

Doubled Spacetime, Homotopy Algebras, and Puzzles of String Fields on Tori

Alex S. Arvanitakis
Vrije Universiteit Brussel

SFT at cloud

September 24, 2021

Based on

- ▶ [Homotopy Transfer and Effective Field Theory II: Strings and Double Field Theory](#), ASA, Chris Hull, Olaf Hohm, Victor Lekeu, [2106.08343]
- ▶ [Homotopy Transfer and Effective Field Theory I: Tree-level](#), — *idem* —, [2007.07942]

Consider the low-energy effective theory of closed bosonic strings on Minkowski:

$$S[g, B, \phi] = \int \sqrt{-g} e^{-2\phi} (R_{\text{icci}} + (\partial\phi)^2 - (\partial B)^2).$$

This tells us string theory is a theory of gravity (coupled to $\phi, B \dots$).

Can we find *fundamentally stringy* features of this quantum gravity theory?

For this talk: ‘effective’ theory of strings on $\mathbb{R}^n \times T^d$: *double field theory (DFT)* [Hull Zwiebach 2009], known to **cubic order**.

It exhibits a **doubled spacetime**, courtesy of the torus factor T^d :

$$\text{field } \Psi = \Psi(y, x, \tilde{x}) \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad x \in T^d, \quad \tilde{x} \in \tilde{T}^d \text{ (“dual” torus)}.$$

Question:

Does doubled spacetime survive beyond cubic order?

We employ **homotopy algebra** (L_∞ -algebras to be precise) to provide an algorithm for the quartic and higher DFT vertices:

[arXiv:2106.08343]

Closed bosonic string field theory $\xrightarrow{\text{homotopy transfer}}$ Double field theory

Manifestly doubled from beginning to end; consistent with gauge invariance.
(Contrast here *strongly-constrained DFT* [Hohm Hull Zwiebach 2010] — known to all orders; $O(d, d)$ -covariant; but not *doubled*.)

Implementation of [Sen 2016] proposal for general, (non-)Wilsonian effective actions from SFT. [See also: Masuda Matsunaga 2020; Erbin Maccaferri Schnabl Vošmera 2020 both (largely) for A_∞ /open strings]

Outstanding technical issues involving tachyons and signature (Euclidean is best. . .).

Closed strings. . .

- ▶ on \mathbb{R}^d : Oscillators $\alpha_n, \bar{\alpha}_n$; **one** zero-mode $\alpha_0 = \bar{\alpha}_0 = p$ (centre-of-mass momentum)
- ▶ on T^d : Oscillators $\alpha_n, \bar{\alpha}_n$; **two** zero-modes

$$\begin{aligned} p &= \bar{\alpha}_0 + \alpha_0 && \text{momentum,} \\ w &= \bar{\alpha}_0 - \alpha_0 && \text{winding.} \end{aligned}$$

String states, e.g. the level $N = \bar{N} = 1$ state (a g , B , or ϕ perturbation)

$$\Psi(x, \tilde{x}) = \int dpdw e^{i(px+w\tilde{x})} \Psi_{ij}(p, w) \alpha_{-1}^i \bar{\alpha}_{-1}^j |p, w\rangle,$$

see the double torus T^{2d} because we simultaneously have momenta *and* windings.

T-duality swaps $p \leftrightarrow w$. So we must take dual positions \tilde{x} as seriously as positions x !

[Hull Zwiebach 2009]: truncation of **bosonic closed SFT** to levels $N = \bar{N} = 1$ (graviton, dilaton, B -field) is consistent to **cubic** order — **double field theory** (DFT).

Who ordered that? Wilson didn't...

... because (for a spacetime $\mathbb{R}^n \times T^1$, where T^1 of radius R)

$$\text{mass}^2 = (p/R)^2 + (wR/\alpha')^2.$$

Lagrangian resembles Fierz-Pauli (+ cubic) for $\Psi = (e_{ij}, d)$ — perturbations of a *generalised metric* and *dilaton*. (e_{ij} non-symmetric.)

String field gauge symmetry gives **double diffeos** (gauge params $\lambda_i, \bar{\lambda}_i$). Action is **local** in doubled space; Fields *and* gauge params **obey level-matching** (“weak section”)

$$S_{\text{DFT}} = \int dx d\tilde{x} \left[e_{ij}(\partial^2 + \tilde{\partial}^2)e^{ij} + (\partial^i e_{ij})^2 + \dots \right], \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^i \partial \tilde{x}_i}(\text{any}) = 0.$$

(This is also $O(d, d)$ -covariant with respect to $\eta(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{P}) = 2p_i w^i$ for $\mathbb{P} = (p, w)$.)

Brute-force construction to e.g. quartic order?

Combinatorial explosion!

- ▶ Projectors $[\dots]$ to $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{x}} = 0!$

$$[(\partial\Psi)^2]\Psi^2, [\partial\Psi]\Psi^2\partial\Psi, [\partial\Psi\Psi]\partial\Psi\Psi, \dots$$

Only relevant at $\mathcal{O}(\Psi^4)$ due to momentum conservation.

- ▶ “Cocycle signs”! factors that appear already in torus string field theory of the form

$$\exp(i\pi p w'),$$

(relative to \mathbb{R}^d SFT) relevant for gauge invariance at $\mathcal{O}(\Psi^4)$ [HIKKO 87]

Homotopy transfer does not suffer from these difficulties.

(It suffers *differently*.)

Definition (L_∞ -algebra aka *homotopy* Lie algebra)

Vector spaces X_n in chain complex $\cdots \xrightarrow{\partial} X_1 \xrightarrow{\partial} X_0 \xrightarrow{\partial} X_{-1} \xrightarrow{\partial} \cdots$, $\partial^2 = 0$,

Jacobi identities $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} [[x, y], z] + [[y, z], x] + [[z, x], y] = \partial[x, y, z], \\ [[x_1, x_2 \dots x_k], x_{k+1}, \dots x_\ell] + \text{perms} = 0, \dots \end{array} \right.$

1 bracket $b_n : X^n \rightarrow X$ of n arguments for each $n = 1, 2, \dots \infty$.

Lie algebra with Jacobi “up to homotopy” — **i.e. up to ∂ -exact.**

L_∞ -algebra \leftrightarrow **field theory dictionary:** [Hohm Zwiebach 17] [Also Hohm's talk on Thursday]

$\cdots \xrightarrow{\partial}$ gauge params $\xrightarrow{\partial}$ fields $\xrightarrow{\partial}$ Eq. of Motion $\xrightarrow{\partial} \cdots$

$\partial :$ linearised EoM & gauge transformations,

$b_{n \geq 2} :$ **interaction** $(n + 1)$ -**vertex**,

$\kappa(-, -) :$ inner product/antibracket (if present).

Example (Covariant bosonic tree-level closed-string field theory [Zwiebach 92])

$$\Psi \in X \iff \Psi \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{ock}}, \text{ and } (L_0 - \bar{L}_0)\Psi = (b_0 - \bar{b}_0)\Psi = 0.$$

$\partial :$	worldsheet Q_{BRST} ,
$b_{n \geq 2} :$	Sirs Not-Appearing-In-This-Seminar,
$\kappa(-, -) :$	Essentially BPZ.

For any* “matter” CFT with $c = +26$, $\exists b_n$ so $(X; \kappa; \partial, b_1, b_2 \dots)$ is L_∞ -algebra.

Unfortunately b_3 and above are nonzero: we need an L_∞ -algebra [Sonoda Zwiebach 89].

However: equivalent lightcone type theories for some backgrounds (e.g. [HIKKO 87]) **can** be cubic. Cubic theories \leftrightarrow (differential graded) Lie algebras.

We need an *equivalence* of L_∞ -algebras that connects e.g. covariant to lightcone SFT. Fortunately this is known: *homotopy equivalence*. [Stasheff 92, Kontsevich 95]

This is a tower of linear maps $\phi_n : X^n \rightarrow Y$ of which ϕ_1 preserves ∂ -cohomologies:

$$\phi_1(H(X)) = H(Y) \quad (\star)$$

plus conditions involving brackets (∂^X, b_n^X) on X , (∂^Y, b_n^Y) on Y .

Homotopy transfer

Say you have an L_∞ -algebra on X , some chain complex Y , and a ϕ_1 with (\star) . Give Y brackets $b_2^Y, b_3^Y \dots$, to turn it into an L_∞ -algebra (equivalent to X).

This is an algorithm. If Y is a subspace PX , the input includes a **homotopy map**

$$h : X \rightarrow X, \quad \text{with} \quad P = 1 + \partial h + h \partial.$$

The conditions for homotopy transfer *only* involve ∂, h, P — the *free theory*!

One can view [Sen 2016] as an ansatz for h :

$$h = G(1 - P),$$

depending on the physical data of a *propagator* G and projector P to effective d.o.f.'s.

For string field theory $\partial = Q_{\text{BRST}}$: ∂ -cohomology is worldsheet BRST cohomology.

The 2×10^6 -dollar question: take P projector on DFT states $N = \bar{N} = 1$.

Can we find an h ?

... No.

However: *can* take

$$P = P_{N=\bar{N}=1} + \underbrace{P_{N=\bar{N}=0}}_{\text{tachyon}} \quad (\text{generic torus moduli, Euclidean signature}).$$

Homotopy transfer *construction* of vertices & gauge transfs of “{DFT + tachyon}”.

Agrees with cubic result of [Hull Zwiebach 09] *modulo* elimination of auxiliaries.

Given

- ▶ *cyclic* (with inner product κ) L_∞ -algebra of closed bosonic SFT
- ▶ (Siegel gauge) propagator G
- ▶ projector P & homotopy $h = G(1 - P)$ satisfying $P = 1 + Q_{\text{BRST}}h + hQ_{\text{BRST}}$

we obtain another *cyclic* L_∞ -algebra \leftrightarrow theory of “effective” *im* P modes given by BV master action.

Do we have a starting cyclic L_∞ -algebra given by CSFT?

Subtlety involving κ /BPZ inner product for torus CSFT, actually.

A torus CFT paradox...?

Old news: tachyon vertex ops $\mathcal{V}_{k,\bar{k}}(z,\bar{z}) =: \exp(ik\hat{X}(z) + i\bar{k}\hat{X}(\bar{z}))$: **aren't bosons**

$$\mathcal{V}_{k,\bar{k}}(z,\bar{z})\mathcal{V}_{\ell,\bar{\ell}}(w,\bar{w}) = (-1)^{(\bar{k}\bar{\ell}-k\ell)}\mathcal{V}_{\ell,\bar{\ell}}(w,\bar{w})\mathcal{V}_{k,\bar{k}}(z,\bar{z}), \quad |w| = |z| \pm \varepsilon.$$

Fix by introducing “cocycle operator” $C_{k,\bar{k}}$ depending on momenta/windings (via k, \bar{k})

$$\mathcal{V}_{k,\bar{k}} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_{k,\bar{k}} \underbrace{\exp(i\pi/2(k-\bar{k})(\hat{\alpha}_0 + \hat{\bar{\alpha}}_0))}_{C_{k,\bar{k}}} = \mathcal{V}_{k,\bar{k}}^{\text{correct}}.$$

(Can be absorbed into position zero modes x, \bar{x} to make them non-commutative.) [[Sakamoto 89](#); [Erler et al 92](#); ... [Freidel Leigh Minic 17](#), [Zwiebach 17\(?\) unpublished](#)]

$\mathcal{V}_{k,\bar{k}}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{k,\bar{k}}^{\text{correct}}$ create the same ket (state-operator map)...

$$C_{k,\bar{k}}|\mathbf{1}\rangle = |\mathbf{1}\rangle, \quad \text{so} \quad \mathcal{V}_{k,\bar{k}}^{\text{correct}}(0)|\mathbf{1}\rangle = \mathcal{V}_{k,\bar{k}}(0)|\mathbf{1}\rangle$$

A torus CFT paradox...?

... but they create *different* bras:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathbf{1} | \mathcal{V}_{k, \bar{k}}^{\text{correct}}(\infty) &= \langle \mathbf{1} | \mathcal{V}_{k, \bar{k}}(\infty) C_{k, \bar{k}} = (\text{sign}) \langle \mathbf{1} | C_{k, \bar{k}} \mathcal{V}_{k, \bar{k}}(\infty), \\ &= (\text{sign}) \langle \mathbf{1} | \mathcal{V}_{k, \bar{k}}(\infty).\end{aligned}$$

This (cocycle) **sign** is -1 for states with

$$pw = 1 \pmod{2}$$

It enters $\kappa(x, y) = R(x, (c_0 - \bar{c}_0)y)$, through the **reflector** R :

$$R(x, y) = \lim_{z \rightarrow 0, w \rightarrow 0} \langle \mathbf{1} | (I \circ \mathcal{V}_x)(z) \mathcal{V}_y(w) | \mathbf{1} \rangle \quad I(z) = -z^{-1},$$

with associated **transpose** T (BPZ conjugation)

$$R(\mathcal{O}_x, y) = (-1)^{x \cdot \mathcal{O}} R(x, \mathcal{O}^T y).$$

Inversion $I(z) = -z^{-1}$ realised (?) on operators by transpose:

$$I \circ \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}^T.$$

Oscillator $\alpha_n, \bar{\alpha}_n$ transpose known because $i\partial X(z)$ is a conformal primary ($\alpha_n^T \propto \alpha_{-n}$).

Position zero mode x, \bar{x} transpose not fixed. Demand $I \circ \mathcal{V}_{k, \bar{k}}^{\text{correct}} = (\mathcal{V}_{k, \bar{k}}^{\text{correct}})^T$ to find

$$(\exp(ik\hat{x}) \exp(i\bar{k}\hat{\bar{x}}))^T = C_{k, \bar{k}} \exp(ik\hat{x}) \exp(i\bar{k}\hat{\bar{x}}) C_{k, \bar{k}}(\dots)$$

$\mathcal{V}_{k, \bar{k}}$ & $\mathcal{V}_{k, \bar{k}}^{\text{correct}}$ are not simultaneously primary under global conformal transformations. Neither are $\mathcal{V}_{k, \bar{k}}^{\text{correct}}, \mathcal{V}_{k, \bar{k}}^{\text{correct}'}$ for different choices of cocycle operator.

- ▶ Choice of $C_{k, \bar{k}}$ fixes conformal primary tachyon operator & a compatible R
- ▶ Bose commutations select $\mathcal{V}_{k, \bar{k}}^{\text{correct}}$ over $\mathcal{V}_{k, \bar{k}}$ (also advocated by [\[Hellerman Walcher 06\]](#) for T-duality reasons.)
- ▶ With above $\mathcal{V}_{k, \bar{k}}^{\text{correct}}$, R agrees with [\[HIKKO 87; Kugo Zwiebach 92\]](#)

Remarks & open questions

Manifestly doubled & gauge-invariant “{DFT + tachyon}” from bosonic closed Euclidean SFT, as an application of very general homotopy-algebraic technology.

- ▶ Tachyon? At least two resolutions:
 1. **Consistent L_∞ -truncation** to remove the tachyon. Possible if \exists injective L_∞ -morphism. This is *a fortiori* a consistent truncation à la SUGRA [see our paper II].
 2. **Superstring field theory.** Recent development! (Type II: [Kunitomo Sugimoto 2019])
- ▶ Locality?
 - ▶ Need (?) to allow ‘cocycle’ signs $\exp(i\pi p w')$ — related **ambiguity** in torus SFT.
 - ▶ We resolved it for the free theory via $\mathcal{V}_{k, \bar{k}}^{\text{correct}}$ with its *associated* reflector $R \implies$ **cocycle sign prescription for higher brackets/vertices?**
- ▶ Background independence?
 - ▶ The *strongly-constrained DFT* of [Hohm Hull Zwiebach 2010] is non-polynomial and background-independent. . .
. . . does this remain true when we go double?

Thank you!