

T-duality and Riemann⁴

Linus Wulff

Masaryk University

Based on:

[2406.15240](#) and work with Steven Hsia and Ahmed Kamal

Workshop on Noncommutative and Generalized Geometry,
Corfu , Sep 17 – 24, 2024

Motivation

The low-energy effective action for the **massless fields** of the closed string is an expansion

$$S_{\text{eff}} = \sum_{k,l=0}^{\infty} \alpha'^k g_s^{2(l-1)} S^{(k,l)}$$

in

- ▶ α' – inverse string tension
- ▶ g_s – string coupling

Usually we work only with $S^{(0,0)}$, but in some situations the **higher corrections** become important, e.g. in the study of black holes

Here we will ignore the g_s corrections, i.e. restrict to the **tree-level** string effective action

$$S_{tree} = \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-g} e^{-2\Phi} (L_0 + \alpha' L_1 + \alpha'^2 L_2 + \dots)$$

We further confine ourselves to the **NSNS sector** fields: g , B and Φ

At **lowest order** we have ($H = dB$)

$$L_0 = R + 4(\nabla\Phi)^2 - \frac{1}{12}H^2$$

We are interested in the **higher derivative corrections** L_1 , L_2 , L_3 , ...

They can be found from tree-level **string scattering amplitudes**

This involves two steps: (1) compute the relevant **amplitudes** and (2) make an **ansatz** for the effective action and **match the amplitudes**

The first correction in the type II case is

[Gross, Witten '86]

$$L_3 = \zeta(3)\text{Riem}^4 + \dots$$

It is actually present also for the heterotic and bosonic string.

To find the full result for L_3 would require computing amplitudes up to **8 points** and matching to an ansatz for the effective action with **$\mathcal{O}(1000)$ terms!**

However, the form of the correction is highly constrained by:

- (1) Supersymmetry
- (2) **Duality symmetries**

In fact, in a series of papers [M. Garousi \('18-'20\)](#) has shown that T-duality **completely fixes** L_3 in the NSNS sector (up to the overall coefficient)!

He started from an ansatz in 10 dimensions, reduced on S^1 and required the result to be **invariant under T-duality**.

The starting ansatz for L_3 has $\mathcal{O}(1000)$ terms and the answer **hundreds of terms**.

Unfortunately, it is very hard to recognize any **structure** in the result.

I will describe a **simplified approach**, which also makes it is easier to recognize what structures should appear in the answer.

Outline

1. $O(d, d)$ symmetry
2. Necessary condition for $O(d, d)$
3. The α'^3 correction
4. Why T-duality/ $O(d, d)$ cannot be made manifest

$O(d, d)$ symmetry

When the closed string effective action is reduced from 10 to $10 - d$ dimensions, i.e. taking all fields **independent of d coordinates $y^{m'}$** ($m' = 1, \dots, d$), an **$O(d, d)$ symmetry** appears

[Meissner, Veneziano '91]

The non-trivial part of this symmetry is

$$O(d) \times O(d) \subset O(d, d)$$

It arises because the left/right-moving modes of $y^{m'}$ become effectively **independent** and each can be rotated by an $O(d)$. This symmetry persists to **all orders in α'** (though it is not an exact symmetry).

[Sen '91]

This can be used to **constrain** the form of the (tree-level) **α' corrections** to the action.

We first need the action of $O(d, d)$ on the (NSNS) fields.

In the **dimensional reduction** we get

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{g}_{mn} &\rightarrow g_{mn}, & \underline{g}_{m'n} &= A_{m'n}^{(1)}, & \underline{g}_{m'n'} \\ \underline{B}_{mn} &\rightarrow B_{mn}, & \underline{B}_{m'n} &= A_{m'n}^{(2)}, & \underline{B}_{m'n'} \\ \underline{\Phi} &\rightarrow \Phi\end{aligned}$$

Besides g , B and Φ of the reduced theory we get **$2d$ vectors** and **d^2 scalars**, which we group into

$$\mathcal{A}_M = \begin{pmatrix} A^{(1)m'} \\ A_{m'}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathcal{H}^{MN} = \begin{pmatrix} (g - Bg^{-1}B)_{m'n'} & (Bg^{-1})_{m'n'} \\ -(g^{-1}B)^{m'n'} & g^{m'n'} \end{pmatrix}$$

transforming as a **vector** and a **symmetric 2-index tensor** (a.k.a. generalized metric) under $O(d, d)$

$O(d, d)$ invariants

We will consider only the terms in the reduced action **quadratic** in the **KK vectors**.

There are **three** possible combinations

$$A_m^{(1)} \cdot A_n^{(1)}, \quad A_m^{(2)} \cdot A_n^{(2)} \quad \text{and} \quad A_m^{(1)} \cdot A_n^{(2)}$$

However, there are only **two** $O(d, d)$ invariants

$$\mathcal{A}_{mM} \eta^{MN} \mathcal{A}_{nN} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_{mM} \mathcal{H}^{MN} \mathcal{A}_{nN}$$

where

$$\eta^{MN} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \delta_{m'}^{n'} \\ \delta_{n'}^{m'} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

is the $O(d, d)$ invariant metric

A necessary condition

Defining

$$A = -\frac{1}{2}(A^{(1)} + A^{(2)}), \quad \hat{A} = \frac{1}{2}(A^{(1)} - A^{(2)})$$

the invariants are

$$A_m \cdot A_n \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{A}_m \cdot \hat{A}_n,$$

while

$$A_m \cdot \hat{A}_n$$

explicitly violates $O(d, d)$

A **necessary condition** for $O(d, d)$ symmetry is therefore that all terms in the reduced action involving $A_m \cdot \hat{A}_n$ **cancel out**

This condition is **very strong** (it fixes everything except terms involving only derivatives of the dilaton)

Order α'^3

To fifth order in fields one finds \mathcal{R}^4 , $H^2\mathcal{R}^3$ and $H^4\mathcal{R}$ terms:

$$\begin{aligned}
 L_3 = & \frac{1}{4!} t_8 t_8 \mathcal{R}^4 + \frac{1}{4(4!)} (\varepsilon_8 \varepsilon_8)' \mathcal{R}^4 - \frac{1}{2(3!)} t_8 t_8 H^2 \mathcal{R}^3 + \frac{1}{2(3!)^3} (\varepsilon_9 \varepsilon_9)' H^2 \mathcal{R}^3 \\
 & - \frac{1}{2(3!)^2} H^2 (\varepsilon_6 \varepsilon_6)' \mathcal{R}^3 + \frac{1}{2(3!)^3} (\varepsilon_9 \varepsilon_9)' [H^2] \mathcal{R}^3 + 2\varepsilon_4 H^2 \varepsilon_4 \mathcal{R}^2 \mathcal{R} \\
 & + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{t}_8 \tilde{t}_8 H^2 (\nabla H)^2 \mathcal{R} - \frac{1}{2(3!)^2} (\varepsilon_9 \varepsilon_9)' [H^2] (\nabla H)^2 \mathcal{R} - 4\varepsilon_4 H^2 \varepsilon_4 (\nabla H)^2 \mathcal{R} \\
 & - 4! (\nabla H)^{abef} (\nabla H)^{cd}_{ef} H_{k[ab} \nabla^2 H^k_{cd]} + 4! \nabla^e H^{fab} \nabla_e H_f{}^{cd} H_{k[ab} \nabla^2 H^k_{cd]} \\
 & - 2(4!) H^2_{[abcd]} (\nabla H)^{abef} (\nabla H)_{ghef} \mathcal{R}_S^{cdgh} - 2(4!) H^2_{[abcd]} \nabla^e H^{fag} \nabla_e H_f{}^{bh} \mathcal{R}_S^{cd}_{gh} \\
 & + 8 \nabla_e H^{kcd} \nabla^e H_{fcd} H_{abk} \nabla^2 H^{abf} - 8 \nabla_e H_{kcd} H^{fcd} \nabla^e H_{abk} \nabla^2 H^{abf} \\
 & + 19 \text{ more } H^2 (\nabla H)^2 \mathcal{R}\text{-terms}
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_{abcd} = R_{abcd} - (\nabla H)_{abcd} + \frac{1}{2} H^2_{a[cd]b}$$

with $(\nabla H)_{abcd} = \nabla_{[a} H_{b]cd}$ and $H^2_{abcd} = H_{abe} H^e{}_{cd}$.

T-duality cannot be made manifest

The $O(d, d)$ violating terms cancel only up to total derivatives and terms proportional to the **lowest order e.o.m.**. The latter can be removed by **field redefinitions**.

Interesting question: Can we find a choice of Lagrangian in 10d so that **no field redefinitions** are needed to achieve $O(d, d)$ upon dimensional reduction?

The answer turns out to be **no**. One can prove that some required field redefinitions **cannot be lifted to 10d**. [\[Work in progress\]](#)

This gives a clear explanation why approaches like Gen. Geometry/DFT/ExFT fail to capture this correction.

[\[Hronek, Wulff '20\]](#)

Conclusions and outlook

- ▶ Cancellation of $O(d, d)$ violating terms quadratic in the KK vectors can be used to find α' -corrections to string eff. actions
- ▶ Leads to simpler expressions than previously available in the literature [Liu, Minasian '19; Garousi '20; Gholian, Garousi '23]
- ▶ $O(d, d)$ symmetry appears only after field redefinitions which cannot be lifted to 10d \rightarrow Extended symmetry approaches fail at this order (in 10d)
- ▶ The structure of the corrections remains to be better understood
- ▶ At α'^3 it remains to complete the correction with terms of the form $H^4\mathcal{R}^2$, $H^6\mathcal{R}$ and H^8 (and RR fields)