $+(-)$  sign for branes with electric (magnetic) RR charges, we conclude that the first (second) class of solutions in (B.17) in the case of two  $D$ -branes, describes bound states of two  $D$ -branes of the same (opposite) ‘electromagnetic’ type.

### Special cases of $D = 4, 6, 10, 11$

We present here the summary of the above classifications of solutions for  $D = 4, 6, 10, 11$ . In this summary we relax the restrictions:  $\delta > 0$  ,  $d < \bar{D}$  to the extent that:  $\delta \geq 0$  ,  $d < D$ ; so that the solutions include ‘instanton-like’ objects as well as the ‘non-asymptotic flat’ configurations. The last column in each table indicates that the two branes are of the same or different electric/magnetic type according to  $\alpha_1\alpha_2$  to be positive or negative.

$\delta$	$(d_1, d_2)$	$m$	$sgn(\alpha_1\alpha_2)$
0	(2, 2)	2	+

table (2)  $D = 4$

$\delta$	$(d_1, d_2)$	$m$	$sgn(\alpha_1\alpha_2)$
0	(2, 2)	2	+
1	(3, 3)	2	+
2	(2, 2)	0	-

table (3)  $D = 6$ 

$\delta$	$(d_1, d_2)$	$m$	$sgn(\alpha_1\alpha_2)$
0	(0, 4), (1, 3), (2, 2), (1, 6)	0, 1, 2, 1	0, +, +, +
1	(1, 5), (3, 3), (2, 2), (2, 3), ..., (2, 9)	0, 2, 1, 1, ..., 1	-, +, -, -, 0, +, ..., +
2	(2, 6), (3, 5), (4, 4), (3, 6)	0, 1, 2, 1	-, -, 0, +
3	(3, 7), (4, 6), (5, 5)	0, 1, 2	-, 0, +
4	(4, 8), (5, 7), (6, 6), (5, 6)	0, 1, 2, 1	0, +, +, -
5	(5, 9), (6, 8), (7, 7), (6, 6)	0, 1, 2, 1	+, +, +, -
6	(6, 7)	0	-

table (4)  $D = 10$ 

$\delta$	$(d_1, d_2)$	$m$	$sgn(\alpha_1\alpha_2)$
0	(0, 3), (2, 2), (0, 6)	0, 2, 0	0, +, 0
1	(3, 3)	2	0
2	(2, 7), (3, 6)	0, 1	-, 0
3	(3, 9)	0	0
4	(6, 6)	2	0
5	(7, 7)	2	+
6	(6, 9), (8, 8)	0, 2	0, +

table (5)  $D = 11$ 

### C. Definition of the angles between two branes

We have seen at the beginning of section 4 that the ‘relative’ orientation of a pair of branes can be described in terms of the parameters  $\gamma_{mm'}$  entering the metric as in (4.1). The asymptotic form of this metric, restricted to the subspace of coordinates  $(y_1^m, y_2^{m'})$  then is written as <sup>17</sup>

$$d\sigma^2 \equiv (dy_1^m)^2 + (dy_2^{m'})^2 + 2\gamma_{mm'} dy_1^m dy_2^{m'} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Therefore  $\gamma_{mm'}$ ’s are related to the angles between coordinates as

$$\gamma_{mm'} = \cos(\partial_m, \partial_{m'})|_{z \rightarrow \infty} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Clearly the  $(\delta_1\delta_2)$  numbers  $\gamma_{mm'}$  depend on the choice of the (Cartesian) coordinate system:  $(y_1^m, y_2^{m'})$ , transforming as components of a rank (1, 1) tensor under the rotations:  $SO(\delta_1) \times SO(\delta_2)$  of these coordinates. Therefore we can *not* identify  $(\gamma_{mm'})$  as the set of *independent* parameters needed to describe the relative orientation of the two branes,

<sup>17</sup>Refer to table (1), section 1, for the definitions of coordinates and subspaces.

since they are related through these rotations. To do this, we need to specify the *maximal* set of  $SO(\delta_1) \times SO(\delta_2)$ -invariant quantities. We call such invariant parameters as the ‘geometric’ or ‘intrinsic’ angles of the two branes. To give a simple description of these angles, we use our intuitions in 3-dimensional Euclidean geometry<sup>18</sup>. We first take a pair of *arbitrary unit* vectors  $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2)$  within the  $(\delta_1, \delta_2)$  subspaces respectively as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{n}_1 &= \omega_1^m \partial_m & ; & & (\omega_1^m)^2 = 1 \\ \mathbf{n}_2 &= \omega_2^{m'} \partial_{m'} & ; & & (\omega_2^{m'})^2 = 1\end{aligned}\tag{C.3}$$

The angle between  $(\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2)$  according to the metric (C.1) then is defined by

$$\cos\theta = \mathbf{n}_1 \cdot \mathbf{n}_2 = \gamma_{mm'} \omega_1^m \omega_2^{m'}\tag{C.4}$$

We now define the ‘geometric’ angles between the two branes to be the ‘non-trivial’ extremums of the quantity  $\lambda \equiv \cos\theta$ . By ‘non-trivial’ here, we mean those extremums which are not zero identically, and not related together by a change of signs. These extremums are obtained by extremizing the function

$$S(\omega) = \gamma_{mm'} \omega_1^m \omega_2^{m'} - \frac{\lambda_1}{2} (\omega_1^m)^2 - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} (\omega_2^{m'})^2\tag{C.5}$$

subject to the constraints in (C.3) with  $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$  as the Lagrange multipliers. For the extremum points we have

$$\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda = \cos\theta\tag{C.6}$$

where  $\lambda$  is obtained from the eigen-value secular equation

$$\det[\hat{\gamma} - (1 + \lambda)\mathbf{1}] = 0\tag{C.7}$$

where  $\hat{\gamma} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \gamma \\ \gamma^T & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  is a  $(\delta_1 + \delta_2) \times (\delta_1 + \delta_2)$  matrix representing the metric tensor of (C.1). So (C.7) is written as a polynomial equation in  $\lambda$  of degree  $(\delta_1 + \delta_2)$ , whose ‘non-trivial’ roots  $\{\lambda_r\}_{r=1, \dots, m}$  give, via  $\lambda_r = \cos\theta_r$ , the geometric angles  $\{\theta_r\}$ . Not that by Hermiticity of  $\gamma$  all the  $\lambda_r$ ’s are real. Also by positive-definiteness of  $d\sigma^2$  we can show that always  $-1 \leq \lambda_r \leq 1$ . Further the secular equation (C.7) can be written as

$$\lambda^{\delta_2 - \delta_1} \det(\gamma \gamma^T - \lambda^2) = 0\tag{C.8}$$

which (assuming  $\delta_1 \leq \delta_2$ ) implies that the roots of (C.7) consist of a set of  $(\delta_2 - \delta_1)$  zeros and  $\delta_1$  pairs of opposite numbers (this had been expected, since reversing the direction of  $\mathbf{n}_1$  or  $\mathbf{n}_2$  in (C.4) changes the sign of  $\cos\theta$  but preserves its extremum property). So the

---

<sup>18</sup>You may consider e.g. a line and a plane at angle in the 3-space.

number of  $\theta_r$ 's equals the degree of the determinant in (C.8) as a polynomial function of  $\lambda^2$ , which is in general

$$m = \text{Min}\{\delta_1, \delta_2\} \quad (\text{C.9})$$

This number is in fact the (maximum) number of the successive rotations, required for bringing the smaller in dimension brane from a parallel to an angled status relative to the other brane.

### D. Derivation of useful $H$ -surface identities

The model for the form-field sector of the RL (3.40) can be simulated by a simplified model in the discrete mechanics as

$$L[x, y] = -\frac{1}{2}g_{ij}(x)\dot{y}^i\dot{y}^j \quad (\text{D.1})$$

where  $(x^\alpha)$  and  $(y^i)$  are two sets of dynamical variables and  $g_{ij}(x)$  is any invertible ‘metric tensor’. The equations of motion for  $y^i$ 's are obviously integrable and yield

$$\dot{y}^i = c_j g^{ij}(x) \quad (\text{D.2})$$

where  $c_j$ 's are some integration constants. Eliminating  $y^i$ 's in (D.1) by this equation, we obtain

$$L[x] = -\frac{1}{2}c_i c_j g^{ij}(x) \quad (\text{D.3})$$

Applying equation (D.2) again, it is easy to prove the ‘on-shell identity’ :

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\alpha} L[x, y] = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\alpha} L[x] \quad (\text{D.4})$$

Changing the role of  $(x^\alpha, y^i, \gamma_{ij}, L)$  to  $(\phi^\alpha, A_{(i)}^r, e^{2\alpha_r \varphi}(h^{ij}), \mathcal{L}_F)$  in this equation, and using the definitions (3.44) and (3.50), we obtain the ‘H-surface identity’ :

$$U_{\lambda\lambda',\alpha}(\phi, H) = -u_{\lambda\lambda',\alpha}(\phi) \quad (\text{D.5})$$

Differentiating the  $H$ -surface identity (3.49) relative to  $H_{\lambda''}$  and using (D.5), we obtain another identity:

$$U_{\lambda\lambda',\lambda''}(\phi, H) = 2\partial_{\lambda''} u_{\lambda\lambda'}(\phi) = 2\partial_{\lambda''} U_{\lambda\lambda'}(\phi, H) \quad (\text{D.6})$$

Using this result in the equation (3.47), after simple manipulations we obtain

$$\partial_{\lambda'} U_{\lambda\lambda''} = \partial_{\lambda''} U_{\lambda\lambda'} \quad (\text{D.7})$$

Noting the symmetry of  $U_{\lambda\lambda'}$  in its two indices, this equation implies the existence of a function  $U(H)$ , such that

$$U_{\lambda\lambda'}(\phi(H), H) = \partial_\lambda \partial_{\lambda'} U(H) \quad (\text{D.8})$$

This result could be seen in a (somehow) different manner. Let's define

$$U_{\lambda\lambda'}^r \equiv e^{-2\alpha_r\varphi}(h^{ij})\partial_\lambda A_{(i)}^r(H)\partial_{\lambda'} A_{(j)}^r(H) \quad (\text{D.9})$$

so that  $U_{\lambda\lambda'} = \sum_{r=1}^n U_{\lambda\lambda'}^r$  by (3.44). From (3.48) it is evident that

$$U_{\lambda\lambda'}^r(\phi(H), H) = \partial_\lambda(c_{\lambda'}^{r(i)} A_{(i)}^r) = \partial_{\lambda'}(c_\lambda^{r(i)} A_{(i)}^r) \quad (\text{D.10})$$

This implies the existence a function  $U^r(H)$ , in terms of which we can write

$$c_\lambda^{r(i)} A_{(i)}^r = \partial_\lambda U^r \quad (\text{D.11})$$

$$U_{\lambda\lambda'}^r = \partial_\lambda \partial_{\lambda'} U^r \quad (\text{D.12})$$

which proves (D.8) again.

## References

- [1] M. J. Duff, R. R. Khuri and J. X. Lu, *String Solitons*, Phys. Rep. **259** (1995) 213
- [2] J. P. Gauntlett, *Intersecting Branes*, hep-th/9705011
- [3] K.S. Stelle, *Lectures on Supergravity p-branes*, hep-th/9701088
- [4] A. Dabholkar, G. Gibbons, J. Harvey and F. Ruiz Ruiz, *Superstrings and Solitons*, Nucl. Phys. **B340** (1990) 33
- [5] R. Kallosh and J. Kumar, *Supersymmetry Enhancement of D-p-branes and M-branes*, hep-th/9704189
- [6] R. Guven, *Black p-Brane Solutions of D=11 Supergravity Theory*, Phys. Lett. **B276** (1992) 49
- [7] M. S. Costa, *Composite M-branes*, hep-th/9609181
- [8] E. Bergshoeff, C. Hull and T. Ortin, *Duality in the type-II Superstring Effective Action*, Nucl. Phys. **B451** (1995) 547
- [9] A. A. Tseytlin, *Composite BPS Configurations of p-branes in 10 and 11 dimesions*, hep-th/9702163
- [10] J. C. Breckendridge, G. Michaud and R. C. Myers, *More D-brane Bound States*, hep-th/9611174



- [11] H. Lu , C. N. Pope, T. A. Tran and K. W. Xu, *Classification of p-branes , NUT's, Waves and Intersections*, hep-th/9708055
- [12] H. Lu and C. N. Pope, *Interacting Intersections*, hep-th/9710155
- [13] H. Lu and C. N. Pope, *p-brane Solitons in Maximal Supergravities*, hep-th/9512012
- [14] H. Lu and C. N. Pope, *Interacting Intersections*, hep-th/9710155
- [15] J. P. Gauntlett, D. A. Kastor and Traschen, *Overlapping Branes in M-theory*, hep-th/9604179
- [16] G. Papadopoulos and P.K. Townsend, *Kaluza-Klein on the Brane* hep-th/9609095
- [17] M. J. Duff and J. X. Lu, *Black and Super p-branes in Diverse Dimensions* Nucl. Phys. **B416** (1994) 301
- [18] G. Horowitz, A. Strominger, *Black Strings and p-branes*, Nucl. phys. **B360** (1991) 197
- [19] G. W. Gibbons and K. Maeda, *Black Holes and Membranes in Higher Dimensional Theories*, Nucl. Phys. **B298** (1988) 741
- [20] I. Ya. Aref'eva, M. G. Ivanov, and O. A. Rytchkov, *Properties of intersecting p-branes in Various Dimensions*, hep-th/9702077
- [21] R. Argurio, F. Englert, L. Huart, *Intersection Rules for p-branes* , hep-th/9701042
- [22] N. Ohta, *Intersection Rules for Non-extreme p-branes* , hep-th/9702164
- [23] R. Argurio, *Intersection Rules and Open Branes*, hep-th/9712170
- [24] A. A. Tseytlin, *Harmonic Superpositions of M-branes*, hep-th/9604035
- [25] A. A. Tseytlin, *No force Condition and BPS Combinations of p-branes in 11 and 10 Dimensions*, hep-th/9609212
- [26] N. Khviengia, Z. Khviengia, H. Lu, C. N. Pope, *Intersecting M-branes and Bound States*, hep-th/9605077
- [27] H. Lu and C. N. Pope, *Multi scalar p-brane Solitons*, hep-th/9512153
- [28] M. Berkooz, M.R. Douglas and R.G. Leigh, *Branes Intersecting at Angles*, Nucl. Phys. **B480** (1996) 265

- [29] J. C. Breckendridge, G. Michaud and R. C. Myers, *New Angles on D-branes*, hep-th/9703041
- [30] G. Michaud and R. C. Myers, *Hermitian D-brane Solutions*, hep-th/9705079
- [31] N. Hambli, *Comments on Dirichlet Branes at Angles*, hep-th/9703179
- [32] V. Balasubramanian, F. Larsen, R. G. Leigh, *Branes at Angles and Black Holes*, hep-th/9704143
- [33] M. M. Sheikh Jabbari, *Classification of Different Branes at Angles*, hep-th/9710121
- [34] R. Abbaspur, H. Arfaei, in prepration
- [35] J. Polchinski, *TASI Lectures on D-branes*, hep-th/9611050
- [36] C. Bachas, hep-th/9701019
- [37] H. Arfaei, M. M. Sheikh Jabbari *Different D-brane Interactions*, Phys. Lett. **B394** (1997) 288
- [38] N. Ohta, J. Zhou, *Towards the Classification of Non-Marginal Bound States of M-branes and Their Construction Rules*, hep-th/9706153
- [39] S. Mathur, *Non-BPS Excitations of D-branes and black holes*, hep-th/9609053
- [40] V. Balasubramanian, F. Larsen, *Extremal branes as Elementary Particles* hep-th/9610077
- [41] J.X. Lu *ADM masses for black strings and p-branes* Phys. Lett. **B313** (1993) 29
- [42] P.K. Townsend *Brane surgery*, hep-th/9609217