

# Supergravity, Non-Geometric Fluxes and Double Field Theory

Eric Bergshoeff

Groningen University

based on work with Fabio Riccioni and Tomas Ortín

Indian Strings Meeting ISMM 2014

Puri, December 16 2014

# The Problem

supergravity is not complete!

## The 'good' sector

- there is no problem with the supergravity fields that describe physical degrees of freedom
- for instance, in each dimension  $D \leq 11$  maximal supergravity describes  $128 + 128$  degrees of freedom

## The 'problematic' sector

- D-dimensional maximal supergravity also contains (D-1)-form and D-form potentials that are not controlled by the representation theory of the supersymmetry algebra and that are not related to each other via dimensional reduction. These potentials couple to domain walls and space-filling branes
- Note: (D-1)-form potentials  $\Leftrightarrow$  gauged supergravities

# Outline

## An Update on Branes

# Outline

An Update on Branes

Brane Classification  $\rightarrow$  Exotic Branes  $\Leftrightarrow$  Non-Geometric Fluxes

# Outline

An Update on Branes

Brane Classification  $\rightarrow$  Exotic Branes  $\Leftrightarrow$  Non-Geometric Fluxes

The relation with Double Field Theory

# Outline

An Update on Branes

Brane Classification  $\rightarrow$  Exotic Branes  $\Leftrightarrow$  Non-Geometric Fluxes

The relation with Double Field Theory

Summary and Open Issues



# Outline

## An Update on Branes

Brane Classification  $\rightarrow$  Exotic Branes  $\Leftrightarrow$  Non-Geometric Fluxes

The relation with Double Field Theory

Summary and Open Issues

# Branes

The NS-NS 2-form  $B_2$  suggests a **half-supersymmetric string**

Similarly, the 3-form  $C_3$  of 11D sugra couples to a **half-susy M2-brane**

**Branes** are extended objects with a number of **worldvolume** and **transverse** directions. They are an essential part of (non-perturbative) string theory

*sugra potential ↔ half-supersymmetric brane*

Does it always work as simple as that?

## Strings and T-duality

In  $D < 10$  we have a singlet NS-NS 2-form  $B_2$  as well as 1-forms  $B_{1,A}$  ( $A = 1, \dots, 2d$ ) that transform as a vector under the T-duality group  $SO(d,d)$  with  $d = 10 - D$

To construct a gauge-invariant WZ term

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{WZ}}(D < 10) = B_2 + \eta^{AB} \mathcal{F}_{1,A} B_{1,B}$$

we need to introduce “extra scalars”  $b_{0,A}$  via  $\mathcal{F}_{1,A} = db_{0,A} + B_{1,A}$

# Counting the Bosonic Worldvolume D.O.F.

$$D = 10 : \quad (10 - 2) = 8,$$

$$D < 10 : \quad (D - 2) + 2(10 - D) \neq 8!$$

Twice too many 'extra scalars'  $b_{0,A} \rightarrow$  'doubled geometry'

Hull, Reid-Edwards (2006-2008)

Self-duality conditions on the extra scalars  $b_{0,A}$  give correct counting

## ‘Wess-Zumino term requirement’

the construction of a **gauge-invariant WZ term** may require, besides the embedding coordinates, the introduction of a number of **extra** worldvolume  $p$ -form potentials

**worldvolume supersymmetry** requires that these worldvolume fields fit into a **multiplet with 16 supercharges**

Does the ‘WZ term requirement’ always lead to the rule that

**potential  $\Leftrightarrow$  half-susy brane?**

## 'New' supergravity development

- The T-duality representations of all high-rank form potentials have been determined using three different techniques:

- closure** of the supersymmetry algebra

de Roo, Hartong, Howe, Kerstan, Ortín, Riccioni + E.B. (2005-2010)

- using the very extended Kac-Moody algebra  $E_{11}$

Riccioni, West (2007); Nutma + E.B. (2007)

a similar analysis can be done for  $E_{10}$ , see e.g. Nicolai, Fischbacher (2002)

- using the **embedding tensor** technique

for a review, see de Wit, Nicolai, Samtleben (2008)

# Outline

An Update on Branes

**Brane Classification  $\rightarrow$  Exotic Branes  $\Leftrightarrow$  Non-Geometric Fluxes**

The relation with Double Field Theory

Summary and Open Issues

## Question

*given a  $(p + 1)$ -form potential which components of its  
 $T$ -duality repres. couple to a **half-supersymmetric brane**?*



## A scaling symmetry

All potentials transform as a representation of the **T-duality** group  $O(d,d;\mathbb{Z})$  and scale under a  $\mathbb{R}^+$  scaling symmetry

The **scaling weight**  $\alpha$  determines the dependence of the brane tension  $T$  on the string coupling constant  $g_s$  via

$$T \sim (g_s)^\alpha$$

This scaling weight is invariant under **dimensional reduction**

## A universal pattern arises

$\alpha$	potentials	branes
$\alpha = 0$	$B_{1,A}, B_2$	fundamental
$\alpha = -1$	$C_{2n+1,a}, C_{2n,\dot{a}}$	Dirichlet
$\alpha = -2$	$D_{D-4}, D_{D-3,A}, D_{D-2,A_1A_2}, D_{D-1,A_1\cdots A_3}, D_{D,A_1\cdots A_4}$	solitonic
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$

$A$  ( $a, \dot{a}$ ) are vector (spinor)-indices of T-duality

10D:  $\alpha = 0, -1, -2, -3, -4$  universal behaviour for  $-4 < \alpha \leq 0$

# Outcome Wess-Zumino Term Requirement

Riccioni + E.B. (2010)

There is a simple **group-theoretical characterization** of which components of the T-duality representation couple to a **half-supersymmetric brane**

- the (group-theoretical) details can be found in our papers

for an alternative  **$E_{11}$  derivation**, see Kleinschmidt (2011)

- Comparing branes in different dimensions an interesting patterns arises ...

# ‘Wrapping Rules’

the wrapping rules of ‘standard geometry’

$$\text{any brane} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \text{wrapped} & \rightarrow \text{undoubled} \\ \text{unwrapped} & \rightarrow \text{undoubled} \end{array} \right.$$

only works for D-branes !

# Counting D-branes

Dp-brane	IIA/IIB	9	8	7	6	5	4	3
0	1/0	1	2	4	8	16	32	64
1	0/1	1	2	4	8	<b>16</b>	<b>32</b>	64
2	1/0	1	2	4	8	<b>16</b>	32	64
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	
8	1/0	1						
9	0/1							

spinors  $(Dp)_{\alpha}$ ,  $\alpha = 1 \dots 2^{9-D}$

# Fundamental Branes

the wrapping rules of **fundamental branes** are given by

$$T_F \sim 1 : \quad \begin{cases} \text{wrapped} & \rightarrow \text{doubled} \\ \text{unwrapped} & \rightarrow \text{undoubled} \end{cases}$$

the extra input comes from **pp-waves**

Two points of view:

**'new objects'** (pp-waves) or **'string geometry'** (doubled geometry)

# Counting Fundamental Branes

Fp-brane	IIA/IIB	9	8	7	6	5	4	3
0		2	4	6	8	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>	14
1	I/II	1	1	1	1	<b>1</b>	1	1

$(F0)_A$  and  $F1$

$$A = 1, \dots, 2(10 - D)$$

## Solitonic Branes with $T \geq 3$

the wrapping rules of **solitonic branes** are given by

$$T_S \sim (g_s)^{-2} : \quad \begin{cases} \text{wrapped} & \rightarrow \text{undoubled} \\ \text{unwrapped} & \rightarrow \text{doubled} \end{cases}$$

For instance, in **9D** we have **two** solitonic 5-branes coming from an un-wrapped NS5-brane and a **KK monopole**

$$\text{10D KK monopole:} \quad \begin{cases} 5 + 1 \text{ worldvolume directions} \\ \text{1 isometry direction} \\ 3 \text{ transverse directions} \end{cases}$$



Counting Solitonic Branes with  $T \geq 3$ 

$Sp$ -brane	IIA/IIB	9	8	7	6	5	4	3
0						<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	
1					1	<b>10</b>		
2				1	8			
3			1	6				
4		1	4					
5	<b>1/1</b>	2						

$S(D-5)$ -brane and  $S(D-4)$ -brane<sub>A</sub>

Solitonic Branes with  $T \leq 2$ 

$Sp$ -brane	IIA/IIB	9	8	7	6	5	4	3
0						1	12	84
1					1	10	60	280
2				1	8	40	160	560
3			1	6	24	80	240	
4		1	4	12	32	80		
5	1/1	2	4	8	16			

The red numbers follow from imposing the **Wess-Zumino term requirement**

## Solitonic Branes with $T \leq 2$

$Sp$ -brane	IIA/IIB	9	8	7	6	5	4	3
0						1	12	84
1					1	10	60	280
2				1	8	40	160	560
3			1	6	24	80	240	
4		1	4	12	32	80		
5	1/1	2	4	8	16			

Precisely the same numbers are reproduced by the **solitonic wrapping rule**!

## Question

*what is the 10D origin of the solitonic branes with  $T \leq 2$ ?*

needed for T-duality!

# Exotic Branes

- T-duality can be recovered by assuming that supergravity can be extended with a set of **mixed-symmetry potentials** with an underlying  **$E_{11}$ -symmetry** structure
- These mixed symmetry potentials couple to extended objects called '**generalized monopoles**' or '**exotic branes**'. These extended objects have worldvolume, transverse and **special isometry** directions

see, e.g., Lozano-Tellechea, Ortín (2001)

see also work by de Boer and Shigemori (2010, 2012)

## The general picture

The branes with fixed  $\alpha = 0, -1, -2, -3, -4$  satisfy specific wrapping rules

$$T \sim (g_s)^{-3} : \quad \begin{cases} \text{wrapped} & \rightarrow \text{doubled} \\ \text{unwrapped} & \rightarrow \text{doubled} \end{cases}$$

$$T \sim (g_s)^{-4} : \quad \begin{cases} \text{wrapped} & \rightarrow \text{doubled} \end{cases}$$

The branes with  $\alpha < -4$  do not have a higher-dimensional brane origin. They belong to 'non-geometric' orbits

# A Relation

exotic branes  $\Leftrightarrow$  non-geometric fluxes

## An Example: 7D Solitonic Gaugings

The 7D solitonic 6-form potentials  $D_{6,ABC}$  ( $A = 1, \dots, 6$ ) transform as **20** under  $SO(3, 3)$ . These **6-forms** are dual to **constant fluxes**  $\theta_{ABC}$

10D potential	10D brane	7D 6-form potential	flux
$B_6$	NS5 ( $5_2$ )	1	$H_{abc}$
$h_{7,1}$	KK5 ( $5_2^1$ )	9	$f^a{}_{bc}$
$B_{8,2}$	$5_2^2$	9	$Q^{ab}{}_c$
$D_{9,3}$	$5_2^3$	1	$R^{abc}$

$$a=1,2,3$$



# Outline

An Update on Branes

Brane Classification  $\rightarrow$  Exotic Branes  $\Leftrightarrow$  Non-Geometric Fluxes

**The relation with Double Field Theory**

Summary and Open Issues

## A very brief review of bosonic DFT

In DFT one extends the usual spacetime coordinates  $x^\mu$  with a set of **winding coordinates**  $\tilde{x}_\mu$  :  $X^M = (x^\mu, \tilde{x}_\mu)$

The metric  $g_{\mu\nu}$  and the NS-NS 2-form  $B_{\mu\nu}$  get combined into a **generalized metric**  $\mathcal{H}_{MN}(X)$

The relation with an action and transformation rules of supergravity can only be made after imposing the **strong constraint** which can be solved by assuming that all fields only depend on  $x^\mu$

Siegel (1993); Hohm, Hull, Zwiebach (2009 - 2014)

# Supergravity and T-duality

$D$	$\alpha = -2$ potentials	branes
10	$B_6$	solitonic
7	$B_3, B_{4,A}, D_{5,AB}, D_{6,ABC}, D_{7,ABCD}$	solitonic

To achieve **T-duality** we are forced to extend  $B_6$  as follows:

$$B_6 \Rightarrow B_6, h_{7,1}, D_{8,2}, D_{9,3}, D_{10,4}$$

$$\text{cp. to } B_2 \Rightarrow B_2, g_{1,1}$$

## Question

Why is it that DFT gets away with T-duality without introducing mixed-symmetry potentials?

## DFT does not cover all sectors!

So far we have  $\alpha = 0$  DFT (Siegel; Hohm, Hull, Zwiebach) and  $\alpha = -1$  DFT (Hohm, Kwak)

Where does  $B_6$  fits into DFT?  $\Rightarrow$  we need  $\alpha = -2$  DFT!

In SUGRA one can dualize  $B_2$  into  $B_6$  without dualizing the metric tensor  $g_{\mu\nu}$  but in DFT  $B_2$  is part of the generalized metric  $\mathcal{H}_{MN}$ !

## A DFT 4-form Potential $D_{MNPQ}$

One should look for a duality relation between the generalized metric  $\mathcal{H}_{MN}$  and  $B_6$  plus all the **solitonic mixed-symmetry potentials**

This suggests a **DFT 4-form potential**  $D_{MNPQ}$

$$M = (\mu, \mu)$$

$$D^{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_4} \rightarrow B_6$$

$$D^{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_3}_{\mu_4} \rightarrow h_{7,1}$$

$$D^{\mu_1 \mu_2}_{\mu_3 \mu_4} \rightarrow D_{8,2}$$

$$D^{\mu_1}_{\mu_2 \cdots \mu_4} \rightarrow D_{9,3}$$

$$D_{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_4} \rightarrow D_{10,4}$$

# Poincare Duality

A possible **duality relation** between  $\mathcal{H}_{MN}$  and  $D_{MNPQ}$  is given by

$$\partial^M D_{MNPQ} = \mathcal{H}_{M[N} (\partial_P \mathcal{H}_{Q]}^M)$$

# Outline

An Update on Branes

Brane Classification  $\rightarrow$  Exotic Branes  $\Leftrightarrow$  Non-Geometric Fluxes

The relation with Double Field Theory

Summary and Open Issues



# Summary

- In this talk I reviewed the classification of the branes of maximal supergravity and showed how, for the solitonic sector, this suggests the introduction of **exotic branes**  $\Leftrightarrow$  **non-geometric fluxes**
- Next, I discussed the relation between **exotic branes/non-geometric fluxes** and **double field theory** and speculated on the introduction, within DFT, of a **4-form potential**  $D_{MNPQ}$

# Open Issue

*Is there a 'complete' description of supergravity?*

## Take-Home Message

We need to understand **mixed-symmetry potentials** better !

See, e.g., Bunster, Henneaux (2013)