Black hole microstates with a new constituent

Minkyu Park

Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics
Kyoto University

Abstract

One interesting property of black holes is that they obey thermodynamic laws. The entropy of black holes is given by the area of the horizon and it is naturally expected to be understood from the statistical mechanical viewpoint. However there has not been many things known about black hole microstates in the gravity, even though their holographic understanding has been well-known. In microstate geometry program which is a conjecture about black hole microstates, typical microstates are described as smooth and entropyless (i.e., horizonless) supergravity solutions which have the same mass, angular momentum, and charges as that of black holes. In this thesis, a new class of black hole microstates are suggested and studied in addition to the known microstate solutions and discussed in the context of microstate geometry program.

This thesis is based on the following published papers that the author was involved.

1. M. Park and M. Shigemori, *Codimension-2 solutions in five-dimensional supergravity*, *JHEP* **10** (2015) 011, [1505.05169].

2. J. J. Fernández-Melgarejo, M. Park and M. Shigemori, *Non-Abelian supertubes*, *JHEP* **12** (2017) 103, [1709.02388].

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Masaki Shigemori for leading me to this interesting subject. I have learned many things through many valuable discussions with him. I also would like to thank all the faculty members who have been very kind and enthusiastic for sharing their knowledge and discussing with me. It has been glad to having been with Jaewang Choi and Kento Watanabe during the graduate course. We often talked from very tiny things to some research topics. I also would like to thank José J. Fernández-Melgarejo for his kind advices and instructive discussions. Lastly, I would like to thank my family. My parents, Hyeongnam Bak and Youngsuk Oh, have always encouraged me from a far distance. I thank them from the bottom of my heart. In addition I have been able to do well, because of the very dedicated support from my wife Jiyoung. I really appreciate it.

Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

Black holes have been one major topic in theoretical physics since its discovery. They are involved with many important concepts or puzzles in the modern theoretical physics, for example, holography, information loss problem, etc. Black holes have entropy that is given by the area of the horizon [1] and also obey thermodynamic laws [2]. As a thermodynamic object, black holes are naturally supposed to have underlying microstates. Especially in string theory, it has been able to uncover some aspects of them, e.g., [3, 4]. These understanding of black hole microstates are basically relying on the gauge/gravity duality [5], namely the black hole entropy is accounted for state counting of D-brane system which is the dual description of gravity. Although this is very beautiful results of string theory, it would be really desirable if we could find a gravity description for microstates of black holes. Once we find a such description, it would solve many puzzles of black holes in a direct way, since we would know the exact microstructure of black holes. Let us explain one approach in string theory to achieve this.

Because string theory is a microscopic theory of gravity, i.e., quantum gravity, black hole microstates must be describable within string theory, at least as far as black holes that exist in string theory are concerned. These microstates must have same charges, mass and angular momentum as that of black holes and the scattering in the microstate must be well-defined as a unitary process. The fuzzball conjecture[1] [12, 13, 14, 15, 16] claims that typical microstates spread over a macroscopic distance of the would-be horizon scale. More recent arguments [17, 18] also support the view that the conventional picture of black holes must be modified at the horizon scale and replaced by some non-trivial structure.

The microstates for generic black holes are expected to involve stringy excitations and, to

[1] This was originated from the success of explaining the entropy of two-charge black holes as a smooth and horizonless geometry [6, 7]. In the frame of D1-D5 black holes, the microstates are described as a Kaluza-Klein monopole geometry which is smooth and horizonless. Note that the Kaluza-Klein monopole in this case is a dual description of a supertube [8]. A similar analysis for 1/2-BPS states in $\mathrm{AdS}_5 \times S^5$ was done in [9, 10, 11]. In this thesis, we will mainly discuss three- and four-charge black holes respectively in five and four dimensions.

describe them properly, we probably need quantum string field theory. However, for supersymmetric black holes, the situation seems much more tractable. Many microstates for BPS black holes have been explicitly constructed as regular, horizonless solutions of supergravity — the massless sector of superstring theory. It is reasonable that the massless sector plays an important role for black hole microstates because the large-distance structure expected of the microstates can be supported by massless fields [19]. It is then natural to ask how many microstates of BPS black holes are realized within supergravity. This has led to the so-called "microstate geometry program" (see, e.g., [20]), which is about explicitly constructing as many black hole microstates as possible, as smooth and horizonless solutions in supergravity.

A useful setup in which many supergravity microstates have been constructed is five-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 2$ ungauged supergravity with vector multiplets, for which all supersymmetric solutions have been classified [21]. This theory describes the low-energy physics of M-theory compactified on a Calabi-Yau threefold X or, in the presence of an additional S^1 [22, 23], of type IIA string theory compactified on X. The supersymmetric solutions are completely characterized by a set of harmonic functions on a spatial $\mathbb{R}^3$ base, which we collectively denote by H. We will call these solutions *harmonic solutions*. If we assume that H has codimension-3 singularities, its general form is

$$H(\mathbf{x}) = h + \sum_{p=1}^{N} \frac{\Gamma_p}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_p|}. \tag{1.1}$$

The associated supergravity solution generically represents a bound state of N black holes which sit at $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_p$ $(p = 1, \ldots, N)$ and are made of D6, D4, D2, and D0-branes represented by the charge vectors Γ_p. In this thesis, we take $X = T^6 = T^2_{45} \times T^2_{67} \times T^2_{89}$ and the D-branes wrap some of the tori directions.

By appropriately choosing the parameters in the harmonic functions, the harmonic solutions with codimension-3 centers, (1.1), can describe regular, horizonless five-dimensional geometries that are microstates of black holes with finite horizons [24, 25]. However, although they represent a large family of microstate geometries, it has been argued that they are not sufficient for explaining the black hole entropy [26, 27].

In fact, physical arguments naturally motivate us to generalize the codimension-3 harmonic solutions, which lead to more microstates and larger entropy. One possible way of generalization is to go to six dimensions. This is based on the CFT analysis [28] which suggests that generic black hole microstates must have traveling waves in the sixth direction and thus depend on it. This intuition led to an ansatz for six-dimensional solutions [29], based on which a new class of microstate geometries with traveling waves, called superstrata, was constructed [30]. For recent developments in constructing superstratum solutions, see [31, 32, 33, 34].

The other natural way to generalize the codimension-3 harmonic solutions (1.1) is to consider

codimension-2 sources in harmonic functions. This generalization is naturally motivated by the supertube transition [8] which in the context of harmonic solutions implies that, when certain combinations of codimension-3 branes are put together, they will spontaneously polarize into a new codimension-2 brane. For example, if we bring two orthogonal D2-branes together, they polarize into an NS5-brane along an arbitrary closed curve parametrized by λ. We represent this process by the following diagram:

$$\mathrm{D2}(45) + \mathrm{D2}(67) \to \mathrm{ns5}(\lambda 4567), \tag{1.2}$$

where D2(45) denotes the D2-brane wrapped on T^2_{45} and "ns5" in lowercase means that it is a dipole charge, being along a closed curve. The original D2(45) and D2(67)-branes appeared in the harmonic functions as codimension-3 singularities, as in (1.1). The process (1.2) means that those codimension-3 singularities can transition into a codimension-2 singularity in the harmonic function along the curve λ. Another example of possible supertube transitions is

$$\mathrm{D2}(89) + \mathrm{D6}(456789) \to 5^2_2(\lambda 4567; 89), \tag{1.3}$$

where 5^2_2 is a non-geometric exotic brane which is obtained by two transverse T-dualities of the NS5-brane [35, 36].

We emphasize that the supertube transition is not an option but a must; if two codimension-3 branes that can undergo a supertube transition are put together, they will, because the supertube is the intrinsic description of the bound state [12, Section 3.1]. This suggests that considering only codimension-3 singularities in the harmonic solutions is simply insufficient and we must include codimension-2 supertubes for a full description of the physics. Later we will give another reason why we have to consider codimension-2 sources.

As we will see in explicit examples later, this does not just mean to smear the codimension-3 singularities in the harmonic function (1.1) along a curve to get a codimension-2 singularity, but the harmonic function can also have branch-point singularities and be *multi-valued* in $\mathbb{R}^3$. It is a generic feature of codimension-2 branes that, as one goes around their worldvolume, the spacetime fields undergo a U-duality transformation [35, 36] and become multi-valued; the harmonic function being multi-valued is the manifestation of this.

The purpose of the works presented in this thesis is to demonstrate how configurations with codimension-2 sources, geometric and non-geometric, can be represented in the harmonic solution. To our knowledge, the harmonic solution with codimension-2 sources has not been investigated before, and represents a large unexplored area of research. For the codimension-3 case, (1.1) gives the general multi-center solution. More generally, however, the codimension-3 centers must polarize into supertubes, thus giving a multi-center solution of codimension-3 and codimension-2 centers. It is technically challenging to explicitly construct general multi-center solutions involving codimension-2 centers. So, in this thesis, we present some simple but

explicit solutions which must be useful for finding the general solutions. An obvious application of codimension-2 solutions is to generalize the studies previously done for codimension-3 sources to include codimension-2 sources such as the black hole attractor mechanism [37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43], split attractor flows and wall-crossing [44, 45, 46, 47]. In [35, 36], it was argued that codimension-2 solutions play an essential role in the microscopic physics of black holes and we hope that these works will set a stage for research in that direction.

Chapter 2

Harmonic solutions

Harmonic solutions refer to supersymmetric and stationary solutions of supergravity in four and five dimensions which are determined by a set of harmonic functions on $\mathbb{R}^3$ with one constraint. When the sources are codimension 3 in $\mathbb{R}^3$ (i.e., point-like), the harmonic solutions are often called multi-center solutions. The framework we are going to use is mainly five-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 2$[1] ungauged supergravity coupled to vector multiplets. This theory can be obtained as the low-energy effective theory of M-theory compactified on a Calabi-Yau threefold X. In this chapter, we briefly summarize some essential properties of harmonic solutions.

2.1 Harmonic solutions in five-dimensional supergravity

In this section, we will use five-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity which provides a fertile model for constructing black hole microstates to explain what harmonic solutions are. Furthermore, we will focus on the theory with two vector multiplets and presume the theory was obtained through a compactification of M-theory on a Calabi-Yau threefold X which we take it as $T^6 = T^2_{45} \times T^2_{67} \times T^2_{89}$.

All supersymmetric solutions of timelike class[2] in five-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity coupled to vector multiplets are classified in [21]. The metric, gauge fields and scalars of the supersymmetric solutions are given by

$$ds_5^2 = -Z^{-2/3}(dt + k)^2 + Z^{1/3} ds^2_{\mathrm{HK}}, \tag{2.1.1a}$$

$$A^I = B^I - Z_I^{-1}(dt + k), \quad I = 1, 2, 3, \tag{2.1.1b}$$

$$X^I = Z^{1/3} Z_I^{-1}, \quad Z = Z_1 Z_2 Z_3, \tag{2.1.1c}$$

[1] 8 supercharges.

[2] Depending on whether the Killing vector constructed from the Killing spinor bilinear is timelike or null, the solutions are classified into timelike or null classes.

where the scalar functions Z_I and the one-forms k, B^I depend only on the hyper-Kähler base space with the metric $ds^2_{\rm HK}$. It is easy to confirm that the scalars satisfy

$$X^1 X^2 X^3 = 1, \tag{2.1.2}$$

so only two of them are independent.

It will be convenient to define the magnetic field strength by

$$\Theta^I = dB^I. \tag{2.1.3}$$

The demand of supersymmetry leads to the following BPS equations to be satisfied by the quantities Θ^I, Z_I, and k [22]:

$$\Theta^I = *_4 \Theta^I, \tag{2.1.4a}$$

$$d *_4 dZ_I = \frac{1}{2} C_{IJK} \Theta^J \wedge \Theta^K, \tag{2.1.4b}$$

$$(1 + *_4) dk = Z_I \Theta^I, \tag{2.1.4c}$$

where $*_4$ is the Hodge dual with respect to the base metric $ds^2_{\rm HK}$ and C_{IJK} are constants that are symmetric under permutations of IJK, and in our case $C_{IJK} = |\epsilon_{IJK}|$. If we solve these equations in the order presented, the problem is linear; namely, at each step, we have a Poisson equation with the source given in terms of the quantities found in the previous step.

Solving the BPS equations with a Gibbons-Hawking base

It is difficult to write down solutions explicitly without any assumption. But once we assume the presence of a U(1) isometry on the base space that preserves the hyper-Kähler structures (namely, if the Killing vector is tri-holomorphic), the hyper-Kähler base should be a Gibbons-Hawking space [48] and its metric take a following form [49]:

$$ds^2_{\rm GH} = V^{-1}(d\psi + A)^2 + V \delta_{ij} dx^i dx^j, \qquad i, j = 1, 2, 3. \tag{2.1.5}$$

The isometry direction ψ has periodicity 4π. Here, the one-form A and the scalar V depend only on the coordinates x^i of the $\mathbb{R}^3$ base and satisfy

$$dA = *_3 dV. \tag{2.1.6}$$

The orientation of the Gibbons-Hawking base is given by

$$\epsilon_{\psi 123} = +\sqrt{g_{\rm GH}} = V. \tag{2.1.7}$$

From (2.1.6), it is easy to see that V is a *harmonic* function on $\mathbb{R}^3$,

$$\Delta V = 0, \qquad \Delta = \delta^{ij} \partial_i \partial_j. \tag{2.1.8}$$

If we decompose Θ^I and k according to the fiber-base decomposition of the Gibbons-Hawking metric (2.1.5), we can solve all the BPS equations (2.1.4) in terms of harmonic functions on $\mathbb{R}^3$. For later convenience, let us recall how this goes in some detail [23].

First, by self-duality (2.1.4a), the two-form Θ^I can be written as

$$\Theta^I = (d\psi + A) \wedge \theta^I + V *_3 \theta^I, \tag{2.1.9}$$

where θ^I is a one-form on $\mathbb{R}^3$. The closure $d\Theta^I = 0$ (the part multiplying $d\psi + A$) implies $d\theta^I = 0$, which means that $\theta^I = d\Lambda^I$ with a scalar Λ^I. If we plug this equation back into $d\Theta^I = 0$, we find

$$\Delta(V\Lambda^I) = 0. \tag{2.1.10}$$

Therefore, $\Lambda^I = -V^{-1}K^I$ with K^I harmonic, and

$$\Theta^I = -(d\psi + A) \wedge d(V^{-1}K^I) - V *_3 d(V^{-1}K^I). \tag{2.1.11}$$

Next, plugging (2.1.11) into (2.1.4b), we find that Z_I satisfies the following Laplace equation:

$$\Delta Z_I = C_{IJK} V\, \partial_i(V^{-1}K^J)\, \partial_i(V^{-1}K^K) = \frac{1}{2} C_{IJK} \Delta(V^{-1}K^J K^K), \tag{2.1.12}$$

where in the last equality we used harmonicity of V, K^I. This means that

$$Z_I = L_I + \frac{1}{2} C_{IJK} V^{-1} K^J K^K, \tag{2.1.13}$$

where L_I is harmonic.

Furthermore, if we decompose the one-form k as

$$k = \mu(d\psi + A) + \omega, \tag{2.1.14}$$

where ω is a one-form on $\mathbb{R}^3$, we can show that the condition (2.1.4c) leads to another Laplace equation:

$$\Delta\mu = V^{-1}\partial_i[V Z_I \partial_i(V^{-1}K^I)] = \Delta\Big(\frac{1}{2}V^{-1}K^I L_I + \frac{1}{6}C_{IJK}V^{-2}K^I K^J K^K\Big). \tag{2.1.15}$$

In the last equality, we used harmonicity of V, K^I, L_I. Therefore, μ is given in terms of another harmonic function M as

$$\mu = M + \frac{1}{2}V^{-1}K^I L_I + \frac{1}{6}C_{IJK}V^{-2}K^I K^J K^K. \tag{2.1.16}$$

The one-form ω is found by solving the equation

$$*_3\, d\omega = V dM - M dV + \frac{1}{2}\left(K^I dL_I - L_I dK^I\right) \tag{2.1.17}$$

that also follows from (2.1.4c). We sometimes write eight harmonic functions collectively as $H = \{V, K^I, L_I, M\}$. For two such vectors H, H', we define the skew product $\langle H, H' \rangle$ by

$$\langle H, H' \rangle \equiv VM' - MV' + \frac{1}{2}(K^I L'_I - L_I K'^I). \tag{2.1.18}$$

In this notation, (2.1.17) is rewritten as

$$*_3\, d\omega = \langle H, dH \rangle\,. \tag{2.1.19}$$

By taking $d *_3$ of this equation, we can derive the so-called integrability equation:

$$0 = \langle H, \Delta H \rangle\,, \tag{2.1.20}$$

or more explicitly,

$$0 = V\Delta M - M\Delta V + \frac{1}{2}\left(K^I \Delta L_I - L_I \Delta K^I\right). \tag{2.1.21}$$

This must be satisfied for the one-form ω to exist. Although we allow delta-function sources for the Laplace equations (2.1.8), (2.1.10), (2.1.12) and (2.1.15), this equation (2.1.21) must be imposed without allowing any delta function in order for ω to exist.

Finally, we note that the magnetic potential B^I can be written as

$$B^I = V^{-1} K^I (d\psi + A) + \xi^I, \qquad d\xi^I = -*_3\, dK^I. \tag{2.1.22}$$

In summary, under the assumption of the additional U(1) symmetry, we can solve all the BPS equations (2.1.4) in terms of harmonic functions V, K^I, L_I, M.

Eleven- and ten-dimensional uplift

The solution (2.1.1) can be thought of as coming from M-theory compactified on $T^6 = T^2_{45} \times T^2_{67} \times T^2_{89}$ as it was mentioned, with the following metric and the three-form potential:

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2_{11} &= -Z^{-2/3}(dt+k)^2 + Z^{1/3} ds^2_{\mathrm{GH}} + Z^{1/3}\left(Z_1^{-1} dx^2_{45} + Z_2^{-1} dx^2_{67} + Z_3^{-1} dx^2_{89}\right), \\ \mathcal{A}_3 &= A^I J_I, \qquad J_1 \equiv dx^4 \wedge dx^5, \quad J_2 \equiv dx^6 \wedge dx^7, \quad J_3 \equiv dx^8 \wedge dx^9, \end{aligned} \tag{2.1.23}$$

where $dx^2_{45} \equiv (dx^4)^2 + (dx^5)^2$ and so on. The scalars $X^I = Z^{1/3} Z_I^{-1}$ correspond to the volume of each torus. M-theory on T^6 has $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supersymmetry (32 supercharges) in five dimensions, and the model we are using is its $\mathcal{N} = 2$ truncation in which only 8 supercharges are kept.

We can regard the isometry direction of the Gibbons-Hawking space as M-theory circle and compactify along it. Then it should give a low-energy effective theory of type IIA string theory compactified on the same Calabi-Yau threefold X. So we will obtain four-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity coupled to vector multiplets. We use conventions in appendix A for M-theory to type IIA string theory reduction.

In the type IIA picture, the metric, dilaton, B-field and p-form potentials are

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2_{10,\text{str}} &= -\mathcal{Q}^{-1/2}(dt+\omega)^2 + \mathcal{Q}^{1/2}\delta_{ij}dx^i dx^j \\ &\quad + \mathcal{Q}^{1/2}V^{-1}\left(Z_1^{-1}dx^2_{45} + Z_2^{-1}dx^2_{67} + Z_3^{-1}dx^2_{89}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.1.24a}$$

$$e^{2\Phi} = \mathcal{Q}^{3/2}V^{-3}Z^{-1}, \tag{2.1.24b}$$

$$B_2 = \left(V^{-1}K^I - Z_I^{-1}\mu\right)J_I, \tag{2.1.24c}$$

$$C_1 = A - V^2\mu\mathcal{Q}^{-1}(dt+\omega), \tag{2.1.24d}$$

$$C_3 = \left[(V^{-1}K^I - Z_I^{-1}\mu)A + \xi^I - Z_I^{-1}(dt+\omega)\right]\wedge J_I. \tag{2.1.24e}$$

where $\mathcal{Q}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{Q} = V(Z - V\mu^2). \tag{2.1.25}$$

In terms of harmonic functions, (2.1.25) is written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q} &= VL_1L_2L_3 - 2MK^1K^2K^3 - M^2V^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4}\sum_I (K^IL_I)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{I<J}(K^IL_I)(K^JL_J) - MV\sum_I K^IL_I \\ &\equiv J_4(H), \end{aligned} \tag{2.1.26}$$

where J_4 is the quartic invariant of $\mathrm{E}_{7,7}$ U-duality group; for some more discussion, see appendix B. We also note that the complexified Kähler moduli τ^1, τ^2, and τ^3 for the 2-tori T^2_{45}, T^2_{67}, and T^2_{89}, respectively, are

$$\tau^1 = \frac{R_4R_5}{l_s^2}\left(B_{45} + i\sqrt{\det G_{ab}}\right) = \frac{R_4R_5}{l_s^2}\left[\left(\frac{K^1}{V} - \frac{\mu}{Z_1}\right) + i\,\frac{\sqrt{\mathcal{Q}}}{VZ_1}\right], \tag{2.1.27}$$

where $a, b = 4, 5$, and similarly for τ^2, τ^3. We denoted the radii of x^i directions by $R_i, i = 4, \ldots, 9$. If we compactify the theory to four dimensions, these τ^I become scalar moduli parametrizing the moduli space $[\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})/\mathrm{SO}(2)]^3$. It is sometimes called STU model which was studied in [50, 51].

For other embeddings of the harmonic solutions in type IIA and IIB supergravity, see [22, 52, 53].

Conditions for the absence of closed timelike curves

(Super)gravity solutions can exhibit closed timelike curves (CTCs), signaling that the solution is not physically allowed.[3] To study their existence, let us look at the 10D metric (2.1.24). First, for g_{tt}, g_{ii} $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ to be real, we need $\mathcal{Q} \geq 0$. Then, for the torus directions to give

[3] For over-rotating supertubes, CTCs will appear along the profile of the supertube [54, 55].

no CTCs, we get $VZ_I \geq 0$, $I = 1, 2, 3$. So, we must impose the following conditions:

$$\mathcal{Q} \geq 0, \tag{2.1.28a}$$

$$VZ_I \geq 0. \tag{2.1.28b}$$

Next, let us focus on the $\mathbb{R}^3$ part of the 10D metric (2.1.24) which is

$$ds^2_{10,\text{str}} \supset \mathcal{Q}^{-1/2} \left(-\omega_i \, \omega_j + \mathcal{Q} \, \delta_{ij}\right) dx^i dx^j. \tag{2.1.29}$$

It is possible that closed curve $\mathcal{C}$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ becomes timelike under this metric, depending on the behavior of the one-form ω. That would imply a CTC, which must be physically disallowed.

2.2 Codimension-3 sources: multi-center solutions

The harmonic solutions are characterized by a set of 8 harmonic functions. Non-trivial harmonic functions in $\mathbb{R}^3$ must have singularities, which correspond to physical sources such as D-branes. Depending on the nature of the source, the singularity can have various codimension. Here we review some specifics about solutions with codimension-3 sources, or codimension-3 solutions for short, which have been extensively studied in the literature. In the next subsection, we will proceed to codimension-2 solutions, which is the main focus of the current thesis.

If one assumes that all singularities of the harmonic functions have codimension 3, the general form of the harmonic functions is [56, 57, 23]

$$\begin{aligned} V &= h^0 + \sum_{p=1}^{N} \frac{\Gamma^0_p}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_p|}, \qquad & K^I &= h^I + \sum_{p=1}^{N} \frac{\Gamma^I_p}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_p|}, \\ L_I &= h_I + \sum_{p=1}^{N} \frac{\Gamma^p_I}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_p|}, \qquad & M &= h_0 + \sum_{p=1}^{N} \frac{\Gamma^p_0}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_p|}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.2.1}$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x^1, x^2, x^3)$ and $\mathbf{x}_p \in \mathbb{R}^3$ $(p = 1, \ldots, N)$ specifies the location of the codimension-3 sources where the harmonic functions become singular. The charge vector $\Gamma^p \equiv \{\Gamma^0_p, \Gamma^I_p, \Gamma^p_I, \Gamma^p_0\}$ carries the charges of each source and, together with $h \equiv \{h^0, h^I, h_I, h_0\}$, fully determine the asymptotic properties of the solution, namely mass, angular momenta and the moduli at infinity. See figure 2.1(a) for a schematic explanation of codimension-3 solutions.

We still have to satisfy the integrability condition (2.1.20). Because the Laplacian Δ acting on $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_p|^{-1}$ gives a delta function supported at $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_p$, the right-hand side of (2.1.20) does not generally vanish. Mathematically, this does not pose any problem for the existence of ω, although it becomes multi-valued, having a Dirac-Misner string [58]. However, the presence of a Dirac-Misner string leads to CTCs [24]. Therefore, it is physically required that the delta-function singularities be absent on the right-hand side of (2.1.20). This condition implies the



Figure 2.1: The harmonic solution is specified by harmonic functions on the base $\mathbb{R}^3$. (a) The codimension-3 solution is specified by point-like singularities of the harmonic functions. (b) The general solution involves point-like (codimension-3) as well as string-like (codimension-2) singularities in the harmonic functions.

well-known constraint [44]

$$\sum_{q(\neq p)} \frac{\langle \Gamma_p, \Gamma_q \rangle}{x_{pq}} = \langle h, \Gamma_p \rangle \qquad \text{for each } p, \tag{2.2.2}$$

where $x_{pq} \equiv |\mathbf{x}_p - \mathbf{x}_q|$.

Let us see how this argument goes [24]. Let B^3 be a small ball containing $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_p$, and consider the integral

$$\int_{B^3} d^2\omega = \int_{B^3} d^3\mathbf{x} \, \langle H, \Delta H \rangle \,, \tag{2.2.3}$$

where we used (2.1.19). The integrand on the right-hand side is the same as the one in the integrability condition (2.1.20). If it has a delta-function source at $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_p$, the integral is nonzero. On the other hand, the left-hand side can be rewritten as

$$\int_{B^3} d^2\omega = \int_{S^2} d\omega = \int_{\partial S^2} \omega, \tag{2.2.4}$$

where $S^2 = \partial B^3$ and the boundary ∂S^2 can be taken to be an infinitesimal circle going around the north pole, through which a Dirac-Misner string passes. This being non-vanishing means that the component of ω along ∂S^2 is finite; if we take the Dirac-Miser string to be along the positive z-axis, then $\omega_\varphi \neq 0$ where φ is the azimuthal angle around the z-axis. Therefore, for this curve $\mathcal{C} = \partial S^2$, the first term in (2.1.29) does not vanish while the second one vanishes (note that $\mathcal{Q}$ is finite as long as we are away from $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_p$). So, curve $\mathcal{C}$ is a CTC. Therefore, the right-hand side of the integrability condition (2.1.20) must not even have delta-function singularities, and this is what leads to the constraint (2.2.2).

The interpretation of the singularities in the harmonic functions (2.2.1) from a string/M-theory point of view is the existence of extended objects in higher dimensions. In the string/M-theory uplift, p-form potentials are expressed in terms of the harmonic functions, which allows

us to establish a dictionary between the harmonic functions and their corresponding brane configurations [57]. For example, in the type IIA picture (2.1.24), the dictionary between the singularities in the harmonic functions and the D-brane sources is

$$V \leftrightarrow \text{D6}(456789), \qquad \begin{matrix} K^1 \leftrightarrow \text{D4}(6789) \\ K^2 \leftrightarrow \text{D4}(4589) \\ K^3 \leftrightarrow \text{D4}(4567) \end{matrix}, \qquad \begin{matrix} L_1 \leftrightarrow \text{D2}(45) \\ L_2 \leftrightarrow \text{D2}(67) \\ L_3 \leftrightarrow \text{D2}(89) \end{matrix}, \qquad M \leftrightarrow \text{D0}. \tag{2.2.5}$$

The D-branes are partially wrapped on T^6 and appear in 4D as point-like (codimension-3) objects sourcing the harmonic functions. When multiple sources are present, the harmonic solution (2.2.1) represents a multi-center configuration of D-branes.

The harmonic solutions with codimension-3 sources have been extensively used to describe various brane systems for various purposes. Examples include a 5D three-charge black hole made of M2(45), M2(67) and M2(89)-branes, which is dual to the Strominger-Vafa black hole [3]; the BMPV black hole [59]; the MSW black hole [4]; the supersymmetric black ring [60, 22, 52]; multi-center black hole/ring solutions [57]; and microstate geometries [24, 25].

One simple example is when (2.2.1) contains only one term, namely, $N = 1$. For the generic charge vector $\Gamma \equiv \Gamma^{p=1}$, this describes a single-center black hole in 4D which is made of D0, D2, D4 and D6-branes. The area-entropy of this black hole can be readily computed to be

$$S = \frac{\pi\sqrt{J_4(\Gamma)}}{G_4}, \tag{2.2.6}$$

where the 4D Newton constant is given by $G_4 = g_s^2 l_s^2/8$ and $J_4(\Gamma)$ is obtained by replacing $H = \{V, K^I, L_I, M\}$ in (2.1.26) by $\Gamma = \{\Gamma^0, \Gamma^I, \Gamma_I, \Gamma_0\}$. Multi-center solutions which have the same asymptotic moduli as this single-center solution and the same total charge $\sum_p \Gamma^p = \Gamma$ can be thought of as representing microstates/sub-ensemble of the ensemble represented by the single-center black hole.

Let us briefly mention the relation between four- and five-dimensional multi-center solutions. Four-dimensional multi-center solutions were studied in [44, 57]. In [61] it was shown that four-dimensional multi-center solutions can be uplifted to five-dimensional multi-center solutions using the relation between type IIA string theory and M-theory. See [62, 63, 64] for the related works. This five-dimensional multi-center solutions that include black holes and black rings were constructed in [22] and later interpreted as microstates of five-dimensional black holes and black rings [24, 25].

2.3 Codimension-2 sources

In the previous subsection, we considered the harmonic solution which has only codimension-3 sources of D-branes. However, recall that, in string theory, certain combinations of branes

can undergo a supertube transition [8], under which branes spontaneously polarize into new dipole charge, gaining size in transverse directions. For example, as we have discussed in the introduction, two transverse D2-branes can polarize into an NS5-brane along an arbitrary closed curve λ, as in (1.2). Because the NS5-brane is along a closed curve, it has no net NS5 charge but only NS5 dipole charge. The original D2 charges are dissolved in the NS5 worldvolume as fluxes. When the curve λ is inside the $\mathbb{R}^3_{123}$, which is generically the case and is assumed henceforth, the NS5-brane appears as a codimension-2 object in the non-compact 123 directions. Therefore, if we are to consider *generic* solutions describing D-brane systems, we *must* include codimension-2 brane sources in the harmonic solution. Even in such situations, the procedure (2.1.11)–(2.1.16) to solve the BPS equations goes through and the solution is given by the harmonic functions V, K^I, L_I, M. However, they are now allowed to have codimension-2 singularities in $\mathbb{R}^3$. See figure 2.1(b) for a schematic explanation for solutions with codimension-2 sources.

To get some idea about solutions with codimension-2 sources, here we present the harmonic functions for the D2 + D2 $\to$ ns5 supertube (1.2) when the puffed-up ns5-brane is an infinite straight line along x^3.[4]

$$\begin{aligned} &V = 1, \qquad K^1 = K^2 = 0, \quad K^3 = q\theta, \\ &L_1 = 1 + Q_1 \log\frac{\Lambda}{r}, \quad L_2 = 1 + Q_2 \log\frac{\Lambda}{r}, \quad L_3 = 1, \qquad M = -\frac{1}{2}q\theta, \end{aligned} \tag{2.3.1}$$

where $q = l_s^2/(2\pi R_8 R_9)$, $Q_1 Q_2 = q^2$, and Λ is a constant.[5] We took the cylindrical coordinates for the $\mathbb{R}^3$ base,

$$ds_3^2 = dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2 + (dx^3)^2. \tag{2.3.2}$$

We will discuss such solutions more generally in chapters 4 and 5. A novel feature is that the harmonic function K^3 has a branch-point singularity along the x^3 axis at $r = 0$. So, K^3 does not just have a codimension-2 singularity but is *multi-valued*. This K^3 cannot be obtained by smearing a K^3 with codimension-3 singularities as in (2.2.1). As one can see from (2.1.24), this K^3 leads to the B-field

$$B_2 = \frac{l_s^2 \theta}{2\pi R_8 R_9} dx^8 \wedge dx^9. \tag{2.3.3}$$

Around the x^3-axis, this has monodromy $\Delta B_2 = l_s^2/(R_8 R_9)$, which is the correct one for an NS5-brane extending along 34567 directions and smeared along 89 directions. On the other hand, the codimension-2 singularities in L_1, L_2 represent the D2-brane sources dissolved in the NS5 and are obtained by smearing codimension-3 singularities in (2.2.1). The monodromy in M (2.3.1) does not have direct physical significance here, because what enters in physical quantities is μ, which is trivial in the present case: $\mu = M + \frac{1}{2}K^3 L_3 = 0$.

[4] An infinitely long NS5-brane would not have a dipole charge. The solution (2.3.1) must be regarded as a near-brane approximation of an NS5-brane along a closed curve.

[5] Λ is the cutoff for r, beyond which the near-brane approximation mentioned in footnote 4 breaks down.

In the lower dimensional (4D) picture, the B-field appears as the scalar moduli τ^I defined in (2.1.27). For the present case (2.3.3), we have

$$\tau^3 = \frac{\theta}{2\pi}. \tag{2.3.4}$$

As we go around $r = 0$, the modulus τ^3 has the monodromy

$$\tau^3 \to \tau^3 + 1, \tag{2.3.5}$$

which can be understood as an $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ duality transformation. It was emphasized in [35, 36] that the charge of the codimension-2 brane is measured by the duality monodromy around it. It is possible to consider codimension-2 objects around which there is more general $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ monodromy of τ^I. For example, if we have an object around which there is the following monodromy:

$$\tau^3 \to \frac{\tau^3}{-\tau^3+1}, \qquad \text{or} \quad \tau'^3 \to \tau'^3 + 1, \quad \tau'^3 \equiv -\frac{1}{\tau^3}, \tag{2.3.6}$$

it corresponds to an exotic brane called the $5^2_2(34567,89)$-brane [35, 36]. This brane is non-geometric since the T^2_{89} metric is not single-valued but is twisted by a T-duality transformation around it. The 5^2_2-brane is produced in the supertube transition (1.3) and must also be describable within the harmonic solution in terms of multi-valued harmonic functions. We will see this in explicit examples in chapters 4 and 5.

Chapter 3

Codimension-2 harmonic solutions

In this chapter, we briefly discuss on the current state of microstate geometry program which is mainly exploiting codimension-3 multi-center solutions. Then we suggest codimension-2 solutions as a possible microstate of black holes with some supporting arguments. In the subsequent chapters, we will present the main results of [65, 66] without changing many things for the completeness of the thesis.

3.1 Harmonic solutions as black hole microstates

The harmonic solutions with codimension-3 sources will be smooth and horizonless geometries under appropriate choices of h and Γ (2.2.1) when solving the integrability condition (2.2.2). This could be understood as a geometric transition [24, 25]. The entropy of these large family of smooth solutions are estimated in [26, 27] and it turned out that those smooth solutions are not typical enough to explain the entropy of four- and five-dimensional black holes. In this section, we will briefly review what was done in [26, 27] without many details. Then we suggest another possibility of microstate solutions.

The entropy estimations in [26, 27] were based on the system suggested in [67] that a four-dimensional four-charge black hole made of D4-D0 charges can be deconstructed into a bound state of D0-branes with a D6-$\overline{\text{D6}}$ pair containing worldvolume fluxes. Because of the worldvolume fluxes, the deconstructed system has the same charges as the D4-D0 black hole we started with. The deconstructed system is describing smooth and horizonless geometry only when it is interpreted in five dimensions not in four dimensions, because D6-branes will be uplifted into Kaluza-Klein monopoles of M-theory which are smooth and horizonless geometries.

In the regime where D0-branes are treated as probes, it was claimed in [67] that the entropy of the D4-D0 black hole could be obtained from the same Landau degeneracy found in [68]. A similar discussion for black rings was done in [69]. However this analysis has not been extended

to including backreaction of D0-branes. For a related discussion, see [70].

In the successive works of [71, 72, 26], the deconstructed D6-$\overline{\text{D6}}$-D0 system is directly quantized in supergravity and the entropy was estimated. The conclusion of [26] was that the entropy of D6-$\overline{\text{D6}}$-D0 system has the same order of the entropy of free supergraviton gas which is not enough to explain the entropy of D4-D0 black hole.

In [27], they put supertubes on a D6-$\overline{\text{D6}}$ background and calculated backreacted solutions by constructing an explicit Green function. The solutions were interpreted as microstates of five-dimensional three-charge black holes. Through the entropy enhancement mechanism [73], they were able to obtain a large amount of entropy. However it also turned out that it is not enough to explain the entropy of the black hole.

In conclusion, there has not been any satisfactory explanation of the entropy of the black hole using codimension-3 harmonic solutions.

One missing possibility

The deconstruction of black holes we just mentioned can be seen as one explicit example of more general hypothesis [74]:

> Every supersymmetric four-dimensional black hole of finite area, preserving 4 supercharges, can be split up into microstates made of primitive 1/2-BPS "atoms", each of which preserves 16 supercharges. In order to describe a bound state, these atoms should consist of mutually non-local charges.

This was conjectured in the context of $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity, and it was extended to more general situation, e.g., $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity, stating that "atoms" could include 1/4- or 1/8-BPS horizonless states [15, Section 5.1].

One justification of including horizonless 1/4- and 1/8-BPS states into "atoms" can be brought from [75]. According to [75], the value of the $\mathrm{E}_{7,7}$ invariant $\mathcal{Q}$ (2.1.25) determines the amount of supersymmetry preserved by the system. For $\mathcal{Q} > 0$, the system is describing a 1/8-BPS black hole; a single-center black hole with $\mathcal{Q} < 0$ is non-BPS; and if $\mathcal{Q} = 0$ the system preserves 1/8 or more supersymmetries, i.e., we could have 1/8-BPS, 1/4-BPS and 1/2-BPS states. The supertube transition could be another justification as we explain in the next section.

Therefore, we are able to have entropyless 1/4- and 1/8-BPS solutions and we should include them into microstate solutions to explain the entropy correctly. In the later chapters, we will focus on 1/4-BPS states and give some explicit realization of them in terms of supertubes which are known to be a proper description of 1/4-BPS states.

3.2 Codimension-2 sources are inevitable

In addition to codimension-3 sources, the harmonic solutions can also describe codimension-2 sources. Actually, codimension-2 sources are *not an option but a must*; codimension-3 sources are insufficient because they can spontaneously polarize into codimension-2 sources by the *supertube transition* [8]. The supertube transition is a spontaneous polarization phenomenon that a certain pair of species of branes — specifically, any mutually local 1/4-BPS two-charge system — undergo. In this transition, the original branes polarize into a new dipole charge, which has one less codimension and extends along a closed curve transverse to the worldvolume of the original branes. This new configuration represents a genuine BPS bound state of the two-charge system [12, Section 3.1]. The supertube transition may seem similar to the Myers effect [76], but it is different; the Myers effect takes place only in the presence of an external field, whereas the supertube transition occurs spontaneously, by the dynamics of the system itself.

The system described by codimension-3 harmonic solutions involves various D-branes as we saw in (2.2.5). These D-branes can undergo supertube transitions into codimension-2 branes, which act as codimension-2 sources in the harmonic function. Therefore, codimension-2 solutions are in the same moduli space of physical configurations as codimension-3 solutions, and consequently *must* be considered if one wants to understand the physics of the D-brane system.

In particular, supertubes are known to be important for BPS microstate counting of black holes because of the entropy enhancement phenomenon [73, 53, 26, 27]. So, the supertubes realized as codimension-2 sources in the harmonic functions must play a crucial role in the black hole microstate geometry program, as first argued in [35, 36]. The codimension-2 brane produced by the supertube transition can generically be non-geometric, having non-geometric U-duality twists around it.

A prototypical example of the supertube transition [8] can be represented as

$$\mathrm{D0} + \mathrm{F1}(1) \to \mathrm{d2}(\lambda 1). \tag{3.2.1}$$

This diagram means that the two-charge system of D0-branes and fundamental strings has undergone a supertube transition and polarized into a D2-brane along an arbitrary closed curve parametrized by λ. The object on the right-hand side is written in lowercase to denote that it is a dipole charge. In this case, as the D2 is along a closed curve, there is no net charge but a D2 dipole charge. The original D0 and F1 charges are dissolved into the D2 worldvolume as magnetic and electric fluxes. The Poynting momentum due to the fluxes generates the centrifugal force that prevents the arbitrary shape from collapsing.

Upon duality transformations of the process (3.2.1), other possible supertube transitions can

be found. For example,

$$\begin{array}{lclcl} \text{D0} & + & \text{D4}(4567) & \to & \text{ns5}(\lambda 4567), \\ \text{D4}(4589) & + & \text{D4}(6789) & \to & 5^2_2(\lambda 4567; 89), \\ \text{D2}(45) & + & \text{D2}(67) & \to & \text{ns5}(\lambda 4567), \\ \text{D2}(89) & + & \text{D6}(456789) & \to & 5^2_2(\lambda 4567; 89). \end{array} \tag{3.2.2}$$

This means that the ordinary branes on the left-hand side can polarize into codimension-2 branes, including the exotic branes such as the 5^2_2-brane.[1] Note in particular that the D-branes appearing on the left-hand side are the ones that appear in the brane-harmonic function dictionary (2.2.5). So, the dictionary is insufficient and must be extended to include codimension-2 branes that the codimension-3 D-branes can polarize into. Because we solved the BPS equations and obtained harmonic solutions without specifying the co-dimensionality of the sources, the codimension-2 supertubes on the right-hand side of (3.2.2) must be describable in terms of the same harmonic solutions, just by allowing for codimension-2 singularities. The formulas for the M-theory/IIA uplift also remain valid.

3.3 General remarks on codimension-2 solutions

For the codimension-3 case, we could show the direct connection between the presence of delta-function sources on the right-hand side of (2.1.20) and the existence of CTCs. We can follow the same line of logic for the codimension-2 case, but the conclusion is that there is no such direct connection.

In (2.2.3), we had an integral over a small ball B_3 containing a point where there is a possible delta function. In the codimension-2 case, delta-function singularities are expected to be along a curve on which a source lies, and there is a Dirac-Misner "sheet" ending on that curve. Let us consider an integral over a very thin filled tube T^3 containing a piece of such a curve. Now we rewrite the integral as we did in (2.2.4). Instead of $S^2 = \partial B^3$, we have a cylinder $C^2 = \partial T^3$, where we can ignore the top and bottom bases for a very thin tube. As the boundary of the cylinder, ∂C^2, we take two lines that go along the curve in opposite directions. The Dirac-Misner sheet goes between the two lines. Then the integral is basically equal to the jump across the Dirac-Miner sheet in the component of ω along the curve. Let us denote it by $\Delta\omega_{\parallel}$. Then, the integral is equal to $l\Delta\omega_{\parallel}$, where l is the length of the tube. On the other hand, the same integral is equal to $l\sigma$, where σ is the local density of the delta-function source along the curve. Equating the two, we obtain

$$\Delta\omega_{\parallel} = \sigma. \tag{3.3.1}$$

[1] For a review on exotic branes and a further analysis of supertube transitions involving them, see [36]. We also briefly discuss them in section 4.1.

Namely, the jump in ω along the curve is given by the density of delta-function sources.

However, this does not give the behavior of ω itself, which is necessary for evaluating (2.1.29) and study the presence of CTCs. So, the argument that worked for codimension 3 does not apply to codimension 2. It must be some other singular behavior of the harmonic functions, not just the delta-function source, that one must study to investigate the no-CTC condition. We do not pursue that in this thesis. Instead, we will study (2.1.29) for specific explicit metrics in the presence of codimension-2 sources.

Although we have only discussed sources with codimension 3 and 2, it is also possible to consider sources with codimension 1. Such a source represents a domain wall that connects spaces with different values of spacetime-filling fluxes, just like a D8-brane in 10D connects spacetimes with different values of the RR flux 10-form. Including codimension-1 sources should lead to a wide range of physical configurations which have been little studied. It would be very interesting to include them in the harmonic solutions and explore the physical implications of solutions with codimension 3, 2, and 1 sources.

Chapter 4

Abelian codimension-2 solutions

In this chapter, we give some explicit example of Abelian codimension-2 solutions and discuss them in the context of microstate geometry program. All the material of this chapter is based on [65].

The plan of the chapter is as follows. In section 4.1, we present some example solutions with codimension-2 source in the harmonic functions. The examples include supertubes with standard and exotic dipole charges and, in the latter case, the spacetime is non-geometric. In section 4.2, we give an example in which codimension-3 source and codimension-2 one coexist. We conclude in section 4.3 with remarks on the fuzzball conjecture and the microstate geometry program. The appendices explain our convention and some detail of the computations in the main text.

4.1 Examples of Abelian codimension-2 solutions

In section 2.3, we have motivated codimension-2 solutions and presented simplest examples of them — straight supertubes. In this section, we consider more "realistic" codimension-2 solutions that should serve as building blocks for constructing more general solutions.

4.1.1 1-dipole solutions

We begin with the case of a pair of D-branes puffing up into a supertube with one new dipole charge, such as (1.2) and (1.3) presented in the introduction. The supergravity solution for such 1-dipole supertubes can be obtained by dualizing the known solutions describing supertubes, such as the one in [54].[1] In that sense, the solutions presented here are not new. However, they have not been discussed in the context of the harmonic solutions and harmonic functions as we do here.

[1] See, e.g., [6, 36] for details of such dualization procedures.

D2(67) + D2(45) → ns5(λ4567)

As just mentioned, the supergravity solution for the D2 + D2 → ns5 supertube (1.2) can be obtained by dualizing known solutions, and we can read off from it the harmonic functions using the relations in the previous section. Explicitly, the harmonic functions are

$$\begin{aligned} V = 1, \qquad K^1 = 0, \quad K^2 = 0, \quad K^3 = \gamma, \\ L_1 = f_2, \quad L_2 = f_1, \quad L_3 = 1, \qquad M = -\frac{\gamma}{2}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1.1}$$

Here, the harmonic functions f_1 and f_2 are given by

$$f_1 = 1 + \frac{Q_1}{L}\int_0^L \frac{d\lambda}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{F}(\lambda)|}, \qquad f_2 = 1 + \frac{Q_1}{L}\int_0^L \frac{|\dot{\mathbf{F}}(\lambda)|^2 d\lambda}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{F}(\lambda)|}, \tag{4.1.2}$$

where $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{F}(\lambda)$ is the profile of the supertube in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and satisfies $\mathbf{F}(\lambda+L) = \mathbf{F}(\lambda)$. The functions f_1 and f_2 represent the D2(67) and D2(45) charges, respectively, dissolved in the codimension-2 worldvolume of the ns5 supertube. Q_1 is the D2(67) charge, while the D2(45) charge is given by

$$Q_2 = \frac{Q_1}{L}\int_0^L d\lambda\, |\dot{\mathbf{F}}(\lambda)|^2. \tag{4.1.3}$$

The charges Q_1, Q_2 are related to the quantized D-brane numbers N_1, N_2 by

$$Q_1 = \frac{g_s l_s^5}{2R_4R_5R_8R_9}N_1, \qquad Q_2 = \frac{g_s l_s^5}{2R_6R_7R_8R_9}N_2, \qquad L = \frac{2\pi g_s l_s^3}{R_4R_5}N_1. \tag{4.1.4}$$

where R_i, $i = 4, \ldots, 9$ are the radii of the x^i directions. We have also written down the expression for L, the periodicity of the profile function $\mathbf{F}(\lambda)$, in terms of other quantities.[2]

The function γ is defined via the differential equation

$$d\alpha = *_3 d\gamma \tag{4.1.5}$$

where α is a one-form in $\mathbb{R}^3$ given by (see appendix 4.A)

$$\alpha_i = \frac{Q_1}{L}\int_0^L \frac{\dot{F}_i(\lambda)\, d\lambda}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{F}(\lambda)|}. \tag{4.1.6}$$

It is easy to see from (4.1.5) that γ is harmonic: $\Delta\gamma = *_3 d *_3 d\gamma = *_3 d^2\alpha = 0$. Note that, even though α is single-valued, the function γ defined via the differential equation (4.1.5) is multi-valued and has a monodromy as we go along a closed circle c that links with the profile; see figure 4.1(a). The monodromy of γ can be computed by integrating $d\gamma$ along c, which can be homotopically deformed to a very small circle near some point on the profile, and is equal to

$$\int_c d\gamma = \int_c *_3 d\alpha = \frac{4\pi Q_1}{L}. \tag{4.1.7}$$



Figure 4.1: (a) The function γ has a monodromy as one goes around the cycle c that links with the profile. (b) The integral region in (4.1.9). The contribution from the top and bottom surfaces of the tube is negligible if the tube is very thin.

The integrability condition (2.1.20) requires

$$V\Delta M - M\Delta V + \frac{1}{2}\left(K^I \Delta L_I - L_I \Delta K^I\right) = -\Delta\gamma \equiv 0. \tag{4.1.8}$$

Superficially, this is satisfied because γ is harmonic. However, one must be careful because γ is singular along the profile and may have delta-function source there (as is the case for $L_{1,2}$). We can show that it actually does not even have delta-function source as follows. If we integrate $\Delta\gamma$ over a small tubular volume V containing the profile $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{F}(\lambda)$, we get

$$\int_V d^3x\ \Delta\gamma = \int_V d{*_3}d\gamma = \int_{\partial V} {*_3}d\gamma = \int_{\partial V} d\alpha = \int_{\partial^2 V} \alpha = 0, \tag{4.1.9}$$

where the last equality holds because α is single-valued. See figure 4.1(b) for explanation of the integral region. Therefore, $\Delta\gamma$ in (4.1.8) vanishes everywhere, even on the profile, and the integrability condition is satisfied for any profile $\mathbf{F}(\lambda)$.

From harmonic functions (4.1.1), we can read off various functions and forms that appear in the full solution:

$$(Z_1, Z_2, Z_3) = (f_2, f_1, 1), \quad (\xi^1, \xi^2, \xi^3) = (0, 0, -\alpha), \quad \mu = 0, \quad \omega = -\alpha. \tag{4.1.10}$$

The existence of ω is guaranteed by the integrability condition. Substituting this data into (2.1.24), we obtain the type IIA fields:

$$\begin{aligned}
ds_{10}^2 &= -(f_1 f_2)^{-1/2}(dt-\alpha)^2 + (f_1 f_2)^{1/2} dx^i dx^i + (f_1 f_2)^{1/2}\left(f_2^{-1} dx_{45}^2 + f_1^{-1} dx_{67}^2 + dx_{89}^2\right), \\
e^{2\Phi} &= (f_1 f_2)^{1/2}, \\
B_2 &= \gamma\, dx^8 \wedge dx^9, \\
C_1 &= 0, \\
C_3 &= -f_2^{-1}(dt-\alpha)\wedge dx^4 \wedge dx^5 - f_1^{-1}(dt-\alpha)\wedge dx^6 \wedge dx^7,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1.11}$$

[2]In the F1-P system, L corresponds to the length of the fundamental string. For the expressions of L in different duality frames, see references in footnote 1.

where we have dropped some total derivative terms in the RR potentials. Since $f_1, f_2 \to 1$ as $|\mathbf{x}| \to \infty$, the spacetime is asymptotically $\mathbb{R}^{1,3} \times T^6$. Multi-valuedness is restricted to the B-field and the metric is single-valued; namely, this solution is geometric.

One can show that the solution (4.1.11) has the expected monopole charge; it has monopole charge for D2(67) and D2(45) but not for NS5 (we show this for more general solutions in the next subsection). The dipole charge for NS5 is easier to see in the monodromy of the Kähler moduli, as we discussed around (2.3.3), and their values are

$$\tau^1 = i\frac{R_4 R_5}{l_s^2}\sqrt{\frac{f_1}{f_2}}, \qquad \tau^2 = i\frac{R_6 R_7}{l_s^2}\sqrt{\frac{f_2}{f_1}}, \qquad \tau^3 = \frac{R_8 R_9}{l_s^2}\left(\gamma + i\sqrt{f_1 f_2}\right). \tag{4.1.12}$$

τ^1 and τ^2 are single-valued while, as we can see from (4.1.7), τ^3 has the following monodromy as we go around the supertube along cycle c:

$$\tau^3 \to \tau^3 + 1, \tag{4.1.13}$$

where we used (4.1.4) and (4.1.7). This is the correct monodromy around an NS5-brane. So, this solution has the expected monopole and dipole charge.

Although we have derived the harmonic functions (4.1.1) by dualizing known solutions, we can also derive it by requiring that they represent the charge and dipole charge expected of the supertube (1.2) as follows. First, no D6-brane means $V = 1$ and no D0-brane means $\mu = 0$. Then (2.1.24) implies that, in order to have an NS5-brane along the profile $\mathbf{F}(\lambda)$, the harmonic function $K^3 \equiv \gamma$ must have the monodromy (4.1.7). As we show in appendix 4.A, this means that γ must be given in terms of α via (4.1.5) and (4.1.6). Next, to account for the D2 charges dissolved in the NS5 worldvolume, we need L_1, L_2 given in (4.1.1) and (4.1.2).

Note that, if we lift the supertube (1.2) to M-theory, we have

$$\text{M2}(67) + \text{M2}(45) \to \text{m5}(\lambda 4567). \tag{4.1.14}$$

Therefore, our solution simply corresponds to the 4D version of Bena and Warner's solution in [22]. The difference is that they were discussing 5D solutions with general supertube shapes, while we are focusing on solutions which has an isometry and can be reduced to 4D. Because of that, we can be more explicit in the solution in terms of harmonic functions.

D2(89) + D6(456789) $\to 5^2_2(\lambda 4567; 89)$

The second example is the D2 + D6 $\to 5^2_2$ supertube (1.3), which can be obtained by taking the T-dual of the above solution (4.1.11) along 6789 directions. Involving the exotic 5^2_2-brane, this is a non-geometric supertube where the metric becomes multi-valued.[3]

[3]The metric for an exotic non-geometric supertube (D4 + D4 $\to 5^2_2$) was first discussed in [35, 36].

Harmonic functions which describe this supertube (1.3) are

$$\begin{aligned} V = f_2, \qquad K^1 = \gamma, \quad K^2 = \gamma, \quad K^3 = 0, \\ L_1 = 1, \quad L_2 = 1, \quad L_3 = f_1, \qquad M = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1.15}$$

The charges appearing in harmonic functions are related to brane numbers by

$$Q_1 = \frac{g_s l_s^5}{2R_4R_5R_6R_7}N_1, \qquad Q_2 = \frac{g_s l_s}{2}N_2, \qquad L = \frac{2\pi g_s l_s^7}{R_4R_5R_6R_7R_8R_9}N_1. \tag{4.1.16}$$

As we can easily check, the integrability condition (2.1.20) is trivially satisfied. The various functions and forms are

$$(Z_1, Z_2, Z_3) = (1, 1, f_1F), \quad (\xi^1, \xi^2, \xi^3) = (-\alpha, -\alpha, 0), \quad \mu = f_2^{-1}\gamma, \quad \omega = -\alpha. \tag{4.1.17}$$

The IIA fields are given by

$$\begin{aligned} ds_{10}^2 &= -(f_1f_2)^{-1/2}(dt-\alpha)^2 + (f_1f_2)^{1/2}dx^idx^i + (f_1/f_2)^{1/2}\left(dx_{4567}^2 + f_1^{-1}F^{-1}dx_{89}^2\right), \\ e^{2\Phi} &= f_1^{1/2}f_2^{-3/2}F^{-1}, \\ B_2 &= -\frac{\gamma}{f_1f_2F}\,dx^8\wedge dx^9, \\ C_1 &= \beta_2 - f_1^{-1}\gamma\,(dt-\alpha), \\ C_3 &= -\frac{1}{f_1F}(dt-\alpha)\wedge dx^8\wedge dx^9 - \frac{\gamma}{f_1f_2F}\,\beta_2\wedge dx^8\wedge dx^9, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1.18}$$

where we defined

$$F \equiv 1 + \frac{\gamma^2}{f_1f_2}. \tag{4.1.19}$$

We have dropped some total derivative terms in the RR potentials. Since $f_1, f_2 \to 1$ as $|\mathbf{x}| \to \infty$, the spacetime is asymptotically $\mathbb{R}^{1,3}\times T^6$. However, because the multi-valued function γ enters the metric, this spacetime is non-geometric. Every time one goes through the supertube, one goes to different spacetime with different radii for T_{89}^2, although it is related to the original one by T-duality.

It is not difficult to show that the solution (4.1.18) carries the expected monopole charge for D2(89) and D6(456789), and not for other charges. To see the 5_2^2 dipole charge, let us look at the Kähler moduli which are

$$\tau^1 = i\frac{R_4R_5}{l_s^2}\sqrt{\frac{f_1}{f_2}}, \quad \tau^2 = i\frac{R_6R_7}{l_s^2}\sqrt{\frac{f_1}{f_2}}, \quad \tau^3 = \frac{R_8R_9}{l_s^2}\left(-\frac{\gamma}{f_1f_2F} + i\frac{1}{\sqrt{f_1f_2}F}\right). \tag{4.1.20}$$

If we define

$$\tau'^3 \equiv -\frac{1}{\tau^3} = \frac{l_s^2}{R_8R_9}\left(\gamma + i\sqrt{f_1f_2}\right), \tag{4.1.21}$$

the monodromy around the supertube is simply

$$\tau'^3 \to \tau'^3 + 1, \tag{4.1.22}$$

where we used (4.1.7) and (4.1.16). This is the correct monodromy for the 5^2_2-brane.

Although one sees that the RR potentials are also multi-valued in (4.1.18), this does not mean that we have further monopole or dipole charges. We will see this in a different example in subsection 4.1.2.

Other duality frames

One can also consider supertube transitions in other duality frames, such as

$$\mathrm{D0} + \mathrm{D4}(4567) \to \mathrm{ns5}(\lambda 4567) \tag{4.1.23}$$

or

$$\mathrm{D4}(6789) + \mathrm{D4}(4589) \to 5^2_2(\lambda 4567, 89). \tag{4.1.24}$$

The latter transition (4.1.24) was studied in [35, 36]. The configuration on the left-hand side of (4.1.23) and (4.1.24) are not in the timelike class but in the null class [77, 21], and their analysis requires a different 5D ansatz from the one we used above.

4.1.2 2-dipole solutions

A naive attempt

In the above, we demonstrated how the codimension-2 solution with one dipole charge fits into the harmonic solution. The next step is to combine two such solutions so that there are two different types of dipole charge. For example, can we construct a solution in which the supertube transition (1.2) happens simultaneously for two different D2-D2 pairs? For example, consider

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathrm{D2}(45) & + & \mathrm{D2}(89) & \to & \mathrm{ns5}(\lambda 4589) \\ \mathrm{D2}(67) & + & \mathrm{D2}(89) & \to & \mathrm{ns5}(\lambda 6789) \end{array} . \tag{4.1.25}$$

How can we construct harmonic functions corresponding to this configuration? For codimension-3 solutions (2.2.1), having multiple centers was achieved just by summing the harmonic functions for each individual center. So, a naive guess is to simply sum the harmonic functions for each individual supertube, as follows:[4]

$$\begin{aligned} V = 1, \qquad & K^1 = \gamma', \quad K^2 = \gamma, \quad K^3 = 0, \\ & L_1 = f_1, \quad L_2 = f_1', \quad L_3 = f_2 + f_2', \qquad M = -\frac{\gamma}{2} - \frac{\gamma'}{2}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1.26}$$

However, this does not work; as one can easily check, the integrability condition (2.1.20) is not generally satisfied for this ansatz (4.1.26). The two dipoles talk to each other and we must appropriately modify the harmonic functions to construct a genuine solution.

[4]This was obtained by permuting K^I, L_I of (4.1.1) and also by a suitable reparametrization of λ in f_1', f_2'.

A non-trivial 2-dipole solution

So, the above naive attempt does not work and we must take a different route to find a 2-dipole solution. Here, we use the superthread (or supersheet) solution of [78] to construct one. The superthread solution describes a system of D1 and D5-branes with traveling waves on them, and corresponds to the following simultaneous supertube transitions:

$$\begin{array}{lcccl} \text{D1}(5) & + & \text{P}(5) & \to & \text{d1}(\lambda) \\ \text{D5}(56789) & + & \text{P}(5) & \to & \text{d5}(\lambda 6789) \end{array} . \tag{4.1.27}$$

The left-hand side of (4.1.27) can be thought of as the constituents of the three-charge black hole. This is not just a trivial superposition of D1-P and D5-P supertubes, since the two supertubes interact with each other.

The superthread solution was originally obtained as a BPS solution in 6D supergravity. The BPS equations in 6D have a linear structure [29] which descends to that of the 5D equations (2.1.4) and facilitates the construction of explicit solutions. The 6D BPS equations involve a lightlike coordinate v and a 4-dimensional base space which is flat $\mathbb{R}^4$ for the superthreads. We use $\mathbf{x} = (x^1, x^2, x^3, x^4)$ for the coordinates of $\mathbb{R}^4$. The superthread solution is characterized by profile functions $\mathbf{F}_p(v)$, which describe the fluctuation of the D1 and D5-brane worldvolume. The index $p = 1, \cdots, n$ labels different threads of the D1-D5 supertubes. We review the superthread solution in appendix 4.B.

If we smear the superthread solution along x^4 and v directions, it describes the D1-D5-P supertube (4.1.27) extending along the $\mathbb{R}^3_{123}$ directions and can be connected to the harmonic solutions discussed in section 2.1. After duality transformations,[5] the resulting solution can be regarded as describing precisely the 2-dipole configuration (4.1.25). More precisely, the final configuration is as follows. We have n supertubes labeled by $p = 1, \ldots, n$ and the p-th tube has the profile $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, where λ_p parametrizes the profile and the function $\mathbf{F}_p$ has the periodicity $\mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p + L_p) = \mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p)$. The p-th tube carries the D2(45), D2(67), D2(89) monopole charges Q_{p1}, Q_{p2}, Q_{p3} respectively, as well as ns5 dipole charges displayed in (4.1.25).

[5]Specifically, to go from (4.1.27) to (4.1.25), we can take T_{4567}, S, then T_4 duality transformations and rename coordinates as $456789 \to 894567$, so that D1(5), D5(56789), P(5) charges map into D2(45), D2(67), D2(89) charges, respectively.

Explicitly, the harmonic functions describing the 2-dipole configuration (4.1.25) are

$$V = 1, \qquad K^1 = \gamma_2, \quad K^2 = \gamma_1, \quad K^3 = 0, \tag{4.1.28a}$$

$$L_I = 1 + \sum_p Q_{pI} \int_p \frac{1}{R_p} = Z_I, \qquad I = 1, 2, \tag{4.1.28b}$$

$$\begin{aligned} L_3 = 1 &+ \sum_p \int_p \frac{\rho_p}{R_p} \\ &+ \sum_{p,q} Q_{pq} \iint_{p,q} \left[\frac{\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p \cdot \dot{\mathbf{F}}_q}{2R_p R_q} - \frac{\dot{F}_{pi}\dot{F}_{qj}(R_{pi}R_{qj} - R_{pj}R_{qi})}{F_{pq}R_pR_q(F_{pq} + R_p + R_q)} \right] - K^1K^2, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1.28c}$$

$$M = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p,q} Q_{pq} \iint_{p,q} \frac{\epsilon_{ijk}\dot{F}_{pqi}R_{pj}R_{qk}}{F_{pq}R_pR_q(F_{pq} + R_p + R_q)} - \frac{1}{2}(K^1L_1 + K^2L_2) \tag{4.1.28d}$$

where we defined

$$\begin{gathered} \mathbf{R}_p(\lambda_p) \equiv \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p), \qquad \mathbf{F}_{pq}(\lambda_p, \lambda_q) \equiv \mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p) - \mathbf{F}_q(\lambda_q), \\ R_p \equiv |\mathbf{R}_p|, \qquad F_{pq} \equiv |\mathbf{F}_{pq}|, \qquad Q_{pq} \equiv Q_{p1}Q_{q2} + Q_{p2}Q_{q1}. \end{gathered} \tag{4.1.29}$$

Also, for integrals along the supertubes, we defined

$$\int_p \equiv \frac{1}{L_p} \int_0^{L_p} d\lambda_p, \qquad \iint_{p,q} \equiv \frac{1}{L_pL_q} \int_0^{L_p} d\lambda_p \int_0^{L_q} d\lambda_q \tag{4.1.30}$$

and the dependence on the parameter λ_p in (4.1.28) has been suppressed.[6] The quantity $\rho_p(\lambda_p)$ in (4.1.28c) is an arbitrary function corresponding to the D2(89) density along the p-th tube. A similar density could be introduced for M in (4.1.28d), but it had been ruled out by a no-CTC (closed timelike curve) analysis in [78] and was not included here. The scalars γ_I satisfy

$$d\gamma_I = *_3 d\alpha_I, \qquad \alpha_I = \sum_p Q_{pI} \int_p \frac{\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p \cdot d\mathbf{x}}{R_p}, \qquad I = 1, 2, \tag{4.1.31}$$

generalizing (4.1.5), (4.1.6). Furthermore, the one-form ω is given by

$$\omega = \omega_0 + \omega_1 + \omega_2, \tag{4.1.32a}$$

$$\omega_0 = \sum_p (Q_{p1} + Q_{p2}) \int_p \frac{\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p \cdot d\mathbf{x}}{R_p}, \qquad \omega_1 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p,q} Q_{pq} \iint_{p,q} \frac{\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p \cdot d\mathbf{x}}{R_pR_q}, \tag{4.1.32b}$$

$$\omega_2 = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{p,q} Q_{pq} \iint_{p,q} \frac{\dot{F}_{pqi}}{F_{pq}} \left[\left(\frac{1}{R_p} - \frac{1}{R_q} \right) dx^i - 2\frac{R_{pi}R_{qj} - R_{pj}R_{qi}}{R_pR_q(F_{pq} + R_p + R_q)} dx^j \right]. \tag{4.1.32c}$$

[6] For example, the first term in the second line of (4.1.28c) means $\sum_{p,q=1}^{n} \frac{Q_{pq}}{L_pL_q} \int_0^{L_p} d\lambda_p \int_0^{L_q} d\lambda_q \frac{\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p(\lambda_p)\cdot\dot{\mathbf{F}}_q(\lambda_q)}{2R_p(\lambda_p)R_q(\lambda_q)}$. Note that, even for $p = q$, the integral is two-dimensional; namely, the summand for $p = q$ is $\frac{Q_{pp}}{L_p^2} \int_0^{L_p} d\lambda_p \int_0^{L_p} d\lambda'_p \frac{\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p(\lambda_p)\cdot\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p(\lambda'_p)}{2R_p(\lambda_p)R_p(\lambda'_p)}$.

The charges Q_{pI}, Q_{p3} and the profile length L_p are related to quantized numbers by[7]

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{p1} &= \frac{g_s l_s^5}{2R_6R_7R_8R_9}N_p, \qquad & Q_{p2} &= \frac{g_s l_s^5}{2R_4R_5R_8R_9}N_p, \\ Q_{p3} &= \frac{g_s l_s^5}{2R_4R_5R_6R_7}N_{p3}, \qquad & L_p &= \frac{2\pi g_s l_s^3}{R_4R_5}N_p. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1.33}$$

It is interesting to compare the above harmonic functions (4.1.28) with the naive guess (4.1.26). The naive $V, K^1, K^2, K^3, L_1, L_2$ were correct, but L_3, M needed correction terms proportional to Q_{pq} to be a genuine solution. Since Q_{pq} involves the product of two types of charge (D2(45) and D2(67)) and represents interaction between two different dipoles.

It is not immediately obvious that L_3 and M in (4.1.28) are harmonic on $\mathbb{R}^3$. One can show that their Laplacian is given by

$$\Delta L_3 = -4\pi \sum_p \int_p \rho_p\, \delta^3(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{F}_p) - 4\pi \sum_{p,q} Q_{pq} \iint_{p,q} \frac{\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p \cdot \dot{\mathbf{F}}_q}{F_{pq}}\, \delta^3(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{F}_p), \tag{4.1.34}$$

$$\Delta M = -\frac{1}{2}K^I \Delta L_I = 2\pi \sum_p Q_{pI} \int_p K^I(\mathbf{F}_p)\, \delta^3(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{F}_p). \tag{4.1.35}$$

Namely, L_3 and M are harmonic up to delta-function source along the profile. In deriving these, we used the following relations:

$$\Delta\left[\frac{R_{pi}R_{qj}-R_{pj}R_{qi}}{F_{pq}R_pR_q(F_{pq}+R_p+R_q)}\right] = -\frac{R_{pi}R_{qj}-R_{pj}R_{qi}}{R_p^3R_q^3}, \tag{4.1.36}$$

$$\int_p \frac{\mathbf{R}_p \cdot \dot{\mathbf{F}}_p}{R_p^3} = \int_p \partial_{\lambda_p}\left(\frac{1}{R_p}\right) = 0, \qquad \Delta\left(\frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|}\right) = -4\pi\delta^3(\mathbf{x}). \tag{4.1.37}$$

With the relations (4.1.34) and (4.1.35), it is straightforward to show that the integrability condition (2.1.20) is identically satisfied for any profile.

The harmonic functions L_3, M in (4.1.28) are multi-valued, because K^1, K^2 are. However, the quantities that actually enter the 10D metric (2.1.24) are single-valued. Indeed,

$$Z_3 = 1 + \sum_p \int_p \frac{\rho_p}{R_p} + \sum_{p,q} Q_{pq} \iint_{p,q} \left[\frac{\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p \cdot \dot{\mathbf{F}}_q}{2R_pR_q} - \frac{\dot{F}_{pi}\dot{F}_{qj}(R_{pi}R_{qj}-R_{pj}R_{qi})}{F_{pq}R_pR_q(F_{pq}+R_p+R_q)}\right], \tag{4.1.38a}$$

$$\mu = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{p,q} Q_{pq} \iint_{p,q} \frac{\epsilon_{ijk}\dot{F}_{pqi}R_{pj}R_{qk}}{F_{pq}R_pR_q(F_{pq}+R_p+R_q)}. \tag{4.1.38b}$$

So, the metric is single-valued and the spacetime is geometric. This is as it should be because the configuration (4.1.25) does not contain any non-geometric exotic branes.

[7] The p-th tube has equal D2(45) and D2(67) numbers by construction. It is also possible for the p-th tube to carry only the D2(45) (or D2(67)) charge. In that case, $Q_{p2} = 0$ (resp. $Q_{p1} = 0$) and Q_{p1} (Q_{p2}) is still given by (4.1.33).

Single/multi-valuedness and physical condition

It is instructive to see how these multi-valued harmonic functions come about in solving the BPS equations as reviewed in section 2.1. Assume that we are given V, K^I of (4.1.28a) (which corresponds to having specific ns5-brane dipole charges and no D6-brane), and consider finding L_I, M or equivalently Z_I, μ from the BPS equations. To find Z_I, we must solve (2.1.12). For $I = 1, 2$, this gives a simple Laplace equation for L_1, L_2, whose solution is (4.1.28b). On the other hand, the equation (2.1.12) for Z_3 reads

$$\Delta Z_3 = \Delta(K^1 K^2) = 2\partial_i K^1 \partial_i K^2 = 2(\partial_i \alpha_{1j} \partial_i \alpha_{2j} - \partial_i \alpha_{1j} \partial_j \alpha_{2i}). \tag{4.1.39}$$

Although $K^{1,2}$ are multi-valued, the last expression in (4.1.39) is a single-valued. Therefore, it is possible to solve this Poisson equation for Z_3 using the standard Green function $-\frac{1}{4\pi}\frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}'|}$, and the result will be automatically single-valued. The above solution (4.1.38a) corresponds to this solution. This is physically the correct solution in the current situation where we only have standard (D2 and NS5) branes and the metric must be single-valued. Alternatively, we can solve (4.1.39) in terms of a multi-valued function. If we rewrite (4.1.39) as $\Delta L_3 = 0$ with $L_3 = Z_3 - K^1 K^2$, then $L_3 = 1 + \sum_p \int_p (\rho_p / R_p) \equiv L_3^{\text{alt}}$ is a possible solution. This is the direct analogue of what we did for the codimension-3 solution. This gives a multi-valued $Z_3 = L_3 + K^1 K^2 \equiv Z_3^{\text{alt}}$ and hence a multi-valued metric, which is physically unacceptable.

One may find it strange that there are two different solutions, Z_3 of (4.1.38a) and Z_3^{alt}, to the same Poisson equation (4.1.39). However, the solution to the Poisson equation is unique given the boundary condition at infinity. The two solutions have different boundary conditions (a single-valued one for the Z_3 of (4.1.38a) and a multi-valued one for Z_3^{alt}) and there is no contradiction that they are both solutions to the same Poisson equation. The BPS equations such as (4.1.39) must be solved taking into account the physical situation one is considering.

The μ equation (2.1.15) is

$$\Delta \mu = \frac{1}{2}\Delta(K^I L_I) = \partial_i K^I \partial_i Z_I = \epsilon_{ijk} |\epsilon_{IJ}| \partial_j \alpha_{Jk} \partial_i Z_I. \tag{4.1.40}$$

Again, we have two options. The first one is to use the standard single-valued Green function to the last expression to obtain the single-valued μ as given in (4.1.38b). The second one is to rewrite the above as $\Delta M = 0$, $M = \mu - (1/2) K^I L_I$ and say that M is single-valued. This gives multi-valued μ and is inappropriate for the current situation.

Closed timelike curves

It is known that near an over-rotating supertube there can be closed timelike curves (CTCs) which must be avoided in physically acceptable solutions [54, 78]. The dangerous direction for

the CTCs is known to be along the supertube, which is inside $\mathbb{R}^3$. By setting $dt = d\psi = 0$ in the metric (2.1.1), the line element inside $\mathbb{R}^3$ is

$$dl^2 = -Z^{-2/3}(\mu A + \omega)^2 + Z^{1/3}(V^{-1}A^2 + V d\mathbf{x}^2). \tag{4.1.41}$$

In the present case, we have $V = 1$ and $A = 0$, and therefore the line element becomes

$$dl^2 = Z^{-2/3}(-\omega^2 + Z d\mathbf{x}^2), \tag{4.1.42}$$

where ω is given by (4.1.32).

In the near-tube limit in which we approach a particular point $\mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p^0)$ on the p-th curve, where λ_p^0 is the value of the parameter corresponding to that point, the functions $Z_{1,2,3}$ can be expanded as

$$Z_I = Q_{pI}\mathcal{R} + 1 + c_I + \mathcal{O}(r_\perp), \qquad I = 1, 2, \tag{4.1.43a}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Z_3 &= \left(Q_{p1}\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p\mathcal{R} + \mathbf{d}_1 + \mathcal{O}(r_\perp)\right)\left(Q_{p2}\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p\mathcal{R} + \mathbf{d}_2 + \mathcal{O}(r_\perp)\right) + \rho_p(\lambda_p^0)\mathcal{R} + c_3 + 1 + \mathcal{O}(r_\perp) \\ &= Q_{p1}Q_{p2}|\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p|^2\mathcal{R}^2 + \left[\rho_p(\lambda_p^0) + (Q_{p1}\mathbf{d}_2 + Q_{p2}\mathbf{d}_1)\cdot\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p\right]\mathcal{R} + \text{const.} + \mathcal{O}(r_\perp). \end{aligned} \tag{4.1.43b}$$

Here, $\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p = \dot{\mathbf{F}}_p(\lambda_p^0)$ and $\mathcal{R}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{R} \equiv \frac{2}{|\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p|}\ln\frac{2|\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p|}{r_\perp} \tag{4.1.44}$$

where $r_\perp$ is the transverse distance in $\mathbb{R}^3$ from the point $\mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p^0)$ on the tube. The constants $c_{I=1,2,3}$ and $\mathbf{d}_{I=1,2}$ are defined in appendix 4.C. Similarly, $\omega_{0,1,2}$ are expanded as

$$\omega_0 = (Q_{p1} + Q_{p2})\left(\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p\cdot d\mathbf{x}\right)\mathcal{R} + (\mathbf{d}_1 + \mathbf{d}_2)\cdot d\mathbf{x} + \mathcal{O}(r_\perp), \tag{4.1.45a}$$

$$\omega_1 = Q_{p1}Q_{p2}\left(\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p\cdot d\mathbf{x}\right)\mathcal{R}^2 + \frac{\mathcal{R}}{2}\left[Q_{p1}\left(\mathbf{d}_2 + c_2\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p\right) + Q_{p2}\left(\mathbf{d}_1 + c_1\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p\right)\right]\cdot d\mathbf{x} + \mathcal{O}(r_\perp), \tag{4.1.45b}$$

$$\omega_2 = \frac{\mathcal{R}}{2}\sum_{q(\neq p)} Q_{pq}\int d\lambda_p \frac{\left(\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p(\lambda_p^0) - \dot{\mathbf{F}}_q(\lambda_p)\right)\cdot d\mathbf{x}}{|\mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p^0) - \mathbf{F}_q(\lambda_p)|} + \mathcal{O}(r_\perp). \tag{4.1.45c}$$

By plugging in the above expressions, the line element (4.1.42) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{2/3}dl^2 = {} & (Q_{p1}Q_{p2})^2\mathcal{R}^4|\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p|^2\left(d\mathbf{x}^2 - \frac{|\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p\cdot d\mathbf{x}|^2}{|\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p|^2}\right) \\ & + (Q_{p1}Q_{p2})\mathcal{R}^3\Bigg[\rho_p(\lambda_p^0)d\mathbf{x}^2 + \left(|\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p|^2 d\mathbf{x}^2 - 2|\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p\cdot d\mathbf{x}|^2\right)\left(Q_{p1}\left(1 + c_2\right) + Q_{p2}\left(1 + c_1\right)\right) \\ & + \dot{\mathbf{F}}_p\cdot\left(Q_{p1}\mathbf{d}_2 + Q_{p2}\mathbf{d}_1\right)d\mathbf{x}^2\Bigg] + \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{R}^2). \end{aligned} \tag{4.1.46}$$

For displacement along the tube, $d\mathbf{x} \propto \dot{\mathbf{F}}_p$, the leading $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{R}^4)$ term vanishes and the $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{R}^3)$ term gives the leading contribution. If the coefficient of the $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{R}^3)$ term is negative for all $\lambda_p^0 \in [0, L_p]$, the cycle along the tube will be a CTC. Conversely, for the absence of CTCs, there must be some value of λ_p^0 for which the following inequality is satisfied:

$$\rho_p(\lambda_p^0) \geq Q_{p1}\left(|\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p|^2(1+c_2) - \dot{\mathbf{F}}_p \cdot \mathbf{d}_2\right) + Q_{p2}\left(|\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p|^2(1+c_1) - \dot{\mathbf{F}}_p \cdot \mathbf{d}_1\right). \tag{4.1.47}$$

This can be written more explicitly, using (4.C.11) and (4.C.15), as

$$\rho_p(\lambda_p^0) \geq |\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p(\lambda_p^0)|^2 \left(Q_{p1} + Q_{p2}\right) + \sum_{q(\neq p)} Q_{pq} \int d\lambda_p \, \frac{\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p(\lambda_p^0) \cdot \left(\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p(\lambda_p^0) - \dot{\mathbf{F}}_q(\lambda_p)\right)}{|\mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p^0) - \mathbf{F}_q(\lambda_p)|}. \tag{4.1.48}$$

This is analogous to the no-CTC condition for the superthread solution ((2.34) in [78]).

Charge and angular momentum

Let us study if the solution above has the expected monopole and dipole charges. In the presence of Chern-Simons interaction, there are multiple notions of charge [79], and here we choose Page charge, which is conserved, localized, quantized, and gauge-invariant under small gauge transformations. Specifically, the Dp-brane Page charge is defined as [79, 36] (see also appendices A and A.1)

$$Q_{\mathrm{D}p}^{\mathrm{Page}} = \frac{1}{(2\pi l_s)^{7-p} g_s} \int_{M^{8-p}} e^{-B_2} G = \frac{1}{(2\pi l_s)^{7-p} g_s} \int_{\partial M^{8-p}} e^{-B_2} C. \tag{4.1.49}$$

Here, M^{8-p} is an $(8-p)$-manifold enclosing the Dp-brane, and $G = \sum_p G_{p+1}$, $C = \sum_p C_p$ with p odd (even) for type IIA (IIB). In the integrand, we must take the part with the appropriate rank from the polyforms $e^{-B_2}G$, $e^{-B_2}C$. In the second equality, we used the relation (A.4) between G and C.

Using the definition above, we can readily calculate Page charges for this 2-dipole solution. For example, the D4(6789)-brane charge, which is expected to vanish, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\mathrm{D4(6789)}}^{\mathrm{Page}} &= \frac{1}{(2\pi l_s)^3 g_s} \int_{S^2 \times T^2_{45}} e^{-B_2} G = \frac{1}{(2\pi l_s)^3 g_s} \int_{\partial S^2 \times T^2_{45}} e^{-B_2} C \\ &= \frac{R_4 R_5}{2\pi l_s^3 g_s} \int_{\partial S^2} \left\{ \left[-\frac{1}{Z_1} + \frac{V\mu}{Z - V\mu^2} \left(\frac{K^1}{V} - \frac{\mu}{Z_1} \right) \right] \omega + \xi^1 \right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1.50}$$

where in the last equality we used (A.4). If the surface S^2 is at infinity enclosing the entire profile, then the function in the $[\cdots]$ above is single-valued. Also, the requirement of integrability (2.1.20) guarantees that ω is also single-valued. Therefore, the entire first term in the integrand is single-valued and does not contribute to the integral on ∂S^2. The only contribution comes from the second term, ξ_1. Thus we find

$$Q_{\mathrm{D4(6789)}}^{\mathrm{Page}} = \frac{R_4 R_5}{2\pi l_s^3 g_s} \int_{\partial S^2} \xi^1 = \frac{R_4 R_5}{2\pi l_s^3 g_s} \int_{S^2} d\xi^1 = -\frac{R_4 R_5}{2\pi l_s^3 g_s} \int_{S^2} *_3 dK^1. \tag{4.1.51}$$

The integral is equal to -4π times the coefficient of $1/r$ in the large r expansion of K^1. However, $\alpha_2 = \mathcal{O}(1/r^2)$ and hence $K^1 = \gamma_2 = \mathcal{O}(1/r^2)$ and the coefficient of the $1/r$ term vanishes. So, we conclude that $Q^{\text{Page}}_{\text{D4(6789)}} = 0$, as expected. Similarly, other Page charges are related to the coefficient of the $1/r$ in the large r expansion of the corresponding harmonic function (see appendix A.1 for the expressions for necessary RR potentials to compute the Page charge). We find that the non-vanishing charges are

$$Q^{\text{Page}}_{\text{D2(45)}} = Q^{\text{Page}}_{\text{D2(67)}} = \sum_p N_p, \tag{4.1.52}$$

$$Q^{\text{Page}}_{\text{D2(89)}} = \sum_p N_{p3}, \qquad Q_{p3} = \int_p \rho_p, \tag{4.1.53}$$

where we used (4.1.33).

It is easy to check that we have appropriate monodromy for ns5(λ4567) and ns5(λ6780). The real part of $\tau^{1,2}$ contain $K^{1,2}$ (2.1.27) and others are all single-valued. Then we can apply same argument as (4.1.7). So we obtain

$$\tau^1 \to \tau^1 + 1, \qquad \tau^2 \to \tau^2 + 1 \tag{4.1.54}$$

as we go around each tubes. This is proper monodromy for our system.

The angular momentum can be read off from the ADM formula [80]

$$g_{ti} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{V(Z - V\mu^2)}}\,\omega_i = -2G_4 \frac{x^j J^{ji}}{|\mathbf{x}|^3} + \cdots \tag{4.1.55}$$

where G_4 is 4-dimensional Newton constant. By expanding g_{ti} to the leading order, we obtain

$$-g_{ti} = \frac{x^j}{|\mathbf{x}|^3}\left(\sum_p (Q_{p1} + Q_{p2}) \int_p \dot{F}_{pi} F_{pj} + \frac{1}{4}\sum_{p,q} Q_{pq} \iint_{p,q} \frac{\dot{F}_{pqi}F_{pqj} - \dot{F}_{pqj}F_{pqi}}{F_{pq}}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|^3}\right) \tag{4.1.56}$$

where we used

$$\frac{1}{R_p} = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|} + \frac{\mathbf{x}\cdot\mathbf{F}_p}{|\mathbf{x}|^3} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}|^3}\right). \tag{4.1.57}$$

Therefore the angular momentum of the 2-dipole solution is

$$J^{ji} = \frac{1}{4G_4}\left(\sum_p (Q_{p1} + Q_{p2}) \int_p (\dot{F}_{pi} F_{pj} - \dot{F}_{pj} F_{pi}) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{p,q} Q_{pq} \iint_{p,q} \frac{\dot{F}_{pqi}F_{pqj} - \dot{F}_{pqj}F_{pqi}}{F_{pq}}\right). \tag{4.1.58}$$

The second term represents the contribution from the interaction between supertubes.

4.1.3 3-dipole solutions

We can also consider a 3-dipole configuration as an extension of the 2-dipole configuration (4.1.25) such as

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{D2}(45) & + & \text{D2}(89) & \to & \text{ns5}(\lambda 4589) \\ \text{D2}(67) & + & \text{D2}(89) & \to & \text{ns5}(\lambda 6789) \\ \text{D2}(45) & + & \text{D2}(67) & \to & \text{ns5}(\lambda 4567) \end{array} . \tag{4.1.59}$$

Because there is no D6-brane, we have $V = 1$. How can we find the rest of harmonic functions for this 3-dipole configuration, generalizing the 2-dipole solution?

First, it is natural to guess that the 3-dipole solution has the dipole sources in all $K^{I=1,2,3}$, generalizing the 2-dipole case where $K^{I=1,2}$ had dipole sources. Namely,

$$\alpha^I = \sum_p Q_{pI} \int_p \frac{\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p \cdot d\mathbf{x}}{R_p}, \qquad dK^I = *_3 d\alpha^I, \qquad I = 1, 2, 3. \tag{4.1.60}$$

Note that the next layer of equation (2.1.12) to determine Z_I is quadratic in K^I and therefore knows only about 2-dipole interactions. So, we can construct Z_I the same way as in the 2-dipole case, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_I = 1 &+ \sum_p Q_{pI} \int_p \frac{\rho_{pI}}{R_p} \\ &+ C_{IJK} \sum_{p,q} Q_{pJ} Q_{qK} \iint_{p,q} \left[\frac{\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p \cdot \dot{\mathbf{F}}_q}{2R_p R_q} - \frac{\dot{F}_{pi} \dot{F}_{qj} (R_{pi} R_{qj} - R_{pj} R_{qi})}{F_{pq} R_p R_q (F_{pq} + R_p + R_q)} \right], \end{aligned} \tag{4.1.61}$$

where $I = 1, 2, 3$ and the same shorthand notation (4.1.29) is used. Finally, the last layer of equation (2.1.15) to determine μ is

$$\Delta\mu = \partial_i Z_I \partial_i K^I = \epsilon_{ijk} \partial_i Z_I \partial_j \alpha^I_k. \tag{4.1.62}$$

Because Z_I involves 2-dipole interactions, μ involves 3-dipole interactions. Although we have not been able to solve this in terms of integrals along the tubes as in the 2-dipole case (cf. (4.1.38b)), we know physically that the solution must be single-valued and therefore we can solve it by using the standard single-valued Green function. Namely, the solution is

$$\mu(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int d^3x' \, \frac{\partial_i Z_I \partial_i K^I(\mathbf{x}')}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'|}. \tag{4.1.63}$$

In order to satisfy the integrability condition (2.1.20), we have no option of adding to this a term like $\sum_p \int_p \sigma_p / R_p$ with an arbitrary function σ_p, as we did in the second term of (4.1.38a). In the present case, with $V = 1$, $\Delta K^I = 0$, the integrability condition (2.1.20) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= V\Delta M - M\Delta V + \frac{1}{2}\left(K^I \Delta L_I - L_I \Delta K^I\right) \\ &= \Delta M + \frac{1}{2} K^I \Delta L_I = \Delta\mu - \partial_i Z_I \partial_i K^I, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1.64}$$

where in the last equality we used (2.1.13), (2.1.16). This is nothing but (4.1.62). If we added the term $\sum_p \int_p \sigma_p/R_p$ to the μ in (4.1.63), then the integrability condition would be violated by a delta-function term. This is why we do not have an option of adding such a term. This also explains as a corollary why we do not have a term like $\sum_p \int_p \sigma_p/R_p$ in the 2-dipole μ in (4.1.38b).[8]

Although it is not as explicit as the 2-dipole case, (4.1.63) gives the interacting 3-dipole solution in principle.

4.2 Mixed configurations

Thus far, we have studied the harmonic solution with codimension-2 centers. In this section, we present a simple example in which codimension-3 and codimension-2 centers coexist.

As the simplest codimension-2 center, let us consider the 1-dipole configuration with the harmonic functions (4.1.1),

$$\begin{aligned} V = 1, \qquad K^1 = 0, \qquad K^2 = 0, \qquad K^3 = \gamma, \\ L_1 = 1 + f_2, \quad L_2 = 1 + f_1, \quad L_3 = 1, \qquad M = -\frac{\gamma}{2}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.2.1}$$

where we have extracted "1" as compared from (4.1.2) and

$$f_1 = \frac{Q_1}{L}\int_0^L \frac{d\lambda}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{F}(\lambda)|}, \qquad f_2 = \frac{Q_1}{L}\int_0^L \frac{|\dot{\mathbf{F}}(\lambda)|^2 d\lambda}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{F}(\lambda)|}, \tag{4.2.2}$$

while γ is still given by (4.1.5) and (4.1.6).

We would like to add to this a codimension-3 source of the type (2.2.1). Here, let us simply add a codimension-3 singularity to (4.2.1) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} V &= n_0 + \frac{n}{r}, \\ K^1 &= k_0^1 + \frac{k^1}{r}, \qquad K^2 = k_0^2 + \frac{k^2}{r}, \qquad K^3 = k_0^3 + \gamma + \frac{k^3}{r}, \\ L_1 &= l_1^0 + f_2 + \frac{l_1}{r}, \qquad L_2 = l_2^0 + f_1 + \frac{l_2}{r}, \quad L_3 = l_3^0 + \frac{l_3}{r}, \\ M &= m_0 - \frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{m}{r}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2.3}$$

For these harmonic functions, the integrability condition (2.1.20) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = &-4\pi\delta(\mathbf{x})\left[n_0 m - m_0 n + \frac{1}{2}(k_0^I l_I - l_I^0 k^I) - \frac{1}{2}\Big(k^1 f_2(\mathbf{x}=0) + k^2 f_1(\mathbf{x}=0)\Big)\right] \\ &- 2\pi\gamma\,\delta(\mathbf{x})(n + l_3) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\left[\left(k_0^2 + \frac{k^2}{r}\right)\Delta f_1 + \left(k_0^1 + \frac{k^1}{r}\right)\Delta f_2\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2.4}$$

[8] In the context of the supersheet solution [78], (the 6D version of) this was explained from the no-CTC condition.

The three lines on the right-hand side are of different nature and must vanish separately. So,

$$0 = n_0 m - m_0 n + \frac{1}{2}(k_0^I l_I - l_I^0 k^I) - \frac{1}{2}\frac{Q}{L}\int_0^L d\lambda \frac{k^1|\dot{\mathbf{F}}(\lambda)|^2 + k^2}{|\mathbf{F}(\lambda)|}, \tag{4.2.5a}$$

$$0 = n + l_3, \tag{4.2.5b}$$

$$0 = k_0^2 + \frac{k^2}{|\mathbf{F}(\lambda)|} + |\dot{\mathbf{F}}(\lambda)|^2 \left(k_0^1 + \frac{k^1}{|\mathbf{F}(\lambda)|}\right) \qquad \text{for each value of } \lambda. \tag{4.2.5c}$$

The first equation (4.2.5a) says that the total force exerted by the tube on the $r = 0$ brane must vanish. This is a single equation and easy to satisfy. The second equation is also easy to satisfy. On the other hand, the third equation (4.2.5c) says that the force exerted by the $r = 0$ brane on every point of the tube must vanish, and gives the most stringent condition. Let us investigate this last condition in detail.

Note that, if the asymptotic moduli k_0^1, k_0^2 vanished, then the distance between the tube and the codimension-3 brane, $|\mathbf{F}(\lambda)|$, would disappear from the condition (4.2.5c), and we have

$$0 = k^2 + |\dot{\mathbf{F}}(\lambda)|^2 k^1. \tag{4.2.6}$$

Because $|\dot{\mathbf{F}}(\lambda)|^2$ is the ratio of the D2(67) and D2(45) charge densities carried by the tube while k^1, k^2 are the D4(6789), D4(4589) charges of the $r = 0$ brane, (4.2.6) would mean that the tube must have, at every point along it, charge density that would be mutually supersymmetric with the $r = 0$ brane in flat space. This can of course happen only if the total charge of the tube is mutually supersymmetric with the $r = 0$ brane. In this case, the distance between the two objects is arbitrary, implying that they are not bound.

On the other hand, if the asymptotic moduli k_0^1, k_0^2 are non-vanishing, the tube does not have charge density that would be mutually BPS with the $r = 0$ brane in flat space, and the configuration represents a true bound state. The condition (4.2.5c) gives

$$|\dot{\mathbf{F}}(\lambda)|^2 = -\frac{k_0^2|\mathbf{F}(\lambda)| + k^2}{k_0^1|\mathbf{F}(\lambda)| + k^1}. \tag{4.2.7}$$

Because $\mathbf{F}(\lambda)$ is a vector with three components, this differential equation leaves the orientation of $\dot{\mathbf{F}}(\lambda)$ undetermined. Therefore, the tube profile can wiggle depending on *two* functions of one variable. We expect that this remains true for more general configurations with both codimension-2 and codimension-3 centers: each codimension-2 center has a profile depending on two functions of one variable, so that the force from other centers vanishes at each point along the tube.

4.3 Discussion

In this chapter, we studied the BPS configurations of the brane system in string theory in the framework of 5D supergravity. In the literature, multi-center configurations of codimension-

3 branes have been extensively studied. However, we pointed out that these codimension-3 branes can polarize into codimension-2 ones by the supertube effect and hence multi-center configurations involving codimension-2 branes along arbitrary curves must also be included if we want to capture the full configuration space of the system. Codimension-2 branes can be exotic, and the solution containing them can represent non-geometric spacetime.

Therefore, the most general configuration is a multi-center configuration including both codimension-3 branes and codimension-2 ones. In the framework of the harmonic solution, such configurations are described by harmonic functions with codimension-3 and codimension-2 singularities in $\mathbb{R}^3$. In this chapter, we provided some simple examples of such solutions, hoping that they serve as a guide for constructing general solutions.

The solutions with codimension-2 centers have various possible applications and implications, some of them already mentioned in the introduction. Here let us discuss their relevance to the fuzzball proposal for black holes [12, 13, 14, 15, 16] and the microstate geometry program.

Smooth harmonic solutions with codimension-3 centers have been put forward as possible microstates for the three- and four-charge black holes [24, 25]. However, the entropy represented by these solutions have been estimated [26, 27] to be parametrically smaller than the entropy of the corresponding black hole. In particular, for the three-charge black hole, [27] considered placing a probe supertube in the scaling geometry [81, 82] and estimated the associated entropy to be $\sim Q^{5/4}$ whereas the desired black hole entropy is $\sim Q^{3/2}$, where $Q \sim Q_{1,2,3}$ is the charge of the black hole. In our setup, a supertube in a scaling geometry corresponds to a configuration with codimension-3 centers as well as a codimension-2 one. It may be possible to make their estimate more precise by including backreaction using our setup.

Another issue with identifying smooth harmonic solutions with codimension-3 centers with black hole microstates concerns the pure Higgs branch. Ref. [83] (see also [84]) studied quiver quantum mechanics describing 3-center solutions and showed that most entropy of the system comes from zero-angular momentum states in what they call the pure Higgs branch. On the other hand, the multi-center solutions with codimension-3 centers are naturally identified with states in the Coulomb branch of the quiver quantum mechanics. This is because the codimension-3 solutions are characterized by the position of the centers, which corresponds to the adjoint vev in the quiver quantum mechanics. Therefore, these solutions do not seem to correspond to typical microstates of the system. In contrast, a codimension-2 center has a finite-sized *profile*, as a result of two branes getting bound together and puffing up by the supertube effect. In the quiver quantum mechanics, this has a natural interpretation as a Higgs branch state, with a finite vev for the bifundamental matter connecting two centers or nodes. Therefore, it is very interesting to understand the relation between the codimension-2 configurations in gravity and states in quiver quantum mechanics to elucidate the role of codimension-2 centers in black hole

microphysics.

We have focused on codimension-2 centers in this chapter but, of course, we could consider objects with still lower codimensions, namely one and zero. A codimension-1 center is a membrane in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and is a harmonic-solution realization of the "superstrata" recently proposed as possible microstates [35, 36, 85, 28]. It is interesting to study if the setup of the harmonic solution sheds new light on superstrata or makes their construction and analysis easier. Codimension-1 and codimension-0 branes are generally more non-geometric than the codimension-2 ones [86, 87], and studying them in the context of the harmonic solution is an interesting subject.

Explicit construction of a solution with codimension-2 centers with general charge, position and profile is technically a challenging problem. In subsection 4.1.2, we discussed how to solve the BPS equations of section 2.1 for a 2-dipole supertube. As mentioned there, when solving the BPS equations, there are multiple solutions differing in the monodromy properties. We must construct them and choose from them the physically appropriate one expected from the dipole charges produced by supertube transitions. This is in some sense similar to (but more complicated than) the problem of finding solutions of F-theory with various monodromies around 7-branes [88, 89, 90] and is a non-trivial task. In particular, in the presence of non-trivial harmonic function V, which corresponds to having D6-branes, solving (2.1.12) is itself a challenging problem. We leave this for future research.

To conclude, the solutions involving codimension-2 provide interesting new directions of research, and studying them is bound to reveal richer physics of brane systems than was found in codimension-3 solutions. We hope to report on the progress in such research in near future.

Appendix 4.A Monodromic harmonic function

Here, we show that if the harmonic function γ has the monodromy (4.1.7) independent of the cycle c, then it is given in terms of the one-form α by (4.1.5) and (4.1.6).

Harmonicity of γ means that $d(*_3 d\gamma) = 0$, which implies that $*_3 d\gamma$ is closed and can be written in terms of a one-form α as $*_3 d\gamma = d\alpha$ at least locally. Because α has the gauge ambiguity $\alpha \to \alpha + d\Lambda$ where Λ is a scalar, we can impose the "Lorenz gauge" $\partial_i \alpha_i = 0$. In this gauge, the monodromy of γ can be expressed as

$$\Delta\gamma = \int_c d\gamma = \int_c *_3 d\alpha = \int_D d *_3 d\alpha = -\int_D \Delta\alpha_i \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ijk} dx^j \wedge dx^k = -\int_D \Delta\alpha_i \, n_i \, d^2A, \quad (4.A.1)$$

where D is a 2-surface with $\partial D = c$, n_i is the unit normal to D, and d^2A is the area element of D. In order for the monodromy $\Delta\gamma$ not to change even if we homotopically deform the cycle c, the quantity $\Delta\alpha$ can only have delta-function source along the profile $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{F}(\lambda)$. Therefore, it

must be that

$$\alpha_i(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{L}\int_0^L \frac{v_i(\lambda)}{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{F}(\lambda)|}d\lambda \tag{4.A.2}$$

where $v_i(\lambda)$ are some functions. This gives

$$\Delta\alpha_i(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{4\pi}{L}\int_0^L v_i(\lambda)\,\delta^2(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{F}(\lambda))\,d\lambda. \tag{4.A.3}$$

Namely, α_i has delta-function source distributed along the profile with (vectorial) density v_i. Then (4.A.1) is proportional to

$$v_i n_i \times \frac{1}{\cos\theta} \times \frac{1}{|\dot{\mathbf{F}}|}, \tag{4.A.4}$$

where θ is the angle between n_i and the unit tangent to the profile, t_i. The second factor takes into account the fact that the curve does not necessarily perpendicularly intersect with D, and the third factor takes into account the "speed" of the parametrization λ. Because $\cos\theta = t_j n_j$ and $t_j = \dot{F}_j/|\dot{\mathbf{F}}|$, the quantity (4.A.4) is equal to

$$\frac{v_i n_i}{t_j n_j}. \tag{4.A.5}$$

Given c, there are infinitely many choices for D which can intersect the profile at any point at any angle. So, if (4.A.5) is to be independent of the choice of D, the only possibility is $v_i \propto \dot{F}_i$. This means that α is given by (4.1.6).

Appendix 4.B Superthread

In this appendix, we briefly review the superthread solution which was used in subsection 4.1.2 to derive the 2-dipole solution. The superthread solution was originally obtained in [78] as a BPS solution in 6D supergravity [29].

The metric for the superthread is

$$ds_6^2 = 2(Z_1Z_2)^{-1/2}dv\left(du + k + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{F}\,dv\right) - (Z_1Z_2)^{1/2}ds_4^2 \tag{4.B.1}$$

where the base space is flat $\mathbb{R}^4$ with metric $ds_4^2 = \delta_{ij}dx^i dx^j$ $(i = 1, \cdots, 4)$. We denote the coordinates of the $\mathbb{R}^4$ by $\vec{x} = (x^1, x^2, x^3, x^4)$. All quantities that appear in the metric are independent of the coordinate u. The scalars Z_I, $I = 1, 2$ are harmonic functions in $\mathbb{R}^4$ and are given by

$$Z_I = 1 + \sum_p \frac{Q_{pI}}{R_p^2}, \tag{4.B.2}$$

where

$$R_p \equiv |\vec{x} - \vec{F}^{(p)}(v)| \tag{4.B.3}$$

and $\vec{F}^{(p)}(v) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ is the profile of the supertube. Note that we use this $\mathbb{R}^4$ version of R_p only in this appendix (R_p in the main text is defined for $\mathbb{R}^3$ as in (4.1.29)). The 6D solution also involve self-dual field strengths

$$\Theta^I = *_4\Theta^I, \quad I = 1, 2, \tag{4.B.4}$$

which are related to Z_I by the following equation:

$$d\Theta^I = |\epsilon^{IJ}| *_4 d\dot{Z}_J. \tag{4.B.5}$$

Here $\dot{}$ means the v-derivative and d is the exterior derivative with respect to the $\mathbb{R}^4$. For Z_I given in (4.B.2), this equation can be solved by

$$\Theta^I = (1 + *_4)d\left(|\epsilon^{IJ}| \sum_p Q_{pJ} \frac{\dot{\vec{F}}^{(p)} \cdot d\vec{x}}{R_p^2}\right). \tag{4.B.6}$$

The one-form k appearing in the metric (4.B.1) satisfies the relation

$$(1 + *_4)dk = Z_I\Theta^I. \tag{4.B.7}$$

The solution to this equation is

$$k = k_0 + k_1 + k_2, \tag{4.B.8a}$$

$$k_0 = \sum_{I=1,2} \sum_p \frac{Q_{pI}\dot{\vec{F}}^{(p)} \cdot d\vec{x}}{R_p^2}, \tag{4.B.8b}$$

$$k_1 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p,q} Q_{pq} \frac{\dot{\vec{F}}^{(q)} \cdot d\vec{x}}{R_p^2 R_q^2} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{p,q} Q_{pq} \frac{(\dot{\vec{F}}^{(p)} + \dot{\vec{F}}^{(q)}) \cdot d\vec{x}}{R_p^2 R_q^2}, \tag{4.B.8c}$$

$$k_2 = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{p,q} Q_{pq} \frac{\dot{F}_i^{(p)} - \dot{F}_i^{(q)}}{|\vec{F}^{(p)} - \vec{F}^{(q)}|^2} \left[\left(\frac{1}{R_p^2} - \frac{1}{R_q^2}\right) dx^i - \frac{2}{R_p^2 R_q^2} \mathcal{A}_{ij}^{(p,q)} dx^j\right], \tag{4.B.8d}$$

where we defined

$$Q_{pq} \equiv Q_{p1}Q_{q2} + Q_{q1}Q_{p2}. \tag{4.B.9}$$

With this k, the scalar field $\mathcal{F}$ can be obtained by solving the equation

$$- *_4 d *_4 d\mathcal{F} = *_4(\Theta^1 \wedge \Theta^2) + 2\dot{Z}_1\dot{Z}_2. \tag{4.B.10}$$

This can be solved by

$$\mathcal{F} = -1 - \sum_p \frac{\rho_p}{R_p^2} - \sum_{p,q} Q_{pq} \left[\frac{\dot{\vec{F}}^{(p)} \cdot \dot{\vec{F}}^{(q)}}{2R_p^2 R_q^2} - \frac{\dot{F}_i^{(p)} \dot{F}_j^{(q)} \mathcal{A}_{ij}^{(p,q)}}{R_p^2 R_q^2 |\vec{F}^{(p)} - \vec{F}^{(q)}|^2}\right], \tag{4.B.11}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_{ij}^{(p,q)} \equiv R_i^{(p)} R_j^{(q)} - R_j^{(p)} R_i^{(q)} - \epsilon^{ijkl} R_k^{(p)} R_l^{(q)}. \tag{4.B.12}$$

After smearing out the above solution along x^4 and v directions[9] and identifying quantities as stated in [91], we can reinterpret the quantities above $(Z_I, \Theta^I, k, \mathcal{F})$ in terms of the harmonic functions appearing in the harmonic solution. Specifically, we obtain $V = 1$, $K^3 = \Theta^3 = 0$, $\mathcal{F} = -Z_3$. All other quantities can be read off from the relations (2.1.13), (2.1.14), (2.1.16), and (2.1.17).

Appendix 4.C Near-tube expansions

In this appendix, we carry out the near-tube expansions of quantities that are used in the no-CTC analysis in the main text. To avoid clutter, we suppress the subscript p from the quantities such as $\mathbf{F}_p$ and λ_p associated with the p-th tube.

We want to evaluate the near-tube limit of quantities such as

$$I(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \int \frac{d\lambda}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{F}(\lambda)|}. \tag{4.C.1}$$

Consider a point $\mathbf{x}$ very close to the tube. Near the point $\mathbf{x}$, the tube can be thought of as a straight line. Let us take a cylindrical coordinate system $(r_\perp, \theta, z)$ in which the point $\mathbf{x}$ is at $\theta = z = 0$. Also, let the point $r_\perp = z = 0$ on the curve (which is now a line) be $\mathbf{F}(\lambda^0)$ where λ^0 is the value of the parameter corresponding to that point. Both the points $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{F}(\lambda^0)$ are in the $z = 0$ plane. Then, by approximating the curve by a straight line there,

$$|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{F}(\lambda)| \approx \sqrt{r_\perp^2 + |\dot{\mathbf{F}}(\lambda^0)|^2(\lambda - \lambda^0)^2} \tag{4.C.2}$$

where $r_\perp$ is the radial distance from the curve. For very small $r_\perp$, most contribution to the integral (4.C.1) comes from very small $|\lambda - \lambda^0|$. So, let us introduce a small cutoff $\epsilon > 0$ and divide the integral as

$$\int d\lambda = \int_{\lambda^0-\epsilon}^{\lambda^0+\epsilon} d\lambda + \int^{\lambda^0-\epsilon} d\lambda + \int_{\lambda^0+\epsilon} d\lambda \tag{4.C.3}$$

$$\equiv \int_{\lambda^0-\epsilon}^{\lambda^0+\epsilon} d\lambda + P_\epsilon \int d\lambda \tag{4.C.4}$$

where $P_\epsilon \int$ means to exclude the interval $[\lambda^0 - \epsilon, \lambda^0 + \epsilon]$ from the integral. We take the following limit:

$$r_\perp \to 0, \qquad \epsilon \to 0, \qquad \text{with} \qquad \frac{r_\perp}{\epsilon} \to 0. \tag{4.C.5}$$

We take $\epsilon \to 0$ so that the curve for $\lambda \in [\lambda^0 - \epsilon, \lambda^0 + \epsilon]$ can be regarded as a straight line. Because we are very close to the straight line, we must take $r_\perp \to 0$, $\frac{r_\perp}{\epsilon} \to 0$.

[9] The smearing along v is similar to that in [6].

In this limit, the first term in (4.C.5) is evaluated as

$$\int_{\lambda^0-\epsilon}^{\lambda^0+\epsilon} \frac{d\lambda}{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{F}(\lambda)|} \approx \int_{\lambda^0-\epsilon}^{\lambda^0+\epsilon} \frac{d\lambda}{\sqrt{r_\perp^2 + |\dot{\mathbf{F}}|^2(\lambda-\lambda^0)^2}}$$
$$\approx \frac{1}{|\dot{\mathbf{F}}|}\int_{-|\dot{\mathbf{F}}|\epsilon}^{|\dot{\mathbf{F}}|\epsilon} \frac{d\lambda'}{\sqrt{r_\perp^2+\lambda'^2}} \approx \frac{2}{|\dot{\mathbf{F}}|}\log\left(\frac{2\epsilon|\dot{\mathbf{F}}|}{r_\perp}\right) \tag{4.C.6}$$

where $\dot{\mathbf{F}} \equiv \dot{\mathbf{F}}(\lambda^0)$ and $|\dot{\mathbf{F}}|(\lambda-\lambda^0) \equiv \lambda'$. This diverges as $\epsilon/r_\perp \to \infty$ because the contribution from an infinite straight line is infinite. However, of course, the actual curve is finite and closed, and the integral must be finite. In other words, in the full integral (4.C.4), ϵ-dependence must cancel out. Therefore, we must be able to split $I(\mathbf{x})$ as follows:

$$I(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{2}{|\dot{\mathbf{F}}|}\ln\frac{2|\dot{\mathbf{F}}|}{r_\perp} + \lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\left[P_\epsilon\!\int \frac{d\lambda}{|\mathbf{F}(\lambda)-\mathbf{F}(\lambda^0)|} + \frac{2}{|\dot{\mathbf{F}}|}\ln\epsilon\right] + \mathcal{O}(r_\perp), \tag{4.C.7}$$

where $[\dots]$ is finite in the $\epsilon \to 0$ limit. Indeed, the second term in (4.C.3) is

$$\int^{\lambda^0-\epsilon} \frac{d\lambda}{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{F}(\lambda)|} \approx \int^{\lambda^0-\epsilon} \frac{d\lambda}{|\mathbf{F}(\lambda^0)-\mathbf{F}(\lambda)|} \tag{4.C.8}$$

and includes a divergent contribution from near the upper bound of the integral, $\lambda = \lambda^0 - \epsilon$. The diverging contribution can be evaluated as

$$(4.C.8) \approx \frac{1}{|\dot{\mathbf{F}}|}\int^{-\epsilon}\frac{d\lambda'}{|\lambda'|} \approx -\frac{1}{|\dot{\mathbf{F}}|}\ln\epsilon. \tag{4.C.9}$$

We get an identical contribution from the third term in (4.C.3). These divergences precisely cancel the second term in $[\dots]$ of (4.C.7).

So, for example, as we approach the point $\mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p^0)$ on the p-th tube, the behavior of the integral appearing in $Z_{I=1,2}$ of (4.1.28b) is

$$\sum_q Q_{qI}\int_q \frac{1}{R_q} = \sum_q \frac{Q_{qI}}{L_q}\int \frac{d\lambda_q}{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{F}_q(\lambda_q)|} = \frac{Q_{pI}}{L_p}\mathcal{R} + c_I + \mathcal{O}(r_\perp) \tag{4.C.10}$$

(see (4.1.30) for the first equality) where $c_{I=1,2}$ is defined by

$$c_I \equiv \frac{Q_{pI}}{L_p}\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\left[P_\epsilon\!\int \frac{d\lambda_p}{|\mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p^0)-\mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p)|} + \frac{2}{|\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p|}\ln\epsilon\right] + \sum_{q(\neq p)}\frac{Q_{qI}}{L_q}\int\frac{d\lambda_q}{|\mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p^0)-\mathbf{F}_q(\lambda_q)|} \tag{4.C.11}$$

and is independent of $r_\perp$. We also defined

$$\mathcal{R} \equiv \frac{2}{|\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p|}\ln\frac{2|\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p|}{r_\perp}. \tag{4.C.12}$$

Using the same argument, we can also derive the behavior of the integrals appearing in ω and Z_3 as follows:

$$\sum_q Q_{qI} \int_q \frac{\dot{\mathbf{F}}_q(\lambda_q)}{R_q(\lambda_q)} = \sum_q \frac{Q_{qI}}{L_q} \int \frac{\dot{\mathbf{F}}_q(\lambda_q)\, d\lambda_q}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{F}_q(\lambda_q)|} = \frac{Q_{pI}}{L_p} \dot{\mathbf{F}}_p(\lambda_p^0)\mathcal{R} + \mathbf{d}_I + \mathcal{O}(r_\perp), \tag{4.C.13}$$

$$\sum_q \int_q \frac{\rho_q}{R_q} = \sum_q \frac{1}{L_q} \int \frac{\rho_q(\lambda_q)\, d\lambda_q}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{F}_q(\lambda_q)|} = \frac{1}{L_p} \rho_p(\lambda_p^0)\mathcal{R} + c_3 + \mathcal{O}(r_\perp), \tag{4.C.14}$$

where

$$\mathbf{d}_I \equiv \frac{Q_{pI}}{L_p} \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \left[P_\epsilon \int \frac{\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p(\lambda_p)\, d\lambda_p}{|\mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p^0) - \mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p)|} + \frac{2\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p(\lambda_p^0)}{|\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p|} \ln \epsilon \right] + \sum_{q(\neq p)} \frac{Q_{qI}}{L_q} \int \frac{\dot{\mathbf{F}}_q(\lambda_q)\, d\lambda_q}{|\mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p^0) - \mathbf{F}_q(\lambda_q)|}, \tag{4.C.15}$$

$$c_3 \equiv \frac{1}{L_p} \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \left[P_\epsilon \int \frac{\rho_p(\lambda_p)\, d\lambda_p}{|\mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p^0) - \mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p)|} + \frac{2\rho_p(\lambda_p^0)}{|\dot{\mathbf{F}}_p|} \ln \epsilon \right] + \sum_{q(\neq p)} \frac{1}{L_q} \int \frac{\rho_q(\lambda_q)\, d\lambda_q}{|\mathbf{F}_p(\lambda_p^0) - \mathbf{F}_q(\lambda_q)|}. \tag{4.C.16}$$

Chapter 5

Non-Abelian codimension-2 solutions

In this chapter, we give an explicit example of non-Abelian codimension-2 solutions and discuss its meaning in the context of microstate geometry program. All the material of this chapter is based on [66].

The plan of the chapter is as follows. In section 5.1, we explain some backgrounds and summarize the results we obtained. We also discuss some implications of the solution in the context of microstate geometry program. In section 5.2, we explicitly construct an example of non-Abelian supertubes. We first introduce the colliding limit and the matching expansion which allow us to construct the solution order by order by connecting the far-region and near-region solutions. We then use it to perturbatively construct the solution. As the near-region solution, we use an ansatz inspired by the SU(2) Seiberg-Witten theory. In section 5.3, we study the physical properties of the solution. We work out the brane charge content, the asymptotic geometry and the angular momentum, and discuss the condition for the absence of closed timelike curves (CTCs). Based on the results, we argue that the solution is a bound state and thus represent a black hole microstate. We also discuss the cancellation mechanism responsible for the vanishing of the angular momentum. The appendices include some details of the computations carried out in the main text and some topics tangential to the content of the main text.

5.1 Introduction and summary

5.1.1 Background

In the presence of codimension-2 branes, the harmonic functions H in general become multi-valued as we have seen in chapter 4. This is because codimension-2 branes generally have a non-trivial U-duality monodromy around them [35, 36], and H transforms in a non-trivial representation under it. For a multi-center configuration, if the i-th codimension-2 brane has

U-duality monodromy represented by a matrix M_i around it, the harmonic functions will have the monodromy

$$H \to M_i H. \tag{5.1.1}$$

When the matrices M_i, M_j do not commute for some i, j, we say that the configuration is *non-Abelian*.[1]

In the previous chapter, we wrote down first examples of codimension-2 harmonic solutions. They involve multiple species of codimension-2 supertubes and can have the same asymptotic charges as a four-dimensional (4D) black hole with a finite horizon area. However, the constituent branes were *unbound*; namely, by tuning parameters of the solution, we can separate the constituents of the solution infinitely far apart. This implies that the solution does not actually represent a microstate of a BPS black hole, for the following reason [12, Section 3.1]: Classically, it is possible to consider a configuration in which constituents are separated by a finite fixed distance from each other. However, quantum mechanically, by the uncertainty principle, fixing the relative position of the constituents increases kinetic energy and the configuration would not exactly saturate the BPS bound. Namely, it cannot be a microstate of a BPS black hole. So, the solution constructed in the previous chapter is not a black hole microstate. Relatedly, the solution in chapter 4 had Abelian monodromies. There is some kind of linearity for codimension-2 branes with commuting monodromies, and we can construct solutions with multiple codimension-2 centers basically by adding harmonic functions for each center.[2] This suggests that codimension-2 branes with Abelian monodromies do not talk to each other and are not bound.

Then the natural question is: does a configuration of supertubes with non-Abelian monodromies exist? If so, is it a bound state, and does it represent a black hole microstate? These are precisely the questions that we address in this chapter.

5.1.2 Main results

In this chapter, we will construct a configuration of codimension-2 supertubes with *non-Abelian monodromies* within the framework of harmonic solutions, in a certain perturbative expansion. We will give evidences that, as expected, it represents a bound state, and that it corresponds to a microstate of a 4D black hole with a finite horizon.

Our configuration is made of two circular supertubes which share their axis. The two tubes are separated by distance $2|L|$ and the radii of both rings are approximately R. See figure

[1] This is totally different from making the gauge group non-Abelian, namely generalizing Einstein-Maxwell to Einstein-Yang-Mills. For some recent work on non-Abelian generalizations in that sense, see [92, 93].

[2] More precisely, one should include certain interaction terms as well as we saw in chapter 4. However, it is still true in this case that one can in principle construct solutions with multiple codimension-2 centers located wherever we want.

5.2 on page 51. The harmonic functions H will have a non-trivial monodromy around each of the two tubes. The monodromies for the two supertubes do not commute, namely, they are non-Abelian. Because it is technically difficult to find the solution for general R and $|L|$, we consider the "colliding limit", $|L| \ll R$, in which we can construct the harmonic functions order by order in a perturbative expansion.

Despite that the colliding limit allows us to construct the solution explicitly, it also has a drawback: we cannot determine the value of R and $|L|$ separately. If we knew the exact solution, not a perturbative one, then we would be able to constrain them by imposing physical conditions (the absence of closed timelike curves) on the explicit solution. In this chapter we will not be able to do that. Instead, we will make use of supertube physics to argue that R and $|L|$ are fixed (section 5.3.4). Although the argument physically well motivated and convincing, it is not a proof; we hope to revisit this point in future work.

Because the physical parameters R and $|L|$ are fixed, it is not possible to separate apart the two supertubes and therefore the configuration represents a bound state. Moreover, it has asymptotic charges of a 4D black hole with a finite horizon. Therefore, the non-Abelian 2-supertube configuration is arguably a black hole microstate. The geometry is not regular near the supertubes, but the singular behavior is an allowed one in string theory, just as the geometry near a 1/2-BPS brane is metrically singular but is allowed. In this sense, our solution is not a microstate geometry but a microstate solution as defined in [20]. Our solution simultaneously involves the two types of supertube, (1.2) and (1.3), and therefore is non-geometric in that the internal torus is twisted by T-duality transformations around the supertubes.

We find that the asymptotic geometry of the perturbative solution is $\mathrm{AdS}_2 \times S^2$, namely the attractor geometry [37] of the black hole with the same charge. Furthermore, we find that the 4D angular momentum of the solution is zero, $J = 0$. We will argue that this is due to cancellation between the angular momentum that the individual supertubes carry and the one coming from the electromagnetic crossing between the monopole charges carried by the supertubes.

On a more technical note, in the colliding limit $|L| \ll R$, we can split the problem of finding harmonic functions with desired monodromies into two parts. If one is at a distance $d \sim R \gg |L|$ away from the supertubes (the "far region"), the configuration is effectively considered as made of a single tube whose monodromy is the product of two individual monodromies. On the other hand, if one is at a distance $d \sim |L| \ll R$ away from the tubes (the "near region"), we can regard the tubes as infinitely long and the problem reduces to that of finding 2D harmonic functions with desired monodromies. Once we find harmonic functions in both regions, we can match them order by order in a perturbative expansion to construct the harmonic function in the entire space. This is the sense in which our solution is perturbative in nature. In the near region, the problem is to find a pair of holomorphic functions with non-trivial $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$

monodromies around two singular points on the complex z-plane. Mathematically, this problem is the same as the one encountered in the SU(2) Seiberg-Witten theory [94] and we borrow their results to construct the harmonic functions.

The solution thus constructed is perfectly consistent at the perturbative level, but it is possible that unexpected new features are encountered in the exact, full-order solution. However, constructing such an exact solution is beyond the techniques developed in this chapter and left for future research.

In terms of the harmonic solutions $H = \{V, K^I, L_I, M\}$, our configuration is given by

$$\begin{aligned} V = \operatorname{Re} G, \qquad K^1 = K^2 = -\operatorname{Im} G, \qquad K^3 = \operatorname{Re} F, \\ L_1 = L_2 = \operatorname{Im} F, \qquad L_3 = \operatorname{Re} G, \qquad M = -\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Re} F, \end{aligned} \tag{5.1.2}$$

where F and G are complex functions and carry the information of the monodromies. This class of solutions describes the general configuration in which the complexified Kähler moduli of T^2_{45} and T^2_{67} are set to $\tau^{1,2} = i$ whereas the one associated with T^2_{89} is given by $\tau^3 = \frac{F}{G}$. This class is a type IIA realization of the so-called SWIP solution [95]. It is the particular choice of the pair $\binom{F}{G}$ that fixes the monodromies of the configuration. In our solution, F and G are related to the defining functions of the Seiberg-Witten solution.

5.1.3 Implication for black hole microstates

In the above, we argued that our codimension-2 configuration represents a black hole microstate. Our perturbative solution is quite different from the supergravity microstates based on codimension-3 harmonic solutions [24, 25, 13] that have been extensively studied in the literature. In particular, its 4D asymptotics is the $\mathrm{AdS}_2 \times S^2$ attractor geometry of the black hole with the same asymptotic charges, because the harmonic functions cannot have constant terms. Furthermore, the 4D angular momentum of our solution vanishes, $J = 0$, because of a cancellation mechanism between the tube and crossing contributions. To better understand the possible implications of these properties, let us recall some known facts and conjectures about black hole microstates.

For codimension-3 harmonic solutions, a well-known family of microstate geometries whose 4D asymptotics can be made arbitrarily close to $\mathrm{AdS}_2 \times S^2$ and whose angular 4D momentum J can be made arbitrarily small is the so-called scaling solutions [96, 81, 82].[3] Scaling solutions are made of three or more codimension-3 centers and exist for any value of the asymptotic

[3] Note that the angular momentum here is the 4D one. In the scaling solution, the 4D angular momentum can be made arbitrarily small. If one goes to 5D, there are two angular momenta, and the 4D angular momentum is one of the two. The other 5D angular momentum, which is nothing but the D0-brane charge from the 4D viewpoint, has been quite difficult to make smaller than a certain lower limit, for the geometry to correspond to a microstate in the D1-D5 system [81, 82, 97, 98]. This problem can be overcome by generalizing the harmonic solution to the superstratum in 6D [32]. This issue is not relevant to the current discussion.

moduli, provided that certain triangle inequalities are satisfied by the skew products of the charges of the centers. The defining property of the scaling solutions is that we can scale down the distance between centers in the $\mathbb{R}^3$ base so that they appear to collide. However, the actual geometry does not collapse; what is happening in this scaling process is that an AdS throat gets deeper and deeper, at the bottom of which the non-trivial 2-cycles represented by the centers sit. At the same time, the angular momentum J becomes smaller and smaller. In the infinite scaling limit where all the centers collide in the $\mathbb{R}^3$ base, the geometry becomes precisely AdS and the angular momentum J vanishes. It has been argued [99, 100] that the majority of the black hole microstates live in this infinite scaling limit, where the branes wrapping the 2-cycles [67], called "W-branes", become massless and condense. In the IIA picture, W-branes are fundamental strings stretching between D-brane centers. In the language of quiver quantum mechanics [96] dual to scaling solutions, the configurations with a finite throat correspond to Coulomb branch states, while the configurations with W-brane condensate would correspond to pure-Higgs branch states [83]. However, the gravity description of such condensate is unclear.[4] It cannot simply be the infinite throat limit of the scaling solution, because in that limit the non-trivial 2-cycles disappear in the infinite depth and the entire geometry becomes just AdS, indistinguishable from the black hole geometry. Furthermore, quantization of the solution space of the scaling solutions [72] says that the depth of the throat cannot be made arbitrarily large but is limited by quantum effects. So, it appears that, although the scaling solution is an important clue for the W-brane condensate and pure-Higgs branch states, it is not the answer itself.

Relatedly, Sen and his collaborators argued [104, 105, 106] that the contribution to black hole microstates can be split into the "hair" part which lives away from the horizon and the "horizon" part which gives the main contribution to black hole entropy. The horizon part has asymptotically AdS_2 geometry and vanishing angular momentum, $J = 0$. This is based on the fact that, in 4D, only $J = 0$ black holes are BPS and all extremal black holes with $J \neq 0$ are non-supersymmetric [104]. The analysis of the quiver quantum mechanics describing the worldvolume theory of a D-brane black hole system [106] also supports the claim that all black hole microstates in 4D have $J = 0$.

In summary, both the analysis of the scaling solutions and the arguments of Sen et al. suggest that the majority of the black hole microstates have AdS asymptotics and vanishing angular momentum, $J = 0$. They are states with a condensate of W-branes, or equivalently fundamental strings stretching between D-branes, and correspond to the pure-Higgs branch states of the dual quiver quantum mechanics.

Now if we look at our perturbative solution, it seems to have all the above properties expected

[4] For recent attempts to construct the gravity description of W-branes, see [70, 101, 102, 103].

of a typical microstate of a 4D black hole. First, it has AdS_2 asymptotics. This was not done by fine-tuning of parameters but is a consequence of the non-trivial monodromy of the supertubes. Second, its angular momentum vanishes, $J = 0$. This did not require fine-tuning either, and it was due to the cancellation mechanism mentioned before between different contributions to angular momentum. Moreover, our solutions are made of supertubes generated by the supertube transition which is nothing but condensation of the strings stretching between the original D-branes. Therefore, it is natural to conjecture that our solution is giving a gravity description of the W-brane condensate and represents a state in the pure-Higgs branch. At least, it is expected to provide a clue for the gravity description of pure-Higgs branch states.

Of course, to make such a strong claim we need strong evidence, including the demonstration that non-Abelian supertube configurations do exist beyond the perturbative level, and the proof they have a huge entropy to account for the black hole microstates. Such studies would require more sophisticated tools and techniques than developed in the current thesis. At this point, we just state that it is quite non-trivial and intriguing that the perturbative non-Abelian 2-supertube solution has the properties expected of black hole microstates, and leave further investigation as an extremely interesting direction of future research.

In [107] (see also [108]), an interesting set of solutions with $\mathrm{AdS}_2 \times S^2$ asymptotics were constructed. They belong to the so-called IWP family of solutions [109, 110] and are characterized by one complex harmonic function in three dimensions. The main differences between the solutions in [107] and ours are as follows. First, because the solutions in [107] are based on one complex harmonic function, their possible monodromies are Abelian. On the other hand, our solution has two complex harmonic functions and thus the monodromies are in general non-Abelian. Second, the solutions in [107] have two distinct $\mathrm{AdS}_2 \times S^2$ asymptotic regions. In contrast, the multiple asymptotic regions in our solutions are related by U-duality and regarded as one asymptotic region in different U-duality frames. Therefore, our solution has only one physical asymptotic region.

Let us end this section by mentioning one other difference between microstates with codimension-3 centers and ones with codimension-2 centers. One issue about the existing construction of black hole microstates based on codimension-3 harmonic solutions is that, multi-center configurations (except for the case where there are two centers and one of them is a 1/2-BPS center) are expected to lift and disappear from the BPS spectrum once generic moduli are turned on [111]. The physical origin of this is that, if there are multiple centers, when one continuously changes the moduli to arbitrary values, the discreteness of quantized charges is incompatible with the BPS condition [112]. This is certainly an issue for codimension-3 centers but, codimension-2 supertubes may be able to avoid it by continuously deforming the tube shapes and re-distributing the monopole charge density along its worldvolume, so that the BPS condition is met even if

one changes the moduli continuously. Therefore, it may be that codimension-2 solutions provide a loophole for the no-go result of [111] and represent microstates that remain supersymmetric everywhere in the moduli space.

5.2 Explicit construction of non-Abelian supertubes

5.2.1 Non-Abelian supertubes

In the previous chapter, we saw that harmonic solutions can describe BPS configurations of codimension-2 supertubes. A codimension-2 supertube has a non-trivial U-duality monodromy around it, which can be represented by a monodromy matrix M. If multiple codimension-2 supertubes are present and the i-th supertube has a monodromy matrix M_i then, in general, the monodromies of different supertubes do not commute, $[M_i, M_j] \neq 0$ for some pair (i, j), namely, the monodromies are *non-Abelian*. In this section, we show, for the first time, that such a non-Abelian configuration of supertubes is indeed possible.

We will focus on configurations in which only one modulus $\tau^3 \equiv \tau$ is non-trivial and has $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ monodromies. As discussed in section 5.A.1, in this situation, only four harmonic functions are independent (5.A.2), which can be combined into two complex harmonic functions F, G. In terms of them, the modulus τ can be written as

$$\tau = \frac{F}{G}. \tag{5.2.1}$$

The simplest non-Abelian configuration is one with two supertubes. As we go around the i-th supertube, the harmonic functions transform as

$$\begin{pmatrix} F \\ G \end{pmatrix} \to M_i \begin{pmatrix} F \\ G \end{pmatrix}, \qquad M_i \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z}), \qquad i = 1, 2. \tag{5.2.2}$$

We require that the monodromies be non-Abelian,

$$[M_1, M_2] \neq 0. \tag{5.2.3}$$

See figure 5.1 for a pictorial description of such a 2-supertube configuration.

Specifically, we will consider a two-supertube configuration with the following monodromies:

$$M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 2 \\ -2 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.2.4}$$

These clearly give a non-Abelian pair of monodromies satisfying (5.2.3). As we will discuss later in this section, this choice is motivated by the solution to a similar monodromy problem



Figure 5.1: A non-Abelian configuration of two supertubes. The monodromy matrices M_1, M_2 of the two supertubes do not commute, $[M_1, M_2] \neq 0$.

discussed in the SU(2) Seiberg-Witten theory [94]. If we go around the two supertubes, the total monodromy is

$$M = M_2 M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 2 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.2.5}$$

If one is far away from the supertubes, none of the monodromies of the supertubes are visible and the configuration looks like that of a single-center codimension-3 solution. From the $|\mathbf{x}| \to \infty$ behavior of the harmonic functions, we can read off the charges of the single-center solution. We will find that the charges are those of a four-charge black hole in four dimensions with a finite horizon. In other words, seen from a large distance, our configuration looks like an ordinary four-charge black hole without any monodromic structure. However, as one approaches it, the topology of the supertubes becomes distinguishable and discovers that the spacetime has non-trivial non-Abelian monodromies.

5.2.2 Strategy

The problem that we should attack in principle is the following. We first specify two closed curves $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ along which the two supertubes lie, such as the ones in figure 5.1. Then we must find a pair of harmonic functions (F, G) which, as we go around curve $\mathcal{C}_i$, undergoes the monodromy transformation (5.2.2) with the monodromy matrix M_i given in (5.2.4). If we can find such pair (F, G), then the configuration exists.

Although this is a mathematically well-posed problem, explicitly carrying it out for general shapes of supertubes is technically challenging. Instead, our strategy here is to take a particularly simple configuration for the two supertubes and further take a limit in which the problem of finding the solution becomes simple and tractable but is still non-trivial. This is sufficient for the purpose of proving the existence of a configuration of non-Abelian supertubes.

Specifically, we assume that the two tubes are circular and share the axis (so that the configuration is axisymmetric). The two tubes have almost identical radius $R > 0$ and are very



Figure 5.2: (a) A configuration of two circular supertubes sharing the axis. (b) The configuration in the colliding limit, $|L| \ll R$. In this limit, we can study the problem in two different regimes, the near and far regions. In the near region, the system becomes 2-dimensional but we must consider two separate monodromies M_1, M_2 of two supertubes. In the far region, the system remains 3-dimensional but there is only one tube with monodromy $M = M_2 M_1$.

close to each other, separated by distance $2|L|$; see figure 5.2(a). More precisely, in equations, the location of supertubes 1 and 2 is specified as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Supertube 1:} \qquad (x^1)^2 + (x^2)^2 = (R + |L|\cos l)^2, \quad x^3 = +|L|\sin l, \\ &\text{Supertube 2:} \qquad (x^1)^2 + (x^2)^2 = (R - |L|\cos l)^2, \quad x^3 = -|L|\sin l, \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.6}$$

where l is the angle between the two tubes relative to the x^1-x^2 plane; for example, $l = 0$ if they are concentric. We study this system in the *colliding limit*,

$$|L| \ll R. \tag{5.2.7}$$

In this limit, we can break down the problem into two regimes, depending on the distance d from an observer to the supertubes, as follows:

(i) The near region, $d \sim |L| \ll R$.

In this region, the two supertubes can be regarded as infinite straight lines and we can forget the direction along them. Therefore, the system can effectively be treated as 2-dimensional. By symmetry, we can zoom in onto the region near the point $(x^1, x^2, x^3) = (R, 0, 0)$ without loss of generality, and identify the z-plane with a small piece of the x^1-x^3 plane near that point with the relation

$$z = (x^1 - R) + ix^3, \qquad |x^1 - R|, |x^3| \sim |L| \ll R. \tag{5.2.8}$$

On the z-plane, the two supertubes are located at $z = L$ and $z = -L$, where we defined

$$L = |L|e^{il}. \tag{5.2.9}$$

So, the problem reduces to that of finding on the z-plane a pair of 2D harmonic functions (F, G) that has non-trivial monodromies M_1, M_2 given in (5.2.4) around $z = \pm L$. See figure 5.2(b).

(ii) The far region, $|L| \ll R \sim d$.

In this region, the two supertubes cannot be resolved and we effectively have only one supertube sitting at

$$(x^1)^2 + (x^2)^2 = R^2, \qquad x^3 = 0, \tag{5.2.10}$$

with the combined monodromy $M = M_2 M_1$ given in (5.2.5). So, the problem reduces to that of finding 3D harmonic functions (F, G) with the monodromy M around one circular supertube.

After finding the expressions for the harmonic functions (F, G) in regions (i) and (ii), we must connect them in the intermediate region, $|L| \ll d \ll R$, in order to show the existence of (F, G) defined in the entire space. Namely, we must match the large-$|z|$ behavior of the near-region solution smoothly onto the near-ring (i.e., $(x^1, x^2, x^3) \to (R, 0, 0)$) behavior of the far-region solution.

This matching can be done order by order and the harmonic function in the entire space can be reconstructed to any order in perturbative expansion. To see exactly how this works in practice, let us study a toy example in which we can work out the matching procedure in detail.

A toy model for the matching procedure

As a simpler physical problem in which there are two very different scales $|L|$ and R with $|L| \ll R$, let us consider the following problem. In three dimensions, we would like to find the field configuration sourced by two point-like charges at $\mathbf{x} = \pm\mathbf{L} \equiv (0, 0, \pm|L|)$ with charge $Q_\pm$. Assume that the field H is governed by the Helmholtz equation

$$\left(\Delta - \frac{1}{R^2}\right) H = 0. \tag{5.2.11}$$

Of course, for this problem, we know the exact answer:

$$H = \frac{Q_+ e^{-\frac{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{L}|}{R}}}{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{L}|} + \frac{Q_- e^{-\frac{|\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{L}|}{R}}}{|\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{L}|}. \tag{5.2.12}$$

However, let us try here to recover this expression by working in the "near region" $|\mathbf{x}| \sim |L| \ll R$ and in the "far region" $|L| \ll R \sim |\mathbf{x}|$ separately, and finally matching the expressions in the intermediate region connecting the two.

In the near region $|\mathbf{x}| \sim |L| \ll R$, we can ignore the R dependence in (5.2.11). Therefore, the expression in the near region is

$$H = \frac{Q_+}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{L}|} + \frac{Q_-}{|\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{L}|}. \tag{5.2.13}$$

Let (r, θ, φ) be the spherical polar coordinates for $\mathbb{R}^3$. If we increase r, still staying inside the near region, we can do a small $\frac{|L|}{r}$ expansion of this and obtain

$$H = \frac{Q_+ + Q_-}{r} + \frac{(Q_+ - Q_-)|L| \cos\theta}{r^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{|L|^2}{r^3}\right), \tag{5.2.14}$$

which corresponds to the standard multipole expansion. We would like to find how this multipole expansion matches onto the one in the far region.

To be able to do the matching, there must be an intermediate region where the expansion (5.2.14) is correct. To understand what this means, let us make the scaling for the intermediate region, $|L| \ll r \ll R$, more precise by setting

$$\frac{r}{R} \sim \epsilon, \qquad \frac{|L|}{r} \sim \delta, \tag{5.2.15}$$

where $\epsilon, \delta \ll 1$. If we are to keep r finite, the replacement

$$R \to R\epsilon^{-1}, \qquad |L| \to |L|\delta, \tag{5.2.16}$$

will keep track of the order of expansion. If we do this replacement in the exact expression (5.2.12) and expand it in powers of ϵ and δ, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} H = &\left[\frac{Q_+ + Q_-}{r} + \frac{(Q_+ - Q_-)|L| \cos\theta}{r^2}\delta + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2)\right] - \frac{(Q_+ + Q_-)\epsilon}{R} \\ &+ \left[\frac{(Q_+ + Q_-)r}{2R^2} - \frac{(Q_+ - Q_-)|L| \cos\theta}{2R^2}\delta + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2)\right]\epsilon^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3). \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.17}$$

If we make ϵ small enough so that only the $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^0)$ terms remain, then this reproduces the near-region expansion (5.2.14). Therefore, the correct procedure is: take $\epsilon \to 0$ first, and then match the δ expansion. In other words, take $R \to \infty$ first, and then match the small $\frac{|L|}{r}$ expansion.

With this mind, let us go to the far region. Here, the two charges cannot be resolved and the function H can be singular only at $r = 0$. The instruction is: find solutions of the Helmholtz equation such that their $R \to 0$ limit reproduces (5.2.14), term by term in the $\frac{|L|}{r}$ expansion. First,

$$(Q_+ + Q_-)\frac{e^{-\frac{r}{R}}}{r} \tag{5.2.18}$$

is clearly an exact solution with a singularity at $r = 0$. If we take $R \to \infty$, this gives r^{-1}, which reproduces the first term in (5.2.14). Next,

$$(Q_+ - Q_-)\,|L|\,e^{-\frac{r}{R}}\left(\frac{1}{r^2} + \frac{1}{Rr}\right)\cos\theta \tag{5.2.19}$$

is an exact solution and its $R \to \infty$ limit reproduces the second term in (5.2.14). So, up to this order, the far-region solution which reproduces (5.2.14) is

$$H = \frac{(Q_+ + Q_-)\, e^{-\frac{r}{R}}}{r} + (Q_+ - Q_-)\, |L|\, e^{-\frac{r}{R}} \left(\frac{1}{r^2} + \frac{1}{Rr} \right) \cos\theta + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{|L|^2}{r^3} \right). \tag{5.2.20}$$

It is clear that we can keep going with this procedure to find the far-region solution that reproduces the expansion (5.2.14) to an arbitrarily high order, upon taking the $R \to \infty$ limit. In principle, if we can sum this expansion to all orders, we can recover the exact expression (5.2.12) with singular sources at $\mathbf{x} = \pm\mathbf{L}$. However, at any finite order, the perturbative expression (5.2.20) has a singularity only at $r = 0$; namely, some features of the exact solution can be seen only after carrying out the infinite sum, which is a limitation of the method of matching expansion.

Below, we will use the exactly same matching procedure to find the harmonic functions describing a configuration of non-Abelian supertubes.

5.2.3 The near region

Now with the colliding limit and the matching procedure understood, let us construct the solution starting from the near-region side.

Some general statements

As we mentioned before, in the near region, we can regard the round supertubes as parallel, infinite straight lines. Forgetting about the direction along the tubes, the problem reduces to the one on the z-plane defined in (5.2.8). A harmonic function in 2D can be written as the sum of holomorphic and anti-holomorphic functions. In the present case, this means that F, G are both written as a sum of holomorphic and anti-holomorphic functions.

Let us further assume that F and G are purely holomorphic:

$$F = F(z), \qquad G = G(z). \tag{5.2.21}$$

This is equivalent to assuming that $\tau = F/G$ is holomorphic. In this case, we can solve (5.A.8) to find ω explicitly. If we set

$$\omega = \omega_2 dx^2 + \omega_z dz + \omega_{\bar{z}} d\bar{z}, \tag{5.2.22}$$

where ω_z, $\omega_{\bar{z}}$ and ω_2 are independent of x^2, then

$$\omega_2 = -\operatorname{Im}(F\bar{G}) + C, \qquad \partial\omega_{\bar{z}} - \bar{\partial}\omega_z = 0 \tag{5.2.23}$$

where C is a constant.

The above ω_2 is $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ invariant because

$$\begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix} : \quad \operatorname{Im}(F\bar{G}) \to \operatorname{Im}[(\alpha F + \beta G)(\gamma\bar{F} + \delta\bar{G})] = \operatorname{Im}[(\alpha\delta - \beta\gamma)F\bar{G}] = \operatorname{Im}(F\bar{G}), \tag{5.2.24}$$

for $\alpha\delta - \beta\gamma = 1$. Therefore, even if there is a singularity around which there is an $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ monodromy and (F, G) are multi-valued, ω_2 is always single-valued. By (3.3.1), this means that the integrability condition (2.1.20) is satisfied without delta-function singularities along the supertube.

The constant C and functions $\omega_z, \omega_{\bar{z}}$ must ultimately be fixed by extending the near-region solution to the far-region solution and requiring that ω be regular everywhere and vanish at 3D infinity. In the present case, we will find that ω in the far region has a non-vanishing component only in the direction along the supertube. Therefore, we set $\omega_z = \omega_{\bar{z}} = 0$. On the other hand, the constant C cannot be fixed unless we have an exact solution (we only have a perturbative solution in the present thesis).

When there is a supertube, the direction along its profile is a dangerous direction where there can be CTCs [54, 55]. This is the x^2 direction in the present case and the 22 component of the metric which is, e.g., from (2.1.24),

$$g_{22} \propto -\omega_2^2 + \mathcal{Q} = -[-\operatorname{Im}(F\bar{G}) + C]^2 + [\operatorname{Im}(F\bar{G})]^2 = C[2\operatorname{Im}(F\bar{G}) - C]. \tag{5.2.25}$$

From (5.A.9), $\operatorname{Im}(F\bar{G}) \geq 0$. So, for (5.2.25) not to be negative, the constant C must be in the following range:

$$0 \leq C \leq 2\min[\operatorname{Im}(F\bar{G})]. \tag{5.2.26}$$

This does not have to hold up to $z = \infty$. It only has to hold up to some value of $|z|$ above which the 2D approximation breaks down.

The solution

On the z-plane, we would like to construct a pair of harmonic functions (F, G) that has non-trivial non-Abelian monodromy (5.2.2) around some singular points. In doing that, we must require that the imaginary part of $\tau = F/G$ be always positive, because of the condition (5.A.9). There are many such possibilities, but in this chapter we will take the pair of holomorphic functions that appeared in the solution of $d = 4, \mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric gauge theory by Seiberg and Witten [94], because it is a fundamental example of configurations with non-Abelian monodromies.

The original work of Seiberg and Witten was about the exact determination of the low-energy effective theory of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ pure SU(2) gauge theory. At low energy, the theory has a Coulomb moduli space parametrized by the vacuum expectation value of the vector multiplet scalar, $z = \langle \operatorname{tr} \phi^2 \rangle \in \mathbb{C}$. At point z on the moduli space, one has a pair of holomorphic functions $(a_D(z), a(z))$ which represent the mass of the magnetic monopole and the electron at that point. In terms of them, the low-energy coupling constant, $\tau(z)$, is expressed as

$$\tau(z) = \frac{da_D}{da} = \frac{a_D'(z)}{a'(z)}. \tag{5.2.27}$$



Figure 5.3: The monodromy structure in the near region. At $z = \pm L$ we have singularities corresponding to the position of the supertubes. When going around one of them, (F, G) gets transformed by M_i. Going around both of them induces a monodromy transformation $M = M_2 M_1$.

The theory has an $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ duality group which changes the coupling constant τ and acts non-trivially on the spectrum of dyons. More specifically, under $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$, the pair (a_D, a) transforms as a doublet and τ undergoes linear fractional transformation. The moduli space has three singularities at $z = \pm L, \infty$ around which there are non-trivial monodromies of the $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ duality. The one at $z = L$ is due to the magnetic monopole becoming massless and the monodromy around it is given by M_1 in (5.2.4). On the other hand, the one at $z = -L$ is due to the $(1,1)$ dyon getting massless and the monodromy is given by M_2 in (5.2.4). Finally, the one at $z = \infty$ is due to asymptotic freedom and the monodromy is given by M in (5.2.5). See figure 5.3 for the monodromy structure of the moduli space.

One sees that this theory has everything we need. We identify the $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ duality group on the gauge theory side with the $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_3$ U-duality group on the supertube side, the modulus z with the z coordinate of the near region, the mass parameters (a_D, a) with the harmonic functions (F, G), and τ with the torus modulus $\tau^3 = \tau$. Furthermore, the position $z = \pm L$ of the singularities on the moduli space is identified with the position of the supertubes in the near region. The precise identification between (F, G) and (a_D, a) is

$$\begin{pmatrix} F \\ G \end{pmatrix} = c \begin{pmatrix} a'_D(z) \\ a'(z) \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.2.28}$$

where $c \in \mathbb{C}$ is a constant of dimension $[c] = (\text{length})^{1/2}$.[5] Now figure 5.3 is understood as the monodromy structure of the harmonic functions (F, G) in the near region.

[5] At this stage, c can actually be an arbitrary single-valued holomorphic function in z. However, one can show that, in order that the fields near each of the two supertube at $z = \pm L$ behave the same way as they do near ordinary supertubes, such as the $\mathrm{D2} + \mathrm{D2} \to \mathrm{ns5}$ supertube or the $\mathrm{D2} + \mathrm{D6} \to 5^2_2$ supertube, we must take c to be constant. It must be possible to derive the behavior of c near supertubes by properly taking account of its backreaction of the brane worldvolume. See [90] for a discussion of such backreaction in F-theory configurations of 7-branes.

One may wonder about the meaning, in the supertube context, of the singularity at $z=\infty$ of the Seiberg-Witten solution. Recall that the near-region description in terms of the z-plane is only an approximation near the tubes. In reality, the infinity of the near-region z-plane is connected to the 3D space, where the tube is not infinitely long but is finite and closed. In the context of the original Seiberg-Witten theory, which is defined in the z-plane, the monodromy at $z=\pm L$ must be canceled by the monodromy at $z=\infty$. On the other hand, in the supertube context, the z-plane is connected to a larger space, $\mathbb{R}^3$ and the monodromy is canceled by the other side of the supertube in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

The explicit expression for $a(z)$ and $a_D(z)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} a(z) &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi}\int_{-L}^{L} dx\sqrt{\frac{z-x}{(L-x)(L+x)}} = \sqrt{2(z+L)}\,{}_2F_1\left(-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2};1;\frac{2L}{z+L}\right), \\ a_D(z) &= \frac{\sqrt{2}\,i}{\pi}\int_{L}^{z} dx\sqrt{\frac{z-x}{(x-L)(x+L)}} = \frac{L-z}{2i\sqrt{L}}\,{}_2F_1\left(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2};2;\frac{L-z}{2L}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.29}$$

Here ${}_2F_1(a,b;c;z)$ is the hypergeometric function. Note that L is a complex number (see (5.2.9)). The sign of the square root in the integral expression is defined to be positive for $0<L<z$ and, for complex L,z, it is defined by analytic continuation. Taking derivatives, we have

$$\begin{aligned} a'(z) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\,\pi}\int_{-L}^{L}\frac{dx}{\sqrt{(z-x)(L-x)(L+x)}} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi\sqrt{z+L}}\,K\left(\frac{2L}{z+L}\right), \\ a_D'(z) &= \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}\,\pi}\int_{L}^{z}\frac{dx}{\sqrt{(z-x)(x-L)(x+L)}} = \frac{i}{\pi\sqrt{L}}\,K\left(\frac{L-z}{2L}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.30}$$

where $K(z)=\frac{\pi}{2}\,{}_2F_1(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2};1;z)$ is the complete elliptic integral of the first kind. As mentioned above, as we go around the singular points $z=L,-L$ and $z=\infty$, the pair (a_D,a) and hence (a_D',a') undergoes $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ transformations given by the monodromy matrices M_1,M_2 in (5.2.4) and M in (5.2.5), respectively.

Now we have (F,G) in the near region, which is related via (5.2.28) to (a_D',a') given in (5.2.30). To match this with the far-region solution, we will later need the $|z|\to\infty$ behavior of (a_D',a'). It is given by

$$a'(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2z}} + \frac{3L^2}{4(2z)^{5/2}} + \frac{105L^4}{64(2z)^{9/2}} + \cdots, \tag{5.2.31a}$$

$$a_D'(z) = \frac{i}{\pi}\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2z}}\ln\frac{8z}{L} + \frac{3L^2}{4(2z)^{5/2}}\left(\ln\frac{8z}{L}-\frac{5}{3}\right) + \frac{105L^4}{64(2z)^{9/2}}\left(\ln\frac{8z}{L}-\frac{389}{210}\right)+\cdots\right]. \tag{5.2.31b}$$

Just from the leading terms, it is easy to check that we have the monodromy

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_D' \\ a' \end{pmatrix} \to \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 2 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} a_D' \\ a' \end{pmatrix} = M\begin{pmatrix} a_D' \\ a' \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.2.32}$$



Figure 5.4: Toroidal coordinates (η, σ, ϕ). η is a "radial" coordinate that decreases as one goes away from the ring, σ is the angular variable around the ring and ϕ is an angular variable along the ring.

For later convenience, let us also write down the behavior near the singularities $z = \pm L$. Near $z = L$,

$$a'(z) = -\frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{L}}\left[\ln\frac{z-L}{32L} - \frac{1}{8L}\left(\ln\frac{z-L}{32L} + 2\right)(z-L) + \cdots\right]. \tag{5.2.33a}$$

$$a'_D(z) = \frac{i}{2\sqrt{L}}\left[1 - \frac{1}{8L}(z-L) + \cdots\right] = \frac{i}{2\sqrt{L}}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{(2n)!}{2^{2n}n!^2}\right)^2\left(\frac{-1}{2L}\right)^n(z-L)^n. \tag{5.2.33b}$$

Near $z = -L$,

$$a'(z) = \frac{i}{2\pi\sqrt{L}}\left[\ln\frac{z+L}{-32L} + \frac{1}{8L}\left(\ln\frac{z+L}{-32L} + 2\right)(z+L) + \cdots\right]. \tag{5.2.34a}$$

$$a'_D(z) = -\frac{i}{2\pi\sqrt{L}}\left[\ln\frac{z+L}{32L} + \frac{1}{8L}\left(\ln\frac{z+L}{32L} + 2\right)(z+L) + \cdots\right]. \tag{5.2.34b}$$

From these, it is easy to check the monodromy M_1, M_2.

5.2.4 The far region: coordinate system and boundary conditions

Having fixed the near-region solution, the next task is to find the far-region solution that matches onto it. For that, as preparation, let us introduce the coordinate system appropriate for our purpose and discuss the boundary conditions that the far-region solution must satisfy.

Toroidal coordinate system

As we explained, in the far region, we effectively have one supertube. To describe this configuration, we introduce the toroidal coordinate system (η, σ, ϕ) [113]; see figures 5.4 and 5.5. In terms of Cartesian coordinates (x^1, x^2, x^3), the toroidal coordinates are given by

$$x^1 = R\frac{\sqrt{\eta^2-1}}{\eta - \cos\sigma}\cos\phi, \quad x^2 = R\frac{\sqrt{\eta^2-1}}{\eta - \cos\sigma}\sin\phi, \quad x^3 = R\frac{\sin\sigma}{\eta - \cos\sigma}, \tag{5.2.35}$$

where R is the radius of the ring, σ is the angular variable around the ring and ϕ is the angular variable along the ring. The inverse relations are given by

$$\eta = \frac{\mathbf{x}^2 + R^2}{\Sigma}, \quad \cos\sigma = \frac{\mathbf{x}^2 - R^2}{\Sigma}, \quad \tan\phi = \frac{x^2}{x^1}, \tag{5.2.36}$$



Figure 5.5: Toroidal coordinates in the $x^2 = 0$ section. Solid lines represent constant-η surfaces and dotted lines represent constant-σ surfaces. As $\eta \to 1$, the constant-η surface approaches the vertical (x^3) axis , while the position of the ring corresponds to the $\eta \to \infty$ limit.

with

$$\Sigma^2 = (\mathbf{x}^2 - R^2)^2 + 4R^2(x^3)^2. \tag{5.2.37}$$

The domain of the coordinates is $1 \leq \eta < \infty$, $-\pi \leq \sigma < \pi$, $0 \leq \phi < 2\pi$. Then, the flat 3D metric in the toroidal coordinates is given by

$$ds^2 = \frac{R^2}{(\eta - \cos\sigma)^2}\left(\frac{d\eta^2}{\eta^2 - 1} + d\sigma^2 + (\eta^2 - 1)d\phi^2\right). \tag{5.2.38}$$

To connect the far- and near-region solutions, we have to relate the near-region (2D) and the far-region (3D) coordinates. In the near-region limit $\eta \to \infty$, the Cartesian coordinates are given, to leading order, by

$$x^1 \simeq R + \frac{R\cos\sigma}{\eta}, \qquad x^2 = 0, \qquad x^3 \simeq \frac{R\sin\sigma}{\eta}. \tag{5.2.39}$$

Then we can relate the z coordinate defined in (5.2.8) to the toroidal coordinates (η, σ) as

$$z = (x^1 - R) + ix^3 = \frac{R}{\eta}e^{i\sigma}. \tag{5.2.40}$$

This is the fundamental relation to connect the near- and far-region solutions.

Boundary conditions

On the far-region solution, we have to impose boundary conditions at infinity ($\eta \to 1$ and $\sigma \to 0$ simultaneously) and near the supertube ($\eta \to \infty$).

First, let us discuss the boundary condition at infinity. We require the harmonic functions to go as

$$H = h + \frac{\Gamma}{r} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{r^2}\right) \quad \text{as} \quad r \to \infty, \tag{5.2.41}$$

where $r = \sqrt{(x^1)^2 + (x^2)^2 + (x^3)^2}$. This is the same $r \to \infty$ behavior as the codimension-3 solution, (2.2.1) (or (5.A.10)). This is because we are interested in codimension-2 branes (supertubes) which have been produced by the supertube transition out of codimension-3 branes. Very far from it, the codimension-2 brane must look like a codimension-3 object with the original monopole charge. Therefore, the harmonic function must have the $1/r$ term whose coefficient Γ is the same as the total monopole charge of the original brane configuration.

The boundary condition near the tube ($\eta \to \infty$) comes from the matching condition discussed at the end of section 5.2.2. Let us write the large-$|z|$ expansion of $a'(z)$ and $a'_D(z)$ as[6]

$$a'(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a'_n(z), \qquad a'_D(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a'_{Dn}(z), \tag{5.2.42}$$

where $a'_n, a'_{Dn} = \mathcal{O}(z^{-2n-1/2})$ (here it is understood that $\mathcal{O}(z^{-2n-1/2})$ includes $z^{-2n-1/2}\log z$). The first three terms of each expansion are given in (5.2.31a) and (5.2.31b). As we discussed earlier in section 5.2.2, we must be able to find a far-region solution that matches onto this expansion, order by order. Concretely, let us do a near-ring ($\eta \to \infty$) expansion of the far-region harmonic functions F and G and let the n-th term be F_n and G_n where their behavior as $\eta \to \infty$[7] is $F_n, G_n = \mathcal{O}(\eta^{2n+1/2})$.[8] Then, upon using the dictionary (5.2.40), we must have

$$F_n = ca'_{Dn} + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{2n-1/2}), \qquad G_n = ca'_n + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{2n-1/2}), \qquad \eta \to \infty. \tag{5.2.43}$$

Note that the lesson of the toy model in section 5.2.2 was that we have to take the limit $r \ll R$ first, and then match the small $\frac{|L|}{r}$ expansion. In the present case, the former corresponds to matching only the leading $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{2n+1/2})$ term in (5.2.43), while the latter corresponds to doing this for each value of n.

For example, for the first ($n = 0$) term, we have

$$F_0 = \frac{ic}{\pi\sqrt{2z}} \ln \frac{8z}{L} + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/2}), \qquad G_0 = \frac{c}{\sqrt{2z}} + \mathcal{O}(\eta^{-1/2}). \tag{5.2.44}$$

In principle, we can find F_n and G_n satisfying (5.2.43) for n arbitrarily large. If we could carry out the infinite sum $F = \sum_n F_n$ and $G = \sum_n G_n$, it would correspond to the exact two-supertube solution defined in the entire $\mathbb{R}^3$.

[6] This expansion corresponds to (5.2.14) of the toy model in section 5.2.2.

[7] The behavior will be determined in the next section 5.2.5 and appendix 5.C.

[8] These n-th terms correspond to (5.2.20) of the toy model in section 5.2.2.

5.2.5 The far region: the solution

In the far region, there is only one supertube (see figure 5.4) and we are instructed to find a pair of harmonic functions (F, G) that has the monodromy

$$\begin{pmatrix} F \\ G \end{pmatrix} \to M \begin{pmatrix} F \\ G \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 2 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} F \\ G \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.2.45}$$

as $\sigma \to \sigma + 2\pi$. In other words,

$$F \to -F + 2G, \tag{5.2.46a}$$

$$G \to -G, \tag{5.2.46b}$$

Harmonic functions in toroidal coordinates

Let us explain now how to construct F and G. We start with the ansatz for G since its monodromy (5.2.46b) is simpler. If we assume the following separated form,

$$G(\eta, \sigma, \phi) = \sqrt{\eta - \cos\sigma}\, T(\eta) S(\sigma) V(\phi), \tag{5.2.47}$$

the Laplace equation becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta G = & \frac{(\eta - \cos\sigma)^{5/2}}{R^2} T(\eta) S(\sigma) V(\phi) \\ & \times \left[\frac{1}{\eta^2 - 1} \frac{V''(\phi)}{V(\phi)} + \frac{S''(\sigma)}{S(\sigma)} + \frac{1}{T(\eta)} \left(\frac{1}{4} T(\eta) + 2\eta T'(\eta) + (\eta^2 - 1) T''(\eta) \right) \right] \\ = & \, 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.48}$$

This can be reduced to the following three ordinary differential equations:

$$0 = V''(\phi) + m^2 V(\phi), \tag{5.2.49a}$$

$$0 = S''(\sigma) + k^2 S(\sigma), \tag{5.2.49b}$$

$$0 = (\eta^2 - 1) T''(\eta) + 2\eta T'(\eta) + \left(\frac{1}{4} - k^2 - \frac{m^2}{\eta^2 - 1} \right) T(\eta), \tag{5.2.49c}$$

with arbitrary constants m and k. The general solutions for these equations are given by

$$V(\phi) = e^{im\phi}, \tag{5.2.50a}$$

$$S(\sigma) = e^{ik\sigma}, \tag{5.2.50b}$$

$$T(\eta) = P^{|m|}_{|k|-1/2}(\eta) \quad \text{and} \quad Q^{|m|}_{|k|-1/2}(\eta), \tag{5.2.50c}$$

where $P^m_k(\eta)$ and $Q^m_k(\eta)$ are the associated Legendre functions of the first and second kind, respectively, with degree k and order m. If we require 2π periodicity along the ϕ (respectively

σ) direction, the constant m (respectively k) will take integer values. Because our configuration is symmetric along ϕ (see figure 5.4), we should take $m = 0$. Then as we can easily see from the form of the solutions (5.2.50), we have to choose $k \in \mathbb{Z} + 1/2$ in order for G to have the monodromy (5.2.46b). So the solution for G is written as

$$G = \sqrt{\eta - \cos\sigma}\, e^{ik\sigma} \left(A_{|k|-1/2} P_{|k|-1/2}(\eta) + B_{|k|-1/2} Q_{|k|-1/2}(\eta) \right), \tag{5.2.51}$$

where $k \in \mathbb{Z} + 1/2$ and $A_{|k|-1/2}, B_{|k|-1/2}$ are constants.

Let us turn to F. The monodromy (5.2.46a) motivates the following ansatz:

$$F(\eta, \sigma, \phi) = \sqrt{\eta - \cos\sigma} \left(U(\eta) - \frac{\sigma}{\pi} T(\eta) \right) S(\sigma) V(\phi). \tag{5.2.52}$$

Plugging this into the Laplace equation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = U(\eta) &\left[\frac{1}{\eta^2 - 1} \frac{V''(\phi)}{V(\phi)} + \frac{S''(\sigma)}{S(\sigma)} + \frac{1}{U(\eta)} \left(\frac{1}{4} U(\eta) + 2\eta U'(\eta) + (\eta^2 - 1) U''(\eta) \right) - \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{T(\eta)}{U(\eta)} \frac{S'(\sigma)}{S(\sigma)} \right] \\ &- \frac{\sigma}{\pi} T(\eta) \left[\frac{1}{\eta^2 - 1} \frac{V''(\phi)}{V(\phi)} + \frac{S''(\sigma)}{S(\sigma)} + \frac{1}{T(\eta)} \left(\frac{1}{4} T(\eta) + 2\eta T'(\eta) + (\eta^2 - 1) T''(\eta) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.53}$$

If we take T, S and V to be the solutions of (5.2.48) given by (5.2.50), then the second line of (5.2.53) vanishes and we are left with

$$(\eta^2 - 1) U''(\eta) + 2\eta U'(\eta) + \left(\frac{1}{4} - k^2 - \frac{m^2}{\eta^2 - 1} \right) U(\eta) = \frac{2}{\pi} T(\eta) \frac{S'(\sigma)}{S(\sigma)}. \tag{5.2.54}$$

This differential equation differs from (5.2.49c) in its inhomogeneous term. The solution of (5.2.54) for a specific choice of $T(\eta)$ and $S(\sigma)$ can be easily found. We gave a few examples in appendix 5.C.

Even though we have to solve (5.2.54) to get explicit harmonic functions, the monodromy can be easily seen without solving it. Let us assume $k \in \mathbb{Z} + 1/2$ as in (5.2.51) to get an overall sign flip after going around the supertube ($\sigma \to \sigma + 2\pi$). We also set $m = 0$ because of the symmetry of our configuration. Then the monodromy is exactly what we want (5.2.46a):

$$F \to -F + 2G \quad \text{as} \quad \sigma \to \sigma + 2\pi. \tag{5.2.55}$$

If we choose a particular term in (5.2.42) with a specific value of n that we want to reproduce, the value of k can be determined and the equation (5.2.54) can be solved. Here we will focus on the first ($n = 0$) term in (5.2.43). The leading term in the large-$|z|$ expansion of $a'(z)$ is

$$a'_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2z}} = \sqrt{\frac{\eta}{2R}} e^{-i\sigma/2}, \tag{5.2.56}$$

where we have used the dictionary (5.2.40). Then we have to take $k = -1/2$ to reproduce this as a limit of the 3D harmonic function G. We can easily show that this is also correct choice for

a'_{D0} and F. With this choice, $T(\eta)$ is also fixed and is given by a linear combination of $P_0(\eta)$ and $Q_0(\eta)$.

The resulting harmonic functions can be written as

$$F(\eta,\sigma,\phi) = \sqrt{\eta-\cos\sigma}\, e^{-i\sigma/2} U(\eta) - \frac{\sigma}{\pi} G, \tag{5.2.57}$$

$$G(\eta,\sigma,\phi) = \sqrt{\eta-\cos\sigma}\, e^{-i\sigma/2} T(\eta), \tag{5.2.58}$$

where

$$T(\eta) = A_0 P_0(\eta) + B_0 Q_0(\eta) \tag{5.2.59}$$

and $U(\eta)$ is a solution of

$$(\eta^2-1)U''(\eta) + 2\eta U'(\eta) = -\frac{i}{\pi}\, T(\eta). \tag{5.2.60}$$

A_0 and B_0 are constant of integration which should be chosen from the boundary conditions.

It is easy to write down solutions explicitly if we impose boundary conditions at infinity, (5.2.41), before solving (5.2.60). The boundary condition at infinity, (5.2.41), leads to the condition

$$B_0 = 0, \tag{5.2.61}$$

since $Q_0(\eta)$ diverges at 3D infinity.[9] Then (5.2.60) is easily solved to give

$$U(\eta) = C_0 P_0(\eta) + D_0 Q_0(\eta) - \frac{i}{\pi} A_0 \ln\frac{\eta+1}{2}. \tag{5.2.62}$$

By imposing the same boundary condition at infinity on $U(\eta)$, (5.2.41), we conclude that

$$D_0 = 0. \tag{5.2.63}$$

The final expression for the harmonic functions is

$$F(\eta,\sigma,\phi) = \sqrt{\eta-\cos\sigma}\, e^{-i\sigma/2} \frac{i}{\pi} A_0 \left(\frac{\pi}{i}\frac{C_0}{A_0} - \ln\frac{\eta+1}{2} + i\sigma \right), \tag{5.2.64}$$

$$G(\eta,\sigma,\phi) = \sqrt{\eta-\cos\sigma}\, e^{-i\sigma/2} A_0, \tag{5.2.65}$$

where we used $P_0(\eta) = 1$.

[9] More precisely, $B_0 \neq 0$ would lead to divergence at 3D infinity and on the x^3-axis. If $\sigma \neq 0$, as we can see from (5.2.35), $\eta = 1$ corresponds to the points on the x^3-axis, $(x^1, x^2, x^3) = (0, 0, R\cot\frac{\sigma}{2})$. As $\eta \to 1$, $Q_{|k|-1/2}$ diverges as $\log(\eta-1)$ while the prefactor is finite: $\sqrt{\eta-\cos\sigma} = \sqrt{2}\,|\sin\frac{\sigma}{2}|$. Therefore, $B_0 \neq 0$ makes the harmonic function diverge on the x^3-axis and should be avoided.

Matching

We have obtained the solutions in the near and far regions. Let us fix the coefficients A_0 and C_0 by matching the two solutions in the intermediate region. This amounts to imposing the conditions (5.2.44). The near-ring ($\eta \to \infty$) expressions for F and G are

$$F \simeq \sqrt{\eta}\, e^{-i\sigma/2} \frac{i}{\pi} A_0 \left(\frac{\pi}{i} \frac{C_0}{A_0} - \ln \frac{\eta}{2} + i\sigma \right), \qquad G \simeq \sqrt{\eta}\, e^{-i\sigma/2} A_0. \tag{5.2.66}$$

Therefore, the conditions (5.2.44) read

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{i}{\pi} \sqrt{\eta}\, e^{-i\sigma/2} A_0 \left(\frac{\pi}{i} \frac{C_0}{A_0} - \ln \frac{\eta}{2} + i\sigma \right) &= \frac{i}{\pi} c \sqrt{\frac{\eta}{2R}}\, e^{-i\sigma/2} \left(\ln \frac{4R}{L} - \ln \frac{\eta}{2} + i\sigma \right), \\ \sqrt{\eta}\, e^{-i\sigma/2} A_0 &= c \sqrt{\frac{\eta}{2R}}\, e^{-i\sigma/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.67}$$

These determine the constants to be

$$A_0 = \frac{c}{\sqrt{2R}}, \qquad C_0 = \frac{i}{\pi} \frac{c}{\sqrt{2R}} \ln \frac{4R}{L}. \tag{5.2.68}$$

The final expression for the far-region solution is

$$F(\eta, \sigma, \phi) = \frac{ic}{\pi \sqrt{2R}} \sqrt{\eta - \cos\sigma}\, e^{-i\sigma/2} \left[-\ln \frac{L(\eta+1)}{8R} + i\sigma \right], \tag{5.2.69a}$$

$$G(\eta, \sigma, \phi) = \frac{c}{\sqrt{2R}} \sqrt{\eta - \cos\sigma}\, e^{-i\sigma/2}. \tag{5.2.69b}$$

5.3 Physical properties of the solution

In the previous section, we obtained the explicit expression for the harmonic functions (F, G) in (5.2.69) which describes the far-region behavior of a non-Abelian two-supertube configuration, at the leading order in a perturbative expansion. In terms of these complex harmonic functions, the real harmonic functions $\{V, K^I, L_I, M\}$ can be expressed via (5.A.5). Here we discuss some physical properties of this solution.

5.3.1 Geometry and charges

First, let us study the asymptotic form of the harmonic functions near 3D infinity, $r = \infty$, which corresponds to $\eta = 1, \sigma = 0$ in the toroidal coordinates. Using the relation (5.2.36), we find that

$$F = h_F + \frac{Q_F}{r} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{r^2}\right), \qquad G = h_G + \frac{Q_G}{r} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{r^2}\right), \tag{5.3.1}$$

where

$$h_F = h_G = 0, \tag{5.3.2}$$

$$Q_F = ic\sqrt{R}\,\nu, \qquad Q_G = c\sqrt{R} \tag{5.3.3}$$

with

$$\nu \equiv \frac{1}{\pi} \log \frac{4R}{L}. \tag{5.3.4}$$

The asymptotic form (5.3.1) is the same as that of the general codimension-3 harmonic function, (5.A.10). Note that, under our assumption (5.2.7),

$$\operatorname{Re} \nu = \frac{1}{\pi} \log \frac{4R}{|L|} \gg 1. \tag{5.3.5}$$

The asymptotic monopole charges of the solution can be read off from the coefficients of the $1/r$ terms in the harmonic functions, (5.3.3). The corresponding D-brane numbers N^0, N^I, N_I, N_0 can be determined from the relation (5.A.12). Explicitly,

$$N^3 + iN_1 = \frac{2ic\sqrt{R}\,\nu}{g_s l_s}, \qquad N^0 - iN^1 = \frac{2c\sqrt{R}}{g_s l_s}. \tag{5.3.6}$$

The entropy of the single-center black hole with charges (5.3.3) can be computed using (5.A.13):

$$S = \frac{8\pi\,|\operatorname{Im}(Q_F \bar{Q}_G)|}{g_s^2 l_s^2} = \frac{8\pi |c|^2 R}{g_s^2 l_s^2} \operatorname{Re} \nu. \tag{5.3.7}$$

This is non-vanishing because of (5.3.5) and therefore our solution has the same asymptotic charges as a black hole with a finite horizon area.

One peculiar thing about the harmonic functions (5.3.1) is that the constant terms always vanish, $h_F = h_G = 0$. This fact came from the harmonic analysis in the toroidal coordinates. For example, in the ansatz for G, (5.2.51), the prefactor goes as $\sqrt{\eta - \cos\sigma} \sim \sqrt{2}R/r$ in the 3D infinity limit $\eta \to 1, \sigma \to 0$. On the other hand, $P_{|k|-1/2}(\eta = 1) = 1$ and therefore $G \sim 1/r$ and does not have a constant term. We do not have the option of turning on $Q_{|k|-1/2}(\eta)$, because it diverges on the x^3-axis and should not be present (see footnote 9).

This means that this solution cannot have flat asymptotics. Instead, the asymptotic geometry is always the attractor geometry [37] of a single-center black hole with D6, D4, D2 and D0 charges in the near-horizon limit. Indeed, the asymptotic form of the type IIA geometry is easily seen from (2.1.24) to be

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2_{10,\text{str}} &= -\frac{1}{\operatorname{Im}(F\bar{G})}(dt+\omega)^2 + \operatorname{Im}(F\bar{G})\left(dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_2^2\right) + dx^2_{4567} + \operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{F}{G}\right) dx^2_{89} \\ &\sim -\frac{r^2}{\operatorname{Im}(Q_F\bar{Q}_G)} dt^2 + \operatorname{Im}(Q_F\bar{Q}_G)\left(\frac{dr^2}{r^2} + d\Omega_2^2\right) + dx^2_{4567} + \operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{Q_F}{Q_G}\right) dx^2_{89}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.8a}$$

$$e^{2\Phi} = \operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{F}{G}\right) \sim \operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{Q_F}{Q_G}\right). \tag{5.3.8b}$$

We see that this is $\mathrm{AdS}_2 \times S^2 \times T^6$ with radius $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{AdS}_2} = \mathcal{R}_{S^2} = \sqrt{\operatorname{Im}(Q_F\bar{Q}_G)}$.

Asymptotic charge versus local charge

It is interesting to compare the asymptotic charges (5.3.3) with the one that we would obtain from the behavior of fields near the supertubes. From (5.2.33) and (5.2.34), we find that the behavior of the harmonic functions F, G near the supertubes is

$$\begin{aligned} z \sim +L: &\qquad F \sim \text{const.}, &&G \sim -\frac{c}{2\pi\sqrt{L}}\log(z-L), \\ z \sim -L: &\qquad F \sim -\frac{ic}{2\pi\sqrt{L}}\log(z+L), &&G \sim \frac{ic}{2\pi\sqrt{L}}\log(z+L). \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.9}$$

If a codimension-2 source at $|z| = 0$ has D-brane number densities n^0, n^1, n^3 and n_1 per unit length for D6(456789), D4(6789), D4(4567), and D2(45) branes, respectively, then the harmonic functions will have the following logarithmic behavior:[10]

$$\begin{aligned} V &\sim -g_s l_s n^0 \log|z|, &\qquad K^1 &\sim -g_s l_s n^1 \log|z|, \\ K^3 &\sim -g_s l_s n^3 \log|z|, &\qquad L_1 &\sim -g_s l_s n_1 \log|z|. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.11}$$

Or, in terms of the complex harmonic functions F, G,

$$F \sim -g_s l_s (n^3 + i n_1)\log|z|, \qquad G \sim -g_s l_s (n^0 - i n^1)\log|z|. \tag{5.3.12}$$

Comparing this with (5.3.9), we see that the D-brane number densities are

$$\begin{aligned} z = +L: &\qquad n^3 + i n_1 = 0, &&n^0 - i n^1 = \frac{c}{2\pi g_s l_s \sqrt{L}}, \\ z = -L: &\qquad n^3 + i n_1 = \frac{ic}{2\pi g_s l_s \sqrt{L}}, &&n^0 - i n^1 = -\frac{ic}{2\pi g_s l_s \sqrt{L}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.13}$$

Because these charges are distributed over rings of radius approximately R, the total D-brane numbers would be

$$N^3 + i N_1 \stackrel{?}{=} \frac{icR}{g_s l_s \sqrt{L}}, \qquad N^0 - i N^1 \stackrel{?}{=} \frac{(1-i)cR}{g_s l_s \sqrt{L}}. \tag{5.3.14}$$

These are completely different from the charge we observe at infinity, (5.3.6).

The reason why we obtained incorrect total charges (5.3.14) is that our solution is multi-valued. In normal situations, the Gaussian surface on which we integrate fluxes to obtain charges can be continuously deformed from asymptotic infinity to small surfaces enclosing local charges. However, in the present case, the fields in our solution are multi-valued because of the monodromies around the supertubes, and so are the fluxes. Another way of saying this is that

[10] For example, if we array D6-branes at intervals of distance a, from (5.A.11)

$$V \sim \frac{g_s l_s}{2}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|z|^2 + na}} \sim \frac{g_s l_s}{2a}\int_{-\Lambda}^{\Lambda} \frac{dx}{\sqrt{|z|^2 + x^2}} \sim -\frac{g_s l_s}{a}\log\frac{|z|}{2\Lambda} + \mathcal{O}(\Lambda^{-2}) \tag{5.3.10}$$

where Λ is a cutoff. By replacing a with $1/n^0$, we obtain (5.3.11).

there is a branch cut (or disk) inside each of the two tubes, and the fluxes are discontinuous across it. When we deform the Gaussian surface at infinity, we cannot shrink them to enclose just the supertubes; all we can do is to deform it into two surfaces, each of which encloses one entire branch disk with the supertube on its circumference. When we evaluate the flux integral on the Gaussian surfaces, there will be contributions not just from the supertubes but also from (the discontinuity in) the fluxes on the disks. The difference between (5.3.6) and (5.3.14) is due to the contribution from the fluxes on the disks.

This situation of branch cuts carrying charge by the discontinuity in the fluxes across it is an example of the so-called Cheshire charge that appears in the presence of vortices with non-trivial monodromies called Alice strings [114, 115, 116]. For discussions on the realizations of Alice strings in string theory, see [117, 118].

When integrating fluxes on Gaussian surfaces to compute charges in the presence of Chern-Simons interactions (such as supergravity in 11, 10, and 5 dimensions), one must be careful about different definitions of charges [79]. The relevant one here is the Page charge, which is conserved, localized, quantized, and gauge-invariant under small gauge transformations. For Page charge, we can freely deform a Gaussian surface unless they cross a charge source or a branch cut for the fluxes. The discussion of charges in the paragraphs above is understood to be using the Page charge. For the explicit form of the Page fluxes for D-brane charges, see, e.g., appendix A.1 and [36, Appendix D].

Angular momentum

By solving equation (5.A.8) for the harmonic functions given in (5.2.69), we find

$$\omega = \frac{|c|^2}{2\pi}\left(\eta+1)\ln\frac{|L|(\eta+1)}{8R} + 2\ln\frac{4R}{|L|}\right)d\phi, \tag{5.3.15}$$

where the integration constant was fixed by requiring that ω vanish at $\eta = 1$ (3D infinity). In spherical polar coordinates (r, θ, φ), the asymptotic behavior of (5.3.15) as $r \to \infty$ is

$$\omega \simeq \frac{|c|^2 R^2}{\pi}\left(1 + \ln\frac{|L|}{4R}\right)\frac{\sin^2\theta}{r^2}d\varphi = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{r^2}\right). \tag{5.3.16}$$

In four dimensions, the angular momentum is given by the $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{r}\right)$ term in the (t, i) components of the metric, which is nothing but the one-form ω in our case. Therefore, we conclude that the 4D angular momentum J of our configuration vanishes:

$$J = 0. \tag{5.3.17}$$

Note that (5.3.16) means that the entire angular momentum vector vanishes, not just its x^3 component.

5.3.2 Closed timelike curves

No-CTC conditions for the one-modulus class solutions with $\tau^1 = \tau^2 = i$ were briefly discussed in section 5.A.1. For the explicit harmonic functions of the far-region solution (5.2.69), the condition (5.A.9) gives

$$\mathrm{Im}(F\bar{G}) = \frac{|c|^2(\eta - \cos\sigma)}{2\pi R} \ln \frac{8R}{|L|(\eta+1)} \simeq \frac{|c|^2\eta}{2\pi R} \ln \frac{8R}{|L|\eta} \geq 0 \tag{5.3.18}$$

for large η (near the supertube). This means that, in order not to have CTCs, we must restrict the range of the variable η to be

$$\eta \lesssim \frac{8R}{|L|}. \tag{5.3.19}$$

Namely, the far-region solution has CTCs very near the tube.

Next, let us consider the positivity of the metric (2.1.29) along the supertube direction, ϕ. This gives

$$-\frac{\omega^2}{\mathcal{Q}} + \frac{R^2(\eta^2-1)}{(\eta-\cos\sigma)^2} d\phi^2 \geq 0. \tag{5.3.20}$$

After plugging the explicit expression for ω (5.3.15), we can rewrite (5.3.20) as

$$\frac{R^2 d\phi^2}{(\eta-\cos\sigma)^2 \left[\ln \frac{|L|(\eta+1)}{8R}\right]^2} \times \left((\eta^2-1)\left[\ln\frac{|L|(\eta+1)}{8R}\right]^2 - \left[(\eta+1)\ln\frac{|L|(\eta+1)}{8R} + 2\ln\frac{4R}{|L|}\right]^2 \right) \geq 0. \tag{5.3.21}$$

Near the ring ($\eta \to \infty$), the no-CTC condition (5.3.21) gives

$$-2\eta \ln\left(\frac{2R\eta}{|L|}\right) \ln\left(\frac{|L|\eta}{8R}\right) \geq 0, \tag{5.3.22}$$

which is satisfied for

$$\frac{|L|}{2R} < 1 \leq \eta \leq \frac{8R}{|L|}. \tag{5.3.23}$$

The lower bound does not impose any condition on η because $\eta \geq 1$ by definition, and the upper bound is the same as (5.3.19).

So, we found that there are CTCs in the far-region solution very near the ring, $\eta \sim \frac{8R}{|L|}$. However, this does *not* represent a problem with our solution. It only indicates that, too much near the ring, the description in terms of the far-region solution with a single ring breaks down and we must instead switch to the near-region solution with two rings. Indeed, by the relation (5.2.40), $\eta \sim \frac{R}{|L|}$ corresponds to $|z| \sim |L|$ in the near region, which is the distance scale at which the single "effective" supertube must be resolved into two supertubes. This is exactly parallel to the familiar story in the context of F-theory [119, 120]. In type IIB perturbative string theory, the O7-plane has negative tension and its backreacted metric has a wrong signature very near

its worldvolume. However, in F-theory, non-perturbative effects resolve the O7-plane into two (p, q) 7-branes and replace the wrong-signature metric by a new metric with the correct signature everywhere. The two (p, q) 7-branes have non-commuting monodromies of the $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ duality of type IIB string. We are seeing exactly the same phenomenon in a more involved situation with circular supertubes.

To rigirously show that our solution is completely free from CTCs, we must construct the exact solution by summing up the infinite perturbative series, because the perturbative solution to any finite order will have CTCs (this is related to the limitation of the matching expansion discussed below (5.2.20)). However, that is beyond the scope of the present thesis and we will leave it as future research.

5.3.3 Bound or unbound?

Our 2-supertube configuration has three parameters: $c \in \mathbb{C}$ determines the overall amplitude of the harmonic functions, $L \in \mathbb{C}$ parametrizes the distance and the angle between two supertubes, and $R > 0$ is the average radius of the two supertubes. The crucial question is: does this represent a bound state or not?

In the case of codimension-3 solutions, allowed multi-center configurations are determined by imposing equation (2.2.2). How this works is as follows. One first fixes the value of moduli (the constant terms in H), the number of centers (say N), and the charges of each center (Γ^p, $p = 1, \ldots, N$). By plugging these data into (2.2.2), we can fix the inter-center distances x_{pq}. After this, some parameters will remain unfixed. They parametrize the internal degrees of freedom of the multi-center configuration, similar to the internal atomic motion inside a molecule. When it is a bound state, it is not possible to take some centers infinitely far away from the rest of the centers by tuning the parameters.

In our solution, the asymptotic moduli have already been fixed to the attractor value [37]. We have two codimension-2 supertube centers, and we know that the total monopole charges are given by (Q_F, Q_G). Actually, as we will discuss below, the monopole charges of each of the two supertubes can be also determined if we fix the complex charges Q_F, Q_G. So, the question is whether there is some free parameter left by tuning which we can make the two tubes infinitely far apart. If so, then the configuration is unbound. Otherwise, it is bound.

Our solution contains five real parameters ($R \in \mathbb{R}$; $c, L \in \mathbb{C}$) and four of them can be determined by fixing $Q_{F,G} \in \mathbb{C}$. So, we seem to be left with one free real parameter. For example, we can take it to be $|L|$, the absolute value of the inter-tube distance parameter L. If $|L|$ could take an arbitrarily large value, the two tubes could be separated infinitely far away from each other and thus the solution would be unbound. Physically, however, we expect that we can constrain this parameter by requiring the absence of CTCs [54, 55], and that the tubes

cannot be infinitely separated. Such no-CTC analysis would be possible *if we knew the exact solution*. The problem is that we only have a perturbative solution in the matching expansion. As we saw in the previous section, perturbative solutions have apparent CTCs and are not suitable for such analysis.

To work around this problem, we will instead make use of supertube physics to argue that all the parameters are constrained and thus our non-Abelian solution represents a bound state. Actually, we can fix all the parameters from this argument. It is not a rigorous argument, but is robust enough to give convincing evidence that the solution represents a bound state.

5.3.4 An argument for a bound state

We know that the monodromy matrices of the two supertubes sitting at $z = \pm L$ are

$$M_L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad M_{-L} = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 2 \\ -2 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.3.24}$$

In appendix 5.B.2, we derived the monodromy matrix of the supertube produced by the supertube transition of a general 1/4-BPS codimension-3 center. In the one-modulus class that we are working in ($\tau^1 = \tau^2 = i$, τ^3: any), a general 1/4-BPS codimension-3 center has charge $\Gamma = \frac{g_s l_s}{2}(a, (b, b, c), (d, d, a), -\frac{c}{2})$, where $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$, $ad + bc = 0$ and not all of a, b, c, d simultaneously vanish. Using the formulas (5.B.17) and (5.B.18), it is easy to see that the unique sets of charges that lead to supertubes with monodromy $M_{\pm L}$ are the ones with

$$M_L: \ c = d = 0, \qquad M_{-L}: \ a = -c, \ b = d, \tag{5.3.25}$$

with the dipole charge $q = 2$ for both cases. In terms of complex charges (cf. (5.A.12)),

$$Q_F = \frac{g_s l_s}{2}(c + id), \qquad Q_G = \frac{g_s l_s}{2}(a - ib), \tag{5.3.26}$$

the condition (5.3.25) can be written as:

$$M_L: \ Q_F = 0, \qquad M_{-L}: \ Q_F = -Q_G. \tag{5.3.27}$$

The supertubes at $z = \pm L$ must have come from two codimension-3 centers with charges satisfying this condition, respectively.[11]

From (5.3.3), the total charges of our two-supertube configuration is

$$\begin{pmatrix} Q_F \\ Q_G \end{pmatrix}_{\text{total}} = c\sqrt{R} \begin{pmatrix} i\nu \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.3.28}$$

[11] To be precise, by charges here, we mean Page charges discussed in section 5.3.1.

Let us split this total charge into the ones for the $z = +L$ supertube and the ones for the $z = -L$ supertube as

$$\begin{pmatrix} Q_F \\ Q_G \end{pmatrix}_{\text{total}} = \begin{pmatrix} Q_F \\ Q_G \end{pmatrix}_{L} + \begin{pmatrix} Q_F \\ Q_G \end{pmatrix}_{-L}, \tag{5.3.29}$$

and require that the individual charges satisfy the condition (5.3.27), namely,

$$Q_{F,L} = 0, \qquad Q_{F,-L} = -Q_{G,-L}. \tag{5.3.30}$$

We immediately find

$$\begin{pmatrix} Q_F \\ Q_G \end{pmatrix}_{L} = c\sqrt{R}\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1+i\nu \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \begin{pmatrix} Q_F \\ Q_G \end{pmatrix}_{-L} = c\sqrt{R}\begin{pmatrix} i\nu \\ -i\nu \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.3.31}$$

In our solution we have two codimension-2 supertubes, instead of codimension-3 centers. However, these supertubes must still carry the original monopole charges (5.3.31) dissolved into their worldvolume. Using the relation (5.A.5), we can express (5.3.31) in terms of charges vectors as

$$\Gamma_{\pm L} = \left(\operatorname{Re} Q_G, (-\operatorname{Im} Q_G, -\operatorname{Im} Q_G, \operatorname{Re} Q_F), (\operatorname{Im} Q_F, \operatorname{Im} Q_F, \operatorname{Re} Q_G), -\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Re} Q_F\right)_{\pm L}. \tag{5.3.32}$$

The radii and angular momentum of the configuration are determined by the charges of the centers. Then, we can study what the radii of the circular supertubes generated by the supertube transition of codimension-3 centers with charges (5.3.31) are. This has been worked out in appendix 5.B.3 and, using the formula (5.B.21), it is not difficult to show that the radii of the supertubes at $z = \pm L$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_L^2 &= R|c(1+i\nu)|^2 = R|c|^2\left[1 + \frac{2l}{\pi} + \frac{1}{\pi^2}\left(\left(\log\frac{4R}{|L|}\right)^2 + l^2\right)\right], \\ \mathcal{R}_{-L}^2 &= R|c|^2|\nu|^2 = \frac{R|c|^2}{\pi^2}\left(\left(\log\frac{4R}{|L|}\right)^2 + l^2\right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.33}$$

In deriving this, each supertube was assumed to be in isolation; the actual radii must be corrected by the interaction between the two tubes. On the other hand, the radii squared of the two tubes in our actual solution are

$$(R \pm \operatorname{Re} L)^2 = (R \pm |L|\cos l)^2. \tag{5.3.34}$$

As a preliminary, zeroth-order approximation, let us equate (5.3.33) and (5.3.34). It is not difficult to show that, unless $l = -\frac{\pi}{2}$, there is no solution that is consistent with the colliding limit, $\frac{R}{|L|} \gg 1$. If $l = -\frac{\pi}{2}$, the two supertubes have the same radius and the condition that (5.3.33) equals (5.3.34) gives

$$|c| = \frac{\sqrt{R}}{|\nu|} = \frac{\pi\sqrt{R}}{\sqrt{\left(\log\frac{4R}{|L|}\right)^2 + \frac{\pi^2}{4}}}. \tag{5.3.35}$$

The total charges (5.3.3) are, if we set $c = |c|e^{i\gamma}$,

$$(Q_F, Q_G) = c\sqrt{R}\,(i\nu, 1) = \frac{e^{i\gamma}R}{\sqrt{\left(\log\frac{4R}{|L|}\right)^2 + \frac{\pi^2}{4}}}\left(i\log\frac{4R}{|L|} - \frac{\pi}{2}, \pi\right). \tag{5.3.36}$$

Fixing these charges will fix $\gamma, R, |L|$. So, everything is fixed.

In summary, consideration of supertube physics suggests that the configurational parameters of our two-supertube solution are all fixed if we fix the asymptotic charges. In particular, it is impossible to take the two tubes infinitely far apart. This is strong evidence that our solution is a bound state. Having the same asymptotic charges as a black hole with a finite horizon, it should represent a microstate of a genuine black hole. Our argument is not rigorous in the sense that, in computing the supertube radii (5.3.33), we ignored the interaction between the tubes. Therefore, precise values such as $l = -\frac{\pi}{2}$ may not be reliable. However, we expect that it captures the essential physics and the conclusion remains valid even for more accurate treatments.

5.3.5 A cancellation mechanism for angular momentum

In the last section, we pointed out the puzzling fact that the total angular momentum of our solution vanishes, even though the two constituent supertubes are expected to carry non-vanishing angular momentum. Here, we argue that this is due to cancellation between the angular momentum $J_{\pm L}$ carried by the two individual tubes and the angular momentum J_{cross} that comes from the electromagnetic crossing between the two tubes; namely,

$$J_{\text{total}} = J_L + J_{-L} + J_{\text{cross}} \approx 0. \tag{5.3.37}$$

Just as in section 5.3.4, our argument will not be rigorous; we will see that (5.3.37) holds only to the leading order in $\frac{|L|}{R}$. We expect that, in an exact treatment, (5.3.37) will hold as a precise equality. However, this study is beyond the scope of this thesis.

In our solution, we have two round supertubes which were produced by the supertube effect of codimension-3 centers with charges (5.3.31). In appendix 5.B.3, we computed the angular momentum carried by a round supertube created from a general 1/4-BPS codimension-3 center. Applying the formula (5.B.21) to the charges (5.3.31), it is not difficult to show that the component of angular momentum along the axis of the tubes (x^3-axis) is[12]

$$J_L = -\frac{R|c|^2(1 + |\nu|^2 - 2\,\mathrm{Im}\,\nu)}{4G_4}, \qquad J_{-L} = -\frac{R|c|^2|\nu|^2}{4G_4}. \tag{5.3.38}$$

Now let us turn to J_{cross}. For multi-center codimension-3 solutions with charge vectors Γ^p, there is non-vanishing angular momentum coming from the crossing between electric and

[12]The sign was determined from the sign of $\omega_2 = \omega_\phi/R$ in (5.2.23) near $z = \pm L$ using (5.2.33) and (5.2.34).

magnetic fields given by [44]

$$\mathbf{J}_{\text{cross}} = \frac{1}{2G_4} \sum_{p<q} \langle \Gamma^p, \Gamma^q \rangle \frac{\mathbf{x}_{pq}}{|\mathbf{x}_{pq}|}, \qquad \mathbf{x}_{pq} \equiv \mathbf{x}_p - \mathbf{x}_q. \tag{5.3.39}$$

In the present case, we have supertubes with codimension 2, not 3. However, let us still apply this formula using the tubes' monopole charges (5.3.31) (or (5.3.32)) . This is not precise, but must give a rough approximation of the crossing angular momentum for our solution. Using (5.3.31) and (5.3.32), the component of the angular momentum along the tube axis is[13]

$$J_{\text{cross}} = \frac{1}{2G_4} \langle \Gamma_{-L}, \Gamma_L \rangle = -\frac{R|c|^2(\text{Im}\,\nu - |\nu|^2)}{2G_4}. \tag{5.3.40}$$

If we add (5.3.40) and (5.3.39), we get

$$J_L + J_{-L} + J_{\text{cross}} = -\frac{R|c|^2}{4G_4}. \tag{5.3.41}$$

This is much smaller than the individual terms:

$$J_L, J_{-L}, J_{\text{cross}} \sim \frac{R|c|^2|\nu|^2}{G_4} \sim \frac{R|c|^2(\log \frac{R}{|L|})^2}{G_4} \tag{5.3.42}$$

because we are taking the limit $\frac{R}{|L|} \gg 1$. Therefore, we conclude that (5.3.37) holds to the leading order in $\frac{|L|}{R}$.

This is an interesting observation, suggesting that the vanishing of angular momentum in our configuration is indeed due to cancellation between the "tube" angular momentum and the "cross" angular momentum. Presumably, the nonzero reminder (5.3.41) gets canceled if we take into account the contribution to the angular momentum arising from the interaction between the two tubes (recall that we computed the angular momentum of supertubes as if they were in isolation).

5.4 Future directions

We constructed our solution by taking the configuration that appeared in the SU(2) Seiberg-Witten theory as the near-region solution. More specifically, it was a holomorphic fibration of a genus-1 Riemann surface on a base of complex dimension 1. However, this is just an example, so any other such holomorphic fibration will work. In particular, any F-theory solution can be used for the near-region solution. In the standard F-theory background, the metric only knows about the torus modulus τ, but in our case we also need the periods (a_D, a) and richer structure is expected. We can generalize this structure by replacing the torus fiber by a higher-genus Riemann surface. For example, if one considers compactification of type IIA on $T^2 \times K3$,

[13] In section 5.3.4, we argued that the physically allowed configuration in the limit $\frac{R}{|L|} \gg 1$ has $l = -\frac{\pi}{2}$, which means that the center of the $z = \pm L$ tubes are at $x^3 = \mp|L|$. This determines the sign of (5.3.40).

the U-duality group becomes $\mathrm{O}(22,6;\mathbb{Z})$, which contains the genus-2 modular group $\mathrm{Sp}(4,\mathbb{R})$. Therefore, one can construct configuration of more general supertubes using a fibration of a genus-2 Riemann surface over a base [121]. One can also consider generalizing the base. In the near region the base is complex 1-dimensional, while in the far region it is real 3-dimensional. By including an internal S^1 direction, one can extend the base to a complex 2-dimensional space, where a supertube must appear as a complex curve around which there is a monodromy of the fiber. In such a setup, one can use the power of complex analysis and it might help to construct solutions on a real 3-dimensional base as the one we encountered in the current thesis.

It is known that the geometry of the Seiberg-Witten theory has a string theory realization [119, 122, 123]. If one realizes the Seiberg-Witten curve as a configuration of F-theory 7-branes, then the worldvolume theory of a probe D3-brane in that geometry is exactly the $d=4,\mathcal{N}=2$ theory. One may wonder if our solution also represents a moduli space of some gauge theory on a probe D-brane. However, such interpretation does not seem straightforward. The near-region geometry looks very similar to F-theory configurations, but the 7-brane in the current setup is not just a pure 7-brane but it has some worldvolume fluxes turned on to carry 5-brane and 1-brane charges. Therefore, it is not immediately obvious what probe brane one should take. Furthermore, although the near-region configuration preserves 16 supersymmetries, only 4 supersymmetries are preserved in the far region, as a four-charge black hole microstate. A brane probe will most likely halve the supersymmetries in each region. So, the relevant theory seems to be $d=3,\mathcal{N}=1$ (or $d=2,\mathcal{N}=2$) theory whose moduli space has a special locus, which corresponds to the near region, at which supersymmetry is enhanced to $\mathcal{N}=4$ (or $\mathcal{N}=8$). It is interesting to investigate what the theory can be.

We developed techniques to construct solutions in the far and near regions separately and connect them by a matching expansion. We worked out only first terms in the expansion, but one can in principle carry out this to any order. In some situations one may be able to carry out the infinite sum and obtain the exact solution in entire $\mathbb{R}^3$. Such exact solutions are important because, as discussed below (5.2.20), there are features of the exact solution that are not visible at any finite order. Such features include the precise structure of the monodromy and the metric near the supertubes. They are crucial to analyze the no-CTC condition near the supertubes and fix parameters of the solution, such as L and R. We hope to be able to report development in that direction in near future.

In this chapter, we mainly considered the case where two of the three moduli are frozen. It is interesting to investigate possible solutions in the case where this assumption is relaxed. In appendix 5.A.2, we discussed the case where two moduli are dynamical. For example, it is interesting to study how the solutions studied in the previous chapter fit in the formulation developed in appendix 5.A.2. Relatedly, we assumed that in the near region the modulus τ^3

is holomorphic. However, as far as supersymmetry is concerned, this is not necessary; the only requirement is that the harmonic functions be written as a sum of holomorphic and anti-holomorphic functions. It would be interesting to see if there are physically allowed solutions for which τ^3 is not holomorphic.

Our configuration has the same asymptotic charge as a 4D black hole. 4D black holes are often discussed in the context of the $\mathrm{AdS}_3/\mathrm{CFT}_2$ duality where the boundary CFT is the so-called MSW CFT [4]. However, this CFT is not as well-understood as the D1-D5 CFT which appears as the dual of black hole systems in 5D. It is interesting to see if our solutions can be generalized to construct a microstate for 5D black holes; for recent work to relate microstates of the MSW CFT and those of the D1-D5 CFT, see [34].

Appendix 5.A Constrained configurations

5.A.1 Configurations with only one modulus

In chapters 2 and 4, we have been discussing configurations for which all moduli τ^I, $I = 1, 2, 3$ can in principle be all non-trivial. Now let us focus on configurations with

$$\tau^1 = \tau^2 = i, \qquad \tau^3 = \text{arbitrary}. \tag{5.A.1}$$

Although being particular instances of the general solution, they can still describe a wide range of physical configurations, such as ones with multiple centers with codimension 3 and 2. This class of solutions provides a particularly nice setup for our purpose of constructing codimension-2 solutions with non-Abelian monodromies. This class is nothing but a type IIA realization of the solution called the SWIP solution in the literature [95]. Here we discuss some generalities about this class.

Using the expression (2.1.27) for τ^I in terms of harmonic functions, we see that the condition (5.A.1) implies the following relations:[14]

$$K^1 = K^2, \qquad L_1 = L_2, \qquad L_3 = V, \qquad M = -\frac{K^3}{2}, \tag{5.A.2}$$

leaving four independent harmonic functions. If we plug these expressions into (2.1.27), we obtain

$$\tau^3 = \frac{K^3 + iL_1}{V - iK^1} = \frac{F}{G}, \tag{5.A.3}$$

where we defined complex combinations

$$F \equiv K^3 + iL_1, \qquad G \equiv V - iK^1. \tag{5.A.4}$$

[14] For simplicity, we set $R_i = l_s$ for $i = 4, \ldots, 9$.

As we can see from (B.4), the pair $\binom{F}{G}$ transforms as a (complex) doublet under $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_3$. From the expression (5.A.3), it is obvious that τ^3 undergoes linear fractional transformation under $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_3$ (although we already said this in (B.5) in general). The harmonic functions are written in terms of them as

$$\begin{aligned} V = \mathrm{Re}\, G, \qquad K^1 = K^2 = -\,\mathrm{Im}\, G, \qquad K^3 = \mathrm{Re}\, F, \\ L_1 = L_2 = \mathrm{Im}\, F, \qquad L_3 = \mathrm{Re}\, G, \qquad M = -\frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{Re}\, F. \end{aligned} \tag{5.A.5}$$

In terms of the complex quantities F, G, some previous formulas become

$$\langle H, H' \rangle = \mathrm{Re}(F\bar{G}' - G\bar{F}'), \tag{5.A.6}$$

$$\mathcal{Q} = (\mathrm{Im}\, F\bar{G})^2. \tag{5.A.7}$$

The equation for ω, (2.1.19), reads

$$*_3\, d\omega = \mathrm{Re}\left(F d\bar{G} - G d\bar{F}\right). \tag{5.A.8}$$

Let us consider the general no-CTC conditions. Under the constraint (5.A.2), the condition (2.1.28a) is automatically satisfied because $\mathcal{Q} = (\mathrm{Im}\, F\bar{G})^2 \geq 0$. On the other hand, the condition (2.1.28b) gives

$$\mathrm{Im}(F\bar{G}) = |G|^2\, \mathrm{Im}\, \tau^3 \geq 0. \tag{5.A.9}$$

Here we have seen that switching off two moduli τ^1 and τ^2 leads to a substantial simplification. In appendix 5.A.2, we discuss switching off one modulus τ^1, which also leads to interesting simplification.

In the one-modulus class we are discussing, the harmonic functions (2.2.1) can be rewritten in terms of the complex harmonic function (5.A.4) as

$$F = h_F + \sum_{p=1}^{N} \frac{Q_F^p}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_p|}, \qquad G = h_G + \sum_{p=1}^{N} \frac{Q_G^p}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_p|}, \tag{5.A.10}$$

where the complex quantities (h_F, h_G) and (Q_F^p, Q_G^p) are related to the real quantities h and Γ^p, respectively, just as (F, G) are related to H via (5.A.5). We will refer to (Q_F, Q_G) as complex charges.

Note that the components of the charge vector $\Gamma = \{\Gamma^0, \Gamma^I, \Gamma_I, \Gamma_0\}$ are related to the quantized D-brane numbers by

$$\Gamma^0 = \frac{g_s l_s}{2} N^0, \qquad \Gamma^I = \frac{g_s l_s}{2} N^I, \qquad \Gamma_I = \frac{g_s l_s}{2} N_I, \qquad \Gamma_0 = \frac{g_s l_s}{4} N_0, \tag{5.A.11}$$

where $N^0, N^I, N_I, N_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ (here we set the radii of the internal torus directions to $l_s = \sqrt{\alpha'}$). Then using (5.A.5) and (5.A.11), we can see that they are related to quantized charges by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_F = \frac{g_s l_s}{2}(N^3 + iN_1), \qquad Q_G = \frac{g_s l_s}{2}(N^0 - iN^1), \\ N^1 = N^2, \qquad N_1 = N_2, \qquad N^0 = N_3, \qquad N^3 = -N_0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.A.12}$$

The black hole entropy (2.2.6) can be written as

$$S = \frac{8\pi\,|\mathrm{Im}(Q_F\bar{Q}_G)|}{g_s^2 l_s^2} = 2\pi\,|N^3N^1 + N_1N^0|. \tag{5.A.13}$$

5.A.2 Configurations with only two moduli

Let us consider configurations with one modulus set to a trivial value. Specifically, we set

$$\tau^1 = i, \qquad \tau^2, \tau^3 : \text{arbitrary}. \tag{5.A.14}$$

This choice fixes two harmonic functions; from (2.1.27), we find

$$-L_1 - 2iM = \frac{(K^2 + iL_3)(K^3 + iL_2)}{V - iK^1}. \tag{5.A.15}$$

Only six harmonic functions are independent. In this case, the expression for the other moduli $\tau^{2,3}$ simplifies to

$$\tau^2 = \frac{K^2 + iL_3}{V - iK^1}, \qquad \tau^3 = \frac{K^3 + iL_2}{V - iK^1}. \tag{5.A.16}$$

Because τ^2 undergoes linear fractional transformation under $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_2$, we can set[15]

$$K^2 + iL_3 = H_2F_2, \qquad V - iK^1 = H_2G_2, \tag{5.A.17}$$

where under $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_2$ the pair $\binom{F_2}{G_2}$ transforms as a doublet while H_2 is invariant. The quantities F_2, G_2, H_2 are complex. With this choice (5.A.17), τ^2 is invariant under $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_3$ as it should be. Similarly, because τ^3 undergoes linear fractional transformation under $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_3$, we can set

$$K^3 + iL_2 = H_3F_3, \qquad V - iK^1 = H_3G_3, \tag{5.A.18}$$

where under $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_3$ the pair $\binom{F_3}{G_3}$ transforms as a doublet while H_3 is invariant. F_3, G_3, H_3 are complex. Combining (5.A.17) and (5.A.18), we find that $H_2 = G_3$ and $H_3 = G_2$ and therefore

$$K^2 + iL_3 = F_2G_3, \qquad V - iK^1 = G_2G_3, \qquad K^3 + iL_2 = G_2F_3, \tag{5.A.19}$$

with which (5.A.15) becomes

$$-L_1 - 2iM = F_2F_3. \tag{5.A.20}$$

The moduli (5.A.16) can now be written as

$$\tau^2 = \frac{F_2}{G_2}, \qquad \tau^3 = \frac{F_3}{G_3}. \tag{5.A.21}$$

[15] Actually, one could more generally set $K^2 + iL_3 = \sum_i H_2^{(i)}F_2^{(i)}$, $V - iK^1 = \sum_i H_2^{(i)}G_2^{(i)}$ where $\binom{F_2^{(i)}}{G_2^{(i)}}$ transforms as a doublet under $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_2$ for all i. However, τ^1 would not be invariant under $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_3$, unless the i summation contains only one term. For a different argument for (5.A.19), (5.A.20), see appendix B.

In terms of $F_{2,3}, G_{2,3}$, the harmonic functions are

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \operatorname{Re} G_2 G_3, \quad K^1 = -\operatorname{Im} G_2 G_3, \quad K^2 = \operatorname{Re} F_2 G_3, \quad K^3 = \operatorname{Re} G_2 F_3, \\ L_1 &= -\operatorname{Re} F_2 F_3, \quad L_2 = \operatorname{Im} G_2 F_3, \quad L_3 = \operatorname{Im} F_2 G_3, \quad M = -\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im} F_2 F_3. \end{aligned} \tag{5.A.22}$$

Because we are parametrizing 6 real harmonic functions using 4 complex functions $F_{2,3}, G_{2,3}$, there is redundancy: the transformation $\binom{F_2}{G_2} \to H\binom{F_2}{G_2}$, $\binom{F_3}{G_3} \to H^{-1}\binom{F_3}{G_3}$, where H is a complex function, leaves the harmonic functions invariant.

Let us consider the no-CTC conditions (2.1.28). The condition (2.1.28a) is automatically satisfied because $\mathcal{Q} = (K^1 K^3 + L_2 V)^2 (K^1 K^2 + L_3 V)^2 / ((K^1)^2 + V^2)^2 \geq 0$. The conditions $V Z_I \geq 0$, (2.1.28b), become

$$\begin{aligned} V Z_2 &= K^1 K^3 + L_2 V = |G_2|^2 \operatorname{Im}(F_3 \bar{G}_3) = |G_2 G_3|^2 \operatorname{Im} \tau^3 \geq 0, \\ V Z_3 &= K^1 K^2 + L_3 V = |G_3|^2 \operatorname{Im}(F_2 \bar{G}_2) = |G_2 G_3|^2 \operatorname{Im} \tau^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.A.23}$$

Appendix 5.B Supertubes in the one-modulus class

In section 5.A.1, we discussed a class of harmonic solutions for which only one modulus, $\tau^3 = \tau$, is turned on. (This class is nothing but a type IIA realization of the solution called the SWIP solution in the literature [95].) Here let us study some properties of supertubes described in this class.

5.B.1 Condition for a 1/4-BPS codimension-3 center

Let us consider a codimension-3 center in the harmonic solution and let the charge vector of the center be Γ. In terms of quantized charges, Γ can be written as

$$\Gamma = \frac{g_s l_s}{2} \left(a, (b, b, c), (d, d, a), -\frac{c}{2} \right), \tag{5.B.1}$$

where $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$. Here, we took into account the constraint (5.A.2) and charge quantization (5.A.11). In general, this center represents a 1/8-BPS center preserving 4 supercharges, with entropy (see (5.A.13))

$$S = 2\pi \sqrt{j_4(\Gamma)}, \qquad j_4(\Gamma) \equiv (ad + bc)^2. \tag{5.B.2}$$

We would like to find the condition for the charge vector Γ to represent a 1/4-BPS center preserving 8 supercharges, which can undergo a supertube transition into a codimension-2 center.

According to [75], a center with charge vector Γ represents

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{four-charge 1/8-BPS center} &\Leftrightarrow j_4(\Gamma) > 0. \\
\text{three-charge 1/8-BPS center} &\Leftrightarrow j_4(\Gamma) = 0,\ \frac{\partial j_4}{\partial x_i} \neq 0 \\
\text{two-charge 1/4-BPS center} &\Leftrightarrow j_4(\Gamma) = \frac{\partial j_4}{\partial x_i} = 0,\ \frac{\partial^2 j_4}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \neq 0 \\
\text{1-charge 1/2-BPS center} &\Leftrightarrow j_4(\Gamma) = \frac{\partial j_4}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial^2 j_4}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} = 0,\ \frac{\partial^3 j_4}{\partial x_i \partial x_j \partial x_k} \neq 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.B.3}$$

where x_i represents charges of D-branes which, in the present case, are a, b, c, d. Applying this to the present case, we find that

$$\text{four-charge 1/8-BPS center} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad ad + bc \neq 0, \tag{5.B.4a}$$

$$\text{two-charge 1/4-BPS center} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad ad + bc = 0, \quad \text{but not } a = b = c = d = 0 \tag{5.B.4b}$$

In the present class of configurations satisfying (5.B.1), we cannot have a three-charge 1/8-BPS center or a 1-charge 1/2-BPS center. For the latter, for example, even if $a = b = c = 0$ and $d \neq 0$, it still represents a D2(45)-D2(67) system which is a two-charge 1/4-BPS system.

5.B.2 Puffed-up dipole charge for general 1/4-BPS codimension-3 center

If the 1/4-BPS system with charges satisfying (5.B.4b) polarizes into a supertube, what is its dipole charge, or more precisely, the monodromy matrix around it? From (B.4), we see that the combinations of charges that transform as doublets are

$$\begin{pmatrix} K^3 \\ V \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -2M \\ L_3 \end{pmatrix} \propto \begin{pmatrix} c \\ a \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \begin{pmatrix} -L_1 \\ K^2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -L_2 \\ K^1 \end{pmatrix} \propto \begin{pmatrix} -d \\ b \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.B.5}$$

with $ad + bc = 0$. If we act with a general $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ matrix, the first doublet transforms as

$$\begin{pmatrix} c \\ a \end{pmatrix} \to \begin{pmatrix} c' \\ a' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c \\ a \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha c + \beta a \\ \gamma c + \delta a \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5.B.6}$$

where $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\alpha\delta - \beta\gamma = 1$. The second one transforms in the same way. Let us require that the lower component of the first doublet in (5.B.5) vanishes in the transformed frame, namely, $a' = \gamma c + \delta a = 0$. If we write

$$a = x\hat{a}, \qquad c = x\hat{c}, \qquad x = \gcd(a, c), \tag{5.B.7}$$

so that $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{c}$ are relatively prime, then it is clear that $a' = 0$ for the following choice:

$$\gamma = \hat{a}, \qquad \delta = -\hat{c}. \tag{5.B.8}$$

Note that the lower component of the second doublet in (5.B.5) also vanishes in the transformed frame:

$$b' = -\gamma d + \delta b = -\hat{a}d - \hat{c}b = -\frac{1}{x}(ad + bc) = 0 \tag{5.B.9}$$

by the assumption of 1/4-BPSness, (5.B.4b). For the matrix $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ to be an $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ matrix, we must satisfy

$$\alpha\delta - \beta\gamma = -\alpha\hat{c} - \beta\hat{a} = 1, \tag{5.B.10}$$

but there always exist $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying this, for $\hat{a}, \hat{c}$ are coprime.

In the frame dualized by the $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_3$ matrix

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \hat{a} & -\hat{c} \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.B.11}$$

satisfying (5.B.10), it is easy to show that the charges are

$$\begin{pmatrix} K^3 \\ V \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -2M \\ L_3 \end{pmatrix} \propto \begin{pmatrix} x \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \begin{pmatrix} -L_1 \\ K^2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -L_2 \\ K^1 \end{pmatrix} \propto \begin{pmatrix} y \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.B.12}$$

To derive this, we used the fact that, if we write b, d as

$$b = y\hat{b}, \qquad d = y\hat{d}, \qquad y = \gcd(b, d), \tag{5.B.13}$$

then the condition $ad + bc = 0$ implies that

$$(\hat{b}, \hat{d}) = \pm(\hat{a}, -\hat{c}). \tag{5.B.14}$$

(5.B.12) correspond to the following charges:

$$x \text{ units of D4(4567)+D0}, \qquad y \text{ units of D2(45)+D2(67)}. \tag{5.B.15}$$

As we can see from (3.2.2), both of these pairs must puff out into ns5(λ4567), where λ parametrizes a closed curve in transverse directions. The $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_3$ monodromy matrix for ns5(λ4567) is

$$M_{\mathrm{ns5}(\lambda 4567)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & q \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.B.16}$$

where $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the dipole charge number (the number of NS5-branes). If we dualize this back, the monodromy of the supertube in the original frame is

$$M = U^{-1} M_{\mathrm{ns5}(\lambda 4567)} U = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - q\hat{a}\hat{c} & q\hat{c}^2 \\ -q\hat{a}^2 & 1 + q\hat{a}\hat{c} \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.B.17}$$

where we used (5.B.10). This result is symmetric under the exchange of $\binom{c}{a}$ and $\binom{-d}{b}$ as it should be because, using (5.B.14), we can write this as

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + q\hat{b}\hat{d} & q\hat{d}^2 \\ -q\hat{b}^2 & 1 - q\hat{b}\hat{d} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.B.18}$$

Even in cases where some of a, b, c, d vanish, we can use the formulas (5.B.17) or (5.B.18). If $a = c = 0$, we can use (5.B.18). If $b = d = 0$, we can use (5.B.17). If a or c vanishes, we can use the rule $\gcd(k, 0) = k$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$ in (5.B.7). For example, if $c = 0$, then $x = a$ and $\hat{a} = 1, \hat{c} = 0$.

5.B.3 Round supertube

Let us compute the radius and the angular momentum of the round supertube that is created from a 1/4-BPS center with general a, b, c, d satisfying $ad + bc = 0$.

If we T-dualize (5.B.15) along 7, S-dualize, T-dualize along 4567, and then finally S-dualize, we obtain

$$x \text{ units of F1(7)+P(7)}, \qquad y \text{ units of F1(6)+P(6)}. \tag{5.B.19}$$

This is the so-called FP system which is well-studied, rotated in the 67 plane. In the FP system with F1(7) and P(7) with quantized charges $N_{\mathrm{F1}}, N_{\mathrm{P}} \in \mathbb{Z}$, the radius $\mathcal{R}$ and angular momentum J of a circular configuration are given by (see, e.g., [54]):

$$\mathcal{R} = l_s \frac{\sqrt{N_{\mathrm{F1}} N_{\mathrm{P}}}}{q}, \qquad J = \frac{N_{\mathrm{F1}} N_{\mathrm{P}}}{q}, \tag{5.B.20}$$

where $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the dipole charge number. For the rotated system (5.B.19), this becomes

$$\mathcal{R} = l_s \frac{\sqrt{x^2 + y^2}}{q}, \qquad J = \frac{x^2 + y^2}{q}. \tag{5.B.21}$$

Following the duality chain back, we find this expression is again valid for the original frame with general $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$, $ad + bc = 0$.

Appendix 5.C Matching to higher order

In the main text, we worked out the matching between the far- and near-region solutions to the leading order. In this appendix, we carry out the matching to higher order.

From the large-$|z|$ expansion of the near-region solution (5.2.31), we find that the far-region solution must have the following expansion:

$$F = \sqrt{\eta - \cos\sigma} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-i\frac{4n+1}{2}\sigma} \left(f_n(\eta) - \frac{\sigma}{\pi} g_n(\eta) \right), \tag{5.C.1a}$$

$$G = \sqrt{\eta - \cos\sigma} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-i\frac{4n+1}{2}\sigma} g_n(\eta). \tag{5.C.1b}$$

The Laplace equations for F and G lead to

$$\begin{aligned}(1-\eta^2)f_n'' - 2\eta f_n' + 2n(2n+1)f_n &= \frac{i}{\pi}(4n+1)g_n,\\ (1-\eta^2)g_n'' - 2\eta g_n' + 2n(2n+1)g_n &= 0.\end{aligned} \tag{5.C.2}$$

The equation for g_n is the standard Legendre differential equation while the one for f_n is an inhomogeneous Legendre differential equation of resonant type [124].

The general solution for $g_n(\eta)$ is given by

$$g_n(\eta) = A_{2n}P_{2n}(\eta) + B_{2n}Q_{2n}(\eta), \tag{5.C.3}$$

where $P_{2n}(\eta)$ is the Legendre polynomial and $Q_{2n}(\eta)$ is the Legendre function of the second kind. As $Q_{2n}(\eta)$ diverges at 3D infinity and on the x^3-axis (see footnote 9), we require $B_{2n} = 0$. The expression for $P_{2n}(\eta)$ for some small values of n is

$$P_0(\eta) = 1, \tag{5.C.4a}$$

$$P_2(\eta) = \frac{1}{2}(3\eta^2 - 1), \tag{5.C.4b}$$

$$P_4(\eta) = \frac{1}{8}(35\eta^4 - 30\eta^2 + 3). \tag{5.C.4c}$$

$P_{2n}(\eta)$ are normalized so that $P_{2n}(1) = 1$.

Having found g_n, we can plug it into (5.C.2) to find f_n. We have not been able to find a simple explicit expression for f_n that works for general n. We give the following integral form:

$$\begin{aligned}f_n(\eta) &= C_{2n}P_{2n}(\eta) + D_{2n}Q_{2n}(\eta)\\ &\quad - \frac{i}{\pi}A_{2n}(4n+1)\left(P_{2n}(\eta)\int_1^\eta ds\, P_{2n}(s)Q_{2n}(s) - Q_{2n}(\eta)\int_1^\eta ds\,[P_{2n}(s)]^2\right).\end{aligned} \tag{5.C.5}$$

We have chosen the particular solution (the last term) to vanish at 3D infinity ($\eta = 1$). As before, we require $D_{2n} = 0$ so that f_n is finite at infinity. For given n, it is easy to carry out the integral and the explicit expression for a few small values of n is

$$f_0(\eta) = C_0 - \frac{i}{\pi}A_0 \ln\frac{\eta+1}{2}, \tag{5.C.6a}$$

$$f_1(\eta) = C_2P_2(\eta) - \frac{i}{\pi}A_2\left(P_2(\eta)\ln\frac{\eta+1}{2} + \frac{1}{4}(\eta-1)(7\eta+1)\right), \tag{5.C.6b}$$

$$f_2(\eta) = C_4P_4(\eta) - \frac{i}{\pi}A_4\left(P_4(\eta)\ln\frac{\eta+1}{2} + \frac{1}{96}(\eta-1)(533\eta^3 + 113\eta^2 - 241\eta - 21)\right). \tag{5.C.6c}$$

The undetermined coefficients A_{2n} and C_{2n} are fixed by matching the expansion (5.C.1) order by order with the large-$|z|$ expansion of the near-region solution given in (5.2.31). This has been done for the leading $n = 0$ term in the main text in section 5.2.5; see (5.2.68). For $n = 1$, this determines the coefficients to be

$$A_2 = \frac{cL^2}{2(2R)^{5/2}}, \qquad C_2 = \frac{i}{\pi}\frac{cL^2}{2(2R)^{5/2}}\left(\ln\frac{4R}{L} - \frac{1}{2}\right). \tag{5.C.7}$$

Chapter 6

Conclusions

In this thesis, we have shown that the codimension-2 harmonic solutions indeed exist and can be regarded as microstates of black holes in some cases. On the other hand, we have not been able to find a systematic prescription of constructing such codimension-2 solutions and typical enough codimension-2 harmonic solutions which is able to explain the entropy of black holes. However, this work can be thought of as a rudimentary, but important, step for searching general codimension-2 harmonic solutions in the sense that their existence and implications are explicitly confirmed for the first time in the context of black hole micro-physics.

We have mainly used supergravity in studying codimension-2 microstate solutions, but as we mentioned typical microstates are expected to be involved with exotic branes in general. Since supergravity can only capture behaviors of exotic branes locally, we need to extend our tool to, e.g., double field theory [125, 126]. We hope we could pursue this direction in the future.

It would be also interesting to study whether the phenomena such as wall-crossing, split attractor flow, etc. occurring for codimension-3 multi-center solutions will happen to codimension-2 solutions we found. Another active direction of research is constructing general superstrata solutions [30, 31, 32, 33, 34]. This is currently regarded as most promising candidate of microstates for three-charge black holes.

What would correspond to codimension-2 solutions in a dual gauge theory side? This is an interesting question to ask, since we could possibly obtain some useful information of typical codimension-2 solutions by studying the dual gauge theory.

We hope the works on codimension-2 solutions we have initiated could shed some light on the understanding of microstructures of black holes.

Appendix A

Convention

The reduction formulas for the 11D metric and three-form potential to type IIA supergravity in 10D are

$$\begin{aligned} ds_{11}^2 &= e^{-\frac{2}{3}\Phi} ds_{10,\mathrm{str}}^2 + e^{\frac{4}{3}\Phi} \left(dx^{11} + C_1\right)^2, \\ \mathcal{A}_3 &= C_3 + B_2 \wedge dx^{11}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

The relation between the gauge-invariant RR field strength G_{p+2} and the RR potential C_{p+1} is

$$G_{p+2} = dC_{p+1} - H_3 \wedge C_{p-1}, \tag{A.2}$$

where $H_3 = dB_2$. The higher forms G_6, G_8 are related to G_4, G_2 by

$$G_6 = *G_4, \qquad G_8 = - * G_2. \tag{A.3}$$

If we define the polyforms $G = \sum_p G_{p+1}$, $C = \sum_p C_p$ with p odd (even) for type IIA (IIB), the relation (A.2) can be written more concisely as

$$G = dC - H_3 \wedge C = e^{B_2} d(e^{-B_2} C). \tag{A.4}$$

We define the Hodge dual of a p-form ω in d dimensions as

$$(*\,\omega)_{i_1 \cdots i_{d-p}} = \frac{1}{p!}\, \epsilon_{i_1 \cdots i_{d-p}}{}^{j_1 \cdots j_p} \omega_{j_1 \cdots j_p}, \tag{A.5}$$

$$*(dx^{j_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx^{j_p}) = \frac{1}{(d-p)!}\, dx^{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx^{i_{d-p}} \epsilon_{i_1 \cdots i_{d-p}}{}^{j_1 \cdots j_p}, \tag{A.6}$$

with

$$\epsilon_{01\ldots(d-1)} = -\sqrt{-g}, \qquad \epsilon^{01\ldots(d-1)} = +\frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}. \tag{A.7}$$

A.1 The type IIA uplift and Page charges

The type IIA uplift of the harmonic solution is, including higher RR potentials (cf. (2.1.24)),

$$
\begin{aligned}
ds^2_{\mathrm{IIA},10} &= -\mathcal{Q}^{-1/2}\widetilde{dt}^2 + \mathcal{Q}^{1/2}\,dx^2_{123} + \mathcal{Q}^{1/2}V^{-1}\left(Z_1^{-1}dx^2_{45} + Z_2^{-1}dx^2_{67} + Z_3^{-1}dx^2_{89}\right),\\
e^{2\Phi} &= \mathcal{Q}^{3/2}V^{-3}Z^{-1},\\
B_2 &= \Lambda^I J_I,\\
C_1 &= -V^2\mu\mathcal{Q}^{-1}\,\widetilde{dt} + A,\\
C_3 &= \left(-Z_I^{-1}\widetilde{dt} + \Lambda^I A + \xi^I\right)\wedge J_I,\\
C_5 &= \left(\mu Z_2^{-1}Z_3^{-1}\widetilde{dt} + \Lambda^2\Lambda^3 A + \Lambda^2\xi^3 + \Lambda^3\xi^2 + \zeta_1\right)\wedge J_2\wedge J_3 + (\text{cyclic}),\\
C_7 &= \left(\mathcal{Q}Z^{-1}V^{-2}\widetilde{dt} + \Lambda^1\Lambda^2\Lambda^3 A + \Lambda^1\Lambda^2\xi^3 + \Lambda^2\Lambda^3\xi^1 + \Lambda^3\Lambda^1\xi^2 + \Lambda^I\zeta_I + W\right)\wedge J_1\wedge J_2\wedge J_3,
\end{aligned}
\tag{A.1}
$$

where

$$
\widetilde{dt} \equiv dt + \omega, \qquad \mathcal{Q} \equiv V(Z - V\mu^2), \qquad \Lambda^I \equiv V^{-1}K^I - Z_I^{-1}\mu, \tag{A.2}
$$

and the one-forms (A, ξ^I, ζ_I, W) are related to the harmonic functions (V, K^I, L_I, M) by

$$
dA = *_3 dV, \qquad d\xi^I = -*_3\,dK^I, \qquad d\zeta_I = -*_3\,dL_I, \qquad dW = -2*_3\,dM. \tag{A.3}
$$

The expressions for forms that are useful for computing the Page charge (4.1.49) are

$$
\begin{aligned}
e^{-B_2}C\big|_1 &= -V^2\mu\mathcal{Q}^{-1}\widetilde{dt} + A,\\
e^{-B_2}C\big|_3 &= \left[V\mathcal{Q}^{-1}\left(\mu K^I - ZZ_I^{-1}\right)\widetilde{dt} + \xi^I\right]\wedge J_I,\\
e^{-B_2}C\big|_5 &= \left[\mathcal{Q}^{-1}\Big(Z_1\left(K^2Z_2 + K^3Z_3 - \mu V\right) - \mu K^2K^3\Big)\widetilde{dt} + \zeta_1\right]\wedge J_2\wedge J_3 + (\text{cyclic}),\\
e^{-B_2}C\big|_7 &= \left[\frac{1}{V\mathcal{Q}}\left(\mathcal{Q} - \sum_{I>J}(K^IZ_I)(K^JZ_J) - \mu V\left(VM - \frac{1}{2}K^IL_I\right)\right)\widetilde{dt} + W\right]\wedge J_1\wedge J_2\wedge J_3,
\end{aligned}
\tag{A.4}
$$

where $X\big|_p$ means the p-form part of the polyform X.

Appendix B

Duality transformation of harmonic functions

Because we will consider codimension-2 configurations with non-trivial U-duality monodromies, it is useful to recall some facts about the U-duality group in the STU model, which is $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_1 \times \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_2 \times \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_3$ [51].

In particular, it is important to understand how the U-duality acts on the harmonic functions. Let us take $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_1$. This group is generated by (i) simultaneous T-duality transformations on the 45 directions and (ii) the shift symmetry $B_{45} \to B_{45} + 1$. Because we know the T-duality action on 10D fields from the Buscher rule and their expression (2.1.24) in terms of harmonic functions, it is easy to read off how the harmonic functions transform under (i). The same is true for the B-shift symmetry (ii). The result is that (i) and (ii) are realized by the $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_1$ matrices

$$M_{\text{T-duality}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad M_{B\text{-shift}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{B.1}$$

and that the eight harmonic functions transform as a direct sum of four doublets,

$$\begin{pmatrix} K^1 \\ V \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} 2M \\ -L_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} -L_2 \\ K^3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} -L_3 \\ K^2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{B.2}$$

Since (i) and (ii) generate $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_1$, we conclude that, even for general transformations $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_1$, the harmonic functions transform as a collection of doublets (B.2).

Because all three $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$'s are on the same footing, we can infer the transformation of harmonic functions under general $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})_I$ transformation for $I = 1, 2, 3$. Under $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})_I$, the eight harmonic functions transform as a direct sum of four doublets:

$$\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \to M_I \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}, \qquad M_I \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_I & \beta_I \\ \gamma_I & \delta_I \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})_I, \tag{B.3}$$

where the vector $\binom{u}{v}$ represents any of the pairs

$$\begin{pmatrix} K^I \\ V \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} 2M \\ -L_I \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} -L_J \\ K^K \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} -L_K \\ K^J \end{pmatrix}, \qquad J \neq K \neq I. \tag{B.4}$$

One can show that the transformations (B.3) for different values of I commute, as they should because they are associated with different tori.

It is not difficult to show that the transformation (B.3) of the harmonic functions means the standard linear fractional transformation of the complexified Kähler moduli as:

$$\tau^I \to \frac{\alpha_I \, \tau^I + \beta_I}{\gamma_I \, \tau^I + \delta_I}, \qquad \tau^J \to \tau^J \quad (J \neq I), \tag{B.5}$$

where there is no summation over I.

In the main text, we introduced vectors such as $H = \{V, K^I, L_I, M\}$. To see the group theory structure, it is more convenient to introduce the $\mathrm{Sp}(8,\mathbb{R})$ vector [127]

$$\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{H}^\Lambda, \mathcal{H}_\Lambda) = (\mathcal{H}^0, \mathcal{H}^I, \mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_I) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(-V, -K^I, 2M, L_I) \tag{B.6}$$

which transforms in the standard way under the four-dimensional electromagnetic $\mathrm{Sp}(8,\mathbb{R})$ duality transformation of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supergravity.

The skew product $\langle H, H' \rangle$ defined in (2.1.18) can be written as

$$\langle H, H' \rangle = -\mathcal{H}^\Lambda \mathcal{H}'_\Lambda + \mathcal{H}_\Lambda \mathcal{H}'^\Lambda \tag{B.7}$$

For a generic $\mathrm{Sp}(8,\mathbb{R})$ symplectic vector $\mathcal{V} = (\mathcal{V}^\Lambda, \mathcal{V}_\Lambda) = (\mathcal{V}^0, \mathcal{V}^I, \mathcal{V}_0, \mathcal{V}_I)$, the quartic invariant $\mathcal{J}_4(\mathcal{V})$ is given by

$$\mathcal{J}_4(\mathcal{V}) = -(\mathcal{V}^\Lambda \mathcal{V}_\Lambda)^2 + 4 \sum_{I<J} \mathcal{V}^I \mathcal{V}_I \mathcal{V}^J \mathcal{V}_J - 4\mathcal{V}^0 \mathcal{V}_1 \mathcal{V}_2 \mathcal{V}_3 + 4\mathcal{V}_0 \mathcal{V}^1 \mathcal{V}^2 \mathcal{V}^3. \tag{B.8}$$

Using this, the quantity $\mathcal{Q}$ defined in (2.1.25) and rewritten in (2.1.26) can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{Q} = J_4(H) = \mathcal{J}_4(\mathcal{H}). \tag{B.9}$$

In this language, the most general U-duality transformation can be written as an 8×8 matrix $S \in [\mathrm{SU}(1,1)]^3 \cong [\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})]^3 \subset \mathrm{Sp}(8,\mathbb{R})$ [50, 127]

$$S = \mathcal{S}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{U}, \tag{B.10}$$

where

$$\mathcal{S} = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_1 & \gamma_1 & & & & & & \\ \beta_1 & \alpha_1 & & & & & & \\ & & \delta_1 & & & & & \gamma_1 \\ & & & \delta_1 & & & \gamma_1 & \\ & & & & \alpha_1 & -\beta_1 & & \\ & & & & -\gamma_1 & \delta_1 & & \\ & & & \beta_1 & & & \alpha_1 & \\ & & \beta_1 & & & & & \alpha_1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{B.11a}$$

$$\mathcal{T} = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_2 & & \gamma_2 & & & & & \\ & \delta_2 & & & & & & \gamma_2 \\ \beta_2 & & \alpha_2 & & & & & \\ & & & \delta_2 & & \gamma_2 & & \\ & & & & \alpha_2 & & -\beta_2 & \\ & & & \beta_2 & & \alpha_2 & & \\ & & & & -\gamma_1 & & \delta_2 & \\ & \beta_2 & & & & & & \alpha_2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{B.11b}$$

$$\mathcal{U} = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_3 & & & \gamma_3 & & & & \\ & \delta_3 & & & & & \gamma_3 & \\ & & \delta_3 & & & \gamma_3 & & \\ \beta_3 & & & \alpha_3 & & & & \\ & & & & \alpha_3 & & & -\beta_3 \\ & & \beta_3 & & & \alpha_3 & & \\ & \beta_3 & & & & & \alpha_3 & \\ & & & & -\gamma_3 & & & \delta_3 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{B.11c}$$

with $\alpha_I\delta_I - \beta_I\gamma_I = 1$, $I = 1, 2, 3$. It is straightforward to show that the action of the matrix (B.10) on the symplectic vector $(\mathcal{H}^\Lambda, \mathcal{H}_\Lambda)$ reproduces the transformation law (B.3).

The transformation law (B.3) means that the eight harmonic functions transform under the $\mathbf{2} \otimes \mathbf{2} \otimes \mathbf{2}$ representation of $[\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})]^3$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{H}^0, \mathcal{H}^I, \mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_I) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(-V, -K^I, 2M, L_I) \\ &= (\mathcal{H}^{222};\ \mathcal{H}^{122}, \mathcal{H}^{212}, \mathcal{H}^{221};\ -\mathcal{H}^{111};\ \mathcal{H}^{211}, \mathcal{H}^{121}, \mathcal{H}^{112}) \end{aligned} \tag{B.12}$$

where $\mathcal{H}^{abc}$ $(a, b, c = 1, 2)$ transforms as $\mathcal{H}^{abc} \to \sum_{a',b',c'} (M_1)^{aa'} (M_2)^{bb'} (M_3)^{cc'} \mathcal{H}^{a'b'c'}$. In terms

of $\mathcal{H}^{abc}$,

$$-\langle H, H'\rangle = \mathcal{H}^{\Lambda}\mathcal{H}'_{\Lambda} - \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda}\mathcal{H}'^{\Lambda} = \epsilon_{a_1a_2}\epsilon_{b_1b_2}\epsilon_{c_1c_2}\mathcal{H}^{a_1b_1c_1}\mathcal{H}^{a_2b_2c_2}, \tag{B.13}$$

$$J_4(H) = \mathcal{J}_4(\mathcal{H}) = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{a_1a_2}\epsilon_{a_3a_4}\epsilon_{b_1b_2}\epsilon_{b_3b_4}\epsilon_{c_1c_3}\epsilon_{c_2c_4}\mathcal{H}^{a_1b_1c_1}\mathcal{H}^{a_2b_2c_2}\mathcal{H}^{a_3b_3c_3}\mathcal{H}^{a_4b_4c_4}. \tag{B.14}$$

A matrix M^{ab} cannot be written as a product of two vectors u^a, v^b in general but it can be written as a sum of multiple vectors, $M^{ab} = \sum_i u_i^a v_i^b$. Similarly, we must be able to decompose the tensor $\mathcal{H}^{abc}$ as

$$\mathcal{H}^{abc} = \sum_i u_i^a v_i^b w_i^c, \tag{B.15}$$

where u_i^a, v_i^b, and w_i^c are real functions transforming as doublets of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_1$, $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_2$, and $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_3$, respectively.

Let us consider the situation considered in appendix 5.A.2 where we set one of the moduli to a trivial value: $\tau^1 = i$. Here we will give an alternative proof that the harmonic functions in this case are given by (5.A.19), (5.A.20). As we can see in (5.A.16), the combinations of harmonic functions that transform nicely under the remaining $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_2 \times \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_3$ are $V - iK^1$, $K^2 + iL_3$, $K^3 + iL_2$ and $-L_1 - 2iM$. In terms of $\mathcal{H}^{abc}$, they are

$$\begin{aligned} V - iK^1 &= \sqrt{2}\,(-\mathcal{H}^{222} + i\mathcal{H}^{122}) \equiv \mathcal{H}^{22}, \\ K^2 + iL_3 &= \sqrt{2}\,(-\mathcal{H}^{212} + i\mathcal{H}^{112}) \equiv \mathcal{H}^{12}, \\ K^3 + iL_2 &= \sqrt{2}\,(-\mathcal{H}^{221} + i\mathcal{H}^{121}) \equiv \mathcal{H}^{21}, \\ -L_1 - 2iM &= \sqrt{2}\,(-\mathcal{H}^{211} + i\mathcal{H}^{111}) \equiv \mathcal{H}^{11}. \end{aligned} \tag{B.16}$$

The components of the tensor $\mathcal{H}^{bc}$ defined here are complex functions transforming as a $\mathbf{2} \otimes \mathbf{2}$ of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_2 \times \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})_3$. Just as in (B.15), we can decompose it as

$$\mathcal{H}^{bc} = \sum_i V_i^b W_i^c, \tag{B.17}$$

where V_i^b, W_i^c are complex. However, this is inconsistent with the constraint (5.A.15), which reads in terms of $\mathcal{H}^{bc}$ as

$$\mathcal{H}^{11}\mathcal{H}^{22} = \mathcal{H}^{12}\mathcal{H}^{21}, \tag{B.18}$$

unless the summation over i in (B.17) has only one term. In that case,

$$\begin{aligned} V - iK^1 &= \mathcal{H}^{22} = V^2W^2, \qquad & K^2 + iL_3 &= \mathcal{H}^{12} = V^1W^2, \\ K^3 + iL_2 &= \mathcal{H}^{21} = V^2W^1, \qquad & -L_1 - 2iM &= \mathcal{H}^{11} = V^1W^1. \end{aligned} \tag{B.19}$$

This is the same as (5.A.19), (5.A.20) with the identification $\binom{V^1}{V^2} = \binom{F_2}{G_2}$, $\binom{W^1}{W^2} = \binom{F_3}{G_3}$.

It is interesting to see how the transformations of the harmonic functions known in the literature are embedded in the general $[\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})]^3$ transformation (B.3). We will consider the "gauge

transformation" [64] and the "spectral flow transformation" [128] as such transformations. To our knowledge, explicit $[\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})]^3$ matrices for these transformations have not been explicitly written down in the literature. For a discussion on how these transformations are embedded in the U-duality group of the STU model from a different perspective, see [127].

The so-called "gauge transformation" [64] is defined as the following transformation of harmonic functions:

$$\begin{aligned} &V \to V, \qquad K^I \to K^I + c^I V, \\ &L_I \to L_I - C_{IJK} c^J K^K - \frac{1}{2} C_{IJK} c^J c^K V, \\ &M \to M - \frac{1}{2} c^I L_I + \frac{1}{4} C_{IJK} c^I c^J K^K + \frac{1}{12} C_{IJK} c^I c^J c^K V. \end{aligned} \tag{B.20}$$

It is easy to see that this transformation is a special case of general $[\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})]^3$ transformations (B.3) with

$$M_I = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & c^I \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad I = 1,2,3. \tag{B.21}$$

This transformation shifts the B-field as

$$B_2 \to B_2 + \frac{c^1 \alpha}{R_4 R_5} J_1 + \frac{c^2 \alpha}{R_6 R_7} J_2 + \frac{c^3 \alpha}{R_8 R_9} J_3. \tag{B.22}$$

If one likes, the shift in B_2, (B.22), can be always undone by subtracting $\frac{c^1\alpha}{R_4R_5}J_1 + \frac{c^2\alpha}{R_6R_7}J_2 + \frac{c^3\alpha}{R_8R_9}J_3$ from B_2 by hand, because subtracting from B_2 the closed form J_I affects none of the equations of motion or supersymmetry conditions. This is relevant especially in 5D solutions (for which $h^0 = 0$) because, changing the asymptotic value of B_2 as in (B.22) would mean to change the asymptotic value of the Wilson loop along ψ for a 5D gauge field that descends from the M-theory three-form $A_{\mu ij}$. Such a gauge transformation would not vanish at infinity in 5D and is not allowed. So, one must always undo the shift (B.22) after doing the gauge transformation (B.20). After this procedure, no gauge-invariant fields are changed under the transformation (B.20) and it is just re-parametrization of harmonic functions $\{V, K^I, L_I, M\}$.

The "spectral flow transformation" is defined as [128]

$$\begin{aligned} &V \to V + \gamma_I K^I - \frac{1}{2} C^{IJK} \gamma_I \gamma_J L_K + \frac{1}{3} C^{IJK} \gamma_I \gamma_J \gamma_K M, \\ &K^I \to K^I - C^{IJK} \gamma_J L_K + C^{IJK} \gamma_J \gamma_K M, \\ &L_I \to L_I - 2\gamma_I M, \qquad M \to M, \end{aligned} \tag{B.23}$$

where $C^{IJK} = C_{IJK}$. This transformation has been used extensively to generate new solutions from known ones. It is easy to see that this transformation is a special case of general $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ transformations with

$$M_I = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \gamma_I & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad I = 1,2,3. \tag{B.24}$$

Bibliography

[1] J. D. Bekenstein, *Black holes and entropy*, *Phys. Rev.* **D7** (1973) 2333–2346.

[2] J. M. Bardeen, B. Carter and S. Hawking, *The four laws of black hole mechanics*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **31** (1973) 161–170.

[3] A. Strominger and C. Vafa, *Microscopic origin of the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy*, *Phys. Lett.* **B379** (1996) 99–104, [hep-th/9601029].

[4] J. M. Maldacena, A. Strominger and E. Witten, *Black hole entropy in M-theory*, *JHEP* **12** (1997) 002, [hep-th/9711053].

[5] J. M. Maldacena, *The large-N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity*, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **38** (1999) 1113–1133, [hep-th/9711200].

[6] O. Lunin and S. D. Mathur, *Metric of the multiply wound rotating string*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B610** (2001) 49–76, [hep-th/0105136].

[7] V. S. Rychkov, *D1-D5 black hole microstate counting from supergravity*, *JHEP* **01** (2006) 063, [hep-th/0512053].

[8] D. Mateos and P. K. Townsend, *Supertubes*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** (2001) 011602, [hep-th/0103030].

[9] H. Lin, O. Lunin and J. M. Maldacena, *Bubbling AdS space and* 1/2 *BPS geometries*, *JHEP* **10** (2004) 025, [hep-th/0409174].

[10] L. Grant, L. Maoz, J. Marsano, K. Papadodimas and V. S. Rychkov, *Minisuperspace quantization of "bubbling AdS" and free fermion droplets*, *JHEP* **08** (2005) 025, [hep-th/0505079].

[11] L. Maoz and V. S. Rychkov, *Geometry quantization from supergravity: the case of "bubbling AdS"*, *JHEP* **08** (2005) 096, [hep-th/0508059].

[12] S. D. Mathur, *The fuzzball proposal for black holes: an elementary review*, *Fortsch. Phys.* **53** (2005) 793–827, [hep-th/0502050].

[13] I. Bena and N. P. Warner, *Black holes, black rings and their microstates*, in *Supersymmetric Mechanics - Vol. 3* (S. Bellucci, ed.), vol. 755 of *Lecture Notes in Physics*, pp. 1–92. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008, hep-th/0701216, DOI.

[14] K. Skenderis and M. Taylor, *The fuzzball proposal for black holes*, *Phys. Rept.* **467** (2008) 117–171, [0804.0552].

[15] V. Balasubramanian, J. de Boer, S. El-Showk and I. Messamah, *Black holes as effective geometries*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **25** (2008) 214004, [0811.0263].

[16] B. D. Chowdhury and A. Virmani, *Modave lectures on fuzzballs and emission from the D1-D5 system*, in *5th Modave Summer School in Mathematical Physics Modave, Belgium, August 17-21, 2009*, 2010, 1001.1444.

[17] S. D. Mathur, *The information paradox: a pedagogical introduction*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **26** (2009) 224001, [0909.1038].

[18] A. Almheiri, D. Marolf, J. Polchinski and J. Sully, *Black holes: complementarity or firewalls?*, *JHEP* **02** (2013) 062, [1207.3123].

[19] G. Gibbons and N. Warner, *Global structure of five-dimensional BPS fuzzballs*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **31** (2014) 025016, [1305.0957].

[20] I. Bena and N. P. Warner, *Resolving the structure of black holes: philosophizing with a hammer*, 1311.4538.

[21] J. B. Gutowski and H. S. Reall, *General supersymmetric* AdS_5 *black holes*, *JHEP* **04** (2004) 048, [hep-th/0401129].

[22] I. Bena and N. P. Warner, *One ring to rule them all and in the darkness bind them?*, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **9** (2005) 667–701, [hep-th/0408106].

[23] J. P. Gauntlett and J. B. Gutowski, *General concentric black rings*, *Phys. Rev.* **D71** (2005) 045002, [hep-th/0408122].

[24] I. Bena and N. P. Warner, *Bubbling supertubes and foaming black holes*, *Phys. Rev.* **D74** (2006) 066001, [hep-th/0505166].

[25] P. Berglund, E. G. Gimon and T. S. Levi, *Supergravity microstates for BPS black holes and black rings*, *JHEP* **06** (2006) 007, [hep-th/0505167].

[26] J. de Boer, S. El-Showk, I. Messamah and D. Van den Bleeken, *A bound on the entropy of supergravity?*, *JHEP* **02** (2010) 062, [0906.0011].

[27] I. Bena, N. Bobev, S. Giusto, C. Ruef and N. P. Warner, *An infinite-dimensional family of black-hole microstate geometries*, *JHEP* **03** (2011) 022, [1006.3497].

[28] I. Bena, M. Shigemori and N. P. Warner, *Black-hole entropy from supergravity superstrata states*, *JHEP* **10** (2014) 140, [1406.4506].

[29] I. Bena, S. Giusto, M. Shigemori and N. P. Warner, *Supersymmetric solutions in six dimensions: a linear structure*, *JHEP* **03** (2012) 084, [1110.2781].

[30] I. Bena, S. Giusto, R. Russo, M. Shigemori and N. P. Warner, *Habemus superstratum! A constructive proof of the existence of superstrata*, *JHEP* **05** (2015) 110, [1503.01463].

[31] I. Bena, E. Martinec, D. Turton and N. P. Warner, *Momentum fractionation on superstrata*, *JHEP* **05** (2016) 064, [1601.05805].

[32] I. Bena, S. Giusto, E. J. Martinec, R. Russo, M. Shigemori, D. Turton et al., *Smooth horizonless geometries deep inside the black-hole regime*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117** (2016) 201601, [1607.03908].

[33] W. Tian, *Multicenter superstrata*, *Phys. Rev.* **D94** (2016) 066011, [1607.08884].

[34] I. Bena, E. Martinec, D. Turton and N. P. Warner, *M-theory superstrata and the MSW string*, *JHEP* **06** (2017) 137, [1703.10171].

[35] J. de Boer and M. Shigemori, *Exotic branes and non-geometric backgrounds*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104** (2010) 251603, [1004.2521].

[36] J. de Boer and M. Shigemori, *Exotic branes in string theory*, *Phys. Rept.* **532** (2013) 65–118, [1209.6056].

[37] S. Ferrara, R. Kallosh and A. Strominger, *$N = 2$ extremal black holes*, *Phys. Rev.* **D52** (1995) 5412–5416, [hep-th/9508072].

[38] A. Strominger, *Macroscopic entropy of $N = 2$ extremal black holes*, *Phys. Lett.* **B383** (1996) 39–43, [hep-th/9602111].

[39] S. Ferrara and R. Kallosh, *Supersymmetry and attractors*, *Phys. Rev.* **D54** (1996) 1514–1524, [hep-th/9602136].

[40] S. Ferrara and R. Kallosh, *Universality of supersymmetric attractors*, *Phys. Rev.* **D54** (1996) 1525–1534, [hep-th/9603090].

[41] G. W. Moore, *Les Houches lectures on strings and arithmetic*, in *Frontiers in Number Theory, Physics, and Geometry II* (P. Cartier, P. Moussa, B. Julia and P. Vanhove, eds.), pp. 303–359, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004, hep-th/0401049, DOI.

[42] P. Kraus and F. Larsen, *Attractors and black rings*, *Phys. Rev.* **D72** (2005) 024010, [hep-th/0503219].

[43] F. Larsen, *The attractor mechanism in five dimensions*, in *Supersymmetric Mechanics - Vol. 3* (S. Bellucci, ed.), vol. 755 of *Lecture Notes in Physics*, pp. 249–281. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008, hep-th/0608191, DOI.

[44] F. Denef, *Supergravity flows and D-brane stability*, *JHEP* **08** (2000) 050, [hep-th/0005049].

[45] F. Denef, B. R. Greene and M. Raugas, *Split attractor flows and the spectrum of BPS D-branes on the quintic*, *JHEP* **05** (2001) 012, [hep-th/0101135].

[46] F. Denef and G. W. Moore, *Split states, entropy enigmas, holes and halos*, *JHEP* **11** (2011) 129, [hep-th/0702146].

[47] G. W. Moore, *PiTP lectures on BPS states and wall-crossing in $d = 4, \mathcal{N} = 2$ theories*, 2010, URL.

[48] G. Gibbons and P. Ruback, *The hidden symmetries of multicenter metrics*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **115** (1988) 267.

[49] G. Gibbons and S. Hawking, *Gravitational multi-instantons*, *Phys. Lett.* **B78** (1978) 430.

[50] K. Behrndt, R. Kallosh, J. Rahmfeld, M. Shmakova and W. K. Wong, *STU black holes and string triality*, *Phys. Rev.* **D54** (1996) 6293–6301, [hep-th/9608059].

[51] M. J. Duff, J. T. Liu and J. Rahmfeld, *Four-dimensional string/string/string triality*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B459** (1996) 125–159, [hep-th/9508094].

[52] H. Elvang, R. Emparan, D. Mateos and H. S. Reall, *Supersymmetric black rings and three-charge supertubes*, *Phys. Rev.* **D71** (2005) 024033, [hep-th/0408120].

[53] I. Bena, N. Bobev, C. Ruef and N. P. Warner, *Supertubes in bubbling backgrounds: Born-Infeld meets supergravity*, *JHEP* **07** (2009) 106, [0812.2942].

[54] R. Emparan, D. Mateos and P. K. Townsend, *Supergravity supertubes*, *JHEP* **07** (2001) 011, [hep-th/0106012].

[55] D. Mateos, S. Ng and P. K. Townsend, *Tachyons, supertubes and brane/anti-brane systems*, *JHEP* **03** (2002) 016, [hep-th/0112054].

[56] K. Behrndt, D. Lust and W. A. Sabra, *Stationary solutions of $N = 2$ supergravity*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B510** (1998) 264–288, [hep-th/9705169].

[57] B. Bates and F. Denef, *Exact solutions for supersymmetric stationary black hole composites*, *JHEP* **11** (2011) 127, [hep-th/0304094].

[58] C. W. Misner, *The flatter regions of Newman, Unti and Tamburino's generalized Schwarzschild space*, *J. Math. Phys.* **4** (1963) 924–938.

[59] J. C. Breckenridge, R. C. Myers, A. W. Peet and C. Vafa, *D-branes and spinning black holes*, *Phys. Lett.* **B391** (1997) 93–98, [hep-th/9602065].

[60] H. Elvang, R. Emparan, D. Mateos and H. S. Reall, *A supersymmetric black ring*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93** (2004) 211302, [hep-th/0407065].

[61] D. Gaiotto, A. Strominger and X. Yin, *New connections between 4D and 5D black holes*, *JHEP* **02** (2006) 024, [hep-th/0503217].

[62] H. Elvang, R. Emparan, D. Mateos and H. S. Reall, *Supersymmetric 4D rotating black holes from 5D black rings*, *JHEP* **08** (2005) 042, [hep-th/0504125].

[63] D. Gaiotto, A. Strominger and X. Yin, *5D black rings and 4D black holes*, *JHEP* **02** (2006) 023, [hep-th/0504126].

[64] I. Bena, P. Kraus and N. P. Warner, *Black rings in Taub-NUT*, *Phys. Rev.* **D72** (2005) 084019, [hep-th/0504142].

[65] M. Park and M. Shigemori, *Codimension-2 solutions in five-dimensional supergravity*, *JHEP* **10** (2015) 011, [1505.05169].

[66] J. J. Fernández-Melgarejo, M. Park and M. Shigemori, *Non-Abelian supertubes*, *JHEP* **12** (2017) 103, [1709.02388].

[67] F. Denef, D. Gaiotto, A. Strominger, D. Van den Bleeken and X. Yin, *Black hole deconstruction*, *JHEP* **03** (2012) 071, [hep-th/0703252].

[68] D. Gaiotto, A. Strominger and X. Yin, *Superconformal black hole quantum mechanics*, *JHEP* **11** (2005) 017, [hep-th/0412322].

[69] E. G. Gimon and T. S. Levi, *Black ring deconstruction*, *JHEP* **04** (2008) 098, [0706.3394].

[70] T. S. Levi, J. Raeymaekers, D. Van den Bleeken, W. Van Herck and B. Vercnocke, *Gödel space from wrapped M2-branes*, *JHEP* **01** (2010) 082, [0909.4081].

[71] J. de Boer, F. Denef, S. El-Showk, I. Messamah and D. Van den Bleeken, *Black hole bound states in* $\mathrm{AdS}_3 \times S^2$, *JHEP* **11** (2008) 050, [0802.2257].

[72] J. de Boer, S. El-Showk, I. Messamah and D. Van den Bleeken, *Quantizing* $\mathcal{N} = 2$ *multicenter solutions*, *JHEP* **05** (2009) 002, [0807.4556].

[73] I. Bena, N. Bobev, C. Ruef and N. P. Warner, *Entropy enhancement and black hole microstates*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** (2010) 231301, [0804.4487].

[74] V. Balasubramanian, E. G. Gimon and T. S. Levi, *Four dimensional black hole microstates: from D-branes to spacetime foam*, *JHEP* **01** (2008) 056, [hep-th/0606118].

[75] S. Ferrara and J. M. Maldacena, *Branes, central charges and U-duality invariant BPS conditions*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **15** (1998) 749–758, [hep-th/9706097].

[76] R. C. Myers, *Dielectric-branes*, *JHEP* **12** (1999) 022, [hep-th/9910053].

[77] J. P. Gauntlett, J. B. Gutowski, C. M. Hull, S. Pakis and H. S. Reall, *All supersymmetric solutions of minimal supergravity in five dimensions*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **20** (2003) 4587–4634, [hep-th/0209114].

[78] B. E. Niehoff, O. Vasilakis and N. P. Warner, *Multi-superthreads and supersheets*, *JHEP* **04** (2013) 046, [1203.1348].

[79] D. Marolf, *Chern-Simons terms and the three notions of charge*, hep-th/0006117.

[80] R. L. Arnowitt, S. Deser and C. W. Misner, *The dynamics of general relativity*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **40** (2008) 1997–2027, [gr-qc/0405109].

[81] I. Bena, C.-W. Wang and N. P. Warner, *Mergers and typical black hole microstates*, *JHEP* **11** (2006) 042, [hep-th/0608217].

[82] I. Bena, C.-W. Wang and N. P. Warner, *Plumbing the abyss: black ring microstates*, *JHEP* **07** (2008) 019, [0706.3786].

[83] I. Bena, M. Berkooz, J. de Boer, S. El-Showk and D. Van den Bleeken, *Scaling BPS solutions and pure-Higgs states*, *JHEP* **11** (2012) 171, [1205.5023].

[84] S.-J. Lee, Z.-L. Wang and P. Yi, *Quiver invariants from intrinsic Higgs states*, *JHEP* **07** (2012) 169, [1205.6511].

[85] I. Bena, J. de Boer, M. Shigemori and N. P. Warner, *Double, double supertube bubble*, *JHEP* **10** (2011) 116, [1107.2650].

[86] F. Hassler and D. Lust, *Non-commutative/non-associative IIA (IIB) Q- and R-branes and their intersections*, *JHEP* **07** (2013) 048, [1303.1413].

[87] D. Andriot and A. Betz, *NS-branes, source corrected Bianchi identities, and more on backgrounds with non-geometric fluxes*, *JHEP* **07** (2014) 059, [1402.5972].

[88] B. R. Greene, A. D. Shapere, C. Vafa and S.-T. Yau, *Stringy cosmic strings and noncompact Calabi-Yau manifolds*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B337** (1990) 1–36.

[89] C. Vafa, *Evidence for F-theory*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B469** (1996) 403–418, [hep-th/9602022].

[90] E. A. Bergshoeff, J. Hartong, T. Ortin and D. Roest, *Seven-branes and supersymmetry*, *JHEP* **02** (2007) 003, [hep-th/0612072].

[91] B. E. Niehoff and N. P. Warner, *Doubly-fluctuating BPS solutions in six dimensions*, *JHEP* **10** (2013) 137, [1303.5449].

[92] P. F. Ramirez, *Non-Abelian bubbles in microstate geometries*, *JHEP* **11** (2016) 152, [1608.01330].

[93] P. Meessen, T. Ortín and P. F. Ramírez, *Dyonic black holes at arbitrary locations*, *JHEP* **10** (2017) 066, [1707.03846].

[94] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *Electric-magnetic duality, monopole condensation, and confinement in $N = 2$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B426** (1994) 19–52, [hep-th/9407087].

[95] E. Bergshoeff, R. Kallosh and T. Ortin, *Stationary axion/dilaton solutions and supersymmetry*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B478** (1996) 156–180, [hep-th/9605059].

[96] F. Denef, *Quantum quivers and Hall/hole halos*, *JHEP* **10** (2002) 023, [hep-th/0206072].

[97] P. Heidmann, *Four-center bubbled BPS solutions with a Gibbons-Hawking base*, *JHEP* **10** (2017) 009, [1703.10095].

[98] I. Bena, P. Heidmann and P. F. Ramirez, *A systematic construction of microstate geometries with low angular momentum*, *JHEP* **10** (2017) 217, [1709.02812].

[99] E. J. Martinec and B. E. Niehoff, *Hair-brane ideas on the horizon*, *JHEP* **11** (2015) 195, [1509.00044].

[100] E. J. Martinec and S. Massai, *String theory of supertubes*, 1705.10844.

[101] J. Raeymaekers and D. Van den Bleeken, *Unlocking the axion-dilaton in 5D supergravity*, *JHEP* **11** (2014) 029, [1407.5330].

[102] J. Raeymaekers and D. Van den Bleeken, *Microstate solutions from black hole deconstruction*, *JHEP* **12** (2015) 095, [1510.00583].

[103] A. Tyukov and N. P. Warner, *Supersymmetry and wrapped branes in microstate geometries*, *JHEP* **10** (2017) 011, [1608.04023].

[104] A. Sen, *Arithmetic of quantum entropy function*, *JHEP* **08** (2009) 068, [0903.1477].

[105] A. Dabholkar, J. Gomes, S. Murthy and A. Sen, *Supersymmetric index from black hole entropy*, *JHEP* **04** (2011) 034, [1009.3226].

[106] A. Chowdhury, R. S. Garavuso, S. Mondal and A. Sen, *Do all BPS black hole microstates carry zero angular momentum?*, *JHEP* **04** (2016) 082, [1511.06978].

[107] O. Lunin, *Bubbling geometries for* $\mathrm{AdS}_2 \times S^2$, *JHEP* **10** (2015) 167, [1507.06670].

[108] L. Pieri, *Fuzzballs in general relativity: a missed opportunity*, 1611.05276.

[109] W. Israel and G. A. Wilson, *A class of stationary electromagnetic vacuum fields*, *J. Math. Phys.* **13** (1972) 865–871.

[110] Z. Perjés, *Solutions of the coupled Einstein-Maxwell equations representing the fields of spinning sources*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **27** (1971) 1668.

[111] A. Dabholkar, M. Guica, S. Murthy and S. Nampuri, *No entropy enigmas for* $\mathcal{N} = 4$ *dyons*, *JHEP* **06** (2010) 007, [0903.2481].

[112] B. D. Chowdhury and D. R. Mayerson, *Multi-centered D1-D5 solutions at finite B-moduli*, *JHEP* **02** (2014) 043, [1305.0831].

[113] P. M. Morse and H. Feshbach, *Methods of Theoretical Physics, Part I.* International Series in Pure and Applied Physics. McGraw-Hill, 1953.

[114] A. S. Schwarz, *Field theories with no local conservation of the electric charge*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B208** (1982) 141–158.

[115] M. G. Alford, K. Benson, S. R. Coleman, J. March-Russell and F. Wilczek, *Interactions and excitations of non-Abelian vortices*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64** (1990) 1632.

[116] J. Preskill and L. M. Krauss, *Local dscrete symmetry and quantum mechanical hair*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B341** (1990) 50–100.

[117] J. A. Harvey and A. B. Royston, *Localized modes at a D-brane-O-plane intersection and heterotic Alice strings*, *JHEP* **04** (2008) 018, [0709.1482].

[118] T. Okada and Y. Sakatani, *Defect branes as Alice strings*, *JHEP* **03** (2015) 131, [1411.1043].

[119] A. Sen, *F-theory and orientifolds*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B475** (1996) 562–578, [hep-th/9605150].

[120] C. V. Johnson, *D-Branes.* Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press, 2002, DOI.

[121] A. P. Braun, F. Fucito and J. F. Morales, *U-folds as K3 fibrations*, *JHEP* **10** (2013) 154, [1308.0553].

[122] K. Dasgupta and S. Mukhi, *F-theory at constant coupling*, *Phys. Lett.* **B385** (1996) 125–131, [hep-th/9606044].

[123] T. Banks, M. R. Douglas and N. Seiberg, *Probing F-theory with branes*, *Phys. Lett.* **B387** (1996) 278–281, [hep-th/9605199].

[124] N. Backhouse, *The resonant Legendre equation*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **117** (1986) 310–317.

[125] G. Aldazabal, D. Marques and C. Nunez, *Double field theory: a pedagogical review*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **30** (2013) 163001, [1305.1907].

[126] O. Hohm, D. Lüst and B. Zwiebach, *The spacetime of double field theory: review, remarks, and outlook*, *Fortsch. Phys.* **61** (2013) 926–966, [1309.2977].

[127] G. Dall'Agata, S. Giusto and C. Ruef, *U-duality and non-BPS solutions*, *JHEP* **02** (2011) 074, [1012.4803].

[128] I. Bena, N. Bobev and N. P. Warner, *Spectral flow, and the spectrum of multicenter solutions*, *Phys. Rev.* **D77** (2008) 125025, [0803.1203].