# A nalytic Solutions for Tachyon C ondensation with G eneral P rojectors

YujiO kawa<sup>1</sup>, Leonardo Rastelli<sup>2</sup>, and Barton Zwiebach<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> DESY Theory Group Notkestrasse 85 22607 Hamburg, Germany yu jilokawa@desy.de

<sup>2</sup> C N. Yang Institute for Theoretical Physics Stony B rook University Stony B rook, NY 11794, USA Leonardo.rastelli@stonybrook.edu

<sup>3</sup> C enter for T heoretical P hysics M assachusetts Institute of Technology C am bridge, M A 02139, U SA zwiebach@lnsmit.edu

#### A bstract

The tachyon vacuum solution of Schnabl is based on the wedge states, which close under the star product and interpolate between the identity state and the sliver projector. We use reparam eterizations to solve the long-standing problem of nding an analogous fam ily of states for arbitrary projectors and to construct analytic solutions based on them. The solutions sim plify for special projectors and allow explicit calculations in the level expansion. We test the solutions in detail for a one-param eter fam ily of special projectors that includes the sliver and the butter y. Reparam eterizations further allow a one-param eter deform ation of the solution for a given projector, and in a certain lim it the solution takes the form of an operator insertion on the projector. We discuss implications of our work for vacuum string eld theory.

# C ontents

1	Introduction	1						
2	Reparam eterizations							
	2.1 Denitions	. 8						
	2.2 The operator U,	. 9						
	2.3 Reparam eterizations as gauge symmetries	. 11						
	2.4 Reparam eterizations of surface states	. 12						
3	A belian fam ilies for general projectors							
	3.1 Abelian families by reparameterizations	. 15						
	3.2 Abelian fam ilies for special projectors	. 21						
4	Solutions from reparam eterizations							
	4.1 Review of the algebraic construction	. 26						
	4.2 Solutions in the CFT formulation	. 29						
	4.3 Operator insertions in the geometric language	. 33						
5	perator construction of the solution 3							
	5.1 The hypergeometric collection	. 38						
	5.2 The solution in operator form	. 41						
	52.1 Reparameterizations within a family	. 41						
	522 Operator formula	. 43						
6	evel and other expansions							
	6.1 Level expansion prelim inaries	. 47						
	6.2 LevelExpansion for = 0 $\dots$	. 49						
	6.3 No Siegel gauge in the family	. 52						
	6.4 Projector expansion	. 54						
7	Concluding Remarks	55						

# 1 Introduction

The rst analytic solution of open string eld theory (OSFT) [1], corresponding to condensation of the open string tachyon, was recently constructed by Schnabl [2] and further studied in

[3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. The starting point of [2] is a clever gauge- xing condition, which makes the in nite system of equations of motion amenable to a recursive analysis. Schnabl's gauge choice for the open string eld is

$$B_0 = 0; (1.1)$$

where  $B_0$  is the antighost zero mode in the conformal frame  $z = f_s$  () =  $\frac{2}{3}$  arctan of the sliver<sup>1</sup>:

$$B_{0} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{dz}{2i}zb(z) = \frac{1}{2i}\frac{d}{2i}\frac{f_{s}(z)}{f_{s}^{0}(z)}b(z) \\ = \frac{1}{2i}\frac{d}{2i}(1+z^{2}) \arctan b(z) = b_{0} + \frac{2}{3}b_{2} - \frac{2}{15}b_{4} + \dots$$
(1.2)

The sliver state  $W_1$  is a nontrivial projector of the open string star algebra, i.e., a string eld di erent from the identity that squares to itself [9, 10, 11, 12]. The wedge states W with 0 are a fam ily of states which interpolate between the sliver  $W_1$  and the identity  $W_0$  I, and they obey the abelian relation:

$$W \quad W = W_{+} : \tag{1.3}$$

Schnabl's solution is constructed in terms of a state , with 0, which is the wedge state  $W_{+1}$  with suitable operator insertions. One de nes the derivative state

$$^{\circ} \quad \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}}; \qquad 0; \qquad (1.4)$$

and then Schnabl's solution can be written as follows?

$$= \lim_{N \downarrow 1} N + \sum_{n=0}^{N} \sum_{n=0}^{1} (1.5)$$

A simple description of the states was presented in [3] using the CFT formulation of OSFT [13].

W hile the sliver was historically the rst example of a projector, it was soon realized that in nitely many projectors exist [14]. Let us restrict attention to the subset of string elds known as surface states. A surface state is specified by a local coordinate map z = f() from the canonical half-disk  $D^+$  f j= 0; j j 1g to a region in the upper-half plane (UHP) H fz j= z 0g. The surface state jfi is defined by its inner product

h; 
$$fi = hf$$
 (0)  $\frac{1}{H}$  (1.6)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For convenience, we have rescaled the traditional conform alfram e of the sliver by a factor of  $2^{=}$ . This does not change the sliver state because of the SL (2;R) invariance of the vacuum, nor does it a ect the de nition of B<sub>0</sub>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> W e use the conventions of  $\beta$ ], and the solution di ers from that in [2] by an overall sign. See the beginning of section 2 of  $\beta$ ] for m ore details.

with any state in the Fock space. The condition that jfi is a projector is f(i) = 1 [14], namely, the local coordinate curve goes to the boundary of H at the open string midpoint = i. (Throughout this paper, we will restrict our considerations to \single-split" projectors, i.e., surface states whose coordinate curve goes to in nity only at the open string midpoint.) The associated open string functional f(()) is split, namely, it is the product of a functional of the left half of the string time as a functional of the right half of the string,  $f(X_L) = \frac{L}{f}(X_L) = \frac{L}{f}(X_R)$ . In the half-string form alism of OSFT [15, 16], where string elds are regarded as operators acting on the space of half-string functionals, surface state projectors are interpreted as rank-one projectors [14]. From this view point, all surface state projectors should be equivalent. This is the intuition provided by nite dimensional vector spaces, where all rank-one projectors are related by similarity transform ations.

These observations raise the natural question of whether Schnabl's solution, based on the sliver projector, can be generalized to solutions based on a generic surface state projector. In this paper we nd that this is indeed the case. We also nd, however, that the solution technically simpli es for the subclass of special projectors [5], which includes the sliver as its canonical representative. W hile we give a geom etric description of the solution associated with a general projector, with the technology currently available we are able to evaluate its explicit Fock space expansion only when the projector is special.

It is useful at this point to recall some facts about special projectors [5]. The crucial algebraic property of a special projector is that the zero mode  $L_0$  of the energy-momentum tensor in the frame of the projector<sup>3</sup>,

$$L_{0} \qquad \frac{dz}{2i}zT(z) = \frac{I}{2if^{0}(z)}T(z); \qquad (1.7)$$

and its BPZ conjugate  $L_0^2$  obey

$$[L_0; L_0^2] = s(L_0 + L_0^2); \quad s > 0:$$
(1.8)

The sliver is a special projector with s = 1 and the butter y is a special projector with s = 2. The sliver and the butter y t into an in nite \hypergeom etric" collection of special projectors | one projector  $P_1^{(s)}$  for each real s 1 | which was brie y described in [5]. We believe that the hypergeom etric collection contains all the single-split special projectors. For special projectors, we shall use the notations

L 
$$\frac{L_0}{s}$$
; L<sup>?</sup>  $\frac{L_0^?}{s}$ : (1.9)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>The de nition of a special projector further requires the conform al fram e f ( ) to obey certain regularity conditions [5] which guarantee that the operator  $L^+ = \frac{1}{s} (L_0 + L_0^2)$  has a non-anom alous left/right decom position.

In term s of L and L<sup>?</sup> the algebra (1.8) takes the canonical form

$$[L;L^{?}] = L + L^{?} :$$
 (1.10)

For any special projector  $P_1$  a family of states P with 0 analogous to the wedge state family of the sliver is described by the following simple expression:

$$P = e^{\frac{1}{2}L^{+}}I; L^{+}L + L :$$
(1.11)

The states in the family interpolate between the projector  $P_1$  and the identity  $P_0$  I, and they obey the relation:

$$P = P_{+}$$
: (1.12)

We are now in the position to outline our strategy. Our starting point is the fact that all single-split, twist-invariant projectors can be related to one another by a reparam eterization of the open string coordinate. Reparam eterizations are generated in nitesim ally by the star-algebra derivations  $K_n = L_n$  ()<sup>n</sup>L<sub>n</sub> and are familiar gauge symmetries of 0 SFT [17, 18]. Given a generic projector  $P_1$ , there exists a nite reparam eterization that relates it to the sliver, form ally implemented by an operator  $e^H$ , with H a linear combination of  $K_n$ 's:

$$P_1 = e^H W_1$$
;  $H = \sum_{n=1}^{X^I} a_n K_n$ : (1.13)

Acting with  $e^H$  on the solution  $_{W_1}$  associated with the sliver  $W_1$  , we nd the solution  $_{P_1}$  associated with  $P_1$  :

$$P_1 e^{H} W_1$$
: (1.14)

By construction,  $P_1$  is gauge equivalent to  $W_1$ . The idea of using reparam eterizations as a solution-generating technique was already noted in [3]. The solution  $P_1$  will take the form (1.5), with the replacement of all the elements associated with the sliver by the corresponding elements associated with  $P_1$ . In particular, we can de ne an abelian family of states interpolating between the identity and a generic projector  $P_1$  simply by taking  $P = e^H W$ . If we write

$$W = e^{\frac{1}{2}L_{s}^{\dagger}} I; \qquad (1.15)$$

where the subscript S in  $L_{S}^{+}$  denotes that it is an operator related to the sliver, we have

$$P e^{H} W = e^{H} e^{\frac{1}{2}L_{s}^{+}} e^{H} e^{H} I e^{\frac{1}{2}L^{+}} I:$$
(1.16)

Note that the identity is annihilated by H and we have de ned

$$L^{+} e^{H} L_{S}^{+} e^{H}$$
: (1.17)

Sim ilarly we take

L 
$$e^{H} L_{S} e^{H}$$
; L<sup>?</sup>  $e^{H} L_{S}^{?} e^{H}$ : (1.18)

The operators L and L<sup>?</sup> are BPZ conjugates of each other since H<sup>?</sup> = H, and they obey the canonical algebra (1.10). If the projector P<sub>1</sub> is special, the de nition (1.18) turns out to coincide with (1.9), but for general projectors the operator L is not proportional to L<sub>0</sub>.

It is in practice prohibitively di cult to determ ine the operator H. The construction, while motivated by the above considerations, must be realized di erently. The main result of this paper is to give a geometric description of the reparameterization procedure and a concrete implementation using the CFT language of OSFT. In particular we provide a geometric description for the family of interpolating states P associated with an arbitrary projector that makes the abelian relation (1.12) obvious.

The description simplies further for the case of a special projector. It should be emphasized that the geometrical construction of the family of states has been a long-standing question | there have been several attempts for the butter y. In this paper we nd out that the answer is quite simple if one uses the conform all frame of the projector itself.

It is rem arkable that projectors play a central role in the construction of the analytic tachyon solution. Projectors have been intensively studied in the context of vacuum string eld theory (VSFT) [19, 20]. In its simplest incamation, VSFT is the conjecture that the OSFT action expanded around the tachyon vacuum has a kinetic operator Q of the form [20]:

$$Q = \frac{c(i) \quad c(i)}{2i}$$
: (1.19)

Taking a matter/ghost factorized ansatz for classical solutions, =  $_{\rm m}$  , the VSFT α equations of motion reduce to projector equations for the matter part m. VSFT correctly describes the classical dynam ics of D-branes [11, 12, 21], but it is som ewhat singular. For example, the overall constant in front of the VSFT action must be taken to be form ally in nite. It is believed that V SFT arises from 0 SFT, expanded around the tachyon vacuum, by a singular eld rede nition. Moreover, the operator (1.19) is expected to be the leading term of a more complicated kinetic operator that involves the matter energy-momentum tensor as well, as discussed in more detail in [22]. One specic example of such a eld rede nition given in [20] was the reparam eterization that maps wedge states to one another, which in a singular limit form ally maps all wedge states to the sliver. Interestingly, this reparam eterization emerges naturally in the context of this paper. Indeed, it turns out that for each projector  $P_1$  there is a reparam eterization that leaves the projector invariant but m aps the states in the interpolating fam ily to one another. It takes P to  $P_{e^2}$ , where is an arbitrary real number. If we implement this reparam eterization on the sliver-based solution and take the large limit, all wedge states approach the sliver and the solution takes the form of an operator insertion on the sliver. A closely related approach in constructing a solution in a series expansion was proposed som e time ago in [23] and investigated further in [24]. It would be interesting to nd a system atic way to derive the kinetic operator of VSFT starting from a suitably reparam eterized version of the tachyon vacuum solution.

We begin in section 2 with a general introduction to reparam eterizations. A fler reviewing basic de nitions and algebraic properties, we explain why any two regular twist-invariant surface states can be related by a reparam eterization. The geom etrical reason is simple. A surface state can be de ned by what we call the reduced surface: it is the surface H for the inner product in (1.6) m inus the local coordinate patch. In this picture the open string is a param eterized boundary curve created by removing the patch. The two string endpoints and the string m idpoint de ne three special points on the boundary of the reduced surface. G iven two surface states, the Riemann mapping theorem ensures that there is a conformal map between the reduced surfaces that m aps the two endpoints and the m idpoint of one string into those of the other. This map de nes a relationship between the param eterizations of the two open strings; this is the induced reparam eterization. When the surface state is a projector, the reduced surface is split in two at the point where the open string m idpoint reaches the boundary of the full surface. When we map the reduced surfaces of two projectors to each other, each of the split surfaces of one reduced surface is mapped to a split surface of the other reduced surface. Since each split surface has only two special points (a string m idpoint and a string endpoint), the conform alm ap has a one-param eter am biguity.<sup>4</sup>

In section 3 we use the above insights to give the geometric construction of the abelian fam ily P associated with a generic projector. In fact, once we choose a map R that relates the sliver to the chosen projector, the surface states P are obtained from the wedge states by a reparam eterization naturally induced by R. This construction represents the surface states P using the conform al fram e of the projector: the local coordinate patch is that of the projector but the surface only covers part of the UHP. The geometric description of the surface states P sim pli es in this conform al fram e | a fact that was missed in the earlier attempts to describe them. In x3.2 we specialize to special projectors, for which we nd remarkable sim pli cation. The reparam eterization m ap that relates the sliver to the special projector in the hypergeom etric collection with the param eter s can be chosen to be sim ply R (z) =  $z^s$ , where z is the coordinate in the UHP. For any xed s, the regions of the UHP needed to represent states P with di erent

 $<sup>^{4}</sup>$ T he m aps of the two split surfaces are related by a sym m etry constraint, so there are no two independent parameters.

values of are related to one another by rescaling. This is related to the fact that for special projectors the operator L de ned in (1.18) is proportional to  $L_0$ , which is the dilation operator in the conform all frame of the projector.

In section 4 we begin by discussing the algebraic fram ework of the tachyon vacuum solution. We then present our main result, the CFT construction of the solution using reparam eterizations. We also present a detailed analysis of various operator insertions in the CFT description and derive useful form ulas. In section 5 we use the operator form alism to derive an expression for the solutions associated with special projectors. The solution is written as a sequence of norm al-ordered operators acting on the vacuum and can be readily expanded in level. Our expression has two param eters, s 2 [1;1 ) labeling the special projectors and 2 (1;1) labeling the reparam eterizations of the solution that leave the projector invariant.

In section 6 we give the level expansion of the solutions for special projectors up to level four. We nst set = 0 and exam ine the dependence of the energy on s to level zero, two, and four. We nd that as the level is increased the energy density approaches the expected value that cancels the D-brane tension. The solutions constructed by our method can be written in term s of even-moded total V irasoro operators and even-moded antighost operators in addition to the modes of c ghost. This structure im poses additional constraints, and thus the solutions belong to a resticted sector of the universal subspace of the CFT. We then exam ine the most accurate expression for the solution in the Siegel gauge computed in [25] and nd evidence that it does not belong to the restricted universal subspace at level four. We thus conclude that the solution in the Siegel gauge cannot be obtained by our construction. In x6.4 we exam ine the solution for a xed value of s and in the limit as becomes large. The leading term in the solution takes the form of an insertion of the c ghost in P multiplied by  $e^{2} = a$  and by a nite, calculable coe cient. We oer some concluding remarks in section 7.

## 2 Reparam eterizations

In this section we describe some general facts about reparam eterizations. The st three subsections are for a review of well-known material. In x2.1 we dene the notion of midpoint-preserving reparameterization ' of the open string coordinate, t!  $t^0 = '(t)$ , with  $t = e^i$ . Corresponding to ' there is an operator U, acting on the space of string elds that obeys a number of algebraic properties, as explained in x2.2. The transformation ! U, is a gauge transformation of 0 SFT with a vanishing inhomogeneous term, as we review in x2.3. Finally, in x2.4 we explain the key idea: any two regular twist-invariant surface states can be related to one another by a unique reparameterization. For surface states that correspond to single-split projectors, an

interesting and useful am biguity arises.

In the rest of the paper we shall use these facts to nd solutions of OSFT corresponding to a general projector, starting from Schnabl's solution corresponding to the sliver. By construction, all these solutions will be gauge equivalent.

### 2.1 De nitions

Let us start by recalling the de nition of midpoint-preserving reparam eterizations (henceforth, simply reparam eterizations) [17]. A reparam eterization of the open string coordinate is a map  $! = 0^{\circ} = 0^{\circ}$  (with  $i = 0^{\circ} = 0^{\circ}$ ) (with  $i = 0^{\circ} = 0^{\circ}$ ) that obeys

$$() = ():$$
 (2.1)

Note that this is a much stronger condition on than just xing the midpoint = =2: it is plies that points at equal parameter distance from the midpoint remain at equal parameter distance after the map. We will use the coordinate t exp(i) de ned on the unit sem icircle in the upper half plane. It follows from (2.1) that a map t !  $t^0 = \prime$  (t) (with  $j = j^0 j = 1$ , <t  $0; <t^0$  0) is a reparameterization if

$$\frac{1}{t} = \frac{1}{\prime (t)}$$
: (2.2)

For an in nitesim al reparam eterization we write the general ansatz

1

$$'(t) = t + v(t) + O(^{2});$$
 (2.3)

where is an in nitesimal real parameter and v(t) is a complex vector. We deduce from (2.2) that the vector eld v(t) must be BPZ odd:

v 
$$\frac{1}{t} = \frac{1}{t^2} v(t)$$
: (2.4)

Hence v (t) is a linear combination of the BPZ odd vector  $elds v_{K_n}$  corresponding to the familiar derivations  $K_n = L_n$  (1)<sup>n</sup>L<sub>n</sub>:

$$v(t) = \begin{cases} X^{1} & X^{1} \\ a_{n}v_{K_{n}} = \\ n=1 \end{cases} a_{n} t^{n+1} (1)^{n}t^{n+1} :$$
 (2.5)

By de nition, reparam eterizations preserve the unit norm of tj. U sing (2.3) this condition gives

$$tv(t) + tv(t) = 0;$$
 (2.6)

which implies that the coe cients  $a_n$  in (2.5) satisfy

$$a_n = ()^n a_n :$$
 (2.7)

W e see that  $a_n$  must be real for n even and imaginary for n odd.

A nite reparameterization ' (t) can be obtained by exponentiation of a vector v(t) of the form (2.5):

$$\exp(v(t)\theta_t) t = '(t)$$
: (2.8)

Indeed, the condition (2.4) implies that ' (t) satisfies (2.2). Moreover, (2.6) implies that ' (t) has unit norm. In general ' (t) is defined only on the unit sem icircle with j = 1 and cannot be extended to a holomorphic function inside the local coordinate half-disk D<sup>+</sup>. If v is a nite linear combination of  $v_{K_n}$  vectors, ' (t) can be extended to a nite annulus in the upper-half plane H containing the unit sem icircle.

#### 2.2 The operator U,

We now consider the operator  $U_r$  that implements a nite reparameterization. The operator is dened to act on any operator 0 (t) in the CFT as

$$U, O(t)U, ^{1} = ' O(t)$$
: (2.9)

This is the same relation one has for operators that realize the conform alm apsued for surface states, the di erence being that here the action on 0 is only de ned for jj=1 and typically does not extend to the origin. We write<sup>5</sup>

$$U_{r} = e^{H}$$
;  $H = \sum_{n=1}^{X^{1}} a_{n}K_{n}$ ;  $a_{n} = (1)^{n}a_{n}$ : (2.10)

We can verify that the reality condition on the coe cients a  $_n$  guarantees that U, preserves the reality condition of the string eld. In OSFT the string eld obeys the reality condition:

$$= hc^{\perp} bpz():$$
 (2.11)

BPZ conjugation (bpz) and herm itian conjugation (hc) act on V irasoro generators as follows:

$$bpz(L_n) = (1)^n L_n; \quad hc(L_n) = L_n:$$
 (2.12)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>We use the symbol H rather than K since we reserve the latter for the operator introduced in [5]: K  $\mathbf{\hat{E}}^+ = \mathbf{L}_{R}^+ = \mathbf{L}_{L}^+$ .

For any operator 0 we let 0<sup>?</sup> denote its BPZ conjugate. Recalling that BPZ conjugation is a linear transform ation while herm it ian conjugation is an anti-linear transform ation, we easily check that reparam eterizations preserve the reality of the string eld:

hc<sup>1</sup> bpz(U j i) = hc<sup>1</sup> bpz() je<sup>$$\sum_n a_n K_n$$</sup>  
= e <sup>$\sum_n (1)^n a_n K_n$</sup>  jhc<sup>1</sup> bpz() i (2.13)  
= e <sup>$\sum_n a_n K_n$</sup>  j i = U, j i:

The operator U, obeys the following form alproperties:

$$U_{i}^{?} = U_{i}^{1};$$
 (2.14)

$$[Q_{\rm B}; U, ] = 0;$$
 (2.15)

$$U, I = U, I = I;$$
 (2.16)

$$U_{1} U_{2} = U_{1} (1_{2}); 8_{1}; 2:$$
 (2.17)

These identities are the exponentiated version of the following familiar properties of H =  $P_{n=1}^{1} a_n K_n$ :

$$H^{?} = H;$$
 (2.18)

$$[Q_{\rm B};H] = 0;$$
 (2.19)

$$H I = 0;$$
 (2.20)

$$H_{1} + H_{2} + H_{2} = H(1 + 2); \quad 8_{1}; 2: \qquad (2.21)$$

The properties (2.14) { (2.17) can also be understood from the view point of 0 SFT without reference to the operator H. For example, since points at equal parameter distance from the m idpoint remain at equal parameter distance after reparameterizations, (2.17) follows at once from the picture of the star product as gluing of half open string functionals. Sim ilarly, (2.16) follows, at least form ally, from the understanding of the identity string eld as the functional that identi es the left and the the right halves of the open string. In [5] it was found that the property (2.20) m ay fail to hold for certain singular BPZ odd operators H. The nite reparameterizations that we explicitly consider in this paper appear to be perfectly sm ooth, and we believe that they obey all the form al properties (2.14) { (2.17). Follow ing the discussion of [5], we note that a regular H should adm it a left/right decom position H = H<sub>L</sub> + H<sub>R</sub> that is non-anom alous:

$$[H_{L}; H_{R}] = 0; H_{L}(A B) = (H_{L}A) B; H_{R}(A B) = A (H_{R}B)$$
 (2.22)

for general string elds A and B.

#### 2.3 Reparam eterizations as gauge sym m etries

Reparam eterizations are well-known gauge sym metries of OSFT. (See, for example, [18] for an early general discussion.) In nitesim algauge transform ations take the fam iliar form

$$= Q_{B} + ;$$
 (2.23)

where, in the classical theory, carries ghost number one and the gauge parameter carries ghost number zero. Choose now =  $H_R I = H_L I$ . The inhomogeneous term in (2.23) vanishes since  $[Q_B; H_R] = 0$  and  $Q_B I = 0$ . Using (2.22) we have

$$H_{RI} = (H_{R}I) + (H_{L}I) = H_{R}(I) + H_{L}(I) = (H_{R} + H_{L}) = H : (2.24)$$

This shows that the in nitesimal reparameterization generated by H can be viewed as an in nitesimal gauge transformation with gauge parameter  $H_R I$ . Exponentiating this relation, we claim that

$$U_{,} e^{H} = U_{,}^{1} U_{;}$$
 (2.25)

where the string elds U, and U, <sup>1</sup> are de ned by

U,<sup>1</sup> exp ( H<sub>R</sub>I) I H<sub>R</sub>I + 
$$\frac{1}{2}$$
H<sub>R</sub>I H<sub>R</sub>I + :::  $\frac{(1)^n}{n!}$  (H<sub>R</sub>I)<sup>n</sup> + :::; (2.27)

and they obey

$$U^{1}, U = U, U^{1} = I$$
: (2.28)

It is straighforward to check that for arbitrary string eld A,

exp (
$$H_{L}I$$
) A =  $e^{H_{L}}A$ ; and A exp ( $H_{R}I$ ) =  $e^{H_{R}}A$ : (2.29)

These identities, together with  $[H_L; H_R] = 0$ , can be used to show that the equality in (2.25) holds. The right-hand side of (2.25) has the structure of a nite gauge-transform ation in OSFT:

$$! U, ^{1} U + U, ^{1} Q_{B}U, ;$$
 (2.30)

where the inhom ogeneous term U, <sup>1</sup>  $Q_B U$ , is identically zero.

Since reparam eterizations are gauge symmetries, it is clear that they map a classical solution of 0 SFT to other gauge-equivalent classical solutions. If is a solution then  $U_{\tau}$  is also a solution, as is veried using the form alproperties (2.15) and (2.17):

$$Q_B + = 0 ! U , (Q_B + ) = 0 ! Q_B U , + U , U = 0 : (2.31)$$

It is also clear that and U, have the same vacuum energy. Indeed, using (2.14) and (2.15),

Furthermore, from (2.14) and (2.17),

 $hU_{,i}U_{,i}U_{,i}$  U, i  $hbpz(U_{,i})U_{,i}U_{,i} = hbpz()U_{,i}U_{,i}$  i = h; i: (2.33)

The two equations (2.32) and (2.33) guarantee that if the equations of motion for are obeyed when contracted with itself, the same is true for U  $_{\prime}$ .

#### 2.4 Reparam eterizations of surface states

W e now explain how reparam eterizations can be used to relate surface states. Consider a twistinvariant surface states jfi, specied as usual by a local coordinate map z = f() from the canonical half-disk D<sup>+</sup> to a region in the upper half plane H. (Both D<sup>+</sup> and H are de ned above (1.6).) We denote by V<sup>(f)</sup> the reduced surface corresponding to the surface state jfi. The reduced surface is de ned as the complement of the local coordinate half-disk in H:

$$V^{(f)} = H = f(D^+)$$
: (2.34)

The reduced surface  $V^{(f)}$  has two types of boundary. The set type is the boundary where open string boundary conditions apply; it is the part of the boundary of H which belongs to  $V^{(f)}$ . The second type is provided by the coordinate curve  $C_f$  which represents the open string:

$$C_f ff(t) 2 H; tj = 1; = (t) 0g:$$
 (2.35)

Let us assume for the time being that the local coordinate curve does not go to in nity anywhere. Then V<sup>(f)</sup> has the topology of a disk. The twist invariance f( ) = f( ), together with the standard conjugation symmetry (f( )) = f( ), implies that f( ) = (f( )) so V<sup>(f)</sup> is invariant under a rejection about the imaginary z axis. We now claim that given any two such surface states jfi and jgi, there exists a reparameterization ' (depending of course on f and g) that relates them :

This is shown as follows. By the Riem ann mapping theorem, there exists a holom orphic map  $z^0 = \mathbb{R}(z)$  relating the reduced surfaces V<sup>(f)</sup> and V<sup>(g)</sup>:

$$V^{(g)} = \Re(V^{(f)})$$
: (2.37)

We construct the map using the symmetry of the problem : rst we uniquely map the region to the right of the imaginary axis of V<sup>(f)</sup> to that of V<sup>(g)</sup> by requiring that f(1), f(i), and in nity are mapped to g(1), g(i), and in nity, respectively. We then extend the map to the left of the imaginary line using Schwarz's rejection principle, which applied here gives  $\Re(z) =$ 

 $(\Re (z))$ . The map  $\Re$  so constructed takes the local coordinate curve  $C_f$  to the local coordinate curve  $C_g$  (de ned by (2.35) with f replaced by g):

$$C_{q} = \Re (C_{f})$$
: (2.38)

A reparam eterization  $t^0 = \prime$  (t) of the two coordinate curves is de ned in plicitly by the relation

$$\Re(f(t)) = g('(t)):$$
 (2.39)

It follows from the above construction that ' is a reparam eterization. Indeed one readily veries that

$$\begin{split} \hat{\mathbb{R}} f &= \hat{\mathbb{R}} (f(t)) = \hat{\mathbb{R}} ((f(t))) = (\hat{\mathbb{R}} (f(t))) \\ &= (g('(t))) = g(('(t))) = g(\frac{1}{'(t)}) ; \end{split}$$

$$(2.40)$$

which establishes that (2.2) holds.

We now give a form all argument that explains why (2.36) holds. The surface state hfj is defined by its overlap with a generic state ji. W ithout loss of generality, we can restrict to states ji =  $\chi_{bi}$  which are eigenstates of the position operator<sup>6</sup>  $\hat{X}$  (t),

$$\dot{X}$$
 (t)  $\dot{X}_{b}i = X_{b}$  (t)  $\dot{X}_{b}i$ : (2.41)

The overlap hf  $X_{b}$  is computed by the path-integral over V<sup>(f)</sup>, where we impose open string boundary conditions on the portion of the boundary with = z = 0 and the boundary conditions X (f (t)) = X<sub>b</sub>(t) on the coordinate curve C<sub>f</sub>. Schem atically,

$$hf X_{b}i = \int_{z^{2}V^{(f)}} [dX (z)] e^{S_{BCFT}[X]} \text{ with } X (f(t)) X_{b}(t) \text{ on } C_{f}: (2.42)$$

Applying the reparam eterization  $z ! z^0 = \Re(z)$ , we see that hf  $\chi_{bi}$  is equivalently computed by the path-integral over  $V^{(g)}$ , provided we keep track of how the boundary conditions are mapped,

$$\int_{z^{0} Z^{(g)}} dX (z^{0}) = \int_{z^{0} Z^{(g)}} dX (z^{0}) = \int_{z^{0} Z^{(g)}} w = x^{0} \Delta (g(t^{0})) X_{b} (t^{0}) \text{ on } C_{g} :$$
 (2.43)

 $<sup>^{6}</sup>$ For notational sim plicity, we are focussing on the matter part of the CFT .

The path-integral in (2.43) can now be interpreted as computing the overlap of the surface state hgjw ith the position eigenstate  $\chi_{\rm b}$  /<sup>1</sup> i. Thus

$$hf X_{b}i = hg X_{b}$$
 /<sup>1</sup> i: (2.44)

To proceed, we note that the reparam eterization U, that gives

$$U, \hat{X}(t)U, ^{1} = \hat{X}(t'(t));$$
 (2.45)

w ill also give

$$U_{,} X_{b} i = X_{b} / i :$$
 (2.46)

Indæd

$$\hat{X}(t) \cup \hat{X}_{b}i = \bigcup \cup \hat{U}^{1} \hat{X}(t) \cup \hat{X}_{b}i = \bigcup \hat{X}(t'^{-1}(t)) \hat{X}_{b}i = X_{b}(t'^{-1}(t)) \cup \hat{X}_{b}i; \quad (2.47)$$

con m ing that  $U_{,j}X_{,b}i$  is the  $\hat{X}$  (t) eigenstate of eigenvalue  $X_{,b}$   $'^{1}$  (t), as stated in (2.46). Back in (2.44), we see that

$$hf X_{b}i = hg JU, X_{b}i = 8 X_{b}i;$$
 (2.48)

which implies

$$hgj = hfjU,^{1} = hfjU,^{2}$$
: (2.49)

This is the BPZ conjugate of the claim ed relation (2.36).

So farwe have assumed that the coordinate curves  $C_f$  and  $C_g$  do not reach in nity. It is vital for us to consider projectors, for which the coordinate curve does reach in nity at the open string m idpoint: f(i) = 1. If we assume that the m idpoint is the only point for which f(t) is in nite then the reduced surface  $V^{(f)}$  splits into two disks  $V^{(f)}$  and  $V^{(f)+}$ , with < z < 0 and < z > 0, respectively, joined at the point at in nity. The claim (2.36) still holds in this case: any two such twist-invariant projectors jfi and jgi can be related by a reparam eterization '. We de ne the m ap  $\Re$  for  $V^{(f)+}$  and, as before, we extend it to  $V^{(f)}$ . Again, the m ap  $\Re$ :  $V^{(f)+}$ !  $V^{(g)+}$ , is guaranteed to exist by the R iem ann m apping theorem, but this time it is not unique. W hile before f(i) and 1 provided two di erent points whose m aps could be constrained, now they are the same one. We partially x the SL (2;R) symm etry by requiring that f(1) and f(i) = 1 are m apped to g(1) and g(i) = 1, respectively. There is one degree of freedom left un xed, so there exists a one param eter fam ily of analytic m aps from  $V^{(f)+}$  to  $V^{(g)+}$ . This redundancy will play an important role in the following.

F inally, we note that we can never hope to relate regular surface states to projectors using reparam eterizations, since the topologies of the reduced surfaces  $V^{(f)}$  are dimensioned in the two classes.

# 3 A belian fam ilies for general projectors

The basic building block of Schnabl's solution is the state , which is constructed from the wedge state W  $_{+1}$  by adding suitable operator insertions. In this section we generalize the wedge states W , associated with the sliver W  $_1$ , to states P associated with a generic twist-invariant projector P $_1$ . In the next section we shall deal with the operator insertions and construct the analog of the state for a generic projector.

A swe have explained in x2.4, given a projector  $P_1$ , there exists a reparam eterization ' that relates it to the sliver:

$$W_1 = U_r P_1$$
: (3.1)

(There is in fact a one-parameter family of such reparameterizations. For now we simply choose one of them .) We de ne P by

$$P = U_{,1}^{1}W = U_{,1}W :$$
(3.2)

It follows from (2.16) that  $P_0 = I$  and from (2.17) that the states P obey the same abelian relation as W :

$$P = U_{,1}W = U_{,1}(W = U_{,1}$$

In x3.1 we give a geometric construction of P by determining the shape of the associated one-punctured disk P in the presentation where the local coordinate patch is that of the projector  $P_1$ . In x3.2 we focus on special projectors, for which the construction simplifies considerably and the reparameterization to the sliver can be given in closed form. For a special projector the corresponding abelian family obeys a remarkable geometric property: the surfaces P with different values of are related to one another by overall conform all scaling.

### 3.1 A belian fam ilies by reparam eterizations

G iven a single-split, twist-invariant projector jfi, we wish to nd a reparam eterization that relates it to the sliver. In the notations of x2.4, we write the sliver as  $\mathbf{j}V_1$  i jgi with  $z^0 = g() = \frac{2}{2} \arctan()$  and look for a one-param eter family of conform alm aps $\mathbf{k}^0$ :  $\mathbf{V}^{(f)}$ !  $\mathbf{V}^{(g)}$ . From now on we shall drop the superscript in  $\mathbf{V}^{(f)}$ !  $\mathbf{V}$ , and we rename the sliver's coordinate  $z^0$ !  $z_s$  and the sliver's region  $\mathbf{V}^{(g)}$ ! U.

To describe the conform alm aps  $\Re$  (z) we need to de ne a set of curves and regions in the conform alplane. We denote by  $C_0^+$  and  $C_0^-$  the right and left parts, respectively, of the coordinate curve  $C_0^-$  of the projector jfi. It is convenient to extend  $C_0^+$  and  $C_0^-$  by complex



Figure 1: Left: Coordinate curves  $C_0$  of the projector and (shaded) regions V to the left and right of the coordinate disk. Right: Coordinate curves  $V_0$  for the sliver and (shaded) regions U to the left and right of the coordinate disk. The map R relates the reduced surfaces of the two projectors. It takes V to U and de nest the reparam eterization that relates the two projectors.

conjugation to curves on the full plane, making the extended curves invariant under complex conjugation. For twist invariance of the projectors, the curve  $C_0$  is determined by  $C_0^+ : z \ge C_0$  if  $z \ge C_0^+$ . The curve  $C_0$  is the mirror in age of  $C_0^+$  across the in aginary axis. (See Figure 1.)

Let  $V^+$  denote the region of the z-plane to the right of  $C_0^+$  and let  $V^-$  denote the region of the z-plane to the left of  $C_0^-$ . Since the coordinate curves reach the point at in nity, both  $V^+$  and  $V^-$  are conform ally equivalent to the UHP, with the role of the real axis in the UHP played by the curves  $C_0^-$ . The union of  $V^+$  and  $V^-$  is V, the surface of the projector m inus its coordinate disk. Let us de ne analogous regions  $U^-$  for the sliver as follow s:

$$U^{+} = {n \choose z_{\rm S}} < (z_{\rm S}) \quad \frac{1}{2}^{\circ}; \quad U = {n \choose z_{\rm S}} < (z_{\rm S}) \quad \frac{1}{2}^{\circ}:$$
 (3.4)

It is also useful to de ne vertical lines V in the sliver fram e:

$$V = {n \choose z_S} < (z_S) = \frac{1}{2}(1+)^{\circ}$$
: (3.5)

The boundaries of U are V. Both U<sup>+</sup> and U are conformally equivalent to the UHP, with the role of the real axis in the UHP played by the lines  $V_0^+$  and  $V_0$ . (See Figure 1.)

W e are interested in the m ap

$$R : V^{+} ! U^{+}; z_{S} = R(z):$$
 (3.6)

The map must exist since both regions are conformal to the UHP.O focurse, the map will take the boundary  $C_0^+$  to the boundary  $V_0^+$ . We impose two additional conditions:

- 1. The intersection of  $C_0^+$  with the real axis is mapped to  $z_s = 1=2$ .
- 2. The point at in nity on  $C_0^+$  is mapped to the point at in nity on  $V_0^+$ .

The map R commutes with the operation of complex conjugation: R (z) = (R (z)). Thus the portion of the real axis contained in  $V^+$  is mapped to the portion of the real axis contained in  $U^+$ . We can then de ne the map  $\mathbb{R}$  that maps the whole V to the whole U as follows:

$$\dot{\Re}(z) = \begin{cases} c & R(z) & \text{if } z \ 2 \ V_0^+ \ ; \\ c & R(z) & \text{if } z \ 2 \ V_0 \ ; \end{cases}$$
(3.7)

It is easy to check that  $\mathbb{R}$  is an odd function:

$$\dot{\mathbb{R}}(z) = \dot{\mathbb{R}}(z): \qquad (3.8)$$

The map  $\Re$  describes a reparam eterization between the projector and the sliver. Indeed, letting f() denote the coordinate function of the projector and  $f_s(_s)$  denote the coordinate function of the sliver, we have the relation  $_s = f^1 \ \Re \ f()$ . A subset is a reparam eterization, it satisfies the condition in (2.2).

A swe have already remarked, the reparam eterization  $\Re(z)$  is not unique: we only specified two out of the three conditions needed to determ ine a map H ! H uniquely. The remaining ambiguity is that of post-composition with the selfmaps of U<sup>+</sup> that have the points  $z_s = 1=2$ and  $z_s = 1$  invariant. Given a function  $R_0(z)$  that realizes the map in (3.6) with the conditions listed above, we can generate a one-parameter family R (z) of maps that satisfy the same conditions as follows:

R (z) 
$$e^2$$
 R<sub>0</sub>(z)  $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}$ ; (3.9)

with 1 < < 1 an arbitrary real constant. It is clear that the map is a scaling about z = 1=2 with scale factor  $e^2$ . With R replacing R in (3.7) we obtain a family R of reparameterizations. We will later use this ambiguity to produce, for any xed projector, a family of solutions parameterized by .

Let us continue our analysis, assuming that a choice of  $\mathbb{R}$  has been made for the projector under consideration. Since the function  $\mathbb{R}$  (z) is invertible we can de ne the curves C as the in age under the inverse function  $\mathbb{R}^{-1}$  of the vertical lines V :

$$C R^{1}(V):$$
 (3.10)



Figure 2: Left: The surface P with its coordinate disk shaded. Right: The wedge surface W with its coordinate disk shaded.

It follows from  $\mathbb{R}^{(C)}(\mathbb{C}) = \mathbb{V}$  that

$$<(\Re(z)) = \frac{1}{2}(1+); z 2 C^{+}:$$
 (3.11)

The various lines V and C are shown in Fig 1.

We now proceed to the key step in the construction: we introduce a family P of states associated with the projector that is related by a reparameterization to the wedge states. Consider rst the surface W for the wedge state W given by

Wedge state surface W : 
$$\frac{1}{2}(1 + ) < (z_s) + \frac{1}{2}(1 + )$$
: (3.12)

This surface is shown on the right side of Figure 2. We write

$$W = (V ; V^{+});$$
 (3.13)

where (C;C<sup>0</sup>) denotes the region between the curves C and C<sup>0</sup>. The coordinate disk for W is ( $V_0$ ; $V_0^+$ ). Using  $z_s$  for coordinates on V , the identi cation for the surface is described as follows:

$$z_{\rm S}^+ \quad z_{\rm S}^- = 1 + :$$
 (3.14)

Now de ne the surface

$$P (C;C^{+}) = \Re^{1}(V); \Re^{1}(V^{+}); \qquad (3.15)$$

with the identi cation inherited from that of the vertical lines in (3.14). The surface P is shown on the left side of Figure 2. The coordinate disk in P is the region ( $C_0$ ;  $C_0^+$ ), or  $P_0$  without the identi cation. It follows that the complement of the coordinate disk in W is mapped by  $\mathbb{R}^{-1}$  to the complement of the coordinate disk in P. We have thus related the states P and W by a reparameterization. Using z for coordinates on C, the identi cation (3.14) becomes

$$\Re(z^+)$$
  $\Re(z) = 1 + :$  (3.16)

Using (3.7) this gives

$$R(z^{+}) + R(z) = 1 + :$$
 (3.17)

A few comments are in order. Since  $P_0$  is the coordinate disk of the projector with its boundaries identied, this is simply another surface for the identity state. Moreover, the limit of  $P_0$  as

! 1 is expected to be the surface for the projector itself. In fact, the curves to be identied are going to in nity, and the identication becomes immaterial because in nity is a single point in the UHP.We thus obtain the UHP with the coordinate patch of the projector | this is the surface for the projector.

In order to describe star products of wedge states it is convenient to use an alternative presentation of the region (3.12). We use the transition function (3.14) to move the region (V;  $V_0$ ) to the right of V<sup>+</sup>. Since the image of  $z_s = 1=2$  is  $z_s^+ = (1+2)=2$ , we have

$$W = (V_0 ; V_2^+);$$
 (3.18)

with the identi cation in (3.14) still operational. (See Figure 3.) Similarly, the surface P can also be represented as

$$P = (C_0; C_2^+); (3.19)$$

with the identi cation in (3.17) still operational. (See Figure 3.)

The gluing for the star product of wedge states is performed simply by translation with a real parameter in the sliver frame. Using the representation (3.18), the two vertical lines to be glued are always in U<sup>+</sup>. This induces the identication between two C<sup>+</sup> curves in V<sup>+</sup> for the star product of the states P<sup>-</sup>. If the curve C<sup>+</sup> described with a coordinate  $z_{<}$  is to be glued to C<sup>+</sup><sub>+</sub> with a coordinate  $z_{>}$ , then  $z_{<}$  and  $z_{>}$  are related by

$$R(z_{>}) R(z_{<}) = \frac{1}{2}$$
: (3.20)

The right-hand side is the real translation parameter that relates the curves R (C  $^{+}$  ) and R (C  $^{+}_{+}$  ).



Figure 3: Left: The surface P presented as the region between C<sub>0</sub> and C<sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup>. Right: The wedge surface W presented as the region between V<sub>0</sub> and V<sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup>.



Figure 4: Left: P presented as the region between  $C_0$  and  $C_2^+$ . Middle: P presented as the region between  $C_0$  and  $C_2^+$ . Right: The surface P + obtained by gluing the complement of the coordinate disk in P to P.

We now demonstrate the abelian relation P  $P = P_+$  geometrically. We present P as the region (C<sub>0</sub>;C<sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup>) and P as the region (C<sub>0</sub>;C<sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup>), as shown in Figure 4. The surface for P P is obtained by mapping the region (C<sub>0</sub><sup>+</sup>;C<sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup>) in P to the immediate right of C<sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup> 2 P and by gluing together C<sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup> 2 P and C<sub>0</sub><sup>+</sup> 2 P. Using coordinates z 2 P and z<sup>0</sup> 2 P, the gluing identication that follows from (3.20) is

$$R(z) = R(z^0) = (3.21)$$

W hen  $z^0 2 C_2^+$ , we have

$$< (\mathbf{R} (\mathbf{z})) = < (\mathbf{R} (\mathbf{z}^{0})) + = \frac{1}{2}(1+2) + = \frac{1}{2}(1+2(+));$$
 (3.22)

where we made use of (3.11). It thus follows that, after gluing, the image of  $C_2^+$  in the z-plane is the curve  $C_{2+2}^+$ . The composite surface is the region ( $C_0$ ;  $C_{2+2}^+$ ) shown on the right side of Figure 4. To fully con m that this is simply P<sub>+</sub> we must exam ine the identication between  $C_0$  and  $C_{2(+)}^+$ . Let  $z_0 \ge C_0$  and  $z_1 \ge C_2^+$  denote two points identied in P<sub>-</sub> (see Figure 4):

$$R(z_1) + R(z_0) = 1 + :$$
 (3.23)

Let  $z_2 \ 2 \ C_0^+ \ 2 \ P$  denote the point identi ed with  $z_1$  by the following relation:

$$R(z_1) \quad R(z_2) = :$$
 (3.24)

Let  $z_3 \ 2 \ C_2^+ \ 2 \ P$  be the point associated with  $z_2$  on account of having the same in aginary value after m apping by R:

$$R(z_3) R(z_2) = :$$
 (3.25)

F inally, let  $z_4 \ge C_{2(+)}^+$  in the z-plane denote the point glued to  $z_3$ :

$$R(z_4) \quad R(z_3) = :$$
 (3.26)

The relation between  $z_4$  and  $z_0$  is the identication derived from the gluing procedure. To nd this relation we note that the last three equations in ply that  $R(z_1) = R(z_4)$ . Together with (3.23) we obtain  $R(z_4) + R(z_0) = 1 + +$ , which is the expected gluing relation on  $P_+$ . This completes the veri cation that  $P_- P_- = P_+$ .

#### 3.2 Abelian fam ilies for special projectors

For single-split special projectors, the maps R(z) that relate them to the sliver are explicitly given by

$$R(z) = z^{s};$$
 (3.27)



Figure 5: The surface P for an arbitrary special projector with parameter s. The curves C and C<sup>+</sup> are identified via the relation  $(z^+)^s + (z^-)^s = 1 + \dots$  The local coordinate patch is the region between C<sub>0</sub> and C<sub>0</sub><sup>+</sup>.

where s is the parameter appearing in the algebra  $[L_0; L_0^2] = s(L_0 + L_0^2)$  of the special projector. We will explain (3.27) in x5.1. The fullm ap from the complement of the coordinate disk in the projector to the complement of the coordinate disk of the sliver given by (3.7) is

$$\dot{\mathbb{R}}(z) = \begin{cases} s & \text{if } z \ 2 \ V^{+} \ ; \\ \vdots & (z)^{s} & \text{if } z \ 2 \ V \ ; \end{cases}$$
(3.28)

It follows from (3.27) that the coordinate curve  $C_0^+$  is the s-th root of the sliver line  $V_0^+$ . Sim ilarly  $C^+$  is the s-th root of  $V^+$ . The surface P associated with a special projector with parameter s is shown in Figure 5.

Another key feature of special projectors is that we can write the map from P to H in terms of the map z = f() that de ness the projector. Recall that f() maps the upper-half disk of to the region  $(C_0; C_0^+)$  this is  $P_0$  without the identication The map f() is known explicitly for special projectors, as we shall review in x5.1.

The rst step in constructing the map from P to H is relating the curves  $C^+$  to the curve  $C_0^+$ . From the relation (3.11) we have

$$<(z^{s}) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + 1)$$
 for  $z \ge C^{+}$  and  $<(z^{s}) = \frac{1}{2}$  for  $z \ge C^{+}_{0}$ : (3.29)

It follows that  $C^+$  is obtained from  $C_0^+$  by a constant scaling! Indeed,

$$z^{0} 2 C^{+}; z 2 C_{0}^{+} ! z^{0} = (1 + )^{1=s} z:$$
 (3.30)

Since it appears frequently later, we de ne the scaling function I ;s as follows:

$$I_{s}(z) (1+)^{1=s}z$$
: (3.31)

Because of the relection symmetry about the imaginary axis, C is obtained from  $C_0$  by the same constant scaling. The identication for P is also properly transformed by the scaling. Indeed, using (3.17) we have

$$(z^{+0})^{s} + (z^{0})^{s} = 1 + \text{ for } P \text{ and } (z^{+})^{s} + (z^{-})^{s} = 1 \text{ for } P_{0};$$
 (3.32)

and the scaling z  $^{0}$  =  $(1 + )^{1=s}$  z relates the identi cations. W e thus have a full m apping of the surfaces:

$$P = I_{,s} (P_0) \text{ for special projectors:}$$
(3.33)

For a general projector, this map is di cult to obtain and does not follow directly from the know ledge of R (z) and f ( ).

We now claim that the map from P to H is given by the following function h :

$$h = f_{I} f^{1} I^{1}_{:s}$$
: (3.34)

The function I  $\frac{1}{i^{s}}$  scales P down to P<sub>0</sub>, with the identi cation applied to the boundary of P<sub>0</sub>. The function f<sup>-1</sup> then m aps P<sub>0</sub> to the upper-half disk with the inherited identi cation. Finally, the function f<sub>I</sub> is defined by

$$f_{I}() = \frac{1}{1 - 2}$$
: (3.35)

This is the function that de nes the identity state: it maps the upper-half disk of , with the left and right parts of the sem icircle boundary identied via 1 = 1, to H. It is then clear that h maps P to H.

The surface state P corresponding to the surface P is de ned by

h; P i hf 
$$(0) = hf (0) = hf (3.36)$$

for any state in the Fock space. The correlation function on P in the projector frame has been m apped to that on the UHP on the right-hand side, where f is given by

$$f = h \quad f = f_{f} \quad f^{\perp} \quad I_{is}^{\perp} \quad f:$$
 (3.37)

This is the expression obtained in [5]. (See (3.35) of [5].) In that work, however, the presentation of P using the conform all frame of the projector was not given, and a geometric proof of the

relation  $P = P_+$  was not provided. The above results will be useful later in our calculations on the tachyon vacuum solutions. For a general projector, the calculation of f is complicated because the map from P to  $P_0$  is nontrivial.

We conclude this section with an example. A side from the sliver, the simplest and most fam iliar projector is the butter y state. The butter y is a special projector with s = 2. Recall that the conform all frame of the butter y is dened by

$$z = f() = \frac{p}{1 + 2}$$
: (3.38)

Let us see that the butter y is related to the sliver through the reparam eterization induced by

$$R(z) = z^2$$
: (3.39)

The full map (3.7) between the complements of the coordinate disks is then given by

$$z_{\rm S} = \Re(z) = \begin{cases} {}^{\circ} z^2 & \text{if } z \ 2 \ V^+; \\ {}^{\circ} z^2 & \text{if } z \ 2 \ V^+; \\ {}^{\circ} z^2 & \text{if } z \ 2 \ V \ : \end{cases}$$
(3.40)

Since the butter y is a special projector with s = 2, the square of the coordinate curve must be a straight line or a set of straight lines [5]. Points on the coordinate curve are f () for  $= e^{i}$ , so we have

$$z^{2} = (f(e^{i}))^{2} = \frac{e^{2i}}{1 + e^{2i}} = \frac{e^{i}}{2\cos} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{i}{2}\tan$$
 (3.41)

The points here span a vertical line with realpart equal to 1=2. For  $2 \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2}; \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix}$ , we obtain the full vertical line so we indeed not that  $\Re$  maps  $C_0^+$  !  $V_0^+$ . For  $2 \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2}; \frac{3}{2} \end{bmatrix}$ , (3.41) shows that  $z^2$  also spans the full vertical line with its realpart equal to 1=2. W ith the minus sign in the second case of (3.40), we not that  $\Re$  maps  $C_0$  !  $V_0$ .

If we write z = x + iy, with x and y real, it follows from the real part of (3.41) that the butter y coordinate curve is part of the hyperbola given by

$$\langle (z^2) = x^2 \quad y^2 = \frac{1}{2}$$
: (3.42)

In fact, the full coordinate curve is the part of the hyperbola that lies on H.

Consider now the surface  $P_0$ , namely, the region in H in between  $C_0$  and  $C_0^+$ . Let  $z_+ 2 C_0^+$ and  $z 2 C_0$ . How do we write the identi cation of  $C_0$  and  $C_0^+$  as an analytic relation between z and  $z_+$ ? From (3.17) we have

$$z_{+}^{2} + z^{2} = 1$$
: (3.43)



Figure 6: (a) The surface P in the butter y family. The curves C and C<sup>+</sup> are identied. The coordinate patch is that of the butter y itself. (b) The same surface, with the complement of the coordinate patch placed completely to the right of the patch. The curves  $C_0$  and  $C_2^+$  are identied.

This correctly identies  $z = 1 = \frac{p}{2}$  with  $z_{+} = 1 = \frac{p}{2}$ . We can con mm (3.43) by recalling that the identication is induced by that of and 1 =. Therefore the point z = f() is identied with  $z_{+} = f(_{+})$  when  $_{+} = 1 =$ . This gives

$$z^{2} = \frac{2}{1+2} = \frac{1}{1+2} = 1 \qquad z_{+}^{2}$$
 (3.44)

in agreem ent with (3.43).

The surface P associated with the butter y projector is obtained by a dilation  $z ! (1 + )^{1=2}z$  of P<sub>0</sub>, as we have seen in (3.33). Under this dilation the bounding curves C<sub>0</sub><sup>+</sup> and C<sub>0</sub> in (3.42) become the curves C<sup>+</sup> and C whose points satisfy

$$z 2 C$$
 !  $\langle (z^2) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + )$ : (3.45)

Their identication is obtained from (3.43) by the dilation:

$$z_{+}^{2} + z^{2} = 1 + :$$
 (3.46)

The surface P is the region between C and  $C^+$ . The coordinate disk can be viewed as  $P_0$ , without identications, inside P. The surface P is shown in Figure 6(a).

We can use the identi cation (3.46) to move the region (C ; C<sub>0</sub>) to the right of C<sup>+</sup>. Since points z 2 C<sub>0</sub> satisfy < ( $z^2$ ) = 1=2, (3.46) shows that under the identi cation they become

$$\langle (z_{+}^{2}) = \frac{1}{2}(1+2)$$
 !  $z_{+} 2 C_{2}^{+}$ ; (3.47)

where we have used (3.45). The surface P can therefore be described as the region between  $C_0$  and  $C_2^+$ , with these two curves identied via (3.46). This presentation is shown in Figure 6(b).

# 4 Solutions from reparam eterizations

In this section we construct the tachyon vacuum solution associated with a general twistinvariant projector. We begin x4.1 with a review of the algebraic structure of Schnabl's solution. We then give a form alconstruction of the solution associated with a general projector using reparameterizations. In x4.2 we present the CFT description of the states and <sup>0</sup> for a general projector. In the last subsection we analyze the various operator insertions in more detail and geometrically con m that they obey the expected algebraic properties.

#### 4.1 Review of the algebraic construction

Schnabl's solution consists of two pieces and is de ned by a limit:

$$= \lim_{N \neq 1}^{h} \sum_{n \neq 0}^{N} + \sum_{n \neq 0}^{0}$$
(4.1)

The \phantom piece"  $_{\rm N}$  does not contribute to inner products with states in the Fock space in the limit. Namely,

$$\lim_{N \ge 1} h ; n = 0$$
 (4.2)

for any state in the Fock space. On the other hand, the piece involving the sum of  $n^0$  is the limit ! 1 of a state ,

which form ally satis es the equation of motion for all ,

$$Q_{\rm B} + = 0:$$
 (4.4)

The state can be formally written as a pure-gauge conguration [3] and is considered to be gauge-equivalent to = 0 for j j < 1. The equation (4.4) for any is equivalent to the following relations for  $\frac{0}{n}$  with integer n:

$$Q_{\rm B} \,_{0}^{0} = 0;$$
 (4.5)

$$Q_{B} {}_{n}^{0} = {}_{m=0}^{X^{1}} {}_{n m 1}^{0} {}_{n m 1}^{0} {}_{i} n > 0: \qquad (4.6)$$

There is a simple algebraic construction of the states  ${}_{n}^{0}$ , which we now review. It helps to use the abstract notation of [5] even though for the time being all the operators are meant to be those associated with the sliver. The left and right parts of the operator  $L^{+} = L + L^{2}$  are

denoted by  $L_{L}^{+}$  and  $L_{R}^{+}$ , respectively, and  $L^{+} = L_{L}^{+} + L_{R}^{+}$ . The operator K  $\hat{E}^{+}$  is defined by  $K = \hat{E}^{+} = L_{R}^{+}$   $L_{L}^{+}$ . For the sliver, its explicit form derived in [2] is

$$K = \hat{E}^{+} = \frac{1}{2}K_{1} = \frac{1}{2}(L_{1} + L_{1}):$$
(4.7)

The antighost operators  $B, B^?, B^+ = B + B^?, B^+ = B_R^+ B_L^+$  are similarly dened by replacing T(z) ! b(z) or  $L_n ! b_h$ . Thus for the sliver,

$$\mathfrak{B}^{+} = \frac{1}{2} (b_1 + b_1) : \tag{4.8}$$

In this language, we can write

$$_{0} = C P_{1}i;$$
 (4.9)

$$n = C \mathcal{P}_{1} i \mathcal{P}_{n 1} i B_{L}^{+} C \mathcal{P}_{1} i; n > 0; \qquad (4.10)$$

as well as

$${}^{0}_{0} = Q_{B}B_{L}^{+}CP_{1}i$$
 (4.11)

$$\mathbf{P}_{n}^{0} = \mathbf{C} \mathbf{P}_{1} \mathbf{i} \quad \mathbf{P}_{n 1} \mathbf{i} \quad \mathbf{B}_{L}^{+} \mathbf{L}_{L}^{+} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{P}_{1} \mathbf{i}; \quad n > 0; \qquad (4.12)$$

where the operator C is

$$C = \frac{2}{c_1}$$
: (4.13)

A gain, at this stage all objects are de ned in the sliver fram e. In particular,  $\mathcal{P}$  i is the wedge state  $\mathcal{W}$  i and  $\mathcal{P}_1$  is just the SL (2;R)-invariant vacuum jDi.

It was algebraically shown in [3] that the string elds  $_{n}^{0}$  de ned by (4.11) and (4.12) satisfy (4.5) and (4.6). In the proof, one uses the abelian algebra P = P + , standard properties of the BRST operator (Q<sub>B</sub> is a nilpotent derivation of the star algebra and annihilates the vacuum state), as well as the following identities:

$$\mathbf{B}^{+} \mathbf{P}_{1} \mathbf{i} = (\mathbf{B}_{R}^{+} \quad \mathbf{B}_{L}^{+}) \mathbf{P}_{1} \mathbf{i} = 0; \qquad (4.14)$$

$$\mathfrak{B}^{+} C \mathfrak{P}_{1} \mathfrak{i} = (\mathfrak{B}_{R}^{+} \mathfrak{B}_{L}^{+}) C \mathfrak{P}_{1} \mathfrak{i} = \mathfrak{P}_{1} \mathfrak{i}; \qquad (4.15)$$

$$(B_{R-1}^{+})_{2} = (1)_{1}^{1} (B_{L-2}^{+}):$$
 (4.16)

The set two equations (4.14) and (4.15) are immediately checked using  $\mathcal{P}_1 i = \mathcal{D} i$  and the expansions (4.8) and (4.13). The identity (4.14) can also be understood as a special case of the familiar conservation laws obeyed by wedge states,

$$\hat{E}^{+} \hat{P} i = (L_{R}^{+} L_{L}^{+}) \hat{P} i = 0;$$

$$\hat{B}^{+} \hat{P} i = (B_{R}^{+} B_{L}^{+}) \hat{P} i = 0:$$

$$(4.17)$$

The last identity (4.16) is obtained by observing that for any derivation  $D = D_{L} + D_{R}$  one has

 $(D_{R-1})_{2} = (1)_{1}^{D_{1}}_{1} (D_{L-2}):$  (4.18)

For  $D = \mathbb{B}^+$  we nd (4.16), while for D = K we obtain

$$(\mathbf{L}_{R-1}^{+})_{2} = _{1} (\mathbf{I}_{L-2}^{+}):$$
 (4.19)

Let us con m that  ${}^{0}_{n}$  as de ned in (4.12) is indeed the derivative with respect to n of the state  ${}_{n}$  in (4.10). Since  $\mathcal{P}$  i = e  $\overline{2}^{L^{+}}$  Ji, we have

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}} \mathfrak{P} = \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{L}^{+} \mathfrak{P} = \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{R}}^{+} \mathfrak{P}; \qquad (4.20)$$

where we have used (4.17). With the help of (4.19) we nd that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{dn}}_{n} = C \mathcal{P}_{1} \mathbf{i} \quad \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{R}}^{\dagger} \mathcal{P}_{n \ 1} \mathbf{i} \quad \mathbf{B}_{\mathrm{L}}^{\dagger} C \mathcal{P}_{1} \mathbf{i} = C \mathcal{P}_{1} \mathbf{i} \quad \mathcal{P}_{n \ 1} \mathbf{i} \quad \mathbf{I}_{\mathrm{L}}^{\dagger} \mathbf{B}_{\mathrm{L}}^{\dagger} C \mathcal{P}_{1} \mathbf{i}; \qquad (4.21)$$

as claim ed. Note that  $L_{L}^{+}$  and  $B_{L}^{+}$  commute because  $L_{L}^{+} = fQ_{B} ; B_{L}^{+} g$  and  $(B_{L}^{+})^{2} = 0$ .

One can also show that the solution satis as the gauge condition B = 0. The algebraic properties that guarantee this fact are

fB;Cg = fB<sup>?</sup>;Cg = 0; (4.22)  
LC
$$P_1$$
i = C $P_1$ i;

which follow immediately from the mode expansions on B, L, and C in the sliver frame. To show that (4.22) imply B  $_{n} = B _{n}^{0} = 0$ , the following identities are useful. Writing  $B = \frac{1}{2}(B + B_{L}^{+} + B_{R}^{+})$ , one can prove that

$$B(_{1} _{2}) = B_{1} _{2} + (1)^{1} _{1} (B B_{L}^{+}) _{2}: \qquad (4.23)$$

For a larger num ber of factors we have

$$B(1 2 ::: n) = (B_1) ::: n + \sum_{m=2}^{X^{11}} (1)^{\sum_{k=1}^{m-1} k} (1) ::: (B_{k-1} ::: n) :: (4.24)$$

One can actually make manifest the fact that  $\frac{0}{n}$  is annihilated by B in the following way:

$$n_{n}^{0} = \frac{1}{n} B C P_{1}i P_{n}i (I_{L}^{+} + \frac{1}{n}) C P_{1}i :$$
 (4.25)

We have seen in the previous section that a generic single-split projector  $P_1$  can be related to the sliver  $W_1$  by a reparameterization ' as  $P_1 = U$ ,  ${}^1W_1$ . This allowed us to construct

the abelian fam ily P from the wedge states by the same transform ation P U, <sup>1</sup>W. We now proceed to de ne operators associated with P<sub>1</sub> by similarity transform ations of the corresponding operators associated with the sliver. From now on we use the subscript S to denote objects in the sliver frame, and objects without the subscript are those in the frame of P<sub>1</sub>. We have

C 
$$U, {}^{1}C_{S}U, ;$$
 (4.26)

$$L U, {}^{1}L_{S}U, ;$$
 (4.27)

$$L^{?} = U, {}^{1}L_{S}^{?}U, ;$$
 (4.28)

- L  $U, {}^{1}L_{S}U, = L L^{?};$  (4.29)
- $L_{L}^{+}$  U, <sup>1</sup> ( $L_{L}^{+}$ )<sub>S</sub> U, ; (4.30)
- $L_{R}^{+}$  U, <sup>1</sup> ( $L_{R}^{+}$ )<sub>S</sub> U, ; (4.31)

and analogous expressions for the antighost operators B, B<sup>?</sup>, B, B<sup>+</sup><sub>R</sub>, B<sup>+</sup><sub>L</sub>. Because of the form al property (2.14), L<sup>?</sup> in (4.28) is the BPZ conjugate of L in (4.27), so our notation is consistent. It is also consistent to use  $L_{L}^{+}$  and  $L_{R}^{+}$  in (4.30) and (4.31) since reparam eterizations preserve the left/right decom position of operators. A swew ill see explicitly in x4.3, the operators  $L_{L}^{+}$  and  $L_{R}^{+}$  are, respectively, the left and right parts of the operator  $L^{+}$  de ned in (4.29). It is also obvious that all the algebraic properties (4.14), (4.15), (4.16), (4.17), and (4.22) are obeyed by the operators in the fram e of P<sub>1</sub>.

The states n associated with P<sub>1</sub> are given by

$$U^{1}_{n} = C \mathcal{P}_{1} i \mathcal{P}_{n} i B^{+}_{L} C \mathcal{P}_{1} i;$$

$$(4.32)$$

and  $^{0}_{n}$  associated with P<sub>1</sub> are similarly obtained. Finally, the solution associated with P<sub>1</sub> is obtained from the sliver's solution  $_{s}$  as

$$= U , {}^{1} {}_{S} :$$
 (4.33)

C learly, it takes the same form (4.1), with the understanding that the states  $n_n^0$  and  $N_N$  are now those in the frame of  $P_1$ .

### 4.2 Solutions in the CFT form ulation

W e now translate the above form al construction into a geometric description. In the CFT formulation, the state  $_{n S}$  in the sliver frame is dened by

h; 
$$_{nS}i = f_{S}$$
 (0) c(1)  $\int_{V^{+}}^{Z} \frac{dz}{2i}b(z) c(n + 1) \int_{W_{n+1}}^{W} (4.34)$ 



Figure 7: A diagram of the correlator on  $W_{n+1}$  used in (4.34) to describe the solution in the sliver frame. Shown are ghost insertions at  $z_s = 1$  and  $z_s = n + 1$ . The vertical line in between these insertions represents the antighost line integral.

for any state in the Fock space, where 1 < 2n + 1. A pictorial representation of the correlator is given in Figure 7. The contour V<sup>+</sup> is oriented in the direction of increasing in aginary  $z_s$ , and by V<sup>+</sup> we denote the same contour with opposite orientation. The expression (4.34) is the direct geometric translation of the algebraic expression (4.10), as explained in detail in [3]. Recall the change in the normalization of  $f_s$ .

Let us apply the reparam eterization U,<sup>1</sup> to the state  $_{nS}$ . G com etrically, this amounts to mapping the region  $(V_0^+; V_{2(n+1)}^+)$ , including the operator insertions, by the conform altransform mation R<sup>-1</sup> used to construct the state  $\mathcal{P}_{n+1}$  if from the wedge state  $\mathbf{j}_{n+1}$  i. It is straightforward to calculate the transform ations of the operator insertions in (4.34). We not that the state  $_n$  associated with a general projector is given by

h; 
$$_{n} i = hf$$
 (0) C(1) BC(2n + 1)  $\frac{1}{2}_{n+1}$  (4.35)

for any state in the Fock space, where

C() 
$$R^{0} R^{1} \frac{1+}{2} c R^{1} \frac{1+}{2}$$
;  $B \frac{dz}{2iR^{0}(z)}$ : (4.36)

The contour of the integral for B can be taken to be  $C^+$  with 1 < < 2n+1. (The orientation of the contour  $C^+$ , inherited from the orientation of  $V^+$ , is directed towards increasing in aginary z). In general, when B is located between two operators, the contour of the integral must run between the two operators. Note that C() is nothing but the operator  $c(z_S)$ , with  $z_S = \frac{1}{2}(1+)$ , expressed in the fram  $e z = R^{-1}(z_S)$ . The argument of C denotes the label of the line  $C^+$  that contains the insertion. The surface and insertions for the correlator indicated in (4.35) are shown in Figure 8.



Figure 8: The surface and insertions relevant to the correlator (4.35) used to de ne  $_n$ . The surface  $P_{n+1}$  includes two ghost insertions C and an antighost line integral B.

This de nition of  $_{n}$  is valid for n > 0, and  $_{0}$  can be de ned by the limit n ! 0:

$$\int_{n+0}^{\infty} \lim_{n \to 0} \frac{1}{n} :$$
 (4.37)

Let us calculate  $_0$  explicitly. The anticom mutation relation of B and C is given by

$$fB;C()g = BC() + C()B = 1:$$
 (4.38)

Note that the contour for B in the term BC() should be  $C^+$  with < , and the contour for B in the term C() B should be  $C^+$  with > . Using this anticommutation relation, the inner product h; n i in the limit n ! 0 is given by

$$\lim_{n \downarrow 0} h ; n i = hf \quad (0) C (1) \downarrow_{1} : \qquad (4.39)$$

This gives the CFT description of the state  $_0 = C P_1 i$  in (4.9) for a general projector. It coincides with the state obtained by reparameterization from the sliver's  $_0$ .

A nother useful expression for the inner product h ;  $_{n}$  i is

h; 
$$_{n}i = R^{0}(R^{1}(1))^{2} c(R^{1}(1)) f(0) c(R^{1}(1)) \int_{C^{+}}^{L} \frac{dz}{2} i \frac{b(z)}{R^{0}(z)} ;$$
 (4.40)

where > 1, and we have mapped the operator C(2n + 1) to  $\mathbb{R}^0 \mathbb{R}^{-1}(1) \subset \mathbb{R}^{-1}(1) = \mathbb{R}^0(\mathbb{R}^{-1}(1)) \subset (\mathbb{R}^{-1}(1))$  using the identication (3.17) for the surface  $P_{n+1}$ . Note that must be G rassmann even in order for the inner product to be nonvanishing. We will use (4.40) in the next section.

Let us now consider  ${}_n^0$ . Taking a derivative of  ${}_{n S}$  with respect to n is equivalent to an insertion of the operator  ${}_Z$ 

$$\int_{v^{+}} \frac{dz}{2 i} T(z)$$
 (4.41)



Figure 9: The surface and insertions relevant to the correlator (4.43) used to de ne  $n^{0}$ . The surface  $P_{n+1}$  includes two ghost insertions C, an antighost line integral B, and a stress-tensor line integral L.

in (4.34), with 1 < < 2n + 1. See [3] for more details. Since the operator is transformed by R<sup>-1</sup> to Z

$$L \qquad \frac{dz}{2} \frac{T(z)}{R^{0}(z)}; \qquad (4.42)$$

the geom etric translation of (4.12) for a general projector is

h; 
$${}_{n}^{0}i = hf$$
 (0) C(1) L B C(2n + 1)  $\frac{1}{2}_{n+1}$ ; (4.43)

where the contour of the integral for L can be taken to be  $C^+$  with 1 < < 2n + 1. The surface and insertions for this correlator are shown in Figure 9.

Note that B and L commute. In general, when L is located between two operators, the contour of the integral must run between the two operators. The de nition (4.43) is valid for n in the range n > 0. As in the case of 0, the state  $\frac{0}{0}$  can be de ned by the lim it n ! 0:

$${}_{0}^{0} = \lim_{n \, : \, 0} \, {}_{n}^{0} : \qquad (4.44)$$

Using the anticom mutation relation (4.38), the inner product h ;  $\frac{0}{n}$  i can be written as

h; 
$${}_{n}^{0} i = hf$$
 (0) C(1) B L C(2n + 1)  $\frac{1}{P}_{n+1}$   
= hf (0) L C(2n + 1)  $\frac{1}{P}_{n+1}$  hf (0) B C(1) L C(2n + 1)  $\frac{1}{P}_{n+1}$ : (4.45)

It is trivial to take the limit n ! 0 for the rst term. The limit of the second term can be calculated using the formula

$$\lim_{\substack{i \\ j \\ 0}} C(i) L C(i + j) = \lim_{\substack{i \\ j \\ 0}} C(i) [L; C(i + j)] = Q_B C(i);$$
(4.46)

where  $Q_B = 0$  is the BRST transform at ion of 0. The inner product h;  ${}_0^0$  i is thus

h; 
$${}^{0}_{0}i = hf$$
 (0) L C (1)  $i_{1}$  hf (0) B  $Q_{B}$  C (1)  $i_{2}$  (4.47)

This gives the geometric translation of the state  ${}_{0}^{0} = L_{L}^{+} C \not{P}_{1} i + B_{L}^{+} Q_{B} C \not{P}_{1} i = Q_{B} B_{L}^{+} C \not{P}_{1} i$ in (4.11) for a general projector, as we will explain further in the next subsection. The state coincides with the state obtained by reparameterization from the sliver's  ${}_{0}^{0}$ .

### 4.3 Operator insertions in the geometric language

The expressions of n and  $n^{0}$  in (4.35), (4.40), and (4.43) are the central results of this section. While the solution constructed from these states are guaranteed to satisfy the equation of motion because it is related to Schnabl's solution by a reparam eterization, it is also possible to con rm this directly without referring to the reparam eterization. In this subsection we over a more detailed analysis of how various operator insertions are presented in the CFT formulation. It is then straightforward to con rm that the equation of motion is satisfy the formulas in this subsection. The techniques developed in this subsection will be useful in handling operator insertions in the conform al frame of a general projector.

Let us begin with the operator L. It is, by de nition, obtained from  $L_s$  by the reparam – eterization ', where ' is implicitly de ned by the relation  $\Re$  (f (t)) =  $f_s$  (' (t)) in (2.39). The function  $f_s$  (t) becomes  $f_s$  (' (t)) =  $\Re$  (f (t)), and thus L in the general projector frame z = f () is given by  $L_s$  in the sliver frame  $z_s = f_s$  (s) by the conform altransformation  $z = \Re^{-1} (z_s)$ :

In obtaining the second line we made use of (3.7). For special projectors, R (z) =  $z^s$  and the expression for L simplifies to I

$$L = \frac{1}{s} \frac{dz}{2i} z T (z) = \frac{L_0}{s} :$$
 (4.49)

The operator  $L_0$  is the V irasoro zero m ode in the fram e of the projector. This is the de nition of L given in [5]. If the projector is not special, (4.49) does not hold. Generically the expansion of L in ordinary V irasoro operators  $L_n$  contains term s with negative n.

The inner product hL ; P i for any state in the Fock space is given by

hL ;P i= 
$$\begin{array}{c} Z \\ \sum_{\substack{c_0^+ \\ c_0^+ \end{array}}} \frac{dz}{2i} \frac{k (z)}{k^{0}(z)} T (z) f (0) \\ = \frac{z_{c_0^+}}{2i R^{0}(z)} \frac{dz}{2i R^{0}(z)} T (z) f (0) \\ = \frac{z_{c_0^+ }}{2i R^{0}(z)} T (z) f (z) f (z) \\ = \frac{z_{c_0^+ }}{2i R^{0}(z)} T (z) f (z) f (z) \\ = \frac{z_{c_0^+ }}{2i R^{0}(z)} T (z) f (z) f (z) \\ = \frac{z_{c_0^+ }}{2i R^{0}(z)} T (z) f (z) f (z) \\ = \frac{z_{c_0^+ }}{2i R^{0}(z)} T (z) f (z) f (z) \\ = \frac{z_{c_0^+ }}{2i R^{0}(z)} T (z) f (z) f (z) \\ = \frac{z_{c_0^+ }}{2i R^{0}(z)} T (z) f (z) f (z) \\ = \frac{z_{c_0^+ }}{2i R^{0}(z)} T (z) f (z) f (z) \\ = \frac{z_{c_0^+ }}{2i R^{0}(z)} T (z) f (z) f (z)$$

This provides the CFT representation of the state  $L^2$  ? ibecause hL ; P i = h ;  $L^2$  P i.

Next, we wish to derive a representation of L  $\mathcal{P}$  i. To this end, we need an expression for hL<sup>?</sup>; P i. W hile it is possible to construct L<sup>?</sup> from L<sup>?</sup><sub>S</sub> by the reparam eterization ' as in (4.48), it is instructive to understand BPZ conjugation directly on the surface P . BPZ conjugation is, by de nition, performed by the map I() = 1= in the coordinate. For an operator in the z-plane, BPZ conjugation requires mapping the operator to the coordinate, performing the conjugation, and mapping the resulting operator back to the z coordinate. The full conform altransform ation is then

$$z^{0} = I_{f}(z) = f I f^{1}(z); I() = 1 = :$$
 (4.51)

This relation between  $z^0$  and z is nothing but the identication between  $z_+$  and z for  $P_0$ , namely,

$$R(z_{+}) + R(z) = 1:$$
 (4.52)

Let us apply this geometric understanding of BPZ conjugation to the operator L. The m ap  $\rm I_f$  transforms the two integrals in (4.48) as follows:

Thus the inner product hL? ;P i is given by

hL<sup>?</sup>; P i= 
$$\begin{array}{c} Z \\ C_{0}^{+} C_{0} \end{array} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{2} \frac{z}{2} \frac{z}{2}$$

Recalling (4.50), we can write

$$hL^{?}$$
;  $P = hL$ ;  $P =$ 

It im mediately follows that

$$hL^{+}$$
;  $P = h(L + L^{?})$ ;  $P = \frac{Z}{c_{0}^{+} + c_{0}} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{T(z)}{R^{0}(z)} f$  (0); (4.56)

and thus the operator  ${\rm L}^+~$  is

$$L^{+} = \frac{Z}{c_{0}^{+}} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{T(z)}{iR^{0}(z)} + \frac{Z}{c_{0}} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{T(z)}{iR^{0}(z)} :$$
(4.57)

From these expressions, we easily con m the algebra  $[L;L^2] = L + L^2$ ,

$$[L;L^{?}] = [L;L + L^{?}] = \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ Z^{C_{0}^{+}+C_{0}} \end{bmatrix} \frac{dw}{2} \frac{1}{i \frac{1}{R^{0}(w)}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{R}{i \frac{1}{R^{0}(z)}} T(z) T(w) \\ \frac{dw}{2} \frac{1}{i \frac{1}{R^{0}(w)}} = L + L^{?}; \end{bmatrix}$$

$$(4.58)$$

where the contour of the integral of z encircles w counterclockwise, and we have neglected surface term s of the form  $\Re(w)$  T (w)= $\Re^0(w)^2$  for integration by parts with respect to w. W hether or not the surface term s vanish should be checked for a given  $\Re(z)$  by evaluating them in a coordinate where the midpoint of the open string is located at a nite point.

We now consider the operators  $L_{L}^{+}$  and  $L_{R}^{+}$ . Since  $C_{0}$  and  $C_{0}^{+}$  are respectively the left and right parts of the coordinate curve, the expression in (4.56) splits as follows:

$$hL_{R}^{+}; P i = \begin{array}{c} Z \\ C_{0}^{+} \end{array} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{T(z)}{R^{0}(z)} f \quad (0) \\ Z \\ hL_{L}^{+}; P i = \begin{array}{c} Z \\ C_{0} \end{array} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{T(z)}{R^{0}(z)} f \quad (0) \\ C_{0} \end{array} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{R^{0}(z)}{R^{0}(z)} f \quad (0) \\ P \end{array}$$

$$(4.59)$$

The BPZ conjugation m ap  $\mathrm{I}_\mathrm{f}$  acts as

$$I_{f}: \frac{Z}{c_{0}^{+}} \frac{dz_{+}}{2 i} \frac{T(z_{+})}{R^{0}(z_{+})} ! \frac{Z}{c_{0}} \frac{dz}{2 i} \frac{T(z)}{R^{0}(z)}; \qquad (4.60)$$

so we see

$$[L_{R}^{+})^{?} = L_{L}^{+}$$
: (4.61)

Since BPZ conjugation is an involution, we also have  $(L_{L}^{+})^{?} = L_{R}^{+}$ .

Using the presentation of P as the region between  $C_0$  and  $C_2^+$  and recalling that these curves are identied by (3.17), we can rewrite  $hL_L^+$ ; P i in (4.59) as

$$hL_{L}^{+}$$
;  $P$   $i = \begin{pmatrix} Z \\ C_{2}^{+} \end{pmatrix} \frac{dz}{2 i} \frac{T(z)}{R^{0}(z)} f \qquad (0) \\ P \end{pmatrix}_{P}$ ; (4.62)

Since  $(L_R^+)^2 = L_L^+$  and  $(L_L^+)^2 = L_R^+$ , the inner products h ;  $L_R^+P$  i and h ;  $L_L^+P$  i are given by

h ;L<sub>R</sub><sup>+</sup>P i = f (0) 
$$\begin{array}{c} Z \\ c_{2}^{+} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{T(z)}{R^{0}(z)} \\ Z \\ c_{0}^{+} \end{array}$$
; (4.63)  
h ;L<sub>L</sub><sup>+</sup>P i = f (0)  $\begin{array}{c} Z \\ c_{0}^{+} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{T(z)}{R^{0}(z)} \\ c_{0}^{+} \end{array}$ ;

We see that the states  $L_R^+ \not P$  i and  $L_L^+ \not P$  i are both represented as the region between  $C_0^+$  and  $C_2^+$  with the same operator inserted on di erent locations: it is on the right edge for  $L_R^+ \not P$  i and on the left edge for  $L_L^+ \not P$  i. Since there are no operator insertions in the region between  $C_0^+$  and  $C_2^+$ , the contour  $C_2^+$  can be deformed to  $C_0^+$ , and we con rm that the states are the same:

$$L_{R}^{+} \mathcal{P} i = L_{L}^{+} \mathcal{P} i:$$

$$(4.64)$$

Let us next consider the star multiplication of states with insertions of  $L_R^+$  or  $L_L^+$ . We take P  $(L_L^+P)$  as an example, but the generalization to other cases is straightforward. The operator  $L_L^+$  of  $L_L^+P$  is represented by an integral over  $C_0^+$  on P in (4.63). For the gluing of the star product we need the identi cation of curves in two di erent coordinate system s. A curve  $C_q^+$  in the  $z_{<}$  coordinate is mapped to  $C_{q+}^+$  in the  $z_{>}$  coordinate when  $z_{<}$  and  $z_{>}$  are related by

$$R(z_{>}) = R(z_{<}) + \frac{1}{2}$$
 (4.65)

Under this identication the operator insertion in (4.63) takes the same form in the two coordinates: z = z

$$\int_{C_{q}^{+}} \frac{dz_{<}}{2} \frac{T(z_{<})}{R^{0}(z_{<})} = \int_{C_{q+}^{+}} \frac{dz_{>}}{2} \frac{T(z_{>})}{R^{0}(z_{>})} :$$
(4.66)

The operator integrated over  $C_0^+$  on P is thus mapped to the same operator integrated over  $C_2^+$  on the surface P + = ( $C_0$ ;  $C_{2+2}^+$ ) for the star product P ( $L_L^+P$ ). It follows from the rst equation in (4.63) that the star product can also be interpreted as ( $L_R^+P$ ) P.We have thus shown that

$$(L_{R}^{+}P) P = P (L_{L}^{+}P)$$
: (4.67)

The antighost eld b(z) transforms in the same way as the energy-momentum tensor T(z). Therefore the form ulas we have derived for the energy-momentum tensor based on its transform ation properties also apply to the antighost. The equations in (4.59), for example, become

$$hB_{R}^{+}; P = \sum_{\substack{c_{0}^{+} \\ c_{0} \\ c_{$$

and the equations in (4.63) become

h ;B<sup>+</sup><sub>R</sub>P i= f (0) 
$$\begin{bmatrix} Z \\ c_2^+ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} dz \\ 2 \\ i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} b(z) \\ R^0(z) \end{bmatrix}_{P}$$
;  
h ;B<sup>+</sup><sub>L</sub>P i= f (0)  $\begin{bmatrix} Z \\ c_0^+ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} dz \\ 2 \\ i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} b(z) \\ R^0(z) \end{bmatrix}_{P}$ ; (4.69)

W e also have the analogs of (4.61), (4.64), and (4.67)

$$(B_{R}^{+})^{?} = B_{L}^{+}; \qquad (B_{L}^{+})^{?} = B_{R}^{+}; \qquad (4.70)$$

$$B^{+} P i = (B_{R}^{+} B_{L}^{+}) P i = 0; (4.71)$$

$$(B_{R}^{+}P) P = P (B_{L}^{+}P)$$
: (4.72)

F inally let us exam ine the operator C. As we have discussed in the calculation of  $_0$  in x42, the state C  $\mathcal{P}_1$  i for a general projector is given by

h; 
$$CP_1 i = hf$$
 (0)  $C(1) i_{P_1} = R^0 (R^{-1}(1)) hf$   $c(R^{-1}(1)) i_{P_1}$  (4.73)

for any state in the Fock space, where  $P_1$  is represented by the region between  $C_0$  and  $C_2^+$ . Let us con m that  $C P_1$  is satisfied as the relation (4.15). We need to show that h;  $B^+ C P_1 i = h$ ;  $P_1 i$  for any state in the Fock space. Since must be G rassmann odd in order to have a nonvanishing inner product, there is an extra m inus sign in taking the BPZ conjugate of  $B^+$ , and we have

h ;
$$\mathbf{B}^{+}$$
 CP<sub>1</sub>i = h ; ( $\mathbf{B}_{R}^{+}$   $\mathbf{B}_{L}^{+}$ ) CP<sub>1</sub>i = h ( $\mathbf{B}_{R}^{+}$   $\mathbf{B}_{L}^{+}$ )<sup>?</sup> ; CP<sub>1</sub>i = h ( $\mathbf{B}_{R}^{+}$   $\mathbf{B}_{L}^{+}$ ) ; CP<sub>1</sub>i: (4.74)

The relevant correlation function can be written using (4.68), and it can be evaluated as follows:

$$h(B_{R}^{+} B_{L}^{+}); CP_{1}i = R^{0}(R^{1}(1)) \qquad \frac{dz}{c_{0}^{+} c_{2}^{+}} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{b(z)}{iR^{0}(z)} f \qquad (0) c(R^{1}(1))$$

$$= R^{0}(R^{1}(1)) f \qquad (0) \qquad \frac{dz}{2} \frac{b(z)}{iR^{0}(z)} c(R^{1}(1)) = hf \qquad (0) \frac{1}{F_{1}};$$

$$(4.75)$$

where the contour of the integral in the last line encircles  $z = R^{-1}$  (1) counterclockwise. This concludes the con mation that  $\mathbb{B}^+ \subset \mathbb{P}_1 i = \mathbb{P}_1 i$ .

# 5 Operator construction of the solution

In this section we give an explicit operator construction of the solution for the most general single-split special projector for arbitrary value of the reparam eterization parameter introduced in (3.9). We begin in x5.1 with a discussion of single-split special projectors. They form a hypergeometric collection," indexed by a parameter s 1. Then in x5.2 we derive an operator expression for the state \_n, the key ingredient of \_ in (1.5). The result, given in (5.50), takes the form of norm al-ordered operators acting on the SL (2;R)-invariant vacuum. It holds for any projector in the hypergeometric collection.

#### 5.1 The hypergeom etric collection

In a previous paper [5], a fam ily of special projectors with a parameter s 1 was introduced. It was demanded that the vector eld  $v_{L_s}$  associated with the V irasoro operator  $L_s$  in the fram  $e_z = f'()$  take the form ?

$$v_{L_{s}}(f) = \frac{s}{(f^{s})^{0}} = \frac{(1+2)^{s}}{s};$$
 (5.1)

or, equivalently,

$$\frac{df^{s}}{d} = \frac{s^{s}}{(1+2)^{s}} :$$
 (5.2)

By integrating this di erential equation, f ( ) was found to be

$$f'() = {}_{2}F_{1} \frac{h_{s}}{2}; s; 1 + \frac{s}{2}; \qquad {}^{2} \frac{1}{2} = s \qquad (5.3)$$

It turns out that for even s the operator  $L_s$  is proportional to  $L^+$  while for each odd s it is proportional to  $K = L_R^+ \quad L_L^+$ . M ore precisely, we found that

$$q(s) L_{s} = \begin{pmatrix} L^{+} & \text{for s even ;} \\ K & \text{for s odd ;} \end{pmatrix}$$
 with  $q(s) = \frac{(s=2+1)(s=2)}{(s+1)}$ : (5.4)

It will be convenient to x the normalization of f'() by introducing a rescaled f() with  $f(=1) = 2^{1=s}$ . To implement this, we simply take

$$f() = 2^{\frac{1}{s}} \frac{f'()}{f'(1)} = 2^{\frac{1}{s}} \qquad \frac{{}_{2}F_{1} \frac{s}{2};s;1 + \frac{s}{2};}{{}_{2}F_{1} \frac{s}{2};s;1 + \frac{s}{2};} \frac{2}{1} :$$
(5.5)

 $<sup>^7</sup>$  W e reserve the use off for the m ap with a di erent norm alization. The m ap f( ) here corresponds to f( ) of [5].

Noting that

$${}_{2}F_{1} \frac{h}{2}; s; 1 + \frac{s}{2}; 1$$
 (s) =  $\frac{2 {}^{s}P - [1 + \frac{s}{2}]}{[\frac{1}{2} + \frac{s}{2}]};$  (5.6)

a short computation shows that with the new normalization

$$\frac{1}{s}L_{s} = \begin{matrix} L^{+} & \text{for s even ;} \\ K & \text{for s odd :} \end{matrix}$$
(5.7)

This means that in the z-coordinate of the projector we have

(

$$\frac{1}{s} \frac{1}{z^{s}} = v^{+}(z) \text{ for seven }; \\ (t(z))v^{+}(z) \text{ for sodd }; \\ \text{with } z = f(t); t = e^{i}: (5.8)$$

In here we have used the step function (t) de ned in [5], eqn. (2.37). By de nition, the vector v corresponding to  $L = L_0 = s$  is

$$v = \frac{1}{s} z :$$
 (5.9)

It now follows from  $v + v^2 = v^+$  that

$$v^{2}(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{s} & \frac{1 z^{s}}{z^{s-1}} & \text{for s even ;} \\ \frac{1}{s} & \frac{z^{s}}{z^{s-1}} & \text{for s odd :} \end{cases}$$
(5.10)

The hypergeom etric conform all frames are projectors for all reals 1: f(i) = 1. Moreover the midpoint = i is the only singular point, so the projectors are single-split. These properties and the precise shape of the coordinate curve can be deduced from the dimensial equation (5.2). A little algebra gives

$$\frac{dF()}{d} = \frac{is}{2^{s+1}f'(1)^s} \frac{1}{(\cos )^s}; F() (f(e^i))^s:$$
(5.11)

By twist symmetry it is su cient to consider the part of the curve with 0 =2. The di erential equation (5.11) must be supplemented with the initial condition F (0) = f (1)<sup>s</sup> = 1=2. Since the right-hand side of (5.11) is purely in aginary we see at once that  $\langle F() \rangle = 1=2$  for 0 < =2. It follows also that for s 1, = (F()) is a monotonically increasing function in the interval 0 < =2 with  $\lim_{s \to 2} = (F()) = +1$ . We recognize  $F_0 = fF() j$  0 < =2g as the vertical line  $V_0^+ = fz_s j < (z_s) = 1=2$ )g, the positive part of the sliver's coordinate curve. We conclude that the reparameterization mapping the hypergeometric projector with s > 1 to the sliver is simply

 $z ! z_s = R (z) = z^s; \langle z \rangle 0;$  (5.12)

a fundam ental fact that we had so far claim ed without proof.

It seems to us plausible that the hypergeom etric collection contains all the single-split special projectors. It was shown in [5] (section 7.2) that for a conform all frame to be special the function  $z_s = F(), 0 = 2$ , needs to be piece-wise linear in the g-plane. On the other hand we also saw in [5] (section 7.3) that corners in  $F_0$  seem to lead to operators K that fail to kill the identity, thus violating one of the conditions required to have a special projector. If corners are not allowed anywhere, the intersection of  $F_0$  with the real line must be orthogonal and then  $F_0 = V_0^+$ , up to a real scaling constant. This would in ply that all single-split projectors are in the hypergeom etric collection.

For integers the hypergeom etric function can be expressed in terms of elementary functions. For the rst few integer values one nds

$$s = 1 : f() = \frac{2}{-} \arctan ;$$

$$s = 2 : f() = \frac{p}{1+\frac{2}{1+\frac{2}{2}}};$$

$$s = 3 : f() = \frac{2}{-} \frac{\frac{1}{3}}{-} \arctan \frac{(1-\frac{2}{2})}{(1+\frac{2}{2})^2};$$

$$s = 4 : f() = x \frac{3+x^2}{(1+x^2)^3} \frac{1-4}{3};$$

$$s = 5 : f() = \frac{2}{-} \frac{\frac{1}{5}}{-} \arctan \frac{(1-\frac{2}{2})(3+14\frac{2}{2}+3\frac{4}{2})}{3(1+\frac{2}{2})^4};$$

$$s = 6 : f() = x \frac{10+5x^2+x^4}{(1+x^2)^5} \frac{1-6}{-};$$
(5.13)

For s = 1 we recover the sliver fram e with a scaling. For s = 2 we recover the butter y. For s = 3 we recover the projector in (7.56) of [5]. For s = 4 we have the projector with a = 4=3 in (6.3) of [5].

For arbitrary s, a series expansion gives  $L = L_0 = s$  with a simple analytic form :

$$L_{0} = L_{0} + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{X^{L}} \frac{s!!}{(s-2k)!!} \frac{s!!}{(s+2k)!!} L_{2k}$$

$$= L_{0} + \frac{2s}{2+s} L_{2} + \frac{2s(s-2)}{(2+s)(4+s)} L_{4} + \frac{2s(s-2)(s-4)}{(2+s)(4+s)(6+s)} L_{6} + :::$$
(5.14)

For even s the operator L contains a nite number of term s and therefore so does  $L^+$ . This is consistent with (5.7), since according to (5.1) L <sub>s</sub> involves a nite number of operators for any integer s.

## 5.2 The solution in operator form

To obtain the operator representation of the solution we will begin with equation (4.40). For notational clarity it is useful to introduce the de nition

r 
$$R^{\perp}(1)$$
; or  $R(r) = 1$ : (5.15)

Moreover, letting n ! n 2, we have that (4.40) gives

h; 
$$_{n 2} i = (R^{0}(r))^{2} c(r) f(0) c(r) \int_{c^{+}}^{L} \frac{dz}{2 i R^{0}(z)} \frac{b(z)}{R^{0}(z)} ;$$
 (5.16)

with 1 < n 1. The surface  $P_{n,1}$  in this correlator is defined by the reparameterization function R.Our goal is to obtain a formula for the state  $n_2$  as a string of operators acting on the vacuum. The operators must be normal ordered so that evaluation in the level expansion is possible.

In order to incorporate the reparam eterizations that act within the family of surface states associated with a projector we take R to be -dependent as in (3.9),

R (z) = 
$$e^2$$
 R<sub>0</sub>(z)  $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}$ ; (5.17)

where  $R_0$  is the \original" function and R the function obtained by reparam eterization. For generic projectors, the state  $n_2$  can be evaluated explicitly only if certain conform alm aps are known. For the case of special projectors in the hypergeom etric collection, full and explicit evaluation is possible. Our result is an operator form ula for  $n_2$  that depends on the param eter s of the special projector and the param eter in (5.17).

#### 5.2.1 Reparam eterizations within a fam ily

Let us begin with some preparatory results concerning the relations between operators and surfaces de ned by R and those de ned by  $R_0$ . Using (5.17) one can readily verify that

$$\frac{R}{R^{0}(z)} = \frac{R_{0}(z)}{R_{0}^{0}(z)} + \frac{1}{2} e^{2} - 1 \frac{1}{R_{0}^{0}(z)}$$
(5.18)

Letting L;L denote operators de ned by R and L;L<sup>?</sup> denote operators de ned by R<sub>0</sub>, equation (4.48) gives

$$L = \frac{Z}{c_{0}^{+}} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{R(z)}{iR^{0}(z)} T(z) + \frac{Z}{c_{0}} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{R(z)}{iR^{0}(z)} T(z);$$

$$= L + \frac{1}{2} e^{2} - 1 \frac{Z}{c_{0}^{+}} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{T(z)}{iR^{0}_{0}(z)} + \frac{Z}{c_{0}} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{T(z)}{iR^{0}_{0}(z)} :$$
(5.19)

W e have therefore obtained

$$L = L + \frac{1}{2} e^2 - 1 (L + L^2)$$
: (5.20)

A nalogous relations hold for the operators associated with the antighost eld b(z).

It is interesting to exam ine L for some special values of As = 0, we get  $L = L \cdot As$  becomes arbitrarily large and positive L becomes proportional to  $L^+$ :

L ! 
$$\frac{1}{2}e^2$$
 (L + L<sup>?</sup>); as ! 1 : (5.21)

As becomes arbitrarily large and negative L approaches L :

L ! 
$$\frac{1}{2}$$
 (L L<sup>?</sup>); as ! 1: (5.22)

The transition from  $R_0$  to R can be viewed as a reparameterization, as discussed around equation (3.9). Indeed, a short calculation gives

$$L = e^{(L - L^{2})} L e^{(L - L^{2})};$$
(5.23)

showing that L  $L^{?}$  generates the reparam eterization that m aps the R<sub>0</sub>-based operators to the R-based operators.

Let us compare surfaces de ned by R  $\,$  and surfaces de ned by R  $_0.$  Since R m aps C  $^+$  to V  $^+$  , we nd

$$z 2 C^{+} ! < (\mathbb{R} (z)) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + ):$$
 (5.24)

For such z we also have

$$< (\mathbf{R}_{0}(\mathbf{z})) = \mathbf{e}^{2} - \frac{1}{2}(1+) - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}(1+\mathbf{e}^{2}):$$
 (5.25)

Since we are focusing on a single curve in the projector we conclude that

$$C^{+} = C^{+}_{e^{2}}$$
; (5.26)

where the bar indicates a curve de ned by R<sub>0</sub>. W e thus have the identi cation of surfaces

$$P = \overline{P}_{e^2} ; \qquad (5.27)$$

where the overline indicates a surface de ned by R<sub>0</sub>. Note that the surface P<sub>0</sub> coincides with  $\overline{P_0}$ . This means that the function z = f() that de nes the projector does not depend on  $\cdot$ .

The last ingredient we consider is the antighost insertion in (5.16). We wish to rewrite it in terms of a closed contour integral that involves  $R_0$ . We begin by noting the equality

$$Z_{c^{+}} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{b(z)}{iR^{0}(z)} = e^{2} \frac{Z_{c^{+}_{n-1}}}{2 iR^{0}(z)} \frac{dz}{2 iR^{0}_{0}(z)};$$
(5.28)

which follows from (5.17) and contour deform ation. To rewrite the right-hand side in terms of an integral over a closed contour we recall that on the surface  $P_{n-1}$  the identi cation of points on  $C_{n-1}^+$  and  $C_{n-1}$  is given by (3.17):

$$R(z^{+}) + R(z) = n;$$
 (5.29)

In term  $s of R_0$  the identi cation reads

$$R_0(z^+) + R_0(z) = 1 + (n - 1)e^2$$
: (5.30)

W e now consider the integral

$$Z = \sum_{\substack{C_{n+1}^+ C_{n+1}}} \frac{dz}{2 i} \frac{k_0(z)}{k_0^0(z)} b(z) = \sum_{\substack{C_{n+1}^+ \\ C_{n+1}^-}}^{Z} \frac{dz^+}{2 i} \frac{k_0(z^+)}{k_0^0(z^+)} b(z^+) + \sum_{\substack{C_{n+1}}}^{Z} \frac{dz}{2 i} \frac{k_0(z)}{k_0^0(z)} b(z) : (5.31)$$

Using (5.30) and its dimension  $R_0^0(z^+)dz^+ = R_0^0(z^-)dz^- = 0$ , we can write the second integral above as an integral over  $C_{n-1}^+$ . We then india cancellation and we are left with

$$Z = \sum_{\substack{C_{n-1}^{+} C_{n-1}}} \frac{dz}{2 i} \frac{\Re_{0}(z)}{\Re_{0}^{0}(z)} b(z) = 1 + (n-1)e^{2} = \sum_{\substack{C_{n-1}^{+} \\ C_{n-1}^{+}}}^{Z} \frac{dz}{2 i} \frac{b(z)}{\Re_{0}^{0}(z)}; \quad (5.32)$$

or, equivalently,

$$Z_{C_{n-1}^{+}} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{b(z)}{iR_{0}^{0}(z)} = \frac{1}{1+(n-1)e^{2}} Z_{C_{n-1}^{+}C_{n-1}} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{R_{0}(z)}{R_{0}^{0}(z)} b(z) :$$
(5.33)

Back in (5.28) and using again contour deform ation, we nd

$$\frac{Z}{c^{+}} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{b(z)}{iR^{0}(z)} = \frac{e^{2}}{1+(n-1)e^{2}} \frac{Z}{c^{+}c} \frac{dz}{2} \frac{R_{0}(z)}{R_{0}^{0}(z)} b(z); \text{ on } P_{n-1}: (5.34)$$

This is our desired result.

#### 5.2.2 Operator form ula

We are now in a position to derive an operator result beginning with (5.16). As a rst step we use (5.34) to obtain

h; 
$$_{n 2} i = \frac{R_0^0(\mathbf{r})^2 e^2}{1 + (n 1)e^2} \sum_{c^+ c}^{Z} \frac{dz}{2 i} \frac{R_0(z)}{R_0^0(z)} b(z) c(\mathbf{r}) f \quad (0) c(\mathbf{r}) \frac{1}{P_{e^2}(n 1)} c(z) c(z) c(z) f$$

Note that we have expressed the surface in terms of the function  $R_0$ . Moving the antighost insertion contours inwards we pick up contributions from each of the ghost insertions and we remain with an antighost insertion that electively surrounds the insertion of the test state :

$$h ; {}_{n 2} i = \frac{R_0^0(r)R_0(r)e^2}{1+(n 1)e^2} \quad c(r)f \qquad -\frac{1}{P_{e^2(n 1)}} + f \qquad c(r) \frac{1}{P_{e^2(n 1)}} + \frac{R_0^0(r)^2e^2}{1+(n 1)e^2} \quad c(r)f \qquad -\frac{1}{P_{e^2(n 1)}} + f \qquad c(r) \frac{1}{P_{e^2(n 1)}} + \frac{1}{P_{e^2(n$$

Here 0 < 1. This is the most simplified expression we have obtained for  $_{n 2}$  when the projector is completely general.

Let us now assume that we have a special projector with parameter s. We thus take

$$R_{0}(z) = z^{s} ! \frac{R_{0}(z)}{R_{0}^{0}(z)} = \frac{1}{s}z;$$
 (5.37)

which implies that

N otice the great simplication: all that is left of the antighost insertion is a holom orphic integral encircling the origin. We also de ne

$$a_n = 1 + (n = 1)e^2$$
; (5.39)

and con m that

$$R_0(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{r}^s = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{e}^2$$
 : (5.40)

U sing the above relations (5.36) can be written as

h; 
$$_{n 2} i = sr^{2s 1} (a_n)^s e^2$$
 c(r) f  $_{\overline{P}_{e^2}(n 1)}$  + f c(r)  $_{\overline{P}_{e^2}(n 1)}$   
+  $sr^{2s 2} (a_n)^s e^2$  c(r)  $\frac{dz}{2i}zb(z) f$  (0) c(r)  $_{\overline{P}_{e^2}(n 1)}$  (5.41)

To map the correlators to the upper-half plane we rst scale  $\overline{P}_{e^2 (n 1)}$  down to  $P_0$ . This requires the scaling map

$$z^{0} = a_{n} z;$$
 (5.42)

with  $a_n$  de ned in (5.39). We let  $f a_n$  f and perform the scaling, nding

h; 
$$_{n 2} i = sr^{2s 1} (a_n)^{s 1} e^2$$
 c( $a_n r$ )  $f_{P_0} + f c(a_n r)_{P_0}$   
+  $sr^{2s 2} (a_n)^{s 2} e^2$  c( $a_n r$ )  $\frac{dz}{2i} zb(z) f$  (0) c( $a_n r$ ) :  
P\_0 (5.43)

Themap

$$g f_{I} f^{1}$$
(5.44)

takes  $P_{\ 0}$  to the upper half plane H . Letting

$$f_{n 1} g f = f_{I} f^{1} a_{A} f;$$
 (5.45)

we map the correlators by g and nd, noting that g is an odd function,

h; 
$$_{n 2} i = sr^{s} (a_{n}r)^{s 1} \frac{e^{2}}{g^{0}(a_{n}r)} c(g(a_{n}r)) f_{n 1} + f_{n 1} c(g(a_{n}r)) H$$
  
+  $sr^{s} (a_{n}r)^{s 2} \frac{e^{2}}{(g^{0}(a_{n}r))^{2}} c(g(a_{n}r)) B^{s} f_{n 1} (0) c(g(a_{n}r)) H$   
(5.46)

Here all correlators are now on the upper half plane H and

$$\dot{B} = \frac{dz}{2 i (g^{1})^{0}(z)} b(z) : \qquad (5.47)$$

Note that the  $\overset{b}{\mathbb{P}}$  insertion is independent and n independent.

Since the operator I  $f_{n-1}$  (0) corresponds to h  $jU_{f_{n-1}}^{?}$  in the state-operator correspondence, it is convenient to perform a nalm ap by I(z) = 1=z. Noting that the test state must be G rassman even, the result is

where we de ned

$$e^{2} r^{s} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + e^{2}):$$
 (5.49)

W e can now read out the operator expression for  $n_2$ :

$$n_{2} = s(a_{n}r)^{s_{1}} \frac{g(a_{n}r)^{2}}{g^{0}(a_{n}r)} U_{f_{n}}^{2} c \frac{1}{g(a_{n}r)} + c \frac{1}{g(a_{n}r)} + c \frac{1}{g(a_{n}r)} + \frac{g(a_{n}r)^{2}}{a_{n}rg^{0}(a_{n}r)} B^{2}c \frac{1}{g(a_{n}r)} c \frac{1}{g(a_{n}r)} j0i:$$
(5.50)

Equation (5.50) is the expected result: a formula for the state  $_{n 2}$  in which operators act on the SL (2;R)-invariant vacuum. The state depends on both s and . M oreover, as we will see in the following section, we can readily nd a level expansion of the solution. We recall that the \phantom " piece  $_{\rm N}$  of the solution in (1.5) does not contribute in the level expansion, so we have

h; 
$$i = {\begin{array}{*{20}c} X^{i} \\ h ; n = 2 \end{array}} h ; {\begin{array}{*{20}c} 0 \\ n = 2 \end{array}} i$$
 (5.51)

for any state in the Fock space.

# 6 Level and other expansions

In this section we will expand and analyze the operator form (5.50) of the solution. We set up the level expansion computation for arbitrary s and in x6.1. We proceed up to level four, but give the ingredients necessary to carry the computations to arbitrary order, if so desired.

In x62 we consider the special case = 0 and compute the vacuum expectation values of elds up to level four for arbitrary values of s. This allows us to compute the level zero, two, and four vacuum energies as functions of s. For s 1 we nd num erical evidence consistent with convergence of the vacuum energy to the expected value of minus the D-brane tension.

Recall that for s < 1 the special fram es are not projectors. The string eld which provides a solution for s 1 is therefore not expected to provide a solution for s < 1. Indeed, for s < 1we nd num erical evidence consistent with the energy failing to converge to the expected value.

In x6.3 we show that the tachyon vacuum solution in the Siegel gauge cannot be obtained in the present fram ework. The fram ework imposes constraints on expectation values that we show are not satis ed in the most accurate version of the Siegel gauge solution known to date.

Finally, in x6.4 we consider the limit ! 1 of the solution. This limit is of some interest because the surface states used to build the solution approach the surface state of the projector. For large the solution provides an analytic expression closely related to the alternative level expansion scheme introduced in [23] and explored further in [24]. In this scheme, the string eld solution is written in terms of operators of increasing level inserted at the midpoint of a regulated projector. Our solution is given in terms of exponentials of and has a leading divergent term as well as terms that vanish as ! 1.

#### 6.1 Level expansion prelim inaries

We now set up the level expansion of the solution (5.50). We begin by level expanding the operators  $U_{f_n}^2$  and  $\dot{B}$ . We then write out the level four string eld and compute the expectation values of the various components. The results are given in terms of in nite sums that we evaluate num erically.

The operator U  $_{f_{n-1}}^{\, ?}\,$  is de ned by the function  $f_{n-1}$  ( ) introduced in 6.45):

$$\mathbf{f}_{n 1} = \mathbf{f}_{I} \quad \mathbf{f}^{1} \quad \mathbf{a}_{n} \quad \mathbf{f}: \tag{6.1}$$

It is most convenient to obtain a factorized form in which

$$U_{f_{n-1}} = e^{t_0 L_0} e^{t_2 L_2} e^{t_4 L_4} e^{t_6 L_6}$$
(6.2)

with calculable coe cients  $t_n$ . The bpz dual is immediately written

$$U_{f_{n-1}}^{?} = {}^{t_{6}L}e^{6} e^{t_{4}L_{4}} e^{t_{2}L_{2}} e^{t_{0}L_{0}} :$$
 (6.3)

G iven an arbitrary function f ( ) that de nes a surface state and has an expansion

$$f() = + f_{2}^{3} + f_{4}^{5} + f_{6}^{7} + f_{8}^{9} + ; \qquad (6.4)$$

the rst few  $t_n$  coe cients are obtained following the steps indicated in appendix A of [2]. We nd that they are given by

$$t_{2} = f_{2};$$

$$t_{4} = f_{4} \quad \frac{3}{2}f_{2}^{2};$$

$$t_{6} = f_{6} \quad 3f_{2}f_{4} + 2f_{2}^{3};$$

$$t_{8} = f_{8} \quad 3f_{2}f_{6} \quad \frac{5}{2}f_{4}^{2} + 9f_{2}^{2}f_{4} \quad \frac{19}{4}f_{2}^{4}:$$
(6.5)

U sing this result and the power series expansion of  $f_{n-1}$  we can readily calculate the coe cients  $t_n$  needed to obtain  $U_{f_{n-1}}$  to level four:

$$e^{t_0} = a_n; \quad t_2 = \frac{s + 2a_n^2(1+s)}{2+s}; \quad t_4 = \frac{(s-2)s + 8a_n^4(1+s)}{2(2+s)(4+s)}:$$
 (6.6)

W ith these we get

$$U_{f_{n-1}}^{?} = {}^{t_4 L} e^4 e^{t_2 L_2} (a_n)^{L_0} :$$
 (6.7)

The expansion of  $\mathbf{B}^{?}$  is easier to obtain. Recalling (5.47) and the relation  $g = f_{I}$   $f^{1}$  we nd

$$\mathbf{b} = \sum_{n=0}^{X^{4}} b_{n} = b_{0} + \frac{4(1+s)}{2+s} b_{2} - \frac{16(1+s)}{(2+s)(4+s)} b_{4} + \mathbf{c}$$
(6.8)

N ote that both the V irasoro operators and the antighost operators in the above expansions are even m oded.

The level expansion of the string is obtained by the action on the vacuum of arbitrary ghost oscillators, even moded V irasoro operators, and even moded antighost oscillators. The string eld up to level four is thus given by

$$\begin{aligned} & _{4} = & tc_{1} \text{ } \text{pi} \\ & + & uc_{1} \text{ } \text{pi} + & vL_{2}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi} + & wb_{2}c_{0}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi} \\ & + & AL_{4}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi} + & BL_{2}L_{2}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi} + & Cc_{3} \text{ } \text{pi} + & Eb_{2}c_{2}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi} + & FL_{2}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi} \\ & + & w_{2}b_{2}c_{1}c_{0} \text{ } \text{pi} + & w_{3}b_{4}c_{0}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi} + & w_{4}L_{2}b_{2}c_{0}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi} \end{aligned}$$

$$(6.9)$$

The set line contains the level-zero tachyon, the second line contains the three level-two elds, and the last two lines contain the eight level-four elds. In this expansion the V irasoro operators include matter and ghost contributions and have zero central charge.

To describe the solution, assume a general expansion in a basis of Fock space states

$$= \sum_{i}^{(i)} \mathcal{D}_{i}i: \qquad (6.10)$$

Up to level four, the states  $\mathcal{D}_{i}$  i and the expansion coe cients <sup>(i)</sup> are those in (6.9). Our goal is to compute those expansion coe cients, since they are the expectation values of the component elds. A sum e now that  $_{n 2}$ , given in (5.50), is also expanded in the same basis:

$$_{n 2} = \sum_{i}^{X} (i)_{n} \mathcal{D}_{i} i:$$
 (6.11)

Using (5.51) we have

$$= \begin{array}{cccc} X^{i} & X & X^{i} \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & &$$

Comparing with (6.10) we nd that the vevs are given by

$$^{(i)} = {X^{i} \atop n=2} Q_{n} {n \atop n}^{(i)} :$$
 (6.13)

We can now expand the solution (5.50) to level four. Since the combination  $a_n r$  appears repeatedly both by itself and as the argument of g we introduce the notation

$$a a_n r; g g(a):$$
 (6.14)

Using the expansion (6.7) of  $U_{f_{n-1}}^{?}$  and the expansion (6.8) of B, together with (6.11), we nd that the expansion of (5.50) yields

$$t_{n} = 2 \operatorname{rs} a^{s^{2}} \frac{g^{2}}{g^{0}} 1 \frac{g}{ag^{0}}; \quad u_{n} = \frac{a^{2}}{rg^{2}} t_{n}; \quad v_{n} = \operatorname{rt}_{2} t_{n}; \quad w_{n} = 2 \frac{1}{r} s_{2} a^{s^{1}} \frac{g^{3}}{g^{0}};$$

$$A_{n} = \operatorname{rt}_{4} t_{n}; \quad B_{n} = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{rt}_{2}^{2} t_{n}; \quad C_{n} = \frac{a^{4}}{r^{3}} \frac{a^{4}}{g^{4}} t_{n}; \quad E_{n} = 2 \frac{1}{r^{3}} s a^{s+1} \frac{1}{2} \frac{g}{g^{0}};$$

$$F_{n} = \frac{a^{2}}{rg^{2}} t_{2} t_{n}; \quad (w_{2})_{n} = \frac{1}{r^{3}} E_{n}; \quad (w_{3})_{n} = 2 \frac{1}{r^{3}} s a^{s+1} \frac{1}{4} \frac{g^{3}}{g^{0}};$$

$$(6.15)$$

$$(w_{4})_{n} = 2 \frac{1}{r} s a^{s-1} t_{2-2} \frac{g^{3}}{g^{0}}:$$

The powers of r here arise from the factor  $(a_n)^{L_0} = (a=r)^{L_0}$  in  $U_{f_{n-1}}^?$  | see (6.7). In the above form ulae all appearances of  $a_n$  are in the combination a. Note, how ever, that the coe cients  $t_2$  and  $t_4$  have  $a_n$  dependence. Following (6.13), the expectation value of A, for example, would be given by

$$A = \bigcup_{n=2}^{X} \varrho_n A_n :$$
 (6.16)

For arbitrary and s, the derivatives with respect to n of the component elds in (6.15) give long and complicated expressions. Therefore, we do not attempt any further simplication of the string eld.

### 6.2 LevelExpansion for = 0

In this subsection we set = 0 and explore the solution for various values of s. We calculate explicitly the expectation values of level four elds and use them evaluate the approximate energy of the solution. We nd numerical evidence consistent with the energy converging to the expected value of 1 (in units of the D-brane tension) for s 1. For s < 1 we can still use (5.50) to calculate a string eld but given that the s < 1 surface states are not projectors, we have no reason to believe that the constructed eld is a solution. Indeed, a level computation of the energy in those cases suggests that it does not converge to m inus one. For = 0 we have r = 1 and the solution in (5.50) reduces to

$$s(a_{n})^{s-1} \frac{g(a_{n})^{2}}{g^{0}(a_{n})} U_{f_{n-1}}^{?} c \frac{1}{g(a_{n})} + c \frac{1}{g(a_{n})} + \frac{g(a_{n})^{2}}{a_{n}g^{0}(a_{n})} B^{?} c \frac{1}{g(a_{n})} c \frac{1}{g(a_{n})} j0:$$

$$(6.17)$$

This time we write

a 
$$a_n = n^{1=s}$$
; g g(a); g<sup>0</sup> g<sup>0</sup>(a); (6.18)

and the results in (6.15) simplify to

$$t_{n} = 2sa^{s^{2}} \frac{g^{2}}{g^{0}} 1 \frac{g}{ag^{0}}; \quad u_{n} = \frac{a^{2}}{g^{2}}t_{n}; \quad v_{n} = t_{2}t_{n}; \quad w_{n} = 2s_{2}a^{s^{1}}\frac{g^{3}}{g^{0}};$$

$$A_{n} = t_{4}t_{n}; \quad B_{n} = \frac{1}{2}t_{2}^{2}t_{n}; \quad C_{n} = \frac{a^{4}}{g^{4}}t_{n}; \quad E_{n} = 2sa^{s^{+1}} \frac{g}{g^{0}}; \quad (6.19)$$

$$F_{n} = \frac{a^{2}}{g^{2}}t_{2}t_{n}; \quad (w_{2})_{n} = E_{n}; \quad (w_{3})_{n} = 2sa^{s+1} \frac{g^{3}}{g^{2}}; \quad (w_{4})_{n} = 2sa^{s+1} t_{2} \frac{g^{3}}{g^{2}}:$$

These form ulae, together with (6.13) allow the evaluation of the level four expectation values. As in [2], no simple closed form seems possible and the computation must be done num erically.

The level four string eld in (6.9) can be rewritten using matter V irasoro operators. Expanding the V irasoro operators in (6.9) into matter and ghost parts one obtains the string eld

$${}_{4} = t^{0}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi}$$

$$+ u^{0}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi} + v^{0}L_{2}^{m}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi} + w^{0}b_{2}c_{0}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi}$$

$$+ A^{0}L_{4}^{m}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi} + B^{0}L_{2}^{m}L_{2}^{m}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi} + C^{0}c_{3} \text{ } \text{pi} + D^{0}b_{3}c_{1}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi} + E^{0}b_{2}c_{2}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi}$$

$$+ F^{0}L_{2}^{m}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi} + w_{2}^{0}b_{2}c_{1}c_{0} \text{ } \text{pi} + w_{3}^{0}b_{4}c_{0}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi} + w_{4}^{0}L_{2}^{m}b_{2}c_{0}c_{1} \text{ } \text{pi} \text{ ; }$$

$$(6.20)$$

	s= 0 <b>:</b> 6	s= 0 <b>:</b> 8	s= 1	s= 1:2	s= 1:4	s= 2:0	s= 3:0
t(s)	0 <b>:</b> 52860	0 <b>:</b> 53755	0 <b>:</b> 55347	0 <b>:</b> 57278	0:59361	0.65779	0 <b>:</b> 75882
u (s)	0:02935	0:03881	0 <b>:</b> 04367	0:04600	0:04694	0:04634	0:04268
v (s)	0:04541	0:09289	0:13765	0:17939	0:21840	0:32231	0:46548
w (s)	0:09945	0:11908	0:13108	0:13860	0:14330	0:14857	0:14617

Table 1: The expectation values of all elds up to level two calculated using the exact analytic expressions as a function of the parameter s.

where the primed elds are given by

$$t^{0} = t u^{0} = u + 3v u^{0} = w 2v u^{0} = u + 3v u^{0} = w 2v u^{0} = w 2v u^{0} = w 2v u^{0} = u + 3v u^{0} = w 2v u^{0} = u + 3v u^{0} = w 2v u^{0} = u + 3v u^{0} = w 2v u^{0} = u + 3v u^{0} = w 2v u^{0} = w 2v u^{0} = u + 3v u^{0} = w 2v u^{0} = w 2v u^{0} = u + 3v u^{0} = w 2v u^{0} = u + 3v u^{0} = w 2v u^{0} = w 2v u^{0} = u 2v u^{0} u^{0} = u 2v u^{0} u^{0} = u 2v u^{0} u^{0} u^{0} u^{0} = u 2v u^{0} u^{0}$$

Note that in (6.20) we had to introduce a eld D<sup>0</sup> to multiply the state  $b_3 c_1 c_1$  jDi. Since B<sup>0</sup> only has even-moded oscillators, that state arises from (5.50) only after expanding the total V irasoro operators in  $U_{f_{n-1}}^2$  into matter and ghost parts. Note also that the state  $L_3^m c_0$  jDi does not arise in the expansion. The expansion in ghost and matter parts cannot generate odd-moded V irasoro operators, only odd-moded antighost operators.

We can now consider some numerical work. For s = 1 we nd the expectation value t = 0.553466, u = 0.0436719, v = 0.137646, and w = 0.131082. These imply  $t^0 = 0.553466$ ,  $u^0 = 0.45661$ ,  $v^0 = 0.137646$ , and  $w^0 = 0.14421$  in complete agreement with [2]. We have also checked that the expectation values of the level four elds for s = 1 agree with those in [2]. For s = 2 we nd

$$t = 0.65779; u = 0.04634; v = 0.32231; w = 0.14857:$$
 (6.22)

Vacuum expectation values for these and other values of s are listed in Table 1.

	s= 0 <b>:</b> 6	s= 0 <b>:</b> 8	s= 1	s= 12	s= 1:4	s= 2:0	s= 3:0
E <sub>0</sub> (s)	0 <b>:</b> 91925	0 <b>:</b> 95064	1 <b>:</b> 00777	1 <b>:</b> 07934	1:15927	-1.42348	1:8943
E <sub>2</sub> (s)	0 <b>:</b> 91495	0 <b>:</b> 96663	1:00782	1 <b>:</b> 02736	1:02271	0 <b>:</b> 87438	02896
E 4 (s)	0 <b>:</b> 91389	0 <b>:</b> 97221	1:0045	1 <b>:</b> 00843	0 <b>:</b> 99591	0 <b>:</b> 98916	1 <b>:</b> 4827

Table 2: The energy calculated at levels zero, two, and four, for several values of the parameter s.

The energy, norm alized to m inus one, can be computed using the vevs of the elds and the kinetic terms in the string eld theory. To level zero, two, and four we get

$$E_{0} = \frac{2}{3} \frac{1}{2}t^{2};$$

$$E_{2} = E_{0} + \frac{2}{3} \frac{1}{2}u^{2} + 3u(v w) + 2(v w)^{2};$$

$$E_{4} = E_{2} + \frac{2}{3} \frac{1}{2}u^{2} + 24AB + 5AC \quad 6AE + 18AF \quad 8Aw_{3} \quad 24Aw_{4} \quad (6.23)$$

$$3BC + 8BE \quad 24Bw_{2} \quad 24Bw_{3} + CF \quad Cw_{2} \quad 5Cw_{3} + 3Cw_{4}$$

$$\frac{3}{2}E^{2} + 6EF + 3Ew_{2} + 6Ew_{3} \quad 8Ew_{4} \quad \frac{13}{2}F^{2} \quad 5Fw_{2} \quad 18Fw_{3}$$

$$2w_{2}^{2} + 24w_{2}w_{4} + 4w_{3}^{2} + 24w_{3}w_{4} :$$

In Figure 10 we plot energies as a function of s 2 [0:6;2:0]. There are three curves: the level-zero energy  $E_0$  (s), the level-two energy  $E_2$  (s), and the level-four energy  $E_4$  (s). At each level the energy was computed using the exact numerical values for all the elds. For s 1 the various curves are consistent with an energy that approaches the correct value. For s < 1 the plot suggests that the energy will not approach the correct value. Some particular values are also tabulated in Table 2. Note how e cient the convergence is for s = 2, while for s = 0:6 it appears that the energy will not move much beyond the value 0:91.

#### 6.3 No Siegel gauge in the fam ily

The solution for the tachyon vacuum in the Siegel gauge is a state in the universal subspace of the total CFT: the ghost number one subspace spanned by all states built on the vacuum by acting with nite numbers of ghost and antighost oscillators as well as nite number of matter V irasoro operators. A part from an SU (1;1) symmetry that relates certain expectation values no additional relations are known.



Figure 10: P lot of the energies  $E_0$  (s);  $E_2$  (s); and  $E_4$  (s) computed at levels zero, two, and four, respectively. The exact value is 1.

It is clear from the form of  $_n$  that the solution belongs to a constrained universal space where states are built acting on the vacuum with arbitrary ghost oscillators, even-m oded antighost oscillators, and even-m oded total V irasoro operators. Before imposing any gauge condition, the level four universal subspace contains 10 states, while the level four constrained space has only 8 states.

A swe show now, at level four the Siegel gauge expectation values must satisfy an additional relation if it is to lie on the constrained universal space. This condition is not satis ed.

In the Siegel gauge we can use the expansion (6.20) of the string eld. The question is whether the values of the primed elds in the Siegel gauge are consistent with expectation values for the unprimed elds. Can we solve for the unprimed elds using (6.21)? There is a constraint, however. We readily nd that

$$D^{0} = 5A^{0} \quad 3B^{0} + F^{0}:$$
 (6.24)

This is a constraint that must be satis ed by the Siegel gauge solution, if it is to have the structural form required by the generals solution. From [25] we have

$$A^{0} = 0.005049;$$
  
 $B^{0} = 0.000681;$  (6.25)  
 $F^{0} = 0.001234:$ 

This together with (6.24) predicts  $D^0 = 0.028522$ . The value from [25], how ever, is  $D^0 = 0.01976$ , in clear disagreem ent. We conclude that we cannot reach the Siegel gauge solution for any value

of the parameter s.

#### 6.4 Projector expansion

In [23] a variant of level expansion was proposed in which the string eld solution is written in terms of operators of increasing level inserted at the m idpoint of a regulated projector surface state. The original discussion used the butter y state but this was extended to large classes of projectors in [24]. In this section we show how to obtain a possibly related expansion using the parameter in the limit of large .

In the solution (5.50) and in its level expansion we noted the repeated appearance of  $a_n r = a$ , which is given by

$$a = a_n r = \frac{h_1}{2} \frac{1 + e^2}{1 + (n - 1)e^2} \frac{i_{1=s}}{s}$$
 (6.26)

For ! 1 we get a nite limit

$$\lim_{i \to 1} a = \frac{1}{2n - 2} a:$$
 (6.27)

W e also note that for large

r' 
$$2^{1=s}e^{2}=s$$
;  $a_n$ '  $2^{1=s}ae^{2}=s$ : (6.28)

Let us separate the factor U  $_{\rm f}^{\, ?}$  from U  $_{\rm f_{n-1}}^{\, ?}$  . W e recall (6.1), which in plies that

$$U_{f_{n-1}} = U_{f_{1} f^{-1}} (a_{n})^{L_{0}} U_{f} :$$
 (6.29)

It follows that

$$U_{f_{n-1}}^{?} = U_{f}^{?} (a_{n})^{L_{0}} U_{f_{1}-f^{-1}}^{?} (a_{n})^{-L_{0}} (a_{n})^{L_{0}} :$$
 (6.30)

Since  $f_{n-1}$  is independent of the overall scale of f, we can assume that f(z) = z + ::: in evaluating  $U_{f_{r-1}-1}$ . We can then write an expansion without an  $L_0$  term :

$$U_{f_{I} f^{1}}^{?} = d_{6}L_{e^{6}} e^{d_{4}L_{4}} e^{d_{2}L_{2}}$$
 (6.31)

Here the  $d_n$  are calculable coe ciencts that are independent of  $\ . W$  e then have

$$U_{f_{n-1}}^{?} = U_{f}^{?} \qquad {}^{d_{6}a_{e}^{6}L_{6}} e^{d_{4}a_{n}^{4}L_{4}} e^{d_{2}a_{n}^{2}L_{2}} (a_{n})^{L_{0}} : \qquad (6.32)$$

The string eld will be an expansion in powers of  $e^{2} = s$ . The leading term in the expansion of the string eld will occur when  $U_{f_n}^2$  acts on the tachyon state, the state with  $L_0 = 1$ . In this case, to leading order in  $e^{2} = s$ , the above factor in parenthesis is equal to one, and we have

$$U_{f_{n-1}}^{?} c_1 p_i' U_f^{?} c_1 p_i \frac{1}{a} 2^{1=s} e^{2} = s$$
: (6.33)

It now follows from (5.50) that

$$n_{2}$$
 '  $\frac{1}{2}$  sa<sup>s 1</sup>  $\frac{g(a)^{2}}{g^{0}(a)} \frac{1}{a} 2^{1=s} e^{2} = U_{f}^{2} c_{1} p_{1} 21 \frac{g(a)}{ag^{0}(a)}$ ; (6.34)

or, equivalently,

$$_{n 2} ' U_{f}^{?}c_{1} Di 2^{1 \frac{1}{s}} se^{2 s} 2a^{s 2} \frac{g(a)^{2}}{g^{0}(a)} 1 \frac{g(a)}{ag^{0}(a)} :$$
 (6.35)

This means that to leading order in the expansion the string eld is given by

$$ji = U_{f}^{?} c_{1} j j i \quad 2^{1} \frac{1}{s} e^{2} = 2 \sum_{n=2}^{X^{1}} \theta_{n} a^{s} \frac{g(a)^{2}}{g^{0}(a)} \quad 1 \quad \frac{g(a)}{ag^{0}(a)} \quad : \qquad (6.36)$$

This is the general result, valid for all arbitrary s 1. Note that this term diverges parameterically with . For the case of the sliver, the string eld becomes

$$ji = U_{f}^{?} c_{1} j j i_{f} \frac{1}{4} e^{2} \qquad 2_{n=2}^{X^{1}} \theta_{n} \frac{g^{2}(a)}{ag^{0}(a)} 1 \frac{g(a)}{ag^{0}(a)} ; \quad s = 1; \quad (6.37)$$

with  $g(z) = \frac{1}{2} \tan(z)$ . Recalling the de nition of a in (6.27) one can easily evaluate the above expression num erically. The result is

$$ji = U_{f}^{?} c_{1} p_{i} \frac{1}{4} e^{2}$$
 (0:39545107): (6.38)

W e will not attempt the calculation of the subleading terms in the solution. In the work of [23] the leading term of the solution is a divergent coe cient that multiplies a ghost insertion on a regulated projector. The regulation parameter and the divergent coe cient are related, and this helps produce nite energy. W hile the expansion of the solution around the sliver in this subsection is well de ned in calculating coe cients in front of states in the Fock space, it is not well de ned in calculating the energy of the solution. It would be interesting to nd a more system atic way to expand the solution for large , in particular, in the context of VSFT.

# 7 Concluding Remarks

We nd it tantalizing that projectors play a signi cant role in the construction of solutions of OSFT.Projectors are essentially the solutions of vacuum string eld theory (VSFT), so this fact should help relate OSFT to VSFT and, with some luck, to obtain a regular form of VSFT. In addition to noting new solutions of OSFT, the development of VSFT may pave the way for further progress in this eld.

The role of projectors was some what hidden in the tachyon vacuum solution of Schnabl [2]. The  $L_0$ ,  $L_0^2$  structure associated with the geometry of the wedge states seem ed to be the central and necessary ingredient. In [5] it was found that the  $L_0$ ,  $L_0^2$  structure is not unique to the wedge states. Including other conditions required by solvability, one is led to special projectors.

In this work we have used reparam eterizations to show that any twist-invariant, single-split projector furnishes a solution. It is not required to have a special projector, but the form of the solution simpli es considerably for that case. This is a satisfying conclusion: each single-split projector furnishes a solution in a di erent gauge, and all single-split projectors are allowed.

Our methods using reparameterizations do not immediately apply to multiple-split projectors, i.e., conformal frames where the coordinate curve goes to in nity at other points besides the string midpoint. These projectors are not related by regular reparameterizations to the sliver. Examples of multiple-split special projectors were given in [5]. It is not di cult to construct form alsolutions for a certain class of multiple-split special projectors by inserting operators analogous to those in section 4, but it is not obvious if the calculation of their energies is well de ned.

W hile the idea of using reparam eterizations is certainly not new, it was generally felt that concrete com putations would be di cult since the operators that perform reparam eterizations are extrem ely di cult to construct. W e found a way to im plem ent the necessary reparam eterizations w ithout constructing the operators.

One particularly interesting by-product is the construction of an abelian algebra of states for any projector. The surface states interpolate between the identity and the projector. For the sliver this is the familiar algebra of wedge states. We believe, although we have not proven, that the wedge states are the unique states that interpolate between the identity and the sliver and star-multiply among them selves. If this is the case, the possibility of reparam eterizations in plies that the interpolating family must be a canonical unique object for any projector. In this sense there is no preferred projector and our use of the sliver is recognized to be just a technical tool.

#### A cknow ledgm ents

W e would like to thank Ian E llwood and W ati Taylor for helpful conversations. The work of LR is supported in part by the N ational Science Foundation G rant No. PHY-0354776. Any opinions, ndings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reject the views of the N ational Science Foundation. The work of BZ is supported in part by the U S.DOE grant DE-FC 02-94ER 40818.

### References

- E.W itten, \N oncommutative Geometry And String Field Theory," Nucl. Phys. B 268, 253 (1986).
- [2] M. Schnabl, \Analytic solution for tachyon condensation in open string eld theory," arX iv hep-th/0511286.
- [3] Y.Okawa, \Comments on Schnabl's analytic solution for tachyon condensation in W itten's open string eld theory," JHEP 0604, 055 (2006) [arX iv hep-th/0603159].
- [4] E. Fuchs and M. Kroyter, \On the validity of the solution of string eld theory," JHEP 0605, 006 (2006) [arX iv hep-th/0603195].
- [5] L.Rastelli and B.Zwiebach, \Solving open string eld theory with special projectors," arX iv hep-th/0606131.
- [6] I. Ellwood and M. Schnabl, \Proof of vanishing cohomology at the tachyon vacuum," arX iv hep-th/0606142.
- [7] E. Fuchs and M. Kroyter,  $\Schnabl's L_0$  operator in the continuous basis," arX iv hep-th/0605254.E. Fuchs and M. Kroyter,  $\Universal$  regularization for string eld theory," arX iv hep-th/0610298.
- [8] H. Fuji, S. Nakayama and H. Suzuki, \Open string amplitudes in various gauges," arX iv hep-th/0609047.
- [9] L.Rastelli and B.Zwiebach, \Tachyon potentials, star products and universality," JHEP 0109,038 (2001) [arX iv hep-th/0006240].
- [10] V.A.Kostelecky and R.Potting, \Analytical construction of a nonperturbative vacuum for the open bosonic string," Phys. Rev. D 63, 046007 (2001) [arX iv:hep-th/0008252].
- [11] L.Rastelli, A.Sen and B.Zwiebach, \Classical solutions in string eld theory around the tachyon vacuum," Adv. Theor. M ath. Phys. 5, 393 (2002) [arX iv:hep-th/0102112].
- [12] L.Rastelli, A. Sen and B. Zwiebach, \Boundary CFT construction of D-branes in vacuum string eld theory," JHEP 0111, 045 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0105168].

- [13] A. LeC lair, M. E. Peskin and C. R. Preitschopf, \String Field Theory On The Conform al Plane. 1. K inem atical Principles," Nucl. Phys. B 317, 411 (1989). \String Field Theory On The Conform al Plane. 2. Generalized G luing," Nucl. Phys. B 317, 464 (1989).
- [14] D.Gaiotto, L.Rastelli, A.Sen and B.Zwiebach, \Star algebra projectors," JHEP 0204, 060 (2002) [arX iv:hep-th/0202151].
- [15] L.Rastelli, A. Sen and B. Zwiebach, \Half strings, projectors, and multiple D-branes in vacuum string eld theory," JHEP 0111, 035 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0105058].
- [16] D. J. Gross and W. Taylor, \Split string eld theory. I," JHEP 0108, 009 (2001) [arX iv hep-th/0105059]. \Split string eld theory. II," JHEP 0108, 010 (2001) [arX iv hep-th/0106036].
- [17] E.W itten, \Interacting Field Theory Of Open Superstrings," Nucl. Phys. B 276, 291 (1986).
- [18] Z.Qiu and A. Strom inger, \Gauge symmetries in (super)string eld theory," Phys. Rev. D 36, 1794 (1987).
- [19] L.Rastelli, A.Sen and B.Zwiebach, \Vacuum string eld theory," arX iv hep-th/0106010.
- [20] D.Gaiotto, L.Rastelli, A.Sen and B.Zwiebach, \Ghost structure and closed strings in vacuum string eld theory," Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 6, 403 (2003) [arX iv:hep-th/0111129].
- [21] Y. Okawa, \Open string states and D-brane tension from vacuum string eld theory," JHEP 0207,003 (2002) [arX iv:hep-th/0204012].
- [22] N. Drukker and Y. Okawa, \Vacuum string eld theory without matter-ghost factorization," JHEP 0506,032 (2005) [arX iv:hep-th/0503068].
- [23] Y.Okawa, \Solving W itten's string eld theory using the butter y state," Phys. Rev. D
   69,086001 (2004) [arX iv:hep-th/0311115].
- [24] H.Yang, \Solving W itten's SFT by insertion of operators on projectors," JHEP 0409,002
   (2004) [arX iv hep-th/0406023].
- [25] D. Gaiotto and L. Rastelli, \Experimental string eld theory," JHEP 0308, 048 (2003) [arX iv hep-th/0211012].