

A 4d non-BPS NS-NS microstate

Soumangsu Chakraborty^{a,b} , Shaun D. Hampton^a

^a*Institut de Physique Théorique, Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, CEA
Orme des Merisiers, 91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France*

^b*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Amsterdam
1090GL Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

E-mail: soumangsuchakraborty@gmail.com, shaun.hampton@ipht.fr

ABSTRACT: We construct a two-parameter four-dimensional non-BPS NS-NS smooth microstate solution that asymptotes to flat spacetime with a linear dilaton in type II superstring theory. From the microscopic point of view, the background is made out of a certain number of decoupled (*i.e.* $g_s \rightarrow 0$) NS5 branes wrapping $T^3 \times S^1 \times S^1$ with fundamental strings wrapping non-contractable cycles of $S^1 \times S^1$ with integer momentum modes along them. We show that perturbative worldsheet theory in this background is given by a null-gauged WZW model. We also show that the consistency of the worldsheet theory imposes non-trivial constraints on the supergravity background.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Null gauged WZW model	5
3	Worldsheet constraints on supergravity	7
4	Supergravity background	11
4.1	Background charges	13
4.2	Summary of the supergravity solution	17
5	RG flow interpretation	18
6	Discussion	21
A	General null gauging	22
B	Spacetime supersymmetry	26

1 Introduction

String theory provides a rich framework to address many questions about the microscopic nature of black holes [1–6]. One of its most significant achievements is to count the number of BPS states of a certain D1-D5 system and show agreement with the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy of the corresponding black hole in the supergravity theory [6, 7]. This strongly suggests that there should exist a realization of black hole microstates within gravity. Since then much work has been done to understand this in a concrete way.

The main proponent in this direction is the fuzzball proposal [8–10], which says that generic black hole microstates are horizonless configurations of fundamental objects in string theory that have the same mass and charge as the corresponding black hole¹. The first smooth solutions, [8, 9] and [13], which were constructed were two charge configurations. The geometries in [8] were derived in the F1-P system in the

¹See [11, 12] and references therein for a recent review of the subject.

$M_{4,1} \times S^1 \times T^4$ setup with an F1 string with momentum P placed along S^1 where the string was given a nontrivial profile in $M_{4,1}$, a noncompact space. Through dualities this configuration can be mapped to the D1-D5 system with D1 branes wrapping S^1 and D5 branes wrapping $S^1 \times T^4$ where the branes now have a nontrivial profile in $M_{4,1}$, [9, 13]. A further refinement of the fuzzball proposal delineates i) generic and possibly non-geometric configurations, ii) singular configurations, and iii) smooth geometries. The third category has enjoyed a very fruitful exploration. These are called microstate geometries, configurations that are horizonless and smooth, admitting a nice realization in terms of supergravity. They have been studied in a variety of scenarios, *i.e.* [14–22]. Typically, three charge microstate geometries are constructed in the D1-D5-P system where the momentum charge, P , is a wave that travels along the common D1-D5 direction, S^1 . In [23, 24] the authors used a consistent truncation from 10d down to 3d to describe a certain class of these microstate geometries. Similarly, from this 3d perspective, smooth, purely NS-NS microstate geometries were constructed in [25] and in [26] a set of NS-NS microstate geometries were derived in 10d. Though numerous examples have been constructed, the entropy coming from these configurations, however, is subleading in the powers of the charges [27, 28]. This is because the torus, T^4 , on which the remaining directions of the D5 brane are wrapped, is largely a spectator in the full theory, containing no nontrivial dynamics. The reason being that, in the construction of such solutions, one typically smears over the torus directions resulting, upon reduction, in a theory described by 6d supergravity. The only effects along the T^4 are typically an overall breathing mode in which its volume oscillates according to the motion of the momentum wave along the common D1-D5 circle. In [29] the authors addressed a possibly singular limit of the three-charge solution in which a horizon might have formed. To resolve this, they constructed a geometry in the NS5-F1 frame with a nontrivial density profile along the common circle which carries the momentum P , and with spherical symmetry in the spacetime, $M_{4,1}$. This density profile, coming from a bound state of D0-D4 branes averts the formation of a macroscopic horizon by causing the common circle to pinch-off beforehand. Instead, the horizon area was shown to be of zero size and so near this point, the globally three-charge solution looked locally two-charge. This configuration belongs to the second class of solutions mentioned previously, namely those which are singular and even degenerate, corresponding to brane sources.

This work prompted the investigation of black hole microstates into the regime in which the T^4 was no longer treated democratically but allowed to have nontrivial behavior. Recent analysis [30, 31] suggests that in order to obtain the full entropy, at least parametrically in the charges, one must consider nontrivial dynamics along at least one direction of T^4 . A step in this direction was made in [30] where super-

symmetry projectors were analyzed for three charge microstates in which one of the torus directions was taken to be nontrivial while maintaining spherical symmetry in the noncompact directions. Two conditions were imposed: 1) that locally the object be half-BPS, a criterion that, so far, indicates that an object is horizonless, and 2) that the global symmetries are consistent with the presence of three global charges. These are statements coming purely from branes and supersymmetry and so should be valid irrespective of a geometrical description. This system of branes is argued to capture, parametrically, the three-charge entropy. In [31] a similar procedure was performed but for a more general scenario where the underlying constituents had nontrivial behavior along the common circle, S^1 , along one spacetime direction in $M_{4,1}$ and along one direction in T^4 . See [32] for more recent work on locally enhanced supersymmetry in the context of three charge black hole microstates.

BPS configurations have been the focus of many studies of black hole microstates. This is because supersymmetry provides a reliable identification between gravitational physics and the dual holographic field theory. For works in this direction see [33–38]. In order to understand configurations whose properties are closer to the black holes we observe in nature, it is instructive to also study non-BPS objects. From the perspective of black hole microstructure this has traditionally been a challenging task. However, progress has been toward this direction. The construction of a non-BPS microstate was originally carried out in [39] in which the configuration was highly rotating. More recently work has been done in computing non-BPS solutions in [40], which uses again a consistent truncation from the full 10d theory to a 3d. For work on the holography of non-BPS solutions see [37]. A set of smooth nonextremal microstate geometries were constructed in [41]. A set of smooth non-BPS geometries were constructed in a variety of scenarios using non-trivial topological structures in [42–45], with a smooth Schwarzschild-like geometry being constructed in [46]. While microstate geometries have yielded significant results in recent years one can consider what happens beyond the regime of supergravity. This is where string worldsheet methods play a significant role. Due to the difficulty of constructing the full worldsheet theory with Ramond-Ramond flux, worldsheet methods are most easily explored in NS-NS backgrounds. In [47] the authors constructed the string worldsheet solutions corresponding to two charge BPS microstates of a certain NS5-F1 configuration often termed as supertube geometries [48, 49]. Later, the construction of [47] was generalized to three-charge non-BPS microstates in [38, 50–54]. The worldsheet construction of the above-mentioned microstates are given by a certain class of null-cosets.

In addition to the special class of null-cosets, discussed in the previous paragraph in the context of microstate geometries, worldsheet sigma models obtained by various gauging of $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ WZW models have always played a very important role in un-

derstanding black hole physics [55–58], solvable non-AdS holographic models [58–60], resolution of cosmological singularities [61–63] and condensed matter applications [64]. In this paper, we will take a similar approach as in [47] to construct a 4d, non-BPS, NS-NS microstate solution that asymptotes to flat spacetime with a dilaton field that is linear in the radial direction. As in [47], perturbative string theory in our microstate background is described by a certain null coset (2.1). We show that the consistency of the worldsheet theory ensures that the geometry is smooth (*i.e.* no finite area horizon) and is labeled by four integers which are related to the background charges. Changing the background charges (which are allowed by the consistency of the worldsheet theory), yields a different microstate solution. A closer inspection of the background charges reveals that the geometry is sourced by a certain number (greater than 1) of coincident NS5 branes wrapping $T^3 \times S^1 \times S^1$ and F1 strings wrapping $S^1 \times S^1$ with winding and momentum charges along the two cycles. The smoothness of the geometry further imposes an algebraic constraint on the F1 winding and momentum charges.

As discussed earlier, most NS5-F1 (or equivalently D1-D5 system in the S-dual frame) systems studied in the literature involve wrapping the fivebranes on $T^4 \times S^1$ and F1 strings on S^1 . In all such constructions, the T^4 is a mere spectator. From the supergravity point of view, exciting one or more moduli of the T^4 is technically challenging. One of the novel features of our worldsheet construction is to bypass this technical difficulty and put winding and momentum charges along one of the circles of T^4 . In Appendix A, we generalize our construction even further where we excite all the moduli of T^4 and put momentum in the space transverse to the fivebranes (*i.e.* separating the fivebranes rotating along a transverse circle and giving them some rotational angular momentum). One can think of these more general solutions as the fully backreacted supergravity backgrounds discussed in [65] with pure NS-NS flux.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we construct the null gauged sigma model and read off the spacetime metric, the B-field, and the dilaton. In section 3, we take an algebraic approach to construct the string theory spectrum and derive the various worldsheet constraints to be imposed on the supergravity solution derived in section 2. In section 4, we compute the various background charges and impose the worldsheet constraints on the supergravity solution and investigate its consequences. In section 5, we interpret the supergravity solution as an RG flow and discuss its AdS decoupling limit. Finally, in section 6, we discuss our results and point out various directions for future research.

2 Null gauged WZW model

In this section, we would like to study type II superstrings in the coset background

$$\frac{SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \times U(1)_x \times \mathbb{R}_t \times U(1)_y}{U(1)_L \times U(1)_R} \times S^3 \times T^3, \quad (2.1)$$

where the gauged $U(1)_L \times U(1)_R$ is null with embedding

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} &= l_1 \mathcal{J}_3 + l_2 \mathcal{J}_x + l_3 \mathcal{J}_t + l_4 \mathcal{J}_y, \\ \bar{\mathcal{J}} &= r_1 \bar{\mathcal{J}}_3 + r_2 \bar{\mathcal{J}}_x + r_3 \bar{\mathcal{J}}_t + r_4 \bar{\mathcal{J}}_y, \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

where $\mathcal{J}_3, \bar{\mathcal{J}}_3$ are the holomorphic and anti-holomorphic timelike currents of $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$, $\mathcal{J}_{x,t,y}, \bar{\mathcal{J}}_{x,t,y}$ are the holomorphic and anti-holomorphic currents of $U(1)_x, \mathbb{R}_t, U(1)_y$ of the upstairs theory. Let n_5 be the level of $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ supersymmetric WZW model. The coordinates x, y that parametrize $U(1)_{x,y}$ respectively are compact with periodicities

$$x \sim x + 2\pi R_x, \quad y \sim y + 2\pi R_y. \quad (2.3)$$

The currents

$$J_{3,x,t,y} \equiv i \mathcal{J}_{3,x,t,y}, \quad \bar{J}_{3,x,t,y} \equiv i \bar{\mathcal{J}}_{3,x,t,y}, \quad (2.4)$$

are normalized such that they satisfy the following OPE:²

$$\begin{aligned} J_3(z) J_3(0) &\sim \frac{-n_5/2}{z^2}, \\ J_x(z) J_x(0) &\sim \frac{1/2}{z^2}, \\ J_t(z) J_t(0) &\sim \frac{-1/2}{z^2}, \\ J_y(z) J_y(0) &\sim \frac{1/2}{z^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

and similarly for the anti-holomorphic components $\bar{J}_{3,x,t,y}$. The detailed derivation of the gauged WZW model can be found in Appendix A with further generalizations.

Since the gauge currents $\mathcal{J}, \bar{\mathcal{J}}$ are null, the $\mathcal{J}\mathcal{J}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{J}}\bar{\mathcal{J}}$ OPE are regular. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} -n_5 l_1^2 + l_2^2 - l_3^2 + l_4^2 &= 0, \\ -n_5 r_1^2 + r_2^2 - r_3^2 + r_4^2 &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

Without loss of generality, one can set $l_1 = r_1 = 1$. This would imply

$$\begin{aligned} l_2^2 - l_3^2 + l_4^2 &= n_5, \\ r_2^2 - r_3^2 + r_4^2 &= n_5. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

²Unless otherwise states we work in the convention $\alpha' = 1$.

The null gauge currents take the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J} &= \mathcal{J}_3 + l_2 \mathcal{J}_x + l_3 \mathcal{J}_t + l_4 \mathcal{J}_y , \\ \bar{\mathcal{J}} &= \bar{\mathcal{J}}_3 + r_2 \bar{\mathcal{J}}_x + r_3 \bar{\mathcal{J}}_t + r_4 \bar{\mathcal{J}}_y .\end{aligned}\tag{2.8}$$

In order to compute the gauged sigma model, let's consider $g \in SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \sim SU(1, 1)$ to be parametrized as

$$g = e^{\frac{i}{2}(\tau-\sigma)\sigma_3} e^{\rho\sigma_1} e^{\frac{i}{2}(\tau+\sigma)} .\tag{2.9}$$

The gauged WZW action on

$$\frac{SL(2, \mathbb{R})_{n_5} \times U(1)_x \times \mathbb{R}_t \times U(1)_y}{U(1)_L \times U(1)_R}\tag{2.10}$$

is given by [66]

$$S = S[g] + S[x] + S[t] + S[y] + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d^2z (A\bar{\mathcal{J}} + \bar{A}\mathcal{J} - MA\bar{A}) ,\tag{2.11}$$

where A, \bar{A} are the gauge fields and

$$M = 2(n_5 \cosh 2\rho - l_2 r_2 + l_3 r_3 - l_4 r_4) .\tag{2.12}$$

The gauged action (2.11) is Gaussian in the gauge fields A, \bar{A} . Integrating out the gauge fields one obtains

$$S = S[g] + S[x] + S[t] + S[y] + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d^2z \frac{\mathcal{J}\bar{\mathcal{J}}}{M} ,\tag{2.13}$$

along with the dilaton field

$$\Phi = \Phi_0 - \frac{1}{2} \log \Delta ,\tag{2.14}$$

where

$$\Delta = \frac{M}{2} .\tag{2.15}$$

The gauged action (2.13) is invariant under null $U(1)_L \times U(1)_R$. In order to have a spacetime interpretation of the gauged sigma model one needs to fix the gauge. Thus, after fixing the gauge

$$\tau = \sigma = 0 ,\tag{2.16}$$

one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}S &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d^2z \left[- \left(1 - \frac{2l_3 r_3}{\Delta} \right) \partial t \bar{\partial} t + \left(1 + \frac{2l_2 r_2}{\Delta} \right) \partial x \bar{\partial} x + \left(1 + \frac{2l_4 r_4}{\Delta} \right) \partial y \bar{\partial} y + n_5 \partial \rho \bar{\partial} \rho \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{2l_3 r_2}{\Delta} \partial t \bar{\partial} x + \frac{2l_2 r_3}{\Delta} \partial x \bar{\partial} t + \frac{2l_3 r_4}{\Delta} \partial t \bar{\partial} y + \frac{2l_4 r_3}{\Delta} \partial y \bar{\partial} t + \frac{2l_2 r_4}{\Delta} \partial x \bar{\partial} y + \frac{2l_4 r_2}{\Delta} \partial y \bar{\partial} x \right] .\end{aligned}\tag{2.17}$$

Using standard worldsheet techniques, one can easily read off the metric, the B-field, and the dilaton (after lifting it to 10 dimensions and restoring $\alpha' = l_s^2 = 1$) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{ds^2}{\alpha'} &= - \left(1 - \frac{2l_3 r_3}{\Delta} \right) dt^2 + n_5 d\rho^2 + \left(1 + \frac{2l_2 r_2}{\Delta} \right) dx^2 + \left(1 + \frac{2l_4 r_4}{\Delta} \right) dy^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{2(l_3 r_2 + l_2 r_3)}{\Delta} dt dx + \frac{2(l_4 r_3 + l_3 r_4)}{\Delta} dt dy + \frac{2(l_4 r_2 + l_2 r_4)}{\Delta} dx dy + ds_{S^3}^2 / \alpha' \\
&\quad + ds_{T^3}^2 / \alpha' , \\
\frac{B}{\alpha'} &= \frac{l_3 r_2 - l_2 r_3}{\Delta} dt \wedge dx + \frac{l_3 r_4 - l_4 r_3}{\Delta} dt \wedge dy + \frac{l_2 r_4 - l_4 r_2}{\Delta} dx \wedge dy + n_5 \cos^2 \theta d\phi \wedge d\psi , \\
e^{2\Phi} &= \frac{e^{2\Phi_0}}{\Delta} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

where Φ_0 is the dilaton background and

$$\Delta = n_5 \cosh 2\rho - l_2 r_2 + l_3 r_3 - l_4 r_4 . \tag{2.19}$$

The metric on S^3 is given by

$$ds_{S^3}^2 / \alpha' = n_5 (d\theta^2 + \cos^2 \theta d\psi^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) , \tag{2.20}$$

where $ds_{T^3}^2$ denotes the standard metric on T^3 .

One can explicitly check that supergravity background (2.18) satisfies the 10d type II supergravity equations of motion for all values of $l_{2,3,4}, r_{2,3,4}$ subject to the null-gauge constraints (2.7). In the next section, we will show the consistency of the worldsheet theory in the coset background (2.1), imposes further constraints on the gauge parameters $l_{2,3,4}, r_{2,3,4}$.

3 Worldsheet constraints on supergravity

In this section, we will take an algebraic approach to construct the spectrum of physical operators of type II string theory in (3.1) with pure NS-NS flux and derive the constraints on the geometry imposed by the consistency of the worldsheet theory. To begin with, let's consider type II string theory in

$$\frac{SL(2, \mathbb{R})_{k_{sl}} \times U(1)_x \times \mathbb{R}_t \times U(1)_y}{U(1)_L \times U(1)_R} \times SU(2)_{k_{su}} \times T^3 , \tag{3.1}$$

where k_{sl} and k_{su} are respectively the WZW (supersymmetric) levels of $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ and $SU(2)$. Criticality of the worldsheet theory (*i.e.* the total worldsheet central charge of the matter sector is 15) requires

$$k_{sl} = k_{su} \equiv n_5 . \tag{3.2}$$

The null $U(1)_L \times U(1)_R$ gauge currents are generated by

$$\begin{aligned} J &= J_3 + l_2 J_x + l_3 J_t + l_4 J_y , \\ \bar{J} &= \bar{J}_3 + r_2 \bar{J}_x + r_3 \bar{J}_t + r_4 \bar{J}_y . \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

The normalizations of the currents $J_{3,x,t,y}$ are such that they satisfy the OPE algebra (2.5). Switching the chiralities one can equivalently obtain the OPEs of the anti-holomorphic currents $\bar{J}_{3,x,t,y}$. Regularity of the JJ and $\bar{J}\bar{J}$ OPEs implies

$$l_2^2 - l_3^2 + l_4^2 = r_2^2 - r_3^2 + r_4^2 = n_5 . \quad (3.4)$$

Here, as before, we set $l_1 = r_1 = 1$ without loss of generality.

The vertex operators in the coset sigma model (3.1) in the $(-1, -1)$ picture are given by

$$V(z, \bar{z}) = e^{-\varphi} e^{-\bar{\varphi}} V_{m, \bar{m}}^{j; w} e^{i(P_L x_L + i P_R x_R)} e^{iEt} e^{i(Q_L y_L + Q_R y_R)} V_{\mathcal{M}} , \quad (3.5)$$

where $\varphi, \bar{\varphi}$ are the worldsheet superconformal fields coming from the bosonization of the $\beta\gamma$ and $\tilde{\beta}\tilde{\gamma}$ system, $V_{m, \bar{m}}^{j; w}$ is a spectrally flowed (with integer w) $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ vertex operator from the discrete or continuous series representation, $e^{iEt}, e^{i(P_L x_L + i P_R x_R)}, e^{i(Q_L y_L + Q_R y_R)}$, are respectively the plane wave vertex operators in $\mathbb{R}_t, U(1)_x, U(1)_y$, $V_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a vertex operator of $SU(2)_{n_5} \times U(1)^3$ WZW model with dimensions $(\Delta_L^{\mathcal{M}}, \Delta_R^{\mathcal{M}})$. The charges $P_{L,R}, Q_{L,R}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} P_{L,R} &= \frac{n_x}{R_x} \pm w_x R_x , \\ Q_{L,R} &= \frac{n_y}{R_y} \pm w_y R_y , \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

where $n_{x,y}$ and $w_{x,y}$ are integers and $E \in \mathbb{R}$.

Using the parafermionic decomposition [67] of $SL(2, \mathbb{R})_{n_5} \sim SL(2, \mathbb{R})_{n_5}/U(1) \times U(1)_Y$, one can bosonize the timelike $SL(2, \mathbb{R})_{n_5}$ currents J_3, \bar{J}_3 as

$$J_3 = -\sqrt{\frac{n_5}{2}} \partial Y_L , \quad \bar{J}_3 = -\sqrt{\frac{n_5}{2}} \bar{\partial} Y_R . \quad (3.7)$$

where $Y = Y_L + Y_R$ is a free field normalized such that

$$Y_L(z) Y_L(0) \sim -\log z , \quad Y_R(\bar{z}) Y_R(0) \sim -\log \bar{z} . \quad (3.8)$$

The spectrally flowed $SL(2, \mathbb{R})_{n_5}$ vertex operator $V_{m, \bar{m}}^{j; w}$, under parafermionic decomposition, can be expressed as [67]

$$V_{m, \bar{m}}^{j; w} = \Phi_{m, \bar{m}}^j e^{\sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}} [(m + \frac{n_5}{2} w) Y_L + (\bar{m} + \frac{n_5}{2} w) Y_R]} , \quad (3.9)$$

where $\Phi_{m,\bar{m}}^j$ is the parafermionic part of the $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ vertex operator whose OPEs with J_3, \bar{J}_3 are regular. Using (3.7), (3.8), and (3.9), it is easy to show

$$J_3(z)V_{m,\bar{m}}^{j;w}(0) \sim \frac{\left(m + \frac{n_5 w}{2}\right)}{z} V_{m,\bar{m}}^{j;w}(0). \quad (3.10)$$

Similarly, the OPE of the currents $J_{x,t,y}$ with the plane wave vertex operators are given by

$$J_x(z)e^{i(P_L x_L + P_R x_R)}(0) \sim \frac{P_L/2}{z}, \quad J_t(z)e^{iEt}(0) \sim \frac{-E/2}{z}, \quad J_y(z)e^{i(Q_L y_L + Q_R y_R)}(0) \sim \frac{Q_L/2}{z}. \quad (3.11)$$

Switching the chiralities one obtains the equivalent OPEs of the anti-holomorphic components of the currents and the vertex operators.

Physical vertex operators of the form (3.5) must be gauge invariant. This can be imposed by demanding that string states described by vertex operators (3.5) must be annihilated by the null gauge charges

$$Q_B = \oint dz J, \quad \bar{Q}_B = \oint d\bar{z} \bar{J}. \quad (3.12)$$

An equivalent way of saying this would be to say that the OPEs of the null currents (3.3) with the vertex operators (3.5) are regular. This imposes the null-gauge constraints

$$\begin{aligned} \left(m + \frac{n_5 w}{2}\right) + \frac{l_2 P_L}{2} - \frac{l_3 E}{2} + \frac{l_4 Q_L}{2} &= 0, \\ \left(\bar{m} + \frac{n_5 w}{2}\right) + \frac{r_2 P_R}{2} - \frac{r_3 E}{2} + \frac{r_4 Q_R}{2} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Note that a detailed analysis of the BRST quantization of the gauged WZW model (3.1) would give $cQ_B, \bar{c}\bar{Q}_B$, (3.12), as the BRST charges that square to zero where c, \bar{c} are the holomorphic and anti-holomorphic fields of the bc and $\bar{b}\bar{c}$ system. Thus the null-gauge constraints, (3.13), can also be thought of as the BRST constraints on the vertex operators. We would like to emphasize the fact that $cQ_B, \bar{c}\bar{Q}_B$ are BRST charges of the gauged WZW model and not of the worldsheet string theory. The worldsheet BRST charges are constructed in Appendix B.

We are interested in vertex operators (3.5) that live in the physical Hilbert space of string theory in (3.1). This means, in addition to the null-gauge constraints (3.13), the vertex operators must satisfy the Virasoro constraints

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{j(j+1)}{n_5} - mw - \frac{n_5 w^2}{4} + \frac{P_L^2}{4} - \frac{E^2}{4} + \frac{Q_L^2}{4} + N_L + \Delta_L^{\mathcal{M}} &= \frac{1}{2}, \\ -\frac{j(j+1)}{n_5} - \bar{m}w - \frac{n_5 w^2}{4} + \frac{P_R^2}{4} - \frac{E^2}{4} + \frac{Q_R^2}{4} + N_R + \Delta_R^{\mathcal{M}} &= \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

where j parametrizes the quadratic Casimir of $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ and $N_{L,R}$ are the oscillator levels in AdS_3 .

Naively, one might think that vertex operators (3.5) satisfying the null gauge constraints (3.13) and the Virasoro constraints (3.14) constitute all states in the Hilbert space of the string theory. But, as we are going to argue next, there are still some residual gauge redundancies that need to be fixed. To realize the residual gauge freedom, let's define the following fields:

$$\begin{aligned} H_L &= -i\sqrt{\frac{n_5}{2}}Y_L + l_2x_L + l_3t + l_4y_L , \\ H_R &= -i\sqrt{\frac{n_5}{2}}Y_R + l_2x_R + l_3t + l_4y_R . \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

It's easy to check that the OPEs of $H_{L,R}$ with respect to the null gauge currents J, \bar{J} , (3.3), are regular. This means, a physical vertex operator V , (3.5), and $V.e^{i\alpha(H_L+H_R)}$ are gauge equivalent $\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} (w, P_L, E, Q_L) &\sim (w, P_L, E, Q_L) + (\alpha, \alpha l_2, \alpha l_3, \alpha l_4) , \\ (w, P_R, E, Q_R) &\sim (w, P_R, E, Q_R) + (\alpha, \alpha r_2, \alpha r_3, \alpha r_4) . \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

The identifications (3.16) impose further constraints on $\alpha, l_{2,3,4}, r_{2,3,4}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\in \mathbb{Z} , \quad \alpha l_2 = \tilde{P}_L , \quad \alpha l_4 = \tilde{Q}_L , \\ \alpha r_2 &= \tilde{P}_R , \quad \alpha r_4 = \tilde{Q}_R , \\ l_3 &= r_3 , \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}_{L,R} &= \frac{\tilde{n}_x}{R_x} \pm \tilde{w}_x R_x , \\ \tilde{Q}_{L,R} &= \frac{\tilde{n}_y}{R_y} \pm \tilde{w}_y R_y . \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

where $\tilde{n}_{x,y}, \tilde{w}_{x,y}, \tilde{w} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Without loss of generality, one can set $\alpha = 1$. Solving (3.16)–(3.18) and (3.4) one obtains ³

$$\begin{aligned} l_2 &= \frac{\tilde{n}_x}{R_x} + \tilde{w}_x R_x , \quad l_4 = \frac{\tilde{n}_y}{R_y} + \tilde{w}_y R_y , \quad r_2 = \frac{\tilde{n}_x}{R_x} - \tilde{w}_x R_x , \quad r_4 = \frac{\tilde{n}_y}{R_y} - \tilde{w}_y R_y , \\ l &= l_3 = r_3 = \sqrt{\tilde{P}_L^2 + \tilde{Q}_L^2 - n_5} = \sqrt{\tilde{P}_R^2 + \tilde{Q}_R^2 - n_5} \\ &= \sqrt{\left(\frac{\tilde{n}_x^2}{R_x^2} + \frac{\tilde{n}_y^2}{R_y^2} + \tilde{w}_x^2 R_x^2 + \tilde{w}_y^2 R_y^2\right) - n_5} . \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

³Note that the worldsheet constraints (3.19) on the gauge parameters $l_{2,3,4}, r_{2,3,4}$ can also be obtained by directly analyzing the null gauge constraints (3.13), the Virasoro constraints (3.14) and the periodicities of the vertex operator (3.5). See [50] for an elaborate discussion.

In (3.19) we have chosen the positive branch for l_3, r_3 . The negative branch would simply correspond to $t \rightarrow -t$. The fact that $l_3 = r_3$ imposes the following constraint

$$\tilde{P}_L^2 - \tilde{P}_R^2 + \tilde{Q}_L^2 - \tilde{Q}_R^2 = 0 , \quad (3.20)$$

implying $\tilde{n}_{x,y}, \tilde{w}_{x,y}$ lie on a null cone in $\Gamma_{2,2}$. Substituting (3.18) into (3.20) one obtains

$$\tilde{n}_x \tilde{w}_x + \tilde{n}_y \tilde{w}_y = 0 . \quad (3.21)$$

The reality of the gauge angle l in (3.19) further imposes the constraint

$$\frac{\tilde{n}_x^2}{R_x^2} + \frac{\tilde{n}_y^2}{R_y^2} + \tilde{w}_x^2 R_x^2 + \tilde{w}_y^2 R_y^2 \geq n_5 , \quad (3.22)$$

for all integer values of $\tilde{n}_{x,y}$ and $\tilde{w}_{x,y}$ satisfying (3.21). Thus, the allowed values of $R_{x,y}$ heavily depend on the choice of the integers $\tilde{n}_{x,y}$ and $\tilde{w}_{x,y}$.

4 Supergravity background

In this section, we will study the supergravity background (2.18), calculate the conserved charges, and impose the worldsheet constraints derived in the previous section. We would like to stress the fact that the solution (2.18) satisfies the type II supergravity equations of motion for all values of the gauge angles $l_{2,3,4}, r_{2,3,4}$ subject to the constraint (3.4), but the consistency of the worldsheet theory imposes further constraints (3.19)–(3.22) on the gauge angles which are otherwise not manifest at the supergravity level.

To begin with, let's recall the supergravity background derived in section 2:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{ds^2}{\alpha'} &= - \left(1 - \frac{2l_3 r_3}{\Delta} \right) dt^2 + n_5 d\rho^2 + \left(1 + \frac{2l_2 r_2}{\Delta} \right) dx^2 + \left(1 + \frac{2l_4 r_4}{\Delta} \right) dy^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2(l_3 r_2 + l_2 r_3)}{\Delta} dt dx + \frac{2(l_4 r_3 + l_3 r_4)}{\Delta} dt dy + \frac{2(l_4 r_2 + l_2 r_4)}{\Delta} dx dy + ds_{S^3}^2 / \alpha' + ds_{T^3}^2 / \alpha' , \\ \frac{B}{\alpha'} &= \frac{l_3 r_2 - l_2 r_3}{\Delta} dt \wedge dx + \frac{l_3 r_4 - l_4 r_3}{\Delta} dt \wedge dy + \frac{l_2 r_4 - l_4 r_2}{\Delta} dx \wedge dy + n_5 \cos^2 \theta d\phi \wedge d\psi , \\ e^{2\Phi} &= \frac{e^{2\Phi_0}}{\Delta} , \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

with

$$\Delta = n_5 \cosh 2\rho - l_2 r_2 + l_3 r_3 - l_4 r_4 . \quad (4.2)$$

The background (4.1) has a boundary at $\rho \rightarrow \infty$. Near the boundary, the background (4.1) asymptotes to two-dimensional flat spacetime times two circles with radii $R_{x,y}$

(finite) and a dilaton that grows linear in ρ :

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{ds^2}{\alpha'} &= -dt^2 + kd\rho^2 + dx^2 + dy^2 , \\ B &= 0 , \\ \Phi &= \tilde{\Phi}_0 - \rho .\end{aligned}\tag{4.3}$$

where $\tilde{\Phi}_0$ is a constant.

The IR limit of the solution (4.1) is obtained by taking the limit $R_y \rightarrow \infty$ keeping R_x fixed⁴. This limit is a bit tricky and should be considered after imposing all the worldsheet constraints into the supergravity solution. We postpone this discussion to section 5.

In the discussion that follows, we will argue that the supergravity background (4.1) is a microstate solution and derive constraints on the solution for which the background geometry is smooth (absence of horizon). The absence of a horizon in microstate geometries is a result of topological changes within the geometry.⁵ When branes wrap compact directions, due to their tension, the tendency is for those directions to shrink. Placing momentum along the branes produces an opposing effect in which they want to expand. The balance between these two effects stabilizes the size of the compact directions, allowing for a horizon to form. For microstate geometries with the same global charges, however, the compact directions are stabilized in a certain region of the geometry but not all the way down to the horizon scale. Rather, the momentum dilutes in such a way as to allow the compact directions to shrink to zero precisely as one approaches the would-be horizon, allowing the space to end smoothly (up to an orbifold singularity at $\rho = 0$). Therefore, let us analyze our supergravity background and thus show that, under suitable constraints, it is a non-BPS, microstate geometry; a solution that is non-BPS, smooth, and horizonless. The analysis below is similar to the one that appears in [53]. Let's begin by looking at the induced metric (in the string frame) on a constant $\rho = \rho_0$ surface at a fixed time and then consider the limit $\rho_0 \rightarrow 0$. This is given by

$$\lim_{\rho_0 \rightarrow 0} \det \left(\begin{array}{cc} 1 + \frac{2l_2r_2}{\Delta} & \frac{l_4r_2 + l_2r_4}{\Delta} \\ \frac{l_4r_2 + l_2r_4}{\Delta} & 1 + \frac{2l_4r_4}{\Delta} \end{array} \right) = - \frac{n_5(l_3 - r_3)^2}{(n_5 - l_2r_2 + l_3r_3 - l_4r_4)^2} .\tag{4.4}$$

⁴Since there is complete democracy between R_x and R_y , one can also obtain an equivalent IR limit by taking $R_x \rightarrow \infty$ keeping R_y fixed. However, choosing R_x or R_y as the parameter to flow to the IR breaks the democracy in x and y .

⁵Another way to understand this is the following: the near horizon region of a black hole geometry continues infinitely due to the presence of a horizon. For a microstate geometry, however, the near horizon region ends smoothly due to the presence of nontrivial microstructure at the would be horizon scale. For more discussion see [9, 68].

Note that this quantity is negative definite and requiring the absence of a horizon imposes ⁶

$$l_3 = r_3 . \tag{4.5}$$

This is precisely the constraint one obtains from the consistency of the worldsheet theory (3.17). Let's define

$$l = l_3 = r_3 . \tag{4.6}$$

The determinant of the 4d (excluding S^3 and T^3) part of the metric is given by

$$-\frac{n_5^3 \sinh^2 2\rho}{\Delta^2} , \tag{4.7}$$

which also smoothly goes to zero as $\rho \rightarrow 0$. One can also check that the Ricci scalar with $l_3 = r_3$ is smooth everywhere.

Diagonalizing the induced metric at $\rho = \rho_0$ and at a fixed time and then taking $\rho_0 \rightarrow 0$, one can easily show that one of the circles shrinks to zero size in the limit $l_3 = r_3$ with a conical deficit. This is reflected in the fact that the determinant of the induced metric (4.4) vanishes at $\rho_0 = 0$. The size of the other circle, on the other hand, remains finite.

The supergravity background (4.1) has a B -field with components along $tx, ty, xy, \phi\psi$ directions. This means that the background is sourced by NS5-branes wrapping T^3 and the x and y circles and F1-strings wrapping the x and y circles. The metric has non-zero tx, ty components which further imply that the F1-strings have momentum modes along the x and y compact directions. In the following subsection, we will compute the conserved fundamental charges namely the NS5 and F1 charges and the ADM mass and angular momenta along x and y .

4.1 Background charges

As is standard in any gauge theory, the charges are calculated from the integrals of the field strength over various surfaces. In the discussion that follows, we define the NS5 and F1 charges denoted respectively by Q_5 and Q_1 , such that they are topological charges that count respectively the number of NS5 branes and F1 strings wrapping the x -circle and the y -circle. The NS5-brane charge is given by

$$Q_5 = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2 l_s^2} \int_{S^3} H = n_5 , \tag{4.8}$$

where, $H = dB$. Similarly, the F1-string charge is given by

$$Q_1 = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^6 l_s^6} \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}_8} e^{-2\Phi} \star_{10} H , \tag{4.9}$$

⁶One can also independently arrive at (4.5) by demanding the absence of close timelike curves.

where $\partial\mathcal{M}_8$ is a 7-dimensional boundary of the 8-dimensional compact manifold at a fixed time and ρ . The 7-form $\tilde{H} = \star_{10}H$ has the following non-vanishing components:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{H}_{t\rho xy z_1 z_2 z_3} &= \frac{2l_s^6 n_5 \sinh 2\rho}{\Delta}, \\ \tilde{H}_{x\theta\psi\phi z_1 z_2 z_3} &= \frac{l_s^6 n_5 l(l_4 - r_4) \sin 2\theta}{\Delta}, \\ \tilde{H}_{y\theta\psi\phi z_1 z_2 z_3} &= \frac{l_s^6 n_5 l(l_2 - r_2) \sin 2\theta}{\Delta},\end{aligned}\tag{4.10}$$

where $z_{1,2,3}$ denote coordinates on T^3 . The volume form on the 7-cycle at $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ can formally be expressed as

$$d\Omega_{7\text{-cycle}} = dx \wedge d\Omega_{S^3} \wedge d\Omega_{T^3} + dy \wedge d\Omega_{S^3} \wedge d\Omega_{T^3} .\tag{4.11}$$

Using this measure the total F1 winding charge can be split up into two components

$$Q_1 = |Q_1^x + Q_1^y| ,\tag{4.12}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}Q_1^x &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^6 l_s^6} \int dy d\Omega_{S^3} d\Omega_{T^3} e^{-2\Phi} \tilde{H}_{y\theta\psi\phi z_1 z_2 z_3} = \frac{n_5 l(l_2 - r_2) R_y v}{e^{2\Phi_0}}, \\ Q_1^y &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^6 l_s^6} \int dy d\Omega_{S^3} d\Omega_{T^3} e^{-2\Phi} \tilde{H}_{x\theta\psi\phi z_1 z_2 z_3} = \frac{n_5 l(l_4 - r_4) R_x v}{e^{2\Phi_0}},\end{aligned}\tag{4.13}$$

where v is such that the dimension of T^3 is given by

$$V_{T^3} = (2\pi)^3 l_s^4 v .\tag{4.14}$$

The charges $Q_1^{x,y}$ can be thought of as the topological winding charges of the F1 strings along the x and y circles respectively.

In order to compute the ADM charges (mass and angular momenta), it is often useful to cast the string frame background metric (4.1) in the form

$$ds^2 = g_{tt} dt^2 + n_5 d\rho^2 + g_{ab} (dx^a + \mathcal{R}^a dt)(dx^b + \mathcal{R}^b dt) ,\tag{4.15}$$

where (a, b) run over (x, y) and

$$\begin{aligned}g_{tt} &= -\frac{n_5 \cosh^2 \rho}{l^2 + n_5 \cosh^2 \rho}, & g_{ab} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \frac{2l_2 r_2}{\Delta} & \frac{l_4 r_2 + l_2 r_4}{\Delta} \\ \frac{l_4 r_2 + l_2 r_4}{\Delta} & 1 + \frac{2l_4 r_4}{\Delta} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathcal{R}^x &= \frac{l(l_2 + r_2)}{2(l^2 + n_5 \cosh^2 \rho)}, & \mathcal{R}^y &= \frac{l(l_4 + r_4)}{2(l^2 + n_5 \cosh^2 \rho)}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.16}$$

The geometry (4.15) with (4.16) and the B-field have nonzero tx and ty components that do not fall off sufficiently fast. This means that the supergravity solution has finite angular charges, $L_{x,y}^{(G,B)}$. Using standard techniques from general relativity, one can read off the angular velocities as

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega^x &= -\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{R}^x = -\frac{l(l_2 + r_2)}{2(n_5 + l^2)} , \\ \Omega^y &= -\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{R}^y = -\frac{l(l_4 + r_4)}{2(n_5 + l^2)} .\end{aligned}\tag{4.17}$$

The angular velocities (4.17) can further be decomposed into left and right movers ⁷

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_L^x &= -\frac{ll_2}{2(n_5 + l^2)} , & \Omega_R^x &= -\frac{lr_2}{2(n_5 + l^2)} , \\ \Omega_L^y &= -\frac{ll_4}{2(n_5 + l^2)} , & \Omega_R^y &= -\frac{lr_4}{2(n_5 + l^2)} .\end{aligned}\tag{4.18}$$

As stated earlier, the solution (4.15) with (4.16) is invariant under constant shifts in t, x, y . The corresponding conserved charges can be evaluated using the covariant phase space formalism [60, 69, 70] which we calculate next.

The conserved angular charges can be derived using the 1-forms

$$k_G^a = \mathcal{G}_{a\mu} dX^\mu , \quad k_B^a = \mathcal{B}_{a\mu} dX^\mu , \quad a = x, y ,\tag{4.19}$$

by the Komar formula ⁸

$$L_a^{(G,B)} = \frac{1}{\kappa_0^2} V_{S^3} V_{T^3} l_s \int \star (dk_{(G,B)}^a) e^{-2\Phi} ,\tag{4.20}$$

where $\mathcal{G}_{\mu\nu}, \mathcal{B}_{\mu\nu}$ are the components of the metric and the B-field in (4.1), and $V_{S^3}, V_{T^3}, V_x, V_y$ are respectively the volumes of the S^3, T^3 and the x and y circles at the boundary given by

$$V_{S^3} = 2\pi^2 n_5^{3/2} l_s^3 , \quad V_{T^3} = (2\pi)^3 l_s^3 v , \quad V_x = 2\pi R_x l_s , \quad V_y = 2\pi R_y l_s ,\tag{4.21}$$

⁷From the supergravity point of view, the four angular velocities $\Omega_{L,R}^{x,y}$ can be understood as follows. Dimensional reduction along $S_{x,y}^1$ gives rise to four $U(1)$ gauge fields (two coming from the metric and two coming from the B-field). From the value of the gauge fields at $\rho = 0$, one can work out the chemical potential conjugate to the four $U(1)$ charges using standard methods. From the higher dimensional point of view, the four chemical potentials can be interpreted as angular velocities $\Omega_{L,R}^{x,y}$. Similarly, the four $U(1)$ charges of the compactified theory can be realized as the four angular charges of the higher dimensional theory.

⁸That the conserved charges can be expressed as Komar integrals, follow directly from the covariant phase space formalism developed in [69] for spacetimes with arbitrary asymptote.

and

$$\kappa = \kappa_0 e^{\Phi_0} = \sqrt{8\pi G_N} , \quad (4.22)$$

G_N is the 10-dimensional Newton constant. One can also define the left and the right moving components of the angular momenta as

$$J_a^{L,R} = \frac{L_a^{(G)} \pm L_a^{(B)}}{2} , \quad a = x, y . \quad (4.23)$$

Using (4.20) with (4.19) and (4.23) one can write

$$\begin{aligned} J_x^L &= -\frac{2V_{S^3}V_{T^3}V_xV_y}{l_s^2\kappa_0^2}ll_2 , & J_x^R &= -\frac{2V_{S^3}V_{T^3}V_xV_y}{l_s^2\kappa_0^2}lr_2 , \\ J_y^L &= -\frac{2V_{S^3}V_{T^3}V_xV_y}{l_s^2\kappa_0^2}ll_4 , & J_y^R &= -\frac{2V_{S^3}V_{T^3}V_xV_y}{l_s^2\kappa_0^2}lr_4 . \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

Similarly one can use the analogous Komar integral for the energy/mass

$$E = -\frac{1}{\kappa_0^2}V_{S^3}V_{T^3}l_s \int \star(dk_{(G)}^t)e^{-2\Phi} , \quad (4.25)$$

where $dk_{(G)}^t = \mathcal{G}_{t\mu}dX^\mu$ which gives

$$E = \frac{2V_{S^3}V_{T^3}V_xV_y}{l_s^2\kappa_0^2}l^2 . \quad (4.26)$$

Let us end this subsection with a quick consistency check of the various ADM charges (4.24),(4.26), and the angular potentials (4.18) derived above. Free energy of supergravity solution (4.1) is given by

$$\mathcal{F} = E - TS - \Omega \cdot J = E - TS - \Omega_L^x J_x^L - \Omega_L^y J_y^L - \Omega_R^x J_x^R - \Omega_R^y J_y^R , \quad (4.27)$$

where S is the entropy of the system and T is its temperature. It has been proved that the solution (4.1) with (4.5) is smooth with no finite area horizon *i.e.* $S = 0$. This is reminiscent of the fact that the solution (4.1) with (4.5) describes a microstate. Thus substituting (4.18),(4.24),(4.26),(4.24) and $S = 0$ in (4.27) one obtains

$$\mathcal{F} = E - \Omega_L^x J_x^L - \Omega_L^y J_y^L - \Omega_R^x J_x^R - \Omega_R^y J_y^R = 0 . \quad (4.28)$$

This can also be cross-checked by explicit computation of the Euclidean classical supergravity action. In fact, this observation agrees with the fact that in the semi-classical approximation (at leading order), the free energy of a supergravity solution that asymptotes to linear dilaton in the UV always vanishes [60, 71, 72].

4.2 Summary of the supergravity solution

Let us close this section with a brief summary of the full supergravity solution with all the worldsheet constraints imposed. As explained before the background is sourced by n_5 NS5 branes and Q_1 , (4.12) F1 strings. This allows us to express the background dilaton Φ_0 in terms of Q_1 . Using (4.12) and (4.13) one obtains

$$e^{2\Phi_0} = \frac{n_5 v l}{Q_1} |(l_4 - r_4)R_x + (l_2 - r_2)R_y| = \frac{2n_5 l v R_x R_y |\tilde{w}_x + \tilde{w}_y|}{Q_1} . \quad (4.29)$$

Imposing the worldsheet constraints (3.19)–(3.22) in the supergravity solution (4.1) with (4.29), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{ds^2}{\alpha'} &= - \left(-1 + \frac{2l^2}{\Sigma} \right) dt^2 + n_5 d\rho^2 + \left(1 + \frac{2(\tilde{n}_x^2 - R_x^4 \tilde{w}_x^2)}{\Sigma R_x^2} \right) dx^2 \\ &+ \left(1 + \frac{2(\tilde{n}_y^2 - R_y^4 \tilde{w}_y^2)}{\Sigma R_y^2} \right) dy^2 + \frac{2\tilde{n}_x l}{\Sigma R_x} dt dx + \frac{2\tilde{n}_y l}{\Sigma R_y} dt dy \\ &+ \frac{2}{\Sigma} \left(\frac{\tilde{n}_x \tilde{n}_y}{R_x R_y} - \tilde{w}_x \tilde{w}_y R_x R_y \right) dx dy + ds_{S^3}^2 / \alpha' + ds_{T^3}^2 / \alpha' , \\ \frac{B}{\alpha'} &= - \frac{2\tilde{w}_x R_x l}{\Sigma} dt \wedge dx - \frac{2\tilde{w}_y R_y l}{\Sigma} dt \wedge dy + \frac{2}{\Sigma} \left(\frac{\tilde{n}_y \tilde{w}_x R_x}{R_y} - \frac{\tilde{n}_x \tilde{w}_y R_y}{R_x} \right) dx \wedge dy \\ &+ n_5 \cos^2 \theta d\phi \wedge d\psi , \\ e^{2\Phi} &= \frac{2n_5 R_x R_y v l |\tilde{w}_x + \tilde{w}_y|}{Q_1 \Sigma} , \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} l &= \sqrt{\left(\frac{\tilde{n}_x^2}{R_x^2} + \frac{\tilde{n}_y^2}{R_y^2} + \tilde{w}_x^2 R_x^2 + \tilde{w}_y^2 R_y^2 \right) - n_5} , \\ \Sigma &= n_5 \cosh 2\rho + 2\tilde{w}_x^2 R_x^2 + 2\tilde{w}_y^2 R_y^2 - n_5 . \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

with $\tilde{n}_{x,y}, \tilde{w}_{x,y} \in \mathbb{Z}$ subject to the constraint

$$\tilde{n}_x \tilde{w}_x + \tilde{n}_y \tilde{w}_y = 0 . \quad (4.32)$$

Few comments about the supergravity solution (4.30)–(4.32) are in order:

1. The supergravity solution (4.30)–(4.32) is an NS-NS microstate solution of type II string theory. The geometry is smooth (up to an orbifold singularity at $\rho = 0$) with no finite-size horizon. Perturbative string theory in this background is described by the null coset (2.1). The solution (4.30)–(4.32) is non-BPS because none of the spacetime supersymmetry generators are annihilated by the worldsheet BRST charge (See appendix B for a detailed discussion on this).

There is another way to see that the solution is non-BPS. For 6d supergravity, BPS solutions take a particular form which makes manifest the supersymmetry. See [73] for more details. However, our solution after reducing to 6d (*e.g.*, reducing on either the x or the y circle) can not be rearranged into such a form thus supporting the claim that the geometry is in fact non-BPS.

Further justification that the solution (4.30)-(4.32) is a microstate can be obtained by looking at the conserved charges. Our solution carries the NS5 charge, n_5 , and F1 charges, \tilde{n}_x, \tilde{n}_y (momentum) and \tilde{w}_x, \tilde{w}_y (winding) under the constraint that $\tilde{n}_x \tilde{w}_x + \tilde{n}_y \tilde{w}_y = 0$. Changing any of these charges produces a different background seen by an observer at ∞ . This is in contrast with a system that has both global charges and dipole charges. Dipole charges usually integrate to zero for an asymptotic observer. However, as we zoom in towards the would-be horizon, these dipole charges begin to distinguish and make manifest, locally, the microscopic structure or different microstates.

2. The JMaRT solution [39] is a non-BPS three-charge configuration. However, this state is very atypical from the point of view of black hole microstates because it is highly rotating along the S^3 . In a similar manner, the microstate constructed in this paper is also atypical where, now, the momentum is carried along S_x^1 and S_y^1 instead of S^3 . It is still interesting nonetheless, to derive a non-BPS supergravity background from worldsheet string theory, which is exact to all orders in α' .
3. The background (4.30)-(4.32) can be thought of as the fivebrane decoupling limit (*i.e.* $g_s \rightarrow 0$) of a stack of n_5 NS5 branes wrapping $T^3 \times S_x^1 \times S_y^1$, with F1 strings wrapping the x and y -circles with integer winding numbers $\tilde{w}_{x,y}$ respectively and $\tilde{n}_{x,y}$ units of momenta along the x and y -circles. Note that the integers $\tilde{w}_{x,y}$ and $\tilde{n}_{x,y}$ are not all independent. The smoothness of the geometry (*i.e.* no horizon condition) imposes the constraint (4.32) on the integers $\tilde{w}_{x,y}$ and $\tilde{n}_{x,y}$. Thus three out of the four integers $\tilde{w}_{x,y}$ and $\tilde{n}_{x,y}$ are independent.

5 RG flow interpretation

As stated in section 4, the background (4.30) asymptotes to 2d flat spacetime times two spacelike circles with a dilaton field that is linear in the radial direction (4.3) and a vanishing B-field (The B-field is non-vanishing in the S^3). The full background (4.30), however, can be thought of as a two-parameter family of solutions parametrized by R_x and R_y . In this section, we are going to argue that there exist, one-parameter families of solutions embedded in the two-dimensional R_x, R_y parameter space which

can be interpreted as an RG flow from linear dilaton spacetime in the UV to some AdS_3 (locally) in the IR. From the holographic point of view, the boundary field theory is a certain Little String Theory with two dimensionless parameters $\lambda_{x,y} = \alpha'/R_{x,y}^2$ that flows to a CFT_2 in the IR. In the discussion that follows, we will identify two one-parameter lines of theories that flows to some AdS_3 at large distances.

Let's start by considering the one-parameter subspace in the R_x, R_y parameter space obtained by varying R_y for some fixed R_x . The AdS decoupling limit of such a one-parameter flow is obtained by taking $R_y \rightarrow \infty$ keeping R_x fixed (see the red curve in figure 1). In terms of the coordinates

$$\tilde{t} = \frac{t}{R_y}, \quad \tilde{y} = \frac{y}{R_y}, \quad (5.1)$$

which are well defined in the $R_y \rightarrow \infty$ limit, the supergravity background (suppressing $S^3 \times T^3$) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{ds^2}{\alpha'} &= n_5 \left(-\frac{\cosh^2 \rho}{\tilde{w}_y^2} d\tilde{t}^2 + d\rho^2 + \frac{\sinh^2 \rho}{\tilde{w}_y^2} d\tilde{y}^2 \right) + \left(dx + \frac{\tilde{n}_x}{\tilde{w}_y R_x} d\tilde{t} - \frac{\tilde{w}_x R_x}{\tilde{w}_y} d\tilde{y} \right)^2, \\ H &= \frac{n_5 \alpha'}{\tilde{w}_y^2} d\rho \wedge d\tilde{t} \wedge d\tilde{y}, \\ e^{2\Phi} &= \frac{n_5 v R_x}{Q_1} \left| 1 + \frac{\tilde{w}_x}{\tilde{w}_y} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

Note that for $\tilde{w}_x = \tilde{n}_x = 0$ and $\tilde{w}_y = 1$, the above background is precisely global- $AdS_3 \times S^1$, but for generic $\tilde{w}_{x,y}, \tilde{n}_x$, the background (5.2) can be identified as $(AdS_3 \times S^1)/\mathbb{Z}_{\tilde{w}_y}$ with $\sqrt{n_5 \alpha'}$ as the radius of AdS . Redefining the coordinate

$$x' = x + \frac{\tilde{n}_x}{\tilde{w}_y R_x} \tilde{t} - \frac{\tilde{w}_x R_x}{\tilde{w}_y} \tilde{y}, \quad (5.3)$$

with

$$x' \sim x' + 2\pi R_x \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{w}_x}{\tilde{w}_y} \right), \quad (5.4)$$

the metric takes the simpler form

$$\frac{ds^2}{\alpha'} = n_5 \left(-\frac{\cosh^2 \rho}{\tilde{w}_y^2} d\tilde{t}^2 + d\rho^2 + \frac{\sinh^2 \rho}{\tilde{w}_y^2} d\tilde{y}^2 \right) + dx'^2, \quad (5.5)$$

This is known as a large gauge transformation because the effects are felt at the boundary. In the dual field theory, this is equivalent to a spectral flow operation of the




Figure 1. Diagrammatic representation of the two-parameter family of the microstate solution (4.30). The red curve denotes the flow obtained by varying R_y keeping R_x fixed. The IR of this flow is obtained when $R_y \rightarrow \infty$ where the spacetime is well approximated by $(AdS_3 \times S^1)/\mathbb{Z}_{\tilde{w}_y}$. Similarly, the blue curve denotes the flow obtained by changing R_x keeping R_y fixed. The IR geometry here is given by $(AdS_3 \times S^1)/\mathbb{Z}_{\tilde{w}_x}$.

$SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ invariant NS vacuum. It would be interesting to further explore the boundary interpretation of this background.⁹ This feature is similar to the JMaRT solution (See [53] for details.).

Since the background (4.30) is democratic in R_x and R_y , one can equivalently obtain a second line of theories by varying R_x and keeping fix R_y . The AdS decoupling limit is obtained by taking the limit $R_x \rightarrow \infty$ with R_y kept fixed (the blue curve in figure 1). The decoupled background in the IR, thus obtained, is $(AdS_3 \times S^1)/\mathbb{Z}_{\tilde{w}_x}$.

It would be interesting to understand if there exists some other one-parameter family of solutions that would give rise to some (locally) AdS_3 in the IR.

⁹It's important to note that the large gauge transformation (5.3) is valid only in the AdS decoupling limit (5.2) and not in the full geometry (4.30)-(4.32).

6 Discussion

In this paper, we studied type II superstrings in the background (2.1) in the presence of pure NS-NS flux. We showed that the corresponding supergravity background (4.30)-(4.32) is a two-parameter (parametrized by $R_{x,y}$) family of smooth non-BPS microstate solution that satisfies the type II supergravity equations of motion. Microscopically one can think of (4.30)-(4.32) as the fivebrane decoupling limit of a stack of n_5 NS5 branes wrapping $T^3 \times S_x^1 \times S_y^1$ with F1 strings wrapping the non-contractable cycles of $S_x^1 \times S_y^1$ with winding charges $\tilde{w}_{x,y}$ and $\tilde{n}_{x,y}$ unites of momenta respectively along the x and y -circles. The background asymptotes to flat spacetime with a linear dilaton. The AdS decoupling limit is obtained by sending $R_y \rightarrow \infty$ (or equivalently $R_x \rightarrow \infty$) keeping R_x fixed (or equivalently R_y fixed) where the background takes the form of some \mathbb{Z}_w orbifold of $AdS_3 \times S^1$.

The background derived in this paper is similar to the JMaRT solution, a highly rotating (atypical) three-charge non-BPS microstate. The main difference is that instead of carrying angular momentum along the S^3 , our solution carries it along the S_x^1 and S_y^1 directions.

The construction in this paper is intimately connected to single trace $T\bar{T}$ [58, 74–77] deformation of string theory in AdS_3/\mathbb{Z}_N for some integer N . In particular if one sets \tilde{n}_x and \tilde{w}_x to zero then the coset describes single trace $T\bar{T}$ deformation of the spacetime theory dual to string theory in global AdS_3 or its \mathbb{Z}_N orbifolds.

Our construction paves the way for various follow-up problems. The first and foremost is to understand the structure of spatial entanglement using the Ryu-Takayanagi (RT) prescription. Microstate geometries are dual to coherent states of the spacetime theory. The entanglement of a bipartite system in a coherent state has certain specific features [78]. It would be nice to revisit this issue from the behavior of the RT surface. Entanglement entropy in similar asymptotically linear dilaton backgrounds [79, 80] exhibits a certain non-local features. It would be interesting to investigate such non-local effects in this setup as well.

One of the great advantages of having a coset description is to construct operators of the spacetime theory. In fact, the correlation function of operators can easily be computed using techniques described in [58–60, 81]. It would be interesting to set up a 4-point scattering problem in the background (4.30)-(4.32) and understand its analytic properties.

For a better understanding of the microstate solution constructed in this paper, it is instructive to study solutions to Klein Gordon equation in this background. From the holographic point of view, this would allow us to compute correlation functions of operators of the spacetime theory. Introducing a perturbative polynomial potential

would allow us to evaluate the Witten diagrams which would eventually lead to the computation of S-matrices in this background. It would also be interesting to probe the geometry by a D1 brane with its endpoints anchored at the conformal boundary. As discussed in [82], in the context of a similar non-AdS setup, the classical effective action of a probe D1 brane captures various non-perturbative aspects of the spacetime theory (*e.g.*, various phases of the theory including confinement-deconfinement phase transitions). We hope to report on this in the future.

Most of the previous microstate geometries which have been constructed contain both Ramond-Ramond and NS-NS flux making a worldsheet formulation challenging. Recently, in [25, 26], purely NS-NS microstate geometries were constructed. It would be interesting to explore the worldsheet formulation of these geometries. We plan to investigate this in future work.

Acknowledgements

We thank I. Bena, J. de Boer, N. Čeplak, A. Giveon, A. Hashimoto, N. Kovensky, D. Kutasov, F. Larsen, E. Martinec, D. Turton, and N. Warner for useful discussions. We especially thank I. Bena for reading the manuscript and providing helpful insight and N. Čeplak for reading through the Introduction and providing helpful suggestions. The work of SC received funding under the Framework Program for Research and “Horizon 2020” innovation under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement n° 945298. This work was supported in part by the FACCTS Program at the University of Chicago. SC would like to thank APCTP, Pohang for hospitality during part of this work. SDH would like to thank the hospitality of the University of Warsaw, Faculty of Physics during the completion of this work. The work of SDH is supported by ERC Grant 787320 - QBH Structure.

A General null gauging

In this appendix, we would like to study a general null gauging

$$\frac{\mathbb{G}}{\mathbb{H}} \equiv \frac{SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \times SU(2) \times U(1)^4 \times \mathbb{R}_t \times U_y(1)}{(U(1)_L \times U(1)_R)_{null}}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where we will refer to the WZW theory on \mathbb{G} as the upstairs theory. The four circles of $U(1)^4$ are parametrized by x_i , $i = 1, \dots, 4$ with periodicities $x_i \sim x_i + 2\pi R_i$. As usual y parametrizes $U(1)_y$ with radius R_y and t parametrizes \mathbb{R}_t . Let

$$G = \text{diag} \left[g, g', e^{i\sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}}x_1}, e^{i\sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}}x_2}, e^{i\sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}}x_3}, e^{i\sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}}x_4}, e^{-\sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}}t}, e^{i\sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}}y} \right], \quad (\text{A.2})$$

with $g \in SL(2, \mathbb{R})$, $g' \in SU(2)$ be a diagonal block element of the upstairs theory (A.1). The $(U(1)_L \times U(1)_R)_{null}$ that we want to gauge are generated by $\exp T_L$ and $\exp T_R$ where $T_{L,R}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} T_L &= \text{diag} \left[il_1 \sigma_3, il_2 \sigma_3, i\sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}} l_3, i\sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}} l_4, i\sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}} l_5, i\sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}} l_6, \sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}} l_7, i\sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}} l_8 \right] , \\ T_R &= \text{diag} \left[ir_1 \sigma_3, ir_2 \sigma_3, i\sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}} r_3, i\sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}} r_4, i\sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}} r_5, i\sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}} r_6, \sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}} r_7, i\sqrt{\frac{2}{n_5}} r_8 \right] . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

In other words, we would like to gauge the symmetry

$$G \rightarrow e^{T_L} G e^{T_R} . \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The generators of the symmetry (A.3) are null

$$\text{tr}(P.T_L^2) = \text{tr}(P.T_R^2) = 0 , \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where

$$P = \text{diag} [1, 1, -1, -1, -1, -1, -1, -1, -1, -1] , \quad (\text{A.6})$$

is the projection operator that keeps track of the signature of the Killing form ¹⁰. Substituting (A.3) and (A.6) in (A.5) one obtains,

$$\begin{aligned} -n_5 l_1^2 + n_5 l_2^2 + \sum_{i=3}^6 l_i^2 - l_7^2 + l_8^2 &= 0 , \\ -n_5 r_1^2 + n_5 r_2^2 + \sum_{i=3}^6 r_i^2 - r_7^2 + r_8^2 &= 0 . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Without loss of generality, we will set $l_1 = l_2 = 1$.

The gauge currents are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} &= n_5 \text{tr}(P.T_L . \partial G . G^{-1}) , \\ \bar{\mathcal{J}} &= n_5 \text{tr}(P.T_R . G^{-1} . \bar{\partial} G) . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

To compute the gauged sigma model let's choose the following parametrization for $g \in SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ and $g' \in SU(2)$

$$\begin{aligned} g &= e^{\frac{i}{2}(\tau-\sigma)\sigma_3} e^{\rho\sigma_1} e^{\frac{i}{2}(\tau+\sigma)\sigma_3} , \\ g' &= e^{\frac{i}{2}(\psi-\phi)\sigma_3} e^{i\theta\sigma_1} e^{\frac{i}{2}(\psi+\phi)\sigma_3} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

¹⁰The projection operator is chosen such that the sign of the kinetic terms of the timelike fields are negative and the spacelike fields are positive.

The gauged sigma model is given by

$$S_g = S[G] + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d^2z (A\bar{\mathcal{J}} + \bar{A}\mathcal{J} - MA\bar{A}) , \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where A, \bar{A} are the gauge fields, $S[G]$ is the WZW action given by

$$S[G] = \frac{n_5}{4\pi} \int d^2z \text{tr}(PG^{-1}\partial GG^{-1}\bar{\partial}G) + \frac{in_5}{24\pi} \int_{\mathcal{B}} \text{tr}(PG^{-1}dG \wedge G^{-1}dG \wedge G^{-1}dG) , \quad (\text{A.11})$$

and

$$M = 2 \left(n_5 \cosh 2\rho - n_5 l_2 r_2 \cos 2\theta - \sum_{i=2}^6 l_i r_i + l_7 r_7 - l_8 r_8 \right) . \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Integrating out the gauge fields in (A.10), one obtains

$$S_g = S[G] + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d^2z \frac{\mathcal{J}\bar{\mathcal{J}}}{M} . \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Substituting (A.8), (A.10), and (A.12) into (A.13) and using the parametrizations (A.9) one obtains the gauged WZW action. After fixing gauge $\tau = \sigma = 0$ and using standard worldsheet techniques one can read off the metric, B-field, and the dilaton as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{ds^2}{\alpha'} &= - \left(1 - \frac{2l^2}{\Delta^2} \right) dt^2 + n_5 d\rho^2 + \mathcal{G}_{ij} dX^i dX^j + \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{ij} dY^i dY^j + A_\psi d\psi + A_\phi d\phi + A_t dt , \\ \frac{B}{\alpha'} &= \frac{n_5 l \cos^2 \theta}{\Delta} (r_2 - l_2) dt \wedge d\psi + \frac{n_5 l \sin^2 \theta}{\Delta} (r_2 + l_2) dt \wedge d\phi \\ &\quad + dt \wedge B_t + d\phi \wedge B_\phi + d\psi \wedge B_\psi + \mathcal{B} d\phi \wedge d\psi + \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{ij} dY^i \wedge dY^j , \\ e^{2\Phi} &= \frac{e^{2\Phi_0}}{\Delta} , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

where $l_7 = r_7 = l$ which follows from the smoothness of the geometry, $\Delta = M/2$, the vectors X^i, Y^j are defined as

$$X^i = \{\psi, \theta, \phi\} , \quad Y^i = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, y\} , \quad (\text{A.15})$$

$\mathcal{G}, \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ are given by

$$\mathcal{G} = \begin{pmatrix} n_5 \cos^2 \theta \left(1 + \frac{2n_5 l_2 r_2 \cos^2 \theta}{\Delta} \right) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & n_5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & n_5 \sin^2 \theta \left(1 - \frac{2n_5 l_2 r_2 \sin^2 \theta}{\Delta} \right) \end{pmatrix} , \quad (\text{A.16})$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \frac{2l_3r_3}{\Delta} & \frac{l_4r_3+l_3r_4}{\Delta} & \frac{l_5r_3+l_3r_5}{\Delta} & \frac{l_6r_3+l_3r_6}{\Delta} & \frac{l_8r_3+l_3r_8}{\Delta} \\ \frac{l_4r_3+l_3r_4}{\Delta} & 1 + \frac{2l_4r_4}{\Delta} & \frac{l_5r_4+l_4r_5}{\Delta} & \frac{l_6r_4+l_4r_6}{\Delta} & \frac{l_8r_4+l_4r_8}{\Delta} \\ \frac{l_5r_3+l_3r_5}{\Delta} & \frac{l_5r_4+l_4r_5}{\Delta} & 1 + \frac{2l_5r_5}{\Delta} & \frac{l_6r_5+l_5r_6}{\Delta} & \frac{l_8r_5+l_5r_8}{\Delta} \\ \frac{l_6r_3+l_3r_6}{\Delta} & \frac{l_6r_4+l_4r_6}{\Delta} & \frac{l_6r_5+l_5r_6}{\Delta} & 1 + \frac{2l_6r_6}{\Delta} & \frac{l_8r_6+l_6r_8}{\Delta} \\ \frac{l_8r_3+l_3r_8}{\Delta} & \frac{l_8r_4+l_4r_8}{\Delta} & \frac{l_8r_5+l_5r_8}{\Delta} & \frac{l_8r_6+l_6r_8}{\Delta} & 1 + \frac{2l_8r_8}{\Delta} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.17})$$

$A_{\psi,\phi,t}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_\psi &= \frac{2n_5 \cos^2 \theta}{\Delta} \left[l(l_2 + r_2) dt + (l_3r_2 + l_2r_3) dx_1 + (l_4r_2 + l_2r_4) dx_2 + (l_5r_2 + l_2r_5) dx_3 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (l_6r_2 + l_2r_6) dx_4 + (l_8r_2 + l_2r_8) dy \right], \\ A_\phi &= \frac{2n_5 \sin^2 \theta}{\Delta} \left[l(r_2 - l_2) dt + (l_3r_2 - l_2r_3) dx_1 + (l_4r_2 - l_2r_4) dx_2 + (l_5r_2 - l_2r_5) dx_3 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (l_6r_2 - l_2r_6) dx_4 + (l_8r_2 - l_2r_8) dy \right], \\ A_t &= \frac{2l}{\Delta} \left[(r_3 + l_3) dx_1 + (r_4 + l_4) dx_2 + (r_5 + l_5) dx_3 + (r_6 + l_6) dx_4 + (r_8 + l_8) dy \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.18})$$

$\mathcal{B}, \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B} &= \frac{n_5 \cos^2 \theta}{\Delta} (\Delta - 2l_2r_2n_5 \sin^2 \theta), \quad (\text{A.19}) \\ \tilde{\mathcal{B}} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{l_3r_4-l_4r_3}{\Delta} & \frac{l_3r_5-l_5r_3}{\Delta} & \frac{l_3r_6-l_6r_3}{\Delta} & \frac{l_3r_8-l_8r_3}{\Delta} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{l_4r_5-l_5r_4}{\Delta} & \frac{l_4r_6-l_6r_4}{\Delta} & \frac{l_4r_8-l_8r_4}{\Delta} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{l_5r_6-l_6r_5}{\Delta} & \frac{l_5r_8-l_8r_5}{\Delta} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{l_6r_8-l_8r_6}{\Delta} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

and $B_{\psi,\phi,t}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} B_\psi &= \frac{n_5 \cos^2 \theta}{\Delta} \left[(l_2r_3 - l_3r_2) dx_1 + (l_2r_4 - l_4r_2) dx_2 + (l_2r_5 - l_5r_2) dx_3 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (l_2r_6 - l_6r_2) dx_4 + (l_2r_8 - l_8r_2) dx_5 \right], \\ B_\phi &= -\frac{n_5 \sin^2 \theta}{\Delta} \left[(l_3r_2 + l_2r_3) dx_1 + (l_4r_2 + l_2r_4) dx_2 + (l_5r_2 + l_2r_5) dx_3 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (l_6r_2 + l_2r_6) dx_4 + (l_8r_2 + l_2r_8) dx_5 \right], \\ B_t &= \frac{l}{\Delta} \left[(r_3 - l_3) dx_1 + (r_4 - l_4) dx_2 + (r_5 - l_5) dx_3 + (r_6 - l_6) dx_4 + (r_8 - l_8) dx_5 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.21})$$

B Spacetime supersymmetry

The supergravity background (4.30)–(4.32) obtained via the null coset is (2.1) is non-BPS. Below we sketch the worldsheet argument to prove this statement.

The numerator theory (i.e. the theory before gauging) is 10+2 dimensional. Such a theory has 12 spacetime fermions. Let $\psi_{sl}^{\pm,3}$ be the worldsheet fermions corresponding to $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$, $\psi_{x,t,y}$ be the worldsheet fermionic superpartners of x, t, y respectively, $\psi_{su}^{\pm,3}$ be the worldsheet fermions corresponding to $SU(2)$ and $\psi_{7,8,9}$ be the worldsheet fermionic superpartners of T^3 . Let's bosonize the fermions as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{sl}^+ \psi_{sl}^- &= i\sqrt{2}H_1, & \psi_{su}^+ \psi_{su}^- &= i\sqrt{2}H_2, & \psi_{sl}^3 \psi_{su}^3 &= i\sqrt{2}H_3, \\ \psi_t \psi_y &= i\sqrt{2}H_4, & \psi_x \psi_7 &= i\sqrt{2}H_5, & \psi_8 \psi_9 &= i\sqrt{2}H_6. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

The bosonized fields H_a are normalised such that

$$H_a(z)H_b(w) \sim -\delta_{ab} \log(z-w). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

The spin fields are given by

$$S_\varepsilon = e^{\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{a=1}^6 \varepsilon_a H_a}, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where $\varepsilon_a = \pm$ are the fermion polarizations. The worldsheet has the usual superconformal β, γ fields as well as the $\tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\gamma}$ fields due to null gauging. The fields $\beta, \gamma, \tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\gamma}$ are bosonized as

$$\begin{aligned} \beta\gamma &= -\partial\varphi, & \gamma &= e^\varphi \eta, & \beta &= e^{-\varphi} \partial\eta, \\ \tilde{\beta}\tilde{\gamma} &= -\partial\tilde{\varphi}, & \tilde{\gamma} &= e^{\tilde{\varphi}} \tilde{\eta}, & \tilde{\beta} &= e^{-\tilde{\varphi}} \partial\tilde{\eta}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

The spacetime supersymmetry operators in the $-1/2$ picture are given by

$$Q_\varepsilon = \oint dz e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\varphi-\tilde{\varphi})} S_\varepsilon. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Switching the worldsheet chiralities one can similarly define the anti-holomorphic spacetime supercharge \bar{Q}_ε . The background is BPS or non-BPS depending on whether Q_ε is annihilated by the BRST operator or not. The BRST operators are given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{brst} &= \oint \left(cT + \gamma G + \tilde{c}\mathcal{J} + \tilde{\gamma}\lambda + (bc, \tilde{b}\tilde{c} \text{ and } \beta\gamma, \tilde{\beta}\tilde{\gamma} \text{ terms}) \right), \\ \bar{Q}_{brst} &= \oint \left(\bar{c}\bar{T} + \bar{\gamma}\bar{G} + \bar{\tilde{c}}\bar{\mathcal{J}} + \bar{\tilde{\gamma}}\bar{\lambda} + (\bar{b}\bar{c}, \bar{\tilde{b}}\bar{\tilde{c}} \text{ and } \bar{\beta}\bar{\gamma}, \bar{\tilde{\beta}}\bar{\tilde{\gamma}} \text{ terms}) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where $\mathcal{J}, \bar{\mathcal{J}}$ are the worldsheet null currents that we want to gauge, given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} &= l_1 \mathcal{J}_3 + l_2 J_x + l_3 J_t + l_4 J_y, \\ \bar{\mathcal{J}} &= r_1 \bar{\mathcal{J}}_3 + r_2 \bar{J}_x + r_3 \bar{J}_t + r_4 \bar{J}_y, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_3 &= J_3 + \frac{2i}{k} \psi_{sl}^1 \psi_{sl}^2, \\ \bar{\mathcal{J}}_3 &= \bar{J}_3 + \frac{2i}{k} \bar{\psi}_{sl}^1 \bar{\psi}_{sl}^2.\end{aligned}\tag{B.8}$$

and $\lambda, \bar{\lambda}$ are the superpartners of the gauge currents $\mathcal{J}, \bar{\mathcal{J}}$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda &= l_1 \psi_{sl}^3 + l_2 \psi_x + l_3 \psi_t + l_4 \psi_4, \\ \bar{\lambda} &= r_1 \bar{\psi}_{sl}^3 + r_2 \bar{\psi}_x + r_3 \bar{\psi}_t + r_4 \bar{\psi}_4.\end{aligned}\tag{B.9}$$

Here c, \bar{c} are the usual worldsheet fields of the bc and $\bar{b}\bar{c}$ systems, and $\tilde{c}, \bar{\tilde{c}}$ are the Faddeev–Popov fields that one needs to introduce due to null gauging. The $\tilde{c}\mathcal{J}$ and $\bar{\tilde{c}}\bar{\mathcal{J}}$ terms in Q_{brst} and \bar{Q}_{brst} acting on Q_ε and \bar{Q}_ε gives $l_1\varepsilon_1$ and $r_1\bar{\varepsilon}_1$ respectively. Since we assumed $l_1 \neq 0, r_1 \neq 0$ to begin with, under no circumstances, the background can be BPS.

References

- [1] C. G. Callan and J. M. Maldacena, *D-brane approach to black hole quantum mechanics*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **472** (1996) 591 [[hep-th/9602043](#)].
- [2] S. R. Das and S. D. Mathur, *Comparing decay rates for black holes and D-branes*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **478** (1996) 561 [[hep-th/9606185](#)].
- [3] S. R. Das and S. D. Mathur, *Excitations of D strings, entropy and duality*, *Phys. Lett. B* **375** (1996) 103 [[hep-th/9601152](#)].
- [4] J. M. Maldacena and A. Strominger, *Black hole grey body factors and d-brane spectroscopy*, *Phys. Rev. D* **55** (1997) 861 [[hep-th/9609026](#)].
- [5] J. R. David, G. Mandal and S. R. Wadia, *D1 / D5 moduli in SCFT and gauge theory, and Hawking radiation*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **564** (2000) 103 [[hep-th/9907075](#)].
- [6] J. M. Maldacena, G. W. Moore and A. Strominger, *Counting BPS black holes in toroidal Type II string theory*, [hep-th/9903163](#).
- [7] A. Strominger and C. Vafa, *Microscopic origin of the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy*, *Phys. Lett. B* **379** (1996) 99 [[hep-th/9601029](#)].
- [8] O. Lunin and S. D. Mathur, *Metric of the multiply wound rotating string*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **610** (2001) 49 [[hep-th/0105136](#)].
- [9] O. Lunin and S. D. Mathur, *AdS / CFT duality and the black hole information paradox*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **623** (2002) 342 [[hep-th/0109154](#)].
- [10] S. D. Mathur, *The Fuzzball proposal for black holes: An Elementary review*, *Fortsch. Phys.* **53** (2005) 793 [[hep-th/0502050](#)].
- [11] I. Bena, E. J. Martinec, S. D. Mathur and N. P. Warner, *Snowmass White Paper: Micro- and Macro-Structure of Black Holes*, [2203.04981](#).
- [12] I. Bena, E. J. Martinec, S. D. Mathur and N. P. Warner, *Fuzzballs and Microstate Geometries: Black-Hole Structure in String Theory*, [2204.13113](#).
- [13] J. M. Maldacena and L. Maoz, *Desingularization by rotation*, *JHEP* **12** (2002) 055 [[hep-th/0012025](#)].
- [14] S. Giusto, O. Lunin, S. D. Mathur and D. Turton, *D1-D5-P microstates at the cap*, *JHEP* **02** (2013) 050 [[1211.0306](#)].
- [15] S. D. Mathur and D. Turton, *Momentum-carrying waves on D1-D5 microstate geometries*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **862** (2012) 764 [[1202.6421](#)].
- [16] I. Bena, S. Giusto, R. Russo, M. Shigemori and N. P. Warner, *Habemus Superstratum! A constructive proof of the existence of superstrata*, *JHEP* **05** (2015) 110 [[1503.01463](#)].

- [17] I. Bena, S. Giusto, E. J. Martinec, R. Russo, M. Shigemori, D. Turton et al., *Smooth horizonless geometries deep inside the black-hole regime*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117** (2016) 201601 [[1607.03908](#)].
- [18] I. Bena, S. Giusto, E. J. Martinec, R. Russo, M. Shigemori, D. Turton et al., *Asymptotically-flat supergravity solutions deep inside the black-hole regime*, *JHEP* **02** (2018) 014 [[1711.10474](#)].
- [19] N. Čeplak, R. Russo and M. Shigemori, *Supercharging Superstrata*, *JHEP* **03** (2019) 095 [[1812.08761](#)].
- [20] P. Heidmann and N. P. Warner, *Superstratum Symbiosis*, *JHEP* **09** (2019) 059 [[1903.07631](#)].
- [21] N. P. Warner, *Lectures on Microstate Geometries*, [1912.13108](#).
- [22] W. Govaerts and R. Walker, *Asymptotically flat (1,m,n) superstrata: a farewell to AdS*, [2301.10329](#).
- [23] D. R. Mayerson, R. A. Walker and N. P. Warner, *Microstate Geometries from Gauged Supergravity in Three Dimensions*, *JHEP* **10** (2020) 030 [[2004.13031](#)].
- [24] B. Ganchev, A. Houppe and N. P. Warner, *New superstrata from three-dimensional supergravity*, *JHEP* **04** (2022) 065 [[2110.02961](#)].
- [25] B. Ganchev, A. Houppe and N. P. Warner, *Elliptical and purely NS superstrata*, *JHEP* **09** (2022) 067 [[2207.04060](#)].
- [26] N. Čeplak, *Vector Superstrata*, [2212.06947](#).
- [27] M. Shigemori, *Counting Superstrata*, *JHEP* **10** (2019) 017 [[1907.03878](#)].
- [28] D. R. Mayerson and M. Shigemori, *Counting D1-D5-P microstates in supergravity*, *SciPost Phys.* **10** (2021) 018 [[2010.04172](#)].
- [29] I. Bena, N. Čeplak, S. Hampton, Y. Li, D. Toulukas and N. P. Warner, *Resolving black-hole microstructure with new momentum carriers*, *JHEP* **10** (2022) 033 [[2202.08844](#)].
- [30] I. Bena, S. D. Hampton, A. Houppe, Y. Li and D. Toulukas, *The (amazing) super-maze*, *JHEP* **03** (2023) 237 [[2211.14326](#)].
- [31] I. Bena, N. Čeplak, S. D. Hampton, A. Houppe, D. Toulukas and N. P. Warner, *Themelia: the irreducible microstructure of black holes*, [2212.06158](#).
- [32] Y. Li, *Local supersymmetries and three-charge black holes*, in *CORFU2022: 22th Hellenic School and Workshops on Elementary Particle Physics and Gravity*, 5, 2023, [2305.03747](#).
- [33] I. Kanitscheider, K. Skenderis and M. Taylor, *Holographic anatomy of fuzzballs*, *JHEP* **04** (2007) 023 [[hep-th/0611171](#)].

- [34] I. Kanitscheider, K. Skenderis and M. Taylor, *Fuzzballs with internal excitations*, *JHEP* **06** (2007) 056 [[0704.0690](#)].
- [35] S. Giusto, E. Moscato and R. Russo, *AdS₃ holography for 1/4 and 1/8 BPS geometries*, *JHEP* **11** (2015) 004 [[1507.00945](#)].
- [36] S. Giusto, S. Rawash and D. Turton, *AdS₃ holography at dimension two*, *JHEP* **07** (2019) 171 [[1904.12880](#)].
- [37] B. Ganchev, S. Giusto, A. Houppe and R. Russo, *AdS₃ holography for non-BPS geometries*, [2112.03287](#).
- [38] E. J. Martinec, S. Massai and D. Turton, *On the BPS Sector in AdS₃/CFT₂ Holography*, *Fortsch. Phys.* **71** (2023) 2300015 [[2211.12476](#)].
- [39] V. Jejjala, O. Madden, S. F. Ross and G. Titchener, *Non-supersymmetric smooth geometries and D1-D5-P bound states*, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005) 124030 [[hep-th/0504181](#)].
- [40] B. Ganchev, A. Houppe and N. P. Warner, *Q-balls meet fuzzballs: non-BPS microstate geometries*, *JHEP* **11** (2021) 028 [[2107.09677](#)].
- [41] A. Bombini and S. Giusto, *Non-extremal superdescendants of the D1D5 CFT*, *JHEP* **10** (2017) 023 [[1706.09761](#)].
- [42] I. Bena, G. Bossard, S. Katmadas and D. Turton, *Non-BPS multi-bubble microstate geometries*, *JHEP* **02** (2016) 073 [[1511.03669](#)].
- [43] I. Bah and P. Heidmann, *Smooth bubbling geometries without supersymmetry*, *JHEP* **09** (2021) 128 [[2106.05118](#)].
- [44] I. Bah, P. Heidmann and P. Weck, *Schwarzschild-like topological solitons*, *JHEP* **08** (2022) 269 [[2203.12625](#)].
- [45] I. Bah and P. Heidmann, *Non-BPS bubbling geometries in AdS₃*, *JHEP* **02** (2023) 133 [[2210.06483](#)].
- [46] I. Bah and P. Heidmann, *Geometric Resolution of Schwarzschild Horizon*, [2303.10186](#).
- [47] E. J. Martinec and S. Massai, *String Theory of Supertubes*, *JHEP* **07** (2018) 163 [[1705.10844](#)].
- [48] D. Mateos and P. K. Townsend, *Supertubes*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** (2001) 011602 [[hep-th/0103030](#)].
- [49] R. Emparan, D. Mateos and P. K. Townsend, *Supergravity supertubes*, *JHEP* **07** (2001) 011 [[hep-th/0106012](#)].
- [50] E. J. Martinec, S. Massai and D. Turton, *String dynamics in NS5-F1-P geometries*, *JHEP* **09** (2018) 031 [[1803.08505](#)].

- [51] E. J. Martinec, S. Massai and D. Turton, *Little Strings, Long Strings, and Fuzzballs*, *JHEP* **11** (2019) 019 [[1906.11473](#)].
- [52] E. J. Martinec, S. Massai and D. Turton, *Stringy Structure at the BPS Bound*, *JHEP* **12** (2020) 135 [[2005.12344](#)].
- [53] D. Bufalini, S. Iguri, N. Kovensky and D. Turton, *Black hole microstates from the worldsheet*, *JHEP* **08** (2021) 011 [[2105.02255](#)].
- [54] D. Bufalini, S. Iguri, N. Kovensky and D. Turton, *Worldsheet computation of heavy-light correlators*, *JHEP* **03** (2023) 066 [[2210.15313](#)].
- [55] E. Witten, *On string theory and black holes*, *Phys. Rev. D* **44** (1991) 314.
- [56] R. Dijkgraaf, H. L. Verlinde and E. P. Verlinde, *String propagation in a black hole geometry*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **371** (1992) 269.
- [57] A. Giveon, E. Rabinovici and A. Sever, *Beyond the singularity of the 2-D charged black hole*, *JHEP* **07** (2003) 055 [[hep-th/0305140](#)].
- [58] S. Chakraborty, $\frac{\text{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})\times\text{U}(1)}{\text{U}(1)}$ *CFT, NS5+F1 system and single trace $T\bar{T}$* , *JHEP* **03** (2021) 113 [[2012.03995](#)].
- [59] M. Asrat, A. Giveon, N. Itzhaki and D. Kutasov, *Holography Beyond AdS*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **932** (2018) 241 [[1711.02690](#)].
- [60] S. Chakraborty and M. Goykhman, *Solvable time-like cosets and holography beyond AdS*, *JHEP* **08** (2022) 244 [[2204.03024](#)].
- [61] C. R. Nappi and E. Witten, *A Closed, expanding universe in string theory*, *Phys. Lett. B* **293** (1992) 309 [[hep-th/9206078](#)].
- [62] S. Elitzur, A. Giveon and E. Rabinovici, *Removing singularities*, *JHEP* **01** (2003) 017 [[hep-th/0212242](#)].
- [63] S. Elitzur, A. Giveon, D. Kutasov and E. Rabinovici, *From big bang to big crunch and beyond*, *JHEP* **06** (2002) 017 [[hep-th/0204189](#)].
- [64] M. Goykhman and A. Parnachev, *Stringy holography at finite density*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **874** (2013) 115 [[1304.4496](#)].
- [65] F. Larsen and E. J. Martinec, *U(1) charges and moduli in the D1 - D5 system*, *JHEP* **06** (1999) 019 [[hep-th/9905064](#)].
- [66] T. Quella and V. Schomerus, *Asymmetric cosets*, *JHEP* **02** (2003) 030 [[hep-th/0212119](#)].
- [67] R. Argurio, A. Giveon and A. Shomer, *Superstrings on AdS(3) and symmetric products*, *JHEP* **12** (2000) 003 [[hep-th/0009242](#)].
- [68] O. Lunin and S. D. Mathur, *The Slowly rotating near extremal D1 - D5 system as a 'hot tube'*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **615** (2001) 285 [[hep-th/0107113](#)].

- [69] G. Barnich and F. Brandt, *Covariant theory of asymptotic symmetries, conservation laws and central charges*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **633** (2002) 3 [[hep-th/0111246](#)].
- [70] G. Compère and A. Fiorucci, *Advanced Lectures on General Relativity*, [1801.07064](#).
- [71] D. Kutasov, *Introduction to little string theory*, *ICTP Lect. Notes Ser.* **7** (2002) 165.
- [72] A. Giveon and D. Kutasov, *The Charged black hole/string transition*, *JHEP* **01** (2006) 120 [[hep-th/0510211](#)].
- [73] S. Giusto, L. Martucci, M. Petrini and R. Russo, *6D microstate geometries from 10D structures*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **876** (2013) 509 [[1306.1745](#)].
- [74] A. Giveon, N. Itzhaki and D. Kutasov, *$T\bar{T}$ and LST*, *JHEP* **07** (2017) 122 [[1701.05576](#)].
- [75] S. Chakraborty, A. Giveon and D. Kutasov, *$T\bar{T}$, black holes and negative strings*, *JHEP* **09** (2020) 057 [[2006.13249](#)].
- [76] S. Chakraborty, A. Giveon and D. Kutasov, *Comments on Single-Trace $T\bar{T}$ Holography*, [2303.12422](#).
- [77] S. Chakraborty, A. Giveon and D. Kutasov, *Momentum in Single-trace $T\bar{T}$ Holography*, [2304.09212](#).
- [78] S. Giusto and R. Russo, *Entanglement Entropy and D1-D5 geometries*, *Phys. Rev. D* **90** (2014) 066004 [[1405.6185](#)].
- [79] S. Chakraborty, A. Giveon, N. Itzhaki and D. Kutasov, *Entanglement beyond AdS*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **935** (2018) 290 [[1805.06286](#)].
- [80] S. Chakraborty and A. Hashimoto, *Entanglement entropy for $T\bar{T}$, $J\bar{T}$, $T\bar{J}$ deformed holographic CFT*, *JHEP* **02** (2021) 096 [[2010.15759](#)].
- [81] W. Cui, H. Shu, W. Song and J. Wang, *Correlation Functions in the $TsT/T\bar{T}$ Correspondence*, [2304.04684](#).
- [82] S. Chakraborty, *Wilson loop in a $T\bar{T}$ like deformed CFT_2* , *Nucl. Phys. B* **938** (2019) 605 [[1809.01915](#)].