

SUPERWAVES

W. Siegel¹

*C. N. Yang Institute for Theoretical Physics
State University of New York, Stony Brook, NY 11794-3840*

ABSTRACT

We give some supersymmetric wave solutions, both chiral (selfdual) and nonchiral, to interacting supersymmetric theories in four dimensions.

¹ <mailto:siegel@insti.physics.sunysb.edu>
<http://insti.physics.sunysb.edu/~siegel/plan.html>

1. Introduction

Exact wave solutions to interacting theories [1] have recently drawn attention for application to the AdS/CFT correspondence [2]. In Yang-Mills theory they take the form (neglecting matter sources)

$$dx^m A_m = dx^+ A_+(x^+, x^i), \quad (\partial^i)^2 A_+ = 0$$

and in gravity

$$dx^m dx^n g_{mn} = dx^m dx^n \eta_{mn} + dx^+ dx^+ g_{++}(x^+, x^i), \quad (\partial^i)^2 g_{++} = 0$$

In the absence of sources, they describe free particles in interacting theories; in the presence of sources, they describe free particles produced by the interaction of particles of lower spin. In this paper we consider supersymmetric generalizations of such solutions. They describe particles of various spins, related by supersymmetry; in some solutions there are no interactions, in others, some act as sources for the highest spin.

2. Complex solutions

In quantum field theory one begins with a classical solution to the field equations as a vacuum, and perturbs about it: The perturbations include both tree and loop graphs. Generally real Euclidean solutions are considered, as appropriate to the Euclidean path integral.

Two types of real Euclidean solutions to interacting field theories have been considered: (1) Those that have time-reversal invariance with respect to the coordinate to be Wick rotated remain real after analytic continuation to Minkowski space. (The symmetry $t \rightarrow -t$ becomes complex conjugation invariance $it \rightarrow -it$, i.e., reality.) This includes static solutions, such as monopoles or spherical black holes. (But see, e.g., the use of Euclidean space to eliminate black hole singularities [3].) Nonstatic solutions include certain cosmological ones, with appropriate choice of time coordinate. (Euclidean space has also been proposed to eliminate singularities in cosmology [4].)

(2) More complicated time-dependent solutions, such as instantons, can become complex upon continuation, so their validity has sometimes been questioned. (Instantons are complex in Minkowski space because their selfduality is a complex condition on the field strength.) Since wave solutions by definition propagate at the speed of light (as distinguished from solitons, etc.), we need to consider the general validity of

such complex solutions. We begin by looking at such solutions that are themselves perturbative.

Since we are considering classical solutions, such perturbative solutions correspond to tree graphs. It is generally stated that tree graphs of quantum field theory are equivalent to classical field theory [5]. However, there are two important differences: (1) Classical field theory requires retarded (or advanced) propagators to preserve reality, while quantum field theory requires the complex Stückelberg-Feynman propagator. (In time-3-momentum space, compare the retarded $2\theta(t)\sin(\omega t)$ or advanced $-2\theta(-t)\sin(\omega t)$ to the Stückelberg-Feynman $ie^{-i\omega|t|}$.) This requirement is equivalent to analytic continuation from real solutions in Euclidean space. (Consider $ie^{-i\omega|t|}$ vs. $e^{-\omega|t|}$ under complex conjugation, including $\vec{p} \rightarrow -\vec{p}$.)

(2) While classical field theory uses the same real field for each external line, quantum field theory uses different one-particle wave functions for each line, and they are complex in Minkowski space, from choosing either positive (initial) or negative (final) energies for each line, by the same considerations as for the propagator. (Similar remarks apply for theories with multiple fields, or with respect to reality properties for complex fields, which can always be re-expressed in terms of real ones.) But any such solutions that are, e.g., traveling in a given direction are also complex in Euclidean space, since spatial momentum is not Wick rotated. (However, such solutions can be real in two space and two time dimensions.) Thus, external line factors can result in complex solutions in both Minkowski and Euclidean space in quantum field theory. In particular, for solutions propagating at the speed of light it is not possible to eliminate the problem by choice of time axis. (In classical field theory, adding the complex conjugate solution to make a real solution can still give a wave propagating in a given direction, since changing the signs of both the momentum and energy leaves the velocity invariant.)

Thus we are led to consider only complex solutions that are consistent with the requirements of perturbation theory. In fact, wave solutions are perturbative: Their contributions to the field are linear in the coupling, and satisfy the non-self-interacting Laplace equation (perhaps with sources) in two fewer dimensions; they take the exact same form as in the Abelian theory. (Yang-Mills wave solutions are the same as Abelian ones; gravitational wave solutions are the same as the flat metric plus an Abelian spin-2 field.) However, this requirement generalizes to nonperturbative solutions, by analytic continuation from regions of spacetime where they can be expressed perturbatively. (For example, the Schwarzschild solution can be derived perturbatively, at least outside the event horizon [6].)

3. Selfdual solutions

In particular, in four dimensions these wave solutions to the two-dimensional Laplace equation decompose into the sum of parts analytic and antianalytic in the complex coordinates for those two dimensions. Treated as a classical theory, the analytic and antianalytic terms must be complex conjugates to preserve reality; but in quantum field theory the two terms correspond to positive and negative helicity, and can be treated as independent. In practice, we set one term to vanish to describe a particle of definite helicity.

Truncation to states of given helicity corresponds directly to truncation of the theory to the selfdual theory, as has been demonstrated both in Feynman diagrams [7] and directly in the action [8]. (This differs from early actions for selfdual theories [9], which not only did not correspond to truncations of nonselfdual theories, but violated Lorentz invariance and even dimensional analysis. Also, when coupling selfdual gravity to selfdual Yang-Mills, they violated Lorentz invariance and selfduality of the field equations themselves.) Here we will concentrate our attention to maximally symmetric theories, since in the lightcone they can be described by a single (super)field.

In the lightcone, the action for (super) Yang-Mills theory can be written as the sum of (1) the kinetic term, (2) the selfdual (3-point) vertex, (3) the antiselfdual vertex, and (4) the 4-point vertex [10]. The (polynomial form of) the lightcone gauge for the selfdual theory [11] is described in terms of the same fields, but keeping just the first two terms in the action [12]:

$$S = tr \int d^4x d^4\theta \left[\frac{1}{2} \phi \square \phi + g \frac{1}{3} \phi (\partial_{[-} \phi) (\partial_{t]} \phi) \right]$$

where ∂_t is the derivative with respect to the complex coordinate. Since any solution to the selfdual theory is also a solution to the full theory, it is sufficient to consider this truncated action. Since the action contains no derivatives with respect to the anticommuting coordinates, the field equations take the same form for all spins (“spectral flow”): Only the labels on the component fields change, since the helicities at the vertex must add to 1. Consequently, the wave solution is *identical* to that of non-supersymmetric selfdual Yang-Mills theory (i.e., one helicity of the nonselfdual theory), except that the field has arbitrary dependence on the anticommuting coordinates. Since the field strength is defined by taking the same derivatives (∂_- and ∂_t) that appear in the action, not both of them can vanish. We will choose ∂_- to vanish; the other choice is related by parity. Furthermore, since $\frac{1}{2} \square = -\partial_+ \partial_- + \partial_t \partial_{\bar{t}}$, the

wave solution is then

$$\phi(x, \theta) = \phi(x^+, x^t, \theta^i)$$

and the only nonvanishing components of the gauge field and field strength are

$$A_+ = \partial_t \phi, \quad F_{t+} = \partial_t^2 \phi$$

Except for the arbitrary θ dependence, this is the same as the wave solution stated in the introduction, specialized to one of the two chiralities in D=4 (analytic, and not antianalytic). These superfields yield the corresponding component fields at $\theta = 0$; other component fields (for spinors and scalars) reside in ϕ at higher orders in θ ($\psi_i = \partial_i \partial_t \phi$, $\varphi_{i\kappa} = \partial_i \partial_\kappa \phi$, etc.).

Similar remarks apply to (super)gravity, except that the action [13] is polynomial only in the lightcone gauge [14]:

$$S = \int d^4x d^8\theta \left[\frac{1}{2} \phi \square \phi + \kappa \frac{1}{6} i \phi (\partial_{[-} \partial_{-} \phi) (\partial_{i]} \partial_{i]} \phi + g \frac{1}{6} \phi (\partial_i \partial_{[-} \phi) (\partial_{i]} \partial_i \phi) \right]$$

where the last term is an optional gauge coupling for gauged selfdual supergravity, for gauge group SO(8) (but contractions and Wick rotations of this group are also allowed). The wave solutions

$$\phi(x, \theta) = \phi(x^+, x^t, \theta^i); \quad g_{++} = \partial_t^2 \phi, \quad R_{t+t+} = \partial_t^4 \phi$$

exhibit the usual “direct product” structure in terms of the (super) Yang-Mills solutions.

These results can be generalized to nonmaximal supersymmetry: There the action takes the same form, but one field in each term is replaced with a second, Lagrange multiplier field (since it then appears linearly). The equations of motion (and thus the solutions) for the original (selfdual) field are identical, while those for the Lagrange multiplier field can be solved by setting it to zero. (For the number of supersymmetries N one less than maximal, which describes a theory equivalent to the maximal, the counting of nonvanishing components is the same because of the existence of a reality condition on the field only for the maximal case.)

4. Nonseldual solutions

Although complex solutions are allowed, and may be simpler, real solutions are not prohibited: In Minkowski space, they correspond to identical incoming and outgoing states, and thus have a simpler classical interpretation. In the supersymmetric case such wave solutions are not free; such solutions have already been considered for

nonsupersymmetric waves (as bosonic solutions in supersymmetric theories; see, e.g., [2]).

Here we consider the simplest case in $D=4$, namely $N=1$ super Yang-Mills. We first consider the theory in components: In two-component spinor notation, the nonvanishing component of the vector is $A_{+\dot{+}}$. Therefore, we choose for the nonvanishing spinor components ψ_+ and its complex conjugate $\bar{\psi}_{\dot{+}}$. Again dropping dependence on $x^{-\dot{-}}$, the field equations reduce to

$$\partial_{-\dot{+}}\psi_+ = \partial_{+\dot{-}}\bar{\psi}_{\dot{+}} = 0, \quad \partial_{+\dot{-}}\partial_{-\dot{+}}A_{+\dot{+}} = i\bar{\psi}_{\dot{+}}\psi_+$$

We can then write the solution in terms of

$$\bar{\phi}_{\dot{+}}(x^{+\dot{+}}, x^{+\dot{-}}), \quad \phi_{+\dot{+}}(x^{+\dot{+}}, x^{+\dot{-}})$$

(where $x^{+\dot{-}}$ is x^t) as

$$\psi_+ = \partial_{+\dot{-}}\bar{\phi}_{\dot{+}}, \quad \bar{\psi}_{\dot{+}} = \partial_{-\dot{+}}\phi_{+\dot{+}}; \quad A_{+\dot{+}} = \phi_{+\dot{+}} + \bar{\phi}_{+\dot{+}} + i\phi_{+\dot{+}}\bar{\phi}_{\dot{+}}$$

The superfield formulation is interesting in its own right. It is not as simple as in the selfdual case, but may suggest generalizations. As in the component analysis, the only nonvanishing components of the spinor field strength are W_+ and $\bar{W}_{\dot{+}}$. In the chiral representation, the only nontrivial covariant derivatives are then ∇_+ and $\nabla_{+\dot{+}}$. We then have

$$\nabla_+ = e^{-V}d_+e^V; \quad d_-V = \bar{d}_{\dot{-}}V = \partial_{-\dot{-}}V = 0$$

$$W_+ = \bar{d}_{\dot{+}}e^{-V}\partial_{+\dot{-}}e^V$$

The field equations are then

$$\nabla^\alpha W_\alpha \sim \partial_{-\dot{+}}e^{-V}\partial_{+\dot{-}}e^V = 0$$

These are familiar as the field equations for the (Euclidean) 2D Wess-Zumino model, with solution

$$e^V = e^{\bar{\Omega}(x^{+\dot{+}}, x^{+\dot{-}})}e^{\Omega(x^{+\dot{+}}, x^{+\dot{-}})}$$

where Ω (as V) effectively depends on just θ^+ and $\bar{\theta}^{\dot{+}}$ out of the anticommuting coordinates. Component expansion then reproduces the above results (where we set the $\theta = \bar{\theta} = 0$ component of Ω and thus V to vanish in a Wess-Zumino gauge).

5. Future directions

An interesting application of perturbation about selfdual wave solutions would be a description of the full theory by a perturbation in helicity. This could be particularly useful for gravity, where only the selfdual action is polynomial.

Generalizations to higher dimensions might be relevant for further generalizations of the AdS/CFT correspondence. For example, for super Yang-Mills in $D=3,4,6,10$, where there are no scalars, we again keep only the A_+ component of the vector, and just the $\gamma_+\psi$ part of the spinor, to find

$$\gamma_i \partial_i \psi = 0, \quad (\partial_i)^2 A_+ = \bar{\psi} \gamma_+ \psi$$

so that a free solution to the Dirac equation in the transverse dimensions acts as source to the Abelian A_+ , as we have already seen for $D=4$ (and is somewhat trivial in $D=3$, where such wave solutions reduce to the usual plane waves).

Acknowledgments

I thank Martin Roček for pointing out references [3-4]. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation Grant No. PHY-0098527.

REFERENCES

- 1 H.W. Brinkmann, *Math. Annalen* **94** (1925) 119;
I. Robinson, unpublished lectures (1956);
J. Hély, *Compt. Rend. Acad. Sci.* **249** (1959) 1867;
A. Peres, [hep-th/0205040](#), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **3** (1959) 571;
J. Ehlers and W. Kundt, Exact solutions of gravitational field equations, in *Gravitation: An introduction to current research*, ed. L. Witten (Wiley, 1962) p. 49
- 2 M. Blau, J. Figueroa-O'Farrill, C. Hull, and G. Papadopoulos, [hep-th/0110242](#), *JHEP* **0201** (2002) 047, [hep-th/0201081](#), *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19** (2002) L87;
R.R. Metsaev, [hep-th/0112044](#), *Nucl. Phys.* **B625** (2002) 70;
D. Berenstein, J.M. Maldacena, and H. Nastase, [hep-th/0202021](#), *JHEP* **0204** (2002) 013
- 3 J.B. Hartle and S.W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev.* **D13** (1976) 2188
- 4 J.B. Hartle and S.W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev.* **D28** (1983) 2960
- 5 Y. Nambu, *Phys. Lett.* **26B** (1968) 626;
D.G. Boulware and L.S. Brown, *Phys. Rev.* **172** (1968) 1628
- 6 M.J. Duff, *Phys. Rev.* **D7** (1973) 2317
- 7 W.A. Bardeen, *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **123** (1996) 1;
D. Cangemi, [hep-th/9605208](#), *Nucl. Phys.* **B484** (1997) 521
- 8 G. Chalmers and W. Siegel, [hep-th/9606061](#), *Phys. Rev.* **D54** (1996) 7628
- 9 H. Ooguri and C. Vafa, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* A5 (1990) 1389, *Nucl. Phys.* **B361** (1991) 469, **367** (1991) 83;
N. Marcus, [hep-th/9207024](#), *Nucl. Phys.* **B387** (1992) 263

- 10 S. Mandelstam, *Nucl. Phys.* **B213** (1983) 149;
L. Brink, O. Lindgren, and B.E.W. Nilsson, *Nucl. Phys.* **B212** (1983) 401
- 11 A.N. Leznov, *Theor. Math. Phys.* **73** (1988) 1233,
A.N. Leznov and M.A. Mukhtarov, *J. Math. Phys.* **28** (1987) 2574;
A. Parkes, [hep-th/9203074](#), *Phys. Lett.* **286B** (1992) 265
- 12 W. Siegel, [hep-th/9205075](#), *Phys. Rev.* **D46** (1992) R3235
- 13 W. Siegel, [hep-th/9207043](#), *Phys. Rev.* **D47** (1993) 2504
- 14 J.F. Plebański, *J. Math. Phys.* **16** (1975) 2395